"the old Catechisms which were imposed upon us in our youth—when our intelligence could not defend itself against them—no longer command our respect.

"They have become mildewed with neglect. The times in which they were conceived and composed are dead—quite dead!

"A New Catechism to express the thoughts of men and woman and children living in these new times is needed," and adds the author: "This is a modest effort in that direction."

To characterise the work, we point out a few passages at random, which may at the same time show in what respect the new Catechism needs amendment:

"Q. What is man?—A. A rational animal.—Q. How old is man?—A. Hundreds of thousands of years old.—Q. Who were his ancestors?—A. The mammalia."

We agree perfectly with the idea which Mr. Mangasarian means to convey, but it goes without saying that while man is a mammal, there are many mammalia which are not man's ancestors, and there are other creatures among the lower classes which are. The statement lacks precision.

"Q. What is Christian Science?

"A. The belief that a certain New England woman has recently received a special revelation from God."

While the Catechism is devoted more than is necessary to polemics, by stating why the Christian and Jewish faiths are unacceptable, it is by no means void of positive ideals, and with a reference to Giordano Bruno and De Tocqueville Mr. Mangasarian concludes his new Catechism as follows:

"Q. What, then, is the chief end of man?

"A. To seek the supreme wisdom by the reason, and practise the sovereign good by the will, and for the good of humanity."

It is not easy to write a catechism, for questions that should be simple need a good deal of maturation. That the present work answers to a great want in the circles for which it is written is best proved by the fact that within a few weeks after its appearance the book reached its second edition.

We hope that the Catechism will be more and more adapted to the needs of the Independent Religious Society, and that future editions will gradually remove the shortcomings of the first and second.

P. C.

THE SHAPE OF THE CROSS OF JESUS.

Crosses (viz., the martyr-instruments) were of all conceivable shapes,¹ but mostly simple poles or stakes. As a matter of fact all the Greek words for cross (σταυρός, σκόλυψ, σκινδάλμος) mean pole or stake (viz., simple beams), and the New Testament uses also the word "wood," ἔξοδον, obviously translating the Hebrew term for cross (ץיע) which means "tree" or "wood." There is no positive evidence in the New Testament as to the shape of Christ's cross and almost all the Christian authors from the second century down to the present time in forming their opinion are swayed by mystic or dogmatical considerations.

Tertullian regards belief in any other form of the cross (save that of two intersecting lines) as heretical and deems it essential that Christ should have been cru-

¹Josephus's description (in Ant., XIII, 14, 2; Bell Jud., IX., 2 ff., V., 11, 1) will be remembered: further the passages in Seneca, Consolations, 20; Plautus, Mostell., I., 3, 54, and 11., 1, 13; Herodotus on Polycrates, III., 115, and on Persian crucifixions, III., 159; cf. also VII., 194, and IX., 112; Horace, Epist., I., 16, 48; Propertius, III., 21, 37.
cified in such an extraordinary way (*tom insigniter*).\(^1\) The symbolism of the figure of intersecting lines is as important to him as the fact of Christ’s sacrificial death.

Lipsius, the first learned author who collected all references to the cross, exclaimed:

"There are all kinds of crosses, but on which form he has died who by his death was our life, I do not mean to question, so as to avoid even the semblance of my doubting or disputing the grave men versed in sacred things. I believe in the last one [viz., the *crux immissa*], which with its four ends comprises the entire world, not without mystery, because the Saviour was suspended dying for the whole world."\(^2\)

Damascenus\(^3\) declares in favor of the four-armed cross because "'the four extremities are joined in their center and contain the height, the depth, the length, and the breadth, or the whole visible and invisible creation.'"

It would lead us too far to adduce other arguments, for they are worthless and do not deserve consideration.

In contradiction to the traditional belief, the Rev. Herman Fulda\(^4\) claims that there is no reason to doubt that Christ died on the simple cross; but he assumes that when Christ is said to have borne his cross it was the pole of the cross, not the transverse beam.

It is well known (and Mr. Fulda himself grants it) that Roman slaves when doomed to die on the cross had their arms tied to the transverse beam (*patibulum*) and this beam (or *patibulum*) is itself called the cross.

In spite of the insufficiency of the arguments offered by the Church-fathers and mystics in favor of the four-armed cross, and in spite of Fulda's scholarly defense of the simple pole as the probable cross of Calvary, we believe that Jesus died on a cross like that assumed by tradition, viz., a Latin cross, so-called, a pole traversed by a patibulum.

When Christ is reported as having borne his cross, we must assume that his arms were tied to the patibulum after the Roman manner in execution. Being exhausted from a sleepless night and lack of food, Christ broke down under the burden, and a man passing by, Simeon of Cyrene, was pressed into service to carry the beam (the *patibulum* or *crux*) to the place of execution.

The main pole of the cross, which must have been a stout beam of more than twelve feet in length, must have been too heavy to be carried to the place of execution by one man, unless he were an athlete in training, and it seems that Jesus who was broken down by fatigue and hunger would have been unable to lift it, let alone to bear it, even though it was only part of the way. We have no positive informa-

---

\(^1\) Lipsius, *De Cruce*, Ch. X., p. 22.


\(^3\) De Orth., libr. IV., Ch. XII.

\(^4\) *Das Kreuz und die Kreuzigung*, § 36, pp. 117 ff. This book is a very scholarly investigation written by a Protestant clergyman. Fulda having presented his reasons in favor of a simple stake adds (pp. 223–224): "Very early the Church began to make the death of Jesus the main work of its life [so Paul in Tim. ii. 5; Rom. viii. 34] and called the Gospel the word of the cross. Thus the symbolisation of the faith through the cross was suggested, and it cannot be denied that the customary figure of the cross, more complex and still simple, lends itself better for the purpose than the mere pole. . . . Thus I would not exchange the cross of the Church for the historically true cross, but I do not agree with Lipsius's saying: 'What shall become of us Christians if we are obliged to think of the figure of the cross under another form than the holy sign of the cross and had we to make it otherwise with our hands [viz., in crossing ourselves]?’ Indeed, there is no science that so easily combines with the grandest subjects a clinging to the unessential and false as does theology."
tion that the main pole was ever carried to the place of execution, but there are scattered indications that it was erected before the arrival of the victim who was hoisted up on the patibulum and thus attached to it.

Accordingly we believe that Jesus carried the patibulum, not the whole cross, and even that a beam of about five feet proved too heavy for him. If, however, in the crucifixion of Jesus the patibulum was used, it is obvious that his cross must have had the shape of the Latin cross, so called.

While we dissent from Mr. Fulda on the question of the shape of the cross, we are inclined to side with him as to the nailing of the hands, and believe that according to the oldest Church tradition which prevailed among the Christians of the second generation who were still in connection with personal disciples of Jesus, the idea prevailed that the hands alone, and not the feet, had been nailed to the cross; for in John, chap. xx. 25, Thomas the doubter says: "Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe." No mention is made of the print of the nails in the feet, neither in verse 25 nor 27 where we read that Jesus makes Thomas thrust his hands into his wounds. Luke (xxiv. 39), belonging to a later age, represents the later belief according to which both hands and feet were pierced.

Further it is more than likely that ropes were used for tying Jesus to the cross, for when prophesying to Peter the same death (in John xxi. 18) Jesus says: "When thou wast young, thou girdest thyself, and walkest whither thou wouldest: but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not."

Plautus in his witty comedy Miles Gloriosus (II., 4) gives a humorous description of a slave frightened by the mere idea of the several details of his prospective crucifixion. He is told: "I believe you will have to walk out of the city-gate with outstretched arms when you carry the patibulum." And when the slave shows his horror at the thought of carrying the heavy beam, he is comforted by the prospect that thereafter the patibulum will carry him. Forcellini (s. v., patibulum) cites as a fragment from Plautus the passage: "With the patibulum I shall be led through the town and then be attached to the cross."

THE CRUCIFIXION OF DOGS IN ANCIENT ROME.

Pliny has preserved a strange report that in Rome dogs were annually crucified; while on the same day geese were carried around in a triumphal procession through the streets of the city. The latter were kept on the Capitol and fed from public funds as sacred birds, being called the "brothers of the sun and the cousins of the moon." The story is referred to by Cicero and also by the grammarian Servius. This strange custom is generally explained by the story of the siege of the Capitol by the Gauls, according to which the barbarians climbed the rock in

1 Fulda in reply to the objection of one of his critics that aesthetical reasons and respect for social etiquette prevented the Gospel writer from mentioning the feet, says: "That would have been the most lamentable prudery . . ." Moreover, consider the symbolic act of Jesus washing the feet of the disciples.

2 Credo tibi esse eundum extra portam dissipessis manibus, patibulum quum habeabis.

3 Patibulatus ferar per urbem, delinde affigare cruci.
