

ARTICLE VII.

EXPOSITION OF 2 COR. V. 14.¹

BY. W. S. C. OTIS, ESQ., MEMBER OF THE BAR, CLEVELAND, O.

Do any of the translations of the New Testament correctly render the last clause of this verse, and is its meaning understood? A suggestion which calls in question the critical judgment of the great number of distinguished scholars who have taken part in translating the New Testament, and of the still greater number who have written commentaries thereon, may savor of egotism; still, the admitted grammatical and logical difficulties which surround all translations and explanations of this verse render the question a legitimate and proper one for examination. Notwithstanding a majority of the most distinguished modern commentators omit the conditional conjunction *ei, if*, which introduces the hypothetical period, we have, beyond all reasonable doubt, in the received text of the Greek Testament, the very words used by the Apostle Paul; and the question is: Do these translations convey the same meaning as Paul's words? If they do, then these translations are correct; if they do not, then these translations are erroneous, no matter when made, by whom made, or how generally received. The question is not a doctrinal one, but purely a question of interpretation, to be determined in the same manner as the disputed meaning of a statute, contract, or business letter which is made the subject of judicial investigation; that is, by the meaning of the individual words used by Paul, and by the requirements of the whole context or connection in which these words stand.

It is conceded, at the very outset of this investigation, that all translators have rendered the clause substantially in the

¹ "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead."

same manner, and that all commentators have accepted their translations as substantially correct; and that this weight of authority can be overcome only by the clearest grammatical and logical reasons against the correctness of the received versions. To treat the question fairly, it seems necessary to set forth these translations, and the explanations of the leading commentators thereon in their own language respectively, point out their errors, and then submit a better translation. Success in this matter is to be measured, not simply by pointing out the difficulties of the received translations, but by substituting a better translation in their place.

The verse, in the received text of the Greek Testament, reads as follows:

Ἡ γὰρ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ συνέχει ἡμᾶς, κρίναντας τοῦτο, ὅτι εἰ εἰς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον.

In the Vulgate version, translated from the old Italic versions, by Jerome, about the year 390, and which has been exclusively adopted by the Roman Catholic church, since the seventh century, the verse is rendered: "Charitas enim Christi urget nos; estimantes hoc, quoniam si unus pro omnibus mortuus est, ergo omnes mortui sunt."

In the Douay, or English Catholic Bible, adopted, with slight variations, from the Rheims version of the New Testament, translated in 1582, "out of the authentical Latin, according to the best corrected copies of the same," the verse is rendered: "For the charity of Christ presseth us; judging this, that if one died for all, then all were dead."

In the Authorized version, "translated," in 1611, "out of the original Greek, and with the former translations diligently compared and revised," the verse is rendered: "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead."

Without referring more particularly to any other translations of the New Testament, it is sufficient to say, that in all of them this verse is rendered substantially in the same way; and that all translations have, until recently, been generally supposed to teach the idea, as the doctrine of

Paul, that Christ died for all men *because* all men were dead. The interpretation adopted by the Fathers and Schoolmen was that Christ died for all men *because* all men were dead *in sin*; and this interpretation is still maintained by the Roman Catholic church and by a large number of Protestant commentators. But a more careful consideration of the verse has disclosed the fact that, while these translations apparently teach the doctrine that Christ died for all men *because* all men were dead, they logically, and therefore really, teach the doctrine that the *death* of all men was the result of the *death* of Christ *for* all men. And, therefore, the interpretation now adopted by a majority of Protestant commentators is, that all men, for whom Christ died, die *to sin* as the result of the *death* of Christ *for* all men. Now, although Christ died for the benefit of the race, and all the individuals of the race are, until renewed, dead *in sin*, and although all the individuals of the race, when renewed, are required to die *to sin*, still there is no logical connection whatever, as a condition and result, or as cause and effect, between the physical death of Christ and the metaphorical death of the race *in sin*, or the metaphorical death of the renewed *to sin*. Men were dead *in sin*, and men died *to sin*, before Christ died. Therefore the translators of Paul have failed to comprehend his meaning.

Since the time of Augustine, and his famous controversy with Pelagius, but more particularly within the last thirty-five years, the meaning of this verse has been the subject of repeated investigation. Commentators have wrestled with it to extract from it some meaning which should be consistent with the apparent or real idea contained in the received translations, the teachings of the other portions of the sacred scriptures, and the admitted natural and moral state of the race; but no result satisfactory to all has yet been reached. Men of equal learning and critical ability still come to different conclusions as to its true meaning.

Dunigan's Edition of Haydock's Catholic Family Bible, specially approved by the Pope and by all the Archbishops

and Bishops in America, and the commentaries of Archbishop Kendrick are regarded as the very highest authority among Catholics; while the commentaries and annotations of Olshausen, Conybeare and Howson, Dr. Bloomfield, Dean Alford, and Lange and his associates in his voluminous Bible-work, are regarded as the very highest authority among Protestants; and the respective views entertained by these distinguished scholars of the meaning of this verse, though not alike, may be safely accepted as the best considered expositions of the verse which have hitherto been published.

Haydock explains the meaning of the verse as follows: "*For the charity of Christ, the love of God, the love that Christ has shown to me and all mankind, and a return of love due to him, presseth me on* — is the motive of all that I do — because I consider that, *if one, our Redeemer Christ Jesus, died for all, then all were dead*, and had been lost in their sins, had not Christ come to redeem us. Thus Augustine, in many places, proving original sin against the Pelagians. Divers interpreters add this exposition: *Therefore all are dead*, that is, ought to die, and by a new life look upon themselves as dead to sin, which is connected with what follows in the next verse."

Archbishop Kendrick explains the verse as follows: "The lost state of the whole human family, and the universal character of the atonement of Christ, are here strongly expressed."

Olshausen explains the meaning of the verse as follows: "Therefore the love of Christ (i.e. not love toward Christ, but that which he bears within himself, and imparts to his people) is, as it were, the *destruction* of all those belonging to him; since he died for all, therefore all (who accept him) likewise die for him, i.e. they are annihilated in their independent existence; they live no longer for themselves, but for Christ. The only difficulty existing here is in the fact (apart from the idea of substitution, already considered at Rom. v. 12) that v. 14 says precisely, *ἀπα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον*, *then did all die*, which makes the death of all appear the necessary consequence of the death of the substitute for all;

while in v. 15, the ἀπέθανεν ἡμεῖς, κ.τ.λ. represents the death of all as an act depending on their own pleasure, to wit, how they should believe. The difficulty may be thus explained: Without the death of Christ, absolutely none would be in a condition to die to himself, for that is possible only by entering into and appropriating his life of love; but man may always hinder, by his resistance, the power of Christ, 'which kills, and at the same time makes alive,' from perfecting his work in him. From this obstructing resistance the fifteenth verse is intended to withhold the Corinthians. Before Christ's death it was a subject of reproof to no man that he lived to himself, but after Christ's death it was a crime in all those to whom the word of the cross had come. In this manner a strict connection is visible with v. 16. (In ἐξέστημεν, excess and exaggeration, in this connection, of praise, are represented as the expression of an ἑκστασις or μανία. Chrysostom well elucidates συνέχει, constrains, of v. 14, by ἡ ἀγάπη οὐκ ἀφήσῃ ἡσυχάζειν με, love does not permit me to rest. See Acts xviii. 5. The εἰ is wanting in B, C, D, E, F, G, and is justly omitted by Lachmann; it is only introduced to join the ἄρα more easily, and also, probably, in order to remove the apparent pleonasm with v. 15. But the hypothetical conception of the substitution is perfectly untenable; the idea applies to no one except Christ, who only, as the second Adam, could be a substitute for the whole human race. The ὑπέρ plainly stands here = ἀντί, for only upon this supposition does the ἄρα κ.τ.λ. acquire significance. See on Matt. xx. 28.)"

Conybeare and Howson, the authors of the admirable "Life and Epistles of Paul," in a note on this verse, say: "Οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον cannot mean *all were dead* (A. V.), but *all died*." They render the verse as follows: "For the love of Christ constrains me, because I thus judge, that if one died for all, then his death was their death."

Doctor Bloomfield, in the ninth edition of his Greek Testament with English Notes, remarks as follows: "As respects the words ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον, on carefully reconsidering

what has been urged by Professor Scholef against the common version, 'then were all dead,' I admit the force of his objections; but I would render not, with the Professor, 'then all died,' but, with Dr. Peile, 'then did all these die,' viz. 'whose substitute he was'; in other words, 'were in no better condition than dead men.' See Rom. xii. 19; Eph. ii. 1, 3, 5."

Dean Alford, in the fourth edition of his Greek Testament, explains the meaning of the verse as follows: "*Κρίναντας τοῦτο*, because we formed this judgment (viz. at our conversion:—learned to regard this as a settled truth) that one died on behalf of all (not only, for the benefit of all, as Meyer,—but *instead* of all, suffered death in the root and essence of our humanity, as the second Adam. This death on behalf of *all men* is the absolute objective fact: that *all* enter not into the benefit of that Death is owing to the non-fulfilment of the subjective condition which follows)—therefore all died (i.e. therefore, in the death of Christ, *all, the all* for whom He died, *οἱ πάντες, died too*), i.e. see below, because planted in the likeness of His death, died to sin and to self, that they might live to him. This was true *objectively*, but not *subjectively*, till such death to sin and self is realized in each: See Rom. vi. 8, ff. 7. The other renderings—*ought to die*, as Thomas Aquinas, Grotius, Estius, and others; *were under sentence of death*, as Chrysostom, Theodoret, Beza, and others; *as good as died*, Flatt—are shown to be erroneous by carefully noticing the construction with or without *εἰ*. The *verb* is common to both members of the sentence; the correspondent emphatic words in the two members being (1) *εἰς ὑπὲρ πάντων*; (2) *πάντες*; (One on behalf of all) died, (*all*) died: if *One* died the death of (belonging to, due from) *all*, then *all* died (in and with him). Meyer's rendering of *ὅτι, because*, can hardly be right, as it would leave *κρίναντας τοῦτο* standing awkwardly alone."

Lange, in his commentaries, edited by Dr. Schaff, explains the meaning of the verse as follows: "When the Apostle

adds 'we having formed this judgment,' he introduces the subjective cause of that influence which the love of Christ has over him. That love has led him to form this judgment, i.e. had brought him to this conclusion, to this conviction. Whether this judgment was reached at the time of his conversion (Meyer), or whether the whole meaning of the death of Christ became thus clear to his apprehension at some later period of his life (Oslander), may be left undetermined. Neander remarks that 'the aorist was here used because Paul intended to speak of something which happened once upon a time. He means, that ever since he became conscious of the saving love of Christ, a new principle has entered his heart.' The substance of this conviction, or, rather, of the judgment then formed, was:—that One died for all, and so all died. If we accept the reading of the Receptus, which gives us *εἰ* after *ὅτι*, we must regard *ὅτι ἄρα . . . ἀπέθανον* as belonging together; that (if one died for all) then all died. The hypothetical sentence, however, could have been only formally problematical, since what is there expressed must have been really certain to the Apostle. But if the *εἰ* be left out, *ὅτι* is either equivalent to *because*, and so introduces the antecedent of a proposition (Meyer); or it is in this instance equivalent to *that*, and both clauses depend upon it, i.e. 'we have judged that One died for all, and that all died' (Oslander). *Τοῦτο* appears to favor this latter supposition ('we judged this, that,' etc.). One thing, however, which would go far to determine us in favor of the causal signification is, that it brings out more prominently the *οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον*, as the proper substance of the judgment to which the Apostle says in the context he had come ('judged this, that One died for all, and so all died'). And yet the whole force of the sentence seems to require that *ὅτι*; in the sense of *that*, should be made to govern both clauses of it. The logical relation, however, would be destroyed, if we thus bring in an independent conclusion by means of *ἄρα*. The inference which the Apostle makes from the proposition that One died for all, argues strongly in favor of its judicially vicarious

signification. One was in the place of all ; therefore all must be looked upon as dead ; one has made expiation for the offence of all ; therefore all are to be looked upon as having suffered punishment.”

Before examining in detail the foregoing opinions and arguments of these commentators, we wish to say, generally, that Paul might speak of the death of Christ, and yet not make, or intend to make, any reference whatever to the atoning character of his death, or to the fallen state of mankind ; and, also, that he might use the aorist participle to declare that he had already formed an opinion upon the subject which he was then discussing, and yet not make, or intend to make, any reference whatever to the time of his conversion as the date of that opinion. If there be nothing in the words used by Paul, or in the connection in which they stand, to show such reference, it is mere assumption on the part of his commentators to put any such construction upon them. Whoever shall claim such reference must establish it by some affirmative evidence ; and until such affirmative evidence shall be produced, a mere denial of such reference is sufficient. All such reference here is denied. And we wish to say, further, that, unless the word *ei, if*, be retained, the last clause of the verse cannot be intelligibly translated.

It is understood that the learned divines of the Roman Catholic church regard the Vulgate version of the Greek Testament as of equal authority with the original text ; and it will be observed that both Haydock and Archbishop Kendrick tacitly admit the verse to be correctly translated, and that neither of them make any reference to the Greek text in order to determine or illustrate its meaning.

Haydock gives two explanations of the meaning of the last clause of the verse : one, the old interpretations of the Fathers and Schoolmen, that Christ died for all men, *because* all were dead *in sin* ; the other, the recent interpretation, that men die *to sin* as the *result* of Christ's death. These two explanations are so widely different from each other that only one of them can possibly be correct ; and both of

them may be erroneous. It is a sufficient answer to the first explanation to say that neither Paul nor any of his translators use any such language, nor will the language which they do use bear any such interpretation. And it ought to be a sufficient answer to the second explanation, to say that men died to sin before Christ's death, and therefore death to sin cannot be the result of His death.

Archbishop Kendrick gives no critical explanation of the meaning of this clause; but contents himself with saying that it strongly expresses the lost state of the whole human family, and the universal character of the atonement of Christ. But it does not express either. It does not even assert the existence of any fact. The phrase "that if One died for all, then all were dead," is a mere hypothetical statement; and a hypothetical statement proves nothing until it ceases to be an hypothesis by becoming established as a reality.

Olshausen, it will be observed, undertakes to establish the meaning of this clause by a syllogism. He first lays down the proposition that the love of Christ is, as it were, the *destruction* of all who are Christ's; he then lays down the further proposition, that all who accept Christ are annihilated in their independent existence; and from these premises he forthwith draws the conclusion that all who live for Christ are *οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον*, *dead men*. Substituting these supposed equivalent words of Olshausen for the words of Paul, and omitting *εἰ, if*, as Olshausen does, the verse will read: "For the love of Christ, as it were, destroys us; because we judge this, that Christ died for all, therefore all who live for Christ are dead." A syllogistic argument, however specious, which terminates in such a palpable absurdity, must necessarily be founded upon false premises. The idea which Olshausen supposes to have been in Paul's mind, and the idea which was actually in Paul's mind at the time, are the very opposite of each other. Olshausen supposes Paul's meaning to be, that if any man live for Christ, that is, be in Christ, he is a dead man; whereas, Paul himself says, in

the seventeenth verse of the same chapter, that if any man be in Christ, he is, not a *dead man*, but a *new creature*. The words of Paul have no such meaning, and convey no such idea, as the words of Olshausen. To die, is a physical act; it is to pass from an animate to a lifeless state; it is precisely what Christ did; and the verb *ἀπέθανεν* describes this act of Christ. To die *to sin*, is a moral act; it is to pass from that state of moral infirmity in which our selfish and sinful propensities have dominion over us, to that state of moral likeness to Christ in which they have no longer dominion over us; it is, to all the subjects of it, the commencement of an eternal life; and the verb *ἀπέθανον* does not describe this act, either in its inception, progress, or consummation.

But there is another still more serious objection to the exposition of Olshausen. As a supplemental argument, in favor of his construction of the words *οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον*, he says that "before Christ's death it was a subject of reproof to no man that he lived to himself." To live to one's self is to follow one's selfish pleasures, passions, and interests as the paramount good, regardless of the claims of God and the rights of men. Cain, when he slew his brother, David, when he was compassing the dishonor and death of Uriah, and Ahab and Jezebel, when causing the murder of Naboth under the forms of a judicial trial, that they might possess themselves of his vineyard, were all living to themselves; and, though Christ had not then died, both reproof and punishment speedily followed their crimes. These cases are mentioned, not because they are exceptional ones, but because they furnish pertinent and indisputable evidence of the fact that both the Old Testament and the New bear the same testimony against all who live to themselves.

Conybeare and Howson hold the clause to mean, and so render it, that if One died for all, then his death was their death. This exposition is more erroneous, if an absolute error will admit of degrees of comparison, than the exposition of Olshausen; for we know that neither in a literal

nor metaphorical sense did the death of *all* follow the death of Christ, as the result of it.

Doctor Bloomfield says that the words *ἀρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον* read: "then did all those die," which he expands into the phrase, as expressive of the meaning of Paul: "then all those whose substitute he was were in no better condition than dead men." As Doctor Bloomfield retains *εἰ, if*, the logical meaning of his statement is, not that Christ died for all *because* all whose substitute he was were in no better condition than dead men before or at the time of his death, but that all whose substitute he was were in no better condition than dead men after his death, and as the result of it. This interpretation of Doctor Bloomfield naturally suggests three questions, the mere statement of which are so many convincing arguments that his interpretation is wrong, and upon which we propose to rest our objections to it: 1. If Paul said precisely, "then did all those die," did he mean that "all those" did *not* die, but only that "all those" were in no better condition than dead men? 2. If those whose substitute Christ was were in no better condition than dead men after his death, and as the result of it, wherein did the condition of those whose substitute he was, and of those whose substitute he was not, differ? 3. If, after the death of Christ, and as the result of it, all those whose substitute he was were still in no better condition than dead men, what benefit accrued to them from his death?

Dean Alford expands the few plain words of Paul into the following sentence: "Because, at the time of our conversion, we learned to regard this as a settled truth, that One suffered death instead of all, in the root and essence of our humanity, as the second Adam, therefore in the death of Christ the all for whom he died, died to sin and self *objectively*, but not *subjectively* till such death to sin and self is realized in each." It is a sufficient answer to this forced and fanciful exposition of Dean Alford, to say that the words of Paul have no such meaning as he strives to impose upon them, and that, if Paul said what he intended

to say, he had no such thought in his mind at the time as Dean Alford attributes to him. In this exposition, Dean Alford is right in one particular, and in one particular only, which is, that, although he omits *εἰ, ἵf*, he makes *οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον*, whatever may be the meaning of the phrase, a consequence or result of the death of Christ. In all other particulars he is wrong.

Lange rejects *εἰ*, and so translates the verse as to make Paul say that the love of Christ had brought him to the conclusion that One died for all, and so all died; and, by drawing one inference from another, he finally arrives at the following result, as the meaning of Paul, viz. One has made expiation for the offence of all, therefore all are *looked upon* as having suffered punishment. Such a proposition requires no confutation: the mere statement of the proposition carries with it its own refutation. The difference between this exposition of Lange and the foregoing expositions is one of degree merely, and consists chiefly in this, that Lange has misconceived the meaning of the entire verse — its beginning, middle, and end — while these other commentators have only misconceived the meaning of the phrase *ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον*.

These words of Paul can have but one true meaning; and it is evident, from the different results to which all these commentators have come, their illogical and unsatisfactory arguments, and the arbitrary course pursued by them all in construing the words of Paul, that they also have failed to comprehend his meaning. Indeed, we know of no commentator, from the time of Augustine to the present, who has comprehended it. All commentators, so far as we know, have mainly held the meaning of Paul to be, either that Christ died for all men *because* all men were dead in sin *before* his death, or that all men for whom Christ died die to sin *after* his death, and as the result of it. And, although there is no conclusive evidence of the fact, there is some reason to suppose that the former of these meanings was attributed to these words of Paul as early as the second century.

The question naturally arises, How came this interpretation, if erroneous, to be adopted so early, and finally to obtain such universal recognition? The answer is, that the early Fathers, under the influence of the spirit of the age in which they lived, were accustomed to look for some secret or mystical meaning in the words of scripture lurking beneath their natural signification; and in this particular verse they supposed the words of Paul to have reference to original sin and the atonement of Christ, and they interpreted them, not according to their obvious and natural signification, but according to their supposed mystical meaning. In this these early Fathers have been implicitly followed by all subsequent translators and commentators; and so these words of Paul have been blindly subjected, through a period of fifteen hundred years, at least, to gross misconstruction, in order to extract from them a meaning which grammatically they cannot bear, and which they never were intended to convey. The movements of a door, swinging backwards and forwards upon its hinges, without making one particle of advance, is not an inapt illustration of the course and result of the critical investigations upon this verse during all this period of time.

The question now recurs: What was the precise thought in the mind of Paul when he wrote these words, and which he intended thereby to express? The only true and satisfactory way to ascertain this is to refer, first, to the natural signification of the words themselves, and to their grammatical structure and arrangement; and secondly, to the requirements of the argument of which these words form a part.

If the words thus fairly and reasonably interpreted convey a definite meaning, and this meaning corresponds with the requirements of the context, then the meaning apparent on the face of the words, and this meaning alone, must be held to be the true meaning of Paul.

The first clause of the verse has always been translated with substantial correctness. The whole difficulty has arisen from the translation of the last clause, and the interpretation given to this translation.

What is the natural signification of the principal words of the verse, which admit of more than one signification, and which determine its meaning?

Συνέχει is from the verb *συνέχω*, which means, *to hold fast, seize, grasp, urge, possess*, and embraces the idea of irresistible power. The verb is used by Paul in only one other instance (Phil. i. 2, 8), and is rendered: "For I *am in a strait betwixt two.*" In the translation of Wiclif, it is rendered by the word "driveth"; in the translations of Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva, and in our Authorized version, it is rendered by the word "constraineth"; and in the Rheims translation, it is rendered by the word "urgeth." It means, in the connection in which it stands, to urge with irresistible power, which was also the meaning of the word "constraineth" when the Bible was translated into English.

Κρίναντας is the aorist participle, from the verb *κρίνω*, which means *to judge, resolve, decide*, and embraces the idea of deliberation and careful thought.

Ἰνέπ, with a genitive — *ὑπὲρ πάντων* — generally signifies *for*, and in this connection means, *for the benefit of all*, and not, *instead of all*.

Ἀπέθανεν and *ἀπέθανον* are from the verb *ἀποθνήσκω*, which means *to die — to pass from an animate to a lifeless state*. And, as both these words are in the same mode, tense, and person, and differ only in number, they must be translated in like manner. It is not allowable to translate these words in any other way. If *ἀπέθανεν* describes physical death, *ἀπέθανον* must describe physical death also. Moreover, as the death of the One was voluntary, in order that the parallel which was evidently in the mind of Paul should be complete, the death of the *οἱ πάντες* should be voluntary also.

The demonstrative pronoun *οἱ*, *these*, prefixed to *πάντες*, *all*, which all the translators, except Beza, have failed to render, and the force of which the commentators have failed clearly to see, bears an important part in determining the true meaning of Paul. The word *οἱ*, *these*, is used in a

restrictive sense. It restricts the *all* from the *all* of the race, as previously used, to the *all* of a particular class. The persons who compose this class must be those who have become renewed through the death of the One. It is wholly unreasonable and illogical to suppose that those who are ignorant of, or who feel no interest in, this death can be induced to make any sacrifices on account thereof.

The sentence *ὅτι εἰ εἰς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον* is a definitive appositive sentence, which definitely expresses what the preceding word *τοῦτο* vaguely indicates. It is also a compound sentence, consisting of a *principal* and of a *dependent* clause. *Εἰ εἰς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν* is the *dependent* clause; *ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον* is the *principal* clause. The former clause assumes something as a *condition*, from which the latter follows as a *conclusion* or *result*. That which is assumed as a condition in this sentence is, that One died for all; that which follows as a conclusion or result is, that these all came under obligation to die, that is, should die. The condition assumed is a simple supposition, without any affirmation of its reality in this sentence, but affirmed to be a reality in the very first sentence of the following verse. If any one shall still be of the opinion that the phrase *ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον* should be translated, with Olshausen, *then did all die*; or, with Conybeare and Howson, *then all died*; or, with Doctor Bloomfield, *then did all those die*; or, with Dean Alford, *therefore all died*; or, with Lange, *and so all died*, because *ἀπέθανον* is in the second aorist tense, which represents the action as done, instead of translating it, *then these all came under obligation to die*, or by its precisely equivalent term, *then these all should die*, a complete and satisfactory answer thereto, is to be found in almost every Greek grammar, which is, that a future action, in view of its *nearness*, its *certainty*, its *rapidity*, or its *connection with another action*, may be conceived of as *now doing*, or even as *already done*, and may be expressed in the Greek by the present, aorist, or perfect tense. Hence, though the obligation of these all to die, as the result of

their renewal through the death of the One, is future thereto, yet, in the opinion of Paul, this obligation is so intimately connected with their renewal through the death of the One, and its consummation ought so certainly and speedily to follow their renewal, that in speaking of these all upon whom the obligation had come, he makes use of a tense which represents them as having already suffered the consummation of this obligation.

But in this instance the argument does not rest upon the natural signification and the grammatical arrangement of the words of the fourteenth verse alone. In the fifteenth verse Paul restates the result which ought to follow from the death of the One for the benefit of all; and the difference between the statement in the fourteenth verse and the statement in the fifteenth verse is simply the difference between the literal and the rhetorical statement of the same deduction from the same fact. *Oi πάντες*, *these all*, in the fourteenth verse, are described as *the living*, in the fifteenth verse, that is, those who have experienced the benefit of the death of the One by becoming renewed thereby; while *ἀπέθανον*, in the fourteenth verse, is defined to mean, in the fifteenth verse, that these should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who died and rose from the dead for them. And when it is remembered that to live unto Christ in the days of primitive Christianity always involved sacrifices, sufferings, perils, persecutions, and oftentimes tortures and death, it must be conceded that the meaning of the two phrases is the same, and that the latter explains and defines the former.

The grammatical construction of the sentence, then, is, that if One died for all, then these all should die; or, in other words, that if One died for all, then all those who have experienced the benefit of his death should die. The sentence is susceptible of no other grammatical translation or meaning. And the whole verse would then read: "For the love of Christ urges me with irresistible power, having deliberately come to the conclusion, that if One died for all, then all those who have experienced the benefit of his death should die." The

only things omitted are the course or object to which the love of Christ urged Paul with irresistible power, and the object or purpose for which *these all* should die. But Paul was a rapid thinker, and he oftentimes passed from his premises to his conclusions without stating all of his intermediate steps: and hence we naturally look for verbal omissions in his language. These ellipses do, in fact, so frequently occur from this cause, that they may be said to constitute one of the characteristics of Paul's style.

Having ascertained the grammatical meaning of the verse, it now remains to ascertain the logical meaning of it.

Paul was constitutionally a man of ardent and imaginative zeal; and his natural enthusiasm was intensified to the very highest degree by the miraculous manner of his conversion and call. Thenceforth there was no labor which he was not prepared to undertake, no persecution which he was not ready to suffer, no danger which he was not willing to encounter, that he might communicate the knowledge of eternal life — “*the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus*” — to a perishing world. The conversion of men is emphatically the cause of God, which has engaged his love and sympathy from the foundation of the world, and for which, in the fulness of time, he gave his only-begotten and dearly beloved Son; and for this cause Paul labored with a love second only to that of Christ, more abundantly than all. In his own graphic and heart-stirring description, ‘the life which he lived in the flesh he lived by the faith of the Son of God, who loved him and gave himself for him. Hard pressed, yet not crushed; helpless, yet not hopeless; persecuted, yet not forsaken; cast down, yet not destroyed; looking not to things seen, but to things unseen’; with his love, his hope, his faith, his zeal renewed day by day, he discharged the ministry of reconciliation committed to him, amidst discouraging trials, exhausting labors, and at the frequent peril of his life. To the frivolous, pantheistic Greek, to the formalistic Jew, to the half-developed Christian living amidst the influences of his old religion and only partially emanci-

pated therefrom, the motives to such a life as that of Paul were utterly incomprehensible; and they all alike regarded him as a mad religious enthusiast. This was the obvious and popular and, in the estimation of the world, the most vulnerable point of attack upon Paul's character and influence. It was one of the points which the false teachers and the false brethren of the Corinthian church, who wished to destroy his apostolic character and overthrow his religious teachings, would be likely to make against him; for contempt and ridicule are always regarded by the unthinking and unscrupulous as the most powerful and destructive weapons of offence. It was, in fact, one of the points which they did make against him for that purpose, as this letter to the Corinthians clearly shows. In the general vindication of his character and conduct, to which this letter is in part devoted, Paul felt it to be his duty to meet and refute this particular charge. And he did meet and refute it, in the true Pauline style. Instead of denying, or even palliating, the acts upon which they based their charge, he claimed that these acts sprung from the most disinterested love for the Corinthians themselves; and, in a few fervid words, he demonstrated that the conduct which his enemies denounced as fanatical was a rule of Christian action of universal obligation. There is not a more eloquent passage in the whole compass of Paul's writings than the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth verses, which constitute the pith of his reply to their charge: *Εἶτε γὰρ ἐξέστημεν, Θεῷ· εἶτε σωφρονούμεν, ὑμῖν. Ἡ γὰρ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ συνέχει ἡμᾶς, κρίναντας τοῦτο, ὅτι εἰ εἰς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἵνα οἱ ζῶντες μηκέτι ἑαυτοῖς ζῶσιν, ἀλλὰ τῷ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀποθανόντι καὶ ἐγερθέντι.* As Paul is speaking of himself alone, the singular pronoun and verb should be substituted for the plural; and the passage, translated as literally as the idiom of our language will permit, will read: "For if I be mad, it is for God's sake, or if I be of sound mind, it is for yours; for the love of Christ urges me with irresistible power, having deliberately come to the conclusion

that if One died for all, then these all should die; and he died for all, that the living should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who died and rose from the dead for them."

A paraphrase, which shall fully express the whole idea in Paul's mind, and be both a translation and commentary, will read: "For if I be a mad enthusiast in my efforts for your salvation, it is for God's sake, who takes the deepest interest therein; or if my efforts be only such as the subject demands, they spring from my interest in you; for the love of Christ urges me to this course with irresistible power, having deliberately come to the conclusion that if One died for the benefit of all, then all who have experienced the benefit of his death should die, if need be, to bring to others the knowledge of that death; and he died for the benefit of all, that those who have experienced the benefit of his death should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who died and rose from the dead for them."

It thus appears that the logical argument perfectly coincides with the grammatical argument; and when such is the case the translation must be correct; for it is a rule of interpretation no less applicable to sacred than to secular writings, that, where the words are clear and precise in their terms, and the grammatical structure and arrangement of the words and the requirements of the context agree, and lead to no absurd conclusion, the meaning which such words naturally present must be held to be the meaning of the author.

The Apostle John gives expression to a sentiment similar to this of Paul (1 John iii. 16),¹ but not so catholic and comprehensive. John teaches that Christians should lay down their lives for the brethren. Paul teaches that Christians should lay down their lives for those who are not brethren, in order that they may make them brethren. When this exalted teaching of Paul, which has been so long

¹ "Hereby perceive we the love of God; because he laid down his life for us; and we ought to lay down *our* lives for the brethren."

hidden from the world, shall become known to Christians, and shall be heartily adopted by them as a rule of Christian action, then will the church of Christ bear palms of victory, through conquering love, over the whole earth; then will there be "great voices in heaven, saying, **THE KINGDOMS OF THIS WORLD ARE BECOME THE KINGDOMS OF OUR LORD AND OF HIS CHRIST.**"