

3195 (paf)
TAYLOR, C.
1901

Jef Philology 1901
0 21-28-1901

NOTE ON HERMAS AND CEBES—A REPLY.

The foregoing *Reply* (pp. 87—93) to the article *Hermas and Cebes* in vol. XXVII. 276—319 is useful as calling attention to things in it liable to misconstruction, whether for want of further explanation or for any other reason.

1. To begin with a remark which has no bearing on the relation of the *Pastor* to the *Tabula*, the authorship of the discovery of the close connexion between them is said to be "a secret which is revealed to us at the end" (p. 87). The reader might fairly accept this statement about so simple a matter as not likely to be inexact. But if he should proceed to verify it he will read at the end of vol. XXVII., "the discoverer referred to at the beginning of this article is Dr J. M. COTTERILL." Then in the first paragraph (p. 276) he will find the information that the name "will be given" at the end of the article, viz. on page 319. In a passage on *Mand. i.* specially referred to in the *Reply* (p. 89) the initials J. M. C. (p. 292) indicate the authorship of the short summary in terms of the μυθολογία of Cebes.

2. That the *Pastor* is "constructed on the same lines as the *Tabula*" (p. 88) is a statement into which the *Reply* reads something very different from what was meant by it. The traditional way of quoting the parts of *Hermas Pastor* being retained, it was pointed out that "Properly speaking" the so-called *Vis. v.* belongs to the "Book of the Shepherd", *Vis. i.—iv.* standing apart as an introduction in which the Shepherd does not appear. Traces of the introductory part of the *Tabula* are then pointed out in *Vis. i.—iv.*, and it is noted that this is the corresponding part of the *Pastor*.

NOTE ON HERMAS AND CEBES—A REPLY. 95

3. Of the *Pastor* and the *Tabula* it is said in the *Reply*, without explanation, that "no two works could well be more unlike" (p. 88). There may be, as I have written, an "essential difference" between them (p. 38), but this does not preclude resemblance and organic relationship. The comparatively lengthy *Pastor* covers more ground than the *Tabula*, but this and parts of the *Pastor* have marked features in common, and their affinities have to be accounted for.

Patristic writers bring together all manner of forms of the *Two Ways*. Justin Martyr (quoted in vol. XXI. 245) quotes Xenophon as saying that Hercules at the parting of the ways found τὴν τε Ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν Κακίαν ἐν γυναικῶν μορφαῖς φαινόμενας κ.τ.λ. His contemporary "Hermas", I should say, and "Cebes" before him used the same story as material for their allegories, both replacing Virtue and Vice by a multitude of particular virtues and vices personified. Hermas in *Sim. ix.* has twelve Christian graces and their opposites, the four δυνατότεραι in the latter dodecad being Ἀπιστία, Ἀκρασία, Ἀπεΐθεια, Ἀπάτη. To this group correspond in the *Tabula* Ἀκρασία, Ἀσωτία, Ἀπληστία, Κολακεία, and Ἀπάτη plays a leading part elsewhere therein. The two writings having this peculiar dramatic element in common, the question naturally arises whether they are independent; and a careful comparison of them seems to me to shew that Hermas, like Lucian in two places (p. 24), imitated Cebes.

4. Of Hermas it is said, "there is no denying that he is a clear writer" (p. 92). Certainly much of the *Pastor* is plain teaching; but it also, as is well known, contains some enigmas, and in places its imagery is anything but transparent and natural.

For example, of the πύλη and entrance by it Hermas says in *Sim. ix. 2—4, 12*, according to Dr Harmer's rendering, "Now this rock was ancient, and had a gate hewn out of it... And around the gate stood twelve virgins... I saw six men come... and they summoned a multitude of men... And the six men ordered them to build a tower above the gate... Now the virgins had spread out their hands, as if they would take some-

NOTE ON *HERMAS AND CEBES*—A *REPLY*.

The foregoing *Reply* (pp. 87—93) to the article *Hermas and Cebes* in vol. XXVII. 276—319 is useful as calling attention to things in it liable to misconstruction, whether for want of further explanation or for any other reason.

1. To begin with a remark which has no bearing on the relation of the *Pastor* to the *Tabula*, the authorship of the discovery of the close connexion between them is said to be “a secret which is revealed to us at the end” (p. 87). The reader might fairly accept this statement about so simple a matter as not likely to be inexact. But if he should proceed to verify it he will read at the end of vol. XXVII., “the discoverer referred to at the beginning of this article is Dr J. M. COTTERILL.” Then in the first paragraph (p. 276) he will find the information that the name “will be given” at the end of the article, viz. on page 319. In a passage on *Mand.* i. specially referred to in the *Reply* (p. 89) the initials J. M. C. (p. 292) indicate the authorship of the short summary in terms of the *μυθολογία* of Cebes.

2. That the *Pastor* is “constructed on the same lines as the *Tabula*” (p. 88) is a statement into which the *Reply* reads something very different from what was meant by it. The traditional way of quoting the parts of *Hermas Pastor* being retained, it was pointed out that “Properly speaking” the so-called *Vis.* v. belongs to the “Book of the Shepherd”, *Vis.* i.—iv. standing apart as an introduction in which the Shepherd does not appear. Traces of the introductory part of the *Tabula* are then pointed out in *Vis.* i.—iv., and it is noted that this is the corresponding part of the *Pastor*.

3. Of the *Pastor* and the *Tabula* it is said in the *Reply*, without explanation, that “no two works could well be more unlike” (p. 88). There may be, as I have written, an “essential difference” between them (p. 38), but this does not preclude resemblance and organic relationship. The comparatively lengthy *Pastor* covers more ground than the *Tabula*, but this and parts of the *Pastor* have marked features in common, and their affinities have to be accounted for.

Patristic writers bring together all manner of forms of the *Two Ways*. Justin Martyr (quoted in vol. XXI. 245) quotes Xenophon as saying that Hercules at the parting of the ways found τὴν τε Ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν Κακίαν ἐν γυναικῶν μορφαῖς φαινομένας κ.τ.λ. His contemporary “Hermas”, I should say, and “Cebes” before him used the same story as material for their allegories, both replacing Virtue and Vice by a multitude of particular virtues and vices personified. Hermas in *Sim.* ix. has twelve Christian graces and their opposites, the four δυνατότεραι in the latter dodecad being Ἀπιστία, Ἀκρασία, Ἀπείθεια, Ἀπάτη. To this group correspond in the *Tabula* Ἀκρασία, Ἀσωτία, Ἀπληστία, Κολακεία, and Ἀπάτη plays a leading part elsewhere therein. The two writings having this peculiar dramatic element in common, the question naturally arises whether they are independent; and a careful comparison of them seems to me to shew that Hermas, like Lucian in two places (p. 24), imitated Cebes.

4. Of Hermas it is said, “there is no denying that he is a clear writer” (p. 92). Certainly much of the *Pastor* is plain teaching; but it also, as is well known, contains some enigmas, and in places its imagery is anything but transparent and natural.

For example, of the πύλη and entrance by it Hermas says in *Sim.* ix. 2—4, 12, according to Dr Harmer’s rendering, “Now this rock was ancient, and had a gate hewn out of it... And around the gate stood twelve virgins... I saw six men come,... and they summoned a multitude of men... And the six men ordered them to build a tower above the gate... Now the virgins had spread out their hands, as if they would take some-

thing from the men... And the six men called to the virgins, and ordered them to carry all the stones which should go unto the building of the tower, and to pass through the gate and to hand them to the men that were about to build the tower... For if, [say they,] they be not carried in through the gate by the hands of these virgins, they cannot change their colours. Labour not therefore, [say they,] in vain... This rock, saith he, and gate is the Son of God... Thus, saith he, no one shall enter into the kingdom of God, except he receive the name of His Son. For if thou wishest to enter into any city,... canst thou enter into that city except through the gate which it hath?"

It is not according to nature that the fitness of stones for a building should depend upon their being carried by any person or persons through a gate; nor is men's entrance into a city "through the gate which it hath" a complete parallel to the conveyance of stones for a tower through a preexistent gate over which it is going to be built. Something simpler must underlie such symbolism. Its incongruities are accounted for by the supposition that Hermas began with the gate of life (*βίος*) according to Cebes, made the gate stand for the Son of God, and converted the crowd at the gate into stones for the tower (Matt. iii. 9, 1 Pet. ii. 4—5). His use of *Cebetis Tabula* is then confirmed by verbal coincidences, such as those pointed out in vol. XXVII. 293. My words introduced on page 90 with the remark, "Yet even this feat &c.", seem to me to express well enough what I meant, which is simply, Given that Hermas was turning the *Πίναξ* into a picture of Christian life, it was natural that he should use *ζωή* from the New Testament instead of *βίος*, cf. "strait is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth εἰς τὴν ζωήν."

5. The article *Hermas and Cebes* is a set of notes on things as they occur in the *Πίναξ*, and not in order of their importance. The *Reply* follows it a little way "seriatim" and indiscriminately, but does not rightly represent what I wrote. About words common to Hermas and Cebes I of course do not make the assumption with which I am credited (p. 90). Some

verbal coincidences are merely noted and left to the judgment of the reader. When I conclude that Hermas borrowed from Cebes, there is some reason for it, although it may not be explicitly stated.

In vol. XXVII. 294 I wrote,

c. 98, 233 ἀληθινὴ ὁδός] *Vis.* iii. 7. 1 ἀφίουσιν τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτῶν τὴν ἀληθινήν,

not intending at the time to say anything more on the point. To some readers this use of ἀληθινή by the two writers may seem quite unimportant. Commentators however have been struck by the phrase ὁδὸν ἀληθινήν in the *Pastor* and have done their best to illustrate it, but with only partial success (p. 34). The exact parallel in the Πίναξ is therefore of some significance, and I think it a tenable and probably right view that Hermas took the phrase "true way" from Cebes.

One of the characters common to the *Pastor* and the *Tabula* is Ἐγκράτεια. In the *Tabula* Ἐγκράτεια and Καρτερία make signs to the ascending pilgrims, and descend and drag them up the steepest part of the way. In the *Pastor* the virgins, including Ἐγκράτεια, receive the stones, which represent the climbers of Cebes, and carry them up to the tower. The actions are not altogether different, but as nearly as was possible identical. Compare the versions of this in vol. XXVII. 303, 305 and the *Reply* (p. 92).

I conclude that here, as elsewhere, Hermas is under obligation to Cebes. On the free handling of famous writings by imitators and adapters see the words of Tertullian quoted on page 24. Hermas has been thought to be a very simple, not to say senseless writer; but I have long thought that he had more knowledge and literary skill than he is commonly imagined to have had.

6. *Hermas and Cebes* presupposes investigations by which the hypothesis that Hermas used the *Tabula* had been already arrived at. The *chair* and the *bench* (p. 88) were discussed in a paper read before the article was written, and sufficient reason (I think) was given for taking the chair to be tripodal.

The argument for an allusion to the *Tabula* in the *θηρίον μέγιστον* of Hermas does not rest upon or begin with the word *προβάλλειν* (p. 89). Chap. XXII. f. of Cebes on the crowning of those who have prevailed in or over *τοὺς μεγίστους ἀγῶνας* and *τὰ μέγιστα θηρία* would have been noticed by Hermas, and he is supposed to have reproduced it with necessary variations. See page 31 and vol. XXVII. 284, 290, 310.

As an instance of necessary variation take also the symbolism of the round stones in the *Pastor*, which is accounted for by the *Tabula*, but, so far as I know, had not been explained by any commentator. See vol. XXVII. 278, 282, 294.

Adopting again a method which I had found useful on former occasions, I followed the order of the earlier work in comparing it with the later, and aimed first of all at completeness in the comparison. This involved the inclusion of some things of doubtful validity or minor importance, on which the reader might wrongly suppose that stress was laid. An advantage of the method is that it detects hidden coincidences, and thereby explains the later work by the earlier. For another example of this see *Sim.* vi. of Hermas, in which the story of *Ἀπάτη* and *Τιμωρία* is found to reappear (XXVII. 294, 297), with sheep for men.

C. TAYLOR.