

tially the same as that of the Old Testament. Every main facet regarding God's appointment of the nations found in the Old Testament is found also in the Apocrypha. The Apocrypha does, however, tend to engage in a certain amount of interpretation of the Old Testament, but these interpretations do not seem, at face value, to be anything but complementary.

Pseudepigrapha

The writings included in the Pseudepigrapha⁸⁹ are rich in material pertaining to God's relation to foreign nations. Apocalyptic literature in particular has much to say on this topic since most of it was written in response to Israel's treatment by foreign powers, in particular, Greece and Rome.

In general, those writings in the Pseudepigrapha which do deal with God's relation to the nations have a number of things in common: they reflect a Jewish, monotheistic theology; God is sovereign over all the nations and the whole earth; nations have been allowed to invade Israel because of her many sins and apostasies; these invading nations will eventually be punished by God (for going too far in their punishment of Israel); angels are involved in God's rule of the nations, fulfilling a variety of functions.

Although most of the writings do not articulate a clear and specific understanding of God's ordination of the nations, a number of documents do get somewhat specific and it is worth noting these.

⁸⁹Following those included by J. H. Charlesworth in his 2 volume work on the Pseudepigrapha.

The Book of Dream Visions in 1 Enoch⁹⁰ teaches that foreign nations (Greece and Rome) have received their sovereignty from God in order that they might slay, at appointed times, predetermined numbers of God's people.⁹¹ Seventy shepherds (angels) are put in charge of the nations who will execute this punishment on Israel.⁹² It appears that the job of these angels is to watch over the nations so that no more than the predetermined number should be killed. The angels fail to restrain the nations and the result is excess violence and killing, for which the angels and nations will be judged.⁹³

3 Enoch is similar to the teaching of the Book of Daniel (10:20-21) and 1 Enoch (89:59) in that it assigns an angel to each of the (apparently seventy-two) nations, but goes one step beyond and assigns an angel to be in charge of all nations and angels as well as the whole world.⁹⁴ This "prince of the world" acts as an advocate of the whole earth and its deeds in a heavenly courtroom.⁹⁵

⁹⁰1 Enoch is obviously a composite work with differing theologies and, in particular, differing angelologies.

⁹¹1 Enoch 89:51-68. This teaching is quite similar to that found in Dan. 7:23-27.

⁹²1 Enoch 89:57-69

⁹³1 Enoch 89:62-69 (see also 90:1-5) This teaching is implied in the Old Testament and taught in Rabbinic writings. See footnote no. 65 in this chapter.

⁹⁴3 Enoch 30; 17:8

⁹⁵3 Enoch 30:2. The "heavenly courtroom" idea occurs often in Jewish literature.

The function of the several angels of the nations seems to be that of reporting the sins (and good deeds?) of the nations to God in order that he might decide their fate.

In one place in 3 Enoch Satan and the angel-princes of Rome and Persia are seen attempting to convey information to God concerning Israel's sins so that God will destroy Israel. Seraphim intervene and prevent this from happening:

Every day Satan sits with Samma'el, Prince of Rome, and with Dubbi'el, Prince of Persia, and they write down the sins of Israel on tablets and give them to the seraphim to bring them before the Holy One, blessed be he, so that he should destroy Israel from the world. But the seraphim know the secrets of the Holy One, blessed be he, that he does not desire that this nation of Israel should fall. What, then, do the seraphim do? Every day they take the tablets from Satan's hand and burn them in the blazing fire that stands opposite the high and exalted throne, so that they should not come into the presence of the Holy One, blessed be he, when he sits upon the throne of judgment and judges the whole world in truth.⁹⁶

Book three of the Sibylline Oracles sees the history of the nations unfolding according to "cyclic course" of ten divisions of history predetermined by God.⁹⁷ God raises each nation up in its turn, beginning with the house of Solomon, and terminates each one when it follows a "course of unjust haughtiness."⁹⁸

As in Daniel, chapters two and seven in the fourth book of

⁹⁶₃ Enoch 26:12. This teaching is reminiscent of Col.2:14.

⁹⁷Sib. Or. 3:115

⁹⁸Sib. Or. 3:165-180 This is a general summary of Book three's political complexity. See J. J. Collins, "Sibylline Oracles," in The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, 2 vols., ed. by J. H. Charlesworth (Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1983), 1:354-361.

the Sibylline Oracles divides the history of man (after the flood) into four world kingdoms, Assyria, Mede, Persia and Rome, all of which have their times of rule predetermined by God.⁹⁹

In the fourth book of Ezra, the author wonders why God has given the nations descended from Adam dominion, but Israel possesses nothing. An angel of God answers Ezra as follows:

For I [God] made the world for their [Israel's] sake, and when Adam transgressed my statutes, what had been made was judged. And so the entrances of this world were made narrow and sorrowful and toilsome; they are few and evil, full of dangers and involved in great hardships. But the entrances of the greater world are broad and safe, and really yield the fruit of immortality. Therefore unless the living pass through the difficult and vain experiences, they can never receive those things that have been reserved for them.¹⁰⁰

Perhaps this cryptic answer is suggesting that hardships endured make Israel worthy for her inheritance or in some other way prepare her for it.

Chapters eleven and twelve of 4 Ezra reveal an interpretation of history similar to Daniel and the fourth book of the Sibylline Oracles: there are a total of four world kingdoms with Rome being the fourth. These kingdoms are made by God so that "the end of my [God's] times might come through them."¹⁰¹ Rome's appointed time for rule is over and she is

⁹⁹Sib. Or. 4:49-114. Predetermination plays a large part in much of intertestamental theology, but often a complex mix of "free will" ideas are included as well.

¹⁰⁰₄ Ezra 7:11-15

¹⁰¹₄ Ezra 11:39. Perhaps this means that God's ultimate purposes are somehow accomplished through the kingdoms.

ripe for destruction due to her insolence and pride.¹⁰².

The book of Jubilees, a document Paul was most likely familiar with,¹⁰³ states that God has caused evil spirits to rule over Gentiles in order to lead them astray.¹⁰⁴ Israel, however, was not given a spirit to rule over her because God alone is her ruler. He does, however, use angels, spirits and authorities to protect and bless his people.¹⁰⁵

Rabbinic Teaching

There are two main facets of Rabbinic Theology regarding the state which are important to consider here. The first concerns the early haggadic understanding that the seventy grandsons of Noah mentioned in Gen. 10 (cf. Gen. 10:32 and 46:27) were the basis for a division of mankind into seventy nations each of which was assigned a guardian angel:¹⁰⁶

When the Most High gave the world for an inheritance to the nations which came forth from the sons of Noah, when He divided the alphabets and tongues to the sons of men, he cast lots with the 70 angels, the princes of the nations . . ., and established the borders of the peoples according to the number of the 70 souls of Israel which went down into Egypt.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰² Ezra 11:42-45 There are several eschatological schemes in this book. In one of them a messianic kingdom of God is set up after Rome's tyranny ends (12:32-34).

¹⁰³ O. S. Wintermute, "Jubilees," The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, ed. by J. H. Charlesworth, 2:53.

¹⁰⁴ Jub. 15:31 The reason for this action is not made clear in the book.

¹⁰⁵ Jub. 15:32

¹⁰⁶ The Jewish Encyclopedia, s.v. "Nations and Languages," pp. 184-188.

¹⁰⁷ Targum Pseudo-Jonathan (Gen. 46:27) as quoted in

Later rabbis either considered the Genesis list to be nothing more than a simple, incomplete historical narrative, or came up with alternative interpretations.¹⁰⁸

The second facet of Rabbinic theology to be considered here has to do with the Rabbinic statements that governments (the Roman government in particular) are ordained by God:

The kings of this earth rule by the appointment of Heaven. blessed is the All-merciful who has made the earthly royalty on the model of the heavenly and has invested you [Rome] with dominion.¹⁰⁹

When Rabbi Jose ben Kisma was ill, Rabbi Hanina ben Terdyon went to visit him. He said to him: Brother Hanina, do you not know that it is heaven that has ordained this (Roman) nation to reign? For though she has laid waste His House, burnt His temple, slain His pious ones, and caused His best ones to perish, still she is firmly established!¹¹⁰

In light of this understanding of God's role concerning Rome's existence, it is not surprising that Jewish leaders often counseled submission to, prayer for, and payment of taxes to earthly rulers:

The Holy One said unto Israel, I adjure you that even though the Roman government decrees against you harsh decrees, ye shall not rebel against it for anything that it decrees, but keep the king's command. But if it decrees against you to abandon the Torah and the commandments and deny God, then do not obey it, but say unto it: I keep the king's laws only in those things which are ne-

C. R. Briggs, S. R. Driver, and A. Plummer, eds., *The International Critical Commentary*, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1896), *Deuteronomy*, by S. R. Driver, pp. 355-56.

¹⁰⁸ *Jewish Encyclopedia*, p. 188.

¹⁰⁹ Berakot 58a., as quoted in Polish, "Pharisaism and Political Sovereignty," *Judaism* 19(4, 1970):421.

¹¹⁰ Abodah Zarah 18a., as quoted in Polish, "Pharisaism and Political Sovereignty," pp. 421-22.

cessary for the government.¹¹¹

Pray for the peace of the government, for were it not for the awe attached to it we should have swallowed each other.¹¹²

In so far as duties and taxes are concerned, in all that thou decreest upon us, we will obey, and thou art the king, but to deny God--we have no need to answer thee in this matter . . . we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up.¹¹³

The above statements appear quite positive, but in the context of the whole of Rabbinic/Pharisaic thought, this ordination was understood as being conferred by God only for the purpose of punishing Israel.¹¹⁴ The Pharisees never viewed Rome as being legitimate rulers over the land of Israel in any other sense. Israel would be under the heel of Gentile domination until the time of the Messiah and the commencement of the Kingdom of God.¹¹⁵

The Pharisees counseled submission so that Israel would be purified for the end times¹¹⁶ and so that the community of God might remain in the land promised to them.¹¹⁷ This

¹¹¹Tanhuma on Gen. 8:16, Noah 10., as cited in Alfred J. Gross, The Development of Pauline Paraenesis on Civil Obedience (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1947), p.34.

¹¹²Pirke Aboth 3:2. The Babylonian Talmud, ed. Rabbi I. Epstein (London: The Socino Press, 1935), p.27.

¹¹³Midrash on Dan. 8:16, as cited in Gross, The Development of Pauline Paraenesis on Civil Obedience, p. 34.

¹¹⁴David Polish, "Pharisaism and Political Sovereignty," Judaism 19(4, 1970):417

¹¹⁵Ibid. Note the similarity of this idea with Jesus's teaching in Luke 21:24-27.

¹¹⁶Ibid.

¹¹⁷Ibid., p. 418. Jewish submission often seems to be

submission did not, however, extend to breaking any of the laws of God.¹¹⁸

Zealots

For the most part, the Zealots held to the same theological beliefs as the Pharisees, but differed mainly in that while the Pharisees accepted Roman rule as God's ordained punishment, the Zealots believed that God did not desire Rome to rule over Israel.¹¹⁹ Consequently, as they believed, revolt was their only course of obedience, and God would certainly give them victory, as with Mattathias and his sons.¹²⁰

Josephus

The teaching of Josephus on God's relation to Rome was essentially that of the Pharisees. According to Josephus, "Without God's aid, so vast an empire [as Rome] could never have been built up."¹²¹ The fall of the temple and the defeat of the Jewish Revolt in A.D. 70 was due to civil strife; the Jews brought upon themselves the wrath of the Romans.¹²² Josephus does lay almost all of the blame concerning the "civ-

motivated by utilitarian reasons rather than theological.

¹¹⁸Ibid., p. 421

¹¹⁹F. F. Bruce, New Testament History (Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1980), pp.96-97

¹²⁰Ibid., p.97

¹²¹War. 2:390-391. This is a logical conclusion within "orthodox" Jewish theology.

¹²²Ibid., 1:9-10 & 5:395-397

il strife" at the feet of the Zealots: "God made a present to the Romans of the wretched Galileans."¹²³

Josephus counseled submission since God was judging his people and those who would not submit would experience God's wrath as expressed in Roman retaliation.¹²⁴

Philo

Philo's political thought (as found in *The Allegory*) is a careful laying out, in light of parts of the Old Testament, what constitutes the well-governed society.¹²⁵ His view of the ordination of rulers is that they are appointed "by nature," which is the equivalent, in his thought, of being appointed by God, and there are certain criteria for knowing if a ruler is ordained or not: the ruler must be a "philosopher-king," surpassing others in wisdom and stature; his rule must be just and democratic (in the Platonic sense); he must not come to his rule through military means.¹²⁶

Curiously, Philo omits any reference to the role of the ruler in the Land of Israel from the Maccabean dynasty up to and including his own time,¹²⁷ It is possible to see,

¹²³Ibid., 3:293. Most scholars consider the Galileans to refer to the Zealots.

¹²⁴Ibid., 5:377-412

¹²⁵See H. A. Wolfson, *Philo* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), pp.322-438 for a good discussion of Philo's thought.

¹²⁶Samuel Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria: an Introduction*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), pp. 104-05.

¹²⁷Ibid., pp. 102-03. This may have been for his own safety, but the total absence of any such reference is unusual.

however, through some of his allegorical writings, that he probably did not consider Roman rule during his time legitimate.¹²⁸

Philo further taught that God accomplishes his works on the earth both directly and indirectly. His indirect rule is achieved through a system of powers, (including angels) some of which are responsible for government.¹²⁹

Stoic Thought

Stoic thought, as with Philo, spends much time defining what should be the "ideal," and less with current situations. In general, it can be said that the Stoic believed that ". . . government was sanctioned by a universal natural law that reflected the cosmic order."¹³⁰ More specifically, this meant a state described as follows:

. . . without marriage, family, temples, courts, public schools or coins--a state which excluded all other states because all the nationalities of men were merged in one common brotherhood.¹³¹

This ideal was not to be found in any existing form of government with the result that Stoic thought on political ethics was often inconsistent and ambiguous. Stoic thinkers can

¹²⁸Ibid., p. 103

¹²⁹See G. B. Caird, Principalities and Powers: A Study in Pauline Theology, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), pp.14-15.

¹³⁰Encyclopaedia Britannica, 15th ed., s.v. "Political Philosophy," p. 687

¹³¹Alfred G. Gross, Development of Pauline Paraenesis on Civil Obedience, p. 82.

be found teaching abstinence from public affairs (due to their less than ideal constitution) as well as patriotism and civic duty.¹³²

Essene Thought

There is little information to be found regarding the attitude of the Essenes toward government. According to Josephus, each new member of the community agreed to "forever keep faith with all men, especially with the powers that be, since no ruler attains his office save by the will of God."¹³³ The Essene War Scroll, however, ". . . manifests a community which envisaged a future conflict between themselves and Rome; so intense was the hostility that Rome and the Roman forces are explicitly identified as Satan and his hosts."¹³⁴

Jesus

There are four passages attributed to Jesus that bear consideration here: Luke 21:20-24, Mark 12:13-17, John 19:10-11, and Luke 4:6.

Luke 21:20-24 is a somewhat enigmatic passage. It can be understood, perhaps, in two different ways: 1) it may be seen as referring to a "day of grace" for Gentiles, understood in the same sense as Paul speaks of such a period in Rom. 11:25. 2) It may be understood as period of Gentile rulership in af-

¹³²Ibid., pp. 81-82

¹³³Josephus, War. 2:140.

¹³⁴Marcus Borg, "A New Context for Romans xiii," New Testament Studies 19(2, 1973):206.

fecting God's wrath on Israel.

The first interpretation has little exegetical support other than to suppose that since Luke wrote it he knew and agreed with Paul's understanding in Rom. 11:25.

The second alternative seems the better choice for two reasons. First, it is in line with the context of the section (verses twenty through twenty-nine). Jesus is speaking of the "days of vengeance," when Jerusalem is "trodden under foot" until the "times of the Gentiles are fulfilled." It would seem that the end of Gentile rule comes when the Kingdom of God comes (verse thirty-one). Second, it is quite in line with the Rabbinic theology (discussed above) of Jesus' time:

The [Hasmonean] dynasty's fall in 63 B.C.E. was seen by the Pharisees as a retributive act of God against whom the Hasmonean house had rebelled, and, according to many of the faithful, the subjugation of the Jewish people to Roman rule restored the divine order of the world. Wordly power, ordained from the beginning, had been imposed over Israel, and Israel would endure under its domination until the advent of the Messiah and the Kingdom of God.¹³⁵

Mark 12:13-17 is considered by some to hold the key to the New Testament understanding of the state and by others to add nothing clear to the issue.¹³⁶

There are a number of points worth noting about this passage. First, the tax in question was the "head tax," a tangible token of Roman domination.¹³⁷ Jesus was essentially

¹³⁵David Polish, "Pharisaism and Political Sovereignty," p. 417

¹³⁶C. K. Barrett, New Testament Essays (London: S. P. C. K., 1972), p.6

¹³⁷Karl H. Schelkle, Theology of the New Testament 3 vols. Morality, trans. by William A. Jurgens (Collegeville,

being asked whether he was for or against Rome. Second, the word "render" (*ἀπόδοτε*) as used in both clauses suggests a legitimate duty. Third, it is significant that both injunctions are linked with the word "and" (*καί*). This implies that Jesus did not regard duty to God and duty to Roman rule as two mutually exclusive alternatives.¹³⁸ This doesn't place the two duties on an equal level of course, and it doesn't necessarily mean that Jesus had a particularly positive view of the Roman government. It does indicate, however, that Jesus ". . . did not find it necessary to oppose it on principle."¹³⁹

The obvious emphasis of the passage is duty to God, yet it must be acknowledged that Jesus does not negate duty to Rome, at least in the paying of this particular tax.¹⁴⁰ Little more can be said with confidence regarding the interpretation of this passage and Jesus' attitude toward Rome.

Concerning the interpretation of the third passage, John 19:10-11, two problems need to be addressed. One is whether Jesus means that the authority given refers only to Pilate's intent to crucify him (divine consent seems implied) or whether Jesus also refers to the Roman government in general. Whichever interpretation is correct, it is obvious that the

Minnesota: the Liturgical Press, 1973), 3:337

¹³⁸C. K. Barrett, New Testament Essays, p. 9

¹³⁹Ibid.

¹⁴⁰Whether Jesus would approve of all taxes levied is another question. It would be presumptuous to think that Jesus here sanctions the payment of all and any taxes that any particular government decides to levy.

former is primary.¹⁴¹ Two, it is not clear that the authority conferred, if it does include Roman government in general, necessarily establishes anything positive in Jesus' (or John's) attitude towards Rome:

We may recall from the same Gospel (11:51) the belief that the high priest in office might receive the gift of prophecy and so give utterance to truths of which he was not himself aware. Pilate, though on the whole very favourably regarded by John, is not capable of entering into serious exchanges about the truth, and does not even receive an answer to his own question. He has authority to exercise the office which has been given him in the present world order; but in Jesus he is confronted with one who represents an order not of this world (18:36), and the one authority serves as no more than a pale shadow of the other.¹⁴²

In the final passage, Luke 4:6, Satan states that the kingdoms of the world have been "handed over" to him and that he has the authority to give them to whomever he wishes. The whole tone of the temptation passage suggests that Luke (and Matthew) understood that Jesus was truly tempted by valid choices. In other words, it seems safe to assume that the writers understood that Satan did indeed have such authority and was not lying to Jesus.

Since it appears from the Old Testament (cf. Job) that Satan is a fallen angel, it would seem that Luke 4:6 (and Matt. 4:8-9) are parallel in thought to the rather common Jewish understanding that angels are involved somehow in earthly governments.

¹⁴¹C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1978), p. 543

¹⁴²Barrett, New Testament Essays, pp. 10-11.

Little can be found in the Gospels about Jesus' exact understanding of the ordination of the state. One explanation as to why Jesus spoke so little about the state is offered by Carl Soule:

He [Jesus] saw so much in Judaism that needed purification that--like Isaiah and Jeremiah, who in the face of Assyrian and Babylonian aggression upbraided their countrymen instead of the invaders--he spoke primarily to the consciences of his own people. Before the Roman wrongs could be adjusted, the Jews must purify themselves.¹⁴³

¹⁴³ Carl David Soule, "The New Testament and War and Peace," p. 241.

CHAPTER III

EXEGETICAL ISSUES IN ROMANS 13:1-7

Introduction

For the purpose of understanding the nature of the ordination of the state in Rom. 13:1-7, it is not necessary to examine every verse or issue in the passage. Therefore this chapter contains, in addition to some preliminary exegetical concerns (context, style, structure and purpose), discussions on only those issues which are necessary for understanding Paul's concept of the ordination of the state.

Context

The relation of Rom. 13:1-7 to its context is somewhat problematical. Since some of the issues dealing with the section's relation to its context were previously discussed in chapter two (concerning James Kallas' contention that Rom. 13:1-7 is an interpolation), only those concerns which remain will be discussed here.

As described in chapter two, James Kallas maintains that the continuity between 12:21 and 13:8 is interrupted by 13:1-7, both by its abrupt introduction and by the fact that if Rom. 13:8-14 is read immediately after the closing of chapter twelve, there is a very smooth progression of thought which is otherwise broken by 13:1-7. In addition to this,

μηδενὶ is repeated both in 12:17 and in 13:8 and both times it introduces what looks like a paraphrase of Jesus' command to love one's neighbor.¹ According to Kallas, Paul is writing a commentary on synoptic teaching in Rom. 12:14-21 and 13:8-12 (cf. Matt. 5:11, 39; Luke 26:27 and Matt. 22:39), but no such reference to synoptic thought is found in 13:1-7.²

While it must be admitted that Rom. 13:1-7 does interrupt the flow of its context in some ways, it appears that there is more evidence for contextual continuity than against it. First of all, even though verse seven does not appear at first to be a quote of synoptic material, it does not seem reasonable to exclude it as such since it bears a strong similarity to Luke 20:22-25 and Mark 12:17 in attitude, content, and in the use of two key words, *ἀποδοῦτε* and *φῶρον*.

Second, the discrimination urged in verse seven is further reinforced in verse eight because in verse seven "that which is due" (*ὀφειλάς*) is linked to "owing" (*ὀφείλετε*) in verse eight. In other words, verse eight appears to be a "verbal echo" of verse seven.³

Third, if the governing authorities serve the "good" of men (verse four), assisting the state could be understood as partly fulfilling the debt of love one has to his neighbor,

¹C. E. B. Cranfield, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1975, 79), 2:651.

²James Kallas, "Romans xiii:1-7: An Interpolation," New Testament Studies 11(4, 1965):366.

³John Howard Yoder, The Politics of Jesus, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972), p. 211.

the subject of verses eight through ten.⁴

Fourth, since Paul in 12:14-21 urges humility, harmony and non-resistance to evil, the transition to submission to governing authorities in 13:1-7 seems quite logical.⁵

Fifth, the words evil (*κακος*), vengeance (*ἐκδίκησις*), wrath (*ὄργη*) and good (*ἀγαθος*) which occur in the discussion in 12:17-21 occur again in 13:3-5. This is rather strong evidence of continuity. Of the particular interplay between 12:19 and 13:4, John Howard Yoder insists "It is inconceivable that these two verses, using such similar language, should be meant to be read independently of one another."⁶

⁴Cranfield, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, 2:652.

⁵Alexander F. C. Webster, "St. Paul's Political Advice to the Haughty Gentile Christians in Rome: An Exegesis of Romans 13:1-7," St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly, 25(4, 1981):279. Marcus Borg "A New Context for Romans xiii," New Testament Studies, 19(2, 1973):205-18, offers an argument which, if correct, provides an interesting confirmation of this point. According to Borg, the references to non-violence which Paul makes in chapter twelve are from the sayings of Jesus. Since the sayings of Jesus about non-violence and non-retaliation took place against the specific background of conflict between Rome and Judaism, they are best understood not as general ethical commands, but as counsel against a "militant anti-Roman policy." It is possible then, that in chapter twelve Paul is exhorting his readers with the same intent. If so, the submission urged in Rom. 13:1-7 is not only logical, but necessary and expected. Interpreting the section in this way lends support to the position (which Borg holds) that the Roman government was God's servant only in the sense that it was the agent of judgment on Israel at that particular time in history.

⁶Yoder, The Politics of Jesus, p. 199.

Style

According to many authorities, Rom. 13:1-7 is written in the catechetical style of diasporic Jewish Hellenism.⁷ S. Hutchinson thinks that the style is essentially diatribe,

. . . reminiscent of Jewish Hellenistic Wisdom teaching: it appeals to the reason, the nous, of the reader: there is a play on words, hypotassestho, antitassomenos, and a repetitive catechetical style, gar, occurring seven times in seven verses, agathon three times in two verses. In the general subject matter one is reminded of Wisdom 6:1-11 with its allusion to the 'Kings of the earth, to whom God has delegated authority' or of the Rabbinical saying that 'to resist the King is to pitch oneself against the Shekinah.'⁸

Hutchinson goes as far as to state that in Rom. 13:1-7 Paul has ". . . incorporated a ready-made pericope of catechetical teaching."⁹ If this is so, then it would explain why Christ is not mentioned in the passage. We would have strongly expected Paul to mention Christ since he always seems to be very careful to point out, in contexts such as this, that God has placed Christ as the head over all rulers and authorities both in heaven and on earth (cf. Eph. 1:20-22, Col. 1:16-17, 2:10-15).

Whether Rom. 13:1-7 is an incorporation of a previous-

⁷Perhaps the most extensive work on this issue has been done by Edward Gordon Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter (London: Macmillan, 1955), see esp. pp. 407-13. See also Webster, "St. Paul's Political Advice to the Haughty Gentile Christians," pp. 273-77; S. Hutchinson, "The Political Implications of Romans 13:1-7," Biblical Theology, 21(3, 1971):50; and Ernst Käsemann, New Testament Questions of Today, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), pp. 204-05.

⁸S. Hutchinson, "The Political Implications of Romans 13:1-7," Biblical Theology, 21(3, 1971):50.

⁹Ibid., p. 51.

ly existing Jewish pericope or not is not crucial for this thesis. It is sufficient to note that if Paul has incorporated a preexisting catechism, he has "Christianized" it. Therefore when Paul uses *θεος* in the passage he uses it in the full Christian sense.¹⁰

Structure

Rom. 13:1-7 develops along a rather simple, three part scheme: There is an initial exhortation in 1a (repeated in verse five); the basis for the exhortation in between (verses 1b-four); and in verses five through seven, some practical ethical duties which are involved in submission.

Purpose

Rom. 13:1-7 reads in such a way that it does seem to imply that the Roman Christians were having some trouble with the ruling authorities. The rather exact rhetoric of verse one, the repeated warnings, the explanations supporting submission and the lengthy note on taxes all suggest this.

Not surprisingly, a number of different hypotheses are offered as to what the trouble may have been: 1) Since the Jews had always had trouble with foreign domination and all that it meant for their religion, and because many of them looked forward to the overthrow of Roman rulers by the Messiah, there may have been revolts in Rome due to this.¹¹ These

¹⁰Cranfield, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, 2:654. There is therefore no basis for insisting the passage is "non-Christological."

¹¹Hodge, Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, pp.

could have been what led to the expulsion of the Jews from Rome in A.D. 49 under Claudius, and Paul may have wanted to prevent another such problem (among Jewish Christians at least) since many of those who had been expelled were probably returning after Claudius' death in A.D. 54.¹² 2) There may have been trouble and resistance to Roman government during the tax protests which occurred during Nero's reign as recorded in Tacitus and Suetonius.¹³ This idea dovetails well with Paul's injunction in verses six and seven to pay taxes. 3) There may have been a group of antinomians in the Roman congregations as suggested by Rom. 3:7-8.¹⁴ Frank Stagg thinks the antinomians were probably gnostics whose "world-despising" attitude and "already attained sinless state" made them think they were exempt from having to be obedient in any area.¹⁵

It is perhaps impossible to prove that any particular

405-06. It is not at all certain that "Chrestus" is a misspelling of Christ; the uprisings were probably purely Jewish since only Jews were expelled. Stagg, "Rendering to Caesar what Belongs to Caesar: Christian Engagement with the World," p. 107, does not think that there were any "Zealot-type" Jews outside of Palestine.

¹²Alan R. Culpepper, "Righteousness in the Life of His People: Romans 12-15," The Review and Expositor 73(1976):456.

¹³See J. Friedrich, W. Pöhlmann, and P. Stuhlmacher, "Zur Historischen Situation und Intention von Röm 13, 1-7," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 73(2, 1976):131-166.

¹⁴Moulder, "Romans 13 and Conscientious Disobedience," p. 17.

¹⁵Stagg, "Rendering to Caesar What Belongs to Caesar: Christian Engagement with the World," Journal of Church and State, (Winter, 1976):107-110.

hypothesis is correct. All of these hypotheses seem reasonable. It is even possible all three problems were present in the Roman congregation and that Paul was aware of them all.

Paul Furnish, however, offers a number of observations which may make the second hypothesis the most likely:¹⁶ 1) Romans is the only existing Pauline letter where the issue of taxes is mentioned: it was not a "standard" topic in his paraenetic material. 2) Verse seven is worded in such a distinctive way that it suggests Paul had a specific issue in mind: a) It uses an imperative (*ἀπόδοτε*) which means that it is an admonition in contrast to verse six which is a mere statement. b) The imperative *ἀποδοτε* (render, discharge) is a more "forceful" verb than *τελεῖτε* (pay), which was used in verse six. c) The word for "all" in verse seven (*πασιν*) is particularly striking. d) Verse seven uses two different words for "tax" (*φορος* and *τέλος*), whereas verse six has only one.

According to Furnish, these two words were deliberately chosen by Paul because they were the Greek equivalents of the official Latin terms for the direct tax (*φορος* = tributa) and the indirect tax (*τέλος* = portoria). This is significant because in Tacitus (Ann. 13:50) it is recorded that there was public outrage over the unjust collection of the indirect tax,

¹⁶Paul Furnish, The Moral Teaching of Paul (Nashville: Abingdon, 1979), pp. 131-35. Although Furnish mentions that most of his understanding on the issue comes from "a team of German scholars," he does not name them. It is obvious that he took his information from J. Friedrich, W. Pöhlmann, and P. Stuhlmacher, "Zur Historischen Situation und Intention von Röm 13, 1-7," pp. 131-66.

the *τέλος* , in A.D. 58.

Nero considered abolishing the tax, but his advisors warned that if he did, the next thing to go would be the direct tax, thereby placing Rome in trouble financially. As a result, Nero kept both taxes in force. Since Paul wrote Romans in A.D. 56 or 57, it is reasonable to assume that public anger was rising at this time, and that Paul would have known about it. Furnish therefore concludes that Paul is urging his readers to pay both Nero's direct tax and his controversial indirect tax.

Verse One

Πᾶσα ψυχὴ is a Semitic expression (cf. Rom. 2:9, Acts 2:43, 3:23 & Rev. 16:3) and means simply "every person." In this context it means specifically "every Christian."¹⁷ The phrase may indicate some emphasis and possibly, with its Old Testament nuance, solemnity.¹⁸

ὑπερχούσας is an adjectival participle modifying *ἐξουσίας*. The problem with this term is in deciding how it modifies *ἐξουσίας*. There are two options here: 1) Paul is indicating higher grades of authorities (the emperor and important Roman officials) or 2) The word simply means "ruling," or "governing."

In non-Biblical Greek the word is used in a number of ways. Transitivity, the word generally means to "hold (some-

¹⁷Cranfield, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary, 2:656.

¹⁸Ernst Käsemann, Commentary on Romans, trans. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), p. 355.

thing) over or above."¹⁹ It is most often used intransitively though, in several senses: 1) "To be above" (physically);²⁰ 2) "To be prominent" (of persons, in stature);²¹ 3) In a military sense of "outflank";²² 4) In several metaphorical senses: a. "To outdo or exceed" (another person);²³ b. "Prevail";²⁴ c. "To be more powerful";²⁵ d. "To stand out, be prominent" (because of possessions);²⁶ e. As a participle, it quite often refers to "those in authority,"²⁷ but it is not found modifying *ἐξουσία* or any related word.

In other words, in those contexts in non-Biblical Greek where civil authorities are the subject, the participial form of *ὑπερέχω* by itself means ruler, civil authority or magistrate. According to Gerhard Delling the phrase *οἱ ὑπερέχοντες* is a "fixed term for rulers" outside of the New Testament.²⁸

ὑπερέχω does not occur often in the Septuagint (thir-

¹⁹E.g., Homer Il. 2:426 and Arist. HA 589.

²⁰E.g., Herod. Hist. 2:4.

²¹E.g., Homer Il. 3:210 and Herod. Hist. 5:92.

²²Xen. Hist. Hell. 4.2.18.

²³E.g., Aesch. Pers. 709.

²⁴E.g., Theog. Trag. 202.

²⁵E.g., Aesch. Prom. Vin 215.

²⁶E.g., Aesch. Prom. 213.

²⁷Diog. Laert. 6.78; 17; 2, 12 p. 102, 4; PGM 4, 2169.

²⁸Gerhard Delling, S.v. "*ὑπερέχω*." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, 8:43, n. 24.

teen times) and is generally used in two senses: a literal, such as "excell" or "surpass" (Gen. 25:23; Exod. 26:13), and a figurative, such as "greater" (in the sense of non-political authority, e.g., Gen. 39:9), or "to be over" (in the non-political sense of "in charge of," e.g., Gen. 41:40). The word occurs only once in a political context in the sense of "rulers," "kings," or "high and mighty ones:" (Wis. 6:5).²⁹

In the New Testament *ὑπερέχω* is found only five times (Rom. 13:1; Phil. 2:3, 3:8, 4:7; 1 Pet. 2:13) four of which belong to Paul and three of the five occurrences are in Philippians. In Philippians the word can be translated (as in the New American Standard Bible) "surpass" in each case. In the Philippian passages the word is never used in contexts dealing with civil authorities. In 1 Pet. 2:13, however, the term is found in a political context and it appears that it should be translated "supreme" because the emperor is being compared to lesser rulers and governors.³⁰

In light of this background data alone, it would appear that the word could be indicating either "higher grades of authority" or simply "governing" or "ruling" in Rom. 13:1. There appear, however, to be a number of reasons which would suggest that it would be best to translate *ὑπερέχω* as "ru-

²⁹On the translation of the Wisdom passage see David Winston, "The Wisdom of Solomon," in The Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1979), 43:151-53.

³⁰Charles Hodge, Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953, reprint ed., 1886 rev. ed.), p. 405.

ling," or "governing," rather than using an English superlative such as "supreme" or even the comparative "higher:"

1) Paul does not appear to be thinking of higher grades of authority as opposed to lower since there is no comparison between rulers indicated in the context (as there is in 1 Pet. 2:13 or Wis. 6:5). Rather, both the singular and the plural of *ἐξουσία* occur in the verse, suggesting rather strongly that comparison is not his aim. 2) In 1 Tim. 2:2 the phrase *τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων* (without *ἐξουσία*) means simply "those in authority." 3) The evidence from extra-biblical literature suggests, as noted above, that in contexts where rulers are in mind, *οἱ ὑπερέχοντες* is a "fixed term for rulers."

The word is therefore probably best translated "ruling" or "governing." *ὑπερέχω* indicates that the authorities are "raised above" the simple citizen because they have authority over them (cf. verse seven).³¹

Since both *ὑπερέχω* and *ἐξουσία* are able to mean political authorities by themselves (see Tit. 3:1), it might be thought that *ὑπερέχω* is superfluous in Rom. 13:1. But in light of Paul's use of the negative and the words *ἀίοντα* in the rest of the verse, it makes good sense because it emphasizes that he is referring to ALL existing ruling authorities.³² This is an important point to keep in mind because of what it reveals about Paul's concept of ordination.

³¹F. Godet, Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1883), p. 441.

³²Ernst Käsemann, Commentary on Romans, pp. 355-56.

One of the most discussed and important terms in this verse is *ἐξουσία*. It therefore requires a rather thorough examination.

In classical literature *ἐξουσία* appears to have three general meanings: 1) "power" (or authority, license or control) to do something;³³ 2) "civil authorities" (or political office, magistrates);³⁴ 3) "abundance of means" (or abundance of resources or excessive wealth).³⁵

In the Septuagint *ἐξουσία* occurs over seventy times and has five general meanings: 1) "dominion" (of God or a King);³⁶ 2) "power" (to rule, defend, kill, etc.);³⁷ 3) "liberty," or "permission;"³⁸ 4) "authority" (to rule, impose restrictions);³⁹ 5) "rulers," "civil authorities."⁴⁰

In the Papyri all of the meanings found in the Septuagint can be found except perhaps "dominion:"⁴¹

³³Soph. Frag. 88.11 codd.; Isoc. Orat. 3:45; Diog. Oen. Epic. 57; and Plato Gorg. 46 le.

³⁴Plato Alc. 1.135b; Arist. Ethica Nicom. 1095 b21; and Plut Phil. 17.

³⁵Thucyd. Hist 6:31; and Com. Ades.25a.5d.

³⁶4 Kgs. 20:13; Isa. 39:2; Dan. 4:34.

³⁷Jdt. 8:15; Wis. 16:13; Prov.17:14.

³⁸Sir. 25:25; Bel. 26; 2 Macc. 4:9.

³⁹1 Esdr. 8:22; Dan. 3:30; Wis. 10:14.

⁴⁰Dan. 3.2,3; Jdt. 8:15.

⁴¹According to the listing in H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, rev. by H. S. Jones, A Greek-English Lexicon, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940): 1) "Liberty," "power of choice" (BGU 4.1158). 2) "Authority" (P. Oxy.:11 237). 3) "Power" (BGU 4. 1200). 4) "Rulers: (P. Par. 63.176).

In the New Testament, the word occurs one hundred three times, twenty-eight of which are found in Paul. The word displays several meanings: 1) "power," or "ability" (to do something: Matt. 9:8; Acts 8:19; 1 Cor. 7:37); 2) "right," or "liberty" (to choose or do something: John 10:18; Rom. 9:21; 1 Cor. 8:9); 3) "authority," or "power" (political, spiritual, theological, etc.: Matt. 21:23; Luke 7:8, 20); 3) "domain," or "dominion" (Eph. 2:2; Luke 4:6); 4) "political authorities," or "officials" (Luke 12:11; Tit. 3:1); 5) "spiritual authorities," or "spirit rulers" (Eph. 3:10, 6:12); 6) "symbol of authority," or "means of authority" --referring to a veil? (1 Cor. 11:10).

Although it would seem obvious that ἐξουσίαις refers to political authorities in Rom. 13:1 since Paul mentions "doing good," "receiving praise," and "paying taxes," quite a number of authorities contend that it has a DUAL reference in that it refers not only to earthly authorities, but to spiritual authorities as well, who stand behind and control or influence the earthly rulers. If this is true, then the ordination Paul speaks of would include spiritual authorities as well as earthly. Clinton Morrison and Oscar Cullmann (and a fair number of others) argue for this position.⁴²

⁴²For more information on this issue, both pro and con, see especially the following: Oscar Cullmann, The State in the New Testament, 2nd ed. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956). See esp. Excursus I & II, pp. 70-88; O. Cullmann, Christ and Time: The Primitive Conception of Time and History, rev. ed. (London: S. C. M. Press, 1962); Karl Barth, Church and State, trans. by G. Ronald Howe, (London: S. C. M. Press, 1939), pp. 23-36; Gerhard Kittel, S.v. "ἄγγελος," Theological Diction-

There are a number of arguments posited by those who believe Paul intended a dual reference, some of which are rather complex. One fairly common argument offered by those who see a dual reference is essentially as follows: In every place where Paul uses the plural form (ἐξουσιαί) or the pluralistic sense (πᾶσα ἐξουσιαί [except Tit. 3:1]) the meaning indicated is clearly spiritual beings or angels: (1 Cor. 15:24; Eph. 1:21; 3:10; 6:12; Col. 1:16; and 2:10, 15). Therefore, when Paul uses the word in Rom. 13 in a context where earthly authorities are clearly indicated, he must have intended a dual reference.⁴³

This argument is not valid. Even if it could be proven that in every other place where Paul used the plural form (except, of course, Tit. 3:1) he meant spiritual beings, this does not prove that this meaning MUST be included in Rom. 13. ἐξουσιαί was commonly used for earthly authorities in Paul's

ary of the New Testament, 1:80-87; G. B. Caird, Principalities and Powers: A Study in Pauline Theology, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956); Clinton Morrison, The Powers That Be: Earthly Rulers and Demonic Powers in Romans 13:1-7, (Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1960); S. Hutchinson, "The Political Implications of Romans 13:1-7," Biblical Theology, 21(3, 1971):57-58; Alexander Webster, "St. Paul's Political Advice to the Haughty Gentile Christians in Rome: An Exegesis of Romans 13:1-7," St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly, 25(4, 1981):270-272; C. E. B. Cranfield, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, 2:656-659; Frank Stagg, "Rendering to Caesar What Belongs to Caesar: Christian Engagement with the World," Journal of Church and State, (Winter, 1976):104-106; Franz J. Leenhardt, The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary, (New York: World Pub., 1961), pp. 328-329; A. Strobel, "Zum Verständnis von Röm 13," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 47(1956):67-93.

⁴³Karl Barth, Church and State, (London: S. C. M. Press, 1939), p. 23.

day and "if Paul ever had occasion to mention earthly authorities, the same plural form (*ἐξουσίαι*) was the most natural term for him to use."⁴⁴

Some exegetes argue that there are other passages in Paul's writings where a dual reference can be found.⁴⁵ If true, this would constitute reasonable evidence that Paul may well have intended the same in Rom. 13. It is necessary therefore to examine a number of passages where Paul could have intended a dual reference.

In 1 Cor. 15:24 *ἐξουσία* occurs as a singular, but has a pluralistic sense because of *πας*. The context in which the word occurs is dealing with Christ's victory over *πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν* and over all his enemies, the last of which is death. Although it is difficult to know whether the authorities and rulers here are spiritual or not, the mention of the last enemy as death may suggest that cosmic rulers are in Paul's mind.⁴⁶ There is no evidence in this passage that Paul intended a dual reference, however. There is no hint of civil rulers in the entire chapter.

Eph. 3:10 states that the church makes known, somehow,

⁴⁴F. F. Bruce, "Paul and 'The Powers That Be,'" Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester 66(6, 1984):82.

⁴⁵Oscar Cullmann, The State in the New Testament, 2nd ed., (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956), pp. 86-87.

⁴⁶Grant Osborne and Rodney Peterson, "Paradox in Paul and the Apocalypse: A Model for Attitudes Toward Government." Unpublished Mss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 1984, p. 9.

the manifold wisdom of God to the *ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις* . The phrase "*ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις*" makes it certain that there is no dual reference in this context. Obviously, the rulers and authorities here are spiritual only.

Eph. 1:20, 21 states that Christ is at the right hand of God in the heavenlies, "far above all *ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος* and every name that is named, not only in this age, but also in the one to come." In this passage it is not clear if Paul is speaking about civil rulers or spiritual. It is possible that the reference to "every name that is named" alludes to those who are on the earth (as in Eph. 3:15), and that the rulers and authorities, etc., refer to spiritual beings (as in Eph. 3:10). In either case there is no indication of a dual reference in this passage.

In Eph. 6:12 Paul describes a conflict between Christians and *ἀρχάς , ἐξουσίας* and *κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τούτου* as well as *τα πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις*. In context, the conflict is seen as taking place, in an overall sense, with the devil (verse eleven: "*διαβόλου* "). Combining this observation with the denial that Christians struggle against "flesh and blood," and the phrase "*ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις*" makes it difficult, if not impossible, to see a dual reference here. It seems apparent that spiritual beings only are in Paul's mind.

In Col. 1:16 Paul states that all things in the heavens and on the earth have been created in Christ, the invisible and the visible, whether they be *κυριότητες* or *ἀρχαὶ* or

ἑρόνοι or *ἐξουσίαι*. If there is any passage which comes close to indicating a bona fide dual reference in Paul this would seem to be the one. The mention of "in the heavens" and "visible and invisible" and then the use of *εἴτε . . . εἴτε* , when using the terms which describe what has been created, could very well suggest that Paul is thinking of earthly as well as spiritual authorities in the one word *ἐξουσία* .

Yet it must be noted that the context does not clearly state this; it simply reads in a somewhat ambiguous way. In the whole of Colossians however, prominence has been given to the spiritual powers, and "Paul here forces them to realize that these too are subject to, indeed were created by Christ."⁴⁷ This last observation at least suggests that spiritual powers may be all that Paul is thinking of in this passage. It does not seem possible to prove he intended either a dual or a unitary reference (to either civil or spiritual authorities).

In Col. 2:10, 15 it would seem fairly certain that Paul is speaking of the demonic realm when he mentions rulers and authorities. The entire epistle is dealing with the problem of heresy and verses 2:8-15 (note especially the "fullness of Christ" idea in verse nine) use the teaching about Christ's exalted spiritual position in 1:3-2:5 to combat the heresy, which is directly linked (in verse ten) to "rule" and "authority," and (in verses 17-18) to angels.⁴⁸ There is however,

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 9-11. Wesley Carr, Angels and Principalities: The background meaning and development of the Pauline phrase *hai archai kai hai exousia*; (SNTSMS 42: New York: Cam-

nothing in the passages which clearly indicates a dual reference intent.

Although 1 Cor. 2:8 does not contain *ἐξουσία*, it is worth examining since it is a relevant verse for this issue. Cullmann thinks that in 1 Cor. 2:8 the phrase *ἄρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος* is a reference both to earthly rulers and spiritual beings. It appears to refer to earthly rulers since (according to Cullmann) the rest of the New Testament always portrays men and not demons as those who crucified the Lord.

There is also some indication that Paul may also be referring to spiritual (demonic) authorities in 1 Cor. 2:8. First, *καταργεῖω* and *ἄρχαι* are almost always used by Paul when he speaks of spiritual beings, and second, a very significant parallel in thought is found in 2 Cor. 4:4 where Satan is described as "the god of this age."⁴⁹

Against this Gene Miller and Wesley Carr⁵⁰ argue that the "wisdom" is not something that the *ἄρχοντες* "give." Instead it is characteristic of their thought. Also, in chapters one through three of First Corinthians the wisdom is not supernatural but human (cf. 1:20, 3:19). Furthermore, *αἰών* should be identified with *κόσμος* in Rom. 2:2 and especially 1 Cor. 3:18.

bridge University Press, 1981), pp. 52-66, argues that Paul is addressing good rather than evil angels.

⁴⁹Osborne, "Paradox in Paul and the Apocalypse," p. 14.

⁵⁰Gene Miller, "Archontes tou aionos toutou--A New Look at 1 Corinthians 2:6-8," Journal of Biblical Literature 91(1972), 522-28; Wesley Carr, "The Rulers of This Age--1 Corinthians 2:6-8," New Testament Studies 23(1976), 20-35.

The wisdom in verse eight, however, does appear to be supernatural, and Conzelmann (who believes the rulers are spiritual) argues that earthly rulers do not have access to supernatural wisdom.⁵¹ This argument does not appear legitimate in light of verses nine and ten though, which, beginning with *ἄλλα*, logically suggests that up UNTIL the present NO ONE had access to that particular supernatural wisdom which would have kept the princes from crucifying Christ. In other words, it is implied that there was no way the princes could have known about the supernatural wisdom since it is only NOW being revealed.

Although it is difficult to be absolutely sure, the evidence in favor of spiritual rulers would seem to slightly outweigh that of earthly rulers in 1 Cor. 2:8. "Paul states here that divine wisdom is beyond the earthly wisdom of Paul's adversaries, and that this earthly wisdom parallels that of the spirit-adversaries of Christ (cp. Col. 2:15)."⁵²

Even though Paul is speaking of spiritual rulers this does not necessitate a dual reference. If the spiritual beings did do the influencing of those who physically crucified Christ, Paul could still say that they had crucified Christ in the sense that they were the instigators. It is important to note that it is at least implied that the spiritual rulers used human rulers as instruments.

⁵¹H. Conzelmann, I Corinthians, trans. by J. W. Leitch (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), p. 61.

⁵²Osborne, "Paradox in Paul and the Apocalypse," p. 14.

In summary, there does not appear to be any solid evidence from these passages which would suggest that Paul intended a dual reference in Rom. 13:1. There is no clear instance of a dual reference in any of Paul's statements on the topic. Therefore it is reasonable to conclude that Paul was speaking only of earthly authorities in Rom. 13 because that is all that is indicated in the context. But there are other arguments for a dual reference which must be considered.

Perhaps the most complex arguments offered for the dual reference position are those which attempt to prove that Paul believed spiritual beings were at work behind the scenes in influencing earthly rulers and that this indicates a dual reference in Rom. 13.

It is worth noting from the beginning though, that this particular reasoning is inherently faulty. Assume, for the sake of argument, it could be proven that Paul believed spiritual beings were at work behind the scenes in influencing earthly rulers. This in itself would not prove that he intended a semantic dual reference meaning in Rom. 13. It would merely prove that he believed spirit beings COULD influence earthly rulers. Conceivably, although it would raise certain problems, Paul could have believed that spirit beings stood behind and influenced earthly rulers and still have been referring only to earthly authorities in Rom. 13.

For the purpose of this thesis it is important to determine if Paul believed that spiritual beings were at work behind earthly rulers since this would be an important factor

in understanding his concept of the ordination of the state. It is therefore necessary to examine a number of arguments which attempt to corroborate this.

Cullmann argues that 1 Cor. 6:1-4 reveals that Paul believed angels were behind earthly rulers. In this passage Paul instructs the Christians to stay away from civil law courts and then bases this exhortation on the statement that one day they will judge angels (verse three). The question that arises is why should Paul have mentioned angels? As Cullmann notes, "Paul might have been content simply to write that the Christian would one day take part in the last judgment."⁵³ Since the last judgment will certainly include nations (verse two), Cullmann thinks it is reasonable to conclude that the specific reference to angels supports the idea that Paul understood angels and governments were in some way closely related.⁵⁴

It is possible that Paul mentions angels here for the reasons Cullmann has given, but the passage does not provide enough evidence to be confident that Paul believed such a relationship existed. It seems more reasonable, since the PRIMARY basis of Paul's injunction is that Christians will one day judge the world, to think that the angels were men-

⁵³Cullmann, The State in the New Testament, 2nd ed., p. 79.

⁵⁴Cullmann, Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History, rev. ed. (London: S. C. M. Press, 1962), p. 193.

tioned merely to further support this statement.⁵⁵ The inclusion of angels as support for Paul's statement does not seem particularly arresting to those of us conditioned by a theology in which such beings are relatively unimportant. But this was not the case in Paul's time.

According to G. B. Caird, 1 Cor. 11:10-11 is evidence that Paul held to the spiritual ruler/earthly ruler position. He argues that it is natural to assume that the angels in 1 Cor. 11:10 are the same as those in 1 Cor. 6, and, since verse eleven stands in contrast to verse ten, one should assume that

The subjection of woman to man, like the subjection of slave to master, was part of the structure of the pagan social system, and any Christians who ignored that system would be undermining the divinely decreed order of natural law whereby the the present age was governed. Therefore out of deference to the angelic guardians of the natural order of society, Christian wives ought not to appear in public without a⁵⁶ veil, the symbol of their subjection to their husbands.

While this is an interesting interpretation of 1 Cor. 11:10-11, it is a weak one. There is simply not enough information in the passage to be certain of what Paul means. Also, the angels may not be the same as those mentioned in chapter six. Furthermore, the reason for the contrast between verse eleven and ten might simply have been for the sake of balance: Paul may have been worried that his statement in verse nine (that women were created for the sake of men) could lead to an improper understanding of the relation of women to men. Fi-

⁵⁵Osborne, "Paradox in Paul and the Apocalypse," p. 15.

⁵⁶G. B. Caird, Principalities and Powers: A Study in Pauline Theology, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), pp. 17-18.

nally, Caird relies too much on his own understanding of "the divinely decreed order of natural law," as well as his belief that Paul believed there were "angelic guardians of the natural order of society," a point which, although possible, must remain in the realm of conjecture since Paul nowhere explicitly states such a belief nor does he even sufficiently allude to the idea.

Cullmann and others argue that Ps. 110 as used in the the New Testament indicates Paul's belief in the position. According to Cullmann, "there is no other Old Testament passage which is so often cited by all New Testament writers as this one."⁵⁷ Its use shows the Lordship of Christ over angelic powers and is at the very heart of primitive Christian thought.⁵⁸ The phrase "Christ is Lord" is another way of expressing the belief that Jesus was seated at the right hand of God, in fulfillment of the Psalm. The use of this Psalm in the New Testament shows a dual reference since in the Old Testament the Psalm refers to the enemies as EARTHLY rulers but the New Testament treats the enemies as SPIRITUAL, invisible powers:

While the 'enemies' mentioned in the psalm refer to the nations which oppressed Israel, Paul has applied the term in I Cor.15.24f and Eph.1.20ff. to the heavenly powers. The same kind of association is evident in Paul's use of Isa.45.23 in Phil.2.10f. That Paul has obviously applied to the heavenly powers passages which refer to nations offers evidence that he accepted a system in which there were angelic powers behind the things of this world, in-

⁵⁷Cullmann, The State in the New Testament, 2nd ed., p. 75.

⁵⁸Ibid.

cluding the nations and their rulers.⁵⁹

Cullmann also argues that Ps. 110, as used in Heb. 1:13-14, supports the idea that the powers have now become servants of Christ.⁶⁰ He argues that in Heb. 1:14 the "ministering spirits" (λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα) are obviously angels, but in verse thirteen, Psalm 110 is quoted where God's enemies (ἐχθροί) are subjected (made a footstool). Since the enemies in Ps. 110 are equated with angelic powers in the rest of the New Testament, it follows that these subjected spirits are also made servants (λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα εἰς διακονίαν ἁποστολλόμενα). This is essentially the same terminology used in Rom. 13:4 (διάκονός) and 13:6 (λειτουργοί). Because in many other places where Paul mentions ἐξουσίαι he means spiritual/angelic beings hostile to God and his people, and in Rom. 13:1-7 they are called servants, the subjection-to-service interpretation solves this apparent conflict: Christ has made the former spiritual enemies his servants and Christians should submit to them for this reason.

Against Cullmann's contention that the spiritual powers have been "pressed into service" it is argued that there is no concrete evidence in Paul's writings that hostile forces are commissioned or recommissioned into the service of Christ. Instead, in Col. 1:13, 16, 2:10, 15 and in Eph. 1:21, 22, 3:10 and 6:12 the ἐξουσίαι are hostile and need to be resisted, not

⁵⁹Caird, Principalities and Powers, p. 23.

⁶⁰Cullmann, The State in the New Testament, 2nd ed., p. 81, and Christ and Time, p. 205.

submitted to.⁶¹ Also, in Rom. 8:38 the powers are trying to separate the believer from God. How then could Paul counsel submission to them in Rom. 13?⁶²

[Christ] has not placed them in His service, but has rendered them powerless to harm the elect who in spite of everything have still to struggle against them with the strength which Christ the Victor supplies. How can we conceive of these powers as being converted and becoming servants of the good? How could believers be exhorted⁶³ to obey powers which they have still to fight against?

Cullmann argues that there is no contradiction when the complexity of redemptive history (which is due to a temporal "dualism") is properly understood. By temporal dualism Cullmann means the tension between the "already fulfilled" and the "not yet completed" in the New Testament (and Paul's) teaching on Christ's victory over principalities and powers.⁶⁴ In 1 Pet. 3:22, Col. 1:16-20, 2:15 and Phil. 2:10 the powers are presented as already defeated; in 1 Cor. 15:24-28 and Heb. 10:13 the defeat is yet to come. This means, according to Cullmann, that angelic powers have a certain amount of freedom to disobey Christ. They are bound as on a "rope" that can be "lengthened," yet never broken. The Christian should be subject, therefore, to the already (partially) subjected servant powers, yet he should remain watchful of the state since

⁶¹Frank Stagg, "Rendering to Caesar What Belongs to Caesar: Christian Engagement with the World," pp. 106-07.

⁶²J. Hutchinson, "The Political Implications of Romans 13:1-7," pp. 57-58.

⁶³Franz J. Leenhardt, The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary, (New York: World Pub., 1961), p. 329.

⁶⁴Cullmann, Christ and Time, pp. 197-200.

the powers behind them may decide (as in Revelation chapter thirteen) to become disobedient.

Cullmann's argument is interesting and clever, and does apparently harmonize many Scripture passages, but it is founded more on speculation than on hard exegetical evidence. It is crucial for Cullmann's interpretation of Heb. 1:13-14 that Ps. 110 supports the belief on the part of New Testament authors that spirit beings were behind earthly rulers because in the Old Testament the passage refers to earthly rulers and in the New to spiritual authorities. But it is not a certainty that New Testament writers quote Ps. 110 in their writings for the reason Cullmann has suggested. It seems more reasonable to think that New Testament authors knew that the enemies originally referred to in Ps. 110 were earthly, but have applied the Psalm's promise of God's victory over his people's enemies in the past to fit the present situation where spiritual beings were considered the principle enemies.

Cullmann's interpretation should therefore be rejected, not only for the reasons previously cited, but especially since the submission in Rom. 13 is NOT based on the subjection of angels, but on the fact that that no authority exists apart from God's sovereignty!

Clinton Morrison argues that in the Graeco-Roman world there was a rather common understanding that the state was divinely appointed and was related to a system of spiritual powers.⁶⁵ According to Morrison, this understanding was so

⁶⁵ See Morrison, The Powers That Be, chap. four for a

prevalent that if it is not openly opposed by New Testament writers it should be assumed that it was shared by them.⁶⁶

Against this A. Strobel contends that the terminology used in Rom. 13:1-7 is the official phraseology of the Graeco-Roman/Hellenistic world which contained no hint of a dual reference.⁶⁷ Therefore, according to Strobel, Paul is deliberately suggesting, by the particular words he uses, that he is not thinking in terms of a Jewish theology of guardian angels, but of earthly rulers only.

As Cullmann notes,⁶⁸ Strobel's point does not rule out the possibility that Paul understood angels were in the background; it merely shows that Paul is referring to earthly authorities in the passage. Strobel's evidence does weaken Morrison's position by showing there were mixed views about the state and its relation to the spiritual realm in Graeco-Roman thought. Neither Strobel's nor Morrison's arguments seem to contribute anything substantial towards the issue; they rather seem to cancel each other out.

None of the preceding arguments are very convincing, although they are taken seriously by many authorities on the subject. However, a consideration of the combined data pro-

discussion of this issue.

⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 99.

⁶⁷ A. Strobel, "Zum Verständnis von Röm. 13," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 47(1956):67-93.

⁶⁸ Cullmann, The State in the New Testament, 2nd ed., p. 85.

vided by the following arguments does seem to provide sufficient evidence to conclude that Paul believed spirit beings stood behind and influenced earthly rulers (yet did not intend a semantic dual reference in Rom. 13).

First, there is clear evidence that Paul believed spirit beings could influence/affect both groups and individuals (1 Cor. 5:5, 7:5; 2 Cor. 2:10-11, 11:13-15; 1 Thess. 2:18). Although civil authorities are not mentioned in these passages this does not mean Paul thought they were exempt. According to Paul, "the prince of the power of the air" is a spirit who works in ALL who practice disobedience. Logically then, one could assume that when a civil ruler did evil, the "prince of the power of the air" could have been involved in the disobedience.

In 2 Thess. 2:3-10 the "man of sin" accomplishes his deeds with the help of Satan. Although it is possible that the "man of sin" refers only to a false prophet, as Ridderbos⁶⁹ argues, there is evidence that he was considered a political figure, another "Antiochus Epiphanes," who would also function as a false prophet.⁷⁰ As noted earlier, if in 1 Cor. 2:6-8 spiritual beings are indicated, this would imply that human rulers were their instruments.

⁶⁹Hermann Ridderbos, Paul: An Outline of His Theology, trans. by J. R. DeWitt, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), pp. 512-14.

⁷⁰See James Moffatt, "The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians," The Expositor's Greek Testament, ed., R. Nicoll 5 vols., (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 4:48 and Donald Guthrie, New Testament Theology (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1981), pp. 806-09.

This interpretation is in agreement with the Gospel tradition that Satan was working in Judas to betray Christ so that he might be crucified. Also, the "hour" of Christ's betrayal and crucifixion was specifically related to the working of the "power of darkness."⁷¹ Although we cannot be certain, it does not appear unreasonable to suggest that not only would Paul have been aware of this particular Gospel tradition, but that he would also have agreed with it.

Second, Paul held the Old Testament as authoritative and it is clearly taught in Daniel (see chapter two of this thesis) that angels have an influence on the deeds of earthly rulers. Also, although this is perhaps a somewhat weaker point, Deut. 32 (in one Jewish tradition) taught that when God gave the nations their boundaries he did so "according to the number of the sons of God," which suggests (perhaps as in Daniel and later Judaism) that each nation had an angel "assigned" to it (see chapter two of this thesis).

Third, in the New Testament as a whole, angelic powers seem to be behind nearly all earthly events.⁷² In Acts 12:15 we learn that every person has an angel as is also implied in Matt. 18:10. In Revelation chapters two and three each church has its own angel. In Eph. 6:12 Paul teaches that our fight is not with flesh and blood, but with principalities and powers in the heavenly places. In 1 Cor. 4:9 Paul states

⁷¹Luke 22:3, 4 & 25.

⁷²Cullmann, The State in the New Testament, p. 79.

that the apostles have "become a spectacle to angels and men." In Luke 4:6 Satan has been given the nations of the earth and offers them to Jesus if he will worship him.

This evidence does not directly prove Paul believed spirit rulers were behind earthly rulers, but it does demonstrate that such a belief on Paul's part would conform with the rest of Scripture, a point of considerable significance for those interpreters whose belief in Scriptural inerrancy precludes the existence of conflicting theologies among Biblical writers.

The motif of angels influencing earthly rulers shows up so uniformly in Jewish literature (Old Testament, Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Philo, Rabbinic writings, etc.) that Paul must have been aware of the concept. It does not seem illogical to suggest that he was influenced by these teachings and that this influence can be seen in the "hints" that we have in his writings (and in those of the rest of the New Testament) about spirit beings influencing those who dwell on the earth.

This does not mean that Paul's concept would necessarily be identical in all respects with, for instance, that found in Rabbinic writings (as Moore⁷³ argues), or in any

⁷³George Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Three Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim, 4 vols., (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927), 3:97. David Polish, "Pharisaism and Political Sovereignty," Judaism 19(4, 1970):421-22, however, strongly objects to this equation on the basis that Paul's understanding of ordination and motives for submission were different. According to Polish, Paul (and the early Christians) submitted to temporal authority for three reasons: 1) the true Kingdom was not of this world, 2) government was a necessary, permanent condition due to man's depravity, and 3) earthly rule was "God's surrogate." As a con-