

ARTICLE III.

EXPOSITION OF ROM. 6: 2, 8, AND 10, 11.

By Rev. J. H. Goodhue, South Boston, Mass.

DYING unto sin, with Christ; or Exposition of Rom. 6: 2, 8, and 10, 11—"How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" "Now, if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him." "For, in that he [Christ] died, he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God."

The object of this Article is to present what seems to be the key to the exposition of that class of Scripture passages which involve the idea of Christ and the Christian's dying unto sin, whether separately or conjointly. This is thought to be found by examining the exigencies of the passages cited above.

We shall begin the examination by considering the phrase "dead to sin," as found, in the common English version, in Rom. 6: 2—"How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" This phrase is commonly understood as equivalent to being dead to the exercise of sin; that is, having no fellowship with it, being deadened or benumbed, so as not to be influenced by it. The language is supposed to be figurative merely, the figure being based upon the relation which a dead body sustains to objects around it. It is so explained by lexicographers of the New Testament, and by critics and commentators in general. And not only so, but the phrase "dead in sin," has obtained currency in religious conference and discourse, as the vehicle of this thought. It is used to convey this idea; and, when so used, it does convey it. And what especially commends its use, in the minds of men, is, that it is supposed that the Scriptures employ it in this sense, and hence that it has their sacred sanction.

Now, that the idea which is commonly conveyed by this

phrase, is a just one, and that this language may be used, by common consent, to convey this idea, is not denied. But whether the Scripture furnishes or sanctions it, in the passage before us, and others kindred, is the point now to be discussed. A moment's reflection upon the character of the term *dead*, will suggest to the mind, in the outset, that mere want of fellowship is, by no means, adequate to exhaust the meaning of a word so intensive in its nature. "*To die*," is the bearer of a heavier burden. Nor is it denied that the state which is commonly supposed to be denoted by being dead to sin, is one which can be appropriately predicated of him who has become dead to sin in the Scripture sense. The statement is, that the common view does not involve an adequate conception of the Apostle's idea, which is to be shown from the fact that it does not meet the demands of his language. This will be evident if we apply the common interpretation to Rom. 6: 8: "Now, if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him." To be dead with Christ, must mean, here, to be dead with Christ to sin; for the Apostle's argument, in this chapter, involves no other kind of death. And having no fellowship with sin, which is what is understood by being dead to sin, is equivalent to living with Christ. The passage will therefore be equivalent to this: "Now, if we be living with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him," which is, at least, not very Pauline.

A still stronger objection to this interpretation is, that it does not give to the original text its full force. It is to be observed that the passage (Rom. 6: 2) does not denote simply a state or condition, but a process by which a certain state is attained. The verb in the Aorist is employed, *Οἷτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ*; and should be rendered: How shall we, who have died, or who at any time die, to sin, live any longer therein: the affirmation involved in the question is, that it is inconsistent and absurd (*πῶς*) that we who, i. e. whoever of us (*οἷτινες*) have died, or at any time die, to sin, should live any longer therein. Many of the most critical earlier commentators are

agreed that the verb should be so rendered. Even if the Aorist may here, like the Perfect, be rendered "are dead," of which there is a possibility, still the idea of the process, implied in the verb, is not at all removed. It would then be rendered: How shall we, who have died to sin, and hence are dead, live any longer therein? In this case, the mind still rests upon the process, by which the consequent state has been arrived at. But, by the common interpretation, this process is not recognized; and, in many of the instances in which it is employed, as we shall see hereafter, it is not admissible. The same remarks are applicable, also, to Rom. 6: 8, *Εἰ δὲ ἀπέθανομεν σὺν Χριστῷ, πιστεύομεν, ὅτι καὶ συζήσομεν αὐτῷ*, "Now, if we have died, or at any time die, with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him." In Rom. 6: 10, the verb is rendered, in the common version, *Ὁ γὰρ ἀπέθανε, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἑφάπαξ*, "For, in that he [Christ] died, he died unto sin once." In the 11th verse, where the phraseology is applied to the Christian, there is a change of the construction, which makes the adjective more euphonious: *Οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς λαγίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ*, "Likewise reckon ye, also, yourselves to be dead, indeed, unto sin." In 6: 7, we have the participle, *Ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας*, "For he, having died, or who has died, is freed from sin." Wherever the construction admits it, in corresponding passages in other epistles, the verb is uniformly employed. The following are examples:— Col. 2: 20, *Εἰ ἀπέθανετε σὺν Χριστῷ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου*, "If ye have died, with Christ, from the rudiments of the world." Col. 3: 3, *Ἀπέθανετε γάρ, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κέκρυπται σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ*, "Ye have died, and your life is hid, with Christ, in God." 2 Tim. 2: 11, *Εἰ γὰρ συναπέθανομεν, καὶ συζήσομεν*, "If we have died with him, we shall also live with him." 1 Pet. 2: 24 is not a parallel passage. The language is altogether changed. These passages all conspire to establish the position that the phraseology in question denotes, not merely a *state*, but a *process*, through which the Christian has passed, in coming into a certain state. This process, which the Apostle

calls, so often, a *dying* process, by the common interpretation is not recognized at all. The intense signification of the term 'dead,' is entirely explained away. This interpretation supposes the Apostle to be speaking, in three passages, of a condition of death to sin as the appropriate and permanent condition of one in a Christian state. Our examination, thus far, supposes the Apostle to be speaking of dying unto sin as the appropriate process for one to pass through in coming into the Christian state, and no more.

It is now decided that the passages above denote the process of coming into a condition of death to sin; but what that condition is, is not yet determined. That it cannot be a state resulting from having lost fellowship with sin, is evident, in addition to reasons already given, from the comparison which is instituted between Christ and the Christian's dying unto sin. In the 8th verse of this chapter, we are said to have died with Christ, *Εἰ δὲ ἀπεθάναμεν σὺν Χριστῷ*; and this must be, with Christ, unto sin, as is indicated in the 2d, and the 10th, and the 11th verses; this being the same death that is there spoken of. Robinson, in his Lexicon, renders the word *σὺν*, in this verse, *with*, in the sense, not of companionship merely, but of likeness. That this is its meaning here, seems to be abundantly confirmed by the context. In the 5th verse, we are spoken of as being planted, together, in the *likeness* of Christ's death. In the 10th and 11th verses, a parallelism is strictly drawn between Christ's dying unto sin, and the Christian's: "For, in that he died, he died unto sin once;" "likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin." The word *οὕτως*, rendered "likewise," means, strictly, "in like manner," and this couples together Christ's dying unto sin and the Christian's.¹ It appears, then, that the parallelism between Christ's

¹ The leading idea of the parallelism between the passages joined by *οὕτως* lies between the impossibility, on the one hand, of a repetition of death on the part of Christ, and the consequent permanence of his life, and, on the other hand, of the same on the part of the Christian. The parallelism which we are now considering, and which is all we have occasion now to consider, is a subordinate one, or a subordinate portion of the general one. A fuller description of the whole will be given hereafter.

dying unto sin, and the Christian's, is based upon a certain likeness between them.

It is evident, now, that this parallelism will oblige us to set aside the interpretation at which we seemed to be arriving, namely, coming into a state resulting from having lost fellowship with sin. The same interpretation of the language in question, whatever it is, must be one which is applicable to Christ as well as the Christian. But though Christ might be said to *be* in a state of having no fellowship with sin; yet he cannot be said to have *come* into such a state.

In order, therefore, to decide upon the signification of this phraseology, we must ascertain the point or points of likeness here set forth between Christ and the Christian's dying unto sin. We have seen that it cannot be to lose fellowship with sin, since that is not applicable to Christ. Nor can it be to die unto sin, in the sense of atoning for it; since that does not apply to the Christian. Now it is to be observed that, in the original, no preposition is used between the verb and the noun, but the verb is followed, directly, by the dative case. By reference to the verb ἀποθνήσκω, in Robinson's Lexicon, we find the passage in the 10th verse, referring to Christ, rendered as a dying *for* sin, in the sense of *on account of*, representing sin as being the author or occasion of Christ's dying, the construction being that which grammarians call "*dativus causæ vel occasionis*." If this be the true signification of the passage in the 10th verse relating to Christ, then it must be also of that in the 11th verse relating to the Christian. And if this be so, then the same signification must also be attached to the 8th verse, in which both are combined; and not only so, but also to the 2d verse, in which the same death is spoken of in relation to the Christian alone.

If, now, this signification will furnish any real point or points of likeness, between Christ's dying unto sin and the Christian's, we shall think we have arrived at the true signification of the phraseology. We shall be constrained, at least, to prefer this to that which both Schleusner and Rob-

inson have given of the same phraseology in Rom. 6, 2, namely, to renounce sin, or to abandon fellowship with it; since, as we have seen, that is not at all applicable to the passages in the context. That the passage, in this sense, is applicable to Christ, is quite easy to see. None will deny that it was, at least, on account of sin that Christ died. That sin was the author, the occasion, of his dying, there can be no question. No doubt it was also the object, for the expiation of which he died; but we shall presently see that the argument of the chapter does not require the introduction of the idea of expiation, in the passages before us; while the parallelism instituted between Christ and the Christian's dying, does necessarily preclude it.

But the question now arises,—and this is the most important of all—When is it, and how does it appear, that the Christian experiences a dying with Christ, on account of sin? As to the first inquiry, When does this take place? we are informed, by the 8th verse, that it is when the person becomes a believer in Christ: “If we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him.” We are, then, to seek, in the conversion of the sinner, for a process which the Scriptures call a dying on account of sin; and not only so, but a dying, on account of sin, with Christ. Do the Scriptures recognize such a process? If we mistake not, it is that which is indicated in the seventh chapter of this same Epistle, where Paul says of himself: “I was alive without the law, once; but, when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died.” Here, in Paul's conversion, is what he calls a dying on account of sin; or, a death, of which sin was the author or occasion. He says, in the 5th verse: “When we were in the flesh, the motions of sin which were by the law,” that is, which were excited by his being brought into contrast with a pure and holy law, “did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death.” Also in the 11th verse: “Sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and slew me.”¹

¹ Gal. ii. 19: Ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, of which the common version is: “For I, through the law, am dead, to the law,” is doubtless to be explained

That this is a dying, also, with *Christ*, on account of sin, has been already shown from Rom. 6: 8, and 10, 11. As additional confirmation of this, we have clauses in Rom. 6: 4, 5, 6—"We are buried with him, by baptism, into death." "If we have been planted, together, in the likeness of his death." "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him." The argument of this chapter involves in it the statement that the dying on account of sin, which took place in Paul's conversion, was also a dying, on account of sin with Christ. In his Epistle to the Colossians (2: 20), Paul speaks of their having died with Christ, from the rudiments of the world; that is, of their having so died with him, as to become separated from the very first principles of the world's instruction. Now here is a dying with Christ, which must have taken place in conversion; and unless there are, in this, two dying processes, the one with Christ on account of sin, and the other with Christ, but not on account of sin, then this must be the same with that mentioned in the sixth of Romans, and hence a dying with Christ, on account of sin. 2 Tim. 2: 11 is doubtless a quotation, by the Apostle, from his own language in Rom. 6: 8. Gal. 2: 20—"I am crucified with Christ," is kindred. It must here be remembered that the dying with Christ is a dying in like manner with him, the chief point of likeness being, that the cause of dying, on the part of each, is the same, and hence the characteristics the same, except in those respects wherein the difference between the character of Christ and the Christian prevents.

This is the experience of every one, in the process of conversion. By the enlightening grace of God, the sinner, under conviction of sin, is aroused to a consciousness of the ruinous effects of sin upon him. Under the pangs of an enlightened conscience, he endures extreme suffering; he feels that he comes down to the very gates of death; he has a

in harmony with the above. For I have died on account of the law (*νόμου*), as the *instrumental* occasion (*διὰ νόμου*, adjunct of *νόμου*), the law being taken hold of by sin (sin taking occasion by the commandment or law,) which is the *prime* occasion or the cause of my dying.

foretaste of eternal death. He experiences a degree of that same kind of suffering that the lost soul will endure in hell. This is death entailed upon the soul by transgression. Before his consciousness of sin was aroused, he was, *in fact*, dead, on account of sin, equivalent to being dead in trespasses and sins; but it was not to *him* a reality, until his consciousness was awakened. When this takes place, it becomes real to him, and he dies. This dying of the sinner on account of sin, is also a dying *with Christ*, if, in the event, he becomes a believer in him.

And this is in the following manner. The sinner, in dying on account of sin, comes to an apprehension of the destructive powers of sin, in causing his own suffering and death, as well as that of Christ; and, in this sense, he feels that he suffers and dies, in like manner with Christ, the guilt, however, resting wholly on himself, an impressive representation of which is the actual physical as well as spiritual death of the penitent thief, hanging side by side with Christ, upon his cross. And not only does he feel that the cause of their suffering is the same; but, at this point, he is led to apprehend the expiatory nature of the death of Christ, and hence to a deep sympathy with and trust in it, as having power to save him from death; and so, in the last extreme of his suffering, he yields himself up, like the penitent thief, into the death of Christ, emphatically dying with him. His suffering on account of sin, runs parallel with the suffering of Christ, until they come to the point of dying, when the dying of the sinner becomes merged into the death of Christ, and its own progress on to eternal death is forever arrested.

This consciousness of the ruinous effects of sin, is that which will overtake every sinner, sooner or later, either in this world or in the next. Every one diseased by sin must die on account of it. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." It is a mortal disease, and is the cause of all the suffering and death which takes place in this world and the next. If this death take place in this world, in sympathy with, and trust in, the death of Christ, then may the sinner share with Christ in the victory which he has obtained over death.

But if he be not aroused to this painful consciousness of the destructive effects of sin upon him in this life, then must he in the next, when it will be an eternal death, and he alone must bear it.¹

This is the dying of the sinner with Christ, on account of sin. It is actual death, in the case of the Christian, as well as of Christ. If we apply, here, a definition of death, it will exhibit, more clearly, the parallelism between the dying of Christ and the Christian, on account of sin. Death is, simply, suffering of soul or body, carried to its last extreme. It is not annihilation of either, for this cannot be. Christ actually endured spiritual death (or, what we should prefer to say, if it were not liable to be misunderstood, death of soul) upon the cross, and so does the Christian.² In the case of each, there is suffering of soul, carried to its last extreme. In the case of Christ, it is suffering on account of the pressure upon him of the sins of the world; in the case of the sinner, on account of the pressure upon him of his own sins. There is no suffering like that arising from such a cause. Here it is carried to its last extreme, as the history of Christ, and Christian experience, abundantly prove.

But Christ had power, having laid down his life, to take it again. And hence if the sinner be planted together with Christ, in the likeness of his death, he may have a part in his victory over death; he may be planted in the likeness of his resurrection. With Christ, this was chiefly a spiritual resurrection, or resurrection of spirit or soul. His bodily death was not more severe than men have endured. He suffered, to the last extreme, in soul; and, in soul, he obtained the

¹ Olshausen says: "According to the law, the sinner must die; and even so he dies who is justified through Christ: only, in the dying of the old man, the new gets life."

² Although the view which Olshausen takes of the passages under consideration differs in the main from that here presented, yet upon this point he makes the following remark: "This idea of the faithful being dead, Paul carries through to verse 11, and that in such a manner as to regard the death of Christ not merely as a symbol of the death of the faithful, but as a *real event* in themselves, of which they are partakers, as they are also of his resurrection through faith." In his view, therefore, there is at least, in the conversion of the sinner, a real dying.

victory, or resurrection. And so it is with the sinner. His death is in soul chiefly, and so is his resurrection. This is the resurrection of which the Apostle speaks to the Colossians, when he says: "If ye be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above." It is that which is also spoken of under the figure of baptism: "Buried with him, in baptism;" that, like as he was raised up from the dead, so we also should [rise and] walk in newness of life."

It is in this manner that the mysterious union of the believer with Christ, is entered into. It is cemented in the grave—in the grave of the soul; whence the sinner grows up to a new life in Christ.

But the parallelism does not stop here. Christ's death was in body as well as in spirit; and so was his resurrection. The sinner, too, must endure death of body, on account of sin. If he endure it, having previously obtained a sympathy with and trust in Christ, as having endured bodily death also for him, on account of sin, then shall he, with him, obtain the victory over bodily death. He shall have a glorious bodily resurrection. This second physical death, like his former spiritual death, shall have no power over him; because, as he has had part with Christ in a former, spiritual resurrection, so he is also to have part with him in this, a second bodily resurrection. But he who has had no part in a spiritual resurrection in this life, shall have no part in the resurrection of a *new* and *glorious* body. On him death, that is, suffering carried to its last extreme, is entailed, in both soul and body, forever.

It would appear, from this, that the spiritual and physical resurrection are intimately related. They are the complement of each other: one marks the beginning, and the other the final completion of one and the same thing. The spiritual resurrection of soul, is begun here, to be completed not until the body itself shall have undergone a thorough renovation from sin, in the grave, and risen again with Christ a new and glorified body. The believer, in this life, is not fully risen with Christ. He is *said* to be risen with him, in the same sense in which he is said to be now saved. He

has simply come into a "safe" state, or a state in which he is to attain, ultimately, to a complete resurrection. So the unbeliever is said to be "dead in trespasses and sins," in the same sense in which he is said to be in a lost condition. Death in him, or the ruinous effect of sin, is not yet fully developed; but, unless its progress is arrested, it is certain to become so ere long; the chief difference between the present condition of the sinner, and his condition after he has passed the day of probation, being that now the progress of the destructive effect of sin upon him (which is death) can be arrested, but then it cannot.

It appears that the death of Christ is the great purifier of the bodies and souls of men. The poison of sin is so deeply inwrought, that it can be purged out of man only by a burial with him in the grave, or by a spiritual and physical death and resurrection, with him, from the power of the same. And not only of the bodies and souls of men. But because Christ has died and risen again, triumphantly, the heavens and the earth are to undergo a dissolution and reorganization, or a death and resurrection, or a regeneration, so as to constitute a new heavens and a new earth, for these renovated souls to dwell in. Their dissolution is, of course, on account of sin; their reorganization, on account of the victory of Christ over sin.

Returning now to the passages before us, let us see how this interpretation affects the argument in the context. Preliminary to this, however, there is another point of some importance which must be considered. In the 10th verse there is expressed an antithesis between Christ's dying unto sin and his living unto God: "For in that he died, he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God." A similar antithesis also follows in the 11th verse, in which the dying unto sin is applied to the Christian: "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God." Now, whatever interpretation we attach to the phraseology under consideration, it must not be such as to destroy these antitheses. How, then, does the proposed interpretation affect them? Evidently there must

exist the same relation between sin and the dying of Christ and the Christian, as exists between God and the living of Christ and the Christian. The same terms which express the one relation will express the other also.¹ Now, according to the proposed interpretation, the relation which exists between sin and the dying of Christ and the Christian is expressed by the phrase, "on account of." This represents sin as the author or occasion of the dying. Prof. Stuart, in commenting on this passage, remarks that the dative case, without a preposition, is often used to denote the author or occasion, and would adopt it here, were it not that he does not see how it can be applied to the second member of the antitheses. In consequence of this difficulty, therefore, he regards the dative here as being not the *dativus causae vel occasionis*, but the ordinary dative, the relation of which is expressed by "to" or "for," and supposes Christ's dying unto sin to mean his dying to diminish the power of sin, and his living unto God to mean his living to increase the power of God. Olshausen, on the 10th verse, says: "There is no difficulty in the first half of the verse. . . . In the second half, however, the ζῆ τῷ Θεῷ causes a difficulty, some antithesis being looked for to ἐφάπαξ, or at least to ἁμαρτία; but to neither does ζῆ τῷ Θεῷ seem to afford any. . . . The only tenable acceptance of the passage seems to many to be that of the Fathers. Chrysostom, and after him Theophylact, take τῷ Θεῷ as ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ Θεοῦ, that is, *through* God. Taken so, the idea, certainly, of eternal and imperishable life, which the context requires, comes clearly into view; for God it is who only hath immortality. But even so, there arises no antithesis to ἁμαρτία; and then, too, verse 11 does not come right, where ζῆν τῷ Θεῷ is said of men, and when, notwithstanding, it can have no other sense than verse 10. Accordingly, we can only say, that to live to God is the same as 'to live to righteousness,' namely, for

¹ The main point of the antithesis here exists between the idea of perpetual cessation implied in dying once for all, and that of perpetual continuance implied in living unto God. The point of antithesis before us now is a subordinate one, but not on that account less real. Its relation to the general antithetical thought in the passage will be stated more fully hereafter.

the purpose of furthering it among men, whereby this sense results: Christ died once for sin, that is, to extirpate it, and lives eternally for God, that is, to further righteousness." An anonymous writer says: "It is plain that Christ's and men's dying τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, must be very dissimilar. Paul delights in parallelisms which require much caution to interpret. It is plain that he considers the death of Christ as an expiation for sin; but no man has ever died for sin in this sense." On the 11th verse he says, we must "die as truly unto sin as he died for sin; live as truly unto God as he lives with God." The same interpretation is adopted by Dr. Adam Clarke. Beza also explains ζῆ τῷ Θεῷ by *apud Deum*. Another writer remarks, that the best interpreters, among whom he mentions Rosenmueller and Hoppe, render it, "unto the glory and honor of God," i. e., to fulfil his designs.

Now these interpretations, which, with only slight modifications, are adopted also by many other critics, do violence to the direct and simple form of the antithesis. The form of the antithesis is as follows: In that Christ died, he died unto, i. e., on account of, sin; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto, i. e., on account of, God. The terms *die* and *live* are indeed opposite in their nature, but they are not the terms between which the apostle designs to state an opposition here. Between these there is a necessary and acknowledged opposition, and hence he has no occasion to declare it. Taking, therefore, this necessary and acknowledged antithesis, he makes respecting each of its members a modifying statement; which statements are themselves antithetical, containing as they do antithetical terms, namely, *sin* and *God*. This modifying antithesis, however, is not independent of the necessary one above, but only develops it still further in the same direction; the modifying terms employed, on the one side and on the other, being harmonious with the terms which they modify, namely, *sin* with *dying*, and *God* with *living*. Now, between the originally opposite terms *die* and *live*, and their modifiers, which are kindred to each, but opposite to each other, we must have, in order to

preserve the direct and unique form of the general antithesis, relations which are not diverse, but precisely similar. These relations are each expressed by the dative case, and, according to the conclusions above, must be rendered by the same terms, although the datives themselves would not require it. This is in confirmation of a foregoing statement, that there exists between dying and sin the same relations that exist between living and God.

We have stated, that to a necessary and acknowledged antithesis between dying and living the apostle has appended a modifying antithesis, expressed by the terms *sin* and *God*. But this is not the main antithetical idea he designed to state; it is only a natural offshoot from it. The main antithetical idea is expressed by *ἐφάπαξ*, on the one hand, declaring a denial of all repetitions of Christ's dying, and is *implied*, on the other, in living unto, i. e., on account of, God, furnishing the inference of a perpetual living. In respect to the dying of Christ, the writer states that it was on account of sin, and not this chiefly, but that that dying was for once only. In respect to his living, he states that it is on account of God; but he does not add, that that living is forever, which is the leading point of the opposition of this member of the antithesis to the former, but leaves this to be inferred, as it must be, from the fact that his living is on account of God. That his dying, which was on account of sin, was not to be repeated, he needed to declare; but that his living, which is on account of God, is to be perpetual, he needed not to declare.

But the interpretation adopted by Stuart and others introduces another antithetical idea, expressed by the phraseology "to diminish the power of," and "to increase the power of," and others similar. Now, it is true that if the datives employed here are the ordinary datives, or the datives "*commodi et incommodi*," they will admit, in the interpretation, the introduction of the phrases which Stuart employs, and the kindred ones employed by others, in either or both of the members of the antithesis. But the objections to this interpretation are these:—1st, The rendering. In that

he died, he died to diminish the power of sin, once only. Giving too great prominence to the object of Christ's dying in the passage, impairs too much the emphasis which belongs to the word *once*, the most important term of all. 2ndly, It does violence to the simple form of the antithesis, by making the relation which exists between the terms *living* and *God* the opposite of that which exists between the terms *dying* and *sin*, whereas the unity of the general antithesis requires that it should be the same. Again: it is objected, that there being no antithesis of terms, and no antithetical relation of terms, which requires another antithetical thought, the mind is yet required to supply it. This is supposed to be necessitated by doctrinal exigencies. But if it can be shown that there are no doctrinal exigencies which require this, but that the same phraseology, namely, "on account of," will denote a suitable relation between the terms *living* and *God*, as well as between *dying* and *sin*, then the interpretation proposed will at least be preferable to those considered above.

But more than this. We think that a careful examination will show that this relation is not only a suitable one, but *the* one which is actually required by the Apostle's argument. If this be so, then the antithesis will be this: It is on account of sin that Christ died; but it is on account of God that he lives; that is, as sin was the cause of his dying, so God is the cause of his living. "Because we have testified of God, that he raised up Christ." The same, also, in application to the Christian. This phraseology, introduced into the second member of the antithesis, is not, it is true, so euphonious as in the first; but, if it be consistent with, and required by, the sense, then it ought not on that account to be rejected. In the original, however, no such want of euphony appears; and, even if it did, may we not conceive that the Apostle, in certain instances, for the sake of the antithesis, of which he seems especially fond, should sacrifice a slight want of euphony in one member or the other?

This leads us, now, to bring forward the Apostle's argument in the context, that we may see its bearing, not only

upon the antitheses before us, but also in connection with these upon the general exposition proposed. The object of the Apostle, in this chapter, is to show that, in the very nature of the case, it is inconsistent and absurd for a Christian to live in sin. The proposition is stated thus: "Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" The common interpretation of being dead or dying unto sin gives the Apostle's argument here this construction: How shall we, who have no fellowship with sin, live therein, or have fellowship with it, any longer? To this it might be answered, that this is not altogether impossible or absurd, for the affections of men do sometimes change. But the interpretation here offered seems to give to the Apostle's argument a force which is worthy of the author. The argument is this: How shall we, who have died on account of the sin which we have served, and risen again to a new life which is free from sin, reverse the current of this new life, and return through that dying process, and live again in sin, as before we became a Christian? In the nature of the case, it is absurd; such a thing was never known. As well might we expect Christ to reverse the current of his resurrection life, and return through the grave, and so expose himself to again suffering and dying on account of sin. Indeed, it is certain that unless he does so, then we cannot, for Christ is our life. "If we have died with Christ, we believe that we shall live *with him*." Our life is hid with Christ, and hence it becomes impossible that we should be anywhere where he is not. But it is not possible that he should go back, and be exposed to suffering any more the painful effects of sin; because we know that, being raised from the dead, he dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. "For in that he died, he died on account of sin once," and only once; but in that he liveth, he liveth on account of God, that is, on account of the sustaining power of God, just as it was on account of the destroying power of sin that he died. If it is in consequence of the power of God that the resurrection life of Christ is

now sustained, then it is certain that he can never have suffered death more than once on account of sin, and, moreover, that his resurrection life is an eternal one; for he who hath raised him from the dead is the ever-living God, and is able to keep him forever from the power of death. And if we, who have died and risen with Christ, shall, as we believe, also live with him, then we too shall live forever. The connection which we have with Christ, and, through him, with God, is a guarantee of our eternal life, and a proof of the inconsistency and absurdity of our ever again living in sin, or of being subjected to its death-working power.

This is the argument of the Apostle against the Christian's indulging in sin. It hinges upon the fact of his having died on account of it, and entered upon a new life with Christ, which is eternal, because sustained by the power of God. This seems to us to make the interpretation which we have given to the antithesis between Christ and the Christian's dying unto sin, and living unto God, not only apposite, but requisite (for we know of no other interpretation which will preserve the antithesis), and also forcibly to sustain the proposed exposition of the Scripture sentiment of dying unto sin with Christ, as found in the passages under consideration.

The argument of the chapter, thus understood, contains also the strongest proof of the doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints. It does this, too, while it acknowledges the practical necessity of the Christian's being stimulated by every possible motive to persevere in a holy life. The remainder of the chapter, commencing with the 12th verse, is employed in exhortations to this effect, in which is recognized the continued partial subjection of the believer, during this life, to still remaining sin.

It was remarked, in the early part of this Article, that the idea of expiation was not necessarily included in Christ's dying unto sin. Christ did die to expiate sin; but the idea is not aimed at, at all, in the argument of the chapter, while the comparison instituted between Christ and the Christian's

dying unto sin of necessity precludes it. It does not follow, however, that because the sufferings and death of the Christian run parallel with the sufferings and death of Christ, in one or more particulars, they do, therefore, in all others. There is in them none of that atoning merit which belongs to the sufferings and death of Christ. The sinner may suffer forever on account of sin, but unless, in his suffering, he fall into a spiritual sympathy with, and trust in, the expiatory sufferings and death of Christ, then his own suffering will avail him nothing. And this he does not do until his sufferings have been carried to the last extreme; until he dies; until he is planted together with Christ, in the likeness of his death. It is there that the atonement finds him, and brings him up to a new life. Hence, it appears that the sufferings and death of Christ are not a perfect substitute for all the suffering and death which are consequent upon sin; for if so, then there would be no suffering, on account of sin, by the sinner, in this life or in the next; nor would there be any suffering by the believer, on account of his still remaining sin. Christ is, however, a perfect substitute for the sinner, in that he removes from him the last extreme of the penalty of transgression, which is eternal death. Thus it is that "the righteous are scarcely saved." They suffer much, on account of sin; they even come down to the verge of eternal death, and are then raised up to a new and glorious life; while the finally impenitent are left to die forevermore.

It is believed that the interpretation here offered of dying unto sin, or of dying unto sin with Christ, will find an appropriate application to many or all of those passages in which such phraseology occurs, and also subserve the elucidation of many other passages in which the same thought resides, but clothed in other language. Such passages need not be cited here, as they are constantly meeting the eye in reading the sacred Scriptures.