A SCRIPTURE CHAMPION.

Judge Waite's "History of the Christian Religion to the Year Two Hundred."

The Rev. Dr. Curtiss, Professor in Chicago Theological Seminary,

Points Out the Defects of the Book and the Ignorance and Bias of the Author.

Judge Waite Impaled Upon the Point of a Very Sharp Pen—A Severe Criticism.

Dr. Curtiss Claims that the Author Is Influenced by a Recent Publication,

And Charges Him with a Contemptuous Handling of the Christian Fathers.

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION TO THE YEAR TWO HUNDRED. By Charles B. Waite, A. M. Chicago: C. V. Waite & Co.

To the Editor of The Inter Ocean.

CHICAGO, Feb. 8, 1881.—Before entering upon the specific criticism of this book, some preliminary remarks are in place. I presume all will agree that there is need of a special training for the pursuit of every science, and that the more advanced the science becomes the greater the necessity of such a training. Before a man can attain eminence in any scientific departmen the must have mastered all the important discoveries in that department. It would obviously be absurd for a geologist to set himself up as an authority in geology who should be unfamiliar with the views of leading geologists during the last two decades, and who should quote the opinions of men in the last century to establish his positions, when an examination of recent authorities would have prevented him from wasting his time to no purpose. Still there are many who are led by curiosity to pursue studies for which they are unprepared for want of the right training. Their love of knowledge is commendable, and they are deserving of praise so long as they recognize the incompleteness of their investigations. But when they attack established institutions and claim to be public teachers, it is right to try to convince them and the public that they are not scientists, but sciolists; and that the positions which they set forth with so much confidence are due to an ignorance of the subject.

SCIENCE OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

There can be no doubt that Biblical criticism is as truly a science as that of geology, or anthropology—a science which has occupied the close attention of many untiring investigators and brilliant students for the last hundred years. These men belong to all schools of belief. So far as they deserve the title of scientists, they are characterized with an ardent love of truth. They would rather make an admission which is unfavorable to them than carry a point by unfair means. Their opinions have been recorded, and although there are many differences among them, it is perfectly possible to ascertain what the consensus of New Testament criticism is; for example, whether critics generally agree that the books of the New Testament did not arise before the last quarter of the second century.

Now there are certain prerequisites which are absolutely necessary to pursue such an investigation. Since German scholars have made such extensive contributions in this department, a familiarity with the German language is absolutely necessary. To lack a knowledge of German is to incapacitate one for becoming a master in this department. This, however, is simply a medium. It is necessary besides to be familiar with the principles of historical and Biblical criticism. Without it the greatest industry will be misdirected. Furthermore, the student must have a complete knowledge of the literature of the subject, and of

THE BEST AUTHORITIES.

This is the last place where mere numbers are decisive. Not every book which may have been written on the subject is an authority. The leaders in this department have as clear and settled a reputation as the eminent astronomers or chemists, but they are perhaps less familiarly known to the general public. The last prerequisite which I notice is that of a judicial and unbiased mind. The question is, What are the facts? These must be understood and weighed without reference to the preferences of the writer.

I deem it important to dwell upon these points, not only that the public may see the grounds of my criticisms upon our author, but also that they may be in a position properly to estimate the many similar attempts which will be made in this direction.

Whether Judge Waite would claim the possession of these prerequisites I do not know. The question is not whether he is an amiable gentleman, a person of literary tastes and culture, and of good common sense. He may possess all these qualities which commend one to the confidence of the public, and yet be totally unfitted to examine these questions and to pass a judgment upon them.

Now, without any personal knowledge of the gentleman, I desire to point out plainly the

DEFECTS OF THIS VERY PLAUSIBLE BOOK—

I call it plausible because, without the least heat, he would seem to all who are inclined to doubt to establish his positions triumphantly. And yet I cannot discover a trace of one of the prerequisites which I have mentioned. He has not had the requsite training. He does not seem to be acquainted with German. He does not know the literature of the subject, although he has consulted so many books; and in this discussion, however excellent and impartial he may be upon the bench, he does not display an unbiased and judicial mind. Indeed he employs methods which are in vogue among advocates in making out a case, or what the Germans with reference to Baur and the Tuebingen school call tendency-criticism; that is, his entire investigation is predetermined by a theory. There is an obvious effort to disparage all testimony offered on the other side. This will appear farther on in his treatment of the apostolic fathers, Eusebius, the Canon of Muratori, etc., are all disparaged. There seems to be a tendency, which is probably unconscious, to withhold evidence which might be prejudicial.

Unbelief is in every case given the benefit of the doubt. This may be a safe principle in criminal law, where it is esteemed better that nine guilty men should escape punishment than that one innocent man should suffer, but in a question where not only truth is at stake, but especially truth which concerns man's weal or woe, every argument in favor of the Christian system and its character must be weighed with scrupulous care, and it seems to me that these, rather than infidelity, should have the benefit of the doubt.

AN EXAMINATION.

Passing now to an examination of the author's work, I wish to have it understood in advance that I do not feel called upon to controvert, with much argument, positions which Mr. Waite never could or would have taken if he had been more conversant with the literature of this subject. I refer here especially to the evidence which he adduces for the priority of certain apocryphal gospels (pp. 128-221).

There are three points which he urges in his conclusion: "No evidence is found of the existence in the first century of either of the following doctrines: The immaculate conception, the miracles of Christ, His material resurrection."

As these doctrines are plainly taught in the gospels, the author can only establish his position by relegating them to the second century. This he seeks to do by external and internal arguments, claiming that Luke arose 170 A. D.; Mark, 175; John, 178, and Matthew, 180. I need not say that scarcely any critics of eminence maintain such late dates, except the author of "Supernatural Religion," who is the inspiration of so many agnostics in this country, and who can scarcely be ranked as a critic. The following is Hilgenfeld's criticism upon him, which is all the more significant, as he belongs to the most liberal party in Germany: (Zeitschrift fuer wissenschaftliche Theologie. Leipzig, 1875, vol 18, pp., 583-584.) "It cannot be denied that the author (i. e. of "Supernatural Religion") has taken great pains to look about carefully in old and new writings. One may also thankfully recognize many an excellent remark. But the author shows a similar partisanship against as the orthodox for the traditional authority of the gospels, and it cannot be denied that, in many respects, he has transcended the proper limit. * * * * Such conduct is not calculated to retain and secure respect for criticism." The force of these strictures will appear when it is known that Judge Waite, who is evidently

INFLUENCED BY "SUPERNATURAL RELIGION,"

but cannot for a moment be compared with its author in learning, has taken positions which the author of "Supernatural Religion" is too wise to urge.

Let us now begin our investigation of Judge Waite's book with an examination of the propositions which he so confidently maintains in the conclusion, that there is no proof of the doctrine of the immaculate conception, of miracles, and of Christ's material [i. e. actual] resurrection in the first century. Our author sets our canonical gospels entirely aside as too late to have any bearing on this question. What evidence does he afford in support of these propositions? None whatever. Either the tradition is true, which maintains that the Gospels of Peter and of Paul are our Gospels of Mark and Luke, or it is false, as Judge Waite claims, and these gospels are lost. If the tradition as to these gospels is true, as many excellent critics hold, then we know these doctrines were taught, for they are contained in our gospels; but if this tradition is false, then the assertion that it cannot be proved that these doctrines were held in the first century can be met with the counter assertion that it cannot be disproved. For if the documents named are not our gospels, then they are lost, we have no clear record of what was in them, and they cannot be cited on either side of the question. In that case, we should have to consider whether our gospels were in existence at that period. Although the evidence down to a certain age is not strong when each argument is examined singly, yet we shall find, if we begin in the last quarter of the second century, and move back into the first century, that the critical evidence for the existence of the gospels is very strong up to a certain point, and that beyond that point the moral evidence, when we combine all the arguments, is such as to satisfy every unprejudiced person. The only reason why scholars are so cautious in dealing with this subject is that unbelievers practically claim that all evidence which is merely circumstantial should be excluded. It is asserted that if we cannot trace the gospels back earlier than the time of Justin Martyr (d. 165) by critical evidence we must stop there, we may not construct a cumulative argument from the circumstantial evidence which remains, carrying us back to the first century. Now, this course is obviously unfair where men are seeking after truth. It may be said that this circumstantial evidence would not suffice to establish a case in court. Granting this, for the sake of argument, does the fact that there is not sufficient legal evidence that certain events took place disprove their actual occurrence? Have we not experienced many things in our lives of which we might not be able to furnish satisfactory evidence in a court of justice? Have they, therefore, never occurred? Might not, however, the statement of a citizen, who was a man of veracity and a public benefactor, be accepted, even in a court of justice, in regard to matters which he could prove only by circumstantial evidence, when all his other testimony was fully established? Now, this illustrates the condition of our argument in

TRACING THE HISTORY OF THE GOSPELS

backward from the last quarter of the second century. We have, as I have remarked, a good degree of certainty up to a given point, and beyond that a strong probability.

It is customary, however, for the critics, in beginning with the apostolic age, to assail each position until they reach a period where the arguments against them are impregnable. This is obviously unfair. We cannot rightfully expect any quotations from the apostles who may have been living after the gospels were written, since each was in possession of an oral gospel. Descending to the next period, that of the apostolic fathers, it must be remembered that it was not productive. These fathers were overshadowed by the age that preceded them. They have left very few writings. Their minds were impressed more with persons and sayings than with documents. They naturally tended to use the same Bible which Christ and his apostles had used, that is, the Old Testament, and while they felt their inferiority to the apostles, yet, when they had occasion to quote the sayings and doings of Christ, in an age when manuscripts of the gospels were not plentiful, and were not divided into chapters and verses, they were not likely to be anxiously literal in their quotations, since they had so often heard the oral gospel, and the written gospels had been prepared rather for the wants of the future church than for them. They had no occasion to quote the gospels by the names of the different evangelists, for the substance of the gospel was already known to the churches to which they ministered. They had no special occasion for emphasizing the immaculate conception, Christ's miracles, or the circumstances of his resurrection. If they had laid special stress on those things it would have been natural for skeptics to have charged them with originating these doctrines. Hence their allusions to these facts are not at all inconsistent with the accounts in the canonical gospels.

According to Judge Waite's own admission "the first allusion to the immaculate conception is in the Epistles of Ignatius, A. D. 115." Does not the very fact that there is merely an allusion indicate that the immaculate conception was generally accepted as a fact which needed no proof? So, too, he says that "the first mention of

THE MIRACLES OF JESUS

was in the Epistle of Barnabas, A. D. 71-132." Does that imply that the gospel account of miracles had not been previously in existence? Likewise he says that the material resurrection was taught by Justin Martyr. On the other hand he seeks to prove that Paul in holding the doctrine of a spiritual resurrection knew nothing of the facts of Christ's resurrection. This seems absurd. For Paul had no occasion to enter into the particulars of Christ's resurrection. The fact that he simply mentions that Christ was raised does not at all prove that he did did not know the manner as described in the gospels. Indeed what he says respecting Christ's resurrection in no way contradicts the narrative given in the gospels but rather presupposes it. Hence it follows that the evidence which Judge Waite adduces in support of these three positions in regard to the immaculate conception, miracles, and the actual resurrection of Christ is purely negative. It fails to prove his propositions. It simply amounts to this, that there were three gospels in the first century, which he thinks were entirely different from our first three gospels. These gospels are lost. Notwithstanding our ignorance as to their contents Judge Waite thinks that they did not teach these doctrines. I need not dwell upon the transparent weakness of such an argument.

Our canonical gospels, according to our author, did not exist in the first century. He claims that all seeming references to them in the apostolic fathers are to be explained away as derived from what the church has designated apocryphal gospels, from which our gospels in the last quarter of the second century were derived. He says that Marcion preceded our Luke, and that Justin Martyr knew nothing of our gospels. I shall not waste any ink or paper to prove that the Protevangelium, the Gospel of the Infancy, the Acts of Pilate, etc., in their present forms as known to us, and as quoted by Judge Waite, arose at a later period than our canonical gospels. While I might be amused to see into what a trap he has fallen, I feel a sincere compassion for a man who doubtless thinks with many others of his admirers, that this is one of the most convincing parts of his book. A knowledge of the original sources and the literature of the subject would have saved him from this pitiful blunder. I simply refer to Professor Lipsius article on the "Apocryphal Gospels," in Smith and Wace's "Dictionary of Christian Biography," London, 1880, vol. 2, pp. 700 sq.; and Holtzmann, "Apokryphen des Neuen Testaments," in Schenkel's "Bibel-Lexikon," Leipzig, 1869, vol. 1, pp. 170 sq. As neither of these articles are by orthodox men, or by those who have the slightest bias toward orthodoxy, they are calculated to inspire confidence in persons of every shade of belief or disbelief. Both are authorities; Meyer's "Konversations-Lexikon" says of Professor Lipsius, of Jena, that he is one of the most eminent scholars in Germany.

Still further, a knowledge of the course of criticism and of the latest authorities would have kept Judge Waite from claiming that Marcion's gospel preceded that of Luke. The opinion that Marcion's gospel was not a gnostic recast of our Luke's gospel, but that Luke's gospel was derived from Marcion, was held for a time years ago by some Germans, and more recently by the author of "Supernatural Religion," but

THE WEIGHT OF SCHOLARSHIP

is overwhelmingly in favor of the priority of Luke. Even the author of "Supernatural Religion" has been compelled, in the last edition of his work, London, 1879, to make the following admission, which nullifies his entire argument as to the priority of Marcion. He says (vol. 2, p. 138):

"In the earlier editions of this work we contended that the theory that Marcion's gospel was a mutilated form of our third Synoptic, had not been established, and that more probably it was an earlier work, from which our gospel might have been elaborated. Since the sixth edition of this work was completed, however, a very able examination of Marcion's gospel has been made by Dr. Sanday, which has convinced us that our earlier hypothesis is untenable, that the portions of our third Synoptic excluded from Marcion's gospel, were really written by the same pen which composed the mass of the work, and, consequently, that our third Synoptic existed in his time, and was substantially in the hands of Marcion."

The hypothesis which found favor with Baur and the Tuebingen school thirty-five years ago has long since been given up in Germany, even by Baur himself in the main. Ritschl, who recorded his adherence to the theory in 1846, gave his recantation five years later as follows (see Weiss, "Kritisch Exegetisches Handbuch ueber die Evangelien Markus and Lukas," Goettingen, 1878, p. 240): "I see that the hypothesis put forth by me, that Marcion did not change the gospel of Luke, but that his gospel is a preliminary step to

THE CANONICAL LUKE,

has been refuted by Volkmar and Hilgenfeld. Whoever reflects upon the exceeding one-sidedness with which Hahn has defended the traditional view will know how to excuse me for being led by him to the contrary one-sidedness (i. e. that the author of Luke's gospel made use of Marcion's). Compare Lipsius, in Smith and Wace's "Dictionary of Christian Biography," vol. 2, p. 715; Holtzmann in Schenkel's Bibel-Lexikon, vol. 1, pp. 178-179; Reuss, "Die Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften Neuen Testaments," Braunschweig, 1874, vol. 1, p. 254, says of Marcion: "He took his material principally from Luke as the least Judaizing . . . . in fact his books were castrated editions of single apostolical writings." And Hilgenfeld remarks in his "Zeitschrift fuer Wissenschaftliche Theologie," Leipzig, 1875, p. 584, in a criticism of the sixth edition of "Supernatural Religion:" "Among the Germans it will not pass for progress that he (i. e., the author of S. R.) is determined to consider the gospel of Marcion as independent from that of Luke." If the author of "Supernatural Religion" is compelled to yield this point, Judge Waite cannot any longer maintain his position with reference to Marcion, except among those who are so ignorant in regard to the matter, or so prejudiced, that they will not see.

Our author has followed "Supernatural Religion" in finding that Justin Martyr does not refer to

OUR CANONICAL GOSPELS.

This is ground which has been searched again and again by the most critical minds in Europe. Starting with America, and with a New Testament scholar who has a distinguished continental reputation, we find Professor Ezra Abbot, D. D., LL. D., of Harvard College, in his work on "The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel," Boston, 1880, maintaining in a masterly way that Justin Martyr used all our canonical gospels. Crossing over to England, we find the same position ably argued by Dr. Wescott, on the "Canon of the New Testament," London, 1875; by Sanday, "The Gospels in the Second Century," London, 1876; by Dr. E. A. Abbott, in the "Encyclopedia Britannica," New York, 1879, pp. 816 seq., with some qualifications in regard to John's Gospel, which are met by our Professor Abbot. Passing to Germany, and taking a look at the standard, critical New Testament introductions, we find that Bleek, and his editor, Mangold, "Einleitung in das Neue Testament," Berlin, 1875, pp. 271, 371, maintain that Justin Martyr was acquainted with our four gospels; that Reuss, ibid, § 294, rem., says, in regard to the character of his citations from the gospels, that they refer, so far as we can compare them with our texts, mostly to Matthew, but also some things which are only found in Mark and Luke are expressly cited, and the latter as from the disciple of an apostle; and Hilgenfeld, "Historisch-Kritsche Einleitung in das Neue Testament," Leipzig, 1875, pages 66 and 67, remarks: "Was in Justin's Evangelien * * * stand, fuehrt bereits uber die beiden Evangelien des Matthaeus und des Marcus hinaus. Es unterliegt keinem Zweifel dass er auch das Lucas-Evangelium gebraucht hat. Sogar der Gebrauch des Johannes-Evangelium wird schwer abzuweisen sein." "That which stood in Justin's gospels leads us out already over the two gospels of Matthew and Mark. There is no doubt that he also used the gospel of Luke. It will be hard to deny even the use of John's gospel."

There can be no question, then, that the very best critics in America, England, and Germany, as the result of the latest and most searching investigations, are agreed that Justin made use of the three synoptical gospels, and that most of them recognize, with varying degrees of assent, his use of John's gospel. Here again Judge Waite, in denying this secondary relation of Justin to our canonical gospels, builds upon the sand.

The constant tendency of our author's book is seen in his treatment of the fathers and of Eusebius. Whenever there is any danger that their testimony may cast a barrier in the way of his arguments, he seeks to disparage them. Such a course may be natural enough for one who is accustomed to the usages of a court-room, but it is carried to such an extreme, especially in the case of Eusebius, as to cast grave reflections upon the methods of one who claims to be seeking after the truth. We look in vain in any modern critical works for such a

CONTEMPTUOUS HANDLING OF THE FATHERS.

Granted that they were credulous like the men of their age, is all their testimony to be rejected on that account?

Old Scaliger, who died in 1609, is summoned from his grave to repeat an exploded slander against Eusebius, that "no writer has contributed more to Christian history, and no one is guilty of more mistakes." This is but a specimen of the way in which the Judge conjures up the shades of the past for the delectation of sciolists, who are ready to discuss any theme in the heavens above, or in the earth beneath, with the assurance that they are perfectly competent to settle the question. But it is absurd to quote these ancient authorities when scholars in the last decade have made new discoveries in the same fields, and can speak with authority. I know of no critics of any repute, and I have consulted many, who call in question the honest intent of Eusebius' statements. Semisch, in Herzog and Plitt's "Real Encyklopaedie," Leipzig, 1879, vol. iv, pp. 394-95, in commenting on Eusebius' silence with regard to the bad things in Constantine's character, remarks that his fault lay in this, and not in a material falsification of them, and afterwards adds: "His character for historical fidelity cannot in the main be denied in that which is handed down." The following estimate of Eusebius, by Bishop Lightfoot, one of the most careful English scholars, is taken from Smith and Wace's "Dictionary of Christian Biography," London, 1880, vol. 2, pp. 324, sq., where, after speaking of the enormous labor incurred in preparing the church history and defending him from

THE ASPERSIONS OF GIBBON,

bon, he says: "The writer contents himself with condemning the sins and shortcomings of Christians [which Lightfoot says are denounced in no measured language] in general terms without entering into details, and declares his intention of confining himself to such topics as may be profitable to his own and future generations. This treatment may be regarded as too great a sacrifice to edification. It may discredit his conception of history, but it leaves no imputation on his honesty. Nor, again, can the special charges against his honor as a narrator be sustained. There is no ground whatever for the surmise that Eusebius forged or interpolated the passage from Josephus relating to our Lord, quoted in H. E. i., 11, though Heinichen (iii., p. 623 sq., Melet. ii.) is disposed to entertain the charge. Inasmuch as this passage is contained in all our extant manuscripts, and there is sufficient evidence that other interpolations (though not this) were introduced into the text of Josephus long before his time, no suspicion can justly attach to Eusebius himself. Another interpoltation in the Jewish historian, which he quotes elsewhere (ii., 23), was certainly known to Origen. Doubtless, also, the omission of the owl in the account of Herod Agrippa's death (ii., 10) was already in some texts of Josephus (Ant. xix., 8, 2). The manner in which Eusebius deals with his very numerous quotations elsewhere, where we can test his honesty, is a sufficient vindication against this unjust charge. * * * *As regards the canon of Scripture, indeed, he takes special pains; he lays down certain principles which shall guide him in the production of testimonies; and, on the whole, he adheres to those principles with fidelity.*" [The italics are mine.]

I close with the following quotations from Meyer's "Konversations-Lexikon," Leipzig, 1875, vol. 6, p. 446: "His main work, the church history, written between 324 and 326, contains a

RICH COLLECTION FROM THE PUBLIC ARCHIVES,

church libraries, and private collections, increased through traditions, inquiries from those who had been participants in that which had taken place, or which they themselves had experienced, and although in many respects wanting in criticism, and unpartizanship, and evenness of treatment, yet, in general bearing the character of fidelity and credibility."

There can be no doubt, therefore, that when Judge Waite charges Eusebius with forgeries, and claims that his testimony ought not to be taken except as supported by others, he is guilty of using arguments which, in the judgment of modern criticism, cannot stand.

Judge Waite quotes Faustus, a Manichaean, who had a discussion with Augustine, which has been preserved in the writings of the latter, as saying: "Besides, as we have proved again and again, the writings are not the production of Christ or of His apostles, but a compilation of rumors and beliefs, made long after their departure, by some obscure semi-Jews, not in harmony even with one another, and published by them under the name of the apostles, or of those considered the followers of the apostles, so as to give the appearance of apostolic authority to all these blunders and falsehoods." Our author supposes that Faustus must have made this boast good in some of his writings. But of this there is no evidence. He never establishes this assertion anywhere, but affirms that the Paraclete (i. e., the Holy Ghost) teaches him what to receive and what to reject.

AUGUSTINE RETALIATES

on him by asking him what proof he has that Christ sent his Paraclete, and says: "You reply that you find the proof in the gospel. You do not accept all the gospel, and you say that it has been tampered with. Will you first accuse your witness of corruption, and then call for his evidence? To believe him when you wish it, and then to disbelieve him when you wish it, is to believe nobody but yourself. Where, then, will you find the proof required to show that it is from the Paraclete that you have learned that the gospels were not written by the apostles?" In another place he is inclined to claim that a passage in Romans is spurious because Paul asserts that the Son of God was born of the seed of David according to the flesh. He simply concedes that Paul wrote the passage because Augustine will not hear of anything being spurious in his writings. Augustine responds to such denials of the genuineness of the Scriptures as follows: "In your inability to find a reason for not receiving what is written in the New Testament, you are obliged, as a last resource, to pretend that the passages are not genuine. This is the last gasp of an heretic in the clutches of truth." From this it is evident that Faustus, instructed by the Paraclete (i. e the Holy Ghost), as he claimed, rejected all passages in the Old and New Testaments which were contrary to his doctrines as spurious, without the slightest evidence. This is all the more evident when we go back to Celsus, who is quoted by Origen. According to Judge Waite he did not write "The True Word," in which he refers to the New Testament books, until early in the third century. Unfortunately for Mr. Waite, however, Dr. Keim, who belongs to the most liberal German school, and who made a very careful investigation of the subject, Celsus' "Wahres Wort," Zurich, 1873, sets the date in the year 177 or 178 A. D.; see Smith & Wace's "Dictionary of Christian Biography," London, 1877, vol. 1, p. 436. When pushed with arguments which he cannot answer he does not, like Faustus, urge

THE SPURIOUSNESS OF THE GOSPELS,

as he might well have done if Judge Waite's theory were true, that they were not written before the last of the second century. His refuge, like that of so many skeptics of the present time, is in interpolations. He is the forerunner of Judge Waite and his compeers, who assume that the supernatural elements and all the unpalatable doctrines were interpolated. The following is his charge and Origen's answer:

"Certain Christian believers * * * have corrupted the gospel from its original integrity, to a three-fold, and four-fold, and many-fold degree, and have remodeled it, so that they might be able to answer objections."

To this Origen replies: "Now I know of no others who have altered the gospel save the followers of Marcion, and those of Valentinus, and I think, also, those of Lucian. But such an allegation is no charge against the Christians, but against those who so dared to trifle with the gospel."

Taking the quotation from Faustus in connection with that of Celsus, it will be seen that their charges of forgeries and interpolation rest on mere assertions, and apply to those parts of the New Testament which they do not like.

A further illustration of Judge Waite's tendency-criticism is seen in the date which he assigns to the old versions. He says (p. 304): "The four gospels were written in Greek, and there was no translation of them into other languages earlier than the third century." The best and latest authorities assign the old Latin version to about the middle, or not later than the end of the second century." Hilgenfeld says the New Testament was translated into Latin in the second century. Wescott assigns the date of that translation to the year 170 A. D. Bleek, Tregelles, Scrivener, Sanday, all assign it to the middle of the second century. Roensch holds that it could not have been made later than 200 A. D. Of course these dates are very unfavorable to his hypothesis that the gospels first arose in the last quarter of the second century.

Another illustration of the unvarying tendency of our author's argument is in his attitude toward the Muratorian fragment, respecting which, after speaking very depreciatingly of it, he says: "It is supposed by some to have been written in the second century. * * * There are eminent critics, however, who hold that the original was not written earlier than the third century. The document itself, a production of about the eighth century, cannot be looked upon as a very satisfactory evidence of the condition of the church in the second century." Now, the fact is that

THE MOST EMINENT NEW TESTAMENT SCHOLARS

in America, England, and Germany, with a few exceptions, hold that the Muratorian fragment was written in the last quarter of the second century (most setting the date at about 170-180 A. D.) Some of them are: Professor Ezra Abbott, of Harvard College; Dr. E. A. Abbot, Canon Wescott, W. A. Sanday, Credner, Wieseler, Bleek, Reuss, Hilgenfeld, any many others.

Even the author of "Supernatural Religion" has to admit that the mass of critics, thirty-two in all, are against him, while only eight can be found who assign a later date, and these, with the exception of Donaldson, merely hold that the fragment dates from the end of the second or the beginning of the third century. This is a case where the author of "Supernatural Religion" and Judge Waite show that they "have few equals in their power of resisting evidence opposed to their prejudices."—Professor Abbot. In view of the investigations of the most distinguished scholars, the Muratorian fragment is a very important witness for the canonical character of our gospels in the last quarter of the second century.

Again, Judge Waite shows his bias and his ignorance in regard to manuscripts, when he expresses his surprise that no autographs of the gospels have come down to us, and that none of the existing manuscripts of the gospels date further back than the fourth century. The following quotation from Scrivener's "Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament," Cambridge, 1874, pp. 3-4 will tend to set this matter in its true light:

THE MANUSCRIPTS.

"As the New Testament far surpasses all other remains of antiquity in value and interest, so are the copies of it yet existing in manuscript, and dating from the fourth century of our era downward, far more numerous than those of the most celebrated writers of Greece or Rome. Such as have been already discovered and set down in catalogues are hardly fewer than 2,000; and many more still linger unknown in the monastic libraries of the East. On the other hand, manuscripts of the most illustrious classic poets and philosophers are far rarer and comparatively modern. We have no complete copy of Homer himself prior to the thirteenth century, though some considerable fragments have been recently brought to light which may plausibly be assigned to the fifth century; while more than one work of high and deserved repute has been preserved to our times in only a single copy."

The following remark is made in Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology, Boston, 1870, vol. 2, p. 795, in regard to the manuscripts of Livy's (V. 59, B. C. d. 17 A. D.) History: "No manuscript of Livy has yet been discovered containing all the books now extant. * * * Of the first and third decades we have manuscripts as old as the tenth century; those of the fourth (decade) do not ascend higher than the fifteenth century." And Max Muller, in his "Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion," New York, 1873, p. 148, states that "but few Sanskrit manuscripts are older than 1000 A. D."

THE MANUSCRIPT OF THE TESTAMENT.

When we consider that the earliest copies of the New Testament may have been written on the perishable papyrus, which was chiefly employed for ordinary purposes in the first century (ex. Scrivener, pp. 23, 24), we need not be surprised that the sacred autographs have perished. Indeed, when we remember that a portion of the precious Sinaitic manuscript was consigned to a waste-basket as useless by the ignorant monks of St. Catharine, who had previously burned two baskets full of bits of old manuscripts, and was only rescued by Tischendorf's timely visit, it need not surprise us that we have so few very ancient manuscripts of the Scriptures.

Before leaving the subject of the external evidences adduced by Judge Waite in proof of his position that the gospels were not written before the last quarter of the second century, I should perhaps notice the striking parallels which are drawn between Christ as portrayed in the existing gospels of the Infancy and the account of Krishna in the "Bhagavat Purana." Before discussing this subject I wish to have it understood that, to my mind, it is no impeachment of the truths of the Bible that we find traditions of the creation, the fall, and the deluge which, even in their grotesque forms, remind us of the accounts in Genesis, and which may be reminiscences from one ancestral house. The fact that other nations besides the Hebrews confessed their sins and sought forgiveness does not disprove the divine nature of that doctrine. David is not less inspired because we find in the Chaldean literature passages which remind us of the penitential psalms (Lenarmant, "Die Magie und Wahrsagekunst der Chaldaer," pp. 66-67):

"God, who knowest that which is secret, be gracious.
Godess, who knowest that which is secret, be gracious.
O my God, my sins are seven times seven, forgive my sins
O my Godess, my sins are seven times seven, forgive my sins."

These are only "some solitary fragments of pure gold from a heap of rubbish."—Max Muller. But the parallels between Christ and Khrishna have evidently risen in a different way. Either the gospels of the Infancy have borrowed certain elements from the account of Khrishna, in the "Bhagavat Purana," as Judge Waite claims, or the "Bhagavat Purana" has

BORROWED FROM APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

Now, unless it can be shown, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the "Bhagavat Purana," in its present form, has essentially the same form as it had before the gospels of the Infancy appeared, Judge Waite's claim, and that of all his kith and kin, breaks down.

But Judge Waite cannot establish his position; he adduces Colonel Kennedy, who, in the quotation given, simply argues the matter as a question of probabilities. Mr. Wilson, in "The Vishnu Purana," (London, 1840, p. 6,) says: "The inference deduced from the discrepancy between the actual form and the older definition of a Purana, unfavorable to the antiquity of the extant works generally, is converted into certainty when we come to examine them in detail; for, although they have no dates attached to them, yet circumstances are sometimes mentioned or alluded to, or references to authorities are made, or legends are narrated, or places are particularized, of which the comparatively recent date is indisputable, and which enforce a corresponding reduction of the antiquity of the work in which they are discovered." Unless these things can be satisfactorily explained, and it can be proved that the Puranas have not received any modern elements since the Christian era, Judge Waite's assumption, as I have stated, must fall to the ground. All the authorities accessible to me corroborate the above statement in regard to the comparatively recent origin of the Puranas. Max Muller, in his "Chips from a German Workshop," (New York, 1870, vol. 2., p. 75), says: "What is commonly called Hindu mythology is of little or no avail for comparative purposes. The stories of Siva * * * * Krishna, etc., are of late growth, indigenous to India, and full of wild and fanciful conceptions. But while this late mythology of the Puranas," etc. Again in his "Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion," New York, 1879, p. 149, he remarks: "We must carefully distinguish between the Puranas, such as they now exist, and the original Purana, a recognized form of ancient tradition. * * * * Totally distinct from this are the Puranas. So late as the time of Gaimini no importance was attached to the Puranas, for he does not even refer to them in his "System of Mimamsa." Compare the Bibliotheca Sacra, vol. 9, pp. 245, 247; vol. 15, p. 844 sq.

The following quotation from Weber, "Allgemeine Weltgeschichte," Leipzig, 1857, vol. 1, p. 296, doubtless gives the prevailing view of German scholars as to their age: "The jealousy of the priestly families who claimed the pre-eminence for this or that form of worship and temple, and who fought one another with malignant hatred, contributed not a little to

THE FORMATION OF SECTS.

The Puranas belong to this time of religious divisions, * * * which in their present form hardly extend beyond the eleventh and twelfth centuries of our era." Compare Meyer's Konversations-Lexikon, Leipzig, 1878, vol. 13, p. 341, where it said of them: "Along with these reminscences of primitive times they show the peculiarities of a modern tendency," etc.

There seems, therefore, to be no doubt that the Bhagavat Purana may have derived those particulars in which the portraiture of Krishna corresponds to that of Christ through the medium of one of the apocryphal gospels. Without laying any weight upon the tradition given by Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, B. V., 10, that Pantaenus visited the Indies and found on his arrival that Bartholomew, one of the apostles, had already preached there and left the gospel of Matthew in Hebrew, since the India referred to here is generally supposed to have been Arabia, it is not difficult to suppose that some form of the Gospel of the Infancy, which existed both in Syriac and Arabic translations, may have given a coloring to the myths respecting Krishna. Indeed, this is far more reasonable than the theory that the apocryphal gospels have gathered only these things from the myths of Krishna, since they do not exhibit any traces of a hero who is represented as reveling in licentiousness and mischief, for when we come to the person of Christ, there is no similarity in the portraiture.

Leaving the discussion of Judge Waite's external history of the gospels, not because I have by any means indicated all his false hypotheses, but for want of space, I turn to consider very briefly his criticisms on their internal character. His strictures upon them are as histories. Hence he dwells upon their alleged discrepancies and their incompleteness. It must be evident, however, that he judges them from a false standpoint. As their name gospels imparts, they are not histories, but glad tidings, good news, for particular classes of people. They differ as much from complete biographies as historical discourses do, which are designed to teach specific lessons. Their authors were by no means anxiously concerned to secure a verbal agreement. If that had been the case it would have been a very simple matter for each evangelist to have so given

THE INSCRIPTION ON THE CROSS

that there should have been no deviation; but would not our skeptics have been ready to accuse them of collusion? Would not four persons who should repeat the same story word for word in court excite suspicion? It is not within the range of human power for different individuals to report the same events and discourses experienced and heard in a series of years alike or in the same order. Shall we, therefore, deny that the facts reported never happened? Certainly, if we had only one gospel, skeptics would claim that it was not true because it lacked confirmation. If all the gospels related the same facts in the same order, it would be argued far more strenuously than at present, that one had been derived from another. But as the case now stands variations in the accounts, which under ordinary tests would not be regarded as fatal to the substantial accuracy of the narrative, are urged as reasons for doubting everything of a supernatural character. If, however, we once admit the claim of Scripture that God became flesh and dwelt among us, we have no difficulty in regard to the immaculate conception, the miracles, or

CHRIST'S ACTUAL RESURRECTION.

Indeed, as regards the miracles, I cannot conceive how a compassionate Redeemer could resist the cries for help which were directed to Him as He walked among men. Now, the fact that there has been no anxious attempt to conform one gospel narrative to another in every particular is, as I have already suggested, an indication of genuineness, especially as it has been ably shown by Canon Wescott (*Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, London, 1875, p. 209 sq.) and others that each gospel was designed to meet the wants of a specific class, Matthew being written originally for the Jews, Mark for the Romans, Luke for the Hellenists, and John for the Alexandrians, and so the gospels come to have a universal character adapted to every age and civilization. Much is made of the differences between John and the first three gospels, not only as to the facts related, but also with reference to the style of Jesus' addresses. But the difficulty disappears when we remember that Matthew, Mark, and Luke present the scenes of Christ's Galilean ministry among the rude peasantry who were less acquainted with the law than their southern brethren, and who needed simple and direct teaching; on the other hand John sets forth mainly Christ's Judean ministry among those who were conversant with the law and were accustomed to elaborate discussions. The ministry of one year implied by the Synoptists, considered by themselves, does not exclude the three years' ministry which is derived from John's gospel, for the four taken together supplement each other. I shall not enter here into the difficult subject of the genealogies, or of the enrollment. They have been explained sufficiently, considering our want of data, to satisfy every seeker after the truth who does not wish to find a stumbling-block in them. Canon Farrar, who confesses that he would be perfectly ready with his views of inspiration to admit that they involved historical inaccuracies if necessary, receives the records in regard to them as true.

I pass now to consider the alleged

INFLUENCE OF THE ROMAN HIERARCHY

upon the four gospels. I shall not attempt to controvert Judge Waite's preposterous assumption, but merely to show that the claim that Victor played the part of a sovereign Pontiff in excommunicating the non-conforming Asiatic churches who differed with him in regard to the celebration of Easter, and that Irenaeus supported his supremacy, can not be established. Gieseler in his Church History, New York, 1857, vol. i., pp. 196-97, says: "With the rejection of Montanism in Rome was probably connected Victor's opposition to the Asiatic mode of celebrating Easter. He called upon the bishops in Asia Minor (about 196) to adopt the custom of the West on this point, and after their refusal, when he had been assured of the assent of the bishops in Palestine, Pontus, Gaul, and Corinth, broke off church communion with them. Several bishops, however, and Irenaeus himself among them, admonished him on account of his too great haste; peace was again restored, and both parties continued undisturbed in the observance of their own customs till the council of Nice." It is clearly evident that a Roman bishop who had to yield to the protests of his brethren was not absolute, and that Irenaeus in denouncing his course, as he does in no measured language, is by no means the subservient creature of the Church of Rome that Judge Waite would have us believe. Compare, Schaff's "History of the Christian Church," New York, 1869, vol. i., pp. 375, 428.

In closing it will be seen that Judge Waite's assumption that there is no evidence of the doctrine of the immaculate conception, of miracles, and of Christ's material [i. e. actual] resurrection in the first century, is, as I have proved, according to his theory, unfounded, because he asserts that the gospels then existing are lost and we are not acquainted with their contents. I have shown that the consensus of criticism is that Justin Martyr used at least three of our gospels, and according to Professor Abbot and other able scholars the fourth, that Marcion had Luke, that the Muratorian fragment mentions the last two gospels and implies the other two; that the old Latin version contained the four gospels. Here, then, is positive proof, in the opinion of all critics, except those who are blinded by prejudice, that the three (and perhaps four) gospels were in existence in the time of Justin Martyr. This result has been secured by

THE MOST CAREFUL SIFTING OF EVIDENCE.

Thus far the case is not argued on probabilities, but is as strong and positive as anything can be under the circumstances. From every point the argument is strengthened. I quote for illustration from Sanday, "The Gospels in the Second Century," London, 1876, p. 326: "Irenaeus (who speaks of the four gospels), as we have seen, was writing in the decade 180-190 A. D. But his evidence is surely valid for an earlier date than this. He is usually supposed to have been born about the year 140 A. D., and the way in which he describes his relations to Polycarp will not admit of a date many years later. But his strong sense of

THE CONTINUITY OF CHURCH DOCTRINE

and the exceptional veneration that he accords to the gospels seem alone to exclude the supposition that any of them should have been composed in his own lifetime."

Returning, then, to Justin Martyr, the weight of critical evidence shows that, at the latest in the year 146 or 147 A. D., he appeals to gospels which critics maintain were coextensive with our first three, and as Professor Abbot and other eminent critics hold with the four. These, as Professor Abbot shows, Justin Martyr mentions eight times as "Memoirs by the Apostles;" four times he calls them "the memoirs" simply; once, "memoirs made by the apostles, which are called gospels;" once, when he cites apparently from the Gospel of Luke, "memoirs composed by the apostles of Christ and their companions." Once again, when he speaks of a fact only mentioned, so far as we know, in the Gospel of Mark, he designates as his authority "Peter's memoirs," which, supposing him to have used our gospels, is readily explained by the fact that Peter was regarded by the ancients as furnishing the materials for the Gospel of Mark, his traveling companion and interpreter. "On the day called Sunday," he says, "all who live in the cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs by the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read as long as time permits. When the reader has finished the President admonishes and exhorts to the imitation of these good things." From this it appears that the "Memoirs by the Apostles" were held in as great reverence as the prophets of the Old Testament; and that in the year 147 they occupied the same pre-eminent position which Irenæus assigned to the gospels forty years later; hence, irrespective of the linguistic evidence furnished by the critics, we have good reason for believing that the memoirs of Justin, which he once calls gospels, are the same as our canonical gospels, since, as Mr. Norton says: "We cannot suppose that writings such as

THE MEMOIRS OF WHICH JUSTIN SPEAKS,

believed to be the works of apostles and companions of apostles, read in Christian churches, and received as sacred books of the highest authority, should immediately after he wrote have fallen into neglect and oblivion, and been superseded by another set of books." Up to this point, it seems to me that we can pretty clearly trace the presence of the canonical gospels. Earlier than this the arguments derived from the quotations found in the apostolic fathers taken alone would not prove the contemporary existence of our canonical gospels, still the evidence furnished by some passages in Barnabas (130 A. D.) and in Clement of Rome (95-100 A. D.), which correspond to passages in our gospels seems to be confirmatory; and taken in connection with the fact that the memoirs, or gospels, which were held in such reverence in the churches in the time of Justin, could not have suddenly secured that pre-eminence, is important. We are thus borne on toward the end of the first century, and can now better appreciate the various dates assigned to our four gospels by eminent scholars.

Taking up the gospel of John as the youngest, we find that the progress of criticism has been that of a retreat towards the beginning of the second century. While Baur and Schwegler of the Tuebingen school assigned it to the years 160 and 170 A. D., they were beaten back so that Zeller and Scholten adopted the year 150; Hilgenfeld, at last compelled to admit its use by Justin Martyr, retreats to a time between 130 and 140; Renan assigns it to 125 or 130, and Keim, in the first volume of his "History of Jesus of Nazareth," confidently placed it between 110 and 115, but seeing the dangerous consequences of this admission, he maintained in his last volume of the same work that it arose in the year 130. "Schenkel assigns it to A. D. 115-120." In this connection Professor Abbot, from whom I have derived these statements, positively says: "It is the uniform tradition, supported by great weight of testimony, that the evangelist John lived to a very advanced age, spending the latter portion of his life in Asia Minor, and dying there in the reign of Trajan, not far from A. D. 100. How could a spurious gospel of a character so peculiar, so different from the earlier synoptic gospels,

SO UTTERLY UNHISTORICAL,

as it is affirmed to be gain currency as the work of the apostle, both among Christians and the gnostic heretics, if it originated only twenty-five or thirty years after his death, when so many who must have known whether he wrote such a work or not were still living." It will then be seen that the probability that the apostle John wrote the fourth gospel is very strong indeed. See on this point an admirable critical treatise on "The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel," by Professor Abbot, Boston, 1880.

With reference to Luke, the antiquated hypothesis of Schleiermacher ("Krit. Versuch ueber die Schriften des Lukas I.," Berlin, 1837), with reference to the composite character of Luke, which Judge Waite quotes in the main with approval, has long since been rejected. Weiss remarks that the genuineness of this gospel is assured by the external witnesses without exception. Baur and Zeller hold that it arose 110-130 A. D. Hilgenfeld, Keim, and Volkmar assign it to the year 100 A. D. Godet says that it can be referred back as far as the period from 64 to 80 A. D., and Weiss holds that it arose between 70 and 80. Compare Weiss ("Kritisch Exegetisches Handbuch ueber die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas," Goettingen, 1878, and the introduction to Godet's excellent and cheap "Commentary on Luke," New York, 1881.

Mark, which is regarded by Weiss as the primitive gospel, was written, according to Hitzig, 55-57 A. D.; Schenkel, before 60; Volkmar, 73; Koestlin, who distinguishes between a primitive Mark (65-70) and our gospel, before 110; and Keim, 115-120. The best authorities, with Weiss and Meyer, hold that it arose before

THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.

Matthew was written, according to Baur, about 130. Hertwig, however ("Tabellen zur Einleitung ins Neue Testament," Berlin, 1872), says that in this opinion he received no support. Volkmar places it between 105 and 110, Schenkel after, and Keim before, 70. Hertwig says that it was certainly written before the destruction of Jerusalem, between 60 and 70, and this latter date is the one adopted by sober criticism.

While regarding Judge Waite's work as a complete failure from a critical point of view, and as years behind the times, except so far as he leans upon the author of "Supernatural Religion," I have no doubt that the book will do many great injury on account of its apparent learning and candor. Those, however, who appreciate the weight of the testimony which Christianity affords in its historical existence, as confessedly the greatest and most beneficent power in those lands which have been visited by the gospel, will not be shaken by a work which they may not be in a position to refute, while the Christian scholar who is familiar with the ground may well smile at the assurance with which uncritical and absurd hypotheses are set forth. This entire class of literature will only lead true Christian scholars to examine the foundations more carefully and to revindicate those glorious doctrines which skeptics from Celsus down to the present time have assailed in vain.

SAMUEL IVES CURTISS.

LEGAL.

TRUSTEE'S SALE—WHEREAS, CHARLES HUOT and Rosalie Huot, his wife, and Eugene Fortin and Albine Fortin, his wife, of the city of Chicago, Cook County, Illinois, by their certain trust deed, duly executed, acknowledged, and delivered, bearing date July 22d, 1873, and filed for record in the Recorder's office of Cook County, Illinois, July 29, 1873, and there recorded in book 183 of Records, at page 583, did convey unto Francis H. Kales, as trustee, the following described property, situate in Cook County, Illinois, viz.: Lot fifty-one (51) in C. J. Hull's subdivision of blocks twelve (12), nineteen (19), and the west half (w ½) of block eleven (11) in the Canal Trustees' subdivision of the southeast quarter (s e ¼) of section seventeen (17), township thirty-nine (39) north, of range fourteen (14) east of the third (3d) principal meridian, which trust deed was made to secure the payment of one certain promissory note of said Charles Huot and Eugene Fortin for the sum of five thousand ($5,000) dollars, payable to the order of themselves, and by them indorsed, said note bearing even date with said trust deed, and payable at the Illinois Trust and Savings Bank, in Chicago, on the first day of July, 1878, with interest thereon until the maturity thereof, at 8 per cent per annum, payable semi-annually, evidenced by coupon notes thereto attached, and at the rate of 10 per cent per annum thereafter. And whereas, it is provided in and by said trust deed, that in case of default in payment of said promissory note, or any part thereof, with the interest thereon, or in case of non-payment of taxes or assessments, or in case of a breach of any of the covenants or agreements in said trust deed contained, then, and in such case, on the application of the legal holder of said note, it might and should be lawful for the said Francis H. Kales, or his successor in trust, after having given notice of sale in a newspaper published in the county where the said premises are situated, 30 days before such sale, to sell the said premises, or any part thereof, and all the right and equity of redemption of the said Charles Huot and Rosalie Huot, his wife, and Eugene Fortin and Albine Fortin, his wife, their heirs, executors, administrators, or assigns therein, at public vendue, at the north door of the Court House in said county, or at such place in said county as might be appointed in such notice, to the highest bidder for cash, and to make, execute, and deliver to the purchaser or purchasers a deed or deeds of conveyance in fee of the premises sold by virtue of said trust deed, applying the proceeds of such sale as in said trust deed provided.

And whereas, it was, and is, further provided in and by said trust deed, that the Illinois Trust and Savings Bank, a corporation duly created by and doing business under the laws of this State, might, at any time and times thereafter, with writing, sealed with the corporate seal of said corporation, and signed by its President, or Vice President, appoint a trustee as often as it might desire, in the place and stead of Francis H. Kales, and, upon the filing of such appointment, and appointment for record in the Recorder's office of the county wherein the said lands are situate, the said premises and the title thereto, and the trusts aforesaid should thereupon, and by force of the said appointment and filing thereof for record as aforesaid, become immediately vested in such appointee, upon the trusts and with all the powers aforesaid, and this whether the said Francis H. Kales be or be not in life at the time of such appointment.

And whereas, the said Illinois Trust and Savings Bank did, on the 4th day of February, A. D. 1881, duly exercise the power of appointment of a new trustee, as above specified, and in said trust deed provided, and did appoint the undersigned, Winfield Scott Baker, such new trustee, and did, on the 5th day of February, A. D. 1881, file such appointment for record in the Recorder's office of Cook County, Illinois, where the same is recorded in book 1,003 of Records, at page 476, by virture whereof the title to the said premises, and the trusts and powers aforesaid, and in said deed of trust granted, became fully vested in the undersigned, the appointee upon the trust, and with all the powers in said trust deed provided.

And whereas, default has been made in the payment of the whole of said principal note, and the interest thereon since July 1st, 1880, and there is now due thereon the sum of $5,306.94;

And whereas, the legal holders of said promissory note have made application to the undersigned trustee, under the appointment aforesaid, to exercise the trusts and powers in said trust deed contained, and to sell the said premises, under and by virtue of the said trusts and powers, for the purposes in said trust deed specified,

Now, therefore, public notice is hereby given that on Monday, the fourteenth (14th) day of March, A. D. 1881, at 10 o'clock a. m. of that day, at the most westerly of the two north doors of the Court House in said city of Chicago, situated on the southeast corner of Adams and LaSalle streets, in said city, I shall sell at public vendue, to the highest bidder, for cash, the premises above and in said deed of trust described, and all the right and equity of redemption of the said Charles Huot, Rosalie Huot, Eugene Fortin, and Albine Fortin, their heirs, executors, administrators, or assigns therein.

One Eugene Robitaille appears of record to have some interest in said premises.

Chicago, Feb. 7, 1881.
feb10-3-14 WINFIELD SCOTT BAKER, Trustee.

JOHN M'KEOUGH, Attorney, Room 68, 162 LaSalle street.

ASSIGNEE'S NOTICE — IN BANKRUPTCY—Northern District of Illinois, ss. At Chicago, in said district, on the 6th day of December, A. D. 1880.

The undersigned hereby gives notice of his appointment as assignee of Arthur Martin, of Chicago, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois, within said district, who has been adjudged a bankrupt, upon his own petition, by the District Court of the United States in and for said district.

JOHN McKEOUGH, Assignee.
Chicago, Feb. 4, 1881. feb5-2-19

JOHN M'KEOUGH, Attorney, Room 68, 162 LaSalle Street.

ASSIGNEE'S NOTICE—IN BANKRUPTCY—Northern District of Illinois, ss. At Chicago, in said district, on the 9th day of June, A. D. 1880.

The undersigned hereby gives notice of his appointment as assignee of Lachlan McLachlan and Thomas McLachlan, of Chicago, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois, within said district, who have been adjudged bankrupts upon their own petition, by the District Court of the United States, in and for said district. JOHN McKEOUGH, Assignee.
Chicago, Feb. 4th, 1881. feb5-2-19

ASSIGNEE'S NOTICE—NORTHERN DISTRICT of Illinois, ss. At Chicago, in said district, on the 11th day of October, A. D. 1880.

The undersigned hereby gives notice of his appointment as assignee of Doctor S. Place, of Chicago, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois, who has been adjudged a bankrupt, upon his own petition, by the District Court of the United States in and for said district.
feb5-2-19. ROBERT E. JENKINS, Assignee.