

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

I venture to think this parallel from Hippolytus in itself a sufficient justification of Harris' interpretation of xix. 4 f. as referring to the two testaments, as against Harnack's (see EXPOSITOR VIII. 9, September 1911, p. 249 f.). It is indeed quite as easy to apply the implied reference to those on the left hand who do not receive the milk "in its fulness" to Jews who reject the New Testament as to Marcionites who reject the Old. In either case we have relatively late Christian (interpolated) material. Hitherto, so far as I am aware, the earliest date to which this material (referred to by Harris as the "latest" in the *Odes*, and as "at the earliest a product of the second century") could be certainly carried back by external evidence was the beginning of the fourth century, when Lactantius quotes this ode by name and number. If Hippolytus be really employing it the date of Lactantius (c. 311) will be carried back almost a century. But it is far from improbable that the dependence is on the other side. The passage from Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* i. 6) quoted by Harris (p. 115) might be suggested by Ode viii. 17, and the application made by Hippolytus to the two testaments of Scripture might rest on one or both. But Ode xix. 2-5 seems more likely to have been suggested by Hippolytus than conversely. If so, this relatively late addition may be dated c. 250 A.D. BENJ. W. BACON.

### THE DATE OF HEROD'S MARRIAGE WITH HERODIAS AND THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE GOSPELS.

THE purpose of this article is to draw attention to a problem in criticism and chronology which seems to deserve more attention than it has lately received.

The question is the bearing of the story of Herod, Herodias and John the Baptist, on the one hand on the criticism of

the Gospels, especially of Mark, and on the other hand on the chronology of the life of Christ ; while the criticism of the writings of Josephus plays an important part in the view which has to be taken of the whole complex of facts.

According to Mark, whose account is followed in the main by Matthew, John the Baptist owed his imprisonment and ultimately his death to the hostility of Herod and Herodias, against whose marriage he had protested. It is also stated that the death of John the Baptist preceded that of Jesus. "But when Herod heard of it (i.e. the ministry of Jesus) he said, 'John, whom I beheaded, is risen again.' For Herod himself had sent and arrested John and bound him in prison on account of Herodias, the wife of Philip his brother : because he had married her. For John said to Herod, 'It is not right for you to take your brother's wife.'"

If this story stood alone we should have no hesitation in saying that it dates the marriage of Herod and Herodias in the years of the public ministry of Jesus ; or, if we look at the facts the other way round, that it dates the public ministry of Jesus as contemporary with the marriage of Herod and Herodias.

Now if we start by accepting the usual chronology of the life of Christ we have to say that this was 29 A.D. This date rests, of course, primarily on the theory, derived from Luke iii. 1, that the baptism of Jesus was in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, who succeeded Augustus in 14 A.D. But if we turn round, and start with the chronology implied by what Josephus tells us as to the history of Herod, we find that any natural interpretation of his statements points to the probability that the marriage of Herod and Herodias took place 35 A.D.

It is clear that the discrepancy between these results points to a problem which can be solved in three ways. In the first place we can reject the obvious implication of the

story of Josephus, introduce an interpretation of his statements which is not the most natural, and in this way rescue the generally-received chronology of the life of Christ. Or, in the second place, we may revise our critical judgment as to the value of the Gospel of Mark, and by treating some of his statements as unhistorical get rid of the supposed synchronism between the ministry of Jesus and the marriage of Herod and Herodias. Or, in the third place, we may revise the usual chronology of the life of Christ in such a way as to enable us to accept a date more in accordance with the statements of Josephus as to the life of Herod.

Probably the clearest manner of approaching the question is to state at once the evidence of Josephus in his own words. In his *Antiquities of the Jews*, xviii. 4, 6, he relates the death of Herod the Tetrarch of Trachonitis, in the twentieth year<sup>1</sup> of Tiberius, that is, either in 33 or 35 A.D. He then goes on to say that "At this time strife arose between Aretas, the king of Petrea, and Herod, for the following reason: Herod the tetrarch had married the daughter of Aretas, and had lived with her for a long time; but when he was setting out for Rome he stayed in the house of his half-brother Herod, the son of Herod by the daughter of Simon the high priest. Now, he fell in love with Herodias, his host's wife, who was the daughter of Aristobulus, the brother of the Herods, and the sister of Agrippa the Great, and ventured to suggest marriage to her. She listened, and an agreement was made that she would come to his home on his return from Rome. It was also part of the agreement that he would send away the daughter of Aretas. So he sailed to Rome with this agreement, but when he returned after accomplishing his object his wife, having heard of the agreement as to Herodias before her husband knew that she had done so,

<sup>1</sup> Or possibly the twenty-second, according to the Latin version of Josephus.

asked him to send her to Machaerus, which is on the frontier of the domains of Aretas and Herod, without letting her plan become known. So Herod let her go, not thinking that she had any perception of the state of affairs, but she had sent instructions in advance to Machaerus, which paid tribute to her father, and everything had been made ready for her by the representative of Aretas, so that on her arrival she set out for Arabia and, under the care of successive representatives, reached her father in haste and explained to him Herod's attitude. This he made the beginning of hostility, in addition to a boundary dispute in the district of Gamala. The armies of both sides were mobilised : they sent away the representatives of each other, and began a war. In the battle which ensued the whole army of Herod was destroyed, and he was deserted by the refugees from the tetrarchy of Philip who were serving under Herod. Herod wrote a report of these events to Tiberius, and he was enraged at Aretas's action and wrote to Vitellius to take up the war and either to capture him alive and send him home as a prisoner or to kill him and send his head to the emperor. So Tiberius entrusted the execution of these orders to the Praetor in Syria. But some of the Jews thought that Herod's army had been destroyed by God and that he was paying a very just penalty for the death of John the Baptist."

Then follows an account of John the Baptist, explaining that Herod had been afraid that his teaching would lead to political trouble, and had sent him as a prisoner to Machaerus and had put him to death there. Finally, Josephus ends by repeating :

" But the Jews thought that the destruction wrought on his army was the act of God, who willed that Herod should suffer this punishment for his treatment of John."

It is clear from these statements of Josephus that he

regards the marriage of Herod and Herodias, and the war between Aretas and Herod, as closely connected events belonging to the same period as the death of Herod of Trachonitis, which he dates in the twentieth or twenty-second year of Tiberius. As he relates these events after mentioning the death of Herod of Trachonitis it is *prima facie* probable that he regards them as slightly later; but too much must not be made of this argument, as Josephus often turns back and relates incidents in one part of the country after he has completed the narrative of events of a later date which had taken place in another district. More important for fixing the chronology is what follows. Vitellius endeavoured to carry out the command of the emperor and to punish Aretas. For this purpose he collected a number of troops and made preparations for an expedition. But before the expedition could get further than Jerusalem news reached him that Tiberius was dead, and all preparations were postponed until the will of the new emperor could be ascertained. Now, Tiberius died in March, 37 A.D. It is thus practically certain that the war in which Herod was defeated took place in the year 36 A.D., and the suggestion is certainly very strong that the marriage of Herod and Herodias which occasioned this war had not taken place more than a year or two before the outbreak of hostilities; so that the year 35 A.D. is the most probable for the marriage of Herod and Herodias, although a few months earlier is not entirely inconceivable. If, then, we had only the evidence of Josephus to enable us to date the chronology of the Gospel we should certainly say that it is clear from Mark that the ministry of Jesus was contemporary with the death of John the Baptist, that His death was later than the death of John the Baptist, that the death of John the Baptist was contemporary, or nearly so, with the marriage of Herod and Herodias, and that therefore the death of Jesus could not

but be later than the marriage of Herod and Herodias in the year 34-35. Thus, we should say, the year 35 is the earliest possible date for the crucifixion; and the question arises, how much later than this it can possibly be placed, according to the combined evidence of the Gospels and of Josephus.

Probably the clearest way of dealing with this question is to set out fairly fully the arguments which fix the possible limit before which the crucifixion must be placed.

The main fact, which alone is quite clearly attested, is that the crucifixion took place when Pontius Pilate was Procurator of Judaea. To fix the date at which his procuratorship began is not possible, except in dependence on the date on which it ended, and the fact that Josephus says that he was Procurator for ten years. The date of his departure can be fixed more satisfactorily. There was a disturbance in Samaria, which Pilate construed as an insurrection and put down with great severity: the Samaritans complained to Vitellius, the Emperor's Legate in Syria, and he, after holding an inquiry while he was in Jerusalem, sent Pilate to Rome to answer to the emperor. But while he was still on his way, Tiberius died, or, at all events, the news of Tiberius's death reached him. Tiberius died a few days before March 18, 37 A.D., on which date his successor Gaius was proclaimed emperor, so that we can safely put the end of Pilate's rule somewhere after the Passover of 36 and before that of 37. The Passover of 36 is therefore the latest possible date for the crucifixion.

Subsidiary to the fact that Pilate was Procurator at the time of the crucifixion is the probability that Caiaphas was high priest. This is, of course, much less certain. Caiaphas is not mentioned by Mark, nor in connexion with the crucifixion by Luke. That he was high priest at that time is stated by John and by the redactor who worked over the

Marcan narrative in Matthew. But, so far as Josephus takes us, 36 is also probably the date of the last Passover during which Caiaphas was high priest. He was appointed high priest by Valerius Gratus, Pilate's predecessor, and was removed by Vitellius in favour of Jonathan, the son of Annas, at the time of a visit which he paid to Jerusalem at the Passover, and this Jonathan was again removed in favour of his brother Theophilus. Now, Theophilus was appointed just after the Passover of 37. Jonathan was therefore high priest for this year, and the date of his appointment cannot well be earlier than just after the Passover of 36, which would in this case be the last passover at which Caiaphas was high priest. I take it that Josephus means in each case that Vitellius went up at the feast, and after the feast considered complaints and made rearrangements.<sup>1</sup>

Thus 36 A.D. seems to be the latest possible date for the crucifixion, and, as has been shown already, dates earlier than 35 become increasingly less and less probable as they go further and further back.

Nevertheless there is an imposing consensus of authority among New Testament scholars that the years 35-36 are improbable for the Crucifixion, and it is therefore desirable to note the facts on which they build, and the manner in which they circumvent the evidence of Josephus and St. Mark.

The general starting point for any discussion of the chronology is as a rule St. Luke's statement that John the Baptist began to preach in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, i.e. 28-29

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to note in passing that Josephus does not testify to the smallest opposition from the Jews to this appointment of high priests by the Roman Legates—the idea that the high priest's was an hereditary life office seems to have become obsolete—and the title of "high priest" is applied to previous as well as to actual holders of the office. It is also interesting, especially in connexion with the God-fearers and the question of Jewish exclusiveness, that Josephus represents Vitellius as going to Jerusalem in 37 to sacrifice (*θύσων*) with the Jews.



A.D. This is then equated with the Baptism of Jesus, one or three years (according to the view adopted as to the length of the ministry) are added on, and the crucifixion is placed in 30 A.D. or thereabouts. It then becomes necessary to explain away the evidence of Josephus as to Herod's marriage, or in the alternative to get rid of Mark's allusion to that event.

The more popular method is the former: it has the authority of the late Professor Schürer. It is suggested that there was an interval of many years between the marriage of Herod and Herodias and the war undertaken by Aretas in the interests of his insulted daughter. The dominant view, though it could scarcely have been that of Schürer himself, seems to be that Aretas required a long time to make his preparations and to assemble his troops. This is quite contrary to the facts as we know them with regard to the respective strength of Herod and Aretas. Herod was a comparatively insignificant prince under the protection of the Romans. Aretas, on the other hand, was one of the most powerful of the independent rulers of the East, and probably regarded himself as by no means incapable of holding out for a long time even against the power of Rome itself. Thus political or strategical reason for a long delay on the part of Aretas cannot possibly be found. I would also suggest that it is psychologically extremely improbable that an outraged and insulted father who had the power to act immediately would have waited eight years, the period suggested, before taking active measures against Herod. Politically and psychologically, therefore, this suggestion as to the interpretation of Josephus is untenable. That it is also exegetically untenable, or at least extremely improbable, seems to me to be self-evident if the words of Josephus as given above are taken in their plain sense. It is, of course, possible that Josephus made a mistake, but it seems to me

extremely improbable that he really intended to suggest that there was any serious interval between the marriage of Herod and Herodias and the war between Herod and Aretas. For these reasons I regard this line of dealing with the difficulty as open to grave objections, and I am inclined to believe that those who have accepted it, as I have always done myself up to the present, have only done so because they have paid insufficient attention to the actual words of Josephus.

The other line of treatment has been adopted by Professor Wellhausen in his recent work on the synoptic Gospels. He accepts Josephus in the natural sense of his narrative, but is inclined to think that Mark is here an untrustworthy source of evidence. He thinks that the whole account of the connexion between John the Baptist and Herod, and especially the account of his death at the request of the dancing daughter<sup>1</sup> of Herodias, is entirely untrustworthy. He therefore cuts out all this passage from Mark as a legendary interpolation, and thinks that the death of the Baptist took place long before Herod's marriage. Now it is quite true that there are various other details besides the chronology which are very difficult to accept in the Markan narrative. If, for instance, Josephus is correct in thinking that John was sent to Machaerus it is not easy to see how it was possible so speedily to obtain his head for the satisfaction of Herodias, as it is extremely improbable that Herod was holding great festivities in a distant frontier town

<sup>1</sup> It no doubt adds picturesqueness to the narrative to call her Salome. Perhaps she was Salome, though this seems to me to be wildly improbable; but in the view of the sudden growth of a tradition which is artistic rather than historical it is perhaps well to point out (1) that the text of Mark is very obscure, and that the oldest witnesses, *NBD*, etc., describe the dancer as Herod's daughter; (2) the theory that she was called Salome is merely a deduction from the fact that Josephus says that Herodias had a daughter named Salome who married Philip, who died in 32. Of course it is possible that the young wife or the widow of Philip may have danced at the court of Antipas, but is it likely?

partly tributary to his outraged father-in-law. Nor is the episode of the dancer quite intelligible in other respects. It seems quite incredible that a princess should dance before the court if we consider the position of dancing girls in the ancient world. It seems even more incredible if we consider that, according to the chronology of Josephus, Salome was by this time either a wife or a widow. It is, however, true that the point is cleared up if we suppose that there has been some slight confusion in the tradition between a daughter of Herodias or of Herod and one of her or his slaves.<sup>1</sup> At the same time, it is one thing to admit that the details of the story concerning the death of John the Baptist may be inaccurate, and another thing to say that it took place long before Herod's marriage, as Wellhausen does. Here it seems to me that Josephus really supports Mark. He says that the people connected Herod's defeat by Aretas with the execution of John the Baptist. Does not this imply that John was put to death more or less at the time of the war with Aretas? Just as Josephus implies that Herod's marriage took place just before the war, so he also seems to imply that the execution of John belongs to the same series of more or less synchronous events. But if this be so, it fixes the date of John's death, independently of the Gospels, at a time much later than chronologists have hitherto accepted, and I can hardly think that Wellhausen is justified in completely throwing over the authority of Mark, supported as it is by Josephus, in order to avoid the chronological difficulty, any more than Schürer was justified in throwing over the plain meaning of Josephus in order to avoid the same difficulty and at the same time to rescue the trustworthiness of Mark.

The preceding paragraphs seem to show that the result

<sup>1</sup> The antiquity of the Greek word *παῖς* naturally suggests itself as in some way a possible factor in such a confusion.

of a comparison between Mark and Josephus raises the question whether we ought not to revise our whole conception of the chronology of early Christianity. This is such a complicated question that it is very difficult to avoid being overwhelmed in detail. I shall endeavour in a few paragraphs to concentrate attention upon the main points on which the edifice raised by the chronologists really rests. There are, it is true, other points, but they are not really fundamental. But I would wish to emphasise that I am not so much advocating any one line of interpretation as trying to call attention to the necessity of really considering this problem.

The chronology of early Christianity, so far as its beginning is concerned, rests on two points, quite intelligible without any special knowledge, though there is a subsidiary but extremely complicated problem dealing in the main with astronomical questions which few of us can hope more than vaguely to understand. The first deals with the chronology of St. Paul's life, and the second with Luke iii. 1.

Turning to the chronology of the life of St. Paul, we find that the fixed point on which all must now agree with at least relative certainty, is that he was in Corinth in the year 50 A.D. The most recent and clearest treatment of this point will be found in Professor Deissmann's *Paulus*. Reckoning backwards from this, we obtain as the shortest conceivable chronology the result that the apostolic council of Acts xv. was in 48 A.D., and if we assume (though I believe that this is erroneous) that Acts xv. refers to the same events as those dealt with in Galatians ii. we can fix the conversion as thirteen or sixteen years previously, according to our exegesis of various passages. Even when we take into consideration all the possibilities of reckoning parts of years as the equivalent of whole years, this does not give us a later date for the conversion of St. Paul than 35 A.D., and

33 is on the whole far more probable. Any other system of reckoning the dates in the earlier part of St. Paul's life makes his conversion still earlier. This has seemed to force us to place the crucifixion not later than 32 A.D., and as a matter of fact 29 A.D. is at present probably the more popular date. If so, there is no escape from the conclusion that the crucifixion, and therefore also the death of John the Baptist, preceded the marriage of Herod and Herodias, unless we fall back on the position of Schürer. But one observation remains. All this argument depends on a single iota, and I submit that the question deserves consideration whether it is easier to sacrifice one iota in the text of Galatians or the obvious meaning of Josephus and Mark. The iota in question is in the text (Gal. ii. 1), in which St. Paul says that he went up to Jerusalem "after fourteen years." Write it in Greek with the usual method of writing numbers which St. Paul no doubt adopted, and the text is this:—

ΔΙΑΔΕΤΩΝ = διὰ ἰδ' ἐτῶν.

If you leave out one iota, assuming that it has crept in as a primitive corruption in the text, you obtain the following:—

ΔΙΑΔΕΤΩΝ = διὰ δ' ἐτῶν.

That is to say that St. Paul went up to Jerusalem, not after *fourteen* years but after *four* years, and therefore the whole chronology of St. Paul can be put ten years later than it usually is so far as the conversion and his history up to the time of his second visit to Jerusalem is concerned. That means that the conversion was about 43 A.D., and if so, we shall have no difficulty in accepting 36 as the year of the crucifixion, and thus satisfactorily accepting the obvious and natural meaning both of Josephus and of Mark.

Of course, there is always an objection to "playing tricks" with the text in the interests of interpretation, but the point here is that we are forced to "play tricks" with something; either the plain meaning of Josephus or the narrative of

Mark or the text of Galatians has to be sacrificed. The question is, which is the most desirable victim. Schürer says Josephus; Wellhausen says Mark: I suggest one iota in the text of Galatians. Moreover, there are certain subsidiary advantages in the suggestion that Paul went up to Jerusalem after four years instead of after fourteen. The fourteen years of the ordinary text have always been a puzzle to commentators upon St. Paul. What did he do in those fourteen years? No one has any answer to make. They are an almost blank space in the history of St. Paul, and without suggesting that this is a sufficient reason for emending the text it is at least a point to be noticed that if the text be emended for other reasons we do obtain the advantage of only having four years to deal with instead of fourteen, in which, so far as we can see, history stood almost still, although it moved with extreme rapidity before those fourteen years and after them.

Besides the chronology of St. Paul there is the direct statement in Luke iii. 1 that John the Baptist began to preach in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, i.e. in 28-29 A.D. This is generally taken to mean that Jesus was baptized in that year. But St. Luke does not say this; what he says is that John the Baptist began to preach in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, and that he continued to do so until Herod, whom he had rebuked for marrying Herodias, put him in prison. He then says that Jesus was baptized by John, and that he, after the temptation, began to preach in Galilee. He does not say, but I think that he implies—in any case Mark states expressly—that this preaching began after the imprisonment of John. The natural interpretation of these statements is that John the Baptist preached from the fifteenth year of Tiberius to the time when Herod married Herodias, i.e. 34-35, and that the baptism of Jesus was one of his last acts. This view

has not only the advantage of being quite unforced, but it enables us to suppose that St. Luke knew when the census of Quirinus had been held. In spite of many ingenious efforts to prove the contrary, it remains an unassailable fact that the only known census of Quirinus was in A.D. 6, and that at an early time, when Quirinus may perhaps have been in Syria, Bethlehem was in the control of Herod Archelaus, a "protected" but independent ruler, and not under the government of Augustus or of the Legate in Syria. But if we suppose for one moment that St. Luke really did mean the famous census of A.D. 6—a view strongly supported by his reference to it as the "the census" in Acts—and that he supposed that Jesus was in His thirtieth year at the time of the baptism, we obtain a result agreeing exactly with the evidence of Mark and Josephus that the baptism was probably in the year 35.

It is interesting to ask why this result, inevitable if St. Luke's statement about Quirinus had been accepted at its face-value, has been so little noticed. It is partly due to the desire to harmonise Luke with Matthew, which of course undoubtedly places the nativity in the time of Herod the Great, but it is also, I believe, partly due to the influence of Eusebius, who was not unnaturally puzzled by the statement that Annas and Caiaphas were high priests. It is unfortunately quite clear that St. Luke means that Annas and Caiaphas were simultaneously high priests, in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, or that the one succeeded the other in that year: the former is apparently incredible and the latter impossible. Eusebius knew this quite as well as we do, and he invented the theory that St. Luke meant that the ministry of Jesus fell within the period covered by the high priestships of Annas and Caiaphas and the three intervening high priests. That forced him to choose a very early chronology, and put the crucifixion early instead of late in the time of Pilate. Nevertheless his treatment

of the double priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas cannot be regarded as possible; St. Luke's statement remains as permanently in conflict with the custom of the Jews as revealed by Josephus,<sup>1</sup> as his statement about Lysanias is in conflict with the known facts of history.

It is also worth noticing that there is no real difficulty in St. Luke's statement that John the Baptist was born in the days of "Herod the king." This title would apply to Archelaus as well as to Herod the Great. Indeed, even on the popular hypothesis of a census by Quirinus c. B.C. 3, Archelaus, not his father, was king. It is not impossible that John the Baptist was born in the last days of Archelaus, and that the birth of Jesus was in the first days of Quirinus.

All this argument is of course largely hypothetic: I should be sorry to build on it. My only desire has been to show that St. Luke's statement about the fifteenth year of Tiberius is by no means a clear answer to the theory that the crucifixion was in 36 or, at latest, in 35. I would also urge that as a rule the implicit evidence of facts which we can synchronise with events as to the date of which there is no possible doubt, is worth more than unsupported direct statements. I should, for instance, be far more certain that a document of the present day was not earlier than 1887 if it referred to the Jubilee, than if it merely bore the date of that year; and if it was dated 1877 I should have no hesitation in rejecting the date in favour of the internal evidence. In the same way the implicit evidence of the Gospels combined with Josephus seems to be worth more than any direct and unsupported chronological statement.

One point remains, which I am unfortunately not able

<sup>1</sup> The repeated statements of Josephus show plainly that the high priesthood was not a life office, and that the Roman claim to dismiss and appoint the high priest was acquiesced in by the Jews. There is no trace of a double priesthood; but it is possible that the title of high priest was kept, as a matter of courtesy, after dismissal, and possibly, given in general to all who belonged to the class from which the official high priest was appointed.



to discuss fully. The fact that the crucifixion was on a Friday seems to be undoubtedly part of the earliest tradition, nor can it fairly be claimed that any other tradition ever existed. It is also apparently plain that it was either on the 14th or 15th Nisan, the former being on the whole more probable. In what years is it possible that the 14th (or 15th) Nisan fell on a Friday? If I understand the problem correctly, the facts relating to the year 36 A.D. are that the moon of Nisan was new on Friday, March 16. If so, the arguments used by Mr. C. H. Turner as to the day of the week in connexion with the chronology of the Passion in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* seem to apply to 36 A.D. with even more force than they apply to 29 A.D., the year which he prefers. But the question is complicated by considerations as to the possibility of observing the new moon, and the doubt whether the Jews employed a calendar in the first century instead of observation. Perhaps some astronomically gifted theologian will consider the case for the year 36 (and 35) from this point of view. The questions which require to be faced by him are:— (1) In 35 or 36 was Nisan 14 on a Friday? (2) Was Nisan 15 on a Friday? (3) How far is the answer to either question affected (*α*) if the New Moon was fixed by observation, (*β*) if it was fixed by a calendar? KIRSOPP LAKE.

OPERA FORIS.

MATERIALS FOR THE PREACHER.

ACTS xvii. 17-18:—*So he reasoned . . . every day with them that met with him. And certain also of . . . the Stoic philosophers encountered him. Encountered him at a task and in possession of a conviction which were strange to their philosophy. "The Stoics looked on the mass of men as ignorant and wicked, and it never occurred to them that it was a duty of the Good Man to teach and redeem them—to*