

cially to its central concept, the Jesus? Does not even Tertullian (in the passage quoted in *The Monist*, p. 531) dare to represent Tiberius as convinced by "intelligence from Syria Palestine"? Does not Justin (A. I, 35, 48) still earlier appeal to a fictive official report of the trial of Jesus?¹ In fact, unless I widely err, this strain towards historization, especially in the Western church, has been the main determinant of old Christian literature and dogma.

10. In conclusion, a few minima. Dr. K. does not like a certain parenthesis of mine "(who are much higher than deep)," which he thinks offensive to "higher critics." Now I yield to no one in genuine admiration of these critics and would be the last to violate propriety in speech about them. But such disquisition is at best exceeding dry, even repellent, and in mercy to the reader it seemed admissible to interject an occasional bit of good-natured humor. However, if yielding to such rare impulse to lay aside high seriousness for the moment seems likely to wound any one's feelings, I shall firmly resist it and make my discourse as solemn and severe as the sternest could desire.

As to the great harm which Dr. K. fears the new notions may do liberal criticism, it may be suggested that criticism was made for the truth and not the truth for criticism. If the liberal contentions are sound, no form nor fashion of research can really harm them; if unsound, no amount of homage or advocacy can ultimately save them.

Instead of lumping the investigations of Bauer, Kalthoff, and many others with my own, it would seem juster to distinguish things that differ. Dr. K. should know from careful reading (which may often check cavils that careless reading has started) that neither in method nor in spirit nor in results is there any such likeness as would justify such classification, which not even German critics would employ or approve.

COMMENTS AND ADDENDA BY MR. KAMPMEIER.

1. The weight of the Sulpician passage on the festivities of Nero has been entirely overlooked. If this passage (though not dealing with the persecution) was taken almost verbatim from Tacitus, why can't the passage on the persecution be a copy from him? I beg to compare both passages closely.

2. That part of the Clemens passage speaking of women martyrs reads: "On account of zeal women were persecuted, who, Dan-

¹ ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ Πορτίου Πιλάτου γενομένων ἁκτων.

aids and Dirkae, suffering horrible and impious treatment, arrived at the goal of the race of faith and obtained glorious honor, though being weak in body." I simply left out the two words, for the omission of which I am criticized, because I did not wish to go into unimportant detail, as I only cited the Clemens passage very generally anyway. I am now sorry for not having given it fully; it would have strengthened my position the more. The two words perhaps refer to a peculiar treatment some women suffered in the persecution mentioned by Clemens.

3. In the James passage not only the disputed words must be taken into consideration, but the whole passage following, which states that James and others were accused and stoned by Ananus as "breakers of the law," and that the most equitable of the citizens, disliking what was done, protested through King Agrippa (the personal friend of Josephus) against the procedure of the high priest before the new Roman governor Albinus. Schürer only suspects the James passage because Josephus otherwise is silent on Christianity. But this is no valid reason.

4. Dr. Smith does not notice that by now saying the mother and brethren of Mark iii. 31, "standing without," symbolize the Jews in their rejection of the Jesus cult he entangles himself more and more, since in his previous article he spoke of the brothers of Jesus and Cephas as only spiritual brothers.

5. In regard to the number 666 I do not see any necessity of receding yet from the *zeitgeschichtliche* position. As long as the Jewish and Christian Sibyllines are full of instances in which historical persons are designated by numbers, I cling to the position that 666 can likewise denote an historical person. Book XIV of the Sibyllines designates a whole row of Roman emperors by numbers. Does Gunkel really declare "*die zeitgeschichtliche Erklärung bankerott*" in every detail? According to his article (*Monist*, April 1903) he of course leads much of the language of Revelation back to primitive myths, in which I fully agree with him, but does this exclude any reference to contemporary history? There is repeated reference to Rome, "the great city" in chaps. xiii-xviii. In xvii. 9 Rome is designated as sitting on seven hills, and then follows the mention of seven kings, one of which, says the seer, will be the beast, "that was, and is not, even he is the eighth."

6. The passage in *Ascensio Jesajae* says: "Beliar, the great prince, the king of this world, will appear in the form of a man, an unjust king, a matricide. [Nero is repeatedly referred to in the

Sibyllines as matricide] who will persecute the plantation, which the twelve apostles of the beloved have planted and of the twelve one will be given into his hands." I hope Dr. Smith will not deny the great prevalence of the Nero-*redivivus* legend in early Christian circles.

7. Furneaux aptly remarks that the statement of Suetonius concerning the punishment of Christians occurs among a whole list of police regulations for which Nero is commended. This may account for the short wording.

8. As the tilt between Dr. S. and myself may fall into the hands of some who know me personally, I will say that I lay no claim to either a Ph. or D.D., for which my opponent erroneously assumes me.

A. K.

REMARKS ON DR. CARUS'S VIEW CONCERNING GEOMETRY.

In an interesting essay published in *The Monist* of January, 1910, Dr. Carus has attempted to explain the nature of mathematical thought. Putting aside other points, he has mainly endeavored therein to establish "the foundation of geometry without resorting to axioms," which we could not but receive with hearty approval and close attention, because hitherto we have been compelled to proceed with some set or other of axioms, or rather assumptions, as we prefer to call them. If we could ever do away with them, how glad we would be! Nothing else in the domain of mathematics,—nay of any subject in the entire scope of science, could ever afford greater satisfaction to our esthetic requirements by which we are seeking simplicity in our scientific thought. But the case is not simple. We must first enter into a critical examination before we can give assent or dissent to this enticing view of Dr. Carus.

On page 50 of his article we read: "If my conception of mathematics is true we do not need in geometry a certain number of primitive ideas supposed incapable of definition, and a certain number of primitive propositions or axioms, supposed to be incapable of proof."

All this would be very well if it were really true as Dr. Carus maintains. In his Conclusion he feels confident that he has "furnished a conception which satisfies all demands and will be conceivable for all practical purposes," and further that "in the main (his) solution is on the right track." But in spite of all he has said we are compelled to doubt whether he is certainly right. Mathe-