

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

the sayings themselves, but has to be read into them from other passages.

Lastly, the theory gives a low and unworthy colouring to the teaching of Jesus, since it represents Him as laying the whole stress on the self-centred desire of the individual for his own salvation, and as caring little or nothing for the effect of good actions on others and the world as a whole. We cannot indeed exclude from ethics the thought of reward, but it is psychologically false to regard it as the primary and consciously-realised motive of the life of self-sacrifice. If for no other reason, we should be bound to reject the *Interimsethik* theory on account of its essential selfishness, and we may fairly appeal to the impression made by the life and teaching of Jesus as a whole as a proof that self-interest, however enlightened and far-seeing, is not the true expression of His inmost mind.

No one will deny that there is much in the teaching of Jesus which is neither easily understood nor lightly put into practice. But we do not make such passages more intelligible by referring them to doubtful motives which are not expressed in the context, nor shall we encourage mankind to apply them to life as we know it by basing them on an admittedly mistaken view of the world and its future.

C. W. EMMET.

ST. PAUL AND THE MYSTERY-RELIGIONS.

VI. ST. PAUL AND THE CENTRAL CONCEPTIONS OF THE MYSTERY-RELIGIONS.

IN the light of the evidence we have tried to exhibit in the preceding articles, it is not difficult to make a rough statement of the chief aims of the Mystery-Religions. They may be said to offer salvation (*σωτηρία*) to those who have

been duly initiated. And salvation means primarily deliverance from the tyranny of an omnipotent Fate, which may crush a human life at any moment. Death, with its unknown terrors, will be Fate's most appalling visitation. Hence the element prized above all others in *σωτηρία* is the assurance of a life which death cannot quench, a victorious immortality. This boon is reached by the process of regeneration (*ἀναγεννᾶσθαι* : *παλιγγενεσία*). A genuinely Divine life is imparted to the initiate in a transformation of essence, which in many, if not in all, instances is conceived more or less physically, although occasionally, at least, a psychical element is quite manifest. The full significance of the process becomes clear from its being frequently described as deification (*θεωθῆναι*, *ἀποθεωθῆναι*). And it seems always to depend on some kind of contact with Deity. In order to reach a standpoint from which a comparison with St. Paul's conceptions can be profitably made, we must examine with some care the most prominent notions of communion with the god, through which, for the Mystery-Religions, the process of regeneration or deification becomes possible.

The first thing that strikes us about these notions is that they reflect the various phases of primitive belief which emerge in the Mystery-cults, from the crudest up to those which have become spiritualised in the course of a gradual development. We touch a very ancient stratum of thought in the idea that communion with a deity can be gained through partaking of him. This conception is found in early Egyptian texts, and seems to be involved in the rites which circled round the mystic figure of Dionysus-Zagreus, in which the bull, representing the god himself, is torn asunder and devoured. His life passes into his votaries.¹ The more

¹ See Dieterich, *Eine Mithras-liturgie*², pp. 105, 106; Rohde, *Psyche*³, II. pp. 15, 117, 118. The scholion on Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* I. p. 433, qu. by Dieterich, is specially significant.

refined form of this idea, which meets us in the usage of sacramental meals, must be discussed in a later article in connexion with Paul's view of the Lord's Supper. Less crass in its associations, but perhaps scarcely less corporeal in its implications is that contact with deity described in Greek religion as *ἐνθουσιασμός*. This condition was induced by all manner of sensuous stimuli. It might mean the entrance of the god into the human personality as it was. A remarkable instance, belonging somewhat incongruously to an elevated plane of mysticism, occurs in a prayer to Hermes: ¹ "Come to me, O Lord Hermes, *ὡς τὰ βρέφη εἰς τὰς κοιλίας τῶν γυναικῶν*." Here the corporeal background is evident enough. Closely akin, although nearer the sphere of the spiritual, is the prayer of the Mithras-Liturgy: "that I may be initiated and that the holy spirit may blow within me." ² But *ἐνθουσιασμός* was often virtually synonymous with *ἔκστασις*. Here the soul is regarded as leaving the body and becoming one with the deity. In many mystic cults, such as that of Dionysus and the Great Mother, a state of wild delirium is produced, and the subject of it becomes conscious of impressions and powers completely alien to his normal experience.³ As Proclus expresses it: "Going out of themselves, they are wholly established with the gods and possessed by them."⁴ But ecstasy is found in a large variety of phases. It has no necessary connexion with frenzy. The ascent of the soul into the sphere of the Divine is often conceived of, apart from all sensuous excitements. We have seen, e.g., how the condition of *γνώσις*, or the vision of deity, transforms the soul, which has left

¹ Qu. by Dieterich from Kenyon, *Greek Papp.*, 1893, p. 116.

² *Mithras-liturgie*², 4. 14.

³ Cf. Plato, *Ion*, 534 B: *ἐνθεός τε γίγνεται καὶ ἐκφρων καὶ ὁ νοῦς οὐκέτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἔνεστιν*.

⁴ On *Republ.*, p. 59, 19. See Rohde's important discussion, *Psyche*³, II. pp. 18-21.

behind the hampering associations of the body, into *οὐσία*, the Divine essence. The astral mysticism, so dear to Posidonius, employs the method of absorbing contemplation. By its means, communion with the divinity is possible of attainment. Belonging to the same sphere of more "spiritual" modes of achieving union with the god is that described in the Hermetic literature, in which external ritual plays a very subordinate part. There the communication of a revelation produces the mysterious change. The revelation regenerates. The soul is enabled to pass upwards into the Divine abode, and to become one with deity as having received the 10 powers (*δυνάμεις*) of God. A close kinship may be traced between this representation and the *ἀπαθανατισμός* or process of deification which appears in the Mithras-Liturgy. Only, that is accompanied by a variety of ritual postures and gestures. A still more spiritual foundation for the *unio mystica* is traceable in that pantheistic Element-mysticism, resulting partly from ancient physico-religious speculations, partly from Pythagorean and Stoic modifications of these, which teaches that men reach the vision of God which deifies by means of the "elements" in them, whose first principles exist in the Deity.¹ Nothing could more strikingly reveal the continuity of mystic thought than a comparison of this element-mysticism with the words of Ruysbroek: "All men who are exalted above their creatureliness into a contemplative life are one with this Divine glory—yea, *are* that glory, and they see and feel and find in themselves, by means of this Divine light, that they are the same Ground as to their uncreated nature . . . Wherefore contemplative men should rise above reason and distinction . . . and gaze perpetually by the aid of their inborn light, and so they become transformed, and one with the same light by means of which they see, and which they are."²

¹ See Dieterich, *Abrazas*, pp. 58, 59.

² Qu. by Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, p. 189.

Some further ideas of a more or less primitive character must be noted. Traces exist in obscure mystical formulæ of the conception of union with the god under the guise of the marriage relationship. The terms employed disclose the grossly sensuous nature of the early forms of the notion.¹ While hints of a survival of the ceremonial of the *ἱερός γάμος* appear here and there, it is probable that fairly early the conception came to be little more than a metaphor. The symbol was one which must inevitably take its place in all mystical self-expression.² In our last article it was pointed out that regeneration in the Mithras-Liturgy is compared to dying: "Born again I depart, being exalted [i.e., into the Divine sphere), and having been exalted I die: born through that birth which gives life, dissolved into death, I go the way which thou hast appointed" (14. 26 ff.). Brückner remarks that this prayer might just as appropriately come from the lips of a worshipper of Attis or of Serapis.³ For one of the most arresting aspects of the idea of regeneration in the Mystery-Religions is that which is associated with the death and restoration to life of a Divine Personage, a process through which, by a mystic sympathy, the initiate obtains the guarantee of undying life for himself. It is of supreme importance for our purpose to notice that the central deities in this sphere of religion, Osiris (-Serapis), Attis, and perhaps we might venture to say, Dionysus, are intimately connected with the growth and decay of vegetation. Isis and Cybele are each represented as mourning her beloved, just as Demeter at Eleusis mourns for her daughter Kore,

¹ E.g., the description of the sacred snake (associated with the Dionysus-Sabazius mysticism) as ὁ διὰ κόλπου θεός. The mystic drama corresponded to the designation. See Dieterich, *Mithras-liturgie*², pp. 123, 124.

² Cf. E. Underhill, *Mysticism*, p. 496: "The mystic for whom intimate and personal communion has been the mode under which he best apprehended Reality, speaks of the consummation of this communion, its perfect and permanent form, as the *Spiritual Marriage* of the soul with God."

³ *Der sterbende und auferstehende Gottheitland*, p. 11.

with whom at a later period Dionysus (Iacchus) was brought into close affinity. The real significance of the myths becomes clear when it is observed that the festivals of these deities were held either in early spring, when the blackness of winter began to give place to a luxuriant life, or in autumn, after the fruits of the earth had been gathered in, and when the corn-seed (e.g., in Egypt) was buried in the soil. In the case both of Attis and Osiris the mourning and the rejoicing were celebrated at the same festival. The ancient formula of the Attis-ritual, quoted in our third article, reveals the significance for the initiates of the god's restoration to life: "Be of good cheer, initiates, the god has been saved: thus for you also shall there be salvation from your troubles." It is difficult to determine on what actual basis the votaries of Attis were made sure of their immortality. Another early formula, quoted as above, suggests a sacred meal in which the participant entered into communion with the living deity. But this is no more than hypothesis.¹ We have also seen that in the Osiris-cult, the worshipper, as becoming one with the god who lives, must share eternally in his divine life. Of the mystic ritual by which this process was symbolised we know little beyond some obscure indications which may be gathered from Apuleius.

Some remarkable hints, however, have been handed down to us of a death issuing in life through which the initiated have to pass. These have often been exaggerated, and treated as full-fledged doctrines. But we must beware of going beyond our data. The clearest evidence of the conception is found in Apuleius' description of the initiation of Lucius into the Isis-Mysteries, which was succeeded after an interval by that into the rites of Osiris. There the initiation is described by the high priest as "the symbol of a

¹ Dieterich makes assertions on this question which go beyond the data, e.g., *Mithras-liturgie*², p. 174.

voluntary death" (*voluntariae mortis*) which is followed by a new birth (*quodam modo renatos*). Probably this explains Lucius' narrative of what befel him in the innermost shrine: "I penetrated to the boundaries of death." How much of a genuinely religious experience was involved, and what precisely it meant, it is hard to determine. Of course, there was an impressive sensuous ritual. Perhaps we ought to interpret in the light of this passage the designation by Firmicus Maternus of an initiate of Attis as *moriturus*, "about to die." And Dieterich would assign to the same group of ideas a reference of Proclus, in his work on the theology of Plato, to "priests who in the most mysterious of all initiations give orders to bury the body as far up as the head." Dieterich regards this as a symbolic burial, and believes it to belong to Dionysiac-Orphic ritual.¹ There is a further description by Sallustius, in his treatise *Concerning the gods and the world*, of Attis-initiates as "cut off from the further progress of their natural life." With this scanty evidence must be grouped the passage from the Mithras-Liturgy quoted above. The extract which Reitzenstein makes from *Corp. Hermet.* xiii. 3, and supports from the visions of Zosimus, as representing regeneration as an experience of death and burial, apart altogether from its relevance, depends far too much upon conjectural emendation to be used as valid testimony.² One or two survivals of mystic ritual seem to bear upon the conception before us. Sallustius speaks of those newly initiated into the Attis-mysteries as receiving the nourishment of milk, "as born anew" (*ὡσπερ ἀναγεννωμένων*). With this Dieterich would compare the Dionysiac-Orphic formula found in Southern Italy: "a kid I lighted upon the milk," *ἔριφος* denoting the "newly-born" in the mystic sense.³ But the formula is so obscure

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 163.

² See *Psimandres*, pp. 368-370.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 171.

that it is precarious to make it the basis of an argument. Nor is it legitimate to adduce the barbarous ceremony of the *taurobolium*, the bath of bull's blood, associated with the ritual of the Great Mother, in which the descent into the pit seems to have symbolised the burial of the old life, and the votary, coming up from his bloody baptism, was feasted as a god, and described as "born again for eternity." For Cumont has shown that this was a comparatively late development of that cult.¹

We have dwelt on these meagre data because they have been made the foundation of extraordinarily bold assertions. Thus Loisy, e.g., gives the following summary of St. Paul's conception of Jesus Christ: "He was a saviour-god, after the manner of an Osiris, an Attis, a Mithra. Like them, he belonged by his origin to the celestial world; like them, he had made his appearance on the earth: like them, he had accomplished a work of universal redemption, efficacious and typical: like Adonis, Osiris, and Attis he had died a violent death, and like them he had been restored to life; like them, he had prefigured in his lot that of the human beings who should take part in his worship, and commemorate his mystic enterprise: like them, he had predestined, prepared, and assured the salvation of those who became partners in his passion."² This paragraph implies that Paul's whole conception of salvation through Christ is directly parallel to the central ideas of the Mystery-Religions. Before we examine the question more closely, we would suggest as a preliminary caution that nothing is more misleading than an inaccurate use of terminology.³ Paul never speaks of Jesus as a "sa-

¹ *Les Religions Orientales*, pp. 98-105.

² *Hibbert Journal*, October, 1911, p. 51. Cf. Brückner, *op. cit.*, pp. 35, 36; Dieterich, *op. cit.*, p. 176 ff.; Lake, *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, pp. 233, 234.

³ "We may speak of 'the vespers of Isis' or of a 'Last Supper of Mithra and his companions,' but only in the sense in which one talks of . . . 'the socialism of Diocletian.' . . . A word is not a demonstration" (Cumont,

viour-god." For him there is one God, "the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." In Jesus the redeeming love of God is brought near to men (Gal. ii. 20 ; iv. 4, 5). Nor is it legitimate to call Osiris or Attis "saviour-gods" in the sense in which "Saviour" was applied by Paul to Jesus. Paul knew Jesus as an historical Person who, as the result of his boundless devotion to the good of his brethren, suffered a shameful death, from which he did not flinch, in loyalty to his Father's purpose, so that this death became to men the very pledge of the unspeakable love of God and the forgiveness of sins. Osiris and Attis were originally mythological personifications of the processes of vegetation. The legends of their deaths have nothing to do with a purpose of redemption. There is no parallel between the New Testament story of the Incarnation, which meant so much for Paul, and the myths which recount their history. It is a caricature to compare the story of the murder of Osiris or the self-destruction of Attis with the self-sacrificing death of Jesus. Nor is any real comparison possible between the New Testament view of the resurrection of Jesus and the restoration to life of these mythical divine personages. In the one case, the disciples of Jesus were raised from despair to a victorious joy, a few days after the crucifixion which had blighted all their hopes, by an experience of their risen Lord which, however much it may elude attempts at explanation, can never be resolved into a subjective fancy of Peter's, gradually kindling the hearts of his companions, and finally constituting the basis of the Christian Church. The world-transforming effect demands a more elemental cause. And such a cause alone is congruous with the Jesus of the Gospels. The coming to life of Osiris and Attis is embodied in grotesque myths, and these become the centre of an artificial ritual,

op. cit., p. xiii.). See also some forcible paragraphs in Schweitzer, *Gesch. d. Paulin. Forschung*, pp. 151, 152.

through which there is conveyed to their votaries the hope of immortality. There is no true analogy, moreover, between the New Testament idea of a fellowship in the sufferings of Christ, and that ritual sympathy with the goddesses who mourned the loss of Osiris and Attis or with the woes of these deified beings themselves. In the former, self-sacrificing devotion which shrinks from no hardship is the core of the experience. The latter is the result of sensuous impressions more or less artificially produced. Hence a foundation is lacking for Loisy's conclusion: "These are analogous conceptions, dreams of one family, built on the same theme with similar imagery."¹

But we must now attempt to discover what relationship, if any, exists between Paul's standpoint and the central Mystery-doctrine of regeneration (involving salvation, or deification) through communion with deity. To begin with, we are not at liberty to identify their respective conceptions of salvation. For the Mystery-Religions *σωτηρία* has primarily in view the pressure of those burdens (such as fate, necessity, etc.) which are involved in the limitations of earthly life, and especially the dark shadow of death. In the Osiris-cult, at least, the immortal life beyond the grave is pictured in the precise form of the bodily life,² as was that of Osiris himself. What the conception of the eternal future meant for the Cybele-Attis cult it is impossible to determine. The deification which was the goal in the Hermetic doctrine seems certainly to have been clothed in a more spiritual guise. But it is important to note that *σωτηρία* was invariably assured "by the exact performance of sacred ceremonies."³ Hence, inevitably, it was conceived as a *character indelibilis*.⁴ Above all, it did not necessarily involve a new

¹ *Loc. cit.*, p. 52. ² See, e.g., Brückner, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

³ Cumont, *op. cit.*, p. xxii.

⁴ Cf. Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen*, p. 54.

moral ideal. "We have no reason to think," says Professor Percy Gardner, "that those who claimed salvation through Isis or Mithras were much better than their neighbours. They felt secure of the help of their patron-deity in the affairs of life and in the future world; but they did not therefore live at a higher level."¹

Paul's conception of *σωτηρία* is many-sided. Like all his regulative ideas it has direct connexions with the Old Testament, and denotes that Messianic salvation which is the consummation of God's redeeming purpose for His people. Again and again in the LXX. *σωτηρία* is the translation of *יְשׁוּעָה* or *יְשׁוּעָה*, which was a current Messianic idea. The term includes deliverance both from material and spiritual ills. In Paul, along with its cognate verb *σώζω* (which he uses far more frequently than the noun), it is always spiritual,² and associated with the good news of God in Christ. But as the Apostle made no distinction between physical and spiritual in his conception of death as the consequence of sin, *σωτηρία* involves immortal life in the profoundest sense of the phrase, an ethical quite as distinctly as a metaphysical magnitude, a sharing in the Divine Life which for him is primarily love and holiness. The best illustration of the meaning of the conception for Paul occurs in Romans v. 8-10: "God proves his own love toward us because while we were still sinners Christ died for us. Much more, therefore, having been justified now by his blood, we shall be saved from the wrath [the final reaction of the Divine nature against sin] through him. For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, having been reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." The atmosphere of *σωτηρία* in Paul is the love of God revealed to

¹ *Religious Experience of St. Paul*, p. 87.

² Probably Phil. i. 19 means acquittal for Paul in his trial, but he looks upon that also as ultimately the working of God.

men in the Cross of Jesus Christ. Everything in it goes back to that. And this background reveals the essential difference between it and the *σωτηρία* of the Mystery-Religions. Further, *σωτηρία*, in Paul's usage, is, from the very nature of the case, charged with moral implications. The mercy of God in Christ lays claims upon men. They are under obligations (*ὀφειλέται*) "not to live according to the flesh" (Romans viii. 12). "The love of Christ constrains us . . . that they who live should live no longer to themselves, but to him who died for them and was raised" (2 Cor. v. 14, 15). Here again we move among a different group of ideas from those of the Mystery-Religions. We are far from denying any moral influence to initiation. There is some evidence at least to the contrary. But there was no necessary connexion between the mystical experiences and a changed ethical standard. An additional point must be emphasised. In Romans i. 16 Paul declares that his Gospel, the good news of God's forgiveness in Christ the crucified, is "the power of God resulting in salvation for every one that believes." Salvation is given to faith. And faith for Paul means personal surrender to the "Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me" (Gal. ii. 20).

How, then, does Paul conceive this salvation to be mediated to the believer? His utterance in Romans v. 5 is decisive: "Our hope [i.e., of the final salvation, which he has described as *ἡ δόξα τ. θεοῦ*] cannot put us to shame, because the love of God has been poured out in our hearts through the Holy Spirit which has been given to us." Another way of expressing the same fact occurs in Romans viii. 16: "The Spirit himself bears witness with our spirit that we are children of God." The gift of the Spirit is the Divine response to faith."¹

¹ Cf. Weinel, *Biblische Theologie d. N. T.*, p. 318: "We can see clearly that this doctrine of the Spirit and of Christ in the believer is not mere

Here we are brought into the heart of Paul's conception of the New Life. For him, as for the Mystery-Religions, regeneration is intimately associated with communion with the Divine. He does not happen to use the term *ἀναγεννᾶσθαι* (or cognates). But there is scarcely even a difference of metaphor in his affirmation: "If any one is in Christ, he is a new creation (*καὶνὴ κτίσις*): old things have passed away, behold, new things have come into being" (2 Cor. v. 17: similarly, Gal. vi. 15). But before we briefly look at Paul's idea of communion with Christ, it must be noted that that, like everything else in the sphere of salvation, stands out against the background of the Cross. The words we have just quoted rest on the judgment that "one died for all" (ver. 14). And the very next statement declares: "Now all this comes from God who reconciled us to Himself through Christ" (ver. 18). So that we dare not isolate the thought of communion with Christ in Paul from the demonstration of the Divine Love in the Crucified. The significance of the living Lord for the Apostle lies in the fact that this is He who loved men and gave Himself for them. Dr. Denney is in strict accord with Paul's standpoint when he says that for him, Christianity "consists, first and last, of experiences generated in the believer by the Cross. . . . Whatever it may be proper to say of the Holy Spirit, or of union to Christ, or incorporation in Him, must be said on the basis of such experiences and within their limits."¹ That consideration discloses at a glance the impassable cleft between Paul and the Mystery-Religions in their central experiences.

It is almost needless to say that Paul's most characteristic description of the believer's relation to Christ is *ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι*. It is really only a variation of expression when he

theory, not an imitation of Mystery-doctrine, but inmost personal experience metaphysically interpreted after the manner of his time."

¹ EXPOSITOR, vi. 4, pp. 310, 311.

speaks of *Χριστὸς ἐν ἡμῖν*. And often a distinction can scarcely be drawn between this and *τὸ πνεῦμα ἐν ἡμῖν*. The phrase is sufficiently indefinite to admit of a large freedom of interpretation. Not to speak of the purely sensuous explanation of Dieterich,¹ or Heitmüller's elusive designation of the relationship as "physical-hyperphysical,"² it seems to us precarious to go even as far as Deissmann does in emphasising the "local" element in the conception.³ The Apostle is surely using that language dear to mystics of all ages, which transcends spatial categories. The key to the meaning of the phrase is found in some of Paul's most famous utterances, e.g., Galatians ii. 20: "No longer do I live, but Christ lives in me: as for the life I now live in the flesh, I live by faith, faith in the Son of God who loved me"; and Philippians iii. 8 f.: "Christ Jesus my Lord, for whom I suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but refuse that I may win Christ and be found in him, not having a righteousness of my own, that which is from the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is from God on the ground of faith." These passages, and many others which might be adduced, make it clear that Faith, in Paul's far-reaching sense of a personal surrender of the life, constitutes the basis of this unspeakably intimate relation of the soul to Christ.⁴ There is no conception which can be compared with this in the Mystery-Religions.⁵ Moreover, it reminds us of the thoroughly ethical character of Paul's mysticism. This is no vague absorption in the

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 109, 110.

² *Taufe und Abendmahl bei Paulus*, p. 20.

³ "Dwelling in a pneuma-element which may be compared to the air" (*Die neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu,"* p. 98.)

⁴ So also Pfeiderer, in the *frsted.* of his *Paulinism*, E. Tr. I. p. 199. In our judgment, Pfeiderer shows a much surer insight into Paul's thought in this early work (1877) than in any of his later writings.

⁵ Reitzenstein's brief note on the Hellenistic conception of *πνεῦμα* (*H. M. R.*, p. 85) does little more than reveal its meagreness.

supra-sensible Reality. It is a personal relationship established by adoring trust in and devotion to Him in whom Paul has reached the possibility of a life which shall be "right" with God. The passage we have just quoted from Philippians is a striking testimony to that aspect of his religion.¹

We do not require to dwell on the fact, often emphasised, that Paul's is a Christ-mysticism rather than a God-mysticism. The distinction must count for little in view of a statement like Colossians iii. 3 : "Your life is hid with Christ in God." Of more importance is the relation of the Spirit to this experience. As we have seen, the Apostle seems here and there at least to use Christ and the Spirit synonymously. Most notable is 2 Corinthians iii. 17 : "Now the Lord is the Spirit : and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." Perhaps the most direct application of this conception to our subject is 1 Corinthians vi. 17 : "He that is joined (*κολλώμενος*) to the Lord is one spirit." But under this aspect also, the moral implications of the mystic fellowship are made prominent : the "life" and "power" which are the tokens of the Spirit's presence are essentially ethical. Possession of the Spirit means the free, unhampered relation of the child to the Father, e.g., Romans viii. 15 ; Galatians iv. 6 ; 2 Corinthians iii. 17. That relationship from its very *raison d'être* forbids any compromise with evil : see the decisive passage, Galatians v. 16-24. In this connexion, Paul lets us see clearly what he means by "life" ; e.g., Romans viii. 13 : "If ye by the Spirit put to death the deeds of the body (= "works of the flesh," Gal. v. 19), ye shall live." These positions once more reveal the difference of atmosphere between Paul and the Mystery-cults.

¹ But Paul's mysticism means something more than "a relation of ethical harmony," in which Prof. Pringle-Pattison finds the real truth of the mystical experience (Art. *Mysticism*, Encyc. Brit. ed. 9).

It is in the light of them that we must briefly examine his statements regarding death and resurrection with Christ, on which so much stress has been laid by those who find in Paul the direct influence of Mystery-conceptions. The passages usually selected to establish this influence are those which speak of "being baptized into the death of Christ," or, "being buried with him in baptism." There are, however, only two which are really relevant, Romans vi. 3, 4, and Colossians ii. 12. We must consider these, along with 1 Corinthians xii. 13, and Galatians iii. 27, which are cognate to them, in our next article, on Baptism in Paul and the Mystery-Religions. But the large majority of Paul's utterances concerning death with Christ have no reference whatever to baptism. Thoroughly typical is Galatians ii. 19 : "I through the law died to the law that I might live to God. I have been crucified with Christ." The same conception appears in Romans vii. 4 : "Ye also were made dead to the law through the body of Christ." So also Romans vi. 6 : "Knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him that the body of sin might be done away, that so we should no longer be in bondage to sin";¹ and Galatians vi. 14 : "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which (or, whom) the world has been crucified unto me, and I unto the world." The thought occurs with different expression in Colossians i. 21, 22 : "You, being in time past alienated and enemies in your mind in your evil works yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and without blemish." Important also is Colossians ii. 20 : "If ye died with Christ from the elements (*στοιχεῖα*) of the world, why, as though living in the world, do ye subject yourselves to ordinances?" We do not, of course, deny the connexion between

¹ This passage is quite independent of the reference to baptism, which comes in earlier in the chapter.

this passage and the reference to baptism in ii. 12. But its true explanation is found in ii. 14, 15 : " Having blotted out the bond written in ordinances that was against us . . . and he hath taken it out of the way, nailing it to the cross, having despoiled (or, stripped off himself) the principalities and the powers." Whatever be the significance for Paul of baptism, the conspectus of passages before us plainly shows that when he speaks of the believer as " dying with Christ," he has the quite definite idea of identification with the relation toward sin of the crucified Redeemer, the identification which he sums up in the memorable words of Philippians iii. 10, *συμμορφιζόμενος τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ*. There is not a suggestion of baptism in the whole context of the passage. The correlative to this idea is, of course, living with Christ, rising with Christ, or (as in Philippians iii. 10), " knowing the power of his resurrection."

Now, so far as we can judge, the central Pauline conception which we have been considering has no real equivalent in the Mystery-Religions. Even if we were bold enough to assert, with some scholars, on the basis of the very meagre extant evidence, that the initiates in the mystic cults regarded themselves as having died with the Divine personages whose restoration to life they celebrated, it is perfectly obvious that the death of which Paul speaks is something wholly different. It is exclusively a death to sin, and its correlative is a life to holiness in the most ethical sense conceivable. The ceremonial dedication to a deity whose ritual, based on the revival of life in the world of nature, suggests the soul-kindling prospect of a life beyond the grave, could very naturally be described as a dying to the ignorant past, and the entrance on a new life of hope. But it requires an unusually daring imagination to fill these terms in the Mystery-cults with the profound ethical content which they held for St. Paul. We admit a certain kinship in the imagery, but

this imagery has been the common property of mystics and philosophers and preachers throughout the ages.

H. A. A. KENNEDY.

*A CONSIDERATION OF THE HISTORY OF
NORTHERN ISRAEL.¹*

THE main difference between the religions of Asia and of Europe appears to be that whereas those of the West are abandoned by their votaries for something which satisfies their adherents better, those of the East are not completely deserted, but something further is evolved out of them. Our ancestors, even though they retained many superstitions, at least professedly forsook their old beliefs when they accepted Christianity; but in India Brahminism was the parent of Buddhism, in Persia Zoroastrianism was the outcome of an older faith, the ancient religion of the Hebrews gave birth to Judaism, Judaism to Christianity, Judaism, Oriental Christianity and the faiths of early Arabia to Mohammedanism. It is not the religion of a Western nation which survives in Christianity, but rather its philosophy, as in the case of Hellas, its law in that of Rome, its political ideas as among the Teutonic races. Herein seems to be the fundamental difference between East and West. In the one religion is everything, in the other its influence has been subordinated to or shared by other interests. Our Christianity has hitherto been exempted from this rule, and has proved itself capable of infinite development, sometimes legitimate, at others deplorable; but this, to my mind, tends to prove its inherently oriental character.

But my purpose is not to dwell on this point, but to submit to the consideration of the Congress the importance of

¹ A paper read at the Fourth Congress of the History of Religions at Leiden.