

APPENDIX A.

The Book of Mormon states that after the Apostles' day a great and abominable church took away from our Bible many parts that were plain and most precious—so much taken away that what is left is at best but a poor excuse for a Bible; quite incapable, without the help of the Book of Mormon, of guiding the soul safely to Heaven.

The substance of Apostle Orson Pratt's objection is clearly presented in the following passage:

The gathering together of the few scattered manuscripts which compose what is now termed the Bible was the work of uninspired man, which took place centuries after John had finished his manuscript. Among the vast number of professedly inspired manuscripts, scattered through the world, man, poor, weak, ignorant man, assumed the authority to select a few, which, according to his frail judgment, he believed or conjectured were of God; but the balance not agreeing, perhaps, with his peculiar notion of divine inspiration, were rejected as spurious. The few selected from the abundance were finally arranged into one volume, divided into chapter and verse, and named the Bible. . . How does the Protestant world know that the compilers of the Bible, in hunting up the sacred manuscripts which were widely scattered over the world, one in one place, and another in another, found all that were of divine origin? How do they know that the compilers of the Bible found even the one-hundredth part of the manuscripts that were sacred? And as the compilers rejected many that they did find, how do they know but what some of the rejected books were equally sacred with those received into the collection? Would not the prophecy of Enoch with which the Apostle Jude was familiar, and from which he makes a quotation relative to the second coming of Christ, be as sacred as any other prophecy in the Bible? Would not the book of Iddo, the seer, the book of Nathan the prophet, together with some twelve or fifteen other books and epistles written by inspired prophets, seers and apostles, and referred to in Scripture, be as worthy of a place in the Bible as any that human wisdom has already compiled? Would it have been any more a violation

324 THE GOLDEN BIBLE.

of the caution (in Rev. 22:18) for the compilers to have added the book of Gad the seer, with the collection called the Bible, than it was for them to add to the volume the book of Ezekiel, the book of Solomon's Songs, the book of Matthew, the book of James or any other book of the collection. "—"Divine Authenticity of the Book of Mormon," by Orson Pratt, p. 130.

This is an old infidel objection to the Bible that has been assiduously peddled over the world for two hundred years and more. And though fully and completely answered a hundred times, yet is just as boldly thrust forward to-day as ever, because it is found exceedingly effective among a certain class of people who are not acquainted with the facts, and who are glad to pick up something against the Word of God, because they *hate* it, and are anxious to find it untrue. But why a man in high standing in a professedly Christian church, an accredited *apostle*, should be willing to give the sanction of his name and character to such a bundle of malicious falsehoods, designed to cast doubt and distrust upon the Word of God, that he *professed to love*, we cannot understand.

The *gist* of the above objection to the Bible is found in the question, "How do we know that the compilers of the Bible found even the one-hundredth part of the manuscripts that were sacred?"

It will be the purpose of this article briefly to tell our readers *how* we know.

And not to mix things that God has been very careful to keep separate, we will first give attention to the Old Testament:

I. It is frankly conceded that there are quite a number of books mentioned in the Old Testament that have furnished any amount of food for the attacks of infidelity, because not found in our collection or in any collection of the Holy Scriptures. For instance, in Numb., 21st chapter, we have a quotation from the "Book of the Wars of the Lord." In Joshua and Samuel we have the book of "Jasher" mentioned. In 1st Sam., 10:25, we have an account of Samuel's writing a book and laying it up before the Lord. In 1st Kings, 11:41, is mentioned "the Book of the Acts of Solomon," while in 1st Chron., 29:29, three strange books are found in one verse—the "Book of Samuel the Seer," the "Book of Nathan the Prophet," and the "Book of Gad the Seer." Besides these the

THE GOLDEN BIBLE. 325

Apostle Jude quotes from "the Prophecy of Enoch, the Seventh from Adam," and the martyr Stephen mentions facts relative to Moses not found in our Bibles, etc., etc.

Now in reference to these books supposed to be lost, please bear in mind

I. The probabilities are, *they are not lost*. It is, in fact, almost universally conceded that the books mentioned as the "Book of Samuel the Seer," the "Book of Nathan the Prophet" and the "Book of Gad the Seer" are simply those portions of the books of Judges, 1st and 2d Samuel and the Kings, that these different prophets wrote out. And the same may be said of the other books mentioned. The word "book" in the Old Testament means any writing, however small. If merely a short letter, it was called a book. So far as we can know, all the books named above* are fragments or portions of the books now found in the Old Testament, but

known by other names so long as they existed in separate fragments.

It is believed, for the best of reasons, that the various books of the Old Testament were not written out in full and put together as we now have them till after the captivity at Babylon. The universal tradition among the Jews anciently was that *Ezra* the scribe, with the help of other wise men, was inspired of God to do this work—collect together all the various materials that had been accumulating during all the previous ages, and put them into shape and for the first time in the history of the Jews furnish them a *complete* book.

The probabilities then, are that the books mentioned *are not lost*. But whether lost or not, please bear in mind two other self-evident statements:

2. Because a book is mentioned in the Bible furnishes no proof whatever that it was written under direction of the Holy Spirit; and

3. Very much was said and perhaps written under the immediate

— — —
*There is not a particle of evidence that the apostle Jude quoted from a book known as the “Prophecy of Enoch,” or that Enoch ever wrote a book of any kind. The evidence is all the other way. No written language existed. And it is more than probable that this one sentence quoted by the apostle Jude is all the prophesying Enoch ever did. It is at least all that the Holy Spirit thought worth perpetuating.

326 THE GOLDEN BIBLE.

direction of the Holy Spirit that had to do simply with *local matters* and was never designed to form a part of the scriptures of truth. For instance, Jesus was constantly preaching for three and a half years—often said more in a single day than we have reported in the entire four gospels. He performed miracles by the thousand, possibly tens of thousands, but only *forty* of them are recorded for us, enough to be a fair sample of the whole. The same was true of the Apostles after the day of Pentecost—they said and did a thousand things *under the direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit too*, that were not considered of such value to the whole world as to be left on record.

The question, therefore, becomes exceedingly interesting and practical, *have we any means of knowing certainly and positively whether the Old Testament, as we find it to-day, is perfect and complete, all that God designed to be preserved for the world?*

We have. And it is evidence the most satisfactory and conclusive. Jesus Christ and his Apostles, when under the direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit, gave their full and entire assent to the volume of the Old Testament *as it existed*

in their day.

“Suppose a merchant in San Francisco receives a large order from a firm in Liverpool for several cargoes of wheat. He goes to the Merchants’ Intelligence Office and satisfies himself that the Liverpool house is perfectly solvent. But he has never had any correspondence with that house before, and so does not certainly know that the signature is genuine. Just then one of his neighbors, whom he knows to be a true man, and who has recently returned from England, steps in with a strange gentleman, and introduces him as a son of the senior partner, and himself a member of the firm. The San Francisco merchant shows the letter to the young Englishman. ‘Yes!’ he says, ‘that is all right; that is my father’s signature.’ Then he proceeds to explain the letter. There is no longer any doubt or delay in filling the order.

Now, can we authenticate the Bible in any such way? We *can* authenticate the Bible in this very way. The Son of God, the Lord Jesus Christ, has visited our world as the Word of God, *on this very business*, to declare God’s word to us. He has read the Bible carefully, as much of it as was then written, and he has directed the writing of the remainder. He has given us his opinion of it repeatedly in direct statements; has quoted many passages from it, and explained them, and exposed and reprobated the additions which the Scribes and Pharisees would have made to the Bible by their tradition. We can trust the testimony of Jesus

THE GOLDEN BIBLE. 327

unhesitatingly. All Christians acknowledge Him as the Truth, and no infidel has dared to charge Him with falsehood. . .

“ . . . It is exceedingly interesting to turn over the leaves of Christ’s pocket Bible, to mark where it opens of itself to His favorite passages; to see where his tears have fallen on the page; to notice the texts He has underlined for His own soul’s nourishment and to follow His course of reading and marking all over the book from Genesis to Malachi.”*

There are in the New Testament nearly *two hundred direct quotations* from the books of the Old Testament, besides very many indirect allusions to them. Every book now found in the Old Testament, except *seven* of the smaller, is quoted from in the New Testament, and has thus secured heaven’s seal to its genuineness and its divinity. And because seven of the smaller are not quoted from directly, there is no lack of evidence, as we shall see, that they were found, every one of them, in the Bibles Jesus and His Apostles used; and formed, as they now do, an integral portion of “Moses, the Prophets and the Psalms,” the three general divisions into which the Holy Scriptures, were separated in the time of Christ.

But what is still more to our present purpose, *no other books are quoted from*. Not one of the “vast number of professedly inspired manuscripts, scattered through the world,” according to our excellent Apostle Orson Pratt, received so much as the slightest attention from our Lord Jesus Christ. In fact there is nowhere in the New Testament so much as a hint that there is any chasm, any lack whatever; no book lost, no command or precept wanting. On the contrary they

are frequently and unhesitatingly held up as perfect and complete, as an all-sufficient rule of life, able to make one wise unto salvation. If they were considered perfect and complete as they then existed, that is, perfect and complete for the purposes for which the Old Testament was given, as the preparation for Christ, the schoolmaster that leads up to Christ, aye, more, the completed temple of truth that only required a living Christ within to fill it with the divinest beauty and completeness and glory—if there was found in the Old Testament as it existed in

— — —
*“*The Testimony of Christ to the Truth of the Old Testament*,” by Rev. Robert Patterson. Pub. by H. L. Hastings, No. 47 Cornhill, Boston.

328 THE GOLDEN BIBLE.

New Testament times everything that was needed, all that the great Author cared to preserve for the world to read—why, then, of course, there is no occasion to go farther back. We need not be concerned *who* wrote the different books of the Old Testament, or *when* or *how* it was written, or whether any books or parts of books have been lost. *The Christian asks no higher authority or better voucher than Jesus himself and his Apostles when under the direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit.*

Hence the only question that concerns us is, *what books* belonged to the Old Testament in the time of Christ and his Apostles. Did they read the same Old Testament you and I read, the same books with the same contents essentially as now?

Fortunately the student of history finds abundant material for the satisfactory solution of this question. The Old Testament existed in the time of Christ in two languages—in the *Hebrew* and in the *Greek*. The Greek version was a translation from the Hebrew, made in Alexandria, Egypt, some *two hundred* years before Christ. It speedily became the common version of the people all over the world where the Greek language was known, and remained so for several centuries after Christ. The Hebrew text, however, was tenaciously clung to by the Jewish writers of those times, of whom we have quite a large number, both before and during and after the time of Christ, whose writings have, in part, come down to us. Some of them wrote commentaries upon the Old Testament, or paraphrases; some wrote *about* the different books, or the authors of the different books of the Old Testament. We have works of fiction founded upon the histories of the Old Testament, and traditions in reference to every portion.

The Old Testament in Hebrew was regarded with so much veneration that the most scrupulous care was taken in transcribing it. They not only give us the names of the various books found in it, counted the words and tell us the

number—they even inform us which is the *middle word* and where the *middle letter* may be found. And the fact that the Jews were from the first the bitterest opponents of the Christians and jealously guarded the Hebrew text as the latter did the Greek, makes the solution of the question before us all the more satisfactory and complete. For *collusion* between

THE GOLDEN BIBLE. 329

the two was simply impossible, and any attempted change in the one would have been immediately discovered and exposed by the other.

II.—Inasmuch as a large portion of the evidence relied upon to prove the identity of the Old Testament used by the Savior and his Apostles with the Old Testament in our hands to-day, is the same evidence used to identify the *New Testament* of the early Church with ours of to-day—we will combine these two questions and consider them together. Have a great many of the best things in the New Testament *been taken out of it* by a great and abominable church *since* the Apostles' day, as the Book of Mormon tells us? Or is it true that from a vast number of inspired manuscripts of equal value a few were selected by weak, imperfect men, centuries after Christ, as a man claiming to be an apostle of the Lord Jesus Christ is pleased to tell us?

Such a piracy of Holy Scripture could not have occurred *later* than 350 A. D., because there are now in existence copies of the Bible that are between fifteen and sixteen hundred years old, copies written out by hand not later than 350 years after Christ—250 years after the death of the Apostle John. There are *four* of these old manuscripts of the Bible now in the possession of scholars, known as the Alexandrian, the Vatican, the Ephraim and the Sinaitic manuscripts of the Bible, besides quite a number of fragments or portions of the Bible that are nearly as old. And these old copies of the Bible contain precisely the same books as are found in our Bibles to-day, *and no others*; and with precisely the same contents.

If, therefore, a “great and abominable church” took out of the Bible its most precious and valuable portions, the theft must have occurred *after* the close of the first century, or the death of the Apostle John, and *previous* to the year 350 A. D. It could not have occurred before John died, for he would have exposed it, and it could not have occurred after the year 350 since we have Bibles that were written at that time, and find that ours of to-day *agree with them*.

Let us briefly review a small portion only of the evidence at hand,

that no such piracy occurred or was possible during the period in question:

In the first place, a large number of Christian writers flourished during this period, many of whose productions have come down to us. During the Fourth Century (from A.D. 300 to A.D. 400) a large number of ponderous volumes were written by such men as Athanasius, Epiphanius, Eusebius, Jerome, Rufinus, Augustine, Cyril, Gregory of Nazianzem, Philaster, Chrysostom and Basil.

During the Second and Third Centuries there have come down to us the writings of such men as Arnobius, Lactantius, Victorinus, Origen, Gregory of Caesarea, Dyonysius, Cyprian, Caius, Hyppolytus, Portuensis, Ammonius, Julius Africanus, Tertullian, Clement, Theophilus, Athanagorus, Irenaeus, Melito, Tatian, Justin and Papias. Add to these Ignatius and Polycarp of the First Century, whose lives extended far into the Second Century, who, with Barnabas, Clement of Rome and Hermas, were contemporary with the Apostles themselves, lived and labored with them.

Now the point we wish to make is this: from the hundreds of large volumes written during this period by these men and others like them, all directly or indirectly connected with the Bible, defending or explaining it, it is comparatively an easy task to identify their Bible with ours or to satisfy us of the change, if it were changed during that period. And the facts are, as has often been declared by those best qualified to know, that from the numerous commentaries, harmonies, exegeses, and paraphrases, from the theological discussions, the doctrinal treatises and apologies written in defense of Christianity, and from the sermons, the epistolary correspondence and such like writings of the first four centuries of the Christian era, from these alone could be collected such a vast body of quotations, direct and explicit, from the different books of the Bible, as to nearly if not entirely restore the Bible to the world if by any means during the middle ages or at any other period, past or future, it had been or shall be lost.

The experiment has actually been tried, as the following narrative will show. (The person referred to is the late Sir David Dalrymple, better known to literary men abroad by his title, Lord Hailes, a Scottish Judge):

THE GOLDEN BIBLE. 331

"I was dining some time ago with a literary party at old Mr. Abercrombie's, father of General Abercrombie, who was slain in Egypt at the head of the British army, and spending the evening together. A gentleman present put a question which puzzled the whole company. It was this: 'Supposing all the New Testaments

in the world had been destroyed at the end of the third century, could their contents have been recovered from the writings of the first three centuries?'

"The question was novel to all, and no one even hazarded a guess in answer to the inquiry. About two months after this meeting, I received a note from Lord Hailes, inviting me to breakfast with him next morning. He had been one of the party. During breakfast he asked me if I recollected the curious question about the possibility of recovering the contents of the New Testament from the writings of the first three centuries.

"I remember it well' said I, 'and have thought of it often, without being able to form any opinion or conjecture on the subject.'

"Well,' said Lord Hailes, 'that question quite accorded with the turn or taste of my antiquarian mind. On returning home, as I knew I had all the writings of those centuries, I began immediately to collect them, that I might set to work on the arduous task as soon as possible.' Pointing to a table covered with papers, he said, 'There have I been busy for these two months, searching for chapters, half-chapters, and sentences of the New Testament, and have marked down what I have found, and where I found it, so that any person may examine and see for himself. I have actually discovered the whole New Testament from those writings, except seven (or eleven) verses (I forget which), which satisfied me that I could discover them also. 'Now,' said he 'here was a way in which God concealed or hid the treasure of his Word, that Julian, the apostate emperor, and other enemies of Christ who tried to extirpate the Gospels from the world, never would have thought of; and though they had, they never could have effected their destruction.'

"The labor of effecting this feat must have been immense: for the Gospels and Epistles would not be divided into chapters and verses as they are now. Much must have been effected by help of a concordance. And having been a judge for many years, a habit of minute investigation must have been formed in his mind.

"The facilities for investigating this question are ample and easily accessible to any intelligent student. The Ante-Nicene Library, published by T. and T. Clark, of Edinburgh, comprises some twenty-four octavo volumes, averaging about five hundred pages each. In these twelve thousand octavo pages of printed matter are comprised nearly all the extant writings of some fifteen or twenty of the most eminent Christian authors who lived *before*

332 THE GOLDEN BIBLE.

the year A. D. 325, when the Council of Nice was convened. One of the volumes also contains such remains of those spurious, uncanonical and fictitious Gospels, Acts, etc., as have come down to us from early ages. In these twelve thousand pages, all of which are accessible to skeptics in English translations, which can be compared with the originals by those who are competent to do so, will be found an overwhelming avalanche of evidence upon the question of the origin of the New Testament Scriptures.

These men, some of whom were contemporary with the apostles, and others who, as their immediate successors, were well acquainted with their associates and contemporaries, give in these writings the most positive and unmistakable evidence as

to the New Testament books which they received, and as to the estimation in which those books were held. They quote passage after passage, and page after page of the same Scriptures that are quoted to-day and read in every Christian assembly. They quoted the books which we quote; they quoted them as we quote them; they received them as we receive them, and this long before the Council of Nice or any other council had anything to say about the canon of the Scriptures.

“Polycarp, who was martyred A.D. 155 or 156, after having served Christ eighty-six years, and who was, during some thirty years of his long Christian life, contemporary with the Apostle John, whose disciple he was; quotes in his Epistle to the Philippians nearly forty passages from our New Testament; and Justin Martyr, who wrote about A. D. 140, or some forty years after the decease of the Apostle John, quotes again and again the very words which we now read in the New Testament. In the writings of Irenaeus, A. D. 178; Clement, A. D. 194; Tertullian, A. D. 200; * and Origen, A. D. 230, are to be found 8723 quotations from the New Testament, including *every book* which we accept as canonical.

“In the sixth chapter of his *Demonstration of the Truth of the Christian Religion*, Dr. Keith records the number of quotations from the New Testament which can be seen in works which are still extant, by the writers whom we have named. He reports seven hundred and sixty-seven (767) passages quoted by Irenaeus, from every book in the New Testament except the third Epistle of John, and the Epistle of Jude, three hundred and eighty-nine (389) passages quoted by Clement, from every book except the Epistle of James and the second and third Epistle of John, and the Epistle of Jude eighteen hundred and two (1802) passages, or, if repe-

— — —
*Herrmann Ronsch, a learned German writer, occupies more than 500 pages of his *Das Neue Testament Tertullians*, with an exhibition, in parallel columns, of the New Testament quotations made by Tertullian alone placed side by side with the passages he referred to as they *now stand* in the New Testament itself and Tertullian wrote 125 years *before* “the Council of Nice compiled the New Testament.”

THE GOLDEN BIBLE. 333

titions are included, more than *three thousand* passages, quoted by Tertullian, from every book in the New Testament except the Epistle to James, the third of John, the second of Peter, and the Epistle of Jude; while the works of Origen yet extant contain five thousand seven hundred and sixty-five (5765) quotations from the New Testament, including every book contained therein, and *excluding all of the so-called apocryphal books, about which infidels sometimes talk so freely*. Many works of Origen and other authors of those times have perished, but it is probable that if Origen’s entire writings had been preserved, if the New Testament had been lost, it could have been reconstructed from them alone.

“The learned, conscientious, accurate, and painstaking critic, Dr. S. P. Tregelles, when speaking of Origen, who died about A. D. 254, says: In his writings he makes such extensive use of the

New Testament, that although a very large number of his works are lost, and many others have come down to us only in defective Latin versions, we can in his extant *Greek* writings alone (I speak of this from *actual knowledge* and *examination*), find cited at least *two thirds of the New Testament*; so that, had such a thing been permitted as that the Gospels, and some of the other books, should have been lost, we might restore them in a great measure by means of the quotations in Origen.”*

It may be more satisfactory to the reader, if we present a few specimens from the ancient writings mentioned above.

Polycarp, for instance, was an immediate disciple of the Apostle John, by whom he was appointed bishop of Smyrna. Of his various writings, only one Epistle has come down to our times. But “in this he has nearly *forty* allusions to the different books of the New Testament.” The following are specimens:

“Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? as Paul teaches.”

“For I trust that ye are well exercised in the holy scriptures, as in these scriptures it is said: Be ye angry and sin not; let not the sun go down upon your wrath.”

“We remember what the Lord said also in his teaching, ‘Judge not that ye be not judged; forgive and it shall be forgiven you: be merciful and ye shall receive mercy : with what measure ye measure, it shall be measured back to you’ : and ‘blessed are the poor and they who are persecuted for righteousness sake for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.’ ‘Christ Jesus, who bore our sins in his own body on the tree; who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.’”

— — —
*“Who Made the New Testament,” by H. L. Hastings, 47 Cornhill Street, Boston, Mass.

334 THE GOLDEN BIBLE.

Irenaeus was a disciple of Polycarp, had conversed with many who had been instructed directly by the apostles, and other immediate disciples of Jesus Christ. He was the author of many works, only five of which remain. “In these,” says Mr. Home, “he has shown himself to be well acquainted with heathen authors, and the absurd and intricate notions of the heretics, as well as the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments . . . Considering the age in which he lived, and his access to the original sources of information, the testimony of Irenaeus to the genuineness and authenticity of the New Testament, gives to such of his writings as are extant a perpetual interest and value in the Christian Church: for his quotations are so numerous and, many of them are so long, as to afford undoubted evidence that the books of the New Testament which were known to the disciples of Polycarp are the same books which have descended to the present age.”

“We have his testimony in one form or another to *every one of the books of the New Testament, except the three smallest, Philemon, 3d John and Jude.*”

This is the way he quotes scripture : “ Again writing to the Romans, Paul says: ‘Whose are the fathers and of whom concerning the flesh Christ came, who is God over all blessed forever more.’”

“This also Paul manifestly proves in his Epistle to the Corinthians, saying ‘ Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant how that all our fathers were under the cloud.’

Paul, in his second Epistle to the Corinthians says ‘In whom the God of this world hath blinded the eyes of them that believe not.’”

“The Apostle Paul says in his Epistle to the Galatians: ‘Wherefore then serveth the law of work ? It was added until the seed should come to whom the promise was made.’”

“As also blessed Paul says in his Epistle to the Ephesians, for we are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones.’”

How easy from such quotations to learn that Irenaeus had the same Bible, with the same books and the same contents you and I have to day.

And thus, if space permitted, we might continue by the hour quoting from one author and another, until the whole vast literature of the early Church had been examined.— And when from thousands

THE GOLDEN BIBLE. 335

and tens of thousands of direct quotations, almost the entire Bible had been reproduced, every book and every chapter, and almost every verse just as we have it now—and *no other books* or parts of books in the remotest manner alluded to as inspired of God—could any one after such evidence have hardihood enough to say that the most valuable and precious portions of the Bible “were taken away” by “a great and abominable Church”; or that some uninspired men “centuries after John had finished his manuscript” had the presumption to “select a few” out of a “vast number” of professedly inspired manuscripts and dub their selection with the comprehensive name “the Bible”? A falsehood that has not the merit of even a tinge of truth in it—fabricated out of “full cloth” without a shadow of foundation in fact.

And it would add not a little to the conclusiveness of the evidence already adduced, to learn more definitely the character of the writings referred to. They were almost exclusively controversial. Our readers can readily understand that the writers of the *first* century, who had been contemporary with the apostles, and heard the gospel directly from

their lips, were more inclined to quote from *memory*, and usually from what they themselves had heard the apostles say, instead of what the apostles had written. They quote *oral* rather than *written* testimony. But at the beginning of the *second* century a complete change is observed. Heresies arose, and were dividing the churches. There was Cerinthus, who denied the divinity of Christ — Marcion, who rejected all the books of the New Testament except the first thirteen of Paul’s Epistles and the gospel by Matthew. There were the Ebeonites, who, directly the contrary, rejected all the Epistles of Paul because they believed all Christians should keep the law of Moses, and Paul taught differently. There were the Gnostics, the Nazarenes and a host of other heresies, with various views of truth, corrupting this or that doctrine of the Bible.

And to meet all these diverse errors was the object of nearly all the Christian writers of the second century. Hence they were forced to appeal directly to the *written* word. And when they quoted a passage, it would not do to depend upon memory—they must look up the passage, and quote it exactly as written: for a single variation would be picked up at once and used against them by sharp

336 THE GOLDEN BIBLE.

critics who were watching every possible opportunity to gain some advantage. Hence both the heretical writers, and the orthodox Christian fathers were very careful in their quotations.

And this, as the reader can readily see, makes the evidence of identity all the more complete and valuable to us. Had they quoted scripture as many do today, in a loose, off-hand, inaccurate manner, half the time mixing two or more passages together, or quoting as Paul’s or Peter’s language something John, David or Isaiah said—it would have been far more difficult to prove the identity of our Bible with theirs. But when they are found to be exceedingly careful, not only naming the author, but often the book and the very place where the passage can be found, and then writing it down just as they find it, with the points and inflections of the Greek all carefully copied—then the evidence of identity becomes as complete and conclusive as the most ardent could desire.

Still farther evidence of identity may be found in the writings of the heretics already mentioned. When Marcion, for instance, tells us that he cannot accept the gospels by Mark and Luke and John, nor of the Epistles of Peter and John, and explains why — because of certain doctrines plainly taught in said books, directly contrary to his ideas of truth—and goes so far as to quote the passages to which he objects, which upon comparison are found to be just as we have them to day—this furnishes us the very strongest

possible evidence that those books have come down to us precisely *as he read them in the beginning of the second century*. Or when he quotes Paul's language believing it to be inspired of God, and then tries to ring out of it a meaning utterly foreign to the plain common sense teaching of the passage — this also affords striking proof, not only that the passage existed then substantially as it does today; but also that it had been become fixed and unchangeable in the current literature of the time. For had it been possible, he would have changed the passage to suit his own views, instead of laboring so hard to twist out of it a meaning that never belonged to it. And especially had there been in existence a "*vast number* of professedly inspired manuscripts," Marcion, Cerinthus and men of his ilk, would certainly have hunted them through, and found something they could triumphantly have produced as an offset to the hated declarations of

THE GOLDEN BIBLE. 337

Paul, or Peter, or John, in the "few scattered manuscripts" that now bear their name.

Still farther—will the reader pardon a brief allusion to another class of testimony upon this subject quite as satisfactory and conclusive as that already adduced—and certainly beyond the suspicion of interested motives in favor of the Bible.

We refer to the testimony of the *open and avowed enemies of Christianity*.

There was *Celsus*, an Epicurean philosopher, who flourished in the Second Century, the first real infidel of any note who took up the pen against the Bible and the Christian religion. In his treatise *Celsus* not only mentions by name, but also quotes passages from the books of the New Testament, so that it is certain we now have the identical books to which he refers. For instance, he refers to the star seen at the birth of Christ; the adoration paid him by the Magi at Bethlehem; the murder of the infants by Herod, because deceived by the wise men; the appearance of the angel to Joseph and his flight into Egypt. We are informed of the descent of the Spirit in the form of a dove, and the voice from Heaven at the Savior's baptism in Jordan; of his temptation in the wilderness, and his conversation with the woman of Samaria at the well. *Celsus* acknowledges the miracles of Christ, and those of healing the sick, feeding five thousand men and raising the dead are expressly mentioned, though they are attributed to magical influence. Several passages in the Savior's sermon on the mount are quoted verbatim, and his predictions relating to his sufferings, death and resurrection are recorded. With equal exactness are the closing scenes in the life of Jesus mentioned, the treachery of Judas, Peter's denial of his Master, His

being bound, insulted, beaten with rods and crucified; the gall and vinegar offered him, blood and water flowing from his pierced side, and the earthquake and the darkness that accompanied the crucifixion. He even mentions some of the words uttered by the Savior upon the cross, the appearance of the angels at the sepulcher, and Christ's manifestation of himself to Mary Magdalene and the disciples afterwards. All proving beyond a doubt the identity of the Gospel history as read by him and accepted and believed by the Christians then, with the history as read by ourselves to-day in the four Evangelists.

338 THE GOLDEN BIBLE.

The testimony of *Porphery* (the most noted infidel of ancient times) is quite as much to the point as that of *Celsus*. Though he lived a hundred years later, yet his thorough knowledge of all kinds of history, his skill in the different languages in which the Bible was at that time published, his extensive acquaintance with the Christians and their history, his philosophical mind, his keen and careful method of thought, places him by universal consent foremost among the adversaries of the Christian religion.

A little after *Porphery* the Emperor *Julian* lived and wrote bitterly against the Christian religion and the Christians' Bible. This man, at the head of the greatest empire the world has ever known, certainly possessed every needed advantage for ascertaining the whole truth in reference to the Bible as it then existed, whether the whole of it or any part of it was a forgery, whether it had been changed, taken from or added to, whether a great and abominable church had eliminated its most precious portions, whether a council of self-appointed censors had taken upon them to select out from a vast number of sacred writings, of equal claim and equal value, a few that in their weak and perverted judgments were best adapted to the wants of the world.

Reader, the testimony of such men as these is absolutely conclusive upon the point under discussion. It is testimony wrung out from the most bitter enemies of the truth. The testimony of men who not only possessed every facility for ascertaining the facts, but whose excessive hate inspired them to press to the utmost every possible advantage. And yet these men quote from the same books we now possess and no others, used substantially the same language, and mention the same facts found in the Bibles we possess to-day. And with all their ingenuity in digging up every conceivable objection to the word of God, and their zeal in culling every page of history to find some plausible pretext for rejecting it, and though one of them lived within a hundred years of the age of the Apostles, yet they never seemed to have discovered that the Bible received and loved by the Christians of their day was, after all, but a very small

portion of the real Scriptures; and that this small portion had been sadly changed and perverted and honeycombed of the truth.

It was left to modern infidelity and the author of the Book of Mormon to discover these damaging facts, and especially was it left

THE GOLDEN BIBLE. 339

to the versatile pen of Apostle Orson Pratt to ask the stunning question, "How do we know that the compilers of the Bible found even one-hundredth part of the manuscripts that were sacred?"

Our space is more than occupied, and yet it is due the candid reader and the subject before us that some additional facts should be stated.

1. It is true that during the First and Second centuries many books were written purporting to be lives of Christ and lives of the Apostles. But *it is not true* that any one of these books was ever accepted as inspired of God, as Mr. Pratt so positively states.

"In reality they are all, without exception, infinitely beneath the canonical Gospels in all respects."—Michel Nichols.

"Before I undertook this work I never realized so completely as I do now the impassible character of the gulf which separates the genuine Gospels from these.

"Any statement made now, that the spurious Gospels were ever regarded in the church as inspired and true, must arise from ignorance or malicious misrepresentation, and must be condemned as false and deceitful."—B. H. Cowper, in Preface to Apochryphal Gospels.

"Their real demerits, their mendacities, their absurdities, their coarseness, the barbarities of their style, and the inconsequence of their narratives have never been excused or condoned."—Bishop Ellicot in Cambridge Essays for 1866.

2. The controversy that arose in the early church over the canon of the New Testament was over books now found in the New Testament and not over a single one of these various other uninspired histories above mentioned.

3. There never was any controversy about the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the thirteen Letters of

would have branded them as such. And if there existed in his day any other books not found in our list that were really inspired by God and were of value to the churches and to the world—it would have been cruel indeed on his part to have kept silence, and leave the Christian world in ignorance of such invaluable treasures.

5. A great amount of capital has been made out of the *supposed corruptions* that have during the ages crept into the received text of the Holy Scriptures through mistakes of transcribers, supposed interpolations, etc. — But that all the changes or corruptions taken together do not materially alter the sense of a single chapter, and do not take from or add to a single one of the doctrines the "precious things" of the Bible—any reader of these pages can easily ascertain for himself by comparing King James' version of the Bible with the Revised Version recently completed—or better still, by looking over the vast number of quotations from the Bible found in the writings of the first *three* centuries, already referred to, and compare them with the corresponding passages in our Bibles today.

For a brief but very satisfactory discussion of this whole subject, the reader is referred to "The Corruptions of the New Testament" by H. L. Hastings, No. 47 Cornhill, Boston. Price, 15 cents.

340 THE GOLDEN BIBLE.

Peter (see 2d Peter, 3:16). If any of the books now found in the New Testament *were not inspired* certainly the old patriarch John, who loved the Churches and loved the truth,