

On the Clementine Vulgate's Errors and On Heretical Commentaries



R. J. M. I.

By

The Precious Blood of Jesus Christ;
The Grace of the God of the Holy Catholic Church;
The Mediation of the Blessed Virgin Mary,
Our Lady of Good Counsel and Crusher of Heretics;
The Protection of Saint Joseph,
Patriarch of the Holy Family and Patron of the Holy Catholic Church;
The Guidance of the Good Saint Anne,
Mother of Mary and Grandmother of God;
The Intercession of the Archangels Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael;
The Intercession of All the Other Angels and Saints;
and the Cooperation of

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

To Jesus through Mary

*Júdica me, Deus, et discérne causam meam de gente non sancta:
ab hómine iníquo, et dolóso érue me*

Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam

“The authority of the Septuagint is pre-eminent
as far as the Old Testament is concerned.”
(St. Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*)

Original version: 3/2020; Current version: 10/2020

Mary's Little Remnant

302 East Joffre St.

Truth or Consequences, New Mexico 87901-2878, USA

Website: www.JohnTheBaptist.us

(Send for a free catalog)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	7
<i>On the Haydock Bible.....</i>	<i>7</i>
ON THE HERESIES AND OTHER ERRORS IN THE CLEMENTINE VULGATE.....	9
ON HERESIES AND OTHER ERRORS IN COMMENTARIES THAT TRY TO EXPLAIN ERRONEOUS TEXTS.....	28
SOME OF THE HERESIES AND OTHER ERRORS IN THE CLEMENTINE VULGATE	28
<i>The heresy that Isaac was Abraham’s only-begotten son</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>The heresy that the Southern Kingdom of Juda consisted of one tribe instead of two.....</i>	<i>30</i>
An erroneous commentary on the erroneous text.....	32
<i>The heresy that life does not begin in the womb.....</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>The heresy that the Paschal sacrifice was a lamb and a goat</i>	<i>33</i>
A heretical commentary on the heretical text	33
<i>The heresy and blasphemy that has God profaning men</i>	<i>34</i>
An erroneous commentary that explains away the heresy and blasphemy.....	34
<i>The idolatry that faithful Jews allowed pagans to worship with them.....</i>	<i>34</i>
An erroneous commentary that explains away the idolatrous and blasphemous text	35
<i>The heresy and blasphemy that God is perverted.....</i>	<i>35</i>
A heretical commentary that accepts the heretical and blasphemous text.....	35
<i>The heresy that God repented and thus had sinned</i>	<i>36</i>
A heretical commentary on the heretical text	36
<i>The heresy that after King Saul died he went to the same place as Samuel.....</i>	<i>36</i>
Erroneous commentaries on the heretical text.....	37
<i>The heresy and blasphemy that replaces curses with blessings</i>	<i>37</i>
An erroneous commentary on the heretical and blasphemous texts	38
<i>The heresy that all wars are unjust.....</i>	<i>39</i>
An erroneous commentary that explains away the heretical text	39
<i>The heresy that a holy prophet does not know the wisdom of God</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>The heresy that Samuel was an Ephraimite.....</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>The contradiction that the Levite Joseph was also a Gentile</i>	<i>41</i>
<i>Alexandria did not exist in the days of Jeremias, Ezechiel, and Nahum.....</i>	<i>41</i>
Commentaries give the correct name but leave the incorrect one in the text	42
<i>Both the heart and the liver, not the heart or the liver.....</i>	<i>42</i>
The commentary mentions the true text but does not address the error in the Clementine Vulgate.....	43
<i>Imposed a tribute on the land instead of condemned the land</i>	<i>44</i>
<i>Not any king removes evil but a righteous king.....</i>	<i>44</i>
<i>Doctrine of baptism not of baptisms</i>	<i>44</i>
<i>Can be taken to heretically mean that the faithful must not pray for certain sinners.....</i>	<i>45</i>
<i>Says that sin is an inconvenience and thus implies it is not sin.....</i>	<i>45</i>
<i>Elders not senators</i>	<i>46</i>
<i>From Caesarea to Antioch and not to Jerusalem.....</i>	<i>46</i>
<i>Some verses that make no sense</i>	<i>46</i>
HERETICAL OR OTHERWISE ERRONEOUS TEXTS NOT BASED ON THE CLEMENTINE VULGATE	48
<i>The idolatry of worshipping angels and men.....</i>	<i>49</i>
Challoner’s idolatrous translation of Josue 5:15 has men worshipping angels	49
Challoner’s idolatrous translation of Genesis 27:29 has men worshipping men.....	50
<i>The idolatry that God does not hold idolaters guilty (Acts 17:30)</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>The heresy that men are saved by following their own conscience (1 Cor. 4:4)</i>	<i>51</i>
<i>The heresy and blasphemy that Jesus was a malefactor (Lk. 23:32)</i>	<i>51</i>
<i>Slaves not servants</i>	<i>52</i>
<i>Repentance not penance</i>	<i>53</i>
MORE HERETICAL OR OTHERWISE ERRONEOUS BIBLICAL COMMENTARIES	55

<i>Introduction</i>	55
<i>Evidence</i>	55
The heresy of respecting and condoning false religions.....	55
The stoic heresy.....	55
The stoic-influenced error that Abisag was David's wife.....	56
The heresy that slavery is intrinsically evil	56
The heresy that denies the power of the Devil	57
The heresy that anger is intrinsically evil	57
Implies that Jesus and Mary sinned	57
The error that non-sinful falsehoods are sinful	58
The heresy that denies dreams from God	61
The heresy that the sodomites killed in Sodom will not be condemned to hell	61
The heresy of heliocentrism	61
The heresy that there is no pain after death for the damned	62
The heresy that denies the Salvation Dogma	62
Heresies regarding the Old and New Testament eras	63
The heresy that idolatry was tolerated among the faithful during the Old Testament era	67
The idolatry of glorifying mythology or philosophy.....	67
The heresies of non-judgmentalism and non-punishmentalism	69
Condemns justified rebukes (1 Tim. 5:1)	69
Condemns righteous anger (Ja. 1:19-20).....	69
Excuses idolatry (3 Ki. 12:28).....	70
Denies a dogma on excommunications (2 Cor. 10:8)	70
Condemns justified punishments and incites rebellion (Est. 1:19-21).....	71
Condemns killings executed by religious (3 Ki. 19:17).....	72
Condemns justified killings and torture.....	72
Condemns justified revenge	79
The doubt or denial of miraculous events.....	83
The heresy that God does not attend to the petitions of the innocent	85
The heresy that denies the temporal Kingship of Christ	85
The heresy that all sins proceed from ignorance	86
The heresy that idolatry is not idolatry or wicked but only a weakness	87
The glorification of heretics.....	87
The heresies that polygamy and divorce are intrinsically evil	88
VERSIONS OF THE SEPTUAGINT	88
THE CATHOLIC FAITH IS NOT DIMINISHED JUST BECAUSE NO PURE VERSION OF THE BIBLE EXISTS	90
I AM WORKING ON PRODUCING THE PUREST POSSIBLE VERSION OF THE CATHOLIC BIBLE	90

Introduction

On the Haydock Bible

The apostate Bishop George Haydock is the author of the Haydock Bible which was published in 1859.

Haydock's Catholic Family Bible and Commentary, by the apostate Bishop Fr. George Leo Haydock, 1859. Published by Edward Dunigan and Brother, New York, NY. Approved by many bishops.

The Haydock Bible contains commentaries from Haydock himself and others. Many of the commentaries contain contradictions and heretical probabilism in which he presents dogmas not as dogmas and the heresies that oppose them not as heresies. Instead he presents them as allowable opinions and leaves the reader to decide which one is true.¹

In the beginning of his Bible, Haydock lists all the commentators and identifies most of the heretical commentators and thus warns the reader, which justifies his use of them without scandalizing the readers. However, he *culpably* refers to some heretical commentators as orthodox and thus not as heretics, such as Origen; and hence Haydock is a formal heretic on this point alone.

He lists Origen 89 times in the Old Testament and 64 times in the New Testament and does not once refer to Origen as a heretic, which would be acceptable if he had listed Origen as a heretic in a prominent place in the work. What is worse is that he lists Origen as orthodox instead. In the "Preface" of his Bible in the section titled "A List of the Principal Commentators, &c," he lists all the commentators he quotes in his Bible and says that the ones with a cross next to their names are not Catholic. For example, Martin Luther and Calvin have a cross next to their names; but the apostates Origen and Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius do not, and thus he refers to the three of them as orthodox and thus Catholic:

Heretical *Haydock Bible*, by apostate Bishop George Haydock, 1859: "Preface, A List of the Principal Commentators, &c.: Those who have a Cross prefixed to their Names, have been perhaps Men of Learning, but they have erred from the Faith which was once delivered to the Saints, and can therefore be consulted only as Critics, or to be refuted... +Calvin; Clem. Alex; Eusebius; +Luther; Origen."

¹ See RJMI book *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics: Heretical Probabilism*.

A LIST OF THE PRINCIPAL COMMENTATORS, &c.,

WITH THE YEAR OF THEIR DEATH.

<p>S. Ambrose 397 S. Anselm 1109 S. Athanasius 373 S. Augustine 430 C. Wm. Allen 1594 † Aquila Gr. Int. 130 † Ananias 1629 S. Basil 379 Bede 735 S. Bernard 1153 S. Bonaventure 1274 C. Cas. Baronius 1607 C. Rob. Bellarmine. 1621 W. F. Berthier 1782 Jas. Bonfrere 1642 Ric. Bristow 1681 Alb. Butler 1773 J. B. Bossuet 1704 Bartholucci 1687 † Beza 1605 † Bayle 1706 † Boehart 1667 S. Chrysostom 407 Clem. Alex. 217 S. Cyprian 258 S. Cyril Jerus. 386 S. Cyril Alex. 444 Ric. Challoner 1781 Den. Carthusian 1471 Aug. Calmet 1757 C. Thos. Cajetan 1534 C. Amb. Catharin 1653 Pet. Collet 1770 Carrieres 1717 De la Chetardie 1714 De Calasio.—<i>Cone.</i> 1621 † Calvin 1564 † Le Clerc 1736 † Cappel 1658 † Collier.—<i>Diet.</i> 1721 † Chateillon 1563 S. Jo. Damasc. 780 Du Pin 1720 Duquene 1790 † De Dieu 1642 † Drusius 1616 S. Ephrem 380 S. Epiphanius 403 Eusebius 339 D. Erasmus 1536 Wm. Estius 1613 Fl. Fleury 1723 Fa. Foreiro 1581 M. A. Flaminius 1550</p>	<p>† Fagius 1550 † J. A. Fabricius 1736 † Frishmuth 1687 S. Gregory I. 604 Jo. Gerson 1429 Guarin 1729 J. Gordon 1641 Gil. Genebrard 1597 † Grotius 1645 † Grabe 1712 S. Hilary, Piet. 868 Hesychius 609 J. B. Du Hamel 1706 Jo. Henten 1566 Houbigant 1783 P. Dan. Huet 1721 † Hammond 1660 S. Ignatius, M. 107 S. Isidore, Sev. 636 S. Irenæus 202 Innocent III. 1216 S. Jerom 420 J. Justin, M. 167 Jansenius 1576 C. Jans. of Ypres. 1638 † Juda Hakkad. 2 Cent. † Josephus 1 Cent. † Blind Joseph 1 Cent. † Jonathan 1 Cent. † Jarchi Rabbi 1180 † K. James I.—Bible by 47 Trans- lators, in 6 divisions. 1607 † Junius 1602 † Kennicott 1783 † Kimchi, R. 1240 S. Leo I. 461 Louvain Bible 1583 Luc. of Bruges 1619 Corn. a Lapide 1637 Phil. Labbe 1667 Lenglet 1755 Liranus 1340 J. Le Long 1721 † Leo of Modena 1609 † Leigh 1671 † Lightfoot 1675 † Luther 1546 Maldonat 1583 T. Malvenda 1628 And. Massius 1573 Mic. Mauduit 1709 Jo. Mariana 1624 Menochius 1655 Ed. 4 vol. by Tournemine.</p>	<p>Mar. Merseuse 1648 Ber. Montfaucon 1741 Jo. Morinus 1659 Sim. de Muis 1644 † Maimonides 1209 † Marsham 1685 Bill 1707 † Munster 1552 † Michælis 1700 S. Greg. Naz. 390 S. Greg. Nyssa. 400 Noel. Alexander 1724 Nob. Flaminius 1590 Origen 253 (Œumenius 10 Cent. Jer. Oleaster 1583 † Onkelos Chald. 1 Cent. S. Paulin 431 S. Prosper 463 Sant. Pagnin, tr. and revised by. 1536 B. Ar. Montanus 1598 Ja. Pamelius 1587 Pelletier 1711 Den Petau 1652 Paul Pezron 1706 Jo. Pineda 1637 Bas. Ponce 1629 Ben Porerius 1610 Jo. Price 1676 † Pliny the elder 79 † Philo the Jew 1 Cent. † Polus, or Poole 1669 † Poccoke 1691 Mic. Le Quien 1733 † Pas. Quesnel 1719 Rab. Maurus 856 Mart. Raimond 1286 Rupert 1155 Ribera 1591 J. B. Riccioli 1671 Wm. Reynolds 1592 Rondet 1785 † Rivet 1651 † Reland 1718 † J. J. Rousseau 1778 Septuagint, B. C. 284, &c. (Edited by Sixtus V. 1587, and Du Bos, from the Vat.; by Grabe, from the Alex. Copy.) Samaritan—Gr. Version older. Sulp. Severus 420 Em. Sa 1596 Jas. Salieu 1640</p>	<p>Alf. Salmeron 1585 Gas. Sanchez 1628 Nic. Serarius 1609 Ch. Sigonius 1594 Sixt. of Sienna 1560 Hen. Sponda 1643 Ric. Simon 1712 Aug. Steuchus Eng. 1550 † Le Mait de Saci 1684 † Symmachus 290 † 2 Scaligers 1558 & 1609 † Saumaise 1653 † Schmid 1697 † Selden 1654 † Spencer 1693 † Strabo 16 S. Tho. Aquinas 1274 Theodoret 431 Theophylact 1071 Theophilus An. 182 Jas. Tirin 1636 Le Nain Tillemont 1698 N. Toinarel 1706 Alf. Tostat 1454 Fr. Turrian 1584 R. Jos. Tournemine. 1739 † Theodotion 185 † Tertullian 245 † Tremellius 1580 Laur. Valla 1565 Vatable 1547 Correct Edit. of Salamanea. 1684 Fr. Vavasseur 1681 Gab. Vasquez 1694 J. B. Villalpand 1698 Marq. Velesius, or Pet. Faxard. 1600 L. Vives 1540 † Mic. Villanovan, or Servetus. 1552 † Ja. Vosius 1689 † Jas. Usher 1655 † Voltaire 1778 Th. Worthington 1628 C. Walmesley 1797 Rob. Witham 1788 Th. Ward 1708 † Walton 1661 † Wetstein 1754 † Whitby 1726 † Wesley 1791 † Whitfield 1769 † Whiston 1755 † Wolf 1744 Ximenes the 1st Polyglot. 1602-22 Zunica, or Stunica. 1530</p>
---	--	--	--

Those who have a Cross prefixed to their Names, have been perhaps Men of Learning, but they have erred from the Faith which was once delivered to the Saints, and can therefore be consulted only as Critics, or to be refuted. A more particular account of many of these Authors might probably be desired, but we must refer to the Historical Dictionaries, and other sources of information. In quoting any Work, we shall observe the utmost brevity: thus, S. Aug. de C. D. x. & Plin. v. 6. will refer to the City of God, 10 Book, 5 number, by S. Aug.; and to the 5 B. 6 number of Pliny's Natural History—this will easily be understood by the Learned, who alone will probably consult the originals.

The initials and names of the commentators from the Haydock Bible quoted in this book are as follows:

- B. is Bristow; C. is Calmet; Ch. is Challoner; D. is Du Hamel; E. is Estius; H. is Haydock; J. is Jansenius; M. is Menochius; P. is Pastorini; Po. is Polus; T. is Tirinus; V. is Bible de Vence; W. is Worthington; Wi. is Witham.

Whenever I say “Haydock” or “Haydock commentary” in this book, I mean commentaries in his Bible but not necessarily his commentaries. Because he put commentaries in his Bible that are not his, he takes responsibility for them.

On the Heresies and Other Errors in the Clementine Vulgate

Far from being infallible, the Clementine Vulgate's Old Testament contains many errors, contradictions, inconsistencies, and even contains some heresies. While the Clementine Vulgate's New Testament also contains textual errors, it does not contain heretical errors and contains only a few errors in comparison to the many errors in the Old Testament.

During the time of Christ's first coming, the Septuagint (also known as "The Seventy" or "LXX") was an authentic Old Testament which was used by Jesus Christ, his Apostles and disciples, and the Church Fathers. It is a miraculous Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament that took place in Egypt around 280 BC:

Flavius Josephus (AD 37-c. 101), *Antiquities of the Jews*, 1st century: "1. WHEN Alexander had reigned twelve years, and after him Ptolemy Soter forty years, Philadelphus then took the kingdom of Egypt, and held it forty years within one. He procured the law to be interpreted, and set free those that were come from Jerusalem into Egypt and were in slavery there, who were a hundred and twenty thousand. The occasion was this: Demetrius Phalerius, who was library keeper to the king, was now endeavoring, if it were possible, to gather together all the books that were in the habitable earth, and buying whatsoever was any where valuable or agreeable to the king's inclination, (who was very earnestly set upon collecting of books,) to which inclination of his Demetrius was zealously subservient. And when once Ptolemy asked him how many ten thousands of books he had collected, he replied that he had already about twenty times ten thousand; but that, in a little time, he should have fifty times ten thousand. But he said he had been informed that there were many books of laws among the Jews worthy of inquiring after, and worthy of the king's library, but which, being written in characters and in a dialect of their own, will cause no small pains in getting them translated into the Greek tongue; that the character in which they are written seems to be like to that which is the proper character of the Syrians, and that its sound, when pronounced, is like theirs also; and that this sound appears to be peculiar to themselves. Wherefore he said that nothing hindered why they might not get those books to be translated also; for while nothing is wanting that is necessary for that purpose, we may have their books also in this library. So the king thought that Demetrius was very zealous to procure him abundance of books, and that he suggested what was exceeding proper for him to do; and therefore he wrote to the Jewish high priest that he should act accordingly.

"2. Now there was one Aristeus, who was among the king's most intimate friends, and on account of his modesty very acceptable to him...

"3. When Aristeus was saying thus, the king looked upon him with a cheerful and joyful countenance, and said, 'How many ten thousands dost thou suppose there are of such as want to be made free?' To which Andreas replied, as he stood by, and said, 'A few more than ten times ten thousand.' The king made answer, 'And is this a small gift that thou askest, Aristeus?' But Sosibius, and the rest that stood by, said that he ought to offer such a thank-offering as was worthy of his greatness of soul, to that God who had given him his kingdom. With this answer he was much pleased; and gave order, that when they paid the soldiers their wages, they should lay down [a hundred and] twenty drachmas for every one of the slaves. ...

"4. Now when this had been done after so magnificent a manner, according to the king's inclinations, he gave order to Demetrius to give him in writing his sentiments concerning the transcribing of the Jewish books; for no part of the administration is done rashly by these kings, but all things are managed with great circumspection. On which account I have subjoined a copy of these epistles, and set down the multitude of the vessels sent as gifts [to Jerusalem], and the construction of every one, that the exactness of the artificers' workmanship, as it appeared to those that saw them, and which workmen made every vessel, may be made manifest, and this

on account of the excellency of the vessels themselves. Now the copy of the epistle was to this purpose:

‘Demetrius to the great king. When thou, O king, gavest me a charge concerning the collection of books that were wanting to fill your library, and concerning the care that ought to be taken about such as are imperfect, I have used the utmost diligence about those matters. And I let you know, that we want the books of the Jewish legislation, with some others; for they are written in the Hebrew characters, and being in the language of that nation, are to us unknown. It hath also happened to them, that they have been transcribed more carelessly than they ought to have been, because they have not had hitherto royal care taken about them. Now it is necessary that thou shouldst have accurate copies of them. And indeed this legislation is full of hidden wisdom, and entirely blameless, as being the legislation of God; for which cause it is, as Hecateus of Abdera says, that the poets and historians make no mention of it, nor of those men who lead their lives according to it, since it is a holy law, and ought not to be published by profane mouths. If then it please thee, O king, thou mayst write to the high priest of the Jews to send six of the elders out of every tribe, and those such as are most skillful of the laws, that by their means we may learn the clear and agreeing sense of these books, and may obtain an accurate interpretation of their contents, and so may have such a collection of these as may be suitable to thy desire.’

“5. When this epistle was sent to the king, he commanded that an epistle should be drawn up for Eleazar, the Jewish high priest, concerning these matters; and that they should inform him of the release of the Jews that had been in slavery among them...

“6. When this epistle of the king was brought to Eleazar, he wrote an answer to it with all the respect possible:

‘Eleazar the high priest to king Ptolemy, sendeth greeting. If thou and thy queen Arsinoe, and thy children, be well, we are entirely satisfied. When we received thy epistle, we greatly rejoiced at thy intentions; and when the multitude were gathered together, we read it to them and thereby made them sensible of the piety thou hast towards God. We also showed them the twenty vials of gold, and thirty of silver, and the five large basons, and the table for the shew-bread; as also the hundred talents for the sacrifices, and for the making what shall be needful at the temple; which things Andreas and Aristeus, those most honored friends of thine, have brought us; and truly they are persons of an excellent character, and of great learning, and worthy of thy virtue. Know then that we will gratify thee in what is for thy advantage, though we do what we used not to do before; for we ought to make a return for the numerous acts of kindness which thou hast done to our countrymen. We immediately, therefore, offered sacrifices for thee and thy sister, with thy children and friends; and the multitude made prayers, that thy affairs may be to thy mind, and that thy kingdom may be preserved in peace, and that the translation of our law may come to the conclusion thou desirest and be for thy advantage. We have also chosen six elders out of every tribe, whom we have sent, and the law with them. It will be thy part, out of thy piety and justice, to send back the law, when it hath been translated, and to return those to us that bring it in safety. Farewell.’

“7. This was the reply which the high priest made. But it does not seem to me to be necessary to set down the names of the seventy [two] elders who were sent by Eleazar, and carried the law, which yet were subjoined at the end of the epistle...

“11. ...And when they were come to Alexandria, and Ptolemy heard that they were come, and that the seventy [two] elders were come also, he presently sent for Andreas and Aristeus, his ambassadors, who came to him, and delivered him the epistle which they brought him from the high priest, and made answer to all the

questions he put to them by word of mouth. He then made haste to meet the elders that came from Jerusalem for the interpretation of the laws...

“13. ... And when they had gone over the bridge, he proceeded to the northern parts, and showed them where they should meet, which was in a house that was built near the shore, and was a quiet place, and fit for their discoursing together about their work. When he had brought them thither, he entreated them (now they had all things about them which they wanted for the interpretation of their law) that they would suffer nothing to interrupt them in their work. Accordingly, they made an accurate interpretation, with great zeal and great pains, and this they continued to do till the ninth hour of the day; after which time they relaxed, and took care of their body, while their food was provided for them in great plenty...

“Now when the law was transcribed, and the labor of interpretation was over, which came to its conclusion in seventy-two days, Demetrius gathered all the Jews together to the place where the laws were translated, and where the interpreters were, and read them over. The multitude did also approve of those elders that were the interpreters of the law.

“They withal commended Demetrius for his proposal, as the inventor of what was greatly for their happiness; and they desired that he would give leave to their rulers also to read the law. Moreover, they all, both the priest and the ancientest of the elders, and the principal men of their commonwealth, made it their request that since the interpretation was happily finished it might continue in the state it now was and might not be altered. And when they all commended that determination of theirs, they enjoined that if any one observed either any thing superfluous, or any thing omitted, that he would take a view of it again and have it laid before them and corrected; which was a wise action of theirs, that when the thing was judged to have been well done, it might continue for ever.

“14. So the king rejoiced when he saw that his design of this nature was brought to perfection, to so great advantage; and he was chiefly delighted with hearing the laws read to him; and was astonished at the deep meaning and wisdom of the legislator. And he began to discourse with Demetrius, ‘How it came to pass, that when this legislation was so wonderful, no one, either of the poets or of the historians, had made mention of it.’ Demetrius made answer, ‘that no one durst be so bold as to touch upon the description of these laws, because they were Divine and venerable, and because some that had attempted it were afflicted by God.’ He also told him that ‘Theopompus was desirous of writing somewhat about them, but was thereupon disturbed in his mind for above thirty days’ time; and upon some intermission of his distemper, he appeased God [by prayer], as suspecting that his madness proceeded from that cause.’ Nay, indeed, he further saw in a dream, that his distemper befell him while he indulged too great a curiosity about Divine matters, and was desirous of publishing them among common men; but when he left off that attempt, he recovered his understanding again. Moreover, he informed him of Theodectes, the tragic poet, concerning whom it was reported, that when in a certain dramatic representation he was desirous to make mention of things that were contained in the sacred books, he was afflicted with a darkness in his eyes; and that upon his being conscious of the occasion of his distemper, and appeasing God [by prayer], he was freed from that affliction.

“15. And when the king had received these books from Demetrius, as we have said already, he adored them, and gave order that great care should be taken of them, that they might remain uncorrupted.”²

Apostate Justin Martyr, *Hortatory Address to the Greeks*, 2nd century: “But if any one says that the writings of Moses and of the rest of the prophets were also written in the Greek character, let him read profane histories, and know that Ptolemy, king

² b. 12, c. 2. How Ptolemy Philadelphus procured the laws of the Jews to be translated into the Greek tongue, and set many captives free, and dedicated many gifts to God.

of Egypt, when he had built the library in Alexandria, and by gathering books from every quarter had filled it, then learnt that very ancient histories written in Hebrew happened to be carefully preserved; and wishing to know their contents, he sent for seventy wise men from Jerusalem, who were acquainted with both the Greek and Hebrew language, and appointed them to translate the books; and that in freedom from all disturbance they might the more speedily complete the translation, he ordered that there should be constructed, not in the city itself, but seven stadia off (where the Pharos was built), as many little cots as there were translators, so that each by himself might complete his own translation; and enjoined upon those officers who were appointed to this duty, to afford them all attendance, but to prevent communication with one another, in order that the accuracy of the translation might be discernible even by their agreement. And when he ascertained that the seventy men had not only given the same meaning, but had employed the same words, and had failed in agreement with one another not even to the extent of one word, but had written the same things and concerning the same things, he was struck with amazement, and believed that the translation had been written by divine power, and perceived that the men were worthy of all honour, as beloved of God, and with many gifts ordered them to return to their own country. And having, as was natural, marvelled at the books, and concluded them to be divine, he consecrated them in that library. These things, ye men of Greece, are no fable, nor do we narrate fictions; but we ourselves having been in Alexandria, saw the remains of the little cots at the Pharos still preserved, and having heard these things from the inhabitants, who had received them as part of their country's tradition, we now tell to you what you can also learn from others, and specially from those wise and esteemed men who have written of these things, Philo and Josephus, and many others.”³

St. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, c. 180-199: “2. For before the Romans possessed their kingdom, while as yet the Macedonians held Asia, Ptolemy the son of Lagus, being anxious to adorn the library which he had founded in Alexandria, with a collection of the writings of all men, which were [works] of merit, made request to the people of Jerusalem that they should have their Scriptures translated into the Greek language. And they — for at that time they were still subject to the Macedonians — sent to Ptolemy seventy of their elders, who were thoroughly skilled in the Scriptures and in both the languages, to carry out what he had desired. But he, wishing to test them individually, and fearing lest they might perchance by taking counsel together conceal the truth in the Scriptures by their interpretation, separated them from each other and commanded them all to write the same translation. He did this with respect to all the books. But when they came together in the same place before Ptolemy, and each of them compared his own interpretation with that of every other, God was indeed glorified, and the Scriptures were acknowledged as truly divine. For all of them read out the common translation [which they had prepared] in the very same words and the very same names, from beginning to end, so that even the Gentiles present perceived that the Scriptures had been interpreted by the inspiration of God. And there was nothing astonishing in God having done this—he who, when, during the captivity of the people under Nebuchadnezzar, the Scriptures had been corrupted, and when, after seventy years, the Jews had returned to their own land, then, in the times of Artaxerxes king of the Persians, inspired Esdras the priest, of the tribe of Levi, to recast all the words of the former prophets, and to re-establish with the people the Mosaic legislation.

“3. Since, therefore, the Scriptures have been interpreted with such fidelity, and by the grace of God, and since from these God has prepared and formed again our faith towards his Son, and has preserved to us the unadulterated scriptures in Egypt, where the house of Jacob flourished, fleeing from the famine in Canaan; where also

³ c. 13, History of the Septuagint.

our Lord was preserved when he fled from the persecution set on foot by Herod; and [since] this interpretation of these Scriptures was made prior to our Lord's descent [to earth], and came into being before the Christians appeared—for our Lord was born about the forty-first year of the reign of Augustus; but Ptolemy was much earlier, under whom the scriptures were interpreted;—[since these things are so, I say,] truly these men are proved to be impudent and presumptuous, who would now show a desire to make different translations, when we refute them out of these scriptures, and shut them up to a belief in the advent of the Son of God. But our faith is steadfast, unfeigned, and the only true one, having clear proof from these scriptures, which were interpreted in the way I have related; and the preaching of the Church is without interpolation. For the apostles, since they are of more ancient date than all these [heretics], agree with this aforesaid translation; and the translation harmonizes with the tradition of the apostles. For Peter, and John, and Matthew, and Paul, and the rest successively, as well as their followers, did set forth all prophecies, just as the interpretation of the elders contains them.

“4. For the one and the same Spirit of God, who proclaimed by the prophets what and of what sort the advent of the Lord should be, did by these elders give a just interpretation of what had been truly prophesied.”⁴

St. Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, 395: “[Chap. 15. Among Versions a Preference Is Given to the Septuagint and the Itala.] ...22. Now among translations themselves the Italian (Itala) is to be preferred to the others, for it keeps closer to the words without prejudice to clearness of expression. And to correct the Latin we must use the Greek versions, among which the authority of the Septuagint is pre-eminent as far as the Old Testament is concerned: for it is reported through all the more learned churches that the seventy translators enjoyed so much of the presence and power of the Holy Spirit in their work of translation, that among that number of men there was but one voice. And if, as is reported, and as many not unworthy of confidence assert, they were separated during the work of translation, each man being in a cell by himself, and yet nothing was found in the manuscript of any one of them that was not found in the same words and in the same order of words in all the rest, who dare put anything in comparison with an authority like this, not to speak of preferring anything to it? And even if they conferred together with the result that a unanimous agreement sprang out of the common labor and judgment of them all, even so it would not be right or becoming for any one man, whatever his experience, to aspire to correct the unanimous opinion of many venerable and learned men. Wherefore, even if anything is found in the original Hebrew in a different form from that in which these men have expressed it, I think we must give way to the dispensation of Providence which used these men to bring it about, that books which the Jewish race were unwilling, either from religious scruple or from jealousy, to make known to other nations, were, with the assistance of the power of King Ptolemy, made known so long beforehand to the nations which in the future were to believe in the Lord. And thus it is possible that they translated in such a way as the Holy Spirit, who worked in them and had given them all one voice, thought most suitable for the Gentiles. But nevertheless, as I said above, a comparison of those translators also who have kept most closely to the words, is often not without value as a help to the clearing up of the meaning. The Latin texts, therefore, of the Old Testament are, as I was about to say, to be collected if necessary by the authority of the Greeks, and especially by that of those who, though they were seventy in number, are said to have translated as with one voice. As to the books of the New Testament, again, if any perplexity arises from the diversities of the Latin texts, we must of course yield to the Greek, especially those that are found in the churches of greater learning and research.”

⁴ b. 3, c. 21.

St. Augustine, *City of God*, 413: “For while there were other interpreters who translated these sacred oracles out of the Hebrew tongue into Greek, as Aquila, Symmathus, and Theodotion, and also that translation which, as the name of the author is unknown, is quoted as the fifth edition, yet the Church has received this Septuagint translation just as if it were the only one; and it has been used by the Greek Christian people, most of whom are not aware that there is any other. From this translation there has also been made a translation in the Latin tongue, which the Latin churches use.”⁵

Outlines of Dogmatic Theology, by the apostate Sylvester Hunter, 1894: “This Septuagint...represents the Scriptures as they were received by those Jews who had adopted the Greek language and the centre of whose learning was at Alexandria. This is indicated by the fact that the writers of the New Testament, Jews themselves, and in many cases writing primarily for Jews, but writing in Greek, habitually used the Septuagint version, which is the source of three hundred out of the three hundred and fifty citations from the Old Testament that are found in the New; and in many of the remaining fifty cases it is easy to see that the deviation from the Septuagint was rendered necessary by the particular purpose for which the citation was made. (See Michaelis, Introduction to the New Testament, vol. i, p. 215.) It is clear, therefore, that the Apostles regarded the Septuagint as being the standard Greek version of the Scriptures. From the Apostles the same version passed to the Christian Church. Other Greek versions of the Scriptures existed, but the Septuagint was the version in common use, and it naturally followed that all the Books which it contained were esteemed to be Holy Scripture. Here we have the first stage in the history of the question (n. 113); general acceptance undisturbed by doubts.”⁶

While a text of the original Hebrew Old Testament was most probably in circulation in the days of Jesus’ first coming, Jesus and his disciples did not use it as the primary text. Instead, they used the Septuagint as the primary text. Whereas, the Old Testament Vulgate is not the original and thus authentic Hebrew text of the Old Testament. The Old Testament Vulgate was created by the apostate Jerome, which was a translation of a corrupted Hebrew text (the Masoretic text), which is a corrupted version of the Old Testament created by apostate Jews to accommodate their denial of Christ, their other sins against the faith, and their immoralities:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, “Versions of the Bible”: “(6) The Vulgate: ...The Hebrew text used by St. Jerome was comparatively late, being practically that of the Massorettes. For this reason his version, for textual criticism, has less value than the Peschitto and the Septuagint.”

A General and Critical Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture, by the heretic A. E. Breen, D.D., 1897: “(5.) The Hebrew MS. used by Jerome for the most part agrees with the Masoretic text, though there are a few unimportant various readings.”⁷

Jerome foolishly believed that his Old Testament Vulgate was a translation of the original and thus an uncorrupted Hebrew text. He said that his intention was not to replace the Septuagint but to correct it by his Vulgate, since parts of the Septuagint had become corrupted in his day⁸:

Apostate Jerome, *Letter 113*, to St. Augustine, 404: “20. ...My attempt to translate into Latin, for the benefit of those who speak the same language with myself, the corrected Greek version of the Scriptures [the Septuagint], I have laboured not to

⁵ b. 8, c. 43.

⁶ *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology*, by the apostate Sylvester Hunter, S.J. Nihil Obstat: Joannes Clayton, S.J., Die Julii 10, 1894. Imprimatur: Herbert. Card. Vaughan, Archip. Westmonast, Die Julii 13, 1894. Publisher: Longmans, Green, and Co., London, 1909. V. 1, c. 4, s. 152, p. 210.

⁷ Nihil Obstat: P. L [rest not legible], S.T.B., Censor Deputatus. Imprimatur: Bernard, Bishop of Rochester, Oct. 2, 1897. Publisher: The John P. Smith Printing House, Rochester, NY, 1897. Chap. 17, p. 394.

⁸ See in this book [More Heretical or Otherwise Erroneous Biblical Commentaries](#), p. 54.

supersede what has been long esteemed, but only to bring prominently forward those things which have been either omitted or tampered with by the Jews, in order that Latin readers might know what is found in the original Hebrew [RJMI: not the original text but the Masoretic text]. If any one is averse to reading it, none compels him against his will. Let him drink with satisfaction the old wine, and despise my new wine...”

Because an original Jerome’s Vulgate is not in existence, the total amount and kind of errors in it are not known. The main problem is that Jerome believed that his new version, which was based on a corrupted Hebrew text which contained very many errors and omissions, was as good as the Septuagint, which contained a few errors and was the primary text used by Jesus and his followers, which in the days of Jesus was not yet corrupted.

The Septuagint Bible, by Charles Thomson, edited, revised, and enlarged by C. A. Muses, M.A., Ph.D., 1954: “[Introduction, pp. xxi-xxii] 4. By the end of the first century of the Christian Era—the first of several to be filled with fierce religious controversies—the official Hebrew biblical text had already become considerably altered from what it was in the third, or for that matter in the second or first centuries preceding the Christian Era,—thus furnishing grist for the controversial mill by enabling post-Christian Jewish proponents to answer any opponents who might quote from the Septuagint Bible text, by saying that it was ‘not the same’ as the Hebrew. Of course it was not, for the Hebrew text had changed during the first century of the Christian Era, as even a cursory examination of the older and later texts will prove... As Swete after a survey of the evidence concludes (*op. cit.* p. 320):

‘At some time between the age of the LXX and that of Aquila (ca. 125 A.D.), a thorough revision of the Hebrew Bible must have taken place, probably under official direction; and the evidence seems to point to the Rabbinical school which had its center in Jamnia in the years that followed the fall of Jerusalem as the source from which this revision proceeded. Among the Rabbis of Jamnia were Eleazar, Joshua, and Akiba, the reputed teachers of Aquila.’

“5. The changes that appeared in post-Christian times were literally followed thereafter, particularly after being formally crystallized by the 7th century Hebrew ‘traditionalists’ (who were, however, often following a post-Christian tradition) called the Masoretes, from *masorah*, ‘tradition.’...”

“6. ...[Hence] the present Hebrew text...dates no earlier than 100 years after the Christian Era had begun. Unfortunately, that late text was relied upon by both Origen and Jerome as the ‘original’ Hebrew in their work of redaction and translation, and the same dependence was used by Luther and the King James committee. Five out of the six columns in Origen’s comparative *Hexalpa* represent the 100 A.D. text, and he even tried to adapt the sixth or Septuagint column to it in a natural desire to approximate what he believed to be the Hebrew original... Jerome’s version [was] finally accepted in the Vulgate Bible...”⁹

For example, as recorded in 1 Peter 4:18, St. Peter quotes the Septuagint version of Proverbs 11:31 which is not the same as the Masoretic text used in the Clementine Vulgate:

1 Pt. 4:18: “And if the just man shall scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?” (Cross Reference: Proverbs 11:31)

Prv. 11:31, Septuagint: “If the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?”

Prv. 11:31, Masoretic and Clementine Vulgate: “If the just man receive in the earth, how much more the wicked and the sinner.”

⁹ Published by The Falcon’s Wing Press, Inc., Indian Hills, Colorado, USA, 1954.

Hence the true text of Prv. 11:31 refers to salvation while the false text only refers to death. This is just one example of many.

Jerome's revision, then, of the Old Testament was not based upon the Septuagint nor the original Hebrew text but upon a corrupted Hebrew text that came to be called the Masoretic text. And Jerome's new translation of the Old Testament was called the Vulgate. His translation of the New Testament, which he did first, is also called the Vulgate but is not nearly as corrupted as his Old Testament Vulgate¹⁰:

Handbook of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, by Sir Frederic George Kenyon, 1912: "It was on his [Jerome's] return [to Italy], about the year 382, that the request of Damasus laid upon him the great work of his life, the production of an authoritative Latin Bible. In its beginnings the undertaking was not so great as it subsequently became. The Pope's invitation to him was that he should revise the existing text by reference to the original Greek in the New Testament, and to the Septuagint in the Old Testament; and in the part of the work first taken in hand, the New Testament and the Psalter, this was all he did. It was only later that, becoming dissatisfied with the process of revision, he laid aside all that he had done with regard to the Old Testament, and undertook a new translation of it from the Hebrew [RJM: the Masoretic text of the apostate Jews]. With this we have nothing to do here; and in the New Testament he was emphatically a reviser, not a new translator... So far, then, as the New Testament is concerned, the Vulgate is merely a revision of the Old Latin [Latin translations of the original texts or copies of them]... One result of this conservative treatment was that the new version met with general acceptance—far more so than was the case with Jerome's wholly new translation of the Old Testament."¹¹

The Vulgate, by B. F. Westcott, 1881: "The critical labors of Jerome were received... with a loud outcry of reproach. He was accused of disturbing the repose of the Church, and shaking the foundations of faith... Even Augustine... endeavored to discourage Jerome from the task of a new translation (*Ep. civ.*), which seemed to him to be dangerous and almost profane. Jerome, indeed, did little to smooth the way for the reception of his work. The violence and bitterness of his language is more like that of the rival scholars of the 16th century than of a Christian Father..."¹²

The apostate Jerome even had an apostate Jew help him in his translation of their Hebrew text into Latin:

Apostate Jerome, *Letter 84*, to Pammachius and Oceanus, 400: "3. ...What trouble and expense it cost me to get Baraninas to teach me under cover of night. For by his fear of the Jews he presented to me in his own person a second edition of Nicodemus..."

Apostate Rufinus, *Apology against Jerome*, 401: "[Bk. 2] 33. ...The seventy translators, each in their separate cells, produced a version [the Septuagint] couched in consonant and identical words, under the inspiration, as we cannot doubt, of the Holy Spirit; and this version must certainly be of more authority with us than a translation made by a single man under the inspiration of Barabbas [the apostate Jew who taught and guided Jerome]. But, putting this aside, I beg you to listen, for example, to this as an instance of what we mean. Peter was for twenty-four years

¹⁰ In revising the New Testament, the original text is to be used if available. If not, then copies of the originals are to be referred to and then translations of the originals or copies, such as the following Syriac manuscripts: the Curetonian Syriac, the Sinaitic Syriac, and the Peshitto. The Old Latin and Greek versions should also be referred to. And then the Church Fathers are to be referred to.

¹¹ Second Edition, 1912, by Sir Frederic George Kenyon, KCB, FBA, director and principal librarian of the British Museum, 1912. Publisher: MacMillan and Co., Limited, London. Chap. 5, sec. 8b, pp. 217-218.

¹² From Dr. William Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, by Dr. William Smith, revised and edited by Prof. H. B. Hackett, Volume IV (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, and Co., 1881). IV. The History of Jerome's Translation to the Invention of the Printing Press, sec. 21, pp. 345-82.

Bishop of the Church of Rome. We cannot doubt that, amongst other things necessary for the instruction of the Church, he himself delivered to them the treasury of the sacred books, which, no doubt, had even then begun to be read under his presidency and teaching. What are we to say then? Did Peter the Apostle of Christ deceive the Church and deliver to them books which were false and contained nothing of truth? Are we to believe that he knew that the Jews possessed what was true, and yet determined that the Christians should have what was false? But perhaps the answer will be made that Peter was illiterate, and that, though he knew that the books of the Jews were truer than those which existed in the Church, yet he could not translate them into Latin because of his linguistic incapacity. What then! Was the tongue of fire given by the Holy Spirit from heaven of no avail to him? Did not the Apostles speak in all languages?

“34. But let us grant that the Apostle Peter was unable to do what our friend has lately done. Was Paul illiterate? we ask; he who was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, touching the law a Pharisee brought up at the feet of Gamaliel? Could not he, when he was at Rome, have supplied any deficiencies of Peter? Is it conceivable that they who prescribed to their disciples that they should give attention to reading did not give them correct and true reading? These men who bid us not attend to Jewish fables and genealogies, which minister questioning rather than edification; and who, again, bid us beware of, and especially watch, those of the circumcision; is it conceivable that they could not foresee through the Spirit that a time would come, after nearly four hundred years, when the Church would find out that the Apostles had not delivered to them the truth of the Old Testament, and would send an embassy to those whom the Apostles spoke of as the circumcision, begging and beseeching them to dole out to them some small portion of the truth which was in their possession: and that the Church would through this embassy confess that she had been for all those four hundred years in error; that she had indeed been called...to be the bride of Christ, but that they had not decked her with a necklace of genuine jewels; that she had fondly thought that they were precious stones but now had found out that those were not true gems which the Apostles had put upon her, so that she felt ashamed to go forth in public decked in false instead of true jewels; and that she therefore begged that they would send her Barabbas, even him whom she had once rejected to be married to Christ, so that in conjunction with one man chosen from among her own people, he might restore to her the true ornaments with which the Apostles had failed to furnish her.”

By the 4th century, the Septuagint was corrupted and thus needed some correcting. But the Septuagint should have remained the main text to work from (the template) while primarily referring to translations of the Septuagint into other languages for revisions, such as Latin translations of the Septuagint (known as the Old Latin, Italic, *Vetus Itala*, or *Versio Antiqua*) and Syriac translations of the Septuagint. The Church Fathers, who quoted from the Septuagint, are also an important source. And even the Masoretic text and thus Jerome's Vulgate based upon that text could be referred to for revisions to the Septuagint in places where the apostate Jews were not likely to corrupt the text in order to defend their apostasy, heresies, and immoralities. St. Augustine warned Jerome not to use the corrupted Hebrew text as the main template for the Old Testament but instead to use the Septuagint:

St. Augustine, *Letter 56*, to Jerome, 403: “4. For my part, I would much rather that you would furnish us with a translation of the Greek version of the canonical Scriptures known as the work of the Seventy translators. For if your translation begins to be more generally read in many churches, it will be a grievous thing that, in the reading of Scripture, differences must arise between the Latin Churches and the Greek Churches, especially seeing that the discrepancy is easily condemned in a Latin version by the production of the original in Greek, which is a language very widely known; whereas, if any one has been disturbed by the occurrence of something to which he was not accustomed in the translation taken from the

Hebrew, and alleges that the new translation is wrong, it will be found difficult, if not impossible, to get at the Hebrew documents by which the version to which exception is taken may be defended. And when they are obtained, who will submit to have so many Latin and Greek authorities pronounced to be in the wrong?

Besides all this, Jews, if consulted as to the meaning of the Hebrew text, may give a different opinion from yours: in which case it will seem as if your presence were indispensable, as being the only one who could refute their view; and it would be a miracle if one could be found capable of acting as arbiter between you and them... I wish you would have the kindness to open up to me what you think to be the reason of the frequent discrepancies between the text supported by the Hebrew codices and the Greek Septuagint version. For the latter has no mean authority, seeing that it has obtained so wide circulation, and was the one which the apostles used, as is not only proved by looking to the text itself, but has also been, as I remember, affirmed by yourself. You would therefore confer upon us a much greater boon if you gave an exact Latin translation of the Greek Septuagint version.”

If the apostate Jerome had produced the Old Testament Vulgate for apologetic purposes or to correct the Septuagint and thus not to put it on the same plane as or above the Septuagint, then that would have been a good deed. But he did so to put it on the same plane as the Septuagint. And he denigrated the miracles that attended the production of the Septuagint:

Apostate Jerome, Apology against Rufinus, Book 2: “25. I do not know whose false imagination led him to invent the story of the seventy cells at Alexandria, in which, though separated from each other, the translators were said to have written the same words.”

I strongly suspect that Jerome wanted his Vulgate to replace the Septuagint but was not bold enough to say so in his day. It was not until a long time after Jerome’s death that his Vulgate was used as the primary text. It was first used only as a corrective text to the Septuagint. It was then made equal to the Septuagint. And it eventually replaced the Septuagint as the primary text. But along this path, Jerome’s Vulgate progressively became corrupted with many versions of the Vulgate, each contradicting one another in several places. And no original Vulgate of Jerome’s survived.

While it was commendable that the invalid and heretical Council of Trent attempted to clear up the confusion by producing one Bible as the papally approved and thus only official and primary text, the main text it used as a template for the Old Testament (the Vulgate) was not commendable because it is based upon the corrupted Masoretic text. And, even worse, Trent lied by saying that an authentic Old Latin Vulgate text existed that was used by all or at least by most for many centuries previous to and up until Trent:

Invalid and heretical *Council of Trent*, Session 4, 1546: “Moreover, the same sacred and holy Synod taking into consideration that no small benefit can accrue to the Church of God, if it be made known which one of all the Latin editions of the sacred books which are in circulation is to be considered authentic, has decided and declares that the said old Vulgate edition, which has been approved by the Church itself through long usage for so many centuries in public lectures, disputations, sermons, and expositions, be considered authentic, and that no one under any pretext whatsoever dare or presume to reject it.” (D. 785)

Hence Trent’s decree is the first official so-called papal approval of the Vulgate which from that point forward set out to replace and thus abolish the Septuagint as the primary text for the Old Testament. Now for the errors and lies in Trent’s decree:

Firstly, it admits that the Bible it authorizes has no link with Tradition because it was only in use for several centuries before Trent.

Secondly, it lies because no *one* version of the old Vulgate or any other vulgate existed for many centuries previous to Trent. Instead, there were many differing Latin versions of the Vulgate:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, “Manuscripts of the Bible”: “It is estimated that there are more than 8000 manuscripts of the Vulgate extant. Most of these are later than the twelfth century.”

Take the following example from the 13th century:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, “Roger Bacon” (d. 1294): “The text of Holy Writ is horribly corrupted, especially in the ‘exemplar Parisiense,’ that is to say the Biblical text used at the University of Paris and spread by its students over the whole world. Confusion has been increased by many scholars or religious orders, who in their endeavours to correct the Sacred Text, in default of a sound method, have in reality only augmented the divergences; as every one presumes to change anything ‘he does not understand, a thing he would not dare to do with the books of the classical poets,’ the world is full of ‘correctors or rather corruptors’... Nowadays it is impossible to speak or write about the methods and course of lectures in ecclesiastical schools of the Middle Ages...on the efforts of revision and correction of the Latin Bible made before the Council of Trent, or on the study of Oriental languages urged by some scholars before the Council of Vienne, without referring to the efforts made by Bacon.”

Hence Trent lies when it says that there was an “authentic” and thus one pure version of the old Vulgate used by Catholics for many centuries. Trent’s use of the word “authentic” indicates that the original and thus pure version of the text existed and thus contained no errors:

Haydock Bible, New Testament, General Preface: “III. By an authentic writing deed, or testament, is often understood the very original itself, written, made, or signed by the author of it.”

Trent lies when it says “no one under pretext whatsoever dare or presume to reject it.” The “it” refers to the supposed *one* authentic version of the old Vulgate, which in fact did not exist. This was brought to the attention of the apostate fathers at Trent, and thus they tried to find or produce one before the council ended. The old Vulgate they produced before the council ended contained so many errors that the theologians advised the council to modify its decree. But it did not. It still pretended that there was one authentic and error-free old Vulgate in use for many centuries even though they could not produce it:

A General and Critical Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture, by the heretic A. E. Breen, D.D., 1897: “When, during the existence of the Council, the decree was sent to Rome for the Pope’s approbation, the Roman theologians protested against it, affirming that there were many errors in it [their ‘authentic’ old Vulgate] that could not be attributed to the copyists, but which were certainly due to the translator himself. In fact, such a storm was raised, that there was thought of delaying the printing of the decree till changes might be made. When this was made known to the Papal legates in the Council, they made answer that nothing was alleged by the Roman theologians that the Council had not maturely weighed.”¹³

The Vulgate, by B. F. Westcott, 1881: “[The Sixtine and Clementine Vulgates, 26] The final decree...was made on April 8th, 1546, and consisted of two parts, the first...contains the list of the canonical books...the second ‘On the Edition and Use of the Sacred Books’... The wording of the decree itself contains several marks of the controversy from which it arose... In spite...of the comparative caution of the decree, and the interpretation which was affixed to it by the highest authorities, it

¹³ c. 28, Jerome and the Vulgate, p. 547.

was received with little favor, and the want of a standard text of the Vulgate practically left the question as unsettled as before. The decree itself was made by men little fitted to anticipate the difficulties of textual criticism, but afterwards these were found to be so great that for some time it seemed that no authorized edition would appear.”¹⁴

Instead of correcting its decree by saying that an effort should be made to produce the best version of the old Vulgate among the many versions, Trent maintained the lie that an “authentic” and thus pure version of the old Vulgate already existed!

It was not until forty-three years after Trent’s decree that an old Vulgate was put together, declared as authentic and error-free, and promulgated by apostate Antipope Sixtus V in 1589. But this version contained so many errors that it had to be withdrawn after it was printed and circulated in 1590:

A General and Critical Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture, by the heretic A. E. Breen, D.D., 1897: “Sixtus, to his energy of character, added a certain stubborn, excessive trust, in his own judgment. His action here is inexcusable, and rendered void the conscientious labors of the best talent of Italy. After thus inducing these changes, Sixtus committed the printing of the work to Aldo Manuzio, who had succeeded his father as printer at the Vatican press. The Augustinian Angelo Bocca and Francis Toleti, S. J., were appointed to see the work through the press. The Pope himself read every page as it came from the press. The work appeared in a magnificent volume in 1590. The text is preceded by the famous Bull, ‘Aeternus ille,’ of Sixtus V. The text of the Bull is given in full in Comely, op. cit., p. 465, et seqq. . . After his death, by universal consent, it was judged necessary to correct the edition. . .”¹⁵

The Vulgate, by B. F. Westcott, 1881: “[The Sixtine and Clementine Vulgates, 26] Nothing further was done towards the revision of the Vulgate under Gregory XIII. . . In the second year of the pontificate of Sixtus V, who had been one of the chief promoters of the work, . . . Sixtus immediately devoted himself to the production of an edition of the Vulgate. He was himself a scholar, and his imperious genius led him to face a task from which others had shrunk. ‘He had felt,’ he says, ‘from his first accession to the papal throne (1585), great grief, or even indignation (*indigne ferentes*), that the Tridentine decree was still unsatisfied;’ and a board was appointed, under the presidency of Card. Carafa, to arrange the materials and offer suggestions for an edition. Sixtus himself revised the text, rejecting or confirming the suggestions of the board by his absolute judgment; and when the work was printed he examined the sheets with the utmost care, and corrected the errors with his own hand. The edition appeared in 1590, with the famous constitution *Aeternus ille* (dated March 1st, 1589) prefixed, in which Sixtus affirmed with characteristic decision the plenary authority of the edition for all future time.

‘By the fullness of Apostolical power’ (such are his words) ‘we decree and declare that this edition . . . approved by the authority delivered to us by the Lord, is to be received and held as true, lawful, authentic, and unquestioned, in all public and private discussion, reading, preaching, and explanation.’¹⁶

¹⁴ From Dr. William Smith’s *Dictionary of the Bible*, by Dr. William Smith, revised and edited by Prof. H. B. Hackett, Volume IV (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, and Co., 1881). IV. The History of Jerome’s Translation to the Invention of the Printing Press, sec. 21, pp. 345-82.

¹⁵ c. 28, Jerome and the Vulgate, pp. 554, 556.

¹⁶ Footnote 40: “ . . . ex certa nostra scientia, deque Apostolicae potestatis plenitudine statuimus ac declaramus, eam Vulgatam sacrae, tam veteris, quam novi Testamenti paginae Latinam editionem, quae pro authentica a Concilio Tridentino recepta est, sine ulla dubitatione, aut controversia censendam esse hanc ipsam, quam nunc, prout optime fieri poterit, emendatam et in Vaticana Typographia impressam in universa Christiana Republica, atque in omnibus Christiani orbis Ecclesiis legendam evulgamus, decernentes eam . . . pro vera, legitima, authentica et indubitata, in omnibus publicis privatisque disputationibus, lectionibus, praedicationibus, et explanationibus recipiendum et tenendam esse.’ (Hody, p. 496; Van Ess, p. 273).”

“He further forbade expressly the publication of various readings in copies of the Vulgate, and pronounced that all readings in other editions and MSS. which vary from those of the revised text ‘are to have no credit or authority for the future’ (*ea in iis quae huic nostrae editioni non consenserint, nullam in posterum fidem, nullamque auctoritatem habitura esse decernimus*). It was also enacted that the new revision should be introduced into all missals and service-books; and the greater excommunication was threatened against all who in any way contravened the constitution. Had the life of Sixtus been prolonged, there is no doubt but that his iron will would have enforced the changes which he thus peremptorily proclaimed; but he died in Aug. 1590, and those whom he had alarmed or offended took immediate measures to hinder the execution of his designs. Nor was this without good reason. He had changed the readings of those whom he had employed to report upon the text with the most arbitrary and unskillful hand; and it was scarcely an exaggeration to say that his precipitate ‘self-reliance had brought the Church into the most serious peril.’ During the brief pontificate of Urban VII, nothing could be done; but the reaction was not long delayed.

“On the accession of Gregory XIV, some went so far as to propose that the edition of Sixtus should be absolutely prohibited; but Bellarmine suggested a middle course. He proposed that the erroneous alterations of the text which had been made in it (*‘quae male mutata erant’*) ‘should be corrected with all possible speed and the Bible reprinted under the name of Sixtus, with a prefatory note to the effect that errors (*aliqua errata*) had crept into the former edition by the carelessness of the printers.’¹⁷ This pious fraud, or rather daring falsehood,¹⁸ for it can be called by no other name, found favor with those in power... Bellarmine did not scruple to repeat the fiction of the intention of Sixtus to recall his edition, which still disgraces the front of the Roman Vulgate by an apology no less needless than untrue...”

Notice that the apostate Bellarmine lied and covered up the errors of Sixtus and his defective Bible by blaming it on the printers. This is another vile trait of heretics and apostates—they lie worse than self-professed gangsters, such as we see today when nominal Catholic prelates lie about and cover up the sex crimes and other crimes committed by their apostate comrades. And the scandal created by lies like these from men who remain in good standing and some who were even made saints (like the apostate Bellarmine) prevents good-willed people from embracing the Catholic faith and entering the Catholic Church.

After Sixtus’ version of the old Vulgate, the next version was put together, declared as authentic and error-free, and promulgated by apostate Antipope Clement VIII in 1592, which became known in 1641 as the Clementine Vulgate. And this version also contained many errors. It is said that there were three versions of the Clementine Vulgate: one in 1592, another in 1593, and another in 1598, each correcting the previous version:

The Vulgate, by B. F. Westcott, 1881: “[The Sixtine and Clementine Vulgates, 26] At the beginning of 1592, Clement VIII was raised to the popedom. Clement entrusted the final revision of the text to Toletus, and the whole was printed by Aldus Manutius (the grandson) before the end of 1592. The Preface, which is moulded upon that of Sixtus, was written by Bellarmine, and is favorably

¹⁷ Footnote 42: “The following is the original passage quoted by Van Ess from the first edition of Bellarmine’s Autobiography (p. 291), anno 1591: ‘Cum Gregorius XIV. cogitaret quid agendum esset de bibliis a Sixto V. editis, in quibus erant permulta perperam mutata, non deerant viri graves, qui censerent ea biblia esse publice prohibenda, sed N. (Bellarminus) coram pontifice demonstravit, biblia illa non esse prohibenda, sed esse ita corrigenda, ut salvo honore Sixti V. pontificis biblia illa emendata proderentur, quod fieret si quam celerrime tollerentur quae male mutata erant, et biblia recuderentur sub nomine ejusdem Sixti, et addita praefatione qua significaretur in prima editione Sixti prae festinatione irrepisse aliqua errata, vel typographorum vel aliorum incuria, et sic N. reddidit Sixto pontifici bona pro malis.’ The last words refer to Sixtus’ condemnation of a thesis of Bellarmine, in which he denied ‘Papam esse dominum directum totius orbis;’ and it was this whole passage, and not the Preface to the Clementine Vulgate, which cost Bellarmine his canonization (Van Ess, from the original documents, pp. 291-318). It will be observed that Bellarmine first describes the errors of the Sixtine edition really as deliberate alterations, and then proposes to represent them as errors.”

¹⁸ Footnote 43: “The evidence collected by Van Ess (pp. 285 ff.), and even the cautious admissions of Ungarelli and Vercellone (pp. xxxix.-xliv.), will prove that this language is not too strong.”

distinguished from that of Sixtus by its temperance and even modesty. The text, it is said, had been prepared with the greatest care... Another edition followed in 1593, and a third in 1598, with a triple list of errata, one for each of the three editions. Other editions were afterwards published at Rome (comp. Vercellone, civ.), but with these corrections the history of the authorized text properly concludes.”

And the last version of the Clementine Vulgate also contained many errors. Hence more lies and cover-ups ensued in order to defend or excuse the errors. At first, Clementine’s Vulgate kept the name “The Sixtine Vulgate” so that people would not know that the Sixtine Vulgate was ever rejected and withdrawn. However, in 1641 it was correctly renamed “The Clementine Vulgate”:

A General and Critical Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture, by the heretic A. E. Breen, D.D., 1897: “The edition [Clementine Vulgate] differed not in external form from the Sixtine edition. It was printed by Aldo Manuzio, who had printed the edition of Sixtus. Moreover, it bore at first the name of Sixtus in its title: ‘Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis Sixti V. Pont. Max. jussu recognita atque edita.’ It was not till 1641 that the name of Clement VIII was placed in the title page, and the honor of the work was given to whom it by right belonged. Since that time it is called the Clementine edition. It differs from the Sixtine edition in over three thousand texts.”¹⁹

Hence, as you can see, Trent lied when it said that an authentic old Vulgate existed that was used by Catholics in the days of that invalid and heretical council. And the apostate theologians lied by pretending that Clementine’s Vulgate was Sixtus’ Vulgate and thus tried to cover up the errors in the Sixtine Vulgate. And there are also many errors in the final version of the Clementine Vulgate, which is used down until today.

Yet even if an authentic version of the old Vulgate were found (Jerome’s original Vulgate), that would not solve the problem because the main problem is the Vulgate itself. Trent, then, promoted a corrupted version of the Old Testament while rejecting the Septuagint as the main template. Trent should have ordered a search for a pure version of the Septuagint and put all its efforts toward that direction. And if a pure version of the Septuagint were not found, then the purest version of the Septuagint should have been used as the template and revised. Trent, then, promoted a corrupted version of the Old Testament while rejecting the Septuagint and its Latin translations as the main text for the Old Testament.

After many years of trying to arrive at the purest version of Jerome’s Old Testament Vulgate and only finding that more corrections needed to be made, many theologians and others correctly said that the only way to obtain the purest Old Testament would be by using the oldest copies of the original text as the template, which for the Old Testament is the Septuagint, and only using the Vulgate and other Bibles as a reference to correct any errors in the best copy of the Septuagint:

A General and Critical Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture, by the heretic A. E. Breen, D.D., 1897: “Clement VIII appointed Toleti to supervise the printing of the Vulgate, and Angelo Rocca to correct the proofs. The edition was pushed rapidly forward, and completed before the end of 1592. And thus, at last, the design formulated in 1546 by the Fathers of the Council of Trent, and approved by the Pope, was put in effect, and the Church received an authentic version of Scripture... The edition...does not lay claim to absolute perfection... We still think that the Church with her immense resources, human and divine, could prepare a better edition, and we look forward to future times to add this glory to the works of the Catholic Church... If it be not presumption, I express here a regret, that the authorities of the Church did not at that time, by the labors of those great [RJMI: apostate] linguists and theologians, make a translation of the entire Scriptures, as far as possible, from the original texts [the Septuagint for the Old Testament],

¹⁹ c. 28, Jerome and the Vulgate, p. 559.

employing in the work the Vulgate only for reference, and inasmuch as it helped to the full meaning of the original text.”²⁰

What makes the Clementine Vulgate even more evil and damaging to the Catholic faith and Catholics is that it was originally declared by apostate Antipope Clement VIII to be free from all errors:

Apostate Antipope Clement VIII, *Bull of Promulgation of Vulgate*, 1592: “When come to light from our Vatican typography the text of the edition of the Vulgate Holy Scriptures, restituted, after a great work and vigils, and clean of errors with much attentiveness, with the blessing of the Lord; Us, in order to keep incorrupt the same text from now on... The structure of this exemplary, be inviolably observed, so that not even a minimum particle of the text can be changed, added or taken away from it...”

This decree created another great scandal because the many errors in the Clementine Vulgate could not be corrected by order of this so-called pope. The more they tried to pretend that there were no errors in the Clementine Vulgate, or tried to secretly correct the errors while pretending that they never existed, the more scandal they caused and the more the public saw these apostates as the obstinate liars and deceivers they were. And if any one dared to criticize the Clementine Vulgate, he was punished and even excommunicated! Hence Clement’s Bible and decree regarding it were considered infallible by many, which created another scandal regarding papal infallibility. The following author gives a good description of this conflict. But beware of the fact that he lies by pretending that Trent said things that it did not say, such as it only meant to approve a Bible that was free from all errors on faith and morals and thus not free from other errors:

A General and Critical Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture, by the heretic A. E. Breen, D.D., 1897: “The decree of the Council of Trent set in motion a turbulent movement especially in Spain. The power was in the hands of those who defended the absolute infallibility and absolute sanction of the Vulgate. These by violence and the power of the law prevented any expression of honest thought which came short of adoration of the Vulgate. Men were cast into prison for attempting to explain the legitimate sense of the great Council’s decree. Others, through fear of the Inquisition, either adopted the views of the party in power or kept a prudent silence. ‘I know,’ says Bannez, ‘what I would respond by word of mouth, if asked by the Church; meanwhile, I maintain a prudent and religious silence.’ (In I. Thom.) “The position of these extremists was that the Council had defined the absolute infallibility of the Vulgate, even in the least details; that no error of whatever nature was to be found in the Latin Vulgate; that since the Greek Schism, the Latin Church had remained the sole depository of the truth, and hence her Scriptures alone were authentic, and absolutely authentic. Of this movement Richard Simon truly wrote:

‘There were but very few persons who accurately comprehended the sense of the decree of Trent which pronounced the Vulgate authentic... The greater number of those who agitated this question scarcely understood anything of it, and they were moved more by prejudice and passion than by sense and judgment. “*Periit iudicium postquam res transit in affectum.*” ’ (Hist. Crit. du V. T. II. 14.)...

“The deliberations of the Fathers, as related to us by Pallavicini (*Storia del Cone, di Trento*), show plainly that the Fathers wished to save the credit of the original texts and the old versions:

²⁰ Nihil Obstat: P. L. [rest not legible], S.T.B., Censor Deputatus. Imprimatur: Bernard, Bishop of Rochester, Oct. 2, 1897. Publisher: The John P. Smith Printing House, Rochester, NY, 1897. Chap. 30, The Correction of the Vulgate, pp. 558-559.

‘It was the common opinion that the Vulgate edition should be preferred to all other (Latin) editions; but Pacheco petitioned that these others should be also condemned, especially those made by heretics; and he extended this afterwards to the Septuagint. Bertram opposed this, maintaining that there was always a diversity of versions in use with the faithful, which usage the Fathers had approved. And who would dare, he said, condemn the translation of the Septuagint which the Church uses in her psalms? ...Let one version be approved, and the others be neither approved nor condemned.’

“After the expression of these views, Card. Del Monte, one of the presidents of the Council, closed the disputation in these words:

‘The matter has been discussed and prepared. We come now to the form. The majority holds that the Vulgate should be received, but care must be taken lest the others should be thought to be tacitly rejected.’

“The ‘others’ are evidently the original texts and the old versions. Could anything be clearer? The Fathers took thought lest their action might seem to be the tacit repudiation of the other texts. [RJMI: Yet Trent did not say anything at all about the other texts.]

“This sense is confirmed by the express declarations of some of the principal theologians of the Council. Salmeron, S.J., who was one of the Pope’s theologians in the Council, declares:

‘We shall show that the approbation of Jerome’s translation imported, in no way, the rejection of the Greek or Hebrew texts. There was no question of Greek or Hebrew texts. Action was only taken to determine which was the most excellent of the many Latin versions.

[RJMI: Jerome’s Vulgate was not the most excellent Latin version. The Old Latin translations of the Septuagint were the most excellent versions.]

‘The Council left every man free to consult the Greek and Hebrew texts, that he might thereby emend its errors or elucidate its sense; hence, without infringement on the authority of the Council, where the texts differ we may make use of the text from the Greek or Hebrew copy and expound it as a text of Scripture. We may use such text, not alone for moral instruction, but also use it as a Scriptural basis for the dogmas of the Church.’

“The same testimony is rendered by the Franciscan Andrea Vega, whose wisdom was held in great repute by the Fathers of Trent. In his work *De Justificatione* XV 9, he thus addresses Calvin:

‘Lest thou shouldst err, O Calvin, regarding the approbation of the Vulgate, give ear to a few things, which I would wish Melancthon also might hear, who also, before you, arraigned the Fathers for this. The Synod did not approve the errors which linguists and those moderately versed in Holy Scripture find in the Vulgate. Neither did they ask that it be adored as though it had descended from heaven. The Fathers knew that the interpreter was not a prophet, ...and, therefore, the Synod did not restrain, nor wish to restrain, the labors of linguists, who teach us that certain things might be better translated, and that the Holy Spirit could signify many things by one and the same word, and, at times, a sense more apt than can be obtained from the Vulgate. But considering the Vulgate’s age, and the esteem in which it was held for centuries by Latin Councils which used it, and in order that the faithful might know—which is most true—that no pernicious error can be drawn therefrom, and that the faithful can read it safely without danger to faith, and to remove the confusion caused by a multitude of translations, and to modify the tendency to continually produce new versions, the Council wisely enacted that we should use the Vulgate in all public readings, disputations, and expositions of Scripture. And it

declared it authentic in this sense, that it might be known to all that it was never vitiated by any error from which any false doctrinal or moral teaching might result; and for this reason it decreed that no one should reject it on whatsoever pretext. And that this was the mind of the Council, and that it wished to decree nothing further than this, you may draw from the words of the Council.

[RJMI: No such words exist in Trent. It just said that the old Vulgate is authentic. The Protestants were right in this regard for pointing out the hypocrisy and lies of the apostate Catholics in regard to Trent's decree and attempts to explain it and carry it out.]

‘And lest you should doubt of this, I am able to invoke a veracious witness, his Eminence the Cardinal of Holy Cross (Card. Cervini, afterwards Pope Marcellus II), who presided over all the sessions. Both before and after the decree, more than once, he testified to me that the Fathers wished nothing more for the Vulgate. Therefore, neither you nor anyone else is hindered by the approbation of the Vulgate from recurring, in doubt, to the original texts, and one may bring forth out of them whatever he may find, in order that the sense of the Latin may be cleared and enriched, and that he may purge the Vulgate from errors, and arrive at those things most consonant with the sense of the Holy Spirit and the original texts.’ (Mariana, 1. c.)

[RJMI: So why, then, did not Trent's decree contain this very, very, very important addendum?]

‘...The excellence which the Fathers of Trent attested of the Vulgate is well expressed by Sixtus of Sienna:

‘Although errors are found in the Vulgate, it is certain that neither in the old edition nor in the new was anything ever found which is dissonant from Catholic faith, or false or contrary to doctrine or morality, or interpolated, or changed to disagree with truth or omitted to the prejudice of truth, or so corrupted that it would furnish occasion of pernicious error, or occasion and incite to heresy, or thus obscurely and ambiguously translated that it would obscure the mysteries of our faith, or in which the saving truth is not sufficiently explained.’ (Sixt. Sen. Biblioth. Sancta.)

‘The opponents of the Catholic faith sometimes allege as the Catholic position the opinion of Basil Poncius (+1626), the Chancellor of the University of Salamanca. He declares:

‘In my judgment it must be affirmed according to the Council's decree, that not only are all things in the Vulgate true, but that they are also in strict conformity with the original text, and their sense faithfully rendered by the interpreter, so that he has neither by ignorance nor negligence erred in the least thing, but that all things, even the most minute, are, as regards the sense, faithfully translated. And this is the common opinion of our time.’ (Migne, Cursus S. S. I., p. 878)...

‘At all events, the common opinion of Spain could not have been what he says, for we have adduced the testimonies of her best theologians, which are directly opposed to his position. The only argument which he adduces in support of his opinion is that the Council declared the Vulgate authentic. Now, in the first place, we deny that the Council promulgated a dogmatic definition that the Vulgate was authentic... The truth of our position is corroborated by the history of the decree. When, during the existence of the Council, the decree was sent to Rome for the Pope's approbation, the Roman theologians protested against it, affirming that there were many errors in it [the Vulgate] that could not be attributed to the copyists, but which were certainly due to the translator himself. In fact, such a storm was raised that there was thought of delaying the printing of the decree till changes might be made. When this was made known to the Papal legates in the Council, they made

answer that nothing was alleged by the Roman theologians that the Council had not maturely weighed. The Tridentine Fathers had adverted to the errors of the Vulgate, but they were warranted in declaring it not substantially erroneous. (Pallavic. Hist. Cone. Trid. VI)

“The dullest mind must see that there was no question of absolute conformity with the original text, or of immunity from errors which affected not doctrine and morals.

[RJMI: This author’s mind is dull because Trent said no such thing. The whole argument revolves around what Trent meant by the word “authentic.”]

“...Even during the authorized revision of the Vulgate, Salmeron, who was one of the theologians of the Council, declared:

‘In the meantime, while the Vulgate is being revised, nothing prevents one from correcting the evident errors, either by means of the Hebrew and Greek text, or from the various readings of the Fathers, or by a clearer understanding of the text itself, provided such a one in such a grave matter is prepared to submit himself to the Church if she should decide otherwise.’ (Salmeron, Proleg. III, p. 24)

“This is the golden rule for all theologians. Relying on this, a theologian can freely conduct any research, sustained by the thought that if he speaks true things, the Church will commend him, and she will safeguard him from error...

“The scope of the revisers was simply to restore the text of Jerome to its pristine state.

[RJMI: Firstly, that is not possible. Secondly, even if it were, the problem still exists because the main problem is Jerome’s Old Testament Vulgate.]

“They did not contemplate the removal of the errors which Jerome committed.

[RJMI: And this is another problem that these so-called wise guys should have considered.]

“...If it be not presumption, I express here a regret, that the authorities of the Church did not at that time, by the labors of those great linguists and theologians, make a translation of the entire Scriptures, as far as possible, from the original texts, employing in the work the Vulgate only for reference, and inasmuch as it helped to the full meaning of the original text. They may have thought that such a move would be interpreted to signify that the text of the Latin Scriptures had been unreliable, but a comparison of the two texts would have convinced all that the substantial truths of God’s covenants were safely contained in the Vulgate, and this would have repelled the false accusation...”²¹

After the author does his best to defend what he thinks Trent’s decree means and defends its resultant Vulgate as the most authentic Bible, he then admits the truth that Jerome’s Vulgate, after all, is not the most authentic, is not the best translation. Hence he correctly says that it would have been better to have a translation from the original texts, which for the Old Testament are the Septuagint and its Latin translations, and only use the Vulgate for reference. And that, of course, is true and gets to the very root of the problem, which is Jerome’s Vulgate itself being presented as the primary and most reliable and credible Bible. The author also does not acknowledge that the Clementine Vulgate contains heresies and thus is not free from errors in faith or morals.

By the force of numerous, valid criticisms of the Clementine Vulgate, apostate antipopes eventually allowed corrections to be made to it. For example, in the 20th century the apostate antipopes Pius X and Pius XII acknowledged that there were many textual errors in the Clementine Vulgate and thus they authorized revisions to it:

²¹ c. 28, Jerome and the Vulgate, pp. 539-558.

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, “Versions of the Bible”: “After his death a further revision was carried out under the direction of Franciscus Toletus, S.J., and finally the work was printed in 1598, with its title unchanged: ‘Biblia Sacra Vulgatæ editionis, Sixti V Pontificis Maximi jussu recognita et edita’. This was under the pontificate of Clement VIII, and his name has appeared in the title since 1641. This revision is now the officially recognized version of the Latin Rite and contains the only authorized text of the Vulgate. That it has numerous defects has never been denied [RJMI: This is a lie. Clement VIII never acknowledged such. In fact, he said it was “clean of all errors.”], yet it ranks high in the evidence it affords of the competent scholarship that produced it. To bring it into closer touch with the latter developments of textual criticism is the purpose that induced Pius X to entrust to the Benedictines the work of further revision. The importance of this enterprise consists in this, that it will reproduce, as correctly as possible, the original translation of St. Jerome, and will thereby furnish biblicists with a reliable clue to an ancient Hebrew text, differing in many details from the Septuagint, or the Masoretic Text.”

The Jerome Biblical Commentary, 1968: “(D) *Divino afflante Spiritus*: This encyclical was issued by Pius XII on September 30, 1943... In its doctrinal part the encyclical teaches the great importance of textual criticism at the present time. As for the true meaning of the Tridentine decree regarding the Vulgate, the authenticity of the Vulgate is not specified primarily as critical, but rather as juridical; this means that no claim is made that the Vulgate is always an accurate translation, but that it is free from any error in faith and morals.”

Apostate Antipope Pius XII, *Divino afflante Spiritu*, 1943: “But that the Synod of Trent wished the Vulgate to be the Latin version ‘which all should use as authentic,’ applies, as all know, to the Latin Church only, and to the public use of Scripture, and does not diminish the authority and force of the early texts. For at that time no consideration was being given to early texts, but to the Latin versions which were being circulated at that time... It is demonstrated that this text, as the Church has understood and understands, in matters of faith and morals is entirely free of error, so that, on the testimony and confirmation of the Church herself, in discussions, quotations, and meetings it can be cited safely and without danger of error; and accordingly such authenticity is expressed primarily not by the term critical but rather juridical... And not even this is prohibited by the decree of the Council of Trent, namely, that for the use and benefit of the faithful in Christ and for the easier understanding of divine works translations be made into common languages; and these, too, from the early texts, as we know has already been praiseworthy done with the approval of the authority of the Church in many regions.”

Apostate Antipope Pius XII, in an attempt to cover up Trent’s lying and incompetent decree, told yet more lies. He said that Trent did not intend to authorize a Bible that was completely free from all errors but only free from errors on faith or morals. But Trent said no such thing. Instead, it said that the version it approved was “authentic,” which most commonly means “having a genuine original” and thus is pure and free from all errors. This gives the impression that the Bible it approved is the original text of the Bible and thus is free from all errors. And this is what many theologians, especially in Spain, believed. Their opinion was bolstered when Clement VIII’s promulgation decree of the Vulgate declared that his version of the Vulgate was “clean of errors.” He did not say “clean of errors regarding faith and morals.” Hence there was great confusion among those who knew that there were many textual errors in the Clementine Vulgate and even heresies. Some admitted there were errors while others tried to reconcile or explain away the errors because they believed that a pope had infallibly declared the text to be free from all errors, as Trent and Clement VIII had decreed.

And down until today, the Clementine Vulgate (with all its heresies and other errors) is still used as an approved Catholic Bible. Yet it is not approved because Clement VIII was an apostate

antipope and thus all his acts were null and void (invalid), as well as all of the acts of the so-called following popes because they too have been apostate antipopes.

On Heresies and Other Errors in Commentaries That Try to Explain Erroneous Texts

Biblical commentaries that do not acknowledge that a heretical or erroneous text is heretical or erroneous fall into inescapable dilemmas by trying to explain the text and thus they cause even more scandal and discredit the Catholic faith even more so.

- If they defend the heresy or other error in the erroneous text, they are guilty of the heresy or other error.
- If they try to defend the heretical or otherwise erroneous text in a way in which it is not heresy or an error, they fall into several traps. They either contradict other biblical texts, or give illogical or senseless explanations, or make unfounded or ridiculous presumptions.

In the following chapter I will list some of these scandalous commentaries that are based upon erroneous texts. The only way to escape these dilemmas is to acknowledge that the text is erroneous and then to present the correct text, which ninety-five percent of the time is contained in the Septuagint regarding the Old Testament or in the Syriac and Old Latin for the New Testament. Indeed, some commentators, at times, acknowledge that the text is erroneous, or could be erroneous, without explicitly saying so because of the ban on criticizing the Clementine Vulgate or because of undue reverence toward it. This too will be pointed out in the following chapter.

In most cases, when the text is corrected, there is no need for a commentary to try to explain the text.

Some of the Heresies and Other Errors in the Clementine Vulgate

Some of the errors in the Clementine Vulgate are so obvious that a simple child who reads the Bible daily can pick them out. Yet the genius scholastics, who thus idolized reason, could not pick them out because in their idolatrous quest for knowledge and wisdom they lost God's grace, lost common sense, and became stupid:

“For he is found by them that tempt him not, and he sheweth himself to them that have faith in him. For perverse thoughts separate from God; and his power, when it is tried, reproveth the unwise. For wisdom will not enter into a malicious soul, nor dwell in a body subject to sins.” (Wis. 1:2-4)

“Be not more wise than is necessary lest thou become stupid.” (Ectes. 7:17)

Hence true wisdom cannot dwell in men who work under images of devils, false gods, false religions, pornography, and immodesty!²² True wisdom cannot dwell in men who idolize pagan philosophers and their philosophies! True wisdom cannot dwell in men who mix pagan philosophies with Catholicism and thus create a hybrid called scholasticism, which I call Theophilosophy! True wisdom cannot dwell in men who idolize, patronize, or do not sufficiently condemn false gods and mythologies! True wisdom cannot dwell in men who practice astrology and other forms of sinful divination and black magic! Hence true wisdom cannot dwell in men

²² See RJMI book *The Desecration of Catholic Places*.

who commit these sins, nor in men who do not commit these sins but consent to them or insufficiently condemn the sins or insufficiently denounce or punish the offenders.²³

As a result of the scholastics' idolization of pagan philosophies or mythologies, they either despised or demoted the Bible because the Bible condemned them:

“For the word of God is living and effectual, and more piercing than any two edged sword, and reaching unto the division of the soul and the spirit, of the joints also and the marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.” (Heb. 4:12)

That is why some of the apostate antipopes and other nominal Catholic rulers banned Catholics from reading the Bible because it condemns them and their many sins against the Catholic faith and morals. Their excuse that the average Catholic must not read the Bible because he will take it out of context can equally pertain to Catholic catechisms or any other religious works. Yet they would have Catholics read their many Summas full of heresies, contradictions, snake-like meanderings, and willful ambiguities. Hence what they are saying is that Catholics should not learn the word of God, should not learn the Catholic faith, except from corrupted books chosen by them, by these apostates. These apostates are condemned by the very Bible which teaches in many places that *all* of God's chosen people are required to read the Bible or at least have it read to them if they cannot read:

“Let not the book of this law depart from thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate on it day and night that thou mayest observe and do all things that are written in it; then shalt thou direct thy way and understand it.” (Jos. 1:8)

Jesus tells men to “Search the scriptures.” (Jn. 5:39)

“From thy infancy thou hast known the holy scriptures, which can instruct thee to salvation, by the faith which is in Christ Jesus. All scripture, inspired of God, is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice.” (2 Tim. 3:15-16)

“For what things soever were written, were written for our learning, that through patience and the comfort of the scriptures we might have hope.” (Rom. 15:4)

“Let the word of Christ dwell in you abundantly, in all wisdom: teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual canticles, singing in grace in your hearts to God.” (Col. 3:16)

A Catholic Bible, which thus has a good Catholic commentary (such as *The Catholic Bible* revised by RJMI), solves any problem of Catholics' taking verses out of context. Because all of these nominal Catholic apostates were cursed by God, they could not give the world a credible Catholic Bible with a credible Catholic commentary:

“What can be made clean by the unclean? And what truth can come from that which is false?” (Eccus. 34:4)

What follows are only a few examples of hundreds of the errors, some of which are heretical, in the Clementine Vulgate. A list at the end of my revisions to the Bible will list all of the errors. At the end of my revisions to the Bible, I will list all of the errors that I have found so far.

The heresy that Isaac was Abraham's only-begotten son

Anyone who reads the Bible with a minimum of attention would know that Abraham's first child was Ismael and his second child was Isaac:

²³ See RJMI books *The Great Apostasy* and *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics*.

“And Agar brought forth a son to Abram [later called Abraham], who called his name Ismael. Abram was fourscore and six years old when Agar brought him forth Ismael.” (Gen. 16:15-16)

“And Abraham called the name of his son, whom Sara bore him, Isaac. And he circumcised him the eighth day, as God had commanded him, when he was a hundred years old: for at this age of his father was Isaac born.” (Gen. 21:3-5)

Hence when Abraham offered up Isaac, Isaac was not his “only begotten son,” as the Clementine Vulgate erroneously says. However, the Septuagint correctly says his “beloved son.”

Genesis 22:12:

Clementine Vulgate: “Dixitque ei non extendas manum tuam super puerum neque facias illi quicquam nunc cognovi quod timeas Dominum et non peperceris filio tuo unigenito propter me.”

English translation of CV: “And he said to him: Lay not thy hand upon the boy, neither do thou any thing to him: now I know that thou fearest God, and hast not spared thy only begotten son for my sake.”

Septuagint: “And he said, Lay not thine hand upon the child, neither do anything to him, for now I know that thou fearest God, and for my sake thou hast not spared thy beloved son.”

Genesis 22:16:

Clementine Vulgate: “Per memet ipsum iuravi dicit Dominus quia fecisti rem hanc et non pepercisti filio tuo unigenito.”

English translation of CV: “By my own self have I sworn, saith the Lord: because thou hast done this thing, and hast not spared thy only begotten son for my sake.”

Septuagint: “I have sworn by myself, says the Lord, because thou hast done this thing, and on my account hast not spared thy beloved son.”

The heresy that the Southern Kingdom of Juda consisted of one tribe instead of two

Anyone who reads the Bible with a minimum of attention would know that the Northern Kingdom of Israel (first ruled by Jeroboam) consisted of ten tribes (which included the two half-tribes of Joseph, the half-tribes of Manasses and Ephraim, which accounted for two tribes as each had its own possession of land); and the Southern Kingdom of Juda (also called the house of David and first ruled by Roboam) consisted of two tribes, the tribes of Juda and Benjamin. And the tribe of Levi, which had no possessions, inhabited both kingdoms.

Yet the Clementine Vulgate in 3 Ki. 11:32, 36; and 12:20 says that there was only one tribe in the Southern Kingdom of Juda; whereas the Septuagint correctly says that there were two tribes.

3 Kings 11:32:

Clementine Vulgate: “Porro una tribus remanebit ei propter servum meum David et Hierusalem civitatem quam elegi ex omnibus tribubus Israhel.”

English translation of CV: “But one tribe shall remain to him for the sake of my servant David, and Jerusalem the city, which I have chosen out of all the tribes of Israel.”

Septuagint: “But two tribes shall remain to him for the sake of my servant David, and Jerusalem the city, which I have chosen out of all the tribes of Israel.”

3 Kings 11:36:

Clementine Vulgate: “Filio autem eius dabo tribum unam ut remaneat lucerna David servo meo cunctis diebus coram me in Hierusalem civitatem quam elegi ut esset nomen meum ibi.”

English translation of CV: “And to his son I will give one tribe, that there may remain a lamp for my servant David before me always in Jerusalem, the city which I have chosen, that my name might be there.”

Septuagint: “But to his son I will give the two remaining tribes, that my servant David may have an establishment continually before me in Jerusalem, the city which I have chosen for myself to put my name there.”

What makes this error even worse is that the preceding two verses (30 and 31) of the same chapter in the Clementine Vulgate say that out of the twelve tribes ten will belong to the Northern Kingdom of Israel and thus, by implication, two will remain in the Southern Kingdom of Juda:

Clementine Vulgate, 3 Ki. 11:30-31: “Adprehendensque Ahia pallium suum novum quo opertus erat scidit in duodecim partes. Et ait ad Hieroboam tolle tibi decem scissuras haec enim dicit Dominus Deus Israhel ecce ego scindam regnum de manu Salomonis et dabo tibi decem tribus.”

English translation of CV: “And Ahias taking his new garment, wherewith he was clad, divided it into twelve parts. And he said to Jeroboam: Take to thee ten pieces: for thus saith the Lord the God of Israel: Behold I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon, and will give thee ten tribes.” (3 Ki. 30-31)

Twelve minus ten leaves two tribes in the Southern Kingdom of Juda, not one. Hence smart and genius as these scholastics were, they could not subtract. They believed that $12-10 = 1$.

And in the very next chapter, the Clementine Vulgate contains the same error. In 3 Ki. 12:20 it says that there is only one tribe in the Southern Kingdom, the tribe of Juda. But the Septuagint correctly says that there are two, the tribes of Juda and Benjamin.

3 Kings 12:20:

Clementine Vulgate: “quisquam domum David praeter tribum Iuda solam.”

English translation of CV: “there was none that followed the house of David but the tribe of Juda only.”

Septuagint: “there was none that followed the house of David but the tribes of Juda and Benjamin only.”

What makes this error in the Clementine Vulgate even worse is that the very next verse in the Clementine Vulgate correctly says that there were two tribes in the Southern Kingdom, the tribes of Juda and Benjamin, thus contradicting the previous verse that said the “tribe of Juda only”:

English translation of CV: “And Roboam [king of the Southern Kingdom] came to Jerusalem, and gathered together all the house of Juda, and the tribe of Benjamin, a hundred fourscore thousand chosen men for war, to fight against the house of Israel [Northern Kingdom] and to bring the kingdom again under Roboam the son of Solomon.” (3 Ki. 12:21)

In this case the genius scholastics could not read or comprehend so as to catch this obvious error. One wonders how all the genius scholastics, many who had encyclopedic memories, did

not catch these obvious errors for century after century. Well, the answer is also obvious, they were cursed and blinded by God and became stupid and thus lost common sense because of their idolization of intellect by putting the mind over the heart, reason over faith. Hence they were cursed and fell into idolizing mythology and/or philosophy. I am sure these genius scholastics would have been more attentive when they translated and read the works of their idols—Plato, Aristotle, and other pagan philosophers, and the authors of pagan mythologies.

An erroneous commentary on the erroneous text

In order to cover this obvious error, the Haydock commentary says that the tribe of Benjamin was so small that it did not merit being mentioned as part of the Southern Kingdom of Juda. It then gives another illogical and unhistorical opinion. It says that Benjamin did not yet ally itself with the Southern Kingdom:

Haydock Commentary on 3 Ki. 12: “Ver. 20. **Only.** Benjamin was a small tribe, and so intermixed with the tribe of Juda, (the very city of Jerusalem being partly in Juda, partly in Benjamin) that they are here counted but as one tribe. Perhaps Benjamin at first hesitated; but, considering the greater danger to which it would be exposed, embraced the party of Roboam (Ver. 21). Salien.”

The heresy that life does not begin in the womb

The correct text of Exodus 21:22-23 (as contained in the Septuagint) teaches that a live infant does not exist in the womb at conception but only when the body is “formed” in the womb. The body without a soul is called “not formed” and the body with a soul is called “formed”:

*Septuagint (Versio Antiqua*²⁴), Ex. 21: “(22) Si autem litigabunt duo viri, & percusserint mulierem in utero habentem, & exierit infans ejus nondum formatus: detrimentum patietur, quantum indixerit vir muliens, & dabit cum postuiatione. (23) Si autem formatum fuerit, dabit animam pro anima.”

Septuagint, Ex. 21: “(22) If two men quarrel and they having struck a woman in the womb, and the infant exits not yet formed, atonement shall be made by a fine. According as the husband of the woman shall with a judicial decision lay upon him, he shall pay; (23) but if it be formed, he shall give life for life.”

Beware of the following erroneous Clementine Vulgate text which can imply the heresy that life does not begin in the womb but at birth when the infant takes its first breath:

Clementine Vulgate, Ex. 21: “(22) Si rixati fuerint viri et percusserit quis mulierem praegnantem et abortivum quidem fecerit sed ipsa vixerit subiacebit damno quantum expetierit maritus mulieris et arbitri iudicarint. (23) Sin autem mors eius fuerit subsecuta reddet animam pro anima.”

English translation of CV: “If men quarrel, and one strike a woman with child, and she miscarry indeed, but live herself: he shall be answerable for so much damage as the woman’s husband shall require, and as arbiters shall award. But if her death ensue thereupon, he shall render life for life.” (Ex. 21:22-23)

The “life for life” in the Vulgate text refers to the mother; in the Septuagint it refers to the death of the infant who hence was previously alive in the womb. The Vulgate’s erroneous text, then, can be easily taken to mean that the infant was not alive because there is no life for life for the infant that was miscarried but only for the death of the mother. Hence it can be taken to mean

²⁴ The *Versio Antiqua* is an old Latin translation of the Septuagint.

that life does not begin in the womb but when the child is born and takes its first breath, which is heresy. Indeed, this erroneous text was taken from the apostate Jewish Masoretic Text, which is the template for the Clementine Vulgate's Old Testament.²⁵

The heresy that the Paschal sacrifice was a lamb and a goat

The Clementine Vulgate's Ex. 12:5 has the Jews offering a lamb and a goat for the Paschal sacrifice instead of only a lamb. But the Septuagint does not!

Exodus 12:5:

Clementine Vulgate: "Erit autem agnus absque macula masculus anniculus iuxta quem ritum tolletis et hedum."

English translation of CV: "And it shall be a lamb without blemish, a male, of one year: according to which rite also you shall take a kid."

Septuagint: "It shall be to you a lamb unblemished, a male of a year old; ye shall take it out from the sheep or from the goats."

The Septuagint correctly teaches that the only Paschal sacrifice is a lamb which can be taken from among either the sheep or the goats, since many times both mingled:

Catholic Commentary on Ex. 12:5: "**From the sheep or from the goats:** [RJMI: Lambs mingled with themselves or with goats. Hence he tells them to take an unblemished lamb, a male of the first year, from among the lambs; or if he is among the goats, then from among the goats. When Moses relayed this command from God to the people, as recorded in Verse 21, he mentions only a lamb as the Phase's sacrifice and not a kid (a young goat). However, during the days the Passover was celebrated, other animals were sacrificed, such as oxen for peace offerings and goats for sin offerings. (See 2 Par. 25:1-20.)]"

"And Moses called all the ancients of the children of Israel and said to them: Go take a lamb by your families, and sacrifice the Phase." (Ex. 12:21)

What makes this heresy even worse is that all the other verses in the Clementine Vulgate that refer to the Paschal sacrifice only mention a lamb and thus not a goat. So why, then, did the genius scholastics from generation to generation not catch this obvious heresy.

A heretical commentary on the heretical text

The Haydock commentary embraces the heresy that the Paschal sacrifice was a lamb or a goat:

Haydock Commentary on Ex. 12: "Ver. 5. **Lamb.** Heb. *se*, which denotes the young of either sheep or goats. (Kimchi) —He who had not a lamb was to sacrifice a kid. (Theodoret) —A kid. The Phase might be performed either with a lamb or with a kid; and all the same rites and ceremonies were to be used with the one as with the other. (Challoner). —Many have asserted that both were to be sacrificed. But custom decides against them."

²⁵ For more details, see RJMI article *Life Begins in the Womb: Exodus 21:22-23 on an embryo vs. an infant in the womb.*

The heresy and blasphemy that has God profaning men

While God allows men and devils to profane themselves, God does not profane anything or else God would be guilty of sin. The Clementine Vulgate has God profaning princes. But the Septuagint does not. Instead, it has princes defiling God's sanctuaries.

Isaias 43:28:

Clementine Vulgate: "Et contaminavi principes sanctos dedi ad internicionem Iacob et Israhel in blasphemiam." (Isa. 43:28)

English translation of CV: "I am, I am he that blot out thy iniquities for my own sake, and I will not remember thy sins. Put me in remembrance, and let us plead together: tell if thou hast any thing to justify thyself. Thy first father sinned, and thy teachers have transgressed against me. And I have profaned the holy princes, I have given Jacob to slaughter, and Israel to reproach." (Isa. 43:25-28)

Septuagint: "I am, I am he that blot out thy iniquities for my own sake, and I will not remember thy sins. But do thou remember and let us plead together: do thou first confess thy transgressions that thou mayest be justified. Your fathers first and your princes have transgressed against me. And the princes have defiled my sanctuaries: so I gave Jacob to enemies to destroy and Israel to reproach." (Isa. 43:25-28)

An erroneous commentary that explains away the heresy and blasphemy

The Haydock commentary says that that text meant to say that God declared the princes to be profane and thus did not make them profane. However, because he knows this does not suffice, he gives the Septuagint which does not contain the heresy or blasphemy:

Haydock Commentary on Isa. 43: "Ver. 28. **Profaned, or declared such**, (H.) Nadab, &c. (ev. 10:1) (C.) or Moses and Aaron. M. —Septuagint. 'and the princes defiled my holy things.' "

The idolatry that faithful Jews allowed pagans to worship with them

The Clementine Vulgate teaches the idolatry that faithful Jews allowed pagans to join with them in their worship and ceremonies. The Septuagint, and in this case the Masoretic as well, does not.

Esther 8:17:

Clementine Vulgate: "Apud omnes populos urbes atque provincias quocumque regis iussa veniebant mira exultatio epulae atque convivia et festus dies in tantum ut plures alterius gentis et sectae eorum religioni et caerimoniis iungerentur grandis enim cunctos iudaici nominis terror invaserat."

English translation of CV: "And in all peoples, cities, and provinces, whithersoever the king's commandments came, there was wonderful rejoicing, feasts and banquets, and keeping holy day: insomuch that many of other nations and religion, joined themselves to their worship and ceremonies. For a great dread of the name of the Jews had fallen upon all."

Septuagint: "In every city and province wherever the ordinance was published, wherever the proclamation took place, the Jews had joy and gladness, feasting and

mirth and many of the Gentiles were circumcised and became Jews for fear of the Jews.”

Masoretic: “And in every province, and in every city, whithersoever the king’s commandment and his decree came, the Jews had gladness and joy, a feast and a good day. And many from among the peoples of the land became Jews, for the fear of the Jews was fallen upon them.”

An erroneous commentary that explains away the idolatrous and blasphemous text

In order to cover up this heresy, the Haydock commentary says that the pagans did not actually join themselves to the worship and ceremonies of the Jews but only became acquainted with them. Because he knows that this interpretation contradicts the clear and obvious words of the erroneous text, he then gives the correct text as contained in the Masoretic text, which is also in the Septuagint:

Haydock Commentary on Est. 8: “Ver. 17. **Ceremonies.** Becoming acquainted with the sanctity of the law and the protection which God gave to his people. M. —Hebrew. ‘the Jews had joy and gladness, a feast, and a good day, and many of the people of the land became Jews, for the fear of the Jews,’ &c. Prot. H.”

The heresy and blasphemy that God is perverted

The Clementine Vulgate says that God is perverted. The Septuagint does not!

Psalm 17:27:

Clementine Vulgate: “Cum electo electus eris et cum perverso perverteris.”

English translation of CV: “With the elect thou wilt be elect, and with the perverse thou wilt be perverted.”

Septuagint: “With a warrior thou wilt be a warrior, and with the wily thou practice wiles.”

2 Kings 22:27:

Clementine Vulgate: “Cum electo electus eris et cum perverso perverteris.”

English translation of CV: “With the elect thou wilt be elect, and with the perverse thou wilt be perverted.”

Septuagint: “With a warrior thou wilt be a warrior, and with the wily thou wilt practice wiles.”

A heretical commentary that accepts the heretical and blasphemous text

While the Haydock commentary says that no word can express the idea properly, it allows for the word “perverted” to be used and thus as the best word possible and hence embraces the heresy and blasphemy that God is perverted:

Haydock Commentary on Ps. 17: “Ver. 27. **Perverted.** No version can properly express this idea. God turns away from those who abandon him, treating every one according to his works...”

The heresy that God repented and thus had sinned

Genesis 6:6:

Clementine Vulgate: “Paenituit eum quod hominem fecisset in terra.”

English translation of CV: “It repented him [God] that he had made man on the earth.”

Septuagint: “It grieved him that he [God] had made man on the earth.”

Genesis 6:7:

Clementine Vulgate: “paenitet enim me fecisse eos.”

English translation of CV: “for it repenteth me [God] that I have made them.”

Septuagint: “for it grieved me [God] that I have made them.”

A heretical commentary on the heretical text

Part of the following commentary teaches that God does not repent, and thus it contradicts the clear words of the corrupted text and thus lies. And it teaches the stoic heresy that the reason God does not repent is not because he never sins but because God has no emotions and passions. The second part of the commentary teaches that God acted as if he had repented and thus acted as if he had sinned, which is still heresy because not only does God not sin but he does not even *pretend* to sin:

Haydock Commentary on Gen. 6: “Ver. 6. **It repented him, &c.** God, who is unchangeable, is not capable of repentance, grief, or any other passion. But these expressions are used to declare the enormity of the sins of men, which was so provoking as to determine their Creator to destroy these his creatures, whom before he had so much favoured. (Challoner). —God acted outwardly as a man would do who repented. (Haydock)”

The heresy that after King Saul died he went to the same place as Samuel

The Clementine Vulgate says that after King Saul died, he went to the same place where the holy prophet Samuel was. This gives the impression that Saul was saved, when, in fact, he is presumed to be damned. Some say that it only means that Saul would be dead like Samuel. But the Septuagint leaves no doubt regarding this. It does not say that Saul would be with Samuel, but that Saul would fall.

1 Kings 28:19:

Clementine Vulgate: “Et dabit Dominus etiam Israhel tecum in manu Philisthim cras autem tu et fili tui mecum eritis sed et castra Israhel tradet Dominus in manu Philisthim.”

English translation of CV: “And the Lord also will deliver Israel with thee into the hands of the Philistines. And tomorrow thou and thy sons shall be with me, and the Lord will also deliver the army of Israel into the hands of the Philistines.”

Septuagint: “And the Lord shall deliver Israel with thee into the hands of the Philistines. And tomorrow thou and thy sons with thee shall fall, and the Lord shall deliver the army of Israel into the hands of the Philistines.”

Erroneous commentaries on the heretical text

The Haydock commentary and the Douay commentary say that Saul will be dead like Samuel, but the words of the erroneous text say that Saul will be *with* Samuel and thus imply that he will be saved:

Haydock Commentary on 1 Ki. 28: “Ver. 19. ...—**With me**. That is, in the state of the dead, and in another world, though not in the same place. (Challoner).”

Douay-Rheims Commentary on 1 Ki. 28: “Ver. 19. In the state of the dead in another world, not in the same particular state.”

The heresy and blasphemy that replaces curses with blessings

Job 1:11:

These heretical texts replace the word “curse” with “bless” and thus turn curses into blessings. The whole purpose of the Devil tempting and trying Job was to get him to curse God, not to bless him. The Septuagint, as well as the Masoretic, has the correct text:

Clementine Vulgate: “Sed extende paululum manum tuam et tange cuncta quae possidet nisi in facie tua benedixerit tibi.” (Job 1:11)

English translation of CV: “But stretch forth thy hand a little, and touch all that he hath, and see if he blesseth thee not to thy face.” (Job 1:11)

Septuagint (Thomson version): “But stretch forth thy hand a little, and touch all that he hath, and he will curse thee to thy face.” (Job 1:11)

Masoretic: “But put forth Thy hand now, and touch all that he hath, surely he will blaspheme Thee to Thy face.” (Job 1:11)

Job 2:5:

Clementine Vulgate: “Alioquin mitte manum tuam et tange os eius et carnem et tunc videbis quod in facie benedicat tibi.” (Job 2:5)

English translation of CV: “But put forth thy hand, and touch his bone and his flesh, and then thou shalt see that he will bless thee to thy face.” (Job 2:5)

Septuagint (Thomson version): “But put forth thy hand, and touch his bone and his flesh, and then thou shalt see that he will curse thee to thy face.” (Job 2:5)

Masoretic: “But put forth Thy hand now, and touch his bone and his flesh, surely he will blaspheme Thee to Thy face.” (Job 2:5)

Job 2:9:

The following corrupted text has Job’s wife cursing God but uses the word bless instead for the reasons stated above. The true text does not have Job’s wife cursing God, as it would be unseemly for the faithful Job to have or remain with a blasphemous wife:

Clementine Vulgate: “Dixit autem illi uxor sua adhuc tu permanes in simplicitate tua benedic Deo et morere.”

English translation of CV: “And his wife said to him: Dost thou still continue in thy simplicity? Bless God and die.”

Septuagint: “And much time having elapsed, his wife said to him, How long wilt thou persist saying, Behold I will wait yet a little longer, in hope and expectation of my deliverance? ...Do but say some words for the Lord and die.”

Job 1:5:

In Job 1:5, the Clementine Vulgate’s erroneous use of the words “my sons have sinned, and have blessed God in their hearts” implies that it is a sin to bless God. Or it means “cursed God,” which would make sense, but it did not want to use the words “cursed God” for the reasons stated above. The Septuagint’s use of the correct words “lest peradventure my sons have thought evil in their minds against God” dispels the erroneous meanings given to the corrupted text:

Clementine Vulgate: “Cumque in orbem transissent dies convivii mittebat ad eos Job et sanctificabat illos consurgensque diluculo offerebat holocausta per singulos dicebat enim ne forte peccaverint filii mei et benedixerint Deo in cordibus suis sic faciebat Job cunctis diebus.”

English translation of CV: “And when the days of their feasting were gone about, Job sent to them, and sanctified them: and rising up early offered holocausts for every one of them. For he said: Lest perhaps my sons have sinned, and have blessed God in their hearts. So did Job all days.”

Septuagint: “And when the days of the banquet were completed, Job sent and purified them, having risen up in the morning, and offered sacrifices for them, according to their number, and one calf for a sin-offering for their souls: for Job said, lest peradventure my sons have thought evil in their minds against God. Thus, then Job did continually.”

An erroneous commentary on the heretical and blasphemous texts

The Haydock commentary has the audacity to say that the word “bless” actually means “curse” but “bless” is used instead in reverence to God in order not to write, say, or even think the words “curse God” or “blaspheme God.” Yet, in truth evil men and devils do curse and blaspheme God. Hence this false piety, this false reverence, actually attacks the very truth itself and thus God because it has devils and evil men blessing God instead of cursing him and thus turns the true God into Satan because the god that devils and evil men bless is Satan and not the true God. Just as conversely, the faithful bless the true God and curse the Devil:

Haydock Commentary on Job 1: “Ver. 5. **Blessed.** For greater horror of the very thought of blasphemy, the Scripture both here and (Ver. 11), and in the following chapter (Job 2:5), (Job 2:9) uses the word bless to signify its contrary. (Challoner) —Thus the Greeks stiled the furies Eumenides, ‘the kind,’ out of a horror of their real name. Even those who are the best inclined, can hardly speak of God without some want of respect, (Challoner) in the midst of feasts, where the neglect of saying grace is also too common. H. —Sept. ‘they have thought evil against God.’ ”

Note that Haydock, at the end of his commentary, quotes the correct text from the Septuagint in an attempt to prove that the Clementine Vulgate meant “curse God” and “evil against God” even though it said “bless God” and “blessed God in their hearts.” This only hangs Haydock all the more because why, then, did not the Clementine Vulgate use the correct words as does the

Septuagint! Or are we to say that the Septuagint, which Jesus Christ and the Apostles used, is irreverent for using the words “curse God” or “blaspheme God” or “thought evil against God.”

And Haydock hangs himself even more and is guilty of hypocrisy because other verses in the Clementine Vulgate itself use the words “curse God” and “blaspheme God.” For example,

“Because they met not the children of Israel with bread and water: and they hired against them Balaam, to curse them, and our God turned the curse into blessing.” (2 Esd. 13:2)

“And they shall pass by it, they shall fall, and be hungry: and when they shall be hungry, they will be angry, and curse their king, and their God, and look upwards.” (Isa. 8:21)

“Incline, O Lord, thy ear, and hear: open, O Lord, thy eyes, and see, and hear all the words of Sennacherib which he hath sent to blaspheme the living God.” (Isa. 37:17)

“And suborn two men, sons of Belial against him, and let them bear false witness: that he hath blasphemed God and the king: and then carry him out, and stone him, and so let him die.” (3 Ki. 21:10)

“And there was given to him [the Antichrist] a mouth speaking great things, and blasphemies: and power was given to him to do two and forty months. And he opened his mouth unto blasphemies against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven.” (Apoc. 13:5-6)

Hence, according to Haydock’s commentary on Job 1:5, the Clementine Vulgate is irreverent regarding these passages in which it uses the words “curse God” or “blaspheme God.” And either way you look at it, the Clementine Vulgate is discredited. Either it lies by using the words “bless God” instead of “curse God” or “blaspheme God” in some passages, or it is irreverent for using these words in other passages.

The heresy that all wars are unjust

The Clementine Vulgate’s Proverbs 22:5 teaches the heresy that any use of arms and swords is always perverse and thus intrinsically sinful and evil. Hence it denies the dogmas of the justified use of arms and swords in just wars and of justified capital or corporal punishment. The Septuagint teaches no such thing.

Proverbs 22:5:

Clementine Vulgate: “Arma et gladii in via perversi custos animae suae longe recedit ab eis.”

English translation of CV: “Arms and swords are in the way of the perverse: but he that keepeth his own soul departeth far from them.”

Septuagint: “Thistles and snares are in perverse ways.”

An erroneous commentary that explains away the heretical text

In trying to explain away the heresy, the Haydock commentary has the audacity to say that perverse does not actually mean perverse but means danger and trouble:

Haydock Commentary on Prv. 22: “Ver. 5. **Perverse.** They are always in danger and in trouble.”

The heresy that a holy prophet does not know the wisdom of God

The Clementine Vulgate's Proverbs 30:3 has a prophet not knowing the wisdom of God, also called the science of the saints. The Septuagint does not!

Proverbs 30:3:

Clementine Vulgate: "Non didici sapientiam et non novi sanctorum scientiam."

English translation of CV: "I have not learned wisdom, and have not known the science of saints."

Septuagint (Thomson version): "God hath taught me wisdom, and I have gained a knowledge of holy things."

The heresy that Samuel was an Ephraimite

The Prophet Samuel was a priest and thus of the tribe of Levi. But the Clementine Vulgate contains the heresy that the Prophet Samuel's father was an Ephraimite and thus of the tribe of Ephraim and thus Samuel was an Ephraimite:

Clementine Vulgate: "Fuit vir unus de Ramathaimsophim de monte Ephraim et nomen eius Helcana filius Hieroam filii Heliu filii Thau filii Suph Ephratheus."

English translation of CV: "There was a man of Ramathaimsophim of mount Ephraim and his name was Elcana [the father of Samuel] the son of Jeroham, the son of Eliu, the son of Thohu, the son of Suph, an Ephraimite." (1 Ki. 1:1)

The Septuagint has the correct translation. It says that Elcana was living in Nasib-Ephraim and thus does not say he was an Ephraimite:

Septuagint: "There was a man of Ramathaimsophim of mount Ephraim and his name was Elcana the son of Jeroham, the son of Eliu, the son of Thohu, the son of Suph, in Nasib-Ephraim."

Contrary to the Clementine Vulgate's translation of 1 Ki. 1:1, the Bible teaches that Samuel was a Levite and performed the offices of the priesthood, which were forbidden to all the tribes of Israel except for the tribe of Levi:

Clementine Vulgate: "The sons of Levi were Gerson, Caath, and Merari... And these are they that stood with their sons, of the sons of Caath, Hemam a singer, the son of Joel, the son of Samuel, the son of Elcana, the son of Jeroham, the son of Eliel, the son of Thohu." (1 Par. 6:1, 33-34)

Clementine Vulgate: "And they said to Samuel: Cease not to cry to the Lord our God for us that he may save us out of the hand of the Philistines. And Samuel took a sucking lamb and offered it whole for a holocaust to the Lord: and Samuel cried to the Lord for Israel, and the Lord heard him." (1 Ki. 7:8-9)

The Challoner commentary on the Clementine Vulgate's heretical translation of 1 Ki. 1:1 tries to excuse the heresy instead of correcting it:

Haydock Commentary on 1 Ki. 1:1: "...**Ephraimite:** He was of the tribe of Levi, (1 Par. 6:34) but is called an Ephraimite from dwelling in Mount Ephraim. Ch [Challoner]."

If so, the text should have said that "he dwelt in the land of Ephraim" instead of that he was an Ephraimite because he was *not* an Ephraimite.

The contradiction that the Levite Joseph was also a Gentile

Joseph, surnamed Barnabas, was a Levite. While the Clementine Vulgate's translation of Acts 4:36 says he was a Levite, it also says that he was born as a Cyprian and thus was a Gentile:

Clementine Vulgate: "Ioseph autem qui cognominatus est Barnabas ab apostolis quod est interpretatum Filius consolationis Levites Cyprius genere."

English translation of CV: "And Joseph, who, by the apostles, was surnamed Barnabas, (which is, by interpretation, the son of consolation,) a Levite, a Cyprian born." (Acts 4:36)

Peshitto: "And Joseph, who, by the apostles, was surnamed Barnabas, (which is, by interpretation, The son of consolation,) a Levite, of the country of Cyprus." (Acts 4:36)

Alexandria did not exist in the days of Jeremias, Ezechiel, and Nahum

The Clementine Vulgate says that Alexandria existed in the days of Jeremias, Ezechiel, and Nahum, which is false. The Septuagint does not use the name Alexandria for the city in question.

Jeremias 46:25:

Clementine Vulgate: "Dixit Dominus exercituum Deus Israhel ecce ego visitabo super tumultum Alexandriae et super Pharao et super Aegyptum et super deos eius et super reges eius et super Pharao et super eos qui confidunt in eo." (Jer. 46:24)

English translation of CV: "The Lord of hosts the God of Israel hath said: Behold I will visit upon the tumult of Alexandria, and upon Pharao, and upon Egypt, and upon her gods, and upon her kings, and upon Pharao, and upon them that trust in him." (Jer. 46:25)

Septuagint: "Behold, I will avenge Ammon her son upon Pharao, and upon them that trust in him." (Jer. 46:25; 26:25 Sept.)

Ezechiel 30:14:

Clementine Vulgate: "Et disperdam terram Fatures et dabo ignem in Taphnis et faciam iudicia in Alexandriam."

English translation of CV: "And I will destroy the land of Phatures, and will make a fire in Taphnis, and will execute judgments in Alexandria."

Septuagint: "And I will destroy the land of Phathore, and will send fire upon Tanis, and will execute vengeance on Diospolis."

Nahum 3:8:

Clementine Vulgate: "Numquid melior es ab Alexandria populorum quae habitat in fluminibus aqua in circuitu eius cuius divitiae mare aquae muri eius."

English translation of CV: "Art thou better than the populous Alexandria, that dwelleth among the rivers? Waters are round about it: the sea is its riches, the waters are its walls."

Septuagint: "Art thou better than the populous Ammon, that dwelleth among the rivers? Waters are round about it: the sea is its riches, the waters are its walls."

Commentaries give the correct name but leave the incorrect one in the text

To let the people know the modern name of a town that went by a different name in the Bible, the modern name should be listed in a commentary on the verse but not put in the main text. Instead, the commentaries put the correct name in the commentary and left the incorrect name in the text. For example,

Haydock Commentary on Jer. 46: “Ver. 25. ...**No.** which was the ancient name of the city, to which Alexander gave afterwards the name of Alexandria; (Ch.) or this city was built near Rachotes, the harbour. ‘Ammon of No’ was rather Diospolis, {Ez. 30:14} (Sept.) in the Delta, north of Busiris. Ammon was the chief god adored at No, {Nahu. 3:8}.”

Haydock Commentary on Ez. 30: “Ver. 14. ...**Alexandria.** In the Heb. No, which was the ancient name of that city, which was afterwards rebuilt by Alexander the Great, and from his name called Alexandria. Ch. —Sept. ‘Memphis or Diospolis;’ (C.) or Thebes, capital of Higher Egypt; (Boch.) though it seems rather a maritime town, (Nahu. 3:8). C.”

Haydock Commentary on Nahu. 3: “Ver. 8. **Populous Alexandria.** No-Amon. A populous city of Egypt, destroyed by the Chaldeans, and afterwards rebuilt by Alexander, and called Alexandria. Others suppose No-Amon to be the same as Diospolis. Ch. This seems preferable, as it was amidst waters and near the Mediterranean.”

Both the heart and the liver, not the heart or the liver

In Tobias 6:5, St. Raphael the Archangel tells young Tobias that the heart, liver, and gall of a fish will be used for medicines, which would actually be instruments used for miraculous purposes.

Tobias 6:5:

Clementine Vulgate: “Tunc dixit ei angelus extentera hunc piscem et cor eius et fel eius et iecur reponere tibi sunt enim haec necessaria ad medicamenta utiliter.”

English translation of CV: “Then the angel said to him: Take out the entrails of this fish, and lay up his heart, and his gall, and his liver for thee, for these are necessary for useful medicines.”

Both the heart and the liver were to be burned and the smoke would chase away the devil from Sara. And the gall was to be used to heal the elder Tobias’ blindness.

But the Clementine Vulgate in Tobias 6:8 says that only the heart was to be burned and its smoke would chase away the devil. But the Septuagint correctly says that it was both the heart and the liver that must be burned.

Tobias 6:8:

Clementine Vulgate: “Et respondens angelus, dixit ei: Cordis ejus particulam si super carbones ponas, fumus ejus extricat omne genus dæmoniorum sive a viro, sive a muliere, ita ut ultra non accedat ad eos.”

English translation of CV: “And the angel, answering, said to him: If thou put a little piece of its heart upon coals, the smoke thereof driveth away all kind of devils, either from man or from woman, so that they come no more to them.”

Septuagint (verses 6-8): “Then the young man said to the angel, Brother Azarias, to what use is the heart and the liver and the gall of the fish? And he said unto him, Touching the heart and the liver, if a devil or an evil spirit trouble any, we must make a smoke thereof before the man or the woman, and the party shall be no more vexed. As for the gall, it is good to anoint a man that hath whiteness in his eyes, and he shall be healed.” (Tob. 6:6-8)

While the Clementine Vulgate in Tobias 6:8 says that the smoke of the burned heart will chase away the devil, it says in Tobias 6:19 and Tobias 8:2 that the smoke of the burned liver will chase away the devil but does not mention the heart. Hence the Clementine Vulgate contradicts itself. Whereas, the Septuagint correctly says that the smoke of the burned heart and the liver will chase away the devil.

Tobias 6:19:

Clementine Vulgate: “Ipsa autem nocte incenso iecore piscis fugabitur daemonium.”

English translation of CV: “And on that night lay the liver of the fish on the fire, and the devil shall be driven away.”

Septuagint: “And on that night lay the heart and liver of the fish on the fire, and the devil shall be driven away.”

Tobias 8:2:

Clementine Vulgate: “Recordatus itaque Tobias sermonem angeli protulit de cassidile suo partem iecoris posuitque eam super carbones vivos.”

English translation of CV: “And Tobias, remembering the angel’s word, took out of his bag part of the liver and laid it upon burning coals.”

Septuagint: “And as he went, he remembered the words of Raphael, and took the ashes of the perfumes, and put the heart and the liver of the fish thereupon, and made a smoke therewith.”

As you can see, there are obvious contradictions in the Clementine Vulgate but none in the Septuagint.

The commentary mentions the true text but does not address the error in the Clementine Vulgate

The following commentaries do not explicitly mention the contradiction but do give the correct text from the Septuagint (Gr.) and thus know that there is a contradiction. Yet, they do not take sides by favoring the Septuagint, which is the only text that is consistent with the other texts regarding the liver and heart:

Haydock Commentary on Tob. 6: “Ver. 19. **Lay.** Gr. adds, ‘some of the heart...and make it smoke, and the devil shall smell, and flee away, and shall not return for ever.’ H.”

Haydock Commentary on Tob. 8: “Ver. 2. ...**Liver.** (Tob. 6:8). ...—Gr. ‘and he took the ashes of incense, and placed thereon the heart of the fish and the liver, causing them to smoke. And when the devil perceived the odour, he fled to the highest parts of Egypt, and the angel bound him...’ (H.)”

Haydock Commentary on Tob. 6: “Ver. 8. **Its heart, &c.** The liver, ...—Gr. ‘and he said to him, respecting the heart and liver, if any demon or wicked spirit be

troublesome, make these smoke before a man or a woman, and the person shall be troubled no longer.’ ”

Imposed a tribute on the land instead of condemned the land

In 2 Paralipomenon 36:3, the Clementine Vulgate’s use of the words “condemned the land” makes no sense in context and at best is overly harsh and obscure. The Septuagint leaves no room for obscurity.

2 Paralipomenon 36:3:

Clementine Vulgate: “Amovit autem eum rex Aegypti cum venisset Hierusalem et condemnavit terram centum talentis argenti et talento auri.”

English translation of CV: “And the king of Egypt came to Jerusalem, and deposed him, and condemned the land in a hundred talents of silver and a talent of gold.”

Septuagint: “And the king brought him over to Egypt, and imposed a tribute on the land, a hundred talents of silver and a talent of gold.”

Not any king removes evil but a righteous king

The Clementine Vulgate’s Proverbs 20:8 implies that all kings, and thus even evil kings, remove evil from their kingdoms. The Septuagint says that only righteous kings do.

Proverbs 20:8:

Clementine Vulgate: “Rex qui sedet in solio iudicii dissipat omne malum intuitu suo.”

English translation of CV: “The king that sitteth on the throne of judgment scattereth away all evil with his look.”

Septuagint: “Whenever a righteous king sits on the throne, no evil thing can stand before his presence.”

Doctrine of baptism not of baptisms

Hebrews 6:2:

Clementine Vulgate: “Baptismatum doctrinae inpositionis quoque manuum ac resurrectionis mortuorum et iudicii aeterni.”

English translation of CV: “Of the doctrine of baptisms, and imposition of hands, and of the resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment.”

The Peshitto contains the correct text:

Peshitto: “Of the doctrine of baptism, and imposition of hands, and of the resurrection of the dead, and of everlasting judgment.”

Can be taken to heretically mean that the faithful must not pray for certain sinners

The Clementine Vulgate's mistranslation of 1 John 5:16 can easily be taken to heretically mean that the faithful can know if men commit certain sins that cannot be remitted and hence they must not pray for these men.

1 John 5:16:

Clementine Vulgate: "16. Qui scit fratrem suum peccare peccatum non ad mortem petet et dabit ei vitam peccantibus non ad mortem est peccatum ad mortem non pro illo dico ut roget."

English translation of CV: "He that knoweth his brother to sin a sin which is not to death, let him ask, and life shall be given to him, who sinneth not to death. There is a sin unto death: for that I say not that any man ask."

Only God knows if men have committed certain sins that cannot be remitted. Hence the faithful must pray for the repentance of all sinners no matter how grievous their sins may be.

However, if the "sin unto death" means the death penalty, then that interpretation would not be heretical and would be correct. And it is the only explanation of the "sin unto death."

The true translation, which is in the Peshitto, leaves no doubt that the death penalty is the true meaning:

Peshitto: "He that knoweth his brother to sin a sin which doth not deserve death, let him ask and life shall be given to him, who sinneth not unto death. There is a sin unto death, for that I say not that any man ask."

RJMI Commentary on 1 Jn. 5:16: "**A sin which doth not deserve death**: [RJMI: Some sins are so grievous that they deserve the death penalty. Of those who commit these sins, St. John says to not ask for their life. Do not ask that they may be granted a reprieve from the death sentence. "*Deliver them that are led to death, and those that are drawn to death forbear not to deliver.*" (Prv. 24:11) But that does not mean that Catholic sinners on death row cannot confess their sins and die in a state of grace no matter how grievous their sins are. Hence the faithful are to pray for the repentance of all sinners, even those on death row.]

Beware of the heretics who believe that the death penalty is intrinsically evil, as they do not like this true translation, which is one of many Bible verses that prove that the death penalty is ordained by God to punish certain sinners.

Says that sin is an inconvenience and thus implies it is not sin

Romans 1:28:

Clementine Vulgate: "Et sicut non probaverunt Deum habere in notitia tradidit eos Deus in reprobum sensum ut faciant quae non conveniunt."

English translation of CV: "And as they liked not to have God in their knowledge, God delivered them up to a reprobate sense, to do those things which are not convenient."

The Peshitto contains the correct text:

Peshitto: "And as they liked not to have God in their knowledge, God delivered them up to a reprobate sense to do those things which they ought not."

Elders not senators

The Clementine Vulgate's Proverbs 31:23 says that the Jews had senators, which is false. The Romans had senators, not the Jews. The correct word is elders not senators.

Proverbs 31:23:

Clementine Vulgate: "Nun nobilis in portis vir eius quando sederit cum senatoribus terrae."

English translation of CV: "Her husband is honourable in the gates, when he sitteth among the senators of the land."

Septuagint: "Her husband is honourable in the gates, when he sitteth among the elders of the land."

From Caesarea to Antioch and not to Jerusalem

The Clementine Vulgate's Acts 18:21 does not mention St. Paul's going to a feast in Jerusalem. And Verse 22 has him going from Caesarea to Jerusalem instead of to Antioch first and then has him going from Jerusalem to Antioch. And it says that St. Paul went "down to Antioch" from Jerusalem, when one goes *up* to Antioch from Jerusalem. Antioch is north of Jerusalem:

Clementine Vulgate: "(21) Sed vafaciens et dicens iterum revertar ad vos Deo volente profectus est ab Epheso. (22) Et descendens Caesaream ascendit et salutavit ecclesiam et descendit Antiochiam." (Acts 18:21-22)

English translation of CV: "(21) But taking his leave, and saying: I will return to you again, God willing, he departed from Ephesus. (22) And going down to Caesarea, he went up to Jerusalem, and saluted the church, and so came down to Antioch." (Acts 18:21-22)

The Peshitto contains the correct text:

Peshitto: "(21) But bade them farewell, saying: I must by all means keep this feast that cometh in Jerusalem; but I will return again unto you, if God will. And he sailed from Ephesus. (22) And when he had landed at Caesarea and gone up and saluted the church [at Caesarea Mazaca in Cappadocia not Caesarea Maritima in Palestine], he went down to Antioch." (Acts 18:21-22)

Some verses that make no sense

Here are a few of many verses that make no sense in the Clementine Vulgate but make sense in the Septuagint.

Proverbs 13:23:

Clementine Vulgate: "Multi cibi in novalibus patrum et alii congregantur absque iudicio."

English translation of CV: "Much food is in the tillage of fathers, but for others it is gathered without judgment."

Septuagint: "The righteous shall spend many years in wealth, but the unrighteous shall perish suddenly."

Jeremias 6:15:

Clementine Vulgate: “Confusi sunt quia abominationem fecerunt quin potius confusione non sunt confusi et erubescere nescierunt quam ob rem cadent inter ruentes in tempore visitationis suae corruent dicit Dominus.”

English translation of CV: “They were confounded, because they committed abomination: yea, rather they were not confounded with confusion, and they knew not how to blush: wherefore they shall fall among them that fall: in the time of their visitation they shall fall down, saith the Lord.”

Septuagint: “Were they ashamed when they had committed abomination? Nay, they were not at all ashamed, neither could they blush: therefore they shall fall among them that fall: at the time that I visit them they shall be cast down, saith the Lord.”

Psalms 105:33:

Clementine Vulgate: “Quia exacerbaverunt spiritum eius et distinxit in labiis suis.”

English translation of CV: “Because they exasperated his spirit. And he distinguished with his lips.”

Septuagint: “For they provoked his [Moses’] spirit, and he spoke unadvisedly with his lips.”

Ecclesiasticus 18:21:

Clementine Vulgate: “Ante languorem humilia te et in tempore infirmitatum ostende conversationem tuam.”

English translation of CV: “Humble thyself before thou art sick, and in the time of sickness shew thy conversation.”

Septuagint: “Humble thyself before thou be sick, and in the time of sins shew repentance.”

Hebrews 9:9:

Clementine Vulgate: “Quae parabola est temporis instantis iuxta quam munera et hostiae offeruntur quae non possunt iuxta conscientiam perfectum facere servientem.”

English translation of CV: “Which is a parable of the time present: according to which gifts and sacrifices are offered, which cannot, as to the conscience, make him perfect that serveth, only in meats and in drinks.”

The Peshitto contains the correct text:

Peshitto: “Which was a figure for the time then present in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices that could not make him that did the service perfect as pertaining to the conscience which stood only in meats and drinks.”

James 1:18:

Clementine Vulgate: “Voluntarie genuit nos verbo veritatis ut simus initium aliquod creaturae eius.”

English translation of CV: “For of his own will hath he begotten us by the word of truth, that we might be some beginning of his creature.”

The Peshitto contains the correct text:

Peshitto: “For of his own will hath he begotten us by the word of truth that we might be the first fruits of his creatures.”

James 3:6:

Clementine Vulgate: “Et lingua ignis est universitas iniquitatis lingua constituitur in membris nostris quae maculat totum corpus et inflamat rotam nativitatis nostrae inflammata a gehenna.”

English translation of CV: “And the tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity. The tongue is placed among our members, which defileth the whole body and inflameth the wheel of our nativity, being set on fire by hell.”

The Peshitto contains the correct text:

Peshitto: “Now the tongue is a fire, and the world of sin is like a forest. And this tongue, which is one among our members, marreth our whole body; and it inflameth the series of our generations that roll on like a wheel; and it is itself on fire.”

Heretical or Otherwise Erroneous Texts Not Based on the Clementine Vulgate

In several places, the apostate Bishop Challoner’s revision of the Douay-Rheims Bible mistranslates the Clementine Vulgate, which the Douay-Rheims is based on:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, “Versions of the Bible”: “Dr. Challoner probably merits the credit of being the principal reviser of the Douai Version (1749-50); among the many other revisers we may mention Archbishop Kenrick, Dr. Lingard, Dr. John Gilmary Shea.”

English Bible Versions, by Rev. Henry Barker, M.A., 1907: “Dr. Challoner, coadjutor of the Vicar Apostolic of London, revised the Rhemish (N. T.) and Douay (O. T.) texts. The first edition of his New Testament was published in 1749 and the entire Bible in 1750. Challoner’s revision was so extensive as practically to form a new translation... Catholic Dictionary (No. 41, page 304) says:

‘A new epoch was made by Dr. Challoner who revised the Rheims and Douay Text, making alterations so many and so considerable, that he may really be considered the author of a new translation. His chief object seems to have been that of making the English Catholic Bible more intelligible, and in this he has succeeded, but “undoubtedly,” says Cardinal Newman, “he has sacrificed force and vividness in some of his changes.” He approximates, according to the same authority, to the Protestant version.’

“Further editions were published by Dr. Challoner as follows: New Testament, 1752, 1772, and 1777. Entire Bible, 1763-4. In these editions many variations occur. The notes are Dr. Challoner’s own. The original annotations of the New Testament and Dr. Worthington’s notes on the Old Testament have now disappeared. Dr. Challoner’s text was revised by the Rev. Mr. McMahon, a Dublin priest, at the request of Archbishop Troy of Dublin, and issued (N. T.) 1783, and (whole Bible) 1791. Carrying on the history, in 1794 the Bible, and in 1803 and 1810 the New Testament were reprinted in Challoner’s Version, which was also adopted in an edition published in Philadelphia in 1805.”²⁶

²⁶ Later Editions of the Douay Bible, pp. 160-161.

Some of Challoner's mistranslations of the Vulgate (which the Douay-Rheims is based on) are heretical. Hence these heresies and other errors are not found in the Clementine Vulgate but in Challoner's Bible. What follows are a few examples of many.

The idolatry of worshipping angels and men

The Latin words *adorate* and *colatis* have several meanings:

Latin Dictionary: "**Adorate.** honor, adore, worship, pay homage, reverence; beg, plead with, appeal to."

Latin Dictionary: "**Colatis.** honor, cherish, worship; tend, take care of; adorn, dress, decorate, embellish."

When the Latin words *adorate* or *colatis* mean veneration or honor, they can apply not only to God but also to creatures, as God must always be venerated and honored but certain creatures can also be venerated and honored, such as good secular or religious rulers, saints, and holy objects (the Holy Cross, relics of the saints, etc.).

However, if the Latin words *adorate* or *colatis* mean worship, then they can only apply to God because worship is the highest form of adoration, veneration, and honor and is given only to God. Hence it is idolatry to worship anything other than the one true God.

When the Clementine Vulgate and other Latin Bibles use the Latin words *adorate* or *colatis*, the English translation of the words must be based upon the context of the passage so as to avoid any idolatrous, heretical, or otherwise erroneous translation. Beware, then, of idolatrous English translations of the Latin words *adorate* and *colatis* to mean worship when directed to angels and men. Take the following two examples, out of many, from the Challoner Bible.

Challoner's idolatrous translation of Josue 5:15 has men worshipping angels

In the Challoner Bible, the English mistranslation of the Latin word *adorans* to mean worshipping in Josue 5:15 is idolatrous because it has God condoning the worship of a creature, in this case St. Michael the Archangel:

Clementine Vulgate: "Cecidit Josue pronus in terram et adorans ait quid dominus meus loquitur ad servum suum." (Jos. 5:15)

Challoner's mistranslation of the CV: "(Ver. 14) And he answered: No: but I am prince of the host of the Lord [St. Michael the Archangel], and now I am come. (Ver. 15) Josue fell on his face to the ground. And worshipping, said: What saith my lord to his servant?" (Jos. 5:15)

To not be idolatrous, the translation of the Clementine Vulgate should say "adoring," as the original Douay translates it. The following is a commentary from Douay on Josue 5:15 regarding the use of the word "adoring":

Douay-Rheims Commentary on Jos. 5: "Ver. 15. **Adoring.** Josue, knowing that the person which appeared was an angel and not God nor a man, neither adored him with godly honor, for that had been idolatry, nor with civil, for that pertaineth to worldly and temporal excellency and is not competent to sacred things, especially to immortal and glorious spirits; and therefore the honor he did to this angel was religious honor infinitely inferior to divine, and yet much greater than civil."

However, the Septuagint, as well as the Masoretic, does not contain the word "adore":

Septuagint: “And Joshua fell on his face upon the earth, and said to him, my lord, what commandest thou thy servant?” (Jos. 5:15)

Masoretic: “And he said: ‘Nay, but I am captain of the host of the Lord; I am now come.’ And Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and bowed down, and said unto him: ‘What saith my lord unto his servant?’ ” (Jos. 5:15)

Challoner’s idolatrous translation of Genesis 27:29 has men worshipping men

The Challoner Bible’s English mistranslation of the Latin word *adorate* to mean “worship” in Genesis 27:29 is idolatrous because it has God condoning worship given to a creature, in this case Jacob:

Clementine Vulgate: “Et serviant tibi populi et adorent te tribus...” (Gen. 27:29)

Challoner’s mistranslation of the CV: “And let peoples serve thee [Jacob], and tribes worship thee...” (Gen. 27:29)

To not be idolatrous, the translation of the Clementine Vulgate should say “and tribes adore thee.” However, the Septuagint, as well as the Masoretic, uses the words “bow down”:

Septuagint: “And let nations serve thee, and princes bow down to thee...” (Gen. 27:29)

Masoretic: “Let peoples serve thee, and nations bow down to thee...” (Gen. 27:29)

What follows are other idolatrous verses in the Challoner Bible that have human beings or angels being worshipped:

(Gen. 19:1) (Gen. 27:29) (Gen. 37:9) (Gen. 37:1) (Gen. 50:18) (Ex. 18:7) (Num. 22:31) (Jos. 5:15) (Ruth 2:10) (1 Ki. 24:9) (2 Ki. 9:6) (2 Ki. 14:4) (2 Ki. 24:21) (3 Ki. 1:16, 23, 31, 53) (4 Ki. 2:15) (4 Ki. 4:37) (1 Par. 29:20) (2 Par. 24:17) (Tob. 13:11-14) (Est. 3:2, 5) (Est. 8:17) (Est. 13:12) (Est. 16:11) (Isa. 49:23) (Isa. 60:14) (Dan. 2:46)

For more information, see RJMI article *On Worshipping, Adoring, and Bowing Down*.

The idolatry that God does not hold idolaters guilty (Acts 17:30)

Challoner’s mistranslation of the Vulgate’s Acts 17:30 says that God *winked* at the idolatry of the Gentiles during the Old Testament era and thus implies that God did not hold these idolaters guilty:

Challoner’s mistranslation of the CV: “And God indeed having winked at the times of this ignorance, now declareth unto men, that all should every where do penance.” (Acts 17:30)

The Clementine Vulgate says that God *despised* the ignorance of the idolaters:

Clementine Vulgate: “Et tempora quidem huius ignorantiae despiciens Deus nunc adnuntiat hominibus ut omnes ubique paenitentiam agant.” (Acts 17:30)

English translation of the CV: “And whereas God indeed despised the times of this ignorance, now he commandeth all men everywhere to repent.” (Acts 17:30)

The heresy that men are saved by following their own conscience (1 Cor. 4:4)

The heresy that men can be saved by following their own conscience makes no account of corrupt consciences, such as those who believe that rape, idolatry, and homosexuality are good. And it denies the dogma that to be saved men must have *informed* consciences, which can only be obtained by external revelations that teach the Catholic faith, which men must learn, believe, and obey in order to be saved. Hence it is a dogma that men are saved not by God conforming his conscience to men's consciences but by men conforming their consciences to God's conscience (to God's will).

Challoner's mistranslation of the Vulgate's 1 Corinthians 4:4 teaches the heresy that men are saved by following their own conscience:

Challoner's mistranslation of the CV: "For I am not conscious to myself of anything, yet am I not hereby justified..."

The Clementine Vulgate says the opposite, that just because a man has nothing on his conscience (and thus follows his own conscience) that does not mean that he is justified:

Clementine Vulgate: "Nihil enim mihi conscius sum sed non in hoc iustificatus sum qui autem iudicat me Dominus est." (1 Cor. 4:4)

English translation of the CV: "For I am not conscious to myself of anything, yet I am not hereby justified..." (1 Cor. 4:4)

This correct translation is used by all the Church Fathers and is in the Haydock and Confraternity Bibles:

St. Ambrose, *Ambrosiaster*, 4th century: "'I am not aware of anything against myself, but I am not thereby acquitted.'" (1 Cor. 4:4)"

St. Augustine: "'14. ... 'For I am conscious of nothing in myself, but I am not hereby justified.'" (1 Cor. 4:4)²⁷

Haydock Bible, 19th century: "For I am not conscious to myself of any thing: yet hereby I am not justified. (1 Cor. 4:4)"

Confraternity Bible, 1961: "For I have nothing on my conscience, yet I am not thereby justified. (1 Cor. 4:4)"

See in this book [The heresy that denies the Salvation Dogma](#), p. 62.

The heresy and blasphemy that Jesus was a malefactor (Lk. 23:32)

While Jesus was treated as a malefactor, he was *not* a malefactor. The Challoner's mistranslation of the Vulgate's Luke 23:32 says that Jesus was a malefactor along with the other two malefactors with whom Jesus was crucified:

Challoner's mistranslation of CV: "And there were also two other malefactors led with him [Jesus] to be put to death." (Lk 23:32)

The Clementine Vulgate says,

Clementine Vulgate: "Ducebantur autem et alii duo nequam cum eo ut interficerentur." (Lk 23:32)

English translation of CV: "And there were led also some others, two malefactors, with him [Jesus] to be put to death." (Lk 23:32)

²⁷ *Sermons on Selected Lessons of the New Testament*, Sermon 87 (137 Ben), The Tenth Chapter of The Gospel of John. Of the Shepherd and the Hireling.

Slaves not servants

The Latin word *servus* means slave or servant. A slave and a servant are not the same thing. A slave is the property of his master and hence cannot leave his master. A master has absolute power over the body and life of a slave. A servant is not the property of his master and hence can leave his master. A master does not have absolute power over the body and life of a servant. Hence the context must be taken into consideration when translating the Latin word *servus* into English.

The Challoner Bible in many places mistranslates the word *servus* as servant when in context it means slave. Challoner does so, no doubt, because he denies the dogma that slavery is not intrinsically evil and thus is good when God ordains it. He does not want the reader to believe that God's holy chosen people ordained slavery and thus had slaves.

For example, in Ecclesiasticus 7:22-23 *servus* means slave not servant. The Challoner Bible mistranslates it as servant. These verses speak of a slave and a hired man and say that the master has power to deprive the slave of necessities and liberty. Here is the correct translation:

“Hurt not the slave that worketh faithfully, nor the hired man that giveth thee his life. Let a wise slave be dear to thee as thy own soul, defraud him not of liberty, nor leave him needy.” (Eccus. 7:22-23)

In 1 Peter 2:18-20 *servus* means slave not servant. The Challoner Bible mistranslates it as servant. In these verses the slave is told to be subject to his master; whereas servants work for their masters but are not subject to them. And the master has power to inflict physical punishment upon a slave but not upon a servant. Here is the correct translation:

“Slaves be subject to your masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle but also to the froward. For this is thankworthy, if for conscience towards God, a man endure sorrows, suffering wrongfully. For what glory is it if committing sin, and being buffeted for it, you endure? But if doing well you suffer patiently, this is thankworthy before God.” (1 Pt. 2:18-20)

In Ephesians 6:5-8 *servus* means slave. The Challoner Bible mistranslates it as servant. In these verses the master has power over the slave's flesh, a power which a master does not have over a servant. And St. Paul calls the slave a bondman, which is another word for slave. Here is the correct translation:

“Slaves, be obedient to them that are your lords according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in the simplicity of your heart, as to Christ: Not serving to the eye, as it were pleasing men, but as the servants of Christ doing the will of God from the heart, with a good will serving, as to the Lord and not to men. Knowing that whatsoever good thing any man shall do, the same shall he receive from the Lord, whether he be bond or free.” (Eph. 6:5-8)

Dictionary: “**Bondman**. 1. A man slave, or one bound to service without wages.”

In 1 Timothy 6:1 *servus* means slave. The Challoner Bible mistranslates it as servant. The persons mentioned in this verse are under the yoke of their masters, owned by their masters, and thus are slaves and not servants. Here is the correct translation:

“Whosoever are slaves under the yoke, let them count their masters worthy of all honour, lest the name of the Lord and his doctrine be blasphemed.”

The very next verse teaches that Catholic masters may also have Catholic slaves:

“But they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren, but serve them the rather because they are faithful and beloved, who are partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort.” (1 Tim. 6:2)

In Jn. 8:34 *servus* means slave not servant. The Challoner Bible mistranslates it as servant. Here is the correct translation:

“Jesus answered them: Amen, amen, I say unto you: that whosoever committeth sin is the slave of sin.” (Jn. 8:34)

Any man who is guilty of original sin or mortal sin is a slave of Satan, not a servant. He is the property of Satan. Catechumens preparing to enter the Catholic Church must renounce Satan as their master. Other Bibles correctly translate *servus* as slave:

Confraternity Bible: “Jesus answered them, Amen, amen, I say to you, everyone who commits sin is a slave of sin.” (Jn. 8:34)

The main reason why *servus* is mistranslated as servant instead of slave is that most, if not all, of these translators deny the Catholic dogma on slavery. They believe the heresy that slavery under the New Covenant era is intrinsically evil and thus immoral. If that were true, then slavery would also have been intrinsically evil during the Old Testament era. This heresy began to make steady progress from the 16th century onward and is part of the idolization of human beings.

It is a dogma of both the ordinary and the solemn magisterium of the Catholic Church that slavery is not intrinsically evil, and hence there are reasons for slavery that are just. Slavery is ordained by God as a good thing in order to punish and humble the wicked and their offspring and to try the faithful. Slavery was taught and practiced by God’s Church during the Old and New Testament eras, by the Israelites and Catholics and by priests, prophets, popes, apostles, evangelists, disciples, and laymen.²⁸

Repentance not penance

The Latin word *paenitentia* (penitence) means repentance not penance:

Cassel’s Latin English Dictionary: “**paenitentia** –ae, f.: repentance, regret.”

The Latin word for penance or atonement is *piaculum*:

Cassel’s Latin English Dictionary: “**piaculum** –i, n.: a means of expiating or appeasing; sacrifice, remedy, punishment, atonement...”

A combination of words can be used also to describe penance, such as when St. Paul said, “*I chastise my body and bring it into subjection, lest perhaps when I have preached to others I myself should become a castaway.*” (1 Cor. 9:27)

Repentance and penance are two different things. One must first repent before he can do penance. When a Catholic goes to confession, he must first repent and confess his sin with a firm purpose of amendment (with a will not to commit the sin again) and only then is he given a penance to help expiate the punishment due to his confessed sin. If one does penance for a sin that he has not repented of and thus is still committing and hence with no purpose of amendment, then his penance is of no avail.

The Challoner Bible and many other nominal Catholic Bibles erroneously translate the Latin word *paenitentia*, as contained in the Clementine Vulgate, as penance. The correct translation is repentance, which in most cases is made clear by the context of the passage. For example, the Clementine Vulgate for Luke 17:3 is as follows:

Clementine Vulgate: “Adtendite vobis si peccaverit frater tuus increpa illum et si paenitentiam egerit dimitte illi.” (Lk. 17:3)

English translation: “Take heed to yourselves. If thy brother sin against thee, reprove him; and if he repent, forgive him.” (Lk. 17:3)

²⁸ See *RJMI Topic Index*: Slavery.

Challoner mistranslation of CV: “Take heed to yourselves. If thy brother sin against thee, reprove him; and if he do penance, forgive him.” (Lk. 17:3)

The next verse in the Challoner Bible (Lk. 17:4) translates *paenitet* correctly as “repent” and thus contradicts its translation of “do penance” in the previous verse (Lk. 17:3):

Clementine Vulgate: “Et si septies in die peccaverit in te et septies in die conversus fuerit ad te dicens paenitet me dimitte illi.” (Lk. 17:4)

Challoner correct translation of CV: “And if he sin against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day be converted unto thee, saying, I repent; forgive him.” (Lk. 17:4)

One must first repent before he can do penance. And one cannot do penance for a sin he does not acknowledge or has not repented of. Hence Jesus is teaching Catholics to forgive others who have repented from their sins. If Jesus meant penance, then he would have made no account of the need to repent. And Catholics would not be able to forgive others who have repented until they had completed their penance, which in many cases extends for a long period of time.

On Pentecost Day, St. Peter preached in order to convert unbelieving Jews. Logically, he would not have called them to do penance if they had not yet converted. First he called them to repent, and only then did he tell them they also needed to do penance.

St. Peter preached to them and baptized them on the same day. Hence if St. Peter had told them to “do penance and be baptized,” they would not have had the time to do penance before being baptized. Hence St. Peter told them to “repent and be baptized.” The Challoner Bible’s mistranslation of the Clementine Vulgate has St. Peter first calling them to do penance and mentions nothing of repentance:

Clementine Vulgate: “Petrus vero ad illos paenitentiam inquit agite et baptizetur unusquisque vestrum in nomine Iesu Christi in remissionem peccatorum vestrorum et accipietis donum Sancti Spiritus.” (Acts 2:38)

Challoner’s mistranslation of CV: “Therefore let all the house of Israel know most certainly that God hath made both Lord and Christ, this same Jesus, whom you have crucified. Now when they had heard these things, they had compunction in their heart and said to Peter and to the rest of the apostles: What shall we do, men and brethren? But Peter said to them: Do penance and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.” (Acts 2:36-38)

It would be heresy to baptize a person who did penance but did not repent and to say that his sins could be remitted, as this translation can be taken to mean. And these converts did not have time to do penance before they were baptized because they were baptized on the same day they repented. The correct translation, then, leaves no room for a heretical interpretation:

English translation of CV: “But Peter said to them: Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.” (Acts 2:38)

These are just two examples of many in which the context also proves the correct translation.

I believe that nominal Catholic theologians with stoic tendencies went too far, as they always do, and thus dishonestly mistranslated these verses to defend the dogma that Catholics must do penance to be saved. The end effect does not help defend the dogma but creates a scandal, undermines the dogma, and undermines the credibility of true Catholic theologians and true Catholic theology. Catholics do not need to mistranslate or misinterpret verses in order to defend the dogma that penance is necessary for salvation, nor to defend any other dogma.²⁹ When they do, they undermine all dogmas.

²⁹ See RJMI book *Penance Is Necessary for Salvation*.

More Heretical or Otherwise Erroneous Biblical Commentaries

Introduction

All of the nominal Catholic English Bibles I have access to contain idolatrous or heretical commentaries, some more than others, such as the original Douay-Rheims Bible, the Challoner Bible, the Haydock Bible, the Confraternity Bible, and the New American Bible.

In this chapter I will only list a few of the idolatries or heresies of the many, mostly from the Haydock and Challoner Bibles because I have not read all of the commentaries in the other Bibles.

Evidence

The heresy of respecting and condoning false religions

The following commentary idolatrously teaches that Jeroboam's setting up of two calves to be worshipped in the Northern Kingdom of Israel was right and thus good. And it teaches the idolatry and heresy that all religions (and thus even false religions) promote a spirit of concord and peace and thus implies that Jeroboam was wise and right to set up a new religion and the two calves to worship:

“And finding out a device he made two golden calves, and said to them: Go ye up no more to Jerusalem: Behold thy gods, O Israel, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt... And he appointed a feast in the eighth month, on the fifteenth day of the month, after the manner of the feast that was celebrated in Juda. And going up to the altar, he did in like manner in Bethel, to sacrifice to the calves, which he had made: and he placed in Bethel priests of the high places, which he had made.” (3 Ki. 12:28, 32)

Haydock Commentary on 3 Ki. 12: “Ver. 28. **Device.** ...Jeroboam was right in judging, (H.) that it is one of the strongest foundations of government, (C.) and therefore he would have a peculiar religion for his subjects. H...”

Haydock Commentary on 3 Ki. 12: “Ver. 32. **Day.** ...Religious assemblies tend greatly to promote the spirit of concord and peace. ”

The stoic heresy

The following commentaries support the stoic heresy which condemns as evil or at least abhors the flesh, the material world, and good passions. The ideal state for the stoic is a passionless person who is more akin to a robot than to a living creature.³⁰

The following commentaries teach that God has no passions:

“But the Lord shall laugh at him: for he foreseeth that his day shall come.” (Ps. 36:13)

Haydock Commentary on Ps. 36: “Ver. 13. **Laugh.** This expression is often used to denote the triumph of divine justice, whose day will set all right... —God cannot indeed mock at any one. C.”

³⁰ See RJMI book *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics: The Stoic and Epicurean Philosophies.*

“I also will laugh in your destruction, and will mock when that shall come to you which you feared.” (Prv. 1:26)

Haydock Commentary on Prv. 1: “Ver. 26. **Mock.** God is too much above us to act thus; but he will treat us as an enraged enemy. C.”

“O Lord, rebuke me not in thy indignation, nor chastise me in thy wrath.” (Ps. 6:2)

Haydock Commentary on Ps. 6: “Ver. 2. **Indignation.** Lit. ‘fury.’ H. —Such strong expressions were requisite to make the carnal Jews fear God’s judgments, though a being of infinite perfection can have no passion.”

The stoic-influenced error that Abisag was David’s wife

Beware of the stoic commentary that has Abisag as David’s wife or concubine because Abisag slept in David’s bed to keep him warm when he was sick and dying:

“Now king David was old, and advanced in years: and when he was covered with clothes, he was not warm. His servants therefore said to him: Let us seek for our lord the king a young virgin, and let her stand before the king, and cherish him, and sleep in his bosom, and warm our lord the king. So they sought a beautiful young woman in all the coasts of Israel, and they found Abisag a Sunamitess, and brought her to the king. And the damsel was exceeding beautiful, and she slept with the king and served him, but the king did not know her.” (3 Ki. 1:1-4)

Haydock Commentary on 3 Ki. 1: “Ver. 4. **Her.** Which shews the virtue and temperance of David. —She was his wife, at least of a secondary order.”

Nowhere in these verses does it say that Abisag was David’s wife or concubine. Instead, it said she was a virgin. If she had been his wife or concubine, she would not have remained a virgin. This verse was influenced by stoics who believe it is evil simply to look upon, talk with, or touch any woman other than one’s wife.

The heresy that slavery is intrinsically evil

Slavery is not intrinsically evil. God ordains slavery for just causes, such as to punish evildoers or to test the faithful.³¹ Beware, then, of the heretical commentaries that condemn slavery as intrinsically evil and thus as something that must be eradicated:

“Slaves, be obedient to them that are your lords according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in the simplicity of your heart, as to Christ: Not serving to the eye, as it were pleasing men, but, as the servants of Christ doing the will of God from the heart, with a good will serving, as to the Lord, and not to men. Knowing that whatsoever good thing any man shall do, the same shall he receive from the Lord, whether he be bond, or free.” (Eph. 6:5-8)

Confraternity Commentary on Eph. 6: “Ver. 5-8. St. Paul does not laud slavery as an institution, but in the circumstances he exhorts those already slaved to humble acceptance of it in corporal activity for a supernatural motive.”

“But as the Lord hath distributed to every one, as God hath called every one, so let him walk: and so in all churches I teach. Is any man called, being circumcised? Let him not procure uncircumcision. Is any man called in uncircumcision? Let him not be circumcised. Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing: but the

³¹ See *RJMI Topic Index*: Slavery.

observance of the commandments of God. Let every man abide in the same calling in which he was called.” (1 Cor. 7:17-20)

Haydock Commentary on 1 Cor. 7: “Ver. 17. ...If any one that is converted was a bond-man, or a slave, let him not be concerned at this, but use it rather, which many interpret, let him rather endeavour to be made free, though Chrys. and others understand, let him rather remain content with his servile condition.”

And the Challoner Bible in many places mistranslates the word *servus* as servant when in context it means slave. He does so, no doubt, because he denies the dogma that slavery is not intrinsically evil and thus is good when God ordains it. He does not want the reader to believe that God’s holy chosen people ordained slavery and thus had slaves.³²

The heresy that denies the power of the Devil

Beware of the heresy which teaches that the devil does not have the power to do evil things that are above the understanding of men, such as to divine and foretell the future³³:

“And it came to pass, as we went to prayer, a certain girl, having a pythonical spirit, met us, who brought to her masters much gain by divining.” (Acts 16:16)

Challoner Commentary on Acts 16: “Ver. 16. **A pythonical spirit.** That is, a spirit pretending to divine and tell fortunes.”

Haydock Commentary on Acts 16: “Ver. 16. **A pythonical spirit.** A spirit pretending to divination, to tell secrets, and things to come. Wi. —A divining spirit, which pretended to foretell things to come.”

The heresy that anger is intrinsically evil

Beware of the commentaries that teach the heresy that anger is intrinsically evil and hence condemn righteous and thus justified anger³⁴:

“My son, reject not the correction of the Lord: and do not faint when thou art chastised by him...” (Prv. 3:11)

Haydock Commentary on Prv. 3: “Ver. 11. **Him.** Correction is rather a proof of love than of anger. C.”

“And I brought him to thy disciples, and they could not cure him. Then Jesus answered and said: O unbelieving and perverse generation, how long shall I be with you? How long shall I suffer you? Bring him hither to me.” (Mt. 17:15-16)

Haydock Commentary on Mt. 17: “Ver. 15. ...We must not imagine that our Saviour, who was meekness and mildness itself, uttered on this occasion words of anger and intemperance.”

Implies that Jesus and Mary sinned

The following commentary implies that Jesus and Mary sinned when it says that they suffered “more than they deserved.” The fact is that they did not deserve to suffer at all but did so in order that men could be redeemed:

³² See in this book [Slaves not servants](#), p. 51.

³³ See *RJMI Topic Index: Signs and Wonders*.

³⁴ See *RJMI Topic Index: Anger*.

Haydock Commentary on Job 6: “Ver. 3. **Heavier.** ...Job intimates that the punishment was incomparably greater than his sins. As he and other saints, particularly our Saviour and the Blessed Virgin, have thus patiently suffered more than they had deserved... W.”

The error that non-sinful falsehoods are sinful

The following commentaries teach the error that all falsehoods are lies and thus sinful. The truth is that non-sinful falsehoods are not lies and can even be good and necessary³⁵:

“Thou hast deceived me, O Lord, and I am deceived: thou hast been stronger than I, and thou hast prevailed. I am become a laughing stock all the day, all scoff at me.” (Jer. 20:7)

Challoner Bible on Jer. 20: “Ver. 7. **Thou hast deceived:** The meaning of the prophet is not to charge God with any untruth; but what he calls deceiving was only the concealing from him, when he accepted of the prophetic commission, the greatness of the evils which the execution of that commission was to bring upon him.”

“And David said to Achimelech the priest: The king hath commanded me a business, and said: Let no man know the thing for which thou art sent by me, and what manner of commands I have given thee: and I have appointed my servants to such and such a place.” (1 Ki. 21:2)

Haydock Commentary on 1 Ki. 21: “Ver. 2. **The king, &c.** This was an untruth, which David, like many other great men, might think lawful in such an emergency. But it is essentially evil. C.”

“And she answered: I am a daughter of the Hebrews, and I am fled from them because I knew they would be made a prey to you, because they despised you, and would not of their own accord yield themselves, that they might find mercy in your sight.” (Judi. 10:12)

Haydock Commentary on Judi. 10: “Ver. 12. **Because I knew, &c.** In this and the following chapter, some things are related to have been said by Judith which seem hard to reconcile with truth. But all that is related in Scripture of the servants of God is not approved by the Scripture: and even the saints in their enterprises may sometimes slip into venial sins. Ch.”

“But Sisara fleeing came to the tent of Jahel the wife of Haber the Cinite, for there was peace between Jabin the king of Asor and the house of Haber the Cinite.” (Jdg. 4:17)

Haydock Commentary on Jdg. 4: “Ver. 17. **Tent.** ...What then must we think of the conduct of his wife? Commentators generally justify her, as the Scripture gives her great commendations, and as the family of the Cinites enjoyed the religion and privileges of the Israelites... Jahel might however deserve the praise of fortitude, which the Scripture gives her, and yet mingle some human imperfection in her manner of acting. She seems to speak with fraud, and to betray the sacred rights of hospitality... —Yet, if she told a lie, it was only an officious one, (M.) such as Sisara desired should be told for his safety. H.”

In order to defend their error that all falsehoods are sinful and thus lies, the following commentaries pretend by absurd arguments that falsehoods were not told; when in fact falsehoods were told but they were non-sinful falsehoods and thus not lies. Hence these commentaries

³⁵ See *RJMI Topic Index: Lies Are Sinful Falsehoods*.

themselves are lies, sinful falsehoods, which they told in order to defend their error that all falsehoods are lies or otherwise sinful.

In the following verse the Prophet Eliseus told two non-sinful falsehoods. After God blinded the enemies of Eliseus, the prophet deceived them by telling them a falsehood that the way to Dothan was not the way to Dothan. And he told them that he was not Eliseus and thus told them another falsehood:

“And the enemies came down to him, but Eliseus prayed to the Lord, saying: Strike, I beseech thee, this people with blindness. And the Lord struck them with blindness, according to the word of Eliseus. And Eliseus said to them: This is not the way, neither is this the city: follow me, and I will shew you the man whom you seek. So he led them into Samaria.” (4 Ki. 6:18-19)

The commentary pretends that these were not falsehoods by saying that Eliseus was speaking about what the men saw and not about what was true, which is contrary to the clear words of Scripture which nowhere say that Eliseus was speaking of what the men saw and not what was true:

Haydock Commentary on 4 Ki. 6: “Ver. 18. **Blindness.** The blindness here spoken of was of a particular kind, which hindered them from seeing the objects that were really before them; and represented other different objects to their imagination; so that they no longer perceived the city of Dothan, nor were able to know the person of Eliseus; but were easily led by him, whom they took to be another man, to Samaria. So that he truly told them; this is not the way, neither is this the city, &c., because he spoke with relation to the way and to the city which was represented to them.”

The following verse in the Challoner Bible mistranslates the Latin word *mendax* to mean “lying” instead of “false”:

Clementine Vulgate: “Et ille ait egrediar et ero spiritus mendax in ore omnium prophetarum eius et dixit Dominus decipies et praevaleris egredere et fac ita.” (3 Ki. 22:22)

Challoner’s mistranslation of CV: “And he said: I will go forth, and be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And the Lord said: Thou shalt deceive him, and shalt prevail: go forth, and do so.” (3 Ki. 22:22)

The Latin word *mendax* has several meanings:

Latin Dictionary: “**mendax**: lying, false; deceitful; counterfeit.”

The Septuagint uses the correct word “false” instead of “lying”:

“And there came forth a spirit and stood before the Lord, and said, I will deceive him. And the Lord said to him, Whereby? And he said, I will go forth, and will be a false spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And he said, Thou shalt deceive him, yea, and shalt prevail: go forth, and do so. And now, behold, the Lord has put a false spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets, and the Lord has spoken evil against thee.” (3 Ki. 22:21-23)

This is important because God never lies but does tell and condone non-sinful falsehoods. Hence God allowed a good angel to put a false spirit, not a lying spirit, in the mouths of the prophets who were worthy of being deceived. However, commentaries on the corrupted text which have “a lying spirit” say that God allowed the devil to deceive the prophets who were worthy of being deceived:

Douay-Rheims Commentary on 3 Ki. 22: “Ver. 22. The coherence of the text showeth that God only permitted, but commanded not, the Devil to deceive Achab.”

Haydock Commentary on 3 Ki. 22: “Ver. 22. **Go forth, and do so.** This was not a command but a permission; for God never ordaineth lies, though he often permitteth the lying spirit to deceive those who love not the truth. And in this sense it is said in the following verse, The Lord hath given a lying spirit in the mouth of all thy prophets... The devils can do nothing without such a permission. Achab deserved to be deceived by the false prophets, as he would not hearken to a true one.”

It is not that God does not give permission to devils to deceive people. He does, as devils can do nothing without God’s permission. However, the point is that the main purpose of the mistranslation and commentaries on it was to defend the error that God never tells or condones any falsehoods and thus good angels and holy men never tell any falsehoods and thus not even non-sinful falsehoods.

What follows is a commentary on 3 Ki. 21:23 from my book *A Lie Is a Sinful Falsehood*:

“God can deceive evildoers by commanding a good angel to deceive them by putting a false prophecy in their hearts and mouths... This ‘false spirit’ that the good angel put in the heart and mouth of the false prophets (which is called a ‘lying spirit’ in the Vulgate) was a non-sinful falsehood because the cause was just, to deceive the false prophets who were worthy of being deceived, and the falsehood was not intrinsically sinful. It was a factual error.”

And God can deceive his friends (men who are just) with non-sinful deceptions or evasions to protect them from information they should not know. Jesus deceived the Apostles by telling them that he was not going up to a feast in Jerusalem, but he went up anyway:

“[Jesus said to the Apostles:] Go you up to this feast, but I go not up to this feast because my time is not accomplished. When he had said these things, he himself stayed in Galilee. But after his brethren were gone up, then he also went up to the feast, not openly, but, as it were, in secret. The Jews therefore sought him on the festival day, and said: Where is he? And there was much murmuring among the multitude concerning him. For some said: He is a good man. And others said: No, but he seduceth the people. Yet no man spoke openly of him for fear of the Jews. Now about the midst of the feast, Jesus went up into the temple, and taught.” (Jn. 7:8-14)

Because Jesus is God and thus knew all along that he was going to go up to the feast, it cannot be said that he believed he was not going up to the feast but changed his mind and then went, for all things are known to the Lord God, past, present, and to come. Jesus deceived his Apostles because he wanted to go up to the feast secretly and only reveal himself at the middle of the feast. Beware, then, of the commentaries that pretend that Jesus did not tell a falsehood. They make excuses that contradict the clear words of the scriptures. For example,

Haydock Commentary on Jn. 7: “Ver. 8. Go you up to this festival day, which lasted eight days. I go not with you, nor to be there at the first day, nor in that public manner as you desire. But when the feast was half over, about the fourth day, Jesus went thither in a private manner, yet so that when he arrived, he spoke publicly in the temple. Wi.”

Haydock Commentary on Jn. 7: “Ver. 10. But why does he ascend to the festival day when he said he would not? He did not say, I will not ascend, but only, I do not ascend; that is, in your company. Or, I do not go up to this festival, viz., the first or second day of the feast, which lasted eight days, and to which you wish me to ascend; but he went afterwards when the first part of the festival was over.”

Jesus did not say that he would “not go up with the Apostles” nor that he would “not go up to the first day of the feast.” He said, “Go you up to this feast, but I go not up to this feast because my time is not accomplished.” Hence he said that he would not go up to this feast at all.

Consequently the commentary lies (tells a sinful falsehood) by putting words in the text that do not exist.

The heresy that denies dreams from God

Dreams can come from God, the Devil, or simply from man's emotions. Beware, then, of commentaries that deny the dogma that dreams can come from God and thus be godly dreams, or that deny the dogma that God, as well as the Devil, can foretell future events in dreams:

“They answered: We have dreamed a dream, and there is nobody to interpret it to us. And Joseph said to them: Doth not interpretation belong to God? Tell me what you have dreamed.” (Gen. 40:8)

Haydock Commentary on Gen. 40: “Ver. 8. Physicians indeed sometimes form some judgment of the nature of a distemper from dreams; on which subject, Hippocrates and Galen have written. But to pretend to discover by them the future actions of free agents would be superstitious.”

However, the first part of this commentary is correct:

Haydock Commentary on Gen. 40: “Ver. 8. Doth not interpretation belong to God? When dreams are from God, as these were, the interpretation of them is a gift of God. But the generality of dreams are not of this sort but either proceed from the natural complexions and dispositions of persons, or the roving of their imaginations in the day on such objects as they are much affected with, or from their mind being disturbed with cares and troubles and oppressed with bodily infirmities; or they are suggested by evil spirits to flatter or to terrify weak minds in order to gain belief and so draw them into error or superstition; or at least to trouble them in their sleep, whom they cannot move when they are awake: so that the general rule with regard to dreams is not to observe them nor to give any credit to them. Ch.”

The heresy that the sodomites killed in Sodom will not be condemned to hell

“What do ye devise against the Lord? He will make an utter end: there shall not rise a double affliction.” (Nahu. 1:9)

Haydock Commentary on Nahu. 1: “Ver. 9. **Affliction.** ... Many hence infer that those who have been slain by God, like the Sodomites, &c. will not be condemned to hell.”

The heresy of heliocentrism

The following commentaries doubt or deny the dogma of Geocentrism and thus are heretical:

“Then Josue spoke to the Lord, in the day that he delivered the Amorrhite in the sight of the children of Israel, and he said before them: Move not, O sun, toward Gabaon, nor thou, O moon, toward the valley of Ajalon.” (Jos. 10:12)

Haydock Commentary on Jos. 10:12: “... It is not material whether the sun turn round the earth, or the contrary. H. The Hebrews generally supposed that the earth was immovable; and on this idea Josue addresses the sun. Philosophers have devised various intricate systems: but the Scripture is expressed in words suitable to the conceptions of the people. The exterior effect would be the same, whether the sun or the earth stood still.”

“His going out is from the end of heaven, and his circuit even to the end thereof: and there is no one that can hide himself from his heat.” (Ps. 18:7)

Haydock Commentary on Ps. 18: “Ver. 7. **Circuit.** ...may insinuate that the sun is found in the centre while the earth moves daily and yearly round it, according to the Copernican system.”

“Who hast founded the earth upon its own bases: it shall not be moved for ever and ever.” (Ps. 103:5)

Haydock Commentary on Ps. 103: “Ver. 5. **Ever.** The established order shall subsist, though the earth may move.”

“The Lord hath reigned, he is clothed with beauty: the Lord is clothed with strength, and hath girded himself. For he hath established the world which shall not be moved.” (Ps. 92:1)

Haydock Commentary on Ps. 92: “Ver. 1. **Not be moved:** ...Moved, or disturbed in the order established by him. H. —This does not prove that the earth moves not on its own axis daily, and round the sun every year. Bert.”

The heresy that there is no pain after death for the damned

The following commentary teaches the heresy that pain ends for all men when they die and thus denies the dogma that men in hell suffer pain:

“But yet thou stretchest not forth thy hand to their consumption: and if they shall fall down thou wilt save.” (Job 30:24)

Haydock Commentary on Job 30: “Ver. 24. **Consumption.** ...The grave is more desirable than such a life. There the dead are freed from the miseries of this world. C.”

The heresy that denies the Salvation Dogma

The Salvation Dogma teaches that outside the Catholic Church there is no salvation and thus only members of the Catholic Church can be in the way of salvation. And only those who die as good members are saved. Hence all who die as non-members of the Catholic Church are not saved and thus are forever damned to hell—such as those who die worshipping a false god or gods; believing in or practicing a false religion; adhering to a false church or sect; believing in no god or religion; as formal heretics, as formal schismatics, as pre-catechumens, or as catechumens.

The following commentaries deny in one way or another the Salvation Dogma:

“And being but one, she can do all things: and remaining in herself the same, she reneweth all things, and through nations conveyeth herself into holy souls, she maketh the friends of God and prophets.” (Wis. 7:27)

Haydock Commentary on Wis. 7: “Ver. 27. **Prophets.** ...The philosophers also knew God....”

“Then Herod perceiving that he was deluded by the wise men was exceeding angry, and sending killed all the men children that were in Bethlehem and in all the borders thereof, from two years old and under, according to the time which he had diligently inquired of the wise men.” (Mt. 2:16)

Haydock Commentary on Mt. 2: “Ver. 16. ...these holy Innocents have been honoured as martyrs, and their holyday kept ever since the apostles’ time, although

they died not voluntarily, nor all, perhaps, circumcised, and some even children of pagans. B.”

Douay-Rheims Commentary on Mt. 2: “Ver. 16. ...these holy Innocents have been honored for Martyrs, and their holy day kept ever since the apostles’ time, although they died not voluntarily, nor all perhaps circumcised and some the children of Pagans.”

“I wonder that you are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ, unto another gospel. Which is not another, only there are some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.” (Gal. 1:6-7)

Haydock Commentary on Gal. 1: “Ver. 6-7. ...the Catholic Church, out of which there is no salvation, unless perhaps through ignorance.”

The following commentaries deny the Salvation Dogma by teaching the heresy that men sin every time they do not follow their conscience. And thus, by implication, they teach the heresy that men do not sin every time they follow their conscience and thus men can be saved by following their own conscience:

“I know, and am confident in the Lord Jesus, that nothing is unclean of itself; but to him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean... But he that discerneth, if he eat, is condemned; because not of faith. For all that is not of faith is sin.” (Rom. 14:14, 23)

Haydock Commentary on Rom. 14: “Ver. 23. ...For whatever a man doth, and is not according to what he believeth he may do, or whatever is against a man’s conscience, is sinful in him... —Of faith. By faith is here understood judgment and conscience: to act against which is always a sin. Ch.”

Douay-Rheims Commentary on Rom. 14: “Ver. 23. He that discerneth. ...Everything that a man doeth against his knowledge or conscience is a sin...”

See in this book [The heresy that men are saved by following their own conscience \(1 Cor. 4:4\)](#), p. 51.

Heresies regarding the Old and New Testament eras

Beware of the commentaries that teach heresies regarding the Old and New Testament eras, which consist of the following:

- The heresy that the Old Testament elect were weak, carnal, un-virtuous, unholy, imperfect, and barbarians because they enjoyed the material world and good passions and that the New Testament elect are the only ones who are strong, spiritual, virtuous, holy, perfect, and civilized because they supposedly hate the material world and the passions. Hence this heresy believes that Jesus came to eventually abolish the material world and the passions and replace them with a passionless, formless, spiritual world.
- The heresy that Jesus gives Christians special graces to live a perfect and holy life and that he did not give these graces to the Old Testament elect, which thus presents God as the author of sin.
- The heresy that the Old Testament elect were under the “law of fear” but not under the “law of love” whereas the New Testament elect are under the “law of love” but not the “law of fear.”

- The heresy that God hates or despises the Jewish race while he loves the Gentile races.

For evidence of the heretical commentaries, see RJMI book *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics: The Stoic and Epicurean Philosophies: Stoic heresy that the Old Testament elect were unholy barbarians*. The following heretical commentaries are not in that book as of 3/2020. Hence I will list them here:

The following commentaries teach the heresies that God is not to be feared during the New Covenant era and that there was no love and mercy during the Old Covenant era. Hence they present the God of the Old Testament as a merciless, loveless maniac, and the God of the New Testament as a mushy, non-judgmental, non-punishmental teddy bear. And, hence, they also present God as a hypocrite or schizophrenic:

“And so terrible was that which was seen, Moses said: I am frightened, and tremble. But you are come to mount Sion, and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to the company of many thousands of angels...” (Heb. 12:21-22)

Haydock Commentary on Heb. 12: “Ver. 22. But you are come to Mount Sion, where not a law of fear, like that of Moses, but a new law of love and mercy hath been given you, preached by our Saviour himself, and by his apostles, testified by the coming of the Holy Ghost, and by the effusion of God’s spirit upon the believers...Wi.”

“The son honoureth the father, and the servant his master: if then I be a father, where is my honour? and if I be a master, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts.” (Mala. 1:6)

Haydock Commentary on Mala. 1: “Ver. 6. ...The old law was a law of fear. C.”

“And Elias answering, said to the captain of fifty: If I be a man of God, let fire come down from heaven, and consume thee, and thy fifty. And there came down fire from heaven, and consumed him, and the fifty that were with him.” (4 Ki. 1:10)

Haydock Commentary on 4 Ki. 1: “Ver. 10. **Let fire, &c.** ...He [Jesus] came to display the spirit of mildness, (C.) to attract all to his holy religion; while Elias had manifested the severity of the divine judgments, conformably to the law of terror, under which he lived. H.”

“And after the earthquake a fire: the Lord is not in the fire, and after the fire a whistling of a gentle air.” (3 Ki. 19:12)

Haydock Commentary on 3 Ki. 19: “Ver. 12. ...The Lord was pleased to shew his prophet the difference between the two laws: the one was full of terror, the other of mildness. Grotius. —He insinuated likewise, that he could easily exterminate the offenders, but he chose to bear patiently with them; (T.) and taught his prophet to moderate his zeal, and, after terrifying sinners, to bring them to a sense of their duty by gentle means. Sanctius. C. —His spirit is most indulgent and mild.”

“For whosoever are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.” (Rom. 8:14)

Haydock Commentary on Rom. 8: “Ver. 14. &c. ...Under the former law of Moses, God rather governed his people by fear... Wi. ...In the Old Testament...God rather governed his people by fear of punishments, and promises of temporal blessings, but not in that particular manner as in the new law. Wi.”

The following commentary teaches that injustice prevailed only during the Old Testament era and thus not during the New Testament era:

Haydock Commentary on Isa. 23: “Ver. 17. **Commit.** ... Great injustice prevailed formerly among merchants, so that it is represented as a dishonest calling. H.”

The following commentary teaches the heresy that God *tolerated* the Old Testament sacrifices and thus they were sinful because only sinful things are tolerated, not good things:

“To what purpose do you offer me the multitude of your victims, saith the Lord? I am full, I desire not holocausts of rams, and fat of fatlings, and blood of calves, and lambs, and buck goats.” (Isa. 1:11)

Haydock Commentary on Isa. 1: “Ver. 11. **Victims.** ...God tolerated bloody victims to withdraw the people from idolatry, but he often shewed that they were not of much importance, in order that they might be brought to offer the sacrifice of the new law, which eminently includes all the rest. Theod.”

Both the sacrifice of the Old Law and that of the New Law (the Holy Mass) do not benefit those who offered or offer them in sin or without piety. Hence this commentary pretends that all who offer the Holy Mass are holy and pious.

The following commentary teaches the heresy that the teachings of the prophets during the Old Testament era were not wise and understandable but abstruse as opposed to the New Testament teachers:

“For this is the testament which I will make to the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord: I will give my laws into their mind, and in their heart will I write them: and I will be their God, and they shall be my people...” (Heb. 8:10)

Haydock Commentary on Heb. 8: “Ver. 10. ...So great is the efficacy of this divine teacher, that by means of a short and easy catechism, children are now taught to know God more perfectly than the first sages of antiquity by their abstruse and erudite disquisitions.”

It is the Anti-Church Fathers’ and scholastics’ teachings during the New Testament era that are abstruse, not wise and understandable, and not the teachings of the Old Testament prophets such as Jesus, son of Sirach, and Isaias.

The following commentaries teach the heresy that the Old Testament elect were not given the graces and helps they needed to be perfect and holy and thus were not as good as the New Testament elect, which makes God the author of sin:

“Now if the ministration of death, engraven with letters upon stones, was glorious; so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses, for the glory of his countenance, which is made void...” (2 Cor. 3:7)

Haydock Commentary on 2 Cor. 3: “Ver. 7. **Now if the ministration of death:** he meaneth the former law, which by giving them a greater knowledge, and not giving graces of itself to fulfill those precepts, occasioned death, was notwithstanding glorious...Wi. ...The law of Moses, written on tables of stone,...was only able to cause death, inasmuch as it gave us light sufficient to know what was right, though it did not give us strength or graces to comply with the obligations imposed by it;... Calmet.”

“And of his fullness we all have received, and grace for grace. For the law was given by Moses; grace and truth [the reality] came by Jesus Christ.” (Jn. 1:16-17)

Lapide Commentary, on Jn. 1: “Ver. 16. *For the law was given by Moses, &c.* He gives the reason why through Christ we have received *grace for grace*. It is because Moses, who was the Jews’ greatest prophet and lawgiver, could only give a law which taught and commanded the precepts of God, but could not bestow grace to keep those commandments. Hence the need of Christ to give grace to fulfill the law.”

If there were no grace at all during the Old Testament era, then God’s chosen people would not have been able to be good at all but purely evil. And if there were no truth during the Old

Testament era, then all of the teachings of God's faithful chosen people during the Old Testament era would have been lies and falsehoods. Hence the words "grace" and "truth" in Jn. 1:17 must be taken in context with other verses in the Bible that teach that there were grace and truth during the Old Testament era and hence there were men during the Old Testament era who were faithful and holy. The word "grace" in John 1:17 means sanctifying grace, not actual grace, because actual grace was given to the Old Testament elect so that they could be holy. The following is a quote from my book *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics*:

"The difference between the Old and New Testament elect is sanctifying grace: What, then, was the great difference between the Old and New Testament elect? While God gave the same actual graces and other helps to the Old and New Testament elect to be holy and perfect, the Old Testament elect did not have sanctifying grace and thus their forgiven sins were covered but not remitted. Whereas the New Testament elects' sins are forgiven and remitted by sanctifying grace, which was made available for the first time by the sacrificial death of Jesus Christ. That is the great difference between the Old Testament elect and the New Testament elect. That is why the Old Testament elect were detained in the Limbo of the Fathers, which is the highest level of hell. They did not get their forgiven sins remitted and thus enter heaven until Christ died on the holy cross. Whereas, holy and perfect men who die during the New Testament era have all their sins forgiven and remitted and thus enter heaven. The great difference, then, is that Jesus Christ opened heaven to the elect and made their souls completely justified by remitting their forgiven sins.³⁶ Hence if a true Church Father or other Catholic were to teach that the New Testament elect are more perfect than the Old Testament elect, he would mean it in this sense but not in the sense that the Old Testament elect could not have become just as holy and perfect in their beliefs and way of life as the New Testament elect.³⁷"

The word "truth" in John 1:17, which is more accurately translated in the Peshitto as "the reality," means Jesus Christ himself who is the fulfillment of the law. The Old Law foretold and symbolized many things concerning Christ, while the New Law gives us Christ himself, the truth, the reality, that the Old Law promised would come and paved the road for. "*Jesus saith to him: I am the way, and the truth, and the life.*" (Jn. 14:6)

The following commentaries teach the heresy that the holiest Israelites during the Old Covenant era were not nearly as holy as the worst of Christians:

Haydock Commentary on Soph. 3: "Ver. 9. ...The synagogue was never so pure as the Christian Church, even in the worst times. C."

Haydock Commentary on Soph. 3: "Ver. 13. ...The synagogue was far from the perfection of the primitive Christianity, or even from that of many pious souls in these days of relaxation... C."

The following two commentaries teach the heresy that God's chosen people during the New Testament era do not fall into idolatry as did his chosen people during the Old Testament era:

"And a path and a way shall be there, and it shall be called the holy way: the unclean shall not pass over it, and this shall be unto you a straight way, so that fools shall not err therein." (Isa. 35:8)

Haydock Commentary on Isa. 35: "Ver. 8. **Way**, leading to Jerusalem. Idolaters, &c. shall not be there, (Isa. 52:1). This was only verified (C.) in the Catholic Church, where, though some wicked may be found, the truth still prevails... H. —This Church is unspotted, {Eph. 5:27}. C."

³⁶ See RJMI *Topic Index*: Justification during the Old and New Testament Eras.

³⁷ See RJMI book *Baptism Controversy Revision*: Old Testament Elect Were Partially Justified.

“And idols shall be utterly destroyed.” (Isa. 2:18)

Haydock Commentary on Isa. 2: “Ver. 18. **Destroyed.** This was verified by the establishment of Christianity. And by this and other texts of the like nature, the wild system of some modern sectaries is abundantly confuted, who charge the whole Christian Church with worshipping idols, for many ages. Ch. —Yea, for above a thousand years, while she still professed the name of Christ. W.”

While the Catholic Church is unspotted, her members can be very spotted, very evil, and even fall away by heresy or idolatry, just as had happened during the Old Testament era. This heretical commentary lies by pretending that Catholics do not fall into idolatry in spite of the abundant evidence that proves otherwise, especially since the beginning of the Great Apostasy in 1033. See RJMI books *The Great Apostasy* and *The Desecration of Catholic Places*.

The heresy that idolatry was tolerated among the faithful during the Old Testament era

The following commentary teaches the heresy that idolatry was tolerated among the faithful during the Old Testament era. It is one thing, and allowable, to tolerate idolatry among pagans; but quite another, and heresy, to teach that the faithful tolerated idolatry among the faithful:

“And I will destroy the cities of thy land, and will throw down all thy strong holds, and I will take away sorceries out of thy hand, and there shall be no divinations in thee.” (Mich. 5:11)

Haydock Commentary on Mich. 5: “Ver. 11. **Sorceries.** The Jews after their return abstained more from such things; but not like the Church of Christ, in which idols and dealings with the devil have never been tolerated.”

While it is true that the Church of Christ (the true Catholic Church) has never tolerated idols and dealings with the devil among the faithful, it is not true but idolatrous to believe that the same did not also apply to the Church and faithful during the Old Testament era. And what makes this commentary even worse is that it portrays the faithful under the New Testament as not prone to falling into idolatry while the Old Testament faithful were. This lie is easily exposed by looking at the history of how many Catholics fell away from the faith either by idolatry or heresy—just as many and maybe even more than fell away during the Old Testament era.³⁸

The idolatry of glorifying mythology or philosophy

Some commentaries idolize mythology or philosophy by glorifying it.³⁹ If some of these commentaries simply added “even the pagans said such true things” or “even the pagans’ idea of god spoke this truth,” that would be acceptable. However, they do not. In the context that they quote them, they glorify them. I will list only a few of many:

“And there is hope for thy last end, saith the Lord: and the children shall return to their own borders.” (Jer. 31:17)

Haydock Commentary on Jer. 31: “Ver 17. ... ‘When the gods perform, nothing appears incredible.’ Pindar, Pyt. x. H.”

“In Judea God is known: his name is great in Israel.” (Ps. 75:2)

³⁸ See *RJMI Topic Index: The Great Apostasy*.

³⁹ See RJMI book *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics: The Methods and Effects of Hellenizing Christianity: The Ways That Philosophy or Mythology Are Glorified*.

Douay Commentary: “(c) God was not only known in general, as to pagan Philosophers, and some others, but more particularly to the Jews, the issue of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, by his special benefits towards them.”

“And he remembered that they are flesh: a wind that goeth and returneth not.” (Ps. 77:39)

Douay Commentary: “(i) Man’s life is like the wind, that still passeth, and the same returneth not. As Aristotle teacheth.”

“Be subject to the Lord and pray to him. Envy not the man who prospereth in his way; the man who doth unjust things.” (Ps. 36:7)

Haydock Commentary on Ps. 36: “Ver. 7. ... We must wait patiently for his aid. ‘Allow the gods to judge what’s best for us.’ Juv. Sat. 13. H.”

“Because the wicked shall perish. And the enemies of the Lord, presently after they shall be honoured and exalted, shall come to nothing and vanish like smoke.” (Ps. 36:20)

Haydock Commentary on Ps. 36: “Ver. 20. ... There is a continual antithesis between the good and bad. The latter shall shortly lose all their splendour. ‘I fear, lest offending the gods, I may receive glory among men.’ said the poet Ibcus, (C.)...”

“And when all had said, Amen, they went to the feast: but the marriage feast they celebrated also with the fear of the Lord.” (Tob. 9:12)

Haydock Commentary on Tob. 9: “Ver. 12. **Lord.** Not giving too much way to pleasure, (H.) or gluttony, as Plato beautifully commends. Leg. vi. Serarius. W.”

“Amasias would not hearken to him, because it was the Lord’s will that he should be delivered into the hands of enemies, because of the gods of Edom.” (2 Par. 25:20)

Haydock Commentary on 2 Par. 25: “Ver. 20. ... The king was permitted to give ear to evil counsellors. — ‘Jupiter deprives those of understanding, whom he means to destroy.’ Homer.”

“How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, who didst rise in the morning? How art thou fallen to the earth, that didst wound the nations?” (Isa. 14:12)

Haydock Commentary on Isa. 14: “Ver. 12. ... Homer (Iliad xix.) represents the demon of discord hurled down by Jupiter to the miserable region of mortals.”

“And I turned and lifted up my eyes: and I saw, and behold a volume flying.” (Zach. 5:1)

Haydock Commentary on Zach. 5: “Ver. 1. ... The former signifies a book written on vellum, particularly that in which the poets say Jupiter marks the sins and punishments of mankind. The prophet saw a volume of this nature.”

“They are become as amorous horses and stallions, every one neighed after his neighbour’s wife.” (Jer. 5:8)

Haydock Commentary on Jer. 5: “Ver. 8. **Stallions.** The horse is the most intemperate of all animals but man. Aristot. Hist. vi. 22.”

“The floor and the winepress shall not feed them, and the wine shall deceive them.” (Osee 9:2)

Haydock Commentary on Osee 9: “Ver. 2. **Deceive.** The grapes shall yield no wine. C. — Spem mentita seges. Hor. ii. ep. 2. and 3. ode 1. and 16.”

The heresies of non-judgmentalism and non-punishmentalism

The following commentaries contain the heresies of non-judgmentalism or non-punishmentalism. These are in the category of mortal sins of omission regarding the faith. And they make the men who follow these heresies effeminate:

- The heresy of non-judgmentalism teaches that Catholics must not condemn or denounce sinners or must do so insufficiently. Hence non-judgmentalist heretics do not condemn sin or denounce sinners when they are obliged to, or they do so insufficiently.
- The heresy of non-punishmentalism teaches that Catholics are not to punish sinners when they are obliged to or must do so insufficiently. Hence non-punishmentalist heretics do not punish sinners when they are obliged to, or they do so insufficiently.

Condemns justified rebukes (1 Tim. 5:1)

“An ancient man rebuke not, but entreat him as a father: young men, as brethren... ”
(1 Tim. 5:1)

Haydock Commentary on 1 Tim. 5: “Ver. 1. ...Reproof, under any circumstances, is always sufficiently painful, without being accompanied by harsh and unfeeling words and manners.”

This denies the dogma that some sinners must be harshly rebuked if their sin is greatly evil or obstinate. St. Paul says,

“For there are also many disobedient, vain talkers, and seducers, especially they who are of the circumcision, who must be reprov'd, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake.” (Titus 1:10-11)

However, the Haydock commentary on Titus 1:13 contradicts its commentary on 1 Tim. 5:1 by correctly teaching that some sinners must be sharply rebuked:

Haydock Commentary on Titus 1: “Ver. 13. ...They must be rebuked sharply, their condition and dispositions requiring it, which, therefore, is not contrary to the admonition he gave to Timothy, to be gentle towards all, {2 Tim. 2:24}. Wi.”

Hence, Haydock, like a good (or, more properly, evil) scholastic, employs the heretical methods of willful contradictions and presenting heresies and dogmas as allowable opinions and thus not as heresies or dogmas.

Condemns righteous anger (Ja. 1:19-20)

In the following Bible text, some translate the Latin word *iram* as wrath and some as anger. But the principle is the same for both regarding justified and unjustified wrath or anger:

“Let every man be swift to hear but slow to speak and slow to wrath [anger]. For the wrath [anger] of man worketh not the justice of God.” (Ja. 1:19-20)

Here is my commentary on this verse:

Ja. 1:20. “**Wrath of man:** [RJMI: When wrath proceeds from a personal injury alone and thus not with consideration of God's justice and mercy, then that is the ‘wrath of man’ and thus sinful. However, when God's justice and mercy are considered, then that is the ‘wrath of God’ carried out by man and thus is justified

and righteous. Even pagans can have justified wrath when it conforms to the justice and mercy God puts in their hearts by the natural law. The same applies to anger, as there is an 'anger of man' and an 'anger of God' (a godly anger). See *RJMI Topic Index: Anger.*]

The Haydock commentary misinterprets this Bible verse and teaches the heresy that all wrath, all anger, is evil and sinful; and thus it denies the dogma that wrath and anger can be justified or unjustified:

Haydock Commentary on Ja. 1: “Ver. 20. **The anger of man, &c.** Let us not then be angry with each other on the way to eternal life, but rather march on with the troop of our companions and brethren meekly, peaceably, and lovingly; nay, I say to you absolutely and without exception, be not angry at all, if it be possible, and admit no pretext whatsoever to open the gate of your heart to so destructive a passion.”

Wrath and anger when justified are not destructive to the person who is wrathful and angry but are necessary not only for physical life but also for holiness, sanctity, and everlasting life; for a man sins when he does not have wrath and anger when he should.

However, and again, the Haydock commentary on Ja. 1:20 contradicts his commentary on Ja. 1:19 in which he correctly says that anger (wrath) can be justified and thus not sinful but necessary and good:

Haydock Commentary on Ja. 1: “Ver. 19. ...Let every man be swift to hear the word of God, but slow, or cautious in speaking, especially slow to anger, or to that rash passion of anger, which is never excusable, unless it be through a zeal for God’s honour, and against sin. Wi.”

Excuses idolatry (3 Ki. 12:28)

In the following commentary, Haydock denounces Monceau’s commentary that attempts to excuse as “weak” instead of “idolatrous” Jeroboam’s idolatry of setting up two golden calves:

“And finding out a device he made two golden calves, and said to them: Go ye up no more to Jerusalem: Behold thy gods, O Israel, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt.” (3 Ki. 12:28)

Haydock Commentary on 3 Ki. 12: “Ver. 28. ...Monceau pretends that they resembled the cherubim, and were intended to represent the true God; thus endeavouring to excuse the Israelites from idolatry, on this occasion, as well as when they came out of Egypt, {Ex. 32:4}. But his arguments are weak, and Jeroboam is constantly condemned as a most wicked and idolatrous prince, {3 Ki. 14:9}, {4 Ki. 23:15}, {Osee 8:5}, {Osee 10:5}. C. —Egypt. The same had been said by Aaron. M.”

Denies a dogma on excommunications (2 Cor. 10:8)

The following Rheims commentary teaches the heresy that heretics and other offenders who are worthy of excommunication must not be excommunicated if 1) it will not benefit the heretics or offenders, or 2) too many people are guilty of the heresy or offense and excommunication would disturb the peace of the church:

“For if also I should boast somewhat more of our power, which the Lord hath given us unto edification, and not for your destruction, I should not be ashamed.” (2 Cor. 10:8)

Heretical *Rheims Commentary* on 2 Cor. 10: “Ver. 8. **Unto edification.** This great power of the Church’s censures, specially of excommunication, as it was given for

the good and salvation of the people, so it must not be used against the innocent: no nor yet upon heretics or other offenders, but where and when it may by likelihood benefit either the parties, or the people, or may be executed without the hurt or perturbation of the whole Church, as often times it cannot be, by reason of the multitude of the offenders.”

The opposite is true. 1) The best thing for an obstinate heretic is to be excommunicated and shunned so that he may know the enormity of his sin that placed him outside the Church and on the road to hell. 2) A church full of heretics mixed with some who do not hold the heresy cannot be peaceful. True peace in a church can only exist when manifest heretics are cast out of the church and thus out of communion with the faithful even if only a few of the faithful are left or even if the priest is the only one faithful, as St. Paul teaches:

“Brethren, rejoice, be perfect, take exhortation, be of one mind, have peace; and the God of peace and of love shall be with you. (2 Cor. 13:11) Stand fast in one spirit, with one mind labouring together for the faith of the gospel. (Phili. 1:27) Fulfill ye my joy, that you be of one mind, having the same charity, being of one accord, agreeing in sentiment. (Phili. 2:2)”

Hence Moses, the other prophets, yea God himself sinned on many occasions for condemning and punishing the multitude of sinners even with death in order to purify the camp and protect a faithful little remnant.

According to Haydock, then, if enough people hold the same heresy or commit the same sin (be it adultery, murder, or pedophilia), then nothing should be done to them because that would disturb the peace. This is totally opposed to the truth, to dogma! When so many are committing the same sin, that is when the utmost condemnations and punishments must be inflicted to purify the camp and protect the faithful from falling into the same sins and from being a partner in their sins.

And the peace he wants to maintain at all costs by allowing even obstinate heretics and other sinners to remain in communion with good Catholics is the peace of the world (a temporal peace) and not the peace of God (a spiritual peace), for such a mixing of obstinate sinners with good Catholics does not bring true peace (does not bring spiritual and thus inner peace) but brings inner conflict, confusion, chaos, stress, and perturbation among the good Catholics and it places their souls in a state of mortal sin for being in religious communion with obstinate sinners.

The Haydock commentary does not contain this heresy in its commentary on 2 Cor. 10:6:

Haydock Commentary on 2 Cor. 10: “Ver. 6. **Having in readiness.** God gave power not only to persuade and to convince the incredulous but also to punish them, as we see in the examples of Simon Magus and Elymas. What then should hinder him from using the same against these false apostles? But he says, your obedience must first be fulfilled. God forbid that I should first use the sword before I have tried the ways of sweetness and conciliation. But if any remain obstinate, then I will employ the arms that God has given me. Grotius.”

Condemns justified punishments and incites rebellion (Est. 1:19-21)

Haydock’s following commentary is effeminate since he believes that the banishment of the queen for grave disobedience was excessive:

“If it please thee, let an edict go out from thy presence, and let it be written according to the law of the Persians and of the Medes, which must not be altered, that Vasthi come in no more to the king, but another, that is better than her, be made queen in her place. And let this be published through all the provinces of thy empire, (which is very wide,) and let all wives, as well of the greater as of the

lesser, give honour to their husbands. His counsel pleased the king and the princes, and the king did according to the counsel of Mamuchan.” (Est. 1:19-21)

Haydock Commentary on Est. 1: “Ver. 21. **Counsel.** It was very inconclusive; (M.) and even supposing the queen were guilty of some indiscretion, the punishment was too severe. M. Grotius, v. 11. H.”

Hence, if Haydock and Grotius had their way, disobedience of subjects to kings, and wives to their husbands, would become rampant because grave or obstinate disobedience would not be sufficiently punished. Is that not a perfect picture of what we have today in these end times.

Condemns killings executed by religious (3 Ki. 19:17)

The following Haydock commentary defends the heresy that men dedicated to God, such as high priests and prophets during the Old Covenant era and bishops and priests during the New Covenant era, are forbidden under all circumstances to kill anyone or fight in wars. As a general rule, they should not. But under certain circumstances, they can and must as ordained by God. Against the clear words of the text, he says that the holy Prophet Eliseus did not slay anyone:

“And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall escape the sword of Hazael, shall be slain by Jehu: and whosoever shall escape the sword of Jehu, shall be slain by Eliseus.” (3 Ki. 19:17)

Haydock Commentary on 3 Ki. 19: “Ver. 17. **Shall be slain by Eliseus.** Eliseus did not kill any of the idolaters with the material sword; but he is here joined with Hazael and Jehu, the great instruments of God in punishing the idolatry of Israel... Ch.”

The liars Haydock and Challoner go against the clear words of the text which say that not only Hazael and Jehu will kill by the sword but also Eliseus—“shall be slain by Eliseus.”

Condemns justified killings and torture

The commentaries in this section teach one or more of the following heresies:

- All killings, and thus even justified and lawful killings, are sinful.
- All torture, and thus even justified and lawful torture, is sinful.

The following commentaries in the Haydock Bible, condemn the justified killing and/or torture of evildoers by God’s chosen people. Instead of commending them for their manly acts of virtue, courage, and dedication to God, the commentaries portray them as having sinned and some portray them as sadistic, homicidal maniacs.

In the following commentary, the effeminate Haydock allows the opinion that David sinned in the manner in which he killed his enemies while also allowing the opinion that David did not sin. Therefore, Haydock presents as an allowable opinion the heresy that all acts of cruelty (and thus justified cruelty) are sinful while he also presents as an allowable opinion the dogma that some acts of cruelty are not sinful. And then he takes no sides and remains neutral. Hence Haydock is a heretic on this point alone for presenting a heresy and a dogma as allowable opinions:

“And the people that were therein he brought out: and made harrows, and sleds, and chariots of iron to go over them, so that they were cut and bruised to pieces: in this manner David dealt with all the cities of the children of Ammon: and he returned with all his people to Jerusalem.” (1 Par. 20:3)

Haydock Commentary on 1 Par. 20: “Ver. 3. ...This exemplary punishment was in consequence of the violation of the law of nations. Abulensis pronounced it lawful.

Tirin accuses David of a grievous sin of cruelty; observing that he was at this time involved in the sin of adultery: and people easily fall from one abyss into another. Cruelty and lust often go together. Yet it seems best to suspend our judgment. H. —David might only treat the most guilty in this manner. D.”

One wonders what the effeminate, non-punishmental Haydock thinks about God torturing devils and humans in hell forever with the most excruciating pains!

The following commentary is the parallel text of 1 Par. 20:3 in which Haydock again presents as an allowable opinion the heresy that all cruel killings are sinful while he also presents as an allowable opinion the dogma that they are not sinful:

“And bringing forth the people thereof he sawed them, and drove over them chariots armed with iron: and divided them with knives, and made them pass through brickkilns: so did he to all the cities of the children of Ammon: and David returned with all the army to Jerusalem.” (2 Ki. 12:31)

Haydock Commentary on 2 Ki. 12: “Ver. 31. **Sawed.** ...Some condemn David of excessive cruelty on this occasion. T. Sanctius. But the Scripture represents his conduct as irreproachable, except in the affair of Urias, (3 Ki. 15:5) and at this distance of time, we know not the motives which might have actuated him to treat his enemy with such severity. The Ammonites had probably exercised similar cruelties on his subjects. See (1 Ki. 11:2), (Amos 1:13). C. They had shamefully violated the law of nations, and had stirred up various kings against David. M. —Salien blames Joab for what may seem too cruel. But, though he was barbarous and vindictive, we need not condemn him on this occasion, no more than his master: as we are not to judge of former times by our own manners. H. —War was then carried on with great cruelty. C.”

The last sentence contains the heresy that modern men are less cruel than men of the past, as if men of the past were sinful in every case for acts of cruelty. The only reason modern men appear less cruel is because of the heresy of non-punishmentalism. Hence their lack of justified cruelty is a sin on their part and not on the part of men of the past. In fact, nowadays it is considered cruel to spank disobedient children! A result of non-punishmentalism is that modern men are much more cruel than men of the past. In order to appear more civilized and thus better than men of the past, modern men resort to psychological punishments instead of physical punishments. As a result, they are actually more cruel than men of the past because spiritual ills (ills of the soul, of the very inner being of man) are much greater than physical ills. A man can suffer great physical pains (such as a Catholic martyr) while having a great inner peace; whereas, men can be physically healthy while suffering great inner turmoil. Modern man’s use of psychological punishments and treatments while not employing physical punishments has led to massive mental illnesses, massive lawlessness, massive unchecked rebellion, massive alcohol and drug addiction, and massive inner turmoil because of unbridled and unchecked sins.

The following Haydock commentary contradicts his previous one. The commentary correctly teaches that Josue’s killing in a cruel manner was not sinful but ordained by God and thus good while not presenting the heretical opinion that it was sinful. Hence he contradicts his other commentaries in which he allows both opinions:

“And when they were brought out to him, he called all the men of Israel and said to the chiefs of the army that were with him: Go, and set your feet on the necks of these kings. And when they had gone, and put their feet upon the necks of them lying under them, he said again to them: Fear not, neither be ye dismayed, take courage and be strong: for so will the Lord do to all your enemies against whom you fight. And Josue struck and slew them, and hanged them upon five gibbets, and they hung until the evening.” (Jos. 10:24-26)

Haydock Commentary on Jos. 10: “Ver. 24. ...The conduct of Josue would appear cruel if we did not reflect that he was only the executioner of the divine justice, which was pleased thus to punish these proud and impious princes, that others might not imitate their example.”

The following commentaries in the Haydock Bible condemn David for wanting to kill Nabal, an enemy of David and thus of God:

“May God do so and so, and add more to the foes of David, if I leave of all that belong to him till the morning, any that pisseth against the wall.” (1 Ki. 25:22)

Haydock Commentary on 1 Ki. 25: “Ver. 22. ...**Leave.** David certainly sinned in his designs against Nabal... Ch.”

If David had sinned for wanting to kill Nabal, then God sinned because God did kill Nabal after David spared Nabal’s life at the request of Abigail. Abigail petitioned David to spare her husband Nabal and her family. And David granted her petition. Instead of acknowledging David’s act of mercy, the commentary says that Abigail spared David from carrying out his sinful desire to kill Nabal:

“Now therefore, my lord, the Lord liveth, and thy soul liveth, who hath withholden thee from coming to blood, and hath saved thy hand to thee: and now let thy enemies be as Nabal, and all they that seek evil to my lord.” (1 Ki. 25:26)

Haydock Commentary on 1 Ki. 25: “Ver. 26. **To thee.** She felicitates David on not having put his design in execution. C. —Theodoret thinks he might lawfully have done it; but others believe that the fault bore no proportion with the intended punishment. T.”

“This shall not be an occasion of grief to thee, and a scruple of heart to my lord, that thou hast shed innocent blood or hast revenged thyself: and when the Lord shall have done well by my lord, thou shalt remember thy handmaid.” (1 Ki. 25:31)

Haydock Commentary on 1 Ki. 25: “Ver. 31. ...For David might defend himself but ought not to attack or take revenge, like a king.”

Hence the commentary teaches another heresy, that the only just war is a defensive war and thus all offensive wars are evil and thus sinful, such as the offensive wars the Israelites conducted against the Canaanites and other pagans at the command of God, and the many just offensive wars Catholic kings and other Catholic rulers executed against pagan nations at the command of God. Thus Haydock portrays God as the author of sin when he says, “For David might defend himself but ought not to attack or take revenge.” Well, if David would have sinned for killing Nabal in an offensive war, then God sinned because he himself killed Nabal:

“And Abigail came to Nabal: and behold he had a feast in his house, like the feast of a king, and Nabal’s heart was merry, for he was very drunk, and she told him nothing less or more until morning. But early in the morning when Nabal had digested his wine, his wife told him these words, and his heart died within him, and he became as a stone. And after ten days had passed, the Lord struck Nabal, and he died. And when David had heard that Nabal was dead, he said: Blessed be the Lord, who hath judged the cause of my reproach at the hand of Nabal, and hath kept his servant from evil, and the Lord hath returned the wickedness of Nabal upon his head. Then David sent and treated with Abigail, that he might take her to himself for a wife.” (1 Ki. 25:36-39)

When David said that God kept him from evil, he did not mean from sinning but from punishing Nabal, as the word “evil” has several meanings. It can mean sin or it can mean afflictions sent by God, such as a sickness, death, imprisonment, plagues, and captivity. Hence

when it is said that God does evil, it means that God punishes men by bringing upon them the evils of afflictions:

“Shall there be evil in a city which the Lord hath not done?” (Amos 3:6)⁴⁰

Haydock Commentary on Amos 3: “Ver. 6. **Evil.** He speaks of the evil of punishment of war, famine, pestilence, desolation, &c. but not of the evil of sin, of which God is not the author. Ch. —All evil of punishment is sent by God, either to reclaim sinners or to be the beginning of sorrows, if they die impenitent. W.”

Therefore, when David said that God kept him from evil, he meant from having to kill Nabal himself. Beware, then, of Haydock’s lie in the following commentary in which he says that David meant that God kept him from sinning:

“May God do so and so, and add more to the foes of David, if I leave of all that belong to him till the morning, any that pisseth against the wall.” (1 Ki. 25:22)

Haydock Commentary on 1 Ki. 25: “Ver. 22. ...**Leave.** David certainly sinned in his designs against Nabal and his family, as he himself was afterwards sensible, when he blessed God for hindering him from executing the revenge he had proposed. Ch.”

Haydock, then, undermines David’s act of mercy in sparing Nabal’s life by referring to it as a confession and repentance of sin. And he further lies by not mentioning that God killed Nabal because David did not; hence if David had sinned, it would have been because he did not kill Nabal.

The reason why God spared Nabal’s family is not because they were not worthy of death but because God had mercy on them because of Abigail’s petition. Hence in the following commentary, Haydock lies by presuming that her family was innocent:

Haydock Commentary on 1 Ki. 25: “Ver. 31. ...**Innocent.** Many of Nabal’s family were such, and even his fault did not deserve death.”

At best he should have said that Nabal’s family could have or could not have been innocent, since many times God kills whole families and tribes for the sin of one or a few. In which case, God knew that the hearts of the family or tribal members were ultimately evil and thus killed them even though they did not commit the same sin as the one or few that caused the death sentence. For example,

By the will of God, Josue killed Sehon, king of the Amorites, and the men, women, and children that were under Sehon:

“And Sehon came out to meet us with all his people to fight at Jasa. And the Lord our God delivered him to us, and we slew him with his sons and all his people. And we took all his cities at that time, killing the inhabitants of them, men and women and children. We left nothing of them, except the cattle which came to the share of them that took them, and the spoils of the cities, which we took...” (Deut. 2:32-35)

God commanded the Israelites to kill all the inhabitants of Canaan and possess their land:

“But of those cities that shall be given thee, thou shalt suffer none at all to live: But shalt kill them with the edge of the sword, to wit, the Hethite, and the Amorrhite, and the Chanaanite, the Pherezite, and the Hevite, and the Jebusite, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee: Lest they teach you to do all the abominations which they have done to their gods, and you should sin against the Lord your God.” (Deut. 20:16-18)

God, speaking through the holy Prophet Samuel, commanded Saul to kill all of the Amalecite men, women, children, and infants:

⁴⁰ See (Isa. 45:7), (Jer. 42:6), (Jer. 42:10), (Lam. 3:38), and (Jona. 3:10).

“And Samuel said to Saul: The Lord sent me to anoint thee king over his People Israel. Now therefore hearken thou unto the voice of the Lord: Thus saith the Lord of hosts: I have reckoned up all that Amalec hath done to Israel, how he opposed them in the way when they came up out of Egypt. Now therefore go, and smite Amalec, and utterly destroy all that he hath. Spare him not, nor covet any thing that is his: but slay both man and woman, child and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass.” (1 Ki. 15:1-3)

In this case, Haydock does not presume that the women and children were innocent:

Haydock Commentary on 1 Ki. 15: “Ver. 3. **Destroy**, as a thing accursed. H. —Child. The great master of life and death (who cuts off one half of mankind whilst they are children) has been pleased sometimes to ordain that children should be put to the sword, in detestation of the crimes of their parents, and that they might not live to follow the same wicked ways. But without such ordinance of God, it is not allowable in any wars, how just soever, to kill children. Ch. —The Israelites were now to execute God’s orders with blind obedience, as he cannot be guilty of injustice.”

Yet Haydock heretically teaches that children can only be killed when God directly ordains it. This contradicts the dogma that at times God inspires men, even evildoers, without speaking directly to them or through a holy man, to kill children. However, in his following commentary Haydock presumes that the enemies killed by the Jews by the will of God and a decree from the king of Persia were innocent and thus killing them was sinful. Hence he makes God the author of sin and makes the faithful Jews sinners for executing God’s will:

“And the king gave orders to them to speak to the Jews in every city, and to command them to gather themselves together, and to stand for their lives, and to kill and destroy all their enemies with their wives and children and all their houses and to take their spoil.” (Est. 8:11)

Haydock Commentary on Est. 8: “Ver. 11. **Spoil**. This was retaliating, as they were to have been treated in like manner. C. —Such were the barbarous customs of the country. H. —It might not still be lawful thus to involve the innocent with the guilty, though the king did not ill in allowing the Jews to stand up in their own defence, (2 Ki. 21:6)... M.”

In this commentary, Haydock also teaches the heresy that God never kills the innocent. This denies the dogma that at times God kills directly or indirectly the innocent (as only his faithful chosen people can be) for several reasons; such as to preserve them from falling into evil (the holy King Josias), to put an end to their sufferings, or to test their faith (God ordered Abraham to kill his holy son Isaac):

“But the just man, if he be prevented with death, shall be in rest. For venerable old age is not that of long time, nor counted by the number of years: but the understanding of a man is grey hairs. And a spotless life is old age. He pleased God and was beloved, and living among sinners he was translated. He was taken away lest wickedness should alter his understanding, or deceit beguile his soul.” (Wis. 4:7-11)

“Josias was eight years old when he began to reign, and he reigned one and thirty years in Jerusalem. And he did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, and walked in the ways of David his father: he declined not, neither to the right hand, nor to the left... But as to the king of Juda that sent you to beseech the Lord, thus shall you say to him: Thus saith the Lord the God of Israel: Because thou hast heard the words of this book, and thy heart was softened, and thou hast humbled thyself in the sight of God for the things that are spoken against this place, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and reverencing my face, hast rent thy garments, and wept before me:

I also have heard thee, saith the Lord. For now I will gather thee to thy fathers, and thou shalt be brought to thy tomb in peace; and thy eyes shall not see all the evil that I will bring upon this place and the inhabitants thereof. They therefore reported to the king all that she had said. (2 Par. 34:1-2, 26-28)...

“In the eighteenth year of the reign of Josias was this phase celebrated. After that Josias had repaired the temple, Nechao king of Egypt came up to fight in Charcamis by the Euphrates: and Josias went out to meet him. But he sent messengers to him, saying: What have I to do with thee, O king of Juda? I come not against thee this day, but I fight against another house, to which God hath commanded me to go in haste: forbear to do against God, who is with me, lest he kill thee. Josias would not return, but prepared to fight against him, and hearkened not to the words of Nechao from the mouth of God, but went to fight in the field of Mageddo. And there he was wounded by the archers, and he said to his servants: Carry me out of the battle, for I am grievously wounded. And they removed him from the chariot into another, that followed him after the manner of kings, and they carried him away to Jerusalem, and he died, and was buried in the monument of his fathers, and all Juda and Jerusalem mourned for him, particularly Jeremias, whose lamentations for Josias all the singing men and singing women repeat unto this day, and it became like a law in Israel: Behold it is found written in the Lamentations. Now the rest of the acts of Josias and of his mercies, according to what was commanded by the law of the Lord...” (2 Par. 35:19-26)

In the following commentary, the effeminate, non-punishmental Haydock says that men must always be directly inspired by God not only before killing children (as he taught above in his commentary on 1 Ki. 15:3) but also before they kill *anyone* and thus condemns almost all soldiers who kill people in wars because almost all of them are not directly inspired by God to do so. In the following example, he condemns holy Judith’s justified killing of Holofernes as sinful when in fact it was an act of great faith, courage, and dedication to God, which saved the Israelites:

“And when she had said this, she went to the pillar that was at his bed’s head, and loosed his sword that hung tied upon it. And when she had drawn it out, she took him by the hair of his head, and said: Strengthen me, O Lord God, at this hour. And she struck twice upon his neck, and cut off his head, and took off his canopy from the pillars, and rolled away his headless body.” (Judi. 13:8-10)

Haydock Commentary on Judi. 13: “Ver. 8. ...If she had not been inspired by God to act thus, like Aod, (Jdg. 3), it would be difficult to excuse her, in thus hurrying a man, in the most wretched state, before the judgment-seat of God. H.”

Anyone who kills an evildoer, no matter when or by what means, sends him to God for judgment. So what is the point! If no one is allowed to hurry a man to the judgment-seat of God, then no one can kill anyone no matter how justified and necessary. Judith’s holy act of killing Holofernes is similar to David’s killing of Goliath.

Haydock also allowed the opinion that Judith committed a venial sin of lying for deceiving Holofernes, when, in truth, her deception was a non-sinful falsehood and thus good and, in this case, necessary to save Israelites⁴¹:

“And she answered: I am a daughter of the Hebrews, and I am fled from them because I knew they would be made a prey to you, because they despised you, and would not of their own accord yield themselves, that they might find mercy in your sight.” (Judi. 10:12)

Haydock Commentary on Judi. 10: “Ver. 12. **Because I knew**, &c. In this and the following chapter, some things are related to have been said by Judith, which seem hard to reconcile with truth. But all that is related in Scripture of the servants of God

⁴¹ See in this book [The error that non-sinful falsehoods are sinful](#), p. 57.

is not approved by the Scripture, and even the saints in their enterprises may sometimes slip into venial sins. Ch.”

Let us hear Judith’s prayer of thanksgiving, and the praises others sang to her, for her means and methods of deceiving and killing Holofernes by the will and power of God:

“Judith said: Praise ye the Lord our God, who hath not forsaken them that hope in him. And by me his handmaid he hath fulfilled his mercy, which he promised to the house of Israel: and he hath killed the enemy of his people by my hand this night. Then she brought forth the head of Holofernes out of the wallet, and shewed it them, saying: Behold the head of Holofernes the general of the army of the Assyrians, and behold his canopy, wherein he lay in his drunkenness, where the Lord our God slew him by the hand of a woman. But as the same Lord liveth, his angel hath been my keeper both going hence, and abiding there, and returning from thence hither; and the Lord hath not suffered me his handmaid to be defiled but hath brought me back to you without pollution of sin, rejoicing for his victory, for my escape and for your deliverance. Give all of you glory to him because he is good, because his mercy endureth for ever. And they all adored the Lord, and said to her: The Lord hath blessed thee by his power, because by thee he hath brought our enemies to nought. And Ozias, the prince of the people of Israel, said to her: Blessed art thou, O daughter, by the Lord the most high God, above all women upon the earth. Blessed be the Lord who made heaven and earth, who hath directed thee to the cutting off the head of the prince of our enemies. Because he hath so magnified thy name this day, that thy praise shall not depart out of the mouth of men who shall be mindful of the power of the Lord for ever, for that thou hast not spared thy life, by reason of the distress and tribulation of thy people, but hast prevented our ruin in the presence of our God. And all the people said: So be it, so be it.” (Judi. 13:17-26)

Yet, that bastard, cowardly, effeminate, and non-punishmental Haydock would dare allow an opinion that Judith sinned by her means or methods of killing Holofernes:

Haydock Commentary on Judi. 13: “Ver. 8. ...It would be difficult to excuse her, in thus hurrying a man, in the most wretched state, before the judgment-seat of God. H.”

Haydock Commentary on Judi. 10: “Ver. 12. **Because I knew**, &c. In this and the following chapter, some things are related to have been said by Judith, which seem hard to reconcile with truth. But all that is related in Scripture of the servants of God is not approved by the Scripture, and even the saints in their enterprises may sometimes slip into venial sins. Ch.”

The following Haydock Bible commentary teaches the heresy that all assassinations are sinful and thus denies the dogma that justified assassinations are good and many times necessary:

“And Godolias the son of Ahicam said to Johanan the son of Caree: Do not this thing [kill Ismahel]: for what thou sayst of Ismahel is false.” (Jer. 40:16)

Haydock Commentary on Jer. 40: “Ver. 16. **Do not. He did right in forbidding this assassination, which could never be authorized**, even to prevent a similar crime... (C.)”

Either Haydock did not read the whole story, or he did and willfully omitted parts of it; the latter is assuredly the case. Godolias made his mistake by not trusting his faithful advisers and thus not assassinating Ismahel. As a result, the schismatic, rebellious, and unfaithful Ismahel murdered Godolias (God’s chosen and faithful governor of the Jews in Israel) and caused the Jews to go into exile in Egypt, which God had forbidden, speaking through the prophet Jeremias. Hence if Godolias had assassinated Ismahel as he should have, the Jews would have remained faithful to God’s command to remain in Israel. Consequently, if a sin were committed, it was

because Godolias had *not* assassinated Ismahel. And Judith's killing of Holofernes was a justified assassination; and thus Haydock again condemns her in his above commentary when he says that "assassination...could never be authorized." There are many justified assassinations mentioned in the Bible; such as Aod's killing of Eglon, king of Moab (Jdg. 3); and Jahael's killing of Sisara (Jdg. 4).

Condemns justified revenge

Revenge carried out by humans can be either justified or unjustified, good or sinful. Justified revenge is when one takes vengeance in consideration of God's justice and mercy, which even pagans can do because God's justice and mercy is in the hearts of all men. Unjust revenge does not take into consideration God's justice and mercy and thus is sinful. It is a dogma that most of the time God does not directly carry out his vengeance but has angels, holy men, devils, evil men, animals, and natural and supernatural events execute his revenge:

"Revenge is mine, and I will repay them in due time, that their foot may slide: the day of destruction is at hand, and the time makes haste to come." (Deut. 32:35)

"There are spirits that are created for vengeance, and in their fury they lay on grievous torments. In the time of destruction they shall pour out their force: and they shall appease the wrath of him that made them. Fire, hail, famine, and death, all these were created for vengeance. The teeth of beasts, and scorpions, and serpents, and the sword taking vengeance upon the ungodly unto destruction. In his commandments they shall feast, and they shall be ready upon earth when need is; and when their time is come, they shall not transgress his word." (Eccus. 39:33-37)

"And his zeal will take armour, and he will arm the creature for the revenge of his enemies." (Wis. 5:18)

"And Moses was instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and he was mighty in his words and in his deeds. And when he was full forty years old, it came into his heart to visit his brethren, the children of Israel. And when he had seen one of them suffer wrong, he defended him; and striking the Egyptian, he avenged him who suffered the injury. And he thought that his brethren understood that God by his hand would save them; but they understood it not." (Acts 7:22-25)

"And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying: Revenge first the children of Israel on the Madianites, and so thou shalt be gathered to thy people. And Moses forthwith said: Arm of you men to fight, who may take the revenge of the Lord on the Madianites." (Num. 31:1-3)

"And Judas Machabeus who is valiant and strong from his youth up, let him be the leader of your army, and he shall manage the war of the people. And you shall take to you all that observe the law: and revenge ye the wrong of your people." (1 Mac. 2:66-67)

"But he called upon the Lord, saying: O Lord God, remember me, and restore to me now my former strength, O my God, that I may revenge myself on my enemies, and for the loss of my two eyes I may take one revenge." (Jdg. 16:28)

"A Levite bringing home his wife, is lodged by an old man at Gabaa in the tribe of Benjamin. His wife is there abused by wicked men, and in the morning found dead. Her husband cutteth her body in pieces, and sendeth to every tribe of Israel, requiring them to revenge the wicked fact." (Jdg. 19)

"The Lord liveth, and my God is blessed; and the strong God of my salvation shall be exalted: God who giveth me [King David] revenge, and bringest down people under me..." (2 Ki. 22:47-48)

Hence beware of the following commentaries that teach the heresy that vengeance carried out by men is intrinsically evil and thus condemn the Word of God and make God the author of sin:

“Cover not their iniquity, and let not their sin be blotted out from before thy face, because they have mocked thy builders.” (2 Esd. 4:5)

Haydock Commentary on 2 Esd. 4: “Ver. 5. **Face.** Punish the obstinate. T. —He does not wish that they may continue impenitent. C. —But, on that supposition, he approves of the divine justice, and foretells what will happen. E. —Revenge was equally criminal under the old law, as it is at present...(C.)”

The following commentary not only teaches the heresy that revenge carried out by anyone other than God is sinful, but also the heresy that the reason the Jews carried out revenge during the Old Covenant era was because they were barbarians and thus it condemns the holy Israelites (such as Moses, Josue, and King David) who took justified revenge on God’s enemies:

“That whosoever shall kill a person unawares may flee to them and may escape the wrath of the kinsman, who is the avenger of blood.” (Jos. 20:3)

Haydock Commentary on Jos. 20: “Ver. 3. **Of blood,** and authorized to kill the manslayer, (M.) if he find him out of one of these cities. See (Num. 35:6), (Deut. 19:4). Revenge was never lawful: but to prosecute offenders in the courts of justice, (C.) or agreeably to the law of God, can never deserve blame. H. —If some of the saints of the old law seem to have taken delight in revenge, their expressions must be explained in a favourable sense. David, who is accused of this crime, (C.) repels the charge with horror, (Ps. 7:5). The evils which he denounces to his adversaries were predictions of what they had reason to expect, (Ps. 57:11), (Jer. 11:20). H. —If some of the Jews looked upon vengeance as lawful, it cannot be a matter of surprise, when we reflect that even some, who have been taught the mild law of the gospel, think themselves bound, in some cases, to revenge an affront. C. —So far have the maxims of the world [revenge] supplanted Christianity in their breasts! ...H.”

This commentary also teaches the heresy that God’s chosen people are not to take delight in justified revenge, which is akin to teaching the heresy that man’s will must not be one with God’s will, and the heresy that God sins by rejoicing in revenge. But the Word of God says,

“The just shall rejoice when he shall see the revenge: he shall wash his hands in the blood of the sinner.” (Ps. 57:11)

By taking David’s words out of context in Ps. 7:5, the Haydock commentary not only lies but condemns the Word of God by pretending that King David looked upon all acts of vengeance by himself and other creatures as sinful:

“O Lord my God, if I have done this thing, if there be iniquity in my hands: If I have rendered to them that repaid me evils, let me deservedly fall empty before my enemies.” (Ps. 7:4-5)

Haydock Commentary on Ps. 7: “Ver. 5. **That repaid.** ...The man who takes revenge, injures himself, and becomes the devil’s slave. David had been so far from giving way to ingratitude, that he would not even hurt his enemy. H. He let Saul escape, when he might easily have slain him. C.”

The revenge spoken of in Ps. 7:5 is unjustified revenge and not justified revenge, as David took justified revenge many times. Just as there is a time for war and a time for peace, a time for justice and a time for mercy, so also there is a time for revenge and a time not for revenge. This heretical commentary only mentions David’s acts of mercy when he withheld his arm from executing justified vengeance on Saul and wants the reader to believe that David’s vengeance

would have been sinful. And he wants the reader to believe that David never carried out many acts of vengeance when vengeance was justified and thus ordained by God. For example,

“The Lord liveth, and my God is blessed; and the strong God of my salvation shall be exalted: God who giveth me [King David] revenge and bringest down people under me...” (2 Ki. 22:47-48)

“The saints shall rejoice in glory; they shall be joyful in their beds. The high praises of God shall be in their mouth, and two edged swords in their hands: To execute vengeance upon the nations, chastisements among the people: To bind their kings with fetters, and their nobles with manacles of iron: To execute upon them the judgment that is written: this glory is to all his saints. Alleluia.” (Ps. 149:5-9)

“May God do so and so, and add more to the foes of David, if I leave of all that belong to him till the morning, any that pisseth against the wall.” (1 Ki. 25:22)

“And the people that were therein he brought out: and made harrows, and sleds, and chariots of iron to go over them, so that they were cut and bruised to pieces: in this manner David dealt with all the cities of the children of Ammon: and he returned with all his people to Jerusalem.” (1 Par. 20:3)

Haydock also lies when he says that “The evils which he [David] denounces to his adversaries were predictions of what they had reason to expect, (Ps. 57:11), (Jer. 11:20),” as if David never executed vengeance himself. Many times David not only predicted God’s revenge but also executed it. And even in his predictions, David’s will was one with God’s and thus he willed (desired) to execute the revenge himself even when he did not.

Upholding the heresy that all acts of revenge by creatures are sinful, the above Haydock commentary on Jos. 20:3 heretically teaches that revenge is also sinful during the New Covenant era. However, other commentaries teach the heresy that revenge was allowed and thus not sinful during the Old Testament era but not allowed and thus is sinful during the New Testament era. The God of the Old Testament is the same as the God of the New Testament and thus his justice, wrath, mercy, and other passions are the same during both eras:

“For I am the Lord, and I change not.” (Mala. 3:6)

“Jesus Christ is the same, yesterday, and today, and forever.” (Heb. 13:8)

The New Testament and the history of the Catholic Church have many examples of Christians taking justified vengeance against God’s enemies. For example, the following verse proves that God takes revenge also during the New Covenant era:

Jesus says, “And will not God revenge his elect who cry to him day and night: and will he have patience in their regard? I say to you, that he will quickly revenge them.” (Lk. 18:7-8)

The following verse proves that even during the New Testament era God uses others to execute revenge upon his enemies:

Jesus says, “But as for those my enemies, who would not have me reign over them, bring them hither, and kill them before me.” (Lk. 19:27)

St. Paul says,

“For princes are not a terror to the good work, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise from the same. For he is God’s minister to thee, for good. But if thou do that which is evil, fear, for he beareth not the sword in vain. For he is God’s minister, an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil.” (Rom. 13:3-4)

“For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty to God unto the pulling down of fortifications, destroying counsels, and every height that exalteth itself

against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every understanding unto the obedience of Christ; and having in readiness to revenge all disobedience, when your obedience shall be fulfilled.” (2 Cor. 10:4-6)

Catholic Commentary on Cor. 10:6: “**To revenge:** God gave power not only to persuade and to convince the incredulous but also to punish them, as we see in the examples of Simon Magus and Elymas. What then should hinder him from using the same against these false apostles? But he says, your obedience must first be fulfilled. God forbid that I should first use the sword before I have tried the ways of sweetness and conciliation. But if any remain obstinate, then I will employ the arms that God has given me. You may see hereby that the spiritual power of bishops is not only in preaching the Gospel, and so by persuasion and exhortation only (as some heretics hold) to remit or retain sins, but that it hath the authority to punish, to judge, and condemn heretics and other like rebels. This sweet and forcible example of the apostle is worthy of the imitation of all superiors, temporal and ecclesiastical, however high their dignity or command.”

Hence the following verse, which when taken alone seems that St. Paul condemns all acts of revenge, must be taken in context:

“Revenge not yourselves, my dearly beloved; but give place unto wrath, for it is written: Revenge is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord.” (Rom. 12:19)

St. Paul got this teaching from the Old Testament:

“He that seeketh to revenge himself shall find vengeance from the Lord, and he will surely keep his sins in remembrance.” (Eccus. 28:1)

From other verses in the Bible, we know that God ordains acts of justified revenge by his creatures during the Old and New Testament eras. Hence the above two Bible verses must be taken in context. To “revenge oneself” is sinful revenge because it is said to be the “revenge of man” and not the “revenge of God” because it does not take into consideration God’s justice and mercy. Hence the “revenge of man” is sinful, but the “revenge of God” when executed by men is lawful and thus good. The same can be said of wrath and anger—the “wrath or anger of man” is sinful, but the “wrath or anger of God” executed by angels and men is lawful and good.

Just as there is a time when revenge must not be taken (as when Jesus prevented the Sons of Thunder from killing certain Samaritans (Lk. 9:52-56)), there is also a time when revenge must be taken (such as when the Two Witnesses take vengeance upon the inhabitants of the earth in the name and by the power of God during the reign of the Antichrist):

“And I will give unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred sixty days, clothed in sackcloth. These are the two olive trees, and the two candlesticks, that stand before the Lord of the earth. And if any man will hurt them, fire shall come out of their mouths, and shall devour their enemies. And if any man will hurt them, in this manner must he be slain. These have power to shut heaven, that it rain not in the days of their prophecy: and they have power over waters to turn them into blood, and to strike the earth with all plagues as often as they will.” (Apoc. 11:3-6)

So here, then, is yet another example of justified revenge executed by creatures during the New Testament era. And this will be followed by Jesus Christ and his angels taking vengeance upon evildoers during his second coming:

“Seeing it is a just thing with God to repay tribulation to them that trouble you: And to you who are troubled, rest with us when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with the angels of his power: In a flame of fire, giving vengeance to them who know not God, and who obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.” (2 Thes. 1:6-8)

And the history of the Catholic Church has many examples of Catholic rulers, such as the Holy Roman Emperor Constantine (the Josue of the New Covenant era) and the Holy Roman Emperor Charlemagne (the King David of the New Covenant era), taking justified revenge upon God's enemies.

Lastly, following the evil and deceptive scholastic method of willful contradictions, the following Haydock commentaries teach the truth (the dogma) regarding justified revenge and thus contradict their other commentaries that teach the heresy that creatures must never take revenge:

“But he [Samson] called upon the Lord, saying: O Lord God, remember me, and restore to me now my former strength, O my God, that I may revenge myself on my enemies, and for the loss of my two eyes I may take one revenge.” (Jdg. 16:28)

Haydock Commentary on Jdg. 16: “Ver. 28. **Revenge myself.** This desire of revenge was out of zeal for justice against the enemies of God and his people, and not out of private rancour and malice of heart. Ch.”

“He that seeketh to revenge himself shall find vengeance from the Lord, and he will surely keep his sins in remembrance.” (Eccus. 28:1)

Haydock Commentary on Eccus. 28: “Ver. 1. **Sins.** To seek revenge out of rancour, or contrary to justice, is a grievous sin. W.”

Hence these commentaries correctly teach that the “vengeance of men” which is from “private rancour and malice of heart” or “contrary to justice” is sinful. But the “vengeance of God” which is for “zeal and justice against enemies of God and his people” and thus not contrary to justice is good and many times necessary.

The doubt or denial of miraculous events

The following commentaries doubt or deny miraculous events in the Bible and thus undermine the veracity of the Holy Scriptures. The authors are also suspect of denying or doubting God's power to do miracles, or at least certain miracles.

The following commentary in the Haydock Bible doubts or denies divinations and thus presents them as tricks. The dogma is that there are godly divinations and ungodly divinations in which secret things are revealed or things prophesized come to pass. Casting lots is in the category of divinations:

“In the first month (which is called Nisan) in the twelfth year of the reign of Assuerus, the lot was cast into an urn, which in Hebrew is called Phur, before Aman, on what day and what month the nation of the Jews should be destroyed: and there came out the twelfth month, which is called Adar.” (Est. 3:7)

Haydock Commentary on Est. 3: “Ver. 7. **Lot.** The Persians were much addicted to divination... Reason began to shew the futility of divination, (Cicero) but the Christian religion alone has been able to counteract its baneful influence. C. —India is still much infected with it. Bernier.”

Note how he invokes reason to deny divinations, to deny things that are above human reason. This is a mark of the scholastic-type heretics who put reason over faith. The Christian religion did not do away with godly divinations. Matthias, the apostle that replaced Judas Iscariot, was chosen by lot:

“And praying, they said: Thou, Lord, who knowest the hearts of all men, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen to take the place of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas hath by transgression fallen, that he might go to his

own place. And they gave them lots, and the lot fell upon Matthias, and he was numbered with the eleven apostles.” (Acts 1:24-26)

The Prophet Agabus and the prophetess daughters of Philip the Evangelist practiced godly divinations:

“And as we tarried there for some days, there came from Judea a certain prophet, named Agabus, who, when he was come to us, took Paul’s girdle and binding his own feet and hands, he said: Thus saith the Holy Spirit: The man whose girdle this is, the Jews shall bind in this manner in Jerusalem and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles.” (Acts 21:10-11)

“And the next day departing, we came to Caesarea. And entering into the house of Philip the evangelist, who was one of the seven, we abode with him. And he had four daughters, virgins, who did prophesy.” (Acts 21:8-9)

For Jesus himself said,

“Do not think that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets. I am not come to destroy but to fulfill.” (Mt. 5:17)

Hence Jesus did not come to destroy prophecies and other godly divinations. St. Luke verifies this:

“And it shall come to pass in the last days, (saith the Lord,) I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams.” (Acts 2:17)

The first part of the following commentary doubts a miracle by giving it a natural explanation. The miracle was either God turning water to blood or God creating an illusion by making the Moabites see blood in the water. However, the last part of the commentary acknowledges the miracle:

“And they rose early in the morning; and the sun being now up and shining upon the waters, the Moabites saw the waters over against them red, like blood. And they said: It is the blood of the sword: the kings have fought among themselves and they have killed one another. Go now, Moab, to the spoils. And they went into the camp of Israel; but Israel rising up defeated Moab, who fled before them. And they being conquerors went and smote Moab.” (4 Ki. 3:22-24)

Haydock Commentary on 4 Ki. 3: “Ver. 22. **Blood.** The clouds have frequently a reddish colour at sun-rise, which would be reflected in the waters: the sand might also be red. As the Moabites knew that no water could be expected there at that season of the year, and as some examples had occurred of people turning their arms one against another in the night, they concluded that what they saw was blood. C. —God had also destined them for slaughter, (Abulens. q. 21.) and suffered their imagination and judgment to be deluded. H.”

The following commentary also doubts a miracle by giving a natural explanation for the deep sleep that Saul and his soldiers were under:

“So David took the spear, and the cup of water which was at Saul’s head, and they went away: and no man saw it, or knew it, or awaked, but they were all asleep, for a deep sleep from the Lord was fallen upon them.” (1 Ki. 26:12)

Haydock Commentary on 1 Ki. 26: “Ver. 12. **Water,** for refreshment, or for purifications. —Lord. It is not necessary to have recourse to a miracle, (C.) though it must have been by a special providence that all continued in such a deep sleep, (H.) to give David an opportunity of manifesting his innocence. W.”

Whereas, the Douay commentary acknowledges the miracle:

Douay-Rheims Commentary on 1 Ki. 26: “Ver. 12. God’s providence sent this extraordinary sleep and inspired David, to do this fact, for more justification of his innocency.”

The following commentary denies the dogma that God appoints guardian angels to protect provinces. It turns this dogma into a myth to accommodate the understanding of men and thus not as a fact revealed by God:

“And I said: What are these, my Lord? and the angel that spoke in me, said to me: I will shew thee what these are: And the man that stood among the myrtle trees answered, and said: These are they, whom the Lord hath sent to walk through the earth.” (Zach. 1:9-10)

Haydock Commentary on Zach. 1: “Ver. 10. **These are they, &c.** The guardian angels of provinces and nations. Ch. —The Jews believed that each nation had such an angel, who had to give an account to one in higher authority. God proportions his revelation to their ideas.”

The heresy that God does not attend to the petitions of the innocent

The following commentary questions the dogma that God attends to the petitions of the innocent:

“David therefore said to the Gabaonites: What shall I do for you? And what shall be the atonement for you, that you may bless the inheritance of the Lord?” (2 Ki. 21:3)

Haydock Commentary on 2 Ki. 21: “Ver. 3. **Atonement**, to expiate the injury done to you by Saul; (M.) and that you may turn your curses into blessings. The ancients were convinced that God attends to the imprecations of the innocent. C.”

The heresy that denies the temporal Kingship of Christ

The following commentaries deny the temporal Kingship of Christ. The dogma is that Christ first came to establish his spiritual kingdom in the souls of men and nations, which does not come by the observation of a temporal kingdom. And once that is accomplished, he establishes his temporal kingdom on earth (as with the Holy Roman Empire and earthly paradise after the second coming, when the whole world will accept Christ as its temporal King of kings):

“And being asked by the Pharisees when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said: The [spiritual] kingdom of God cometh not with observation.” (Lk. 17:20)

Haydock Commentary on Lk. 17: “Ver. 20. **When the kingdom of God should come:** ...He answers them, that the manifestation of the Messiah, and the establishment of his kingdom, shall not be effected in a conspicuous, splendid manner. It shall be brought about insensibly, and the accomplishment of the designs of the omnipotence of our Lord shall appear a casualty, and the effect of secondary causes. You shall not see the Messiah coming at the head of armies, to spread terror and desolation. His arrival shall not be announced by ambassadors, &c. every thing in the establishment of my kingdom shall be the reverse of temporal power. Calmet.”

How contrary this is to the following verses:

“And you are filled in him [Jesus], who is the head of all principality and power...” (Col. 2:10)

“For he must reign, until he hath put all his enemies under his feet. And the enemy death [the Antichrist] shall be destroyed last: For he hath put all things under his feet. And whereas he saith, All things are put under him; undoubtedly, he is excepted, who put all things under him.” (1 Cor. 15:25-27)

“But to the Son: Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of justice is the sceptre of thy kingdom.” (Heb. 1:8)

“And she [the Blessed Virgin Mary] brought forth a man child [Jesus], who was to rule all nations with an iron rod: and her son was taken up to God, and to his throne.” (Apoc. 12:5)

“And out of his [Jesus’] mouth proceedeth a sharp two edged sword; that with it he may strike the nations. And he shall rule them with a rod of iron; and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness of the wrath of God the Almighty.” (Apoc. 19:15)

“And I [Jesus] will kill her children with death, and all the churches shall know that I am he that searcheth the reins and hearts, and I will give to every one of you according to your works. But to you I say, and to the rest who are at Thyatira: Whosoever have not this doctrine, and who have not known the depths of Satan, as they say, I will not put upon you any other burden. Yet that, which you have, hold fast till I come. And he that shall overcome, and keep my works unto the end, I will give him power over the nations. And he shall rule them with a rod of iron, and as the vessel of a potter they shall be broken.” (Apoc. 2:23-27)

“And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies gathered together to make war with him [Jesus] that sat upon the horse, and with his army. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet, who wrought signs before him, wherewith he seduced them who received the character of the beast, and who adored his image. These two were cast alive into the pool of fire, burning with brimstone. And the rest were slain by the sword of him, that sitteth upon the horse, which proceedeth out of his mouth; and all the birds were filled with their flesh.” (Apoc. 19:19-21)

The following verse denies the dogma that the Catholic Church also can have temporal power when the circumstances permit:

“And he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers: lest I come, and strike the earth with anathema.” (Mala. 4:6)

Haydock Commentary on Mala. 4: “Ver. 6. ...Some of our crafty adversaries have inferred from the above explanation of anathema that the Church means heretics to be destroyed: but her kingdom is not of this world: she speaks only of the soul, and exercises a spiritual power. H.”

The Catholic Church has not only spiritual power but also temporal power when the circumstances permit. As such, the Church must inflict not only spiritual punishments but also temporal ones (such as scourges, imprisonment, and death) when possible. Speaking to the members of his Catholic Church, Jesus says,

“But as for those my enemies, who would not have me reign over them, bring them hither, and kill them before me.” (Lk. 19:27)

The heresy that all sins proceed from ignorance

“And as for any oversight or fault committed unto this day, we forgive it, and the crown which you owed: and if any other thing were taxed in Jerusalem, now let it not be taxed.” (1 Mac. 13:39)

Haydock Commentary on 1 Mac. 13: “Ver. 39. **Oversight.** All sins in some sense proceed from ignorance.”

The heresy that idolatry is not idolatry or wicked but only a weakness

The following idolatrous commentary refers to the idolatry of Achaz as an innovation, weakness, and dangerous and thus at best a venial sin and near occasion of sin and not as wickedness, idolatry, and deadly:

“He [Achaz] consecrated also his son, making him pass through the fire according to the idols of the nations: which the Lord destroyed before the children of Israel. He sacrificed also and burnt incense in the high places and on the hills, and under every green tree... And king Achaz went to Damascus to meet Theglathphalasar king of the Assyrians, and when he had seen the altar of Damascus, king Achaz sent to Urias the priest a pattern of it, and its likeness according to all the work thereof. And Urias the priest built an altar according to all that king Achaz had commanded from Damascus, so did Urias the priest, until king Achaz came from Damascus. And when the king was come from Damascus, he saw the altar and worshipped it: and went up and offered holocausts, and his own sacrifice.” (4 Ki. 16:1-12)

Haydock Commentary on 4 Ki. 16: “Ver. 11. **Priest,** or pontiff, as no other would have dared to make this innovation. Salien. —He was guilty of a great weakness; as the altar of Solomon had been so solemnly consecrated by God’s presence. All changes in religion are dangerous... C.”

The glorification of heretics

While Catholics are allowed to quote heretics for historical, educational, or refutational purposes, they are forbidden to present the heretics as orthodox or to glorify them. If they do, then they share in the guilt of the heretic and thus are heretics themselves by sins of omission and association. Hence a Catholic work that contains quotes from heretics must have a warning in a prominent place that denounces the heretics as heretics for the glory of God and the purity of the Catholic faith and to warn the readers and thus avoid scandal and occasions of sin.

While the Haydock Bible does denounce some of the heretics as heretics that he quotes, he does not denounce all of the heretics, such as Origen.⁴² And in some of his commentaries, he glorifies heretics. And what is worse, some of the heretics he glorifies, he listed as heretics in his list of commentators. For example,

The Haydock Bible contains commentaries that glorify the Arian heretic Grotius and the heretic Origen:

Haydock Commentary on Isa. 50: “Ver. 6. ... ‘The great Grotius, (I wish he were great in explaining the prophets)’ applies this to Jeremias. Houbigant.”

Haydock Commentary on Gen. 6: “Ver. 15. **Three hundred cubits, &c.** ... Still less need we adopt the geometrical cubit, which contains six ordinary ones, as we might be authorised to do by the great names of Origen and S. Aug. de C. D. xv. 27. q. in (Gen. 1:4)... H.”

⁴² See in this book [On the Haydock Bible](#), p. 7.

The heresies that polygamy and divorce are intrinsically evil

Beware of the heresies that polygamy and divorce are intrinsically evil and thus always sinful. This denies the fact that God allowed and condoned polygamy and divorce during the Old Testament era. Hence if polygamy or divorce were intrinsically sinful, then God would be the author of sin. The truth is that polygamy and divorce are disciplinary laws and thus not dogmatic laws. Therefore they can be maintained, abolished, or modified, just like the disciplinary law that banned the Israelites from eating pork during the Old Covenant era.

Only evil, sinful, and immoral things must be tolerated, not good things. Hence when the following commentary says that polygamy was tolerated during the Old Testament era, it implies that polygamy is evil, sinful, or immoral:

“If a man have two wives, one beloved, and the other hated, and they have had children by him, and the son of the hated be the firstborn...” (Deut. 21:15)

Haydock Commentary on Deut. 21: “Ver. 15. **Two wives.** Moses never expressly (H.) sanctions polygamy; but he tolerates it frequently, as excused by custom, the example of the Patriarchs, &c. a toleration which Christ has revoked, as contrary to the primary design of God, and the institution of matrimony. C.”

The following heretical commentary presents as an allowable opinion the heresy that divorce was tolerated by God and thus sinful. And it also presents as an allowable opinion the dogma that divorce was a disciplinary law and thus not sinful. Hence it is heretical for allowing the dogma to be doubted or denied:

“The former husband cannot take her again to wife: because she is defiled, and is become abominable before the Lord: lest thou cause thy land to sin, which the Lord thy God shall give thee to possess.” (Deut. 24:4)

Douay-Rheims Commentary on Deut. 24: “Ver. 1. Dismiss her: Whether this divorce was tolerated as a less sin, to avoid a greater, as Jerome, (li. 1. in Mat. c. 5. & li 3. in c. 19.) St. Chrysostom, (ho. 12.) in {Mt. 5} and others teach; or dispensed withal, and so made lawful to the Jews, which is also probable, for that none of the holy Prophets did ever reprehend it.”

See *RJMI Topic Index*: “Polygamy” and “Divorce.”

Versions of the Septuagint

By at least the 4th century, the original version of the Septuagint, the one used by Jesus and his followers, no longer existed. However, copies did exist which contained some errors in the process of copying. The earliest copies still available are as follows. And they differ from one another in several places, and some are more complete than others:

- Codex Vaticanus (B) (4th century)
- Codex Sinaiticus (S) (4th century)
- Codex Alexandrinus (A) (5th century)
- Codex Ephraemirescriptus (C)

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, “Septuagint Version”: “On account of its diffusion among the hellenizing Jews and early Christians, copies of the Septuagint were multiplied; and as might be expected, many changes, deliberate as well as involuntary, crept in. The necessity of restoring the text as far as possible to its pristine purity was felt. The following is a brief account of the attempted

corrections: A. Origen reproduced the Septuagint text in the fifth column of his Hexapla; marking with obeli the texts that occurred in the Septuagint without being the original; adding according to Theodotion's version, and distinguishing with asterisks and metobeli the texts of the original which were not in the Septuagint; adopting from the variants of the Greek Version the texts which were closest to the Hebrew; and, finally, transposing the text where the order of the Septuagint did not correspond with the Hebrew order. His recension, copied by Pamphilus and Eusebius, is called the hexaplar, to distinguish it from the version previously employed and which is called the common, vulgate, *koine*, or ante-hexaplar. It was adopted in Palestine. B. St. Lucien, priest of Antioch and martyr, in the beginning of the fourth century, published an edition corrected in accordance with the Hebrew; this retained the name of *koine*, vulgate edition, and is sometimes called *Loukianos*, after its author. In the time of St. Jerome it was in use at Constantinople and Antioch. C. Finally, Hesychius, an Egyptian bishop, published about the same time, a new recension, employed chiefly in Egypt.

“The three most celebrated manuscripts of the Septuagint known are, the Vatican, ‘Codex Vaticanus’ (fourth century); the Alexandrian, ‘Codex Alexandrinus’ (fifth century), now in the British Museum, London; and that of Sinai, ‘Codex Sinaiticus’ (fourth century), found by Tischendorf in the convent of St. Catherine, on Mount Sinai, in 1844 and 1849, now part at Leipzig and in part in St. Petersburg; they are all written in uncials.

“The ‘Codex Vaticanus’ is the purest of the three; it generally gives the more ancient text, while the ‘Codex Alexandrinus’ borrows much from the hexaplar text and is changed according to the Masoretic text. The ‘Codex Vaticanus’ is referred to by the letter B; the ‘Codex Alexandrinus’ by the letter A, and the ‘Codex Sinaiticus’ by the first letter of the Hebrew alphabet *Aleph* or by S. The Bibliotheque Nationale in Paris possesses also an important palimpsest manuscript of the Septuagint, the ‘Codex Ephraemirescriptus’ (designated by the letter C), and two manuscripts of less value (64 and 114), in cursives, one belonging to the tenth or eleventh century and the other to the thirteenth (Bacuez and Vigouroux, 12th ed., n. 109).”

Two English translations of the Codex Vaticanus version of the Septuagint are as follows, and they differ from one another in several places:

- Thomson version: *The Septuagint*, translated into English by Charles Thomson (Late Secretary to the Congress of the United States), 1808. Original Publisher: Jane Aitken, Philadelphia, USA, 1808. Re-published with added Preface by S. F. Pells, by Publishers to His Majesty the King, London, England, 1904, in two volumes. Said to be translated from the Codex Vaticanus and the first English Translation of the Septuagint. Edited, revised, and enlarged by C. A. Muses, M.A., Ph.D. (Columbia). Published by The Falcon's Wing Press, Indian Hills, Colorado, USA, 1954.
- Lancelot version: *The Septuagint with the Apocrypha, Greek and English*, translated by Sir. Lancelot C. L. Brenton from the Codex Vaticanus, 1851. Originally published by Samuel Bagster & Sons, Ltd., London 1851. Current publisher: Hendrickson Publishers, 2014.

The Thomson version is more accurate but does not contain all the books of the Old Testament. The Lancelot version contains all the books of the Old Testament, as defined by the Catholic Church, but also contains some unapproved books.

The Catholic Faith Is Not Diminished Just Because No Pure Version of the Bible Exists

The Bible by itself does not infallibly define dogmas. The Catholic Church does by her solemn magisterium and ordinary magisterium. The solemn magisterium is all of the infallible papal teachings on faith and morals.⁴³ The ordinary magisterium is all of the unanimous teachings of the Church Fathers on faith and morals.⁴⁴

Hence God the Holy Spirit would never allow an error in the Bible to be infallibly defined as a dogma. Whereas, the Holy Spirit inspires a pope or the unanimous consensus of the Church Fathers to infallibly define many things in the Bible.

Consequently, the errors in the Bible, even if some are heretical, do not diminish or harm the Catholic faith one bit, although they can be scandalous if the crucial errors are not addressed and corrected and, even worse, if they are covered up or lied about.

I Am Working on Producing the Purest Possible Version of the Catholic Bible

I began many years ago revising the apostate Bishop Richard Challoner's version of the Bible, which is his version of the Douay-Rheims translation, which in turn is an English translation of the Clementine Vulgate. The text contained some heresies and many other crucial errors. And his commentaries contained many heresies. I have progressed to the point that I believe that all of the heresies and crucial errors in the text and commentary have been corrected.

However, since I discovered that the Septuagint version of the Old Testament was the official version in the days of Jesus and the Church Fathers and thus is the most accurate, even though some errors have crept in, I am now revising the Septuagint and that will be the purest version of the Old Testament possible and will serve as the Catholic Church's only official version of the Old Testament.

But until I am done with the Septuagint, which will take some time, I will publish my incomplete revision of Challoner's Old Testament—incomplete because 1) there are still minor and possibly major errors in it; 2) it does not contain cross-references; and 3) the grammar is horrendous. When I began working on the Septuagint, I stopped correcting the grammar in my revised Challoner version of the Old Testament. The parts in which I revised the grammar are as follows: (Exodus Chapters 19 to 33); (Psalms Chapters 5 to 19); (Proverbs Chapters 11 to 24); (Jeremias Chapters 33 to 47).

I have temporarily stopped revising the Septuagint until I complete my revision of the New Testament, which will be published along with the Old Testament in one book when completed.

My revised Bible also contains orthodox and needful commentaries, the extensive ones are listed in the back of the Bible under their own heading; such as Holy Trinity; Holy Eucharist; Traditions of God vs. Men; Hard Hearts; Papal Supremacy; Rich and Poor; Jesus Is God; The Ways the Father Is Greater Than the Son; Jesus Is Begotten of the Father; Dreams; and Love, Hatred, and Abhorrence.

My revised Bible also contains a list of all of the texts I revised.

⁴³ It is the solemn magisterium that infallibly defined which books belong to the Bible, which is not the same as infallibly defining the purity of the text.

⁴⁴ All of the holy teachers in the Bible (such as the prophets and Apostles) were Church Fathers. The first Church Fathers of the New Testament era were Jesus' Apostles and disciples.