

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

1-1-1924

### The Christian Religion vs Philonism and Stoicism

Otto P. Kretzmann

*Concordia Seminary, St. Louis*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Kretzmann, Otto P., "The Christian Religion vs Philonism and Stoicism" (1924). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 597.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/597>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION

VS

PHILONISM AND STOICISM

with a few notes on the relation  
of Gnosticism and Zoroastrianism to the New Testament.

----

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of  
Concordia Seminary  
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the  
Degree of Master of Sacred Theology. 1924.

OTTO  
O. P. PAUL  
Kretzmann. 1901-

## Introductory.

The study of Comparative Religions and the application of the evolutionistic principle to the field of religion have in the last decades lent tremendous impetus to inquiries into the origin of Christianity and the philosophical background of the New Testament. Every remnant of the ancient philosophic literature has been carefully examined by writers with a naturalistic tendency in order to discover some natural explanation for the thought and phraseology of the New<sup>1</sup> Testament. An examination of these alleged points of contact, which are supposed to have exerted such a tremendous influence on nascent Christianity, together with a critical estimate of this influence on the actual making and meaning of the New Testament will be the purpose of the present inquiry.

---

<sup>1</sup> It can only be regretted that this examination must confine itself to the philosophical thought. The claim of Christianity to be absolutely original has been contended from many points of view, of which the topic of this inquiry includes only a fraction. Thus, for example, modern writers greatly emphasize the influence of the Mystery Religions, of Emperor Worship, of contemporary Judaism, etc.--all with a more or less patent ignoring of relevant facts. The contention that the Mystery Religions influenced the making of the New Testament shatters on the question of chronology; that of the Emperor Worship on the rigid exclusiveness of Christianity, and that of contemporary Judaism, on the openly expressed hostility so often expressed in the Gospels.

## Plato and Jesus.

By way of introduction to the alleged points of contact between later Greek philosophy and Christianity, which shall be examined in a more detailed manner, it will be convenient to contrast the basis of all Greek philosophic systems, Platonism, with Christianity.

As early as the days of<sup>1</sup> Celsus the charge was made that Christianity found its origin in the system of Plato. One illustration always given is our Lord's utterance<sup>2</sup>: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God." This, Celsus says, is taken from Plato's words: "That for one who is very good also to be rich is impossible." Origen finds no difficulty in answering this charge, and in this particular instance shows that the point of the remark is greatly weakened in Plato by his not referring to the camel. Origen also shows that Christian writers, even before his day, had argued that it was the philosophy of Plato that was not original, but that it was borrowed from Hebrew sources which Plato may have studied during his sojourn in Egypt. Plato is charged with borrowing his distinction between Being that is only and never becomes from the name of Jehovah, "I am that I am"; and also with deriving his ideas from the law given to Moses on Mt. Sinai.

---

<sup>1</sup> Contra Celsum (ed. Mosheim) pp. 410, 604-610, 621, 622, 624, 766, 778, 814.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 619.

Origen<sup>1</sup>, though he does not insist on these views concerning the origin of certain Platonic tenets, does not dissent from them. However, modern scholars for the most part do not allow any contact between Plato and Hebrew thought in Egypt.

But be that as it may, there can be no doubt that whatever vague resemblances there are between Platonism and Christianity, they lie entirely in the field of morality, which alone could never have created Christianity. We find no consciousness of sin in Plato and the idea of immortality, while expressed, appears vague and fluctuating. However, Plato's whole moral system, even granting that it was accurately reproduced in Christianity, which is hardly the case, could at best be only the ethical presupposition of the Christian religion. It has been pointed out, and very correctly, that Mohammed could, with far more ease, have gotten all he wanted in Plato, than the alleged human authors of Christianity.

The absence of every definitely Christian doctrine in Plato cannot be emphasized too strongly. The Trinity has been

---

<sup>1</sup> Contra Celsum (ed. Mosheim): p. 410:

"Ich lasse es übrighens dahin gestellet sein ob Plato selbst auf diese Einfälle geraten sei; oder ob das wahr sei, was einige gläuben, das er auf seiner Reise durch Egypten mit einigen in der jüdischen Religion erfahrenen Leuten, bekannt geworden sei, und vieles von denselben gelernet habe."

suggested, but the resemblance is merely verbal.<sup>1</sup> The doctrine as well as the name Logos is not found, and any idea of an Incarnation is precluded by Plato's depreciation of matter. There is absolutely no foreshadowing of the doctrine of the Atonement. Undoubtedly Plato's description of the fate of the perfectly righteous man is very remarkable: "They will say that in such a situation the just man will be scourged, racked, fettered, will have his eyes burnt out, and at last, after suffering every kind of torture, will be crucified, and thus learn that it is best to resolve not to be, but to seem just." This has often been pointed out as an unconscious prophecy; but it is far more reasonable to believe that it was the death of his great master Socrates that led Plato to express this truth. From his tragic end Plato had learned what he graphically described as the fate of the truly good man. As to any idea of Atonement, it is not only entirely absent in Plato but also in those later Christian theologians most profoundly influenced by him and Neo-Platonism. Butler remarks<sup>2</sup>: "They abound with noble thoughts nobly expressed, but they are all marked with the characteristic defect of Platonized Christianity - a forgetfulness or inadequate

---

<sup>1</sup> Contra Celsum p. 608.

<sup>2</sup> Is the Evolution of Christianity from Natural Sources credible? p. 14.

commemoration of the most tremendous proof this part of the universe has ever been permitted to witness of the reality of the Divine hatred for sin - the fact of the Christian atonement."

The Resurrection of the body is not only unknown, but excluded from the system of Plato by his depreciation of all matter, including the body. With these essential and distinctive features of true Christianity entirely absent in Platonism, it is impossible to trace any relation between the two.

In view of these facts, it is hardly necessary to raise other difficulties<sup>1</sup> as to how Christ, or the writers of the New Testament, treated in this connection from a merely human point of view, could have become acquainted with Plato and his writings. These differences and difficulties have been so widely recognized in our day that no serious critic any longer attempts to point out alleged resemblances between Christianity and Platonism.

---

<sup>1</sup> Contra Celsum: p. 619 f.

## I. Alexandrianism and the New Testament

### 1-a. Philo.

In order to gain a complete picture of the Jewish-Alexandrian school of thought it will be necessary to review briefly the life and characteristics of its outstanding exponent, Philo Judaeus.

Philo Judaeus<sup>1</sup> was born about the year 20 B.C. of a rich and wellknown family<sup>2</sup>. Of his life very little is known outside of his visit to Rome as the leader of an embassy to complain of the brutality of the Prefect Flaccus. This visit occurred in the year 39 A.D.<sup>3</sup> Some time prior to this event and during the lifetime of our Lord he paid a visit to Jerusalem where his priestly birth secured him the privilege of offering sacrifices in the Temple<sup>4</sup>.

With a lifetime of leisure at his command he wrote

---

<sup>1</sup> The surname "Judaeus" was given him early in the second century to distinguish him from a Christian bishop of Alexandria. Cf. Eusebius.

<sup>2</sup> His brother, the Alabarch Alexander, is mentioned by Josephus several times: Antt. 18, 6 § 3. 19, 5 § 1. 20, 5 § 2.

<sup>3</sup> Philo himself has left us a complete record of that expedition in the two works which comprise the political section of his writings: Legatio ad Gaium; Contra Flaccum.

<sup>4</sup> Eusebius: Praep. Evang. VIII, 12.



numerous works which Gförer<sup>1</sup> excellently divides into four general classes:-- 1. Philosophic (De mundi incorruptibilitate; Quod omnis probus liber; De vita contemplativa); 2. Historical (De mundi opificio; De vita Mosis; De Decalogo; De Monarchia; De Circumcisione; De legibus specialibus; De praemiis et poenis etc.); 3. Allegorising (Liber Legum allegoriarum; De somniis etc.); 4. Political (Legatio ad Gaium; Contra Flaccum).

It is certainly difficult to define Philo's exact position in the history of Philosophy. While he was undoubtedly the foremost exponent of Jewish Hellenism, which is supposed to have exerted such a profound influence on the New Testament writers, he was by no means its founder and originator.<sup>2</sup> The whole period<sup>3</sup> of which Philo is the central figure was characterized by eclectism,

---

<sup>1</sup> Philo: I, 7-37.

<sup>2</sup> Traces of the peculiarities and characteristics of the Alexandrian school of philosophy can be found in the extra-canonical books of Wisdom which undoubtedly antedate Philo. For example, the author of the "Wisdom of Solomon" repeatedly exhibits the influence of Greek philosophy. Cf. 8,7.

<sup>3</sup> Windelband in his "History of Philosophy" calls the period of Philo the "Religious Period". This is very evidently a misnomer; this period can hardly be called Religious. Its eclecticism naturally also absorbed some religion but its theistic conception was nevertheless always metaphysical rather than ethical, and it never even in its ethics transcended metaphysics, but ever remained a matter of contemplation and thought, never becoming a matter of worship and conscience.

a peculiar attempt to reconcile and harmonize religion with philosophy. Among the predecessors of Philo, Aristobolus, who was religious enough to present one of the Ptolemies with a copy of the Septuagint, constantly appeals to verses in Orpheus and Linus in Homer and Hesiod as having equal authority with the Pentateuch. With Philo himself, the great men of Greek philosophy appear side by side with the Old Testament, as bearers of wisdom. His unbounded admiration for Plato appears when he calls him τὸν ἱερώτατον παντῶν<sup>1</sup>. In the same passage he uses the significant appellation: τὸν τῶν βασιλείων ἱερώτατον Δίασον

Philo's own reasoning was so deeply affected by his admiration for the Greek philosophers that he must properly

---

Cf. Also "Quis Rerum Divinarum heres sit", 43.

<sup>1</sup> "Quod omnis probus liber" = it is probably the second half of a work on the freedom of the just according to Stoic principles. Although its genuineness has been disputed by Frankel, Grätz ("Geschichte" etc. III, 464ff) and Hilgenfeld (Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie 1888 pp. 49-71) it is now accepted by Wendland, Schürer and others.

be classified as a philosopher and not a theologian.<sup>1</sup> In entire keeping with the fundamental characteristic of the Jewish-Hellenists

---

<sup>1</sup> To give a lengthy defense of this conclusion at this point would carry the present inquiry too far afield. To students of Philo who overemphasize his influence on the New Testament Philo has always been a great theologian and "forerunner of Christianity". However, the validity of the above conclusion will become apparent in the course of this study. In general, his dualistic contrast between God and the world, between the finite and the infinite, so evident throughout his works, appears also in Neo-Pythagorism. The influence of Stoicism is unmistakable in the De Allegoriis Legum III, 3, doctrine of God as the only efficient cause, in De Cherubim 8 34, that of divine reason immanent in the world, in that of the powers emanating from God and suffusing the world. His conception of matter as dead, inert and even non-existent harmonizes in its essentials with the Platonic and Stoic views. The influence of Plato's "Timaeus" is strongly evidenced in his account of the Creation (De Opificio Mundi), in his exposition of the world as having no beginning and no end and in his placing the act of creation outside of time, on the Platonic ground that time begins only with the world. Timaeus 38B: χρόνος δ' οὐκ ἔσται μετὰ τὸ γενέσθαι γένεσθαι. The influence of Pythagorism appears in his frequent symbolical use of numbers. To prove our contention that Philo freely adopted Greek philosophical concepts which were absolutely contradictory to the Jewish religion, we need only point to his fluctuating conception of the human soul. At one point he adopts the Stoic division of the soul into eight faculties, then again he uses the Platonic trichotomy of

of Alexandria Philo's system<sup>1</sup> was essentially eclectic, a mixtum compositum of platonic, stoic and Neo-pythagorean principles. The

---

(Cont'd)

reason, courage and desire or the Aristotelian division of the vegetative, emotive and rational souls. To Philo the body and all matter was per se evil, which conception is based on the Neo-Pythagorean doctrine and anticipates the Gnostics and Manicheans. His ethics and allegories (on the latter we shall dwell more fully in connection with Paul) exhibit strong traces of the influence of Stoicism. Conclusive proof for our estimate of Philo is his own admission that he owes his real learning to Greek philosophers (see "De Congressu Quaerendae Eruditionis Gratiae" 6; "De Specialibus Legibus" II, 229). Schürer remarks p. 547: "Philo leitet alle philos. Lehren, die er tatsächlich von den griechischen Philosophen sich angeeignet hat, formell aus dem Alten Testament ab."

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Gaenssle, in his valuable article in the "Theological Quarterly VIII, 65 on "The Logos", makes the pertinent remark that "Philo has no system; he is full of contradictions and incongruities. God is ἄποιος, ἄρρητος, ἀκατάληπτος ; to predicate any qualities of Him would be to reduce him to the finite. In this respect Philo anticipated the omnis determinatio est negatio of Baruch Spinoza" p. 69.

tremendous influence of his Graeco-philosophical training can be seen even in his language; Siegfried remarks: "die Einwirkung der platonischen Schriften auf Philo auch in lexikalischer und phraseologischer Hinsicht ist sehr erheblich zu nennen."<sup>1</sup>

When Philo applies the results of his philosophical training to the exposition of the Old Testament his incongruities become glaring. He is an ardent exponent of the verbal inspiration; yet, in spite of this principle he uses the sacred text very freely - omits words, allegorizes others, changes some, etc., thus exhibiting two entirely irreconcilable attitudes. For example:<sup>2</sup> In Gen. 15,6 for the clause, "it was counted to him for his righteousness", he substitutes "he was considered righteous." In expounding Gen. 2,21: "And he took a rib", etc. he remarks: "The literal narrative in this case is mythical, for, could anybody accept the story that woman was made out of the rib of a man?" Instances of this sort could be multiplied<sup>3</sup>; whatever

---

<sup>1</sup> Siegfried: Philo S. 32. The same author, who was a profound student of Philo, remarks in the Jewish Encyclopaedia sub verbo Philo Judaeus: "Philo formed his language by means of extensive reading of the classics." "His works offer an anthology of Greek phraseology of the most different periods; and his language, in consequence, lacks simplicity and purity."

<sup>2</sup> Leg. Alleg. II, 19 (Yonge's translation).

<sup>3</sup> A complete catalogue of these changes in the text may be found in Ryle: "Philo and Holy Scripture."

doctrine he promulgated or language he used it is nevertheless evident that in reality he accepted as much of the literal text as suited his scheme of thought, and had no hesitation in explaining away what proved incompatible with that. Here, then we find his principle of the twofold interpretation of the Word of God - the literal and the allegorical. The letter of the text could be held fast as long as it presented no contradictions to the Greek philosophies. As soon as it did, whether those contradictions were real or apparent, the literal meaning of the text must be given up and the allegorical interpretation adopted. With vastly more enthusiasm than calm judgment Philo threw himself into the task of allegorizing Scripture in such a way as to make it speak the language of Greek philosophy. This tendency exhibits itself throughout his writings - in fact it is the impelling power of his work. His treatise "De Opificio Mundi" is an open endeavour to bring the cosmogony of Gen. 1 into harmony with the views of Plato in his Timaeus. His "De Vita Mosis" and the cognate tracts "De Decalogo" and "Legum Allegoriarum Libri" exhibit throughout an earnest, yet at times ridiculous, effort to reconcile the "Thorah" with the moral and ethical precepts of Plato.

Of the greatest importance in Philo is his doctrine of the "Logoi" or "Logos"; and it is this point which is of particular interest to the student of Christian origins, since it is supposed to have supplied the basis for the doctrine of the Logos in the New Testament.

In order to gain the proper perspective for the argument it will be convenient to trace the Logos-idea to its original source.

Its history begins with Heraclitus of Ephesus (535 - 475 B.C.). To him the Logos was reason or reality, or the divine soul of the world. His idea is somewhat narrowed down by Anaxagoras in whom the Logos (or νοῦς, the two terms being evidently synonymous and interchangeable) is strictly the divine Intelligence.

With the advent of Stoicism the Logos-idea received a somewhat more definite form. Regarding fire as the primordial substance, early Stoicism called it the λόγος σπερματικός the seminal Reason, since it was conceived as being endowed with inherent productive activity. This λόγος σπερματικός manifests itself in the various phenomena of nature, consequently we have here for the first time the plural, λόγοι σπερματικοί. While the earlier Stoicism undoubtedly distinguished between the λόγος ἐσθιάθετος, the potential, unmanifested Reason, and the λόγος προφορικός, reason in action, manifested, it nevertheless cannot be emphasized too strongly that in no remnant of Stoic literature does λόγος ever lose its first meaning for philosophy, that of "Reason, Thought."

Taking over this conception from the Greek philosophers Philo poured into it the various elements of his contradictory system. He adopted the Stoic conception of the Logos as reason manifested, the divine νοῦς at work in the κόσμος

as the efficient cause, the *λόγος σπερματικός* .<sup>1</sup>

However, besides this philosophical concept Philo also incorporated three other distinct lines of thought into his doctrine of the Logos: the platonic doctrine of the archetypal ideas or the *ἰδέα ἰδεῶν* , the Old Testament doctrine of angels and the Greek conception of demons. Out of all these elements Philo constructed his own peculiar doctrine of the Logos. Following Heraclitus he calls the Logos the *λόγος τομεύς* which calls the various objects into being by a combination of contrasts.<sup>2</sup> Imitating Plato the Logos is the idea which

---

<sup>1</sup> To the Stoics it was the operative principle that pervaded all matter. To it the phrase was applied *ὁ κοινὸς λόγος ὁ διὰ πάντων ἐρχόμενος*. To this Stoic conception we must undoubtedly ascribe the preponderance of influence in the formulation of the Logos doctrine of Philo. Zeller remarks (Philosophie der Griechen, III, 2 S. 385): "Man durfte nur dieser stoischen Logos-lehre durch die Unterscheidung des Logos von der Gottheit ihr pantheistisches, durch seine Unterscheidung von dem gebildeten Stoff, ihr materialistisches Gepräge abstreifen, und der philonische Logos war fertig."

<sup>2</sup> "Quis Rerum Divinarum - Heres sit", paragraph 43.



includes all other ideas<sup>1</sup>, the power which includes all others. He is neither created nor uncreated.<sup>2</sup> He is the mediator<sup>3</sup>, the archangel who reveals God to man<sup>4</sup>, the means by which God has created the world.<sup>5</sup> Of particular interest is the fact that Philo

---

<sup>1</sup> The ἰδέα ἰδεῶν : "De Migratione Abrahami" paragraph 18. De Specialibus Legibus" - paragraph 36.

<sup>2</sup> "Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres sit", I: οὔτε ἀγέννητος ὡς ὁ Θεὸς ὢν, οὔτε γεννητός ὡς ὑμεῖς, ἀλλὰ κείσος τῶν ἄκρων, ἀμφοτέροις ὁμικρεύων

<sup>3</sup> "Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres sit", I: πρεσβευτῆς τοῦ ἡγεμόνος πρὸς τὸ ὑπήκοον

<sup>4</sup> Leg. All. I, 122: τὸν ἄγγελον ὅς ἐστι λόγος De Confusione Linguarum", paragraph 37: τὸν πρωτόγονον αὐτοῦ λόγου, τὸν ἀγγέλω πρεσβύτατον, ὡς ἂν ἀρχάγγελον πολυώνυμον ὑπάρχοντα.

<sup>5</sup> Leg. All. I, 106: σκιά Θεοῦ δὲ ὁ Λόγος αὐτοῦ ἐστίν, ᾧ καθάπερ ὄργανῳ προσχρησάμενος ἐκκοσμοποιεῖ.

De Opificio Mundi, passim. In De Opificio Mundi the Logos plays an important part; not only is it the pattern after which the νοῦς of man is created, but also the power by which God created - a logical and metaphysical necessity for Philo, since God, essentially good, cannot come into immediate and direct contact with matter, essentially evil. Gaenssle: l.c. p. 70: "This intermediate agent is the only bond by which he can unite his etherialized God with the finite world."

calls the Logos ἱκέτης and παράκλητος.<sup>1</sup> In several of these passages the Logos is very evidently hypostasised; in others, again, it is just as evidently not. Zeller remarks:<sup>2</sup> "Die Bestimmungen, welche nach den Voraussetzungen unsers Denkens die Persönlichkeit des Logos fordern würden, kreuzen sich bei Philo mit solchen, die sie unmöglich machen, und das Eigentümliche seiner Vorstellungsweise besteht gerade darin, das er den Widerspruch beider nicht bemerkt, das der Begriff des Logos zwischen persönlichem und unpersönlichem Sinn unklar in der Mitte schwebt. Diese Eigentümlichkeit wird gleich sehr verkannt wenn man den philonischen Logos schlechtweg für eine Person ausser Gott hält, und wenn man umgekehrt annimmt, das er nur Gott unter einer bestimmten Relation, nach der Seite seiner Lebendigkeit, bezeichne. Nach Philo's Meinung ist er beides, eben deshalb aber keines von beiden ausschliesslich; und das es unmöglich sei, diese Bestimmungen zu einem Begriff zu verknüpfen, sieht er nicht . . . Philo kann aber auch diese Bestimmungen gar nicht entbehren. Der Logos ist ja für ihn, wie alle göttlichen Kräfte, nur deshalb notwendig, weil der höchste Gott selbst in keine unmittelbare Berührung mit dem Endlichen treten kann, er soll zwischen beiden stehen und ihre gegenseitige Beziehung

---

<sup>1</sup> "De Migratione Abrahami", paragraph 45: τὸν ἀρχιερέα λόγον . "Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres sit", I, 42:  
ὁ δ' αὐτὸς ἱκέτης μὲν ὅτι τοῦ θνητοῦ κηραίνοντος  
ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸ ἄφθαρτον.  
Also: De Vita Mosis III, 14.

<sup>2</sup> "Philosophie der Griechen" III, 2 S. 378-380.

vermitteln; wie könnte er dies, wenn er nicht von beiden verschieden, wenn er nur eine bestimmte göttliche Eigenschaft wäre? In diesem Fall hätten wir ja wieder die unmittelbare Wirkung Gottes auf die endlichen Dinge, welche Philo für unzulässig erklärt. Andererseits muss der Logos nun freilich auch wieder mit den Gliedern des Gegensatzes, den er vermitteln soll, identisch sein; er muss ebenso eine Eigenschaft Gottes, wie eine in der Welt wirkende Kraft sein. Beides widerspruchslos zu vereinigen, konnte Philo nicht gelingen."

1-b.

It is this conception<sup>1</sup>, then, vague, philosophical and fluctuating, to which, it is alleged, the Prologue of the Gospel according to St. John as well as the Logos doctrine in other

---

<sup>1</sup> There are in Philo's works 62 references to the Logos. Of these 26 seem with any clearness to speak of the Logos as distinct from God. The other 36 can hardly be classified except that in them the concept is never hypostasized. In one peculiar passage Philo identifies the Logos with the world, De Opificio Mundi 6: "It is manifest also, that the archetypal seal, which we call the world, which is perceptible only to the intellect, must itself be the archetypal model, the idea of ideas, the Reason (Logos) of God." (Yonge's translation, Vol. I, 6).

parts of the New Testament is greatly indebted. Dean Inge writes<sup>1</sup>: "The large obligations of the author of the Fourth Gospel to the Philonian school cannot reasonably be denied, though they have often been questioned. It is clear from the tone of the Prologue that Philo's conception of the Logos, or something akin to it, was already familiar to those for whom the Evangelist wrote. No explanation of the word Logos is given and almost every verse in the Prologue might be paralleled from Philo. Technical terms from Philo (σφραγίς and παράκλητος are examples) abound in the Gospel. Indeed, the whole treatment adopted by the Evangelist presupposes the Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy of religion and would be unintelligible without it." Schürer remarks<sup>2</sup>: "Schon das Neue Testament zeigt unverkennbare Spuren philonischer Weisheit; und fast alle griechischen Kirchenväter der ersten Jahrhunderte, die Apologeten so gut wie die Alexandriner, die Gnostiker so gut wie ihre Gegner, und auch noch die grossen griechischen Theologen der späteren Jahrhunderte haben bald mehr, bald weniger, sei es direkt oder indirekt, bewusst oder unbewusst, aus Philo geschöpft." Harnack<sup>3</sup> is very definitely radical: "The writer of this prologue

---

<sup>1</sup> Hastings Encycl. of Religion and Ethics, sub verbo Logos.

<sup>2</sup> Schürer: "Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes" III, 562.

<sup>3</sup> Quoted by Dr. Gaenssle in Theo. Quarterly VIII, p. 66 from "Das Wesen des Christentums", p. 127ff.

is the forerunner of those Christian teachers who, prior to their conversion to Christianity, had been adherents of the Platonic - Stoic philosophy, and, to whom, therefore, the idea of the Logos was an inalienable element in their Weltanschauung. The identification of the Logos with Jesus Christ was the most important step ever taken in the history of Christian dogma. Instead of the wholly unintelligible term 'Messiah' a more intelligible one was found at a single stroke; Christology, fluctuating by reason of its multifarious modes of expression, received a fixed form; the world-significance of Christ was established, his mysterious relation to the Deity made clear; Cosmos, reason and ethics were gathered together in one central idea." Dr. Gaenssle also quotes the historian Gibbon<sup>1</sup>: "A prophet or apostle inspired by the Deity can alone exercise a lawful dominion over the faith of mankind; and the theology of Plato might have been forever confounded with the philosophical visions of the Academy, the Porch, and the Lycaeum, if the name and divine attributes of the Logos had not been confirmed by the celestial pen of the last and most sublime of the Evangelists. The Christian revelation, which was consummated under the reign of Nerva, disclosed to the world the amazing secret that the Logos, who was with God from the beginning, and was God, who had

---

<sup>1</sup> l.c. p. 67 from Decline and Fall Vol. I, p. 305 f.

made all things, and for whom all things had been made, was incarnate in the Person of Jesus Christ."

Because of the fact that the Prologue of John's Gospel has aroused the attention of speculative minds<sup>1</sup> throughout the ages, the literature on the subject<sup>2</sup> is tremendous and quotations, on the order of the above, could be multiplied indefinitely. The writer who today rejects all influence of Philo on John is

---

<sup>1</sup> Already Augustine remarks that the Neo-Platonists were deeply impressed with it (De civitate Dei X, 29) and very early John was designated by the symbol of the eagle because "he alone had soared above earthly considerations into the realm of ideas and true Gnosis." Celsus, the heathen philosopher, also refers to it. (Keim, Celsus' wahres Wort, p. 223 ff).

<sup>2</sup> In this connection Hilgenfeld's assertion that the Prologue exhibits traces of Valentinianism (Gnosticism) is only worthy of passing notice, since it has never received any support. Cf. Hilgenfeld: "Das Johannes-evangelium" p. 19 ff. The theory shatters on the first expression of the Prologue  $\bar{\epsilon}\nu \bar{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta\tilde{\iota}$  which was hypostasized by Basilides, Valentinus and Marcion, thus creating three distinct entities in V. 1, the  $\bar{\epsilon}\nu \bar{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta\tilde{\iota}$ , the  $\Lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$  and  $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ . To ascribe such an idea to John is ridiculous.

by far the exception.<sup>1</sup>

In the consideration of the Prologue it is of prime importance to keep in mind the fact that it is not metaphysical or speculative. The Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel, although the storm center of New Testament criticism for many years, has only been more firmly established by the assaults upon it, and there are few who will deny that John, the peaceloving, the Apostle of Love, the disciple whom Jesus loved, was never a speculative philosopher. From all that we know of his character and tendencies, it is farthest removed from the realm of actual fact that he should be excogitating for himself a religio-philosophic view of the world, a "Weltanschauung". On the contrary, it can be definitely shown, that he is intensely practical, that he has a double and most practical purpose in

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Sanday in his "Commentary on Fourth Gospel" holds the unique view that the author drew his doctrine of the Logos from the combination of the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, the Memra of the Targumims, and Philo; although this last connection was probably derived more from personal intercourse than from reading. That this view is untenable, if for no other reason than that it attempts to combine and unify widely divergent and contradictory conceptions, is apparent.

writing his whole Gospel - the open proclamation of the deity of the Savior, and that this proclamation might serve to bring men to faith.<sup>1</sup> This double purpose he himself expresses in 20,31: "But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His name." This, then, is also the purpose of the Prologue - a purpose so intensely practical that metaphysical speculation can have no place in it.

In this connection it is also worthy of note that John at no time exhibits weak, temporizing tendencies, which would lead him to a favorable attitude toward Greek philosophical systems. He throughout emphasizes most strongly the absolute deity of Jesus Christ; he alone records the conversation with Nicodemus in which the indispensable condition of entering the kingdom of God is "that a man be born again"; to him faith

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. L. Fürbringer: "Einleitung": "Dieser Zweck lässt sich deutlich erkennen aus den von ihm in jedem Kapitel mitgeteilten Taten und namentlich Reden Jesu." Vgl. besonders 1, 1-18. 49; 2, 11. 13-22; 3, 13-18; 4, 14. 42; 5, 17-47; 6, 35-58; etc. (p. 34).



and love are of prime importance and not any vague philosophical conception of "virtue".

Although the examination of John's purpose, character<sup>1</sup> and tendencies makes the theory that he was influenced by Greek philosophy most implausible from the very outset, the insistence of so many writers makes a detailed consideration of the phraseology and thought of the Prologue imperative.

The word itself, *Λόγος* is found in our prologue four x times, three times in the opening sentence: *Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος*  
*καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος*

and once in the closing sentence *ὁ*

*λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*. In these sentences it stands absolutely while in Rev. 19, 13 and 1 John 1, 1 we find it modified by *τοῦ θεοῦ* and *τῆς ξωῆς* respectively.

---

<sup>1</sup> Zahn: "Kommentar zum Johannesevangelium" - p. 100:  
"Hätte Johannes von dem wunderlichen Gebräu aus stoischen und platonischen Gedanken und misbrauchten Worten des Alten Testaments, welches man alexandrinische Religionsphilosophie nennt, überhaupt gewusst, so würde er sich mit Abscheu davon abgewandt haben, so gewiss er das Bild eines schlichten Verstandes, eines entschiedenen Charakters und einer stets auf die Hauptsache gerichteten religiösen und ethischen Betrachtung ist, welches uns in allem was uns sonst von dem Apostel Johannes aus den Tagen seiner Jugend und aus den Jahren seines Greisenalters überliefert ist, entgentritt."

The first phase of our problem is presented by Dean Inge x  
in the words "the conception of the Philonic Logos was undoubtedly  
familiar to the readers." Based on the fact that John introduces  
the term so abruptly, evidently very confident that it would be  
properly understood, the contention has arisen that his readers  
must have been accustomed to its usage from the realm of  
philosophy.

However, this assumption is amenable to conclusive con-  
tradiction. There can be no doubt that when John wrote his  
Gospel, the name Logos constituted a part of the Christian  
vocabulary as a current designation of Jesus Christ although x  
the fact that it appears only in the Johannine writings points  
to a comparatively late origin.

The question then arises: Can we find a plausible ex-  
planation of the origin and use of the term in the early Christian  
church? The following offers the only possible one:

If there was any doctrine for which the early Christians x  
had to contend most earnestly and insistently, both over against  
Judaism and paganism, it was the doctrine of the deity of Jesus  
Christ. Therefore we can well conceive of them adopting a  
name for their Savior which would at one and the same time  
express the fulness of His deity and distinguish Him from God the  
Father; and such a designation they in the case, specifically  
John, found in the name Logos, the "Word", based entirely on  
the Old Testament revelation. This explanation demands more  
detailed consideration.

In the New Testament the only definition possible for Logos is "Word"; never is it used of "reason". The evident parallelism<sup>1</sup> of Gen. 1,1: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" with John 1,1: "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and God was the Word" in conjunction with an examination of Ps. 33,6: "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth" makes the conclusion inevitable that the word Logos comes from Old Testament<sup>2</sup> sources. This conclusion becomes all the more reasonable when we note that John here could only have chosen a name which would be in entire accord, first, with his purpose, and secondly, with the grandeur and sublimity of the whole prologue. Hengstenberg<sup>3</sup> remarks: "Hierher gehört nur ein solcher Name, durch den das vorweltliche Dasein, die innige Gemeinschaft mit Gott, die Gottheit bezeichnet wird, und aus dem sich die Teilnahme

---

<sup>1</sup> The  $\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\rho\chi\eta$  of John 1,1 so clearly points back to the  $\eta\ \omega\varsigma\ \eta\eta$  of Gen. 1,1 that the conclusion is inevitable that also the  $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$  points back to the  $\eta\ \omega\varsigma\ \eta\eta$  of v. 3.

<sup>2</sup> The quasi-personality ascribed in many passages of the Old Testament to the Word of God as the principle of His action points in the same direction; cf. for example, Is. 55, 11 and Ps. 107, 20.

<sup>3</sup> Komm. zum Johannes Evangelium: p. 43.

an der Weltschöpfung unmittelbar ergibt." The name Logos then connoted for the early Christians and John the highest that could possibly be said of Christ; everywhere where the name Logos appears it stands in connection with the highest and most divine that can be predicated of Christ<sup>1</sup>. This would be entirely inexplicable if the early Christians had derived it from extra-Biblical sources, if the name were such an one which could denote merely a mediating power; the name Logos connotes the divine nature and fulness of Christ<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note also the contrast to *σάρξ* in V. 14 and 1 John 1,1:

*λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ* and Rev. 19, 13: *λόγος τῆς ἑωῆς*

That the latter passage refers to Christ is denied by Baur (Neutestt. Theologie p. 216 ff) for insufficient reasons.

<sup>2</sup> This point is defined more closely by Dr. Fürbringer (Notes on Prov. 8): "Bei dem Begriff Logos ist die Beziehung auf die Welt nicht das Erste. Christus als Logos ist das in dem Inneren und Wesen Gottes Gesprochene und dann aus dem Inneren Gottes Hervorgehende." Bengel remarks: "Der Name Jesus zeigt besonders seine Gnade und der Name Logos besonders seine Majestät an. Wie tief muss das, was durch diesen Namen bezeichnet wird in der unerforschlichen Gottheit liegen! Ein Wort eines Menschen ist nicht nur desjenige, das er mit dem Munde ausspricht und durch das Gehör vernehmen lässt, sondern auch das was er bei sich und in seinem Sinne hat und in seinen Gedanken lieget. Wenn dieses inwendige Wort nicht wäre, so könnte es in keine Rede und Aussprache gefasst werden."

It can therefore only keep its full meaning and import for us if we trace its source back to Gen. 1 and Ps. 33,6 to which v. 3: "All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made," so evidently points.

If, then, we have traced the origin of the designation Logos to its source in the Old Testament, we are now prepared to note whether John connected any graeco-philosophical conceptions with his usage of the name. And here, in spite of the fact that the connection has often been so strongly emphasized we can note only the most amazing divergencies. John's conception of the Logos differs toto caelo from that of Philo. The following points will serve to bear out this conclusion.

1. With John the term *λόγος*, as we have seen, means "Word". With Philo, the meaning of the term never transcends that of "Reason". When he wishes to give the designation the meaning "Word" he invariably adds *ῥῆμα*. In describing the creation he says that God has made all things through His *λόγῳ ῥήματι*<sup>1</sup>. The creation itself is ascribed to the *ῥῆμα Θεοῦ*.

2. In John the Logos is clearly hypostasized. It denotes a very definite person, Jesus Christ, the Messiah.<sup>2</sup> Now Philo

---

<sup>1</sup> De Opificio Mundi 1 and passim.

<sup>2</sup> It is amazing to note that Philo never mentions the Messiah, not even under the name "the Son of Man." This fact also serves to bear out our conclusion that Philo was pre-eminently influenced by his graeco-philosophical training.

does not only never identify his Logos with the Messiah, but even his hypostasing of the Logos is always vague. Niedner<sup>1</sup> summarizes his conclusions on this point in the significant words: "No passage in Philo demands a hypostasising differentiation between God and the Logos, but the greater majority absolutely exclude such an idea."

3. In John's Prologue the word Logos, besides expressing the deity of Jesus Christ, also includes the Biblical truth that He who is designated by this appellation is the only true Mediator between God and the world, i.e. that only through Him can men come to faith and a knowledge of God. This idea, in spite of many high-sounding phrases and expressions, is entirely absent in Philo; he does not need any mediator, in fact, to Philo, such an one would have been entirely superfluous. According to him, the "sage" enters into communion with God, attains to a knowledge of God, not through any mediation, not even by a process of logical thought, but rather by a process of mystic enthusiasm in which the reasoning faculty and self-consciousness are entirely

---

<sup>1</sup> "De subsistentia τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ ἀπὸ  
Philoneam tributa", Quaestiones Philoneae II, p. 3.

suspended and the individual subject coalesces with the object - God.<sup>1</sup> In this respect Philo is the forerunner of Plotinus and later Neo-Platonists. The doctrine of John stands in tremendous contrast: all access to God is impossible except by the Logos; cf. 1,12: "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name", and 14,6: "Jesus saith unto Him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me".

4. The crowning divergence between Philo and John appears when the words of v.14 are taken into consideration:

καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο. John tells his readers that the Logos, who was with God in the beginning, by whom all

---

<sup>1</sup> "Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres sit"; 69 and 70: "If a yearning come upon thee, O soul, to possess the good, which is Divine, forsake not only thy 'country', the body, and thy 'kindred', the sense-life, and thy 'father's house', the reason, but flee from thyself, and depart out of thyself, in a Divine madness of prophetic inspiration, as those possessed with Corybantic frenzy. For that high lot becomes thine when the understanding is rapt in ecstasy, feverishly agitated with a heavenly passion, beside itself, driven by the power of Him who is true Being, drawn upwards towards Him, while truth leads the way." (Yonge's translation). This passage also furnishes a good example of Philo's allegory.

things were made, became flesh, i.e. became a human being, a man. To Philo matter was per se evil<sup>1</sup> and the Logos, in the few cases in which it might be hypostasised, must always remain above the sensuous world; to him then the words *ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο* would have been absolutely abhorrent. Baur, a strong exponent of the theory that Philo's influence is noticeable in the Prologue, felt the force of this objection so keenly that he sought to explain away v. 14 altogether on the basis that John meant to say that the Logos became visible by a kind of theophany, thereby accusing John of Docetism. However, John's own Gospel furnishes the best commentary on what he means by v. 14: He pictures Jesus as a true man - Jesus is weary and asks the Samaritan woman for a drink to quench his thirst (4, 6 and 7); He sheds tears at the grave of a friend (11, 35); He is moved and troubled (11, 33).

The tremendous importance of the words *καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο* in shattering the theory we are examining is recognized by sober criticism on all sides. Edersheim remarks:<sup>2</sup> "St. John strikes the pen through Alexandrianism when he lays it down as the fundamental fact of New Testament history that 'the

---

<sup>1</sup> Bentwich in his "Philo Judaeus", a defense of Philo from the Jewish point of view, attempts to deny this fact. However, Philo was so strongly influenced by Plato, also in this particular, that any denial of the presence of this conception in his works is entirely untenable. It was for this reason that matter, flesh, is essentially evil that Philo first had recourse to his Logoi.

<sup>2</sup> Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah: Vol. I. p. 56.



Logos was made flesh' just as St. Paul does when he proclaims the great mystery of 'God manifest in the flesh'." Farrar says<sup>1</sup>: "Philo's misty and everchanging Logos is an intellectual possession for Judaising philosophers, but is almost inconceivably removed from the Divine Redeemer, the Savior of all the world . . . The four words of St. John "The Word became flesh" created an epoch. They tell us more, and are of infinitely more value to us than all the pages and volumes on the "Logos" which Philo and his contemporaries ever wrote. They summarize and concentrate the inmost meaning of the Old Testament revelation." •

One objection advanced by modern criticism still remains to be answered briefly: If John did not get his doctrine of Logos from Alexandrianism, where did he find it?

We have already attempted to show that the expression Logos finds its basis in the Old Testament; and, leaving the question of inspiration entirely aside for the moment, we can with equal certainty point to the Old Testament as the source also for John's doctrine of the Logos.

In considering this point the Old Testament doctrine of the Angel of the Lord is of importance since it was undoubtedly one of the phases of Old Testament revelation which John had in mind when he penned the Prologue. The  $\text{אֱלֹהִים} \text{ אֲנִי}$  first appears in Gen. 16. From 16,7 we gather that to the expression "and Jehovah appeared to him", we must add "in His Angel" as, for example, also in 18, 1. We arrive at the same conclusion by other methods. For example, in Gen. 28, 11-22 Jehovah appears

---

<sup>1</sup> The Early Days of Christianity I, p. 276.

to Jacob. In Gen. 31, 13 the "Angel of the Lord" calls himself the God of Bethel, referring back to the episode in Chap. 28. In Ex. 23, 21 he is designated as the angel in whom the "Name of the Lord" is, i.e. God Himself. In Josh. 6,2 he is called Jehovah. In Josh. 5,14 he appears as the "ruler of the armies of Jehovah" since the powers of heaven are subservient to Him. In v.15 he ascribes to himself divine honor by commanding Joshua to unloose his shoes since the place where he stands is holy. In Is. 63,9 he is called the Angel of the Presence, i.e. the angel in whom God reveals Himself, in whom the face or presence of God is manifest. In Hos. 12,4 the person who wrestled with Jacob is called Elohim, just as in Genesis, but in v.5 he is called "the angel". In Zechariah 11 the personal appearance of the "angel of the Lord" among His people is foretold. Finally, according to Mal. 3,1 the "angel of the covenant" will come to His temple.

There can be little doubt that John had this Old Testament doctrine in mind when he penned the Prologue; very often in his Gospel Christ appears as "being sent by God". He undoubtedly refers to it in 12,41 when he says that Isaiah saw Christ's glory; the passage to which he refers is Is. 6,1 in which the prophet speaks of the glory of Jehovah.

However, the locus classicus for our conclusion that the Logos doctrine of John 1 rests on Old Testament revelation is Prov. 8,22-31 which contains not merely a poetical,

but a real, personification<sup>1</sup> of the Chokma and refers clearly to the second Person of the Trinity. This is undoubtedly the Old Testament passage most closely connected with John 1, 1-14 and it, on conjunction with Gen. 1 and the doctrine of "the Angel of the Lord", furnishes us with sufficient grounds to definitely reject any Philonic influence on the Prologue. As far as the Logos of Philo or of Stoicism is concerned, John created his conception of the Logos out of nothing.

---

<sup>1</sup> To present a detailed defense of this conclusion would carry the present inquiry too far afield. Dr. Fürbringer (Notes on Prov. 8): "Die Christliche Kirche hat immer die Stelle messianisch verstanden und die Weisheit hier als Bezeichnung des Sohnes Gottes vor seiner Menschwerdung gefasst. Sie hat die Chokma je und je persönlich gefasst und diese Stelle als Grundlage für die neutesttl. Ausführung des Logos-begriffs angesehen ... Die spätere jüdische Kirche hat diese reale Fassung von der Weisheit als Person. So die Apokryphen: Weisheit 7, 26. 8, 6. 9, 9. 8, 3. 9, 1 and 2. Jesus Sirach: 1, 4 and 9. 24, 1-4 ... Das Neue Testament nimmt deutlich Bezug auf Prov. 8: Luk. 11, 49 and 50. Vgl. dazu Matth. 23, 34 and 35. Matth. 11, 19. Luk. 7, 35. 11, 31. Matth. 12, 42. 1 Kor. 1, 24 & 30. Kol. 2,3. Especially the comparison of Luke 11, 49 & 50 with Matth. 23,34 & 35 clearly shows that Christ in the former passage designates Himself as the wisdom of Prov. 8 appearing in the flesh.

If, then, the Prologue of the Gospel of St. John can only be contrasted with Philo, it is from the outset very probable that the remainder of the Fourth Gospel exhibits no traces of Alexandrianism, whether in the thought or in the vocabulary.

Dr. H. A. A. Kennedy in "Philo's Contribution to Religion" p. 47 ff. is the only author we have found who is ardent enough in his defense of the Alexandrian influence on John to attempt to find certain cognate elements in the two. He remarks: "Beside Philo's constant emphasis on the significance of numbers, e.g. on the number 4 (De Opificio Mundi 45-52), on 7 (ibid. 89-106), on 10 (De Decal. 18-31), may be placed, with some reservation, the six waterpots at Cana, the five husbands of the Samaritan woman, and the five porches at Bethesda. What may be called the 'esoteric' element in the vocabulary of the Fourth Gospel embracing such terms as *ῥάβδος*, *ἄνωθεν ὑψωθῆναι*, *νύμφιος*, *ὑδάτος ζῶν*, *οἱ νεκροί* has parallels in Philo's mystic use of *τόπος* (De Somniis II, 61-68) *ἄφεις* (De Migr. ABr. 32) and *πηγή* (De Fuga 177 f.). Specially noteworthy in Philo is his elaborate symbolism of names. Names and their component parts, he says (De Mut. Nom. 65) are really 'distinctive marks of capacities' (*χαρακτῆρες δυνάμεων*) and, on this principle, such proper names as Egypt, Joseph, Leah, Rachel, etc. designate certain definite qualities or characters. The interpretation of Siloam by the Evangelist suggests an allied standpoint and possibly, if we had a clue to the usage of his

circle, the same might be said of such names as Nathaniel and Nicodemus. Curiously enough, Philo shows the same kind of reticence about Jacob's son, Judah, whom he usually describes as 'the fourth in age' (e.g. De Josepho 15, 189), without mentioning him by name, as the Fourth Evangelist with regard to 'the disciple whom Jesus loved.'"

It is evident that throughout this passage Dr. Kennedy employs very guarded and cautious language - and properly so - for the weakness of his attempted parallelism becomes apparent at a glance. Any comparison between Philo's emphasis on numbers and John's use of them in the passages mentioned is entirely out of the question; John in these passages speaks merely as the historian and does not look upon these numbers as symbolical. To Philo the numbers four, seven and ten in the passages mentioned are fraught with symbolical meaning upon which he dwells at great length. To John the six waterpots at Cana, the five husbands of the Samaritan woman, the five porches at Bethesda, are historical facts and are set down as such.

Dr. Kennedy calls attention to the "esoteric element" in the Gospel according to St. John. An examination of his contention reveals the following facts:

1. John's use of  $\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha$  in 7,30 and 8,20 (cf. 16, 21) is paralleled absolutely by its usage in Matth. 26, 45 and Mark 14, 35.41.

2.  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$  : John alone is supposed to use it in the sense of "again": John 3, 3 and 7:  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\theta\epsilon\nu \gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\eta \theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$  .

However, ἀνωθεν is used in Acts 26, 5 in the sense "from the beginning, from the first", a meaning evidently closely connected with ἀνωθεν in John 3,3: "to begin again, anew, over again." Of especial import is also Gal. 4,9: πάλιν ἀνωθεν<sup>εν</sup> the two words together meaning "again".

3. ὑψωθῆναι : it is used in John of the elevation of Jesus on the cross, John 3,14. 8,28. 12,32. ὑψωθῆναι in this meaning is confined to John; however, in these passages, especially in 12,32 it includes the conception that through the elevation on the cross Jesus will also be raised to glory - and this is closely paralleled by Acts 5,31 and especially Acts 2,33: τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑψωθεῖς . The concept is then not absolutely peculiar to John.

4. νύμφιος : In John 3,29 John the Baptist applies this term to Jesus. However, in Matth. 9,15, Mark 2,19, Luke 5, 34 and Matth. 25, 1.5.10 Jesus calls Himself νύμφιος ; the conception, therefore, being not confined to the Fourth Gospel.

5. ὕδωρ ζωῆς : ὕδωρ ζωῆς is used in Rev. 21, 6. 22, 1.17; ὕδωρ ζωῆς appears in John 4, 10 ff. and 7,38. Although this particular term is confined to John we need not go to extra-biblical sources for the basis of his figurative application; the Old Testament expression  $\text{H}^{\text{h}} \text{H}^{\text{h}} \text{H}^{\text{h}}$  (Gen. 26, 19; Lev. 14,5) furnishes a sufficient explanation.

6. οἱ νεκροί : This term is used so often in the New Testament also in a spiritual sense, that it cannot be termed peculiar to John. Cf. Rom. 6, 13. Eph. 5,14 etc.

This examination leads us to the following conclusion: Since these terms (with the possible exception of *ἰσοψη σῶν* ) are not peculiar to John, but are also found in the Synoptics and Paul, and are evidently understood by the vast and widely divergent body of readers for which they wrote, they can furnish no basis for an alleged parallelism between John and Philo. The terms were undoubtedly current throughout the early Christian church and were introduced by our Savior Himself. And only by a manifest ignoring of historical facts can any influence of Philo be predicated of our Lord and the Synoptics, especially <sup>the</sup> Matthew and Mark. Alexandrianism was abhorrent to the inhabitants of Palestine and it can be definitely asserted that it was despised throughout the Holy Land. Philo's work was never accepted by Judaism as he himself tells us<sup>1</sup>: "The sophists of literalism opened their eyes superciliously" when he explained to them the marvels of his exegesis. It is altogether improbable that Matthew and Mark knew anything of Philo.<sup>2</sup> Noteworthy is also the fact that Philo, when he uses words in a figurative sense, invariably expounds them while the Evangelists and Paul take for granted that they are understood.

---

<sup>1</sup> De Somniis I, 16-17.

<sup>2</sup> For the very same reason we would, from the very outset, question any influence of Philo also on Luke and Paul. There can be little doubt that Alexandrianism during the time of the New Testament hardly extended its influence beyond the confines of the city which gave it its birth.

Dr. Kennedy's further suggestion that John's interpretation of Hebrew names shows an allied standpoint is also entirely untenable; John merely explains these terms and names for the benefit of his readers who knew only Greek. The contention that Philo shows the same kind of reticence about Judah as the Fourth Evangelist<sup>1</sup> does about "the disciple whom Jesus loved" is true; however, the cause for the reticence in John, his modesty, differs toto caelo from the occult reason that Philo may have had for his peculiar method with regard to Judah.

Just as the prediction of any Philonic influence on the vocabulary of St. John is entirely untenable, so it can also be shown that the thought of the Fourth Gospel exhibits no traces of Alexandrian influence. The following comparison between passages in Philo and John bearing on various subjects will justify this conclusion:

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Kennedy evidently does not believe that John, the Apostle, wrote the Fourth Gospel.



On God.

Philo.

John.

Legum Allegoriarum Libri I,  
81<sup>1</sup>: "There is nothing equal to  
God, and nothing superior to Him,  
and nothing is combined with Him  
which is worse than Himself ...  
God exists according to oneness  
and unity."

Ibid. I, 102: "The most  
universal of all things is God.  
But other things have an exist-  
ence only in word, but indeed  
they are at times equivalent  
to that which has no existence."

John, 3,16: "For God so loved the  
world that He gave His only-  
begotten Son, that whosoever be-  
lieveth in Him should not perish  
but have everlasting life."

John 10, 30: "I and the Father  
are one."

John 16,27: "For the Father Him-  
self loveth you, because ye have  
loved me and have believed that I  
came out from God."

John 6,44: "No man can come to me  
except the Father which hath sent  
me draw him."

The contrast is apparent; Philo cannot even dissociate his  
metaphysical tendencies from his conception of God. To him God is  
the one pure Being, "das reine Sein", and therefore incapable of  
contact with the finite world. John's conception of God rests on  
diametrically opposed premises; to him God is the "Father", Whose every  
essence is love and Who stands in direct relation to the world because  
of His desire to save it through His only begotten Son.

---

<sup>1</sup> The numbers refer to the volume and page of the Yonge  
translation which has been used throughout this section of the inquiry.

## On the Holy Spirit.

Philo.

De Gigantibus I, 333: "But the spirit of God is spoken of in one manner as being air flowing upon the earth, bringing a third element in addition to water. In reference to which, Moses says in his account of the creation of the world: 'The spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters,' since the air, as it is very light, is raised and borne aloft, having water, as it were, for its foundation; and, in another manner, unalloyed knowledge is said to be so, of which every wise man naturally partakes. And Moses shows us this when speaking of the Creator and maker of the holy work of the creation, in these words: 'And God summoned Bezaleel, and filled him with his Holy Spirit, and with wisdom and understanding, and knowledge, to be able to devise

John.

John 1, 32 & 33: " And John bare record, saying, 'I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon Him. And I knew Him not; but He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, 'Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on Him, the same is He which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.'"

John 14,26: "But the Comforter which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you."

John 15,26: "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me."

Philo.

every work.' "

Ibid. I, 334: "Now the spirit which is upon him (Moses) is the wise, the divine, the indivisible, the undistributable, the good spirit, the spirit which is everywhere diffused, so as to fill the universe, which, which it benefits others, is not injured by having a participation in it given to another, and if added to something else, either as to its understanding, or its knowledge, or its wisdom."

To be noted is the fact that Philo speaks of the "spirit" as air and then again as the Holy Spirit, the vagueness so characteristic of him being evident here also. With John there is no vagueness; the Holy Spirit is plainly the Comforter, the Third Person of the Godhead, Who will guide His people "into all truth", John 16,13.

#### Righteousness and Sin.

Philo.

John.

De Opificio Mundi I, 21: "Of existing things there are some that partake neither of virtue

John, 3, 19 & 20: "And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world and men loved

Philo.

or of vice; as for instance, plants and irrational animals; the one because they are destitute of soul, and are regulated by a nature void of sense; and the other because they are not endowed with mind or reason. But mind and reason may be looked upon as the abode of virtue and vice; as it is in them they seem to dwell. Some things alone partake of virtue alone, being without participation in any kind of vice; as for instance the stars ... Some things again are of mixed nature, like man, who is capable of opposite qualities, of wisdom and folly, of temperance and dissoluteness, of courage and cowardice, of justice and injustice, in short of good and evil, of what is honorable and what is disgraceful, of virtue and vice."

Legum Allegoriarum Libri I,  
68: "In these words Moses in-

John.

darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For everyone that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reprov'd.

John 8,24: "I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins, for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins."

John 8, 44-47: "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar and the father of it. And because I tell you the truth, ye believe me not. Which of you convinceth me of sin? And if I say the truth, why do ye not believe me? He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God."

John 15,22-23: "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin: but now they have no cloak

Philo.

tends to stretch out the particular virtues. And they are also four in number: 'prudence, temperance, courage, and justice.' Now the greatest river from which the four branches flow off is generic virtue, which we have already called goodness."

De Plantatione I, 381: "I will cut down all the trees of folly, and temperance, and injustice, and cowardice: and I will eradicate all the plants of pleasure, and appetite, and anger, and passion, and of all similar affections, even if they have raised their heads as high as heaven."

Again the contrast is glaringly obvious; Philo does not soar above the graeco-philosophical conception of virtue and vice; John emphasizes sin, defines it as unbelief in the Son of God, and announces judgment for the source of sin, the devil.

John.

for their sin. He that hateth me hateth my Father also."

John 16, 8-11: "And when he (the Comforter) is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment; of sin because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; of judgment because the prince of this world is judged."

## The Relation of Men to God.

Philo.

John.

Legum Allegoriarum Libri III,  
454: "When one has erred, then to change so as to adopt a blameless course of life for the future is the part of a wise man, and one who is not altogether ignorant of what is expedient."

Ibid. III, 456: "It is a very beautiful exchange and recompense for this choice on the part of man thus displaying anxiety to serve God, when God thus without any delay takes the suppliant to himself as His own, and goes forth to meet the intentions of the man who, in a genuine and sincere spirit of piety and truth, hastens to do Him service."

John 3,5 & 6: "Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh and that which is born of the spirit is spirit."

John 3,36: "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him."

John 8,24: "I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: for if ye believe not that I am He, ye shall die in your sins."

The passages adduced from Philo under this heading represent the best he has to say on the subject and it is important to note the vast gulf separating him from John. On this fundamental point, the relation of man to God, Philo does not transcend ethics while John affirms that only through faith in the Son of God can men enter into the proper relationship to God. Also in this particular then John is untinged by Alexandrianism.

Faith.

Philo.

John.

De Migratione Abrahami II, 72:

John 8, 24: "I said therefore

"Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve; and thou shalt cleave to Him." What then is this cleaving? What?

unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins."

Surely it is piety and faith; for these virtues adapt and invite the mind to incorruptible nature."

John 11, 25 & 26: "Jesus said unto her 'I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. Believest thou this?'"

Ibid. II, 111: "Do not attribute to unworthy persons that most perfect of virtues, faith ... To anchor firmly and unchangeably on the only living God is a thing to be admired among men."

John 14, 11: "Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or else believe me for the very works' sake."

De Praemiis et Poenis: III, 462: "What can anyone conceive to be either more useful or more respectable than to believe in God and throughout one's whole life to be continually rejoicing and beholding the living God."

While Philo in his definition of faith exhibits his knowledge of the Old Testament, yet it will readily be seen that also here his graec philosophic training plays an important role. "To adapt and invite the mind to incorruptible nature" is a thought foreign to the Old Testament. John's distinct definition of faith as the belief in the incarnate Son of God stands in sharp contrast.

# The Fundamental Principle of Conduct

## Toward God and Men.

Philo.

De Virtutibus III, 524: "To choose what is right and to avoid what is wrong, using a threefold variety of rules and criteria, namely, the love of God, and the love of virtue, and the love of mankind."

De Migratione Abrahami II, 71: "As God commands, in that very manner does the virtuous man act, guiding the path of his life in a blameless way, so that the actions of the wise men are in no respect different from the divine commands."

Quoted by Eusebius, Praep. Evang. 7,7: "What you hate to suffer, do not do yourself."

In accord with his philosophical background Philo evidently takes no account of the corrupt nature of man, making "a virtuous life a matter of wisdom." Notable is also the fact that the golden rule is only expressed negatively. John emphasizes faith in the Redeemer and union with Him as the fundamental principle of conduct toward God and men.

John.

John 6, 63: "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life."

John 8, 24: "I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins."

John 15, 4 & 5: "Abide in me and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: He that abideth in me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing."



## The Kingdom of God.

Philo.

John.

De Execrationibus III, 495:

"When they come, cities will be rebuilt which but a short time ago were in complete ruins, and the desert will be filled with inhabitants and the barren land will change and become fertile, and the good fortune of their fathers and ancestors will be looked upon as a matter of but small importance, on account of the abundance of wealth of all kinds which they will have at the present moment, flowing forth from the graces of God as from ever-running fountains, which will thus confer vast wealth separately on each individual, and also on all the citizens in common, to an amount beyond the reach even of envy."

Philo's vague description is difficult to interpret and, in view of his usual philosophizing attitude, amazingly materialistic. On this point he evidently shared the misconception of contemporaneous Judaism concerning the earthly kingdom of the coming Messiah. John emphasizes the spirituality of the kingdom of God.

John 3, 3: "Jesus answered and said unto him, 'Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.'" v. 5: "Jesus answered, 'Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.'"

John 18, 36: "Jesus answered, 'My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence.'"

## The Son of God.

Philo.

De Congressu Eruditionis Gratia II, 31: "Even if there be not anyone who is worthy to be called a son of God, nevertheless let him labor earnestly to be adorned according to his firstborn Logos... Even if we are not yet suitable to be called the sons of God, still we may deserve to be called the children of his eternal image of his most sacred Logos; for the image of God is his most ancient Logos."

De Fuga et Inventionem II, 216:

"He (i.e. the Logos) has received imperishable and wholly pure parents, God being his father, who is also the father of all things, and wisdom being his mother."

According to Philo the Logos evidently, especially in the latter passage, is the Son of God; however, hardly in any particular sense, so that an identification with the Messiah would become possible for he adds "who is also the father of all things." The assertion that "wisdom is the mother of the Logos" throws an interesting light on his conception of Prov. 8 and at the same time serves to emphasize the difference between him and John. To John the Son of God is the Redeemer, the Logos, the Chokma.

John.

John 1, 18: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father he hath declared him."

John 1, 34: "And I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God!"

John 11, 4: "When Jesus heard that, he said, 'This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby.'"

## The Messiah

Philo.

De Execrationibus III, 494:

"When they have received this unexpected liberty those who but a short time before were scattered about in Greece, and in the countries of the barbarians, in the islands, and over the continents, rising up with one impulse, and coming from all the different parts imaginable, all hasten to one place pointed out to them, being guided on their way by some vision, more divine than is compatible with its being of the nature of man, invisible indeed to every one else, but apparent only to those who were saved, having their separate inducements and intercessions, by whose intervention they might obtain a reconciliation with God."

De Praemiis et Poenis III,  
477: "A man will come forth, says the word of God, leading a host and warring furiously who will subdue great and populous nations,

John.

In the Gospel according to St. John the references to Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and the Messiah are numerous and variegated.

Cf. John 1, 17. 19. 20. 41;  
3, 28; 4, 25. 28. 29; 7, 25-27;  
10, 24 & 25 - etc.

God sending that assistance  
which is suitable for pious  
men ... He will have an  
irresistible power of dominion  
so as to be able to benefit  
the people subject to him, who  
may become so, whether out of  
good will, or out of fear, or  
out of shame; for he will have  
in him three things of the  
greatest importance, all con-  
tributing greatly to rendering  
his authority indestructible,  
namely, dignity, and terror and  
beneficence, by means of which  
qualities the ends above mentioned  
will be gained."

These two passages in Philo are commonly supposed to refer to the Messiah and it is entirely possible that they do. However, an examination of their contents proves that they present a deterioration of, rather than an advance on, Old Testament prophecy. Philo does not mention the Messiah by name and he completely emptied all Old Testament prophecy concerning Him of its glorious meaning. It is evident that also in this particular John could have borrowed nothing from the Alexandrian.

The Future of the World and of the  
Wicked.

Philo.

De Plantatione I, 423-424: "A road to travel along, leading to virtue, and having for its end life and immortality; and another road leading to vice, having for its end the loss of life and immortality, that is to say death."

De Praemiis et Poenis III, 472: "Men look upon death as the supreme limit of all punishments, but in the view of the divine tribunal it is scarcely the beginning of them ... For there are two kinds of death: the one that of being dead, which is either good or else a matter of indifference; the other that of dying, which is in every respect an evil; and the more protracted the dying the more intolerable the evil."

De Excratationibus III, 491: "The man of noble descent who has adulterated the courage of his noble birth, will be dragged down to the lowest depths, being hurled

John.

John 3, 18: "He that believeth on Him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already because he hath not believed in the name of the only-begotten Son of God"

John 3, 36: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him."

John 5, 28 & 29: "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."

Philo.

John.

down to Tartarus and profound darkness, in order that all men who behold this example may be corrected by it."

Here particularly the oftquoted proverb of Suidas applies: "Either Philo platonises, or Plato philonises." The passages quoted above could just as well have been penned by Plato - so little does Philo betray his birth and so completely has his philosophy overwhelmed the religious thought of his people. John is untouched by his vague generalities.

We have endeavored to present a comparison between Philo's views on certain matters in the field of religion, and the thoughts of the Gospel according to St. John. From the subject-matter of the passages quoted above, religion, it is already evident that they present the best and the noblest expressions found in the works of the foremost exponent of Alexandrianism; and yet, it is impossible to note anything but the most glaring divergencies. In view of the result of this examination we can only conclude that any theory which sees in Philo a connecting link between the Old Testament and the Gospel according to St. John or predicates any Alexandrian influence on John, entirely ignores the most relevant facts - the only facts upon which such a theory might rest - a comparison of the Gospel - with the works of Philo. The "disciple whom Jesus loved" lived and died entirely oblivious to, and untarnished by, the vague speculative philosophy of Philo.

## Philo and Paul

The predication of Philonian influence on the part of modern historical criticism is concerned primarily with the Johannine literature because of the eminent position of the Logos-doctrine. However, modern criticism is not content to stop there; it is alleged that during the gradual dissemination of Philonian literature in the course of the first century of the Christian era also Paul came under the influence of the Alexandrian, possibly not to the extent to which John was "led astray" but nevertheless very noticeably. This influence manifests itself along two distinct lines: first, in the vocabulary, and secondly, in the thought.<sup>1</sup>

Ignoring for the moment the acknowledged weakness of the vocabulary argument it may be noted in general that there can hardly be any close relationship between the vocabulary of Philo and that of Paul. Philo assimilated his vocabulary from the Hellenistic philosophers and, as we have noted above, it was very much like his system, essentially eclectic. Paul used nothing but the *κοινή*, the language of the people, which was in common use wherever Rome held sway.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gföerer in Philo p. 299 ff asserts confidently that Paul had read Philo's works. That this allegation is entirely without foundation in fact, will become apparent in the course of this inquiry. The supposition already shatters on the question of chronology; no one can reasonably suppose that the works of Philo had received any degree of attention before the year 60 A.D.

An examination of a few details will immediately bear out this conclusion. For example, a discussion<sup>1</sup> of the titles for God in Paul, as well as throughout the New Testament, shows that the conception of God is distinct from the philosophical and religious conceptions of the Deity as presented by Philo. The following compilation of the designations for God is of interest:

	God	Lord	Father	Almighty
New Testament	1136	43	215	10
Philo	4000	30	75	2

(Besides these Philo uses Creator 124 times, King 11 times, First Cause 18 times, besides many other sporadic designations such as Ruler, Governor, Elder, Benefactor, Deity, Divine Providence, Judge, Master and Supreme Being.)

At first sight this tabulation does not present any striking divergencies between Philo and Paul. However, an examination reveals the following facts concerning the usage of the terms:

1. Lord (*κύριος*). The definition of this term as given by Philo is the opposite of that found in such modern writers as Hengstenberg, Kurtz and Green. De Plantatione 20 he says: "The title Lord is that power existing in the living God according to which he governs; and the other is God, according to which he is beneficent." The use of the term by Philo corresponds with his definition and stands in striking contrast to its usage in the Pauline

---

<sup>1</sup> For this particular section, especially for the collation of numbers, we are greatly indebted to Dr. R. D. Wilson's article in the Princeton Theological Review Vol. XIX, p. 392 ff.



Epistles where it invariably designates Jesus Christ, the Second Person of the Trinity. Dr. Wilson remarks:<sup>1</sup> "That Christianity was not due to the "Zeitgeist", or spirit of the times, is apparent when we contrast the use of Lord in the New Testament with its use or non-use in the contemporary literature."

2. Father. The independence of the New Testament, specifically Paul, appears also in its use of this term as an appellation of God. Philo uses Father alone 30 times; Father of the Universe 9 times; Father and Creator of the Universe 19 times; in isolated instances he has Father and Ruler of the Universe, Father of that which is the father of time, Father and Creator and governor of all this system, Father and Creator of all things, Father and Sovereign of the Universe, etc. From these compounds with Father it is evident that Philo used the term in the same sense as Plato, that is, as the equivalent of Creator, the Father of the Universe. In fact, Philo explains his use of the appellation himself in De Opificio Mundi I, 45<sup>2</sup>: "The Creator of the Universe is the Father of his creatures ... the Mother was the knowledge of the Creator with whom God uniting became the father of the creation." This usage can only be contrasted with that of Paul in which God is the father of all men and especially of those who believe, and in a more particular sense still, of Jesus the Son of God.

3. The appellation "Almighty" Philo borrowed from the Old Testament with which Paul was far better acquainted.

---

<sup>1</sup> l.c. p. 393.

<sup>2</sup> Yonge's translation.

The conclusion is therefore inevitable that Paul's appellations for God, as well as those of the entire New Testament, are entirely independent of Philo.

Of the utmost importance is the fact that Dr. Kennedy finds a relationship between Philo and Paul in their usage of the terms  $\piνεῦμα$  ,  $σάρξ$  ,  $ψυχή$  ,  $νοῦς$  , and the corresponding adjectives. He remarks:<sup>1</sup> "There is nothing to show that Philo regarded matter as per se evil. This fact is important for its bearing on the significance of the Pauline antithesis between Flesh and Spirit ... Philo anticipates St. Paul in using  $σάρξ$  , "flesh", to denote the lower side of human nature as realised and felt in an ordinary experience ... In De Gigantibus 29 Philo says: "The supreme cause of lack of knowledge is the flesh and intimate association with the flesh. Indeed God himself acknowledges this when he affirms that "because they are flesh" (Gen. 6,3) the Divine spirit ( $\piνεῦμα$  ) cannot abide with them." This is a usage extraordinarily akin to Paul's regular contrast between  $σάρξ$  and  $\piνεῦμα$  ... In Philo  $νοῦς$  is often interchangeable with  $ψυχή$  , although, of course, it usually stands for the higher aspect of the soul. Here Paul also approximates to his older contemporary."

An inquiry into Dr. Kennedy's allegations leads to the following conclusions:

1. As we have noted above, to Philo all matter is per se evil, therefore also the body. His Platonic training so completely

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. H. A. A. Kennedy "Philo's Contribution to Religion", p. 74 ff.

dominated his entire thought that this is the only conclusion possible. In De Migratione Abrahami I, 9 he exclaims: "Away my friend, from that earthly vesture of yours, escape from that accursed prison, the body, and from its pleasures and lusts, which are your jailors." It is the body which is inherently bad.

2. Accordingly then Philo cannot anticipate Paul in his usage of *σάρξ*. In De Gigantibus 40, Philo says: "Contrast the 'good' of the flesh with that of the soul (*ψυχή*) and that of the whole. That of the flesh is irrational pleasure, but that of the soul and of the whole is the reason of the universe, even God." Here Philo sets *σάρξ* and *ψυχή* in antithesis, as usage never found in Paul. Philo completely shared the feelings expressed by Plato that true blessedness is achieved only by getting rid of the body - an idea which is entirely foreign to Paul. To Paul the body is indeed inferior to the soul and needs to be kept in subjection and there is a force in man that makes for evil; his natural corrupt state, which he calls *σάρξ* yet this force is not to be identified with the body.<sup>1</sup>

3. Philo uses *ψυχή* in a sense foreign to Paul. For the Alexandrian it is very often equivalent to *νοῦς* or *πνεῦμα* and the terms seem to be synonymous and interchangeable. By it he means the highest element in human nature, an element which is to be

---

<sup>1</sup> Lietzmann in his "Romerbrief" p. 38 asserts that "the *σάρξ* in Philo is viewed entirely from the intellectual standpoint, in Paul from that of pure religion." While his statement is true in the greater majority of instances, it is hardly tenable throughout - in several instances Philo exhibits religious tendencies in his use of *σάρξ*.

distinguished from mere animal life. Paul rarely uses  $\psi\chi\eta^1$  except in the sense of "life" or "personality" for which " $\psi\chi\eta$ " constantly stands in the Old Testament and is generally rendered in this connection by  $\psi\chi\eta$  in the LXX.

4. In the usage of  $\pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$  Paul and Philo differ *toto caelo*. In Philo it designates the higher element, the  $\nu\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$ , the  $\psi\chi\eta$ , the "mens" - in fact the term is typically Philonian, vague and fluctuating. With Paul the  $\pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$  (in this particular sense<sup>2</sup>) is

<sup>1</sup> Paul uses it about eight times: Rom 11, 3; 16, 4; 2 Cor. 1,23; Phil. 2,30, 1 Thess. 2,8; Rom. 13,1; 1 Cor. 15,45; 2 Cor. 12,15. The only doubtful passage is 1 Cor. 15,45 where he carefully follows the LXX of Gen. 2,7 which translates  $\beta\epsilon\tau\omega\tau\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\iota$  with  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \psi\chi\eta\upsilon\ \sigma\tilde{\omega}\sigma\alpha\nu$ . Here he deliberately contrasts  $\psi\chi\eta$  with  $\pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$  and it is evident that  $\psi\chi\eta$  stands for the life of man as untouched by the Holy Spirit. The contrast to Philo is apparent.

<sup>2</sup> We are not considering the use of  $\pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$  as an appellation for the Third Person of the Trinity. However, the contrast between Philo and the entire New Testament, as pointed out by Dr. Wilson, is most interesting:

	Spirit	Holy Spirit	Spirit of God	Spirit of the Lord
New Testament:	120	91	15	5
Old Testament:	30	2	15	26
Philo:	1	2	5	0

It is evident that the New Testament doctrine of, as well as the appellations for, the Holy Spirit, rest on the Old Testament. Furthermore, in every case in which Philo uses the above terms he is commenting on Old Testament passages.

invariably the regenerate part of man which cannot be considered apart from the working of the πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ .

πνεῦμα in Paul, Luther says:<sup>1</sup> "is the highest and noblest part of man, which qualifies him to lay hold of incomprehensible, invisible, eternal things; in short, it is the house where Faith and God's word are at home."

If then the fundamental meanings of πνεῦμα and σὰρξ differ in Philo and Paul it is evident that there can be no Philonian influence on St. Paul's antithesis between πνεῦμα and σὰρξ . In the usage of all these terms as well as the definitions of the relation between them, Paul is either entirely original or gives evidence of a thorough knowledge of the Old Testament.-

It can well be affirmed then that Alexandrianism exerted no influence on the phraseology of Paul. However, it has been repeatedly asserted that there is a close relationship between the thought of Philo and Paul.

Dr. Kennedy has collated and emphasized the various points at which "there is a common point of view." Of these the most important are the following:

1. Faith. Dr. Kennedy remarks:<sup>2</sup> "Faith in Philo is an 'amelioration of the soul at all points', but 'of the soul resting and established on the Cause of all things who is able for anything,

---

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Thayer sub verbo πνεῦμα .

<sup>2</sup> l.c. p. 122 f.

but who wills the best.'" (De Migratione Abrahami I, 268). In the main Philo's view accords with the Old Testament account of Abraham's faith. His description of it is most significant for his entire outlook. "He first is said to have believed God, since he was the first to possess an unwavering and stable notion (*ὑπολήψιν*) that the sole Cause is the highest and that his providence is over the universe and all that belongs to it. So having come to possess faith, the most stable of the virtues, he entered into possession of all the others along with it." (De Virtutibus I, 216) "This is ... in remarkable agreement with Paul's interpretation of the same story."

The weakness of the attempted parallelism becomes apparent at a glance; Paul's description of Abraham's faith, the promise, and its relation to the law in Rom. 4,16 ff. and Gal. 3,7 ff. 18 differs toto caelo from that of Philo both in the terminology and in the thought. The passage in Philo quoted by Dr. Kennedy is by far the best<sup>1</sup> in his works inasmuch as, in this particular point, he adheres most closely to the Old Testament. However, even in this passage his terminology is permeated with the phrases of Greek philosophy and could impossibly

---

<sup>1</sup> At other points his definitions are so vague that Dr. Bigg concludes that Philo associates Faith with a lower stage of spiritual life and points to "Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres Sit 21" in support of his contention. ("Christian Platonists of Alexandria" p. 26). In the passage to which he refers Philo is expounding Gen. 15,8: "And he said, Lord God, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?" and points out that "doubt is often associated with faith before the soul comes into full communion with the Ruler of the Universe."

have provided a starting-point for Paul. Paul's conception of faith throughout his writings is so concrete and so personal, for the simple reason that its object is always the living person of the living Lord, that it is virtually impossible to predicate of him a lack of originality in this particular.

2. Grace. Dr. Kennedy remarks:<sup>1</sup> "Paul's great watchword: 'By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves. God's is the gift' (Eph. 2,8) can be rendered directly in terms of Philo's thought, if we discount the Apostle's definitely Christian background. Precisely as in Paul's view, Philo regards man as having nothing in which he can glory in God's presence. Even anything good which he achieves - and Philo, like Paul, recognizes the importance of such achievement - must ultimately be ascribed to Divine influence. For it is impossible for a human creature to rid himself of his defilement.' 'What period would suffice to wash away these stains? I cannot tell ... What eternity could transform the impurity of a soul into a well-ordered life? Not even an eternity, but God alone, to whom are possible the things which with us are impossible.' (De Specialibus Legibus II, 281 f.) The words have an extraordinary affinity with New Testament positions."

Dr. Kennedy's argument is amenable to the following criticism:

(1) In a consideration of Philo's and Paul's attitude toward grace we cannot "discount the latter's definitely Christian background." Such a procedure is manifestly unfair as Paul's attitude toward grace

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. p. 150 f.

cannot be dissociated from the teachings of Christianity. Paul affirms that "by grace are ye saved" - i.e. salvation is the prime gift of God's grace. Such an idea is entirely foreign to Philo, in whose system "salvation by grace" has no place. Consequently, the two differ in their cardinal conception of the value of grace.

(2). Philo's depreciation of man is entirely philosophical and metaphysical, springing from his Platonic training. He never says that the whole being, the whole personality of man is the recipient of God's grace, but only the soul, for which his designation is fluctuating; - sometimes he calls it the  $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ , then again  $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ , then again  $\pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\mu\alpha$ . Paul's emphasis on God's grace springs from an entirely different motive - from the deep consciousness of the fact that the natural man, soul and body, is corrupt, hostile to God. According to Paul the function of the grace of God is to save the body and soul of man from eternity; when he uses  $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\varsigma$  he does not mean the body as such, but rather the corrupt natural state of man.

3. Immortality. Gathering his material from Plato and from the Old Testament, Philo has several references to immortality<sup>1</sup>, which, Dr. Kennedy remarks<sup>2</sup> "remind us vividly of St. Paul." It is true that Philo includes this point in his system; however, no relationship to Paul can be based on these few isolated references. Dr. Kennedy himself says:<sup>3</sup> "The fact cannot be ignored that Philo's conception

---

<sup>1</sup> De Sacrificiis I, 5: "When Abraham left the mortal state, he was gathered to the people of God, (Gen. 25,8: Philo's own adaptation of the text) reaping immortality, made like unto the angels."

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 138.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 141.



of immortality is far less rich in content than that of the Apostle. This is partly due to his failure to connect the Hope in any definite fashion with the consummation of the Kingdom of God and those spacious moral processes of the Divine government of the world which find their climax there. It is surrounded by too rarefied an atmosphere, philosophical rather than religious. And thus, while it strives to express, as we have seen, a genuine religious need, its undue intellectualism narrows it down to something less impressive even than the Jewish-Apocalyptic conception of immortality."

It will be seen then that in his cardinal conceptions Paul betrays no evidence of Philonian influence; both in terminology and thought his writings are entirely independent of the great Alexandrian. In fact, it may be said that the whole modern endeavor to search out groups of parallel ideas or formulas in Philo and Paul is a most useless one and can never lead to any important results. Entirely too much, as we have endeavored to show, depends on the background against which they stand and a true conception of Philo's training. Words and phrases mean little when this point is left out of consideration.

Repeated attempts have been made to trace a relationship between Philo's method of allegory and that used by Paul. In a consideration of this contention the following points demand attention:

1. Philo employs allegory throughout his exposition of the Old Testament since it was for him an absolute necessity; the Pentateuch could not be made to speak the language of Greek philosophy if the literal text was held fast. Consequently, every detail of the history of the Pentateuch is allegorized, approaching in its vagueness and ridiculous character only the later Rabbinical writers.

2. As far as this method of allegory is concerned, it is based

entirely on the Stoic method who applied it to Homer and others in order to remove the offensive anthropomorphisms and other difficulties, precisely the same reason for which Philo employed it.

With these two facts in mind a comparison with St. Paul's standpoint at once presses itself on our attention. Very rarely does he have recourse to the allegorical method; the most notable instance is, of course, the allegory of the two covenants under the names of Sarah and her handmaid, Gal. 4, 21-31. In this passage Paul uses the verb ἀλληγορεῖν : "to express or explain one thing under the image of another;" pass. "to be so explained i.e. under the image of another." Meyer, De Wette, and most modern commentators attempt to represent this whole phrase as a subjective i.e. an erroneous interpretation of St. Paul arising either from his rabbinical education or from an acquaintance with Philo.<sup>1</sup>

Both contentions are beside the point: 1. Paul was not influenced by his Rabbinical education for it must be remembered that he is declaring, by inspiration of the Holy Spirit (of which he was at all times conscious, cf. 1 Cor. 2,13) that the passage he has cited has a second and deeper meaning than it appears to have: that it has that meaning is, then a positive, objective and indisputable truth.

2. Paul could not have been influenced by Philo; the fact that he was educated at Jerusalem precludes all knowledge of Philo's

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Meyer in loco. Also Weiss.

works<sup>1</sup>. Furthermore, Philo more than once allegorizes the same story but on totally different lines.<sup>2</sup> Thus, for him, Sarah stands for complete virtue, with whom Abraham, the learner, cannot at first be fruitfully united. He must first wed Hagar i.e. preliminary instruction. The difference in the two methods as well as the results arrived at, is apparent. Philo allegorizes the story merely to make room for some Platonic ideas; Paul uses it to drive home the truth concerning the difference between the law and the promise.

In comparing Philo and Paul, Dr. Kennedy<sup>3</sup> finds a parallelism between the two in the fact that both believed in the literal inspiration and divine validity of the Old Testament and both were driven away from this position by a development in their theology. First Paul held that the Law was necessary to intensify the consciousness of sin (Romans); then he compares Jewish Legalism to pagan ritualism (Galatians); finally, (Colossians) he sternly sweeps away the entire principle of Legalism as something inherently valueless. In analyzing Paul's attitude in Romans (Rom. 7,13. Rom. 5,20) and

---

<sup>1</sup> Here again this point cannot be emphasized too strongly - the Palestinian rabbis were absolutely hostile to the Alexandrian philosophy. The commemoration of the completion of the LXX, which was annually celebrated in Alexandria, was to the Rabbis of Palestine a day of fasting and humiliation. Philo was despised in the schools in which Paul received his education.

<sup>2</sup> De Congress. Erud. Grat. esp. 11-24. A precisely similar use of the story is made by him in Quaestt. in Gen. III, p. 190-191.

<sup>3</sup> "Philo's Contribution to Religion" p. 44ff.

Galatians ( 4, 4.8-13) and Colossians (Col. 2,14) Kennedy says: "Thus as in Philo's case, Paul is driven by the inexorable logic of experience, probably without any formal recognition of what was happening, far away from his original position." This, to say the least, is a very subjective judgment: Philo's position toward the Law was always the same and Paul's changed its aspect only with the various uses which he finds for the lessons of the Old Dispensation. His fundamental position, that the Law is abrogated, never changed - the attempted parallelism with Philo is entirely out of the question.-

The conclusion is then inevitable that St. Paul and Philo more in two entirely different spheres, both linguistically and doctrinally. Their language has nothing in common; St. Paul makes but the most subordinate use of the allegoric method, which with Philo is all in all; to Philo Abraham becomes a mere idealised virtue, to Paul he is an historical person; Philo addresses his esoteric electicism to the illuminated few; St. Paul regards all alike as the children of God. Dean Farrar<sup>1</sup> says: "In Philo we see the impotence of Hellenising rationalism; in St. Paul the power of spiritual truth; Philo explains and philosophizes in every direction; St. Paul never recoils before a paradox, and leaves antinomies unsolved side by side. Philo, like St. Paul, speaks of faith; but the 'faith' of Philo is something far short of a transforming principle, while that of St. Paul is a regeneration of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Farrar "Life and Work of Paul" Appendix: Excursus IV, p. 704.

whole nature through union with Christ. The writings of Philo are a collection of cold abstractions, those of St. Paul a living spring of spiritual wisdom." Prof. Jowett remarks<sup>1</sup>: "Philo was an eclectic, St. Paul spoke as the Spirit gave him utterance. Philo was an Eastern mystic, St. Paul preached the resurrection of the body. Philo was an idealiser, St. Paul a spiritualiser of the Old Testament. Philo was a philosopher, St. Paul was a preacher; the one taught a system for the Alexandrian Jews, the other a universal religion. The one may have guided a few more solitaries to the rocks of the Nile, the other has changed the world. The one is a dead, unmeaning literature, lingering amid the progress of mankind; the other has been a principle of life to the intellect as well as to the heart. While the one has ceased to exist, the other has survived, without decay, the changes in government and the revolutions in thought of 1800 years."

---

<sup>1</sup> Jowett "Commentary on Romans" p. 416.

## Philo and the Author of Hebrews.

The so-called "Alexandrian or Philonian coloring" of the Epistle to the Hebrews has ever received a tremendous amount of attention also from conservative scholars because of the evident fact that the whole question is bound up with the authorship of the Epistle. Consequently, we find those who would make Barnabas or Apollos the author of the Epistle most vigorously emphasizing the Philonian characteristics of the letter, while those who reject Apollos or Barnabas as the author naturally tend to minimize the Alexandrian element. In this connection, however, it is very significant that more conservative scholars who hold that Apollos was the author, such as Tholuck and Bleek, are very careful not to place much emphasis on the alleged Philonian characteristics, preferring to base their arguments on other considerations. We shall endeavor briefly to consider the supposed Alexandrian elements in the Epistle entirely detached from their bearing on the authorship.

The following points are stressed in a defense of the Philonian character of the letter to the Hebrews:

1. The fact that the author quotes the LXX exclusively, although he himself is a Hebrew.<sup>1</sup> This reason is by no means decisive;

---

<sup>1</sup> Heb. 13, 19: "But I beseech you the rather to do this, that I may be restored to you the sooner." Since the letter was most probably addressed to Jews in Palestine (Cf. Dr. Fürbringer: *Einleitung* p. 82) it is indeed plausible that the author himself is a Hebrew, most probably from Jerusalem, because of his intimate acquaintance with the Temple and its ritual.

St. Paul also uses the LXX frequently, although not exclusively; the difference is therefore only relative, not absolute: to base a close relation to Philo on this point is eminently unreasonable.

2. The allegorical method of exegesis. We would first point out that this method is not exclusively Alexandrian, but also Palestinian and Pauline. We have already pointed out an example of allegory in Paul, Gal. 4, 21ff<sup>1</sup>. At this particular point it would also be well to clearly distinguish allegory and typology, for it is apparent that on this particular point the whole modern misunderstanding of the whole Epistle rests. An Old Testament type is a real prefiguration of a New Testament fact, as the Jewish tabernacle explained in Heb. 9, or Melchizedek etc. Cf. also James 3,14. Rom. 5,14. 1 Cor. 10, 6.11. An allegory exhibits figuratively the ideal character of a fact. The type allows no latitude of interpretation. The allegory lends itself to various interpretations. Now Philo allegorizes, often foolishly and extravagantly; the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews uses a divinely sanctioned typology. The stricter the distinction between these two methods is upheld, the more apparent it becomes that there is a tremendous difference between the vague allegorizing of Philo and the typology of the Epistle to the Hebrews. And if passages can be pointed out in which the language is closely related to the language of Philo it still must be very evident that the spirit is entirely different. Mynster correctly remarks<sup>2</sup>: "der Geist Philo's ist himmelweit

---

<sup>1</sup> Paul undoubtedly takes certain passages of the Old Testament from their context and adapts them to his use - always inspired by the Holy Ghost.

<sup>2</sup> Studien und Kritiken II, 2 S. 333.

verschieden und Richtung und Art der Betrachtung deutet gewiss nicht auf dieselbe Schule." Tholuck says:<sup>1</sup> "Philo's Allegorien haben einen verschiedenen Charakter von der Typik unseres Briefes."

3. The relation in language. This point merits somewhat closer attention. Bleek<sup>2</sup> has carefully prepared a list of 22 phrases which are supposedly exclusively Philonian. Upon examination a number of these alleged parallels are sufficiently explained on the ground of Philo's and the author's knowledge of the LXX. Another group is also found in the Pauline writings.<sup>3</sup> Still others are not distinctively Philonian but are common in Greek usage.<sup>4</sup> The most important

---

<sup>1</sup> Hebräerbrief S. 66. His remark is all the more important since he upholds the theory that Apollos was the author of the Epistle.

<sup>2</sup> Einleitung in das Neue Testament - paragraph 189ff.

<sup>3</sup> Tholuck: op. cit. p. 67: ... "so wenn zu Heb. 1,2 eine Stelle verglichen wird in der Philo den Logos εἰκὼν θεοῦ nennt, δι' οὗ πάντα ὁ κόσμος ἐδημιουργεῖτο was ja auch paulinisch ist, wenn zu v.3 φέρων τὰ πάντα als Parallele angegeben wird: ὃ τὰ μὲν ὄντα φέρων καὶ τὰ πάντα γεννῶν, während doch Kol. 1 eine Sachparallele bildet, und φέρειν in dem dort obwaltenden Sprachgebrauche jener Zeit ganz gewöhnlich ist."

<sup>4</sup> Thus, for example, μετριοπαθεῖν (5,2) προσαγορευθεῖς (5,10), the combination of δεήσεις τε καὶ ἐκετηρίας, ἀμήτωρ ἔκουσίως ἁμαρτάνει (10,26), ὡς ἔπος ἐπεῖν (7,9) and others.



point, however, is Heb. 13,5 where it is alleged that the quotation is not found in the LXX, nor in the Hebrew, but only in Philo. The passage reads: οὐ μὴ σε ἀνῶ, οὐδ' οὐ μὴ σε ἐγκαταλίπω and is a quotation from 1 Chron. 28,20 where the LXX has κύριος ὁ Θεὸς μου μετὰ σου οὐκ ἀγῆσει σε, οὐδ' οὐ μὴ σε ἐγκαταλίπη. Deut. 3,16 and Is. 1,5 are to be compared with 1 Chron. 28,20. In these three passages the whole quotation stands in the third person while in Philo<sup>1</sup> and the Epistle to the Hebrews it stands in the first person. However, it is easily possible that in a citation the oratio directa could be transposed into the oratio indirecta. A comparison of Acts 13,22 and 1 Sam. 13,14 shows that Paul has transposed the words, which, in the Old Testament passage, stand in the third person, into the first person. A similar case is found in 1 Cor. 1,19 which is a quotation from Is. 29,19. This point, then, does not prove that the author of Hebrews had read Philo. The language used in the Epistle to the Hebrews in introducing quotations, while not Pauline, is on the other hand, not Philonian.

4. The relation in thought. Hayes<sup>2</sup> introduces a number of striking parallels between Philo and Heb. 1, 2.3.4.6.8. 4,14. 7, 25,26. 5,10. 7,3. 4,12; however, not one of these parallels cannot be explained on the basis of the thorough knowledge of the Old Testament that they undoubtedly had in common. Especially the reference to Melchizedek, which is prominent in Philo, can easily be explained on the basis of Gen. 14,19 and Ps. 110, 4 - especially

---

<sup>1</sup> De Confusione Linguarum I, p. 344.

<sup>2</sup> Hayes: New Testament Epistles p. 45ff.

the latter, which the author of Hebrews undoubtedly considered Messianic.

To summarize, then, we would find in the Epistle to the Hebrews no "unhesitating appropriation of Philo's system", as Hayes<sup>1</sup> would. The most that can be said of the character of the Epistle to the Hebrews is that it was written by an educated Jew of the Pauline circle, a master of Greek, well acquainted in Jerusalem, and a past-master of Old Testament interpretation. He has absolutely no connection with Philo<sup>2</sup> beyond the effect that the Alexandrian vocabulary may have had on any educated man of that time. The purposes of the two writers are also entirely different: Philo wishes to harmonize Old Testament revelation and Greek philosophy; the author of Hebrews does not consider the Gentiles at all in his Epistle but addresses himself exclusively to the Jews.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. p. 44.

<sup>2</sup> Tholuck in his Hebräerbrief p. 67 (note) makes the very pertinent remark: "Verhält es sich so mit der Behauptung das der Urheber des Hebräerbriefs mit den Schriften des Philo bekannt gewesen sei, wie viel weniger wird man dies mit irgend einer Wahrscheinlichkeit bei Johannes, dem ἰδιώτης behaupten können."

## II. Stoicism and the New Testament.

It is but natural that the most powerful system of Philosophy in the first century A. D. should often be compared with Christianity. By modern writers on the subject, however, the coincidences in language or in thought are often overemphasized. To determine the true value of the alleged coincidences and points of contact between Stoicism and Christianity will be the purpose of the present section of this inquiry.

A brief resume of the history and teachings of Stoicism will be necessary by way of introduction.

The Stoic school was founded at Athens by Zeno of Cyprus<sup>1</sup> (ca. 340-265 B.C.) and was so named from the porch ( *στώα ποικίλη* ) where Zeno taught. Of his followers Chrysippus, who died in 206 B.C., is especially known for his extraordinary productions, and for the

---

<sup>1</sup> It is important to note that he was a native of Citium, a Phoenician colony in Cyprus and was probably of Semitic origin, for he is commonly called the Phoenician. Cf. Diog. Laert. VII, 3, where Crates addresses him as *τί φεύγεις, ὦ φοινικίδιον* ; also II, 114: *Ζήνωνα τὸν φοίνικα*. Lightfoot remarks (Comm. on Philippians p. 273): "Babylon, Tyre, Sidon, Carthage reared some of his most illustrious successors. Cilicia, Phrygia, Rhodes, were the homes of others. Not a single Stoic of any name was a native of Greece proper." These facts will be of importance when we consider the ethics of Stoicism.

ability with which he systematized and defended the Stoic principles.

The Stoic system itself existed properly in two forms: first the original system of Zeno and Chrysippus, and secondly, the modified Roman Stoicism of the first century of the Christian era. A glance at its metaphysics immediately makes the inference most plausible that it contained little or nothing in harmony with Christianity. It was clearly a revival of the Heraclitic Pantheism.<sup>1</sup> Nothing exists but matter. The soul itself is a corporeal entity. The universe is one and is governed by one, all-embracing law. Matter and the Deity are identical - the same principle in different aspects. The Deity, that is, the immanent, creative force in matter, always acts according to law. This power or force which organized all things was to the Stoics an all-permeating material

---

<sup>1</sup> That the Stoics are essentially pantheists is the result of logical necessity; for if God permeates and interpenetrates the whole universe then God and the universe are convertible terms. The universe is one being, animate and rational, endowed with the faculty of perception. This latter conclusion Diogenes Laertius (VII, 143) arrives at by abstract reasoning: "A living being is better, more efficient, than a non-living being; nothing is better than the universe; therefore the universe must be a living being. And it is animate, as is clear from our vitality being a detached particle (ἀπόσπασμα) of the universe." Since we are a part of the universe there is something divine in us also. (Seneca, Epistolae, 92, 30).

substance, ether, gas, heat, reason, God - call it what you will; by them it was often called the *λόγος σπερματικός* containing within itself the germination of all organic life and the cause of all happenings, past, present and future. The world itself, proceeding by evolution from primitive fire, eventually returns to its source through a universal conflagration, and the same process is to be renewed in an endless series of cycles. Fate rules everything. The world is an organic unity; considered as a whole, it is perfect. Evil, when looked at in relation to the entire system, is good. The denial of free agency, and of immortality, was a corollary. As to the personality of the minor gods, the old Stoics were vacillating. Now they are spoken of as functions of nature, and now as persons. But if personal, they share the fate of men; they disappear in the final conflagration.

In view of this rigidly pantheistic<sup>1</sup> logic it is amazing to note the emphasis placed on ethics and morals in the Stoic system. And here is the most important point in a study of Stoicism; the truth is that the Stoics did not derive their ethics from their physical and metaphysical theories, but were indebted from them to their Eastern and Oriental origin and affinities. To this fact must be ascribed the intense moral earnestness which is its most honorable characteristic. Lightfoot remarks:<sup>2</sup> "If the later philosophers generally, as distinguished from the earlier, busied themselves with

---

<sup>1</sup> In reality it was a form of naturalistic monism: Deus sive Natura.

<sup>2</sup> Lightfoot: "Comm. on Philipians" p. 273.

ethics rather than metaphysics, with the Stoics this was the one absorbing passion. The contrast between the light reckless gaiety of the Hellenic spirit and the stern, unbending, almost fanatical moralism of the followers of Zeno is as complete as could well be imagined. The ever active conscience which is the glory, and the proud self consciousness which is the reproach, of the Stoic school are alike alien to the temper of ancient Greece. Stoicism breathes rather the religious atmosphere of the East, which fostered on the one hand the inspired devotion of a David or an Isaiah, and on the other the self-mortification and self-righteousness of an Egyptian therapeute or an Indian fakir. Stoicism may be described as the contact of Oriental influences with the world of classical thought."

But though the germ of Stoicism was derived from the East, its systematic development and its practical successes were attained by transplantation into western soil. It is only when Stoicism comes to Rome and the West that it gains importance for the student of the New Testament. This latest, or Roman, period of the school is the one which has chiefly attracted attention, not only because its practical influence becomes most manifest, but also because this stage of its history is most adequately illustrated by extant writings of the school. And of this stage in its history Seneca is without doubt the most striking representative.

Before comparing the thought of Seneca with that of the New Testament it would be well to examine the repeated allegations that certain words in the Epistles are derived from Stoic terminology. Dr. Bigg, commenting on 2 Peter 2, 11, says: "The ethical use

of *σάρξ* in the Epistles may have come from Epicurus and from the Stoics - Epictetus II, 23. 20: *Παρελθούσα ἡμῖν λεγέτω κρᾶτιστον εἶναι τῶν ὄντων τὴν σάρκα* ; Marcus Antoninus II, 2: *τῶν μὲν σαρκίων καταφρόνησον* . A large number of New Testament words are found in Epictetus, *δόγμα, κανών, σώζεσθαι, ἀπόλλυσθαι, ἁμαρτάνειν κηρύσσειν* (- to preach, 4.6.23), *τὰς ἐντολάς τοῦ θεοῦ* (IV, 7,17) *καλεῖν* (of God II, 1,39) *ἀπιστία* (II, 14.8), *μάρτυς* (II, 24,113), *ἄγγελος* (III, 22.33), *κύριε ὁ θεός* (II, 16.13) *κύριε ἐλέησον* (II, 7.12). Some Christian words evidently come from Stoicism, such as *προκοπή* in Phil. 1,25; *κατόρθωμα* (Acts 24,2); *ἕξις* Heb. 5,14 (though the Stoics distinguished this word from *διάθεσις* ); *διάνοια* 1 Pet. 1,13; *φύσις θεία* , 2 Pet. 1,4. No doubt there was a certain amount of give and take."

Dr. Bigg's whole allegation is rendered valueless by the question of chronology. Epictetus, in whose writings the greater majority of the parallelisms with the vocabulary of the New Testament are found, lived and wrote about the year 100 A.D., far too late to influence the vocabulary of the New Testament. In fact, the whole matter may be just the opposite; we have little doubt that Epictetus, as well as the later melancholy Antonine, Marcus Aurelius, both on a much higher plane than Seneca, had some knowledge of Christian writings.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In fact, Epictetus, the lame philosopher of Nicopolis in Epirus has one distinct allusion to the Christians: "Then it is from insanity that someone may be disposed toward these things (i.e. is to treat the dearest things of life as mere shells) and the Galileans from habit" (*ὅπερ ἔθους* ) - he belittles their motive in enduring martyrdom as "mere habit."

However, it is eminently unreasonable to suppose that Paul was entirely oblivious to his surroundings and that the terms used also in Stoicism did not have any effect on his vocabulary. It can be seen that he gradually becomes familiar with certain philosophical terms. None of the following are found in the Epistle to the Thessalonians: *γνώσις, σοφία*  
*συνέσις, συνείδησις, σχῆμα* , all of which are found in 1 Cor. and later Epistles. The following also are not found in the Epistle to the Thessalonians, but are found in one or more of the Epistles which are later than 1 Cor. : *αἴσθησις, διάνοια*  
*θειότης, μορφή, ὄρεσις* . However, in this connection two facts must never be lost sight of: first, Paul uses these words in an entirely different meaning, and secondly, it is most improbable that he became acquainted with these terms through the reading of Stoic literature. By far the most plausible and acceptable explanation is that these terms had gradually become part and parcel of the current vocabulary.



## Jesus and Seneca.

As was noted above, in a consideration of the relation of Stoicism to Christianity, Seneca<sup>1</sup> is by far the most arresting figure. Born probably in the year 7 B.C. (although the exact date is somewhat uncertain) in the city Corduba of the Spanish province Baetica, he was carried to Rome at the tender age of two years, where he received his entire training probably under the Stoic Attalus. At this point one might indulge in the interesting speculation

---

<sup>1</sup> Throughout the ages he has aroused so much interest, that already the earliest of the Latin fathers, Tertullian, writing about a century and a half after Seneca's death, speaks of him as "often our own" (De Anim. 20: "Seneca saepe noster.") Some two hundred years later Jerome omits the qualifying adverb and calls him broadly "our own Seneca". (Adv. Jovin. I, 49: "Scripserunt Aristoteles et Plutarchus et noster Seneca de Matrimonio Libros" etc.). Living midway between these two writers Lactantius points out several coincidences with the teaching of the Gospel in the writings of Seneca, whom he nevertheless styles "the most determined of the Roman Stoics." (Div. Inst. I, 5: "Annaneus Seneca qui ex Romanis vel acerrimus Stoicus fuit.") In the council at Carthage in the year 567 he is quoted with an amazing deference.

whether Seneca, like so many other Stoics, had not Semitic blood in his veins. The whole district from which he came was thickly populated with Phoenician settlers. The name of his native province Baetica, the name of his native city Corduba, are both said to be Phoenician. Even his own name, though commonly derived from the Latin, may perhaps have a Semitic origin; for it is borne by a Jew of Palestine early in the second century.<sup>1</sup>

It is the general practise of writers who examine the relation of Seneca to Christianity to point out certain general and often very vague resemblances of sentiment without narrowing these down to definite parallelisms. It will be readily seen that this process can carry little weight and achieve no results in the solution of the problem presented, since the context as well as the exact meaning of the terminology employed is of the utmost importance.

One of the most important as well as ridiculous assertions which are made in an examination of this subject is the one presented by Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics sub verbo Stoicism: "While the doctrine of the Trinity is somewhat dimly adumbrated by Paul, it has long ago been noted that its principle finds full expression in the earlier writings of Seneca." The passage to which the writer refers is found in Ad Helviam VIII, 3 and reads: "Quisquis formator universi fuit, sive ille Deus est potens omnium sive incorporalis ratio ingentium operum artifex, sive divinus spiritus per omnia maxima ac minima aequali intentione diffusus, sive fatum et immutabilis causarum inter se cohaerentium series." The writer quoted has found the doctrine of the Trinity here; however, he significantly ends his quotation with "diffusio" omitting the

---

<sup>1</sup> The name ΣΕΝΕΚΑΣ or ΣΕΒΕΚΑΣ occurs in the list of the early bishops of Jerusalem, Eusebius H.E. IV, 5.

all important clause "sive fatum" etc. which robs the attempted parallelism of all its weight.

However, the purpose of this section of the inquiry will best be served and the moral teaching of Seneca will be brought out most clearly by collating the "parallels" between his writings and the words of our Savior.

Seneca.

Ep. Mor. lxxxvii 21: "The mind, unless it is pure and holy, comprehends not God."

De Beneficiis V, 14: "A man is a robber even before he stains his hands; for he is already armed to alay, and has the desire to spoil and kill."

Ep. Mor. LI, 13: "Cast out whatsoever things rend thy heart: nay, if they could not be extracted otherwise, thou shouldst have plucked out thy

Jesus.

Matth. 5,8: "Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God."

Matth. 5,21f: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of judgment: But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell-fire."

Matth. 5,29: "And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole

heart itself with them."

De Const.Sap. 14: "What will the wise man do when he is buffeted (colaphis percussus)? He will do as Cato did when he was smitten on the mouth. He did not burst into a passion, did not avenge himself, did not even forgive it, but denied it having been done."

De Vita beata 20: " I will be agreeable to friends, gentle and yielding to enemies." De Otio 1: "Give aid even to enemies."

De Beneficiis I, 1: "Let us follow the gods as leaders, so far as human weakness allows: let us give our good services and not lend them an usury... How many are unworthy of the light: and yet the day arises....

This is characteristic of a great and good mind, to pursue not the fruits of a kind deed but the deeds themselves."

body should be cast into hell."

Matth. 5,39: "But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also."

Matth. 5,44: "But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you."

Matth. 5,45: "That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust."

De Beneficiis IV, 25 & 26:

"We propose to ourselves to follow the example of the gods. See what great things they bring to pass daily, what great gifts they bestow, with what abundant fruits they fill the earth... With what suddenly falling showers they soften the ground ... All these things they do without reward, without any advantage accruing to themselves... Let us be ashamed to hold out any benefit for sale: we find the gods giving gratuitously. If you imitate the gods, confer benefits even on the unthankful: for the sun rises even on the wicked, and the seas are open to pirates."

De Beneficiis V, 8: "One ought so to give that another may receive. It is not giving or receiving to transfer from the right hand to the left."

De Beneficiis II, 10: "This is the law of a good deed

Luke 6,35: "But love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be called the children of the Highest: for He is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil."

Matth. 6,3f: "But when thou doest alms let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth: That thine alms may be in secret: and thy Father which seeth in secret himself shall reward thee openly."

between two: the one ought at once to forget that it was conferred, the other never to forget that it was received."

Ep. Mor. lxxiv 20: "Let whatsoever has been pleasing to God, be pleasing to man."

Ep. Mor. V, 1,2: "Do not, like those whose desire is not to make progress but to be seen, do anything to attract notice in your demeanor or mode of life. Avoid a rough exterior and unshorn hair and a carelessly kept beard and professed hatred of money and a bed laid on the ground and whatever else affects ambitious display by a preverse path.. Let everything within us be unlike, but let our outward appearance (frons) resemble the common people."

Ep. Mor. CX 18: "Apply thyself rather to the true riches. It is shameful to depend for a happy life on silver and gold."

De Vita beata 24: "Let thy

Matth. 6,10: "Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven."

Matth,6,16: "Moreover when ye fast, be not, as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance: for they disfigure their faces, that they may appear unto men to fast. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward."

Matth. 6,19: "Lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal."

good deeds be invested like a treasure deep-buried in the ground, which thou canst not bring to light, except it be necessary."

De Vita Beata 27: "Do ye mark the pimples of others, being covered with countless ulcers? This is as if a man should mock at the moles or warts on the most beautiful persons, when he himself is devoured by a fierce scab."

Ep. Mor. XCIV 43: "Expect from others what you have done to another."

De Beneficiis II,1: "Let us so give as we would wish to receive."

Ep. Mor. lxxxvii 24,25:

"Therefore good things cannot spring of evil... good does not grow of evil, any more than a fig of an olive tree. The fruits correspond to the seed."

Matth. 7,3f: "And why beholdest thou the mote in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam in thine own eye? Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam is in thine own eye?"

Matth. 7,12: "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets."

Matth. 7,16f: "Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit: but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit."

Nor are these coincidences of thought and imagery confined to the Sermon on the Mount; Lightfoot<sup>1</sup> says: "If our Lord compares the hypocritical Pharisees to whited walls, and contrasts the scrupulously clean outside of the cup and platter with the inward corruption, Seneca also adopts the same images: "Within is no good: If thou shouldest see them, not where they are exposed to view but where they are concealed, they are miserable, filthy, vile, adorned without like their own walls... Then it appears how much real foulness beneath the surface this borrowed glitter has concealed."<sup>2</sup> If our Lord declares that the branches must perish unless they abide in the vine, the language of Seneca presents an eminently instructive parallel: "As the leaves cannot flourish by themselves but want a branch wherein they may grow and whence they may draw sap, so those precepts wither if they are alone: They need to be grafted in a sect."<sup>3</sup> Again the parables of the sower, of the mustard-seed, of the debtor forgiven, of the talents placed out at usury, of the rich fool, have all their echoes in the writings of the Roman Stoic: "Words must be sown like seed which, though it be small, yet when it has found a suitable place unfolds its strength and from being the least spreads into the largest growth... They are few things which are spoken: yet if the mind has received them well, they gain strength and grow. The same, I say, is the case with precepts as with seeds. They produce much and yet they are scanty..."<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Comm. on Philippians p. 285.

<sup>2</sup> De Providentia 6.

<sup>3</sup> Ep. Mor. XCX 59. With this remark Seneca virtually condemns and abandons the proud Stoic self-sufficiency.

<sup>4</sup> Ep. Mor. XXXVIII, 2.



"Divine seeds are sown in human bodies. If a good husbandman receives them, they spring up like their origin...; if a bad one they are killed as by barren and marshy ground, and then weeds are produced in place of grain."<sup>1</sup> "We have received our good things as a loan. The use and advantage are ours, and the duration thereof the Divine disposer of his own bounty regulates. We ought to have in readiness what He has given us for an uncertain period, and to restore it, when summoned to do so, without complaint. He is the worst debtor, who reproaches his creditor."<sup>2</sup> "As the moneylender does not summon some creditors whom he knows to be bankrupt... So I will openly and persistently pass over some ungrateful persons nor demand any benefit from them in turn."<sup>3</sup> "O how great is the madness of those who embark on distant hopes; I will buy, I will build, I will lend out, I will demand payment, I will bear honors: then at length I will resign my old age wearied and sated to rest. Believe me, all things are uncertain even to the prosperous. No man ought to promise himself anything out of the future. Even what we hold slips through our hands, and fortune assails the very hour on which we are pressing."<sup>4</sup> If our Master declares that "it is more blessed to give than to receive", the Stoic philosopher tells his readers that "he would rather not receive benefits, than not confer them,"<sup>5</sup> and

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. lxxiii 16.

<sup>2</sup> Ad Marc. 10.

<sup>3</sup> De Beneficiis V, 21.

<sup>4</sup> Ep. Mor. CI, 4. This passage is typical of the Stoic despair of all things.

<sup>5</sup> De Beneficiis I, 1.

that "it is more wretched to the good man to do an injury than to receive one."<sup>1</sup> If our Lord reminds his hearers of the Scriptural warning, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice", if He commends the poor widow's mite thrown into the treasury as a richer gift than the most lavish offerings of the wealthy, if His whole life is a comment on the prophet's declaration to the Jews that God "cannot away with their sabbaths and new moons" so also Seneca writes: "Not even in victims, though they be fat and their brows glitter with gold, is honor paid to the gods, but in the pious and upright intent of the worshippers."<sup>2</sup> The gods are "worshipped not by the wholesale slaughter of fat carcasses of bulls nor by votive offerings of gold or silver, nor by money poured into their treasuries, but by the pious and upright intent."<sup>3</sup> "Let us forbid any one to light lamps on sabbath-days, since the gods do not want light, and even men take no pleasure in smoke... he worships God, who knows Him."<sup>4</sup> And lastly, if the dying prayer of the Redeemer is 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do' some have discovered a striking counterpart (I can only see a mean caricature) of this expression of triumphant self-sacrifice in the language of Seneca: "There is no reason why thou shouldest be angry: pardon them; they are all mad."<sup>5</sup>

At first sight this amazing array of coincidences in language and thought is most striking. However, there are a number of

---

<sup>1</sup> De Beneficiis IV, 12. VII, 31.32.

<sup>2</sup> De Benef. I, 6.

<sup>3</sup> Ep. Mor. CXV 5.

<sup>4</sup> Ep. Mor. CXV 47.

<sup>5</sup> De Benef. V. 17.

considerations which tend to minimize this impression. Because of the evident fact that all the coincidences in language and thought between Stoicism and the New Testament must be subjected to one and the same kind of examination, we shall first proceed to point out the parallels between Paul and Seneca and then open the discussion.

## II -3.

### Paul and Seneca.

The most striking coincidences between Paul and Seneca are the following:

De Superstitione<sup>1</sup> 31: "They consecrate the holy and immortal and inviolable gods in motionless matter of the vilest kind: they clothe them with the forms of men, and beasts, and fishes."

Ep. Mor. XXXIX 6: "They are even enamored of their own ill deeds, which is the last ill of all: and then is their wretchedness complete, when shameful things not only delight them but are even approved by them."

Rom. 1,23: "And changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things."

Rom. 1,28.32: "And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them."

---

<sup>1</sup> This quotation appears in Augustine's De Civitate Dei VI, 10.

De Ira II, 28: "The tyrant is angry with the homicide, and the sacrilegious man punishes thefts."

Ep. Mor. X, 2: "Hope is the name for an uncertain good."

De Beneficiis 7,31: "Pertinacious goodness overcomes evil men."

De Vita Beata 2: "I have a better and a surer light whereby I can discern the true from the false. The mind discerns the good of the mind."

Ep. Mor. 10: "Let us use them, let us not trust in them; and let us use them sparingly, as a loan deposited with us, which will soon depart."

Rom. 2,21f: "Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? Thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? Thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?"

Rom. 8,24: "For we are saved by hope: but hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?"

Rom. 12,21: "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."

1 Cor., 2,11: "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?"

1 Cor. 7,31: "For they that use this world, as not trusting in the future, the fashion of this world passeth away."

Ep. Mor. XCVIII, 3: "What blows do athletes receive in their face, what blows all over their body. Yet they bear all the torture from thirst of glory. Let us also overcome all things, for our reward is not a crown or a palm branch or the trumpeter proclaiming silence for the announcement of our name, but virtue and strength of mind and peace acquired ever after."

De Vita Beata 15: "To obey God is liberty."

Ep. Mor. LXXXIV 18: "Not only corrected but transfigured."

Ep. Mor. XCIV 48: "What is man? A cracked vessel which will break at the least fall."

Ep. Mor. XXXII, 2: "This is salutary; not to associate with

1 Cor. 9,25: "And every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things. Now they do it to obtain a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible."

2 Cor. 2,17: "Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

2 Cor. 3,18: "But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord."

2 Cor. 4,7: "But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us."

2 Cor. 6,14: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers:

those unlike ourselves and having different desires."

De Beneficiis I, 7: "That gift is far more welcome which is given with a ready than that which is given with a full hand."

Ep. Mor. I, 1: "Gather up and preserve the time."

Ep. Mor. XIV, 1: "I confess that love of our own body is natural to us."

De Vita Beata 7: "Which comes or passes away very quickly, destined to perish in the very using (in ipso usu sui periturum)."

Ad Helv. matr. 16: "Neither jewels nor pearls turned thee aside." (Addressed to Seneca's mother.)

Ep. Mor. LXXX, 2: "I reflect how many exercise their bodies, how few their minds."

for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?

2 Cor. 9,7: "Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver."

Eph. 5,16: "Redeeming the time, because the days are evil."

Eph. 5,29: "For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth it and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church."

Col. 2,22: "Which are all to perish with the using; after the commandments and doctrines of men."

1 Tim. 2,9: "In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with braided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array!"

1 Tim. 4,8: "For bodily exercise profiteth little: but godliness is profitable unto all things, having

Ep. Mor. CXII, 3: "It is a foolish occupation to exercise the muscles of the arms ... Return quickly from the body to the mind; exercise this, night and day."

Ep. Mor. XXIII 9: "They live ill who are always learning to live."

Ep. Mor. XXXIII, 9: "How long wilt thou learn? begin to teach."

Finally, in the speech on the Areopagus:

De Beneficiis VII, 7: "The whole world is the temple of the immortal gods"... "Temples are not to be built to God of stones piled on high: He must be consecrated in the heart of each man."

Ep. Mor. XLI, 1: "God is near thee: He is with thee; He is within."

promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come."

2 Tim. 3,7: "Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth."

Acts 17,24 f: "God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that He is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is worshipped with men's hands as though he needed anything, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things."

Acts 17,27: "That they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us."

Ep. Mor. XXX, 11: "Thou shalt not form Him of silver and gold: a true likeness of God cannot be moulded of this material."

Acts 17,29: "Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the God-head is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device."

As we have noted above the first impression made by this series of parallels is amazing. They seem to show a tremendous coincidence both in language and thought with the writings of the New Testament. However, in a consideration of these coincidences the following facts must not be ~~list~~ sight of:

1. The question of chronology. In investigating the obligations of one author to another the dates of the several writings are obviously a most important element in the decision. In this particular case the chronology is involved in considerable difficulty because the dates of Seneca's various works cannot be determined definitely. Roughly, however, the period of his literary activity covers the same time as the writing and dissemination of the Synoptic Gospels and the Epistles. With this fact in mind it becomes obvious that there could hardly have been any direct exchange of thought between the two groups; that is, Seneca could hardly have been in possession of the Gospels, and the Evangelists and St. Paul could not have had copies of Seneca's works.



2. Seneca's obligations to older writers. Seneca was evidently a voracious reader and gathered much of his material from the writings of others. The parallels between him and Plato, Aristotle, and the older Stoics, as well as the Pythagoreans are numerous and striking. Some of the most striking passages cited are direct quotations from earlier writers, and therefore can have no direct connection with Christian ethics. This point again brings us back to the old question: "Where did the earlier philosophers obtain those brilliant flashes of ethical sentiment which Seneca reproduces?" We cannot but ascribe them to the faint reflection of the truths which God had implanted in man at his creation. The conscience of the heathen, although in the vast majority of cases gone pitifully astray, could undoubtedly have prompted these occasional flights into the realm of ethics.

3. The context. This consideration is of the utmost importance; coincidence in language and thought when detached from their context and the backgrounds against which they stand, are often most illusory and fallacious. In spite of the parallelisms of expressions quoted above, the ethics of Christianity and Stoicism present a direct contrast. Only when Seneca completely deserts the Stoic platform does he rise to the level of Christianity. When he does not do that he presents nothing but the grossest opposition to Christianity. He is a pantheistic naturalist; he identifies God with the world, with fate, with necessity, with

nature;<sup>1</sup> his language concerning God must therefore be interpreted according to his tenets; it entirely loses its theological meaning and becomes merely an allusion to physical facts. Hence also language which, to a Christian, would be shocking blasphemy, is consistent and natural on the lips of Seneca. "The good man" he says<sup>2</sup> "differs from God only in length of time." "He is like God excepting his mortality."<sup>3</sup>

Because of this absence of belief in a personal God, it is impossible for Seneca to have any consciousness of sin; he cannot view it as an offense against a righteous God. Hence, also his numerous distinctions between "right and wrong" lose all value and could well be translated into the terms of our own thought "what is expedient and what is not."

Again Seneca's morals, in spite of his language, betray all the repulsive features of his school. His fundamental maxim is not to train and guide nature but to overcome it.<sup>4</sup> The passions and affections are not to be directed, but to be crushed. It is immediately obvious that this tone leaves no place for repentance,

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. especially De Beneficiis IV, 7.8: "Natura, inquit, hoc mihi praestat. Non intellegis te, cum hoc dicis, mutare nomen deo? Quid enim aliud est natura quam deus et divina ratio toti mundo partibusque eius inserta? ... Hunc eundem et fatum si dixeris, non mentieris.. Sic nunc naturam voca, fatum, fortunam, omnia eiusdem dei nomina sunt varie utentis sua potestate"; De Vita Beata 8: "Mundus cuncta complectens rectorque universi deus."

<sup>2</sup> De Providentia I.

<sup>3</sup> Ep. Mor. XXXI.

<sup>4</sup> De Brevitate Vitae 14: "Hominis naturam cum Stoicis vincere."

for forgiveness, for restitution, on which the foundations of the Gospel rest.

These considerations lead to the patent conclusion that many even of the most obvious parallels in Seneca's language are really no parallels at all because of the diametrically opposed background against which they stand.

4. Stoicism's Eastern origin. This fact, which was already mentioned above, becomes most important in this connection. If the principal Stoic teachers, whom Seneca followed, were all from the East, it is obvious that the stamp of their Oriental origin is also borne by Seneca's writings. Dr. Lightfoot remarks<sup>1</sup>: "One Stoic teacher comes from Scythopolis, a second from Apamea, a third from Ascalon, a fourth from Ptolemais, two others from Hierapolis, besides several from Tyre and Sidon or their colonies, such as Citium and Carthage." In view of these facts it would indeed be strange if, living on the confines and even within the borders of the home of Judaism, the Stoic teachers escaped all influence from the high standard of ethics and morals of the Old Testament. It is probably no extravagant assumption to say that the Stoics, specifically also Seneca, owed those ethical maxims and coincidences with the morals of Christianity which cannot be explained in any other way, to their Eastern origin and to their acquaintance with the flourishing Jewish schools of their age, founded on the teaching of the Old Testament.

---

<sup>1</sup> Comm. on Philippians p. 299.

5. Paul and Seneca. The above considerations are sufficient to explain the few parallels between Seneca and the New Testament which really require some explanation. However, in this connection another interesting point suggests itself: the possibility of a direct meeting between Paul and Seneca.<sup>1</sup> Although we personally would reject the possibility for lack of convincing evidence, yet there are certain points which have often been pointed out which lend a certain amount of plausibility to the theory. Already in the early church we find a legend extant that Seneca was a Christian and that Seneca and Paul had met; there is a correspondence between the two (which is, however, patently spurious); at Corinth Paul was brought before Gallio, Seneca's brother, with whom Seneca corresponded; at Rome Paul was delivered to Burrus the prefect of the praetorian guards, the intimate friend of Seneca; lastly, when Paul was brought before Nero for trial, Seneca must have been present as the emperor's adviser and may have become interested in such a singular prisoner. However, these are all conjectures and the matter must remain unsolved.

To sum up: In spite of all the seeming parallels between Stoicism and Christianity there can be no connection between the two - they are diametrically opposed. Stoic philosophy with all its high-sounding phrases and seemingly beautiful teaching wholly

---

<sup>1</sup> An indirect acquaintance with Christianity Seneca may have possibly gained from conversation with slaves in his household. He himself says that he often "engaged them in familiar conversation (Ep. Mor. XLVII) and it is at least possible that there were Christians among them.

failed to present to the world a Christian ideal, and could never have formed a basis from which the spirit and life of Christ and the Apostles could have been derived. Seneca's own life shows this; in spite of the heights to which he occasionally rises he was far from being above reproach; to the weakling Nero he played the submissive sycophant, he amassed a vast fortune, and finally fell so low as to become the author of the shameful document in which Nero's matricide was covered with falsehoods. In Stoicism heathen philosophy made its last desperate stand against Christianity; Bishop Lightfoot says<sup>1</sup>:

"Like all the later systems of Greek philosophy, Stoicism was the offspring of despair. Of despair in religion: for the old mythologies had ceased to command the belief or influence the conduct of men. Of despair in politics: for the Macedonian conquest had broken the independence of the Hellenic states and stamped out the last sparks of corporate life. Of despair even of philosophy itself: for the older thinkers, though they devoted their lives to forging a golden chain which should link earth to heaven, appeared now to have spent their strength in weaving ropes of sand." Contrast this with Christianity, essentially the religion of hope, and the vast gulf separating the two becomes apparent at once. To the Stoics as well as to the Greeks "who sought wisdom" (*ἐπειδὴ καὶ Ἕλληνας σοφίαν ζητοῦσιν* 1 Cor. 1,22) the message of Christianity was and remained foolishness (*μωρία* 1 Cor. 1,18).

---

<sup>1</sup> Comm. on Philippians: p. 271 f.

### III.

#### Gnosticism and the New Testament.

During the last century the claim was repeatedly advanced that there are certain very definite traces of Gnosticism in the New Testament. The books which were especially examined were Paul's Epistle to the Colossians and his Pastoral Letters. The allegation that there were evidences of Gnosticism in these letters gained tremendous importance from the fact, that, if it were true, it would very definitely place these books at a much later date than the traditional one. To examine the strength of this theory will be the purpose of the present section of this inquiry.

It will be necessary to briefly define Gnosticism in order to gain a view of its predominant characteristics. Our knowledge of this peculiar mixture of Christianity and philosophy comes almost entirely from secondary sources, from their opponents, Irenaeus (140-200; his treatise *Ἐλεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνῶσεως* Hyppolytus ( *κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων Ἐλεγχος* ) Tertullian (*Adversus Valentinianos*) and others. Of treatises by Gnostics themselves, only one, and that by an unknown author, is extant, *πίστις σοφία*. Partly because of these secondary sources and partly because of the extremely indefinite character of this potent anti-Christian influence it is extremely difficult to present an exact definition of its doctrines. Orr remarks:<sup>1</sup> "The infinitely varied shapes assumed by the systems render it almost impossible to classify them, or even to give an account of their

---

<sup>1</sup> James Orr: "The Progress of Dogma" p. 58.

leading ideas which shall not be open to objection. We might as well try to classify the products of a tropical jungle, or the shapes and hues of the sunset clouds, which change under our view as we look at them."

A general definition of Gnosticism may best be given in the words of the same author<sup>1</sup>: "Gnosticism may be described generally as the fantastic product of the blending of certain Christian ideas - particularly that of redemption through Christ - with speculations and imaginings derived from a medley of sources (Greek, Jewish, Parsic; philosophies, religions, theosophies, mysteries) in a period when the human mind was in a kind of ferment, and when opinions of every sort were jumbled together in an unimaginable welter. It involves, as the name denotes, a claim to "knowledge", knowledge of a kind of which the ordinary believer was incapable and in the possession of which "salvation" in the full sense consisted. This knowledge of which the Gnostic boasted, related to the subject ordinarily treated of in religious philosophy; Gnosticism was a species of religious philosophy."

Though the exact definition of the entire Gnostic system is a matter of extreme difficulty, a few of its chief tenets may readily be pointed out:

1. A claim on the part of the initiated to a special knowledge of the truth, a tendency to regard knowledge as superior to faith.
2. The absolute separation of matter and spirit, matter

---

<sup>1</sup> James Orr: "The Early Church" p. 71.

being per se evil and the source of all evil. This tenet was very evidently derived from Greek philosophy or even Philo.

3. An attempt at the solution of the problem of the creation and of the origin of evil by the conception of a Demiurge<sup>1</sup> i.e. a Creator or Artificer of the world as distinct from the Supreme Deity, and also by means of emanations (Aeons) extending between God and the visible universe.

4. A denial of the true humanity of Christ, a docetic Christology, which looked upon the earthly life of Christ and especially his sufferings on the cross as unreal.

5. The denial of the personality of the Supreme God, and the denial also of the free will of man.

6. The teaching, on the one hand, of asceticism, as the means of attaining to spiritual communion with God, and on the other hand, of an indifference which led directly to licentiousness.

7. A syncretistic tendency which combined certain more or less misunderstood Christian doctrines, various elements from Oriental,

---

<sup>1</sup> The creation of the world of sense is portrayed by Valentinus, quoted by Windelband "History of Philosophy" p. 254 in the following theogonic-cosmogonic poetic invention: "When the lowest of the Aeons, Wisdom (σοφία), in overhasty longing, would fain have plunged into the original Ground and had been brought back again to her place by the Spirit of Measure (ὄρος), the Supreme God separated from her her passionate longing (πάθος) as a lower Wisdom (κάτω σοφία), called Achamoth, and banished it into the 'void'. This lower σοφία, nevertheless, impregnated by ὄρος for the redemption, bore the Demiurge and the world of sense." It is difficult to determine the meaning of this conglomerative nonsense which, however, is typical of Gnosticism because of its eclectic tendencies.



Jewish, and other sources.

8. The Old Testament was ascribed to the Demiurge<sup>1</sup> or inferior Creator of the world, who was the God of the Jews, but not the true God.

The Gnostic system did not reach the apex of its power and influence until well in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century A.D. However, it is entirely plausible that it was already extant several decades, perhaps even longer before this time. In fact, as we have noted above, <sup>the</sup> Tübingen school has made it a definite factor in the Colossian heresy<sup>2</sup> and finds traces of it in the Pastoral letters.

---

<sup>1</sup> This term itself is Platonic.

<sup>2</sup> The Colossian heresy has naturally received wide attention and, because of the Apostle's mildness in correcting it when compared with his sternness in rebuking the Judaizers in Galatians, the attempts at an exact definition of it have differed widely. Baur thinks they were "Gnostic Ebionites"; Mayerhoff "Cerinthians"; Lipsius "Christian Essenism in its progress to Gnosticism"; Nitzsch "A connecting link between Essenes and Cerinthians"; Holtzmann "Ascetics and Theosophists of the Essene school"; Ritschl "precursors of the Christian Essenes"; Heinrichs "disciples of John the Baptist"; Michaelis and Storr "Essenes"; Neander "speculatists who endeavored to combine Oriental theosophy and asceticism with Christianity"; Tertullian calls them "philosophers"; Eichhorn "Jews"; Grotius "heathen followers of Pythagoras." A number of these conclusions can evidently be thrust aside immediately; the Apostle's mild tone makes the conclusion inevitable that the heretics were still Christians of a sort and that the heresy itself had not taken deep root.

An examination of the exact nature of the Colossian heresy will be necessary before it can be analyzed for Gnostic elements. The first definite characteristic of it was undoubtedly a pretentious philosophy which affected an esoteric knowledge, received through tradition, and which abandoning Christ the Head, indulged in vain speculations and idle imaginings concerning the number and nature of the beings in the spiritual world (Col. 2, 8, 18). The second element was a strict Judaistic observance of all the Jewish ordinances (Col. 2, 16. 20-22). The third characteristic may be defined as the practice of ascetic regulations.

At first sight these elements seem incongruous and mutually exclusive.<sup>1</sup> However, the epistle itself contains no hint that the Apostle had more than one set of antagonists view; besides it is most improbable that in such a small community as that at Colossae two or even three parties could exist side by side. Therefore the problem before us is not to define two or three distinct heretical tendencies but rather to analyze the separate elements of a single heresy.

The theory that there is a Gnostic element in the Colossian heresy rests on the following points which we shall examine briefly:

1. The term *παῖρωμα* . It is maintained that this term is a technical expression in Gnosticism and that Paul's

---

<sup>1</sup> Judaizers were not able to entertain speculative gnosis or ascetic tendencies, while ascetics were hardly favorable to the Pharisaical ordinances.

correct<sup>1</sup> use of it springs from the desire to correct a Gnostic perversion of it. However, this theory is hardly tenable; although the heretics at Colossae undoubtedly connected erroneous tendencies with this term, maintaining that only a single divine power, a fraction of the pleroma, resided in our Lord (Col. 1, 19) yet this usage of the term is far from being Gnostic. Cerinthus definitely treats the pleroma as a locality, a higher spiritual region, from which the divine power, typified by the dove-like form, issued forth as on wings and to which it ever reascends. With Valentinus the pleroma is very definitely a locality, a region, an abode of the divine powers. Nothing could be farther from the meaning of the term for the Colossian heretics.

2. The term γνῶσις . While this aristocracy of intellect, this emphasis on esoteric knowledge, on the gnosis in opposition to πίστις was undoubtedly an element in Gnosticism, it was by no means peculiar to it. This spirit was, so to speak, in the air; it animated all the ancient religions as well as the heathen philosophies; it was a part of Philo's system and was prominent in Stoicism, - knowledge, wisdom, reserved for the privileged few was all in all. It is therefore eminently unreasonable to suppose that the appearance of this term in Colossians as well as the emphasis placed on it by the heretics forces one to predicate Gnostic elements of the heresy.

3. Asceticism. This also was a prominent element in Gnosticism.

---

<sup>1</sup> We are not considering here the allegation made by isolated radical writers that Paul himself is guilty of Gnostic tendencies. The theory ignores all the relevant factors in the Apostle's language and thought.

However, here also our remarks concerning the former term are pertinent. A certain asceticism, a tendency to flagellate the body was part and parcel of almost every sect and philosophical party of the vast Roman empire. Such tendencies were noticeable in the Mystery Religions, in the variegated and numerous sects which sprang up in the fruitful soil of Eastern mysticism. It is therefore obviously a most subjective and tendential judgment to find a Gnostic characteristic in the Colossian heresy because of its asceticism.

4. The intermediary *δυνάμεις*, spirits, angels in the Epistle to the Colossians. These, it is alleged, correspond to the Gnostic aeons or emanations linking God to the universe. However, we cannot reasonably take the word *ἄγγελοι* in any way but its usual meaning; by far the most plausible explanation is that these are entirely the manifestations of a local tendency, finding its antecedent in the worship of river spirits at Colossae.<sup>1</sup> Colossae evidently was a hotbed for speculation, especially in this line; in later years we find Colossae the center of worship of St. Michael<sup>2</sup> as its patron saint. The theory of emanations is therefore excluded from the Colossian heresy both by the terminology and the reasonableness of other explanations for the *δυνάμεις*.

The results of this examination are evident; we have found

---

<sup>1</sup> Another reasonable explanation is that these *δυνάμεις* are local modifications of the vague *λόγοι* of the Jewish Hellenist, Philo.

<sup>2</sup> His temple was still in existence in the Middle Ages. In the 35<sup>th</sup> Canon of the Laodicean Council directed against the worship of angels, Theodoret has a note concerning the *ἑκπηρία* of the archangel Michael in Phrygia and Pisidia.

none of the dominant Gnostic characteristics noted above in the Epistle to the Colossians except asceticism and the emphasis on gnosis, neither of which are peculiar to Gnosticism and are in fact so widespread that they could come from various sources. The Colossian heresy was evidently a combination of Judaistic tendencies with some elements of purely local speculation concerning angelology.

## Gnosticism in the Pastoral Epistles.

Neander was the first to find traces of Gnosticism in the Pastoral Epistles. Baur followed him in this and attempted to build up and expand this view. The words of Jülicher are typical of this tendency<sup>1</sup>: "Selbst wenn nicht 1 Tim. 6,20 geradezu die fälschlich sogenannte Gnosis erwähnt würde, könnte kein Zweifel sein, dass es gnostisierende Ketzer sind, von denen der Verfasser schweres Unheil in der Kirche bereits erlebt hat und noch befürchtet. Antignostisch gestimmt ist alles, was von Theologie des Verfassers selber etwa greifbar wird; 1 Tim. 2,4 klingt wie ein Protest gegen der gnostische Verteilung der Menschen in 2 or 3 Klassen, von denen für die eine, die Hyliker, ein Errettung schlechtweg ausgeschlossen ist; die Schwärmerei für die Überlieferung und die antidoketischen Äusserungen stimmen damit überein. Noch deutlicher erkennen wir jedoch die Gnostiker aus den Pastoralbriefen. Gleichviel ob ehemalige Juden (Titus 1,10.14) oder Hellenen, renommieren sie mit ihren tiefsinnigen Mythen, unendlichen Genealogiea, imponieren durch ihre dialektischen Künste und ihre Fähigkeit, immer neue Probleme aufzustellen und zu lösen; das Gesetz benutzen diese neumodischen Gesetzeslehrer, 1 Tim. 1,7; 2 Tim. 3,15-17, zu unnützen Spekulationen oder berufen sich gar auf dasselbe um Menschengebote (Titus 1,14) durchzusetzen, wie das Verbot von Ehe, Wein und Fleischgenusz 1 Tim. 4,3; 5,23. Eine zukünftige Auferstehung leugnen sie 2 Tim. 2,18, da die wahre schon stattgefunden habe, jedenfalls in der "Erkenntniss." Nun passen freilich die

---

<sup>1</sup> Einleitung p. 125f; Quoted by Wohlenberg "Die Pastoralbriefe" p. 24.

:zusammengetragenen Züge nicht alle auf ein einzelnes gnostisches System, etwa des Basilides oder des Marcion, aber wir kennen zahlreiche gnostische Systeme nur dem Namen nach, und die Einzelheiten will der Verfasser gar nicht genau besprechen, prinzipiell beschränkt er sich solchem Gift gegenüber möglichst auf andeutende Behandlung; und man verkennt die Postition der Pastoralbriefe gründlich, wenn man in ihnen 3 Klassen von Irrlehrern zurechtdrückt ... Nun ist aber der Kampf um die Existenz zwischen der rechten gesunden Lehre der apostolischen Tradition und dem Subjektivismus erst im 2<sup>n</sup> Jahrhundert die Hauptaufgabe der Kirche geworden, wie denn auch die straffe Organisation der Gemeinden mit den Interessen dieses Kampfes zusammenhängt; ist der Verfasser der Pastoralbriefe ein Mann, der an solchem Kampf den lebendigsten Anteil nimmt und, weil er die Grösse der Gefahr ermisst, kein Bedenken trägt, im Interesse der Abwehr sogar zu dem bedenklichen Mittel der Unterschiebung paulinischer Briefe zu greifen, so können die Briefe nur nach 100 entstanden sein. Der äusseren Bezeugung wegen bleiben wir beim ersten Viertel des 2<sup>n</sup> Jahrhundert stehen."

Jülichers judgment is typical of the tendency to find Gnosticism in the Pastoral Epistles. An examination of the facts leads to the following conclusions:

1. The term  $\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$  is amenable to the same discussion as in Colossians. It is by no means a Gnostic technical term: Cf. above.

Wohlenberg remarks: "Im übrigen ist der echten, wertvollen, von Jesus<sup>1</sup>, und den Aposteln<sup>2</sup> selbst gebilligten und empfohlenen Erkenntniss

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Matth. 13,11; 11,25; 16,3; 24,32f. John 10,38; 13,7; 17, 3.25.

<sup>2</sup> John 6,69; Rom. 15,14; 1 Cor. 1,5; 8, 1.7.10.f; 12,8; 13,2.8; 14,6; 2 Cor. 6,6; 8,7; 11,6.

frühzeitig eine ihre Schranken vergessende, die lauterer Quellen verabsäumende oder trübende und darum auf Abwege kommende und andere darauf führende Richtung auf Wissen und Erkennen entgegengetreten."

2. That 1 Tim. 2,4 should refer to the Gnostic division of men into classes is ridiculous. The passage simply refers to God's grace which is extended to all men. If Jülicher's contention were correct it would follow that "the kings and those in authority" mentioned in v. 2 have less opportunity to be saved than others.

3. The repeated emphasis on the Apostolic doctrine in the Pastoral Epistles would obviously not be necessary only against Gnostics, but against all heretical tendencies.

4. The famous γενεαλογίας ἀπὲρ αὐτοῦ in Titus 3,9 and 1 Tim. 1,4, which are supposed to be the Gnostic genealogy of aeons, do not betray any of the characteristics necessary to support this contention. They are undoubtedly the noted and overemphasized Jewish genealogies which occupied a ridiculously dominant place in the thought of the Judaizers.<sup>1</sup>

In short, to the unprejudiced observer there are no traces of Gnosticism in the pastoral letters. We find no evidences of the dualism between matter and spirit, of the doctrine of emanations, of the differentiation between the Supreme God and the Demiurge, or between the God of the Old Testament and the Father of Jesus Christ. The heresy combated in the Pastoral Epistles is closely related to the Colossian heresy and has Judaizing tendencies, with a mixture of vague philosophical ideas added.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Book of Jubilees gives sufficient evidence of this tendency.



## Zoroastrianism and the Apocalypse.

Of late years the modern critical study of the Apocalypse has resulted in the predication of Zoroastrian influence on its making and meaning. Although the detailed examination of this theory would properly be the subject of a special inquiry, we would note a few of the most prominent facts in this connection, since Zoroastrianism, while often called a religion, is in reality an attempt at a philosophical explanation of the cosmos, as well as the origin of good and evil.

Dr. Moffatt<sup>1</sup> in the Expositor's New Testament remarks: "Zoroastrian influence is strongly marked, though not so strongly as Völter, in his latest volume (pp. 29f. 63f. 86f. 116f.) would make out. This, like that of Babylonia reaches back not simply to the indirect channel of the post-exilic Judaism, but apparently to an almost direct relationship. In Zoroastrian angelology and eschatology alone, for example, does anything adequate correspond to the sort of conceptions which in their present shape are peculiar, or almost peculiar, to the Apocalypse: viz. 1. the binding or noosing of the fiend (Apoc. 20, 1f); 2. the blasting of the third part of the earth (Apoc. 8,7f); 3. the seven spirits of God (Apoc. 1,4); 4. the guardian "fravishes" of the churches (see note on 1,20 - quite an Avestan touch); 5. the recrudescence of evil geni before the consummation (Apoc. 20,7f); 6. the emphasis on the millenium period; 7. the renewal of the universe. See, further, notes on 1,13; 2,5;

---

<sup>1</sup> Other writers who hold this view are Gunkel and Moulton, although the former predicates chiefly the Babylonian influence.

4,3; 7,17; 11,5f; 14,7f; 16, 13.20."

The above allegation is subject to one all-embracing sweeping criticism: The traditional view that the Apostle John is the author of the Apocalypse is by far the most acceptable; now, if John wrote the book, it is practically impossible to say that he was influenced by Zoroastrian demonology or eschatology. That John, the quiet peace loving disciple of Christ, the ἰδιώτης should have been interested in the Zend-Avesta is eminently unreasonable. Before considering the details of such an allegation as the above, Dr. Moffatt may well be asked the following questions: Had the Zend-Avesta gone beyond its native soil at that early date? Had it been translated (for it is impossible that John could have been able to read Zend, a sister language to the Sanskrit)? It is evident that before these and similar questions are answered satisfactorily, the alleged verbal coincidence, often based on subjective judgments and arbitrary translations, can carry no weight. We might add that all the coincidences which Moffatt points out (except the seven spirits of God) are natural conceptions in Zoroastrianism because of its dualism; nothing could be farther from John's mind than to propose an explanation for the origin and existence of evil.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The Bible: Hebrew text. LXX. Authorized Version.

Walther: Ad. Harnack geprüft.

Jones: The New Testament in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century.

Machen: Origin of Paul's religion.

Fisher: The Supernatural Origin of Christianity.

Fisher: The Beginnings of Christianity.

Philo: Works. The Cohn and Wendland edition contains the following treatises:

De Opificio Mundi

Legum Allegoriarum Libri I, II, III.

De Cherubim.

De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini.

Quod Deterius Potiori insidiari soleat.

De Posteritate Caini.

De Gigantibus.

Quod Deus sit immutabilis.

De Agricultura.

De Plantatione.

De Ebrietate.

De Sobrietate.

De Confusione Linguarum.

De Migratione Abrahami.

Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres sit.

De Congressu Eruditionis Gratia.

De Fuga et Inventione.

De Mutatione Nominum.

De Somniis I, II.

De Abrahamo.

De Josepho.

De Vita Mosis I, II, III.

De Specialibus Legibus I, II, III, IV.

De Virtutibus.

De Praemiis et Poenis.

De Execrationibus.

Legatio ad Gaium.

Quaestiones in Genesim I, II, III, IV.

Quaestiones in Exodum I, II.

Philo's Works: Yonge's translation.

Schürer: "Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes" Vol. III.

Zöckler: Article "Philo" in Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia.

M. Heinze: Lehre vom Logos.

Ewald: "Geschichte" etc. VI, 257-312.

Drummond: Philo Judaeus.

Catholic Encyclopedia on "Philo" and "Logos".

Encycl. Britt. on "Philo" and "Logos".

Jewish Encyclopedia: "Philo Judaeus" "Memra" "Wisdom".

Farrar: "Early Days of Christianity."

Hartmann: "Verbindung des Alten Testaments mit dem Neuen."

Zahn: "Kommentar zu Johannes."

Bleek: "Einleitung in das Neue Testament."

Hilgenfeld: "Das Johannes Evangelium."

Wichelhaus: "Das Johannes Evangelium."

Usteri: "Entwicklung des paulinischen Lehrbegriffs."  
Burton: "Commentary on Galatians." International Critical Series.  
Zeller: "Philosophie der Griechen."  
Sihler: "Testimonium Animae."  
Sihler: "From Augustus to Augustine."  
Farrar: "Seekers after God."  
Seneca: Works.  
Davidson: "The Stoic Creed."  
Lightfoot: "Commentary on Philippians."  
Alston: "The Stoics."  
Clemen: "Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources."  
Uhlhorn: "Does Hellenism contribute constituent elements to  
Paul's Christology."  
Lutheran Quarterly Review: Oct. 1923 (The Areopagus).  
Lightfoot: Comm. on Colossians.  
McClintock and Strong: Encyclopedia: passim.  
Farrar: "Life and Work of Paul."  
International Standard Encyclopedia.  
Charles: "Commentary on Revelation". Int. Crit. Series.  
The Expositors New Testament.  
Orr: "The Progress of Dogma."  
Princeton Theological Review Vol. XIX.  
Wohlenberg: "Die Pastoralbriefe."  
Tholuck: "Der Hebräerbrief."  
Hofmann: "Heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments."  
Deissmann: "Licht vom Osten."

Hilgenfeld: "Einleitung in das Neue Testament."  
Edersheim: "Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah."  
Pieper: Dogmatik.  
Bentwich: Philo Judaeus.  
Bowman: "Christian Thought and Hindoo Philosophy."  
Luther: VII, 1543.  
Theological Quarterly: Vol. VIII, 65. Gaenssle: "The Logos" etc.  
Lehre und Wehre: 55, 337: "Die Abfassung des Johannesevangeliums."  
Weiss: "Biblical Theology."  
Hayes: "John and His Writings."  
Hayes: "The New Testament Epistles."  
Weiss: "Der johanneische Lehrbegriff."  
Windelband: "History of Philosophy."  
Hengstenberg: "Kommentar zum Johannes."  
Jowett: "Philo and Paul" in Comm. on Romans.  
Godet: "Das Johannesevangelium."  
Thiersch: "Kritik der neutest. Schriften."  
Kennedy: "Philo's Contribution to Religion."  
Hastings: "Cyclopedia of Religion and Ethics: "Logos" "Stoicism".  
Scott-Holland: "The Fourth Gospel."  
Zahn: "Geschichte des Neutest. Kanons."  
Presbyterian and Reformed Review: Vol. II.  
Fairbairn: "The Place of Christ in Modern Theology."  
Fürbringer: "Einleitung in das Neue Testament."  
McGiffert: "The Apostolic Age."  
Case: "The Evolution of Early Christianity."  
Bossurt: "Geschichte der Welt und der Religion."

Ramsay: "The First Christian Century."

Milman: "History of Christianity."

Snowden: "The Making and Meaning of the New Testament."

Bigg: "Christian Platonists of Alexandria."

Burton: "A Source Book for the Teaching of Jesus."

Origen: Contra Celsum.

Siegfried: "Philo".

Keim: "Celsus' wahres Wort."

Butler: "Is the Evolution of Christianity from Natural Sources  
credible?"