welcomes the simple believer; on the other hand, his highest message is delivered to a small coterie, for by the conditions of human life his 'gnostics' must always be few in number. There is a significant passage in which he describes the gnostic as 'dwelling in a city, yet despising those things in the city which are objects of admiration to others, and living there as if in a desert'.[1] Set this by the side of the Athenian's pride in his beautiful city, and the Jew's passionate love —'If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning'— and we get some idea of the cold inhumanity to which Clement's teaching might easily lead. It is this intellectual isolation which makes Art of small consequence to him. But such a position is untenable, for it depends upon a false view of the intellect as the sole guide to truth, combined with an equally false depreciation of feeling and the external world.

Nevertheless the Alexandrine teaching obtained a strong hold over the Eastern Church, and shewed itself alive and vigorous centuries later in the iconoclastic controversy. The simpler and more practical Western Church, however, took an opposite line. From the days of the catacombs Art was fearlessly claimed as the handmaid of religion, and though the union of the two is not without danger, it may be safely said to have worked on the whole for the advancement of both.

G. W. BUTTERWORTH.

TRIANGULAR NUMBERS.

IN the *Journal of Theological Studies* for October, 1914 (pp. 67 ff.), Mr F. H. Colson gave a most interesting note on Triangular Numbers in the New Testament, and, incidentally, on other matters of Nicomachean arithmetic. Noting that the Johannine number 153, in some way a symbol of 'the number of the elect', is a triangular number, being equal to $\frac{17 \cdot 18}{2}$, he tells us that Augustine on John xxi shews by addition that it is the 'triangle' of 17. It might be added that he also shews that it is the product of 17 and 9 ($=\frac{18}{2}$), or rather of 17.3 and 3. But it may also be noted that this number possesses the unique property of being the sum of the cubes of its three digits, for

[1] iii 55^{5-7} (878) ὃς πόλιν οἰκῶν τῶν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν κατεφρόνησεν παρ' ἄλλοις θαυμαζομένων, καὶ καθάπερ ἐν ἐρημίᾳ τῇ πόλει βιοῖ.

$1^3+5^3+3^3 = 1+125+27 = 153$; and this would well make the number mystical, though I do not know that the ancients noticed it.

I would suggest that the fact that 28 is in Pythagorean arithmetic a 'perfect' number—equal, that is to say, to the sum of all its divisors (except, of course, itself)—deserves more than a passing reference in a footnote. The first perfect number is 6, for $1+2+3=6$, as $1+2+4+7+14=28$; and 36, the square of 6, has, as Mr Colson shews, several notable properties. The number 6 touches also on geometry as suggesting the equality of the side of a regular hexagon inscribed in a circle to the radius, which apparently led to the sexagesimal reckoning of degrees. The third perfect number is 496, which is not a New Testament number, and the fourth is 8128, which passes quite beyond our range. (There are but five others known, and the ninth requires thirty-seven digits for its expression.) But 17 has another property, in all probability unknown to the ancients. It equals 2^4+1 and is a prime number; and it is possible, by the use of the straight line and the circle only, to construct a regular polygon of any number of sides which can be expressed by 2^n+1, if this is a prime number. The next number in this series is 257. We might add that 15 is a geometric number, it being perfectly easy to construct a regular pentadecagon; and that a regular polygon of 36 sides is also easily constructed.

May I note that in the second equation on page 69 the indication of the square has slipped from the parenthesis? Read $\left(\frac{n+1}{2}\right)^2$.

SAMUEL HART.