THE BIBLE THE WORD OF GOD

Continued from 12.

Then it is well known that many scientists and philosophers are sceptics and infidels, and look on the Bible with with an evil eye.

Some people may be led to believe that scientists and philosophers have other sources of information regarding the origin of man than that contained in the Bible. They have not. They may dissect the bodies of dead men and dead monkeys all their life and what can they find? Nothing but dust and ashes. What theories can they form from these with reference to the origin of man? What information can they give us on this important subject? Nothing except what we have in the Book of Genesis.

But they say Geologists have examined the crust of the earth and the various strata of rocks of which it is composed, and have gained much interesting information. No doubt they have. But man's body was not formed from the rocks of the earth but from the dust of the earth. God said to Adam, Dust thou art and unto dust thou shalt return. This is all that can be known of man's origin.

Great is the sin of those who deny God the honor of man's creation. They deny the testimony God has given of His work of creation and so far as they can make Him a liar. They are the enemies of God, and shall receive the reward of their doings.

On the other hand, blessed are they who receive the Bible as the word of God. They alone have the true knowledge of God and honor Him who is worthy of Glory and honor. Great are the blessings of God's children in the present world and shall be greater in that which is to come.

They are wise who keep to the word of God, and take their opinion from it. All historical records contained in the Bible are Divine truths, and therefore perfectly reliable. There is no deviation from the word of God. It alone contains all true knowledge of the creation of all things, and that of man as briefly and clearly told. Profane History and Mythology are misleading, erroneous, and unsafe. The Bible is safe, helpful, clear and instructive. God is its author, and His servants are its penmen. They are wise and happy who take their instruction from the word of God.

I am Sir, etc.

DONALD MacLEAN

137 Hillsboro St., Nov. 1925.

THE VULGATE NOT A POOR EQUIPMENT

Continued from 12)

It is, however sometimes alleged that the Church confesses a fear of the Bible by discouraging its use. The Church never did discourage the use of the Bible but only its abuse. Protestants think the Bible is easy to understand, because they can find some meaning or other in every verse. It is quite a different matter to find the true original meaning. The most extraordinary ideas can be drawn out of an English translation, which reference to the original Hebrew or Greek will show not to be in the text at all.

No wonder, then, if the Church considers the Bible anything but an easy book, which he who runs may read. The infinite capacity of the human mind to go wrong is sufficient reason for caution; but in spite of this, Catholics have always been free to read the Bible, and encouraged to do so, provided they use the original text or an authorized translation.

Still, they consider that the Bible was never intended for the sole and adequate Rule of Faith, partly because it is not a sufficiently exhaustive account of all Christ's teaching, partly because its expressions of doctrine are often ambiguous, and require authoritative interpretation.

Moreover, during the first four centuries of the Church, it remained an unsettled question what belonged to the sacred Scripture and what did not. There were many Gospels current besides the four we now acknowledge, and a few other works no book has ever been so badly abused as the Bible. There is no heresy which has not claimed Scripture in its own support against the doctrine of the Church. The Arians and Socinians both relied strongly on Holy Writ. When it became a fashion to use the Scripture in this way for the support of private views, the Bible, instead of being a help to faith, was converted into a source of confusion.

The Bible tells us how hard St. Paul's epistles were to understand, and how some had wrested them to their own destruction (2 Peter iii. 16.)

It required much discussion to arrive at a final conclusion. But when in the Synods of Hippo and Carthage, about A. D. 393-397, a list of authentic books was agreed upon and Pope Innocent I. and afterwards Pope Gelasius (A. D. 494) confirmed this list, the discussion was closed; and for the first time the New Testament was capable of being bound up into one book as we have it now.

But how was this question set at last after so long a discussion? Purely and simply by an appeal to the traditions existing in local churches where each document had been preserved, and by the authoritative verdict of the Church judging according to those traditions. The various parts which now make up the New Testament were carefully treasured and read in the local churches where they had been received, and it was only by degrees that copies were spread to other places, and the whole series came to be circulated throughout Christendom.

Though held in the highest authority, we find no signs of the Scriptures being substituted for traditional teaching as a sole Rule of Faith. The bishops were regarded as the authoritative successors of the Apostles, responsible for the preservation of Christian doctrine, and the people looked to them for the true interpretation of Scripture. Belief did not follow interpretation of Scripture, but interpretation of Scripture followed belief. When heretics cited Scripture in support of novel views, the Fathers denied them the rights to do so, reserving the interpretation of Scripture to the Church. On the other hand, the Church quoted Scripture against the heretics, not as the sole basis of its teaching but as an inspired witness to its correctness.

Passing on through the ages, we find the same system at work. Down to the sixteenth century there existed in Christendom no other than this idea. The Bishops were looked upon as successors of Apostles, and their unanimous teaching was regarded as absolutely trustworthy—as truly representing the doctrine of Christ. The Church as a whole could not possibly fall into error—this was guaranteed by the promises of Christ; and those who claimed Scripture in support of their new doctrines, and against the prevailing doctrine of the Church, were regarded as heretics and rebels against Christ, and against His authority delegated to the Church.

It was not till the sixteenth century that this state of things received a rude shock. The radical principle of the Protestant Reformation lay in the rejection of the living authority of the Catholic Church, and the substitution of the Bible, interpreted by each individual, in its place. Reviewing the consequences of this experiment and the absence of all warrant for it in Scripture itself, and considering that it runs counter to the unanimous conviction of Christendom for fifteen hundred years, it will only be prudent for Protestants to reconsider their position; and to ask themselves whether, after all, the conviction of Christendom for fifteen hundred years may not be right.

The first word written was by St Matthew, and he wrote for the benefit of a few individuals. He wrote the Gospel about seven years after Christ left this earth, so that the Church of God established by Christ, existed seven years before a line was written of the New Testament.

St. Mark wrote about ten years after Christ left this earth; St. Luke about twenty-five years, and St. John about sixty-three years after Christ had established the Church of God. St. John wrote the last portion of the Bible—the Book of Revelations — about sixty-five years after Christ had left this earth and the Church of God had been established.

Protestants, in accepting the New Testament as it stands, are implicitly reposing the highest confidence in the authority of the Catholic Church in the fifth century; and some of them have candidly acknowledged this (c. f. preface to Revised Version). These facts seem fatal to the idea that Scripture was intended by Christ and His Apostles to be the sole and adequate Rule of Faith; since our very assurance as to what the New Testament contains rests historically on the teaching authority of the bishops of the fifth century, the successors of the Apostle commissioned and guaranteed by Christ "the Church is the ground and the pillar of truth," and the moment you take away the authority of the Church of God you induce all kinds of errors and blasphemous doctrines.

It is against reason to place the book ahead of the teacher. Imagine what would happen if our schools and Universities would give the book to the student and tell him to go ahead and study it, that the teacher was only a secondary consideration? The learning is in the book. Let us save the country the cost of schools and teachers. Just present the pupil with a text-book of each subject and let him take whatever meaning he likes out of it!

Most assuredly the teacher comes before the book. Among many of the Catholic historians and authors we find the terms "Holy Scriptures" and "Holy Gospels" used instead of the word Bible and this also gives rise to the supposition that the Holy Bible is unfamiliar among the Catholics. Indeed, in Catholic writings, I have seen the term "Holy Scriptures" used much oftener than "Holy Bible" and yet it is the same book and both appellations are perfectly justifiable.

Incidently I may remark that at the time the revolt was raging in Europe against the authority of the Church, one of the greatest missionaries who ever lived, St. Francis Xavier and his missionaries were converting millions to the Faith in India, Japan and the Far East. So great was his success, that he was called the Apostle of the Indies and we know that it was his oral teaching of the Holy Scriptures that caused thousands to flock to his standard.

This wrong idea about the Holy Scriptures being kept from Catholics has been widely circulated and it is about time that those who were and are the instigators of it should be brought to a halt. When supposedly learned preachers hold conferences and give sermons either by pulpit or by radio, it takes some courage or any person especially one lone woman, to come out publically and to call them to account for misrepresentations, but in the interest of Truth it must be done. I find that this propaganda of trying to make the world believe that Catholics will have nothing to do with the Bible, is becoming intolerable. I think in this article I have made it clear that the Catholic Church has everything to do with the Holy Bible. It was the bishops of the Catholic Church who collected all the books which go to make up the Bible, and made them into one book. It was the monks and nuns who copied the Bible in their own handwriting for centuries when printing was not invented until 1440. It was the Catholic Church which guarded and treasured the Bible and kept it true to the original text when so-called "reformers" tore it to pieces in the sixteenth century and made Bibles of their own, substituting words to suit themselves and changing the meaning of whole sentences so that it might suit "a modern scholar." It is the Catholic Church which stands today, a towering monument against which the gates of hell cannot prevail. The Mars-book is nearly all a reprint from the Bible; the Breviary is taken nearly all from the Bible. Catholic priests are obliged to read their Breviary and celebrate Holy Mass daily, thus you see that the Bible is never long out of the priests' hands. Thus we see that the Holy Bible is one of the most treasured possession of the Catholic Church.

For twelve hundred years the Catholic Church never interfered with the reading of the Bible, and when since that time she has condemned particular translations of the Sacred Scriptures, she has done so, not because they were translations of the Bible into a spoken language, but because they were not translations of God's Word.

In other words, if by the Bible we mean the sacred writings in their inspired sense, and we can only mean this, we must declare that many of these translations are not the Bible at all, but only the work of men, who have put their own meaning in the place of the inspired sense of God's Word.

Before Luther's pretended discovery of the Bible, the Catholic Church had printed over 100 editions of the Latin Bible which means many thousand copies.

In German there were 27 editions before Luther's Bible appeared.

In Italian there were over 40 editions of the Bible before the first Protestant edition appeared.

There were two in Spain by 1515, one with the express permission of the Spanish Inquisition.

In French there were 18 editions by 1547; the first Protestant version appearing in 1525.

Speaking of England, Canon Dixon, of Carlisle (Protestant), says "From the earliest times the English Church or nation was possessed of the Sacred writings (i. e. the Bible) through the labors of monks and bishops."

The history of the authorized English version itself will show you how many English Bibles have been so incorrect that we cannot call them Bibles at all. The pedigree of the Protestant English Bible is this: Tyndale's New Testament under Henry VIII., then Cranmer's Great Bible (1539), then the Bishops' Bible (1568) under Elizabeth, then the Authorized Version (1611) under James I. and finally the Revised Version under Queen Victoria (1881). Each of these editions of the Bible was brought out because the previous one was found not to give the Word of God in its true sense.

With regard to the Great Bible, Cranmer himself declared to Convocation "that in the translation both of the Old and New Testaments there were many points which required correction." And he took a vote of the Upper House as to whether the "Great" Bible could be retained without scandal to the learning of the clergy. It was decided by a majority of the Bishops that it should not be retained. (Blunt, Reformation, I c. 10.) This Great Bible was succeeded by the Bishops' Bible, which was displaced in a few years by another version, and this in its turn was put aside by the Authorized Version of James I., which was corrected in 1881 by the Revised Version.

The Protestant story is that Luther "discovered" the Latin Bible about 1507; that he was the first to translate it into German; that other reformers followed his example and made the first translation of the Bible into the languages of their countries; and that then for the first time the people came to know the Bible for up to that date the Catholic Church had kept the Bible away from them. All this is untrue.

1. 1. The Protestant Church Times, July 26 1878, says: "This catalogue (of Bibles in the Caxton Exhibition at South Kensington, 1877) will be very useful for one thing at any rate, as disproving the popular lie about Luther finding the Bible for the first time at Erfurt, about 1507. Not only are there very many editions of the Latin Vulgate, (i. e., the Bible in Latin, the very thing Luther is pretended to have discovered,) but there are actually nine German Editions of the Bible in the Caxton Exhibition earlier than 1483, the year of Luther's birth, and at least three more before the end of the century."

In the year 1520—the first Protestant came into the world. Before that one there was not a Protestant in the world, not one on the face of the whole earth; and that one, as all history tells us, was Martin Luther, who was a Catholic priest who fell away from the Church.

Martin Luther was the first to raise the standard of rebellion and revolt against the Church of God. He said to his disciples that they should take the Bible for their guide and they did so. But they soon quarrelled with him; Zuinglius, and a number of others, and everyone of them started a new religion of his own.

At one time Bible translations were falsified in the interest of certain heresies. Tyndale, for example, always substituted the word "congregation" for "Church"; and "ordinance" for "tradition" because of the Catholic connotation attached to these words. He also translated "Little children, keep yourselves from images," instead of using the more accurate rendering "idols."

The Rev. J. H. Blunt, in his History of the Reformation of the Church of England, says: "In some editions of Tyndale's New Testament there is what must be regarded as a wilful omission of the gravest possible character, for it appears in several editions, and has no shadow of justification in the Greek or Latin of the passage (1 Peter ii. 13, 14.). Such an error was quite enough justification for the suppression of Tyndale's translation."

Reformers try to tell us that Tyndale was the first to print the Bible in English, but this leaves out Caxton's "Golden Legend," printed in 1483 which contained most of the five books of Moses and the Gospels.

Indeed these reformers would like to make people think that Tyndales was the first English version in existence, but the History of England, probably the one now in use in all our schools here, the second edition of MacMillan's Canadian School Series, printed in 1914, on page 24, gives us a lengthy account of the Venerable Bede whose monastery was also a great school, in which there were six hundred monks. Bede was a great writer and the King of Northumbria asked him to write a history of the Church in England. He wrote the Ecclesiastical History." He also translated the Bible into English and he died while dictating the Gospel of St. John to one of his pupils. His death occurred in the year 735 A.D. so that Tyndales Version in 1526 had many, many English translations of the Bible before his time.

"Tindal was the stormy petrel of his day. Early in his priesthood he chafed under the limitations and checks of the religious life and became more Catholic than the Pope and more religious than those who lived and practised the religious life. He played the part of the superpatriot who interprets the will of the people contrary to the laws of the country.

"Tindal refused to abide by the restraints of religion and publicly rebelled against established authority and the ordered ways of ecclesiastical life. In more than one post-prandial speech he called the Pope 'anti-Christ' and the monks 'caterpillars,' 'horse leeches' and 'drone bees.' Will any true and impartial historian claim that Tindal should not have been refused the imprimatur of the Church in his translation of the Bible? The Church could neither sanction nor approve of his mistranslation of many important texts."

The ecclesiastical element adjudged Tindal guilty of heterodoxy and open rebellion to the common standard of belief, the civil judges found him guilty of writing and preaching doctrines subversive of law and order in the State and imposed the penalty of death."

The Catholic party in the 16th century persecuted in defense of faith in which they were brought up and the system of government, which had hitherto obtained, while the Protestant party persecuted their opponents in order to make way for a religion which in faith and morals was independent of Pope and bishop. The persecution by the one was defensive, the persecution by the other was offensive.

"Tindal was a pitiable victim of tragic circumstance; in purpose and performance he rebelled against Church and State. In Church circles his aggressive personality provoked conflict, hostility and much embitterment of religious feeling; while in the civic arena he was foremost among the destructives of his day. In his translation of St. Peter's first epistle, he malignantly omitted the apostle's command to be subject to kings and governors. Henry VIII. wished him deported from the continent to answer charges which would have sent him to the gallows.

On this matter of the Bible there is a vast misapprehension on the part of even well-informed Protestants. Their whole standpoint would be modified if they only realized that the Holy Scriptures which they venerate so profoundly were collected, compiled, and preserved by the Catholic Church.

They were written for her, they were delivered to her, thy were guarded by her.

Ages before the Bible Society came into existence, and long prior to Luther and Wiclif, she was busily engaged in disseminating these writings, of which she was the trustee. You should never pass an impartial sentence if you do not hear both sides of the question.

What would you think of a judge before whom a policeman would bring a poor offender, and who on the charge of the policeman, without hearing the prisoner, would order him to be hung? "Give me a hearing," says the poor man, "and I will prove my innocence. I am not guilty" says he. The policeman says he is guilty. "Well hang him anyhow," says the judge! What would you say of that judge?

I am Sir, etc.

M. M. M.

Box 504, Charlottetown, P. E. I.

VITAMINS

Many grown people do not realize the importance of the right selection of vitamin-rich foods to assure a sound body and health.

Scott's Emulsion

is the food-tonic rich in vitamins that helps solve nutrition problems. It supplies vitamin-nourishment to build health.

Scott & Bowne, Toronto, Ont. 25-33

Children Like Baby's Own Tablets

Because They Are Tasteless and Are Easy to Take.

One of the strongest points in favor of any medicine for children is that it is so agreeable that the mother does not have to force it down the little one's throat.

Baby's Own Tablets have no drug taste may be crushed to a powder if desired, and babies like them. They are perfectly safe for they contain no opiate or narcotic. They sweeten the stomach and remove the cause of fretfulness.

Mrs. Arthur Charlebois, Pawtucket, R. I., says: "I have found Baby's Own Tablets to be a gentle laxative and a safe remedy for stomach disorders in children. Our little boy had been given harsh cathartics but these tablets worked more effectively without the severe griping. I can recommend them to all mothers of little children."

Baby's Own Tablets are sold by medicine dealers or by mail at 25 cents a box from The Dr. Williams' Medicine Co., Brockville, Ont.

DEMAND "PHILLIPS" MILK OF MAGNESIA

Beware of imitations of genuine "Phillips' Milk of Magnesia," the original Milk of Magnesia prescribed by physicians for fifty years. Accept only the genuine "Phillips."

Each bottle contains full directions—any drug store.

Rheumatic People Now Find Relief

By Driving the Poisonous Acid From the System.

Rheumatism attacks people when the blood is thin and watery or charged up with impurities, thus setting up inflammation of the muscles and joints. Cold, wet weather or sharp winds may start the pains, but the cause is rooted in the blood, and to get relief it must be treated through the blood. As a blood builder and nerve tonic Dr. Williams' Pink Pills are unsurpassed, and for that reason do not fail to give relief to rheumatic sufferers when given a fair trial. Among the rheumatic sufferers who have proved the great value of this medicine is Mr. N. M. Foley, Windsor, N. S., who says:—"My trouble started with a bad cold, the result of working in a heavy rain storm. From that it developed into rheumatism which badly crippled me and kept me confined to bed for upwards of six months. The doctor who treated me did not help me, and every friend who called to see me had something different to advise. Some of these remedies I tried, but with no better results. My legs were stiff from the hips down, and every move I made caused intense pain, and constantly I was growing weaker. Then a friend from Falmouth, who came to see me, asked if I had tried Dr Williams' Pink Pills. I had taken so much medicine without benefit that I was skeptical and said so. My friend, however, had so much faith in the pills that he got me a supply and to please him I began taking them. I had not been taking them long when I began to feel a change for the better, and I gladly got a further supply. Soon I was able to get out of bed and walk around on crutches. Still taking the pills I used in all seventeen boxes, by which time I was a well man and at work every day. Now I always keep a box of Dr. Williams' Pink Pills in the house and if I feel an ache or pain I take them, and always with good results. I believe I would still be a bed-ridden cripple but for these pills, and I shall always praise and recommend them."

You can get these pills from any medicine dealer or by mail at 50 cents a box from The Dr. Williams Medicine Co., Brockville, Ont.

I should imagine that four-fifths of the marriages contracted in this country are happy marriages. — The Rev. Dr. Geikie Cobb.

The Sweetest Little Singer and Cheeriest Little Pet in the World—Your Canary Bird

You wouldn't have anything happen to your bird. His song and happy presence in the house are precious and delightful. Take good care of his health and preserve his voice in all its strength and beauty. What you feed your canary has all to do with his condition. No feed has ever been so good as Brock's Bird Seed. This is a scientific mixture of seeds collected from various parts of the world, giving the bird all the varied requirements of his diet. It is clean, invigorating, and sure to keep your pet full of song and spirits. To introduce Brock's Bird Seed and Brock's Bird Treat, we offer a FREE sample, enough for a week's feeding, to all who cut out, fill in, and mail to us, the coupon in the corner of this advertisement.

Brock's Bird Seed *and* **Brocks "Bird Treat"**

FREE SAMPLE PACKAGE COUPON

Messrs. Nicholson & Brock, Ltd., 115 Market Street, Toronto, 3, Ont.

Dear Sirs,—

Please send me FREE a sample package (a week's supply) of Brock's Bird Seed and Brock's Bird Treat, as advertised.

Name .....

Address .....

MENDING RUGS AND CARPETS

A bare patch in the pile of a rug or carpet may be easily and effectively mended with suitable colored darning wools.

Fold the carpet over to the bare patch. Lay a round metal meat skewer along the first line of the backing, and with the wool cover it with close overcasting. When the line is completed draw out the skewer and complete the next line. When the bare patch is covered the loops are cut through with scissors and trimmed.

"Proper Food and Exercise," by ARTHUR A. McGOVERN Former physical director, Cornell Medical College

Abdominal muscles and posture

"STAND up straight" is a common expression. All parents use it when addressing their children regarding posture. However, that doesn't do any more towards adding to the child's welfare than if a picture hanging crookedly on the wall were so addressed. Just as you would have to straighten the picture yourself, by moving it to the correct angle and supporting it with framework or braces of some sort, it is necessary also to have the child develop the proper support before he can keep his shoulders back and hold his chest high.

If we attempted to stand a skeleton up straight, it would have to be supported by wires, otherwise it would fall forward. Between our lower ribs and the hips we have a wonderful set of abdominal muscles which we call the main support.

A great many cases of bad posture are due solely to the flabbiness of these organs. In order to bend forward, we must relax these muscles, allowing the body to pitch forward. When muscles are flabby and soft, they are relaxed, thus producing a permanent pitch-forwardness of the shoulders and chest. Parents speak of their children as having flat chests when the real trouble is flabby abdominal muscles. Everybody would have a flat chest if the muscles of the abdomen did not perform their proper work by holding the chest in its upright position.

It is surprising how many pieces of apparatus and machines have been sold with the intention of developing the chest or straightening back curvature. These contraptions are called chest weights, chest exercisers, back exercisers, and numerous other names pertaining to the medical terms given these physical defects.

If we will develop good muscles in the abdominal wall, we will 999 times out of a thousand carry our bodies as Nature intended.

As some people advance in years, they begin to stoop, pitch forward and develop round shoulders, scoliosis, and curvature. These are not conditions of old age as a great many are inclined to think; they are simply caused by inactivity of the muscles which have degenerated through lack of use and have completely weakened, no longer being able to carry the weight of the upper body.

I am devoting an article exclusively to a series of abdominal exercises which will shortly follow this story and will aid greatly in the development of the abdominal muscles.

Diet Menu for Those Who Are Reducing

Drink two glasses of water before breakfast.

BREAKFAST: Fruit such as orange juice, grape fruit or raw apples. Uncooked hard cereal with skimmed milk. Coffee substitute and one slice of toast unbuttered. Drink two glasses of water between breakfast and lunch.

LUNCH: A plain vegetable or fruit salad; one slice of toast; glass of buttermilk. Drink two glasses of water between lunch and dinner.

DINNER: Consomme or a thin soup; broiled lean meat, chicken or fish; fresh fruit or crackers and cheese. Drink two glasses of water between dinner and retiring hour.

Mr. McGovern will answer your questions. © A. A. McGovern

This photograph was taken Monday, November 16th, of the 200 or more delegates who were in attendance at the first Dominion-wide conference of boards of trade and chambers of commerce, being held in Winnipeg, Man., November 16—18. The sessions were presided over by S. B. Gundy, president of the Toronto board of trade, who formulated plans for the convention; and F. B. Tolchard, of Toronto, was secretary. Many notable persons attended, among whom are Sir Thomas White, former minister of finance; W. C. Noxon, agent-general in London, Eng., of the Province of Ontario; A. M. Belding and F. Maclure Scland ers, of St. John, N. B.; W. F. Cockshutt, of Brantford, Ont.; J. J. Gibbons, D. B. Hanna, Brig.-Gen. C. H. Mitchell and C. W. Rowley, all of Toronto; Paul E. Joubert and Col. Robert Starke, of Montreal; J. P. Gordon, of