

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

Council, insisting on the integrity and inspiration of Holy Scripture, expressly includes all those portions which scholarship, whether in the sixteenth or in the nineteenth century, has shown not to have formed part of the original text. I thus found myself in a clearly false position, apparently assenting to propositions which in my heart and mind I rejected as untenable. And from the Roman Church a man must depart promptly, if he has doubts about its teaching. There is no recognized harbour of refuge for Liberalism there. And so I announced my intention to Cardinal Newman; who, while he was, as courteous and as affectionate as ever, and showed anxiety as to what my future might be, none the less agreed that there was no other course open to me. In a sense I may say that, by God's grace, I saved my soul when, in 1876, I abandoned what was becoming a dishonest position in the Church of England by submission to Rome; and that I saved it a second time in 1883, when I exchanged a similarly dishonest position in the Church of Rome for spiritual freedom outside all Churches. But there was still another conversion, another saving of the soul, to be accomplished, and for this I had to wait some years.

(To be continued.)



Zeno the Stoic and St. Paul at Athens.

BY THE REV. F. W. ORDE WARD, B.A.,
Eastbourne.

THE teaching of Zeno the Stoic, and the preaching of St. Paul the Apostle, at Athens—the Christian coming three hundred years later—constitute an interesting historical contrast. The one proclaimed a new philosophy, and the other a new religion. Each was more or less original, and each the founder of a faith destined to grip the world, if the former appealed more to the head and the latter to the heart. But we need not suppose for a moment that the great Apostle to the

Gentiles was unacquainted with the learning of his time or the transmitted wisdom of the ages, or indifferent to either. Some authorities think that the Epistle to the Romans displays a study of Aristotle, and St. Paul certainly uses occasionally metaphysical terms. To the Gnosis of one famous sect he opposes the Epignosis of Christianity, and meets the lower knowledge with a higher. Once, indeed, he actually says, "Gnosis puffeth up, but Charity buildeth up." Yet to St. Paul, as to the later Stoics of his own time, conduct appeared three-fourths of life, to say the very least. But in the contrast before us we find in the two subjects the first fruits and the last fruits of (what may be called for our immediate purpose) Hellenized Orientalism. For it must never be forgotten that Stoicism, like Christianity, was of Eastern origin, and had behind it ages of Semitic thought, as its meditative impassiveness and rapt resignation might naturally suggest. The almost cosmic conquests of Alexander, the spear-point of the Macedonian phalanx, had opened the mind as well as the markets of the East to the intelligence of the West, and the eager analysis and ardent synthesis of the Aryan imagination. Trade followed the track of armies, and new doctrines avenged old defeats. The phalanx passed, and the hoary sleeper returned to her gorgeous dreams of the immemorial past, and Europe accepted a fresh yoke in the visions of Asia. And the Greek huckster—"Græculus esuriens ad cœlum (jusseris) ibit"—brought back from Syria and Coele-Syria, in the peddler's pack of his receptive mind, other religions and other philosophies. Thus the conquered East led captive her fierce conqueror, and added to new routes of traffic the more spacious paths of speculation. It was a splendid revenge. And though the painted Stoa, by the market-place of Athens, was localized in Greece, its frescoes by Polygnotus depicted the long-drawn-out agony of the Trojan War—not all legend, but rather one of the landmarks of the world's history—while its mental soil and ultimate inspiration were far away. Its first and foremost adherents were mainly of Hellenistic, and not Hellenic, extraction, and Zeno himself had

a Phœnician ancestry. Stoicism was more than the rival of Platonism for centuries, mainly, perhaps, from the fact that its sturdy virile virtues appealed better to the Roman character than the transcendental systems of a beautiful idealism, because its ethical precepts fortified better the unphilosophical temperaments of a people who produced soldiers, and legislators, and statesmen, and builders, and moralists, like Seneca, but not metaphysicians. From the slave in his *contubernium* to the Emperor in his purple, Stoic doctrine was strength and life.

Zeno's promulgation of a fresh philosophy, or a fresh departure in philosophy, came at a singularly opportune time. The wave of stimulating thought, starting from Socrates, had lost much of its pristine power. The exponents of its method and message then possessed none of the early enthusiasm of the first generation, with the doubtful exception of Stilpo. The moment was ripe for a new prophet with a new development. Zeno himself had an intimate acquaintance with all the old doctrines, and knew all that his contemporaries could teach, having made the round of the schools and gone from altar to altar in search of light and enchantments with which to conjure. Apparently he discovered most comfort and congenial wisdom among the Cynics. But though, at the outset of his mission, he cannot be called very original, he speedily took a mighty step into the unknown when he claimed for the cosmos what the Cynics had only admitted for man. That is to say, he extended the operation of the Logos, which was accepted as the law of man, to its utmost limits, and made it the law of the universe. Physics now, in his hands, fell into line with ethics. And it would perhaps be truer to say that he moralized the former than that he materialized the latter. He is usually considered a dualist, because of his seeming division of force and matter. But we hardly appear to know enough, records hardly suffice, to speak with confidence here. At any rate, Reason was the Stoics' God, and in the *λόγος σπερματικός* we have the seed or principle of modern Evolution. Everything

could be explained, and everything was ultimately explained by the Logos. Zeno had a fairly clear conception of that scientific postulate, the ether, which is at present alike the cradle and the grave of our knowledge. All differences, though this was the contribution of the water-carrier Cleanthes, arose from differences of strain or tension, and expressed themselves in eternal transformations of the universal substance. And so Heraclitus before had been the mystical teacher of the *ὁδὸς ἄνω κάτω*. But with the recognition of a primitive fountain-head, from which all things flowed, that they called *πνεῦμα*, and in the establishment of a common law named the *λόγος*, the Stoics prepared the way for Christianity, and St. Paul became at last the inevitable successor of Zeno at Athens. The great Apostle, the founder of our faith, was the sole logical conclusion from the pagan philosopher. No doubt the Stoics taught the corporeality of the soul, but this corporeality seemed qualified by the necessary paradox that it was one with the principle of hegemony, the mind or reason. And their ethical teaching left little to desire, and only needed the Divine Plus and Personality of Christ, and had all the inwardness of Christianity in placing the motive before the deed. They insisted, as the Cynics, that man required either "the altar of reason or the halter of force," and proclaimed the efficiency and sufficiency of the illuminated reason. Indeed, without the ploughing and sowing of Zeno, and Cleanthes and Chrysippus, the Word of our Faith would have fallen on untilled and unready and unreceptive soil. While the Epicureans made too much of pleasure as an end, the Stoics made too much of self-preservation. Christ's Incarnation was demanded by the human heart to expand this last doctrine, in revealing the final truth that self-development can only be realized in and by self-sacrifice. And the Stoic requirement, that life should be in harmony with nature, awaited its full interpretation and complete expansion in the deeper reconciliation with the Divine Nature. Zeno and his successors also broke new ground in their conception of a Cosmopolis and the *συμπάθεια* of a cosmopolitan relationship. They did not always practise what they

preached, though the saintly Emperor Marcus Aurelius was a shining example of practical Stoicism and the happy union of the simple and the sublime. But in theory, at any rate, the Stoics were Christian Socialists. And it seems certain that St. Paul alluded to this doctrine in Gal. iii. 28 and elsewhere. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Seneca, though he had thousands of slaves, nevertheless denounced bondage as a vicious institution. But that prince of moralists was not more inconsistent than multitudes of professing and even devoted Christians. Zeno had elevated ideas of prayer, and would have thought with Cowper—

"For Thou, within no walls confin'd,
Inhabitest the humble mind."

Those worshipped God the most, he said, who served Him most. At the same time Stoicism was exceedingly tolerant, and while seeing the futility of mere forms and images and sacrifices without the accompaniment of spiritual offerings, it did not disallow them, and excused and explained Polytheism. It recognized the fundamental fact that ceremonies and external aids were inevitable accommodations to human infirmities and imperfections. In its catholicity and temperance and rationality, in its optimism and light and its dispassionate elevation of thought, Stoicism was a magnificent precursor of Christianity, with its sweet reasonableness of unreasonableness and its yet loftier standards of Divine charitableness and self-denial, or rather self-seeking in others through Christ. It sought strength and beauty within and not without, and preached long before St. Paul the might of meekness, and the supreme dignity of endurance and ministration, and the joy of suffering for truth. Denouncing with righteous contempt the popular doctrine of rewards and punishments, it declared virtue was its own reward in right of the *εὐδαιμονία* established in the heart of man. The acceptance of the right reason made everything else right, and created a perfect union between desires and deeds. Defective

radically, we know now, as such doctrines were, they, notwithstanding their shortcomings, pointed in the true direction, and anticipated the Epistles of St. Paul and his speech on Areopagus. Zeno, it may be fearlessly asserted without exaggeration, was a prophecy or shadow of the coming Christ, and he stood behind the Apostle to the Gentiles and bequeathed to him his mantle. We cannot break, we dare not despise, the continuity of history. And each fresh teacher, whether he knows it or not, whether he confesses it or not, had his appropriate and necessary forerunners, and received an inheritance and a lamp to be used and transmitted to successors. Nor would a man like St. Paul have repudiated the debt or denied his obligations.

St. Paul's visit to Athens after Zeno's inauguration of a new philosophy, an interval of more than three hundred years, cannot be considered the hopeless failure so many believe it to have been. The atmosphere was charged with the electricity of thought. Philosophers and moralists of all sorts abounded, and at Athens the intellectual centre of the world East and West met and collided, and the metaphysical speculations of the one were interpenetrated by the gorgeous mysticism of the other with solemn sacramental ceremonies, and doctrines that moored man to the Infinite by declaring his immortality. At any rate, his visit, if a failure, was one of those splendid failures which marked a spiritual epoch in the world's history. "Some mocked, and others said, We will hear thee again of this matter. . . . Howbeit certain men clave unto him and believed; among the which was Dionysius the Areopagite"—reported by tradition to have been made Bishop or overseer of the Christian Church there—"and a woman named Damaris, and others with them." St. Paul may have known something of such teachers as Sotion and Attalus, and it is difficult to believe he was altogether unacquainted with Seneca. In those days the philosopher, Cynic, Epicurean, Stoic, was the religious missionary, and followed the trader, and bales of thought (so to speak) followed or accompanied bales of merchandise. New

truths were not the least important part of the tribute paid by the East to the West, and Roman ethic, as well as Roman law, reacted on the most distant provinces. The idea of a superintending and all-embracing Divine Providence had become familiar to everyone. And the Stoic pantheism, which arose out of its original dualism, contained the core of the Christian dogma of the Trinity. Fresh doctrines, like children's diseases, were quickly caught and quickly thrown off by eager inquirers for light. But something practical and something permanent and something valuable usually remained. And the Apostle to the Gentiles, with his broad mind and ardent faith, must have sympathized intensely with much of the Stoic morality. If he cautioned the Colossians against mere verbal subtleties and metaphysical logomachies when he wrote, "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit," it was only his exceeding jealousy for the honour of Christ. He must have profoundly appreciated many of the Stoic rules for the conduct of life, which denied that the really illuminated man walking in the order of things could suffer any misfortune, and affirmed that nothing of the kind could shake the true inwardness of the character. External trials were but the necessary and appropriate conditions of virtuous education and human development. The *divinæ particula auræ* could not be bound or impeded, or in any way injured by mere outward accidents. And the cosmos was conquered by philosophic indifference and unconcern, and the fact that the spirit remained indomitable whatever happened to the body. While the Stoic teaching of moral progress or *προκοπή* was in accordance with St. Paul's own instruction and belief, Zeno's faith and Seneca's, and also St. Paul's, were alike militant, in the best sense—that they resisted evil by similar methods, with the weapons of gentleness and love. The provocations of boundless charity, and the peaceful aggressiveness of a confident faith, that were in the world though not of the world, distinguished eminently the doctrines of both schools of ethics.

It had been asserted of Athens, as of Croton, that it con-

tained more gods than men. St. Paul alluded to this fact at the commencement of his address: "I perceive that in all things ye are earnestly reverential." He had noticed that the city "was covered with idols" and the many "objects of worship." But the Apostle was aware that this parade of religiosity in numerous instances only revealed, by its ineffectual attempt to conceal, a hollow and hopeless Agnosticism, and he therefore made his text the Altar of the Unknown God. This must have forcibly arrested the attention of those hearers who, in believing everything and worshipping all gods, really believed nothing and worshipped none. He came to proclaim the new Logos, the predestined Judge, the Righteous Man, that the Universal Father, in whom "we live and move and have our being," had ordained for that purpose. He accepted in his own way the *pneuma* of the Stoics and its vital truth of the Divine immanence, while he superadded the essential complementary truth of the Divine transcendence. Recognizing with pleasure the "miracles of man's art" (for thus the words may be freely translated) as an admirer rather than an iconoclast, he quoted Aratus, and perhaps also Cleanthes, to emphasize the Fatherhood of God, and interpret it in the light of the Resurrection—a doctrine by no means new to Asiatic hearers, at least. God, he taught, was no dreadful Fate or iron Force working by irresistible laws from which there was no appeal, but a Creator who offered a reasonable Panentheism for an unreasonable and impossible Pantheism, which simply explained things by confusing them. And the Apostle had used the same language almost to the men of Lycaonia. St. Paul would have discovered truth in the famous line and in its Greek original: *Ab Jove principium est, Musæ, Jovis omnia plena.*

But he supplied the lacking personal attribute implied in the act of Creation. He stood up on the Areopagus to preach a new religion, and not a new philosophy, nor even a new code of ethics. Pagan morality had to be impregnated and fertilized by the doctrine of the Cross. Christ alone, the man ordained to judge, and therefore to save by judging continually, who had

broken the bondage of the grave in rising from the dead—Christ alone, incarnate in humanity by His Holy Spirit, could accomplish this. Stoicism up to a certain point was wise, and good, and true, and strong teaching, and no doubt the Apostle himself had learned much from it, but it required a rebaptism in the precious Blood of the Cross. God the Father, “for we also are His offspring,” and no blind Epicurean chance, had sent His own Son, the Resurrection Man, the Judge Saviour, to redeem us from sin and death and from ourselves. And the doctrine that “He had made of one blood all nations of men,” though not novel to Stoics, was accepted and practised by few, if by any, at a time when ethnic morality really ruled. But the doctrine of the universal brotherhood announced by St. Paul, as involved in the Divine Fatherhood, fell on good ground. The best of the Stoics, such as the inspired Seneca, had prepared the soil of many souls for the reception of the blessed seed. And as even worms, by their humble labours and patient engineering, help to render lands fruitful, so even errors, by leading at last to the inevitable recoil of disgust, tend to make the barren mind productive in the end. How much more such lofty lessons as those inculcated by the noblest representatives of Stoicism! *Non enim possumus aliquid adversus veritatem, sed pro veritate.* Falsehoods have their place and use in the scheme of things.

So far the Apostle and his Stoic hearers, at least, stood on common ground. But even the most spiritually-minded philosophers of the Porch had little or no sense of sin. Seneca and Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius here had much to learn and little to teach. They would, perhaps, have agreed more or less with a clever writer in a great monthly, who should read Dr. Du Bose on the subject, that “the transgression of Divine laws is obviously a contradiction in terms,” and “Spirit, if it is anything, is Divine, and therefore incapable of sin.” A cheap and easy way this of dismissing the unanimous testimony and hereditary conviction of human experience in all the records of history. Such an established position as the sense of sin

demands no defence; it stands psychologically and experimentally unassailable. It is no longer an open question. The writer would possibly endorse Seneca's rhetorical flourish—that, if there be a question of superiority, it would be rather in favour of man than of God. And the quotation from Professor Duncan of a fact stated long before by Dr. Gustave Le Bon, in the sphere of radio-active substances, only confirms the religious doctrine, *Mors janua vite*. St. Paul, who had himself passed through death unto life, preached the necessity of this: "God . . . now commandeth all men everywhere to repent." He knew the Gospel was ever the Gospel of the impossible, and he proclaimed to all the sweet reasonableness of its Divine unreasonableness. Christ commanded men to believe and love and repent to order, as if we could control our affections and divert them into a prescribed channel at a moment's notice. But if Christianity had merely been a religion of the possible, it would not have been worth promulgation. It required the impossible because it required of men an infinite ideal, exemplified in the Cross, and embodied in Christ alone. Take away the sense of sin, the consciousness of guilt, and you destroy religion. "The earth trembled and shook," says the Talmud, "and could not find rest until God created repentance, and then it stood fast." And what did the Saviour teach Himself? "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." "Joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth." And again, as St. Paul has told us, "Godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation," and to life. The denial of this universal fact would remove a main-spring of spiritual progress and moral improvement, for all civilization rests ultimately on an ethical and religious basis. And a nation of self-complacent saints or self-righteous Pharisees would be a thousand times worse than a nation of impenitent thieves and irresponsible hooligans. Sanctified pigs are the meanest and most squalid and most contemptible form of humanity conceivable. "God Himself," says the Talmud again, "prays"—as if He, amid His boundless perfection, entertained some consuming need—because He hungers and thirsts for

souls. The last word of false philosophy and science may be : " God, I thank Thee I am not as other men are." But the first and last word, and the perpetual confession of the humble and contrite seeker at the foot of the Cross, will ever be : " Father, I have sinned against Heaven and before Thee, and am not worthy to be called Thy son." Repentance grasps the hand that rules the world. And from the other point of view, what is Creation (in the light of the Cross) but the Heart of God broken for us ?

NOTE.—It would not, perhaps, be difficult to show that St. Paul's doctrine or use of terms like "predestination" showed an acquaintance with the Stoics' teaching on the same subject, though, of course, he made everything new that he touched, and was always rather the hammer than the anvil—to quote Goethe's classification of men. And his employment of *προκοπή* and *προκόπτω* was an invasion of Stoic terminology. It has been asserted that St. Paul's "predestination" simply implies the teleology of Nature and Revelation. But even assuming this explanation, why does he press into his service words already associated with a peculiar significance ? Indeed, it would be impossible to believe that an intellectual giant like St. Paul was not familiar with all the theories of all the schools, educated as he was at such a centre of converging civilizations as Tarsus of Cilicia—"a citizen of no mean city."



Where the Shoe Pinches.

BY THE REV. CHARLES COURTENAY, M.A.,
Vicar of St. Peter's, Tunbridge Wells.

AN association secretary, whose district covered the North of England, once made to me a startling statement. He said that among the many clergy with whom he had familiar converse he found very few who could be said to be content with their lot. The great majority declaimed against their hard position, and looked with not a little envy over their neighbours' fences, declaring that no men were so sadly placed as they. One and all longed for a change, for promotion, for a new charge, and fretted because the change was so long in coming. In fact, to put it shortly, the shoe was pinching them.