

**Baptism, INFANT, NOT AN APOSTOLIC INSTITUTION.**—Originally baptism was administered to adults; nor is the general spread of infant baptism at a later period any proof to the contrary; for even after infant baptism had been set forth as an apostolic institution, its introduction into the general practice of the church was but slow. Had it rested on apostolic authority, there would have been a difficulty in explaining its late approval, and that even in the third century it was opposed by at least one eminent Father of the church. Paul's language, in 1 Cor. 7: 14, is also against its apostolic origin, where he aims at proving that a Christian woman need not fear living in wedlock with a heathen, since the unbeliever would be sanctified by the believing wife; as a proof of this he adds, otherwise the children of Christians would be unclean, but now are they holy, therefore, the children of Christian parents are called holy, on account of the influence of Christian fellowship. Had infant baptism been practised at that time, the argument would have had no force; for they would have been holy by means of their baptism. Infant baptism, therefore, cannot be regarded as an apostolic institution.—"*Lectures on the History of Christian Dogmas,*" Neander, Vol. I, pp. 229, 230. London: George Bell & Sons, 1882.

Whereas, in the early ages, adult baptism was the rule, and infant baptism the exception, in later times infant baptism is the rule, and adult baptism the exception.

What is the justification of this almost universal departure from the primitive usage? There may have been many reasons, some bad, some good. One, no doubt, was the superstitious feeling already mentioned which regarded baptism as a charm, indispensable to salvation, and which insisted on imparting it to every human being who could be touched with water, however unconscious.—"*Christian Institutions,*" Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, Dean of Westminster, chap. 1. par. 3, p. 22. London: John Murray, 1881.

**Baptism.**— See Justification, 278.

**Baptist Missionary Society.**— See Two Witnesses, 575.

**Bavarians.**— See Rome, Its Barbarian Invaders, 442.

**Belisarius.**— See Papal Supremacy, 359, 360, 361; Rome, Its Barbarian Invaders, 445, 447-449, 457; Ten Kingdoms, 555.

**Belshazzar.**— See Babylon, 54-58.

**Bible, THE WRITERS OF ITS SIXTY-SIX BOOKS.**—The authorship of this book is wonderful. Here are words written by kings, by emperors, by princes, by poets, by sages, by philosophers, by fishermen, by statesmen; by men learned in the wisdom of Egypt, educated in the schools of Babylon, trained up at the feet of rabbis in Jerusalem. It was written by men in exile, in the desert, in shepherds' tents, in "green pastures" and beside "still waters." Among its authors we find the tax-gatherer, the herdsman, the gatherer of sycamore fruit; we find poor men, rich men, statesmen, preachers, exiles, captains, legislators, judges; men of every grade and class are represented in this wonderful volume, which is in reality a library, filled with history, genealogy, ethnology, law, ethics, prophecy, poetry, eloquence, medicine, sanitary science, political economy, and perfect rules for the conduct of personal and social life. It contains all kinds of writing; but what a jumble it would be if sixty-six books were written in this way by ordinary men! —"*Will the Old Book Stand?*" H. L. Hastings, p. 19. Boston: H. L. Hastings & Sons, 1916.

**Bible, ABOUT FORTY PENMEN USED IN ITS WRITING.**—Altogether about forty persons, in all stations of life, were engaged in the writing of these oracles, the work of which was spread over a period of about 1,600 years, viz., from about 1500 B. C., when Moses commenced to write the Pentateuch amid the thunders of Sinai, to about A. D. 97, when the apostle John, himself a son of thunder (Mark 3: 17), wrote his Gospel in Asia Minor.—"*All About the Bible,*" Sidney Collett, pp. 11, 12, 9th edition. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.

#### Bible, ITS AUTHORSHIP.—

Hast thou ever heard  
Of such a book? The Author, God himself;  
The subject, God and man, salvation, life  
And death—eternal life, eternal death—  
Dread words! whose meaning has no end, no bounds.  
Most wondrous Book! bright candle of the Lord!  
Star of eternity! the only star  
By which the bark of man could navigate  
The sea of life, and gain the coast of bliss  
Securely! only star which rose on time,  
And on its dark and troubled billows, still,  
As generation, drifting swiftly by,  
Succeeded generation, threw a ray  
Of heaven's own light, and to the hills of God,  
The eternal hills, pointed the sinner's eye.  
By prophets, seers, and priests, and sacred bards,  
Evangelists, apostles, men inspired,  
And by the Holy Ghost anointed, set  
Apart, and consecrated to declare  
To earth the counsels of the Eternal One  
This Book, this holiest, this sublimest Book,  
Was sent. Heaven's will, heaven's code of laws entire,  
To man, this Book contained; defined the bounds  
Of vice and virtue, and of life and death;  
And what was shadow, what was substance taught.

This Book, this holy Book, on every line  
Marked with the seal of high divinity,  
On every leaf bedewed with drops of love  
Divine, and with the eternal heraldry  
And signature of God Almighty stamped  
From first to last, this ray of sacred light,  
This lamp, from off the everlasting throne,  
Mercy took down, and, in the night of time  
Stood, casting on the dark her gracious bow;  
And evermore beseeching men, with tears  
And earnest sighs, to read, believe, and live.

—"*The Course of Time,*" Robert Pollok, book 2, pars. 17, 19.

**Bible, THE PENTATEUCH WRITTEN BY MOSES.**—The unanimous tradition of the Jews ascribes the Pentateuch to Moses, and among Christians the Mosaic authorship was not called into question until a comparatively recent period. The evidence of the genuineness of the Pentateuch rests on direct testimony. If it had perished, most of its ordinances could have been gathered from the later books of the Bible; and the chain of evidence is completed by the testimony of Christ and his apostles, who without hesitation ascribe the composition of the Pentateuch to Moses.—"*The Bible and Its Transmission,*" Walter Arthur Copinger, p. 10. London: Henry Sotheran & Co., 1897.

**Bible, ITS INSPIRATION AND AUTHENTICITY.**—On what ground do we believe that the Bible is inspired? Some will give the ready answer. "We believe that the Bible is inspired because the church says so." . . . Others there are who, when asked why they believe the Bible to be inspired, would reply, "It is because we have found it to be so practically; by reading it we found our way to God; by searching it the will of God has become clearer to us; by living according to its precepts we have proved that they are divine; and now its words move us as no other words do: other books delight us, instruct us, thrill us, but this book is a prophetic voice discoursing about eternity and the unseen in the same breath that it speaks with a demonstrable truthfulness concerning the temporal and the seen." . . . The people who answer in this way certainly seem to render a more solid reason than those who found their assertion about inspiration upon the tradition of an authoritative church.—"*Inspiration and the Bible*," Robert F. Horton, M. A., pp. 2, 4, 5. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1891.

There are, it is well known, many theories of inspiration. But whatever view or theory of inspiration men may hold, plenary, verbal, dynamical, mechanical, superintendent, or governmental, they refer either to the inspiration of the men who wrote, or to the inspiration of what is written. In one word, they imply throughout the work of God the Holy Ghost, and are bound up with the concomitant ideas of authority, veracity, reliability, and truth divine.—Canon Dyson Hague, M. A., in "*The Fundamentals*," Vol. I, p. 105. Chicago: Testimony Publishing Company.

The present Hebrew text is admitted by the most able scholars of the day to be substantially accurate, the great majority of the errors discovered being of a trivial description, such as the misspelling or transposing of words, the omission of insignificant particles or their insertion, and errors of the like description. The variations of the MSS. of the New Testament are very much more numerous than those which have been discovered in the Old, and yet we have the authority of two of the greatest textual critics of the New Testament (Drs. Westcott and Hort) for saying that the New Testament variations of any importance, if all put together, would not exceed one thousandth part of the whole text.—"*The Bible and Its Transmission*," Walter Arthur Copinger, pp. 4, 5. London: Henry Sotheran & Co., 1897.\*

Inspiration is not affected by minor differences in various narratives. While God used men as media of communication, they were not mere machines, but were left to use their faculties in individual freedom. Hence arose peculiarities, not only of style, but of treatment, according as the same utterances or occurrences might impress each observer or narrator. But this, instead of impairing, rather increases the trustworthiness of the record, as it proves that there could have been no prior agreement or conspiracy among the various writers.

Most so-called discrepancies or disagreements disappear when the various records are regarded as partial, rather than complete, as each of the four Gospel narratives may present some feature not found in the rest, but capable of being combined with the others in one full statement. For example, the complete inscription over the cross was, "This is Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews." Of this inscription of ten words, Matthew records eight, Mark five, Luke seven, and John eight, and not the same in any two cases; but the full inscription includes all the words found in any record. There is, therefore, no antagonism or contradiction.—"*Knowing the Scriptures*," Arthur T. Pierson, D. D., p. 18. New York: Gospel Publishing House, 1910.

The revelations of prophecy are facts which exhibit the divine omniscience. So long as Babylon is in heaps; so long as Nineveh lies empty, void, and waste; so long as Egypt is the basest of kingdoms; so long as Tyre is a place for the spreading of nets in the midst of the sea; so long as Israel is scattered among all nations; so long as Jerusalem is trodden underfoot of the Gentiles; so long as the great empires of the world march on in their predicted course,—so long we have proof that one Omniscient Mind dictated the predictions of that book, and "prophecy came not in old time by the will of man."—"Will the Old Book Stand?" H. L. Hastings, p. 19. Boston: H. L. Hastings & Sons, 1916.

Respecting the particular manner of divine inspiration, there are two opinions extant:

1. That the Spirit of God inspired the thoughts; but that the writers were left to express themselves in their own words and phrases, but they were so guided that they were kept from theological errors.

2. That every word was suggested to them by the Spirit of God, and that the writers did nothing but write. This is verbal inspiration. . . . Both views secure the Scriptures from all error.—"*Theological Compend*," Rev. Amos Binney, pp. 21, 22. New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1902.

**Bible, HISTORY IN, DIFFERS FROM OTHER HISTORIES.**—Niebuhr says that the Old Testament history is the only exception to ancient history, in that it is free from what he calls all "national patriotic falsehood." . . . In other histories we see the great tendency to hero worship. The historian has some favorite character. He wants to show what a grand man that was. The Bible never wants to show what a grand man anybody was. There is no hero worship in the Bible.—"*The Divine Unity of Scripture*," Rev. Adolph Saphir, D. D., pp. 213, 214. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1909.

**Bible, CREDIBILITY OF.**—The main facts of the history they [books of the Pentateuch] contain have received strong confirmation from Egyptian and Eastern research.—"*The Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture*," William E. Gladstone, pp. 14, 15. London: Wm. Isbister, 1890.

It is of no use to say that Christ, as exhibited in the Gospels, is not historical—who among his disciples or among their proselytes was capable of inventing the sayings ascribed to Jesus, or of imagining the life and character revealed in the Gospels? Certainly not the fishermen of Galilee, as certainly not St. Paul.—"*Essays*," John Stuart Mill, p. 233; quoted in "*The Bible: Its Origin and Nature*," Marcus Dods, D. D., p. 208. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.

**Bible, CREDIBILITY OF: ARCHEOLOGICAL AND GEOGRAPHICAL CONFIRMATIONS.**—This is the century of romance,—romance in exploration, in discovery, in invention, in thought, and in life. . . . Through a series of marvelous discoveries and romantic events we have been let into the secrets of wonderful centuries of hitherto unknown peoples and events. . . . Now through the co-operation of explorer, archeologist, and linguist, we are the heirs of what was formerly regarded as prehistoric times. . . . These marvelous revelations from the archives of the nations of the past have painted for us a new background, in fact, our first background, of the Old Testament.—"*The Monuments and the Old Testament*," Ira Maurice Price, Ph. D., pp. 17, 18, 5th edition. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1907.

Almost every year ancient records are brought to light which confirm some statement of the Old Testament which the scholars supposed to be a mistake. One of the most familiar is that with reference to the location of Ur of the Chaldees. Scholars knew of only one Ur, and it was at Oorfah, six hundred miles away from Chaldea. So they said the Bible must be mistaken. But Lenormant and Smith have identified Mughier as the site of the home of Terah and Abraham. The scholars were wrong because they did not have the facts in hand. When the facts came to light, the Scriptures proved to be exactly correct. The more light men bring to bear upon the Old Testament, the more certain becomes the accuracy of its historic statements.—“*Scientific Faith*,” *Howard Agnew Johnston*, pp. 117, 118. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910.

**Bible, ST. BASIL (329-379) ON.**—Without doubt it is a most manifest fall from faith, and a most certain sign of pride, to introduce anything that is not written in the Scriptures, our blessed Saviour having said, “My sheep hear my voice, and the voice of strangers they will not hear;” and to detract from Scripture, or to add anything to the faith that is not there, is most manifestly forbidden by the apostle, saying, “If it be but a man’s testament, no man addeth thereto.”—“*De Fide*,” *Garnier’s edition*, Vol. II, p. 313; quoted in “*The Infallibility of the Church*,” *George Salmon*, D. D., pp. 143, 144. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1914.

**Bible, ST. JEROME (340-420) ON.**—As we accept those things that are written, so we reject those things that are not written.—*On Matt. 23:35*; quoted in “*The Infallibility of the Church*,” *George Salmon*, D. D., p. 147. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1914.

**Bible, POPE PIUS VI (1778-1799) ON.**—At a time when a great number of bad books . . . are circulated among the unlearned, . . . you judge exceedingly well that the faithful should be excited to the reading of the Bible; for this is the most abundant source which ought to be left open to every one to draw from it purity of morals and doctrine. . . . This you have seasonably effected . . . by publishing the Bible in the language of your country [viz., Italian] suitable to every one’s capacity.—Quoted in “*The Catholic Church and the Bible*” (pamphlet), p. 1. Brooklyn: International Catholic Truth Society.

**Bible, POPE PIUS VII ON BIBLE SOCIETIES, 1816.**—We have been truly shocked at this most crafty device, by which the very foundations of religion are undermined: and having, because of the great importance of the subject, convened for consultation our venerable brethren, the cardinals of the holy Roman Church, we have, with the utmost care and attention, deliberated upon the measures proper to be adopted by our Pontifical authority, in order to remedy and abolish this pestilence as far as possible.—*Bull Against Bible Societies, issued from Rome, June 29, 1816, by Pope Pius VII to the Archbishop of Gnezn, Primate of Poland*; cited in “*A Dissertation on the Seals and Trumpets of the Apocalypse*,” *William Cuninghame*, Preface, p. xiii, 4th edition. London: Thomas Cadell, 1843.

**Bible, POPE LEO XIII (1898) PROCLAIMS INDULGENCE FOR READING.**—His Holiness Leo XIII, at an audience on Dec. 13, 1898, with the undersigned Prefect of the Congregation of Indulgences and Relics, made known that he grants to all the faithful who shall have devoutly read

the Scriptures for at least a quarter of an hour, an indulgence of three hundred days, to be gained once a day, provided that the edition of the Gospel has been approved by legitimate authority.—Quoted in “*The Catholic Church and the Bible*” (pamphlet), p. 2. Brooklyn: International Catholic Truth Society.

**Bible, CARDINAL WISEMAN ON READING OF, BY COMMON PEOPLE.**—Years of experience, and observation not superficial, have only strengthened our conviction that this course must be fearlessly pursued. We must deny to Protestantism any right to use the Bible, much more to interpret it.—“*The Catholic Doctrine on the Use of the Bible*,” *Cardinal Wiseman*, p. 11. London.

It is not too much to say, that God, who could have given us a Bible as easy to read as a child’s primer, a Bible in words of two syllables, has, on the contrary, chosen to give us a work more difficult to understand than any other perhaps in existence.—*Id.*, p. 13.

We answer, therefore, boldly, that we give not the Word of God indiscriminately to all, because God himself has not so given it. He has not made reading an essential part of man’s constitution, nor a congenital faculty, nor a term of salvation, nor a condition of Christianity. But hearing he has made such, and then has told us that “faith cometh from hearing, and hearing from the Word of God.” Rom. 10: 16, 17. He has not made paper and ink (2 John 12) the badges of his apostles’ calling, but the keys of his kingdom.—*Id.*, p. 20.

In Catholic countries, such as can read, or do read, have access to the Latin Version without restraint. . . . But though the Scriptures may be here permitted [in Great Britain, with notes] we do not urge them on our people; we do not encourage them to read them; we do not spread them to the utmost among them. Certainly not.—*Id.*, p. 26.

**Bible, CATHOLIC EDITOR ON SUBSTITUTE FOR OLD TESTAMENT.**—Bible histories drawn up by skilled theologians, and giving the substance of the Bible narrative, are just as useful for the practical effect as the original words, and have the advantage of greater conciseness in the narratives they select.—*Editorial in The Month (London), December, 1888 (Vol. LXIV, p. 485)*.

**Bible, CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA ON CIRCULATION OF, BY BIBLE SOCIETIES.**—The attitude of the church toward the Bible societies is one of unmistakable opposition. Believing herself to be the divinely appointed custodian and interpreter of Holy Writ, she cannot without turning traitor to herself, approve the distribution of Scripture “without note or comment.” The fundamental fallacy of private interpretation of the Scriptures is presupposed by the Bible societies. It is the impelling motive of their work. But it would be likewise the violation of one of the first principles of the Catholic faith—a principle arrived at through observation as well as by revelation—the insufficiency of the Scriptures alone to convey to the general reader a sure knowledge of faith and morals. Consequently, the Council of Trent, in its fourth session, after expressly condemning all interpretations of the sacred text which contradict the past and present interpretation of the church, orders all Catholic publishers to see to it that their editions of the Bible have the approval of the bishop.

Besides this and other regulations concerning Bible reading in general, we have several acts of the Popes directed explicitly against the Bible societies. Perhaps the most notable of these are contained in the Encyclical *Ubi Primum* of Leo XII, dated 5 May, 1824, and Pius IX's Encyclical *Qui Pluribus*, of 9 November, 1846. Pius VIII in 1829 and Gregory XVI in 1844, spoke to similar effect. It may be well to give the most striking words on the subject from Leo XII and Pius IX. To quote the former (*loc. cit.*):

"You are aware, venerable brothers, that a certain Bible society is impudently spreading throughout the world, which, despising the traditions of the holy Fathers and the decree of the Council of Trent, is endeavoring to translate, or rather to pervert the Scriptures into the vernacular of all nations. . . . It is to be feared that by false interpretation, the gospel of Christ will become the gospel of men, or still worse, the gospel of the devil."

The Pope then urges the bishops to admonish their flocks that owing to human temerity, more harm than good may come from indiscriminate Bible reading.

Pius IX says (*loc. cit.*): "These crafty Bible societies, which renew the ancient guile of heretics, cease not to thrust their Bibles upon all men, even the unlearned,—their Bibles, which have been translated against the laws of the church, and often contain false explanations of the text. Thus, the divine traditions, the teaching of the Fathers, and the authority of the Catholic Church are rejected, and every one in his own way interprets the words of the Lord, and distorts their meaning, thereby falling into miserable errors."—*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. III, art. "Bible Societies," p. 545.

**Bible, GREEK CHURCH ON.**—III. Everything necessary to salvation is stated in the Holy Scriptures with such clearness, that every one, reading it with a sincere desire to be enlightened, can understand it.—*Russia: or, Miscellaneous Observations on the Past and Present State of That Country and Its Inhabitants*, Robert Pinkerton, D. D., pp. 42, 43; chap. 3, section on "Comparison of the Differences in the Doctrines of Faith Betwixt the Eastern and Western Churches," by Philaret, Metropolitan of Moscow. London: Seely & Sons, 1833.

**Bible, THE FRENCH CONFESSION OF FAITH (A. D. 1559) ON.**—Art. V. We believe that the Word contained in these books has proceeded from God. . . . It is not lawful for men, nor even for angels, to add to it, to take away from it, or to change it. Whence it follows that no authority, whether of antiquity, or custom, or numbers, or human wisdom, or judgments, or proclamations, or edicts, or decrees, or councils, or visions, or miracles, should be opposed to these Holy Scriptures.—*The Creeds of the Evangelical Protestant Churches*, Philip Schaff, p. 362. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1877.

**Bible, THE BELGIC CONFESSION (A. D. 1561) ON.**—Art. VII. We believe that these Holy Scriptures fully contain the will of God, and that whatsoever man ought to believe unto salvation, is sufficiently taught therein.—*Id.*, pp. 387, 388.

**Bible, THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION OF FAITH (1647) ON.**—VI. The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture: unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the spirit, or traditions of men.—*Id.*, p. 603.

IX. The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself; and therefore, when there is a question about the true and full sense of any Scripture (which is not manifold, but one), it must be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly.—*Id.*, p. 605.

**Bible, THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ON.**—VI. Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.—*Id.*, p. 489.

XX. It is not lawful for the church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another.—*Id.*, p. 500.

**Bible, THE NEW HAMPSHIRE BAPTIST CONFESSION (A. D. 1833) ON.**—We believe that the Holy Bible was written by men divinely inspired, and is a perfect treasure of heavenly instruction; that it has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth without any mixture of error for its matter; that it reveals the principles by which God will judge us; and therefore is, and shall remain to the end of the world, the true center of Christian union, and the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds, and opinions should be tried.

[This confession was drawn up by the Rev. John Newton Brown, D. D., of New Hampshire (b. 1803, d. 1868), about 1833, and has been adopted by the New Hampshire Convention and widely accepted by Baptists, especially in the Northern and Western States, as a clear and concise statement of their faith, in harmony with the doctrines of older confessions, but expressed in milder form. The text is taken from the "Baptist Church Manual," published by the American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia.]—*Id.*, p. 742.

**Bible, CONFESSION OF THE FREEWILL BAPTISTS (A. D. 1834, 1868) ON THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.**—These are the Old and New Testaments; they were written by holy men, inspired by the Holy Spirit, and contain God's revealed will to man. They are a sufficient and infallible guide in religious faith and practice.

[This confession was adopted and issued by the General Conference of the Freewill Baptists of America in 1834, revised in 1848, and again in 1865, and 1868. The text is taken from the "Treatise on the Faith and Practice of the Freewill Baptists," written under the direction of the General Conference, Dover, N. H.]—*Id.*, p. 749.

**Bible, METHODIST ARTICLES OF RELIGION (1784) ON.**—V. The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. . . .

VI. The Old Testament is not contrary to the New; for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard who feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, doth not bind Christians, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity be received in any commonwealth, yet, notwithstanding, no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral.—*Id.*, p. 808.

**Bible, CONGREGATIONALISTS ON.**—Standing by the rock where the Pilgrims set foot upon these shores, upon the spot where they worshipped God, and among the graves of the early generations, we, elders and messengers of the Congregational churches of the United States in National Council assembled—like them acknowledging no rule of faith but the Word of God—do now declare our adherence to the faith and order of the apostolic and primitive churches.—*Declaration of Faith of the National Council of the Congregational Churches, held at Boston, Mass., June 14-24, 1865, par. 1; cited in "The Creeds of the Evangelical Protestant Churches," Philip Schaff, p. 734. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1877.*

**Bible, ST. CHRYSOSTOM (A. D. 347-407) ON IGNORANCE OF.**—And so ye also, if ye be willing to apply to the reading of him with a ready mind, will need no other aid. For the word of Christ is true which saith, "Seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you" (Matt. 7: 7). . . . From this it is that our countless evils have arisen—from ignorance of the Scriptures; from this it is that the plague of heresies has broken out.—*Homilies on Romans," preface; "Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers," Vol. XI, p. 335. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.*

**Bible, POPE GREGORY THE GREAT ON STUDY OF.**—What is Sacred Scripture but a kind of epistle of Almighty God to his creature? And surely, if Your Glory were resident in any other place, and were to receive letters from an earthly emperor, you would not loiter, you would not rest, you would not give sleep to your eyes, till you had learned what the earthly emperor had written.

The Emperor of heaven, the Lord of men and angels, has sent thee his epistles for thy life's behoof; and yet, glorious son, thou neglectest to read these epistles ardently. Study them, I beseech thee, and daily meditate on the words of thy Creator. Learn the heart of God in the words of God, that thou mayest sigh more ardently for the things that are eternal.—*Epistle of St. Gregory the Great to Theodorus, book 4, epistle 31: "Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers," Vol. XII, p. 156. New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1895.*

**Bible, ST. CHRYSOSTOM ON RULE OF DOCTRINE.**—"For doctrine." For thence [from the Scriptures] we shall know whether we ought to learn or to be ignorant of anything. And thence we may disprove what is false. . . .

"That the man of God may be perfect." For this is the exhortation of the Scripture given, that the man of God may be rendered perfect by it; without this therefore he cannot be perfect. Thou hast the Scriptures, he says, in place of me. If thou wouldst learn anything, thou mayest learn it from them. And if he thus wrote to Timothy, who was filled with the Spirit, how much more to us!—"Homilies on Timothy," Homily 9, on 2 Tim. 3:16, 17; "Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers," Vol. XIII, p. 510. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.

**Bible, DECLARED RULE OF FAITH IN THE "PROTEST OF THE PRINCES," AT SPIRES (1529).**—Moreover, . . . as the new edict declares that the ministers shall preach the gospel, explaining it according to the writings accepted by the Holy Christian church; we think that, for this regulation to have any value, we should first agree on what is meant by the true and holy church. Now, seeing that there is great diversity of opinion in this respect; that there is no sure doctrine but such as is

conformable to the Word of God; that the Lord forbids the teaching of any other doctrine; that each text of the Holy Scriptures ought to be explained by other and clearer texts; and that this Holy Book is in all things necessary for the Christian, easy of understanding, and calculated to scatter the darkness: we are resolved, with the grace of God, to maintain the pure and exclusive preaching of his only Word, such as it is contained in the Biblical books of the Old and New Testament, without adding anything thereto that may be contrary to it. This Word is the only truth; it is the sure rule of all doctrine and of all life, and can never fail or deceive us. He who builds on this foundation shall stand against all the powers of hell, whilst all the human vanities that are set up against it shall fall before the face of God.

For these reasons, most dear lords, uncles, cousins, and friends, we earnestly entreat you to weigh carefully our grievances and our motives. If you do not yield to our request, we PROTEST by these presents, before God, our only Creator, Preserver, Redeemer, and Saviour, and who will one day be our Judge, as well as before all men and all creatures, that we, for us and for our people, neither consent nor adhere in any manner whatsoever to the proposed decree, in anything that is contrary to God, to his Holy Word, to our right conscience, to the salvation of our souls, and to the last decree of Spire.—*"History of the Reformation," J. H. Merle D'Aubigné, D. D., book 13, chap. 6, pars. 13, 11.*

**Bible, CHILLINGWORTH'S FAMOUS STATEMENT CONCERNING.**—*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 mine own eyes that there are popes against popes, councils against councils, some Fathers against others, the same Fathers against themselves, a consent of the Fathers of one age against a consent of the Fathers of another age. . . .

There is no sufficient certainty but of Scripture only for any considering man to build upon. This, therefore, and this only, I have reason to believe: this I will profess; according to this I will live, and for this, if there be occasion, I will not only willingly, but even gladly, lose my life, though I should be sorry that Christians should take it from me. Propose me anything out of this Book, and require whether I believe it or no, and seem it never so incomprehensible to human reason. I will subscribe it with hand and heart, as knowing no demonstration can be stronger than this: God hath said so, therefore it is true.—*"The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation," William Chillingworth, M. A., p. 463. London: Bell and Daldy, 1870.*

**Bible, REFORM AND REVIVAL SYNCHRONIZE WITH ITS STUDY.**—History showed that the periods of reform and revival synchronized with the increase of attention to the Word of God.—*Sir George Smith, in London Times, March 8, 1904; quoted in "All About the Bible," Sidney Collett, p. 44. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 9th edition.*

**Bible, OLD TESTAMENT RECOGNIZED AS AUTHORITY.**—The Old Testament is not contrary to the New; for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man.—*Article VII of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England; quoted in "The Creeds of the Evangelical Protestant Churches," Philip Schaff, p. 491 (American Revision, 1801). London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1877.*

It is a very strange thing that there are not a few who, professing to believe in the Scriptures of the New Testament, regard the Old Testament with a feeling of perplexity and doubt, not to say of antipathy; and the objections which are brought forward by them against the Old Testament, I endeavored to show, were rooted in their insufficient understanding of the teaching of the New Testament.—“*The Divine Unity of Scripture*,” Rev. Adolph Saphir, D. D., pp. 160, 161. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1909.

There is a persistent attempt in some quarters to depreciate the Old Testament, with the lamentable result that it is comparatively neglected. Yet the New Testament itself unmistakably teaches the organic unity of the two Testaments, and in various ways exhibits their mutual relations.—“*Knowing the Scriptures*,” Arthur T. Pierson, D. D., p. 53. New York: Gospel Publishing House, 1910.

#### Bible, EULOGIES OF.—

*John Quincy Adams*: So great is my veneration for the Bible that the earlier my children begin to read it, the more confident will be my hope that they will prove useful citizens to their country and respectable members of society.—Quoted in “*Biblical Authenticity*,” L. L. Shearer, p. 68. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1899.

*Dr. Adam Clarke*: This Bible, or the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, are the only complete guide to everlasting blessedness: men may err, but the Scripture cannot; for it is the word of God himself, who can neither mistake, deceive, nor be deceived. 2 Tim. 3: 16, 17.

From this word all doctrines must be derived and proved; and from it every man must learn his duty to God, to his neighbor, and to himself. Isa. 8: 20.—“*Clavis Biblica*” (“*The Preacher’s Manual*”), Adam Clarke, p. 64. New York: Carlton and Lanahan, 1820.

*Samuel Taylor Coleridge*: For more than a thousand years the Bible, collectively taken has gone hand in hand with civilization, science, law, — in short, with the moral and intellectual cultivation of the species, always supporting, and often leading the way.—“*Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit*,” Letter VI, p. 100. Boston: James Munroe & Co., 1841.

*Benjamin Franklin*: Young man, my advice to you is that you cultivate an acquaintance with and firm belief in the Holy Scriptures, for this is your certain interest. I think Christ’s system of morals and religion, as he left them with us, the best the world ever saw or is likely to see.—“*The Fundamentals*,” Vol. II, p. 120. Chicago: Testimony Publishing Company.

*W. E. Gladstone*: Revelation [the Scripture] not only illuminates, but binds. Like the credentials of an earthly ambassador, it is just and necessary that the credentials of that revelation should be tested. But if it be found genuine, if we have proofs of its being genuine equal to those of which, in the ordinary concerns of life, reason acknowledges the obligatory character, then we find ourselves to be not independent beings engaged in an optional inquiry, but the servants of a Master, the pupils of a Teacher, the children of a Father.—“*The Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture*,” William E. Gladstone, pp. 293, 294. London: Wm. Isbister, 1890.

*U. S. Grant*: Hold fast to the Bible as the sheet anchor of our liberties; write its precepts in your hearts, and practice them in your lives.

To the influence of this Book we are indebted for the progress made in true civilization, and to this we must look as our guide in the future.—Quoted in “*Biblical Authenticity*,” L. L. Shearer, p. 68. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1899.

*J. R. Green, English Historian*: As a mere literary monument the English version of the Bible remains the noblest example of the English tongue, while its perpetual use made it, from the instant of its appearance, the standard of our language.—“*Short History of the English People*,” book 7, chap. 1, par. 6.

*St. Gregory*: The Bible changes the heart of him who reads, drawing him from worldly desires, to embrace the things of God.—*Mag. Moral.* 1, 20, c. 1; quoted in “*The Catholic Church and the Bible*” (pamphlet), p. 4. Brooklyn: The International Catholic Truth Society.

*Patrick Henry*: There is a Book worth all other books that were ever published.—Quoted in “*Biblical Authenticity*,” L. L. Shearer, p. 68. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1899.

*Sir John Herschel*: All human discoveries seem to be made only for the purpose of confirming more and more strongly the truths contained in the sacred Scriptures.—Quoted in “*Bible Criticism and the Average Man*,” Howard Agnew Johnston, p. 26. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1902.

*Thomas Jefferson*: I have said and always will say that the studious perusal of the Sacred Volume will make better citizens, better fathers, and better husbands.—Quoted in “*The Fundamentals*,” Vol. II, p. 120. Chicago: Testimony Publishing Company.

*Dr. Howard A. Kelley*: I believe the Bible to be God’s Word, because, as I use it day by day as spiritual food, I discover in my own life, as well as in the lives of those who likewise use it, a transformation correcting evil tendencies, purifying affections, giving pure desires, and teaching that concerning the righteousness of God which those who do not so use it can know nothing of. It is as really food for the spirit as bread is for the body.

Perhaps one of my strongest reasons for believing the Bible is that it reveals to me, as no other book in the world could do, that which appeals to me as a physician, a diagnosis of my spiritual condition. It shows me clearly what I am by nature — one lost in sin and alienated from the life that is in God. I find in it a consistent and wonderful revelation, from Genesis to Revelation, of the character of God, a God far removed from any of my natural imaginings.

It also reveals a tenderness and nearness of God in Christ which satisfies the heart’s longings, and shows me that the infinite God, Creator of the world, took our very nature upon him that he might in infinite love be one with his people to redeem them. I believe in it because it reveals a religion adapted to all classes and races, and it is intellectual suicide knowing it not to believe it.—*Id.*, Vol. I, p. 125.

*Abraham Lincoln*: In regard to the Great Book, I have only this to say: It is the best gift which God has given to man. All the good from the Saviour of the world is communicated through this Book. But for this Book we could not know right from wrong. All those things desirable to man are contained in it.—Quoted in “*Biblical Authenticity*,” L. L. Shearer, p. 71. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1899

*Dr. C. R. McAfee:* From the literary point of view the Bible stands as an English classic, indeed, as the outstanding English classic. To acknowledge ignorance of it is to confess oneself ignorant of our greatest literary possession.—“*The Greatest English Classic*,” pp. 93, 94. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1912.

*Sir Isaac Newton:* I account the Scriptures of God to be the most sublime philosophy.—Quoted in “*Biblical Authenticity*,” L. L. Shearer, p. 67. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1899.

*Daniel Webster:* If we abide by the principles taught in the Bible, our country will go on prospering and to prosper; but if we and our posterity neglect its instructions and authority, no man can tell how sudden a catastrophe may overwhelm us and bury all our glory in profound obscurity.—Quoted in “*The Fundamentals*,” Vol. II, p. 120. Chicago: Testimony Publishing Company.

If there be aught of eloquence in me, it is because I learned the Scripture at my mother's knee.—Quoted in “*The Fascination of the Book*,” Rev. E. W. Work, p. 150. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1906.

*Woodrow Wilson:* I have a very simple thing to ask of you. I ask of every man and woman in this audience that from this night on they will realize that part of the destiny of America lies in their daily perusal of this great book of revelations—that if they would see America free and pure, they will make their own spirits free and pure by this baptism of the Holy Scripture.—Address of Hon. Woodrow Wilson, Governor of New Jersey, at the Tercentenary Celebration of the Translation of the Bible into English. Denver, Colo., May 7, 1911; quoted in the *Congressional Record*, Aug. 13, 1912.

**Bible, METHODS OF STUDYING.**—No investigation of Scripture, in its various parts and separate texts, however important, must impair the sense of the supreme value of its united witness. There is not a form of evil doctrine or practice that may not claim apparent sanction and support from isolated passages; but nothing erroneous or vicious can even find countenance from the Word of God when the whole united testimony of Scripture is weighed against it. Partial examination will result in partial views of truth which are necessarily imperfect; only careful comparison will show the complete mind of God.—“*Knowing the Scriptures*,” Arthur T. Pierson, D. D., p. 214. New York: Gospel Publishing House, 1910.

**Bible, NOT TO BE STUDIED AS OTHER BOOKS.**—So there never was or will be another book that combines the human and divine elements as this Book does. When therefore we are told that it must be studied just as other books are, that is exactly what we deny. It must be studied as no other book is, because it constitutes a class by itself, and can be classed with no others.—“*The Bible and Spiritual Criticism*,” Arthur T. Pierson, D. D., p. 14. New York: The Baker and Taylor Co., 1905.

**Bible, CORRECT ATTITUDE TOWARD.**—Look not into the Bible for what God never put in it—look not there for mathematics or mechanics, for metaphysical distinctions or the abstruse sciences; but look there simply for the way of spiritual life and salvation, and you will find enough, an abundance for all your spiritual needs.—“*Origin and History of the Books of the Bible*,” Prof. C. E. Stowe, D. D., pp. 32, 33. Hartford Publishing Company, 1867.

**Bible, NOT AN ARSENAL, BUT A TEMPLE.**—I use the Scripture, not as an arsenal to be resorted to only for arms and weapons to defend this party or defeat its enemies, but as a matchless temple, where I delight to be, to contemplate the beauty, the symmetry, and the magnificence of the structure, and to increase my awe and excite my devotion to the Deity there preached and adored.—“*The Works of the Hon. Robert Boyle*” (6 vol. edition, Vol. II, p. 277), art. “*Some Considerations Touching the Style of the Holy Scriptures*,” 3d Obj., 8. London: Johnson & Others, 1772.

**Bible, CONSOLES IN TROUBLE.**—Weary human nature lays its head on the bosom of the Divine Word, or it has nowhere to lay its head. Tremblers on the verge of the dark and terrible valley, which parts the land of the living from the untried hereafter, take this hand of human tenderness, yet of godlike strength, or they totter into the gloom without prop or stay. They who look their last upon the beloved dead, listen to this voice of soothing and peace, or else death is . . . an infinite tragedy, maddening and sickening, a blackness of darkness forever.—Quoted in “*Origin and History of the Books of the Bible*,” Prof. C. E. Stowe, D. D., p. 35. Hartford Publishing Company, 1867.

**Bible, SAFETY WHERE IT IS FOUND.**—Years ago, a young infidel was traveling in the West with his uncle, a banker, and they were not a little anxious for their safety when they were forced to stop for a night in a rough wayside cabin. There were two rooms in the house; and when they retired for the night, they agreed that the young man should sit with his pistols and watch until midnight, and then awaken his uncle, who should watch until morning. Presently they peeped through the crack, and saw their host, a rough-looking old man, in his bearskin suit, reach up and take down a book—a Bible; and after reading it awhile, he knelt and began to pray; and then the young infidel began to pull off his coat and get ready for bed. The uncle said, “I thought you were going to sit up and watch.” But the young man knew there was no need of sitting up, pistol in hand, to watch all night long in a cabin that was hallowed by the Word of God and consecrated by the voice of prayer. Would a pack of cards, a rum bottle, or a copy of the “*Age of Reason*,” have thus quieted this young infidel's fears?—“*Will the Old Book Stand?*” H. L. Hastings, pp. 8-10. Boston: H. L. Hastings & Sons, 1916.

**Bible, THE READING OF IT MAKES FOR LIBERTY.**—Up to the time of the translation of the Bible into English, it was a book for long ages withheld from the perusal of the peoples of other languages and of other tongues, and not a little of the history of liberty lies in the circumstance that the moving sentences of this book were made familiar to the ears and the understanding of those peoples who have led mankind in exhibiting the forms of government and the impulses of reform which have made for freedom and for self-government among mankind. For this is a book which reveals men unto themselves, not as creatures in bondage, not as men under human authority, not as those bidden to take counsel and command of any human source. It reveals every man to himself as a distinct moral agent, responsible not to men, not even to those men whom he has put over him in authority, but responsible through his own conscience to his Lord and Maker. Whenever a man sees this vision, he stands up a free man, whatever may be the government under which he lives, if he sees beyond the circumstances of his own life.—Address of Hon. Woodrow Wilson, at the Tercentenary Celebration of the Translation of the Bible into English. Denver, Colo., May 7, 1911; quoted in *Congressional Record*, Aug. 13, 1912.

**Bible INTERPRETATION, LITERAL MEANING OF.**—Theologians are right . . . when they affirm the literal sense, or that which is derived from the knowledge of words, to be the only true one; for that mystical sense, which indeed is incorrectly called a sense, belongs altogether to the thing and not to the words. . . . In fact, there is but one and the same method of interpretation common to all books, whatever be their subject. And the same grammatical principles and precepts ought to be the common guide in the interpretation of all.—“*Biblical Repertory*,” Charles Hodge, editor, Vol. III, pp. 128, 136, article by Prof. J. A. Ernesti. New York: G. & C. Carvill, 1827.

Let the Christian reader's first object always be to find out the literal meaning of the Word of God; for this, and this alone, is the whole foundation of faith and of Christian theology. It is the very substance of Christianity. . . . Allegories are often of a doubtful nature, depending on human conjecture and opinion; for which reason Jerome and Origen, and other Fathers of the same stamp, nay, I may add, all the old Alexandrian school, should be read with the greatest caution. An excessive esteem for these has gradually introduced a most mischievous taste among later writers; who have gone such lengths as to support the most extravagant absurdities by Scriptural expressions.—*From Luther's Exposition of Deuteronomy; given in "The History of the Church of Christ," Rev. Joseph Milner, A. M., (5 vols.) Vol. V, p. 263. Boston: Samuel T. Armstrong and Crocker & Brewster, 1822.*

The words and sentences of the Bible are to be translated, interpreted, and understood according to the same code of laws and principles of interpretation by which other ancient writings are translated and understood; for when God spoke to man in his own language, he spoke as one person converses with another, in the fair, stipulated, and well-established meaning of the terms. This is essential to its character as a revelation from God; otherwise it would be no revelation, but would always require a class of inspired men to unfold and reveal its true sense to mankind.—“*The Christian System*,” Alexander Campbell, pp. 15, 16. Pittsburgh: Forrester and Campbell, 1839.

Metaphors and parables prove nothing; they only illustrate, and are never allowed to be produced in support of any doctrine. This is a maxim in theology to which all polemic divines are obliged to bow.—“*A Letter to a Preacher*” (“*The Preacher's Manual*”), Adam Clarke, p. 90. New York: Carlton and Lanahan, 1820.

**Bible, TO BE UNDERSTOOD BY ALL.**—VII. All things in Scripture are not alike plain in themselves, nor alike clear unto all; yet *those things which are necessary to be known*, believed, and observed for salvation, are so clearly propounded and opened in some place of Scripture or other, that not only the learned, but the unlearned, in a due use of the ordinary means, may attain unto a sufficient understanding of them.—*Westminster Confession of Faith, 1647, chap. 1, "Of Holy Scripture;" cited in "The Creeds of the Evangelical Protestant Churches," Philip Schaff, p. 604. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1877.*

IX. The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself; and therefore, when there is a question about the true and full sense of any Scripture (which is not manifold, but one), it must be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly.—*Id.*, p. 605.

**Bible, ITS OWN INTERPRETER.**—To know in what specific sense words and terms are employed by any writer, is to have, so far, keys to unlock his meaning. It pleases the author of Holy Scripture to provide, in the Bible itself, the helps to its understanding and interpretation. If all doors to its secret chambers are not left open, the keys are to be found; and part of the object of leaving some things obscure, instead of obvious, is to incite and invite investigation, to prompt us to patient and prayerful search. Its obscurities awaken curiosity and inquiry, and study is rewarded by finding the clew to what was before a maze of perplexity.—“*Knowing the Scriptures*,” Arthur T. Pierson, D. D., p. 106. New York: Gospel Publishing House, 1910.

**Bible, ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH CLAIMS SOLE RIGHT TO INTERPRET.**—No one, relying on his own skill, shall, in matters of faith, and of morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine, wresting the sacred Scripture to his own senses, presume to interpret the said sacred Scripture contrary to that sense which holy Mother Church, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, hath held and doth hold; or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.—“*Dogmatic Canons and Decrees*,” p. 11; *The Council of Trent, Session IV, April 8, 1546, in the "Decree Concerning the Edition and the Use of the Sacred Books."* New York: The Devin-Adair Company, 1912.

If any one has the interpretation of the Church of Rome concerning any text of Scripture, although he does not understand how the interpretation suits the text, yet he possesses the identical word of God.—*Cardinal Suusius, "De Expresso Verbo Dei," p. 623, edition 1584; quoted in "The Novelities of Romanism," Charles Hastings Collette, p. 22. London: Wm. Penny, 1860.*

**Bible, BEST UNDERSTOOD NOW.**—The apostle Paul declares in his epistle to the Romans that all these things happened for our example, and were written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world have come. Seeing, therefore, that we have the fulness of the gospel light, and that there have been manifested to us these histories, it is for us to enter into the consideration of Moses and the prophets, in the full assurance and expectation that the Holy Ghost has there treasured up for us all that is profitable and needful for our instruction and guidance, in connection with that fuller development of history and teaching which we now possess.—“*The Divine Unity of Scripture*,” Rev. Adolph Saphir, D. D., p. 200. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1909.

**Bible, ERA OF COMPOSITION.**—About the close of the first two thousand years, God called Abram out from the idolatrous surroundings of his native home (Gen. 12: 1; Joshua 24: 2, 15), changed his name to Abraham (Gen. 17: 5; Neh. 9: 7), and constituted him the head of a people (Gen. 12: 2; 15: 5), known as the Hebrews or Jews, whom he was pleased to call his own peculiar possession (Deut. 14: 2), and whom he specially fitted and prepared during many generations, that they might in due time become the depositaries of a revelation committed to writing (Rom. 3: 2), which would at once be more permanent in its nature and less liable to be either forgotten or corrupted. . . .

Accordingly, about five hundred years after the call of Abram—i. e., about 1500 B. C.—the time came to have this written revelation accomplished, which was to embody a history of the preceding 2,500



years, including an account of the creation, together with God's laws, precepts, promises, prophecies, etc.—*"All About the Bible," Sidney Collett, p. 6. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 9th edition.*

**Bible, DATES OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.**—The precise time when the several books of the New Testament were written, cannot in every case be determined certainly, but the following table will show the facts with a very close approximation to the true state of the case:

	Yrs. after Christ	A. D.		Yrs. after Christ	A. D.
Matthew	6	39	Hebrews	29	62
Mark	10	43	Acts	30	63
1 Peter	19	52	1 Timothy	30	63
1 Thessalonians	19	52	2 Timothy	30	63
2 Thessalonians	19	52	Titus	30	63
Luke	23	56	2 Peter	30	63
Galatians	23	56	James	33	66
1 Corinthians	24	57	Jude	33	66
2 Corinthians	24	57	Revelation	61	94
Romans	24	57	John	63	96
Philippians	29	62	1 John	65	98
Philemon	29	62	2 John	65	98
Colossians	29	62	3 John	65	98
Ephesians	29	62			

—*"The Revised New Testament and History of Revision," Isaac H. Hall, pp. 17, 18. San Francisco: J. Dewing & Co.\**

**Bible, ORIGINAL LANGUAGES OF.**—The Old Testament—at least, almost the whole of it—was written in Hebrew. The following three small sections, however, were written in Chaldean, viz., Jer. 10: 11; Dan. 2: 4 to 7: 28; and Ezra 4: 8 to 6: 18.—*"All About the Bible," Sidney Collett, p. 22. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 9th edition.*

**Bible, HOW THE HEBREW LANGUAGE WAS WRITTEN.**—The Hebrew language was originally written, not only entirely in consonants, without any vowels at all (thus Jehovah was simply written JHVH), but there was no spacing to divide one word from another, as if we should write the Lord's prayer thus:

RFTHRWHCRTNHVNHLLWDBTHNM, etc.<sup>1</sup>

It was not until after the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity that words were divided from one another, and the Hebrew Old Testament generally was arranged into verses and paragraphs. . . . The vowel points were introduced very much later—about A. D. 500 or 600.—*Id., p. 16.*

**Bible, QUOTATIONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE NEW.**—A considerable difference of opinion exists among some learned men, whether evangelists and other writers of the New Testament quoted the Old Testament from the Hebrew, or from the venerable Greek version, usually called the Septuagint. Others, however, are of opinion that they did not confine themselves exclusively to either; and this appears most probable. The only way by which to determine this important question, is to compare and arrange the texts actually quoted.—*"Introduction to*

<sup>1</sup> Aside from the omission of the vowels, the same might be said of the New Testament as originally written.—Eds.

*the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures," Thomas Hartwell Horne, D. D., Vol. I. p. 293. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1854.*

Westcott and Hort, in their edition of the Greek New Testament, have done a great service by indicating in capitals the quotations of sentences and phrases from the Old Testament in the New. They have traced more than fifteen hundred such in the twenty-seven New Testament books. It is both a curious and significant fact that frequently these citations are in the very center of some paragraph and are a sort of turning point of the whole argument or mark the heart of the treatment, as in Paul's great portrait of charity, in 1 Corinthians 13, where the phrase, "Thinketh no evil," from Zech. 8: 17, marks the central feature in the portrait.—*"Knowing the Scriptures," Arthur T. Pierson, D. D., pp. 54, 55. New York: Gospel Publishing House, 1910.*

**Bible, FREE ORIENTAL STYLE OF LANGUAGE.**—The Rev. James Neil, an experienced Eastern resident, in his "Strange Scenes," says, in relation to what are sometimes looked upon as coarse or immodest statements:

"No Eastern could possibly see any objection on this score. They still, as in ancient times, use the greatest plainness of speech throughout Syria. As soon as one acquires a knowledge of common Arabic the ear is assailed by a plain speaking on the most delicate subjects which is extremely embarrassing, until such time as one learns to become accustomed to it. Things that are never mentioned among us, are spoken of publicly in the East, even by ladies of the highest class, and of the greatest respectability, refinement, and purity.

"This explains at once the naturalness and innocency of the use of expressions and the mention of matters in the Bible which our translators have softened down in some instances, and public readers have tacitly, and as I believe wrongly, agreed to omit in others. The purest-minded Eastern woman would smile at an objection to the Bible on this score!"—*"All About the Bible," Sidney Collett, pp. 146, 147, 9th edition. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.*

**Bible, NO VITAL DOCTRINE RESTS ON DISPUTED READINGS.**—No fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith rests on a disputed reading. Constant references to mistakes and divergencies of reading, such as the plan of this book necessitates, might give rise to the doubt whether the substance, as well as the language, of the Bible is not open to question. It cannot be too strongly asserted that in substance the text of the Bible is certain.—*"Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts," Fred-eric G. Kenyon, M. A., Litt. D., p. 10. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1903.*

The Bible is a book which has been refuted, demolished, overthrown, and exploded more times than any other book you ever heard of. . . . They overthrew the Bible a century ago, in Voltaire's time—entirely demolished the whole thing. In less than a hundred years, said Voltaire, Christianity will have been swept from existence, and will have passed into history. . . . But the Word of God "liveth and abideth forever."—*"Will the Old Book Stand?" H. L. Hastings, p. 5. Boston: H. L. Hastings & Sons, 1916.*

**Bible, UNITY OF.**—The Bible is characterized by the unity of its theme. It unfolds a series of acts, all contributing to one design or end. This is the more remarkable on account of the variety in its authorship.

Had the Bible been written in one age, or by one person, its unity might not so much surprise us. But the Bible is a collection of books which were written by different persons, in different languages, in different lands, and at different times. Seventeen centuries were employed in its composition. The subjects it embraces are so numerous as to give it a cyclopedic character. Yet from first to last that marvelous collection of books is occupied with one subject, animated by one Spirit, directed to one object or end.—“*Creation Centred in Christ*,” *H. Grattan Guinness, D. D., p. 84. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1896.*

On the whole, the unity of Scripture has been universally recognized. Moreover, this unity is obviously not designed and artificial; it is not even conscious; the writers of the several parts had no intention to contribute nor any idea that they were contributing to one whole. . . . And yet when these various writings are drawn together, their unity becomes apparent.—“*The Bible: Its Origin and Nature*,” *Marcus Dods, D. D., p. 18. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.*

Here is a book coming from all quarters, written by men of all classes, scattered through a period of fifteen hundred years; and yet this book is fitted together as a wondrous and harmonious whole. How was it done? “Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.” One mind inspired the whole book, one voice speaks in it all, and it is the voice of God speaking with resurrection power.—“*Will the Old Book Stand?*” *H. L. Hastings, p. 20. Boston: H. L. Hastings & Sons, 1916.*

**Bible, MULTITUDE OF MANUSCRIPTS.**—There are in existence today many thousands of Hebrew and Greek manuscripts, which have been copied from earlier manuscripts by Jewish scribes, etc., from time to time. These are the documents generally referred to when the “originals” are now spoken of. . . .

For the sake of simplicity, however, these existing manuscripts may be divided thus:

1. Hebrew manuscripts of the Old Testament; the earliest of these date back to the eighth century of the Christian era.
2. Greek manuscripts of the New Testament; the earliest of these date back to the fourth century.
3. Greek manuscripts of the Old Testament (known as the Septuagint), translated from the Hebrew about 277 B. C.; these also date back to the fourth century.
4. Early translations of the Scriptures, or parts thereof, in Syriac, Latin, German, and other languages, of various dates.—“*All About the Bible*,” *Sidney Collett, p. 14, 9th edition. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.*

**Bible, OLDEST GREEK MANUSCRIPTS.**—**N:** Codex Sinaiticus, found by Tischendorf (1844 and 1859) in the Convent of St. Catherine at the foot of Mt. Sinai, now preserved in St. Petersburg. Forty-three leaves of the Old Testament portion of the manuscript, known as the Codex Friderico-Augustanus, are in the library of Leipzig University. Besides twenty-six books of the Old Testament, of which five form the Codex Friderico-Augustanus, the manuscript contains the entire New Testament without the least break, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the first third of the Shepherd of Hermas.—*The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Vol. III, art. “Bible Text,” p. 103.*

**A:** Codex Alexandrinus, now in the British Museum, presented in 1628 by Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Constantinople, to Charles I. The

New Testament begins with Matt. 25: 6, and contains the whole except John 6: 50-8: 52, and 2 Cor. 4: 13-12: 6, with the First Epistle of Clement and part of the Second.—*Ibid.*

**B<sub>1</sub>:** Codex Vaticanus, No. 1209, in the Vatican Library. The manuscript contains, besides the Old Testament, the entire New Testament, with the exception of Heb. 9: 14 to end and 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon, and Revelation.—*Ibid.*

**B<sub>2</sub>:** Codex Vaticanus 2066 (eighth century), formerly Basilian Codex 105, contains Revelation.—*Ibid.*

**C:** Codex Ephraemi (fifth century), now No. 9 in the National Library at Paris; its text was altered in the sixth century and again in the ninth. In the twelfth century the original writing was washed off to make room for the Greek text of several ascetic works of Ephraem Syrus (d. 373). Pierre Allix, at about the close of the seventeenth century, noticed the traces of the old writing under the later characters. Wetstein in 1716 collated the New Testament part so far as it was legible. In 1834 and 1835 the librarian Carl Hase revived the original writing by the application of the Giobertine tincture (prussiate of potash). Tischendorf, after great labor, brought out in 1843 an edition of the New Testament part of the manuscript, and in 1845, of the Old Testament fragments, representing the manuscript line for line, in facsimile. The codex contains portions of the Old Testament on sixty-four leaves, and five eighths of the New Testament.—*Id., pp. 103, 104.*

**Bible, ANCIENT VERSIONS.**—The principal ancient versions which illustrate the Scriptures are the Chaldee Paraphrases, generally called **Targums**, the Septuagint, or Alexandrian Greek version, and the Vulgate, or Latin version.—“*Notes, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Genesis*,” *George Bush, Vol. I, p. ix of Introduction. New York: Mark H. Newman, 1845.*

**Targums:** The Chaldee word תרגום (*targum*) signifies in general any version or explanation; but the appellation is more particularly restricted to the versions or paraphrases of the Old Testament, executed in the East Aramean or Chaldee dialect, as it is usually called. . . . There are at present extant ten of these Chaldee paraphrases on different parts of the Old Testament, three of which, and those by far the most important, comprise the Pentateuch, viz. (1) The Targum of Onkelos; (2) That falsely ascribed to Jonathan, and usually cited as the Targum of the Pseudo-Jonathan; (3) The Jerusalem Targum.—*Id., pp. ix, x.*

**Septuagint:** The early Greek version was probably termed “the Septuagint” because it was looked upon with favor, and possibly officially recognized, by the Jewish Sanhedrin at Jerusalem, which was composed of seventy persons. In later times, when the Jews of Palestine and Egypt became estranged from one another, and when the Greek version had become interwoven with the religious life of the Egyptian Jews, an attempt was made to claim divine sanction for the Greek translation. The name “Septuagint” was then expounded as containing a reference to the number of the supposed translators, who, according to the legend, were divinely assisted in their task. Those translators are said each to have produced a translation identical in phraseology, although they had been carefully secluded and shut off from intercourse

with one another during the performance of the work.—“*Daniel and His Prophecies*,” Charles H. H. Wright, D. D., pp. 59, 60. London: Williams and Norgate, 1906.

The autograph or original copy of the Septuagint Version, was, most probably, consumed in the fire which destroyed the Alexandrian Library, in the time of Julius Cæsar, about fifty years before the Christian era; but the translation was preserved by the numerous transcripts taken for the use of the different synagogues in Egypt, Greece, and Italy, and which were sure to be copied with the utmost accuracy and care.—“*Illustrations of Biblical Literature*,” Rev. James Townley, D. D., Vol. I, p. 64. New York: Lane and Scott, 1852.

*Samaritan*: The version of the Old Testament which possesses the longest pedigree is that which owes its existence to the Samaritans. Strictly speaking, it is not a version at all, as it is in the Hebrew tongue, though written [probably in the second century B. C.] in a different character from that of the extant Hebrew MSS.—“*Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*,” Frederic G. Kenyon, M. A., Litt. D., p. 44. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1903.

*Peshitto, or Syriac*: This is the great standard version of the ancient Syriac Church, made not later than the third century (those scholars who hold it older than the Curetonian would say the second), and certainly current and in general use from the fourth century onwards. The name means “simple” or “common,” but the origin of it is unknown.—*Id.*, p. 157.

*Palestinian Syriac*: There is yet another version of the New Testament in Syriac, known to us only in fragments, in a different dialect of Syriac from all the other versions. It is believed to have been made in the fifth or sixth century, and to have been used exclusively in Palestine.—*Id.*, p. 159.

*Coptic*: [Dating probably from the middle of the third century.] The two most important of the Coptic versions are (*a*) the Memphitic or Bohairic Version, current in Lower or Northern Egypt; and (*b*) the Thebaic or Sahidic Version, current in Upper or Southern Egypt [probably neither earlier than the fourth century]. Of these the Bohairic alone is complete, having been ultimately adopted as the standard Bible for all Egypt.—*Id.*, p. 76.

*Old Latin or Italic*: The importance of the Old Latin Version, as it is called, to distinguish it from the later version of St. Jerome, is much greater in the New Testament than in the Old. In the former, it is the earliest translation of the original Greek which we possess, and is an important evidence for the state of the text in the second century. In the latter it is only a version of a version, being made from the Septuagint, not from the original Hebrew.—*Id.*, pp. 77, 78.

*Vulgate Versions*: The Latin Vulgate [was] made by St. Jerome from the older Latin, Hebrew, and Greek versions about the year 400. This version of St. Jerome, called the Vulgate, was declared by the Council of Trent [1563] to be authentic. It was revised by Pope Sixtus V (1585) and by Pope Clement VIII (1593).—“*Catholic Belief*,” Joseph Faà di Bruno, D. D. (R. C.), p. 16. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1884.

*English Versions*: About the year 1320, John Wycliffe, the great Reformer, was born. He was the first to translate the whole Bible into

the English language; this translation, which occupied about twenty-two years, was made from the Latin Vulgate; the Hebrew and Greek originals being then practically unknown.—“*All About the Bible*,” Sidney Collett, p. 32, 9th edition. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.

In 1525, William Tyndale, one of the great Protestant Reformers, and a contemporary of Luther, made another English translation from Erasmus's Greek, . . . and was the first to publish an English New Testament in print. This was done under great difficulties, partly at Cologne and partly at Worms, in exile, poverty, and distress; as he found it impossible to carry out this work in England, owing to Romish opposition.—*Id.*, pp. 33, 34.

In 1535 the whole Bible, Old Testament and New, was for the first time printed in English by Miles Coverdale, who made his translation from the German and Latin. This contained also the apocryphal books.—*Id.*, p. 35.

The first English Bible printed in England was the translation of John Hollybushe, which was issued in 1538 by John Nicholson, in Southwark. The great Cranmer Bible was printed between 1539 and 1541, the funds for its publication being supplied by Cranmer and Cromwell.—“*The Censorship of the Church of Rome*,” George Haven Putnam, Litt. D., Vol. II, p. 31. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1906.

The English New Testament was translated by the English College at Rheims, France, in 1582; and the Old Testament by the English College, Douay, France, in 1609. Both, as revised in the last century by Bishop Challoner and others, have been republished, with notes, from time to time, with the approbation of the Catholic bishops. This version is commonly called the Douay Bible.—“*Catholic Belief*,” Joseph Faà di Bruno, D. D. (R. C.), p. 16. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1884.

*Hebrew New Testament*: In 1876 Professor Delitzsch completed his translation of the New Testament into Hebrew. It had been his dream to produce such a text as the apostles themselves might have penned, had they written in the “language of Canaan.”—“*A History of the British and Foreign Bible Society*,” William Canton, Vol. III, p. 151. London: John Murray, 1910.

**Bible, MODERN VERNACULAR TRANSLATIONS.**—One of the most important phases of the work of the American Bible Society is the work of translating and revising the Scriptures, either in co-operation with other Bible societies and missionary organizations, or acting independently when necessary. This task is fundamental and of the utmost importance. It is estimated that the Scriptures are circulated today in over 500 languages. The Bible or some portion of it has, therefore, been translated into all of the great languages of the world; and it is estimated that “seven out of every ten of the human population have had provided for them the gospel story in their own tongue,” but it is probable that there are still 1,000 minor languages or dialects spoken by a limited number of people into which no portion of the Bible has yet been translated. In British India, according to the census of 1911, 147 languages are spoken, and in Africa it is said there are about 850 languages or dialects in use. Into some of the minor languages it will not be necessary to translate the Scriptures, as many tribal, unwritten dialects will gradually disappear or be combined with others. When

these facts are borne in mind, one realizes how great a task still confronts the Bible societies of the world.—“*Story of the American Bible Society*,” pp. 10-12. Published in 1914.

**Bible, COMPARED WITH SACRED BOOKS OF THE EAST.**—These sacred books are, roughly speaking, five in number, i. e., they are the only ones worth taking into consideration. All others are extremely insignificant and unimportant.

- I. The Veda of the Brahmans or Hindus.
- II. The Zend-Avesta of the Parsees or Zoroastrians.
- III. The King, or Confucian Texts, of the Chinese.
- IV. The Tripitaka, or three collections, of Buddhist writings.
- V. The Koran, the code of Islam, or Mohammedanism.

Translations of these were published some few years ago by the University of Oxford in forty stately volumes, but these are, of course, not within reach of the multitude.—“*All About the Bible*,” Sidney Collett, pp. 289, 290, 9th edition. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.

*Veda* is a Sanscrit word meaning “knowledge,” or “sacred science.” The writings consist of four collections of hymns, detached verses, and sacrificial formulæ; viz., (1) the Rigveda, or Veda, of praises or hymns, of which there are 1,028; (2) the Samaveda, or Veda of chants or tunes; (3) the Yajurveda, or Veda of prayers, of which there are only a few preserved; and (4) the Atharvaveda, or Veda of the Atharvians, consisting of about twenty books of hymns to certain divine powers, and incantations against evil powers.—*Id.*, p. 290.

*Avesta* means “text” or “lore,” and represents the original writings; *Zend* means “commentary,” and represents the comments which have grown around the original writings, just as the Brahmana commentaries grew around the original Sanhita of the Veda.

Zoroaster, the celebrated sage of ancient Persia, was the supposed founder or reformer of the religion embodied in the Zend-Avesta. He flourished, according to the Parsees (who are about the only representatives of ancient Persia) about 500 B. C. He probably, however, lived—if, indeed, he lived at all—many centuries earlier. For “not only has his date been much debated; but the very fact of his historical existence has been denied.” However, some of the oldest writings of the Zenda-Avesta are said to date some 700 or 800 B. C.—*Id.*, pp. 294, 295.

In addition to the actual writings of Confucius there are what are called the Confucian Analects, or Extracts, compiled soon after his death from the reminiscences of his disciples.

Confucianism inculcates the worship of no God, and can scarcely, therefore, be called a religion. . . . There is no confession of sin; no seeking of forgiveness; no communion with God. . . . One of his tenets, not often referred to—viz., that it was right to tell lies on certain occasions—has left its terrible mark on the four hundred millions of China.—*Id.*, pp. 297, 298.

Buddha is said to have lived about 500 or 600 B. C., was a prince of one of the ruling military tribes of India, but was of Persian origin. His personal name was Gautama, the title “Buddha” being a Sanscrit word, meaning the “Enlightened One.” He early discovered that all that life could offer was vanity and vexation of spirit; that ignorance was the cause of all suffering and misery, as it was the ultimate cause of existence itself.

He therefore separated himself from his family and friends, and gave himself up to years of lonely contemplation. At length, while sitting under a tree near Gaya Town in Bengal, he professed to attain perfect wisdom by the extinction of all desires and passions of every kind, whether good or bad. . . . First, extinction of all desires and passions; and secondly, extinction of individual existence—complete annihilation. This is the highest state it is possible for a Buddhist to reach. . . .

He himself wrote nothing. In course of time, however, his teaching . . . was, however, ultimately committed to writing by his disciples, and approved by various councils long after his death. These writings are called the “*Tripitaka*” = triple basket, or three collections.—*Id.*, pp. 298, 299.

Muhammad (the Praised One), commonly called Mohammed, the celebrated false prophet of Arabia, was born at Mecca A. D. 570. He claimed to teach his followers the doctrines of Islam, i. e., resignation or entire submission to the will of God, as a successor to Abraham, Moses, and Christ, of whom he claimed to be the greatest. . . .

At the age of forty he had his first “divine” communication. In this, and later visions at Mecca and Medina, extending over a period of twenty-three years, he received those “revelations” which are contained in the Koran, the sacred book of the Mohammedans, who believe that it has been in existence, like God, from all eternity.—*Id.*, pp. 306, 307.

**Bible, TEACHING OF, COMPARED WITH OTHER SACRED BOOKS.**—The one keynote, the one diapason, the one refrain which is found running through all those sacred books, is salvation by works. They all declare that salvation must be purchased, must be bought with a price, and that the sole price, the sole purchase-money, must be our own works and deservings.—*Sir M. Monier-Williams: quoted in “All About the Bible,” Sidney Collett, p. 313, 9th edition. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.*

**Bible.**—See Rule of Faith; Scriptures; Tradition; Two Witnesses.

**Bible Societies.**—See Bible, 74-76; Increase of Knowledge, 233; Two Witnesses, 576.

**Bishop, UNIVERSAL, VIEWS OF GREGORY I.**—Writing to the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, St. Gregory says: “This name ‘Universal’ was offered during the Council of Chalcedon to the Pontiff of the Apostolic See. . . . But no one of my predecessors ever consented to use so profane a title, plainly because if a single patriarch be called Universal, the name of patriarch is taken from the rest. . . . Wherefore presume not ever to give or receive letters with this title Universal.” (Ep. v. 43.)

To the Patriarch of Alexandria he writes again: “You are my brother in rank, my father in character, and I said that you were not to write any such thing to me or to any one else; . . . and behold, in the very heading of your letter, directed to me, the very person who forbade it, you set that haughty title, calling me Universal Bishop, which I beg Your Holiness to do no more.” (Ep. viii. 30.)

To the Patriarch of Antioch he says that this title is “profane, superstitious, haughty, and invented by the first apostate; . . . and