

NEW TESTAMENT ORIGIN

It is not surprising that every Christian believes that the whole Bible is the “Inspired Word of God.” What is surprising, is that few people seem to know how the New Testament came to be part of that “Inspired Word of God.”

Historical Fact No. 1

Nowhere in the New Testament does it say that Christ wrote anything down. He could have written everything that He wanted taught, handed it to his Apostles, and told them to make copies and spread it around the world. He did not do so. It also does not say anywhere that He told his Apostles to write anything down. Everything was to be transmitted by hearing.

Christ said, *“He who hears you, hears me; and he who rejects you, rejects me; and he who rejects me, rejects him who sent me.”* {Luke 10:16} And there is: *“Faith then depends on hearing, and hearing on the word of Christ.”* {Romans 10:17} It does not say that Faith depends on reading. And then in Matthew 24:35, *“Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will not pass away.”*

From Pentecost in the year 33 to the first book of the Bible written around the year 40, Christianity was totally spread by Oral Tradition. If potential converts after Christ’s Resurrection wanted to believe in Christ, they had to believe the Apostles who were there - and St. Paul who was not there. He did not see or hear Christ either before or after His death on the cross. So anyone that St. Paul converted had to believe what he taught, which was from the Oral Tradition that had been given to him - and as it was given to every other convert for the next 15 centuries.

St. Paul specifically urged Christians to follow the unwritten teachings: *“And the things that thou hast heard from me through many witnesses, commend to trustworthy men who shall be competent in turn to teach others.”* {2 Timothy 2:2}

“So then, brethren stand firm, and all the teachings you have learned, whether by word or letter of ours.” {2 Thessalonians 2:15}

(St. Paul was talking about Oral Tradition first, and what he wrote second. He also did not say to forget about what they learned by word once they had a letter from him.)

Historical Fact No. 2

As Christ's teachings were spread, some people started to have a wrong definition, understanding, or conclusions about Christ's teachings. So the Apostles started writing to individual communities. So from around the year 40 to around the year 90, the Apostles, specifically St. Paul, wrote to explain or correct in matters of Faith. It was also at this time that the Gospels were written. (It is also pertinent to state that two out of the four evangelists who wrote the Gospels had never met Christ. All of their information came from Oral Tradition.) And still after that, the teachings of Christ were still being preached probably 99% by Oral Tradition.

Historical Fact No. 3

It was specifically the Catholic Church at the Council of Rome in 382 - under the guidance of the Holy Spirit - that decided which books, out of all the writings that existed in the 4th Century, were to be the ones to be considered as "inspired, and which ones were not. Then the Council of Hippo in 393 and the Council of Carthage in 397 reaffirmed those chosen books. The "reformers" could come along 11 centuries later and agree with it - but they are not the one who defined those books as "inspired" in the first place. Therefore, whether non-Catholic Christians like it or not – or want to believe it or not – it is a historical fact that if they believe the New Testament is the "inspired Word of God," they are taking the word of the Catholic Church - the only Christian Church that existed at the time.

Non-Catholic Christians say that if it's not in the Bible they don't believe it. First of all, the last line in John is, *"There are, however, many other things that Jesus did; but if every one of these should be written, not even the world itself, I think, could hold the books that would have to be written. Amen."* {John 21:25} Does that mean that everything else Christ taught that is not in the New Testament is worthless? Even after 397, until the printing press, probably 95% of Christianity was still being spread by Oral Tradition.

Historical Fact No. 4

There were other books that were not decided by the Catholic Church to be "inspired." The list of rejected books, not considered part of the New Testament includes: Epistle of Barnabas - 1 Clement - Paul's Epistle to the Laodiceans - Preaching of Peter -

Apocalypse of Peter - Gospel According to the Hebrews

Now isn't it logical, that since believing that the Holy Spirit inspired the Catholic Church on which writings were to be considered "inspired," to believe that the same Holy Spirit would inspire the same Catholic Church in the correct interpretation of those writings?

It is more than interesting to note that the interpretation of Christ's words stayed the same for 1000 years before the revolutionaries in the 16th century came along and changed them.

It is good to remember what St. Paul said: *"As we said before, so now I say again: If any one preach to you a gospel, besides that which you have received, let him be anathema."* {Galatians 1:9} That is exactly what the "reformers" did. It is also interesting to note that the interpretation for those thousand years has remained the same in the Catholic Church in the 500 years since then.

Now just logically, which makes more sense: that the interpretations taught for those 15 centuries is correct - or the new ones? Does anyone think that the Holy Spirit had Alzheimer's, to forget what Church He inspired to define the New Testament and its proper interpretation, and then change His mind eleven centuries later?

Historical Fact. No. 5

Once the New Testament was printed and was then available to common people - even to those who could read - it did not nullify all the Oral Tradition that had been taught for those previous 15 centuries.

It makes no sense to believe only what the "reformers" taught after the 16th Century, and ignore other teachings taught for the 15 centuries that preceded it? Believing in the New Testament and dumping Sacred Oral Tradition is like throwing out the baby and keeping the bathwater.

The bottom line is that the New Testament is an **addition** to Oral Tradition - **not a replacement** of it. It would even make more sense to accept Oral Tradition and not the New Testament, than to accept the New Testament and not Oral Tradition - as Oral Tradition not only came first, but was where the books of the New Testament came from. To accept the New Testament but not Sacred Oral Tradition, is like recognizing your parents as responsible for your existence - but not your grandparents.

