Dionysius had made a mistake, and that Christ was born about one year before the time set by him. But by this time there were great numbers of important State and other documents and papers in existence, all dated according to the incorrect calculation of this Romish monk. How to remedy this the people did not know, for it would not do to alter all these dates.

Another set of chronologists made calculations, and they discovered that Dionysius had made a mistake of two years in regard to the time of the Savior's birth. Four others, very learned men, sought diligently, and from the information they obtained they found that Jesus was born three years before the time published by Dionysius. Five others made it four years; some few made it five years before, and some seven vears before the time specified by this Romish monk. All modern chronologists who have taken up the subject, agree that Dionysius was incorrect, at least several years. But did the people alter the dates of their documents and manuscripts when his error was fully made manifest? Not at all; they have continued that old, erroneous reckoning down to this present year. But they have attached the name of vulgar era to it, in order to indicate that it is incorrect. Vulgar era! I think the name is inappropriate, for there are thousands of people at the present day, including the youth of our land, and perhaps many who have had a collegiate education, who never knew or inquired into the meaning of vulgar era, or why the term was introduced. Its real meaning is, incorrect era or date. For instance, we write a letter today, and we call it the 29th day of December, 1872. This is according to the vulgar era, or erroneous date, or the reckoning of Dionysius; but this

is not the true date. The probability is, independent of the Bible or Book of Mormon, from the great mass of testimony that has been accumulated for generations past, that Jesus was born nearly four years prior to the commencement of this vulgar era, so that our present year, 1872, should be 1876. You will find a full account of these matters in the writings of the learned, in encyclopedias, and in various works touching upon chronology, so that you have no need to take my testimony alone on this subject, for you have access to our library here in this city, and you can examine works on chronology and see that I am correct. There may be those here who would like me to cite some works on this subject. I will cite one that I read while I was in England, a Bible dictionary, by a very learned author named Smith. This subject is treated very plainly and fully in that work. I think that Mr. John W. Young of this city has this work in his private library. The reason why I make these remarks is, that this is the first Sabbath after Christmas, and the day on which I believe the Roman Catholics in this city are celebrating certain ordinances in their church in commemoration of this event.

Having found out that there is an error in regard to the year of Christ's birth, now let us inquire if the day observed by the Christian world as the day of his birth, the 25th of December, is or is not the real Christmas Day? A great many authors have found out from their researches that it is not. I think that there is scarcely an author at the present day that believes that the 25th day of December was the day that Christ was born on. Still it is observed by certain classes, and we, whether we make any profession or not, are just foolish enough to observe this old