

to lose; for the stories of the Old Testament stir the imagination as nothing else in the world can do. We should give up that connexion with the ideas and feelings of the East which have so much to contribute to the right understanding of

the Christian faith. Above all, we should surrender the very key to the revelation of the New Testament, which was, and is, and always must be based upon the right understanding of the books of the Old Testament.'

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.

AN examination of the dualistic element in the thinking of St. Paul seems to be called for, in view of the double fact that it has very important bearing on the exegesis of several passages in the Epistles as well as on the theology of the Apostle in general, and that at the same time it has received quite inadequate recognition and treatment. The most cursory examination of the current handbooks and treatises on Paul and the Pauline theology will show how little place and weight are given to this element in his thought. And if some are prepared to say that it is overlooked because it is not there, they have good authority for their opinion. It will suffice to turn to the index to Professor H. A. A. Kennedy's valuable work on *St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things*, where we find this entry: 'Dualism, no trace of, in Paul.' In the text to which the index refers we find something not quite so sweeping: (p. 146) 'We see nothing in his writings to justify the hypothesis so frequently charged upon him, that he took a dualistic view of human nature'; (p. 329) 'It is altogether groundless to rear on this foundation the theory of a cosmic dualism in St. Paul.' With both of these statements we may heartily agree, and yet demur strongly to the opinion that there is 'no trace of dualism in St. Paul.'

For, quite apart from a 'cosmic dualism' or a 'dualistic view of human nature,' there is a dualism which consists in the recognition, whether in theory or practice, of a power or powers other than God, external to man, exerting influence over human affairs, and in some sense or degree independent of God. This definition is purposely made very wide: for there are many forms or grades of this dualism, each affecting a man's

thinking in a different way. We have to ascertain what traces there may be of dualism of any kind, and to estimate its character and its influence on the thinking of St. Paul.

Before examining the evidence of the Apostle's own letters, it will be well to mark the antecedent probability that he held a dualistic view of life; in other words, that there were certain sides of life, certain experiences which he interpreted by referring them to the action and influence of powers which were in some sense independent of, and even hostile to, God. The probability is very strong. Indeed, if Paul did not hold some such view, he would be at variance with the universal opinion of his time. For dualism was one of the three new factors which make their appearance in the later stage of the Old Testament history, and specially after the exile, Individualism, Dualism, and Pessimism. These three are closely connected, and together go far to account for the too long unrecognized gulf between 'Hebrew' and 'Jewish' thought.

The optimism regarding the future, which was the essence of the Messianic hope in all its forms, was simply the counterpart of a pessimism regarding the present which laid increasing hold on the Jewish mind. And this pessimism partly grew out of, and partly fostered, a dualistic view of things. But that view was religious, not philosophic, in its origin. The very intensity of men's belief in God led them, when faced by the hopeless situation of His people, to postulate a source for their present experience other than God. Because they despaired of the world that now is, they looked with increasing wistfulness for a world or age to come, a new heaven and a new earth. And they found a justification for their despair, as well as an

explanation of their experience, in the view that the present world or age had fallen under the dominion of an evil power. In the later canonical and the inter-canonical literature the pictures and predictions due to the old prophets are reproduced indeed, but on a new plane. The old world and the old nation are no longer regarded as furnishing a sphere for the Divine redemption. The contrast between present and future in this world undergoes the supremely significant change into a contrast between this world or age and the world or age to come. And all hope is projected beyond a crisis of Divine interference. The situation is well summarized by Hollmann: 'If we compare the apocalyptic with the older Jewish views, even those of the earliest post-exilic period, the most important difference that confronts us is the dualism of the Apocalyptic theory of the world. It is the most decisive characteristic of this class of literature, a new trait foreign to Judaism. The present world is bad, the prey of Satan and the demons, given over to irremediable destruction. . . . No doubt there always existed in the Jewish religion, as in all popular religions and even in the prophetic period, a belief in evil, uncanny spectres, and goblins. What is new in the apocalyptic is the remarkable pronouncement of this belief, and the consolidation of all these beings to a kingdom of evil under a monarchical government.'¹ And, in fact, the Messiah of Apocalyptic literature, so far as he appears at all, is really a dualistic figure. His appearance is called for by the fact that the world *κείται ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ*: he is the vice-gerent of God, sent to give battle not to earthly tyrants, but to Satan and the spiritual hosts of evil.

It is, of course, impossible to say that the point of view found in this Apocalyptic literature was characteristic of all sections of the Jewish people, e.g. in the time of Paul. The Sadducees doubtless, who denied the existence of angels or spirits, would necessarily be excluded from it. But there can be no doubt that for the bulk of the people it formed the background of religion; and the probability is great that it would colour the earliest impressions on the mind of Saul of Tarsus.

This *a priori* probability might be challenged from two sides. It might be argued, as it is

¹ Hollmann, *Jewish Religion in the Time of Christ*, Eng. tr. p. 103 ff.; cf. also Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*, pp. 7, 60; and Bousset, *Religion des Judentums*, p. 239.

probably taken for granted by many, that St. Paul, when he became a Christian, started with a *tabula rasa* for a mind: that though this might be the view of the world held by him before his conversion, that has no bearing on the question of his subsequent opinions. But such a position becomes untenable in the light of any thorough research. The evidence is too copious and too strong which points to the persistence after his conversion alike of conceptions and of habits of thought which belonged to his Jewish atmosphere and upbringing. We see in the Epistles the utterance of living thought in which both old and new elements of consciousness are intermingled, the new sometimes overcoming and excluding the old, sometimes coalescing with it; and the fascinating task of the student is to apply a kind of qualitative analysis, to discover what elements are present in their traditional form, what others are wholly new, and what others again have been 'altered' by the irruptive forces of Christian experience.

It might be argued, more plausibly perhaps, that the Apocalyptic literature from which we derive much evidence and many details of this dualistic conception belongs to, and represents, only a section of Jewish society, and that possibly Paul belonged to another section and was unaffected by it. It is true that the strictly legal Rabbinic schools rejected the Apocalypses; but that was not till after A.D. 70. And the fact that formal repudiation was necessary may be said to point to a period when they had been widely accepted. 'It is incorrect,' says Hollmann, 'to regard the Apocalyptic literature as a sort of heretical backwater of legal Judaism, though Jewish scholars are apt to take this view. In the writings themselves there is no trace of anything of the kind. The volume of this literature and the fact that the Christians simply took over the Apocalypses, and wrote similar works themselves, tells strongly against such a notion.' And as regards belief in a spirit-world among the Pharisees to whom Paul belonged, we have emphatic testimony in the Acts that they believed both in angels and in spirits (23^s).

There seems, therefore, no sufficient ground to doubt the antecedent probability that Paul shared the prevailing dualistic views of his time, as they are generally represented in the literature which has survived. But such *a priori* considerations

are possibly redundant in view of the clear evidence of his own writings.

In the first place, Paul makes that sharp distinction between the two worlds or ages which is the sign-manual of the Apocalyptic point of view. The wisdom that he speaks is not the wisdom 'of this age,' but the wisdom of God (2 Co 2⁶): he describes the effect of the work of Christ as the deliverance of believers 'out of this present evil age' (Gal 1⁴), and charges them not to be conformed to 'this age' (Ro 12²). When he describes the condition of those who did not know Christ as that of men living under the power of darkness (Col 1¹³), or themselves as 'darkness,' when, on the other hand, he addresses Christians as 'children of light,' he is speaking in terms which have their source in Apocalyptic dualism, such as we find, e.g., in Enoch (41⁸), 'The Lord who made a separation between light and darkness and divided the spirits of men'; (108¹¹) 'The spirits of the good who belong to the generation of light.'

In the second place, he recognizes that of these two ages the one that now is, is in some sense and degree under the dominion of powers hostile alike to God and to man. These are represented sometimes as a host or hierarchy of numerous grades, sometimes as concentrated under or in a single individual. To this individual various names and descriptions are given. Some ten or eleven times Paul refers to this power under the name of 'Satan,' and once as 'Beliar': for descriptive epithets he uses *ὁ πονηρός*, and *ὁ πειράζων*. As to the name 'Satan,' what is important to observe is that St. Paul's Satan is not just the Satan of the Old Testament, even of its latest stratum. Rather does the figure include the conception of the Power of Evil as developed during the inter-canonical period. In his *Introduction to the Book of Job*, Dr. A. B. Davidson gave us what might be called a history of Satan, beginning with the unnamed spirit of 1 K 22¹⁹, and passing through the representation in Job to that in Zechariah. 'In the prophet the Satan appears in somewhat darker colours and in somewhat stronger opposition to the merciful purposes of God in regard to men; hence, while in Job he is merely reproached by God for setting Him on against His servant, he is rebuked in Zechariah. We must be careful not to impose on the Book of Job, or even on this prophet, conceptions which belong to a more

advanced period. The Satan of these books is no mere "evil spirit," the real enemy of God though His unwilling subject. There is no antagonism between God and the Satan. The Satan in Job is the servant of God represented as carrying out His trying, sifting process, and the opposer of men because he is the minister of God.'

It is a very different conception of Satan which meets us in the Pauline Epistles, and indeed in the New Testament in general. He *is* the enemy of God, and exercises other than a merely delegated authority over men. Again, we find the earliest traces of the new conception in the Apocalypses. Under one of many names, such as Mastema, Azazel, or Semjaza, there appears there an independent power of evil, head of a world of evil spirits, the determined foe of God and man. 'In the New Testament period the figure of the Devil is a settled factor of popular belief.' That belief St. Paul shows no signs of repudiating or criticising: yet it is remarkable, as Bousset has pointed out,¹ that his references to Satan under that name are comparatively few, and of these several have a perfunctory sound, that is to say, he seems to use the name in an unreflecting popular way, as, e.g., when he says: 'Satan hindered us,' 'certain have turned aside after Satan.' A greater sense of Satan's reality and independent power seems to underlie the two passages where he claims authority to deliver over an offender to Satan. And yet that one of these two passages which give fullest expression to his thought (1 Co 5⁵) reveals, when closely examined, an unexpected approximation to the Old Testament point of view. Such an one is to be delivered over to Satan unto the destruction of the flesh, in order that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord. The punishment to be inflicted by Satan, however it is to be understood, is disciplinary: it has for its end and purpose the saving of the spirit. So that we have a close parallel to the thought in 1 Co 11³²: *κρινόμενοι δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου παιδευόμεθα ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν*. Here sickness, disease, and death are the punishments inflicted upon the community which celebrates the Lord's Supper 'unworthily'; but again the purpose is disciplinary, that they may not be condemned together with the world, *i.e.* that they may be saved. The difficulty of the earlier passage is largely met if we recognize that

¹ Bousset, *Religion des Judentums*, p. 330.

Paul is there regarding Satan as the agent of the Divine discipline.

But while the ideas underlying the Apostle's use of 'Satan' seem to affiliate rather with the figure of the Old Testament, it is otherwise with that class of passages of which we find the type in 2 Co 4¹: ἐν οἷς ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσε τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων. The full significance of this phrase must not be minimized, as is done by many commentators, by urging, e.g., that 'Satan is only the God of this world . . . because worldliness makes him its god.' This would still leave open the possibility that for Paul and his contemporaries this power had a very real and objective existence and authority; but it is inconsistent with the direct initiative here ascribed to the God of this world or age. He 'hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving,' and modern commentators, almost without exception, recognize here a dualistic element in the thinking of St. Paul. Volz¹ maintains that the phrase goes in this direction beyond anything that can be produced from Jewish theology, and adds that 'a comparison between Jewish literature and the New Testament on this point shows that the dualism of the New Testament is sharper than that of contemporary Judaism.' If this is so, the explanation may be found partly in the fact that in the New Testament more than elsewhere we are confronted with the ideas of the people rather than the learned, and partly by the reflex influence of a Divine Personality manifested in Jesus: this may well have led to a new emphasis on the person and character of the Power hostile to God.²

The striking phrase in Eph 2², 'the prince of the power (or, powers) of the air,' furnishes a bridge by which we pass from illustrating Paul's conception of evil as concentrated in an individual to his conception of it as distributed among a host or hierarchy of spiritual forces. For the word translated 'power' is a collective noun, and might be rendered 'powers'; and the fact that 'the air' is assigned as their abode gives a clue to their character. Apocalyptic literature throws useful light on the meaning of this phrase. It bears witness to the fact that whereas we think of one 'heaven,' a place of homogeneous experience, the special

dwelling-place of God, and the final home of His people, the view widely held among the Jews of Paul's time was that there were several 'heavens,' of which only the highest was the abode of the Great Glory. The lowest, on the other hand, was occupied by the two hundred rulers of the stars, and the lowest heaven but one by the angels who had apostatized from the Lord.³ Below the lowest heaven was the air, and that, according to a still widespread belief, was the abode of demons and of evil spirits, over which Satan ruled as prince.⁴ The Testament of Levi, again, gives us a catalogue of the seven heavens, and places in the third beings who are described as 'thrones and powers,' while others of the heavens are made the abode of angels of divers kinds and functions.

This conception, so unfamiliar to us, throws light on several important passages in the Epistles. First, let us take the Angels. St. Paul had a poor opinion of angels. That may seem somewhat startling: yet it is true, and to bear it in mind helps to clear some difficulties. The Bible, as a whole, lends little countenance to the conception of angels which plays no inconsiderable part in our popular religion, and is reflected both in our stained-glass windows and in many of our hymns. The Old Testament adheres very closely to the conception of an angel as a messenger from God, without any distinctive ethical character of his own, but deriving his quality of good or bad from the nature of the errand on which he is sent. An 'evil angel' is an emissary of God sent upon an errand of judgment.⁵

But it is not the angels of the Old Testament whom St. Paul has in mind. During the Interval a change of great significance has passed over the prevalent conception regarding such beings. To whatever cause or source this change may be due, its effect was to assign to angels a new independence and initiative, the exercise of power apart from the direct mandate of God, and to many of them a fixed attitude of hostility to God which reacted on the fortunes of men. A further change is seen in the habit of classifying them according to character as good angels or bad, and according

² So in the *Slavonic Secrets of Enoch*; see esp. Dr. Charles' edition, p. xxxi ff.

³ Cf. Test. Benj., τὸ ἀέριον πνεῦμα βελιάρ; and see Everling, p. 109.

⁵ See A. B. Davidson, in Hastings' *E.D.* i. 96, art. 'Angels.'

¹ Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*, p. 81.

² See Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus*, pp. 2, 209 ff.

to rank under such titles as lordships, principalities, powers, or thrones.¹ St. Paul does not press the classification of angels according to character. When he thinks of an angel as belonging to one class or other, he speaks of him either as 'an angel of light' or 'an angel of Satan.' Neither does he show any interest in the question which so fascinated some of the Apocalyptic writers, concerning the 'fallen angels' and the manner of their fall. To put it very briefly, the apostle seems to regard the spirit world as morally very much in the same condition as the world of men; but most of his references are to angels regarded as spiritual forces not on the side of God.

1. If we collect the more significant passages, we find that the intervention of angels even in a good work, reduces its value. This appears to be the idea lying at the back of the sentence in Galatians (2¹⁹) as to the giving of the Law. It was *διαταγείς δι' ἀγγέλων ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου*, and that marked its inferior or transitory character. St. Paul is comparing the promise given to Abraham with the Law ordained through Moses, with the purpose of showing the sufficiency and superiority of the former. And the Jewish legend of the presence and intervention of angels at Sinai, to which Stephen appeals in Ac 7⁵³ in order to enhance the dignity of the Law, is applied by Paul to illustrate its inferiority. The promise came direct; the Law only mediately, and that by a double mediation, passing first through the hands of the angels, and then through those of Moses. The

¹ E.g., *Slavonic Secrets of Enoch*, xx. 20: 'And these men took me thence and brought me to the seventh heaven, and I saw there a very great light and all the fiery hosts of great archangels and incorporeal powers and lordships and principalities and powers; cherubim and seraphim, thrones.'

mediation of angels therefore tended rather to depreciate the Law in comparison with the promise, just as in He 2² it is suggested as depreciating the Law in comparison with the gospel.

2. This is consistent with the fact specially emphasized in the Epistles of the Captivity, that the angels themselves were created beings. Paul here only goes beyond the current belief of Judaism in assigning their creation to Christ.²

3. The knowledge of the angels is limited. This again is common to Jewish and to New Testament thought. In the *Slavonic Enoch* (24³) we read: 'Not even to my angels have I told my secrets, nor have I informed them of their origin, nor have they understood my infinite creation which I tell thee of this day.' And so, according to St. Paul, it is actually one of the privileges of the Church to make known the manifold wisdom of God unto the principalities and the powers in heavenly places (Eph 3¹⁰).³

4. The angels require redemption, or at least reconciliation to God, and it was part of the work of Christ to effect this reconciliation. The idea that angels, unless specified as 'evil' or 'fallen,' are sinless is not supported by the Old Testament. There are not wanting passages which indicate the opposite, as, for example, Job 4¹⁸, 'He putteth no trust in his servants, and his angels he chargeth with folly.'⁴ And so the Apostle includes them in the sweep of the Atonement.

² Col 1¹⁶; on the Jewish view, see St. John Thackeray *Relation of St. Paul to Contemp. Jewish Thought*, p. 150.

³ Cf. 1 P 1¹², *εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παράκνυται*.

⁴ Cf. also 21²², Ps 82¹, Is 24²¹; and see Thackeray, *ut sup* p. 155.

(To be concluded.)

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF CHRONICLES.

He did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, but not with a perfect heart.—2 CHRON. XXV. 2.

He did it with all his heart, and prospered.—2 CHRON. XXXI. 21.

1. THE first of these passages refers to Amaziah, the second to Hezekiah. Both were kings of Judah, and both were good men. Of Amaziah it

is said, 'he did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord'; and of Hezekiah it is said, 'He wrought that which was good and right and faithful before the Lord his God.' Yet the one failed and the other succeeded. What was the cause of Amaziah's failure? It was half-heartedness. 'He did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord