

The history of the Bible shows, very clearly, that the Church was the organization who made the Bible and that the Church is older than the Bible. The Bible itself shows that there were Christians before a word of the New Testament was written – the whole of the book of Acts, for example, describes the early life of the Church from the Ascension of Jesus onwards. There is no doubt whatsoever that these people were Christians and there were no Protestant denominations back then, so starting from the day of Pentecost the Church was the Catholic Church; there was no other Church.

Without the Catholic Church there would not be a Bible. The last book of the New Testament was written around 100 AD. Before that date no Christian could have had a complete “Bible” as we understand it today. If the Bible is the “sole source of Christian teaching and knowledge” as sola scriptura claims, how can these people have been Christians? Peter, Paul, James, John and Andrew never saw a complete modern Bible – what they had was the Old Testament Scriptures and the preaching and Tradition of the Church.

It is a simple truth that not all Christians have a Bible – in many places in the world not everyone can read, and certainly not everyone can afford a Bible. Historically, this was certainly the case – before the advent of cheap printing, Bibles were very expensive (the equivalent of \$100,000 in today's money!) and few people had them. Is it the case that these people were not Christians?

The claim that Christianity is “the Bible and nothing but the Bible” is a very modern, privileged Western notion – based on the ease of access to the Bible, affluence and literacy. Many Protestants simply have no idea about the historical facts of Christianity and how – for centuries – the Bible simply was not read by the common man because he could not afford to buy one or because he could not read.

\

Please provide the scripture verses that state that Christians are to refer and to obey the Bible alone in regards to their faith and disregard the Church leaders and authorities guidance. Please provide the scripture verse where Jesus said to write down what He said or create a Bible. Actually, the Bible says that there are many other facts, details, and teachings of Jesus that are not recorded in the Bible. That is right, the Bible itself states that it is not a complete record of the teachings and details of Jesus’ life; therefore, the Bible alone is not sufficient in regards to learning the Christian faith. John 21:25 “And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written. Amen”. John 20:30 “Now Jesus did many other signs in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book”. 1 Timothy 3:15 states that the Church and not the Bible is pillar and foundation of truth. This would be the Catholic Church because no other Church existed at that time, “**the church of the living God, the pillar and foundation of the truth.**” (The Church, not the Bible).

**Protestants actually *are* using extra-Biblical sources – for example, if the non-Catholic believes in [the Trinity](#) and uses the words which came out of the Council of Nicea, he or she is using a non-Biblical source.**

Until around the start of the 16th century very few people had access to the Bible or Scripture because the printing press was not in heavy use until then, so how did the entire world become converted to Christianity without mass use of the Bible? I guess many people don't believe that anyone was a Christian until 1500 A.D. and that the Church didn't exist until somewhere around 1500 A.D.; almost 1500 years after Christ's death. Now that is fuzzy math or fuzzy theology.

How did the early church convert the entire world? The early Catholic Church converted the entire world by evangelization through the use of tradition because there was no Bible. Read history; it is all there.

The entire New Testament was not written until after the Church was created. So in truth the Catholic Church wrote the entire New Testament by inspiration of the Holy Spirit. The New Testament was not written by the Jewish Nation, but the Church. It is inconsequential that many in the Church were Jewish. What matters is that they were the Catholic Church and the Catholic Church inspired by the Holy Spirit assembled and canonized the Bible.

It is a simple fact of history that the Protestant Bible with its 66 books is missing seven whole books (I and II Maccabees, Sirach, Wisdom, Baruch, Tobit, and Judith) and portions of two others (Daniel and Esther). These were removed primarily for doctrinal reasons (II Maccabees supports the doctrine of [purgatory](#), for example).

Why do the Protestant reformers call parts of Scripture false when the whole of antiquity has held them as articles of faith? We see many writers from the first three centuries including St. Clement of Rome, St. Irenaeus, St. Hippolytus, Tertullian, Cyprian and many others all allude to the deuterocanonical books we mention above. Who gave the reformers the direction to declare these books false? For example, the book of Judith was made authoritative by the Council of Nicea, when the Church was never greater or more solemn. Why blatantly defy the decisions of this council?

Where did the Protestant reformers come up with the exact list of books in the Canon they choose to follow? Who told them which books should be included or removed? It was not the Jews that told them as the Gospels would not be there. It was not from the Council of Laodicea for the Apocalypse would be in it. It was not from the Council of Carthage or Florence for Ecclesiasticus and Machabees would be included. So where did the reformers decide on their specific list of books to include? No such Canon was used before the Protestant reformation as the many Protestant denominations use now. What is the likelihood that the Holy Spirit hid for the first 1400+ years of the Church, then revealed a new Canon to two unknown men, namely Luther and Calvin?

The Protestant reformers have taken away many books from the original Scriptures such as Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, Tobias, Judith, Wisdom and both books of Maccabees. In the ancient

Church there was originally some doubt about some books being inspired and no doubt about many others, yet the Protestant reformers have accepted some of the doubtful and cast out some that were never doubtful. So why were these specific set of books cut from the Scriptures by the Protestant reformers other than that the doctrine of some were hard for them to accept? The reformers do not give a logical answer for their striking some books from the Canon and it is clear that they were simply contradicting the Church. It just so happens that the contents of the books of Maccabees contains doctrine on the intercession of Saints and prayers for the departed and Ecclesiasticus contains doctrine on the honor of relics, which is doctrine that just so happens to be accepted by the Catholic Church and denied by the reformers. Remember, it was the Catholic Church in Her early days (when She was the [True Church](#) according to the Protestant reformers) that received the books Maccabees as canonical along with the other books of Scripture. So why defy the Church on just Maccabees?

Of those reformers who claim their decisions to strike books from the Canon are from the Holy Ghost, we ask that you please show proof. Why would the Holy Ghost suddenly give inspirations as to what everyone must believe to unknown men like Luther and Calvin, after they abandoned the Councils and the entire Church? Shall we simply believe the reformers at their word? How then do we believe or not believe the next person who also claims the same inspiration? If the Protestant reformers were inspired, then God would clearly show the world a sign like with others inspired in Scripture, but a sign the reformers have not shown so they are not to be believed.

If God had revealed something a thousand times over to a private person we should not be obliged to believe it unless God gave us such an undeniable sign that we could no longer call it into question. How else are we to separate the false prophet from the true prophet? If we were obliged to believe everyone claiming internal revelations, we would soon be swamped with deceivers and would be completely lost.

It is one thing for the Protestant reformers to dare cut off entire books, chapters, sentences and words from Scripture, but even more, the books that they chose not to cut off they have corrupted and violated by their translations. Compare the Vulgate Latin translation from the middle of the second century, (universally received by the Church at that time and declared as authentic by the Council of Trent) to translations of Scripture Protestant churches use today. There is a night and day difference in wording. And even worse, compare translations of Scripture between different Protestant denominations and they also differ!

How can private men (the reformers) so boldly take their hand to the word of God and change it? If one man does such a thing, then what is to stop the next man from doing it to his taste, and the next to his taste? An example:

In Acts 2:27 we see, "*thou wilt not leave my soul in hell*" while in a version of a Protestant bible we see the verse, "*thou shalt not leave my corpse in the tomb*". Clearly this is not an accurate translation and the meaning is not at all the same. It is common knowledge that only one word can change the meaning of an entire sentence. **We note here that Hieronymus Emser, a literary opponent of Luther, points out 1400 inaccuracies in Luther's translation of Scripture, while Bunsen, a Protestant scholar, points out 3000.** If Luther, Calvin and other reformers' translations of a verse in Scripture differ from the original AND from each other,

which one is the word of God? Or are all three versions of the verse still the word of God, though their translation may make their meaning completely different from the next? How can so many brains which are so different make so many translations without overthrowing the sincerity of Scripture?

Christians have the current 46 book Old Testament because this was the canon used by the leaders of the early Christian Church; the apostles and their followers. This canon was found in a Greek translation of the Scriptures known as the Septuagint. This was the version used by very many Jews in the first century.

The Jews were using a Greek translation because very few Jews actually spoke Hebrew any longer. Owing to their capture by the Babylonians and subsequent freeing by the Persians, most Jews no longer spoke Hebrew, but rather spoke Aramaic – a Persian-derived language. The priestly class still spoke Hebrew, but the average Jew did not. In addition, owing to the massive conquests of Alexander the Great of Macedon, the Greek language had become the common language of business and culture in the Near- and Middle East. Accordingly, the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures was very popular.

It can clearly be seen that the Septuagint was used by the early Christians – when the Old Testament is quoted in the New Testament over 90% of the quotations are taken from the Septuagint text. Many Protestants will argue that the Septuagint canon is not the correct one – but it is clear that [the correct canon of the Bible is the 46 book Septuagint one](#).

Thus, if a Protestant chooses to reject the Septuagint canon because some Jews at a later date did so because the books of the Septuagint pointed to a Messianic figure like Jesus Christ, why is he not rejecting Christ and the New Testament? The Jews did not reject these seven books – or the Septuagint as a whole – for roughly 250 years. From the completion of the Septuagint to the school of Jamnia a large group of Greek speaking Jews were happy to use the Septuagint. This group of Jews included Jesus and His disciples. Additionally, the number of quotes from the Septuagint in the New Testament (some of which come from the deuterocanonical books) show that Jesus and the apostles considered the Septuagint (which contained the deuterocanon) to be Scripture. The final lists produced by the various councils who were inspired by the Holy Spirit to [determine](#) which books were in the Bible are *the very same lists* which give us the books of the New Testament. If they don't trust the lists for the Old Testament, why do they trust them for the New Testament?

The canon of the Bible is not open to interpretation and modification by people who are doing so because it doesn't agree with their personal theology. If a book of the Bible disagrees with a personal theology it is a sign that the personal theology is wrong, not that the book should not be in the Bible!

It has always been a practice of the early Church to limit the Scriptures to universal languages such as Greek and Latin since they are not only universal but also not subject to changes like other languages. Most other languages change town to town in accents, phrases, and words (i.e. slang), and vary season to season and age to age and therefore it has never been recommended by the early Christian Church to translate the Bible to other languages that are not fixed languages.

Doing so has much more danger than profit as we can see from our example above. **Though we note here also that the early Christian Church has never disallowed translation of the Scriptures to non-fixed languages, though She has always insisted that public services of the Church use a fixed language translation to avoid possibly misleading the faithful with verses of possibly incorrect translation and meaning.**

In summary, the Protestant reformers not only made major changes to Scripture by poor translations, but also translated Scripture to all the local non-fixed languages of the people where they started their churches, and they use those faulty translations in their church services. **Is it not evident why there are so many Protestant interpretations of Scripture all in conflict with one another?**

The list was compiled by the bishops of the Catholic Church. Initially, local canons were assembled by individual bishops. These canons were lists of books which could be read aloud in Churches at Mass. Despite the fact that these canons were independently assembled they bore a great deal of similarity to each other – because the Catholic bishops were all using the same criteria to determine which books should be included. They looked to see if the books were written by an apostle or someone who was reporting the words of an apostle. They checked to see how much the book was being used by other bishops and priests in their Masses, and also looked at how often the book was quoted by the Church Fathers in their writings. Only those books which “scored” favorably on all three of these criteria made it into their canons.

The Bible was not put under one cover until the Councils of Hippo (393) and 3rd Council of Carthage (397) accepted the official list of books. Not for over 1000 years after these early Councils was the printing press invented (1450), so Bible manuscripts were quite rare and costly before the printing press came about. Between 397 and 1450 then, **how did most people learn about the contents of Scripture, and who was the authoritative figure for the early Church during these centuries? The authority clearly could not have been the Bible, but clearly was the Church Herself who preached it to the faithful. So how can Scripture have been our only guide for the centuries before copies of the Bible were readily available, and were the people who lived during those centuries all damned because they did not have access to Scripture?**

**Nowhere in Scripture do we see references to Jesus writing anything down during His public life, nor does Scripture show that He ever asked His Apostles to write down what He was teaching either. If Scripture were the ONLY resource we should have for our salvation, surely Jesus and His Apostles would have written constantly, but they did not. So while Scripture is essential, tradition is also essential.**

Are we really to think that anything Jesus did or said that didn't make it into the books of Scripture are false or should not be adhered to? **John 20:30 says, “Now Jesus did many other signs in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book.”**

**Nowhere in Scripture does it say Scripture alone should be accepted as revelation, and it certainly does not say we should condemn Apostolic tradition. Look all through the Gospels and you will see nothing spoken against tradition except for traditions which are**

**human or against Scripture. Why do the Protestant reformers add this to Our Lord's words? It is forbidden to add anything to Scripture, as it is to take anything away from it. Why do the Protestant reformers also take away the traditions which are expressly authorized?**

**Consider the verse, "*Therefore, brethren, stand fast; and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word, or by our epistle, 2 Thessalonians 2:15.* What else does this tell us than the Apostles spread the word of God not only through Epistles, but also by WORD, and that we should hold to the traditions which we are taught?**

**Tradition as defined by the Church is "Any unwritten Apostolic doctrine". Consider the verse, "*If any man be hungry, let him eat at home; that you come not together unto judgment. And the rest I will set in order, when I come.*" 1 Corinthians 11:34. This clearly shows St. Paul writing important words to the Corinthians, then stating he will "*set the rest in order*" when he comes, yet we do not have writing about them elsewhere. What he said then, will it be lost to the Church? No, it has come down through tradition.**

**Consider the verse, "*Having more things to write unto you, I would not by paper and ink: for I hope that I shall be with you, and speak face to face: that your joy may be full.*" 2 John 1:12. St. John had something worthy of being written yet he chose to speak instead. Instead of Scripture, he has made tradition.**

**Consider the verse, "*Hold the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me in faith, and in the love which is in Christ Jesus.*" 2 Timothy 1:13. This is clearly St. Paul recommending to St. Timothy an unwritten Apostolic word. This is tradition!**

**Also consider the verse, "*And the things which thou hast heard of me by many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also.*" 2 Timothy 2:2. What is this but the Apostle speaking, the witnesses relating, and St. Timothy teaching, followed by these teaching others? This is clearly tradition.**

**Consider the verse, "*I have yet many things to say to you: but you cannot bear them now*" John 16:12. When did He say these things which He had to say? Was it all written? It is also said that He was forty days with them teaching them of the Kingdom of God, but we have neither all of His apparitions nor everything he told them during that time.**

**Consider the verses, "*Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you*" Matthew 28:20, and "*He that heareth you, heareth me*" Luke 10:16, etc. This clearly shows the Apostles teaching is true revelation.**

**If the Holy Spirit can divinely inspire you to think something and write it down, it is clearly logical that the Holy Spirit can divinely inspire you to think something and speak it out loud.**

**In the early history of the Church, there were *hundreds* of different documents circulating around, all of them purporting to the authentic Christian teaching and accurate history and doctrine. However, many of these documents were not what they claimed to be – they were**

**forgeries not written by the people whose names they bore, or were heretical documents advancing novel notions about Christ. Some of these documents have survived today – examples are the *Gospel of Judas* and the *Gospel of Thomas*. Neither of these documents were written by their alleged authors – they are late forgeries designed to cash in on the success and popularity of Christianity.**

**Out of all these hundreds of documents – many of them forgeries – the current 27 book New Testament appeared.** This process took a long time – roughly 300 years went by from the writing of the last book of the New Testament (Revelation) until the list was finalized.

The numerous quantity of books that were not included in the Canon of Scripture were determined to be frauds for numerous reasons. The Catholic Church did not approve the Gospel of Thomas. They didn't approve the Gospel of Judas or the writings of Mary Magdalene, or Barnabas. You can write all the books you want, but if I don't choose them and include them in my Bible, WHO CARES!

A [commonly-made charge](#) is that the Catholic Church is somehow “anti-Bible”. This is a typical [anti-Catholic slander](#) and is totally untrue. If the Catholic Church really wanted to destroy the Bible, why did she not do so when she was the only Church there was and was the sole protector of the Bible? For over one thousand years the Bible was the possession of the Catholic Church alone, as there were no other Christians! The Bible was copied by monks in monasteries – if the Church had wanted to get rid of the Bible she could have done so simply by not copying it!

A number of anti-Catholics say that the Catholic Church's doctrines are contrary to the Bible – what they mean is that *their interpretation of the Bible* is at odds with the Catholic Church's. But if it were truly the case that there were verses in the Bible which were against the Catholic Church's doctrines, why did she not change them when she had the chance? The Catholic Church could have changed the Bible to remove such embarrassing verses. The fact she did *not* shows that these verses are, in fact, not embarrassing at all and that the [interpretation of non-Catholics must be considered incorrect!](#)

If I write a term paper, I determine all of the sources I use and quote. I am not putting anything in the term paper that doesn't totally agree with what I believe and the thesis I am trying to prove. The exact same applies to the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church had four large councils that spent years determining the books that would become part of the canon of the Bible. **In 382 A.D. the council of Rome and Pope Damasus created the current accepted canon of the Holy Bible. Later the councils of Hippo and the two councils of Carthage all agreed with the Canon of the council of Rome.** They made sure that not one book, word or letter was canonized that did not totally agree with the teaching of the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church alone assembled the Bible and alone is the expert and authority on the Bible. No protestant denomination assembled any part of the Bible. Period. It is like my term paper. I assembled it and put it together and I taught and give speeches on this paper for 2,000 years. Then you come along and take the paper I assembled and you start telling me what I meant to

say in my own term paper that I assembled. That is ridiculous, illogical, irrational, and unbelievable arrogant and prideful. The point is I chose what sources I put in my term paper and no one else.

However, Martin Luther, by himself removed several books from the Bible and removed several more New Testament books before they were added back in by his followers who disagreed with Luther. If Protestants acknowledge that Luther was wrong about removing the New Testament books from the Bible, doesn't it make rational and logical sense that he could have been wrong about the Old Testament books he removed?

The entire early church was Jewish, but they didn't have a Bible. All the Jewish patriarchs and apostles were dead long ago before the Bible was canonized and assembled by the Catholic Church.

How did the early church convert the entire world? By tradition; because there was no Bible. The entire New Testament was not written until after the Church was created. So in truth the Catholic Church wrote the entire New Testament by inspiration of the Holy Spirit. The New Testament was not written by the Jewish Nation, but the Church. It is inconsequential that many in the Church were Jewish. What matters is that they were the Catholic Church and the Catholic Church inspired by the Holy Spirit assembled and Canonized the Bible.

**The Christians who wrote the New Testament were Catholic – they were Catholic for two reasons. One, they believed everything which the current Catholic Church (and *only* the Catholic Church) teaches (as is shown by the writings of the [Church Fathers](#)). And they were Catholic because there *was no other church* at the time. Myths such as the [“Trail of Blood”](#) simply do not hold water – the Catholic Church was, quite literally, the only game in town.**

Accordingly, the Bible can be considered to be two things – it is *younger* than the Catholic Church and it is *the product* of the Catholic Church. This means that [the Bible is not the sole rule of faith for Christians](#), but rather [“the Church is the pillar and foundation of the truth”](#) as it says in [I Timothy 3:15](#).

**The Catholic Church confirmed the books (the Canon) of the Bible in the Councils of Hippo (393) and 3rd Council of Carthage (397). So if the Catholic Church was in heresy and evil in 300 A.D. then the Bibles that you use today are also evil and heresy because the canon of the Bible was not comprised until 393 and 397 A.D. This is long after some Protestants say the Catholic Church became evil and heretical.** This remained the only Canon and the undisputed Canon of the Bible until Martin Luther decided he was the Protestant Pope who had the authority by himself to remove 7 books and parts of Daniel and others. He did this by his own little self. Even the Catholic Church had four councils of numerous men to decide this, but Luther thought he was smarter than anyone else.

Saint Jerome of the Catholic Church was the man who compiled and translated the first unified Bible in the early 400s. This was the first time that the entire Bible was compiled into one translated book. The entire Bible composed into one book could not have even been distributed until this time, so how did the entire world convert to Christianity up until this time? By the preaching of the good news of Christ through tradition and word of mouth!

As can clearly be seen the canon of the Bible was produced by the Catholic Church. The Church also existed long before the Bible – it was the early fifth century before the Bible existed as we might recognize it today, and none of the books of the Bible were even written until around 50 AD. But the Catholic Church began 20 years earlier, at Pentecost when the Holy Spirit descended on the apostles.

In Europe in 1452, metal plates are first used in printing. [Gutenberg](#) begins printing the Bible which he finishes in 1456. Gutenberg's printing press finished printing its first Bible in 1456. Before then, mass distribution of printed Bibles was impossible.

It is no coincidence that soon after the printing press was invented and the masses had access to the Bible for the first time, people like Martin Luther, John Calvin and many others started to make up their own opinions and interpretations of the Bible. This has continued until this very day where we now have estimates of approximately 40,000 Christian denominations. Each denomination is convinced that they are correct and all others are wrong. We have estimates that there are approximately 2 billion Christians worldwide. In reality, almost 2 billion people make up their own religious denomination and proclaim themselves to be the infallible authority and interpreter on the Bible and Christianity.

Actually by any standards all of the protestant churches and protestant Bibles are guilty of plagiarism. It is Martin Luther, John Calvin, and many others that brought in their own traditions and heresies. So, which protestant denomination is correct?

In the gospel of John Jesus prayed to his heavenly Father that the Church remain one single unified Church John 17:18-23: "As thou didst send me into the world, so I have sent them into the world. And for their sake I consecrate myself, that they also may be consecrated in truth. "I do not pray for these only, but also for those who believe in me through their word, that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us, so that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. The glory which thou hast given me I have given to them, that they may be one even as we are one, I in them and thou in me, that they may become perfectly one, so that the world may know that thou hast sent me and hast loved them even as thou hast loved me." Obviously Jesus did not want the Church to be scattered and splintered into 40,000 denominations. To believe otherwise contradicts the Bible and the words of Jesus himself. So the verses of Acts 20:29-30 are clearly talking about the heresies of Luther, Calvin, et al. "I know that after I leave, savage wolves will come in among you and will not

spare the flock. Even from your own number men will arise and distort the truth in order to draw away disciples after them."

A common charge leveled against the Bible by atheists and others is that the Bible is not historically accurate and is simply a collection of myths and stories. This is not the case. Modern archaeology and history have shown that the Bible is generally very historically accurate. The events described in the Bible are supported by secular historians such as Tatian and Josephus.

In order to refute the charge that the Bible is not historically accurate it is necessary to understand something very important about the nature of historical documents and history. Historical documents are *not* generally assumed to be inaccurate and packs of lies; they are generally assumed to be accurate because people are not assumed to be liars. Additionally, historians do not automatically require there to be two, three or four sources in order to actually believe something.

If historians were very skeptical about all documents and required multiple sources we would not know very much about history – for most of the historical events which humans beings believe to be true and to have really happened, there is only a single source which is not attested elsewhere.

Additionally, historical records which do not *precisely* agree on all the details are *not* automatically thought to be inaccurate or flawed. As an example, we only have two accounts of Hannibal crossing the Alps into Italy with elephants. These two accounts cannot be reconciled with each other – yet no historian says that Hannibal did *not* cross the Alps.

Most historical documents concerning events in the ancient world were written down long after the events they describe, and the copies which have survived are much later than the already late originals. This is true for the histories about Alexander the Great, for example. In comparison it is a simple fact that the documents of the Bible were written within living memory of the events (this is shown by the fact that the [Church Fathers](#) are quoting from the documents which make up the Bible very early indeed). Paul's letters are written during the life of Paul – he was executed around 68 AD. Such temporal proximity to the events means that, firstly, there is less chance of legendary development and, secondly, that any errors would be corrected by the people who were there!

The question of legendary development – that is, the addition of legendary, fantastical elements to a story which turn it into a myth – is one which many [atheists](#) raise. They say that the Gospels originally did not contain any supernatural elements and that these were added afterwards – but this is not consistent with legendary development. There is not enough time for legendary development to take place; legendary development takes centuries to occur (it does not occur, for example, with the histories of Alexander the Great until the middle ages).

The people who say that the Bible is historically inaccurate are not historians, or at least are not unbiased historians. They do not understand the nature of historical documents; the fact that

there are seeming contradictions or that the documents are not detailed, identical, or supported elsewhere does *not* automatically mean that the documents are flawed and are lies.

Many of these so-called inconsistencies are based on scientific assumptions which have not been proven (a good example is the Genesis creation story – the scientific theories of the creation of the world have never been *proven* and so cannot be treated as definite fact. In addition many Biblical scholars consider that the Genesis account should not be read literally, but rather allegorically). [Historical “evidence”](#) is often flawed, and comes from sources which are opposed to Christianity. The Bible is often the only source we have for information concerning the events described in the Bible – why is the Bible being automatically considered to be unreliable when *no other* historical document contradicts it and there is no evidence to suggest it is wrong? This is an unfair double standard which shows bias and prejudice against Christianity.

**The reason the Bible is considered divinely inspired is *because the Catholic Church says so and [the Catholic Church has the authority](#) to do so.* This is not an argument most people have heard – most people are expecting something along the lines of “The Bible says so” or “I was told so by God”. But this is not the reason. The Bible cannot self-authenticate itself as inspired Scripture; there *has* to be an external authority which provides not only the canon of the Bible but also accurate interpretation of the Bible and the assurance that it is divinely inspired. [This authority is the Catholic Church.](#)**

God is the sole authority of morality and ethics. God gave all authority to His Son Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ gave authority in this world to His Church until He returns. The Bible is historically accurate. The Church through its authority and by confirmation that the Bible is historically accurate, declared the Bible divinely inspired. This is how Christian and Biblical authority works; therefore, the Catholic Church was the authority which put the Bible together and is [the only authority which can correctly interpret it.](#)

Some [atheists](#) will call this a circular argument – but this is not the case. It is perhaps best described as a *spiral* argument. The conclusion is not contained in the premise and an earlier logical step does not depend on a later one; the first point is that the Bible is *historically accurate* and that means [the Catholic Church has authority.](#) The Catholic Church assembled the Bible and then declared it divinely inspired. Because the Church has authority she can declare the Bible to be divinely inspired. Divinely inspired is *not* the same thing as historically accurate and hence this is not a circular argument.

For a non-Catholic Christian who already accepts the divine inspiration of the Bible the Catholic apologist should ask “Why do you believe the Bible is divinely inspired?” Various answers will be offered – but none of them are logically consistent and satisfying except the fact that the authority of the Catholic Church states that it is divinely inspired. **The question which should then be put to the non-Catholic is “Don’t you think that, because the Catholic Church was the organization who put the Bible together and the organization who declared it inspired, [the Catholic Church has to have authority](#) in order to do this?”**

## The History of the Printing Press

<http://inventors.about.com/od/pstartinventions/a/printing.htm>

Before Gutenberg, printing was limited in the number of editions made and nearly exclusively decorative, used for pictures and designs. The material to be printed was carved into wood, stone, and metal, rolled with ink or paint and transferred by pressure to parchment or vellum. Books were hand copied mostly by members of religious orders. Johannes Gutenberg was a German craftsman and inventor. Gutenberg is best known for the Gutenberg press, an innovative printing press machine that used movable type. It remained the standard until the 20th century. Gutenberg made printing cheap.

<http://inventors.about.com/od/gstartinventors/a/Gutenberg.htm>

Johannes Gutenberg, a goldsmith and businessman from the mining town of Mainz in southern Germany, borrowed money to invent a technology that changed the world of printing. Johannes Gutenberg invented the printing press with replaceable/moveable wooden or metal letters in 1436 (completed by 1440). This method of printing can be credited not only for a revolution in the production of books, but also for fostering rapid development in the sciences, arts and religion through the transmission of texts.

The Gutenberg press with its wooden and later metal movable type printing brought down the price of printed materials and made such materials available for the masses. It remained the standard until the 20th century. The Gutenberg printing press developed from the technology of the screw-type wine presses of the Rhine Valley. It was there in 1440 that Johannes Gutenberg created his printing press, a hand press, in which ink was rolled over the raised surfaces of moveable hand-set block letters held within a wooden form and the form was then pressed against a sheet of paper.

Johannes Gutenberg is also accredited with printing the world's first book using movable type, the 42-line (the number of lines per page) [Gutenberg Bible](#).

During the centuries, many newer printing technologies were developed based on Gutenberg's printing machine e.g. offset printing.

<http://publishing.about.com/od/Books/a/Gutenberg-Johann-Gutenberg-And-The-Invention-Of-The-Printing-Press.htm>

The Gutenberg Bibles, which date from the 1450s, are considered to be the first books printed in the Western world and, although they don't bear the printer's name anywhere in the volumes, are attributed to Gutenberg's first printing efforts.

[Prior to the invention of the printing press](#), books were hand-copied and a Bible would take around two years to produce. Most of the general public would have seen a book--that Bible--

only in church, and all but the wealthy and learned would likely have to travel to get a look at one of the classic texts such as Homer's *Illiad*.

The efficiencies of using movable type and a printing press to produce books quickly paved the way for the mass production of books and other reading material, including printed handbills advertising these early books--the first book marketing!

Printed information caught on quickly as a method of communication. For the first time in history, ideas were literally put in the general public's hands in the form of the printed word, [and book publishing](#) enabled knowledge, thoughts and culture to spread at a rate faster than ever before.

[http://inventors.about.com/od/pstartinventions/a/printing\\_3.htm](http://inventors.about.com/od/pstartinventions/a/printing_3.htm)

In Europe in 1452, metal plates are first used in printing. [Gutenberg](#) begins printing the Bible which he finishes in 1456. Gutenberg's printing press finished printing its first Bible in 1456. Before then, mass distribution of printed Bibles was impossible.

<http://www.netplaces.com/philosophy-book/the-scientific-revolution/the-invention-of-the-printing-press.htm>

His Gutenberg Bible was printed in 1455. It contained forty-two lines per page and took over two years to complete. It also was the first "modern" book ever printed in Europe.