

in America in these days. He is conservative but not cramped, liberal but not loose. 'In things essential unity, in things doubtful liberty, in all things charity,'—he knows the saying, he practises it prosperously.

The Apostolic Age.

THE Apostolic Age is still the greatest age of the Church. Our Lord said, 'Greater things than these shall ye do,' and He seems to have intended that the things done should grow greater as the days grew longer. But it has not been so. It is not that with the Apostolic Age there ceased the power to work a physical miracle, though it is possible that even that ought not to have ceased. It is rather that the work of the Apostolic Age is greater than the work of to-day, and that the men and women were greater who did it. We feel that if we could fetch back the Apostolic Age it would be well with us.

We cannot fetch it back. It would not be well with us if we could. We must do the work of our own age; we must be the men and women of our own possibilities and powers. What we need is the overwhelming sense of the presence of God's Spirit which the Apostolic Age had. It was that that made them; it is that and that alone that will make us. There is no better thing therefore that we can do than to study the Apostolic Age.

For this purpose Mr. Vernon Bartlet of Oxford

has written a history of *The Apostolic Age, its Life, Doctrine, Worship, and Polity*. The book belongs to the series entitled 'Eras of the Christian Church.' It is published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark. It is a large book (crown 8vo, pp. xlvi, 542, 6s.), for the Apostolic Age as we now know it is a large subject. It is a new book also, for the discoveries that have been made in early Christian literature within recent years have made the books which some of us were suckled on both inadequate and misleading. It is only when we see it gathered into a consecutive history that we realise how vast and how important the new material is. Mr. Bartlet has used it ably and, as it seems, most skilfully. It was a difficult task they gave him to do. He has done it in such wise that no teacher or student would dream of going back to the old histories except as English literature, now that his volume has been published.

He has used the new material skilfully. Let us add temperately. Much of it touches the questions of Church organization, the most testy questions of our day. On these questions Mr. Bartlet has much to say, and he says it firmly. But his fulness of knowledge, or his love of the truth, or both, have enabled him to let the evidence speak for itself. Not once have we found his assertion stronger than his evidence seemed to warrant.

One thing more. We used to complain of Mr. Bartlet's style. He has mended that. It is a pleasure to read this book.

A New Date-Indication in Acts.

BY W. P. WORKMAN, M.A., LATE FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

READERS of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES do not need to be reminded that the date of St. Paul's voyage to Rome, which is one of the most important dates in fixing the chronology of the New Testament, is also one of the most disputed. From 55 A.D. to 62 A.D. there is no single year which has not found defenders, and as will be shown by the following table, which is compiled from lists given in the well-known books of Farrar, Harnack, and Schürer, with additions from obvious recent sources, there is no year in the advocacy of which powerful names cannot be cited.

καὶ οὗτος ἤδη ἐπισφαλούς τοῦ πλοῦς διὰ τὸ καὶ τὴν νηστείαν ἤδη παρεληλυθέναι.—ACTS xxvii. 9.

- A.D. 55. Bengel, Eusebius, McGiffert, (Harnack), Holtzmann, Kellner, Vincent, Weber.
 56. Baronius, Blass, Harnack, Petavius.
 57. Jerome.
 58. Lehmann, Turner.
 59. Basnage, Grätz, Kuinoel, Ramsay.
 60. Aberle, Anger, Conybeare and Howson, Farrar, Hoffmann, Lechler, Lewin, Lightfoot, Pearson, Schanz, Schürer, Spannheim, Tillemont, Wandel, De Wette, Wieseler, Winer, Wurm.
 61. Alford, Ewald, Meyer, Schrader, De Wette, Wordsworth.
 62. Eichhorn, Ideler, Michaelis, Olshausen, Usher.

We propose in this article to direct attention to an indication of date which does not appear as yet to have received attention, and which, if the argument which is to follow be admitted to have cogency, will render the date of 59, for which Ramsay has recently argued so strongly, at least more probable than any other except perhaps 56, while it will render impossible the dates 55, 58, and 61, and less probable the date 60, which has at present the predominant vote in its favour.

The indication in question is contained in the passage quoted at the head of this article, and particularly in the underlined word. What is the precise force of this little word *καί*? Surely it can mean only one of two things, either that the Fast *as well as something else* had passed, or that '*even the Fast*' had passed. Whichever meaning is adopted we may safely infer that 'the Fast' was in this particular year unusually late. 'The Fast' is, of course, the Great Fast of the Day of Atonement. For the Jews the seas were regarded as navigable only from the Feast of Pentecost to the Feast of Tabernacles (Lewin, who quotes Schöttgen, *Horae Heb.* i. 482), and it is clear from the passage which we are discussing that some Jews at least would fix the limit earlier, or, at all events, would regard the five days which intervened between the Great Fast and the Feast as days on which to set sail was to tempt Providence. It is certain that both Paul and Luke shared this belief. But it is surely almost certain that Luke, who had travelled so widely in the Roman Empire and made such a careful study of its institutions, would be aware of the Roman limit, by which we may safely assume that both the centurion and the master of the corn-ship would be guided. Now there is no doubt at all as to what this limit was—the Autumnal Equinox. The following well-known passages from Cæsar are of themselves sufficient to prove it.

B.G. IV., 36. Eoque in continentem adduci iussit, quod propinqua die æquinoctii infirmis navibus hiemi navigationem subiciendam non existimabat.

V. 23. Quas cum aliquamdiu Cæsar frustra expectasset, ne anni tempore a navigatione excluderetur quod æquinoctium suberat . . . prima luce terram attigit omnesque incolumes naves perduxit.

Can we not now see what is passing in Luke's mind when he writes this *καί*? He himself be-

lieves the Great Fast to be the limit of safety; the sailors on every hand are referring to the Autumnal Equinox. Luke points out that both time-limits had expired, and the *καί* must naturally be taken with the later of the two. It seems to follow, therefore, that Luke is writing of a year in which the Great Fast is subsequent to the Autumnal Equinox, or is at all events very late indeed. We proceed to examine therefore in what years of the octennium in question this condition is satisfied.

The Great Fast took place on the 10th day of Tishri (Lv 16²⁹). Its date in our present calendar may be readily determined from that of 14th Nisan by adding $6 \times 29\frac{1}{2} - 4$, i.e. 173 days to this date. Of course the determination of 14th Nisan is not free from difficulty, but, as will be seen later, it is only in the year 56 that this difficulty is serious, and perhaps insurmountable. Taking for the present Lewin's dates for 14th Nisan, and adding to these 173 days as already explained, we have the following results:—

	Nisan 14—	Tishri 10—
A.D. 55	March 30	September 19.
56	March 19 (April 17)	September 8. October 7).
57	April 7	September 27.
58	March 27	September 16.
59	April 15	October 5.
60	April 3	September 24.
61	March 23.	September 12.
62	April 11	October 1.

Two difficulties must be referred to before we examine the results of this table. The first and most serious is that presented by the year 56. Turner points out (*D.B.* i. p. 411 (2)) that while the rule, accepted at the time of which we are writing, about the month Nisan was that it should commence on such a day that the Paschal full-moon on 14th Nisan should be that immediately following the Vernal Equinox, yet there is evidence that in 277 A.D. the Jews were wrong in their reckoning of the date of the equinox, and fixed it as early as 19th March, and not on 21st March as did the whole Christian world from the fourth century, still less on 25th March as the Romans appear to have done in the time of Julius Cæsar. If we suppose that this error affected the calculations of the Jewish authorities in the time of St. Paul, it is possible that in 56 19th March would lie in the intercalary month Veadar, and that the Paschal full-moon would be the one next following this. If this were the case, we should obtain the

dates given in the table in brackets. It is not at all likely that this difficulty affects the year 61 also.

The second difficulty is suggested by Turner (*D.B.* i. p. 420 (1)). According to the Alexandrian cycle, 'which has prevailed in the Christian Church ever since the fourth century,' the dates for 14th Nisan differ slightly from those given above on the authority of Lewin, who usually agrees with Wieseler. The difference amounts to this, that in every case Lewin's dates may be as much as two days too late. To allow for this we shall state alternatives for 10th Tishri, and accordingly the estimates for the dates of 10th Tishri become as follows:—

55	56	57	58
Sept. 17-19	Sept. 6-8 [Oct. 5-7]	Sept. 25-27	Sept. 14-16
59	60	61	62
Oct. 3-5	Sept. 22-24	Sept. 10-12	Sept. 29-Oct. 1

Now the bearing of the argument will be at once clear. The calendar of Julius Cæsar fixes the Autumnal Equinox on 24th September, and the present reckoning dates it 23rd September. If the argument of this paper be admitted, we are bound to strike out from the above list all years in which 10th Tishri does not fall at least later than 23rd September, and probably also those in which it does not fall after the 24th. We see, therefore, that the years 55, 58, and 61 are definitely impossible. Of these the first is the one which seems to be preferred by Harnack, while the second is selected by Turner. Of the remaining years there can be little doubt that 59 satisfies the conditions best, though a strong case might be made out for 56 if only the possible error in the Jewish reckoning of the Vernal Equinox could be proved. Is it, however, *à priori* likely that so great an error could have crept in so soon after the Julian reconstruction of the calendar? As regards 60 all that can be claimed is that the difficulties which surround this popular choice are slightly increased. If the equinox actually fell either on or within at most a couple of days of 10th Tishri, it is hard to understand the almost apprehensive *καὶ* which St. Luke uses. As no one nowadays argues seriously for 57 or 62 their case need not be considered.

There is still another consideration which, although it cannot be pressed, perhaps tells in favour of the year 59. Ramsay points out (*Sz.*

Paul the Traveller, p. 322) that as St. Luke mentions the Great Fast and does not mention the Feast which followed, it is probable that they left Fair Havens before the Feast took place, say at the latest on 10th October. He further states (p. 345) that the wreck took place before the 'middle of November.' The fact is that it must have been quite early in November, if in this month at all, and it is by no means easy to account for the twenty-one days between 10th October and 1st November. They leave Fair Havens with a gentle S. wind on 10th October say. They have but four miles to go before they weather C. Matala, and turning upon a north-west course for Phoenix, get full advantage of the breeze which is blowing. When they have sailed 'no long time,' and at most some six miles farther, they are struck by Eurquilo and carried to Cauda, driving before the wind. These incidents cannot possibly have taken more than one day, however gentle the wind. Cauda is not more than forty miles from their starting-point, according to any conceivable course. At Cauda sufficient light remained to carry out the difficult operation of 'undergirding' the ship, and while it is just possible that they lay under the lee of the island during the night, Luke's narrative implies that Cauda was only a partial shelter (*Ac* 27¹⁶), and that their drift was continuous until clear of the island the full wind struck them again, and 'they lowered the gear, and so were driven.' In that case the 'next day' of *Ac* 27¹⁸ will be 11th October, and it is difficult to see how the 'fourteenth night' of *v.*²⁷ can possibly be later than the night of 25th October, while in all probability it should be earlier. It follows then that not later than 25th October they land at Malta. Yet Luke says that 'after three months' we set sail. If he here follows the usual course the 'three' should include both the first and the last of the months in question (*Cf.* *Mt* 27⁶⁸). This leads to the impossible conclusion that they set sail again in December. This difficulty may be removed in one of three ways. It may be that the 'three months' do not include the few days spent at the house of Publius (28⁷), and that a few days more were necessary before permanent lodgings could be found in Melita (*Civita Vecchia*), so that it would be November before they regarded themselves as settled in the island, and in that case Luke asserts that they set sail again in January; no doubt quite

at the end of the month. Now spring was considered to begin on 7th February (Ovid says 9th February), and it is perfectly possible that the master of the *Dioscuri* risked a little in order to gain the glory which always accrued to the first corn-ship of the year to reach Rome. There is nothing, therefore, necessarily inconsistent in Luke's narrative. It may be also Luke is not thinking of 'calendar months,' or, once again, that he is reckoning in Jewish months, on either of

which suppositions it is easy to show that we are led to a date at the end of January.

The point, however, which we wish to emphasize is this, that difficult as it is to fit in the 'three months' in 59 A.D., it is immensely more difficult to fit it in if the year of the voyage be, say, 58, for in that year they must have left Fair Havens some nineteen days earlier, and must therefore have reached Malta nearly three weeks before the date which can be assigned in 59.

On the Question of the Exodus.

BY PROFESSOR J. V. PRÁŠEK, PH.D., PRAGUE.

III.

LET me once more emphasize the fact that the Jahwistic tradition relates simply the fortunes of a single, and that not a numerous, tribe, and of its chieftain Abraham, without bringing these into any connexion with the general history of Palestine. Even the relation of Abraham to the inhabitants of the land had already become obscure at the time when the Jahwistic tradition took its rise. The part played by Abraham in the destruction of the Elamites, and his relation to the city and district of Kiriath-arba [Gn 23⁸⁻¹⁰, following the Priests' Code, but upon the authority of a secondary source, or under the influence of the contemporary geographical situation, incorrectly names the Hittites as inhabitants of Kiriath-arba (Hebron)], justify the inference that Abraham was a powerful tribal chief who, in consequence of his share in delivering the land from the Elamites, and presumably, also, of the Babylonians, gained high repute with the aboriginal population, and was regarded by them both as *'ādōn* ('lord'), like the rulers of certain Canaanite towns (e.g. Adonibezek in Bezek, or Adonizedek in [Uru] Salem), and as *nāsī* ('exalted one'). Abraham's relation to particular kinglets is in some measure illustrated by his treaty with Abimelech of Gerar (Gn 21²²⁻²³, which belongs, indeed, to E). The oath was sworn at Abraham's residence in Beersheba (Gn 21³¹. JE, v.¹⁹ E), to which Abimelech came in person, a circumstance from which one may conclude that Abraham was

regarded as a powerful personage, and the same relation is exhibited in his dealings with Melchizedek of Salem and with the king of Sodom (Gn 14¹⁷⁻¹⁹). We may assume, accordingly, that Abraham in his latter days established a somewhat powerful principality in the southern part of the west Jordan land, somewhere about Hebron and Beersheba, where Amorite kinglets were still named at the time of Chedorlaomer. The way in which this came to pass is, indeed, quite unknown to us.

The details the Jahwist gives us about Abraham's descendants are extremely meagre. Abraham's son and successor was called, according to the Jahwist, *Yizhak* (Isaac), and after his father's decease he is said to have fixed his residence at Beer-laḥai-roi (Gn 25¹¹). Elsewhere the Jahwist mentions, further, that Isaac's wife Rebecca was an Aramæan, of the cognate tribe of Naḥor, in Ḥaran. We have to represent the case in this way, that the principality established by Abraham called in the support of its tribal relations in Ḥaran, which of course is to be understood here in a wider sense as N. Mesopotamia with the adjacent desert. If Isaac obtained a wife not from among the daughters of the land but from distant Ḥaran, it may be concluded that in addition to a dowry he secured also the active aid of his Mesopotamian fellow-tribesmen. Presumably we should see in the retinue of Rebecca a new immigration of Aramæans into S. Palestine.