

HERALD
OF THE
KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

“*And in their days, even of those kings, the Eloah of the heavens shall set up A KINGDOM that shall not be abolished FOR AGES, and A DOMINION that shall not be left to another people. It shall grind to powder and bring to an end all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand FOR THE AGES.*”—DANIEL.

JOHN THOMAS, Editor. Mott Haven, Westchester, N.Y., SEPTEMBER, 1859
Volume 9—No. 9.

LECTURE ON THE HISTORIC EVIDENCE OF THE AUTHORSHIP AND
TRANSMISSION OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY S. P. TREGELLES, LL. D.

Introduction. —The object of the following lecture is to present, in an intelligible and popular form, an accurate statement of the historic evidence which enables us to speak with certainty as to the authorship of the books of the New Testament, and also to describe the channels through which they have been transmitted to us; —these channels of transmission themselves bearing an important testimony to the books handed down.

In the compass of a lecture but an outline of some parts of the subject was possible; I have, therefore, stated very briefly those points about which no question is raised; and thus, in such parts, I have rather pointed out the evidence than given it in detail; on those subjects, however, which are at all controverted, the evidence has been given with considerable minuteness.

My reasons for publishing this lecture are identical with those which led me to deliver it: I wished to give a clear and sufficient answer to the inquiries, Why do you receive the New Testament books as genuine? and, How have these ancient writings come down to our days? Professed scholars will see (if they should read the following pages) that I have not sought to make myself intelligible to them exclusively: indeed, on biblical subjects, although there are many things which scholars only can *investigate*, yet the practical *value* of their investigations all depends on their being intelligently communicated to general readers. I trust that it will not be thought that it is ever needful to sacrifice accuracy to this end. The historic evidence to the authorship of the New Testament books is a subject of common concern to all Christians. If attacks are made with a great show of learning and research, it is well for those who may meet with such popular attacks to be forearmed. It is not the lot of every one to examine and search for himself through the mass of Christian literature for the first four centuries; but there are few, indeed, who cannot apprehend the bearing of evidence when it is placed before them. The needful avocations of daily life will often render personal study and research impossible; the daily discharge of daily duty has to be fulfilled conscientiously; and it is to those who are thus engaged in the laborious occupations of the desk, the warehouse, or the shop, that I wish especially to address this statement of evidence.

All men are not astronomers; yet all can appreciate the results of mathematical knowledge when applied to astronomy; just in the same way may the results of critical studies, applied to Scripture, be understood and used by readers in general. It is true that many may not even remember the *names* of the early witnesses to our New Testament books; still, however, if they can grasp the *facts* of their evidence, they will carry away and retain those *results* which will be of great practical value when occasion should arise.

On ordinary subjects there are many things to which we give credit, because we rely on the accuracy of our informant. Thus, even amongst men of some scientific knowledge, but few calculate an eclipse for themselves; they see that its occurrence is stated in the almanac, and that is enough; and as to persons in general, they believe that the eclipse will take place at such a day and hour, with perhaps hardly a thought *how* it can be predefined by astronomers. And so on most subjects: we trust the information which we receive, because we believe in the *competency* of our informant. But when questions are raised, then, indeed, there is often enough a desire to investigate the *grounds* on which the information rests; we may frequently satisfy ourselves as to these, though we never could have traced them out for ourselves.

Thus, as to this part of Christian evidence, I only ask for credit to be given me for bringing forward true testimonies of persons who lived at the times mentioned; —thus pointing out the steps of argument which others may easily follow. On this it may be remarked that the evidence of the witnesses is by no means weakened through the peculiar opinions which any of them held; and it is also well to notice that the paucity of the Christian writings in the *second* century arises, in part, from so many ancient works having been lost: this loss of ancient writings causes such a contrast between the second century and the fourth.

In saying that I do not now address myself to professed scholars. I wish it to be plainly understood that I do not avoid their scrutiny: they will find that all extracts from ancient writers have been fairly and sufficiently quoted, and that when mere references to passages have been made, places have always been pointed out which sufficiently prove the subject in hand. * I mention this because *popular* statements are sometimes opposed (most needlessly) to critical exactitude. On points of Christian evidence I have myself often felt how unsatisfactory it is to find, instead of a close and severe statement of what the testimony of a writer is, a loose assertion, "it cannot be doubted but that he used and quoted such or such a book." I never knew what value to attach to such remarks, until I had the opportunity of examining for myself.

* I suppose that no objection will be made to the citations being given only in a translated form; I can assure the reader, be he friend or foe, that every quotation has been taken from the original source.

Of course I claim no originality as to the passages brought forward; they have all, I believe, been cited by others; in every case, however, I have re-examined them; and in drawing up the arguments based on them, I have followed in the track of others or not, as I found suitable.

No apology is needed for endeavouring to popularize accurate statements on such subjects. Had I my choice, I would seek to address myself to the Christian *people* on points connected with Scripture, rather than to the instructed few; because such matters are of equal or of greater concern to them; and especially so in the present day, when endeavors are

habitually made to circulate almost every possible statement which would invalidate the authority of Scripture. As things are so, it is the Christian *people* that ought especially to be considered on these subjects; in illustration of this, an ancient saying occurs to my mind, "that it were as well not to have thought of that which is for the common good, if one did not know how to express it intelligibly to those whom it concerns."

In the popular literature of the present day, how habitually do we find a laxity of thought and expression with regard to Scripture authority, or even a tacit assumption that modern research has disproved this as an antiquated superstition! I do not now speak of the open and avowed attacks on Revelation. And then, again, there is often a tone of gentleness when errors on these fundamental points are mentioned; whereas, any distinct assertion of the authority of God's word is stigmatized as polemical intolerance. This may be found in publications which professedly avoid all mention of religious opinions. Thus, a popular review, conducted ostensibly on such principles, recently dismissed a work with only the following remark: "A thoughtful book on a great and difficult historical problem;"—this said "thoughtful book" being one of the most bitter and unseemly of modern attacks on revealed religion, intolerant and severe; and the "*difficult* historical problem" being just this, —whether the four Gospels are forgeries or not! If avowedly neutral publications, through oversight, admit what casts, by insinuation, such doubt on the objective facts of Revelation, what must be the tone of those which oppose it?

And there *are* open opposers, —men who use all their influence, not only to negative the truths of revealed religion, by causing a rejection of the distinctive doctrine of Christianity, —redemption by the blood of the Son of God, —but who set themselves to disprove the records of our faith; and when any defend those truths which they know to be of infinite preciousness to their own hearts, they stigmatize such with being actuated by sectarian bigotry, and a narrow-minded repudiation of the highest results of modern philosophy. Then be it so; let modern philosophy perish, so that the Cross of Christ be maintained; * let those who know the gospel of the grace of God uphold it in all its preciousness, —remembering that the contradictions of man can never invalidate the truth of God.

* Sometimes they accuse defenders of being actuated by "interested motives"; be it so; — those who defend the title-deeds of their heavenly inheritance, the book of the Covenant which has been ratified by the blood of the Son of God, shed for the remission of sins, may well be "interested" in so doing; for here they have the record of that eternal life which God has given them in his Son. "Interested motives," such as these, have nothing in them at least of temporal policy.

We are told with regard to the publication of certain works, not a few of which are of doubtful or thoroughly sceptical character, —"Nothing could be more unworthy than the attempt to discourage, and indeed punish, such unselfish enterprise, by attaching a bad reputation for orthodoxy to everything connected with German philosophy and theology. This is especially unworthy in the 'student' or the 'scholar,' (to borrow Fichte's names,) who should disdain to set themselves to the task of exciting, by their friction, a popular prejudice and clamor on matters on which the populace are no competent judges, and have indeed no judgment of their own; and who should feel, as men themselves devoted to thought, that what makes a good book is not that it should gain its reader's acquiescence, but that it should multiply his mental experience."

This, then, is modern liberalism. We are recommended to read books which in many ways run counter to every doctrine of Christian belief. We may pore over all that has been written in opposition to the Godhead and sacrifice of Christ; we may study the sceptical and pseudo-philosophic objections to the authority of Scripture; we may waste our hours over writings intended to disprove that there is a "personal" God; and all this is to be commended as increasing our mental experience; in truth, it would increase it, even as our first parents obtained by transgression the knowledge of good and evil. "Be not deceived: evil communications corrupt good manners." However unworthy it may be of a *Fichtian* * "student" or "scholar" to object to the habitual use of poison for the mind, the Christian student of God's truth may rightly warn the popular mind (if he have ability so to do), especially as it is admitted that on this subject it possesses no judgment of its own. # We have not to stigmatize any body of men, or the writers of any nation; but surely, if we are sincere in our belief in fundamental truth, we can do no other than show the *real tendency* of those writings, which are designed (even when many other things are introduced into them) to lead the mind away from the simple reception of the Revelation given to us in the Scripture.

* The philosophy of Fichte is, I hope, but little known amongst those for whom these pages are especially designed. The attempts to popularise his system in an English garb have not been particularly successful. Dr. Davidson ("Biblical Hermeneutics," p. 219) thus speaks of it—"The Fichtian philosophy, which was *idealism*, regarding all objective being as real only in our subjective ideas, and thus denying the existence of a Supreme Being, which Fichte resolved into the notion of a *subjective moral arrangement of the world*, was not expressly made the foundation of any system of theology." Of course a Fichtian, —a rejecter of all thoughts of our responsibility to God, —would approve of whatever would unsettle belief in actual Christianity.

What a solemn responsibility, then, do those incur who press on the attention of a *populace, devoid of competency of judgment*, books which dogmatically teach the religion of negation! What would be thought of the *liberalism* of any friends of "progress" who should say, "The people are no competent judges of what is wholesome in food; it is, therefore, an unworthy act in any who excite a 'popular prejudice' against us when we offer them well-flavoured poison"?

And as to what was said about "German philosophy and theology," in the extract given above, it should be observed that the most determinedly anti-Christian of the books thus commended to our attention, is of mere English origin.

The mode in which many conduct their opposition to the truthfulness and authority of Scripture has been thus described: —

"Religion and metaphysics are now contemplated from within, and not from without; the world has been absorbed in man. The opponents of Christian doctrine in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were generally men of reckless and abandoned impiety, while they *now* claim its blessings without a Church, affect its morality without a Covenant, assume the name of Christ without acknowledging a personal Saviour, and regard Christianity itself as a necessary truth, independent of any gospel-histories, and unsupported by any true redemption. They have abandoned the 'letter' to secure the 'spirit,' and in return for the mysteries of our faith, they offer us a law without types, a *theocracy without prophecies*, a Christianity without miracles; —a cluster of definite wants, with no reality to supply them; for the 'mythic' theory, as if in bitter irony, concedes every craving which the gospel satisfies, and only accounts for the widespread 'delusion' by the intensity of man's need. Christian apologists have exhibited

the influence of the same change; they are naturally led to value exclusively those arguments which meet the exigencies of their own times; and so it is now a common thing to depreciate the outward evidences of religion, which are not, however, the less important because they are not conclusive to some minds. Historical proofs must necessarily claim attention, even where they cannot convince; and, as aforetime, many who did not believe for Jesus' words, believed for his very works' sake, so still the external array of Christian evidence may kindle the true inner faith, and in turn reflect its glory."—(*Elements of the Gospel Harmony*: by Brooke Foss Westcott, M. A., Fellow of Trinity College Cambridge: pp. 3, 4.)

Whatever be the tone of mind in the present day, nothing surely can deprive historic *proof* of its value and force. Be it remembered, that its force depends not on the mental power of perception of those to whom it is addressed, but upon its own nature. If a man be incapable of understanding a demonstrated theorem, the fault lies in *his* mind, and not in the nature of the proof itself. We must consider this whenever we see men who are not convinced by the plain and distinct testimonies to the historic reality of the Christian revelation. Those who are proof against all conviction, seem to assume that it displays mental superiority; if so, it is of the same kind as would be shown by one who would deny the conclusiveness of a single geometrical demonstration. Such a one *might* deem himself superior to common opinions; what others would think of *him* is a somewhat different question.

I do not undervalue the labours of Christian apologists who regard the subject (as it is attacked by many) from *within*. If there were in existence some ancient edifice of vast extent, presenting an untold variety of parts, some might say that it was the product of many ages, without definite plan, or unity of design. Others might look on it with more intelligent eyes, and might perceive the mutual coherence and adaptation of the respective portions; they might show that allegations of want of symmetry arose wholly from the partial and incorrect view taken by the objectors. They might thus prove that the common opinion was true, that it had proceeded from the mind of one skilful architect. But if there were *records* of the origin of the edifice, such as inscriptions on its various parts, which had *always* been well known, then it might be thought that the most direct proof would be to point an objector to these public monuments. He who took this line of evidence would by no means overlook the labours of those who proved the adaptation of the parts of the whole (a work which would probably require superior powers), but still he might feel that he took the more direct way of proving the point, *—a way, be it observed, which is not simply apologetic, but which puts the opposer on the defensive, instead of allowing him to hold a supposed vantage-ground in choosing for himself, how, when, and where to attack.

* In this Lecture I have almost exclusively confined myself to the external parts of testimony; the internal accordance has only been hinted at incidentally. Many points, therefore, in which the New Testament books exhibit their wonderful unity and coherence, have of course been passed by, as well as, in general, the sort of testimony which one book bears to another. The citation of St. Luke's Gospel in 1 Tim. has been brought forward, because it is *direct*, but not the mention of St. Paul's Epistles in 2 Pet., because it does not bear on certain *specific* epistles.

The evidence derived from mutual coherence and relation of Scripture has great value for *those who think*, while historic proof addresses itself not to these *only*, but also to those who, from their avocations or their mental constitution, *think but little*, — whose attention needs to be aroused by a presentation of distinct facts, wholly irrespective of whether they think or not.

I wish, if possible, to restore the historic grounds of Christian evidence to their proper place; they are, I am persuaded, a citadel which will ever be found impregnable: it seems as if the enemies of Revelation have secret misgivings as to this point: for they direct those attacks, which are intended to make an impression on the *multitude*, on any other point rather than this; they casually describe it as of small importance, or else they pass it by as though they would ignore its very existence, and lead others to do the same.

Thus, every conceivable subject which relates to the books of Scripture is made in turn the locality of the incursion of those rude forayers: *their* object being offensive, they choose their time, their place, and their weapons; and using a vigilance and an activity worthy of a better cause, they seek ever to put the upholders of truth merely on the defensive. It is, indeed, our duty "to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints"; but we ought to occupy such a position as to be able so to uphold the external fabric of Revelation, that it may afford a well-known shelter against the onslaught of assailants, and that its *historic reality* may be so known that none may doubt, except those who are willingly ignorant.

If it be objected by any that I set out from the assumed *ground of belief*; I answer, that objectors commonly, if not universally, assume the *ground of negation of belief*; however, in the exposition of *argument* (as found in the following Lecture), I *assume* nothing on the peculiar *Christian* evidence; I take there the simple ground, *if the ordinary process of historical investigation be well founded, then it follows that the New Testament books are indeed genuine*: the *proof* is then given, and all rests on the testimony of witnesses, and not on dogmatic assumption.

It is a great mistake to suppose (as many now seem to do) that a negation of belief in Revelation marks mental elevation, or is an indication of a mind that thinks for itself. Any one can thus acquire a kind of celebrity; and not a few of those whose writings and words are circulated amongst us, appear to maintain their negative opinions, simply to obtain a notoriety which they could gain in no other way. But few of these, however, seem to think for themselves at all. They adopt some notion from some leader, and thus, while they boast of being free from all trammels, they are really the superstitious admirers (might I not say *adorers*?) of what they consider to be superior intellect or transcendent genius. * They profess to have taken a position of "progress," and they speak of the need that we have of some new declarer of truth. Some even *expect* such a thing: they anticipate the rise of some one who shall be (to use their own words) *a true priest, a prophet, a godlike soul*: to *him* they are evidently prepared to listen with ears of obedient credulity. The "mission" of such a one (to use a term which certain modern writers apply so uncouthly to persons or things sent forth by no one) would be to arouse men to an apprehension of the *unreality* of all that has been credited as revealed truth, and to present instead such rationalistic apprehensions as shall fully extol and glorify the mere human intellect.

* [And as to the leaders themselves, the mass of their objections and arguments are nothing but a repetition of refuted assertions, utterly devoid of originality, and marking no superiority of mind whatever: these leaders would not impose so easily on their followers, had they to do with persons tolerably well acquainted with what had been thought and written on the subject long ago, or with those who are not willing to be deceived.]

Whatever opinions the readers may profess on the subject of the prophetic warnings of Scripture, at least he will, I think, see in these expectations, on the part of those who reject the Revelation given to us by Jesus Christ, that which calls his solemn words to mind, —"I am

come in my Father's name and ye receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive."—(John iv. 43.) The Scripture tells us of "many antichrists," and also of "*the* antichrist," who shall "deny the Father and the Son."—(1 John ii. 18, 22.) Are not the rejecters of Him who once came in his Father's name, *prepared* to receive one, who is marked by the denial of all revealed truth? Has not the Scripture warned us as to those that "received not the love of the truth that they might be saved," that "for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie?"

But what other can be expected, if men have before them the full extent of the evidence to the coming of the Messiah of God, and to his work of atonement, and yet cast it all aside as unworthy of acceptance, but that they should be allowed to follow the Messiah of their own hearts, and to receive the solemn and righteous judgment of Jesus Christ of Nazareth at his second appearing? *

* [Since the above was written, I have noticed some observations on statements contained in Tennyson's poetry, which I transcribe. The passage to which reference is made is that in which he says, "Ring out a slowly-dying cause," and afterwards, "Ring in the Christ that is to be." These expressions seem plain enough, but I prefer not to comment on them in my own words, but in those of a reviewer. His remarks are: —

"His ringing out of the old is intelligible enough, especially where he speaks of a 'slowly-dying cause' (that, namely, of Christianity); but what and where, pray, are the 'nobler modes of life, the sweeter manners, purer laws? *Who* is to bring the thousand years of peace? And who, tell us, Tennyson, if you can, is the 'Christ that is *to be*?' Of this one thing we are certain, you do not mean Jesus of Nazareth, or any one system or person retaining Him in his or its belief.

"We ask Tennyson, as a thoughtful and gifted man, if he really thinks *on his principles*, the millennium so near, as that he needs be awakening already the bells of its jubilee? Is it literature or poesy that is to make men happy? Or is it philosophy which is to effect this mighty change? —philosophy which, in its modern refined shapes, has substituted a dead idea for a living God and Father, shaken under man's feet the hope, of immortality, sought with cold, firm hand to quench the only fire from heaven which has ever shone on our benighted way, and decreed solemnly, in its chilly and skeleton-surrounded halls, that Revelation is impossible. We, on the other hand, hold to a more sure word of hope and promise. We expect new heavens and a new earth, in which dwelleth righteousness. We look for the help of man to a higher source than himself."—*Critic*, Feb. 2nd, 1852.]

These observations have been suggested wholly by the remarkable language of the objectors themselves, and the yearnings for the future which have occupied their hearts. Would that they might learn to be satisfied with Him who has already come, and that through faith in his name they might find a shelter from that solemn reality, "the wrath to come"!

All adherence to belief in Revelation is stigmatised as opposition "to progress" and "free" inquiry: then let *words* be thus used; *things* remain the same: —it is better to oppose all *progress* towards error, and utterly repudiated should be all *free* inquiry which sets out with the rejection of the authority of God. Such *progress* as some now talk of with regard to religious truth is that which they never would apply to any other subject. If the first step in *progress* as to Revelation is to throw aside all that we know of the elementary laws of evidence as to facts, then let us make progress in learning by rejecting letters, in natural philosophy by denying the law of gravitation, in geometry by repudiating definitions and

axioms, in optics by denying the very existence of light, and in chemistry by rejecting the law of definite proportions.

Let none suppose that I wish to put an acknowledgment of the facts of Revelation in too high a place, as though such a reception of Scripture and Christianity were in itself the object to be attained. Far from it: —just as the law only brought condemnation on those who owned its claims but transgressed it, *so the New Testament brings condemnation on every man who owns it to be from God, and yet docs not use its teaching as showing the way to God, through the faith of Christ.* * But while this is the case, we may well ask, Which is the more likely to give heed to the light, —he who rejects it, shuts his eyes to it, and goes in a contrary direction, or he who owns that it is really light, and that it marks the way in which his steps should go?

* [This is precisely the case with tho clergy; they use it as a book of mottoes for their wild speculations called "sermons," not as showing the strait gate and narrow way that leadeth unto life, and found of only few. —*Editor Herald.*]

Romanism, on the one hand, may own that Scripture is from God, and yet keep it from the eyes of men; rationalism, on the other, may deny the claims of Scripture altogether. Romanism may affirm that men cannot understand Scripture for themselves, and therefore may present to them doctrines which *contradict* it, and may also set up authority based on false assertions; rationalism may declare that man possesses sufficient "intuitional consciousness" to teach him aright. In opposition to both these forms of error we may stand with the Scripture as our safeguard. We have not to show any favour to Rome because it opposes rationalism, nor are we to have any sympathy with rationalism because it rejects the demands of Rome. We may admit that spiritual illumination is needed to understand Scripture aright, but that God gives this by the operation of the word itself upon the mind; and so far from claiming any ability of our own we may repudiate the possession of any intuitive powers to guide us aright. The misuse or the misinterpretation of Scripture is no argument for lessening its own value: it is a witness to the truths of God, even though its testimony may be often unheeded. A heart that is early taught the authority of Scripture, and that is instructed in *what the Scripture says*, is imbued with those objective truths which may be used to teach their living power and efficacy as inwardly applied; while he who is taught to reject scripture has an especial barrier placed before him to exclude the light.

This, then, is an answer to those who think that too much stress may be laid on the historic evidence to the Word of God as an external thing. Happy is he who is led to receive the testimony of Scripture *into his heart*, so that he may find eternal life, through "the obedience of faith," he knows the real preciousness of Scripture; but what can be thought of the twofold blindness of the condition of him who not only rejects the truths which bestow spiritual blessing, but who formally sets up some supposed philosophy, instead of that which authoritatively declares those truths?

In 2 Tim. ch. ii., the value of holy Scripture is especially declared in connection with "perilous times" of the "last days," when "evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived." In contrast to this, Timothy was reminded that he from a child had known the Holy Scriptures, [The writings of Moses and the Prophets were the only scriptures at that time in existence. Children then were more enlightened in divine things than the adults, whether clergymen or people, of the nineteenth century. These have an idea that to study the prophets is calculated to craze the mind. But this was not its effect in the days of

old. — *Editor.*], which are able to make wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. Thus we may learn *what* it is that has a protective power: we have the *whole* Scripture, of which there was but a *part* written when Timothy received his training; and Scripture is the instrument by which God acts on the mind of a child that learns it; the same Scripture makes wise unto salvation, through faith in that Saviour of whom it testifies; and it is still the same Scripture which affords spiritual support and instruction to him who has received the gospel of Christ; for by it "the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

In speaking of the historic evidence of the authorship and transmission of the books of the New Testament, I propose, first, to bring before your attention those proofs which are conclusive on the subject of their having really been written by the Apostles and their companions, and then, to point out briefly the channels through which they have been transmitted to us.

I need not dwell at length on the importance of the subject: it must be evident to all who value the revelation which God has given us in the New Testament, that it is well for our minds to be informed as to the distinct grounds of evidence on which we believe and receive these writings as authentic. We hold Christianity as a divinely-communicated system of religion, —a religion which is based on promises and *facts*, and which sets forth doctrines connected with those *facts*: the New Testament presents to us the record by which those facts and their doctrines have been made known to us, —hence the interest of this subject to the mind of every intelligent Christian.

The ground-work of our religion is the Covenants confirmed to Abraham and David, and the *fact* that the Son or Spirit of God, which was with the Father before all worlds, became man, and for our salvation, after He had in all things glorified the Father by a life of obedience, laid down his life upon the cross as a sacrifice for believing sinners, that He rose again from the dead, and that He ascended to the right hand of God the Father, after having commanded repentance and remission of sins to be preached in His name amongst all nations, and having set forth "the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," as the object of our allegiance and religious worship, whereinto we are baptized.

This basis is the ground and reason why there is such a thing as Christianity in the world: it is this which has delivered multitudes of men from the blindness and idolatry in which they were once sunk. And although the name of Christian is unhappily for the most part a mere profession, and although it is confounded with false and evil superstitions, hateful to God and hurtful to man, —yet still it is to this basis, brought to our souls by the life-giving power of the Word, that any of us know the real blessing of peace with God, through the great salvation preached by Christ and his Apostles.

It is thus, to those who really know the value of the gospel of Christ, that the subject before us is replete with interest; for such only can enter into the *true* value of the Scriptures, since they are not only their instructor in the truth of God, but they are also the title-deeds of their heavenly inheritance.

We may in a sense apply to this subject the words of Luke, in the introduction to his Gospel, "that thou mayest know the *certainty* of those things wherein thou hast been instructed;" for, thoroughly satisfied as we may be in our own minds of the full authority of the records of our religion, we cannot but feel that exact information as to the grounds of

evidence has a peculiar value, when objections or difficulties are raised by any. Our own minds may be wholly unaffected by the objections brought forward, —we may be as sure as ever we were that Scripture is the word of God, and yet we must feel that it is at least unsatisfactory to have questions raised which we do not know how to answer; and this must be especially true in a case like the present, when the difficulties and objections may be so fully met, as to show that they arise either from the objector not being fully aware of the bearings of the subject, or else from a desire on his part to take advantage of the ignorance of others.

But there are also inquirers, —persons who really wish to know on what ground the Scriptures of the New Testament are received: now, if such inquirers are candid, they certainly ought to be met: —such persons ought to be shown that it is not a mere prevalent *opinion* that Matthew and others bore testimony, in the books which bear their names, to the events of our Lord's life, death, and resurrection, but that we have the most simple and well-defined grounds of certainty that this is the unquestionable fact.

We ought to know what to answer, when asked why we receive as authoritative the Acts of the Apostles, and reject the Acts of Paul and Thecla; —why we own the Epistles of the New Testament, and reject the Epistles and Discourses attributed to Peter in the Clementine Homilies. The answer may be given as simply, clearly, and fully as if the question were, Why do you acknowledge the first and second parts of "The Pilgrim's Progress" to be written by John Bunyan, and reject the third part as a spurious addition?

I have now to endeavour to present before you such a statement of the evidence on the subject as shall be both clear and ample: the details into which I must of necessity enter require a certain measure of attention, of the same kind as is needed in pursuing any other line of proof, whether mathematical or moral.

PROCESS OF PROOF.

How, then, can we know satisfactorily to whom we ought to ascribe the authorship of ancient works? How can we *prove* that any book was really written by the person whose name it bears? How can we, living at this time, inquire with all confidence into points of authorship which relate to a period eighteen hundred years ago? In other words, What is the process of proof which must be applied to this subject?

A very distinct statement of the mode of investigation is given by the "Christian" writer, Augustine, about the year 400. He lays down, plainly and unhesitatingly, that the authorship of Scripture must be investigated in just the same manner as we would inquire into that of secular writings. In the case of profane writers, he says, most truly, that it has often happened that works have been produced and attributed to their pens, which have afterwards been rightly rejected as spurious, —and why? Because such alleged writings possess no external evidence of their authenticity, not being mentioned by contemporary and immediately subsequent authors; and because they also, in their contents, present those things which are not in accordance with the author to which they have been ascribed, or to his known writings, or to the time in which he lived. This is a plain, discriminating canon of Augustine, for the rejection of suppositious writings.

But as to authentic works, we have simply to apply the converse of this canon. Augustine asks how we can then determine such and such works to be the genuine productions of Hippocrates. He replies, —

"Because a successional series of writers, from the time of Hippocrates and onward to the present day, have declared them to be such; so that to doubt would be to act the part of a madman. Whence (he continues) do men know as to the writings of Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Varro, and other such authors, what is really theirs, but by the same continued testimony of successive ages?"

This principle he then applies to the point, with which I would now connect it: —

"Many (he says) have written much on subjects relating to the Church, not indeed with canonical authority, but for purposes of aid or instruction. Whence does it stand as an admitted fact whose any work may be, unless it be by testimony from the author's time, and by the continued and wide-extended knowledge amongst those who come after, that these things have been transmitted to us, so that, when asked, we need not hesitate what we ought to answer?"

Augustine, in this passage, is addressing Faustus, the Manichaeon, the first (it is said) who denied that the Gospels were really written by those whose names they bear. He then applies the argument to the controversy which he was at that very time carrying on with him.

"Why should I go back to things long past? Look at these very letters which we hold in our hands; and if some while after we shall be dead, any should deny those to be Faustus's, or these to be mine, whence will he be convinced, except through those who now know these things, transmitting, by continued succession, their acquaintance with the facts to posterity?"—(*Contra Faustum*, l. 33.)

Now, these principles are of the utmost importance with regard to historic proof; for although it might be objected that Augustine concedes too much to his opponent, in laying down that a genuine work ought *of necessity* to possess such successive testimonies, and although we know that many writings are received without doubt or hesitation, although the absolute evidence is but small in itself yet this is certain, that no work can be spurious which is authenticated by such evidence as that which Augustine has described.

Thus, if in the ages which immediately follow that in which a work is said to have been written, we have distinct statements from credible witnesses of its existence and authorship, we possess that definite historic ground on which we receive the best authenticated productions of antiquity.

The New Testament, we must remember, consists of a collection of books; the statement of evidence must, therefore, relate in part to the collection as such, and in part to the several portions of which it is composed.

The period of inquiry as to any work is of course limited to the ages immediately following that in which the authors are said to have lived: we need not go below the fourth century as to the New Testament, for from that time our twenty-seven books have been all commonly received.

THE NEW TESTAMENT AS A COLLECTIVE VOLUME.

The first statement, then, to which I shall call your attention is the list which Eusebius gives of the twenty-seven books of the New Testament.

This well-known ecclesiastical historian was born in Palestine about the year 264: in his history, written about the year 330, he thus mentions the Scriptures of the New Testament:—

" Now, this appears to be a suitable place to give a summary statement of the books of the New Testament, which I have already mentioned. In the first place, then, we must put the holy quaternion of the Gospels: these are followed by the Acts of the Apostles: then we must mention the Epistles of Paul; then we must place the acknowledged first Epistle of John, and, similarly, the admitted Epistle of Peter: after this may be placed, if it appear suitable, the Apocalypse of John; the various opinions about which we shall set forth in proper time. And these are amongst the books *universally owned* (Homologoumena). Now, of *opposed* books (Antilegomena), which are, however, acknowledged similarly by the many, are reckoned the Epistle called that of James, and that of Jude, and the second of Peter, and those named the second and third of John, or of some other of the same name. Amongst *spurious* writings are reckoned the Acts of Paul, and the book called the Shepherd, and the Apocalypse of Peter, and also the Epistle of Barnabas, and what are called the Instructions of the Apostles; and also (as I said), if it appear suitable, the Apocalypse of John, which (as I said) some reject, but which others rank amongst the books universally received. And now some reckon amongst these the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which especially pleases those of the Hebrews who have received Christ. And these are all the books which are *opposed*. We have of necessity included these in our catalogue, having distinguished the writings which, according to the accounts delivered by the Church, are true, genuine, and universally owned, and those others which, although known by many ecclesiastical writers, are not reckoned in the canon, but are opposed"—(l. iii. c. 25).

From this passage we learn, that in the time of Eusebius—the latter part of the third century and the beginning of the fourth—all the twenty-seven books of the New Testament were known and received by Christians in general, —that there was discrimination exercised as to *what* books ought to be included in the New Testament collection; that several books *professedly* apostolic were rejected, but that none were included in the collection which we do not now receive; and none of those which we receive were absolutely rejected, although, as to a few of the number, there was some difference of opinion.*

* This difference of opinion may be ascribed to the denunciations of Peter, James, John and Jude, recorded in those epistles against the clergy, who were contending for pre-eminence over the church, and which they at length *acquired*. —*Editor*.

Not long before Eusebius wrote his history, events had occurred which rendered it needful for the Church to discriminate accurately between its authoritative Scriptures and other books. The Diocletian persecution, which commenced in the year 303, was directed even more against the sacred books of the Christians than against their persons. The endeavour was made to exterminate the Christian Scriptures: had this effort succeeded, it was thought that the form of belief which hindered the disciples of Christ from uniting in the popular idolatries, would at once fall to the ground. Such an effort had been made by Antiochus Epiphanes to destroy the Old Testament, and thus to annihilate Judaism. However

foolish such an attempt may sound, there are facts which show that such an endeavour to destroy a book may be successful. A century after the invention of printing, an Italian book, on "The Benefits which we receive by the Death of Christ," had passed through many editions, and was possessed (it is said) by almost every intelligent family in that peninsula. The question of heresy was raised—the free grace of the gospel of Christ was found to be set forth in this widely-circulated volume, and its destruction was decreed. The machinery of the confessional was set in motion; all were required to surrender their copies, and thus the work disappeared so thoroughly, that its contents were only known from the accounts of contemporary writers. Ranke, in his "History of the Popes," says that this book was as much lost as the lost Decades of Livy. I may observe that this volume, after a disappearance of three hundred years, has again been discovered in an English version, from which it has been re-translated into Italian, and printed, and again employed as an instrument in the endeavours now carried on for introducing the light of the gospel into that land. That the present efforts to spread the gospel of Christ in that country, the seat of Romish power and idolatry, may be blessed in spite of the existing persecutions, far more widely than was the case at the time of the Reformation, must be the earnest desire and prayer of all who prize the gospel of Jesus Christ, and value the possession of God's holy word.

In the Diocletian persecution, the Christians throughout the Roman empire, from the Euphrates to the Atlantic, from the cataracts of the Nile to Britain, were required to give up their copies of the New Testament to be destroyed: those who refused, suffered imprisonments, tortures, slavery or death. Many refused to surrender the Scriptures, and endured the consequences; others complied with the order of the emperors, and thence received, amongst Christians, the designation of *Traditors*, as though they had betrayed the word of God, just as Judas had betrayed our blessed Lord Himself. There were also some who allowed the emissaries of the government to take away any books which were *not* Scripture; some bishops placed books of the heathens, or of heretics, where the messengers of the magistrates were likely to search for copies of the Gospels. Indeed, not a few of those employed by the persecutors had but little zeal in the cause, so that (unlike the agents of the authorities in Italy, who are now so diligent in searching for copies of the Scriptures, and in arresting those who read them,) they willingly took away whatever books were delivered to them, without inquiring whether they were the Christian Scriptures or not.

In consequence of this persecution, and the light in which the *Traditors* were regarded as subject to severe ecclesiastical discipline, it became really an anxious question, *What* are the sacred books of the Christians? Hence the need of discrimination on this point. Whoever gave up any of the books universally received was a *Traditor*, —whoever gave up any of the books reckoned as spurious, was not subjected to any ecclesiastical discipline; but from the general feeling of the many (as stated in the passage quoted from Eusebius), any who gave up the books opposed by some, would be looked on with doubt, and by most would be condemned as *Traditors*. The importance of the question was felt as widely as was the diffusion of the Christian name.

The conclusion is manifest, that two centuries after the death of the Apostle John, all the books of the New Testament were known and used as a *collection*, that they were received as universally owned, with the exception of five of the shorter Epistles and the Apocalypse, of which some doubted. *

* The fact of books of the New Testament being known and used as a collected volume, at the close of the third and beginning of the fourth century, is also evident from the manner in

which Lactantius, at that period, speaks (Inst. iv. c. 20) of the New Testament, as comprising that portion of holy Scripture which was written after the passion of our Lord.

We may trace *backwards*, from Eusebius towards the days of the Apostles, so as to observe the notices which exist of the collected books of the New Testament.

In the former half of the third century, there was no Church teacher so conspicuous, as an author, as Origen. He was born at Alexandria about the year 185, and he died A. D. 254, ten years before the birth of Eusebius. In his writings he makes such extensive use of the New Testament, that although a very large number of his works are lost, and many others have come down to us only in defective Latin versions, we can in his extant Greek writings alone (I speak this from actual knowledge and examination) find cited at least two-thirds of the New Testament; so that, had such a thing been permitted as that the Gospels, and some of the other books, should have been lost, we might restore them in a great measure by means of the quotations in Origen.

Origen passed a considerable portion of his life in Palestine; he had also visited Borne, so that his testimony to the books of the New Testament cannot be considered as belonging merely to his native locality.

Eusebius (l. vi. c. 25) extracted from Origen's writings such passages as mention the uncontroverted books of the New Testament. In these passages he speaks of the four Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, as received by the whole Church which is under heaven. He mentions the Acts, as well as the Gospel, as the work of Luke. He speaks of the Epistles of Paul in a general manner (every one of which he cites in his writings). He mentions the Apocalypse as the work of the Apostle John, who wrote the Gospel and the first Epistle that bear his name. He speaks of the second and third Epistles of John as held to be doubtful by some; the first Epistle of Peter he calls universally owned; the second he speaks of as one about which there were doubts. In this sort of casual mention of the New Testament books, Origen does not speak of the Epistle of James or Jude, both of which, however, he uses in his works. In other passages of Origen, which are only extant in the old Latin version (which is not worthy of *implicit* confidence), lists may be found of all the New Testament writings as we receive them.

I shall not now dwell on the manner in which Tertullian at Carthage, Clement of Alexandria, and Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, at the beginning of the third and close of the second century, speak of the New Testament: —I shall have occasion to refer to these important witnesses when speaking of particular parts of the collected volume of the Christian Scriptures.

The earliest notice of any *collected* books of the New Testament is found in a remarkable testimony of an unknown writer. The document to which I refer is commonly called the Canon in Muratori, because it was first published by that Italian scholar and antiquary, from a MS. in the Ambrosian library at Milan. This document is defective at the beginning, and throughout it is grievously disfigured by the gross errors of the copyist. The ignorance of the transcriber makes, however, the testimony not at all the less forcible. This canon, as it is called, from containing a list of our canonical books, bears undoubted marks of being a translation, made from the Greek and Latin, by some one whose knowledge of the grammar and construction of the Latin language was very imperfect.

In the beginning the writer is speaking of the four Gospels. That part which relates to Matthew and Mark is lost, except the concluding words: then Luke, the companion of the Apostle Paul is mentioned as the author of the third Gospel, and John of the fourth; John's first Epistle is next mentioned; then the Acts of the Apostles as written by Luke; then all those Epistles of Paul are spoken of to which his name is prefixed, and then the Apocalypse of John: then the writer speaks of some spurious works which were rejected, and adds, "It is not fitting to mix gall with honey. The Epistle of Jude, and two of the above-mentioned of John, are reckoned amongst the general writings." In saying the two Epistles, the writer may have known of but one of John's shorter Epistles, or, as it appears probable to me, he may mean two *besides* the first Epistle of which he had spoken before. He then continues in a sentence which is not very comprehensible—"and Wisdom, written by the friends of Solomon in his honour." This stands in almost unintelligible obscurity; —*how* it can find a place amongst New Testament writings is difficult to be imagined; and also *what* book is intended is by no means clear, —whether the apocryphal book, or Proverbs, to which this name of wisdom was appended in the second century, —a book the latter part of which was written out by "the men of Hezekiah," and of which some chapters are the words of Agur and king Lemuel.

The writer thus concludes what he has to say of New Testament books: "the Apocalypse, also, of John and Peter alone we receive, which [latter] indeed some amongst us do not choose to be read in the Church."—(*Routh's Reliquiae Sacrae*, vol. i. p. 394.)

Thus, this ancient canon recognises the four Gospels, the Acts, thirteen Epistles of Paul, and, in short, all the New Testament books, except the Epistle to the Hebrews, that of James, those of Peter, and perhaps the second or third of John: —it speaks of no book, as belonging to the New Testament, which we reject, except the Apocalypse of Peter, and even that is mentioned doubtfully.

The author of this list of books speaks also of some which ought *not* to be received as of divine authority. He mentions "the Shepherd, written very recently in our own time, in the city of Rome by Hermas, while Pius, his brother, was bishop of the see of Rome." This incidental remark supplies us with the date of the writer. Pius the First, bishop of the church in Rome, died about the middle of the second century; he appears to have succeeded to the office about the year 140. Thus, the list of New Testament books, which we have under consideration, cannot have been written at a much later period. And not only so, but as the writer speaks of the episcopate of Pius the first as being in his own days, his testimony reaches back as far, and probably farther. These were books known, and received, and used as divine Scripture in the former half of the second century.

It is often remarkable, when pursuing a historical inquiry of a kind wholly different, how we meet with the strongest possible evidence against the claims of the Papacy. This writer, in speaking of authentic Scripture, rests on known historic facts, instead of cutting short the investigation by appealing at once to the infallible authority of *Pope* Pius the first. And further, he mentions the book which the brother of this same Pius had put forth during his episcopate: now, this book is still in being; and though many have treated it with most undeserved respect, imagining the author to be the Hermas whom Paul salutes in Rom. xvi., yet the absurdities, to use no stronger expression with which it is replete, evince that it is no exposition of Christian truth. If, then, Hermas put it forth with the sanction of his brother, the bishop, it would show that the then Pope could authorise a work both unedifying and unorthodox; if, however, Hermas put forth his idle fancies *without* the authorisation of his brother, the bishop, what possibility is there that any censorship then existed? How different

were the claims of Rome in the days of Pius the First from what we see in the days of Pius the Ninth!

The existence of this Pius the first is a simple historical fact; the time, too, is known approximately; but in some of the lists of Popes he is numbered the ninth, in some the tenth, and in others the eleventh! Some make him the predecessor, some the successor, of Anicetus. Had the certainty of papal succession and transmission been the basis of all continued Christianity, how uncomfortable would all these doubts and uncertainties make us! It is well that the facts of the transmission of the Scriptures rest on a firm and certain basis, independent of all questions of papal succession.

We are thus able to trace back lists of New Testament books *almost* to the apostolic age: the author of the Canon in Muratori, from which I have been quoting, lived in the days of some who had been in part contemporaries of the Apostle John. We know from the natural course of events that this *must* have been the case. And we need not rely on deductions, however certain, for we know as a fact, that Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, who had himself personally known John, laid down his life at a very advanced age as a martyr for Christ, about the year 168. * Polycarp visited Rome, the place at which the author of this fragmentary list seems to have lived and written, after the middle of the second century—a visit memorable for the amicable contention between him and Anicetus, the Roman bishop, about the proper time for the celebration of Easter: each remained unconvinced by the other, and each left the other to the exercise of his individual Christian liberty: —what a proof that the claims of infallibility and universal jurisdiction were as yet unknown!

* He had been a Christian 86 years. When invited to reproach Christ, he said "Eighty and six years have I served him, and he hath never wronged me, and how can I blaspheme my king who hath saved me?"—*Milner*.

We have thus proof that the New Testament books in general, were in use as authoritative Scripture in the days of those who lived in the apostolic age—that they were ascribed to the same writers to whom we attribute them, and that several of them were classed together as being, though not as yet *one* collected volume, yet at least in some measure a collection.

For ancient writings in general we ask no more distinct proof of genuineness: it is commonly regarded as quite sufficient, if a work is mentioned by one or more writers of the succeeding age, in such a way as to show that it was then known and used as the work of the author whose name it bears.

With regard to the New Testament books, however, we can go much further with our proofs, when we consider, not the volume as a *collection*, but the distinct parts of which the volume is composed.

In the second century *two* collected portions of the New Testament were known and used by Christians, as read in their public assemblies; the one of these contained the Epistles of Paul, to which his name is prefixed, the other comprised the four Gospels as a *collected* volume. Besides these there were other writings used separately.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

Protestantism.

THE following truthful picture of Protestantism, drawn by a Protestant minister in Torquay, England, shows that the world is about ripe for the judgments of God. The remarks were made a short time before the commencement of the present war. The writer says: —

"It has at last become evident, even to the most thoughtless, that some great catastrophe is at hand, and that some heavy judgment is hanging over Christendom. . . How is the gold become dim! Every thing in confusion — every thing threatening! All nations preparing for war! —and not only war, but revolution! . . . The world is rushing headlong into a tremendous revolution, and falling directly under the judgments of God! Such is our state; and the true cause is—THE EXTINCTION OF CHRISTIANITY. 'Because THOU art LUKEWARM, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth.' (Rev. 3d.) APOSTACY is the cause, and destruction is the END. . . . Wherever we look, nothing is to be seen but the ruins of Christian truth. Christianity, like some ruined temple, lies scattered here and there. Its sheltering walls are overthrown—its symmetry destroyed. No man flies to it for defence from the cruelty of the world—no man finds an asylum within its gates—no man looks any more on its beautiful proportions, as a model for the construction of his life. The broken columns, —the cornices, —the hewn stones, —lie here and there, and each man may find a fragment useful for his purpose, and precious in itself; but you will search in vain for any shelter for the multitude—for any spot where nations may meet together, in unity.'"

In speaking of the English nation, he says: —"We have blown Christianity to pieces, as we did the wretched people of India, after we had first driven them to insurrection by ages of cruelty; and we believe that, at this moment, Christianity has become absolutely EXTINCT.

If you will not take this upon trust, you may find it proved by undeniable facts. . . . The world looked on and sneered at the hypocrisy which sent out missionaries and Bibles, cut a road for them with the sword, and built it up with mangled limbs, torn to pieces with artillery. By these unholy deeds, —by the abject silence of our clergy, we have . . . taught the rest of mankind that Christianity is a jest—a loose garment to be put on for an ornament in time of peace, and to be thrown aside the moment we can gain any thing by war. Such a Christianity has long enveloped the nation at large; and the clergy, by their abject silence, have adopted it for their own.

We believe that Protestantism has been put on its trial before God and man. It had long been corrupt, and worldly to the heart's core. It had worshipped money, and rank, and worldly prosperity. It had fallen away from all the simplicity of Christ. And yet it had dared to pour its abuse upon the church of Rome, which was certainly as bad; but could hardly have been worse. Both are equally APOSTATES—one being an apostate church worshipping SAINTS, —the other, an apostate church worshipping MONEY. . . . The conduct of our clergy has been, more especially discreditable. Zealous in trifles; indifferent in great things. Zealous when zeal was popular; tame and silent when zeal was disreputable

What shall we say to these things? That Protestantism had fallen into the idolatries of Paganism, and is become a worshipper of demons. . . .

Were fifty Luthers to arise at once, they could not revive it. Wretched, miserable, poor, blind, and naked; it thinks itself rich and in need of nothing; and self-conceit is an incurable disease. You can act upon vice, and rage, and revenge, but you can never act upon SELF-CONCEIT. We believe that Christendom is enervated beyond recovery."

Theiopolitical.

The Italian Question.

"The Kings of the earth shall hate the Harlot—Rev. xvii. 19.

The apostle John in Rev. xvii. 3, informs us, that he was borne off in spirit into a wilderness. "Personally, he was in the isle called Patmos, under guard, as the prisoner of the Lord in the hand of the Romans. But while thus guarded, he had a vision, —that is, he saw *mentally* things which did not actually exist at the time he saw them; and things which he could not have so seen, if they had not been daguerretyped upon his sensorium by the spirit of the Deity. This is what he means by saying of the angel, *απηνεγκε με εν πνευματι* "*he bore me off in spirit,*" He was "in spirit" away off in the nineteenth century, while personally a prisoner in Patmos at the closing of the first; for what he saw in spirit, and recorded in the seventeenth and eighteenth chapters of the apocalypse, belongs to our present and near future.

He tells us, that he was translated "*into a wilderness*" *εις ερημον*. The Hebrews give the name of *wilderness* to all places not cultivated, but which are chiefly destined to the feeding of cattle, and on which trees grow wild. So that when wilderness is mentioned in scripture, we are not always to imagine it to be a place forsaken, abandoned, void of cities or inhabitants; as this word, in Hebrew *midbar*, often represents the soil near a city or village which was appointed for pasture, and where the plough never came. Thus in scripture, there are few cities which had not their wilderness, that is, uncultivated places for woods and pastures.

Peoples are styled trees, grass, forests, waters, and so forth; hence there is a wilderness especially denominated "THE WILDERNESS OF THE PEOPLES"—*midbar hahammim*—Ezek. xx. 35. The house of Israel is now in this wilderness. Adonai Yahweh has brought them there, and there he will "plead with them face to face, as he pleaded with their fathers in the wilderness of the land of Israel." Into this wilderness of the peoples John was translated in spirit or vision.

He saw there "many waters," verse 1; which, in verse 15, are declared to mean, "peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues." Hence it was a wilderness of peoples, and so called because the multitudes and nationalities inhabiting it, or rather, composing it, are aggregations of wild and uncultivated races—uncultivated by that "wisdom which is from above, which is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy"—James iii. 17. The races, by whatever name designated, are strangers to this wisdom. The wisdom of which they glory is "earthly, psychical, and demoniac;" and all emanates from "the flesh in which dwelleth no good thing." It is the wisdom of the clergy, styled in the apocalyptic epistles, "the depths of the Satan as they speak," with which both the clergy, and the peoples guided by them, have prostituted and debauched themselves.

John saw the clergy of the mother Church, and the clergies of her Harlot-Daughters, and the clergies of the abominable names and denominations of the Western habitable, or wilderness; or "court which is without the temple given unto the Gentiles," (Rev. xi. 2); and he saw them "sitting upon the many waters," or peoples of "Christendom;" and sustained by their imperial and kingly governments. He saw this, and he represents to us what he saw, by *a drunken murderess and prostitute, sitting upon a scarlet-coloured beast with eight heads and ten horns*, as described in the chapter. He says, she was drunk with blood, and the nationalities upon which she rode, were drunk with the wine with which she drugged them. When he saw this representation of the ecclesiastical and civil constitution of what is styled Latin Christendom, he says, "I wondered with great astonishment." And well he might. Acquainted as he was with original and genuine Christianity in precept and practice, he must indeed have been astonished when he contemplated what the clergy now term Christianity in its civil, ecclesiastical, and doctrinal constitution, under the aspect of the symbols presented to his view in the wilderness. The mind of the Spirit concerning our Clerical Christendom or Jezebel, is discerned in the label he has placed upon her forehead, which is descriptive of her name or character. The original ecclesiastical institution of *the apostasy* he styles, "Mystery, Babylon the Great Mother:" that is, "*the mystery of iniquity*," Paul said was already working, and predicted would overshadow everything; in its ecclesiastical organization, would be a system of strong delusion and doctrinal confusion, and therefore "Babylon the Great:" that it would be *the mother-system* of spiritual iniquity in a multitude of forms; which *forms* would be "*names of blasphemy*" abounding in the scarlet-coloured beast, the symbol of the "many waters" in their political constitution. "I saw a woman sitting upon a scarlet-coloured beast full of names of blasphemy." The beast was full of the names, not the woman, as the construction of the original shows. These names of blasphemy which abound among *the scarlet-beast peoples* are classified by the spirit into two categories, — "the Harlots," and then, "the abominations of the earth;" so that the label upon Jezebel's forefront designates the three grand divisions of the mystery of iniquity; and which for the sake of clearness may be specified as,

1. The great Babylonish Mother, with Rome for its ecclesiastical capital and throne;
2. The Harlots, or State Churches of the West; and,
3. The abominations of the earth; or all the other names and denominations known as "the Sects."

It is a remarkable fact that all the State Churches and Gentile Sects style the Roman or Latin Church "the Mother Church." They admit that she is a true church, and the most ancient of them all; and that there is salvation in her pale. They all acknowledge that they obtained their "baptism," as they absurdly enough term their baby-sprinkling, from her; while she declares that she did not get it from the scriptures. She, however, is not so "charitable" as they; for she denies salvation to all who die out of her communion. Thus "the mother of all churches" stands confessed; while those same churches, endorsing the opinion of Martin Luther and his contemporary reformers, proclaim their mother to be no other than "the Mother of the Harlots!"

To this protestant opinion we have no objection. The Roman Church, the spiritual system of Daniel's Fourth Beast in its western development, is unquestionably the ecclesiastical mother John saw in the wilderness. But, then, we contend, that this universal admission must be carried out to its logical conclusion, which is this: namely, that the Roman Church being the "mother of the Harlots," and "the mother of all churches," those churches must of necessity be "the Harlots" and "the Abominations." There is no evading this

conclusion which is sustained by reason and doctrinal likeness. Thus the mother Jezebel teaches the congenital existence of an immortal soul in sin's flesh; so do all her Harlot daughters; —she teaches, that holy souls go to Heaven at death, where they enter upon the reward; so do they; —she teaches, that the wicked souls go immediately to punishment in material fire, so do they; she invented baby-sprinkling, or rather established it by law, and they accept her invention as their only baptism. But there is no end to the parallel. They have repudiated some of their mother's practices, and are more "charitable" in their theories; but in substance they are the same—children of the flesh, walking in the flesh, and glorying in its principles, which are the mystery of iniquity, and death to all that hold them.

"The Harlots" are styled in Rev. xiv. 4, "women"—women of bad character, with whom the Lamb's virgin-companions have no fellowship. Speaking of "the 144,000 redeemed from the earth," the Spirit saith, "these are they who were *not defiled with women*, for they are virgins. These are they who follow the lamb wheresoever he goeth." This is as much as to say, they were not in communion with the Church of England and Ireland, nor with the church of Scotland; nor with the Lutheran Church; nor with the Genovese Church; nor with their Roman mother; nor in short, with any of the sects of the Gentile Court. The *Antipas* have nothing to do with any of these but to protest *against all* of them, as a family of disreputable women with whom a true believer can have no fellowship under penalty of death and everlasting exclusion from the kingdom of God.

The symbology of the first six verses of this seventeenth chapter exhibits an awful picture of Roman, Protestant, and Sectarian Christendom—its mother a murderess and a drunken adulteress; its churches, harlots; its sects, "names of blasphemy" and "abominations;" its doctrines "wine of prostitution;" and its peoples all intoxicated! The mother of all the churches is the concubine of all the kings of Europe existing upon the Latin section of the habitable—"with her the kings of the earth," says the Spirit, "have committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her prostitution." This is most true. The clergy and peoples are all intoxicated, and nothing scriptural can be extracted from them upon the subject of religion.

John also saw this great Italian Jezebel decked out in the trappings of imperial state; and holding in her hand "a golden cup full of abominations and filthiness of her prostitution." Though drunk her drunkenness was not of wine; but "with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the witnesses of Jesus."

John says that this *Queen* of nations (Rev. xviii. 7,) sits, or is enthroned, upon seven mountains, represented by seven heads of the beast which she bestrides. She is a "great city," or ecclesiastical state, whose capital is the seven mountains, whence she exercises dominion over the potentates of the earth—"the woman which thou sawest is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth." When John saw the vision he knew of but one city that ruled imperially; and that was the seven-hilled city upon the Tiber called ROME; and so also at this day, this is the only city having imperial dominion over the besotted kings and peoples of the Roman earth.

The beast she rides is of a scarlet colour, which signifies that it is imperial. She is also clothed in scarlet, being dyed in iniquity, transgression, and sin, whose livery is paraded by her cardinals and priests. The beast she rides is portrayed so as to represent the constitutional characteristics of the peoples, by which the reader might be able to identify the things referred to. Hence it is said to have "seven heads and ten horns." The *heads* have a twofold

signification; first representing *seven mountains*; and then "seven kings," or forms of government, thereon established. The seven mountains are these:

1. Mount Coelius;
2. " Viminal;
3. " Aventine;
4. " Esquiline;
5. " Quirinal;
6. " Capitoline;
7. " Palatine.

Upon these seven elevations Rome stood in the days of John, and contained a population of millions. She was founded 753 years before the birth of Jesus Christ; so that she is now 2612 years old. Her limits are now greatly reduced. In the days of Augustus she contained two millions of inhabitants, and was fifty miles in circumference; but in 1847, she contained only 175,883 inhabitants, exclusive of Jews, whose number was computed at 8000. As long as she continues above ground she will be an interesting city. She contains 354 clerical bazaars dedicated to immortal ghosts, the saints of the Romish calendar, of which St. Peter's holds the first rank, being the largest temple in the world. It is 666 feet long, 284 wide, and its magnificent cupola rises to the height of 408 feet. It was 200 years in building. This is the temple in which the man of sin, commonly styled "the Pope," sits as a god publicly exhibiting himself, because he is a god—2 Thess. ii. 4. This blasphemer is the head of Jezebel, and the centre of unity to all her children.

But the seven heads of the beast are also representative of seven forms of government upon the seven hills; and are thus stated by the spirit "*five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh he must continue a short space.*" Before John was in Patmos the first five had passed away; he was living under the sixth head; so that the other or seventh, was in his future, but in our past. The heads may be enumerated as follows:

1. The first head the *Regal* from A. U. C. for 240 years; abolished before Christ 513 years;
2. The second head the *Consular*, which continued for 11 years;
3. The third head the *Dictatorship*, for 5 years;
4. The fourth head the *Decemvirate*;
5. The fifth head the *Tribunitial* with consular authority;
6. The sixth head the *Imperial* from B. C. 31 to A. D. 476;
7. The *Gothic Kingly* continued for 60 years, being only "a short space" compared with its predecessor which continued 507 years. The seventh passed away A. D. 554.

Such were the heads common to the Beast of the Abyss and the Dragon, all of which exercised their sovereignty in "the Eternal City" of the Seven Hills. But though John lived under the Sixth, or Imperial Head, the scarlet-colored beast did not exist. This is explained by the fact that the heads of this beast are also the heads of the Dragon. When John lived under the sixth the heads were on the Dragon, which ruled all the territory of Daniel's Beast. That the scarlet-colored beast organization of the Latin nations and peoples did not exist in John's day is evident from the angel's prediction that "it *shall* ascend out of the abyss." John saw it "in spirit," or vision; but when he looked at what existed in the political world contemporary with himself, he did not see it there. It never had existed down to his time; for history testifies to no Ten Horns, no Seventh Head, and no Mother of the Harlots, loved or hated by them,

until several centuries after his death. It was therefore styled by the Spirit "*the Beast that is NOT, and YET IS*"—*is to be*; and *is*, so far as the manifestation of six of its heads in Rome is concerned: "*is not*" in its totality, but "shall ascend" complete "*out of the abyss*," not all at once, but gradually—in a series of ages, happily for us passed away never to return.

But this political constitution of "the many waters," or "peoples and multitudes, and nations, and tongues," is not to continue eternally. Providence has not delivered them up to eternal tyranny; to groan, and bleed, as a reeking sacrifice to Caesar and his Roman god. In other words, SIN'S FLESH imperially, regally, and sacerdotally organized, as represented in John's vision of the wilderness of the peoples, is not to rule mankind longer than a definitely appointed time, which is now almost expired. The present constitution of the Latin populations is to be abolished. French, Austrian, and Russian Caesars, are all to be numbered among the things that were; and with them the Harlot-Mother and her Head, to whom they affect to pay so much deference at present. So that in a few years hence, when one shall read the seventeenth of the Apocalypse, and inquire, "What meaneth this?" he will be told, "It is the symbolical representation of the Gentile civil and ecclesiastical polity as it existed previous to the war of the great day of the Omnipotent Deity (Rev. xvi. 14) by which it was utterly abolished; so that now not a vestige of it remains to curse the world." When this can be said, ROME will be in the *Lago d'Inferno*—there will be no such city above ground; and when she goes down like Sodom we should rejoice if all the miscreants, called "*Popes*," that ever reigned upon her seven mountains, and poured out the blood of the Saints and Witnesses of Jesus, were raised from the dead, and shut up in her, and being subjected to her last plagues (ch. xviii. 8) should finally all go crashing down together into the subterranean volcanic abyss, perishing all in the gainsaying of Korah. When this can be said, there will be no longer any Mother of Harlots upon earth; and all her Harlot-Daughters, and Abominable Names of Blasphemy, will have ceased to be. Not a man will then be found who will acknowledge himself to be a clergyman. Clergymen of all "names and denominations of Christians," as the phrase is, from "the Holy Apostolic Roman Catholic Church," as "the Satan" delight to style *their* "Synagogue," down to the last manifestation of abomination in Utah—will be at a ruinous discount. The whole batch of soul-traders, styled by the Spirit, "the merchants of the earth shall weep and mourn over Babylon the Great; for no man buyeth their merchandize any more"; among which is enumerated, "bodies and the souls of men"—Rev. xviii. 11,13. Men will then be too enlightened to hire clergymen, pastors, ministers, or any other spiritual traders by whatever title designated, to funeralize their "bodies" in consecrated ground; to preach their "immortal souls" to glory beyond the realms of time and space; to sprinkle their babies' faces with holy water in the Name of the Deity, and so blaspheming it; to minister Christian consolation to murderers and pirates under the gallows; or to administer what the Devil terms, "the consolations of religion," to death-bed repentants, who have served sin all their days, and think to cheat justice by professing to be very sorry, and to die in peace with all mankind. All this "sorcery" will be despised, and hated, and remembered only as the lies, vanity, and unprofitable delusion of a past age and generation of human imbeciles—Jer. xvi. 19. A clerical prophet then will be regarded, as he is in fact, the enemy of God and man; for certainly he is an enemy of both, who by his false teaching "blasphemes God in blaspheming his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven" (Rev. xiii. 6); and misdirect the ignorant in spiritual affairs. Such a prophet may profess to love God, and my "precious immortal soul," as they term it; but this is all mere practical hypocrisy, if his teaching make God a liar, make his word of no effect, and instead of showing me "the way of salvation", lead me into the condemnation of unbelief and disobedience. Such a prophet is the worst enemy God and man can have. No long prayers, holy tone, and pious grimace can compensate for this. They only aggravate the injury; and destroy a man, as Joab slew Amasa, asking of his

health—2 Sam. xx. 9, 10. Such prophets are the ecclesiastical element of the beast's concubine. They are the worst enemies of the people, deceiving them, and being themselves deceived. We do not deny that many of them sincerely believe that they teach "the truth as it is in Jesus", and that they do God service in the work they perform. We do not deny this, but heartily believe it of many. Nevertheless, what they think does not make it so. If a man is wrong in all points, and he yet think he is right in all, his thoughts do not alter the fact. Saul had a zeal of God, earnestly devoted himself to the establishment of his own righteousness, and thought he did God service in persecuting the faith he afterwards embraced. But all this time he was persecuting Jesus. But, he did it ignorantly in unbelief, as do many of the people's *divines*. The great bulk of these, however, are mere professionals; ignorant enough, and indifferently honest; who really care no more for God nor man than what they can make by their soul-trading speculation. Well, we rejoice to know, that the spiritual orders are all to be abolished, with their sects, names, and denominations of pious fraud and imposition. Mankind will cease to be brutes debased by superstition. They will come to know Yahweh, like Israel, from the least unto the greatest; and if any prophet then, shall yet prophesy, even his father that begot him and the mother that bore him, shall slay him, saying, "Thou shalt not live; for thou speakest lies in the name of Yahweh"—Zech. xiii. 3,4. If such discipline were carried out now, not a clergyman would be left alive; for they all speak lies in the Lord's name, as every one knows who understands and believes the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

With the spiritual guides of the scarlet-colored beast's populations are also abolished the Ten Powers represented by its Ten Horns. Their kingdoms are taken possession of by the Saints for the Mystical Christ; as it is written in Daniel vii. 18, "the Saints of the Most High Ones shall take the kingdom (of the Fourth Beast) and shall possess the kingdom during the Olahm, even during an Olahm of the Olahms," or the "*season and a time*" of a thousand years duration, commonly termed "THE MILLENNIUM"—verse 12; Rev. xx. 4: and again, "the kingdoms of this (the Fourth Beast) *kosmos* are become the kingdoms of our Yahweh and of his Anointed; and he shall reign for the Aions of the Aions"—the Millennium and beyond.

Here then is an entire, utter, and complete abolition of papal and protestant Christendom in its civil and ecclesiastical orders and constitution. When this becomes an accomplished fact, which we believe we shall live to see if we have the ordinary longevity of our stock, the existing Latin Kosmos, or Order of Things, will be in the perdition-state. It will then be "THE BEAST THAT WAS"—a mere historical reminiscence, as all its Seven Heads are at this day.

But the interest that this beast has for us is, that we are contemporary with its last days. Its horns, as constituents of its polity, have existed 1330 years. Is there not something remarkable in this? Do these figures contain no hint? Do *not five years* added to them give us "*the End of the Days*" when Daniel "shall arise to his lot"—ch. xii. 12, 13: and bring us to A.D. 1864? *The beast that is* is to "go into perdition" that it may become "*the beast that was.*" When is this going into perdition to begin? The answer to this question is contained in the fourteenth verse, namely, when the Lamb shall have come, and made war upon the Ten Powers, in the great day of the omnipotent Deity.

But there are one or two points of this prophecy to be noted before we shall have arrived at the end so much to be desired. Preparatory to this consummation something is to be developed in relation to the Ten Horns and one of the heads of the beast. Does the reader know upon which of the seven heads the horns are planted? That is, with which head are they confederate so as to "have one mind to give their power and strength to the beast?" To this we

reply, *with neither of the seven*; yet with a head partaking *"of the seven"*, by which participation he acquires Romish characteristics. *An Eighth Head, and that imperial, in political combination with the Ten Horns, upholding the superstition of the Jezebel Apostasy* is the premillennial situation of transatlantic Christendom, indicated by the Spirit in verses 11, 12, 13, and 17, of the chapter before us.

We have already stated that the Seventh Head of the beast passed away A. D. 554. This seventh head is establishing itself upon the seven mountains inflicted upon the Sixth Head a wound that for a time appeared to be unto death. For the 60 years of the reign of the Seventh Head, the jurisdiction of the Imperial Sixth Head was excluded from Rome and Italy; though it continued to reign in Constantinople over what is now termed the Ottoman, or Turkish, empire. Speaking of the exclusion of this Sixth Head from Rome and Italy, John says, in Rev. xiii. 3, "I saw one of his heads as if it had been slain unto death." But the plague, or stroke, of the seeming death-blow was healed; and the imperial Sixth Head's dominion over Rome and Italy was re-established by the conquest of the Seventh Head in 554, by Narses, general to Justinian the Roman Emperor, reigning in Constantinople—"*and the wound of its death was healed.*"\

But though healed in the Italian Peninsula being restored to the dominion of the Sixth Head, ROME was not yet restored to sovereignty. The judgments of the Fourth Trumpet had smitten the Sun, Moon, and Stars of the Roman Firmament; and though the smiting was stayed, they were *"darkened, and the day shone not for a third part of it and the night likewise"*—Rev. viii. 12. The civil state of Italy, after the agitation of a tempest of twenty years, was fixed by a Pragmatic Sanction which the emperor Justinian promulgated at the request of the Bishop of Rome. The Seven-Hilled City was degraded to the rank of a provincial town; yet the senators were permitted to approach without obstacle the throne of Constantinople. It was still the residence of the Senate, to which, with the Bishop, Justinian delegated the regulation of weights and measures; but its glory was under eclipse; and this ancient capital of the world, so long accustomed to sovereignty, was pragmatically subordinated to the city of Constantine.

It was to continue eclipsed for the third part of a day and the third part of a night, after the expiration of which the Majesty of Rome would be restored. Now, a *day*, in Jewish computation, is equal to twelve hours; and a *night* to twelve also. History shows, that the obscuration of the Roman Firmament continued for two hundred and forty years after the promulgation of Justinian's Pragmatic Sanction, which bears the date of Aug. 15, 554; and that, at the end of that period, measures were taken by Adrian and Leo III. Bishops of Rome, for the restoration of imperial sovereignty to that city; which were consummated in the crowning of Charlemagne emperor of the Romans in St. Peter's on Dec. 25, 799. Hence the *"day"* and *"night,"* to be divided, could not have been a day and night of twelve common hours each; nor a day and night of twelve ordinary months, of thirty days each. They must therefore be taken for a *day-time* and a *night-time* of three hundred and sixty years each; a twelfth part of which is an hour of thirty years. Now a third part of a time is 120 years. This must be multiplied by 2; because the obscuration lasts a third part of a day and the third part of a night. Twice 120 is 240 years; which added to the date of the Pragmatic Sanction, A. D. 554—240=A. D. 794; leaving five years to work out the revival of the Roman Empire of the West.

A question of popular superstition, the worship of images, so fiercely disputed in the eighth and ninth centuries between the Greeks and Latins, produced the revolt of Italy from

the dominion of Constantinople, the temporal power of the Bishops of Rome, and the restoration of the Roman empire in the west. It is agreed, that in the eighth century, the dominion of the popes was founded in rebellion, which was produced by the Iconoclasts, or Image Breakers. Leo the Iconoclast, emperor of Constantinople, commanded the abolition of images from all the churches of Italy; and enjoined the obedience of the Roman pontiff under penalty of degradation and exile if he did not comply. But instead of complying, he boldly armed against his sovereign, and exhorted all Italians to do the same. These swore to live and die in the defence of their bishop and the images. The victory of Ravenna confirmed the safety, the worship of images, and the freedom of Rome and Italy. The people desired to elect a new emperor; but the bishop counselled delay, and exhorted the Italians not to separate from the body of the Roman monarchy; so that till near the imperial coronation of Charlemagne, the government of Rome and Italy was exercised in the name of the successors of Constantine.

A combination of circumstances converted the bishops of Rome into civil magistrates. Elected by the free choice of the people, they became by their favor and their own ambition, princes of the city. Being oppressed by the Lombards, instead of applying to Constantinople for aid, they formed an alliance with the Franks, who under Pepin and Charlemagne conquered Lombardy, and gave some of the plunder to the church. Adrian the first, now pretended that Constantine had bestowed on the bishops of Rome the free and perpetual sovereignty of Rome and Italy, and the provinces of the west. This fiction believed, convicted the Greek emperors of usurpation, and made the revolt of the pope the claim of his lawful inheritance. People were then too ignorant to detect the fraud. It was believed for many centuries. The sovereignty of Rome was thus asserted; and the pretended successors of St. Peter and Constantine were at length invested with the purple and prerogatives of the Caesars. A hostile opposition had existed between Rome and Constantinople for seventy years. In that schism the Romans had tasted of freedom, and the Popes of sovereignty. But by the conquest of Lombardy and the deliverance of Rome by the sword, the city was subject, as his own, to the sceptre of Charlemagne. The people swore allegiance to his family and person; and the election of the Popes was examined and confirmed by his authority. The original and self-inherent claim of imperial sovereignty, however, was set up by the Pope; so that when Charlemagne was crowned by the pope Roman emperor of the west, he was considered as deriving his imperial grace from the successor of Constantine and from God.

In the days of John the offices of *Emperor* and *Pontiff* were united in one man called CAESAR; but at the termination of the eclipse of the Roman luminaries, A. D. 794, the offices of Emperor and Pontiff were filled by two men, Charlemagne and Leo. Charlemagne, though crowned in Rome "emperor of the west," resided at Aix-la-Chapelle, a city now on Prussian territory; while Leo and his papal successors reigned as the *Imperial Pontiff of the west* in the city of the Seven Mountains. Hence the Majesty restored to Rome was an *eleventh* horn having "eyes like the eyes of a man, whose look was more stout than his fellows; and a mouth speaking very great things;" but by its eradication of three of the ten horns, whose territories it annexed to its own, it became the *eighth horn* of the fourth beast—Dan. vii. 8, 20—ONE DOMINION in a two-man manifestation; one man reigning in ROME; and the other man, *the proprietor of the city and of Italy*, reigning in Aix-la-Chapelle; but in after ages, as at this day, in VIENNA. The body of the eighth horn symbolizes the civil and military elements of the power, while the *eyes and the mouth* represent the episcopal or pontifical element; still *by concordat* they are but one horn. Now this eleventh horn made its appearance in the Latin West AFTER the ten horns; as it is written, "the ten horns out of the fourth kingdom are ten Kings" or powers; "and *another shall arise after them*" and "among

them."—Dan. vii. 24, 8. As we have said, this little eleventh horn became the EIGHTH of the system, by the subjugation of three of its predecessors. Charlemagne, who represented the secular element of the horn, was proprietor by conquest of France, Spain, Italy, Germany, and Hungary. These constructed *the new Roman empire of the West* A. D. 799; and because of the Bishop of Rome being the Imperial High Priest of this *body politic* or *beast*, it is styled, "the holy Roman Empire;" the civil head of which is called, "his Royal Apostolic Majesty," and its spiritual, "his Holiness the Pope." The history of this dominion extends over more than a thousand years. Its fortunes have been various, which cannot even be outlined here at present. Suffice it to say, that in A. D. 962, after seventy-four years of intense confusion, the sovereignty passed from the family of Charlemagne. Otho 1, king of Germany, restored and appropriated the empire. At the head of a victorious army, he passed the Alps, subdued Italy, delivered the Pope, and fixed the imperial crown in the name and nation of Germany. "From that memorable era," says Gibbon, "two maxims of public jurisprudence were introduced by force and ratified by time.

1. That the prince who was elected in the German Diet, acquired from that instant, the subject kingdoms of Italy and Rome.
2. But that he might not legally assume the titles of Emperor and Augustus TILL HE HAD RECEIVED THE CROWN FROM THE HANDS OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF."

In a note to this the historian says, "the Italians, Muratori for instance, only reckon the princes *who have been crowned at Rome.*"

Now, this GERMANO-ITALIAN dominion, whose Emperors, as well as Pontiffs, were formerly *elective*, but now hereditary in the house of Hapsburg, of which Francis Joseph of Austria is the representative, is symbolized in Rev. xvii. 11, by the eighth head of the scarlet-coloured beast, or polity, by which the Roman Jezebel is carried: as it is written there, "and the beast that was, but is not, even he is the eighth." It must be remembered here, that the angel is discoursing to John about "heads" under which the polity of the Romanized nationalities had been capitalized. There are not eight beasts, but eight heads to one beast. The angel's words are therefore historically interrupted thus—"and the beast that *was*, but *is not*, even he is the *eighth head.*" This eighth head did not exist in John's day, for he was living under the sixth; and could have no existence until after the termination of "the short space," during which, the seventh head or Gothic kingly form of government, was to reign in Rome, and until the eclipse of the Roman Majesty "for the third part of a day, and the third part of a night," should have ended. The eighth head arose seven hundred years after John, "and yet is," as the Germano-Italian, commonly known as the AUSTRO-PAPAL. John saw, in vision, this dominion of the Emperor and the Pope in the wilderness of the peoples existing contemporarily with ten minor sovereignties upon the Romano-Babylonish Habitable, styled by the angel, "ten horns." This Austro-Papal eighth head which "yet is," but "is not" in John's time, though of a like character to the sixth head under which he was living being imperio-pontifical, the angel declared, "goeth into perdition," and in so doing, becomes "the beast that was:"—"the beast that thou sawest," saith he, "was and is not;" and shall ascend out of the abyss, *and go away into perdition*, and they that dwell upon the earth (whose names have not been written in the book of the life from (or beginning from) the foundation of (the Millennial) *Kosmos*, (or order of things) shall do homage, when they behold the beast which was, and is not, yet is;" and in verse 11, "the beast which was, but is not, even he is *the eighth*, and out of the seven, *and goes away into perdition.*

Perdition, then, is the fate of this Germano-Papal empire. A very desirable result certainly. But the end is not immediately. Ezekiel shows, that the Austrian dynasty will be subordinated to a Russian Prince, but nevertheless the eighth head dominion will remain. A change of the sovereign house does not change the power. A kingdom may pass into the possession of different families, or houses, as in the case of France and England, yet the kingdom remains the same. The Prince of all the Russias is to become the imperial representative of the eighth head dominion. This is evident from the thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth chapters of Ezekiel. The present Germano-Italian (for Austria is a member of the German bund) will then be a Russo-German Italian sovereignty; of a far more extended jurisdiction than the Austrian and Papal combined, being the power prophetically styled "Gogue of the land of the Magogue, Prince of Rosh, Mosc, and Tobl;" which being interpreted signifies, *Emperor of the land of the Germans, Poles, Bohemians, Hungarians, &c.; and Prince of Russia, Moscovy and Siberia*. This is the eighth head in its last phase. The house of Austria will most likely continue to exist, but subordinated to the imperial sovereignty of Russia. Its extinction is not necessary to this; we expect, therefore, that it will become a satrap of the Gogian dominion. But of this the prophecy says nothing.

The infusion of the Russian element into the sovereignty of the eighth head, although of the Greek form of catholicity, does not necessitate the abolition of the *spiritual* supremacy of the Pope. It will be fatal to his civil power, but not to his ecclesiastical authority with the ten horns; for in Rev. xix. 30, we learn, that "the beast is taken, and with him the false prophet," who is the eye and mouth of the Roman Jezebel or church, and "both of them are cast alive into the lake of the fire burning with brimstone;" by him even the king of Israel, against whom they make war. The pope venerated by the horn-powers, has still influence enough in Catholic Christendom to cause the head of the Greek superstition to respect him. The prophet before him at the present crisis is exceedingly gloomy; and much evil awaits him; but when reaction comes, the prospect, in the estimation of those who walk by sight, will brighten, and the soul merchants of Babylon the Great, protected and strengthened by Gogue, will say in their heart for mother church, "I sit Queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow." But, as Paul has said, "when they shall say, 'peace and safety;' then sudden destruction cometh upon them as travail upon a woman with child; and they shall not escape;" for as the angel told John, "her plagues shall come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire, for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her."—Rev. xviii. 8.

The eighth head, then, of the scarlet-coloured beast, or body politic, like all the seven that preceded it, is to go away into perdition. But before that event so much to be desired come to pass, the ten powers of the Roman earth are to have "*one γνώμην counsel or policy.*" But before considering what this policy is, or results in, it will not be amiss to say something about the horns themselves.

The ten horns of the scarlet-coloured polity are the same powers as those represented by the crowned horns on John's beast of the sea, by those on Daniel's fourth beast, and by the ten toes of Nebuchadnezzar's image. In Rev. xvii, John does not treat of their origin, but *of the last thirty years of their existence*. He alludes to their origin in Rev. xiii. 1, as being "out of the sea," or "out of the abyss"—ch. xi. 7, phrases signifying apocalyptically, the sea of peoples, multitudes, and nations of the Mediterranean region, termed in scripture the "great city,"—Dan. vii. 1. Daniel says, that "the four winds of the heavens strove upon the great sea; and four great beasts came up out of the sea, diverse from one another, and among them was the beast with the ten horns. Daniel's "four winds" are also introduced in the apocalypse in the

seventh chapter, and the first verse; where four angels are said to "hold the four winds of the earth, that the wind should not blow on the earth, nor on the sea, nor on any tree," until a certain work was accomplished, styled, "the sealing the servants of God in their foreheads" to the symbolic number of 144,000. After this was accomplished, the four winds were successively let loose in the blowing of the four trumpets, which may therefore be termed the wind trumpets, to distinguish them from the last three, which are the woe trumpets. The wind trumpets began to blow at the end of the fourth century, and by A.D. 476, the Latin west was conquered by the barbarians of the north, who slew the sixth head, as it seemed to death; set up the seventh head in Rome, and laid the foundations of the ten kingdoms of Europe.

Now commentators have vexed themselves a good deal upon the date of the beast's origin. But we take it that the matter is more simple than is generally supposed. In determining the age of the United States we do not reckon from the settlement of the country; but from the declaration of their independence of the crown of England. If it had been predicted, that the union should continue to practice prosperously for 1260 years, we should reckon that period from the constitution of the republic; not from the landing at Plymouth rock, or the settlement of James Town in Virginia. The scarlet-coloured beast with its heads, horns, and harlot it sustains, is a civil and ecclesiastical polity. It was to have *power to make war with the saints, and to overcome them* (ch. xiii. 7) during "forty and two months" of years, which is 1260. Hence this time must be reckoned from the constitution of the ten powers as part and parcel of the latin body politic, and not from the invasion and settlement of the Roman territory. When they invaded this they were pagan or heretical hordes. They found a country with inhabitants living under Roman laws; and worshipping the immortal ghosts of dead men and women in splendid temples, and according to a showy ritual, calculated to intoxicate the brains of uncultivated and illiterate barbarians. Having therefore acquired possession of the country by the sword, instead of changing its institutions, they adopted them; and the Roman became the civil law of their kingdoms; and the drunken harlot a common prostitute to them all; and as it is written in Rev. xvii. 1, 2, "the great harlot with whom the kings of the earth (or ten horns) have committed fornication; and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication."

The voluminous imperial ordinances adopted by the barbarians were afterwards purged, retrenched and reproduced in twelve books, or tables, under the name of *the Code of Justinian*, and published April 7, 529. After this, the spirit of jurisprudence was extracted from the decisions and conjectures, and questions and disputes of the Roman civilians. This was accomplished in three years. It was an abstract of two thousand treatises comprised in an abridgement of fifty books—a reduction of three million of lines or sentences to the moderate number of one hundred and fifty thousand, called the *digest* or *pandects*. The publication of this great work was preceded by that of the INSTITUTES; as it seemed reasonable that the *elements* should precede the *digest* of the Roman law. The *code*, the *pandects*, and the *institutes*, were declared to be the legitimate system of civil jurisprudence, and they alone were admitted in the tribunals, and they alone were taught in the academies of Rome, Constantinople, and Berytus. Justinian addressed to the Senate and provinces his *eternal oracles*, and his pride, under the mask of piety, ascribed the consummation of this great design to *the support and inspiration of the deity*. The institutes were published in November and the *pandects* on Dec. 16, 533.

We may remark further in relation to this constitutional basis of the Romano-Gothic horns, that there was promulgated in March 533 an imperial decretal epistle addressed "to John the Most Holy Archbishop of the sacred city Rome, and patriarch;" wherein there is a solemn

recognition of said Archbishop as "head of all holy churches," and as *head and judge of the faith*, by Justinian himself appealing to him for his approbation, ere he published to the Roman world a formal statement of orthodoxy, by his declaring that even the patriarch of Constantinople wished in all things to follow Rome; and by his representing the unity of all churches as converging to Rome as its centre. Thus the imperial law invested the Roman Bishop with legal or constitutional authority; so that the powers adopting the Roman law would *de jure* accept the pope, and his church as their Jezebel.

Now, it is well known to readers of history that the Gothic or German kings, after their first conquests, were all most anxious to receive appointments from the Roman Emperor (the Western emperor while there was one, and the Eastern afterwards) as *Master-Generals* or *Patricians* of the empire; the appointment being equivalent to that of *viceroys*, and most useful in order to legitimize their government in the eyes of their Roman subjects, who in respect of number immensely exceeded the barbarian population that had conquered them. Thus Clovis the Frank in 510, had the plenary sovereignty of Gaul awarded him by the Byzantine emperor, with the title of Consul and Augustus, and a diadem of pearls as its badge or token: a grant renewed in 532 to the children of Clovis, by Justinian, with full power over the coinage.

Thus a constitutional relationship manifestly existed between the sixth head of the dragon and the beast, in which the ten barbaric powers may be regarded as imperial vice-kings. Their civil law is that of Justinian; and their ecclesiastical, that provided for them by his legislative authority. Hence their *civil* constitution as horns of the beast bears date A. D. 529-533; but as they did not all *de facto* acknowledge the Romish superstition under the pope's headship until about 75 years after, their *ecclesiastical* constitution as paramours of Jezebel does not bear date till A. D. 604-608. In 604 the emperor Phocas wrote to the bishop of Rome, and acknowledged the supremacy of the Roman see; and in 608, a gilt statue was erected to his honor with an inscription upon the base of the pillar, stating that it was erected "for the innumerable benefits of his piety, and for the quiet procured for Italy, and the preservation of liberty;" referring doubtless to his concessions to the pope. Thus, the four years from 604 to 608 are remarkable in the history of Phocas' aggrandizement of the Papal see. He confirmed the legislation of Justinian 75 years before, and as the imperialized kings had by this time all "committed fornication" with the Roman Mother (*the harlots* not having yet been born) their civil and ecclesiastical constitution was perfected at this epoch.

Here, then, are two epochs of four years each, and seventy five years apart; the one from 529 to 533; and the other from 604 to 608. The latter, I verily believe, is the commencement of the apocalyptic "forty and two months" of chap. xi. 2, xiii. 5; or 1260 years; and the former, of Daniel's 1335 years, in ch. xii. 12; so that we are now *only five years distant from the resurrection of the saints who have been overcome and scattered by the beast*.

These horns seen in vision by Daniel and John were prophetic of what should be afterwards. Daniel saw them about seven hundred years before John, yet in John's day they had no existence. This is manifest from the angel's words, who said concerning them, "they have received no kingdom as yet." The foreign element, the outside barbarians of the German and Sarmatian countries, focalizing the Roman population around ten new political centres, had not emigrated from its native soil; nor did it for about three hundred years after John. Let those speculators, who talk about Daniel's prophecy of the kingdom of God being set up "in the days of the kings" receiving its fulfilment on the day of Pentecost, remember this. Seventy years after that day, the angel said that they had received no kingdom as yet, and added "but

they receive power as kings one hour with the beast," even with him that is the eighth, and of the seven. They receive power with the eighth head of the scarlet-coloured beast. This eighth head, we have seen appeared in the year 799, and is now therefore 1060 years old. But in all that time, there has been no period in which the ten powers have agreed to give their kingdom to this eighth head; yet it is predicted, that "they have one mind, and shall give their power and strength to the beast;" "for God hath put in their hearts to fulfil his will, and to agree, and give their kingdom unto the beast, until the words of God shall be fulfilled"—verse 17. This is to be for "one hour." An hour according to scripture reckoning is a *twelfth part of time*; not a twenty-fourth, as among the heathen. As we have seen from the use of "day" and "night" in the obscuration of the Roman firmament, they each stand for a time of 360 years. A twelfth part of this is *an hour of 30 years*; or a month of years, which is the same thing, a month being a twelfth part as well as an hour.

Now from these premises the proposition before us is clearly this, that *the kings or powers of the Roman earth, which have debauched themselves with the drunken murderers of the saints and witnesses of Jesus, are to receive power as kings with the eighth, or Russo-German head of "Christendom" for thirty years*. There has been hitherto no such combination as this in the history of what is called Christendom; yet both Ezekiel and John require it so to be "in the latter days" or "years." This being granted, the first thing necessary to this development is *the establishment of the sovereignty of Russia over Germany*, that the eighth head may assume the Russo-German phase; and next, that the Romish powers enter into such treaty relations with Russia as shall exhibit the continental European polity of nations under the aspect of ONE IMPERIAL HEAD *in sovereignty over TEN ROYALTIES*—the eighth head and its ten horns. This is the new map of the European west to be carved out by the sword. Three of these royalties will be fiefs of the imperial crown; for the eleventh horn plucks up three of the first horns by the roots, by which it becomes the eighth of the system, or body politic. As the horns are introduced more with reference to their special operations during the "one hour," which is the last of their existence, than with regard to their previous history (though this has not been altogether ignored) we are more concerned to know them as they now exist, than as to their designation at their original appearance before the manifestation of the eighth head. They were founded by ten tribes of barbarians called, Visigoths, Sueves, Alans, Vandals, Franks, Burgundians, Hunus, Lombards, Gepidae, and Ostrogoths. By grants conceded by the Emperor they settled down upon his territory, and became *imperio addictas*, devoted to the empire. Some of their kingdoms fell and new ones arose; but whatever their number afterwards they are still called the *ten kings* from their first number. The kingdoms that now exist upon their territory are those of Spain, Portugal, France, Belgium, Holland (in part) Sardinia, Lombardo-Venetia, Naples, Hungary, and Bavario-Greece. Thus they stand at present; though the probability is that on entering upon the last phase of their existence the list will be subjected to change.

But, by what process is the present constitution of the established order of Europe to be caused to pass into that defined in the proposition before us? To this question I reply, that the transition is to be effected by the operation of the power represented in Rev. xvi. 13, 14, by "three unclean spirits like frogs." The policy of the Frog-power, operating upon the Ottoman, Austrian, and Roman governments, generates unclean purposes in them, which they will seek to carry into effect by diplomatically, or demoniacally, influencing all the other powers. The effect of their diplomacy will be to divide them into hostile camps; and to bring about a general war. This, like all other wars, will, of course, have its questions of debate; and in the prophecy these are revealed as *the Eastern and Western questions*. The eastern is expressed in the words of the sixth vial, which is said to be "poured out upon the great river

Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up that the way of the kings of a sun's rising might be prepared." In this the abolition of the Turkish empire is foretold, that, being "dried up," a crisis may be prepared in which the saints may be manifested. The western question is indicated in the terms of Rev. xvii. 16, which declare that "the ten horns shall hate the harlot, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh and burn her with fire; for God hath put in their hearts to fulfil his will." This is the western or Italian question which is now being debated between Austria, France and Sardinia at the cannon's mouth. Rome and the kingdom of the Pope, in connection with Austro-papal policy, are the body, soul, and spirit of this question. Apart from the Roman harlot, the Pope, and the Austrian power, this question could not exist. These are the representatives of "the dark ages" in their ignorance, barbarism, cruelty and superstition. They are struggling might and main to uphold and perpetuate "the rights of sovereigns and the order established" upon these. When this comes to be perceived in the full force of the emergency which is being created, the governments of the horns "will agree and give their kingdom unto the beast"—its eighth head as the champion of "the rights of sovereigns and established order." But "the situation" must first be created and well defined; and then the powers which are now looking on with intense interest at the progress of events, will bestir themselves; *first*, to enter into treaty with the imperial head for the preservation of their sovereign rights and established order; *and then*, for the subjugation of the harlot city of the "Seven Mountains" to the order they shall have decreed.

Now, the exciting cause of" these results is, as I have said, the policy of the frog-power. The historical and traditional policy of this power is adverse to the rights of sovereigns and the established order of the Romish Christendom. Its policy dates from 1789—'90, which was the year of its resurrection, and ascension to the heaven of one of the horn-powers, styled apocalyptically "the tenth of the city"—that is, of France. It had been suppressed in that and other countries "the great city Babylon," three lunar days and a half of years, or 105 years, before; that is, 1685; previous to which suppression the policy embodied in "the witnesses," played the same part against "the rights of the sovereigns and established order," which the Austrian government proclaims itself the champion of, that the French revolution and Napoleon the first did, and his nephew is now beginning to do. The civil and military witnesses of Jesus against the established order of "the great city" in their wars and testimony made their enemies tremble upon the throne for 1260 years. "Fire proceeded out of their mouth, and devoured their enemies; the waters they turned into blood; and the earth they smote with every plague" as they are now doing upon the rivers and lakes of Italy. This their policy is historical, and has been delivered to the present generation of "oppressed nationalities" in the providence of Him who uses the wicked as his sword upon the wicked, until the time appointed for "judgment to be given to the saints."

Now heaven, in carrying out its policy against the powers of the great city, is never at a loss for instruments with which to work. It has always a Cyrus, an Alexander, a Constantine a Cromwell, or a Napoleon, in preparation for the situations it has decreed. These tools have each their own particular ambition to which they are devoted, as to a special inspiration. Ignorant of God and his purpose they seek to establish their own in which they encounter insurmountable circumventions and disappointment; they labour for themselves, but the fruit of their labour is for God—they accomplish his purpose and confound themselves.

This arrangement is notably illustrated in the history of Napoleon the first; and will also be in the career of Napoleon the third. Both of them in their course are inspired by one and the same ambition; and that is, *to Napoleonize the nationalities of the Latin Christendom*. This, of course, is subversive of the rights of all sovereigns and of the established order,

which reigns in the kingdoms devoted to the papacy. The first Napoleon proved this; and the third of the name is too much devoted to the ideas of the first to stray very far from the way he "consecrated" for the satisfaction of nationalities in their cry for vengeance upon their destroyers.

Louis Napoleon like his uncle, is a *parvenu*, or upstart, among the powers. He is so much the more respectable on this account. He has started up in the midst of the great city and assumed to be the *Emperor* thereof. Now the constitution of that city, or polity, admits of *but one Emperor*; and recognizes him only as such *who had received the crown from the hands of the Roman Pontiff*. But there are two Emperors, both of whom are uncrowned by the Pope, the Emperor Francis Joseph, and the Emperor Louis Napoleon; consequently, neither of them is the legal representative of Charlemagne, the Emperor of the Roman West. Napoleon the first was crowned by the Pope successor to this founder of the dominion; and the house of Austria was restricted to its family domain. But the treaty of Vienna in 1815 stripped Napoleon of this honor, and restored it in effect to Austria. This treaty has now become a dead letter, and the rights and order based upon it consequently destroyed. For the present, the Austrian power is in abeyance in Italy, the Pope is virtually a prisoner in the hands of the French, and the organized revolution triumphs. Such is the present situation of affairs. But they cannot long remain thus. Louis Napoleon has promised to satisfy the nationalities, which will of necessity dissatisfy the governments. He has promised independence to Italy from the Alps to the Adriatic; but will he be able to fulfil his promise; and if so, what compensation does he reserve for himself and for France? As to Italian independence that is a mere cry. There will be no such thing. The present is all delusive, and the excited hopes of all nationalities will be in the end defeated. Reaction will come. The future policy of Napoleon will stir up the powers against him, and "established order" will temporarily prevail.

Rome is the holy city of the Latin apostasy; and the established order enthroned there is hostile to every thing that does not minister to the lust and avarice of a superstitious and brutal priesthood. Its sympathy is therefore with Austrian tyranny, and with all in every place that sympathize with it; and consequently, bitterly opposed to revolutionary democracies whether championized by a Robespierre, or a Napoleon, first or third. If therefore it crown Louis Napoleon the successor of Charlemagne, the Pope will do so, doubtless, from compulsion. But the present Pope, now 78 years old, may die, leaving Napoleon uncrowned, but in military occupation of "the patrimony of St. Peter." In this event, a pope might be elected in a country not occupied by the French, out of whose mouth might proceed "an unclean spirit" invoking the aid of all Catholic powers for the deliverance of "the states of the church" from the domination of the revolutionary French. This papal invocation may be at a time when Russian policy, having witnessed the humiliation of Austria, may deem it expedient to humble France; and, as chief of a new holy alliance, to make common cause with the Pope and the kings of his communion, for the expulsion of the French from Italy. A situation of this kind would answer the requirements of the prophecy. It would bring the forces of the ten horns against Rome; and, though they would not desire to destroy their holy city, yet in effecting the expulsion of the French, or the Revolution, they would "make her desolate and naked, and eat her flesh, and burn her with fire."

But this desolation of Rome, though the annihilation of the frog power there, would not be the end of the city. Rome has often been besieged and desolated in past ages. In the reign of Justinian she was for forty days without an inhabitant; but she has as often recovered on the expulsion of the enemy. The western question even will not be settled by the restoration of the Pope to liberty and independence in his capital and states. Rome may then

rejoice over the fall of the revolution; and as a harlot sing, "I sit Queen and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow;" but the self-gratulation will be only the prelude to a disaster more striking and terrible than any she has ever experienced before. The papacy is not to be destroyed by the kings of the earth, nor by any combination of revolutionary nationalities; nor is it to be abolished before the return of Jesus Christ, and the resurrection of the saints. The eighteenth of the revelation shows this. The first verse of this chapter announces the descent of "a messenger from heaven having great power" who enlightens the earth with "his glory." After this descent, the judgment is executed in the presence of the apostles, prophets, and saints, by the Lord God; which implies their previous resurrection, and his apocalypse. Rome is then suddenly and finally blotted out of existence; and the eighth head of the beast and the Pope, or false prophet power, are for ever abolished. This occurs before the casting down of the thrones of the ten horns; for these are represented as bewailing and lamenting her destruction. But not long after this their dominion is destroyed; for in Rev. xvii. 14, it is written, these shall make war with the lamb, and the lamb shall overcome them; for he is lord of lords, and king of kings;" and he will not be alone in this war, which is called "the war of that great day of the omnipotent deity"; for it is also written, that "they who are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful." Jesus and the saints, as the captains of the hosts of Israel, are the destroyers of the polity represented by the scarlet-colored beast, the horns and drunken harlot. The Italian question is solved by them after they have disposed of that pertaining to the east. They take the dominion under the whole heaven; so that "the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of Jehovah and of his anointed," as foretold in Rev. xi. 15.

Such is the situation now inaugurated by the war in Italy. Its development is beyond the conduct of the actors engaged in carrying it on. There may be suspensions of arms and efforts at pacification; but these are only probable incidents and episodes. The drama still goes on to the consummation of the divine purpose. The general impression is that no man can tell the end to which events are now advancing with hasty strides. Apart from scripture this is true; but with the apocalypse in hand and understood, the knowledge of the end is certain, and the interpretation sure. In the *details* of the outworking of the crisis, which are not revealed, error may occur, and our prevision may be at fault, as we are not prophets but simply the interpreters of prophecy; but of "the end" itself which is revealed, we know assuredly, that the solution of the questions of the east and west will result in the ruin of the papacy, the fall of the governments, and the establishment of the kingdom of God; and the time for the infusion of the supernatural into the crisis can scarcely transcend the epoch contained within the years 1864 and 1868.

EDITOR.

The Literal and the Spiritual.

STUDENTS of the Scripture should bear in mind at all times, that there can be no foundation whatever for a spiritual meaning to anything that has not first of all a literal fulfilment; for if God's promises are not literally true, neither can they be spiritually true. "That which is spiritual was not first, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual." This, though spoken by Paul of flesh-body and spirit-body, is true also of speech, world, Jew, Christ, temple, Jerusalem, Babylon, and so forth. The literal first and then the spiritual; and see that you have a spiritual discernment of each; that you do not confound prophecies which refer to the literal with those that pertain only to the spiritual, and *vice versa*. The first man was the literal Adam; Jesus was the spiritual Adam; yet both these Adams were literal or real men, of whom the second was developed from the first.

Discretion.

BISHOP LATIMER said in his sermon before the King, "It rejoiceth me when my friends tell me that people find fault with my discretion; for by likelihood, think I, the doctrine is true; for if they could find fault with the doctrine, they would not charge me with the lack of discretion."
