

Excerpted from Walter Wink, *Naming the Powers, The Language of Power in the New Testament* (The Powers : Volume One) (Augsburg Fortress Pub).

## 1. Identifying the Powers

### Introduction

#### Power in Its Mythological Context

The reader of this work will search in vain for a definition of power. It is one of those words that everyone understands perfectly well until asked to define it. Sociologists and political scientists generally complain that no one (prior to their writing) has ever provided an adequate definition, but the definitions they offer are in turn rejected by others. This is all quibbling. The dictionary definitions of power will do quite well, as long as the word is not pressed to answer for the myth with which it presently keeps company.

Our use of the term "power" is laden with assumptions drawn from the contemporary materialistic worldview. Whereas the ancients always understood power as the confluence of both spiritual and material factors, we tend to see it as primarily material. We do not think in terms of spirits, ghosts, demons, or gods as the effective agents of powerful effects in the world. When the typewriter jams, I do not suspect a jinni of having jimmed with it, though I sometimes behave as if I did, nor do I lay on hands and pray for it, though I confess to having friends who do. No, most of us, if we are truly "modern," look for nonspiritual, material causes. What happens then when we moderns examine the biblical understanding of the Powers? Will we not tend to assume that what the ancients called "Powers" were merely little-understood manifestations of material power: the laws of physical power, institutionalized forms of corporate power, psychological forms of power, perhaps even various forms of psychic power? And whatever residue we cannot force into our material categories, we will tend to regard as "superstition." The ancients could not help it if they did not understand the physical laws of the universe uncovered by our science. They could deal with these invisible, unknown forces only by personifying them and treating them as if they were conscious, willing beings.

There is a fine irony here. We moderns cannot bring ourselves by any feat of will or imagination to believe in the real existence of these mythological entities that traditionally have been lumped under the general category "principalities and powers." We naturally assume that the ancients conceived of them and believed in them the same way we conceive of and disbelieve them. We think they thought of the Powers quite literally as a variety of invisible demonic beings flapping around in the sky, occasionally targeting some luckless mortal with their malignant payload of disease, lust, possession, or death. This view of their view finds its way into even the best modern translations of

the Bible, where words like "spiritual" and "spirits" are constantly being added to the text gratuitously in order to make it clear that spiritual, not material, or material/spiritual, entities are involved. When we read the ancient accounts of encounters with these Powers, we can only regard them as hallucinations, since they have no real physical referent. Hence we cannot take seriously their own descriptions of these encounters-as long as our very categories of thought are dictated by the myth of materialism.

In short, our eyes and minds are themselves captive to a way of seeing and thinking that can only regard such entities as mere fantasies conjured up by the prevailing belief system. It is as impossible for most of us to believe in the real existence of demonic or angelic powers as it is to believe in dragons, or elves, or a flat world. For us the intermediate realm- what Henry Corbin has called the "imaginal" realm-is virtually unknown. We simply do not have categories for thinking of such Powers as real yet unsubstantial, as actual spirits having no existence apart from their concretions in the world of things. We play a double trick on ourselves, first personifying spiritual entities that are in fact not "persons," and then dismissing the creations of our own personifying as improbable, nonempirical, unscientific superstitions.

Thus a gulf has been fixed between us and the biblical writers. We use the same words but project them into a wholly different world of meanings. What they meant by power and what we mean are incommensurate. If our goal is to understand the New Testament's conception of the Powers, we cannot do so simply by applying our own modern sociological categories of power. We must instead attend carefully to the unique vocabulary and conceptions of the first century and try to grasp what the people of that time might have meant by power, within the linguistic field of their own worldview and mythic systems.

It is a virtue to disbelieve what does not exist. It is dangerous to disbelieve what exists outside our current limited categories. The three volumes comprising this study are themselves the record of my own pilgrimage away from a rather naive assurance that the "principalities and powers" mentioned in the New Testament could be "demythologized," that is, rendered without remainder into the categories of modern sociology, depth psychology, and general systems theory. The Powers, I thought, could be understood as institutions, social systems, and political structures. They would provide a means for developing a Christian social ethic from within the language of the New Testament.

Much of that proved true. But always there was this remainder, something that would not reduce to physical structures-something invisible, immaterial, spiritual, and very, very real. Perhaps the reader would be helped by knowing briefly where I came out in the concluding section of this volume. I will argue that the "principalities and powers" are the inner and outer aspects of any given manifestation of power. As the inner aspect they are the spirituality of institutions, the "within" of corporate structures and systems, the inner essence of outer organizations of power. As the outer aspect they are political systems, appointed officials, the "chair" of an organization, laws-in short, all the tangible manifestations which power takes. Every Power tends to have a visible pole, an outer form-be it a church, a nation, or an economy-and an invisible pole, an inner spirit or driving force that animates, legitimates, and regulates its physical manifestation in the world. Neither pole is the cause of the other. Both come into existence together and cease to exist together. When a particular Power becomes idolatrous, placing itself above God's

purposes for the good of the whole, then that Power becomes demonic. The church's task is to unmask this idolatry and recall the Powers to their created purposes in the world-"so that the Sovereignities and Powers should learn only now, through the Church, how comprehensive God's wisdom really is" (Eph. 3:10, JB).

This hypothesis, it seems to me, makes sense of the fluid way the New Testament writers and their contemporaries spoke of the Powers, now as if they were these centurions or that priestly hierarchy, and then, with no warning, as if they were some kind of spiritual entities in the heavenly places. In order to try to distinguish the material from the spiritual pole I will refer to the latter as the "spiritual aspect of the Powers." By that means I hope to make it clear that the Powers generally are only encountered as corporealized in some form. The implications of this view for healing the split between one-sided materialism and one-sided spiritualism are, I believe, extremely far-reaching. But I leave that for Part Three and the subsequent volumes. Enough has been said, at least, to provide the reader with a way to test the data to see if they do, in fact, support the hypothesis. Let us then consider the evidence.

### Preliminary Guidelines for Analyzing the Data

Despite several excellent studies of the "principalities and powers" over the last fifty years,<sup>1</sup> there has been no comprehensive treatment of the theme. Most studies have focused on the epistles attributed to Paul, or even an aspect of Paul (such as Romans 13), ignoring or overlooking the pervasiveness of the language of power throughout the New Testament. This has led to preoccupation with the question whether these Powers are evil spirits or social institutions and whether they are good or evil, leaving aside the broader and more significant question of how power was conceived by people in the first century and by the New Testament authors in particular.

Now liberation and political theologians are attempting to undergird their social ethics by appealing to the biblical notion of the Powers, reducing them almost entirely to social institutions and structures. At the other extreme, Wesley Carr has recently argued that the Powers are good altogether, and not the demonic forces they have been pictured to be; hence they cannot be made to serve the needs of Christian social ethics.<sup>2</sup> Care's thesis is fundamentally in error, as I have tried to show briefly elsewhere.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless it usefully opens the whole subject for a complete reassessment of the precise field of meanings that the language of power manifested in the New Testament era.

A word about method is in order here. Because the language of power pervades the New Testament, not so much as a consciously articulated set of doctrines but as a background belief held almost universally by the age, I have chosen to treat the terms synthetically, drawing on usage found anywhere in the New Testament, rather than analytically, writer by writer. While the latter would have introduced more precision, it would also have complicated an already complex discussion, and with very little return. What we are dealing with here is not so much the conscious reflections of a discrete author (or even a community or set of communities) but the unconscious presuppositions and worldview of an entire era. I am, in short, trying to reconnoiter what Michel Foucault called the "epistemological space specific to a particular period"<sup>4</sup> as it touches on the way the Powers were experienced and described. I will, however, try to indicate when

differences of usage exist among writers.

To aid in the analysis of the data, let me propose a series of preliminary observations as guidelines:

1. The language of power pervades the whole New Testament. No New Testament book is without the language of power. The phrase *archai kai exousiai* ("principalities and powers") is but one of many paired expressions for power and should not be singled out as of unique significance. Other such pairs are:

Rulers (*archontes*) and great men (Matt. 20:25)

Those who supposedly rule (*hoi dokountes archein*) and great men (Mark 10:42) Kings (*basileis*) and those in authority (*hoi exousiazontes*) (Luke 22:25) Chief priests (*archiereis*) and rulers (*archontes*) (Luke 24:20)

Authorities (*archonten*) and Pharisees (John 7:48)

Rulers (*archontes*) and elders (Acts 4:8)

Kings and rulers (*archontes*) (Acts 4:26)

Angels and principalities (*archai*) (Rom. 8:38)

Power (*dynamei*) and name (*onomati*) (Acts 4:7)

Power (*dynamin*) and wisdom (*sophian*) (1 Cor. 1:24)

Power (*dynamin*) and authority (*exousian*) (Luke 9:1; Rev. 17:13)

Authority (*exousias*) and commission (*epitropes*) (Acts 26:12)

Authority (*exousia*) and power (*dynamei*) (Luke 4:36)

Half of these (7) are found in the Gospels, 4 in Acts, and only 2 in Paul.

Of the 10 times *archai kai exousiai* are paired, 2 instances refer explicitly to human agents or institutions: Luke 12:11 ("And when they bring you before the synagogues and rulers [*archas*] and the authorities [*exousias*]") and Luke 20:20 ("[they] sent spies, who pretended to be sincere, that they might take hold of what he said, so as to deliver him up to the authority [*arch!*] and jurisdiction [*exousia*] of the governor [*hegemonos*]"). Both passages have a political focus, but one uses the terms under discussion to refer to human officeholders, the other to refer to the structures of authority.

Of the other 8 pairs of *archai kai exousiai*, I is found in 1 Cor. 15:24, 3 in Colossians (1:16; 2:10, 15), 3 in Ephesians (1:21; 3:10; 6:12), and I in Titus 3:1. If one holds that at least Ephesians and possibly also Colossians are by Paul's disciples and not Paul himself, then this most "Pauline" of phrases appears possibly as little as once in Paul! Around these 8 pairs most of the debate has focused. I will call them the "disputed passages" and postpone their assessment, and that of other similarly problematic

passages, until Part Two of this volume.

Not only do expressions for power tend to be paired, they also attract each other into series or strings, as if power were so diffuse and palpable a phenomenon that words must be heaped up in clusters in order to catch a sense of its complexity. One need only scan this list of phrases to get a sense of their variety and frequency:

Chief priests, captains, elders (Luke 22:52)

Chief priests, rulers (archontas), people (Luke 23:13)

Rulers (archontas), elders, scribes (Acts 4:5)

Synagogues, rulers (archas), and authorities (exousias) (Luke 12:11)

Death, life, angels, principalities (archai), present, future, powers (dynamis), height, depth, any other creature (Rom. 8:38) Rule (arches), authority (exousias), power (dynamis), dominion (kyriotetos), name (onomatos) (Eph. 1:21) Principalities (archas), powers (exousias), world rulers (kosmokratōras), spirits of wickedness (pneumatika tes ponerias) (Eph. 6:12) Thrones (thronoi), dominions (kyriotetes), principalities (archai), authorities (exousia) (Col. 1:16) Angels, authorities (exousion), powers (dynamis) (1 Pet. 3:22)

Power (dynamis), throne (thronon), authority (exousia) (Rev. 13:2)

Salvation, power (dynamis), kingdom, authority (exousia) (Rev. 12:10)

Glory, majesty, dominion (kratos), authority (exousia) (Jude 25)

Of these strings, the first four decidedly consist of human agents, the last two run more to attributes of one who has power. The remainder appear to be at least heavenly, perhaps also earthly, powers; for now that question, which will remain one of the chief preoccupations of this study, must remain open.

In the lists above I have had to transliterate the Greek for key terms because the English translations constantly shift (I am following the RSV); this shifting is unavoidable because the terms themselves are fluid. This leads to our second observation:

2. The language of power in the New Testament is imprecise, liquid, interchangeable, and unsystematic. An author uses the same word differently in different contexts, or several different words for the same idea. In a single chapter, only six verses apart, Luke uses exousia in reference to the "power" of Satan (12:5) and to human "authorities" (12:11). In the same book he uses arche to mean "rulers" (12:11) and the more structural principle of power, "jurisdiction" (20:20). In one chapter Matthew uses archon both of a Jewish leader or "ruler" (9:18) and of the "prince" of demons (9:34, although a few manuscripts omit this sentence). John does likewise; in 12:31 archon designates Satan as the "ruler" of this world, yet only verses later it means the Jewish "authorities" who believed in Jesus (12:42). So it goes throughout the New Testament: arche refers twice to human rulers, perhaps as many as 8 times to divine powers; 24 times archon refers to human rulers, 9 times (at least) to divine powers. This same shift of meaning is found in other documents of the period.<sup>6</sup>

Not only do we find an author using the same word to mean different things, we

also find an author using different words for the same thing. Exousia and archi can both be used for "authority" (Luke 20:20; 10:19); exousia and dynamis can both denote "power" (Eph. 6:12; 1:21). (In Rom. 13:3 archon and exousia are used as synonyms, through common association with the word "good.") Archon always means an incumbent- in-an-office or role, whereas archi might be expected to denote the office or role itself (on the basis of the usage of the LXX and Josephus). Yet in the New Testament, archi often usurps its place and denotes an incumbent; this is the case in 10 of its 12 nontemporal uses in the New Testament. "Thrones" is the one term that remains stable in its usage, thanks to its clear image. But kyriotis is so imprecise that no one is quite sure how to translate it in Jude 8. It wobbles between "lordship" and "dominion," but the latter term can also be preempted by thronos and exousia.'

3. Despite all this imprecision and interchangeability, clear patterns of usage emerge. Archon (always, without exception in the LXX, Josephus, and the New Testament) refers to an incumbent-in-office. Arche can indicate the office itself, or an incumbent, or the structure of power (government, kingdom, realm, dominion). Exousia denotes the legitimations and sanctions by which power is maintained; it generally tends to be abstract. Dynamis overlaps with exousia in the area of sanctions; it refers to the power or force by which rule is maintained. Kyrioteis may point to that over which the kyrios reigns-the dominion, realm, territory-although in later usage it collapses toward equivalence with kyrios. Thronos designates the seat of power, the locus or centralization of rule. And onoma is a metonym in which the part ("name") stands for the whole (the person), usually a person or power of celebrity or rank.i

4. Because these terms are to a degree interchangeable, one or a pair or a series can be made to represent them all. It is the demands of rhetoric, not the requirements of precision, that drive Paul to the long list of Rom. 8:38-39:

For I am sure that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord. Elsewhere the same realities can be indicated just as well by three terms-

Then comes the end, when he delivers the kingdom to God the Father after destroying every rule and every authority and power (1 Cor. 15:24); by two terms-

And you have come to fulness of life in him, who is the head of all rule and authority (Col. 2:10); or by one term--

If with Christ you died to the elements of the universe, why do you live as if you still belonged to the world? (Col. 2:20; au. trans.). So too the reader is clear that I am referring to the same thing whether I say "the Principalities and Powers" or simply "the Powers."

5. These Powers are both heavenly and earthly, divine and human, spiritual and political, invisible and structural. The clearest statement of this is Col. 1:16, which should have been made the standard for all discussions of the Powers: "For in him [the Son] all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones (thronoi) or dominions (kyriotites) or principalities (archai) or authorities (exousiai)-all things were created through him and for him." The parallelism of the Greek, ably rendered here by the RSV,' indicates that these Powers are themselves both earthly and heavenly, visible and invisible. We would expect them to include human agents, social

structures and systems, and also divine powers. The reiteration of "whether on earth or in heaven" in v. 20 connects back to v. 16 and suggests that the cosmic reconciliation which God is bringing about through Christ will specifically include these powers, human and divine, and that no reconciliation would be complete without them.

Indeed, it is only because scholars have narrowed the focus to just the occurrences of *archai kai exousiai* in the Pauline or Paulinist corpus that the full scope of the Powers has gone unrecognized. 10 We have already seen that they are found in every book of the New Testament; much more evidence waits its turn. The theme of the Powers encompasses every concentration of power in any authorized agent or actor. If a worldview includes spiritual beings, then they naturally will be covered by the vocabulary of power. But they do not exhaust it or even have first call on it. The vast preponderance of uses of the terms for power is for its human bearers or the social structures that manifest it.

6. These Powers are also both good and evil. Recently Carr has challenged this assertion, arguing that all the Powers mentioned in Paul, and indeed in the whole New Testament, are good and that there is no evidence for a belief in demonic forces of any stature, apart from Satan, until almost the end of the second century. He is able to make this sweeping assertion only by regarding Eph. 6:12 as an interpolation and by a consistently tendentious exegesis of every text that would seem to controvert his thesis. Nevertheless he has done us the service of forcing a rigorous discussion of the issue. In each of the subsequent sections, then, we will deal with the question whether the Powers referred to by the New Testament are good or evil.

The six observations above will prove indispensable for evaluating the mass of data that must now be examined in order to establish how the Powers were regarded in the first-century world and in the New Testament in particular.

## Chapter 2 The Powers

### Arche and Archon

For the purposes of this discussion the two terms *arche* and *archon* may be taken together, since *arche* so often verges on the sense of *archon* in the New Testament.<sup>1</sup> The normal use of both terms is for human power arrangements. Apart from four passages in Philo, in the LXX, Philo, and Josephus, *archon* is used exclusively for an incumbent-in-office and, with the sole exception of Daniel 10 and 12, for human agents. *Arche* is a more abstract term for power, the presociological word for the institutionalization and continuity of power through office, position, or role, although occasionally (as in the New Testament) it is used, like *archon*, of incumbents-in-office. And as the data in Appendix I shows, both terms were most certainly used of evil spiritual forces.

The LXX, Josephus, and Philo are consistent with classical and Hellenistic usage generally. *Arch-* simply denotes the organization of power. It was compounded with other terms to form the title of virtually every conceivable office. Most frequently it denotes the role or position which an incumbent (*archon*) filled, such as town clerk

(archigrammateus) or head jailer (archidesmophylax, Gen. 39:21, LXX); occasionally it could extend to the place where the role was played, such as a local court of record (archeiotika) or the town hall or mayor's office (archeion). Archon, as usual, specifies the actual incumbent, from the emperor to the mayors of Greek cities' to the chairperson (archithronos: note the use of "throne") of a club. The Liddell-Scott-Jones Greek-English Lexicon lists more than two hundred positions of power just with archi- as a prefix; scores of other words use it as a suffix (e.g., gymnasiarchai, chiliarchai, hekatontarchai).

It is necessary to survey the full sweep of this usage in order to make clear that the expression "principalities and powers" did not exist in a vacuum. The normal, daily use of the terms described the political, religious, and economic structures and functionaries with which people had to deal. This language was known even within Palestine itself, which during the reign of the Ptolemies had been subdivided into districts under hyparchoi.' The Jews themselves called the civil governor of the district of Jerusalem under the rule of Antiochus IV Epiphanes a meridarchis (1 Mace. 10:65). Galilee was sectioned by the tetrarchis Herod Antipas into five toparchoi,' and Tiberias, which Herod the Great founded, had an archon as mayor,' in imitation of the Greek cities of the Decapolis.<sup>6</sup> Jesus and his disciples must have been familiar with these titles, even in their Greek forms; the sarcasm in Mark 10:42 par. and Matt. 11:8 par. is directed precisely against such "so-called rulers" who live "in kings' houses."

The fact that almost every extant pre-Christian use of archon and archon refers to the role played by some human agent in the exercise of office should caution us against assuming too quickly that their use in the New Testament implies exclusively angelic or demonic powers. Neither Paul nor any other New Testament writer ever feels compelled to explain what is meant by these terms. Every commentator qualified to judge has agreed that the biblical authors assume a content for these words which is familiar to the readers as a part of the background beliefs of the epoch, held almost universally by the age.\$

It is within this language-world that arche and archon were occasionally used to designate spiritual powers, good or evil. It was far from the case that these terms primarily referred to spiritual entities; to the contrary, these terms could be extended to take in spiritual powers because they were the normal terms for power in all its manifestations. The world of the ancients was not a physical planet spinning in empty space in rotation around a nuclear reactor called the sun; it was a single continuum of heaven and earth, in which spiritual beings were as much at home as humans. There is thus no distinctive pattern in the use of these terms for human or for spiritual beings, apart from the vast preponderance being human (see Observation 2, above, and Appendix 1). The language of power in the New Testament is far too rich and complex to reduce either to the human structures and institutions of the liberation theologians or to the spiritual beings of traditional theology. What is needed is an interpretive framework that can do justice to the loose way the ancients could refer to these powers as now human, now structural, now heavenly, without feeling any apparent need to indicate specifically which they had in mind.

We find in the use of *exousia* the same general pattern that held for *arche* and *archon*. The vast majority of references are to human arrangements of power, with an occasional use to designate spiritual beings. In the LXX, Philo, and Josephus, *exousia* is never used of spiritual Powers, apart from a handful of references to the authority of God. The term usually bears the sense of the right or authorization to exercise power, or else refers to that body or person so authorized (see Appendix 2). "Legitimation" comes closest to catching its meaning.

The New Testament uses *exousia* 102 times, 87 of them for the impersonal capacity for action which is bestowed by an office. Most studies on the Powers simply bracket that impressive figure and rush on to hypostatized *exousiai*-those regarded as spiritual beings-as being more significant. But the single most significant fact about *exousia* as a term for power is that 85 percent of its uses refer to a structural dimension of existence, that permission or authorization provided by some legitimate authorizing person or body. In other words, the *exousiai* in the New Testament are, in the vast majority of cases, not spiritual beings but ideological justifications, political or religious legitimations, and delegated permissions.

It is a modern bias to single out just the supernatural Powers as if they alone were of significance. For the ancients, heaven and earth were a seamless robe, a single interacting and continuous reality. To read the literature on the subject, one would never have suspected that the spiritual Powers comprised only 15 percent of the uses of the term. We are fascinated with the supernatural forces the ancients described; they seem to have taken them for granted and to have been much more preoccupied with that more amorphous, intangible, indefinable something that makes it possible for a king to command subjects to voluntary death in war or for a priest to utter words that send a king to his knees. Perhaps they lacked the systematic precision of modern sociological analyses of power, but that does not mean they lacked experience of what our modern analyses describe or a vocabulary for designating it. And they may have been in touch with dimensions of power which our more materialistic point of view scarcely glimpses.

The material surveyed in Appendix 2 also shows how arbitrary was Oscar Cullmann's assertion that *exousiai* in its plural form (or the collective usage of the singular, *pass exousia*, "all authority") in the New Testament always has "no other sense than that which it always has for Paul, that is, the meaning of 'angelic powers.'" "9 Not only does the risen Jesus use the pluralistic singular of his own authority in Matt. 28:18 ("All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me"), but Luke 12:11 and Titus 3:1 use the plural for undeniably human rulers:

And when they bring you before the synagogues and the rulers (*archas*) and the authorities (*exousias*), do not be anxious....Remind them to be submissive to rulers (*archais*) and authorities (*exousiais*).... As Appendix 2 shows, both the LXX and Josephus are also familiar with the plural use of *exousia* for human agents of power.

On the other hand, there is not a single instance of the use of *exousia* for angels, demons, or spirits prior to the New Testament. First Enoch 61:10 offers the only possible exception, but the Parables section in which it appears is now regarded by most scholars as contemporary with or postdating most of the New Testament.10 Paul seems to have launched the phrase *archai kai exousiai* on its peculiarly Christian voyage as denoting spiritual entities. It is easy to see how *exousia* could be extended to spiritual beings," but

its main use, even in the New Testament, continued to be in reference to the legitimations, sanctions, and permissions that undergird the everyday exercise of power.

### Dynamic

In Jewish sources of the period, dynamis is most often used of military or political power or forces (a "host" or army, military might, or political clout). (See Appendix 3.) By extension it was applied to the angelic "army" or "host" of God. God was "Lord of the Powers" (dynameon). As "heavenly hosts," the Powers were identified in the LXX with angels (Ps. 103:21), stars (Isa. 34:4), and even gods (Ps. 29:1; 89:5-8). The term is often used by Philo of angels, a use probably also paralleled in at least some of our disputed texts (Rom. 8:38; 1 Cor. 15:24; Eph. 1:21; 1 Pet. 3:22). In contrast to Philo, however, the Powers in at least some of these disputed texts would appear to be evil.

With the exception of Rev. 13:2 and 17:12-13, the New Testament ignores the military, political, and economic uses of the term, so frequent in the LXX and Josephus, focusing instead on the spiritual dimension of power in its capacity to determine terrestrial existence for weal or for woe "from above." Consequently we encounter the term as denoting evil spirits, the spirits of the dead, stars, spiritual powers, Godhead, and delegated authority (Appendix 3). In the New Testament, and increasingly in later Christian writers, both orthodox and gnostic, the "Powers" are no longer so much God's agents as God's enemies. The "Lord of the Powers" now is engaged in a cosmic struggle to assert lordship over the Powers.

### Thronos

In the LXX, "throne" is used 123 times of kings and dynasties, emphasizing the continuity and legitimacy of royal office. Here "throne" indicates not so much the actual seat but "a symbol of government ... which transcends the present occupant of the By analogy, God has a throne (29 times), and Wisdom sits beside God (Sir. 24:4). This use is continued by Josephus (27 of the seat of kings, 2 of the high priest's chair, 1 of God's throne). In most of these cases the term "throne" is used structurally to represent all the paraphernalia and power resident in the "chair" and its incumbent."

One obscure reference in Dan. 7:9 set in motion a whole new extension of the term, however. In a vision whose impact for Jewish merkabah mysticism and Christian theology is incalculable, Daniel saw:

**thrones were placed  
and one that was ancient of days took his seat  
his throne was fiery flames. . . .**

The plurality of thrones around a central throne suggests the "sons of God" (bone elohim) of the heavenly council, but no further reference is made to them. No surviving documents allude to these thrones again prior to the New Testament. Those that have been cited by some scholars are all late."

But some kind of speculative ferment must have existed almost from the publication of Daniel, for what crops up in the Book of Revelation is a full-blown and mature picture of God's throne surrounded by twenty-four thrones, on which were seated twenty-four elders with golden crowns (Rev. 4:4 [twice]; so also 4:2; 11:16; 20:4). We are given little data for deciphering the identity of these heavenly "elders"; by analogy they are "advice-givers" and possibly represent the heavenly council. But in this book they give no advice, only praise.

Other than that, and the enigmatic reference to "thrones, dominions, principalities, and authorities" in Col. 1:16, the New Testament uses thronos of God's throne (42 times), of earthly rulers (3 times), of the disciple's future place in heaven (3 times), the throne of Satan or his agents (3 times), of the Son of man's throne in heaven (2 times), and once of Christ's throne in heaven."

The use of "thrones" in Col. 1:16 is puzzling; are these spiritual, personalized beings, or are they impersonal structures of power? Perhaps Asc. Isa. 7-8 offers a clue. In each of the first five heavens, Isaiah is shown a "throne"; each time the text adds the qualifying phrase "he who sat on the throne" (7:19, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37). Isaiah and other righteous persons have thrones laid up for them in heaven (7:22; 8:26). In short, someone always occupies these thrones. The term is simply metonymy for a "throne-prince" or "throne-angel," one of the highest of the heavenly orders.<sup>16</sup> We find a revealing case of double metonymy in 8:8-"For it is He alone to whose voice all the heavens and thrones give answer." By "heavens" the author clearly means the heavenly hosts in each of the seven heavens; by "thrones," then, he must mean those seated on them (so also 7:27). The fact that the chair could supplant its incumbent as a symbol for authority is an indication that the structure of power, and not the personality of the one exercising it, is the central focus. The "thrones" in Col. 1:16, by inference, would not be spiritual beings then but symbols of authority stretching through time. Like the scepter, the crown, the robes, and the ring, the throne represents the continuity of power which may be assumed by a series of incumbents but transcends each individual personality.

Only much later, by the time of Pseudo-Dionysius (ca. 500), was the object of this metonymy forgotten, and "thrones" began their medieval career as a curious kind of praise-singing, animated, heavenly musical chairs."

#### Kyriotes

There is no evidence of pre-Christian use of kyriotJs. Its principal sense seems to be "dominion," "lordship," "ruling power"; later it blurs to become synonymous with exousia in the sense of "authority." The image is that of the realm or expanse of territory over which a kyrios rules. There are pre-Christian sources that use "dominion,"<sup>17</sup> but it is not clear whether the Greek terms used in 1 Enoch and Jubilees were kyriotis or exousia (Col. 1:13) or hegemonia (Josephus War 6.330) or even archt (Deut. 17:20, LXX). Kyriotifs appears in Jude 8 and 2 Pet. 2:10 meaning "authority" or possibly "limit." Col. 1:16 and Eph. 1:21 use it in series. Some later Christian exegetes tended to regard these series as heavenly beings (Epist. Apost. 13; NHL Treat. Res. 44:35-38), but others used the term in the sense of a human "ruling power" (Hermas, Sim. 5.6.1). Thus only the context can help determine the meaning of the term in Colossians and Ephesians (see Part Two).

## Onoma

The "name" (onoma) is once more a case of metonymy, the part representing the whole." In the older sections of the Old Testament the "name of Yahweh" (shem Yahweh) stands for Yahweh as such. This gives way later to its being hypostatized as a distinguishable though not separate agent of God's will and work. Thus Ps. 54:1 (LXX, 53:2) reads: "Save me, O God, by thy name (onomati), and-vindicate me by thy might (dynamei)." Here both "name" and "might" are virtually hypostatic forces acting on God's behalf. The name is thus a transcendent entity at work on Yahweh's behalf in the world. This tendency toward hypostatization was characteristic of developing Judaism generally; as God's transcendence was heightened it became necessary to transfer God's working in the world to intermediate beings.<sup>2</sup> Jub. 36:7 goes so far as to state that the earth itself and all the cosmos were created by the "name" of Yahweh (see also I Enoch 69:13-21). Thus in Acts 8:18-19, Simon Magus is depicted as thinking that the "Holy Spirit" is a magical, miracle-working name of "power" (exousia) which can be transferred to him on payment of a fee.<sup>u</sup>

Angels have power, according to the rabbis, because God has shared his name with them: Michael, Gabriel, Uriel. God's shem ("name") is inscribed over their hearts (Pesiq. R. 21:10; 46:3). They are thus only "powers" or "names" in a derivative sense; there can be no thought of independent action.

As a term of power, onoma in the New Testament is used most often of Jesus as Lord or Christ (97 of 226 uses). It is also associated with God's name 44 times, always with the sense of the totality of God's power and being. In one place "name" designates the office, dignity, or rank of Christ as opposed to that of angels: "having become as much superior to angels as the name he has obtained is more excellent than theirs" (Heb. 1:4). Seven times "name" represents the essence of satanic evil, all in Revelation. Used of the beast or harlot (Rev. 13:1, 17; 14:11; 15:2; 17:3, 5) it crystallizes the inner reality, the moral degeneracy and political brutality of the Roman Empire; used of the king of the locusts, it encompasses etymologically his function: he is the "angel of the bottomless pit; his name in Hebrew is Abaddon, and in Greek he is called Apollyon," that is, Destroyer (Rev. 9:11). The names of evil powers are sought by Jesus ("Legion," Mark 5:9) and by the "rulers (archontes) and elders and scribes," who ask Peter and John, "By what power (dynamer) or by what name (onomatt) did you do this?" In defense, Peter responds, "There is no other name under heaven given among [humanity] by which we must be saved" (Acts 4:7, 12). Before this name demons quail, as the disciples (Luke 10:17) and even outsiders (Mark 9:38; Acts 19:13-16) discover. Jesus' name, in short, has become the Name of names; "on his thigh he has a name inscribed, King of kings and Lord of lords" (Rev. 19:16).

When in the disputed passages Jesus is given "a name which is above every name," that is, kyrios (Phil. 2:9-11), and is exalted far "above every name that is named" (Eph. 1:21), this is all but verbally identical to the statements just examined in Acts 4:12 and Rev. 19:16. Since both the disputed passages use the qualifier "every" (see Acts' "no other") and couch the claim in utterly comprehensive spatial and temporal categories ("in heaven and on earth and under the earth," "not only in this age but also in that which is to

come"), we cannot limit those named to heavenly or angelic powers. They must include every power with a title, every authority invested with an office, every incumbent with a role, whether divine, diabolical, or human. Like Col. 1:16, then, the term *onoma* points us toward the most expansive understanding of the Powers possible.

### Angels

Angels are, of course, the Powers in their "heavenly" form par excellence. But even this term is subject to the same imprecision we found with other terms for power. *Aggelos* can be used of a human "messenger" or prophet even in books where heavenly angels are rife (Mal. 1:1; 3:1; Hag. 1:13; Isa. 44:26; Luke 7:24; 9:52; James 2:25);<sup>2</sup> or "angel" can be substituted for "the Holy Spirit" or used where the Holy Spirit would have been expected (Mark 13:32; Luke 9:26; Matt. 24:36; Rev. 3:5). In the Ascension of Isaiah the expression "the angel of the Holy Spirit" is even used (3:16; 4:21; 7:23; 9:36, 39, 40; 11:33). We find angels spoken of as *archai*, *archontes*, *exousiai*, *dynameis*, *thronoi*, *onomata*, and possibly *kyriotetes*. But the most common synonym, especially in the Pseudepigrapha, is the word *pneumata*, "spirits." The evidence for this is too extensive to list; just the title of Yahweh in I Enoch ("Lord of Spirits") is clue enough.

Angels could be good or evil ("fallen"). By virtue of their exclusion from heaven, the latter become a category all their own.

### Fallen Angels, Evil Spirits, Demons

The problem of theodicy has obsessed Jewish writers from the time of the exile right down to the present. Israel's misfortunes were too great to ascribe purely to human sin. Adam and Eve could not bear the weight of all human tragedy. The ancient myth of the fall of the "sons of God" in Gen. 6:1-4 was enlisted to explain the presence of an evil that emanates not from humanity alone but from something higher as well: not divine, but transcendent, suprahuman, that persists through time, is opposed to God and human faithfulness, and seeks our destruction, damnation, illness, and death. The fall, mischief, and judgment of the angels is one of the chief preoccupations of intertestamental Jewish literature, its most striking innovation and most lasting contribution to theodicy.

Carr, however, insists that the terms for power are used in Jewish literature not to refer to evil spirits, demons, or Satan but only to obedient angelic powers whose activity and presence confirm the status of Yahweh, that the world into which the gospel came was not a world which longed for release from powers, and that the Christian message was not one of a cosmic battle in which Christ rescued humanity from the domination of such forces. Indeed, Carr states, there was nothing in Judaism from which such a myth could be constructed. Further, Carr claims that there is no evidence for a belief in demonic forces of any stature, apart from Satan, until toward the end of the second century c.E., and nothing in Pauline writings that refers to a battle between Christ and hostile powers.<sup>u</sup>

But the evidence points in almost the opposite direction from everything Carr asserts. Ecclus. 16:7 (which Carr dismisses as a book with "almost no reference" to angels or demons<sup>25</sup>) happens to contain one of the earliest indications of new interest in the myth of the Watchers and Giants. The Hebrew reads "He forgave not the princes (*nasik*) of old who revolted in their might." For "princes," the LXX reads "giants."

Wisdom of Solomon, which Carr also dismisses with the same expression, alludes to the same myth in 14:6. But by far the densest concentration of references to the fallen-angels myth is found in the oldest sections of 1 Enoch. Add to that the evidence from Jubilees, Daniel, and Qumran, and we have ample grounds for dismissing Carr's "elief that angels in Jewish literature are only good.D' These defecting angels sired giants, who were drowned in the flood; their spirits live on as demons, evil spirits, or "the powers of Mastema."" Their leader is variously called Semjaza," Azazel,<sup>3</sup> Mastema,<sup>30</sup> Satan," and Beliar." Idol-worshippers in fact worship these demonic powers," and the language of power is most certainly used of them x whatever the precise Greek terms. The sheer weight of these data renders unintelligible Carr's assertion that in Jewish literature, "compared with the number of names and terms for angels.... the terminology for the demonic is notably limited."" In fact, fallen angels and demons receive as much attention as the good angels." The world that produced Jubilees and 1 Enoch very much believed in evil powers. And it was a world that sought redemption from these Powers: "Deliver me from the hands of evil spirits who have dominion over the thoughts of men's hearts, and let them not lead me astray from thee, my God," cries Abraham on behalf of himself and all who, through him, will subsequently believe." It was in precisely such a spiritual climate that 1 John 3:8 declares, "The reason the Son of God appeared was to destroy the works of the devil."

First Enoch and Jubilees do not hold the franchise for the language of fallen angels and evil powers. One of the earliest allusions to the myth of the fallen angels is Ps. 82:6-7: "I say, 'You are gods, sons of the Most High, all of you; nevertheless, you shall die like [human beings], and fall like any prince'" (LXX, archontOn). The myth appears frequently in Jewish literature of the period." It is alluded to in the New Testament in I Cor. 6:3; 11:10; Jude 6; and 2 Pet. 2:4.<sup>39</sup>

In the early church, Christians were instructed in the art of discerning the good spirits from the evil spirits.'<sup>0</sup> The use of "demons" and "evil spirits" in the New Testament is too extensive to review here;" it must suffice simply to note that Jesus regards his healings and exorcisms as an assault on the kingdom of Satan and an indication that the kingdom of God is breaking in.'<sup>2</sup> The gospel is very much a cosmic battle in which Jesus rescues humanity from the dominion of evil powers.

### Angels of the Nations

The fascinating notion of angels of the nations is quite ancient. Our first evidence for it is Deut. 32:8-9, but even there (v. 7b) it is described as a piece of primordial tradition. Verses 8-9 read: "When the Most High gave to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of men, he fixed the bounds of the peoples according to the number of the sons of God. For the Lord's portion is his people, Jacob his allotted

The idea that God had appointed an angel or god over each of the pagan nations finds its most notable development in Daniel 10. According to the Book of Daniel, in the third year of Cyrus, king of Persia, an angel appears to Daniel, delayed for twenty-one days because "the prince of the kingdom of Persia" withstood me." But Michael, "one of

the chief princes (archontbn)," came to the angel's aid. "So I left him there with the prince (archan) of the kingdom of Persia and came...." Hastily he finishes his message, then: "But now I will return to fight (polemesat) against the prince (archontos) of Persia; and when I am through with him, lo, the prince (archon) of Greece will come.... There is none who contends by my side against these except Michael, your prince (arch6n)" (Dan. 10:13, 20, 21).

This connection between the angels or "princes" of the nations and the "sons of God" is also reflected by Isaiah 41-46 and 48, where Yahweh, in a "divine lawsuit" (rib) before the heavenly council, addresses the pagan nations, calling them to hear his case. The real suit, however, is not with the nations as such but with their idol-gods. Since Israelite tradition had already long since identified the "sons of God" or "sons of gods" with the heavenly council, and the heavenly council with angels, it was perfectly natural and inevitable that early on these gods of the pagan nations would be understood as the guardian angels appointed over them. What we find in Daniel 10, the Jerusalem Targum, and the Dead Sea Scrolls had thus already had a long prehistory. `s

The notion of angels appointed over each nation, devoted to that nation's well-being and responsible for its fate, represents a kind of systems- view of international politics under the aspect of God's final sovereignty. Daniel's vision pictures two of the highest angels of God virtually held to a standoff for twenty-one days by the archon of Persia. This scarcely moves in the smooth channel of a simple monotheism, where God directly causes all that happens (Isa. 45:7). This is rather a complex, antagonistic henotheism' in which, under the sole sovereignty and permission of God, vying forces are able to prevail against one another to determine the unfolding of history. The power of the prince of Persia here reflects the actual power of the Persian Empire and Israel's experience of the difficulty of praying in the face of such monolithic power. Not even God, it appeared, could easily prevail against such forces." We must not regard these angels of the nations as necessarily evil; they merely represent the interests of their own people, which would not evidently be served by Israel's ascendancy over them.

God grants each empire a certain time and judges it for what it does within that time. Only tiny Israel's guardian, Michael, takes the part of the messenger sent from God to Daniel (earlier tradition had reserved that task for God alone). No other angels in the heavenly council rush to their side. Even in the celestial sphere, Israel experienced itself iso laced-or, put in the terms of the worldview we are describing, Israel experienced itself isolated on the plane of world affairs because it was isolated in the celestial sphere."

Jub. 15:31-32 adds a surprising twist:

... For there are many nations and many peoples, and all are His, and over all hath He placed spirits in authority to lead them astray from Him. But over Israel He did not appoint any angel or spirit, for He alone is their ruler, and He will preserve them and require them at the hand of His angels and His spirits, and at the hand of all His powers in order that He may preserve them and bless them.... Why would God want the nations led astray? Is this merely hindsight that treats what happens in history as the determined plan of God? In any case, this inevitably casts the angels of the nations in a negative light. The step from this to their demonization is very short.

In a most important passage, 1 Enoch 89-90, we can watch that step being taken.

Seventy shepherd-angels are appointed to punish Israel. They are not commissioned to protect Israel or defend its interests. Their sole task is to punish, either directly (through pestilence, plague, famine) or by means of the Gentile nations (through war, occupation, oppression) (89:63). A seventy-first angel is appointed to keep track of their overkill: "for they will destroy more than I have commanded them" (89:61). The allegory covers the period from the decline of the two kingdoms until the Hasmonean renewal, all of which time, except the very first years, Israel had languished under foreign dominion (the devouring "beasts"). The issue is one of theodicy: how can God allow the elect to suffer under foreign oppressors? The answer is a variation on the theme of Assyria as the rod of God's anger: God is punishing Israel for its sins by means of foreign oppression, which is admittedly excessive and will be avenged on the last day (90:20-27).\*

When the Maccabees rise up to throw off the foreign yoke, the shepherd-angels actually join with the "beasts" in trying to crush the resistance (90:13), which would be unthinkable if the shepherds were Israel's guardians. These shepherds seem to be none other than the spiritual aspect of the hostility Israel experienced from the nations. They are not here called the angels of the nations, but their being seventy in number certainly presses in that direction. Later exegesis was to make that connection explicit, as we shall see.

We can easily trace the threads leading from these early witnesses to their later developments. One thread completes their demonization. Even in I Enoch 90:20-27 the shepherd-angels will be punished with the fallen Watchers of Gen. 6:1-4; by virtue of their excesses they have become evil. The demonic motif becomes explicit in Luke 4:6, where Satan speaks of the authority and glory of the kingdoms of the world having been "delivered" to him, or in 3 Enoch, where Sammael, or Satan, is described as the angel of Rome and the head of the seventy princes of the kingdoms of the world. JO Even here, however, Satan and the angels of the nations remain members in good standing in the heavenly court: "Every day Satan is sitting, together with Sammael, the Prince of Rome, and with Dubbiel, the Prince of Persia, and they write the iniquities of Israel on writing tablets which they hand over to the Seraphim, in order that they may present them before the Holy One, blessed be He, so that He may destroy Israel from the world," that is, so that they might be permitted, as the rod of God's judgment, to let their nations devour Israel. But the Seraphim, true to their name, burn (saraph) the accusations before they can reach God's throne (3 Enoch 26:12)."

Another thread from I Enoch 89-90 leads to the full identification of the seventy shepherds with the seventy angels of the seventy nations. This identification may have already been intended by I Enoch, since the idea of seventy nations was as old as Genesis 10. The Hebrew Testament of Naphtali 8, whose antiquity has now been confirmed by the discovery of fragments at Qumran, tells of the time when "the Lord ... came down from His highest heavens, and brought down with Him seventy ministering angels, Michael at their head. He commanded them to teach the seventy families which sprang from the loins of Noah seventy languages."<sup>52</sup>

One last thread drawn out from the tradition in I Enoch 89-90 is the idea that whatever happens on earth is the result of events in heaven which it simultaneously mirrors. In I Enoch, the Gentile nations are -able to ravage Israel only when their angelic

shepherds permit them to do so. This connection is developed further in 3 Enoch 17:8 (A), where the "seventy-two princes 13 of the kingdoms on high corresponding to the 72 tongues of the world" who ride on royal horses holding royal scepters in their hands, with royal servants running before them, are precisely mirrored at that very moment on earth by human princes traveling in chariots with horsemen and great armies and in glory and greatness. This motif is developed in more detail below (pp. 131-40).

Given the prominence of the notion of angels of the nations in Judaism and its popularity among the early Christian theologians, it is surprising that we find so little clear evidence for it in the New Testament. The chief controversy surrounds Rom. 13:1-2: are the "higher authorities" angels of the nations or merely human rulers? We will return to that question in Part Two; here we merely present the data for such a discussion."

Luke shows familiarity with the idea of seventy Gentile nations when he describes the sending of the seventy disciples, ostensibly symbolic of the later mission to the Gentile nations (10:1). But he makes no mention of their angels. Again, in Luke 4:6 Satan offers Jesus all the kingdoms of the world but says nothing about their angels. When he says, "To you I will give all this authority and their glory; for it has been delivered to me, and I give it to whom I will," he is not lying, as some theologians allege. Insofar as the nations have turned away from the purposes of God to their own narrow interests, they and, possibly by implication, their angels are in effect "delivered to" and made bondservants of Satan.

Dibelius finds a reference to the angels of the nations in I Cor. 4:9. We apostles, Paul complains, "have become a spectacle (theatron) to the world, to angels and to [humanity]." Since the image of the Roman theater conjures up hostile and jeering crowds oblivious to the sufferings of the victim, Dibelius sees the angels here as the heavenly representatives of the Gentile nations and peoples, who watch, not without malicious glee, the tribulations endured by the apostle to their peoples."

First Timothy 3:16 may be another instance of the angels of the nations. In the hymn quoted, Christ was "seen by angels, preached among the nations." The angels are apparently ignorant of God's plan of salvation through Christ and need revelation. Their coming to knowledge of Christ as Lord is juxtaposed, then, to the preaching to the nations. It may be that an awareness of the relation between the good will of the angel and the responsiveness of a people to preaching is what later led Father Peter Faber, a colleague of Ignatius Loyola, to pray to the angel of a region before entering it.<sup>6</sup>

Origen interpreted Acts 16:9 in a similar way. When Paul saw in a vision a "man of Macedonia" beseeching him, "Come over and help us," Origen understood this to be the angel of Macedonia appealing to Paul for help in bringing the people under its care into alignment with the purposes of God.'

Dibelius thinks the angels of the nations are alluded to offhandedly in 1 Cor. 6:3 also: "Do you not know that we are to judge angels?" The idea that the saints will be the agents of judgment was commonplace the judgment of angels was a constituent part of the world judgment.<sup>60</sup> Paul assumes that his hearers all know that they are to judge angels ("Do you not know?"); otherwise his appeal from the lesser to the greater ("how much more") has no support. But the judgment of angels requires that they have sinned. Satan and his angels come first to mind. But much tradition identified Satan as the angel

of Rome, thus adapting the angels- of-the-nations idea to the situation of Roman world-hegemony. Since Rome had conquered the entire Mediterranean region and much else besides, its angel-prince had become lord of all other angel-princes of the vanquished nations. This identification was already explicit at Qumran, where Rome and the Romans (the "Kittim" of the War Scroll) are made the specific allies and agents of Satan and his host.<sup>61</sup> Similarly in the New Testament, Satan as the "archon of this world" (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11) or "god of this aeon" (2 Cor. 4:4) could scarcely avoid being identified as the special patron of Rome. In 1 Cor. 6:3, Paul probably is still thinking in more general terms of all fallen or disobedient angels, those of the nations possibly included. But by the time of the Apocalypse of John (12-17), the connection had been made explicit: Satan (the "Dragon") is the lord and master of the Empire (the "Beast from the sea") and its entire cultic and propaganda apparatus (the "Beast from the land").

Michael's role in Revelation 12 is inexplicable apart from the angels- of-the-nations motif. The problem Michael poses in a Christian work is that it is he, and not Christ, who overthrows Satan and casts him down to earth with his angels. This victory has been made possible somehow by the blood of the Lamb and the witness of the martyrs on earth (v. 11); as the heavenly guardian of the elect, Michael is thus empowered to act against his ancient enemy (v. 9). The usual causal sequence ("as above, so below") is here reversed, breaking the heavenly deadlock. Now "as below, so above"; the suffering of Christ and the martyrs makes possible the expulsion of Satan from heaven. The Dragon and his angels (identified as Satan and his hosts in v. 9) are the heavenly counterpart to the beast and the kings of earth who "are of one mind and give over their power and authority to the beast" (17:12-13). This is a virtual signature of the belief in angels of the nations, who are here subordinated to the prince of this world, Satan, just as the kings of their nations are subjugated to the empire. Revelation 12-17 thus recurs to all the themes of 1 Enoch 89-90. The "angel" of the nation has now been fully demonized; it is completely identified with a hostile nation which, in the freedom of God, "is allowed"<sup>62</sup> to make war on the saints and to conquer them; and what happens on earth is simply a mirror of the activity of spiritual forces in the transcendent realm.<sup>63</sup>

In summary, the angels of the nations are far better attested immediately before and after the New Testament period than within the New Testament itself. The motif is fairly explicit in Revelation 12-17. It may also be presupposed in Acts 16:9 and 1 Cor. 6:3, and possibly also in 1 Cor. 4:9, 1 Tim. 3:16, and Luke 4:6 and 10:1 as well. Whether Rom. 13:1 is a further example of the angel of the nation must be determined in Part Two.

In biblical studies, word studies are the equivalent of field exploration and mineral classification in geology. Very little may seem to have been revealed in the field, yet when all the finds have been plotted, it is possible to view the whole map and predict where oil, or copper, or iron might be discovered. Our explorations in the language of power in this volume are indispensable for establishing a firm basis for the entire study. Because no comprehensive study of the Powers has been undertaken before, previous works have tended to depend on word studies isolated from the entire language-field and on a thin selection of texts (almost always only the "disputed texts"), and have thus been more impressionistic than exhaustive. On the whole our more extensive exploration has

served to confirm the findings of the pioneers in this field-Schlier, Berkhof, Stewart, Caird, Morrison, Stringfellow, Yoder-and to map in the areas passed over in their earlier sweeps through the territory.

Mapmakers have one privilege denied most explorers, however. the chance to become so engrossed with the contours and characteristics of an environment that its total configuration begins to emerge as a single entity. The sheer comprehensiveness of this survey of data makes it possible to attempt such a total view of our subject. Such a synthetic interpretation of the Powers cannot proceed without an analysis of the disputed passages, and that will be our concern in Part Two. But now the topography has been charted. We are in a better position to see the disputed passages within the larger cosmological framework through which people perceived, encountered, and suffered from the Powers.