

He hath exalted the humble and meek. . . . Blessed are the meek.

He hath filled the hungry. . . . Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled.

The Beatitudes [re-echo the phrases of *Magnificat*, and fill them with a more spiritual meaning. The contrast between the proud and the humble is the perpetual theme of both Old Testament and New Testament; even as the spirit which can see God's mercy in His judgements no less than in His favours is in both commended as blessed. And as *Magnificat*, with its hopes of securing salvation, its faith in the Divine *mercy*, is the daily hymn of the Church, so the daily prayer of the Church [for each soul is, *O Lord, shew Thy mercy upon us: And grant us Thy salvation.*

J. H. BERNARD.

LUCAN *VERSUS* JOHANNINE CHRONOLOGY.

THE only New Testament writer who confronts his task as a historian, aiming to present the origins of Christianity in their proper sequence and their relation to the larger world-order, is St. Luke. It is natural that we should find several direct attempts in his two-fold treatise to correlate the events narrated with secular history, besides the occasional undesigned points of contact. These, however, do not exactly bear out Professor Ramsay's classification of St. Luke as a historian along with Tacitus and Thucydides. In spite of some very laboured defences, it is the general verdict of impartial historical criticism that in identifying the census of Luke ii. 1 with that of Quirinius (*v.* 2), taken at the deposition of Archelaus in A.D. 6, and again referred to in Acts v. 37, he has shown himself capable of decided con-

fusion.¹ The same judgment applies to his identification of the famine predicted by Agabus with an alleged world-wide famine "in the days of Claudius" (Acts xi. 28). The famine in question being admittedly that which prevailed in *Judaea* in A.D. 46-48,² it was both several years after the death of Agrippa (Acts xii.) and not to be identified either with the *assiduae sterilitates* which, according to Suetonius,³ characterized the reign of Claudius, nor the famine in Rome 51 A.D.,⁴ made memorable by the great harbour works erected to prevent a recurrence. As to the historical references of the speech put in the mouth of Gamaliel (Acts v. 36 f.) the anachronisms are hopeless.

There is, however, but one fully reckoned out *date* in the entire work, and the uniqueness of this, together with the elaborateness with which it is calculated by the current method of synchronisms, are proof that the author regarded it as both fundamental and sufficient. From the position St. Luke has given to this carefully elaborated date the year it defines can be no other than the epoch-making year *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, the year of grace, or, as designated in the programmatic address of Jesus at Nazareth,⁵ "the acceptable year of the Lord." Down to the time of Eusebius this was the universal understanding of the Lucan chronology, both among orthodox and heretics, so that even on the appearance of the Fourth Gospel, with its extension of the ministry over several passovers, those who maintained on this ground that admission of the Johannine writings set "the Gospels at variance" were not opposed by any change in the traditional interpretation of Luke. Save for the curious exceptions here-

¹ See, however, the article "Die chronologischen Notizen und die Hymnen in Lc. I u. 2," by Fr. Spitta in *Zts. f. nt. Wiss.* vii. 4 (Dec. 1906), where only the redactor is made responsible for the confusion. The source placed the nativity about B.C. 4-3, when a census was really taken by Quirinius.

² *Jos. Ant.* XX. i. 1, 2; ii. 1, 5; v. 1, 2; *B. J.* II. xii. 1.

³ *Claud.* 18. ⁴ Tacitus, *Ann.* xii. 43.

⁵ Luke iv. 19.

inafter to be mentioned harmonists only maintained that "It is evident that the three evangelists recorded only the deeds done by the Saviour for one year after the imprisonment of John the Baptist . . . but John in his Gospel records the deeds of Christ which were performed before the Baptist was cast into prison."¹ The one-year ministry is therefore part and parcel of the Lucan chronology. The ridicule poured by Irenaeus on Gnostic number symbolism attached to the thirty years of Jesus' age at baptism and the twelve months of the ministry, with his own extravagant extension of it to a period of twenty years, are only the exception which proves the rule.² The Lucan chronology was not only dominant in the Church, but among Gnostics as well, among whom Clement of Alexandria enables us to name specifically Basilides himself,³ whose *Ἐξηγήτικα* date back to ca. 133. And the implication of a one-year ministry is so universal and so persistent in its acceptance, even in face of the Johannine tradition, that we cannot but assume that Gnostic exegesis was at least correct to the extent of maintaining that Luke iv. 19 conveyed the evangelists' own understanding of the duration of the ministry.⁴

¹ Eus. *H. E.* III. xxiv. The whole chapter is a defence of the Fourth Gospel against the charge of being "at variance with" the rest. The unnamed opponent is probably Gaius, whose *Dialogue* against the Montanist Proclus was in Eusebius' hands. In this work the *διαφωνία* of the Fourth Gospel with the rest in respect to the duration of the ministry was urged as a ground for its rejection. Irenaeus and Hippolytus confront the same, as well as the *Fragm. Murat.*

² *Her.* II. xxii. For an exception of almost equal interest see the chronographic fragment of Dobschütz, *T. u. U.* xi. 1, p. 136 ff. The author is Alexander of Jerusalem (218 A.D.), though claiming to transcribe from "Apostolic documents." The effort is to harmonize the Lucan and Johannine chronologies by applying the 12 years period before the Dispersion of the Twelve (*Ker. Petri ap. Clem. Al. Strom.* vi. 5) to the duration of the ministry.

³ *Strom.* i. 145 f.

⁴ On the one-year ministry as a tradition "too well grounded to be easily displaced" by that of the Fourth Gospel, see Drummond, *Char. and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 47, with note referring to the "great

2. The great Paschal Controversy, coincident in its first outbreak (ca. 154) with efforts in the secular world to reform the calendar and methods of dating, led first in Palestine, afterwards at Rome,¹ to various attempts at an absolute chronology, which culminated in the great chronological work of Hippolytus of Rome on the Paschal Cycle, published A.D. 234. In all of these the point of departure seems to be the sixteenth year of Tiberius, or "year of the two Gemini,"² for the Crucifixion=29 A.D. This is almost certainly taken from Luke iii. 1, where the beginning of the ministry is placed in Tiberius xv.³ In all probability this was a substantially correct understanding, and St. Luke himself regarded the year of redemption as beginning between passover A.D. 28 and passover A.D. 29, if not at the former date precisely.

3. Unless modern authorities are wrong in regarding John ii. 20 as intended to fix the date of the beginning of the ministry by synchronism with the building of the temple, this understanding of the absolute chronology of St. Luke is confirmed and the consequent date *for the crucifixion* accepted by our Fourth Evangelist. The duration of the ministry is extended in John to cover a period of exactly two years, so that beginning with a passover at Jerusalem, at which Jesus publicly assumes His Messianic office (ii.

number of references to writers who limited the ministry to one year" in Ezra Abbott: *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel: External Evidence*, Boston, 1880, p. 73, note.

¹ Eus. *H.E.* V. xxiii.-xxv.

² I.e. of the consuls L. Rubellius Geminus and C. Fufius (or Rufius, or Rufus, or Fusius) Geminus=29 A.D.

³ St. Luke may date from the actual beginning of Tiberius' reign, Aug. 9, A.D. 14, or, more probably, as Josephus does, from Passover, as the beginning of the year, making Tiberius xv.=April A.D. 28-Aug. A.D. 29. At all events the year would be understood by second century chronographers, who date by consulships, as beginning Jan. 1, so that the year of the Crucifixion, 29 A.D. (=Tiberius xvi.) would correspond to their understanding of Luke iii. 1. Cf. Turner, *Hastings' B.D.* s.v. "Chronology," p. 413b.

13-22), its earlier half, in Galilee and Samaria, is concluded at a second (vi. 4), and its later, in Judaea and Peraea, at a third, when the crucifixion occurs coincidentally with the slaying of the passover lamb. Thus the incident of the Cleansing of the Temple, removed from its position in Synoptic narrative, comes to occupy with relation to the chronology a place corresponding in prominence to the synchronisms of Luke iii. 1, followed by the address in Nazareth (Luke iv. 16 ff.). The painstaking necessary to establish this year as the forty-seventh from the inception of Herod's enterprise is evidence of the importance attached by the Evangelist to the date. Calculation of the synchronism in question gives A.D. 27,¹ so that the "year of the two Gemini" again appears as that of the crucifixion. Thus the Lucan absolute dating is accepted, while his relative dating, involving the two features developed by Basilides in his symbolism of numbers, the twelve-month of the ministry, and the thirty years of Jesus' age, is tacitly but firmly set aside.

If the reckoning of St. Luke can in this instance withstand the tests of criticism, it will be reasonable to hold that it, if not the Johannine synchronism as well, is based on actual historical tradition of the correct date.² If for any reason it prove inadmissible, not only the patristic absolute chronologies worked out from "the year of the two Gemini" fall with it, but that of the Fourth Gospel as well, which here as elsewhere will have evinced its erroneous dependence upon St. Luke.³

4. Since the time of the astronomer Wurm repeated attempts have been made to determine the year of the crucifixion astronomically by eliminating all years in which neither

¹ See Turner, *ibid.* p. 405b. The year of Herod's undertaking to build the temple would seem to be B.C. 20-19.

² So e.g. Clemen, *Paulus*, i., "Chronologie," p. 393.

³ Cf. John xi. 2, xii. 2, with Luke vii. 36-50, Mark xiv. 3-9.

Nisan 14 (the date according to John) nor Nisan 15 (the date according to the Synoptic tradition) could fall on a Friday, the correct day of the week according to all accounts. Nisan was always that lunation whose full-moon fell first after vernal equinox, and the date of this full-moon (properly Nisan 14) can be calculated within a few minutes of error for Jerusalem during all the period in question. Had the problem been merely to determine this (astronomic) full-moon, as recently assumed by Achelis,¹ the result would have been exceedingly simple. The year 29 would be wholly excluded; but the year 30 would meet the conditions on the supposition that the Fourth Gospel is correct. It is perfectly certain, however, from copious contemporary references² that the date of Passover (Nisan 14) was determined not by reckoning astronomically when the full-moon would be due, but by "sanctifying" as the first day of the month (and of the year) that day in the evening of which the slender sickle of the new-moon had been first actually observed. In case of failure to observe in time, from bad weather or otherwise, the "head of the year" was held to have been "sanctified in heaven." If the preceding month had had its full quota of thirty days, failure to observe would make no difference at all. If this had had only twenty-nine days, and bad weather prevented observation, the new moon (Nisan 1) might be twenty-four hours late and no more. It is obvious that the next moon would correct even this error, so that the margin of uncertainty is not wide. Moreover the allowance to be made on this account is partly cancelled by the margin we are compelled to allow for the divergence of Johannine from Synoptic tradition, since a delayed Nisan 14=Nisan 15.

¹ *Gött. gel. Nachr. phil. hist. Kl.* 1902, 707 ff.

² Not only the Talmudic sources in *Rosh ha-shanah*, but explicitly the fragment of the *Kerygma Petri ap. Clem. Al. Strom.* vi. 5 declares that the Jewish calendar was dependent on actual observation.

Besides the deduction to be made on this account certain years require the admission of two possible lunations for Nisan; for if the 14th of the lunation in question fell very near equinox (Mar. 25 according to the current Julian calendar, erroneously for Mar. 23), the priests might call it Veadar, the intercalary month, assigning it to the preceding year, in which case the following lunation would be Nisan.

Tables having due regard to all these considerations have been prepared in recent years by Professor Fotheringham of Oxford,¹ by which it becomes possible to exclude absolutely certain years, because the new moon was *not visible* in time for either Nisan 14 or 15 in those years to have fallen on a Friday. Among these inadmissible years is "the Year of the two Gemini" A.D. 29, when Nisan 14 fell either on Sunday, March 20, or (if the next lunation was Nisan) on Tuesday, April 19. Inasmuch as not even the discredited method of Achelis succeeds in bringing this year within the bounds of possibility,² it may be set down as a mathematical certainty that the ancient chronographers were wrong in fixing upon it.³ Fotheringham is doubtless correct in accounting for its origin as follows:—

Spring Equinox = March 25 or March 18 is a synchronism following from the Julian Calendar, where the former is given as the date of the equinox, the latter as the date of the entrance of the sun into Aries. But the crucifixion was notoriously at the season of Passover. Therefore March 25 or March 18 is the natural date for it to one who used the Julian Calendar. All other early dates, with two exceptions, are within the range of calendar dates for the spring equinox. . . . The two exceptions are the Basilidian dates, apparently the less favoured Basilidian dates, April 20 and April 14; but they are

¹ *Journal of Philology*, 1903, 100 ff.

² Achelis makes Nisan 14 A.D. 29 to fall on Sunday, April 17, whether reckoning by astronomic full-moon or by phasis, assuming the latter to occur thirty-six hours after conjunction. The assumption is incorrect, but in this case does not affect the result.

³ Turner, in his able article "Chronology" in the *Hastings B. D.*, fixes upon this year, but does not succeed in reconciling it with astronomical data.

apparently connected with the "dies Aegyptiaci," and are therefore artificial. Now 29 and 35 are the only dates at all conceivable, in which March 25 was a Friday; therefore the date March 25 [or March 18] carries with it 29 A.D.; and this date had the additional advantage that both the cycle of Hippolytus and the Roman 84 years' cycle would give March 25 as the date of Good Friday in 29 A.D.¹

In his fuller statement of the following year² Fotheringham supplies the link which was lacking to make the proof conclusive of the artificial origin of the patristic dates, March 18 or March 25, 29 A.D.³ It was certainly "natural" for churches which continued to celebrate the feast of the full-moon of spring equinox⁴ as the anniversary of the Passion, calling it "the true Passover of the Lord's death," and declaring their purpose to be "nothing else than to celebrate the memory of His Passion, and at the very date which those who were eyewitnesses from the beginning have handed down,"⁵ to determine this date, once they were no longer under control of the Jewish priestly calendar of feasts, by the Julian calendar, just as we ourselves celebrate the Nativity annually on December 25, the *Dies Natalis invicti solis* of the same calendar. But the "natural" in this case is fortunately attested to be also the historical, not only by Epiphanius⁶ regarding churches of Cappadocia, but by the Magdeburg centuriators among those of Gaul as well.⁷ Therefore when Alexander of Jerusalem in 218 A.D. gives March 25 as the true date of the Resurrection, and

¹ *Abstract of Proceedings of the Society of Historical Theology*, Oxford, 1901-1902, p. 40.

² *Journal of Philology*, p. 116.

³ The *Acts of Pilate* have in some editions March 25, in others March 18.

⁴ Called "Quartodeciman" from their observance of the "fourteenth" (Nisan) instead of the day of the (Easter) week. From A.D. 150-200 this was the almost universal practice of the East, and was known even in Gaul.

⁵ *Chron. Pasch.* 7, 6. ⁶ *Panher.* i. 1 and 1.

⁷ *Magd. Cent.* ii. 118, 56.

claims to be transcribing "apostolic documents,"¹ he need not be accused of conscious deception, but only attests the antiquity of this date. The churches of Cappadocia may well have continued the practice of the pre-Christian synagogue in these regions in their celebration of the passover by absolute (Julian) dating.

5. There remains no room to doubt that "the year of the two Gemini" is incorrect and artificial. The question that ensues is whether the patristic understanding of St. Luke was correct, so that the chronology on which all have built, including as it would seem our fourth Evangelist as well, merely anticipated the second century chronographers in looking up in the current calendars the year in which March 25 (or March 18) fell on a Friday.

If astronomical calculation could exclude the year 30 as well as 29, the probability would be very strong that such was the actual origin of the Lucan chronology; for outside of 30 the only admissible years, according to Fotheringham's tables, are either much too early or much too late to agree with the datum Tiberius xv. of Luke iii. 1,² implying Tiberius xvi. for the crucifixion. But if it occurred on Nisan 14 (so the Fourth Gospel), A.D. 30 becomes a possible year. Fotheringham says indeed, "In the case of 30 the (astronomical) conditions are so pronouncedly in favour of a late phasis that it would be difficult to adopt an earlier date" for Nisan 14 than Saturday, April 8. Nevertheless

¹ Dobschütz in *T. u. U.* xi. 1, p. 136 ff. The fragment contains a curious chronology aiming to reconcile the Johannine with the Lucan, extending the ministry to twelve years (traditional period of the offer of the gospel to Israel in *Ker. Petri ap. Clem. Al. Strom.* vi. 5), and the life of Jesus from A.D. 9 to A.D. 58 (i.e. 49 years; cf. John viii. 53). The fact that March 25 in A.D. 58 was *not* a Friday proves the independence of this date from the rest of the chronology.

² Attempts have been made to reckon the year Tiberius xv. from A.D. 11, when Tiberius was made co-ordinate in the provinces with Augustus, or 13 when he received the Tribunician power (which he had held for years previously) for life. These are very improbable.

Friday, April 7, is not impossible,¹ and the Johannine date Nisan 14 is more probable than the Synoptic Nisan 15. A.D. 33 is perhaps more probable astronomically, and A.D. 34 more probable still. But we must reckon with the possibility that in Luke iii. 1, if not in John ii. 20 also, A.D. 30 was contemplated as the year of the crucifixion, and that at least the former Evangelist may have had the date by real historical tradition.

6. The absolute chronology of the Fourth Gospel is certainly coincident with, if not dependent on, the Lucan. Windisch has recently shown² that Basilides probably based his twenty-four books of *ἐξηγητικά* on St. Luke's Gospel as edited by himself, thus anticipating Marcion. The fact is best accounted for by the derivation of both the Alexandrian school of Gnosticism and the Roman (through Cerdo) from Antioch, the traditional place of origin of the Lucan writings. But Basilides does not appear to have built on anything but the relative chronology of St. Luke, though his followers celebrated the baptism on the 15th Tybi, and declared it to have occurred in the 15th year of Tiberius.³ The relative chronology was employed in the Basilidian system, and Irenaeus devotes much space to a refutation of the arguments of Ptolemaeus based on the thirty years from the nativity to the baptism, and the twelve months from the baptism to the resurrection,⁴ adducing (a) the "three" passovers mentioned in the Fourth Gospel,⁵ (b) the age

¹ The case cited on p. 106 *ibid.* in a note appended "since this article was written" of the new moon of 3.49 a.m., Mar. 29, 1903, seen by Mr. C. H. Thompson at Damascus on the evening of *the same day*, was not more favourable astronomically for early observation than that of 8 p.m., Mar. 22, A.D. 30, which Fotheringham thinks could hardly have been observed until the evening of Mar. 25.

² *Zts. nt. W.* vii. (1906), p. 240.

³ *Cl. Al. Strom.* i. 21, 146.

⁴ *Her.* II. xxii.

⁵ Irenaeus seems to be at odds with his material (derived from Justin's Syntagma ?) in II. xxii. 3. For his second passover is that "on which he

which seems there to be attributed to Jesus. In both respects Irenaeus is certainly right in declaring the Fourth Gospel to be opposed to the Basilidian number symbolism ; but in both he fails to do full justice to either side. As regards the Basilidians Drummond correctly points out that they were simply following the old tradition "too well grounded to be easily displaced" by the Fourth Gospel. For Basilides the Fourth Gospel had not yet appeared above the horizon, so that Irenaeus' marvel "how it has come to pass that . . . they have not examined the Gospels" is scarcely justified. As regards the Fourth Gospel Irenaeus miscounts the passovers, enumerating John ii. 23, v. 1, and xi. 54, instead of ii. 23, vi. 4, and xi. 54,¹ but his attempt to harmonize by extending the ministry over twenty years does not of course represent the method by which the fourth Evangelist himself would meet the contention of the Basilidians.

(a) It requires no great critical insight to understand the literary art of St. Luke in removing the scene of the preaching in the synagogue at Nazareth from the place it occupied in Mark, and setting it as a programmatic discourse at the opening of the ministry. Jesus thus appears in the spirit and power of the prophet, "proclaiming the acceptable year of the Lord" to Israel, foreshadowing also (ver. 24-29) the turning to the Gentiles which will result from their rejection of Him. With the procedure of St. Luke before us we should not be blind to the method of the fourth Evangelist in removing from its Synoptic setting the incident in which Jesus

cured the paralytic who had lain beside the pool 38 years" (John. v. 1 ff), after which he goes on to refer to his "withdrawing to the other side of the sea of Tiberius and feeding the multitude there," but *without counting this Passover* (John. vi. 4), and finally declares that of John xi. 54, xii. 1 to be the *third*. John. v. 1 ff. is really a Pentecost. Irenaeus perhaps preserves the numbering of his source, but applies it wrongly in the Gospel.

¹ See preceding note.

publicly assumes the Messianic office at the centre of Jewish worship, and in symbolic language announces the great sacrifice which is to do away with the "temple made with hands" (John ii. 13-22). If, then, in the same way that St. Luke had embodied in his scene of rejection in the synagogue at Nazareth his much debated reference to "the acceptable year of the Lord," our fourth Evangelist also, in his scene of rejection in the temple in Jerusalem, embodies his chronological data, he is likely to have given them intentionally this commanding position. It will also be with full intention that he has made the ministry cover exactly two years, one in Galilee and Samaria (ii. 13-vi. 4), the other in Judaea and Peraea (vii. 1-xi. 54). He could infer from Mark vi. 39 as well as moderns that the close of the Galilean ministry had been marked by a passover when Jesus had not gone to Jerusalem, even if he did not know, as was probably the historical fact, that the ministry did cover more than one year. Herein he corrects St. Luke, tacitly, after his manner, but justly, and yet without attaining a historical result; for the exact two-year period is manifestly more artificial than that of approximately one year. And to place the public assumption of the Messianic office, a throwing down of the gauntlet to the hierocracy, at the beginning instead of the end of the ministry violates all historical conditions.

(b) So with his representation of Jesus' age. Possibly he may not intend to suggest in ii. 21 that Jesus was then in His forty-seventh year, as was inferred by some early interpreters,¹ and as is believed by several modern authorities; but beyond all question Irenaeus was right in maintaining

¹ *De mont. Sina et Sion*, 4, ap. Cyprian, ed. Hartel, iii. 108. Augustine (*de Doctr. Christ.* ii. 28) refers to errorists (affected by the arguments of Gaius?), who made the age of Jesus forty-six "because the temple was said by the Jews to have been built in that number of years." See Loisy, *Quatrième Evangile*, p. 293, who himself adopts this interpretation of John ii. 21.

that John viii. 57 is out of all harmony with the idea of "about thirty years" as the age of Jesus.¹ Irenaeus himself has contributed an important item to our understanding of the matter in the endeavour to support his interpretation of the passage. From "the elders" quoted by Papias² he reports a tradition that Jesus "when He taught" had reached the age which befits the teacher, viz. forty years; for the words "and fiftieth" in the phrase "but from the fortieth and fiftieth year a man begins to decline towards old age" are manifestly an insertion of Irenaeus' own to adapt the tradition to his exegesis of John viii. 57.³ According to the preceding paragraph Jesus was baptized at thirty. "He came to Jerusalem (John ii. 13-22) when He had attained the full age of a teacher (*magistri*), so that He might properly be listened to by all as a teacher." The allusion is to the requirement attested in *Aboda Zara: Ad quodnam vero aetatis momentum expectandum est antequam vir doctus alios docere possit?* Resp. *Ad exactos annos quadraginta.*⁴ The ancient tradition was a vindication of Jesus' right to the title and office of Rabbi, as having reached, when He began to teach, the full required age of forty years. It is not so much Johannine as Lucan, or rather pre-Lucan, since while demonstrable in one of the sources of St. Luke and probably implied also in Matthew, it has been superseded in the

¹ *Her.* II. xxii. 4, 5.

² *Her.* II. xxii. 5. A quadragesimo et (var. aut) quinquagesimo anno declinat jam in aetatem seniore, quam habens Dominus noster docebat, sicut evangelium καὶ πάντες οἱ πρεσβύτεροι μαρτυροῦσιν οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἰωάννη Ἰωάννη τῷ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῇ συμβεβληκότες, παραδεδοκέναι ταῦτα τὸν Ἰωάννην. The written testimony of Papias is implied by the present μαρτυροῦσιν. Irenaeus wishes here, as in V. xxxiii. 4, to add the written authority of Papias, whose preface he interprets as meaning that Papias was himself a hearer of the Apostles Andrew, Peter, Philip, etc., to the oral of "the Elder John" whom Papias was here quoting.

³ Corssen, supported by Drummond (*op. cit.* p. 252), proposes to strike out "et (aut) quinquagesimo" from the text of *Irenaeus*. This is simply to obliterate the evidence instead of interpreting it.

⁴ *Bab. Talm.* ed. Frankfort, 1715, fol. 196, quoted by Schoettgen.

canonical Third Gospel by the thirty-year dating. In Acts vii. 23 "the prophet" who prefigures Jesus is declared *without any Old Testament authority* to have "visited His brethren the children of Israel when He had fully attained the age of forty years."¹ Probably a similar age is intended in the birth stories of Matthew and Luke when the nativity is set "in the days of Herod the king." The Fourth Gospel accordingly is not more arbitrary in reverting to this older tradition of Jesus' age, than in correcting St. Luke on the duration of the ministry, and all the Synoptics on the date of the crucifixion. Only it carries its correction to an exaggerated degree, presenting at least the suggestion, on which Irenaeus and some contemporary and later chronographers have built, that Jesus' "glorification" was not until His forty-ninth or Jubilee year.

7. The evidence of the Johannine chronology in comparison with the Lucan justifies in some measure the view that an independent and in its nucleus a historical tradition underlies the divergences of the Fourth Gospel from the Synoptic type. In respect to the occurrence of the crucifixion on Nisan 14 rather than Nisan 15, this is now very widely acknowledged. The tendency is to acknowledge also a nearer approach to the facts in the two-year than in the one-year duration of the ministry. The present discussion should tend to show that on the point also of Jesus' age when He began to teach, the Fourth Gospel has independent and older authority than the chronology of Luke, in at least partial justification of its representations.

On the other hand, an impartial consideration of the changes wrought in the Lucan chronology, at just the points on which Basilides had built up his system of number symbolism, makes it probable that a counter-symbolism has been the really determinant factor. The Fourth Gospel, as

¹ So the Greek literally.

we saw, had not yet appeared above the horizon of Basilides. But had not Basilides already appeared above the horizon of the Fourth Gospel ?

BENJ. W. BACON.

*THE NUMBER OF THE BEAST: A WARNING
AGAINST MITHRAS WORSHIP.*

THE text (Apoc. xiii. 18) in Codex Alexandrinus reads : *καὶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτοῦ ἑξακόσιοι ἑξήκοντα ἕξ*. Codex Vaticanus has the same number 666 written with the three letters *χξϛ*. Codex *N* has the variant *ἑξακόσιαι*. Codex Ephraemi (C) reads *ἑξακόσια δέκα ἕξ*, 616, with Cod. 11 of unknown date in the library of Petavius. This alternative reading was known to Irenaeus at the end of the second century,¹ and has been accepted by Zahn, Holtzmann, and Spitta.² Irenaeus himself rejected it, accepting the witness of those who saw John face to face.

Irenaeus had learnt from them that the number of the beast, *κατὰ τὸν τῶν Ἑλλήνων ψῆφον διὰ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ γραμμάτων*, was sexcentos et sexaginta et sex ; and then he adds (the Greek text is lost) : “ hoc est, decadas aequales hecatontasin, et hecacontadas aequales monasin.” Some authorities left out five decads from the middle figure : “ Ignoro quomodo erraverunt quidam sequentes idiotismum, et medium frustantes numerum nominis, quinquaginta numeros deducentes, pro sex decadis unam decadem volentes esse.” He thinks it may be the fault of the MSS. :—“ Scriptorum peccatum, ut solet fieri ”—since the numbers were represented by letters, and it was easy to alter the Greek letter which stood for 60 “into an Iota,”—“in Iota.” Once the mistake was made, some adopted it without inquiry ; others usurped

¹ *Iren. c. Haer. V. xxx. 1.*

² *Encyc. Bibl. p. 210.*