

now found to be inapplicable to them. All the early literature, once relied upon, is now the subject of suspicion, doubt, or dispute.

I do not wish to convey the idea that the opinions about the value of these writings are uniform and consistent among scholars in general. The same remark applies to other early writers, who were not claimed as successors to the Apostles. Opinions differ among men equally honest and able to judge of these writers. Let us take the case of "Pliny the Younger" and his alleged writing to the Emperor Trajan in A.D. Mr. Wm. Addis, M.A., in his "Christianity and the Roman Empire," says that Pliny, in describing the "infection" of the Christian "superstition" as having spread into his province, is "a witness beyond suspicion." But Prof. Edwin Johnson, M.A., in "The Rise of Christendom," informs us that this supposed correspondence is not to be found in any extant MS. It was added to the collection by Aldus. Not only so, but he says that, on reading the first two sentences, we feel that they are the writing of one "unaccustomed to think in classical Latin;" and, finally, that it is "one of the most glaring and impudent fabrications in the long series." Prof. Johnson holds, and I think rightly, that all the allusions in the authors I have referred to are but "interpolations" of a later age, even when they only name Jews or Christians, and this is nearly all they ever do.

Prof. Johnson, in his extensive researches, devotes over thirty pages to examples of interpolations in Roman literature. Although I think he makes out a very good case, he is held to be "extreme" in his views in maintaining that this fraudulent business was enacted in modern times by the monks. He may be proved wrong about the date, but it will be difficult to show he is wrong about the fact that the passages he refers to are interpolations.

Mr. Addis (although writing in defence of Christianity) refers to one of my "silent" authors in these terms: "But it is significant that Dion Cassius, who lived under Alexander Severus and wrote the history of the Empire down to his time, never once mentions the name of Christian" (p. 51).

Speaking of Tacitus and Suetonius, Mr. Addis says they "show by their brief and contemptuous notices that they knew little about Christianity and cared less." Epictetus and Aurelius "dismiss Christianity in scornful phrase." Lucian enlarges on its "credulity," because it "supplies an easy mark for his wit" (p. 51). But if all this be true, it is not by any means important.

Then, as to the existence of a Christian Church as a corporate body with an external government and a constitution of its own, Mr. Addis says: "Of such a body there is no trace during the first century and a half of the Christian era" (p. 94).

The allusion, found in Suetonius, to Claudius, that he "drove out of Rome the Jews who were excited to constant riot by Chrestus," he refers to correctly as "confused" and "obscure," although "famous." But

the all
statem

Th
moder
"sacre
well to
has no
answer
beast i

Ref
seem n
absurd
that th
made in
body w
there is
inscript
What it

The g
within
Testam
it woul
lawyers
the won
contrary
my judg
the writ
Jerome.

stories t
—that li
ests of t
who they
ecording t
uncertain
willing to
Britanni

A new
that is not
eccentric
velopment
"True, m
and that w

Minister
Brother