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The Problem and The Approach. The subject of this study was fixed and phrased as a result of conferences with Professor William Manson. It is a subject, to be sure, which is touched upon by almost every book dealing with Pauline Christology. But very few deal specifically and at suitable length with Paul's conception of the humanity of Jesus Christ and its ramifications. Scholars have properly and quickly pointed out the essential truth that the Christ of Paul was a risen, Exalted Lord, but they have been slow to recognize in due proportion the place and vitality of the Apostle's concept of the humanity of Jesus Christ. In a sense, one realizes, it is not possible to discern Paul's concept of the humanity of Jesus Christ per se, for he never thought of it as a single, distinct aspect of the person of Christ. Unlike later theologians he did not attempt to distinguish between His divine and His human nature because Christ to him was a unity. Consequently, little progress can be made in an attempt to understand this aspect of the Apostle's thought by means of a direct Christological or metaphysical approach. The thought of Paul cannot be fully appreciated without the realization that he conceived of the humanity of Christ primarily in a functional sense and as being integrally related to his concepts of anthropology, soteriology, ecclesiology, and eschatology. Hence an indirect approach in the light of these ideas as background is the most promising for revealing how Paul thought of the humanity of Jesus Christ.

Scope and Purpose. In endeavoring to follow the Apostle's thought one encounters the above cluster of doctrines to which the humanity of Christ is inseparably related and which all contribute to the total picture of Paul's conception. Accordingly, the scope of this study is necessarily extensive. A considerable range of ideas must be brought into focus if one is even to
begin to do justice to the thought of Paul on this subject. Moreover, in the pursuit of the subject one discovers that a study could scarcely be selected that embraces a greater number of perplexing and controversial Pauline statements. Concerning Paul's letters, indeed, "there are some things in them hard to understand" (II Pet. 3:16). But neither space nor propriety will permit an exhaustive treatment of any of these challenging verses. One must be content with studying and weighing the various arguments bearing on some difficult passages and then presenting the interpretation which seems most likely to represent Paul's intention and meaning. Consequently, this study, while not claiming to cast much fresh light from an exegetical standpoint, does attempt to bring together in a new way the various factors which enter into and comprise Paul's total concept of the humanity of Jesus Christ. For this reason some consideration of the relevant background of ideas is demanded. The central factor holding together the various elements of this study is Paul's doctrine of the Second Adam. The emphasis herein given to this concept is that it is a development of Jesus' Suffering Servant-Son of Man self-designation, and this approach to the conception of the humanity of Jesus Christ necessarily involves the interesting and ambiguous Hebrew idea of the One and the Many.

Sources. For the purpose of this study the ten letters that are usually considered genuinely Pauline are accepted. Although considerable doubt has been leveled against the authenticity of Ephesians, the negative conclusion has not yet been adopted as final by a convincing number of scholars. The Pastoral Epistles are herein regarded as being by the "Pauline school" and as embodying a few genuine fragments of the Apostle's writing. P. N. Harrison, The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles (1921), is taken as the guide in determining the amount and location of these genuine elements. Therefore, citations
from these few sections are taken as authentic, while others from the bulk of the three letters are given only as comparative references.

**Bibliography.** The amount of literature applicable to various aspects of this study is enormous. Indeed, there are more books on the life, letters, and teaching of Paul than there are years since his time,¹ and a majority of these would have something to say that is relevant to the present subject. Obviously it would be impossible and unnecessary to consult all the volumes, commentaries, histories, and periodical articles that are pertinent. Therefore, although the attached bibliography is lengthy, it is by no means exhaustive. It represents a partial amount of the literature consulted. In the first two categories ("Books" and "Articles and Essays") the list includes only that which actually has been cited in footnotes or text.²

**Mechanics.** Regarding the mechanics of composition the following require notice:

1) American spelling, punctuation, and rules of grammar are employed;

2) Scriptural quotations, unless otherwise noted, are from the Revised Standard Version, or else they are the present writer's own translation from the Greek (in which case an asterisk is usually appended);

3) A number of more or less standard abbreviations are used, and these are interpreted in a convenient table on p. x.

---


² An interesting, but sometimes confusing fact, is that there are no less than four scholars frequently referred to in the following pages that have the same surname. Hence, the initials of these men must be carefully observed: H. Wheeler Robinson, J. Armitage Robinson, John A. T. Robinson, and William Robinson.
CHAPTER ONE

PAUL AND THE HISTORIC JESUS
CHAPTER ONE

PAUL AND THE HISTORIC JESUS

A) Negative Views. Some scholars have denied the dependence of the Apostle Paul upon the historical Jesus. Certainly one of the most notorious endeavors involving this attitude was that propounded by Drews, who took the position that Paul created the Gospel out of a synthesis of contemporary mystery-religion belief in a redeemer-god and certain elements in Judaism. According to his theory, Paul combined the idea of a sect-god called "Jesus" with a belief in the death and resurrection of Adonis and the concept of the Isaianic Suffering Servant. This produced the idea that a god had come in human form, and that by his death and resurrection had redeemed men and enabled them to become divine. According to this hypothesis there was no need for a historic person to account for the religion centered about Jesus and the Christianity forwarded by Paul.¹

Earlier critics following this Hegelian dialectic approach (e.g. Baur, Holsten) held that Paul's Christology was only the result of an intellectual, reasoning process applied to the death-fate of Jesus. Therefore, Paul jettisoned the Judaistic theological system when faced with the death of Jesus which somehow had a redemptive value, and replaced it with a concept of Christ who was a synthesis of historical tradition and Hellenistic doctrines of a pre-existent "Heavenly Man."²

Following this interpretation there was the opinion, shared by a number of scholars, that Paul's Christology was more or less the natural result of a descent of ideas from the Jewish background that reached noble expression through the Apostle. The words of Weinel aptly illustrate this point of view:

"The [Christological] dogma already existed in all essential particulars before Jesus was born. Jewish Messianic speculations had already imagined a picture


² H.R. Mackintosh, The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ, p. 50.
for the completion of which nothing was wanting but the Nicene dogma that the Father and the Son were of the same substance . . . . Even the statement that the world was created by the Son of God was as current an opinion among the Jews as everything else that Paul tells us of Christ's life from the beginning of the world until His second advent in judgment. ¹

This whole approach, however, is demolished by the single significant fact that nowhere is the pre-Christian Messiah thought of as attaining exaltation and glory via the path of a suffering redemptive death. ²

Others such as Wrede, Brückner, and Bousset held negative notions concerning the relation of Paul to the historic Jesus. Wrede ³ not only denied that "the life-work and life-picture of Jesus" was the determinative element in Pauline theology, but sought to widen the gap as far as possible between the teachings of the historical Jesus and the theology of the Apostle. According to him, Paul already had a complete conception of Christ prior to his belief in Jesus to such an extent that his view of Christ's humanity was retained only in a formal way and because the theology of the Apostle required that Christ should suffer and die. Jülicher (among many others) had some sharp criticism which he justly aimed at Wrede:

An apostle of Jesus Christ who declined to learn anything of the earthly life of the Messiah, and who acted thus in order to support his own dogmatic theory, is the product of the modern mania for a logical consistency. It is certainly not the Paul of history.⁴

Of the same school of thought as Wrede was Brückner, who held that Paul's Christology came about as the result of the insertion of the episode of His human humiliation, which embraced the incarnation, death, and rising again, into a conception of a heavenly pre-existent Christ that the Apostle already possessed. "Paul does not report the history of a human personality, but of a heavenly being in earthly form." ⁵

---


² H.R. Mackintosh, op. cit., p. 51.

³ William Wrede, Paul, pp. 165ff.

⁴ Adolf Jülicher, Paulus und Jesus, p. 55 (slightly altered).

⁵ Martin Brückner, Die Entstehung der paulinischen Christologie, p. 30. A heading in this volume actually reads, "Die Bedeutungsloskeit des Erdenlebens Jesus für Paulus" (p. 41)!
Bousset's statement that "the Jesus whom Paul knows is the pre-existent supra-mundane Christ"\(^1\) is in line with the above opinions as is also the attempt of Windisch to explain Paul's Christ on the basis of philosophical conceptions.\(^2\)

Some English scholars also, near the end of the 19th century, put forward the similar view that the Christ of the flesh was of no importance to Paul. For example, Cone said: "the Christ of the flesh, the human Jesus, has no important place of function in the Christology of the Apostle. If he was acquainted with the tradition of the life and teachings of Jesus, he makes little use of this knowledge except in an occasional reference to an aphorism."\(^3\)

Needless to say the above representative opinions regarding the relation (or lack of relation) of Paul to the historic fact of Jesus were not the only ones in the field, nor did they go unchallenged by more balanced New Testament scholars in Germany, Britain, and America.\(^4\)

B) Current Negative Reaction. Several influential schools of thought today (e.g. eschatological, comparative and syncretistic, form-critical, and dialectical) not only belittle the relation and interest of Paul in the earthly life of Jesus but also discredit the whole attempt to know anything about the historic person of Jesus. Indeed, the new historical radicalism of the Form-Critical school led by Bultmann and M. Dibelius in Germany, and by R.H. Lightfoot in Britain holds that the New Testament records (principally the Gospels, which, however, are a reflection of the primitive Christian "kerygma") are so historically unreliable that not

---

1 Wilhelm Bousset, Kyrios Christos, p. 144.
4 Alfred Resch, Der Paulinismus und der Logia Jesus, pp. 131-134, supplied an impressive chronological bibliography up to 1902 of over 35 works on the subject of the relationship of the Apostle Paul to the historic person and the tradition of the teaching of Jesus, especially according to the witness of the synoptic Gospels. See also a survey of the literature on the same subject in R.J. Knowling, The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ, pp. 496-528, and in many subsequent volumes.
much at all can actually be learned about the earthly life of Jesus. So Bultmann made the extreme statement:

... interest in the personality of Jesus is excluded, and not merely because in the absence of information, I am making a virtue of necessity. I do indeed think that we can now know almost nothing concerning the life and personality of Jesus since the early Christian sources show no interest in either, and are, moreover, fragmentary and often legendary, and other sources about Jesus do not exist...

Similarly, leading representatives of the "Theology of the Word" school devalue interest in the life and personality of the Jesus of history. Although Brunner, for example, insists that God became incarnate in an individual human life on earth, he also reveals that his only interest is in the dogmas about Him and not in the life and personality of that Jesus of history. Says he, "Faith presupposes, as a matter of course, a priori, that the Jesus of history is not the same as the Christ of faith." 2 The British Hellenistic scholar, Bevan, takes a corresponding position. 3 Barth also seems to deny that the man Jesus of Nazareth makes any contribution to faith. He implies that our modern interest in the "personality of

1 Rudolf Bultmann, Jesus and the Word, p. 8f.

2 Emil Brunner, The Mediator, p. 18f. It is difficult, however, to reconcile some of Brunner's statements in The Mediator with some appearing more recently in The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption. For instance, in the former he seems to adopt a form of the anhypostasia position: "Even though we are forced to state that Jesus Christ only assumed human nature, but not human personality, still we must insist as strongly as ever that this means the whole human nature." (p. 320). In the later work, however, he says: "We must not make the attempt, which many people thought they could discern in my work in The Mediator, to deny to Jesus full human personality. A man who prays to God is 'True Man' even in the sense of the human historical personality." (p. 360). Even more baffling is the statement in the later work: "Faith in Jesus the Christ is identical with the true perception of the historical reality of Jesus" (p. 327), when compared with the statement to the contrary in The Mediator quoted above in the text. With the statement in The Mediator may be compared the implication, at least, of Martin Kähler's book title, Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche biblische Christus (2 Aufl., 1928).

3 Edwyn Bevan, Christianity, pp. 239f., 241. This writer also advances the startling judgment that Jesus' life "does not offer any signal example of self-sacrifice" (p. 239), that it is doubtful whether He went to the Cross voluntarily, and that His last cry from the Cross can just as well be taken as an indication that the Crucifixion "was an appalling surprise to him." (p. 240)!
Jesus" or in any "personality" is alien to the thought of the New Testament, and furthermore, whatever human life of Jesus can be discerned in the New Testament is not a revelation of God, but just the opposite — a concealment of God.¹

There is no doubt that the violent reaction against the Liberal "Jesus of History" is justified insofar as it recognized that the error of this Liberal school was that it often "rediscovered" a Jesus that was, in reality, a reflection of its own face; or presented a sentimentally regarded Jesus who became almost a substitute for the eternal God; or else depreciated "Christology". But one cannot help feeling that the reaction has gone too far. There is a certain unsteadiness in a position that accepts on one hand the full humanity of Jesus Christ, but on the other hand almost skeptically professes to have no interest in the concrete individual life of Jesus in that humanity. It is difficult to see how one can be so insistent upon the absolute uniqueness of the Incarnation, and yet also insist that there is no point in desiring to know what that Incarnate life in Jesus was like. No doubt there is a certain modern self-centered interest in human personality which is foreign to both the Old and the New Testaments, but it does not follow that the Bible, particularly the New Testament, is devoid of interest in character and personality, especially that of Jesus Christ. As it shall be noted more fully at a later point, the statement by Paul in II Cor. 5:16 does not mean that he abandoned all interest in the human Jesus. Furthermore, that element of the New Testament which presents Jesus as the ideal and perfect example of human character, depicted to the extent of experiencing moral struggle (as in "Hebrews"), presupposes a genuine interest in His individual life and personality. It cannot be said that this element is completely lacking in the Pauline Epistles. One cannot neglect the fact that the humanity of Jesus Christ is essential to Christian faith and that the contemplation of this humanity necessarily involves

¹ Karl Barth, The Doctrine of the Word of God, Vol. I, Part I, pp. 372, 463. The penetrating book by D.M. Baillie, God Was in Christ, provides a lucid summary and criticism of this dogmatic modern attitude. What appears on the above page and following is a digest of some of the points brought out in his first 58 pages.
an act of faith so that history and faith cannot be thought of as unconnected. With this understood, one can see how that interest in the historic personality of Jesus is entirely compatible with the thought of the New Testament and of subsequent Christian expression.

If one accepts the fact of the historic reality of the man Jesus, it is natural and proper that one should be genuinely concerned with seeking to know what kind of man He was. The truth of the Incarnation is not to be thought of exclusively in terms of supplying a life which only veils the Divine, but rather as the revelation of God in the historic personality of Jesus — not just the revelation of a dogma. This historic reality requires a definite connection with the picture of the historical Jesus, and this is communicated through the witness of the Church with the help of the Holy Spirit. As Baillie aptly comments:

If it is true that 'no man can say, Jesus is Lord, except in the Holy Spirit', it is equally true that no man can say it, in a truly Christian sense, except through a knowledge of what Jesus actually was, as a human personality, in the days of His flesh.¹

Without question there have been most significant contributions by scholars of the "Theology of the Word" school, but by the very emphasis of their particular message there is the danger of understating the truth of the Incarnation of the Word in human flesh and the inescapable historical corollary of the personality of Jesus. If there is no identification between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith, then the doctrine of the Incarnation is in danger of becoming superfluous. As Baillie concludes, "If revelation is by the Word alone, then Christ lived for nothing, and the Word was made flesh in vain. This is the ultimate answer to our question as to whether we can dispense with the Jesus of history."²

Although the Form-Critics say that the real historical Jesus is not discoverable from the New Testament records, and therefore whatever picture of Him is derived from them can only be the result of a subjective eisegesis, this same

¹ Ibid., p. 52.
² Ibid., p. 54.
argument based on subjectivity can be devastatingly turned against the Form-Critics themselves. The basic assumptions of the Formgeschichte Schule are remarkably subjective and far from self-evident.1 Furthermore, this school seems to be oblivious to the possibility that an event or saying of Jesus may have been preserved, not because it falls into one of the categories contrived by the Form-Critics, but simply because it concerned Jesus and was true. Many of the Son of Man sayings, for example, must have been handed on simply because He uttered them, even though those who formed the Gospel tradition apparently did not fully understand the meaning of the phrase. One cannot help feeling that any unbiased examination of the New Testament record yields not a negative view as regards the knowledge of the historical personality of Jesus; on the contrary, it provides positive glimpses of that historic personality.

C) Paul's Position. After this digression concerning some influential modern views a return to the expression of the Apostle Paul demonstrates, by contrast to these "skeptical" views, that he provides some weighty evidence on the opposite and positive side. A summary of the points contained in the abundant amount of literature, extending right down to the present day, which sustains a definite relation and even a dependence of Paul upon the fact of the historic Jesus of Nazareth, can be set down as follows:

1) Paul, like the other theologians of the New Testament (John and the author of "Hebrews") is not writing in a world of his own ideas or of ideas borrowed from the Graeco-Roman world. He is expressing himself on the basis of a very particular history. That history is concerned with the facts of Christ's life, and throughout the writings of Paul these facts form the groundwork and basic assumption. Paul's thought of Christ is in contrast to the mystery religion hero-gods whose devotees made no attempt to relate them to valid history. To Paul, Jesus was not a figure originating from human imagination, nor was He a projection of his

---

1 Cf. Baillie, op.cit., p.56.
previous religious ideas or experiences, but a definite fact within his own generation. The historical fact that the Messiah had come in Jesus was of tremendous importance to Paul and his Christology. It was also important to Paul that Christ was not only the pre-existent Son, but the perfect man of sinlessness and obedience. It is justly stated by Mozley that any notion that St. Paul was so intent upon his doctrine of a pre-existent Son of God as to be indifferent to a historic Jesus is to be entirely rejected. Without an attachment of the highest value to the life, sufferings, and death of Jesus, the proclamation of the Christian faith by Paul would have been an empty illusion.

2) The events of Jesus' life—birth, death, resurrection—are more than just episodes in a personal history. They are integral to the redeeming purpose of God in history. The Apostle who wrote about the "fullness of time" and "the eternal purpose of God realized in Christ Jesus our Lord" could not have thought of His Son as being not really and significantly related to that historical design of God.

3) Use of the name "Jesus" by Paul is often intended to indicate the historical life of the Lord. In using that personal Hebrew name he, no doubt, reflected upon the fact that Christ was once a man of a Jewish family and under the Law. It can also be pointed out that he sometimes used the name "Christ" where he intended a reference to the earthly Jesus. (Cf. II Cor. 1:5; Rom. 5:6; 6:8, 9; 7:4).2

Vincent Taylor points out that Paul used the name "Jesus" 18 times, and although it tends to acquire a religious quality in the Epistles, it generally is used in the New Testament where "there is a desire to emphasize the humanity of the Lord. The first Christians could never forget that the grace of God had been manifest to them in His human personality."3 A considerable amount of this original

2 G. Kittel, "Jesus bei Paulus", Theologische Studien und Kritiken (1912), p. 400, points out that the phrase ἐν Χριστῷ can also apply to the historical Christ by instancing Rom. 3:24; 8:39.
meaning must have permeated Paul's thought and expression. Indeed, sometimes when Paul used the name "Jesus" by itself his desire was to point emphatically to the historic personality of Christ. J. Armitage Robinson, for example, interprets Paul at Eph. 4:21 as meaning that Christ has come in the person of Jesus who was crucified, risen, and ascended not merely as the Jewish Messiah but as the hope of all mankind. In this Jesus is embodied the truth presented to mankind. "You have learned the Christ; Him you have heard, in Him you have been taught, even as the truth is in Jesus."  

1 The most significant use, however, of the name "Jesus" comes in connection with his conversion on the Damascus Road. It is worthy of note that in all three accounts of that experience in Acts the name "Jesus" is used, and when Paul writes about it to the Corinthians (I Cor. 9:1) he says, "Have not I seen Jesus, our Lord?" It is the historical Figure that the Apostle now fully realizes, with such overwhelming force, is the Risen and Exalted Lord.

4) The fact that Paul does give us a picture (admittedly far less complete than the Evangelists) of the historic Jesus by referring to certain aspects of His character and conduct, and to some of His "Words" shows a definite knowledge and appreciation of that earthly Life. Paul Feine, one of the strongest opponents to Wrede's position, plainly stated in his Theologie des Neuen Testaments (p. 240) that Paul's religion can only be thought of historically "als erwachsen aus Jesus Leben und Lehre."

5) The traits of Jesus that Paul presents for imitation (e.g. at I Thess. 1:6 and I Cor. 11:1) refer to the Jesus of history and not to an ideal Messianic figure, "for Christ is an object of imitation in the same sense as Paul himself is."  

2 Bultmann's contention 3 that wherever Paul points to Christ as an example he has in mind the pre-existent Jesus and not the historical Jesus imposes an arbitrary

---

boundary on the Apostle's thought of the Person of Jesus Christ. One can hardly believe that when Paul urged, "Be imitators of me as I am of Christ" (I Cor. 11:1) that he had in mind only the pre-existent Christ. The ethic that Paul proclaimed — love, humility, obedience — cannot be realistically contemplated apart from its perfect manifestation in Jesus of history.

6) Paul never could have attributed the redemptive purpose of Jesus Christ solely to a heavenly Christ, but only to a Christ who had perfected that purpose on earth by identifying Himself with humanity and crowning His experience with death and resurrection. Even Bultmann must say, "the historical Person of Jesus makes the preaching of Paul a gospel." 1

7) It is inconceivable that oral tradition about the life and teachings of Jesus did not reach Paul and have an influence upon him. The Epistles reveal some open and some silent acknowledgment of this tradition. Plainly, I Cor. 15:3ff and I Cor. 11:23ff. reveal traditions concerned with specific historical events in that life. By silence, perhaps, Paul reveals that he knew from tradition that Jesus preached to the Jews and not to the Gentiles because, if there had been any tradition about Jesus working among the Gentiles, Paul would have made capital of this in controversy with the Judaizing Christians. 2

It is obvious, then, from any open-minded perusal of the Epistles that their contents are founded upon solid historical Fact. If some today have forsaken Paul, thinking that he moved away from Jesus, they have erroneously concluded that the Apostle substituted for His historic reality doctrines about Him. Certainly Paul supplied soaring interpretations of the person and work of Jesus Christ, but it can never be said validly that in doing so he forsook the historic fact of the reality of Jesus of Nazareth. If others in the apostolic age, because of the presence and power of the Spirit, erred in belittling the need of the historical process and

---

1 R. Bultmann, Glauben und Verstehen (1933), p. 202, in a chapter on "The meaning of the historical Jesus for the theology of Paul."

2 C.H. Dodd, op. cit., p. 64.
became indifferent to the historical Christ, Paul was certainly not in their camp. If it is remembered that his letters were sent to people already Christian and presumably already familiar with the facts of the historical life of Jesus, and "If we make," as Dodd suggests, "due allowance for this fact, we shall be rather disposed to think it remarkable that the Christian documents, unlike all other religious documents of the Graeco-Roman world, depend for the cogency of their arguments and the validity of their conceptions upon the assumption of an historical Figure as a perpetual point of reference."  

I. PAUL'S POINT OF VIEW AND HIS COMPARATIVE SILENCE

Unquestionably Paul had a definite concept of the humanity of Jesus Christ in terms of its earthly, historical expression. It is idle to think that he could have ever so eagerly and seriously preached a Christ who did not have a genuine relation to world history and a real participation in human existence. Yet, at the same time, it is obvious by even the most cursory reading of the Apostle's letters that there is a vast difference between the way Paul thought of that earthly life and the way the disciples and the Synoptics thought of the same. By contrast with the Synoptics, Paul did not provide any specific statements about the development of Christ's physical, mental, or moral character as man. There is nothing in Paul to correspond to Luke's, "And Jesus increased in wisdom and in stature, and in favor with God and man" (2:52), although certain aspects of that character are mentioned. The Apostle did not depict the power of our Lord on earth in the Synoptic fashion by miracles of healing, feeding the multitude, and stilling the storm. With Paul the supreme power of Christ's life on earth was demonstrated overwhelmingly by His triumph over law, sin, and death through the Cross and Resurrection. Neither is there any indication in the Pauline literature of a limited or transcendent knowledge in the possession of our Lord on earth. When Paul spoke of the "mind" of Jesus, it was not with reference to any information in its purview, but rather to the ethical motivation of it. "Have this mind among yourselves, which you have in Christ Jesus . . .," for example, is a reference to the unpar-
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1 C.H. Dodd, op. cit., p. 53.
alleled humility of Jesus. The conditions of our Lord's life on earth as revealed in the Pauline literature are meagre in number by comparison with those of the Synoptics. Nevertheless, a number of discernible conditions make certain Paul's belief in the reality of Christ's life on earth.

A) Contrast to the Disciples. The Twelve were profoundly impressed by that earthly Life with whom they had been close companions. They had heard His simple, yet profound, teachings about the Kingdom of God, witnessed the amazing miracles, and experienced a unique companionship with a Man who had issued to them an irrevocable call from their former occupations to a strange new life of service. Consequently, even though they also were cognizant of the terrible fact of their Master's Crucifixion, followed by His Resurrection and Ascension, the earthly life was an extremely real and prominent factor in their thoughts about His person. They, therefore, looked at the Resurrection in the light of that human life, with its ministry and death, which was now raised to the right hand of God.

Paul, on the other hand, not being a disciple-companion of Jesus, received a special revelation and commission to service from the Risen, Exalted Lord. He, therefore, thought first of the glorified, resurrected Christ, and then reflected on His earthly Life with its limitations and its end by a crucifixion-death in sharp contrast to the supreme truth about that Life which was revealed to him on the Damascus Road. This difference in point of view has been succinctly expressed by H.R. Mackintosh:

To the original disciples the astounding paradox had been, that the Jesus whose companions they had been and who had died in shame, was now raised to the right hand of God; to St. Paul the paradox was rather that the Exalted One, proved by the Resurrection to be the Sop of God and of heavenly nature should have taken flesh and died at Calvary.1

Plainly, the fundamental difference in viewpoint is in regard to the place of beginning. Whereas the disciples began with Jesus Christ in the flesh, Paul began with Him liberated from the flesh. The Christological thought of the Apostle, as a result, is significantly colored and dominated by the fact of the Risen Lord in

---

1 Mackintosh, op. cit., p. 64.
glory. The disciples, so to speak, look forward toward the Resurrection, while Paul looks backward from it.¹

Paul's fundamental point of view, resulting from his conversion experience and from which his concept of Christ was primarily shaped, was of such an overwhelming nature that he could, perhaps, have justifiably relegated the earthly life of Jesus to a negligible position. But he could never think of the Risen Exalted One apart from the cross He endured. He was resolved to know nothing among the Corinthians "except Jesus Christ and him crucified" (I Cor. 2:2). Paul's thought of Jesus Christ started from the Exalted One who met him in glory on the Road, and then led inevitably back to the Cross and to the Person of Christ in His earthly existence, and eventually to His eternal pre-existence.²

When the reader turns from the Gospels to the epistles of Paul, he feels as though he is entering a strange new world of New Testament literature. It is an interesting fact that the first recorded Christian literature (Paul's letters) does not supply the most detail about the earthly life of Jesus; it is not until a few years after the death of the untiring missionary that a "life of Jesus" appears, such as in the Gospel of Mark. Admittedly the written works of Paul provide a comparatively meager source out of which to form a picture of the Man of Nazareth. The chief historic fact upon which Paul seems to concentrate his interest and emphasis is the final climactic event of the death and resurrection. (The two cannot be thought of as separate). If Paul be criticized for presenting such a limited picture, it can be pointed out easily that the Evangelists also supply an account of that Life which converges upon the death of Jesus, for the space devoted in the Gospels to the closing days and end of His life is out of proportion to that describing the


previous part of that Life. Still, Paul's earthly life of Christ, by comparison, remains extremely condensed. It is almost as if the whole Life is violently abridged so that in speaking of Christ's death Paul is really speaking of the antecedent aspects of that Life as well.¹

By contrast to the Evangelists, whose intention is to demonstrate by what was said and done in the life of Jesus that He was the perfect fulfillment of God's Messiah (Mt.), the victorious Son of God over the forces of evil (Mk.), the Messiah of Israel and Savior of all mankind (Lk.), the Son of God in whom there is life by faith in His name (Jn.), Paul's presentation is slim when judged on the basis of the same method of demonstration. No doubt he upheld and proclaimed these same truths, but without referring in the same degree to the earthly events of the historic Jesus. Paul's method was determined, to a large extent, by the very nature of his writings. He sent messages to Christian communities usually in application to particular problems, incipient heresies, or in response to specific questions addressed to him. Presumably the people to whom he wrote were already familiar with the essential facts of the life and ministry of Jesus, and their need was not for further instruction along this line, but rather for particular guidance about some moral matter or for a deeper appreciation of the significance of His death and resurrection. His letters, obviously, were not intended to be "Gospels" employing the narrative method of presentation as the Evangelists did.

B) Reasons for the Comparative Silence. The logical reasons for the comparative silence of Paul concerning the earthly, historical life of Jesus may now be summarized with the addition of a few more possible causes as follows:

1) The life-changing encounter with the Risen Lord naturally made him more concerned with the Exalted Christ than with the Man of Nazareth who walked the roads of Palestine.

2) His interest was concentrated more upon the redemptive work accomplished

¹ Karl Barth, Credo, p. 74.
through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ than in the preliminary events of that Life leading up to the climax.

3) The Pauline corpus, as we have it, is his missionary and imprisonment letters and does not fully represent the actual, original substance of his preaching and teaching. His preaching, similar to that of the other Apostles, was of the Kerygma, and that included an account of the life and characteristics as well as the death and resurrection of Jesus. As J.S. Stewart aptly remarked, "If Paul's epistles say little about the earthly ministry of Jesus, it is certain that his preaching was full of it." Moreover, a certain amount of that preaching and teaching, no doubt, is incorporated into the written record. In any case, he wrote to particular situations of controversy, morals, and personal relationships; and a missionary today, likewise absent from his field of service, has as little cause to include many details of the life of Jesus when writing to his converts about certain specific subjects. Many of the sayings and deeds of Jesus were already common information in the churches to which Paul wrote as a result of the initial and subsequent instruction on these points of those entering the Christian faith.

4) Paul laid great stress upon the revelation he had received directly from Christ, and therefore, he had cause to attach less dependence upon the tradition embodying the sayings and deeds of Jesus (Gal. 1:12). There is no indication, on the other hand, that the silence of Paul might have been engendered from a sensitivity to the fact that he was not an associate in the flesh with Jesus as Peter, James, and others were.

5) Schweitzer, with characteristic eschatological reference, also advances a reason for Paul's silence by holding that the conditions after the death and resurrection were so different that the teachings of the earthly Jesus were no longer applicable. Since Paul was the first to appreciate this wholly new situation, he did not frequently refer to the events and teachings belonging to a past period. There
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1 J. S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, p. 283.

is an attractive sense to this, but the previously stated possible reasons
explain the comparative silence of the Apostle more convincingly.

6) Paul's comparative silence can also be attributed to the fact that he
employed a unique way of referring to the humanity of Jesus Christ when he intro-
duced the Second Adam doctrine. (This point will be developed throughout this study).

Regardless of how the attempt is made to explain the relative silence of
Paul concerning the human life and message of Jesus, it certainly cannot be admitted
that the argument from silence in this case is sufficiently cogent to warrant the
conclusion that Paul had no knowledge of, or no interest in, that earthly Life. 1
If that were the case, one could say, by the same token, that he had no knowledge
of John the Baptist and of many contemporary events in Roman history since he makes
no mention of them in his letters. Similarly, one could point out that the authors
of other pieces of New Testament literature (aside from the Gospels) were also
ignorant of, or not concerned with, the facts of Jesus' life since they, too, do not
deliberately bring these points to the surface.2

C) "Christ After the Flesh". But with all this discussion of the various
reasons for Paul's relative silence, perhaps it will be objected that the seemingly
obvious point that Paul voluntarily disclaims any regard for Christ as a human
being has been missed. Does he not say, "From now on, therefore, we regard no one
from a human point of view (κατὰ ο ἀρκα); even though we once regarded Christ
from a human point of view (κατὰ ο ἀρκα), we regard him thus no longer" (II Cor.
5:16)? This statement certainly does not mean, as a superficial reading might
lead one to suppose, that Paul had no interest whatsoever in the human life of
Christ κατὰ ο ἀρκα after the resurrection. The extreme statement of Weinel

1 Contrast e.g., Pfleiderer, Paulinism, I, p. 124, who asserted that Paul's
"dogmatic indifference to the historical life of Jesus really presupposes a lack
of historical knowledge of that life, and was only possible at all on this ground."

2 It can be noted, parenthetically and by comparison, that some of the
Pauline Epistles actually provide more historical reference to Jesus than do
other New Testament books not by his hand (e.g. I and II Peter, James).
that Paul "attached no value whatever to Christ according to the 'flesh', to the

man Jesus . . . . Indeed Jesus can scarcely be said to have existed for him as a

human being," finds no solid support from the Apostle. If this actually were

Paul's intention, he could have very easily used the phrase ἐν σαρκί, which would

have conveyed this meaning more accurately.

A considerable variety of opinion has been advanced in an attempt to explain

this verse. Johannes Weiss thought it might be a momentary statement flung out

with overemphasis by Paul, similar to other situations in which he hurled out

exaggerated utterances in conflict. Weizäcker held that Paul was not only repudia-

ting the claims put forward by certain Jewish Christians on the basis that they

had acquaintance or association with the historical Jesus, but that he was also

expressing a "judgment value" on the earthly life of Jesus in contrast to the

present work of Christ. Schweitzer believed it was declared as a "matter of principle"

indicating Paul's attitude in the period of world history in which he labored. Some also might think that Paul is now saying that he does not attach any importance

to the human descent of Jesus from the race of Israel through Jewish parents, as he

might have done for a while after his conversion. This conjecture, however, is

countered by the evidence that both before and after he penned this message to

Corinth he specifically referred to the human descent and parentage of Jesus.

(Earlier in Gal. 4:4 he wrote of God's Son being born of a woman, born under law;

and later in Rom. 1:3 and 9:5 he spoke of His being descended from David and coming

out of the race of Israel κατὰ σαρκά.

Despite the perplexing maze of interpretations put forward, surely the real

meaning of this statement is simple and twofold. Firstly, that by contrast to the

pre-conversion Messianic expectation according to which Paul shared in the common

1 H. Weinel, op. cit., p. 314.


4 A. Schweitzer, Paul and His Interpreters, p. 245.
Jewish hope for a national deliverer with material power, he had now, as a result of his encounter with the Risen, Exalted Christ, a completely superseded and marvelously expanded concept of the Messiah. Thus it was no longer merely a hope but a glorious fact that had been accomplished not only through a human life but by the resurrection. If he had formerly thought of Jesus as a mere Jewish reformer, a revolutionary fanatic who by disregarding the Law had been crucified, he regarded Him thus no longer according to the flesh. This view, however, is devalued by R.H. Strachan, who holds that the whole reference is not to a Messianic conception but rather to the historical person of Jesus Christ. He says that Paul almost always used the term "Christ" as a proper name; therefore, it is inconceivable that he began by preaching Christ in a Judaistic fashion and then turned from this position. But this objection imposes an arbitrary temporary limit on Paul's expression concerning the Christ. Although it is true that Paul generally used the name "Christ" as a personal name, there are possible exceptions where it has a Messianic meaning (e.g. Rom. 9:5), and there are probably instances where the Messianic and the personal senses are merged, as the case may be in II Cor. 5:16. It is by no means clear that if the name "Christ" were understood in connection with a Messianic ideal that it would involve the supposition that Paul preached Christ in a Judaistic fashion for a brief time after his conversion. The verb is ἐγνώκατο ("known" or "regarded"), and does not necessarily convey the thought that He was preached as such. A more exact verb is demanded if that were the intention. The proper approach is voiced by D.M. Baillie by saying that it was not an interest in the human Jesus that Paul gave up but rather a pre-conversion conception of the Messiah. He justly remarks that "it is idle to maintain on the basis of II Cor. 5:16 that St. Paul had no interest in the human Jesus."  

Secondly, Paul had now, by the same experience, come to a spiritual under-
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2 D.M. Baillie, op.cit., p. 45.
standing of the Christ. Formerly he knew of Him outwardly, but now he knows a living fellowship with Him that requires a transcendence of the flesh. As W.D. Davies says (quoting Rawlinson with approval), "For St. Paul there is only one Christ — Jesus of Nazareth. What he is repudiating is not a fleshly kind of Christ but a fleshly kind of knowledge."\(^1\)

Several points have been borne in mind in reaching the above explanation of the statement. One was that its interpretation must not be divorced from the previous verse (15), which speaks of the Christ who died and rose again; and the other was that the \(\kata\ \sigma\'\rho\'\kappa\alpha\) was meant to define the verbs \(\chi\iota\delta\iota\alpha\mu\varepsilon\nu\) and \(\epsilon\gamma\nu\nu\omega\kappa\alpha\mu\varepsilon\nu\) more precisely rather than to limit their respective objects.

II. SOURCES FOR PAUL'S HUMAN LIFE OF JESUS

A) Did Paul See Jesus? Even if the letters of Paul reveal a comparative scarcity of material regarding the life and teachings of Jesus, it does not follow that he lacked fruitful sources for the acquisition of such knowledge. The question, however, which comes immediately to mind when one begins to consider such sources is: did Paul, himself, have a direct, personal acquaintance with Jesus? One of the foremost of the early champions for the opinion that Paul had actually seen the earthly Jesus was Johannes Weiss in his little volume Paul and Jesus (1909). As a rebuttal of Wrede's position (in Paulus), which greatly minimized the life and work of Jesus' earthly life in relation to Paul's theology, Weiss labored to swing the pendulum definitely to the opposite side. He argued that Paul must have seen Jesus in the flesh at some time, most probably during His last visit to Jerusalem, and perhaps had heard Him speak. Since he was an enthusiastic Pharisee, he may have witnessed the Crucifixion. The best explanation for the conversion experience, according to Weiss, is that Paul had previously seen the earthly Jesus and on the Damascus Road recognized this Jesus in the heavenly vision. His own words are:

\(^1\) W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 195.
"Paul's vision and conversion are psychologically inconceivable except upon the supposition that he had been actually and vividly impressed by the human personality of Jesus."\(^1\) Emphasizing that nowhere is there any positive word that Paul had not seen Jesus in person, Weiss concluded that Paul not only saw Jesus but recognized Him on the Road.\(^2\) According to this view II Cor. 5:16 would actually imply that Paul had seen and known Jesus. One of the most interesting theories pertaining to the possibility of Paul's previous meeting with Jesus was that put forward by A.M. Pope that the "rich young ruler" of Mk. 10:17ff actually may have been Paul.\(^3\)

J.H. Moulton enthusiastically followed J. Weiss, and was even bolder than the German scholar in claiming Paul's witness to the events of the last week in Jerusalem, especially the Crucifixion.\(^4\) His intense hatred of Jesus was attributed to the belief that he had actually heard Jesus refer to Himself in a blasphemous relation to God, and as the Son of Man. Because he was one of the fanatics who witnessed the agony on Calvary, this incident was burned into his memory and dominated his thought and expression of the life of Jesus. Concerning his preaching he reminded the Galatians: "before whose eyes Jesus Christ was publicly portrayed as crucified" (3:1). Here the vivid central position of the picture of the death of Jesus in his message is dramatically revealed. (He similarly reminded

\(^1\) J. Weiss, Paul and Jesus, p. 31.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 41. Wm. Ramsay, The Teaching of St. Paul in terms of the Present Day, pp. 21-30, adopted a very similar position by holding that Paul meant to say in I Cor. 9:1 and 15:8 that he was an eyewitness of Jesus just like the other Apostles.

\(^3\) A.M. Pope, "Paul's Previous Meeting with Jesus," The Expositor, 8th Series, Vol. 26, pp. 30ff; 9th Series, Vol. I, pp. 285-296. It is interesting to note that Jesus apparently was drawn to this young man to the extent that the writer says that Jesus looked upon him and loved him. Was it because He saw in this rich young Pharisee some unusual and noble possibilities? Another point of interest is that the brief description of the young Pharisee bears a resemblance to Paul's characterization of his pre-conversion life in Rom. 7, especially with regard to the singling out of "covetousness" as the besetting sin (vv. 7, 8). In view of the observation that Mark does not indicate any possible source for this narrative of the encounter, could it be that Paul himself was the source? (Cf. J.W. Bowman, The Intention of Jesus, p. 172.) Although this is an interesting theory, it obviously must be classed as very speculative.

the Corinthians that it was "Jesus" that he had preached to them (II Cor. 11:4). Perhaps, also, the manner of Paul's references to the "blood" might reflect in some degree his witness of the Crucifixion.¹ Others have suggested additional possible visual contacts between the two men. Perhaps Paul saw Jesus in the Temple, even possibly as a lad when Jesus was in the midst of the doctors listening to them and asking questions;² or perhaps Paul was present with the Sanhedrin that sat at the trial of Jesus.³

The above opinions rest on several points. Historically, it is known that Paul was in Jerusalem as a pupil under Gamaliel (Acts 22:3) and that he was also there at the stoning of Stephen (Acts 8:1). If he were a member of the Pharisaic party and a member of the Sanhedrin, as C.A.A. Scott appears to accept, this would point possibly to a long residence in Jerusalem sufficient to provide opportunity for actually knowing Jesus by sight.⁴ Exegetically, it involves including in Paul's exclamation, "Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" (I Cor. 9:1), a literal, physical interpretation of the relation between the verb and the object (as in the case of the phrase, "for all who have not seen my face" of Col. 2:1). It also means, of course, taking II Cor. 5:16 in a quite literal sense. Johannes Weiss and his followers stressed the point that in the I Cor. 9:1 expression Paul used the title "Jesus", and held that this signified that Paul had not only seen the heavenly Christ but previously also, the earthly Jesus. Opponents of this view, however, point out with equal force that since Paul had to ask the question, "Who are you Lord?", there is an indication that he never before saw Jesus in the flesh because

¹ C.A.A. Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul, p. 11.
³ C.A.A. Scott, op. cit., p. 12; J.H. Moulton, op. cit., p. 18f.
⁴ But R. Banas, The Master Idea of St. Paul's Epistles, p. 199n, conjecturally denies the possibility that Paul saw Jesus in Jerusalem by giving the opinion that he was either in his native city of Tarsus because of poor health, or else he was off somewhere as a preacher of the circumcision; but this view is even more speculative.
he did not recognize Him on the Road.¹

The net result of such speculation about the possibilities of Paul's having seen or known Jesus in the flesh is inconclusive. It involves filling in some gaps in the biography of the Apostle about which one cannot be certain; it assumes, at least, a visual relationship between the two men about which one cannot be dogmatic; and it reads into at least two of Paul's exclamations, having to do primarily with an apprehension of the Risen Lord, a reference to the earthly Life. Yet, at the same time, one must admit that there are some feasible possibilities on the affirmative side, and, accordingly, the door must be left open.²

B) Other More Certain Sources. Regardless of whether or not there ever was a personal acquaintance between Paul and Jesus there were certainly other sources by which the Apostle came to know a great deal about His life and teachings.

1) There was the source provided by the persecuted Christians. Paul's keen and alert interest would have induced him, as he was zealously trying to stamp out the primitive church, to learn as much as possible about the heretical sect -- its Leader and His teachings -- to increase the effectiveness of his pogrom. To be highly effective against the Christian movement he had to inform himself about the Jesus who was at the center of it. In gathering information against the Christians he would naturally be led into contact with what these people remembered about the life of Jesus and what they cherished and repeated of His teachings. He would also have

³There is the incidental and interesting lexical fact that in all the Damascus Road accounts in Acts Paul is uniquely addressed in the Aramaic form Σαουλ. This would seem to indicate a strong recollection of that event when Jesus called him, using the mother tongue of both.

²Cf. W.M. Macgregor, Christian Freedom, p. 96. In general the various opinions concerning Paul's relation to the earthly Jesus can be summed up in the following statements: 1) The extremely radical critics meet the problem by saying that for Paul Jesus was non-historical. 2) The liberal approach finds abundance of evidence in the epistles for a personal knowledge of Jesus. 3) Those of the psychological approach hold that Paul must have had some kind of previous physical picture of Jesus to permit him to recognize Jesus on the Damascus Road. 4) The skeptical approach sees such a wide gulf between the Gospels and the Epistles concerning Jesus, and concludes that Paul never saw Him. 5) The Theology of the Word school says the whole subject is beside the point and irrelevant. None of these interpretations gives a completely satisfying answer.
learned something, indirectly, of the characteristics of His life because such qualities as love, peace, humility, and steadfastness were reflected in the lives of His followers, making them unique among the peoples of that world. Even in his pre-conversion life it would be incredible to suppose that Paul did not have a keen interest in the history of Jesus on earth. Even if he had not personally seen Jesus, and aside from what he learned from the persecuted Christians, he certainly would have gained some picture of Him by interrogating his fellow-Pharisees who had witnessed Jesus in the flesh.

2) The Apostles and evangelists provided a second fruitful source of such knowledge. Two statements in the Galatian letter would, on the surface, negate this assumption: a) Paul announced that "the gospel which was preached by me is not man's gospel (Katà ἄνθρωπον). For I did not receive it from man (παρὰ ἄνθρωπον), nor was I taught it, but it came through a revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. 1:11). b) After the Jerusalem conference, Paul, referring to the Apostles, writes "... those, I say, who were of repute added nothing to me" (Gal. 2:6). In the first statement Paul is emphasizing the special nature of his call to the apostleship, an emphasis which began with the first line of the letter: "Paul an apostle — not from men (οὐκ ἀπὸ ἄνθρωπος) nor through man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father, who raised him from the dead —..." Passionately he stresses that he did not pass along a second-hand religious experience; his was direct and vital, and resulted from a unique and personal experience with the Risen Lord. It was not put into his hands, nor was it taught to him; it came to him by revelation. It is a matter of emphasis here. The Apostle has in mind the mode of commission and the stimulus to preach the gospel in its full significance rather than the specific content of that gospel. Certainly the prominent basis for his preaching was that revelation of Jesus Christ, but there is nothing here to deny that he sought out and accepted information about that Jesus, now exalted in glory. In the second

---

1 Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, p. 185, overstates these two statements as evidence that Paul made no effort to contact the Jerusalem Church for information about the life and ministry of Jesus.
statement (Gal. 2:6) it is again the primacy of the revelation given to him which he is stressing. Paul affirms that the "authorities" were not able to add to him supplementary restrictions or conditions on the gospel when preached to the Gentiles.¹

That Paul was dependent in some measure upon Christian tradition is revealed in several places where he was not engaged in controversy, and where he specifically made such an acknowledgment. Writing to the Corinthians he said, "I delivered to you, as of first importance, what I also received (παρέλαβον), that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures . . . and that he appeared to Cephas," etc. (I Cor. 15:3-5). Earlier in the same letter he stated that the words of the Lord's Supper were received via those who were in Christ before him. (11:23ff.)

On one of Paul's five journeys to Jerusalem he visited Peter for 15 days (Gal. 1:18). The verb describing this encounter (ἰστηρήσα) is a hapaxlegomenon in the New Testament. The verb sometimes used is ἐπισκέπτομαι (e.g., Acts 15:36; Mt. 25:36). But Paul's use of ἐπισκέπτομαι in this case means more than "to visit"; it also connotes "to become personally acquainted with, to know face to face."² In older usage the word also included the sense of inquiry, examination, and gaining knowledge by visiting; so it is quite possible on this occasion that Paul not only visited Peter in order to become better acquainted with the Rock of the church but in the course of that visit gained considerable information about the life and teaching of the Master.³ How much could have been learned from that original apostle, one of the trio taken into closest fellowship with Jesus and upon whose reminiscences the first written Gospel is based? No doubt the person of Jesus Christ

¹ The account in Acts 15, however, implies that Paul accepted the observance of certain minor Jewish food regulations.

² Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon. Cf. also for parallels in Josephus.

³ F.L. Hort, Judaistic Christianity, p. 56, interprets ἐπισκέπτομαι as meaning "to explore", i.e., to learn of Peter's reaction to one who had been a persecutor but was now a champion of the Christian faith; but surely there was more in the use of the word than that.
was a chief topic of conversation during that fortnight, and a great number of His teachings and mighty works were related. ¹ In those early years after his conversion, Paul, no doubt, welcomed as much information as possible about the life of Jesus.

Paul also had contact with James, the brother of Jesus, while visiting Peter in Jerusalem (Gal. 1:19; cf. 2:9). Personal contact with others who had either known Jesus in the flesh or else knew a great deal about that Life enhanced Paul's opportunity to fill in his knowledge. There was Mark (quite possibly self-identified in the presence of Jesus at Mk. 14:51-52), who was an early missionary companion of Paul. There was Luke, who gathered some material for his gospel while traveling in the company of Paul and while the Apostle was incarcerated in Caesarea. Sayings and events of Jesus in Luke's gospel often seem to convey the impression of an eyewitness, and this lends probability to the thought that Luke went up to Jerusalem to interview Peter, John, and any others of the original fellowship that his alert mind and curiosity could locate. Is it not most likely, then, that Luke communicated to Paul many of the interesting facts he had acquired about Jesus?

Luke's contact with Paul in missionary ventures, and his access to the Apostle during the imprisonments in Caesarea, Rome, and during the three winter months in Malta provided ample time for a considerable amount of communication between the two men on this subject. Selwyn² suggests that Silas (or Silvanus) might have been one of those eyewitnesses upon whom Luke drew for his gospel (Lk. 1:2), and if that is the case, another excellent source of information for Paul is recognized. At any rate Silas took an active part in the life of the Jerusalem Church, and if the Christians reviewed or recited something of the life of Jesus at their meetings, some of this presumably was rehearsed in the ears of Paul. Barnabas, too, had the benefit

¹ C.H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and its Development, p. 26, tersely comments: "We may presume that they did not spend all their time talking about the weather." An interesting tradition that Paul knew all of the mighty works of Christ can be read in the second century "Acts of Paul" where the Apostle is reported to have disclosed to a certain Demas and Hermogenes "word by word all the great works of Christ." Cf. M.R. James, The Apocryphal New Testament, p. 272.

² Edward Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, p. 11.
of fellowship with the Church in Jerusalem, and was sent by it to Antioch (Acts 11:22). He also, as a preaching companion with Paul, was a partaker in the common knowledge about the historic Jesus. Furthermore, Paul stayed with some disciples at Tyre for seven days (Acts 21:4), with Philip the evangelist at Caesarea (21:8), and remained briefly with the early disciple Mnason in Jerusalem (21:16). In addition, Paul had a married sister residing in the capital city (Acts 23:16). Moreover, at the very beginning of his Christian life he had been baptized into a Christian group (Acts 9:18), bringing him into immediate fellowship with the disciples in Damascus.

It is inconceivable, in view of all these personal contacts with those who had been eyewitnesses or else had been fully instructed about the historic Jesus, that Paul had not derived a most adequate body of information about the life and teachings of Jesus.

There is also the significant fact that, although Paul and the Jewish Christians did not see eye-to-eye on some issues, there was never any controversy over the central fact of their common faith, viz., the person of Jesus Christ. If Paul had ever taught anything not in harmony with the basic facts of that Life, there would have been earnest refutation by those acquainted with that pre-resurrection existence.

Finally, it needs to be noted from just a practical standpoint that it would be absurd to say Paul had no interest in the human life of Jesus. He certainly would have required to know what kind of man He was who was a crucified Jew, and yet was revered as Lord and Master, and for whom he was willing to suffer the loss of all things and count them as refuse (Phil. 3:8). Indeed, J. Weiss has justly branded the notions that Paul knew nothing at all of Jesus as "purely academic theory."  

---

III. PAUL'S HUMAN LIFE OF JESUS REVEALED IN HIS LETTERS

Thus far reasons have been considered for the comparative silence of Paul. Yet in view of the numerous opportunities available for Paul to learn about the human life of Jesus, it is reasonable to conclude that relative silence cannot be understood in this case as ignorance nor as total lack of concern. Just the opposite, for when one examines his writings, it is found that they do reveal something of his conception of the historical humanity of Jesus Christ. Even though Paul's impression of the life of Jesus was dominated by thoughts of His Incarnation, His obedient self-sacrificing death on the Cross, and His Resurrection to glory and exaltation, the epistles nevertheless provide a picture of the earthly life of Jesus which a sizeable number of critics past and present have either been reluctant to see or else intentionally attempt to minimize. Some of the bold statements uttered particularly by German scholars (e.g., Baur, Holsten, Brückner, Wrede) too easily asserted that Paul was either ignorant of the fact of the historical Jesus or else made practically no use of it, and these judgments appear extremely unbalanced today. Reference has already been made to some of the radical statements made by this group, of which this from Brückner stands as a striking example: "The letters of Paul confirm now, that the earthly life of Jesus has had for him almost no meaning" and "the earthly life of Jesus had no interest for the Apostle Paul."¹ Quotations could be multiplied to exhibit this point of view, but this attitude was demolished by a proper re-emphasis upon the contrary evidence that lay clearly in the epistles. This evidence was convincingly brought out by such works as P. Feine, Theologie des Neuen Testaments, and Jesus Christus und Paulus; R. Drescher, Das Leben Jesus bei Paulus; R.J. Knowling, The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ; and A. Jülicher, Paulus und Jesus. Today most scholars are prepared to accept the position that Paul's knowledge on this point was most adequate — in fact, more detailed than his

¹ Martin Brückner, op. cit., pp. 41, 46.
letters reveal — and that the earthly life played a significant role in his Christology.¹

A) Events of Jesus' Life. Direct evidence from the epistles is the starting point in dispelling any illusion that Paul was indifferent to the historic Christ. They reveal the following facts: He was a man (Rom. 5:15; I Cor. 15:21, 47); He was descended from the Hebrew race (Rom. 9:5), particularly from David (Rom. 1:3); He was born of woman at God's appropriate moment in history (Gal. 4:4); He came under the Law by birth (Gal. 4:4); He had brothers, and one was named James (I Cor. 9:5; Gal. 1:19);² He possessed a body of flesh (Rom. 8:3; Col. 1:22; Eph. 2:15), a human form (Phil. 2:8); His earthly life was in the form of a servant (Phil. 2:7); He had a group of twelve disciples (I Cor. 15:5); He ministered to the circumcised (Rom. 15:8); He was betrayed on the night in which He instituted the Lord's Supper (I Cor. 11:23); He suffered (II Cor. 1:5; Phil. 3:10); He was crucified (passim);³ He died (passim) upon a cross; He was buried (I Cor. 15:4; cf. Paul's expression reported in Acts 13:29); He was raised from the dead (passim); He appeared after the Resurrection (I Cor. 15:5ff.); He ascended into heaven (Eph. 4:8-10; 1:20; 2:6); and He is expected to return to judge the living and the dead (I Thess. 4:16; 1:10). Obviously

¹ A notable and qualified exception to this position is Bultmann, who holds that Paul is interested only in the fact that Jesus became man and had an earthly experience, but aside from that "Jesus' manner of life, his ministry, his personality play no role at all; neither does Jesus' message" (Theology of the New Testament, I, pp. 186f., 294). The only thing that is important to the Apostle is the fact that Jesus had been born a Jew, lived under the Law, and was crucified. This attitude, as already noted, is fairly typical of the Formgeschichte Schule and the Dialectical School of theology. But surely Paul's knowledge and interest was not restricted merely to the fact that He had lived on earth. M. Goguel was nearer the truth when he stated that Paul "had a definite idea of the story of his life," and on the basis of evidence in his epistles "a small 'life of Jesus' can even be constructed." (Sub. "The Pauline Evidence," C.T.A.F., p. 210.)

² A Hausrath, Der Apostel Paulus, p. 142, saw an allusion to the Baptism of Jesus in Rom. 6:3, 4 and Col. 2:12, but this is somewhat uncertain. Others have seen an allusion to the Transfiguration at II Cor. 3:18.

³ Paul indicates that Jesus was crucified on Friday Nisan 14th (I Cor. 5:7), and thus relates the death of Jesus to the passover lamb. This is in agreement with the time indicated in the Fourth Gospel (Jn. 19:14, 31, 42), but the Synoptics are one in placing the Crucifixion on Friday Nisan 15th. Cf. A.J.B. Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the New Testament, p. 65.
most of these events refer to the earthly life.¹

Although Paul never referred directly to the healing aspect of Jesus' ministry, perhaps a knowledge of the same is implied in his thrice-repeated prayer to Christ for the removal of his thorn in the flesh.² It can also be observed that, although II Cor. 8:9 refers primarily to the poverty of His earthly life in contrast to His heavenly glory, the context of the passage suggests that there might be also an allusion to the poverty of His human circumstances per se.

B) Moral Characteristics of Jesus. In addition to the events of that Life, Paul also supplied a number of significant aspects of the character of Jesus.

1) He stressed the obedience by which Jesus followed the will of God, submitting even to the death upon a cross, thereby bringing righteousness to many (Rom. 5:19).

2) The distinctive quality of love, permeating the whole ethic of the epistles, was derived from that supreme example of love manifest in Jesus Christ. It was that perfect demonstration of love in human life by Jesus that compelled the Apostle to dwell upon it so continuously and to insist upon its incorporation into all relationships of life (Cf. Phil. 2:1; II Cor. 5:14). The best explanation for the exalted hymn to love in I Cor. 13 is that the human life of Jesus served as the model for his expression. To understand love in the terms expressed in that chapter was possible only on the basis of the concrete, perfect example in the Person of Jesus Christ and in all that He said and did. "Genuine love" (Rom. 12:9ff.) is an accurate reflection of the personality of Jesus. To be sure, Paul was overwhelmed primarily by the great love-act of God revealed in the Incarnation of His Son and in the redemption accomplished through His death, but this love was also revealed in the daily events of Jesus's life; and both revelations, really inseparable, tremendously worked upon the mind and expression of Paul.

¹ If the Pastoral Epistles be accepted, at least, as being by a "Pauline" writer there is similar evidence for His Davidic descent (II Tim. 2:8); life in the flesh (I Tim. 3:16); His good confession before Pilate (I Tim. 6:13); His death and Resurrection (II Tim. 2:11).

3) Meekness (πραΰτης) and gentleness (ἐπιείκεία) are singled out as two aspects of His character (II Cor. 10:1). Accordingly, Christians are urged to put on meekness (Col. 3:12; Eph. 4:2), and it is described as one of the fruits of the Spirit (Gal. 5:23). (Cf. Jesus's self-description, "I am meek and lowly in heart.")

4) Paul's hope for the Thessalonians is that their hearts may be directed to the love of God and to the steadfastness (ὑπομονή) of Christ (II Thess. 3:5). This is the quality by which a person is completely devoted to his faith and to his purpose in life, and its supreme attainment was demonstrated in the life of Jesus.

5) The humbleness and selflessness of Jesus are reflected in these statements: "Being found in human form he humbled (ἐπαινόμεν) himself" (Phil. 2:7), and "Christ did not please himself; but, as it is written, 'The reproaches of those who reproached thee fell on me'" (Rom. 15:3).

6) The description of the fruits of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22) — love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, self-control — perfectly fit the human character of Jesus as portrayed by the Evangelists.

7) Paul yearns for the Christians at Philippi "with the affection (or compassion — σπλαγχνία) of Christ Jesus" (Ph. 1:8).

8) The self-impoveryishment by which Christ not only came into human life but also endured its hardships, miseries, suffering, and death is termed grace (χάρις — II Cor. 8:9). Later, John gave this exalted expression by saying "the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth ..." (1:14).

Such features as the above were not apparent in the Messianic picture of Judaism, and could only have been derived from the historic human Jesus. Moreover, one wonders if the passionate love which Paul had for Christ can not be attributed, in some degree, to his knowledge of the earthly deeds and character of the man Jesus. At any rate, with this brief outline it can be seen that the Pauline epistles present a portrait of the human life, events, and moral characteristics of the historic Jesus which is by no means insignificant. No statement could be more gratuitous than Drew's: "... Paul knew absolutely nothing of Jesus as an histor-
IV. THE TEACHINGS OF JESUS IN PAUL'S LETTERS

Paul was not only aware of the events and characteristics of the life of Jesus, but his letters reveal either direct reference or allusion to many of the teachings of Jesus. Such evidence has attracted a considerable amount of investigation within the last 100 years. Paret began this recent inquiry with his classic article "Paulus und Jesus" in the Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie, III B (1858) pp. 1-85. This was followed by Matheson's series of articles entitled "The Historical Christ of St. Paul" in The Expositor, Vols. I, II, 2nd Series (1881). Near the close of the 19th century R.J. Knowling published The Witness of the Epistles (1892), and followed it closely with a second volume, The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ (1905), both of which built upon the earlier work of Paret but provided a treasury of information on the subject. In 1904 appeared the exhaustive analysis of D. Alfred Resch, Der Paulinismus und Die Logia Jesus, which pointed out a startling number of parallels to the Synoptics and the Agrapha, although he stretched the connection in many instances. A number of scholars within recent years (e.g., Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, 1947; A.M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, 1940; C.H. Dodd, Gospel and Law, 1951) have treated the subject. The firm result of all this investigation is to reveal a significant degree of correspondence between the words of Jesus and those of Paul, and to lay the axe to the bulk of the unprofitable discussion of "Jesus or Paul" (initiated by the Hegelian and Ritschlian school of critics) by enabling one to see that it is "Jesus and Paul" — with reference to the gospel announced by the Master and expanded by Paul.3

1 A. Drews, op. cit., p. 207.

2 Resch cited over 1000 parallels between the Pauline Epistles and the Synoptics, and over 100 parallels between the epistles and the Agrapha.

3 The statement by Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, p. 189, that "the so often and so passionately debated question 'Jesus and Paul', is at bottom the question: Jesus and Hellenistic Christianity" fits in with his basic premise that "Paul was won to the Christian faith by the kerygma of the Hellenistic Church" (p. 187); but it will not find agreement with the majority of interpreters today.
The teachings of Jesus reflected in Paul's letters are obviously an aspect of his conception of the humanity of Jesus Christ.

A) Reference to "Words" or "Commands". In some places Paul refers specifically to "words" or "commands" of the Lord. Most obvious are the following:

1) "To the married I give charge, not I but the Lord, that the wife should not separate from her husband ... and that the husband should not divorce his wife" (I Cor. 7:10). Although this is not a verbatim quotation, it is a clear reflection of the Lord's instruction about the permanent character of marriage (Mk. 10:12; Mt. 19:6).

2) "In the same way, the Lord commanded that those who proclaim the gospel should get their living by the gospel" (I Cor. 9:14). This is an echo of the Lord's charge to the disciples at the beginning of their evangelistic mission that "the laborer deserves his food" (or "wages" — Mt. 10:10; Lk. 10:7).¹

3) "For I received of the Lord (παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου) what I also delivered (παρέδωκα) to you ..." (I Cor. 11:23). Paul here is not claiming a special revelation, but rather is referring to an oral tradition which he had received and which he is passing on to the Corinthians. In I Cor. 15:3, the same technical words for "receiving" and "delivering" appear, and likewise refer to a tradition mediated to him through the early body of Christians. Ultimately, of course, the words received about the Lord's Supper were derived from the lips of Jesus.²

4) Twice in the Corinthian letter he refers to a "command" (ἐντολή or ἐπιταγή) of the Lord. In the one place Paul concludes his instruction about orderly conduct in worship by assuring his readers it is in accord with the precepts of Christ.

¹ The opinion of Alfaric that this "word" (as well as I Cor. 7:10) is a reference to some Old Testament command is needless in view of the parallel closer at hand in the teaching of Jesus. Cf., Goguel, op. cit., p. 212f.

² Supra p. 11. It is interesting to note that Paul's reference to the Lord's Supper occurs because there were certain disorders at Corinth on this matter demanding correction. If no such occasion had arisen it is quite possible there would have been no mention in the epistles of the Eucharist. Critics, then, who argue from the testimony of silence would assure us that the Apostle was completely ignorant of the event. The precariousness of that approach also applies in relation to the whole proposition of Paul's conception of the historical humanity of Jesus.
"If any one thinks that he is a prophet, or spiritual, he should acknowledge that what I am writing to you is a command (ἐντολή) of the Lord" (I Cor. 14:37). In another instance, regretting that he is without a specific command (ἐπιταγή) of the Lord, he ventures to give his own opinion. "Now concerning the unmarried, I have no command of the Lord, but I give my opinion as one who by the Lord's mercy is trustworthy. I think..." (I Cor. 7:25, 26). This type of statement can be compared with verse 12 of the same chapter where Paul makes it plain that he does not have specific reference from the teachings of Jesus. These situations reveal the authoritative position which the commands and precepts of Jesus occupied in the mind and ministry of Paul.

5) "For this we declare to you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive, who are left until the coming of the Lord, shall not precede those who have fallen asleep" (I Thess. 4:15). This may be a Pauline interpretation of the "word of the Lord" that appears in the apocalyptic discourses (Mt. 24:30ff; Mk.13:26ff) expanded by the Apostle in I Thess. 4:16, where there is also the figure of the elect being gathered together by a trumpet call. In II Thess. 2:1 there is apparently also a reflection of the same teaching of Jesus because the verb used in the phrase "our assembling" (ἐπισυνάγω) is likewise used in Mt. 24:31 for the gathering of His elect. Kennedy has further pointed out a number of verbal agreements between II Thess. 2:2-4, 8 and the apocalyptic discourses of Mt. 24 and Mk. 13. 1

6) "... remembering the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said,'It is more blessed to give than to receive'" (Acts 20:35). It is highly probable that this logion contained in the farewell speech to the Ephesian elders is a genuine saying of Jesus. Although the exact words cannot be found in the Synoptics, the same thought is present in the teaching about the blessing derived from inviting to one's

---

1 H.A.A. Kennedy, St. Paul's Conception of Last Things, p. 167. He also shows how the statements of Paul about the Parousia, Judgment, and the basis and nature of the future life are reminiscent of the teachings of Jesus (pp. 97-101). Schweitzer, The Mysticism of St. Paul, p. 174, followed cautiously by Hunter, op.cit., p. 54, holds that this "word" does not refer to a historic utterance of Jesus, but rather to "a revelation of Christ made to him through the Spirit." Lightfoot, Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul, p. 65, took the same view much earlier.
banquet those who cannot repay the invitation (Lk. 14:12-14). 1

The Pauline references to the "words" and "commands" of the Lord point to a collection of these for use by the early Christian teachers and missionaries. The use that Paul made of them, as the contexts reveal, was almost always to supply guidance for practical problems or to give a ring of authority to his exhortations.

B) Reference or Allusion to Other Teachings of Jesus. In addition to the "word" and "commands" there are an amazing number of teachings in Paul that bear witness that he had the teaching of Jesus in mind when he wrote. These references, however, are so numerous and have been explored so thoroughly in the literature previously cited that it would be inappropriate to record them here in any detail. Therefore, the reader is directed to Table I (pp. 319 f.) where some of the more obvious Pauline references are noted along with the point of comparison to a teaching of Jesus. (Table I, however, by no means exhausts the Pauline echoes of the teachings of Jesus).2

The purpose for this study, at least, has been sufficiently served by the demonstration that the Apostle was familiar with a considerable body of teaching imparted by the historical Jesus. If there were more sections of his letters devoted to practical exhortations (such as Rom. 12, 13, 14; I Th. 4, 5) or to replies to specific problems addressed to him (e.g., I Cor. 7ff.) one could expect a greater number of "words" of the Lord and more manifold reference to His teachings. Moreover, if the knowledge and memory of those disciples who heard Jesus speak were completely available, one would most likely recognize in the epistles more of the Agrapha. It is significant that these words and teachings of Jesus were regarded as authoritative so that he used them whenever possible to support his advice on a particular matter.

The concern here is not with an attempt to determine how these teachings reached Paul. Whether he shared in and contributed to the development of "Q", or

---

1 This Logion is probably echoed in I Clem. II, 1. Cf. Hunter, op. cit., p. 54.

2 Others have ingeniously (and sometimes with an unsupported degree of imagination) ferreted out all the possible reflections of the teachings of Jesus in the Pauline corpus. Extensive comparisons can be found in the articles by George Mattheson and the volumes by R.J. Knowling previously cited. Supra p. 32.
whether he depended upon a collection of sayings in Greek, some oral and some written, compiled at the missionary center of Antioch is beyond the scope of this study.\(^1\) In any case he was thoroughly familiar with them and understood well the mind of the Master. Significantly, he very rarely quoted the exact words of Jesus, but rather expressed them through the medium of his own vocabulary — so well had he grasped the mind of Jesus. He had assimilated the very gist and marrow of those teachings until they had become a genuine part of his own thought and expression. This can be observed in the way he applied the points of some of the parables in his doctrine. For example, his doctrine of grace and justification can be thought of as an expansion of the parable of the Prodigal Son. The description by Paul of a Christian man is strikingly similar to Jesus’ portrait of an ideal disciple. Such correspondence necessitated a serious pondering over the teachings of Jesus.\(^2\)

Furthermore, it can be noted that in Paul’s thought of God, justification, adoption, faith, ethics, eschatology, in addition to his attitude to the Law, the Kingdom of God, and even to Christology he is true to the mind of Jesus.\(^3\)

Paradoxical as it seems, the Apostle of whom it cannot be definitely proved ever saw or listened to Jesus was the one who best understood Him, grasping and expressing the essence of the truths Jesus taught better than the first disciples. The ethic that Paul advanced was permeated with the reflection upon that perfectly obedient and sinless life of the historic Jesus. To seize upon his exclamation “my gospel”\(^4\) as indicative of a profound difference in message between himself and Jesus is unwarranted. In the graphic words of J.S. Stewart:

To separate Paul from Jesus, to explain Paul’s Gospel without reference to the

---

\(^1\) Davies, op. cit., p. 144 takes the first view, while Selwyn, op. cit., p. 23 and K. Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, pp. 29, 294 take the second view.


\(^3\) J.S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, pp. 291-298; J. Gresham Machen, sub “Paul and Jesus”, C.T.A.P., pp. 375-379; Wm. Morgan, The Religion and Theology of Paul, pp. 252-255 (who points out some differences, but justly gives the balance to the similarities.)

\(^4\) Cf. Rom. 2:16; II Cor. 4:3; I Thess. 1:5; II Thess. 2:14; Gal. 2:2.
life that Jesus lived and the message Jesus taught and the Gospel Jesus brought to light, is, as Haven has well expressed it, 'as absurd as to explain the movements of the planets without reference to the sun.'

V. REFLECTIONS OF A PAULINE GOSPEL

Mention has been made of Mark and Luke as being possible sources of information for Paul regarding the earthly life of Jesus, but can the situation be reversed to say that these two Evangelists actually reflect some of the original teaching of Paul on this matter? This, of course, involves the larger question of whether or not Mark and Luke are "Pauline" gospels, which is not properly within the range of this study. Therefore, the subject will be treated only briefly.

A) In Mark? There have been those, particularly a number of German critics of the last generation, who have promoted the theory that Mark was Pauline. In doing so, supporters of this view must somehow expand the statement of Papias that Mark was the interpreter of Peter to include the name of Paul. Accordingly, Mark would be the recorder, to some extent, of both Peter and Paul. Several recent critics, however, have come out against this hypothesis. Grant strongly disagrees with the theory on the basis of a comparison of the Christologies and the concepts of the earthly life of Jesus. He concluded by saying that any similarities in Mark and Paul can be attributed not to a Pauline influence but rather to a drawing by both upon "the common Gentile Christianity. Most recently, Vincent Taylor points

---

1 J.S. Stewart, op. cit., p 278.


5 Ibid., p. 206. Contrariwise, B.W. Bacon, The Gospel of Mark, pp. 221-271, challenged the negative conclusions of Werner and sought to show how the influence of Paul's teaching can be noted in Mark's gospel. He held that although it does not reveal a definite literary dependence upon Paul, there are reflections of the Apostle's teachings in the Christology, soteriology, and discourses of the gospel.
out that even though there are many similarities in vocabulary between Mark and Paul, there are also many distinctive Pauline words that are absent from the Gospel, and while there are some affinities in doctrine of Christology and soteriology, there are also some signal expansions in Paul which do not appear in Mark. Taylor's cautious conclusion is that, although Mark bears some influence by Paul, this influence cannot be safely exaggerated.¹

It is sometimes said that Mark presents the real humanity of Jesus more than the other evangelists (cf. 6:5; 7:24; 13:32), and this is probably due to the eyewitness account of Peter lying behind the gospel. In association with Paul, it is safe to presume that these and many other incidents would have been related. But is the door not open for some degree of mutual exchange on this matter? As already noted, Paul also had contact with Peter and other disciples, and these meetings provided fruitful opportunity to gather information about the human life of Jesus. Is it not conceivable, then, that Mark enhanced his knowledge somewhat from conversation with Paul and from listening to his preaching and teaching? It is interesting to think that there might be some accounts of that human life of Jesus embedded in the first written gospel that were derived via Paul and the teaching of the primitive Church rather than directly from Peter. This, of course, is theoretical but not fanciful, inasmuch as Mark's Gospel is an expansion of the early Christian kerygma as found both in the speeches in Acts and in the Pauline Epistles.²

B) In Luke? The compiler of Luke-Acts was a companion and close friend of Paul. As a result of this association, Paul could not have been ignorant of at least part of what Luke knew about the life of Jesus. Indeed, an English scholar has suggested that the picture of the earthly life of Jesus which Paul possessed was influenced by the special characteristics which appealed to Luke, basing his view upon the

"brother" reference in II Cor. 8:18. Just as in the case of Mark, there is an obvious possibility that Luke helped to form the picture of Jesus for the Apostle, but there is also the possibility that Paul was able to supply some elements of the picture to this gospel-historian.

The early church tradition made Luke dependent upon Paul. Irenaeus of the second century wrote that "Luke," a follower of Paul, "put down in a book the Gospel which was preached by him." Origen (d. 254), writing of the third gospel, phrases it as "the Gospel commended by Paul and composed for Gentile converts." There is an attractiveness to this ancient tradition, to which a contemporary scholar adds that it is probable that the Gospels took form to meet the needs of the Gentile churches and that "Luke" is the record of Paul's picture of Jesus Christ given to the Gentiles. If this statement could be fully substantiated,

---

1 R.V. Tasker, "St. Paul and the Earthly Life of Jesus," Expository Times, (Sept., 1935), pp. 557ff. Taking the "brother" in this verse to be Luke, Tasker deduced that he is present while Paul is writing, and that several Lukan characteristics regarding the life of Jesus are reflected in the letter to Corinth. These include: 1) The observation that the real significance of the greatness of the life of Jesus was in the fact that it constituted a reversal of what humans ordinarily think of greatness. For Luke, Jesus had a humble birth, and exhibited an extreme humility by taking upon Himself "in the very depth and reality of His sympathy" the burden of others' sins. This can be compared with such Pauline phrases in the letter as "when I am weak, then I am strong" (12:9), "my power is made perfect in weakness" (12:9); and his statement concerning Jesus at II Cor. 8:9; 5:21 can be compared with the description of his own service "as poor, yet making many rich" (6:10). 2) The basing of his actions upon the Christ-like qualities — meekness and gentleness — reveals a probability that Paul had learned of these features of Christ's character from Luke. Account must be taken, however, of the possibility that 10:1 begins a third or "severe" letter sent by Paul from Ephesus, as many critics hold.

2 Several similarities in vocabulary occur between Pauline literature and Luke in the account of Passion Week. The μή γένοιτο exclamation occurring in Pauline expression over a dozen times, appears in Lk. 20:16. The word ἀρχὴ in the sense of "rule" (cf. I Cor. 15:24; Eph. 1:21; Col. 2:10) occurs elsewhere only in Luke with that meaning (Lk. 20:20). The word "cunning" (πανουργία) cf. II Cor. 4:1; 11:3; Eph. 4:14) occurs only in Lk. 20:23 outside of Paul. The verb ῥαγάζομαι (to be worthy) is found only in Paul and Luke (cf. II Th. 1:5; Lk. 20:32). Vide J.H. Moulton, "The Gospel According to Paul," The Expositor, II (1911), pp. 24-26, for these and other Pauline-Luke verbal similarities. In the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper there is also a possible link between I Cor. 11:24 and Lk. 22:19.

3 Eusebius, E.H., V, 8, 2-4.

4 Ibid., VI, 25, 3-6.

then the criticism often leveled at Paul that he was not interested in the human life of Jesus would be buried under the witness of the third gospel.

VII. SIMILARITIES BETWEEN THE HUMAN LIVES OF PAUL AND JESUS

There are striking similarities between the lives and ministries of Jesus and Paul. Hans Windisch (Paulus und Christus) brought out many of these parallels, but he approached the subject as a Biblical-Religious-Historical comparison and was concerned to show that both Jesus and Paul are "God-men" of Biblical stamping ("Gottesmänner Biblischer Prägung"). He concluded by saying that Paul, according to his self-witness, is really an incarnation of the Holy Spirit and also an incarnation of Christ for the Church (p. 314). But it is difficult to think that the Apostle who so keenly felt the presence of his own sin, and who thought of himself as the very least of all the saints could conceive of himself in such exalted terms. A further weakness of the approach of Windisch is that some of the "self-witness" of Paul is derived from the book of Acts, which is mediated through the pen of Luke. Nevertheless, his book serves to call attention to a number of interesting similarities of which either Paul or the historian Luke was apparently conscious. Omitting much of the detail, some of these can be sketched as follows:

1) Paul's conversion experience (Gal. 1:15f.) is similar to Jesus' Baptism experience (Mk. 1:11 par.) in that God is pleased to reveal the Sonship of Jesus Christ. In conjunction with these experiences both Paul and Jesus receive commissions to serve, described in the role of a suffering servant. (Acts 26:15-18; 9:15 ff; Lk. 4:16 ff.).

2) Following the conversion experience, as Paul relates it in Gal. 1:15-17, the Apostle goes off into Arabia. This is analogous to Jesus' going into the wilderness of Temptation after His Baptism (Mt. 4:1 ff. par.).

3) Each explains his motive for preaching on the basis of a deep conviction of having been sent (Rom. 10:15; I Cor. 1:17; Acts 13:47; Mk. 1:38; Mt. 11:5; 4:17 Mk. 3:14 par.), and this idea is primarily derived from the prophetic function of
the Isaianic Servant.

4) Each encounters the same kind of lack of understanding on the part of his own people (Acts 28:23-28; cf. II Cor. 4:4; Mt. 13:14-15; Lk. 8:10; cf. Jn. 12:37-39), and this is also explained by reference to the Isaianic Servant.

5) Each exhibits certain similarities to the prophet Jeremiah; they must preach despite the consequences (I Cor. 9:16; Mk. 8:31-33 par.). All three share the anguish of their fellow countrymen (Rom. 9:3; Lk. 13:34; cf. Jer. 9:1; 14:17; 19ff.), and this, too, is in harmony with the picture of the Suffering Servant.


7) Both Paul and Jesus are wandering preachers, but the extent of their mission is universal (Rom. 15:19; I Cor. 9:19-23; Lk. 19:10); they both give a positive place to the law and the prophets (Rom. 3:21; Mt 5:17); and they teach a subjection of the Son to the Father (I Cor. 15:28; Mk. 10:18).

8) As already observed, both Paul and Jesus look upon their prophetic mission as being fulfilled in the role of a servant. Jesus is never called a δοῦλος but moving all of His life, clearly, is the motive of service. Paul repeatedly refers to himself as a δοῦλος or διάκονος; and so Windisch remarks that "He is a man who has lived, worked, suffered, and gone without as Jesus in His historical existence as a διάκονος and δοῦλος (p.165). Not only did Paul think of himself as being a servant of Christ, but further thought of himself (as did Jesus) in terms of being a servant for others (II Cor. 4:5; cf. Col. 1:24). 3

9) Toward the end of their lives neither Paul nor Jesus sought to avoid his passion. Condemnation awaited both in Jerusalem, but neither shrank from it (Acts 20:22-24; 21:12-14; II Tim. 4:6; Mk. 10:32-34 par.).

---

1 A statement which Pringle-Pattison, Studies in the Philosophy of Religion, p. 241 n., says is "an utterance so full of the spirit of Calvary."

2 But ποιητής, in the sense of "servant", is used with reference to Jesus in Mt. 12:18; Acts 3:13, 26; 4:27, 30).

3 Infra pp. 123-125.
In observing some of these similarities that appear in the New Testament record between the life and mission of Paul and of Jesus, the possibility is recognized that some of the parallels exist because both men were consciously in the line of prophetic tradition. But further, it can be seen how the human life of Jesus as the Servant of God not only stimulated Paul also to take that path by imitation, but required it since he was united with Him. When Paul did not expressly state this similarity, his close companion and historian, Luke, being impressed with the human facts, set them down in Acts. Thus it is that Paul's concept of the humanity of Jesus Christ is revealed, not only by his own life in conscious imitation of the Second Adam-Servant of the Lord, but by a real union with His sacrificial life. Consequently, the human life and teaching of Jesus had a commanding effect upon the very life and message of Paul the Apostle.

The fact that Jesus is portrayed in the New Testament as the perfect Servant of God, providing the model of service (Mk. 10:45), of selflessness (Phil. 2:5-11), and of willing, undeserved suffering and death (I Pet. 2:21-25) naturally led the early church literature to regard humility and martyrdom as the perfection of Christian discipleship. Similarly, but earlier, Paul recognized his own sufferings not only as a direct parallel to, but as a real participation in, the continuous sufferings of the life of Jesus which culminated in the Cross. In view of this situation, he was able to say, "while we live we are always being given up to death for Jesus' sake, so that the life of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal flesh" (II Cor. 4:11).

---

1 Even to the extent of including those events which might be considered coincidental, e.g., the parallels between the two Jerusalem trials.


4 C.A.A. Scott, "Jesus and Paul," Cambridge Biblical Essays (1909), p. 373, makes the interesting suggestion that if one takes the picture of the Good Shepherd of the Fourth Gospel and the Son of man of the Synoptics, who said he came "to seek and save that which was lost" . . . "not to be ministered unto but to minister" . . . "O Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children . . ."
VII. IMITATIO CHRISTI

One of the strongest witnesses to the character traits of Jesus of which Paul had knowledge is to be seen in his repeated emphasis with his converts to become imitators of himself (I Cor. 4:16; cf. II Thess. 3:7-9; Ph. 3:17; 4:9; Gal. 4:12). Surely this was not simply an egocentric exhortation; it was not just the life and character of Paul alone that almost every one of his Christian communities was called to imitate. The key to the whole imitatio Christi ethic of Paul is the imperative, "Be imitators of me as I am of Christ" (I Cor. 11:1). There always stood before the mind of Paul that picture of the Man Jesus Christ, whose outstanding features of love, obedience, self-denial, gentleness, steadfastness, affection, grace — His character and conduct — challenged his most devoted representation. Without a rather distinct picture of the moral character of Jesus, Paul would not have been able to enjoin others, "Be imitators of me." Only insofar as the life of Jesus was reflected in the life of His Apostle were the new converts urged to accept him as an example. Paul was able to say, without vain boasting, that his life was, to a feeble extent, a "copy of that Man of Nazareth; and missionaries throughout Christian history also have realized the necessity for revealing that in their own lives.

It is interesting to note, for example, how the quality of self-sacrifice, the self-stripping of "rights", found conscious influence in Paul's attitude. Grasping the awe-inspiring fact that Christ did not seize after the rights and powers to which he was entitled, but voluntarily took the form of a servant and pursued the servant role in human life, Paul strove after the incorporation of that truth that there is more to do with a "right" than to assert it. Speaking of the right and ye would not," . . . "we get a presentation of yearning self-sacrificing tenderness to which Paul's pastoral consciousness offers the closest possible human equivalent. It is surely not without reason that this man said, 'We have the mind of Christ'.
he had to expect material benefits from the Corinthians he said, "Nevertheless, we have not made use of this right . . ." (I Cor. 9:12).1 Certainly Paul did not urge individuals to become like Christ (and therefore like God) in a general sense, but rather in reference to specific kinds of ethical behaviour meant to be imitable. The words of Dodd are well-taken: "To follow His steps is to have before us a truly human example, but it is also to have the divine pattern made comprehensible and imitable."2

Finally, it needs to be noted that if Paul did not have a genuine knowledge and appreciation of the human life of Jesus, one would expect to find docetic or gnostic elements in his letters, but this is certainly not the case. The preaching of a suffering and dying Messiah demanded a real historic Jesus. It is also interesting to note that the authors of books attributed to the "Pauline School" (e.g., the Pastoral Letters, and especially Hebrews) manifest a great deal of interest in His human life. An interesting and relevant illustration regarding the life of Christ in Paul's letters is supplied by Frederick Wynne:

There is the same kind of difference between the scattered and incidental notices of Christ's Life in Paul's letters and the regular narratives of His life, as there is between the disjointed bones of a prehistoric animal in a bed of drift and the carefully finished diagram of its skeleton by a comparative anatomist . . . there is a sense of reality and certainty conveyed to us by the few bones we have ourselves dug up which no symmetrical arrangement can equal.3

So much for Paul's conception of the humanity of Jesus Christ from a historical standpoint. Examination of the epistles reveals this aspect of the conception

---

1 A few verses later, still on the same theme, he exclaims, "I have made no use of any of these rights" (9:15), and affirms that his reward lies in preaching the gospel free of charge "not making full use of my right in the gospel" (9:18). In the same letter he says, "not seeking my own advantage, but that of many, that they may be saved (10:33-11:1). To Philemon he says, "though I a bold enough in Christ to command you to do what is required, yet for love's sake I prefer to appeal to you" (8, 9), and in another letter he writes of the demands he might have made as an apostle of Christ (I Thess. 2:6), but which he was content to forego. The sublime characteristic of the life of Jesus is at the root of these Pauline expressions.

2 C.H. Dodd, Gospel and Law, p. 42.

3 F. Wynne, Fragmentary Records of Jesus of Nazareth from the Letters of a Contemporary, p. 21.
to be far more significant than sometimes realized. Although Paul holds to a
pre-existent Christ, he insists that Christ became a true man at the Incarnation.
Furthermore, as will be pointed out, this humanity plays a most significant
part in the work of the second Adam in redemption and in His becoming Head of a
New Humanity.
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THE RELEVANCE AND SOURCE OF THE SECOND ADAM CONCEPT

It has been apparent from the examination thus far of the Pauline literature that the Apostle made no little reference to the earthly, human life of Jesus. The epistles provide a considerable number of references to the events of His life, some of His outstanding characteristics, and an indeterminate number of direct echoes or silent adaptations of His teachings. All of this has been amply evidenced (although not exhaustively) in the initial part of this study. It was pointed out as necessary for Paul's preaching and teaching mission, his ethical injunctions, and his "imitatio Christi." It is obvious, then, that there was far more thought of the Apostle devoted to the historical, human life of Jesus than some scholars have been willing to see.

Equally obvious is the fact, however, that with all of Paul's references to that earthly life, they amount to far less than that provided by the Gospels. The Apostle repeats none of the parables (that is, not in the same form, although the points of some may be summarized and expressed in his own original way); he makes no mention of the miracles of healing, nor of any development in the physical life of Christ, nor of any extended fellowship with the Disciples (although he gives a brief account of the Last Supper in I Cor. 11:23ff.). In short, by comparison with the Gospel witness, Paul's reference to the human, earthly life of Jesus is seemingly meager. On the other hand, his picture of the glorified, exalted, risen Lord is boldly emphasized. So much is this the case that one is tempted to conclude that the latter is not only his chief interest but his only interest regarding the person of Jesus Christ. But that this conclusion is untrue is clearly proved by an examination of the Pauline literature, as was attempted briefly in the first chapter.

Part One of this chapter will present in short, introductory fashion the relation of the humanity of Jesus Christ to the Christology of the Apostle, and then the paramount importance and relevance of the Second Adam concept. Part Two, com-
prising the bulk of the chapter, will attempt to locate the source of this key Second Adam concept.

PART ONE — THE HUMANITY OF CHRIST AND THE RELEVANCE OF THE SECOND ADAM CONCEPT

I. THE HUMANITY OF JESUS CHRIST AND PAUL'S CHRISTOLOGY

It is not sufficient merely to demonstrate Paul's knowledge and use of the historical life of Jesus. One must, more importantly, search for the particular way he conceived and expressed that humanity, and the meaning it had for his theology. Such an inquiry leads directly into Pauline Christology, the heart of his theology. Needless to say, this is one of the most difficult areas in which to try to probe the thought of the Apostle.¹ Yet the task today, having available the most complete picture of the life of Jesus that modern scholarship has been able to provide, is to combine that Figure revealed by the Gospels with that Figure which the Christology of Paul has presented in all its meaning not only for himself but for all men.²

Scholars have held widely divergent opinions as to the sources and motives of Paul's Christology. Various thought on this subject has included the following: 1) That Paul was influenced by Alexandrian speculation, particularly in that the Philonic concept of the ideal heavenly man was adopted by Paul, and that he thought of Christ as existing before His incarnation as an archetypal man; 2) That Paul combined the notion of the Philonic ideal man with certain elements of Jewish thought, such as the personification of the divine word and wisdom; 3) That Paul's Christology was an expounding and clarification of the assertions of the primitive church as it sought to express its belief about Jesus in its own inherent Jewish moulds of thought;

¹ H.R. Mackintosh well said: "Paul's affirmations about the Lord Jesus Christ elude us by their very greatness. They are still beyond us; we can but throw out our minds at an infinite reality; and the believing intelligence will for ever strive in vain adequately to discern and express all that Paul saw in Christ when he was moved to say: 'In Him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth.'" "Person of Christ," H.D.B. (1 vol. ed.), p. 708b.

4) That Paul's Christology was ultimately due to his own spiritual experience.¹

G.B. Stevens, however, was near the truth when he said simply and succinctly: "Paul approached the subject of Christ's person from his knowledge of Him as a historic personality, supplemented by his vivid sense of his exaltation to heavenly glory."²

It is significant to note, from the outset, that in the Christology of the Apostle there was no systematic attempt to define or to distinguish between the divine and the human, the two natures in Christ. He did not, in the method of later Greek and philosophical theologians, attempt to define the person of Christ. Throughout he assumed the union of divinity and humanity in Christ, and when he mentioned the pre-existence of Christ, it was not so much in the fashion of an ordered discussion as almost an incidental (but real) reference. This viewpoint of Paul on the relation of the two natures in Christ can perhaps best be understood by his analogous thought about human nature since Paul conceived of man in himself as essentially a unity.³ This concept of the unity of a person is typically Hebrew, and is revealed in the Hebrew idea of the human "nephesh".⁴ It would be perilous, therefore, to think of Paul's conception either of the divinity or the humanity of Jesus Christ as being an aspect of Him quite clear and distinct one from the other.⁵

¹ G.B. Stevens, Theology of the New Testament, p. 400, provides a summary of these views listing the adherents of each. Cf. G. Knight, From Moses to Paul, p. 141.

² G.B. Stevens, op.cit., p. 401, although "dominated" would have been a better word than "supplemented" in the last phrase.


⁴ F.C. Porter, The Mind of Christ in Paul, p. 161, recalls a parable for "the strange fate of the effort to exalt Christ and to justify faith in Him by theories of His origin and nature." In the legend of Lohengrin, "Elsa is warned by her divine-human lover not to ask any questions about his origin and nature. But she was compelled to ask questions, thus betraying her lack of trust. She must know him and all about him in order to make sure that her love was deserved and would endure. Compelled to answer the questions, the consequences of separation from her could not be escaped."

⁵ James Denney, Studies in Theology, pp. 69f, expressed it most aptly: "The divine and the human are not distinct . . . . All that is divine in Him is human, all that is human is divine. He is not separate, or even distinctly, Son of God and Son of Man; it is the Son of God who is Son of Man; the Son of Man who is Son of God."
Although Harnack said that "One might write a history of dogma as a history of Pauline reactions in the Church, and in so doing touch on all the turning points of the history . . . Paulinism has proved to be a ferment in the history of dogma; a basis it has never been," it is, in fairness to the Apostle, incorrect to conclude that he was personally responsible for any contemporary or subsequent heretical views concerning the person of Jesus Christ. Some, for example, stress that the Adoptionist Christology and the Pneumatic Christology are accountable to the early and widespread two-sided formula \( \text{kata oérka - kata pneúma} \) as found in Rom. 1:3f., but this was not Paul's intention. Neither did Paul ever think of Jesus as merely a human teacher, as did the Ebionites; nor did he ever have any sympathies with any gnostic or docetic views. In the third century Christology there was a tendency for the historic Christ, His human life and example, to recede into the background. This tendency opened the way for Arianism, the reactionary movement holding that Jesus was less than God — some sort of an intermediate being. Succeeding heresies\(^2\) were condemned as unacceptable expressions of the relation of the divine and the human in Jesus Christ. It is sufficient only to recall these heretical views to realize how foreign they are to the Christology of Paul. The only way the Apostle could ever be indicted as originating any of these erroneous notions would be by misconceiving his thoughts or by deliberate eisegesis.

Yet to say that Paul was not expressly clear in his distinction between the divine and the human in Jesus Christ does not mean that he did not have some kind of conception of His humanity. Even though he was not a completely logical and orderly metaphysician, he was not prevented from thinking and expressing himself in some fashion on the subject. The task of this study is an attempt to understand this facet of the Apostle's thought, realizing that the concern is with a concept which is not always easy, or even possible, to isolate from the body of other thoughts. It cannot be denied that Paul's mind was occupied chiefly with the crucial act of

---

2 e.g., Appolinarianism, Nestorianism, Eutychianism, Monothelitism.
redemption and its results; hence, it is not surprising that his reference to the human life of Jesus per se should receive comparatively less attention. "At the same time the real humanity of our Lord is to him an axiom."¹ It will be necessary to try to understand how Paul thought of that humanity.

II. THE KEY FOR PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF THE HUMANITY OF JESUS CHRIST

Paul's doctrine of the Second Adam provides the key for an understanding of his conception of the humanity of Jesus Christ. Some would even go so far as to say that Paul's theology centers in the conception of the "Second Adam."² With some interpreters it has been a problem whether Paul's description of the "Second Adam" is a temporary lapse into the realm of human history by one who is moving in the sphere of Hellenistic Mystery religion, or whether the passage "expresses the very foundation of his religion."³ Certainly the latter of these alternatives is the more likely.

Examination of the problem properly begins with a recording of the well-known statements by Paul that have given rise to the so-called "Second Adam" doctrine:

a) I Cor. 15:45 - Ἠγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἄδωρ εἰς ψυχὴν ὄςον ὁ ἐσχάτος Ἄδωρ εἰς πνεῦμα ἐσωποιόν

15:47 - ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς Χαῖκας

οἱ δεύτεροι ἄνθρωποι οὐκ οὐρανός

The next two verses (48, 49) continue: "As was the man of dust, so are those who are of the dust; and as is the man of heaven (ὁ ἐπουράνιος), so are those who are of heaven. Just as we have borne the image of the man of dust, we shall (not "let us")⁴ also bear the image of the man of heaven (Ὑγν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἐπουράνιου)."

b) Rom. 5:12-19 has the contrast throughout between the "one man" Adam and the ἐνὸς ἄνθρωποι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. In this Roman passage the terms ἐσχάτος Ἄδωρ

⁴ Infra, p. 304.
and δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος do not appear, but the contrast between Adam ("one man's trespass," "one man's disobedience") and Jesus Christ ("one man's act of righteousness," "one man's obedience") makes it obvious that the same concept of the Second Adam is here also running through the Apostle's mind. The chief difference, however, lies in the fact that the Corinthian passage is dealing with the person of Jesus Christ and the resurrection body, while the Romans passage is dealing with the work of Jesus Christ and the doctrine of redemption.

Although the I Corinthians and Romans passages provide loci classici for the Pauline doctrine of the Second Adam, they are not the only places where the concept influenced the Apostle's expression. Preliminary mention can be made here of Phil. 2:5ff., for example, where there is an apparent underlying contrast between the first Adam, who strived to be as God and was disobedient to the specific command of the Lord (Gen. 3:3, 5), and the Second Adam, who poured out Himself even to death in humble and obedient service to the will of God. The result was expulsion for the one (Gen. 3:24) and exaltation for the other (Phil. 2:9-11). Behind Paul's thought of Christ as the image (ἐικόν) of God, as in II Cor. 4:4 "... the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, οὐκ ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ " and Col. 1:15 οὐκ ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀποκαταστάτου, there also lies the Adam-Christ typology in that the Second Adam bears the original image of God, the image that was marred by the first Adam but restored in the Second or New Adam, thereby fulfilling all of the original intention of God for man.1 This truth is revealed in II Cor. 4:4-6, where Paul writes of the δόξα τοῦ Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ. These verses are in accord with the Rabbinic belief that the δόξα with which Adam was endowed at Creation departed from him at his Fall.2 Here, then, Paul is proclaiming that the divine δόξα and εἰκόν are perfectly revealed and restored in Christ, and for him this is comparable in magnitude only to the first creation. Furthermore, the restored "glory" and "image" is related by Paul to the "new man" (Ἰδιαίτερα πληρωμάτων δόξας Χριστοῦ - Eph. 4:24), the "new nature" (τὸν νέον - Col. 3:10), and the "new creation"

1 Infra, pp. 293 ff.
2 There may be an allusion to this idea in I Cor. 11:7, "For a man ought not to cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God."
one can easily recognize that the Second Adam concept played a major part in Paul's Christological thinking.¹

May it suffice here also to mention, but only in a preliminary way, that Paul never used the expression "Son of Man". He substituted for this Jewish phrase the term "Second Adam" because (for one reason) of the universalism of his doctrine. It represented an expansion of the national Judaic Messianic idea, to which the "Son of Man" concept was limited.²

In one of Paul's expressions about the Second Adam there is a "man from heaven" phrase linked with the "second man" designation (I Cor. 15:47). On the surface this would seem to indicate a pre-existent Second Adam, but Paul's mind is really dwelling upon a post-existent Christ in the light of His Incarnation.³ Paul's references in I Cor. 15 and Rom. 5 do not pertain to a pre-incarnate Son; he has in mind rather the "historical Jesus in His human history," that earthly experience in which occurred the supreme events associated with His role as Redeemer, i.e., His death on the Cross and His Resurrection to a glorified life.⁴ Within Rom. 5:12ff...

¹ So far both the terms "Second Adam" and "Last Adam" have been used. Actually only the designations "Last Adam" (Ἡσαχάτος Αδήμ) and "second man" (δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος) appear in the Pauline letters. The appellation "Second Adam" (δεύτερος Αδήμ) cannot in those exact words be found in the epistles. It is logical, however, that Paul's Hebrew mind thought of "Adam" also in terms of the Greek ἄνθρωπος, since the Hebrew שָׁם basically means "man." On this basis, therefore, the term "Second Adam" can be employed legitimately. Such usage, furthermore, aids in the appreciation of the wealth of meaning that Paul embraced in the Second or Last Adam concept. The term "Last Adam" calls to mind an eschatological significance, and the term "Second Adam" indicates an historical significance. Admittedly, this inclines toward an artificial distinction, yet it enables one to see that the Apostle thought in historical terms about the New Adam as well as eschatologically, in pre-resurrection as well as in post-resurrection terms. H.L. Goudge, The First Epistle to the Corinthians (WC), p.154, properly emphasizes, as many others do, that Christ is, indeed, the Last Adam — that He is the Last Adam of the race, and that there can be no third Head.

² Infra, pp. 93-101, for the relation between the Son of Man and Second Adam concepts in the Pauline literature.
⁴ Ibid., p.102. Cf. Beyschlag, New Testament Theology, p.88, who held that the "Second Adam" figure used by Paul demonstrates that his Christology began with the historical and exalted Christ, and from there rose to the pre-existent Christ. Even O. Pfleiderer maintained in one place that the name of a Second Adam "can only be explained by the historical consideration of Christ." Paulinism, p. 142.
there is room for the whole content of the gospel history. Moreover, the Second Adam, in addition to his special mission, must possess the unique blend of human nature and sinlessness. As such He is true man, revealing the essence of humanity and demonstrating that sin is not essential to human nature.

A) Objections to Pre-Existent Theories of I Cor. 15:47ff. Doubts have been raised above as to the validity of pre-existent man interpretations of this Corinthian passage. To show this more clearly an outline of objections to the three main theories in this category can be noted as follows:¹

1) The Pre-existent Man Theory. This view conceives of Christ as the Archetype of humanity, the ideal heavenly Pattern Man, and consequently the pre-existent Man.² At the proper time His celestial body became a body on earth as the Pattern Man. This theory has serious objections: a) it disagrees with the other Pauline passages that imply a pre-existence of Christ (e.g., Col. 1:15ff; Phil. 2:6); b) it would mean that the act of prayer would be directed to a creature, a man, and this would be unthinkable for Paul; c) it deprives the act of redemption of the strength of the fact that it involved the taking on of humanity to Himself, for a great deal more occurred than simply the appearance on earth of a Being who was previously human in some form; and d) it involves a reversal of the order of Paul’s first and second Adams.³

2) The Ideal Pre-existence Theory. This view is that Christ in the pre-existent state was Head and Archetype "in posse" only, not "in esse." In the mind of God the Idea alone pre-existed. Accordingly, Jesus Christ is the manifestation in time of the Eternal Idea of the relationship between human life and God. Such a theory is derived from an interpretation of Rom. 5:17ff. and I Cor. 15:45ff. that Paul is not writing about facts, but only of ideas pertaining to the Ideal Man. Those who support this position regard Paul’s source as being in Palestinian theology, where there is

³ Infra, pp. 69, 71.
found the idea that the Messiah was being prepared by God in heaven. God was reserving Him until the proper time of revelation, and in that sense He was pre-existent and from heaven. There is an element of truth in this attractive view, but there are the following objections to it: a) as in the case of the pre-existent Man theory, it does not agree with the other Christological expressions of the Apostle (cf. Gal. 4:4; II Cor. 8:9; Phil. 2:6ff.), for it is only of an existing personality that it can be said that he was rich and became poor, that he was in the form of God but took upon Himself the form of a servant; b) it is inconceivable that the object of Paul's faith could ever be an "Idea," regardless of how elevated it might be; c) the Incarnation is critically impaired if Christ is merely the manifestation of an Idea; and d) this theory involves a change from an Idea to a Person, whereas He must have been one or the other from all eternity.

3) The Pre-existent God-Man Theory. This position maintains that the Son of God is both co-equal and co-eternal with the Father. The Incarnation, then, is considered as the birth of the Son of God as an actual man (previously in the Trinity He was Archetypal Man) and the beginning of ethical obedience to His Father, but He pre-existed as both God and Man in unison. This theory has the following objections: a) the words ἐν γῇs and ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ refer not to Adam's original state and to Christ's pre-incarnate state, but rather to the nature and origin of the two; b) it implies that there is a single nature in Christ, but actually there are two natures in Christ since He is perfect God and perfect Man.

B) An Approach to I Cor. 15:47ff. After this brief summary of objections to three main pre-existent theories it is now the place to indicate a few items in the more likely approach to the meaning of this passage. 1) The phrase ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, as noted, applies to the origin and nature of Jesus Christ, and not to a pre-existent state; 2) ἐξ οὐρανοῦ may imply of the Second Adam an existence as a Person (an integral part of the Trinity) but not the pre-existence as a Man, for Jesus existed ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ but not ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὡς ἄνθρωπος; 3) the Second Adam

---

1 Cf. Rostron, op. cit., pp. 74f.
refers properly to both the historical and exalted Christ. Paul, therefore, has in mind here the historical Jesus of human history who conquered Death and who now is in His glorified, risen humanity. This is the situation that stimulated Paul's thought. As Kennedy said, "The living person stands clear before his imagination." Similarly, Olschewski pointed out that when Paul spoke of the άνθρωπος έστιν ούρανοῦ, he meant the post-existent Christ, and this Christ even as exalted retained human form in an idealized fashion.

Therefore, it is not some form of a pre-existent Man nor only a Resurrection existence that Paul means in I Cor. 15:47ff. He implies the prerequisite event of the Incarnation and the human life as well as the Resurrection. "The nerve of Pauline teaching as to the Incarnation," as Cone says, "consists in the identity of the heavenly Christ with the earthly Jesus." When I Cor. 15:47ff. is taken with the corresponding passage in Rom. 5:12ff., it can be seen that if the parallel between the First and the Second Adam is to have its fullest meaning, it must ascribe to Christ a real human life which provided time and opportunity for Him to make decisions between good and evil, for Paul's theology demanded a reality to the humanity and to the temptations of Jesus. Of little value is the sharp contrast

---

1 W. Morgan criticized the position that the Second Adam had any reference to the human Jesus on the ground that it would not contribute to, but would rather work against, the development of the Christ-cult. The Religion and Theology of Paul, p. 55. But was not the human Jesus a necessary part of the development of the Christ-cult?

2 Wilhelm Olschewski, Die Wurzeln der paulinischen Christologie, p. 64 n4. James Mackinnon, The Gospel in the Early Church, p. 6, was on the right track in saying: "The heavenly man thus seems not to stand for the archetypal, pre-existent man of Philo, whose incarnation Paul finds in Christ, but for the human Jesus, in whom the ideal spiritual life was realized and who, through his resurrection and exaltation to heaven has become the life-giving spirit of a new humanity. His representation of 'the heavenly man' may thus not really go beyond the Synoptics and primitive conception of the historic Jesus as the Son of Man, who by his resurrection, has been exalted to God's right hand, and now belongs to the heavenly sphere . . . " Cf. Millar Burrows, An Outline of Biblical Theology, p. 111.


on the points of humility and obedience unless both Adams were at some time within the same category of humanity. From the moment of His Incarnation there was introduced into the realm of human existence a new order of humanity as supremely manifest in the Second Adam. It was by His appearing in flesh, by His dying and rising again that He became a Man with the power to generate a New Humanity. If, then, this Second Adam is the key to Paul's conception of the humanity of Jesus Christ, it will next be necessary to consider how the Apostle derived this idea.

PART TWO — THE SOURCE OF THE SECOND ADAM CONCEPT

What is the source of the Second Adam concept for Paul? A variety of opinions has been put forward, ranging from the view that the Apostle was totally dependent upon some previous idea, or combination of ideas, to the opinion that the Second Adam concept was completely original with him. Those who make Paul dependent upon prior sources have usually referred to the following origins, or some blending of these possible origins:

1) Various Primal Man or Anthropos myths.
2) Contemporary Jewish ideas concerning the first Adam and possible speculations about a Second Adam. This includes references to the Rabbinic sources, Talmud, Midrash, and Philo.
3) The Primitive Christian community.
4) Old Testament non-canonical literature, especially Enoch and IV Ezra.
5) Old Testament canonical literature, especially Daniel, Ezekiel, and the Psalms (through the "son of man" expression).
6) Jesus' self-description as the "Son of Man."

A brief examination of these various possible sources is now in order.

---

1 Irenaeus stressed that it was through the Incarnation that Christ became the Second Adam. This Church Father insisted upon the necessity of the full humanity of the Second Adam in order to accomplish a genuine redemption, to restore the Image of God to man, and to initiate a process of divinization. Says Irenaeus, in a frequently quoted statement, "The Son of God becomes Son of Man, that man . . . might become Son of God." Against Heresies, Bk. III, 19.1; cf. chapters 16-22.

2 On this J.S. Excell provides an interesting illustration of the unique nature of the Second Adam as revealed at the Incarnation. He points out that certain
I. PRIMAL MAN MYTHS, RABBINIC ATTITUDES, PHILO, UCHEIRSTENTUM

For the purpose of convenience, material relevant to items 1, 2, and 3 above will be considered under this section I, while material appropriate to items 4 and 5 will be under section II of this chapter, and item 6, under III.

A. The Primal Man Source. The extremely complex subject of the idea of a Primal Man or Anthropos will be considered first. Some of the principal documents that reveal this idea (or myth) include the following: Hippolytus ("Refut. V") tells of a second century Gnostic group called the Naassenes, who held a belief, probably derived from a pagan mystery religion, in Attis, who was a heavenly man who descended into chaos, created the world, and imparted life to the ancestor of mankind. Similarly Zosimus (early fourth century) wrote that Nikotheos or \( \Phi \omega \) is the heavenly Man, and that earthly man originated when Nikotheos clothed himself with the earthly "Thot" or "Adam". The Poimandres myth of the first century supplied another form of the widely diffused idea of a Primal Man. Like the other extant Hermetic writings it bore evidence of being dependent upon the LXX (and it was possibly even influenced by Christian conceptions). Other Gnostic systems had a conception of a heavenly Man, but tropical plants are said to bloom only once in 100 years, but at that time burst forth in a single exquisite, glorious blossom, and then die. Although Excell admits this is a rather exaggerated illustration, he goes on to make the application that "only once in the history of humanity did an exquisite faultless flower of a man appear, in which all the possibilities of human life were exhausted. That flower was Christ, the Son of Man, par excellence, the second man." Biblical Illustrator on I Cor., Vol. II, p. 520.

1 See J.M. Creed, "The Heavenly Man," J.T.S., (Jan. 1925), pp. 116ff., for a concise discussion of this whole subject. For a recent discussion of \( \text{A\nu\theta\rho\omicron\nu\omicron} \) in Hermetic literature, and its relation to the Logos in Philo, the redeemer myths in Gnosticism, and the \( \delta \upsilon \iota \sigma \tau \sigma \gamma \nu \sigma \delta \text{A\nu\theta\rho\omicron\nu\omicron} \) in John's Gospel see C.H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (1953), pp. 41-44, 69-73, 109-112, 241-249.

2 Ibid., p. 120. Briefly, the account of the origin and fall of man in Poimandres runs in this fashion: A man was created in the image of Primal Mind. This Man conceived the desire to create for himself, and in descending to the created sphere he acquired from the astral powers some of the aspects of empirical humanity. Breaking through the celestial framework, Man beheld Nature and a mutual love developed, and they were united. As a result of this union Man became a twofold being -- partly immortal, partly mortal -- having authority over creation and yet subject to its fate. Seven sons resulted from the union of Man and nature, and these seven men were at first bi-sexual and were made of both the spiritual elements of the Man and the grosser elements of Nature, but after an age they were divided into two sexes and commanded by Primal Man to increase and multiply. Cf. C.H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, pp. 145ff., for a detailed account of the origin and fall of man in Poimandres.
it was not such an essential feature as compared with those already cited. In the Naassene document, Zosimus, and Poimandres an essential Gnostic syncretism of Babylonian astrology and Persian dualism are incorporated in a myth of a heavenly Man who descends into the empirical world and by some combination with it produces earthly Man, or even the whole world.¹

Possibly the Primal Man, the Anthropos, of the above Gnostic systems was derived from the ancient Iranian Gayomard, who was some sort of prototype of humanity as a part of pre-existent spiritual creation. He was one who became involved in a mortal struggle with the forces of evil and who became the progenitor of humanity at his death.² It is with this widely diffused Hellenistic myth (derived ultimately from Persian mythology) that Reitzenstein,³ Bousset, and others connect Paul's doctrine of the "man from heaven" of I Cor. 15.⁴ According to this view, the origin of man (and even all of the created world) is to be attributed to Primal Man, essentially divine, who descends from heaven. So Reitzenstein and the others contended that a belief in an Anthropos god lies behind I Cor. 15:45-49.⁵

The immediate question arising out of all this is: to what extent, if any, did the Persian Urmensch influence Paul's thinking regarding the "man from heaven" of the

¹ Creed, op. cit., p. 122.

² Cf. Carl Kraeling, Anthropos and the Son of Man, pp. 167ff.

³ R. Reitzenstein, Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, pp. 198f., in which he says that the messianic and eschatological conception of later Judaism is strongly proved to be influenced by the Iranian Anthropos doctrine, "dass sich deren Einfluss auf die Eschatologie und auch auf die Christologie des Paulus nicht bestreiten lassen wird." (p. 258).


⁵ In some writings, viz. of the Elcesites (Jewish Christian sect. c. 100), of certain Mohammedan sects, and possibly in the original form of some of the Clementine writings, there is an identification of Jesus with Adam (the original man). Cf. L. Ginsberg, "Adam Kadmon", Jewish Encyclopaedia, Vol. I, pp. 161ff.
Corinthian passages, and, therefore, the Second Adam? To some (e.g. Baur, Holsten) the very Christology of Paul was developed from a logical synthesis in the Apostle's mind by which Christ became a combination of the historic man Jesus and the Hellenistic "heavenly man". It is doubtful, however, if Paul was familiar with these non-Jewish speculations. Kennedy flatly says, "there is no trace in Paul's writings anywhere of a 'Heavenly Man.'"\(^1\)

To be specific, the following outstanding differences exist between Paul's doctrine of Christ and the Iranian Heavenly Man myth, which Reitzenstein's interpretation favors:

1) According to Pauline statements Christ's pre-existence is either in the "form of God" (Phil. 2:6) or as Son of God (Col. 1:15-17), but not in the form of a man (even with a spiritual nature).

2) In relation to the world and man, Paul's Christ is the instrument or organ of creation (cf. the δΩθ of I Cor. 8:6), but he is not the ontological being of it all.

3) Paul's Christ is called "man from heaven" not because He pre-existed in some form of a man but because He entered human life, taking upon Himself human life by His Incarnation and retaining it in His heavenly life.

4) A Christian's union with Christ is accomplished by one's becoming a new creation by His producing (II Cor. 5:17), and not just by the awakening of an inherent divine principle or nature within oneself.\(^2\)

There is no sound reason, therefore, to suppose that Paul was personally influenced by Primal Man or Anthropos speculations. The more remote question, however,

\(^1\) Kennedy, *op. cit.*, (The Expositor), pp. 97-100; cf. R. Strachan who sharply says, "The whole conception of the Pauline Heavenly Man as a pre-existing Urmensch inaugurated by Baur ... is a good instance of the type of criticism that denies creative originality and intellectual daring to the New Testament writers and seeks to explain all their thought by reference to the libraries of their time." *The Individuality of St. Paul*, p. 98.

\(^2\) Cf. William Manson, *Jesus the Messiah*, p. 186, for these dissimilarities.

In fairness to Reitzenstein, however, it should be recorded that he cautioned against the light deduction that Paul simply borrowed ("entlehnt") the Iranian Anthroposlehre by pointing out three basic differences between the Iranian Anthropos and Paul's Christ: 1) The Anthropos has not died (at least in the Manichaean form); 2) he has no relation to sin; and 3) he has not risen from the dead. Critics of Reitzenstein do not often give him credit for these reservations which he admits in *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, pp. 258ff.
of the possible influence of these pagan ideas upon Jewish thought as expressed in the Old Testament canonical and non-canonical books and Midrash, with an eventual influence upon Paul's thinking, will be mentioned at a later point. ¹ The conclusion of the immediate matter under consideration as advanced by W. Manson is apposite; namely, that there is no agreement, except in form, between the Pauline and the Iranian doctrine, and

While it is possible and indeed likely that traditional or received ideas helped the Apostle here, as at other points, to self-expression, the matter of his gospel must be pronounced independent of extraneous influences, based as it is on Christian historical revelation and on the Christian experience of God. ¹

B) Rabbinic Attitudes Toward Adam. Are the Rabbinic attitudes toward Adam responsible for Paul's Second Adam? A great number of Jewish legends have gathered around the name of Adam.³ One of the most interesting of these describes Adam as a glorified ideal man, a marked tendency in some Jewish writings. In Jewish legends Adam came to be thought of as the Ideal Man, physically, spiritually, and mentally.⁴ Yet, in addition to this tendency to idealize Adam, there was also the record of his Fall and its consequences set down in Jewish literature. Such thoughts developed

¹ Suffice it to say here that although the Primal Man myth was current, the great body of tradition that developed around Adam could naturally have risen from Jewish meditation upon the problem of sin and its relation to Adam. Cf. Davies, op. cit., p. 45.

² W. Manson, op. cit., p. 190.


⁴ He was considered to have been created by God fully and completely developed. His height extended from heaven to earth. Only a few in later generations represented Adam in physical stature and perfection. Samson possessed his strength; Saul, his neck; Absalom, his hair; Asahel, his fleetness of foot; Uzziah, his forehead; Josiah, his nostrils; Zedikiah, his eyes; Zerubbabel, his voice. (It is interesting to note that each of these physical excellencies accounted for the ruin of the one who had the dubious fortune of possessing it). So handsome was Adam that the very soles of his feet obscured the splendor of the sun. Spiritually, Adam's qualities were tremendous because his soul was the image of God. Mentally, his powers included a knowledge of the whole history of mankind, and was demonstrated by his naming of all the animals and originating all the crafts, especially the art of writing and the invention of all the 70 languages, Ginzberg, op. cit., p. 54; cf. Davies, op. cit., pp. 45-47.
particularly in the post-exilic period during which a deepened sense of sin was felt. The belief, for example, that death came into the world through Adam's violation of the commandment of God is expressed. It is interesting to note that the Rabbinic writings hint at both the idea of original sin and also the idea of man's responsibility. On the one hand death is ascribed to Adam's guilt, and on the other hand it is ascribed to personal guilt.

A doctrine of original sin is hinted at in IV Ezra 3:21: "For the first Adam bearing a wicked heart transgressed, and was overcome; and not he only, but all they also that are born of him"; 4:30-31: "For a grain of evil seed was sown in the heart of Adam from the beginning, and how much wickedness hath it brought forth until the time of threshing! Ponder now thyself, how great fruit of wickedness a grain of evil seed hath brought forth." This "grain of evil seed" corresponds to the evil impulse (yetzer hâ-râ') of Rabbinic theology. Adam succumbed to the evil impulse, and the evil heart that resulted led to sin and death. Furthermore, this evil seed impregnated in Adam's heart was received by all his descendents (4:30) with sorrow, misery, impotence, and pain as consequences (4:27; 7:12). The Fall of man is not attributed to any external agency, but rather it is a development of the evil impulse (yetzer hâ-râ'), which is inherent in man's nature. IV Ezra contains another interesting statement: "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" (7:118). Along with these expressions pointing to a doctrine of original sin the Rabbis also put forward the explanation that, although death reigns generally throughout the world since Adam, it gains power over an individual only on account of his own sin. In Jewish writings,


4 Cf. II Baruch 54:15-19, especially, "... each of us has been the Adam of his own soul." Cf. also Enoch 98:4; II Baruch 51:16; III Baruch 4:16-17.
therefore, there was an alternation between an idea of man's inherited tendency to sin and his individual responsibility. Now one and now the other was emphasized, but there was no attempt to form a logical union of the two. Perhaps it can be said, therefore, that the tendency on Paul's part to hold views which seem to be inconsistent is the result of such background and his Pharisaic training.¹

As a result of Adam's disobedience he suffered the loss of six things at his fall. According to Jewish enlargements on Gen. 3 these were: 1) the glory on his face; 2) life; 3) his superhuman stature; 4) the fruits of the ground; 5) the fruits of the trees; and 6) the brightness of the lights of heaven. But in the Messianic Age these lost elements were expected to be restored.²

The important question in view of this discussion of the writings and legends about Adam and his Fall arises: was Paul acquainted with these ideas? It seems very likely that Paul, being a "Hebrew of Hebrews" (cf. Phil. 3:5) and steeped in the traditions of his fathers, would have some acquaintance with the legends about Adam. Possibly I Cor. 11:2ff. and Romans 5 were written with some knowledge of Adamic legends. The whole matter, though, of relative degrees to which Paul was dependent upon the Genesis source and the subsequent legends is impossible to determine. The logical conclusion, therefore, is that to an indeterminate degree "both the rabbinic and Old Testament influences affected Paul's mind as evidenced in the phraseology and thought forms of his Christology."³ But although the Talmud says, "A convert is a palimpsest,"

¹ H. Thackeray, The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, pp. 38f. Cf. Davies, op. cit., pp. 18-25, where this paradox between inevitability and responsibility in relation to sin found both in Rabbinic Judaism and in Paul (cf. Rom. 5:12ff.; Rom. 7) is clearly pointed out, and is associated with the yetzer hā-rā concept.

² Thackeray, op. cit., p. 39.

it is not true that Paul was a slave to Jewish tradition, nor are his conceptions merely the adaptations of contemporary Jewish thought.¹

All of this discussion thus far of Adam in Jewish thought is but preliminary to the main concern here; namely: is there a specific concept of a Second Adam in Jewish literature which has influenced Paul's doctrine of the same? There is an illuminating account of the "Adam Kadmon" (First Man) in the Jewish Encyclopedia.² According to this source the idea that Adam was created androgynos was derived from an ancient Midrash which also stated that the spirit of Adam not only existed before the creation of the earthly Adam, but was actually pre-existent to the whole creation.³ Ginzberg, in the encyclopedia article, feels that this Midrash explains Philo's statement that the original man was neither man nor woman, and that it is the basis for his philosophical concept of the creation of the original man. Furthermore, Ginzberg believes that the same Midrash on Ps. 139:5 and Isa. 11:2 provides the key for the understanding of Paul's first and second Adam. He says:

The apparently insuperable difficulty of Pauline Christology . . . disappears entirely when reference is made to the Midrash. As a pupil of Gamaliel, Paul simply operates with conceptions familiar to the Palestinian theologians. Messiah, as the Midrash remarks, is, on the one hand, the first Adam, the original man who existed before Creation, his spirit being already present. On the other hand, he is also the second Adam in so far as his bodily appearance followed the Creation, and inasmuch as, according to the flesh, he is of the posterity of Adam.⁴

Ginzberg then points out that Paul was not dependent upon Philo for his Christology, but rather absorbed some of the Palestinian theology of his day (although Alexandrian

¹ Loc. cit.
³ This Midrash is based on Ps. 139:5: "Thou dost beset me behind and before, and layest thy hand upon me"; and also on Isa. 11:2: "And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord."
⁴ Loc. cit.
speculations influenced some of his ideas). In brief, therefore, by this interpretation Messiah is identified with both the pre-existing spiritual Adam, and the bodily Second Adam. But Ginzberg's view, as will be shown, is unconvincing.

The expression יִשְׁבַּבּ ("the first Adam") or חַיָּבָן was well known in early rabbinic literature. Moreover, a third-century Midrash (Bereshith Rabba) brings the Messiah into contrast with the first Adam. Although this Midrash cannot be traced back in any part to the first century A.D., it is an example of the type of Rabbinic thought which Paul may have encountered in his early training. Burney's theory is that the antithesis between the first Adam and Christ as the second Adam had been developed in Christian rabbinic circles for use in argument before Paul wrote I Cor. 15. This view is put forward to serve Burney's intention to prove an Aramaic origin of the Fourth Gospel, but it cannot be confidently accepted for our purposes. The fact remains that in spite of what may have taken place concerning the relation of the first Adam to the Messiah, there is no corresponding expression "last Adam" or second Adam" to the "first Adam" designation in all relevant Rabbinic literature until one comes to the medieval document called "Neve Shalom." Notwithstanding, it has been assumed by some that Paul, in using the Second Adam terminology, was employing a common Rabbinic title for the Messiah. Perhaps one could admit the possibility of such a pre-Pauline or contemporaneous Rabbinic association, but concrete evidence for this is lacking. Thackeray, Moore, Schiele, Jeremias, and many others have decisively demonstrated this point. The only positive source from which a "last


2 Burney, op.cit., pp. 45f. Infra p. 72 for objections to this view.


4 A.P. Stanley, The Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, 4th ed., p. 316, writes of "the already existing Rabbinic doctrine, that Christ was the Second Adam," and even Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. 136, speak of "the Rabbinic designation of the Messiah as δὲ υτέρος or δ᾽ ἐκάθως Άδαμ."
Adam" can be adduced is the "Neve Shalom", Book IX, 8, which contains the phrase, "the last man Adam is the Messiah" (Adam האגרס התח comunità הוה המשיח). The significant fact, however, is that this phrase is of late 15th century composition by a Rabbi Abraham ben Isaac Shalom, a Spanish Catalan Jew. Obviously, its 15th century origin nullifies it as any valid reference to a Pauline study.

In summary of this section it can be said that although there was in Jewish literature a considerable store of Adamic legends, and conceivably this total Adamic picture began to move in the direction of a conception of a Second Adam who would reverse the work of the first Adam and would be in the finest sense a Perfect Man, there is no convincing evidence that the idea of a Second Adam took the form of concrete expression until Paul began to write.

C) Philo. There must be no further delay in bringing Philo of Alexandria into the discussion. It is he who supplies the most striking comparison with the Pauline Second Adam. Indeed, Philo is the first to use the expression "original man" or "heavenly man". This is especially interesting since he was an older contemporary of the Apostle whose writings preceded Paul's by about 20 or 30 years.

Philonic speculation is based upon the twofold account of the creation of man recorded in Genesis (LXX):

1) Gen. 1:27, "God made (ἠπόγευς) man, after the image (εἰκόνα) of God he made him."

2) Gen. 2:7, "God formed (ἐπλασεν) man of dust from the earth, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being (ζυγιν δύσαν)."

---

1 There was also a "higher Adam" and a "lower Adam" distinction, but this also was not expressed until the Kabbala in the Middle Ages. Dalman, The Words of Jesus, p. 247, conjectures that this may possibly be remotely connected with an Ophite doctrine which called the primordial light πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος, and the ἐννοια that emanated from him Δέτερος ἄνθρωπος or υἱὸς ἄνθρωπος.

2 It is worthy of note that in the first century Apocalypse of Baruch there is frequent mention of Adam in relation to the destiny of mankind, yet it nowhere reveals the thought of a second, redeeming Adam.

The two principal passages in which Philo expounds this double account are: "Legum Allegoria", Book I, chapter 12, sec. 31; and "De Opificio Mundi", chapter 46, 134. 1 Philo derived from the Genesis records that there are two types of man, a heavenly and an earthly man. Characteristics of the Philonic heavenly man are: 1) he is in the image of God; 2) he was not moulded or formed (πλασθηκός), but rather came into being (γενονότος) by God; 3) he is incorporeal, having no part in material substance; 4) he is an idea, or type, or seal (κατ' εἰκόνα τετυπώθαι); 5) he is an object of thought only; 6) he is neither male nor female; 7) he has an incorruptible nature. By contrast, the characteristics of the Philonic earthly man are: 1) he is created out of matter; 2) he is formed or moulded (πλασθηκός) by God, but is not His offspring; 3) he is mind mingling (but not blended) with body; 4) he is an object of sense-perception; 5) he is corporeal, with body and soul; 6) he is either man or woman (not androgynous); 7) he is mortal; 8) he is corruptible; 9) he is a living soul because God has breathed into him a power of real life.

Several influences, beside the Rabbinic, were at work in Philo to enable him to produce such a doctrine. One of these definitely was the Platonic theory of ideas. In Plato, the concept of the material copy and the immaterial reality is a recurrent theme. 2 The idea of heavenly counterparts and pre-existence is a part of the system, and it is held by some that this doctrine of heavenly counterparts had gradually established itself in Jewish theology before the days of Jesus. 3 Therefore, scholars such as F.C. Baur and Pfleiderer, 4 who interpreted Paul's Christ in terms of pre-existent ideal humanity, the

---

1 Loeb Classical Library divisions. See Appendix I for transcripts of these two passages.

2 Cf. Timaeus, 28c. 29 A, where it is related how the cosmos was constructed after a Model by its Architect. The Architect fixed his eye on the Eternal Model, apprehensible only by reason and thought, and thus constructed the material cosmos.

3 In late Judaism there is a doctrine of a heavenly Jerusalem complete in all its parts that emerged (cf. II Baruch 4:2-7; IV Ezra 13:26). Even in older Judaism there are said to be heavenly patterns of the Tabernacle and its <em>furniture</em> (cf. Exod. 25:9, 40). Allusions in the New Testament to the idea of copies and heavenly patterns can be noted in Hebrews 8:5; 9:23; 10:1; 12:22; Acts 7:44; Rev. 3:1; 21:10f; 11:19; cf. Cal. 4:26.

perfect creative pattern of man, the ideal archetypal man, followed this Plato-Philo line of thought. Although Philo's idea of the heavenly man and the earthly man bears some reference to the Platonic mode of thinking, there is not in Philo the notion of the earthly man being a copy of the heavenly, but rather of his being a different creation by God.

Another element figuring in Philo's thinking was the Logos concept. In some sense Philo thought of the Logos in the following terms: both man and God, the Son of God, the eldest born who puts on the world like a garment, the image of God, above the angels, incorporeal light, eternal, the nearest to God, the shepherd having care of the flock, and the angel who heals evil. Some of these Logos attributes Philo wove into his concept of the heavenly man and earthly man, but with Philo the Logos was diffused throughout creation and scarcely had any connection with Messianic hopes. This kind of Logos could not become a historical Christ to whom Paul bore witness. On the other hand, it can be seen that if a connection is made between the Primal Man idea and the Genesis story, it is through a type of Hellenistic-Jewish exegesis as typified by Philo. "Poimandres" and other Primal Man myths differ from Philo, however, in that the earthly man in them is created by the Primal Man, while with Philo the earthly man is a secondary creation of the same God who made the heavenly man. Yet there is a basic agreement between the two in respect to the idea that mind (νοῦς) came into a union with sense (διογνωσία).

Is there a connection between the Philonic idea and Paul's use of the contrast between the heavenly and the earthly man? Certainly, there is no positive evidence that Paul was familiar with the writings of Philo, or that there was any personal connection between the two. Philo's writings are highly eclectic, being a combination of Jewish and Platonic speculations, with Aristotelian and Stoic elements.

---

1 Jowett, op.cit., p. 431.
also included; whereas the Pauline epistles contain nothing eclectic to the degree of interfering with the uniqueness of the apostle's own religious experience and its expression. The οὐράνιος and γῆνος ἄνθρωπος of Philo do not correspond exactly to the δεύτερος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ and χαϊκος ἄνθρωπος of Paul. If there is an approximate similarity of ideas, this cannot be accounted for on the basis of one borrowing from the other, but only on the supposition that these ideas, in some form, "belonged to the mode of thinking of the age, whatever inflections or adaptations of meaning they may have received." To attribute a further connection between Philo and Paul other than this vague, indirect one would be to go beyond the evidence of the situation. In Paul's time there was both a Rabbinic glorification of Adam in Palestinian Judaism and a speculative distinction between a celestial and an earthly man in Hellenistic Judaism, and these two concepts appeared in Philo's writings modified by Platonic ideas; but Paul had no direct contact or influence from this source.

In fact, striking differences can be pointed out between the Philonic and the Pauline "man from heaven". The most obvious of these contrasts is that with Philo the heavenly man is first, preceding earthly man; while with Paul there is a definite stress on the point that the man from the earth was first (πρῶτος - I Cor. 15:47). "The first (ὁ πρῶτος) man Adam became a living being; the last Adam became a life-giving spirit." (v. 45). Throughout the Corinthian passage (15:45-49) the point in the exposition is that Jesus Christ, in His redemptive role, follows historically the first Adam; and this is exactly the reverse in Philo's presentation. The same sequence holds true for Paul also in Rom. 5:12-19, and in the other passages where the Adam-Christ typology is implied although not expressly stated (e.g., Phil. 2:5ff.).

---

1 Jowett, op. cit., p. 410; Thackeray, op. cit., p. 41-49.

2 Cf. Kennedy, Philo's Contribution to Religion, p. 78. There is one Pauline passage that would seem to contradict this sequence and place Paul in agreement with Philo. In Col. 1:15 he says, "He is the image of the invisible God, the first-born (πρωτότοκος) of all creation . . . ." In connection
In addition, there are further glaring differences between the Pauline Man from heaven and the Philonic idea:

1) Jesus Christ to Paul certainly was not incorporeal and without any part in material substance. He was born of a woman, descended from David according to the flesh, found in human form, and possessed a body of flesh, not to mention the many references to his crucifixion and death which obviously demand a material substance. It can be seen that in every one of Paul's letters, regardless of what the main purpose may be, there is some direct or legitimately implied reference to Jesus Christ in a manner which is in sharp contradiction to the cardinal premise of Philo.

2) Jesus Christ to Paul is far more than just an idea, a type, or seal. To him the astounding fact is that Christ entered into the real, visible, sinful world, and in that realm worked for human redemption; and this entailed the Cross (with its physical agony) and the historic fact of the Resurrection. No mere idea could do that! To Paul there was almost a terrifying reality to the physical life of Christ.

3) Jesus Christ to Paul was not only an object of thought, but a Person who is the supreme object of faith. Further, it is a faith that has with it an inseparable ethic. It is a faith through which the righteousness of God is operative (Rom. 3:21-22). Certainly one of the unique aspects of Christianity in comparison with many other religions is that the worshipper has not only a thought relationship to the Central Object, but he has also inescapable decisions of the will in faith-response to that Person.

4) Jesus Christ to Paul was not some peculiar species, neither male nor female. He was a man. (Cf. Rom. 5:15) "... the grace of the one man Jesus Christ...";
As a result of these contrasting items it can be readily seen that Paul was not dependent upon Philo for the doctrine of the "heavenly man" or the Second Adam. The chief difference, clearly, is that Paul did not identify Him with any pre-existent idea, but with the Jesus of history. Paul could call Jesus Christ the Second Adam, in chronological order after the first Adam. Unlike Philo's heavenly man, Paul's comes directly into the sphere of space, time, and sense. It is one Pauline expression that approaches the Johannine, "the Word became flesh." For any serious purpose, it would not be too strong to say that the Philonic heavenly man is non-existent as far as Pauline Christology is concerned.

D) The Primitive Christian Community. Whether or not the Second Adam idea came from the Primitive Christian Community and was therefore pre-Pauline is debatable. Certainly, Paul received a considerable amount of information from the Christian tradition about Jesus and His life and teachings. (Paul's heated words at Gal. 1:1, 11, 12 are no testimony to the contrary. Supra p. 24). A group of scholars \(^1\) recently have shown most adequately that certain early Christian hymns, testimonia, confessions, and elements of the kerygma emerge at points in the Pauline literature and in ways which reveal that he is quoting something that originated among those who were in Christ before him. Some have placed the identification of Christ with the Second Adam as also a part of this pre-Pauline tradition. \(^2\) Such a theory, however, has difficulties. It must explain why, if the concept was pre-Pauline, it did not more clearly appear in the Synoptic record, especially at the Temptation account, where an obvious opportunity for contrasting Christ and Adam was present. Also, in the back of Hebrews (which accents the

\(^1\) The word \(\alpha ν θ ρωτος\) must contain here both a generic and a specific sense.

\(^2\) P. Carrington, The Primitive Christian Catechism (1940); A.M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors (1940); E.G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter (1945); C.H. Dodd, Gospel and Law (1951) and According to the Scriptures (1953).

\(^3\) E.g., Hunter, op. cit., p. 51.
temptation of Jesus) there is no specific reference to a Second Adam. Burney's theory that I Cor. 15:45 is a quotation from Christian Rabbinic circles which, prior to Paul's writing, had developed for argumentative purposes the contrast between the first Adam and Christ as the Second Adam also has several difficulties.\footnote{Davies, op. cit., pp. 43f. Cf. C.F. Burney, The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel, pp. 43-48.}

In the first place, the priests who came into the Christian church (cf. Acts 6:7) were usually of the Sadducee type and were not much concerned with reflection, speculation, and theology, but gave most of their thought to liturgy and ecclesiastical politics. In the second place, although the Old Testament Testimonia of Scripture verses and passages (and even Midrashic expansions upon them) were used in the defense of the faith, evidence is lacking that the first two chapters of Genesis were a part of that Testimonia. If a verse like Gen. 2:7 had been used to indicate Christ as the Second Adam in the Testimonia of the Primitive Church, there most likely would have been other specific references to it besides I Cor. 15:45. Therefore, the conclusion of Davies regarding the view of whether or not the concept of Christ as Second Adam was pre-Pauline seems sound, viz., that although the idea of His advent as a new creation preceded Paul's expression, the Apostle himself probably introduced the specific idea that Christ was the Second Adam.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 41-44.}

It has now been seen that Primal Man myths, Rabbinic attitudes toward Adam, Philonic speculations, and the early Christian Community are not likely sources for Paul's concept of the Second Adam. Another group of possible sources must now be considered.
II. THE "SON OF MAN" EXPRESSION

The most likely possibility as a source for Paul's Second Adam now approaches. Following the suggestion of a group of scholars today\(^1\), one can agree that the real source is to be found in the "Son of Man" expression recorded in Old Testament canonical and non-canonical writings and transformed by the unique usage of Jesus.

The expression "Son of Man" is either from the Hebrew שָׁנַר הָאָדָם or the Aramaic שָׁנַר אדָם (or סְנַר אדָם), and is translated in English as "the man", Ἰησοῦς οὐρανοῦ.\(^2\) In contrast to a realm of angels and animals it denotes humanity.

A) The Hebrew "Son of Man" and the Primal Man. In dealing, however, with the Hebrew "Son of Man" subject, one must consider if it were influenced by any outside ideas. Clemens\(^3\) says that some speculation regarding the Primal Man found its way into Jewish thought, and traces of it can be found in the Old Testament. Moreover, in late Jewish and early Christian literature there is a marked tendency to glorify Adam, and since this glorification is absent from the older Judaism, one is led to seek the cause of it. Such a glorification of Adam can be observed in the Pseudo-Clementine literature, Hermetic religion of Egypt, the Naassenes, and Philo; and it leads one to suspect that the Hebrew Adam might have been conflated, in some measure, with a Heavenly Man outside Judaism. To conclude, however, that this glorification of Adam is derived directly from an oriental Primal or Heavenly Man and was developed in a cosmological and soteriological direction is not necessarily justified. As W. Manson has said:

The similarities that occur between religions over a cosmological-soteriological

---

\(^1\) E.g., T.W. Manson, J. Jeremias, M. Black, W. Manson, C.H. Dodd, Anton Fridrichsen.

\(^2\) Cf. T.W. Manson, The Teachings of Jesus, p. 212.

\(^3\) Carl Clemens, Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources, p. 153.
Heavenly Man may be the result not of the victorious progress of one particular myth but of the common tendency of all peoples, face to face with the one mystery of life and death, to cast their thoughts about the soul's relation to its own environment into the same or similar mould.  

In any case, even if the idea of a Heavenly Man or a Son of Man entered Judaism from a foreign source it did so with the significant difference that it was altered so as to have eschatological meaning.

In the books of I Enoch and IV Ezra there are pictures of a "Son of Man" as an individual who himself intervenes to judge and to save. This is a step beyond Daniel 7, where the "one like a son of man" is a symbolic figure of the saints of God in their corporate being to whom is given universal and world-wide dominion. If no such conception of a Son of Man in an individual sense was originally in Daniel, nor in older Judaism as a whole, the question arises as to the source of that idea in I Enoch and IV Ezra. So Clemens and also Gressmann held that the idea entered Judaism from without. In any case, the Heavenly Man idea did not assume a final redemptive and eschatological function until it appeared in late apocalyptic Judaism and early Christianity, and there it was transformed by being united to the earlier Messianic conception of Israel.

B) Canonical and Non-canonical Usage. Usage of the "Son of Man" idea in canonical and non-canonical Judaistic literature is revealed mainly in the following books: Ezekiel, Psalms, Daniel, I Enoch, IV Ezra, and the Sybilline Oracles.

1) Ezekiel. Ezekiel, prophesying in the 6th century B.C., provides an unusually abundant use of the term "son of man". In his prophecy the expression occurs over 85 times, and it is almost always prefaced by these, or quite similar words: "The word of the Lord came unto me saying, 'Son of man'. . ." The Hebrew

1 W. Manson, Jesus The Messiah, p. 182.

2 Hugo Gressman, Der Ursprung der israelitisch-judischen Eschatologie, p. 361.

3 Cf. W. Manson, op.cit., p. 18. Creed, in his comprehensive article, conceded that it was possible, but not established, that the Son of Man of Jewish apocalypse was another version of the Persian Primal Man, but, like Manson, rightly insisted that it must have been completely transformed to the extent that He became "the future judge of mankind and redeemer of the elect." Creed, op.cit., p. 135.
used is שָׂרִי-מָן, and it refers to the prophet himself. In other words, it is an idiomatic appellation by which the Lord addresses the man Ezekiel. (In this sense Daniel is also addressed as "ben adam" in Dan. 8:17).

2) Psalms. Like Ezekiel, the expression in the Psalms is used as a periphrasis for "man":

"What is man that thou art mindful of him,
And the son of man that thou dost care for him?" (8:4; cf. 144:3)

and

"Put not your trust in princes,
in a son of man, in whom there is no help." (146:3)

This use of "son of man", in Semitic idiom, as a synonym for the Hebrew "ish" is a mode of address that seems to indicate the littleness and insignificance (yet also, paradoxically, the worth) of man in his humanity by contrast to the power and majesty of God. This "son of man" in Ezekiel and the Psalms has both an individual and a corporate sense. In Ezekiel he is more than just an individual because the prophet realizes that he is a mediator for God's message not only for his own people, but for all nations, so that when he is on his face before God he is "mankind". In the Psalms the corporate sense, in addition to the individual, is apparent in 8:4.

3) Daniel. In this book (written about 168 B.C.) the phrase "one like a son of man" appears in the Aramaic section, Dan. 7:13. The whole context is worth quoting here.

I saw in the night visions, and behold, with the clouds of heaven there came one like a son of man, and he came to the ancient of Days and was presented before him. And to him was given dominion and glory and kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him; his kingdom is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom one that shall not be destroyed.

---

1 Other places in the Old Testament where "son of man" is used in this periphrastic sense can be seen e.g., at Isa. 56:2; 51:12; Job. 25:6.

In this passage pertaining to the "one like a son of man" one notes that:
a) he comes with the clouds of heaven; b) he comes to the Ancient of Days (a figure representing God, who sat in judgment) "not as a divine or semi-divine figure descending from heaven bringing deliverance" but rather as a human corporate figure "going up to heaven to receive it"; c) he corresponds to the "stone" which shattered the image. (Cf. 2:34, 44, 45); d) he receives dominion, glory, and a kingdom; e) he symbolizes the saints of God in a corporate human sense (in contrast to the beasts of 7:3ff. who symbolize the several kingdoms of this world) to whom is given universal and everlasting dominion; f) he is identified with the saints of the Most High who possess the kingdom (7:18), and are associated with judgment (7:22ff.).

4) *I Enoch*. In the non-canonical book of *I Enoch* there is provided a fruitful field of study for the historic, religious development of Judaism from a century or so B.C. to perhaps 100 A.D. Within this book there are the extremely problematic "Similitudes" (chapters 37-71), which bristle with a number of complex, if not insolvable points, and which contain references to a Son of Man concept. According to R.H. Charles, it is in these chapters that the Son of Man title with reference to a supernatural being is first found in Jewish literature. By his analysis this Son of Man is pre-existent, individual, developed from Daniel 7, identified with an "Elect" or "Righteous" One, deliverer of Israel, and Judge of the world. Since the time of Charles, however, a considerable amount of study has been devoted to the enigmatic Son of Man of the Similitudes, and as a result, some items of his analysis have been opened to much question. In particular, the opinion that this

---


2 For a parallel collective significance for the phrase "son of man" see Ps. 80:16-18, where the nation as "the son of man" is depicted as God's "right-hand man". M. Black says that this son of man "has become a collective symbol for Israel". ("The Son of Man in the Old Biblical Literature," *Expository Times*, Vol. 60 (1948), p. 11. Cf. C.H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, p. 117).

Son of Man was pre-existent and individual has been severely challenged. Scholars such as T.W. Manson, Matthew Black, Erik Sjöberg, J.Y. Campbell (to mention here only a few) have delved into the whole problem and have emerged with varying opinions. (See Appendix II for a brief survey of some of the recent interpretation).

5) IV Ezra and Sybilline Oracles. Although there is some doubt that the Enoch Son of Man can be considered strictly as a pre-existent being, there are, however, certain Jewish apocalypses, viz., IV Ezra and the Sybilline Oracles, that are definitely post-Christian and reveal an interpretation of the Danielic figure which has become a supra-mundane, pre-existent Messiah. In IV Ezra 13:3 ff. the Son of Man is depicted as a "Man from the sea" who has a heavenly pre-existence, flies with the clouds of heaven after emerging from the sea, destroys his enemies, and gathers to himself his subjects which are a peaceable multitude. In the Sybil- line Oracles V, 413 ff. (dated by Charles as shortly before 130 A.D.) there is another pre-existent Messianic interpretation of Daniel 7:13. It reads: "For there has come from the plains of heaven a blessed man with the scepter in his hand which God committed to his clasp; and he has won fair dominion . . . ." (Cf. also III, 652; III, 46-50). These two apocalypses probably represent later developments of the Danielic Son of Man than do the Similitudes of Enoch.

It is apparent from this outline of the major points associated with the Son of Man concept in canonical and non-canonical literature that there were some ideas in common and that there was a measure of development in the concept from Daniel to Enoch and to the definitely post-Christian apocalypses. Although the Son of Man seems to be a Messianic figure in pre-Christian Judaism, the predicate of individual pre-existence is uncertain. Yet one of the most significant developments between the sources of the Son of Man idea is represented by the fact that in Daniel it is symbolic of Israel and the indefinite "like" is used about it, while in the Similitudes of Enoch it is a supernatural Messianic figure (with the strong possibility that there is an oscillation in this figure between the individual
and the corporate body), and the definite "that" or "the" is used in connection with the designation.

Any attempt, however, to trace the idea of such a supernatural, Messianic figure from a prior Heavenly Man myth, supposing it to underlay Daniel and appearing in more substantial form in later apocalyptic literature, the Gospel tradition, and the Palestinian conception of Christ encounters serious difficulties. No such concept before its adoption by Christ, went so far as to speak of a crucifixion and death at the hands of sinful men. Indeed, there are a number of striking differences between the Iranian Heavenly Man myth and the Son of Man concept as found in the Synoptics. Unlike the Iranian figure the Synoptic Son of Man does not: 1) have an ontological or cosmological relation to the world or humanity; 2) become the source of the soul or spiritual nature of man, and does not accomplish redemption by means of a re-union with himself; 3) pre-exist as a man; 4) need a redemption himself.² It is obvious upon comparison that the Son of Man designation as used in the Synoptics bears little resemblance to any Heavenly Man myth. Neither is it completely congruous with the Apocalyptic Son of Man, for it has a far richer meaning. The Son of Man in the Synoptics is the result of a unique blending in the mind and personality of Jesus — the Son of God, the Servant of the Lord, and the Son of Man — which in Biblical thought are not mutually exclusive ideas of the agent of salvation, "but rather embody successive historical phases of the one idea."³

III. THE SON OF MAN IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

It is significant that the term "Son of Man" in the Gospels is used only by Jesus and in speaking about Himself.³ The only other case of its use in the New

1 W. Manson, op. cit., p. 185.
2 Ibid., p. 98.
3 The only exceptions are Lk. 24:6f., where the term is used by the two men of dazzling apparel in the empty tomb, but actually they are echoing a previous statement by Jesus; and in Jn. 12:34 where the crowd uses the phrase, but this also is a repetition of the words of Jesus.
Testament is that recorded at the death of the martyr Stephen where he is reported to have exclaimed, "Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing at
the right hand of God" (Acts 7:56. Even this, though, can be an echo of Mk. 14:62).

4) The Meaning of the Term in the Gospels. The commonly accepted grammatical view is that the phrase "Son of Man" in pre-Christian usage had two different Aramaic constructions; namely, "bar nash" and "bar nasha". With "bar nash" the second noun is without the article; and, therefore, the meaning is generic and can be rendered "a man" or "man as such". With "bar nasha" the second noun is with the article and the meaning is that of a title, and can be translated "the son of man" (Dalman) or "The Man" (Manson) in a special way governed by the context.1 The former, "bar nash", is the corresponding Aramaic phrase to the Hebrew "ben adam", which is a synonym for "man" ("ish"), a member of the human race, a "son of man" as in Ezekiel and the Psalms. In Daniel 7:13, 14, the term "son of man" is without the article, and, therefore, would seem to indicate that the expression there does not refer to any particular man. Verses 18-22, however, attribute to the term a unique, corporate sense by equating it with "the saints of the Most High".2

When the Evangelists came to record in Greek the phrase "bar nasha" as it came from the lips of Jesus, they slavishly made ó uids toú ávthrwpou do for the Aramaic אֲחֵרִית בַּרְאָשִׁים (or אַשְׁרִים בַּרְאָשִׁים), whereas the free translation of "bar nasha" would not be ó uids toú ávthrwpou but rather ó ávthrwpós, "the man". It is suggested, therefore, by T.W. Manson3 that when the Evangelists interpreted Jesus's phrase "bar nasha" in the plain sense, they used the Greek ó ávthrwpós, but when they thought it had a special sense they wrote

1 Some, however, have denied that the term is capable of any other meaning than as a periphrasis for "man". So Lietzmann, Der Menschensohn (1896), referred to and supported by Wellhausen, Skizzen und Vorarbeiten, VI, pp. 187-215; while Driver, "Son of Man", H.D.B., Vol. IV, holds that knowledge of Aramaic at the time of Jesus is not adequate enough to say that "bar nasha" meant "man" or "the man", and today J.Y. Campbell, "Son of Man", R.T.W.B., p. 234, inclines toward this view.


3 Manson, The Teachings of Jesus, pp. 212f.
In any case, even if the severe critics be permitted their position, based on linguistic doubts, that Jesus did not use the term "bar nasha" as a specific title (on the belief that in the Aramaic language it was simply the ordinary word for "man"), there is still room for the possibility of its being used with special intent. Jesus could by His tone of voice or by a gesture emphasize that He was not speaking about man in general, but of "The Man" of apocalyptic prophecy.1

Similarly, J.Y. Campbell advanced the possibility that Jesus could have used the "bar nasha" expression of Himself without being misunderstood if, along with the expression, he used a demonstrative adjective in speaking, thus referring to Himself as "this (son of) man" in an oral idiom by which He designated Himself in the third person.2 If this actually was the way Jesus used the self-designation, then it really was an expression and an emphasis on His real humanity and His solidarity with mankind.3 It was T.W. Manson who earlier put forward the theory that ὁ ἴδις τοῦ ἀνθρώπου may be a misunderstanding by the writers of the Gospels of an original Aramaic oral expression.4 According to him, it is possible that the

1 Cf. E.F. Scott, The Kingdom and the Messiah, p. 191.

2 Campbell, "The Origin and Meaning of the Term Son of Man", J.T.S., Vol. 48 (1947), pp. 152-154. This could help to explain why the phrase is not used by anyone but Jesus in the Gospels because He was the only one who could speak of Himself as "this Son of man". An example of similar idiom in the Old Testament is the use of the third person "thy servant" meaning simply "I" or "me".

3 Until recent years the title "Son of Man" was usually explained as the expression for His humanity as compared with "Son of God" denoting His divinity, which together formed the picture of Jesus Christ who was uniquely God and Man. This traditional view embraces an element of truth in that "it makes the Son of Man title a fitting designation for him who was made at all points like unto his brethren, the sons of men, that he might make them sons of God." Campbell, "Son of Man", R.T.W.E., p. 232.

4 Manson pointed out that in the Aramaic of Galilee the expression "ḥāhû gabrā" would be equivalent to "I" (ἐγώ), while a literal rendering would be "that man" (ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος [οὗτος]) or "a certain man" (ἀνθρώπος τις). Similarly, the indeterminate form "bar nash" means "a man". In saying, therefore, ἐγὼ οὖν ὁ ἴδις τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων (Lk. 7:34) "the Son of man" could be a mistranslation of an original oral "a man" ("bar nash"), which idiomatically could mean "I" (ἐγώ) in the light of the comparative use of the "ḥāhû gabrā" of Galilean Aramaic.
phrase "Son of Man" in some cases came about as a result of a "misunderstanding of an Aramaic idiom in which the phrase 'that son of man', which equals 'that man', is used as a periphrasis for the first personal pronoun." It would not, after all, be too unusual if Jesus spoke thus of Himself in the third person. A similar way of speaking can be observed in Paul's language at II Cor. 12:2 where, plainly referring to himself, he says, "I know a man in Christ who fourteen years ago was caught up to the third heaven ..." Finally, one must reckon with the possibility that if Jesus spoke Greek, the phrase ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου might have come from His lips in that language. In any case, Jesus used the Son of Man expression for Himself in some special sense as "the Man".

B) How Jesus Used the Term. Although it is generally agreed that Jesus used the title in reference to Himself, the question remains: What meaning, then, did He attach to the Son of Man designation? An examination of the Synoptics reveals that the sayings involving this term can be grouped into three frequently recognized categories:

1) Concerning an apocalyptic event, the Parousia. For example, "And then they will see the Son of Man coming in clouds with great power and glory," (Mk. 13:26).

2) Concerning suffering, the Passion. For example, "And he began to teach them that the Son of man must suffer many things" (Mk. 8:31).

3) Concerning His earthly life, the present human situation for Jesus. For example, "The Son of man has come eating and drinking . . ." (Lk. 7:34). A closer examination of Jesus's use of the self-description "Son of Man" on the basis of these three main categories reveals that one cannot deny the significance.

---

1 T.W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, pp. 70ff.

2 Some deny this by saying the form ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in the Gospels can be attributed to "Gemeindetheologie", but A.B. Macaulay, The Death of Jesus, p. 105, has effectively shown up the weaknesses of this position.

3 Cf. Lk. 9:58; 19:10, although T.W. Manson has other opinions about these two verses, G. Duncan, Jesus, Son of Man, p. 141, (referring to the Matthean parallel to Lk. 7:34) says that Jesus is surely referring to his own earthly ministry and to the unmistakable human aspect of the Son of man.
that Jesus attached to the apocalyptic, parousia sense, and to the earthly, human-life sense. But by far the most prominent emphasis which Jesus attached to the Son of Man expression was that related to suffering and the Passion. It is when one looks at the application of the Son of Man expression to the idea of the Passion, to the anticipation of the suffering, crucifixion and death of Jesus that, the most interesting and significant observations can be made.

1) All of the passages connected with this thought are spoken after the confession, "You are the Christ", at Caesarea Philippi. This is significant because at that crucial point in the ministry of Jesus the Disciples began to realize that Jesus was the Messiah, and from that moment He desired that they should understand the essential way in which He was to fulfill this role. In Mark the first sentence of the very next paragraph after the confession reads: "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."

Luke uses Mark's words in the same way as does Matthew, except that in the latter the identification of the Son of Man and Jesus is complete by his using the name "Jesus" where the others use "Son of man" (Cf. Mt. 16:21). It is also significant that in Matthew's Gospel Jesus' question which precipitated the confession is: "Who do men say that the Son of man is?" (16:13), and then in verse 15 He asks the question, "But who do you say that I am?" There is also in Mark and Luke, "Who do men (or "the people") say that I am?" This is strong evidence that the Evangelists present Jesus as thinking of Himself as the Son of Man, and as the suffering Son of Man — a new combination of concepts for His hearers. Furthermore, the Synoptics all agree that the next subject of the teachings of Jesus following this crucial event was on the theme of the selfless devotion and the conditions of discipleship — a direct corollary to the self-giving of the Master anticipated in the preceding paragraph. The weight Jesus attached to the association of suffering and death with the
Son of Man concept, therefore, cannot be overemphasized.

2) At another highly crucial juncture in the ministry of Jesus, namely, on the road leading up to Jerusalem, our Lord connected the Son of Man with suffering and death: "Behold, we are going up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man will be delivered to the chief priests and the scribes, and they will condemn him to death, and deliver him to the Gentiles; and they will mock him, and spit upon him, and scourge him, and kill him, and after three days he will rise" (Mk. 10:33-34 par.). Only with such a conception of Himself as Son of Man does Jesus enter into Jerusalem. It is only as such a Son of Man that He anticipates His death and His exaltation and glory. Clearly, at this supreme moment of the ministry of Jesus (as well as at the Caesarea Confession) there stands revealed the central concept of Himself as the Suffering Son of Man. With this the first three Evangelists are in complete agreement.

3) These Passion passages are all spoken to the Disciples exclusively. Although the Son of Man expressions relating to the Parousia and to the conditions of His earthly life and ministry were sometimes addressed to the religious authorities and also to the multitude, the Synoptics concur by presenting Jesus as revealing this new and unique truth about the Son of Man solely to His Disciples. Typical introductory phrases to such Son of Man teachings are: "He began to teach them" (Mk. 8:31), "to show his disciples" (Mt. 16:21), "he was teaching his disciples" (Mk. 9:30), "and taking the twelve again" (Mk. 10:32), "he took the twelve disciples aside" (Mt. 20:17). Apparently Jesus realized that neither the scribes and Pharisees nor the multitudes would understand such a unique interpretation of the Son of Man, but hoped that by concentrating on His Disciples (and sometimes on the inner circle of three in particular, cf. Mk. 9:9 ff.) they would grasp the truth of his accepted way to triumph. 1 The interesting emphasis is made in Luke 9:44, "Let these words

---

1 The contrast, however, between Jesus' teaching on this matter and the immediate behavior of the Disciples betraying their lack of understanding is, at times, pathetically striking. Cf. Mk. 8:32; Mt. 16:22; Mk. 10:35 ff; Mt. 20:20 ff; Mk. 14:50; Mt. 26:56. Luke, who is generally more charitable toward the Disciples in this matter, records specifically the post-resurrection teaching emphasis upon the importance of realizing the necessity for the Son of Man to suffer, die, and rise again (Lk. 24:6 f; 24:26).
sink into your ears; for the Son of man is to be delivered into the hands of men."
It was not, however, until the fact of the Resurrection overwhelmed them that they
grasped the truth that Jesus had taught, and then they eagerly proclaimed it.

4) Written prophecy is appealed to by Jesus in support of His Son of Man
decisions and actions. In the same breath that He announced His intention to go up
to Jerusalem He added as explanation: "... and everything that is written of the
Son of man by the prophet will be accomplished. For He will be delivered to the
Gentiles, and will be mocked and shamefully treated and spit upon; they will scourge
him and kill him, and on the third day he will rise" (Lk. 18:31-33). Mark and Matthew
record that Jesus at the Last Supper announced that "the Son of man goes as it is
written of him (Καθώς γέγραπται—Mk. 14:21; Mt. 26:24, while Luke 22:22 has
κατ' ὅ τι ὄρισμένον). This reference to written prophecy is strategic in attempt-
ing to understand how Jesus thought of Himself as Son of Man. It is not from any
of the canonical or non-canonical apocalyptic passages that Jesus derives the concept
of suffering. The outstanding prophecies, however, in which the ideas of suffering
and redemption are combined are those of the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah,
especially 42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9; 52:13-53:12. It is this Isaianic figure which
not only transformed the original Son of Man concept but provided it with a unique
and most important new meaning which was demonstrated perfectly in the life and
teachings of Jesus Christ.1

5) Luke 6:22 teaches a blessedness when one endures hatred, exclusion,
reviling, and expulsion because of the Son of Man. By associating the possible forth-

---
1 Although the expression of the problematic Passion utterance, "For the Son
of man also came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for
many" (λύτρον ἐντὸς πολλῶν) may have an affinity to the thought of Ps. 49:7, 8,
surely the real basis for the thought resides in Isa. 53. As E.F. Scott, The Kingdom
and the Messiah, p. 234 tersely remarked, that although Jesus does not directly
quote the passage, "he compresses into a single phrase the whole idea of the chapter."
It is interesting also to note that in the Symmachus version of the LXX
there is a linguistic connection between Isa. 53:5, εξοισενμένος καὶ ἐξάκιστος
ἀνώνυμος, and the Son of Man saying in Mk. 9:12b, "... and how is it written of
the Son of man ἵνα πολλὰ πάθη καὶ εξοισενμένη. Cf. H.B. Swete, The
coming suffering of the Disciples with the name of the Son of Man there appears one of the earliest expressions of the fellowship of suffering. This statement, occurring, however, early in Jesus' ministry, would have had very little chance of being understood at the time in any special Son of Man sense; but it must have been recalled by the Disciples after the Resurrection as soon as they began to have these difficult experiences and by succeeding generations when faced with the situation of suffering for the cause of Jesus Christ (Cf. I Peter 3:14; Mt. 5:10-12).

The emphasis that Jesus attached to passion statements in relation to the Son of Man, plus the fact that such utterances were connected with the crucial Messianic events in His life, reveals the intention of Jesus to stress the Suffering Son of Man concept as the supreme fulfillment of Messianic prophecy and expectation. Such a life is accepted by Jesus and is enjoined upon His Disciples.

C) The Source of the Term for Jesus. In view of the ambiguous nature of the Son of Man designation and this unique self-application of the title by Jesus, scholars have been faced with the problem of trying to indicate the historical source for Jesus' use of the term. A number of possibilities have been put forward. Otto pointed out that the book of I Enoch provided the apocalyptic and judgment elements (some of which also appeared in Daniel and IV Ezra), and that these entered into the speech of Jesus when He spoke about the apocalyptic event of the Parousia.1 Charles more exclusively stressed I Enoch as the primary historical source for the New Testament designation,2 but those today who hold this position are few. Others state that the principal source is really the book of Ezekiel, where the phrase "ben adam" is used over 85 times in reference to a specific man. They point out that in Ezekiel the stress is upon the humanity of the "son of man", and, therefore, that Jesus as the Son of Man was Man par excellence, who realized that His role was described by the figure of the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah. So Jesus fused

Son of Man with Suffering Servant, but it was not a Messianic title.¹ There is an attractiveness to this view, but the fact remains that although Jesus' words sometimes bear a possible reference to Ezekiel (Cf. Lk. 19:10 and Ezek. 34:15ff.) the one specific quotation by Jesus of an Old Testament reference embodying the Son of Man idea is not from Ezekiel, but rather from Daniel 7:13 (Cf. Mk. 14:62). This is one main point that leads the majority of scholars today to accept Daniel as the basic historical source.²

The reasons for the acceptance of the Daniel source were concisely set down by Dalman³ and they lead one to make the following deductions: 1) Despite the opinion of Charles it is not definitely agreed among scholars that the Similitudes of Enoch containing the Son of Man figure are from a pre-Christian period; 2) the only Scriptural similarity to the אֱלֹהִים expression from the mouth of Jesus which the Jews would have been able to compare would have been the like Aramaic expression אֱלֹהִים of Daniel 7:13; 3) in the apocalyptic discourses of Jesus (Mt. 24:30 par.) and in His statement before the Sanhedrin (Mt. 26:64; Mk. 14:62) there are obvious reflections of Dan. 7:13; 4) by calling Himself "Son of Man" Jesus was indicating that He was the person in whom the vision of Daniel was moving toward its completion and through whom God would transform all earthly conditions; 5) The complete sovereignty of Jesus as Son of Man, like that in Daniel, was to be in the future — attained in Jesus' case after He had undergone suffering and death.

Jesus called Himself אֱלֹהִים "as that member of the human race (Menschenkind), in his own nature impotent, whom God will make Lord of the world."⁴

---


⁴ Ibid., p. 265.
and in connection with this idea He probably associated with Daniel 7:13 the expression of Ps. 8:5ff.

It has been further suggested that the expression is ultimately derived from a basic element in the faith of Israel; namely, the idea that the lost image of God in man will be restored. This thought could lead many in Israel to expect a man in whom God's purpose for mankind would be perfectly fulfilled. It may, therefore, be a mistake to be too rigid or too selective in the quest for Jesus' historical source for the self-description "Son of Man" because in His life and expression there is revealed a unique blending of the Son of Man concept as expressed throughout the literature of His people. Nevertheless, the Daniel passage remains the most likely basic source.

The opinion of T.W. Manson is that the Son of Man sayings of Jesus indicate a community comparable to "the saints of the Most High" in Daniel 7, and that all such authentic sayings are to be interpreted to mean that Jesus and His followers together are the Son of Man as a corporate entity. Accordingly, His followers, who form with Him the Son of Man as a group, may be thought of as "extension of personality."¹ Other authorities on the subject, however, are not prepared to go to this length in the interpretation. The spokesman for the majority is M. Black, who, when commenting on Manson's communal interpretation, writes that "the communal meaning is not only possible but highly probable and may be the true one, but it is doubtful if in any case, it is the only one, and nothing short of unambiguous evidence is required to demonstrate the point."² At least it is safe to assume that there is an oscillation between the One and the Many, when all of His Son of Man sayings are taken together, just as there is found in the Old Biblical literature. Usually Jesus meant Himself when using the Son of Man term, but sometimes the elect community of which He is the Head was also included in the meaning.³

¹ Manson, op. cit., B.J.R., Vol. 52, p. 191. This "extension of personality" phrase however must be viewed circumspectly lest the uniqueness of the redemptive act of Christ be diminished. Infra pp. 216-218.


³ Cf. V. Taylor, The Names of Jesus, p. 32; G.S. Duncan, op. cit., p. 152.
D) The Suffering Servant and the Son of Man. Jesus is the complete and supreme summary of the whole Son of Man concept, but He brought into it through His Person and teachings a further element which had never before been combined with the Son of Man concept. This additional element was that of the Suffering Servant of the Lord in Deutero-Isaiah.¹ In Jesus there is a blending of the Son of Man with this Isaianic Servant, and although these two ideas separately seem antithetical, together they produce the most sublime picture of the Son of Man. As the result, the Son of Man idea takes on a much deeper spiritual significance and infinitely heightened import for mankind. No longer is the figure only a transcendent apocalyptic Being who appears for the purpose of judgment and the gathering together with Himself of the righteous ones into a kingdom of peace, but He is the One who willingly serves, suffers, sacrifices, and gives His life as a ransom for many and in this way attains the exaltation and glory of the Son of Man. Not until the confession at Caesarea is this synthesis of apocalyptic eschatology and prophetic scripture perfected by the addition of the ideal of the Suffering Servant of the Lord. It is in this light that those Son of Man statements about His life of service, suffering, and death are to be understood. (Cf. Mk. 8:31; 9:31; 10:45; Lk. 17:24, 25; Mt. 16:21)

That this interpretation of the Son of Man in the light of the Suffering Servant is original with Jesus is evidenced by the absence of any such combination in previous Jewish literature. Despite the fact that the idea of expiatory suffering, either in terms of the solidarity of the nation or in a vicarious way for the sins of the people, can be read in certain places,² there is "no evidence that the Jews

¹ It is now recognized, however, that the Son of Man in Enoch has assumed some features of the Servant. Like the Isaianic Servant he hath "righteousness" (4:6;), is "chosen by the Lord" (46:3), has the function of being "the light of the Gentiles" (48:4; Cf: the interesting appendix in W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p. 173), and is called the "Elect One". But the significant point is that nowhere in I Enoch does the Son of Man assume that principle function of the Servant, viz., vicarious suffering and redemption. Thus Black says, "The motif of redemptive suffering is never associated with the figure in Enoch." ("Servant of the Lord and Son of Man", Scottish Journal of Theology (March, 1953) p. 11).

² Cf. II Macc. 7:32ff.; IV Macc. 6:27-29; 17:20-22; and in rabbinic explanations of Exod. 32:32; Num. 11:15; II Sam. 2:17; Isa. 50:6.
had a doctrine of a suffering Messiah."¹ (See Appendix III for further support to this conclusion). The blending of these two ideas for Jesus is a real one, involving no loss to either conception; for the humiliated lowly figure of the Servant is to be glorified and exalted to the majestic role of the Son of Man. Jesus, in taking the "Son of Man" title for Himself, deliberately interpreted His mission in terms of the humiliation of the Suffering Servant and the exaltation of the Messiah, and in so doing uniquely established the first genuinely redemptive concept in the prophetic tradition. Thus Jesus brought together the concepts of Messiah, Son of Man, and Suffering Servant by taking the title Son of Man as the form and pouring into it the content of the Suffering Servant (humiliation and suffering) and Messiah (exaltation) ideas.² Not only did Jesus first unite these concepts, but they became the prominent emphasis in His teaching during the latter half of His ministry.

In addition to the Son of Man declarations, Jesus indicates in other teachings a portrayal of Himself in the role of the Servant of God.³ This self-portrayal is presented in the Gospels not only in the words of Jesus, but also in other ways by the writers themselves, revealing their belief that this was the way Jesus intended Himself to be understood.⁴ Indeed, Jeremias points out that the Christological interpretation of the Deutero-Isaiah Servant of God was used in the very early days of the Christian community, being well-fixed in the Palestinian pre-Hellenistic stage of the early church.⁵ As such it can be seen in the Kerygma of

¹ G.F. Moore, Judaism, I, p. 551.
³ Cf. Lk. 11:22 and Isa. 53:12; Mk. 14:24 and Isa. 53:12; Lk. 22:37 and Isa. 53:12; Lk. 23:34 and Isa 53:12; Mk. 11:17 and Isa. 56:7; Mk. 12:1-12 and Isa. 53; Lk. 4:18-19 and Isa. 61:1. The unique accent Jesus placed upon a life lived out as a servant, of losing one's life to find it, of selfless service, of bearing one's cross, can also be attributed in some degree to the Servant source.
⁴ Cf. Lk. 2:29-32 and Isa. 52:10; 42:6; 49:6; Mt. 8:17 and Isa. 53:4; Mt. 12:17-21 and Isa 42:1-4; Mk. 1:11 par. and Isa. 42:1.
⁵ "... die Christologische Deutung des deutero-jesajjischen Gottes Knechtes gehört den ersten Anfangszeiten der christlichen Gemeinde an und ist sehr
the first apostles and evangelists as recorded in the book of Acts. It also had its influence upon the message of Paul in the epistles. (This will be discussed later in this study). But not only the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline letters express this Christological interpretation; the New Testament literature of the late first century period, particularly Hebrews and I Peter, stresses this new and fundamental truth about Jesus as well.

Although the Gospel of John differs considerably in the words of the Son of Man sayings, the connection between Him and His crucifixion and subsequent glory is firmly established.

It needs finally to be re-emphasized that Jesus' use of the Son of Man self-designation accents His humanity and His solidarity with mankind. Jesus brought together in His person and teaching the Davidic Messiah, the Isaianic Servant, and the apocalyptic Son of Man of Daniel 7; and a feature which is common to each of these figures is humanity — individual or corporate. This is more definite if the Isaianic-Servant element dominated His thought of Himself as Son of Man because the Suffering Servant (whether individual or corporate) was plainly in the category of humanity; so Jesus in adopting this role clearly placed Himself in the same sphere. It is fitting that He who was tempted in all points like His brethren should most often employ a self-designation which expressed and emphasized His real affinity with the human race, especially with regard to suffering and the victory accomplished through it. Only as such would His followers be able to share with Him in suffering and sacrifice, and be partakers with Him in the Kingdom of

---


Heaven.\(^1\) S.R. Driver, in concluding his opinion of the Son of Man usage by Jesus, supplies a fitting summary here:

The title . . . designated Jesus as the Man in whom human nature was most fully and deeply realized, and who was the most complete exponent of its capacities, warm and broad in his sympathies, ready to minister and suffer for others, sharing to the full the needs and deprivations which are the common lot of humanity, but conscious at the same time of the dignity and greatness of human nature, and destined ultimately to exalt it to unexampled majesty and glory.\(^2\)

It has been necessary to treat somewhat at length, although far from exhaustively, Jesus's special concept of the Son of Man because it is this personal interpretation that Paul adopted and preached even though he never once specifically used the Son of Man expression. To anticipate the argument let it be said here that within the Pauline doctrine of the Second Adam there is contained the Son of Man conception of Jesus, and this in turn involves the Pauline conception of the humanity of Jesus Christ. This is built up from Jesus's view of Himself as Son of Man, determined primarily by His central application to it of His interpretation of the Jewish Suffering Servant — all of which affirmed a real humanity on His part and a condition of solidarity with mankind.
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PAUL AND THE "SON OF MAN"

Having dealt with the Son of Man concept both in Judaism and in the unique usage of Jesus, it is now time to turn to the Apostle. The striking fact is that nowhere in all the epistles does the actual phrase "Son of Man" appear as an appellation of Jesus Christ. (This silence is also true of the literature of the "Pauline School", viz., the Pastoral Epistles and Hebrews, although at Hebrews 2:6 there is a quotation from Psalm 8:4 concerning the "son of man"). Although Paul had an abundant range of names for Christ—"Son of God", "his Son", "the Lord", "our Lord", "the Lord Jesus Christ", "Savior", "the hope of Glory", "the last Adam"—he never used "Son of Man".

I. THE SECOND ADAM—SON OF MAN

A) Reasons Why Paul Never Used the Title "Son of Man". Several possible reasons can be advanced to explain why Paul never applied the title "Son of Man" to Christ:

1) Grammatically, Paul's grasp of Greek expression was too accurate to permit him to render the Aramaic "bar nasha" into such a phrase as ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Instead, he would have more adequately translated it idiomatically as ὁ ἀνθρώπως. The Aramaic בֶּן הָאָדָם could be suitable for a special name of a definite personality, but translated into Greek it would not make sense.¹

2) Tactically, the Apostle would not choose to use ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου because to Greek ears the phrase would be unintelligible and barbarous. Instead he emphatically used ὁ ἀνθρώπως (Rom. 5:15; I Cor. 15:21, 47). The Son of Man term was too enigmatic to become a general title, whereas ὁ ἀνθρώπως and ὁ Κύριος would be readily understood by both Jews and Gentiles.

¹Lake and Jackson, The Beginnings of Christianity, I, p. 380; T.W. Manson, The Teachings of Jesus, p. 233; cf. Dalman, op. cit., p. 241, who points out that the Greek ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου can be rendered in German by "des Menschen Sohn, but the Aramaic "bar nasha" is approached only by "der Menschensohn".
3) Evangelistically, Paul's aim was universal, so it is understandable why he would refrain from using a term that was so particularly attached to the narrow, nationalistic, apocalyptic thought of one group of people.1

In view of this grammatical, tactical (or practical), and evangelistic awkwardness of the term "Son of Man", plus the reasonable possibility that Paul was cognizant of the variety of interpretation and ambiguity surrounding the term, and of how even the closest Disciples of Jesus did not understand His self-application of the title, he intentionally chose to express the essential meaning of the title as Jesus had it in mind without actually speaking or writing the same term. Recognizing the fact, then, that the designation "Son of Man" does not appear in the Pauline corpus, can one conclude that he was unaware of it and the particular meaning Jesus attached to it? Certainly not. Most scholars of today would disagree with Holsten's opinion that the expression ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου has no place in Paul's Messianic view.2

J.H. Moulton attributed Paul's early intense hatred of Jesus to the belief that he actually heard Jesus refer to Himself in a blasphemous relation to God as the Son of Man.3 This writer held that Paul was in Jerusalem during "the central week of history" and became "humanly acquainted with Christ". If Paul actually heard the expression from the lips of Jesus, it is suggested that his fanatical hate could have been based upon the injunction of Deut. 13:1-5, where it is commanded that a

1Perhaps this is also one reason, among others, why Paul did not present many positive teachings specifically about the "kingdom of God". Although he mentioned it enough times, it was usually in a negative connection—e.g., "Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God?" (I Cor. 6:9; cf. I Cor. 15:50; Gal. 5:21; Eph. 5:5).

2C. Holsten, Das Evangelium des Paulus, Teil II, p. 42. (F.C. Porter, sub "Apocalyptic Conceptions", C.T.A.P., p. 285, however, implies the same). In complete contrast to Holsten, for example, is Rudolf Otto, who says that Paul naturally knew what the Son of Man term signified because he lived in days when the term was the subject of much speculation, and thus his entire Christology rests upon it. The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, p. 233.

3J.H. Moulton, op. cit., pp. 18 f.
prophet, or dreamer of dreams, who leads the people away from the worship of God, shall be put to death. This is an interesting conjecture which cannot be ruled entirely out of the realm of possibility, but it does not repose on any concrete evidence.

B) **Indications that the Apostle was familiar with the Son of Man concept with reference to Jesus.** These indications are as follows:

1) According to the Lukan account in Acts, Paul was presumably in the group that killed Stephen, who during his condemnation experienced the vision of Jesus standing at the right hand of God and exclaimed, "Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing at the right hand of God." Whether Paul actually heard the exclamation in Stephen's own words or whether he only heard the mob repeating it in anger as a part of their condemnation and act of stoning him cannot be clearly deduced from the narrative. If Paul heard Stephen's own words this would imply that he was a member of the council, but although this is an attractive supposition there is no definite evidence for it.¹ It is safe, however, to assume that Paul, who was present at the stoning, "consenting to his death," and being the zealous persecutor that he was at that stage, would have informed himself of all that this heretical Christian had said, including the Son of Man exclamation.² This is more probable in view of the fact that the exclamation was so unusual. In addition to this point, it is difficult to imagine that Paul's close association with Mark and Luke (in whose Gospels the title appears frequently) would have left Paul without such knowledge of the expression which Jesus so often used as a self-characterization.

2) Writing to the Corinthians about the complete triumph of Christ he affirms, "The last enemy to be destroyed is death. For God has put all things in subjection

¹In his recent book E.J.Goodspeed takes the position that although Paul was probably too young to be a member of the Sanhedrin, he represented it at the stoning of Stephen. *Paul*, p. 15.

²To the contrary, Bultmann thinks it possible that Paul was never in Jerusalem before his conversion, and therefore Acts 7:58 to 8:3 as well as 22:3, are legends. *Glauben und Verstehen*, p. 188.
under his feet" (I Cor. 15:26-27). This is a quotation of Ps. 8:7 (LXX), where
the one who is to have all things under his feet is the "son of man" (a synonym
for "man" in the same verse) who is the object of God's favor. In the original
setting in the Psalm the verse presents the "son of man" in one of its earliest mean-
ings—simply a Hebrew periphrase for the word "man". When Paul, however, quotes
this verse, it is plain from the context that he has more in mind than just this
early meaning. The Apostle is writing about how Christ will ultimately reign supreme
in the established Kingdom, and how He will deliver the Kingdom to God after destroy-
ing all forces of evil, including death. The quotation from the Psalm is inserted
here, but then Paul proceeds to interpret the reference by saying that God cannot
be included in the πάντα which is subjected to Him who is given this all-inclusive
authority. Then in verse 28 Paul identifies the person who is delegated this extensiv
power as the Son himself, who, in turn, is subject to God. By such identification
the Apostle reveals a knowledge of the association of the ἄνθρωπος with
the Messianic Christ. Moreover, in this same paragraph Paul introduces the Adam-
Christ typology: "For as by a man came death, by a man has come also the resurrection
of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive"
(vv. 21, 22). It is clear that here Christ is set forth as the Second Adam, and when
Christ is identified by implication in verse 26 as the Son of Man, the Second Adam,
therefore, is revealed as the Apostle's "Son of Man".

3) In the Ephesian letter Christ is described as the one who is now sitting
at the right hand of God, having been placed "far above all rule and authority and
power and dominion, and above every name that is named, not only in this age but
also in that which is to come; and he has put all things under his feet and has
made him the head over all things for the church, which is his body" (1:21-23).
Here, again, is a reflection of Psalm 8 where the "man" or "son of man" is now
interpreted by Paul as the Christ. In the Psalm the "son of man" is first depicted
as weak, but then he is "visited" by God and exalted to glory and dominion. For
this reason the Psalm came to be regarded as prophetic of the humiliation and
exaltation of Jesus. Similarly, in Psalm 80 and Daniel 7 there is a corporate analogy to a human being whereby the nation Israel is humiliated at first, but then raised to glory by God;¹ and this same movement from humiliation to exaltation is, of course, the experience of the Isaianic Servant of the Lord. Paul must have been aware of this meaning and application.

4) Philippians 3:21 speaks of the Lord Jesus Christ as the Saviour "who will change our lowly body to be like his glorious body, by the power which enables him even to subject all things to himself". This seems, also, to be an allusion to the "son of man" of Ps. 8:4 ff., which Paul thinks of as being fulfilled in the person of Jesus Christ, who as the Son of Man (or "man from heaven" in Paul's terminology), is crowned with all glory and honor, and also as being fulfilled in those who are in Him.²

5) That Paul was familiar with the Son of Man application to Jesus is also shown by the observation that he alludes to a concept which in other New Testament references is associated with the Son of Man. In Rom. 8:34 Paul writes of Christ Jesus "who died, yes, who was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who indeed intercedes for us." Already the similar expression about being at the right hand of God has been noted (Eph. 1:20; cf. Col. 3:1). This idea is to be linked with the Son of Man saying in Mk. 14:62 where Jesus, replying to the high priest's demand to know if He is the Christ, says: "I am: and you will see the Son of

¹ Cf. Rawlinson, op. cit., pp. 75 n3, 124; C.H.Dodd, According to the Scriptures, p. 117.

² Cf. Dodd, op. cit., p. 33.

Similar to the above usages of the Psalm is that adopted by the author of Hebrews at 2:6-8. Explaining the verses 4-6 of Psalm 8, the writer is concerned to emphasize the complete control that was intended for man, but which has not yet been fully accomplished. But Jesus, however, "who for a little while was made lower than the angels" was "crowned with glory and honor because of the suffering of death" (2:9), but in that death He destroyed him who has the power of death, that is ἁγιός τοῦ ἁνθρώπου (2:14). Likewise, in this interpretation the άδΟΣ ΤΟῦ ἁνθρώπου is identified with Jesus Christ. This, at least, provides further indication that the connection was present in the minds of some of the New Testament writers, including Paul, and is a part of the early Christian tradition.
man sitting at the right hand of Power"; and with Acts 7:55 where Stephen sees "the Son of man standing at the right hand of God." If all these verses, as Dodd holds, are dependent upon a common Testimonia of the primitive Christian community, then Paul must have been familiar with this aspect of the association.

Dodd sees further echoes of the Daniel 7 Son of Man passage when: 1) Paul states that "the saints will judge the world" (I Cor. 6:2), this being derived from the Dan. 7:22 phrase, "the judgment was given for the saints of the Most High;" 2) he writes, "And would that you did reign, so that we might share the rule with you" (I Cor. 4:8c), this being an echo of Dan. 7:18, "But the saints of the Most High shall receive the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever and ever" (cf. 7:22). Dodd points out that the real meaning behind these New Testament expressions is declared in the line: "...if we endure, we shall also reign with him" (II Tim. 2:12). The Son of Man is Christ Himself, and the Church is "the people of the Most High"; and Paul must have been familiar with this underlying Christological interpretation attached to the Daniel 7 passage by the Primitive Church.

6) There may also be an association with the Son of Man of I Enoch, for in Colossians Paul yearns for those whom he has not met personally that they may have the understanding and knowledge of God's mystery "of Christ, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge". This may have been a reference to the "hidden reaches of secret places" of Isa. 45:3 (KJ), but it is more probable that the thought is akin to the expression of I Enoch 46:3: "This is the Son of Man who hath righteousness, with whom dwelleth righteousness, and who revealeth all the treasures of that which is hidden, because the Lord of Spirits hath chosen him."

7) In addition to the idea of the Son of Man based upon references to Psalm 8, Daniel 7, and possibly I Enoch, Paul also reveals the influence of such a concept on his mind through the Adam-Christ typology of Romans 5:12 ff. The contrast throughout is between the one man Adam and the one man Jesus Christ with reference

---

Dodd, op. cit., p. 35.
to their solidarity with mankind, and the effects that each has upon this corporate mankind. It has been noted that one aspect of the Son of Man derived from Dan. 7 and incorporated in Jesus' interpretation was the idea of solidarity with humanity. While it is true that the concept of solidarity, or corporate personality, reached far back into Hebrew antiquity and that Paul no doubt was acquainted with this principle, it is difficult to imagine that he could ever have applied it to Jesus as a man unless the union of the Servant of God and the Son of Man ideas had not already been accomplished in the mind and expression of Jesus Himself. To Paul, Jesus is the one man who by His obedience and act of righteousness, His suffering and death for many, has reversed the corporate effect of Adam's transgression and become the Head of a New Humanity. In Paul's expression here in Rom. 5:12-21 and elsewhere, his main emphasis is not upon a coming apocalyptic glory but rather upon the complete way in which Jesus Christ identified Himself with mankind in its condition of sin and death.

St. Paul, in fact, is bringing out the intensely human and historical character of the claim of Jesus to the apocalyptic title. It is true that, taking advantage of the a priori suggestions of the title in the Enoch literature St. Paul insists on Christ's pre-existence as the Son of the Father, but this pre-existent Being who was in 'the form of God' has stooped to the nature and 'to the likeness of men' that, as man, he might serve and redeem his brethren (Phil. 2:5-11). The emphasis is throughout upon the human life, the human drama; the Christological language is but the vehicle of the historical-suprahistorical meaning which Jesus as personal spirit has for faith.

In the use of the Adam-Christ typology Paul has before him the thought of Jesus as the Son of Man. "Can one more happily interpret Christ's thought of himself as the Son of Man than is done by Paul in the contrast he draws between the First and Second Adam?" 2


2 Gess, Christi Person und Werk, II, p. 368, cited by David Somerville, St. Paul's Conception of Christ, p. 230. Some have erroneously reversed the process by advancing the view that the title "Son of Man" as a Messianic designation was introduced into the Gospels by the Greek translators influenced by the Pauline concept of the Second Adam. (See Somerville, op. cit., p. 230n, for references).
8) In the Parousia utterances there is further evidence that Paul was acquainted with the Son of Man concept. Particularly in I and II Thessalonians (e.g., I Th. 1:10; 3:13; 4:16, 17; II Th. 1:7, 10; 2:8) the Parousia sayings reflect Judaistic apocalyptic Son of Man ideas, but Paul does not use the term. It is extremely difficult to imagine that the Apostle applied these figures to Jesus Christ without mentally making the Son of Man connection. In using the term ὁ Κύριος (as in I Th. 4:16; II Th. 1:7) where ὁ κόσμος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου could fit the sentence, Paul must have been conscious of his substitution of terminology, and could not escape reflecting, as he wrote, on Jesus, who described Himself as the Son of Man.

9) Some would say that the source of the idea of Christ's pre-existence can be found in the "identification of Jesus with the eschatological Son of Man"; but while there are statements of Paul implying a pre-existence of Christ which bear a certain affinity with the Son of Man idea, a greater degree of affinity can be discerned in the emphasis upon the heavenly origin of both the Son of Man and "the man from heaven." In I Cor. 15:47-49 Christ is specifically identified as the second man ἐκ οὐρανοῦ (47) ὁ ἐπουράνιος (48), and τῷ ἐπουρανίῳ (49); and the apocalyptic Son of Man is also associated with heaven, as in Dan. 7:13: "... with the clouds of heaven there came one like a son of man." Jesus also, in some of the Son of Man sayings, described Himself as a heavenly being (cf. Mk. 14:62; Mt. 24:30), similar to the apocalyptic expression of Daniel 7. 2 In Johannine statements there is a closer connection made between the idea of the Son of Man and a Jesus whose origin is in heaven. This link is first recorded by the Synoptics and developed more fully in John's Gospel. But Paul's letters, preceding them all, contain the

---

Footnotes:

1 Rawlinson, op. cit. p. 122.

2 Particularly in John's Gospel does Jesus speak most specifically about an origin in heaven (cf. 3:13; 6:38, 41, 51; 6:62; 8:23; 1:51; 3:31). C.H. Dodd, The Fourth Gospel, pp. 244, 249, points out that the Son of Man in John comes very close to the Hellenistic heavenly ἀνθρωπός, but although the two ideas come close, the significant difference in John (and in all New Testament expression) is that whereas the Hellenistic ἀνθρωπός is a "metaphysical abstraction", with John and the other Evangelists he is a "concrete historical human being."
earliest hint at this connection. Accordingly, it is not necessary to conclude that the Son of Man as a "man from heaven" was original with John. It is much more probable that this association was made by the early church, and the idea is first recorded by Paul in I Cor. 15. This being the case, there is the Pauline expression "man from heaven" as the corresponding idea to the "Son of Man" idea of Jesus. The "man from heaven" expression, in other words, is Paul's "Son of Man". Furthermore, this "man from heaven" is also Paul's "second Adam", and, therefore, the Second Adam and the Adam-Christ typology involve the thoughts which lie at the base of Jesus' self-designation as "bar nasha".

10) The Philippian 2:6 ff. passage strongly presents the twofold aspect of humiliation and exaltation in the life of the Second Adam, and this is clearly parallel to the humiliation and exaltation which go together in the Son of Man presentation in the Synoptics. (Infra p. 116)

C) The Humanity of the Second Adam-Son of Man. The concept of the Second Adam, in addition to its eschatological meaning, implies a real humanity, a willing obedience, and a life of suffering and sacrifice. These features coincide with the unique interpretation of Jesus as the Suffering Servant-Son of Man. Thus, there is Paul's conception of the humanity of Jesus Christ as the Suffering Servant-Son of Man, but expressed in his Second Adam doctrine.

There is no doubt that the Second Adam, according to Paul, is human; but he has supernatural properties and powers that manifest that he is not a human being

---

1 Cf. T.W. Manson, The Teachings of Jesus, p. 269 n2; Findlay, Jesus, Divine and Human, pp. 34-36; Mackinnon, op. cit., p. 68; and Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 125, who writes: "Paul has in mind the thought of our Lord as the 'Son of Man' when he writes...of the 'second man from heaven'."

2 One of the strongest exponents of this view today is J. Jeremias, "Adam", T.W.N.T., I, pp. 141 ff. and Jesus als Weltvollender, pp. 53-57. Cf. also Friderichen, op. cit., p. 16; Dodd, According to the Scriptures, p. 117; Similarly, Abbott, op. cit., p. 81, says: "...the connection between Christ and Adam was suggested to Paul by the knowledge that Christ, in the flesh, had called Himself 'the son of Adam'."

in the ordinary sense of the word. In this sense the Second Adam is similar to the
supernatural aspect of the Son of Man which was not completely relinquished by Jesus
when he transformed it with the Suffering Servant concept (cf. Mk. 14:62).
Nevertheless, the comparison and contrast stated or implied with reference to the
first Adam depends for the fullness of its validity upon a Second Adam somehow set
in the realm of humanity; otherwise the term "Adam" is purposeless, since by its in-
herent meaning it indicates an integral connection with the human race.¹

The Second Adam is demonstrated to be in the category of humanity mainly in
two ways: 1) by His obedience and redemptive work; and 2) by virtue of the repre-
sentative quality of His life. Jesus Christ as Second Adam demonstrated a human
life of perfect obedience, the consequences of which were directly opposite from
those engendered by the first Adam. It was an obedience accomplished through his
work in the human sphere, an obedience to the will of God that determined every
action among men, an obedience which shirked not even at the ultimate humiliation
of death on a cross. In a life of constant harmony with the will of God the Second
Adam thus made a perfect offering to God of what He really requires of man.²

Obedience (ὑποκομπία) is a word used almost exclusively by Paul.³ In addition to
its application to Jesus Christ as the Second Adam, Paul uses the word to describe
the submission of individuals to the faith (Rom. 1:5; 6:16; 15:18; 16:26) and of
complete dedication to Christ (II Cor. 10:5). The idea of human obedience involving
a positive act of the will finds its primary example for the Apostle in that perfect

¹ As Vincent Taylor succinctly states: "Christ is not the Last Adam because
He is divine; He is the last Adam and therefore divine." The Names of Jesus, p. 155.
Cf. Wm. Ramsay, op. cit., p. 153, who says that unless Jesus Christ as the second
typical man is in the fullest sense man, "His case will not prove anything for
other men or help them in any way."

² There is an essential truth in what St. Bernard said: "It was not the death
that pleased, but the will to die." Cited by C.A. Scott, St. Paul, The Man and The
Teacher, p. 102.

³ It appears outside of the Pauline corpus only three times in I Peter and
once in Hebrews (and only in a single reference in the LXX).
obedience of Jesus, the Second Adam. Jesus as Second Adam has a human life where he, like the first Adam, faces temptation and has opportunity to choose between the way of obedience and of disobedience. The relation of the Second Adam to temptation is brought out by the Pauline associate Luke, who perhaps reveals a knowledge of the Adam-Christ typology when he reckons the genealogy of Jesus from Adam (Lk. 3:38), and then immediately follows it with the account of the Temptation (4:1 ff.). The perfect obedience accomplished by Jesus was integral to His purpose of redemption, which required a reality to His manhood.

Secondly, the Adam-Christ typology places the Second Adam in the category of humanity because he is also a representative person. As Fairbairn concisely said, "Each contains a race, and is, in a sense the race he contains"; and "Each fontal person is an epitome of his race; and each is an expansion of its creative person." As Adam was the first head of humanity, so Christ is the Second or New Head of humanity, a humanity itself made new in Him, a humanity which is of a corporate group of redeemed men made new in Christ (II Cor. 5:17; Eph. 4:24; Gal. 6:15). The earlier humanity had its federal head and representative in Adam, and so the New Humanity has its Head in Christ. In this sense Adam was a ῥώσις of the one to come (Rom. 5:14). He was a "type" because of the dominant influence that he, like the New Adam, was to exercise on the human race. In Adam all sin, but in Christ the free gift of God's grace is made available to mankind. Sabatier writes, "The Second Adam is from heaven, but He also comes from the bosom of humanity. He enters the human race as a living member of it, and becomes for it the father of a new humanity." In order to be the Head of a New Humanity it is demanded of the Second Adam that he have some real part in human nature. Paul's personal experience of

---


2A.M. Fairbairn, The Place of Christ in Modern Theology, pp. 311, 314.

3Infra pp. 209 ff.

being involved in weakness, sin, and death by being in Adam (cf. Rom. 7) helped him to recognize Jesus as the Perfect Representative of the human race, who triumphed over the enemies of humanity through his complete obedience — the Second Adam in moral contrast to the first Adam. This is the Second Adam who sums up humanity.

II. THE SUFFERING SERVANT-SECOND ADAM

The Second Adam idea underlies much of Paul's Christological expression even though it is not stated in that specific term.1 One of the most interesting examples of a nonspecific passage is Phil. 2:5-11, where, however, there is not only the first Adam-Second Adam contrast, but also the underlying influence of the Suffering Servant of Isa. 53. Thus it provides an association of the Second Adam with the Suffering Servant, and is illuminating for the purpose of this study.

A) An Approach to Philippians 2:5 ff. Approaching this sublime passage one is certainly led to agree with A.B. Bruce when he said:

The diversity of opinion prevailing among interpreters in regard to the meaning of the principal passage bearing on the subject of Christ's humiliation — that, namely, in the second chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians — is enough to fill the student with despair, and to afflict him with intellectual paralysis.2

Yet a great deal of the complexity is reduced if this passage is not interpreted primarily as an exhaustible Pauline presentation of the doctrine of the Incarnation complete with all metaphysical subtleties delineated, but rather as a statement given with a very practical ethical purpose in mind and in the process disclosing some of the facets of his conception of Jesus Christ, including His humanity. Paul is exhorting his Philippian converts to conduct their lives in a manner which is consistent with the gospel of Christ (1:27) and to let love and humility be the ruling attitudes of their relations with each other. He climaxes the emphasis upon this matter of humility by citing the supreme example of Jesus Christ, and urges his readers to "have

1Supra pp. 51 ff.

2A.B. Bruce, The Humiliation of Christ, p. 11.
this mind among yourselves, which you have in Christ Jesus" (2:5), who stooped to the lowest depths of humiliation and self-denial, enduring through perfect obedience suffering and even the shameful death on a cross. The main focus of his interest, therefore, is not to supply a balanced doctrinal statement embracing Pre-existence, Incarnation, and Exalted Glory, but to hold before his readers the supreme example of the humility, obedience, self-denial, and death of Christ.  

It is thought by some that Phil. 2:5 ff. reveals a certain amount of influence derived either from the Primal Man myth or from Gnostic speculations. Leaning toward the former of these views, Clemens holds that the form of some of the Pauline Christological statements, notably Phil. 2:6 ff., appears to be determined by the Primal Man myth.  

Alternatively, Pfleiderer sees in these verses an underlying view which would imply that "before His appearance on earth He was a superhuman and God-like being, and even after His appearance not a real man but only having the form of a man-like existence"; and this is most probably a reference to the myth in the Ophite and Valentinian Gnosis of the Sophia, where a subordinate demiurge attempts to put himself in the place of the highest god. Because of this "gnostic relation" Pfleiderer thinks that Phil. 2:6 ff. is not a genuine part of the Pauline epistle but rather a later interpolation. Accordingly, he suggests that the first word ḫs of verse 6 could be connected immediately with verse 8 (omitting the words between, including

---

1 According to Deissman, "These lines were not written in the hard tones of a theological thesis, they are not calculated for discussion by modern Kenoticists, not for fanatics lustng for formulae to promote discussion." The words "are a confession of the primitive apostolic cult, made by Paul, the prisoner, in order to rally his fellow-worshippers of Jesus Christ round the object of their cult, round a form divine and human and again divine." Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History, p. 193 f. Although the use of the word "cult" in this statement is not a happy one, it supplies a fair general interpretation, providing the last phrase is intended aright. The last two words "again divine" must also include His humanity, or else the whole phrase might itself be construed as a Kenotic statement. Holders of the Kenotic Theory, if they accept the logic of their own position, arrive at a situation which regards the Incarnation not as a hypostatic union of God and Man, but rather as a stage in which Christ is human, coming after a stage in which He was divine and before a stage in which He will be divine again. But this implies a denial of the permanence of His humanity, which is contrary to the implications of vv. 8 and 9 of this context and other places in Pauline literature (e.g., Eph. 2:6) where it apparently is affirmed. Cf. D.M. Baillie, op. cit., p. 97.

2 Clemens, op. cit., p. 159.
The most probable explanation of Phil. 2:6 ff., however, is that advanced by Lohmeyer; namely, that this section is a pre-Pauline Jewish-Christian psalm, composed originally in Greek by a person whose mother tongue was Semitic, and is one of the first confessions of faith used in the worship of the Christian community. Even though Phil. 2:6 ff. is seriously thought to be a pre-Pauline Christian hymn, this does not eliminate it as a true representation of the thought of the Apostle. If it were not for this Philippian letter by Paul, the hymn would not be extant. The very fact that he willingly incorporates it into his epistle is testimony to the fact that he is in thorough agreement with its expression so that it is his thought also. More significantly, it contains elements which are in accord with his view of the humanity of Jesus Christ as the Suffering-Servant-Son of Man.

B) Two Major Points of Contention. There are two major points of contention among scholars that arise in the interpretation of verses 5-11 of Philippians 2:

1) Does the ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων refer to the pre-incarnate or to the historic incarnate life?; and 2) Does the ὄρασιμόν of the later part of the same verse 6 denote a passive or an active sense? The amount of time, effort, and


3A good deal can be said for Davies' opinion that in view of the fact that the Philippian letter was written near the end of Paul's life, he might very well be quoting his own or the writings of one of his disciples. In any case, when Paul employs the hymn there is nothing to indicate he is quoting, but rather he uses the hymn "as if it were part and parcel of his customary exhortation."
imagination that has been expended by interpreters on this verse and those immediately following has been enormous, yet the words here still challenge the thought of those seeking to understand the concepts of the Epistles today. It would be foreign, however, to the purpose of this study to enter into detail upon a presentation of each side of these two questions. It must suffice here to state and to support briefly the more generally accepted opinion that the phrase "being in the form of God" refers generally to the pre-incarnate Christ, and that the ἀπαγμὸν bears a passive sense.

Several reasons for generally accepting the pre-incarnate interpretation of "being in the form of God" can be listed:

1) It agrees by comparison with other Pauline statements that posit a pre-incarnate existence of Christ (Cf. I Cor. 10:4; Col. 1:15-17; Gal. 4:4; II Cor. 8:9).

2) The participle ὑπάρχων implies a sense of prior existence, a prior being in contrast to the historical-human and resurrected being of Christ.

3) The phrase "he emptied himself" indicates, initially, that amazing voluntary act by which He divested Himself of the "glories of heaven, the prerogatives of His divine majesty" by taking the form of a servant in entering the human realm.¹

4) The process by which Christ transferred from a pre-incarnate existence of "being in the form of God" to the "form of a servant" provides the greatest emphasis to the degree of humiliation which Christ accepted in coming into humanity.

The reason it is best to qualify this interpretation of the phrase by saying that it "generally" refers to the pre-incarnate existence of Christ arises out of the conviction that one cannot be dogmatic on the point because, to Paul, the life of Christ was one and undivided. Strictly, the ὡς of 2:6 does not refer exclusively to the pre-incarnate or to the historical career of Christ, but to both. The motives operative in the pre-incarnate Christ can, after all, only be postulated on the basis of those empirically observed motives and attitudes which governed

¹J.B. Lightfoot, Analysis of Certain of St. Paul's Epistles, p. 34.
His earthly life. Furthermore, if this be poetry, one must reckon with the truth that poetry does not confine its view of life to just one level, nor does it make decisive temporal distinctions, but rather it looks upon life depth upon depth and often without clear demarcations of time. So to be dogmatic by holding that the expression "who being in the form of God" refers strictly to the pre-incarnate nature of Christ would be somewhat hazardous.\(^1\) It is safe, then, to accept that the poetic expression οὐκ ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων can refer to more than one aspect of Christ; and as such it is akin to the expression in Col. 1:19, "in him all of the fullness of God was pleased to dwell."

That ἀρπαγμὸν is to be interpreted in a passive sense meaning the "thing prized," "something to be snatched," can be upheld on the following lines:

1) Not all substantives ending in -μος have an active sense.\(^2\)

2) The only place in classical writing where ἀρπαγμὸν is apparently active is in Plutarch, *Moralia*, 12 A.

3) Most of the early Greek church fathers (who would have been aware of the possibilities of the language) and some Latin fathers take the word as passive.

4) ἀρπαγμὸν taken in the passive sense makes the phrase "equality with God" a relation referring to the future (a "res rapienda"), and this is true to the meaning of the passage because it was after an earthly life of humiliation that He was exalted to glory. (The ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, then, refers to the nature of Christ, and the ἡ ἠτρια ἡ θεοῦ refers to the relation of Christ to God, attained only through humiliation).

5) ἀρπαγμὸν in the New Testament is probably closely allied to ἐρμαίον of classical Greek, which also has a passive sense (meaning "an unexpected piece

---

\(^{1}\)C.H. Dodd, *The Coming of Christ*, p. 20, for this idea applied to eschatology.

\(^{2}\)Some words, e.g., ἰερομός, "that which is laid down by law," and ἀρρητός, "oracle" are not used actively; while others such as ἀρρητός, "a defense, or a fencing in," and ἱερομός, "that consecrated, or consecration" are employed in both a passive and an active sense.
of good luck, treasure trove.

6) The passive sense permits the contrast with the first Adam and the object he snatched at, which is one of the analogies residing in this passage.

C) Phil. 2:5 ff. and the Second Adam. The essential meaning of the Philippian passage will be missed if it is approached from a systematic theological standpoint with an eye for a complete doctrine of the nature of Christ and a fully developed Kenotic Theory; or from a grammatical point of view with an attempt to weigh each word, phrase, and clause, and the relation to each other; or from a metaphysical, philosophical standpoint which would seek to explain the words and phrases in relation to their comparative use in classical terminology. Although something of the above methods of approach cannot be altogether avoided, the primary advance to the passage must be made by recognizing that, fundamentally, two concepts are reflected in the verses and they are inseparably linked to each other. These two ideas are: 1) the Second Adam, and 2) the Suffering Servant; and both of these bear a direct reference to the humanity of Jesus Christ.

A considerable number of scholars have associated Phil. 2:5 ff. with a comparison and contrast between the First and the Second Adam. The antithesis between the two Adams in these verses follows the pattern of Rom. 5:12 ff.; and basically it is between the First Man, who grasped at equality with God, and Jesus, who was in the form of God but took the form of a man. On the following points comparison and contrast can be noted between the first and the Second Adam.

1) "... in the form of God" (ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ)


Adam enjoyed an existence unique among other creatures. He was in the image (εἰκὼν) of God. "God said, 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness'." (Gen. 1:26 - καὶ οἶκων ἡμετέρου καὶ καθ ὀμοιωσίν LXX). In view of the anthropomorphic aspect of some of the Old Testament theology, this image cannot be thought of entirely apart from some "corporeal resemblance to God". Skinner, in the International Critical Commentary on Genesis, concludes his excursus on Gen. 1:26 by saying that the image and likeness "denotes primarily the bodily form, but includes those spiritual attributes of which the former is the natural and self-evident symbol." (p. 32) Following this point of view, Thornton presents a plausible origin for the Gen. 1:26 statement by understanding Ezekiel 1:26-28, where the prophet saw a vision of God manifested in human form, as the source for the "P" expression of Gen. 1:26.1 The vision of God appears to Ezekiel in a human form surrounded by a certain "brightness" (a halo or a garment of light), and this may be compared with Psalm 8, where the "son of Adam" is described as having been "crowned with glory and honor." Jewish teachers, then, could deduce that Adam originally shared the glorious form of deity, either in a halo of light or a body garment of light; and this was the view current in the days of the early Church and was known by Paul. Ezekiel and all the other descendents of Adam did not have this glorious body. Like Adam after the Fall they still had the image but were without the glory; that is, they were in "the form of a slave."

1L.S. Thornton, The Dominion of Christ, pp. 92-94. This conclusion is reached by noting that in Ezek. 1:26 the LXX has ὀμοίωσις ὑπὸ εἰδός ἀνθρώπου. Similarly Ezek. 1:5 has, "They had ὀμοίωσις ἀνθρώπου in the LXX. Also in Ezek. 2:1 the LXX ὀμοίωσις likewise appears in the phrase "ὁμοίωσις of the glory of the Lord." In all three of these Ezekiel expressions ὀμοίωσις is the translation for the Hebrew מֵאִים צֹּלְלָה, and it is this Hebrew word which is used for "likeness" (ὀμοίωσις) in Gen. 1:26, 5:1, 3. When the further observation is made that in the LXX of Ezek. 1:5 and 1:26, ἀνθρώπου is the translation of θηρίον, one can come to the conclusion that what the prophet Ezekiel saw was "a likeness of the appearance of Adam sitting upon a throne." Since the writing of Ezekiel antedates that of the "P" document of which Gen. 1:26 and 5:1 are a part, it is logical to assume that the author of the "P" section in Genesis derived three deductions from Ezekiel's vision: 1) From an anthropomorphic viewpoint God exists in the form of a glorified man; 2) this form was conferred upon Adam (Gen. 1:26); 3) this form was transmitted to the sons of Adam (Gen. 5:3). (Throughout the book of Ezekiel the prophet is addressed by God as θηρίον).
The situation of Adam being in the image of God and yet without the glory shows up in the paradoxical statements of Paul concerning sin. Man is, according to the Apostle, the "image and glory of God" (I Cor. 11:7), yet he also has sinned and fallen short of the glory of God (Rom. 3:23). Fallen man is a slave to sin, and the only way of recovery for him is to become a slave to God in obedient sonship (Rom. 6:16-22); the only way this recovery is possible is through Jesus Christ, who voluntarily condescended from the "form of God" by stepping down into Adam's place and taking the "form of a slave". He took upon Himself the form of fallen man, and yet was not obedient to sin.1

A unique relation is established between God and man whereby man has the possibility of understanding God's will and of exercising the duty of obedience to it. His manhood consists in the intimate fellowship which is intended with God. He is given a freedom through which he can glorify God, but by the abuse of the same freedom he can cause his ruin.

The unique position in which Adam found himself is paralleled in the life of Christ, both in His pre-existent and incarnate life. The parallel can be observed in the use of the words ἐἰκόνα and μορφή in application to Christ. In the LXX ἐἰκόνα usually translates either Ἰδε or Ἰδε, when speaking of man being created in God's image (cf. Gen. 1:26, 27; 5:3; 9:6). In one place, however (Gen. 5:1), ἐἰκόνα translates Ἰδα, speaking of the image of God in which man is made. Now the word μορφή in the LXX is used to translate a variety of words, but in one place (Dan. 3:19) it can be a rendering of Ἰδα, which is usually translated by ἐἰκόνα. A.M. Hunter has further pointed out that the Peshitta of Phil. 2:6 renders μορφή by "demoutha". Therefore, it is concluded that μορφή can come very close to ἐἰκόνα as a translation of the Aramaic "demoutha" or "tsalma."2 This becomes more clear when arranged in tabular form:

1Loc. cit.

In Gen. 1:26, 27  \( \text{eikwv} = \text{b'l} \text{ or } \text{b'l} \)
In Gen. 5:1  \( \text{eikwv} = \text{r'm} \)
In Dan. 3:19  \( \text{morphi} = \text{b'l} \)
In Ph. 2:6 (Peshitta)  \( \text{morphi} = \text{r'r} \)

According to this similarity in meaning, Phil. 2:6 might be read: "Who being in God's image, did not consider equality with God a prize to be seized." Here there is clear reference to the account of the Fall of the first Adam, for \( \text{to eivai ida} \) echoes "eritis sicut dii" of Gen. 3:5.\(^1\) In other places in the Pauline corpus (e.g. II Cor. 4:4; Col. 1:15) \( \text{eikwv} \) with reference to Christ seems to be used in a way almost indistinguishable from \( \text{morphi} \). Both words "denote a visible manifestation of inward character."\(^2\)

Now if Christ's existence was in the "form of God", it cannot be said that there was a point at which He completely divested Himself of that form or image. That element of deity was still in Him, although He became a man. In humanity He was not in a condition that was less than the condition of common humanity in which the \( \text{eikwv} \) of God still resides, albeit incomplete as a result of the absence of glory. On the contrary, in that humanity of Jesus Christ there is the perfect \( \text{eikwv} \) of God. So Paul can make the rather paradoxical references: 1) to man as the \( \text{eikwv} \) of God (I Cor. 11:7), and 2) to Christ as the \( \text{eikwv} \) of God (Col. 1:15; II Cor. 4:4). But the perfect image is in Christ, and it is to this image that Christians will have their bodies transformed from a lowly to a glorious state (Phil. 3:21).\(^3\)

---

\(^1\)Ibid, p. 50.
\(^2\)C. Ryder Smith, The Bible Doctrine of Man, p. 231.
\(^3\)Cf. II Cor. 3:18; Rom. 8:29; Eph. 4:24. Infra pp. 302 ff.

As C. Ryder Smith well points out, the key to the understanding of how the Second Adam could be in the "form of a slave" and still retain the "form of God" is not to be understood by any reference to the subtle distinctions of Greek philosophy but rather by reference to a unique capacity of Hebrew thought. Traditional Reformed Theology expressed this situation as the veiled presence of the Divine within the non-divine. The real clue for the proper understanding of this apparent
The comparison, then, in this phrase "being in the form (or image) of God" is that it applies to both First and Second Adams. In the First, however, it became imperfect through sin, while in the Second Adam there was no sin, so that while the phrase is traditionally associated with the pre-existent nature of Christ it is not to be separated from the humanity of the historical career of Him.

2) "... did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped" (οὐχ ἕρπαμεν ἐξ θανατοῦ) The genesis of the idea that Jesus Christ as Second Adam did not count equality with a God a prize to be grasped at derives from the

Paradox is derived from the Synoptic account of the Transfiguration of Jesus. During prayer on the mountain, according to Luke 9:29, the εἰδός (form or appearance) of His face was changed so that something irradiated even the garments that He was wearing. When it is noted that εἰδός in the New Testament always denotes something inward that expresses itself outwardly (cf. I Th. 5:22; Jn. 5:37) it can be deduced that the meaning here is that Christ's inherent glory, i.e., the "form of God" shone out through His physical body and clothes. The two other Synoptics say: "And he was transformed (μεταμορφώθη) before them," which means that His form of man was changed to the form of God, μορφή meaning "the outward expression of inward nature." Similarly, at His Ascension, according to the phrase of a pre-Pauline hymn at I Tim. 3:16, the form of God shone out again as He was "taken up in glory", just as it had shone out at the Transfiguration. The implication of Ph. 3:21 is also related in that at the Ascension "the lowly body" (or "body of humiliation") was transformed into the body of glory. Therefore, as in the Transfiguration, it is implied that the form of God was present in Jesus before the Event on the mountain and that in one brilliant occasion it shone through His human form, so it is logical to assume that Paul's expression in Phil. 2:6-7 represents the thought that the form of God remained in veiled state while the Second Adam was under the "form of a slave." This is also consistent with the later view of Hebrews where the flesh of Jesus is a "veil" (10:20), and of John where His flesh is the tabernacle where the glory or "shekinah" is hidden (1:14). Such a view renders irrelevant the attempt by some Kenotic theorists to delineate carefully what was "emptied" from the pre-existent Christ in becoming man. On the other hand it fits in with Paul's conception of His earthly manifestation in the form of a slave as being a temporary stage between His pre-existent and His exalted, glorified life, so that eventually the form of God does shine through for Paul at His Resurrection and Ascension. This, of course, is the form that he encountered on the Damascus Road and which is referred to in II Cor. 4:6. This aspect, therefore, of the sublime Philippian passage provides a striking parallel to the account of the Transfiguration, and one wonders if this event in the ministry of Jesus does not form the background for the Philippian expression. Cf. The Bible Doctrine of Man, p. 227.

In view of the above it is scarcely necessary to note that μορφή in Ph. 2:6 is not used in a strict metaphysical sense as carefully distinguished from οὐσία, φύσις, and εἰδός; but rather μορφή indicates a form which truly and fully expresses the being which is behind it. The term εἰκών expresses the same idea, and this is carried out in Hebrews as ἀπόγνωσμα of glory (1:3), χαρακτήρ of his nature (1:3), and in John by λόγος (1:1 ff.)
knowledge that the First Adam did just this thing.\(^1\) The Genesis account (3:1 ff.) expresses in more figurative language the reverse truth of that presented in Phil. 2:6. Adam is tempted to eat the forbidden fruit in the selfish desire to possess divine wisdom and thus be "as Gods" (LXX - ἐστε ὃι θεοὶ), i.e., to be on an equality with God. This is the prize (ἀρμοστὸς) at which he snatches. Later, in the same chapter, the judgment of God is pronounced because Adam has become "as one of us" (ὡς ἐστι ξύγῳ) as a result of his seizure of the prize of knowing good and evil. To prevent him from making a further attempt upon the prerogatives of God by taking of the fruit of the tree of life in order to attain immortality, God removes him from the opportunity by casting him out of the garden (3:22-24). So, the Old Testament marks the origin of sin, the consequences of expulsion from the garden of privileged fellowship with God, and the ultimate result in death.

All humanity sees in Adam the prototype of the Adam of his own person. The sin of Adam is the sin of humanity characterized by a selfish pride which leads to an attempt to usurp equality with God; this is man's greatest sin. Isaiah 14:13-14 can be taken as an allusion to the Adam of Genesis, who thought in his heart:

I will ascend to heaven;
above the stars of God
I will set my throne on high
I will sit on the mount of assembly
in the far north;
I will ascend above the heights of the clouds,
I will make myself like the Most High.

Paul saw all this in man, and above all he saw it in his own life and experience; and out of this common human experience, coupled with his conviction of the resurrected Christ and His power, he recognized the Second Adam who expressed in His life the complete and perfect antithesis to the First Adam.

By contrast, Jesus Christ did not snatch at a relation of equality with

\(^1\)It is more likely that the parallel here is to Adam rather than to Satan, as some hold. Cf. Mackinnon, op. cit., p. 74.
God, although His nature was in the form of God. Instead, He voluntarily took the road of human humiliation, and as a result of that he was granted that exalted position of an equality with God and by which He is to be universally proclaimed as Lord (2:9-11). This is a concise commentary and elaboration upon the attitude that shone through many of the events of the human life of Jesus.¹ In the account of the Temptation Jesus does not snatch at the opportunity to acquire a universal kingdom with all its authority and glory (Lk. 4:4,5). Nowhere does Jesus exhibit through His life or His miraculous power an attitude toward equality with God in terms of an object to be seized. Even at the last He resisted the derision hurled at Him on the cross, "Aha, you who would destroy the temple and build it in three days, save yourself and come down from the cross" (Mk. 15:29, 30), and the railing of the crucified criminal, "Are you not the Christ? Save yourself and us!" In the Philippian phrase there is an epitome of Jesus' own teaching: "Whoever exalts himself shall be humbled, and whoever humbles himself shall be exalted" (Mt. 23:12). And in Romans 15:3 a Pauline parallel to οὐχ ἐπικαυρίων ἐγγέσατο Τὸ ἐννα ἐν Θεῷ can be observed in the statement, "Christ did not please himself."

³) "... the form of a slave" (μορφή δούλου)

As a result of Adam's disobedience his life became one of servitude. He was sent forth to till the ground in hard labor — "in toil you shall eat of it all the days of your life" (Gen. 3:17). In the sweat of his face he is to eat bread, and his end is to be death. The result of Adam's fall is that although he still possesses the image, he is without the glory and is in "the form of a slave".

Jesus Christ was also in "the form of a slave", in the realm of those powers which held the first Adam in servitude.² The significant difference between the First Adam and the Second Adam with regard to being in "the form of a servant" is

¹With the picture of Jesus as the perfect model of love in I Cor. 13, Paul says, "Love does not ἁγιασθήσεται τὰ ἑαυτοῦ."

²Infra Chapter V.
that with the First it is a result of disobedience, whereas with the Second it is the result of voluntary acceptance and obedience. Jesus Christ voluntarily took upon Himself the servant status of fallen humanity.

4) "... God has highly exalted him" (διὸ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσε).

There was another factor involved in man's being created in the image of God, viz., that as a corollary he was to have dominion over the earth. In contrast to some pagan religions according to which various animals are frequently more important in the sight of the god, in Genesis the Hebrew concept is that God has given to man, who is in His image, the dominion over all the earth. Man, differing from all other creatures in that he has a self-conscious personality by which he is unique in resembling God, is intended to be supreme over all the universe. Although he is physically feebler than many other creatures, God purposes for him a dominion over all by virtue of the fact that he alone resembles — is in the ἐἰκών of God.1 To Adam was granted a three-fold dominion: 1) over fish of the sea, 2) fowl of the air, and 3) over every living thing that moves upon the earth.2

The dominion of Adam was bestowed as a delegated authority, which was to be properly exercised under obedience to God. The exercise of this sovereignty, however, was lost by the disobedience of Adam. Although this divinely-bestowed prerogative was forfeited by Adam's disobedience, it was thought that this dominion would be restored by the figure of Messianic hope; and this reached its complete fulfillment in Jesus Christ, the Second Adam.

In Phil. 2:10 the three-fold dominion bestowed upon Jesus Christ as the

---

1Cf. Abingdon Bible Commentary, p. 221.

2The uniqueness of this position of dominance is perhaps reflected in one aspect of the use of the verb ἀρχέω in the LXX. Although this word can translate other Hebrew verbs, it is interesting that there are just two places where it translates the Hebrew וו (which means, "to have dominion, rule, dominate"), and both these references are in connection with man's intended dominion over the created world (Gen. 1:26, 28). The verb ἀρχέω does not appear in the New Testament. The verb κυριεύω seems to be the closest in meaning, and in the LXX is the rendering usually for וו.
result of His perfect obedience in humiliation recalls in transcendental fashion the threefold dominion granted to Adam in Gen. 1:28. The passage reads, "that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow: 1) in heaven, 2) and on the earth, 3) and under the earth." Here also is a parallel to the humiliation motif of the Son of Man expression on Jesus' lips, by which the path to His exaltation was defined.

D) Phil. 2:5 ff. and the Suffering Servant. In this passage there are also strong indications of the influence of the Servant sections of Deutero-Isaiah, especially the 53rd chapter. By comparison with Isa. 53 the similarities can be observed under the following phrases:

1) He was in "the form of a servant."

In this phrase ῥοφήν δοῦλον λαμών there is the only place in the New Testament where the term δοῦλος is predicated (albeit limited) of Jesus Christ. (In a similar expression in Rom. 15:8, Christ is spoken of as one "who became a servant to the circumcised . . ." but there the word is διάκονος). It is parallel to the statements about the Isaianic Servant: "You are my servant" (Δοῦλος 49:3) and " . . . who formed me from the womb to be his servant" (δοῦλον , 49:5). Such statements provide the most plausible source for this Philippian expression.

Vincent Taylor¹ points out Paul's neglect of direct reference to Jesus as the Suffering Servant, suggesting that the Apostle could not think of calling his Lord a δοῦλος for personal and apologetic reasons. Nevertheless, as Taylor well recognizes, an abundance of indications demonstrates not only Paul's acquaintance with the Servant conception but its permeation of his soteriology.

Several things can be noted about this taking the form of a servant: a) Throughout the passage one is confronted with a drama in which the whole action of Christ in taking the form of a human servant and the humiliation and death which that Servant life ultimately led to was voluntary; b) He experienced the form of

a servant, but was not overcome by the slavery from which He delivered mankind;
c) The role of a servant was that of a Suffering Servant. His life of service
involved humiliation, suffering, death, and it possessed a vicarious quality.

2) "... he emptied himself."

The significant action of the servant is that ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε. This
aorist form of the verb ἐκένω is unique in the literature of the New Testament.
In places where other forms and expressions of ἐκένω are used, the meaning is to
make void, either by depriving of force or effect (Rom. 4:14; I Cor. 1:17), or
by causing something to be seen as empty, hollow, false (I Cor. 9:15; II Cor. 9:3).
In Phil. 2:7, however, the singular New Testament usage of ἐκένωσε is "to empty",
or "to make empty". The corresponding verb in the Hebrew Old Testament is מֵיהַ
which basically means "to be naked, bare." But in the Piel the verb carries the
meaning "to lay bare by removing the contents," i.e., to "empty" (cf. Gen. 24:20,
where the verb is used regarding emptying water from a pitcher, and II Chron. 24:11
regarding emptying the contents of a chest.) In the Hiphil of the same verb, as
used in Isa. 53:12, the meaning is "to pour out," מִשְׁפַּרְחֵה לַחַיִּים לַתַּחְפִּי. The LXX of Isa. 53:12, however, reads παρέδωθεν εἰς θανάτον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ,
but inasmuch as ἐκκενοῦν is used in three places in the LXX to translate the
Piel of מֵיהַ, Hunter, following Dodd, suggests that the rendering of the
Hiphil of Isa. 53:12 might have been ἐξεκένωσεν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ εἰς θανάτον. ¹
A related idiom in Hebrew thought can be illustrated in the idea that "The anguished
soul is empty", and "The miserable has poured out his 'nepesh' (soul); i.e.,
emptied it of its fulness and strength." This can lead to death; cf. II Sam. 14:14,
"we must needs die and are as water spilt upon the ground." ²

In Isa. 53:12, however, the picture is presented as a voluntary sacrifice --

One can further compare the LXX use of the verb ἐκένω in Jer. 14:2; 15:9, where the idea of strength having been poured out to the point of exhaustion
is given.
"he poured out his soul unto death." This is precisely the thought that is behind Phil. 2:7-8, for there is the picture of Jesus Christ who "poured himself out... unto death." This is a New Testament expression of the vicarious action of the Isaianic Suffering Servant perfectly fulfilled in the sacrificial life of Jesus Christ. The Servant in both contexts abnegates self and pours out his life in unreserved self-sacrifice, devoted in obedience to God and in service of man.¹ The necessity, therefore, for a well-defined "Kenotic Theory" is dismissed if these words are considered primarily in the light of the Suffering-Servant idea; and fruitless effort is saved from the attempt to discern the exact metaphysical distinctions involved in a theory of Christ's emptying Himself of "something." What precisely He did or did not empty Himself of will always baffle human thought, but the fact that He poured out Himself, emptying His fulness into us, will always capture human awe and devotion.² Thus the ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε of verse 7 is the counterpart of οὐχ ἄρπαγμὸν ἔγραμεν of verse 6. He did not seize at the opportunity for self-aggrandizement, but cast all thought of self aside and poured out the fulness of His life for the enrichment of others.

It has been pointed out by A.H. McNeile that although ἐκένωσε here is an aorist it does not refer just to the single moment of the Incarnation, but rather it indicates "the completeness of a series of repeated acts. His earthly life, looked at as one whole, was an unfailing process of self-emptying."³ Such an interpretation is justified on the basis of taking the verb as an aorist of extended action. An action, of course, fits in with the Synoptic saying of Jesus, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out (ἐκχυσόμενον) for many" (Mk. 14:21 par.), where Christ is interpreting His impending death in the light of the Servant.

¹ This action, of course, fits in with the Synoptic saying of Jesus, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out (ἐκχυσόμενον) for many" (Mk. 14:21 par.), where Christ is interpreting His impending death in the light of the Servant.

² Cf. W. Warren, "On ἘΑΥΤΟΝ ΕΚΕΝΩΣΕΝ", Phil. 2:7", J.T.S., Vol. 12 (1910-11), p. 463. G. Knight quotes a Rabbinic source which adds an illustrative light here. This source explains the presence of the Shechinah on earth by the use of a simile of a stormy sea which filled a sea cave with water. "The sea lost nothing of its contents; yet the cave remained a separate entity from the sea. So the Tabernacle became filled with the Presence of God, whilst neither heaven nor earth became the least emptied of it." From Moses to Paul, p. 120.

³ McNeile, op. cit., p. 66.
action which the aorist indicates to have been completed may not necessarily be a
momentary action, but may actually have extended over any length of time provided
that the emphasis is only upon the completion and conclusion of the action, this
being the natural force of the aorist. This sense of the aorist can apply to the
verbs of Phil. 2:6 in that the act of Christ's emptying Himself was not only
momentary, but extended action. Its completion and conclusion is emphasized in the
fact of His death. Thereafter was no emptying, but rather exaltation, Lordship, and
glory.

The expression of verse 8, ἔταπείνωσεν ἑαυτόν parallels and continues
the thought of ἑαυτόν ἐκένωσε, and reflects Isa. 53:7 where the Revised Version
has "He was oppressed, yet he humbled himself," and where the LXX has ἐν τῇ ἔταπείνωσεν in 53:8. The two clauses embrace the three intervening participial
phrases — "taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men, and
being found in human form." Moreover, the humbling of Himself involved the "becoming
obedient unto death, even death on a cross." So here there is, as usual, Paul's re-
current Christological thought of the death of Christ on the cross standing in
 stark contrast to that relation of "equality with God" at which He did not grasp.
When Paul began to write with Isa. 53:12 in mind, of the pouring out of the life of
Christ in humiliation unto death, he was interrupted after ἑαυτόν ἐκένωσε before
concluding with the ἑκέρπη Θανάτου by the remembrance of the human life of
Jesus Christ, which was absolutely necessary for a real death on the cross. Even if
Paul is reflecting an early Christian psalm in this passage, it is apparent that
at verse 8 the phrase Θανάτου ἔτσι σταυροῦ is an original Pauline addition, because
here the regular form and meter of the hymn is violated. This supplement by
the Apostle reveals the emphasis he desires to put forward in the hymn. Therefore,
it would suggest that Paul is thinking of the Crucifixion along with the Incarna-

---

1 Cf. Blass-Debrunner, Grammatik des neuchateartlichen Griechish (1949)
p. 147. Such extended-action aorists may also be noted in Acts 28:30; 18:11; 11:26;
and McNeile would also explain the ἐπτωχεύσει of II Cor. 8:9 in this way.
tion, and this is in line with his general thought. The Incarnation and the thoughts referring to the human life of Jesus are accepted by Paul so that Jesus can be demonstrated as the Servant of God on earth who empties out Himself to death; for although the "kenosis" was culminated in the cross, it naturally involved the Incarnation. Moreover, it is to be noted that Isa. 53 is the only place in the Old Testament where death denotes a sign of humility; and thus the eis θανάτου of Isa. 53:8 finds its parallel in the μέχρι θανάτου of Phil. 2:8.2

3) "Therefore God has highly exalted him."

Immediately after the statement about the death is this expression διὸ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσε which reflects Isa. 52:13, "He shall be exalted (LXX ὑψωθήσεται) and lifted up very high". This word ὑπερύψωσε is a New Testament hapaxlegomenon. In the LXX of Psalm 97:9, it is used in the passive sense, and in both the Psalm and Philippian usages the meaning is to exalt to the highest rank and power, to raise to supreme majesty in superlative measure.3

The idea behind the διὸ introducing the phrase is not so much that Christ received his exaltation as a reward or recompense for his humiliation, but rather


2 That the sense of "poured out" is to be applied to the verb ἐκένωσε is further strengthened by the observation that closely following upon this description of the act of Jesus, Paul writes of himself as "about to be poured out as a libation upon the sacrificial offering of your faith" (2:17). Although the verb σπένδωσα in this case is different, being derived from the consistent LXX rendering of a form of ἔκενω (meaning "to pour out in a sacrificial offering", e.g., Gen. 35:14), in the New Testament the word assumes the figurative idea of pouring out one's blood (or life) in violent death for the cause of Christ. Outside of the Philippian passage the only other place in the New Testament where σπένδωσα is found is in II Tim. 4:6 (part of a genuine last letter of Paul to Timothy, c.f. Harrison, The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles, pp. 126 ff.) where the aged Apostle is thinking about the rapidly approaching moment when his life will be poured out in a martyr's death in Rome. In both instances, as he wrote from Roman imprisonment, he must have held vividly in mind the fact of his Master's life having been poured out unto death in perfect obedience.

3 Cf. Brunner's interesting description of Phil. 2:6 ff. in terms of a parabola which begins from above, descends, and then ascends to its original place. The Mediator, p. 561.
that it was received more as a consequence of His humiliation. According to New Testament teaching, exaltation is the result of humility (cf. Mt. 23:12; 20:26; Lk. 14:11; 18:14), and Phil. 2:9 reveals that the teaching of Jesus concerning "whoever exalts himself shall be humbled, and whoever humbles himself shall be exalted" was perfectly fulfilled in His own case.¹ The humiliation of the Servant of the Lord, both in 2nd Isaiah and in Philippians, results in a glorious exaltation.

Furthermore, this exaltation is such that at the name of Jesus πᾶν γόνυ κάρπη and πᾶσα ἀληθινὴ ἐξαναλογισθη that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of the Father. The origin of this expression (and in Rom. 14:11) is plainly Isa. 45:23 LXX κάρποι πᾶν γόνυ καὶ ὑμεῖς πάσα γλώσσα. Although this Isaianic passage does not properly belong to one of the Servant sections, it is in a context describing God in terms of righteousness and salvation, unto whom universal acknowledgment shall be made. It is easy to see how this idea could be readily appropriated to the Servant concept, and one definite evidence of this is manifest in the Philippian hymn.

It is apparent, then, that underlying the poetic expression of Phil. 2:5-11, accepted and supplemented by Paul, there is the thought of Jesus Christ as the Suffering Servant.² But this is by no means the only place where there is the apparent influence of the Suffering-Servant idea working upon the mind and expression of the Apostle. Numerous examples of this can be cited, but a few of the most obvious will suffice here:

Rom. 4:25 - He "was put to death for our trespasses and raised for our justification."
Rom. 8:32 - "He who did not spare his own Son but gave him up for us all."
Rom. 5:19 - "By one man's obedience many will be made righteous."

¹M. Vincent, Philippians and Philemon, (I.C.C.) p. 61.
²To see this association in tabular form, Phil. 2:5 ff. and the Servant passage of Isaiah can be compared by listing the terms and cognates that are common to both in parallel columns. See Table II, p. 321.
Gal. 1:4 - "who gave himself for our sins."
Eph. 1:7 - "In him we have redemption through his blood."
I Cor. 5:7 - "For Christ, our paschal lamb, has been sacrificed."
I Cor. 15:3 - "Christ died for our sins in accordance with the Scriptures."

These last mentioned "scriptures" certainly included Isa. 53:2, 11, 12. In the light of just these few citations, the statement of Rawlinson¹ that "the most remarkable thing about the New Testament evidence is the virtual absence of any reference to the 'Servant' passages in the Epistles of S. Paul" is very misleading.

It can be noted here, in a short digression, the possible influence of the Second Adam-Suffering Servant idea upon Paul's self-description as δοῦλος and δούκονος. This association in the mind of Paul was at least one influence that led him, as an apostle of the Second Adam, to describe his own life and work in terms of a servant, or slave, to Him. Such a description indicates the servile relationship of one who is completely given up in obedience to the will of another.² Hence, he is a slave, or bondman, of Jesus Christ. Repeatedly he designates himself and his companions in the ministry as δοῦλος and δούλος.³ Although the realization that Jesus had fulfilled in His life the role of the Servant of God was a part of the pre-Pauline Christology, and although the first preachers spoke of themselves as "slaves" (but to God, Acts 4:29), Paul was the first to stress the self-description "slave of Jesus Christ." It is significant that Paul frequently labelled himself by a word that so sharply described the life of Jesus Christ in his human existence; it is the word used to indicate the depth of humiliation which

¹Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 241.
²In several places the Apostle speaks of the type of allegiance rendered by a slave to a human master, and points out that this is the same degree of service that should be rendered to Christ (cf. Eph. 6:5; I Cor. 7:22). No doubt there was some influence of the idea from the LXX. For example, Ps. 116:16 declares, "O Lord, I am thy bond servant (δοῦλος)." To Paul, Jesus is in the position of Lord, and he considers himself a devoted slave to Him in complete surrender, obedience, and love. Although Paul writes as a prisoner (δέοκτος) in the Ephesian and Philemon letters, there is implied the double sense of being confined to a Roman jail and being captive, or slave, of Jesus Christ. The principal meaning of the phrase δοῦλος Χριστοῦ is that Christians have been "bought with a price" (I Cor. 6:20; 7:23) and, therefore, belong to the Master.

³Rom. 1:1, Ph. 1:1; 4:2; Gal. 1:10; Col. 1:7; 4:7.
Christ voluntarily accepted. The fact of Jesus Christ being Second Adam-Servant had so seized the mind of Paul that he was constrained to adopt a similar role and appellation, which indicated not only a willing imitation of Christ's human life, but an incorporation into that Servant humanity. Indeed, Paul thought of his entire Christian life and ministry in terms of being a slave (σουλος) of Him, who in perfect obedience had taken upon Himself the "form of a slave". So he also urges this role upon Christians in their relationships with one another (cf. Gal. 5:13); and the emphasis that Paul puts upon the degree of service and obedience intrinsic in the word σουλος results from the reflection upon that human life of Jesus in the function of the Servant of God.¹

Paul not only applies the servant prophesies to Jesus, but he also follows the line of 2nd Isaiah and the implications of the teachings of Jesus by presenting the collective interpretation of the servant. In other words, he ascribes to himself, to his fellow laborers in the Gospel, and to all Christians, the duties and experiences of the Servant. Echoing the words of the Servant in Isa. 50:8, Paul applies them to all God's elect (Rom. 8:33 f.; cf. Eph. 6:11 ff. where the believer is equipped with items descriptive of the Servant). So G.A. Smith summarizes:

In these instances, as well as in his constant use of the terms "slave", "servant", and "minister", with their cognates, Paul fulfills the intention of Jesus, who so continually by example, parable, and direct commission enforced the life of His people as a Service to the Lord." Isaiah, II, p. 304.

Paul also uses another term, "servant" (δικονος) to denote his relationship to Christ. The term is not employed so often with Christ as the object as is σουλος. The significant point of interest, however, about this word as used by the Apostle is that it sometimes is associated with a statement, or catalogue, of the hardships and sufferings he has encountered and endured in his missionary labours. His credentials for being a servant of God are presented as a list of

¹The word for יִשְׁיַ in the LXX of 2nd Isaiah is translated by either ποιει or σουλος. In the book of Acts ποιει consistently refers to Christ (except at 4:25) and σουλος refers to an apostle; and in the vocabulary of Pauline writings ποιει is absent, while σουλος abounds.
painful experiences—afflictions, hardships, calamities, beatings, imprisonments, tumults, labors, watching (II Cor. 6:4 ff.). In II Cor. 11:23 ff. he strongly submits that he deserves to be called a servant of Christ by reason of his labors, imprisonments, beatings, lashings, Stonings, etc. Here, therefore, the picture of Jesus, the Second Adam-Suffering Servant, also has obviously had an effect upon him, shaping his interpretation of being a servant of God and his daily ministry of being a servant of Christ. 1

But now to return to the Philippian 2:5 ff. passage, it can be noted that if these verses are to be interpreted in the light of the Second Adam-Suffering Servant, there is a further emphasis upon the real humanity of Jesus Christ. He did not appear in the world as a theophany or a Christophany, but "became a real man just as he was real God." 2 In view of Paul's purpose of urging the virtue of humility upon his Philippian readers, it is logical that he should present that human life of Jesus in which that virtue was perfectly manifested. The passage expressly states ἐν ὑπομνήματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενον and σχήματι εὐρεθέας ὡς ἄνθρωπος, and these two phrases amplify the μορφὴν δούλου which He has taken. If one understands μορφή to mean that which is intrinsic and essential, 3 then the proper meaning of μορφή is applicable to Christ's true humanity as well as to His perfect deity. So A.B. Bruce 4 wrote: "The homousia of Christ's humanity may be regarded as a legitimate inference from Phil. 2:5-9." 5

1Cf. "... whoever would be great among you must be your διάκονος, and whoever would be first among you must be δοῦλος of all. For the Son of man also came not δικαίωσαι ἀλλα δικαίωσαι ἐν πάσητοι, and to give his life as a ransom for many." (Mk. 10:45). 2Briggs, op. cit., p. 183. 3Including and not separate from οὐσία and φύσις, but not identified with either, although it is doubtful if Paul ever thought about such distinctions. Cf. E.H. Gifford, The Incarnation, p. 87. 4A.B. Bruce, The Humiliation of Christ, p. 24. 5Vincent went so far as to say that since the thought of Christ's humiliation was uppermost in Paul's mind, His being in the μορφή of a bondservant was probably first in order of thought, so that the μορφὴ Θεοῦ can, therefore, be
Taking the ἐνθρώπως he became "in the likeness of men." The plural ἄνθρωπως is used here to indicate that the humanity of Jesus Christ represented that which is common to all men by nature. He came in the ὁμοίωμα of men, that is in the likeness, the figure of men; and σχῆμα εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος he humbled Himself. Σχῆμα is the fashion, outward appearance, everything in a person which comprises the impression that strikes the senses of others. This includes the whole outward manner of life. Thus Gifford (quoting Meyer with approval) writes: "Men saw in Christ a human form, bearing, language, action, mode of life, wants and their satisfaction ... and in general the state and relations of a human being, so that in the entire mode of His appearance He made Himself known and was recognized (εὑρεθεὶς) as a man."¹

E) Phil. 2:5 ff. and the Son of Man. That the Daniel "son of man", along with the Suffering Servant of Isaiah and the Second Adam concepts, is a part of the union of ideas lying behind Phil. 2:6-11 is indicated by the following grammatical point. The verse at Phil. 2:8 provides the only place in the Greek Bible where εὑρεθεὶς is followed by ὡς (εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος). Ordinarily Greek idiom would simply have the nominative after the passive ἑπίσκω. But here there is a ὡς, and it is connected with ἄνθρωπος; and this is the phrase found in the LXX version of the Aramaic Daniel 7:13, which is a translation of מַעְתָּחֵן יְדִיבָה ("one like a son of man"). This would lead one to suppose that the Daniel Son of Man is a part of the background of the Philippian passage. A careful study of the vocabulary of this section, says Clarke, "shows an affinity to the LXX of 2 Isaiah and Daniel, and that of the early chapters of Acts."²

Of course, the note of exaltation and universal dominion upon which the

considered rather like a rhetorical antithesis to μορφήν δοῦλου. M. Vincent, op. cit., p. 30. This, however, is a precarious interpretation.

¹Gifford, op. cit., p. 89.
Philotian passage concludes finds its parallel in the universal dominion and everlasting kingdom accorded to the saints of the Most High in Daniel 7, as well as the exaltation of the Servant. It is in striking agreement with the Danielic "one like a son of man," the Isaianic Servant, and with Jesus' self-interpretation of the Son of Man that this triumph is to be attained through suffering. In the Synoptics Jesus accepted the title "Son of God" but claimed the title "Son of Man"; and in the Philiiian passage Paul shows something of the same position when he says that Christ "did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, and being born in the likeness of men." In Jesus' self-characterization as Son of Man he united the Isaianic concept of the "man of sorrows," who so identified himself with his sinful nation that he bore its guilt and tragedy as his own, with the Redeemer-Man who is exalted to glory and dominion (Dan. 7:13 f.). "The Son of Man is thus revealed in his solidarity with men, as their friend, helper, benefactor, vicarious substitute, and intercessor: so he becomes their Saviour."\(^1\) This same idea is expressed in the Philippiiman passage describing the Second Adam who was found in human form, was humble and obedient even to the death on a cross, and whom God has highly exalted. Moreover, it includes the idea of a "messianic sovereignty of the Son of Man over a restored dominion of Adam."\(^2\)

The conclusion, therefore, that one draws from this discussion of the Philippiian section is that Paul here shows his conception of the humanity of Jesus Christ in terms of the Second Adam, behind which lies the Suffering Servant-Son of Man. The chief point of the passage is not to describe how the Eternal Christ became man, but to emphasize the astounding fact that He did, and then to show how that human life was poured out in humble, obedient service, thereby attaining its glorious fulfillment. Inasmuch as the three above ideas are basic to Pauline


Christology, it may safely be assumed that they can be thought of in combination with each other in expressing the Apostle's conception of the humanity of Jesus Christ.
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THE SECOND ADAM WITHIN THE REALM OF HUMANITY

Up to now two major points have been dealt with in this study: 1) the humanity of Jesus Christ from a historical point of view, and 2) the humanity of Jesus Christ in terms of the Second Adam—Suffering Servant—Son of Man concept. Now in Chapters four and five the concern will be with the humanity of Jesus Christ, or the Second Adam, as an individual man from a theological point of view.

I. THE ENTRANCE AND PURPOSE OF THE SECOND ADAM

A) The Humanity of Jesus Christ as a Man. In thinking of Jesus Christ in terms of the Second Adam, Paul thought of His humanity as both Man and a man, i.e. inclusively (or corporately) and individually. Although Paul’s conception of the human historical Jesus was conditioned by the fact that he constantly thought of Him as risen and exalted, the numerous references to the life, character, and teachings of Jesus Christ demand a single, historical person, who was born into the human race, lived, died, and rose from the dead. Unless Paul could have conceived Him as such a genuine historical personage, his gospel would have been bankrupt; he would have had no unique message for the Gentiles and no valid reconciliation and salvation to proclaim.

Theologians later than Paul developed distinctions in describing the person of Jesus Christ which were not real concerns to the Apostle. Paul had not, for example, worked out a clear system that posited a "human nature" which was united with a "divine nature", nor did he try to explain how His humanity was assumed by the pre-existent Son, nor did he hold that He possessed an "impersonal humanity". The last mentioned ambiguous concept that Christ's human nature was impersonal (ἀνυπόστατος) was initiated by Cyril of Alexandria (376-444), who held that the Logos had not assumed the person of a man, but rather Man, i.e., the common qualities and attributes of human nature, but not personality. This certainly could not have been an adequate picture of Paul's conception of Christ's humanity because his concrete thought
would not permit the wedding of two inherently contradictory ideas -- "impersonal" and "humanity."¹ To Paul He was not only Man; He was a man, one who had been born of the seed of David according to the flesh.²

One of the distinctive factors of modern Christological thought, as clearly pointed out by D. M. Baillie,³ is the marked end of docetism. Even though there has been a powerful reaction against the "Jesus of History" movement, the humanity of Jesus Christ is emphatically upheld on all sides. Moreover, this humanity is thought of not merely as Man but as a man by almost every theologian, regardless of his school, in accordance with the clear teaching of the New Testament. As Hoskyns and Davey wrote, "Whatever else He may be, He is a man."⁴ Even the current Dialectical-Protestant continental school, so strongly in revolt against the "Jesus of History" school, has in Barth one who holds that the Word became not only Man, but a man.⁵ This school also has in Brunner one who says that the Pauline description "born of a woman" and "born of the seed of David according to the flesh" not only reveals the Apostle's apparent unconcern about the Virgin Birth but also denotes "the perfectly natural character of His human development."⁶

¹ At one point R. C. Moberly appropriately wrote, "Human nature which is not personal is not human nature." Atonement and Personality, p. 93.
² It is interesting to note that in his two Thessalonian epistles the Apostle comes close to presenting the Lord Jesus Christ solely in a historical and resurrection light. There is no direct reference to an eternal relation to God (unless 1:1 conveys such a relation), no pre-existence, no incarnation. He is presented simply as the one who was crucified, raised, and who will come again.
³ Baillie, op. cit., pp. 11ff.
⁴ Hoskyns and Davey, op. cit., p. 209.
⁶ Brunner, The Mediator, p. 361, cf. 363. Yet Brunner is one who tends to express the ancient idea of "anhypostasia" in modern terms. It is justly pointed out by D. M. Baillie that all such attempts lead to a precarious restatement of the Apollinarian heresy. He summarizes his critique of "anhypostasia" by calling attention to the fact that human personality is never more complete than when it is completely dependent upon God: "That is how human personality comes into its own. This is not impersonal humanity, but humanity at its most personal. The only anhypostasia in the case is not a denial of personality, but a denial of independence, and it seems to me to be misleading to call it by that name." Baillie, op. cit., p. 93.
In the New Testament the word \( \text{ἀνήρ} \) can usually be distinguished from \( \text{ἀνθρώπος} \) not only in that it indicates a person of the male sex, but also in that it denotes individuality rather than common nature. This word is sometimes used to indicate the individual, historical humanity of Jesus. John the Baptist exclaims, "This is he of whom I said, 'After me comes a man (\( \text{ἀνήρ} \) ) who ranks before me." (Jn. 1:30). In Peter's Pentecostal sermon he states, "Jesus of Nazareth, a man (\( \text{ἀνήρ} \) ) attested to you by God with mighty works" (Acts 2:22). Paul is reported in his sermon at Athens to have said that God intends to "judge the world in righteousness by a man (\( \text{ἐν ἀνδρὶ} \) ) whom he has appointed . . ." (Acts 17:31). In the Pauline literature, however, Jesus Christ as an individual is never referred to as \( \text{ἀνήρ} \) because that word is reserved almost exclusively by the Apostle to mean a male, a husband, or a grown man as distinguished from a lad (Cf. I. Cor. 13:11). Whenever "man" appears in reference to Jesus Christ it is always \( \text{ἀνθρώπος} \). The phrase \( \text{ἀνθρώπου Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ} \) of Rom. 5:15 is an expression meaning Jesus Christ in His humanity. (Cf. \( \text{ἀνθρώπος} \) \( \text{Χριστός} \) \( \text{Ἰησοῦς} \) of I Tim. 2:5). Since the proper word for "humanity" (\( \text{ἀνθρώπότης} \)) was not used until about 130 years after Paul's writing, it appears that Paul had no other way of expressing Christ's humanity. Thus one cannot conclude that since Paul did not use \( \text{ἀνήρ} \) in relation to Christ he was unconcerned about Him as an individual man. On the contrary, in the Adam-Christ contrast of Rom. 5:12-21 Paul stresses the antithesis between the one Adam and the effect of his sin, and the "one man Jesus Christ" (\( \text{τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ} \)). In four places in the passage he specifically uses the designation \( \text{ἐνὸς} \) (vv. 15, 17, 18, 19), and in three of these places the article is prefixed, so that the emphasis is upon the one man. This could scarcely be more explicit. The primary purpose of the Apostle in this statement is to demonstrate that just as one was

1 In the phrase \( \text{εἰς ἀνδρὰ} \) \( \text{Τέλειον} \) (Eph. 4:13) there is a use of \( \text{ἀνήρ} \), but here the reference is to the mature manhood, the full-grown Man in Christ in a corporate sense.

2 Westcott and Hort, New Testament in Greek, p. 15 (in lexicon). Although Paul uses \( \text{ἀνθρώπινος} \) four times, he never applies it to Jesus Christ.
the author of sin and death so also one was the author of righteousness and life for humanity. Just as there is an intimate relation between unregenerate humanity and Adam its natural head, so also there is an intimate relation between the new spiritual humanity and Jesus Christ, its Head. Therefore, there is a sound basis for the English translation of I Cor. 15:21-22 (which can be considered as a brief summary of Rom. 5:12-19), "For as by a man came death, by a man has come also the resurrection ... For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive." With the two individuals there are united their respective races of humanity.

B) The Entrance of the Second Adam into Human Life. Paul declares that He was "born of the seed of David according to the flesh" (τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυίδ κατὰ σῶμα —Rom. 1:3). Here Paul's expression for the birth of Jesus is τοῦ γενομένου, from the verb meaning "to become", or "to come into existence"; whereas ordinarily the verb to indicate birth as the result of natural human process is γεννάω. But whenever Paul is referring to the entrance of Christ into human nature, he employs a form of γίνομαι as in Rom. 1:3; Gal. 3:24; 4:4; Phil. 2:7. In seeming contrast, the birth stories of Matthew and Luke employ verbs which indicate specifically a human birth by a woman. Matthew uses γενναθέντος (from γεννάω—2:1), and Luke uses ἔθεκε (from τίκτω —2:7), meaning to "bring forth, bear, produce". Can it be said, therefore, that Paul did not think of the birth of Jesus in the usual way from a woman? This seems not the case since he specifically says in Gal. 4:4 γενομένον ἐκ γυναικός. Furthermore, it is instructive to note that in the LXX the verb γίνομαι sometimes was used in the sense of γεννάω, where in several instances it translates ἐγένετο, "to bear, bring forth, to be born" (e.g., Gen. 17:17; 21:9; Deut. 23:8).

According to Paul, then, Jesus entered humanity by a human birth in the line of David. He is from the σπέρμα of David; that is, of his offspring, race, and progeny, and David was thought to be in the line of Abraham (and of Adam, according to Luke). As such, then, Jesus was identified with the humanity of the distant ancestry of His race. He entered into the common natural humanity in which all
of mankind is by nature limited. Paul had no doubt of this Davidic line of Jesus. The fact that he does not have any such doubts is actually one of the best proofs for it, since he, as a former persecutor of the Christians, would have been acquainted with any arguments which might have been used by the Jews in an attempt to refute Jesus' Davidic descent and to discredit His Messiahship. There is not, however, any attempt in New Testament writings to confute such Jewish attacks, which effort would have been necessary had there actually been such charge against the Davidic descent of Jesus. In addition to the specific reference in Rom. 1:3, Paul implies the same by stating that Christ is the offspring (οὐρανός) of Abraham (Gal. 3:16) and that Christ is of the race of patriarchs according to the flesh (Rom. 9:5). Such a position, of course, is in agreement with the common Jewish belief, which Paul shared, that the Messiah would be of Davidic lineage; and such a belief certainly involves a humanity of the Messiah. It is significant that in the Christological statement at the very beginning of Romans, Paul's most important epistle, Christ is described not only as κατὰ πνεῦμα, but also as of the seed of David κατὰ σάρκα. By His inclusion of the latter phrase, in immediate connection with the truth that He is the Son of God, the Apostle indicates his desire, as Bruce says:

... to affirm the reality of Christ's humanity, not in an abstract form, but as a concrete, definitely-qualified thing: Jesus was a real Man; a Jew with Hebrew blood in His veins, and possessing Hebrew idiosyncracies, physical and mental; a descendant of David with hereditary qualities inherited from a long line of ancestors running back to the hero-king.

But was the seed of David through Joseph or Mary? Some have asserted that the Davidic lineage must have passed through Mary; otherwise such descent would have depended upon the procreation of Joseph, and this, therefore, would nullify the virgin birth. Thus Irenaeus, like Ignatius, stated that Jesus "was of the seed

1 Cf. Dalman, op. cit., pp. 320 f.
2 Cf. II Tim. 2:8, "Remember Jesus Christ . . . έΚ οὐρανοῦ Δαβίδ as preached in my gospel."
3 A.B. Bruce, St. Paul's Conception of Christianity, p. 334.
of David according to his birth from Mary, and Weidner asserted that since Paul said that Christ was "born of the seed of David according to the flesh," we, therefore, have a right to infer that Mary was descended from David.

At the other extreme were those who said that the body of flesh that Jesus occupied, according to Paul, was produced by the human procreation of an earthly father. Also, Beyschlag pointed out that there is no Scriptural tradition that He was Davidic from Mary, and, furthermore, such a thought is contrary to the Hebrew view of the descent being reckoned through the father, not the mother. Dalman further pointed out that even though the case of the birth of Jesus was not anticipated by Jewish Law, the child must have been thought of as bestowed upon the house of Joseph, since, by the Law of Israel, even a betrothed held the same status as a wife. In any case, the record shows that Paul nowhere mentioned Mary as being the mother of Jesus; he only says ἐκ γυναικὸς (anarthrous, Gal. 4:4). Being of a strict Hebrew background, it is very doubtful that he would have thought of a Davidic descent through the mother. Above all, it is unlikely that his mind ever dwelt at length upon the specific process by which Christ entered the human realm. The vastly more important truth to Paul was that He did, that He fulfilled the Messianic

---


2 R.F. Weidner, Biblical Theology of the New Testament, II, p. 128. This idea that Mary belonged to the stem of David was a theory that enjoyed some popularity in the second century. The "Acts of Paul," written by an orthodox Asian presbyter about 160 A.D. in honor of Paul, relates how the Apostle wrote to the Corinthians that "our Lord Jesus Christ was born of Mary which is of the seed of David according to the flesh." Cf. M.R. James, The Apocryphal New Testament, pp. 289f. Even as early as the end of the first century Mary is called in the "Ascension of Isaiah" (11:2) "a woman of the family of David." For additional sources for this belief see O. Cullmann, Earliest Christian Confessions, p. 56 n1.

3 E.g. O. Pfleiderer, Paulinism, p. 151, and Primitive Christianity, I, p. 324.

4 W. Beyschlag, New Testament Theology, p. 67. Contra Stevens, op.cit., p. 331. The precarious evidence that has been advanced to point to a possible Davidic descent of Mary is Lk. 1:32, where it is announced to the virgin Mary that her son will be given "the throne of his father David," and in Lk. 3:23ff. when the genealogy is interpreted as being through his mother.

5 Dalman, op.cit., p. 320.

prophecy, including that of Davidic descent in a most unique way in His earthly life of humiliation and resultant glory.

If Paul never mentioned Mary as being the mother of Jesus, likewise he never definitely mentioned a Virgin Birth. Some argue that the silence of Paul on this matter is not to deny his adherence to such a belief, on the basis of his insistence upon the sinlessness of Jesus. They point out that such a doctrine would have found a logical place in his system because of the emphasis upon His holiness. On the other hand, it is quite possible that the Apostle was never seriously concerned with reconciling sinlessness with a natural birth. Several reasons have been advanced in an attempt to explain the silence of Paul on the subject of the Virgin Birth: 1) It is possible that it finds no place in the Pauline literature (as well as the Johannine) because of the difficulty involved in reconciling it with the concept of the pre-existence of Christ of which both insist; 2) he knew of it but attached little importance to it as evidenced by the stress upon the fact that Christ was "born of woman", thus sharing a common element with all other human beings, and that His origin was from the "seed of David"; 3) he did not know of the idea. This last explanation, having the strong support of Vincent Taylor, seems to be the simple key to the silence. The public tradition of the Virgin Birth became current after the writing of Paul, but sometime shortly before the composition of Luke's gospel. This accounts for the lack of references to it in the Pauline corpus.

Although the Virgin Birth was apparently unknown to Paul, just as it was unknown to Mark and "Q", several passages have been cited by those who hold the contrary opinion. A closer examination of these verses, however, reveals their extremely precarious support for the argument. The Pauline statements sometimes adduced in favor of his belief in the Virgin Birth include Gal. 4:4; Rom. 1:3; 5:12-19; I Cor. 15:47; Phil. 2:7; and Rom. 8:3.

---

1 Cf. Mackintosh, Doctrine of the Person of Christ, pp. 527ff.

2 Taylor, The Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth, pp. 3-7.
1) In Gal. 4:4, however, the "born of woman" phrase is one that is sometimes employed in the Bible to indicate a natural human birth (cf. Job. 14:1; 15:14; and also Mt. 11:11; Lk. 7:28). In addition, one must remember that the chief purpose of the context of Gal. 4:4 is to state the fact that it was God's intention to redeem men from the Law. In order to accomplish this, it was necessary for Christ to be identified with those he came to deliver; hence, He must be "born of woman", and "under the law". In other words, His humanity is real; He is a child of the Hebrew race. If Paul knew of the Virgin Birth tradition he could easily have made his vocabulary fit the case because he was fully aware of the difference between a woman (γυνη) and a virgin (παρθένος, cf. I Cor. 7:34).

As noted in the initial paragraph of this section Paul employs here the word γενόμενος instead of γεννητός, the proper word denoting "born". Since this is also the case in Rom. 1:3 and Phil. 2:7, some scholars have assumed that in this peculiar expression lies a signification of a unique birth. Several points, however, are damaging to such an assumption: a) As already noted, the verb γίνομαι was sometimes used in the sense of γεννάω in the LXX, where in several cases it translates γεννάω; b) according to the papyri γίνομαι and γενόμενος were in common usage to mean "to come into being, be born"; and c) in other New Testament places where the verb is located (e.g. Jn. 8:58 πριν ἀρπαξαί γενέσθαι) the same line of interpretation would also logically attribute something extraordinary to the birth of Abraham!

2) In Rom. 1:3, the antithesis in the Κατὰ σώρκα - Κατὰ πνεῦμα makes it difficult to think that Paul had in mind there the Virgin Birth, especially in view of the instance whereby the Divine Sonship is particularly connected with the Κατὰ πνεῦμα aspect of Jesus Christ.

---


3) In the passages supplying the Adam-Christ typology, Gore says, "What we can maintain with great boldness, is that St. Paul's conception of the Second Adam postulates also His miraculous birth."¹ It is difficult, however, to see how the Rom. 5:12 ff. passage reveals such a positive trace in Paul's mind of a Virgin Birth. The burden of the section is to contrast the effects of two persons, who are both indicated as the "one man" (vv. 12, 15). In the similar I Corinthian passage his reference is not to the Incarnation but to the Resurrection.

4) In the passages where He is spoken of as being "in the likeness of men" (Phil. 2:7), or "in the likeness of sinful flesh" (Rom. 8:3), the difference between His humanity and the common humanity is not with reference to mode of origin but to sinlessness and moral perfection. If Paul had known of the Virgin Birth, he would have expressed himself differently when dealing with the Incarnation.²

The conclusion, therefore, is that on a historical basis it is very doubtful that Paul had any such knowledge. If, as many think, he assumed a Virgin Birth of Jesus, this interpretation must be recognized as speculative; and, furthermore, it must be noted that the Apostle never defended such a view.³

C) The Purpose of Christ's Humanity According to Paul. If the Second Adam had an individual life in humanity, entering it, according to Paul, by a natural birth and being descended from David according to the flesh, one is at once confronted

¹ Charles Gore, Dissertations on Subjects Connected with the Incarnation, pp. 11, 65-67; cf. G.H. Box, The Virgin Birth of Jesus, p. 150.

² Taylor, The Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth, p. 6 for this and above points. Emil Brunner is one of the strongest exponents today of the view that Paul had no knowledge of the idea of the Virgin Birth. He points out that this doctrine does not form a part of the kerygma of the New Testament Church for which there is documentary evidence. Cf. The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption, pp. 329, 354; and earlier, The Mediator, pp. 323 ff.

³ But even if it be conceded that Paul might have had such knowledge, it may be, as Brunner points out, that he emphasized that God's Son came "in the likeness of human flesh" as a specific correction to the idea of the Virgin Birth; for the fact of the Incarnation is that He assumed that "likeness of sinful flesh", but was not infected by sin Himself. The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption p. 357.
with the necessity of endeavoring to understand how Paul thought of that humanity.

In several places he definitely associates it with flesh (σάρξ). In addition to being descended from the Hebrew race, and in particular from David according to the flesh (Rom. 1:3; 9:5), by His Incarnation He came in the "likeness of sinful flesh" (Rom. 8:3); He abolished in His flesh the restraints of the law that divided man from man (Eph. 2:15); and He accomplished the reconciliation through His body of flesh by death (Col. 1:22). But primarily the Apostle thinks of this humanity, the individual life of the Second Adam in the body of flesh, in terms of a redemptive function and purpose. The fact that Christ accomplished His work of redemption in the flesh is the basic postulate of Paul's gospel. The purpose of God sending forth His Son born of a woman, born under the Law, was "to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive adoption as sons" (Gal. 4:5). God sent His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh for the purpose of condemning sin in the flesh, thus delivering humanity from its bondage (Rom. 8:3); and this redemption is the deliverance from the powers of the present world order (Gal. 1:4) and from the situation of estrangement from God (Rom. 5:8; Eph. 2:12; cf. I Tim. 1:15; I Jn. 4:10).

The Adam-Christ typology in the Roman epistle, stressing the superior effectiveness of the Second Adam in achieving righteousness and life for humanity, provided the framework for the Pauline doctrine of redemption. Adam and Christ are both representative and heads of the race; Adam is head of the race in relation to its sinfulness, and Christ is head of the race in relation to its redemption. Basic to this redemptive function of the Second Adam is the human life of Jesus. Therefore, both the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles fit the life of Jesus into redemptive history, and with this purpose in mind neither source introduces any element contradictory to the intention of the historical Jesus. As Cullmann says:

The teaching and work of the historical Jesus can be understood at all only on the basis of his consciousness that he was fulfilling the role of the Suffering Servant of God as well as the returning Son of Man. In the execution and combining of these two tasks, as Suffering Servant of God and as Son of Man returning upon the clouds, Jesus carries out God's redemptive plan, which is presented to us as redemptive history.

---

1 Cullmann, Christ and Time, p. 111. The redemptive purpose of Christ, com-
Paul's explanation of redemption is impossible apart from His acquaintance with some facts of the Second Adam's earthly life. The Man of Nazareth was of great importance to the Apostle Paul, not only because of His supreme example and authority in the sphere of conduct, but also because He "embodied the conditions by which alone redemption could be accomplished." 1

The Apostle Paul, in accord with the Primitive Church Christology, emphasized the saving work of Jesus, and from this emphasis the person of Jesus Christ was principally described. Centuries later Melancthon took up this point of view and expressed it memorably in that well-known statement, "Hoc est Christum cognoscere, beneficia ejus cognoscere." For Paul, the work of redemption depended upon Christ's humanity, and, therefore, phrases descriptive of the redeeming function of the Second Adam involve humanity (δι' ἰδρωπου, τοῦ ἐνὸς ἰδρωπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ - I Cor. 15:21, 47; Rom. 5:15). Indeed, DuBose even went so far as to say, "The whole work of Jesus Christ in humanity must be expressible whether or no we may succeed in expressing it, in terms of distinctively human activity and experience, human effort and attainment, human predestination and realization." 2 While it is certainly necessary to hold that redemption is the work of God since "God was in Christ" and the Redeemer is one of the Trinity, it is through His human nature, not directly through His divine nature, that human redemption is accomplished by the God-Man. If redemption had been wrought only by Christ as God, then there would have been no point to the Incarnation because it could then have been attributed directly to the Godhead without any reference to Him who became flesh. But by His Incarnation, Christ is capable of combining divinity and humanity in a personal unity which permits His

acts to be simultaneously the acts of God and the acts of man. Christ, therefore, acts uniquely as God-Man.¹

Paul stresses the literal reality of the manhood of Christ, the Second Adam, as the instrument of redemption. Although there may be considerable doubt as to whether the Apostle ever saw Jesus in the flesh, there can be no doubt that His real humanity — His actual participation in flesh and blood — is indispensable to the Apostle's concept of redemption. Paul's thought was later classically expressed by that famous dictum of Gregory Nazianzen, ἵνα γὰρ ἀπρόσληπτον ἰθεράπευτον.² His participation in human life provided the necessary identification of the Redeemer with the race of mankind. His purpose is to redeem. Not only must He belong to humanity, but He must place Himself under the powers that dominate it. He must subject Himself to the objective power of unseen evil forces, Law, Sin, and Death, sharing in all human experiences except that of sinning.³

The Christology of the Apostle invariably passed over into Soteriology.⁴ Christ entered the living organism of "sinful flesh" in order to redeem it, and this redemption began with the Incarnation when He became a real man under the reign of alien powers, and was fully accomplished by His Death and Resurrection. It is a mistake, therefore, to interpret the emphasis Paul placed upon the Risen Christ as setting aside any knowledge or interest in the historic Christ. Only so far as the Second Adam, the man from heaven, the life-giving Spirit, is identified with the man Christ Jesus does the Second Adam have meaning for the Apostle.⁵

³ "He took upon Him flesh" was an early Christian expression, and this idea is basic to the assertion of the Te Deum, "Thou tookest upon Thee man, to deliver him." J. Armitage Robinson, St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 64.
⁵ Sabatier, op. cit., p. 303; Scott, Christianity According to Paul, p. 13.
the Incarnation means both the completion and the redemption of humanity. Therefore, between the Incarnation and the Redemption there existed the closest relation. Since the Son of God became one with humanity becoming Incarnate, He, as Second Adam, the mediator in whom "dwell the whole fullness of deity bodily" (Col. 2:9) was able to save humanity. The Son of God, consubstantial with the Father, became man that by His partaking of human nature He might make the sons of Adam participants of the divine nature and of eternal life. In Him humanity was redeemed and made sons and daughters of God. In the person of the Second Adam humanity was made right with God, being redeemed from sin and triumphant over death; and this was accomplished in the individual human life of the Second Adam in complete obedience to the will of God, even to the uttermost obedience entailing death (Phil. 2:8). As Perfect, Sinless, Obedient Man, the Second Adam has redemptive efficacy for humanity.  

It is the redemption motif which is central in the mission of the Isaianic Servant of the Lord, and it is this motif which predominates in Jesus' self-characterization as Son of Man. Therefore, it is entirely logical to expect Paul's Second Adam, being a development of Jesus' Son of Man, to manifest uppermost this same redemptive purpose. Such is precisely the case regarding Paul's conception of the humanity of Jesus Christ.  

---

1 W. L. Knox finds in the Hellenistic divine-hero redeemer (e.g. Heracles) a parallel to the Christology of Paul and the author of Hebrews. According to Knox, this Hellenistic concept permitted these two New Testament writers to insist upon the absolute humanity of Jesus and to proclaim his victory over sin and death, not simply as a divine being but as one who attained it by a life of suffering and death. Even though something of a parallel may exist, Knox wisely concedes that Paul and the Auctor ad Hebraeos were not consciously adopting a pagan form of thought. "The 'Divine-Hero' Christology in the New Testament," Harvard Theological Review, Vol. XLI, No. 4 (Oct., 1948), pp. 247-249.

2 As Bruce, St. Paul's Conception of Christianity, p. 329, aptly put it: "His whole earthly experience was a long course of self-humiliation, and the redemption he achieved was a redemption by self-humiliation." Cf. Kennedy, who made the clear observation that "Paul's soteriology is steeped in the thought of Isa. 53." E.T., Vol. 19 (1907-08), p. 395.
II. PAULINE ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE CONDITIONS INTO WHICH THE SECOND ADAM CAME

Since Christ, according to Paul, took upon Himself human flesh for the purpose of redemption, it will be necessary to examine Paul's anthropology to the extent of grasping what the Apostle meant by the term \( \sigma\alpha\rho\sigma\varsigma \), and what the relation was between the Second Adam and \( \sigma\alpha\rho\sigma\varsigma \).

A. PAULINE ANTHROPOLOGY

1) The Old Testament Background. To understand Paul's view of man one must take a further backward step to see some of the elements in the Old Testament view of man, out of which stems the Pauline anthropology. The chief interest for this study is in the idea of "body" and "flesh" in the Old Testament. Although the Hebrew \( \pi\tau\omicron\sigma\varsigma \) is a word for "body", and occasionally refers to a living body (cf. Ezek. 1:11; Gen. 47:18; Neh. 9:37), it is generally used for a dead body, a corpse. So it cannot be said that this word corresponds to the Greek \( \sigma\omega\mu\alpha\). Actually, Hebrew has no term for "body" which bears an equivalent sense as does the Greek \( \sigma\omega\mu\alpha\). The LXX uses \( \sigma\omega\mu\alpha\) to translate 11 different Hebrew words, but the significant fact is that the word which is rendered most frequently by \( \sigma\omega\mu\alpha\) is \( \gamma\psi\tau\omicron\varsigma \), "flesh". This same word is predominantly rendered by \( \sigma\alpha\rho\sigma\varsigma \) in the LXX. This observation enables one to see that the terms \( \sigma\alpha\rho\sigma\varsigma \) and \( \sigma\omega\mu\alpha\) in the Pauline anthropology stem from the

According to the Old Testament the various parts of human nature are the following: 1) Dust ( \( \gamma\tau\omicron\gamma\varepsilon \)), which is the material part from the ground (Gen. 2:7; Job 34:15; Ps. 104:29; Ecc. 3:20; 12:7); 2) Breath or Spirit ( \( \dot\pi\dot\eta\gamma\nu\varepsilon\dot\omicron\varsigma \) or \( \dot\eta\dot\eta\gamma\nu\varepsilon\dot\omicron\varsigma \)), which is the spiritual part by itself (Prov. 20:27; Num. 16:22; Isa. 57:15; passim); 3) Dust united to spirit becomes flesh ( \( \gamma\psi\tau\omicron\gamma\varepsilon \)), which can be described as "living or ensouled matter"; 4) Flesh united to spirit becomes soul ( \( \psi\tau\omicron\gamma\varepsilon \)), which can be termed "incarnate spirit." The spirit and soul of man are not two distinct things but rather the same thing under different aspects. While spirit indicates the immaterial element in man -- life, energy, vital power, and that which responds to the influences of God -- soul also denotes the whole immaterial part of man (as does the spirit), but to the soul ( \( \psi\tau\omicron\gamma\varepsilon \) ) belongs the personality of the individual. It is the bearer of individual personality, but it is modified spirit. While "spirit" suggests something "objective and impersonal", soul suggests something "reflexive and individual." A.B. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, pp. 200-203; cf. J.A.T. Robinson, In the End, God ..., p. 85.
common Hebrew יָם. "Flesh", therefore, is the key word around which the Hebrew concept of the human body is gathered.

What then are the uses of "flesh" ( יָם ) in the Old Testament? At least four chief meanings can be noted as follows:

1) It denotes the muscular substance that clothes the skeleton, yet often is distinguished from skin, blood, and bones (cf. Lev. 13:39, 43; Ezek. 39:17; Isa. 22:13; Gen. 2:23; Job 2:5; 10:11). Since the flesh is the most outstanding part of the living creature, containing the blood and covering the bones, it came to be thought of as the whole of the living creature (e.g. Job 10:4).

2) The above idea led to the concept that sensuous creatures, particularly those of the human race, are designated "all flesh"; and this expression indicates more than just the flesh on the body or the whole body considered from the standpoint of the flesh. This designation is usually found where there is some kind of antithesis between God and man. Deut. 5:26 reads, "For who is there of all flesh, that has heard the voice of the living God speaking out of the midst of fire, as we have, and has still lived?" Likewise, Isa. 40:6-8 has, "all flesh is grass . . . the grass withers . . . but the word of our God will stand for ever" (cf. Gen. 6:12; Isa. 49:26; 66:23; Jer. 32:27). "All flesh", therefore, signifies living creatures in their weakness and transitoriness in contrast to the power of God. Similarly, Jeremiah proclaims the word of God, "Behold, I am the Lord, the God of all flesh; is anything too hard for me?" (32:27). "All flesh" denotes the whole of humanity which by its flesh composition is weak and perishable. (Cf. Psalm 78:39).

4) Although there are instances where physical and moral weakness are spoken

---

† An aid to understanding this use of "all flesh" can be derived from another passage, Isa. 31:5: "The Egyptians are men, and not God; and their horses are flesh, and not spirit." The point of this statement is not to make a distinction between flesh and spirit in the horses, but to indicate their weakness in comparison to the power of the spirit. This interpretation is verified in the previous verse: "Woe to those who go down to Egypt for help and rely on horses, who trust in chariots because they are many and in horsemen because they are very strong, but look not to the Holy One of Israel or consult the Lord!" With Isaiah, the point is the question of where the real strength lies. (Cf. the use of παραγενεστης in Jn. 17:2).
of in the same context (e.g. Job 14:1-4; 4:17-19), there is no indication that man's moral weakness is simply the result of his physical nature. The flesh, in itself, is not considered sinful. If such were the case then one must explain how the writer of Gen. 1:31 was able to say of God after His creative work that He "saw everything that he had made, and behold, it was very good," and also how flesh could be offered in sacrifice to God. It must be recognized, however, that although the Old Testament does not conceive of the flesh as being inherently sinful, it does carry the connotation that sin actually accompanies flesh (e.g. Gen. 6:12-13).¹

2) Differences Between Hebrew and Greek Anthropology. The Hebrew expression about the body in terms of יָם יִשְׂרָאֵל as indicated above is often in contrast to the Greek ideas which bear such an influence upon modern thought. At least four significant differences can be noted:²

1) According to Greek thought, a distinction was made between the body and the parts that compose it. This distinction was not observed by the Hebrews, for they thought of יָם יִשְׂרָאֵל as the whole of the living creature, man or animal, as existing in a corporeal form.

2) Closely related to the first distinction was the Greek recognition of the part of a body as being clearly discerned from the whole, the one set apart from the many. By contrast, the Hebrews freely conceived of almost any one of about 80 parts of the body as capable of representing the whole of the parts. This was one aspect of a basic Hebrew tendency to an interchange or oscillation between the One and the Many. There was no specific Hebrew word for the aggregate of the parts of the body; a part consistently represented what this word would indicate.

3) In sharp contrast to the Greek idea that the soul is imprisoned in the body and reached its fulfillment by being liberated from the body, stands the Hebrew


² Cf. John A. T. Robinson, The Body, pp. 11-16, for these contrasts.
oblivion to such a distinction between body and soul. There was in Greek thought, stemming from Plato, a dualistic view of human nature which conceived of the body as being inherently evil, and, therefore, necessary to shed for the liberation of the soul. Consequently, death was generally accepted as being a separation of soul from body. This led to a body-less view of immortality which was adopted by Philo. In pure Hebrew thought, however, there was no thought of the personality as being essentially soul and yearning for liberation from the body; nor was there any concept which specifically associated the immortality of the soul and the mortality of the flesh. On the contrary, "The Hebrew idea of personality is that of an animated body, not (like the Greek) that of an incarnated soul"; or as Pederson has similarly said, "The body is the soul in its outward form." The soul does not continue after the death of a man, but rather, in accord with the expression of Isa. 53:12, it is poured out to death; it drains out with life.

4) Whereas the Greeks thought of the θεία as designating an individual distinct from the mass, the Hebrews were not concerned to make this distinction. The flesh body was not something that set off one individual from another, but rather was that which united him with other flesh-bodies, thus producing and maintaining a corporate personality. Accordingly, the term "all flesh", as noted, connotes the solidarity of humanity in weakness contrasted with the power of God.

The facility of the Hebrew mind in permitting a part to represent a whole

---

1 The following lines from the Phaedo, 66, B,C,D, illustrate this view: "... as long as we have this body, and the soul is contaminated by such an evil we shall never attain completely what we desire, this is, the truth ... the body fills us with passions and desired and fears, and all sorts of fancies and foolishness ... In fact we perceive that, if we are ever to know anything absolutely, we must be free from the body and must behold the actual realities with the eye of the soul alone."

2 Cf. On the Cherubim, 114 ff. "What of it [the soul] after death? But then we who are here joined to the body, creatures of composition and quality, shall be no more, but shall go forward ... to be with the unbodied (ἀσωμάτων), without composition and without quality."


4 J. Pedersen, Israel I and II, p. 171.
in an individual, and that individual in turn being an inseparable part of the solidarity of the race, is baffling to the modern mind because this way of thinking is at variance with influential Greek thought and much of recent individualism. Yet, despite the fact that the Hebrew psychology or physiology is far from being precise, it embraces a fundamental religious doctrine of man whereby he is set in relationship to man and God.

3) The Pauline Use of Σάρξ. Pauline anthropology involves the use of a number of terms -- e.g., ζάρξ, ζώμα, πνεύμα, ψυχή, καρδία, νοῦς, συνείδησις -- but attention here must be limited to ζάρξ since that is the important term with which the Second Adam is associated. What are the meanings of the term ζάρξ as used over 90 times by the Apostle? The following usages can be discerned in the epistles. Some are obviously influenced by the Old Testament concept, and some are new elements added by Paul.

1) Like the Old Testament ζψυ, the basic meaning of the Pauline ζάρξ is the physical, living, muscular tissue common to men and animals; and in this first sense ζάρξ is, no doubt, good because it was created by God. Paul is more particular, however, in confining ζάρξ to human flesh (except in I Cor. 15:39) by using other terms to designate the comparable part of animals.¹

2) Just as the ζψυ represents the whole of the living creature, so also ζάρξ is not the material out of which a ζώμα is made but rather a whole person from the standpoint of his external physical being. So the Apostle accounts for his sufferings "so that the life of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal flesh" II Cor. 4:11). He assures the Colossians that though he is "absent in body" (literally, "in flesh") he is with them in the spirit (2:5). He reminds the Galatians that it was "because of a bodily ailment" (literally, "weakness of flesh") that he first preached the gospel to them (4:13), and that his "condition" (literally, "flesh") was a trial to them (4:14).²

¹ Κρέας is used for animal flesh in Rom. 14:21; I Cor. 8:13.

² Cf. also Gal. 2:20; 6:13; II Cor. 7:5; 12:7; Col. 2:1; Phil. 1:22, 24.
Inasmuch as \( \sigma \rho \kappa \) connotes that which is physical and external it leads naturally to a contrast to that which is internal and spiritual. Yet even with this distinction it needs to be stressed that the \( \sigma \rho \kappa \) is not a part of a man, but the whole man from the standpoint of \( \sigma \rho \kappa \). Accordingly, the term sometimes stands clearly for "man" in a general sense. When Paul declared that he "did not confer with flesh and blood" (Gal 1:16), he means that he did not consult with other people. Not only does \( \sigma \rho \kappa \) stand for man in a general sense, but sometimes it denotes one's personal self. When Paul confesses that "nothing good dwells within me, that is, in my flesh" (Rom. 7:18), he is using \( \sigma \rho \kappa \) simply as an apposition for himself (cf. Eph. 5:29). When the Apostle writes of "completing" what remains of Christ's afflictions "in my flesh" (Col. 1:24), he is principally referring to the enduring of physical wounds, but he also includes all those afflictions, outward and inward, that he experiences as an individual disciple (cf. also II. Cor. 7:5).

3) "Flesh" represents man in weakness, and this also follows the Old Testament aspect of \( \gamma \upsilon \tau \). The "natural limitations" which compel Paul to write in "human terms" is an expression which in the Greek literally reads "weakness of flesh" (Rom. 6:19). "Flesh" is associated with a vacillation and weakness of decision when Paul asks, "Do I make my plans like a worldly man (\( \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \sigma \rho \kappa \alpha \)) ready to say Yes and No at once?" (II Cor. 1:17). It was because of the "weakness of flesh" that he first preached the gospel to the Galatians (4:13). Paul defends his apostleship against accusations of weakness (not sensuality) when he plead, "I beg of you that when I am present I may not have to show boldness with such confidence . . . against some who suspect us of acting in worldly fashion (\( \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \sigma \rho \kappa \alpha \), II Cor. 10:2). The

---

1 Describing true circumcision Paul writes, "he is not a real Jew who is one outwardly, nor is true circumcision something external and physical (\( \epsilon \nu \sigma \rho \kappa \iota \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \omicron \omicron \)). He is a Jew who is one inwardly, and real circumcision is a matter of the heart, spiritual and not literal" (Rom. 2:28). \( \Sigma \rho \kappa \) corresponds to "our outward man" which is in contrast to "our inner" man (II Cor. 4:16). It is contrasted also with the spirit: "You are to deliver this man to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus" (I Cor. 5:5).

2 Cf. "No human being" (literally, "flesh") will be justified by works of the law (Rom. 3:20; cf. Gal. 2:16; I Cor. 1:29; Eph. 6:12).
weakness of the flesh is plainly contrasted with the strength of the Divine when the Apostle replies to his critics in the following verse: "For though we live in the world (ἐν σαρκί) we are not carrying on a worldly war (κατὰ σάρκα), for the weapons of our warfare are not (σαρκίκα) but have divine power to destroy strongholds" (II Cor. 10:3). Paul contrasts the weakness of flesh and blood with the power of the unseen evil spiritual powers (Eph. 6:12). The power of God supercedes the comparable importance of the Law "weakened by the flesh" (Rom. 8:3). What is "sown in weakness" (I Cor. 15:43) is explained as a flesh body to which is contrasted the risen spiritual body. Sinful passions gain control over human life because of the weakness of the flesh (Rom. 7:5; Cf. the use of ἀνθρώπινος in I Cor. 10:13). The weakness of the flesh is not just physical lack of strength, for the Apostle recognizes that there can be a weak conscience (I Cor. 8:7), and that freedom, without love, can be perverted when used as an opportunity for the flesh. Therefore, "flesh" in the sense of being weakness against sin is anything in human nature, physical or otherwise, through which sin can attack. The "flesh" being weak, but not inherently evil, becomes subjugated by alien evil powers; and if man is ever to attain to his intended purpose of life in the spirit of God, the evil that has invaded and occupied

C. Ryder Smith has found the beginning of the New Testament idea of the weakness of the flesh against sin indicated in the words and experience of Jesus. In Gethsemane the Lord charges Peter, "Watch and pray that you may not enter into temptation; the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak" (Mk. 14:38). Nevertheless, Peter, despite his boastful confidence (14:31), could not watch with Him one hour, for he felt no necessity to watch and pray against temptation. But the trial came which tested not so much his capacity to keep awake but his faith (Lk. 22:32). Did not Jesus a few moments earlier Himself experience the same temptation? In the agony of that evening did He not experience most poignantly that His "spirit" was eager to do the will of God, but that His own "flesh" was "weak"? It is interesting to note that the author of Hebrews seems to interpret the Gethsemane experience in this light when he says, "In the days of His flesh, Jesus offered up prayers and supplications, with loud cries, and tears, to Him who was able to save Him from death" (5:7). So it is probable that Jesus' statement in the Garden marks the origin of the New Testament idea of the flesh being weak against sin. Although the writer of Hebrews develops this concept most fully (cf. 4:15), Paul has a concise proclamation that contains the same idea in Rom. 8:3. The trio of ideas -- "flesh", "weakness", and "test" -- go together in the account of Gethsemane, and these three inhere, for example, in what Paul says about his "thorn in the flesh", for this infirmity was a source of weakness and of numerous trials and tests (II Cor. 4:7-11). The Bible Doctrine of Man, pp. 155 f. The similar thought in this matter between Jesus and Paul is another possible indication of the Apostle's knowledge of the words and experiences of the human life of Jesus.
the flesh must be encountered and utterly defeated on its own ground.

Closely allied to the fact of the weakness of the flesh is its perishable, corruptible, mortal nature. Because the perishable does not inherit the imperishable, "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God" (I Cor. 15:50). "For this perishable (φαστιον ) nature must put on the imperishable, and this mortal nature (θανατιον ) must put on immortality" (15:53). Paul cautions that "he who sows to his own flesh will from the flesh reap corruption" (Gal. 6:8). Writing to the Corinthians he says, "Though our outer nature (literally, "our outer man," i.e., "flesh") is wasting away (διαφθειρεται ), our inner nature is being renewed every day" (II Cor. 4:16). In his "mortal (θανατ) flesh" the life of Jesus is made manifest through his suffering (II Cor. 4:11). Therefore, "flesh" can be crucified (Gal. 5:24) and destroyed (I Cor. 5:5).

4) "Flesh" involves a unity or solidarity which includes all of human life on earth, i.e., the total realm of present human existence. The phrase ἐν σαρκί commonly signifies this solidarity of all flesh and is parallel to the Old Testament "all flesh". So Paul describes his present life as one "in flesh" (Gal. 2:20), and although he is speaking about himself in Phil. 1:22, 24, he is referring to his life in the corporate mass of flesh — "life in the flesh", "to remain in the flesh." So also Onesimus is returned to Philemon as a brother "both in the flesh and in the Lord." 1

5) "Flesh" indicates the natural side of man in contrast to his Christian or spiritual side. It is interchangeable with the "old man" in contrast to a life in the Spirit, and it is in close association with sin. As such, flesh has both a passive and an active sense. a) Passively, it is understood to be that natural state in which God has placed man (cf. Gal. 2:20, Phil. 1:24). Being in the flesh,
however, involves being under the dominion of various powers which can cause the situation of being "in the flesh" to be altered from a passive to an active state so that flesh comes to be described as that which holds one captive (Rom. 7:6, cf. v. 5). b) Actively, "flesh" describes man living for himself and in opposition to God. "The mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God; it does not submit to God's law, indeed it cannot; and those who are in the flesh cannot please God" (Rom. 8:7-8). It describes an attitude of mind that is in complete contrast to a mind set on the Spirit (Rom. 8:5), and a life κατὰ σῶμα which is in active opposition to God and His Spirit, being completely under the sway of alien powers. The net result of this life organized κατὰ σῶμα is a hideous inversion of the intended order of the creature's dependence upon the Creator to a disastrous attempt to glory in himself and in his fleshly ways to the neglect of his obligation to God. But in God's wisdom all such attempts are brought to nought, "so that no human being (πᾶς σώμα) might boast in the presence of God" (I Cor. 1:29).

Therefore, Christians are exhorted not to make any "provision for the flesh, to gratify its desires" (Rom. 13:14), and cautioned against a misuse of their freedom (Gal. 5:15). For the end of such a life κατὰ σῶμα is death (Rom. 8:12). Genuine Christians, however, have been delivered from this state of opposition to God; they are no longer under the active force of the flesh. Romans 7:5 looks back to a time when they "were living in the flesh," but now they are "not in the flesh" but are "in the spirit" (8:9). Although Christians cannot, in this life, escape being ἐν σώμα, they can be empowered to renounce a kind of life which is

---

1 Infra pp. 154 ff. for a discussion of these various subjugating powers.  
2 A life κατὰ σῶμα is variously described by Paul. It is an attachment "earthly things" (Phil. 3:19; Col. 3:2), an "anxiety about worldly affairs" (I Cor. 7:33), an obedience to and a serving of one's own "belly" or appetites (Rom. 16:18; Phil. 3:19), the "desires of the flesh" (Gal. 5:16, 17, 24; Eph. 2:3; Rom. 13:14), a loving of this present world (II Tim. 4:10). All attachment to earthly things such as immorality, impurity, passion, evil desire, and covetousness, amounts to nothing less than "idolatry" (Col. 3:5). Another form of idolatry is evidenced by the flesh in serving the rigid, literal law established by men, which indicates a reversion from dependence upon God to a false human self-sufficiency (II Cor. 3:5-6) and a trust in "fleshly wisdom" (II Cor. 1:12). Cf. W. Grundmann, Sin (ed. Coates), p. 76.
Basic to all this is the Pauline position, stemming from the Old Testament, that flesh is not inherently evil by any metaphysical definition (as Hellenistic dualism affirmed). Instead, the evil of the flesh arises out of an ethical attitude that puts trust in that which is human to live *κατὰ σάρκα* and to forsake dependence upon God. It is to permit the whole of life and conduct to be determined by being in the flesh and to be governed in a totalitarian way by evil forces. Ultimately, then, *σάρκς* does not mean just a weakness against sin, but rather connotes the strength of sin *in it*. Paul still avoids saying, however, that flesh is evil *per se*, because he indicates that flesh in this ultimate condition of sin is the result of man's practice of sin. First the flesh is weak, but then through this weakness it becomes sinful, or completely possessed by sin. Although the Hebrews were given the Law and Gentiles had a law written in their hearts (Rom. 2:15) the knowledge of sin that was taught by their respective laws was not matched with an power to withstand the temptation to sin. As a result, these temptations penetrated the weakness of the flesh to the end that the flesh became completely dominated by sin. A man in that condition lives in the passions (*ἔπιθυμίας*) of his flesh, following the desires (*θελήματα*) of flesh and mind (Eph. 2:3). The case is classically stated in Rom. 7:5, where it is implied that the evil passions are the result of sin and entered into the human flesh by the breaking of law. In fact, the whole of Romans 7 and part of chapter 8 describes this power of sin in the flesh. Paul woefully laments that due to this power of sin in his weak flesh he sins despite the fact that he knows the law and has a genuine desire to keep it (Rom. 7:18-20). Reference, again, can be made to Rom. 8:3, where both the ideas of weakness of the flesh and of the power of sin in it can be seen.

"Flesh", in this sense of having the power of sin in it, is not limited to the physical. In the Apostle's catalogue of the "works of the flesh" there appear not only sensual sins, but also sins of attitude and disposition — "jealousy, anger,
selfishness" (Gal. 5:19 ff.). This reference leads directly into one of the most important uses Paul makes of the concept of ἔπιθυμεῖν in this active, ethical sense; namely, that of its being in opposition to the Spirit. The two loci classici for this expression are Gal. 5:16-25 and Rom. 8:5-17. In the first passage there is the distinct contrast drawn between the works and desires of the flesh and the fruit (καρπός, singular) of the Spirit. The sharp contrast is brought out in the statement, "The flesh desires (or "craves", ἔπιθυμεῖν) against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh, for these are opposed to each other" (Gal. 5:17). The relevant point here is that although the verb ἔπιθυμεῖν can signify in the New Testament any kind of desire (good, bad, or amoral), the noun ἔπιθυμία in the New Testament never denotes a good desire, but constantly describes a bad desire. Evidence, then, indicates, that ἔπιθυμία means a bad desire in relation to ethics and is closely related to ἔπιθυμεῖν. In the ESV this is brought out by the rendering "the desires of the flesh are against the Spirit." The point is that once sin has succeeded in dominating the flesh, it goes on, not only to master the desires, but the whole man, including the νοῦς (Col. 2:18; cf. Rom. 1:28).²

The other pertinent passage, Rom. 8:5-17, emphasizes the same idea that permeates most of the 7th and 8th chapters of that epistle. Again, the life κατὰ ἔπιθυμία, the mind set on things of the flesh in hostility to God and ending in death, is contrasted with the life κατὰ πνεῦμα, the mind set on the Spirit in obedience to God and resulting in life and peace. The strength of the power of sin in the flesh is conveyed by such categorical statements as "those who are in the flesh cannot please God" (8:8), and "nothing good dwells within me, that is, in my flesh" (Rom. 7:18). It is interesting to note that Paul's development of this aspect

² Cf. II Cor. 7:1 "... let us cleanse ourselves from every defilement ἁμαρτίας καὶ πνεύματος." Here the terms are used without reference to the Divine Spirit but simply in a non-technical sense. Cf. Strachan, II Corinthians, p. 6.
of the idea of "flesh" is in line with the teaching of Jesus that the things that come out of a man are what defile him, "For from within, out of the heart of man" come evil things (Mk. 7:20-23). 1

Finally, two adjectives derived from σαρκίς - σαρκίνος and σαρκίνος, appear in the Pauline letters. The first can be translated "fleshy", i.e., composed of flesh (cf. II Cor. 3:3; Rom. 7:14). The second can be rendered "fleshly", and although it also carries the idea of being composed of flesh, it has the further sense of being flesh-minded, i.e., in opposition to the spirit and to God (cf. I Cor. 3:3; II Cor. 10:4). 2

B.

THE CONDITIONS OF HUMANITY WHICH THE SECOND ADAM ENTERED

The point of the discussion of σαρκίς thus far has been for the sake of background and is but preliminary to the primary consideration of the Second Adam involved in that human flesh — a flesh not inherently sinful, but a flesh that had become sinful as a result of defection from proper obedience to God the Creator and a slavery imposed through it upon humanity by the alien powers of evil. The purpose of the Eternal Son of God in taking on human flesh as the Second Adam was to enter the realm of evil-dominated humanity, to redeem it from the slavery under which it groaned, and to impart to it power to become true sons and daughters of God. In an attempt, therefore, to understand the humanity of Jesus Christ it is necessary to view the conditions of humanity under the manifold tyranny of evil into which He entered and in the realm of which He utterly abolished these forces of evil in accomplishing human redemption. These Powers which held humanity in

1 See C. Ryder Smith, The Bible Doctrine of Man, pp. 156-160, for this development of the idea of flesh having the power of sin in it.

slavery and from which humanity cried out for redemption can be examined as follows: 1) Evil Spiritual Powers; 2) Law; 3) Sin; and 4) Death.

1) Evil Spiritual Powers. This form of slavery which seems strange and primitive to the twentieth century mind was apparently very real to the Apostle. He inherited this belief in evil powers from the Jewish religion of the post-exilic age. During that period of Judaism the people had a feeling of the remoteness of God, which led to an attempt on their part to fill up the gulf between heaven and earth by positing "a multitude of mediating supra-earthly existences."¹ With this more distant, transcendent concept of God, the belief arose (perhaps with some influence from ideas of Babylonian astral religion) that the suffering and sin of humanity must have a source other than God, and thus emerged a type of practical dualism. In Judaism these mediating beings were sometimes of a good nature, being ministers to do His pleasure, and this Jewish tradition is seen even in the New Testament description of angels as "ministering spirits sent forth to serve" (Heb. 1:14). Perhaps this good aspect is also reflected in Col. 1:16, but with this one exception, Paul regularly refers to these invisible forces as evil which must be conquered.² At the head of all the cosmic forces of evil was Satan, or the Devil, who is sometimes called by Paul "the prince of the power of the air" (Eph. 2:2),³ "the god of this age" (II Cor. 4:4), who has accomplished the subjection of the whole of humanity by means of the hierarchy of evil forces under him. Those under his dominion are called "sons of disobedience" (Eph. 2:2; cf. Jesus' expression, "sons of this world" or "age" in Lk. 16:8; 20:34).

Paul's terms for these invisible evil forces include the following: a) "Ele-

¹ Kennedy, St. Paul's Conception of Last Things, p. 327.

² It has been aptly pointed out by Cullmann that Primitive Christianity and Paul avoided dualism of a metaphysical type by denying these Evil Forces any power independent of God and insisting that they were eventually to be subjected through Jesus Christ. Christ and Time, pp. 198, 210.

³ For a recent and full discussion of the background of this terminology see Hans Bietenhard, Die himmlische Welt in Urchristentum und Spätjudentum (1951), pp. 209 ff.
mental spirits of the universe" (στοιχεῖα). He speaks of being a slave (δὲσουμένοι) to them (Gal. 4:3), cautions the Colossians against being carried off as a slave (σωλαγωγῶν...κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα, 2:8), reveals that one can die to them (Col. 2:20), and is sorely disturbed when some of the Galatians desire to turn back to slavery under them (4:9). This term στοιχεῖα has two possible meanings: 1) In one sense it means elementary or rudimentary knowledge, and therefore, it was used with reference to the letters of the alphabet. In that light the Pauline phrase has been interpreted by some church fathers and Reformation leaders (including Calvin) to mean the rudimentary truths of natural religion, in contrast to the truths divinely revealed. 2) In another sense, however, στοιχεῖα means the elements of the universe, not only elements on earth but also heavenly bodies and planets. Στοιχεῖα is then, by extension, applied to the angels or spirits that were thought to be connected with the various parts of the universe. Late Judaism had absorbed this idea from some of the eastern religious cosmogonies which held that either angels or evil powers controlled the forces of nature; and when this idea was combined with the notions of "principalities," "powers," etc., the result was an elaborate order of cosmic powers which held an iron grip over pagan humanity in Paul's day. Bevan writes of this tyrannical reign:

When men looked up to the stars, they shuddered to see there the Powers whose mysterious influence held them in the mechanism of an iron necessity. These were the World-rulers (κόσμοκράτορες) who fixed men's destiny without any regard to human will and tears... It was the Seven who bore rule, the five Wandering Stars with the Sun and Moon."

Although the average Jew of Paul's day would have thought of these στοιχεῖα as

1 A current example of this interpretation can be read in Goodspeed, The Goodspeed Parallel New Testament, which has in Gal. 4:3, "material ways of looking at things," and in 4:9, "old, crude notions" as the rendering of στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. Cf. Burton, Galatians (I.C.C.), p. 518, who concludes a long note on the term by saying the word basically means just the "rudimentary religious teachings possessed by the race."

2 Burton, op. cit., p. 134, makes the interesting comment that the word in modern Greek is almost equivalent to "ghosts."

3 Edwyn Bevan, Hellenism and Christianity, p. 77.
active powers between man and God either for good or evil, the Apostle was convinced that these powers held all of humanity in bondage until the Redeemer came who completely nullified their power. That this second interpretation of "elemental spirits of the universe" is Paul's chief one is borne out by the fact that the Apostle emphatically links to στοιχεία the thought of an enslavement. This is the position adopted by both the majority of church fathers and modern scholars.

b) Closely associated with the στοιχεία in the hierarchy of unseen evil forces, according to Paul, are the "angels, principalities, and powers." He urges Christians to stand fast against the "wiles of the devil. For we are not contending against flesh and blood, but against the principalities (ἀρχαῖ), against the powers (ἐξουσίων), against the world rulers (κοσμοκράτωρας), against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places" (Eph. 6:11 f.). In the face of such, Christians are urged to be strong in the Lord Jesus Christ and in the strength of His might. Paul triumphantly asserts that nothing will be able to separate the faithful from the abounding love of God in Christ Jesus — not even "death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities (ἀρχαῖ) ... nor powers (δυνάμεις) ... nor anything else ..." (Rom. 8:38). In final resurrection victory Christ is to be elevated "far above all rule and authority and power and dominion," and all things are to be under His feet (Eph. 1:21, 22; 3:10).

c) Other expressions for these forces that hold humanity in thralldom include the "beings that by nature are no gods" (Gal. 4:8), and "the rulers of this age" (I Cor. 2:6, 8). Although the idea of active invisible forces of evil seems strange to the modern mind in so-called civilized countries, one has only to read

---

1 The cult of astrology today is, of course, a weak vestige of this ancient belief in the powers of astral bodies.


3 Cullmann interprets ἐξουσίων as being applicable to both visible as well as invisible powers. He holds that Rom. 13:1 ff. refers to "the invisible angelic powers that stand behind the State government," and this is analogous to I Cor. 2:8, where the ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου means both the unseen and the visible "rulers of this age." Christ and Time, p. 195.
the reports of missionaries serving among "primitive" peoples to discover how very much alive the belief is today. It then becomes easier to see how such beliefs could exist in the distant civilization of Paul's day. Modern testimonies to the fear of the powers of evil spirits among non-Christian peoples are numerous. ¹

2) Law. A second Power that enslaved human life was Law. Although Paul has, in some respects, a healthy respect for Law, he nevertheless looks upon it as a Power that frustrates, denies life, and actually contributes to the bondage of human life. He can praise the Law by stating, "The law is holy, and the commandment is holy and just and good" (Rom. 7:12). He states that the Law is "spiritual" (Rom. 7:14); he upholds the Law (Rom. 3:21), "delights in the law" (Rom. 7:22); and he even submits to some external rituals prescribed by Law (cf. Acts 16:3; 18:18; 21:18-26).

But on the negative side, he looks upon Law as a "yoke of slavery" to which he earnestly entreats Jewish Christians not to re-submit themselves (Gal. 5:1). He associates being under the Law with being slaves to the elemental spirits of the universe (Gal. 4:3, 4). It is interesting to note here that Paul connects the giving of the Law with the intermediate function of angels (Gal. 3:19); and it is the legal aspects of Judaism concerning the observance of days, months, seasons, and years (4:10), which are all under the control of heavenly bodies, that especially evoke Paul's repudiation.

Law is alien to the original relation of man with God. In the initial rela-

¹ For example, Schweitzer writes that to the African negro Christianity is "the light that shines amid the darkness of his fears; it assures him that he is not in the power of nature-spirits, ancestral spirits . . . since the will of God really controls everything that goes on in the world." On the Edge of the Primeval Forest, (1926), p. 154.

Personal, as a missionary among the Navajo Indians of the U.S.A., the present writer has witnessed the dread that members of this tribe experience as a result of their belief in the power of evil spirits, which can lead them to destroy a "contaminated" hogan (their log and mud dwelling place), or worse still, to leave a "contaminated" person isolated and exposed to perish by the elements.

² Although it cannot be said that Paul equated the angels who mediated the Law with the στοιχεία, one can see that he does recognize an affinity between them in the sense that both were powers of the present age standing between God and man, and were finally defeated by Christ. Cf. Duncan, Galatians, p. 136. Furthermore, there seems to be an association between the legal "bond" and the principalities and powers" in Col. 2:14, 15.
tion there was nothing between the will of God and the response of His children — no impersonal, abstract "Law" — but then, as Paul says, "Law came in" (παρεισηγθεν, Rom. 5:20). The direct relation between God and humanity was forfeited by the result of the rebellion of sin, and consequently the abstract authority of Law was established between the Creator and man. To this intermediary power man became enslaved, and under it he experienced its "curse."¹

Law institutes a dominion over humanity in several ways. a) It provides the opening, the opportunity for the further dominion of Sin. "Sin, finding opportunity (ἀφορμήν) in the commandment, wrought in me all kinds of covetousness" (Rom. 7:8), and brought deception and death (Rom. 7:11). In other words, Law provides the beachhead by which Sin invades and captures the flesh. At one place, Paul interprets Scripture in terms of the Law and makes the sweeping statement, "the Scripture, consigned (σουνέκλεισεν) all things to sin . . . "(Gal. 3:22). Furthermore, it is defined as the "power of Sin" (I Cor. 15:56), i.e., that which excites to sin.

b) The thralldom is further established because the effect of the Law is to impose a curse on all who depend upon it (Gal. 3:10) because of the impossible task of completely obeying the Law. According to orthodox Hebrew belief, if one did not obey all the Law, one was guilty and incurred the curse (cf. James 2:10). Paul adopts this same line (Gal. 3:10), and he warns the Galatians that if anyone submits to circumcision "he is bound to keep the whole law" (5:3). For those who desire to live under Law, disobedience inevitably entails a curse. Law catches man in a snare because not only is he unable to keep perfectly the Law, but it involves him in the erroneous notion that by meticulously following a codified rule of life he can earn the favor of God. Accordingly, Law stimulates man to think of his relation to God on a contractual basis and encourages him to make a claim upon God, or a boast. But inasmuch as no one is justified by works, there is absolutely no legitimate basis for this claim or boast. There is a striking parallel here in this matter of making

¹ Brunner effectively points out how the very existence of Law is indicting evidence of man's rebellion against God, resulting in the establishment of a sinful legal relation to God. Man in Revolt, pp. 155-163.
a claim or boast before God with the point sharply illustrated by Jesus in the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican. Can it be that the message of this parable supplied the background for the Apostle's thought on works of the Law and grace? If so, there is another indication (albeit indirect) of Paul's knowledge of the teaching of the earthly Jesus. The deepest effect of the power of the Law is that it inevitably leads to a misunderstanding of a person's self and his relation to God. Accordingly, Brunner says, "the deepest, most central, effect of Christian redemption is the liberation of man from the curse of the Law, the new creation of human existence ἄφθις νόμον." 1

c) The ultimate dominion imposed by Law is death. It is the beginning of the chain of causes that leads to death. Flesh, being stimulated by Law, arouses sinful passions, which produce fruit for death (Rom. 7:5; cf. Jas. 1:15). Similarly, Paul writes, "when the commandment came, sin revived and I died" (Rom. 7:9). Although Law extended the promise of life (Gal. 3:12; Rom. 7:10), it proved unable to fulfill its promise; just the opposite, it led to death. Paul obviously implies this in Gal. 3:21, and forthrightly labels Law as "the dispensation of death" in II Cor. 3:7.

On the basis of the above points one can readily see how Paul thought of the system of Law as a power holding humanity in thralldom (although he reveals a respect for some of the items of the Law). As a system for seeking to attain righteousness and life, it proved to be the grasping of a sword by the blade for all who tried that way. Inevitably it brought a curse, sin, and death. The outcome is that man is in a state of slavery to Law, and as such is variously described as "under Law" (Gal. 4:21; Rom. 6:14), and held "captive" under flesh infected with Law (Rom. 7:6). 2

3) Sin. A third power enslaving humanity was Sin, which had invaded humanity via the flesh. "It is a power invading, attacking, subjugating men from without,


2 Paul also uses a piece of Old Testament allegory in Gal. 4:21 ff to point out that those who are under the Law are in slavery, since they are children of the slave Hagar, and children of a slave are naturally born to slavery. The slave Hagar symbolizes Law, Mt. Sinai, and the Covenant of Law. Being a slave girl she is a type of that religion which enslaves because it takes that Law covenant as its foundation.
and using for this purpose the flesh or physical constitution as its instrument." ¹

The original external nature of sin is indicated in the Old Testament expression, "and if you do not do well, sin (𐤀𐤇𐤇𐤃𐤃𐤄𐤅𐤆) is crouching at the door" (Gen. 4:7), which supplies the figure of a ravenous beast poised to seize the first opportunity to rush into the house of a man's life. ² Paul expressly states that "sin entered (ἦσαν ἐν) the world" (Rom. 5:12), that apart from the Law it is dead, and when it springs to life it ushers in death (Rom. 7:9). Although Sin was originally alien to humanity, it entered through disobedience and was the instrument by which Death obtained a foothold in humanity. When Paul states that the "sting of death is sin" (I Cor. 15:56), he means that Sin "is the tool and weapon by which death has brought humanity into its power. Through Sin Death got the human race into its grip, and is now its real master." ³ So Death thereby becomes the hideous manifestation of man's rebellion and separation from God.

Although Sin initially entered man through the freedom by which he chose to be disobedient, that original freedom was lost as the consequence of its own fateful decision. The result was that man became controlled, dominated by the Power of Sin which he had unwittingly admitted to himself!⁴ Sin has invaded humanity to the extent that it dwells within a person (Rom. 7:17), taking command of the will and leading one to do that which is even contrary to his best desires and actions. "It is no longer I that do it, but sin which dwells within me" (Rom. 7:20).⁵ No doubt, Paul's thought here is influenced by the Rabbinic doctrine of the yetzer hára. This...

¹ Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul, p. 47.

² Cf. the description of Wickedness as an external entity in Zech. 5:8.


⁴ A rough analogy could be seen in a political situation in which a small nation invites a neighboring nation, larger and more powerful, to enter its realm for "protection" but then realizes, to its bitter regret, that it, in reality, has actually become subjugated to that larger, more powerful, and attractive nation.

⁵ Cf. Ovid, Metamorphoses, VII, 20, "But some strange power holds me down against my will...I see the better and approve it, but I follow the worse."
The Evil Impulse that invades the flesh, and it is most closely rendered by the Apostle's phrase ϕρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς. One becomes a captive and a slave to Sin, which has invaded and is now like an Occupation Force in the flesh of an individual (Rom. 7:23, 25). It can take over the members of the body and use them as instruments of wickedness (Rom. 6:13). Therefore, it is apparent that Paul thinks of Sin not so much as an individual transgression but "as a quasi-personal power which takes possession of human nature and leads it astray." The ultimate end of the power of Sin is death (Rom. 6:23; 5:12, 21; 7:5, 11, 13).

Again, it needs to be emphasized that Sin and flesh are not identical. Sin is associated with flesh in that it invades the latter and uses it as a base of operation, and it is able to do this by the fundamental weakness of the flesh. The whole subject of the relation between flesh and sin in the thought of Paul has been classically summarized in the concluding chapter of Dickson's last century, but extremely valuable, Baird Lectures of 1883.

The slavery of Sin is not limited to an individual. It exercises a universal

---

1 W.D. Davies, op. cit., pp. 24-27.
2 Kennedy, Theology of the Epistles, p. 33.
3 Wm. Dickson, St. Paul's Use of the Terms Flesh and Spirit, pp. 309 ff., supplies a conclusion of eight main points which are well to have in mind on this subject: 1) There is no basis for assuming that Paul identifies ϕροντία with ϕρόνημα. 2) "Flesh" is not limited to an identification with the material body or the outward bodily-substance of man, but rather it applies to the whole of the living man. 3) Matter or the material part of man is not identified with evil. 4) Although Paul recognizes the body and the sensuous nature of man as the seat, or arena of sin's activity by which it is manifested, sin is not exclusively associated with it. It is associated also with the mind, heart, and spirit. 5) Paul does not supply an explanation of the psychological origin of sin. He is not concerned to demonstrate the genesis of sin from the flesh, but to emphasize the power of sin in the flesh. 6) Paul does, however, supply a historical origin for sin in the Rom. 5:12 ff. passage. 7) The Apostle's doctrine is not derived speculatively, but experientially and empirically. 8) The one exception to the universal dominion of sin in the flesh is Jesus Christ because of his perfect sinlessness.

Dickson is admittedly dependent upon H.H. Wesel, Die Begriffe Fleisch und Geist im biblischen Sprachgebrauch untersucht, (1878).
dominion over the human race. The proof supplied by Paul for this situation is simply the observation that all men have sinned and consequently are under its sway. Although slavery to Law may be limited somewhat to a particular race, and slavery to Evil Spirits to a certain degree of intellectual or spiritual attainment, slavery to Sin is experienced universally by humanity. There is no distinction; "all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God" (Rom. 3:23). Death resulting from sin "spread to all men because all men sinned" (Rom. 5:12; 11:32), so that neither Jew nor Gentile was exempt from its tyranny. Among the Gentiles, the fact of Sin was clearly observable because of the outward evidence of their corruption of the purpose and being of human life, which ultimately amounted to their worshiping and serving "the creature rather than the Creator" (Rom. 1:25), and degenerating into all manner of physical and spiritual iniquity (Rom. 1:18-32). But the Jews also, despite their Law (and even because of their Law) were under the power of Sin (Rom. 3:9; 2:12). This is a plainly observable fact to which Paul, in addition, brings Old Testament witness (Rom. 3:10 ff.). Even the patriarchs and others who lived before the giving of the Law were under the power of Sin, and the evidence for this is that death reigned through all that period (Rom. 5:14).

The cause for the universal dominion of Sin is to be found in its origin, as expressed by Paul. From the two observable facts — all men sin, and all men die — the Apostle concluded that there was a casual relation between the two. The chain of thought embraced in Rom. 5:12 is: 1) Sin came into the world through the transgression of Adam; 2) Death was the result of Sin; 3) Death became universal; 4) Death became universal because all men sinned. Moreover, the Apostle deduced that the common historical source was Adam. He is the "one man" through whom Sin and Death came into the world (vv. 12 ff.) and whose trespass involved the death of many (I Cor. 15:22). In the founder of humanity the act of transgression was committed, and the consequences of Sin and Death were entailed upon all subsequent humanity;

---

The development of the idea of the universal reign of Sin might have been influenced by a contrasting idea of totality, as embraced in the monotheistic view of God. Personal conference with J. S. Stewart, Feb. 11, 1954.
but how this transmission of the sin of one to the many was affected Paul does not explain except on the basis of the solidarity of the human race in Adam.

Although the origin of human sin is traced by Paul to Adam, its universal dominion is accounted for by the organic unity of the race with him.¹

The concept of solidarity, of corporate being, was an ancient and accepted aspect of Hebrew thought about humanity. Accordingly, the sin perpetrated by the head of a family or a clan was thought to be not only the sin of that individual but also the sin of the whole group; so, for example, Achan's whole family is condemned to death to answer for his sin (Josh. 7:24, 25; cf. Num. 15:26, "The whole population was involved in the error").² By the same token the sin of Adam could be attributed to the whole of humanity conceived as his tribe. In Adam, therefore, the whole of the human race sinned, and the universal consequence was death (both physical and moral, since Paul does not distinguish between the two).³ Ultimately, the inexorable sway of Sin over human life has such a terrible reality that Paul, out of his own experience, is compelled to cry out, "Wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of death?" (σώματος τοῦ ἄναντος Rom. 7:24).

4) Death. The final supreme Power to which all of the preceding enslavements contribute and in which they reach their terrible consummation is death. This progressive chain of slavery ending in the final dominion of Death is indicated by Paul in two statements attested by human experience: "While we were living in the flesh, our sinful passions, aroused by the law, were at work in our members

¹ G.B. Stevens, The Pauline Theology, p. 139. Paul does not propound a doctrine of Original Sin in the sense of sin being transmitted by sex and heredity.

² Infra, pp. 213 f.

³ Although the connection between Adam's transgression and the universal sin and death of humanity is not specifically made in the Old Testament, this connection does appear in some of the non-canonical books (e.g. I. Enoch, Baruch, IV Ezra), revealing the Rabbinic doctrine in which Paul was reared and which is reflected in his expression on this matter (supra, p. 62). The only explanation in the Old Testament to account for individual sin is that the individual is part of the sinful whole. Beyond presenting the historical fact that Adam sinned and all of humanity since is observed to be sinful, the Old Testament does not elaborate. A.B. Davidson, op. cit., p. 219.
to bear fruit for death" (Rom. 7:5); and "For sin, finding opportunity in the commandment, deceived me and by it killed me" (Rom. 7:11). This progressive enslavement, Law-Sin-Death, is operative because of the essential weakness of the flesh.

Death, like the other Evil Powers, is an alien, unnatural Dominion contrary to human nature as God intended it at creation. According to the Old Testament view, the condition of the original man was that he was created a living person, a complete person consisting of a unity of body and soul. To the Hebrew this was life, and the maintenance of this condition was immortality. Man was made for fellowship with God the Creator, and the question of how long this life of fellowship would last was not raised because a complete person was not thought of in connection with an end. To the Hebrew, life was the normal condition of man.1 If God created man in His own image, including His eternal nature, then man must have been intended for immortality. This unnaturalness of death is implied in Wisdom 2:23:

    For God created man for immortality,
    And made him the image of his own eternity,
    But through the devil's envy death came into the world,
    And those who belong to his party experience it.

Wisdom 1:13 f. has a similar thought:

    For God did not make death,
    And he does not enjoy the destruction of the living;
    For he created everything to exist, . . . (cf. 5:15)2

Not only a non-canonical source, but also the canonical Ezekiel supplies a similar idea: "For I have no pleasure in the death of anyone, says the Lord God; so turn, and live" (18:32); and, "I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live; turn back, turn back from your evil ways; for why will you die, 0 house of Israel?" (33:11; cf. Amos 5:14).

It is plain from Old Testament teaching that life consists in fellowship with God, and sin is that which severs this relationship and results in death. It was because of sin that the consequence of returning unto dust (Gen. 3:19) came upon

---

1 A.B. Davidson, op. cit., pp. 503 ff.

2 Translations from E.J. Goodspeed, The Apocrypha. An American Translation. It can be noted, however, that 17:1-2 is somewhat at variance with the above quotes.
mankind, and a barrier was erected between man and God (cf. Ezek. 18:4). To the Hebrew death signified more than just non-existence; it meant a fearful breach in communion with God, and so it was looked upon as a terrible experience (Ps. 55:4), one of bitterness (I Sam. 15:32) and evil (Deut. 30:15-19). And Death, according to Paul, is a Foreign Power that has usurped dominion over humanity (Rom. 6:9), reigns like a king (Rom. 5:14), and is the last enemy to be destroyed (I Cor. 15:26).  

Man himself is responsible for his subjugation to the power of Death, because he opened the doors of his life, on the hinges of Sin, to the total ruthlessness of the power of Death. Death came by man and brought an inversion of the intended order whereby the body, purposed for life, was corrupted into a "body of death." That this is a flat contradiction of God's intention is demonstrated by the statement, "The body is meant ... for the Lord, and the Lord for the body" (I Cor. 6:13).

Death is the inevitable result of sin, by which a man lives according to the flesh (Rom. 8:6, 7). This is to organize life completely apart from God, to devote one's life to sin and its essential weakness and perishability and therefore to reap the unavoidable consequence of Death. "For he who sows to his own flesh will from the flesh reap corruption" (Gal. 6:8). Within eight verses of the Roman letter Paul gives a threefold emphasis -- the "end", the "wages", the "fruit" of sin (i.e. life κοιτά σαρκα) is Death (Rom. 6:21-7:5). This Death which humanity experiences, according to Paul, is not just the cessation of physical existence. θανατος is not simply natural death, but rather the death of a sinner accompanied by fear and agony. It is the extreme stage of separation between God and man, involving both the physical and the spiritual. This is the power of Death which binds all humanity in an inescapable "body of death."

5) Conclusion. The human race, according to the Apostle, is dominated by the manifold powers of Evil outlined above. Although these Powers have been considered

---

1 Cf. Brunner, Man in Revolt, pp. 468 ff., for a good discussion of the unnaturalness of death, and the dread that humans experience in anticipation of both the event itself and the inseparably connected judgment.
seriatim, it does not follow that each is distinct from the other. On the contrary, they are all interrelated, and together they form the total dominion of darkness, (σκότος, Col. 1:13; Eph. 6:12) in which humanity is bound and blind, experiencing the inevitable end of Θάνατος. All this added up to a tremendous burden upon peoples of the Mediterranean world, so that in the "fullness of time" they were anxiously awaiting a Deliverer to bring redemption from this enslaved condition. Man in this imprisoned, doomed, situation could only hope for a Redeemer who would break asunder the chains of his captivity. Such was the wretched condition of humanity, the First or Old Adam, and it is into this situation of gross thralldom that the Second or New Adam entered for the sake of redeeming humanity from all this bondage.

It is in accord with this redemptive purpose that Paul's concept of the humanity of Jesus Christ, in the light of the Second Adam, plays such a prominent role. If the Redeemer is to deliver humanity from its slavery, he must identify Himself with it, placing Himself under the conditions of that thralldom. Yet, in order really to redeem or save, He must not only know what it is to be like an unredeemed, enslaved human; He must, paradoxically, also not be like him. More identification of the Second Adam with the condition of the First Adam would not suffice to save or redeem the latter any more than a non-swimmer could redeem a fellow non-swimmer from drowning by jumping into the water, thus identifying himself with the condition of the person in deadly peril. In short, there must be an identity and yet a difference between the Second Adam and the humanity of the First Adam. The relation of the Second Adam to these conditions of humanity will be treated in the next chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE

THE RELATION OF THE SECOND ADAM TO THE CONDITIONS OF HUMANITY
A) Identification with Humanity. The antinomy mentioned at the close of the last chapter, viz., the identity and yet the difference between the Second Adam and fallen humanity, is established through the humanity of Jesus Christ. Paul identified the Second Adam with the circumstances of the First Adam, or fallen humanity, yet reserved the all-important difference of the sinlessness of the Second Adam. Both seemingly opposite factors are absolutely necessary, and even though they may be logically irreconcilable by the human mind, they are nevertheless accepted as representing the truth of the situation.

The astounding result of the Incarnation was the self-identification of the Second Adam with fallen humanity. The Apostle taught that to the fullest possible extent, without sin, He took human nature, a body of flesh in this state. This meant a humanity of the Second Adam which was under the consequences of the Fall; it meant He was in the situation of sinful humanity, yet He was not a sinner. He was subject to Death as other men in the fallen state, but He was never guilty of committing sin. Although this is the position held by some leading theologians today (e.g., Barth, Brunner, Thornton, Mozley, Robinson), it is one which has been slow to win acceptance by Christian thinkers in the face of the traditional position that it was "unfallen human nature" which Christ assumed. Though the Spanish Adoptionists of the eighth century put out the view that it was "fallen human nature", it was not until the 19th century that the position really began to be positively expressed. But, if to the Apostle Paul in the first century, the Incarnation was

---


real (and there is no convincing evidence to the contrary in his letters!) then one might well ask the simple question: "What other kind of humanity could the Apostle have thought of Christ assuming in the 'fullness of time' other than that of fallen humanity, which was the only kind he knew anything about?" If one is to avoid the precarious notion that Paul had a docetic or even semi-docetic view of Jesus Christ, one must admit the antinomy in his thought which held that He shared our fallen humanity and yet was sinless. As all paradoxes are illogical, so is this. There are many truths in the Bible that are not precisely logical but are nevertheless true, and this is one of the profoundest.

In order for the Second Adam to have a thorough human experience, He must share the common experience of humanity under the consequences of the Fall, feeling the power of those forces which hold humanity in such tyranny. That this was Paul's view of the humanity of Jesus Christ is the reasonable deduction from his writings, in which he emphasized the redemptive purpose and function of that humanity. It is only in that actual sphere of humanity, and under the subjugating Powers, that He was able to dethrone them completely. Paul was not encumbered in his thinking on this matter by the subsequently appearing theological imbroglio which grew up in connection with the idea of Original Sin, viz., original guilt, and the transmission of sin through sex-procreation. These later views found it necessary to insist on the belief in the Virgin Birth of Jesus to guarantee His sinlessness, but, as previously noted, the idea of the Virgin Birth was apparently unknown to the Apostle. He was able to hold to the sinlessness of Jesus quite apart from any such doctrine for, at least, the same reason that those who associated with Jesus in the flesh were convinced of it. The entire human life of the historical Jesus bore absolutely no trace of sin, and it was this picture of the absolute sinlessness of the earthly Jesus advanced the opinion that Christ's human nature was "fallen". At that period, however, their positions became confused in the discussion of original sin and the attendant ideas of original guilt and biological transmission of sin. Barth, Credo, p. 79, refers with approval to the Heidelberg Catechism Q. 16, which states that "the justice of God requires that the same human nature which has sinned should make satisfaction for sin."
that was conveyed to Paul by those who had been with Jesus in the days of His flesh. The sinlessness of Jesus is also reflected in the Primitive Christian belief that Jesus Christ "was designated Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness by his resurrection from the dead", which Paul endorsed at the outset of his Roman letter. Yet with this exception of sinlessness, He was completely self-identified with fallen humanity and by His Incarnation experienced a real encounter with the Evil Spiritual Powers, Law, Sin, and Death; by His Death on the Cross He shattered their totalitarian reign over humanity. This, of necessity, took place in the category of humanity, so it is now appropriate to consider these various conditions of humanity into which the Second Adam came and what relation He bore to them.

I. THE SECOND ADAM AND THE POWER OF THE EVIL SPIRITUAL FORCES

According to Paul, the Second Adam took upon Himself human flesh, the physical constitution of man, which was originally good as God had made it, but was corrupted through the Fall. This was the aspect of man through which the Evil Forces gained control over and enslaved humanity. In assuming flesh, therefore, the Second Adam came into a direct relation with these alien Forces. Therefore, in the classic Incarnation passage of Phil. 2:6 ff., the phrase "took the form of a slave" carries more meaning than just that He assumed a humble position on earth. It means that the degree of His self-identification with humanity was such that He also took the condition of a slave to the Evil Spiritual Powers that universally dominated humanity.¹

Just as He came into relation with Law by coming under it (Gal. 4:4) and into relation to Sin by being sent "in the likeness of sinful flesh" (Rom. 8:3), so He came into the dominion of these Evil Spiritual Forces and defeated them by exhausting their sting and divesting them of their power. Anticipating the Auctor ad Hebraeos who stated that the purpose of the Incarnation was "that through death

¹ C.A.A. Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul, p. 36, who appropriately quotes Origen as speaking of Christ as "passus dominationem tyranni."
he might destroy him who has the power of death, that is, the devil, and deliver all those who through fear of death were subject to lifelong bondage (2: 14-15), Paul earlier expressed the same thought in Col. 2:15. Here the Apostle stated that on the cross "He disarmed (stripped off from himself, ἀπεκδυσόμενος) the principalities and powers and made a public example of them, triumphing over them in him" (or "in it", i.e., the cross).

A) Ἀπεκδυσόμενος. The crucial word in the verse is the aorist participle ἀπεκδυσόμενος which is rendered in the KJ as "spoiled" and in the RSV as "disarmed", neither of which quite captures the picture of the Greek original (although these translations do fit the grammar of the sentence by taking "principalities and powers" as objects). The word, however, presents the idea of a "putting off" or a "stripping off" of something, as the laying aside of a garment. This is supported by the fact that in the other place in this Colossian letter where the same verb appears (3:9), Paul reminded his readers that they have "put off (ἀπεκδυσόμενοι) the old nature . . . and have put on (ἐνδυσάμενοι) the new nature." Commentaries and recent explanations of this perplexing word have not given sufficient attention to the LXX use of the verb ἐνδυσάω. In almost every case it is a translation of ὄψιν, meaning primarily to "strip off", and secondarily to "plunder, spoil". When Paul used the form ἀπεκδύσει (Col. 2:11) and cognates ἐνδύω and ἐκδύω, they always bore this idea of "putting on" or "putting off" something, referring almost always to the body or an equivalent.

1 This rendering fails to do justice to the middle voice of the word. It was Jerome who was the source for this doubtful interpretation.

2 For "strip off" see: Gen. 37:23; Num. 20:26, 28; I Chron. 10:9; Hos. 2:3; Ezek. 16:39; I Macc. 10:62; cf. Mt. 27:28, 31. For "spoil" see II Sam. 23:10. The usual word for "spoil", however, is ἔπληκτον.

Cf. M. Dibelius, Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus, pp. 138 f., who combines these two interpretations by saying "ἀπεκδύσομαι gleich att. ἐκδύω, ἔκδύω = spoliare ist, also = ausziehen, entkleiden mit der selbstverständlichen Beziehung auf Waffen, Rüstung und dergl. d.h. Überwinden, entwaffnen." This monograph by Dibelius is more adequate than Everling's (op. cit.) because he deals with Christ's relation to the Evil Spirits, whereas Everling omits this.

3 Eph. 6:11 refers, however, to the putting on of armor for spiritual warfare.
Adopting this usual sense of the verb, then, the question becomes: what is that which Jesus "put off" on the Cross?

B) Two Principal Interpretations. In answer to the question above there are two principal ways of interpreting the difficult clause beginning with ἀπεκδύσωσις, a word initiated by Paul and very rarely used after him. It has been mainly thought of as meaning either: 1) "putting off the body", separating the verb from τὰς ἀρχὰς κ.τ.λ. and understanding τὴν σῶμα of or τὸ σῶμα with it; or 2) "having stripped off and put away the powers of evil", making the verb govern the τὰς ἀρχὰς κ.τ.λ.¹

The first view has been championed in this generation by C.A.A. Scott.² According to this first view, Paul intended to say that it is the flesh which Jesus stripped off. This is corroborated by the same use of the verb in Col. 3:9, where the object is the "old nature" (παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον, i.e., the "flesh"). Further support for this interpretation is gained from the use of the form ἀπεκδύσει in Col. 2:11, "In him also you were circumcised with a circumcision made without hands, by putting off the body of flesh(ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός) in the circumcision of Christ." This circumcision of Christ "not made with hands" refers to the crucifixion by which Jesus put off the body of flesh, and this really was His "circumcision." Accordingly, Christians are empowered to "put off the body of flesh" only by participating in the process which Jesus Christ already accomplished fully on the Cross. Perhaps also the idea of Eph. 4:21-24 carries the same idea. This would be the case if the phrase "as the truth is in Jesus" (v. 21) is joined with the following sentence, "Put off your old nature ... and put on the

¹ J.B. Lightfoot, Colossians and Philemon, p. 188. The first of the above interpretations has been generally associated with the Latin fathers, while the second has been generally associated with the Greek fathers.

new nature." Therefore, the phrase "as the truth is in Jesus" would be interpreted in the sense "that, as actually was the case with Jesus, you put off the old man and put on the new."¹ (Although the verb here, ἀποθέωμαι, is different, it carries almost the same meaning as ἀπεκβασάμενος).

The basic idea inherent in the verse, therefore, is that by dying Jesus stripped himself of the flesh, that only avenue by which the Evil Powers had any hope of gaining hegemony over Him. It was the Evil Powers, the rulers of this age, who, in ignorance, put to death the Lord of Glory (I Cor. 2:8); but in doing so, they had, in reality, grasped their sword by the blade, for in the death of Jesus their own death knell sounded. Their "victory" over Him was classically sham and Pyrrhic. Never was "victory" so hollow or so disastrous! It was through the death of Jesus that His flesh was stripped off, and this was His only possible vulnerable point. Shedding the σαρξ at death was the first step toward Resurrection and Exaltation, which signalized that Jesus, the Second Adam, had not only slipped out of the grasp of the Evil Powers but had actually completely shattered their power and proclaimed His victory over all of them, including Death itself. Because death for Him opened up to Resurrection, therefore Death no longer had any dominion over Him (Rom. 6:9). "He was crucified in weakness (ἀσθένειας), but lives by the power of God" (II Cor. 13:4).

Although the Second Adam has actually won the victory and the Evil Powers have been decisively defeated, they are not completely annihilated. They have been dethroned, but from an empirical point of view they still have some power. They are like guerrilla forces that are still holding out after the decisive battle has been fought and won against them. They can still cause some trouble, and it is not until they are utterly annihilated that the Victory is complete.² This is what

¹ Scott, According to Paul, pp. 36 f., makes this point about ἄθρωμα ἐστιν ἀθάνατον και ἀληθινόν and indicates II Cor. 7:14 as a comparative use of ἀθάνατον in the sense of an "actual fact."

² Cullmann, Christ and Time, p. 198, makes the point that the demonic powers are only "apparent", because Christ has actually already conquered them. Cf. J.S. Stewart, "On a Neglected Emphasis in New Testament Theology," S.J.T., IV (1951), p. 299.
Paul meant by saying, "the rulers of this age are doomed to pass away (\textit{Katap-}
\textit{youmērwn}, present participle, i.e., "are being destroyed"). The inevitable and
ultimate conclusion to this struggle, however, will be when Christ has finally
delivered the Kingdom to God the Father after destroying every rule and every
authority and power — when every enemy, including Death, is under His feet (I Cor.
15:24-26; Eph. 1:21-22).

C) Alleged Objections to This View. Critics such as J.B. Lightfoot and E.F.
Scott, who hold to the second view mentioned above, viz., "having stripped off and
put away the powers" of evil, pose some problems for those taking the first point
of view. They point out by way of objection: 1) That, grammatically, the subject of
the sentence is properly God, not Christ; 2) The metaphor is not only isolated, but
it is strange in that it would describe on one hand the evil powers stripped off as
a robe and on the other hand as being led captive in a triumphal procession; nor
is it explained or suggested by anything in the context. So Lightfoot put forward
the interpretation that inasmuch as Christ took upon Himself our common human nature
with all its temptations, He therefore was constantly assailed by the powers of
evil. The final assault upon Him ended at the Cross because there these evil
powers were shattered in that "the powers of evil, which clung like a Nessus robe
about His humanity, were torn off and cast aside forever."\(^1\) On the other hand, E.F.
Scott prefers to revert to the KJ "having spoiled the principalities and powers"
because it gives a "clear and consistent image" of Christ doing battle with the evil
powers, defeating them, spoiling them, and exposing them to ridicule. The danger of
this position is that it smacks of a more distinct dualism (similar to that held by
other near-eastern religions of the age) than Paul would have embraced and expressed.\(^2\)

\(^1\) Lightfoot, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 183, where he cites Zech. 3:1 ff. as a parallel to
this garment image.

\(^2\) A more plausible view, endorsed by T.K. Abbott, along this second line of
approach is that \textit{Tōs ar̃xas kai Tōs ἐσούσια} refers to angelic powers re-
presenting the law and having power over man, which Christ "spoiled" or "disarmed" on
D) Weaknesses of the Objections. One is not convinced that this second interpretation, with any of its variations, has any better grasp on the meaning intended in this expression. The objection that God is actually the subject of the sentence cannot be pressed seriously (as E.F. Scott admits) since the whole context is speaking equally about Christ, with the power of God working through Him. Neither can the objection that the metaphor is isolated or mixed be taken too seriously because, for one reason, the very nature of metaphor denies the application of ruthlessly strict logic; and secondly, there are other instances where the conviction and imagination of Paul exceeds the logic of his expression. Furthermore, to say simply that Christ spoiled or stripped off the evil powers does not really indicate the means by which there was, in Lightfoot's words, "a divestiture of the powers of evil, a liberation from the dominion of flesh."1 It was only the flesh of Christ that was open to possible subjection by these Evil Forces, and, therefore, it was in the flesh of Christ on the Cross that these powers were "spoiled" or "stripped off."

E) A Tentative Conclusion. At the same time one recognizes that the first view involves an alteration of the structure of the sentence by understanding some phrase (either ἡν σῶρα or τὸ σῶμα), and such changes were suggested primarily by the Latin Fathers who might be less sensitive to the fullness of the original meaning than the Greek Fathers. Ultimately, perhaps, one has to conclude that the discerning of the precise intention of the Apostle presents an insolvable problem, recognizing that there might even be a purposed double meaning in the vexing participle as well as in the last phrase of the sentence (i.e., "in him" or "in the cross"). After all, there is nothing contradictory in the idea of Christ stripping off His flesh at death, thus shattering the Evil Powers whose only chance was to get at Him via the flesh, and the idea of Christ stripping off or spoiling the Powers of Evil at His death; for the stripping off of the Powers is inseparably connected with the stripping off of the flesh. Both ideas are comple-

---

1 Lightfoot, Colossians, p. 189.
mentary and ultimately lead to the same thing — the defeat of Evil and Death — and also necessitate the humanity of Jesus Christ as the arena through which this could be accomplished.\(^1\) This is an absolutely necessary factor in the Colossian statement, which Brunner describes as a "powerful passage" which "owes it strength precisely to the fact that in it revelation, atonement and the establishment of lordship are blended into a complete unity."\(^2\) In this "powerful passage" then, one can also see the characteristic twofold motif of humiliation and exaltation, running right back to the meaning of Jesus' self-characterization as Son of Man, which uniquely wedded the two previously antithetical views. Here, therefore, is Jesus Christ, the Second Adam, as the Son of Man who attained glory and exaltation through the humiliation of the fact of the Crucifixion, the decisive moment of His redemptive mission.

Finally, one can now see how this declaration of Paul can be considered as a condensed expression of the point contained in Jesus' parable about the strong man fully armed and guarding his palace, who is assailed by a stronger man, overcome, and is spoiled of his possessions (Lk. 11:21, 22). The point underlying the parable is that Jesus Christ has encountered the Forces of Evil, overpowering and casting out the demons, and this point corresponds with that in Col. 2:15. Can it be that Paul was familiar with this parable also, or with the saying of Jesus, "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me"? (Mt. 28:18). In the Colossian passage one sees the humanity of Jesus Christ in terms of having flesh to divest for the purpose of redemption and as the sphere in which the Evil Powers were defeated.\(^3\)

\(^1\) Cf. the words of J. Weiss: "When Christ died upon the Cross, not only did his body die, but in and with his flesh, 'flesh' in particular was put to death, and with the flesh the indwelling sin (Rom. 8:3). This is naturally only thinkable if 'flesh' and 'sin' are not merely abstract concepts, but realities, and so, for Paul, the flesh of humanity is a living organism into which Christ, by his becoming man, has entered, and which in his crucifixion receives the destroying death-thrust." The History of Primitive Christianity, p. 434.

\(^2\) Brunner, Creation and Redemption, p. 306.

\(^3\) The literature of the Church in the first three centuries also reveals the connection between Incarnation and Redemption in terms of defeating these Evil
II. THE SECOND ADAM AND THE SLAVERY OF LAW

A) Christ's Humanity Under Law. The redemptive purpose of the Second Adam is clearly expressed in Gal. 4:4, 5, "But when the time had fully come, God sent forth His Son, born of woman, born under the law (γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμου), to redeem (ἐξαγόρασάν) those who were under the law, so that we might receive adoption as sons." In the fullness of time He shared common humanity, partaking of human nature with its limitations and weaknesses. The phrase "born of woman" provides no evidence for the knowledge on Paul's part of a Virgin Birth, nor does it exclude the possibility of human paternity. The Apostle's thought here is not about the difference, but rather the likeness of Christ's birth to ours. The expression permits one to recall the picture of Jesus as a Bethlehem babe in His mother's arms — "God's Son, a human infant, drawing His life from a weak woman!" The phrase can be considered as a compressed expression of all that the Gospels tell us about the humanity of Jesus Christ — about His life being subject to all those laws of nature that govern human growth. It also implies His subjection to the Jewish Law, His obedience to Mary and Joseph, how He ate drank, wept, was tired, slept, experienced physical pain, felt the agony of Gethsemane and the still greater agony of Calvary. When He was "born of woman", He took flesh and became truly man; and when "born under

---

1 The verb here (ἐσπανταγόρασέλευ) refers not to the sending out of Jesus from private family life on his preaching mission, but rather to the sending of God's Son from his pre-existent state. This is consonant with Paul's belief in the pre-existence of Christ and is parallel with verse 6 in the context.

2 Cf. also Burton, Galatians, (I.C.C.), ad. loc.; Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 168, in addition to the previous references to V. Taylor and E. Brunner, Supra p. 138.

3 G.G. Findlay, Epistle to the Galatians, p. 250.
the law", He came into a Jewish home and, therefore, was under the Jewish Law with the obligation to abide by its regulations. Regardless of whether or not there is a significance to the point that the phrase ἔν Ἰωάννη is anarthrous, the context reveals that Paul is emphasizing His identification with the Jewish race. As a child of that faith He received its education and was reared in its traditions.

Although the truth of His being under the conditions of natural law inheres in this passage, the primary meaning is that Jesus became a true Israelite, a son born of Abraham "descended from David according to the flesh", and therefore was subject in His humanity to the Law of His race and to the rules and regulations imposed under the Law. The purpose of His entrance into humanity and under the Law was to redeem those under the Law and to lead them into a filial relation with God. God's purpose was to have one group of humanity (Israel) under the Law, and then to have one representative man of that group redeem Israel from the Law. Arising out of such a situation this redemption would then extend to the Gentiles. Such is the expression of Gal. 3:14, "that in Christ Jesus the blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles." ¹

B) Redemption From the Curse of the Law. On account of His Incarnation as a Jew, He not only came under the Law, but also under the curse of the Law. He so completely identified Himself with humanity, and in particular the Jewish race, that it also brought Him into the realm of this form of servitude. Just as He had been "born of woman" and had come into the realm of Evil Spiritual Forces, so He also entered the human race under the Law with all that entailed for the purpose of redemption. When the whole assertion ἐξ ὁμοίωσεν τῆς ἀνθρώπου is taken along with the succeeding modifying phrases, there is the strongest implication that the human birth and subjection to Law were necessary for the accomplishment of redemption. By this statement Paul revealed a thought which is very closely related to

¹ Duncan, Galatians (MNTC), p. 129.
that expressed more definitely by the writer of Hebrews 5:7-9, who associates the limitation of the earthly life of Jesus with His redemptive work. Burton calls attention also to the possibility that Paul might have thought of, and expressed his experience with, the Law when he said, "I through the law died to the law, that I might live to God" (Gal. 2:19), in the light of the knowledge of the similar experience on the part of Jesus.¹ This may account for the statement in part, but the concept of union with Christ by which a disciple shares in His experiences probably enters here more strongly.

In stressing the fact that Christ came not as agent in lawgiving but as One under the Law, Martin Luther wrote, "Christ standeth as a mere patient, and not as an agent, in respect of the law. He is not then a lawgiver, or a judge after the law; but in that He made Himself subject to the law bearing the condemnation of the law, He delivered us from the curse thereby."² Throughout the Galatian letter the redemptive work of the Second Adam, which is indicated as the purpose of the Incarnation, is connected with His death (Gal. 1:4; 2:20, 21; 3:1, 13; 4:12, 14); and so it is that by His death redemption from the curse of the Law is accomplished.

"Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us — for it is written, 'Cursed be every one who hangs on a tree'" (Gal 3:13). The meaning of this perplexing assertion must be derived from the previous verses 10ff., where it is said that for all who rely upon works of the law, disobedience to that law brings a curse upon the individual. This curse Paul thought of as a dreadful reality, and those who were under it (because of inescapable disobedience under the Law) were delivered only by consequence of the fact that "Christ became a curse for us." Jesus Christ, the Second Adam, suffered the extreme consequences of being born of woman and under the Law in that He met death on the Cross, which, according to the Law, indicated a curse. Just as His race was under the curse, the judgment

¹ Burton, Galatians, (ICC), pp. 200-201.
² Luther, A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, p. 236.
of broken Law, so the Second Adam in the manner of His death revealed the depth of His identification with those under the Law.¹

It is interesting to note that directly following this passage dealing with the curse upon those whose faith is in the Law (vv. 11, 12) there is at verse 13 the abrupt introduction of the name of Christ which proclaims in an emphatic way that He alone is capable of dealing with this most tragic condition of humanity under the curse of the Law. As John Henry Newman wrote in the hymn:

O loving wisdom of our God!
When all was sin and shame,
A second Adam to the fight
And to the rescue came.²

He accomplished redemption from the slavery of the Law inasmuch as He triumphed over Death (the final indication or evidence of the curse), and this clearly signalled both victory over the Law which imposed the curse and redemption from the slavery to the Law under which His fellow Jews had fallen. This action is indicated by the verb ἐξαγορασεν, which is built up from the verb ἀγοράζω, meaning "to buy", e.g., to buy out of a condition of slavery (cf. I Cor. 6:20; 7:23). The verb merges into a meaning of "to deliver, redeem, emancipate" as seen in the form ἐξαγοράζω in Gal. 4:5 and in the verse now under consideration. The etymological sense of the word carries along with the idea of deliverance the connotation that this deliverance costs something — effort, suffering, loss — to him who is responsible for it.³ Furthermore, the aorist tense of the verb points to the act of deliverance as a single decisive event in world history, and clearly this event is the death of Jesus Christ on the Cross. In His death He completely exhausted the curse because He accepted the ultimate that the curse of the Law can bring to human life, namely, the destruction of the flesh. But since He triumphed over Death, the

¹ C.A.A. Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul, p. 40.
² Cf. The Scottish Psalter and Church Hymnary (1929), Hymn 32. Duncan, op. cit., pp. 96 f.
curse of the Law can no longer have any application against Him, for "the law is binding on a person only during his life" (Rom. 7:1). This was in the Apostle's mind when he wrote that Christ has "canceled the bond which stood against us with its legal demands; this he set aside, nailing it to the cross" (Col. 2:14). In the death of Christ, the Mosaic ordinances, along with the curse involved in not obeying all of them, were erased or blotted out — taken away by Christ and completely abrogated in His body of flesh on the cross.

In an attempt to understand the Col. 2:14 image, some have supposed that there was a custom in some cities for the abrogation of a decree to be signified by driving a nail through it and attaching it to a place in public view, but there is no definite evidence for this custom. Consequently, E.F. Scott is led to advance the idea, having slight possibility, that what is referred to here is the Roman custom of attaching over the head of a crucified victim the charge under which he had been condemned. Paul knew of the superscription over Jesus, "The King of the Jews", but in the Colossian epistle he thinks of the Law as nailed above Jesus on the cross since it is the charge on which He was put to death; and in this act the curse which was against the race was set aside. Although this is an inviting suggestion, it requires some imaginative expansion of the words of the image. Whatever way the details of the image are finally worked out, the essential point may certainly be described as "redemption" or "emancipation." As of old the Hebrews had been redeemed from slavery in Egypt, being liberated from servitude to become a free people, so again in God's redemptive plan His people had finally been emancipated from the Law with its attendant curse and had become the Free

1 Lightfoot, Colossians, p. 187.
2 E.F. Scott, Colossians, Philemon, and Ephesians (MNTC) p. 47.
3 Perhaps there is something of a parallel to the Colossian verse in the occasion when Job sees himself as entering a plea of innocence before God and implying that if he had the indictment against him he would confidently vindicate himself so that he would make a public display of it, being royally triumphant in his explanation: "I would carry it on my shoulder; I would bind it on me as a crown" (Job 31:36).
People, i.e., His Church.

The destruction of the power of Law in the flesh of Christ was not only an emancipation but was also a means of reconciliation, both vertical and horizontal. Thus the Ephesian letter says that the Second Adam abolished "in his flesh the law of commandments and ordinances" in order to reconcile Gentile and Jew to each other and both to God "in one body through the cross" (2:14-16). In His humanity He abolished human enmity. (Cf. Col. 1:21-22).

C) A Curse But Not Accursed. Christ suffered for man the consequences of broken Law in obedience to the will of God, and upon this vicarious Redeemer the Law exhausted its claim and curse. But although the Apostle says that Christ "became a curse (κατάρα) for us", he is careful not to say that in His own Person He was "accursed." Paul scrupulously avoids applying to Christ the exact wording of the Deuteronomic text — "Accursed by God." ¹ Although the curse of the Law in Jesus' case was real in that it manifested the verdict of legalism, it was not an actual curse in the sense that the Person on whom it fell was accursed by God. Everett's succinct approach is worthy of note: "Christ was accursed because he was crucified. He was not crucified because he was accursed." ² The Galatian passage is best understood by comparison with an expression to be considered later, ³ "He made him to be sin who knew no sin" (II Cor. 5:21; cf. Rom. 8:3). In other words, Christ became a curse for us in the sense that He accepted the human condition of being under a curse; for the only true process whereby sinful man can be saved is by the effect of One who shares the experiences of the results of sin but is Himself, nevertheless, sinless.

At this point one can note again the resemblance to the situation of the Suffering Servant, who was seen as "stricken, smitten by God and afflicted" (Isa.

1814

And is there not an echo here in Paul's expression of that cry of Jesus in dying agony from the Cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Mk. 15:34), in which one feels that Christ is identified with sinners to such a degree that He experiences the "death" that is separation from God, and yet, paradoxically, so close to God that He survived death? Indeed, a prolific modern scholar of Biblical theology C. Ryder Smith has concluded: "Surely Paul was aware of the correspondence between the Words of the Cross and his teaching. Were not the Words the starting point..." in his attempt to explain the Atonement? Similarly, the descriptive words of Bushnell paint a graphic picture of the situation of Christ coming, by His humanity, into the state of corporate evil which Scriptures call the curse:

In this taking of the flesh, He becomes a true member of the race, subject to all the corporate liabilities of His bad relationship. The world is now to Him just what it is to us; save that the retributive causations reach Him only in a public way, and never as a sufferer on His own account.

The resulting freedom from the curse of the Law is accomplished for Christians. Paul expressed it: "You have died to the law through the body of Christ" (Rom. 7:4), and "For I through the law died to the law, that I might live to God" (Gal. 2:19). Christ shattered the power of Law by first realizing in His own Person the depth of being under it and enduring its curse, which is death; but He burst forth from its tyranny by the very fact of His Crucifixion and Resurrection. By incorporation into the Body of Christ, Christians have shared in His death and also His Resurrection, and, therefore, in this sense "Christ is the end of the law, that everyone who has faith may be justified" (Rom. 10:4). Christians have "died to the law through the body of Christ" (Rom. 7:4), and "he who has died is freed from sin" (Rom. 6:7).

---

2 Horace Bushnell, *The Vicarious Sacrifice*, p. 325.
4 Although all of this idea of emancipation from the Law accomplished through the humanity of Jesus Christ refers immediately to the Jew under the Law, Paul would have extended it to the rest of humanity that fell into the grievous position
Paul, of course, saw a definite relation between the eternal purpose of God and the humanity of Jesus Christ. It was in the "fulness of time" according to God's plan that Christ became a Jew of His own age to accomplish redemption from the slavery of Law. In the Ephesian letter the Apostle referred to the fullness of time as "the eternal purpose which he [God] has realized in Christ Jesus our Lord" (3:11), and "his purpose which he set forth in Christ as a plan for the fullness of time" (1:9, 10). The "present time" (Rom. 3:26) is the "right time" (Rom. 5:6). Paul stressed that Jesus was, in His humanity, at the proper time, a "child of His own day and of His own people," subject to the Law in a common and yet a unique way.

The human condition of the Second Adam under the Law no doubt had some influence upon the Apostle's determination to become as one under the law in order to win those under that bondage for redemption. This is part of his resolution to become a slave (εδούλωσα) to all conditions of mankind for the purpose of winning them to Christ. This is another one of those parallels in the life of the Apostle which bear such a striking resemblance to the human life of Jesus that one cannot escape the conclusion that he is consciously influenced by that human life of the Master. At certain points in his epistles he depicts Jesus, in a corresponding sense, as free from all men yet making Himself a slave to all, for he writes in Phil. 2:6 of Christ Jesus, being in the form of God, and yet taking the form of a slave (δούλου) and in Gal. 4:4 of His being born under the Law for the purpose of redemption.

of placing their relation to God on the basis of law and discovering it to be a yoke of slavery. Indeed, in the Galatian 4 context the first person plural ἑστίς of verse 3 refers to both Jews and Gentiles in their pre-Christian condition in bondage both to the Law and to "the elemental spirits of the universe", and the second person ἐστέ of verse 6 is a clear inclusion of the Galatian Christians who have been liberated from slavery and made sons of God. It is apparent from Rom. 2:14 that the Apostle thought of the Gentiles as also having a law, which, although initially inward, could be externalized into a legalistic system.

1 Brunner, Creation and Redemption, p. 236.
2 I Cor. 9:19.
III. THE SECOND ADAM AND THE BONDAGE OF SIN

A) In The Likeness of Sinful Flesh — Rom. 8:3. The locus classicus to begin this subject is the triumphant assertion, "For God has done what the law, weakened by the flesh, could not do: sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh (ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας) and for sin (περὶ ἁμαρτίας), he condemned sin in the flesh..." This statement has claimed an untold amount of critical ink throughout the history of New Testament inquiry.

The liberation from the bondage and power of Sin depended, as in the case of the deliverance by the Second Adam from Evil Powers and Law, upon His Incarnation and the degree of His self-identification with humanity. Christ entered the sphere of Sin's dominion and in that realm won the decisive victory. But the crux interpretum of this Rom. 8:3 statement is the phrase ἐν ὁμοιώματι. What is the intention behind these words? Does Paul intend to emphasize more the likeness or unlikeness between Jesus Christ and the rest of humanity? Then does he intend σαρκὸς and ἁμαρτίας to belong to a single idea or to separate ideas? With these two basic questions critical scholarship, particularly of 19th century Germany, wrestled, applying philosophical and metaphysical categories of thought, and often emerged with some proposed solutions and theories that certainly would have surprised the Apostle Paul!

B) Two Faulty Assumptions. Certain of these critics, e.g., Holsten, Lüdemann, and Pfleiderer, adhered to the position that Christ actually had a σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας. His flesh was not merely similar to flesh having sin, but was such an exact reproduction of it that His flesh may be designated as σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας. There are, however, two faulty assumptions upon which such a claim rests: 1) That the ὁμοιώμα, to use Holsten's words, means "not similarity which posits, but a likeness which
cancels, distinction"; and 2) that σάρξ ὀμορφίας is to be taken as an inseparable combination meaning sin-flesh, or flesh which is inherently sinful. Emphasizing the abstract idea of congruence, Holsten understood the ὀμοιωμα of something to be constantly that which is essentially nothing else than the thing itself; and, therefore, in this scholar's view, Christ's flesh was essentially nothing less than human sin-flesh. In this view he was followed closely by Pfleiderer, while Lademann insisted that the word denotes a "copy or reproduction" in the sense of something which is copied or reproduced after an original; and so his translation is "Nachbildung."

But even if ὀμοιωμα should come closer to "likeness" than to "similarity", it is extravagant to push this point to the extent that the above scholars have done. After all, if Paul's intention concurred with the opinion of these critics, he could have said that Christ was sent "in the flesh" or "in sin-flesh" more directly simply by writing ἐν σαρκί or ἐν σαρκί ὀμορφίας, thus eliminating any confusion that might arise from the ambiguous word ὀμοιωμα. But the very fact that he did use the more complex assertion leads one to deduce that he intended to convey a meaning that these simpler interpretations fail to reach. If one assumes that there was a purpose for Paul's use of this expression, then it was the deliberate combination of words that best approximated the profound thought of the Apostle. If ὀμοιωμα signifies "likeness", as it certainly seems to do, one must be fair with the exegesis and admit that it also implies an element of difference. Inasmuch as Jesus Christ was in His humanity in a flesh-body like the rest of mankind He was also unlike mankind, since His flesh was not flesh of sin. This obviously puts the "likeness" in association with σάρξ, and "unlikeness" in association with ὀμορφία. Even apart from the explicit statement by Paul at II Cor. 5:21 that Christ was made to be sin, yet he knew no sin, the present passage contains the twofold truth that Christ had the σάρξ as the sphere in which sin was decisively condemned, and at the same time it strongly implies that He did not have the ὀμορφία.
Against the second of the dubious assumptions upon which the views of Holstien and Pfleiderer rest, viz., that σαρκὸς ἀμαρτίας must be accepted as one idea, and therefore ἀμαρτία is inseparable from the σῶς, the following may be said: The very addition of the word ἀμαρτίας is redundant if σῶς is already synonymous with ἀμαρτία. The argument that in Christ’s Cross sin in the flesh could not have been condemned to death unless the flesh of Christ had been a σῶς ἀμαρτίας wrongly places the emphasis upon Sin being inseparable from the flesh, whereas the proper emphasis ought to attach to the point that the flesh is the sphere or arena in which the final sentence on sin was passed. The phrase ἐν τῷ σαρκί is to be connected not so much with ἀμαρτίας, but rather to the verb κατέκρινε, for it is in the realm of the flesh where Sin is condemned by the Second Adam. Should one wonder why Paul connected ἀμαρτίας to σαρκός, passing over the more simple expression ἐν σαρκί or ἐν ὑποστάσει σαρκός, a just answer was advanced by Wendt who said, "The σῶς is designated σῶς ἀμαρτίας in order to indicate not wherein, but wherefore Christ became quite like the σῶς. In other words, Paul is not primarily concerned here with a definition of the flesh of Christ, but rather with a statement of the purpose of it, and this is definitely revealed by the specific addition καὶ περὶ ἀμαρτίας. If Christ really condemned sin within humanity itself, then such a redemptive capacity must presuppose that Christ as σῶς was completely free from sin. Indeed, since the Second Adam was fully σῶς and yet sinless, He was by His very presence in σῶς a judgment of God upon sin by virtue of manifesting the truth of God’s intention that sin does not inseparably belong to the σῶς.

C) Classification of Various Interpretations. With a view to classifying the varied opinions on this oft-debated perplexing phrase ἐν ὑποστάσει σαρκός ἀμαρτίας

---

1 Cited by Dickson, op. cit., p. 340.

(even though it involves a slight repetition of some of the above) one cannot do
better than to consult A.B. Bruce,¹ whose keen grasp of the shades of historical
interpretation has summarized the variously suggested possibilities for this verse.
Therefore, the outline of his analysis will be followed and presented with some
clarification and addition.

There are four possible interpretations that arise out of the combination
of opinions on two questions. These two crucial questions each involve two possi-
bilities, and can be set down as follows:

1) Does the word ἀμοιματι contain more of an emphasis upon
   a) likeness, or
   b) unlikeness?

2) Do the words σαρκὸς and ἁμαρτίας
   a) belong together in a single idea implying that sin is an essential
      property of the flesh, or
   b) are the two terms separate, implying that sin is not an essential
      but rather an accidental, though universal, property of the flesh?

Depending on how the alternatives are taken in each of these two questions, four
different views result. These may now be stated briefly, along with the names of a
few of the adherents as follows:

I. The first view, combining 2a with 1b, has Paul regarding sin as an essen-
tial property of the flesh, but Jesus Christ does not have sinful flesh. God did
not send Him in sinful flesh, but only in the likeness of sinful flesh. This
position was held, for example, by Baur, Zeller, and Hilgenfeld.

II. The second view, combining 2a with 1a, also has Paul regarding sin as an
essential element of the flesh, but holds that "likeness" means that Christ was
given a flesh made exactly like ours, viz., a flesh of sin. The sinlessness of
Christ, however, is preserved by observing the distinction that in His flesh it

¹ Bruce, St. Paul's Conception of Christianity, pp. 279-292.
was only objective and not subjective sin; and, therefore, it never came to παρεπίβασις because of the restraining and guiding influence of the Holy Spirit.

Lüdemann\(^1\) was an exponent of this position, as were also Holsten and Pfleiderer, as noted.\(^2\) These views, particularly of Holsten and Pfleiderer, that Christ's flesh was sinful flesh came under the vigorous and just refutation of Gifford\(^3\) and of Sanday and Headlam, who add, "Neither the Greek nor the argument requires that the flesh of Christ shall be regarded as sinful flesh, though it is His flesh — His Incarnation — which brought Him into contact with Sin."\(^4\)

III. The third view, combining 2b and 1b, has Paul regarding "flesh" and "sin" as separate ideas and taking δικόςμα as implying unlikeness with regard to the sinfulness of common fallen human nature. Such is the position of Hoffmann and Weiss.

IV. The fourth view, combining 2b and 1a, has Paul regarding "flesh" and "sin" as separate in the sense that sin adheres to the former only "per accidens" (the sinfulness of our flesh being referred to, not to indicate wherein Christ was like us, but \textit{wherefore} He was made like us), and that Christ was exactly like us in creaturely nature. Wendt and Dickson represent such a position.

Into these four basic categories of interpretation almost very view of Rom. 8:3 can be fitted. Certainly the amount of scholarly exegesis and expositional

---

1 According to Lüdemann's interpretation the πνεῦμα in Christ is not the πνευμα χριστιανου but rather the πνευμα θεου, which paralyzed the effect of the σωφροστις in Christ. On the basis of this view it is difficult to see how this critic avoids the error of Apollinaris. Cf. Die Anthropologie des Apostels Paulus (1872), and p. 116 n. for a digest of the views of Zeller, Hilgenfeld, Holsten, Overbeck, and Pfleiderer.


4 Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. 193.
effort expended on this important passage and the variety of derived opinions can be compared to that devoted to the "Kenosis" section of Phil. 2. In the face of such ponderous weight of conflicting scholarly opinion, what can be ventured as representing Paul's meaning?

D) A Positive Emphasis Upon "Likeness". The more likely approach to the matter is to understand the emphasis in ὁμοίωμα to be on the side of "likeness" instead of an implied "unlikeness". The noun ὁμοίωμα in the New Testament (with one exception, Rev. 9:7) was used only by Paul, and in most cases one can detect an emphasis upon "likeness" rather than any implied "unlikeness". There was no intention on Paul's part to deny that Christ lived a truly human life. On the contrary, the Apostle would have said He lived the only truly human life — and that life in human flesh. He held that the Second Adam was the revelation of the real nature of humanity, in the fullness of time, the True Man. Humanity as it came to be known historically and universally as a consequence of the Fall did not represent the true intention of God because man had been created in His own image, but as a result of Sin's dominion over the flesh that Divinely intended image and glory in man was woefully marred. In such condition humanity is, in point of fact, not "true". But Christ, the Second Adam, is what God intended man to be, namely, the image and glory of God. Paul's concept of the humanity of Jesus Christ attributes to Him, as the Second Adam, the glory of true humanity, while at the same time places Him in the likeness of the flesh of common humanity, which is under the dominion of Sin. This is for the purpose of redeeming the human race from that bondage, accomplishing that redemption in the very same physical realm in which the First Adam had lost the glory. In accordance with this view, one can see in the

---

1 In the LXX the word renders no less than seven Hebrew words, but the only rendering that begins to approach Paul's thought in this verse is that usage which seems to indicate the form in which something divine is manifested upon earth (cf. Ezek. 8:2 ff.), or else where a quality of glory is exchanged for something lowly (cf. Ps. 106:20).

2 Infra pp. 293 ff.
Pauline expression "in the likeness of sin's flesh" the idea of the veiled presence of the divine within the non-divine (cf. Heb. 2:14; 4:14 f.), and some justification, therefore, for the phrase being rendered by several interpreters as "in the guise of sinful flesh."¹

The positive emphasis upon "likeness" is necessary if Paul, as it obviously appears by the context, was stressing the redemptive function of the Second Adam. In order for the Second Adam to feel the power of temptation and sin in the way which closest resembles that experience by man He must in the closest possible way be "like" humanity. Only this will guarantee that His struggle against these powers will not be artificial or sham. So real was the power of Sin to Him that the Apostle could even write that God made Him to be sin for us (II Cor. 5:21). He was so thoroughly identified with humanity that He experienced everything that pertained to man's relation to sin, yet He alone did not consent to it.²

The Second Adam manifested in His life, in contrast to all other humanity, "the Spirit of holiness" (Rom. 1:4), and in accord with that unique sinlessness a unique glory was granted to Him. Supervening His death, there occurred the Resurrection by which He was designated (ο θεόν ματικόν) Son of God in power. This passage, like Rom. 8:3, implies a human state of humiliation after which (like Phil. 2:6 ff.) comes a state of power and glory. Paul does not say specifically when Jesus acquired this "Spirit of holiness," but rather implies that it is "the principle of personality in Jesus." It is the 'Spirit of holiness' which binds the earthly existence

¹ On this matter of Christ being True Man see C.H. Dodd, Romans (MNTO), p. 120; Brunner, The Mediator, pp. 330, 347n; Barth, "Christus und Adam", Theologische Studien, Heft 35, pp. 50 f.

² Cf. Bruce, St. Paul's Conception of Christianity, p. 332; Nygren, op. cit., p. 314. Barth, Romans, p. 281, gives a slightly different twist to the idea of "likeness" by holding that sin-controlled flesh in Jesus Christ becomes a parable of "likeness" in the sense that what is worldly and "natural" is revealed to be what it actually is in relation to God the Creator. It is shown to be "only a transparent thing, only an image, only a sign, only something relative . . . the illusion of the flesh has been done away in Christ."
alike to what went before and to what came after.\footnote{1} Scott points out that this same "Spirit of holiness" may underlie the idea of Rom. 8:2, which introduces the ὁμοίωματί passage of the following verse. This means taking the phrase "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" as equivalent to the Spirit of holiness principle in Him. If ὁ νόμος here means "authority", as Sanday and Headlam state, then one sees in the verse the "authority" or "governing principle" that was in Christ Jesus in contrast to the "authority" or "governing principle" of Sin and Death.\footnote{2}

E) Made to be Sin Who Knew no Sin. When Paul says, "For our sake he made him to be sin who knew no sin", he is using a similar expression as in Gal. 3:13 and Rom. 8:3. In all cases he carefully avoids saying or implying that Christ was a sinner. He was made to be sin, but not a sinner; He became a curse for us, but not accursed; He was in the likeness of sinful flesh, but not in sinful flesh; He took the form of a slave, but was not simply a slave. Paul prefaced the startling phrase ὁμορρίαν ἐποίησεν with the definite assertion τὸν μὴ γνώτα ὁμορρίαν, and the very fact that this phrase is in an emphatic first position in the sentence is significant. In the expression "he knew no sin", the verb is used "in the intimate Hebrew sense of physical and spiritual union."\footnote{3} The Second Adam had no intercourse with sin because His life of perfect obedience constantly repelled the attempts of Sin to enter His human existence.

The Second Adam was made to be sin not in the sense that God forced Him into this situation, but rather in the sense of being voluntarily done in Him in accordance with God's will. The human analogy of a mother who "becomes" the sin of her son or daughter out of the pure motive of her love, by which she voluntarily identifies herself with that shame and sin, and who can often feel the power of that

---


\footnote{2} Loc. cit.

\footnote{3} J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 39.
sin even more than the erring child, helps one to understand this perplexing verse. The mother in such instance "becomes" the sin of her child inasmuch as she "knows" no such sin in her own life. ¹ Although the meaning of the Baptism of Jesus has not found agreement among scholars, it seems that the truest interpretation has been given to it by Paul in this concise Corinthian statement. In the act of submitting to baptism by John, Jesus began to manifest the role of the Suffering Servant by which He identified Himself with sinners in their distant relation to God (cf. Lk. 22:37).² He voluntarily "became sin" for their sake, with the realization that He would work for their redemption. One, therefore, might ask: Does not the account of the Baptism, in addition to the fact of the Cross, lie behind Paul's compact expression in II Cor. 5:21? It is, as Bushnell put it, a great loving, vicarious act that "did not consider the expense of toil, and sacrifice, and suffering the intervention may cost."³

So the Second Adam, according to Paul, was involved in the desperate Sin-dominated situation of man. A striking phrase, borrowed from McCleod Campbell, that reverberates through Macaulay's stimulating book, The Death of Jesus, describing this real encounter of Jesus with the oppressed condition of mankind is: "the perfected personal experience of the enmity of the carnal mind to God." In the role of the Servant he "was numbered with the transgressors" (Isa. 53:12), a condition which Jesus accepted for His life as a necessary fulfillment of Scripture. He completely identified Himself so far as possible with humanity under the power of Sin and yet remained sinless. But in speaking of this sinlessness it is important to realize that Paul did not think of the sinlessness of Jesus merely as a nega-

¹ R.H. Strachan, II Corinthians (MNTC), p. 121. He makes the point that it is a case of a feeling of complicity being more than compassion. In a faintly comparable way Elijah and Moses also identified themselves with their people but did not participate in their sin.

² Cullmann has justly emphasized the significant point that on the two subsequent occasions when Jesus spoke about His own Baptism (Mk. 10:38; Lk. 12:50) He meant His death. Moreover, I Cor. 1:13 seems to indicate that Paul associated baptism with crucifixion. Baptism in the New Testament, p. 19.

³ Horace Bushnell, The Vicarious Sacrifice, p. 7.
tive characteristic of His life, but rather as a positive \( \lambda \gamma \alpha \pi \gamma \), which is sinless in itself, and which can share the burden of the sinner. Thus Bushnell, who considered vicariousness as simply another name for love, appropriately wrote, "Love is a principle essentially vicarious in its own nature, identifying the subject with the others, so as to suffer their adversities and pains, and taking on itself the burden of their evils."\(^1\) In dealing with "the woman that was a sinner", Jesus acted on this principle and so deeply and sympathetically entered into her experience that He realized the heavy burden of guilt which her sin heaped upon her. Accordingly, it was only by the realization on the woman's part that Jesus not only understood, but took upon Himself the burden of it, that she could feel forgiven. He "became sin" for her, yet He was sinless.

F) The Redemptive Servant Role. In the II Corinthians 5:21 passage it is plain that Paul linked the conception of the humanity of Jesus Christ with the purpose of redemption. Here it is expressed "for our sake" and concludes, "so that in him we might become the righteousness of God" meaning that, realizing the victorious relation between Christ and Sin, Christians may enter by faith into a new relationship with God. This Pauline interpretation of the relation of Christ to human sin can best be understood as a development of Jesus' own teaching about His mission in terms of a redemptive function: "The Son of man came . . . to give his life as a ransom for many" (Mk. 10:45), and, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many" (Mk. 14:24, or "for the forgiveness of sins" - Mt. 26:28). Although attacks have been made upon the authenticity of these two sayings, they have by no means been strong enough to definitely discredit them as legitimate statements of Jesus.

In Mk. 14:24, the blood which is poured out is "for (\( \dot{\omicron} \pi \epsilon \rho \) ) many," and this vicarious statement is in accord with Jesus' self-interpretation as Suffering Servant-Son of Man. Moreover, it is significant that Paul never used \( \dot{\omicron} \nu \tau ' \)

\(^1\) Loc. cit.
"instead of"), but always the preposition ὑπὲρ ("for") when writing of the vicarious death of Christ (cf. I Thess. 5:10; Gal. 2:20; I Cor. 15:3; Rom. 5:6; 8:32). In Mark 10:45, however, the phrase is λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, but the preposition here also has the sense of "for" (just as it does in Mt. 17:27). Here the point that Jesus is making is that the Suffering Servant-Son of Man in His death represents the many. It can be clearly seen how Paul carried on this interpretation by speaking of Christ as the inclusive Representative of the New Humanity as Adam was of the Old. When describing the representative nature of His death he employed such expressions as: "For as by one man's disobedience many (ὁι πολλοί) were made sinners, so by one man's obedience many will be made righteous" (Rom. 5:19). Similarly, II Cor. 5:14 states: "The love of Christ controls us, because we are convinced that one has died for all; therefore all have died." Furthermore, the λύτρον idea in Mk. 10:45 is also developed by Paul when he says that Christ has become our "redemption" (ἀπολύτρωσις—I Cor. 1:30), or as Rom. 3:24, 25 has it: διὰ τῆς ἀπολύτρωσις which is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as an expiation by his blood, to be received by faith" (cf. Eph. 1:7). Behind this ransom-redemption idea is the conception of sacrifice. Paul followed the mind of Christ in interpreting His humanity and His death as vicarious, representative, and sacrificial; and involved in this was the recognition of Jesus as the perfect fulfillment of the Suffering Servant-Son of Man role whereby His death was understood as having sin-atoning power for "the many".2 As was noted earlier, Paul presented this interpretation of the

1 Jeremias supports the authenticity of the Markan text of the Lord's Supper on the basis of the frequent number of Semitisms and singularities of Palestinian speech that it contains. Of relevant interest to the point here is that the πολλῶν of Mk. 14:24, on the basis of Semitic expression, means not only "many" but "all." Moreover, this inclusive sense is also exhibited in the ὑπὲρ of the Adam-Christ typology of Rom. 5:15 and in the Body of Christ concept in Rom. 12:5 and I Cor. 10:17. But one of the strongest examples of the inclusive sense for πολλῶν appears in the λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν phrase of Mk. 10:45, which is a clear reference to Isa. 53:10-12, and has its parallel in the ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων phrase of I Tim. 2:6. Die Abendmahls wor te Jesu, pp. 91-93. This inclusive sense will receive more attention in the concluding chapters dealing with the Second Adam as corporate humanity.

death of Jesus in the light of Isa. 53 (cf. Rom. 4:24; Phil. 2:6-11; I Cor. 15:3).

G) Faith in a Paradox. If one is to put a positive emphasis upon "likeness", then secondly, one must recognize that although Paul did not think of the flesh as being inherently sinful, he came to the point where the two ideas of "flesh" and "sin" had practically, or empirically speaking, merged into one idea in his thought because all flesh had come so completely under the power of Sin. How Paul surmounted the obvious difficulty involved when this idea is connected with the first, still maintaining the sinlessness of Jesus, he does not reveal. One seriously wonders if he ever really precisely defined the relationship in his own mind. At this point thinkers of today must, like Paul, plead a health agnosticism, frankly recognizing the reality of the paradox whereby He took upon Himself the likeness of common humanity, universally characterized as having sin's flesh, and yet was sinless. Although scholars are often prone to circumlocutions for this word ομοιόμαι, one must frankly be reconciled to the truth of the paradox which holds to both the "consubstantiality of Christ's humanity and the sinlessness of His nature," and therefore have faith in a paradox — but paradox is at the very heart of Christianity. This, after all, is the obvious, although illogical and perplexing, meaning that one is intended to derive from this sublime statement; and it is the ultimate conclusion that every reputable commentator attains. The flesh of Christ is "like" ours in every possible respect except that in Him it was not sinful. When all the utterance of theological logomachy has finally subsided, one is

1 For example, Sabatier, The Apostle Paul, p. 329, said that the word always designates an "approximate identification, never an absolute material identity," and therefore, Christ's flesh only represents "in a general manner the flesh of humanity." H.R. Mackintosh, "Person of Christ", H.D.B. 1 Vol. ed., pp. 706 f., said that the phrase 'in the likeness of sinful flesh' means that the sinful flesh of man is "the pattern" on which Christ's sinless flesh was formed. Denney, cited by C.A.A. Scott in D.A.C., op. cit., p. 192b, says that Paul, by the introduction of ομοιόμαι, intends "to indicate not that Christ was really man, or that His flesh was not really what in us is ὁμοίωμα ὀμορθίας, but that what for ordinary men is their natural condition is for this Person only an assumed condition."

left with the unanswerable: what more can actually be said about it than to faithfully admit this bold antinomy? The Second Adam of Paul was neither an Ebionite nor a Docetic Christ; He was, paradoxically, "in the likeness of sin's flesh".  

H) In the Likeness of Men. The other well-known occasion when Paul uses the word ὀμοιώματι to indicate "likeness" between Jesus Christ and humanity appears in the Phil. 2:7 expression, "taking the form of a slave ἐν ὀμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος. Again, the word cannot mean a "likeness which cancels all distinction," but it does imply the reality of Christ's humanity. Although the "likeness" is not absolutely without distinction, there is nothing to indicate that the Apostle thought that Jesus was a man only in appearance, a docetic Christ. When He came into the "likeness of men", a true human history of lowly manhood began for Him in which He experienced the limitations and weaknesses of humanity, the human impoverishment, dependence and subjection — all of which was in starkest contrast to His previous existence. The two Philippian phrases "taking the form of a slave" and "being born in the likeness of men" can be understood as parallel in inverse order to those of Gal. 4:4, "born of woman" and "born under law", thus:

\[ \text{μορφήν δούλου λαβὼν} \times \text{ἐν ὀμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός} \times \text{γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον} \]

When inversely combined, the phrases provide true aspects of the humanity of Jesus Christ: being born of a woman, He was in the likeness of men; and being born under the Law, He took the form of a slave.

The use of the plural ἀνθρώπων indicates that the "likeness" was related to the humanity of all men. His likeness was not limited to just an individual or class of the human race but was like mankind in general, and so His assumed

---

1 Cf. Barth's apt phrase "sin-controlled flesh". Romans, pp. 277 ff.

2 Michael, Philippians (MNTC), p. 92, holds the contrary opinion, seemingly on the basis that Paul could have used the word "form" if this were intended; but this is not a strong argument.

3 Robert Rainy, The Epistle to the Philippians, p. 118.
manhood had a complete and representative character. This likeness is further emphasized by the addition "being found in human form" (σχῆμα εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος). Because He came "in the likeness of men", He was observed in all outward appearances, in all that is apprehended by the senses, as a man. In this is included His status, actions, manner of life, mien, conversation, and teaching. His contemporaries saw Him as a man, and the pity was that almost all of them saw Him only as that. The significant irony of this is brought out by Brunner, who writes, "The Son of God in whom we are to be able to believe, must be such a One that it is possible to mistake him for an ordinary man."¹

In addition to this sense of "outward appearance" there is another meaning attached to this word σχῆμα by Paul when it appears in I Cor. 7:31 (the only other New Testament occurrence), "For the σχῆμα of this world is passing away." Here there is the obvious connotation of changeableness, transitoriness. This sense is associated with the first because it is a characteristic of human life in the flesh that it is not only outward but temporary; therefore, σχῆμα indicates the temporary quality of material nature. Thus it was with the Second Adam that His earthly life in a flesh-body was only a transitory, temporal stage in His total life, although His humanity continues permanent.

J) Sin Condemned in the Flesh. Returning to the Rom. 8:3 expression, "... sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin (περὶ ἁμαρτίας), he condemned sin in the flesh," one notes that the purpose of Christ's earthly human life was to encounter and condemn Sin in that very realm where it so thoroughly established its tyranny. Although the phrase περὶ ἁμαρτίας finds a constant parallel in the Old Testament (especially in Leviticus) in the term "sin-offering" (the object of which was to make atonement for sins), the Romans reference to Christ was expanded to include "every sense in which the Incarnation and Death of Christ had relation to, and had it for their object to remove, human sin."² But most

² Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. 193.
important of all is the use of the sin-offering idea in Isa. 53, where verse 10 declares, "... when he makes himself an offering for sin, ..." That the Servant passage of Isa. 53 supplied the background for Paul's expression about the relation of Jesus to Sin and Death can be seen by looking at some of the phrases in the LXX. The Suffering Servant "bears our sins" (τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει - v. 4, cf. v. 11); he shall inherit many and share the spoil of the strong; his life was delivered up (παρεδόθη) to death; he was reckoned among the transgressors (ἀνόμοις); he bore the sins of many (ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήγεγκεν), and was delivered up for the transgressions of others. Like the LXX of this passage Paul characteristically uses a form of the verb παροσίδωμι in reference to the death of Christ (e.g., Rom. 4:25; 8:32; Gal. 2:20; Eph. 5:2, 25).

In Rom. 8:3 Paul employed a figure of speech from the law court. When Christ came in flesh, Sin, exercising dominion over all human flesh, put in its claim against Him, but it made not even the slightest progress because of His complete obedience to God. Although He was exposed to Sin and felt the power of it in His humanity, He did not for a moment permit it to build up any case against Him. On the contrary He, in the truest reality, actually condemned Sin. He entered its occupied realm of flesh, but because He proved to be sinless, Sin the "prosecutor" actually became Sin the "condemned."¹

Other Pauline passages help to illustrate the meaning of the phrase "he condemned sin in the flesh," and certainly one of these keys is Rom. 6:7-10. There the Apostle is telling about sharing in the death of Christ and of the emancipation from the bondage of Sin and Death which He accomplished, because "the death He died He died to sin, once for all" (6:10). So complete was His identification with humanity under the despotic reign of Sin that He even accepted its end, which is death (6:21), but the decisive difference between the death of a common man and the death of Christ was that with the former it is a death through sin (Rom. 5:12),

whereas with Christ it was a death unto sin, once for all (6:10). With the former, death is the result of sin, while with Christ death was for the purpose of destroying the power of Sin.¹ In His human nature He endured death on the Cross, and in that death He once for all severed all contact with, and broke the power of, Sin, whose only possible avenue of attack was through the flesh of His human nature. This He accomplished not only for Himself, but for all those united in Him. From that climactic moment on the Cross the claim of Sin upon His humanity, and upon all those united to Him by faith was categorically denied and cast out of court. Thus there is a finality about this freedom accomplished from the slavery of Sin, even though Christians may not yet be completely liberated. The sentence has been pronounced in all reality, but its effects are not yet completely manifest.

Paul was not merely saying that Christ condemned Sin during His life by setting an example of the sinless life, demonstrating that human nature had the possibility of being sinless, although this was implied when he associated Christ with the "Spirit of holiness". It was implied because the Apostle must have been familiar with the facts of the Gospel which tell of His anointing by the Spirit, His repelling of temptation in the wilderness, His constant refusal to yield to Sin, and of His decisive victory at death over Sin, as this was conclusively proved by His Resurrection. In all this Paul realized that the struggle Jesus had with temptation was intensely real. It is doubtful that Paul would have been found in the later camp which stressed "non potuit peccare", but rather would have been found as one of those witnesses of whom Denney spoke: "No doctrine of Christ's person can hide from a simple spectator the truth that He had a battle to fight, and that we men, in whose nature He fights it, are interested in His victory."² But certainly the finality of this act of condemning Sin, Paul proclaims, is in the death of

¹ Which Macaulay well-describes as "the doom of abiding forever in a wrong relation to God with all its consequences." The Death of Jesus, p. 158.

Jesus. In that moment God condemned Sin in the flesh; that is to say, His judgment came upon that flesh with which Christ had identified Himself and represented as the Second Adam. He "pronounced the doom of sin as it had found lodgment in the physical constitution of men", and with that judgment its right and power came to an end in human nature.¹

IV. THE SECOND ADAM AND THE DOMINION OF DEATH

Much that has already been said in the preceding sections of this chapter is applicable here, for at the moment of death on the Cross the Second Adam forever dealt a decisively crushing blow to all the Alien Powers, including Law and Sin, which reigned over humanity; and in breaking them, He broke their ultimate End, namely, Death. As the Fathers said, Jesus's death was 'the death of death.'²

A) The Extreme Form of a Slave. In taking flesh and accepting the form of a slave the Second Adam voluntarily entered the realm of human servitude, became a curse for us, was made sin for us, and in the depth of humiliation, died for us. In His human nature He even came under the ultimate dominion of Death because in assuming a mortal body "the Son of Man, like every other fallen son of man, must die."³ This ultimate end of His earthly life was in accord with His life of complete obedience to the will of God. He "gave himself for our sins to deliver us from the present evil age, according to the will of our God the Father" (Gal. 1:4); the Second Adam was "obedient unto death, even death on a cross" (Phil. 2:8).⁴

Even though He was sinless He voluntarily took upon Himself all those consequences

¹ C.A.A. Scott, According to Paul, p. 52; cf. Denney, The Death of Christ, p. 188.
² Wm. Neil, The Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians, p. 94.
⁴ Brunner's statement that the "obedience of the Son is not the obedience of an historical personality, but the presupposition on the basis of which this personality could become historical" (The Mediator, p. 311) is not completely true to the picture of Christ's obedience which Paul presents.
of a sinner — even the death of the sinful; and in this sense the Second Adam was most fully in "the form of a slave."

It is well to remember that μορφή means the visible outward expression of inward character, and as such it is similar to the New Testament usage of ἐίδωσ and in contrast to σχήμα, which means simply outward appearance.¹ So by saying that the Second Adam took the μορφήν δοῦλον, Paul was not indicating a docetic view, but rather was emphasizing the reality of His situation under the enslaved conditions of fallen humanity. Yet at the same time one must bear in mind that he never said directly that "Christ was a δοῦλος", just as he never said He was "accursed" or "a sinner". There was always the veiled μορφή Θεοῦ in Him, and this accounted for the difference between His relation to the enslaving powers of Sin and Death and that of the enslaved First Adam humanity, even though He was identified with the humanity of the Old Adam to such an extent that He experienced death as the common consequence of a real sin-enslaved humanity.

Paul declared that from the fact of Christ's Resurrection one knows that He will never die again; "death no longer has dominion (κυριεύει) over him" (or as Moffatt says, "no more hold over him", Rom. 6:9). This statement is significant both for what it does and what it does not say. It implies that there was a time before His Resurrection that the Second Adam was in "bondage" to Death, and at the same time it supplies absolutely no ground for assuming that His death was the consequence of personal sin; as such it is consistent with the other passages concerning the relation of the Second Adam to Law and Sin. Although Sin could find absolutely no footing in His flesh, He voluntarily entered the corporate condition of humanity that resulted from Sin for the sake of redeeming man. In the process, He obediently accepted death, and only in that sense had it "dominion" over Him; only in that sense did He pass through the extreme consequences of sin by His

¹ The contrast between the two words can be clearly seen in the use of their cognates μεταμορφώ and μετασχηματίζω in Romans 12:2; Phil. 3:21; and II Cor. 11:13-15.
Crucifixion and Death. Here, again, one sees Jesus' Suffering Servant - Son of Man self-characterization reflected in the thought and expression of the Apostle. A crisp summary of the situation is made by C. Ryder Smith: "Christ is able to reconcile the alienated because, Himself un-alienated, He is yet so closely one with the alienated that He experiences their alienation."  

Only He who knew in Himself the measure of the holiness of God could realize also in the human nature which He had made His own the full depth of the alienation of sin from God. It is only another wholly self-identified with the sinner in all that can be meant by natural union, quickened and realized in the fire of an infinite love; and yet, without the impulse of sin, gazing full on the undimmed vision of the holiness of God; who can be stricken on his behalf with the full sense of the infinite horror of sin.

At this point it needs to be recalled that when Paul spoke of death he did not have any intention of distinguishing between physical and spiritual death, but often meant both in terms, primarily, of separation from God. In reference, therefore, to the death of Christ as in "Death no more has dominion over him", and "the death he died he died to sin once for all," Paul meant more than just the physical expiration of life, for he also implied that it was a spiritual experience. To redeem man from the tyranny of Death the Second Adam must also have both aspects of the experience. No one ever anticipated the horror of separation from God as Jesus did at death, and yet this deepest humiliation that man ever experienced was also the beginning of His Resurrection and Exaltation.

B) Alienated But Not Separated. In saying that through His Incarnation and Death the Second Adam is in the place where humanity had put itself, the most wretched state of separation from God, one is again brought squarely up against the inscrutable paradox which embraces a twofold truth. On the one hand the Second Adam accepted this alienated position of a sinner, and on the other hand He was not separated from God. This fundamental paradox was admirably set forth in

1 C. Ryder Smith, The Bible Doctrine of Salvation, p. 254.

2 R.C. Moberly, Atonement and Personality, pp. 130, 128.

3 Cf. John Calvin who said, "...He bore in his soul the tortures of a condemned and ruined man." Institutes, II, xvi, 10.
Paul's own words when he asserted in immediate connection that Jesus on the cross was "made to be sin", and "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself" (II Cor. 5:19-21). All attempts to reconcile logically these two facets of the truth inevitably lead to either mental paralysis or heresy, yet this is not to deny their intrinsic validity; for just as human life exceeds logic, so also must His, only more so. Paradoxically, "On the cross Jesus was so closely one with sinners that He experienced the 'death' that is separation from God, and yet so closely one with God that He survived that 'death'." Ultimately, it will have to be said, as Smith suggests, that this basic antinomy runs right back to, and is derived from, two Words of Jesus on the Cross: "Why hast thou forsoaked me?", and "Father, into thy hands ...".

3) Vindication Through Resurrection. Accomplishing the doom of Sin in His death, the Second Adam completely left behind any relation to Sin and Death; and this was victoriously demonstrated by the Resurrection. The process of condemning Sin in the flesh was begun by the Incarnation, perfected by His death, and vindicated by the Resurrection. The Levitical law of sin-offering was utterly inadequate to deal with the ultimate result of Sin; only Christ who was sent περὶ ἁμαρτίας could, by His Death, deal a fatal blow against Sin. This is the amazing fact that Paul repeatedly expressed.3 But the relation of the Second Adam to the dominion of Death cannot be considered apart from its inseparable connection with the Resurrection, the fact of primary importance to the Apostle. The Resurrection was proof that Jesus was conqueror of Death, and in Paul's mind it was inseparably linked to it.

1 C. Ryder Smith, op. cit., p. 261.

2 Loc. cit.

3 A partial catena of his statements on this subject can be readily assembled: "He died for our sins" (I Cor. 15:3). "He did not spare his own Son but gave him up for us all" (Rom. 8:32). "He gave Himself for our sins to deliver us from the present evil age" (Gal. 1:4). He was "put to death for our trespasses" (Rom. 4:25). "While we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son" (Rom. 5:10). "At the right time Christ died for the ungodly" (Rom. 5:6). "The death he died he died to sin, once for all" (Rom. 6:10).
All of the Second Adam's life of humiliation came to a supreme focus in His Death, and out of it came the crowning fact of His Resurrection, which indicated His undeniable exaltation. He not only exhausted the power of Death on the Cross, but His complete triumph was manifested in the Resurrection. The expression in II Tim. 1:10 concerning "our Savior Christ Jesus who abolished death," while probably not from the pen of Paul, nevertheless reflects his conviction (cf. I Cor. 15:26). Moreover, Paul also connected the Resurrection as well as the Passion and Death of Jesus with the atonement and redemption: He "was put to death for our trespasses and raised for our justification" (Rom. 4:25; cf. Rom. 8:34, I Cor. 15:17; Phil. 3:9-11). As Kennedy rightly remarked, "For Paul the cross is unintelligible apart from the resurrection, and the real import of the resurrection becomes clear only in the light of the cross." 1 Throughout his epistles numerous exclamations like "Christ has been raised from the dead" (I Cor. 15:20), and "Christ died and lived again" (Rom. 14:9) are to be read.

Resurrection, according to God's plan, was the inevitable result of His life lived in the perfect Spirit of holiness. It was the risen, exalted Jesus who met Paul on the Damascus Road, which encounter initiated his conversion-resurrection theology and caused him always to interpret the life and death of Jesus in the light of the Resurrection. At the very outset of his most theological epistle he based everything upon the gospel of God's Son, who was "descended from David according to the flesh and designated Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness by his resurrection from the dead, Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 1:3, 4). However frequently Paul might have reflected upon the "Spirit of holiness" in Jesus, the dominating manifestation of it to the Apostle was in His victory over the power of Death and the grave.

D) Conclusion. When the "rulers of this age", in ignorance, "crucified the

---

1 Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles, p. 71.
Lord of glory" (I Cor. 2:8), they, indeed, acted ignorantly, for not only did they lack understanding for the wisdom of God, but they actually (to use a rough figure) fired the gun from the wrong end, thus committing unintentional suicide. Although His flesh was stripped off, He certainly was not destroyed. The powers of evil were not only put into an impossible situation whereby they were deprived of their sole possible avenue of approach to His sinless nature, but they were actually destroyed in the destruction of His flesh. Obviously, a concept of the real humanity of Jesus Christ is absolutely integral to the Apostle's doctrine. For the purpose of redemption the humanity of Jesus Christ is thought to be identified (but not identical) with the human race under the multiple tyranny of Evil Powers, Law, Sin, and Death. The Second Adam was in the flesh (ἐν σώματι), but He, unlike the rest of humanity, did not live according to the flesh (κατὰ σώματος); on the cross He divested Himself of that flesh, and in that act defeated the Enemies of humanity. For this His resurrection is conclusive proof.

Brunner effectively points out the pre-eminence of the Cross in achieving the victory of the Resurrection:

It has usually been too little noticed that the witness of Paul to the victory of Jesus over all hostile powers is connected not so much with the fact of Easter as with the fact of Good Friday. There on the Cross, the decisive thing happened, for there the Incarnation of the Son of God — paradoxically reached its climax. That which, from the world's point of view, was the absolute nadir, the 'zero hour' in the ministry of Jesus, is from the spiritual point of view the absolute zenith, the fulfilment of the revelation of God in the 'form of a servant', and in that very fact His victory over the powers of death.¹

For Paul the death of the historical human Second Adam on the cross became the supreme revelation of God's redemptive love and the pivotal point of all history.

¹Brunner, Creation and Redemption, p. 372.
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THE SECOND ADAM AS MAN, CORPORATE HUMANITY

Just as it has been affirmed that the humanity of Jesus Christ according to Paul was associated with a definite, individual, historical person of a particular nationality, so it must also be recognized that the Apostle thought of His humanity in terms of something much more. For Paul the Son of David was more emphatically "the second Man."¹ Paul thought of Jesus Christ in terms of an inclusive, corporate humanity. Therefore, in a very real sense He was not only a man but was Man. He was both One and the Many. The recognition of this Pauline insight carries one far into the Apostle's Christological expression. Paul's conception of Jesus Christ in terms of the Second Adam reveals the perfect blending of these two, seemingly incongruous, aspects of the person of Jesus Christ. In this chapter and in the remaining two the theme will be this corporate aspect of the humanity of Jesus Christ.

If it is true that Paul's Second Adam is his expression of Jesus' Son of Man, then it is quite logical that the Second Adam should have a twofold aspect. As noted, the Old Biblical concept of the Son of Man had both an individual and a corporate aspect, with often an easy oscillation between the two. This individual and communal idea can also be detected in Jesus' use and meaning of the Son of Man title. In addition, the Suffering Servant concept, which bore the heaviest influence on Jesus' interpretation of the Son of Man, contributed to this individual-corporate oscillation because it is a well-known fact that the Figure of the Servant Songs is either an individual, or the godly remnant, or the whole nation. It would be precarious to insist that the Servant Figure must be consistently one or the other. The Hebrew mind could easily move from one to the other, from an individual to the group which he represents.

¹ Bruce, St. Paul's Conception of Christianity, p. 334.
The Hebrew Concept of Extended Personality. As an aid to understanding Paul's concept of the Second Adam as a corporate person, it is profitable to consider an element of Hebrew thought which lies behind much of Old Testament expression and which probably had some influence upon the thought of the Apostle. It may be called the concept of "extension of personality", upon which Aubrey Johnson has shed a great deal of light.

The starting point in this concept is the Hebrew idea of the distinct vital unity of the personality (יִשְׂרָאֵל). By contrast to Greek distinction, there were in Hebrew thought no twofold or threefold aspects of personality involving component parts of "body", "soul", and "spirit". Since man was created in the image of God, Who is a unity, man, therefore, was also thought to be a unity—an entity in the likeness of the unity of God. The term יִשְׂרָאֵל, as Johnson says, meant "the complete personality as a unified manifestation of vital power." Moreover, this unified human personality, as revealed in the Old Testament record, was capable of being extended in a number of ways, some of which can be noted in the following instances. In the blessing of Jacob and Esau (Gen. 27:27 ff.) the spoken word of Isaac was understood to be an extension of his personality. The continuance of a man's name through the line of his sons (cf. Deut. 25:5 ff.) was a similar extension. A man's house was thought to be his extended personality (cf. Gen. 7:1; 36:6; Josh. 7:24 ff.); and even some items of a man's property were considered as extensions of his personality (cf. II Kings 4:29). The servant or messenger was the extension of the personality of the lord or master, to the degree that the messenger was almost the same as the lord (Gen. 44:4 ff; Judges 11:12, 13). As Johnson says, "the Hebrew יִשְׂרָאֵל is never a mere isolated unit. It is the center of power capable of indefinite extension, and the individual lives in

1 Aubrey Johnson, The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God, 41 pp.; and The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel, p. 89.
2 Johnson, The One and the Many, p. 6.
constant reaction toward others."¹ The household, kin-group, tribe were a
"psychical whole" representing the extended personality of the man who was its head
(cf. Num. 21:4; 11:6; II Kings 9:15; Ps. 124:7; Isa. 3:9). But the ḫânîšû was not
always fixed as either an individual unit or a psychical whole, but rather there was
sometimes an oscillation between the individual and the corporate body, as seen, for
example, in the negotiations of the children of Israel with the king of Edom for
passage through his kingdom. In this account the "we" of Num. 20:17 abruptly changes
to "I" in verse 19. A similar ambiguity can be noted in the usage of the terms
"Christ" or "Anointed" where a difficulty is encountered in the attempt to distin-
guish sharply between the people or a person representing the people: "Thou wentest
forth for the salvation of thy people, for salvation of thy anointed" (Hab. 3:13);
and, "The Lord is the strength of his people, he is the saving refuge of his
anointed" (Ps. 28:8).

Similarly, the Hebrew concept of Jahweh, like that of man, was capable of
extension of personality in a number of ways. It was extended in "Spirit" (I Kings
22:19 ff.), "Word" (Isa. 55:10 ff.), "Name" (Deut. 12:5, 11, 21), and in the "Ark"
(I Sam. 4:5-8). Most interesting, however, of the possibilities of the extension of
personality on Jahweh's part was to that of His messenger. The messenger, perform-
ing his office, imparted God's message to such a degree that he was thought to
be the personality of God extended and identified with God.² In the account of the
promise of a child to Manoah and his wife (Jud. 13:2 ff.), the messenger of Jahweh
was successively described as "angel" (v. 3), "man of God" (v. 6), and "God" (v. 22).
Consequently, Manoah exclaimed that he and his wife would surely die because they had
seen God (v. 22). Likewise, the angel of the Lord communicated the message to Hagar
that she was to give birth to Ishmael, and at the end of the theophany she exclaimed,
"Have I really seen God and remained alive after seeing him?³ (Gen. 16:13).

¹ Ibid, p. 11.
³ Or "have I even here seen after him who sees me?"
Jewish Christians with this conceptual background might be led to think of Jesus the Messiah as the supreme instance of the extension of the personality of Jahweh. It would be but another step for them to think in terms of the extended personality of the Messiah who appeared perfectly in Jesus Christ. This may be what the early Christians, especially Paul, did, although it would be a mistake to apply this too literally or to assume that this was the only basis for deriving a sense of the corporate nature of the Second Adam. It is observable, however, that the supreme drama of the Suffering Servant-Son of Man concept narrowing down through the course of Hebrew history to the one Person, Jesus Christ, and after His death and resurrection receiving a universal extension to include all those united to Him by faith and baptism bears a relationship to the ancient Hebrew idea.

1 The concept of the extension of personality, however, must be applied with caution. It has been carried to doubtful lengths, for example, by G.A. Knight (From Moses to Paul). Knight holds that Jesus may be regarded as the Messenger and Face of God that enters into the suffering of man, and who was thereby the extension of the "nephesh" of God on earth, the one person in whom the Shekinah was concentrated among the people of Israel (p. 172). This "nephesh" of God, according to Knight, is somewhat similar to the "nephesh" of man, which is composed of spirit and flesh ("ruah-cum-basar”), since man was created in the image of God. This leads Knight to make the dubious deduction that God, too, must, in some sense, have "basar", even though it may be a spiritual "basar". Then at the proper time the "nephesh" of God was extended into the "basar" of the created world in the man Jesus Christ. Moreover, if the man Jesus is an extension of the "nephesh" of God, and can be understood as such by our human consciousness, then the Christian believer — the "new man in Christ" according to Paul’s definition — is a further extension of the "nephesh" of God (p. 173). For when the Christian believer meets God face to face in Jesus Christ, he undergoes a transformation by which he receives a new nature as a result of the adoration and obedience of his life given to Jesus Christ, Then Knight concludes that through the love of Christ and the power of his resurrection, the Christian has the opportunity of being an extension of His personality, and Gal. 2:20 ("it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me") is offered as an example of this. So Christ becomes the Head of the community of extended "nepheshes" from Him — "the Son of Man by projecting His personality into those who are desirous of receiving His own fullness of life, becomes thereby the first of a new community." (p. 183).

Although attractive, this interpretation is open to a number of objections: 1) Even though man was created in the image of God and there are anthropomorphic elements in the Old Testament, there is no firm ground for conceiving God in terms of the human "nephesh" with "basar" to the extent that Knight does; 2) the idea of the Shekinah-Face entering into and sharing the cares and sufferings of men is based upon an Isaianic text (63:9) which is by no means certain; 3) the Gal. 2:20 proclamation does not mean that Paul thought of Himself as an extension of Christ’s personality. The Person of Christ and Paul are in fellowship, but not in fusion; 4) the New Testament does not generally describe man as "ruah-cum-basar" because the "spirit" in man is not thought of so much as a natural attribute but as the
B) Corporate Humanity and the Adam-Christ Typology. In a true sense the humanity of Jesus Christ is a corporate humanity; He is not only a man, but also by virtue of His resurrection, Man — Representatively, Inclusively. In the Pauline corpus the outstanding passage in this connection is the Adam-Christ typology of Rom. 5:12-21. So H.W. Robinson states, "The most explicit statement of corporate personality is the Pauline contrast of Adam and Christ, each the representative head of a group which is naturally conceived as sharing in the life or status of its representative."1 The antithesis between the two representative heads of humanity resides in the fact that in the one head there is sin and death while in the other Head there is righteousness and life. Although the analogy may seem somewhat strange today, the basic belief underlying it was very real to the Apostle because behind it lay the influential concept of solidarity, or corporate personality. According to this idea, a family or tribe, rather than just one individual, was thought to be the moral unit. When Achan sins by coveting forbidden foreign spoils (Josh. 7:21 ff; 22:20), his whole family is reckoned guilty, and they are made to suffer the consequences of punishment corporately. In like manner when Korah sins by rebelling against the God-given leadership of Moses, he and all those associated with him as a moral unit are destroyed.2 So by the same process of thought all of natural humanity could be understood as the tribe of Adam, and Adam's sin therefore, as the sin of the whole human race.3 This vital Hebrew concept of grace and power of God invading human life; and 5) the idea of the extension of Christ's personality into individuals of His community does damage to the Einmaligkeit of the Incarnation.

1 H.W. Robinson, Redemption and Revelation, p. 288. In the light of the strong Hebrew idea of solidarity it is unnecessary to think that Paul was under the influence of Gnostic myth when he wrote Rom. 5:12-21, as Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament I, p. 251, holds.

2 Num. 16:31 ff. Moses' plea on behalf of the people is also instructive: "Shall one man sin, and wilt thou be angry with all the congregation?" (16:22). In recent war years there were many cruel applications of this ancient idea of solidarity when a whole family or a town was extinguished because of one person accused of guilt.

Corporate personality exercised an enormous influence on Paul's doctrine of the Second Adam. 1

Inasmuch as Paul thought of the earthly human race in terms of a corporate entity with Adam as its head, he thought of the whole race as being involved in, and continuing under, the consequences of Adam's sin. In his fall all of humanity was affected just as an entire kingdom falls with its monarch. On this same corporate principle the human race was given the opportunity to be represented by the Second Adam, Jesus Christ, and to share in the righteousness and life he achieved by perfect obedience and sacrifice. Indeed, the whole Bible can be thought of as a commentary upon the Pauline summary, "For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive" (I Cor. 15:22).

The idea of solidarity, corporate unity, is no mere figure of speech in any age; it is an inescapable reality for human life. Man is inseparably linked to his fellow creatures in physical, intellectual, and moral nature by a solidarity that is intimate and strong. Every civil liberty and blessing enjoyed today has sprung from the sacrifice of individuals before. The immoral or criminal conduct of a son or daughter also presses upon the parents, and the sins of the fathers are still being visited upon the children of the succeeding generations. The welfare of a monarchy is often contingent upon the condition or disposition of its sovereign. A whole nation in this century has been called "The Sick Man". An aggressor crosses the 38th parallel in Korea and the United Nations are involved in conflict. A dispute arises in Trieste and the world trembles. With the breakdown in this

century of individualism and isolationism, there is a renewed recognition of the inescapable fact of human solidarity.

In the Adam-Christ typology Paul is not concerned with presenting a doctrine of original sin in terms of imputed sin; his emphasis is rather upon this principle of solidarity, the moral unity of the human race. His concern is to present an account of the universality of sin on the basis of the corporate sinfulness of the human race in Adam. This solidarity, as Dodd points out, is presented in a two-fold manner. Considered "forensically", the human race is a corporate unity, which both acts and suffers in its representative head. Considered "metaphysically", the flesh or the lower part of human nature comes to each man as a "tainted heritage", and it is a common aspect of all mankind. If, however, a man partakes in that flesh and is strong enough to deal Sin an effective blow, He accomplishes that action on behalf of all. This is the idea behind Paul's concept of the effective work of Jesus Christ, and obviously it necessitates a reality for His human life. When, for example, the Apostle writes that the death Christ died "he died to sin, once for all" (Rom. 6:10), he depicts the action of Jesus Christ in a representative way so that Christians are included in Him.

According to Paul's thought, then, Adam and Christ are each viewed as a Representative, Inclusive Man of humanity, and just as Paul had no doubt that the First Adam was an historical figure, there is absolutely no doubt in his mind that Jesus Christ was a real person of history. But it is as the inclusive representa-


2 Dodd, Paul for Today, p. 95.

3 Undoubtedly, Paul was acquainted with some of the Rabbinic legends arising out of the post-exilic period that individualized Adam. The view of some today (e.g., Barth, Romans, p. 171) that Adam was not an historical figure was not the view of Paul.
tive of the New Humanity coming into being in Christ that He suffers and dies:

"One has died for all; therefore all have died" (II Cor. 5:14), and "if anyone is in Christ, he is a new creation" (v. 17). Here there is the "distinct thought of Adam as the 'corporate personality' of the race over against Christ as the corporate personality of His body, the church."¹

The comments of Denney on Romans 5:12 ff. supply an admirable summary for this section on the corporate nature of Christ's humanity:

This is the conception which lends itself most readily to what are usually called "mystical" interpretations of Christ's life and work. What is most important in it is the truth which it embodies of the kinship of Christ with all mankind, and the progressive verification of that truth which comes with the universal preaching of the gospel. Paul was convinced of the representative character of Christ and of all His acts; the death that He died for all has somehow the significance that the death of all would itself have; in His resurrection we see the first-fruits of a new race which shall wear the image of the heavenly man. It may indeed be said that men of all races can find their center and rallying-point in Him. The progress of Christian missions is the demonstration in point of fact that Christ is the Second Adam, and while His true humanity is asserted in this, as is taken for granted everywhere in the New Testament, it leaves Him still in a place which is His alone. When Paul thinks of Christ as the second Adam, he does not reduce Him to the level of common humanity, as if He were only one more in the mass; on the contrary, the mass is conceived as absorbed and summed up in Him. It is not a way of denying, it is one more way of asserting, His peculiar place.²

It is hardly necessary, therefore, to point out that although the phrase ἐνός ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ of Rom. 5:12-21 indicates a man, it is not limited to a man; it also means corporate Man in Christ — Inclusive, Representative Man.³


² James Denney, Jesus and the Gospel, pp. 33 f. This reference also provides an introduction to a number of points to be discussed later.


According to Lake-Cadbury, The Acts of the Apostles, part I, Vol. 4 (cf. The Beginnings of Christianity) p. 219, the expression ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ of Acts 17:31 has beneath it the Son of Man conception. The ascribed judging function bears a similarity to the Son of Man of I Enoch. Moreover, the Son of Man figure in the Old Testament often is a corporate personality and has an interrelatedness with the Adam concept. Therefore, one can begin with either concept and discern Christ presented by Paul in the whole context of this Acts 17:31 verse as the corporate Man of the New Race in whom all mankind is re-united. Cf. Hanson, op. cit., p. 104.
I. THE SECOND ADAM AS CORPORATE HUMANITY

A) Corporate Humanity in Redemption. Previously it has been shown how the Second Adam as an individual defeated the autocratic forces of evil that dominated humanity. But it is the Christian experience that the faithful actually share in this redemptive victory won by the Second Adam because they are members of His corporate Body by Baptism. Paul makes it quite plain that Christians share in the redemption accomplished by the Representative Man, Jesus Christ, in the following ways:

1) Christians have with Christ died to those "elemental spirits of the universe" (στοιχεία, Col. 2:20) — one description of those Evil Spiritual Powers that dominate humanity. Formerly they were slaves to these στοιχεία, but now through the redemptive work of the Second Adam they have received "adoption as sons" (Gal. 4:5). In view of this fact it is incredible to Paul that men who have been delivered from the dominion of darkness and transferred (Μετέστησεν) into the Kingdom of the Beloved Son (Col. 1:13) can desire to turn back to a slavery under the weak and beggarly στοιχεία (Gal. 4:9).

2) The dominant theme of the 7th chapter of Romans is freedom from the bondage of the Law. Through the body of Christ, Christians have died to the Law (Rom. 7:4). That which formerly held them captive, the Law, no longer exercises a tyranny over them; they are delivered from a servitude to an old written code and now serve "in the new life of the Spirit" (7:6). Inasmuch as Law is binding upon a person only during life, when Christians willingly accept crucifixion with Christ, they therefore become dead to the Law. This is the meaning when Paul links, in exclamation, the complementary truths "I through the law died to the law that I might live to God", and "I have been crucified with Christ" (Gal. 2:19, 20). On this Mersch suggests the striking phrase "con-crucified with Christ."¹

¹ Emile Mersch, The Whole Christ, p. 130.
The Galatian letter is the emancipation proclamation from the tyranny of the Law for all those in Christ, the Second Adam. The idea of Christ's solidarity with humanity is seen in the declaration, "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us" (Gal. 3:13). Before the time of the Second Adam all were under the custodianship of the Law, but now in Him believers through baptism have become sons of God through faith (3:26 f.). Formerly, all were under the yoke of slavery of Law, but Christ has set us free (5:1). This freedom is such that enables Christians to be led by the Spirit because with Christ Jesus they have "crucified the flesh" (5:18, 24) and, therefore, are no longer under the Law which entails sin and death (Rom. 8:2).

3) Likewise, the breaking of the bondage of Sin by the individual Second Adam is a benefit shared by the corporate Second Adam. This is the dominant theme that rings triumphantly through the sixth chapter of Romans, and which comes to expression in other places in the epistles. The locus classicus is Rom. 6:6, "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." The "sinful body" here is not the body per se, but rather the body that has been taken over by Sin. A similar phrase concerning "flesh" was noted at Rom. 8:3. As a result of His once-for-all death to Sin by which He now lives to God, Christians also are to consider themselves "dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus" (6:10 f.) and, therefore, are exhorted not to let Sin reign in their mortal bodies making them obedient to the passions thereof (6:12). For all "those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires" (Gal. 5:24). On the principle that Sin, like Law, exercises its tyranny upon an individual only during life, the Apostle exclaims, "he who has died is freed from Sin" (Rom. 6:7). Perhaps he is thinking of the rabbinic maxim, "When a man is dead, he is free from the Law and the Com-

---

---

1 ὁ παλαιὸς ἤμων ἄνθρωπος cf. Col. 3:9; Eph. 4:22.
mandments. In any case Paul is ready to apply to the truth of death to Sin any statement that would be valid for the fact of actual physical death. Christians have been delivered from a slavery to Sin and have been set free (Rom. 6:18, 22); and this deliverance from the bondage of Sin is possible only by means of being baptized into Christ and into His death (6:3), whereby one becomes dead to Sin (6:2), thus deposing it of its dominion (6:14).

The sixth chapter of Romans is understandable only in the light of the preceding chapter in which the Adam-Christ typology appears. According to what Nygren calls the "high point" of the epistle, Christ is the inclusive representative of redeemed humanity, which forms with Him the corporate Second Adam. Jesus, as the Second Adam, broke all that bondage imposed by Sin and Death, and those who form with Him the corporate Second Adam experience the same. They become incorporated into the Second Adam (or the Body of Christ) by faith and the necessarily connected act of baptism. This idea of solidarity is also present in II Cor. 5:21, for it is in the sinless One who became sin for us that Christians have the righteousness of God.

Similarly, Christians are redeemed from wrath. A strong phrase which the Apostle employs to express the consequences of sin is "the wrath of God" (διό γάρ θεὸς). Paul uses this phrase three times as descriptive of the righteous judgment of God upon sin. In the majority of cases, however, Paul uses the word "wrath" without God in the genitive position, so that

---

2 C.H. Dodd, Romans (MNTO) p. 91. Cf. I Peter 4:1ff. where the expression, "Since therefore Christ suffered in the flesh, arm yourselves with the same thought, for whoever has suffered in the flesh has ceased from sin" is somewhat parallel to the Pauline idea of dying to the flesh and thereby being freed from its power. (But it is not parallel to Paul's concept of suffering with Christ.)
3 Nygren, Commentary on Romans, p. 20.
4 "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and wickedness of men who by their wickedness suppress the truth" (Rom. 1:18); and it comes "upon the sons of disobedience" (Col. 3:6; Eph. 5:6).
5 Although there is no textual basis for the RSV rendering "of God" in Rom. 5:9, "his wrath" in Rom. 9:22, and "God's wrath" in Rom. 13:5 and I Thess. 2:16, the implication is strongly present.
it is simply "wrath" or "day of wrath" (Rom. 2:5; 5:9), "vessels of wrath" (Rom. 9:22), "children of wrath" (Eph. 2:3), the wrath that is to come (I Thess. 1:10) or has already come (I Thess. 2:16). In one place Paul says, "The Law brings wrath..." (Rom. 4:15). No doubt, this total idea of "wrath" is influenced somewhat by the Old Testament ideas of the "wrath of God" and the "Day of Wrath." In his letters Paul applies it to both Gentiles and Jews as the result of disobedience and sin, and the inevitable concomitant of sin and death. It has a tyrannical function similar to those other powers of bondage from which humanity is in need of redemption. Nygren makes much of this in his commentary on Romans, pointing out that it has "an objective power of destruction" which weighed heavily upon a sin-dominated humanity.¹

In two places Paul speaks of Christ's saving power from wrath: "Since, therefore, we are now justified by his blood, much more shall we be saved by him from the wrath" (Rom. 5:9), and in I Thess. 1:10 Jesus is described as the one who "delivers us from the wrath to come." Both of these statements imply a corporate union with Christ, a justification of the eschatological community of the New Humanity through Christ. In the extent of his identification with humanity the Second Adam drank the cup of divine wrath, experiencing vicariously the wrath of God toward sinners. It is through Jesus Christ that Christians have been removed from the condemnation of wrath, being reconciled to God, and as a result have peace (Rom. 5:1, 10, 11). The fact that Paul uses the verb  ἐκκένωσα to describe God's love that has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit (Rom. 5:5) would seem to indicate a contrast in his mind to that frequent expression in the Old Testa-

¹ Nygren, op. cit., pp. 193, 205; cf. also The Gospel of God, pp. 9 ff., 28 f. Dodd takes a somewhat milder line in his commentary by endeavoring to separate the idea of wrath from God by pointing out that Paul nowhere makes God the subject of the verb "to be angry", and therefore this idea of wrath in Paul is retained simply "to describe an inevitable process of cause and effect in a moral universe," but one feels that this interpretation does not go far enough. Wrath, to be sure, is the inevitable retribution for sin (Gal. 6:7), but it is also more positively integral to God's righteous order of things and is part of the present and eschatological picture of the New Testament. For a recent positive emphasis upon the concept of wrath, stress-
ment about God's wrath being "poured out". So Brunner writes:

Just as truly as sin is real, and cannot be explained away, so also God's anger is real and cannot be explained away .... The wrath of God is not the ultimate reality; it is the divine reality which corresponds to sin. But it is not the essential reality of God. In Himself God is love and in Christ there is the place where the love of God breaks through the wrath of God.

The use of the verb ἐκκεντροῦμαι perhaps also indicates a connection with the Pentecostal pouring out of the Holy Spirit. The pouring of the Spirit into human hearts by the Second Adam, the "life-giving Spirit", gives man the power to triumph over the weakness of the flesh by which man has been given up to hostile powers and which is responsible for incurring the wrath of God. It is only because Jesus Christ has destroyed these alien hostile Forces through His flesh on the Cross and has become Lord by virtue of His resurrection that these Powers have been completely dethroned. Those, therefore, united with Him in the corporate body of the Second Adam now have reconciliation, peace, and life.

5) What is true of the corporate Second Adam in relation to the thralldom of Evil Spiritual Powers, Law, Sin, and Wrath is only valid because it also applies to that final dominion of Death. So Paul can say, "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" (Rom. 6:5). The word "united" (συνφυτοῦμαι) expresses the union by which a graft becomes incorporated into the life of a tree, and so here, the faithful, through baptism, become grafted into Christ and His resurrection life. This union with Christ's death is sometimes expressed as a circumcision: "In him also you were circumcised with a circumcision made without hands, by putting off the body of flesh in the circumcision of Christ; and you were buried with him in baptism, in

---

1 Brunner, The Mediator, pp. 519 f.

2 Cf. Gal. 4:6 with Lk. 24:49, and Rom. 5:5 with Acts 2:33. Thornton, The Common Life in the Body of Christ, p. 126, further suggests that the repetition of the "sent forth" in Gal. 4:4, 6 may have behind it traditional sayings of Jesus such as that in Lk. 24:49.

which (or "in whom" -- ἐν Χριστῷ) you were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead" (Col. 2:11, 12). Comments by Hanson and Newbigin on this statement are especially good. Hanson says that when man is divested of the body of flesh:

he leaves the Old Aeon and simultaneously becomes a member of the Body of Christ, being incorporated into the New Aeon. As Christ died and rose so is also man in baptism buried with Christ and raised with him . . . . Baptism is a transition from death to life . . . . What Christ has accomplished as the Head of the Body, as the representative of the New Race, man becomes a partaker of by being incorporated into this Body, into the Church, for, according to the identity of representation, the same thing applies to it as to its representative. 2

Newbigin's comment is that "true circumcision has been made possible to us by the death of Christ wherein He put off from Himself the flesh and all its powers (Col. 2:15); it is sacramentally mediated to us in baptism and appropriated by faith." 3

When Paul speaks about being buried with Christ in baptism there is a definite reminder of His true humanity. The "sepultus est" clause in the Apostle's Creed states a belief that was highly significant to Paul (cf. I Cor, 15:4), and as Barth observes, if this is said about anyone it is "the strongest possible way of saying He was a true real man." 4

Christ at death put off His flesh (Col. 2:15), and in another passage in the same letter Paul reminds his readers how they have put off the old nature (the "old man", Col. 3:9). When Paul proclaims, "With Christ you died . . . " (Col. 2:20),

1 The phrase ἐν Χριστῷ could be understood as "in whom also", i.e., ἐν Χριστῷ ὑπὸ, and as such it would be parallel to the ἐν Χριστῷ at the beginning of v. 11, which clearly refers to Christ. Although many commentators since Chrysostom have supported this interpretation, it has been rejected by Lightfoot, Abbott, as well as the ESV translators, on the ground that no parallelism is intended, and that the idea of Χριστῷ is more likely demanded after συναγερέθηνε Cf. Lightfoot, Colossians, p. 183; T.K. Abbott, Ephesians and Colossians (ICC) pp. 251 f. The objections, however, are not conclusive because it may be that Paul was employing here (as well as at other points in the context and in Rom. 6:4) an underlying conception of corporate personality.

2 Hanson, op. cit., p. 118.


4 Barth, Credo, pp. 84 f.
by this he means that Christians actually share in the experience and benefits of Christ's death. Those in the corporate Second Adam have died with Christ and are no longer "in the flesh" (ethically), but are in the Spirit (Rom. 8:9). Thus, the theme of the eighth chapter of Romans is the freedom in Christ from Death — freedom from the flesh doomed to death to a life in the Spirit. Therefore, as the consequence of this corporate redemption through faith and baptism one has the obligation through daily conduct to live as a true member of that Second Adam — not to live κατὰ σώρκα, but κατὰ πνεῦμα (Rom. 8:9 ff; cf. Rom. 13:14).

This glorious theme of the shattering of the dominion of Death by the corporate dying with Christ and the corporate rising with Christ is heavily stressed in the Roman epistle and permeates the whole of the Pauline corpus. It bursts out in the triumphant exclamation, "Thanks be to God, who gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ" (I Cor. 15:57). Here it is plain that the triumph over Death is not just of Christ as a man, but as Man, who is corporate Second Adam. In addition to passages already cited there are exclamations such as: "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" (Rom. 6:4); ¹ "But if we have died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him" (Rom. 6:8); "For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive" (I Cor. 15:22). ² The solidarity of Christians in the death of Jesus is most clearly expressed in that statement of conviction, "One has died for all; therefore all have died. And he died for all, that those who live might live no longer for themselves (i.e. κατὰ σώρκα) but for him who for their sake died and was

¹ Moffatt's translation aids the understanding: "Our baptism in His death made us share His burial, so that, as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might live and move in the new sphere of life." Newbigin's comment on this verse is good: "By being a member of Christ's body, the Christian has a share both in His putting off of the body of flesh wherein He gained the victory over all the powers of sin and death and law; and in His risen life — the life of a Spirit-filled body in which the Spirit quickens even the mortal bodies of the members". The Household of God, p. 68.

² Cf. also Rom. 6:5; 8:11, 17; II Cor. 13:4; Gal. 2:20; 6:14; Eph. 2:1; Phil. 3:10; I Thess. 5:10, and II Tim. 2:11.
The implication of this Corinthian passage, as Ramsey points out, is that Christ is no longer described as "the isolated figure of Galilee and Judea but as one whose people, dead and risen with Him, are His own humanity."\(^1\)

Christ's death has value for all men only because He became a member of the human family. By His redemptive work on the Cross He effectively became Second Adam because it was then that He was fully incorporated into humanity and humanity into Him. The dominant position in Paul's soteriological teaching of the idea of solidarity by which humanity is identified with Christ in His redeeming and sacrificial work will not permit him to think of Christ and Christians as separate, nor will he isolate the Representative and Head from the rest of humanity. On the contrary, he emphasizes that the acts of the Redeemer are done for us and in a certain sense are shared by us in Him. This contributes to Paul's insistence upon the human nature of Christ and reveals that the principle of solidarity "determines primarily the Redeemer's relation to us and not His relation towards God."\(^2\)

When Jesus conquered Death, humanity was brought into contact with a new situation that was destined to supplant this present evil age so that Paul was able to exclaim expectantly, "Our commonwealth is in heaven, and from it we await a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will change our lowly body to be like his glorious body, by the power which enables him even to subject all things to himself" (Phil. 3:20). In conquering Death, Jesus demonstrated the kind of triumphant life that is intended for all who are united to Him by faith (cf. Rom. 8:11).

Just as the principle of solidarity underlies the Apostle's view of Christ's death, it has become obvious that the same can be said of His resurrection. The classic passage in I Cor. 15 is to be interpreted on this basis. Especially noticeable are verses 20-22 where the Risen Christ is designated "the first fruits

\(^1\) A.M. Ramsey, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, p. 34.

\(^2\) Bandas, *op. cit.*, p. 224.
of those who have fallen asleep." The Pauline idea of the resurrection of Jesus
does not conceive of Him as a single survivor of death (like the "assumption"
of Elijah), but rather as a Savior who through suffering and death entered into
glory, being perfect Son of Man and Servant of the Lord, and who became the
first-fruits of a redeemed humanity.¹

B) Incorporation Into His Humanity. The humanity of Jesus Christ as the
Second Adam, as the result of His death and resurrection, became a corporate
spiritual humanity in which Christians share by being engrafted by faith and baptism. "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ"
(ἐγένετο δύσος τεθεί — Gal. 3:27). This incorporation into the Second Adam is
something obligatory and real for a Christian. To describe this relation of
Christians with Christ in the New Humanity of the Second Adam, Paul uses a number
of prepositional phrases. The variety of these phrases includes the following:
"in Christ", "into Christ," "with Christ", "of Christ", "belong to Christ",
"fellowship (κοινωνία) with Christ", "apprehended by Christ," "through
Christ", and "to put on Christ." Regarding this last phrase it is significant to
note that the putting on of Christ implies also the putting on of αὐτόν (Col. 3:14).
According to Paul, αὐτόν is that which binds together all the other Christian

¹ Cf. II Cor. 5:15; Eph. 2:5; Col. 3:1-3.

This principle of solidarity also applies to the Parousia, for Paul assures
the Thessalonians: "For since we believe that Jesus died (ἀπέθανεν) and rose
again, οὕτω καὶ ο θεός τῶν κοινωνίας διὰ τοῦ ισομετέρηκεν σὺν αὐτῷ
(I Thess. 4:14). Neil, Thessalonians (NTC) pp. 94 ff., points out that the
probable significance of the use of the words ἀπέθανεν and κοινωνίας
is that since Jesus' death was real and final, all those who live and die in Him
experience a death which is a sleep with an awakening. In this connection
Chrysostom is cited as saying, "Since Christ came and died for the life of the world,
Death is no longer called death but a slumber and a sleep." The KJ offers a most
likely rendering of the last part of the statement: "Even so them also which sleep
in Jesus will God bring with him." This interpretation understands the two pre-
positions — διὰ and σὺν — as parallel expressions for the characteristic
Pauline idea of the union between Christ and the Christian, and here this union
is concerned primarily with the Christian's share in the Parousia. (It is possi-
bile that the phrase κοινωνίας διὰ τοῦ ἴσομετρήκεν may refer to a martyr's death (cf., I
Thess. 2:15), but it is more likely that it simply refers to the dead in Christ,
as in v. 4:16). The concept of continual fellowship with Christ in the Body
depends upon the reality of Jesus' experience of dying and rising again and
the immensity of the Second Advent.
virtues in a perfect harmony (σύνδεσμος τῆς τελείωτης). It also, as Hanson says, "binds Christians together and creates a totality which is perfection, viz., the Body of Christ."\(^1\) The Body grows up into Christ, the Head, by means of love (Eph. 4:15 f.). This primary ethic of love is a reflection of the Divine Ἀγάπη, by which the ἐκλεκτοὶ and ἔγινοι are also designated ἡγοπημένοι (cf. Rom. 9:25). Above all, the Divine Ἀγάπη was perfectly revealed in the human life of Jesus Christ. It was the Ἀγάπη of Jesus upon which His work of salvation was established for the individual and for the church:... the Son of God, who loved (ἀγαπησαντός) me and gave himself for me" (Gal. 2:20);

"Christ loved (ἡγάπησε) the Church and gave himself up for her" (Eph. 5:25; cf. 5:2). Therefore, in the Colossians passage, Paul has a very concrete injunction in mind, Christians are to be baptized into Christ not just in a mystical sense; they are to be engrafted into His humanity of Ἀγάπη, and that is to govern the ethic of their lives as individuals and as united in a community of believers. So Paul exhorts them: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly..." (v. 16). This ὁ λόγος του Χριστοῦ is an unusual phrase\(^2\) and refers in this context not only in a general way to the teaching of Christ, but more specifically to the divinely revealed will of God in Christ's teaching, viz., the doctrine of Ἀγάπη.\(^3\)

The ἐν ὑπην of the injunction is not limited to an individual sense; the context indicates that it refers to a collective body, a community of Ἀγάπη in which Christians are set and united.\(^4\)

In addition to the "putting on of Christ" idea, the whole range of phrases

---

1 Hanson, op. cit., p. 149. Cf. Phythian-Adams, The People and the Presence, p. 201, who points out that Paul was the first to call the Body of Christ by its new name Ἀγάπη. This "is not love in a vague and general sense, it is the Love of God working within, and consolidating the fellowship of the Body of His Son"... "The Spirit of the Body is Ἀγάπη."

2 More often Paul uses ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ or ὁ λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου. Cf. I Thess. 2:13, 1:8, 4:15.

3 Personal conference with Professor M. Black, Feb. 8, 1954.

4 Therefore, Lightfoot's interpretation is not sufficient when he says it "denotes the presence of Christ in the heart, as an inward monitor." Colossians, p. 222.
used to indicate the entrance of the individual into the New Humanity clearly 
demonstrates that the Apostle is not merely setting forth the events of the life of 
Jesus -- sacrificial love, suffering, death, and resurrection -- as an example. He 
really means that Christians share in these experiences with Christ. A number of 
recent scholars have stressed this point. Ernst Percy says:

Bedeutet nun das Sein der Gläubigen in Christus bei Paulus ihre Einverleibung 
in Christus als ihren Stellvertreter, der aus Liebe zu ihnen um ihretwillen am 
Kreuze starb und dann um ihretwillen von Gott auferweckt wurde, und ist 
diese Einverleibung als eine ganz reale gedacht, die sich schon auf jenen am 
Kreuz gestorbenen Leib bezieht, dann kann der paulinische Bezeichnung von der 
Gemeinde als dem Leib Christi jedenfalls letztthin kaum etwas anderes als eben 
jene Einverleibung in Christus selbst als den Gekreuzigten und Auferstandenen 
ausdrücken.¹

Similarly, J.A.T. Robinson wrote:

Christians have died in, with and through the crucified body of the Lord (have 
a share, that is in the actual death that He died unto sin historically, 'once 
for all') because, and only because, they are now in and of His body in the 
'life that he liveth unto God', viz., the body of the church.²

Schweitzer rightly pointed out that the most common of the prepositional expressions 
listed above is "in Christ", but that it referred primarily not to an individual and 
subjective experience but to the experience of Christians as a collective and objec-
tive event. It formed the logical counterpart to other phrases such as "in the 
flesh", "in sin", "in the law", "in the body", "in the spirit"; but it was far more 
than just a linguistic formula. To Paul everyone who was baptized into the body of 
Christ yielded up his natural self and became so one with Him that everything he 
did in life was governed by the person of Christ, the Head of that corporeity. Paul 
gave classic expression to this truth by exclaiming victoriously, "I have been 
crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me" 
(Gal. 2:20).³

¹ Ernst Percy, Der Leib Christi, p. 44.
² J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, p. 47. Cf. Ernst Gaugler, Der Brief an die Römer, 
E.L. Mascall, Christ, The Christian and the Church, p. 85; Wm. Robinson, The Bible 
Doctrine of the Church, p. 71.
Dodd also properly emphasized that the Pauline Christ-mysticism was not primarily an individual experience but rather one that is societary:

Paul's sense of union with Christ is conditioned by the experience of life in a society controlled by His Spirit, as well as constituted historically by His act. It is a sense of being included in the 'corporate personality' of Christ which is manifest in the church... [To be in Christ] depends on active fellowship with others who are also 'members of Christ'.

It is significant that in the beginning stage of Paul's epistolary career he writes "to the church... in Jesus Christ (I Thess. 1:1), thus providing a very early reference to the incorporation of the Church into the Body of Christ, the New Humanity. It is because the Head of mankind is united with His community, His redeemed humanity, in a solidarity forming one body and one organism with Him that the acts of Christ have a real value for mankind. Therefore the victory over Sin and Death which the Head accomplished personally and physically was not just an individual triumph (of which He had no need) but a triumph of the whole Body, of which He is the Head.

C) The Permanence of His Humanity. The humanity into which Christians are incorporated is of the resurrected, ascended Christ, and even though it is now freed from earthly limitations, it nevertheless continues to exist and is fully human. It is at the name of the exalted "Jesus" that universal praise is to be given (Phil. 2:10). In the ascended humanity of Jesus, human nature has reached its ultimate goal, and the Father's acceptance of the exalted Jesus is the ground of the acceptance of all those united with Him. At baptism one is incorporated into this glorified, ascended manhood of Christ. Paul has this in mind when he writes about Christians being made alive together with Christ, and who have been raised up with

---

1 Dodd, Romans (NNTC), p. 88; The Old Testament in the New, p. 21; Cf. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, p. 311, who stresses the ecclesiological and eschatological community sense involved in the phrase \( \xi \nu \chi \rho \sigma \tau \omega \). Deissmann, on the other hand, apparently reached a conclusion that was too individualistic. (Die neuestamentliche Formel 'in Christo Jesu', pp. 97 f. cited by Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles, pp. 120 f.) Cf. R.N. Flew, Jesus and His Church, pp. 152 f.

2 Neil, Thessalonians (NNTC), pp. 3-5.

Him and made to sit with Him in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus (Eph. 2:6; cf. Col. 3:1), who is interceding for us at the right hand of God (Rom. 8:34) as one who has known temptation, suffering, and death (cf. Heb. 4:14-16). Paul teaches that He who sits at the right hand of God is not the pre-incarnate Eternal Son of God, but rather Jesus Christ who has experienced manhood and now has taken that humanity with him into that permanently exalted condition. The very fact that Paul teaches a resurrection of the body and speaks of Christ's glorified body as the prototype (I Cor. 15:23) is further indication of the permanence of Christ's manhood. Through baptism Christians are brought into a union with the ascended manhood of the Redeemer, the human nature of the Incarnate Son, and have been brought into a relationship with the very life of God. So Paul writes, "You have died (in baptism), and your life is hid with Christ in God" (Col. 2:3, par Eph. 2:6). This incorporating baptism into the ascended humanity of Christ is not just an individual matter of reconciliation with God, but it has an inseparable social aspect as well. It is an "insertion into a redeemed community," being a matter not just of re-created man, but of a re-created human race.

Mascall lays great stress upon what is called the "Three Unities". By this is meant: 1) the essential union in the Godhead between Father and Son, 2) the hypostatic union by which all the fullness of the Godhead dwells in the Son's human nature bodily, and 3) the adoptive union by which Christians are one with Him in His human nature. Although it may be doubted whether Paul ever formulated such a

---

1 Cf. Mascall, op. cit., p. 78.

2 Thus traditional church doctrine, built upon the Chalcedonian Council of 451, is in accord with Paul's implication of the permanence of the humanity of Jesus Christ. Likewise, the Westminster Shorter Catechism (answer to Question 21) describes Him as the one "who being the eternal Son of God, became man, and so was, and continueth to be, God and man in two distinct natures, and one person, forever." (underscoring mine)

3 Much later the author of II Peter speaks of Christians as becoming "partakers of the divine nature" (1:4).

4 Mascall, op. cit., p. 79.

5 Ibid., p. 94.
neat threefold unity, there are teachings, at least, that illuminate the third union. His whole concept of adoption as sons, of becoming children of God, depends upon being united with the Son. "In Christ Jesus you are all sons of God, through faith. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ" (Gal. 3:26, 27; cf. 4:4-7; Rom. 8:15 f). As a result of this union with the Son, something of that which is His by virtue of His Sonship is communicated to those adopted so that as sons they are also heirs (Gal. 4:7), or as Paul put it more specifically, "The Spirit himself bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God, and if children, then heirs, heirs of God and fellow heirs with Christ, provided we suffer with him in order that we may also be glorified with him" (Rom. 8:17). In connection with both the Galatian and the Roman passages cited here, Paul used the expression "Abba! Father!", words that came into the liturgical use of the Primitive Church, derived from the characteristic mode of address Jesus used in speaking to His Father and with which Paul must have been familiar. The passages throughout reflect a knowledge on Paul's part of some of the sayings of Jesus -- particularly His prayer language and His parable of the Lost Son. Paul recognizes that all, like the Prodigal Son, have severed their relation with God, departed from His presence, and do not have any right to be called sons of God. But the Father, however, has never abandoned them, for in Christ He has purposed to bring them home and to restore them into the family.¹ The cry Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ was to Paul, then, more than a liturgical expression. It evidenced that those uttering the cry were children of God, that they had received the Spirit of His Son into their hearts, which led them in childlike simplicity, faith, and obedience to call upon Him, "Abba! Father!"² The result is that they are no longer slaves to the bondage enslaving the Old Man, but through the life-giving Spirit of the Second Adam they have the "first installment" of the "glorious liberty of the children

¹ G.S. Duncan, Galatians (MNTC), p. 130.

² Concerning this Spirit, D.M. Baillie, op. cit., p. 153, clearly states, "A new thing had come into the world with Jesus Christ, God manifest in flesh; and the new thing, while dependent on Him, was not confined to the days of His flesh or even to those who had known Him in the flesh: it is available in an even fuller form to everybody, everywhere, and in every age, through the Holy Spirit."
of God" (Rom. 8:21) and begin to share in the life of the Son, being fellow heirs with Christ (Rom. 8:17). This spirit of sonship amounts to the union of adoption whereby Christians become one with Him in His human nature, and all of this is in accord with the will of God by which "He destined us in love to be his sons through Jesus Christ" (Eph. 1:5). So Irenaeus wrote that Jesus Christ became Son of man for the purpose that man also might become the son of God. God, who in old time said, "You shall be my sons and daughters" has now in Jesus Christ, the first-born among many brethren (Rom. 8:29) made it possible for us to be led by the Spirit so that we are sons of God (Rom. 8:14), and to participate in the fellowship and Kingdom of His Son (I Cor. 1:9; Col. 1:13). Thus the New Humanity is initiated in the Last Adam, and one becomes incorporate in this Humanity by faith and the act of baptism.

II. THE REALIZATION OF THE CORPORATE HUMANITY OF JESUS CHRIST AND ITS FURTHER IMPLICATIONS

A) The Significance of Paul's Conversion Experience. The realization that Jesus Christ has a corporate humanity was revealed to Paul when he encountered the Risen Lord at his conversion crisis. Although there are differences in some of the details of the thrice-given account of his conversion in Acts, the direct communication between the Risen Christ and the Apostle is essentially and significantly the same. In all three accounts he hears a voice questioning him, "Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?" (9:4; 22:7; 26:14), and in response to his query as to the identity of the voice the answer comes, "I am Jesus, whom you are persecuting." The voice does

---

1 Cf. John 1:12, 13, "he gave power to become children of God. . . ."

2 Irenaeus, Against Heresies, III, 10.2.

3 This statement, II Cor. 6:18, is part of a mosaic of Old Testament verses (cf. Isa. 43:6; Hos. 1:10). It is interesting to note that in the context of the Isaiah passage the theme is the Lord who is redeemer of his people, and here the theme is that Christians are the temple of the living God. In both there is a societary idea. The religious development of solidarity through the Old Testament leads up to the New Humanity created in the Second Adam, which is established not by ritual process but by the indwelling of His Spirit.

4 Acts 22:8 expands it to, "I am Jesus of Nazareth whom you are persecuting."
not say, "Why are you persecuting them?", but specifically and personally, "Why are you persecuting me?" In a sermon by Augustine that early church father put it effectively:

One whom Paul never saw and never touched cries in heaven: 'Why are you persecuting me?' He does not ask: 'Why are you persecuting My household, My servant, My saints or brothers?' It was none of these things He said. And what did He say: 'Why are you persecuting Me?' He asks that is, My members. For these, trampled on earth, the Head in heaven cries.

If it be objected that the words of communication are Lukan embellishments to the conversion story not found in the Pauline epistles, one can refer to the Apostle's own words where he says, "I persecuted the church of God" (I Cor. 15:9; Gal. 1:13). The fact that he had violently tried to destroy the infant Church in blind, passionate Pharisaic zeal by dragging off Christian men and women to prison and persecution must have brought him to his knees many times in exclamations of repentance and supplications for forgiveness. Having realized that the group of Christians upon whom he had set his injurious hands were indeed the Church of God, and as such the Body of Christ, he could not have escaped the staggering realization that he really had directly persecuted Jesus Christ. Mersch has expressed this point in a striking way: "Since that day, when he saw Christ in the Church which he was persecuting, it seems that he can no longer look into the eyes of a Christian without meeting there the gaze of Christ."

A further illuminating point about the confession, "I persecuted the Church of God," is that it appears at the end of his list of those to whom Christ, in the form of a Risen body, had appeared. Those included Cephas, the Twelve, a group of more than 500 brethren, James, all the apostles — and then, finally, to Paul himself ("as one untimely born") (I Cor. 15:5-8). To all the preceding ones it had been a post-resurrection appearance, whereas to Paul it had been a post-ascension appearance; and yet Paul gives no indication that there is a difference between the "bodies" of

---

1 From Sermon ccclv. 4 (See Sancti Aurelii Augustini Opera Omnia, Tom V, Pars II, p. 1979.)

2 Emile Mersch, The Whole Christ, p. 104.
the two periods of revelation. "For Paul", as Brunner states, "the Exaltation is identical with His Resurrection and the same is true of John."¹ It is, therefore, the same risen, but now ascended, body of Jesus Christ that apprehends Paul on the road and which he realizes has an affinity with the Community of Believers.² The realization that the humanity of the Risen Lord was represented in the body of believers in Him came to Paul, therefore, at the very beginning of his Christian experience. It is also significant that the Voice heard on the Damascus Road identified the Risen Lord with the Jesus of history, the Jesus of Nazareth. Therefore, it is a humanity, once historical, but now risen, of which Christ is the Inclusive, Representative Head, which suffered at the hands of Saul the persecutor. But from the moment of his conversion, he promoted and glorified it with an even greater zeal than he had formerly demonstrated against it. It has been justly remarked by Mersch that much of Paul's preaching and instruction was simply paraphrasing Christ's own words, "I am Jesus, whom you are persecuting."³ Moreover, it is instructive to note that when Paul writes of Jesus Christ "crucified" (I Cor. 2:2; Gal. 3:1), he does not use the aorist σταυρωθησεσ, but rather the perfect participle ἐσταυρωμένος, which indicates that the crucifixion was not something confined strictly to the past but in a sense is still going on⁴ and, therefore, is a further indication of the permanence of His humanity.

As a result of his conversion experience and his Christology springing out of it, the Apostle never established a rigid separation between the historical body of Christ and the corporate Resurrection Body. To a certain extent Schweitzer is right in saying:

² Cf. Traugott Schmidt, Der Leib Christi, pp. 10ff., 21.
³ Mersch, op. cit., p. 86.
All attempts to distinguish in the relevant passages between the personal (historical) and the mystical body of Christ are inevitably doomed to failure. The obscurity was intended by Paul. The body of Christ is no longer thought of by him as an isolated entity, but as the point from which the dying and rising again, which began with Christ, passes over to the Elect who are united with Him; just as on the other hand, the Elect no longer carry on an independent existence, but are now the Body of Christ.\(^1\)

When Paul proclaims "you have died to the law through the body of Christ, so that you may belong to another, to him who has been raised from the dead . . ." (Rom. 7:4), he is using the phrase "the body of Christ" to mean both the flesh-body in which Christ died to the Law and also the body in which the faithful are united one to another and to Him. This same thought is echoed in the Ephesian letter, where in His flesh-body He abolished the Law in order to create in Himself the One New Man, thus making peace and reconciliation not only between Jew and Gentile but for both in relation to God "in one body through the cross" (Eph. 2:15 f.).

B) Corporate Humanity in Relation to I Cor. 15. In the light of the Hebrew background of corporate personality, developed by Paul in a corporate Second Adam, one may look again at I Cor. 15. Here, as in Rom. 5:12 ff., there is a contrast between death in Adam and life in Christ, the Second Adam (vv. 20-22). In the Romans passage death is related to sin, while in the Corinthians passage it is related more specifically to the physical make-up of Adam. He is a "living being" (v. 45 ψυχήν ζωον), and throughout the context this is associated with such phrases as "physical body", "from the earth", a "man of dust", "flesh and blood", "perishable nature", "mortal nature", "weakness", "dishonor" - all of which prevent man in his natural state of \( \text{αγάθως} \) from inheriting the Kingdom of God. On the other hand, the Second Adam (or "Last Adam") is a "life-giving spirit", and this phrase is associated with all the opposite of the above — "spiritual body", "from heaven", "the imperishable", "immortality", "power", and "glory" — and the result of all this is victory over Sin and Death.

Attention must now be devoted to this all-important description of the Second

Adam as the "life-giving spirit", a phrase which is analogous in meaning to "life through the one man Jesus Christ" of Rom. 5:17. The desperate need of mankind is for deliverance from the autocracy of Sin and Death which reign in his physical body. Although the higher nature of man (τὸν ζῶμεν τοῦ νοὸς Rom. 7:23) battles against this tyranny, it alone is not sufficiently strong to hold off the onslaughts of the external forces of Evil attacking through the flesh, and consequently man succumbs and is taken captive by them. For deliverance, therefore, another "invasion" of human life is required, and that by the Spirit of God. This Divine Pneuma, possessing dynamic power, comes into man through the Second Adam, the "life-giving spirit" — through His life, death, and resurrection — and becomes overwhelmingly allied with the inner man in opposition to the power of Sin and Death entrenched in the outer man, i.e., the "flesh". What the Law was impotent to accomplish, due to the weakness of the flesh, the "Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" dynamically achieved (Rom. 8:2, 3).

The power of this "Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" is derived from the fact that with Paul there is an inseparable connection between the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ. A classic reference demonstrating the association in Paul's mind of the terms "Spirit of God" and "Spirit of Christ" is provided in Rom. 8:9: "... if the Spirit of God really dwells (οἶκε?) in you. Any one who does not have the Spirit of Christ does not belong to him." Still more specifically the Apostle states, "the Lord is the Spirit" (II Cor. 3:17). With this also Rom. 8:10 needs to be recorded:

But if Christ is in you, although your bodies are dead because of sin, your spirits are alive because of righteousness. If the Spirit of him who raised Christ Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through his Spirit which dwells in you.

These last two quotations are directly related to the idea expressed about the Last Adam being the "life-giving spirit", which idea supplies a fitting commentary on the Romans 8:10 passage.1

1 And also a commentary on Paul's confession, "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" (Gal. 2:20).
It is through the divine-humanity of Jesus Christ, through His work of redemption and His resurrection, that the Spirit of God is mediated to human life, delivering it from the bondage to Sin and Death and transferring it to a life in the corporate body of the Second Adam. The statement of H.W. Robinson is highly relevant: "Paul's doctrine of the Spirit, as active in the regeneration and sanctification of the believer united with Christ through faith and baptism, is his most important and characteristic contribution to Christian anthropology."¹ The power and effect of the Spirit working in Christian life is stressed by the Apostle in many ways.² Life by the Spirit enables one to put to death the deeds of the flesh-body as a result of one's union with Christ by which the old self, the sinful body, is crucified with Him (Rom. 6:6). It is through the Spirit that Christian life begins and has its present salvation and the promise of its ultimate complete redemption. The first fruits are experienced now, but then later, the finality of redemption from the present weakness of the flesh (II Cor. 1:22; 5:5; Eph. 1:13; 4:30). This is no magical process by which the Spirit prevails, but rather it is an operation inseparably related to obedience, faith, and willingness to suffer with Christ on the part of those who belong to Him.

Now it needs to be emphasized that this deliverance from the bondage of Death, as proclaimed by the Apostle in I Cor. 15, is not intended in a strictly individualistic sense. J.A.T. Robinson rightly insists that this chapter, dealing with the resurrection of the body, ought not to be thought of in separation from the rest of


2 The life in the Spirit described in Rom. 8:1-7 is contrasted throughout with life "according to the flesh", but it is not an even contrast because the Spirit is stronger and exercises a controlling influence over those who are children and sons of God. A parallel is read in Gal. 5:16-25, where there is a contrast between the fruit of the Spirit and the works of the flesh and where the predominating influence is from the Spirit. The Spirit is effective where the Law strives to be, but is ineffective (Rom. 8:3, 4). In contrast to the written code which kills, the Spirit gives life (II Cor. 3:6; cf. Rom. 7:6); it is written not on tablets of stone but on the tablets of human hearts (II Cor. 3:3). Christian conduct is attributed to the strengthening might of His Spirit in the inner man (Eph. 3:16), which produces the harvest of love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control (Gal. 5:22, 23). The power of the Holy Spirit enables Christians to abound in hope (Rom. 15:13). Cf. H.W. Robinson, op. cit., p. 127.
Paul's doctrine of the body. Although the stimulus for Paul's exposition of the spiritual body is provided by his opposition to two current views of individual life after death, Paul does not stop short of connecting it integrally with the risen body of Christ. On the one hand the Greeks held to the immortality of the soul without any body, a disembodied spirit; and on the other hand, the Jewish Rabbinical belief held to the idea that the resurrection body would be similar to the earthly flesh-body. The Apostle eliminates the Greek view by his insistence upon the reality of a spiritual body, and he negates the Jewish belief by declaring that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God" (v. 50). Instead, he presents the unique doctrine that those united by faith and baptism with Christ in His body on the Cross shall also be united with Him in His Body of the Resurrection. Jesus Christ died and rose, but not only as an individual because His resurrection involves the resurrection of all Christians (I Cor. 15:20f.).

It is significant that the whole argument of this Corinthian passage is concluded with the triumphant thanksgiving to God, "who gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ" (v. 57). The dative plural "to us" has more than an individualistic meaning; it has a corporate sense, meaning that all who are united with Him by faith and baptism are organically members of the Body of the Second Adam and experience the victory through that resurrection Body of the Lord Jesus Christ. This results in the assurance that "we shall always be with the Lord" (I Thess. 4:17). Moreover, this is consistent with the exposition from the outset whereby Paul proceeds to meet the question posed by an imaginary objector who uses individualistic terms ("How are the dead raised? With what kind of body do they come?", v. 35) by supplying the answer in collective terms of which the expression about the two Adams provides the key. The two verses, 47 and 49, emphasize the fact that just as there is a corporate unity with the First Adam, so there is also a corporate unity with the Second Adam. A few verses later Paul says, "This perishable nature (i.e., the

---

1 J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, p. 81. His statement, "It is hardly necessary to say that 'the first Adam' and 'the last Adam', 'the man' and the 'last man' (vv. 45, 47) are for him essentially representative and corporate figures" is pertinent, but one must also always leave room for the unique, individual nature of the Last Adam who in Himself was the mediator of the "life-giving spirit."
Old Man of flesh) must put on (ἐνδοξάσθαι) the imperishable (i.e., the New Man freed from flesh), and this mortal nature must put on (ἐνδοξάσθαι) immortality (v. 53). This imperishable, immortal nature belongs, however, not to resurrected individuals as such, but only as they share in the body of the New Humanity into which the Second Adam has imparted life. The repeated use of the verb ἐνδοξάσθαι agrees with the use of the same verb in Gal. 3:27, where the expression concerns being baptized into Christ and putting on Christ, which clearly refers to an incorporation into the body of the Second Adam (cf. Eph. 4:24). Like the imperishable and immortal nature, the "glory" (v. 43) also belongs not to individuals as such. Although Paul says here that the body is raised in glory, he elsewhere makes it plain that it is the church (not the individual) that is presented in glory (ἐνδοξάσθαι, Eph. 5:27). In bringing this out J.A.T. Robinson indicates that the church has been made capable of carrying this glory as a result of Christ's baptism for all men in His crucifixion, wherein He gave Himself up for the church "that he might sanctify her, having cleansed her by the washing of water with the word" (Eph. 5:25, 26).

The Second Adam, being a life-giving Spirit, not only enjoys an affinity with the Spirit of God, but through His resurrection He imparts that Spirit, life, and freedom into the humanity united with Him. He, therefore, is the Head of a new spiritual, redeemed humanity which is integral to His resurrection body. Therefore, one can never say that Christ as "life-giving spirit" is merely an example. When Paul's conception of the humanity of Jesus Christ takes on the function of a "life-giving spirit", one recognizes that he is speaking about a perfect Spiritual Humanity, a Divine-Humanity. Although Paul's thought leads him to think of Jesus Christ, who as Man is the Head of a New Humanity — a spiritual mankind — this same thought of Him as Man would lead him to think of a Person who was much more. Somerville's words are apposite: "It sets Him on a platform where he stands apart, superior, supreme. We are forced back on the recognition of a nature in Him that is an absolutely new fact; and

---

J.A.T. Robinson, op.cit., p. 82. The background of Eph. 5:27 is supplied in Ezek. 16:9 where God is speaking to Jerusalem, His Bride, saying "I bathed you with water and washed off your blood from you, and anointed you with oil."
is identified in a special way with the life of God . . . "¹ As such He is the Head of an eschatological community of the redeemed, of the Spirit.

This is the corporate Second Adam, or, as Paul otherwise terms it, the Body of Christ composed of Christ as Head together with those who are joined to Him. It has become apparent in the foregoing pages of this chapter that Paul's concept of the corporate Second Adam is inseparably connected and identified with his doctrine of the Body of Christ. If, therefore, one examines some of the Pauline thought about the Body of Christ, it will be, at the same time, a pursuit of the Apostle's thought about the corporate Second Adam.² This will be the procedure and purpose of the next chapter.

¹ David Somerville, St. Paul's Conception of Christianity, p. 69.
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There are three senses in which the term "body" is connected with Christ, according to Paul: 1) the body of His flesh, including all His earthly life culminating on the Cross (cf. Rom. 7:4; Col. 1:22); 2) the body imparted in the Eucharist (I Cor. 10:16-17; 11:24, 29); and 3) the Body of the Resurrection, which is the Church.° It is the third sense which Paul uses most frequently, and this is the one which is equivalent to the corporate Second Adam. This must now be considered in connection with Paul's conception of the humanity of Jesus Christ.

A) Possible Sources for the Body of Christ Concept. A considerable variety of opinion has been advanced in an attempt to locate the source of this idea of the Body of Christ. Some look to Hellenistic sources, particularly Gnostic and Stoic. Thus Bultmann holds that Paul is using Gnostic terminology when he calls the Church the Body of Christ.² W.L. Knox sees the origin in the Stoic view of the state as a body in which each member had his function.³ Chavasse advanced the fanciful theory that Paul's idea of the Body of Christ was derived from the Platonic idea of the community as a 'body' with many members (cf. *The Republic*, Bk. 5, 462 DE) which was grafted onto

---

¹ E.g. I Cor. 6:12-20; 12:12-13; Rom. 12:4, 5; Col. 1:18-20, 24; Eph.1:22-23


³ W.L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*, p. 161, who says that this Stoic concept became altered by political developments so that instead of the state being a body in which each member had his function it became a body in which the head was the supreme part, and it was this conception of "headship" that was adopted from the concept of the state and applied by Paul to the "headship" in Christ of the cosmos. Cf. T. Schmidt, *Der Leib Christi*, pp. 128 ff.; G.Johnston, *The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament*, pp. 87 f. (who says, however, that although the form may be derived from Stoic sources, the true content is Paul's Christology).
the Old Testament Nuptial ideas. Accordingly, the idea of the Bride of Christ is primary, and as a secondary consequence she is His Body. Another, W.D. Davies, makes out a strong case for the concept being derived from Rabbinic ideas about Adam, according to which the unity of mankind was speculatively expressed through ideas about the creation of the physical body of Adam. He was thought to have been formed from the dust of the four corners of the world, and, in addition, many stories were formulated to stress that in Adam all people were one and belonged to each other. Some Old Testament attributes of personality have been advanced as explanation. Schweitzer supports the corporate personality idea, interpreted primarily in terms of an eschatological concept of the "pre-existent church" in which there is a solidarity of the Elect with one another and with the Messiah, as the origin of Paul's Body of Christ concept. T.W. Manson has been most bold in using this concept of corporate personality in application to the Son of Man idea, emerging with the conclusion that the community of Christians, the Body of Christ, is now the Son of Man in a corporate sense. The recent brilliant monograph by J.A.T. Robinson, The Body (1952), is based on the extension of personality concept. Still others, such as A.E.J. Rawlinson, hold that the words of the Lord's Supper, "This is my body", provide the main source for the Pauline "Body of Christ".

The reputability of the scholars supporting these different opinions and the

1 Claude Chavasse, The Bride of Christ, pp. 71 f.

2 W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 53. Davies cites an interesting statement from "M. Sanhedrin" 4:5 illustrating the idea of solidarity: "Therefore but a single man was created in the world to teach that if any man caused a single soul to perish from Israel Scripture imputes it to him as though he had caused a whole world to perish, and if any man saves alone a single soul from Israel, Scripture imputes it to him as though he had saved alive a whole world."


weight of their arguments prevents one from saying definitely that any one of the above possible sources can account exclusively for the origin of Paul's concept of the Body of Christ, or the New Humanity. Quite possibly he was influenced by several of these sources. One can say, however, that even though he might have been influenced by certain Hellenistic ideas, it seems altogether unnecessary to stress them in view of the wealth of the Hebrew background which was naturally Paul's. Schweitzer's comment, although given in support of his thoroughly eschatological interpretation, is appropos here: "Those who labor to explain him [Paul] on the basis of Hellenism, are like a man who should bring water from a long distance in leaky watering-cans in order to water a garden lying beside a stream."

His Hebraic background provided the interrelated ideas of solidarity, extended and corporate personality, the oscillation between the One and the Many, the Servant of the Lord, and the Son of Man. There is abundant evidence that Jesus was influenced by these interconnected concepts, and it is most logical to assume that these provided Paul's primary source, brought to a crowning realization by his experience with the Risen Lord.

Thus, there is a strong trace in Paul's Christological thought of the ancient idea of the oscillation between the One and the Many applied to the humanity of Jesus Christ. It is not, of course, an oscillation on the mere historical plane, as is the usual case in the Old Testament, because it is not merely the historical, individual humanity of Christ that is represented in the humanity of the Body of Believers; but rather it is that humanity which has been through the unique experience of the Resurrection. Actually, the word "oscillation" is no longer completely adequate because the relationship now tends really to become one of co-existence by which the humanity of the Risen Lord and the humanity of those in Him are correlative. His Body on earth, the Community of Believers, has the amazing capacity of being and becoming one with the humanity of the Second Adam, who not only lived on

---

earth but reigns in heaven. This fact had been burned into the consciousness of Paul by the Damascus Road encounter with the Risen Jesus, with whom is identified the Community of Christians. It is important, however, to recognize that although the Risen Lord Jesus Christ is identified with the Christian Community, He is not identical with it.

The fact that Paul uses a number of corporate figures is clear. His use of certain proper names such as "Jacob", "Esau", "Israel", "Abraham" in the Roman and Galatian letters cannot be understood apart from this Hebrew concept of solidarity whereby one man represents or embodies a whole group. The most striking use of this mode of thinking is, of course, in the corporate meanings attached to the First and Second Adams, while the most frequent usage is to be found in the "Body of Christ" expression. In view of all this it seems most likely that the Adam-Christ typology provides the basic key for the understanding of Paul's "Body of Christ" concept.

Stig Hanson has well-expressed this approach:

Christ represents a New Humanity, the Church, constituting together with Him one corpus . . . . To an Adam-collectivity corresponds a Christ-collectivity, which, it is true, has an entirely different character, but is anyhow conceived according to the same pattern as the former. Consequently, in the conception of the Second Adam, Christ reveals Himself not as an individual but as the representative and incarnation of a New People of God, a New Humanity. In this respect Christ and the New Humanity are one; Christ is one with the Church. For Christ is one . . . and if now the New Humanity is one with Him, it also follows that this is one. Christ's person comprises the New Human Race into a unity in Himself, and is thus unifying.

B) More Than a Metaphor. At the outset it is well to note that Paul's use of the term "Body of Christ" in relation to the Church is not just a "metaphor" or figure of speech as some writers have stated. The majority of the

---


2 Cf. H.W. Robinson, The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit, p. 149, "... we must constantly remember that it is a metaphor, if we are not to materi-
writers dealing with this subject, however, stress the point that it is more than a metaphor. Many quotations could be recorded supporting this, but only a few must suffice here. Thus Nygren writes,

"To Paul the Χριστός is not merely a figure or comparison, but an indisputable reality. . . . Through faith we belong to Christ; in baptism we have been fitted in with Christ and joined to Him (Rom. 6:5), and are thereby actual members of His body."1

Similarly, Lacey declares it a "statement of reality."2 Mascall insists that the Church as the Body of Christ is to be taken "ontologically and realistically", not just as a metaphor.3 In dealing with the idea of suffering with Christ, Schweitzer states:

The Mystical Body of Christ is thus for Paul not a pictorial expression, not a conception that has arisen out of symbolical and ethical reflections, but an actual entity. Only so can it be explained that not only can Christ suffer for the Elect, but also the Elect for Christ and for one another.4

The fact that this is more than metaphor is more strongly appreciated when one recognizes that Paul is fulfilling the intention of Jesus when he proclaims the reality of the "Body of Christ." On this Fridrichsen says, "The relation between the Pauline idea of the church and the belief of the Son of Man regarding the Israel He had come to redeem, sanctify, and renew by the sacrifice of His life is, in fact, clear and unmistakable."5 A number of scholars have rightly traced the development of the concept of the Church from the Old Testament concept through the Synoptic presentation of the fellowship of the Disciples with

alize its application"; and E.F. Scott, Colossians, Philemon, and Ephesians (MNTC) p. 24, who distinguishes between the Body of Christ being metaphorical in the early epistles and a mystical reality in the later epistles.

1 Anders Nygren, Commentary on Romans, p. 422.
3 Mascall, Christ, The Christian, and The Church, p. 112.
Christ in the flesh to the Pauline conviction of the union of the Body of Christ with the Risen Christ. The point is that Christians in a profoundly real sense have entered into the organism of the Risen Body of Jesus Christ. When Paul wrote about the church as the Body of Christ, he was thinking of this organism of the person of Christ in a way that was just as real as he thought of "the body of his flesh". He recognized the unique unity between the Risen Jesus and those who by faith and baptism are joined to Him, becoming the corporate body of the Second Adam.

C) Not Strictly an Extension of the Incarnation. In view of what has been said above, one must at this point, however, interject a word of caution. Although the Hebrew concept of extension of personality is linked with the companion idea of corporate personality, which taken together help to understand what Paul meant by the Body of Christ designation, it does not follow strictly and literally that the Body, or the Church, is an "extension of the Incarnation." This descriptive phrase has been freely used by many writers (not only Anglican) and expressed in the same or similar words. For example, J.A.F. Gregg wrote, "The Church is the extension in time and space of the Incarnate Word of God, crucified, ascended, glorified. . . ." Similarly, H.W. Robinson stated that "we may rightly speak of the Church as the continued Incarnation of Christ", and quoted with approval the words of Fairbairn, "As Christ is the incarnation of the love of God, the church is the incarnation of Christ's spirit and purpose. . . . The church is His incarnation as He is God's." Also, J.A.T. Robinson found that Paul was the first to make the step "from the


2 Cf. G. Gore, The Incarnation of the Son of God, p. 219, "The Church is the Body of Christ. It is the extension and perpetuation of the Incarnation in the world."

3 J.A.F. Gregg, sub "One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church", The Universal Church in God's Design (WCC), p. 59.

Eucharist to the Ecclesia itself as an extension of Christ's human personality.  

A number of others have indicated adherence to this "extension of the Incarnation" idea or some modification of it.  

By contrast, however, a number of contemporary Protestant writers have protested against such an idea, and some of their objections can be indicated as follows:  

1) Such an idea impairs the New Testament stress upon the \( \alpha \pi \alpha \xi \) nature of the Incarnation by which the Word became flesh and the \( \varepsilon \phi \chi \pi \alpha \xi \) nature of Christ's death and atonement.  

So Torrance points out that the Church cannot be considered as the extension of the Incarnation in terms of completing or making whole the Incarnation because the fact of the matter is that there is "the once-and-for-all wholeness of Jesus Christ in whom God and man are at one . . . ." The wholeness is Christ Himself. So, although the church "participates in the wholeness of Christ", there can be no talk of an extension of the Incarnation "because that wholeness is already whole."  

2) Some embarrassing implications result when the Church is spoken of as the extension of the Incarnation. It can lead to a Romish view of the Mass and the Papacy. It tends to make the Church regarded as an end in itself, thereby denying .

---


2 Cf. C. Chavasse, The Bride of Christ, p. 70, who wrote that "the Incarnation of Christ was no more confined to our Lord's human body than was the flesh of Adam confined to his body. Just as Eve was a continuation or projection of Adam's body, 'bone of his bones and flesh of his flesh', so the Church her antitype, is the continuation of Christ's incarnation. And as it is written of Adam and Eve (and of all husbands and wives) that they are 'one flesh', so St. Paul says of Christ and the Church that they are 'one body". Cf. also J.R. Nelson, op. cit., pp. 95 f. for references to others who support some form of this view.  


4 Cf. Rom. 6:10; Heb. 9:26; I Pet. 3:18. Cf. Gustav Stählin, "\( \alpha \pi \alpha \xi \), \( \varepsilon \phi \chi \pi \alpha \xi \)", T.W.N.T., I, pp. 382 f.  

the power whereby it points beyond it. It endangers the necessary quality of humility which must be a part of the Church's life, and on this point Niebuhr sounds a firmly justified warning:

The deification of the Church is spiritually dangerous, however conceived. The Catholic doctrine that the Church is an 'extension of the Incarnation' represents a significant shift of emphasis from the Pauline-Biblical doctrine that the Church is the 'body of Christ.'

Moreover, this idea implies that the Church is sinless, but this is manifestly contrary to the empirical fact of sin within individual Christians and within the Church as the Body of Christ; and this is irreconcilable with the sinless Incarnate One.

3) Another objection that Newbigin justly points out is that although the New Testament emphasizes that the Body of Christ is a real incorporation into the life of the Risen Christ, it does not speak of an "extension of the Incarnation" because to do so would be to confuse \( \sigma \alpha \rho \psi \) and \( \sigma \omega \rho \alpha \). The risen body of Christ is not flesh, but spiritual. It was the "likeness of sinful flesh" into which He came for the purpose of redemption that had to be put off, and it is His risen spiritual body into which Christians as the Body of Christ are incorporated.

"For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body—" (I Cor. 12:13).

4) Furthermore, such an idea fails to render full justice to the Pauline expression in the Captivity Epistles where Christ is specifically spoken of as the Head of the Body, the Church. Although the Body in those epistles is presented as inseparable from the Head, it is still not identical with the Head.

The conclusion, therefore, is that although the Body of Christ may be referred to as the "extension of the Incarnation" in a loose figure of speech, it must be frankly recognized that this definition cannot apply in a strict, literal sense. This is not to deny, however, that unity in a single organism, the corporate Second Adam, which Paul clearly holds.

1 J.E.L. Newbigin, The Reunion of the Church, p. 61.
4 Newbigin, The Household of God, p. 80; cf. The Reunion of the Church, p. 60.
I. THE ONE BODY OF THE NEW HUMANITY

A) The Union in the One Body. The unity in One Body is sounded by Paul when he first employs the thought of the Body in connection with the Church at I Cor. 6:15, "Do you not know that your bodies are members (μέλη) of Christ?" The context in which this question is set is one in which the Apostle is striking out at immoral use of the human body, specifically, intercourse with a prostitute. He solemnly warns the Corinthians that if anyone joins (καλλώμενος) himself to a harlot, he becomes one body with her (v. 16). Here Paul is using the term σώμα in the Hebrew sense which includes more than just the natural physical body. To the Hebrew mind there was no clear distinction between what is popularly called "soul" and "body", so Pedersen can summarize the Hebrew thought by saying, "The soul is more than the body, but the body is a perfectly valid manifestation of the soul"... indeed "the body is the soul in its outward form." Therefore, when the body is joined to a prostitute, the self, the personality, is also involved so that there is a real union with the harlot — the two become one flesh (v. 16). The promiscuous sex-relation (as well as the proper one) is not just a temporary physical connection; it is a bond that unites two selves into a single self.

Paul's point is that a similar degree of union exists between Christians and Christ in the One Body. They are joined to Him and are members of Him. "He who is united (καλλώμενος) to the Lord becomes one spirit with him" (I Cor. 6:17). This same verb, καλλῶ as in v. 16, is used in the LXX with the same two meanings: to be joined to the Lord, or to be joined in sexual union. Even though Christians become one spirit with Him, this spiritual unity does not exclude the physical or corporal element but rather transforms it so that now it functions as

1 J. Pedersen, Israel I and II, p. 171.
3 Cf. II Kings 18:6 and Gen. 2:24, quoted by Jesus at Mk. 10:8 and by Paul at Eph. 5:31.
an expression of the Spirit.

A parallel thought is contained in Rom. 7:4 where the Christians are told, "You have died to the law through the body of Christ, so that you may belong (γένεσθαι) to another..." Although the verb in this case is not the same as above, the preceding verses 1-3 show that Paul's thought is again turning on the metaphor of marital union. The analogy is between a woman who is bound by law to her husband during his life but is free to marry another if he dies, and the life of a Christian which is dead to the law through the flesh body of Christ on the Cross and now is united to the Body of the Resurrection. So he speaks of Christians being "discharged" (κατηργηθηκέν) from law (Rom. 7:6), i.e., from their former "marriage" to the flesh; and, consequently, to return to this former state of matrimonial bondage seeking to be justified by law means "you are severed (κατηργηθε- emphatic first position) from Christ" (Gal. 5:4). It is significant that Paul relates Christ to His Body (the corporate Second Adam) in a way similar to that of the physical-spiritual relationship of husband and wife. Thus, when Paul refers to the Gen. 2:24 passage about man and wife becoming one flesh (Eph. 5:31),¹ he specifically interprets it to mean the organic relation between Christ and the Church (v. 32), which is paralleled by the union in marriage. Moreover, in the same Ephesian context he states, "For no man ever hates his own flesh, but nourishes and cherishes it, as Christ does the church, because we are members of his body" (vv. 29, 30), which embraces the same thought. Christ is joined in union with the members of His Body, and His love overflows into it.

Since Christians are really members of Christ (I Cor. 6:15), Paul does not understand how they can even think of permitting themselves to become members of a prostitute! To do so is to sever the union between Christians and Christ, and that, to the Apostle, is the real evil of the act. "Reversion to fornication sunders a Christian from the risen body of Christ, just as much as it would had he actually

¹ which the RSV dilutes by omitting "flesh".
been married to Christ in the flesh."¹ When Christians are members of Christ, their bodies (σώματα) become channels of the life-giving Spirit instead of instruments of Sin working through the flesh. Christians, therefore, have the obligation to present their bodies as a living sacrifice in spiritual worship (Rom. 12:1).

It is important to recognize the fact that Paul is reminding the Corinthian Christians that they are members not of a society, but of Christ — "your bodies are members of Christ." In this the Apostle is consistent because he never refers to a "body of Christians" but always to the "Body of Christ", and this with reference "to the organism of a particular person".² So A.M. Ramsey appropriately comments:

To call the church τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ was to draw attention to it not primarily as a collection of men but primarily as Christ Himself in His own being and life: Christianity is never solitary. It is never true to say that separate persons are united to Christ, and then combine to form the Church; for to believe in Christ is to believe in One whose Body is part of Himself and whose people are His own humanity, and to be joined to Christ is to be joined to Christ-in-His-Body; for 'so is Christ' and Christ is not otherwise.

The thought of Paul was followed when Aquinas wrote, "Just as the natural body is one whole, composed of many members, so the whole church which is the Mystical Body of Christ, is reckoned as one person with its Head, who is Christ."³ The Apostle expresses this idea when telling the Galatians they "are all one in Christ Jesus" (3:28). The εἷς (masculine) here denotes a Person or Organism in which all through baptism regardless of national, social, or sexual distinction form a single Person with one another and with Christ. This Body of Christ is the corporate Second Adam in which individual Christians are members of the Risen Christ, and this union is so true that even the word "corporal" as well as "corporate" could be used to express the relationship.

Later in the Corinthian letter the Apostle again stresses the oneness of the Body of Christ: "For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the

---

² J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 50 and footnote.
³ A.M. Ramsey, The Gospel and the Catholic Church, pp. 35 f.
⁴ Aquinas, Summa Theol., III, xlix, 1c, cited by Mascall, op. cit., p. 111.
members of the body, though many, are one body (εν έστι σωμα), so it is with Christ. For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body (εις εν σωμα) — Jews or Greeks, slave or free — and all were made to drink of one Spirit" (I Cor. 12:12-13).

It is clear that the "one body" of v. 12 is not the same as the "one body" of v. 13. In the former it is a figure referring to the unity in a physical body, while in the latter it is a reality; namely, the One Body of Christ into which Christians are incorporated by baptism. The connecting link between the figure and the reality is the concluding phrase of v. 12; viz., σωμα και Χριστος, which is explained by the εν σωμα of v. 13 meaning the Body of Christ. Paul sets out to demonstrate that Christ can be many persons. By using the figure of the human body with its many members, though still a unity in one body, he states that this is also the truth with Christ; for in Him there are likewise many members but just One Body. That the One Body of v. 13 means the One Body of Christ is confirmed by the explicit statement, "Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it" (v. 27). This can be taken as a development of the expression of Jesus, "For where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Mt. 18:20), by which is meant that a group united in His name, i.e., His character or personality as revealed in His life, death, and resurrection.

1 The rendering "so it is with Christ" (Moffatt and RSV) is closer to the Greek idiom than "so also is Christ" (KJ).

2 Numerous pre-Christian Greek illustrations have been brought forward by scholars which bear similarities to Paul's language of the human body in relation to the Church. Although there are some striking resemblances in language between some of these and the Pauline expression, there are significant points at which the Apostle reveals a distinct uniqueness. The foremost of these differences can be noted in the fact that none of the pre-Christian sources went to the limit of the Apostle in claiming that they were speaking of anything but a metaphor or a figure of speech, whereas with Paul the Body of Christ was more than that and more than just a society of individuals. According to him the Church is the Body of Christ (Eph. 1:22 f.). (Cf. J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 59 f. n1) When Paul writes ἕν Χριστος in I Cor. 12:12, this is immediately explained in terms of the Church — the Risen and Exalted Jesus plus all those united with Him. Calvin aptly commented on this passage that the members of the Body are "linked together in such a manner that they coalesce in one" . . . "He calls the Church Christ." (Calvin, Commentary on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, Vol. I, p. 405.)
experience Him as present in the worshipping congregation. Paul further develops this essential Oneness by teaching that this Community of Christians forms a real union with Him and is His Body. Both Rom. 6:3 and Gal. 3:27 speak of being baptized eis Χριστόν, a description which is clearly parallel to baptized eis ἑν σῶμα of I Cor. 12:13, and this further proves that the One Body of I Cor. 12:13 is meant to be the One Body of Christ.

Moreover, the Apostle is concerned to stress the necessity for a body to have many parts in order really to be a body; his primary purpose is to point out the inherent nature of the body, viz., that it must have members. This thought is easily transferred to the Body of Christ to demonstrate that the corporate Second Adam is One yet Many. Therefore, following the analogy of the human body, he declares quite boldly, "You are the body of Christ and individually members of it" (v. 27). 1 In Col. 2:19 Christians are actually described as "joints and ligaments" of the Body of Christ (cf. Eph. 4:16). It is effectively suggested by Robinson that μέλη (members) could be better rendered "membranes" to bring out the truth that the Body of Christ is a unity of a "specific personal organism" . . . "a single physical entity." 2 Now if there is a unity between Christ and the Body of Christ, this again indicates that Paul thought of Christ in terms of a corporate personality. This is the same point that Paul teaches about Christ as the Second Adam, and thereby the relationship between Paul's concept of the Second Adam and the Body of Christ becomes apparent. The two are integrally connected. Hanson expresses this excellently:

It is against the background of Christ as the Second Adam that we wish to understand the Body of Christ and the importance of baptism in this connection. As Adam is not conceived as an individual, but represents all humanity, with which he forms a unity, one body, similarly Christ does not stand alone, but represents a New Humanity, with which He forms one Body, a unity. Individual man is baptized into this Body; in baptism he is embodied in Christ, and, as a member

---

1 Actually in the Greek "body" here is anarthrous, so that the phrase could literally read "You are Body of Christ . . . ."

of His Body, he belongs to an entirely new sphere of life, a New Aeon. On account of this, he may benefit from what Christ as a representative has accomplished for the good of the New Humanity. Thus baptism imparts communion primarily with Christ, but as Christ is not an individual, but the representative of a collectivity, baptism implies communion also with other persons joined to Christ. Individual Christians mutually form a unity in the Body of Christ. This element of unity is strongly emphasized in I Cor. 12:13: 'We were all baptized into one Body.' Baptism bridges πάντες and ἐν οἷς. Combined with the universalism of the Church its unity is still more prominent.¹

A parallel conception to that of I Cor. 12:13 can be seen in Gal. 3:16, where Paul insists that the promises were made to Abraham and his offspring (not "offspring"), which refers not to a plurality but to One; and then the Apostle states that this offspring "is Christ." It is clear, however, that "Christ" is not intended in an individual sense, for verses 22 and 29 reveal that the promise was given to those who believe and have faith in Jesus Christ, and these are the true offspring of Abraham. "You are all one in Christ Jesus. And if you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's offspring" (Gal. 3:28 f.). Therefore, "Christ" here means the corporate Second Adam. The true offspring is the Body of Christ in which there is a union between Christ and His members. He is the Representative of the New People of promise and the New Humanity by contrast to the way that Adam was of the Old Humanity. Between Christ and the New Humanity an essential oneness was thought to prevail because of the influence of the basic concepts of corporate personality and the oscillation between the One and the Many. "In view of this habit of Hebrew thought", says C.A.A. Scott, "it came naturally to St. Paul to identify Christ with the Society of redeemed men of which He was the Head."² Moreover, this New Humanity includes all who are baptized in Him. In three places (I Cor. 12:13; Gal. 3:28; Col. 3:11) the term "all" is used to denote the universal character of the oneness of the Body, and in every

¹ Hanson, op. cit., pp. 77 f.

² C.A.A. Scott, Christianity According to Paul, p. 156. Cf. A. Nairne, Hebrews (CST) p. cvi, who says, "There was no Christ apart from his people, and as in Dan. vii, viii, he could be considered as almost embodying in himself 'the saints of the Most High' who were to possess the Kingdom for ever". The comment of Gloege is also apt: "The Χριστός can no more be Christ without the ἐκκλησία than the ποιμήν can be shepherd without the ποιμνίον." Reich Gottes und Kirche im Neuen Testament, p. 228 (cited by K.L. Schmidt, The Church, p. 40, n 1).
instance the artificial distinctions differentiating categories of humanity are declared to be completely removed through entrance into the One Body of Christ. Thus, Christ is the New Man in whom there is universal unity.

B) Eschatological Associations with the One Body. To the Romans Paul writes that the "many are one body in Christ" (Rom. 12:5; cf. I Cor. 10:17). This results from the reality of the act whereby Christians are "baptized into one body by one Spirit," and this statement strengthens the point already made above. It also is in accord with Paul's view of the "second man from heaven", who, by virtue of the fact that He is a life-giving Spirit, lives in His members and they in Him (cf. I Cor. 15:48 f.). It is doubtful whether the background of the Apostle's thought here is connected with corporate ideas concerning Hellenistic Primal Man or Redeemer myths; it is most possible that Hebrew eschatological thought in which there was the conception of solidarity between the Messiah and the Elect Community was the significant influence. The Son of Man and the Suffering Servant of the Lord were, for example, two figures that were "readily associated with a transcendent corporate idea of the saints." It is interesting to note in this connection that Paul several times refers to the Church as the Body of God's Elect (Rom. 8:33; Col. 3:12; cf. II Tim. 2:10; Titus 1:1). He also describes the Body in such eschatological terms as the "kingdom of God" (Rom. 14:17), "the kingdom of his beloved Son" (Col. 1:13), and a "commonwealth in heaven" (Phil. 3:20). Furthermore, one notes that each of Paul's letters is addressed to a corporate group, either "church" or "saints" or both. While it is true that he most often means by these terms a particular worshipping group, there are some passages which indicate that Paul expanded these terms to embrace the Christian Community as a whole. Thus, he indicts himself for persecuting the ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ (Gal. 1:13), and rebukes the Corinthians for despising the Church of God (I Cor. 11:22). For Paul, therefore, the ἐκκλησία is always Christ's people (local churches do

1 Moffatt, I Corinthians (MNTC), p. 188.
not make up the ἘΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ, but rather represent the total ἘΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ).

The People are one race and are "united in the historical events of Jesus in the flesh." 1

In like manner, Paul can use "saints" as a collective designation just as "the children of Israel", "the Israel of God", and "sons of God" are collective; and this is similar to the Danielic use of "saints of the Most High." The expression of both Jesus and Paul was influenced by the Hebrew eschatological concept of the "Community of Saints", in which the saints were united with one another and with the Messiah by the will of God (cf. Dan. 7:27; I Enoch 38:1-5; 62:7 f.). Jesus, during His earthly life, implied to His followers that by entering into fellowship with Him they had the assurance that in the future they would have a more perfect fellowship with the Son of Man (cf. Mt. 25:31-40). Paul, in the light of the death and resurrection of Jesus, persistently maintained that a fellowship or solidarity of the Elect with Christ was a reality in the period between the Resurrection and Parousia, and as such it was the first installment of that perfect union with Him in the final Messianic Kingdom. 2 Even in the present, then, the Elect share with Jesus "the resurrection mode of existence". For Paul this solidarity assumes a quasi-physical character. It means that those united with the glorious humanity of Christ begin to live a super-earthly or supernatural life; but since they are still involved in the natural world, this new life is not completely manifest. The concept of the Body of Christ, therefore, is inseparably connected with the eschatological view of the Community of Saints. 3

Another point about the corporate Body of the Second Adam that bears a relation

---

1 A. M. Ramsey, The Gospel and the Catholic Church, P. 56.
2 To Paul the "called" (ΚΛΗΤΟΙ) bear the significance of being saints (I Cor. 1:2; Rom. 1:7).
3 This is the position strongly developed by Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul, pp. 52-176.
to the Son of man concept is that it is so closely identified with Christ that it is to share the function of Judge (I Cor. 6:2 f.). Following Hebrew eschatological views, Paul holds that in the Messianic Kingdom the saints are destined to share in the reign of Christ over all things (cf. I Cor. 15:22-28), will exercise the office of Judge (themselves being judged), and will share His glory (Rom. 8:17). The Apostle's views bear an obvious reflection of Daniel 7, where all these ideas are related to the saints of the Most High (cf. vv. 14, 18, 22, 26, 27), and which is an aspect of the Son of Man picture which Jesus adopts: "Truly, I say to you, in the new world, when the Son of man shall sit on his glorious throne, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Mt. 19:28; cf. 25:31). Here, again, the corporate Second Adam can be seen as Paul's development of the Son of Man concept.

When Paul spoke of the many as being "one body in Christ", he was thinking of Christ as the living Lord and Spirit in whom Christians really shared, reproducing His death and resurrection within their own experience. This union in the One Body of Christ is comparable only to the unity of the three Persons of the Trinity. It has been frequently designated by the un-Biblical phrase, "the Mystical Body," but on this Moffatt aptly remarks: "It was only mystical as it was a supernatural or spiritual reality, a corporate personality, in which the saints together shared his sufferings as well as already, to some degree, his risen glory."¹

C) The Union in the One Body through the Eucharist. The union in the One Body of Christ is also stressed by Paul in reference to the observance of the Lord's Supper. Thus he says, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation (κοινωνία) in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a participation (κοινωνία) in the body of Christ? Because there is one loaf, we who are many are one body (ἐν οὐκόμα), for we all partake (μετέχομεν) of the one (ἐνδος) loaf" (I Cor. 10:16 f.). By speaking of a participation in the

¹Moffatt, I Corinthians (MNTC), p. 188.
Paul meant that Christians have a share in the sacrificial suffering and death of Christ, and the benefits of the life which He poured out for many are appropriated to those who participate in the cup and thereby indicate their willingness to share in his suffering. In a similar sense Christians, by breaking the bread, participate in His body, that is, they have a share in what happened in his human body. But it is not only a participation in the sacrificial body of Christ; it is also a fellowship in the Body of Christ, i.e., the Church. Although it may not be clear in verse 16 whether the "body" is singular or corporate, in verse 17 there is no doubt that it is the corporate nature of the "body", the Church, which is intended. With the breaking and eating of the one loaf there is a fellowship with other Christians as members of the One Body of Christ into which they have all been baptized (I Cor. 12:13). As Higgins well says, "Since to Paul, then, Christ is not only the individual Jesus Christ, but a corporate personality whose visible, material manifestation is the Church which is his body, union with Christ finds its expression in this societary way in membership of the body of Christ." Communion in the One Body of Christ constantly reminds Christians that although they are many, they, as the many, are One Body. Inasmuch as Paul passes on the traditional words of Jesus over the loaf, "This is my body [broken or given] for you" (I Cor. 11:24), one can further see that Paul accepted the identification of the loaf with His body. Therefore, as the corollary, by participation in the one cup and the one loaf, the blood and body of Christ, Christians are themselves made One Body of Christ, the Church.

Thus it is not only the crucified body of Christ but also His Resurrection Body in which Christians share. So Thornton points out that when the Apostle wrote to the Corinthians, he did not indicate any distinction in his thought of the One Body:

This one Body was nailed to the Cross and raised from the tomb. To it we belong as the limbs belong to a human body. It has always two aspects. For it is both

---

the Christ and the Church, the Messiah and his people in one organism of the New Israel. The unity of this One Body, however, wholly depends upon the fact that it is the Christ.¹

This eucharistic teaching is consonant with Paul's thought of the Church as the Body of Christ or the One Organism, which runs through the Corinthian and Roman epistles. This concept is sometimes referred to simply as "the Body" (I Cor. 11:29), "Christ" (12:12), or "the One Man Jesus Christ" (Rom. 5:17); and it reveals the two-fold aspect of that One Organism — Messiah and Ecclesia, One and Many, individual Second Adam and corporate Second Adam.²

Furthermore, it has been brought out by Jeremias that the word  ό&omega; in the Eucharistic sayings recorded in Paul and the Synoptics most likely has behind it the Aramaic "bisra" (Hebrew "basar").³ If this is the case, there is further indication that  ό&omega; is to be thought of in a corporal sense. On this basis J.A.T. Robinson interprets it as "the extension of the life and person of the incarnate Christ beyond His resurrection and ascension"; for in asserting 'this is my body ... my blood', Jesus is giving to His followers His own life, and insofar as they partake of His body and blood they become "the very life and personality of the Risen Christ."⁴ But in adopting the "extension" idea Robinson exposes himself to the difficulties involved in that hazardous term,⁵ and, therefore, one cannot cite his interpretation with full approval. It would be better to interpret the Eucharistic saying as a con-corporate relation between the life and personality of Christ and His followers. Instead of an "extension" it is to be thought of as a Κοινωνία, a participation, a real union with the risen humanity of Jesus Christ. And as noted earlier, it was Paul's encounter with the ascended, glorified humanity of Christ that

² Cf. loc. cit.
³ J. Jeremias, Die Abendmahlswoerte Jesu, p. 103.
⁵ Supra p. 2h8.
really stimulated his perception of the truth that the corporate nature of the human personality of Jesus was to be recognized in the Church, the corporate Second Adam, and in the Lord's Supper.

Paul, speaking of the observance of the Lord's Supper, brings out in two other statements the reality or corporality of the One Body of Christ. He puts it squarely that inasmuch as Christians are His Body they "cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons "nor "partake (μετέχειν) of the table of the Lord and the table of demons" (I Cor. 10:21). The reason for this restriction is that union with Christ is broken off if a rival union (bearing physical implications) is established, such as: 1) intercourse with a prostitute (I Cor. 6:13-16); 2) an attempt to maintain a life "according to the flesh" alongside a life "in Christ", e.g., seeking to be justified by the Law by accepting circumcision after being baptized (Gal. 5:4); and 3) communing with demons by partaking of pagan sacrificial feasts and thereby becoming partakers (κοινώνεις) of demons (I Cor. 10:20 f.).¹

In the second instance, Christians are cautioned not to eat the bread and drink the cup in a careless way without discerning the Body lest they eat and drink judgment upon themselves, for that is why many are weak and ill, and some have died (I Cor. 11:29 f.). The "Body" here refers to the Church as the One Body of Christ into which Christians are incorporated (cf. I. Cor. 10:17; 12:13). The point that Paul is urging is that partakers of the Lord's Supper must realize the true significance of the Body, viz., that it is Christ plus those incorporated into Him, Messiah and Ecclesia, the corporate Second Adam. The Lord's Body is really represented in the elements of the Supper, but also in the Body of Believers. Therefore, it is grossly irreverent to act selfishly or unbrotherly in any way toward other Christians present for the Supper. Consequently, any lack of consideration or affront to a member of the One Body at the Supper is a sin against Christ, just

¹ Paul has no doubt about the reality of these demonic forces and warns that communion with them actually makes one liable to subjection by them. Supra pp. 155 ff.
as the Apostle has previously pointed out that a sin against a brother for whom Christ died is a sin against Christ (I Cor. 8:12). Unless communicants discern the living Body of Christ they are apt to despise the Church of God (11:22), for offenses against others at Communion are blows struck at the solidarity, the corporate truth of the Body. Those who so behave at the Communion demonstrate that they do not discern the essential "common life in the body of Christ" (to use L.S. Thornton's theme-phrase), and therefore these anti-Body acts are actually their judgment. As a result of their blindness to the truth of the Body, many have been physically chastised with sickness and some even with death;¹ but this punishment is not intended for final condemnation but as a corrective measure so that they might realize that it is through the sacrificial life of Jesus that Christians are held in a unity and that they partake of His sacrificial life. As Thornton says, "To partake rightly of Holy Communion is to have the eyes opened to understand the glory of Christ crucified. It is to share his thoughts about his sacrifice and therefore to discern the Body".²

D) Further Indications of the Corporate Nature of the One Body. The physical ways by which Paul speaks of the union between the glorified humanity of Jesus Christ and those incorporate into Him, thus together forming the Second Adam, are indeed amazing; but this point is not always given sufficient attention by Pauline students. Take, for example, the curious practice of baptism on behalf of the dead

---
¹ It is interesting to note that the physical consequence of not discerning the Body is pre-figured for the Apostle in the Wilderness experience of the Hebrews (I Cor. 10:1 ff.). They had been baptized "into Moses", all drank of the same supernatural food (Πνεύματικον), all drank of the same supernatural drink, and this was from the Rock which was Christ. Through their spiritual blindness and outright idolatry, by which they violated the covenant with God, they were, as a consequence, overthrown in the wilderness, and many perished. Paul's point is that the Christians at Corinth who have been baptized into Christ, who all partake of the same loaf and drink the same spiritual drink, should take the Wilderness story as a warning to avoid idolatry and to behave properly at the Communion, solemnly discerning the Body. Otherwise physical consequences will result (I Cor. 11:30 and 10:5).

to which Paul refers in I Cor. 15:29, and which indicates what Schweitzer and J.A.T. Robinson call the "quasi-physical" relationship within the Body. Without any particular judgment upon the propriety of the rite, the Apostle refers to it in the context of instruction on the resurrection primarily to point out the absurdity of denying the resurrection — for if the dead are not raised, there is certainly no point in being baptized for them. In attempting to explain this enigmatic reference it seems best to assume at least two things: 1) It is not dependent upon Hellenistic Mystery-religions, as evidenced by the fact that there are no passages in the literature of that field with speak directly of a baptism of the dead. 1 2) Those on whose behalf the baptism was undertaken were contemporary with those being baptized. They could have been either relatives or friends who became believers, but who died before receiving baptism. The motive for such vicarious baptism was not so much to make up the number of elect as it was in the belief that the unbaptized relative or friend could share in the being-in-Christ (or the corporate Second Adam) into which the living person entered through baptism, if the latter made known the desire to include the dead person in his baptism. Although Schweitzer overemphasizes an eschatological aspect (by implying that Christians at Corinth were being baptized for their beloved dead in order to guarantee their rising with those surviving at the Parousia, instead of having to wait until the second, general resurrection of the dead), his basic conclusion is most probable:

The position is not that Paul had to make the best of a misuse of Baptism among the Corinthians, drawn from the heathen Mystery-religions, but rather that it was only in consequence of his teaching about the being-in-Christ and his view of the effect of baptism that baptism for the dead could arise. 2 No doubt eschatological tension was a factor involved in this vicarious baptism of the dead, but primarily the quasi-physical conception of union in the One Body of Christ was fundamental.

1 A similarity sometimes urged from the Apocrypha can be read in II Macc. 12:39 ff., where Judas Maccabaeus orders an atoning sacrifice to be made in Jerusalem on behalf of the fallen Jews in the battle who were found to be wearing heathen amulets under their shirts — but this, of course, is not a vicarious baptism.

This conception seems also to be the criterion by which Paul advises whether a Christian husband or wife should continue in marriage with a pagan partner (I Cor. 7:12-14). Paul resolved the question in the affirmative on the ground that the unbelieving husband or wife is consecrated (or "sanctified") through the believing partner. Again, Schweitzer brings out the bold physical implications of this opinion:

Sanctified (made holy) is not here to be understood in some general sense, but signifies that the unbelieving partner, through bodily connection with the believing, has a share in the latter's being-in-Christ and thereby becomes with him a member of the Community of the Sanctified. Because the married pair belong corporeally to one another, the unbelieving partner becomes attached to Christ and susceptible of receiving the powers of death and resurrection which go forth from Christ and prepare the recipient for the being-in-Christ in the Messianic Kingdom. And similarly, children sprung from such a marriage belong to the Community of the Sanctified.1

The fundamental idea of solidarity lies behind both this instruction concerning mixed marriages and that of baptism by proxy.2

Other physical ways of speaking about the union within the corporate Second Adam are used by Paul. He speaks about Christians "growing up" into Christ ( Eph. 4:15) and about the Head causing the whole Body to be nourished and knit together through its joints and ligaments (Col. 2:19). The Apostle is anxious for his Galatian converts, being in travail until Christ is "formed" (μορφωθή)3 in them like an embryo (Gal. 4:19). These examples of the thought and expression of Paul serve to demonstrate the union he conceives to be existent between the Risen, glorified humanity of Christ and the humanity of those who are incorporated into His Body, which together form the Second Adam. On this Newbigin aptly comments that the body of Christ is not a natural body. "But neither, on the other hand, is it an ideal separable from the actual visible life of the Christian fellowship in the world.

1 Ibid, pp. 127 f.
3 Not likely "found", as Schweitzer translates, op. cit., p. 122.
It is a spiritual body, the body of Christ — the Last Adam who has become a life-giving Spirit."1

II. THE HEAD OF THE NEW HUMANITY

Thus far there has been no careful distinction between two principal ways by which Paul speaks of the relation between Christ and the Body, but now this must be noted. In his earlier letters Paul stresses the oneness between Christ and the Church, His Body, and so he writes of Christians being members of Christ, like limbs of a body, being united in a single Organism with Him and with each other. In the later letters of Colossians and Ephesians, however, the concept of the Headship of Christ in relation to the Body is developed whereby He is indicated as the governing principle: "He is the head of the body, the church" (Col. 1:18). (That the terms "body" and "church" are interchangeable for the Apostle can also be noted by comparing Eph. 5:23, "... Christ is the head of the church, his body ... .") In supreme authority Christ is made "the head over all things for the church, which is his body" (Eph. 1:22). Christians are urged to hold fast to the Head who is the cohesive and nourishing agent of the whole body (Col. 2:19) into whom they are to grow (Eph. 4:15). In other words, in these two late epistles the Body is still identified with the Church and with Christ, but the added feature is that Christ is designated as the Head. Although the idea of the Headship of Christ is introduced in I Cor. 11:3, "the head of every man is Christ, the head of a woman is her husband, and the head of Christ is God" (a statement implying His human nature), it is not related to the Church as the Body of Christ until it is expanded by Paul in Ephesians, "For the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church, his body (5:23).2

---


2 It is interesting to note, however, that the Corinthian statement is given in support of teaching about worship in church.
A) **The Bride of Christ.** The concept of the Church as the Bride of Christ is closely related to the earlier expression about the Body and the members, and it is a natural step from it. In II Cor. 11:2 there is the first allusion to the Church in this language: "I betrothed you to Christ to present you as a pure bride (παρθένον) to her one husband." It is an expression developed more completely in Eph. 5:26-32. The relationship inherent in the idea is based upon the Old Testament nuptial language concerning Israel's covenant with the Lord (Hos. 1-3; Jer. 3; Ezek. 16, 23; Isa. 54:5 ff.; 62:1-4). In the New Testament Jesus appears in the role of Bridegroom, which in the Old Testament is reserved exclusively for Yahweh. For Jesus the "Bridegroom" is a Messianic title connoting the closest relation between the Messianic Lord and His Community. Indeed, Jesus sometimes speaks of Himself in that role (Mt. 2:19; Mt. 9:15; 25:1 ff.; 22:1-14), and in the Gospels there is frequent use of the image of the wedding-feast. Paul also continues the language, and in his Ephesian reference (5:29 ff.) to the Gen. 2:24 account his point is that the Bridegroom and the Bride, Christ and Christians, exist in a unity expressed as "one flesh". As in I Cor. 6 where the concept of the Body of Christ comes up in the context dealing with union in the most intimate physical relationship of life, so also the Ephesian passage emphasizes this oneness. "The 'one flesh' shared by husband and wife", writes Thornton, "symbolizes the 'one flesh' shared by Christ and the Church by virtue of the Incarnation." The Bride in the New Testament is never a designation for an individual Christian in some mystical union with Christ; it is always collective and is an eschatological idea. Although the Bridegroom chooses Her, she must on Her part freely accept the choice and become united with Him.

---


2 Cf. also Jn. 3:29.


Whereas in the Old Testament the marriage relationship applied to Jahweh and Israel, in the New Testament it applies to Christ and His People, the People of a New Covenant.

There is also in the Ephesian passage at verse 25 the phrase "Christ loved the church and gave himself up (παρέσωκεν) for her"; and in view of the other places where the same verb is used (Gal. 2:20; Rom. 4:25), this seems to be another reflection of the Suffering Servant idea of Isaiah 53. Christ, then, is not only presented as the Bridegroom of the Bride but also as the Servant who willingly suffers for her. Some Adam-Christ typology, also, is riding just below the surface of the context, for Paul goes back to the Genesis account to state that the first Adam became one flesh with the woman who was made from his flesh, and the Second Adam became one flesh with His Bride, His Body. "So the Second Adam is Head of his Body and Bride", says Thornton, "and loves her not only as her creator, but also as her saviour, who took her nature in order that he might save her." In depicting Christ as the Savior of the Church, His Body, Paul's thought is running in connection with the idea of a husband loving his wife as his own flesh. Thus, while loving the Church, the Savior is in reality loving that which is His, inasmuch as the Head is loving the Body due to the intimate union inherent in the corporate Second Adam. When Paul, therefore, speaks of the Savior of the

---

1 The idea contained in verse 25 may be hinted at as early as when Jesus spoke about the coming days "when the Bridegroom shall be taken away" (Mk. 2:19 par).


It is interesting to note that in developing the Adam-Christ typology further, some of the Church Fathers taught that the Christian Church came into full being upon the Cross. Thus, Tertullian in the third century wrote, "As Adam was a figure of Christ, Adam's sleep shadowed out the death of Christ, who was to sleep a mortal slumber, that from the wound inflicted on his side, might in like manner (as Eve was formed) be typified the Church, the true Mother of the living." "De Anima" xliii, cited by Mascal, op. cit., p. 127, along with other similar references.

3 But E.F. Scott, Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians (MNTC) p. 238, goes too far in suggesting that a soteriological value ought not to be attributed to the word σωτήρ in this case, but instead, the idea of "preserver". The probable reason for Paul's sparse use of the title "Savior" was its popular use in Greek religion and Caesar worship, but the concept of Savior is integrally related to the idea of the Head of the Church.
Body and of Christ, who "loved the church and gave himself up for her", his thought is parallel to those expressions of I Cor. 6 where he says that the body is meant for the Lord "and the Lord for the body" (v. 13) and that bodies of Christians have been "bought with a price" (v. 20). All of this reveals the essential unity between the Resurrection Body of Jesus and the flesh-bodies united with Him, for although Paul does not make them identical he does not separate the two. This is the great μοσχοφόρον whereby Christ and the Church are One Body (Eph. 5:31 ff.).

B) The Chief Cornerstone. Another designation ascribed to Jesus by Paul is "Chief Cornerstone". Describing the Church as the "household of God", he lays it down that Christ Jesus is "the chief cornerstone, in whom the whole structure is joined together (συναρμολογουμένη) 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" (Eph. 2:19 ff.). The principal Synoptic use of this idea occurs at the conclusion of the Parable of the Vineyard (Mk. 12:10), where Jesus quotes from Ps. 118:22 f.

Although Paul may have been familiar with such usage, the fact that he writes ἀκρωγωνίαίου (not κεφαλής γωνίας) shows that he has in mind primarily Isa. 28:16, where the LXX employs the same word. Paul emphasizes that Jesus is not only the foundation of the Church but also that all who are baptized into Him (Gentile as well as Jew) are united with Him so that, as One, they grow into "a holy temple in the Lord" (v. 21). Therefore, this spiritual temple, constituted by Christ and composed of His Body, depends on Jesus Christ as the foundation and founder of the New Humanity. But it may be that κεφαλή γωνίας and ἀκρωγωνίαίος indicate the "final stone", which meaning would emphasize the unique

---

1 Cf. 1 Pet. 2:6 which also quotes the LXX here in addition to Ps. 118:22 f.

2 Vincent Taylor, The Names of Jesus, p. 95. Perhaps there is a connection here with the words of Jesus, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (Jn. 2:19 ff.), which declares that the old idea of a temple manifested by a visible structure and external ritual is to pass away, and a new temple composed of dedicated men and women is to be raised up with Him in the Resurrection Body. Cf. E.F. Scott, Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians (MNTC), p. 180.
topmost position of Christ. Thus, Hanson points out that such an interpretation would fit better with the other conception of Christ being the Head of the Church, so that as Christ is the κεφαλὴ of the οἶκος, He is also the ἐκκουσίας of the οἶκος.¹ In any case the holy temple in the Lord of which Christ is chief cornerstone does not describe the Church as merely a building, but rather as a living temple which is the community of God's people, and which grows in an organic process as the Body. The prevailing application of the words οἶκος and ναός by Paul is not with reference to individual bodies but to the whole corporate structure of the Body of Christ, the Second Adam.²

Moreover, there is an interesting affinity between the New Testament thought of Christ as "the Stone" and the Son of Man concept. It has already been noted that in Daniel 2:34, 44, 45 "the stone" corresponds to the figure of "one like a son of man" to whom, as the corporate body of the saints of the Most High, is also given an everlasting kingdom. (It is also said of this "stone" that it "became a great mountain and filled the whole earth", Dan. 2:35). It is probable, therefore, that Paul had in mind, as part of his Old Testament background, this Son of Man-Stone association, which in its corporate sense would fit in very well with his thought of Jesus Christ as "the stone" upon whom and in whom the New Humanity was built. The corporate Second Adam concept of Paul, therefore, is related by another link to the Son of Man idea.

C) The Head and Whole of the New Humanity. This later development of Christ as the Head of the Body embraces the concepts of Christ as the Bridegroom and as the Chief Cornerstone, which bear some relation to the Son of Man idea. This development also appears in connection with the vexing Pauline expression about the "fullness"

¹ Hanson, op. cit., p. 131; cf. G.H. Whitaker, "The Chief Cornerstone", The Expositor, VIII, Vol. 22, p. 471, who takes ἐκκουσίας to mean "belonging to the first or chief corner", i.e., the primary corner by which the architect determines the lie of the whole building.

² Cf. I Cor. 3:9, 16 f.; II Cor. 5:1, 6:16; Eph. 2:21; 4:12, 16.
of Christ (which will be viewed in the next chapter). Most likely this Headship of Christ is related to the Hebrew thought whereby the head can be thought of as representative of the whole personality (cf. Josh. 2:19; Prov. 25:22; Rom. 12:20) just as the body was recognized as a manifestation of the soul. In Col. 1:18 Christ is spoken of as "the head" and "the beginning" (as well as "the firstborn"), and such designations represent a development of the Adam-Christ typology of the earlier epistles.¹ In them Christ was compared to Adam because Paul thought of Adam as the first member of humanity and also as the inclusive representative of the whole of humanity. Accordingly, consequences flowed from Adam to all of humanity in him. He was a "microcosm" of the human race. So Thornton states:

Yet the idea of the Headship of Christ signalizes the fact that there is a difference within the Body between the Head and the members in terms of significance and function. So although one can say that the exalted humanity of Christ is identified with that of Christians in the Body, one cannot say it is identical. Vincent Taylor well says that the Church as the Body of Christ "is a living entity indwelt by Him" and in some measure the Church is His "alter ego", but Paul would not say they are identical.² When it is said, therefore, that the Church is "the extension of the Incarnation", it is necessary to realize that although there is an essential oneness and inseparability between the two, they are ultimately not identical. The closest that one can come to describing this paradoxical reality of the relation between Christ, the Head, and the Church, His Body, is by frankly recognizing it as

---

¹ Cf. Hanson, op. cit., pp. 116 f.


a "unity in distinction". The Head and the Body form a single living organism, for without the Body the Head would be incomplete and without the Head the Body would be a decapitated corpse. Although the Church is seen as a human fellowship, it can never be separated from the Divine-Humanity of Jesus Christ. In connection with this Torrance points out that the relation between the divine and the human in the Church must be thought out in Christological terms:

"... yet there seems to have been no real attempt to think out the relation between the divine and human natures of the Church in terms of the relation between the divine and human in Jesus Christ Himself. It will be readily agreed that we cannot think of the divine nature of the Church in the same way as we think of the divine nature of Christ, for in Him the union of God and Man is absolutely unique. And yet it is only on the analogy of the hypostatic union that we can begin to answer our question — that is by giving that relation an analogical extension into the sphere of the Church. The analogy runs not 'as God and Man are related in Christ so the divine and the human are related in the Church', but rather 'as God and Man are related in Christ so Christ and the Church are related. This is a great mystery."

Separate from Christ, the Church is no longer a unique human fellowship but rather a mere collection of individuals; so in Paul's thought there are contained both the conceptions of Christ as the Head of the Church, and, equally, as the Whole of the Church. Whatever development, therefore, there may be in the concept of the Body between the early and late epistles of Paul, the prevailing and primary idea is "that Christ and his people share one single life together after a manner which can be fitly symbolized by the idea of a single human organism." For Paul, Christology and Ecclesiology become inseparable. Mersch says:

"For all its novelty, the figure of the 'Head' formulated in the Epistles of the captivity, does not by any means exclude the role which the great epistles ascribe to Christ. Even when raised above the whole organism, He nevertheless remains within it. He animates and gives life to the whole; and though this whole constitutes His growth and His fullness, yet it comes entirely from Him."

If the identification of the Head with the New Humanity can never be made without some distinction, this distinction must admit of being resolvable to a living unity, a

---

4 E. Mersch, The Whole Christ, p. 123.
single Organism. This thought of Paul is expressed later by John in a similar way when speaking about Jesus as the True Vine (15:1 ff.).

It is in accord with this conceptual background that Paul always connects the terms ΚΕΦΑΛΗ with οὐσία in a complementary fashion. Christ is the Head of His Resurrection Body in which Christians participate. The basic oscillation between the One and the Many pervades the whole of the Pauline doctrine of the Body, for He is at once the Head and the Whole. The Head and Whole of the New Humanity is seen in these later "Headship" epistles in the concept of the new nature, or the New Man in which "Christ is all, and in all" (Col. 3:11), and in the One New Man created in Himself (Eph. 2:15), which J.A. Armitage Robinson says "is no mere alliance of elements naturally distinct, but a con-corporation, the common life of a single organism. ¹ By speaking of a "mature manhood" ( ἄνδρα ΤΕΛΕΙΟΥ - Eph. 4:13), which Christians are to attain, Paul does not mean that they are to become mature men in an individualistic way, but rather they are to grow up in corporate Oneness into the New Man, the full-grown Man. Christians are to attain it in a totality, as in a single Body. He defines it as the "measure and stature of the fullness of Christ", by which he means the Head and the Body together becoming the One New Man. The fullness of God that dwells in Christ bodily is to be shared in by Christians who are united with Him until the One New Man becomes all that it is meant to be. Tennyson's lines provide a parallel here to this Pauline thought:

The One Body of the New Humanity is a corporate New Man through union with His glorious humanity.

¹ J. Armitage Robinson, Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 65. He also says that Paul's "supreme mission was to proclaim Christ as the centre of a united humanity." p. 53.

² From "The Making of Man", The Death of Oenone and other Poems, pp. 85 f.
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THE FULLNESS OF HIS HUMANITY

In saying that Christians are to share as a corporate Body in the fullness of Christ, as the fullness of God was in Him bodily, one is brought to a point of departure for a consideration of the idea of "fullness" in association with the concept of the humanity of Jesus Christ.

I. THE MEANING OF "FULLNESS"

The crux interpretum for the "fullness" concept is Eph. 1:22f., which states that the Father "has put all things under his [Christ's] feet and has made him the head over all things for the church,¹ which is his body, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πληρομένου". Two questions beg for answers in this perplexing statement: 1) who or what has the "fullness"?; and 2) by whom is either Christ or the Church being filled? These two questions are inextricably bound up together. In the following discussion the answer having the most probability will be presented.

A) The Weakness of the Complementary View. A few scholars, notably J. Armitage Robinson, have taken τὸ πλήρωμα as complementary to Christ the Head, and therefore as an apposition for the Church, His Body.² According to this view πλήρωμα is understood in an active sense (quod implet), and therefore Paul is actually dealing with the bold thought that Christ is in some sense incomplete and that the

¹ Literally, "gave him to be head over all things to the church."

Church is the absolutely necessary agent to complete or to fill Christ. J.A. Robinson sees a parallel to Eph. 1:23 in the Socratic concept of the necessity for different kinds of artisans and laborers being in a city to make up its population and to form its πλήρωμα. If all the required elements were present, there was a city; if any of them was lacking there could be no complete city. A complementary, active, interpretation of πλήρωμα in Eph. 1:23, however, encounters several strong objections that must be marked up against it: 1) In the Captivity period when Paul was stressing the pre-eminence and all-sufficiency of Christ, this interpretation would put the Apostle in the position of admitting the incompleteness not only of the person of Christ but also of the work He accomplished by His death and His revelation, and this would be contradictory to Paul's consistent conviction to the contrary. 2) It assumes that since the πλήρωμα idea appears in Eph. 1:23 in the same statement with the Head-Body concept, it has a direct connection with the latter, but it neglects to consider that the πλήρωμα idea is derived from outside sources. Paul took the Hellenistic word πλήρωμα and baptized it into the Christian faith in order to combat heretical beliefs with their own term; it had no original connection with the Head-Body concept. With Paul σώμα (not πλήρωμα) is consistently the complement of the κεφαλή. 3) The most serious criticism of this view, however, arises from an observation of the other uses of the word πλήρωμα and the verb

---


2 J. Armitage Robinson, op. cit., p. 259. Robinson also adduces a Greek nautical usage whereby πλήρωμα designates the complement (either crew or cargo) of a ship, and also a stronger sense in which πλήρωμα is the full complement in entirety, e.g., a basketful.

3 πλήρωμα does, however, have an Old Testament usage, but not in association with the Head-Body concept. The Hebrew equivalent in Ps. 24:1 is אֲדַלָּם: "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof" (quoted by Paul at I Cor. 10:26); and also in Ps. 96:11 יְהֹוָה יָנָּשׁ כְּלָו πָּלִים אֵלֶּה (LXX). In these two cases the word is adequately translated simply as "its contents."
πλήρωμα in the Pauline letters. While in his earlier epistles he used πλήρωμα in relation to law (Rom. 13:10), blessing (Rom. 15:29), and time (Gal. 4:4), his first application of it to Christ was in Col. 1:19: "For in him all the fullness [of God] was pleased to dwell." In combating the Colossian heresy (which held that Christ did not sufficiently or completely represent the Divine nature) Paul took over one of its pet terms and turned it against the heretics by proclaiming that in the person of Christ there resides the very fullness, the plenitude or totality of the Godhead. For this reason Christ was completely capable of accomplishing reconciliation.

Later in the Colossian letter (2:9f.) Paul expanded his first utterance by saying, "For in him dwells πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικὸς καὶ ἐστε ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι, who is the head of all rule and authority." Here, again, Paul asserted the totality of the Godhead in Christ, but added that this dwells (κατοικεῖ — present tense) in Him "bodily". There is a sense in which the word "bodily" (σωματικῶς) refers to the Incarnate human body of Jesus. Accordingly, Lightfoot pointed out that inasmuch as Paul used the carefully selected word σωματικῶς (not ἐν σώματι, which would suggest a limitation of God, nor σωματοειδῆς, which would suggest an unreality of Christ's human body) this term implies the Incarnation and finds a later parallel in the Johannine "the Word became flesh".1 Others, however, point out that inasmuch as Paul used here the present tense, κατοικεῖ and that when he elsewhere referred in the Colossian and Ephesian letters to the individual human body of Jesus he used more specific phrases such as "his flesh", or "the body of his flesh", the thought here is not limited to the Incarnation. In other words, the Apostle is also thinking of the exalted,

glorified humanity of Christ, which is a present reality. Moreover, it is into this οὐρανός Christ that Christians are incorporated. Therefore, while it is "in him" that the fullness of the Godhead dwells (v. 9), it is also "in him" (ἐν οὐρανῷ) that Christians are made full. In other words, as Hanson says, "As Christ is filled with God, similarly the Church, His Body, is filled with Christ. . . . Incorporated in Christ, in His Body (ἐν οὐρανῷ) they have become participators of His fulness."2 (In the Fourth Gospel there is a similar concept applied to Christ as the Word who was "full of grace and truth . . . and from his fullness have we all received, grace upon grace", Jn. 1:14, 16). It is the risen humanity of Jesus which has the fullness of God, and as a result, the Church, His Body, is made full in Him (ἐστε ἐν οὐρανῷ πεπληρωμένοι). This agrees with Paul's earlier expression that there is only One Body of Christ, and that Christians are members of that Body — part of one Organism. οὐρανός, therefore, denotes the Church,3 and the sublime teaching Paul presents here is that the fullness which Christ contains in His glorious ascended humanity is now "overflowing" and filling the corporate Second Adam composed of those united to Him. A statement by Mersch is appropriate here:

Since Christ possesses in Himself the fullness of the divinity, He also possesses in Himself the fullness of all supernatural human life; hence we, too, are filled in Him, filled with all the fullness of God. . . . if the Saviour is Head through His humanity and in His humanity, He is such only by reason of the divinity.4

In view of this usage then, of πλήρωμα in Colossians it is extremely unlikely that a complementary, active sense can attach to it in Eph. 1:23. Accordingly, the

---


2 Hanson, op. cit., p. 128; J.A.T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 66.

3 Although Rawlinson, The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ, pp. 164f., defines "bodily" as "in concrete reality," he fails to make any application to the Church.

4 Emile Mersch, The Whole Christ, pp. 126f.
majority of scholars understand it in a passive sense (quod impletur). 1

B) The Most Likely Interpretation of Eph. 1:23. It is most probable that Eph. 1:23 is to be interpreted in the light of the approach sketched above, and, accordingly the final participle of the contentious phrase τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὸ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πληρομένου is to be understood in the passive or middle voice, with the balance being in favor of the latter. The traditional, but extremely questionable, active sense given by the KJV ("the fulness of him that filleth all in all") is adopted by the RV and also by the RSV. The doubtful nature of this rendering, however, is demonstrated by the fact that elsewhere when Paul expressed the idea of Christ filling all things (Eph. 4:10) he plainly used the active πληρόμενη. It seems more reasonable, therefore, to translate the πληρομένου in the sense of "being fulfilled", or better still, "who fulfills for himself all things." 2 This middle sense indicates Christ's own interest in the action. Although the phrase τὸ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι has cosmic import, it more specifically refers to the Church and is the object of the action. 3 Everything in the Church is filled by Christ, or in E.F. Scott's words: "The Church is the 'fulness' of Christ in the sense that it is


3 Contra J. Armitage Robinson, op. cit., p. 152, who understands the phrase adverbially, i.e., "all in all".
filled by him — pervaded in all its parts with his life, and so wrought into an organic whole." Thus, the "fullness" of Christ, filled by God, flows into and fills the Church, or more simply (this time in Thornton's words), "Christ is filled by God and the Church is filled with Christ." If this interpretation is correct, then Paul was not saying that the Church is filled directly by God, but rather by the mediating Divine-Humanity of Jesus Christ.

The answers to the two questions posed at the beginning of this discussion have now become apparent. Furthermore, such an interpretation is consistent with the previously cited instances in the Captivity Epistles of the use of "fullness" in relation to Christ and is also in agreement with similar expressions of these and earlier letters which speak of Christians being filled with some grace from God through Christ. In Eph. 3:19, for example, Paul prays that they might "know the love of Christ which surpasses knowledge, that you may be filled with all the fullness of God." This last phrase is similar to that of 1:23 where noun and verb are conjoined, only the positions here are reversed. The context teaches that the highest manifestation of wisdom is Christ's love. Comprehension of the supremacy of this love of Christ is initiated by the power of God's Spirit whereby Christ dwells in the hearts of the faithful. Then Christ's love mediates the knowledge whereby Christians are "filled with all the fullness of God."  

II. FULLNESS AND SUFFERING

A) Ἀνεπανλημός τοῦ οστήρηματα. In Col. 1:24 Paul exclaims, "Now I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and ἀνεπανπλημένω τοῦ οστήρηματα

1 E.F. Scott, op.cit., p. 159.


3 For the Philippians Paul prays that they might be "filled with the fruits of righteousness which come through Jesus Christ" (1:11); cf. Eph. 5:16; Col. 1:9; Rom. 15:14, 15:15; II Thess. 1:11; Phil. 4:18f.
of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for the sake of his body, which is the church." (*) At first glance this declaration would seem to be bear Lightfoot's interpretation that Paul's sufferings as an individual supplemented those of Christ, or Robinson's, that Paul's sufferings in his own person on behalf of the Church were filling up the "deficits" of those of Christ. But the theological and apologetical difficulties involved in a complementary interpretation of Eph. 1:23 also weigh upon these views. Lightfoot, however, endeavored to reconcile the idea of the incompleteness of Christ's sufferings with Paul's general view of suffering-atonement by holding that the Apostle did not say that his own sufferings fill up all that is lacking, but rather "they went towards filling them up." For the support of this position he laid great stress upon the necessity of giving the ὁντανοπληρῶ of the verse its proper force in view of its prefix. Consequently, he insisted that the word indicates "a distinction of persons suffering," the distinction being between Christ and Paul. But even if one grants that the compounded word implies a distinction, is it necessary to understand it only as between Christ and Paul? In short, can it not be understood as a relation between Paul and the Christian community?

The crucial word ὁντανοπληρῶ means "I fill up instead", which Lightfoot suggested means on behalf of Christ's sufferings; but the whole statement twice affirms that the Apostle's sufferings are for the sake of the Colossian Christians,

1 J.B. Lightfoot, Colossians, p. 164.
2 J. Armitage Robinson, op. cit., p. 44.
3 Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 164.
4 Lightfoot's insistence that the word means a distinction (not an identification) between the sufferings of the Apostle and of Christ fails to give any consideration to Paul's baptismal-faith union doctrine whereby he can feel that his own sufferings are somehow a share in Christ's. On the other hand, Deissmann went too far in the other direction by holding that the phrase "afflictions of Christ" meant the same thing as the term "my sufferings." He suggested that Gal. 2:20 could be altered to "I suffer, yet not I, but Christ suffers in me. (sub "Where Paul's Theology Begins", C.T.A.F., pp. 252f.) But this interpretation does not attribute any significance to the prefix ὁντι, nor to what might be called the "vicarious element" of the statement.
His Body, the Church. It is Paul, as a member of the Body, who participates in the sufferings of Christ. Inasmuch as the fullness of Christ, including His sufferings, overflows into the Church, Paul gladly takes in his flesh a share of these sufferings which His Body must endure until the consummation. Consequently, it is on their behalf (the members of the Body) that he participates in the sufferings flowing from Christ. Therefore, there is both a vicarious and an eschatological note in this statement.

Another passage concerning the afflictions of the Apostle (II Cor. 1:5-7) supplies a parallel to Col. 1:24 and helps toward the understanding of the vicarious element of the latter statement. In the Corinthian verses he begins by thanking God for the comfort given to him in affliction whereby he in turn is able to comfort others in affliction with that same comfort. Then he writes:

For as the sufferings of Christ abound for us, so also our comfort abounds through Christ. If we are afflicted, it is for your comfort and salvation; and if we are comforted, it is for your comfort, which you experience when you patiently endure the same sufferings that we suffer. Our hope for you is unshaken; for we know that as you share in our sufferings, you will also share in our comfort.

1 Those, however, who understand this verse as primarily meaning Paul's personal mystical union with Christ and His sufferings (e.g. B.F. Scott., op. cit., p. 31; L.B. Hadford, op. cit., pp. 200f.) often fail to give due consideration to the Apostle's relation to the Body in the matter. If it is only a mystical union between the man Paul and Christ, there is no point to the vicarious implications of the term αὐτοκάθαρσις and the phrase ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος σῶτοῦ), nor is there any point in speaking about the ὑπερήφανος of Christ's afflictions. Cf. Hanson, op. cit., p. 119.

2 The words of II Tim. 2:10 provide a helpful parallel: "Therefore I endure everything for the sake of the elect, that they also may obtain the salvation which in Christ Jesus goes with eternal glory."

3 The eschatological note has been stressed by Lohmeyer, who holds that suffering is required on the part of believers to fill up that which is required before the Parousia, for as Christ suffered between the Incarnation and Resurrection so the Body of Christ has to suffer between the Resurrection and the Parousia. Der Brief an die Kolosser, pp. 76-79; cf. H.W. Robinson, Redemption and Revelation, p. 279; T.A. Lacey, The One Body and the One Spirit, p. 43; C.H. Dodd, "Colossians", Abingdon Bible Commentary, p. 1256.

4 II Cor. 1:5-7. (x) Cf. Eph. 3:13: "So I ask you not (or "ask that I may not") to lose heart over what I am suffering for you, which is your glory."
Here, as in Col. 1:24, there is an overflowing of the sufferings of Christ in which Paul's sufferings are a part. Moreover, if the article (τοῦ) that appears twice with "Christ" in verse 5 is taken seriously, there is another indication of the Messiah as Suffering Servant in Paul's thought. Inasmuch as the afflictions of the Messianic Suffering Servant cannot be separated from His people, they must overflow into the Christian Community and must in that sense be shared by it; but not only the sufferings, the comfort also. In other words, Paul is saying that both the sufferings and the comfort bound up together overflow from Christ to him, and this double stream flows on to others united with him and to Christ in the single organism of the corporate Second Adam.  

Again, there is no thought in the Apostle's mind about Christians completing the sufferings of Christ in the sense of filling up a lack or a deficiency. One cannot, therefore, agree with Lightfoot, followed by Strachan, that the "sufferings of Christ" in II Cor. 1:5 and Col. 1:24 are to be interpreted as meaning that "Christ the sinless Master should have left something for Paul the unworthy servant to suffer."  

Certainly there is a "sharing", but it is not a "completing" in that sense because the whole process is to be understood the other way around. It is the sufferings and comfort that flow from Christ that fill the Apostle and which are distributed in the Community, the corporate Second Adam. To participate in Christ's sufferings was a poignant realization on Paul's part of the truth of what Jesus proclaimed to His followers, "The cup that I drink you will drink" (Mk. 10:39). The Apostle, therefore, conceived the burden of his ministry "to fulfil (πληρῶσαι) the word of God" (Col. 1:25; cf. Rom. 15:19; Col. 4:17); i.e., to be a minister (διάκονος) of the fullness of Christ — His sufferings and comfort, His sacrificial Suffering-Servant life, His perfect humanity — whereby those believing and being incorporated


2 Lightfoot, Colossians, p. 163; Strachan, II Corinthians (MNTC), p. 46.
into the Second Adam "come to fullness of life in him" (Col. 2:10) and up to the measure of "all the fullness of God" (Eph. 3:19). This is in accord with Paul's statement about the ministry of reconciliation being entrusted to those who have been reconciled (II Cor. 5:18-20) and also with the intention of Paul to integrally connect his suffering with his ministry in the Col. 1:24-29 context. 1

The perplexing phrase θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ of Col. 1:24, therefore, must be thought of in connection with his doctrine of the One Body of Christ. All efforts to stress that this phrase refers primarily to the afflictions of Christ, 2 or to the afflictions of the Apostle, 3 or to the Church, His Body, 4 or to a personal mystical relation between Paul and Christ 5 are inadequate because of their emphases upon various distinctions which Paul did not clearly intend. The afflictions and sufferings of Paul and the Christian Community were by necessity connected with the afflictions and sufferings of Christ — not in that they had an atoning value as His did, but because of His overflow into individual Christians who are inseparably members of His Body. Consequently, the Apostle's language has reference to His humanity — both to His individual human life and to His glorified humanity into which Christians are incorporated and involved in His sufferings. Through union with Christ there is a sharing with Christ at all points, including not only His resurrection and glory but also His sacrificial obedient life, sufferings and death. So Paul desires: "that I may know him and the power of his

---

2 Lightfoot, op. cit., pp. 163ff.
4 G.J. Ellicott, St. Paul's Epistles to the Philippians, the Colossians and Philemon, p. 147.
resurrection, and may share his sufferings, becoming like him in his death, that if possible I may attain the resurrection from the dead" (Phil. 3:10f.). The background for this passage is II Cor. 4:10f. where the Apostle exclaims that he is "always carrying in the body the death (literally, "the dying") of Jesus, so that the life of Jesus may also be manifested in our bodies. For while we live we are always being given up to death for Jesus' sake, so that the life of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal flesh."¹ The quadruple use of the name "Jesus" in these Corinthian verses can be taken as an indication of a familiarity with the Passion events of an historical life in human nature, climaxing a total situation of suffering that was spiritual as well as physical. Paul is reflecting upon that humanity of Jesus Christ which bore "the strain, shame, and pain"² received at the hands of men and concentrated in those last days; and he is bold to hope that this life of Jesus may be revealed in his body. Indeed, as Jesus suffered and was killed in the body, so also is Paul in his missionary witness, not merely as an imitation of Jesus, but more as the result of incorporation into His humanity. Here, then, the participation in Christ's suffering (an aspect of His fullness) manifests itself in the Apostle's body so that the faith which is inextricably bound up with them may be communicated to others. This is the meaning contained in the seemingly enigmatic clause, "so death is at work in us, but life in you" (II Cor. 4:12). The sacrificial life of one incorporate into the Second Adam helps to communicate the fullness of Christ to others. So Paul can, with all sincerity, bid Christians not to lose heart over what he is suffering for them because it is their glory (Eph. 3:15), and can follow this with the prayer that they "may be filled with all the fullness of Christ's death.

¹ Cf. Gal. 6:17 where Paul announces that he bears in his body the \( \sigma \tau \iota \gamma \mu \alpha \tau \alpha \) of Jesus. As a brand was often wrought in the flesh of a slave to indicate the one he served, so the marks (\( \sigma \tau \iota \gamma \mu \alpha \tau \alpha \)) on Paul's body left by the perils, hardships, beatings, and lashings endured for the cause of Christ were a testimony to his faithful service and a visible proof of his share in the sufferings of Christ.

² Strachan, II Corinthians (MNTC), p. 94.
It is interesting to note here that the verb τελειωμ cannot mean "to complete, to perfect, to render a thing full" (cf. II Cor. 12:9; I Jn. 2:5; 4:12, 17), and sometimes this τελείωμα is accomplished through suffering and martyrdom. For example, Hebrews 5:8f. speaks of Jesus being made perfect through suffering. Similarly, a form of πληρωμ is used in Rev. 6:11 with reference to completing the number of martyrs. Therefore, one can see in the New Testament an affinity between the ideas of πλήρωμα and τελείωμα in that both can be used in connection with fulfillment through suffering. As Jesus was made perfect through suffering, so Paul recognized that Christians as the Body of Christ are destined to be completed, perfected, fulfilled through a participation in His sufferings until they come to ἄνδρα τέλειον, to the measure of the stature τοῦ πληρωματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Eph. 4:13).

In this process Paul gladly takes his place and is willing to suffer on behalf of the Body of Christ.

Both statements in II Corinthians (1:3-7 and 4:7ff.) imply that comfort accompanies the continual sharing in the suffering and dying of Jesus, and with this comfort in affliction there is also included joy (II Cor. 7:4). From the beginning years of his missionary writings the Apostle links together the twin streams of

---

1 The case of Paul and Onesimus is an illustration of this vicarious principle. Just as Christ took upon Himself the burden of human sin, so Paul, although not sinless, took upon himself vicariously the burden which was too weighty for Onesimus. Jesus had no part in our sin, and neither was Paul any partaker in the fault of Onesimus. So in the letter to Philomen one sees Paul revealed in a vicarious action in accordance with a sacrificial life arising out of his participation in the fullness of Christ.

2 Cf. Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon.


4 For a possible Synoptic relation between the two terms see M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, pp. 165-172.
suffering and comfort with joy, for he recalls that inasmuch as the Thessalonians have become imitators of the Apostle, his companions, and of the Lord, receiving the word in much affliction, it has been accompanied by joy and comfort inspired by the Holy Spirit (I Thess. 1:6; cf. 2:14). This imitation cannot be thought of merely as stimulated by an external example but must be thought of in terms of being an integral part of the concept of participation in the One Body of Christ, His risen humanity. Moreover, this suffering is distributed in His Body and is shared by all members of that Body. The resulting fellowship of suffering is so real that if one member suffers, all suffer together (I Cor. 12:26) — an insight expressed in the midst of the Apostle's teaching concerning the Church as Christ's Body. This insight is identical to that truth which broke upon him at his conversion and which Jesus imparted in the concluding parable of Matthew 25. Therefore, the fellowship of suffering, as well as of joy and glory, unites Christians not only with the Lord but with each other in a vital, essential union in the corporate Second Adam. The impressive number of references that Paul has throughout his epistles to the fellowship of suffering among Christians incorporate in the Second Adam cannot be understood save as a pronounced reflection of the humanity of Jesus, which is both the source and the sphere of all such KOINWNAVIA.

B) The Corporate Suffering Servant. Paul was absolutely convinced that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah and that He was a Messiah who suffered, was crucified, and raised from the dead. In view of the fact that Paul quoted a considerable number of times from the Servant passages of Isaiah and recognizing that certain other passages bear an obvious influence from Isa. 53, it can be said that although he never specifically stated in so many words that Jesus was the fulfillment of the Suffering Servant role, the implications are so strong as to assure that this concept permeated Paul's thought.  

1 Christ's sufferings are referred to as an example to follow in I Pet. 2:21, but Paul never expressed it that way.

2 Schweitzer's question, "How . . . can we explain the fact that he never makes any use of the passage about the Suffering Servant of the Lord in Isaiah liii?" (Korinthiaca, p. 315), has been answered by little 81.
One of the strongest indications of Paul's view of the human life of Jesus in terms of the Suffering Servant is evidenced by those statements about sharing in the sufferings of Christ. In Isa. 53:7. 10 the Suffering Servant appears to be an individual, but he is a representative individual, who in himself personifies the sufferings of God's faithful ones. This Servant concept of Deutero-Isaiah results from the narrowing down of the "Ebed Jâweh" idea from the whole nation, to a small remnant, and finally to a representative individual. In the New Testament, however, there is a widening out of the concept from the individual Jesus Christ, who perfectly fulfilled in His life, work, and vicarious death the role of the Suffering Servant of God, to include the Christian Koivvô, the Church.¹

Similarly, this process has been utilized with reference to the Son of Man idea by T.W. Manson, who points out that the Son of Man in the Gospels is the final term in a series of Old Testament concepts, all of which have the Remnant idea as the essential feature. In Jesus the Son of Man is embodied and is perfectly expressed by His life and death. Thus the Son of Man idea, through the vicarious suffering and death of Christ, has been "incarnated in the person of Jesus", but through His death on the cross the Son of Man in a much wider reality is brought into being in the sense that His Body, the Church, of which He is the Head, is now the "Son of Man". In Paul's teaching, then, the Son of Man is conceived in the way Jesus thought of it. Manson's own words are:

In the interval between the teaching career of the Master and the preaching mission of his Apostle the Son of Man idea has been incarnated in the person of Jesus. The Son of Man is no longer a mere religious ideal; it has been

¹ Cf. W.E. Chadwick, The Social Teaching of St. Paul, p. 66. In the definitive volume by C.R. North, The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah (1948), and in the recent but smaller Isaiah 40-55 (1952) the conclusion is given that the Prophet probably had in mind an individual who would come in the future and would perfectly fulfill the Servant idea. North also endorses a diagrammatic representation of the historical sequence thus:

"The Christian Church is heir to the Servant vocation of Israel in the Old Testament. The immediate horizontal lines represent faithful nuclei, of Jews under the Old, of Christians under the New Covenant." Isaiah 40-55, p. 36.
realized to the full in Jesus, the head of the new humanity; and men are now called to become the 'new man' by union with Him. As we study the life of Jesus we seem to see him become the Son of Man ideal, by a process of elimination. When we turn to the teaching of Paul, we find the same idea being carried to further and fuller realization by a process of inclusion. The road to the cross is a road of ever-increasing loneliness; and at the end of it Jesus is absolutely alone. From that point onwards, if we read Paul aright, there is an ever-increasing fellowship of the sufferings of Christ. The prophecy of Jesus is fulfilled 'The cup that I drink ye shall drink: and with the baptism that I am baptized withal ye shall be baptized'. This word could not be fulfilled in his lifetime; it is fulfilled after and through his death and resurrection."

Other scholars, earlier expressed similar views. Davidson said, "In the Old Testament the Messiah is the concentration of the people; in the New, the people are the extension of the Messiah." G.A. Smith expressed it by saying that in Second Isaiah the Servant is "People first, Person second"; but in the New Testament the Servant is "Person first and People afterwards." The idea common to these expressions is that the Divine Ideal narrowed down from the Nation to an Individual, and then from that One Individual it expanded to include the Christian Community.

So Paul, fusing the concepts of Second Adam, Son of Man, and Suffering Servant with reference to the humanity of Jesus Christ, saw his own sufferings and those of his fellow Christians not only as an experience in accord with the life and teachings of Jesus, but as a real participation in His sufferings (Phil. 3:10; Rom. 8:17). In other words, the corporate Second Adam is also the corporate Suffering Servant. Two statements by Torrance are helpful at this point:

... because the Church is already sacramentally concorporate with the Risen Body of Christ but still waiting herself for the redemption of the body, it is the function of the Church to live out the reconciliation or atonement of

---

1 T.W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, p. 234. In Manson's more recent book, The Servant-Messiah (1953), p. 98, he inclines toward the idea that it is the "working body of Christ" rather than the mystical body of Christ which is the extension or continuation of the ministry of the Risen Christ.


3 G.A. Smith, Isaiah II, p. 304.

4 Again, however, one must guard against saying literally that the Church is an "extension of the Incarnation."
Christ in the world — that is, to be in the flesh the bodily instrument of God's crucial intervention, the space in which the great reconciliation already wrought out in the Body of Christ is realized among men, so that the life and action of the Church militant becomes sacramentally correlative to the life and passion of Jesus Christ, the Suffering Servant.

It is not only as she receives the sacrament but as she enacts it, always bearing about in her body the dying of Jesus (II Cor. 4:10), resisting unto blood (Heb. 12:4), that she knows Christ in the fellowship of His sufferings and becomes conformable unto His death. It is thus that she fills up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ, and thus that she shews forth His death till He comes.¹

It is difficult to overemphasize the prominent place that suffering occupies in Paul's thought and expression. He is no hypochondriac, nor does he just relate his sufferings as a list of hard experiences in an autobiography. Along with the emphasis he lays upon them one cannot miss the prevailing conviction that they are an inseparable aspect of the life ἐν Χριστῷ. Moreover, they can only be explained logically by the fact that he was overwhelmingly impressed by the human sufferings of the Second Adam-Servant. But not only did he reflect the truth of the Servant as an individual who suffered, but he also thought of the "collective interpretation of the Servant" — the One Body. Thus the Pauline references to sharing in Christ's sufferings, especially Phil. 3:10 and Col. 1:24 (cf. II Cor. 4:10ff.), perhaps come closer than any other New Testament words to the historical meaning of the Songs of the Servant. "They have caught," says H.W. Robinson, "the iridescence of the blended personality in which the distinction of 'mine' and 'thine' is not lost, but transcended to the enrichment of both."²

III. FULLNESS AND ULTIMATE OR PERFECT HUMANITY

By the overflow of the fullness of Christ the corporate Second Adam is gradually growing up to the fullness of Christ — to the perfect Full-grown Man (Eph. 4:13). Paul envisaged a time when that Divine-Human fullness revealed in the one man Jesus Christ and now manifested through the corporate Second Adam

will eventually incorporate every man into the One Man. Thus there is a strong
eschatological note that sounds through the Pauline concept of the Fullness of
Christ and the Perfect Man. So Paul writes that God:

has made known to us in all wisdom and insight the mystery of his will,
according to his purpose which he set forth in Christ as a plan for the
fullness of time, to unite (rather "re-unite" — ἀνακεφαλαιώσας θεοῦ) all things in him (literally, 'in the Christ'), things in heaven and
things on earth (Eph. 1:9f.).

In the Ephesian letter the Church is the fullness of Christ in a twofold sense.
Primarily, The Church is a Body, like a vessel, into which the fullness of Christ
flows; secondarily, it is the fullness of Christ in the sense that it is the
indispensable container of His fullness and without which that fullness cannot be
manifested among men.1 As Christ Incarnate is the fullness and embodiment of God,
so the Church is the fullness and embodiment of Christ. It cannot rest until it
has drawn all humanity into His Body; its task is not complete until all humanity
has become One Body according to the eternal plan of God. The Church, therefore,
has the constant function of proclaiming the reconciliation through the Divine-
humanity of Jesus Christ by Word, Sacrament, and its whole life.2

A) ἀνακεφαλαιώσας θεοῦ. The crucial word, of course, in Eph. 1:10
is the compounded aorist middle infinitive ἀνακεφαλαιώσας θεοῦ, which ought
to be translated "to sum up". Originally the main part of the verb meant a
"summing up", either of a column of figures or of the points of an argument. The
prefix, however, indicates that here it is a re-uniting, a reunion of all things
with God in Christ, and thus it has eschatological significance. Just as the
harmony of all things was shattered by the entrance of Sin into the world, atom-
izing society, so will the fullness of God in Christ flow into the Church, His
Body, so that eventually all things will be re-united according to God's redemptive

1 Thornton, The Common Life in the Body of Christ, p. 310, who also provides
the illustration; "The Church apart from Christ would be like an empty wine cup.
Christ without the Church would be like wine which, for lack of a wine-cup, no
one could drink."

2 D.M. Baillie, God Was in Christ, p. 209.
plan. To quote B.F. Westcott:

The word here expresses the typical union of all things in the Messiah, a final harmony answering to the idea of creation, just as the corresponding word συνοπτικός θεωρία used in Col. 1:20 expresses the reconciliation of the parts of creation one to another and to God in view of the separation and estrangement wrought by Sin.¹

The article in the phrase ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ needs to be taken seriously to bring out the point that this "summing up", or "re-union", is accomplished by the Messiah with whom His people are inseparable. Just as creation suffered the consequences of sin through man (Gal. 3:22), so also the redemption of creation was initiated through man (I Cor. 15:22-28).

It is at this point that one sees relevance for a literal rendering of Eph. 1:22: "He gave him to be head over all things to the church." The universal sovereignty ascribed to Christ in the preceding verses, as actually accomplished by His victory when His humanity was raised and exalted to the heavens, is now made over to the Church as the agent for communicating this triumphant good news until the whole universe acknowledges His victory and proclaims Him Lord. His fullness, therefore, flows into the Church and through the Church. Consequently, the Apostle sums up his motive for preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ to the Gentiles as "to make all men see what is the plan of the mystery hidden for ages in God who created all things; that through the church the manifold wisdom of God might be made known to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places" (Eph. 3:9f.). The Christ who took the flesh of humanity (2:15) and who shed His blood (1:7) on the cross (2:16) for our redemption is now by the fullness of His ascended humanity filling the Church and summing up all things in Himself. He is the "Christus Consummator", the fulfillment of the eternal, ultimate purpose of God (3:11). Although He, through the Church, is drawing all men into the One

Full-grown Man, the summing up is still wider; it is cosmic, including "all things".¹ All things shall be re-united in Him, and His universal Kingship shall be completely established so that all things are under His feet and He is head over all (1:22). The soaring Christological thought of this first chapter of Ephesians proclaiming the universal sovereignty of Christ in His ascended humanity can be compared in thought with I Cor. 15:24-28, and both of these passages provide reflections of Paul's knowledge of the Son of Man concept.² The link, therefore, between Paul's conception of the humanity of Jesus Christ and the Son of Man idea is still seen to be strong. The "Regnum Christi" is established not only through the exaltation of Jesus Christ whereby His humanity attained the ideal goal, but also through His leading of the community in Him to that goal. In addition, Christ's exaltation supplies "not only the guarantee of the goal of human history, but also of the cosmos."³

B) Recapitulare. The classic Recapitulation Theory so fully elaborated by Irenaeus near the end of the second century was built up from this word ἀνακεφαλασίας. Combating docetic ideas of Christ's humanity and using Pauline phraseology, Irenaeus held that Christ, as the Second Adam who "recapitulated" human nature, was the consummation of all that went before and the fulfillment of the original idea of the universe. Christ "recapitulated" human nature by passing through all the stages of human life in order to sanctify them all afresh to God.

The Second Adam accepted every condition of humanity, yielding even to death, that by His perfect obedience He might reverse the effects of man's disobedience, abolish sin and death, quicken humanity, and restore the image and likeness of God lost by Adam. Then, from his glorified humanity the Holy Spirit proceeds,

¹ The relation of Christ both to the Church and to the world in the Colossian and Ephesian letters demonstrates how interconnected the concepts of ecclesiology and cosmology are for the Apostle.

² Supra, p. 96.

mediating the life-giving quality of the Redeemer's presence for the purpose of re-creating humanity, which process normally takes place in the Church. Thus the Second Adam restores the original type of manhood by gathering into Himself all that belongs to its true essence and by fulfilling all that belongs to the true idea of manhood. With this restored humanity through the Spirit and through the Son there is also the return of all creation to God the Creator.\(^1\)

To the credit of Irenaeus it must be recognized that he saw clearly the necessity for the historic Jesus, the inseparable connection between the Incarnation and redemption, and the basic truth of the solidarity of humanity. He also provided an interpretation of Jesus' use of the Son of Man title which deserves to be noted:

"Therefore does the Lord profess Himself to be the Son of man, comprising in Himself that original man out of whom the woman was fashioned, in order that, as our species went down to death through a vanquished man, so we may ascend to life again through a victorious one; and as through a man death received the palm [of victory] against us, so again by a man we may receive the palm against death."\(^2\)

Although Irenaeus developed the concepts of Paul in an attractive way, one feels, however, that he actually overdeveloped the thought of the Apostle. It is doubtful whether the Apostle thought as specifically as Irenaeus did about Christ recapitulating each specific stage of human life. Also, something of a dualistic note can be detected in his writings, for he held that the Logos remained quiescent in order to permit the possibility of Christ being tempted during his human life; and he also thought of Satan as having independent rights which God respected and with which Christ dealt by way of persuasion. Nevertheless, Irenaeus stands out


Key passages in Irenaeus for this characteristic recapitulation doctrine include: Against Heresies, Bk. III 9; 16.6; 17; 18.1, 7; 19; 21.10; 22.2, 3; 24; IV 38; V 6; 8; 10; 12. (*The Writings of Irenaeus*, Vols. I, II, Ante-Nicene Christian Library).

as one who clearly saw the great significance that the humanity of Jesus had for Paul.¹

C) **The Image of God.** The highest expression of the Fullness of God in the Pauline epistles occurs when the Apostle speaks of Christ as the "image of God" (II Cor. 4:4; Col. 1:15). In describing Christ as the εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ he comes very close to the expressions in Hebrews which define the Son as the effulgence (ὑποστάσεως) of the glory of God and the very stamp or character (χαρακτηρ) of God's nature (ὑποστάσεως, Heb. 1:3), and to the Johannine expression which describes Him in terms of the sublime Logos doctrine.

To Paul, Christ as "the image of God" was not just a "likeness" or a copy of the Original, but rather the perfect manifestation of the very nature of the Divine. Paul does not say that the Father creates His image in Christ, but he teaches that He is the Image as the pre-existent begotten Son of God, and as such this Image is presented to mankind (Col. 1:15). The term, as Kittel observes, is another form of the "Sohn-Sein".² A synonymous expression was recorded by Paul in saying that He "was in the form of God" (Phil. 2:6).³

This Divine Image is that in which humanity was created (Col. 1:15), and at the same time it is the perfect image in Christ of all that man is meant to be, into which humanity united with Him is transformed. The first Adam was created in the image of God (Gen. 1:27), and so Paul says that man is "the image and glory of God" (I Cor. 11:7)⁴ Jesus Christ, the Second Adam, is also the image of God, but in a sense which infinitely exceeds that of the first Adam, for in Him dwells all

---


³ Supra, pp. 111 f.

⁴ The objection which Cairns, *The Image of God in Man*, p. 35f., raises to using this Corinthian statement as a reference to the universal image in man on the
the fullness of God (Col. 1:19), even "bodily" (2:9). Therefore, in His humanity united with the Godhead in one Person, the Second Adam is the perfect image of God in human terms.\(^1\) As this Second Adam He is the perfect norm of human character, and this requires the historical portrait of Jesus — the things He spoke, did, and suffered — as a background and foundation of the doctrine. In other words, He is the perfect divine image and also the perfect human image, and Paul (as well as the other New Testament writers) makes no clear-cut distinction between these two aspects of the image. The Second Adam in this dual role is, therefore, the perfect Divine-Human. In Him one beholds the essential glory of God (II Cor. 4:4, 6) and also the true image of man (Rom. 8:29). Again, one faces an apparent paradox. Christ to Paul is both Son of God and Son of Man because He is the eternal Divine \(\varepsilon\iota\kappa\omega\nu\) after which the first Adam was created. But the first Adam was son of God by creation, whereas the Second Adam was Son of God by nature. Yet this "Son of God became son of Adam," says Thornton, "in order that he might fulfill Adam's destiny as son of God by creation." So the 'second man from heaven' (I Cor. 15:47) "must take up Adam's burden (Ecclus 40:1) and do battle with the serpent as God's Son by virtue of the imprinted image."\(^2\)

Moreover, as Second Adam He is not only a man; but He is like the first Adam, i.e., representative and inclusive Man. He is the New Man through whom the image and sonship of man is restored. Hence it is by incorporation into this Perfect Humanity of Jesus Christ that Christ's people, the corporate Second Adam basis that Paul is really only teaching that man (not woman) is in the image is not too strong. For in using these words the Apostle would certainly have also been aware of their broader meaning in the original context, and his identification of image and glory as revealed by other passages shows also that he would apply "image" to \(\alpha\nu\theta\beta\rho\mu\nu\sigma\) as well as to \(\delta\nu\gamma\) .


2 Thornton, The Dominion of Christ, p. 54. Cf. Rawlinson, The New Testament Doctrine of Christ, p. 127; Gregory Dix, The Image and Likeness of God, p. 34. Although the Son of Adam Christology comes out specifically in the Lukan genealogy \(\alpha\) (3:38, "the son of Adam, the son of God", followed by 4:3, "If you are the Son of God . . ."), it is also the thought of Paul.
has its marred glory and image restored and transformed to reach its intended status, which is God's image (Col. 3:10). Clearly, Paul is building upon the eikōv account in Gen. 1:27, and upon the identification of the eikōv of God with the Divine Sóφa in Jewish teaching. It is obvious, therefore, that Paul's concept of Christ as the image is inseparably connected with his doctrine of the Second Adam. Undoubtedly it implies, as Vincent Taylor surmises, "the conception of Christ as the Second Adam, without the use of the name. It is at this point that Paul's conception of the humanity of Jesus Christ in terms of the Second Adam reaches its supreme height and is seen as the fullness of humanity, both in an individual and a corporate sense.

D) The Second Adam-Image. Several of Paul's statements concerning the image of God in the light of the Second Adam concept may now be looked at specifically.

1) Writing in II Cor. 4:4-6 he says:

In their case the god of this world has blinded the minds of the unbelievers, to keep them from seeing the light of the gospel of the glory (Sóφa) of Christ, who is the eikōv of God. For what we preach is not ourselves, but Jesus Christ as Lord, with ourselves as your servants (Sóφa) for Jesus' sake. For it is the God who said, 'Let light shine out of darkness', who has shone in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory (Sóφa) of God in the face (µροσωπo) of Christ.

Several things can be noted about this passage:

a) Here "glory" and "image of Christ" refer primarily to that pre-incarnate presence with God, but since it is "the gospel of glory", this aspect of Christ must also be thought of in relation to that exaltation attained by way of humiliation and the cross (Phil. 2:8f). The Second Adam in the role of Suffering Servant-Son of Man was not only in the "form of God", but for a redemptive purpose was man,


3 The expression in Eph. 1:17, "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory", can be interpreted as identifying Jesus Christ with "glory" if one neglects the genitive phrase τοῦ; Sóφa as having a possible adjectival sense, but this cannot be done with certainty.
and through perfect love, obedience, and death delivered humanity from the
dominion of the "god of this world" and all the hierarchy of Evil Powers. As
the result He was exalted and glorified.

b) The passage, especially the latter part, reflects both the original
creation and the creative conversion experience of Paul. The same God who pierced
the primeval darkness with the light of His Word and created man had also shone
in Paul's heart on the Damascus Road and revealed to him His glory in the face
(or "person") of Jesus Christ. For Paul this involved both an inner experience
and an external vision, and both these aspects in his conversion come out again
in other statements. He says that God's Son was revealed \( \text{ἐν ἐμοὶ} \) (Gal. 1:16)
and also that he has "seen (ἐσώρακα) Jesus our Lord" (I Cor. 9:1). In a way
which not even the Apostle himself can completely describe (II Cor. 12: 1-3), the
risen and ascended Lord Jesus appeared to him (I Cor. 15:8) essentially in the
same form in which He had been seen previously by the other Apostles and disciples
during the forty days. It was the risen "Jesus" (cf. Rom. 4:24), identified with
the historic personality, but now in His glorified humanity, that Paul saw and
described in a term (which exceeds metaphor) as "the body of his glory" (Phil. 3:21) 1

Inasmuch as these verses (II Cor. 4:4-6) immediately follow the account of
the Divine glory that appeared on the face of Moses, 2 this suggests that Paul is
supplying a comparison by speaking of this Glory "in the face of Jesus Christ" and
explains why he does not say simply "in Christ".

c) As it has been noted, 3 the resurrection-conversion experience of Paul

1 Contrast A. Schlatter, Paulus der Bote Jesu, p. 520, who holds that Paul's
expression in II Cor. 4:4-6 was not influenced by his Damascus Road experience.
This connection, however, has been generally maintained by scholars. Cf.

2 Cf. Enoch 38:4, "And they shall not be able to behold the face of the holy,
For the Lord of Spirits has caused His light to appear
On the face of the holy, righteous, and elect." (Charles).

3 Supra pp. 231 ff.
was the immediate genesis for Paul's realization of the corporate humanity of Christ, the Second Adam, as the Body of Christ. Furthermore, it was out of his conversion experience that he received the Isaianic-Servant commission to open the eyes of the Gentiles for their deliverance "from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God that they may receive forgiveness of sins and a place among those who are sanctified by faith in me." (Acts 26:18). Similarly, in the Corinthian context the Apostle is speaking of his ministry and how he is cognizant of the responsibility he has to communicate that illuminating knowledge which initially enlightened him. This is a part of his responsibility to convey the fullness of Christ—His sufferings, comfort, joy, sacrificial and perfect humanity, which has been communicated to him.

   d) In speaking of Christ in terms of Ἰησοῦς and εἰκών Paul, no doubt, would have thought, by contrast, of that first Adam who was created in the image of God, according to the Biblical record, and who also possessed the glory, according to Jewish teaching. So the tendency in Jewish legend contemporary with Paul was to glorify and idealize Adam, and, as a result, the consequences of his disobedience were more pronounced. One of the consequences was thought to be the loss of glory on his face. The statement "all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God" (Rom.3:23) may be a Pauline allusion to this Rabbinic idea, which suggests the truth, as Ramsey points out, that "the glorifying of man in the new creation is the realization of his true meaning in the old."² Paul, thinking of the humanity of Jesus Christ in the light of the Suffering Servant—Son of Man concept, could see in Christ not only that perfect glory and image of God, but as such a Second Adam, the perfect expression of these attributes intended for man.

2) Colossians 1:15ff. In the Colossian letter Paul immediately follows his

   1 Supra p. 61.

expression about the redemption wrought for us, by which we are delivered from the
dominion of darkness and transferred to the Kingdom of His Son, by defining Christ
as "the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation" (v.15). Again,
as the preceding and subsequent verses show, the ideas of creation and redemption
are linked,¹ as they are also in II Cor. 4:4ff. According to Jewish belief, the
sin of Adam involved the whole creation in corruption. (This idea seems to be
behind Rom. 8:20). Correspondingly, the Messiah was expected to be a figure of
cosmic significance capable of restoring not only man but the total universe to
its intended condition.² Therefore, when Paul realized that Jesus was the Messiah,
it was logical for him to ascribe to Him the power not only of human but of cosmic
redemption. So, as Dodd observes, "the Christian conception of Redemption is the
counterpart of the Jewish conception of Creation."³

There is presented in Col. 1:15ff. the loftiest expression in Paul's letters
concerning the person of Christ. The passage is influenced by Logos-Wisdom concepts
and attributes to Him a supreme cosmical significance. The sheer grandeur of the
expression defies any "assured" analysis and conclusion, but some connection with
the Second Adam concept in terms of Perfect Humanity can be observed. More specific
than II Cor. 4:4, Christ is here described as the image of the "invisible" God
(τοῦ ἀνθρώπου). The presence of this adjective implies a contrast with
εἰκόνα, and leads to the deduction that Christ as the εἰκόνα is the visible
manifestation of the unseen God. As Lightfoot says, "the underlying idea of the
εἰκόνα, and, indeed, of the λόγος generally, is the manifestation of the
hidden."⁴ While some hold that Christ as the εἰκόνα in verse 15 refers strictly

¹ Cf. Hanson, op. cit., p. 109f.
² Cf. the Son of Man (or Mine Elect One) in the Similitudes of Enoch, who is
associated with the judgment to inaugurate the new heaven and new earth (Enoch 45:3-6).
³ C.H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 106; cf. W.D. Davies, op. cit.,
p. 39.
⁴ Lightfoot, Colossians, p. 143.
to His pre-incarnate state, the fact that Paul uses the verb "is" (ἐστιν) would seem to indicate that the Apostle is thinking also of Christ in His present glorified state. Such interpretation is consistent with II Con. 4:4ff. (Cf. Jn. 17:5).

In the accompanying phrase πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, the word "first-born" denotes priority (i.e. "born first before all creation") and indicates the uncreated quality of the perfect Image. The reference in this particular phrase, however, is to Christ's deity rather than His humanity. It was later, in defense against the Arians (who seized upon the phrase to support their contention that Christ was a created being), that some Church fathers taught that this phrase described the Incarnate Christ, and therefore interpreted the κτίσις and the κτισθέναι in the context as referring to the new spiritual creation (such as in II Con. 5:17; Gal. 6:15). But to do this involves taking all of verses 16 and 17 as the work of the Incarnate Son, and this (as Lightfoot says) "shatters the context... and strains language "in a way which would reduce all theological exegesis to chaos." Furthermore, such an interpretation erases the parallelism intended between verses 15 ff and 18ff, which deals first with the relation of Christ as Eternal Word to the natural creation and then deals with the relation of Christ as Head of the Church to the spiritual creation or community.

He is not only "first-born of all creation"; He is also "first-born from the...
dead" (v. 18). Therefore, Christ is actually Head of both creations. In the first sense He is "first-born" because He is prior to all of creation, and all of creation was created in Him; and in the second sense He is "first-born" of the resurrection, the "beginning", and therefore is "the head of the body, the church." Paul, therefore, thought of Christ's Sonship in a twofold sense according to which He was the pre-incarnate Son of God and also the declared Messianic Son by His Resurrection (cf. Rom. 1:3, 4:8:29). Inasmuch as the title "First-born" had a Messianic application (ךָֽ֑יִּ֖בָּ֑ר, Ps. 89:28) and was originally a corporate title for Israel (cf. Exod. 4:22; Jer. 31:9), Paul legitimately adopts the designation for Christ as the Head of the Messianic community. Accordingly, He is Head of the Body, the Church (v. 18), and as "the beginning" He is Head of the New Creation and therefore the Second Adam. There is, therefore, a development here of I Cor. 15:20 ff. and 45ff. Thus, there is apparent the inescapable connection between the Adam-Christ typology and Paul's teaching on the Image of God. As Adam was the first-born of humanity, so Christ was the first-born of the resurrection. By contrast to Adam, Christ by His death and resurrection became the first of a New Humanity in which believers share and partake of His glory. He who is the unique Image of the unseen Father, the first-born of all creation (v.15), is also the Image, in a second sense, as the first-born from the dead. "This second sense of the word 'Image', as Cairns says, "describes Christ's perfect humanity, in which by faith men can share, and in which they hope to be perfected." 2

For the further description of Christ in this verse as "the beginning" (أخبار) it is not necessary to look to Stoic thought for an explanation as Norden does, nor is it reasonable to excise this expression along with all of

---

2 David Cairns, *The Image of God in Man*, p. 35.
verses 15-17 as a non-Pauline insertion by someone of the Logos type of Hellenistic Judaism as Porter does. It is much more likely that Paul is building upon the possible meanings of the first word of the Hebrew Bible (יִ 경우에는 , >) combined with some Wisdom theology, according to which Wisdom is identified with God's Image, attends God at creation, and is called יִ場合は , "the beginning" (cf. Wisdom 7:26; Prov. 8:22). (At another point, I Cor. 8:6, Paul apparently identifies Christ with Wisdom). In Col 1:18 Christ is described as the ἀρχή of the New Creation and First-born from the dead by virtue of His redemptive mission, His complete triumph over Sin and Death, and His resurrection (cf. Rom. 1:4). This is in agreement with Paul's earlier description of Christ as the ἀρχή of the resurrection (I Cor. 15:20, 23). Therefore, as ἀρχή and πρωτότοκος from the dead He is the Head of the Body, the Church. In the sphere of humanity He was able to accomplish this because of what He essentially is - the Image and Fullness of the invisible God and the One who participated with God in the initial creation of all things. As the ἀρχή and Son He is the only Person to have the perfect Image of God. By contrast man, through Sin, has fallen short of the glory of God (Rom 3:23) and has the image only in form defiled by Sin. These two forms of the Image are brought together by Paul in his teaching that Jesus Christ, by virtue of His death and resurrection, is able to restore the Image in man because He is a life-giving spirit. Therefore, Christ is the ἀρχή not only in the sense of being the first example but also as the Principle and Representative of the New Humanity. "Those whom he foreknew", says Paul, "he also predestined to be conformed to the image of His Son, in order that He might be the first-born among many brethren" (Rom 8:29),...


and, "Just as we have borne the image of the man of dust, we shall also bear the image of the man of heaven" (I Cor. 15:49). Thus, the image given to man at creation, although marred by Sin, but not completely obliterated, is immeasurably renewed by this "conformation" to the perfect Image. ¹

E) The Restoration of the Image and the Glory. This restoration of the image in man is part of the total reconciliation of all things accomplished by Him who has the fullness of the Godhead, and who shed His blood on the cross (v.20). So in the succeeding verses (21ff.), which must be held inseparably with verses 15-20, Paul stresses that it was in the physical flesh-body of Jesus Christ on the cross that man, with defiled image and estranged from God, was reconciled. In Him who was the perfect Image of God, creation first took place, and in Him who was also the perfect image of man, the restoration and the New Creation were accomplished. "The body nailed to the Cross", writes Thornton, "was, therefore, in this sense the new organism of the One Man in whom we all died (II Cor. 5:14)." ²

There is a connection in this context with the doctrine previously noted in Eph. 1:10 in that there is a "summing up" in both - all things are not only created through Him, but eis auton (Col. 1:16). The unity of humanity and the universe at the first must also be the unity, restored and centered in Christ, at the end. Christ is not only the Head but the Goal, the ultimate of humanity.³ In both the Colossian and Ephesian references this process is initiated by the redemption accomplished through the blood of His cross, for the restoration of the image in man can be accomplished only through Him who is the express Image of the invisible God. The eikón-Sein of Man, says Kittel, is restored only through union with that eikón-Sein of Christ.⁴ God creates a

¹ Cf. Gregory Dix, op. cit., p. 15.
³ The Chief Cornerstone, interpreted as the "final stone", would also fit in with this point. Supra pp. 267 f.
⁴ Kittel, "eikón", T.W.N.T., II. p. 395.
new humanity in Christ; Christ is the New Man, the Original Man, the Son of Man, as Fridrichsen says, "Through Christ God re-establishes fallen man and re-creates him in His image, according to the divine image in Christ. This new manhood is born into eternal life through baptism, passing through death to life."  

The restoration of the image and also the glory is further described in II Cor. 3:18, "But we all, with unveiled face beholding (καταπτισμένοι) as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are being changed (μετομορφομένοι) into the same image (εἰκόνα) from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit" (*). In contrast to the individual Moses, who veiled his face to conceal the fading glory, Christians with unveiled face, incorporated into the risen and glorified humanity of Christ, enter into a permanent and ever-increasing glory.  

Here again the restoration of the glory is integrally related to the transformation of the image (as also in Rom. 3:29f). In saying that Christians are "transformed into the same image" Paul is using the same verb (μετομορφω) which Mark and Matthew use for the Transfiguration (the word appears otherwise only in Rom. 6:2).  

Again, Paul has in mind the image of God, defaced in Adam but restored in the Second Adam, the perfect image of God and the perfect image of man. Moreover, the sphere of this glorious transformation is the Messianic Community, the corporate Second Adam. An interesting parallel in Jewish literature concerning the corporate

---


2 Although it is debatable, the word καταπτισμένοι seems better translated "beholding" (KJV and RSV instead of "reflecting" as in RV and Moffatt). This interpretation is in line with other statements by Paul about the "glory of God in the face of Christ" (II Cor. 4:6), seeing "in a mirror dimly, but then face to face" (I Cor. 13:12), "the glory that is to be revealed to us" (Rom. 8:18), and is in harmony with the immediate context about seeing the glory on Moses' face. The two passages II Cor. 3:18 and I Cor. 13:12, present the σοφία-werden as being both present and eschatological, and both employ the mirror figure. In the first reference the changing is in the present, while in the second, the idea is that the change is still future. Cf. Kittel καταπτισμένοι, T.W.N.T., II, pp. 693f; Ramsey, The Glory of God and The Transfiguration of Christ, p. 53 n; contrast Dix, op. cit., p. 15; A. Plummer, II Corinthians (ICC), p. 105f.
restoration of glory is cited by M. Black: "For God has chosen them (the 'elect' of the New Covenant) for an eternal covenant so that theirs is all the glory of Adam."¹

The concluding clause of II Cor. 3:18 is translated above, "even as from the Lord the Spirit"², and this reveals that the transformation is accomplished because the Last Adam is a life-giving Spirit who is responsible for the metamorphosis of Christians into the image of Himself, the perfect image of humanity. This leads to the ringing affirmation, "Just as we have borne the image of the man of dust, we shall also bear (φορέσωμεν)³ the image of the man of heaven" (I Cor. 15:49). It is the image of the risen and exalted humanity of Christ that Christians will ultimately attain at the Parousia. God's original purpose in Adam is complete when those in the corporate Second Adam are victorious over Death. Those who share in the first Adam dissolve into dust with him, but those who share in the Second Adam are transformed into His image and glory.

Paul further reveals the corporate nature of this restored Perfect Humanity by stating that Christians "have put on the new nature (τὸν νέον) which is being renewed in knowledge after the image of its creator" (Col. 3:10). In these words Paul climaxes his concrete exhortations to put off the Old Man (vv. 5, 8, 9) by strongly reminding Christians of their new-nature condition. The parallel passage in Eph. 4:22-24 concludes with the exhortation to "put on the new nature (νεωθημένος) created after God in true righteousness and holiness." There is both an indicative and an imperative sense attached to the reality of the

¹ Manual of Discipline, Plate IV, line 24. (Cited by V. Taylor, The Names of Jesus, p. 726 n8.) Cf. Enoch 51:4 where the righteous are spoken of as having their faces "lighted up with joy because the Elect one has appeared."

² For other possible renderings see Plummer, op. cit., p. 108.

³ Not φορέσωμεν, despite weighty MSS testimony (including X A C D G). A hortative subjunctive would be contrary not only to the context and tenor of this whole chapter, but also to the other positive assertions about being transformed into His image. Thus the future φορέσωμεν (although supported only by the Codex Vaticanus MS) must be adopted here. Cf. J. Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief, p. 377.
New Man. Commentators often have been concerned to point out that \( \text{τὸν νέον} \) in Colossians and \( \text{καὶ νὸν ἀνθρωπὸν} \) in Ephesians is not Christ Himself\(^1\) but is rather "the regenerated man formed after Christ."\(^2\) But such a rigid distinction ought not to be heavily stressed in view of the unity in the One Body between the redeemed and the Redeemer according to Paul's thought.\(^3\) In the previous verse (Col. 3:9) Christians are urged to put off \( \text{τὸν παλαιὸν ἀνθρωπὸν} \), which is the Old Adam whose image all men bear; and in verse 10 it is logical to assume that \( \text{τὸν νέον} \) refers to the New Adam (\( \text{καὶ νὸν ἀνθρωπὸν} \)), which they are to put on. Moreover, in other places the Apostle uses the same verb (\( \text{ἐνσώ} \)) with Christ as object (Rom. 13:14; Gal. 3:27), so it is not likely that there is any clear-cut distinction in Paul's mind between putting on "the regenerate man formed after Christ" and "putting on Christ". Consequently, as Abbott admits, "the ultimate meaning is the same."\(^4\) Christians united by baptism and faith with Christ, the Second Adam, have been incorporated into His perfect humanity and have, in the Pauline sense, put on Christ. That this process involves continued growth and development is brought out by the use of \( \text{ἀνακαινομένον} \) (present participle), which is consistent with II Cor. 4:16, "our inner [man] is being renewed (\( \text{ἀνακαινοῦται} \) day by day"; and also with the idea of attaining mature manhood and growing up into Christ, the Head of the Body (Eph. 4:13, 15).

The concluding phrase \( \text{Κατ' Εἰκόνα τοῦ Κτίσαντος ζωῆς} \) is a reference to the Genesis account of the creation of man in the image of God (a story which

\(^{1}\) Contrast Ign. Ephes. 20, \( \epsilonἰς τὸν καὶ νὸν ἀνθρωπὸν Ιησοῦν Χριστὸν \) (Cf. T. Smith, S. Ignatatii Epistolae Genuinae, p. 19).

\(^{2}\) Lightfoot, Colossians, p. 213, who cites the \( \text{Καὶ νὸν Κτίσις} \) of II Cor. 5:17 and Gal. 6:15 as the same idea.

\(^{3}\) Neither should the lexical difference between \( \text{νέος} \) and \( \text{καὶ νὸς} \) in this passage be given too much weight inasmuch as the addition of the present participle \( \text{ἀνακαινομένον} \) adequately supplies to \( \text{νέος} \) what is inherent in its synonym, as Lightfoot concedes.

Paul would have accepted as literal history. Here the new nature, the New Man, is again shown to be the True Man as God originally intended. Although the allusion to the Genesis record leads one to understand τοῦ κτίσαντος primarily of God (cf. κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα of Eph. 4:24) it must also be remembered that Christ is the Image of God (II Cor. 4:4; Col. 1:15), and it is through union with His perfect image of humanity that Christians are renewed after the image intended by God. As Ramsay well puts it:

"In Christ manhood is allowed to see not only the radiance of God's glory but also the true image of man. Into that image Christ's people are now being transformed, and in virtue of this transformation into the new man they are realizing the meaning of their original status as creatures in God's image..."

Through the work of Christ in redemption man becomes what man essentially is. 'Werde das du bist' summarizes the Biblical doctrine. In Christ there is our human nature fulfilling both its true affinity to the Creator and its true dependence upon Him in adoration; and the more we are brought to share in Christ's glory the more shall we share in that giving glory to the Father which was his mission and our calling."

It is interesting to note, with David Cairns, that the implied teaching in Jesus's saying "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's" (Mk 12:17) is that the image imprinted on man signifies his possession by God and his essential nature. Moreover, the retrieving of the creation-intended image of God is identical with the restoration of the Christ-Community. The practical corollary that immediately follows is that when man realizes his true nature, he recognizes the artificiality of all outward distinctions and knows he is One (Col. 3:11). This is further indication of the essential corporate nature of the Second Adam. Therefore, Paul exhorts the Colossians to "put on" those qualities of the New Man, reminding them that they were called "in one body"

---

1 Cf. K. Lake, Paul, His Heritage and Legacy, p. 75.
Traditional Rabbinic doctrine taught the unity of all mankind in Adam and even implied that the physical make-up and method of composition of Adam was symbolic of the essential oneness of humanity. It was natural, therefore, for Paul to be influenced somewhat by this conceptual background when thinking of the New Humanity incorporated into Christ as the corporate body of the Second Adam. Here there can be neither Jew nor Greek, male nor female, bond nor free, for Christ is all and in all (cf. Col. 3:11). The difference, however, between the humanity of the first Adam and that of the Second Adam according to Paul, was that the principle of natural life animated the former, while the Spirit animated the latter. In Christ the divinely-intended oneness of humanity was restored as an eschatological community of the Spirit. Whereas the defaced image was transmitted by the first Adam, the restored image is transmitted by the Spirit from the Second Adam, who as an individual on earth accomplished in His flesh and blood the love and obedience expected from Adam. Thus, by this Spirit those of the corporate Second Adam come "to know the love of Christ which surpasses all knowledge" and are "filled with all the fullness of God" (Eph. 3:19).

Inasmuch as Christians share in the Perfect Image of humanity, so also do they share in the glory of His exalted humanity. Accordingly, Paul writes of the "Lord Jesus Christ, who will change our lowly body to be like his glorious body, by the power which enables him even to subject all things to himself" (Phil. 3:21). Just as Paul's expressions about the \( \text{eschatological} \) and yet also refer to the present, so also "the body that belongs to our low estate" (Moffatt) will be conformed unto His exalted and glorified body at the Parousia, but the process is already in operation. Christians are being changed "from one degree of glory to another" (II Cor. 3:18), and this, as Kittel points out, is a bridge between the Present and the Eschaton. Kittel puts it succinctly by saying that the image and glory into which Christians are changed is simultaneously present and eschatological, something which they have and yet would have, if only..."
do not have — "their eschatology is active in the present and their present is eschatologically firmly established."\(^1\) Barth's description is graphic: "Die Uhr ist abgelaufen, aber der Pendel muss noch ausschwingen."\(^2\) The present eschatological process was initiated at baptism when a person was incorporated into the humanity of Jesus Christ, and will be consummated at the Parousia when the restoration of the image and glory will be complete. The corporate eschatological nature of this is brought out by Paul in writing, "For you have died, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ who is our life appears, then you also will appear with him in glory" (Col. 3:3f.; cf. Rom. 8:17). Consequently, Paul offers comfort in the conviction that "though our outer nature is wasting away, our inner nature is being renewed every day. For this slight momentary affliction is preparing for us an eternal weight of glory beyond all comparison" (II Cor. 4:16f.). Similarly, he says, "I consider that the sufferings of this present time are not worth comparing with the glory that is to be revealed to us. For the creation waits with eager longing for the revealing of the sons of God" (Rom. 8:18f.; cf. 21). It is a continual process involving the change from the corporate life in the first Adam to the corporate life in the Second Adam. The ultimate goal of this process is the complete transformation from a σῶμα φυλίκον to a σῶμα πνευματικόν (I Cor. 15:44) in which the animating Spirit is the Last Adam (15:45), and this involves more than just a spiritual and moral likeness, but also a quasi-physical likeness of our spiritual bodies to His.\(^3\) The solidarity with the Old Adam will be finally changed into a solidarity with the New Adam. The eventual restoration of the image and the glory will be accomplished not in the individual per se but rather in the corporate Second Adam.

---

\(^1\) Kittel, "εἰκόνα", T.W.N.T., II, p. 396; "δόγμα", II, p. 254. This corresponds to the affirmation and limitation involved in other Pauline expressions such as ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύμatos and ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν (Rom. 8: 23; 1:17) and is developed more fully in John 17.

\(^2\) K. Barth, Die Wirklichkeit des neuen Menschen, p. 23.

\(^3\) Cf. D. Cairns, op.cit., pp. 36–39. There is a remarkable parallel in I John 3:2: "... we are God's children now; it does not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when he appears we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is."
The assurance that Christians will attain this glory is the gift of the Spirit which is the guarantee or earnest (ἀρραβών) of the οἴκος τῆς δόξης. Alluding to baptism, Paul says that God "has sealed us" (σφραγίσας ἡμᾶς) and has given the "installment" of His Spirit in our hearts (II Cor. 1:22). Similarly, he speaks of Christians having the first-fruits of the Spirit (ἁπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος) waiting for the final adoption as sons and the redemption of their bodies (Rom. 8:23). The same idea appears in an Ephesian context concerned with the unity in Christ:

"In whom you also, having heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation — in whom also having believed you have been sealed (κατασφραγίσθητε) with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is the installment (ἀρραβών) of our inheritance unto the redemption of God's possession, to the praise of His glory" (Eph. 1:13f. (*); cf. 4:30).

Believers have become a possession of God, and have received the "earnest" as the guarantee of their full inheritance as adopted sons of God, which Paul several verses later terms "the riches of his glorious inheritance in the saints" (v. 18). The basic idea is that through Christ God will finally complete the work of redemption which He has begun in believers, to the end that they will not only acquire the full glorious inheritance (cf. Col. 1:12 where God has qualified Christians "to share in the inheritance of the saints in light") but that God will attain in them His "peculiar people, or treasure" (cf. Exod. 19:5; Deut. 4:20; Mal. 3:17; I Pet. 2:9). In an exposition of Divine sovereignty in Romans 9, Paul reaches a high point when he declares the intention of God "to make known the riches of his glory", described in terms of Christians whom He has called not only

---

1 This word means an advance grant or payment of what is to come in full. It is interesting to note that in modern Greek, with a slight alteration, it has come to mean "engagement ring"! Cf. J. Carter Swaim, Right and Wrong Ways to Use the Bible, p. 63.

2 Cf. II Cor. 5:5. Cf. this context (vv. 1-10) with I Cor. 15:35ff. regarding the spiritual body.

3 Despite the objections of T.K. Abbott, (op. cit., p. 23f.) most commentators agree that the difficult phrase εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς ζωῆς ἑαυτῆς (1:14) has a meaning similar to the rendering given above. Moulton and Milligan suggest that the phrase means God's "ownership is bought back after alienation." V.G.T., p. 508.
from the Jews but also from the Gentiles. God's freedom of choice has been 
exercised in constituting the Church, the New Israel of Jews and Gentiles. ¹ The 
concluding doxology of Eph. 1:14, "to the praise of his glory", was suggested by 
J. Armitage Robinson to be a reflection of that unfulfilled role of Israel, "that 
they might be for me a people, a name, a praise, and a glory, but they would not 
listen" (Jer. 13:11).² Correspondingly, Paul connects baptism (incorporating into 
Christ's humanity) with the eschatological glory of the Church, when it shall be 
presented before Him ἐνδοξον (Eph. 5:27). The idea of a solitary redemption, of 
a mystic flight of the alone to the alone, has no place in Paul's thinking. The 
restoration of the image and the glory comes to one only as a member of the re-
deemed New Humanity. From the very early stage in the Apostle's writing he 
connects the ideas of an eschatological elect community, receiving a corporate 
redemption, being sanctified by the Spirit, and attaining the glory of Jesus 
Christ. In the second Letter to the Thessalonians he states:

But we are bound to give thanks to God always for you, brethren beloved 
by the Lord, because God chose you from the beginning ² to be saved, 
through sanctification by the Spirit and belief in the truth. To this 
he called you through our gospel, so that you may obtain the glory of 
our Lord Jesus Christ. (II Thess. 2:13f.; cf. Col. 3:3ff.)

The concepts of redemption, corporate nature, and sovereignty that inhere 
in this II Thessalonian passage and in the previously mentioned verses all fit 
into what has been ascribed to the corporate Second Adam. In the Body of Christ, 
the corporate Second Adam, by virtue of its inseparable union with the Head, there

¹ Paul finds this in accord with the prophecy of Hosea: 
Those who were not my people 
I will call 'my people', 
and her who was not beloved 
I will call 'my beloved'. 
And in the very place where it was said to them, 
'You are not my people,' 
they will be called 'sons of the living God'. (Rom. 9:25f.)

² J. Armitage Robinson, Ephesians, p. 36.

³ understanding άπροσμήν here, with X., D.
is the restoration of the Divinely-intended image and glory of man. Since there was in Jesus' self-designation as Son of Man relatively less influence from the apocalyptic imagery (such as in Enoch) in comparison with the deeper thought regarding the origin and destiny of man as recorded in Genesis, Daniel 7, and Psalm 8, one can recognize Paul's teachings about Christ in terms of the Second Adam as the development of this view. He is the initiator of the New Humanity. Clearly, "Jesus ist der 'Menschensohn', der 'neue Mensch'."  

Putting a proper emphasis upon the humanity of the Son of Man designation Lindeskog summarizes the truth by pointing out that while "in the Old Testament anyone can be called a 'son of Man', in the New Testament there is only one 'Son of Man', Jesus Christ, who is also called in a Christological sense the image of God (II Cor. 4:4). Christ is the New Man, the Second Adam; as Son of Man, He is also the Perfect Man. What is said in the Old Testament about all men in general is reserved in the New Testament for the one Son of Man."  

Thus Paul is true to the Gospel Son of Man whose fulfillment in history is to be seen, as W. Manson says, in "the taking of man into Christ, the sublimation of the living process by the 'recapitulation' of it in the Redeemer. The resulting substance is the Body of Christ on earth, a body formed in humanity by the indwelling Redeemer." 

According to the eternal plan of God, the union in the Body between Christ and His People is the "hope of glory" (Col. 1:27), for Christians united with Him share in the Perfect Image of Man. The consummation of this is the Fullness of His Humanity — Ultimate or Perfect Humanity — for the corporate Second Adam, the New Man, is destined to attain the "mature manhood", "the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ", by growing up in every way "into him who

---

is the head, into Christ, from whom the whole body, joined and knit together by every joint with which it is supplied . . . makes bodily growth and upbuilds itself in love." (Eph. 4:13ff.).
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

One cannot study Paul's conception of the humanity of Jesus Christ as a single isolated subject, nor simply as a Christological doctrine. Such a procedure is precluded because the concept is integrally related to the Apostle's concepts of anthropology, soteriology, ecclesiology, and eschatology. It is only by examining aspects of these fields of thought in relation to the person of Jesus Christ that an appreciation of His humanity according to Paul can be gained. Although expressions concerning the humanity of Jesus Christ are not so obvious in the Pauline letters as they are in the Synoptics, the Johannine literature, and in Hebrews, the concept is nevertheless present and vital and finds even more significant application in them.

Underlying the Pauline concept is a definite knowledge and appreciation of the historical human Jesus. Even though the question of whether or not he ever saw Jesus in the flesh must remain open, undoubtedly the Apostle was not deaf to the information that was conveyed to him by numerous other sources. References to the basic events, moral characteristics, words and teachings of the earthly Jesus indicate that Paul had a picture of the Jesus of history that was more significant than is often recognized or admitted. It was this historical, human Jesus that was determinative for Paul's Christian concept of the Messiah. He realized that there was an identity between the risen, glorified Christ and the historical, human Jesus. Moreover, the human life and teachings of Jesus had a commanding effect upon the very life and message of the Apostle, not only in terms of a conscious imitation but as a real participation in the Suffering Servant, sacrificial life of Jesus. One of the strongest indications of this was Paul's characteristic description of himself in terms of a ἁγνὸς or a διάκονος.

The key to Paul's concept of the humanity of Jesus Christ is his Second
Adam doctrine, an idea which is obviously present in the Rom. 5 and I Cor. 15 passages but also permeates much of his other writing. It is a doctrine that was not likely derived from any Urmensch myths, Rabbinic attitudes toward Adam, or Philonic speculations on Genesis. Its basic source was the Son of Man idea as adopted from the Old Testament and uniquely transformed by Jesus. The fusion of the Suffering Servant and the Son of Man concepts in the mind and expression of Jesus was accepted and developed by Paul in his Second Adam doctrine. To what extent this had already been done by the Primitive Christian Community is difficult to assess. At any rate, Paul seems to be the first to express specifically the Second Adam concept, and this in the light of Jesus' self-characterization as Son of Man, whose obedience and representative qualities attest to real humanity. Paul's conception of the humanity of Jesus Christ is, therefore, expressed by a threefold association of ideas: Second Adam--Suffering Servant--Son of Man.

Although Paul had practical reasons for not using the Son of Man designation literally, the fact that the concept as used by Jesus was known and employed by him is revealed in his letters by a convincing number of indications that it is an underlying idea. The most striking instance where the concepts of Second Adam, Suffering Servant, and Son of Man are united is Phil. 2:5ff.

Since the Second Adam is a development of the Suffering Servant-Son of Man combination, it has, like these two basic concepts, both an individual and a corporate sense. In other words, the characteristic Hebrew idea of the oscillation between the One and the Many pervades all three. In an individual sense, the humanity of Jesus Christ is revealed in terms of its redemptive function. For that purpose Paul stressed that the Second Adam was placed within the realm of humanity and was identified with the conditions of common fallen humanity. This identification was as complete as possible, and yet Christ was sinless. Therefore, an understanding of Pauline anthropology to the extent of seeing what he meant by
σάρξ (with its individual and corporate meaning) and of noting the conditions of humanity under the manifold tyranny of Evil Spiritual Powers, Law, Sin, Wrath, and Death leads to a deeper understanding of Paul's concept of the humanity of Jesus Christ. The relation of the Second Adam to these conditions of human life demanded the reality of His manhood and the most complete identification with humanity so far as it was possible for Him. In His humanity He defeated the Evil Spiritual Powers by the shedding of His flesh on the Cross; in His humanity He came under Law and suffered its curse, but in that sphere He was also the end of the Law; in His humanity He actually came in the likeness of Sin's flesh and was made to be sin, but in that situation He condemned Sin in the flesh; and in His humanity He even experienced the extreme form of a slave in that He endured death, but through that experience His humanity was raised and glorified.

Paul's concept of the Second Adam in a corporate sense was stimulated by his encounter with the risen, glorified Christ on the Damascus Road, for at that point he dramatically realized that there was a corporate humanity of Jesus Christ. Just as there is a solidarity in the First Adam, so also there is a solidarity in the Second Adam. The redemption accomplished by the Second Adam as an individual, therefore, is actually the redemption and victory of His corporate humanity, i.e., Christians united with Him by baptism and faith. This depends upon the permanence of Christ's manhood, which Paul affirms, and also the reality of the process of incorporation by baptism into His glorified humanity. Inasmuch as Christ in His risen humanity is the Last Adam and the mediator of the life-giving Spirit, He is the beginning of a New Humanity—a redeemed, eschatological community of the Spirit.

This corporate Second Adam, therefore, is inseparably related to the Body of Christ concept, for it is through this concept that the One Body of the New Humanity is presented most clearly. This One Body of the New Humanity is initiated through baptism, sustained through participation in the Lord's Supper,
and is to be fulfilled at the Parousia. Although Christ is One with the Body and yet is its Head, so also He is the Head of the New Humanity. He is identified with it but is not identical to it.

The fullness of His humanity is the corollary from the fact that the fullness of God dwells in Him, but this fullness overflows into His corporate humanity. By reason of the fact that fullness and suffering were inseparably linked in the human life of the individual Second Adam, the corporate Second Adam participates in these sufferings and becomes the corporate Suffering Servant and the agent for communicating the fullness of His sacrificial humanity.

Paul also established a relationship between the fullness of His humanity and Ultimate or Perfect Humanity. In the fullness of His humanity He sums up or re-unites all men into the One Full-Grown Man, the Perfect Man. He recapitulates human life and presents it anew to the Father; and this is accomplished in the sphere of the Church, the corporate Second Adam. In His humanity Christ is both the perfect Image of God to man and the perfect image of man to man; in other words, through the man Jesus both True God and True Man are revealed. All that God intended man to be is seen in Jesus Christ, for in Him is the restoration of the image and glory. He is the Principle and Representative of this New Humanity—the image and glory to which the corporate Second Adam is to conform. Thus Ultimate Humanity is to achieve its final and complete transformation from a σῶμα ψυχικόν to a σῶμα πνευματικόν, a process which begins with baptism, when the Spirit is given as the ἀρραβών, and is to be consummated at the Parousia.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAUL</th>
<th>POINT OF COMPARISON</th>
<th>TEACHING OF JESUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Th. 2:15-16</td>
<td>filling up the measure of sins</td>
<td>Mt. 23:31-32; Lk. 11:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:8</td>
<td>disregarding, rejecting God (ἁθετέω)</td>
<td>Lk. 10:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:2</td>
<td>like a thief in the night</td>
<td>Mt. 24:43ff.; Lk. 12:39ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:3</td>
<td>suddenness of judgment</td>
<td>Lk. 21:33ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:6</td>
<td>watchfulness, sobriety</td>
<td>Mk. 13:37; Mt. 24:42; Lk. 21:33ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:13</td>
<td>be at peace (imperative)</td>
<td>Mk. 9:50 (Cf. Rom. 12:18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15</td>
<td>not repaying evil for evil</td>
<td>Mt. 5:39ff. (Cf. Rom. 12:17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:16</td>
<td>rejoicing always</td>
<td>Mt. 5:12; Lk. 6:23; 15:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:17</td>
<td>praying constantly</td>
<td>Lk. 18:1 (Cf. Rom. 12:12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Th. 1:5(12:12)</td>
<td>Καταφίω and Καλέω</td>
<td>Lk. 20:33 and Mt. 22:3ff. par.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐπισκοπογωνίς and φροεθαί</td>
<td>Mk. 13:7, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal. 5:14(6:2)</td>
<td>love fulfilling the law¹</td>
<td>Mt. 22:39-40; Lk. 10:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:6</td>
<td>prayer to God as Father</td>
<td>Mt. 6:9; Lk. 11:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Cor. 4:12</td>
<td>blessing one's enemies</td>
<td>Mt. 5:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:1</td>
<td>settling disputes before the ἐκκλησία</td>
<td>Mt. 18:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:21</td>
<td>impossibility of divided loyalty</td>
<td>Mt. 6:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:24-26</td>
<td>words spoken at the Lord's Supper</td>
<td>Lk. 22:17-19 par.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:2</td>
<td>colossal results of faith</td>
<td>Mt. 17:20; 21:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom. 2:6</td>
<td>recompense according to works</td>
<td>Mt. 16:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:21</td>
<td>preaching but not practicing</td>
<td>Mt. 23:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15</td>
<td>(Supra Gal. 4:6)</td>
<td>Mt. 5:44; Lk. 6:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:14</td>
<td>blessing those who persecute you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Cf. C.H. Dodd, "ΕΝΝΟΜΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ", Studia Paulina, pp. 96-110, who effectively links Gal. 5:14; 6:2; Rom. 13:8-10 with the injunctions to be "led by the Spirit", to "walk by the Spirit", and also the "words and commands" of the Lord — all of which enables Paul to say that he is ΕΝΝΟΜΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ (I Cor. 9:21).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAUL</th>
<th>POINT OF COMPARISON</th>
<th>TEACHING OF JESUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rom. 12:17</td>
<td>(Supra I Th. 5:15)</td>
<td>Mt. 22:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:7</td>
<td>taxes to whom taxes are due</td>
<td>Mt. 18:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:8-10</td>
<td>(Supra Gal. 5:14)</td>
<td>Mt. 18:6, 7 par.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:10</td>
<td>judging others (Cf. vv. 3, 4, 13)</td>
<td>Lk. 11:41; Mk. 7:19; Mt. 15:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:13</td>
<td>re. stumbling block (σκάνδαλον)</td>
<td>Mt. 6:25-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Cf. Dodd, Romans, p. 218 nl)</td>
<td>Mt. 10:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:14</td>
<td>nothing unclean in itself</td>
<td>Mt. 6:12; Lk. 23:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:17</td>
<td>essential nature of the Kingdom of God</td>
<td>Mt. 5:14-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:19</td>
<td>guileness and innocence (σκέρσιος)</td>
<td>Mt. 6:25 par.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. 3:13</td>
<td>forgiving others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:2</td>
<td>exhortation to watch and pray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil. 2:15</td>
<td>(see Rom. 16:19); disciples as lights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:6</td>
<td>μηδὲν μεριμνᾶτε</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II.

LEXICAL SIMILARITIES BETWEEN PHIL. 2:6ff AND THE SUFFERING SERVANT PASSAGES OF ISAIAH.

Taking the words and phrases of the Philippian passage in sequence the following same terms, cognates, or synonyms in the Servant passages can be noted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philippians</th>
<th>Isaiah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:6f Ῥορφὴ ... ὀξήματι</td>
<td>52:14 ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων τὸ εἰδὸς σου καὶ ἡ δόξα σου ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων οὐκ εἶχεν εἴδος οὐδὲ κάλλος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:6f ἐν ὄροιμοτι ἀνθρώπων ἐς ἀνθρωπός</td>
<td>53:2 τὸ εἴδος αὐτοῦ ... ἀνθρωπός ἐν πληγῇ μν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:7f ἑαυτὸν ἑκένωσε</td>
<td>53:12 παρεδόθη eis θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:7f σοῦλον</td>
<td>52:13 ὁ παῖς μου Θοῦ λόσι μου ἐ ix ὀ ... σοῦλον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:8f ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν</td>
<td>53:8 ἐν τῇ ῥαπείνωσει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:8f ὑπῆκοος ἔχρι θανάτον</td>
<td>53:8 ἡ χεὶς eis θάνατον Παρεδόθη eis θάνατον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:9f διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτοῦ ὑπερύψωσε</td>
<td>52:13 ὑψωθήθηται καὶ δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cf. πᾶν γόνυ κάψῃ ... καὶ πᾶσα γλώσσα ἐξομολογήθηκα</td>
<td>Cf. 45:23 ἔρωι κάψῃ πᾶν γόνυ καὶ ὁμεῖται πᾶσα γλώσσα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

PHILONIC SPECULATION ON THE CREATION OF MAN

"Legum Allegoria", Bk. I, 12.

"And God formed the man by taking clay from the earth, and breathed into his face a breath of life, and the man became a living soul" (Gen. ii. 7). There are two types of men; the one a heavenly man, the other an earthly. The heavenly man, being made after the image of God, is altogether without part or lot in corruptible and terrestrial substance; but the earthly one was compacted out of the matter scattered here and there, which Moses calls "clay". For this reason he says that the heavenly man was not moulded, but was stamped with the image of God; while the earthly is a moulded work of the Artificer, but not His offspring. We must account the man made out of the earth to be mind mingling with, but not yet blended with, body. But this earthlike mind is in reality also corruptible, were not God to breathe into it a power of real life; when He does so, it does not any more undergo moulding, but becomes a soul, not an inefficient and imperfectly formed soul, but one endowed with mind and actually alive; for he says, "man became a living soul."

"De Opificio Mundi", XLVI, 134.

After this he says that "God formed man by taking clay from the earth, and breathed into his face the breath of life" (Gen. ii. 7). By this also he shows very clearly that there is a vast difference between the man thus formed and the man that came into existence earlier after the image of God: for the man so formed is an object of sense-perception, partaking already of such or such quality, consisting of body and soul, man or woman, by nature mortal; while he that was after the (Divine) image was an idea or type or seal, an object of thought (only), incorporeal, neither male nor female, by nature incorruptible.
APPENDIX II

THE SON OF MAN IN THE SIMILITUDES OF I ENOCH

It is difficult to mention this subject without going off on lengthy and indecisive tangents. Hence, this appendix is supplied in which some of the more recent trends of opinion are mentioned in brief compass. The following is a partial list of some of the recent literature dealing with the Enoch Son of Man:


Erik Sjöberg, Der Menschensohn im Äthiopischen Henochbuch. Lund, 1946.

(See this volume for an extensive bibliography on the subject.)
The Similitudes are generally thought to be a separate part of I Enoch compiled from different sources\(^1\), a pre-Christian Jewish apocalypse found only in the Ethiopic version of I Enoch, and with an original Hebrew or Aramaic behind them.\(^2\) The fact, however, that they can be read today only in this confused Ethiopic text has led some scholars to suspect that they may have some Christian elements, and, therefore, to say that the evidence of the Similitudes for pre-Christian Jewish ideas is completely untrustworthy and "quite inadequate to prove anything."\(^3\)

The popularly accepted view in Britain of the Enoch Son of Man is probably still that of R.H. Charles, viz., a pre-Christian Jewish belief in a pre-existent, individual heavenly Messiah, who is a development from Daniel 7, identified with an "Elect One", a "Righteous One", a deliverer of Israel, and Judge of all nations.\(^4\) Since the time of Charles, however, there has been a considerable amount of study of the enigmatic Son of Man in Enoch and, as a result, some of Charles' views have been opened to much question. As early as 1922 Messel\(^5\) came out with a corporate theory of the Enoch Son of Man by which he concluded that it was simply a symbol for Israel, or rather, the Elect Community within Israel, which was termed "the elect" or "the righteous". Accordingly, the "Elect One" was identified with the term descriptive of the new community, the "elect" ones, and therefore the Son of Man (or Elect One) was identified with the Elect People. The dubious assumption, however, upon which Messel's theory was based was that the Son of Man could be limited to just 46:2ff., 48:2. But if one more justly includes a wider range of

\(^1\) But Otto, _op.cit._, pp. 176ff. holds to its literary unity.

\(^2\) Black, _E.T._, Vol. 60, p. 12; and _J.T.S._ (April, 1952), pp. 1f.

\(^3\) J.Y. Campbell, _J.T.S._, Vol. 48, p. 146; following recently by C.H. Dodd, _The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel_, pp. 242ff. T.W. Manson admits that "the Book of Enoch, in the form in which it has come down to us, is a confused and bewildering mass of material." _E.J.R._, Vol. 32, p. 176.


\(^5\) Nils Messel, _Der Menschensohn in den Bilderreden des Henoch_, pp. 33ff.
verses, it will be found that such a simple corporate theory is inadequate to explain the distinction between the Elect One and the elect (cf. 51:1-5), and this distinction is sharper if the Similitude Son of Man is Messianic.

Later, T.W. Manson\(^1\) independently stressed the corporate aspect regarding not only the Elect One but also "the Righteous One" and "the Anointed One" as collective designations. Manson further emphasized what he called the "double oscillation" theory. According to this view, Enoch is identified with the Son of Man in chapters 70 and 71, not by an incarnation of the Son of Man nor by an exaltation of Enoch to the Son of Man\(^2\), but rather by the operation of the Hebrew concept of oscillation between the individual and the corporate, the One and the Many. It is not, however, a single oscillation, but a double oscillation, for while the group idea is expressed in the concept of the elect and righteous ones (i.e., the Remnant, the Israel within Israel) the individual idea is expressed in two personalities - Enoch and the figure of the Messiah. Enoch is regarded as the first human to embody this Son of Man idea, being the nucleus of the group of the elect and righteous ones. At the end of the apocalypse the same idea is expressed again in the figure of the Messiah: "But whether it be in Enoch, who is as it were the first born of many brethren, or in the Messiah, or in the corporate body of the elect and righteous, it is the same idea that is embodied, an idea that formed part of the divine purpose before the creation of the world."\(^3\) Here, as in other places, "we have an individual representing a community that does not yet exist in such a way that the community when it does come into being, may be thought of as an extension of his personality."\(^4\) It is along this line that Manson finds a solution to the Enoch

---
\(^3\) T.W. Manson, *B.J.R.*, Vol. 32, p. 189, where illustrations of this principle found elsewhere are provided. One of the most interesting of these parallels is Eph 1:4, where the idea of the Church being chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world is expressed.
\(^4\) *Loc. cit.*
problem:

Enoch incarnates, not a 'pre-existent heavenly being', but a divine idea. He is hailed by God as the incarnation of the idea, after he has lived a life of righteousness on earth. He becomes the first actualisation in history of the Son of Man idea and the nucleus of the group of the elect and righteous. The thing for which all wait is the manifestation of the Son of Man idea in triumph in the Messianic vindication of the elect and righteous.

Although T.W. Manson, so far, stands alone with this "double oscillation" theory, other scholars (e.g., Otto, Jansen, Taylor, Black) have accepted the idea of a single oscillation between the elect community and the Head of the Elect (or the "Son of Man")

It is generally accepted that the Similitudes of Enoch are a development of Daniel 7, the Son of Man passages of the Similitudes being regarded as "an apocalyptic, poetic Midrash on Daniel 7"; and this is in line with the earlier opinion of Charles. Where there is considerable divergence of opinion, however, is over the point of whether or not the Enoch Son of Man is pre-existent. Sjöberg follows Charles on the affirmative side of this question, while T.W. Manson and Matthew Black take the negative view. The last two mentioned authorities point out that all the text says is that the "name was known from the beginning, and this does not necessitate pre-existence". Therefore, they draw a distinction between a doctrine of pre-existence and a doctrine of premundane or transcendental election. If the latter was meant in the Similitudes, then the intention of the words is that the Son of Man is a transcendental divine idea but not a pre-existent being. The same kind of "pre-existence" is indicated by Paul when he writes of Christians being chosen in Him "before the foundation of the world" (Eph. 1:4), and as one rendering of II Thess. 2:13 has it, "God chose you from the beginning".

---

1 T.W. Manson, op. cit., B.J.R., pp. 189f.
4 Cf. Black, op. cit., E.T., p. 14; T.W. Manson, B.J.R., op. cit., p. 184, where he states, "The naming of the name of a group or an individual can mean simply the designation of that group or individual to some high destiny. And this seems to be the most likely meaning in this passage in Enoch." He also compares the ease with which the Hebrew mind could believe in a premundane election of Israel.
Another crucial point is whether or not the Son of Man in Enoch is Messianic. Charles held that in the Son of Man title there was "the distinct designation of the personal Messiah". He and T.W. Manson support this position by pointing out that in the Ethiopic Enoch the demonstrative "that" is used with the title (i.e., "that Son of Man"), and the implication is that such usage indicates to the Ethiopic translator that there was a special meaning for the "Son of Man", which otherwise would have been a common term. Recently, however, J.Y. Campbell asserts, that on the basis of the uncertainties of the Ethiopic Enoch text, the evidence for the Son of Man being used as a Messianic title is insufficient and renders it doubtful that it was in use by Jesus' day or was adopted for use by Him. Sjöberg also declines to consider the Son of Man of the Similitudes as Messianic but holds a Redeemer-figure concept. Rowley also takes a negative position. A significant trend of opinion, however, still holds that there was a Messianic significance to the title. When the Enoch Son of Man is designated as "the Anointed One" in two passages (48:10; 52:4) and when there are so many parallels between Similitude passages and Messianic passages in prophetic Scripture, it seems difficult to maintain that the Enoch Son of Man was not Messianic. A number of parallels between the Son of Man, Davidic Messiah, and Servant of the Lord involving comparison between the Similitudes and prophetic literature have been pointed out by W. Manson. One of the most striking of these occurs in Enoch 48:4, "He shall be a light of the Gentiles", which clearly is a reflection of the Servant Messiah's function indicated in Isa. 42:6.

---

4 Sjöberg, op. cit., p. 58.
5 Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic, pp. 55ff.
6 W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p. 173. The "Elect One" of chapter 46, to take another example, apparently is borrowed from the description of the Servant in Deutero-Isaiah.
On the basis of these parallels M. Black is led to conclude that if the verses in
Enoch are genuine:

then Isaiah as well as Daniel has been the inspiration of the Similitudes,
and we have here the beginnings of a synthesis between prophetic Scripture
... Moreover, in this outstanding passage, we have to do with an ideal,
like that of the Second Isaiah but unlike any implicit in Daniel, which has
begun to transcend national frontiers, as in Ezekiel the Son of Man speaks
for Man. And for all His Divine majesty as World Judge and Deliverer, He
remains, like Isaiah's Servant of gentle will, a human figure.1

A closely related problem is presented by chapters 70 and 71, where apparently
the Son of Man is identified with Enoch. R.H. Charles, following Appel, simply
emended all of the second persons to third persons, thus avoiding the identification
of the two figures. Recently, Sjöberg accepts the identification, but because he
proceeds on the assumption that the Son of Man is a pre-existent Figure he cannot
explain how the exalted Enoch could have become identified with Him.2 Otto accepts
the identification, but he interprets the pre-existence in terms of a name and destiny
rather than a person on the grounds that in the thought of later rabbinic theology
the "name" of the Messiah was pre-existent.3 Black has a unique interpretation by
which he considers that chapters 70 and 71 are separate from the Similitudes and
form a part of the original and older part of I Enoch. They belong to a younger
stratum of the Enoch tradition representing "a pre-Christian Jewish apocalyptic
belief in the Head of the Elect, who at the beginning of history and at its end,
is ... the immortalized patriarch, the Elect One, the Son of Man."4 The
Similitudes may have grown out of this younger stratum "by a rewriting of the
Enoch legend in support of a doctrine of a supernatural Messiah foreign to the

1 Black, E.T., op. cit., p. 15; cf. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 279.
2 Sjöberg, op. cit., pp. 185-189.
3 Otto, op. cit., pp. 214ff. This is similar to T.W. Manson's theory
mentioned earlier.
4 Cited by Dodd, The Fourth Gospel, p. 242 n2. For Black's presentation
of this theory see "The Eschatology of the Similitudes of Enoch", J.T.S., (1952),
pp. 8-10.
original conception of I Enoch."¹ If such a rewriting of the legend has occurred, the inspiration of the writer's thought has been Daniel (not Ezekiel) and the Messiah (not Henochgestalt), so that the result is that Dan 7:13 is interpreted as referring to a coming Messiah "and this interpretation was embodied as a later (and quite distinct) work as the Similitudes in the earlier Enoch tradition."² It could be that the Son of Man in the Similitudes is both individual and corporate "but in either case it is messianic or represents a later more developed Messianism than the older book" (p. 10). The tradition of the Son of Man-Enoch of chapters 70, 71 may have provided the background, but if this is the case, the Similitude Messianism became independent of it. This later Messianism of the Similitudes was that which passed into Christianity, if it was not influenced by it.

It is obvious from this brief survey that the number of perplexing problems and conflicting opinions regarding the Enoch Son of Man make it impossible for any conclusive results to be established. If, for example, Vaillant³ is correct in his recent opinion that Enoch has Judeo-Christian authorship with Hellenistic elements, then there must be a re-interpretation of points mentioned in this appendix. At any rate the Son of Man of Enoch, therefore, is still an elusive and precarious figure upon which to build and from which to trace ideas. J.Y. Campbell and C.H. Dodd may be right in doubting its reliability for any pre-Christian concepts. In any case, it is highly improbable that the book of Enoch had any primary influence upon the conception of the Son of Man in Jesus' mind nor subsequently in Paul's. Consequently, the treatment of this subject is considered ancillary to the theme of this dissertation, and, therefore, has been relegated to this appendix.

¹ Black, J.T.S., op. cit., pp.8f. This view is based on the observation of H. Ludin Jansen, Die Henochgestalt, that in I Enoch there are related three calls of Enoch of which Ezekiel is the apparent model and inspiration (Enoch 14:8ff, 60, 70-71). Black's suggestion, therefore, is that since chapters 70 and 71 embody one of these calls and is modelled after Ezekiel it represents a "younger status of the Enoch tradition."


Attempts to show by reference to Rabbinic writings that the Messiah was believed to have assumed the role of a suffering servant for the sins of the people usually do not take into consideration the extremely important factor that much of this rabbinic writing is later than the 1st century A.D. References to the comments of the Jalkut on Isa. 49:8; 52:13; 53:5, for example, must always be tempered by the recognition that it is a document of approximately the 11th century A.D. Use of the "Siphre", as quoted by Raymund Martini, reveals R. Jose, the Galilean as saying: "The King Messiah is humiliated and debased on account of the renegades, as it is said, 'He is pierced for our iniquity . . . ' (Isa. 53:5). How much more, therefore, will he make satisfaction for all generations, as it is written: 'And the Lord made him bear the guilt of us all' (Isa. 53:6)." It is to be noted, however, that these words do not appear in the extant texts of the "Siphre" and therefore are highly suspect of being later interpolations.¹

The fact that Jesus' very life on earth as such a Suffering Son of Man evoked the denial of His kinspeople to the point that they crucified Him, plus the evidence that His disciples exhibited a large degree of lack of understanding concerning His mission, are further indications that Jesus' interpretation of the Son of Man was unique. Despite the existence of Isa. 53, the idea that the Son of Man enters His glory through a life intimately associated with human beings to the point of accepting a life of humiliation and obedient self-sacrifice had not penetrated into the Messianic concept of Judaism. But "Jesus perceived the last consequences of the Messianic synthesis of lowly Servant and glorious Son of Man, thus accepting what Judaism in

its retrospect upon its own prophetic history had refused to see or failed to grasp.  

By contrast the Targum Jonathan, although understanding Isa. 52:13, and the 53rd chapter Messianically, deliberately attempted to remove any idea of suffering and death of the Messiah by transferring it either to Israel or to heathen nations. In old rabbinic literature the concept that Messiah bears the sin of the world is nowhere to be found.  

A glaring example of Targumic perversion of the Suffering Servant-Messiah idea can be seen by comparing the text of Isa. 53:7 with the Targum on the same verse:

Text: "He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearsers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth" (K.J.).

Targum: "He prayed, and was answered, and ere even he had opened his mouth, he was accepted: the mighty of the peoples he will deliver up like sheep to the slaughter and like a lamb dumb before her shearsers; there shall be none before him opening his mouth or saying a word."  

Although R.A. Aytoun stated that "the Servant is specifically identified by the Targum and with the Messiah" (p. 174), he must concede that the Servant in this Targum of Jonathan which is identified with the Messiah is not congruous with the Servant of Deutero-Isaiah, because "all hint of suffering and death has been carefully eliminated" (p. 175), and yet this Servant-Messiah becomes "a wholly Triumphant Messiah" (p. 177)! The judgment of H. Wheeler Robinson, expressing the definite opinion of many New Testament scholars is appropos to conclude the matter. Says he: "There has been no success in all the endeavours made to find previous or contemporary identification of the Messiah with the suffering servant of Yahweh.  

---

1 W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p. 117. Contrast W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 283.


5 H. Wheeler Robinson, Redemption and Revelation, p. 199.

The Targum of Jonathan for Isaiah liii does give a Messianic application to some parts of the chapter, but, by a most artificial ingenuity, ascribes all the suffering to the people, not to its Messiah. This is very significant for the main line of tradition. There is no evidence of a suffering Messiah in previous or contemporary Judaism to explain the conception in the consciousness of Jesus."
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