

this and other books by Mr. Robertson. The fundamental notion in Mr. Robertson's mind is that Jesus is an ancient sun-god, otherwise called Joshua and Jason, and the picture in the Gospels is made up partly of Jewish and partly of pagan mythological materials; and that notion Mr. Drews has simply taken over. Unfortunately for himself he takes the ignorance of Mr. Robertson's books along with their knowledge and lays himself open, as Mr. Robertson himself has done, to charges of serious misapprehension and misstatement. To his reviewers Mr. Robertson replies in this edition, admitting some mistakes and denying others, but confessing at the very beginning that he has not been able to keep abreast of the literature on the subject. His most culpable blunder, however, is to write books in refutation of the Gospels before he has studied them.

Should a poet read other poets? It is an unanswered question. But without doubt a philosopher should read other philosophers. And Professor Emile Boutroux has studied his predecessors to some purpose. In a fine octavo volume, published by Messrs. Macmillan (8s. 6d. net), he offers us the results of his study, under the title of *Historic Studies in Philosophy*. It is a hazardous thing to do, and he knows it. Without the processes, he says, who will believe that you have given the subject research enough? Who will be able to enter into the atmosphere of your results? But he need not fear. A Frenchman must first be sincere, after that he can do anything he pleases, so transparent is his language as a vehicle of thought. Only sixty pages are given to Socrates,

less than a hundred to Aristotle, a little over sixty to Boehme, only twenty to Descartes, less than eighty to Kant; and yet we see Kant, Descartes, Boehme, Aristotle, and Socrates as Professor Boutroux sees them. More than that, we are momentarily persuaded that we see them as they are.

It is very difficult to make a bad translation of a French author; Mr. Fred Rothwell, B.A., has made a supremely good translation of these lectures of Professor Boutroux. They give the impression of having been written in English.

The estimate of Boehme is the most refreshing. It is a rare enough thing to find a professional philosopher in utter sympathy with this religious enthusiast. Boehme's motive being, as he frankly says, the salvation of his soul, philosophers are instantly turned off: the motive is tainted; pure metaphysics knows no such interested motives. But Professor Boutroux is only the more drawn to the philosophy of Boehme because the man is in such dead earnest.

In November 1909 Messrs. Morgan & Scott published the first edition of Mrs. Amy Wilson-Carmichael's *Lotus Buds*. It was a quarto, with 50 photogravures. The edition was of 2000 copies, and there was an edition de luxe of 250 copies. In July 1912 they have published the second edition. It is an octavo, with 50 half-tone engravings (6s.). The edition consists of 5250 copies. This is good for a missionary book, but it is an exceptionally good missionary book. Its charm is partly children and partly India. Together they make a tale (told by this accomplished story-teller) that is altogether irresistible.

The Dualistic Element in the Thinking of St. Paul.

BY THE REV. C. ANDERSON SCOTT, M.A., D.D., PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT
EXEGESIS, WESTMINSTER COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

II.

THE conclusions already reached (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, August 1912, p. 488) find confirmation from a consideration of some of Paul's references to spiritual forces under other names besides that of Angels. It is plain that he regards them as

antagonistic to the human cause. 'I am persuaded that . . . neither angels nor principalities nor powers shall be able to separate us from the love of God'; 'our conflict is not with flesh and blood, but with principalities and powers (that

is, according to the understanding of his readers, with angelic beings of high rank), with world-rulers of this darkness, with spirit-forces of evil in heaven.' The modern equivalent of Paul's 'heaven' or the 'heavenlies' would be 'the unseen.' The 'principalities and powers' of the unseen are definitely ranged against man in his efforts after righteousness; they are identical with, or in league with, 'world-rulers' whose dominion is over the 'present age,' with hyper-physical forces whose abode is in one of 'the heavens.'

The use of the word rendered 'world-rulers,' *κοσμοκράτορες*, connects this passage with another in 1 Co 2⁶⁻⁸, where Paul declares that Christians have 'a wisdom which is not of this world, nor of the rulers of this world (or better, age) which are coming to nought'; that none of the rulers of this world (*τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*) know the Divine wisdom; for if they had known it, they 'would not have crucified the Lord of glory.' Who are these 'rulers of this world' (or, age)? The traditional interpretation, and the one still favoured by many students, finds a reference to human powers, to Jewish or Roman authorities, or to both together, who were responsible for the crucifixion of Christ.¹ On the other hand, Everling, following Klöpffer, and followed by Dibelius, is probably right in rejecting this interpretation. It is not possible in any real sense to extend the legal responsibility for the crucifixion of Christ to any 'rulers of this world' beyond Annas, Caiaphas, and Pilate, and to them it is impossible to apply the present participle *καταργούμενων* in any satisfactory way. Certainly, Ellicott's explanation, 'gradual nullification of these powers brought about by the gospel,' is no satisfactory interpretation of the participle as applied to any rulers who could be said to have 'crucified the Lord of glory.' The better interpretation appears to be that first put forward by Origen, viz., that by 'rulers of this world' the Apostle means spiritual forces, or 'angels,' *ἀρχοντες* being the concrete equivalent of the commoner *ἀρχαί*. In the *Ascension of Isaiah* the angels are described as 'principes istius mundi.' Everling quotes also from Barnabas, *ἀρχων καιροῦ τοῦ νῦν τῆς ἀνομιᾶς*; and from Ignatius, *καὶ ἔλαβεν τὸν ἀρχοντα τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἢ παρθενία Μαρίας*.² And while St. Paul's use of the phrase *ὁ θεὸς τοῦ*

αἰῶνος τούτου in reference to Satan leaves little doubt that he could call the angels *οἱ ἀρχοντες τ. α. τ.*, the word *καταργεῖσθαι* is one which he specially affects in order to describe the ultimate fate of these hostile spirit-forces. It is the word used in 1 Co 15²⁴ of the final triumph of Christ over such powers, *ὅταν καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ π. ἐξουσίαν*; in 1 Th 2⁸ of the destruction of Antichrist at the Parousia; in He 2¹⁴ of the destruction of 'him that hath the power of death'; and in 2 Ti 1¹⁰ of the destruction or abolition of death itself by Christ.³ It is further quite consistent with St. Paul's general thinking to regard these hostile forces as being in process of subjection since they had been worsted by Christ at the Cross, and are destined to be completely overthrown at His triumphant return. By 'rulers of this world' we ought therefore probably to understand the unseen powers; and these Paul accuses of having crucified the Lord of glory, inasmuch as they 'controlled the ethical and religious attitude of the pre-Christian world.'

The same unseen powers are also brought into connexion with the Crucifixion in a striking but difficult passage in Colossians (2¹⁵): *ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδείγματισεν ἐν παρηρησίᾳ θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ*. The subject of the sentence is probably *ὁ θεός*. In the Cross, or, possibly, in Christ, God triumphed over the principalities and powers. The use of the personal pronoun *αὐτοὺς* provides a link between *αἱ ἀρχαί* and *οἱ ἀρχοντες*: the *ἀρχαί* are not mere abstractions, but concrete forces. And God has triumphed over the principalities and powers after having stripped them off from Christ; and that somehow in connexion with the Crucifixion. The idea at the back of this strange picture is that our Lord was engaged in a real struggle with real powers of evil, a struggle which culminated in the Cross, and there resulted in a glorious victory for Him.⁴ He proved stronger than the strong power which held humanity in thralldom. What made this conflict and victory possible was the Incarnation: *ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*. He was 'made in the likeness' of sin's flesh, that is of flesh, which historically had come to be an appanage of sin. It was through this *σὰρξ*, this physical nature, that He became open to temptation, exposed to the

¹ So Findlay in *E. G. T.*; Godet, and St. John Thackeray.

² *Asc. Is.* 10, 11; *Bar.* 18; *Ignat. ad Eph.* 19.

³ Outside the N.T. the word is used in the same connexion; e.g. *Test. Benj.* 3.

⁴ Cf. *Lk.* 11²¹, the strong man armed.

assaults of the devil, entangled in the hostility of principalities and powers. And when Paul speaks of God having stripped off from Him (or, possibly, of Christ having stripped off from Himself) the principalities and powers, he describes what he believes to have taken place at the Crucifixion, when the physical nature and the spiritual nature of Christ were parted in twain. The death whereby He laid aside the physical nature was in effect the stripping off of the hostile forces which had got their grip on Him, as it were, through the *σὰρξ*, the *ἀρχαὶ καὶ ἐξουσίαι*, who were also *κοσμοκράτορες τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*.

When once this significance of Paul's language has been perceived, many phrases or turns of expression in the Epistles are found either to illustrate what has been said, or to become themselves clear. The most important of these is one which when rightly understood is probably the most comprehensive expression for the unseen powers,—*στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*. It occurs four times in the writings of the Apostle.¹ What is common to all these passages is that he takes for granted that a condition of submission or enslavement to these *στοιχεῖα* had been a condition common to both Jews and Gentiles. Bishop Lightfoot, after an exhaustive examination, decided that the choice of interpretations lay between 'physical elements' and 'rudimentary teaching,' and himself preferred the latter. But since the commentary of Lightfoot, we have had that of Klöpffer, with its classical discussion of the question, in which after showing the inapplicability of either of these explanations to all the passages, even in the form given to one of them by Hilgenfeld, he raised the question, 'How would it be if we were here confronted by the fact that Gentiles as well as Jews, in the period before Christ, had been subjected to the dominion of subordinate divine beings?' In other words, he suggested that *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου* stands for the elemental forces of nature conceived as beings in the spirit world. There is good authority for rendering *στοιχεῖα* by 'heavenly bodies,' and we need not go beyond the Old Testament itself for the association of angelic beings with the stars of heaven. 'In Job (38⁷) the morning stars and the sons of God or angels stand in synonymous parallelism, and when in the time of the kings Jehovah is called the Lord of Hosts, what is meant is that the God of Israel is

¹ Gal 4^{3, 9}, Col 2^{8, 20}.

one who controls the hosts of heaven, angels and stars, to carry out His purposes.'²

From this point of view *στοιχεῖα* would be a suitable word to denote the same spirit-forces which Paul elsewhere describes as dominions, principalities, and powers. If the same spiritual forces were also instrumental in the giving of the Law, the fact that they were 'put out of action' at the Crucifixion would have its bearing on the continued validity of the Law.

And this interpretation falls in well with the context in all the four passages. Paul adjures the Galatians not to become again enslaved to these cosmic forces which, for all their fancied power, are but weak and poverty-stricken. He reminds the Colossians that their experience of redemption in Christ might be described as having died out from under the dominion of these forces,—inasmuch as they had died with Christ to the flesh, to sin and to the world. And thus these passages fall to be added to those which reflect a dualistic element in the Apostle's thinking. They indicate his recognition of certain independent or quasi-independent forces of a spiritual kind, active in the affairs of man, and generally hostile to man's true happiness and to God.

Can these forces be classified? The answer to that question must be strictly tentative and provisional. Looking closely at all the evidence, they do not appear to be entirely homogeneous for St. Paul, or all of the same rank and influence. In the lowest grade he would probably place evil spirits or *δαίμόνια*, whose dwelling-place was in the atmosphere. So far as idol-worship had any meaning at all, it was really offered to these demons: herein the Apostle would follow the criticism of idolatry by his Jewish forerunners. These demons were under the authority of the 'prince of the power of the air.' They and he were the authors of disease, misfortune, and mischief. Their prince, to whatever form of thought he owes his origin, has taken on some of the characteristics of the Satan of the Old Testament. He is the tempter, the evil one, the 'god of this age,' or world. To a higher grade as to a higher abode belong the angels who are not essentially evil, any more than they are essentially good. But by a process of which Paul suggests no explanation, the chief among them, described as 'princi-

² Klöpffer, *Com. on Col.* p. 879; cf. Ewald, *Lehre der Bibel von Gott*, ii. 294; Deissmann, *E. Bi.* col. 1261.

palities and powers,' have come to occupy an attitude of hostility to God and man. The world, so far as it is not Christian, is in bondage to them. The Law itself, like every other form of religious observance which leads men to trust in what they do, and not in what God is, has been an instrument of this bondage, and its abrogation is bound up with their defeat. But they are, if one may put it so, morally distinct from the prince of evil: he, with death and sin, is marked for destruction; they are included in the reconciling purpose of God.

In conclusion, what are we to say about this dualistic element in the Apostle's thinking? First, as to its character. Its source and its basis are religious and not philosophical. That is to say, it does not rise out of, or rest upon, any speculation regarding the origin of the world and matter, any asserted antinomy between matter and mind, between spirit and flesh, between God and His world. It is possible enough that some of the names and forms in which the principle is clothed may have reached the Jewish mind from extra-Jewish sources, Babylonian, Persian, and the like; or that in others we may see the survivals of primitive religious ideas. But the principle itself rested on a religious basis: we can see it emerging and developing through the conflict between the faith of religious men in their God and their experience of life in a world which had given admittance to sin. The struggle of the righteous after inward peace, and after the realization of Divine rule in the world, is reflected in the conception of powers independent of God which resisted and thwarted Him. And the more intense the struggle, the more real the opposing forces seemed to be. Also, the more real God became in Jesus Christ as a living and loving personality, the more real still became the personality of the foe. So that it is only to be expected that in the New Testament we should find this principle coming more sharply to expression than even in the Apocalyptic literature. And most of all in Paul, in whom the realization of the living and loving Christ, and of the moral struggle in which His followers were engaged, was so intense and so continuous.

Secondly, this dualism differs from what is commonly so termed in that it is conditioned and temporary. Paul does not give any indication as to how he thought it had begun, how there had

come to be this rupture right across the Divine creation, invisible as well as visible. But he is well assured that it is going to end, indeed that its ending has begun. The 'rulers of this world' are already *καταργούμενοι*, forces which are being put out of action; and the end will not be until Christ *καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν, i.e.* till he has finally disabled these hostile powers. For 'he must continue to reign until he has put all enemies beneath his feet'; and the last which will be thus magisterially dealt with is death. The dualism of human experience will be at an end; for God will be all in all. And, as it is temporary, so is it conditioned. Once more, Paul does not say so, but it follows from the fact which is beyond question, that he and his fellow-countrymen never found this dualistic principle infringing in the slightest degree upon the traditional monotheism of the race. We must take care not to invent for these people difficulties which they did not feel. The metaphysical speculation of the Greek was entirely foreign to the Hebrew mind. If the Jew raised any question as to the origin of evil he found the answer in history,—so far as it affected humanity in the fall of one whom God had made in His own likeness—so far as it was manifested in a world of spirits, in a similar self-determination on the part of spirits whom also God had created, and who also had misused their freedom. Thus behind all this dualistic reasoning and expression, this recognition of hostile powers at issue with man and with man's happiness, there was always as an unbroken background the conviction of a sole Divine sovereignty, by which the action of the hostile power was tacitly conditioned. That being so, we shall perhaps have less difficulty in accepting the fact that these views did colour Paul's thinking and language. And that will help greatly to the understanding of his Epistles and of his theology.

This is to be seen in connexion with one matter of supreme importance, the explanation which Paul gave to himself and to others of the death of Christ, its necessity and its meaning. There is one element in that explanation to which ever since the time of Anselm authoritative exponents of Paulinism have failed to do justice; and that is Christ's struggle with and victory over the powers of darkness. Anselm performed what was at once an easy and a useful task in refuting crude notions of the death of Christ as a ransom paid to the

devil, and yet cruder notions that by a kind of trick the devil was cheated of his pay. But this left Paul's view, one side of it at least, still to be reckoned with. What we call the devil, what Paul calls 'principalities and powers' had in Paul's view a very important share in the meaning of the death of Christ. They were not bought off: they were beaten off. Humanity was in their toils. Christ, coming in the likeness of sin, flesh, entered so completely into human conditions that He incurred and felt their antagonism, their power to tempt, their murderous hate.¹ He fought them to the death, and when by the resurrection it was shown that they had done their worst on Him and failed, He triumphed over them, through death destroyed him that had the power of death. And men who by faith in Him come to partake in that death of His, die, as He did, from under the authority and dominion of these hostile powers, and live again as He did, emancipated from death and from the bondage of a nature which had passed into the power of sin.

And this suggests the answer to the question which may be put: how are we to relate ourselves to this mode of thought, so alien to our modern conceptions? Much of this crude belief in a spirit-world has long ago been dismissed as childish superstition. Can we recognize it in St. Paul and other writers of the New Testament, and still hold to our belief in their authority as religious teachers, their inspiration as from God? The answer is, certainly we can: provided we do not force their thinking into the pattern of our own; provided that we recognize such facts as have just been

¹ Heb 2¹⁴.

brought forward. For when we recognize the kind of forces which men felt to be their enemies and the great tyranny they exercised, when we recognize how completely and triumphantly Christ has dealt with them for the emancipation of His people, we ask what are the corresponding forces in our own time? Really and essentially they are the same. We give them abstract names because we think of them as abstractions. The Jew had no abstractions. For him every force took concrete shape, name and personality. What we call worldliness, he called the god of this world; what we call materialism, insolent self-absorption, godlessness, he called 'principalities and powers'; what we call the *Zeitgeist* he called the devil. And these things are real enough. They are the foes of God and man. To them men are in bondage, and their conventions weigh on the spirit of man as heavily as ever did the Law. Where we see cruelty and tyranny and lust embodied in individual men, the men who wrote our New Testament saw them disembodied, shall we say, as spiritual forces of 'wickedness in the heavenlies.' And what Paul has to tell us, amongst other things, is that with all these our Lord has fought the battle of humanity, that over them all He has triumphed, when, having stripped Himself of the flesh through which they attacked Him, He rose victorious from His struggle with death. All these forces which are holding man down, riding over him, like a car of juggernaut, are *καταργούμενοι*: for those who are themselves in Christ, *κατηργήθησαν*; and what Paul would say to us is what he said to the Galatians, 'Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made you free.'

Recent Foreign Theology.

New Testament Handbook.¹

THIS great *Handbuch* is now nearly complete. A great conception lies at the basis of it, and the working out of that conception into all its details is a worthy performance. The handbook will be

¹ *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, in Verbindung mit W. Bauer, M. Dibelius, H. Gressmann, W. Heitmüller, F. Niebergall, E. Preuschen, L. Radermacher, H. Schlosser, P. Wendland, H. Windisch. Herausgegeben von Hans Lietzmann. Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

complete in five volumes. The first volume is complete. Its aim is to place the New Testament in its historical environment. One part of it deals with the language. In the volume called *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*, Dr. Ludwig Radermacher enables the student to see the Greek of the N.T. in the place which it occupies in the historical evolution of the Greek language. With masterly ease, with the highest scholarship, and with unsurpassed knowledge he deals with his problem. He uses all the material which has been made