

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*

sacrifice his life, if need be, in the work of enlightenment. . . . The active enthusiasm of a real religion—the *effective* desire to be in right relation with the Power—was strange to Stoicism. In one way or another, it had many excellent results; it cleared the ground, for example, for a new and universal religion by putting into the shade, if not altogether out of the way, the old local cults with their narrow and limited civic force; it glorified the idea of law and order in an age when the Roman world seemed to be forgetting what these sacred words meant; *but a real active enthusiasm of humanity was wanting in it*” (W. Warde Fowler: *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*, pp. 374–375).

\* \* \* \* \*

1 Corinthians ix. 16–17 :—*Woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel. For if I do this of mine own will I have a reward.*

Two illustrations of this text. One from Walton’s *Life of Donne*, where Donne’s prostration and melancholy after his wife’s death is described. “Thus he continued until a consideration of his new engagements to God, and St. Paul’s ‘Woe is me, if I preach not the Gospel!’ dispersed those sad clouds that had then benighted his hopes, and now forced him to behold the light.” The other from Canon Horsley’s recent book of reminiscences, in which he quotes a remark made to him in Clerkenwell prison by Charles Peace, the murderer: ‘If a minister really believed in his work, it would pay him not merely to go a Sabbath day’s journey to preach, but to go there on his hands and knees over broken bottles.’”

\* \* \* \* \*

Galatians iv. 16 :—*So then am I become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?*

There is a good parallel to this ironical query in the third Olynthiac oration (§ 32), where Demosthenes tells the Athenians that he would not be astonished if they made *him* suffer for mentioning their troubles more than the very people who had caused them (ταῦτα μὰ τὴν Δῆμητρα οὐκ ἄν

θαυμάσαιμι, εἰ μείζων εἰπόντι ἐμοὶ γένοιτο παρ' ἡμῶν βλάβη τῶν πεπονηκότων αὐτὰ γενέσθαι).

\* \* \* \* \*

Titus ii. 10 :—*That they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things.*

The primary claim is that household slaves who had become Christians were to be a credit and ornament to their religion. *Bid slaves be subject to their masters* (instead of bringing the church into disrepute and suspicion by insubordination), and give *entire satisfaction in every respect, not answering back* (even when sorely provoked by cruelty and displays of bad temper), *not pilfering, but showing the utmost trustworthiness and honesty, that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in every respect.* The reason for this moral counsel lies in their spiritual position. *For the grace of God has appeared, teaching us to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world.* Christianity is represented as a disciplining power or force, which is beautiful as it comes into action, and Christians, even in obscure and trying circumstances, are called upon to grace it by making it live in their conduct, instead of disgracing it by inconsistent behaviour. (i.) The first <sup>1</sup> method is the consecration of duty. No line of conduct can set off the doctrine of Christianity if it is indifferent to the plain instincts of morality. There is nothing beautiful in a life which attempts to excuse itself for ethical defects and failures by pointing to right views about God or warm feelings or ecclesiastical strictness. Any type of Christianity, evangelical or ritualistic, liberal or narrow, which relaxes the conscience is a discredit to the religion of Him who gave himself for us that He might purify for Him-

<sup>1</sup> The significance of the precept for Roman slaves is suggested by Dr. Bigg's remark (*The Church's Task under the Roman Empire*, p. 114): "As for sexual morality, what can it have been when the mass of the people were slaves, when slaves were incapable of marriage, and the number of men greatly preponderated over that of women, when women and boys had no protection at all against their masters?"

*self a people zealous of good works.* (ii.) Then, Christianity being more than a moral force, men and women can be an ornament to it by exhibiting the special law of love, in forbearance, charity, brotherly kindness, and the enthusiasm of social service. Sincere people often make their doctrine positively odious by the temper in which they treat those who may differ from them. The Christian graces are essential if the Christian doctrine is to shine in its true lustre, and these graces include courage and intelligence as well as kindness. (iii.) Finally, Christianity is rendered attractive by the gracious spirit of its adherents. Love teaches even the boorish and the awkward to practise tact and courtesy instinctively. There is generally a gracious and an ungracious way of doing a deed or saying a word, or giving a gift. And the gracious method is more than a pretty, nice manner which some natures find it easy to assume ; it is not an extra, but an expression of inward thoughtfulness and self-effacement (as the very sense of *χάρις* suggests). The jewel of the Christian principle is in its proper setting whenever kindness is unostentatious, and charity free from patronising, and help devoid of a secret desire to display one's own strength or wealth or superior goodness.

The thought of these words practically resolves itself, therefore, into this : that Christianity is beautiful as it is real, that if it is beautiful as a doctrine it becomes more beautiful as a life, in which outsiders learn to love it by noting its embodiment in our personal characters. George Herbert applied this thought specifically to servants :—

“A servant with this clause [i.e. ‘for Thy sake’]  
 Makes drudgery divine ;  
 Who sweeps a room as for Thy laws  
 Makes that and the action fine.”

But the sweep of the text covers all lives and levels, with its demand for this fine art of Christian faithfulness.

JAMES MOFFATT.