

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT
333 RICHMOND ST.
LONDON, ONTARIO.REV. JOHN F. COFFEY, M. A., LL. B., EDITOR.
THOS. COFFEY, PRINTER AND PRINTER.GENERAL AGENTS:
Messrs. Donohoe and Luke King,
OTAWA AGENCY:

P. J. Coffey, General Agent, 74 George St.

RATES FOR ADVERTISING:—One copy, 50c;
five copies, \$2.50; ten copies, \$4.00. Pay-
able in advance.Notice of Advertising:—Ten cents per line
each insertion.Approved by the Bishop of London, and
recommended by the Archbishop of St.
Boniface, the Bishops of Ottawa, Hamilton,
Kingston, and Peterboro, and leading Cath-
olic Clergymen throughout the Dominion.All correspondence addressed to the Pub-
lisher will receive prompt attention.Persons writing for a change of address
should invariably send us the name of their
former post office.

Catholic Record.

London, sat., Aug 6th, 1887.

CHRISTIAN UNION.

We read in the *American* for June 18th an article on the new movement for Christian union among Protestants, which, in some parts amusing, must, on the whole, be instructive to Catholics. Our contemporary begins by saying that there is a significance not fully appreciated in the proposal for the union of American Protestants in one body emanating from the Protestant Episcopal church in several forms recently, but more especially from the High Church section of that denomination. The High Churchman it is, according to the *American*, who naturally lays the most stress on the visible corporate union of Christians. This union his theory of the Church involves, less than this is schism, and schism in his eyes must be sinful, sinful especially in the author of disunions and in a less degree in those who perpetuate these disunions. Fifty years ago the High Churchman addressed himself to individuals only, his communion was the Church, simple and absolute submission to its authority being the duty of all outside its fold. No other communion could be in any way recognize and to them as such he had no message. The problem of Christian union was, in his eyes, the problem of bringing all sorts and conditions of men into the Anglican Episcopal Church. Every teaching of that church was sacred, the authority of the Church making them all of obligation. The whole Christian world must accept the Book of Common Prayer, and the governmental traditions of the organization which had drafted that instrument. The very least he would allow was the American form of that book, although some of its divergencies from the English model he deeply deplored. The High Churchman of half a century ago held his head very high. So impressive were the claims of his own Church to himself, so intently had he fixed his eyes upon its excellence, that he saw no future for the "other denominations," as in the American Book of Common Prayer they are termed, except in the absorption of their membership by one—into the Church. Seldom or never were these "other denominations" referred to except in terms of opprobrium or contempt, which contrasted strongly and strangely with those of the Prayer Book. He spoke of them as "sects" and complacently left them to the "unconquered mercies of God." By many churchmen still is this lofty attitude of the earlier years of the Tractarian movement maintained. By not all—but even a majority thinks the *American*—which adds that there are many reasons for the change, one of these being the influence of the Broad Church sentiment. Here we invite the special attention of our readers. The *American* says it is customary to speak of "Broad and High and Low Churches" as mutually exclusive. This, it says, is true of High and Low; but not true of the Broad Church in relation to either of the others. Just think, Catholic reader, of three churches in one fold—three churches differing from each other in doctrine and in discipline. Think of two of these churches being mutually exclusive, and then consider the "monumental brass" of any one of these churches' inviting outside sects to a union. Well might any of these sects say to the disabled and disorganized Anglican ecclesiastical physician: *Medice cura teipsum*. But what follows is still more amusing: "There are Broad High Churchmen, and Broad Low Churchmen, as well as Broad Churchmen who are neither high nor low." The *American* thinks that the influence of men like Thomas Erskine and Frederick Robertson and Maurice and Charles Kingsley has pervaded the High Church in a very marked degree, as their preaching on the Atonement and on inspiration amply proves. From these teachers, opinion that journal, they have learned to look beyond the wall of their own fold, and see what good is doing by others. They have, slow as is their comprehension, been brought to acknowledge that America is

a Christian country—mainly, adds the Philadelphia paper, through other agencies than those of the Episcopal Church, and to see if their own communion were blotted out, the loss to American Christianity, while great would not be fatal. With all due respect to our esteemed contemporary we doubt if many English High Churchmen would be prepared to make any admission so very sweeping. Some American High Churchmen may be prepared to go that length, but the English High Churchman holds his head too high to thus give away his case. So long as the Irish Church remained a state establishment it was customary to give some of the best places in that hapless organization to Englishmen. The training, theological and otherwise, of these latter clergymen was quite different from that of the Irish Protestant churchmen—and between both sprang up a bitterness of feeling which took very deep root, the Irish clergymen being almost unanimously calvinistic in their views, while the Englishman maintained Apostolic succession, freedom of the will, the efficacy of Sacramental grace, and came as near as he dared to the admission of transubstantiation and other "Romish errors." The Englishman was, however, much more exclusive and dogmatic than his Irish brother, of whose salvation he had, of course, grave doubts. So bitter was the feeling between these two schools in the old Irish Church, that we find Curran, nearly a hundred years ago, when speaking in favor of Catholic emancipation, taking fierce racial objection against the English theologians. "If you mean," said he, speaking of Protestant ascendancy, "if you mean the ascendancy of an English school over our Irish university, I cannot look upon it without aversion. An ascendancy of that form raises to my mind a little greasy emblem of stall-fed theology imported from some foreign land, with the graces of the lady's maid, the dignity of a side table. . . brought hither to devour, to degrade and to deform." We doubt if the average High Church English clergyman of to-day is any more friendly to American Protestant Episcopal Christianity than the English clergyman of old to the Irish Protestant Christian of Curran's day. But the *American* speaks, no doubt, of what it knows, when it gives the American High Churchman credit for a very remarkable latitudinarianism. Forty years' experience must, it thinks, have taught the High Churchman that his church is not Moses' rod—going to swallow up all the rest. It gives credit to the Episcopal Church for having grown with great rapidity, especially during the years of the civil war. Entering the war of independence the strongest communion in America, it came out of that struggle one of the weakest, because of its extreme partisanship in opposition to the patriot side. Taught by this sharp and unpleasant experience, it has, thinks the *American* journal, since more than any other religious body in America avoided political discussions and deliberations. In the late civil war it is said to have gained much of the ground lost during the war of independence. Still at the rate in which it has grown during the past twenty-five years it could not absorb the other American Protestant churches, many of which have in that time made a still greater aggregate increase in numbers and in resources.

"If the Episcopal Church has gained a somewhat higher relative position, it still is far below the Methodist, Baptist, and Lutheran bodies, and below the Presbyterian and Congregationalist bodies, in point of numbers and general influence. In some parts of the country, notably in the South, it is very feeble. It is the Church of the cities and their suburbs, while the bulk of the American people is rural, however the ratio of urban population may have increased in recent decades."

The *American* thinks that a broader spirit has grown in the High Church, and this it attributes to the diffusion of a genuine national feeling. The average High Church minister of 1847 was more English than American. He was born on the wrong side of the Atlantic; he was an "ecclesiastical dude." But the average High Churchman of 1887, is, so says the clever Pennsylvania editor, an American with a genuine and hearty respect for his own country. If not satisfied with her ecclesiastical condition he does not despise her religious life and traditions. So far so good. But the *American* seems to forget that Episcopalian congregations in all the great towns of the Atlantic seaboard manifest a striking preference for native English clergymen, and if they cannot get the genuine English article, insist upon the best American imitation available. This imitation, like the genuine imported Anglo-Saxon "ecclesiastical dude," must of course be qualified to take republican institutions under his patronage, east doubts upon the propriety of the Declaration of Independence, utter glib nothings about the Mother Country, and emphatically lament and reprobate the growth of the Irish and German elements with the consequent menacing attitude of Rome in America. We deny not indeed that many Episcopalian

clergymen are thoroughly American in sentiment and in speech, but the majority of these you will find in the rural districts of the east, or the less cultured, if more progressive, communities of the West. We do not think that the influence of that religious body has been or is as a whole conducive to the growth of a genuine American national sentiment, and that it can lead in a reconstruction of American Protestant Christianity on the basis of unity in Church government. Nor do we think that the mass of American Protestants will ever see anything in the worship and government of the Episcopal Church to commend itself to their judgment. The fact is that American Protestants are falling away more and more every year from the recognition of settled forms of Church government, for the simple reason that no Protestant church organization dares define with accuracy or authority, much less enforce, any fixed code of doctrinal teaching. The average American is a very busy man of the world. He believes in God and would like to bring his practice into accord with his professions, but he has no time for theological disquisitions. He needs a Church that, like the Divine Master Himself, will speak to him with authority and clearness and lead him with the charity of Christ to the light of heaven. He does not, cannot find this in any Protestant religious system. Nowhere outside the Church Catholic can the American people find security, unity and peace. The deplorable doctrinal confusion of the High Church so-called in America, will be quite clear from this citation from the columns of the *American*:

"He is not averse to helping on this tendency, and so he begins to ask: 'What is it that we must hold fast as the irreducible minimum of churchmanship?' Not the Book of Common Prayer certainly, in any of its forms, English, Scotch or American. Not the traditions which have gathered around the episcopate and given it a character which makes it less acceptable to the other Christians than to ourselves. Only so much of our liturgy as is indispensable to the proper observance of the two sacraments, and so much of our governmental system as is essential to the episcopal succession, can be included in any basis on which we can insist as a necessary prerequisite to the union of Christians on the right ground. With these reservations, we are ready to negotiate with any body of persons who profess and call themselves Christians and a Christian Church, to weigh any considerations they have to present for a different modification of these (in our view essential) elements of Church existence."

"Such is a view of the High Church attitude toward Christian union as viewed by an outsider. And as the High Church party now controls the Episcopal Church, this may be said to be the attitude of that church."

Whole volumes might be written on this subject, but this one paragraph sets forth in a few lines as well as volumes could, the abject helplessness and deplorable disquisitions of the American Episcopal Church. Without authority in teaching, or unity in its doctrine or discipline, it is certainly the least promising of any form of Protestant Christianity in the union. Never can it with its divisions and disturbances, weld American Protestantism into one. This is in fact beyond the power of any one or all of the sects combined.

NEW ENGLISH PROFESSOR FOR OTTAWA COLLEGE.

Satisfactory arrangements have at last been made with Prof. Glassmaier, M. A., of Cambridge, Mass. The engaging of the services of this eminent Professor by the faculty of Ottawa College is a move in the right direction.

A graduate of the University of Cologne in Europe, Professor Glassmaier, came to the United States in '65. He immediately devoted himself to acquire a thorough knowledge of the English tongue. So well did he succeed that in three years time he was changed from his chair of Greek literature to that of English, in St. Louis College, N. Y. city. For ten years he occupied the position of Professor of English in this college, and when circumstances compelled the closing of this institution Professor Glassmaier was immediately engaged to teach English and Eloquence in St. Thomas Aquinas College. The learned Professor has in preparation a dictionary of English synonyms which will soon be in print.

Catholic Colored Mission of Windsor, Ontario.

As Dean Wagner, who has in hand the work of the Catholic Colored Mission of Windsor, wishes to begin the erection of a suitable school-house and church at the earliest possible date, all persons who have received his appeal for help are kindly requested to fill their lists as soon as convenient, and send the proceeds, together with the beneficiaries' lists, to the reverend gentleman. All moneys received will be immediately acknowledged. Persons not receiving in due time such acknowledgment, will be pleased to notify Dean Wagner by postal card.

We notice that our friend Rev. Father Pujos, of Plainville, Kansas, has been removed to Clyde, Okla. Co. in the same state. He will still retain the spiritual direction of the Catholics of his old mission of Plainville. We trust every success will attend this good priest in his new field of labor.

IRISH LANDLORDISM EXPOSED.

II.

We resume in this issue the discussion of Irish landlordism's claims and rights. We have seen that the argument of those who, like the *Chicago Tribune*, corresponded think that "tenant right means landlord wrong," is based on a false assumption, viz., that the Irish landlord wishes to enjoy all the privileges, without discharging any of the obligations of the feudal lord of old. From what we have already stated and demonstrated it is clear that the Irish and British landlords of to-day are but Crown tenants in the enjoyment of privileges and incomes, based on rapacity and fraud. Their fraudulent devices have no other legal foundation than an act of Parliament. Parliament can undo whatever Parliament has done, it may repeal and alter, and to a certain extent has repealed and altered its enactments in relation to landlord claims and rights. Further repeals and alterations of a more radical character are sure to follow. Besides, the ancestors of the present sub-tenants, the cultivators of the soil, never acknowledged the ownership of the landlords. Their rents they paid under vigorous, repeated, increasing protest. Especially was this so of the Irish cultivators, who during the time of the Tudors, Stuarts, and Hanoverians, were deprived of the lands that came to them from an ancestry whose beginning no man could tell—and this on a religious pretence, fraudulent and insincere. Religious persecution was in Ireland the concomitant of public robbery and of political exclusion. Many of those who supported the legitimate sovereigns of the House of Stuart against the Dutch King William and the Hanoverian dynasty, were changed from Crown tenants to sub-tenants. There never had been acquiescence on the part of the despoiled and persecuted Irish in the robberies perpetrated on them by Cromwellian and Williamite adventurers. No more could there have been, as the *Tribune* puts it, acquiescence on the part of the Southern planters, if after the late civil war in America the Union generals had seized and occupied all the plantations of the South.

It must be furthermore borne in mind, that only the bare land and a castle or two were originally leased to the crown tenant. His tenancy or limited ownership extends therefore in equity to these alone. Improvements of every kind and description, such as farm buildings, drainage, reclamation of waste land, the enrichment of the soil, fencing, tree planting, and the like, all are the creation and therefore justly the property of the sub-tenant. This is particularly true of the Irish sub-tenant. It was but a short time ago established before Lord Cowper's royal commission, that of the 11s. and 4d. (\$2.73) expended per acre on the average, in the improvement of Irish lands since 1840, the landlords contributed but 1s. 1d. or the munificent sum of 26 cents per acre. The land act of 1870 lent partial recognition to the tenant's ownership in the improvements. The act of 1881 went much further and recognized the dual ownership of the sub-tenant and landlord. The pretense of the latter, advanced and asserted since 1670, was by the act of 1881 effectually disposed of. The landlord is now simply a co-tenant. Parliament will no doubt still further determine the real extent of his ownership, based not only upon doubtful but often scandalously bad titles. The act of 1881 is, to some extent, a recognition of the Mosaic law that the first fruits of the soil belong to the cultivator thereof. The first decisions of the commissioners appointed under the act of 1881 were based on the amount that a thrifty tenant could spare after he had paid for the decent support of himself and family and after setting aside for the future an amount equivalent to 6 per cent on his capital invested. In the fixing of these rents the price of produce had, of course, to be taken into account. Since then, however, prices have fallen over 30 per cent—according to the Royal commissioners themselves 18 per cent—and according to a former member of the commission 40 per cent. The tenants cannot in consequence pay the so-called judicial rents of three years ago. It is therefore self-evident that in trying to enforce payment by eviction the landlords are violating the spirit of the law and acting the part, as the *Tribune* expresses it, of inhuman rascals. We have further to ask our readers to bear in mind that the Tory Ministers—all landlords—have admitted the injustice and fraudulent character of these exactions. They have themselves introduced and carried through the House of Lords—a radical measure of land reform, decreeing a sweeping reduction of rents on the basis of present prices. Pending, however, its consideration, the English government, with that admirable consistency so characteristic of British rule in Ireland, is lending the military forces of the Crown to assist the rascally

landlords in evicting the tenant unable to pay the grinding rent that their own Cabinet measure declares to be exorbitant; and there is at the same time being forced through the Commons a coercion bill of a most cruel and sanguinary character, solely for the benefit of the landlord and Orange minority in Ireland. The *Tribune* then justly concludes:

"It will be seen from what has been said that our correspondent when he talks about 'competition,' 'the rights of landlords,' and their 'ownership' of the land, he displays a very comprehensive ignorance of the whole subject. His reference to the 'tenancy' of the land lords, to their 'forbearance,' and to their 'necessities,' is the veriest rot. The term 'rascal' has been properly applied to them."

The *Chicago Journal* then goes on to show, that three years ago when the prices of farm produce in Ireland were 25 per cent. higher than they are to-day, the Land Commissioners reduced the rents of the leading Irish landlords in the proportion shown by the following most interesting table:

Landlord.	Per cent of reduction.
Earl of Charlemont.....	15.4
Lord Lurgan.....	24.7
Duke of Manchester.....	26.5
Earl Annesley.....	51.5
Marquis Conyngham.....	17.2
Earl of Leitrim.....	30.0
Viscount Lifford.....	23.8
Lord Templemore.....	21.4
Viscount Bangor.....	11.0
Earl of Dufferin.....	27.2
Earl of Kilmory.....	10.5
Marquis of Londonderry.....	17.4
Marquis of Ely.....	21.5
Earl of Enniskillen.....	10.0
Marquis of Headfort.....	21.8
Lord Holland.....	22.0
Lord Massereene.....	19.2
Earl Russell.....	30.0
Lord Ashbrook.....	41.4
Lord Castletown.....	30.4
Viscount Gough.....	26.0
Marquis of Blyth.....	19.0
Lord Greville.....	18.5
Lord Carew.....	11.0
Earl of Courtown.....	11.4
Earl of Carysfort.....	15.0
Lord Ardilaun.....	20.0
Earl of Clancarty.....	10.3
Marquis of Clanricarde.....	14.6
Lord Mountmorris.....	40.4
Lord Walscourt.....	23.0
Earl of Albemarle.....	21.3
Lord Harlech.....	19.7
Marquis of Bath.....	16.0
Lord Rathdonnell.....	11.2
Viscount Templeton.....	16.0
Duke of Abercorn.....	12.0
Lord Inchiquin.....	15.4
Earl of Norbury.....	16.8
Earl of Bantry.....	19.6
Duke of Devonshire.....	15.0
Earl of Exmouth.....	20.0
Earl of Kenmare.....	12.5
Viscount Lismore.....	20.0
Viscount Middlesex.....	18.0
Marquis of Lansdowne.....	17.0
Lord Ventry.....	14.8
Lord Leonfield.....	18.0
Lord Massy.....	17.1
Viscount Southwell.....	22.4
Earl of Donaghmore.....	13.3
Viscount Haward.....	17.0
Lord Normanton.....	10.7
Earl of Orkney.....	19.0
Lord Muskerry.....	14.8
Earl of Portarlington.....	10.0
Earl of Ross.....	20.7
Lord Waterford.....	16.8
Lord Ashdown.....	20.5
Earl of Huntingdon.....	24.0
Earl of Portessford.....	15.0
Viscount Doneraile.....	10.0
Duke of St. Albans.....	23.0
Earl of Beasborough.....	25.0
Marquis of Downshire.....	22.0
Marquis of Drogheda.....	12.5
Duke of Leinster.....	12.7
Viscount Mountgarrett.....	17.7
Lord Digby.....	10.3
Earl of Grandison.....	16.7
Lord Bellew.....	16.7
Earl of Darnley.....	11.4
Viscount Gormanstown.....	20.0
Earl of Arran.....	15.0
Lord De Clifford.....	11.6
Earl of Lucan.....	19.3

Many of these noblemen had passed for exceedingly benevolent and humane persons. Some of them are Catholics who figure conspicuously at the church gatherings. All of them are here, however, proven to have been for years exorbitant. Our own excellent Governor General figures on the black list as a recipient of exorbitant rents to the extent of £100 per cent. In other words, for every £100 of rent paid him, he had been for years stealing £17. It is not William O'Brien nor United Ireland that lays this charge at his door, but a judicial body composed of his own political friends and appointed by an act of the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain. He is, however, no worse than the others whose names we above give to our readers. We ask them to peruse that list carefully. Every name thereon recalls some eventful even if painful period of Irish history. These names are a living evidence of apostasy rewarded, of treason honored, and perfidy decorated. That list we ask our readers to preserve. Reference to it will in the trying and critical times at hand be of interest. It is itself the strongest impeachment of Irish landlordism ever drawn up, crushing and irresistible.

The poet Longfellow hit upon a strong illustration of the absurdity of the doctrine of predestination adhered to so pertinaciously by old fashioned Presbyterians. To a friend he wrote: "A theological question has just risen in my mind. What right has a Calvinist to get married and beget children, when, according to his doctrine, the chances are that they will go into everlasting torment? Ought he not rather to go into a monastery or a Shaker brotherhood?"

PILATE'S SENTENCE.

There is at present going the round of the press a document purporting to be a translation of the sentence pronounced by Pontius Pilate against Christ. If it were an authentic document it would be an important testimony to the truth of the Gospels, as it would of itself serve to show that the Evangelists wrote with so full knowledge of the facts that they must have been ocular, or at least contemporaneous witnesses, of the facts which they narrate. But if the document is spurious, the public should be on their guard against giving to it any credit. The faith of Christians does not rest upon doubtful or spurious documents. There is a mass of undoubted and reliable evidence to prove the truth and authenticity of the gospels, and there is no need of relying upon forgeries to vindicate the cause of Christianity. To do so would be to furnish sceptics with an argument which they are not slow in using. They pretend, falsely, of course, that Christianity depends for its support upon spurious evidence. So far is this from being the case that there exists a line of witnesses beginning with the days of the Gospels and extending downwards during the three centuries which followed the establishment of Christ's Church, whose evidence cannot be gainsaid. These witnesses include Catholics, heretics, Jews and Pagans, and their testimony proves to demonstration the truth of the Gospel narrative. The Acts of Pilate constitute one of these witnesses; and though these acts are not themselves extant, there is sufficient evidence to show the substance of their contents.

It was the Roman custom to preserve the record of remarkable events which transpired throughout the Empire. For the city of Rome these events were recorded in the "Acts of the Senate" or the "Daily Acts of the People." In the provinces, the governors kept a similar record, which was sent to Rome. Eusebius, who is known to have been a correct annalist, well acquainted with the usages of the Empire, relates that Pilate had conformed to this usage, and that "Our Saviour's resurrection being much talked of throughout Palestine, Pilate informed the Emperor of it, and also of His miracles, of which he had heard and that being raised up after he had been put to death, he was already believed by many to be a God." History, Book 3. Long before the time of Eusebius these acts were quoted by Christian writers as an undoubted testimony to the truth of important facts in the life of Christ. About the year 200, Tertullian wrote in his Apology for Christianity: "Of all these things relating to Christ, Pilate himself, in his conscience already a Christian, sent an account to Tiberius, who was Emperor then." He further states that Tiberius, "having received from Palestine in Syria an account of those things which proved Christ's divinity, proposed to the Senate that he should be numbered among the Gods of Rome. . . but the Senate rejected the proposition, because the Emperor himself had declined this honor. Nevertheless the Emperor persisted in his opinion, and threatened punishment to those who accused the Christians." He adds, appealing to the pagans themselves: "Search your own public records and you will find that Nero was the first emperor who wielded the sword against this religion when it rose to most prominence in Rome." The events which Tertullian here states to be mentioned in the acts of Pilate are, Christ's crucifixion and resurrection, His appearance to His disciples, and His ascension into heaven in sight of the same disciples, to whom He gave commission to preach His gospel through the world.

The learned Tertullian, a lawyer by profession, was versed in Roman law, and had access to the public records. The apology which contains the above references was addressed to the Roman governors and magistrates in Africa; and certainly he could not appeal with such confidence to the records of the Empire unless these records bore him out in his assertions. At that time the records were in existence, though they were afterwards destroyed or lost amid the vicissitudes through which Rome passed during the incursions of the many barbarous nations that successively sacked the city.

Earlier still, about A. D. 139, Justin the Martyr addressed an apology for the Christians to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, and the Roman Senate, in which he speaks of the crucifixion of Christ and some of the circumstances connected therewith. He adds: "That these things were so done you may know from the Acts made in the time of Pontius Pilate." In the same apology, further down, he appeals to these same Acts in proof of our Lord's miracles, such as healing diseases, and raising the dead to life. The Acts of Pilate were therefore an indubitable record laid up in the archives of the country, and they attested many important events in the life of our Lord, otherwise they would not have been appealed to with such confidence by these men of learning, when they

were addressing the Emperors and Governors of the Empire. On another occasion also the Acts of Pilate were cited by St. Justin, namely, when held at Rome a public discussion with the philosopher Crescens. If quotation were a falsification, Justin would not have dared to have such an appeal.

In the second century the Quartodecimanists circulated a spurious letter of Pontius Pilate to Tiberius, and in the third century the Pagans made public certain spurious records injurious to Christ and to Christians, but these are not to be founded with the authentic Acts of Pilate to which Justin, Tertullian and Eusebius refer.

The document of which we spoke the beginning of this article is also different from these Acts of Pilate. It purports to be the sentence by which our Saviour is condemned to death. This sentence is carried out "on the 25th March the 17th year of Tiberius, during the tithes of Anna and Calapha." No it is known that Tiberius began his reign on the 19th August in the 14th year of Christian era, the 17th year of Tiberius must have begun on the 19th August, 30: and the 25th of March of that year would be 25th of March A. D. 31; however, the closing months of the year were counted as the first year of Tiberius, the second being reckoned the beginning of the following year, the date would be 25th March A. D. This date occurred on a Saturday, former date, 25th March A. D. 31 on day, which evidently does not agree with the day on which the crucifixion place, which was Friday. This discrepancy alone would stamp the document as unauthentic, unless, indeed, the document is going the round of the press merely a wrong translation of the original. An error might easily occur in translating a Roman date into English, unless the translator were thoroughly conversant with the rather complicated methods of the Romans.

The day of the week of this document is easily computed; for by the Julian Calendar each term of 28 years corresponds in this respect with each period and following 28 years. Adding 66 times 28 to 31 we obtain so that the days of the week of 31 correspond with A. D. 1879 old. The 25th March 1879 falls upon a Saturday, New Style, which was Sunday; and 25th of March A. D. 31 was also Sunday.

As regards the precise date of Christ's crucifixion, there exists some difference of opinion. The most probable seems to be that which assigns it to 3 April 33. This date is founded on the following considerations. St. John the Evangelist began his preaching in the 15th year of Tiberius Caesar. This we learn from Luke iii, 1.3. This would be some after 19 August A. D. 28, probably springtime A. D. 29. The baptism of Jesus was, therefore, most probably the last half of the year 29. The gospel of St. John mentions that his four baptisms of the Pasch observed the Divine Saviour. This would bring celebration to the year 33, this being the occasion on which He was condemned to and suffered death. In that year Paschal lamb was eaten on Thursday April 2nd, and thus the day on which Christ suffered is estimated to be April 3rd.

The date we have assigned for Christ's crucifixion has a remarkable corroboration in the Annals of Phlegon. A historian relates that "in the year of the 202nd olympiad occurred the greatest eclipse of the sun which was ever witnessed. It occurred the sixth hour of the day, (noon) so dark, that the stars appeared in the sky. There was also a great earthquake which threw down many houses at Nicæa in Bithynia."

This accords perfectly with the given in St. Matthew xxvii, 45, 51: from the 6th hour there was darkness over the whole earth, until the 9th. . . . And behold the veil of the temple was rent in two from the top, and the bottom; and the earth quaked, and the rocks were rent." It was, a miraculous darkness, expressly by Almighty God to manifest how the awful crime of Deicide which had perpetrated, and which Nature could not passively endure.

Let us try to look upon this life as a night and dream, and the misery of the trials which we upon us without repining. If we shall find little difference between servitude and prosperity and the diadem of the monarchs the shackles of the slave.—Chateau