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PREFACE

With hundreds of volumes having been written on the various aspects of the life and theology of St. Paul, it may appear presumptuous to present a study on St. Paul with the claim that there is in it anything new. This work is presented, however, in the belief that there is not now in existence any other study of this one aspect of St. Paul's thought from the particular point of view from which it is approached here. Professor James S. Stewart, in a conversation with the writer on October 24, 1951, said, "A synthesis of the major categories in Paul's presentation of the atonement, showing that one category was no more dominant than another, would be new work, and would be worthwhile."

The present work is not an attempt to present a comprehensive study of Paul's theology, or even a study of Paul's atonement doctrine in the fullest sense. It is a presentation of the objective ways in which Paul sought to make clear the fundamental meaning of Christ's death.

The spelling and punctuation throughout the work, with the exception of direct quotations, follow standard American usage. Biblical quotations, unless otherwise noted, are from the Revised Standard Version of 1946 and 1952.

I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to the Librarian and staff of each of the following: The New College Library, and The National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh; the Western Theological Seminary Library, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, U.S.A; The Case Memorial Library of the Hartford Seminary Foundation, Hartford, Connecticut, U.S.A.
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INTRODUCTION

"Now I would remind you, brethren, in what terms I preached to you the gospel, which you received, in which you stand, by which you are saved, if you hold it fast — unless you believed in vain.

"For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received, that Christ died for our sins, in accordance with the scriptures..." (1 Corinthians 15:3).

Any discussion of Paul's interpretation of the death of Christ must start from this statement of Paul, as he calls to his readers' attention the facts which he originally taught them, and reminds them that his teaching to them was on the basis of that which he himself 'had received'. Our thesis shall be that Paul understood the death of Christ as being of first importance in his teaching of the Christian faith, that building upon what he had received, both from his pre-Christian background and from the teaching of the church in the earliest years, he endeavored to interpret the meaning of the death of Christ in a much more extensive fashion than the primitive church had done, and arrived at certain categories of thought which collectively considered brought out what for Paul was the meaning of the act of Christ in His death.

Paul was essentially a Jew, - "circumcised on the eighth day, of the people of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew born of Hebrews; as to the law a Pharisee..." (Philippians 3:5). "And I advanced in Judaism beyond many of my own age among my people, so extremely zealous was I for the traditions of my fathers" (Galatians 1:14). As a Jew he would
have been steeped in the Old Testament and the faith of Judaism. He was, in addition, a Hellenistic Jew, "from Tarsus in Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city; ..." (Acts 21:39; see also 22:3) and his ministry was for the most part outside of the boundaries of Palestine. He was thus exposed to the influences of the Greek civilization which was a part of his environment. But Paul was, in addition to being a Jew, and a Hellenistic Jew at that, a man who had seen the Christ. On the road to Damascus he had been confronted by the living Christ. From that encounter a new life began. In his new life, he came into contact with the Palestinian church and its teachings, and consulted with those who had been with the Lord. "After three years I went up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas, and remained with him fifteen days" (Galatians 1:18). He would have heard from them the words of the Lord and the distinctive teachings of the faith. But he clearly thought through the implications of the Gospel which he received for himself. "Then after fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem...; and I laid before them... the gospel which I preach among the Gentiles... and when they perceived the grace that was given to me, James and Cephas and John,... gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship,..." (Galatians 2:1,2,9).

Original Paul was, and his own deep religious experience undoubtedly counted for much; but the thing about which he writes with such creative power was the common faith which stemmed from those who were 'in Christ' before him.

It is from this variegated background that Paul developed his interpretation of the death of Christ. It is a background which places Paul within the life and church of his time.

The old view of Paul as a solitary colossus who dominated the early

---

church, even while he was not understood by it, has given place to the awareness that the apostle was rooted in the life of the early church with which he shared a common faith. Paulinism... is no longer studied as a watertight compartment but far more in relation to the rest of primitive Christianity.¹

In his interpretation we shall find that from this background he has drawn upon certain dominant categories of thought upon which were built in the main his explanation of the saving power of Christ.

In the development of the categories we will find that Paul uses many and varied metaphors to bring out his meaning. Paul was fond of using metaphors, and sometimes used metaphor upon metaphor, as in Colossians where the bond or "note of hand" against the sinner is "rubbed off" or "blotted out" by the act of Christ, but then, presumably by this time blank, is "nailed to the cross", which represents presumably the different picture of the charge posted in a public place as a sign of its nullification (Colossians 2:14). But while they contain the metaphors, and metaphors are used to develop their thought, the categories themselves are far more than metaphors. They are the objective ways by which Paul strove to make clear to himself and to others the fundamental aspects contained in the act of Christ on the Cross. He did not come to these ideas of atonement purely on his own. He received the main idea and used many categories of thought in working out the central thought. Throughout his doctrine he was trying to sound the depths of the mystery which was the revelation of the Cross.

In considering Paul's interpretation of the death of Christ, it is important to set forth as foundation for that interpretation certain fundamental assertions which are of the utmost importance in the under-

standing of Paul's development of the categories of his thought. These we will endeavor to set forth in Chapters I and II. In Chapters III through VIII we shall discuss the categories in turn, and in the final chapter come to some conclusions concerning the Pauline doctrine of the death of Christ. The order of the chapters has been selected somewhat arbitrarily. The order of Romans 3:21-26 has been followed in the first three categories, where, in this important statement of Paul concerning the matter at hand, Justification is mentioned first, followed by Redemption, and then Sacrifice.
CHAPTER ONE

AN ACT OF GOD

The death of Christ, for Paul as well as for the early church, was an act of God. Behind the act of Christ in His death was the purposeful will of God. In the work of Christ generally, and His death particularly, was the power of God. It was a redemptive act of God in bestowing His grace upon men in the face of the sins of the world.

On occasion, in the history of Christian thought, the Cross has been seen as, in some way, appeasing God, placating His anger, or changing His purpose toward men. Certain statements of Paul have been interpreted this way. In particular, discussion has occurred through the years over the meaning of the word ἔλαυξαίπων which Paul uses in Romans 3:25. Does it mean that a wrathful God needed to be propitiated, appeased, to have His favor won? Or does it mean that the act of Christ on the Cross was an expiation which removed the reason for the estrangement between God and man, with no intimation that God had in any way to be changed in His loving purpose toward men? Scholarship almost unanimously today accepts the latter interpretation and denies the existence of the idea in Paul that God had in any way to be appeased. This is supported by the fact that Paul continually emphasizes throughout his letters that it was God Himself who instituted the act; it was a free gift of His grace bestowed upon men without their having previously done anything to win that grace.
Any theory of atonement has lost its base unless it is continually in touch with Paul's statement. 'God commendeth His own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.'(Romans 5:8)

Through all of Paul's writings there is the basic assumption that all that Jesus did, in His Ministry, in His Passion, and in His Resurrection, was the carrying out of the purpose of the Divine in history.

A. The Old Testament Conception of the Redeeming God

The apostle's conviction that it was God who was acting through Christ to carry out His work among men was based upon the idea of God as active for the help of men as that idea is contained in the thought of the Old Testament. His knowledge of the Redeeming God was part of that which he received, not only from the faith of the apostles, but also as a fundamental idea of the Jewish faith into which he was born. Paul clearly witnesses to this fact when for the illustration of man's reception of God's promise by faith he goes back to the Old Testament and God's relationship with the man Abraham (Romans 4), and consistently turns to the Old Testament in the development of his thought for illustration and quotation. There he found the idea of God which was the only idea of the divine which would consistently explain what happened in Christ.

He was justified in the conviction that the Christian message with which he was entrusted was the fulfillment of an age-long process the outline of which had been disclosed in the Old Testament; it was indeed ultimately the outcome of the character of God as it had been revealed to Paul's Jewish forefathers. 2

The picture of God and His relationship with His world in the


Old Testament is one which portrays God as working out on earth His drama of creation and redemption. It is a drama in which God creates His world, chooses Israel as His own people. God of all heaven and earth, He chooses one man Abraham and promises that in him and his seed all nations will be blessed. He sends His prophets to educate them and to warn them. He allows them to suffer under alien domination, but delivers them in His own good time and in time would restore them to freedom and sovereignty. He makes a covenant with His people, and in all His relationship with His people never departs from that covenant. He is just in all His ways and expects righteousness of His people.

God is the author of justice, and as the just God, is bound to act justly; this is the immovable ground of Old Testament faith in all its varieties, the common denominator which gives religious unity to Israel: prophets, priests, lawgivers, the common people - all are convinced of the justice of God as the disposer of all things and the ground of hope.

The picture of God in the Old Testament has a warm and personal side to it as well as an uncompromising one. God's righteousness is shown in that He rules according to the covenant between Himself and Israel, in fellowship with His people. He punishes them for their sinful activity; but He also secures justice for them in their relationships with their conquerors. He brings help and salvation. "For the Lord will vindicate his people and have compassion on his servants..." (Deuteronomy 32:36). In Hosea He says "And I will betroth you to me forever; I will betroth you to me in righteousness and justice, in steadfast love, and in mercy. I will betroth you to me in faithfulness; and you shall know the Lord" (Hosea 2:19,20).

---

Kindness, loyalty and salvation are a part of God in His relationships with men along with His righteousness. The God whose justice would require that Israel be punished for her erring ways and her straying from the covenant relationship also was the God who consistently provided ways in which sinful Israel could be delivered from the consequences of her sins and returned to Him. "I will bear the indignation of the Lord because I have sinned against him, until he pleads my cause and executes judgment for me. He will bring me forth to the light: I shall behold his deliverance" (Micah 7:9). God forgave and sought the return of His wayward children. He sent prophets to proclaim His word and call His people back to His ways (Exodus 3, Isaiah 6:8-13). In fact, according to the Old Testament, he provided the means whereby the children of Israel could return to right relationship with Him. Far from having to be won back, God went out of His way to win back His people, as Forsyth points out, providing them through the institution of sacrifice the means of returning to His favor:

Atonement was not the placating of God's anger. Even in the old economy we are told 'I have given you the blood to make atonement.' ... The Lord Himself provided the lamb for the burnt offering. Atonement in the Old Testament was not the placating of God's anger, but the sacrament of God's grace. ... The effect of atonement was to cover sin from God's eyes, so that it should no longer make a visible breach between God and His people. The actual ordinance was established, they held, by God Himself. He covered the sin. Sacrifices were not desperate efforts and surrenders made by terrified people in the hope of propitiating an angry deity. The sacrifices were in themselves prime acts of obedience to God's grace and His expressed will.¹

God is a just God, but also a merciful and forgiving God. He is constantly active through history to save. "We were Pharaoh's slaves

in Egypt; and the Lord brought us out of Egypt with a mighty hand;... and he brought us out from there, that he might bring us in and give us the land which he swore to give our fathers" (Deuteronomy 6:21,23). Mercy is as much a part of His character as is justice and goes out to all His creatures. As the Psalmist said, "The Lord works vindication and justice for all who are oppressed." And also, arising out of this desire to vindicate, "The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger and abounding in steadfast love" (Psalm 103: 6,8. See also Psalm 114:8). The conception of God as Redeemer is found especially in Second Isaiah.

The conception of God which has possessed this prophet is that of Him as Redeemer. The Redeemer is the Holy One, the Lord of host, our Father and as Saviour there is not other beside Him. In Jehovah, the God of Redemption, the prophet sees love, compassion, and mercy manifested to Israel.1

That prophet proclaims God as saying to Israel, "In overflowing wrath for a moment I hid my face from you, but with everlasting love I will have compassion on you, says the Lord your Redeemer" (Isaiah 54:8). His forgiveness is abundant and His love everlasting.

The conception of God actively seeking out His wayward people and saving them is found clearly also in Ezekiel. "For thus says the Lord God: Behold, I, I myself will search for my sheep, and will seek them out. As a shepherd seeks out his flock when some of his sheep have been scattered abroad, so will I seek out my sheep; and I will rescue them from all places where they have been scattered on a day of clouds and thick darkness (Ezekiel 34:11,12; see all of chapter 34).

The Old Testament is at one in proclaiming an active, redeeming God.

---

B. The Thought in the New Testament

Although there are no specific statements in the Gospels in which Jesus speaks of His death as the act of God, it is clear that He considered Himself to be carrying out a mission given Him by the Father and that His suffering death was part of that mission. He believed that His suffering had a significance deep in the providence of God, a part of the Father's love for His children. At the Last Supper He said "For the Son of Man goes as it is written of him..." (Mark 14:21). His death was part of a fore-ordained plan of God. When in the Fourth Gospel He said "Now is my soul troubled. And what shall I say? 'Father, save me from this hour'? No, for this purpose I have come to this hour. Father glorify thy name," (John 12:27,28), He included the thought that the Father could save Him from His coming death, but would not because it was part of His saving purpose. In the same Gospel, He commanded Peter, "Put your sword into its sheath; shall I not drink the cup which the Father has given me?" (John 18:11). When He refers to Himself as the "shepherd" of the sheep (Mark 14:27; John 10:1-18), the thought expressed in Ezekiel must have been in His mind that God had promised to shepherd His sheep. "Behold, I, I myself will search for my sheep, and I will seek them out. ... And I will set up over them one shepherd, my servant David, and he shall feed them; he shall feed them and be their shepherd" (Ezekiel 34:11,23).

That He was aware of God as being in control of history, able to move events according to His purpose is indicated when He said to Peter in Matthew, "Do you think that I cannot appeal to my Father, and He will at

\[1\text{See Chapter II.}\]
once send me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then should the scriptures be fulfilled, that it must be so?" (Matthew 26:53,54).

In the sermons included in the Acts, which Dodd\(^1\) takes to be examples of the earliest preaching, the death of Christ as part of the divine purpose is frequently emphasized. Jesus was "a man attested to you by God with mighty works and wonders and signs which God did through him in your midst" (Acts 2:22). Above all is Jesus' death an act of God, for He was "delivered up according to the definite plan and foreknowledge of God" (Acts 2:23; see also 3:18). The First Epistle of John also contains this emphasis. "In this is love, not that we loved God but that he loved us and sent his Son to be the expiation for our sins" (I John 4:10).

It is clear from this brief survey that, when the early church came to interpret the meaning of the death of Christ, one of the fundamental teachings was that it was the fulfillment of God's purpose.

C. Paul's Thought of the Death of Christ as the Act of God

A look at some of Paul's statements regarding the death of Christ points out unquestionably his view that Christ was acting as the direct agent of God in His going to the Cross. "They (all who have sinned) are justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as an expiation by his blood, to be received by faith. This was to show God's righteousness... that he justifies him who has faith in Jesus" (Romans 3:24-26). "But God shows his love for us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us" (Romans

5:8). "For God has done what the law... could not do: sending his own Son... he condemned sin in the flesh..." (Romans 8:3). "For the word of the cross is folly to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it is the power of God" (1 Corinthians 1:18, see also 1:24). "All this is from God, who through Christ reconciled us to himself and gave us the ministry of reconciliation; that is God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself..." (2 Corinthians 5:18,19). "Grace to you and peace from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins to deliver us from the present evil age, according to the will of our God and Father" (Galatians 1:4). "For God has not destined us to wrath, but to obtain salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us so that whether we wake or sleep we might live with him" (1 Thessalonians 5:9).

In the above passages are contained references to each of what we shall find are the dominant categories in Paul's interpretation of the death of Christ: Justification, Reconciliation and Sanctification; Redemption; Sacrifice; Representation; the Resurrection; and Eschatology. And in each of the above passages Paul makes quite clear that he sees the work of Christ as God's work. The emphasis is particularly evident in those passages where Paul dwells most fully on the implications of the Cross. In Romans 3:21-26, the references to the categories of Christ's work are by no means incidental, but the dominant thought throughout is upon God's participation in that event by which He could accomplish His purpose. The apostle has been pointing out that Jew and Gentile alike are guilty of sinning against God. He points out that the same salvation is offered to

---

1See also Ro. 8:32,39; 1 Cor. 1:30; 15:57; 2 Cor. 13:14; Eph 1:5,7,8; 2:5,8; Col. 1:13,14,19,20; 2:12-15; 1 Thes. 4:14.
both. Through the act of Christ they are justified, redeemed, their sins are expiated. But this is not the complete story. Behind and through all, is the presence and activity of God. Those who have sinned against God are justified by Him as a gift, redeemed through Him and the expiation is by the sacrifice of Jesus whom God "put forward".

In Romans 5:6-10, we shall be saved by Christ from the wrath of God, and "while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son." It is impossible, however, to see this as a statement of Paul that the Son's act in death had persuaded an unwilling Father to act in a way that He had not formerly willed to act. It is said that Christ died "at the right time." That would be that time which God in His purpose had predetermined. The statement is immediately preceded by the tremendous assertion that "God shows his love for us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." It is God who has opened to us a way of escape from the results of sin.

In 2 Corinthians 5:16-21, Paul describes the redemptive work that Christ has done for men. The emphasis is upon the newness of life which is possible in the individual who has been "reconciled" by being "in Christ." All this is from God in His gracious purpose to redeem. It is God who provided the ministry of reconciliation, who acted through Christ, and who in Christ was reconciling the world to Himself.

In Galatians 1:1-4, man, enslaved by the elemental spirits of the universe, and under the law, was redeemed when God sent His son to accomplish that redemption. Similarly, in the Colossian letter when Paul asserts the pre-eminence of Christ above all the powers in heaven and earth, Christ's pre-eminence is declared on the basis of the fact that He is "the image of the invisible God" and "in him all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell" (Colossians 1:15-20).
These passages will be discussed more fully as we proceed to the investigation of Paul's categories. Here we have done enough to point out the fact that throughout the interpretation of Christ's death in Paul, God is present and active in that event. Somerville says on this point:

The death of Christ had for Paul absolute worth in relation to our salvation as the Revelation of God's gracious love to man... Nothing could be farther from Paul's thought than the idea that the death of Christ was needed to win the love of God for us, or to overcome any reluctance in him to show mercy to sinners. On every page of his writings we are taught that the event on Calvary, so far from begetting love in God's heart, simply revealed and put into exercise the love that was there from eternity. God is habitually set forth as the originating cause of the redemption that has come to us through the cross, and as manifesting His love in the blessings that Christ has brought us. Words could not more emphatically proclaim that the death of Jesus was an event ordained by God for the accomplishment of His own genuine purpose towards the race.¹

Paul's emphasis upon God's activity in salvation through Christ's death is, of course, but a part of the total picture of God's creative and redemptive activity throughout history in the Old Testament. God's creative and redemptive purpose was to be seen in history, according to Paul, in relation to his dealings with Abraham (Romans 4:11ff.; 9:7; Galatians 3:6ff.); Abraham and Sarah (Romans 9:9); Isaac and Rebecca (Romans 9:10); Jacob and Esau (Romans 9:10-13); Pharaoh (Romans 9:17); Moses (1 Corinthians 10:1-5); and Elijah (Romans 11:4). It is God who speaks through the prophets, for example in Hosea. Paul says, in Romans 9:25, "As indeed he says in Hosea,... ."

This creative and redemptive purpose continued through all the events of history even to, and including, the event on Calvary.

Everything in Paul's Gospel runs back to God, the beginning of salvation and its end. How could God be forgotten, when Christ

Himself had been God's gift? Behind the figure of the crucified son, Paul always sees God the Father; and behind the love that bled and died, the love that reigned in the heart of the eternal.¹

1. God's Righteousness and His Will to Redeem

We have seen in our look at the Old Testament view of God an emphasis on the justice or righteousness of God. Paul inherited the picture of the just God, and, in a sense, it was his keen comprehension of the implications of God's righteousness that made Judaism a failure in his eyes as to providing the possibility for salvation for men. We shall discuss this more fully in Chapter III, but it is important in its application to our present point. As Paul saw it, God's righteousness being what it was, even though God's will as revealed in the Old Testament was a will to redeem, the means was not present in the law for that redemption to become a reality in the life of the believer (See Romans 3:20). In Christ's death, however, God Himself took the initiative in making it possible for men to accept His redemption without its being thwarted by the impossible situation of man's being worthy only of wrath in the face of God's righteousness (Romans 3:21,22). The Cross at once bore witness to God's righteousness and His inexorable opposition to sin and evil, and His willingness to put men in a position whereby they could receive His redemption.

The will of God is a will to redeem. Through Christ's death on the Cross, God can fulfil His will without ignoring His eternal opposition to evil and His judgment on sin. This will of God is not a favor which may be won, nor is the work of Christ a means by which God's favor

may be won. It comes to men through God's grace as a gift (Romans 3:24, 25).

2. God's Will to Love

Along with the view of the Cross as the revelation of God's righteousness went that of it as a revelation of God's will to love. "It was to prove at the present time that he himself is righteous" but also it was to prove that "he justifies him who has faith in Jesus," an indication of the way in which God shows his love for sinners.

Paul is nowhere conscious of an opposition between righteousness and love... Thanks to his Old Testament heritage, righteousness to him is a quality and, at the same time, an activity; it is what God is and what He does. Within it there is a warmth which impels Him towards salvation. We may state this truth summarily by saying that for him love is implicit in righteousness and righteousness implicit in love.1

Taylor suggests that the thought of the death of Christ as expression of the love of God was original with Paul. Though a natural conclusion from his Old Testament heritage, it was a new one in the early church, or at least was wanting in the records we possess of primitive Christianity, and had its beginning in the emphasis that Paul gave it. Taking John 3:16 as "the inspired comment of the Fourth Evangelist" he goes further to say that we have no record of Jesus saying that His death was to have the purpose of revealing His Father's love.2

For Paul the love of God in the sacrifice of Christ was the foundation of his faith. As we found the emphasis in Romans 3 on God's righteousness, so in Romans 5 we find the emphasis on His love and His


2Ibid., p. 71.
desire for reconciliation with men. The righteous God makes plain his love for us in Christ's having died for us (Romans 5:8). God's loving work is revealed and realized in Christ's work. Men no longer need to feel themselves enemies of God for His love led God to reconcile men to Himself through Christ's death (Romans 5:10). Again in Romans 8, Paul emphasizes the love of God as revealed in Christ. On this chapter, Stauffer comments:

The mighty argument of Romans setting forth the theme of the new age now inaugurated, fitly culminates in a hymn which starts with the love of the elect towards God, proceeds to the love of Christ, and comes to rest in perfect assurance of 'the love of God that is in Christ Jesus our Lord.'

The will of God is to love. This love is displayed to all the world in the Cross of Christ. It is a love that goes out to men so that, as a result of God's act of love in the death of Christ, men can be described as Paul does describe them in the salutations of two of his letters, "God's beloved" and "brethren beloved by God" (Romans 1:7; 1 Thessalonians 1:4). "What Paul means by the love of God is clear. It is the directing of God's sovereign will towards this world and its salvation."2

3. God's Will to Fellowship

Finally, God's will to redeem in righteousness, His will to love, is also revealed by Christ's death to be a will to fellowship. Paul's main concern is with how man, sinful as he is, can still know this fellowship. He finds the possibility of this fellowship as the result of


2Ibid., p. 55.
Christ's work. The purpose of God's redemptive act, in Christ for men, manifesting at once His righteousness and His love, was that they might have fellowship with Him. God had done what man could not do for himself, and what the law could not do for him, in order to bring about reconciliation, to remove those barriers which existed to fellowship between Himself and men. This fellowship which men have with God is "in Christ", as Paul says, "God is faithful, by whom you were called into the fellowship of his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord" (1 Corinthians 1:9).

Throughout his development of the meaning of the death of Christ, Paul, finds it an act of God. The work of Christ is the work of God, a revelation of His righteousness, His will to redeem, to love and to fellowship.
CHAPTER TWO

THE MISSION OF THE REDEEMER

From our consideration of the emphasis in Paul upon the death of Christ as the Act of God, we now turn to the mission of the Redeemer, the One through Whom God's redemptive act was carried out in history. The visible manifestation of the will of God was in the mission of the Redeemer whom God sent, a divine penetration into human history to carry out His will. Paul was convinced that Jesus of Nazareth was the Redeemer, the Christ, the Son of God. In this chapter we shall discuss first the fact that the Redeemer had a mission to perform of which His death was but one part, although the part on which Paul puts his dominant emphasis. Then we shall turn to the mission of the Redeemer in His death as the Redeemer Himself made claims upon human life, as Paul received word of that mission from the primitive church, and as he sought different ideas which would most clearly express the meaning of the truth revealed in the mission of the Redeemer in His death. Finally we shall look at that experience made possible for men by the mission of the Redeemer, the experience of being "in Christ" by faith, through which the benefits obtained by Christ in His death for men are appropriated by individual men, and without which men cannot enter into the new life which the Redeemer makes possible for men.
A. The Mission in its Unity

Paul's main emphasis as he dwells on the mission of Jesus Christ is on the work of Christ in His death. At the same time he is aware that the death was but a part, if the most essential part, of a total ministry. And, in fact, the significance of the death is there because it was a part of a whole ministry. A reading of Paul's letters brings again to the reader's mind that Paul says very little about the life and ministry of Jesus, and does not outline the teaching of Jesus in any detail. But to deduce from this that Paul had no interest in the historical Christ would be most certainly in error. In considering Paul's knowledge of Christ, and the paucity of references in his letters to the historical Jesus, it must be recalled that in every case in the letters of his available to us in the New Testament Paul was writing to churches who had already received the essential teaching of the Christian Gospel. They had received the Gospel beforehand, either from Paul himself as in the case of the Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Thessalonians, or from other teachers as with the Romans and Colossians. Paul then could presume a background of knowledge upon the part of those who would read or hear his letters, with essentially the same facts about Jesus of Nazareth, His teaching and His ministry as have been preserved for us in the four Gospels.

Even though this is true, however, it is still not in accordance with the facts as contained in Paul's letters themselves to say that Paul had no interest in the historical Jesus. The essential outline of His life is there. Jesus was "born of woman, born under the law" (Galatians 4:4), "descended from David according to the flesh" (Romans 1:3). He died on a cross (Philippians 2:8), was buried, was raised from the dead (1 Corinthians 15:3,4). Paul refers to qualities in His character; "the meekness
and gentleness of Christ" (2 Corinthians 10:1; see Matthew 11:29), the mind of Christ Jesus who "emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men,... humbled himself and became obedient unto death (Philippians 2:7,8). He also reveals a knowledge of his Lord's teachings. The teaching about divorce is given (1 Corinthians 7:10), and Paul distinguishes carefully between the authority of Christ's teaching and his own instructions. Paul quotes Jesus' description of the coming consummation. "This we declare to you by the word of the Lord ... The Lord himself will descend from heaven with a cry of command, with the archangel's call, and with the sound of the trumpet of God" (1 Thessalonians 4:15,16). There are other places in Paul's writing which indicate in him a familiarity with the teachings of His Lord. Paul also recounts the details of the Last Supper in the upper room, including the words of the Lord (1 Corinthians 11:23-26). To these historical facts which he had learned from the apostles themselves, as well as to his own experience of the risen Christ, Paul turned in considering the Mission of the Redeemer. Paul's testimony to the love of God did not begin with an appeal to some trance-like vision but to facts which had taken place in Palestine through the initiative of God and which had come within the knowledge of ordinary simple people. True, something else beyond their mere occurrence was necessary to give to the facts the significance which Paul placed upon them, since history can never be self-explanatory. For this, some judgment of the mind, some leap of faith, some committal to the moral insight are needed: but even here Paul is convinced that the facts concerning Jesus are themselves of such a nature as to quicken insight and stir up faith.

The human life of Jesus, His sharing the life of men at a point in history, was essential to Paul's interpretation of Christ's death. It was the meaning lying inherent in that humanity that made possible the benefits


of the death. It was "in the flesh" that Christ, for example, "condemned sin", and "in the body of the flesh" that God reconciled man to Himself. It was through His humanity that the Redeemer was able to identify Himself with man and in that identification was as His Representative able to redeem him. Dodd points out the importance of seeing the whole of Jesus' ministry as lying behind Paul's thought. It was the ministry of a Christ who has a history of His own, intimately connected at every stage with the history of man from start to finish; and who appears as an individual to share man's life at a point historically determined by His own working as hidden Spirit in humanity. That appearance on earth as an individual is the crisis in history both of Christ himself and of the humanity he saves and leads. The ministry of Jesus, therefore, culminating in His death, is essential to Paul's whole thought. If in certain aspects of his theology it is the death that bulks most largely -- because it seemed to him to be the purest and most moving expression of what the whole life meant -- he is quite aware that the ethical impulse given by the example and teaching of Jesus is the very stuff of the Christian life.\footnote{C.H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for Today (London: The Swarthmore Press, Ltd., 1920), p. 91.}

If the historical Jesus is necessary to Paul's thought, even more is the divine Christ essential to his faith. It was the Risen Christ whom Paul first knew in the encounter on the road to Damascus and who was primary in his experience. Paul saw Christ identifying Himself with man in His mission as Redeemer. He was fully aware, through his own experience as well as that which he had received, that in carrying through His mission Christ was the agent of God, the Son acting for the Father, in full agreement with the Father's will. Paul sees the Father and the Son as working inseparably in the mission to redeem. He speaks of God and of Christ in the closest relationship. Men "are justified by his grace as a gift through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward..." (Romans 3:21,25). "Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" (Romans 1:7). "We have peace with God through our Lord Jesus
Christ" (Romans 5:10). He refers to the kingdom "of Christ and of God" (Ephesians 5:5). On occasion he proclaims Christ Himself as one who willed to redeem. "Christ loved us and gave himself for us" (Ephesians 5:2). But most often the emphasis is upon the ministry of the Redeemer as the agent of the Father, the Son concurring in, and carrying out, the Father's will. The "God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" has "blessed us in Christ" (Ephesians 1:3). In fact, as Taylor says, "With all the insistence upon the atonement as the work of God in Christ, there is an intractable element of subordination in the functions which he assigns to the Son."1 Certainly it must be said that Paul never defines with clarity his total conception of the relationship of Father and Son. He does make clear that from beginning to end the Son acted with the Father to carry out the Father's will to redeem.

Pressed by the necessity brought on by circumstances in the church to whom he was writing, Paul does in Colossians give special attention to the place of Christ in relation to God. "He is the image of the invisible God, the first born of all creation; for in him all things were created, in heaven and on earth,... He is before all things, and in him all things hold together. He is the head of the body, the church; he is the beginning, the first born from the dead, that in everything he might be pre-eminent. For in him all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell, ..." (Colossians 1:15-19). In exhorting the Philippians to humility and obedience, he urges them to "Have this mind among yourselves, which you have in Christ Jesus, who though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself..." (Philip-

---

1Taylor, op. cit., p. 89.
plans 2:5-7). Alongside these statements, however, must go that of Paul in I Corinthians, "When all things are subjected to him then the Son himself will also be subjected to him..." (I Corinthians 15:27).

We conclude that throughout his epistles Paul sees Father and Son working together for man's salvation, the Son carrying out the will of the Father throughout His earthly ministry and beyond, including the benefits of His death. His ministry included His sacrificial life and His death. In His Person was the ministry of redemption.

You cannot separate the death of Christ from the life of Christ. When you think of the self-emptying which brought Christ to earth His whole life here was a living death. The death of Christ must be organic with His whole personal life and action.¹

B. The Mission of the Redeemer in His Death

Although Paul was aware of the implications for mankind of Christ's whole ministry, he placed his greatest emphasis upon the mission of the Redeemer in His death. The basis for this emphasis he received from the early church, which itself received it from the mind of Christ Himself. Paul developed the thought from this background in his own unique way, but at all times remained true to that fundamental fact which he had received and to his own experience of the living Christ.

1. The Mind of Christ Concerning His Mission

That His death was part of His mission as Redeemer, that He saw purpose in His suffering, that He understood His own death as God's will for Him, is clearly the mind of Christ as it is revealed to us in the Gospels. Immediately after Peter declared "Thou art the Christ, the Son of

the Living God," the Gospels portray Jesus as beginning to teach them of the necessity of suffering in the vocation of the Messiah. "From that time Jesus began to show his disciples that he must go to Jerusalem and suffer many things..., and be killed,..." (Matthew 16:21; see also Mark 8:31; Luke 9:22). The suffering and death were not to be the unfortunate outcome of His ministry among men but a definite, purposive, part of that ministry. When he spoke of the fulfillment of His ministry, it contained suffering and death. "And how is it written of the Son of Man, that he should suffer many things and be treated with contempt" (Mark 9:12)? "For he was teaching his disciples, saying to them, 'The Son of man will be delivered into the hands of man, and they will kill him; ...'" (Mark 9:31). Again in Mark 10:33 and following He speaks in the same vein. "For the Son of man also came... to give his life as a ransom for many" (Mark 10:45), a statement that we shall look at again below. At the Last Supper, as He gave the cup to the disciples, Jesus said, "This is my blood of the covenant" (Mark 14:24; see also Matthew 26:28; 1 Corinthians 11:25). Earlier at the Supper He declares "For the Son of Man goes as it is written of him" (Mark 14:21). Taylor suggests that all of these passages presuppose the thought in Isaiah 53, and that in referring to Himself as Son of Man Jesus connects that title with the thought of the Suffering Servant in Isaiah.

Behind this utterance [Luke 22:22] lies His identification of the Son of Man with the Suffering Servant; it is so firmly established in His thought that He can say of the Son of Man what, so far as the text of the Scripture is concerned, is true only of the Servant.

We shall look again in the various categories at Jesus' attitude

---

1 Luke says "For the Son of Man goes as it has been determined" (Lk. 22:22).

2 Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 113.
toward His death, and at the Passion-sayings of the Gospels, particularly in the light of Second Isaiah. Here we seek only to establish that Jesus understood His impending death as being not only inevitable but also a necessary aspect of His ministry and as a distinctive part of His mission.

Since we are in this chapter to discuss Paul's conception of being "in Christ," it is well to refer to that subject in our discussion of the mind of Christ concerning His death. He intended that there be a response on the part of men to His death whereby they would receive the benefits made possible by that death. The evidence indicates that he intended that men should share in the life He was giving up in their behalf and participate in His death. An example of this is found in Jesus' reply to the sons of Zebedee when they come to ask to be given places of special honor in Jesus' glory. "Are you able to drink the cup that I drink, or to be baptized with the baptism with which I am baptized?" When they reply in the affirmative, Jesus then says to them, "The cup that I drink you will drink; and with the baptism with which I am baptized you will be baptized;..." (Mark 10:35-40). Cullmann argues convincingly that Jesus from the beginning connected baptism with His death.

At the moment of his Baptism he receives the commission to undertake the role of the Suffering Servant of God, who takes on himself the sins of the people.... Jesus at the very moment when he is baptized... hears a voice which fundamentally declares: Thou art baptized not for thine own sins but for those of the whole people. For thou art he of whom Isaiah prophesied, that he must suffer representatively for the sins of the people. This means that Jesus is baptized in view of his death, which effects forgiveness for all men,.... Thus the Baptism of Jesus points forward to the end, to the climax of his life, the Cross, in which alone all Baptism will find its fulfillment. ... For him, to 'be baptized' from now on meant to suffer, to die for his people.1

Jesus' statement to James and John could be simply a prediction of their

martyrdom. But in the light of Gullmann's conclusion regarding baptism, 
Jesus could also be promising to the disciples that they were soon to be 
given the opportunity to participate in Christ's death and to share in the 
benefits of that death. If this possibility is granted, we find in Jesus 
the anticipation of what Paul means in the "in Christ" relationship.

That Jesus intended such a participation in His death is also in¬
dicated as we look at the sayings of Jesus at the Last Supper. According 
to Mark, He said, "Take; this is my body" when He gave the bread to them 
after blessing and breaking it (Mark 14:22). The breaking of the bread 
and the saying together suggest that Jesus was here interpreting His ap¬
proaching death and inviting the disciples to share in it with Him.

It now becomes clear that by His action and word Jesus intends the 
bread to be a means whereby the disciples may participate in the 
power of His surrendered life. ... It becomes a means for the com¬
munication of life, because it is invested by Jesus with new meaning 
and power. The life is His own, offered for men and made available 
for them.}

Jesus expected the disciples to appropriate His surrendered life into their 
lives and thereby receive the benefits of His death. Paul understood the 
Lord's Supper in this way as he shows when he says, "For as often as you 
eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he 
comes" (1 Corinthians 11:26).

A hint of the conception in the mind of Christ may be in Jesus'
promise, "For where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the 
midst of them" (Matthew 18:20). Even more does this conception so impor¬
tant to Paul appear to have a background in the discourse about the vine 
and the branches. "Abide in me, and I in you. ... He who abides in me, and 
I in him, he it is that bears much fruit, for apart from me you can do

1Taylor, op. cit., p. 124.
nothing" (John 15:4,5).

2. The Background of the Thought in the Early Church

We have seen already that Paul did not claim that his thought on the death of Christ was original, but emphasized that the Gospel he preached was one that he had received.\(^1\) While his contribution to the understanding of Christ's death is distinctive, he believed that thinking was in line with the interpretation of Christ's death in the early church. He took and developed those ideas which he received concerning that death and its significance. He claims that he did not receive the gospel which he preached, but that it came through a revelation of Christ (Galatians 1:11). In the same letter, however, he declares that he "laid before" James and Cephas and John "the gospel which I preach among the Gentiles," and that it was approved by them (Galatians 2:1-10). In setting forth that which he had received and which he delivered to them, he concludes with "Whether then it was I or they, so we preach and so you believed" (1 Corinthians 15:11). Dodd believes that in addition to the summary of 1 Corinthians 15 Paul is quoting from a formulated Gospel which would have been recognized by his readers in Romans 1:1-4 and 8:31-34.\(^2\)

The sermons in the first part of Acts, while not antedating Paul in their present form and context, give reason for belief that they contain the essential content of the kerygma of the church before Paul.\(^3\) In those sermons, Christ's death is mentioned as an essential part of the Christian preaching.

---

1See p. 1; 1 Cor. 15:3.


It does not appear, however, that the early church had gone to any
length in interpreting the significance of that death, except that it was
"for our sins" (1 Corinthians 15:3). Manson comments on this fact:

It would seem from the evidence of Acts that the preaching largely
limited itself to the stressing of the divine necessity of the event
and to the citing of Old Testament prophecies in which the will of
God had come to light. ... For the evidence of a more inward appreci-
ation of the meaning of the Messiah's death on the part of the prim-
itive church we have, however, to look away from Acts to Paul.¹

Manson goes on to consider what Paul means by speaking of that which he
"received" in 1 Corinthians 15:3. He concludes that the thing which he
received was the interpretation of Jesus' death as "for our sins."

The meaning, therefore, of the First Corinthians passage would seem
to be that the primitive Christian community taught as an article
of faith that 'Christ died for our sins,' and supported this belief
by calling the evidence of Holy Scripture, above all of Isaiah 53."²

Paul also tells the Corinthians that he "received" that account of
the Last Supper which he "delivered" to them. This received tradition
must have contained the words interpreting the significance of Christ's
blood spilled in death as a sign of a "new covenant" (1 Corinthians
11:23-26).

Despite his originality, Paul shared in what might be called a
treasury of thought on the Death of Jesus which was common in
varying degrees to all Christians, and he applied to that event
certain interpretations that were current coin, as it were, in
the primitive church.³

3. Paul's Contribution in Explaining That Which He Had Received.

With Christ's own appearance to him in his conversion, and the

¹William Manson, Jesus The Messiah (London: Hodder and Stoughton,
1943), p. 123.

²Ibid., p. 124.

truth that he received from the church, Paul developed his interpretation
of the death of Christ. Paul was convinced that there was that in what
happened on Calvary which was beyond measure in its significance for the
salvation of mankind. He sought to express this conviction as he wrote to
the various churches. His letters were usually in answer to specific ques-
tions being often on ethical rather than theological issues. His teaching
is given in application to some particular type of ignorance or a moral
problem. Since this is the nature of the epistles, it is not surprising
that we find no specific formulated statement of Paul's belief and preach-
ing about Christ's death. Instead we have references to this belief and
teaching set down as the apostle sought to give light to individual prob-
lems in particular churches. Since he saw the death of Christ as primary
in its significance for salvation, implications of that death continually
came to Paul as he wrote about matters concerning the Christian life.
Again and again, he speaks to a situation with reference to Christ and His
redeeming death. "He exhausted the resources of metaphor and analogy in
trying to express the intuition of the Divine nature which flashed upon
his soul from the cross of Christ."¹

Rising above the multitude of metaphors and analogies which Paul
used, however, are the dominant categories by which Paul sought to inter-
pret the saving significance of Christ's death. In the development of his
categories Paul uses metaphor and analogy in abundance, but the categories
themselves are much more than any of these. Through these categories we
come to a greater understanding of Paul's interpretation of Christ's death.
Within each category is an attempt to set forth the means of understanding

¹H.A.A. Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles (London: Duckworth,
1919), p. 23.
Christ's death as against a given context or background within man's experience. Not that Paul consciously set out to systematically develop a doctrine of the death of Christ, or even to explain in a systematic way the thought of each category. Rather, his thinking on the death of Christ as he set it forth very unsystematically in his letters to the churches falls into certain dominant categories of thought. Paul took these categories from his own religious background. They were categories of thought in Judaism. But interpreted in the light of his experience of Jesus Christ, they took on new life and meaning. Stewart says:

The old categories begin to live and breathe with a vitality that Rabbinism never put in them. ... All the old conceptions were still there, but shining now with a light how different, how transfiguring, how wonderful! ... The saints of the Old Testament had seen God, and to Paul in his great hour outside Damascus the same vision had now come: ... all the majesty, the spirituality, and the urgency of the Old Testament revelation have passed right over into Paul's proclamation of the good news of Christ. ¹

The interpretation we find in Paul concerning the cross of Christ cannot be catalogued under any one category of thought. "The apostle could never be content to confine the interpretation of so unfathomable an aspect of the self-manifestation of God to men within the framework of any single formula."² It is only as we take these various dominant categories together and consider the various facets of each one that we can understand what Paul believed about the Cross.

It is necessary therefore in this study of the dominant categories in Paul's thought on the death of Christ to consider each category in itself and as separated from the other categories. It is equally necessary, however, to keep in mind that the death on the Cross is explained only as we

¹Stewart, op. cit., pp. 40, 41.
²Kennedy, op. cit., p. 132.
consider all the categories as together explaining the one act. They are all attempts to explain in different ways the revelation of God's grace in Christ for man. The death on the Cross was a once-for-all act and the results of that death were for each man a single experience. That is to say, man does not experience one time the death of Christ as "justification" and another time as "redemption." It is one act with one result, but to be fully understood as we look at it from different angles of perspective through consideration of the dominant categories of thought in which Paul's explanation is developed.

That the categories are not to be considered separately in their explaining fully man's individual experience of the Cross is illustrated by the fact that Paul frequently links together various expressions of the different categories. On one occasion in his writing a category will be linked with one category and again at a different place with a different category. For example, in Romans 3:21-26, we shall find references to the categories of justification, redemption, and sacrifice woven together in one statement on the saving death of Christ. In Romans 5 we have reference to justification, reconciliation and sanctification, to redemption, to sacrifice, and to representation. In Ephesians 1:7 redemption, sacrifice and justification are linked. These examples illustrate our contention that Paul employed the various categories of thought to explain the one event. Each category of thought contributes to the understanding of the tremendous significance which Paul saw in the Cross. As we consider all the dominant categories of Paul's thought we shall more fully understand his doctrine of the death of Christ.
C. The "In Christ" Relationship

In order to fully comprehend the significance of the death of Christ for Paul it is necessary to turn to a conception which plays an important part in Paul's interpretation of the Cross as it enters into the experience of men. This is the thought of "faith-union" with Christ, or of being, as a result of faith, "in Christ." We shall see that this conception enters into the development of thought in the categories as the means by which the results defined in the categories are brought into the experience of men.

Paul's use of the "in Christ" conception is illustrated in the following quotations: "But whatever gain I had, I counted as loss because of the surpassing worth of knowing Christ Jesus my Lord. For his sake I have suffered the loss of all things, and count them as refuse, in order that I may gain Christ and be found in him" (Philippians 3:7-9). "I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me; and the life I now live in the flesh, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me" (Galatians 2:20,21).

"Therefore, if anyone is in Christ, he is a new creation; the old has passed away, behold the new has come" (2 Corinthians 5:17). In the opening paragraphs of Ephesians, Paul uses the phrase "in Christ" or "in Him" again and again: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has blessed us in Christ ..., even as he chose us in him.... In him we have redemption through his blood,.... In him... we who first hoped in Christ have been destined and appointed to live for the praise of his glory. In him you also... were sealed with the promise of the Holy Spirit...." (Ephesians 1:3,4,7,11,13,15). These are but a few of the many times the apostle speaks in terms of this relationship.
We have above\(^1\) seen roots of this thought in the mind of Christ. Now we must ask what Paul means by it. The conception certainly contains the thought of communion with Christ, but communion on the most intimate basis. It is a spiritual fellowship, deep and continuing, with the living Christ, such as began for Paul on the Damascus road. It is an entering so completely into the life of the Redeemer that the believer understands himself to be sharing His life with Him. The man in Christ lives in an entirely new spiritual environment. He has, in a spiritual sense been created all over again through his experience in Christ.

Christ is the redeemed man's new environment. He has been lifted out of the cramping restrictions of his earthly lot into a totally different sphere, the sphere of Christ. He has been transplanted into a new soil and a new climate, and both soil and climate are Christ. His spirit is breathing a nobler element. He is moving on a loftier plane.\(^2\)

This conception of Paul has sometimes been referred to as a Pauline mysticism. If by this is meant the idea of the mystical absorption of the personality of the believer into the deity, the word does not describe the "in Christ" relationship. Although "it is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me," Paul never loses the sense of his own responsibility or the uniqueness of his own personality. There is also a social experience involved in the phrase for Paul as we shall see below. In another sense, as Kennedy points out, the "in Christ" conception is a Pauline mysticism. If by mysticism we mean that contact between the human and the Divine which forms the core of the deepest religious experience, but which can only be felt as an immediate intuition of the highest reality and cannot be described in the language of psychology, the emphasis is thoroughly justified.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\)See p. 26.

\(^2\)Stewart, op. cit., p. 157.

\(^3\)Kennedy, op. cit., p. 122.
Again and again Paul comes back to the impact on his own life and on that of the Christian which resulted from the experience of oneness with the exalted Christ.

Paul closely relates the "in Christ" experience with Christ's death as will be seen in the examples quoted above. It is by virtue of the believer's being "in Christ" that he participates in the benefits of Christ's death for his life. Without this conception the categories in which he interprets the Cross could be cold and objective. Within the thought of faith-union with the Crucified they become intensely personal. That which Christ accomplished was not something external and objective only, to be contemplated and considered, but also something vitally real to be personally experienced by the believer. Christ is not only the ground of the Christian life but the realm of it. Man not only believes in Him and the accomplishments of His death, but man is "in Christ," enjoying an inner life of communion with Him.

The union with Christ by which man receives the benefits of Christ's ministry was the result on man's part of faith. Faith and union with Christ are inseparable ideas in Paul. "Probably it is not too much to suggest," Denney says, "that in these two ideas - that of 'faith' and that of being 'in Christ' - we have here... a clue to the terms on which all Christian faith, and most signally the death of Christ, as the apostle interprets it, have their place and efficacy in the life of man." ¹ The Gospel, Paul declares, is "the power of God for salvation to everyone who has faith,..." (Romans 1:16). We are justified "by faith" (Romans 5:1; Galatians 2:16; 3:24). It is by grace that we have been saved "through faith"

(Ephesians 2:8), and it is "through faith" that Christ dwells in our hearts (Ephesians 3:17). Particularly in the passage, Romans 3:21 and following, he emphasizes the necessity of faith on the part of man in connection with Christ's death. "The righteousness of God" has been manifested "through faith in Jesus Christ" (Romans 3:22). Sinful men are justified by God's grace as a gift, "through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as an expiation by his blood to be received by faith" (Romans 3:21, 25). Here Paul links directly three of the dominant categories with being "in Christ" and "by faith." It is by being in Christ by means of faith that the Christian can feel himself justified, can receive the benefits of Christ's redemption, and can see himself as participating in Christ's sacrifice. This is not to say, of course, that the benefits procured by Christ's death are real only where there is faith. They are real because they are God's activity; they are accepted by faith, made a part of the individual believer's life. In this particular passage the main emphasis is on the word faith. Paul has led into it by saying that the righteousness of God in which men are justified "has been manifested apart from the law" (Romans 3:21). The new way of life made possible by God as described in verses 21 and 25 is not on the basis of law and obedience to it, but upon the basis of faith alone. The emphasis is particularly pronounced as Paul repeats it three times: "through faith" in Jesus Christ for all who believe; to be received "by faith," and for "him who has faith."

In Galatians we find this same emphasis. Speaking personally Paul says, "For I through the law died to the law, that I might live to God. I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me; and the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me" (Galatians 2:20). Here
Paul puts the idea of union with Christ in a somewhat different way, but with the same significance. Instead of his being "in Christ," here it is Christ who lives in him. The background of the thought is again his attitude toward the law. Before Christ had been "in him," the old Paul had sought to claim God's favor by mastery of the law, by what he himself could do. Now he sees the new Paul as being mastered by Christ, united with the Son of God whose death was to bring God's favor to him, to be received by faith. For, Paul says, "if justification were through the law, then Christ died to no purpose" (Galatians 2:21).

The believing man was in such real communion with his Lord that he participated in the death and resurrection and new life of Christ. "For if we have been united with him in a death like his, we shall certainly be united with him in a resurrection like his. We know that our old self was crucified with him..." (Romans 6:5,6). "But if we have died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him" (Romans 6:8). "You have died to the law through the body of Christ" (Romans 7:4). "We suffer with him in order that we may also be glorified with him" (Romans 8:17). "We are convinced that one has died for all; therefore all have died" (2 Corinthians 5:14). "In him also you were circumcised with a circumcision made without hands...; and you were buried with him in baptism, in which you were also raised with him..." (Colossians 2:11,12). "With Christ you died to the elemental spirits..." (Colossians 2:20). "You have died, and your life is hid with Christ in God" (Colossians 3:3). "If we have died with him we shall also live with him..." (2 Timothy 2:11). The union was so complete in spirit and will and in moral experience that that which Christ endured became also man's experience.

Finally, we must note also that there was a community emphasis in
Paul's faith-union conception. Duncan emphasizes this point when he says, writing on Galatians 3:14:

'In Christ' means more than 'by Christ's agency'; it implies that Christ and those who are his are linked together in an indissoluble union. This union, moreover, is not the directly personal one between the believer and his Lord. Rather it is implied that Christ and His people form a corporate fellowship, so that to be 'in Christ' means to be a member of a religious fellowship which draws its very life from Christ.¹

So Paul says "if a man is in Christ he is a new creation" (2 Corinthians 5:17), and also "you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Galatians 3:28), and "as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Corinthians 15:22). An individual experience, being "in Christ" is also to have discovered true community.

When, then, Paul speaks in terms of faith-union with Christ, he is touching on the essential experience of Christ in the life of the Christian.

CHAPTER THREE

THE CATEGORY OF JUSTIFICATION, RECONCILIATION AND SANCTIFICATION

We shall consider first a category in Paul's interpretation of Christ's death which has three distinct aspects. No one of the facets in the development of this category of thought - justification, reconciliation, or sanctification - is complete, or has its full meaning, except as it is understood in its relation to the other two aspects of the one thought.

Some scholars have indicated an opinion that that which this category does for man in his relationship with God can be brought together and described in the term "forgiveness." Knox, for example, in writing of justification and reconciliation, says "It is clear that with these two terms, Paul is seeking to represent the meaning of forgiveness."¹ But it will become apparent as we search out Paul's meaning in this category, we believe, that to equate the thought described by Paul to forgiveness is to over-simplify Paul's whole conception of man's relationship with God. Forgiveness is implied within the scope of the category, but the idea of forgiveness alone fails to reveal the full vista of that which Christ accomplished in His death as justification, reconciliation, and sanctification.²

The background of the category is the state of man in his relationship with God, and man's awareness of that state, before Christ enters into

the picture. It is a state of estrangement, of enmity and division between man and his Creator. Man knows himself to be guilty of sinning against God, in spite of his efforts to appear otherwise, knows himself to be unable to do the perfect will of God. As a result of this knowledge he finds himself at once in rebellion against God and in fear of the consequences of that rebellion. Before him looms the thought of the Final Judgment when he is called before the court of the Great Judge, and knows that only one verdict is, in all justice, possible.—Guilty!

The changing of this situation into one of hope for man under God is what Paul understood to be accomplished by Christ through His death. The results of that death, in this category of thought, are conceived of in a way in which each of the terms Paul uses contains a thought which contributes to the whole. Yet at the same time the category is a unified thought. What is needed is for man and God to be reconciled. But this estrangement is the consequences of sin, and any reconciliation must take into account this fact. Hence the need for what Paul calls justification. For the reconciliation to be complete there must be a change in the believer.

The reconciling activity of God... is itself a sanctifying activity, in the sense that the believer is set apart and consecrated to holy ends and purposes; but in its individual and communal aspects this divine hallowing needs to be worked out in a life of ethical and spiritual progress.¹

Sanctification, then is another side of this one thought and related to the death of Christ.

While Paul in his various letters speaks of justification itself, reconciliation itself, sanctification itself, they are not in themselves independent categories of thought. He does not conceive it as possible that

¹Ibid., p. 144, 145.
man could be justified only, without being reconciled, or that the reconciliation could occur without the creation of a basis of righteousness for it that justification affords, or that man's sanctification is possible without his being justified and reconciled. But each of these terms represents a distinct phase in the understanding of God's saving act in Christ. They are one "action" and evoke one response; but to be fully understood, they must be described and seen separately. We may put the results of Christ's death for man in this category of thought in this way. Justification is that which Christ accomplished in His death which constructs a foundation of righteousness and truth and makes possible the building of reconciliation between God and man, and the result of that reconciliation is the sanctification of man under God in the Christian life.

A. JUSTIFICATION

The problem for man as Paul conceives it is this. God was a righteous God, and a God who desired fellowship with His creature, man. His very nature of righteousness, however, demanded that those upon whom He would bestow His favor deserve that favor and be righteous on their part also. Where His creatures were not righteous the justice which was involved in His righteous nature demanded that they be subjected to God's righteous reaction against sin, His wrath, and that He exercise His judgment upon them. "We know that the judgment of God rightly falls upon those who do such things" (Romans 2:2).

Mankind as a whole certainly was not righteous. Whether Jew or Gentile, man was a sinner, "under the power of sin" (Romans 3:9, see Romans 1-3). To Paul's mind, based on his own experience, there was no possibility that man, on his own resources, could ever achieve a completely
righteous life whereby he could be considered worthy of God's favor. The presence of the law for the Jew made the situation even more complex. It opened the possibility that man depend on works of the law with a view to winning God's favor. At the same time it demanded perfect fulfillment before man could be righteous according to its standards, when it was impossible for man to fulfill those standards. The law led only to pride and sin. "For no human being will be justified in his sight by works of the law since through the law comes knowledge of sin" (Romans 3:20). Man deserved only God's wrath at all times and, finally, on the Day of Judgment. "But by your hard and impenitent heart you are storing up wrath for when God's righteous judgment will be revealed" (Romans 2:5).

Yet God in His mercy and love wanted to save man from his deserved fate and have him in true fellowship with Himself. "Do you not know that God's kindness is meant to lead you to repentance" (Romans 2:4b)? How was it possible for God to have fellowship with man, when man was sinful, and yet be consistent with His own righteousness and not open to the charge of compromising that righteousness? Or, how was it possible for sinful man to be righteous before God, so that God could have fellowship with him?

It was in answer to this basic problem that Paul formulated his doctrine of justification. He saw God as taking that step on His own initiative which bridged that chasm between the righteousness of God and the sinfulness of man. Christ accomplished God's purpose in the act of dying by which men through faith in Him could be regarded as righteous and therefore ready for fellowship with God without God having to compromise His righteous nature. The Gospel promises a righteousness which is just what man needs to remedy his seemingly hopeless situation. It is still God's
righteousness and not man's, but it is made available to man. And it was also "to show God's righteousness, because in his divine forbearance he had passed over former sins; it was to prove at the present time that he himself is righteous and that he justifies him who has faith in Jesus" (Romans 3:25,26).

The understanding of the unity of Paul's doctrine of justification is made somewhat more complicated for us in that the terms which Paul uses are from one Greek root, while in English we use different words to translate two aspects of his thought. Thus, the words right, righteous, and righteousness and the words just, justify, and justification have different etymological backgrounds in English but the Greek words which they translate are all from one Greek root. To achieve in English the effect of the significance of Paul's vocabulary we should have to coin some such words as the verb "regard-righteous" or "declare-righteous" for "justify" and a noun "regarded-righteousness" or "declared-righteousness" for "justification." Even then we would not be free from the difficulty of finding out the exact meaning of these words for Paul, as Taylor points out in discussing the verb, δικαιοσύνη.

'To declare righteous', 'to deem righteous', and even 'to treat as righteous', all tend to suggest the thought of an ethical fiction: someone who is not righteous is said to be righteous. There is thus the suggestion of an innuendo in these renderings. This difficulty is real, but it is exegetical, not lexical; it can be met only by examining closely the relevant New Testament passages.1

The significance of this emphasis on etymology we shall see as we proceed.

The metaphor which Paul uses largely in this phase of his explanation of God's act in Christ is the image of the law court, and the language

1Ibid., pp. 33,34.
he uses to express his conviction of God's saving grace is legal language. Sinful man is brought before the court charged with breaking God's law. God is the Judge who hands down a verdict of acquittal. Man is declared free of the charge, and henceforth to be regarded as righteous as he is "in Christ."

1. The Old Testament Background of Justification

The background of Paul's doctrine of justification is to be found in the Old Testament. In fact, Paul's understanding of the problem in man's religious experience necessitating the formulation of that doctrine came from his own experience as a Jew under the law.

In thinking of justification in the Old Testament we must start with the idea of righteousness, and, specifically, the righteousness of God. God is the creator of justice, and as a just, or righteous, God, is bound to act justly. The righteousness of God is found in His just activity, an activity which leads to his justification of men. Righteousness in the Old Testament, particularly in reference to God, is not primarily an ethical term. Snaith points out, for example, that for the eighth century prophets the ethical emphasis was essentially secondary. To the extent that those prophets may be considered ethical prophets, it is because their understanding of the nature of God and His treatment of His creation, which was their primary concern, led them to the matter of ethics. This, in turn, is illustrated in their attitude toward sin. The prophets considered sin not primarily in the ethical sense of transgressing a moral code but in the religious sense of rebellion against God.

No man can talk about sin as being rebellion against God unless he is religious. Such a man realizes that religion primarily is a matter of relationship with God, and secondarily is a matter of ethics. The religious man is also ethical, if and when his conception of God is ethical. These religious prophets of the eighth
century were ethical prophets because their knowledge of God demanded it.\(^1\)

The righteousness of God in the Old Testament is a religious concept, a description of God's nature and His activity, and the ethical conception appears out of that. The nature of God was described not by outlining the various ethical qualities of His character but by recalling His saving activity through history. God was considered as being active in the world, and He was to be known through that activity, by what He had done in His relationships with the world He created, and particularly with man. He had acted at the Creation, and was constantly active in His created world, particularly in relation to His chosen people, Israel. His righteousness was understood as being seen in His activity in the world; it was the just way in which He acted and it was that which He established as the way life should be. He would judge the world in accordance with that standard which He had set. "He will judge the world with righteousness, and the peoples with equity" (Psalm 98:9). The various statutes and ordinances of the law, then, were essential because they were what the righteousness of God established in the world as the way people should live. "And it will be righteousness for us, if we are careful to do all His commandments before the Lord our God, as He commanded us" (Deuteronomy 6:25).

We have said above that Paul's development of his doctrine of justification was in terms of the court of law. With the conception of the righteousness of God as we have suggested it, it will be seen that the language of the law court could best describe the situation of man before God. Righteousness in the Old Testament had primarily this forensic sense.

---

Since God in His righteousness had established certain norms, questions 
of right and wrong in man and his relationship with God were regarded from 
a legal point of view. They were matters to be judged, as to their right-
ness or wrongness as against the norm.

This is characteristic of the Hebrew conception of righteousness 
in all its developments: whether it be a moral quality or a religi-
ous status it is apt to be looked on as in itself controvertible 
or incomplete until it has been confirmed by what is equivalent to 
a judicial sentence.¹

This thought led to the conception that God was bound in inflexible deter-
mination to punish those people who transgressed. "And I will make justice 
the line and righteousness the plummet" (Isaiah 28:17).

Righteousness from the point of view of man, then, had this forensic sense in the Old Testament. Over against the God who acts righteously 
is the condition of man in relation to that God-established righteousness. 
Questions of right or wrong in the conduct of man were looked upon as mat-
ters to be settled by the equivalent to a judicial sentence. In the light 
of the righteousness established by the activity of God, it was asked, can 
the defendant be declared innocent or guilty? The matter was one to be 
settled by a Judge. As Judge God would distribute the rewards and punish-
ments. He would acquit or convict. In the relationship between God and 
His people, God was sometimes portrayed as the plaintiff in the legal 
action, pressing the charge against the defendant, Israel. The Lord says, 
in Second Isaiah, "Put me in remembrance, let us argue together; set forth 
your case, that you may be proved right. Your first father sinned and your 
mediators transgressed against me" (Isaiah 43:26). Usually, however, in 
the Old Testament, God was represented as the Supreme Judge who dispensed

¹J. Skinner, "Righteousness in Old Testament," A Dictionary of the 
Bible, ed. James Hastings (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902), IV, 
273.
justice to His creation, man. The verdict He pronounced was righteous because He is righteous. When Abraham pleads for mercy on Sodom, he appeals to God by asking, "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" (Genesis 18:25). Jeremiah addresses Him as "O Lord of hosts, who judgest righteousness, who triest the heart and the mind" (Jeremiah 11:20), and in the Psalms He is often referred to as judging the world in righteousness (Psalms 9:8, 96:13, 98:9).

The righteous man, then, would be the man who had been acquitted before the court of the Supreme Judge. Again, this thought is basically forensic in the Old Testament, although there are occasions where persons are called 'righteous' in the sense of living blameless lives. 2

With such a view of the righteousness of men, it would follow that the way for man to achieve righteousness was by being "justified," "declared righteous" by a judge, in the view of the Old Testament, of God the Judge. "And the Lord commanded us to do all these statutes. ... And it will be righteousness for us, if we are careful to do all this commandment before the Lord our God, as he commanded us," are the words by which the Israelite is told to instruct his son in Deuteronomy (6:25).

Out of this concept developed the thought of God in His righteousness acquitting or justifying men and thereby bringing salvation. Writing on the meaning of the Hebrew words "cedhaq" and "cedhaqah," Schrenk says that their meaning certainly includes the thought of consistent normal behaviour on the part of God ... Thus God's righteousness is manifested first in that he rules according to the covenant in fellowship with his people. This concrete, rather than abstract, way of conceiving it means that it includes both a forensic and a soteriological element. ... The

---

1Ibid., IV, 279.

2Noah in Gen. 6:9; 7:1; David in 1 Kings 3:6; Israel in Deut. 4:4.
thought of judicial righteousness, with retribution, rewards and punishments, cannot be separated from the rule of him who is both King and Judge. Yahweh's judicial righteousness secures justice for his oppressed people in the proceedings against their conquerors; ... 1

With the view that man's trouble in his relationship with God was his guilt through transgressing God's law and meriting God's judgment and condemnation went naturally that the judge could adjust the relationship as he pronounced the verdict. God could justify those with whom He wanted fellowship, providing certain conditions were met. Hosea, writing in the figure of marriage, records God as saying, "And I will betroth you to me for ever; I will betroth you to me in righteousness and in justice, in steadfast love, and in mercy" (Hosea 2:19). God not only revealed His righteousness by His righteous activity, but revealed also His way of salvation and His desire that men receive the gift of that salvation. The Psalmist cries out "In thy righteousness deliver me; and rescue me; incline thy ear to me, and save me. I" and "My mouth will tell of thy righteous acts, of thy deeds of salvation all the day, for their number is past my knowledge" (Psalms 71:2,15). This relationship between righteousness and salvation is shown clearly, as Schrenk points out 2 when in the Septuagint δικαιοσύνη is used to translate "hesedh" where the usual translation is ἔλεος. The RSV translates "hesedh" as "steadfast love" as against the AV's "mercy". As pertaining to God this translation is found in Genesis 24:27; 32:10 and in Exodus 15:13; 34:7. 3 It can be seen that such a thought of the kinship between righteousness and salvation would be carried along naturally when the transition from legal terms to personal terms was made.


2 Ibid., p. 30,31.

3 In Exodus 34:7, δικαιοσύνη and ἔλεος are employed together.
God's righteousness was a righteousness in which the desire to bring righteousness to man was an inherent factor. God the righteous is, then, also God the justifier of men, willing salvation in men. His "salvation will be forever" and His "deliverance will never be ended" (Isaiah 51:6; see also 51:5,6) and, from the negative side, "I will not acquit (AV justify) the wicked" (Exodus 23:7). In the Old Testament, though, only the righteous have fellowship with God, for only the righteous are acquitted. The Old Testament never reaches the stage of thought about justification where it could say anything like what Paul says when he proclaims "while we were yet helpless, at the right time Christ died for the ungodly" (Romans 5:6), just as in its doctrine of sacrifice it never quite formulated the assertion that the sacrifice was efficacious for "sins with a high hand" but only for ritual sins.¹ The Old Testament, however, has an optimism about the possibility of fulfilling the law that Paul does not have.

In the development of religious thought which was a part of Judaism, the optimism for justification in the present faltered, and the thought of justification as pertaining to God's relationship with man came to be projected into a future fulfillment and salvation.²

When attention began to be focused upon a new age for fulfillment of religious hope and Divine intervention, a new emphasis began to be placed on God's share in justification or declaring righteous. ... It came to be part of the expectation of the Messianic Age, part of the content of the promised "salvation" that God would "justify" those who deserved it.³

The ideas which we shall see Paul taking up in the development of his doctrine of justification, that God is righteous and makes righteous, we have found in our discussion of the Old Testament background. From that

¹See Chapter V.

²This aspect of the thought of later Judaism provided the background for Paul's category of eschatology. See Chapter VIII.

³Scott, op.cit., p. 56.
background, but seen in the light of the revelation of God active in Christ's death on the Cross, Paul formulated his doctrine of justification. To that doctrine we now turn.

2. The Vocabulary of Justification

As we have earlier indicated, Paul's vocabulary of justification is largely confined to forms of one Greek root, and includes the nouns δικαιος, "righteous," and δικαιοσύνη, "righteousness," and the verb δικαίω, "regard righteous, justify." To understand Paul's meaning in using these words, we need to understand the usage of the same words in the Septuagint and the Hebrew which they translated. "While his language largely follows that of the LXX the Greek words are for him always coloured by their Hebrew associations." The Septuagint uses these words to translate the Hebrew expressions represented by derivatives of בְּלָע, — בְּלָע and בְּלָע generally correspond to δικαιος; בְּלָע and בְּלָע to δικαιοσύνη; and parts of the verb בְּלָע to δικαίω.

The word δικαιος in its Greek usage represents one who is correct according to the rules of society, one who observes δικη, custom or right. It is used, says Schrenk, for one who does his duty towards man and God, for one who observes legal norms, or of an innate quality of human nature. Basically it is a forensic term, denoting one who conforms to a standard, with the word containing no definition of what that standard may be. The first meaning mentioned from Schrenk, "one who does his duty towards man and God," shows how from its forensic basis it can be-


come a moral term and may have a reference to the discharge of obligation
to the gods and also to mutual relationships with men. It is not applied,
however, to the gods in Greek literature. "Least of all are the gods spo-
ken of as δίκαιος or their conduct and character conceived of as the stand-
ard of human conduct."1 Δικαιοσύνη in Greek usage is the character of the
δίκαιος, but usually more strictly related to justice. It is, according
to Dodd, the standard Greek term for social righteousness or justice.2

As with δίκαιος and δικαιοσύνη in their Greek usage, so with the
derivatives of the Hebrew בִּנְיָם, the sense is basically forensic, refer-
ing to being correct according to some established norm. But where in
the Greek classical literature its relation to the gods is nominal, in the
Hebrew, as one might expect, there is emphasis on that norm as established
by God, of the one who holds to the norm as righteous before God, and on
God's own righteousness. The standards are those established by God in
His covenant relation with His people, as found in His commandments and
ordinances. The righteous person is he who does justice to the claims made
upon him by God in this relationship. Righteousness is that state of act-
ing as righteous. God's righteousness is revealed in His dealing with
men strictly in relation to His commandments and ordinances. God is right-
eous because He does rightly in establishing those ordinances. Righteous-
ness is also attributed to those who had done or would do that which should
be done by established standards. As such, בִּנְיָם is used of persons
(Isaiah 32:1; 59:14; Ecclesiastes 7:15; Psalms 45:7; 138:2b) or of things
(Isaiah 1:21) or of relationships (Deuteronomy 1:16). The thought of jus-

1 Ernest D. Burton, The Epistle to the Galatians (Edinburgh: T & T.
Clark, 1921), p. 461.

2 C. H. Dodd, op. cit., p. 42.
tice in judging is also brought out in the use of the word. "But, O Lord of hosts, who judgest righteously" (בַּלָּיְךָ יְהוָה) (Jeremiah 11:20). "But with righteousness (בְּכָלַיְךָ יְהוָה) he shall judge the poor" (Isaiah 11:4). It is used specifically of God's righteousness as delivering righteous persons and punishing unrighteous persons.

The conception underlying this use of the term is that a righteous God must distinguish in his dealings between the wicked man, who neither fears God nor deals justly with men, and the righteous man, who though he be not perfect but is indeed often confessedly a sinner, yet relatively speaking lives uprightly and trusts in God.¹

¹Burton, op.cit., p. 462.
that, in Isaiah 56:1 referred to above, the word $\overbrace{\text{Israel}}$ translated in RSV as "my deliverance" is translated into the Septuagint as $\tau \Omega \varepsilon \sigma \varsigma$ $\mu \nu$ when $\varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \varsigma$ usually means "mercy." In the Septuagint, $\delta \kappa \alpha \iota \varsigma$, while essentially conforming to the regular Greek usage of the word, is linked closely with the thought of the judgment of God.

The idea of virtue gave place to the fundamental question of man's standing in the light of that judgment as made known in the Law. The rest of Greek literature means by $\delta \kappa \alpha \iota \varsigma$ one who does what is commonly thought to be right, fulfilling his duty as a citizen; here it means one who obeys God as a member of the theocratic community. It is this thought that is fundamental to the understanding of righteousness and justification in the Old Testament. Back of this connection to the word is the belief that God Himself is $\delta \kappa \alpha \iota \varsigma$. He Himself observes His own law, and never fails to fulfill it in His relationship with His creation. 1 Samuel 2:2 in the Septuagint differs slightly from the Hebrew text, and is translated:

There is no one holy like the Lord,  
There is no one righteous like our God,  
There is no one holy like Thee.

God is said to be just and holy also in Deuteronomy 32:4 in the Septuagint.

God is faithful, and has no injustice,  
Just ($\delta \kappa \alpha \iota \varsigma$) and holy is the Lord.

In the Rabbinical Judaism the Messiah is called righteous. This righteousness is attributed to him because he is in accord with the divine will (See Wisdom of Solomon, 2:18). In Enoch, righteousness is characteristic of the Messianic age (See Enoch 38:2; 53:6). In Wisdom of Solomon, "just" is applied to God to bring out His righteousness in making a distinction between the righteous and the wicked in his action toward them (Wisdom of Solomon 5:16; 12:16). Also in the Wisdom, the righteousness of

---

1Schrenk, op.cit., p. 16.
men is seen as the basis on which God accepts them (Wisdom of Solomon 14:7; 15:3).

We conclude then that the Greek words, δικαιος και κακος, and their Hebrew equivalents, in the Old Testament, both the Hebrew and the Septuagint and in the inter-testamental writings, are basically forensic terms but that the standard of comparison is seen as an ethical standard. Whereas the emphasis is at times on the material content of righteousness, we find also emphasis on righteousness as the divine requirement. In addition, we have seen that righteousness is ascribed to God both in that His own actions were righteous and that He took into account righteousness or the lack of it upon the part of man in His dealings with man, especially in bringing salvation to the righteous.

Paul begins from this background in his use of the terms δικαιος and δικαιοςιν. It is new, however, when Paul says that God's justice is shown in the death of Jesus which was "to prove at the present time that he himself was righteous..." (Romans 3:26). The thought of God as being righteous is in conformity with Old Testament thought but not the linking of righteousness to Christ's death as a proof of it. Background for this, however, may be found in Isaiah 40 to 55, especially in 53:11, "by his knowledge shall the righteous one, my servant, make many to be accounted righteous." Paul also, while basing his interpretation of justification in the belief that no man could be counted righteous, still makes a distinction between the righteous and the wicked which we saw in the background usage. "Why, one will hardly die for a righteous man - though perhaps for a good man one will dare even to die" (Romans 5:7). "For it is not the hearers of the law who are righteous before God, but the doers of the law that will be justified" (Romans 2:13). But Paul adds to this the
thought that no one is righteous in the complete sense because no one can fulfill the law. As to being righteous in the Old Testament sense of conforming to God’s standard, man cannot, according to Paul, be righteous. Paul goes back to the forensic basis of the term, and sees man as becoming righteous through a legal judgment on the part of God. “By one man’s obedience, many will be made righteous” (Romans 5:19). The meaning of this forensic judgment we shall discuss in further detail below, but for Paul the forensic application never replaced the moral connection of the word.

Paul’s whole doctrine of justification and his use of the word δικαιοσύνη are linked so closely together that we shall only briefly comment on his distinctive use of that word. Its meaning for him will come out as we discuss the doctrine of justification further. Paul sees the law as demanding righteousness but there is no “righteousness which is based on law” (Romans 9:31) because it is impossible for man to fulfill the law (Galatians 3:10 and following). Righteousness cannot be “earned”; it must be “bestowed.” The “righteousness of God” is found in Paul in the two emphases, (but always one thought), as that righteousness which God bestows on man by which man is accepted by Him, and that dynamic activity of God which is righteous.1 Paul’s thought on righteousness is put succinctly in Romans 10:3 when, speaking of the Jews, he says: “For, being ignorant of the righteousness that comes from God, and seeking to establish their own, they did not submit to God’s righteousness.” It is God’s nature of vindicating the impious that they might become righteous.

The essential point is that δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ means both the right-

---

1 For the former, see Ro. 5:17, 21; 4:3-11; 6:18-20; 8:10; 1 Cor. 1:30; 2 Cor. 7:11; 5:21; Eph. 6:11; Phil. 1:11; 3:9; for the latter, see Ro. 1:17; 3:21-25; 10:3.
eousness which God has, manifesting it in the act of salvation, and that which, as Saviour, he continually communicates; however the wording may vary, the fact remains that it is always ultimately his righteousness alone. The state of justification is in no sense a human achievement; it is the free gift of God, who draws man into his own righteousness.1

b. Δικαιοσύνη. The verb δικαιοσύνη means "set right," "regard right." It is the verb we translate "justify." In Greek and Hellenistic usage it means holding a thing to be right; doing justly, passing sentence, defending.2 The word is used most commonly in the Septuagint as equivalent of forms of ἰατρόν, usually the Piel and Hiphil forms, where it means "acquit" or "pronounce righteous." In the passive its meaning is "be shown righteous," "be justified." The forensic sense predominates in the use of this verb in the Septuagint.

It is especially clear that in Jewish-Greek usage δικαιοσύνη is purely, or all but purely, a moral forensic term, being used prevalingly in the sense "to recognize or declare as ἱατρόν either positively, 'to recognize as righteous,' or in the negative and restricted sense, 'to accept' with the implication of forgiveness.3

Paul uses δικαιοσύνη also in a forensic sense but also with moral implications. Although Greek verbs in -ος are generally causative and δικαιοσύνη should mean "cause to be right," "make right,"4 for Paul it is not causative but declarative - "declare right," "regard as right." Paul understands the act of justifying on the part of God as the acquittal of the sinner, putting him in the position of being blameless, on the ground of God's action in Christ. Here the Hebrew background of the word enters in in Paul's thought, including the thought of mercy and love with that

2Schrenk, op.cit., pp. 56, 57.
3Burton, op.cit., pp. 467, 468.
4See Dodd, op.cit., p. 28.
of God’s justifying action. But while Hebrew thought looked to the possibility of God’s salvation at the Last Judgment, Paul sees it as a quality of God’s action now. Believers "are justified by his grace as a gift."

3. God the Justifier

Since it involves the relationship between God and men, it is obvious that there are two sides from which Paul's doctrine of justification must be considered — justification from the side of God, the initiator and bestower of justification, the "Justifier"; and justification from the side of man, the recipient of justification, the "justified." Justification is the act of God in His redemptive work. Its ground is the ministry of Christ, especially in His death. That has occurred through which God justifies. Distinguished from this is man’s part if man is to be brought into right relations with God. Man must have faith in the righteousness of God as revealed in his action in the death of Christ. And although in one sense justification has occurred once for all, it is only when it is received by man in faith that it accomplishes its purpose in the life of individual man of bringing about the desired relationship between God and man. Until this distinction is made clear, says Taylor, it is misleading to say that we are justified by faith; for the faith in question is not faith in general, and not simple faith in God, but faith in God active in the redemptive ministry of Christ. It is equally misleading to say that we are justified by the death of Christ; for whatever the death achieved stands outside ourselves until there is a believing response which makes the achievement a vital element in our approach to God.¹

Justification is God’s gracious action in regarding men as righteous which comes to men as a consequence of their faith in His redemptive activity in the death of Christ. It is a single concept; but to fully

¹Taylor, op.cit., p. 48.
understand it, we must approach it from the two sides. Here we look at justification from the side of God the Justifier, and, in the next section, from the side of man the justified. In Romans 3:21-26, Paul says that the justifying act "was to show God's righteousness, because in his divine forbearance he had passed over former sins; it was to prove at the present time that he himself is righteous and that he justifies him who has faith in Jesus." We can distinguish in this statement three important points which have to do with God's act in justification: the necessity of 'proving' that God is righteous because he had passed over former sins; the righteousness of God as shown in His action; and that God justifies the one who has faith in Jesus, He being earlier pointed out as the One through Whose sacrificial death God justified.

a. 'Proving' God is Righteous. In the two verses, Romans 3:25,26, Paul twice declares that the act of Christ in His death on the Cross was to "show God's righteousness" or to "prove... that he himself is righteous," and that this was necessary "because in his divine forbearance he had passed over former sins." In developing his doctrine of justification Paul saw first the necessity of reiterating the Old Testament conception of God who created the world, who set forth laws and ordinances to govern the world, and who in perfect justice judged men as to their fulfilling his laws and ordinances. God had to react with righteousness to man's actions, and any righteousness of man had to be consistent with this view of a righteous God.

Alongside this view of the just God must go the conception of the wrath of God. Like His righteousness God's wrath is active, and is a part of His righteousness as it demands justice. God being righteous, to be wholly consistent within Himself, had to react against that which was un-
righteous, that which defied the laws and ordinances which He had decreed. This reaction against unrighteousness was God's wrath. "For the law brings wrath, but where there is no law there is no transgression" (Romans 1:15). The Jew was conscious of his violations of God's decrees and, thinking in the same forensic terms which we have discussed, looked to the Day of Judgment as a Day of Wrath in which God's wrath could be visited upon those who at the judgment were pronounced guilty. An example of this type of thought is in Jeremiah 36:7 where Jeremiah in ordering Baruch to read the scroll in the house of the Lord says, "It may be that their supplication will come before the Lord, and that every one will turn from his evil way, for great is the anger and wrath that the Lord has pronounced against this people." Paul took this thought and interpreted it in the light of Christ. God's pre-Day of Judgment wrath for him took the form of permitting men to have to face the consequences of their sins. "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and wickedness of men..." (Romans 1:18). When in Romans 1:24,26, he says that God "gave them up" to impurity and to dishonorable passions, Paul saw this as a visible manifestation of the wrath of God which would finally be brought fully on men. "And since they did not see fit to acknowledge God, God gave them up to a base mind and improper conduct" (Romans 1:28). Later on in the same epistle, after mentioning numerous examples of base conduct, Paul says, "We know that the judgment of God rightly falls upon those who do such things... But by your hard and impenitent heart you are storing up wrath for yourself on the day of wrath when God's righteous judgment will be revealed" (Romans 2:2,5). This wrath is visited upon all those who act unrighteously, no matter who they are, for "God shows no partiality" (Romans 2:11). "What we call the moral consequences of sin, Paul thought of as
the direct result of the judicial action of a living, personal God... .
The wrath of God is the active manifestation of his essential incapacity
to be morally indifferent, and to let evil alone.\textsuperscript{1}

God, then, in the face of the sin of man in breaking His laws and
ordinances, could do nothing else but show forth His wrath upon man if He
would remain consistent with Himself. Justice demands that God's wrath go
out against sinners. If God is to save men, and yet retain His righteous
character, that must happen which will allow men to be regarded as right-
eous and therefore worthy of God's favor. Somehow the situation brought
on by the divine wrath had to be changed. God's condemnation of the world
and its sin was the situation which made the Gospel necessary. As God's
wrath is just, and a part of His righteous activity, something had to be
done to remove from man the stigma brought on by his sin which made him
deserving of wrath. Only thus could God's righteousness be consistent.
God must do something to make His people righteous before He could save
them. God must be both "just" and "justifier" (Romans 3:26). It was God's
righteousness which was exhibited in His wrath which also demanded that He
bring righteousness to men.

\textbf{b. God's Righteousness in His Active Will.} Righteousness is God in
action, working out His righteous purpose. Since God is righteous it must
be shown forth in His judgment bringing to man either wrath or justifica-
tion (Romans 1:18; 3:26). Essential to the understanding of Paul's concep-
tion of God's righteousness is that he sees it as a dynamic creative power;
it is not only what God is, but also what God does. The thought is con-

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{1}R.H.Strachan, The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, The
pp. 116, 117.
\end{footnotesize}
tained in Romans 3:26, where Paul says of the death of Christ, "it was to prove at the present time that he himself is righteous and that he justifies him who has faith in Jesus." In His own character, God is just, righteous; it is put forth in His judgment. And in addition, God is also justifier; His righteousness goes out from Him to man and confers righteousness on men. "The controlling thought is that God must act, not in conformity to a standard external to Himself, but in harmony with His own nature as the God of righteousness, truth, and love."¹

The creative, dynamic nature of God's righteousness comes out in His relationship with man. He is concerned that His universe be governed under righteous principles and he is constantly working out these righteous principles. But we have seen above that in the Old Testament conception of righteousness there was a growing tendency to see it in its relationship to salvation, and Paul emphasizes this aspect of God's righteousness even more clearly. In order to be at once consistent in His righteousness and at the same time have His righteousness work out men's salvation, God took it upon Himself to do that which was necessary that men might be regarded as righteous and thus not liable to His wrath.

This is certainly a manifestation of God's mercy, but at the same time, it is an uncompromising putting forth of his righteousness as judge. It is attested in an act of atonement, and makes it impossible to misunderstand the 'passing over of sins done aforetime.' ... It says two things, has two sides - is, in fact, the marrying of judgment and mercy. When Paul sees God's act in the Cross, he is convinced with the absolute certainty of faith, that this is the final and effectual revelation of justice and mercy in one.²

It is to explain this that Paul uses the language of the law court. The judge returns a verdict of acquittal against the accused. God declares

²Schrenk, op.cit., p. 44.
a verdict of righteous upon the man "in Christ." But this forensic lan-
guage must not be pressed in working out all its logical implications.
"The sole purpose of the use of legal terminology is to make it clear that
the grace of God is not something arbitrary and capricious, but that it
operates according to the principles of the holy Covenant, and it is in per-
fected harmony with his justice."¹

c. God's Justification in the Death of Christ. How did God bring about
the justification of men and still show Himself to the world as righteous?
It was through the work of Christ, whereby without compromising His own
righteousness He brought men into a position in which they could be regarded as righteous. The idea of judgment is there. God "condemned sin in the
flesh, in order that the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in
us..." (Romans 8:3,4). The word condemned here refers back to "There is
now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus" (Romans 8:1).
"There is no condemnation for us because there was condemnation for sin.
God has placed sin under the sentence of death."² But that judgment is
taken upon Himself by Christ in His death. "For our sake he made him to
be sin who knew no sin, so that in him we might become the righteousness of
God" (2 Corinthians 5:21). "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law,
having become a curse for us..." (Galatians 3:13).

In His love and mercy God desired to have men in true fellowship
with Himself, rather than as victims of His wrath. The work of Christ in
justification is the clearing the way for this to be possible. Through

¹Ibid., p. 45.

²John Knox, "The Epistle to the Romans," The Interpreter's Bible,
IX, 507.
that which was accomplished by Christ in His death God conferred on man
the status of righteousness. They were "justified by his grace as a gift" (Romans 3:24). "God shows his love for us in that while we were yet sin-
ers Christ died for us. Since, therefore, we are now justified by his
blood, much more shall we be saved by him from the wrath of God" (Romans
5:8,9). Paul explains this in terms of Christ's death as being a repre-
sentative act by which He in His death took upon Himself the consequences
which would otherwise be man's lot as a result of sinning against God's
law. He contrasts the act of Christ in His death as one in which men can
have righteousness bestowed on them with the thought of Adam as represent-
ing the sinful nature of man.

But the free gift is not like the trespass. For if many died through
one man's trespass, much more have the grace of God and the free gift
in the grace of that one man Jesus Christ abounded for many. And
the free gift is not like the effect of that one man's sin. For the
judgment following one trespass brought condemnation, but the free
gift following many trespasses brings justification. If because of
one man's trespass, death reigned through that one man, much more will
those who receive the abundance of grace and the free gift of right-
eousness reign in life through the one man Jesus Christ. Then as one
man's trespass led to condemnation for all men, so one man's act of
righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all men. For as by one
man's disobedience many were made sinners, so one man's obedience many
will be made righteous (Romans 5:15-19).

Just how the death of Christ effects this justification, from the
God-ward point of view, what there is about that death wherein God could
accomplish His purpose of conferring on men the status of righteousness,
Paul explains in different ways. His conviction appears to be that God's
righteousness and His will to justify men required that Christ should suf-
er the consequences of sin (2 Corinthians 5:21).

Christ by God's will so identified himself with sinful men that in
some way, Paul senses, he became involved with their sin; he helped
them not by standing aloof and giving them directions as to what
they should do, but by entering so completely into their situation
that he stood in their place, shared their lot, and grappled with
the problem for them. Only in virtue of so vital a connection with men could the reverse working take place, in which, on the basis of what Christ did in his death and resurrection, we sinful men were enabled to become the righteousness of God, i.e. to receive this righteousness as a gracious gift from God.1

In this way God could show His attitude toward sin and, at the same time, deliver man from the condemnation which was sin's logical and just consequence. That particular characteristic which Christ exhibited in His death which, as it represented all men who are united with Him by faith was His obedience (Romans 5:19). "And being found in human form he humbled himself and rendered that perfect obedience to God that man could not render."

Thereby He made it possible for men to be justified before God. "It will be reckoned to us who believe in him that raised from the dead Jesus our Lord, who was put to death for our trespasses and raised for our justification."2

4. Man the Justified

For a full understanding of Paul's doctrine of justification we must see as alongside that aspect of it which we have just been considering the effect of justification of man. Here we have set forth by Paul the fulfillment of God's purpose in justification in the life of man. Man accepts the benefits of Christ's death into his own life by his faith. On this aspect of the doctrine we can quote from Paul the following passages:

"In it (the Gospel) the righteousness of God is revealed through faith for faith; ..." (Romans 1:17). "But now the righteousness of God has been manifested apart from law, although the law and the prophets bear witness to it,

---

1Floyd V. Filson, "The Second Epistle to the Corinthians," The Interpreter's Bible, X, 344.

2See p. 201 for explanation of the apparent division between the benefits of the death and the resurrection.
the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all who believe" (Romans 3:21,22). "He God justifies him who has faith in Jesus" (Romans 3:26). "For we hold that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law" (Romans 3:28). "Therefore, since we are justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Romans 5:1). "We ourselves, who are Jews and not Gentile sinners, yet who know that a man is not justified by works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Christ Jesus, in order to be justified by faith in Christ, and not by works of the law, because by works of the law shall no one be justified. ... I do not nullify the grace of God, for if justification were through the law, then Christ died to no purpose" (Galatians 2:15-16,21). "For through the Spirit, by faith, we wait for the hope of righteousness" (Galatians 5:5).

Opposed to the righteousness of God is the sinfulness of man. Particularly when faced with the demands of God's law, man shows himself to be unrighteous, guilty, convicted in sin, liable to the righteous anger of God. Pre-justified man is pictured at length in the first and second and third chapters of Romans. "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and wickedness of men who by their wickedness suppress the truth. ... Although they knew God they did not honor him as God or give thanks to him" (Romans 1:18,21). "We know that the judgment of God rightly falls upon those who do such things" (Romans 2:2). This sinful state is universally true; Jew and Gentile know God's law in their own ways, and both alike transgress against it. Paul quotes freely from the Septuagint of Psalms, "None is righteous, no, not one; ... All have turned aside, together they have gone wrong; no one does good, not even one" (Romans 3:10, 12, see Psalms 14:1,2; 53:1,2). This places man in a
position of being estranged from God, incapable of righteousness on his own part and, if God's righteousness were to go only to those to whom it were due, unable to receive it.

This conception of Paul's depends on his Jewish background, on his own experience with the law. It goes back to the Old Testament conception of man's relation to God as expressed in legal terms. God established His law; man in sin breaks the law and wins condemnation and punishment in the righteous anger of God. But the conception came also out of Paul's own experience. As a Jew Paul had an intense zeal for righteousness and sought to attain that righteousness through fulfilling the law. It was his realization that such attainment was impossible for man that taught him the vanity of human effort and man's need to depend completely on God's grace. The law made him conscious of his sin and his need for righteousness. "If it had not been for the law, I should not have known sin" (Romans 7:7). The law, at least for Paul, made him acutely conscious of his alienation from God. When he tried to achieve righteousness through the law, he found himself helpless. "For I delight in the law of God, in my inmost self, but I see in my members another law at war with the law of my mind and making me captive to the law of sin which dwells in my members" (Romans 7:22, 23). The conclusion of such reasoning comes in Galatians, that "all who rely on the words of the law are under a curse; for it is written, 'Cursed be every one who does not abide by all things written in the book of the law, and do them.' Now it is evident that no man is justified before God by the law; ..." (Galatians 3:10,12). Paul's picture of his own struggles in Romans 7 pointed out graphically the greatest need of those who lived under the law. Conscious of their guilt in transgressing against law, afraid of God's coming wrath, they needed an assurance of a verdict of acquittal
at the bar of God. They needed justification.

That justification was provided, as we have seen, by God through Christ in His death. It was God's act "by his grace as a gift" (Romans 3:24). It was available for all. But if justification were to mean anything in new life for the individual man, that man had to accept its fruits in his own life. This he does, according to Paul, by an act of faith. By accepting the justification which God had effected in Jesus Christ man then, by faith, was regarded as righteous, justified, in God's sight. The verdict of righteousness is handed down to man; but it is not his own personal righteousness. It is a gift (Romans 3:24), a "free gift" (Romans 5:17), from God to man, a divine credit for being righteous, not for anything man has done, but because he puts his faith in the justifying God. "They are justified by his grace as a gift, ... to be received by faith" (Romans 3:24).

In a sense, to call this acceptance of God's verdict in Christ "justification by faith" is misinterpreting Paul's thought. It is not man's faith that justifies, not on our own faith that we rely for salvation; that would lead man back to the very dilemma from which Paul would deliver him. Man would work at being faithful, but faith is not an act of merit by which men win salvation. It is faith in Christ that makes the justification possible for man, faith in Christ who at God's direction gave Himself to suffer the consequences of man's sin that man himself might be justified and not have to suffer those consequences. Justification is by God's "grace as a gift, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as an expiation by his blood to be received by faith" (Romans 3:24, 25). It is when man enters by faith into the act of Christ that he is justified, and the works of the law are entirely apart from this
act of God's grace. "For we hold that a man is justified by faith apart from works of the law" (Romans 3:28). "And to one who does not work but trusts him who justifies the ungodly, his faith is reckoned as righteousness" (Romans 4:5). In fact, in Christ, the need for law as formerly understood has come to an end. "For Christ is the end of the law, that everyone who has faith may be justified" (Romans 10:4). "For by grace you have been saved through faith; and this is not your own doing, it is the gift of God, not because of works, lest any man should boast" (Ephesians 2:8,9).

Thus the act of God in Christ in justification and man's justification by virtue of his faith in that act are never separated. "Since we are justified by faith" (Romans 5:1) finds its complete expression in thought only when seen as being preceded by Paul's statement that the faith is in "Jesus our Lord who was put to death for our trespasses and raised for our justification" (Romans 1:4). "We ourselves... know that a man is not justified by works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Christ Jesus in order to be justified by faith in Christ..." (Galatians 2:16). It is man's faith in Christ's act on the Cross that enables him to share the consequences of that act. Faith then, says Schrenk

is a means whereby the individual is drawn into participation in the consequences of the saving event... All who believe share in that righteousness. The demand for faith always accompanies the most objective utterances concerning the righteousness of God. The achievement and proclamation of salvation are never separated from the appropriation of it,....

Man's understanding and assurance of justification comes "in Christ Jesus our Lord, in whom we have boldness and confidence of access through

1Schrenk, op. cit., pp. 46, 48.
our faith in him” (Ephesians 3:11,12).

But with all his confidence in God's justification in bestowing righteousness as an act to be received immediately by faith, yet there is another sense in which Paul sees righteousness as a future necessity for man. Man is regarded as righteous now. He is justified by faith (Romans 3:24; 5:1). He has been saved through faith (Ephesians 2:8). But, at the same time, "through the Spirit, by faith, we wait for the hope of righteousness" (Galatians 5:5). In the future still lies the Final Judgment at which man will achieve final righteousness. There is an ever-present tension in the Pauline teaching on righteousness in man between consciousness of present possession (by faith) of righteousness and future full possession. Paul never fully resolves the tension. It is unresolved.

That Paul still was looking toward Final Judgment is indicated in his letters along with his conception of justification as having come to the believer. "I am not aware of anything against myself, but I am not thereby acquitted. It is the Lord who judges me. Therefore do not pronounce judgment before the time, before the Lord comes, who will bring to light the things now hidden in darkness and will disclose the purpose of men's hearts. Then every man will receive his commendation from God" (1 Corinthians 4:4,5). On this passage, Craig comments:

Paul can speak of justification as having already taken place, or as still to come at the end. Here, in contrast to Romans 8:30, he does not hold that the experience of justification at conversion assures acquittal at the Last Judgment. The course of action in between will determine.1

"We shall all stand before the judgment seat of God" (Romans 14:10). Without losing this idea of a Final Judgment Paul, however, is so aware of the

---

1 Clarence T. Craig, The First Epistle to the Corinthians, The Interpreter's Bible, X, 54.
present justification of believing man that he is convinced that man no longer need fear that Final Judgment because he knows in his own experience the grace of God.

In the twinkling of an eye, the mind of God concerning him is made known; he is pronounced righteous, in virtue of his believing response to the redemptive work of God in Christ; and although he receives no credential which automatically exempts him from further responsibility, he is introduced to a life of such intimate and growing fellowship with God that the Final Judgment is robbed of its terror.  

While the act of vindication has taken place in the death of Christ and man has been declared righteous, and is reckoned as righteous in God's dealings with him, the actual full attainment of a righteousness of his own is still in the future (Romans 5:19). Before man lies the Final Judgment which will bring, for man who has received in faith the initial justification of God, final and total righteousness. The 'justified' man is not by any means for Paul a completely righteous man in the ethical sense; he still is capable of sin; he still has the goal of complete righteousness before him. But the fact of his present justification, bringing him by faith into the experience of Christ, puts him in a new situation. What remains of earthly life is different because of his justification. He now looks to the Final Judgment with confidence; he waits for "the hope of righteousness" (Galatians 5:5).

To believe in God, to trust in His grace as revealed in the act of Christ in His death, is a righteous act -- the only form of righteousness possible for sinful man. But, to go back, justification is not merely the anticipated acquittal to the Day of Judgment; it is the realization of God's verdict of righteousness here and now. Man can not justify him-

---

1Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation, p. 50.
self by the merits of his own life, but he can fully participate by faith in the completely righteous act of Christ and thereby through his faithful participation in that act be led into the new life made possible by Christ in his justification.

By this faithful participation in the righteous act of Christ man is justified, reckoned righteous, ready for fellowship with God. But justification by itself might mean simply sterile acquittal and nothing more. For Paul there was more. The way has been cleared; now it remains for the establishment of right relations and fellowship between the righteous God and the sinner now regarded as righteous. This is what Paul saw happen in his doctrine of reconciliation, the second phase in the development of thought in this category. Justification takes for granted that reconciliation between God and man which comes after and a result of it. Reconciliation presupposes justification which makes the act of reconciliation full and complete. Justification is followed by reconciliation which, based on what justification has accomplished moves forward to a new relationship of fellowship between God and man.

B. Reconciliation

Closely related to justification is reconciliation. The unity of the two conceptions as closely inter-related in thought, reconciliation being made possible by the result of justification, both the act of God, and the connection of both with the death of Christ is seen clearly in Paul. **"Since, therefore, we are now justified by his blood, much more shall we be saved by him from the wrath of God. For if while we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, now that we are reconciled, shall we be saved by his life. Not only so, but we also rejoice**
in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received our reconciliation" (Romans 5:9-11). "All this is from God who through Christ reconciled us to himself, and gave us the ministry of reconciliation; that is, God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not counting their trespasses against them..." (2 Corinthians 5:18,19; see also Ephesians 2:13-16; Colossians 1:19-22).

So long as in the light of the righteousness of God man was faced with the consequences of his own sinfulness and the impossibility of his own becoming righteous, he was without hope. His cry was the cry of Paul, "Wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of death?" (Romans 7:24). The answer was also that of Paul, "Thanks be to God through Jesus Christ our Lord!" (Romans 7:25). Justification occurred through the act of Christ. It was possible for man in the sight of God to be regarded as righteous. He no longer need live in terrifying fear of the Final Judgment. It was possible for God to act in harmony with his nature to love and want fellowship with man and yet not compromise His righteousness. The way is opened for reconciliation.

Our estrangement is the consequence of sin, which under one of its aspects is man's transgression of God's laws. No reconciling process which by-passed this moral fact would be effective. Reconciliation between man and God... is possible only on a basis of righteousness and truth.1

In justification this basis of righteousness and truth is created. It is the basis for a new experience of life in the believer.

There is still something fundamentally wrong between man and God. Sin puts a barrier between them. They are estranged. There is an enmity existing between man and God. So long as that enmity or estrangement exist3

---

1John Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul, p. 146, 147.
there cannot be perfect harmony, for the enmity between man and God means also enmity among men. It is necessary that a reconciliation be effected if there is to be peace between man and God, and man and his fellow men. It was "while we were enemies" that the need for reconciliation came (Romans 5:10). "Men were once estranged and hostile in mind, doing evil deeds" (Colossians 1:21). More than that there was a "dividing wall of hostility between men" (Ephesians 2:14).

Reconciliation is the act of God in restoring the harmonious fellowship between Himself and His creation. The figure changes from the forensic to the personal. Paul's thought moves from the level of the law-court to the plane of personal relations...

It is sin which creates the need for reconciliation. Sin destroys that fellowship with God for which man was made and which is his highest felicity. It sets up an estranging barrier between the holy God and sinful man, his creature. It interrupts the family relationship.1

Reconciliation is the removing of the barriers which exist to that relationship. Man who was made to be in harmony with God, having in the meantime by reason of sin been struggling against God and hostile to God and His goodness, is again reconciled to God. God, in His love, makes possible the reconciliation. The enmity is no more. Peace reigns as a result of the reconciliation (Ephesians 2:15). The importance of the thought of reconciliation in Christianity, and especially in Paul, is emphasized by Stewart when he says:

Clearly it is here that any redemption which claims universal validity must be tested. Can it deal with this alienation? Can it remove the enmity?... Paul perceived that a Gospel which broke the bondage of legalism, and ended the tyrant sway of principalities and powers, and remitted sin's fearsome penalties, and brought up reinforcements for cowed and beaten wills, and then stopped there,

1Hunter, op. cit., p. 28, 29.
was no Gospel worthy of the name... Over and above them all, one thing was needful, one thing without which all the other glories of redemption must remain sterile and unavailing - the restoration of lost fellowship with God.¹

This reconciliation was accomplished by God in the act of Christ in His death. We shall find in discussing Paul's doctrine of reconciliation, as we did in discussing his doctrine of justification, that in order to understand Paul's thought fully we must see the action from two different angles of view. The motivation comes from God alone; He is the Reconciler. The other angle of view is that from man. His only contribution is his faith as a sign of his readiness and his consent to be reconciled. At the center of the picture, where God the Reconciler and man the reconciled meet stands the Cross of Christ.

1. God the Reconciler

For Paul in his doctrine of reconciliation it is always God the Reconciler, man the reconciled. The initial once-for-all action in reconciliation is taken by God. Writing on Romans 5:8, Dodd says:

Observe the perfect naturalness with which Paul passes from the sacrifice of Christ to the love of God. For him it was a matter of course that God Himself was at work in what Christ did. There could never have been for him any question of setting mercy in Christ against justice in God. The love which we see revealed in Christ is qualitatively divine, and if we believe in God at all, then that love is the love of God. ... Thus Christ's self sacrifice could never be thought of as something through which an angry God might be induced to treat us lovingly, since it is the love of God Himself, existing from all eternity, which was expressed in the sacrifice of Christ.²

In His love God provides that act necessary to restore the fellowship

¹Stewart, op.cit., p. 208.

between Himself and man. "All this is from God, who through Christ reconciled us to himself and gave us the ministry of reconciliation" (2 Corinthians 5:18). "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself" (2 Corinthians 5:19). "For in him all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell, and through him to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his cross" (Colossians 1:19,20). In Romans 5 and Ephesians 2, Paul's language is such that he can be interpreted as saying that God is reconciled. In the Romans passage he says that we "shall be saved by him from the wrath of God. For if while we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his son. ..." (Romans 5:9,10). Taken out of its context these statements may appear to portray a wrathful God whose attitude must be changed by the action of some outside agent. By his death the Son saves us from that wrath and brings about the reconciliation. Similarly, in Ephesians, Paul speaks of Christ as reconciling us "to God ... through the Cross" (Ephesians 2:16). But aside from the fact that, as we have seen, the thought would have been impossible for Paul, the context in all cases where Paul speaks of reconciliation makes it clear that while Christ is the reconciling agent in His death, it is God acting through Christ who does the reconciling. In Romans, for example, the death of Christ which reconciles is a revelation of how "God shows his love for us" (Romans 5:8).

As God is seen as Reconciler, so the means of that reconciliation for Paul is in the death of Christ. "We were reconciled to God by the death of His Son..." (Romans 5:10), "through the cross" (Ephesians 2:16), "by his death" (Colossians 1:22). It was God acting through the death of

\footnote{Denney, op.cit., p. 85.}
Christ, but the ground of the reconciliation Paul sees in that death. "While we were enemies" (Romans 5:10), Christ died for us, "thereby bringing the hostility to an end" (Ephesians 2:16).

This act of reconciliation on the part of God toward man was not, according to Paul, a continuous experience. It was a once-for-all accomplishment. "The work of reconciliation, in the sense of the New Testament, is a work which is finished, and which we must conceive to be finished, before the Gospel is preached."1 Because the reconciliation has occurred, Paul has something to preach about. When God "through Christ reconciled us to himself" He gave as a result of the act of reconciliation "the ministry of reconciliation" (2 Corinthians 5:18).

2. Man the Reconciled.

Man was hostile to God and estranged from God, standing before God as an enemy. God initiates the action which in the death of Christ makes reconciliation possible. As a result of that death, man in faith can consider himself to have rendered the same obedience that Christ rendered in going to His death. Men no longer need be enemies, but have before them the possibility of reconciliation. "You, who once were estranged and hostile in mind doing evil deeds, he has now reconciled in his body of flesh by his death..." (Colossians 1:21,22). "But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far off have been brought near in the blood of Christ" (Ephesians 2:13).

As a result of his sin man is separated from God. The greatest punishment of sin as Paul sees it is not in the results of sin in man's life and in the world, although as Paul points out these results are terrible

---

1Denney, op.cit., p. 85.
and far-reaching (Romans 1 and 2). The greatest punishment is in the separation from God which it brings about. God, of necessity, because of His wrath against sin, gave them up to the natural results of their sins -- they were separated from fellowship with God. This being the case, man is in need of that reconciliation effected by Christ on the Cross wherein God holds out to all men the possibility of reconciliation. Further, by way of the results of Christ's reconciling act, the divisions between man and God having been overcome, the divisions which separate man may be overcome. In Ephesians 2:11, the work of Christ brought events about so that "the dividing wall of hostility" between Jew and Greek is broken down in the act of reconciliation. As reconciliation of men with one another is brought about, a new divine community is created, the church of Jesus Christ (Ephesians 2:11-22; 5:25-27).

This reconciliation was a decisive act, as we have said. It was done in Christ's dying on the cross, removing man's sin as a barrier between himself and God. But man must still respond, if the reconciliation is to be made full in his life. This response, too, Paul calls reconciliation. Reconciliation was not complete, so far as the individual man was concerned, until he had accepted it in faith. But this faith was possible, of course, only since God's prior action in reconciliation occurred. The passive forms of are used by Paul in Romans 5:10 and 2 Corinthians 5:20. "We were reconciled to God" (Romans 5:10). "We beseech you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God" (2 Corinthians 5:20). The only other use of in the passive by Paul is in 1 Corinthians 7:11. There Paul is discussing problems of marriage, and counsels

---

\[\text{Katholos, } \text{Katharos, } \text{Theologisches Wörterbuch Zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933), 1, 256.}\]
that "the wife should not separate from her husband" and goes on to say "but if she does, let her remain single or else be reconciled to her husband." Presumably in such a domestic situation Paul would not expect the wife to be passive in the proposed reconciliation. There would need be an active cooperation on her part. This usage throws light on Paul's use of the passive of this verb as he talks of reconciliation with God. "We were reconciled" and we are invited to "be reconciled," but in spite of the passive verb, Paul undoubtedly expects an active response and cooperation on the part of man. This is the response of faith, where man sees God active in love in the Cross, removing the barrier of sin which keeps men from Him. "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not counting their trespasses against them..." (2 Corinthians 5:20). Faith enabled men to enter into the experience of Christ on the Cross "as we are convinced that one died for all; therefore all died. And he died for all, that those who live might live no longer for themselves but for him who for their sake died and was raised" (2 Corinthians 5:15). Paul even implies the possibility of man's losing the reconciliation which he has received, so far as its benefits to himself are concerned. "And you, who once were estranged and hostile in mind, doing evil deeds, he has now reconciled in his body of flesh by his death, in order to present you holy and blameless and irreproachable before him"; but to this Paul adds "provided that you continue in the faith, stable and steadfast, not shifting from the hope of the gospel which you heard. ..." (Colossians 1:21-23). In the Old Testament the view is found that God was willing to forgive man's iniquity and to restore him to His good graces upon repentance (For example in Jeremiah 36:3). To one like Paul, however, who under the law had known the desperate feeling that because of constant failure to keep the law, God could not
persist in love in the face of the wickedness and hostility of man, what was needed was a new revelation of the character of God and His attitude toward men. This he found in part in the doctrine of reconciliation.

"While we were yet helpless, at the right time Christ died for the ungodly" (Romans 5:6). "God shows his love for us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us" (Romans 5:8). So we should "rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ through whom we have now received our reconciliation" (Romans 5:11).

The death of Christ called forth faith in man and made it possible for God to forgive those who by faith were united to Christ, without waiting for them to be worthy of forgiveness. ... Paul saw in it that which should impel sinners to repent and seek forgiveness, for re-admission to the fellowship of God.¹

Christ's reconciling act effected reconciliation between God and man, but Paul saw it as effecting even more. Paul was very much aware of the fact that men and nations were divided and at enmity with one another. This was especially true between the Jews and other peoples, and Paul saw this enmity between peoples as going back to their relationships with God, their common Father. When in the act of reconciliation the breach between God and man was healed, the way was at the same time opened for the enmity among men to be removed. This happened as men united in faith in Christ's death. In Ephesians, Paul reminds the Gentiles that they were, prior to their accepting Christ, "separated from Christ, alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenants of promise" (Ephesians 2:12). He goes on: "But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far off have been brought near in the blood of Christ" (Ephesians 2:13). Then he explains what he means by saying that they have been "brought near." "For he is our

peace, who has made us both one, and has broken down the dividing wall of hostility, by abolishing in his flesh the law of commandments and ordinances, that he might create in himself one new man in place of two, so making peace, and might reconcile us both to God in one body through the cross, thereby bringing the hostility to an end" (Ephesians 2:14-16). It was the law which caused the separation and enmity between Jew and Gentile, because the Jew had it and the Gentile did not, and because it was inadequate in its revelation of the full truth about God. Now that Christ has "abolished the law," this barrier no longer exists. The true nature of God has been revealed in Christ and the hostility can end between man and man as it has between God and man. In this passage he speaks particularly of Jew and Gentile but it is evident that Paul goes further than that particular division to include a common reconciliation of all men into one new community when he continues,

So then you are no longer strangers and sojourners, but you are fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief cornerstone, in whom the whole structure is joined together and grows into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom you also are built into it for a dwelling place of God in the Spirit. (Ephesians 2:19-22).

The result is summed up in Galatians: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Galatians 3:28).

When Paul speaks of the reconciliation in Colossians, he includes not only men but the entire universe, - "all things, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his cross" (Colossians 1:20).

Reconciliation, then, is the re-establishment of fellowship between man and God, brought about through the work of Christ in His death
on the Cross. For the individual, reconciliation depends on his own response of faith in Christ and the work of God in Him, but it concerns more than man as individual. It includes the relationships of people and of nations, and things on earth and in heaven.

C. Sanctification

The culmination of the thought contained in this category of the interpretation of the death of Christ is sanctification. We must see the category in its unity, but to do that we discuss it from its various aspects. Where we have in the discussion of both justification and reconciliation put the emphasis on the fact that each was a momentary act rather than a process, in sanctification we have that which is connected to the death of Christ, but with the emphasis on the attaining the perfection that the death of Christ with its justification and reconciliation make possible.

In a sense, God's justifying act was itself the sanctification of the sinner. Reconciliation, too, has within it God's sanctifying activity. While the emphasis is different, there is unity in the thought. All three are only aspects of the same act and Paul connects them in different ways at different occasions in his epistles. "For just as you once yielded your members to impurity and to greater and greater iniquity, so now yield your members to righteousness for sanctification" (Romans 6:19). In 1 Corinthians, he says that God made Christ Jesus "our wisdom, our righteousness and sanctification" and redemption, ..." (1 Corinthians 1:30). Again he declares: "But you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified

1RSV translates Ανασμος as "consecration" except in Ro. 6:19. We shall use "sanctification" throughout for the sake of clarity.
in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God" (1 Corinthians 6:11). At other times he speaks of sanctification alone. "For this is the will of God," he says to the Thessalonians, "your sanctification... for God has not called us for uncleanness, but in sanctification" (1 Thessalonians 4:3,7).

Sanctification is a necessary aspect of this category as it serves to preserve the ethical and religious character of what, especially in the case of justification, could otherwise be cold and formal. Taylor points this out when he says:

To include attainment within the idea of reconciliation is to rob the latter of its immediate and decisive character. Nevertheless, to exclude the thought of sanctification even when we are thinking of reconciliation, is no less injurious. Reconciliation is meant to end in sanctity, and if it is not followed by sustained movement in this direction, it must lose its meaning as the restoration of the sinner to fellowship with God... A like relationship is even more necessary if justification is to preserve its ethical and religious character. ...As a declaratory act of God, justification stands at the beginning of the Christian journey; as a work of grace, accomplished in us, sanctification relates to its entire course and goal.  

It is the fruits of justification and reconciliation which bring to the believer the possibility of sanctification. This possibility opens to man as in faith he receives into his life Christ and the benefits of His death. This is what Paul means when he says "Do you not know that you are God's temple and that God's Spirit dwells in you? ... For God's temple is holy, and that temple you are" (1 Corinthians 3:16,17). "Do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have from God" (1 Corinthians 6:19)? The believer is a "new" person because he has a new motivating force in his life. God dwells in him by His Spirit guiding him in his new life. Christ's character un-

---

1 Taylor, op.cit., p. 184, 185.
folds in the believer's character. In Ephesians Paul emphasizes again that this is not only an individual matter but a part of the believer's position in the whole community. "You are fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God, ...; in whom you also are built into it for a dwelling place of God in the Spirit" (Ephesians 2:19-22).

Paul does not infer in sanctification that the believer immediately attains to perfection. In Romans 6, he reminds his readers of what baptism signifies. Those who have "been baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death." This was in Christ, a union by faith, that the believer might be free of sin. "For he who has died is freed from sin." In baptism then, the believer joined in Christ's death to sin; he renounced sin. As a result man is to "walk in newness of life." But at the same time Paul recognizes that the believer needs to be ever on his guard not to "yield your members to sin as instruments of wickedness, but yield yourselves to God as men who have been brought from death to life, ..." 1

The initial experience needed to be reaffirmed and deepened through continued faith, watchful and worship: but it was initial, not final. St. Paul's plea was that his readers should live in the power of this experience. "Reckon yourselves dead to sin," did not mean that they had finished with the enemy, but that it was a broken and discomfited foe. 1

That sanctification does not imply perfection is indicated in 1 Thessalonians, where Paul connects it with the ethical activity of life. "For this is the will of God, your sanctification: that you abstain from immorality; that each one of you know how to take a wife for himself in sanctification and honor, not in the passion of lust-like heathen who do not know God; ... For God has not called us for uncleanness, but in sanctification. Therefore whoever disregards this, disregards not man but God

---
1Taylor, op. cit., p. 162.
who gives his Holy Spirit to you" (1 Thessalonians 4:3,8). Believing man is in a state of sanctification. "Sanctification is not a new thing, but simply the unfolding, by the operation of the spirit, of something already present."¹ The result is his "new" life, realizable by his act of faith, as he grows in holiness toward perfection. Paul does not say whether man in Christ can ever reach the stage of sinlessness.

Conclusion

We have described the three aspects of Paul's development of the category of justification, reconciliation, and sanctification. In justification we found the "reckoning-right" of man by God; in reconciliation, the restoration of fellowship with God; and in sanctification the life of grace resulting from that fellowship. We have not meant to imply that in the experience of man this is an automatic three-step process. In fact this is not Paul's thought in the category at all, for its results happened at once in the act of Christ and happen at once as they are accepted in faith by the believer.

¹Stewart, op.cit., p. 258.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE CATEGORY OF REDEMPTION

That category of the interpretation of the death of Christ to which Paul most often refers, which indeed according to some scholars¹ is central to the entire interpretation of Christ's atoning death, is the category of redemption. That the ideas involved in this category of interpretation have appealed historically to men beyond all the others is evident in the fact that the term "redemption" is used very often in Christian vocabulary to describe the act of Christ in His death, even when the suggestions in thought which were originally behind the use of this particular term and its related ideas are not present in the particular context of discussion. We have used the term in this way throughout our discussion, and also the term "Redeemer." This fact at once emphasizes the importance of this category but also the need for caution in interpreting it. For the very popularity of the use of the wording will remind the interpreter that he must be careful to look for the presence of ideas related to this category in Paul and in the history of Christian thought rather than in the mere use of the terminology itself. The word has come to be generalized as a description of the work of Christ beyond its original meaning.

Basic to the idea of Christ's death as redemption in Paul's thinking is the metaphor contained in the word of the thought of Christ "deliv-

ering or "freeing," "emancipating" man from that which held him in thrall. A term Paul uses to describe the redemption (\( \pi \lambda \rho \pi \alpha \rho \omega \) \( \epsilon \) \( \gamma \) \( \tau \) \( \theta \) \( \iota \) \( \theta \) \( \iota \) \( \sigma \) \( \tau \) \( \omicron \) \( \nu \) \( \omega \) \( \eta \) \( \sigma \) \( \nu \) \( \sigma \) \( \tau \) \( \omicron \) \( \nu \)) has for its root the word for "ransom" (\( \lambda \upsilon \tau \rho \omicron \nu \)). There is that in man's spiritual experience which holds him in bondage from which he must be freed if he is to be his whole self. What it is that enslaves him and what sort of bondage it is in which man is found we shall see as we proceed. That Paul found a foundation upon which to build this category in the Old Testament and in his Jewish background we shall also see. Anderson Scott describes the human setting into which the category of redemption fits in this way:

The aspect of Salvation which is suggested by this word [Redemption] is one which would commend itself to those who felt their need as due to some kind of bondage, some crushing limitation on their moral or spiritual freedom, were it only 'the weary weight of all this unintelligible world.'

Here let us look at the impetus toward the development of this category which was given by the contemporary way of life in which Paul wrote. Redemption was the term used for the process by which the slave regained his freedom. Thousands of Paul's contemporaries were slaves. Their slavery was often the result of their having been captured as prisoners of war, often the innocent victims of the ever-present wars of conquest. The Roman armies transported prisoners captured in the course of their various conquests back to Rome, there to serve as slaves. A reference to the common practice of leading these captives in procession behind a triumphant leader through the city as visible evidence of his victory is found in 2 Corinthians 2:14 and in Colossians 2:15. Others in Paul's day were enslaved for non-payment of debts. That person unable to pay a debt was forced into slavery until he could make good the debt, or

1C.A. Anderson Scott, op.cit., p. 97.
was allowed to voluntarily sell himself into slavery for a period of time to pay his creditor. This was common long before Paul's day as is attested by references in the Old Testament.¹

These slaves often were freed or emancipated, that is "ransomed" or "redeemed," and this too might come about in various ways. Dodd states that it was the popular work of benevolence for wealthy Jews to redeem (through the payment of money) the thousands of their compatriots taken prisoner in the wars and sold into slavery in Roman dominions.² Deissmann comments on the light thrown on this category by the social customs of the day which permitted those enslaved to regain their own freedom.

The greatest impetus to the development of the circle of metaphors of redemption came from the custom of social manumission, widespread in the ancient world (and continued amongst Hellenistic Jews and even amongst Christians) with which we have now become acquainted, chiefly thanks to inscriptions. Amongst the various legal forms under which in the time of Paul the manumission of a slave could be effected, we find the solemn ritual purchase of the slave by a deity. The owner comes with the slave to the temple, sells him there to the god, and receives from the temple treasurer the purchase money which the slave has before paid out of his savings. By this means the slave becomes the property of the god, but as against man he is free.³

Among the early converts to Christianity were slaves. Paul counsels these Christians who are slaves to gain their freedom if possible, while at the same time using the figure of their new "slavery to Christ" in his counsel to them.

It will be apparent, as we ask ourselves how the act of Christ in His death can be described in these terms, that we have here in the category of redemption an emphasis on the objective aspect of Christ's work.

¹Lev. 25:47; Amos 2:6, and others. See also, in New Testament, Matt. 18:23-35.
The idea of an emancipation implies an activity on the part of someone other than the one ransomed or freed. It implies also a third party or power from which the ransom must be effected. So here we shall see present in this category God in Christ doing something for man which man could not do for himself, something to which man's only action is to respond and accept. One can see also that with such an objective emphasis there are questions which immediately come to the fore, and which we must face as we consider the metaphors present in Paul's setting forth this category. There is the matter of the "price" of the redemption, and of the recipient of that price. Of the latter Paul says nothing at all. Of the former we shall speak as we go on.

Let us proceed, then, looking first at the background of redemption for Paul, then at those ideas inherent in the redemption which are important in interpreting Christ's death.

A. The Cosmic Background of Redemption

1. Redemption in the Old Testament

One need not go outside the Bible itself to find the background for Paul's use of "redemption" as a category. The conception of man as "enslaved," in need of being purchased, or redeemed, from that slavery is present through the Old Testament.

Robinson points out that the whole conception of redemption is co-extensive with the history of Israel.

That history is conceived as redemptive from the Exodus out of Egypt, with which the history of the nation began, down to coins of the last Jewish rebellion (Bar Kokhba's) in 132-5 A.D., which
bear the inscription "The Redemption of Israel."¹

Paul was describing Christ's work in a category which Jewish, as well as Gentile, Christians could understand and appreciate.

The Old Testament has three terms in the Hebrew which in English translations are translated as "redeemer" or "redeem" or "redemption."
The term padhah (נָפָד) carries with it the fundamental idea of ransom in the sense of an equivalent for what is released. Robinson cites as examples of the use of the term in this way Exodus 21:8 and 1 Samuel 11:4, and says of it: "We see clearly, then, the point of departure of the term padhah; it denoted originally an equivalent in real or assumed value given to release some bond or taboo."² The idea of payment of money is present here in the word, but clearly the idea became spiritualized in the Old Testament and the thought of money payment dropped out. This is illustrated in Deuteronomy where Moses says to the people of Israel: "It is because the Lord loves you, and is keeping the oath which he swore to your fathers, that the Lord has brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you from the house of bondage, from the hand of Pharaoh King of Egypt" (Deuteronomy 7:8).

A parallel term, ga'al (גָּאֶל) has similar meaning. It denotes the buying back of something to which the right has been lost.³ This term is used particularly of the right and duty of the kinsman to be a redeemer, as in Jeremiah 32:7 and following, and in Ruth 4:1-11, and along with this is connected the duty of the kinsman to blood revenge. Snaith comments on Second Isaiah's use of this word in emphasizing the kinship of God and

²Ibid., p. 222.
³See Lev. 25:29, h8, h9.
It is therefore more likely that Second Isaiah's use of the word Go'el (Redeemer) is connected with the idea of causing a slave as property to revert to the original owner, as could be done by payment of an assessment, Leviticus 27:1-25. Israel belonged to God before the Exile, but God sold him, Isaiah 50:1, though without receiving any money for him, 52:5. He therefore will not pay any money to redeem him, 52:3. We take this last passage to be decisive as regards the meaning of the word Go'el. 1

Very frequently in Second Isaiah we find the statement that God is Israel's Redeemer using this term. "I will help you, says the Lord; your redeemer is the Holy One of Israel" (Isaiah 41:14). 2 There is also the expression that God has redeemed His people and they belong to Him. "Fear not, for I have redeemed you; I have called you by name, you are mine" (Isaiah 43:1). 3

Both of these words are commonly translated by ἀντικαταθήσαται in the Septuagint, a word which we shall see again when we come to discuss Paul's vocabulary of redemption.

A third word in the Old Testament translated into English in terms of redemption is kopher (κόπω), translated as "ransom." The word denoted the price paid in compensation for a forfeited life, or less directly for each Israelite enumerated in a census. The references are Exodus 21:30; 30:12; Proverbs 13:8; 6:35; Psalm 49:8. Sometimes it is used in the sense of "bribe" (1 Samuel 12:3; Amos 5:12; Job 36:18). In Isaiah 43:3, this term is used in reference to price paid for deliverance, where the meaning is that Cyrus will actually receive compensation for his service in delivering Israel from exile by becoming a world conqueror and by including Africa in his conquests.

2See also Isa. 43:14; 44:6, 21; 47:4; 48:17; 49:7, 26; 54:5, 8.
3See also Isa. 44:22, 23; 48:20; 52:9.
Behind the meaning of each of these terms, however, lies the idea of redemption as seen working in the spiritual life of the Jew throughout Israel's history. God, through the promise bound up in the covenant, was constantly redeeming Israel from those events in her history which because of her straying away from Him were continually enslaving her. These events ranged from physical enslavements like that in Egypt and Babylon to the completely spiritual application as it usually is in Second Isaiah.

In the "Suffering Servant" passages of Isaiah (Isaiah 52 and 53) we have found a highly developed conception of the redemptive idea. We have already referred to Snaith's statements about Isaiah 52:3 and to other passages where redemptive language is present. We find throughout the whole of Second Isaiah that the redemptive idea is central in the thinking of the writer.

Along with the use of the idea of redemption generally in the Old Testament are other related conceptions which we shall find taken up by Paul in the development of his thought. We shall see that one of the "enslavers" for Paul was "sin." In Romans 5:12 and following, Paul connects the enslavement of man to sin to the original sin of Adam. In 1 Corinthians 10 he connects the redemption of Christ to the act of God behind the Exodus from Egypt and brings in sacramental references from Moses' activities to baptism and the Lord's Supper. On the matter of man since Adam being under bondage to sin, Knox says, on Romans 6,

---

1 The children of Israel were regarded as slaves 'redeemed' by Yahweh, (for example, Deut. 7:8); later the prophets spoke of the liberation from captivity in Babylon as the return of the 'ransomed of the Lord' (Isa. 51:11).

2 See Snaith, op.cit., p. 86.
For Jewish and Jewish-Christian readers there was nothing strange in the argument that the sin of Adam brought death on all mankind. It was common ground to Paul and the strictest rabbi. The argument might be stated in various forms, based on Midrashic exegesis of the Old Testament as expounded by the tradition of the synagogue. In Romans 6 it is stated in terms of the Christian revision of the kerygma in Judaism in which the death and resurrection of Jesus replace the exodus from Egypt.\(^1\)

To this thought we shall refer later on.

Another conception which we shall see in Paul's thought which has a Jewish background is that which sees this enslavement of man from which he needs to be emancipated to be an enslavement at the hands of ultra-human powers. These powers do not loom largely in the Old Testament itself, but they are there. On them, Duncan comments,

Hebrew thought pondered deeply on the dread power and universality of human sin and sorrow, and in the centuries preceding the Christian era it came to associate these evils with certain powers of this world which held humanity in their grasp. The great vision of the ultimate triumph of God's righteousness was never lost, but it was seen that as a preliminary to this triumph God must do something to overthrow these powers of evil and accomplish man's deliverance. The conception of a Messiah, who was to be at once a World Conqueror and a Deliverer of his people, may have assumed some unspiritual forms, but it witnessed to the belief that a new age will not be ushered in by the mere development of human ideals and the exercise of human endeavours. Humanity, as God sees it, is enslaved and requires deliverance.\(^2\)

There is of course the possibility that these conceptions are not so much a part of pure Hebrew thought as they are a carry-over into Judaism of some of the conceptions of the Hellenistic religions of the period immediately preceding the birth of Christ. Our point is simply that the ideas were to be found in the Judaism that Paul knew and were not introduced by Paul himself, nor brought into his theology by him from outside of Judaism.


\(^2\)Duncan, *Galatians*, pp. xlix-l.
Like Paul's own writings the Old Testament does not present a consistent picture of which we can say "This is the Old Testament understanding of the powers or demons." On the one hand, in passages like Deuteronomy 32:17 or Psalms 106:37, we seem to see the sacrifices offered to idols as offered to devils, while on the other hand, in references like Psalm 115, the idols of the heathen are simply the work of men's hands and nothing more. As Judaism developed beyond the Old Testament period it came more and more to be dominated by the belief in the existence of angels, good and evil, who played vital parts in everyday happenings. We shall discuss this point in further detail when we come to the general discussion of the powers.¹

We find then the redemptive idea and the idea of the existence of powers in the universe which affect the affairs of men not uncommon in the Old Testament, and in later Judaism.

The Old Testament idea of redemption, then, lays emphasis on the divine initiative, comprehends within itself the deliverance from material as well as from spiritual perils and constraints and deals primarily with Israel as a people, though growingly concerned with the relation of the individual to God within that social solidarity.²

It was natural for Paul to see the implications of Christ's death in terms of that which he understood, and had been taught, as God's actions with Israel in history, and apply those terms to his own situation.

2. Redemption in the New Testament Outside Paul

The metaphors underlying the category of redemption in Paul are not frequently used in the rest of the New Testament. The word ἀπολύτρωσις

¹See page 105 and following.

²Robinson, op.cit., p. 227.
is found in the New Testament only in Luke 21:28, and in Hebrews 9:15 and 11:35. In Luke and in Hebrew 9, it is used in the metaphorical sense of Christ's redemption; in Hebrews 11 it is in the basic sense of release. The root word λυτρον is found several times with the meaning "ransom" carrying through the metaphor implied in the redemptive idea. In some of the occurrences of λυτρον, the meaning refers back to the Old Testament redemptive hope.¹

Jesus Himself speaks of His impending death as a "ransom for many" (λυτρον δνι πολλων) in Mark 10:45 (Matthew 20:28). In the context of this saying Jesus emphasizes the giving of life, -- the disciples to be willing to give their lives in service to all, based on the purposive activity and example of the Son of man in giving His life. Perhaps there is significance for our point in the change in vocabulary from δυσκολο, servant, to δοῦλος, slave. The latter word may even have prompted the use of the ransom metaphor by Jesus as He thought of His mission of salvation for man. Denney sees here a connection with the sayings in Mark 8:34f., saying:

It is clear from a passage like this that Jesus was familiar with the idea that the ψυχή or life of man, in the higher or lower sense of the term, might be lost, and that when it was lost there could be no compensation for it, as there was no means of buying it back. It is in the circle of such ideas that the words about giving his life a ransom for many must find their point of attachment, and it is not only far the simplest and most obvious interpretation, but far the most profound and the most consonant with the New Testament as a whole, that Jesus in this passage conceives the lives of the many as being somehow under forfeit, and teaches that the very object with which He came into the world was to lay down His own life as a ransom price that those to whom these forfeited lives belonged might obtain them again.²

²Denney, op.cit., p. 33.
Many scholars have seen a connection here in Jesus' thought with that expressed in the Suffering Servant passages in Isaiah. There, as we have seen, the idea of redemption is present, and there also the thought of the giving of life for the benefit of others certainly enters in. The thought begins with God ransoming Israel (Isaiah 52:3,9). To do this God sent His servant who "has borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." He was "wounded for our transgressions;... upon him was the chastisement that made us whole" (Isaiah 53:4,5).¹

Taylor comments on the importance of seeing the use of the redemptive idea in the Old Testament and by Jesus as metaphorical, yet as having distinct objective significance in its contribution to the thought of Jesus.

But the word 'ransom' is used as a metaphor, and ought not to be treated as if it were a fixed scientific term. Even if the language is metaphorical it cannot be explained away, as indicating some vague kind of spiritual service. After all, a metaphor is used in order to say something forcibly. At least the saying means that, by the willing surrender of His life, Jesus, as the Son of Man came to provide a means of deliverance for men.²

There is no reference whatsoever, of course, in the ransom passage in Mark 10:45 as to whom the ransom was to be paid. In 1 Peter 1:18,19, the ransom idea is again used, here connected with the idea of sacrifice in such a way that Deissmann is prompted to say: "It is clear from 1 Peter 1:18, 19, that at a very early period the price was understood to be the blood of Christ."³ We find that Jesus clearly saw the need of a redemption of the type that we shall find described in greater detail in Paul. It was

¹See ibid., p. 34; Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 102.
²Taylor, op. cit., p. 104.
a redemption from that which enslaves men, as in John 8:32 He says "and you will know the truth and the truth will make you free." Yet it was a slavery that was more than subjective in men's minds, for He states that the "ruler of the world" must be "cast out" (John 12:31). And the writer of the Fourth Gospel adds "He said this to show by what death He was to die" (John 12:33).

Let us now look at Paul and at the terminology which he uses in speaking of the redemption in Christ.

3. Paul's Vocabulary of Redemption

In considering Paul's vocabulary of redemption we shall first look at those words and figures which Paul used in expressing the redemptive activity of Christ, and then, in the next section, at the powers from which Paul understood man to be redeemed by Christ.

a. Απολύσει. Paul uses the word Απολύσει in his letters seven times. The references are: Romans 3:24, "they are justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus ..."; Romans 8:23, "... but we ourselves, who have the first fruits of the spirit, groan inwardly as we wait for adoption as sons, the redemption of our bodies."; 1 Corinthians 1:30, "He is the source of your life in Christ Jesus, whom God made our wisdom, our righteousness and consecration and redemption."; Ephesians 1:7, "In him we have redemption through his blood..."; Ephesians 1:14, "Which is the guarantee of our inheritance until we acquire possession of it..."; Ephesians 4:30, "And do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God,

1AV translates more literally here, "which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession..."
in whom you were sealed for the day of redemption."; Colossians 1:14, "in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins." The word meant, according to Büchsel, ¹ "emancipation in exchange for ransom money," and was used of prisoners of war, slaves and convicts condemned to death.

In the Septuagint, ἀπολυτρωσίς is used only once in Daniel 4:32² where the reference is to Nebuchadnezzar's recovery from his madness. ἀπολυτρωσίς itself, as we have said above, is a compound of the word λύσις, "ransom," and the use of the metaphor implied therein with forms of λυτρον and the passive verb λυπάσθαι, were more frequent in the Old Testament than ἀπολυτρωσίς. These words do not occur in Paul's letters. Λυπάσθαι is used in Titus 2:14. Dodd believes that color is given the meaning of the metaphor as used by Paul by the Old Testament associations of the word. ³ The children of Israel, liberated from bondage in Egypt, were regarded as slaves "redeemed" by Yahweh. ⁴ The prophets also spoke of the liberation from captivity in Babylon as a redemption. ⁵ Here too, the emphasis is more on the thought of the deliverance than on that of any ransom-price involved. Λυπάσθαι commonly represents in LXX ἡ ἡ ἡ or ἡ ἡ ἡ where there is no suggestion of price or cost. ⁶ The use of the word in the New Testament seems to put the emphasis on the generalized thought of "liberation" or "deliverance," and away from the idea of "ransom"

¹ Büchsel, Λύσις, ed. Kittel, op. cit., IV, 154.

² In the "real" Septuagint of Daniel as distinguished from that of Theodotion usually included in the Septuagint. The verse numbering varies from 4:29 to 4:34.

³ Dodd, Romans, p. 53, 54.

⁴ For example, in Deuteronomy 7:8.

⁵ For example, in Isaiah 51:11.

⁶ See above, p. 89, 90.
or "price paid." In several of the New Testament passages the idea of a price paid would be very difficult to introduce at all.  

Yet surely the matter of the cost of redemption, when we come to think of it in Christ's death, cannot be so quickly dismissed by argument from the fact that the application is not usually made in the Biblical use of a particular word. There is no doubt that there are the many occurrences of the metaphor when the idea of a price either would be difficult to introduce or could be easily dropped as has just been illustrated. At the same time there is much in the New Testament to caution against dropping the emphasis on price too easily when we discuss the idea of redemption in Paul. Sanday and Headlam, after discussing the background of the metaphor, suggest:

In view of the clear resolution of the expression in Mark 10:45 (Matthew 20:28), and in 1 Timothy 2:6, and in view also of the many passages in which Christians are said to be "bought" or "bought with a price" (1 Corinthians 6:20; 7:23; Galatians 3:13; 2 Peter 2:1 Revelation 5:9; cf. Acts 20:28; 1 Peter 1:18, 19), we can hardly resist the conclusion that the idea of the λύσθαι retains its full force, that it is identical with the ἀποκαθιστάναι, and that both are ways of describing the Death of Christ. The emphasis is on the cost of man's redemption.

Denney says that classical examples of the use of the metaphor favor the idea that a reference to the cost of liberation is involved in the word. It may be that as the word which originally meant "emancipate" or "deliver by paying a price," came to be used to refer to God's emancipation of the people of Israel, the sense of price had faded out in Hellenistic Greek by New Testament times. But if so, the idea of price is certainly

---


restored in the New Testament by the context in which the figure is used. It re-acquired a sense of redemption by paying a price. In Judaism the Exodus is regarded as the redemption of Israel by God. A new \( \omega \nu \alpha \lambda \nu \tau \mu \sigma \iota \varsigma \), says Paul, is affected by Christ Jesus, and that new \( \alpha \nu \pi \omega \lambda \nu \tau \mu \sigma \iota \varsigma \) was not without cost. The price of the redemption was the death of Christ itself.

b. \( \alpha \gamma \omicron \omicron \rho \delta \varsigma \omega \) Four times Paul uses forms of the verb \( \gamma \omicron \omicron \rho \delta \varsigma \omega \), in describing the work of Christ. In 1 Corinthians 6:20; 7:23, "You were bought with a price." In Galatians 3:13, "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, ..." and in Galatians 4:4, "... to redeem those who were under the law." Whereas in \( \omega \nu \alpha \lambda \nu \tau \mu \sigma \iota \varsigma \) the basic idea was that of emancipation by the paying of ransom and thereby bringing freedom to the object of emancipation, here the basic thought is that of deliverance from the power or ownership of one to that of another, a change of ownership. The \( \alpha \gamma \omicron \omicron \) was the place of assembly, the forum or market-place where buying and selling occurred, and the figure expressed in \( \alpha \gamma \omicron \omicron \) is of Christ buying the believer so that he no longer belongs to his former owner, but to God in Christ. In the one sense Christ's death was an act of emancipation -- it set free; in another sense it was a change of ownership. The Christian was "set free" from his former owner but was still beholden, still, in a sense, a "slave," but now with a new owner. Christ had by His death secured the believer's release from a prior slavery. In 1 Corinthians in both instances of the use of the word \( \gamma \omicron \omicron \rho \delta \varsigma \omega \), the emphasis is on the thought of buying; the paying of the price had taken place and put the believer in a new situation. In Galatians and the word \( \varepsilon \xi \gamma \omicron \omicron \rho \delta \varsigma \omega \) the emphasis is on the relation of the believer before the redemption to his former owner, in both cases here the Law as a legalistic system.
In the Old Testament, the word εὑρομα, found in late writers, according to Burton, only from the Septuagint (Daniel 2:8 only) down, is used in two senses: (1) to "buy up"; (2) to "redeem," to "deliver at cost of some sort to the deliverer." Αγοράζω is frequently used in the Septuagint meaning simply "to buy."¹ Thus as in the deliverance by ransom we have seen implications in Paul's thought of the idea of a cost involved, so in the background of these words, and Paul's use of them, there is present the fact that the change from an old to a new owner involves a price paid by the one who effects the change.

Twice in addition to the above references, Paul uses forms of the word εἰκαγοράζω, in Ephesians 5:16 and Colossians 1:5, where the meaning has no direct connection with the results of Christ's work, but simply means "to make the most of the time for doing good."²

Fully conscious of the freedom which Christ bought for Himself and all believers, Paul could still refer to himself and other followers of Christ as "slaves" with this metaphor in mind.³ The affiliation was no less real, but this time the "owner" of the "slaves" was God in Christ who had "bought them with a price."

c. Επίλομαι. A third word that Paul uses in his vocabulary of redemption brings forth still another picture. The deponent verb ἐπιλομα has the meaning "to rescue, to deliver." In Colossians 1:13, "He has delivered (ἐνερθάσατο) us from the dominion of darkness..." and, in 1 Thessalon-

¹Burton, op.cit., p. 168.
²AV translates in both instances, "redeeming the time."
³See Romans 6:17, "But thanks be to God, that you who were once slaves of sin... have become slaves of righteousness." Romans 6:22 - "But now that you have been set free (ἐλευθερωθέντες) and have become slaves of God... ."
ians 1:10, "Jesus who delivers us from the wrath to come." Lightfoot, in commenting on Paul's change in vocabulary from ἐρρυσάτος to ἔλεημον in Colossians 1:13, 15, says "The image of a captive and enslaved people is still continued... The metaphor has changed however from the victor who rescues the captive by force of arms to the philanthropist who releases him by payment of ransom." Here we have a military picture, a campaign of war with the decisive battle fought, and the captive freed, delivered from the bonds of his captors. A look at the Septuagint, however, again reveals that this particular word had been used in Old Testament language to describe a spiritual condition under the same figure of speech. The word seems to have on occasion at least been used interchangeably by the Septuagint translators for the word ιένοπ η η which we have already discussed. So Paul, using this figure to describe the act of Christ, sees Him as the victorious leader, who through His death has accomplished that victory which frees all the prisoners of the vanquished.

Paul uses this word also in Romans 7:24; 15:31; 2 Corinthians 1:10; 2 Thessalonians 3:2; and it is in 2 Timothy 3:11; 4:17. In each of these cases the word is used in speaking of Paul's own deliverance, or hoped-for deliverance, from his physical afflictions or from his enemies with no specific reference to the particular work of Christ in His death.

Closely related to the use of the figure ἡμῶν is the employment by Paul of the word ἐκβαρέσω which means to "celebrate a triumph" or "lead in a triumphal procession." In 2 Corinthians 2:14, "But thanks be to God, who in Christ always leads us in triumph, ...," and in Col-

---


2 See Isaiah 52:9 and 54:8.
ossians 2:15, "He disarmed the principalities and powers and made a public example of them, triumphing over them in him." Here again the thought is of a military triumph, but for Paul it is God's triumph in Christ over the demoniacal powers through Christ's death. On the Colossian passage, Beare comments:

Paul depicts the breaking of their dominion under the figure of a military defeat, and the parade of the vanquished in the triumphal procession of the conqueror. God has stripped them of their arms, displayed them in public as his trophies of victory, leading them in captive chains at his chariot wheels.

In the Corinthian passage, Paul reverses the figure and sees Christ as leading the redeemed Christians in triumphal procession.

\(d\lambda\varepsilon\upsilon\varepsilon\rho\dot{o}\). Still another word that Paul uses puts the emphasis of Christ's work on the resulting freedom which it brings, rather than on some picture describing the manner in which the freedom is achieved. The word \(d\lambda\varepsilon\upsilon\varepsilon\rho\dot{o}\) has as its basic meaning "to make free," "to set at liberty," whether it be free from slavery of any kind or from obligation. We have already mentioned the statement of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, "You shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:32). In Romans 6:18, Paul describes the Roman Christians as "having been set free from sins..." in 6:22, "But now you have been set free from sin and have become slaves of God"; in Romans 8:2, "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set me free from the law of sin and death"; and in Galatians 5:1, "For freedom Christ has set us free." Here then, the emphasis is exclusively upon the act of Christ as making possible for those who have faith in him a new state, that of freedom.

\[1\text{Francis W. Beare, The Epistle to the Colossians, Interpreter's Bible (New York: Abingdon Press, 1955), XI, 199.}\]
In Colossians 2:14, Paul uses the phrase \( \varepsilon\xi\alpha\ell\varepsilon\upsi\alpha\varsigma \chi\varepsilon\iota\rho\delta\gamma\alpha\rho\alpha\varsigma \) which is translated "having cancelled the bond." Here the picture is of the believer having been in debt and Christ getting him out of the consequences of his inability to repay the debt. Thayer says that the \( \chi\varepsilon\iota\rho\delta\gamma\alpha\rho\alpha\varsigma \) was "a note of hand or writing in which one acknowledged that money had either been deposited with him or lent to him by another, to be returned at an appointed time."\(^1\) Abbott comments on the application of this figure by Paul to the work of Christ. He says \( \chi\varepsilon\iota\rho\delta\gamma\alpha\rho\alpha\varsigma \) was ...

... in later Greek a technical term for a written acknowledgment of debt... Here the \( \chi\varepsilon\iota\rho\delta\gamma\alpha\rho\alpha\varsigma \) is the Mosaic Law, which being unfulfilled is analogous to an unpaid note of hand. But the figure must not be pressed too far for in this case the \( \chi\varepsilon\iota\rho\delta\gamma\alpha\rho\alpha\varsigma \) was not written by the debtor... The fact of obligation is enough to justify the use of the figure.\(^2\)

Jesus Himself expresses the same thought, if using different vocabulary, as Grundmann points out, when in the Lord's Prayer He uses the petition, "Forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors."

This noteworthy expression points to man as being in debt. The conception is further illustrated in a number of parables, in which the relation of God to man is likened to those of landowner to steward, creditor to debtor, employer to employee.\(^3\)

Paul expresses the same thought when in Romans 8:12 he says "So then, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live according to the flesh... ."

We conclude that, although Paul uses various words to describe it,


\(^2\)Abbott, op.cit., p. 254, 255.

and his metaphors point to different pictures, each with certain interesting features, the main thought of redemption is for him one. Whether the figure be that of the emancipated slave, the purchased slave with a new owner, the rescued prisoner-of-war, or the debtor whose debt is paid for him, the "redeemed" person is one who has been freed from that which enslaved him. In all these figures, too, although Paul does not in his use of them make a point of it, the cost of the action is a factor. Something had to be achieved, paid, or given, in order that the slave, prisoner, or debtor could find himself in his new estate.

For the most part, Paul emphasizes the fact that the redemption has already been accomplished and man, so far as his former slavery is concerned, is free. Redemption is a present reality. The victory has been won. In Him we "have the redemption..." (Colossians 1:14). "You were bought with a price" (1 Corinthians 6:20, 7:23). He "has delivered us..." (Colossians 1:13). He "has set us free" (Galatians 5:1). "The bond has been cancelled" (Colossians 2:14). But Paul also speaks of the redemption in the eschatological sense, as that which is yet to be fully realized. "We wait for... the redemption of our bodies" (Romans 8:23).

The Holy Spirit is the guarantee of our inheritance until we acquire possession of it. (Ephesians 1:14 - AV translates, again, "until the redemption of the purchased possession"). Man was "sealed" in "the Holy Spirit of God" for the day of redemption (Ephesians 4:30). The complete redemption, the final results of the act of redemption by Christ in His death, Paul sees as still in the future. We shall see this more clearly as we go on in our discussion of the work of Christ in His redemptive act.1

1This subject shall come up again in Chapter VIII.
4. The "Powers"

Paul speaks of the act of Christ as redemption generally through the several figures of speech. We now turn to a consideration of the background of that from which man is redeemed as Paul saw it. Here we seem to have both subjective and objective factors involved in Paul's thinking, but generally he treats the redemption by Jesus Christ as an objective fact; that is, the redemption of man from something other than simply man's own spiritual shortcomings (although, of course, from them, too). Man is redeemed by Christ from "powers" outside man himself. In what manner that redemption occurs remains for the next section of our discussion. Here let us ask from where Paul got his conception of the powers and who or what they were.

The presence of supernatural powers, spirits, angels, or demons had been a part of pagan religion since the earliest days. It was widespread, according to Hughes, in Paul's day throughout the pagan world. "We know from Plutarch and other ancient writers that the theory of demons, as powers of evil, was very deep and widespread throughout the Roman empire, although it appears that they were not all evil powers."¹ These powers were understood as no idle spirits but were constantly active in the world exerting influence for good or evil as they endeavored to force men to do their will, or the will of a higher power, good or evil, to whose authority they themselves were subject. Various orders and classes of beings populated the vast unknown between the infinite and the finite.

In the course of Judaism's contact with the pagan world, the ten-

dency naturally developed to assimilate some of these beings of the heathen religions of that world into terms compatible with the ideas of the Jewish theology. Thus the ὕππνόμείς were adopted as divine powers or agencies under the one God. Caird sees this as happening gradually over the entire span of Biblical history.

Supernatural beings are conceived as forming a heavenly council around the throne of God (Psalms 89:6-7)... The powers of nature were transformed into ministering angels of Yahweh (Psalms 104:24).... Yahweh, as God of the angelic hosts, exercises control over the powers of nature. ... The stars too were included in Yahweh's angelic retinue (Judges 5:20).... Each nation has its own angelic ruler and guardian (Deuteronomy 32:8-9; Daniel 10:13,20). ... In the Septuagint we find the terms powers (ὑππνόμείς), authorities (ἐρωσιαί), principalities (ἀρχαί) and rulers (ἀρχοντες) applied for the first time to angelic beings.¹

Such ideas, it should be emphasized, were not simply the vague superstitions of the ignorant and uneducated, but held a place in the philosophical and religious understanding of the structure of the universe. The entire world of Paul, Jewish and pagan alike, was at one in its general conception of the presence of cosmic creatures which were very much a part of the action within the lives of men and the universe as a whole.

In harmony with these conceptions, and having further bearing on Paul's understanding of cosmic activity is the Jewish concept of the two kingdoms or two impulses which was adapted to the monotheistic ideal. All the universe was, under God, the scene of an unending conflict between the good and the evil. These two opposing forces might be defined as two kingdoms, the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan; as two impulses

working within man, "ha yetzer ha ra" or the evil impulse, and "ha yetzer ha tob" or the good impulse; or as the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness. T. W. Manson sees the doctrine of the two kingdoms as lying in the background of the thinking of both Jesus and Paul.

The essential thing for the understanding both of the ministry of Jesus and the theology of Paul is the doctrine of the two kingdoms: the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan. All the evils under which men suffer and all the evils they commit are the manifestation in history of the power of the evil kingdom. All men's hopes for the future are bound up with the triumph of the kingdom of God over the kingdom of Satan...

Paul seems to have in mind the thought of the evil impulse as opposing the good impulse in man when he says in describing his own experience in Romans 7: "For I delight in the law of God, in my inmost self, but I see in my members another law at war with the law of my mind and making me captive to the law of sin which dwells in my members." Moore says of the Jewish conception of the evil impulse:

The evil impulse is frequently personified. The something within that seduces man into doing what is repugnant to his better judgment and purpose, drugs his conscience, overmasters his will to do good, or blinds him to the consequences of his acts, has always seemed to the introspective imagination to be a demonic power, other than his conscious self, that maliciously plots and compasses his undoing. ... Personified as the tempter, evil impulse may be identified with Satan; and since by their acts they cause the death of the sinner, they can by a further association become the angel of death.

The same dualistic idea is expressed through the conception of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness which is contained in the Gospels, particularly in the Fourth Gospel, and in First John. In Luke, Jesus comments at the end of a parable, "...the sons of this world are wiser in

---


their own generation than the sons of light" (Luke 16:8) In the Fourth Gospel, we find Him exhorting His disciples in the words, "While you have the light, believe in the light, that you may become sons of light" (John 12:36). And in First John, the enmity between the opposing forces is clearly set forth in "If we say we have fellowship with him while we walk in the darkness, we lie and do not live according to the truth but if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship with one another..." (1 John 1:6,7). There are several instances in Paul's letters pertaining to this conception. "Let us then cast off the works of darkness and put on the armor of light;..." (Romans 13:12). "And no wonder, for even Satan disguises himself as an angel of light" (1 Corinthians 11:14). "For you are all sons of light and sons of the day; we are not of the night or of darkness" (1 Thessalonians 5:5).

We have a much better understanding of the background of this latter conception in the period immediately before the beginning of the Christian era since the discovery of the "Dead Sea Scrolls," beginning in 1947. One of the scrolls is entitled "The War of the Sons of Light with the Sons of Darkness." Of it Burrows says:

The document contains directions for the conduct of a war between the tribes of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin, who are called the sons of light, and the Edomites, Moabites, Ammonites, Philistines, and Greeks, who are called the sons of darkness. Whether the war contemplated is an actual conflict that was being waged or was impending at the time when the document was written, or whether it was an eschatological war, like that predicted in the book of Ezekiel and the Revelation of John, is a question to which no final answer can yet be given.

In another of the scrolls, called by Burrows "The Manual of Discipline,"

an extensive description of the two opposing forces is found. Mankind has two spirits ruling its existence. There are in the world the "sons of righteousness" or the "sons of light" and the "sons of error" or the "sons of darkness." Between these two forces there is constant struggle throughout all history.

He (God) created man to have dominion over the world and made for him two spirits, that he might walk by them until the appointed time of visitation; they are the spirits of truth and of error. In the hand of the prince of lights is dominion over all the sons of righteousness; in the ways of light they walk. And in the hand of the angel of darkness is all dominion over the sons of error; and in the ways of darkness they walk. And by the angel of darkness is the straying of all the sons of righteousness, and all their sin and their iniquities and their guilt.... And all the spirits of his lot try to make the sons of light stumble.¹

The Manual makes it quite clear that this is not a doctrine of outright dualism. It emphasizes that all these spirits are under divine authority, that God is the creator of both good and evil spirits.

For he created the spirits of light and of darkness, and upon them he founded every work and upon their ways every service. ... For God has established the two spirits in equal measure until the last period, and has put eternal enmity between their divisions.²

Here we find light thrown on the background of much of Paul's thinking as it regards redemption through Christ's death. Here is the picture of the constant struggle for possession of men's souls. It is a very real struggle, yet both forces exist under one God, created and controlled by Him. He has in His power the key to the conflict in which the forces are constantly engaged, yet sees fit to have it continue until that day which He has set for its conclusion. Minear describes it this way:

Throughout the range of space and time God remains the only true

¹Ibid., p. 374.
²Ibid., p. 374, 375.
Lord. All the hosts of darkness are subjected to Him, even Satan receiving from him permission to tempt men by wielding apparently invincible power over them. The war is civil war, not international war.¹

A further look at the Gospels reveals that this conception of the conflict in the world between Himself and Satan and the evil powers had a place in the thought of our Lord Himself. When in Gethsemane, He says "But this is your hour, and the power of darkness." (Luke 22:53b), or when He says to the crowd "Now is the judgment of this world, now shall the ruler of this world be cast out," (John 12:31; see also John 14:30), as well as in the statements quoted above containing references to the sons of light, He is speaking in the context of an awareness of the conflict just described above. He reveals His awareness of both "sides" in the battle, too, when he commands Peter to put back his sword with "Do you think that I cannot appeal to my Father, and He will at once send me more than twelve legions of angels?" (Matthew 26:53). Stewart confirms that this is one strand of Jesus' thought.

When he (Paul) speaks of the ΣΡΩΧΕΤΑ, or "elements," it is most probably such supernatural beings, or elemental spirits, which he has in mind. This, too, runs back to Jesus' teaching. Round about the lives of men was an unseen realm full of malign influences, emissaries of the Evil One; and suffering, sickness, and sin were regularly attributed to demonic agency. Hence Jesus could say that when, through His own and His followers' mission, the work of saving and healing suddenly began to go forward on a gigantic scale, it was a token that the whole kingdom of Satan was being shaken to its foundations, was indeed breaking up, and that the kingdom of goodness and light and God was at last coming into its own.²

For Jesus this cosmic struggle with demonic powers was very much a part of His appointed work. He was aware of the superiority of His strength

²Stewart, op.cit., p. 105.
over Satan. But the struggle continued. He spoke with authority to the "demons" inhabiting men. They recognized His power and obeyed Him. But they were ever seeking to return to power in men. He recognized that the presence of these "powers" and of Satan, their head, had much to do with the hostile attitude of the people and their leaders toward Him. Their "hour" came in Gethsemane when the authorities arrested Him. His "hour" came when on the Cross He defeated Satan and all the Powers. There He carried out God's purpose for Him "to give His life as a ransom for many" (Mark 10:45), freeing them from their enslavement.

We now have to look at the nature of these powers as Paul understood them. What do we find about them from Paul's letters? What was it from which Paul saw man as needing redemption? We find that Paul speaks of the objects from which Christ redeems men in various ways. They are supernatural beings associated with political rulers and institutions of the day: "rulers of this age" - 1 Corinthians 2:6,8; 15:24; 2 Corinthians 4:4; Galatians 1:4; Ephesians 1:21; 6:12; or "principalities and powers" - Romans 8:38; 1 Corinthians 15:24; Ephesians 1:21; 2:2; 3:10; 6:12; Colossians 1:15,16; 2:15. There are the powers associated with nature and with the heavenly bodies, the "elemental spirits" - Galatians 4:3,9; Colossians 2:8,20. There are the powers in the heavens, the "spiritual hosts of wickedness in heavenly places" - Ephesians 3:10; 6:12. There are the powers in the "dominion of darkness" - Ephesians 6:12; Colossians 1:13. There are "angels" - Romans 8:38; 1 Corinthians 6:3;

1 See Mk. 5:1-20 (Mat. 8:26-34; Lk. 8:26-39).

2 Mat. 12:24-25 (Lk. 11:21-26).

3 Lk. 22:53b.
Galatians 1:8; and "demons" - 1 Corinthians 10:20. Satan is involved, and Satan's servants - 1 Corinthians 5:6; 7:5; 2 Corinthians 2:11; 11:14, 15; 12:7-9; the "Destroyer" - 1 Corinthians 10:10; the "man of lawlessness" - 2 Thessalonians 2:3, 9; the "evil one" - 2 Thessalonians 3:3. Related to these various powers in ways which we shall discuss are the powers of "sin," "the law," "flesh," and "death" in their demonic aspects toward men.

What are the characteristics of these beings? They were secondary powers and Paul emphasizes to the Colossians that Christ was before them and more powerful than they. They were created in Christ, "the image of the Invisible God" (Colossians 1:15, 16). They themselves were in ignorance of this fact (1 Corinthians 2:8). They blind the minds of unbelievers (2 Corinthians 4:14), and contend against believers (Ephesians 6:12). They enslave human beings (Galatians 4:3). They tempt men (1 Corinthians 7:5). They bring disease (2 Corinthians 12:7-9). They crucified the Lord of glory (1 Corinthians 2:8). The picture in Paul we can see is consistent with the portrayal of the nature of these cosmic forces in later Judaism and in the mind of Jesus. A comprehensive description of all these powers is found in Ephesians, where Paul calls them "the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places" (Ephesians 6:12).

B. The Redemption of Jesus Christ

With the foregoing as background, we are now ready to consider the nature of the redemption accomplished by Jesus Christ in His death as Paul conceived of that redemption. In what way did the universe in general and Christian believers in particular benefit through the death of Christ by
being "redeemed" from these various "powers"? We have discussed the idea of redemption as described by the various metaphors contained in the vocabulary Paul used. We have described the conception of the powers as it was received by him and adapted into the context of his gospel. That man's slavery was real Paul did not doubt as we have seen. As a result of Christ's death mankind was now free from this slavery. We have now to discuss the nature of that slavery, and the manner of Christ's redemption from it in Paul.

Following Aulén,¹ we shall divide our discussion in respect to what appears to be a division in Paul's own thought, looking first at Christ's redemption of man from the powers generally, then, secondly, at the act of Christ as redeeming men from the demonic aspect in sin, the law, flesh, and death.

1. Redemption from the Powers

Jesus Christ in His death redeemed man from servitude to those cosmic powers whose attributes we have already set forth. On this Paul is explicit and clear. God has "given us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Corinthians 15:57). "Christ gave Himself for our sins to deliver us from the present evil age" (Galatians 1:4). He has kept man in communion with God by allowing "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" to separate us from His love (Romans 8:38,39). Man being "slaves to the elemental spirits of the universe," "God sent forth His Son... to redeem" him (Galatians 1:3,4). "He has delivered us from the dominion of darkness and transferred us to

¹Aulén, op.cit., p. 81.
the kingdom of His beloved son in whom we have redemption" (Colossians 1:13, 14). "He disarmed the principalities and powers and made a public example of them, triumphing over them..." (Colossians 2:15). With Christ man had the opportunity to "die to the elemental spirits of the universe" (Colossians 2:20). They no longer could exercise power over him. At the end Christ will deliver "the kingdom to God the Father after destroying every rule and authority and power" (1 Corinthians 15:24).

As we have seen, it is not possible to draw a complete, logical picture of what Paul believed about these powers. He makes what seem to be conflicting statements. In 1 Corinthians, after saying "we know that an idol has no real existence..." he then proceeds to say there are "many gods and many lords" (1 Corinthians 8:4,5). We seem to have here "two sides of Paul's belief, an explicit affirmation of monotheism, and yet admission of the existence of other supernatural beings which some look upon as gods."

It is clear that Paul was impressed with the idea of angelic powers in pagan and Jewish thought and was aware of the belief in the powers as current among those to whom he wrote. Particularly is this true in the letter to Colossae. The Colossian heresy was bound up with the belief in the principalities and the powers and in man's subjection to them. It involved the question of whether Christ was more powerful than the powers or one of them, and whether the powers could mediate between God and man as well as Christ. To the Colossians, Paul does not argue the existence of powers but emphasizes the primacy of Christ over all. "He is the image of the invisible God, the first born of all creation; for in Him all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones

1Craig, op.cit., X, 93.
or dominions or principalities or authorities — all things were created through him and for him. He is before all things and in him all things hold together" (Colossians 1:15-17). This is the One in whom God has "delivered us from the dominion of darkness..., in whom we have redemption ...") (Colossians 1:13,14). He was not one power among many, as was being said, for Christ was before all the powers and is supreme over them all.

As we have seen in the quotations earlier in this section, however, this thought in Paul of Christ's victory over the powers freeing men from their domination is by no means confined to Colossians. It is in Romans where neither "principalities, nor powers shall be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord" because "we are more than conquerors through him who loved us" (Romans 8:37-39). It is in Philippians, where "at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth..." (Philippians 2:10). It is in Corinthians where Christ shall deliver the kingdom to God the Father after "destroying every rule and every authority and power" (1 Corinthians 15:24). It is in Galatians where the purpose of Christ's giving Himself up to death was in order "to deliver us from the present evil age" (Galatians 1:4). It is in Ephesians where Christ is "far above all rule and authority and power and dominion..." (Ephesians 1:21).

For Paul, the victory has been won; the redemption has occurred, yet it was still happening and has not yet been completed. "You were bought with a price" (1 Corinthians 6:20; 7:23). "Christ gave himself to deliver us from the present evil age..." (Galatians 1:4). "For freedom Christ has set us free" (Galatians 5:1). The redemption has been completely achieved in one sense. Christ subjected Himself to the powers of the world, that He might overcome them in His death and resurrection. It
happened once for all. Yet in another and different sense the action is not complete. The decisive victory has been won, but the enemy has not been completely destroyed. The full redemption will not be complete until "He delivers the kingdom to God the Father after destroying every rule and every authority and power. For He must reign until He has put all His enemies under his feet" (1 Corinthians 15:24,25).

This victory of Christ in redeeming men from their slavery to these powers is much more than a subjective redemption in individual men from personal "demons" within their own lives. The object of redemption is men, but not only men. The work of Christ in His death had cosmic significance. It is enlarged to include also "all things, whether on earth or in heaven" (Colossians 1:20). Christ has redeemed men from the powers. Paul also sees the victorious Christ eventually, in God's own good time, winning even the powers themselves. Caird suggests that Paul in his later years had begun to entertain the hope that even the powers may be brought within the scope of God's redemption. God had exalted Christ "that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of those in heaven and those on earth and those under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus is Lord." The heavenly powers are among those who must come to acknowledge the lordship of Christ, for it was to this end that they were created. ... Like the redemption of the Christian, the redemption of the powers is achieved by the Cross, worked out in the present, and consummated at the Parousia.¹

Thus Paul saw the redemption of mankind in the victory of Christ in His death when He dealt the fatal blow to all those powers which plagued mankind and held man in their power. From these powers mankind was free.

¹Caird, op.cit., pp. 27, 28.
2. Redemption from Sin

We have seen how Paul thought of Jesus' death as a deliverance from the powers collectively. There are in addition, related to these demonic powers, some specific powers under whose enslavement Paul saw men before they were redeemed by Christ. Paul is much more specific about these powers, and about the way in which Christ redeemed men from them in His death. They are sin, the law, flesh, and death, and are inter-related in their influence, yet with individual attributes. Most prominent of these is "sin" as a demonic power.

Paul speaks of sin in two senses. In one sense of the word he speaks of sin in the sense we ordinarily give it, the sinful choices and acts of men. In this sense he generally speaks of it in the plural.  

Thus it is "sins" in Romans 5:14; 7:5; 1 Corinthians 15:3,17; Ephesians 2:1; Colossians 1:14. A number of times Paul connects the death of Christ and the redemption from sins in this general sense. In Romans 3:25, it was "because of his divine forbearance he (God) had passed over former sins." Christ "gave himself for our sins to deliver us from the present evil age" (Galatians 1:4). "In him we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses" (Ephesians 1:7). And to the Colossians, it is in Christ "in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins" (Colossians 1:14).

But Paul conceived of sin in a much more specific sense, as a ruling, devastating power in the universe. Sin was one of many hostile powers, exercising control over man and threatening his happiness and well-being. Thus sin is personified, is seen as entering the world, ruling

---

1Exceptions are Ro. 1:8, a quotation; and 2 Cor. 11:7.
mankind, as a power which must be over-come if man is to have his freedom. But, as Scott says, Paul's personification of sin is more than a mere giving of personal status to the collective sins of humanity.

In some forty cases he uses the word (sin) in a sense which is entirely unfamiliar to us. He uses it to denote an external Force, external to man, one of the spirit-forces of evil, which is already there before man has succumbed to sin. To see that this is so, and to see its importance, it is enough to read, with this idea in mind, Romans 5:12-6:23. It is not just a personification of sin as it is found in the individual, but a conception of sin as an external Force, hostile to God and man.1

Sin came into the world (Romans 5:12), that is, it had not always been; but it was "not counted" until the "law was given" (Romans 5:13). It was dead, but came to life through the law (Romans 7:8). Now, sin "dwells in men" (Romans 6:17, 20). Sin reigns in mortal bodies, making men obedient to passions (Romans 6:12), covetousness (Romans 7:8), and death (Romans 7:5). It works through that which is good (Romans 7:13), it works through the law (1 Corinthians 15:56), it reigns in death (Romans 5:21). Both Jews and Gentiles are under its power (Romans 3:9).

Paul's thinking on the power of sin in man's life is illustrated particularly in the passage, Romans 7:14-25, which we take to be a description of his own experience of sin's power in his life. He has been writing of the relationship of sin and the law, saying that it was through the law that sin entered into his life. The law made him aware of sin, even prompted him to sin. "For sin, finding opportunity in the commandment, deceived me and by it killed me" (Romans 7:11). The law had promised him life, but it let sin enter into his life, and sin prevented him from obeying the law. This led him to disobedience of the law, brought a sense of his guilt and despair upon him and, speaking in a spiritual sense,

1Scott, St. Paul, the Man and the Teacher, p. 79.
killed him. "It was sin working death in me through what is good ..." (Romans 7:13). The law in itself is good; but the sin which came into his life through the law gained power over him; he is "sold under sin" (7:14). The result so far as law was concerned was that the law has served only to make him aware of his separation from God through sin's power over him.

The power of sin works within him in such a way that he can say of himself, "I do not understand my own actions. For I do not do what I want, but I do the very thing I hate" (7:15). The very fact that he recognizes the actions he does not like in himself as sin is an acknowledgment of the value of God's law. But at the same time his inability to do the right kind of action reveals the power of sin over him. "So then it is no longer I that do it, but sin which dwells in me" (7:17). He sums up the description of the struggle within him when he says, "For I delight in the law of God, in my inmost self, but I see in my members another law at war with the law of my mind and making me captive to the law of sin which dwells in my members" (7:22,23). Undoubtedly Paul thought of his experience as typical of man in general. He is a captive to the power of sin and needs to be redeemed.

If the outlook for man under sin is so hopeless as all this, Paul sees in the Death of Christ the act of redemption by which the power of sin over man is ended. "Wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of death? Thanks be to God through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Romans 7:25)! He points out conclusively how the Divine power manifested in Christ is more than a match for the power of sin. Whereas man was formerly bound by sin and unable to do the good that his better side urged him to do (Romans 7:15-19), something happened when Christ died that altered man's moral situation completely and made a righteous life on the part of
man a possibility. What did the death of Christ do for man in this particular facet of his need?

Christ redeemed man, made him free from his former bondage. Those who accept the benefits of his death "are justified,"1 "made right," "by His grace as a gift, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus" (Romans 3:24). This is so because "the death he died he died to sin" (Romans 6:10). God sent "His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, he condemned sin in the flesh" (Romans 8:3; cf. 2 Corinthians 5:21). Thus the freedom gained for man by Christ in His death was obtained for man by virtue of the fact of Christ's becoming man, "in the likeness of sinful flesh." By coming in the flesh, He subjected Himself to the power of sin. In dying He allowed sin to exercise its power over Him. Yet in the very act of dying He condemned sin and defeated its power, because God in Whom dwelt the supreme power had sent Him for this purpose. Sin had entered through the flesh, In His death, sin no longer had a means of entrance or of keeping its power over Him and it was conquered.

That this defeat of sin by Christ was advantageous to all men was possible in Paul's view because he accepted the principle of solidarity, which he received from his Jewish heritage.2 The implications of this principle in Christ's victory for mankind are brought out in Romans 5:12 and following. "Therefore as sin came into the world through one man and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all men sinned ..." (5:12); "For if many died through one man's trespass..." (5:15); "If because of man's trespass, death reigned through that one man..." (5:17);

1 See Chapter III.

2 This will be treated in further detail in Chapter VI, The Category of Representation.
"Then as one man's trespass led to condemnation for all men..." (5:18); all signify that the fact that Adam sinned allowed sin to gain entry into his life. Because of the fact that man, so to speak, is all one family under God, bound together in solidarity, this exposed mankind generally to sin, and permitted sin to gain power over all men. By virtue of the same principle, then, Christ, by defeating sin in His own life, defeated sin for all men. "For if many died through one man's trespass, much more have the grace of God and the free gift in the grace of that one man Jesus Christ abounded for many" (Romans 5:15). "If because of one man's trespass, death reigned through that one man, much more will those who receive the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness reign through the one man Jesus Christ. Then as one man's trespass led to condemnation for all men, so one man's act of righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all men" (Romans 5:17,18). This of course presupposes the sinlessness of Jesus. It was "Him who knew no sin" whom God "made to be sin on our behalf." All men's sin was on Him, not His own, and He defeated it.

Man then is free from sin. Sin is no longer the slaveholder, legally allowed to order its slave. Man has been "bought with a price" (1 Corinthians 6:20; 7:23). Grundmann says of the connection between the death of Christ and His defeat of sin:

Here lies the importance of His death. It is at the Cross that sin is defeated once for all. That is why the Cross is the sign of victory over sin, and consequently over death and demons, and the preaching of the Cross is the power of God and the wisdom of God. \(^2\)

---

1 Paul goes on, in Ro. 5, "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by one man's obedience many were made righteous." Here we get into another category of Paul's thought. The thought is that, because of man's disobedience in Adam, God in His providential and just reign had to allow sin to reign in man. But through Christ's obedient death, God could acquit men of this sentence of guilt. See Chapter III.

2 Grundmann, op.cit., p. 81.
How though, does man, being freed from sin in the victory of Christ, appropriate the fruits of that victory? In Romans, Paul describes this as being done in the baptismal experience as the acquisition into the individual life of the benefits of Christ’s death. "Do you not know that all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death?" (Romans 6:3). "We know that our old self was crucified with him so that the sinful body might be destroyed and we might no longer be enslaved to sin. For he who has died is freed from sin" (Romans 6:6,7). We have earlier referred to Knox where he points out the relationship of this conception to Paul’s Rabbinic background.  

For Paul and for Jewish readers there was nothing strange in the argument that the sin of Adam had brought death on all mankind... In Romans 6 it is stated in terms of the Christian revision of the kerygma in Judaism, in which the death and resurrection of Jesus replace the Exodus from Egypt. The proselyte through circumcision and the proselyte’s bath was enabled to come out of Egypt and pass through the Red Sea into the promised land of Israel. This original salvation of the people was re-enacted in every Gentile who was prepared to come out of Egypt. ... Paul transfers the argument to the death and resurrection of Jesus. Those who share in it through faith and pass through the waters of baptism are delivered from the old Egyptian bondage to sin and pass instead into a new slavery to righteousness which results in sanctification. Here the union of the Christian with Jesus is stated in terms of an exchange from one slavery to another, on the strength of the Christian conception of the passion and resurrection as the new Passover.  

So for Paul as the believer is baptized, he experiences for his own life the death and resurrection of Christ and brings the results of Christ’s act whereby sin is conquered into His own life. Thus it can be said, "Christ died to sin (Romans 6:10); therefore, "we died to sin" (Romans 6:2) and are dead to it (6:11), set free from it (6:7,18,22), while it is condemned (8:3).  

---

1See p. 92.  
2W.L.Knox, op.cit., pp. 96, 97.
3. Redemption from the Law

Paul's thinking about Christ's death as redeeming men from the power of sin, the law, flesh, and death are so inter-related that we have already found it necessary to refer to some of his ideas concerning the law as they affect his thinking of sin as a power. Now we look further into redemption from the law as one of the powers. We have seen that Paul looked at sin in two senses, both of them evil, the one more subjective, the other objective. Paul's conception of Christ's death as being redemption from the law can be understood only when we are aware that Paul's view of the law, too, had two distinct aspects. But with the law, the division in thought seems more paradoxical. On the one hand Paul sees the law as good, Christ as fulfilling it. On the other, the law is an evil power, enslaving men in much the same sense as had the powers and sin, and Christ's work is to redeem men from it.

On the one hand, Paul takes pains to emphasize the good of the law and his respect and admiration for it. He sees the law as having its fulfillment in Jesus. "The law served as our custodian (AV - schoolmaster) until Christ came" (Galatians 3:24). By the principle of man's salvation by faith in the act of God in Christ we do not disregard the law. "On the contrary we uphold the law" (Romans 3:31). The law bears witness to God's righteousness (Romans 3:21). It serves to clarify man's moral situation. "Where there is no law there is no transgression" (Romans 4:15; see Galatians 3:19). "If it had not been for the law I should not have known sin" (Romans 7:7). Man through the law has been made conscious of sin as an act of wrongdoing toward God, in fact as rebellion against God. Paul exalts the law, emphasizes its divine authority. "The law is holy, and the commandment is holy and just and good" (Romans 7:12; see also
Deuteronomy 6:24. "Neither circumcision counts for anything nor uncircumcision but keeping the commandments of God" (1 Corinthians 7:19). "The whole law," he says, "is fulfilled in one word, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself'" (Galatians 5:14). On this statement of Paul, Burton says,

He affirms that the whole law is fulfilled in one word to which he gives his unqualified assent (Galatians 5:14), a sentence which ... can only mean that he saw in the law, along with many statutes that were for him of no value, certain fundamental principles which he had come to regard as constituting the real essence and substance of the law.1

In his own life, Paul honored and practiced the law.2 In spite of all that evil which, as we shall see, Paul understood as being connected with the law, it is evident that, when its limitations were understood, and its subservience to Christ, the law was for Paul essentially good.

But there is the evil, tyrannical aspect of the law and it was this side of it of which Paul was especially aware, and with which we are concerned here. As we have seen, the law has made man aware of sin, and has actually served as a stimulus to sin. "Through the law comes knowledge of sin" (Romans 3:20). It also increases the trespass (Romans 5:20). "But sin, finding opportunity in the commandment, wrought in me all kinds of covetousness" (Romans 7:8). Law has served to re-inforce sin. "The power of sin is the law" (Galatians 5:19). It arouses sinful passions within man (Romans 7:4). The law is then actually a curse on men because it says "Cursed be every one who does not abide by all things written in the book of the law, and do them."3 This means for Paul, "I testify again

1Burton, op.cit., p. lxi.
3Gal. 3:10. See Deut. 27:26. The Hebrew of Deut. 27:26 says "Cursed be he who does not confirm the words of this law by doing them." Paul quotes from the Septuagint which has "abide by" and "all things," both essential to his argument.
to every man who receives circumcision that he is bound to keep the whole law" (Galatians 5:3). But the law knows all the time full well that it is impossible for man to abide by it completely, so it becomes to man, when man tries hopelessly to live up to it, a curse rather than a blessing. Those, then, who were urging the Galatian Christians to accept the authority of the law in addition to that of Christ were actually tempting them to return to a slavery from which they had been delivered when they accepted the fruits of Christ's death.

This attitude toward the law Paul arrived at on the basis of his own experience as a Jew before his conversion. As Scott conceives the working of Paul's mind,

From his new standpoint as a Christian, Paul looked back on his experience as a Jew, and recognized that the law, which from the Pharisaic point of view was the great glory of Israel and indeed the means to Israel's salvation, had been an intolerable yoke of bondage. The effect of the law had been to lay a curse at least on those who had opportunity to observe it, and had obviously failed. The law actually involved a bondage and imposed a curse.¹

The weakness of the law for salvation, and the reason that in spite of its good qualities it is for man a curse rather than a blessing, is in that the condition on which it offers life to men is the one condition which man cannot by his own power fulfill. The law itself was weakened by the flesh and could not bring to man that condemnation of sin which was necessary if man was to fulfill its just requirements (Romans 8:3).

Whereas Paul approached the law largely from the Jewish viewpoint in his own theological background, it is apparent that he saw the Gentiles as involved in a very similar sense with the legalistic demon which was the tyranny of the law. In the early part of Romans he emphasizes that both Jew and Gentile are deserving of the wrath of God because of their dis-

¹Scott, Christianity According to Paul, p. 39.
obedience. The Jew has the Torah, but the Gentile also knows a law, which is essentially good, but has its evil aspect. "They show that what the law requires is written on their hearts..." (Romans 2:14-16). The Gentiles could have God's favor, too, in the same measure as the Jew. But the same sort of tyranny that subjected the Jew could also work in the Gentile, enslaving him to a "law." "Whether salvation was offered in the name of the ancient gods of the Orient, or of Greece, or of the emperor of Rome, ... the favor of the deity was thought to depend on obedience to the law."¹

Thus the work of redemption by Jesus Christ in His death was as efficacious in its redeeming men from any sort of legalism as from that of the Jewish law.

What, then, does Paul have to say about the manner in which the death of Christ brought about the redemption of men from the tyranny of the law and what does he mean? "Likewise, my brethren, you have died to the law through the body of Christ, so that you may belong to one another ..." (Romans 7:4). "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us..." (Galatians 3:13). "God sent forth His Son, ... born under the law, to redeem those who were under the law, ... so through God you are no longer a slave but a son..." (Galatians 4:4-7). "For He is our peace, who has made us both one, and has broken down the dividing wall of hostility, by abolishing in His flesh the law of commandments and ordinances..." (Ephesians 2:14,15). "And you who were made dead in trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, God made alive together with him, having forgiven us all our trespasses, having cancelled the bond which stood against us with its legal demands; this he set aside, nailing it to

¹Raymond T. Stamm, "The Epistle to the Galatians," Interpreter's Bible, X, 435.
the cross" (Colossians 2:13,14). All this was done by Christ who "emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men" (Philippians 2:7). "Christ became a servant to the circumcised..." (Romans 15:8). Of himself, Paul says, "I through the law died to the law, that I might live to God. I have been crucified with Christ..." (Galatians 2:19,20).

As will have been evident from the passages quoted above, Paul based his argument on the fact of the incarnation and on the principle of solidarity to which we have earlier referred. The reason that Christ's death can be efficacious in delivering men from the tyranny of law is that prior to that death, Christ experienced as a Jew the life in which man was being enslaved. He was "born in the flesh, born under the law" (Galatians 4:4). He was "born in the likeness of men" (Philippians 2:7). As the law put its curse on man, Christ as a man came under that curse and became Himself a curse. In being born as man, Christ assumed human flesh and subjected himself to all that being in human flesh involved. He allowed Himself, by virtue of being in human flesh, to be brought under subjection to the law which held its curse over men. The law enslaved men because it promised salvation but made it impossible for men to achieve that salvation because "cursed be everyone who does not abide by all things written in the book of the law and do them" (Galatians 3:10). The law demanded its full fulfillment and could be satisfied only by one who fulfilled all its claims. Man, unable to fulfill its claims, found himself in bondage to it and needed to be redeemed. Christ as man did for man what man could not do for himself when he lived the perfect life, and having subjected Himself to that power of the law, in His death He removed Himself from the law's authority and became victorious over the law.
With its threat of death to the transgressor, the Law guarantees the very opposite of salvation. Something more than the Law is needed, if the Jew is to be saved and Paul knew this. But man is under the Law as long as he lives, and so the question arises, how to escape from it. The answer is by death alone! But that rules out the possibility of salvation. This situation is fundamentally transformed by the fact of Christ. Through His death, He is the end of the Law. Dying with Christ, man dies to the Law, to receive salvation in a new life with Christ by means of faith.¹

Paul proves his point about the curse of the law and Christ removing that curse by referring to one of a list of curses that Moses commanded be declared unto the people in Deuteronomy 27, which put a curse on those who did not do all the commandments of the law (Deuteronomy 27:26). He then refers to an earlier passage in Deuteronomy where a curse is put on anyone who is hanged - "for it is written 'cursed be everyone who hangs on a tree!'" (Galatians 3:13; Deuteronomy 21:23). He argues that since man was under the curse of the law, and Christ, though living the perfect life, yet by the nature of His death in hanging upon the Cross came under the curse, this was another indication that Christ had entirely entered into the life of man. By the victory obtained in His death (and, of course, His subsequent resurrection to life) He not only bore man's curse but defeated the law which pronounced the curse. More than just logical argument is involved here. Bailey says, on the thought behind the argument,

Paul is here saying that the redemption from the curse of the law is not 'in the curse of hanging on a tree' but in the clear revelation of the truth in Christ that God does not deal with men on the basis of law at all, but on the basis of their faith only. This faith is their response to God who comes to them in Jesus Christ.²

Paul had himself been keenly aware of the curse of the law in his own experience and saw in God's acceptance of man by his faith in Christ not

¹Grundmann, op.cit., p. 76.

only the answer to his own frustrations but those of all mankind.

That this act of Christ in overcoming the law’s power over His own life could be of help to believing mankind generally again brings us to the principle of solidarity by which mankind is seen as bound together with Him in faith. By accepting man’s lot, Christ became one with man. As His solidarity with mankind generally could bring upon Him all the curse of the law, so, on the other hand, when He defeated the law mankind’s solidarity with Him could bring the fruits of His victory to them. Paul was acutely aware of the truth in that which he was setting forth as he surveyed his own personal experience “in Christ.” "I have been crucified with Christ" (Galatians 2:20). In the sense of his oneness with Christ Paul was there on the Cross too, defeating the law with Him. He could say, therefore, "I through the law died to the law" (Galatians 2:19). And to the Romans he could say "you have died to the law through the body of Christ" (Romans 7: 4). In both these passages Paul declares that the believer, being united with Christ in His death has died to the old way of law with its bondage, and become alive as a sharer of His life. Faith in Christ brought with it a new life. "Man of faith in Christ was no longer, then, under the authority of law, but in a new life and under a new authority, that of God in Christ. "You who were made dead ... , God made alive together with Him ... " as He “cancelled the bond” which the law held against man (Colossians 2:13,14).

He broke the power of the law as a yoke of bondage by first realizing in His own Person the utmost extremity of its authority and then by breaking forth from its dominion in the newness of the resurrection of life. Those who by faith participated in His death participated in this aspect of it also. Christ therefore was ‘the end of the law ... to everyone that believeth.’

1Scott, op.cit., p. 40.
1. Redemption from the Flesh

Closely related in Paul's thinking to the thought of Christ's death as redemption from sin and law, which we have already discussed, and as redemption from death at which we shall look next, is that of redemption from the flesh as one of the powers. In a sense the element of "flesh" was behind man's trouble with sin, the law and death.

The word σάρξ, flesh, is used in several different senses in Paul. Often when Paul speaks of "flesh" he is simply referring to humanity, to man as man. 1 At other times he uses it to refer to the human body in its physical makeup, 2 or simply physical life itself. 3 Still other times σάρξ is used for "worldly" as opposed to "sacred"; 4 or sensuous, prone to passion, as opposed to spiritual. 5

Here we are concerned with Paul's use of σάρξ as one of the powers, with an active part in the enslavement of man to evil, and an enemy to Christ and to the spiritual life. It is the demonic distortion of the bodily passions and it needs to be defeated if man is to be free. Reference is to the weakness from the spiritual point of view that is a part of man simply because of the power of the flesh working fleshly desires within him. It was "while we were living in the flesh" that "our sinful passions ... were at work in our members to bear fruit for death" (Romans 7:5).

"For the mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God; it does not

---

1 See Ro. 3:20, where RSV translates "no human being"; Ro. 6:19; 1 Cor. 15:50; Gal. 1:16; 2:16; Col. 2:1.

2 Ro. 2:28; 1 Cor. 15:39; 2 Cor. 7:1, 5; Gal. 4:13.

3 Eph. 5:31; Phil. 1:22, 26.

4 1 Cor. 1:26; 2 Cor. 1:11; 10:2; 11:18.

5 Eph. 2:3, 11; Col. 2:18.
submit to God's law, indeed it cannot; and those who are in the flesh cannot please God" (Romans 8:7,8). Satan tempts men and women through their passions (1 Corinthians 7:5). Sin came in through the flesh (Romans 5:12), and the flesh weakens the law (Romans 8:3,4) and makes it impotent for the good which God ordained it to be. Paul outlines in detail the manner in which the flesh works in man to do its bidding. "Now the works of the flesh are plain: immorality, impurity, licentiousness, idolatry, sorcery, enmity, strife, jealousy, anger, selfishness, dissension, party spirit, envy, drunkenness, carousing and the like" (Galatians 5:19). It includes more than bodily passions, but also those of the will. Men are described as "still of the flesh... while there is jealousy and strife among them" (1 Corinthians 3:3). Flesh, then, corrupts man (Galatians 6:8). The demonic aspect of the flesh appears to be not so much in that the flesh itself is inherently evil, but largely in that it serves as the medium through which the other demonic powers can lay hold of man. The need in man is for a spiritual power to control the flesh which would prohibit its use by evil powers, and when this happened the demonic aspect would be defeated and the flesh would be no longer evil.

There is a distinct similarity between the view of Paul of the demonic aspect of flesh and the Jewish view of the evil impulse as we can see from Moore's description of the latter.

The opportunity or the invitation to sin may come from without, but it is the response of the evil impulse in man to it that converts it into temptation... It is this primarily as the subjective origin of temptation, or more correctly as the tempter within, that the "yetzer ha ra" is represented in Jewish literature. Since it comprises man's undoing by leading him into sin, it is thought of as maliciously seeking his ruin, a kind of malevolent second personality.1

1Moore, op.cit. pp. 461, 482.
There is also a similarity in the use of "flesh" in this moral sense by Paul and the "Manual of Discipline" of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Manual speaks of "iniquities" and "flesh" together, saying that both need to be "cleansed" by the submission of the soul to the statutes of God. On this sentence Davies comments, "The significant point is that the flesh is the seat of evil spirits and can be purged only by God's truth." So Paul sees the powers gaining entry into man through the flesh, to be driven out only by God's act in Christ.

Christ brought about in His death the defeat of the flesh and gave men power over it. The manner of Christ's approach to the defeat of the flesh was, again, in His incarnation, His being born "in the flesh." This fact placed him in the position of being in the flesh and subject to it, yet not dominated by the flesh. Instead of the flesh holding Him in its power, as it did other creatures of the flesh, he defeated the power of the flesh and held it in His power. He did this by His perfect obedience to God which meant that the flesh had no power to sway Him to its own way. "In His flesh" he abolished "the law of commandments and ordinances" which used the flesh as a means of entrance into the domination of man (Ephesians 2:15). "In his body of the flesh by his death" He brought man back into the possibility of right relation with God (Colossians 1:22). By being born in the flesh, then, Christ established that contact with sin, with the law, and with death which was necessary were He to defeat them.

---

1 Burrows, op. cit., p. 373.
3 See Ro. 1:3, "descended from David in the flesh"; Gal. 4:4.
4 Sin: Ro. 8:3,4; Law: Eph. 2:15; Gal. 4:4; Death: Ro. 6:2,6.
In the act of dying, He removed Himself from the flesh and it no longer could attack Him. He defeated its power over Him and the power of those other forces which worked through the flesh, and in defeating them defeated them for all mankind. As Stewart says:

By taking upon Himself our human flesh, which is the seat and source of sin, Christ had brought Himself deliberately into closest touch with sin in all its force and despotism; and by the death He had endured He had settled the despot's fate and pronounced its doom forever. Hence the man who was at one with Christ in that death could say with boldness that sin's ascendancy over him was broken. "Sin in the flesh," as a personal power, had dared to try conclusions with the Lord of glory, but had lost its case, and at the cross God Himself had announced the evil thing's defeat.  

The result of Christ's defeat of the flesh and its benefit for man was that the flesh which in its demonic aspect served as channel for evils to enter, could be subdued in the individual life and made to serve righteousness instead of evil. "Those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with all its passions and desires" (Galatians 5:24). That act has been performed whereby man no longer need be subject to the flesh. Flesh was doomed from that time on forever. Yet, at the same time, man must be ever on guard lest flesh in its evil aspect again gain hold of his life; for flesh, while defeated in Christ, is ever seeking to regain its hold (Galatians 3:3; 5:13).

The redemption is incomplete. The purchase price has been paid. Man has received the Holy Spirit as the first-fruit and pledge of perfect liberty from the domination of evil. He belongs to God, yet not wholly (Ephesians 1:4). By his flesh or body, his physical organization, he is still attached and attracted to the things that are seen and temporal. He is waiting even for the fullness of adoption, for he is waiting for 'the redemption of the body' (Romans 8:23), that is to say, for the redemption of the whole man.

---

1 Stewart, op.cit., p. 187.

2 Scott, op.cit., p. 238.
5. Redemption from Death

Finally, among those evil powers from whom man had need to be redeemed and was redeemed by the death of Christ, was the power of death. As we have seen earlier Paul understood these powers, especially sin, the law, flesh, and death, as inter-related, working with and through one another to keep their collective authority over mankind and the universe. So it was with death as one of those powers. "Death came in through sin and spread to all men" (Romans 5:12). Since Paul saw sin coming into mankind through the man Adam, and since death came in through sin, then he could say "Death reigned through the one man" (Romans 5:17), and "sin reigned in death" (Romans 5:21). It is "obedience to sin" which leads to death, and the "wages of sin is death" (Romans 6:23). So also death is connected to the flesh, for "to set the mind on the flesh is death" (Romans 8:6).

Kennedy suggests that here also Paul's thinking is in harmony with his Jewish background.

Now the remarkable thing is that Paul repeatedly emphasizes the connection between death and sin, which was a familiar Jewish tenet, while apparently hesitating to speculate on the background of sin itself. In several passages, however, he plainly connects the entrance of sin into the world with Adam. And although no explicit statements are to be found on the subject, it is hard to resist the inference that theoretically Paul believed that in virtue of the solidarity of the race all sinned in Adam, and so shared in his penalty of death.

Death having come into the world through sin, having entered into Adam and through Adam into all mankind, has man in its power. It had established its dominance over all. But Christ, in His death (and resurrection), defeated death, and redeemed man from its power. He did this

---

1 At least this is one of Paul's suggestions as to the origin of sin. See Kennedy, op.cit., p. 39; Stewart, op.cit., p. 27.

2 Kennedy, op.cit., p. 39.
by submitting to death, by dying Himself, and conquering death by rising from death to a new life. "For we know that Christ being raised from the dead will never die again; death no longer has dominion over Him" (Romans 6:9). And as death no longer has dominion over Him so for those who have "died with Christ" death no longer is the tyrant. "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set me free from the law of sin and death" (Romans 8:2). It cannot "separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Romans 8:38,39). "For the love of Christ controls us, because we are convinced that one has died for all; therefore all have died" (2 Corinthians 5:14). Because the man of faith died with Christ in baptism, he too now lives, having conquered death.

Baptism means a burial with Christ to sin, a crucifixion of the old self, a union with Him in a death like His. (Romans 6:1-5) Faith expresses itself in the decision to allow the sinful body to be destroyed by treating oneself as one who has died to sin. ... Sinful death no longer holds dominion because death to sin has proved to be stronger.  

Over death, however, as over sin, the law, and flesh, the victory of Christ was not yet complete, even though the decisive battle had been won and death was doomed. The final action was still to come as Christ carried on His victorious work. Death still took men from their physical existence, but through dying with Christ in the spiritual sense men live with him. "For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Corinthians 15:22). The final consummation of Christ's redemption from the power of death will come later. "Then comes the end, when he delivers the kingdom to God the Father after destroying every rule and every authority and power. For he must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy to be destroyed is death" (1 Corin-

---

Conclusion

We have seen Paul’s understanding of redemption as a category in his interpretation of the death of Christ. Through our discussion of the various powers we have found the idea of Christ's redemption from each of them based on similar argument.

First of all, it was the death of Christ which accomplished the redemption. It was in His death that He was enabled to defeat all the powers which enslaved mankind. But, secondly, that death was valuable in this category, on the one hand, because it was the work of Christ incarnate. It was the fact that Christ had taken upon Himself true Manhood that He could carry out His redemptive activity in death. On the other hand, and in the third place, the death accomplished its end because it was followed by the Resurrection which revealed the victorious Christ over the powers. That death accomplished a redemption which was of value in itself and not simply in its effect on man. The redemption was an objective act in which Christ accomplished in His death that which was good in itself whether or not it was accepted by individual men. He had provided the victory and freedom which it promised. It was for each man to make that redemption a fact in his own life, as he accepted the benefits of Christ’s death in faith.

And finally, the redemption, having occurred once for all when Christ died, was yet still occurring as men accepted in faith its fruits in individual lives, and would come to its final consummation at the end of time, in the new age.
CHAPTER FIVE

THE CATEGORY OF SACRIFICE

Jesus was seen by the early Church to have sealed in His life and death a New Covenant between God and man (See 1 Corinthians 11:25). The New Covenant presupposed the Old Covenant, which is that found within what we call the Old Testament. The early Church saw an historic connection between the Covenant of the Old Testament and that of the New Testament. The significant fact about this connection for the first Christians was that the New Covenant fulfilled the Old Covenant, the Old was completed in the New. To Paul and to the early Church, the Old Testament was the Holy Scripture -- within it was to be found the revelation of God, the basis and background of that which Christ carried out fully and completely in His life and death. There were to be found the historical presuppositions of Christian doctrine. The New Testament was not simply a carrying on of the ideas and activities of the Old, but a crowning and completing of them. It is particularly important that this be kept in mind as we discuss the category of sacrifice in Paul's interpretation of the death of Christ. If Paul sees in sacrifice a category which explains Christ's death, and we believe he does, that need not mean that he understands in Christ's death a reduplication in mode or meaning of the Old Testament sacrificial theory or of any particular type of Old Testament sacrifice. Nor does it mean that Paul takes the idea of sacrifice to be the interpretation of Christ's
atonement. As Deissmann says:

Even if the number of passages where sacrifice is clearly mentioned could be increased, still the thought of sacrifice is one amongst many of the various lines of light which radiate from Paul’s contemplation of the cross and these rays cannot be brought into a single geometrical figure.¹

It will mean, however, that Paul sees in Christ’s death the fulfillment of certain ideas inherent in the sacrificial theories and practices under the Old Covenant. This, as we see the facts, is exactly what Paul did find, and why he used the category of sacrifice in endeavoring to interpret the full glorious meaning contained in the fact of Christ’s death. Let us look first at the background of sacrifice in the Old Testament.

A. The Old Testament Background

Under the Old Covenant, the dominant means of gaining or regaining the favor of God was by means of the sacrifice. In earliest times sacrifice may have had, and probably did have, behind it anthropomorphic ideas of deity. Although its practice is found throughout the Old Testament, the fullest development of the means and modes of sacrifice in the Old Testament is found in the book of Leviticus. Two important facts about sacrifice should be noted in the beginning. The first of these is that the sacrifice was understood to be carried out by command of God (Leviticus 1:1, et al.). The sacrifice was a means previously determined by God to heal the breach which would arise between His people and Himself. With such an understanding of the origin of sacrifice, within the context of a revealed religion, it is not surprising that nowhere is there set down clearly a theory to explain the nature or efficacy of the sacrifice. Hav-

¹Deissmann, Paul, pp. 200-201.
ing received the practice as being by command of God in their Covenant, the people had no reason at the early stages of religious history to inquire into theory. It would not have been asked why God had ordained that sacrifices be offered, or why sacrifice rather than some other way. As a part of the religion revealed by God, and having the authority of law they would have been accepted without question or interpretation. It was enough to know that God had commanded Israel to offer them.

A theory of the way in which sacrifice and other rites expiate sin is in a revealed religion a superfluous speculation. God has attached to certain cases certain conditions on which he promises to remit sins. The essential condition is the use of the means he has appointed, whatever they are. To neglect them because a man does not see how they can be of any effect, is itself a deliberate and wilful sin, vastly graver than the original offense. Judaism therefore had no motive for discussing the 'modus operandi' of sacrificial atonement and never even raised the question.1

Thus we will not expect to find a clear-cut theory of sacrifice which we may say was in Paul's mind. The other fact that is clear is perhaps implicit in the first -- the sacrifices were in connection with the removal of the taint of sin which separated the people of Israel from their God. This much can be said by way of introduction, without going into the various theories of sacrifice which have been suggested by modern scholars and which enter into our concern only in passing.

The origin of sacrifice is clothed in the obscurity of history. Probably, as we have intimated, it began in a time of extremely primitive religious ideas and with a primitive, anthropomorphic understanding of the deity, perhaps as far back as the deification of nature and the elements. God, or the gods, had human passions and jealousies and loves. To win good fortune in life, to have productive fields, it was necessary to ensure the support of the deity. With an anthropomorphic god the way to win the

1G.F.Moore, op.cit., p. 500.
favor of the god was to perform acts which would satisfy the passions, jealousies, or loves of the god. Thus food was prepared for the god, cooked so that he could eat it or be pleased and satisfied by the smell of it. There are two dominant theories as to the expected result of these acts to win the god's favor. There is the theory proposed and supported by G. Buchanan Gray, that these sacrifices were thought of as gifts given by a person to the god, thus winning the god's constant good will. The second theory is that of Robertson Smith, that the sacrifices were understood as common meals in which the worshipper had communion with the god and in that way won the god's good will and ensured benefits for himself and his family. This, of course, is to over-simplify, but without delving into the intricate development of either of these theories two things can be said. It is quite likely, and even probable, that each of these throws light on the obscure beginnings of the practice of sacrifice, and that while neither can be satisfactorily proven to be the theory, ideas relating to both theories can be found, and will help us to an understanding, in the historical development of sacrifice as we see it in the Old Testament. The second thing to be said is that since the latter fact appears true, that fact itself is more important to us than the question of which of the theories was basic to an understanding of the origin of ritual sacrifice.

By the time of the writing of the Old Testament, sacrificial theory was well advanced beyond the primitive anthropomorphic ideas, although some allusions to the latter remain. The sacrifice was understood, as we

have seen above, as a religious requirement, ordained by God to remove the obstacles separating man from God.\(^1\) Although originally human sacrifices may have been common and there is at least one reference in the Old Testament which seems to treat the prospect of human sacrifice without horror,\(^2\) sacrifice in the Old Testament commonly consisted of animal, bird or grain.\(^3\) The lamb seems to have been the most common but by no means the only type of animal sacrificed. Oxen, cattle and goats also were sacrificed.\(^4\) Turtledoves and pigeons could be substituted for animals in certain types of sacrifice in cases of the poverty of the offerer.\(^5\) In the animal sacrifices, the blood was shed, and the only principle laid down as to its significance is that "the life of the flesh is in the blood."\(^6\) Certain types of sacrifice called for the offering of grain or flour. The disposal of the sacrificial remains also differed according to the type of sacrifice.\(^7\) The animal sacrifice, after the blood was shed, might be burned entirely to ashes, burned partially to ashes and the remainder given to the Levites, or offered and then eaten by the worshippers. The same is true of the grain sacrifices.

Among the types of the sacrifice were the sin-offering and the guilt-offering, and it may at first appear that here we have a clear link between sacrifice with its forgiveness and the sacrifice of Christ for sin in Paul. However, scholars have pointed out\(^8\) that neither the sin-offering

\(^3\)Lev. 1:2,10,14; 2:1; etc. \(^4\)Lev. 1:2,10;3:12;4:10; etc.  
\(^5\)Lev. 5:7 \(^6\)Lev. 1:5; 17:11.  
\(^7\)Lev. 1:8,9; 3:9-11; 7:6,35-36; etc.  
\(^8\)See G.F. Moore, Sacrifice, in Encyclopedia Biblica, para. 28a.
nor the guilt-offering was conceived as having efficacy toward effacing sin in the general sense in which we ordinarily use it. They were of help to the offerer only in the case of ritual errors done in ignorance and unwittingly. Sins committed intentionally ("with a high hand") and moral sins had no means of forgiveness within the Levitical system. Two things need to be said in this connection to which we will refer again later in our discussion of Paul's ideas of Christ's sacrifice for sin. As the idea of God developed and as the attitude of the offerer came to be seen as more important, the distinction between sins for which the sacrifice atoned and sins "with a high hand" tended to break down. "Certain passages in the Law itself show that in practice there were included all sorts of witting sins..."¹ A second fact hinges on the matter and is to an extent connected with the first. Ideally, Israel was a Covenant people. Ideally again the only types of sin a covenant people would commit would be unwitting and ignorant sins. Hence it is not unnatural that unwitting sins and sins committed in ignorance would be the only types of sins for which the covenant sacrifice would provide. As history showed that this idea did not become fact in practice, again the distinction could, and it would appear did, tend to break down in practice. The truth of these two suggestions is not essential to an understanding of Paul's thought of sacrifice as a category in his interpretation of Christ's death, but they do serve to clear away some of the objections to the thought that Paul uses sacrifice as a category.

Although ritual sacrifice as a religious act had many shortcomings and suffered many abuses, it was also capable of containing deep spiritual

meaning. In spite of the abuses pointed out so strongly by the prophets, the spiritual ideas underlying sacrifice did much to keep the covenant people morally above their contemporaries. It is also true that the spiritual ideas within sacrificial practice developed within the Old Testament to the point that where the ceremony might be the same, and the terminology continued, moral ideas held more and more significance in the performing of the sacrificial act.

If for any reason, Yahweh had been offended, a sacrifice would be offered for the purpose of being reconciled with Him. The offense would not, at first, have been a moral one; there were all kinds of ways in which a deity might be offended, especially in the matter of ritual mistakes or shortcomings. But with the growth of religious ideas the sense of sin gradually arose; and then this type of sacrifice was offered for the purpose of being reconciled to Yahweh who had been offended by some moral sin against Him.\(^1\)

Misunderstandings in interpretation have had much to do with a tendency sometimes present in Christian theology to dismiss sacrifice as of no significance to the Christian message. Chief among these is probably the idea that the sacrifice was seen as a substitutionary rite to propitiate an angry God. Of this, Taylor says:

The idea that the sacrifice is a substitutionary rite is largely due to a misunderstanding of the act of the worshipper in laying his hands on the head of the victim. This ritual act does not signify the transference of guilt, for the offering is still regarded as holy; it is the worshipper's acknowledgment that the offering is his own, and that he identifies himself with it. In general, the sacrifices are expiatory rather than propitiatory; they are appointed means whereby sin is 'covered,' so that it no longer stands as an obstacle between the worshipper and God.\(^2\)

Some of the prophets were highly critical of the sacrificial system, but in post-exilic times Ezekiel, while seeking to correct the faults within the system, puts sacrifice again at the center in his picture of


\(^2\)Taylor, op.cit., p. 50, 52.
the restored Jewish Temple-worship.\footnote{1}{See Ezek. 40-48.} And one further fact concerning the ritual sacrifice in Judaism has bearing upon our discussion. By 70 A.D., when because of the destruction of the Temple by the Romans sacrifice was suspended, there was no difficulty in transferring in Jewish thought and practice from actual sacrifice in the temple and the thought of forgiveness connected with it to the thought of forgiveness alone without its connection with the actual physical sacrifice. This indicates to how great an extent the sacrifice had taken on moral significance. It indicates also that the actual sacrifice was not necessary by this time to carry through the ideas connected with it.

The important thing is that while the temple was still standing the principle had been established that the efficacy of every species of expiation was morally conditioned -- without repentance no rites availed. With the cessation of the cultus repentance itself was left the sole condition of the remission of sins.\footnote{2}

What was the attitude of Jesus of Nazareth toward sacrifice? There is no recorded evidence in the Gospels of Jesus offering sacrifice, but "it is assumed in the Gospels that Jesus throughout his life observed in the matter of sacrifice as in other respects the Jewish law as it was commonly practiced in his time."\footnote{3}{G.F. Moore, "Sacrifice," Encyclopedia Biblica, para. 54.} On at least two occasions he counsels men to carry out the Mosaic Law of sacrifice.\footnote{4}{Cf. Mark 1:44; Luke 17:14; cf. also Taylor, op.cit., p. 69.} But, most important, he appears to have had sacrificial ideas in mind in thinking of his own death.\footnote{5}{Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, trans. Filson and Woolf. (London: The Lutterworth Press, 1936), pp. 256, 257.} Otto\footnote{5} suggests that sacrificial ideas lie behind the word πληρωμα, "ransom" when in Mark 10:45 Jesus said "The Son of Man came not to be ministered
unto, but to minister and give his life a ransom for many." Particularly
in the Passion-sayings do scholars see ideas based on the Old Testament
sacrifices. At the Last Supper Jesus speaks of "my blood of the covenant,
which is poured out for many" (Mark 14:24). Jeremias declares that here
Jesus had in mind His own death as a sacrifice, not only because of the close
relation between the terms "body" and "blood" and the language of sacrifice,
"but above all the words about the 'outpouring of the blood' taken, as they
are, from the language of sacrifice, hardly allow of any other explanation."

The allusion is to the blood of the covenant by which the covenant at Sinai
was ratified (Exodus 24:4-8). Jesus also appears to have interpreted His
death as sacrificial in terms of the Suffering Servant of Isaiah. When He
says His blood is "poured out for many," the thought turns to "he bore the
sin of many" (Isaiah 53:12). We are justified by these words of our Lord
and their significance in believing that He believed His death was a sacri-
ficial offering from which men would gain benefit.

The bond which unites His thoughts and makes them a consistent whole
is the sacrificial principle implicit in Old Testament sacrifice and
transmitted in the idea of the suffering servant. In the thought of
Jesus there is no slavish dependence upon the ritual of the Old Testa-
ment sacrificial system, or the separate ideas associated with indi-
vidual sacrifices, as, e.g., the sin-offering, but a keen and original
appreciation of the underlying motives of sacrifice, and a readiness
to use conceptions as the moulds for his new and distinctive thoughts.

Let us look now to the evidence for the use of sacrifice as a
category in Paul's interpretation of Christ's death, looking to the sacri-
ficial references in Paul's letters, the words connected with sacrifice
that Paul uses, and their link with Old Testament ideas.

1Joachim Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, trans. Arnold

B. Paul's Vocabulary of Sacrifice

The basic evidence is, of course, to be found in Paul's vocabulary. Does he use words or phrases to express himself which have definite sacrificial connotations or which show that with little doubt it was the sacrifice, and particularly the Old Testament sacrifice, which was behind his literary expression? There are such words and phrases; and we shall discuss these in turn, beginning with those more frequently used, and then following their use in the New Testament order of Paul's letters.

1. To Αἷμα

The most frequent word which occurs in Paul with possible sacrificial meaning is the term ἄιμα, "blood." This word occurs in the following places: Romans 3:25 - "whom God put forth as an expiation by his blood"; Romans 5:9 - "Since, therefore, we are justified by his blood"; 1 Corinthians 10:16 - "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation in the blood of Christ?"; 1 Corinthians 11:25b - "This cup is the new covenant in my blood"; Ephesians 1:7 - "In him we have redemption through his blood"; Ephesians 2:13 - "But now in Christ Jesus you who were once far off have been brought near in the blood of Christ"; Colossians 1:19, 20 - "and through Him to reconcile to himself all things whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his Cross." It will easily be seen that compared to the total content of Paul's letters these references are few. In one instance only in using this word 'blood' does Paul definitely connect it with another sacrificial term, and in other instances of its occurrence it is linked with what we have found are other

1 Romans 3:25."Ἅλαστηρίον," see below.
categories in Paul's thinking in connection with the death of Christ.\(^1\) These facts will keep us from putting an over-emphasis on the sacrificial idea in Paul. But it hardly seems to justify the declaration of some scholars that, with the possible exception of Romans 3:24, Paul can have no particular emphasis on the sacrifice in mind when he writes of 'the blood,' but is using the word only in picturesque reference to the violent death suffered by our Lord.\(^2\)

The use of the term 'blood' seems to us to indicate Paul's interest in the connection between the results for man in Christ's death and in the Old Testament sacrifice. The blood was a most important part of that type of sacrifice most frequent in the Old Testament, and this fact alone should make us hesitate to pass off Paul's use of the term too lightly. At the ritual animal sacrifice under the Old Covenant, as the animal offering was slain the shed blood, far from being only a necessarily present element, had a vital part to play in the ceremony. On occasion in the Levitical sacrifice, the shed blood was to be thrown about the altar,\(^3\) drained out on the side of the altar,\(^4\) sprinkled in front of the veil,\(^5\) put on the horns of the altar,\(^6\) and was poured at the base of the altar.\(^7\) It was never to be eaten or drunk.\(^8\) Why were these practices to be carried out? Because there was something particularly significant in the blood, according to a general belief of ancient peoples. "The common root of these

\(^1\)Justification in Ro. 3:24; 5:9; redemption in Ro. 3:24; Eph. 1:7; Reconciliation in Eph. 2:13; Col. 1:20.


\(^3\)Lev. 1:5, et al. \(^4\)Lev. 1:14, et al. \(^5\)Lev. 14:17. \(^6\)Lev. 4:18. \(^7\)Lev. 4:18. \(^8\)Lev. 7:26, 27; 17:10.
diverse uses of blood is the almost universal belief that blood is a fluid in which inheres mysterious potency. ... In the national religion of Israel the blood is efficacious only because God has appointed it so."¹ The only explanation found in the Old Testament as to what the efficacy of the blood may be is found in Leviticus 17:11, that "the life of the flesh is in the blood" (See also Deuteronomy 12:23). When the animal was slain on the altar, by the outpouring of the blood life was released as an essential part of the offering.² This emphasis on the life in the blood would lead us to consider the possibility that it was not the death of the victim in itself that was considered efficacious in the act of sacrifice at all, but the life (in the blood) released by that death — that the life thus released and offered by the worshipper to God improved the relationship between worshipper and Deity. The offering of the blood is the actual offering of life.

The blood is not a symbol of the life, it is the life, or contains it. The offering of the blood to God is the actual offering of the life. The slaying of the victim and offering of the blood are not two separate acts. They are one act, which consists in offering the life or victim to God. The death is not to be regarded as a mere means of getting the blood; the death and the offering are the giving to God of the life of the victim. But while stating the fact that the life thus atones, the ritual law offers no explanation.³

It was in the use of the blood that the essential and decisive act of offering up took place. The sprinkling was the act performed by the priest by which the worshipper offered his life received atonement.

In addition to the above facts from the Levitical accounts of sac-

¹G.F. Moore, op.cit., para. 43.
²cf. Lev. 1:5; 3:2,6,12; 4:7,18,25; etc.
rifice, it is to be noted that the covenant between God and Israel at Sinai (Exodus 20:14-8) was seen as sealed by the covenant blood of sacrifice. In the Gospel accounts of the Last Supper Jesus Himself as we have seen is reported to have applied this incidence of sacrifice to his own imminent death (Matthew 26:28; Mark 14:24). These words from the mouth of our Lord had also been included in the tradition about the Last Supper which had come into Paul's possession long before the Gospels in their present form were written and which he reports in 1 Corinthians 11:23-26. In other New Testament writings outside Paul, the connection between blood and sacrifice is made even more clear. Jeremias emphasizes the cultic significance of the word 'blood' and points out that ἐμέκανιν αἵμα is used in the Septuagint — apart from those cases where it speaks of murder or the domestic killing of cattle — only when speaking of sacrifice. Professor Dodd declares, in commenting on Romans 3:24, that "there can be little doubt that when Paul uses the word blood in conjunction with the word for expiation he is thinking in sacrificial terms."

There would seem then to be strong support for the belief that the sacrifice was in Paul's mind whenever he used the term 'blood' in connection with Christ's death. "... we must insist that for Paul the term 'blood' would inevitably have sacrificial connotations whatever symbolic meaning he may or may not have imported into it. The shedding of blood by Christ on the Cross had for Paul an efficacy comparable, but beyond, the shedding of blood of the sacrificial victim. He offered up His life,

---

1. Pet. 1:2, 19; 1 Jn. 1:7; 5:6, 8; Rev. 1:5; 5:9; 7:11; 12:11; 13:8; Heb. chapters 9, 10, 11.
but not for Himself only. It was an offering for all men.

2. \textit{\textalpha\omicron\rho\alpha\omicron\tau\iota\alpha}

The primary purpose of the Levitical sacrifice was, as we have noted in beginning the chapter, the expiation of man's guilt which came between men and God. The reason for being of the sacrifice was to make atonement for sin. Paul's use of the word sin in connection with Christ's death makes it the second most common term with sacrificial connections. In Romans 3:25, the death of Christ is seen as an expiation "to show forth God's righteousness, because ... he had passed over former sins"; Romans 8:3, God sent His Son "for sin" (\pi\varepsilon\rho i \\textalpha\omicron\mu\omicron\rho\omicron\tau\iota\alpha\varsigma); 1 Corinthians 15:3, "Christ died \textit{for our sins}" (\upsilon\varepsilon\rho \tau\omicron\omicron\omicron \omicron\mu\omicron\rho\omicron\tau\iota\alpha\nu \eta\mu\omicron); also in Romans 4:25, "who was put to death \textit{for our trespasses} (\pi\alpha\omicron\rho\alpha\pi\tau\omicron\omega\mu\alpha\tau\alpha) and Romans 5:6, "Christ died \textit{for the ungodly}" (\delta\omicron\omicron\varepsilon\beta\omicron\omicron). Again, it is only in Romans 3:25 that there is definite connection by Paul of sin with sacrificial terms. It is on the strength of that and the place of sin in the sacrifice that we must base our contention that Paul had in mind the category of sacrifice when he spoke of Christ's death as 'for sin'.

We have already noted the connection between sacrifice and sin and Sanday and Headlam point out that the phrase \pi\varepsilon\rho i \\textalpha\omicron\rho\alpha\omicron\tau\iota\alpha\varsigma is the translation used in LXX for the Hebrew phrase used constantly in the Old Testament for the 'sin-offering'.\textsuperscript{1} The sin-offering was one of the modes of sacrifice, its ritual fully set forth in Leviticus 4. It would be too much to say that Paul thought of Christ's death as specifically a sin-offering, but it is worth noting in reference to the sin-offering in particular that its most characteristic feature was the sprinkling of blood on the horns

\textsuperscript{1}Sanday and Headlam, op.cit., p. 193; "more than fifty times in Leviticus alone."
of the altar of incense and its object was to make atonement, especially for sins of ignorance. It does not cover every sin, nor does any specific type of sacrifice cover all sins. The sacrificial system was provided by God for those within the covenantal relation. Even though the people of Israel were within the covenant, they could, and often did, sin. They would inevitably fall into error and commit sins through ignorance and weakness, or "unwittingly."\(^1\) It was for these sins committed within the covenant that sacrifice provided an expiation. A distinction was thus made between those sins of ignorance or weakness committed within the Covenant and those sins committed "with a high hand," intentionally and wilfully, which put the offender outside the Covenant and for which sacrifice did not provide.\(^2\)

As the moral sense of the people grew the moral ideas connected with sacrifice became more and more prominent. While it would appear that in early times only the act of sacrifice was necessary for the expiation of sins, latterly the attitude of the offerer was held to be important. By the Persian-Greek period of Hebrew history, according to Professor Moore, "though some held that sacrifice expiated sin without repentance, the prevailing view was that repentance was a necessary condition of expiation and the forgiveness of sins."\(^3\) Jesus, Son of Sirach, says that "God will not forgive men for the multitude of their sacrifices."\(^4\) In post-exilic times the outstanding characteristic of the sacrifice was the developed sense of sin in its purpose of atonement and reconciliation with God. This is seen particularly in Ezekiel, chapters 40 through 48.

---

\(^1\)cf. Lev. 4:2,13,22,27,etc.  \(^2\)cf. Num. 15:29-31.

\(^3\)G.P.Moore, op.cit., para. 51.  \(^4\)See 34:18-35.
So much now for sacrifice and sin in the Old Testament. So far as the idea occurs of the human bearing of sins instead of the bearing of them by the animal victim, the background for at least some of Paul's thought may be found in Isaiah 53, where the Servant "bears our sins." The connection between this vicarious suffering for sin and His own sacrificial death seems to have been prominent in our Lord's thinking. In the Judaism between the Testaments there were also traces of the belief that the merits of an innocent man could atone for the sins of the guilty. These thoughts are of course carrying us away from the connection between the Old Testament sacrifice and sin, but they do contribute to an understanding of the background for Paul's line of thought concerning the connection between sacrifice and Christ's dying "for sin." We have endeavored to point out the sacrificial bases for Paul's interpretation of Christ as one who in the words of the tradition which he received "died for our sins." The sacrifice provided the means of removing man's guilt for his sins. Christ in His sacrificial death accomplished this in an even more complete way.

3. Ἰλαστήριον

We have mentioned the Greek word Ἰλαστήριον above in connection with the discussion of the word αἰμα. It occurs in one place only in Paul's writings, in Romans 3:25. AV provided a verb and translated "to be a propitiation." Most modern translators translate "an expiation" or "expiratory." The classical meaning of the root word ἰλασκωμα: was "to placate" a man, or "propitiate" an offended deity. A second meaning was "to expiate" a sin, to perform an act by which its guilt is annulled. The

---

1See 4 Maccabbees 17:22. 21 Cor. 15:3 3cf. R.S.V.; Moffat, et al.
LXX uses the word in connection with the Old Testament sacrifice. There, however, the propitiatory meaning, where God is the object, is rarely if ever found in the Old Testament, and the expiatory thought is found many times. Professor Dodd in discussing the term says,

The underlying character is characteristic of primitive religion. Ancients felt that if a 'taboo' was infringed, the person involved became unclean, defiled or profane. The condition might be removed by performing the appropriate act: washing with water, sprinkling with blood, or simply the forfeiture of some valuable object to the deity concerned with the 'taboo'. Thus in the Old Testament a whole range of ritual actions are prescribed for disinfecting from vari-forms of defilement ritual and moral. Our versions in such cases use the phrase 'to make propitiation', but more proper would be 'to make expiation'.

The word ἅγιος ὑπερτιμάω is used in LXX in the specific sense of the "lid of the ark" or "mercy seat." Büchsel gives the arguments in favor of Paul having this connection in mind when he uses the word. Scholars generally hold, however, that here in Romans 3:25 it is an adjective, masculine, accusative, agreeing with ὧν, "whom God set forth as a means of expiation."

It is God who 'puts forward the means' whereby the guilt of sin is removed by sending Christ. The sending of Christ, therefore, is the divine method of forgiveness. ... There can be little doubt that when Paul uses the word 'blood' in connection with the word for expiation he is thinking in sacrificial terms. The divine method for the forgiveness of sin takes effect through the sacrifice of Christ.

The root verb ἅλωσιμοιαί is in LXX the translation of the Hebrew word, הָנָה, where the idea is "to cover." The Old Testament sacrifices were seen as "covering" the sins and making expiation of the guilt thereof.

---

1C.H. Dodd, op.cit., p. 54. 2Sanday and Headlam, op.cit., p. 87.
4See Stewart, op.cit., p. 211; Denney, Romans, II, 611; Sanday and Headlam, op.cit., p. 88.
5Dodd, op.cit., p. 54.
It is clear in the Old Testament that there is no thought of "propiating" an angry God, as in primitive sacrifice, but of "covering over," removing from God's sight the sin that separates man from God and restoring God's favor to man. Since God is invariably thought of as the originator of the sacrifice or means of expiation, the thought could hardly be held that God had ordained sacrifices to appease His own anger or to placate His own wrath in the human sense. A. B. Bruce, however, suggests that there may be a close connection in Paul between the ἱλαστήριον in Romans 3:25 and the ὑπερήφανος, "wrath," of God in Romans 1:18:

Is it not likely that 3:25 refers back to 1:18 and Paul has in mind the wrath of God when he speaks of God as setting forth Christ as ἱλαστήριον in His blood? If at Romans 3:25, Paul reverts to what he said in 1:18 then it is natural to suppose that in the death of Jesus he sees two things: a revelation of divine wrath and a means of averting it. Both point to the direction of a sacrificial victim.1

In the light of what we have said above concerning the wrath of God, this connection would appear to be a legitimate one. The thought would not be of God placating His own wrath, but that through the sacrifice of Christ He delivered men from the wrath which was His just reaction against sin. The ideas of sacrifice and of justification are used by Paul together in this passage to express his thought. There is no basis for the thought that Paul saw the sacrifice of Christ in the sense of that sacrifice soothing a wrathful God; it is an act of God Himself to cope with the sin which was destroying human life. The use of the word ἱλαστήριον very definitely suggests that there was in the mind of Paul a sense in which the benefits of Christ's death were analogous to the benefits of the ritual sacrifice. In His death the means for the removal of man's guilt was inherent.

The death of Christ occurred during the Passover week, possibly, if the Gospel according to John is to be followed, on the very day of the sacrifice of the Paschal victim in the temple. This fact makes even more significant that Paul calls Christ "our paschal lamb" (1 Corinthians 5:7), and twice in 1 Corinthians appears to refer to parts of the Passover festival ritual (10:16f; 11:23-26). The Passover festival was connected in Jewish ritual with the shedding of the blood of the "Passover" Lamb at the departure from Egypt for the Exodus.1 Professor Gray declares that "So long as the sacrifice lasted the paschal meal was sacrificial."2 It would appear that in the mind of Jesus Himself there was special significance to the Passover in connection with His death when He said "I have earnestly desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer" (Luke 22:15).

Jeremias argues from the language of Jesus at the Last Supper that Jesus referred to Himself as the paschal lamb.

How did Jesus interpret the paschal lamb? The fact that the words of interpretation refer the bread and wine to Jesus Himself, suggests strongly that He also referred the paschal lamb to Himself.... It is most probable, therefore, that in the words 'this is my flesh (which is sacrificed),' and "this is my blood (which is sacrificed)," Jesus speaks of Himself as the paschal lamb. This sets out a comparison between Jesus and the paschal lamb, but does not identify them.3

This comparison Paul seems to have perceived and proclaimed when he refers to "Christ, our paschal lamb, who has been sacrificed"(1 Corinthians 5:7).

The nature of the paschal sacrifice was different in some respects from the ordinary ritual sacrifice. We have seen that generally the Old Testament sacrifice was seen as removing the effects of sin and that Paul

---

1Exod. chapters 12 and 13.
2G.B.Gray, op.cit., p. 376; see also p. 353.
3Jeremias, op.cit., pp. 144, 145.
emphasizes this connection of sin and sacrifice in explaining Christ's death. The Paschal Lamb, while a sacrifice, was not in the Old Testament represented as bearing sin as such. The blood was applied to the Hebrew homes in Egypt to avert the execution of God's judgment on Egypt from His own people. It was redemptive in its significance. The repetition in the Passover was not essentially an offering but a memorial with eschatological significance. God would redeem His people from judgment in the same way in the Final Judgment. In addition to the words of the Lord and their significance, two other possibilities may be mentioned as to the thought in Paul's mind when he speaks of Christ as "our paschal lamb." Possibly the connection is with the Servant of Yahweh, who is compared in Isaiah 53:7 to a "lamb led to the slaughter." A second possibility is that with the thought in mind of the passover and its sacrifice Paul went on from there to emphasize the non-sacrificial elements - the cups in the paschal meal. "The cup of blessing" which Paul calls the eucharistic cup in his two references to the Last Supper was the name of one of the cups in the Passover ritual.

5. Εὐμόια

In two passages in his letters, Paul uses a term common to sacrifice in the Old Testament - εὐμόια, "aroma" or "sweet smell." "We are the aroma of Christ to God" (2 Corinthians 2:15); and "a fragrant offering and sacrifice to God" (Ephesians 5:2). The thought of sacrifice here goes back to ancient anthropomorphic ideas in the efficacy of sacrifice, that the odors of the burnt sacrifice literally ascended to gods, who were thereby sensually pleased and looked with favor upon the offering.

1See ibid., p. 146-148.
The custom of burning offerings to God upon a sacrificial fire seems to have been adopted from the older inhabitants of Canaan. The verb commonly used implies that the object was not so much to consume by fire as to make a savoring smoke. In this fragrant smoke, a finer essence of the gift is conveyed to the deity.¹

There are a number of places in the Old Testament writings where it is clear that if the authors did not believe that Yahweh derived sensuous pleasure from the food offered up, and that he smelt with satisfaction the odors of the burning flesh, they at least used figures of speech implying such a belief. In the LXX rendering of the account of Noah's sacrifice, the Greek εὐωδία is used (Genesis 8:21). It is found also in Leviticus 8:21 in the ordination of Aaron and his sons to the priesthood, and in Leviticus 23:13 of the cereal offering. It is likely that the Hebrew equivalent soon lost any propitiatory idea but was still used in a metaphorical way. It is not clear in Ezekiel 20:11, for example, whether it is a sense of soothing or placating God or not. "As a pleasing odor I will accept you." The word is used also in Testament Levi 3:5, where the angels are said to offer to the Lord a sweet smelling savor. Probably the phrase continued to be used even when people were fully aware that it was not the smell of the offering so much as the piety of the offerer which pleased God.

While it thus appears that Paul is here using this word and phrase with sacrificial significance in mind, he uses the word in another place which must make us hesitate in placing too much emphasis upon the sacrificial connection of the words with Christ's death in Paul's thought. This is in Philippians 4:18, where a gift sent to Paul from the Philippian church delivered by Epaphroditus is said to be a "fragrant offering, a

¹G.F. Moore, op.cit., para. 41.
sacrifice acceptable and pleasing to God." Certainly Paul's use of the phrase here makes clear that the phrase has lost all of the original anthropomorphic connotations, and has become spiritualized into the religious vocabulary. Possibly it is in Paul's mind simply a literary allusion, yet the sacrificial significance is there and is worthy of our consideration in this light.

6. Θυμός, Θυσία

Paul uses in connection with the death of Jesus both the verb and the noun of this word meaning "offer sacrifice." Both references we have already noted as containing other words important to our study. In 1 Corinthians 5:7, "Christ our passional lamb is sacrificed (ἐγκατασκόπησεν) for us," and in Ephesians 5:2, "Christ loved us and gave himself for us, a fragrant offering and sacrifice (Θυσίαν) to God..." The idea of sacrifice in Θυμός is not derived from the slaying itself but from the thought of the smoking connected with the sacrifice.¹ Thus it is fitting that in the latter of the two passages it be connected with the phrase δομημένα Θυματά. Here perhaps most explicitly Paul speaks of Christ's death as a sacrifice. However, again, we must note that he in Philippians 4:8 uses this same word Θυσίαν in referring to a gift from the Philippians to himself.

7. Others

In Ephesians 5:2, Paul uses another word meaning "offering" or "sacrifice," προφορά. Abbott tells us that προφορά and Θυσία are sometimes said to specify respectively

¹cf. Abbott, op.cit., p. 147.
an unbloody and a bloody offering; but such a distinction cannot
be maintained either in classical or Biblical Greek. ... The words
appear to be borrowed from Psalm 40:6, where they are used simply
as together including all kinds of ceremonial offerings.1

Twice Paul uses in close connection with the benefits of Christ's
death a word often found in the Old Testament referring to sacrifice. In
Leviticus 22:19, Numbers 19:2, 28:3, and elsewhere, it is commanded that
the animal to be offered at the altar be ἄμορφος, "without blemish." When
Paul uses the word he applies it not to Christ as the sacrificial victim,
but to those who have received the benefits of Christ's death. In Ephesians
"the church," and in Colossians "you" are found to be ἄμορφος before God as
a result of Christ's giving himself for us.2

Other words with possible sacrificial connection which Paul uses in
the epistles include: παραστήσας in Colossians 1:22;3 ἐφεσκότο in Romans
8:32;4 and σπιλον, ὅτι δα "spot," "wrinkle" in Ephesians 5:27.

It will by now be seen that the evidence is not overwhelmingly in
favor of the theory that the key to Paul's interpretation of Christ's
death is to be found in the category of sacrifice. The basis for the em-
phasis in the history of Christian doctrine on Christ's death as sacrifice
is to be found in the Hebrews in the New Testament more than in Paul. It
will also be seen, however, that there is sufficient evidence in the letters
to warrant the suggestion that the category of sacrifice was one aspect of
Paul's total development of atonement theology. In addition, it is a fact
that Paul's treatment of the death of Christ as sacrifice is not limited to

1Ibid., p. 147.  2Eph. 5:27; Col. 1:22

3Lightfoot regards it as sacrificial, Scott does not. See also
Eph. 5:27; Ro. 12:1.

4The word is used in Gen. 22:16 of the offering of Isaac by Abra-
ham.
passages where "sacrificial" words occur. The thought of vicarious sacrifice is present in Galatians 3:13 and in other passages where Paul speaks of Christ who "died for us." It remains now for us to discuss the implications of Christ's death as a sacrifice. What analogies did Paul find between sacrificial theory and Christ's death? In what ways does sacrifice as a dominant category contribute to the understanding of Christ's death?

C. The Death of Christ a Sacrifice.

In speaking of our Lord's interpretation of the meaning of His own death, Vincent Taylor says:

The bond which unites His thoughts and makes them a consistent whole is the sacrificial principle implicit in the Old Testament sacrifices and transmitted in the idea of the suffering servant. In the thought of Jesus there is no slavish dependence upon the ritual of the Old Testament sacrificial system or the separate ideas associated with individual sacrifices, as for example, the sin offerings, but a keen and original appreciation of the underlying motives of sacrifice and a readiness to use these conceptions as the molds for his new and distinctive thoughts.

Since the gospel according to Paul is no new gospel, but one which he received, it will not be surprising that these words can be applied with equal truth to Paul's interpretation of the death of Christ, especially as regarding sacrifice. The thought is new and distinctive. The basis for the thought is within the old sacrificial system.

Out of his background in Judaism and that which he received from the primitive church, Paul drew on figures of speech in which to express his new beliefs about Jesus Christ. But it was, of course, more than the

---


2 Taylor, op. cit., p. 15.
vocabulary which Paul utilized; there were important points of contact between the new facts as they came to him and the old ideas in which he had been nurtured. As a Jew, Paul was concerned to make the most of those points of contact in his interpretation of the death of Christ, for, as he said, the crucified Christ was "a stumbling block to Jews," while he was determined to convince them that He was "Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God" (1 Corinthians 1:23, 24). We shall now look at some of these points of contact between the new facts and the old ideas in the thinking of Paul.

1. An Act of God

As we saw in the beginning in Chapter 1, in a general way, so we see here in this particular category of sacrifice, Paul emphasizes that the death of Jesus Christ was an act of God. We stress this point of contact in Paul's interpretation of Christ's death as a sacrifice, because the background of sacrifice is such that its meaning as an act of God is often overlooked. The modes and methods of sacrifice, both Old Testament and pagan sacrifices, lend themselves to arguing that precisely the opposite is true -- that rather than being instituted of God, the sacrifices were in fact offered to God to win His favor. Sacrifice was sometimes seen as an offering to God as a means of bribing God, to win God over, to persuade God to overlook sins and errors that would ordinarily merit punishment.

Paul does, as a matter of fact, in using the language of sacrifice in connection with the death of Christ, seem occasionally to speak of Christ as a sacrifice offered to God to win God's favor. In Romans 5:9 we find him saying, "Since therefore we are now justified by His blood,
much more shall we be saved by Him from the wrath of God." Is this exactly what we mentioned above -- Jesus' death assuaging what otherwise would have been God's wrath at man's sin? Or when in Ephesians 5:2, Paul says "And walk in love as Christ loved us and gave Himself up for us a fragrant offering and sacrifice to God," is this sacrifice to win God over when otherwise He would not have been won over? That in neither case is this Paul's thought, is clear from the context of these two quotations, and there is abundant evidence elsewhere in the letters to reveal that in Paul's mind the sacrifice of Christ was an act carried out in the plan of God rather than an attempt to change the purpose of God. For Romans 5:9 is preceded by, "But God shows His love for us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." And in Ephesians Paul makes quite clear that it is God who in Christ forgave (Ephesians 1:32). Elsewhere the matter is made even more explicit. In Romans 3:24, it was God who "set forth" Christ as "an expiation by His blood." In Romans 8:3, God has done what the law could not do, sending forth His Son "for sin." In Colossians 1:19, "For in Him all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell... making peace by the blood of His cross."

As we have seen, Paul had strong Old Testament support for this idea of Christ's sacrifice as an act of God, for the Old Testament frequently speaks of sacrifice as God's act. In Exodus 24:8, in the sealing of the covenant between God and Israel, Moses, as he threw the blood of sacrifice upon the people, said, "Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord has made with you." In Leviticus 17:11, the Lord commands Moses to say to Aaron and all his sons and all the people of Israel, "I have given it (the blood of sacrifice) for you upon the altar to make atonement for your soul."
As a fact, even in the Old Testament it is one of the salient characteristics of sacrifice that as a method or institution it is a Divine gift. The whole conception of sacrifice in reality falls under the category of revelation; this is the way in which Yahweh has made known His desire to be approached; and when it is offered in the right way, the worshipper effectually draws near to God.\(^1\)

Jesus Himself surely saw His sacrifice as a fulfillment of a new covenant made by God, and that He Himself was carrying out God's purpose in His own death. He did not deny the efficacy of the practices prescribed in the old covenant, but on more than one occasion counselled men to fulfill them.\(^2\) Rather Jesus saw His own sacrifice as transcending the sacrifice prescribed in the old covenant, apart from the law, yet fulfilling the law. At its best there were weaknesses in the sacrificial system.\(^3\) Jesus in His death, with all its implications for mankind, corrected those weaknesses, took the deepest spiritual meanings in sacrifice and made the supreme once for all sacrifice that carried out God's purpose of bringing men into right relation to Him.

These ideas Paul accepts and develops. There are the references in the letters to the wrath of God as pursuing sinners; but just as in Old Testament theory God proclaimed the sacrifice to enable men to rid themselves of the consequences of His own wrath, so Christ's sacrifice was an act whereby God showed His love for man, so that being yet sinners and liable to the consequences of God's wrath, man was saved from that wrath and reconciled to God (See Romans 5:8). Paul emphasizes the fact that what Christ did in His atoning sacrifice for man, man could not do

---


\(^2\)In the healing of the ten lepers, Lk. 17:11ff.

\(^3\)Taylor outlines the weakness of the sacrificial system. Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 55.
for himself. Here his thought ascends far above the Old Testament sacrifice. "While we were yet helpless." When we were completely incapable of atoning for our guilt, God provided the atoning sacrifice for us as "Christ died for us" (Romans 5:6,7). His death on the Cross was at the hands of evil men, but behind and beyond that was the hand of God showing His love in making Christ the perfect sacrifice.

Earlier in this chapter, we have discussed in some detail Paul's use of the word ἱλαστήριον in Romans 3:25. We have pointed out that the word is connected with the propitiatory idea of appeasing God, but that rarely, if ever, in the Old Testament is God the object of this propitiation. Here in Paul's usage scholars are generally agreed that the word is not used in a verbal sense at all, but is an adjective agreeing with the ὅν. 1 Professor Dodd says on this point:

In Romans 3:23-26, although God is not made the subject of the verb to expiate, yet He is said to have 'set forth a means of expiation' or of dealing with sin. The means is shown to be thought of in sacrificial terms by the following mention of blood in the sense of life laid down. So far, therefore, from the sacrifice of Christ being thought of as a means of soothing an angry deity it is represented as an act of God Himself to cope with the sin which was devastating human life.2

We see then in Paul that the sacrifice of Christ was an act of God. Paul undoubtedly finds in the life and death of Christ the indispensable atoning sacrifice. To be sure, it is God himself who in Christ Jesus provides the necessary sacrifice and pays the necessary price; and there is no way within our human command of making such a fact logically consistent with itself. But to acknowledge this is not to reduce to the status of mere metaphor the whole conception of a sacrifice vicariously offered or of a penalty vicariously paid.3

---

1See Stewart, op.cit., p. 214; Denney, Romans, II, 611; Sanday and Headlam, op.cit., p. 88.


The idea of sacrifice was an accepted one by his contemporaries. It was present in the Old Testament. It was a part of pagan religions. But Paul, following Christ, lifts the idea of sacrifice above all the inadequate ideas he saw prevalent both in Jewish and pagan sacrifice and portrays Christ's sacrifice as an act of God to reconcile men to Him. "If orthodox Jewish teachers held that God could be reconciled to men by the sacrifice of the old covenant, it was obviously far truer to hold that He had reconciled men to Himself through Christ." The idea of men being reconciled to God, rid of the consequences of their sins, by means of sacrificial ritual, was not new to Paul's contemporaries. What was new, was that this was God acting through the supreme sacrifice of His Son, drawing men to Himself.

2. An Act of Moral Significance

In a specific sense, the death of Christ for Paul had a primarily moral application, in that it was symbolic of a moral transformation which could and should take place in the lives of believers as a result of that death. At its best the sacrificial cultus of the Old Testament had, to a somewhat lesser degree, this same moral significance. The material sacrifice in the cultus was an outward symbol of the offering of the offerer's own life in the pouring forth of the life of the animal victim in its shed blood. It was not the death of the victim that was most important, but the offering of the life, which was in the blood (Leviticus 17:11), and the blood poured out upon the altar signified the desire of the donor to obey the command of God, to be submissive to Him, and to offer an obedient will.

The sacrificial system in itself, then, was in a sense symbolical. Under

\[W. L. Knox, op. cit., p. 114.\]
the symbols of animal and blood and altar were moral ideas relating to ridding man of his sin and restoring his relationship with God. Paul saw that man still needed to be rid of the consequences of his sin and that he still was separated by sin from God. Christ fulfilled that need and joined man and God in fellowship by accomplishing on the Cross that which possessed the significance of sacrifice in the life of man.

This, for Paul, was the importance of seeing Christ's death in the sacrificial terms. Behind the terms themselves was moral significance. The spiritual principle contained in sacrifice Paul saw completely fulfilled in Jesus Christ. Again from Mackintosh:

We must note that sacrifice consists in the offering to God of what is ultimately identical with our personal being, an offering which can only be made complete in death. In its application to Jesus, this means that His sacrifice was primarily inward; it was an unseen self-oblation in mind and will. In Christ's dying there was an absolute surrender of life, of Himself, to that Divine will which made His experience a manifested judgment of sin.1

So for Paul, the symbolic giving of the life of the worshipper, as he identified himself with the shed blood of the sacrificial victim, was made a fact of universal significance in Christ who made himself a sacrificial victim, "died for the ungodly" (Romans 5:6), that we might "have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of his grace which he lavished upon us" (Ephesians 1:7,8).

3. An Act for Sin

When Paul sets down for the Corinthian Christians the most important part of the Christian message which he had received and which he would pass on for their edification, it is summed up in this: "For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received, that Christ died for

1Mackintosh, op.cit., p. 221.
our sins in accordance with the Scriptures" (1 Corinthians 15:3). In his setting forth of the category of sacrifice in his interpretation of Christ's death, we will expect, then, to find sacrifice both as a fact in the Old Testament and in its application to Christ's death to have a connection with sin. If sin is that which separates man from God, then it is evident throughout that sacrifice and sin are inseparably connected in the Old Testament, for the purpose of the sacrifice was to remove all that separates man from God and to bring man into right relationship with God. What Oesterley says about sacrifice and sin in Judaism during the Greek period is generally true of the Hebrew conception of sacrifice in this connection: "Normally the teaching is that man, the sinner, must do something on his part whereby divine forgiveness of sin can be obtained; and what he does is to offer sacrifices."¹

From the beginning some of the types of sacrifice were associated with the removal of sin and, according to Welch, by post-exilic times the sacrificial system as a whole was associated with atonement for sin.

The most significant evidence, however, is the way in which the entire sacrificial system was brought into definite association with atonement for sin. It appears most certainly in certain parts of the book of Ezekiel, where the purpose, not of one or another sacrificial act, but of the entire statutory service is declared to be 'to make atonement for the house of Israel'.²

It must be said, however, as we have noted above, that in the height of the period of its acceptance by the Jews, sacrifice did not atone for all sins. A distinction was made between those sins done "unwittingly," for which the sacrifice atoned, and those done with a "high


hand," for which the sacrifice did not atone. The sins done "unwittingly" were those committed against the regulations of the Torah.

With the multitudinous and minute regulations of the law, it was inevitable that they should often be infringed in ignorance, or mistake or pure accident. For such cases the law itself creates a special category of sins committed "unwittingly" or through inadvertence. The opposite is sinning 'with a high hand', wilfully and defiantly (Numbers 15:30f; Psalm 19:14) or arrogantly, insolently. For such sins no expiation is provided.1

It is obvious (although at the same time it is making the distinction simpler than it actually is) that Paul was for the most part concerned about the very type of sin for which the sacrifice had no efficacy. Davidson points out that one possible reason for the failure of the sacrificial system to provide for atonement of wilful sins is that ideally the covenant people would not commit sins of this type.

God's people are not removed from the possibility of erring and uncleanness must be put away by the blood of the sacrifices. Here we have the key to the strange fact that it is only for unwitting faults of which the redeemed and restored people will be guilty. Yet even these inadvertences disturb the perfect holiness of God and must be atoned or invalidated.2

Hodgson3 and Lods4 suggest the possibility that the distinction between ritual sin and wilful sin tended to break down, particularly in the post-exilic period of Judaism. As Hodgson says: "In the post-exilic priestly legislation involuntary ritual transgressions are mixed up with voluntary moral transgressions so that defilement went beyond what could be consciously confessed."5

The more important point for our discussion is the fact that the

1Moore, Judaism, I, 463. 2Davidson, op.cit., p. 346.
5Hodgson, op.cit., p. 28.
sacrificial system kept the emphasis on sin as disobedience against God, and kept Judaism from becoming a purely ethical religion. Hodgson’s statement shows the background in Judaism for Paul’s conception of Jesus’ sacrifice as for sin.

Through this insistence on God’s will as the source of moral obligation, the prophetic-priestly religion of the Old Testament brought in the central feature of Bible ethics, the recognition of immorality as sin and its need of treatment as such. If our moral insight is our apprehension of the will of God for us, disobedience to it is sin against God. Herein lies the importance in the Bible of the idea of sacrifice and of the development of the sacrificial system.  

How, then, did Paul see Christ’s death as a sacrifice in its relation to sin? It is evident that he saw a relation and that that relation was important to his interpretation of Christ’s death. "In him we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses" (Ephesians 1:7). "And you who once were estranged and hostile in mind, doing evil deeds, he has now reconciled in his body of flesh by his death in order to present you holy and blameless and irreproachable before him" (Colossians 1:21, 22). Most important in this connection is the passage, Romans 3:21-26. Here Paul says that whereas the law with its sacrificial theories and the prophets with their ethical ideals have born witness to God and served to bring men to Him, in the death of Christ God went far beyond the law and the prophets and accomplished in one great act much more than either law or prophets, or the two working together, had been able to accomplish for man. Paul proceeds then to describe this great act which God had done in Christ to forgive men’s sins and win men to Him, and to describe it in the language of sacrifice. All those who have sinned are now "justified by his grace as a gift through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forth as an expiation by his blood, to be

1 Ibid., p. 27.
received by faith" (Romans 3:24,25). The key word in the passage is the word ἐξαποθήκευσις which we have already discussed. Scholars almost universally agree on its sacrificial character and that here Paul is using the word to point out the efficacy of Christ's death in connection with the Old Testament sacrifice and that which the Old Testament sacrifice was supposed to accomplish. Paul is vividly aware of the need of sacrifice if sin is to be forgiven. His use of the phrase

expiration by his blood is not mere metaphor. The feeling that there can be no annulling of sin without the shedding of blood was native to Paul... The apostle sees man as actually under righteous judgment because of his sin, and the righteous God, who has imposed that judgment, cannot reverse it by merely wishing to do so; or better, such a God cannot will to reverse it unless the just demands of the law are met. A price must be paid; a penalty must be suffered; a sacrifice must be offered.¹

The expiation was put forth because "all have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God" and need to be delivered from their sins. Believing man enters into the sacrifice of Christ by faith and receives the redemption.

In Ephesians Paul speaks of the "redemption" we have and defines it as "the forgiveness of our trespasses." The cost of that redemption is that it is "through the blood." The deliverance from sin is accomplished by Christ in the sacrificial offering of His life for man's sake (Ephesians 1:7). In Colossians we find the figure of sacrifice used of the men whom Christ reconciled. Christ presents the believers before God "holy and blameless and irreproachable" (Colossians 1:22).

Christ's death, then, was for Paul a sacrifice for sin, not in exact duplication of the old type of ritual sacrifice but effecting all that the old effected and more. Paul is not concerned with sacrificial

¹John Knox, "The Epistle to the Romans," op.cit., IX, l33.
theory as such, nor with the intricacies of types of sacrifices within the Levitical system. He based his atonement doctrine in part on the belief that Jesus, in His sacrificial death, accomplished something in connection with the wiping away of sin and its consequences in man's relationship with God similar in nature to that which the Old Covenant had accomplished, but that He accomplished far more in effecting fellowship between God and man.

4. An Act of Fellowship

We find the thought of fellowship also connected with sacrifice in the death of Christ (Colossians 1:20). The Passover with its paschal family meal was not thought of in Judaism strictly as a sacrifice.\(^1\) It did, however, have sacrificial significance, and it appears probable that the eating of the Passover meal with His disciples had a special significance for Jesus in connection with His coming death.

The Passover was related to the shed blood of the lamb which was a sign to God to "pass over" the Hebrew people in their trials in Egypt (Exodus 12:13). Then there was the blood covenant of the Lord with Israel in Exodus 24:4–8. There the blood of sacrifice was thrown upon the people to seal the covenant. Here, although the concept of sin is present, particularly in the latter, the primary concern is the care and fellowship which the shed blood betokens between God and man. Speaking of the Old Testament sacrifice in general, Taylor emphasizes that restoring fellowship was a primary purpose of the sacrifice:

The most notable advantage of the cultus was that it held out to the worshipper the possibility of fellowship with God. Its aim was to make that fellowship actual by overcoming the obstacles

which prevented its attainment. Frequent failure cannot hide the greatness of the objective or obscure the fact that it was often realized.\(^1\)

We have referred already to Jeremias' contention that Jesus interpreted His death by means of ideas connected with the shedding of blood of the Passover Lamb at the departure from Egypt.\(^2\) Jeremias outlines the unique features of the Last Supper as compared to other meals which point to the fact that it was a Passover meal that Jesus shared with His disciples.\(^3\)

It would have been natural for Jesus to discourse on the meaning of the paschal lamb if it were a Passover meal. As the disciples joined in table fellowship, and Jesus speaks of "my body" and "my blood", He compares Himself to the paschal lamb which had been sacrificed and which was part of the meal. The Passover also had eschatological significance and Jesus describes His death as the eschatological Passover sacrifice. In addition, when Jesus added that His blood of the covenant was poured out "for many," the word many would have an inclusive meaning, and would have to be translated, according to Jeremias "Which is going to be shed for the whole world."\(^4\)

"When immediately afterwards He gives this same bread and wine whose meaning He has been interpreting to His disciples to eat and drink, the meaning is that by eating and drinking He gives them a share in the atoning power of His death."\(^5\)

The eschatological aspect of Jesus' thought is brought in His statement, "Truly, I say to you, I shall not drink again of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God" (Mark 14:25).

Since Paul delivered to those to whom he preached that which he "received from the Lord" (1 Corinthians 11:23), particularly as regarding

---

1Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, p. 56.
2Jeremias, op.cit., p. 145, 146. 3Ibid., pp. 141. 4Ibid., p. 151.
5Ibid., p. 154.
the Last Supper, those occasions when he uses words and phrases connected with the passover celebration in discussing the Last Supper would seem to possess significance in relating the death of Christ to the category of sacrifice. The passages from the epistles which have bearing here are: "For Christ, our paschal lamb, has been sacrificed. Let us, therefore, celebrate the festival, ... with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth" (1 Corinthians 5:7,8). "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation in the blood of Christ" (1 Corinthians 10:16)? "For I received of the Lord what I also delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed took bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it and said, 'This is my body which is for you. Do this in remembrance of me'. In the same way also the cup, after supper, saying, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me!. For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes" (1 Corinthians 11:23-26). The connection here, is not so much with sacrifice in its relation to sin as with sacrifice as leading to fellowship with God on the part of the believer.

In the light of what we have said above concerning Jesus' interpretation of the Last Supper as a sharing in His sacrifice, the words which Paul adds at the end of his account of Jesus' sayings at the Supper are important. "For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes" (1 Corinthians 11:26). Here he links the thought of the fellowship aspect in the Supper with its eschatological significance for the church directly with Jesus' interpretive words.

So we must hold that with all of this in the background, Paul saw
in the sacrifice of Christ an act of social fellowship. The idea of sacrifice was present when he spoke of Christ 'our paschal lamb', of 'the blood of the covenant', and when he recounted the events of the Last Supper and the words of our Lord. He saw that sacrifice as leading to a new fellowship among men in a new community.

It was a new covenant in a deeper sense than any prophet had anticipated. Thanks to the sacrifice of Christ their paschal lamb, the Christian fellowship now worshipped in the new, final order of communion with God. The thanksgiving which rose from the faithful at every service was not merely for food and wine as God's general gifts to men, but for what their bread and wine signified, i.e. the living sacrifice of the Lord which had inaugurated communion on the basis of his death.

In addition to seeing this fellowship aspect of the sacrifice of Christ in his accounts of the Last Supper as referred to above, Paul also has this aspect of Christ's death in mind in his letter to the Colossians.

"For in him all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell, and through him to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his cross" (Colossians 1:19,20). It seems evident that this phrase can be understood only against the background of the idea of sacrifice in the Old Testament as discussed above. As the Old Testament sacrifice was appointed by God to restore fellowship between man and Himself, so Christ's sacrifice was to remove all barriers to fellowship between God and His creation and the relationship formerly broken has been restored as he "made peace by the blood of his cross." By His sacrifice, Christ restores harmony within the entire universe in its relation of fellowship.

5. An Act of Obedience

Still another aspect of the death of Christ as sacrifice in Paul's

---

1 Moffatt, op.cit., 168.
thinking was its revelation of that death as an act in Christ of obedience to the Father.

"Obedience" and "self-giving" are terms applicable to the ancient theory of sacrifice as well as the Christian interpretation of Christ's sacrifice. P.T. Forsyth emphasizes the thought of obedience in Old Testament sacrifice:

The material sacrifice was, and was meant to be, but an outward symbol of the real inner sacrifice, which was the offering's self-oblation. The victim, or the gift, signified the inward and hearty submission of the donor to God's prior gift and submission. It was a living symbol of life, that is, of an obedient will. The sacrifice must be the symbol and sacrament of the worshipper's self-surrender to God's positive will in the sacrificial act.  

The fact that the act of performing the sacrifice was understood primarily as an act of obedience undoubtedly has much to do with the failure of any Old Testament writer to discuss in any detail the theory of sacrifice. There was no reason for the worshipper to know the why of sacrifice; he had only to understand that to sacrifice was required of him by God and was looked upon with favor by God and his only reaction was to obey that requirement. His sacrifice was a giving of himself through the sacrificial victim in obedience to the command of God. The life of the victim was his life offered to God. By this obedience his sin was expiated and he was restored to fellowship with God.

In discussing Paul's conception of sacrifice in connection with that of the Old Testament, Davies relates this need for obedience upon the part of the worshipper to the covenantal conception of Judaism:

Our discussion ... has further revealed again how much Paul carried

---

over into his interpretation of the Christian Dispensation the covenantal conceptions of Judaism. ... Always correlative with the idea of covenant in Judaism is that of obedience. The 'old' Israel was a covenant people: its redemption from Egypt, through the gracious intervention of Yahweh on its behalf, had been followed by the imposition upon it of a covenantal relationship with Yahweh; but this relation implied ipso facto the acceptance of the obligation to obey the demands made by Yahweh; the covenant was conditioned by obedience.  

By his sacrifice, then, the worshipper was dedicated to the service of God and the obedience of His commandments.

Paul sees the sacrifice of Christ as the act of obedience on the part of the Son to the will of the Father. "As by one man's disobedience many will be made righteous" (Romans 5:9). Christ "did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men. And being found in human form he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even death on a cross" (Philippians 2:6-8).

In the Romans passage, he is concerned with the results of Christ's obedient sacrifice upon the relationship between God and man. That relationship had been destroyed by sin, in the first instance when Adam disobeyed the commands of God. Christ brought justification to men and healed the relationship in His act of obedience to the will of God. His act of obedience was of such a supreme significance for man that it cancelled for all who belong to Him by faith the act of disobedience on the part of Adam together with its consequence for mankind. His sacrificial death was the final, complete demonstration of that obedience. His obedience served not only for Himself but also for all those who by faith entered into His obedient sacrifice. In Him, the believer could enter the life of obedient

---

1Davies, op. cit., pp. 259, 260.
service to the Father.

In Philippians, Paul points directly to the Cross as the manifestation of the obedient sacrifice of Christ. He took "the form of a servant, ... became obedient unto death, even death on a cross" (2:8). He is exhorting the Philippians to humility, to community service and to harmony in the church. He tells the Philippians to "have this mind among yourselves which you have in Christ Jesus" (2:1). Here was the supreme example of humility and obedience. Abandoning all that He rightfully possessed. He obeyed the will of the Father, whose servant He became (2:7), and gave Himself completely in sacrificial death.

6. An Act of a Representative

Finally, in Paul's category of the death of Christ as sacrifice there was the conception of it as a representative act of Christ on behalf of others. We shall discuss representation as a category in Paul's interpretation of Christ's death in the next chapter. Here we are interested in pointing out the representative character of sacrifice in Paul's background and in Paul himself.

In the Old Testament sacrifice, ideally the thought was present of the worshipper "participating" in the sacrifice. Not only was he performing an act of religious ritual, but also he was associating himself with the life of the sacrificial victim poured forth upon the altar. In a very real sense, the worshipper gave his life in the life of his sacrificial offering. "Its representative character is also manifest; the worshipper identifies himself with his offering, and while it is presented to God, he participates in it himself."¹

¹Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 54.
The thought of vicarious suffering, the suffering of one for the sins of others, is evident in Isaiah 53, and there the vicarious suffering is spoken of as a sacrifice. "He shall make himself an offering for sin" (53:10), "he poured out his soul to death and was numbered among the transgressors; yet he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors" (53:12). On this passage Muilenberg comments.

The sin was not the Servant's to be sure; all the more will his voluntary offering of himself as an atoning sacrifice be of great avail. ... The servant lives in intimate fellowship and communion with God, his silence and patience and humility are the expression of his nearness to his covenant Lord. It is the nations who live a broken and unholy existence, who need reconciliation and restoration. Therefore their sin must be atoned for. Sacrifice is the means of effecting that relationship. The servant's nearness to God makes him an instrument for God's purpose. He offers himself as an "'asaham" or "guilt offering" for the sins of the nations. He gives himself as a substitute, suffers vicariously, and his offering is efficacious in achieving the removal of the guilt of others."

We have above referred to the sacrificial significance of Jesus' sayings at the Last Supper, particularly in reference to J. Jeremias. In speaking of Christ's sacrifice as representative, we note that in those sayings Jesus speaks of His blood poured out "for many" (Mark 14:24). Here our Lord speaks of His sacrifice as representative, being done on behalf of all those who would enter into fellowship with Him by faith. "The many," accepting Him as their representative by faith, could feel that they themselves had been present in the sacrifice on the Cross and received its benefits.

So for Paul the death of Christ as a sacrifice was the act of a representative. He refers to Jesus' death in terms of vicarious suffering for the sins of others. Christ was "put to death for our trespasses" (Rom-

---

ans 4:25), "died for the ungodly" (Romans 5:6). "While we were yet sinners Christ died for us" (Romans 5:8). "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us" (Galatians 3:13). In the light of the terminology in Second Isaiah and of our Lord Himself, it is evident that in these instances Paul was setting forth the thought of Jesus in His sacrifice suffering vicariously as the Representative of the believer.

Christ's sacrifice as a representative act is clearly present in Ephesians 5:2, where the act of Christ as vicarious and the description of Christ as a sacrifice appear together. Exhorting his readers to act with forgiveness in love, as they are beloved by God, Paul says, "And walk in love, as Christ loved us and gave himself up for us, a fragrant offering and sacrifice to God." It was in self-sacrificing love that Christ gave Himself completely on behalf of men, and that self-giving is ever a supreme example of love for men to copy. The believer on his part enters so completely into the act of the Representative that he can say with Paul, "I have been crucified with Christ; ... the life I now live I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me" (Galatians 2:20). Having shared in the sacrifice of his Representative and been delivered from his sins, the believer enters into a new life supported by his faith in his Representative.

Steeped in the Old Testament, and in Jewish theological categories, yet not bound by them, Paul portrays the death of Christ in the category of sacrifice. As an act of God, our Lord gave himself as a sacrifice, to transcend all the limitations, and fulfill all the efficacies of the Old Testament sacrifice. He offered on man's behalf the sufficient sacrifice which man could not offer for himself.
CHAPTER SIX

THE CATEGORY OF REPRESENTATION

One of the categories of thought which Paul uses frequently and on which he puts great emphasis in his interpretation of the death of Christ is the category of representation. We have seen as we have discussed the preceding categories that in each of them, to one degree or another, the representative character of Christ's death has been of vital importance in the development of thought contained in the category. Paul puts such emphasis on this aspect of Christ's death, and on the penal-vicarious and substitutionary ideas in connection with it, that it seems clear that the representative character appears as one of the dominant categories in Paul's interpretation of the death of Christ.

It is evident that St. Paul believed that in some way, and in some representative way, Christ acted for men, and that what happened to Him was of supreme importance to them. To this belief he attached great, indeed decisive importance, and he made it one of the foundation principles of his teaching.1

The basis of his thought is representative as it regards the work of Christ for men when Paul emphasizes the vicarious nature of Christ's death. We have touched on this thought above in connection with sacrifice. Paul says that Christ "died for us" (Romans 5:8). He was "put to death for our trespasses and raised for our justification" (Romans 4:25). God "did not spare his own Son but gave him for us all,..." (Romans 8:32).

"Christ loved us and gave himself up for us" (Ephesians 5:2). "Christ
loved the church and gave himself up for her" (Ephesians 5:25). Then
there are those passages which speak of the thought of the believer being
united with Christ in His death. "We have been united with him in a death
like his" (Romans 6:5). "We are convinced that one has died for all;
therefore all have died" (2 Corinthians 5:14). "For our sake he made him
to be sin who knew no sin, so that in him we might become the righteousness
of God" (2 Corinthians 5:21). These passages are examples of the wealth of
references to the representative nature of Christ's death.

A. The Old Testament Background of Representation

Paul would have found the background for his development of the
category of representation a part of the Jewish heritage he received as a
birthright. The representative idea has already been seen in Old Testament
sacrifice; here we discuss it more thoroughly. First we must consider the
presence of the idea of solidarity in the Old Testament, then that princi-
ple as it is applied to vicarious suffering in Old Testament thought.
This principle of solidarity we have had occasion to refer to also, for
carried over into Christianity as it interpreted Christ's death, it forms
the foundation from which Paul's thought in the category of representation
is built, and this category is, of course, inter-related with the other
categories of Paul's thinking.

The idea of solidarity or corporate unity is illustrated in the
fact that the Jews thought of themselves primarily in corporate terms, as
a people or nation. Israel was not merely a collection of independent
individuals, but the nation had a collective corporate identity. When
Israel rejoiced all rejoiced and when the nation sinned its citizens were involved in that sin. Conversely when one member of a family sinned, the whole family was held to be guilty, and when one citizen of a nation sinned the consequences of the transgression were brought upon the entire nation. In Genesis 20, when God had spoken to Abimelech in a dream concerning his taking of Sarah when she was Abraham's wife, Abimelech answers, "Lord wilt thou slay an innocent people?" and goes on to defend his action. It is taken for granted that the whole people will suffer for the error of their king. When Abimelech speaks to Abraham, he asks, "How have I sinned against you, that you have brought on me and my kingdom a great sin?" (Genesis 20:4,9). In Joshua, when in the conquest of the promised land the Israelite army fled before the men of Ai, and Joshua appeals to the Lord, God's answer is: "Israel has sinned; they have transgressed my covenant which I commanded them; they have taken some of the devoted things; they have stolen and lied, and put them among their own stuff" (Joshua 7:11). Yet as the story goes on it is evident that one man had done the wrong for which the whole nation was being accused. When Achan confessed and was stoned to death, "then the Lord turned from his burning anger" (Joshua 7:26). This thought of collective guilt for individual sin is seen in the statement, "The Lord is slow to anger and abounding in steadfast love, forgiving iniquity and transgression, but he will by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquity of fathers upon children, upon the third and upon the fourth generation" (Numbers 14:18; see also Exodus 20:5). The prophets, in contrast to this particular aspect of the principle, emphasize the responsibility of the individual for his actions. "The soul that sins shall die. The son shall not suffer for the iniquity of the father, nor the father suffer for the iniquity of the son" (Ezekiel 18:20). But
certainly this is not an indication of an evolution of thought from corporate to individual responsibility. Man is both an individual and a part of society. While the prophets with their ethical interest emphasized the individual, the interest in social solidarity and group responsibility was present both early and late in Hebrew thought.¹

The Jewish doctrine in the period before Paul's time, building upon this principle of solidarity, saw the whole of humanity being the family of Adam. The sin that Adam committed, then, was the sin of the whole race. When he disobeyed God in Eden, all his descendants were involved in his disobedience. Thus it is said, "O thou Adam, what hast thou done? For though it was thou that sinned, the evil is not fallen on thee alone but upon all of us that come of thee" (2 Esdras 7:118).

This thought of corporate unity held that beginning with Adam the sin of an individual could bring guilt upon the entire tribe or nation, and it followed that, on the other hand, the righteousness of an individual or of a few might save the whole community. When Abraham interceded for Sodom, God agreed not to destroy the city if ten righteous men could be found (Genesis 18:22-33). The procurement of divine forgiveness for sinners by the intercession of a righteous man is seen when at Lot's request the city to which he fled from Sodom was spared from destruction (Genesis 19:18-23). In the prophets it is seen in Amos when at Amos' intercession the Lord repented of His plan against Israel (Amos 7:1-6).

By the principle of solidarity the merits of one person could be considered to be shared with other persons. The man without merit could obtain merit in the sight of God by sharing in the abundance of benefits

¹Herbert G. May, "The Book of Ezekiel," The Interpreter's Bible, VI, 49, 157. See also Dodd, Romans, p. 79.
of another's righteousness. This too is illustrated in Rabbinic thought of which Davies says:

It was a postulate of Rabbinic thought that a man by his obedience to the Torah could obtain merit. In fact, according to some of the Rabbis the Torah had been expressly given in order that Israel might be given the opportunity of gaining merit. ... These merits, however, benefited not merely the person who by his obedience had acquired them, but also his contemporaries, and in addition, because of that solidarity of all the members of the community both past, present, and future, they would also avail for those who preceded him and those who would follow him both here and hereafter.1

There was in Judaism also occasionally expressed the idea that the merit of the good man (and corporately of the nation) might be procured by suffering. If by the principle of solidarity the merits of one man availed for another, and if merit could be gained by suffering, it follows then that the sufferings of the righteous would have value for others than themselves. In the Second book of Maccabees this conception appears, where the meritorious sufferings of Eleazar and his sons are said to bring reconciliation between God and all Israel. "We are suffering for our own sins, and though our living Lord is angry for a little, in order to rebuke and chasten us, he will again be reconciled to his own servants... I, like my brothers, give up body and soul for our father's laws calling on God to show favour to our nation soon ... and to let the Almighty's wrath, justly fallen on the whole of our nation, end in me and my brothers" (2 Maccabbees 7:33,37,38). In Fourth Maccabees, a product of Hellenistic Judaism, is the thought that the sufferings and the death of the Maccabean martyrs had atoning and vicarious value for the whole nation. "Be merciful to Thy people, being pleased with our punishment on their behalf. Make my blood a purification of them ..." (4 Maccabees 6:28,29). In 4 Maccabees 17:22,

1Davies, op.cit., p. 269.
there is the thought of ransom, and of propitiatory death. The seeds of
the thought of vicarious substitution and representation are evident here.
We have seen already that the thought of substitution in this sense was
present in the Old Testament sacrificial system.

The connection of all these ideas into one concept is found most
clearly in the Suffering Servant passages of Second Isaiah (Isaiah 52,
53). Speaking of this conception in sacrificial terms, Taylor says:

The theology implicit in this splendid conception is a doctrine
of representative suffering. . . The Servant bears what others
ought to suffer. They participate in the Servant's oblation and
make it their own, and it is the complete act, including the
Servant's offering and the onlooker's response, which constitutes
the sacrifice presented to God. ¹

We find the thought of representative suffering clearly expressed in

Surely he has borne our griefs and carried our sorrows;
But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our
iniquities;
Upon him was the chastisement that made us whole, and with his
stripes we are healed.
All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to
his own way;
And the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all.

This action on the part of the Servant is seen to be the will of the God
who confirms the activity of the Servant, who will

make many to be accounted righteous; and he shall bear their
iniquities.
Therefore I will divide him a portion with the great, and he shall
divide the spoil with the strong;
because he poured out his soul to death, and was numbered with
the transgressors;
yet he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the trans-
gressors. ²

We see in the thoughts contained in this passage, "the Lord has laid on him
the iniquity of us all," "he shall bear their iniquities," "he poured out

¹Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 42. ²Isa. 53:4,5,6,11,12.
his soul to death," "was numbered with the transgressors," and "he bore the
sin of many," the essential background of the representative idea in such
Pauline statements as "who was put to death for our trespasses" (Romans 4:25), "who did not spare his own Son but gave him up for us all" (Romans 8:32), "who loved me and gave himself for me" (Galatians 2:20), and "Christ
loved us and gave himself up for us" (Ephesians 5:2). The suffering of
the servant was because of sin. But it is not the sinner who suffers. The
sufferer bore the consequences of the sins of others than himself. The
sins of others are transferred to him; he vicariously bears the punishment
for them, and his suffering is efficacious in the eyes of God. "The many
shall be accounted righteous." All this was in the purpose of God who ac¬
cepted the servant's offering and who would apparently restore the servant
to life (vs. 10).

B. Representation in the Mind of Christ

The Gospels leave us with the conviction that Jesus saw His own
death as a (to be) representative death. This is most clearly expressed in the
statement in Mark 10:45 - "For the Son of Man came not to be served but to
serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many." Here, as Rudolph Otto
points out, is found an acceptance on the part of Jesus of the combined
titles of "Son of Man" and "Servant of God," the former being a "majestic,
kindly being," and the latter a "humble, ministering figure." In Otto's words,
these words predicts His death in the context of the expiatory and repre¬
sentative suffering of the Servant of God. In Otto's words,

To save is the calling and the purpose of the Son of Man.† To save,

---

† Otto, op. cit., p. 252.
however, is also the purpose of the suffering of the Servant of God. The Son of Man must be the redemptively suffering Servant of God, if he is to fulfill his vocation as Son of Man, i.e. his vocation as Saviour.  

Jesus also as we have seen spoke of the shedding of His covenant blood as "poured out for many" (Mark 14:24; see also Matthew 26:28, "poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins.").

When the "ransom-passage" and the statements at the Last Supper are seen in conjunction, it is clear that Jesus saw His death as representative, and representative in the context of the thought of the Servant passage in Isaiah 53, having within it definite benefits which He would bring to man in His dying. His was to be a vicarious death in which He would take upon Himself the punishment for the sins of many. The many had, as Jeremias has said, an inclusive meaning and meant the entire world.  

When he spoke of eating the bread and drinking the wine He had in mind the participation of the disciples in His sacrificial death and its resulting salvation.

Jesus, then, identified Himself in His Messianic vocation with mankind. In this corporate relationship He was conscious that He was, in a unique way but comparable in concept to Old Testament ideas of solidarity, representing all men before God. He was to do, in man's stead, that which man was unable to do for himself. He would suffer as the representative of many and "ransom" them by delivering them from the consequences of their sins. He expected men to participate in His sacrifice.

In bidding His disciples to receive the broken bread, which he had interpreted as His 'body', Jesus revealed that He did not look upon His sacrifice as a thing apart from men to be accepted passively as one recognizes an external event. On the contrary, He thought of

---

1Ibid., p. 251.  
2Jeremias, op.cit., p. 151.
it as standing in the closest relation to human need, as an experience to be shared and appropriated; and, as a realist, He provided a rite whereby fellowship in His sufferings and participation in the hallowing power of His sacrifice, might be assured.1

This conception of Christ's vocation, taken by them from Christ Himself, was passed on by the primitive church to Paul as he testified to the Corinthians: "For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received, that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures..." (1 Corinthians 15:3).

C. Christ the Representative

Paul saw the death of Christ as a representative death which brought new life to those who were "in Christ" in faith. We have here to discuss in what way that death was representative and how it benefited mankind. We have seen already the background for such a category in the principle of solidarity and the thought of the vicarious suffering of the innocent for the guilty. We have also suggested that these thoughts were present in the mind of Christ as He considered His redemptive vocation.

The essence of this category for Paul is in his conviction that Christ, as man's representative, identified himself with man in His life and death. This identification was a complete one. He was "descended from David, according to the flesh," "born of woman, born under the law," "took the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men" (Romans 1:1; Galatians 4:4; Philippians 2:7). The identification went even further, with Christ assuming the consequences of man's actions. He was "made... to be sin who knew no sin" (2 Corinthians 5:21). Having identified

1Taylor, op.cit., p. 125.
Himself so thoroughly with man, becoming one with him, He became their representative and did or endured in His own Person that which should have been man's lot in such a way that man could attain the benefits of the Representative's act. "For the love of Christ controls us because we are convinced that one has died for all; therefore all have died. And he died for all, that those who live might live no longer for themselves but for him who for their sake died and was raised" (2 Corinthians 5:14,15).

Paul took over the conception of human solidarity and of Adam as the representative of the sinful race.

Of this human solidarity Adam was the symbol, and the Genesis story of creation and fall served admirably to account for man's condition. When God made Adam, he made man; when Adam succumbed to sin, all mankind became enslaved. When Adam transgressed, all men became guilty.¹

Christ, according to the will of God and His own sense of His mission, appears as Representative of man in His person and the whole human race is collected in Him into a moral unity. He frees man from slavery as man enters into corporate unity with Him. In Him man has one responsibility and one interest, sharing with Him both sin and righteousness, seeking salvation. As sin and righteousness are passed from Representative to represented, sin from represented to Representative, righteousness from Representative to represented, through the death of the Representative, salvation is made possible for man whose Representative Christ is. As He became one with them by His self-identification with them, so they may be one with Him and make His experience their own.

We can see most clearly the thought in Paul's category of representation in his development of the argument in Romans 5. Here particularly we are drawn back to the discussion earlier in the chapter concerning the

¹John Knox, op.cit., p. 369.
principle of solidarity in the Old Testament. In Romans 5, Paul sees both Adam and Christ as man's representatives in this solidarity, Adam as representing the "old" man, under sin, and Christ the "new" man, man in faith. Adam is taken as the representative type of man in sin, in flesh, under the law. In his Fall Adam was the representative symbol of man's disobedience toward God, his sin and, as the result of his sin, his condemnation and death. Through the disobedience of the one man Adam, all mankind was placed in one class, that of being sinners, liable to sin's consequence, death.

On the other side we have the single representative act of Christ. Adam was "a type of the one who was to come" (Romans 5:14). In what sense he was a type Paul goes on to explain in a series of contrasting statements. "If many died through one man's trespass, much more have the grace of God and the free gift in the grace of that one man Jesus Christ abounded for many" (5:15). "If because of one man's trespass, death reigned through that one man, much more will those who receive the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness reign in life through the one man Jesus Christ" (5:17). "Then as one man's trespass led to condemnation for all men, so one man's act of righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all men" (5:18). "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by one man's obedience many will be made righteous" (5:19). Both Adam and Christ were representatives. Adam symbolized trespass and disobedience which led men to sin, condemnation, and to death. Christ was grace, life, righteousness, and obedience, leading men to receive grace, righteousness, acquittal, and life. While the act of sin in Adam involved the whole race in sin, the whole race could also share in Christ's sacrificial death and be delivered from sin.

That which Christ did in His death, the benefits of which man could
share, Paul saw to be His obedient suffering of the consequences of man's sin. His death was efficacious because it was in obedience; and the results of it brought to man deliverance from sin and from death. Perfect in His obedience, sin could not conquer Him. Rather He defeated sin for Himself and for those He represented.

Christ by his perfect obedience 'unto death, even death on a cross' (Philippians 2:8), sets in reverse, so to speak, the process begun by Adam's disobedience. He gives the race of men the opportunity of a fresh start. He becomes the head of a justified, redeemed, and triumphant community.¹

This is the significance, then, of Paul's statement that "Christ died for our sins" or that He was "put to death for our trespasses." Christ Himself was free of the guilt of sin but endured that which he did not deserve, suffered in a way that only sinners should suffer in order that sinners be considered righteous with Him. "For our sake he made him to be sin who knew no sin, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God" (2 Corinthians 5:21). Christ's identification with man was so complete that, although Himself sinless, He somehow shared in men's sin. He accepted its consequences vicariously for men; in their stead He conquered sin so that sinful men could be righteous before God.

Paul never says that Christ died "instead of" us. The preposition \( \alphaiv\gammat\) , "instead of," is never used in the epistle in this connection. Rather, Paul uses the preposition, \( \delta\pi\varepsilon\rho\) , "on behalf of." To speak of Christ's death as substitutionary is true only if the term is used in a restricted sense. As Stevens put it,

With Paul, substitution means, not the substitution of Christ's punishment for our punishment, but the substitution of his sufferings, which were not of the nature of punishment, for our punishment; the substitution of another method of revealing and

¹John Knox, op.cit., IX, 468.
vindicating the divine righteousness in place of the method of punishment.¹

In Galatians 3:13, Paul does not say that Christ was accursed or even was "made a curse" (AV). He says that Christ redeemed us "having become a curse for us." Christ had associated Himself voluntarily with those under the law's curse. Becoming on man's behalf a curse He redeemed man from the law's curse. This He accomplished through the act of His death, destroying the law's power over Him. Nowhere does Paul imply substitution in the cruder sense of Christ bearing punishment instead of us. It is always "on our behalf."

God, instead of inflicting man with the punishment he deserved, and which His justice required, provided a representative in Christ, who, righteous in His own life, accepted in His death the consequences of sin in the lives of those whose representative He was.

We must be careful, too, in our use of the word "penal" in reference to Christ's death. His death certainly is not penal in any sense of His being punished, or the object of God's wrath. But the word has positive meaning in reference to Christ's death when we think that in His death He, in accord with God's will, took upon Himself the punishment of others.

For Paul, Christ's suffering was certainly 'penal' in the sense that he had to realize to the full the divine reaction against sin in the human race in which he was incorporated, and to which he had betrothed himself for better or for worse. If he had not done this, could he have been the Saviour of the race from sin or the Reconciler of sinful men to God?²

Paul pictures Christ as dying a representative death, vicariously giving His own life on behalf of man. It was "while we were yet sinners,

²Hunter, op.cit., p. 92.
Christ died for us" and it was an act wherein "God shows his love for us" (Romans 5:8).

In perfect filial accord with the Father's will, and moved by the greatness of His love for sinners, Christ came under the curse of sin and shared its penalty. There is no question of the transference of punishment from their shoulders to His own, still less any thought of a measured equivalent of suffering: what is meant is that in the work of redemption Christ submitted to the judgment of God on sin.1

D. Man As Represented

As Christ's death was representative, so the full benefits for man so far as that death was concerned were to be gained only as man accepted Christ as his representative through the act of faith, and in his own life entered into the life of his representative. If Christ's death were to be of value to individual man, that man must accept its meaning and enter into the new life associated with Christ, so that Christ was truly his representative. Ideally, then, the Christian's experience would include a repetition in his own life of the experiences of Christ, at least in the main crises, the death and resurrection. Paul emphasizes this as the ultimate experience of the believer. "We know that our old self was crucified with him so that the sinful body might be destroyed, and we might no longer be enslaved to sin" (Romans 6:6). "But if we have died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him" (Romans 6:6). "That I may know him and the power of his resurrection" (Philippians 2:10).

The thought of man's participation by faith in Christ's ministry is expressed in Second Corinthians. "For the love of Christ controls us, because we are convinced that one has died for all; therefore all have died.

And he died for all, that those who live might live no longer for themselves but for him who for their sakes died and was raised" (2 Corinthians 5:14, 15). Once the believer is convinced that Christ's death was vicarious and representative, it is the same with him as if he himself had died to the old life of sin. In this faith the believer enters into a new life of service to Christ. He is certain of his deliverance from sin and judgment and his entry upon a new relationship with God. When the believer reaches this certainty he is a "new creation" (2 Corinthians 5:17). Speaking of his own experience in Christ, Paul says, "For I through the law died to the law, that I might live to God. I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me; and the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me" (Galatians 2:20). "Paul never allows us to forget that to be crucified with Christ is to share the motives, the purposes, and the way of life that led Jesus to the Cross."\(^1\)

The outward sign of this faith Paul held to be in the acceptance of baptism. "Do you not know that all of us who have been baptized in Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him in baptism into death, so that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might walk in newness of life" (Romans 6:3, 4; see also Colossians 2:12). The symbolism may be brought about from the steps in immersion. The important thing is that Paul declares that in baptism the believer enters into all that Christ did in His death as Representative, and emerges into new life. To avoid one death the believer endures another death by faith and enjoys the fruits of the resurrection which follows it. The death of Christ must be realized by each believer as in the act of bap-

\(^1\)Stamm, op.cit., X, 190.
tism he fully enters the life of the One who died for him. More and more he identifies himself with Christ by his faith in the love of God shown on the Cross until he can feel with Paul that "it is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me."

As man enters into the life bought for him by the representative death of his Lord, as he is conscious of the presence of Christ in his life, he fulfills in his own life that perfect life of obedience which he finds in the life of His Lord; not immediately, nor completely, but hopefully, and finds himself living a new life "in Christ."
CHAPTER SEVEN

THE DEATH OF CHRIST AND THE RESURRECTION

Throughout our discussion we have been emphasizing the vital importance to Paul of the death of Christ. Throughout, however, has been the awareness that behind all Paul's thinking on Christ's death there is always and inevitably the risen Christ, that without the resurrection the death of Christ would not have its tremendous significance for man. Paul puts the major emphasis in his epistles on the meaning of the death of Christ. At the same time he is constantly aware that the death would have no atoning significance whatsoever were it not a fact in his own experience that that death was followed by resurrection.

It is a case of recognizing with Paul that without the resurrection the death would have been powerless to save; and that without a risen, living, present Christ, with whom through faith the believer can come into union, all the benefits of the death would have to stand unappropriated forever. . . The fact of the matter is that, so far from belittling the death by laying all the emphasis we can upon the resurrection, we are doing what is most likely to interpret that death in its full redeeming value; and we are in far greater danger of belittling it when the resurrection emphasis is lacking.¹

Bultmann in discussing the theology of Paul discusses the death of Christ under heading "Christ's Death and Resurrection as Salvation-occurrence," and says "The salvation-occurrence, then, includes the death and the resurrection of Jesus . . . Jesus' death-and-resurrection is for Paul the decis-

¹Stewart, op.cit., p. 136.
Ive thing about the person of Jesus and his life experience."

Paul's emphasis on the connection between the death and the resurrection, and on the resurrection as an integral part of the saving work of Christ is in part, of course, because that tradition which he received from the early church included it. In part also, it was because Paul himself had met in his own experience the risen Christ.

A. The Death of Christ and the Resurrection in the Received Tradition

"For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received, that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the Scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the Scriptures, and that he appeared to Cephas, then to the twelve" (1 Corinthians 15:3,4). That which Paul received, and preached included the connection of the death and resurrection as together being one Gospel.

It is impossible to know to what particular scripture passages Paul was referring when he said that Christ's resurrection was "in accordance with the scriptures." Peter, in the Pentecost sermon appeals to Psalm 16:10, "For thou wilt not abandon my soul to Hades, nor let thy Holy One see corruption," and says that in this Psalm David "foresaw and spoke of the resurrection of the Christ, that he was not abandoned to Hades, nor did his flesh see corruption" (Acts 2:27,31). Or perhaps Paul had in mind, when he spoke of Jesus being raised "on the third day," Hosea 6:2, where it is said, "after two days he will revive us; on the third day he will raise us up, that we may live before him." But while the wording may have appealed to Paul, the reference in Hosea seems to be not to any thought of resurrection.

1Bultmann, op.cit., p. 293; see also pp. 292ff.
tion as such, but to a shallow repentance on the part of Israel.

The restoration and revival are to be speedy and without trouble; in two or three days all will be well again. Therein is revealed the shallowness of the popular religious attitude. There is no sense of awe before God, no sense of the loss of an intimate relationship which can only gradually be restored, no searching sense of guilt before divine law and the need for spiritual cleansing.1

The Gospels and the early chapters of Acts were of course written in their present form subsequent to Paul's ministry but were based on primitive tradition and contain older material. There we find the death and resurrection connected. In Mark, Jesus' teaching is summed up by the Evangelist. "And he began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again" (Mark 8:31; see also 9:31; 10:34). In the sermons in Acts, to which we have earlier made reference, the death and resurrection both receive emphasis. In addition to the sermon on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:11-36), in the sermon in Solomon's portico Peter speaks of the fact that his hearers "killed the Author of life, whom God raised from the dead" (Acts 3:15), and to Cornelius he declared that the Jews "put him to death by hanging him upon a tree; but God raised him on the third day and made him manifest, not to all the people but to us who were chosen by God as witnesses, who ate and drank with him after he rose from the dead" (Acts 10:34,31). When the death is mentioned in the kerygma in Acts,2 the resurrection immediately follows.


2See Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching.
B. The Resurrection in the Experience of Paul

Paul also sees particular significance in the resurrection as related to the death of Christ because in his own experience he was called by the risen Christ to the ministry which led him to set forth his interpretation of the death. "He invariably interprets the cross in the light of the resurrection. This follows the order of his religious experience. It was the risen Christ he came to know in the spiritual crisis of his career." The Christ whom Paul first knew, vitally and personally, was the risen Christ. Called by Him to be an apostle, he began to see that the resurrection was the vindication of all that went before it in the mission of the Redeemer. In it he saw the significance of the life and death for himself and for all mankind.

The wonder of the Resurrection to Paul consisted in the fact that this one whom he knew as Lord had actually suffered death upon the cross... When Paul wrote the phrase 'Christ and Him crucified', he was thinking first of all of the risen, exalted Christ, and his thoughts moved backward to the Cross.

Paul witnessed to his own experience of the risen Christ when, in recounting those to whom He appeared after the resurrection, he concludes with, "Last of all, as to one untimely born, he appeared also to me" (1 Corinthians 15:8). This experience he refers to in 1 Corinthians 9:1, when he says, "Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?"; and in Galatians, "But when he who had set me apart before I was born, and had called me through his grace, was pleased to reveal his Son to me" (Galatians 1:15,16). It is described in detail in Acts 9:1-19; 22:14-16; and 26:12-19. Perhaps the reason Paul does

1Kennedy, op.cit., p. 125.
2John Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul, pp. 130, 131.
not dwell in greater detail than he does on the resurrection of Christ is that he felt that it sufficiently explained itself. His own experience on the road to Damascus would have convinced him that Jesus was alive, that with God's power He had spoken to him. Men could be brought to understand the power of the resurrection, whereas it was a much more difficult matter to see God's power in a death on a cross.

C. Christ's Death and His Resurrection.

Paul makes it clear that he considers the resurrection vital to his interpretation of the death of Christ. "Christ died for our sins," but "if Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile and you are still in your sins" (1 Corinthians 15:3,17). We note that Paul does not say that Christ rose from the dead but that He had been raised. It was not the act of Jesus in Himself, but the act of God. God verified all that Christ had done in His life and death and made the redemption complete. Paul puts it negatively, that if God had not raised Jesus from the dead, there would not have been the divine confirmation of the value of Christ's death which Paul saw in the other categories of his interpretation of that death. The mission of the Redeemer would have been denied by God rather than affirmed and man's faith in the value of the sacrificial death would have been in vain.

Paul refers to the resurrection without mentioning the death,¹ just as he mentions the death apart from the resurrection. On occasion he appears to say that the belief in the resurrection is enough for salvation. "If you confess with your lips that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart

¹See Ro. 1:4; 8:11; 10:9; 1 Cor. 6:11; 2 Cor. 4:14; 1 Thess. 1:10.
that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved" (Romans 10:9; see also Romans 8:11). But the thought there is determined by the context rather than a belief on Paul's part that death and resurrection could be separated in their meaning for salvation. Other statements confirm that held the two in conjunction as parts of the one saving act. "Is it Christ who died, yes, who was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God who indeed intercedes for us" (Romans 8:34)? "For to this end Christ died and lived again..." (Romans 11:9). "And he died for all, that those who live might live no longer for themselves but for him who for their sake died and was raised" (2 Corinthians 5:15). "For he was crucified in weakness, but lives by the power of God (2 Corinthians 13:4). "That I may know him and the power of his resurrection, and may share his sufferings, becoming like him in his death, ..." (Philippians 3:10). For since we believe that Jesus died and rose again ..." (1 Thessalonians 4:14).

In Romans 4:25, the death and resurrection are also connected, but in such a way as to leave the reader with the possibility that Paul saw a distinction in effect between the two. "It will be reckoned to us who believe in him that raised from the dead Jesus our Lord, who was put to death for our trespasses and raised for our justification" (Romans 4:24, 25). It seems certain, however, from Paul's interpretation both of the death and the resurrection that he did not mean to say that the death alone was associated only with trespasses and the resurrection with justification.1 Our discussion in Chapter III, for example, will have pointed up how closely justification is linked with Christ's death. Apparently Paul is stating here what he says in other places in a similar way that Jesus died and rose

1See Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation, p. 42.
2Dodd, Romans, p. 70.
again for our trespasses and our justification. Dodd compares the wording to Hebrew parallelism and suggests that Paul is simply bringing the argument back to the thought expressed in Chapter 3 after a digression about Abraham. The fact that in the digression he spoke of God "who gives life to the dead" (Romans 4:17) and came to emphasize the resurrection in Romans 4:21 may also explain the way Paul phrases this particular statement.

Especially when he employs expressions of the category of representation and of man's entering into fellowship with Christ the Redeemer, Paul places the dying and rising of the believer in Christ in close connection. "We were buried therefore with him by baptism into death, so that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might walk in newness of life. For if we have been united to him in a death like his, we shall certainly be united with him in a resurrection like his" (Romans 6:4,5; see also verses 8-10). Here most clearly the baptism of the believer into death to his old life and his rising into new life is contingent upon the fact of the death and resurrection of Christ. Baptism is a "death like his," entry into the new life is a "resurrection like his."

A similar argument is found in Colossians. "And you were buried with him in baptism, in which you were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead" (Colossians 2:12). The difference in tenses in this statement and that of Romans 6 above has significance. In Romans 6:5, 6:8, and Colossians 2:12, the "dying with Christ" is an accomplished fact. The believer has "been united with him in a death like his," has "died with Christ," was "buried with him in baptism." In the Colossian passage, the "rising with Christ" is also an event of the past; but in Romans the tense changes and the resurrection of the believer is a part of the eschatological expectation. We "shall be united with him
in a resurrection like his"; we "shall also live with him." It is possible that in Colossians Paul's reference to believer's being raised as a past occurrence was determined by polemical reasons. "This change of emphasis might well be hastened by the controversy with a party which taught that the work of Christ needed to be supplemented by angelic powers."¹ John Knox suggests, however, that the difference is explained more reasonably by the tension always present in Paul between man's present possession and future expectation of the fruits of Christ's redemption.²

Just as the death and resurrection of Christ as objective facts must be considered together if either is to have significance, so they cannot be separated in the experience of the believer . . . The new life is 'the life of the world to come'. We have received only a foretaste of it; only in that same measure have we actually 'died to sin'. Both the Crucifixion and the Resurrection are, as applied to the believer, eschatological facts. But both are also present facts because the present world is not only already doomed but is already beginning to die, and the new age is not only surely promised but the first installment has been paid - in the coming of the Spirit.³

The present and future of the fact of resurrection for the believer is also found when Paul says "that I may know him and the power of his resurrection"; a present possibility, and "that if possible I may attain the resurrection from the dead," a hope for the future.

The resurrection is so vitally connected by Paul to the death of Christ as the decisive proof of the power of that death that it clearly is a dominant category in Paul's interpretation of Christ's death. Christ's saving activity in His death was made effective for mankind when God raised Him from the dead.

¹Francis W. Beare, "The Epistle to the Colossians," The Interpreter's Bible, XI, 197.

²For further discussion of this "tension," see above, Chapter IV.

³John Knox, "The Epistle to the Romans," The Interpreter's Bible, IX, 476, 477.
CHAPTER EIGHT

THE CATEGORY OF ESCHATOLOGY

It has been apparent throughout our discussion that Paul regarded the death of Christ as a decisive event with a once-for-all significance in the world of man and in the universe. It has been apparent also, however, that Paul's concern included what was to happen to man and the universe at the end of the age, and that he understood Christ's death to have an eschatological significance. The contribution to Paul's interpretation of the death of Christ in the category of eschatology comes in answer to the hypothetical question, "What was the ultimate end achieved by Christ in His death?" We shall in this chapter endeavor to find Paul's answer to this question.

In accordance with his times Paul had an apocalyptic outlook which must be taken into account when we look at his teaching. We have seen already that these apocalyptic convictions color the development of the categories. In the apocalyptic expectation which was in his background there was the anticipation of the eschatological age, an age to come. What made Paul's apocalyptic interpretation distinctive was that it was closely linked with the consequences of the death of Christ and His resurrection. Where his contemporaries looked for the new age as something in the future, Hooke says, "Paul had arrived at the belief that by His death and resurrection, the Messiah, having died to the life of the 'present age,' with all its evil, had entered upon a new life, the life of the spirit, the life of the
More than that, the believer who by being "in Christ" participates in the death and resurrection of his Lord finds that the result of that participation is the opening up of a new life for him. The age to come, which man had looked forward to in the future, is brought by means of Christ's sacrifice on the Cross up to the present experience of the believer. Bultmann says of Christ's death as an eschatological occurrence:

This is the decision-question which 'the word of the cross' thrusts upon the hearer: whether he will acknowledge that God has made a crucified one Lord; whether he will thereby acknowledge the demand to take up the cross by the surrender of his previous understanding of himself, making the cross the determining power of his life, letting himself be crucified with Christ. The fact that this acknowledgment does take place demonstrates that Christ's death is a cosmic event; i.e. that it may no longer be considered as just the historical event of Jesus' crucifixion on Golgotha. For God made this event the eschatological occurrence, so that, lifted out of all temporal limitations, it continues to take place in any present moment, both in the proclaiming word and in the sacraments.

A. The Background of Paul's Eschatological Thought

The background of Paul's thought in this category is found in the development of the apocalyptic idea, especially in later Judaism. Stewart finds the reason for this development in the growing realization that the Messianic age which men expected was not evolving through the events of history as was evidenced by the fall of the Maccabean dynasty.

It was to counter this growing pessimism that the apocalyptists sought to lift men's eyes to a speedily coming day when God would break in gloriously not only to subdue the heathen worldpowers, but to destroy the old order of things entirely and bring in new heavens and a new earth. Hence the root-conception of all this class of literature is the doctrine of the two ages: everything turns on the contrast be-

---


2Bultmann, op. cit., p. 303.
tween this present evil age and the ideal coming age.¹

Manson points out, however, that this putting off of the complete enactment of God of His total purpose to the future had its beginning in Old Testament thought and then was developed in the later apocalypticism. Speaking of the Jahwist document, he sees history and eschatology linked together in the story of Moses.

When Moses asks to know the name of God, the answer which he receives, 'I am that I am' - it should properly be rendered 'I will be what I will be' - refers not to the ontological mystery of God's person, but rather to the inscrutability of God's future purposes from man's present standpoint. God reserves His action. Similarly in Exodus 33:12-23 Moses in the tent asks to see God's 'ways', and receives the answer that he shall have God's 'presence', and shall know His 'goodness', but shall not behold His 'glory'. Moses will stand in his cleft of rock, and he will see God's 'back', but he cannot run before God and see His 'face'. Here again the togetherness of Divine history and eschatology! God has His reserved purposes, and it is to be understood that these will later be revealed. The things which God intends will be, but not yet.²

The roots of Jewish Apocalyptic are seen also in the Old Testament prophets. The prophets foretold the destruction which was to befall Jerusalem and God's judgment on the nation. They also held up before Israel the hope of a future day of glory for the nation, when with God's help all her enemies would be overthrown; she would be free from all her oppressors. God would teach her and exalt her to a new place of power and glory (See Isaiah 2:2-4). As Israel was faithful to God, she would become supreme among all the nations of the earth. "For the nation and kingdom that will not serve you shall perish" (Isaiah 60:12). These ideas are found throughout the prophetic writings.³

¹Stewart, op. cit., p. 46.

²William Manson and Others, Eschatology (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd Ltd., 1952), pp. 3, 4.

³See, for example, Jeremiah 23:5, 6; 31:38-40; Joel 3:16-20; Amos 9:13-15; Ezekiel 34:11-31.
In the prophet Isaiah is the idea that if there is any escape it can be only as God chooses to preserve a remnant (Isaiah 1:9). In this conception of the remnant Manson sees the symbol of an eschatological salvation. "What happens is that the blessings offered to Israel under the covenant, but with a greater weight of glory, are projected into the future... Into the future they project holy nation, righteous prince, Holy Spirit of God, but all within the framework of a 'New Covenant.'" Paul refers to the thought of Isaiah 1:9 (Romans 9:29) and quotes from Isaiah 10:22-23, "Though the number of the sons of Israel be as the sand of the sea, only a remnant of them will be saved; for the Lord will execute his sentence upon the earth with rigor and dispatch" (Romans 9:27,28). His point is there, that it is not necessary to suppose that God's promise to Israel was ever intended to include all Israelites. Through the remnant He accomplishes His purpose.

But in the days when Israel was under Persian and Greek rule, especially at the time of the Maccabbeans, c. 165 B.C., a pessimism set in and modified this view of the prophets even more. The possibility of this day of glory seemed more and more remote. The existing world, the present age, was seen as completely evil and incapable of fulfilling the requirements God demanded of His people if He were to lead them into their exaltation. They were getting farther from God's way, rather than returning to God's way. Not only man was completely corrupt, with power in the hands of wicked men, but the belief in evil powers which we have considered in Chapter IV developed. These powers, to a great degree, were in control of the world, holding it under their evil domination. What was the answer of faith to this situation of history? Finding nothing in the present world to give

---

1Manson, op.cit., p. 5.
them hope, the apocalyptists took refuge in the future and pictured an eschatological hope. God would still bring Israel to glory, but this glory was seen at a future time in a "new age." The hope was that the existing world of this age would be given up to destruction, and God would bring in a new and glorious world in which Israel, or at least the "remnant" of Israel (See Isaiah 10:20-23) would reign.

This thought was summed up in the doctrine of the two ages in contrast, the present world age and the age to come. The writer of II Esdras (IV Esdras or Ezra) for example, says that God has created two ages, one evil, troubled, cursed; the other full of glory. The end of the old age and the opening scene of the new was to be a day of judgment when the wicked, both men and "powers," would be destroyed and the righteous be brought into a new, glorious life in the presence of God.

Jeffrey describes the difference in point of view toward the future between the prophets and the apocalyptists:

The older prophets had preached of a kingdom in which, after his judgment on the enemies of his people God would supersede the kingdoms of this world by a reign of righteousness. As a rule they thought of this as a continuation of the present world. There would be a thorough 'housecleaning' for this world, a purification in which Israel also would be purged of its unworthy members, after which God would set up an ideal kingdom of peace, happiness, and righteousness, in which prosperity would abound and all peoples would be incorporated into, or at least be subject to, the people of God. The later prophets tended to shift the divine intervention to a final judgment and to interpret the kingdom as something beyond this world. In apocalyptic this eschatological interpretation dominates the whole concept of the kingdom.

Scholars differ as to how greatly these apocalyptic ideas affected Judaism as a whole. Moore says it was outside the main stream of Judaism,

1See II(IV) Esdras 5:11,27; 7:12,50,113; see also Apocalypse of Baruch 4:9; 83:6.


3Moore, op.cit., I, 127ff.
while Charles sees it as closely related to all of Judaism. It is enough here to say that it was a strain of thought in the Judaism familiar to Paul, and that in that strain of thought is to be found the background of this category of Paul's thought. Schweitzer, while he sees apocalyptic thought as separated from the rest of Judaism, sees it as supplying the key to Paul's thought. "It is not really a question of Judaism as such, but of apocalyptic thought, which is a separate and independent phenomenon arising within Judaism, and has special presuppositions which are entirely peculiar to it."¹ The details of the apocalyptic picture Paul certainly fills in in his own way, and he is not bound to any particular scheme of it. It is to the general spirit of the apocalyptists that Paul is primarily indebted. While scholars generally do not agree with Schweitzer's assertion that apocalypticism is the key to Paul's thought, they recognize that there is truth in Schweitzer's position that it wields great influence on Paul in the development of his faith. Dodd, for example, says:

It seems clear that Paul started with eschatological beliefs of the type best represented by such Jewish writings as the Book of Enoch, the Apocalypse of Baruch and the Apocalypse of Ezra(II Esdras), especially the last named. The apocalyptists despaired of the present world-order ('This Age'), as being under the dominion of diabolic powers, and looked for a new order ('The Age to Come'), in which the sovereignty of God would be effectively manifested in a radical renewal of the whole universe. His enemies would be destroyed, the righteous dead would be raised to share in His triumph, and the elect still living would be transfigured into bodies of glory, to inhabit the new heavens and new earth.²

¹Albert Schweitzer, Paul and His Interpreters (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1919), p. 211; see also pp. 211ff.

B. The New Age

Paul saw the eschatological age toward which the apocalyptists had been looking as brought into being by the death of Christ. That which had been conceived of as happening at some distant time, when God would bring about the end of the present age, was by the act of Christ in His death brought up to the present, and the eschatological order, the new age, was begun. The death of Christ was an eschatological event, ushering in the new age. The new age made possible new men, brought in a new community, and a new universe. It did not remove the anticipation of a Final Consummation, but did assure the results of that consummation. The complete fulfillment was still to come, but it is present among men who enter it in Christ.

For Paul, as for all the early Christians, the Last Things are in a true sense already here. The 'fullness of time' has come, and the 'Eschaton' has entered history. Christ has died and risen, inaugurating the new order of things... The future has in a real sense become present. In principle, the Christian has begun to enter on his glorious inheritance.

1. The New Age and New Men

The new age ushered in by Christ in His redemptive death, in the first place, was to be made up of those who are "new men" in Christ. That has happened, set forth in the other categories of Paul's thought on the death of Christ, which has made "new" men out of "old" men. Paul was particularly aware of the transformation brought about by Christ in his own experience. When he says "if any one is in Christ, he is a new creation; the old has passed away, behold the new has come" (2 Corinthians 5:17), he is thinking of his own experience, that by the grace of God in the act of Christ on the Cross he had been made a part of the eschatological order which has been brought into existence.

1Hunter, op.cit., p. 51.
What Jesus had called the Kingdom of God, or the Kingdom of Heaven, which was both "at hand" (Mark 1:15), and yet which men still look forward to entering (Matthew 5:20), Paul developed in the terminology of the two ages. The death of Christ brought to the man of faith a "new creation" which gave him entrance to the new age. "But far be it from me to glory except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which the world has been crucified to me, and I to the world. For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation" (Galatians 5:11).

Man in Christ was a new man because Christ had brought about in His death a new creation corresponding to the original creation described in Genesis. Davies points out the significance in this light of Paul's speaking of the first Adam and the Second Adam:

The difference between the Body of the first Adam and that of the second Adam was for Paul that whereas the former was animated by the principle of natural life, the latter was animated by the spirit. Entry upon the Christian life is for the Apostle the putting off of the old man with his deeds and the putting on of the new man. The purpose of God in Christ is ... the reconstitution of the essential oneness of mankind in Christ as the spiritual community, as it was one in Adam in a physical sense.1

The new man is new because of his participation by faith in the death of Christ which had in it the power to make him new. The revelation of love in that death is so compelling in its power that man is aware of a new life within him. "For the love of Christ controls us, because we are convinced that one has died for all; therefore all have died ... From now on, therefore, we regard no one from a human point of view; ..." (2 Corinthians 5:14,16). This controlling power of life leads men into a new spiritual age. The new creation into the spiritual realm comes about as man participates in it through entering by faith into the experience of

1Davies, op.cit., p. 57.
Christ. In the cross of Christ the old world "has been crucified to me and I to the world" (Galatians 5:14).

This sharing of the experience of Christ by men in their new life is what Paul has in mind when he speaks of the Christian and suffering. In Romans 8 he implies a close resemblance between Christ's sacrifice and the sufferings of the man in Christ. "Provided that we suffer with him in order that we may also be glorified with him. I consider that the sufferings of this present time are not worth comparing with the glory that is to be revealed to us" (Romans 8:17,18). Here he refers to the actual sufferings of the faithful. When in Colossians 1:21, the apostle says, "Now I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and in my flesh I complete what remains of Christ's afflictions . . .," he did not conceive of himself as doing anything like Christ did in His suffering but of continuing in the name of the church in this participation in Christ's sacrifice. The message of Paul concerning the work of Christ is one of finality. Christ had done all that needed to be done. When he speaks of himself as completing Christ's sufferings he does not mean to imply that Christ's death on the cross was not enough. He is saying that since he now lives in Christ he rejoices that that life has led him into the opportunity of suffering for others. His sufferings have positive purpose in them.

The new age, then, began with new men. They became new when they died to their old life as they died with Christ and rose under their new master to begin to live a new life.

2. The New Community

The death of Christ, having made new men, at the same time created a new harmony in the world in that it brought about transformed relationships among men and removed the alienating barriers which divided men. All those
divisions which led to disharmony were done away with by Christ. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Galatians 3:28).

This reconciliation which the Cross brought about among men is a dominating idea in Ephesians. Paul emphasizes the thought there particularly as it relates to Christ's abolition of the law.

But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far off have been brought near in the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who has made us both one, and has broken down the dividing wall of hostility, by abolishing in his flesh the law of commandments and ordinances, that he might create in himself one new man in place of two, so making peace, and might reconcile us both to God in one body through the Cross, thereby bringing the hostility to an end (Ephesians 2:13-16).

The old antagonism between Jew and Gentile which has been caused by the law, creating a breach between the Jew who had and the Gentile who did not have it, was no more. The cross broke down the "dividing wall" which the law had been among men, and joined men together in one harmonious body.

Paul lifts, then, the significance of Christ's death beyond the salvation of the individual man to that of man collectively. He sees it as benefiting not only individual man as he accepts in his own life the benefits of Christ's death, but he declares that these same benefits affect to the good all inter-human relationships.

Wherever the primary experience of reconciliation to God is realized, two secondary experiences immediately follow -- reconciliation to life and reconciliation to the brethren, and both these aspects are stressed by Paul.¹

3. The New Community in the Church

Beginning with the immediate reconciliation of Jew and Gentile in Ephesians 2:13-16, Paul goes on to emphasize this harmony brought by Christ among all men. The natural result of that harmony was the new community,
the church.

A specially notable feature of Ephesians 2:11-22 as a whole is the strongly marked communal interest of the section. 'The commonwealth of Israel', 'the covenants of the promise', 'one new man' (of Jews and Gentiles), 'one body', 'fellow-citizens with the saints', 'the household of God', 'a holy temple in the Lord', 'a habitation of God in the spirit', all these expressions reveal that St. Paul is not thinking only of the reconciliation of individuals to God, but also of the creation of a new divine community, the Church of God, in which His work of reconciliation in Christ is to find its perfect embodiment.¹

The new community, the eschatological kingdom brought by Christ in His death into the present, was the church of Jesus Christ. The creation of the church was looked on by Paul as the direct result of the cross of Christ. We have referred already to Ephesians 2 as containing this thought. Paul's words are,

So then you are no longer strangers and sojourners, but you are fellow-citizens with the saints and members of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief cornerstone, in whom the whole structure is joined together and grows into a holy temple in the Lord; ..." (Ephesians 2:19-21).

The inevitable result of the new life in Christ, whereby "in Christ Jesus" men are "all sons of God, through faith" (Galatians 3:26) was the gathering together of men into the new spiritual community, the church.

On the relationship between what Christ does for the individual and that which He does for men collectively in the church, Taylor says,

Primarily, this reconciliation is the experience of the individual and it depends on his personal response in faith to Christ and to the work of God in him; but normally it comes to him within the fellowship of the church, and determines his personal relationship with others; indeed it is the teaching of Paul that it concerns things in heaven and things on earth and has to do with the relationship of nations and people.²

With the end of the law, in the death of Christ, the old Israel had come to an end. In the results of that death as it culminated in the resur-

¹Taylor, op.cit., p. 78. ²Ibid., p. 99.
rection the community of the redeemed began anew. There was therefore a real continuity between Israel of the Old Testament and the Christian Church. Paul sees the Church as fulfilling the function of the faithful remnant of Israel through whom God was working out His ultimate purpose. By the principle of solidarity Christians were united by faith with Christ as He created the New Israel. The church was the body of Christ, drawing together all those who were "in Him." Jesus Christ was the head. "He is the head of the body, the church" (Colossians 1:18).

4. The New Community and the Sacraments

Paul's conception of the new community brought about by Christ in His death and of the believer's place in that new community is illustrated when we look at his doctrine of the sacraments.

There is no true interpretation of the sacraments except by reference to the death of Christ. Baptism always has in view ... the forgiveness of sins; and as the rite which marks the believer's initiation into the new covenant, it is essentially related to the act on which the covenant is based, namely, that which Paul delivered first of all ... 'that Christ died for our sins'. When in Romans 6, Paul argues that baptism into Christ means baptism into His death, he is bringing out only what was always to Him the essential meaning of this ordinance. The Supper, again, of which he speaks at length in 1 Corinthians 10 and 11, bears an unmistakable reference to Christ's death. The cup is specially defined as the new covenant in His blood, and the apostle sums up the meaning of the sacrament in the words, 'As often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till He come'.

Baptism was the act of initiation into the Christian Church, by which men signified their acceptance of the Christian faith, but quite clearly for Paul it was more than that. It was specifically related to Christ's death, as when he says, "Do you not know that all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death?" (Romans 6:8).

---

1Denney, op. cit., p. 80.
In baptism the believer by faith participates in that death and is by that act incorporated into the community of believers. At his baptism the believer died with Christ, has in Christ died to sin, is free to live a new life in communion with God (Romans 6:1-11). While here the act is that of the believer in his individual acceptance of union with Christ, in the first Corinthian letter Paul relates baptism to the community. "For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ. For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body" (1 Corinthians 12:12,13). Of Paul's reference to the body here, Cullmann says that "it is evident that this body is the Body of Christ, and from the whole context that this Body of Christ is the community, i.e., the Church." Cullmann mentions also Galatians 3:27, "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ," and goes on to explain the significance of baptism in connection with the church:

What happens in the act of baptism is clearly defined in the decisive Pauline texts 1 Corinthians 12:13 and Galatians 3:27-28 as a setting within the Body of Christ. God sets a man within, not merely informs him that he sets him within, the Body of Christ; and at this moment therefore the reception of this act on the part of the person baptized consists in nothing else than that he is the passive object of God's dealing, that he is really set within the Body of Christ by God.\(^1\)

The significance of the category in its community emphasis is even more clearly seen in Paul's doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Here we find the explanation and fulfillment of the New Covenant of Jeremiah 31:34. In his account of the Lord's Supper, Paul relates that of the cup the Lord said "This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me." When he adds, "For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes."

\(^1\)Cullmann, op.cit., pp. 30, 31.
Paul is saying that not only have believers received the benefits of Christ's death, but also they have in the church the opportunity to share in His redemptive work in the world. "To have part in the community of the redeemed, to have part in Christ's atoning death -- that is, according to Paul, the benefit received in the Eucharist."\(^1\) In the passage 1 Corinthians 10:16, the cup in the Lord's Supper is described as a "participation" or "communion" in the blood of Christ; and the bread a participation or communion in the body of Christ. On this passage, Knox comments that "the importance of the whole passage lies in the fact that Paul sees in the eucharist a rite in which the partaking of, or communion with, the Body and Blood of Christ is the bond which unites all Christians."\(^2\)

This sacrament, too, symbolizes the bringing of the eschatological age into the present in the Church. "The Church is consecrated to the Lord for a destiny which . . . is not yet realized but . . . is eschatologically borne in upon us as often as the rite is celebrated."\(^3\)

C. The New Universe

Thus far in discussing Paul's category of eschatology we have found its outcome in new life for individuals and a new community of individuals in fellowship. As we have seen earlier, however, Paul was not content with the thought of salvation as being for humanity alone, but saw the effect of Christ's work as reaching beyond human salvation to encompass finally the entire universe.\(^4\) Not only were men to be reconciled to God and to one another, but finally there would be reconciled to Him "all things, whether

\(^1\)Jeremias, op.cit., p. 159.


\(^3\)Manson, op.cit., p. 12.

\(^4\)See Chapter IV, p. 116.
The death of Christ was the turning point of human history. But
more than human history is involved. Man, by the very nature of his crea-
tion has relationship with the universe in its entirety. It follows, then,
that man's salvation cannot be complete unless it includes the whole natural
order. In His death, Christ performed an act which had cosmic significance.

Now a man's body is his bond with the natural universe, and it cannot
be restored without the restoration of the whole natural order. There-
fore our redemption is immediately associated with the Redemption or
restoration of the whole universe, i.e., the power of the elements is
overcome. The spiritual powers of even the distant stars are brought
within the orbit of the redeeming work of Christ. No part of the
universe is left unaffected by what Christ has done.

The background for this may be found at least in part in the inter-
testamental writings where Adam and the Fall assumed cosmological signifi-
cance. Not only was man himself affected by Adam's sin, but in these
writings we find expression that the sin of Adam brought about cosmic dif-
ficulties also. The world is seen there as having been created for the sake
of man. "All this have I spoken before thee, 0 Lord, because thou hast
said that for our sakes thou hast created this world" (4 Ezra 6:55). This
expression of the doctrine that the world was created for man's sake is
found also in 2 Baruch 15:7, "on account of them has this world come"; and
in the Assumption of Moses 1:12, "For he hath created the world on behalf
of his people." Since this was true, it followed that with Adam's sin the
world, created for man, also became involved in sin's consequences. "But
when Adam transgressed my statutes, then that which had been made was
judged and then the wars of this world became narrow and sorrow and painful"
(4 Ezra 7:11,12). The Messianic Age would have to take care of the conse-

1Allan B. Galloway, The Cosmic Christ (London: Nisbet and Co., Ltd.,
1951), pp. 47, 48.
quences of the Fall for the universe, as well as for man. It was understood that it would correspond to the creation of all things, bringing about a new creation. "Then shall the world be turned into the primaeval silence seven days, like at the first beginnings" (Ezra 7:29). The Messiah would have to come with cosmic power, able to bring about the salvation of the universe as well as man.

Paul develops the thought of the power of Christ's death for salvation in terms of this background. In Colossians and Ephesians Christ's work brings together not only all men but "all things in him, things in heaven and things in earth" (Ephesians 1:10). Full of God's power He "reconciled to Himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his cross" (Colossians 1:20). The reconciliation of man is part of a much broader work, the reconciliation of the universe, which includes heaven and earth. The statement of Paul in Colossians follows on his attributing to Christ that cosmical significance which would make it possible for Him to accomplish that work, picturing Him as the center of the entire universe. "He is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation; for in him all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or authorities — all things were created through him and for him. He is before all things, and in him all things hold together" (Colossians 1:15-17).

Having been present at the original creation, Christ would have power for the re-creation of the universe, and the reconciling of it to God, that power being exhibited in His death and resurrection. The universal scope of His redemptive work comes out again in the following passages: "Seeing that you have put off the old nature with its practices and put on the new nature, which is being renewed in knowledge after the image of its creator. Here
there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcised or uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave, free man, but Christ is all, and in all" (Colossians 3:9-11). Again he speaks of the hope of creation itself; "because the creation itself will be set free from its bondage to decay and obtain the glorious liberty of the children of God. We know that the whole creation has been groaning until now; . . .'' (Romans 8:21,22). The cosmic scope of Christ's work is seen in 1 Corinthians. "For although there may be so-called gods in heaven or on earth - as indeed there are many 'gods' and many 'lords' - yet for us there is one God, the Father, from whom are all things and for whom we exist, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and through whom we exist'' (1 Corinthians 8:5,6).

Jesus Christ is, for Paul, the unifying Force, who was the agent of God in creation and who also through His death set in motion that which will ultimately bring all things, the universe in its entirety, into reconciliation with God. "Then comes the end, when he delivers the kingdom to God the Father after destroying every rule and authority and power'' (1 Corinthians 15:21).

D. The New Age in its Final Consummation

As we have pointed out, Paul saw the judgment of God brought forward by the act of Christ into the present, with its terrifying aspects removed by His justification of man. This present judgment and man's vindication before it by God Himself, rids man of his fear of the final judgment at the end of the age. But, according to Paul, this is not to say that there will be no final judgment. There will be a final consummation and in it will be judgment. The end of the age with its Day of Judgment still is to come. The judgment has been handed down but there will still be a final judgment. But because of the once-for-all act of Christ on the Cross, the nature of the
consummation is entirely changed. The end of the age will see the Parousia
of Christ. Although Christ's work is in a real sense complete, there still
remains for Him to bring to a climax and conclusion that which He had accom-
plished by His death. Although the new age exists now in the person of Je-
sus Christ and in His body, the church, the idea of a final consummation still
is not lost. The day will come when His whole work will be crowned in com-
pleteness and triumph.

With all his emphasis on the fact that man is here and now in Christ
confronted with the judgment and mercy of God, there are passages which sug-
gest the idea of final judgment. "For it is not the hearers of the law who
are righteous before God, but the doers of the law who will be justified
(Romans 2:13). "Much more, now that we are reconciled, shall we be saved
by his life" (Romans 5:10). "As by one man's disobedience many were made
sinners, so by one man's obedience many will be made righteous" (Romans 5:
19). Especially is the future consummation of the results of Christ's death
in man seen in Galatians 5:5. "For through the Spirit by faith, we wait for
the hope of righteousness." Paul has in other places said that the man of
faith is justified (Romans 3:21,5:9). God has accepted him as righteous
here and now. But he holds that man's righteousness will not be complete
until Christ completes His work in him and it has been confirmed by God's
verdict of acceptance on the Day of Judgment. Paul still lays upon men,
then, the obligation to grow in their moral and spiritual lives. As Stamm
says, "Since the Christian already has the first installment of the right-
eousness of Christ, the phrase 'hope of righteousness' must be explained as
hope for God's acquittal and acceptance, and for the full realization of
the perfection which he has promised."1 Beyond the present is that time

1Stamm, op.cit., X, 549.
when God carries out His judgment and establishes His rule. Then "we shall all stand before the judgment seat of God" and "each of us shall give account of himself to God" (Romans 14:10,12; see also 2 Corinthians 5:10).

He never doubts that in the end all the saved must say that their salvation is an undeserved gift. Yet for him this never cancels the urgent responsibility to obey faithfully God's will, and he expects to have to account for his record. He can hold both of these apparently contradictory truths because for him divine grace is a morally creative force which opens up the possibilities of good living.1

The final judgment for Paul is still real but is not to be feared because by virtue of man's redemption in Christ, he can look with confidence toward his own judgment.

Hope is an outstanding characteristic of righteousness. The experience of salvation in the present is a pledge of salvation in the future, for justification is grace bridging the gap and inaugurating the world to come; . . . What remains of earthly life is an interim. The believer who has found immediate absolution at the Cross, looks forward to the Last Judgment with confidence.2

The final consummation will include the coming of Christ in glory to complete His redemptive work. Believers when they participate in the Eucharist "proclaim the Lord's death until he comes" (1 Corinthians 11:26). Paul's account of the Supper does not include the Marcan saying about drinking "new in the kingdom of God" (Mark 14:25). But the eschatological outlook is there in the phrase "until he comes." The Eucharist, Manson says "reminds the church forever that it lives not only by what has been accomplished for it in Christ but by what is yet to be effected for it in Him."3 The final consummation, when the Lord comes, will bring man to full realization of that which he had already received in Christ. "Then comes the end, when he delivers the kingdom to the Father after destroying every rule and authority and power . . . When all things are subjected to him, then the Son himself

---

1 Filson, op.cit., X, 332. 2 Schrenk, op.cit., p. 49.
3 Manson, op.cit., p. 12.
will also be subjected to him who put all things under him, that God may be
everything to everyone (1 Corinthians 15:24,28).

Paul looked forward to that time when the work which Christ accom¬
lished in His death would be brought to completion, when He would come again
and present those for whom He died to God for everlasting salvation.
CHAPTER NINE

CONCLUSION

We have argued throughout the preceding pages that the death of Christ was for Paul the focal point of God's love for men and of man's faith in God. It has been evident that he used various means to interpret the meaning of that death in itself and for mankind, and that certain categories of thought dominate in his interpretation. By means of the thought within these categories, Paul explained the eternal truths revealed in the Cross.

To what extent can we arrive at a synthesis, or a drawing together, of these categories of Paul's thought into what might be called his interpretation of the Cross, or his doctrine of the atonement accomplished by Christ in His death? Paul was a great thinker, but he was not a systematic theologian. The nature of his letters is such that we should not expect to find there a logical, consistent explanation of his theological position. His letters were written in response to particular problems and occasions and his beliefs shine through as he brings the light of the Christian Gospel to bear upon those particular matters. The emphasis in the epistles is on evangelism rather than on theology, on bringing men into a deeper understanding of the good news of God in their lives.

The high point of this good news was the proclamation of God's penetration into human life through Jesus Christ and the culmination of that penetration in the death of Christ. Such a sublime truth Paul found
to be unfathomable. He used, however, every means at his command to throw light on the meaning of that death. The categories of thought which we have found in our study of Paul's letters are facets of a supreme revelation which language cannot fully express. As a diamond has many facets and each facet is distinct, yet has its full beauty only as part of a whole, so it is with Paul's interpretation of the death of Christ. It cannot be contained within the terms of any one of the categories of his thought. It is beyond the fullest expectation of any of them. It is beyond the thought of all of them. But by studying them separately and then taking them all together we have come to some realization of the tremendous scope of Paul's estimate of all that took place in Christ's death. That Paul himself did not trust his interpretation of the Cross to the thought of any one of the categories is revealed by the way he drew the categories of thought together again and again, and used one to explain, or to fortify the argument of, another.

No one category contains in itself Paul's interpretation of Christ's death. The thought in the various categories cannot be drawn together into one, consistent, supreme category. The whole meaning in his doctrine cannot be drawn into any formula or system. There are, however, certain conclusions which can be drawn from our study which help us in understanding Paul's interpretation of the death of Christ.

Most important of all in understanding the place of the Cross in Paul's thought is the fact that for him it was an act of God and a revelation of His love. Throughout our study we have been made aware of the supreme importance of this fact. That which was a stumbling block to Jews and folly to Gentiles, the crucified Christ, was according to the definite plan and foreknowledge of God. In each category God's action is presumed. It
is God who justifies, who reconciles, who sanctifies, who redeems. It is
He who put forward the Sacrifice, who made Christ our Representative and
recognizes Him as such, who raised Him from the dead. It is God who in
Christ brought the new age into the present.

A second conclusion which has presented itself through these chap-
ters is that all of the categories depend for their full meaning on the
conception of man as "in Christ." Man as "in Christ" by faith is central
in Paul's thought about Christ's death. It is through this concept that
Paul sees the Christ in His death bringing benefit to men. Man's transfor-
mation by Christ's death is seen from various angles in the categories, but
all have meaning for him only as he enters the relationship of union with
Christ by faith. Man is justified, which leads to reconciliation and re-
solves in sanctification as his whole stature before God is changed by his
being in Christ. Man experiences the deliverance of redemption as he, in
Christ, defeats the powers which had enslaved him. The sacrifice of Christ
is effective for man as he enters by faith in that act of self-giving in
the same way, but to an infinitely greater degree, that the offerer entered
into the life of the victim in the old sacrificial system. Christ is truly
Representative as man is in Christ experiencing His representative act.
Man is raised in Christ from dying to his sin, in His resurrection. The
new age with its present reality and future hope is entered by man as he is
in Christ.

We conclude that a third factor present in all of the categories is
the thought of newness of life. The thought of deliverance from the old
life to the new life, a re-creation, is vital to Paul's understanding of
that which Christ accomplished in His death. Man is in a real sense a "new
man" when he is justified; he is in a new relationship with God when he ex-
periences reconciliation, and is started in sanctification. He is redeemed from the old life in slavery to a new life in freedom. Through Christ's sacrifice man is in God's favor in a new way. He is in a new life as he accepts Christ as his Representative. Having died with Christ he is raised to new life. Being in Christ he finds himself living in a new age.

We find in our study of the dominant categories that there is in them all evidenced a tension in Paul's thought on the interpretation of Christ's death between the objective emphasis and the subjective emphasis. Each tends to overshadow the other, yet both sides are necessary for a full understanding of Paul's interpretation. Paul interprets Christ's death as having objective significance. He does not imply that God's attitude of His disposition is changed by the act of Christ when He himself had not wanted to change it. He does imply that something changes within God as a result of Christ's death. The change is one that God purposed for Himself, but the fact that it is a change expresses the objective result of Christ's death. In the category of justification, reconciliation, and sanctification, the act of Christ changes God's action from one of wrath to one of justification and desire for fellowship. Christ defeated the powers apart from any action or response upon the part of man. He offered the perfect sacrifice of Himself. He voluntarily gave Himself as man's representative. God raised Him from the dead, and He brought in the new age by His death. Yet in none of the categories is the objective significance stressed alone. Along with it must be considered the subjective force of the various categories. Each category finds a complete explanation in its effect upon the man of faith. He is justified, reconciled, being sanctified, redeemed, He enters into the sacrifice, accepts the action of his Representative, is raised in faith, and enters into the life of the new age. Each category is objec-
tively complete and subjectively complete in its explanation of the meaning of Christ's death. Both these must be considered together for a full interpretation of Paul's thought in each category.

Finally, we find in Paul's thought a tension between the benefits of Christ's death for man as they concern his present and his future. Each category concerns the change of man from a past position into a present condition; it also contains an expectation of future fulfillment. In each category there is a tension between history and eschatology. Something has taken place in man as a result of Christ's death; that same thing will take place in the future as a result of that death. Man is now justified, reconciled, sanctified, redeemed, sacrificed, represented, raised, in the new age and enjoying the benefits therefrom in his present life in Christ. At the same time, and without cancelling out the thought of the present benefits as fact, man will at the final consummation be in the most complete sense justified, reconciled, sanctified, redeemed. We will receive the benefits of Christ's sacrifice and His representation. We will be raised and dwell in the new age of heavenly glory. Present fact and future hope are both there, in tension, in Paul's thought. Both must be considered together to fully understand Paul's interpretation.

We conclude that in Paul are dominant categories of thought in his interpretation of the death of Christ, each pointing toward but not fulfilling in itself the glorious truth contained in the fact of Christ's death. Although we can never fully comprehend the unsearchable riches of Christ, through these categories of thought we can come to an understanding of Paul's interpretation of the work accomplished by that One who died for their sins.
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