

Paul's Understanding of the Death of Jesus

James D.G. Dunn

[p.125]

There is little doubt in my mind that Dr Morris's chief contribution to New Testament theology has been his work on the doctrine of the atonement. His treatment of various aspects of the subject in several journals, including the *Expository Times*, *Journal of Theological Studies* and *New Testament Studies*, reached its climax in what for me is still his single most important work, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross* (1955)—followed since then by the more popular *The Cross in the New Testament* (1965).

In this birthday offering to Dr Morris, I wish simply to draw attention to an aspect of Paul's theology which is much more important as a key to Paul's thought than works on Pauline theology would suggest. I refer to Paul's understanding of Christ as representative man (I). When we correlate this with Paul's understanding of Jesus' death as a sacrifice we gain an insight into Paul's theology of sacrifice (II) which certainly strengthens Dr Morris's interpretation of Paul but which also calls for some qualifications (III).

I JESUS AS REPRESENTATIVE MAN

The fact that Paul tells us next to nothing about the historical Jesus has always been at the heart of one of the most intractable problems in New Testament theology and Christian origins—the relation between the gospel of Jesus and the theology of Paul. The discontinuity between the two had been stressed by Liberal Protestantism and by the History of Religions school, particularly W. Heitmüller and W. Bousset.¹ And although R. Bultmann shared many of their conclusions he did attempt to demonstrate a significant element of continuity between Jesus and Paul.² More recently the probable influence of particular sayings of Jesus

[p.126]

on Paul has been highlighted,³ and a link is still possible along the lines of *imitatio Christi* (1 Cor. 11:1; Eph. 4:20; Col. 2:6; I Thess. 1:6).⁴ Perhaps we should also mention that at the other end of the spectrum Paul's apparent lack of knowledge of the historical Jesus has been made

¹ W. Heitmüller, "Zum Problem Paulus und Jesus", *ZNTW* 13 (1912), pp. 320-37; W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos* (1921, ET⁵ Nashville, 1970). See also W. Wrede, *Paul* (1905, ET London, 1907).

² R. Bultmann, "The significance of the Historical Jesus for the Theology of Paul" (1929), ET in *Faith and Understanding: Collected Essays* (London, 1969), pp. 220-46; "Jesus and Paul" (1936), ET in *Existence and Faith* (London, 1960), pp. 217-39.

³ For example, D. M. Stanley, "Pauline Allusions to the Sayings of Jesus", *CBQ* 23 (1961), pp. 26-39; H. Riesenfeld, "Parabolic Language in the Pauline Epistles", *The Gospel Tradition* (Oxford, 1970), pp. 187-204; D. L. Dungan, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul* (Oxford, 1971); C. K. Barrett, "I am not Ashamed of the Gospel", *New Testament Essays* (London, 1972), pp. 116-43.

⁴ Though see H. D. Betz, *Nachfolge und Nachahmung Jesu Christi im Neuen Testament* (Tübingen, 1967), pp. 144, 168.

the major plank in an attempt to revive the nevertheless thoroughly dead thesis that the Jesus of the Gospels was a mythical figure.⁵

What does not seem to have been adequately appreciated is that for Paul the Jesus of history is integral to his soteriology; it is of vital significance for Paul that Jesus actually lived and died in history. Paul calls men not to take up some timeless ideal, not merely to believe in a divine being contemporary with him, but to believe in the Jesus who lived and died and now lives again. The contemporary Christ is one and the same as the Jesus of history. If it is not the same Jesus, then his gospel falls in ruins. It is the Jesus of history now exalted who challenges self-sufficient and self-indulgent man; it is the presence here and now of the Jesus who lived and died which brings men to the crisis of decision. Paul's soteriology therefore hangs on the wholeness of his Christology;⁶ separation of the Jesus of history from the Christ of faith does not characterize Paul's soteriology, it destroys it.

Why is this so? Because for Paul the earthly Jesus was not significant primarily for what he *said* or *did* during his life, but for what he *was*. And what he *did* by his death and resurrection gains its significance for salvation primarily from what he *was*. The key idea which runs through his Christology and binds it to his soteriology is that of solidarity or *representation*.⁷ *Jesus became one with man in order to put an end to sinful man in order that a new man might come into being. He became what man is in order that by his death and resurrection man might become what he is.*

The most sustained expositions of Jesus' representative significance come in Rom. 5:12-21 and 1 Cor. 15:20 ff., 45-9. In both instances Jesus is compared and contrasted with Adam. The point of the comparison and contrast lies in the representative significance of the two men. Adam means "man", "mankind". Paul speaks about Adam as a way of speaking about

[p.127]

mankind. Adam represents what man might have been and what man now is. Adam is man made for fellowship with God become slave of selfishness and pride. Adam is sinful man. Jesus too is representative man. He represents a new kind of man—man who not only dies but lives again. The first Adam represents physical man (ψυχὴ ζῶσα, σῶμα ψυχικόν)—man given over to death; the last Adam represents pneumatic man (πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν, σῶμα πνευματικόν)—man alive from the dead.

Now it is clear from the I Corinthians passage that Jesus only takes up his distinctively last Adam/man role as from the resurrection; only in and through resurrection does he become life-giving Spirit.⁸ How then can we characterize his representative function in his life and

⁵ G. A. Wells, *The Jesus of the Early Christians* (London, 1971), pp. 131-51.

⁶ Cf. A. E. J. Rawlinson, *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ* (London, 1926), chapter 5; W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (London, 1948), pp. 41 f., 49-57; M. Black, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam", *SJT* 7 (1954), pp. 170-79; D. E. H. Whiteley, "St. Paul's Thought on the Atonement", *JTS* n.s. 8 (1957), pp. 242-46; R. Scruggs, *The Last Adam* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 92-112.

⁷ See also G. Dellling, "Der Tod Jesu in der Verkündigung des Paulus", *Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen* (Berlin, 1964), p. 86.

⁸ See J. D. G. Dunn, "I Corinthians 15:45—Last Adam, Life-giving Spirit", *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament: Studies in Honour of C. F. D. Moule* (ed. B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley, Cambridge, 1973), pp. 127-41.

death? The answer seems to be that for Paul the earthly Jesus represents fallen man, man who though he lives again is first subject to death. Adam represents what man might have been and by his sin what man is. Jesus represents what man now is and by his obedience what man might become. This is most clearly expressed in three passages.

(a) Rom. 8:3—"What the law could not do, because it was weakened by the flesh, God has done—by sending his own Son in the precise likeness of sinful flesh (ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας)...". ὁμοίωμα here as elsewhere in Paul means a very close likeness—a mirror image, a twin likeness, an exact replica. In Rom. 1:23 its use with εἰκὼν must signify an intensifying of the idea of likeness/image, otherwise the phrase ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνοσ is tautologous; thus, "changed the glory of the incorruptible God into what was nothing more than the image of corruptible man...". In Rom. 5:14: "death reigned from Adam to Moses even over those who did not sin in precisely the same way as Adam (ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ)". In Rom. 6:5 the "likeness of Christ's death" does not mean baptism nor the death of Christ itself but the convert's experience of death to sin and life to God beginning to work out in himself, which Paul characterizes as a sharing in Christ's death and so as an experience which is precisely like (and dependent upon) Christ's death to sin (6:10).⁹ So in Rom. 8:3 ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας must mean "in the very form of sinful flesh".

But is Paul saying then that Jesus became guilty of sin? No! As is generally recognized, σὰρξ in Paul is not evil, otherwise he could not use it in a neutral sense, or speak of it being cleansed (2 Cor. 7:1).¹⁰ Flesh is not evil, it is simply weak and corruptible. It signifies man in his weakness and corruptibility, his belonging to the world. In particular it is that

[p.128]

dimension of the human personality through which sin attacks, which sin uses as its instrument (Rom. 7:5, 18, 25)—thus σὰρξ ἁμαρτίας. That is to say, σὰρξ ἁμαρτίας does not signify guilty man, but man in his fallenness—man subject to temptation, to human appetites and desires, to death. The "sinful flesh" is nothing other than the "sinful body" (Rom. 6:6), the "body doomed to death" (Rom. 7:24).

Thus in Rom. 8:3 Paul is saying simply that God sent his Son in the very form of fallen man, that is, as representative of fallen men. ὁμοίωμα in other words does not distinguish Jesus from sinful flesh or distance him from fallen man, as is often suggested; rather it is Paul's way of expressing Jesus' complete identity with the flesh of sin, with man in his fallenness.¹¹ So far as Paul was concerned Jesus had to share fallen humanity, sinful flesh, otherwise he could not deal with sin in the flesh. It was only because he shared man's sinful flesh that his death was "a sacrifice for sin" (NEB) and so served as God's act of judgement on sin in the flesh (see further below).

⁹ J. D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (London, 1970), pp. 142 f.; On ὁμοίωμα cf. J. Schneider, *TDNT*, V, pp. 192-97.

¹⁰ H. W. Robinson, *The Christian Doctrine of Man* (Edinburgh, 1926), pp. 114 f.; W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man* (London, 1956), p. 162; E. Schweizer, σὰρξ, *TDNT*, VII, p. 135.

¹¹ Cf. P. Althaus, *Der Brief an die Römer* (NTD 6, Göttingen, 1932, 1966), p. 85; C. K. Barrett, *The Epistle to the Romans* (London, 1957), P. 156; O. Koss, *Der Römerbrief* (Regensburg, 1957, 1959), P. 495; R. Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms* (Leiden, 1971), pp. 150 ff.

(b) Phil. 2:7 f. It is very likely that the Christ-hymn of Phil. 2:6-11 uses an Adam Christology, probably influenced to some extent by the Primal Man speculation current within Hellenism at that time.¹² The lines of the hymn which are most relevant to us are:

μορφὴν δούλου λαβών
ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος
καὶ σχήματι εὐρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος.

In the first of these three lines the choice of δούλος is the significant point. It may be sufficiently explained as a means of heightening the contrast with κύριος in v. 11. The suggestion that it refers to the servant of Isa. 53, though attractive, is not convincing.¹³ But it is probable that it was also deliberately chosen as a description of Jesus' earthly state, and that Paul would understand it in this way. In this case Paul in taking over the hymn would intend to signify that Christ by his incarnation became a slave of the elemental powers of the universe (cf. Gal. 4:1 ff.)—that is, he fully shared the bondage and limitation of man's earthly state.¹⁴

This is surely confirmed by the second and third lines quoted above. The second line gives us the only other occurrence of ὁμοίωμα in Paul: he became the precise likeness of men; he became just what men are. Indeed, he came ὡς ἄνθρωπος, that is, not just as one man among many, but as man, as representative man¹⁵—man, who, be it noted, is immediately described as subject, obedient to death.

[p.129]

(c) 1 Cor. 15:27: Paul explicitly quotes Ps. 8:6—"He has put all things in subjection under his feet"—and refers it to the exalted Christ. Since ps. 8:4-6 was widely used in the early Church as a testimonium to Christ (Eph. 1:22; Phil. 3:21; Heb. 2:6-9; 1 Pet. 3:22) it is probable that Paul had the whole passage in mind.¹⁶ That is to say, it is probable that Paul understood Ps. 8:4-6 with reference to Jesus in the same way as the writer to "the Hebrews". Jesus was the man who fulfilled the destiny God had originally intended for man.¹⁷ Man had been made "lower than the angels", but had not yet been crowned with glory and honour and granted Lordship over all things. But in contrast, Jesus had fulfilled that destiny. He too was man "for a short while lower than the angels", but had now been crowned with glory and honour "because he suffered death" (Heb. 2:9). That this train of thought is in Paul's mind in 1 Cor. 15:27 is likely in view of the explicit Adam Christology in the immediate context of the quotation. In other words, Jesus enters his role as New Man only after living and suffering as Man. Adam had missed his destiny because of sin and his destiny had become death (1 Cor. 15:21 f.). Only after living out that destiny (death) and through it creating a new destiny (resurrection) can the original destiny be fulfilled. Only by living out the destiny of Adam can the destiny of the Last Adam become a reality.

¹² R. P. Martin, *Carmen Christi* (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 116-33, *et passim*. See also Jewett, *op. cit.*, pp. 230-36.

¹³ K. H. Rengstorff, δούλος, *TDNT*, II, p. 278.

¹⁴ Cf. those cited by Martin, *op. cit.*, pp. 177-81.

¹⁵ Cf. Martin, *op. cit.*, pp. 209 ff.

¹⁶ Cf. C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (London, 1952), pp. 32 ff., 120 ff., 126; B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic* (London, 1961), pp. 50 ff., 168.

¹⁷ C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (London, 1968), pp. 359 ff.; F. F. Bruce, *1 & 2 Corinthians* (London, 1971), pp. 147 f.

Space prohibits an elaboration of this aspect of Paul's theology—that for Paul Jesus in his life and death is representative man, representative of fallen man—by living out that fallenness to the death and overcoming it in resurrection he becomes representative of new life, of new man. It must suffice to refer briefly to other passages where the same Christology is reflected. Rom. 1:3—as man he lives, like man, *κατὰ σάρκα*—through flesh, and to some extent anyway, in terms of flesh.¹⁸ Gal. 4:4—as man of flesh, like men, he knows subjection to the law. Rom. 6:9 f.—as man of flesh, like men, he is subject to death. In short, as representative man he shares the weakness and corruptibility of man's flesh, as representative man he knows the power of the powers, law and death, that enslave man. "Christ dies the death of the disobedient, of sinners" (Rom. 5:6, 8; 2 Cor. 5:21).¹⁹

We might mention also Paul's use of the title *Χριστός*. It is frequently assumed that Paul uses the title quite conventionally and adds nothing to it.²⁰ This is not in fact true. And the way in which Paul does use it is of

[p.130]

especial interest for us. For, on the one hand, he nails it firmly to Jesus in his death: the Christ is the Crucified One (1 Cor. 1:23; 2:2; Gal. 3:1). And on the other, it becomes the chief vehicle for Paul's expression of Christ's representative capacity, the solidarity of believers with the risen Christ: he is baptized in the Spirit *into* Christ (Rom. 6:3; 1 Cor. 12:13; 2 Cor. 1:21; Gal. 3:27); he has died *with* Christ, is crucified *with* Christ, his life is hid *with* Christ in God etc. (Rom. 6:3 f., 8; 8:17; Gal. 2:19 f.; Eph. 2:5; Phil. 1:23; Col. 2:20; 3:1, 3; 1 Thess. 5:10); his present life in all its aspects is lived in Christ (e.g., Rom. 6:11; 8:39; 1 Cor. 15:22; 2 Cor. 5:17, 19; Gal. 24; Phil. 2:1; Col. 1:28; 1 Thess. 2:14); he is a member of the *body* of Christ (Rom. 12:5; 1 Cor. 12:12, 27 etc.); Christ is the offspring of Abraham to whom the promise has been made, and all who identify themselves with Christ are counted as Abraham's children (Gal. 3:16, 26-9). The two distinctively Pauline emphases in Paul's use of *Χριστός* cannot be unrelated. Christ is representative man precisely as the Crucified One.²¹

2 Cor. 5:14 now becomes clearer as one of the most explicit expressions of Paul's understanding of Jesus as representative man—"one man died for all; therefore all mankind (*οἱ πάντες*) has died".²² When we talk of Christ as representative man we mean that what is true of him in particular is true of men in general. When we say Adam is representative man in his fallenness, we mean that *all men* are fallen. So when Paul says Christ died as representative man he means that there is no other end possible for men—all mankind dies, as he died, as flesh, as the end of sinful flesh, as the destruction of sin. Had there been a way for fallen man to overcome his fallenness and subjection to the powers Christ would not have died—Christ as representative man would have shown men how to overcome sinful flesh. But

¹⁸ J. D. G. Dunn, "Jesus—Flesh and Spirit: an Exposition of Romans 1:3-4", *JTS*, n.s. 24 (1973), pp. 40-68.

¹⁹ Delling, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

²⁰ See, for example, the treatments of R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* Vol. I (ET London, 1952); O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (1957, ET London, 1959); R. H. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology* (London, 1965). But see also F. Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology* (1963, ET London, 1969), p. 186; W. Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God* (1963, ET London, 1966), pp. 133-50.

²¹ For further material in Paul where Adam Christology provides the basic structure of the thought see Black, *op. cit.*, pp. 174 ff.; Scroggs, *op. cit.*, pp. 95 ff.

²² Cf. H. Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief* (Göttingen, 1924), pp. 182 f.

Christ, Man, died because there is no other way for man—any man. His death is an acknowledgment that there is no way out for fallen men except through death—no answer to sinful flesh except its destruction in death. "Man could not be helped other than through his annihilation".²³ Only through death does the New Man emerge in risen life. In other words, if we may follow the train of thought a little further, Christ's identification with fallen men is up to and into death. But there it ends, for death is the end of fallen men, the destruction of man as flesh—Christ died, all died. Beyond death he no longer represents all men, fallen man. In his risen life he represents only those who identify themselves with him, with his death (in baptism), only those who acknowledge the Risen One as Lord (2 Con 5:15). Only those who identify themselves with him in his death are identified with him in his life from death. Hence it is a

[p.131]

mistake to confine the "all" of 5:14 to believers. The "all" of 5:14-15 are not identical with "the living" Of 5: 15. Jesus' representative capacity before resurrection (sinful flesh—Rom. 8:3) is different from his representative capacity after resurrection (spiritual body—1 Cor. 15:44-45). All die. But only those in Christ experience the new creation (2 Cor. 5:17). In short, as Last Adam Jesus represents only those who experience life-giving Spirit (1 Cor. 15:45).

II JESUS' DEATH AS A SACRIFICE

We must now attempt to view Jesus' death through Paul's eyes from another angle and then bring the two viewpoints together to give us a fuller picture of Paul's thinking about the cross. I refer to Paul's understanding of Jesus' death in terms of cultic sacrifice. The idea of blood sacrifices and of divine-human relationships being somehow dependent on them is so repellent to post-Enlightenment man that many commentators have instinctively played down or ignored this side of Paul's theology. The most recent example is E. Käsemann who reacts against undue emphasis being given to the idea of sacrificial death by firmly denying that Paul ever definitely called Jesus' death a sacrifice, and who sums up, "The idea of the sacrificial death is, if anything, pushed into the background...".²⁴ An examination of Paul, however, makes it difficult to escape the conclusion that Käsemann's own (certainly valuable) demythologizing of Paul's theology of Jesus' death nevertheless falls into the trap of making Paul's language less foreign and less distasteful and so misses both the offence of Paul's thought and its point.

In Rom. 3:25 ἱλαστήριον cannot have any other than a sacrificial reference. Since the word is used so often in LXX for the lid of the ark, the "mercy-seat", the only real debate has been whether it should be understood as place or means of expiation/propitiation—the latter

²³ K. Barth, cited by G. C. Berkouwer, *The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth* (Grand Rapids, 1956), p. 135.

²⁴ E. Käsemann, *Perspectives on Paul* (1969, ET London, 1971), pp. 42-45; cf. V. Taylor, *The Atonement in New Testament Teaching* (London, 1958), pp. 185-90. It is astonishing that G. Bornkamm, *Paul* (1969, ET London, 1971), hardly discusses what Paul means by the gospel of the cross as a whole, let alone the concept of Jesus' death as sacrifice.

("means") being clearly more appropriate.²⁵ And even if the verse is a quotation,²⁶ Paul gives it such a central place in a key passage of his exposition that it must be very expressive of his own thinking; indeed in such a case one quotes from an earlier text or source because it puts the point as well or better than one can oneself. The attempt has sometimes been made to see as the immediate background of Rom. 3:25 the martyr theology which

[p.132]

finds its clearest expression in 4 Macc. 17:21 f., where ἱλαστήριον is used to describe the atoning significance of the Maccabean martyrs' deaths.²⁷ This is certainly possible; but two qualifications are necessary. First, martyr theology is itself an application of sacrificial metaphor; the reason why the death of martyrs can be thought to carry such weight of atonement is because their death can be seen as a kind of sacrifice. Indeed in Diaspora Judaism martyr theology is sacrificial precisely because it served as one of the substitutes for the sacrificial cult in faraway Jerusalem.²⁸ Second, in Rom. 3:25 the ἱλαστήριον is presented by God himself. This thought is not present in Jewish martyr theology but is quite common in connection with the sacrificial cult in the Old Testament.²⁹ Thus, whether or not Paul was consciously alluding to martyr theology here, it is most likely that the primary reference of his metaphor was to Christ's death as cult sacrifice.³⁰

Rom. 8:3—"God sent his Son in the precise likeness of sinful flesh and for sin (περὶ ἁμαρτίας)". NEB translates the last phrase, "as a sacrifice for sin". And this is wholly justified since περὶ ἁμαρτίας is regularly used in LXX to translate the Hebrew *hatta'th* (sin offering—e.g. Lev. 5:6 f., 11; 16:3, 5, 9; Num. 6:16; 7:16; 2 Chron. 29:23 f.; Neh. 10:33; Ezek. 42:13; 43:19; in Isa. 53:10 it translates the Hebrew *'asham*, "guilt-offering").³¹ It is likely that Paul draws the words from this background as a deliberate allusion, since otherwise the phrase is unnecessarily vague.³² Some commentators object that such a reference confuses Paul's thought at this point,³³ although Paul never has been noted for his unmixed metaphors (see e.g. Rom. 7:1-6; Gal. 4:1-6, 19). But is the charge just? When Paul says, God sent his Son περὶ ἁμαρτίας "in order that the just requirement of the law might be

²⁵ For the debate see L. L. Morris, "The Meaning of ἱλαστήριον in Romans 3:25", *NTS* 2 (1955-56), pp. 33-43; K. Kertelge, "Rechtfertigung" bei Paulus (Münster, 1967), pp. 56 f.

²⁶ R. Bultmann, *Theology*, p. 46; E. Käsemann, "Zum Verständnis von Rm. 3:24-26", *ZNTW* 43 (1950-51), pp. 150-54; Kertelge, *op. cit.*, pp. 51 ff. E. Lohse, *Märtyrer and Gottesknecht* (Göttingen, ²1963), p. 149 restricts the pre-Pauline tradition to v. 25.

²⁷ See D. Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings* (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 41-45, and those cited by Lohse, *op. cit.*, p. 152, n. 4.

²⁸ Lohse, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

²⁹ Cf. Kertelge, *op. cit.*, pp. 57 f.

³⁰ Cf. Kuss, *op. cit.*, pp. 165 f. On the question of whether the Gen. 22 tradition about Abraham offering up Isaac (as sacrifice) has influenced Paul here and elsewhere (Rom. 8:32; Gal. 3:13 f.) see N. A. Dahl, "The Atonement—An Adequate Reward for the Akedah? (Rom. 8:32)", *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black*, ed. E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox (Edinburgh, 1969), pp. 15-29.

³¹ The more usual phrase is περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας.

³² C. K. Barrett, *Romans*, p. 156, thinks Paul means nothing more precise than Gal. 1:4—Jesus Christ gave himself "for our sins" (ὅπερ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν). But LXX in Ezekiel usually uses ὑπὲρ instead of περὶ in reference to the sin offering, and Paul may well regard περὶ ἁμαρτίας and ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν as equivalent phrases. In the mind of a Jewish Christian could "for our sins" have any other reference than to the cult? NEB has, quite rightly, "Jesus Christ, who sacrificed himself for our sins". See further below.

³³ E.g. A. Schlatter, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit* (Stuttgart, 1935). p. 257; O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer* (Göttingen, ¹²1963), p. 190, n. 2; Lohse, *op. cit.*, p. 153, n. 6.

fulfilled in us...", does he not include the law of the sin offering as part of "the just requirement of the law"?

I Con 5:7—Paul explicitly states, "Christ, our paschal lamb, has been *sacrificed*". It is frequently remarked that "the Paschal victim was not a

[p.133]

sin-offering or regarded as a means of expiating or removing sins".³⁴ However, the Passover is already associated with atonement in Ezek. 45:18-22, and this link is firmly forged in the words used by Jesus in the last Supper. He interpreted their Passover meal in terms of "blood poured out (ἐκχυσνόμενον) for many". The language is unavoidably sacrificial and signifies atonement.³⁵ This tendency to run together different metaphors and descriptions of Jesus' death so that old distinctions are blurred and lost is clearly evident elsewhere in the early Church (I Pet. 1:18 f.; Jn. 1:29), and Paul's language in 1 Cor. 5:7 and elsewhere hardly suggests that it was otherwise with him.

2 Cor. 5:21—"God made him into sin, him who knew no sin". The antithesis "made into sin", "sinless", makes it difficult to doubt that Paul had in mind the cult's insistence on clean and unblemished animals for the sacrifices. A more specific allusion to the Day of Atonement's scapegoat is probable.³⁶ Perhaps there is also an allusion to the suffering servant of Isa. 53;³⁷ but this should not be seen as a way of lessening the sacrificial allusion since Isa. 53 itself is studded with sacrificial terminology and imagery and the role of the Servant cannot be fully understood apart from the sacrificial background of his death.³⁸

Similarly the several passages in which Paul uses the phrase "in or through his blood" cannot be understood except as a reference to Christ's death as a sacrifice (Rom. 3:25; 5:9; Eph. 1:7; 2:13; Col. 1:20). Again attempts have been made to avoid the full offensiveness of the allusion.³⁹ But the emphasis on blood can hardly have come from the tradition of Jesus' death since it was not particularly bloody⁴⁰ and must be drawn from the understanding of Jesus' death in terms of cult sacrifice.⁴¹ Likewise Paul's talk of Jesus' death as "for sins" (Rom. 4:25; 8:3; 1 Cor. 15:3; Gal. 1:4) or "for us" etc. (Rom. 5:6-8; 8:32; 2 Con 5:14 f., 21; Gal. 2:20; 3:13; Eph. 5:2, 25; 1 Thess. 5:9 f.) probably reflects the same influence, even if, in the latter case, it is mediated through martyr theology.⁴²

Granted then that Paul sees Jesus' death as a sacrifice, what light does this throw on Paul's understanding of Jesus' death? The obvious way to answer the question is to inquire into the Old Testament or Jewish theology of sacrifice. But here we run into a considerable problem. For,

³⁴ G. B. Gray, *Sacrifice in the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1925), p. 397.

³⁵ J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (31960, ET London, 1966), pp. 222 ff.

³⁶ Windisch, *op. cit.*, p. 198.

³⁷ Cullmann, *op. cit.*, p. 76; J. Jeremias, *The Servant of God* (rev. ET London, 1965), p. 97, n. 441.

³⁸ Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 190; M. Barth, *Was Christ's Death a Sacrifice?* (Edinburgh, 1961), pp. 9 f.

³⁹ See, for example, those referred to by Davies, *op. cit.*, pp. 232 ff.

⁴⁰ E. Schweizer, *Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und seinen Nachfolgern* (Zürich, 21962), p. 74 (6e).

⁴¹ So e.g., Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 63 f.; Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 236; Lohse, *op. cit.*, pp. 138 f.; Barth, *op. cit.*, p. 7; contra Delling, *op. cit.*, pp. 89 f.

⁴² H. Riesenfeld, ὑπέρ, *TDNT*, VIII, pp. 509 ff.; cf. Delling, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

[p.134]

as is well known, there is no clear rationale in Judaism concerning sacrifice. No doubt the sacrifices were very meaningful to the pious and penitent worshipper in Israel.⁴³ But just what the essence of atonement was for the Jew remains an unsolved riddle. "It seems necessary to admit", sums up M. Barth, "that we do not know or understand what the old Testament and Judaism' really believed and taught about the mystery of expiating sacrifice".⁴⁴

On the other hand, in view of the passages cited above, particularly Rom. 3:25; 8:3 and 2 Cor. 5:21, it seems likely that Paul himself had a fairly well defined theory of sacrifice. Moreover, whereas rabbinic thought had begun to play, down the importance of sacrifice and to recognize other means of explanation,⁴⁵ Paul seems to retain an important place for the category of sacrifice in describing the effect of Jesus' death.⁴⁶ This too suggests that, however obscure Jewish theology was, Paul himself could give a fairly clear exposition of atoning sacrifice. One possible way forward is to read back Paul's understanding of sacrifice by correlating the two conclusions we have already reached—Paul thinks of Jesus dying both as representative man and in terms of cultic sacrifice—and by examining the sacrificial ritual in their light. The exercise is necessarily speculative, but it may help to illuminate Paul's understanding of Jesus' death.

(a) First, we note that the sin offering, like Jesus' death in Rom. 8:3, was intended to deal with sin. In some sense or other, the ritual of killing the sacrifice removed the sin from the unclean offerer. Now it is true that the sin offering dealt only with inadvertent sins—according to Old Testament ritual there was no sacrifice possible for deliberate sins. But at the same time the fact that a death was necessary to compensate for even an inadvertent sin signifies the seriousness of even these sins in the cult. The others were too serious for any compensation to be made. In such cases the sinner's *own* life was forfeit—no other life could expiate his sin.⁴⁷

(b) Second, as Jesus in his death represented man in his fallenness, so presumably Paul saw the sin-offering as in some way representing the sinner in his sin. This would probably be the significance for Paul of that part of the ritual where the offerer laid his hand on the beast's head. Thereby the sinner identified himself with the beast, or at least indicated that the beast in some sense represented him;⁴⁸ that is, represented him *as*

[p.135]

⁴³ H. H. Rowley, *Worship in Ancient Israel* (London, 1967), chapter 4.

⁴⁴ Barth, *op. cit.*, p. 13. See also G. F. Moore, *Judaism* (Cambridge, 1927), Vol. I, p. 500; E. Sjöberg, *Gott and die Sünder* (Stuttgart, 1938), pp. 175, 256 ff.; Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 235; Lohse, *op. cit.*, p. 21; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, Vol. I (1957, ET Edinburgh, 1962), pp. 251-55; R. de Vaux, *Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice* (Cardiff, 1964), p. 91.

⁴⁵ Davies, *op. cit.*, 253-59; Lohse, *op. cit.*, pp. 21 ff.

⁴⁶ "In an age of spiritualization and moralization of cultic terms, Paul is conspicuous by his insistence upon the message that only sacrifice and blood make pure and righteous" (Barth, *op. cit.*, p. 33).

⁴⁷ See most recently de Vaux, *op. cit.*, pp. 94 f.

⁴⁸ G. Nagel, "Sacrifices", *Vocabulary of the Bible*, ed. J. J. von Allmen (²1956, ET London, 1958), p. 379; J. S. Whale, *Victor and Victim* (Cambridge, 1960), pp. 49 f.; Rowley, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

sinner, so that his sin was somehow identified with it, and its life became forfeit as result—just as Christ, taking the initiative from the other side, identified himself with men in their fallenness (Rom. 8:3), was made sin (2 Cor. 5:21).

It is by no means widely held that this was the generally understood meaning of the act. The laying of a hand on the head of the beast is usually given a far less significant role—simply indicating ownership, or signifying the readiness of the offerer to surrender that which belongs to him.⁴⁹ I am no expert in this field, but this conclusion does seem to me to be rather too sophisticated. For one thing, it hardly seems an adequate explanation of the importance attached to this action in the detailed instructions of Lev. 4. For another, if that was all the action meant we would have expected it to be repeated in all sacrifices, non-bloody ones as well; whereas, in fact, it only occurs in the case of sacrifices involving blood. Again, where the same action is used outside the sacrificial ritual, identification seems to be the chief rationale. Thus, Num. 27:18, 23; Deu. 34:9—Moses lays hands on Joshua thereby imparting some of Moses' authority to him, that is, conveying some of himself in his role as leader to Joshua, so that Joshua becomes in a sense another Moses. Num. 8:10—the people lay their hands on the Levites so that the Levites become their representatives before the Lord, in particular taking the place of their first-born. Finally, Lev. 24:14, where hands are laid on a blasphemer prior to his execution by stoning. The whole people perform the execution, but only those who witnessed the blasphemy lay their hands on his head. This suggests that they do so to identify themselves with the blasphemer insofar as by hearing the blasphemy they have been caught up in his sin.⁵⁰

The only place where the significance of laying hands on an animal in cultic ritual is explained is Lev. 16:21, where the High Priest lays both his hands on the second goat in the Day of Atonement ceremony—thereby explicitly laying the sins of the people on the head of the goat.⁵¹ Of course, it was the first goat which was sacrificed as a sin offering, whereas the second goat was not ritually killed, only driven out into the desert. But were the two layings on of hands seen as quite distinct and different in significance? Could it not be that the two goats were seen as part of the one ritual, representing more fully and pictorially what one goat could not? Perhaps part of the significance of the Day of Atonement ritual was that the physical removal of the sins of the people out of the camp by the second goat demonstrated what the sin offering normally did with

[p.136]

their sins anyway. Sin offering and scapegoat were two pictures of the one reality. Rom. 8:3 and 2 Cor. 5:21 certainly suggest that Paul had such a composite picture of Jesus' death as sacrifice.

Against this view, that the sin offering was thought to represent the offerer, it is sometimes argued that if the beast became laden with the offerer's sin it would be counted as unclean and

⁴⁹ See particularly W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, Vol. I (1958, ET London, 1961), pp. 165 f.; de Vaux, *op. cit.*, pp. 28, 63.

⁵⁰ Cf. D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (London, 1956), pp. 226 f.

⁵¹ Cf. M. Noth, *Leviticus* (ET London, 1965), who speaks of "the transference to the animal of the guilt, conceived in some quite solid sense" (pp. 38 f.).

so could not be used in sacrifice.⁵² But does not this objection miss the point? The animal must be holy, wholly clean precisely so that priest and sinner may be certain that its death is *not its own*, that it does not die for any uncleanness of its own. Only a perfect beast can represent sinful man; only the death of a perfect animal can make atonement for imperfect man.

Alternatively the argument is put that the sin offering could not embody sin since the priests ate the meat left over from some of the sin offerings. Since they could not eat contaminated flesh, the sacrifice could not have been contaminated by sin.⁵³ But again this seems to miss a key point—viz. that the life of the animal was regarded as its blood (Lev. 17:10-12; Deut. 12:23). The priests did not of course eat the blood. On the contrary, the blood was wholly used up in the ritual: indeed, the blood played a more important role in the sin offering than in any other sacrifice;⁵⁴ and the sprinkling of the blood “was regarded as the essential and decisive act of the offering up”;⁵⁵ Lev. 1-7:11—it is the blood, that is the life, that makes expiation”. Thus, since the life *is* the blood, so the *life* of the sacrifice was wholly used up in the ritual. The equivalence between the life of the man and the life of the beast lay in the *blood* of the victim, not in the whole victim. And, since the blood was wholly used up, the use made of the carcase did not affect its role as sin offering; that role was completed in the blood ritual.

(c) Third, if we extend the line of reasoning in the light of Rom. 8:3 and 2 Cor. 5:14, 21, the conclusion follows that Paul saw the death of the sacrificial animal as the death of the sinner *qua* sinner, that is, the destruction of his sin. The manner in which the sin offering dealt with sin was by its death. The sacrificial animal, identified with the offerer in his sin, had to be destroyed in order to destroy the sin which it embodied. The sprinkling, smearing and pouring away of the sacrificial blood in the sight of God indicated that the life was wholly destroyed, and with it the sin of the sinner.

One can hardly fail to recognize what we may call the sacrificial chiasmus:

*By the sacrifice the sinner was made pure and lived free of that sin;
By the sacrifice the pure animal died.*

[p.137]

And we can hardly fail to fill out the rest of the second line by adding: By the sacrifice the *pure* animal was made *impure* and *died for that sin*—by its death destroying the sin. That this is wholly in accordance with Paul's thought is made clear by 2 Con 5:21, the clearest expression of the sacrificial chiasmus:

“For our sake God made the sinless one into sin
so that in him *we* might become the *righteousness* of God.”

So too Rom. 8:3:

⁵² Eichrodt, *op. cit.*, p. 165, n. 2; Nagel, *op. cit.*, p. 378.

⁵³ Eichrodt, *op. cit.*, p. 165, n. 2; de Vaux, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

⁵⁴ R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel* (ET London, 1961), p. 419; *Sacrifice*, p. 92.

⁵⁵ A. Büchler, *Studies in Sin and Atonement* (New York, 1928), pp. 418 f.

God "condemned *sin* in the flesh (of Jesus)
in order that the *just requirement of the law* might be fulfilled in us."

So too Gal. 3:13, although here the metaphor is not directly sacrificial:

"*Christ* redeemed us from the *curse* of the law
having become a *curse* for us".

In short, *to say that Jesus died as representative of fallen man and to say that Jesus died as sacrifice for the sins of men is for Paul to say the same thing*. His death was the end of fallen man, the destruction of man as sinner. But only those who, like the offerer of old, identify themselves with the sacrifice, may know the other half of the chiasmus, the life of Christ beyond the death of sin, the righteousness of God in Christ.

III CONCLUSIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

This recognition of the representative and sacrificial character of Jesus' death in Paul's theology seems to me to confirm Dr Morris in his central affirmations about the atonement over against those who would weaken one or other element. "If it is true that their death is made his death, it is also true that his death is made their death;" this is how he sums up his treatment of the death of Christ in Paul in his most recent work on the subject.⁵⁶ On the other hand our exposition suggests that some qualification, or better, sharper definition, is necessary at two points on which Dr. Morris strongly insists. I refer to the words "propitiation" and "substitution".

(a) *Propitiation*. Should we translate ἰλαστήριον in Rom. 3:25 as "propitiation" or "expiation"? Those familiar with Dr Morris's work will need no introduction to the debate on this question and I certainly cannot enter into it here. Suffice it to say that the studies of Dr Morris, R. R. Nicole and D. Hill⁵⁷ make unavoidable at least some retreat from C. H.

[p.138]

Dodd's rejection of all propitiatory significance for the ἰλάσκεσθαι word group in the LXX.⁵⁸ Dr. Morris's reminder that the context must be considered as well as the individual usage is particularly important.

Nevertheless, in view of the larger understanding of Jesus' death which we have gained above, and without neglecting the context, "expiation" does seem to be the better translation for Rom. 3:25. The fact is that for Paul God is the subject of the action; it is God who provided Jesus as a ἰλαστήριον. And if God is the subject, then the obvious object is sin or the sinner. To argue that God provided Jesus as a means of propitiating God is certainly possible, but less likely I think. For one thing, regularly in the Old Testament the immediate

⁵⁶ Morris, *Cross*, p. 224.

⁵⁷ L. Morris, "The Use of ἰλάσκεσθαι, etc. in Biblical Greek", *ExpT* 62 (1950-51), pp. 227-33; *Apostolic Preaching*, chapters 4-5; R. R. Nicole, "C. H. Dodd and the Doctrine of Propitiation", *WTJ* 17 (1955). pp. 117-57; Hill, *op. cit.*, pp. 23-36.

⁵⁸ C. H. Dodd, "Atonement", *The Bible and the Greeks* (London, 1935), pp. 82-95, reprinted from *JTS* 32 (1931).

object of the action denoted by the Hebrew *kipper* is the removal of *sin*—either by purifying the person or object, or by wiping out the sin; the act of atonement “cancels”, “purges away” sin. It is not God who is the object of this atonement, nor the wrath of God, but the sin which calls forth the wrath of God.⁵⁹ So for example, 2 Kings 5:18: Naaman prays, “May Yahweh expiate (ἰλάσεται) your *servant*”; Ps. 24:11: “For the honour of thy name, O Lord, expiate (ἰλάσῃ) my *wickedness*”; Ecclus. 5:5-6:

“Do not be so confident of pardon (ἐξιλασμοῦ)
that you sin again and again.
Do not say, His mercy is so great,
he will pardon my sins, however many’ ” (ἐξιλάσεται).

And for another, if we have indeed gained an insight into Paul's understanding of the rationale of sacrifice, then it follows that for Paul the way in which Christ's death cancels out man's sin is by destroying it—the death of the representative sacrifice is the destruction of the sin of those represented, because it is the destruction of man's sinful flesh, of man as sinner. NEB therefore correctly translates Rom. 3:25: “God designed him to be the means of expiating sin by his sacrificial death”.

On the other hand, we must go on to recognize that a secondary and consequential result of the destruction of a man's sin in the sin offering is that he no longer experiences the wrath of God which his sin called forth. At this point we must give weight to Dr Morris's reminder that this section of Romans follows immediately upon the exposition of God's wrath “against all ungodliness and wickedness of men” (Rom. 1:18). Almost inevitably therefore, the action of God which makes righteousness possible for men does involve the thought that wrath need no longer apply to them. As C. K. Barrett notes: “It would be wrong to neglect the fact that expiation has, as it were, the effect of propitiation: the sin that

[p.139]

might have excited God's wrath is expiated (at God's will) and therefore no longer does so”.⁶⁰

But we must be clear what we mean by this. As Rom. 1:18-32 shows, God's wrath means a process willed by God—the outworking of the destructive consequences of sin, destructive for the wholeness of man in his relationships.⁶¹ Jesus' death therefore does not propitiate God's wrath in the sense that it turns an angry God into one who forgives; all are agreed on that. But in addition, it is not possible to say, as some do, that Jesus' death propitiates God's wrath in the sense of turning it away. The destructive consequences of sin do not suddenly evaporate. On the contrary, they are focused in fuller intensity on the sin—that is, on fallen humanity in Jesus. In Jesus on the cross was focused not only man's sin, but the wrath which follows upon that sin. The destructive consequences of sin are such that if they were allowed to work themselves out fully in man himself they would destroy him as a spiritual being. This

⁵⁹ “The subject of the ἰλάσκεσθαι is not man, but Christ and in him God, and he who receives the ἰλασμός is not God but man” (Schlatter, *op. cit.*, p. 145). See also Dodd (as n. 58), and F. Büchsel, *TDNT*, III, pp. 34 ff., 320 ff.

⁶⁰ Barrett, *Romans*, p. 78.

⁶¹ I refer particularly to the unpublished doctoral dissertation of S. H. Travis, *Divine Retribution in the Thought of Paul* (Cambridge University, 1970). See also Morris, *Apostolic Preaching*, pp. 161-66; Whiteley, *The Theology of St. Paul* (Oxford, 1964), pp. 61-72.

process of destruction is speeded up in the case of Jesus, the representative man, the ἰλαστήριον, and destroys him. The wrath of God destroys the sin by letting the full destructive consequences of sin work themselves out and exhaust themselves in Jesus.

This means also that we must be careful in describing Jesus' death as penal, as a suffering the penalty for sin. If we have understood Paul's theology of sacrifice aright the primary thought is the *destruction* of the malignant, poisonous organism of sin. Any thought of punishment is secondary. The wrath of God in the case of Jesus' death is not so much retributive as preventative.⁶² A closer parallel is perhaps vaccination. In vaccination germs are introduced into a healthy body in order that by destroying these germs the body will build up its strength. So we might say the germ of sin was introduced into Jesus, the only one "healthy"/whole enough to let that sin run its full course. The "vaccination" seemed to fail, because Jesus died. But it did not fail, for he rose again; and his new humanity is "germ-resistant", sin resistant. It is this new humanity in the power of the Spirit which he offers to share with men.

(b) *Substitution*. As we have to seek a sharper definition of ἰλαστήριον than "propitiation" affords, so that of the two words "expiation" seems more able to bear that fuller meaning, so we must examine "substitution" to check whether it is the best word to describe Paul's theology of the death of Christ. For many "substitution" is perhaps the key word in any attempt to sum up Paul's thought at this point. It is significant that D. E.

[p.140]

H. Whiteley's whole discussion of the death of Christ in Paul's theology is framed with reference to this question (with chiefly negative conclusions),⁶³ Both Dr Morris and D. Hill argue from 4 Macc. 6:29; 17:21 that the idea of "substitution" is involved in the thought of Rom. 3:24 f.—that for Paul Jesus' death was substitutionary.⁶⁴ And W. Pannenberg gives the word "substitution" a central role in his exposition of the meaning of Jesus' death.⁶⁵ So too for Dr Morris 2 Cor. 5:14, 21 can hardly be understood except in substitutionary terms—"the death of the One took the place of the death of the many".⁶⁶ This is a very arguable case, and it certainly gains strength from the theology of sacrifice outlined above—for there it would be quite appropriate to speak of the death of the sacrifice as a substitutionary death.

Nevertheless, although "substitution" expresses an important aspect of Paul's theology of the atonement, I am not sure that Paul would have been happy with it or that it is the best single word to serve as the key definition of that theology. The trouble is that "substitution" has two failings as a definition: it is too one-sided a concept; and it is too narrow in its connotation.

"Substitution" is too *one-sided* because it depicts Jesus as substituting for man in the face of God's wrath. But we do no justice to Paul's view of Jesus' death unless we emphasize with *equal or greater weight* that in his death Jesus also "substituted" *for God* in the face of man's

⁶² For broader considerations on this issue see H. H. Farmer, "The Notion of Desert Bad and Good", *HJ*, 41 (1943), pp. 347-54; C. F. D. Moule, "The Christian Understanding of Forgiveness", *Theology* 71 (1968), pp. 435-43.

⁶³ Whiteley, *Paul*, pp. 130-48.

⁶⁴ Morris, *Apostolic Preaching*, p. 173; Hill, *op. cit.*, pp. 75 f. J. Jeremias, *The Central Message of the New Testament* (London, 1965), p. 36, also uses the word "substitution" to describe Paul's theology.

⁶⁵ W. Pannenberg, *Jesus, God and Man* (1964, ET London, 1968), pp. 258-69.

⁶⁶ Morris, *Cross*, p. 220.

sin—"God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself" (2 Con 5:19). In other words, "substitution" shares the defects of "propitiation" as a description of Jesus' death. It still tends to conjure up pagan ideas of Jesus' standing in man's place and pleading with an angry God (and it must be said that the usual illustrations of popular evangelism only confirm that picture). "Substitution" does not give sufficient prominence to the point of primary significance—that God was the subject:⁶⁷ God provided Jesus as the ἱλαστήριον; God sent his Son as a sin-offering; God passed judgement on sin in the flesh; God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself. Our earlier exposition of Paul's theology of Jesus as Man suggests that a much more appropriate word is "representation": in his death Jesus represented not just man to God but also God to man. And while "substitution" is an appropriate description of Paul's theology of sacrifice, it is perhaps more definite than our knowledge of Paul's thought and of the sacrificial ritual permits. Whereas, in discussing Paul's view of sacrifice, "representation",

[p.141]

the identification of the offerer with his sacrifice, was a word we could hardly avoid. So here, "representation" gives all the positive sense of "substitution" (a positive sense I by no means deny) which the context requires, while at the same time bringing in the other side of the equation which "substitution" tends to exclude.

"Substitution" is also too narrow a word. It smacks too much of individualism to represent Paul's thought adequately. It is true, of course, that Paul can and does say, Christ "loved me and gave himself for me" (Gal. 2:20). But his more typical thought is wider. For as we have seen, in Paul's theology Jesus represents *man*, not just a man, on the cross. Christ died as man, representative man. As Adam represents man so that his fallenness is theirs, so Jesus represents fallen men so that his death is theirs. The point is that he died not *instead of* men, but *as* man; "he died for all, therefore all have died" (2 Cor. 5:14). That is to say, fallen men do not escape death—any more than they escape wrath; they die. Either they die their own death without identifying themselves with Christ; or else they identify themselves with Christ so that they die in his death—his death works out in their flesh. And only insofar as it does so do they live (Rom. 7:24f; 8:10-13, 17; 2 Cor. 4:10-12; Phil. 3:10 f.; Col. 1:24).⁶⁸ Either way fallen humanity cannot escape death—resurrection life, the life of the Spirit, lies on the other side of death, his death. Jesus' death was the death of the old humanity, in order that his resurrection might be the beginning of a new humanity, no longer contaminated by sin and no longer subject to death. In short, Jesus dies not so much as substitute in place of men, but as man, representative man.

As we implied at the beginning of the second section, an emphasis on Paul's theology of Jesus as representative man and of his death as sacrifice for sin increases the strangeness of Paul's gospel to loth century man. But if we can only do justice to Paul's theology by highlighting these aspects of it, then this is unavoidable. Indeed it is necessary to face up squarely to this strangeness and not baulk at it, for only by following out the warp and woof of Paul's thought will we begin to understand its overall pattern; and only by thinking through his mind, so far as we can, will we be able to reinterpret his thought to modern man without

⁶⁷ Cf. Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 75: "God in Christ. No thought is more fundamental than this to St. Paul's thinking".

⁶⁸ Cf. Delling, *op. cit.*, pp. 91 f.; R. C. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising with Christ* (Berlin, 1966).

James D.G. Dunn, "Paul's Understanding of the Death of Jesus," Robert Banks, ed., *Reconciliation and Hope. New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology Presented to L.L. Morris on his 60th Birthday*. Carlisle: The Paternoster Press, 1974. pp.125-141.

distorting its character and central emphases.⁶⁹ I do not suggest that that reinterpretation is easy, and to do so at this point requires a much fuller investigation of the other side of Jesus' death—the life of the Spirit (Rom. 8:1 ff.), the life-giving Spirit (1 Cor. 15:45). But that is another story.

© 1974 *The Paternoster Publishing*. Reproduced by kind permission of the publisher.

Prepared for the Web in November 2008 by Robert I. Bradshaw.

<http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/>

⁶⁹ For examples of such an attempt see J. Knox, *The Death of Christ* (London, 1959), chapter 7, and Moule (p. 139, n. 3).