

those books about which their variance was recommended for God's infallible word by a tradition clearly sufficient to ground belief; for the Church had not as yet examined and defined whether tradition did clearly enough show such and such books to be God's infallible word. But in the days of St. Austin, the third Council of Carthage, anno 397, examined how sufficient or insufficient the tradition of the Church was which recommended those books for Scripture about which there was so much doubt and contrariety of opinions. They found all the books contained in our canon, of which you account so many apocryphal, to have been recommended by tradition sufficient to found faith upon. For on this ground (Can. 47), they proceeded in defining all the books in our canon to be canonical. Because, say they, we have received from our fathers that those books were to be read in the Church. Pope Innocent the First, who lived Anno Domini 402, being requested by Exuperius, Bishop of Toulouse, to declare unto him which books were canonical, he answers (Ep. 3), that having examined what sufficient tradition did demonstrate, he sets down what books are received in the canon of the Holy Scriptures, in the end of his Epistle, chap. 7. To wit, just those which we now have in our canon; and *though he rejects many other books, yet he rejects not one of these.*" (See Mumford's Question of Questions, sec. 3, pars. 4, 12.)

The Pope of Rome gathered together these contending persons in the form of a council, and they sat in judgment upon various manuscripts professing to be divine. That quarrelling and contending Council decided that a certain number of books should be admitted as divine, and should form the true canon of Scripture, and that no other books should be added. We are informed that this Council rejected

a vast number of books. Some of these rejected books were considered by part of the Council of Divine origin.

The manuscripts of the New Testament which these ancient apostates in the third Council of Carthage pronounced canonical have never reached our day. The oldest manuscripts of the New Testament which this age are in possession of are supposed to date from the sixth century of the Christian era. We have none of the original manuscripts written by any of the Apostles or inspired writers. We have five manuscripts in existence that were supposed to have been written as early as the sixth or seventh century after Christ. Three of these you will find deposited in the Royal Library of Paris.

1st. The Vatican Manuscript, noted 1,209. This was probably written by the monks of Mount Athos; first heard of as being in the possession of Pope Urban the eighth. Some of the leaves are wanting; the ink in some places faded. The letters have been retraced by a skillful and faithful hand. (See Unitarian Editors of the Improved Version of the New Testament, and Marsh.)

2nd. The Clermont or Regises Manuscript, 2,245. This dates from the seventh century. It was found in the monastery of Clung, called Clermont, from Clermont in Beauvais, where it was preserved. Thirty-six leaves of it were stolen by one John Aymon, and sold in England, but since recovered. It is Greek and Latin, and contains the Epistles; but that to the Hebrews by a later hand. Like other Greek-Latin Codices, the Greek has been accommodated to the Latin. (For authority, refer to Wetstein, Unitarian Editors, Professor Schweyhausen, quoted by Bishop Marsh, vol. 2, page 245.)

3rd. The Ephrem Manuscript. This also is said to have been written