

available to help us in assigning precise chronological positions to the leading events (apart from miraculous occurrences) narrated in the New Testament." In Vol. 3, p. 91, he says: "No author of distinction deemed his crucifixion worth a passing note."

Yet, page 22, Mr. Gould quotes Tacitus as saying that "*Christ*, the originator of that name (Christians), had been executed by the Procurator Pontius Pilate, in the reign of Tiberius;" and states that the passage had been doubted, but gives no reason why. We know that "*Christ*" was a title, not a name, and it does not appear likely that Tacitus knew it meant Jesus of Nazareth or he would have so described him. Who did he quote from? If he wrote so long after the alleged event, he must have derived his information from some authority.

Again, page 19, Mr. Gould says: "The Roman historian, Suetonius, writing early in the second century, *refers to Christ* as 'one Chrestus,' and regards him as a fomenter of disturbances among the Jews in Rome." Is that at all probable? Why did he write of Christ as Chrestus—if he meant Jesus of Nazareth? There is no reason given for saying that Suetonius "*refers to Christ*." I am not aware of any authority for the statement that Jesus of Nazareth was concerned in a disturbance in Rome, or that he ever appeared in Rome at all. Besides, if Christ and Chrestus were identical and predated the Christian era, as Mr. Gould appears to maintain, we require some evidence that Tacitus and Suetonius, by using that descriptive, meant the Jesus of the Gospels. That is what is wanted to make it testimony to the existence of the carpenter's son.

As he has made this subject his special study, it would be interesting to know why Mr. Gould quotes these two authors of distinction without supplying us with any objections to the authenticity of the quotations. I submit two objections to points arising out of these quotations that are subjects of doubt—that Jesus originated the term "*Christian*," and that he created disturbances in Rome. Following Mr. Gould's history, I should conclude that Jesus did neither of these things.

Josephus is quoted at page 154, Vol. 2, but we are at once told that "the objections to the passage are fatal." Mr. Gould mentions the fact that the passage quoted from Josephus was not referred to till Eusebius, of the fourth century, Origen, of the third century, not mentioning it. Prof. Graetz, already quoted, does not refer to it, although, after making extensive inquiries, I have ascertained that the disputed passage is in all the editions of Josephus in the libraries of this country. It is difficult to understand how some prominent Freethinkers have arrived at the conclusion that the passage was genuine. I have frequently met persons who, in reply to my observation that no historian mentions Jesus, have immediately replied, "Oh, but look at Josephus!"

Well, let us look at Josephus. The paragraph mentioning Jesus occurs in Book 18, c. 3, and is inserted between accounts of disturbances in Jerusalem and Rome. The first account ends with: "And thus an end was put to this sedition,"—in the margin dated a.d. 28. Then follow nine lines about Jesus—a totally different subject: