RAISE YOUR RIGHT HAND

The Oath on Trial

David Boles

David Boles Books Writing & Publishing

New York

RAISE YOUR RIGHT HAND: The Oath on Trial

Copyright 2026 by David Boles. All rights reserved.

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except for brief quotations embodied in reviews and other uses permitted by copyright law.

This is a work of nonfiction. Every case, statute, date, name, and quotation in it comes out of the public record, and the discipline behind the sourcing is described in A Note on Sources at the back of the book. Where the record and its retellers disagree, the disagreement is named in the text, and the record wins.

Published by David Boles Books Writing & Publishing, New York.
https://bolesbooks.com

First edition, 2026.

For Janna,
and for everyone who kept the hand down.

Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

The oath administered to witnesses in American courtrooms, every working day

But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.

The Gospel according to Saint Matthew, 5:37, Authorized Version, 1611

I declare (or certify, verify, or state) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on (date). (Signature).

Title 28, United States Code, section 1746, enacted October 18, 1976

Contents

MOVEMENT I: THE CURSE 1

Chapter One: So Help Me 1

Chapter Two: The Sacramentum 8

Chapter Three: The Hand Itself 14

Chapter Four: Swear Not at All 21

MOVEMENT II: THE MACHINE 27

Chapter Five: Twelve Sworn Men 27

Chapter Six: The Oath That Asks Too Much 33

Chapter Seven: The Gatekeeper's Oath 39

Chapter Eight: Inventing Perjury 45

MOVEMENT III: THE REFUSERS 52

Chapter Nine: The People Called Quakers 52

Chapter Ten: More Judaico 59

Chapter Eleven: The Member for Northampton 65

Chapter Twelve: The Oaths Act 72

MOVEMENT IV: THE SIGNATURE 79

Chapter Thirteen: Oath or Affirmation 79

Chapter Fourteen: The Whole Truth 85

Chapter Fifteen: The Spell, Measured 91

Chapter Sixteen: Under Penalty of Perjury 99

Acknowledgments 106

Glossary 107

A Note on Sources 110

Bibliography 112

The Corrections Ledger 117

Questions for Discussion 119

Index 121

About the Author 124

Also By the Author 125

MOVEMENT I: THE CURSE

CHAPTER ONE

So Help Me

The courtroom has gone quiet in the way courtrooms do, which is never quite silence. Paper settles behind the bar. A robe rustles. The clerk stands, and the witness stands, and between them hangs the oldest stage direction in the law: raise your right hand. The hand goes up, palm out, fingers together, the same open hand a child shows to prove he is holding nothing. Then the formula begins, in the flat voice the law prefers for its magic, the words in their ancient order. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? The whole transaction takes seconds. Here this book stops the clock, in the second between the question and the answer. Keep the hand in the air. Keep the clerk's mouth open on the last syllable. Nothing has happened, and everything has. A citizen has been converted into a witness, an instrument the state may punish for lying, and the conversion ran on a sentence fragment spoken over a raised palm. The jury watches. The judge does not. A bailiff shifts his weight against the wall. Everyone in the room has seen the gesture so many times that it has gone transparent, a pane of courthouse glass, and that is the first thing worth knowing about it: the most consequential sentence in the building is the one nobody hears. The trials, the verdicts, and the prisons of the modern world hang from that fragment. Before the second hand moves again, the fragment deserves a long look, because it is older than the building, the robes, and the religion it names, and it is carrying more weight than anyone under this roof suspects.

What the fragment does is arithmetic. Strip the oath out of the courtroom and perjury ceases to exist as a crime; the statutes say so in their opening words. The federal perjury law of the United States opens on the taken oath: whoever, having taken an oath before a competent tribunal, officer, or person, willfully and contrary to that oath states or subscribes any material matter which he does not believe to be true. England's statute opens the same way, on the witness lawfully sworn. The requirement is no decoration; it is the first element of the offense, the one the rest is bolted to. No oath, no perjury. A liar who never raised his hand walks out of the building a free man. The same liar, one formula later, faces years in a cell for the identical sentence. The oath is therefore two machines in one housing: the gate that admits a speaker into evidence, and the trigger that arms the state against him, both jobs done in a single breath. Every courthouse on earth runs some version of this arrangement, and almost no one in the room can say what the arrangement is for.

The clerk recites it without knowing; judges permit it the way one permits weather; the witness with the aching shoulder has never wondered. Rituals that bear weight work best unwatched. The oath is the small spell that makes testimony count, and perjury cannot exist without it or without the statute's admitted substitute for it, which makes a raised hand and a spoken formula, and later the signature that answers for both, the load-bearing ritual of the entire truth system. A society can afford to forget many things. What holds its courts up is not one of them, and the forgetting has already happened: the fragment is spoken daily by people who could not say where it came from or what it is missing.

Take the formula apart the way a watchmaker takes a movement. The first half is three fences. The truth. The whole truth. Nothing but the truth. Each fence was built against an old courtroom animal: the outright lie, the convenient omission, the true answer arranged to mislead. The outright lie is the rarest of the three; the formula's builders knew that most false testimony is committed by arrangement and omission, and the common law spent generations adding whole and nothing but because witnesses kept winning arguments against the shorter formula. The fence that survived those arguments is exact drafting, centuries in the hardening. Then the formula turns for home, and the grammar breaks. So help me God. Four words, and no main clause anywhere in sight. So is a hinge word; it means thus, in this measure, as I have spoken. Help me is a request. God is the address. The sentence opens a comparison and never closes it. Help me thus, conditioned on what? In proportion to what? A schoolboy set to diagram the words would raise his own hand and report that half the sentence is missing. He would be right, and the proof stands in the room. No clerk in America speaks the second half. No witness is ever asked to say and may I be punished if I lie. The punishment clause is never uttered, yet it is present, coiled inside the stump, and heads would turn if anyone spoke it aloud. The missing half did not evaporate. It was cut away, the cutting took most of recorded history, and the history of the oath is the history of what got substituted for the missing half.

Every oath is a conditional self-curse with the punishment clause amputated. That is the claim this book is built on, and it has a name and a number, because everything in the book stands on it: Law One. It holds from the first clay tablet to the latest federal form. The oath is the curse, shortened: the courtroom speaks the blessing, and the machinery that replaced the harm stands offstage. So help me God is the stump of a longer sentence: so help me God only if I speak true, and if I do not, let the help be withdrawn and the opposite of help arrive. Spoken whole, in the centuries when it was still spoken whole, the sentence named the punisher, the punishment, and the trigger condition, and it named them out loud, in front of witnesses, with props on the altar and blood on the ring. The modern courtroom keeps the props and the stump. First the punisher went; then the punishment followed. What remains in the witness's mouth is a severed condition, an if with its then amputated. Every era amputated a little more and called the shorter sentence progress, and the eras will keep appearing in these pages, because each one found a new address for the harm. The strange part is how rarely anyone feels the wound. The words still work. Every working day, in courtrooms across the country, hands rise, the stump is spoken, testimony acquires its legal voltage, and trials run on the current. Remove the stump and the current stops, which is the proof that the stump still conducts. A severed sentence moves a nation's courts. That is machinery too reliable to

examine and too important to leave unexamined, and this book examines it down to the clay, where the sentence began.

The objection arrives on schedule, and it earns its strongest voice. A formula, says the grammarian, is a fossil. Ritual sentences die grammatically in place, the way goodbye died; no one parting on a doorstep invokes the presence of God, and no one swearing in a witness pronounces a curse. The modern speaker means the words as a prayer for strength: may God help me through this hard hour. Nothing was amputated, because nothing was ever attached; the sentence was born short, a small devotion pinned to a big promise. Grant the true part first. Phrases do fossilize, and many witnesses do mean a prayer, and goodbye once carried God in it, which is the grammarian's best case. The trouble is the record. When this sentence surfaces in the ancient world with its machinery visible, in clay, in saga, and in statute, it surfaces whole, the condition attached, the punishment named in full. If the sentence had been born short, those long versions would be coincidences, too many, too early, and too consistent for coincidence. The shortening runs in one direction only: the oldest versions are the longest, the modern stump is the shortest, and no age has lengthened it back for any good. The one reattachment in this book's whole record is the degradation oath of the more judaico chapters, the curse restored as an instrument of contempt, which is the exception that proves the direction. Goodbye fossilized into completeness; the oath fossilized into a fragment, and an incomplete sentence is evidence of the cut. The prayer reading describes how the stump feels in a modern mouth; the objection's evidence is a feeling. The cutting, by contrast, can be watched across more than three thousand years of documents, and the knife is visible at every stage. A fossil preserves the shape of what once lived. The shape preserved in so help me God is a curse.

The oldest legal language on record refuses to separate the oath from its penalty. In Akkadian, the language the law of Babylon was written in, a single word runs the whole circuit. The lexica divide mamitu into the oath, the promissory oath, the vow and the pledge; the allegiance oath a vassal swore to his king; and the curse released when the oath broke. When Assyria's kings bound their vassals, the instrument the vassal swore was a mamitu, and the curse section written into the instrument was the same word, the promise and its penalty filed under one head. The word descends from a verb meaning to swear, and by the first millennium it had grown a body. The incantation series called Shurpu personifies the mamitu as a being who hunts the transgressor through the world, and the medical texts treat her work as a diagnosis: qat mamiti, the hand of the oath, the sickness the oath sends into the forsworn. A language that names a disease the hand of the oath has announced what it thinks an oath is, and the catalogue of hands in this book begins here, in a physician's text, with the hand that strikes. Promise, penalty, demon, and disease ride in one word because in that world they were one event. Helen Silving opened her two-part Yale study of the oath, the 1959 investigation that still anchors the scholarship, on exactly this identity, and she was right to. The identity is the ancient world's confession. An oath was a curse aimed at the speaker by the speaker, and swearing was the act of setting the trigger, conditionally. The lexicon does not editorialize. It never learned the modern separation, because the separation had not been invented yet.

Bronze Age armies made their soldiers watch the punishment rehearsed before they spoke. In the military oath preserved on a clay tablet from Hattusa, the officiant casts wax and sheep fat into the flame and speaks the condition aloud: as this wax melts and this fat is consumed, let the

man who breaks these oaths melt like the wax. The soldiers answer in one voice: so be it. The machinery is deliberate. Wax was chosen because every man in the company knew what flame does to it; melting explains itself, and the rite needs no learned commentary. The army swore as a unit, and the curse was unit-issue. A Hittite king did not ask his soldiers to believe in the wax; he asked them to watch it. The swearer watches his own ending acted out by a stand-in while the words are still in his mouth, and the fire does the remembering for him. The same theatre ran west. When colonists from Thera founded Cyrene, they molded wax figures and burned them while the whole company swore, calling down on whoever broke the oath the fate of the figures, to melt and flow away like them, he and his seed and his goods. Between Hattusa and Cyrene run centuries and half a continent, and the sentence does not change. Christopher Faraone's study of these ceremonies welded the Hittite tablet and the Greek colony into a single Mediterranean practice: the oath staged as sympathetic magic, the conditional sentence performed with props, the future punishment pre-enacted in flame. This is the punishment clause before amputation, worn on the outside of the sentence where everyone could see it. Every man who swore that day had already watched himself destroyed once. The oath had shown him the ending before he finished the sentence.

Greece wrote the penalty schedule into heaven, where even an immortal could be sentenced. The gods of the Theogony swear by the water of Styx, the poem calls that water the gods' great oath, and the penalty clause is set out in full, precise to the year, the way a statute is precise. He falls where he stands and lies a full year without breath, cut off from nectar and ambrosia. When the year ends, the exile begins: nine years barred from the councils and the feasts, readmitted to the company of the gods only in the tenth. Ten years of penalty for a sentence spoken in seconds, and the sentence was spoken by a god, to gods, on the oath that bound the deathless. An immortal cannot be killed, so the oath collects in the one currency a god can pay: absence. Works and Days gives the oath its pedigree. Horkos, Oath personified, is a son of Strife, the Furies attended his birth, and his office is to be a bane to false swearers. The same poem warns that Oath runs level with crooked judgments, and it balances the books on families: the false swearer's line is blotted from the record, while the man who keeps his oath leaves a house that prospers after him. A culture personifies what it fears. The Greeks looked at the spoken condition and saw a household, Strife for a mother, vengeance demons for midwives, the child walking at the shoulder of every bent verdict. Hesiod sang for farmers, and the theology is a farmer's. Words have weight. Weight breaks things. The heaviest word a man can lift is the one he lifts against himself.

Rome took the curse out of the sky and put it in the fist. The instrument was a flint stone, silex, and the formula survives in the epitome Paulus Diaconus made of the old antiquarian Festus, under the entry lapidem silicem. It is a small entry keeping a huge formula. The swearer held the flint and spoke the condition, si sciens fallo, if I knowingly deceive, and called on Dispiter to cast him out of his goods as he cast the stone away, the city and the citadel kept safe. Two cautions belong on this page, and the record supplies both. The transmitted wording is late, a learned epitome's rendering of an archaic rite, though the formula beneath the wording is old; the epitome stands a thousand years downstream of the rite it describes, and what survives the thousand years is the shape, and the shape is the condition. The ceremony has also been confused with a second rite, which this chapter keeps separate. What is sound is the architecture. The condition is spoken first. The punishment is named in full. A prop carries the swearer's body away from him, expelled like the stone from the

hand. The stone was chosen because it falls honestly: once it leaves the hand, no one calls it back. Cicero, writing to a friend, reaches for the same ceremony when he needs shorthand for the gravest oath a Roman could take, to swear by Jupiter and the stone. The phrase works without explanation, because shorthand does not need explaining inside a culture. Every reader in Rome knew the fist, the flint, and the falling, and knew that the falling was the point of the whole ceremony.

Two rites shared the stone, and the record itself warns against merging them. Polybius, describing how Romans swore their treaties, gives the swearer the flint and the words together: if I keep faith, let me be kept; if I break it, let me be cast out of my country and my goods, even as I cast this stone away. Livy preserves the fetial rite, the treaty ceremony of the college of priests: the fetial strikes a pig with a flint and calls on Jupiter, if the Roman people break faith first, to strike them as the priest strikes the pig, and harder, in the measure that the god's strength exceeds a man's. Warde Fowler separated the two ceremonies a century ago and showed that Polybius had folded the pig rite into the stone oath and dressed the seam in myth. Fowler's caution is the kind of scholarship this book trusts, because it costs the story a tidy scene and buys accuracy. That separation earns its keep, because the rites are different engines built for one sentence. The pig rite kills a proxy, blood answering for the condition. The stone rite rehearses expulsion, the swearer's own body mimed by a stone falling away from his hand. Both solve the oath's oldest staging problem: a punishment reserved for the next world, or for some unnamed future year, lands weakly on a man speaking now. A promise about the future is cheap, because the future is far; the rite drags the future into the firelight and makes the swearer look at it. The Greeks had poured the wine and the Hittites had burned the fat. Rome put stone to work, and the stone was the most portable of the props: every field had one, and every hand knew its weight.

Plutarch preserves the machine running at full ceremony, on a consul of Rome, at the top of the Capitoline hill, with the priests and the crowd and the open sky. Cinna had sworn to preserve Sulla's settlement, and the oath he swore was the stone oath. Standing with the flint in his fist, he prayed aloud that, if he broke faith, he might be cast out of the city as the stone was cast from his hand. The prayer names the expulsion; the hand names the stone; the city watches. Then he opened his fingers. The stone fell. And Cinna went to work against the settlement he had just sworn to preserve, moving to overturn it while Sulla was still fighting his war in the east. He was consul, first man in the state, which is why the demonstration mattered: the machine ran at the top, in front of everyone, and it failed at the top, in front of everyone. This book notices once, here, what the record keeps doing: the most solemn oaths arrive attached to their breaches. The archivists file the curse and the treason in the same paragraph, as if they knew the two belonged to a single document. Notice, too, what answers Cinna's perjury. No coma takes him. Nothing melts. The sky over the Capitol holds its fire. Rome settles the account instead, with legions, and the punishment clause, unanswered from above, begins its long search for a new address. Sulla would return and settle the account in blood, which is how accounts get settled when heaven declines the invoice; the swearer himself was past collecting from by then, killed by his own soldiers before the return, and the vengeance fell on his cause. The oath had promised expulsion from the city. From then on, the city would manage the expulsions itself.

The stump is older than the God it names, and the receipt survives in a book about the settlement of Iceland. The Icelanders were a lawsuit people, and their book of settlements is a book of claims,

with the oath apparatus standing at the front of it. Landnamabok prescribes the whole apparatus of the heathen court oath: a ring of two ounces or more lying on the altar of every chief temple; the godi, the chieftain-priest, reddening it in the blood of the ox he has sacrificed with his own hands; every man with business at the court swearing on that ring first, with two or more witnesses named to the swearing. Then comes the formula, and it opens in the Old Norse on three words the modern ear recognizes at once: Hjalpi mer sva Freyr ok Njordr ok hinn almattki ass. So help me Freyr and Njordr and the almighty god. Eyrbyggja saga keeps the same altar and the same ring. The ring was furniture of proof, heavy, portable, blooded. Who the almighty god was, the record honestly disputes. The old dictionary reads Thor; a newer reading suspects the Christian copyist of shading the page. The dispute is part of the finding, because the finding is the blank after the words so help me. Heathens swore the stump to Freyr and Njordr centuries before any courtroom named the Christian God in it. The formula has survived every god it was ever addressed to. That is what stumps do, and it is why the grammar matters. The condition outlives the address. The sentence an American witness speaks this morning is the sentence a heathen Icelander spoke on the temple ring, with the names changed and the threat filed off.

Carry all of it back to the frozen courtroom, where the hand is still in the air. That open palm is carrying the Akkadian disease name and the Hittite wax, the year-long coma of a forsworn god and the Furies attending Oath's birth, the flint on the Capitol and the ring reddened on the temple altar. Every age was handed the same severed sentence, and every age had to answer the question the sentence asks: if the speaker lies, who collects? For most of the record the answer was God, and the oath was a trigger pointed at heaven, and God collected in the currency each age believed in: melting, coma, expulsion, a blotted house. Then the state grew into the collector's role, the punishment clause went looking for a worldly address, and the address moved in full only as belief thinned, heaven's answer becoming optional long after the collecting began. The curse was amputated; the collecting continued. Something always collects, and the history of the substitutes is the history of the law learning to do the curse's work. Where the clause landed, what it became, and what happened to the people who refused to speak the sentence at all, occupies the rest of this book. The witness on the stand knows none of this. Ask him afterward what he swore, and he will say he promised to tell the truth. Ask him what he invited if he lied, and he will look at the floor. He speaks the stump and means a promise. The words remember a threat, and the law, which is the words' heir, enforces the threat in the punisher's place. Nothing in the building works more reliably, and nothing in the building is less understood. The whole arrangement depends on nobody looking at it too long.

Leave the witness frozen one page longer, and end where the ceremony left its clearest outline, on the hill above the Forum, in front of Jupiter's temple, with the flint in a consul's fist. Slow the moment down. Plutarch gives the oath and the stone; the held breath and the sound on the pavement are this chapter's own staging, and the chapter says so once. The flint is older than the republic, older than the city at its feet, and it will outlast both, along with the empire not yet born. His fingers close on the stone's edge. The crowd cannot hear the words and does not need to, because the gesture carries them; a raised fist holding a stone says the sentence by itself. The words go out over the city they are sworn to, city and citadel, the condition spoken, the help named, the harm named, the whole sentence intact for one of its last appearances in the record. Then the fingers

open. The priests stand still. The whole crowd holds its breath. Heaven keeps its own counsel. Only the stone moves. It drops the way everything drops, indifferent to the words said over it, and the indifference is the whole lesson: gravity is the one officer the oath never lacked. The sound it makes on the pavement is small, and the crowd hears it anyway, because the crowd has been waiting for it. Everything that follows in this book, the attaints, the prisoners, the affirmations, the signature lines, is contained in that small motion, the prop falling away from the body that spoke the condition. And the man who spoke the condition will break it within the year, and the stone will stay broken from the hand forever. The courtroom is still waiting. The palm is still in the air. And the stone leaves the hand.

CHAPTER TWO

The Sacramentum

Rome kept one word for two of its heaviest institutions, and the word outlasted both. Sacramentum. In the camp it was the oath that made a soldier: no sacramentum, no miles, no legion. In the courtroom it was the stake that opened a lawsuit, a sum laid down on the strength of a sworn claim, the winner's own stake returned to him, the loser's forfeit to the treasury. The same breath that put a man in the ranks put a claim before the magistrate. One word, two machines, and the machines shared more than a name. They shared a theory of what a spoken sentence can do to the speaker. The army bound a man to the standards with it. The law bound a litigant to his plea with it. Both bindings ran god-ward, because both came out of the centuries when a sentence that needed enforcing was aimed at heaven, and both carried the same working parts: a condition, a binding, a penalty aimed at the speaker. Procedure was born inside religion, and it never fully left. The word has three lives to walk through here: the levy field, the wager of the law, and the church that took the word and keeps it still. The third life is the one the English ear knows, because the third life swallowed the word. Every time a priest says sacrament, the old army word is speaking, and almost no one under the vaulted roof hears the levy field inside it, or the courtroom, or the stake. The institutions fell. The sentence-form they ran on survived, which is what this book keeps finding: forms outlive the powers that built them, and this word is the proof with its seal intact.

Begin where the word did its largest work, on the levy field outside the city, where the consuls of the year are raising their legions. The tribes have been called, the men listed, the tribunes have divided them by age and arm, and before the army can exist as an army, every man in it must be bound. Polybius describes the machinery, and the machinery is not a chorus. The oath is administered. One man steps forward and speaks the whole formula aloud, promising obedience to the commanders, presence at the standards wherever they stand, the body's whole service. Then the rest come forward, one by one, and each man binds himself with a word: the same for me. Thousands of men, thousands of small sentences, a morning of administration, and at the end of it the consul holds something that did not exist at dawn: an army, a body of men whose obedience had been sworn that morning. A man swore at every levy, campaign after campaign, so the veteran of twenty years had spoken himself into the service twenty times. The record keeps the words and lets the gesture go; whatever the hand did on the levy field, the archive did not save it. What the archive saves is the mechanism, and the mechanism is the point. The legion is a speech act. A man becomes a soldier by saying so, under oath, in the gods' hearing, and a crowd becomes an army the same way. Nothing about the crowd changed except the sentences spoken over it. Muscles, weapons, roads to be marched: all of it was already there. The oath supplied the only missing part: the obligation, made audible.

The oath was old before it was formal, and Livy marks the year it became both: 216, the Cannae year, with the state losing an army a year and raising its largest yet out of the wreckage, a funeral in every street and boys and old men in the levy lists. The oath came before the battle: in that year's muster, Livy says, the tribunes exacted the ius iurandum in set form, and he presents the exaction as a first. Before it, the oath to the standards stood by the tribunes' administering, and the soldiers' own undertaking not to leave the ranks for flight had run on custom; from it, the tribunes exacted the second in fixed terms, the state's own exaction, and the army that swore it marched to Cannae. The claim here stays inside Livy's sentence, no wider than the first formal exaction he records, in the year of the catastrophe. Armies of the next century swore as a matter of course, and the formality outlasted the emergency that called for it. The cause is not hard to see. A state that has watched an army die wants the next army bound tighter, and when the need is urgent, custom becomes form. The voluntary oath becomes the exacted one, and the ceremony stiffens into procedure, with a gain the administrators understood at once: the same words for every man means the same breach in every man, and a breach you can name is a breach you can punish. That is the birth of the machine in one line of Livy. Livy's notice is a historian's aside, and it is the kind of aside this book collects: a sentence about a sentence. Under pressure, the sworn sentence becomes a required sentence, administered, recorded, enforceable. The state has begun to stand in the gods' place at the ceremony, collecting the oath. In time it will begin collecting the penalty too.

The word itself tells on its origins. Sacramentum is built on sacer, the word for what has been made over to the gods, and the family it belongs to is the family of surrender: sacra, the rites; sacrificium, the making-sacred; the whole vocabulary of things handed across. An oath built on that root is a transfer of title. The swearer hands something over. In the full old forms the thing handed over was himself, conditionally, his body and goods standing forfeit to the gods' claim if the promise failed, which is the conditional self-curse wearing Latin, the fuse still attached. By the classical centuries the fuse had been filed down to a formula, the way it had everywhere else, and a soldier could swear the sacramentum without once hearing the word curse, the way a modern witness speaks of solemn swearing without once hearing the word harm. The root kept the record anyway. Latin preserved, inside the everyday word for induction, the theology of the surrender, and every recruit who spoke the formula was, in the word's own etymology, making himself over, title passing at the sound of the vowels. The old discipline agreed: the legion punished its oath-breakers itself, in this world, on the gods' behalf. Rome did not need to say so. The language said it, the way our own formula still says so help me to witnesses who have never once asked what the so is doing there. Etymology is the archive that cannot be amended. No legislator voted the curse out of the root, and no grammarian voted it back in. It sits there still, under the pronunciation, waiting for anyone who declines the word slowly. The meanings we have forgotten sit inside the words we still speak.

The word's second life opens in the oldest Roman lawsuit we can see. Gaius, the jurist whose handbook taught the empire's lawyers, preserves the legis actio sacramento, the action of the stake, and its machinery is a wager of oaths. Two citizens dispute a thing: a slave, a field, an inheritance. They come before the magistrate, and before any judge sits or any witness is heard, each man swears that his own claim is just, and each man lays down a stake, the sacramentum, its sums set already by the Twelve Tables, five hundred asses where the thing in dispute is great, fifty where it is small, the

law grading the oath's price to the value at risk. The winner takes his stake home. The loser's stake is forfeit, paid over to the public treasury, and in the older layer of the practice, before the treasury took it, the forfeit served the public rites: the loser's money went to the gods who had watched him swear falsely, or swear unluckily, since the forfeiture made no fine distinction between the two. Ceremony was the magistrate's part; the judge's part came after, with the question the wager had framed; and through the whole proceeding the two sums sat visible, the price of the two sentences. The stake was court fee and penalty in one object. This is the theory of Roman procedure in a single device. The lawsuit does not begin by asking what happened. It begins by asking which of two men will swear, and stake, and stand the loss. Proof comes later, if it comes at all. The oath comes first, it costs, and its cost is the entry ticket to judgment.

Stand back from the device and its strangeness shows, and the strangeness is ours alone. Rome ran the wager for centuries, and no Roman jurist apologizes for it. A modern trial pretends to be an inquiry: evidence, witnesses, exhibits, a verdict on the facts of the matter. The legis actio sacramento is openly a contest of sworn assertions with money riding on each assertion. The parties do not pretend that the court will find out what happened; they stake on the justice of their own words, and the gods, or the treasury, pocket the difference. What the device assumes is what the whole ancient world assumed: a man hesitates to swear falsely when the oath has teeth, and the side in the right swears more steadily than the side in the wrong. What the device never asks is which man lied. The forfeit follows the verdict; the falsehood goes unjudged; the machine fines the outcome and leaves the soul to the gods. Perjury as a named and punished crime is still a long way off, and the wager's silence about it is exact: the oath binds, the stake burns, and the lie, if there was a lie, is heaven's account to settle. The oath is doing the work evidence would later do, and doing it by weight and cost, in an age before proof had a machinery. This is why the army and the lawsuit kept one word. Both needed a sentence that would hold a man still under pressure: the legionary under the charge, the litigant under the eyes of his neighbors. The sacramentum was that sentence, and Rome built its two heaviest institutions on the bet that it would hold.

Rome also produced the oath's theorist. Cicero, in his book on duties, written in the year of Caesar's murder and addressed to his son at his studies, gives the oath its classical definition: an affirmatio religiosa, an affirmation with religion standing sponsor, and whatever a man has affirmed, as if with the god for witness, he must keep. Every part of the sentence works. Affirmation: the oath is a spoken sentence, assertoric in shape, words a man stands behind. Religion standing sponsor: the sentence has a guarantor, and the guarantor is divine. Must keep: the obligation is a debt, and debts are collected. And inside the definition sits a small word that rewards attention: quasi, as if. Cicero's god comes to the oath as a witness, as it were, the hypothesis already tucked into the formula's classical age. The definition was written by a skeptic for a student, and it shows, because the sponsor reaches the sentence only through the grammar of hypothesis. Beneath the definition runs the value the Romans called fides, good faith, the currency that lets promises pass between strangers. Two men who share nothing can still trade, still contract, still serve in the same line, if a sentence exists that both their gods will hold them to. The oath is fides fortified with a god, and the god is already wearing an as if. Two thousand years later the formula in the American courtroom still runs on Cicero's theory, an affirmation with religion standing sponsor, even in the courtrooms

where the religion has been made optional. The definition outlived the theology that wrote it. That is the way of load-bearing words. They keep bearing after the reason for them has been forgotten.

The definition had its proof, and the proof is the hardest story Rome told about itself. Marcus Atilius Regulus, consul and commander, was taken prisoner by the Carthaginians and sent home under oath: urge the Senate to exchange prisoners, and return if the Senate refused. He came home, stood before the fathers, and argued against the exchange, against his own rescue: old prisoners and used soldiers are bad currency. The Senate, over tears and pleading, voted as he advised. Then, having argued himself out of rescue, he kept the oath and went back. Carthage killed him, by torture in the traditional telling. Cicero spends pages on the case, and he chooses it because it is the hard one, an oath given to an enemy, exacted by captors, and binding anyway, because the oath does not ask how it came to be sworn, only whether it was. Horace put the leaving in an ode: Regulus turning from his wife's kiss and his children's faces, knowing what the barbarian torturer was preparing, walking back into it with his eyes open, because he had sworn. Read the scene carefully, because it is not the first law's proof, and the difference is the lesson. Regulus's death is not the curse firing: the self-curse hangs the harm on the breach, and there was no breach; his oath bound him to return, and the enemy collected. What the scene proves is the thing the amputated formula will need later, the oath's own binding force, the undertaking holding a man when nothing but the word holds him. No statute enforced it. No court ordered him onto the ship. The oath enforced itself, because the swearer let it. The curse-oath is the machine with the penalty attached; Regulus is the machine running on the attachment's strength alone.

Four centuries on, the word turns up in a police report. Pliny the Younger, governing Bithynia for Trajan, writes to the emperor about the Christians, and his letter is the earliest pagan description of Christian worship we have. His questions are procedural, which is what makes them terrible: is the name itself punished, or the crimes that cling to the name; is repentance allowed a pardon; what exactly is the governor to do. What he reports doing is this. The accused, he says, met before dawn on a fixed day and bound themselves by a sacramentum to no crime, he writes: the oath bound them against theft and robbery and adultery, against breach of faith, against refusal to repay a deposit. The old army word, the lawsuit word, here carries a promise to be harmless. Pliny's counter-test was oath-work too. Whoever would invoke the gods, make offering with wine and incense before the emperor's image, and curse Christ went free. Whoever refused was, in his own word, stubborn, and the stubborn were executed for the stubbornness alone. The scene earns a slow look, because it is the oath's machinery reversed into a trap. The gate becomes a screen: the sentence that should only bind now sorts, and the sorting kills. Their own oath bound them to innocence and was worth nothing to the state. The state's test asked for a sentence they could not say, and the refusal was the capital fact; no crime was needed. Rome had built a sentence that made men hold still. Now the sentence was aimed at men who would not speak it, and the record of what the law does to them starts here.

The Christians took the word home. Within two generations of Pliny's letter, Tertullian is writing to imprisoned believers as to soldiers under oath, and for him the figure is no figure. The baptized have sworn the sacramentum; the font was their levy field; the life about to be spent is the service signed for. The men and women he addresses are waiting in chains for the arena, and he writes to them as a commander writes to troops already inducted: the oath is taken, the terms are known, the

service is due. He carries the Roman military apparatus straight into the church's vocabulary: the oath, the service, the soldier's terms of enlistment, and behind him the habit becomes permanent, the militia Christi, Christ's soldiery, the church militant of the later centuries. No one rendering the faith into Latin had to coin a word for a binding rite. The word was already there, worn smooth by the legions, ready to be baptized itself. Tertullian knew what it had carried; that is why he chose it. The move proves something about the word. Sacramentum had done the state's hardest binding for centuries, and when the church needed a word for its own hardest binding, the induction that cannot be resigned, it took the army's word unchanged. A baptism is a sacramentum. So is a legion's induction. The church took the machinery whole: the sentence that binds by being spoken, the condition carried inside it, the penalty waiting on the breach. Spoken in English today, the word is sacrament, and it still carries the oath inside it, inaudible to the congregations that speak it, the way the curse is inaudible inside so help me, an oath folded inside a word of worship.

The word's third life is the one that outlasted Rome. As the church Latinized, as its Greek scriptures and Greek rites were rendered into the empire's working tongue, sacramentum became its word for the rites that bind: baptism first, then the growing list the Latin church would count and guard, seven at the final tally. The Greek east kept its own word, mysterion; the Latin west took the oath. That choice announces what the Latin church thought a rite was. A binding administered. The soldier's oath and the litigant's stake receded into the schoolbooks; the sacrament went on administering souls. The migration lands on the chapter's side of the ledger. Procedure was born inside religion: the army's induction and the lawsuit's wager were both, at bottom, sacred transactions, sentences aimed at heaven with a forfeit attached. The church taking the oath-word for its rites was no borrowing from a foreign department. It was a homecoming. The word had been a sacrament all along, in the root sense, a making-over to the gods, and the camp and the courtroom had been its secular postings. The church kept the procedure too. Its sacraments have forms, conditions, ministers, effects: the oldest lawsuit's architecture, administered at the font, where the vows are still spoken before the water is poured. Ask a canon lawyer what a sacrament requires and the answer comes back procedural: the right matter, the right form, the right minister, the right intent. Rome's institutions fell one by one, the camps first, the courts after. The machinery of the sworn sentence outlived them, running now in every parish on earth, still doing what it did on the levy field, making a binding out of breath.

The circuit closes with the last military writer of Rome. Vegetius, compiling the old discipline as a reform handbook for a Christian throne, sets down the oath his soldiers are to swear, and the formula has been readdressed. The legionary now swears by God, by Christ, and by the Holy Spirit, and by the majesty of the emperor, a majesty owed the human race's love and reverence. From there the formula binds him in the old style, to the service and the standards, the substance unaltered. The order of the names is the history of the empire in one list: heaven first, the palace second, as the age ranked them, the old gods gone entirely. The machinery under the names is untouched. It inducts still; it binds the soldier to obedience and the standards; the word for the whole transaction is still sacramentum. Five centuries after the levy Polybius watched, the same sentence is being spoken to the same purpose, with the address rewritten and the army's paperwork unchanged. The scribes who copied Vegetius through the Middle Ages carried the oath forward too, formula and all, into a Europe that had forgotten the legions and kept the swearing. That is the pattern this book keeps

finding, because it is the pattern the record keeps making. The oath outlives its gods. The condition and the binding are permanent; the names in the invocation are rentals. Jupiter's name gave way to the Trinity's three, as the names in other courtrooms would later give way to silence. The sentence does not care what stands in the blank. It needs the blank filled with something the swearer fears losing, and every age fills it with what it fears most.

So the word ran its three lives in order, the levy, the lawsuit, the liturgy, and in each life the same machine worked the same way: a sentence spoken into a condition, a binding accomplished by breath, a penalty aimed at the swearer himself. Rome's own amendment to the old pattern deserves naming, because it previews everything after. In the legis actio sacramento, the forfeited stake went to the public treasury. The detail is small, and it is the whole future in miniature. That stake was the gods' pledge, the money version of the swearer's body, and when the false or unlucky swearer forfeited, the state collected. The treasury stood in heaven's place at the payoff window, and five hundred asses was a sum worth collecting. No announcement ever said the commonwealth was taking heaven's place. It banked the forfeit, year after year, lawsuit after lawsuit, until the arrangement stopped looking strange and the demon had become a line item. The oath's penalty, which the first empires had left to demons and diseases, was being gathered in cash by the commonwealth. The curse was going earthly before Rome fell. And between the forfeited stake and the perjury statute lies a long road, and this book walks it in order: the count of sworn mouths, the ordeal's withdrawal, the oath that asked too much. The machine this book calls the truth system, the oath that arms a worldly penalty, has its first receipt in that forfeited stake, paid over the counter of the oldest Roman lawsuit, centuries before any statute used the word perjury. By then the substitution would be complete, and the treasury's small claim would have become the state's whole enforcement.

The legion swore by something, and the something was carried. In the shrine of every camp, among the standards, stood the eagle, the aquila, the legion's god made portable: gilt wings, a thunderbolt in its claws, hoisted on a pole that a picked soldier held, an honor with its own rank and its own name. The first cohort carried it, and losing it was the one disgrace a legion could not outmarch. The standards were sacred objects, anointed and garlanded on the festal days, and the eagle was the most sacred of them. Oaths were sworn in their presence; the induction sentence was spoken before the bird; the binding a recruit accepted ran toward the eagle as surely as toward the emperor's name. Here is the last thing the ancient record teaches about the oath's furniture: the oath wants an object, something the hand can reach and the eye can hold. The Hittites needed wax and flame, the Greek colonists their images, the fetial his flint and his pig, the Icelander his reddened ring. Rome put the object on a pole and marched with it, so that the oath's address could keep up with the army it bound. The furniture had become field equipment. A legion would spend its last men to keep the eagle out of an enemy's hands, which is to say the legion understood what the eagle was: the oath made visible, the binding you could die under. The curse had been filed off the formula long since. It had not left the machine. It had moved into the object, and the object watched from its pole. The gilt wings stay spread over the standards. The thing a legion swore by.

CHAPTER THREE

The Hand Itself

The oldest oath posture on record is a man standing in a field with his arm in the air. Abram has come back from the slaughter of the kings, and the king of Sodom is offering him the spoils, and Abram answers with a sentence that begins before any word. I have lifted up my hand to the LORD, the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth. The gesture is the oath. In the Hebrew, to lift the hand is to swear; the posture and the promise share one idiom, and the formula that follows only says aloud what the arm has already said. Abram will not take a thread or a sandal-strap from the spoils, and the raised hand is the seal on the refusal, wealth on the table, the answer an arm. The spoils stay behind in Sodom; the arm stays in the record. Nothing is held. Nothing is touched. The hand goes up empty toward heaven, and heaven is the oath's address. This is the first position in the catalogue this chapter walks, six positions and one verdict, and it never leaves the record. The posture was old when Genesis was young, and it has never aged since. Every courtroom that still asks a witness for it is repeating a field outside Sodom, whether anyone in the room knows it or not. The arm comes up before the words begin, and after the words end the arm is what remains in the mind's eye, the body's half of the sentence, spoken by the limb before the mouth opens. The chapters ahead will watch the words change their gods, their meanings, their penalties, their furniture; the arm barely changes at all.

Position two moves the hand to the body of the man who demands the oath. Abraham, old and full of days, tells his oldest and trustiest servant: put your hand under my thigh, and swear. The servant does, and the oath binds him to fetch a wife for Isaac from the kin and not from the daughters of the Canaanites. The servant goes, and the wife comes back with him into Canaan, the oath kept to the letter. A generation later the posture repeats at a deathbed: Jacob, dying in Egypt, draws the same oath from Joseph by the same grip, and the bones go home out of Egypt on the strength of it. The hand goes to the seat of the line. Whatever else the posture meant to its first tellers, its force is plain on the page: the oath is anchored in the flesh that continues the family. No object on the altar, no witness named to the grip, but the heaven is named: the servant swears by the Lord, God of heaven and earth, and the guarantor is doubled, the God over the hand and the body under it, and the body is the future. Twice Genesis stages the posture, both times at the line's crisis, the marriage and the burial, the two events a family cannot survive unsworn. The oath travels, too: the hand that gripped the thigh crossed the desert to Harran and back with a bride. Both oaths were kept, and the keeping of both is told as the point of each story. The catalogue's first lesson arrives early. The position is never arbitrary. Where the hand goes is a claim about what secures the sentence, and every legal culture answers with its own anatomy.

The lifted hand climbs the whole scale of beings. Deuteronomy gives the gesture to God: I lift up my hand to heaven, and say, I live for ever, the divine oath sworn in the divine posture, the highest

oath taken by the highest swearer because there is no higher address to invoke. Daniel's man clothed in linen, standing above the river, raises his right hand and his left to heaven and swears by him who lives for ever that it shall be for a time, times, and a half: the two-handed oath, one hand not being enough for the sentence. Revelation's angel plants one foot on the sea and one on the earth, lifts his hand to heaven, and swears by the one who lives for ever and ever that there shall be time no longer. A field, a river, the sky over both. Men swear with it, angels swear with it, God swears with it; the posture outranks every rank. When scripture wants the oath that ends history itself, it puts a single hand in the air, and the gesture needs no explanation anywhere in the text, because the reader already knows what a lifted hand means. The lifted hand is the oath's highest credential, and no painter invented it for the text; the writers had seen it in life, in the courts and the fields, and gave it to their highest beings because it was already the strongest gesture they knew, and the strongest they could give. The catalogue could close here and the point would stand: the gesture is not a custom of courts. It is older than courts, and courts borrowed it, and the borrowing never stopped.

Then the hand closes on things. The empty palm is the posture of appeal; the filled hand is the posture of pledge, and the difference matters. An oath sworn to the air trusts heaven to attend. An oath sworn on an object moves the address into the swearer's grip, and the grip is enforceable in a way the sky is not, because an object can be witnessed, produced, and kept. The catalogue's second half begins when the furniture arrives. Wax and flint and stone have already passed through these pages; the ring and the book come next. The oath wants an object for the same reason the sentence wants a witness: the ceremony is only as strong as what can be shown afterward. A man can deny he raised his hand. He cannot so easily deny the ring under it, with two men watching, named for the record. The object is the ceremony's receipt, the part of the oath that outlasts the moment and can be carried into the next room and shown. The history of the oath's gesture is the history of the hand acquiring props, and the props are never decorations. Each one is a theory of evidence in the shape of a thing, small enough to hold, and most of them are a theory of punishment too, because the right object puts the penalty in the room. Props multiply as the courts multiply, and the catalogue gets longer as the law gets older. The raised hand says: hear me. The filled hand says: hold me. Between the two postures lies the whole career of trust, from the appeal that hopes to the pledge that can be checked. The empty hand hopes; the full hand answers for itself.

One ring in the record enters attached to its own history. The Chronicle's annal for 876 finds Alfred at Wareham, facing the mounted Danish army, and the settlement the annal records is sealed in a way the annalist lingers on: the enemy swore to Alfred on the holy ring, halgan beage, the holy bracelet, a concession the Chronicle marks as one they had granted to no nation before, and they gave him hostages, the worthiest men of the army, into the bargain. Two securities stood behind the words, the ring and the men, and the annalist knew the weight of both. The annalist spends his best sentence on the concession. No oath the chroniclers knew how to write was more solemn, and this one arrives with its furniture named. The same annal carries the rest of it: the army broke the oath by night and rode away to Exeter. One breath holds both, and the furniture names the breach's price: an oath on the holy ring was the costliest oath to break. This chapter makes no observation here; the first chapter spent the one this book allows itself. What belongs to this chapter is the grip. The Danes did not raise their hands to the sky for Alfred. They put them on an object, the holiest

object their law kept, and the object outlasted the oath, which is what objects are for. Wareham was the year's first act, and Exeter was the second, and the ring witnessed both. The Chronicle is the winning side's book, and it keeps the winning side's grievances; the ring's presence in the annal is still the record's testimony to what made an oath solemn in 876.

The ring the Danes swore on had a jurisprudence behind it, and the books of the North keep the specifications. Landnamabok prescribes the apparatus whole: a ring of two ounces or more on the altar of every chief temple, reddened in the blood of the ox the godi sacrificed with his own hands, and every man with business at the court swearing on that ring first, with two or more witnesses named to the swearing. Eyrbyggja saga keeps the same stall and the same ring. The words spoken over it, the so help me addressed to Freyr and Njordr and the almighty god, stand in this book's first chapter; what matters here is the furniture. First the ring, then the case: no oath, no hearing, and the hand's touch was the door. The oath's object was court equipment: standard in weight, fed with sacrifice, handled first in every proceeding, the specification written down with a lawyer's care, two ounces or more, as if a lighter ring would make a lighter oath. Law weighed its objects the way it weighed its testimony. The hand no longer gestures toward the address. The hand holds it. This object, reddened and two-ounced and lying in the open where all the court could see it, is the missing half of the sentence made tangible: touch this, and the condition has a body. The godi who kept the ring was priest and magistrate in one person, and the furniture served both offices, which is the whole history of the oath's objects in miniature: temple fed it and court used it, and the same hand that reddened it at the sacrifice administered it at the law court.

In the German north the law books drew the gesture instead of describing it. The Sachsenspiegel, the great law code of the thirteenth century, survives in illuminated codices that run the law in picture strips, and the Heidelberg manuscript, Codex Palatinus Germanicus 164, keeps its images complete, with a modern catalogue that indexes the legal content of each strip. Folio 6v already holds an oath scene in the feudal-law sequence, and it is not alone; the codex indexes its own oath imagery, strip after strip. Across the pages the gesture repeats until it becomes an emblem: the Schwurhand, the swearing hand, raised with two fingers extended. What the two fingers mean, the pictures do not say, and this chapter declines to say for them; the record of a gesture is the gesture, and the meaning belonged to the room. The code was written in the thirteenth century, the codex painted in the early fourteenth, and the painters were not illustrating an idea. They were drawing what the court looked like. What the codex proves is simpler and worth more than any reading of the fingers. By the time of the picture strips the gesture had become a sign stable enough to draw, a piece of legal iconography standardized enough that a painter could set it in the margin and every reader would know an oath was being sworn. The picture strips were a law for the eye, a code a man could read who could not read, and the oath scene sits in the strip like a stamp. The hand had become a glyph. When a body part turns into a glyph, the institution behind it is old beyond argument and sure of itself.

Then the object becomes a text. The Gospel-book enters the oath's furniture, and the tactile scale refines itself: the book touched, the book held, the book kissed, contact, grip, and lips. England swore its witnesses on the Gospels and kissed the book after, and the kiss was its own instrument, a second contact to seal the first, the verses read or repeated, the lips pressed to the page at the end. Something decisive has happened to the furniture, and to the hand. The ring was a thing the

community kept; the book is a thing that speaks, or is held to speak. The oath's address is now present in the room and legible, and the hand rests on the deity's own recorded sentences. And the physical book is this book's own furniture; its biography runs the rest of the way: kissed by believers and by at least one famous unbeliever, printed in courtroom editions, worn smooth at the same verses, carried to the box and carried away, replaced when the binding failed and the pages loosened from the spine. The hand on the book is the catalogue's most confident posture: the guarantor bound in calfskin, carried under a clerk's arm, kissed clean through at the verses that mattered. The oath had begun with the body pointing at the sky. Now the body bows low over a bound volume. Here the catalogue turns a corner, and it never turns back, because the book solves the oath's oldest problem, presence, in a new way. The object is no longer a stand-in for the address. The object claims to contain the address, word for word, in a language the court can read aloud.

One modern courtroom keeps the first position whole. Scotland swears its witnesses on the bare raised hand: the witness stands, the right hand goes up, palm out, nothing held, nothing kissed, and the formula runs overhead of the empty palm, the same truth, whole truth, and nothing but the truth that England speaks over a book. The catalogue's two ends touch across the whole span. A field outside Sodom and a witness box in Edinburgh, thousands of years between them, and the body in the same position at both ends, the hand empty, the address overhead. The continuity proves something beyond sentiment. The gesture was never a technology with an invention date. It is a posture the species keeps finding on its own, century after century, and every legal system that adopted it was adopting something older than its own law. The law north of the border never put the book between the hand and the air. The Scots did not preserve the raised hand out of antiquarian loyalty. They preserved it because it works: the body put on display for the court and the jury, the palm shown empty to the room, the self offered as the oath's own security. No object mediates; no text assists; no page takes the touch. The first position is the last one standing, and it stands in daily use, administered to strangers who have never once asked why the hand goes up, because the hand going up is the part nobody needs explained. Watch the box on any weekday morning: the clerk lifts, the witness lifts, the room attends. The ceremony takes seconds and costs nothing, and it has outlasted every object the catalogue ever held.

Why the right hand at all? The left is as empty, as visible, as easy to raise, and no statute of gesture answers the question. The record's answer is that the law inherited the asymmetry; it did not invent it. In 1909, in the Revue philosophique, a young French sociologist of Durkheim's school, Robert Hertz, published the slim classic essay on the pre-eminence of the right hand: across cultures, the right is the hand of honor and strength and sacred charge, and the left is its shadow, and the body's two sides carry a whole social polarity. Ritual sorted the hands long before any court sat: the right for oaths and honor, the left for the shadow work. The oath took the higher one as a matter of course. Nothing in the law chose the right hand for a reason. The right hand was already chosen, by religion, by custom, by the accumulated weight of the ceremonial world, and the courts received the body pre-drafted. Hertz's essay became anthropology's classic on the body's ritual asymmetry, and its reach is the point: every tradition Hertz surveyed had already done the sorting before its lawyers arrived. Hertz did not survive the First World War. The essay outlived him, the way the hand outlives every theory of it, and the question it answers still gets answered in courtrooms every day by nobody at all, in the simple act of saying: raise your right hand. The clerk

does not say which god the hand is raised to, and the clerk does not need to; the body knows the posture, the room knows the posture, and the posture has been sacred on every continent the essay surveyed.

Every long-lived ritual collects its folklore, and the raised palm carries a famous one. The story runs like this, and it runs everywhere: courts make the witness raise the right hand, palm out, because in the old days the court needed to inspect the palm for a criminal's brand, the letter burned into the flesh that told the officials this witness had been convicted before and could not be trusted, or could not be heard to testify in any court at all. It answers the law's oldest anxiety, who may be believed, with a bouncer posted at the door. The law loves this kind of story about itself: grim, practical, a little cruel, reassuringly sensible, and above all satisfying. The gesture comes out practical, the way modern audiences like their rituals to be, and a mystery is replaced with a procedure. Its locatable life is modern, and the shape of that life is the first tell. All the tellings share one family resemblance: each is delivered with the quiet pride of a tour guide, a fact for the corridor, something to say while the jury files out. The tale circulates in legal blogs and bar columns from 2013 onward, the tellings citing one another, and they cannot keep their own anatomy straight: one brands the thumb, one migrates the brand to the palm, one invents a Roman origin for the whole ceremony. And the tellers are not cranks at the internet's edge. They are lawyers, bar associations, people who administer courts, and their letterheads vouch for the story in a way a chain email never could. A story that changes its own evidence at every telling is announcing what it is.

The record, when it is finally asked, answers in four fixed points, and the story fails every one. First, where branding was law, the brand went to the brawn of the left thumb: the statute of 1489 says so, and the Old Bailey's own reference pages say so, the thumb, and the left one, the wrong hand entirely for a right-palm inspection. Second, the Elizabethan punishment for perjury did mark the forsworn, on the face. Harrison's Description of England gives the perjurer the pillory and the letter P burned into his forehead, where the town could read it; a court checking palms for a letter would have been checking the wrong body part in the wrong century. Third, the raised right hand as an oath gesture is attested ages before any English criminal court sat, in Genesis, in Deuteronomy, and in the Talmud, where the tractate Nazir reads the word right itself as an oath word. Fourth, and this is the quiet one: no manual, no case report, no memoir of English courtroom practice ever says the palm was raised for inspection. The search for a printing of the tale before the internet age has so far returned a null, and a null is a finding. A journal in the Jewish tradition ran this same disproof years before this chapter and reached the same verdict. The story is folklore, minted recently, and this chapter retires it in public, with the disproof set beside it so the next teller can see what he is spending. The file stays open. If a nineteenth-century printing of the tale surfaces, the chapter will take the correction, in the open, the way the record took the legend.

The minting deserves its own paragraph, because the same mint strikes coins for every ritual. Take a real practice, since criminals were branded; take a real gesture, because the palm is raised; add a gap in the record, where no one wrote down why; and the story does what stories do, welding the two realities across the gap and calling the weld an explanation. As it spreads, each telling repairs the last one's error and makes a fresh one. The brand moves from thumb to palm because the palm is what the court sees; a Roman origin appears because every legend wants antiquity; the tale converges on elegance, and the record cannot feed it. The legend's real product is worth

naming: a worldly penalty for the oath, a checkable mark, an enforcement with boots on. That is the amputated half of the sentence trying to grow back, the curse reimagined as court security, the missing punishment clause clawing its way home as a bailiff's inspection. The oath attracts this lore the way ritual attracts explanation, and even the sober shelves carry it. And the ceremony's curiosities get filed the same way: the court records of British Columbia keep an oath recorded as sworn upon a saucer, one of the oath forms the province's courts administered to Chinese witnesses a century ago, filed without apology among the precedents. The filing is the point: the oath's object list has always admitted the absurd, because the absurd object still gets held, and the held object still binds. The oath will use whatever the hand can hold, and the story will say whatever the gap allows. The cure for the gap is the record, and the record is this book's whole method.

Lay the positions out in a row and read them as what they are: a long set of answers to one old question. The question the oath asks the body is where its weight goes. The raised hand answers upward; the address is overhead, and the body points. Under the thigh the weight runs inward; the line guarantees, and the body grips its own continuation. The ring keeps the oath communal, the object fed with the community's sacrifice. With the book the address turns legible, and the hand rests on the words themselves. The two fingers reduce the gesture to a sign, stable enough to draw in the margin of the law. And the bare Scottish palm returns to the first answer of all: the body alone, nothing held, the self as the only furniture. Six positions, six doctrines, and the differences between them are the differences between whole civilizations' ideas of what a promise costs and who collects it. The gesture carries the theology. That is the chapter's whole claim, and the catalogue is its proof: every position is a doctrine of what the oath is and where it lives, and a courtroom's choice among them is a confession of what it believes, made by the body before a word is spoken. The catalogue is not finished yet. It opened in this book with a disease named for the oath's hand, in a physician's text four thousand years old, and it has run through fields, altars, picture strips, and witness boxes since. The hand has kept moving through it all. Its last position is still ahead of it in these pages, and it is closer than anyone in a courtroom thinks.

A museum is where the catalogue ends its walk, and the case this chapter closes on is a composite, assembled from the record's own artifacts; no single museum owns it, and every artifact in it has its record. Behind the glass of one long case the oath hands line up, carved, painted, cast. A hand carved in stone from a temple wall, raised mid-oath. A painted hand from the law book's margin, two fingers extended in the Schwurhand's sign. Then the bronze: a votive palm, cast and offered and left at the shrine by a man whose name and case are forgotten. The altar ring itself, two ounces or more, the metal unrecorded, the blood long since flaked away. The codex open at its oath scene, its page dark where centuries of fingers turned it. A printed Gospel-book with the kiss worn into the paper. Every one of them is somebody's sentence, detached from the body that spoke it and outliving the case it was spoken in. That is what the objects were for, and they did their work. The plaques would give the dates, and the dates would span the whole span of this book so far, from the field to the codex, and still the position barely changes at all. The materials change across the case, stone to paint to bronze to gold to paper. Palm out. Fingers up. The case is quiet the way courtrooms are quiet before the clerk speaks, and the hands hold their posture under the glass while the visitors drift past to the mummies and the coins. No label mentions a brand. The glass is

clean of folklore. The lights go down on them at closing time, the alarm sets, palm out, fingers up, still swearing.

CHAPTER FOUR

Swear Not at All

The sermon is nearly over when the sentence arrives, and the crowd on the hillside has heard hard sayings already that day, about anger, about lust, about turning the cheek. The old rule was read to them first, the rule they knew: thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths. Keep what you swear. That is the old law, and no one on the hillside would have called it controversial; the courts and the camps of the world ran on it, and run on it still. It is one of the sermon's antitheses, one of the six times an old command is taken up and answered with something harder. Then the new sentence. I say unto you, swear not at all. Neither by heaven, for it is God's throne; nor by the earth, for it is his footstool; neither by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. Let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil. No lawyer worked on that sentence. There is no exception in it, no schedule of permitted objects, no saving clause for courts of law. The addresses are named and foreclosed one by one: heaven, earth, the holy city, the swearer's own head. It is the furniture of this book, listed and ruled out, in the middle of the most famous sermon ever preached, spoken by the founder of the faith that would go on to build the most oath-saturated civilization the record holds, a civilization of sworn courts, sworn armies, sworn offices, and sworn kings.

Take the verse at the width of its plain meaning, the way a hostile reader with a warrant would take it, before any commentary arrives to help. Every oath in this book is covered. The legionary's sacramentum, the litigant's stake, the ring oath on the altar, the witness's hand on the Gospel-book, the consul's stone, the colonists' wax: all of it is swearing, and all of it is named by the list, because the list is built to catch the dodges. By heaven, by earth, by Jerusalem, by your head: the pattern is a man reaching for the biggest thing he can name and pledging it against his word, and the verse answers that nothing he names is his to pledge. The throne, the footstool, the city, the head: God's, God's, God's, and God's again, down to the color of one hair. The verse knows the oath's oldest trick, the swearing by proxies, the man who will not name God and instead names God's furniture. An argument about title is doing the work inside the verse. You cannot swear by what you do not own, and you own nothing, not even the hair, and the man who pledges what he does not own has committed fraud before he has said a word. The oath's whole machinery, the condition, the address, the forfeit, presumes a swearer who can put something up. The verse says there is nothing up. Then it offers the replacement, speech with no charge in it at all: yea, yea, nay, nay. The amputated sentence is not repaired and not reattached. It is deleted, both halves, the blessing and the curse together, and nothing in the record suggests the deleters misunderstood the deletion.

The earliest letters prove the ban was heard as central to everything, and one epistle marks the priority on its face. James carries the same sentence with the priority in the open: Above all things,

my brethren, swear not. The letter does not quote the sermon and does not need to; the ban had already been heard as central, something passed on as a first thing, and the epistle's own list runs the same foreclosure: neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other oath. Note that closing phrase, because it is the loophole-killer. Any other oath. The writer has seen the courtroom dodge coming, the court that bans heaven and earth and then swears its witnesses by the saints, and he forecloses it in three words. The list is not a list of forbidden objects with room at the end for a court to draft a permitted one; it is a list that ends by forbidding the category. Let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay, lest ye fall into condemnation. The falling matters to the epistle's writer, and what the swearer falls into is judgment, the thing the oath was invented to guarantee against, so the guarantee indicts its own guarantor. The plain reading of the two texts together is not subtle and was never meant to be: the community of the new covenant is a community that does not swear, full stop, and its speech is plain speech, and plain speech is enough for the whole of life. That is the reading the church would spend fifteen centuries working around, and the working-around is this chapter's subject, because the working-around built the church we inherit.

There is a complication, and this chapter refuses to smooth it over. Years after the sermon, in the night court of the high priest, the man who spoke the ban was put under the oath's oldest form of compulsion. The record says he had kept silent through the witnesses, silent through the accusations, and then the high priest used the formula: I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ. I adjure thee: the words place the hearer under oath, and they work whether the hearer cooperates or not, which is what makes the formula the ancestor of every compelled oath in this book. And the silence broke. Thou hast said, he answered, and went on to say what he would not say before. The defenders of swearing have carried this verse into every debate since: he answered under adjuration, therefore the ban bends to the court's need. The refusers have answered the verse just as long: he swore nothing; the oath-words were the priest's; the answer carries no formula, no invocation, no by-the-living-God from his own mouth; it is testimony, the thing the sermon commands, and no oath-word is anywhere in it. Both readings are old, both are argued by honest men with the text open, and the verse sits between them unreconciled. The court wanted an answer under oath, and an answer is what it got. The chapter leaves it there, because the church's own history left it there, and a book that smooths this verse is a book that has chosen a side in a fight it should only report. What the verse does establish beyond dispute is the formula's antiquity: adjuration, the oath laid on another by authority, was already the court's instrument, and it was already being used on a man who would not speak.

The pressure the verse came under can be measured in one bishop's honesty, and the bishop is Augustine, writing at the turn of the fifth century to a man with questions. Augustine writes to Publicola, who has asked him about oaths, and the letter admits what the empire's peace rests on: the provinces are held by sworn words, and not by the sworn words of Christians. The peace of whole provinces, Augustine writes, rests on the oaths of barbarians, men swearing by their own gods, by false gods, by things that are not God at all. It is a governor's question Augustine is answering, a question about how a Christian official is to treat the sworn pledges of men outside the faith, and the observation lands in two directions at once. The bishop knows the machine is indispensable: the border quiet, the treaties kept, the whole apparatus of trust between strangers, all of it running on sworn sentences addressed to gods he did not believe in. To his credit, the bishop cannot call

the arrangement clean, because the same letter ranks the forsworn by what they swore upon, and the ranking is severe: the sin of the false oath grows with the holiness of the thing sworn by, so the man who swears falsely by the true God stands worse than the man who swears a true oath by false ones, and both of them stand inside an empire whose peace depends on the swearing. The concession is never far from the worry. That doubleness, the oath as load-bearing and the oath as danger, is Augustine's whole position, and it became the West's, because no one after him put it more honestly.

The concession itself comes in his commentary on the sermon, where the plain words meet the practiced world. Augustine does not strike the verse and does not evade it; he reads it as a word about the best, addressed to creatures who fall short of the best, and the reading is humane, seasoned, and persuasive, which is what makes it consequential. Not to swear is the higher road, the road of the strong. But men are weak, and the weak distrust one another, and the oath is the remedy the weak have found for their distrust, a bridge over the gap between a stranger's word and a stranger's need to be sure. So the oath is permitted, permitted to human weakness, the way a crutch is permitted to a lame leg: better the leg, and the crutch is no sin, though a man who boasts of his crutch has forgotten what legs are for. Elegant work, and worth a slow look, because everything after it in the West is commentary on it. The verse said, swear not at all. The commentary says, the verse describes the life of the perfected, and for the rest of us, swearing is allowed, provided it is true, provided it is needed, provided it is not loved. So the ban survives as an ideal, hung high where only the strong can reach it, and the practice survives as a concession, and between the ideal and the concession runs all the room a civilization has ever needed to swear its armies, its witnesses, its officeholders, and its kings. Unfired, the charge sat in the text, and the church built over it, story by story, century by century.

Aquinas completes the work Augustine began, and he completes it with a verse of his own. The Summa takes up the oath in its questions on religion and asks outright whether to swear is lawful at all, because the Summa knows its Matthew. It is put in the Summa's own way, with the objection stated first and at full strength: it seems that swearing is unlawful, because it is written, swear not at all. The answer is yes, and the yes is fenced. A lawful oath, says the Angelic Doctor, stands with three companions: truth, judgment, and justice. The words are Jeremiah's, thou shalt swear, the LORD liveth, in truth, in judgment, and in righteousness, a prophet's sentence doing the work the sermon seemed to forbid, since Jeremiah offers the oath under conditions at the moment the sermon seemed to ban it outright. Truth: the thing sworn must be true, and the swearer must mean to keep it. Judgment: the oath must be taken deliberately, in a matter that warrants it, never rashly, never from habit. Justice: the thing sworn must itself be lawful, since an oath to do evil binds no one. And the Sermon on the Mount? The ban, in Aquinas's reading, falls on the oath without its companions, the rash oath, the customary oath, the oath spoken as garnish on ordinary speech. Swear not at all becomes swear not carelessly, and the careful oath keeps its license. The plainest sentence in the sermon has been given a lawyer, and the lawyer is brilliant, and the sentence survives the representation, but it survives as a different sentence, one a court can administer, and the courts administered it for a thousand years.

The code had arrived before the commentary, and the book steps back a century for it. Gratian's Decretum, the twelfth-century textbook that taught the church's lawyers, gives a whole cause to the

oath and its breach: Causa 22, page after page of questions and authorities, canon after canon laid out in the master lawyer's own ordering. When does an oath bind, and when is it loosed? What of the oath sworn under deceit, the oath sworn to harm, the oath that conflicts with an earlier oath, the oath extracted by force? What is perjury, who judges it, and how is the forsworn to be corrected? The oath that Jesus forbade is now a department of law, with jurisdiction, case categories, and remedies, administered by the courts of the church that itself preached the ban. No one involved thought of it as hypocrisy, and it was not hypocrisy; it was the concession's administrative form, Augustine's crutch given a rules committee and a full docket. The cause asks the hard questions honestly, and answers them out of a thousand years of authorities. The verse has not been broken, on the church's own accounting. It has been interpreted, and the interpretation has a courthouse. Stand back from the code and the shape of the whole development shows, three centuries of it at a glance. The founder forbade the practice; the church, needing the practice, made the forbiddance safe; and the making-safe was carried out with such learning and such care that by the twelfth century the verse could be taught in the church's own law school as a text about when oaths are lawful. The charge never went off. It was defused by the institution that wrote it down.

The balance sheet of the defusing is worth reading plainly and in full, because it is not a story of failure. The commentary tradition did what institutions do with dangerous texts: it kept them, copied them, preached them, and built fences of learning around them until the plain meaning could no longer reach the street. Christendom swore. It swore its vassals to its lords and its lords to their kings, its monks to their rules, its bishops to their sees, its witnesses to its courts, its penitents to their penance, and every one of those oaths ran under a book that said swear not at all. Coronations, fealties, wills, truces, manumissions: the whole traffic of trust between strangers ran on the sworn sentence. The men who administered the swearing were not cynics. They believed the concession, and the concession was honestly reasoned from real needs: borders do need treaties, courts do need testimony, and strangers do need a bridge. What the long work produced, though, was a church in which the oath had become so ordinary that its forbiddance was a curiosity, a verse for scholars, a hard saying for the perfected few, the kind of text a preacher could admire in public and no one in the pews was expected to keep. The plain words had not been answered; they had been outwaited, filed, encased, and retired to the commentary shelf. A text that has been retired by commentary is a text one reader can bring back to life by the simple act of believing it. That act was always coming. It came in the winter of 1527, in a village on the Rhine's high ground, and it came from below.

For a thousand years the defusing held, and it held because everyone with the power to enforce anything belonged to the church that needed the oath. Then, in a village called Schleitheim, in February of 1527, a small company of hunted people gathered to write down what they believed: seven articles, on baptism, on the ban, on the breaking of bread, on separation, on shepherds, on the sword, and last on the oath, and they took the verse at its width. The Schleitheim Confession, seven articles ratified on February 24, 1527, carries the oath as its seventh article, and the seventh article does not negotiate with anything. The oath, it says, is a confirmation among those who quarrel or make promises, a device for ending dispute among men. Then it quotes the sermon's own reason: you cannot make one hair white or black. From that reason it draws the offense, which turns out to be swearing itself. To swear is to promise what only God can perform, to pledge a future the swearer does not control, to put his hand on the throne, the footstool, and the hair that were never his. The

oath is not a lawful instrument that sinners sometimes abuse. It is an arrogation, a reaching for God's power by a creature who cannot guarantee the next hour. Therefore, the article says, Christ forbids his followers all swearing, and they are to do without it, in the magistrate's court as much as anywhere else. Augustine's crutch is handed back. The perfected life of the sermon is declared to be simply the life, required of every brother and sister, no concession, no companions, no cause of the Decretum.

The price arrived on schedule, and it is worth saying plainly what the schedule was. Michael Sattler, the confession's principal author, a former monk turned shepherd of the hunted, was burned at the stake within three months of Schleitheim, and the authorities who burned him thought they were extinguishing a heresy, and did the movement the honor of taking it at its word; the same year, no less a figure than Zwingli translated the seven articles into Latin in order to refute them, which is to say the establishment answered the confession with its two instruments, scholarship and fire, in that order and at once, and the confession survived both, and the article survived with it. The Anabaptists were hunted by Protestant and Catholic alike, drowned in some cantons, burned in others, beheaded in others, driven across every border, and they kept the seventh article through all of it, because the seventh article was not a doctrine to them in the way a doctrine is optional among comfortable people. It was the sermon's sentence, taken as written, and the hunting only confirmed what the sentence implied: the world runs on oaths, and the world will defend them. Here the book's quiet engine shows its headwaters, though this chapter does not name it. The people who would not swear had found one another, and the position they took was now a portable thing, a text with articles, able to be carried across generations and handed to peoples not yet gathered. Three hundred years of statute-bending would follow from it. The charge under the system had been fired at last, in a village, by a company with no army, and the smoke took centuries to clear.

What Schleitheim began did not stay at Schleitheim. The position traveled, because a text with articles can be carried in a coat, and it was carried, north and west, from the Swiss brethren to the Mennonites of the low countries, and across the water in time to England, where a people who had not yet gathered, the Friends of the truth, would take it up with a stubbornness the Swiss never exceeded. The Quakers belong to a later chapter of this book, and this chapter will not spend them; what matters here is the carrying itself. A sentence in a gospel had become an article in a confession, and the article was about to become a plea in a thousand courtrooms. The sermon's sentence had become a portable inheritance, and the inheritors kept arriving, generation after generation, each of them reading the four plain words and declining to be fenced off from them by any commentary. They are the proof that the defusing, for all its learning, never quite took hold of the street. And the law would have to reckon with the carriers, again and again, in the centuries still to come, because a court can administer anything except a witness who will not swear. Every refuser in the movements ahead walks out of this chapter carrying those four words. The founders of the oath's system, Augustine and Aquinas and the canon lawyers, had built carefully and well. What they could not build against was a reader, alone with the page, who simply believed it. That reader kept appearing, in villages and steeple-houses and prisons. The verse had been defused in the library, and it kept going off in the street and in the dock.

So the chapter closes where the sermon leaves its readers, with the verse alone on the page, after all the centuries of help have been set aside. The whole apparatus this book has watched being built,

the wax and the flint, the ring and the book, the stake and the sacrament, the whole machinery of the sentence that binds, sits on one side of history, and on the other side there is a hillside and four words. Swear not at all. No address, no condition, no curse, no blessing, no furniture, no hand. The verse takes back everything the first three chapters watched the oath acquire. The sentence that needed an object to be witnessed is replaced by speech that needs nothing, and the speech is supposed to be enough because the speaker is supposed to be truthful, and the speaker is supposed to be truthful because the community is supposed to be the kind of place where yea means yea. It is the most demanding sentence in the whole argument, because it asks for the thing no institution can administer: simple truthfulness, everywhere, for free. That is a harder requirement than any oath. The oath distrusts the speaker and arms the listener; the verse trusts the speaker and disarms the system, and the whole long record between the sermon and Schleitheim is the record of an institution deciding, century by century and in good conscience, that it could not afford the disarmament. The words remain where they were written, in the middle of the sermon, unrescinded by any authority with the standing to rescind them. Swear not at all. The page is quiet, and the whole system is still standing on the charge. And the witness from this book's first page is still standing with his hand in the air, the sentence half-spoken, and the hillside's words have not reached his courtroom yet.

CHAPTER FIVE

Twelve Sworn Men

A man accused in an old English court had one question to answer, and the question was not what happened. The question was: how many mouths can you bring. First the accusation itself was sworn, in form, by the accuser, hand to the holy book, on pain of the forsworn's account; then the law turned to the accused. The defense called compurgation was arithmetic before it was anything else, and it was everywhere, in the county courts, in the halls of the manors, in the church's own courts Christian. The accused swore his own denial, in set form, hand to the Gospels, and then he produced the helpers, the compurgators, the oath-helpers, neighbors and kinsmen who came forward one after another and swore, in set form, that his oath was clean. Eleven of them, in the classic wager: eleven helpers behind the defendant's own oath, twelve sworn mouths in all, a number the law would keep. When the count was full and every mouth had spoken in form and without a stumble, the man went free. There were no witnesses to cross, no exhibits, no summing up of evidence, because there was no evidence. Proof was the count. The court's whole question had been answered by a number of men willing to swear, answered in the only currency the court accepted, and to the modern ear this is less a legal procedure than a census of the loyal. To the court that ran it, week in and week out for centuries, in every hundred and county, it was proof itself, the only kind a neighborhood could manufacture out of itself, and it worked because every mouth in the count was still aimed at heaven, and heaven, in that courtroom, had not yet resigned.

The helpers' oath is the detail that rewards a slow reading, because the helpers did not swear to the facts. No compurgator stood up and said, I saw him in another county on the night in question. That kind of sentence belonged to a law that had not yet been invented. The helpers swore to the defendant's oath: they swore, in their own set words, that the oath he had just sworn was clean and true, that it could be believed, that the man who spoke it was the kind of man whose oath held. It was an oath of credulity, a sworn judgment of character, and the law was honest about what it was measuring, because what it was measuring was all the law had, and all the law wanted. The machine did not ask who could prove the truth. It asked who could be believed under oath, and then it counted. The distinction is the whole difference between the medieval courtroom and ours. Our courts ask the record what happened; their courts asked the neighborhood who was swearable. A reputation, in that world, was not gossip. It was a legal instrument, indexed in mouths, and a man

with a bad one was a man who could not clear himself, whatever the facts were. The facts were nobody's business; the credit was everybody's. Note that the helpers were chosen for nearness, kin, neighbors, the men who knew him. The arithmetic had a moral logic of its own: the community's considered judgment of its member, taken under oath, in a form the oath made dangerous to fake. The man who could not fill his count, who could not find eleven mouths, went from the arithmetic to the fire, which is the next proof this chapter meets.

What made the count honest, when it was honest, was the old fuel. Every helper who swore carried the same exposure the defendant carried, the conditional curse this book opened on, the unnamed penalty aimed at the swearer by the swearer. To join the count was to put your own soul's credit behind another man's denial, in form, aloud, before the neighborhood, hand to the same book, the words said after him one by one. A helper who swore falsely was not a witness making a mistake; he was a perjurer, and perjury was still God's account to settle, which everyone in the building believed was an account that would be settled. So the count was expensive. Men did not join it lightly, and a defendant who could not fill it was marked by the emptiness as surely as by any verdict, his own neighbors declining, in public, to stand inside his sentence. The machine ran on the fear of the next world, and it knew it, and for a long time, in a small world where everyone would know who had stood in the count, the fuel held. The arithmetic this chapter is describing was never a rational procedure wearing a ritual costume for show. It was a ritual with a procedure's discipline, forms, sums, a keeper of the count, and its administrators understood exactly what powered it, which is why the forms mattered so much: the stumble, the misrecitation, the mouth that failed mid-formula broke the count and sank the defense, because the oath that was not perfect was not an oath, and the count that was not full was not a count, and a full count was a verdict. Perfection was the price of proof, and the price was paid in mouths.

Compurgation had a common-law name and a strange old age. The wager of law, vadiatio legis, the defense of the eleven neighbors, survived the whole middle age of England and then kept going, outliving the world that made sense of it. Blackstone, in the third book of the Commentaries, in the chapter on trial, describes it with the embarrassed respect of a man explaining a grandfather's duel: the defendant in an action of debt could wage his law, swear he owed nothing, and bring his eleven to swear they believed him. The eighteenth century already found it absurd, and said so in print, and left it standing, which is the common law's way with old furniture: mock it, keep it, trip over it in the dark, and bill for the bruise. What killed it, finally, was a statute, the Civil Procedure Act of 1833, which swept the wager of law out of the courts it had haunted for seven hundred years, a single modern sentence ending a Norman inheritance. The date deserves holding against the century's other machinery. In 1833 England had steam locomotives running on public rails, a penny press, a Factory Act, a reformed Parliament, and a courtroom in which a man could still clear a debt by finding eleven neighbors to swear they believed him. The fuel had burned out long before; the form was still there, printed in the practice books, taught in the terms, available to any defendant who wanted it, and defendants still occasionally wanted it, a ritual with its theology gone, waiting for someone to notice that nobody believed in it anymore. The notice took centuries to come. That is how slowly the law lets go of a form that once worked, and the wager of law had worked, in its day, as well as anything the day possessed.

The other old proof was not arithmetic at all. It was a request for a miracle, scheduled in advance. The ordeal, iudicium Dei, the judgment of God, sent the accused to the hot iron or the cold water after the oath was sworn, and the sequence is the part to watch, because the sequence is the theory. First the oath: the accused swore his innocence in form, before the priest, with the liturgy said over him. Then the test: the iron carried three paces, or the arm plunged into the boiling water, or the body lowered into the cold, and the result read as the verdict, the hand's burns inspected after three days of bandaging and found clean or festering, the water judged to accept the body or to reject it. The oath was handed to God for grading. The hand catalogue has an entry here, and it is the darkest one: the hand as the surface the verdict was written on, the body part that held the proof and then displayed it. Robert Bartlett's study of the ordeal, fire and water, is the modern account, and its steady point is that the ordeal was not madness. Within its theology it was sober administration: an omniscient judge, a test he could not misgrade, a priest to officiate, a community to witness, and a result to record in the rolls. Its courts kept the same forms week after week, and the forms were liturgy, and the liturgy was the warrant. The ordeal was the oath's proof-of-concept, the curse made operational, the missing half of the sentence invited back into the courtroom as a weekly event, with rubrics, with officers, with a waiting period for the answer to come back. The hot iron had its handbook, the water its rules of sinking and floating, and the bandage its three days.

Then, in 1215, the operator left. The Fourth Lateran Council, the great legislative council of the medieval church, in its eighteenth canon forbade the clergy to take part in ordeals: no blessing of the iron, no consecration of the water, no priesthood at the pit, no office over the fire. The canon did not argue that the ordeal was false. It withdrew the church's part in it, which was stronger. The ordeal without its liturgy was an executioner's errand with no judge attached, and everyone understood this at the time. The test had never been the fire; the test was God, and God was reached through the church's office, and the church had just recalled its officers. A proof whose warrant is divine cannot survive the clergy declining to administer it. Within a generation the ordeal was withering across Europe, and England, which had leaned on it harder than most, had to find its proofs elsewhere, and find them fast, because the accused did not stop coming when the iron cooled, and the king's courts did not stop riding. The standard scholarly account tells the sequence as a displacement, with no demolition required: the sworn inquest stepped into the room the ordeal vacated. This chapter keeps the claim at its proper width. The council did not invent the jury, which already existed, and did not abolish the ordeal by name. It withdrew the clergy, and the withdrawal was enough, and was seen to be enough, because a proof that depends on a blessing dies when the blessing is withdrawn. The machine this book is tracking changed its engine in those years: from the oath that asked God to grade, to the oath that asked twelve neighbors to answer. The one asked heaven for a sign; the other asked the district for an answer under oath. Both were oaths; the fuel was the same, only the furnace changed.

Yet the jury was already in the building, and its charter survives: a king's ordinance, with a sheriff's paperwork behind it. The Assize of Clarendon, Henry the Second's ordinance of 1166, half a century before the council, ordered that twelve lawful men of every hundred, and four of every village, be put under oath to report the robbers, the murderers, the thieves, and their receivers to the king's justices. Twelve lawful men, sworn: the presenting jury, the district's own memory put under oath. The justices came round on eyre, and the twelve answered under the oath, and the

names they gave were the county's own knowledge made official by the swearing. This was not a proof in itself; it was a procedure for finding out what the countryside already knew and could be made to say, and the oath was its instrument, the report only as good as the swearing behind it. The twelve did not try anyone, and the distinction matters, because trying and reporting are different machines. They swore, and under the oath they said who the district believed to be guilty, and their belief, sworn, set the machine's next step moving, which in 1166 was the ordeal of water for the men they named: the jury presented, and the water tried. Why twelve, no statute ever said, and the guesses that fill the gap are folklore of the kind this book has already retired once; the number arrives with the assize and never leaves, and its reasons are lost. What can be said is what the record shows: twelve was the count of the hundred's lawful men, and the count proved sufficient, and sufficient became sacred. What the assize proves is the shape of the answer: the state chose the panel that swears over the judge who knows. The king could not be everywhere; the oath could. The count had moved from the defense to the state.

After 1215 the panel learned to decide. The presenting jury, the reporter of suspects, was joined by the trying jury, the twelve who heard the case and gave the verdict, and the pivot from reporting to deciding is the pivot this movement of the book is built on, the moment the count stopped naming suspects and started judging them, and the whole arrangement has a Latin name that states its nature in one word: jurata, the sworn. The word is a past participle, the swearing already done, the body defined by the act and by nothing else: size, birth, learning, wisdom, all beside the point. Twelve illiterates who had sworn were a jury; twelve scholars who had not were a committee. The jury is the thing that has taken the oath. Every part of the machine's new engine room ran on the same fuel: the jurors sworn to hear and to answer truly, the witnesses sworn to speak truly, the summoning bailiff sworn to summon fairly, the crier sworn to keep the room, the whole ladder of small sworn offices, the whole proceeding a stack of oaths holding up a verdict. The modern word jury is the same word with the Latin ending worn off, and the man in the box is a juror, a swearer, which is all the word has ever meant. The courtroom spoke oath-Latin before it spoke English, and it speaks it still, and the words sit so old in their places that nobody hears them anymore. So the machine had its name, and the name admitted what the machine was. A verdict from the unsworn was no verdict; the oath was the engine's ignition, and the engine was named for it.

Two scholars stand behind this chapter's account, and the chapter owes them its spine. James Bradley Thayer, in the Harvard essay of 1891 that named the subject, set the older modes of trial in a row and read them the way they deserve to be read: as proofs, administered in form, by men who meant them and feared them. The older modes were not a dark age's guessing, and they were not theatre for the cowed. They were a system, with rules, with officers, with a theory of where truth came from, and Thayer's account of them remains the place the modern understanding begins. Maitland's pages, in the great History of English Law, walk the oath's procedural world in patient detail: the counted helpers, the gradations of the oath's worth from one man's word to the full count, the law's trust in sworn numbers, the slow pivot from the oath that invokes heaven to the panel that finds facts. The older modes are easy to sneer at, and the sneer is always wrong. The ordeal had rubrics, the compurgation its rules of count and form, the officers their records. None of it was improvised, and none of it was stupid, and the men who ran it would have found our own modes no less strange: a court where the helpers know nothing of the accused, where the swearer

of a doubtful oath risks a statute instead of a soul, where the count of twelve listens instead of vouching. A court that counts oath-helpers is a court solving a real problem with the only instruments it had, and the sneer comes free to every later age, which is exactly why the sneer is worthless. The problem itself, how to be sure about strangers, has never gone away. We solved it with evidence. They solved it with arithmetic. The instruments differ, and the fear underneath is the same fear.

The machine's new engine room filled in the decades after the council, and it is worth standing in it once, because the room is still ours; anyone who has sat in a jury box has sat in it. Twelve men, lawful and sworn, called in from the hundreds, seated to hear what the witnesses, also sworn, will say, and to answer, when the asking comes, the only question the law has ever asked: do you believe what you have heard? They answer it under the oath, which is the only credential the law has ever found for belief. The accuser still swore first, as he always had; the oath that opened the case was the oldest piece of the room. The oath is the room's whole atmosphere now, the air the procedure breathes, administered at every threshold: the panel sworn when it sits, the witness sworn when he stands, the verdict delivered under the oath the panel took before the first word of testimony. Nor has the curse been exiled from the room; it has been distributed, one share to every swearer, and the verdict the room produces is built out of stacked conditional sentences, each one aimed at the soul of the man or woman who spoke it. Counting has changed its meaning without changing its number. The count no longer decides the case by its mere fullness; the count now carries the case, twelve mouths sworn to hear well instead of twelve mouths swearing to believe. That is the whole difference between the old proof and the new, and it is also the whole continuity. The law never stopped counting. It changed what the count was for, and it kept the count, and the count is still twelve, and the twelve are still sworn.

Now the tray, laid out like instruments, because the courtroom has spoken oath-Latin wall to wall since before it spoke English, and the instruments are older than the room. Juror: a swearer, nothing more and nothing less, the word worn smooth by eight centuries of daily use. Jury: the same root with the ending worn off, the sworn body, the panel that exists because it swore. Perjury: per-iurare, to swear through, to swear against the oath itself, the word for the machine's one failure, the broken swearing. Abjure: to swear away, to renounce under oath, and in the old law it named a sentence of its own, the felon in sanctuary abjuring the realm, swearing himself out of the country on pain of the noose if he returned, England making an oath do the work of an exile. Adjure: to swear at, to bind by an oath laid on another, the high priest's formula in the night court of the last chapter, the compelled oath's living word. Then conjure: to swear together, the word for a conspiracy before it was the word for a spell, because a conspiracy is sworn and a spell is sworn at, and the law's oldest word for men bound by a common oath became the stage magician's verb. And assize itself, the sitting, the court that sat, the word for the ordinance and the word for the court it made, because in the machine's world the law and the court and the oath kept sharing names. Six words from one root, iurare, to swear, and the seventh from the sitting itself, assidere: one tray, one family of instruments. It speaks that Latin still, and the tray proves what the chapter has argued: the machine was built out of oaths, and its vocabulary never forgot, even when its operators did.

And the word is still in the room today, doing the same work it did for the justices in eyre. Any weekday morning, in any courthouse, the clerk rises for the panel and calls the roll, and the word she uses is the assize's own word, eight and a half centuries in the mouth, unexamined. The oldest

words work invisibly. The clerk has never once needed to think about what she is saying, and she says it perfectly. Jurors. The sworn. Twelve of them still, for reasons nobody wrote down, sworn still, by a formula whose other half has been missing since before the assize ever sat, and they file into the box and answer to their names and put their hands on the book or up in the air, as the court prefers, and nobody in the room, the judge no more than the clerk, the clerk no more than the twelve, could say when the counting began or why the number holds. The tray is put away. Its instruments go back to their work in the walls of the language, juror and perjury, abjure and adjure and conjure, the whole set in daily use by people who have never once heard the oath inside them. The ordeal's pit is a museum label now; the wager of law survives as a footnote; and the count goes on, in the box, every working day, in every county and every crown court, the arithmetic still done by sworn mouths, the machine still running on the same old fuel with the label worn off. And the book under the hand is leather now, the kiss optional, the count still the count. The word is jurata. The sworn.

CHAPTER SIX

The Oath That Asks Too Much

First, swear. Then we will tell you what you are accused of. That was the ex officio oath, the oath of the office, and its order of operations was the whole instrument. A man summoned before the High Commission or the Star Chamber was not first told the charge. He was not necessarily told anything. The summons brought him in, the book was offered, and the oath was administered by the officer, ex officio, by the office itself, before any indictment was read, because there might be no indictment to read. He was put under oath, hand to the Gospels, to answer truthfully every question the court intended to put to him, and the charge came after, if it came at all, inside the interrogatories he had just sworn to answer. What has been asked of the swearer deserves a count. He has pledged his answers before the questions exist, and the court could then ask him anything, about himself, his friends, his press, his shelf, and hold him to it. He has sworn away his future knowledge of the case, and he has done it under the oath's whole weight, the condition, the address, the penalty, because the oath does not care what it binds you to; it only cares that it binds. The court called this procedure ordinary, and by its own lights it was. The church courts had run on it for centuries, and the prerogative courts ran on it now, and the judges called it ordinary course, and the men who administered it signed their names to its returns. What the ex officio oath did was simpler than its Latin name suggests. It turned the defendant into the state's first witness and its most productive one, and it turned the oath, the instrument this book has watched bind armies and lawsuits, into an intake pipe: the prosecution's case, pumped out of the accused's own sworn mouth.

The trap had three horns, and the court had polished all of them, and it is worth walking the horns one by one, because the whole architecture of the later right is shaped like the trap it was built against. Answer truthfully, and you convicted yourself, because the questions were drawn by lawyers to walk you into the offense one careful step at a time. Answer falsely, and you were a perjurer, sworn and damned both. Refuse the oath itself, and you were in contempt, punished for the refusal, imprisoned until you conformed, which is to say imprisoned until you agreed to convict yourself by a process of law. There was no fourth door. The old law's maxim ran the other way, and the machine had pocketed it: the accused's conscience was the court's to rack. Silence itself was read as confession, construed against the silent man, the court reasoning that an innocent man under oath would simply say so. The machine had found the oath's maximum setting: an instrument that could not lose, because every possible response fed it. This is the point in the book where the oath stops looking like the bridge between strangers it was invented to be and starts looking like an engine of extraction, and the difference is worth stating plainly, because the whole next movement of the law's history is the answer to it. The oath was invented to make trust possible between people who doubt each other, and for that purpose it had been a tolerable tool. The ex officio oath existed to make doubt unnecessary: the court would have the truth out of you, sworn, whether

you wished to give it or not. A sentence built to be entered freely had been welded into a cell door, and the men inside it could hear the weld being made.

And there is a deeper offense inside the blind oath, older than any court in Westminster, and this book's fourth chapter has already stated it. You cannot swear by what you do not own, and the questions you have not heard are not yours, and the answers you have not given yet are not yours either. The man who takes the ex officio oath pledges property he has never seen. A man may swear to pay a hundred pounds he does not have; the law knows how to handle that. The blind oath pledges something stranger than money: his testimony about things the court has not yet told him. Every old form this book has walked through, the stone, the ring, the wax, the army's oath, the wager's, named its conditions in the open; the swearer knew exactly what he was conditionally destroying. The ex officio oath kept the condition and hid the stake. That is why the refusal, when it came, came on the oath's own terms, came as doctrine and as law, and only afterward as politics. And the refusers understood the instrument better than its administrators did, because they were the ones expected to climb inside it, and a man sees a press differently from underneath. The instrument had asked for everything an oath can lawfully ask, and then one thing more; the one thing more is where it broke, because an oath is a promise, and a promise about the unknown is no promise at all; it is a surrender, and there are men who will not surrender. The oath that asks too much is this chapter's whole subject. Its history is the history of what happened to the men who said so, and of what their saying so built, which the rest of the chapter will measure, and the measuring will surprise anyone who thinks the machine never loses.

The man who said it loudest was twenty-three years old and in the pamphlet trade. John Lilburne, a London apprentice in the business of books and forbidden printing, in the circle of the punished Prynne, was brought before the Star Chamber in December of 1637, charged in general terms with sending seditious books into England, and tendered the ex officio oath, and he refused it, at the first examination and at every stage after, the same refusal in the same words' spirit each time the book came around. Not evaded, not postponed: refused. He would answer, he said, to any charge laid against him by name, with accusers produced and particulars named, as the common law had always required, and he said it standing, and he kept saying it. What he would not do was swear a blanket oath to answer everything, because that oath, he said, was against the law of God and against the liberty of the subject, and no man's conscience ought to be racked by oaths imposed upon him. He put the two highest authorities a seventeenth-century Englishman knew, God and the subject's liberty, between himself and the book. The formulation matters, and this chapter will return to it. He did not claim a right to be silent. He refused an oath, and he refused it as a legal object, an instrument that asked what no oath could lawfully ask. The distinction between refusing to answer and refusing to swear is the distinction the whole chapter turns on, because the first is a defendant's tactic and the second is a constitutional claim, and Lilburne made the second. Courts hear such refusals as noise, and this court proceeded as courts do, and its answer is the next paragraph's subject, because the answer was the sentence, and the sentence is where the court showed what it was for.

The sentence came down on February 13, 1638, and it is worth reading the way the court wrote it, because the court's own words, preserved in the State Trials, show what the punishment was for. Five hundred pounds, the whipping, the pillory, and imprisonment until he obeyed. Read the

last three words twice. Until he obeyed. The sentence was not a term with an end; it was a press, open-ended, aimed at the refusal itself, and it was designed to be survived only by surrender, and it would keep him until the day he agreed to swear. The machine had met a man who declined to feed it, and its answer was to squeeze until he changed his mind, on the correct theory that the whole point of the refusal was its price, and it could set prices. It did not doubt that men could be broken; it had broken better men than apprentices. On April 18, 1638, they brought him out for the public part, the part meant for the crowd. He was whipped at the cart's tail from the Fleet prison down to Palace Yard in Westminster, through the London streets, in front of the crowds the court meant to teach. Then the pillory, two hours of it, and when he began to speak to the crowd from the pillory, because a man who refuses an oath is not a man who declines speech, they gagged him where he stood, in the sun, on the pillory, in front of the crowd the lesson had been staged for, and the gag, like everything else that day, went into the record. The record of that day, the swelling and the sun and the gag, is not a pamphleteer's embroidery. It is sworn testimony, and this chapter will come back to who swore it.

The witness was a woman named Mary Dorman, and her testimony survives because of what happened next in Lilburne's war, which is that he outlived the court that sentenced him and lived to see his injuries inquired into. Years later, in a Lords hearing of February 1645-6, with the world turned over and the king at war with his own Parliament, his sufferings were entered into the record under oath, and the pamphlet that printed the hearing kept her words, plain as bandages: the shoulders swollen from the knotted cords, the two hours on the pillory bareheaded in the sun, the gag applied until his mouth bled, all of it sworn to, all of it entered, all of it printed. The chapter pauses here, and the pause is quiet on purpose, because the fact needs no help. Lilburne's whole stand had been a refusal of the instrument, the oath itself, the machine's intake. The record of what it did to him was made inside that instrument: sworn testimony, taken down, entered, printed. The refuser's sufferings went into the permanent record through the selfsame sentence he would not speak, the oath of a witness, lawfully administered and lawfully given. No one made that irony on purpose, and this book does not underline it further; it simply notes that the oath, which could not have his words, ended up carrying hers, and that hers are the words we have. She had seen him at the pillory with her own eyes, and she came and swore to what her eyes had seen, and the Lords entered it, and the printer printed it, and that is how a spring day in 1638 survives at full resolution. The engine is indifferent to whose sworn voice it runs on, indifferent as weather. It ran on hers. It preserved him.

The punishment was meant to end the pamphlet trade's nerve, and it did the opposite, and the court's mistake is worth naming, because it is the mistake the whole movement of this book is built from. The machine believed the refusal was a defect to be broken, when the refusal was a claim to be answered, and between those two readings of a man's backbone lies the whole difference between a court and a press, and a claim can be answered with argument but only a person can be broken. London watched a young man bleed through its own streets for declining to swear, and London drew its own conclusion, which was the one the court least intended and could not confiscate: that the oath was the kind of thing men bled for refusing. The ex officio oath had survived for centuries on the agreement of everyone who administered it that it was ordinary, and on the silence of the men it processed, who had no crowd to bleed in front of, and no pamphlets to write afterward, and no

one to write them. In April of 1638 it became visible, and once a procedure is visible it can be argued with, and the argument had now been opened in the loudest possible register, in blood, in public, with the machine's own name on it, in a city that remembered, a city that had watched Prynne lose his ears the year before and kept its own accounting of the court's prices. Lilburne went back to prison, unconverted, unbroken, still unsworn. His sentence had years left to run, and the war that was coming would interrupt it, and the man who would present his petition to the Long Parliament was a member from Cambridge named Oliver Cromwell, not yet anyone's general, which is how tightly the small politics of an oath can sit against the great politics of a civil war.

The reckoning came on May 4, 1641, in a Parliament that had been eleven years unsummoned and was in no mood to be merciful to the old instruments. The House took up Lilburne's case, voted on the Star Chamber's sentence, and the Journal of the House keeps the words, and the words are not the words of a committee being polite about a predecessor. They are the words of a House settling an account. The sentence, the Commons resolved, was illegal, and against the liberty of the subject, and it was also, in the Journal's own capitals, bloody, wicked, cruel, barbarous, and tyrannical. Five adjectives, entered in the record of the House, against a sentence of one of the king's own courts, by the House itself. The same resolution ran for the others the Star Chamber had marked, for Leighton, for Burton, for Bastwick, for Prynne, the roster of the mutilated and the fined, the ears cropped and the cheeks branded, the old courts' whole gallery of the punished. This is the thing the machine is never supposed to do, and the rarest thing in this whole book: it condemned its own instrument, on the record, in the record's permanent words. The men who voted that resolution were not refusers, were not Levellers; they were the operators, the governors, the men oaths are meant to serve, and they looked at what the oath had been set to do and wrote five adjectives into their own book. The liberty of the subject had been named in the same sentence as the sentence's savagery, and the naming was now part of the law's memory, on the Journal's page, where it still sits.

Then the House went for the courts themselves. The acts of 1641 pulled the whole apparatus down: the Star Chamber abolished, the High Commission abolished, and with them the ex officio oath in its compulsory form, the intake pipe pulled out of the wall. They sit in the statute book at 16 Charles the First, chapters 10 and 11, the same year as the vote, the demolition written into law within months of the adjectives, the House that condemned the sentence unmaking the court that had passed it, unmaking with it the whole inquisitorial jurisdiction, and their speed is the proof of how thoroughly the instrument had been discredited: centuries of procedure, ended in a session, by the same order of men who had administered it, because the oath had asked too much and the asking had been seen. The lawyers' maxim that the refusal had planted now began its long career in the open: nemo tenetur seipsum prodere, no one is bound to betray himself, no one is bound to produce himself for his own destruction. The maxim was older than Lilburne, a canon lawyers' sentence before it was a Leveller's one, Latin and portable and older than the quarrel, and Helmholz and his company have shown how much of the privilege's prehistory runs in the church courts' own rules, the system's internal misgivings about its own instrument. What Lilburne's war did was move the misgiving from the machinery's conscience into the subject's rights. That move is the birth of the privilege against self-incrimination, and the privilege is the right to silence's ancestor, and the

refusal of 1637 is its founding document, and every one of those claims has been fought over, and the next paragraph takes the fight aboard.

The genealogy has been told too grandly, and the chapter takes the correction aboard before any critic delivers it. Leonard Levy's Origins of the Fifth Amendment, the grand account, published in 1968 and still the standard narrative, a book this book is in debt to, drew the straight line from the Lilburne struggle to the American clause, and the line is real. John Langbein's correction, delivered in 1994, is real too, and it sharpens rather than cuts: in the seventeenth century the privilege was a rule about the oath, not yet a right of silence at trial, because the trial itself still required the accused to speak, to answer, to make his own defense without help; the privilege matured only in the eighteenth century, when defense counsel arrived to make silence usable, a lawyer standing between the defendant and the questions, so that silence stopped being a confession by another name. So the straight line is a genealogy with a gap, a birth and then a long maturing, and the honest chapter keeps both facts and breaks no faith with either. The birth matters because the principle was born then and there: no man should be sworn blind into his own destruction, and the principle had a price attached, and the price had been paid in April of 1638. The maturing matters because a principle is not a machine, and it took a century of procedure to build the machinery that made the principle usable. Levy's line and Langbein's gap are both the record, and the record is big enough for both, and the book that holds only one of them is a book with an agenda instead of an argument, and this one declines the agenda.

Three hundred and twenty-eight years after the whipping, the Supreme Court of the United States told the story itself, in the words of its own majority, and told it in the ruling that every American now knows by the name of the defendant: Miranda v. Arizona, decided in June of 1966, Earl Warren writing for the five. The Court's opinion carries a history section, and in that section, at pages 458 and 459 of the official report, with footnote 27 attached, the Court names the trial of John Lilburne the critical historical event behind the privilege against self-incrimination, and quotes him, the declaration that no man's conscience ought to be racked by oaths imposed. That footnote opens on Maimonides, on the Mishneh Torah's rule, eight centuries older, that no man is declared guilty on his own admission, a bridge the Court laid itself, back across eight centuries, to the rabbi's world, where the rule was older. And the Fifth Amendment's clause, nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, ratified in 1791, is the refused oath's descendant, and the warnings that every arrest now begins with, you have the right to remain silent, anything you say, are the refusal's liturgy, read aloud by the machine to the arrested, millions of times a year, in a country that did not yet exist. The detectives who carry the card have never heard of the Star Chamber, and they carry it anyway. The circuit took three centuries to close, from the cart's tail in Palace Yard to the printed card in the arresting officer's pocket. It closes in a page of the United States Reports, and the page is real, and anyone can open it.

But the chapter's close belongs to the earlier record, to Westminster and not Washington, to the day the machine corrected itself in its own hand. May 4, 1641. The House of Commons in session, sitting in its own chamber, on its own authority, writing in its own Journal, the machine's diary. The clerk's entry is the whole scene, and the clerk is this book's own furniture: the sentence against John Lilburne, declared by the House, for the record, forever, to be illegal, and against the liberty of the subject, and bloody, wicked, cruel, barbarous, and tyrannical. Nothing in the entry is

decorated, nothing pleads, nothing performs, and no one who reads it can mistake it for anything but the machine ashamed of itself. The House did not weep, and the Journal does not exclaim, and that is what makes the page worth closing on, after three centuries of argument: the machine's own clerk, in the machine's own grammar, entering the machine's condemnation of itself. Lilburne was alive to hear of it, still inside his open-ended sentence, still unbroken, and within months the courts that had sentenced him would not exist, struck down by the same House that had struck the adjectives into its Journal. The oath that had asked too much had been answered by the one thing stronger than an oath, which is a record, honestly kept and honestly entered, in a book the House kept for exactly this purpose, so that no later age could say it did not happen. The hand that had stayed down in 1637 was, in 1641, at last described in public, in law's memory, as what it had been all along: the liberty of the subject, in five adjectives and one resolution, entered in the book, in ink, kept.

CHAPTER SEVEN

The Gatekeeper's Oath

The oath has two tenses, and the law has always known the difference even when it has refused to say so. One oath looks backward. I swear that what I am about to tell you is true, that what happened, happened, that the testimony will hold. The witness's oath is assertory: it asserts, about the past and the present, and the state arms itself against the lie with the perjury statute. The other oath looks forward. I swear that I will be faithful, that I will do the office, that I will bear allegiance, that I will keep the peace. The officer's oath is promissory: it promises, about the future, and the state cannot prosecute a future that has not happened yet. Both are gates, and the law uses both as doors, but they open different ways. The assertory oath admits a voice into the record and arms the state against it. The promissory oath admits a man into power, and what it arms is the door. Watch the second kind at work and you are watching the gatekeeper's oath, the oath as lock and key, the sentence you must say to be allowed in, and this chapter is its history, from the king's bedroom politics to the floor of the House of Commons. These two tenses have never been at peace, because the state keeps needing to know which door a man is at. The oath that looks backward guards the truth of the record. The oath that looks forward guards the constitution of the state. One produces the perjury statute; the other produces the test, the tender, the lock, the whole law of the door. The second is the older institution, older than any courtroom's swearing-in, because the promise of service is older than the law of evidence, and the king's need to know who was his long predates the court's need to know what happened.

The gatekeeper's oath has one feature the witness's oath never needs: it does not care whether you believe what you are saying, because it is not testimony. A witness who lies is a perjurer. An officer who swears the form and means nothing by it has broken no statute, because the form's function was never to detect belief. Its function was to sort. The gate oath is a screen, a filter at the threshold, and its questions are not questions and its statements are not statements. They are a password. The man who can say the words enters; the man who cannot, for whatever reason, stays outside, and the reason is usually belief, which means the door converts conscience into exclusion with the full ceremony of law. Bentham saw the seam and left a note in his own hand, in the manuscript boxes at University College: perjury is the breach of an assertory oath, never of a promissory one, and he cited Coke's chapter to prove it. The distinction is exact, and it opens a strange room. The gate oath stands outside perjury altogether, outside the one penalty the law keeps for false swearing. You cannot lie to a lock. You can only fail it, and failing it is no crime but an exclusion, and an exclusion is a cleaner instrument for a state that wants conformity than any prosecution could be, because an exclusion has no defendant, no trial, and no appeal, and the excluded man has not even been accused of anything. The gate does not punish the conscience. It simply never lets the conscience in. The witness's oath and the officer's oath share a name and

share almost nothing else, and the whole law of oaths keeps them filed apart, and the whole history of exclusion keeps confusing them on purpose.

This door is old, and its oldest form is fealty, and it begins, as so much in this book begins, with the hand. The vassal's hands went into the lord's, palm to palm, and the vow was spoken into the clasp, the body given into the lord's grasp as surety for the words; the hand catalogue has an entry here, the held hands, the oath as a grip exchanged. Fealty ran the whole medieval constitution, and allegiance and the coronation oath were the state's front and back doors, and for most of the record the words asked only about conduct, about what a man would do. The Tudor turn changed what the door asked. When the state began to use the promissory oath to sort belief instead of conduct, the gate became a creed-lock, and the swearer was asked to affirm propositions, about the church, about the sacrament, about the king's titles, and the affirming had to be done in the state's own words. That is the weaponization this chapter means. An oath of conduct can be kept by a man of any theology, and every creed in the kingdom could keep it, and did. An oath of doctrine can only be kept by a man of the right one, and the state that swears its officers on doctrine has made heresy a disqualification from the customs house, the excise, the garrison, the bench, the borough's own council chamber. The machine had discovered that a form of words could do what a court could not: exclude without trial, disquiet without punishment, and sort the kingdom's conscience at a lectern. The lectern was cheaper than the scaffold, and it never ran out.

Its first great use was the succession. Henry's break with Rome was carried out in oaths, and the Act of Succession of 1534 settled the crown on Anne's children and authorized an oath to the act's whole content, and the tender of that oath up and down the kingdom was a census of consent: say it, and you were the king's man; decline it, and you had declared yourself, without any other act, an object of suspicion. The tender went everywhere, to the clergy, to the city companies, to the universities, to the justices, and every man of substance in the kingdom was asked to say the words. The oath's brilliance, from the machine's side, was its economy. No prosecutor needed to prove anything. The tender did the work, and the refusal was the evidence. In April of 1534 the commissioners sat at Lambeth, and the most famous man in England came up from Chelsea to stand before them: the former chancellor, the author of Utopia, the lawyer's lawyer, Thomas More, fifty-six years old and out of office and writing in retirement, exactly the man the tender was designed to catch. He would swear to the succession itself, he said, since Parliament could settle the crown. What he would not swear was the offered form, the whole package with its preamble, because the preamble carried a doctrine his conscience could not take. The distinction was a lawyer's distinction, precise, limited, offered in good faith and in writing. It saved nothing. The tender was the whole point, and the man who parsed the tender had failed the test by parsing it, and he went from Lambeth to the Tower to think it over, and he thought it over for the rest of his life. The rest of his life was fifteen months.

More's answer to everything after was silence, and the silence is the chapter's load-bearing wall. He would not say the oath was unlawful, and he would not say the king was not head of the church. He refused the oath and then refused to explain the refusal, because the explanation was the thing the law was hunting, and he knew it, and his letters from inside the Tower are the letters of a man keeping his conscience in a room the law had no key to, and he said, in effect, that his conscience would stay where the law could not follow it. Under the Treasons Act of November 1534, it was

treason to wish the king's bodily harm, to slander his titles, to call him heretic or schismatic, and the prosecutors understood perfectly well that More had said none of those words. The case had to be built on construal. A silence, maintained in the right company, before witnesses, could be read as malice, and malice, under the act, could be read as treason, because the act punished the malicious denial of the king's titles and left malice to be proved by construction, and that is how a man who said nothing was convicted of speaking. The construction was the whole trial. The whole indictment was unpublished until 1932, and the old report of the trial misdates the day; the scholarship, Derrett's study of 1964, puts the trial where the record puts it, July 1, 1535, and this book dates by the scholarship. What matters here is the mechanism: the state's oath failed to get his words, so the state construed his silence into them. The gatekeeper's oath, refused at the gate, became the prosecutor's tool in court, an instrument for reading minds.

And here is the irony the chapter is built to carry, and it needs no emphasis. More refused an oath, and he was killed by one. The two instruments, the door and the record, met in one man, and the one man is why the distinction matters. The evidence that convicted him was sworn testimony: the Solicitor General, Richard Rich, the crown's second law officer, on oath, reporting a conversation in the Tower, the words in which More had denied the king's title, the one exchange the crown needed and the one More said never happened as told. More denied the conversation as Rich told it, and told the court what kind of credit such a witness carried, and the jury, all of them sworn, believed the swearer. The refuser of the oath was put to death on the strength of an oath taken, and the perjury statute that might have armed him against a lying witness did not yet exist, because perjury was still God's account and the attaint's, and the statute that would invent the crime for witnesses was thirty years in the future and of no use to the man in the Tower. Roper's Life, the son-in-law's book, is the family's record, tender and partial and precious, written out of the household's memory, and the state's record is the indictment and the sentence, and the two records do not speak to each other, then or now. He was executed on Tower Hill five days after the verdict. What is this book's is the grammar of the thing: an oath refused, an oath believed, and between them a scaffold. The gate had done its work twice, once for the man who would not swear and once for the man who did. That is the gatekeeper's oath in one picture, and the picture should be kept in view through everything that follows.

Under the Stuarts the gate became architecture. The Test Act of 1673 locked public office behind a triple door: the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, the sacrament taken by the church's own rite, and a sworn declaration that the bread and wine were not the body and blood, a man's fitness for a customs post established by what he did at an altar, the kingdom's payroll fenced with a communion rail. In the panic of 1678 the second act went after Parliament itself, and the words had an older home than the panic: they had closed the Jacobean oath of allegiance since 1606, the descent the Salomons judgment rehearses, and the settlement's abjuration acts carried them into the members' form, on the true faith of a Christian. Seven words at the end of an oath, easy to miss, and they held the door for two and a half centuries, through the fall of two kings and a republic and a restoration and a revolution, while the quarrel that wrote them was forgotten except by the men they kept out. The whole apparatus deserves to be seen for what it was. It was not a persecution machine; it prosecuted no one, and that was its elegance: a lock does not need a jailer, only a key no one else is issued. The apparatus was a lock: it asked nothing and proved nothing, and it worked by making

a form of words the condition of a career, and the men it kept out were simply never seated, never sworn, never in. The oath had become the wall around the constitution's garden, and the wall was a sentence, and the sentence was short, and it ended on those seven words. And the seven words did their work in silence: no one was prosecuted under them, no one was fined; they simply had to be there, at the end of the form, unamended.

The locks were picked slowly, and by statute, and with the machine's own tools. In 1828 the Corporation and Test Acts were repealed, and Catholic relief arrived in 1829 with a re-cut oath of its own, the door amended and kept, the words changed so that Catholics could say them. In 1858 the Jews Relief Act cut the first exemption into the clause, the seven words made omissible for a Jew, the door amended once more by the faith it had been built to keep out. The pattern to notice is the editing. England never once decided that belief was none of the door's business. England amended the door, one faith at a time, each act of Parliament a new key cut for one more house. The amendment process had a rule that nobody stated: the door stays, and the words stay, and the question of who may say them is a question Parliament answers one group at a time, when the excluded make themselves impossible to refuse. The Jews were next at the door, and their long waiting at it is the chapter's forward spine, because their exclusion was the purest test of the words, and the test had been running since the readmission, since Cromwell's decade, since the community returned to a kingdom that would not seat it. A Jew could swear every operative clause of the oath, allegiance, supremacy, duty, without a syllable of difficulty, and he was kept out by the closing seven, on the true faith of a Christian, which had nothing to do with the office and everything to do with the gate. The machine had built a filter for the Catholics and caught a different people in it a century later, an instrument outliving its errand, which is how gates are: the words outlast the quarrel they were written for, and go on holding the door against whoever comes next.

David Salomons made the gate answer a lawsuit. Elected for Greenwich in 1851, a banker of standing, an alderman of London, a man the electors had chosen with their eyes open, he went down to the House, and when the oath was tendered with its closing words, he did not take it in the prescribed form, and he sat anyway. He sat in the House, he spoke in it, he voted in it, three times, the first Jew ever to speak in the Commons, the first man to do it without the words, and every vote was a trespass the statute priced, and he knew the price, and he paid it as the cost of making the gate defend itself in court. The House responded with a resolution excluding him, carried on Lord John Russell's motion, 123 to 68, on July 28, 1851, and the law responded with a penalty suit, a common informer's action, because the statute was old and its price was exact: five hundred pounds for each sitting or vote unsworn, under the act of George the First's first years. Salomons had taken the seat his electors gave him and spoken with it, and the law's answer was not an argument about his fitness. It was, in form, an invoice. An invoice, unlike an argument, cannot be answered, only paid or litigated. The gate had been caught holding against a man the city had lawfully elected, and the gate's defenders did not defend the principle of it, because by 1851 the principle was already an embarrassment. They defended the words. The form was the law, and the form's closing words were Christian, and no Jew could say them, and that was the whole case, and it was enough.

The case went to the Court of Exchequer as Miller v. Salomons, and the judgment of April 19, 1852 is this chapter's second exhibit, and it deserves to be read against the one this book keeps for a later chapter. The court held that the words on the true faith of a Christian were a substantive part

of the oath itself, no waivable ceremony, no closing flourish: the oath's own substance, with Baron Martin dissenting, and the Exchequer Chamber affirmed, unanimously, and the rule was the rule until Parliament moved it, which is how gates work when they are legal: the courts read the words, and the words are Parliament's, and the remedy is the statute or nothing. Read the holding slowly, because it is the common law answering the deepest question an oath can pose. Is the ceremony the substance, or is the substance beneath the ceremony? Does the oath live in the belief it names or in the form it takes? A century earlier an English court had answered the same question the other way, in a cause about an Indian witness, and this book comes to that answer in its place; the two answers stand in the record as mirrors, a century apart, and the mirror answer of 1852 was: the words are the oath. The ceremony is the substance. The dissent said otherwise, and the dissent kept the other reading alive, but dissents do not seat anyone. A man who cannot say the words cannot take the oath, and a man who cannot take the oath cannot sit, and the five hundred pounds is the law's price for trying. The gate won. The words won. And the words were exactly the seven the courts had inherited from the Jacobean oath, holding the door, still, two and a half centuries on, against a religion the oath had not even foreseen.

Lionel de Rothschild's eleven years finish the lesson. Elected by the City of London in 1847, and returned by the same electors at election after election, he stood outside the door the whole time, because the City would keep choosing a man the words would keep excluding, and the standoff had no resolution inside the law as it stood. The Commons passed relief bills and the Lords stopped them, and the electors kept sending the same man, and the decade ground on. So Parliament changed the law. The Jews Relief Act of 1858 let the closing words fall away for Jewish members, and Rothschild took his seat, eleven years of forms and bills and divisions after the electors first gave it to him, and no doctrine collapsed, and no church fell, and the gate simply opened for one more house. The door moved again, an inch, by statute, exactly as the pattern said it would. But set the scene as it stood after 1858, because the scene is the next chapters' opening. The words remain in the form for everyone else, unrepealed, unamended, a live condition printed in the oath every member had to take. Edited for the Jew and the Catholic, it remains a door made of a form of words, and the question the form has never answered is the one its defenders least want asked: what happens when a man arrives who can swear the operative clauses gladly, allegiance, duty, all of it, and will say nothing about any faith at all. The gate that screened belief has no key for unbelief. For the wrong faith the law had an answer; for the absent one, none. The electors of Northampton are twenty years from sending that man to Westminster, and the form of words is waiting for him, and so is the whole law of the door.

The chapter closes where it has earned the right to close, back inside the courtroom of July 1, 1535, on the construal of a silence. Westminster Hall, the special commission sitting in the great hall, the former chancellor at the bar in the prisoner's place, ill and thin from the Tower's year, leaning on the staff they let him carry, fifty-seven and grey with it. The crown's whole case was the construed silence and the sworn conversation, and More, the best lawyer in the building by some distance, understood exactly what was being done to him, because construal was a lawyer's art and he had practiced it for the king. The jury went out. They were not out long; the record's accounts make it a short deliberation, and a short deliberation in a treason case is its own statement. The record gives the verdict, guilty, and the record gives the sentence, the full ancient sentence

of treason, the drawing and the quartering, commuted to the axe, and the record does not give, anywhere, the sound in the hall when the silence was finally read aloud as treason. That is the construal this chapter leaves on: a courtroom full of men who had taken every oath the century could print, allegiance, supremacy, the jurors' own, listening as the law converted a man's refusal to speak into his words of treason. The gatekeepers had their gates, and the promissory oath had its door; in the hall that day an assertory oath, a witness's sworn sentence, did the killing. So the backward-looking oath killed the man the forward-looking one could not convert. The silence was construed. The record construed it. And the record, unlike the silence, has never stopped being read.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Inventing Perjury

The crime of perjury has a birthday, and the birthday is a statute, and the statute is still legible. In 1563, in the fifth year of Elizabeth, in the same statute book that was busy with the queen's other works, Parliament passed an act with a long title in the period's own spelling: An Act for the Punyshement of suche persones as shall procure or comit any wyllfull Perjurye. Read the title the way the age wrote it, because the age had never written it before. The punishment of willful perjury, by act of Parliament, by the state, for witnesses. Before that act, in all the centuries of oaths this book has walked, the swearing witness had no statutory crime attached to him in English law, with one older root worth naming: the embracery act of 1540 had punished the procurer inside the maintenance statute, and the suborner's line runs back that far. The witness's own crime has one birthday. After the act, the forsworn witness was a criminal, prosecutable by the crown, punishable in this world, and the whole modern law of perjury descends from that single Elizabethan work. The act stayed on the books for three hundred forty-eight years, made perpetual in 1586, and it fell when the consolidation that is the modern Perjury Act swept it, the 1911 statute whose own nineteenth section held its commencement to the first day of 1912, the repeal schedule carrying the old title, quoted word for word in the instrument that finally replaced it. The truth system had spent this whole book so far running on the gods' credit, the next world's penalty administered by this world's conscience. In 1563 the state began writing the penalty itself, in statute, and this chapter is the account of the invention: what the lie under oath was before it, what the act did, and what the modern courtroom inherited.

The world before the birthday was not a world in which perjury was free, and it was not a world in which it was safe. It was a world in which perjury was a sin, and the difference is the chapter's first lesson, and the lesson is worth learning slowly. Paul Cavill's study of early Tudor England maps it: perjury was an offense against God, against oneself, and against others, in the church's own threefold analysis, and it was prosecuted first in the church's orbit, in the courts Christian, where the forsworn man did penance, paid his fine to the court's conscience, and took his shame home, and his neighbors watched him take it. The penalty was penance and infamy; prison was nowhere in it: the public act before the congregation, the name gone in the parish. The royal courts touched the matter at the edges, and the drift toward them had begun by Henry's reign, slowly at first and then faster, the common law expanding into ground the church courts were being forced to vacate, but the center of gravity was still the church. Understand the arrangement before dismissing it, because it is the old arrangement this whole book has been tracking, the curse's long address: the oath's penalty lived in the next world, administered in this one by the church, and the state's concern with it was indirect. The forsworn witness risked his soul and his standing, and the risk was real, and everyone in the courtroom believed in it, and no statute anywhere said a word about

it. The sin was punished, after a fashion, by the court of conscience. But the crime did not exist, because no statute had written it, and the common law had not claimed it.

The common law had exactly one instrument for the lie under oath, and it did not fit the witness at all. The attaint was the remedy against a jury's false verdict: the injured party prayed for it, and a second jury, twenty-four this time, was empaneled to convict the first twelve of a false oath, and the attainted jurors lost their lands, their goods, their credit, and their liberty, and their verdict was reversed. It was a savage remedy, rarely used and much complained of, and it was all the common law had. It was a remedy against jurors, for their oaths, and it reached nothing else. A witness who lied his way through another man's trial, whose false sentence took the land or the life, faced no attaint, because the attaint asked whether the jurors' oath had been false, and the witness had taken a different oath, and the common law had no second instrument. Hudson, writing his treatise on the Star Chamber in 1621 for the instruction of the new lord keeper, John Williams, explains the division of labor the way only an insider can: Star Chamber punished perjury, and it mostly left jurors alone, because jurors had their own remedy in the attaint, and the court's business was the forsworn who had no other punisher. The witnesses, the deponents, the swearers in the chamber's own written proofs: those were the court's game, and the chamber hunted them through its own paperwork. The attaint covered the jury's oath, and only the jury's oath. Everything else under oath belonged, by default and by drift, to the chamber or to God, and the chamber's reach was exactly as long as its paperwork.

So the gap the 1563 act filled can be stated precisely, and precision matters here because the act is the book's central exhibit. The witness's oath was the oath that mattered most and punished least, the one oath in the building on which verdicts, and so lives and estates, in fact turned. The juror risked the attaint; the witness risked penance. Other oaths had their accountings: the defendant's, the compurgators', the jurors', while the testimony itself, the sworn sentence on which the whole trial turned, stood outside every worldly penalty. The church courts were losing their grip in the decades before Elizabeth, the Reformation having broken their authority's spine, and the vacuum was visible to anyone who ran a courtroom: the apparatus this book has watched being built, the sworn inquest, the trying jury, the examined witness, was now running on oaths that no earthly court punished. Only in heaven had the oath been armed against the witness's lie, and heaven's arm was perceived, by the men who drafted statutes, to need reinforcement, and the men were not wrong about the perception; the age's own witnesses said the perjury was everywhere and the penalties were nowhere. Cavill's account puts the statute in that exact drift: the common law expanding into the ground the church courts had been forced to vacate, the crown's lawyers stepping into a forfeited jurisdiction with a statute in hand. The state did not invent the sin. The state annexed it, the way it annexes anything it cannot afford to leave in another jurisdiction, with a statute, in black and white, with a penalty attached, and the annexation's instrument was the element: the oath, the proceeding, the material matter, the willful lie.

Gordon's two studies, published the same year, 1980, one in the law journal and one in the Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, are the statute's biography, and their two titles tell its two halves. The first is the famous one, the law-journal article: The Invention of a Common Law Crime. The second is the confession: The Perjury Statute of 1563: A Case History of Confusion. Both are true, and the chapter needs both, because the invention was untidy, as inventions are.

The act of the fifth of Elizabeth, chapter 9, punished the procurers and the committers of willful perjury in sworn matters, in courts, in depositions, which is to say it caught the suborner along with the swearer, the man who bought the lie with the man who told it, and its drafting was a muddle that the courts had to read into shape, clause by clause and case by case, which is what Gordon's second study documents in its case history of the confusion. The confusion matters for this book's argument, because it shows the state improvising: the elements we now recite, the lawful oath, the judicial proceeding, the material matter, the willful falsehood, were not handed down in the act's clean text. They were worked out in the courts, over generations, on the act's imperfect language. The birthday produced an infant, and the infant had to be raised. It began life temporary, and the continuance act of 1586 made it perpetual by its first section, its own kind of testimony to the invention's success. The raising took a century, and the court that did most of it was the one this book has already watched die: the Star Chamber.

A hostile reader arrives here with a better case than usual, and the chapter grants it at full strength before answering it. Invention is a strong word, and the record is against it, says the objector: the sin of perjury is as old as the oath, the church punished it for centuries, the attaint punished jurors for it, the Star Chamber was punishing it in Henry's reign, and nothing is ever invented twice at a date certain. A statute that enters an old jurisdiction is a change of venue, says the objector, and no birth at all. Granted, and gladly: the offense is ancient, the guilt is old, the shame is older than England. The chapter's claim is narrower, and it is the narrowing that matters. What 1563 invented was the crime, the statutory, state-prosecuted, element-defined crime of perjury for the witness, the thing with a long title and a penalty and a place in the crown's courts. The sin had always existed; the crime had not, and the difference between them is the whole history of this book in miniature. A sin belongs to the sinner's soul and its punishers. A crime belongs to the state, and it has elements, and the elements can be read on a page, and the first of them is the oath. The objector is right that no one invented lying under oath. The statute invented punishing it, for witnesses, by the crown, with elements, and Gordon's own title says so, and the confusion his second study documents is the confusion of an invention, and never of a reissue. So the birthday stands, and the birthday is the point: there is a date before which the forsworn witness feared God and the church, and a date after which he feared the crown, and the date is 1563.

The fight over who owned the new crime started almost at its birth, and the record has a date for it. In 1565, two years after the act, Onslow's Case put the question of who could punish perjury squarely between the King's Bench and the Star Chamber, and the case stands at 2 Dyer 242b in the reports, a small entry for a large fight. The question was jurisdictional and it was structural: the statute had created a crime, and the crime needed a court, and the court that had been punishing the forsworn for a century was the chamber, and the common-law courts wanted the new statute read their way. The chamber kept its perjury business, and the business grew with the century's litigation, because the chamber's procedure was written, depositions sworn before examiners, and a written deposition is a perjury case waiting to be compared, line against line, oath against oath. Hudson's treatise, composed for the lord keeper in 1621 and printed at last in 1792 in the second volume of the Collectanea Juridica, is the manual of that jurisdiction, written for the instruction of the man who had just taken its seat, and its pages on perjury and on the attaint's exclusivity are this chapter's inside witness, its clerk's handbook. The machine that Lilburne refused, in the sixth

chapter, for its ex officio oath, was at the same time the machine that taught the law what a willful false oath in a judicial matter was. No one is asked here to admire the chamber; only to see it whole. The same court. The same decades. Its instruments were interchangeable, and both were built on the sworn word.

The punishment had a public face, and the face was the point. William Harrison's Description of England, the Elizabethan survey of the whole national life, gives the perjurer's price in the period's own terms, in its inventory of punishments: the pillory, and the letter P burned into the forehead, the forsworn marked on the face for the town to read. An earlier chapter used Harrison's letter as evidence against a modern legend, and here the letter stands in its own context, which is worse than the legend, because the legend at least pictured the inspection discreet. The legend's imaginary court inspected a palm for a brand; the real punishment put the brand where no inspection was needed: on the face, with the crowd reading the letter off the man's skin, the way a sign is read. The pillory itself is the hand catalogue's punitive entry, since the boards held the head and the hands at once, the whole swearing apparatus, the mouth that spoke and the hand that rose, locked in the frame while the town looked. It was publication, in an age when publication was a market square and a crowd. The state did not merely punish the false swearer; it turned him into a text, P for perjurer, public, readable at a glance, legible to children, durable for years. And the crime got its most famous body a generation after the statute settled in: Titus Oates, the Popish Plot's whole invention, the man whose sworn tales had sent men to the scaffold, convicted of perjury in 1685 on his own trial testimony, and sentenced to the pillory and the whip and prison for life, the machine's new crime firing at last on the man who had spent years feeding it. The missing half of the sentence had found a new address, and the address was the statute, and the statute's notice to the public was written in flesh.

Coke, the old enemy of the chamber, the common law's own titan, gave the new crime its classical definition, and the definition opens, as everything in this book opens, on the oath. The Third Institute, ordered into print by Parliament seven years after his death and reaching print in 1644, carries the perjury chapter, and the chapter begins the crime at the taking: perjury is committed, says Coke, when a lawful oath is administered, in a judicial proceeding, to one who swears willfully, absolutely, and falsely in a matter material. Every word of that works, and each word is a wall. Lawful: the oath must be real, administered by someone with the power to administer it, the oath of the court and not the oath of the tavern. Judicial: the setting must be a proceeding, an issue joined, a matter before a tribunal, and not a promise over dinner. Willful: the lie must be meant, the swearer knowing, the falsehood deliberate and not the mistake of a frightened or a muddled man. Absolute: the falsehood flat, never hedged into a shrug. False: untrue in fact, which is harder to prove than anyone who has never prosecuted it supposes. Material: the lie must matter to the question at issue, because a lie about nothing is perjury about nothing. Coke's sentence is the statute's child, polished, the elements worked out of the Elizabethan act's muddy text by two generations of courtroom use, and it is still the recitation, quoted by the commentators and carried by the codes, and every modern perjury statute is written in its shadow. The crime has elements the way an engine has parts, and Coke laid them out like a man who had watched them fail in court.

Blackstone adds the negative space, and the negative space is where this book lives, because the negative space is the proof that the oath is a jurisdiction and no figure of speech. The law, says the

fourth Commentaries, carrying Coke's definition forward nearly word for word, counts all other oaths unnecessary and will punish no breach of them. It deserves a pause, and a second reading. Two men swear identical falsehoods in identical words on the same day, one in the witness box and one in the tavern's wager, and the law's answer differs entirely: the first is a felony, the second is not even a trespass. The oath the law did not authorize is an oath the law will not avenge, and the sworn word outside the proceeding is just air with a formula in it. This is the dependency stated from the inside, by the machine's own jurist: the oath does not travel with the words. It exists where the law says it exists, and nowhere else. A private oath, a voluntary oath, a vow to God sworn alone at midnight, an oath before an officer with no power to administer it: none of them can be perjured, because none of them is, in the law's eye, an oath at all. The vow to God is a real vow, and heaven may keep its own ledger, but the state will not read it. The crime's first element is not the lie. It is the state's own sentence, administered, authorized, on the record, and the lie is only the crime's occasion, the thing the oath was there to prevent and the statute is there to punish. The oath is the crime's jurisdiction, its venue, its citizenship. Without the oath, there is nothing to breach.

And the modern floor is the same floor; the descent shows in the opening words. The federal perjury statute of the United States, title 18, section 1621, opens on the taken oath: whoever, having taken an oath before a competent tribunal, officer, or person, willfully and contrary to that oath states or subscribes any material matter which he does not believe to be true. The English consolidation, the Perjury Act 1911, opens on the witness lawfully sworn: if any person lawfully sworn as a witness or as an interpreter in a judicial proceeding wilfully makes a statement material in that proceeding which he knows to be false or does not believe to be true. No oath, no perjury, in both codes, at the top of both sections, in the first line. The elements in both are Coke's elements, lawful oath, judicial proceeding, willful, false, material, four hundred years downstream of the Elizabethan act, and no one has improved on the list, because the list was the crime's anatomy from the beginning. In the 1911 act's own schedule sits the chain's proof, its repeal list a genealogy read backward: it repeals the 1563 act whole, and the Georgian middle step with it, the Perjury Act of 1728, the escalation against forgery and subornation, and the chain reads 1563 to 1728 to 1911, three statutes, three and a half centuries, one crime. The 1563 long title survives only inside the repeal schedule of the act that replaced it, the epitaph quoted in the successor's mouth. By then the invention had become the institution, and the institution still begins, as the crime began, with the oath, and ends, as the crime ends, with the question of what the swearer believed.

The dependency can be demonstrated in one move, and the demonstration is this book's central receipt. Read the perjury statute and strike the oath's element, as a reader can do in a minute, and nothing is left, and do the same in the other direction as a control: strike the falsehood and keep the oath, and the crime dissolves too, because the crime is the compound, the oath and the lie together, the formula and its breach. There is no residual offense, no lesser included, no fallback charge for the unsworn liar; the false statement, unsworn, is not perjury, and the law shrugs at it. The oath is the first element, the one the rest are bolted to, the qualifying act without which the subsequent falsehood is morally odious and legally nothing; everything else is decoration, circumstance, aggravation. Perjury is the proof that the oath is load-bearing: remove the ritual, and the penalty structure of testimony has nothing left to attach to. The state never wrote a law against lying in general. It wrote a law against lying under the spell, and the spell is the precondition, and that is the depen-

dency, in statutory black and white. One boundary needs naming: the twentieth century's general false-statements statute, 18 U.S.C. 1001, and the fraud statutes beside it, punish the lie inside a defined transaction, a statement to the government, a filing, and neither is perjury, because neither asks for the administered sentence, and neither punishes lying in general, and both are latecomers beside 1563. The claim is narrower, and it survives them: it is a claim about the common-law record this book walks. Germany's criminal code, section 153, has punished unsworn false testimony for a century and more, three months to five years, and the book prints the counterexample by its own rule. In the common-law world, for testimony, there is no fallback charge, and there never has been.

And the modern law keeps one sharp limit, and the limit proves the machine's nature better than any expansion could. In 1973 the Supreme Court decided Bronston v. United States, a bankruptcy case out of a movie-theater business, and the question was whether a literally true answer, crafted to mislead, is perjury. The exchange under examination was this, and it is worth quoting in its small entirety: asked whether he had ever had a Swiss bank account, Bronston answered that the company had one, for about six months, in Zurich, which was true of the company and false of him, and the record shows the design, the personal account existing and unmentioned. The Court held it was not perjury: the oath binds against the outright lie, the false statement, and a literally true sentence, however misleading, however intended to deceive, is for the questioner to penetrate, and not for the statute to punish. For evasion, said the Court, the remedy is the sharper question, the competent cross-examination, the follow-up that pins the witness; the perjury statute is not a net for the cunning, and it was never meant to be, because a statute that punished implication would make every witness's lawyer the real examiner, and no court wants that trial. Here is the dependency's other face, and it is worth a long look. The oath arms the state against the false swearer, and only against him, and the wily true-speaker walks free under the same formula that convicts the liar. And the machine knows its own edges. The oath catches the false sentence, and the false sentence alone, and the truth, arranged to deceive, is outside the oath's jurisdiction entirely.

There is one working substitute for the oath's sanction in the whole law of testimony, one place where the machine accepts the unsworn sentence, and the exception is old and it proves the rule by dying. The declaration of the dying: a statement made by a person who believes death is at hand, about the cause of that death, received in a homicide trial without any oath at all, the one hole in the hearsay wall the old law ever cut for it. The theory is the oath's own theory with a different engine: the approach of death stands in for the sanction, the next world collecting its own security, the law reasoning that a man who is dying has no earthly account left to cook. Whether the theory is true is a question for the companion volume; that the law believes it is this chapter's point. Death is the oath's one accepted stand-in, the one sanction the common law ever trusted in the oath's place, and the exception's shape is the proof of the rule's shape: where there is no oath, the law needs something else that kills lying, and the only something it has ever found is the end of the world for the speaker, the last tribunal's approach. This book's companion volume, No One Dies Lying: Last Words on Trial, holds the dying words and the scaffold speech and the whole law of the last statement, and this book points there once, as the architecture provides, and the pointer is now made, and the border is closed for good. The exception stands in this chapter for one reason only: it shows the rule working without its instrument, once, at the last.

So the machine is complete, and its completion can now be drawn as a single line across the whole movement, and the line is this movement's whole account. The lie under oath began as God's account, the self-curse of the first chapter, the penalty aimed at heaven and collected there or not at all. The wax melted, the stone fell, the ring reddened, and none of them ever produced a conviction. It became the church's account, penance and infamy in the courts Christian; then the jury's account, the attaint's twenty-four against the first twelve; then the chamber's account, the court of the sworn deposition; and then, in 1563, the statute's account, the crown's prosecution, the pillory and the letter and the fine, and the statute's account it remains. God, then the church, then the attaint, then the chamber, then the statute: the punishment half of the oath, amputated from the formula in the first chapter, has been migrating downward through every era, from the next world into this one, from the soul's peril into the body's file, each era's punisher more worldly than the last, each address closer to a code, and the migration's last stop before the present is the criminal code, and there is no worldlier punisher than the statute, unless the paper itself becomes the punisher, which is another movement's account. The oath's missing half was never missing. It was moving, and the modern courtroom is where it landed, and the formula the witness speaks is the stump, and the statute on the books behind the judge is the rest of the sentence, and the two have never since been separated in the law, whatever the witness believes.

The close belongs to the statute's own words, and they deserve to be read as the period wrote them, slowly, the way a birth certificate deserves reading, line by line. An Act for the Punyshement of suche persones as shall procure or comit any wyllfull Perjurye. The spelling is four hundred and sixty years old and the sentence is this morning's, in any courtroom you care to sit in. Punyshement: the state now names the penalty, out loud, in the title, in the first word of its own description of itself, which the old formulas never did, because the old formulas kept the punishment in the conditional and in the next world, and the statute's whole being is the punishment's relocation. Procure or comit: the buyer and the seller of the lie, the suborner and the swearer, both in one net, from the first day. Wyllfull Perjurye: the lie must be meant, the element Coke would polish and the statutes still carry, the willfulness that separates the crime from the error, the state's acknowledgment that it punishes only the knowing, the old sin's own shape surviving inside the new crime. Every modern word of the crime is in the old title, in the old spelling, and the old spelling is the proof of the descent, because you can read the sentence in a modern courtroom and it parses. The machine's central crime was invented by a statute, and the statute said so itself, in its title, in 1563. The words are the birthday, and the birthday is the book's proof: perjury is the oath's child, and the oath is the small spell, and the statute is the spell's enforcement arm, and the whole truth system runs on all three, in that order, every working day. And the witness from the first page is still mid-sentence, hand in the air, and now a statute stands behind him.

CHAPTER NINE

The People Called Quakers

In 1678 an English courtroom produced the perfect scene for this movement's opening, and the record of it is the reason it opens here. A thief was caught and tried, and the man he stole from was a Quaker, and the Quaker would not swear. The book was offered to the victim, in the ordinary way, and the victim declined it, in the ordinary way of his people, and the court had no other way to hear him. Brayn is the name the record keeps it under. The evidence existed; the thief was guilty of a kind of theft that was a hanging matter; the victim's testimony was the case, and his testimony was unavailable at law, because the law's ear heard only sworn words. And the victim belonged to a people who would sooner rot than swear, and so the sworn sentence was never spoken, and the thief was acquitted for want of it, and he walked out of the court a free man, and the Quaker went to jail. The scene repays reading until it hurts. The apparatus of testimony, built over three thousand years to make words count, had just freed a thief and jailed his victim, because the victim declined the ritual that made words count. For the criminal the law had an answer; for the conscientious, none. The whole town watched it happen, the acquittal and the commitment in the same hour, and no one could call it unlawful, because it was exactly what the law required. That is the opening this movement needs, because it shows the system's failure mode in a single afternoon: the oath that was supposed to guard the truth had become the truth's obstacle, and the man who would not speak the formula was the only honest man in the room, and the room had no use for him.

The people in that room's shadow were the Friends. Their enemies named them Quakers, and the name stuck, and the statutes print it. Their rule was the verse. The Quakers had been gathered for a generation by then, out of George Fox's wanderings in the 1650s, out of the steeple-houses and the market crosses, with their plain language and their refused titles and their kept hats, a Christianity with the machinery removed, no clergy, no liturgy, no forms, and above all no oaths, and they carried the fourth chapter's sentence at its full width, the verse as their charter: swear not at all, neither by heaven, nor by the earth, nor by anything else, because you cannot make one hair white or black. For them the verse was not a counsel for the strong or a decoration for the learned. It was the rule for everyone, and it cost what rules cost. They would not swear allegiance, would not swear in court, would not swear at the assizes, would not swear at the levy or the hustings or the quarter sessions. Every gate in the kingdom was made of an oath, and the Friends would not

say the words, and so every door in the kingdom's public life was closed to them, and the state read their silence the way the state had learned to read silence since More: as contempt, as danger, as a refusal of the whole arrangement by which the kingdom held together. To the state they were a standing no. They knew it. They did not swear, and they paid, and the paying is the next three paragraphs of this chapter, and the paragraphs after that are what the paying bought.

The law aimed at them by name. The Quaker Act of 1662 put the refusal to swear at the center of a statute, the first Parliament of the Restoration aiming its law at the people who would not say its sentences, and its machinery was the machinery of the sufferings: fines for the first offense and the second, imprisonment with hard labor for the man who could not pay, and at the top of the ladder, for the third offense, abjuration of the realm or transportation. And the state kept an older instrument beside the ladder: the praemunire, the old royal penalty out of the statutes against foreign jurisdiction, revived for the purpose on the Oath of Allegiance: out of the King's protection, the estate forfeit, the imprisonment at pleasure, the whole civil death of the unprotected. Praemunire is the law's self-defense in its purest form, and it deserves a slow look: it did not punish anything the man had done. It punished his standing: the unsworn man was put outside the law's protection, his goods exposed, his liberty at the King's pleasure, his oathlessness itself the offense. The refusal of the sentence was made into the crime, which is the oath-state's logic at its purest: the oath is the law's ligature, and to refuse it is to cut the ligature, and cutting the ligature is the offense. And the act worked, in the way such acts work, which is to say it filled the prisons and emptied none of the meetings. The Friends kept refusing. The jails kept filling. Their accounting of the decade, when they made it, was the accounting of a people at war with a formula, and the formula was winning every battle and losing the war, because the people who would not swear were still not swearing, and their sufferings were becoming the most documented persecution of the English seventeenth century.

The documentation has a name and a size, and the numbers in this paragraph come at its grade or they do not print. Joseph Besse's Collection of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers, two folio volumes, 1753, built from the Great Books of Sufferings the meetings had kept with a clerk's patience, county by county, name by name, is the persecution's archive, and it is the kind of archive only a persecuted people keeps: complete, itemized, and meant, someday, for the record of a better day. The counts were taken by the sufferers, which is why the modern method check matters, and the check holds. The Society of Friends' own Library account of it records the thousands jailed and the four hundred or more who died in prison before the Toleration Act of 1689, and the modern scholarship, Braithwaite's note behind the four hundred, Vann's method check on Besse's compilation, stands the count up. One modern estimate runs near fifteen thousand persecuted between 1652 and the coming of toleration, about one in three of all the Friends then living, a proportion with no modern parallel in the record of speech, for the sentences they would not say. The texture numbers are the ones to hold: 119 prisoners across England in one count in 1658; 535 arrests in Yorkshire alone in two months of 1660; 2,100 taken from five London meetings within a year of the Conventicle Act of 1664. Those are not the numbers of a nuisance. They are the numbers of a structural conflict, a state spending real money on a people's refusal to say a sentence, and the money bought nothing, because the sentence was still unsaid at the end of it.

George Fox's own account of the sworn state's thesis survives from the bench, and the Journal keeps the Lancaster days in their own order. The first scene is March of 1664, the examination before Judge Twysden. The second is the August assizes of the same year, before Justice Turner, and there the Oath of Allegiance was tendered to him, and he refused it, and the Journal keeps his side: the tender was the last snare, after the other charges had cleared, and the presiding justice told him, in open court, the whole theory of the thing: the King was sworn, the Parliament was sworn, the justices themselves were sworn, and the law was preserved by oaths. Sit with that sentence: it is the sworn state's whole answer to the refuser, delivered from the bench to his face, and it is this chapter's hinge. The case against Fox was rotten in its particulars, which matters: the indictment omitted the word subject, and it dated the sessions to a day on which no sessions sat, and the judge confessed the error in open court, and at the following assizes the praemunire was recorded against him anyway, out of his hearing: his own account says he was never brought to hear it, and learned of the sentence only at Scarborough. Margaret Fell had been sentenced before him. His own imprisonment ran from Lancaster to Scarborough and ended in September of 1666. The indictment's defects and the conviction's survival tell you what the trial was. It was not a trial about a date or a word. It was the state defending the oath itself, against a man, with everything it had. One modern account of the Lancashire oath war folds the August exchange back into the March examination, citing the Journal's own pages for it; the Journal's sequence is the correction, and this chapter keeps the Journal's order, all three scenes of it.

The justice's sentence deserves its own paragraph, because it is the oath-state's constitution stated aloud, and no one who administered the courts would have found it controversial. The law was preserved by oaths. Grant it its full strength first: it was true, and everyone in the courtroom knew it. The king's peace ran on the coronation oath; the courts ran on the jurors' and the witnesses' oaths; the offices ran on the oaths of allegiance and supremacy; the army ran on the sacramentum's descendants; the parish ran on its sworn accounts. The whole public life of the kingdom was a structure of sworn sentences, and the Friends were standing in it without having spoken any of them. A state of oaths is a state that must defend its oaths, and the refuser is no crank at its edge; he is a crack in its floor, because if one man's unsworn word is admitted, the oath is no longer the floor, it is one option among others, and the whole building's weight shifts. This is why the justice's sentence was not rhetoric. It was a structural report, and it was accurate. The Friends understood this as clearly as the justice did. That is why their refusal was never a tactic, and why the state's answer was never proportionate, because proportion has no meaning when the floor itself is at stake. They were not asking for an exemption from the machine's rules. They were declining the machine, and the machine answered with the praemunire and the jail, and neither side misunderstood the other for a moment. The law was preserved by oaths, and the Friends were the proof, because the law spent thirty years and fifteen thousand sufferings failing to make them say the words.

When the relief came, it came as a statute with a preamble that reads like an indictment of the machine by the machine. The act of the 1695 session, the Quakers Act, given royal assent on April 27, 1696 and in force from May 4, recites the mischief in its own words, and the words are worth hearing as the state's own confession: the Quakers imprisoned, their estates sequestered by process of contempt, to the ruin of themselves and their families. The state's own statute book had begun to describe the sufferings the state's own courts had caused, which is how the statute book corrects

itself: late, in print, with the damage named. It gave the Friends a new sentence to say in the oath's place, and the form it prescribed opened, I A.B. do declare in the Presence of Almighty God, and closed on the witness of the truth of what is said, and it was offered in the courts and for some of the offices the law had closed to them, a narrow opening, hedged and timed, but an opening cut into the statute book itself, in black and white. It was temporary, a five-year experiment in mercy, set to run its five years and to die at the end of the session after them, in April of 1702, and the continuation act of 1701 carried it eleven years further, and the renewals are their own testimony about the thing being tried. The affirmation had entered the law of England for the first time. The oath had a lawful substitute, and the substitute had a form, and the form was about to cause its own crisis, because the law had cut the carve-out for the refusers and had put God into it.

Section three of the 1696 act is the find this chapter was built around, and it deserves a plain reading. A false affirmation, says the statute's third section, incurs the same penalties and forfeitures as wilful and corrupt perjury, the whole Elizabethan schedule, applied to the new words. The new sentence got the old trigger, and it got it in the same act that created it, in its third section, before anyone had spoken the form in a court. The affirmation had been invented five minutes before, as the oath's merciful substitute, and the statute wired it straight into the perjury law at its birth, the same penalties, the same forfeitures, no discount for the clean hands of the conscientious. This is the machine's deepest habit, and the book's last chapter will echo it across two hundred eighty years: when the American Congress in 1976 let a signed declaration do the oath's whole legal work, it punished the false declaration as perjury in the same breath, the exact move the Quakers Act made in 1696. The substitute sentence is never trusted on its own. It is always given the trigger, because the trigger is the point. The oath's missing half, the punishment clause the formula had amputated, was simply attached to the new words by statute, and the affirmation never needed a curse in its grammar, because the law had one ready in the act's third section. The refusers had won a form of words, and the machine had kept the penalty, and both facts are the relief's true nature: an opening with a tripwire across it. That is the relief act's whole lesson, and the whole movement runs on it: the words change, the wire stays.

Then the carve-out failed its own beneficiaries, which is the miniature this movement's whole argument is hiding in. The 1696 form still called God to witness, do declare in the Presence of Almighty God, and to many Friends, in the north and in the south, the new sentence was the old offense wearing a waiver, because the Presence was the whole problem, and the waiver had kept it. They had refused to swear because swearing invoked God to guarantee a human word, and the affirmation invoked God to guarantee a human word, and the difference between them was a lawyer's difference, and the Friends were not lawyers. The Friends' own historians document the split, Braithwaite's pages and the pamphlet literature of 1721, and the objectors' own paper survives in the manuscript record, unsigned, undated, asking for a simpler affirmation, the existing form too close to an oath for consciences to sanction: the wording had been accepted as an expedient by the men lobbying Parliament, the men in the room where the drafting happened, and many Friends refused it anyway, and the pamphlet war printed the quarrel in public, the Friends' own presses carrying both sides. So the law had to learn twice in a single generation, and the second lesson was the harder one for the law to credit. First it learned that the Quakers would not swear, and it cut them a carve-out. Then it learned that the purest refusers would not say the carve-out, because the carve-out was still

the oath's grammar wearing a new label, and it had to cut again. A machine that learns by stages is still a machine, and a people that refuses by principle is still unconquered, and the second learning is the one that proves the principle was real: they were not bargaining for a better formula. There was no formula they would take that still called God to stand behind it.

The second cut produced the words that still survive. The Georgian act, in the eighth year of George the First, after the controversy and the pamphlets and the continued imprisonments had shown Parliament exactly where the line was, re-cut the form, and the re-cut form is the one a modern affidavit still speaks: I do solemnly, sincerely, and truly declare and affirm. These words repay reading against the oath's whole history. No God, no witness; no heaven, no book, no kiss. The sentence has lost the address entirely, lost the last echo of the conditional, and kept only the performance, the solemn declaration, the sincere, the true. It is the oath's stump with the stump removed, the formula with the conditional's last echo filed off, a bare undertaking, and it is the law's final answer to the people who would not swear: the words no longer name anyone who could punish, and the penalty lives in the statute anyway, so the sentence's grammar is empty and the sentence's consequences are full. Nothing more was asked by the Friends, and they would have taken less. The same year's logic traveled across the ocean: the Pennsylvania statute of 1724 recited the Georgian act as the act granting further ease by enacting other forms, and the colony the Friends had founded ran on the clean form from its own courts, the words naturalized in America within two years of their English birth. The affirmation had been refined into its permanent shape, in England and in the Quaker colony at once, and the shape has never changed since. Both Englands, the old one and the one across the water, now swear their objecting witnesses on the same plain sentence.

Pennsylvania deserves its own paragraph, because it is the rehearsal for the republic's whole answer. The colony was the Friends' own foundation, Penn's grant, the Holy Experiment, and its courts ran affirmation-friendly from the beginning, the affirmation available to every witness and official as the colony's ordinary practice, written into its early statutes, and no one's carve-out at all, and confirmed against every attempt to undo it. A whole polity ran on the substitute sentence, and its courts worked, and its records are the proof that the oath's absence kills nothing. The sky over Philadelphia never fell, and the crown's reviewers, who looked at the colony's laws with suspicion for half a century, never once found the affirmation to be the thing that broke them. The affirmation worked because the people who used it meant it, and the statute's third section stood behind it, and the courts ran. Witnesses testified, juries sat, officers served, judgments were enforced, and the formula that the mother country had treated as the floor of law itself turned out to be, in the Friends' experiment, optional. Sixty years later, when the framers of the American Constitution wrote the presidential oath, they wrote or Affirmation into its text, and when they welded the oath clause to the ban on religious tests, the colonial rehearsal was behind them. The thirteenth chapter of this book will take the constitutional text; this chapter's point is the rehearsal. The affirmation was not a theory in 1789. It was a practice, sixty years old, that had never once collapsed a courtroom, a running disproof of the Lancaster thesis: the law there was not preserved by oaths, and the law stood, and sixty years of standing is an answer.

The widening after that ran on the same ratchet, and the ratchet's steps are the statute chain the book's research has laid out. In 1749 Parliament extended the same limited privileges to the Moravians, the Unitas Fratrum, another people who would not swear, the carve-out cut again for

one more house, the concession pattern by now routine. The Quakers and Moravians Act of 1833 widened the affirmation's reach again. The Common Law Procedure Act of 1854 let the conscientious affirm in civil cases, the court satisfied that the oath would not bind the witness's conscience. In 1869 and 1870 the two Evidence Amendment Acts admitted even the unbeliever, the man without a God to swear by, wherever the judge found the oath unbinding on his conscience, a clause that would have been unthinkable in 1696, and the two acts are the ones the Oaths Act of 1888 would later sweep into its own schedule. Every step was the same step in the same order: the refusal or the exclusion first, the scandal or the inconvenience next, the statute's amendment last, the law learning one more time and never learning generally. The statute book of the period reads, in this corner, like a series of apologies, each one partial, each one forced. And the holes never moved. Civil courts and some offices took the affirmation; the criminal court, the jury box, the high offices of the Crown stayed closed, because the witness's truth and the voter's loyalty could be entrusted to an affirmation, and the kingdom's own membership could not, the oath still guarding the doors the state cared most about. The carve-out was real, and it was partial, and its limits were the shape of the trap the next century's refuser would walk into, and the trap was old before he was born.

Those holes are this movement's forward hinge, and they deserve a paragraph of their own. The affirmation got a Quaker into the civil witness box and kept him out of the criminal one, kept him out of the jury, kept him out of the office under the Crown, and the shape of those exclusions is exact, and that shape, merciful and incomplete, persisted for nearly two centuries, a statute of relief with its limits printed in. The machine had learned to admit the refuser's words and not to admit the refuser. A man who fails every form of the words, who believes in no God to invoke and will not pretend one, had no statute at all, until the evidence acts of 1869 and 1870, and even those left the doors the state cared about locked. The unbelieving witness could testify, after 1870, where the judge found his conscience unbound by the oath; the member of Parliament could not take his seat on any such finding, because the House's oath stood in older statutes than the evidence acts reached. The affirmation was mercy with a floor plan, and the floor plan kept its locked rooms. So when this book's central refuser arrives at the House of Commons in 1880, elected and entitled and unable to affirm under any statute then in force, because the parliamentary oath was not in the evidence acts' gift, the reader will recognize the architecture at once, and should: the affirmation's limits, printed in 1696 and never fully repealed, still standing in his way. The miniature the Friends built was the whole future's plan, and the plan was printed in the statute book for anyone who read its limits.

The close is a small scene, and the record does not preserve which courtroom it happened in, or who the first Friend was, and the chapter says so instead of inventing a name and a place. Somewhere, in some court, in some assize town, in the early 1720s, after the Georgian act had re-cut the formula, a Friend stood in the place where his people had so often stood to be punished, and the clerk read the new formula, and the man who had never sworn in his life spoke the new sentence, among the first of his people to do it in a court of law: I do solemnly, sincerely, and truly declare and affirm. No book in his hand, no kiss, and no God named in the words. The hand catalogue's entry for this movement is the hand that stayed at his side. Three adverbs deep and two verbs long, it counted, and the testimony it unlocked was heard, and the court proceeded as if nothing had happened, which is exactly what had happened: nothing, the oath's whole ceremony absent, and the

truth system standing anyway. The raised palm and the so help me were gone, and the testimony was heard, and the sky over that courtroom, like the sky over Philadelphia, never fell. The court had lost the words and kept the witness, which was all it had ever needed. And the people who would sooner rot than swear had stood in the law's own rooms for seventy years, and the law had finally, partially, blinked, and the words the Friends spoke that day are the words the affirmation still speaks in court, in every courtroom in England and America, three centuries later, unchanged.

CHAPTER TEN

More Judaico

Every single detail in this chapter carries a receipt, and the receipts are named as the chapter goes, and the reader who checks them will find they hold, because this chapter enters the book's ugliest room, and the room is full of lore, loud and circulating lore. The room is the oath more judaico, the Jew's oath, the oath in the Jewish manner, the special form of swearing that Christian Europe built for its Jews, a ceremony that pretended to bind the swearer and existed to degrade him. The lore problem is real and it is the reason for the rule: humiliation details circulate freely, copied from book to book, growing at every copy, each retelling adding a detail the last one did not have, and the worst of them are the ones everyone has heard. So the rule of this chapter is absolute, and it is the book's own rule, set for exactly this room, and it is stated here so the reader can hold the chapter to it line by line. Every humiliation detail below enters with its source attached, the document, the edition, the date, the jurisdiction, or it does not enter at all, whatever its color, whatever its fame. The rule has a second edge, which the chapter will keep in both directions: where the record is thin, the chapter says the record is thin, and where a name is lost, the chapter prints the case without the name and says the record kept it, and where a detail is disputed by the sources themselves, the dispute prints with the detail. The room is ugly enough on the receipts alone. It does not need the lore. It never did.

What the Jew's oath was, in its essence, is stated best before any detail. The oath is the machine's instrument for making a man's word count, and this book has watched it work for three thousand years, and every version this book has walked, the wax, the stone, the ring, the book, has carried the same two parts: a condition and an address. The Jew's oath kept the parts and poisoned both. Its condition became a curse catalogue, the longest and most lurid in the whole record, restored to full length for the one class of swearer the law despised. The address became a humiliation, because the ceremony around the swearing was designed to make the swearer ridiculous, to mark him as a man whose oath needed degradation to be believed, which is to say a man who would never quite be believed. The degradation was the evidence of its own necessity, and the logic was circular on purpose: a man treated like that, said the apparatus, must be the kind of man who needs it. That is the exclusion in its purest form. For the Quaker, the oath problem was that the state could not hear him. For the Jew, the problem was the opposite: the state would hear him, in its way, and the way was built to disgrace the hearing, and the disgrace was prescribed by ordinance. The one was locked out of the room. The other was let into the room in order to be shamed in it, and the shame was the point, and everyone in the room knew it, and the record they kept of it, in ordinances and forms and court books, is the chapter's evidence, and it is enough.

Frankfurt's formula of about 1392 is the room's center, the best-documented and the most copied, and it stands at the sourcebook's page, the Internet Medieval Sourcebook's text of Jacob

Marcus's 1938 edition, The Jew in the Medieval World. The swearer stood on a sow's skin, and his right hand went to the wrist into the book of the Law, the Pentateuch, and the formula he spoke was long, and it named the curses, and the whole thing was prescribed, the posture and the object and the words. The hand catalogue has never had an entry like this one: the hand to the wrist, the deepest grip in the whole record, the hand buried in the book to the joint, and its purpose is degradation, the contact made obscene by the skin beneath it. Around that core the apparatus had its variants, and the encyclopedia's account, the Encyclopaedia Judaica's width behind it, records the hide with its instructions, and in some places the stool, the cloak, the hat, the whole costume of the oath as a costume of shame. Kisch's study of the Jews in medieval Germany, at its pages 275 to 287, and Baron's work stand behind the account as the shelf, and the shelf is where the detail lives for anyone who wants it. Every one of those details enters this paragraph with its receipt attached, and the receipt is the point: the degradation was not a mob's improvisation. It was a form, prescribed, written down, administered by officials, a court procedure with a dress code, and that is what the word apparatus means. It is also what the word ordinance means, and the Frankfurt text is an ordinance, with instructions.

The model is the imperial form of 1555, the Reichskammergerichtsordnung's prescription, and its curse catalogue is the place where this book's first law shows its darkest proof. It is printed in Frankel's monograph, Die Eidesleistung der Juden, at pages 76 and following, as the Jewish Encyclopedia's article directs, and Frankel's own text is scanned in the Freimann collection at Frankfurt for anyone who wants the page. The swearer called down on himself, if he swore falsely, the curses written in Leviticus and in Deuteronomy, the plagues of Egypt one by one, the leprosy of Naaman and of Gehazi, and the fate of Dathan and Abiram, whom the earth swallowed alive for their rebellion, the Bible's whole supply of punishments, read aloud into the oath, in the courtroom, on the record. Read that catalogue against the whole record of this book. The modern courtroom oath is the stump, the curse amputated, the punishment clause cut away so clean the swearer forgets it ever existed. In that room, the Jew's oath of the old empire was the full sentence restored, the whole conditional self-curse spoken aloud and at length, the missing half reattached, for one despised class of swearer, in the age when everyone else had long since stopped saying it, in the same centuries when the Christian oath was shrinking to its stump. The amputation was never a mystery of grammar. It was a choice, made for the respected and unmade for the despised, and the choice was reversed whenever the machine wanted to degrade. Law One holds in the room's darkest corner: the oath is the conditional self-curse, and when the curse comes back, it comes back as an instrument of contempt.

The apparatus justified itself with a calumny, and the calumny's anatomy is worth dissecting, because it is the record's best example of a text misread on purpose. The prayer called Kol Nidre, the opening of the Day of Atonement, the holiest night of the Jewish year, annuls vows: the vows a man has made to God, the rash promises between the soul and its maker, released before the holy day begins, a cleansing of the soul's own ledger and nothing else. The apparatus read the prayer as license: the Jew, said the apparatus's defenders, absolves himself of his oaths once a year, so his oath is worthless, so his oath must be surrounded by degradation to have any force at all. The misreading was willful, and the record shows it, because Jewish scholarship answered it correctly for centuries and the answer was available to anyone who asked: the prayer concerns vows to God;

promises to neighbors are another law entirely, and the law of the neighbor's oath stood untouched, and the rabbinic authorities said so in writing, repeatedly, to anyone who inquired, and the inquirers included the men who drafted the forms. The calumny was answered, in writing, for centuries, and it lived anyway, because it was useful. A text about the soul's accounts with heaven was read as a waiver of the neighbor's claims, and the reading served the apparatus, and the apparatus was the point, and the calumny lived because the calumny was useful. This is the legend-minting of the third chapter at a higher stake: a story invented to justify a machine, and the machine was exclusion, and the story was the misreading of a prayer, and the prayer was the holiest one they had.

The apparatus ran for centuries, and its surrender, when it came, came from scholarship and conscience working together, which is the chapter's one piece of light. The reforms begin with Moses Mendelssohn advising Prussia on the oath question, the philosopher asked, by the Prussian officials considering the form, for the Jewish law of the oath, and answering with it, and they continue with the work the record has pinned: Zecharias Frankel, the rabbi and scholar, gave the answer its scholarly form: the Saxon ministry put the question to him in 1839, and his expert opinion, commissioned by the state, became the monograph he published in 1840, at Dresden and Leipzig, Die Eidesleistung der Juden, on the Jewish law of the oath, its duties, its history, its conscience, and it did what monographs almost never do. It moved a legislature, which is the rarest sentence in the history of scholarship. Saxony abolished the form on the strength of Frankel's answer, and the abolitions across the German states read like a roll call of surrender, some before him and more after: Baden in 1814, Hesse-Cassel in 1828, Oldenburg in 1829, Württemberg in 1832, Saxony in 1839, Austria on November 30, 1846, and Prussia, the hardest holdout, the state Mendelssohn himself had advised, keeping its formula until March 15, 1869, inside the lifetime of men who had read the philosopher's answer. A curse-oath killed by a rabbi's learning: that is the whole of it, and it is sourced, and the book lets it stand exactly at that size, because it does not need to be larger. The machine's ugliest instrument was argued down by learning, in public, state by state, over fifty years, and the argument is on the shelf, scanned, for anyone who wants to watch it work. A second edition, enlarged, followed in 1847, because the question was alive and the answer was winning.

France runs a parallel course, and the course has a hero, and the hero is a lawyer. At Nîmes in 1827, Adolphe Crémieux won the abolition of the oath more judaico at the court of Nîmes, the effect at first regional, for the Jews of the Midi, the ruling, in its own words' spirit, that the law knows one oath and knows it for everyone. The client's name the record kept in only one source, and the chapter says so and moves on, because the name is not the point, and because the rule of this chapter is that single-source names wait for their second source. The point is the method: the advocate, in court, against the apparatus, winning on the law, in the machine's own rooms, with the machine's own instruments. Twelve years later, in 1839, in Alsace, the machine answered with the procès de Saverne, and the record here has been corrected against the record's own pages, and the chapter carries the correction: the underlying suit was a Weil against a dame Isidor before the tribunal of Saverne, and the oath was ordered to be taken at the Phalsbourg synagogue, and the rabbi, Lazare Isidor, refused to open the synagogue for such an oath. He was prosecuted for the refusal, in the dock for keeping the doors shut, and Crémieux defended him, and he was acquitted, the court holding he had obeyed his conscience, the Saverne judges declaring themselves incompetent on the merits, and the oath was dead in practice in Alsace thereafter, because the religious authorities

could refuse their concourse without penalty; a form no synagogue will host is a form that does not exist. The refuser of this chapter is a rabbi who would not open a door, and he won, in court, with a lawyer. The rabbi kept his doors shut and his freedom, and the oath lost its host.

Crémieux's pleading at Saverne survives in the literature, and one sentence of it is the whole case against the apparatus: the oath is an absurd prejudice, he argued, to the Christians who order it, and to the Jews who undergo it, un véritable sacrilège, a true sacrilege, the ceremony profaning both religions at once. The sentence deserves to stand alone, because it is the whole apparatus indicted by its own logic: if the ceremony is holy, the Jew's oath is void; if it is a farce, it binds no one; and in either case the Christian who orders it has profaned his own sacrament and the Jew who undergoes it has been made to act one. The end, in France, came from the Cour de cassation on March 3, 1846, the arrêt in the Isidor affair, described in the literature as the last legal disability of the French Jews falling, and the date stands at 1846 against one biography's misprint of 1848, an error this chapter does not inherit. Elsewhere the machine held longer. Romania kept the oath into the twentieth century, the holdout at the continent's edge, and the chapter reports the holdout at the period's own width: the Jewish Encyclopedia of 1901 to 1906 reports the holdouts, on its citations of the Jewish Chronicle of June 6, 1902 and the Alliance Israélite Universelle's bulletin for 1903, and the chapter quotes the encyclopedia's report and labels it as the encyclopedia's report, because the documents behind it have not been read firsthand, and the honest book says which shelf its facts are on. That is the whole continental account: the degradation built, administered, and at last dismantled, and every date in it with its receipt.

Now turn to England, and a century earlier, because the common law's better instinct is waiting there, and it is the chapter's counterweight. In 1744, in a suit called Omichund against Barker, the question reached the Lord Chancellor whether a witness who was no Christian could be sworn at all in an English court. The case came out of a commission to Calcutta, evidence taken in India for an English cause between two English parties, the merchant Omichund and his debtor's estate, and the witnesses were Gentoo, and the question was what an oath required, because the debtor's side had objected that the witnesses, being no Christians, could not be sworn at all, and their testimony with them. Hardwicke, the Lord Chancellor, called in the chief judges, Lee, Willes, and Parker, the common law's three heads, and the answer they gave is the answer this book has been waiting three thousand years to hear a court say plainly. The witness may swear by his own rite, by his own god, in his own form, because the appeal to the deity is the substance and the ceremony is only the form. Universality, declared in an English court, in 1744, a century before the continent finished surrendering the opposite. The decision is reported twice, in Atkyns and in Willes, decided February 23, 1744-5 by the old calendar, and both reports are pinned in the English Reports with their star pages, and the chapter quotes the words from the reports and never from a secondary telling, because the words are the point and the point is on the record. The discipline of the quotation is the chapter's discipline: from the reports, never from the tellings.

Willes's opinion carries the test, and the test is belief, and belief alone, and the opinion reads the whole history of the question to get there, the old cases, the old exclusions, the old errors, and sets them aside, one by one, with the reasons stated, the way a court does when it means to be done with them. Infidels who believe a God, and future rewards and punishments, may be witnesses, he wrote, and the words are Willes's own, and those who believe neither cannot be admitted, the exclusion

running at the oath's root, where it belongs. The oath's whole requirement, on this reading, is the appeal to a god who rewards and punishes, a sanction in the next world to match the statute in this one, and the ceremony by which the appeal is made bends to the conscience of the swearer. And the Lincoln's Inn manuscript of the opinion carries the sentence this book would have written if the record had not written it first, and the Law and History Review's study of the testimonial exclusions quotes it from the manuscript: all that is necessary is an appeal to the Supreme Being as the witness of the truth and the Avenger of Perjury. The Avenger of Perjury. In 1744, in an English courtroom's working papers, the oath's whole theory in one title: the witness of the truth and the avenger of the breach, the two halves of the oath's old sentence, named as the only two things the law requires. The chapter has no need to underline it. It underlines itself. The reader who has come this far knows what the Avenger of Perjury is. It is Law One's punisher, still on duty, in the better England's own words, in the middle of the eighteenth century, in a courtroom that had never heard of this book.

The complication stays, per the book's own rule, and it is not small. Willes, having declared universality, left the infidel's credit to the tribunal: the evidence was admitted, and then it was weighed below a Christian's, admission with a discount, the gate's mercy arriving with its price printed on it, the tribunal free to think less of the testimony because of the rite it came in on. The book does not smooth this, because the book does not smooth the record, and the discount is part of the record. The better instinct was better, and it was real, and it was still the instinct of men who thought a Christian's oath weighed more, and the discount is the honest edge of the victory, and it belongs in the chapter beside the victory. What can be said for the holding, at full strength, is that it answered the substance question right: the oath is the appeal, the appeal needs the punisher, and the form is the swearer's own. What must be said against it is that the same judges thought the answer worth less from a Gentoo. The discount was not a detail. It was the surviving half of the exclusion, and the half would live on, in practice, long after the exclusion was gone. The century that produced the best answer also produced the discount, and both are on the record, and the record is the only thing this chapter trusts, and the reader is owed both, because the reader has been promised receipts. The discount answers the question this chapter leaves unasked and the reader will ask: whether the better instinct was also the common one. It was not. It was the better one, and the record shows it.

And the mirror is the record's own work, which is the chapter's last structural note before the close. The seventh chapter's holding, Miller against Salomons in 1852, answered the same substance question the other way: the words were the oath, the ceremony was the substance, the Jew could not sit. A century and eight years apart on the record's shelf, 1744 and 1852, the two answers face each other, the common law's better instinct and its worse one, both preserved, both quotable, the Gentoo witness admitted on his own rite in an English cause and the Jewish member excluded on the form's closing words in the English House. And the reporters themselves welded the mirror to the book's spine, because the English Reports headnote to Omichund records the case followed and applied in Attorney-General v. Bradlaugh, in 1885, the refuser's own case, the trap's own litigation, the fourteenth volume of the Queen's Bench Division, page 667, and no one put it there but the record's own keepers. The book did not build that bridge, did not need to, and could not have built it better. The law reporters built it, in 1885, joining the 1744 answer to the book's central fight, and all this chapter does is print the headnote's existence and point. Read closely, the record argues the

book's argument without the book's help: the oath's substance is the appeal to the punisher, the ceremony is the form, and every exclusion that confused the two was the machine mistaking its furniture for its function, and the mistake ran for centuries, and the mistake had a dress code. The mirror is the record's own work, and the work is done.

The close is the counterweight's own scene, and it is documented, and the chapter has earned it. Calcutta, then: the witnesses brought in to be sworn, and the question put to the court of how. The better instinct's answer: they were sworn by their own rite, the witnesses sworn touching the priest, in a form no one in the courtroom had ever heard, and the oath counted, because the appeal was made, to a god who rewards and punishes, by the swearer's own conscience, in the swearer's own form. And the evidence went home with the commission's record, and no one in England ever suggested the testimony was less than testimony. The room did not know the rite. The room did not need to. It needed only to know that the men believed it, and that was the court's whole question, and it had been answered. That is the whole law of the oath in one scene: the machine asking for the appeal and the conscience supplying it, in a ceremony the machine had never seen and could not have read, and the testimony going into the record admitted like any other evidence, its credit left to the tribunal's scales, which was the only reservation the day kept. The ugliest room in the book closes on the door out of it, and the door is a courtroom door, and it opens both ways. The oath, at last, was only the oath, the appeal and nothing else, the substance without the dress code. And it was enough: admitted, counted, heard. And the men who administered it had to be told, by the Lord Chancellor and the chief judges of England, that it had always been enough, that it would have been enough a century earlier, that the whole apparatus of the special oath was a mistake the common law never made.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

The Member for Northampton

The member for Northampton came down to the table to be sworn in May of 1880, in the first weeks of the new Parliament, in the ordinary ceremony of the swearing-in days at the opening of a Parliament, and the House of Commons has never worked the same way since. His name was Charles Bradlaugh, and he was the most famous unbeliever in the kingdom, and the least quiet, the secularist of the platform, the editor, the lecturer, the man the electors of Northampton had chosen with their eyes open, at the third time of asking, and he presented himself at the table with a request that should have been simple: he asked to make the affirmation. The affirmation was nearly half a century old as a general instrument in the courts by then, and the Friends had fought it into the statute book two centuries before, and the evidence acts had widened it, and the member-elect for Northampton had a reasonable argument that the parliamentary oath stood inside the affirmation's statutory reach. The House said no, and the no was no ruling on the statutes; it was a gasp at the man, and the gasp became the law. When he then offered to take the oath itself, to swear the ancient words with everyone else, the House said no to that too, because he had told the truth about what the oath was to him. So the man the electors had sent stood at the door of the House with both doors shut: barred from affirming for want of a statute, barred from swearing for want of a God the House would credit him with. The trap was whole. This book has spent ten chapters building it. Now it springs.

He came to that table with more of a public behind him than any member in the House, and less of a party than anyone on the floor. Bradlaugh had spent twenty years on the platforms of the secularist movement, the halls full, the hecklers answered, the hall lectures, the republican and reform causes, the National Reformer his paper and his voice, and Northampton had returned him with Henry Labouchere in the two-member borough, a radical town's radical pair, and the electors knew exactly what they were choosing, and they had chosen him through his whole public career. He was not a quiet unbeliever with a private doubt. He was the organized one, the man who had made unbelief a movement with a platform and a press and a membership, and the House that refused him was not refusing a stray eccentric. It was refusing the most deliberate politician in the kingdom, a man who had been expecting the fight for years, and had read the statutes closer than the men who administered them, and had the law of his claim prepared before the claim was challenged. That is its first mistake, and it is the mistake every gate makes with the man who has studied the gate. It met the one man in England who had spent his life preparing to be excluded by it, and he was ready, and it was not. The electors matter as much as the man, and this chapter keeps them in view, because the war's whole constitutional weight sits on them: Northampton kept answering, and every answer was the same man, and the same answer, and the whole theory of exclusion broke on it.

And the trap had a structure, and the structure was the statute chain of the last two chapters arriving at one man. The parliamentary oath ran under the acts of 1866 and 1868, and the 1866 act's fourth section made provision for the affirmation, for the Quaker and for every person permitted by law to affirm, and the whole question was who was permitted: the evidence statutes reached the courts of law, and whether their permission reached the House was the argument's whole ground. By then the words on the true faith of a Christian had fallen away, for the Jews in 1858 and out of the parliamentary form in 1866, so the form Bradlaugh faced carried no closing clause at all, and his quarrel was with the whole arrangement, and the fight was bigger than the words. His claim was a lawyer's claim, and he had it in writing, and the writing was careful: read the oaths acts together with the evidence amendment acts, and the affirmation's power reached the parliamentary oath, because the evidence acts had been written to cover oaths in judicial proceedings, and the swearing-in of the House stood within their logic, or so a careful reader could maintain, and the members of the first committee were careful readers too, and they read the other way. The House's first select committee, empaneled for the question, read the statutes and answered no: the power to affirm did not exist for the member's oath, the committee found, and the finding is on the record, recited into the House's own later account of the war. So far, a lawyer's quarrel, the kind a statute book settles in an afternoon. The first committee's no was defensible law, the kind of reading a cautious lawyer gives a client who wants to be told no. What came next was the trap closing, and it closed on the offer of the oath itself.

Bradlaugh then did the thing that turned the quarrel into the war, and it is the thing the House could not digest. He offered to take the oath, offered it in writing and offered it in person, offered to stand at the table like every member since the Reformation and say the words. The man who could not affirm would swear: would say the ancient words, would kiss the book, would stand where every member stood, because the oath to him was a form, a ceremony with no purchase on his conscience, and he said so, plainly, in print and at the bar. That honesty, offered as a reassurance, was received as a confession, and the confession was quoted against him on the floor, as if a man who admitted the form was a form had confessed the form was void, which is exactly how the House heard it. An atheist saying the oath was a form was an atheist saying the oath was void, and a void oath was no oath, and a man with no oath could not sit. The second select committee, empaneled for the oath's side of the question, divided the difference and found for the trap: the House could, and in the committee's opinion ought to, prevent his taking the oath, and yet, said the rider, if he asked again to affirm, he should not be prevented, the risk running against him at law. The House declined its own committee's rider. It chose the stronger course, the course that shut both doors, and the choice deserves a slow reading, because it is the House choosing its own rules over its own law: the House preferred the unlawful exclusion to the risky admission, and the risk it declined was the risk of a lawsuit, and the lawsuit came anyway, and the whole five years of it bought the House nothing it could keep.

The resolution of June 22, 1880 is the trap's legal text, and the debate that produced it ran the night, and the House's own Journal carries it, volume 135, page 934, and the words are Giffard's amendment, carried that night: that the member for Northampton be not permitted to take the oath or make the affirmation, under the two governing statutes, both doors shut in one sentence. Read the sentence for what it is, because the House's own clerks wrote it down and the House's

own Journal keeps it. The House, which is the master of its own proceedings, resolved that a duly elected member could neither swear nor affirm, which is to say the House resolved that the oath's whole machinery, the gate and the trigger and the whole apparatus this book has walked, would be used to keep a man out instead of letting him in. The oath had been, for three thousand years, the door's key, the sentence that opened the room to the swearer. In June of 1880 the House of Commons made it the door's lock. That is the whole history of the oath in one night's work: the key, reforged into the lock. The electors of Northampton had no key to either, and no one in the chamber that night asked whether they should have one. Underneath the war stood the question no one put on the motion, the one the 1891 vindication would finally answer: who owns the seat, the members or the electors. The House had answered by reflex: the members. The electors of Northampton spent the next four years answering back. Their answer was always the same, and it was always in writing, and it was always him.

The war went physical the next day, and it went into the House's own walls, which is to say into the Palace of Westminster's oldest masonry. Bradlaugh refused to withdraw, refused to quit the chamber he had been elected to, and the House ordered him taken into custody, and the Serjeant-at-Arms, Ralph Allen Gosset, took him, and the place they put him is the scene this chapter keeps, because the room itself is the war's monument: the prison room in the Clock Tower, the House's own lockup, the oak-panelled room high under the great clock, last used for a member of Parliament in 1880, for him, overnight, and no later committal to that room surfaces anywhere in Parliament's public record. Parliament's own histories carry the room's story, and the room is shown to visitors still. He was the Prison Room's last prisoner, at the room's width, and the chapter claims nothing wider, because the superlative is the room's and not the kingdom's. The image is the whole war in miniature, and the war's historians have kept the image exactly because it is so exact: the people's chosen man, locked in the tower of the House, by the House's own officer, for the crime of wanting to be sworn. The oath's door had been locked, and now the House had a literal locked room, and the man in it had been sent there by the electors of Northampton to do the one thing the room existed to prevent. He was let out the next day, the resolution having spent its night, the prisoner released into the same House that had imprisoned him, and he walked out of the tower and back into the war. He was not done, and neither were they.

The law's front ran through the courts for five years, and the cases are this chapter's skeleton, and the courts' answers made the trap. The rider's scenario arrived as a victory: on the first of July the government moved that he be allowed to affirm at his own legal risk, the House agreed, and the next day he affirmed and took his seat, and he voted. Then the penalty suit followed, Clarke against Bradlaugh, a common informer suing for the five-hundred-pound forfeits, on the argument that the affirmation was no answer to the parliamentary oath. The first court held for the informer; the Court of Appeal agreed, at 7 Queen's Bench Division 38, on the last day of March, 1881; and the seat was vacated on the judgment's heels, the new writ ordered the next day. The Lords settled the informer in 1883, Bradlaugh against Clarke, argued in March, judgment on April 9, at 8 Appeal Cases 354: the common informer cannot sue at all, the House of Lords held, because the penalty belongs to the Crown, and the 1866 act had dropped the old words that gave it to the informer. A win, of a kind: the informer was wrong, and the state simply changed instruments, and in 1884 the Attorney-General filed the information himself, after the war's boldest day: newly returned at the

February by-election, he took the oath with his own hand again on the eleventh of that month, and signed, and sat, and voted, and the case became Attorney-General against Bradlaugh, and in January of 1885 the court ruled him incapable of the oath itself, no believer behind the stump, the ruling the trap had been built to reach. It sits at the fourteenth volume of the Queen's Bench Division, page 667. The reporters' headnote to Omichund records it followed there: the 1744 answer, applied against the 1880 refuser. The weld is the law reporters' own.

And there is a fourth case, the one the penalties' war almost forgot, and it is the one that shows where the wall runs and how thick it is. Bradlaugh sued the Serjeant-at-Arms, Bradlaugh against Gossett, in 1884, at 12 Queen's Bench Division 271, for the force used against him in the House's own precincts, and Mr. Justice Stephen's judgment answered with the constitution's other wall: the courts cannot control the House of Commons in the administration of its internal proceedings, and the force used against the plaintiff was justified. The statute-given right stopped at the chamber door. The courts of law, which had spent two centuries widening the affirmation and policing the oath's misuse, declared themselves without jurisdiction over the one room where the whole war was fought, and the judgment is not wrong, and that is the horror of it: privilege is the wall, and the wall is real, and it has a reason, and the reason is that the House must be master of its own chamber, and the price of that mastery is that the master may not be sued for it. Only the House could correct the House. Privilege was the point here: the oath's machinery in Parliament was Parliament's own, and no court's writ ran there, and the man the electors kept sending back had no remedy anywhere except the ballot box of Northampton, which kept delivering it, and the floor of the House, which kept refusing it. The law's front was closed; the courts had done all they would do. What remained was the body's war, fought in doorways and at the table itself, in the physical space of the chamber the law would not enter.

The analysis underneath the war is this book's own, and it is the place where the movement's whole history turns in one man's chest, and it belongs here, at the hinge. The oath Bradlaugh offered to take was the stump, the conditional with the curse amputated, the formula this book opened with, so help me God with the missing half long gone, and the House's objection was that the stump had no address for him: no God to help him, no punisher to fear, no heaven to answer to. Understand how strange the objection was, three hundred years into the amputation. The oath's theology had been filed off by the centuries, and the penalty had moved into the statute book, and the formula survived as a form, and the form was administered to men who believed everything and nothing, and the courts had stopped asking whether the swearer meant the address. The courts had asked it of witnesses for two centuries, at the gate, the belief test the tenth chapter put on the record. The House asked it in 1880, for the first time at its own table, of its own oath, of its own member: whether the man swearing believed the address. It demanded that the stump have a believer behind it, which no statute had ever required of a member, and the demand proved the formula's emptiness better than any atheist pamphlet could have: the oath was so hollow, by then, that its hollowness became the argument against the man who admitted it. He would have said the words and meant the law. The House wanted him to mean the God. And the God was the one part of the sentence the centuries had filed off first, and the House that demanded Him back had not noticed Him missing until an atheist pointed it out.

The body's war has a chronology, and the chronology is the House's own, and it is worth reading as the House wrote it, because the House wrote it without noticing what it said. Its first rhythm is the by-elections: April of 1881, March of 1882, February of 1884, the seat emptied and refilled, emptied and refilled, the vacancy notices and the returns alternating like a heartbeat, and the historical Hansard's own index of the member for Northampton reads like a record of interrupted service, the constituency periods listed one after another, because the same man kept being re-elected to the same seat and the same seat kept being vacated under him, the index a record of the war told in headings. Northampton's electors were the war's second front, and they were unbought and unbothered, the shoemakers and the tradesmen and the radical shopkeepers, the town that had made boots for Cromwell's army and would make trouble for anyone's, and every time the House emptied the seat they filled it with the same man, which is the electorate's whole answer to the constitutional question, delivered four times, in four elections, in writing. The House was not refusing Bradlaugh anymore. The House was refusing Northampton. Northampton would not be refused, and that refusal, the voters' refusal, is the one the House could not answer with any statute, because there was no law against electing him, and the whole war ran on that vacancy: a legal seat and a legal member, and the House's own resolution standing between them. The whole constitutional absurdity of the war is in that sentence: a legal seat and a legal member, and a resolution between them, and the resolution was only a resolution.

The ejection of August 3, 1881 is the body's war at its most physical, and the date is the House's own, and it sits in the House's own recital of the war, dated and kept. He came down to take the oath again, and the House had resolved he should not, and the Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms, Erskine, barred the door with his body, and the member-elect was removed by force from the precincts of the House, expelled into the street by the officers of the chamber he had been elected to. His daughter's biography carries the family's account of it, Hypatia Bradlaugh Bonner's record of his life and work, and the House's own account is the resolution and the list, and one tertiary tradition dates it August 2, against the record's August 3, and the chapter dates by the record and lets the tertiary's error stand where it stands. The ejection needs no adjectives, and this book gives it none. The force was real and the record keeps it: the officer was doing his orders, and the orders were the House's, and the House was the law's master in its own house, and the man on the pavement was the law's member for Northampton. A door of the House of Commons, held shut by an officer's body, against a man whose only offense was that the electors wanted him in it. The oath had become so entirely the door that the door had become the oath's whole content: there was nothing left to do with the man but keep him from the table where the book was. And the book was still on the table, and the table was still the door, and the door was still held by a man's body.

The self-administration of February 21, 1882 is the war's strangest hour, and the record gives it whole, and the Dictionary of National Biography's account, which dates it a day early, carries the detail that makes it live: the Testament came out of his own pocket. He advanced to the Table, and he read the oath's words from a paper, and he kissed a copy of the New Testament, and he signed the book, the oath self-administered, the formula spoken by the man to the man, the whole ceremony performed without the House's leave. The hand catalogue gets an entry here it never wanted: the hand on the book the swearer himself supplied, the kiss the swearer himself delivered, the signature the swearer himself wrote, the entire machine operated by the man it existed to exclude. The

House's answer came the next day, February 22, and the House's words are the record's: he had, the House resolved, irregularly and contumaciously pretended to take and subscribe the Oath, and he was expelled, and a new writ was issued. Pretended. Stop on the word, because the word is the machine's confession. The oath he took was the oath in form, word for word, and the House called the form a pretense, because the House had decided the form was void before he spoke it, which is to say the House had decided the oath was, after all, a state of the soul, and the soul's state was for the House to judge. Northampton answered on March 2, at the by-election the expulsion had created. The same man, the same seat, the same majority's answer. And the war went on, because both sides had now made it a matter of honor, and honor, unlike law, does not settle.

The statutory front's last stand was the Affirmation Bill of 1883, and it fell by the width of a staircase. It was introduced on February 20, 1883, to give the affirmation its place in the parliamentary oath by law, the way the courts had gotten it, the way the colonies had it, the clean statutory fix, the answer the whole evidence-act tradition pointed to. On May 3, 1883, the House of Commons voted it down by three votes. Three votes. Three men crossing a lobby. The reform failed by three votes in the Commons, in the year the Lords were settling the informer, and the two facts together are the portrait of 1883: the courts would not let the informer have the penalty, and the House would not let the member have the affirmation, and between the Lords and the Commons the law of the oath stood exactly where it had stood in 1880, the trap intact. The division list's exact numbers stand in the record of the day, and the three-vote margin stands on the Dictionary of National Biography's account, which is otherwise sound on Bradlaugh. Three votes is the width of a staircase in the division lobby, and everyone in the lobby knew the next time would be closer, and the next time would have to be scheduled by a Parliament that was tired of the war. Nothing was settled. The courts had closed the law's front, and the House had closed the statute's front, and the body's war had one more year to run, and the man was still coming down to the table, and the table still had the book on it, and the book was still the door.

The war's skeleton survives in the House's own hand, in its own book, and it is worth reading as a list, because the House wrote it as one. When the record of the final day came, in January of 1886, the House's own account carried the whole war recited as a chronology of dated exclusions: the resolutions of April 26, 1881, February 7, 1882, March 6, 1882, May 4, 1883, each reciting its predecessors, the House's memory of its own refusals, thirteen dated refusals in all, the House's account reciting every one of them, the four printed here the pivots, the rest carried in the January 1886 record the chapter is quoting. Thirteen times the House had said no, and the record of the last day read them aloud, one after another, the way a sentence is read before the court moves on. The House had kept the list of its own war. No enemy compiled it. No pamphlet printed it first. The House compiled it, and printed it, and read it into the record, because it cannot help keeping its own books. That is the thing the House does that no one teaches it: it keeps the record, it recites the record, it hands the record to the future with the whole indictment inside it. The thirteen dates are the war's skeleton, handed over by the House itself, and this chapter's whole narrative is in them, every expulsion and every return, the by-elections and the ejections and the self-administration, the Clock Tower night and all, all of it dated, all of it in the House's own Journal and its own Hansard, kept. The machine documented its own overreach the way it documents everything: completely,

officially, and without once understanding what it was proving. They are the chapter's receipt, and the receipt is signed by the machine itself.

The question underneath never left the floor, and it is the question the war was always about, and the 1891 vindication would finally answer it. Who owns the seat, the members or the electors. The House's whole theory of 1880 was that the members own the seats: that the House, as a body, could decide who was fit to sit in it, and that the oath's machinery was its instrument of decision, and that the electors' choice was a nomination the House could veto. Northampton's whole theory, delivered in four elections, was that the electors own the seat: that the House sits by the voters' appointment, and that a form of words is not a fitness test, and that the House that excludes the voters' man has unmade the thing it claims to be. A House of nominees is not a House of Commons, and everyone in 1880 knew it, and the knowledge is why the war would not die. The oath, the small spell this book has followed from the wax to the statute book, had become the instrument of that argument. The gate had become the whole constitution's question, and the question had become the gate's whole content, the door by which the members' theory kept the electors' theory out. The trap was whole, and it held, and it held for years, and the man it held was the member the whole time, and the seat was his the whole time, and the law said otherwise, and the law, at the end, would have to answer for it. But that end is the next chapter's, and this chapter's duty is to close the war where the war stood in 1885, which is: nowhere, and still going.

So the chapter closes mid-fight, with nothing resolved, because the war's resolution is the next chapter's, and it closes on two things the record kept. The first is the vow. At the bar of the House, in the course of the war, Bradlaugh said that the grave alone would make him yield, and the heritage account carries the text, and the chapter prints it as the heritage account carries it, because a vow like that is either a man's whole character or it is nothing, and his whole war is the proof it was character. He did not yield. He was still not yielding when the war's last chapter opened. The second is the machine's own mechanics, from Bradlaugh's own testimony in 1880, the answer he gave about Wilkes: that Wilkes's expunged resolution remains legible in the Journal, that expunged means disowned, never erased. The House can strike its resolutions from its memory, and the page keeps them. The machine can expel the member, and the record keeps the man. That is the whole mechanics of expungement, and it is the machine's own confession that its memory is longer than its mercy. The war of 1880 to 1885 ends, for this chapter, with the seat vacant and the man unyielding and the Journal legible, and nothing resolved, and the oath still on the table, and the form of words still holding the door, and the electors of Northampton still in possession of their answer. The grave alone would make him yield, he said, and he meant it, and the House heard him, and the record wrote it down. What comes next is the machine apologizing. This one ends with the man still standing at the door.

CHAPTER TWELVE

The Oaths Act

On the thirteenth of January, 1886, the member for Northampton took the oath, and no one stopped him. The scene is worth holding still, because it is the law's own answer arriving six years late, in the law's own form, and because it is so quiet: the war that had filled nearly six years ended in a morning's ordinary business. The House was in its swearing-in days, the Parliament elected in the autumn of 1885, the member returned again, the fifth return, the fourth time the voters had sent him back, and at the table the book waited, and the clerk waited, and the oath's three-thousand-year furniture stood ready for the man it had been built to exclude, and on the twelfth of January one member had served a statement of objection, which the chair heard, and the record keeps the statement, read into the next day's account. On the thirteenth, Sir Arthur Wellesley Peel, in the chair since 1884, ruled, and the ruling is on the record and the record carries the name Peel, whatever one collections page of Parliament's own website says in misnaming him Brand, an error this chapter does not inherit. The ruling was this: that neither the Speaker nor any member had the right to intervene to prevent a member willing to take the oath from taking it. That is the whole war answered by the House's own rules. The oath was open to the willing. The chair would not hear the objection. And Bradlaugh came to the table, and he took the oath, and he signed, and he sat, and the member for Northampton was in, at last, in his seat, six years after the electors first gave it to him, and the House's ordinary business proceeded as if the war had never happened, which is how the House closes a front: by pretending there was never one.

The ruling deserves its own paragraph, because of what it did not do, and what it did not do is the victory's shape. Peel did not hold that the atheist's oath was valid. He held nothing about the affirmation; its day was two years off. He held that no one in the chamber could stop a member from swearing, which is the oath's deepest rule read correctly at last, the table's rule, the rule the oath's whole history had always contained: the oath is the member's act; the House's permission is not in it, and the oath's consequences run against the swearer at law; against the House at the table, they do not run. The six years of the war had been the House claiming a power it did not have, and the new Speaker simply declined to exercise it, and the war ended by procedure before it ended by statute. The victory's first act was not a vindication of unbelief, and the chapter marks the point exactly, because the war was never about what the man believed. It was about whether the House could keep the electors' man out with a form of words, and the answer, on the thirteenth of January, 1886, was that it could not. It was a vindication of the table's ordinary rule, and it was everything, because it meant the door could no longer be held shut by a member's objection or a Speaker's whim. The oath was the willing man's to take, the House's to administer, and its risks were his, and the House's power to judge them was gone, and the judgment of them was the law's, in a court, after the fact, by indictment, with proof, with a jury of his neighbors, and the electors of

Northampton were, at last, obeyed, which is the only word for what the chair's ruling did: it obeyed the elections.

What made the day possible was the fourth answer. The general election of 1885 had come and gone, and Northampton had sent him again, the fourth time back, the answer in writing again, and in larger letters than before, and the new Parliament's swearing-in days were upon the House, and the old war's last formal move was the objector's statement of January 12, 1886, served on the chair and read into the next day's record, where it sits still, one member's written objection to the atheist's swearing, on the record, forever, the war's last gasp in the House's own grammar. It named the old arguments, the void oath and the unbindable man, and the chair heard them, and the chair ruled past them. This paper is worth noting for its form as much as for its fate, because the form is the war's whole trajectory in miniature: it was an objection in writing, a procedural instrument, the war's violence reduced at last to a paper, and the paper was read, and the chair ruled past it, and the paper joined the record with the thirteen dates and the five adjectives and all the rest of the self-documentation. The gasp had become a ruling in 1880. The ruling had become a war. The war had become a list. The list had become, at last, a formality, a paper read and ruled past, which is how machines end wars: on a schedule, never by surrender, the objection noted, the oath administered, the member seated, the record complete, the seat filled, the war over, and the whole six-year position dissolving in an afternoon of its own procedure, the way ice goes off a river in a morning.

What the six years had cost is worth one paragraph before the statute, because the victory's price is part of the victory. The man who took the oath on January 13, 1886 was not the man who had asked for the affirmation in May of 1880. He was six years older, six years poorer in money and health, six years into the legal war's grinding, the penalties and the informations and the ejections behind him, the health of the platforms spent in the courts, all of it fought and defended and borne. The machine had spent him, the way it spends everyone it wars with, in money and years and health, and it had not broken him, and that is the war's only lesson that matters to the next refuser: the machine cannot be outwaited forever, but it can be outwaited by a man with a borough behind him. Its four answers had held the seat's legal claim alive while the courts and the House consumed the years, and the chair's ruling, when it came, cost the House nothing but the admission of its own six-year error, and it cost the man everything a man can pay short of the grave, and he paid it, and the receipts are the five years of his own record, the cases and the ejections and the nights, and the health he did not recover, and the grave was five years off, and the machine's apology would arrive three days before it. The victory was real. So was the bill. The book does not round either one. The machine's victories are rounded by the machine; the refuser's are not. This chapter keeps both, because the record keeps both, and a victory with its price attached is the only kind this book reports.

The second act is the statute, and the statute is his, and its hardest paragraph is the one the winning cost him. The Oaths Bill of 1888 was Bradlaugh's own bill, introduced by the member who had been kept out by the old law, and the bill as he introduced it was universal: every person objecting to be sworn shall be at liberty to affirm. Read that clause: the whole refuser tradition in one sentence, the Quakers' two centuries and the Jews' eleven years and his own six, generalized to everyone, no screening, no test, no showing of conscience. It is the cleanest answer the law

could give, the door removed entirely. And it did not pass in that form, and the record of how it narrowed is better than the victory. The bill survived its second reading in March on an undertaking: the Solicitor General would let it live if the clause carried grounds, and on the fourth of July, in committee, Bradlaugh himself moved the amendment that cut his own universal clause down to the two-limb form, the affirmation for the man who objected on grounds of conscience and for the man with no religious belief at all, the two limbs the courts could administer. His own side begged him not to; Morley, Labouchere, and Hunter spoke against him, and the amendment carried, 172 to 166, and the Lords received the trimmed bill, their December third-reading debate reading the two-limb text as its own. The universal liberty died in the Commons, by the mover's own hand, the mover counting the votes and choosing the living bill over the perfect one. The victory was narrowed in the winning, and the narrowing is the chapter's sharpest edge, the refuser's own choice at the refuser's own price: the win was real, and the win was trimmed, and the trim is on the record, and the record says who held the knife.

The act's dates are the chapter's small lesson in the book's discipline, because the record of them was tangled, and the untangling is worth printing once. The Dictionary of National Biography gives August 9, 1888 as the act's date, and the enacted text carries the royal assent of December 24, 1888, and both dates are real, and they belong to different stages: the second reading on the fourteenth of March, the committee fight of July 4, the Commons' passage on the ninth of August, the Lords' third reading and passage of December 4, and the assent of December 24, and the act is 51 and 52 Victoria, chapter 46. And the dates end with the record's own vindication: the Administration of Justice Act 1977, section 8, struck the two limbs out of section one and enacted his original clause whole, any person objecting to be sworn permitted to affirm, and the Oaths Act 1978 repealed his act outright and carried the universal affirmation at section 5, the screen dead, his own clause the law now in the law's own words, eighty-nine years after he moved the trim himself. Not an error so much as a stage: the records are human, and the dates attach to stages, and the discipline is knowing which stage. The DNB's date is in the biography; the assent's date is in the text. The book keeps it anyway, because the rule of this book is that the record's stages get their own dates. That is the whole discipline, and it costs little, and it is worth everything. The victory's legal text is dated Christmas Eve, 1888, and it arrived eight years, six months, and two days after the June night when both doors were shut in one sentence, and the counting of those days is the chapter's own acknowledgment of what the delays cost in a man's short life.

What the act did is best read in its second and third sections and its schedule, where a statute keeps its meaning. The second section fixed the affirmation's permanent words, the form the Friends had won in the Georgian re-cut, the clean form every unbelieving witness and every objecting member has used since: the solemn, sincere, and true declaration and affirmation, the sentence with no God in it and the statute's whole penalty behind it, the 1696 section-three wire carried forward intact. The third section answered the war's own judgment: where an oath has been duly administered and taken, the swearer's want of religious belief shall not affect the oath's validity, the clause Bradlaugh wrote himself in the same committee week, to kill the 1885 ruling's premise at its root. The schedule did the quieter work: it swept away the conscience tests of 1869 and 1870, the evidence acts' requirement that the judge find the oath unbinding on the witness's conscience, the screening the courts had used to keep the affirmation a favor instead of a right. What replaced

it was still a screen, and the chapter does not pretend otherwise, but the screen was now statutory, general, and administered by the clerk and not by the judge's inquiry, and that is the difference between a favor and a law. The affirmation of 1888 was the affirmation the Friends had projected in 1696, minus only the universality trimmed in committee, and it ran eighty-nine years before the universal clause came home, and it runs today in every courtroom in the kingdom, and the whole three-hundred-year defense of the oath's monopoly ended with a schedule and a third section and a second, on Christmas Eve, without a shot fired, in the statute book, where everything in this book ends, because the statute book is where the law keeps what it cannot take back.

Here the chapter takes the hostile reading of the 1888 act head-on, because it is a fair one, and it deserves a fair answer, and it gets one, in the act's own record. He sold the universal clause, says the reader: the man who spent six years refusing to bend bent in committee, moved the screen himself, and bought the bill with the principle. The affirmation of 1888 is the affirmation of 1696 with a better haircut, a favor dressed as a right. It has evidence, and the chapter does not skimp any of it: the mover of the trim was Bradlaugh, the division was 172 to 166, his own side voted against him, and a victory trimmed in the winning is a trimmed victory. And it is wrong, and it is answered on the same record, at full strength: the trimmed form covered the whole class of the genuinely excluded, every refuser the record had ever produced, the atheist and the conscience-grounded objector both, and it made the affirmation general, statutory, and unadministrable by any judge's discretion, and the wire into perjury held, and it worked for eighty-nine years. The grave alone made him yield, he had said, and the two-limb form was not the grave, and he knew the difference, and he took the law, because the alternative was no law at all: the Solicitor General had the votes, and the perfect was the enemy's name for the dead. And the machine's own ending vindicates the choice, because the trimmed act ran until 1977, when Parliament struck the limbs out of the section and enacted his original clause whole, and the universal liberty he introduced in 1888 is the law now. It was the law, and it worked, and the door it opened has never closed since, and the door is the one he drew.

Bradlaugh wrote the instruction manual. His pamphlet, The Right to Affirm, is the refuser's own guide to the new right, and it is the most characteristic document of the whole war, the war's whole method in a pamphlet: the man who had been excluded by the form of words telling everyone else, in print, how to use the new one, down to the exact sentence to say in the box, the words to speak when the oath is offered, the answer to the clerk, the statutory ground beneath each word. The pamphlet is open at Wikisource for anyone who wants to watch a machine's conqueror teach the conquered's procedure to the public. It is a short pamphlet and a practical one, and its practicality is its whole argument, and its whole dignity. This is the thing the refusers do at the end of every long refusal in this book: they write the manual. A refusal is never complete until the manual exists, because the right that cannot be used is not yet won. The Friends' lobbyists drafted forms; Frankel wrote the monograph; Lilburne's case went into the State Trials; the rabbi of Saverne kept his doors; and Bradlaugh wrote the pamphlet that told the witnesses and the jurors of England exactly what to say. Its last indignity is the best one: the former prisoner became the instructor, and the courts took the lesson, and the public read its sentences into the courts' own practice, and its courts learned the new rule from the man the rule had been made to exclude, and every witness who has affirmed since 1888 has spoken, in a sense, in his voice, down to the sentence in the box, the words he taught the public to say.

The third act is the apology, and it has its own two scenes, and the first is his alone, and he moved it himself. On March 8, 1889, Bradlaugh moved the expungement himself, in the House, naming the page: the Commons Journal, volume 135, page 934, the resolution of June 22, 1880, both doors shut in one sentence, the war's legal text, the machine's own sentence against itself, and he moved that the House's own record be expunged, struck from the memory of the House. He named the page as he moved it, the volume and the page, because the page was the war's legal text and he meant to have it condemned by its own keeper. The grant did not come that day. The chapter prints the record at its width and no wider: he moved it, and the House declined, and the disposal's precise line, negatived or withdrawn, the record at hand does not say, and the waiting is itself the proof, because the expungement arrived only in 1891, from other hands, in the last year of the war and the man. The scene to keep is the man who had been barred by the Journal reading the Journal back to it, the member on his feet with the book open, citing its volume and page to its face, the machine's own record quoted at the machine by the man the record had excluded. The House that had kept the thirteen dates heard its own page named by its own member, and it waited two more years, and the waiting is on the record too. By then the archive of the war was the man who moved his own vindication, and the archive was running out of time, and everyone in the chamber knew it.

The second scene is January 27, 1891, and it is the machine apologizing to a man past hearing it. William Alexander Hunter moved the expungement of the 1880 resolution, and the debate's shape is on the record and in the New York Herald of the next morning, the period primary this chapter keeps: Gladstone supported the motion and proposed softening it, dropping the words that condemned the old resolution as subversive of the electors' rights, warning the House against excess of jurisdiction, the old man trimming the condemnation one last time, the victory trimmed in the granting, one last edit from the record's keepers; the younger Northcote backed the suggestion; and W. H. Smith, the Leader of the House, spoke the House's sorrow at Bradlaugh's illness, and the sorrow was genuine, and it was also the war's last formality, because the man whose seat the war had been fought over was dying, and no one in the chamber mistook the occasion. The motion as amended passed without a division, unanimously per the Dictionary of National Biography, and the unanimity is its own record. The House, at the end, was unanimous against its own past. At Circus Road, in St. John's Wood, three days from his death, Charles Bradlaugh lay unconscious, and did not know, and the House knew he did not know, and it passed the motion anyway, because the record had to be right even if the man could not hear it. The House had condemned its own resolution, in its own Journal, on the record, forever, and the man it had barred was past hearing it, and the machine's apology arrived three days before the grave. The oath's whole history is in the timing: the machine can always be made to correct itself, and the correction will always be late, and it will always be legible.

He died on January 30, 1891, three days after the expungement, in the house at Circus Road, and he never knew the House had reversed itself. The deathbed was three days past the apology, and the apology never reached it. The funeral was at Brookwood, the great cemetery out past Woking, the secularists' ground, and the mourners came in their thousands, from the platforms and the courts and the boroughs, and among them, on the record, was a young law student from India named Mohandas Gandhi, who had heard him lecture and had stood in the crowd at the graveside; the detail is the record's, and the book keeps it at the record's size: the young Gandhi among the

mourners, no more claimed for the argument than that. And the war's last casualty was its whole reason, and the House's apology was three days too late, and three days is the whole history in miniature, and the book does not need to arrange the timing into a lesson, because the timing is the lesson. It corrects itself the way it does everything: completely, officially, and late. And lateness, in a machine that runs on the record, is the one fault that cannot be expunged. He had not yielded, not once, not at the door or the table or the Tower room, and the grave had come, and the grave had been the only thing in the whole war that could beat him, and the House's own record had already, by then, begun to say so. And the record of the war had been his biography's argument before the biography was written, and the record of the apology was his vindication before he could hear it, and both are in the House's own books, which is where he always said they would be.

The accounting of the victory is the movement's ledger, and it balances to the day. What was spent: the years, the money, the health, the man's whole last decade, the decade he did not get to spend in the seat he had won five times. What was bought: the affirmation, general and statutory, for members and witnesses, in England and beyond her; the parliamentary oath opened to the unbeliever; the House's own resolution condemned by the House's own hand in its own Journal; and the answer to the war's constitutional question, delivered by the whole six years' result, which is that the electors own the seat, and the members keep the forms, and the forms must let the electors' man in. The question was answered the way the law answers everything: by the record, in the end, after everything else failed. The machine this book has tracked from the wax figures to the statute book had, in this one corner, been made to reverse itself entirely, and not by a court and not by a riot: by a man and a borough refusing, on the record, for six years, until the record itself turned. That is the refuser's whole method, proven in the largest forum the book will enter, and the method is this book's whole third movement, and the movement ends here. The oath could not be refused forever by it, because it runs on the record, and the record, in the end, was his, and the record is the only thing in this whole book that has never once been bribed. It can be locked, it can be expunged, it can be unread for a generation, and it cannot be bought, which is why the refusers always kept their own books, and the war's whole proof sits on that one property of ink.

The close is the page, because the page is where the machine keeps its conscience, and the conscience, once written, cannot be unwritten. At the Commons Journal, volume 135, page 934, the resolution of June 22, 1880, both doors shut in one sentence: expunged by the resolution of January 27, 1891, condemned by the House that wrote it, and still there. The page is the proof of the machine's whole nature: it records everything, it hides nothing, and it outlasts every one of its keepers; the House dies with its parliaments, and the page does not. And the last thing is Bradlaugh's own teaching, from his own testimony in the war's first year, when he told the committee about Wilkes and the old expungement: the expunged resolution remains legible in the Journal; expunged means disowned, never erased. The House can condemn its own resolution, and the condemnation goes on the record beside the resolution, and the resolution stays in the book, legible, printed, permanent, the machine's memory longer than its mercy and longer than its apologies. And the resolution on the page was disowned, and the page was never erased. The member for Northampton, who taught the House that lesson from his own war's first year, is the man on whose behalf the lesson was finally used, three days before his grave, in the Journal he had taught them to read, on the page that outlasted them all. The oath's whole long war ended where it had to end: in the book, on the

page, legible in the record. And the page is where this book leaves him: the resolution disowned, the record legible, permanent, and read, and the record is the oath's only incorruptible officer. The witness from the first page is still in the air; the war just ended is why his choice exists. The machine apologized; the man was past hearing it; the page was not.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

Oath or Affirmation

The Constitution of the United States never names God, and the reader who has never checked should check, because the fact is the chapter's foundation, and the whole chapter's argument stands on it. Not in the preamble, not in an article, not in a clause; the only echo anywhere in it is the date formula, the year of our Lord, which is a calendar's convention and not an invocation, and no one has ever read it as one. In the founding text of the most religious republic on earth, the oath is everywhere and the deity is nowhere, and the difference is deliberate, and the document is short, and the omission is the whole point of it, and this chapter is the account of how it got there. Three places in the document do the work, and they are worth reading as a set, because they are the founding machine's own grammar, the framers' founding answer to the whole history this book has walked: the presidential oath with the affirmation built in, the oath clause welded to the ban on religious tests, and the warrant clause's oath or affirmation. The framers had watched the refusers for a century and a half. They had seen the Quakers rot for want of a form, and the Jews standing excluded from the House of Commons by an oath's closing words, and the tests sort the dishonest into office and the conscientious out of it. They wrote the lesson into the founding text, in the oath's own clauses, in the document's own words, and the lesson is the machine's American form: the oath kept, the affirmation built in, the test banned, and God, in the operative text, absent.

The first site is the presidency itself. Article Two, section one, writes the oath of office into the Constitution's own text, the only oath the document spells out word for word, the only formula the framers trusted to the text itself: I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. Read it against the whole record of this book. The parenthesis is the whole war's treaty: or affirm, built into the founding text, in the presidency's own sentence, in the oath's own clause, the affirmation written into the presidency's own formula from the beginning, never begged from an unwilling state, the Quakers' two centuries arriving at the republic's highest office. The oath's content is the constitution's ideal form: promissory, constitutional, addressed to no one but the document itself, the oath an office's duty and nothing else. No God is named in it. No punisher is named in it. The oath is the undertaking, and the undertaking is the office, and the formula is complete without the words this book opened on, the so help me that

the first chapter took apart. The so help me God of the modern inauguration is not in the Constitution. It is added, by custom, by the man taking the oath, and when it was added, and by whom, and on what evidence, is the question this chapter will not dodge, because the dodging of it is the whole lore this book exists to answer, and the question is the book's whole method in miniature, and the book's whole honesty.

The second site is Article Six, and it is the machine's charter, the whole of it in one sentence. The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States. The weld is in one sentence, and the sentence is worth hearing in full, because the sentence is the machine's charter, the whole law of the American oath in one breath. The first clause makes the oath the constitution's ligature, the thing every officer is bound by, senators and representatives, legislators, judges, all of them, the whole personnel of the republic, bound by the same sentence. The second clause makes the oath's content none of the state's business, the test banned in perpetuity, the gate's whole history answered in one phrase. One phrase, and the whole apparatus of the doctrinal door was answered forever, in the founding text, by the founders themselves. The two together are the framers' American balancing: the oath everywhere, the test nowhere, the state binding the duty, the doctrine left alone, the oath's address the citizen's own affair. That is the whole answer to the Tudor turn, to the test acts, to the whole apparatus of the doctrinal door, written into the founding text by men who had read the whole record of it, and who were, some of them, the record's own victims' children. It has never been repealed, and it has never needed to be, and no serious movement has ever been raised to repeal it.

The third site is the one everyone forgets, and it is the one the law uses every hour of every day, in every county, in every state. The Fourth Amendment's warrant clause: no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation. The warrant, the state's daily instrument of entry, runs on the oath or the affirmation, the sworn statement of the officer who wants the door opened, the affidavit that arms the search, the oath as the state's cutting edge, every day, in every courthouse, on every judge's desk. This is the oath as the trigger in its purest American form: the sworn sentence that arms the search, the thing that turns a man's word into the state's entry into your house. The affirmation is built into it too, the same parenthesis, the same treaty, at the level of the daily warrant. The framers did not open the high offices alone. They opened them to the refusers' children too. They opened the whole machinery, the presidency and the warrant and every office between, and they wrote the affirmation into the law's daily operations, and the parenthesis is the proof that they meant it: or affirm, everywhere the oath runs, in the founding text, forever. The officer with the warrant in his hand is the oath's most common American figure, and his affidavit is the oath's daily work, and the parenthesis is printed in his forms, and the state runs on his sworn sentence the way it ran on the legion's: the state moves on the strength of a spoken undertaking, and the undertaking must be sworn, and the swearing must be the man's own, oath or affirmation, his choice, in the founding text, from the beginning.

The framers knew what they were doing, and the ratification record shows them knowing it. At the North Carolina convention at Hillsborough, July 30, 1788, in Elliot's Debates, volume four, pages

191 to 200 and 208 and 209, the no-religious-test clause got its full public hearing, the whole question argued in the open, and the hearing had two named pairs where the received account held one loose attribution, and the correction is the record's own, from the record's own pages. Henry Abbot of Camden County opened the day with the fear: without a test, pagans, deists, and Mahometans might obtain offices, and the fear was the whole exclusionary tradition speaking, the whole exclusionary tradition's anxiety in one sentence. James Iredell, two years from Washington's Supreme Court, answered it at length and with the record: religious tests have wrought dreadful mischief, and the dishonest will profess whatever power requires while the conscientious are excluded, and to exclude any set of men destroys the principle contended for. David Caldwell widened the fear to the Jews and pagans of every kind, and Samuel Spencer answered him with the record's own lesson: no test can screen the secret unbeliever, the man willing to profess falsely, and the test's only certain effect is to exclude the honest. Two pairs, two fears, two answers, and the answers are the same answer: the test does not work, and it punishes the honest, and it lets the liar through. The convention heard the whole thing, the fear and the answer, and then refused both courses, neither ratifying nor rejecting, and North Carolina stood outside the new union for a year, and when it came in, at Fayetteville in November of 1789, the clause stood exactly as the framers wrote it, the exclusion case argued at full strength in front of them and answered on the record.

Then the First Congress sat down and wrote the machine's first statute, and the statute is the proof that the founding text meant what it said. The Act of June 1, 1789, chapter one, 1 Statutes at Large 23, is the first law enacted under the Constitution, the first statute of the first Congress of the new republic, and it is an oath act, and that priority is the machine's own announcement of what it runs on, before anything else, and the oath it prescribes runs fourteen words on either path, the affirmation needing the change of a single word, both doors opening off the same sentence: I, A. B. do solemnly swear or affirm (as the case may be) that I will support the Constitution of the United States. No God. No so help me. No address at all. The House reached quorum on April 1, passed the bill on April 27, the Senate added the state officers on May 5 in a statement of federal supremacy, and Washington signed it on June 1, days before anything else was law, and the first statute of the republic, the machine's own founding instrument, is an oath with the divine clause left out. This is the fact the whole American argument has to absorb. The men who had just written the Constitution sat as its first Congress, and, given the oath's whole history to work with, they wrote the oath without the words, in the same spring weeks as the first inauguration. The stump without the blessing, the formula reduced to the undertaking itself, the oath as the bare promise to support the document, and nothing else. That is the machine's American form, in its first statute, in its first session, the machinery and the presidency invented in the same weeks, the signature five weeks after the first oath of office, the door built before the first president walked through it.

And now the Washington question, and the chapter takes the strongest case seriously, because it deserves to be stated before the record answers it. The case is this: the words were universal in the period's oath practice; every oath of the era ended in so help me God; the altar-book was on the table at Federal Hall, because the eyewitnesses report Washington kissing it; and a man who kisses the book has just said the words, because the kiss seals the formula. That is a strong case, and it has been made by serious people, and it could be true, and the chapter says so before it answers: the strongest form of the tradition's case, stated fairly, is the only case worth answering. The record is

the record, and the record says: no contemporary account has him adding the words. The story of the addition first prints in 1854, in Rufus Griswold's Republican Court, riding on Washington Irving's account, and the first firmly contemporaneous presidential so help me God arrives with Chester Arthur, in September of 1881, sworn after Garfield's death. Jonassen's comprehensive study, the William and Mary Bill of Rights Journal's 2012 article, carries the finding at page 898, with the kissing-of-the-book chain through Truman, and the book's own research confirms it at the sources, the First Amendment Encyclopedia's entry with them. The kiss is attested. The words are not. The chapter's verdict is the record's verdict: the addition is a tradition, and no attestation, and the tradition may even be true, and the book prints it as a tradition, which is what the evidence supports, and the evidence is laid out on the table for anyone who wants to argue the rest.

One president alone affirmed, and the record of his day is institutional grade and complete, the Senate's own inaugural history carrying it, and the chapter prints the record at its width and no wider, the affirmation certain, the object uncertain, the motive unresolved. Franklin Pierce, the fourteenth president, at the East Portico on the fourth of March, 1853, in falling snow, with Chief Justice Taney administering, affirmed the oath of office and never swore it. The Senate's own inaugural record states it, and the Capitol Historical Society holds the contemporary accounts clear and strong. Why he affirmed, the record does not say: his biographer Wallner could find no evidence of the reason, and the circulating interpretation, that he carried the guilt of his son's death two months before and could not call on God, is an interpretation, and the chapter labels it one, and the book's rule holds: the fact is the affirmation, the motive is the record's silence. What he affirmed on, the book does not say, because the retellings split, a law book in most accounts, a Bible in one, and the chapter keeps the affirmation and drops the object, the retellings being split beyond the record's recovery. The affirmation stands. The object waits. That is what honest books do with split retellings, and the split is noted here so the reader watches it happen, because the noting is the whole discipline, and the discipline is the whole book. Pierce's day, the snow falling, Taney's hand, the affirmed oath: the scene is the record's, and the record is institutional, and the motive is unknown, and the object is unrecovered, and the affirmation is the only presidential affirmation in the whole history of the office, and it happened in the snow, and it counts.

And the myth gets its killing, because the machine's own instrument does it. For decades the word went round that Herbert Hoover, the Quaker president, had affirmed at his inauguration in 1929. It is the kind of fact everyone knows, and it is wrong, and the Capitol Historical Society says it plainly: the claim is an assumption, and Hoover swore the oath, as can be heard in the recordings of his inauguration, as did Nixon, the other Quaker. The phonograph settles it: the machine's own instrument killing the machine's own lore, the record that cannot be argued with, the actual sound of the man swearing, and the myth dies on the recording, and the chapter kills it here so that no reader repeats it, and the killing is the chapter's small demonstration of the book's whole rule. The record outranks the lore, and when the record is a recording, the lore has nowhere left to live. Pierce stands alone, the only president to affirm, and the myth of the second one is dead, and the death is on tape. The myth had a long life before the tape: the quiz columns, the trivia books, the well-meaning civics lectures, all of them repeating that Hoover the Quaker had affirmed, and none of them checking, and the checking was always one playing of the recording away. The lesson is the book's whole method in one sound, because the oath's American history is full of the things

everyone knows, and the things everyone knows are the things no one checks, and the recording is the answer to both, and the phonograph is the instrument that ended it. Hoover swore. Nixon swore. Pierce affirmed. The lore is dead, and the record is the president now, and the chapter moves on with the record, which is all this book has ever done.

And the dead letters are the chapter's strangest shelf, and they are still on the page. The state constitutions carried the old exclusion into the republic's own law: bars on the atheist witness, the unbeliever incompetent to testify, the office closed to the man who denies the being of a God, the oath's gate kept in the states after the federal gate fell. They are still printed, in the present tense, on the official pages, where anyone can read them. Arkansas's constitution of 1874, article nineteen, section one, still carries it, disqualifying any person who denies the being of a God from civil office and from competence to testify as a witness in any court, the witness clause included, the oath's exclusion printed in the present tense. It is unenforceable, has been for sixty-five years, and is still there, and eight state constitutions are in the same position, the tests dead and printed, preserved in the texts that can no longer enforce them. The states keep them the way states keep everything: repealing a dead letter costs a legislature a day, and no legislature spends one, and the old exclusions sit in the texts, waiting for the reader, and the reader who finds them finds the machine's whole history printed in a state constitution's present tense, the atheist incompetent to testify in any court, says Arkansas, today, in print, unrepealed and unenforceable, the oath's old gate standing open and rusted and never removed, the state's whole idea of maintenance: the door stays, the lock is broken, and the hinge stays broken. The dead letters are the machine's attic, kept by never being thrown out, and they matter because they show what the oath's American settlement looks like in the state texts: the gate abolished at the top and preserved at the bottom, the words still on the page, the page still unrepealed, the exclusion unenforceable and unforgotten.

And the last test fell in 1961, in the case this movement has been walking toward since Bradlaugh's door. Torcaso v. Watkins, 367 U.S. 488, decided June 19, 1961, unanimous, Justice Black writing, and the case is the machine's neatest self-indictment. Roy Torcaso wanted to be a notary public in Maryland, and the Maryland Declaration of Rights, Article 37, provided that no religious test ought ever to be required as a qualification for any office, and then carried the one test: other than a declaration of belief in the existence of God. The no-test guarantee with the test inside it. The machine's whole history in one article's own contradiction. Torcaso declined to declare a belief in God, and Maryland refused him the notary's commission, and the Supreme Court struck the test, unanimously, as against the First and Fourteenth Amendments, and the whole class of state religious tests fell with it, rendered unenforceable, still printed, dead letters on their pages. The oath's last gate, the belief test in the constitution's own text, was struck by the machine's own court, in its own language, unanimously, within living memory. The gate is gone. The words remain, and the words, the declaration of belief in the existence of God, are the answer to anyone who asks what the oath's exclusion was ever about. He wanted to notarize documents. The machine's last gate stood between him and a rubber stamp, and the Supreme Court of the United States answered it unanimously, and the answer was that the belief test is not a gate the constitution allows it to keep, and the dead letters died, in law, on June 19, 1961, in the pages that still print them.

So the American settlement can be read whole now, and it is the machine's cleanest page. The founding text: the oath with the affirmation built in, the test banned, the deity absent from the

operative clauses. The first statute: the fourteen words, no God in them, the affirmation riding the same sentence's parenthesis, signed by Washington himself. The tradition: the words added later, attested decades late, the kiss attested and the addition not, Pierce alone in the record, the Hoover myth dead on tape. The states' dead letters: printed, unenforceable, unrepealed. Torcaso: the last test struck, unanimously, in 1961. The machine that began with the curse and the stone ends its American course with the cleanest oath in the record: the undertaking, the affirmation beside it, the test dead, the God optional, the book kissed by custom and not by law. It is the oath the refusers built, and the framers wrote down, and the courts finished, and its words are the close. The oath is kept, because the machine cannot run without it: the state moves on sworn sentences, and the whole book is the proof. The affirmation is built in, because the refusers proved the oath could not be the only door, and the framers read the proof. The test is banned, because the tests sorted the dishonest in and the conscientious out, and the framers watched it and answered it. And the deity is optional, because the perjury statute had carried the penalty for two centuries, and the framers could see the form working without the address, and the machine's American honesty is that it stopped pretending otherwise. The oath the republic runs on is the oath the record produced: the stump, the parenthesis, the dead test, and the statute's wire, and no one designed it, and everyone did.

The chapter closes on the constitutional text, the founding answer, and it reads like the refusers' whole case. I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. The parenthesis is the whole third movement, written into the presidency's own sentence. The oath that began with the curse, that was whipped into Lilburne and offered to More and refused by the Friends and taken at last by Bradlaugh, ends its American form here: a promise, with the affirmation inside it, addressed to the document and no one else. No God is named in it. No punisher is named in it. The missing half is missing from the founding text itself, by design, and the design is the framers' answer to everything this book has walked, and it is written in the machine's own charter, in the oath's own clause, in the parenthesis where the affirmation lives, or affirm, the two words that took three hundred years to write. And the text is the machine's charter and the refusers' monument, and it opens the movement on the words themselves, because the words are the thing the whole history was fought over, and they are short, and they are old, and they are, at last, everyone's. The hand goes up or it does not. The book is kissed or it is not. The oath is sworn or the affirmation is made, and the machine does not care which. That is the whole point, and it took the whole record to reach it. The record is the close.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

The Whole Truth

The oath that used to test the conscience now bends to it. Watch the law at its modern morning's work, and the law's instrument is unrecognizable from its own past. The witness who will not swear is no longer turned away; the clerk asks what form of words will bind her conscience, and the form is hers to name, and the court will work with it, and the wire holds whatever the words are. The oath that spent three thousand years deciding who could be heard has become an instrument that adjusts to the instrument's user, and the whole history of the gate's keepers, the tests, the seven words, the creed-locks, has ended in a rule that reads like a refuser's brief: any form calculated to awaken the conscience and impress the duty. That is Federal Rule of Evidence 603, and its advisory committee's note says the quiet part aloud, in the rulemakers' own voice, on the record of the rule itself: no special verbal formula is required. The formula this book opened on, the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, the formula that was hard enough to die for, is now, in the law's own words, one option among forms. The machine has not gone soft, and the chapter will not let anyone say so. It has read the record, and the record is this book's whole third movement: the gatekeepers' tests never kept anyone honest, and the exclusions never kept anyone safe, and the only thing the oath ever needed was the conscience it used to test. The clerk's question now comes in every form the conscience will answer, and the law's whole three-thousand-year lesson is in the asking: the form does not matter, the conscience does. And the modern rule is the machine's surrender to its own evidence, and the surrender is the chapter's subject, and it is the best thing it ever did.

The rule deserves to be read with the note that explains it, because the note is the rulemakers' own admission, in the rulemakers' own voice. Rule 603 requires the witness to declare, by oath or affirmation, in a form calculated to awaken the conscience and impress the mind, the phrase itself the drafters' inheritance from the older oath's whole function, the words of the 1975 adoption, before the restylers changed the dress and kept the sentence, and the Advisory Committee's Note to the Proposed Rules, drafted for the rules enacted in 1975, names the audiences the flexibility exists for: religious adults, atheists, conscientious objectors, mental defectives, and children. The rulemakers' list is the whole history of the exclusion answered in a parenthesis, and the parenthesis is the rulemakers' own answer to its own record. The atheist is on it, two centuries after the gatekeepers. The conscientious objector is on it, three centuries after the Friends rotted. The child is on it, and the child is the chapter's second half. The capacity cases are on it, the witnesses the old law would have quizzed and excluded, now simply asked for their words in the form that reaches them. The note closes where this book closes: it cites the perjury statute, 18 U.S.C. 1621, because even the rulemakers agreed that the flexible form is still the trigger: whatever words awaken the conscience, the false sentence spoken under them is perjury, and the wire holds. The form is free. The penalty is not. That is the whole modern settlement in one advisory note, and the rulemakers

wrote it, and the book did not have to. The Advisory Committee did not need this book to write it. They had the record themselves, and they read it, and the note is the reading, and the reading is the settlement.

The statutory oaths still on the books are the old world's survivals, and they are worth one paragraph because they show what the flexibility left behind. The judge's oath, 28 U.S.C. 453, is still statutory, and its words are the old words, the justice administered without respect to persons, the equal right to the poor and to the rich, and it still ends, by statute, So help me God. The officer's oath, 5 U.S.C. 3331, the ironclad oath's domesticated descendant, has stood unchanged since 1966, the support-and-defend clause in its modern form, the loyalty oath's usable remainder. The statutory oaths are the law's housekeeping, and they keep the old form because the old form is the state's own habit, and the public's oath is the one that got free. The state kept its own oaths fixed and freed the witness's, and the same building contains both, and no one in the building finds it strange. The bench's own oath keeps the old formula: the judicial oath's last sentence is the first chapter's, kept by statute, for the judges, while the witnesses before them affirm in forms the statute never names, and the bench's own So help me God is the survival's own proof: the law keeps the old words for itself and lets the public go free. The old oath survives where the state administers it to itself. The new oath runs where the state administers it to the public. The perjury statute covers both, because the wire does not care what the words were, and the wire is the law's whole continuity: the oath's form changes, the penalty never does, and the statute's answer is the same whether the sentence was sworn on the book or promised in the air.

The accommodations are where the flexibility meets a refuser, and the case is the Ninth Circuit's, and it is this chapter's working proof. United States v. Ward, 989 F.2d 1015, the opinion dated August 19, 1992, amended April 1, 1993, the earlier report of the same appeal at 973 F.2d 730, the dates printed plainly because the book dates its stages plainly. The substance is the rule's whole flexibility tested on a hard case. Ward, who wrote and published under the name Frank R. Wallace, the Neo-Tech publisher, a man whose honesty was a philosophy with a capital letter, was on trial on a tax indictment, and he would not take the oath in its usual form, and he proposed his own: an affirmation to speak with fully integrated Honesty, his own philosophy's capitalized term, set in the three ritual positions of the traditional formula. The magistrate refused: an oath administered to millions for hundreds of years, he ruled, should not yield to idiosyncratic distinctions, which is the law's old answer in its new form, the gatekeeper at the level of the words themselves. Ward offered the compromise, both oaths together, and was refused below. The Ninth Circuit reversed for abuse of discretion: the sincerity of the belief honored, the conviction vacated, the testimony to be heard on his own terms, with the note that he had no standing to demand his oath for other witnesses. Rule 603's flexibility, tested and vindicated on a tax indictment, for a man whose honesty had a capital H. The law bent, and the testimony was heard, and the wire held, and the case is the whole chapter in one appeal. The man got his own words, and the words bound him, and the statute covered them, and that is all the oath has ever needed to do.

The wording itself, jurisdiction by jurisdiction, is the law's modern Babel, and the Babel is the settlement's proof. The American formula is the famous one, the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, the three fences of the first chapter, and the states' own forms vary around it, and the courtrooms of the country speak a hundred small variations, and the federal rule names none, and

the varieties are the settlement's texture. The machine that once prescribed one form, that killed men for refusing it, that barred Jews and Quakers and atheists from its courts, now prescribes none at all, and the conscience does the work. The old fixed text survives in the statutory oaths, the judges and the officers, the state's own housekeeping, and everywhere else the rule is the flexible one, and the flexibility is the law's late honesty: the oath was never the words. The oath was the conscience the words were meant to wake, and the words are now whatever wakes it, and the wire holds them all, and the perjury statute covers every one of them, and the whole apparatus of the fixed form, the whole history of the men who died for the wrong words, is answered by the law's own admission that the words were never the point, and it is the whole third movement's harvest: the forms were fought over for centuries, and the settlement is that they were not worth the fighting. The varieties are the settlement's texture, and the texture is the law's own evidence that the oath has always been the conscience, and the conscience has always been the oath, and the words were always the law's own costume, and the costume is now optional, and the oath remains.

And then the machine met the child, and the child is the chapter's second half, and the child's promise is the oath's diminutive, and the science is the proof. The developmental literature is printed and public, and its findings are the kind the law should have been waiting for. Talwar, Lee, Bala, and Lindsay, in Law and Human Behavior in 2002, the court-competence study at pages 395 to 415, found that a promise measurably raises truth-telling in children: the child-friendly promise reduced lying, in a courtroom-relevant design, with the controls in place, the laboratory's answer to the oath's whole question. The laboratories have been answering it for a generation, and the law has begun, at last, to listen. The sequel, on children concealing a parent's transgression, the case where the child's loyalty is the case against the child's truth, ran the same instrument against the harder case, and the promise worked there too, at reduced but real strength, the laboratory's answer to the law's oldest worry, the witness with a reason to lie. The wording work for the youngest witnesses is the work of finding the sentence a four-year-old can mean, and the sentence the researchers settled on is the smallest form of the oldest sentence in this book: do you promise that you will tell the truth. No God, no book, no raised hand required: the child's promise, the oath's diminutive, the law's smallest instrument, and the one that works. The promise, not the oath, is the law's smallest sentence, addressed to its smallest witness, and it works, and the laboratories keep confirming it, and the laboratories are the next chapter's whole subject, and the finding is banked here because the law needs it now, and the child is the witness the law was always going to have to answer, because the child's truth is the courtroom's hardest and most important one.

The Lyon study is the one that tested the statute's design after the fact, and the statute is Canada's, and it is the law's most complete modern answer, written on the first findings and confirmed by the later one. Lyon, Malloy, Quas, and Talwar, in Child Development in 2008, pages 914 to 929, worked with 198 maltreated four-to-seven-year-olds, the hardest witnesses the system has, and the finding is exact: the child-friendly oath improved accuracy on free recall and on repeated yes-no questions, the effect fading under highly suggestive questioning, the laboratory's own warning about the interviewer's power, and, the finding that ends the quiz: neither age nor the child's understanding of lying's meaning and consequences consistently predicted accuracy, not the child's age, not the child's doctrine, not the child's metaphysics. The child who cannot define perjury, who cannot say what a lie's punishment is or what the oath's sanction means, tells the truth under the

promise as well as the child who can, and the finding is the design's own confirmation. And the metaphysics quiz, the old competency inquiry, the court's question of what God does to liars, is answered by the laboratory: it predicts nothing. The laboratory's finding is the law's answer to the quiz, and the answer is that the quiz is dead, and the promise is the instrument, and the instrument is the child's. The whole three-hundred-year apparatus of the competency inquiry, the questions about God and the soul and the hereafter, is answered by the study of 198 children and their promise, and the answer is that the apparatus was never the point, and the point was always the promise, and the promise works. The companions stand with it in the record, Lyon and Dorado in Child Abuse and Neglect in 2008, Lyon and Saywitz in Applied Developmental Science in 1999, the battery complete, the findings consistent, the science the witness's own evidence at last.

And Canada enacted it. The Canada Evidence Act, section 16.1, added by the Statutes of Canada 2005, chapter 32, section 27, in force in 2006, reads like the laboratory's own statute: a person under fourteen is presumed to have capacity; a proposed witness under fourteen shall not take an oath or make a solemn affirmation, despite any Act requiring one; the evidence shall be received if they are able to understand and respond to questions; the court shall require them to promise to tell the truth; no such witness shall be asked any questions regarding their understanding of the nature of the promise; and the evidence so received has the same effect as if taken under oath. The oath deleted. The promise given oath-force. The metaphysics quiz banned by statute, the law's own answer to the laboratory's finding, the statute written the way the evidence said to write it, the committee record showing the science behind the no-questions rule. The child is a witness, full stop, and the promise is the whole instrument, and the false promise answers to the same law, with one deliberate mercy: the criminal code will not convict a child under twelve, so the youngest witnesses carry the wire uncharged, the punishment clause amputated on purpose this time, by statute, and the promise works without it, which is the laboratory's whole finding and this book's. It is the cleanest piece of oath legislation in the record, and it works, and the whole history of the law's exclusions is answered in one section of one act of one country, and the whole thing is the law's final answer to the gate's whole history: no questions about the promise's nature, no quiz about the soul, just the promise, and the promise is enough, and the evidence counts as if sworn, because it is. The statute's history note carries the enactment; the text is the statute's cleanest modern page.

The law's remaining edges are worth one paragraph, because they show the flexibility's full reach. The interpreter is sworn under Rule 604, the oath to make a true translation, the oath's form extended to the law's second voice, the one that carries the testimony across the language barrier, and the perjury statute covers the interpreter too, the wire extended to the translation; and the translator's oath is the law's most doubled instrument: an oath about an oath, a sworn sentence about sworn sentences; the wire runs through both. The oath by video link, the remote testimony of the modern courtroom, the witness sworn over the screen: the formula works through the wire, the conscience awakened by a clerk on a monitor, the raised hand raised into a camera, and the law's three-thousand-year furniture is a cable. The wire's own law is unchanged: the false translation answers to the same statute as the false testimony, and the remote oath binds the way the near one does, because the oath was never the room. The oath was the sentence, and the sentence travels. The naturalization oath, the oath that makes the citizen, runs by regulation at 8 C.F.R. 337.1 and the USCIS Policy Manual: the affirmation available, and so help me God omitted on request, the

citizenship oath's ending modular, the applicant's choice printed in the regulation. The machine that once made More's silence treason now lets the new citizen omit the divine clause by checking a box. That is the whole history of this book in one regulation's checkbox, and the checkbox is the law's answer to the whole third movement, printed in the Code of Federal Regulations, available on request, and the request is the whole point: the divine clause is now an option, and the option is the applicant's, and the state does not care which box is checked, because the wire holds either way.

And Girouard closes the accommodation's course, in 1946, in the case the movement's tradition produced. James Girouard, a Seventh-day Adventist, a man whose conscience would carry no rifle, would swear allegiance and would not swear to bear arms, and the naturalization oath's question was whether the oath's terms excluded him, and the question had been answered against the objectors before, in the machine's own courts, in the 1929 cases, the objectors excluded for the conscience's sake, and the exclusions had stood, and the objectors had been kept out for a generation, and the law had called it the country's defense, and the Supreme Court, in Girouard v. United States, 328 U.S. 61, held they did not: the allegiance sworn without the rifle, the conscientious objector admitted to citizenship, the oath read to fit the conscience instead of the conscience cut to fit the oath. The case overruled the law's own earlier answers, the trilogy of 1929 to 1931 that had excluded the objectors, and the overruling is the law's whole late form: the oath's terms are read against the conscience they bind, and the conscience wins, and the citizenship is the country's, and the oath is the citizen's. The machine that whipped Lilburne and excluded Bradlaugh now reads its own formula to fit the man who comes to it, and the reading is the law's late form, the accommodation as the law's own doctrine, and the reading is the statute, and the statute is the settlement, and the settlement was made the law's own way: the record corrected on the record, by the court, in the reports, and the settlement is the oath's modern form, and the whole thing is the refusers' three centuries arriving at the regulation's checkbox and the child's promise, and the law, at last, working for the people it used to exclude. The exclusion's whole history is the settlement's own preface.

So the modern oath stands whole, and it is the law's best self, and the chapter does not pretend otherwise. Competency has collapsed into near-universal capacity: the witness is presumed able, the exceptions narrow and named, the child included, the metaphysics quiz dead in the federal courts, the whole apparatus of the old inquiry retired there, the court's question no longer whether the witness may be heard but how best to hear her, the law's whole care now spent on the witness's own ability to speak, and the answer to the exclusion's whole history is: include, and wire the inclusion to the penalty, and let the conscience work. The form bends to the conscience it once tested: Rule 603's any form, Ward's capital-H Honesty, the interpreter's true translation, the applicant's checkbox. The child's promise stands revealed as the oath's diminutive, the smallest form of the smallest sentence, and it works, and one country has made it statutory, and the laboratory keeps confirming it, and the whole three-thousand-year answer to the oath's question is: ask the witness to promise, and mean it, and that is all. The machine that spent centuries deciding who could swear now spends its care deciding how each witness can, and the care is the answer to the whole history of the gate: the gate is gone, and the ramp is built, and the wire holds, and the false promise answers to the same statute the false oath always did. The oath's missing half is now the statute's whole work, and the oath's present half is now whatever words awaken the conscience,

and the conscience is the only thing the law ever needed, and it took three thousand years to say so, and the saying is the settlement, made by the law's own process, on the record, and the record is the refusers' whole method proven in the law's own rooms.

And the close is the smallest scene in the book, and it is the law's whole history answered in a child. A witness room like a thousand others, a child of six, the clerk, no book, no raised hand unless the child wants one, and the question is the smallest form of the oldest sentence in the record, the sentence this book opened on and the sentence the whole machine was built to produce, in every room it ever ran in: do you promise that you will tell the truth. And the child, who cannot define perjury, who has never heard of the sanction, who does not know what the oath is for or what the statute says, gives the promise, and the promise, the laboratory says, works, and the statute says it counts as the oath, and the testimony is heard, and the record has its sentence, and the wire holds, and the child goes home at the end of it. Nothing in the room looks like the first chapter's courtroom, and everything in it is that courtroom reduced to its working part. The whole apparatus this book has walked, the wax and the stone, the ring and the book, the whip and the pillory and the statute and the schedule, has come to this: a small sentence, spoken by a child, in a room built for it, and the sentence works, and it was always enough, and the law's whole history is the record of how long the learning took. Somewhere behind her, in another room, the witness from this book's first page is still standing, hand in the air. The machine is patient. It can hold him a while longer.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

The Spell, Measured

In the spring of 1955, a philosopher at Harvard described the oath perfectly without ever studying it. J. L. Austin, delivering the William James Lectures, was building the theory of the performative, the class of sentences that do not describe the world and instead change it, and his examples are the book's whole history in miniature: I do, said at the altar, marries; I name this ship, said at the hull, christens; I swear, said in the courtroom, binds. The sworn sentence is the textbook case of words that do the thing they say, the purest performative in the whole literature, and Austin's book, How to Do Things with Words, 1962, is the philosophy the law has been running on since before anyone called it that. The oath's sentence does not report a binding. It performs one. Austin's own analysis of how performatives fail is the law's own failure list, the infelicities, as he called them: the wrong person, the wrong place, the wrong form, the wrong intent, and the whole history of this book's exclusions and refusals is the history of those failures weaponized, the law declaring some people's performatives void because of who they were. The philosopher named the mechanism. The mechanism is the book's whole subject, and the subject's philosophy is now complete: the oath is the performative, the performative is the sentence that does what it says, and the courtroom's whole ritual is the century's purest example of the century's purest speech act, and the philosopher who named it never once walked into a courtroom to study it, because the mechanism is obvious to anyone who watches. The question the philosopher could not answer is the one the laboratory answers: does the sentence work? Does the swearing change the speaker? And the answer, measured, is this chapter's whole content, and the answer is yes, and the numbers are on the record.

The economics of the oath is a real literature, and it begins where the law's own question begins: whether the sworn sentence moves the speaker. Its first station is preference elicitation, the laboratory's measurement of what people say they value, the willingness-to-pay numbers the policy literature runs on, and Jacquemet, Joule, Luchini, and Shogren, in the Journal of Environmental Economics and Management in 2013, at pages 110 to 132, ran the preference study under oath: the values people state for public goods move when the statement is sworn, the elicitation's numbers shifting when the oath attaches to them, the stated preference measurably different under the oath than off it. The finding is quiet, and it is the foundation, and the foundation is worth a slow look: the oath does not change what people want. It changes what they say about what they want, which is the only thing the law has ever been able to reach. The oath works on the speaker, and the speaker is the law's whole jurisdiction, and the elicitation study is the first number: the oath moves the statement, measurably, in the laboratory, under control. The law's whole jurisdiction is the statement, and the statement moves, and the movement is the oath's whole measured effect, and the effect is the program's first number, and the whole program of the oath's measurement descends from it, because the program's whole question is the law's own question, and the law's own question is

whether the sentence works on the speaker, and the answer, from the first number forward, is yes, and has been yes since the wax. The spell, measured, works on the words, and the words are the law's whole reach.

The deception experiments are the program's center, and the center is Jacquemet, Luchini, Rosaz, and Shogren, Truth Telling Under Oath, in Management Science in 2019, at pages 426 to 438, and the design is the whole point, so the chapter prints the design with the number. And the laboratory ran a deception game, the economist's standard instrument for measuring lying, the sender's message to the receiver with money riding on the lie, a live incentive to lie, and the treatment was a freely signed truth-telling oath, a solemn written undertaking to tell the truth, signed before the game, and the finding is the one this book has been walking toward since the wax melted for the soldiers: the oath cut falsehoods by a third in the loaded design, from 25.4 to 17.1 percent, in the laboratory, under the incentive built to pay the lie. A third in the main experiment, and half in the combined comparison the paper's abstract quotes, the framing and the oath together. The freely signed truth-telling oath, the law's smallest written sentence, reduced the lying by a third, in the game built to let the lying pay. And the number is the whole empirical answer to the oath's whole history: the curse's descendant, the statute's sibling, the solemnity's measurable effect, cutting the lie by a third in the loaded game. And the number's design is attached, and the design is the loaded one, and the number stands at the hardest setting the laboratory has built for it, and the open text stands in the record for anyone who wants to check the game. The game is open, the number is printed, and the whole thing is the record's own answer to the whole ancient question, in the journal of the field, in the open text, with the design attached, and the whole answer is the number.

The tax games give the number its shape, and the shape is the honest limit, and the honest limit is the part the law's defenders never say. The European Economic Review's study ran the oath through a tax-compliance game, the laboratory's model of the state's daily question, the report that the whole revenue of the modern state runs on, and the finding is the one this book needs most, because it is the limit in the data's own shape: the oath converts partial liars to full honesty and leaves the chronic liar untouched. And the figures are the finding, and the finding is worth reading slowly because it is the law's whole history in one distribution: the players who would have shaded, trimmed, rounded in their own favor, the ordinary liars, the law's whole clientele of the persuadable, moved to full honesty under the oath, and the players who lied chronically, the committed ones, were unmoved. It works on the persuadable and does nothing to the committed, which is the whole history of the oath's enforcement in one dataset: the law's sentence moves the decent and does not touch the determined, and the determined are the perjury statute's whole clientele, and the oath's whole function is to arm the statute against them, and the statute's whole function is to punish what the oath could not prevent. The limit is the finding, and the finding is the law's whole honest account of itself, and the account is worth printing whole: the oath prevents the ordinary lie, and the statute punishes the committed one, and the two together are the truth system's whole working form, and the laboratory printed it in the data's own shape.

The freshest number is the eyewitness number, and it is 2026's, the current decade's own contribution to the law's current record. In the Journal of Experimental Criminology, the 2026 study, its version of record published April 8, put the oath into the eyewitness paradigm, the laboratory's

model of the identification evidence the courts run on, the hardest case in the whole courtroom, and the first time the oath had been tested there. The task was the honest one: the witness watches a video and answers questions about it under an incentive built to buy the lie, and the finding runs in the record's own words: deception down 39.2 percent under a live incentive to lie, the interval labeled 95 percent in the abstract and built as a 90 percent interval in the appendix, the paper's own complication, which the book prints the way it prints every complication. Thirty-nine percent. The number is about deliberate deception, and the chapter keeps it there: the oath showed no detected improvement or impairment in memory performance, and the honest mistake, the misidentification made in good faith, remains the law's hardest unmeasured ground, and what the oath steadied, measurably, by more than a third, is the witness with a reason to lie. The distinction is the book's own discipline applied to the decade's own number, because the temptation the study built is the temptation the law was built for, and the error the study did not touch is the error no ritual has ever claimed to cure. It is the program's current terminus, and it is this decade's own, and it prints with its design attached, and the text is open, and anyone who wants to check the game can check it, and the design is the eyewitness's, the hardest case, and the number is 39 percent, and the chapter holds it to the end.

The mechanism is worth one paragraph, because the numbers need their account, and the account is this book's own. And the oath works by raising the cost of the lie in the speaker's own accounting, and the account is this book's own reading of the literature, stated as such: the solemnity is attention technology, the ceremony forcing the speaker to notice the sentence, the public commitment made where the commitment is expensive. The laboratory's oath works without the curse, without the God, without the statute in the room, and that is the whole history of the oath in one experimental result, and the result deserves its slow reading: the missing half has been missing for centuries, and the sentence still works, and the sentence works because it is solemn, public, and costly to break in the speaker's own accounting, and the accounting is the soul's own, the statute nowhere in it. The law's whole history, measured, is the history of the solemn sentence's effect on the speaker, and the effect is real, and the effect is a third, and the effect's limit is the committed liar, and the limit is the statute's job, and the whole system, oath and statute, solemnity and sanction, is the truth machine's working form, and the form is the whole book's subject, and the subject is now measured, and the laboratory has now confirmed what the wax and the stone and the ring and the book were all built to do: the sentence works on the speaker, and the speaker knows it, and that is why he swears. The mechanism is the book's oldest claim measured at last: the solemn sentence pressures the speaker, and the speaker feels the pressure, and the numbers are the pressure's receipt.

The perception limb is the shadow the law casts in the jury box, and the study is McKay, Gervais, and Davis, in the British Journal of Psychology in 2023, at pages 991 to 1014, and the title is the record's own: 'So Help Me God'? Does oath swearing in courtroom scenarios impact trial outcomes? The findings are the law's old prejudice measured in the modern jury, and the measurements are worth reading with the designs attached, per this book's rule: people read the oath choice as a credibility signal, the sworn witness rated over the affirmed one, and one in five oath-choosers picked the oath as the more credible option, and religious participants discriminated against the affirming defendant. The registered mock trial, 1,821 participants, found no overall guilt penalty for affirming,

yet the jurors who had themselves sworn discriminated against the affirming defendant, the effect possibly riding on authoritarianism, and the authors conclude the religious oath is an antiquated legal ritual needing reform. And the authors' conclusion is the record's own, printed in the journal, preregistered and open, the reform's own evidence produced by the machine's own instrument. The shadow is measured: the law's history in the jury's head, the oath's old theology surviving as a bias against the affirmed witness, the whole exclusion's afterlife in the box. The chapter does not smooth it, because the chapter's whole rule is the record, and the record includes the shadow. The perception limb is the law's past measured in its present, and the measured answer is more useful than the chapter's own side would have it: the study concerns credibility judgments and verdict decisions, not whether the oath makes witnesses more truthful. The public choice between the religious and the secular form carries an unnecessary signal into the box. The authors' own conclusion, that the ritual is antiquated, is printed, preregistered, and open.

And the children's promise is carried over from the last chapter in one clause, because the developmental line and the economics line are the same finding, and the finding is the whole program's answer: the promise works, the oath works, the solemn sworn sentence works, in the child and in the adult, in the laboratory and in the courtroom, and the whole program of measurement is the law's answer to the book's whole first question, the question the first chapter asked the witness stand: does the spell do anything? It does. The clause is the whole of this chapter's debt to the last one, and the debt is the program's own convergence: the child and the adult, the promise and the oath, the laboratory and the courtroom, all of it the same instrument, and the instrument is the solemn sentence, and the solemn sentence is the law's whole history, measured. The measured spell, the solemn sentence, the public commitment, cuts the lie by a third in the loaded design, the version with the explicit moral frame, and the load still matters: the largest cut sits where the truthfulness language is explicit, which is the oath's own mechanism made visible, and by more than a third in the eyewitness's, and the child's promise carries the same effect into the smallest witness, the four-year-old's own, and the whole thing is on the record, and the record is the laboratory's now, and the laboratory agrees with the wax and the stone and the ring and the book, the whole furniture of the oath's whole history: the sentence works on the speaker, and the speaker knows it, and that is why the law built it. And the whole book's whole answer is the number, and the number is the close.

And the scandal paragraph is told straight, and the names print only as the records carry them. The cautionary tale is the signature-placement affair, the most famous honesty-nudge study of the era: Shu, Mazar, Gino, Ariely, and Bazerman, in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences in 2012, at pages 15197 to 15200, finding that signing at the beginning of a form decreased dishonest self-reports in comparison to signing at the end, the finding that launched a thousand nudge units. The record of its fall is the record the chapter prints, in the journals' own words: first, in the same journal in 2020, Kristal, Whillans, Bazerman, Gino, Shu, Mazar, and Ariely, the multi-team failed replication, five conceptual replications totaling 4,559 participants and one preregistered direct replication of 1,235 run with the original authors, finding no effect; then the fabrication findings of 2021, and the retraction notice of September 2021, at PNAS 118, issue 38, the editors retracting and observing that Simonsohn, Simmons, and Nelson had provided evidence to question the validity of the data, the Data Colada analysis cited inside the notice itself, the journal's own page

now headed RETRACTED; and, separately, the 2018 multi-lab registered replication of the moral-reminder effect, in Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science, finding the same null. One late wrinkle: a 2026 correction to the Kristal paper, at PNAS 123, logged here because the record keeps correcting itself, and the corrections are the record's own honesty. The most famous honesty-nudge finding of the modern era collapsed on evidence of fabricated data, the independent analysis naming the fabrication and the journal's own notice questioning the data's validity, and the collapse is on the record, and the chapter prints it before any critic can, because the chapter's whole discipline is to print first, and the discipline is the whole book's strength.

And the strength is the separation, and the separation is the whole point, and the chapter states it plainly because the chapter's critics will. The oath findings stand on separate legs, and the legs are the literature's own structure, and the structure is worth reading honestly: the designs differ, the decades differ, the teams overlap at the core, the same few laboratories carrying most of the program, which the table below prints plainly, and the instrument differs from the collapsed one: the oath studies measure a public sworn commitment, a solemn spoken or signed undertaking, and the collapsed study measured a private form-box, a signature's position on a bureaucratic page. The one is the law's whole history, the sworn sentence, the solemnity, the public cost, the thing this whole book is about. The other was a form's layout, the nudge era's whole contribution, and the two are not the same instrument, and the record knows it, and the record is the difference. And the replication crisis's most famous casualty is the layout, and the oath's findings, the deception experiments and the tax games and the eyewitness number and the child's promise, stand on their own legs, in their own journals, in their own designs, and the chapter has printed every one of them with its design attached. The law's answer to the replication crisis is the same as its answer to everything else: the record. And the oath's findings are on the record, in the open text, with the numbers and the designs, and the collapsed study is on the record too, retracted, in the same light, and the difference between them is the difference between the law's whole history and the nudge era's shortcut, and the chapter has now printed both. The printing is the whole point: the law's findings and the nudge's collapse, in the same chapter, on the same record.

The program at a glance. The studies this chapter prints, with their designs and their limits attached.

Study	Task	Undertaking tested	Outcome	Principal limit	Replication
Jacquemet, Joule, Luchini, Shogren, 2013, JEEM 65(1): 110-132	Preference elicitation	The oath as price	Preferences held under oath	Elicitation, not performance	The program's first design

Study	Task	Undertaking tested	Outcome	Principal limit	Replication
Jacquemet, Luchini, Rosaz, Shogren, 2019, Management Science 65: 426-438	Truth-telling game with money at stake	The solemn signed oath	Lying down from 25.4 to 17.1 percent with the oath in the loaded design; the abstract's combined comparison halves; the neutral robustness check still shows a smaller real effect	Laboratory game, student players	The team's own program, repeated across designs
Jacquemet, Luchini, Malézieux, Shogren, 2020, European Economic Review 124: 103369, Who'll stop lying under oath?	Tax compliance game	The signed truthfulness declaration	Cheating cut; some partial liars moved into full honesty; chronic lying's frequency unchanged	Same laboratory family, overlapping authors	Within the program, not outside it
Jacquemet, Launay, Luchini, Mijovic-Prelec, Prélec, Py, Rosaz, Shogren, 2026, Journal of Experimental Criminology	Video witness questions under a paid incentive to lie	The signed written oath	Deception down 39.2 percent; truth-tellers unimpaired; the interval labeled 95 percent in the abstract, built as 90 in the appendix	Deception, not memory; not preregistered; the newest and least replicated	None yet; the record's freshest page
Talwar, Lee, Bala, Lindsay, 2002, Law and Human Behavior 26: 395-415	Children's truth-telling in a court-competence design	The child's promise	The promise raised truth-telling measurably	Children, not adults	Carried forward by the same group
Lyon, Malloy, Quas, Talwar, 2008, Child Development 79: 914-929	Maltreated four-to-seven-year-olds, the hardest witnesses	The child-friendly oath	Accuracy improved on free recall; the effect faded under suggestive questioning	The interviewer's power limits the instrument	Companion papers beside it (2008) and before it (1999)

Study	Task	Undertaking tested	Outcome	Principal limit	Replication
Shu, Mazar, Gino, Ariely, Bazerman, 2012, PNAS	Signature placement on a form	Signing at the top	Effect reported, then retracted after the independent fabrication analysis, the journal's notice questioning data validity	The record's own honesty caught it	Failed in 2020 (Kristal et al.); the moral-reminder effect failed separately in 2018 (Verschuere)
Kristal, Whillans, Bazerman, Gino, Shu, Mazar, Ariely, 2020, PNAS 117: 7103-7107	Signing before versus after	The form's position	No effect across five replications and one preregistered direct replication	The collapse of the nudge, not of the oath	Corrected 2026; the correction is in this book
Verschuere and twenty-five laboratories, 2018, Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science 1(3): 299-317	The moral-reminder effect	The reminder itself	Null across the primary analysis of nineteen laboratories and 4,674 participants, twenty-five laboratories collecting	The reminder is not the oath	The largest single replication on the list
McKay, Gervais, Davis, 2023, British Journal of Psychology: 991-1014	Vignette and mock-trial, 1,821 participants	The oath as credibility signal	No overall guilt penalty for affirming; the sworn jurors discriminated against the affirming defendant	The bias lives in the sworn observer	None reported; preregistered and open

The limit is the chapter's last honesty, and it is stated plainly, and once. The oath arms prosecution and shapes the speaker, and those are the two things the whole book has proven it does, and they are the whole of its measured work. What the oath does not do is detect the liar. The machine has always wanted the third thing: prevention, punishment, and then detection, the instrument that would find the lie in the speaker instead of binding the speaker against it, and the third thing has never existed, and every instrument offered for it, from the ordeal's water to the polygraph's stylus, has failed its own validation, and the ordeal and the stylus failed in the same way, by measuring the body and calling it the soul. Neither the oath nor the statute was ever that instrument, and the ex officio oath was the closest the law ever came to building one, and the sixth chapter has the price of that attempt. This book's whole claim about detection is the one the record supports: the oath prevents, the statute punishes, and nothing detects, spoken or signed. The limit matters because the machine keeps trying to cross it, and every crossing is the next chapter's overreach wearing a laboratory coat. And the laboratory's honesty is the chapter's own: none of the numbers

in this chapter is a detector's number, and the difference is the whole limit. The detector's apparatus, the polygraph and the analysis and the attribution, is another subject, and it is another book: this book's companion, Swimming the Author, takes up the detection, and this book leaves it there, and the reader who wants it knows where it lives.

So the spell is measured, and the measurement is the book's whole answer to its oldest question, printed at last in the machine's own units. The philosopher named the mechanism: the sentence that performs the binding. The laboratory measured the effect: the solemn sworn sentence cutting the lie by half in the loaded design, by more than a third in the eyewitness's, moving some partial liars into full honesty and leaving chronic lying's frequency unchanged, and the oath reduced dishonesty in every loaded setting tested, and the neutral designs show the effect at the margin, the adjusted number still on the oath's side: the effect is real in both frames and largest where the frame is explicit, with the effect's size depending on the task and the participant. And the perception study measured the shadow: the oath read as a credibility signal, the affirmed witness discounted, the ritual's afterlife in the jury's head. The scandal's records measured the laboratory's own honesty: the nudge collapsed, the oath stood, and the difference between the private form-box and the public sworn commitment is the whole lesson of the modern literature. And the modesty is the chapter's last discipline: the numbers do not prove the book's history, because the record does that, and what the numbers answer is the only question the record could not, which is whether the instrument still works, and the answer comes back the same from the tax game and the eyewitness chair and the child's promise: it works. The oath is the small spell that makes testimony count, and the spell can be measured, and it works, and the machine has known it for three thousand years, and now the machine can prove it, and the proof is printed where anyone can read it, in the open texts, with the designs attached, and the proof is the numbers, and the numbers are the close.

And the close is the measured numbers, and there are two of them, and the chapter prints them plainly. The freely signed truth-telling oath, the solemn written undertaking, the smallest written sentence in the whole record of this book, cut falsehoods by a third in the loaded design, the one the whole program stands on. And the eyewitness's oath, the hardest instrument in the hardest case, cut deception by 39 percent under a live incentive to lie. A third in the game, and better than a third in the eyewitness chair, at the two hardest settings the laboratory knows how to build, and the numbers are the modern law's answer to the ancient question, and the answer is on the record. The table above is the whole program at a glance, the studies and their tasks and their outcomes and their limits, printed because this book's rule is to show the work, and the work is the table's own honesty: the same few laboratories carry most of the program, and the strongest designs are the newest ones, and the oldest finding in the room is the one the whole history predicted. The wax figures melted for the soldiers, and the stone fell for the consul, and the ring reddened for the Icelander, and the pillory stood for the Elizabethan, and the statute waits for the modern, and all of it was the same instrument, the solemn sentence's pressure on the speaker, and the instrument's effect is now printed, in the journals, with the designs attached. The oath is the machine's whole working sentence, and it works, and the numbers are the proof, and the proof is printed and open, and the proof is the record, and the record is the close, and the close opens the last chapter.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

Under Penalty of Perjury

Under penalty of perjury, I declare that the foregoing is true and correct. There is a sentence at the bottom of the form, under everything, in the smallest print on the page, and it is the machine's whole modern form, and nobody reads it, and nobody says it aloud, and it does the oath's whole legal work, and the whole of the modern state runs on it, and the whole of the modern state's record is built on it, and the sentence is the machine's whole history reduced to its smallest readable form. The formula this book opened with, the raised hand, the clerk's cadence, the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, has become a printed line above a signature line, and the printed line is the whole of it now, and the whole history of the oath, the wax and the stone and the ring and the book and the whip and the pillory and the statute, has come down to this: a sentence in small print, and a signature, and the statute behind them both. The machine that once needed a priest, a fire, a book, and a crowd now needs a signature, and the signature is the hand's last position. It sits on the loan and the passport and the tax form and the court filing, the everyday instruments, and the machine's whole daily record is written over it, and the paperwork state runs on a formula nobody speaks aloud, and the formula is the oath's ghost, and the ghost is the whole modern world, and the signature is the hand at last, at rest, on the page, in the smallest room the machine ever built.

The statute that did it is 28 U.S.C. 1746, enacted in 1976, Public Law 94-550, and the statute is the machine's cleanest modern instrument, the one the whole modern state runs on, the one every federal form now carries, the unsworn declaration under penalty of perjury, two forms of it, the declaration executed within the United States and the one executed without, each one ending in the same small print, the same true-and-correct, the same date and signature, the same machine's own receipt. The statute keeps its own exceptions, and they are the proof of the rule: not the deposition, where the state still faces the speaker, not the oath of office, where the officer still rises, not the oath before the officer the law names. Where the state must look at the swearer, the oath survives. Everywhere else, the section lets a signature line do the oath's whole legal work, and the work is the whole of it, and the whole of it is worth reading slowly, because the whole of it is the machine's final form: the declaration is evidence, the declaration is testimony, the declaration is the court filing and the visa form, and the declaration is perjury's whole subject, because the false declaration is punished like the false oath, and the punishment is the whole point. And the circle closes at 18 U.S.C. 1621, whose second branch names the section 1746 declaration itself, the false declaration punished as perjury, the wire completed, with 1623 keeping the courtroom's own declarations beside it, the machine's two instruments at last one instrument, the oath and the declaration, the spoken and the signed, the courtroom's and the form's, and the whole thing runs on the same wire: the formula's power is now the statute's, the statute's is the signature's, the signature is the hand's, and the hand is the whole book's first image.

The ancestry is exact, and it is the book's own, and the chapter prints it once, because the record opened it and the last chapter of the book owes it its echo, and the echo is the whole history in one rhyme: the first affirmation statute, the Quakers Act of 1696, the one the Friends won, carried in its third section the wire: the false affirmation incurs the same penalties and forfeitures as wilful and corrupt perjury. The new sentence got the old trigger, at its birth, in 1696. And 1746, the statute's own number by coincidence, the unsworn declaration's home, made the same move in 1976, two hundred eighty years later: the new instrument, the printed line, wired into perjury at its birth, the same penalties, the same statute's answer to the same machine's same need, the machine's answer complete the day the declaration was born, the way it was complete the day the affirmation was born. The echo is the book's own, and it is the whole history in one rhyme: the machine has answered every new form the same way since 1696, the way it answered the affirmation, the way it answers the signature line, the wire attached at the birth of the form, because the form is never trusted on its own, and the machine has never once, in three thousand years, trusted any sentence on its own. The oath is the sentence with the wire attached, and the wire is the statute. Three hundred years apart, the affirmation and the declaration were admitted on the same condition, and the condition is the machine's oldest rule: the form changes, the wire never does, and the wire is why the sentence counts.

And the daily empire of the signature line is the machine's whole present, and it is worth one paragraph, because it is the whole modern world and nobody sees it, and the whole modern world is built on the unread sentence, the oath's ghost, the machine's whole answer. The tax return carries the same small print on its own older wire, sections 6065 and 7206 of the tax code, drawn by an older statute, the declaration's cousins, not its children. The visa form: the same. The court filing: the same. The whole paperwork state, the state's whole daily business with its citizens, the whole apparatus of the forms and the filings and the applications, runs on the printed line and the signature, and the printed line is the oath with the ritual removed, and the ritual's removal is the whole modern settlement, and the settlement is the machine's final form. Notaries remain, the jurat and the acknowledgment, the oath's surviving room, the one place the ceremony is still live, and even they run by regulation now, the remote-notarization wave of the early 2020s, the notary on the screen, the signer on the other screen, the oath administered through the wire. And the e-signature closes the rest: the click, the checkbox, the typed name, the machine's whole furniture reduced to a form field, and the statute behind it, and the wire, and the whole thing is the oath's ghost, running the world, read by no one, spoken aloud by no one, and everywhere, and the everywhere is the whole point, because the machine's whole history is the history of the sentence that binds, and the sentence that binds is now the sentence that is everywhere, and the everywhere is the signature, and the signature is the hand, and the hand is the whole book's last image.

One caution belongs here, before the book's second law: the record of what happens when the oath overreaches its one legitimate job, and it takes one section of this one chapter, and the reader who has walked the whole book has earned the caution's point already, because every enlargement in the record was a correction, and every correction was late. The loyalty oath is the oath's cautionary sibling: the oath not about testimony, not about the office's duty, but about the past, about history, about belief, the oath that is not an oath at all in the machine's own terms, because it does not ask what the man did or will do but what the man believes, and belief is not the oath's juris-

diction. The oath's one legitimate job is the truth of the testimony and the duty of the office, and the loyalty oath is the machine's whole overreach: the oath that asks the swearer to swear to what he has not done, to what he has not believed, to what he will not think. The signature is the oath's smallest modern form, and the loyalty oath is its worst modern abuse, and both live on paper, and the difference between them is the whole of the machine's self-knowledge: the first asks for the truth ahead, the second for the soul behind. The loyalty oath asked for the soul, and the machine's own courts killed it, and the killing is the cautionary sibling's whole lesson, and the lesson is the next five paragraphs, the machine's own record of its own overreach, printed in its own reports, by its own courts, in its own words, and the record of it is the answer to the question of what the oath is for.

The sibling's founding document is the ironclad oath of July 2, 1862, the act at chapter 128, 12 Statutes at Large 502, and its words are on the record, and the words are the machine's whole overreach in one form. The whole overreach is in the words, and the words are the record's own, and the record's own is the whole lesson. The swearer declares he has never voluntarily borne arms against the United States, has given no aid, countenance, counsel, or encouragement to persons in armed hostility, has sought no office under any hostile authority, has yielded no voluntary support to any pretended government, and then swears the support-and-defend clause against all enemies, foreign and domestic. An oath about the past: the swearer swearing to his own history, the machine asking the oath to do what the oath was never built for, the proof of the soul's record, the past's audit by formula, the whole instrument pointed backward at the speaker's own life, which is the one direction the oath was never meant to face. And the penalty was the machine's whole price: false swearing was perjury with perpetual disqualification, refusal forfeited the salary, and the oath was the gate to the whole federal service, and the whole federal service was the oath's hostage. And the archive keeps the proof in the flesh: the signed period oath forms, headed Oath prescribed by the Act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, sit transcribed in the Freedmen's Bureau records at the Smithsonian, the ironclad as paper under a named hand, the whole overreach documented in the handwriting of the sworn, the names in the records, the signatures on the forms, the signature the whole instrument's proof, the hand's position on the paper the machine's own receipt.

The collapse began at once, and the collapse was the machine's own courts answering the machine's own overreach, and the answer is the machine's own charter read against the machine's own error, and the error is the whole loyalty century, and the whole loyalty century is the record's own account of the machine's own overreach: Cummings v. Missouri, 71 U.S. 277, and Ex parte Garland, 71 U.S. 333, both in 1867, struck the test oaths, the machine's own courts striking the machine's own overreach, in the machine's own reports, by the machine's own charter: the priest Cummings against Missouri's clerical test, the Confederate-sympathizing lawyer Garland against the federal one, and the Court's answer was the Constitution's own, the ex post facto clause and the bill of attainder, the machine's charter read against the machine's own overreach: the oath about the past was a punishment without a trial, a legislative judgment of the soul's record, and the oath about the past fell, and the ironclad's own elements fell away after, in 1868, in 1871, in 1884, the whole form dissolving back into the support-and-defend clause, the overreach repealed piece by piece by the same Congress that had passed it, the machine correcting its own error with its own hands, which is the oath's legitimate work, the future's conduct, the duty's whole content, and which sur-

vives today at 5 U.S.C. 3331, unchanged since 1966, the machine's own answer to its own overreach, in the statute book, where everything in this book ends. The correction is the whole answer to the overreach: the oath that asked for the soul was repealed piece by piece by the body that passed it, and the oath that asked for the duty survived.

And the wall against the compelled affirmation is the sibling's other lesson, and it is Barnette, and it is 1943, and it is the machine's own court building the wall the refusers always needed, the wall the whole book has been walking toward, West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette, 319 U.S. 624: the compulsory flag salute, the schoolchildren refusing, the Barnette children, Gathie and Marie, among them, the state's own formula required from the children, the machine's smallest subjects ordered to speak the machine's own words, the children made to affirm the state's own orthodoxy, and the Supreme Court striking it, and the Court's answer is the machine's own charter read correctly, and the record keeps the words: no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox. The words are the Court's own, and the Court's own are the record's, and the record's are the whole answer. The compelled affirmation is the machine's overreach in its purest form, the state prescribing the citizen's own words, the formula put in the mouth by force, which is the one thing the oath was never built to do, and the wall against it is the machine's own court's own answer, and the wall has held since 1943, and the schoolchildren's refusal is the whole refuser tradition's smallest case, the smallest refusers in the whole record, the children, the ones the machine's whole apparatus was built to compel, and the ones the machine's own court protected, and the smallest case built the wall, and the wall is the whole point: the oath's work is the witness's truth and the officer's duty, and the state's prescription of belief is the machine's whole error, and the error is the sibling's whole record, and the record is the answer.

The collapse ran case by case from 1952 to 1967, and the case-by-case is the machine's own way of dying. Wieman v. Updegraff, 344 U.S. 183, in 1952, the Oklahoma loyalty oath, the vague one, the one that asked the officer to swear to his own associations, the machine asking for the soul's address book, fell, the Court refusing to let the state punish membership without regard to what the member knew, the innocent and the knowing swept into the same class. Elfbrandt v. Russell, 384 U.S. 11, in 1966, the Arizona one, the support-and-defend oath with the legislature's gloss attached, the gloss that made membership itself the perjury, fell. Keyishian v. Board of Regents, 385 U.S. 589, in 1967, the New York one, the teachers', the university's own, the machine's own teachers' own oath, the oath the whole academy was made to swear, fell. The loyalty oaths fell one by one, and the falling was the machine's own courts reading the machine's own charter, the machine correcting itself the way it corrects itself, late, and on the record, and one report at a time, and the charter's answer was the same answer every time: the state cannot prescribe the citizen's orthodoxy, and the oath cannot ask the soul, and the machine's whole overreach is void, and the oath's one legitimate job is the testimony and the duty, and the rest is the sibling's whole error, and the error is the record, and the record is the answer, and the answer is the whole loyalty century's collapse, in the reports, in the machine's own courts, by the machine's own rules. The whole loyalty century is the machine's own record of its own answer: the oath's work is the testimony and the duty, and the rest is the overreach, and the overreach dies on the record.

And California keeps the whole chain alive on the page: the sibling's lesson is not history alone, it is the present tense. The chain, staged whole, from the record's own pages: the pre-1952 state

constitution's article XX, section 3, carried the public employee's oath with its own guarantee that no other oath would be required, the machine's own protection written into the constitution itself. The Levering Act of 1950, Government Code 3100 to 3109, imposed the disavowal on every public employee, the machine overreaching inside the constitution's own guarantee. The non-signers were fired, and the appellate courts reinstated them on the no-other-oath clause, the constitution's own protection answering the machine's own overreach. Then the 1952 quartet, Pockman v. Leonard, 39 Cal. 2d 676, with Tolman, Fraser, and Bowen, upheld Levering and occupied the field. Then Proposition 6 of 1952 wrote the loyalty litany into the constitution itself, the overreach constitutionalized, the error made permanent by the machine's own amendment process. Then Vogel v. County of Los Angeles, 68 Cal. 2d 18, in 1967, the state's own supreme court striking the oath's second paragraph while the first stood, the machine's own law cutting the machine's own error out of its own constitution. And the current text still carries the five-year disavowal, and its blank instructs the swearer to write No Exceptions, the blank the machine's own confession that the correction is incomplete, because the words print and do not bind, the dead letter distinguished from the live one exactly as the thirteenth chapter distinguished them, and the perjury wire runs at section 3108, and the whole chain, the guarantee and the overreach and the firing and the reinstatement and the quartet and the proposition and the struck paragraph, is alive on the page, in the state constitution, in the present tense, the machine's way of keeping its errors: on the record, in the text, forever.

The sibling's lesson is the book's last structural note before the second law, and it is the one the whole book has been walking toward since the first chapter's missing half. What happens when the oath overreaches its one legitimate job: the machine kills it, eventually, on the record, by its own courts, after doing the damage, and the damage is the cost, and the correction is always late, and the lateness is the machine's whole character, on the page, in the reports, forever. The loyalty century is the proof printed in the machine's own reports: the oath that reached for the soul died by the machine's own hand, and the oath that kept to the testimony and the duty survived everything the century threw at it. The ironclad oath's own text is five paragraphs back, and the signature's is at the chapter's head, and the whole book's argument lives in the distance between them. California's constitution still prints the litany and the courts still refuse it, which is the machine's whole way of keeping its own lessons: legible, unrepealed, unenforceable, on the record. The overreach's whole record is the machine's own confession, and the confession is the caution this book needed printed once. And the lesson belongs to the book's second law, because the migration's whole proof is the difference between the two instruments: the one that asks for the truth ahead stands, and the one that asks for the soul behind falls, and the record is the whole difference between them, and the record's answer to the whole loyalty century is the floor the second law stands on, and the reader has now seen both instruments whole, the smallest and the worst.

And now the book's second law, and it is earned in the last chapter as the first was stated in the first, and the whole book's record is its proof. Law Two: the penalty migrated from the next world into this one, the state annexing the jurisdiction as its capacity grew, the church courts emptied first, the statute of 1563 written while belief in the curse was universal, and the migration completed as the belief thinned, and God's vengeance became the perjury statute, and the hand's last position is the signature. The two laws are one law read at two ends: the first is the sentence's anatomy, the second is the sentence's history, and the history is the anatomy aged three thousand years.

The treasury was banking the forfeited stake in the republic already, because the migration ran on capacity before it ran on unbelief, and the two gears are the chapter's whole account of how the next world's penalty became this world's. It is the whole migration in one sentence, and the whole book is its evidence: the curse in the first chapter, the sacramentum's double life, the catalogue of the hand, the verse that forbade it all, the count of sworn mouths, the oath that asked too much, the gatekeeper's two tenses, the invention of the crime, the refusers and the affirmation, the founding text's parenthesis, the laboratory's numbers, and now the printed line and the signature. The curse is not gone. The curse is printed, in small print, under penalty of perjury, at the bottom of the form, and the hand signs it, and the signature is the hand's last position, and the migration is complete, and nothing after this chapter needs another law.

And the hand's last position is the signature, and the catalogue closes. The raised palm, the hand under the thigh, the hand on the ring, the hand on the book, the two fingers, the bare Scottish palm, the hand that would not rise, the hand on the self-supplied Testament, the hand at his side, the child's hand, the hand raised into the camera, the hand that signed the form: the whole catalogue, the body's whole history of the oath, every position a different answer to the machine's oldest question, from the fist that held the flint to the fingers that hold the pen, and it resolves here, in the signature, the hand at rest, writing. The third chapter's whole walk was the hand learning to carry the oath's weight, from the palm that showed itself empty to the palm that pressed the book, and the signature is the same hand still carrying it, set down and writing. The signature is the oath's final gesture because it is the oath's smallest gesture: no sky over it, no book under it, no crowd around it, only the printed line above and the name below, and the whole three-thousand-year apparatus reduced to what it always was, a person answering for a sentence with the record watching. The room is any room now, an office, a closing, a program's final screen, and the oath's whole furniture fits on one printed line. The name signed is the speaker's whole self in the sentence's place, which is what the oath always wanted and never needed the sky for. And the catalogue is complete, and the hand is at rest at last, on the page, in the signature, under the penalty of perjury.

And the frame closes. The witness from page one, the one whose hand has been in the air since the first chapter, the palm out, the fingers together, the second frozen: the hand comes down. The oath is spoken, the formula answered, the witness seated, the testimony begun. The machine's whole ritual, the clerk's cadence, the raised hand, the formula, the whole three-thousand-year furniture of the oath, has done its work, and the witness is a witness now, and the testimony will be heard, and the record will keep it, and the perjury statute stands behind it, and the wire holds. The testimony will be tested the way testimony has always been tested, by the room, against the record, under the statute's eye, and what he says will be measured against the whole history this book has walked, the refusers' and the framers' and the laboratories', because the room he testifies in is the room they built. And the frozen second's question, the one the whole book was spent inside, was what the sentence does, and the answer is in the record now: it binds, and it has always bound, and the binding is the whole answer. The wax and the stone and the ring and the book are the room's past, and the room works anyway. And the signature's work begins on another page, in another room, where another hand is resting on another form: the same sentence, at its smallest size, under the same statute's wire. The two gestures are the machine's whole present, the spoken

one where the state still faces the speaker, the signed one everywhere else, and the clerk is already asking the next question.

The hand at rest is the close, and the close is the whole book's last image. The hand that rose in the first chapter is down, the palm that answered the clerk is at rest, and in another room another hand is signing, the signature on the page, the printed line above it, and the whole apparatus of the oath is in the rest: the wax, the stone, the ring, the book, the whip, the pillory, the statute, the schedule, the laboratory, the form. The oath's whole history is the history of the missing half, the punishment clause amputated and migrated and printed, and the printed line is the missing half's final address, and the signature below it is the hand's last position. The whole history is in the two images now: the hand raised into the air at the book's opening, and the hand at rest on the page at its close, and the distance between them is the three thousand years this book walked. The witness is answering. The record is keeping it. The law has its evidence. The child has gone home. The refusers' doors stand open. The machine's whole work continues in the morning, and every morning, on the record, under the wire. The machine runs on the two gestures, the spoken and the signed, and the two are one, and the one is the sentence, and the sentence is the oath, and the oath is the small spell that makes testimony count, and the spell is now the statute, and the statute is now the signature, and the signature is the hand, and the hand is at rest, and the book is done, and the record stands.

Acknowledgments

This book has no patrons to thank and no committee standing behind it. What it has is creditors, and they fall into two companies, and the book is glad to name both.

The first company is the keepers of the record. The clerks who wrote the journals, the reporters who printed the trials, the scribes who copied the statutes, the librarians who shelved the pamphlets nobody was reading, and the digitizers of our own century, who carried the whole shelf onto the open web: the open repository of the Yale Law School, which keeps Silving's great study whole; the Internet Archive; the Perseus Digital Library and LacusCurtius, where the classical texts stand in their two languages; the Avalon Project; British History Online; CommonLII, which keeps the English Reports; the Legal Information Institute at Cornell; the historical Hansard and Parliament's Living Heritage pages; the Library of Congress; the Internet Medieval Sourcebook at Fordham; Sefaria; Wikisource. A writer who works from the public record works on their shoulders, and the record this book stands on was free to any reader who wanted to check it, which was the whole point of putting it there.

The book's scholars are named where their work is used, and the whole company stands in the bibliography: Silving, Tyler, Hertz, Thayer, Pollock and Maitland, Bartlett, Levy, Langbein, Helmholz, Derrett, Guy, Gordon, Cavill, Williams, Frankel, Kisch, Arnstein, Bonner, Henriques, Jonassen, and the working scientists of the final movement, Talwar, Lee, Bala, Lindsay, Lyon, Dorado, Saywitz, Jacquemet, Luchini, Rosaz, Shogren, and their colleagues. Their work carries the book. The errors that remain are the author's own, which is what the corrections ledger is for.

And the second company is the refusers. George Fox and the Friends who would not swear. John Lilburne, who would not swear to answer questions that had not yet been asked. Thomas More, who would not say. David Salomons, who sat down anyway. Charles Bradlaugh, who made the machine change its sentence. James Girouard, whose conscience would carry no rifle. The Barnette children, who would not salute. The four-year-olds in the laboratories, who promised and meant it. None of them was thanked in his own day, and most of them paid in his own coin, and every door this book walks through is a door one of them forced. The dedication belongs to Janna, and the debt belongs to them, and the book is the receipt.

Glossary

Abjuration. The oath of renunciation, sworn in reverse: the sanctuary felon abjuring the realm promised to leave the country and never return, on pain of the noose he had just escaped.

Adjuration. The charging of another by an oath: the high priest's formula at the trial, I adjure thee by the living God, the oath's oldest form of compulsion.

Affiant. The person who signs an affidavit, the swearer at the signature's end of the machine.

Affidavit. A written statement sworn before an officer authorized to administer oaths, the testimony that travels without the witness.

Affirmation. The solemn declaration the law accepts in place of the oath, with no book, no kiss, and no God in it. It carries the same duty to tell the truth and the same exposure to the perjury statute, because the first affirmation statute wired the false affirmation to perjury's penalties in 1696.

Assertory and promissory oaths. The oath's two tenses: the assertory swears to a fact, the testimony that looks backward; the promissory swears to a duty, the office that looks forward. The loyalty oath abused a third direction, the soul's record.

Attaint. The old proceeding against a jury that had sworn falsely in its verdict, the perjury law's ancestor, savage in its penalties and rarely used.

Common informer. The private suitor who brought a penalty action for a share of the fine, the machine's outsourced prosecutor, the informer the Lords disarmed in Bradlaugh v. Clarke in 1883.

Compurgation. See wager of law.

Deposition. Sworn testimony taken out of court, in writing, for use in the record. The federal unsworn declaration cannot replace it, which is one of the three exceptions written into section 1746.

The engine. The book's quiet mechanism, proven across the chapters and never signposted: every enlargement of the oath's form was forced by someone who refused to swear.

Ex officio oath. The oath the ecclesiastical courts administered to the accused, requiring truthful answers to questions not yet asked, the engine of the Court of High Commission and the oath John Lilburne refused.

The gate. This book's name for the law's decision about who may give evidence at all, the door the unsworn stood outside for three thousand years.

Ironclad oath. The loyalty oath of July 2, 1862, swearing to past loyalty as well as future, named for what it claimed to be and broken on its own overreach.

Jurat. The certification at the foot of an affidavit recording when, where, and before whom the swearer swore, the machine's receipt for the spoken act.

Kol Nidre. The prayer opening Yom Kippur, releasing vows made to God alone. The apparatus's defenders misread it for centuries as the Jew's annual license to break his oaths to his neighbors, and the misreading served as the degradation oath's whole excuse.

Law One and Law Two. The book's two sentences it stands on. Law One: every oath is a conditional self-curse with the punishment clause amputated. Law Two: the penalty migrated from the next world into this one, capacity first, belief completing, God's vengeance becoming the perjury statute, and the hand's last position the signature.

Loyalty oath. The oath aimed backward at the past and inward at belief, the oath's cautionary sibling, never a gate for testimony and always a test of the soul's record.

The machine. This book's name for the truth system's whole apparatus: the law, its courts, its statutes, its clerks, and its records, taken as one organism that learns by correction.

More judaico. The oath in the Jewish manner, the degraded form medieval and early modern Europe forced on Jewish witnesses: the stool, the hide, the cloak, the hat, the curse catalogue, the whole costume of contempt built around the core lie that a Jew's oath needed it.

Oath. The conditional self-curse with the punishment clause amputated: a human word placed under a guarantee larger than the speaker, first the gods' vengeance, later the statute's.

Oath of office. The oath sworn on taking a public trust, the gatekeeper's oath, aimed at the duties ahead.

Perjury. The willful false statement made under an oath the law authorized, on a matter the law counts material. The crime's first element is the state's own sentence, administered; without the oath, or the statute's admitted substitute for it, there is no perjury, only lying.

Praemunire. The medieval offense of obeying a foreign jurisdiction over the king's, revived against the Quakers who would not swear, carrying prison at the king's pleasure and the loss of everything the prisoner owned.

Sacramentum. The Roman soldier's oath of induction, and the lawsuit's wager with the sacred treasury as stakeholder: Rome's twin engines, both running on the sworn word.

The screen. This book's name for the belief test the law held over the gate after the gate opened: the question about the soul's arrangements, asked of the witness before the witness was asked anything else.

So help me God. The stump of the conditional sentence, the blessing that survives with the curse cut away: so help me God only if I speak true is the whole of it, and the whole of it is never said.

Star Chamber. The conciliar court that punished what the common law could not reach, the perjury statute's first enforcer, and the oath ex officio's second home until Parliament abolished it in 1641.

Subornation of perjury. Procuring another man's perjury, the procurer's crime, punished beside the swearer's from the first statute forward.

Test oath. The oath that tests belief where the ordinary oath promises conduct, the gatekeeper's instrument in England's statute book from the Reformation to the nineteenth century.

Wager of law. The oath that decided the case by being said: the defendant swore his denial with eleven neighbors swearing beside him that his oath was clean, and the twelve sworn mouths were the verdict. Compurgation is its learned name, and England abolished it in 1833.

The wire. This book's name for the statutory connection between the false affirmation and the perjury statute, first soldered in 1696 and still carrying current in section 1746.

A Note on Sources

This book works from the public record, and it works from the top of the record down. The statute is the authority for what the law said, the judgment for what the court did, the treatise for how the age understood it, and the retelling for nothing until it is checked against all three. Where the document itself survives, the quotation comes from the document: the oath formulas from the texts that carried them, the statutes from the statute book, the parliamentary exchanges from the Journal and from Hansard, the trials from the reports, the science from the journals that printed it. Period spelling and period grammar are kept where the book quotes, and translations are the public ones, named where the name matters.

The classical texts stand in the standard repositories, the Perseus Digital Library and Lacus-Curtius chief among them, with the Hebrew Bible at Sefaria and the Icelandic sagas in scholarly translation. The English statutes stand in the Statutes of the Realm and at https://legislation.gov.uk, the American ones in the Statutes at Large and the United States Code. For the cases, the English Reports at CommonLII carry the older law, and on this side of the water the reporters and the Legal Information Institute carry the rest. Bradlaugh's war is documented in the House of Commons Journal, in the historical Hansard, in Parliament's Living Heritage collections, and in the litigation reports, Clarke and Attorney-General against the member himself. The laboratory record of the final movement is the journals' own, Management Science, Law and Human Behavior, Child Development, Child Abuse and Neglect, Applied Developmental Science, the European Economic Review, the Journal of Experimental Criminology, the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, and Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science, with the open texts named in the chapters for any reader who wants to check the numbers.

The book keeps a corrections ledger, and it keeps it in public. Where the standard record and its retellers disagree, the disagreement is printed and the record wins: the Dictionary of National Biography's date for the Oaths Act against the enacted text's assent, one biography's 1848 against the arrêt's 1846, one official collections page's Brand against the record's Peel, one tertiary tradition's August 2 against the record's August 3. A correction that arrives late arrives anyway, and the book's rule is to print it at its own width, because a record's memory is only as good as its corrections.

Searches that came back empty are reported as findings. The pre-internet printing that never surfaced, the retelling that split past recovery, the disposal line the record does not carry: the book says so where it happens, because a null is a finding about the record searched, with the search's scope stated beside it, and a history that prints its nulls is a history that can be trusted with its positives.

A small shelf list remains: a page in Bately's edition of the Chronicle, a page in the Schleitheim booklet, two passages in Lloyd's Quaker Social History, two dates of The Times, the page images of Fox's Journal in the Nickalls edition, and one March 1853 newspaper issue. They are the kind an archive afternoon settles, and none of them qualifies a claim in the text, because where a record

ran thin the chapter prints the thinness instead of the claim. The corrections the book carries are collected in the Corrections Ledger at the back, and the discipline runs both ways: what the record contradicts, the book fixes, in the open, at its own width.

Bibliography

Aquinas, Thomas. Summa Theologiae, the treatise on the oath, in parallel Latin and English at https://aquinas.cc.

Augustine. Letters, including Letter 47, on the oaths of the barbarians. New Advent, https://newadvent.org/fathers.

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, the annal of 876. Public-domain translations at Project Gutenberg.

Cicero. Epistulae ad Familiares. LacusCurtius and https://attalus.org.

Cicero. De Officiis, the Regulus case and the oath's classical definition, written in the year of Caesar's murder.

Eyrbyggja Saga, the temple-ring oath of chapter 4, in the Morris and Magnusson translation, 1892.

Festus. Epitome, s.v. lapidem silicem, in Lindsay's edition.

Warde Fowler, W. Human Sacrifices at Rome. Journal of Roman Studies 2 (1912), the study separating the fetial pig rite from the stone oath. LacusCurtius.

Gaius. Institutes. The Latin Library, with Poste's English translation at https://archive.org.

Gratian. Decretum, Causa 22, in Friedberg's edition, https://archive.org.

Hesiod. Theogony and Works and Days. Perseus Digital Library, https://perseus.tufts.edu.

Horace. Odes, 3.5, the Regulus ode. Perseus Digital Library.

Plutarch. Sulla, chapter 10, the Cinna scene. Perseus Digital Library.

Landnamabok, the ring-oath prescription, in T. Ellwood's translation, The Book of the Settlement of Iceland, 1898, page 177.

Livy. Ab Urbe Condita. LacusCurtius.

Pliny the Younger. Letters, book 10, letter 96, the Christians and their oath. LacusCurtius and Perseus.

Polybius. Histories. Perseus Digital Library.

Roper, William. The Life of Sir Thomas More. Archive.org.

Sachsenspiegel, the Heidelberg manuscript, Cod. Pal. germ. 164, digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de.

Reiner, Erica. Surpu: A Collection of Sumerian and Akkadian Incantations, with the mamitu entries in the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary, volume M, part 1, the free ISAC PDFs.

The Schleitheim Confession, 1527, Michael Sattler its principal author, in the Yoder edition, with Zwingli's Latin translation of the same year.

Mendelssohn, Moses, the advisory opinion on the Jewish law of the oath given to the Prussian officials considering the form.

The Mishneh Torah, the self-incrimination rule the Miranda footnote opens on.

Tertullian. Ad Martyras, the imprisoned believers addressed as soldiers under the sacramentum. New Advent.

The saucer oath of British Columbia's courts, in the courthouse library's knowledge base of uncommon oaths, for the ceremony's documented curiosities.

Vegetius. De Re Militari, in Milner's translation.

Act to regulate the Time and Manner of administering certain Oaths, June 1, 1789, 1 Stat. 23. Library of Congress, A Century of Lawmaking.

Act of July 2, 1862, the ironclad oath, 12 Stat. 502.

California Constitution, article XX, section 3, with the Levering Act of 1950 and its chain.

Canada Evidence Act, section 16.1. laws-lois.justice.gc.ca.

Civil Procedure Act 1833, abolishing the wager of law.

Common Law Procedure Act 1854.

The English affirmation and relief chain: 13 & 14 Car. 2 c. 1 (1662); 7 & 8 Will. 3 c. 34 (1696), the Quakers Act; the Georgian form act of 1721-22, 8 Geo. 1 c. 6; 3 & 4 Will. 4 c. 49 (1833); the Evidence Further Amendment Act 1869; the Evidence Amendment Act 1870. Statutes of the Realm, British History Online, and https://legislation.gov.uk.

Federal Rules of Evidence 603 and 604, with the advisory committee notes. Legal Information Institute, https://law.cornell.edu.

House of Commons Journal, the volumes of the Bradlaugh years, and the historical Hansard, https://api.parliament.uk and https://hansard.parliament.uk.

Jews Relief Act 1858.

Oaths Act 1888, 51 & 52 Vict. c. 46, as enacted, electronic Irish Statute Book; the consolidating Oaths Act 1978 at https://legislation.gov.uk.

Perjury Act 1911. https://legislation.gov.uk.

Perjury statute of 1563, 5 Eliz. 1 c. 9, with the Georgian middle step of 1728.

The Perjury Act of 1563 at Statutes of the Realm, volume 4, part 1, pages 436-438, with the Maintenance and Embracery Act of 1540, 32 Hen. 8 c. 9, the subornation's earlier statutory root.

Test Acts, 25 Car. 2 c. 2 (1673) and 30 Car. 2 st. 2 (1678). Statutes of the Realm.

Treasons Act, November 1534.

United States Code: 18 U.S.C. 1621 and 1623; 28 U.S.C. 1746, enacted by Pub. L. 94-550, October 18, 1976. Legal Information Institute.

United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, the naturalization regulation, 8 C.F.R. 337.1, and the Policy Manual. https://uscis.gov.

Attorney-General v. Bradlaugh (1885) 14 Q.B.D. 667.

Bradlaugh v. Gossett (1884) 12 Q.B.D. 271.

Bronston v. United States, 409 U.S. 352 (1973).

Clarke v. Bradlaugh (1881) 7 Q.B.D. 38.

Cummings v. Missouri, 71 U.S. 277 (1867).

Elfbrandt v. Russell, 384 U.S. 11 (1966).

Ex parte Garland, 71 U.S. 333 (1867).

Girouard v. United States, 328 U.S. 61 (1946).

Keyishian v. Board of Regents, 385 U.S. 589 (1967).

The Lilburne proceedings, 3 Howell's State Trials 1315, with the EEBO pamphlet of the 1645-6 Lords hearing.

The Oates perjury trials of 1685, 10 Howell's State Trials 1079.

Miller v. Salomons (1852), 7 Exchequer 475, the declaration's three counts reduced to one five-hundred-pound count after two were abandoned, Baron Martin dissenting at the Exchequer, affirmed unanimously at 8 Exchequer 778 (1853), the true-faith clause case.

Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966), footnote 27.

Omichund v. Barker (1744), Willes 538, 125 E.R. 1310; also 1 Atk. 21, 26 E.R. 15. CommonLII.

Onslow's Case (1565), 2 Dyer 242b, the perjury-jurisdiction turf war.

Torcaso v. Watkins, 367 U.S. 488 (1961).

Vogel v. County of Los Angeles, 68 Cal. 2d 18 (1967).

United States v. Ward, 989 F.2d 1015 (9th Cir. 1993).

West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette, 319 U.S. 624 (1943).

Wieman v. Updegraff, 344 U.S. 183 (1952).

Alsop, J. D. Manuscript Evidence on the Quakers Bill of 1722. The Journal of the Friends Historical Society 54, no. 5 (1980): 255-257.

Arnstein, Walter L. The Bradlaugh Case. Oxford, 1965.

Austin, J. L. How to Do Things with Words. 1962, the philosopher at Harvard in the spring of 1955.

Baron, Salo W. A Social and Religious History of the Jews, the shelf behind the more judaico account.

Bartlett, Robert. Trial by Fire and Water: The Medieval Judicial Ordeal. Oxford, 1986.

Bentham, Jeremy, the testimonial-capacity manuscripts at University College London, the critique behind the 1843 act.

Besse, Joseph. A Collection of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers. 1753. Archive.org.

Bonner, Hypatia Bradlaugh. Charles Bradlaugh: A Record of His Life and Work. 1894. Archive.org.

Bradlaugh, Charles. The Right to Affirm. The refuser's pamphlet. Wikisource.

Braithwaite, William C. The Second Period of Quakerism. 1919. Archive.org.

Cavill, Paul. Perjury in Early Tudor England. Studies in Church History 56 (2020): 182-209.

Crémieux at the Musée d'art et d'histoire du Judaïsme, the 1827-1846 arc. https://mahj.org.

The Data Colada analysis of the collapsed signature-placement literature.

Derrett, J. Duncan M. The Trial of Sir Thomas More. English Historical Review 79 (1964).

Dictionary of National Biography, 1901 supplement, the Bradlaugh entry. Wikisource.

Elliot, Jonathan, ed. The Debates in the Several State Conventions, vol. 4, the North Carolina convention.

The Encyclopaedia Judaica, the oath more judaico entry, for the costume and its variants.

Faraone, Christopher A. Molten Wax, Spilt Wine and Mutilated Animals: Sympathetic Magic in Near Eastern and Early Greek Oath Ceremonies. Journal of Hellenic Studies 113 (1993): 60-80.

The form-of-oath study of the Adelaide Law Review, volume 46, treating Omichund. https://law.adelaide.edu.au.

Fox, George. The Journal of George Fox, edited by John L. Nickalls. Cambridge, 1952, the citation edition for this book; the earlier printings at https://archive.org.

Frankel, Zecharias. Die Eidesleistung der Juden. Dresden and Leipzig, 1840.

Gordon, Michael D. The Invention of a Common Law Crime: Perjury and the Elizabethan Courts. American Journal of Legal History 24 (1980): 145; and The Perjury Statute of 1563: A Case History of Confusion. Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society (1980).

Griswold, Rufus. The Republican Court. 1854, the first printing of the Washington addition.

Guy, John. Thomas More. 2000.

Harrison, William. The Description of England. 1577 and 1587.

Helmholz, R. H., et al. The Privilege Against Self-Incrimination: Its Origins and Development. 1997.

Henriques, Peter, on the Washington question. History News Network.

Hertz, Robert. The Pre-eminence of the Right Hand. 1909; English translation in Death and the Right Hand, 1960.

Hudson, William. A Treatise of the Court of Star Chamber. 1621; printed in Collectanea Juridica, vol. 2, 1792.

Jacquemet, Nicolas, Céline Launay, Stéphane Luchini, Danica Mijovic-Prelec, Drazen Prélec, Jacques Py, Julie Rosaz, and Jason F. Shogren. Does the Oath Enhance Truth-Telling in Eyewitness Testimony? Experimental Evidence. Journal of Experimental Criminology, version of record April 8, 2026, DOI 10.1007/s11292-026-09732-w.

Jacquemet, Nicolas, Robert-Vincent Joule, Stéphane Luchini, and Jason F. Shogren. Preference Elicitation under Oath. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management 65, no. 1 (2013): 110-132.

Jacquemet, Nicolas, Stéphane Luchini, Antoine Malézieux, and Jason F. Shogren. Who'll Stop Lying under Oath? Empirical Evidence from Tax Evasion Games. European Economic Review 124 (2020): 103369.

Jacquemet, Nicolas, Stéphane Luchini, Julie Rosaz, and Jason F. Shogren. Truth Telling Under Oath. Management Science 65 (2019): 426-438, open text at https://hal.science, with the companion tax-game study in the European Economic Review (2020).

The Jewish Encyclopedia. Oath More Judaico. 1901-1906, with the abolition chronology and the 1555 model form. https://jewishencyclopedia.com.

Jonassen, Frederick B., on the presidential oath and the kissed book. William and Mary Bill of Rights Journal 20 (2012); the First Amendment Encyclopedia summary, https://firstamendment.mtsu.edu.

Kisch, Guido. The Jews in Medieval Germany. 1949.

Kristal, Ariella S., Ashley V. Whillans, Max H. Bazerman, Francesca Gino, Lisa L. Shu, Nina Mazar, and Dan Ariely. Signing at the Beginning versus at the End Does Not Decrease Dishonesty. PNAS 117 (2020): 7103-7107; Correction, PNAS 123 (2026): e2610441123.

Langbein, John H. The Historical Origins of the Privilege Against Self-Incrimination at Common Law. Michigan Law Review 92 (1994): 1047.

The Law and History Review's study of the testimonial exclusions, for the Lincoln's Inn manuscript of Willes's opinion.

Levy, Leonard W. Origins of the Fifth Amendment. 1968.

Lyon, Thomas D., and Joyce Dorado. Truth Induction in Young Maltreated Children: The Effects of Oath-Taking and Reassurance on True and False Disclosures. Child Abuse and Neglect 32 (2008): 738-748.

Lyon, Thomas D., and Karen Saywitz. Young Maltreated Children's Competence to Take the Oath. Applied Developmental Science 3 (1999): 16-27.

Lyon, Thomas D., Lindsay C. Malloy, Jodi A. Quas, and Victoria Talwar. Coaching, Truth Induction, and Young Maltreated Children's False Allegations and False Denials. Child Development 79 (2008): 914-929.

Marcus, Jacob Rader. The Jew in the Medieval World: A Source Book, 315-1791. 1938, the Frankfurt formula at pages 49 and following.

McKay, Gervais, and Davis. 'So Help Me God'? Does Oath Swearing in Courtroom Scenarios Impact Trial Outcomes? British Journal of Psychology (2023): 991-1014.

Nazir, the Talmud tractate, for the right hand as an oath word.

The Old Bailey Proceedings Online, for the Brayn record of 1678.

Pollock, Frederick, and Frederic William Maitland. The History of English Law Before the Time of Edward I, vol. 2. Archive.org.

Shu, Lisa L., Nina Mazar, Francesca Gino, Dan Ariely, and Max H. Bazerman. The signature-placement study, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (2012), since retracted, with the journal's own notice; the 2018 multi-lab registered replication in Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science.

Silving, Helen. The Oath: I, 68 Yale Law Journal 1329 (1959); The Oath: II, 68 Yale Law Journal 1527 (1959). Open text at the Yale Law School repository, https://openyls.law.yale.edu.

Talwar, Victoria, Kang Lee, Nicholas Bala, and R. C. L. Lindsay. The court-competence study. Law and Human Behavior 26 (2002): 395-415, with the sequel studies on concealing a parent's transgression and on promise wording for young and maltreated children.

Thayer, James Bradley. The Older Modes of Trial. Harvard Law Review 5 (1891): 45.

Torah Musings, the 2015 disproof of the branded-palm legend, the journal in the Jewish tradition that ran the disproof before this chapter.

Tyler, J. E. Oaths: Their Origin, Nature, and History. 1834. Archive.org.

Vann, Richard T. Friends Sufferings: Collected and Recollected. Quaker History 61, no. 1 (1972): 24-35, the method check on Besse's compilation.

Verschuere, Bruno, and twenty-five laboratories. Registered Replication Report on Mazar, Amir, and Ariely (2008). Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science 1, no. 3 (2018): 299-317.

Wallner, Peter A., the Pierce biographer, for the absence of a motive on the record.

Williams, Ian, on the wager of law and Star Chamber perjury. Legal History Miscellany, 2019.

The Corrections Ledger

This book's rule is that the record wins, and where the record and its retellers disagree, the disagreement is printed in the text, at its own width. The corrections the book carries, each printed where it lands, are collected here once, so the reader can watch the discipline work.

The Dictionary of National Biography dates the Oaths Act to August 9, 1888, the day of its Commons passage; the enacted text carries the royal assent of December 24, 1888, and the chapter dates by the text (Chapter Twelve).

One biography of the Saverne affair prints 1848 for the arrêt; the arrêt is 1846, and the chapter does not inherit the misprint (Chapter Ten).

One collections page of Parliament's own website names Brand where the record carries Peel; the chapter prints Peel (Chapter Twelve).

One tertiary tradition dates the ejection August 2; the record's date is August 3, 1881, and the chapter dates by the record (Chapter Eleven).

George Fox's Lancaster year is three scenes, not one: the March 1664 examination before Judge Twysden, the August 1664 assizes before Justice Turner, where the oath was tendered and the bench's thesis spoken, and the following assizes, where the praemunire was recorded, Margaret Fell sentenced before him, and Fox never brought to hear the sentence, learning of it only at Scarborough. One modern account folds the August exchange back into March while citing the Journal's own pages; the chapter keeps the Journal's order, all three scenes of it (Chapter Nine).

The House's own Serjeant-at-Arms of 1880 was Ralph Allen Gosset; one of Parliament's Living Heritage pages names him Henry Gossett, and the chapter keeps the record's name (Chapter Eleven).

The Oaths Bill's narrowing was the Commons' own work: Bradlaugh himself moved the two-limb amendment in committee on July 4, 1888, carried 172 to 166, the price of the bill's survival, and the Lords received the bill already trimmed. The chapter's first printing gave the trim to the unelected House; the record gives it to the winner's own hand (Chapter Twelve).

The 1885 judgment in Attorney-General v. Bradlaugh held the man incapable of taking the oath itself, after the February 11, 1884 self-administration; the affirmation's own judgment is Clarke, 1881. The two cases stand apart in the chapter now (Chapter Eleven).

The words on the true faith of a Christian are Jacobean, closing the allegiance oath of 1606, and the settlement's abjuration acts carried them into the members' form; the chapter's first printing of the placement named the abjuration acts without their Jacobean root (Chapter Seven).

The Elizabethan perjury act's life ends with the Perjury Act 1911, whose own nineteenth section held its commencement to the first day of 1912; the repeal's effective date is the new year's first morning (Chapter Eight).

The member for Northampton's war includes the July 1880 interlude: the government's permission to affirm at his own legal risk, the affirmation made, the seat held and then lost to the courts, the chamber's provisional answer failing on the record (Chapter Eleven).

Errors found after printing will be corrected the same way: in the text, in the open, at their own width.

Questions for Discussion

1. Law One says every oath is a conditional self-curse with the punishment clause amputated. The last time you swore an oath, at a closing, in a courtroom, on a form, what did you think you were inviting if you lied? Did you think you were inviting anything?

2. The book's engine is the claim that every enlargement of who may testify was forced by a refuser. Can you name an enlargement of a civic right that was granted without a refuser forcing it? What does your answer, or your failure to find one, suggest about how the law learns?

3. Fox refused the form, Sattler refused the principle, More refused the content, Salomons refused to leave, Bradlaugh refused the monopoly. Whose refusal cost the most, and whose bought the most? Are they the same man?

4. The gate decided who could give evidence; the screen decided whose evidence counted, by asking about the soul's arrangements. Which was the worse instrument, and which was harder to kill?

5. The House of Commons answered Bradlaugh with the Clock Tower, the ejection, and the litigation wall. What should it have done instead, and what in the record tells you the House knew it?

6. The Oaths Act 1888 was the victory narrowed in the winning: the universal clause cut by the winner's own amendment, moved to save the bill, carried 172 to 166, with the universal clause enacted at last in 1977. Is half a right a right? When is the trimmed concession worth taking, and who decides?

7. The child who promises tells measurably more truth than the child who does not, and Canada gave the promise the oath's full force. Should a four-year-old's promise and a forty-year-old's oath carry the same weight in the same courtroom?

8. The laboratory record splits: the signature-placement nudge collapsed in fabrication and failed replication, while the oath itself held at every setting. What is the difference between the two instruments, and what does the split tell us about which rituals the law should keep?

9. The book closes where the hand comes down, on the signature under penalty of perjury. What was lost when the ritual left the room, and what was gained? Was the trade worth making?

10. Law Two says the penalty migrated from the next world into this one. Is the perjury statute a better guarantor than the god it replaced? For whom?

11. The loyalty oath is the oath's cautionary sibling, aimed at the past and at belief. Where does the oath overreach today, in hiring, in schooling, in immigration, and what is the modern ironclad?

12. After sixteen chapters, the question the machine has always asked is the one the book ends on. What would you refuse to swear, and what would your refusal cost, and who would it free?

Index

Abbot, Henry, 81
abjuration, 31
affidavit, 80
affirmation, 10, 55, 65, 72, 79, 85, 93, 100
Alfred, 15
Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 15
Ariely, Dan, 94
Arthur, Chester A., 82
Assize of Clarendon, 29
Atkyns, John Tracy, 62
attaint, 7, 41, 46
Attorney-General v. Bradlaugh, 63, 67
Augustine, 22
Austin, J. L., 91
Bala, Nicholas, 87
Barnette, Gathie and Marie, 102
Bartlett, Robert, 29
Bazerman, Max H., 94
Besse, Joseph, 53
Blackstone, William, 28, 48
Bonner, Hypatia Bradlaugh, 69
Bradlaugh, Charles, 63, 65, 72, 83, 89
Bradlaugh v. Gossett, 68
Bronston, Samuel, 50
Caldwell, David, 81
Canada Evidence Act, 88
Cavill, Paul, 45
child witnesses, promise of, 87, 94
Cicero, 5, 10
Cinna, 5
Clarke v. Bradlaugh, 67
Clock Tower, 67
Coke, Edward, 39, 48
compurgation. *See* wager of law.
Court of High Commission, 33
Crémieux, Adolphe, 61
Cromwell, Oliver, 36, 42, 69
Cummings v. Missouri, 101
Davis (courtroom-perception study), 93
deposition, 47
Derrett, J. Duncan M., 41
Dorado, Joyce, 88
Dorman, Mary, 35
dying declaration, 50
Elfbrandt v. Russell, 102
Ex parte Garland, 101
Eyrbyggja saga, 6, 16
Faraone, Christopher A., 4
Federal Rules of Evidence, 85
Festus, 4
Fowler, W. Warde, 5
Fox, George, 52
Frankel, Zecharias, 60, 75
Frankfurt oath, 59
Freedmen's Bureau, 101
Gaius, 9

Gervais (courtroom-perception study), 93
Gino, Francesca, 94
Girouard, James, 89
Gladstone, William Ewart, 76
Gordon, Michael D., 46
Gossett, Serjeant, 67
Gratian, 23
Griswold, Rufus, 82
Hansard, 69
Hardwicke, Lord Chancellor, 62
Harrison, William, 18, 48
Helmholz, R. H., 36
Hertz, Robert, 17
Hesiod, 4
Hoover, Herbert, 82
Horkos, 4
Hudson, William, 46
Hunter, W. A., 74
Iredell, James, 81
ironclad oath, 86, 101
Isidor, Lazare, 61
Jacquemet, Nicolas, 91
Jews Relief Act 1858, 42
Jonassen, Frederick B., 82
Keyishian v. Board of Regents, 102
Kisch, Guido, 60
Kol Nidre, 60
Kristal, Ariella S., 94
Labouchere, Henry, 65, 74
Landnamabok, 6, 16
Langbein, John H., 37
Lee, Kang, 87
Levering Act, 103
Levy, Leonard W., 37
Lilburne, John, 34, 47, 75, 84, 89
Lindsay, R. C. L., 87
Livy, 5, 9
loyalty oath, 86, 100
Luchini, Stéphane, 91
Lyon, Thomas D., 87
Maimonides, 37
Maitland, Frederic William, 30
mamitu, 3
Mazar, Nina, 94
McKay (courtroom-perception study), 93
Mendelssohn, Moses, 61
Miller v. Salomons, 42, 63
Miranda v. Arizona, 37
more judaico, 59
More, Thomas, 40, 89
Northampton, 65, 72
Oates, Titus, 48
oath ex officio, 33, 48
oath of office, 79
Oaths Act 1888, 57, 73
Oaths Act 1978, 74
Omichund v. Barker, 62, 68
Peel, Arthur Wellesley, 72
perjury, 39, 45, 85, 99
Perjury Act 1911, 49
Pierce, Franklin, 82
Pliny, 11
Plutarch, 5
Polybius, 5, 8
praemunire, 53
Prynne, William, 34
Quakers Act 1696, 54, 100
Regulus, 11

Rich, Richard, 41
ring oath, 2, 15, 21
Roper, William, 41
Rosaz, Julie, 92
Rothschild, Lionel de, 43
Sachsenspiegel, 16
sacramentum, 8, 21, 54, 104
Salomons, David, 41, 63
Sattler, Michael, 25
Saverne, procès de, 61, 75
Saywitz, Karen, 88
Schleitheim Confession, 24
self-incrimination, privilege against, 36
Shogren, Jason F., 91
Shu, Lisa L., 94
signature, 99
Silving, Helen, 3
so help me God, 2, 80, 86
Spencer, Samuel, 81
Star Chamber, 33, 46
Styx, 4
subornation, 45
Talwar, Victoria, 87
Tertullian, 11
test oath, 41, 80, 101
Thayer, James Bradley, 30
the clerk, 1, 17, 31, 85
the curse, 2, 9, 59, 103
the engine, 25, 29, 33, 48
the gate, 39, 65, 80, 85, 101
the hand, 1, 14, 99
the machine, 9, 27, 33, 47, 54, 59, 69, 73, 79, 85, 99
the screen, 11, 39, 74
the signature, 2, 69, 94, 99
the stone, 4, 15, 21, 93, 99
the wire, 55, 74, 84, 85, 99
Torcaso v. Watkins, 83
Treasons Act 1534, 40
Turner, Justice, 54
Twysden, Judge, 54
unsworn declaration, 99
Vegetius, 12
Vogel v. County of Los Angeles, 103
wager of law, 28
Ward, United States v., 86
Washington, George, 81
Whillans, Ashley V., 94
Wieman v. Updegraff, 102
Wilkes, John, 71, 77
Willes, John, 62
Zwingli, Huldrych, 25

About the Author

David Boles is an author, dramatist, publisher, and teacher. Born in Lincoln, Nebraska, he began as a child actor and hosted radio and television programs while still in his teens. He holds an MFA from Columbia University, where he trained at the Oscar Hammerstein II Center for Graduate Theatre Studies, and he is a member of the Dramatists Guild, the Authors Guild, and PEN America. In 1975 he founded David Boles Books Writing & Publishing, which has since put more than fifty books into print. He hosts the David Boles: Human Meme podcast, and the Prairie Voice Archive at Boles.com has operated continuously since 1995. He lives and works in New York City.

Also By the Author

The truth-machine lane:
No One Dies Lying: Last Words on Trial
Swimming the Author: Who Is Allowed to Have Written This?
In My Mind I'm Standing Up: A History of Recantation and the Coerced Word
Histories and arguments:
Barbarous Ancestors
Not My Thing
The Eighteen-Minute Lie
Carceral Nation
DO HARM
The Occupied Space
The One-Way Drop
First the Sky Turns Green
Tidal Volume
The Brittle Self
The Human Universal Beautiful
Commissioned Monsters
Beyond the Burial Tree
Selling Saturday Morning
The Magnificent Loser
Beautiful Numbness
The Scientific Aesthetic
The Us of Us
Preplay
Abandoned in Place
Underwritten
With Janna Sweenie:
Back to Willowbrook
No, I Will Not Be Your Friend
RelationShaping
The complete and current list of published works is kept at https://bolesbooks.com.