

Bible (Whole) BS 400

1002370

**Controversy On the Bible
By Father Lambert**

PART I



PRICE - 10 CENTS

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY

Flood Building

San Francisco

1905

AEQ 0121

Controversy On Questions of the Bible

BEING FRIENDLY TALKS WITH AN INTELLIGENT PRO-
TESTANT ON MANY POINTS OF DIFFERENCE
BETWEEN CATHOLICITY AND PROTESTANTISM

BY

REV. L. A. LAMBERT, LL.D.

Author of "Notes on Ingersoll," "Tactics of Infidels," etc.,
and Editor of the New York "Freeman's Journal."



CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY
FLOOD BUILDING SAN FRANCISCO
1905

INTRODUCTORY.

By permission of the author, Rev. L. A. Lambert, LL.D., the following controversy is republished from the editorial columns of the New York Freeman's Journal. The original title of the articles was "Versions of the Bible," the subject under discussion being the relative merits of the Catholic and Protestant Versions. As the controversy progressed, many other important questions were treated. To meet a general demand for these articles in book form, the Catholic Truth Society issues the first part of the controversy. The Society desires to acknowledge its thanks to Rev. Dr. Lambert and the Freeman's Journal for kind permission to republish.

It is deemed advisable to give a brief explanation of the more important Catholic and Protestant Versions whose merits are discussed.

The Latin Vulgate. This is the Latin Version of the Sacred Scriptures authorized by the Catholic Church. It was prepared by St. Jerome, the most celebrated Biblical scholar of his age. Westcott, a Protestant scholar, says of him that "Jerome probably alone for 1,500 years possessed the qualifications necessary for producing an original Version of the Scriptures for the use of the Latin Churches." An ancient Latin Version, known as the "Vetus Itala," was in existence from the second century. Through mistakes of transcribers it had become unsatisfactory, and Pope Damasus requested St. Jerome to undertake its revision. He began with the New Testament, which was revised with the aid of the best Greek manuscripts in existence. The revision of the Four Gospels was finished A. D. 383, and the remainder of the New Testament followed. Next he undertook the revision of the Book of Psalms, correcting the old Latin version by the best Greek texts. Then he began a new translation of the Old Testament directly from the Hebrew, at which he labored for fifteen years, from 391 to 406. The Books of Tobias and Judith were translated from the Aramaic. A few books of the Old Testament were not translated by St. Jerome, but were embodied in the Latin Vulgate as they had been preserved in the old Latin Version.

The Douay Version. The English Catholic Bible is generally known as the Douay Version. A Catholic seminary was established at Douay, in 1571, by Dr. Allen, who had

renounced his dignities at Oxford University in 1559 and betaken himself to Louvain. The priesthood in England was threatened with extinction, and Dr. Allen started the Douay seminary to supply priests for the English mission. On account of political troubles in Flanders, the seminary was moved to French territory at Rheims in 1578, where the work of translating the Bible was begun by Dr. Allen and his fellow professors. The entire Bible was finished in 1582, and the New Testament was published at Rheims in that year. "Lack of good means" and "our poor estate in banishment" delayed the publication of the Old Testament. In 1593 the seminary was moved back to Douay, where the Old Testament was published, 1609-10. The translation was made from the Latin Vulgate. It was revised in 1749 by Dr. Challoner, Vicar-Apostolic of London, who substituted modern words and constructions for the old and obsolete. Many revisions have since been made.

The Protestant Authorized Version. At a conference held at Hampton Court, in 1604, presided over by King James I of England, a new translation of the Bible was suggested, as the "versions allowed in the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI were corrupt and not answerable to the truth of the original." The King announced, in the same year, that he had chosen fifty-four scholars for the purpose. The actual list of revisers numbered forty-seven, who formed six companies. The Bishop's Bible (a revision of the Great Bible which was translated by Coverdale, an apostate monk, who "was no Greek or Hebrew scholar," and who translated from the German and Latin), was to be followed. The first revision occupied two years, and the final revision nine months. Finally, the Authorized, or King James', Bible was published in 1611. Its merits are examined in this controversy.

The Revised Version (1881-85). Constant demands were made for a revision of the Authorized Version. After long discussion the Convocation of Canterbury appointed a committee in 1870 to report upon the desirability of a revision and to co-operate with a similar committee of the Convocation of York. The latter convocation, however, declined to co-operate. The committee of Canterbury resolved in favor of revision and of the appointment of two bodies of revisers, and American scholars were invited to co-operate, and consented to act. The Revised New Testament was published in 1881, and was received with consternation. Over 36,000 departures from the King James' Version occurred in the New Testament. The Revised Old Testament was published in 1885.

Controversy On Questions of the Bible

BY REV. L. A. LAMBERT, LL.D.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHALLENGE OF THE IDEAL AMERICAN.

“One hundred dollars will be for the person who can prove that the Bible’s Roman Catholic translation is better than the translation from originals.”—Ideal American.

FATHER LAMBERT: The opportunity to pocket a hundred dollars is too rare to let this liberal offer pass by with impunity.

The proof required is the fact that there are no English translations from the original and a translation from copies of the originals is better than no translation. Any English translation claiming to be made from the originals is *ipso facto* a fraud, for the originals had ceased to exist over a thousand years before the Protestant Authorized Translation was made. And when it was made, it was from copies of the originals, copies that we owe to the caligraphic industry of the so-called “lazy monks.” All the English translations of the Bible, Catholic as well as Protestant, were made from copies or copies of copies.

The superiority, then, of the Catholic or Protestant Bible Version must consist in correctness of translation from copies in the Greek and other languages, and not that either was made from the originals.

The question then comes to this: Which is the better Translation, the Catholic or the Protestant? We hold that the Catholic is the better, and in proof of it we will confine ourselves to two or three texts, though we might point out others.

The first text is found in Matthew vi., 13. It is the conclusion of the Lord's Prayer. In the King James or Authorized Version—the one used by English-speaking Protestants for nearly 300 years—the text referred to is: "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil; for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen."

In the Catholic Bible the words, "For Thine is the kingdom, etc.," are not found, making the text read, "Lead us not into temptation. But deliver us from evil. Amen."

Now it is evident that the Protestant translators of the Authorized Version were guilty of interpolating the words, "For Thine is the kingdom, etc.," or the Catholic translators were guilty of omitting a part of the Bible; for those words belong to the Lord's Prayer or they do not. If they are a part of the Prayer as our Lord uttered it, the Protestant Version is the more correct. If they do not belong to the Prayer, the Catholic Version is the more correct.

How is it to be determined? We shall leave it to recognized Protestant scholars to determine, to the learned compilers of the Revised Version, which was published in 1885. These learned revisers omitted the words, "For Thine is the kingdom, etc.," from their Version of Matthew vi., 13, leaving the text just as it is found in the Catholic Version. They thus showed their conviction that the words, "For Thine is the kingdom, etc.," are an interpolation, and that the Catholic rendering of the verse is the correct one.

Let us take two other texts. In the King James Bible, Matthew xxvii., 5, speaking of Judas, says "And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed, and went and hanged himself." Compare this with Acts i., 18. "Now this man (Judas) purchased a field with the reward of his iniquity; and falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out."

Now, these two verses are evidently contradictory. The first says Judas hanged himself. The second says he fell headlong and was killed.

In the Catholic Version there is no such contradiction found. The text is: "And he indeed hath possessed a field of the reward of his iniquity, and, being hanged, burst asunder in the midst; and all his bowels gushed out."

Here there is no contradiction, and, therefore, we must conclude that the Catholic Translation of the texts is the better, or it was made from a more correct copy of the original.

As we are not in any grievous need of money, the *Ideal American* may send his hundred dollar check to the New York Catholic Truth Society with our compliments.

CHAPTER II.

MR. JONES OF PITTSBURG ENTERS THE CONTROVERSY.

Editor Freeman's Journal—Dear Sir: In your editorial of January 30th, headed "About Translations of the Bible," you state that the Roman Catholic translation of the Bible is better than the Protestant translation, or Authorized Version.

The omission you speak of in the Revised Version of "Thine is the Kingdom, the power," etc., is altogether in favor of the "Revised" and "American Revised," which is now the standard edition. As to the hanging of Judas, there is no contradiction whatever in the chapters and verses referred to. There is individual liberty exercised by Matthew and Luke in relating events. The occurrence is recorded all right by both, though dressed in different terms.

FATHER LAMBERT: The omission, or more correctly the rejection, from the Lord's Prayer, of the words "For Thine is the Kingdom, etc.," is certainly altogether in favor of the Revised Version as compared with the Authorized Version that has been the Protestant standard for nearly three hundred years. In admitting this you admit that the Authorized and Standard Version has for three hundred years been misleading Protestant readers by giving them as the words of God

what the Revised Version now rejects as not His words; thus recognizing the superior correctness of the Catholic Version over the King James' or Authorized Version, which we claimed. For in rejecting the words "For Thine is the Kingdom, etc.," the Revised follows the Catholic or Douay Version, as it does in most of its corrections.

It is a notable fact that the King James' Version, in improving on former translations, approached nearer to the Catholic text; and the Revised, in improving on the King James', approaches still nearer to the Catholic text. Ward, in his "Errata," points out no less than thirty texts which, in correcting the King James' Bible, follow the Catholic Version, and many other texts wherein it approaches nearer to the Catholic translation. This fact tells its own story.

You say the "American Revised" is now the "Standard Edition." By whom has it been recognized as such? We are not aware that any denomination has given it official recognition as the standard, and your calling it so commits nobody but yourself. The admittedly erroneous King's or Authorized Version, has been the Standard Version for three hundred years. It is the version which the Bible Societies sent out to the heathen. Who deposed it? The fact that it is acknowledged to be erroneous does not relegate it to "innocuous desuetude" as long as it is read from the pulpit and issued by the Bible Societies as the Word of God.

MR. JONES: "According to the original Greek text, your translation of Acts, i, 18, in the Catholic Version, is incorrect."

FATHER LAMBERT: You speak of the original Greek text as if there were any such text. You know, or ought to know, that there is no original text in existence; that all the manuscripts are copies, or copies of copies, all varying more or less in their readings, and the most of which are of comparatively modern date. All you could therefore say is that the the manuscript copy from which the printed Greek copies were made, was different from the manuscript copy used by St. Jerome when he made the Vulgate Trans-

lation. The manuscript copies of the fourth century—when St. Jerome wrote—were purer, more free from the errors, intentional and otherwise, of copyists than those of a later date. There were variant copies in his time. St. Jerome translates Acts i., 18, thus, from the Greek manuscript used by him: “Et hic quidem possedit agrum de mercede iniquitatis, et suspensus crepuit medius et diffusa sunt omnia viscera ejus,” which the Catholic Version translates thus: “And he indeed hath possessed a field of the reward of iniquity, and being hanged burst asunder in the midst and all his bowels gushed out.” The correctness of this English translation will not be disputed.

The question then comes to this: Was the manuscript copy from which St. Jerome translated more correct than the copy used by the translators of the King James' Bible? The presumption is in favor of the former for two reasons: first, it was an earlier copy and nearer the autograph originals; second, it avoids the contradiction which is found in the King James' Bible.

You tell us there is no contradiction between Matt., xxvii., 5, and Acts i, 18, as found in King James' Bible. Let the reader judge. Matthew says: “He cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed and went and hanged himself.” In the Acts of the Apostles, the account of Judas' death is this: “Now this man purchased a field with the reward of iniquity, and falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst,” etc. According to the first account Judas committed suicide by hanging. According to the second, so far as the text throws any light upon it, his death was accidental, not suicide at the end of a rope. The “individual liberty” you speak of does not justify such contradictions in historical documents, whether made by copyists or translators. It must be assumed that this contradiction did not appear in the original inspired writings, and it does not appear in St. Jerome's Vulgate, nor in its Catholic Translation.

MR. JONES: “If the Protestant version of to-day, that

is, the American Revised Version, 1901, has been made from copies duly authenticated of the original manuscripts in Hebrew and Greek it certainly ought to be more correct than a version made from copies of copies of versions instead of original copies of manuscripts."

FATHER LAMBERT: If! A conclusion based on an "if" is a very lame conclusion. There is not a manuscript copy in existence that has been duly authenticated as a correct and complete copy of the originals. There are a number of variant and fragmentary copies. The oldest extant Hebrew manuscript is not older than the tenth century. The oldest Greek manuscripts of the New Testament are not earlier than the fourth century. And, Mr. Jones, you will please remember that these manuscripts are the work of what you and Protestants generally call the lazy, ignorant, dissolute Monks. The Protestant Harman, in his "Introduction to the Holy Scriptures," page 48, says: "The convents of the Christians, existing from the early centuries of the Church to the present day, have been safe depositories of Christian Scriptures. The convent has proved the ark for the transmission of the ancient manuscripts to us."

Now, Mr. Jones, after the manuscripts were made by the Monks and in their possession to alter and interpolate, for a thousand years before Protestantism came into existence, how can you assume, even with an "if," that the American Revised edition has been made from duly authenticated copies of the original manuscripts. You still harp on "the original manuscripts in Hebrew and Greek," knowing, as you should know, that there are no original manuscripts in existence in Hebrew, or Greek, or in any other language. There is not even a manuscript known to be a first or immediate copy from the originals.

CHAPTER III.

PEDIGREE OF THE PROTESTANT VERSION.

MR. JONES: "But the Protestant Version lived in the time of Christ and His Apostles, not only in original manuscript copies, but in the autographs, and for over 1,000 years after, continued said existence by copying and recopying original copies. Those whose Bible lived thus were in the minority, and the Bible of the majority was the manuscript Bibles of Italic and Vulgate."

FATHER LAMBERT: This is a vain and puerile begging of the whole question, assuming as proved or admitted what is neither proved nor admitted. As such it does not deserve a serious reply.

A version, as Mr. Jones should know, is a translation, and as a matter of history he should know that there was no Protestant translation until made by Protestants. The copying and recopying of manuscripts was done by the monks, as Dr. Harman testifies. Needless to say that these monks were not Protestants.

The autographs cannot be traced further than the third century, and the oldest copies go back only to the fourth century. It is not improbable that there were more copies of versions or translations than there were copies of the originals, but to say that any of these copies or versions were Protestant is too absurd for refutation. The meaning of words should not be tampered with. It is not at all improbable that those who used copies in the original languages of the Scriptures were in the minority, and that those who used translations were in the majority. But it is not true to say that the majority used the Italic or the Vulgate, for the great majority of early Christians were as ignorant of the Italic or Latin as they were of the Greek. They, like the people of this age, used translations. Thus there were translations into the Ethiopic, the Armenian, the Bashmuric, the Coptic, the Slavonic, the Gothic, the Syriac and other languages, and doubtless those who used these various versions were more numerous than those who

used the original Greek, or even the Latin, just as a majority use translations now. Consequently, when you say the majority used the Italic or Vulgate, you forget the existence of the translations in many other languages. All these translations, as well as the Italic and Vulgate, were made to meet the needs of those early Christians who did not understand the language of the originals. Among these Christians, and the Greeks, the Latins were not in the majority. Those Christians, except the Greeks, acquired their knowledge of Christianity from speeches in their various languages or from translations of the New Testament, just as modern people acquire it .

MR. JONES: "As the Protestant Bible emerged from the age of manuscripts to that of print, the famous Wm. Tyndale went back to these same original manuscripts, not in Latin, but in the more original, Hebrew and Greek."

FATHER LAMBERT: The Protestant Version of the Bible had no existence in the age of manuscripts. It emerged into existence in the shape of translations, recognized by critics and scholars as corrupt translations, at the time of the Western revolt against the Catholic Church. Before that time there was no such thing known to the Christian world as the "Protestant Bible." Luther's translation in German and Tyndale's in English were the first specimens of the Protestant Bible. Sir Thomas More exposed the corruptions of Tyndale's translation. In the New Testament part of it Bishop Tunstal discovered no less than 2,000 corruptions. You say Tyndale translates from original Hebrew and Greek. The originals do not seem to have been able to prevent him from corrupting the text.

The character of the English Protestant Bibles, prior to the Authorized Version of King James, may be learned from the protests against them made by those who urged the King to authorize a new translation. One of these protests says that "Our translation of the psalms, comprised in the Book of Common Prayer, doth, in addition, subtrac-

tion and alteration differ from the truth of the Hebrew in at least two hundred places."

If two hundred corruptions were found in the Psalms alone, how many more must have been in the whole Bible?

"The English translators," says Carlisle, "have depraved the sense, obscured the truth, and deceived the ignorant; in many places they distort the Scriptures from their right sense and show themselves to love darkness rather than light, falsehood more than truth."

The ministers of the Diocese of Lincoln, in their appeal, said to the King that the English translation of the Bible "is a translation that takes away from the text, that adds to the text, and that sometimes to the changing or obscuring of the meaning of the Holy Ghost."

Another zealous Protestant, Broughton, declared to the Bishops that "their translations of the Scriptures into English (Bishop's Bible) is such that it perverts the text of the Old Testament in eight hundred and forty-eight places." Such as they were, however, they were not the first that appeared in the vulgar tongues of Europe. There were many Catholic translations in print before that of Luther or Tyndale.

MR. JONES: "Now a translation of the 'Authorized Version (which is the edition you referred to), which is but an offspring of the scholarship of Tyndale and fellow-students, has come to us from the original manuscripts, is more correct than that of the Roman Catholic Version, because the former is fifteen steps, at least, nearer the handwriting of the blessed Apostles."

FATHER LAMBERT: We have seen the character of the scholarship or honesty of Tyndale's translation. To call the Authorized Version an offspring of it is not saying much for it.

By "original manuscripts" we suppose you mean manuscripts in the original languages of the Scriptures. You speak of these manuscripts as if Protestant translators alone had recourse to them. These manuscripts were in the hands of Catholics before Protestantism had existence,

and Catholic translators had recourse to them. There were two Greek printed editions of the New Testament, one by Erasmus, a Catholic, in 1516, and the other by Cardinal Ximenes, in 1514, at Alcalá in Spain, twelve years before Tyndale made his corrupt English translation. The Old Testament was printed in Hebrew in 1488 by a Hebrew printer at Soncino in Lombardy. So there was no lack of printed Bibles in the original languages before Tyndale published his translation in 1526.

That the Douay translators made a faithful version into English is shown by the fact that King James' Authorized Version approaches nearer to it than any former Protestant version did, and that the recent Revised Version approaches nearer still. Take, for example, the Lord's Prayer in Matthew vi., 9-13. In the last verse the King's Authorized Version has "For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen." The recent Revised Version omits these words entirely, and in doing so makes the Prayer correspond with the Catholic translation. Just how this erroneous translation "comes fifteen steps, at least nearer the handwritings of the blessed Apostles" we leave Mr. Jones to explain. We do not say that King James' translators added the above words to the Lord's Prayer intentionally. It can be explained by supposing that they had before them an incorrect copy of the original. So doubtless thought the editors of the Revised Version, on comparison with other copies of the originals—and with the Catholic Translation. At any rate they made the text coincide with the latter.

MR. JONES: "If you can show me that it is not, and that the Catholic is more correct, I am willing to bow down and also make a subscription to the benefit of the Catholic Truth Society of New York."

What we have said above goes to show that the Catholic Version is, on the authority of Protestant translators, the more correct version. Whether their authority will convince you or not is another story.

CHAPTER IV.

ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPTS AND COPIES.

MR. JONES: "Certainly we have original manuscripts of the Bible."

FATHER LAMBERT: Certainly we have not. We have remote copies of the original manuscripts, but they are not original manuscripts, for the simple reason that they are copies.

MR. JONES: "The duly authenticated copies made from duly authenticated copies of the autographs are properly called originals."

FATHER LAMBERT: They are not originals, and cannot be properly called so. They began as copies and they remain copies or transcripts. You speak of authenticated copies of authenticated copies. Where are these copies, and who authenticated them? And who authenticated the no longer existing copies from which your "authenticated" copies were copied? All this talk of authenticated copies comes with bad logic from a Protestant who by his rule of faith—the Bible alone—must reject tradition and the authority of the Church. Aside from Church authority and tradition where is there any proof that the now non-existent copies were correct copies of the originals; or where is your evidence that the existing copies are correct copies of the non-existent ones?

MR. JONES: "Extant legal documents and medical papers are correctly called original documents, though it be known that they are but copies of authenticated (?) copies of the first originals which have been long since worn out and disappeared."

FATHER LAMBERT: How can they be correctly called original documents when it is known that they are but copies of the originals?

MR. JONES: "The former—that is, the copies—are recognized as original, and so honored by the highest courts of the land."

FATHER LAMBERT: When a copy of an original docu-

ment—in the absence of that original—is duly proved to the satisfaction of the court to be a correct copy, the court accepts it as a copy, not as an original document, which the court knows to be lost.

MR. JONES: "You certainly know this, and, knowing it, you are too broad a man and ripe scholar not to consider it."

FATHER LAMBERT: We are broad enough to know that no court ever knowingly received a copy of a document as the original document. It receives the copy only when it is duly verified, not as the original, but as a true copy of it. The court always distinguishes between similarity and identity.

MR. JONES: "The old axiom still lives: 'Things that are equal to the same thing are equal to each other.' Our oldest manuscripts are therefore equal to the first originals, and are themselves original."

FATHER LAMBERT: Even if we were to grant you—which we do not—that the copies were complete and correct, they would still be copies, and not the originals. You confound similarity with identity. The old axiom is true, but your application of it is incorrect. Let you make a perfect copy of your neighbor's draft for a thousand dollars, signature and all, and present it to the bank. When your neighbor discovers it he will soon teach you that things that are like the same thing are not the same thing.

There is a weight, an authority attached to the phrase "original document" that is not attached to a copy or transcript. You seem to desire to give the latter the full weight of the former by miscalling it the former. It is to prevent this abuse of terms that we insist on the distinction between an original document and a copy of it.

MR. JONES: "I dispute the correctness of your translation of Acts, i, 18, as given by Jerome: 'Et hic quidem possedit agrum de mercede iniquitatis et suspensus,' etc. If you had used the word 'praecipitatus,' instead of 'suspensus,' I would not so much object. But, pray, from what original source did Jerome draw 'suspensus'? There is nothing in

any of the accepted original Greek texts that I have examined to warrant it. From what Greek manuscript did Jerome receive it?"

FATHER LAMBERT: St. Jerome answers your question by stating in his "De Viris Illustribus," "I brought the New Testament (of the *Vetus Itala*) into accord with the original Greek." And in his dedication to Pope Damasus, prefixed to the Four Gospels, "The Four Gospels have been revised by collating old Greek manuscripts."

Here it must be noted that in the year of our Lord, 382, St. Jerome, in his letter to Pope Damasus, calls the Greek manuscripts which he issued "old." Those manuscripts therefore dated not only beyond the fourth century, but beyond any manuscript of the Greek Testament now existing. St. Jerome, therefore, had an advantage over you in having more ancient Greek manuscripts to consult than are within your reach. The *Vetus Itala* which he was revising was older than any Greek manuscript known to us of to-day. Dr. Westcott, an eminent Protestant authority, says of it: "This translation (the *Vetus Itala*) was fixed and current more than a century before the transcription of the oldest Greek manuscript. Thus it is a witness to a text more ancient and *cæteris paribus* more valuable than is represented by any other authority, unless the Peshito in its present form be excepted."

Hence we conclude that, as St. Jerome's honesty and Greek scholarship have not been questioned, he found before him in those old Greek manuscripts valid reasons for the word, "suspensus"—hanged—in reference to Judas, found in Acts i, 18. It is a word that clears Matthew and Luke of contradiction.

CHAPTER V.

GLARING CONTRADICTION IN THE PROTESTANT VERSION.

MR JONES: "You say there is nothing in the text to justify your insertion of 'suspensus.'"

FATHER LAMBERT: Nothing in what text? The Greek text before you, or the earlier Greek text that was before St. Jerome? His being the earlier, nearer to the originals of the sacred writers, is by all the rules of critical judgment, more reliable than yours.

MR JONES: "You say, 'Let the reader judge.' That is just what I want the reader to do. You and I cannot be good judges in our own case. Let the Biblical scholarship of the country pass judgment thereon. I will abide by its decision. If you can satisfactorily prove your translation to be the more correct I am ready to put aside that of the American Revised and accept that of the Vulgate."

FATHER LAMBERT: That is very well, but your proposition involves what logicians call an "ignoratio elenchi," you mistake the real question. You want us to prove that St. Jerome's is a correct translation of a manuscript which he never saw. He translated from a copy much more ancient, nearer the Apostles, than any manuscripts existing now, or than any from which modern translations have been made; manuscripts that he called "old" in his time, namely, in the fourth century. His translation was accepted by the Biblical scholarship of his time, when Greek was better known than now, and when manuscript copies were purer and freer from errors incident to transcription than later copies.

The question then is not whether St. Jerome's is a correct translation of the more modern manuscript, which he never saw, and which you admit to have been vitiated by the interpolation of "For thine is the Kingdom, etc.," in the Lord's Prayer, but whether his is a correct translation of the more ancient manuscript used by him.

The question raised by your proposal is this, which manuscript was the purer and freer from errors, the ancient

one used by St. Jerome, or the more modern one used by the translators of the version authorized by King James? According to the rules of sound criticism, the more ancient copies are preferred as being more free from errors of transcription, or errors of malice, or of defective judgment.

That the more modern manuscript used by the English Protestant translators was vitiated by interpolation you admit and try to explain away. A witness who is convicted of having falsified in matters you know of is not to be trusted in matters you know not of. What is true of a witness is equally true of a manuscript claimed to be a correct copy of the original. If found false in one case, its claim to be a correct copy is no longer valid. Such, according to your own admission, was the copy used by the English translators. After such admission, is it not absurd in you to ask us to prove that St. Jerome's translation of an ancient copy harmonizes with an admitted incorrect copy of the original?

MR. JONES: "Allow me to repeat that there is no contradiction between Matthew and Luke in their rendering of the hanging of Judas as described in Matthew, xxvii, 5, and Acts, i, 18."

FATHER LAMBERT: We certainly allow you to repeat that there is no contradiction, but at the same time we reserve to ourselves the right to repeat that there is a contradiction in the texts as given in both the Authorized and the Revised Protestant versions of the Bible. Certainly Matthew and Luke did not contradict each other, but your Protestant version makes them do so. In St. Jerome's translation of a more ancient copy of the original than that used by the English translators there is no contradiction, a proof of its greater reliability.

MR. JONES: "Each of the writers described a different phase of the occurrence, and each gave truly the facts of the particular impressions made."

FATHER LAMBERT: Each of the writers described the fact and manner of Judas' death, and we who believe in the

inspiration of the Scriptures must assume that they did not contradict each other. Assuming this, we are forced to the conclusion that the Protestant translation of the two texts referred to is erroneous, or that the manuscript from which it was made was defective, and that the ancient manuscript which St. Jerome translated was a correct copy, for in the former there is a contradiction, in the latter there is not.

MR. JONES: "Matthew emphasized the hanging; Luke the effect, the falling forward from the end of a rope and 'bursting asunder.' How make this out a contradiction?"

FATHER LAMBERT: The question is as to the words of the two texts, and not as to your interpretation and explanation of them. In the texts, as found in your version of the Bible, Matthew tells us that Judas hanged himself; Luke tells us that he fell in a field and burst asunder. In the latter text there is no suggestion of a rope or of hanging. The contradiction in the texts of your version is evident. According to Matthew, Judas was a suicide; according to Luke, he was the victim of an accident. As there is no such contradiction in St. Jerome's translation of these texts, we must conclude that the ancient copy of the original which he translated was more reliable than the copy used by your English translators.

MR. JONES: "In order to make it a contradiction these writers would have to contradict themselves on the same point mentioned by each."

FATHER LAMBERT: Well, the point mentioned by each was the death of Judas. One gives hanging as the cause of his death, the other gives falling in a field and bursting asunder as the cause of his death, one makes him a suicide; the other a victim of an accident. We do not say Matthew and Luke did this. But they are made to do it by the Protestant Translation of the Scriptures.

You say there is no contradiction. Suppose Matthew had said nothing about the death of Judas, what impression would you get from the words in Acts i., 18. "This man (Judas) purchased a field with the reward of his

iniquity and falling headlong he burst asunder and all his bowels gushed out." Would you not conclude that he died by accident or by a punitive visitation of God? The idea of suicide at the end of a rope would not have occurred to you. Suppose further that Josephus or some contemporary historian had written, what Matthew did, that Judas hanged himself, would you not deem it necessary to reject his authority and prefer that of the inspired writer of the Acts, who said that Judas fell and burst asunder and all his bowels gushed out?

MR. JONES: "If Luke stated that Judas burst asunder, and Matthew had denied that he did burst asunder; then, and only then, would there be a contradiction, and your argument would be entitled to consideration. But this neither Matthew nor Luke has done, namely, contradict each other on same point."

FATHER LAMBERT: The "same point" is the death of Judas and the manner of it. Now, a man who comes to his death by hanging, cannot truthfully be said to come to his death by falling and bursting asunder. These two manners of death exclude each other. If one be true the other must be false, hence a contradiction.

CHAPTER VI.

A QUESTION OF LOGIC.

MR. JONES: "You seem to not take well to an 'if.' But you need not shy at it, for reasoning based on an 'if' leads to valid conclusions when the antecedent is admitted in the minor premise. Let it come out to the light.

"Major Premise: If the American Revised Version has been made from duly authenticated copies of original manuscripts, it is more correct than a version made from copies of versions

"Minor Premise: But the American Revised Version has been made from duly authenticated copies of original manuscripts.

"Conclusion: Therefore the American Revised Version is more correct than a version made from copies of versions.

"This conclusion is based on an 'if,' and seems to me not lame in the least."

FATHER LAMBERT: It is, nevertheless, lame, but it seems like a loss of time to spend any of it in following your dialectic excursion. But we have no choice but to go where you lead. Well, then, your conclusion does not rest on an "if," as you think. It rests on the minor premise; if the minor be true the conclusion is true, if the minor be false, or not proved, or not admitted, the conclusion is false, or not proved, or not admitted. Again, if the minor be affirmative the conclusion must be affirmative; if negative the conclusion must be negative. A short reflection on these principles of the syllogism will make it clear to you, or ought to, that in your syllogism the nature of your conclusion depends on the nature of the minor, and not on the "if." To make this still more clear, we will show that your conclusion may be as logically deduced from your premises after we have changed your hypothetical major to the categorical form.

Using the symbols to save space, your syllogism stands thus:

"If the American Revised Version is A it is B. But the American Revised Version is A. Therefore it is B."

Changing the major from the hypothetical to the categorical form the syllogism stands thus and reaches the same conclusion:

"Every version that is A is B. But the American Revised Version is A. Therefore the American Revised Version is B."

Here the conclusion is arrived at without the "if," and therefore it in no way depends on it.

But why this dry digression about so little a word as "if?" Well, we took your hint and thought it well not to shy at it, but to show that it is not of the fundamental importance you thought it was.

We have said that your conclusion is lame. To show this we must consider your syllogism as a whole. There is a defect in the major which finds its way through the minor into the conclusion, violating and rendering it lame. It is

the failure in your major to make a very important distinction and limitation.

You say, "If the American Revised Version has been made from duly authenticated copies of original manuscripts." Here you do not distinguish between correct and incorrect versions or translations, and you do not limit your statement to correct translations. Owing to this lack of necessary syllogistic explicitness you make the mere fact of translation from authenticated copies of the originals the ground of superiority over other translations made from copies of versions. Now "correctness" of translation is a necessary element of your reasoning, if you would have your conclusion go without crutches. Owing to this defect—failure to say "correct translation or version"—your conclusion proves that even an incorrect or false translation of an original is superior to a correct translation of a correct translation from an authentic copy of the original manuscripts simply because the incorrect translation is made from duly authenticated copies of the originals. Now we have enough confidence in your judgment to believe you did not intend to make so absurd a conclusion. But, nevertheless, this absurd conclusion is the logical deduction from your premises, and is all sufficient to prove that your whole syllogism is vitiated by the defect in your major, a defect that passes to the minor and lurks in the conclusion. Your syllogism, as worded, is illegitimate—a logical monstrosity.

You will say you meant "correct version or translation." Doubtless you did, but we are now criticising your syllogism as you made it, not as you may have intended to make it. It is the business of a syllogism to say all and no more than its maker intends.

Having done with your syllogism as to its form, we will now consider the matter of it. Overlooking the vitiating defect in your major and assuming it to be all that it ought to be, we pass to the minor. This minor says that the American Revised Version is made from duly authenticated copies of the originals. Holding you to your Protest-

ant Rule of Faith—the Bible and the Bible alone—we deny your minor. There are but two ways conceivable to authenticate a copy of an original. First, by comparison with the original; second, by some competent authority declaring that it contains the true sense of the original. The first way is practically impossible, since the originals no longer exist. The second way is impossible to the Protestant, since he recognizes no competent authority to determine the true sense of the non-existent originals.

Now, inasmuch as the originals no longer exist, we ask you who authenticated the manuscript copies used by the translators of the American Revised Version? On what authority do you say they were “duly authenticated?” Authenticated by whom?

The fact is you have in the last analysis no competent authority for saying those manuscript copies are duly authenticated, either as correct reproductions of the words or of the sense of the originals. We, therefore, reject your minor, and with it the conclusion must fall. This is why we have called it lame. On reflection we must candidly admit that the word “lame” is not strong enough. We should have said it had no legs on which to even limp.

But you will ask, Does not all you have said as to the authentication of copies bear equally against all copies in existence or that existed since the originals were lost?

It certainly does, so far as copies claiming to be verbal reproductions of the originals are concerned, and it is equally against all copies claiming to reproduce the true sense of the originals, unless there is on earth an authority competent to determine the identity of sense in the existent copy and the non-existent original. For you, with your Bible alone, there is no such authority, and consequently the authentication of copies of any or all the sacred originals is impossible, not only as to words but as to sense as well.

It is different with the Catholic. He holds that Our Divine Lord, before departing from this world, established

His Church to continue His work of teaching and governing His flock for all time. He promised to be with it for all time and commanded His followers to hear it under pain of being looked upon as heathens and publicans. According to His promise the Holy Ghost is with it to direct its teaching and guard it from error and from all danger of leading into error those whom it was commissioned to teach and lead to salvation. This Church St. Paul calls "The House of God, the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth."—I. Tim., iii, 15.

This Church, visible now as always, taught and governed the flock of Christ in obedience to His command before one word of the New Testament was written. He made it the guardian of His revelation of all that He revealed, it knew the sense of the original Scriptures and knows it through all the centuries. It was this Church that in the post-apostolic age taught the people what Books were inspired and what were not.

It was this Church that, in the General Council of Trent, ordained and declared that "the old and vulgate edition, which, by the lengthened usage of so many ages, has been approved of in the Church, be . . . held as authentic," that is, that the Vulgate reproduces the true sense of the original Scriptures. This is the only authentication that is needed by those who seek the truth. For the Catholic it, and it alone, is all sufficient. It is a sense authentication, not a verbal one, for the Church does not depend on the fallibility of transcribers or copyists for the truth she teaches, but on the promise of its Divine Founder, Who builded it on a rock and made it the Pillar and Ground of Truth.

MR. JONES: "Your entire argument that Jerome used a more correct copy than the translators of the Authorized Version is based on a presumption."

FATHER LAMBERT: We stated that the copy used by St. Jerome was more ancient than any used by the translators of the English King's Bible known as the Authorized

Version. Now, it is a principle recognized by you and Biblical scholars that the more ancient the copy, the nearer the Apostolic times, the more correct and reliable it is. Hence if you admit the fact that St. Jerome's copy was more ancient you must admit, according to the above rule, that it is better than more modern copies. The presumption stands valid until you prove that St. Jerome's copy was not more ancient, a thing you cannot do. But we have positive proof of the superiority of St. Jerome's copy over that of the translators of the Authorized Version. The copy used by those translators had the interpolation, "For Thine is the Kingdom, etc." in the Our Father (Matth. vi, 5-9.) It was translated and believed by Protestants to be the Word of God since 1611, that is, for nearly three hundred years. The authors of your Revised Version recognized the words as an interpolation and have thrown them out. Some old Greek copyist with more piety than judgment forgot his role of translator and thought the Lord's Prayer would be improved by the addition of a doxology which, though beautiful in itself, when out of place—as it is in the Sacred Text—destroys the claim of the copy to correctness and purity.

The translators of the Authorized Version were misled by the unfaithfulness of the copy and they in turn misled the Protestant English-speaking people for nearly three hundred years. Now this interpolation was not in the copy used by St. Jerome, for it is not found in his translation—the Vulgate. Therefore, we must conclude that the copy used by St. Jerome is better, because more faithful to the originals. This conclusion is more than a presumption; it is a demonstration.

CHAPTER VII.

ADDING TO THE BIBLE.

MR. JONES: "You ask by whom has it (the American Revised Version) been recognized as the standard edition? I would reply, by the denomination to which I belong, and by every other Evangelical denomination in this country, as far as I know. If you investigate a little in New York, you

will find it accepted and put above all former editions in the churches by leading scholars and published and taught in the Sabbath school lessons side by side with those of the Authorized edition. But, remember, it is yet but young, and cannot be expected to have the circulation that has been accorded to the Authorized Version."

FATHER LAMBERT: We spoke of an official authoritative act of some church or denomination giving its official sanction to the American Revised Version as the Standard. All that you say only shows that the Protestant denominations merely tolerate the use of it by their silence, not that they have given it official sanction. If any such official recognition has been given the Revised Version we are not aware of it, and we would be obliged to you if you would tell us when, where and by what denomination it has been done. As for your scholars, they recognized for three hundred years a version that is now admitted to be incorrect, interpolated and, therefore, not representative of the originals. After so protracted an error of judgment their sanction of a new version is not of sufficient weight to be authoritative.

MR. JONES: "As to the insertion of 'Thine is the Kingdom, the power,' etc., to the end of the Lord's Prayer, in the Authorized Version, I believe it has been merely added as doxology, the revisers, I presume, believing that too much praise and 'amens' could not be added to the Lord's Prayer. I don't see how this would 'mislead' or injure Protestants if they used it 'for three hundred years.' Since not added to the Lord's Prayer as Scripture, it could not mislead as Scripture."

FATHER LAMBERT: You are doubtless right in believing that those words, "For Thine is the Kingdom, etc.," were added as a doxology, added by the Greek copyist and turned into English by the translators of the Authorized Version of King James. Whatever motive the copyist had in view—and we need not suppose a bad one—he corrupted the original text, and the English translators, following him, misled English-speaking people into using a form of prayer as delivered by our Lord that was not delivered by Him: made them victims of a deception, whether pious or otherwise

does not concern us. The people wanted the prayer as delivered, and they did not get it. If this be not misleading and an injustice to the too confiding Protestant reader we know not the meaning of those words.

You say the words, "For Thine is the Kingdom, etc.," were not added to the Lord's Prayer "as Scripture." We do not see what possessed you to make that statement. Look at Matthew vi, 13, and see if it be not added as Scripture. It is precisely because it is given in the text as if spoken by our Lord that we object to it. We remember the time when as a boy it was pointed out to us as an evidence of the superiority of the Protestant Bible over the Catholic, with the hint that dishonest Catholic translators had wickedly suppressed it. Now, however, the revisers of the American Version have, after three hundred years, vindicated the superiority of the Catholic Version.

MR. JONES: "And by adding it Protestants imagined that there was nothing wrong in it any more than Roman Catholics would think it wrong to add to the 'Hail full of Grace,' gathered from the Scriptures, the following words: 'Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners now and at the hour of our death. Amen.'"

FATHER LAMBERT: Catholics have no more right to put words or sentences into the writings of the author of the Sacred Text, and make them say what they did not say, than unfaithful copyists or Protestant translators have. You do not deny that an unfaithful copyist or the translators of the Authorized Version have done this thing in Matthew vi, 13. You cannot deny it, since the revisers of the American Version, whom you approve, have thrown out as spurious the words, "For Thine is the Kingdom, etc.," from that verse. The Protestant who imagines there is nothing wrong in falsifying by interpolation or otherwise, the Sacred Text, sadly needs primary instructions in the first principles of moral rectitude. But the question is not what Protestants may imagine not to be wrong, but is verse 13 of chapter vi in the Authorized Version a true reproduction of the original? You admit it is not, and your

excuse that "Protestants imagined that there was nothing wrong in it" is to no purpose. The question is as to correctness of translation, or copy.

To mitigate the offense of interpolating, and thereby corrupting the Scriptures, you say, first, "Protestants imagined there was nothing wrong in it." A strange confession, indeed, an acknowledgment of moral imbecility, of ignorance of the first principles of morals.

And, second, you resort to the boy's argument of "you're another," and insinuate that Catholics have done the same thing, interpolated words in the sacred text—added to "Hail full of Grace," in Luke i, 28, the prayer, "Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us, sinners, now and at the hour of our death. Amen."

It is very vexatious to have to meet a statement like that. It is so difficult to be polite in stamping it as it deserves to be stamped. Look in the Catholic Version at Luke i, 28, and you will find no such addition or interpolation as that you insinuate is there.

MR. JONES: "If it has been wrong for Protestants to add a doxology which has never been considered on a level with the Word of God——"

FATHER LAMBERT: We must interrupt you to say that it is wrong to add or interpolate into the Sacred Text of St. Luke a sentence that does not belong there. Do that same with the text of a will and you render yourself liable to prosecution and punishment. If it be a crime to corrupt by interpolations the will of a dead man, is it not a greater crime to corrupt by the same means the Written Word of God? On what authority do you say it was never considered on a level with the Word of God? If it was never considered on a level with the Word of God why was it put in the Authorized Version as a part of the Word of God? From the time the interpolation was published in the "Authorized" Version, Protestants have considered it as the Word of God, and have been taught so to consider it. Now you can proceed.

MR. JONES: "Surely it would not have been less criminal for the Roman Catholic Church to add a prayer to the 'Hail full of Grace.'"

FATHER LAMBERT: It would not have been less criminal for any church or any person to incorporate into the Scriptures things not written there by the sacred authors. You surely know that the Catholic Church or Catholic translators have not done this. If you do not know it, then look at the text, Luke i, 28, as we have before advised you.

MR. JONES: "Besides, the addition to the Lord's Prayer in the Authorized Version is conceded to be consistent with the Sacred Writings."

FATHER LAMBERT: The consistency of the addition, or interpolation, is not the question between you and us, but the correctness and purity of the Sacred Text. Any interpolation, consistent or otherwise, makes the text spurious, and misrepresents the original author. It is inconsistent with the moral code of the Scriptures.

CHAPTER VIII.

FALLIBLE COPIES AND THE INFALLIBLE CHURCH.

MR. JONES: "You state that we have not the originals of the Scriptures, even though we have true copies thereof. I am confident that we have. Who is to decide?"

FATHER LAMBERT: You can decide it, if you can produce or locate a single manuscript written by any one of the authors of the books of the Bible. As long as you cannot do this—and you know you cannot—you should not be so "confident" that we have them. That is the only way to decide. Copies—even true copies—are nothing more than copies. They are no more originals than a photograph of Mr. Jones is the original of Mr. Jones. We simply insist on the correct use of words. The incorrect use, or abuse of words, is, of all the sources of error, the most prolific; it should be avoided with strenuous care. If you sold a copy of the Transfiguration as the original of Raphael you could be prosecuted for it, and no court would

let you off on the plea that it was a correct copy of the original. The very plea would be taken by the court as a confession of fraud, and it would punish you accordingly for representing a thing to be what you knew it was not—thus taking advantage of your dupe's ignorance.

MR. JONES: "You don't seem to accept original for the Bible in any sense."

FATHER LAMBERT: We are not talking about the Bible; we are talking of manuscripts, and no copy of a manuscript is the original manuscript. This is so plain a fact that it is surprising that any one is found—even in so smoky a place as Pittsburg—to deny it.

MR. JONES: "Then why does the Douay Bible in its preface say that it is made 'from the Latin Vulgate and diligently compared with the original Mss.?'"

FATHER LAMBERT: We do not know why the writer of that preface said that. We can only surmise that if he said it, he fell into the same error you did, and said "original manuscripts" when he meant manuscript copies in the language of the original manuscripts. In the Douay Bible before us we do not find the quotation you give. But we find on its title page the following: "Holy Bible, translated from the Latin Vulgate. Diligently compared with the Hebrew, Greek and other editions, in divers languages." There is nothing here about "original manuscripts."

MR. JONES: "If we have no true copies of the originals, neither Protestants nor Catholics have the true Word of God at all."

FATHER LAMBERT: If our Lord left no means to know the Word of God, but through the fallibility of transcribers we would be in a bad way, indeed. This fallible medium is not a secure enough basis to rest our faith upon, and we could never be certain that we knew the revealed truth and will of God.

But the fallibility of transcribers was not the means left us by our Lord to arrive with certainty at a knowledge of the truths He revealed. He established His Church

as the Supreme teacher and guide of His flock in all things whatsoever He commanded. He said: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (Matth. xvi, 18.) To this Church He intrusted the whole deposit of revealed truth—the Word of God—when He said to it in the person of its first ministers, "All power is given to Me in Heaven and on earth; going, therefore, teach ye all nations. * * Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." (Matth. xxviii, 18-20.)

To enable the teaching body of His Church to fulfill this great commission, and forget nothing, He said: "I will ask the Father, and He shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you forever, the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive because it seeth him not nor knoweth him; but you shall know him, because he shall abide with you, and shall be in you. * * * The Paraclete, the Holy Ghost whom the Father will send in My name, He will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said to you." (John xiv, 16-26.)

This teaching body thus commissioned and animated by the Holy Ghost, St. Paul calls "The Church of the living God the pillar and ground of truth." (I Tim. iii, 15.) This Church is the divinely ordained medium through which men can arrive at a knowledge of the revealed truth—the Word of God. This Church taught the revealed truth intrusted to her before a word of the New Testament was put in writing, and would continue to teach it if no original writings or copies of them had come down to us. To say she would not is the same as to say that Christ's promises have failed, and that He was therefore a false prophet.

This Church of His, the Pillar and Ground of Truth, has existed through the ages, and still exists on earth, still continues to be the guardian and exponent of revealed truth,

whether written or unwritten. And if we have the written word to-day, after two thousand years, it is because of her guardianship of it. It does not then follow, as you think, that if we had no correct copies of the original manuscripts we would not have the Word of God at all. It is true that you who disregard our Lord's command to hear the Church, have no better basis for your knowledge of the Word of God than the fallibility of transcribers; but not so with those who obey His command and hear His Church whom He commissioned to teach all things whatsoever He commanded.

MR. JONES: "Whom, then, am I to believe?"

FATHER LAMBERT: You are to believe the Church which Christ established and commissioned to teach you, and commanded you to hear under pain of being considered as a heathen or a publican.

MR. JONES: "How find the truth of divine revelation?"

FATHER LAMBERT: As above.

MR. JONES: "Must I go to the visible, natural universe to find out God's will and ways and nature, and my relation to Him?"

FATHER LAMBERT: As long as you persist in disregarding the will of your Redeemer and refuse to hear the Church—that agency He appointed to teach you—it makes little difference where you go to; you will not learn the things He requires you to know, and to believe under penalty of damnation. "He that believeth not shall be condemned." (Mark xvi, 16.)

MR. JONES: "It seems to me that the translators of the Douay Bible, or the ecclesiastical authorities superintending the work, didn't value the original manuscripts as much as they did the Vulgate Version."

FATHER LAMBERT: They did not value the original manuscripts as much as they did the Vulgate Version for the very good reason that the original manuscripts had ceased to exist many centuries before they began their work. They preferred the Latin Vulgate to corrupted

copies of the original manuscripts, and it appears they had good reason for it. The Rev. Thomas Hartwell Horne, no friend of the Catholic Church, says in his "Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures," vol. 1, page 277: "The Latin Vulgate preserves many true readings where the modern Hebrew copies are corrupted." It is to these corrupted copies that the Catholic translators preferred the Latin Vulgate. This you call preferring the Vulgate to the "original manuscripts."

MR. JONES: "Why, pray, did the Fathers of the Council of Trent declare that the Vulgate of St. Jerome 'was superior to the Hebrew or Greek texts'?"

FATHER LAMBERT: If they did so—and we will have something to say about that in a moment—they doubtless did it because they considered a correct translation of a document to be superior to a corrupted copy of it, such corrupted copies, for instance, as Horne, the well-known Protestant Biblical scholar, speaks of.

MR. JONES: "The belief by a general council speaking on a matter of the highest importance for all Christendom, and rendering 'de fide' that a Latin version is superior to the original text in Hebrew and Greek, discourages further inquiry into the relative merits of our English translations."

FATHER LAMBERT: Some one has been playing on your absorptive credulity. The Council of Trent made no such declaration as that which you attribute to it. The decree of the Council concerning the Vulgate was passed in the fourth session. Read it and you will wonder how you could have been so misled as to make so egregious a blunder. There is not one word or sentence in it that could suggest the statement you make; not one word about "the original text in Hebrew and Greek," no comparison whatever made. It would be interesting to know how you were seduced into making so serious a blunder. Whoever did it ought to ask your pardon for having fooled you into committing yourself so badly.

CHAPTER IX.

PROTESTANTS IN THE EARLY AGES.

MR. JONES: "What you call 'Protestants' were called Christians in the early ages of the Church."

FATHER LAMBERT: If you prove that Protestants of to-day belong to the same Church that the early Christians belonged to—that is, to the Church of Christ builded on a rock and commissioned to preach what he commanded the early Christians and His followers in all time to hear, we will concede what you say. Those who do not belong to that divinely established Church and do not hear and accept its teaching as the Lord commanded, are not Christians, whatever they may call themselves, whether in ancient or modern times. Assuming, as we must, that our Lord was not a false prophet, that Church which was to exist for all time exists to-day. If you belong to it and accept its teaching you can truly say you believe as the early Christians believed, but if you do not belong to it and do not hear it, that is, accept its teaching, you are, according to the command of our Lord, to be considered as a heathen or a publican.

You may say, this seems severe. It undoubtedly does, but you must observe that it is the severity of our Lord Himself, and from it you can judge with what aversion He looks upon those who hear not His Church, but prefer their own private judgment to its teaching and revolt against its authority.

MR. JONES: "There is no evidence that I know of that any other church than that of Christians existed during the first centuries of our era."

FATHER LAMBERT: The Church established by our Lord and built on Peter was the only true Christian Church in the early Christian ages, and is the only true Church in all ages since our Lord said to its ministry: "He that hears you hears Me."

There were, however, in the early centuries some people

who did not obey the command of Christ to hear His Church, who set their private judgment against the divinely commissioned teacher. But such people were universally known as heretics. They were condemned by the Church of Christ and expelled from the household of the faith as unworthy members, and in obedience to the command of Christ they were considered as heathens and publicans. If you wish to identify Protestants of to-day with those ancient heretics, you are free to do so. You would have good ground for such identification in the fact that they, like you, disregarded the command of our Lord to hear this Church, and preferred to its infallible authority their own fallible judgment.

You may ask, Is not a man justified, nay, bound, in the last resort, to follow his own private judgment, his reason? Yes, reason is a gift of God, and every being endowed with it should follow it until it leads him into the presence of the Supreme Wisdom, the divine reason. Once there, the finite reason should yield absolutely to the divine and infallible judgment and teaching.

You, as a Christian, believing in the divinity of Christ, have come face to face with the supreme and infallible reason, the divine teacher who, your private judgment tells you, is its superior—ininitely so. Once having recognized this infallible teacher, your judgment must yield to Him in every thing He deigns to teach you. This, you will admit, is the highest dictate of human reason and logic.

If you are bound by reason and conscience to yield your private judgment to this recognized infallible teacher you are equally bound to submit in like manner to an agent that He has appointed to teach you, an agent so competent that He has said of it: "He that hears you hears Me." This agent—His teaching Church—is, as your teacher, His "Alter Ego," His Other Self. To despise it—to reject its authority—is to despise Him, and to despise Him is to despise the Father who sent Him. He has said it.

Thus, when your private judgment leads you to recognize

Christ as God, it binds itself to accept the teaching of the appointed agent, His Church, His Other Self.

The radical difference between you and the Catholic is this. The Catholic, believing in the divinity of Christ, recognizes the above conclusion as logically necessary, and complies with it; you recognize its logical necessity but fail to comply with it. Just herein is the inconsistency of Protestantism, an inconsistency that amounts to a revolt against the authority of Christ Himself, a refusal to obey His command to "hear the Church."

MR. JONES: "These churches (the early) had the same Gospel, the same doctrines and same order of worship as that of the Christian churches of to-day."

FATHER LAMBERT: This is too indefinite. To make it intelligible and definite you must say, first, what you mean by "these churches," whether you mean those churches known in the early ages as heretical bodies, or whether you mean those people who were members and hearers of the one and only Church which was established by Christ and which He commanded all to hear. Second, you must explain what you mean by "the Christian churches of to-day." Until you explain these two things your statement has no definite sense. If by "these churches" you mean the heretics of the early ages, and by "the Christian churches of to-day" you mean the aggregate of all the Protestant sects of the present, we are not disposed to dispute what you say. In fact, so far as principles are concerned, we will admit that those ancient heretics and Protestants of to-day are as alike as two eggs of the same hen.

CHAPTER X.

DID THE CHURCH OPPOSE THE TRANSLATION OF THE SCRIPTURES?

MR. JONES: "You very truly say that there were many Catholic translations in print before that of Luther or Tyndale. Yes, but not in the English language."

FATHER LAMBERT: The fact that there were many translations in the languages of the people of Europe before that of Luther or Tyndale ought to convince you that all the talk about the Catholic Church being opposed to translations is a groundless calumny. It is strange that this necessary inference did not attract your attention.

You would have the impression that Tyndale's was the first translation of the Bible into English. This is a very erroneous impression. Foxe, the author of Foxe's "Book of Martyrs," and a hot-headed anti-Catholic zealot, in a letter to Archbishop Parker, wrote: "If histories will be examined, we will find, both before the Conquest and after, as well as before John Wycliffe was born, as since, the whole body of the Scriptures was by sundry men translated into our country tongue."

Thomas Cranmer, the first Protestant Archbishop of Westminster, in his prologue to a Bible published in his time, wrote: "If the matter should be tried by custome, wee might also alledge custome for the reading of the Scripture in the vulgar tongue, and prescribe the more ancient custome. For it is not much above one hundred years since Scripture hath not been accustomed to be read in the vulgar tongue within this realme, and many hundred years before that, it was translated and read in the Saxon tongue, which at that tyme was our mother tongue * * * and when the language waxed olde and out of common usage, bycause folke should not lack the fruit of reading, it was again translated into the newer language, whereof yet also many copies remayne and be daily founde."

Sir Thomas More, Lord Chancellor, and one of England's worthiest sons, says: "The whole Byble was long before his (Wycliff's) days, by virtuous and well learned men, translated into the English tongue and by good and godly people with devotion and soberness, well and reverently red."

These witnesses put an end not only to the claim of Tyndale, but also to that of Wycliff, as being the first transla-

tors of the Bible into English. We will now quote a witness to show that these various translations were read and were familiar to the people.

Dr. Maitland, a learned English Protestant writer, says in his "The Dark Ages":

"The fact to which I have repeatedly alluded is this: the writings of the Dark Ages are, if I may use the expression, made of the Scriptures. I do not merely mean that the writers constantly quoted the Scriptures and appealed to them as authority on all occasions, as other writers have done since their day—though they did this, and it is a strong proof of their familiarity with them—but I mean that they thought, and spoke, and wrote the thoughts and words and phrases of the Bible, and that they did this constantly and habitually as the natural mode of expressing themselves. They did it, too, not exclusively in theological or ecclesiastical matters, but in histories, biographies, familiar letters, legal instruments, and in documents of every description."

Meditate on the words of these witnesses—all Protestant except one—and you will see that the people of Europe were not at all depending on such translators as Luther and Tyndale for their knowledge of the Bible.

MR. JONES: "You know, as well as I do, that the Church (Catholic) was against the translation of the Scriptures into English at that time (Tyndale's time—1526)."

FATHER LAMBERT: We do not know anything of the kind. Nor do you; you only think you do. We have already shown, on the authority of Foxe, Cranmer and Sir Thomas More, that the Scriptures were translated into English long before Tyndale's time, long before the so-called Reformation, and, as More says, "read by godly people with soberness and devotion." Why should the Church be opposed to the Scriptures in English when she was not opposed to them in all the languages of Continental Europe?

The English Catholics were opposed to Tyndale's translation doubtless for the same reason that Sir Thomas More was opposed to it, because, as it proved, it was a *false translation*. And for the further reason given by the Protestant

Canon Dixon, in his "History of the Church of England." This dignitary of the Church of England says:

"Every one of the little volumes containing portions of the Sacred Text, that was issued by Tyndale, contained also a prologue and notes written with such hot fury of vituperation against the prelates and clergy, the monks and friars, the rites and ceremonies of the Church, as, though an extensive circulation was secured to the work thereby, was hardly likely to commend it to the favor of those who were attacked. Moreover, the versions themselves were held to be hostile to the Catholic faith, as it was then understood, and to convey the sense unfaithfully or maliciously. The venerable words were ignored in them, and every variation that indicated opposition to the standing system was introduced."

Here is certainly a good and sufficient reason to account for Catholic, and Protestant opposition as well, to Tyndale's translation, without supposing it arose from opposition to the Word of God in English.

MR. JONES: "If the Church was not opposed to the translation of the Bible into English, for what cause was Wycliffe excommunicated?"

FATHER LAMBERT: As he was not excommunicated, we certainly have no idea of the cause of his excommunication. Certain of his doctrines were condemned as false and heretical. There were many charges brought against him, but the charge of having translated the Bible into English was not among them. Though twenty-four of his propositions were condemned as false, he was, strange to say, not deprived of his rectory of the parish of Lutterworth. He died holding that charge in 1384.

We will give a few of the doctrines of Wycliffe that were condemned and ask what your decision would be if you were called upon to pass a judgment on them:

1. Everything that is, is God. (This, you will observe, is pantheism.)
2. God can produce nothing besides what He does produce.
3. He cannot increase or diminish the universe; nor can he create souls beyond a certain number.
4. All things happen from absolute necessity.
5. God necessitates every creature to its every act.
6. All the sins

committed in the world are necessary and inevitable. 7. Nothing is possible to God save that which actually occurs.

Do you consider these propositions orthodox? Is it not the duty of the Church to warn its members against them by condemning them as errors?

You excuse the mistranslations of Tyndale by attributing them to the imperfection of the English language in his time. This excuse is groundless. If Sir Thomas More could expose the mistranslations of Tyndale in the time of Tyndale, it was equally possible for Tyndale to have avoided those mistranslations. More at that time wrote his famous "Utopia," and his daughter wrote her charming and pathetic "Diary." The English language was the language of Parliament and of the courts in Tyndale's time.

MR. JONES: "The translators of that time had but one or two original manuscripts to follow."

FATHER LAMBERT: They had no original manuscripts to follow, for they were not in existence. You meant to say that they had but one or two copies of the original manuscripts. But, letting that pass, the copies they used were correct or erroneous. If correct, no number of newly found copies could improve on them; if incorrect, then the translation correctly made from them would give an erroneous Bible. An erroneous Bible is a fallible Bible—that is, not the Word of God. And yet, according to you, Tyndale's was the only Bible the English Protestants had as their sole Rule of Faith. According to your admission, Protestants have never had, since Protestantism began, some four hundred years ago, a correct, that is, a true Bible in the English language until the "American Revised Edition" appeared.

CHAPTER XI.

A NEW METHOD OF BIBLE-MAKING.

MR. JONES: "You ask, 'Where are those copies (of the Bible), and who authenticated them?' You will find hun-

dreds of them in London, Paris, St. Petersburg, Rome, etc."

FATHER LAMBERT: This is too off-hand, too liberal, in a word, too easy. Our question referred to ancient copies, the only ones we have been considering. Our request is very modest. We will be satisfied if you produce or locate, not hundreds, but one single, complete manuscript copy of the Bible duly authenticated as a correct reproduction of the original manuscripts. In a loose, general, indefinite way, you have offered hundreds, but not a single one have you named, located or indicated. This wholesale method will not do. You must come down to particulars. We, therefore, must request you again to name and locate one single manuscript such as you have described.

The oldest manuscript of the Hebrew part of the Bible in existence is not older than the eleventh century. Who is to duly authenticate it; that is to say, who can supply you with evidence sufficient to build your faith upon, that this manuscript is a correct reproduction of the original writings of Moses and the other authors, writings that no longer exist?

MR. JONES: "Jewish rabbis, Christian churches and noted scholars throughout the world."

FATHER LAMBERT: How can the Jewish rabbis prove to you that a manuscript of the eleventh century of the Christian era is a correct reproduction of a non-existent manuscript written by Moses fifteen hundred years before the Christian era? How can they say anything is like another thing if they never saw and cannot see the other thing? Then what better authority are the Jewish rabbis to authenticate the eleventh century copy, or supposed copy, than you are yourself, in the absence of the original? Even if the rabbis agreed it would not help you. But they do not agree. The Hebrew copies of the Spanish Jews differ from the copies of the French, Italian and German Jews, and it is a question with Biblical critics which are the more correct or less correct.

The same difficulty confronts your other authenticators;

that is, the impossibility of comparing two documents together when one of them no longer exists.

But enough until you have named or located the one single manuscript copy of the Bible we have asked for, one only of the hundreds you have all over Europe.

MR. JONES: "You ask, 'Where is your evidence that the existing copies are correct copies of the non-existent originals?'"

FATHER LAMBERT: Yes, we want your evidence that any existent copy is a correct reproduction of the non-existent originals. You have not yet answered, as we shall see.

MR. JONES: "The evidence is found by comparison of all extant manuscripts, young and old, of various tongues and of every nation, with their respective attestation."

FATHER LAMBERT: How can any number of extant copies, whose correctness is the very point at issue, prove that any one of them is a correct copy of the non-existent originals? How can one document whose character is in doubt be evidence of the correctness of another document whose character is equally in doubt? But go on.

MR. JONES: "These (manuscripts) are then compared with the oldest versions, the Vulgate included, some of which bring us back to a time whose people could have readily walked and talked with the Apostles."

FATHER LAMBERT: At first you made it a special boast that the Protestant translators went directly to the originals. Now you think that it is necessary to have recourse to old versions or translations in various languages in order to construct a correct text. These ancient versions or translations have suddenly acquired a great value in your estimation when you have to have recourse to them for evidence of the correctness of manuscript copies in the original languages.

As the oldest manuscript copies of those ancient versions do not go back farther than the fourth century, those people at that time who talked with the Apostles, who were dead some centuries before, must have used some sort of a chronophone. But, granting them the extraordinary power,

how could they know that a particular manuscript was a correct reproduction of all the original manuscripts of the sixty-six books of your Bible? We will be as liberal as possible and suppose that the fourth century people could have known and testified that a particular manuscript was really an exact reproduction of those sixty-six non-existent manuscripts, did they as a matter of fact know that any existing manuscript was such a correct reproduction of the non-existent originals? And if they did know, have they any testimony to that effect? If you think they have, try to produce it, and then you will learn the full import of our request for evidence, which you thought so easy to comply with.

But suppose those old fourth century manuscript copies and fragments of copies are found not to agree, what then?

MR JONES: "Well, then, they are marked with a 'cave,' until original documents are exhausted, for something to support their claim."

FATHER LAMBERT: But suppose all the known existing copies are found to vary and the originals are non-existent, what then?

MR JONES: "If nothing anywhere can be found to sustain a word or a translation of a word, it is suspected and left out of the bunch."

FATHER LAMBERT: It is not only a word or many words, but the whole manuscript that is to be sustained. How, in the absence of any known correct copy, can you know which, if any, of the varying copies is a correct reproduction of the original? Among any number of varying copies it is impossible for you to know which of them, or if any of them, is correct, unless you have a known correct copy, as a criterion, rule or measure, with which to compare them. But you must acknowledge that you have no such known correct copy. Consequently, all the varying copies are unverifiable; and as long as they are all unverified they are to you all equally erroneous. As all vary from each other all cannot be true, and as you know not which

one, if any, is true, they are all to you equally unreliable, not competent witnesses either to the verity or fallacy of each other.

Just here we request you to recall our question. It was this: Where is your evidence that the existing copies, or any of them, are correct copies of the non-existing originals? If you will reflect a moment, you will see that you have not answered it or got anywhere near it. Instead of producing the evidence demanded to prove and identify any existing correct copy—which you undertook so willingly—you have simply tried to show how a correct text might be constructed by bunching together the variations and errors of existing copies; that is, you would get at the truth by a combination of errors.

Now, even if we were to admit—as we do not—that you could construct a true text in this way, you would still not have complied with our demand for evidence to prove that any existing copy is a correct copy of the originals.

MR. JONES: “The quotations from the ancient Fathers are also called in evidence to warrant the accuracy of our manuscripts and true rendering.”

FATHER LAMBERT: As the ancient Fathers did not indicate from what manuscript they quoted, their quotations are not evidence for any particular manuscript among the varying manuscripts.

But you are skating on thin ice when you appeal to the Fathers, for they will leave you in a bad way. If you grant that their quotations prove the correctness of the translation from which they quoted, you must reject your “American Revised Version” of the Bible as imperfect. For not only the Fathers, but our Lord and His Apostles, quoted from the Septuagint. Then, according to your reasoning, the Septuagint is a true copy of the Old Testament. But the Septuagint has in it all those books which the American Revised rejects as apocryphal. Consequently the rejection of these books leaves your American Revised imperfect, *minus habens*.

Again, St. Augustine quoted from the *Vetus Itala*, yet you say that version was incorrect, and St. Jerome, at the request of Pope Damasus, revised and corrected it in his *Vulgate*. The *Vetus Itala*, being a translation from the *Septuagint*, had in it from the *Septuagint* the books which your American Revised Version rejects as apocryphal; so, if Augustine's quoting from the *Vetus Itala* proves that version to be correct, it proves at the same time on his authority that the American Revised is erroneous or defective in that it does not contain the apocryphal books.

The Fathers of the Church are not safe witnesses for a Protestant to appeal to. They generally give him away badly, as they do in the present case.

MR. JONES: "We should not rely too much on any one version, or on any one manuscript."

FATHER LAMBERT: Right. But if you cannot rely on any one version or manuscript you cannot rely on all of them taken together, for no number of unreliable versions can give you a reliable one. Truth is not begotten of error. Or, to give an illustration in keeping with the business instincts of the times, you cannot from any number of false dollar bills extract a genuine bill; at least you cannot do it without recourse to practices that are likely to land one in jail. Without a genuine bill as a rule to judge by, you can not tell either a true or a false bill when you see it.

This is precisely your situation with regard to existing and differing manuscripts, and as you say we must not rely on any one manuscript or version there is none that you can consider as genuine. Hence, the originals being non-existent, you have no rule or criterion by which to judge of the reliability or genuineness of any existing manuscript or version.

CHAPTER XII.

THE VULGATE VERSION OF ST. JEROME.

MR. JONES: "The Greek manuscript to which you say St. Jerome had access is unknown to you and me. There is no time or place or date given."

FATHER LAMBERT: Yes, to our great disadvantage, it is not known to you and me, but it was known to St. Jerome, one of the Fathers of the Church, whose integrity and scholarship are known to the world, and recognized. A few moments ago you appealed to quotations from the Fathers to prove the correctness of copies and versions. And now when one of those Fathers, one of the most celebrated among them, indicates a preference for a particular manuscript or version by selecting it to translate, you attempt to throw doubt on that manuscript by implying a lack of knowledge or judgment or honesty on the part of that most famous Father of the Church, the most celebrated Scripture scholar of any age.

MR. JONES: "But there is no time or place or date given (of Jerome's copy)."

FATHER LAMBERT: Not given to us sixteen hundred years after St. Jerome used it, but it does not follow that he did not know the time, place and date, and other information about the copy he used sufficient to determine his selection of it in preference to other then extant copies. As to date, we know it was older than any manuscript now existing, for he called it old in his time; that is, in the fourth century—sixteen hundred years ago. And no existing manuscript can be traced with any certainty beyond the fourth century.

But if absence of time, place or date destroys the value of the copy used by St. Jerome, it equally destroys the value of all ancient manuscripts now in existence, for the time, place or date of none of them is known.

MR. JONES: "We can't classify it (Jerome's copy) with genuine since we have no history of it."

FATHER LAMBERT: You cannot classify it with genuine or correct manuscripts for the very simple reason that no manuscripts known to be correct exist. The fact that it was selected by Jerome is a higher guarantee of its correctness than is possessed by any existing manuscript copy, and if it were in existence to-day it would for that reason take a higher place than any existing copy. Try to produce, if you think you can, a fourth-century witness as authoritative as St. Jerome to the correctness of any manuscript extant, any witness who gives so positive and direct testimony as St. Jerome gave to his manuscript by selecting it to translate, from among the many manuscripts existing at his time. Just try it.

MR. JONES: "We have Greek manuscripts now that bring us far beyond the days of St. Jerome."

FATHER LAMBERT: You will do us a real service if you will name just one of those Greek manuscripts that goes "far beyond the days of St. Jerome," that is, beyond the fourth century. We refer, of course, to Greek manuscript copies of the Bible.

MR. JONES: "You can't rely on age of manuscripts."

FATHER LAMBERT: Here you attempt to saw off the limb on which you sit. For, if we cannot rely on the age or antiquity of the early manuscripts, we can much less rely on later manuscripts transcribed from those ancient ones. On what does your American Revised Version of the Bible rest, if not on the reliability of those ancient manuscripts or later copies made from them? Thus you see in discrediting the ancient manuscripts you discredit your own favorite Bible, you knock your own feet from under you, and leave the ground to the infidel and the higher critic.

MR. JONES: "Many spurious and defective manuscripts were let loose in the third and fourth centuries."

FATHER LAMBERT: Yes, even earlier. We have before us a list of no less than thirty-two books that were in use among the Christians of the fourth and earlier centuries. It is not necessary to suppose that all these books were

spurious or fraudulent. Many of them, indeed most of them, were doubtless written in good faith as histories of particular Apostles, and making no claim to inspiration. The Catholic Church in the fourth century, in fixing the Canon of Inspired Books, left them out of the list as not being inspired. This omitting of them is not equivalent to a condemnation of them as spurious and fraudulent.

If by "spurious and defective manuscripts" you meant manuscript copies of the Bible, then the same difficulty confronts you that we have noted above. As long as you can not prove that the later manuscripts were not copied from some of those spurious and defective ancient manuscripts, you have no security for the reliability of your favorite American Revised Bible.

Referring again to those thirty-two books rejected by the Catholic Church in the fourth century, suppose you had lived at that time, how could you, with your private judgment, have sifted those thirty-two books from the twenty-seven books that now constitute the New Testament, giving a special reason why each of those thirty-two books should be rejected as not inspired, and why the other twenty-seven should be received as inspired? You would not have attempted it; you would have seen, as those early Christians saw, that private judgment was not competent for the task, and, like them, you would have left the matter to the Church, and have, like them, abided by her decision. You will remember that some books and parts of books now in your New Testament were not considered as inspired by some of the early Christians until the Church, by her decision, placed them in the Canon. All doubts about them were destroyed by the action of the Church, not by private judgment.

MR. JONES: "A modern manuscript may transmit a truer text than an older and more remote manuscript."

FATHER LAMBERT: It is equally true to say that an older and more remote manuscript may transmit a truer text than a modern manuscript. Both these statements are true, but neither is of any practical use in solving the ques-

tion before us. As both are too indefinite to be made the basis of a definite conclusion, we may put them together face to face and throw them both out as so much waste of energy. The value of a modern manuscript depends on whether it is a true copy of a correct ancient manuscript. If you throw doubt on the ancient ones, the same doubt throws its ugly shadow on all modern copies.

MR. JONES: "Manuscripts and versions and various texts thereof were in a terrible muddle in the good saint's (Jerome's) time."

FATHER LAMBERT: Yes, there were at that time heretical translators and transcribers, who, like heretics of later days, did their work to favor the doctrines of their sects. But there were watchmen on the ramparts of Israel then as there have been at all times. The Catholic Church stood guard over the Scriptures then as she does now, and among the many books then in circulation among Christians she distinguished and determined the inspired from the uninspired. And were it not for her care and guardianship you would not know to-day what books constitute the New Testament.

But your statement, like others that precede it, sacrifices your Bible to its infidel and higher critic enemies. For, if the scholars of those early days could not and did not distinguish false from true copies of the Scriptures, you of to-day cannot tell whether the copies that now exist are or are not made from the false copies that made the "terrible muddle in the good saint's (Jerome's) time."

It is strange that, with your private judgment and your rejection of tradition and the authority of the Church of Christ, you did not see your statement's destructive effect on your American Revised Bible; strange that you did not reflect that there was and is no way out of the "terrible muddle" of manuscripts and versions except through the authority of that Church which Christ established to guard His flock from error.

MR. JONES: "The Roman Catholic Church accepted for centuries Jerome's edition as the standard, but a thousand

years afterward reached the climax by repudiating it and giving the world a Latin version, containing not only various readings different from the original Vulgate, but inserting therein uncanonical books, some of which Jerome despised as fables, and even refused to translate them from the Septuagint."

FATHER LAMBERT: First—St. Jerome's Translation was never accepted by the Church as the standard—that is, as containing the whole Canon of Inspired Books. Second—St. Jerome's Translation of the books he translated was never repudiated by the Catholic Church. Third—The Church did not a thousand years after—that is, at the Council of Trent—add a single book to the Bible that was not recognized by her as belonging to it during the lifetime of St. Jerome. Fourth—As a matter of fact, St. Jerome did translate some of those books, which are called apocryphal, and which you say he "despised as fables and refused to translate." True, he did not translate them from the Septuagint, just as he did not translate any of the books of the Old Testament from the Septuagint. The two books—Judith and Tobias—which he "despised as fables," he translated from the original Chaldaic. The other books, which he did not translate because they were not extant in the original Hebrew or Chaldaic, he left as he found them in the Latin version, which was used by the Latins a century and a half or two centuries before he was born, a version which St. Augustine used in preference to other Latin versions, that is, the *Vetus Itala*.

You will be good enough to remember that St. Jerome, whom you would transmogrify into a sneering modern higher critic, was a Catholic, a Papist. He was for a time Secretary to Pope Damasus, and it was at this Pope's request that he undertook his great work of translating the Scriptures into Latin. When in the East St. Jerome was greatly bothered by the disputes of the Arian and Sabellian heretics, and to be secure in the right way he wrote a letter to Pope Damasus for direction. For the purpose of edifying you and showing you how this great saint and scholar of

the fourth century did not trust to private judgment in matters of faith, we will give a portion of his letter, written in the year 376. Here it is:

"I am joined in communion with your Holiness, that is, with the Chair of Peter; upon that Rock I know the Church is built. Whoever eats the lamb out of that house is a profane person. Whoever is not in the ark shall perish in the flood. I do not know Vitalis; I do not communicate with Meletius; Paulinus is a stranger to me. Whoever gathereth not with you, scatters; that is, he who is not Christ's, belongs to Antichrist. * * * Order me, if you please, what I should do."

In a second letter to the same Pope he wrote:

"On the one side the Arian fury rages, supported by the secular power; on the other side the Church (at Antioch) being divided into three parts, each would needs draw me to itself. All the time I cease not to cry out: Whoever is united to the Chair of Peter is mine."

This voice of one of the greatest Christians and scholars of the fourth century has the true Catholic ring to it.

MR JONES: The Church has not appreciated the labors of Jerome."

FATHER LAMBERT: The best evidence of the Church's appreciation of St. Jerome is the manner in which she has treated him. He was held in the highest esteem by Pope Damasus, and it was by request of that Pope that he undertook his Translation of the Scriptures into Latin. You ought to meditate on this fact. It has a valuable lesson in it for all those who think or pretend to think that the Church is opposed to the Bible in the common speech of the people. It shows that Pope Damasus, in the fourth century, was anxious to have the best possible translation of the Bible in the language of the people, which at that time was Latin. His appointment of St. Jerome for the work shows his high appreciation of the saint's great learning and ability. The work when completed was received with applause, and Pope Gregory the Great, a successor of Damasus, preferred it to all other Latin translations. For his holy work and holy life St. Jerome was canonized by the Church and

held in veneration by Catholic peoples throughout the world as one of the immortal champions of the Catholic Faith against the heretics of his time. For his zeal in defense of the true Faith he was made to suffer, as many have been made to suffer during the many ages since from the fury of heretics and pagans. The Pelagian heretics, the know-nothings and A. P. A.'s of that day, sent a troop of seditious banditti to Bethlehem to assault the holy monks and nuns who lived there under the direction of St. Jerome. These heretics set fire to the monasteries and reduced them to ashes, just as their successors in iniquity, some years ago, fired the convent in Boston over the heads of helpless nuns and burned them out in the night. St. Jerome, with great difficulty, escaped their fury by flight. After this storm and riot of heretical malignity St. Jerome continued his labors, hated by all enemies of the Church, but beloved and revered by all good men, as St. Augustine testifies. Having triumphed over the heresies of his time, he passed away at a good old age in the year 420. He was buried in a vault near the ruins of his monastery at Bethlehem. But his remains did not long remain there. They were brought with loving care and veneration to Rome, and now rest in the Church of St. Mary Major, on the Esquiline Hill. The Church established a festival to commemorate his death on the 30th of September, and on that day in every year of the many centuries that have gone into the past she has honored him and held him up before her children as an example of Christian life to be imitated. And yet you tell us that the Church has not appreciated the labors of St. Jerome! It was the heretics of his time, the enemies of the Church he loved so well, that did not appreciate him, and mobbed him, and burned his monastery.

MR. JONES: "Repeatedly before the Council of Trent the Church revised his (Jerome's) Vulgate, and then in the sixteenth century saw fit to pronounce it defective in some passages, and, besides, to push in several uninspired books among the inspired books of Jerome's Bible. The Council of Trent went farther, for it put these spurious books on a

level with the Word of God to be believed in by members of the Church *sub poena anathemae*."

FATHER LAMBERT: You should have been more careful with the Graeco-Latin genitives, and, instead of saying *poena anathemae*, you should have said *poena anathematis*. It would have looked better. But as you put it it is a very good illustration of how errors creep into manuscripts through carelessness or ignorance.

But your carefully sewn piece which we have quoted must be ripped out and each stitch examined under a sun-glass.

1. "Before the Council of Trent the Church repeatedly revised the Vulgate." This is not true. Your error arose from your confounding the official, magisterial action of the Church with the labors of Catholic Biblical scholars. For more than a thousand years before the Council of Trent the Church used the Vulgate, or St. Jerome's Version. But in doing this she did not scrutinize every manuscript copy as it came from the hands of the copyists and give a decision as to its correctness or fidelity to the original of St. Jerome. It was natural and practically inevitable that errors of copyists, intentional or otherwise, should during the ages creep in, just as the error of *poena anathemae* crept into your letter to us. It was the duty of the Biblical scholars to scrutinize these manuscript copies; and such vigilant watchmen as Alcuin, Lanfranc and others during the Middle Ages were as industrious in keeping the original versions free from the vermin of mis-transcription as the strenuous mother with a fine tooth-comb. It was a work that required constant and vigilant attention as long as the Scriptures were handed down by transcription.

You erred, therefore, when you said "the Church repeatedly revised," instead of saying the Biblical scholars repeatedly revised, to keep the manuscript copies as true as possible to the original Vulgate Version.

2. "Then in the sixteenth century it (the Church) saw fit to pronounce it (the Latin Vulgate) defective in some passages."

This is a very strange statement from one who pretends to know anything about the Council of Trent and its canons and decrees. In one of your letters you refer to a passage in the "History of the Council of Trent" wherein is given an account of the action of one of the committees of that Council. This committee reported as follows concerning the Vulgate:

"The great variety of translations current in the Church was an evil to be remedied; and it was accordingly advised that one translation only should be regarded as authorized; and for this purpose St. Jerome's Version, or the Vulgate, was selected and proposed, as being the most ancient, the most used, as representing more correctly the state of the ancient copies of the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures than any other Latin version, or even, probably, than any other then or now existing Greek or Hebrew edition; and finally, as having been prepared ages before the modern disputes, and therefore unbiased by them."

There is nothing here about "defects in some passages." But this, you may say, was not the action or decision of the Church. True, it was only the action of a Committee of the Council, not the act of the Council. But it shows the mind of those learned Biblical scholars, members of the committee, as to the correctness of the Vulgate.

Now let us see what the Council said on the subject; and remember that what it said is the official act of the Church. In its fourth session, on the Canonical Scriptures, it decreed as follows, after giving the list of canonical books:

"But if any one receive not as sacred and canonical the said books entire with all their parts, as they have been used to be read in the Catholic Church, and as they are contained in the old Latin Vulgate edition, and knowingly and deliberately contemn the traditions aforesaid, let them be anathema."

The Council decreed further as follows:

"Considering that no small utility may accrue to the Church of God if it be made known which out of all the Latin editions now in circulation of the sacred books is to be held as authentic, ordains and declares that the said old

and Vulgate edition, which by the lengthened use of so many ages has been approved of in the Church, be, in public lectures, disputations, sermons and expositions, held as authentic; and that no one is to dare or presume to reject it under any pretext whatever. The Synod ordains and decrees that henceforth the Sacred Scriptures, and especially the said old and Vulgate edition, be printed in the most correct manner possible."

Now, Mr. Jones, in view of these official pronouncements of the Church on the Vulgate, can you, with your hand on your heart and with a conscience duly awake, say that you knew what you were talking about when you said, "The Church pronounced it (the Vulgate) defective in some passages"? We think somebody has fooled you again, because we do not assume that you would knowingly tell an untruth. But you should be more careful in making statements on unverified hearsay.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE.

MR. JONES: "The Church saw fit to push in several uninspired books among the inspired books of Jerome's Bible."

FATHER LAMBERT: You talk of inspired and uninspired books as if you had a private key or touchstone by which to distinguish the one kind of books from the other, as you would distinguish chalk from cheese, by the taste. If from your Protestant position you examine and carefully investigate the grounds for your belief in the inspiration of any book of the Bible, you will discover that you have no touchstone or key to help you in the least.

Try to answer the following question, and you will see the difficulty of your Protestant position, resting as it does on Bible alone and private judgment: Why do you believe that any book in the American Revised Version of the Bible is inspired? Ponder this question carefully, and then pro-

ceed to give, on Protestant principles, an account of the faith that is in you.

Do you believe in the inspiration of those books because they say they are inspired? If so, that is not a solid and reasonable ground of belief, first, because they do not say they are inspired, and, second, if they said it their authority would be insufficient as a ground of belief until their inspiration was proved, for until known to be inspired their claim to inspiration is equivalent to an uninspired claim like that made by the Book of Mormon or the Koran.

Then their own statement alone—even if such statement had been made—must be rejected as a reasonable ground of belief in their inspiration.

What further reason have you? The Jewish Church? There are two or more reasons why this is not sufficient for you. First, the Jewish Church says nothing about the New Testament. Second, that church is fallible or infallible. If fallible, it is no better authority on inspiration than your own private judgment, which is equally fallible. If infallible, you cannot accept it, because you reject all infallible authority except the very books whose inspiration you have not as yet ascertained.

What further reason have you? The belief of the Christian world? Such belief cannot be of any authority to you, as a Protestant, who reject all authority but your Bible and private judgment.

Now, if you have no way of telling what books are inspired, you have no way of telling what books are uninspired. Why, then, do you talk with such assurance about the Church putting uninspired books in the Canon? The only way to know what books are inspired is St. Augustine's way, namely, that the Church of Christ puts them in the Canon, or list of inspired books. This is the way our Lord indicated when He commanded us to hear the Church.

MR. JONES: "The Council of Trent put these spurious books on a level with the Word of God, to be believed in by members of the Church *sub poena anathemae*."

FATHER LAMBERT: By this you mean that the Council of Trent added to the Canon of Scriptures certain books which were not recognized by the early Church as inspired. Now, the obligations imposed on us by the principles of veracity require us to inform you that your statement is not true. One of the most onerous and irksome duties of the Catholic controversialist is to impart this kind of unwelcome information when discussing theological questions with modern heretics; the same duty was imposed on the early orthodox Christians by the early heretics.

Now, the Council of Trent added no book to the Bible, put no book "on a level with the Word of God" that was not declared by the Church twelve hundred years before to be a component part of the Bible; that is, to be in the list or Canon of inspired Books, and that was not recognized as such by the Church during the intervening centuries. This, we hope, is sufficiently clear and explicit to contradict your groundless statement. Let us then verify it:

1. The Council of Hippo, held in 393, and the Councils of Carthage, held in 397 and 419, declared to be canonical the same books given by the Council of Trent. The Council of Carthage of 397—that is, twelve hundred years before the Council of Trent—gave as the reason of its decision that "It is from our fathers that we hold that these books are those which should be read in the Church."

2. Pope Innocent I, in a letter to Exuperus, Bishop of Toulouse in the year 405, gave the same list of books given by the Council of Trent.

3. Pope Gelasius, in the Council held in Rome in the year 679, declared canonical the same books given by the Council of Trent.

4. The books recognized by the Council of Trent were found in the most ancient Latin version—that known as the *Vetus Itala*, which was so highly esteemed by St. Augustine, and which is attributed by Biblical scholars to the latter half of the second century. The Old Testament of the *Vetus Itala* was translated from the *Septuagint*, a Greek version

made by the Hellenist Jews in the second century before the Christian Era. The great authority and use of the Septuagint is shown by the frequent quoting of it by our Lord Himself, by the writers of the New Testament, and by the early Christian Fathers of the first four centuries. Out of about 350 quotations from the Old Testament in the New, about 300 are from the Septuagint. St. Augustine speaks of the Septuagint as "approved by the Apostles."

Now, this Septuagint version of the Old Testament, from which the *Vetus Itala* was made, has the same books of the Old Testament which the Council of Trent has given. It follows from this that the books which you call "spurious" and say were "put on a level with the Word of God," were recognized by the Hellenist Jews as on a level with the other books of the Old Testament—that is, equally inspired. This recognition of your "spurious" books took place nearly eighteen hundred years before the Council of Trent and one hundred and thirty years before the birth of Christ.

5. Some Protestants in the seventeenth century started a movement to induce the Greek Church to unite with them. The Greeks held a Council at Jerusalem, under the Patriarch Dositheus, and, in their reply to the proposal of a union, they said concerning the books in the Canon of the Council of Trent: "We regard all these books as canonical; we recognize them as Holy Scripture, because they have been transmitted to us by ancient custom, or, rather, by the Catholic Church." These words attest the tradition of the ancient Greek Church relative to the canonical books.

Thus the Greek Church would not accept the defective Protestant Canon, and hence, as you doubtless know, the proposal of union with Protestantism was rejected.

Now, in view of all these facts, it seems to us that you should begin to suspect, or awake to the conviction, that some one, in a spurious book, possibly, has fooled you into making an egregious blunder when you said the Council added those books to the Canon of Scripture. It seems that

the books you have been reading have added to your store of knowledge a vast amount of misinformation.

MR. JONES: "Five and forty years after said Council (of Trent), the Bishop of Rome, Sixtus V, complained of errors in the same Vulgate that was accepted by Trent."

FATHER LAMBERT: The Council, after approving of the Vulgate, in preference to all other Latin versions, decreed that an edition be printed "in the most correct manner possible." This shows that the Council did not consider any of the several editions of the Vulgate then in print satisfactory. While it approved of the Vulgate Version as authentic, it did not approve of any of the different and differing editions gotten out by private enterprise as authentic. The Council, therefore, ordered that as correct an edition as possible should be produced. The complaint of Sixtus V shows that up to his time no satisfactory edition of the Vulgate had been produced. He ordered an edition to be prepared, but on its completion he was not satisfied with it, and ordered the work to be again submitted to correction, but he died before another edition was prepared. Clement VIII took up the work, and in 1593 issued the edition which is the model of our present Bibles, from which no publisher is permitted to depart.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE VULGATE EDITION PREPARED FROM AUTHENTIC MSS.

MR. JONES: "How am I to know that this Clementine edition is more in accord with the autographs than that of Sixtus V, or that of Jerome in the fourth century?"

FATHER LAMBERT: How are you to know that the American Revised Version is more in accord with the autographs than any other version of the Bible?

As the Church does not claim infallibility in the art of book-making, it is not impossible that some differences may be discovered between the Vulgate and the Clementine edition of it; when discovered, if there be any, they will be

corrected by the same authority that makes the Vulgate the standard version.

MR. JONES: "You say 'it is a principle that the more ancient the copy, the nearer the Apostolic times, the more correct and reliable it is.'"

FATHER LAMBERT: Yes. Such is the view of Biblical scholars, and that is why they all, without exception, seek for ancient manuscripts, and prefer them to modern copies. It is a common sense view, for if the ancient copies are assumed to be incorrect, the modern transcripts from them must be assumed to carry the same incorrectness, plus others that experience teaches us creep in in the course of many repeated transcriptions.

MR. JONES: "That is so, provided the (ancient) copy be a correct one."

FATHER LAMBERT: If either the ancient or the modern copy is known to be correct, inquiry need go no further. But where the question is as to the comparative correctness of the two copies, the ancient is to be preferred, for the simple reason that it has not been subject to so many transcriptions through which errors are so liable to creep in, through carelessness or ignorance, or even malice.

MR. JONES: "You might as well say that the Chinese plow is superior to our American plow, because the former is nearly 3,000 years older."

FATHER LAMBERT: The Chinese plow made 3,000 years ago is certainly better evidence of what the original Chinese plow was than is the American plow. And if we were called upon to determine what the original Chinese plow was like we would prefer the ancient specimen to the modern as the basis of our judgment; and we think you would do the same. The American plow is superior as a soil-tiller, but not as a witness to the ancient form of the Chinese plow. It is the same with manuscripts. If asked to determine which of two manuscripts is the more correct reproduction of the original first manuscript, we would prefer the one made in the first century—if we had it—to one made in the

tenth or fifteenth century. We think you would do the same.

MR. JONES: "I have stated that old manuscripts have furnished incorrect texts."

FATHER LAMBERT: This statement imposes upon you the burden of proving that the old manuscripts used in making the American Revised Version are not copies from some of the older incorrect manuscripts you speak of. Until you prove they are not, the doubt as to correctness which you raise as to the old manuscripts throws its shadow equally on all modern versions of the Bible. In the absence of the original manuscripts, you have no criterion by which to determine which of the extant ancient copies is a correct reproduction of the originals. This is the mesh you, as a Protestant, are placed in by your statement, because you reject the authority of the Church and her traditions, which are the only criterion left to determine which of all the copies represents truly the thought of the writers of the Scriptures. The rejection of this criterion severs you absolutely from the common Christian faith of the past, leaves you an isolated critic, and places you in precisely the same position a Chinese pagan would be in if the ancient Christian manuscripts were placed in his hands and he required to determine which of them is a correct reproduction of non-existent originals. He would throw them down in despair of solving the problem. Having rejected the sole criterion—the Church and her traditions—you are as isolated as he, and as helpless to solve the problem. Having rejected this criterion—which, as a Protestant, you must—you have broken the only link that united you in faith and corporate unity with the early Christians. Having abandoned the divinely built ark, the Church, you float alone, and drift with the tide.

You may say that you are not isolated from the early Christians, that the Bible is the link which unites you with them. But that begs the question, for until you prove that your Bible is a correct reproduction of the original manu-

scripts it is not the same Bible the early Christians had; and you cannot prove it to be a correct reproduction without the criterion which you have rejected.

You may say you have the same faith the early Christians had. This again begs the question, for you claim to get your belief out of the Bible you have. But until you prove it is the same Bible the early Christians had, you cannot assert that the belief you get out of it is the same belief they had. As a matter of fact, the early Christians did not get their belief from the Bible. They got it, before the New Testament was written, from the oral teaching of the Apostles and other ministers of the Church of Christ. It was because of their Christian belief thus acquired that they believed in the Bible at all. Their Christian faith was not drawn from the Bible. On the contrary, their belief in the Bible was drawn from their Christian faith.

Even if we were to grant—which we do not—that you had the same belief as the early Christians, it would not prove that you are a member of the same household of faith, that is, a member of the same Church that they were members of. A foreigner may believe in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, but his belief does not make him a citizen of the United States. Besides his belief he must be naturalized, initiated into the corporate unity of the republic by its duly appointed officers. In the same way, before you can be a member of the Church of the early Christians—the Church which Christ established for all time—you must be naturalized, initiated into that divine corporation by duly appointed officers of it. The only duly appointed officers are the legitimate successors of the original officers. If you have not thus been naturalized, or, more correctly, supernaturalized, into the Kingdom of Christ on Earth, His Church, you are not a citizen thereof, whatever you may think about it.

To come back now to your statement, meant to weaken confidence in ancient manuscripts, we agree with you that there were—as, considering the human frailties of tran-

scribers, there must have been—incorrect copies. And we leave you in the position the consequences of that statement place you; you may extricate yourself as best you may. Your position is the logical result of your Protestant principles, and it in no way concerns Catholics.

MR. JONES: "Our American Revised Version has had access to older and more correct manuscripts than ever the Latin Vulgate has had."

FATHER LAMBERT: Before committing yourself to such a statement, you should be very sure of your ground, because if not true, it compels us to place you in a very humiliating position. We will now give the facts, and they will show where they leave your statement.

1. There is no Hebrew copy of the Old Testament older than the tenth century. As St. Jerome began his translation of the Vulgate in the fourth century (380), the Hebrew manuscript from which he translated the Old Testament must of course have been made prior to that time, probably long prior to it, for he would naturally seek the oldest and most reliable copy which he could find among the Jews of Palestine, where he made his translation.

2. Let us now consider the oldest Greek manuscripts of the New Testament. The oldest known to exist go back only to the fourth century. The two recognized as the most ancient are the manuscripts known as the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex Sinaiticus. The former is in the celebrated Vatican library, the latter in St. Petersburg, the property of the Emperor of Russia. The German critic, Hug, places the Vatican Codex in the first part of the fourth century, and Tischendorf refers it to the fourth century, and remarks that "It scarcely differs in age from the Codex Sinaiticus." This latter codex was found by Tischendorf in the convent on Mount Sinai, in 1859. He referred it to the middle of the fourth century, that is, about the year 350. These two manuscripts are the most ancient that the translators of the American Revised Version could have had access to.





LIBRARY
OF THE
SAN FRANCISCO COLLEGE FOR WOMEN

