

to keep back Valiant by recounting them. It is curious to observe how such oracular people of experience in the material world get hold of every detail of disadvantage and trial in the spiritual world. It is still more curious that these knowing ones find consistency so entirely unnecessary to them; for if the dangers were as bad as they represent, it might have struck them that so assiduous a life could hardly be called an unreal one.

Their next objection is still more amusing. They warn their son of the danger of meeting Worldly Wiseman, and other such enemies of the road. Bunyan must have been laughing when he wrote this. The idea of these worldly-wise parents counting worldly wisdom a danger is really too absurd for words, if it were not for its exact truth to experience. Your real worldling does not know himself for what he is, and Bunyan has afforded us no truer picture of the cant and blindness and vulgarity of worldliness than he has given us here.

The warnings against the failures of many who have tried, and the misery of Christians, are the usual stock-in-trade of such critics of the Way. But the rumour that Christian himself had been drowned in the river touches a still darker depth than any of the other warnings. They have no evidence for this, but they know that he was certainly drowned, and that somehow or other the incident was hushed up. Obviously the wish is father to the thought, but the warning stands as a reminder of the unscrupulous recklessness with which the Christian pilgrimage is often opposed by the worldly.

Altogether it is a formidable arraignment of the road, much of which doubtless is mere suspicion and ill-will; and yet, taken together, it seems to indicate that after all there is a good deal to be said against being a Christian. The disadvantages

of being good are many; and the Lord of the road, when He Himself trod His pilgrimage, was very frank about them, insisting that every follower of His should first count the cost before undertaking the journey. Yet this dark and courageous soul had been so deeply and immovably impressed by what Tell-true had said at the beginning, that all these arguments fall off from him without effect. His parents stood for common sense and reason, but the voice within him sounded clearer and more convincing than 'all the rangèd reasons of the world.'

The narrative closes with a poem of quite a different order from any that we have had from Bunyan's pen. Here again the highest imagination calls forth a more brilliant style in Bunyan, and that wonderful literary instinct of his has free play. It may have been the excitement of his mind that induced him to adopt an unusual versification, or it may have been the irregularity of the versification that shook off the dullness of his usual couplet rhymes. In any case, he has given us a memorable little bit of poetry. The first verse of it reminds one of Shakespeare's song:

Who doth ambition shun,  
And loves to sit i' the sun,  
Seeking the food he eats,  
And pleas'd with what he gets,  
Come hither, come hither, come hither;  
Here shall he see  
No enemy,  
But winter and rough weather.<sup>1</sup>

The whole poem has also points in common with Robert Browning's *Grammarians' Funeral*. There is something in it that is unique even among Bunyan's own verses, and tells of a mood to which we are not accustomed.

<sup>1</sup> *As You Like It*, II. v.

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### A Survey.

THE Benedictine Monks in Rome are at present superintending the issue of a series of volumes called 'Collectanea Biblica Latina,' to be published by Fridericus Pustet. The first volume has been edited by Dr. Ambrosio Amelli. Its title is *Liber Psalmorum ex Casinensi Cod.* 557 (Fr.8). There

is an introduction which tells something of the history of this ancient Latin version, there is an appendix of various grammatical and textual matters, and there are four beautiful photographs of portions of the manuscript.

Dr. Hub. Lindemann has edited and Mr. Herder has published a volume of select passages from

the Hebrew Old Testament 'in usum scholarum et disciplinae domesticae.' The title is *Florilegium Hebraicum* (3s. 3d. in cloth). The passages are chosen for the purpose of exhibiting the characteristics of Old Testament literature of every kind. The type is from a beautiful large clear fount.

An important contribution to the study of Hebrew eschatology has been made by Dr. Ernst Sellin. The volume which he has published (through Deichert of Leipzig; M.4.80) under the title of *Der Alttestamentliche Prophetismus*, contains three essays: (1) A Sketch of the History of Old Testament Prophecy, (2) the Antiquity, Nature, and Origin of Old Testament Eschatology, and (3) Ancient Eastern and Old Testament Apocalypse. The first essay is a surprise of originality. After a clever exposition of the principles of prophecy Dr. Sellin takes Amos and Hosea together, next Isaiah, Micah, Nahum and Zephaniah, then Habakkuk and Jeremiah, and lastly Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah, and in each case compares their inheritance, their outlook and their influence.

Why do we so often come upon the first personal pronoun in the Psalter? Who is this *I*? The whole question, and it is an important question, is discussed by Lic. theol. Emil Balla in a monograph entitled *Das Ich der Psalmen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht; Glasgow: F. Bauermeister. M.4.80).

It has surprised most students of the New Testament who have seen the translation of Hebrews made by 'Two Clerks' that the Greek word *διαθήκη* is translated 'covenant' throughout the ninth chapter. The point seems small, but it is one of the nicest in Greek New Testament scholarship, and no one will be surprised that a considerable book has been written by a German student on the use of this word in the New Testament. The title is *Der Begriff ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ im Neuen Testament* (Leipzig: A. Deichert; M.3). The author is Lic. Johannes Behm, Erlangen.

*Auferstehungshoffnung und Pneumagedanke bei Paulus* (Leipzig: A. Deichert; M.3.50) is the title of a work by Lic. Kurt Deissner, in which the language of the Apostle on the condition of the resurrection life is made the subject of thor-

ough and careful investigation. The secret both of the resurrection and of the assurance of it is found in the phrase 'in Christ.'

The first volume has been published of a work entitled *Die cartesianische Scholastik in der Philosophie und reformierten Dogmatik des 17 Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig: A. Deichert; M.3.60). This volume contains an account of the origin, character, history and philosophical inheritance of the Cartesian scholastic. Its value is immensely increased by the fact that every statement has its authority given in a footnote, the passage referred to being frequently quoted in full. The author is Lic. theol. Josef Bohatec.

A much more substantial volume of a similar character is entitled *Die Prinzipienlehre der neuern Systematischen Theologie im Lichte der kritik Ludwig Feuerbachs*, by Lic. Kurt Leese (Leipzig: Hinrichs M.5.50). Feuerbach is little studied even by students of philosophy now, at least in Great Britain and America, still less by theologians. There is the more necessity for directing attention to this able and well-written essay.

### Epictetus and the New Testament.<sup>1</sup>

IN an age like our own, when all research into the phenomena of early Christianity is dominated by *Religionsgeschichte*, interpreted in the barest and most literalistic fashion, it is almost a surprise to come upon a book dealing with the relation of Epictetus to the New Testament, which is not only a model of scholarly investigation, but also reveals a sanity of judgment that at once establishes a relation of confidence between author and reader. Bonhöffer has long been recognized as an expert in Stoicism. His earlier works, *Epiktet und die Stoa* (1890), and *Die Ethik des Stoikers Epiktet* (1894), are highly important contributions towards an estimate of Epictetus, to say nothing of such valuable articles as those on Stoic psychology in the journal *Philologus*. The book is much more than a comparison of Epictetus with the New Testament. Its detailed researches are the outcome of a study so minute, and at the same time, so comprehensive, that on almost every page one lights upon flashes of insight into the very structure and texture of

<sup>1</sup> *Epiktet und das Neue Testament*. Von Adolf Bonhöffer. Pp. xii, 412. Giessen: A. Töpelmann.

Stoicism. Thus, *e.g.*, the elaborate examination of important words and conceptions (pp. 105-136, 146-194, 218-281), which at the first glance might seem wearisome in its thoroughness, is more illuminating for the Stoic atmosphere than many an imposing treatise which has been devoted to the subject.

But experts in the Stoic philosophy have not always shown an equal grasp of the thought of the New Testament. A fair criterion of the aptitude of such scholars to handle the main New Testament conceptions will usually be found in their method of dealing with Paul. Many learned investigators, *e.g.*, seem to forget the existence of the Old Testament. Hence we are startled by such statements as that of Professor E. V. Arnold in his recent book on *Roman Stoicism*: 'In the analysis of human nature, Paul . . . started from the Stoic basis' (p. 419). Others apparently ignore the phenomena of a profound Christian experience. And so Reitzenstein (*e.g.*, in *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*) can interpret Paul's mystic fellowship with Christ by means of the technical terminology of a Hellenistic Mystery-literature. Bonhöffer has taken the trouble to penetrate beneath the surface of the Apostle's religious thought, and his study has plainly been without prejudice. Once or twice, indeed, he shows traces of a misleading influence as, *e.g.*, when he indicates agreement in important features with W. Brückner's position in his *Die Entstehung der paulinischen Christologie* (p. 100, n. 2). He does not seem to be acquainted with Olschewski's demonstration of the groundlessness of Brückner's fundamental hypothesis. But, as a rule, he adopts sound principles of investigation. How much fruitless labour would be saved by observance of the following caution: 'It always appears to me more probable that a man like Paul reaches a word or metaphor by himself than that he copies it from others whose position he by no means shares, indeed, is bound to reject and controvert' (p. 170, note). Similarly, the brief but richly suggestive discussion of the Logos in the Fourth Gospel (pp. 182-193) is a crucial example of scientific restraint in a region which is the playground of premature hypotheses.

Bonhöffer's careful statements are obviously the result of fulness of knowledge. Again and again they expose inaccuracies which pass from volume to volume in current discussion. At the present

time, *e.g.*, a good many scholars write with the air of experts on the Diatribe-literature of the early Empire. Bonhöffer, in two or three almost casual notes (*e.g.* p. 93, n. 2; p. 102, n. 2; p. 225, n. 1), points out the delicate distinctions which must be drawn between the so-called Diatribes of various writers. In this connexion he criticizes such positions as that of Bultmann in his interesting comparison of the style of Paul's preaching with the Cynic-Stoic Diatribe (Göttingen, 1910), that the Apostle had listened so often and with such deep interest to popular philosophical discourses by heathen, that 'echoes of them had become part of his flesh and blood' (p. 179, note).

The opening sections of the book are devoted to a refutation of the theories of Zahn and Kuiper as to the dependence of Epictetus on the New Testament. These theories are so far-fetched that they scarcely seem to deserve such patient handling. But Bonhöffer's criticism is singularly instructive in showing the ease with which a master in his own department can expose the common fallacy of superficial resemblances. Zahn, *e.g.*, connects the use of *κλήσις*, 'calling' or 'call,' in Epictetus with N.T. usage. Bonhöffer conclusively proves that *κλήσις* and *καλεῖν* in Epictetus refer to the trying situations in which the philosopher may be placed, and which he must regard as a summons from God to give proof of the truth and strength of his mental and moral position (p. 37 f.: see also p. 208). A much closer parallel to the Pauline usage, which our author has not noted, is that adduced by Reitzenstein from the language of the mysteries of Isis, in which a solemn summons of the goddess to the novice is designated by *καλεῖν* (*vocare*: see *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, pp. 99 ff.). In discussing the term *συναστροφή*, which Epictetus uses of intercourse with God, and which Kuiper connects with the N.T. idea of communion, Bonhöffer points out that the latter is totally different from the Stoic conception. The Stoic thinks of a moral and spiritual equivalence of the wise man to God. For the N.T., in spite of the intimate relationship of the child to the Father, the incomparable pre-eminence and majesty of God remains intact (p. 52, note). Again, Kuiper finds in Epictetus' metaphor of liberation or redemption a contradiction to his usual position, according to which, man, good by nature, does not require to be redeemed, or rather, is able to redeem himself.

But Bonhöffer shows that when Epictetus speaks of redemption, 'he means nothing more than this, that man has been so created by God, that at all times, in spite of all outward compulsion, he can be and remain inwardly free.' Hence he is not thinking of any experience of redemption effected by God in time, but of a possibility which is inherent in human nature (p. 70, n. 2). The whole spirit and character of Epictetus are opposed to the notion that he should in any sense borrow from Christianity. And Bonhöffer suggests, on the basis of the sage's own utterances, that Christianity must have appeared to him far inferior to his own system, as not being a product of the reason (p. 80).

The second main division of the book, which inevitably overlaps the first at certain points, treats of the dependence of the N.T. on Stoicism. The larger part of this very important discussion is occupied with Paul (pp. 98-180). In the few pages which deal with the Synoptic Gospels, Bonhöffer establishes the superficiality of comparisons between Epictetus and the Sermon on the Mount, and concludes that even the slight traces of influence from Græco-Roman philosophy which Clemen (*Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des N.T.*, 1909) finds in the Gospels are scarcely justified by the facts. The section on Paul investigates his vocabulary, his style, specially significant words and conceptions, and finally, certain utterances which are supposed to have a Stoic colour. It would be difficult to overestimate the value of these pages. Bonhöffer selects a number of terms common to Paul and Epictetus, such as *αἴσθησις* and *ἀπάρκης*, and demonstrates that in the large majority of instances there is no trace of a specific influence of Greek thought. Even those which admittedly belong to the terminology of the schools give no hint, as a rule, of their characteristic philosophical meaning (p. 135). As regards *style*, any real resemblance to Epictetus is confined to a few paragraphs. 'No unprejudiced reader can deny that the greater part of what we have from Paul in the N.T., not merely reveals no likeness to the dissertations of Epictetus or to the works of Cynic-Stoic authors as a whole, but rather, even in the matter of language and expression, breathes a totally different spirit' (p. 141).

Perhaps the most fascinating section of the book is that which investigates significant words common to Paul and Epictetus, like *σάρξ*,

*φύσις*, *νοῦς*, *πνεῦμα*, and *συνείδησις*. Take the last mentioned as an example. According to statements current even in the works of prominent scholars, *συνείδησις* is a term which clearly shows the influence of the popular philosophy, and notably, of Stoicism, on the thought of Paul. Bonhöffer remarks that the Stoic origin of the word is not at all probable. In any case it plays no important part in Stoicism. The cognate phrase *τὸ συνειδός* is fairly common, but is not used in the ethical sense of 'conscience.' It means the consciousness a man has of a Divine commission or of a unique vocation. For natural moral feeling Epictetus uses *τὸ ἐντροπικόν* or *τὸ αἰδήμον*. Accordingly, *συνείδησις*, in its Pauline significance, has no analogy at all in Stoicism (pp. 156-157), and there is no justification, e.g., for Professor Arnold's emphasis on Paul's use of the word (*Roman Stoicism*, p. 415). We would also call attention to the luminous discussion of the phrase *λογικὴ λατρεία*, in which some reference ought to have been made to Reitzenstein's important note in *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen* (pp. 155-159). In the light of both, Professor Arnold's reference (*op. cit.* p. 419) requires correction. No less valuable is the treatment of *σάρξ* and *πνεῦμα*, in which Bonhöffer manifests a real appreciation of the Pauline conception of *πνεῦμα*, although he seems inclined to favour the metaphysical interpretation of *σάρξ*, which is quite untrue to Paul's thought (p. 162, n. 1). The author sums up this investigation by affirming 'that even such expressions, modes of speech, and ideas as, at the first glance, have an astonishing resemblance to Stoicism, on closer examination, prove to be so different and indeed opposed in their significance, that a more accurate knowledge of Stoic doctrine and a conscious approximation to it can not be assumed in Paul's case' (p. 178).

The second half of the volume is divided into three sections which deal respectively with the vocabularies of Epictetus and the N.T., parallel passages from Epictetus and the N.T., and a systematic comparison of Epictetus with the N.T. The examination of the vocabularies, which is conducted with the help of exhaustive tables, is less impressive than the survey of parallel passages, but has a special value of its own as an introduction to Stoic terminology (see p. 266). The second section presents an array of remarkable

resemblances, which Bonhöffer readily acknowledges, while he is always careful to indicate any important shades of distinction involved in the standpoint which belongs to Epictetus as a representative of orthodox Stoicism. One may remark in passing that every now and then the N.T. quotations are seen in a fresh perspective in view of the parallels from Epictetus. Worthy of note in this connexion is the comment on the difficult Parable of the Unjust Steward (p. 293).

The systematic comparison which occupies the last fifty pages of the book, while provoking criticism at one or two points, appears to us an admirable piece of work. It is impossible to do it any justice in a summary. Epictetus may be said to approximate to the N.T. in his genuine Theism, his vital association of religion and morality, his optimistic and idealistic view of life, and that ethical earnestness which is the result of such a view. The difference between the two positions is inherent in Stoicism. However marked its religious element, Stoicism is essentially philosophy. Hence reason is exalted at the cost of revelation. Further, man, for Epictetus, is essentially bounded by the present. 'All that he

can attain lies within the limits of this temporal life' (p. 355). As a deduction from these standpoints, self-sufficiency came to be the fundamental principle of Stoicism. Our space does not admit of detailed reference to the various aspects of religious thought which Bonhöffer selects for a careful comparison of Epictetus with the N.T. But we have been specially impressed by the section on the idea of God (pp. 358-363). The historical significance of Stoicism is vividly sketched, and the reason of its conquest by Christianity is found, above all else, in the fact that it was unable, and from its inherent nature could not seriously attempt, to ethicize the masses. We believe that, while this is strictly true, the explanation lies deeper. And we cannot admit the advantage over Christianity which, in his closing sentence, the author claims for Stoicism:—that the latter, 'as based entirely on the reason is independent of all changes in philosophical theories and religious ideas, and is therefore, in a higher 'degree, free from transitory elements' (p. 390). This is surely a one-sided estimate of human experience. H. A. A. KENNEDY.

*New College, Edinburgh.*

## Contributions and Comments.

### The Soldiers' Portions (John xix. 23, 24).

WHAT were the four articles of our Saviour's dress which the quaternion of Roman soldiers divided among themselves before proceeding to cast lots for His seamless tunic?

The answer of most readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will no doubt be: 'The turban or other headgear, the outer garment or "cloak" (Mt 5<sup>40</sup>), and the girdle, with the sandals, of course, for the fourth soldier.' So at least such of the commentators as descend to particulars; so, too, Edersheim, who writes: 'The four pieces of dress to be divided would be the head-gear, the more expensive sandals or shoes, the long girdle, and the coarse *Tallith*—all about equal in value' (*The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i. 625).

Now I have my doubts about the 'sandals' or 'shoes,' and this for three reasons: (1) Would not our Lord, as a condemned criminal, be led to

execution barefoot? (2) Even if it were not so, what warrant is there for the 'more expensive shoes . . . about equal in value' to the large woollen tallith or mantle? One thinks rather of a pair of peasant's sandals, the synonym in Amos' day for a thing of no value (Am 2<sup>6</sup> 8<sup>6</sup>—the rich buy and sell 'the needy for a pair of sandals,' for a 'mere bagatelle,' as we would say).

(3) To make the sandals the share of one of the quaternion is to overlook the shirt which, at the date in question, was worn under the tunic (*χιτών*), even by the poorest. Thus Josephus tells a graphic story of a slave who concealed a fatal letter in a fold of his 'inner tunic' (*Antiq.* xvii. v. 7, § 136). This 'inner tunic' I take to be the *ḥālūq* or shirt, frequently mentioned in Mishna and Gemara as worn by men and women alike (cf. *Shabbath*, 15<sup>2</sup>, where a woman's *ḥālūq* is fastened by knotting a string at the neck).

That our Lord wore such a garment beneath His tunic seems implied in St. John's account of