The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

On St. John's Method of Reckoning the Hours of the Day

Edwin A. Abbott

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 06 / June 1894, pp 243 - 246
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00188298, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00188298

How to cite this article:

Edwin A. Abbott (1894). On St. John's Method of Reckoning the Hours of the Day. The Classical Review, 8, pp 243-246 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00188298

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

problem in any case: we can hardly doubt that the original forms *τιθ-μεν *τιθ-ασι have been reacted on in a pre-historic period of Greek by the forms of the unreduplicated conjugation, Idg. *dhāmés dhēnti*, *θέμεσ *θέντι (cf. the 2nd aorist). In that case the Doric τίθεντι is clearly more original, but the Ionic accent may very well represent the consciousness of another form after the type of τίθεασσι, Boeot. διδόανθι: the evident antiquity of this type is certainly a point in favour of Johansson, as referred to above. In the verb *esmi* there were two forms in the plural, *ésnti* and *sénti*, *ἔαντι and *έντι, and the ultimate forms of these (*ἔαντι*, *έντι*) probably did more than anything else to fix the alternatives in τίθημι.

Here I must close my remarks, in which I have ventured perhaps rather farther than is wise from the safe paths of merely negative criticism. The novelty of Mr. Walker's ideas and the long-felt fascination of this field of verb morphology must be my excuse. Two impressions remain in my

mind as I account to myself for a general lack of conviction produced by these very original researches. On the one side is the absence of the necessary destructive criticism, which might clear away the structures occupying at present the ground Mr. Walker wishes to annex. On the other is the feeling that Mr. Walker is before all things a classical scholar, with the inevitable prejudice in favour of Greek and Latin as better able to tell us the secrets of primitive language than any other dialects can be. A heavier sprinkling of words from Zend and Sanskrit, Gothic, Old Irish, Lithuanian, and sources less classical still, would doubtless send off the pure scholar or the archaeologist with a shrug to more congenial pages in the *Review*, but it would produce more effect upon students of a subject more and more imperatively demanding the thorough traversing of the whole field.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

Cambridge, March 16th.

ON ST. JOHN'S METHOD OF RECKONING THE HOURS OF THE DAY.

ALL admit that, with the exception of the Fourth Gospel, the New Testament (Mt. xx. 3, 5, 6, 9, xxvii. 45, 46; Mk. xv. 25, 33, 34; Lk. xxiii. 44; Acts ii. 15, iij. 1, x. 3, 9, 30, xxiii. 33) reckons 'the hour' from sunrise (or sunset in Acts xxiii. 33 where 'of the night' is added). But it is contended that St. John may have adopted a different reckoning, namely from midnight (or mid-day).

Westcott (*Gospel of St. John*, p. 282) mentions 'two passages' which 'furnish a sufficient presumption' that the reckoning from midnight was general in the Roman province of Asia and was adopted by John. One of these refers to the death of Polycarp, another to that of Pionius who 'is said to have been martyred (at Smyrna also) at the tenth hour.'¹ The latter, if Pionius died in A.D. 250, is not cogent concerning the usage of 100 A.D. As to the former, Westcott says, 'This—the eighth hour—from the circumstances, must have been 8 A.M.' But Lightfoot (*Apost. Fathers* P. II. Vol. i. p. 612) says 'The hour of the day we have no means of testing. "The eighth hour" might mean either 8 A.M. or 2 P.M.'; and,

The reference to the authority, in the case of Pionius, is not given.

though he pronounces the former the more probable, he adds, 'Either is consistent with the narrative.'

But, upon close examination, the evidence as to Polycarp will be found in favour of 2 P.M. and incompatible with 8 A.M. For it would appear that Polycarp was not brought into the stadium till (*Epist. Smyrn.* 9) the 'sports' had begun. When he was led into the stadium, the excitement was at its height (8), 'such a tumult that no man's voice could be so much as heard.' The words (*ib.* 9), 'at length, when he was brought up (λοιπόν προσαχθέντος αὐτοῦ)'—perhaps 'at length' is rather strong for λοιπόν, but I am quoting Lightfoot's translation—imply that the martyr had to wait his turn till the 'sports' were concluded; and this is further implied by (*ib.* 11) the proconsul's threat, 'I have wild beasts at hand here and I will throw thee to them,' taken with what follows. The people shout for a lion to be let loose on Polycarp, upon which the Asiarch replied that (12) 'It was not lawful for him, since he had brought the sports to a close (πεπληρώκει τὰ κνηγέσια).' Now it is most unlikely that 'the sports' could have been 'brought to a close' in time enough to allow Polycarp to be examined by

the Proconsul, and a fire to be extemporized to consume him, and all this by 8 A.M. on a February morning (*ib.* 21, *πρὸ ἑπτὰ Καλανδῶν Μαρτίων*).

The passages in John bearing on the subject are the following:—

(a) i. 39 ‘about the tenth hour.’ The Baptist is here introduced as ‘looking upon Jesus as he was walking (*περιπατοῦντι*).’ The walking does not necessarily imply anything in the nature of a journey. Two disciples of the Baptist, wishing to know Jesus, ask ‘Where abidest thou?’ They ‘came therefore and saw where he abode; and they abode with him that day (*παρ’ αὐτῷ ἔμειναν τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην*): it was about the tenth hour.’ There is nothing here conclusive either way; but the most natural supposition is that they took the evening meal there and remained for the night as well as the remainder of the day. (It should be hardly necessary to quote, for ‘day’ used loosely in connexion with hours after or before sunset, *Mk.* xiv. 30 ‘to-day, even this night,’ and *Matth.* xxvii. 19, where Pilate’s wife speaks of the dream she had had ‘this day.’)

(b) iv. 6 ‘about the sixth hour.’ This was the hour at which Jesus rested at ‘Jacob’s well,’ wearied with the journey, while the disciples went into the city to buy food. Now, if this was ‘the sixth hour of the afternoon,’ i.e. 6 P.M. as in modern reckoning, we have to suppose that the woman came to the well shortly after 6 P.M. and that the dialogue followed afterwards (lasting long enough to allow of the return of the disciples to interrupt it): then the woman returned to the city and told her story to the men; and then the men came out to Jesus, heard His words, welcomed Him, and induced Him to remain with them. Even if this occurred in the summer it crowds a great deal into a small space of time; but if it occurred in winter it is almost impossible.

Here rises the question of the time of year, and of the bearing on this point of *John* iv. 35 *οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι Ἔτι τετράμηνός ἐστιν καὶ ὁ θερισμὸς ἔρχεται; ἰδοὺ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐπάρατε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν καὶ θεάσασθε τὰς χώρας ὅτι λευκαὶ εἰσιν πρὸς θερισμόν*. The words ‘lift up your eyes’ appear to mean ‘lift up your eyes to the truth as it is in heaven,’ ‘discern the true harvest’; and the most probable rendering is, ‘You (*ὑμεῖς* emph.) the children of men, who talk of earthly seed and earthly harvest, say, or are in the habit of saying, “Four months more and the harvest [of earth] will come”;

but I tell you the harvest [of heaven] is white already.’

It appears (*Tristram, Land of Israel*, p. 399 and 583, quoted by Westcott, *John* iv. 34) that corn sown *just after Christmas* was four inches high on 20 Feb., and that the harvest lasted from about 15 April to 15 May. This gives an interval of ‘four months’ between seed-time and the average time for the middle of harvest, and points to a common proverb by which the farmers in Galilee exhorted one another to patience, after seed-time was over. (The *ἐτι* does not mean ‘more,’ and creates no difficulty; comp. the saying of Joseph to Pharaoh’s butler, *Gen.* xl. 13 *ἐτι τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ μνησθήσεται Φ. τῆς ἀρχῆς σου*, ‘Three days hence, Pharaoh will remember thy office’: = so *ib.* 19 and vii. 34.

Now it might seem at first sight as if all the bearing of the ‘four months’ upon the actual time of year disappears as soon as it is admitted that the words probably constitute a proverb. But in fact, all the point of our Lord’s words consists in the *exact application of the proverb to the time of utterance, and in the contrariety between what the proverb said about the earthly harvest and what He said about the spiritual*. For the former, the seed had only just been sown, and the fields were bare; for the latter, the harvest was white for reaping, if the disciples would only ‘lift up their eyes’ and discern it. Consequently, though the words are probably proverbial, their use here is strongly for winter as the time of utterance.

This makes it all the more unlikely that ‘the sixth hour’ meant the last hour in the evening. In the winter the Samaritan woman might naturally come to the well in the early afternoon; and in the winter people might naturally be travelling at noon. And the rest of the narrative will suit a winter noon-tide. Jesus had not intended to stay there; He merely rested at noon because He was ‘tired out’ (*κεκοπιακώς*); but the talk with the Samaritan woman led the Samaritans to come out to see Him in the afternoon; and the consequence was that they induced Him to remain in their city for that night and the next.

(c) iv. 52 ‘Yesterday, about (?) the seventh hour (*ἐχθές ὥραν ἑβδόμην*), the fever left him.’ [Winer quotes for the accus. *Acts* x. 3, *Rev.* iii. 3. But in *Acts* the best MSS. ins. *περί*: *Rev.* οὐ μὴ γνῶς ποῖαν ὥραν ἤξω possibly contains some corruption concealed under the marginal *γνώση*: in any

case, the juxtaposition of γνῶς, and the solecisms with which Rev. abounds, make it worthless as an instance bearing on the present passage. Possibly the original was ΕΧΘΕΕΙC (comp. Plutarch, *Timoleon*, ed. Holden, index, εἰς with the meaning of ἐν, temporal, εἰς ἕνα καιρόν xii. 3, and he compares Polyb. xxiv. 34, 10 εἰς τὴν ἐπαύριον ἐξῆλθε).]

But let us assume that, so far as the hour is concerned, the text is correct. Westcott says (*ad loc.*) that 'the uncertainty of the site of Cana causes a little difficulty in determining the time required for the journey from Capernaum to Cana. This may however be fairly reckoned at about four or five hours. Comp. Jos. *Vit.* ch. 17; a night journey from Cana to Tiberias.'

Now Josephus tells us that he travelled from Cana to Tiberias all through the night (δὲ ὅλης τῆς νυκτός)—and he had every motive to travel fast, as his object was to secure Tiberias from being brought over by his enemy. Moreover he was journeying downhill, and it would take longer to go uphill from the border of the low-lying lake to the uplands of Cana. We may therefore reckon Josephus' journey at 7 to 8 hours and the return journey at 9 or 10; this gives about 17 hours of journeying, too much to be done at a stretch.

The most probable supposition is that the father started from Capernaum very early in the morning, say at 4 or 5 A.M., and reached Jesus in eight or nine hours, at 1 P.M. ('the seventh hour'). After the delay necessary for rest and refreshment, he started on the return journey, but stopped when night came on, and resumed his journey next morning. His servants did not start to meet him on the afternoon of the boy's recovery; for, by the time they had convinced themselves that danger was over, say 2 P.M., it was too late to allow them to reach Cana before sunset. But they started very early in the morning and met their master 'when he was by this time descending (ἤδη αὐτοῦ καταβαίνοντος)'—a phrase which may here mean (a little more precisely than in iv. 49, 'Sir, come down') the descent from the table-land to the border of the lake.

But on the supposition (adopted by Westcott) that the words of Jesus were spoken at 7 P.M., we have to ask how it was that the father (who most probably started before sunrise) was so late in finding Jesus, taking, say, fourteen hours to reach Him. Also, the pressing petition to Jesus ('Come down, ere my child die') is much more natural at

1 P.M., when there was time for the journey to be at all events commenced, than at 7 P.M., when it would be rather unreasonable to ask a Prophet to begin a journey that would last, as it did for Josephus, 'all through the night.' This last argument is all the more forcible because this incident occurred only a few days after the dialogue in Samaria, and therefore probably in the winter; so that the sun would have set long before 7 P.M.

(d) xix. 14 'about the sixth hour.' This passage states the hour when Pilate pronounced sentence on Jesus; and, as the context stands, is unquestionably incompatible with Mk. xv. 25, which fixes the Crucifixion at 'the third hour.' But the omission of Mk. xv. 25 by Mt. and Lk. indicates some early obscurity as to the exact hour.

In any case the interpretation of 'the sixth hour' as 6 A.M. involves other extreme difficulties: for (Westcott on John xviii. 28) 'the Roman court could be held at any time after sunrise, but not before; but at 6 A.M. the sun would only just have risen, so that the Chief Priests could not expect to begin the trial till that time. And yet, according to this interpretation, we have to suppose that (xviii. 29–32) the dialogue between Pilate and the Jews, (xviii. 33–37) the dialogue between Pilate and Jesus, (xviii. 39–40) the expostulation of Pilate with the Jews and the choice of Barabbas instead of Jesus, (xix. 1) the scourging, (xix. 2, 3) the clothing with the purple robe and the crown of thorns and the offering of mock homage, (xix. 4–7) the exhibition of Jesus in this condition to the Jews and Pilate's further expostulation with them, (xix. 8–11) Pilate's re-entry into the Palace and further dialogue with Jesus, (xix. 12) Pilate's subsequent attempts (ἐκ τούτου ἐζήτει) to procure an acquittal, and the recalcitration of the Jews, (xix. 13) the leading of Jesus to Gabbatha and (apparently) the erection of a tribunal (βῆμα, not τὸ βῆμα) there—all occur after 6 A.M. in the course of about half-an-hour, so as to justify the writer in saying that the final sentence was pronounced 'about 6.30 A.M.' (Westc. *Gosp.* p. 282, 'If we suppose that the time approximately described was about 6 A.M. it is not difficult to fit in all the events of the trial'). If to this we were to add Mt.'s incidents of the washing of Pilate's hands, and the message about his wife's dream, and Lk.'s supplementary trial of Jesus by Herod, and the mocking by Herod's soldiers, and the sending back

from Herod to Pilate, the difficulty—if it did not amount to an impossibility before—would certainly amount to one now.

Strong evidence would be needed to make us believe that John departed from the synoptic method of reckoning the hours of the day. The substance of the synoptic Gospels—it is generally admitted—was widely read and recognized as authoritative at the time of the composition of the Fourth Gospel. The Fourth Gospel—according to a very ancient and general tradition—was composed to supplement them and to give a more spiritual aspect of Christ's life, but not to supersede them. But if the Fourth

was intended to be read with the Three, would it not have been a grievous and even culpable error to introduce, without warning or even suggestion of difference, a method of reckoning the hours (and more especially as regards the Passion, where the four authors cover the same ground and all enter into considerable detail) wholly different from that of the Synoptists, and certain to create confusion in the minds of all readers? So far, the evidence alleged by Westcott (and I have dealt with no other) appears insufficient to prove such a departure.

EDWIN A. ABBOTT.

THEOPHILUS AD AUTOLYCUM II, 7.

ἀλλὰ καὶ Σάτυρος, ἱστορῶν τοὺς δῆμους Ἀλεξανδρέων, ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Φιλοπάτορος τοῦ καὶ Πτολεμαίου προσαγορευθέντος, τούτου μηνύει Διόνυσον ἀρχηγέτην γεγονέναι· διὸ καὶ φυλὴν ὁ Πτολεμαῖος πρώτην κατέστησεν. Λέγει οὖν ὁ Σάτυρος οὕτως·

Here follows the genealogy purporting to connect the Ptolemies with Dionusos; after which Theophilus continues:—

Ἡ μὲν οὖν πρὸς Διόνυσον τοῖς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ βασιλεύσασι συγγένεια, οὕτω περιέχει. Ὅθεν καὶ ἐν τῇ Διονυσίᾳ φυλὴ δῆμοι εἰσὶ κατακεχωρισμένοι· Ἀλθῆς ἀπὸ τῆς γενομένης γυναικὸς Διονύσου, θυγατρὸς δὲ Θεστίου Ἀλθῆας· Δηϊανείρης ἀπὸ τῆς θυγατρὸς Διονύσου καὶ Ἀλθῆας, γυναικὸς δὲ Ἑρακλέους, ὅθεν καὶ τὰς προσω-
νυμίας ἔχουσιν οἱ κατ' αὐτοὺς δῆμοι· Ἀριάδνης ἀπὸ τῆς θυγατρὸς Μίνω, γυναικὸς δὲ Διονύσου, παιδὸς πατροφίλης, τῆς μιχθείσης Διονύσῳ ἐν μορφῇ πρύμνιδι· Θεστὶς ἀπὸ Θεστίου τοῦ Ἀλθῆας πατρὸς· Θεαντὶς ἀπὸ Θεάντος παιδὸς Διονύσου· Σταφυλὶς ἀπὸ Σταφύλου υἱοῦ Διονύσου· Μαρωνὶς ἀπὸ Μάρωνος υἱοῦ Ἀριάδνης καὶ Διονύσου· οὗτοι γὰρ πάντες υἱοὶ Διονύσου.

I give the passage 'with all faults' as it stands in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* tom. vi., coll. 1057—60, since I am here concerned only with the obscure words underlined. An Appendix containing the conjectures and emendations of J. H. Nolte speaks thus of the clause in question:—

Locus haud dubie corruptus. Neque interpretum explicationes neque Toupii ep. p. 177 et Meinekei Anal. Alex. et Mulleri *Frag. Histor. Graec.* iv. p. 660, coniecturae

probabiles sunt. Legendum *πρυμνητοῦ* aut *προσύμνου* (cf. Clem. Alex. *Prot.* p. 29 P et Arnob. c. nat. 5, 29) alibi olim proposui.

Toup *l.c.* remarks: 'Appello omnes monstrorum averruncatures, an quidquam viderint hac lectione monstrosius,' and comparing the statement in Hom. *Od.* A 325 rewrites the passage with confidence ('procul dubio') as follows: τῆς μιχθείσης Διονύσῳ ἐν ἀμφι-
ρύτῃ Διᾷ. Meineke *op. cit.* p. 347 hazards τῆς μιχθείσης Διονύσῳ ἐν ὀροφῇ πρυμναίᾳ, which C. Müller *l.c.* rightly condemns as 'nimis quaesita' and unwarranted by tradition. He himself offers with some hesitation ἐν κορυφῇ δρυμώδει, citing Diodorus v. 51, 4: Διόνυσος δὲ νυκτὸς ἀπήγαγε τὴν Ἀριάδνην εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Δρύος. As an alternative he suggests that the words *παιδὸς...πρύμνιδι* may have crept into the text from some such gloss as the following: τῆς Μίνω παιδὸς καὶ Πασιφάης τῆς μιχθείσης [Μινотаύρω] ἐν [βοδὸς] μορφῇ πρυνίῃ.

It will be seen that these scholars unanimously proceed on the assumption that the words *παιδὸς...πρύμνιδι* are descriptive of Ariadne. Dr. Jackson, however, who first drew my attention to the passage, observes that in that case the iteration of the word *Διονύσῳ* is strange. It is not used more than once in any of the parallel clauses, and had a repetition been required we should have expected the pronoun αὐτῷ. This may be taken as an indication that the words *παιδὸς...πρύμνιδι* cover the name and eponym of another deme.

Assuming, then, that in the clause *παιδὸς πατροφίλης, τῆς μιχθείσης Διονύσῳ ἐν μορφῇ πρύμνιδι* we have to look for the name of a