

THE OLD MAN AND THE NEW MAN  
A STUDY IN PAULINE THEOLOGY

---

A DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED TO  
THE DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY  
AND RELIGIOUS STUDIES  
UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

---

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

---

BY

© JOHN D. GRASSMICK  
JANUARY 2000

## THESIS ABSTRACT

### The Old Man and the New Man A Study in Pauline Theology

The purpose of this thesis is to investigate the meaning and function of the "old man / new man" metaphor in the theology of the Apostle Paul. The method chosen for this investigation is an exegetical study of the four passages in the *corpus Paulinum* of the New Testament where one or both of these designations occur.

Chapter one sets the context for this study by addressing five issues: 1) the authenticity of Colossians and Ephesians as primary sources; 2) relevant facets of Pauline theology as the setting for the study; 3) the origin and background of this dual metaphor; 4) various views of the meaning of this metaphor; and 5) the key questions that need to be resolved in the interpretation of this metaphor. Chapter two investigates the crucifixion of "our old man" with Christ in Romans 6:1-14. Chapter three discusses the creation of the "one new man" in Ephesians 2:14-18. Chapters four and five deal with the formulations "put off the old man" and "put on the new man" in Colossians 3:5-11 and Ephesians 4:17-24 respectively. Chapter six draws conclusions on the meaning and function of this dual metaphor in Paul's theology and relates it to his use of the "outer / inner man," the "natural / spiritual man," the "flesh," and the role of the indicative and imperative in his ethics.

We conclude that Paul himself formulated the "old man / new man" terminology by drawing on the Adam / Christ typology within his own redemptive-historical, eschatological perspective. This metaphor fits his "once / now" motif and functions at two levels. On the corporate level, the "old man" is the world of unredeemed humanity in solidarity with Adam, the prototypical "old man," and the "new man" is the Church, the world-wide community of redeemed humanity in solidarity with Christ, the prototypical "new man." At this level the "old man / new man" coexist in redemptive history. On the individual level, the "old man" is the person who is identified with Adam and belongs to "the present age," and the "new man" is the Christian who is identified with Christ and belongs to "the age to come" that, "in Christ," has now begun. At conversion-initiation, the Christian "put off the old man" and "put on the new man" and now as a "new man" he / she is being progressively renewed in the knowledge of God and his ways.

## Author's Declaration

I affirm that this thesis is entirely my own work and that all significant quotations have been properly acknowledged in the footnotes. No part of this thesis has been submitted previously for consideration for any degree.

Signed: John D. Brassnick  
Date: January 20, 2000

# CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS ..... vi

## Chapter

1.	INTRODUCTION: THE CONTEXT OF THIS STUDY .....	1
1.1	Authenticity of New Testament Sources .....	5
1.2	Relevant Aspects of Pauline Theology .....	22
1.3	Background of the "Old Man / New Man" .....	42
1.4	Views on the Meaning of the "Old Man / New Man" .....	52
1.5	Key Questions and Method of Approach .....	60
2.	ROMANS 6:6—OUR OLD MAN CRUCIFIED .....	64
2.1	Historical Setting of Romans .....	64
2.2	Literary Context of Romans 6 .....	65
2.3	Structural Form of Romans 6:1-14 .....	73
2.4	Exegesis of Romans 6:1-14 .....	76
2.5	Concluding Observations on "Our Old Man" .....	140
3.	EPHESIANS 2:15—ONE NEW MAN CREATED .....	145
3.1	Historical Setting of Ephesians .....	145
3.2	Literary Context of Ephesians 2 .....	146
3.3	Structural Form of Ephesians 2:11-22 .....	148
3.4	Background and Form of Ephesians 2:14-18 .....	152
3.5	Exegesis of Ephesians 2:14-18 .....	160
3.6	Concluding Observations on the "One New Man" .....	190

4.	COLOSSIANS 3:9-11 — THE OLD MAN PUT OFF THE NEW MAN PUT ON .....	193
4.1	Historical Setting of Colossians .....	193
4.2	Literary Context of Colossians 3 .....	196
4.3	Structural Form of Colossians 3:1-11 .....	198
4.4	Exegesis of Colossians 3:5-11 .....	200
4.5	Concluding Observations on the "Old Man / New Man" .....	243
5.	EPHESIANS 4:22-24 — THE OLD MAN PUT OFF THE NEW MAN PUT ON .....	247
5.1	Literary Context of Ephesians 4 .....	247
5.2	Structural Form of Ephesians 4:17-24 .....	248
5.3	Exegesis of Ephesians 4:20-24 .....	256
5.4	Concluding Observations on the "Old Man / New Man" .....	286
6.	CONCLUSION: THE OLD MAN / NEW MAN IN PAUL .....	289
6.1	Setting in Paul's Theology .....	289
6.2	The "Old Man / New Man" in Paul's Theology .....	293
6.3	Relationship to Other Pauline <i>ἄνθρωπος</i> Themes .....	301
6.4	Indicative and Imperative in Paul's Theology .....	316
6.5	Summary of the Argument .....	324
	BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	325

## TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

### Journals, Reference Works, Series, and Others

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	D. N. Freedman, ed., <i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> , 6 vols.
ABR	<i>Australian Biblical Review</i>
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
AC	<i>Acta Classica</i>
ACNT	Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
ANF	A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, eds., <i>Ante-Nicene Fathers</i> , 10 vols.
ANRW	H. Temporini and W. Haase, eds., <i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i>
ANS	Auslegung Neutestamentlicher Schriften
ARSHLL	Acta Reg. Societatis Humanorum Litterarum Lundensis
AsbSem	<i>Asbury Semarian</i>
ASNU	Acta seminarii neotestamentici upsaliensis
AsSeign	<i>Assemblées du Seigneur</i>
ASV	<i>American Standard Version</i> of the Bible
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
AThJ	<i>Ashland Theological Journal</i>
AThR	<i>Anglican Theological Review</i>
AUSS	<i>Andrews University Seminary Studies</i>
AV	Authorized Version = KJV
BAGD	W. Bauer, W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, and F. Danker, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> , 2nd rev. ed.
<i>BanT</i>	<i>Banner of Truth</i>
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BBR	W. E. Mills, ed., <i>Bibliographies for Biblical Research</i> , 7 vols. to date
BCE	Before the Christian era
BDB	F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i>
BDF	F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament</i>
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BETS	<i>Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
BEvT	Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie
BGBE	Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese
BGC	Berlin Gnostic Codex
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
<i>BibSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
<i>BiTr</i>	<i>Bible Translator</i>
<i>BJRL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</i> (also BJRULM)
<i>BKC</i>	J. F. Walvoord and R. B. Zuck, eds., <i>Bible Knowledge Commentary</i> , 2 vols.
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
<i>BR</i>	<i>Biblical Research</i>

<b>BulBR</b>	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
<b>BWANT</b>	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
<b>BZ</b>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i> (Paderborn)
<b>BZAW</b>	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
<b>BZNW</b>	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
<b>ca.</b>	<i>circa</i> , about, approximately
<b>CAH</b>	J. B. Bury, S. A. Cook et al., eds., <i>Cambridge Ancient History</i> , 12 vols.
<b>CBC</b>	Cambridge Bible Commentary
<b>CBQ</b>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<b>CE</b>	Christian era
<b>CDSSE</b>	G. Vermes, <i>The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English</i>
<b>cf.</b>	<i>confer</i> , compare
<b>CGTSC</b>	Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges
<b>ch.</b>	chapter (plural, chs.)
<b>CH</b>	A. D. Nock and A.-J. Festugière, trans. and eds., <i>Corpus Hermeticum</i> , 4 vols.
<b>CNT</b>	Commentaire du Nouveau Testament
<b>col.</b>	column
<b>COL</b>	Christian Origins Library
<b>COS</b>	Cardinal O'Hara Series
<b>CRINT</b>	S. Safrai et al., eds., <i>Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum</i> , 5 vols.
<b>CThM</b>	<i>Currents in Theology and Mission</i>
<b>CThR</b>	<i>Criswell Theological Review</i>
<b>CTJ</b>	<i>Calvin Theological Journal</i>
<b>CTQ</b>	<i>Concordia Theological Quarterly</i>
<b>CV</b>	<i>Communio Viatorum</i>
<b>DJD</b>	D. Barthélemy, J. T. Milik et al., eds., <i>Discoveries in the Judean Desert</i> , 5 vols.
<b>DPL</b>	G. F. Hawthorne et al., eds., <i>Dictionary of Paul and His Letters</i>
<b>DSS</b>	Dead Sea Scrolls
<b>DSST</b>	F. García Martínez, <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated</i> , 2nd. ed.
<b>DTT</b>	<i>Dansk Teologisk Tidsskrift</i>
<b>EB</b>	Echter Bibel (Würzburg)
<b>EBNT</b>	G. Wagner, ed., <i>An Exegetical Bibliography of the New Testament</i> , 4 vols.
<b>ed.</b>	editor, edited by, edition (plural, eds.)
<b>EDNT</b>	H. Balz and G. Schneider, eds., <i>Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament</i> , 3 vols.
<b>EDT</b>	W. A. Elwell, ed., <i>Evangelical Dictionary of Theology</i>
<b>e.g.</b>	<i>exempli gratia</i> , for example
<b>EGT</b>	W. R. Nicoll, ed., <i>Expositor's Greek Testament</i> , 5 vols.
<b>EKKNT</b>	Evangelische-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<b>ENT</b>	Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament
<b>esp.</b>	especially, specifically
<b>ET</b>	English translation
<b>et al.</b>	<i>et alii</i> , and others
<b>etc.</b>	<i>et cetera</i> , and so forth
<b>EThL</b>	<i>Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses</i>
<b>EuroJTh</b>	<i>European Journal of Theology</i>
<b>EvQ</b>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
<b>EvTh</b>	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>

<i>ExAu</i>	<i>Ex Auditu</i>
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
f	and the following line, verse, page, section (plural, ff)
FBBS	Facet Books Biblical Series
fig.	figure, figurative (use)
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
FS	Festschrift, volume written in honor of
<i>FZPhTh</i>	<i>Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie</i>
GBS	Guides to Biblical Scholarship
<i>GTJ</i>	<i>Grace Theological Journal</i>
hap. leg.	<i>hapax legomenon</i> , only occurrence
<i>HBT</i>	<i>Horizons in Biblical Theology</i>
<i>HE</i>	Eusebius, <i>Historia Ecclesiastica</i>
Herm	Hermeneia
<i>HeyJ</i>	<i>Heythrop Journal</i>
HKNT	Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HNTC	Harper's New Testament Commentaries
HR	E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, <i>A Concordance to the Septuagint</i> , 3 vols.
<i>HRel</i>	<i>History of Religions</i>
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
HUTh	Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie
<i>IB</i>	G. A. Buttrick, ed., <i>The Interpreter's Bible</i>
ibid.	<i>ibidem</i> , in the same place [book]
<i>IBSt</i>	<i>Irish Biblical Studies</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
id.	<i>idem</i> , by the same [author]
<i>IDB</i>	G. A. Buttrick, ed., <i>Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i> , 4 vols.
IDBSup	K. Crim, ed., <i>Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible Supplementary Volume</i>
i.e.	<i>id est</i> , that is
<i>Interp</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
<i>ISBE</i>	G. W. Bromiley, ed., <i>International Standard Bible Encyclopedia</i> , rev. ed., 4 vols.
<i>IThQ</i>	<i>Irish Theological Quarterly</i>
IVPNTCS	InterVarsity Press New Testament Commentary Series
<i>JAAR</i>	<i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i>
JB	<i>Jerusalem Bible</i> (1966)
<i>JBC</i>	R. E. Brown et al., eds., <i>The Jerome Biblical Commentary</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JBLMS	Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
<i>JCBRF</i>	<i>Journal of the Christian Brethren Research Fellowship</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JPT</i>	<i>Journal of Psychology and Theology</i>
<i>JR</i>	<i>Journal of Religion</i>
JRelSt	<i>Journal of Religious Studies</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>



JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
JTC	<i>Journal for Theology and the Church</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KB	L. Köhler and W. Baumgartner, <i>Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros</i>
KEKNT	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Meyer)
KGS	J. R. Kohlenberger III, E. W. Goodrick, J. A. Swanson, eds., <i>The Exhaustive Concordance to the Greek New Testament</i>
KJV	<i>King James Version</i> (=AV) of the Bible
KNT	Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
KPCS	Kregel Popular Commentary Series
LCC	Library of Christian Classics
LCL	Loeb Classical Library (London: W. Heinemann, Ltd.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)
LD	<i>Lectio Divina</i>
lit.	literally
LouvSt	<i>Louvain Studies</i>
LQHR	<i>London Quarterly and Holborn Review</i>
LSJ	H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. S. Jones, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> , 9th ed. with Supplement
LThPM	Louvain Theological and Pastoral Monographs
LTP	<i>Laval Théologique et Philosophique</i>
LuthQ	<i>Lutheran Quarterly</i>
LW	<i>Lutheran World</i>
LXX	Septuagint version of the Old Testament
MGM	W. F. Moulton, A. S. Geden, H. K. Moulton, eds., <i>A Concordance to the Greek Testament</i> , 5th ed. with Supplement
MHT	J. H. Moulton, W. F. Howard and N. Turner, <i>A Grammar of New Testament Greek</i> , 4 vols.
MM	J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, <i>The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources</i>
MNTC	Moffatt New Testament Commentary
MPG	J. -P. Migne, ed., <i>Patrologia graeca</i>
MPL	J. -P. Migne, ed., <i>Patrologia latina</i>
ms.	manuscript (plural, mss.)
MT	Masoretic Text of the Old Testament
MThSt	Marburger Theologische Studien
MThZ	<i>Münchener theologische Zeitschrift</i>
n	footnote (plural nn)
NA <sup>27</sup>	E. Nestle, K. Aland et al., eds., <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> , 27th ed.
NAS	<i>New American Standard</i> version of the Bible
NBI	<i>New Blackfriars</i>
NCB	New Clarendon Bible
NCBC	New Century Bible Commentary, new edition
NDIEC	G. H. R. Horsley, ed., <i>New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity</i> , 5 vols.
NEB	<i>New English Bible</i>
Neotest	<i>Neotestamentica</i>
NHL	J. M. Robinson, gen. ed., <i>Nag Hammadi Library</i>
NIBC	New International Biblical Commentary
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament

<b>NIDNTT</b>	C. Brown, gen. ed., <i>New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology</i> , 3 vols.
<b>NIGTC</b>	New International Greek Testament Commentary
<b>NIV</b>	<i>New International Version</i> of the Bible
<b>NIVAC</b>	New International Version Application Commentary
<b>NJB</b>	<i>New Jerusalem Bible</i> (1985)
<b>NKJV</b>	<i>New King James Version</i> of the Bible
<b>NOT</b>	<i>Notes on Translation</i>
<b>NovT</b>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<b>NovTSup</b>	Novum Testamentum Supplements
<b>NPNF</b>	P. Schaff and H. Wace, eds., <i>Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers</i> , 14 vols.
<b>NRSV</b>	<i>New Revised Standard Version</i> of the Bible
<b>NRT</b>	<i>Nouvelle revue théologique</i>
<b>NS</b>	New Series of a periodical
<b>NSBT</b>	New Studies in Biblical Theology
<b>NT</b>	New Testament
<b>NTA</b>	E. Hennecke, W. Schneemelcher, R. McL. Wilson, eds., <i>New Testament Apocrypha</i> , 2nd ed. 2 vols.
<b>NTAbh</b>	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
<b>NTC</b>	New Testament Commentary
<b>NTD</b>	Neue Testament Deutsch
<b>NTG</b>	New Testament Guides
<b>NTL</b>	New Testament Library
<b>NTOA</b>	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
<b>NTS</b>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<b>NTSR</b>	New Testament for Spiritual Reading
<b>NTT</b>	New Testament Theology
<b>NTTS</b>	New Testament Tools and Studies
<b>OCD</b>	N. G. L. Hammond and H. H. Scullard, eds., <i>Oxford Classical Dictionary</i> , 2nd ed.
<b>OJRS</b>	<i>Ohio Journal of Religious Studies</i>
<b>OT</b>	Old Testament
<b>OTKNT</b>	Oekumenischer Taschenbuch Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<b>OTL</b>	Old Testament Library
<b>OTM</b>	Oxford Theological Monographs
<b>OTP</b>	J. H. Charlesworth, ed., <i>The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> , 2 vols.
<b>p.</b>	page (plural, pp.)
<b>pace</b>	with due respect but differing from or contrary to
<b>par.</b>	parallel (plural, pars.)
<b>passim</b>	here and there throughout
<b>PC</b>	Proclamation Commentaries
<b>PGM</b>	K. Preisendanz, ed., <i>Papyri graecae magicae</i>
<b>plu.</b>	plural
<b>PTMS</b>	Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series
<b>PTR</b>	<i>Princeton Theological Review</i>
<b>PVTG</b>	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece
<b>QD</b>	Quaestiones disputatae
<b>q.v.</b>	<i>quod vide</i> , which see
<b>RB</b>	<i>Revue biblique</i>

<i>RefJ</i>	<i>Reformed Journal</i>
<i>RefR</i>	<i>Reformed Review</i>
rev.	revised, revised by, revision
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>RExp</i>	<i>Review and Expositor</i>
<i>RGG</i>	K. Galling et al., eds., <i>Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i> , 3rd ed., 7 vols.
<i>RHPR</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>
<i>RivBib</i>	<i>Rivista Biblica</i>
RNT	Regensburger Neues Testament
<i>RSPR</i>	<i>Revue des sciences philosophiques et religieuses</i>
<i>RSR</i>	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i> (Paris)
RSV	Revised Standard Version of the Bible
<i>RTR</i>	<i>Reformed Theological Review</i>
SANT	Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
SBG	Studies in Biblical Greek
SBibSt	Sources for Biblical Study
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBL SBS	Society of Biblical Literature Sources for Biblical Study
SBLSP	Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
<i>ScEc</i>	<i>Sciences ecclésiastiques</i>
<i>ScEs</i>	<i>Science et esprit</i>
SD	Studies and Documents
sec.	section
sg.	singular
SH	Scripta Hierosolymitana
SHR	Studies in the History of Religion
<i>sic</i>	so, thus [in the original]
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
SL	Schweich Lectures (1946)
SNT	Studien zum Neuen Testament
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SNTW	Studies in the New Testament and Its World
<i>SPCIC</i>	<i>Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus 1961</i>
<i>SR</i>	<i>Studies in Religion</i>
<i>StTh</i>	<i>Studia theologica</i> (Lund)
<i>StBibT</i>	<i>Studia Biblica et Theologica</i>
Str-B	H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, <i>Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch</i> , 4 vols., with Index vols. 5-6.
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
sup	supplement
s.v.	<i>sub verbo, sub voce</i> , under the word (plural, s.vv.)
<i>SymBU</i>	<i>Symbolae biblicae upsalienses</i>
<i>Tarb</i>	<i>Tarbiz</i>
TBC	Torch Bible Commentary

TC	Tradio Christiana
TD	<i>Theological Digest</i>
TDNT	G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., <i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> , 10 vols.
TDOT	G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren, eds., <i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> , 8 vols. to date
ThCol	Theological Collections
<i>Theol</i>	<i>Theology</i> (London)
<i>ThEv</i>	<i>Theologia Evangelica</i>
THKNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>ThLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
<i>ThR</i>	<i>Theologische Rundschau</i>
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
trans.	translator, translated by, translation
<i>TrinJ</i>	<i>Trinity Journal</i>
TS	<i>Theological Studies</i>
<i>TSFBull</i>	<i>Theological Students Fellowship Bulletin</i>
TSK	<i>Theologische Studien und Kritiken</i>
t.t.	technical term
TTS	Trierer theologische Studien
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen
<i>TynB</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
TZ	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
UBS <sup>4</sup>	B. Aland, K. Aland et al., eds., <i>The Greek New Testament</i> , United Bible Societies, 4th ed.
USQR	<i>Union Seminary Quarterly Review</i>
v.	verse (plural, vv.)
UTR	Utrechtse Theologische Reeks
VC	<i>Vigiliae christianae</i>
v.l.	<i>varia lectio</i> , alternate / variant reading
viz.	<i>videlicet</i> , namely
vol.	volume
<i>VoxEv</i>	<i>Vox Evangelica</i>
vs.	<i>versus</i> , against
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WPC	Westminster Pelican Commentaries
WR	Weltgespräch der Religionen
<i>WThJ</i>	<i>Wesleyan Theological Journal</i>
<i>WTJ</i>	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
YJS	Yale Judaica Series
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZBK	Zürcher Bibelkommentare
<i>ZKTh</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie</i>
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZPEB	M. C. Tenney, gen. ed., <i>Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible</i> , 5 vols.
ZThK	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION: THE CONTEXT OF THIS STUDY

The Apostle Paul is one of the most fascinating and influential figures in the history of Christian thought. Anyone who attempts a historical-critical understanding of his writings in the New Testament, whether sympathetic to Christianity or not, soon realizes there are no easy approaches. There are several reasons for this, one of which is the fact that nowhere in his extant letters did Paul write an explanatory preface or arrange his theological thinking in systematic categories with topical headings.<sup>1</sup> This is mainly because of the "occasion-specific" character of his letters.<sup>2</sup> In them, Paul brought the Christian gospel to bear on particular situations and events in each Christian community he addressed and drew out applications for specific problems in the life of the church there.<sup>3</sup> In a nutshell, one could argue that Paul's letters brought the "constant elements of the Christian gospel" into dynamic interaction with the "variable elements of the particular Christian communities" he addressed.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Morna Hooker discusses seven reasons why it is difficult to understand Paul's thought in chapter one of her book, *A Preface to Paul* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980). The fact that Paul has been understood in a variety of ways is a patent indication of the difficulties involved. See W. W. Gasque, "Images of Paul in the History of Biblical Interpretation," *Crux* 16 (1980) 7-16.

<sup>2</sup>R. W. Funk, "The Apostolic Parousia: Form and Significance," in *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox*, eds. W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, and R. R. Niebuhr (Cambridge: The University Press, 1967) 249-68, has shown that Paul's letters served as a substitute for his personal presence, represented his apostolic authority, and conveyed his gospel message and pastoral concerns. See also R. N. Longenecker, "On the Form, Function, and Authority of the New Testament Letters," in *Scripture and Truth*, ed. D. A. Carson and J. D. Woodbridge (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983) 101-14.

<sup>3</sup>It is debated whether or not Romans and Ephesians (if accepted as Pauline) are exceptions to this general statement. For arguments on both sides of the issue for Romans, see the essays in K. P. Donfried, ed., *The Romans Debate: Revised and Expanded Edition* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991); for Ephesians, see M. Barth, *Ephesians*, AB 34 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1974) 37-59; and E. Best, *Ephesians*, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998) 1-6, 63-75.

<sup>4</sup>J. C. Beker formulates the hermeneutical issue in this manner in his article, "Contingency and Coherence in the Letters of Paul," *USQR* 33 (1978) 141-51; and in his book, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980) 11-36. One may not agree with Beker's apocalyptic interpretation of Paul or the interpretive fluidity that he assigns to the Pauline "core," nevertheless, in the above article he makes the point that Paul's

Just what constitutes the "constant elements of the gospel" and the "variable elements of the particular situations" as well as the relationship between the two (i.e., the coherent core and the contingent circumstances) raises many inter-related literary, historical, hermeneutical, and theological questions in the critical study of the *corpus Paulinum*. The issues involved are familiar to Pauline scholars, and a variety of proposals and positions on these wide-ranging questions can be found in the history of Pauline investigation.<sup>5</sup>

Within the broad scope of Paul's theology, his anthropology is one of the most difficult aspects of his thought to understand. There are several reasons for this. First, his views on what it means to be human are based on presuppositions or inherited convictions that he did not mention or explain in his letters. Second, his anthropology is relational and practical rather than philosophical and systemic. He is mostly concerned about human beings in terms of their relationship to God, evil, the world, and each other. Consequently, his anthropology is intertwined with various other elements of his theology as a whole.<sup>6</sup> Third, we encounter Paul's anthropology through a variety of anthropological terms, some with antecedents in Jewish tradition and others in Hellenistic tradition. However, he presents no systematic treatment

---

letters are "occasional, but not casual . . . they are not *private*, but *personal*; *authoritative* and not simply products of the moment" (141, emphasis his). More recently, J. D. G. Dunn, in his full-scale study of Paul's thought, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998), acknowledges both the flexibility and the salutary influence of Beker's *coherence within contingency* hermeneutical model (23). Dunn himself prefers a *dialogue* model—to hear Paul's own dialogue with himself and with those to whom and for whom he wrote and, at the same time, to engage in mutually critical dialogue with him (7-9, 23-25).

<sup>5</sup>A. Schweitzer, *Paul and His Interpreters: A Critical History*, trans. W. Montgomery (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1912; reprint, New York: Schocken Books, 1964), provides a masterful historical survey of critical studies in Germany following the Reformation. More recently, see W. G. Kümmel, *The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of Its Problems*, trans. S. McL. Gilmour and H. C. Kee (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972); O. Merk, "Paulus-Forschung 1936-1985," *Theol Rund* 53 (1988) 1-81; V. P. Furnish, "Pauline Studies," in *The New Testament and Its Modern Interpreters*, ed. E. J. Epp and G. W. MacRae (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989) 321-50; S. Westerholm, *Israel's Law and the Church's Faith. Paul and His Recent Interpreters* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988); and J. K. Riches, *A Century of New Testament Study* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1993) 125-49.

<sup>6</sup>Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 52-53, calls attention to this point.

that classifies a human being's nature, qualities, or constituent parts. As a result, there is little definition of terms and sometimes puzzling diversity in their usage. He can use different anthropological terms to mean the same thing and the same term to designate different things.<sup>7</sup> Many of the key terms appear with varied frequency and in variable settings throughout Paul's letters. This lack of terminological and conceptual systematization contributes to the complexity of his anthropology.<sup>8</sup> Nevertheless, in light of these factors, scholars must still deal with Paul's anthropological language as he used it in order to understand his anthropology and related facets of his theology. This opens the way into our present study.

The chief concern of this thesis is to investigate two anthropological formulations found in the Pauline corpus, namely, *ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος* (the "old man") and *ὁ καινὸς / νέος ἄνθρωπος* (the "new man"). These designations occur in the following four passages of this literature:

1) "Our old man" in Romans 6:6: *τοῦτο γινώσκοντες, ὅτι ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη, ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ.*

2) "One new man" in Ephesians 2:14-15: *Αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἐν καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας, τὴν ἔχθραν, ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ, τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν καταργήσας, ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον ποιῶν εἰρήνην, . . .*

3) Both the "old man" and the "new man" in Colossians 3:9-10: *μὴ ψεύδεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ*

---

<sup>7</sup>For example, *σῶμα* (body) and *σὰρξ* (flesh) occasionally overlap in meaning, cf. 2 Cor. 4:10 with 4:11 and 1 Cor. 7:34 with 2 Cor. 7:1; yet both terms have a rather broad spectrum of meaning, cf. for *σῶμα*: Gal. 6:17; Rom. 12:4-5; 1 Cor. 15:44; Col. 1:22; 2:17; and for *σὰρξ*: Rom. 3:20; 6:19; 7:5; 8:7; 11:14.

<sup>8</sup>R. Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms. A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings*, AGJU 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1971) 1-4. Jewett provides the most recent and best history of research into each of Paul's anthropological terms. For a current discussion of the way Paul used these terms, see Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 51-78.

ένδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν, . . .

4) Both the "old man" and the "new man" in Ephesians 4:22-24: ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφήν τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης, ἀνανεοῦσθαι δὲ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοῦς ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας.<sup>9</sup>

These designations are part of a larger ἄνθρωπος category in the Pauline writings involving four additional antitheses: 1) ὁ ψυχικὸς / πνευματικὸς ἄνθρωπος—the natural / spiritual man (1 Cor. 2:14-15; note also σαρκινοί / σαρκικοί vs. πνευματικοί in 1 Cor. 3:1-3); 2) ὁ ἔξω / ἔσω ἄνθρωπος—the outer / inner man (2 Cor. 4:16; Rom. 7:22; Eph. 3:16); 3) ὁ πρῶτος / δεύτερος or ἔσχατος ἄνθρωπος—the first / second or last man (1 Cor. 15:45-47; cf. 15:20-22; Rom. 5:12-19); and 4) ὁ χοϊκὸς / ἐπουράνιος [ἄνθρωπος]—the earthly / heavenly man (1 Cor. 15:47-48).<sup>10</sup> The modifying words παλαιός and νέος / καινός also occur together elsewhere in Paul in the antitheses "old leaven / new lump" (1 Cor. 5:7-9) and "old / new covenant" (2 Cor. 3:6-14).

The presence of the "old man / new man" formulation in the above passages raises several issues that we wish to address in this chapter. These, in turn, set the stage for the content and contribution of this study. First, all of the passages except one—Romans 6:6—appear in what many scholars consider to be the deutero-Pauline letters. This requires a brief discussion of the authorship of Colossians and Ephesians since these two documents are primary sources for our topic. We will present a case for their authenticity as a working hypothesis for our study (1.1). The

---

<sup>9</sup>The text of these verses is cited from *The Greek New Testament*, ed. B. Aland, K. Aland et al., 4th rev. ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft / New York: United Bible Societies, 1993).

<sup>10</sup>In addition, the following single designations occur in the Pauline corpus: 1) φθαρτὸς ἄνθρωπος—corruptible or mortal man (Rom. 1:23); 2) ταλαίπωρος ἄνθρωπος—wretched man (Rom. 7:24); 3) τέλειος ἄνθρωπος / ἀνὴρ—mature man (Col. 1:28; Eph. 4:13); 4) ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας—the man of lawlessness (2 Thess. 2:3); and 5) αἰρετικὸς ἄνθρωπος—divisive man (Tit. 3:10).



authenticity of Romans is not disputed. Second, the terms appear relatively infrequently in the Pauline corpus raising a question about their place and importance in the wider scope of Pauline anthropology and related facets of Pauline theology. The word *ἄνθρωπος* relates the discussion to anthropology, but the modifiers *παλαιός* and *καινός / νέος* put it in a wider theological frame of reference. In order to position these terms within this framework, we will sketch the main contours of Pauline anthropology and related features in recent study (1.2). Third, the designations appear rather abruptly with little explanatory comment. One wonders whether or not they were in use prior to these Pauline writings so we will briefly discuss matters related to their origin and background (1.3). Fourth, the contextual modifiers cited above along with several striking verbal ascriptions (*συνεσταυρώθη*, Rom. 6:6; *κτίση*, Eph. 2:15; *ἀπεκδυσάμενοι*, Col. 3:9 / *ἀποθέσθαι*, Eph. 4:22; and *ἐνδυσάμενοι*, Col. 3:10 / *ἐνδύσασθαι*, Eph. 4:24) indicate that the author intended the "old man / new man" designations to be understood as metaphors. What is not as clear are their referents and thematic function. We will survey current views of these metaphors in terms of these items (1.4). This will lead to listing several programmatic questions that need to be resolved in the interpretation of this dual metaphor and to stating the methodological approach we will take in the remainder of this study (1.5).

### 1.1 Authenticity of New Testament Sources

Two of the three uses of the designation "old man" and all three uses of the "new man" in the Pauline corpus appear in Colossians and Ephesians. As is well known, the authorship of these documents is disputed. With regard to our topic, if Paul is not the author, then references to the "new man" and the "old man / new man" combination as ideas coming directly from Paul could be called into question even though one could argue that they accurately reflect his theological thinking. If, on the other hand, sufficient evidence can be presented supporting Pauline authorship, then

one can more confidently claim that the "new man" is a Pauline term and the "old man / new man" motif has a place in Paul's theology. We turn our attention to a consideration of this issue.

### 1.1.1 Authenticity of Colossians

The author of the New Testament letter bearing the title "To the Colossians" claims to be the Apostle Paul (1:1, 23, "I, Paul"; 4:18). He describes himself as an apostle of Christ Jesus by the will of God (1:1) and makes it known that he is in prison for declaring "the mystery of Christ" (4:3; cf. 1:24; 4:10, 18).<sup>11</sup> He closes the letter with the words: "I, Paul, write this greeting with my own hand" (4:18, NIV; cf. Gal. 6:11; 1 Cor. 16:21; Phlm. 19, also 2 Thess. 3:17). This suggests that up to this point he may have been dictating to an amanuensis and so adds a concluding note in his own handwriting as a guarantee of genuineness.<sup>12</sup>

A significant number of scholars think Colossians is authentic,<sup>13</sup> but a growing number, probably the majority (ca. 60 percent of critical scholarship),

<sup>11</sup>The verb in the clause *δι' ὃ καὶ δέδεμαι* (Col. 4:3), if taken literally as most do, would refer to the author being bound with chains and put in prison. This has linked Colossians with Philemon (vv. 9-10, 13), Ephesians (3:1; 6:19-20), and Philippians (1:12-30). Traditionally, these four letters have been ascribed to Paul and grouped together as the "captivity epistles." All four may well have been written from the same prison at about the same time. However, this is disputed and the place of imprisonment has been strongly contested. Several views have been proposed—Ephesus, Caesarea, Rome. Each one has its own peculiar problems, but the balance of probability lies with Rome, a view that still holds scholarly support. See P. T. O'Brien, *Colossians, Philemon*, WBC 44 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1982) xlix-liv, who surveys the various views and states his own preference for a Roman imprisonment. If Pauline authorship and the Rome hypothesis are accepted, most likely Paul wrote these letters while he was under house arrest in Rome ca. AD 61-62. Those who reject Pauline authorship of Colossians and Ephesians usually date them between AD 70-90.

<sup>12</sup>R. Longenecker, "Ancient Amanuenses and the Pauline Epistles," in *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, ed. R. N. Longenecker and M. C. Tenney (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974) 281-97, esp. 288-92. We know that Luke was with Paul in Rome (Acts 28:14; cf. Col. 4:14) as was Aristarchus (Acts 27:2; cf. Col. 4:10) and presumably Timothy also (cf. Col. 1:1).

<sup>13</sup>W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, rev. ed., trans. H. C. Kee (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975) 340-46, esp. 340 n12, lists a number of scholars, including himself, who favor the Pauline authorship of Colossians. To this can be added the following: O'Brien, *Colossians*, xli-xlix; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984) 28-33; and N. T. Wright, *The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians and to Philemon*, TNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986) 31-34.

consider it inauthentic on literary and theological grounds.<sup>14</sup> Some who doubt its authenticity, but acknowledge that the theology of the letter is essentially Pauline, think that the language and style is the strongest indicator that someone other than Paul wrote it.<sup>15</sup> Others build their case on theology, claiming that the language and style of the letter do not provide adequate grounds on which to question Pauline authorship.<sup>16</sup>

**1.1.1.1 Literary Arguments.** Most interpreters acknowledge that Colossians has some distinctive features in vocabulary and style.<sup>17</sup> Eduard Lohse calls attention to numerous similarities to the undisputed Pauline epistles, but he also lists differences in vocabulary and peculiarities of style.<sup>18</sup> After a detailed discussion, he concludes that a final decision on the question of authenticity cannot be based on these matters.<sup>19</sup> He acknowledges that differences of vocabulary with other Pauline letters are balanced by many similarities and that divergences have parallels in other letters. *Hapax legomena* and unusual expressions also appear in significant numbers in the undisputed Paulines.<sup>20</sup> Thus, statistics alone cannot determine if the language

---

<sup>14</sup>Kümmel, *Introduction*, 340 n13, lists a number of those who dispute Pauline authorship. To this can be added the following: E. Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon*, trans. W. R. Poehlmann and R. J. Karris, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971) 84-91, 178-81; E. Schweizer, *The Letter to the Colossians: A Commentary*, trans. A. Chester (Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1982) 15-24; and R. E. Brown, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, ABRL (New York: Doubleday, 1997) 610-19.

<sup>15</sup>E.g., Schweizer, *Colossians*, 18-19, suggests that the author was Timothy. Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 13 n39, also believes that Colossians was "probably written by Timothy before Paul's death . . ." For most, the identity of the author is unknown.

<sup>16</sup>E.g., Lohse, *Colossians*, 89-91.

<sup>17</sup>E. Percy, *Die Probleme der Kolosser-und Epheserbriefe*, ARSHLL 39 (Lund: Gleerup, 1946) 16-66; Kümmel, *Introduction*, 341-42; Lohse, *Colossians*, 84-91.

<sup>18</sup>Lohse, *Colossians*, 84-89.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., 91. Kümmel, *Introduction*, 342, concludes: "On the basis of language and style, therefore, there is no reason to doubt the Pauline authorship of the letter."

<sup>20</sup>Percy, *Probleme*, 16-66, provides a thorough discussion of the linguistic and stylistic relationships between Colossians and the undisputed Pauline epistles. He strongly defends Pauline

of Colossians is authentic or not.<sup>21</sup> In fact, consideration must be given to the subject matter of the letter and the needs of the audience. In matters of style, similar features, though less frequent, can also be found in the undisputed Pauline letters.<sup>22</sup> The liturgical-poetic cadence of Colossians incorporating traditional material (cf. 1:12-20; 2:9-15), and its confrontation with a christological heresy have influenced its language and style (see ch. 4, 194-96). In light of 4:18, it could also be argued that an amanuensis had a hand in formulating this letter under Paul's direction.<sup>23</sup>

**1.1.1.2 Theological Arguments.** A more formidable line of argument has been put forward on theological grounds. After examining the theological content of the letter, Lohse concludes that Paul's theology has undergone a profound change in Colossians producing "new formulations in christology, ecclesiology, the concept of the apostle, eschatology, and the understanding of baptism. Therefore, Paul cannot be considered to be the direct or indirect author of Col. Rather a theologian schooled in Pauline thought composed the letter with the intention of bringing the Apostle's word to bear on the situation that had arisen in the Asia Minor communities because of the 'philosophers.'"<sup>24</sup> In this connection, Lohse makes reference to several distinctive

---

authorship, arguing that the language and style of Colossians are entirely conditioned by its particular content and the specific situation necessitating the letter (43). On the other hand, W. Bujard, *Stilanalytische Untersuchungen zum Kolosserbrief als Beitrag zur Methodik von Sprachvergleichen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973), uses stylistic arguments to establish differences between Colossians and the undisputed Paulines and concludes that this letter could not have been written by Paul.

<sup>21</sup>P. N. Harrison, *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* (London: Oxford University Press, 1921) 20-22, demonstrates that, with respect to *hapax legomena*, Colossians falls within the normal range of Pauline usage.

<sup>22</sup>For example, the undisputed Pauline letters link synonyms together (cf. e.g., Rom. 1:18, 21, 25, 29), pile up dependent genitives (cf. e.g., Rom. 2:5; 4:11; 1 Cor. 2:6), and contain long, complex sentences (cf. e.g., Gal. 2:3-5, 6-9; Rom. 1:1-7; 2:5-10, 14-16; 3:23-26).

<sup>23</sup>See Percy, *Probleme*, 10-14, for a critique of the "secretary" hypothesis. Also, Lohse, *Colossians*, 91.

<sup>24</sup>Lohse, *Colossians*, 180-81. According to Lohse, the deutero-Pauline writings presuppose a Pauline school tradition based in Ephesus, the center of the Pauline mission in Asia Minor. Colossians was written before Ephesians with a composition date ca. AD 80 (182 n17).

theological features in Colossians: 1) it lacks many characteristic terms of Paul's theology; 2) its cosmic christology is based on the Christ-hymn of 1:15-20; 3) its ecclesiology designates the Church as the universal "body" of Christ, which is subordinate to Christ, the "head of the body" (1:18); 4) its eschatology has receded into the background so that the expectation that the Lord Jesus would come again soon has disappeared; and 5) the understanding of baptism is not only that believers have died with Christ and been buried with Him, but also that they have been raised with Christ already (2:11-13, 20; 3:13).<sup>25</sup>

In response, however, we may note the following. First, the absence of characteristic Pauline terms is not a strong argument because a similar observation can be made about some of the undisputed Paulines.<sup>26</sup> Second, what is said in Colossians about cosmic christology and Christ's headship over the church is indeed an advance on what we find in the undisputed Pauline letters. However, these advances are not separated from nor contradictory to their antecedents in those writings (cf. 1 Cor. 2:8; 8:6; 2 Cor. 4:4; Gal. 4:3; Phil. 2:9-11 for christology; and Rom. 12:4-5; 1 Cor. 1:13; Gal. 3:28; 1 Cor. 12:12-14, 27 for ecclesiology).<sup>27</sup>

Third, the eschatological emphasis of Colossians is clearly more "realized" than "futuristic" (see ch. 4, 197 n6). But both elements are present reflecting the genuine "already / not yet" eschatological tension present in the undisputed Paulines. Although there is no direct mention of the expectation that the Lord would soon come, there are traces of "futuristic" eschatology (1:22, 28; 3:4, 6, 24; 4:11). The now revealed mystery (1:26) and the exaltation of Christ, which has already occurred

---

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., 178-180.

<sup>26</sup>D. A. Carson, D. J. Moo, L. Morris, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992) 333. For example, the noun *δικαιοσύνη* and the verb *δικαίω* are missing in 1 Thessalonians, and the verb is absent from 2 Corinthians and Philippians also.

<sup>27</sup>Even Lohse, *Colossians*, 178-79, acknowledges this although he sees Colossians going far beyond the undisputed Paulines. If 1:15-20 is the adaptation of a preformed hymn, it could just as easily have been done by Paul as by a later disciple.

(2:12; 3:1; cf. 1 Cor. 2:7, 10; Phil. 3:20), are balanced by the expectation of Christ at the parousia (3:4; cf. 1 Thess. 4:16; Phil. 3:20). Similarly, the fact that in some sense believers have already been raised with Christ (2:12; 3:1) is congruent with Paul elsewhere (e.g., Rom. 6:4, 11).

Fourth, in light of the statements in Colossians 1:21–2:5, which lend validity to ministry in the Pauline era, there seems to be no compelling reason to assign the letter to the post-apostolic age. No attempt is made to give Epaphras (cf. 1:7-8; 4:12) apostolic authorization through teaching that represents Paul's mind in order to combat heresy. Also, to put the letter in the post-Pauline period makes the personal allusions, especially those of chapter four, difficult to explain.<sup>28</sup> To make it contemporary with Paul and yet assign it to a different person, such as Timothy, creates a new problem since we know nothing of Timothy's literary capabilities. Two additional points that lend support to authenticity are the close connection of Colossians with Philemon, whose genuineness is not challenged,<sup>29</sup> and the strong external evidence in favor of Pauline authorship.<sup>30</sup>

It seems, then, that the arguments against Pauline authorship, while worth careful consideration, are not decisive. They do not give sufficient weight to the concrete polemical situation of the letter and to the ability of Paul himself to address a new situation and adopt new language and concepts to meet new needs. On the

---

<sup>28</sup>On the matter of pseudonymity, see the literature cited in footnote 51 and the comments in footnote 56 below. For a critique of pseudonymity, especially in epistolary literature, see D. Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 4th rev. ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1990) 1011-28.

<sup>29</sup>See footnote 11 above. Colossians and Philemon have several specific features in common (cf. Col. 1:1 with Phlm. 1; Col. 4:3, 10, 18 with Phlm. 9-10, 13; Col. 4:17 with Phlm. 2; Col. 4:9 with Phlm. 12; and Col. 4:10-14 with Phlm. 23-24). If Paul authored Philemon, then it seems most likely he also wrote Colossians (pace Lohse, *Colossians*, 175-76, who claims that a later disciple of Paul used Philemon and expanded it to write the personal remarks in Colossians).

<sup>30</sup>Guthrie, *Introduction*, 576, states that Colossians was a part of the Pauline corpus as far back as can be traced and there is no evidence that Pauline authorship was ever disputed until the nineteenth century. Colossians is first attested with certainty in Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 3.14.1 (ca. AD 175-195) and is listed among the Pauline epistles in the Muratorian Canon (ca. AD 200).

other hand, arguments for Pauline authorship are credible in light of these factors.

### 1.1.2 Authenticity of Ephesians

The author of the New Testament letter bearing the title "To the Ephesians" also claims to be the Apostle Paul (1:1; 3:1 "I, Paul"). He describes himself as an apostle of Christ Jesus by the will of God (1:1) and a prisoner for Christ Jesus on behalf of the Gentiles, specifically his Gentile Christian readers (3:1, 13; 4:1; 6:20). He closes the letter with a request for their prayers (6:19-20) and the promise to send Tychicus (cf. Col. 4:7-8) so that they might know "how I am and what I am doing" (6:21-22).

There is widespread agreement that Ephesians was written to Christian communities in western Asia Minor, including Ephesus. Various elements of internal evidence and the textual uncertainty for the reading *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* in 1:1<sup>31</sup> make it likely that the letter was intended for more than the Christian readers in Ephesus. If it was intended as a general "circular letter," as is likely, it may well have been sent first to Ephesus and then copied and circulated from there to a wider group of churches (1:15-16; 6:21-22).

Some scholars still argue for the authenticity of Ephesians.<sup>32</sup> Nevertheless,

---

<sup>31</sup>For a discussion of various hypotheses regarding the original reading of 1:1, see E. Best, "Ephesians i.1," in *Text and Interpretation*, ed. E. Best and R. McL. Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979) 29-41; and id., "Ephesians 1.1 Again," in *Paul and Paulinism*, ed. M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson (London: SPCK, 1982) 273-79. See footnote 58 below for further comment.

<sup>32</sup>Kümmel, *Introduction*, 357 n25, lists several scholars who defend authenticity, including Percy, *Probleme*, 179-488, esp. 448, and the later H. Schlier, *Der Brief an die Epheser: Ein Kommentar*, 7th ed. (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1971) 22-28. More recently, see Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:36-50, 2:207-09; G. B. Caird, *Paul's Letters From Prison (Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon) in the Revised Standard Version*, NCB (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976) 11-29; Bruce, *Epistles*, 229-40; and Guthrie, *Introduction*, 496-528. The last major work devoted to this subject is by A. van Roon, *The Authenticity of Ephesians*, NovTSup 39 (Leiden: Brill, 1975), who concludes that Paul, along with the influence of another person from his circle, was the author (cf. 438-39). Some scholars believe that Paul appointed one of his associates (e.g., Timothy or Luke) to do the writing and gave him a free hand. See Kümmel, *Introduction*, 357 n28 for a listing of those who advocate the use of an amanuensis; see also E. R. Richards, *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul*, WUNT 2.42 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1991) 190-92. For arguments against the "secretary" hypothesis, see Percy, *Probleme*, 10-14, 421-22; C. L. Mitton, *The Epistle to the Ephesians: Its*

Pauline authorship has been strongly and widely contested in scholarly discussion on literary, historical, and theological grounds.<sup>33</sup> The majority view at present (ca. 75-80 percent of critical scholarship) is that the letter is pseudonymous, written in Paul's name by an unknown author at a later time.<sup>34</sup>

**1.1.2.1 Literary Arguments.** Most interpreters acknowledge that Ephesians has significant differences in language and style from the undisputed Pauline letters.<sup>35</sup> Andrew Lincoln notes several statistics, but admits that they are not that significant in comparison with similar figures for other New Testament writings. More important for him are the words that are unique to Ephesians that also appear in post-apostolic literature as well as the unique word combinations that reflect its distinctive language.<sup>36</sup> He also calls attention to the heavy, pleonastic style of Ephesians instead of the more direct, incisive argumentation of the earlier undisputed letters.<sup>37</sup> These features prompt Lincoln and others to conclude that the

---

*Authorship, Origin and Purpose* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951) 249-50; Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:40-41; and Best, *Ephesians*, 30-31.

<sup>33</sup>For a brief history of the discussion and a chart arranged in chronological order listing scholars who have endorsed or rejected Pauline authorship of Ephesians in print during the last two centuries, see W. H. Harris III, *The Descent of Christ: Ephesians 4:7-11 and Traditional Hebrew Imagery*, AGJU 32 (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 198-204.

<sup>34</sup>Kümmel, *Introduction*, 357-63, especially 357 n26, lists a number of scholars, including himself, who reject authenticity; more recently, F. Mussner, *Der Brief an die Epheser*, OTKNT 10 (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1982); R. Schnackenburg, *Ephesians. A Commentary*, trans. H. Heron, EKKNT 10 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991) 24-29; A. T. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, WBC 42 (Dallas: Word Books, 1990) lix-lxxiii; Brown, *Introduction*, 626-33; and Best, *Ephesians*, 6-36, who states, "Many of the objections to Pauline authorship are not individually capable of disproving it but it is their cumulative effect which suggests another author" (36). See Kümmel, *Introduction*, 357 n27, for a listing of those who leave the question undecided.

<sup>35</sup>Percy, *Probleme*, 179-229; Kümmel, *Introduction*, 358; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, lxxv-lxxvi; Best, *Ephesians*, 27-32.

<sup>36</sup>Lincoln, *Ephesians*, lxxv. He cites 9 words unique to Ephesians that are found in post-apostolic literature and 16 unique word combinations, including the phrase *ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις* (1:3, 20; 2:6; 3:10; 6:12); also see Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 25-26.

<sup>37</sup>*Ibid.*, lxxv-lxxvi; also Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 26; and Best, *Ephesians*, 29-30. Lincoln states: "The frequent piling up of synonyms, the genitival combinations, the long sentences, the repetition of certain phrases, and the lack of conjunctions and particles are striking, even in comparison to Colossians . . ." (lxxvi).



author was more heavily influenced than Paul by a writing style more characteristic of the Qumran hymns.<sup>38</sup>

Though these literary distinctives make it very difficult for many to hold that Paul wrote Ephesians in its extant form, they do not render Pauline authorship impossible. Similarities in letter structure and language with other Pauline letters must also be considered as well as the fact that the differences have parallels in the undisputed letters.<sup>39</sup> As with Colossians, word statistics cannot determine if the language of Ephesians is authentic or not.<sup>40</sup> Other significant factors such as the general nature of the letter, its subject matter, and its liturgical-sermonic style in places also play an influential role.

**1.1.2.2 Historical Arguments.** Lincoln argues that the point of view of Ephesians is much later than that of the undisputed Paulines. In particular, the use of Paul's name and various personal allusions to the apostle appear to be a later writer's reflections on Paul and his apostleship rather than Paul talking about himself. He views Paul as a revered figure of the past. This suggests the writer is seeking to pass on genuine apostolic tradition and, according to Lincoln, these personal allusions are "best explained as the device of someone who wishes to boost claims for the authority of the apostle's teachings for a later time."<sup>41</sup> It is in this

---

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., lxvi; also, see Kümmel, *Introduction*, 358; Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 26; and Best, *Ephesians*, 8-9. K. G. Kuhn, "The Epistle to the Ephesians in the Light of the Qumran Texts," in *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis*, ed. J. Murphy-O'Connor (Chicago: Priory Press, 1968) 115-31, claims that "Semitic syntactical occurrences appear four times more frequently in the Epistle to the Ephesians than in all the remaining letters of the *corpus Paulinum*" (116).

<sup>39</sup>The structure of Ephesians is like that of the undisputed Paulines and the letter contains much Pauline language, including words unique to Ephesians and the undisputed letters of Paul, but nowhere else in the NT (e.g., *υιοθεσία*, 1:5; Rom. 8:15, 23; 9:4; Gal. 4:5; *ἀρραβών*, 1:14; 2 Cor. 1:22; 5:5; *προσαγωγή*, 2:18; 3:12; Rom. 5:2). See also footnote 22 above.

<sup>40</sup>Harrison, *Pastoral Epistles*, 20-22, demonstrates that, with respect to *hapax legomena*, Ephesians falls well within the normal range of Pauline usage. In addition, some of the Church Fathers (e.g., Clement of Rome, Polycarp, Ignatius) knew and used Ephesians so its vocabulary probably influenced them.

<sup>41</sup>Lincoln, *Ephesians*, lxiii.

post-apostolic setting that Lincoln reads the apostolic self-portrait of 3:1-13, the humility statement of 3:8, the settled Jew-Gentile situation portrayed in 2:11-22, the Church's apostolic foundation in 2:20, and the emphasis on the universal Church, including the key role assigned to its ministers in 4:11-16.

On the other hand, one should note that none of the above items is out of place during the later part of Paul's lifetime (i.e., early to mid 60s). Paul could and did speak for himself, recommending his own insights without provocation from opponents (3:4). In fact, the "mystery" concept (3:3-4) is a traditional idea that was not unique to Paul. He attributes to other apostles the reception of special revelation concerning it (3:5-6). It is difficult to see how the humility statement of 3:8 is more exaggerated and less spontaneous than Paul's reference to himself as "the least of the apostles" (1 Cor. 15:9). Paul's reputation as the apostle to the Gentiles proclaiming a law-free gospel emerged early in his confrontation with Peter in Antioch (cf. Gal. 2). The largely Gentile Christian audience in Asia Minor (cf. Acts 19:17-41) likely alters the emphases portrayed in Ephesians and gives Paul the opportunity not only to set forth aspects of the Christian gospel he has already defended but also to present needed instruction on some matters in a form he had not articulated previously. In light of this and a natural, complementary development of thought, the portrait of Jew-Gentile unity and the Church with its gifted leaders is not incompatible with Paul's earlier letters. No suggested post-apostolic pseudepigraphical setting seems to fit these matters any better. Furthermore, there is strong external evidence in favor of Pauline authorship.<sup>42</sup>

**1.1.2.3 Theological Arguments.** As with Colossians, a more formidable line of argument has been put forward on theological grounds. Lincoln contends that the theological differences between Ephesians and the undisputed Paulines cannot be

---

<sup>42</sup>Kümmel, *Introduction*, 357, concedes that "Eph is extraordinarily well attested in the early church." See the external data given in Guthrie, *Introduction*, 497.

explained by the circumstances surrounding the letter because "the number of differences that have to be accounted for are too many for this to be a convincing explanation for the whole phenomenon."<sup>43</sup>

In this regard, Lincoln makes reference to several distinctive features in Ephesians. The christology of the letter focuses attention on Christ's resurrection, exaltation, and cosmic lordship with little stress on the cross (only 2:16) and the death of Christ (only 1:7; 5:2, 25) compared to the undisputed letters. Its soteriology makes no mention of justification as in Galatians and Romans, and there is a different perspective on works (2:8-10) and the law (2:15). Realized eschatology pervades the whole letter with no explicit reference to the Parousia as in the undisputed Paulines.<sup>44</sup> Finally, its ecclesiology is more advanced and comprehensive than in the earlier Pauline letters.<sup>45</sup>

These theological differences make it virtually impossible for many to accept Pauline authorship. However, though significant, they need not be pressed into contradictions or conflicts with earlier Paulines. Neither is it necessary to view them as evidence of an entirely changed perspective at a later stage of composition beyond Paul's lifetime. It seems more likely that these distinctives constitute the logical extension of Paul's thought in new directions by Paul himself closer to the end of his life.

Four references to the cross and the death of Christ (1:7; 2:16; 5:2, 25) in a

---

<sup>43</sup>Ibid., lxiii-lxv. Also, see Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 26-28; and Best, *Ephesians*, 32-35.

<sup>44</sup>Salvation language appears in the past tense, depicting it as already completed for believers (2:5-8, esp. *ἔστε σεσωσμένοι* in vv. 5, 8). The emphasis is more on believers' present relationship to the exalted Christ in the heavenly realm (e.g., 1:3, 20-23; 2:6) and on growing up in maturity as a "body" toward its "head" (4:15).

<sup>45</sup>Ephesians uses *ἐκκλησία* exclusively of the universal Church (cf. 1:22; 3:10, 21; 5:23-25, 27, 29, 32) rather than local assemblies of believers, which is how it appears most frequently in the undisputed Paulines (although see 1 Cor. 12:28; 15:9 and Gal. 1:13). Thus, Lincoln, *Ephesians*, lxiv, concludes that this view of the universal Church "as one (4:4), holy (5:26-27), catholic (1:22-23), and apostolic (2:20) in all probability reflects a stage beyond that of the ministry of Paul."

relatively brief, general letter are not insignificant, especially the central role of the cross in 2:11-22 as the ground for Jew-Gentile unity (cf. 2:15-16). The emphasis on Christ's exaltation fits with the traditional views of the Church as shown in Acts (cf. Acts 2, 3, 13) and in Paul's defense speeches regarding the hope of the resurrection (cf. Acts 23:6; 24:14-16; 26:17-23; see also 1 Cor. 15:20-28).

The fact that justification is not mentioned, the law is said to be abolished (2:14-15), and "good works" are included as the product of saving grace (2:10) probably reflects the large Gentile makeup of the author's audience (cf. 2:1-3, 11-13; 4:17-24) and his more general reference to salvation by grace through faith unto good works (2:8-10). One could argue that Paul has a functional view of the law that is nuanced contextually thereby accommodating both negative (e.g., Gal. 3:13, 19-25) and positive (e.g., Rom. 3:31; 7:7-12; 13:8-10) statements about it, a phenomenon also reflected in Ephesians (cf. 2:15 with 5:31 and 6:2-3).<sup>46</sup>

The emphasis on realized eschatology is clearly evident, but it is not in conflict with the undisputed Paulines (cf. e.g., Rom. 5:1-2a, 9a, 10a; 6:4; 8:1, 24a) nor maintained at the expense of futuristic eschatology in Ephesians itself (cf. 1:10, 14; 4:30; 5:5; 6:13). In line with the author's exaltation christology, the emphasis on the believer's relationship to Christ shifts from dying with Him (Rom. 6:8a) and rising with Him in the future (Rom. 6:8b) to that of already being raised and seated with Him in the heavenly places far above all authority and power (1:20-21; 2:5-6). With different issues at stake, Paul can hold both emphases without conflict.

The advanced ecclesiology of Ephesians is also clearly evident, but this need not be viewed as inconsistent with the undisputed Paulines nor reflect a later setting. If the letter was intended to circulate among several churches, as is likely, then it would be appropriate to use *ἐκκλησία* in a universal sense. The reference to Christ as

---

<sup>46</sup>C. G. Kruse, *Paul, the Law and Justification* (Leicester: Apollos, 1996) 261-65, discusses the texts in Ephesians and argues convincingly that they are compatible with each other and with Pauline usage in his earlier letters.

Head of the Church appears to be the logical development of the "body of Christ" metaphor. Regarding the role of the apostles and prophets, the new feature in Ephesians is how the Church is pictured as a building, where Jesus Christ is the cornerstone and the apostles and prophets through their witness to Him form its foundation.<sup>47</sup> All this is a natural extension of an earlier idea (cf. 1 Cor. 3:10-11). As noted above, the mainly Gentile audience also accounts for no mention of the continuity between Israel and the Church (as in Rom. 3:1-8; 9-11) without denying it. The point for Gentile Christians to grasp is that they are part of God's people on equal footing with Jewish Christians through Jesus Christ who has made peace (2:11-22). All this suggests that Paul himself could bring further development to his own ideas as warranted by his and his readers' circumstances.

**1.1.2.4 Relationship to Colossians.** All interpreters recognize that Colossians and Ephesians share close similarities in language and argument. Those who defend the authenticity of Ephesians invariably argue for the authenticity of Colossians also. Accordingly, the relationship between the two letters is accounted for by the view that Paul wrote both of them.<sup>48</sup>

However, Lincoln and many others argue that such a hypothesis is highly unlikely because the nature of the differences indicates a changed perspective that requires a lapse of time. Consequently, the letters "could not have been written at the same time, which is what must be supposed if Pauline authorship of Ephesians is claimed."<sup>49</sup> Instead, the author was "a later follower of Paul who used Colossians as

---

<sup>47</sup>The apostles and prophets are viewed as foundational in a logical sense, not in a past, temporal sense because they have passed off the scene. The description of them as "holy" (3:5) reflects Paul's typical designation of anyone "set apart for a sacred purpose" rather than an indication of later veneration by others.

<sup>48</sup>So Percy, *Probleme*, 360-433, who argues that the similarities and differences between the letters are best explained in this way. See also footnote 11 above.

<sup>49</sup>Lincoln, *Ephesians*, lxvii. Also, see Mitton, *Ephesians*, 254-55; and Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 29.

the basis for his own reinterpretation of the Pauline gospel."<sup>50</sup> To make this claim is to maintain the view that this author used the literary device of pseudonymity.<sup>51</sup>

Many who view Ephesians as pseudonymous contend that it depends on Colossians as its primary source.<sup>52</sup> However, the evidence for direct literary dependence is minimal,<sup>53</sup> so most scholars put more emphasis on overall structure and content involving the same thematic material, on certain key terms and on theological concepts. It is argued that the author of Ephesians rearranged and gave fresh expression to his source material to suit his own distinctive interests and

---

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., lxviii. Also, see Kümmel, *Introduction*, 358-61; Mitton, *Ephesians*, 254-61; and Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 29. On the other hand, Best, *Ephesians*, 20-25, argues that, while there is a relationship with Colossians, "it cannot be proved that AE [the author of Ephesians] used that letter" (35).

<sup>51</sup>Pseudonymity within the NT canon is a complex issue and continues to be debated, especially as it relates to Colossians and Ephesians. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, lxviii-lxxiii, gives a concise but spirited defense of canonical pseudonymity drawing on the work of R. J. Bauckham, "Pseudo-Apostolic Letters," *JBL* 107 (1988) 469-94; L. R. Donelson, *Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles*, ed. H. D. Betz, G. Ebeling, and M. Metzger, HUTH 22 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1986) esp. 7-66; and D. G. Meade, *Pseudonymity and Canon* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) esp. 103-57. Meade shows how pseudonymity may have functioned had it been accepted in early Christianity, but he does not adequately demonstrate the plausibility of that premise. See also Best, *Ephesians*, 10-13, and the literature cited there. Vigorous counter-arguments have been put forward by Percy, *Probleme*, 443; Guthrie, *Introduction*, 1011-28; id., "The Development of the Idea of Canonical Pseudepigrapha in New Testament Criticism," in *The Authorship and Integrity of the New Testament*, ThCol 4 (London: SPCK, 1965) 14-39; T. D. Lea, "The Early Christian View of Pseudepigraphic Writings," *JETS* 27 (1984) 65-75; and Carson, Moo, and Morris, *Introduction*, 367-71. For a discussion of motives for the writers of pseudepigraphy, see B. M. Metzger, "Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha," *JBL* 91 (1972) 5-12.

<sup>52</sup>E. Best, "Who Used Whom? The Relationship of Ephesians and Colossians," *NTS* 43 (1997) 72-96, states: ". . . it has become an accepted tenet of scholarship that Colossians was written prior to Ephesians and the latter composed in its light" (73). Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 32, holds that Ephesians is based on the author's memory of Colossians. There have been a few attempts to argue for the priority of Ephesians; see J. Coutts, "The Relationship of Ephesians and Colossians," *NTS* 4 (1957-58) 201-07.

<sup>53</sup>The most extensive point of contact is the commendation of Tychicus in Col. 4:7-8 and Eph. 6:21-22. After a detailed study of possible literary parallels, Best, "Who Used Whom?", concludes that "in almost every case it is impossible to say with any certainty that A/Eph [the author of Ephesians] used Colossians or that A/Col [the author of Colossians] used Ephesians" (92). In light of his study, he states that three possible solutions to the question of authorship remain open: "Paul wrote both letters, they had a common author who was not Paul, they did not have a common author and Paul wrote neither of them" (96). Best favors the last option: "The similarities and dissimilarities of the two letters can be explained most easily on the assumption of distinct authors who were members of the same Pauline school and had discussed together the Pauline theology they had inherited" (96). See further id., *Ephesians*, 20-25, 35-40.

theological purposes.<sup>54</sup> Even if Colossians is authentic, many find it highly doubtful that Paul could have written Ephesians because of differences in theology at certain points. The author must have been a later disciple of Paul.

While considerable weight is given to this argument, much of the troublesome evidence can be viewed differently without resorting to pseudonymity. Several observations are worthy of consideration. First, Paul's ability and versatility as a writer and theologian should not be underestimated. He is quite capable of rephrasing, developing, and qualifying his own thoughts for a different audience facing different circumstances within a relatively short time (cf. e.g., 1 Thess. 4–5; 1 Cor. 15 and 2 Cor. 5). It is likely that themes he had thought about for a long time received fresh expression. An expansion of the horizons of Paul's literary capability in this way would accommodate both the similarities and the differences between Ephesians and Colossians and show how both letters fit comfortably with the theology of the undisputed Paulines.<sup>55</sup>

Second, a change of audience, subject matter, or authorial purpose should not be downplayed. The change of emphasis from Christ in Colossians to the Church in Ephesians and the occasion of each letter does much to account for the different nuances of the terms shared by the two letters. For example, describing Christ as head of His body, the Church, is an extension of Paul's metaphor in both letters, but in Colossians (1:18-20; 2:18-19) it is used christologically to combat heresy while in Ephesians (1:22-23; 4:15-16) it is used ecclesiologically to foster the unity of believers.

---

<sup>54</sup>For example, Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 170, claims that Eph. 3:1-13 is a distinctive reworking of Col. 1:23-29. Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 30-32, summarizes the uniqueness of the relationship between Colossians and Ephesians but concludes that differences in style, theology, and literary objectives between them "are so great that we can only with difficulty conceive of the same author"(32). He believes the author of Ephesians was very familiar with Colossians, though probably not as a written document.

<sup>55</sup>Wright, *Colossians*, 38, makes this point. See also C. E. Arnold, "Ephesians," in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, eds. G. F. Hawthorne et al. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993) 243 [hereafter *DPL*].

Third, personal allusions, expressions of intent, and requests for things ring true as coming from Paul himself in both Colossians (more extensive) and Ephesians (cf. 1:1; 3:1-13; 4:1; 6:19-20).<sup>56</sup> In addition, a plausible life-setting for the letters in Asia Minor during Paul's lifetime in the early 60s should not be ignored.<sup>57</sup>

Again, it seems that the arguments against Pauline authorship, while formidable, are not decisive. They do not give sufficient weight to the general pastoral character of Ephesians and to Paul's creative ability to reflect on God's purposes in Christ to meet the needs of a broader Christian readership. With these considerations in view, the arguments supporting Pauline authorship are plausible.

### 1.1.3 Conclusion

In light of the above discussion, it can be argued persuasively that the differences between Colossians and Ephesians and the undisputed Pauline letters do not constitute sufficient grounds for rejecting Pauline authorship. With due consideration of the difficulties, we hold the view that in all probability Paul wrote Colossians to a local congregation in Colossae to combat, in part, a christological heresy. With the Colossian letter still fresh on his mind, he used similar language and concepts, with modifications and expansions, to write Ephesians as a general, circular or "open" letter to several churches of western Asia Minor, with Ephesus as either

---

<sup>56</sup>Those who favor pseudonymity explain the autobiographical material in various ways. For example, Meade, *Pseudonymity*, 139-61, argues that such material in a pseudonymous writing is primarily "an assertion of authoritative tradition, not of literary origins" (161), but this dichotomy lacks convincing support. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, lxxxvii, claims that the later author of Ephesians makes the letter "more personal, direct, and forceful by adopting the device of Paul himself appealing to the churches." But surely this would be unnecessary and even suspect within 30 years of Paul's death (most who reject Pauline authorship date Ephesians ca. AD 80-90), and it is not easy to reconcile the content of Ephesians (cf. 4:15, 25) with the idea that the first-person details are simply well-meaning attempts to show respectful affinity with Paul.

<sup>57</sup>Best, *Ephesians*, 63-75, discusses a variety of proposals for the occasion and purpose of Ephesians. In light of the letter as a whole and its general nature, he suggests it was written for Gentile Christians who formerly were members of one or more groups in the community (i.e., a trade guild, a cult group). Now as Christians who have come into the Church from paganism, "they have entered a new group and it is important that they should realise its nature and the conduct required of them in it" (75). Though Best links this life-setting and purpose with a later author, they are equally applicable in Paul's lifetime.



the first or most important destination.<sup>58</sup> Since Paul was a prisoner at the time of writing both letters, it is reasonable to suppose that they originated from the same imprisonment, which was most likely the one he experienced at Rome in the early AD 60s.<sup>59</sup> While in prison he may have had secretarial assistance from Timothy (cf. Col. 1:1; 4:18) or someone else (see footnote 12 above). The repetition of Colossians 4:7-8 in Ephesians 6:21-22 reads naturally if both letters were dispatched at the same time and were taken to their intended destinations in the province of Asia by Tychicus.

It should be noted that even if Paul did not write Colossians and Ephesians, most scholars acknowledge that they stand in the Pauline tradition and reflect terms and patterns of thought used by Paul. Consequently, with due regard for possible adaptation and development, these letters can be consulted without fear of misrepresenting Paul's own ideas. In fact, in some cases they enhance our understanding of certain ideas that are mentioned but not explained in the undisputed Paulines, such as Paul's one reference to "our old man" in Romans 6:6.

In subsequent discussion we will refer to Paul as the author of Colossians and Ephesians as well as Romans. We will consider both the "old man" and the "new man" to be Pauline terms and the "old man / new man" motif to be an integral part of

---

<sup>58</sup>G. Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles; A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum*, SL (London: Oxford University Press, 1953) 228n, cites some evidence for circular letters in the ancient world. Objections to the circular letter theory can be found in D. E. Nineham, "The Case Against Pauline Authorship," in *Studies in Ephesians*, ed. F. L. Cross (London: A. R. Mowbray, 1956) 25. However, the objections raised by Nineham and others do not dispose of the circular letter theory in general, although they do go against the "blank address" form of it. In our view the inclusion of ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in 1:1 as attested in A D 33 81 et al. is preferred. The phrase is omitted in P<sup>46</sup> 8 and B. Apparently ἐν Ἐφέσῳ was deliberately omitted in these early manuscripts to show that the letter was of general rather than simply local reference. In later manuscripts the phrase was reinstated in order to identify the letter and verify the title given to it in the second century. The second half of v.1 could be translated: "to the saints who are in Ephesus, that is (καί), believers in Christ Jesus." In this view, the participial clause (τοῖς οὖσιν . . .) functions substantivally in apposition to ἀγίοις and provides a brief definition of this term. See A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek in the Light of Historical Research*, 4th ed. (Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1934) 1106-08 for the articular substantival participle. The word καί is understood in an explanatory or ascensive sense rather than an adjunctive or connective sense (cf. Robertson, *Grammar*, 1181, and ch. 3, 167 n55).

<sup>59</sup>See the discussion in footnote 11 above.

Paul's theological thought. In order to position the study of this theme within recent discussion of his thought, we turn to a survey of key interpretations offered for aspects of Paul's theology relevant to our topic.

## 1.2 Relevant Aspects of Pauline Theology

The presence of *ἄνθρωπος* in the "old man / new man" formulation links this motif with facets of Paul's anthropology. At the same time, the modifiers *παλαιός* and *καινός / νέος* relate it to facets of his eschatology. Thus it is necessary to give some attention to both areas.

### 1.2.1 Perspectives on Pauline Anthropology

Many interpreters from the days of the Church Fathers (2nd–3rd century) through the time of the Reformation (16th century) into the Enlightenment period (18th century) viewed Paul as a systematic theologian whose teaching could be understood as a compendium of theological statements. During this extended period of time the dichotomy / trichotomy question was the main focus of attention in discussions of Paul's anthropology. Does the human person consist of two parts (body and soul) or three (body, soul, and spirit)? Through the influence of Augustine and the Protestant Reformers, dichotomy (material and immaterial) became the dominant view in Western theology.<sup>60</sup> But the complexity of Paul's anthropology spawned additional issues and debates.

**1.2.1.1 Background Influence Debate.** With the Enlightenment of the 18th century came the rise of historical-critical exegesis and the investigation of Paul's thought in its socio-historical setting. On one hand, there emerged a growing awareness that Paul was not, after all, a systematic theologian and that his theology, including his anthropology, needed to be interpreted in light of his own historical and

---

<sup>60</sup>G. C. Berkouwer, *Man: The Image of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962) 194-233.

cultural milieu. On the other hand, the critical study of his thought became susceptible to the religious and philosophical thinking of the day. With respect to Paul's anthropology, F. C. Baur (1792–1860) and the Tübingen school, heavily influenced by the idealism of G. W. F. Hegel, taught, for example, that the conflict between the *σάρξ* (flesh) and the *πνεῦμα* (spirit) represented the conflict between "anything merely outward, sensuous and material" and the "principle of consciousness" that forms the link between man and God.<sup>61</sup> In scholarly circles, this idealist tradition was largely dismantled by the "history of religions" school near the end of the 19th century.

In 1872, Hermann Lüdemann set the agenda for succeeding decades of discussion by his sharply defined antithesis between Paul's "Jewish" notion of *σάρξ* as man in his weakness, and his later, more dominant "Hellenistic" conception in which *σάρξ* as material substance was greatly devalued.<sup>62</sup> In light of this, many subsequent studies assumed a fundamental distinction between Hellenistic (partitive and dualistic) and Hebraic (aspective and holistic) views of the human person and sought to determine whether Paul was influenced more by one or the other.<sup>63</sup> Some scholars contended that Paul's anthropology was strongly influenced by Hellenistic philosophy and popular religion.<sup>64</sup> By the mid-20th century an additional phase of the discussion

---

<sup>61</sup>F. C. Baur, *Paul. The Apostle of Jesus Christ*, trans. A. Menzies, 2 vols. (London: Williams and Norgate, 1876) 2:126-28.

<sup>62</sup>H. Lüdemann, *Die Anthropologie des Apostels Paulus und ihre Stellung innerhalb seiner Heilslehre* (Kiel: Universitäts-Buchhandlung [P. Toeche], 1872). He divided Pauline anthropology under the two headings of "outer man" and "inner man," with soul, flesh, and body belonging to the former, and spirit, mind, and heart to the latter.

<sup>63</sup>For a review of the debate see W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man in Relation to its Judaic and Hellenistic Background* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1956) 40-55; for individual terms see Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms*, passim.

<sup>64</sup>E.g., O. Pfleiderer, *Paulinism. A Contribution to the History of Primitive Christian Theology*, trans. E. Peters, 2 vols. (London: Williams and Norgate, 1877); W. Wrede, *Paul*, trans. E. Lummis (Lexington: American Library Association, 1962 [1904]); W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*, trans. J. E. Steely (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970 [1913]); and R. Reitzenstein, *The Hellenistic Mystery-Religions:*

involved the possibility of Gnostic influence on Paul.<sup>65</sup> Others contended that the decisive influences on Paul, apart from Jesus and early Christianity, were the Hebrew Scriptures and Palestinian Judaism.<sup>66</sup> They argued that Paul antedated or opposed much of the non-Jewish teaching on which he was supposedly dependent.

In recent decades scholars have generally agreed that one should not erect rigid distinctions between "Hellenistic" and "Jewish" influences or between "Hellenistic" and "Palestinian" Judaism. Differences must be acknowledged but not exaggerated because of the extent to which Hellenistic ideas had penetrated Palestine and Judaism in the first century.<sup>67</sup> Paul lived in both worlds so his anthropological language owed something to both Hellenistic and Jewish thought and scholars have continued to look for parallels from other writers of his day.<sup>68</sup> In the end, however, we are left with Paul himself and the need to find some explanation for the distinctive uses of various terms in his anthropology. The key factor in determining his meaning is the way he used these terms in context augmented by relevant parallels, if any, in

---

*Their Basic Ideas and Significance*, trans. J. E. Steely from the 3rd German ed., PTMS 15 (Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1978 [1910]). See the discussion and critique by Schweitzer, *Paul and His Interpreters*, 66-77.

<sup>65</sup>E.g., R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. K. Grobel (London: SCM, 1956) 1:199, 204. Bultmann acknowledged that Paul opposed some Gnostic notions, but he claimed that Paul's portrayal of a deep division in man and his use of some terms in a derogatory sense betrayed Gnostic influence.

<sup>66</sup>E.g., H. W. Robinson, *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, 3rd ed. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1926) 8, passim; J. A. T. Robinson, *The Body. A Study in Pauline Theology*, SBT 5 (London: SCM, 1952) passim; and Stacey, *Pauline View of Man*, passim. Stacey's more general thesis is that Paul's anthropology was fundamentally Christian and that he normally used Jewish language, though occasionally Hellenism offered a more adequate term (39).

<sup>67</sup>M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, trans. J. Bowden, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974); also I. H. Marshall, "Palestinian and Hellenistic Christianity: Some Critical Comments," *NTS* 19 (1972-73) 271-87.

<sup>68</sup>For example: E. Brandenburger, *Fleisch und Geist: Paulus und die dualistische Weisheit*, WMANT 29 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968) 114-221, makes an extensive comparison of Paul and Philo as a representative of Hellenistic Judaism. Substantive comparisons between the Dead Sea Scrolls and elements of Pauline anthropology, especially *πνεῦμα* and *σάρξ* in connection with sin, can be found in several places such as A. Sand, *Der Begriff 'Fleisch' in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1967) 253-73.

Greek or Hebrew thought.<sup>69</sup> Many terms exhibit a range of meaning with some overlap for certain pairs.<sup>70</sup> Based on this approach, many acknowledge that Jewish thought provides the greater background influence for most Pauline terms and ideas.

Related to the preceding discussion is the question about whether Paul's anthropology is monistic or dualistic. Most scholars today view it as some form of monism, or basically so, such that any evidence of dualism is minimal and extraneous, a vestige of Greek influence.<sup>71</sup> But this understanding has been challenged.<sup>72</sup> According to Robert Gundry, "anthropological duality," not "monistic unity," best describes Paul's anthropology. The whole person (*ἄνθρωπος*) consists of a corporeal side for which Paul uses the term *σῶμα* (sometimes *σάρξ*), and an incorporeal side whose various functions he describes by using *πνεῦμα*, *ψυχή*, *καρδία*, *νοῦς*, *ἔσω ἄνθρωπος* et al.; thus there is "an ontological duality, a functional pluralism, and an overarching unity."<sup>73</sup> Paul's emphasis lies on unity, viewing a human being as a fully integrated whole person.

Along with the monism / dualism issue, scholars have sought to understand

---

<sup>69</sup>See J. M. G. Barclay, *Obeying the Truth. A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians*, ed. J. Riches (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988) 185-92, for a perceptive discussion and evaluation of parallels from Philo and Qumran in relation to *πνεῦμα* and *σάρξ* leading to this conclusion. Also, see Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 54-55.

<sup>70</sup>Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 55-78, summarizes the spectrum of meaning for *σῶμα* / *σάρξ*, *νοῦς* / *καρδία*, and *ψυχή* / *πνεῦμα*, and points out where each pair overlaps in meaning.

<sup>71</sup>See the discussion in Bultmann, *Theology*, 1:209, who concludes: "Man does not consist of two parts much less of three; nor are *psyche* and *pneuma* special faculties or principles (within the *soma*) of a mental life higher than his animal life. Rather, man is a living unity." See also Stacey, *Pauline View of Man*, 126; Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms*, passim; and H. Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*, trans. J. R. DeWitt (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975) 29-32.

<sup>72</sup>See R. H. Gundry, *Sōma in Biblical Theology with Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology*, SNTSMS 29 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), and J. W. Cooper, *Body, Soul, and Life Everlasting: Biblical Anthropology and the Monism-Dualism Debate* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), passim. See ch. 6, 302-03.

<sup>73</sup>Gundry, *Sōma*, 79, 83-84, 156, and 117-83 for supporting arguments. Similarly, Cooper, *Body, Soul, and Life Everlasting*, 50, 179, demonstrates that "functional holism" rather than "ontological holism" and "holistic dualism" rather than "holistic monism" best describe Pauline anthropology; see 36-103 and 147-95 for supporting arguments. Contra Bultmann, *Theology*, 1:192-96 et al.

Paul's anthropology in relationship to other facets of his theology. Since the mid-20th century the theological analysis of his anthropology has been dominated by Rudolf Bultmann and Ernst Käsemann. We turn to a brief sketch of their contributions to the subject.

**1.2.1.2 Contribution of Rudolf Bultmann.** For Bultmann, Pauline theology is not a theoretical, speculative system. It deals with God only as He is significant for man, and, correspondingly, it deals with the world and man not as they are in themselves but in their relationship to God. On this premise Bultmann states: "Every assertion about God is simultaneously an assertion about man and vice versa. For this reason and in this sense Paul's theology is at the same time anthropology."<sup>74</sup> Therefore, he links anthropology with soteriology—God's deed for man and his demand of him—and treats Paul's theology as his doctrine of man: first, man prior to faith, and second, man under faith.

The way in which Bultmann interprets the movement from unbelief to faith is reflected in his discussion of Paul's anthropological terms. He states that *σῶμα* is the most comprehensive and most complex term that Paul uses. In Pauline usage it may mean the physical body, but more characteristically it denotes the human person as a whole, such that we can say "man does not *have* a *σῶμα*; he *is* *σῶμα* . . . ."<sup>75</sup> Consequently, man is able to experience himself as the subject to whom something happens or as the object of his own action. In this way Paul denotes man in relationship to himself; and because of this, a double possibility exists: he can be at one with himself or he can be estranged from himself. Man as *σῶμα*, therefore, is responsible for his own existence. He can *have* himself under control or lose this control and come under the domination of outside powers.

---

<sup>74</sup>Bultmann, *Theology*, 1:191. Unfortunately, he overstates the importance of anthropology in Paul leading to his own existentialist individualism and to further anthropological reductionism in some of his followers.

<sup>75</sup>*Ibid.*, 1:193-94; 195-96, 203.

According to Bultmann, Paul uses the terms *πνεῦμα* and *σάρξ* to denote man at one with himself or estranged from himself respectively. *Σάρξ*, in addition to denoting the concrete, fleshly body, refers to man estranged from himself as "fleshly," lost in the world, and existing in inauthenticity. Thus, the meaning of *σάρξ* is extended to include not only human nature at work in man himself, but also the environment within which man lives, "*the whole sphere of that which is earthly or 'natural.'*" To take *σάρξ* as one's norm for living is what Bultmann defines as sin for it means to turn from the creator to the creation, to trust in one's self as being able to obtain life through one's own strength and accomplishment. But man has fallen victim to his own attempt to secure life and thus has lost to the flesh and sin as personified powers his capacity to determine his own actions. Bultmann goes on to show how this can apply to both Gentile lawlessness and Jewish religious piety.<sup>76</sup>

On the other hand, *πνεῦμα* is descriptive of the kind of existence in which a person is oriented to God and thus able to live authentically. Paul then uses the terms *νοῦς*, *συνείδησις*, *καρδία*, and *ψυχή* to oscillate between *πνεῦμα* and *σάρξ* and describe different aspects of human existence with respect to its authenticity or inauthenticity. They describe what belongs to human nature, which in itself is neither good nor evil, but which offers the possibility of deciding for good or evil. In describing the Spirit, Bultmann stresses the freedom the Spirit brings, namely, "release from the compulsion of sin" and a newly opened possibility of obtaining "life." At the same time he limits the sense in which the Spirit is viewed as "power" because to be "led by the Spirit" presupposes a decision between two alternatives: "flesh" or "spirit."<sup>77</sup> This reflects Bultmann's characteristic emphasis on human "decision" and on faith as obedience. As John Barclay points out, it indicates that he sees the Spirit

---

<sup>76</sup>Ibid., 1:234, 239-45. Bultmann discusses *σάρξ* along with sin and death as personified powers to which man has fallen victim.

<sup>77</sup>Ibid., 1:330-40.

in Paul primarily "as the possibility of authentic obedience, a possibility previously unavailable to man trapped in his own self-seeking (the flesh)."<sup>78</sup>

Bultmann's existential interpretation of Pauline anthropology has been very influential. According to Robert Jewett, "the existential interpretation of the *σάρξ-πνεῦμα* categories has now become common property for almost all exegetes in contact with present-day discussion of the matter."<sup>79</sup> Prior to Bultmann, Pauline anthropology was often discussed in "partitive terms" where each anthropological term referred to a different part of the human constitution, and it was only a question of whether such an analysis had a Greek or Jewish antecedent. One of Bultmann's primary insights was to take Paul's anthropological terms as representing different ways of looking at the whole human person in relationship to himself and the control of opposing powers. As we shall see, this perspective has a bearing on how one views the "old man" and the "new man."

Despite the compelling nature of much in Bultmann's interpretation, some problems remain. Two issues are important for our consideration. First, as Barclay notes, Bultmann's schematic presentation of Paul's use of terms can be misleading. To avoid this, one must observe carefully the particular context in which an anthropological term or expression occurs.<sup>80</sup> Second, and more formidable, Bultmann's analysis is grounded in existentialist philosophy. A major effect of this is the almost exclusive attention he gives to the individual; but the range of Paul's anthropological terminology cannot be restricted so narrowly. Another result of this approach is Bultmann's "tendency to demythologize Paul's remarks about historical

---

<sup>78</sup>Barclay, *Obeying the Truth*, 195.

<sup>79</sup>Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms*, 67, 103. It must be noted, however, that a unitary view of Pauline anthropology is held by many who reject Bultmann's existential interpretation. See Barclay's assessment, *Obeying the Truth*, 195, along with additional references.

<sup>80</sup>Barclay, *Obeying the Truth*, 196, states that in this respect "Jewett's analysis of Paul's terms letter by letter is an important complement to the schematic presentations of the evidence by Bultmann, Sand and others" (196 n45). See also our approach on pp. 60-63 below.



events and their influence on 'the world.'<sup>81</sup> He interprets the cross as a revelatory event that discloses God's grace and "frees man from himself." Similarly, the eschatological gift of the Spirit becomes "the power of futurity . . . the new possibility of genuine, human life which opens up to him who has surrendered his old understanding of himself."<sup>82</sup> However, one cannot eliminate the historical and eschatological dimensions of Paul's thought so completely. This becomes one of the main reactions of Ernst Käsemann who challenged Bultmann's views on the role of anthropology in Paul's thought as well as his interpretation of key anthropological terms.

**1.2.1.3 Contribution of Ernst Käsemann.** In his earliest work on anthropological themes, Käsemann emphasized the cosmic scope of Paul's thought and compared it with Gnostic thought.<sup>83</sup> In his later essays and his commentary on Romans,<sup>84</sup> he dropped the comparison with Gnosticism in favor of an emphasis on apocalyptic themes as determining factors in Pauline theology.<sup>85</sup> He repeatedly criticizes Bultmann for making anthropology the focal point of Paul's theology leading to an exaggerated individualism.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup>Ibid., 198.

<sup>82</sup>Bultmann, *Theology* 1:335-36; also id., "Christ the End of the Law," in *Essays Philosophical and Theological*, trans. J. C. G. Greig (London: SCM, 1955) 36-66, esp. 59-60.

<sup>83</sup>E. Käsemann, *Leib und Leib Christi: Eine Untersuchung zur paulinischen Begrifflichkeit*, BHT 9 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1933).

<sup>84</sup>Many of Käsemann's essays have been translated and published in *New Testament Questions of Today*, trans. W. J. Montague (London: SCM, 1969) and in *Perspectives on Paul*, trans. M. Kohl (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971); id., *Commentary on Romans*, trans. and ed. G. W. Bromiley from the 4th German edition, HNT 8a (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980).

<sup>85</sup>See, e.g., "The Beginnings of Christian Theology" and "On the Subject of Primitive Christian Apocalyptic" in *New Testament Questions of Today*, 82-107 and 108-37 respectively. For a discussion of the change in Käsemann's view of the background against which he interpreted Paul's theology as reflected in his pre-1950 and post-1960 publications and his understanding of apocalyptic, see D. V. Way, *The Lordship of Christ. Ernst Käsemann's Interpretation of Paul's Theology*, OTM (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991) 122-32.

<sup>86</sup>Käsemann, "On Paul's Anthropology," in *Perspectives on Paul*, 1-31, esp. 1-14.

Instead of focusing on the anthropological terms themselves, as Bultmann did, Käsemann puts the subject in a wider Pauline context of christology, cosmology, and eschatology. He argues that Paul does not see a human being simply as an individual in relationship with him or herself, but in relationship with others and with his or her Lord. A human being is "a challengable and a continually challenged being," something that is a constitutive element of one's existence. The challenge of the gospel does not end with conversion because salvation is an "endless path" that embodies "the challenge of being called to be a new creation and a new man."<sup>87</sup>

Käsemann agrees with Bultmann's insight that Paul's anthropological terms do not refer exclusively to the component parts of a human being but rather to existence as a whole. However, he argues that Paul did not share the idealist notion of an inherent continuity of existence. Such a notion, he claims, is alien to Paul's thinking. One way he makes this point is by arguing that Christian baptism marks "the death of the old man and the miraculous beginning of a new life under the banner of the resurrection." Further, Paul regards salvation history as divided into epochs, and his understanding of the resurrection shows that for him "discontinuity is the mark of both existence and history." Discontinuity exists between the worlds of [original] creation and the fall, and between the lordships of sin, Christ, and the resurrection.<sup>88</sup>

One important distinction from Bultmann emerges in Käsemann's interpretation of *σῶμα*. Bultmann minimized the importance of corporeality. Käsemann argues that this concept is fundamental to Paul's theology because all of God's ways with His creation begin and end in corporeality. As such, man in his corporeality is never neutral in himself but is always "in the mode of belongingness

---

<sup>87</sup>Ibid., 5-6.

<sup>88</sup>Ibid., 8-9.

and participation." This means that a man or woman as a whole person is always part of a particular world and always belongs to a structure of solidarity.<sup>89</sup> According to Käsemann, Paul sees human beings as standing in solidarity with and thus in the power-sphere of either Adam or Christ. As such, a human being is the object or at most the exponent of the power that rules him or her. Since the Genesis fall, humanity is not free but enslaved to the power of evil forces from which it can only be rescued by an eschatological intervention. Thus Paul's hope was directed toward the time when Christ would rule and place all His enemies under His feet, and God would be all in all (cf. 1 Cor. 15:25-28). In this context the resurrection of believers means participation in a world set free by the rule of God.

Within this framework of thought, Käsemann discusses selected anthropological terms. He insists that these terms "do not signify . . . the individuation of the individual human being, but primarily that reality which, as the power either of the heavenly or the earthly, determines him from outside, takes possession of him and thereby decides into which of the two dualistically opposed spheres he is to be integrated."<sup>90</sup> This means the whole person is involved in the cosmic conflict between God and the forces of evil. Anthropology, then, is bound up with cosmology even in the sphere of faith.

As a result, Käsemann expresses his interpretation of Paul's anthropology in terms of lordship and connects it to his idea that a human being is a participant in a particular "world" (power-sphere). This understanding of human existence not only stresses the idea of "belonging to a lord" but also the notion that human beings are able to respond to realities (worlds or lordships) that are already present. Because of this, the change of existence spoken of by an existentialist interpretation is in reality

---

<sup>89</sup>Ibid., 18-22.

<sup>90</sup>Käsemann, "Primitive Christian Apocalyptic," in *New Testament Questions of Today*, 131-37, specifically 136; also "On Paul's Anthropology," 26, where he states that human existence is "always fundamentally conceived from the angle of the world to which one belongs."

a "change (or exchange) of lordship."<sup>91</sup> Human beings are always under a lord. They cannot escape from the power of sin to an autonomous state. But as a Christian, a human being exchanges this lordship for the lordship of Christ.

Käsemann's interpretation of Paul's anthropology has also been influential. As Barclay points out, "[his] emphasis on apocalyptic, on the physicality of *σῶμα*, and on the Spirit and flesh as powers which determine human existence 'from outside' have all won increasing recognition in recent years. Many scholars now concur with his point of view on the importance of apocalyptic in Paul—not just in isolated motifs but in the whole framework of his theology."<sup>92</sup> Käsemann's achievement in scholarly discussion was to put Pauline anthropology into a broader cosmological and apocalyptic context that others have developed in various ways.<sup>93</sup> Two of his insights are useful for our consideration of the "old man / new man": 1) a person is part of a particular world (power-sphere), set in a structure of solidarity; and 2) discontinuity between the lordships of sin and grace, Adam and Christ, and the "old" and the "new" is characteristic of human existence and requires divine intervention to bridge the gap between them. This renewed emphasis on apocalyptic features leads us to consider the eschatological structure of Paul's theology.

### 1.2.2 Eschatological Structure of Paul's Theology

In light of renewed emphasis on Jewish backgrounds there is growing agreement that what lies at the "core" of Paul's theological thinking is the eschatologically-understood saving activity of God through Jesus Christ. Yet there are divergent views regarding this perspective.

---

<sup>91</sup>Käsemann, "On Paul's Anthropology," 27-28, and *Romans*, 179, 282, 363.

<sup>92</sup>Barclay, *Obedying the Truth*, 201.

<sup>93</sup>Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms*, 93-95; Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, passim; J. L. Martyn, "Apocalyptic Antinomies in Paul's Letter to the Galatians," *NTS* 31 (1985) 410-24; M. C. de Boer, *The Defeat of Death. Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5*, JSNTSup 22 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988).

**1.2.2.1 Divergent Views.** Albert Schweitzer (1875–1965) was a key figure among others who examined the comparative religions approach to Paul at the beginning of the 20th century. In an analysis of Pauline research in Germany at the time, he criticized the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* for interpreting Paul in Hellenistic rather than Jewish categories, especially those of apocalyptic Judaism.<sup>94</sup> Later, he set forth his own view in which he argued that Paul shared Jesus' eschatology and drew on apocalyptic Judaism to explain that there is an "already" realized kingdom begun at Christ's resurrection and a "not yet" full revelation of God's kingdom at the end of history.<sup>95</sup> The presently realized aspect of the eschaton comes to expression in Paul's prominent *ἐν Χριστῷ* motif. According to Schweitzer, this Christ-mysticism, the Christian's mystical union with Christ as a "pneumatic corporeality" realized through the sacraments, became the central core of Paul's theology, relegating justification by faith to a subsidiary role.<sup>96</sup> Though Schweitzer's reconstruction can be criticized at several points,<sup>97</sup> his interpretation of Paul helped recapture both the redemptive-historical and eschatological character of Paul's overall theology.

---

<sup>94</sup>Schweitzer, *Paul and His Interpreters* (1911), 59-60. He praised R. Kabisch, *Die Eschatologie des Paulus in ihren Zusammenhängen mit dem Gesamtbegriff des Paulinismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1893), as the first to understand fully "the great paradoxes of Paulinism" and to describe clearly "their real eschatological essence." For others opposed to the *religionsgeschichtliche* interpretation of Paul, see H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1913); more recently, G. Wagner, *Pauline Baptism and the Pagan Mysteries*, ATANT 39 (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1967 [1962]); and C. Colpe, *Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule. Darstellung und Kritik ihres Bildes vom gnostischen Erlösermythus*, FRLANT 78 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961).

<sup>95</sup>A. Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, trans. W. Montgomery (New York: Seabury Press, 1968 [1930]) 52-55, 110-15. Schweitzer did not use the term "apocalyptic," even though he argued that Paul was to be understood in light of Jewish eschatology. He maintained a consistent futuristic eschatological (apocalyptic) approach to Paul, even though, in his view, it proved to be an illusion in the end since the kingdom of God failed to arrive at Christ's death and resurrection (115).

<sup>96</sup>*Ibid.*, 3, 117, 225.

<sup>97</sup>Of the many evaluations of Schweitzer's "consistent eschatology," the following are helpful: T. F. Glasson, "Schweitzer's Influence—Blessing or Bane?" *JTS* 28 (1977) 289-302; A. C. Thiselton, "Schweitzer's Interpretation of Paul," *ExpTim* 90 (1978-79) 132-37; and W. Willis, "The Discovery of the Eschatological Kingdom: Johannes Weiss and Albert Schweitzer," in *The Kingdom of God in 20th Century Interpretation*, ed. W. Willis (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1987) 1-14.

C. H. Dodd also recognized the eschatological framework for Paul's theological thinking, but he interpreted it as an expression of Paul's belief that history had reached its *fulfillment* in Christ's death and resurrection.<sup>98</sup> In his view, Paul shifted from "futuristic" to "realized" eschatology. Then, Paul brought this to full development in his emphasis on "Christ-mysticism" (one's consciousness of spiritual union with Christ) and on the Church as the sphere of divine grace and spiritual life.

Rudolf Bultmann also saw the significance of eschatology for Paul, but he considered Jewish apocalyptic ideas to be a stumbling block because they had not been empirically confirmed. According to him, Paul moved the interpretation of the earliest kerygma beyond mythology to an anthropologically construed doctrine of justification by faith. The present reality of the believer's status before God replaced any thought of future redemption. For Paul, the eschatological moment of salvation is neither a space-time event in the past nor an event yet to occur in the future but an existential happening that takes place in each individual's confrontation with the claims of the gospel and consequent decision for faith.<sup>99</sup> Thus, the core of Paul's theology is not eschatology but the anthropological concepts found in it.

During the mid-20th century, however, the discovery and publication of the Qumran documents and the apocalyptic force of their sectarian theology began to return interpreters to Schweitzer's appreciation of the apocalyptic character of early Christianity. While Greeks typically viewed time as cyclical,<sup>100</sup> Hebraic thought typically viewed time as a succession of ages and looked for the age to come (the

---

<sup>98</sup>C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments*, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1951 [1936]) 44, 63-65.

<sup>99</sup>R. Bultmann, *The Presence of Eternity: History and Eschatology* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957) 33-50; id., "History and Eschatology in the New Testament," *NTS* 1 (1954) 5-16; id., *Theology*, 191. See also pp. 26-29 above.

<sup>100</sup>See A. A. Long and D. N. Sedley, *The Hellenistic Philosophers*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987) 1:308-13.

"messianic age" in some circles) to deliver them from the evils of the present age.<sup>101</sup>

Paul shared the latter view modified by the coming of Jesus Christ and the split between the "already" past and present, and the "not yet" future.<sup>102</sup>

Apocalyptic as an interpretive approach to Pauline theology came into full discussion with the later work of Ernst Käsemann who asserted that "apocalyptic was the mother of all Christian theology."<sup>103</sup> He argued against Bultmann's anthropocentrism and defended Schweitzer's claim that Paul's apocalyptic world view was determinative for his thought.<sup>104</sup> He and others contributed to the development of a fresh look at the nature of apocalyptic and its place in early Christianity.<sup>105</sup>

J. Christiaan Beker has made a spirited plea for this perspective by arguing that apocalyptic in the sense of the imminent, cosmic triumph of God over the created order is the heart of Paul's thought. He contends that Paul locates the center of the gospel in the apocalyptic interpretation of the Christ-event.<sup>106</sup> Beker focuses

<sup>101</sup>See, e.g., Dan. 2 and 7; CD 6.10, 14; 12.23; 15.7; 1QpHab 5.7; and the later Jewish apocalypses 4 Ezra (e.g., 6:7; 11:44) and 2 Baruch.

<sup>102</sup>Cf. Rom. 1:2-4; 8:15-18, 23-25; 1 Cor. 2:6-8; 10:11; 2 Cor. 4:4; Gal. 1:3-5; 4:4-6; Phil. 3:20-21; Col. 1:26-27; Eph. 1:19b-21.

<sup>103</sup>E. Käsemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Theology" in *New Testament Questions of Today*, 102. For a summary and analysis of Käsemann's work, see W. G. Rollins, "The New Testament and Apocalyptic," *NTS* 17 (1970-71) 454-76. See also Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, 13-19, 360-62.

<sup>104</sup>See footnotes 84 and 85 above and "An Apologia for Primitive Christian Eschatology" in *Essays on New Testament Themes*, trans. W. J. Montague (London: SCM, 1964) 169-95. Käsemann took issue with Schweitzer's claim that Paul's apocalyptic hopes relegated the doctrine of justification by faith to a subsidiary role as simply a polemical device against Judaizers. In his essay, "Justification and Salvation History in the Epistle to the Romans" in *Perspectives on Paul*, 60-78, he insisted that it is God's justification of the ungodly by faith in Christ that is the distinctive mark of the new age.

<sup>105</sup>E.g., O. Cullmann, *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History*, rev. ed. (London: SCM / Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962) 88, 145-55; id., *Salvation in History* (London: SCM / New York: Harper and Row, 1967) 170-75, 202; P. Stuhlmacher, *Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965) 175, 203; and W. G. Kümmel, *The Theology of the New Testament According to Its Major Witnesses: Jesus, Paul, John*, trans. J. E. Stealy (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1973 [1969]) 144.

<sup>106</sup>Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, 18-19, also 205, "The cross . . . is the apocalyptic turning point of history;" and 207, "The death and resurrection of Christ in their apocalyptic setting

on Paul's distinctive use of Jewish apocalyptic but acknowledges that it undergoes "a profound modification" in light of God's decisive act in Christ. Because of the Christ-event, believers can already claim "the new creation" and live in the power of the Spirit. At the same time, the Christ-event is a proleptic anticipation of God's final glory and the consummation of history. Since it inaugurates the end times and points to God's cosmic triumph, the Christ-event itself is eschatologically oriented.<sup>107</sup> Despite an ongoing debate over the meaning and the appropriate use of the term "apocalyptic,"<sup>108</sup> Beker's work has prompted further studies<sup>109</sup> that have added support to his conviction that affirms Schweitzer's basic insight: Paul's interpretation of the Christ-event reflects the use of Jewish apocalyptic language and ideas. Nevertheless, as Beker acknowledges, Paul's use of traditional apocalyptic is "modified," a modification that fits with his understanding of God's activity in redemptive history.

In line with Schweitzer's insight but with less emphasis on apocalyptic is the highly influential work of E. P. Sanders that spawned a "new perspective on Paul"

---

constitute the coherent core of Paul's thought." See also pp. 13-17, 40-41, 277-78, 355-58, 362-67.

<sup>107</sup>Ibid., 145-52. This modification calls in question Beker's very broad view of traditional apocalyptic, which is primarily concerned with future events. The word "eschatological" seems to be a more appropriate descriptive term for Pauline thought since "eschatology" encompasses the entire present-future polarity.

<sup>108</sup>See R. E. Sturm, "Defining the Word 'Apocalyptic': A Problem in Biblical Criticism," in J. Marcus and M. L. Soards, eds., *Apocalyptic and the New Testament*, JSNTS 24 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989) 17-48; and R. B. Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul: Paul's Interpreters and the Rhetoric of Criticism*, JSNTS 127 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).

<sup>109</sup>For example: Martyn, "Apocalyptic Antinomies," 410-24, focuses on the cross rather than the parousia (pace Beker); M. A. Getty, "An Apocalyptic Perspective on Rom. 10:4," *HBT* 4-5 (1982-83) 79-131; L. E. Keck, "Paul and Apocalyptic Theology," *Interp* 38 (1984) 229-41; and H. Moore, "Paul and Apocalyptic," *IBSt* 9 (1987) 35-46. Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 461-72, following Cullmann, calls the distinctive "already fulfilled" but "not yet completed" framework the "eschatological tension" in Paul's theology. Although many Pauline studies define the role of Jewish apocalyptic in Paul's theology differently, they all—along with a growing number of contemporary scholars—believe that one cannot do justice to Paul's theology without accounting for his widespread use of apocalyptic language and ideas. The diversity of views is due in large measure to a lack of consensus regarding the nature and extent of Jewish and Christian apocalyptic thought.



in the final two decades of the twentieth century.<sup>110</sup> Using a holistic approach, Sanders presents a descriptive account of two patterns of religion, namely, Second Temple Judaism and Paul, and compares them.<sup>111</sup> After a detailed discussion of Jewish texts, he concludes that first-century Judaism was not a legalistic religion of “works-righteousness,” the prevailing view in Pauline scholarship and popular preaching.<sup>112</sup> Instead, Judaism was a religion of grace—the covenant had been given by divine initiative—with human obedience to the law understood as the proper response to God’s grace. Observing the law along with atonement for transgressions was the means of “staying in” not of “getting into” the covenant. Sanders calls this pattern of religion underlying various forms of Judaism “covenantal nomism.”<sup>113</sup>

In his treatment of Paul, Sanders concludes, among other things, that justification by faith cannot be the center of Paul’s theology, the traditional view held by many scholars.<sup>114</sup> Instead, following Schweitzer, he argues that the language and imagery of participation in Christ is the dominant (soteriological) theme in Paul. Union with Christ effects a transfer from one sphere of lordship (sin, law, death) to

---

<sup>110</sup>E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977); id., *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983); id., *Paul* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); and id., *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE—66 CE* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1992). The “new perspective” designation comes from J. D. G. Dunn, “The New Perspective on Paul,” *BJRL* 65 (1983) 95-122. Dunn has been a leading voice in adopting Sanders’ view (with modifications) and working out its implications in understanding both first-century Judaism and Paul. See Dunn’s *Romans 1-8, 9-16*. 2 vols. WBC 38A, 38B (Dallas: Word Books, 1988); his collection of essays, *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1990); and his *Theology of Paul*, 335-40.

<sup>111</sup>By “pattern of religion,” Sanders means the description of how a religion functions in terms of how its adherents / members understand “getting in” and “staying in” the group of the saved (*Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 17).

<sup>112</sup>Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 1-12, 33-59, 552. See also Bultmann, *Theology*, 1:243 and Dunn, *Romans*, 1:185.

<sup>113</sup>*Ibid.*, 75 (definition), 420, 422 (summary), and 544. See also Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 338-39.

<sup>114</sup>*Ibid.*, 438-41. At the same time, Sanders notes that “there is no neat division in Paul’s thought between ‘mystical’ [participationist] and ‘juridical’ [language / categories]” (441) and he discusses the relationship between the two (502-08, 520).

another (righteousness, gospel, life) and the ensuing transformation will not be completed until the Lord returns. This pattern of religion, which is fundamentally different from Judaism, Sanders calls "participationist eschatology."<sup>115</sup>

Sanders' work has generated considerable discussion on the relationship of Paul's theology to his Jewish heritage (esp. his view of the law), and his "new perspective" views have been criticized at several points.<sup>116</sup> Nevertheless, his reexamination of first-century Judaism has countered caricatures and misrepresentations of it, and his treatment of Paul has refocused attention on Paul's participationist language and reaffirmed the redemptive-historical, eschatological character of his theology.

**1.2.2.2 Redemptive History and Eschatology.** We noted above that a governing principle of Paul's theological thinking is the eschatologically-understood saving activity of God through Jesus Christ. On one hand, this saving activity is the fulfillment of God's work in the history of Israel and thus also the fulfillment of Old Testament Scripture. On the other hand, it reaches out to the parousia of Christ and the ultimate consummation of all things in the future kingdom of God. In light of this broad conception of Paul's theological thinking, the most adequate interpretive approach appears to be one that does justice both to the present and the future significance of this "eschatology" without dissolving the historical backbone of Paul's preaching concerning what has already taken place, nor dismissing the future

---

<sup>115</sup>Ibid., 441-42, 523, 547-49 (descriptive summary), 552. "In Christ" not "in Judaism" Paul found life, thus, according to Sanders, his theological thinking moved from the solution (Jesus Christ) to the problem (human enslavement to sin) and what he found wrong in Judaism was that it was not Christianity (552). Since Sanders makes no sustained attempt to explain what Paul meant by "participation in Christ," see Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 390-412, for further development of this imagery.

<sup>116</sup>Of the many summaries and evaluations of Sanders' "new perspective," the following are helpful: J. Neusner, "Comparing Judaisms," *HRel* 18 (1978-79) 177-91; R. H. Gundry, "Grace, Works, and Staying Saved in Paul," *Bib* 66 (1985) 1-38; S. Westerholm, *Israel's Law and the Church's Faith: Paul and His Recent Interpreters* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988); F. Thielman, *Paul and the Law: A Contextual Approach* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1994) esp. ch. 1; and Riches, *A Century of New Testament Study*, 136-42. For further bibliography, see ch. 3, 173 n81.

dimension concerning what must yet take place. This could be summarized as the *heilsgeschichtliche*-eschatological character of Paul's theology.<sup>117</sup> This approach emphasizes the element of *fulfillment* in Paul's preaching (realized eschatology), and the importance of a continual future *expectation* (futuristic, apocalyptic eschatology). Within this framework, the various strands of Paul's theology can be integrated in terms of their unity and diversity as well as their continuity and discontinuity.

The christological character of Paul's eschatology emerges plainly in the tension between fulfillment and expectation. On one hand, he speaks of "the fullness of time" (Gal. 4:4), "the acceptable time" and "the day of salvation" (2 Cor. 6:2) that have already taken effect. This is also apparent when he speaks of the great change that occurred with the death and resurrection of Christ as the arrival of a "new creation" (2 Cor. 5:17). This is meant not only in an individual, spiritual sense, but also in a redemptive-historical, eschatological sense with a corporate dimension. The person who is "in Christ," therefore, is in the "new creation." He or she with others belong to this new order that has dawned with Christ's resurrection.

On the other hand, Paul was clearly aware that the person "in Christ" still lives in the present world ("this age") and the time corresponding with it ("the now time;" cf. Rom. 8:18; 11:5; 12:2 et al.). He speaks of the present world time as "the ends of the ages" (cf. 1 Cor. 10:11), the overlap of "this age" that is passing away and the "new age" begun with Christ. He can speak of "the present evil age" as a situation from which Christ has delivered His people (Gal. 1:4), while elsewhere he speaks of the present age as the place where believers must live godly lives and "shine like stars in the universe" (Phil. 2:15).

---

<sup>117</sup>Ridderbos, *Paul*, 42. Another compatible approach arguing that Paul's dynamic, multifaceted theology emerges from its narrative substructure (i.e., the story of God and creation, Israel, Christ, the Church and consummation) has been set forth by R. B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989); N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992); and B. Witherington, *Paul's Narrative Thought World* (Louisville: Westminster / John Knox, 1994).

Thus in certain contexts Paul describes existence prior to the redemptive time of Christ as *ποτέ* ("once," Rom. 6:20-23; 11:30; Gal. 4:29; cf. Col. 1:21-22; 3:7-8; Eph. 2:2, 12). This stands in contrast with the present *νῦν* ("now") of the new creation, the time of redemption and fulfillment (Rom. 3:21, 26; 5:9-11; 8:1, 18; 2 Cor. 5:16; Col. 1:26; Eph. 2:13; 3:5, 10). In other contexts, however, the present *νῦν* ("now" / "already") refers to the continuation of earthly existence defined by the world over against the *τότε* ("then") of the consummation still to come (1 Thess. 5:2-3; 4:5; 1 Cor. 13:10, 12; 15:28, 54; Col. 3:4). These two motifs, "once / now" and "already / not yet," relate the past of redemptive time to the present and the present to the future.

This dynamic is also found in passages in which Christ is set over against Adam. Paul speaks of Adam as "the first man" and of Christ as "the last Adam," the "second man" (1 Cor. 15:45-47). Adam is a type of Christ (Rom. 5:14). In this regard, he represents the whole of humanity and the present age (5:12) while Christ represents the age to come and redeemed humanity (5:15b, 17b). By His resurrection the new life of the new creation has already come to light and become a reality in this age. In Paul's statement, ". . . for as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor. 15:22), the words "in Christ" are parallel with "in Adam." Adam and Christ stand in contrast to each other as two archetypal figures at the outset of two "creations," the old and the new, and two "realms," death and life. In their actions and destiny lie the course of life and destiny for all who belong to them because they are included in them and thus are reckoned either to death or to life. This relationship between Adam and Christ and those who belong to them reflects an ancient Hebraic (Josh. 7:16-26) and Greek (Sophocles, *Oedipus*, 314) idea of "all in (or, connected to) one," a concept at one time denoted by the unfortunate expression "corporate personality."<sup>118</sup> A more appropriate designation is "corporate solidarity,"

---

<sup>118</sup>The concept of "corporate personality" had its origin in the work of H. W. Robinson, *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, 8; id., *Corporate Personality in Ancient Israel*, rev. ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980 [1935]). See also J. Pedersen, *Israel: Its Life and Culture* (London: Oxford

which points to an archetypal figure who represents a whole group of people and is the one with whom the individual members of the group are identified because of a particular relationship they have with the archetypal figure. This is reflected in "the many / all"-in-"the one" language Paul uses with respect to Adam and Christ (Rom. 5:12-21; 1 Cor. 15:22). Though he does not elaborate on this corporate connection, various interpreters use the concept of "corporate solidarity" to explain it.<sup>119</sup>

### 1.2.3 Conclusion

As surveyed above, recent scholarly discussion has called attention to the holistic and relational nature of Paul's anthropology with both an individual and corporate dimension. It also has given attention to the redemptive-historical, eschatological framework of Paul's theology within which the various facets of his thought operate. The "once / now" turning point from the old to the new creation and the "already / not yet" tension of redemptive time relate the past to the present and both of these to the future. This wider theological perspective provides the context for a narrower focus on the terms "old man / new man" and their contribution to Paul's

---

University Press, 1959 [1926, 1940]) I-II: 263-96, 474-79; III-IV: 76-86; A. R. Johnson, *The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God* (Cardiff: University of Wales, 1942); R. P. Shedd, *Man in Community: A Study of St. Paul's Application of Old Testament and Early Jewish Conceptions of Human Solidarity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964) 132-38; and A. J. M. Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection: Studies in Pauline Theology Against Its Greco-Roman Background*, WUNT 44 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1987) 351-56. For a critique of the legal aspects of the concept, see J. R. Porter, "Legal Aspects of Corporate Personality," *VT* 15 (1965) 361-80. J. W. Rogerson, "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality: A Reconsideration," *JTS* 21 (1970) 1-16, presented a rigorous critique of Robinson's views in which he questioned the theoretical basis of his position. Rather than a concept of psychological or even physical unity, Rogerson argues that there is a concept of corporate representation in the OT. He concluded correctly that the expression "corporate personality" should be dropped. See also S. E. Porter, "Two Myths: Corporate Personality and Language / Mentality Determinism," *SJT* 43 (1990) 289-307; and Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 408-10.

<sup>119</sup>Some, among others, who use the Adam-Christ typology in this way are E. Percy, *Der Leib Christi in den paulinischen Homologoumena und Antilegomena* (Lund: Gleerup, 1942); S. Hanson, *The Unity of the Church in the New Testament: Colossians and Ephesians*, ASNU 14 (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1946) 67-70; E. Best, *One Body in Christ: A Study in the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul* (London: SPCK, 1955); C. K. Barrett, *From First Adam to Last. A Study in Pauline Theology* (New York: Charles Scribner's and Sons, 1962); D. E. H. Whiteley, *The Theology of Saint Paul*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1974) 45-46; 132-34; Ridderbos, *Paul*, 61-62; and, in a more nuanced sense, Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 90-97, 199-204, 208-12; 241-42.

thought in this study. To prepare the way further, we must ask an additional question. In taking up these terms, did Paul make use of existing formulations, or did he himself contribute these terms to Christian thought? This leads us to consider the background of this dual metaphor.

### 1.3 Background of the "Old Man / New Man"

The word *ἄνθρωπος* has a versatile range of usage. It includes "man" (male person), "human being" (generic), and "humanity" (collective).<sup>120</sup> The main corresponding Hebrew word, אָדָם, has a similar range of usage, including a reference to the first man, Adam.<sup>121</sup> *Ἀνθρώπος* also allows for a variety of special combinations as noted above (see p. 4). Specifically, for our study, this involves the modifying adjectives "old" and "new" and particularly the verbs "put off" and "put on" with the "old man" and "new man" as their object respectively.

In light of such adjuncts, background investigations could be wide-ranging if one were to pursue possible antecedent parallels related to the metaphorical uses of "old" and "new" and the clothing metaphor "put off / put on" by themselves. However, our concern is focused more narrowly on the combinations "old man" and "new man" used as metaphors either independently, or as objects of the verbs "put off" and "put on," or, for that matter, any other verb.

---

<sup>120</sup>H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* [LSJ], 9th ed. rev. and augmented by H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie, 2 vols. in 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925-40) s.v. *ἄνθρωπος*, provide several examples of the meaning "man, both as a generic term and of individuals, the ideal man, humanity, and in the plural, mankind." See also W. Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* [BAGD], trans. and adapted from Bauer's 4th rev. ed. by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, 2nd ed. rev. and augmented by F. W. Gingrich and F. W. Danker from Bauer's 5th ed., 1958 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979) s.v. *ἄνθρωπος*, 1.

<sup>121</sup>F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953) s.v. אָדָם. There is a wordplay on "man," "mankind," and the first man, "Adam," in Gen. 1-3; see Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 82-84.

### 1.3.1 "Put Off / Put On" Parallels

The verbs ἀπεκδύω (-ομαι, "take off") and ἐνδύω (-ομαι, "put on"), with the "old man" and "new man" respectively as objects appear in Colossians 3:9-10 while the same construction occurs in Ephesians 4:22-24 using ἀποτίθημι (-ομαι, "take off") and ἐνδύω. These verbs, often depicting the act of taking clothes off and putting them on in the active voice, were frequently used in the middle voice as metaphors in the ancient world. They had the sense of "taking off (of oneself), removing" something and "taking on (for oneself), acquiring" something, and often denoted a change in identity, status, or character.<sup>122</sup> The objects involved were usually impersonal items. The picture of putting off vices and putting on virtues was relatively common in pre-Pauline Hellenistic literature.<sup>123</sup> The imagery of clothing oneself with a person was much less common, usually occurring in a stage-play setting as "playing the part of [someone]," that is, taking on the status and character of that person and becoming like him / her.<sup>124</sup> The idea of the soul that puts on a body as a "garment" and the physical body as the "garment" of the soul that is "put off" in death was widespread in antiquity.<sup>125</sup>

---

<sup>122</sup>BAGD, s.v. ἐκδύω, 2 fig. (also s.v. γυμνός, 4 fig.); ἀπεκδύομαι, 1; ἀποτίθημι, 1.b fig., and ἐνδύω, 2.b fig. See also LSJ, s.v. ἀποτίθημι, II.1-2; ἐκδύω, III.1; ἐνδύω, I.1; and A. Oepke, "δύω, κτλ," in *The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament [TDNT]*, eds. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, trans. and ed. G. W. Bromiley, 10 vols. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-76) 2:318-21. Cf. ch. 4, 212.

<sup>123</sup>For removal of vices or hindrances, see, e.g., Demosthenes 4.8, 8.6; for post-Pauline uses, see, e.g., Plutarch, *Cor.* 19.4; and Lucian, *Dial. Mort.* 10.8.9. For taking on virtues or benefits, see, e.g., Plato, *Rep.* 457A, 620C; Euripides, *Iph. T.* 602; Aristophanes, *Eccl.* 288; for post-Pauline uses, see, e.g., Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.75; 6.25; Artemidorus 3.14; Hermas, *Sim.* 9.24.2; and *CH* 10.18; 13.8-9.

<sup>124</sup>E.g., Dionysius Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.* 11.5, "to put on Tarquin," i.e., to play the role of Tarquin; also Callimachus, *Epigr.* 21.6; Cicero, *Tusc.* 1.38.92; *Off.* 3.10.43; for post-Pauline uses, e.g., Libanius, *Epist.* 968, 1048.2-4; and Maximus Tyrius 1.4e.

<sup>125</sup>E.g., Pindar, *Nem.* 11.15-16; Euripides, *Heracl.* 1269; *Bacch.* 746; Aristotle, *Anima* 1.3; also Philo, *Leg. All.* 2.56, 59; *Mut.* 233; *Fug.* 108-12; and *Op.* 134. For the origin of this idea and further discussion, see Käsemann, *Leib*, 87-94; and E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966) 135-50. This metaphor also occurs in later authors, for example: Artemidorus 5.40; *CH* 1.24-25; 7.2; Origen, *Contra Celsum* 8.44 and Hippolytus, *Haer.* 5.8.44; 8.10.7.

In the Hebrew Scriptures the verb *לְבַשׁ* often denotes a change in character or position by the "clothing" of someone with moral and spiritual qualities or benefits. Using *ἐνδύω*, translators adopted this metaphor in the LXX with a variety of objects: 1) *σωτηρίαν* (2 Chron. 6:41; Ps. 132:16; Isa. 61:10); 2) *δικαιοσύνην* (Job 29:14; LXX Ps. 131:9; Isa. 59:17); 3) *ἐξομολόγησιν καὶ εὐπρέπειαν* (LXX Ps. 103:1; 92:1; Job 40:10 has *δόξαν καὶ τιμήν*); 4) *ισχύν* (Prov. 31:25; Isa. 51:9; 52:1); and 5) *κατάραν* and *ἐντροπήν* (LXX Ps. 108:18, 29).<sup>126</sup> Similar usage involving the removal of bad or the acquisition of good moral qualities or benefits is also found in early Jewish literature,<sup>127</sup> in the New Testament (e.g., Rom. 13:12; 1 Thess. 5:8; Col. 3:8, 12; Eph. 4:25; 6:11, 14; Heb. 12:1; Jas. 1:18-21; 1 Pet. 2:1-2), in rabbinic literature (e.g., humility and reverence, e.g., *m. Aboth* 6.1; *Gen. Rab.* 50.2), and in early Christian authors (e.g., Hermas, *Sim.* 9.23.5; Chrysostom, *Hom. in Eph.* 13). In the mystery religions and Gnostic literature, the metaphor is associated with an event of "transformation," such as in the Isis community where an initiate was clothed with a heavenly garment and transformed into a new being, and the priestess of Isis "clothed herself" with the power of the goddess (cf. Apuleius, *Metamorphoses*, 11.21-24).

All these passages and others show that the dual "clothing" metaphor was well-known in the ancient world, and this in itself may have encouraged Paul's bold use of it, especially with a "person" as the object (cf. Gal. 3:27; Rom. 13:14).<sup>128</sup> Most

---

<sup>126</sup>More examples are cited in E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983) s.v. *ἐνδύω*; also Oepke, *TDNT*, 2:320; and L. Coenen, E. Beyreuther and H. Bietenhard, eds., *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology [NIDNTT]*, trans. with additions and revisions by C. Brown, gen. ed., 3 vols. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975) 1:314-16.

<sup>127</sup>E.g., Wis. 5:17-20; Bar. 5:1-2; 4 Ezra 4:14; *Ep. Arist.* 122; *1 Enoch* 62.14-16; 1QS 4.7-8; Philo, *Conf.* 31; and *Som.* 1.224-25.

<sup>128</sup>Pauline usage of the clothing metaphor occurs in connection with three events: 1) conversion-initiation (Gal. 3:27); 2) ongoing acts of ethical renewal (1 Thess. 5:8; Rom. 13:12, 14; Eph. 6:11, 14; Col. 3:8, 12); and 3) receiving the resurrection body (1 Cor. 15:53-55; 2 Cor. 5:2-5). At issue for our study is the category in which Col. 3:9-10 and Eph. 4:22-24, 25 fit.



often it denotes a change in character, status, or mode of existence. When a personal object is involved, which is much less common, the allusion is likely to a stage actor taking on the persona of his character in a play. However, neither the "old man" nor the "new man" appear as the object of these verbs prior to Paul.

### 1.3.2 "Old Man / New Man" Parallel?

To our knowledge, an exact antecedent parallel to the metaphorical use of the terms "old man / new man" has not been found in extant pre-Pauline literature.<sup>129</sup> P. W. van der Horst claims to have found an exception to this in a fragment of Aristocles of Messene, a Peripatetic philosopher of the second century AD.<sup>130</sup> This fragment from his historical work, *Περὶ φιλοσοφίας*, was preserved by Eusebius in his *Praeparatio Evangelica* (14.18.26). Aristocles, in turn, preserved a fragment of Antigonus of Carystus, a popular biographer of philosophers, who lived in the third century BC. This fragment deals with Pyrrho of Elis, the founder of the Sceptic philosophical school. Pyrrho claimed that reality is unknowable and, thus, people should ignore sense impressions. However, when he was attacked by a dog, he sought refuge in a tree demonstrating that his behavior did not reflect his philosophical convictions. When bystanders mocked and criticized him for this inconsistency, Pyrrho admitted they were right and by way of excuse said: *Χαλεπὸν εἶη τὸν ἄνθρωπον*

---

<sup>129</sup>Jeremias, *TDNT*, 1:366 n12, states that "the extra-Christian provenance . . . of the image of the old and new man has never been proved." He notes that the image occurs in Manichean literature (*Aug. contra Faustum*, 24.1.717-21), but Mani (3rd century A.D.), no doubt, borrowed it from Paul. J. Jervell, *Imago Dei: Gen. 1,26f im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen*, FRLANT 76 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960) 240-41, also concludes that no exact parallel has been found in non-Christian sources. The formulations "knowing the perfect man" and "putting on the perfect man" appear in two later Gnostic works dealing with the creation of man, viz., the *Apocryphon of John* (NHL II.1.15-25), and *The Gospel According to Mary* (NHL BGC 8502.1.18), see E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher, eds., *New Testament Apocrypha*, ed. W. Schneemelcher, trans. R. McL. Wilson, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963) 1:322, 343. Later Christian writings refer to the new man: Ignatius, *Eph.* 20.1, "the new man Jesus Christ;" *Ep. Barn.* 16.8, believers "have become new [people]"; *Ep. Diog.* 2.1, Diognetus has become "a new man."

<sup>130</sup>P. W. van der Horst, "Observations On A Pauline Expression," *NTS* 19 (1973) 181-87.

ἐκδύναί, "It is difficult to put off the man."

This wording cannot be attributed to either Eusebius or Aristocles because it occurs in Diogenes Laertius (9.66) who also reports this story from Antigonus of Carystus. Thus the words τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκδύναί go back to Antigonus (3rd century BC) and may even go back to Pyrrho himself who was a contemporary of Antigonus. Van der Horst concludes that in the third century BC the expression was used "in philosophical language to denote the transition from . . . the unenlightened state to the enlightened state."<sup>131</sup> He believes that Paul's acquaintance with the popular philosophy of his time makes this a plausible explanation of the origin of the expressions "put off the old man" and "put on the new man." However, three observations make this conclusion unlikely: 1) such a relatively rare use in extant literature suggests that the expression was not well known and makes Paul's acquaintance with it improbable; 2) Pyrrho's statement likely means no more than "it is difficult to put off what is human" (i.e., a natural human response); and 3) in Pauline usage ἄνθρωπος is qualified by the significant words "old" and "new" that have no parallel in Pyrrho's statement or its context.

### 1.3.3 General Background Proposals

In light of the absence of an exact antecedent parallel, scholars have offered several general solutions to the background question. Three proposals have received the most attention. First, some scholars appeal to the mystery religions or Gnosticism as the sources behind this motif. Accordingly, the clothing metaphor "put on" refers to 1) the act of initiation into the mystery religions in which the initiate is clothed with cosmic, divine-life power symbolizing deification or final redemption;<sup>132</sup>

---

<sup>131</sup>Ibid., 186.

<sup>132</sup>Reitzenstein, *Hellenistic Mystery Religions*, 338-42; K. M. Fischer, *Tendenz und Absicht des Epheserbriefes*, FRLANT 111 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973) 158-60; see Käsemann, *Leib*, 147-50; and Jervell, *Imago*, 130-40, for parallels; also W. Matthias, "Die alte und der neue Mensch in der Anthropologie des Paulus," *EvTh* 17 (1957) 385-97, esp. 386-87. The text

or, 2) the Gnostic idea of salvation in which the recipient is clothed with the knowledge of his true identity by the heavenly redeemer and taken up into the divine world and infused with its enlightenment and power.<sup>133</sup>

However, when Paul uses clothing imagery, he does not refer to a constitutional transformation of a person or the infusion of a divine element into a person. For him, the image pictures change of a different kind. Other objections can also be raised: 1) most parallels belong to a different sphere of ideas that often involve the release of the *πνεῦμα* from the *σῶμα* prison; 2) none of the parallels cited predates the New Testament; 3) a true parallel with "man" or "person" as the object of the *ἐκδύω / ἐνδύω* verbs has not been found; and 4) the proponents of this view find it difficult to explain how Paul came into direct contact with these ideas.<sup>134</sup> In Gnostic texts there is no concept of an "old" and a "new" man because the inner man, the spirit-image (*pneuma-eikon*) in man, is the *ἄνθρωπος* himself.<sup>135</sup> All this militates against a background in the mystery religions or Gnosticism.

Second, several scholars have suggested a connection between the clothing metaphor and the event of Christian baptism (cf. Gal. 3:27-28).<sup>136</sup> If so, the imagery

---

almost universally and exclusively cited in support of this interpretation is Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* 2.24; 11.21-24.

<sup>133</sup>R. Bultmann, *The Old and the New Man*, trans. K. Crim (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964 [three essays published in 1924, 1932, 1959]) passim; H. Schlier, "Vom Menschenbild des Neuen Testaments," in *Der alte und der neue Mensch*, ed. G. von Rad et al., BEvT 8 (München: Kaiser Verlag, 1942) 24-36; id., *Christus und die Kirche im Epheserbrief* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1930) 27-37; Käsemann, *Leib*, 87-94; F. W. Eltester, *Eikon im Neuen Testament*, BWANT 23 (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1958) 156-64; and E. Brandenburger, "Alter und neuer Mensch, erster und letzter Adam-Anthropos," in *Vom alten zum neuen Adam*, ed. W. Stolz, WR 13 (Freiburg / Basel / Wien: Herder, 1986) 182-223.

<sup>134</sup>E.g., Bultmann, *Theology*, 1:174, 251.

<sup>135</sup>See Jervell, *Imago*, 240-41; O'Brien, *Colossians*, 189; and van der Horst, "Observations," 181-87.

<sup>136</sup>R. C. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising with Christ. A Study in Pauline Theology*, BZNW 32 (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1967) 52-54; G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1972) 148-49; F. Zeilinger, *Der Erstgeborene der Schöpfung. Untersuchungen zur Formalstruktur und Theologie des Kolosserbriefes* (Wien: Herder Verlag, 1974) 152; R. Scroggs and K. I. Groff, "Baptism in Mark: Dying and Rising with Christ," *JBL* 92 (1973) 539-40; and van der Horst, "Observations," 182.

of the ἐκδύω / ἐνδύω verbs may be an allusion to the custom of putting off old garments and putting on new ones after emerging from the waters of baptism. However, this custom, which occurs later, was probably not practiced in the baptismal ceremonies of the early church.<sup>137</sup> Also, even in Pauline usage, there is nothing inherently "baptismal" about the clothing metaphor itself (cf. 1 Thess. 5:8; Rom. 13:12, 14).

Third, as noted above, the pervasive influence of Judaism on Paul causes one to look in that direction. Many interpreters counter the alleged influence of pagan ideas by an appeal to Jewish antecedents. Barth points out several possibilities: 1) Philo's doctrine on the creation of two men (one earthly, one spiritual);<sup>138</sup> 2) a wide variety of apocalyptic and early Jewish references to the first Adam;<sup>139</sup> and 3) the "corporate solidarity" concept that underlies the Old Testament and subsequent Jewish references to Israel's patriarchs, the king, or the servant of the Lord.<sup>140</sup> To this must be added references to Adam in Genesis 1-3 and Jewish proselyte language in rabbinic writings.

In response, Philo's treatment of the ideal man and the earthly man as the source for Paul's antithesis between the "old" and the "new man" is unlikely since

---

<sup>137</sup>Evidence for this conclusion can be found in J. D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, SBT 15, 2nd series (Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1970) 109-10, esp. n16. If *Gospel of Thomas* 37 contains an allusion to Christian baptismal practice as argued by J. Z. Smith, "The Garments of Shame," *HR* 5 (1965) 217-38, then this would be the earliest evidence, probably from the first half of the 2nd century AD. With respect to other later material that contains a reference to the practice, see A. F. J. Klijn, "An Ancient Syriac Baptismal Liturgy in the Syriac Acts of John," in *XAPIΣ KAI ΣΟΦΙΑ*, FS for K. H. Rengstorf, ed. U. Luck (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964) 216-28.

<sup>138</sup>E.g., *Leg. All.* 1.31-32, 53-55; 2.4; 3.104; *Op.*, 134.

<sup>139</sup>For example, 4 Ezra 3:7-10, 21-26; 4:30-32; 7:11-14, 116-31; 8:44-45; 2 *Enoch* 30-31; and 2 *Bar.* 54.14-19, 115-19, although late 1st century, probably reflect ideas already current in Paul's time. See R. Scroggs, *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966) 59-75, 97-111; and J. R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch*, JSPSup (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), who presents a critique of previous studies of Adam as background for Pauline theology (14-23) and points out the diversity that characterized early Jewish interpretations of Adam.

<sup>140</sup>See pp. 40-41 above; and Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:538 n200.

Philo does not use these terms and lacks a clear eschatological perspective.<sup>141</sup>

Although Philonic and later Jewish texts show the influence of Gnostic thought patterns, the early Genesis narratives and extensive reflection on Adam and the fall in late Second Temple Judaism provide ample Jewish tradition prior to Paul's time.<sup>142</sup>

The treatment of Adam takes place within the broader framework of Jewish views on creation, the fall, and new creation. In Jewish thought, he is the archetypal individual who represents the whole human race, and, in creating him, God created the eschatological person as well.<sup>143</sup> In some sources, Adam is often exalted and his attributes frequently cited as those that God intended human beings to possess now and those they will possess in the age to come.<sup>144</sup> Considerable attention is also given to Adam's transgression and its effects on the human race. According to some strands of Jewish thinking, the salvation of the end time (*Endzeit*) would be the restoration of all that Adam and humanity through him had lost in his fall at the beginning (*Urzeit*).<sup>145</sup> The eschaton was pictured as the new creation—the reversal of the effects of the fall and the restoration of paradise—in the Old Testament prophets (e.g., Isa. 65:17; 66:22; 51:3; 4:2; Amos 9:12; Isa. 11:6-9; 65:25;

---

<sup>141</sup>Pace E. Kamlah, *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese in Neuen Testament*, WUNT 7 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1964) 204; see Lohse, *Colossians*, 142 n60; and O. Merk, *Handeln aus Glauben: Die Motivierungen der paulinischen Ethik*, MThSt 5 (Marburg: Elwert, 1968) 206.

<sup>142</sup>E.g., Sir. 17:1-12; Wis. 2:23-24; 15:1-11; 4 Ezra 3:7-10, 21-26; 7:11; *Jub.* 3.17-31; 2 *Bar.* 17.3; 18.2; 48.42-43; 54.14-19; see further Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 35-48, 123-24, 130-36.

<sup>143</sup>E.g., 4 Ezra 7:97, 125; 2 *Bar.* 72.1-74.4; 1 *Enoch* 62.15-16; 85-90; *T. Levi* 18.4.

<sup>144</sup>E.g., Sir. 49:16 with 4 Ezra 7:95-97; 2 *Enoch* 30.11 with 1 *Enoch* 38.4; 39.7-9; 103.2-3; and 2 *Bar.* 15.8; 49.3, 51; 54.15, 19, 21. See Scroggs, *The Last Adam*, 23-30, 54-60.

<sup>145</sup>*Genesis Rabbah* 12.6 lists six things lost to Adam that are to be restored in the world to come. Three of these refer to Adam himself: his glory, life, and stature. The other three are deprivations affecting the cosmos that will also be restored: the spontaneous reproduction of plants and trees, the brilliance of the luminaries, and peace between animals and people.

27:1; 24:21; 25:8; 26:19) and in early Judaism (e.g., *1 Enoch* 4-5; 72:1; 91:16; *2 Bar.* 32:6; 44:12; 1QS 4:23; 1QH 3:22; 11:12) as well as in early Christian eschatology (e.g., 2 Pet. 3:13).<sup>146</sup>

Some have also associated the clothing imagery with the restoration in the Jewish *Urzeit*-equals-*Endzeit* scheme mentioned above.<sup>147</sup> Nils Dahl points out that the positive correlation of protology (*Urzeit*) and eschatology (*Endzeit*) was as much a feature of Jewish eschatology as the contrast between this age and the age to come, and it was also a firm position within the common tradition of the early church, the New Testament, and especially the Pauline epistles.<sup>148</sup> This correlation is expressed in several themes such as the creation / new creation motif and the Adam / Christ typology, but the common thought running throughout all these discussions is the idea that "the end will bring the final realization of what, from the beginning, was the will of God, the Creator, who is himself the first and the last (Isa. xlv.6, xlviii.12; Rev. i.8, xxi.6, etc.)."<sup>149</sup> However, none of this was expressed by an "old man / new man" motif. Though many of the *Urzeit/Endzeit* themes appear in both Jewish and Christian eschatology, there is a shift of focus and a sharp difference of emphasis in the latter. The superiority of the new creation is emphasized more in the New Testament (especially by Paul) than is usual in Judaism because of Jesus, the crucified, risen Messiah. Paul does not speak of the glory of Adam before the Fall, but of Christ, the "last Adam," and the glory of the new creation (cf. 2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 3:27;

---

<sup>146</sup>See W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*, 4th ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980) 36-57; Scroggs, *The Last Adam*, 32-58, 70; D. S. Russell, *Method and Message*, 280-84; and N. Dahl, "Christ, Creation and the Church," in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956) 422-43.

<sup>147</sup>W. A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983) 155, 188; id., "Image of Androgyne," *HR* 13 (1974) 165-208, esp. 207-08.

<sup>148</sup>Dahl, "Christ, Creation and the Church," 423, with supporting references.

<sup>149</sup>*Ibid.*, 429.

6:15). Nevertheless, this correlation provides for several applications of the creation pattern to God's dealings with humankind in redemptive history that are useful to our study.

Another area of potential influence can be found in Jewish proselyte language. Erik Sjöberg has gathered material from Jewish rabbinic texts that speak of a Gentile proselyte as "created anew" and of Israel herself as "created into a new being."<sup>150</sup> The idea of creating a Gentile anew and making him / her a proselyte may have been known in pre-Christian, Hellenistic Judaism as shown by the conversion experience of Aseneth. On becoming a proselyte, she was told by a heavenly messenger: "Behold, from today, you will be renewed and formed anew and made alive again . . . ."<sup>151</sup> A common rabbinic teaching declared that when a Gentile became a proselyte, he experienced a radical change from a condition of unholiness to one of holiness.<sup>152</sup> Such a proselyte was not only compared to one newly created but also to a newborn child, and as such he was considered to have no previous existence.<sup>153</sup> This indicates that a proselyte's former relationships have ceased and that his sins have been forgiven.

Thus, a whole new life begins for a Gentile converted to Judaism. He / she enters a completely new legal, social, and religious situation. For him / her, there is a new beginning. The former things are no longer taken into account. Indeed, there are

---

<sup>150</sup>E. Sjöberg, "Wiedergeburt und Neuschöpfung im palästinensischen Judentum," *StTh* 4 (1950) 44-85, esp. 45-61. For example: *Gen. Rab.* 39.14; *Ex. Rab.* 15.6; *Lev. Rab.* 30.3; *Num. Rab.* 11.2 (about Abraham); *Cant. Rab.* 1.3.3, 8.1-5 (about Israel); and *Midr. Ps.* 18.1.

<sup>151</sup>*Joseph and Aseneth* 15.5 (4), cf. also 8.9-11, 27.10. The date and origin of this Hellenistic Jewish romance is disputed, but most scholars believe it originated in Egypt between 100 BC and AD 115; see C. Burchard, "Joseph and Aseneth" in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth, vol. 2 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1985) 1878-88. Cf. also *Cant. Rab.* 8.1-2.

<sup>152</sup>See *b. Yeb.* 11a, 42a, 98a; *b. Ket.* 4.3; and *b. Sanh.* 57b, 58a.

<sup>153</sup>See *b. Yeb.* 22a, 23a, 48b, 62a; *b. Bek.* 47a; and H. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* [Str-B], ed. J. Jeremias, 6 vols. (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1922-61) 2:423.

some striking analogies to Christian conversion that may have influenced Paul's thinking. Nevertheless, analogy is not necessarily origin. The "old man / new man" motif does not appear, and Paul's understanding, if not totally different, is at least distinctive in this religio-cultural milieu.

### 1.3.4 Conclusion

There is no mention of the "old man / new man" metaphor in Hellenistic or Jewish texts prior to Paul. However, if we accept the above assessment, the Hebrew Scriptures and a Jewish milieu provide the best conceptual background for the "old man / new man" motif in Paul's thought. At this point it appears that he draws on the Adam / Christ typology and its corporate associations within his distinctive eschatological framework to formulate the "old man / new man" terminology. Then he takes up a common clothing metaphor representing a change of condition and character and attaches these two objects from his own thinking in order to capture in summary fashion some central ideas in his theology. If so, this motif may well be an original formulation that Paul contributed to Christian thought. Now we are prepared to survey various views on the referential meaning of this Pauline language and motif.

### 1.4 Views on the Meaning of the "Old Man / New Man"

Various attempts have been made to explain the meaning and function of this double Pauline metaphor. Translators who retain the noun "man" in their translation reflect the Greek text more literally than those who render *ἄνθρωπος* by an abstract term such as "nature," "self," "being," "humanity," or "way of living / life."<sup>154</sup> Literal translations alone, however, give little help in understanding the meaning of

---

<sup>154</sup>Many translations give the phrase *ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος* and its counterpart *ὁ καινὸς / νέος ἄνθρωπος* an interpretive rendering such as: "old nature / new nature" (RSV, NEB in Col. 3:9-10 and Eph. 4:22, 24); "the man we once were / new humanity" (NEB in Rom. 6:6 and Eph. 2:15 respectively); "old self / new self" (NJB, NAS, NRSV, NIV); "sinful / renewed being" (Jeremias, *TDNT*, 1:365); and "old way of living / new life" (Phillips). The KJV and ASV have the literal rendering "old man / new man."



the "old" and the "new man." The difficulty of this task is illustrated by the array of defining terms and the diversity of views among scholars. Barth summarizes the various views under three headings: the individual view, the corporate view, and the representative view.<sup>155</sup> The representative view, which Barth prefers, turns out to be a defining element of the corporate view, so it will not be considered separately.<sup>156</sup> We shall use the first two categories as a convenient taxonomy for our discussion, bearing in mind that they are not mutually exclusive.

### 1.4.1 The Individual View

Interpreters who hold this view treat the terms "old man" and "new man" as a reference to the life experience of each individual person. They maintain that every person has to put off his own "old man" and to put on his own "new man."

Within this group of interpreters, however, there are two main explanations of these terms.

**1.4.1.1 The Old Nature Versus the New Nature.** Some interpreters in this group understand the contrast between the "old" and the "new man" as a conflict within the believer between the "old nature" derived from Adam and the "new nature" derived from Christ.<sup>157</sup> In this view, the terms refer to distinguishable moral

---

<sup>155</sup>Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:537-40.

<sup>156</sup>Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:539, states his preference for the representative person view because it "includes the former two and gives them proper edge and depth." For him, the "old man" and "new man" denote Adam and Christ respectively and each one rules over the people connected to them determining their attitudes and actions. He claims that the christological understanding of the term "new man" in Eph. 4:24 is supported by the use of the term "man" elsewhere in Ephesians with specific relation to Christ (cf. 2:15; 3:16-17; 4:13) as well as the "put on / put off" metaphor with Christ as the object in Gal. 3:27 and Rom. 13:14. However, these texts involve issues that militate against viewing the "new man" as Christ Himself as we shall see.

<sup>157</sup>Some form of this view has been held in various Christian circles since the time of the Reformation. Some, among others, who hold this view are: M. Luther, *Lectures on Romans*, trans. and ed. W. Pauck, LCC (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961) 15:182; id., *Luther's Works*, eds. J. Pelikan and H. T. Lehman (Philadelphia: Muhlenburg Press, 1958) 26:352, where he says, "by propagation from Adam we have acquired this garment, that is, this corrupt and sinful nature, which Paul calls 'the old man;'" J. Calvin, *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians*, trans. R. Mackenzie, eds. D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance (Grand Rapids:

components in the Christian, hence a coexistence of "two natures," the "old" and the "new" nature. Accordingly, in Romans 6:6, the "old man" is judged and his power is "rendered inoperative" at one's conversion, but he remains active. He does not cease to exist. Thus the "old man" is a metaphor for the corrupt, sinful nature variously described as: the rebel within, the sinful disposition, indwelling sin, the inborn tendency to evil, the propensity to sin, the sin principle, the sin nature, the old Adamic nature, or even the "flesh." The "old man" is in conflict with the "new man," a metaphor for the (sinless) nature implanted in (added to) the Christian at conversion, which is described as: the new nature, the spiritual nature, or, the "inner man of the heart." When a believer sins, he is acting out of the old nature / man, which he still retains; when he does what is good, he is acting out of the new nature / man, which he has received. The moral struggle of the Christian life, in this view, is the struggle between these two natures within the believer's being.

The "put off / put on" constructions in Colossians 3:9-10 and especially Ephesians 4:22-24 are usually taken as *imperative* in force. They call for an ethical response and thus are a reference to progressive renewal in the Christian that involves a continual "putting off of the old man" and a "putting on of the new man." Thus, the "old man" and the "new man" coexist, that is, the believer is understood to be partly an "old" and partly a "new man" at the same time, and this antithesis is functionally equivalent to what Paul refers to elsewhere as the conflict between the flesh and the Spirit (cf. Gal. 5:16-17).

Many of these interpreters believe that the conflict between the old and the new nature / man is the ongoing Christian conflict with sin that is not fully and finally

---

Eerdmans, 1976) at Rom. 6:6; id., *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. J. T. McNeill, trans. F. L. Battles, LCC (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960) 1:603; J. Owen, in *The Works of John Owen*, ed. W. H. Goold, 16 vols. (reprint, London: Banner of Truth, 1965) 3:222, "This 'old man' is the corruption of our nature;" C. Hodge, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950 [1886]) 197; J. B. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (reprint of 9th ed., Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1959) 209, who says that each believer has in himself a two-fold moral potentiality—the "old man" and the "new man;" and L. S. Chafer, *He That Is Spiritual* (reprint, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1967 [1924]) 113-14, 144-45.

resolved until the end of a Christian's earthly existence. Thus, the "putting off of the old man" and the "putting on of the new man" is the lifelong, gradual process of progressive sanctification.<sup>158</sup> Some within this "two natures" view affirm the ongoing total corruption of the "old man / nature" but, at the same time, the present perfection of the "new man / nature."<sup>159</sup> Others, however, believe that this conflict is only the initial Christian conflict with sin until the sin principle within is eradicated and the "old man" is finally crucified at the time the Christian achieves a state of complete sanctification.<sup>160</sup>

**1.4.1.2 The Old Self and the New Self.** The interpreters in this group understand the contrast between the "old" and the "new man" as a reference to an individual before and after conversion respectively, that is, the person "in Adam" in contrast to the person "in Christ." In this view, the terms refer to the whole person under the lordship of sin through Adam or under the lordship of grace through Christ. The "old man" is a metaphor for one's pre-conversion identity and status, and the "new man" is a metaphor for the Christian's post-conversion identity and status.

These interpreters hold that in Romans 6:6 Paul declares that the "old man" (i.e., the person enslaved to sin) was put to death with Christ with the result that he or she is no longer a slave to sin. Presumably, by contrast, the "new man" is

---

<sup>158</sup>H. Bavinck, *Magnalia Dei*, 2nd ed. (Kampen: Kok, 1931) 474-75; id., *Our Reasonable Faith*, trans. H. Zylstra (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956) 492-93; A. A. Hoekema, "The Struggle Between Old and New Natures in the Converted Man," *BETS* 5 (1962) 42-50, who later changed his view; and W. Hendriksen, *Exposition of Ephesians* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1967) 213-14.

<sup>159</sup>J. T. Mueller, *Christian Dogmatics* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1934) 388, states: "The believer is perfectly holy in so far as he is a new man." Also: "When a true believer sins, it is not his regenerated self or the new man in him that sins, but his Old Adam, his corrupt flesh" (399). See also Chafer, *He That Is Spiritual*, 148.

<sup>160</sup>B. Carradine, *The Old Man* (Chicago: The Christian Witness Company, 1965 [1896]) 118-22; H. O. Wiley, *Christian Theology* (Kansas City: The Nazarene Publishing House, 1940) 2:481-83, "The 'old man' must be kept on the cross until he dies; and when sin expires, in that moment the soul is entirely sanctified and lives the full life of perfect love" (483); this view is mentioned but not held by W. Taylor, "The Epistle to the Ephesians," in *Beacon Bible Commentary*, ed. A. F. Harper (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1965) 9:218-21, "the 'old man' is the carnal mind, which is removed in the experience of entire sanctification" (220).

the whole person under the lordship of Christ. This is the basis for and the ruling principle of the believer's life-conduct. The transfer from "old" to "new" is usually said to have occurred at the time of faith / baptism (conversion).<sup>161</sup>

In the ethical texts of Colossians 3 and Ephesians 4, however, the contrast between the "old" and "new man" is understood in two distinct ways. First, many interpreters in this group take at least one (Eph. 4:22-24) or both of these passages (Col. 3:9-10 and Eph. 4:22-24) as *imperative* in force. They see Paul urging his readers to bring their daily conduct into correspondence with their conversion-initiation position by exhorting them to "put off the old man" and "put on the new man." In this way the terms are applied to the Christian's ethical situation such that he is to turn from the old, pre-conversion life of sin and error to the new, post-conversion life of righteousness and truth (e.g., Eph. 4:22-24). Consequently, there is a shift from a conversion-initiation (baptismal) use of the term "old man" in Romans 6:6 to an ethical use in Colossians 3 and especially Ephesians 4. In these "ethical" passages Paul is said to be urging his believing readers to *displace* the *conduct* (vices) of the "old man" with the *conduct* (virtues) of the "new man." The dual metaphor, then, encompasses both the "once / now" transfer of conversion and the "already / not yet" tension of Christian existence.<sup>162</sup>

---

<sup>161</sup>J. Jeremias, *TDNT*, 1:365-66, states that the "old man" denotes "the sinful being of the unconverted man" and the "new man" denotes "the renewed being of the convert to Christ" (365). Some interpreters use regeneration language, viz., "the unregenerate and regenerate man," to express this antithesis (cf. Bruce, *Epistles*, 146-47 n83).

<sup>162</sup>Some, among others, who take this position are: H. A. W. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Romans*, trans. J. C. Moore, 5th ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1881) 1:288; W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 5th ed., ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902) 158; J. A. Robinson, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1909) 108-11; B. Rey, "L'homme nouveau d'après S. Paul. Exégèse de Rom. 6,4-11; Col. 3,5-15; Ep. 2,11-22; Ep. 4,22-24," *RSPR* 48:4 (1964) 603-29; 49:2 (1965) 161-95; C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 2 vols. ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975) 1:309; Lohse, *Colossians*, 141; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 285; D. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) 372-75. Both Lincoln (*Ephesians*, 285, 291) and Moo (*Romans*, 374) et al. take Col. 3:9-10 as *indicative* in force but Eph. 4:22-24 as *imperative* in force.

Second, some interpreters in this group take both "ethical" passages as *indicative* in force. They maintain that Paul is not exhorting believers to "put off the old man" and "put on the new man," but rather, he urges them to stop committing various sins because they have already "put off the old man" and have already "put on the new man." "Putting off the old man" is neither a gradual, continuous process nor a present duty, it is an accomplished reality of salvation. At the individual level, faith / baptism is the dividing line between the "old man" (unregenerate person) and the "new man" (regenerate person). Though there is continuity of person since the one who "put off the old man" and "put on the new man" is the same individual, the emphasis is on discontinuity—a radical change of theological status and identity in which the "new man" *replaces* the "old man." The dual metaphor, then, applies only to the "once / now" transfer of conversion.<sup>163</sup> Consequently, it is unwarranted to speak of the believer as having within him / her both the "old" and the "new man" at the same time, or, of his / her being both the "old" and the "new man" at the same time.

To describe it another way, the "old man" was the believer in his / her pre-conversion mode of existence—a person who was constantly deceived by the desires of the flesh and was in the process of being corrupted. He / she was in the state of being "dead in sin" and "without God." The "new man" is the same person in his / her new post-conversion mode of existence—the believer who lives on the basis of the gospel and is being renewed in the image of Christ. He / she is in the state of being "dead to sin" and "alive to God." In this way, the terms apply both to a state of existence and to the way of life within that state.<sup>164</sup>

---

<sup>163</sup>Some, among others, who take this position are: Abbott, *Ephesians*, 136, 284; J. Murray, *Principles of Conduct: Aspects of Biblical Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957) 202-28; id., *The Epistle to the Romans*, 2 vols., NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968) 1:219-20; Best, *One Body In Christ*, 67-68; van Roon, *Authenticity of Ephesians*, 325-49; D. M. Lloyd-Jones, *Romans: An Exposition of Chapter 6, The New Man* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1973) 62, "The 'old man' is the man I used to be in Adam. . . . It is the man I once was, but which I am no longer."

<sup>164</sup>See further, van Roon, *Authenticity of Ephesians*, 336-40; Käsemann, "On Paul's Anthropology," 1-31, "Thus baptism marks the death of the old man and the miraculous beginning

### 1.4.2 The Corporate View

The interpreters who hold this view maintain that the "old man" is a designation for sinful humanity as a whole (old humanity) and the "new man" is a designation for redeemed humanity as a whole, that is, the Church, the Body of Christ as the expression of the new creation (new humanity).<sup>165</sup> In effect, there is only one "old man" and one "new man," each a collective entity. The death and resurrection of Christ in redemptive history mark the dividing line between the "old" and the "new." In this event the new creation dawns, representing the beginning of a new order of life for humankind. The term "man" is considered appropriate because it can be used generically and collectively, meaning "humanity" (see p. 42 above).

This view arises out of the Adam-Christ typology (Rom. 5:12-19; 1 Cor. 15:21-22, 45-49) in that the "old man" refers to sinful humanity in solidarity with Adam and the "new man" refers to redeemed humanity in solidarity with Christ (see pp. 40-41 above). It is reinforced by the expression "one new man" in Ephesians 2:15, which is viewed as a designation for the Church, the corporate Body of Christ. Elsewhere in Ephesians the descriptions of the Church as "one body" (2:16), a "mature man" (4:13), and "the bride of Christ" (5:22-33) appear to uphold a corporate view.

In support of this view, Hermann Ridderbos argues that the contrast between the "old man" and "new man" is not to be understood primarily and only as a

---

of a new life under the banner of the resurrection" (8); ". . . the old man truly and radically dies; the new man is therefore not to be understood as something like a metamorphosis of the old" (10).

<sup>165</sup>Some, among others, who hold some form of this view are: C. F. D. Moule, *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, 3rd ed., CGTSC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968) 119; Barrett, *From First Adam to Last*, 92-99, who says the "old man / new man" terms are applied primarily to the individual Christian, but they also point to the new community—"man" is a historical and individual term for Paul, but it is also an eschatological and collective term; id., *Romans*, 125, "'The old man' is Adam or rather ourselves in union with Adam and 'the new man' is Christ, or rather, ourselves in union with Christ;" Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:539, who relates the "old man" and "new man" more directly to Adam and Christ respectively (see footnote 156 above); Ridderbos, *Paul*, 62-64, 205-14, 224, who also acknowledges the personal application of this to the individual at conversion; Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 24-30, 48-54; and O'Brien, *Colossians*, 189-93.

change that comes about through faith / baptism in the life of the individual Christian, but it is a change that took place once in history with the death and resurrection of Christ. It has affected Christians in their existence because their "old man" was crucified with Christ on Golgotha (Rom. 6:6). In His death and resurrection believers have been "transferred to the new order of life—the life order of the new creation, the new man."<sup>166</sup> At the same time, according to Ridderbos, the "put off / put on" imagery in Colossians 3:9-10 and Ephesians 4:22-24 refers to the transition that came about in the life history of the individual believer by faith / baptism. Yet even here, these terms retain a supra-individual significance because in faith / baptism believers apply to themselves that which has already taken place in Christ. In faith / baptism they bid farewell to the old mode of existence ("old man") and become incorporated into the new mode of existence, the Church, which Christ has created in Himself as "one new man" (Eph. 2:15).<sup>167</sup>

### 1.4.3 Summary

The classification of views concerning the "old man" and the "new man" given above presents the various ways in which scholars have understood these metaphors in the Pauline corpus. Some explain them in individual salvation-historical terms; consequently they are applicable to every human being subject to certain conditions. Some see them as metaphors related to the "once / now" conversion transfer only, while others view them as encompassing both the "once / now" and the "already / not yet" of Christian existence. Still others emphasize a corporate redemptive-historical dimension; consequently there is only one "old man" and one "new man," each a collective entity linked to Adam and Christ respectively. Some even equate the "old

---

<sup>166</sup>Ridderbos, *Paul*, 63, 208; also note Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 25-30, 46-54.

<sup>167</sup>*Ibid.*, *Paul*, 223-24.

man" with Adam and the "new man" with Christ directly. At any rate, there is a corporate structure involved for both the "old" and the "new man."

In light of these options and the integrative nature of Paul's theology, it is not surprising that some scholars understand this double Pauline metaphor in a multi-dimensional sense that is contextually defined. Thus they subscribe to a combination of the views presented above without being confined to any one line of interpretation.<sup>168</sup> Nevertheless, this classification of views provides a useful point of departure for a detailed investigation of the Pauline passages where these terms appear. This leads us, in a final section, to identify the key issues that will guide our investigation and to state our method of approach.

## 1.5 Key Questions and Method of Approach

This study proposes to deal with the meaning and function of the "old man / new man" metaphor as a motif in Paul's theology. The contributions of the various perspectives and viewpoints presented above may now be gathered together in the form of three major questions that set forth the rationale for this study and form its agenda.

### 1.5.1 Key Questions

First, what is the meaning of the Pauline double metaphor "old man / new man"? To elaborate, is the referent for each a distinctive component of human nature, a representative figure, a corporate community of people, an individual person, or a combination of these referents? Is the metaphor applied in only one way

---

<sup>168</sup>For example, for some, the "new man" is the Church in Eph. 2:15 and the individual person in Christ in Eph. 4:24 and Col. 3:10: Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 115; Barrett, *From First Adam to Last*, 92-99; O'Brien, *Colossians*, 189; and Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 283-289. For others, the "new man" refers to Christ, the Church, and the believing individual—all three: Caird, *Paul's Letters*, 206; Bruce, *Epistles*, 147 n83, 299-300, 359; and Dahl, "Christ, Creation, and the Church," 436, where he states: "the new man is not simply the converted individual, but an eschatological entity, personal, corporate and pneumatic, nearly identical with Christ himself."



throughout the Pauline corpus, or, is it applied in various ways depending on the context? Does it operate within an individual or a corporate structure?

Second, do the "old man" and the "new man" coexist at both the individual and the corporate level? To elaborate, does the "old man" continue to exist, or does he come to an end at a point in time? If the former, what is the relationship between the "old man" and the "new man"? If the latter, when does the transfer from "old man" to "new man" take place? Is it a singular, one-time event, or, is it a gradual process?

Third, what was Paul's purpose in using this double metaphor? To elaborate, does it function as doctrinal affirmation (the indicative) or practical exhortation (the imperative) or both? Does it apply only to Paul's "once / now" construct or does it encompass both the "once / now" and the "already / not yet" structure of his theology? Does it serve more than one purpose for Paul at the same time?

### 1.5.2 Method of Approach

The above questions can only be answered satisfactorily after a thorough investigation of both the context and the content of the four passages in which Paul uses this double metaphor (see pp. 3-4 above). Thus the method of approach for this study is a detailed exegetical treatment of these passages. Then, in light of the results, we will set forth answers to these questions in the final chapter.

The order in which we will consider the Pauline texts is complicated by two factors: 1) the chronology of Paul's letters, and 2) the scope of the metaphor, namely, the "old man" in Romans 6:6; the "new man" in Ephesians 2:15; and both the "old man" and "new man" in Colossians 3:9-10 and Ephesians 4:22-24. The conclusions of this present study do not depend on any particular chronological theory or any hypothesis about the development of Paul's thought.<sup>169</sup> The problem of the

---

<sup>169</sup>Though we do not see signs of major theological development in Paul's thought, there certainly are differences in the way in which he expressed himself in different circumstances. Yet behind varying formulations there is a basic consistency of theological thinking. The variations are viewed as developments in presentation and argument.

sequence of Paul's letters is a complex one, but we maintain that Romans precedes the other two and consider it likely that Colossians precedes Ephesians but both come at roughly the same time from his Roman imprisonment near the end of his life.<sup>170</sup> The order in which we will discuss the texts, however, is topical based on the single reference to the "old man" in Romans 6:6, the "new man" in Ephesians 2:15, and both together with the clothing metaphor "put off / put on" in Colossians 3:9-10 and Ephesians 4:22-24.

In addition to the exegetical analysis of the "old man / new man" passages, this study also seeks to relate these terms to Paul's anthropology and to his redemptive-historical, eschatological perspective. Most scholars recognize the fact that there is a tension between the present and the future in Paul's eschatology, but there is less agreement about the precise nature of it. These elements have often been investigated in studies of various motifs, but, to our knowledge, no single, full-scale study has been undertaken from the perspective of the "old man / new man" motif with a view to answering the questions stated above. This is the intended contribution of the following study.

Some of the questions we have raised have an important bearing on wider issues in the interpretation of Paul's theology. The targeted passages and the "old man / new man" metaphor have played an important role in various attempts to describe the basis and nature of Paul's teaching on sanctification and spirituality. Thus in the course of our discussion, we will attempt to shed some light on the following points: 1) the relationship between the redemptive-historical, corporate emphasis and the personal, individual emphasis in Paul's pastorally-applied theology; 2) the relationship between the "old man / new man" and other anthropological antitheses mentioned at the outset of this chapter (p. 4); 3) the relationship between

---

<sup>170</sup>For discussion and support of this view, see p. 6 n11 and pp. 20-21 above.

the "old man" and the "flesh" in the life of the Christian; and 4) the relationship between the "indicative" and the "imperative" and their function in Pauline ethics. These issues will be addressed at the conclusion of our study in the final chapter.

In light of these defining features, our thesis will proceed along the following lines. Chapter two will investigate the crucifixion of "our old man" with Christ in Romans 6:6. Chapter three will discuss the creation of the "one new man" by Christ in Ephesians 2:15. Chapter four will deal with the formulations, "put off the old man" and "put on the new man" in Colossians 3:9-11 and chapter five will examine the same formulations in Ephesians 4:22-24. On the basis of these investigations, chapter six will summarize and draw some conclusions about the meaning, function and significance of the "old man" and the "new man" in Pauline theology.

## CHAPTER 2

### ROMANS 6:6

#### OUR OLD MAN CRUCIFIED

The words "our old man was crucified with [Christ]" occur in Romans 6:6. This is the first occurrence chronologically and a primary reference theologically to the "old man" in the *corpus Paulinum*. It is also the only text in this literature to mention the "old man" without its counterpart, the "new man." For these reasons, an exegetical examination of this text in its context is important to our study. This chapter will proceed with an overview of the historical setting of Romans (2.1) and the literary context of Romans 6 (2.2), a discussion of the structural form of Romans 6:1-14 (2.3), an exegesis of relevant elements in Romans 6:1-14, especially 6:1-7 (2.4), and some concluding observations on the "old man" (2.5).

#### 2.1 Historical Setting of Romans

Paul wrote a letter to the Christians in Rome at an important transition point in his missionary career. For nearly 25 years he had planted and nurtured churches in the eastern Mediterranean region (15:15-21, 23). Now he was planning a journey westward into Spain by way of Rome for further missionary labor (15:22-24, 28). In his letter, he explained and defended the gospel he preached to a Gentile (majority) and Jewish (minority) Christian community.<sup>1</sup> He had neither founded nor visited this church (1:11-13; 15:22-23), but he hoped it would support him in his

---

<sup>1</sup>Romans contains evidence that Paul addressed both Jewish (e.g., 2:17-3:8; 3:19-20, 27-31; 4:1, 11-15; 5:13-14, 20; 6:14; 7:1-25; 8:2-4; chs. 9-11; 14:1-6; 16:3, 7, 11) and Gentile (e.g., 1:5-6, 13-15; 11:13-32; 15:1-2, 7-12) Christians. Consequently, a majority of scholars believe his audience in Rome was a mixed community of Jewish and Gentile Christians with the latter in the majority. See J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8, Romans 9-16*, 2 vols., WBC 38A, 38B (Dallas: Word Books, 1988) 1:xliv-liv; J. A. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, AB 33 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1993) 25-36, esp. 32-33; and D. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) 9-13. C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 2 vols., ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975-79) 1:17-21, acknowledges both groups but does not wish to estimate their relative proportion in number or influence.

missionary work in the western Mediterranean region (15:24, 28-29). To accomplish this purpose, among others, he wrote a letter containing substantial theological content and logical structure.<sup>2</sup> Bracketed by a personal epistolary opening (1:1-15) and closing (15:14-16:27)<sup>3</sup> that relate the letter to the Christian community in Rome, the main body (1:16-15:13) is a "treatise" on Paul's gospel. It contains a sustained series of arguments expounding the gospel and addressing important theological issues facing Christianity in the middle of the first century AD. In light of this, Romans could be called a tractate letter; however, it is not a historically isolated treatise nor a comprehensive summary of Paul's theology.

## 2.2 Literary Context of Romans 6

### 2.2.1 The Wider Context: Romans 1-8

After introducing himself and announcing his plans to bring the gospel to Rome (1:1-15), Paul stated his theme in 1:16-17. He expressed his full confidence in the gospel because it mediates "the power of God that brings salvation to everyone who believes," both Jew and Gentile alike (1:16). The gospel has such power because it reveals "the righteousness of God," namely, His saving activity in Jesus Christ, and all who respond to it in faith are put "right" (justified) before God and live under His favor (1:17).<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Paul's purpose in writing is one of the most debated questions in the critical study of Romans. Because he says little on the subject directly (cf. 15:15), many different answers have been given. On this issue, see the survey of views in L. Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988) 7-18; the essays collected in K. P. Donfried, ed., *The Romans Debate. Revised and Expanded Edition* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991); A. J. M. Wedderburn, *The Reasons for Romans* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988); and, with some critique of Wedderburn, A. J. Guerra, *Romans and the Apologetic Tradition. The Purpose, Genre, and Audience of Paul's Letter*, SNTSMS 81 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995) 40-41, 170-79. At the very least, one can say that Paul had missionary, pastoral, and theological reasons for writing Romans.

<sup>3</sup>Most recent commentators believe there are good grounds for concluding that ch. 16 (minus vv. 25-27 for some) was part of Paul's letter to Rome. For a review of the arguments and additional references, see Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:9-11; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 55-67; and Moo, *Romans*, 5-9.

<sup>4</sup>The theme of "righteousness" in Paul, expressed by *δικαιοσύνη* and its cognates, has generated considerable discussion in recent years; see, e.g., M. T. Brauch, "Perspectives on 'God's

The righteousness of God by faith is the theme of the first major section of the letter, 1:18–4:25. To explain why it was necessary for God to manifest His righteousness and why all people, Jew and Gentile alike, can experience it only by faith, Paul declared that all people, Jew and Gentile alike, have rebelled against God, turned away from Him, and are bound by the enslaving power of sin (3:9). They are unable of themselves to do anything to escape God's impartial judgment and gain a right relationship with Him (1:18–3:20). As Paul saw it, only God can change this situation, and this He has graciously done by making available through the sacrificial death of His Son the means of becoming righteous before God. This enables Him to redeem people from their dilemma, to put them in a right relationship with Him, and to do this without violating His own justice (3:21-26). Again, Paul stressed that this justification can only be obtained by faith for Jew and Gentile alike (3:27-31), as illustrated clearly in the life of Abraham (4:1-25). Justification brings about for the believer a new status before God and, at the same time, a new kind of existence. But what is the nature of this new status? What implications does it have for the present lives of believers and their future? Paul addressed these questions next.

Traditionally, scholars have viewed chapter 5 as the conclusion to Paul's discussion of righteousness by faith in chapters 1–4.<sup>5</sup> However, in recent years, with persuasive exegetical arguments, many have been inclined to place chapter 5 with

---

Righteousness' in Recent German Discussion," in E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977) 523-42; M. C. de Boer, *The Defeat of Death: Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5*, JSNTSup 22 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988) 149-56, where he summarizes and evaluates the Bultmann-Käsemann debate about the meaning of righteousness in Paul; Moo, *Romans*, 79-90; and Wedderburn, *Reasons*, 122-23, who correctly emphasizes that the term "righteousness (of God)" has a "field of meaning" that embraces distinct aspects for Paul.

<sup>5</sup>The best recent treatments defending this structure can be found in U. Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer*, 3 vols., EKKNT (Neukirchen/Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag and Zürich: Benziger, 1978-82) 1:181-82, 286-87; 2:3-5; M. Wolter, *Rechtfertigung und zukünftiges Heil. Untersuchungen zu Röm 5,1-11*, BZNW 43 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1978) 207-16; and Dunn, *Romans*, 1:242-44. See also J. Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 2 vols., NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959, 1965) 1:211-12; and Morris, *Romans*, 243 n1. Some argue for a major transition at 5:12; see F. J. Leenhardt, *The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary*, trans. H. Knight, CNT 6 (London: Lutterworth, 1960, 131; and A. Feuillet, "Le règne de la mort et le règne de la vie (Rom V, 12-21)," *RB* 77 (1970) 481-521.

chapters 6–8 as part of Paul's presentation of present Christian existence and future hope.<sup>6</sup> In chapters 5–8, then, he deals with the new situation that has come about for all those justified by grace through faith. Being justified means "peace with God" now and a secure hope for final salvation in the future (5:1-11). This hope is grounded in the believer's solidarity with Christ who has undone the effects of Adam's sin and won eternal life for all who belong to Him (5:12-21). Christ has set believers free from the power of sin and, although they still must battle against its attacks, sin is no longer their master (6:1-14). God is their new master to whom they must present themselves for conduct pleasing to Him (6:15-23). Similarly, the Mosaic Law, which cannot conquer sin, no longer has controlling power over them (7:1-25). Through the agency of God's Spirit who makes them God's children, Christians are assured of final victory over the power of death (8:1-17). The same Spirit assures them that God's purposes, already worked out in justification, will be brought to a triumphant conclusion in future glory (8:18-39).

### 2.2.2 The Immediate Context: Romans 5

Chapter 5 plays a crucial role in the argument leading up to chapter 6. In 5:1-11 Paul celebrated the soteriological benefits given to those who have been justified. He emphasized two of them: "peace with God" or reconciliation to God now (5:1-2a, 11), and the sure hope of final salvation in spite of present sufferings based on God's love revealed in Christ's death for sinners (5:2b-10). Three things are of particular interest here: 1) for the Christian, the present reality of "peace with God"

---

<sup>6</sup>The best recent treatments defending this structure can be found in Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:252-54; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 96-102; and Moo, *Romans*, 290-95. See also O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*, KEKNT (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978) 129; and E. Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, trans. and ed. G. Bromiley, HNT8a (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980) 131, 159. Some argue that ch. 5 should be viewed as a transitional "bridging" chapter: B. N. Kaye, *The Thought Structure of Romans with Special Reference to Chapter 6* (Austin, TX: Schola Press, 1979) 1-13; Sanders, *Paul*, 486-87; J. C. Beker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980) 64-69, 83-86, esp. 85; and de Boer, *Defeat of Death*, 148-49.

in the realm of grace,<sup>7</sup> and the hope of sharing the future glory of God is based on the past reality of justification by faith (5:1-2);<sup>8</sup> 2) Jesus Christ, sent by God, died for Christians while they were still sinners and alienated from God, thus demonstrating the magnitude and reliability of God's love undergirding their hope (5:5-8); and 3) the parallel *πολλῶ μᾶλλον* arguments (5:9, 10)<sup>9</sup> show the unbreakable connection between the Christian's present status (already "justified" / "reconciled") and his / her future destiny yet to come ("shall be saved"). The soteriological "now" (*νῦν*, vv. 9, 11) situation as part of Paul's "already-not yet" eschatological tension forms the basis of what it means to have new life and prepares the reader for the exposition of death and life to follow.

In 5:12-21 Paul explains why those who have been justified / reconciled already can be certain that they will be saved from final wrath (eternal death) and share in God's glory forever (eternal life). To accomplish this he used the Adam / Christ typology to show that there is "a life-giving union between Christ and His own that is similar to, but more powerful than, the death-producing union between Adam and all his own."<sup>10</sup> It is Christ's death and resurrection that guarantee eternal life for

---

<sup>7</sup>In 5:2 *χάρις* is used to denote the state or realm into (*εἰς*) which God through Christ transfers believers who were once in the realm of wrath as enemies of God (5:10). It is the realm (domain) "in which (*ἐν ἧ*) we have taken our stand" (pf., *ἐστήκαμεν*, 5:2), in which "grace reigns" (5:21), and one that stands in contrast to the realm of Law such that believers are not "under the law" but "under grace" (6:14-15). This realm, where grace (i.e., God's work in Christ) rules, encompasses all that God conveys to believers through Christ, including, but not limited to, justification (pace Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:259, and Murray, *Romans*, 1:160-61).

<sup>8</sup>The aorist participle *δικαιωθέντες* (5:1) is understood to have causal force: "since we have been justified by faith;" see D. B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 662, 631-32.

<sup>9</sup>The words *πολλῶ μᾶλλον* (5:9, 10, 15, 17) reflect the common rabbinic קל וחומר style of argument by which the point to be established is based on another already accepted or accomplished point that makes the conclusion all the more certain. Here the argument moves *a minori ad maius* in which the already accomplished and accepted action (justification / reconciliation) is mentioned first, from which the conclusion (final salvation) is evident *a fortiori* (cf. Wolter, *Rechtfertigung*, 179-80).

<sup>10</sup>Moo, *Romans*, 318. Most interpreters agree that *τοῦτο* (5:12) is retrospective and the phrase *διὰ τοῦτο* introduces 5:12-21 as a conclusion to something in the preceding context such as: 1) the whole argument from 1:18-5:11 (Dunn, *Romans*, 1:272); 2) the benefits won for the believer



all those who receive the gift of righteousness (5:17).

The argument of the paragraph begins with a comparison (*ὡσπερ*, v. 12) introducing the key similarity between Adam and Christ that is not completed until later in the passage because Paul expands on the protasis of the comparison (5:12) in preparation for the apodosis (5:18). In verses 13-14 he reinforces the fact of universal sin and death, even in the absence of a written law-code to define sin as transgression between the time of Adam and Moses, the Law-giver. At the end of verse 14 Paul declares that Adam is a type of "the One who was to come," namely, Christ (cf. Matt. 11:3), but before completing the comparison of verse 12, he presents the dissimilarity between Adam and Christ in a series of clauses (*ὡς . . . οὕτως καὶ . . .*) that contrast their representative acts and the respective consequences in 5:15-17. The comparison begun in verse 12 is reintroduced in 5:18a (*Ἄρα οὖν ὡς . . .*), completed in 5:18b (*οὕτως καὶ . . .*), and supported by further clarification in 5:19 (*ὡσπερ γάρ . . . οὕτως καὶ . . .*).<sup>11</sup> These verses highlight the key similarity between Adam and Christ: just as through the disobedience of one man, Adam, "the many" (all those belonging to him) were constituted<sup>12</sup> sinners who are destined for condemnation and death; so also through the

---

through Christ in 5:1-11 (Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:271; Käsemann, *Romans*, 146; de Boer, *Defeat of Death*, 145-46); 3) the reference to reconciliation in 5:10-11 (Morris, *Romans*, 228); or, 4) the assurance of final salvation in 5:9-11 (Moo, *Romans*, 316-18). The last view forges the clearest, most fitting link between the content of both 5:1-11 and 5:12-21 largely because 5:9-11 have brought Paul's whole argument from 1:16 onward to an effective climax.

<sup>11</sup>Most commentators and translators observe a break in the grammatical construction at the end of v. 12 and treat it as an *anacolouthon* with the original protasis reintroduced in v. 18a, completed with the proper apodosis in 18b, and both explained in v. 19 (cf. Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:272-73 for supporting arguments). On *anacolouthon* here, see F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. and rev. of the 9th and 10th German edition by R. W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961) §459 [hereafter BDF]; and A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934) 438. Pace C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, HNTC (New York: Harper & Row, 1957) 109-10, who sees no *anacolouthon* here and translates *καὶ οὕτως* ("and so") in v. 12c as "so also."

<sup>12</sup>The verb *καθίστημι* in this text has a real, though forensic, connotation of "make" or "appoint" (active), "be constituted" (passive), or, with a double accusative, "to make someone (to be) something" (cf. Jas. 3:6; 4:4; 2 Pet. 1:8). See A. Oepke, "*καθίστημι*," in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ed. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, trans. and ed. G. W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-76) 3:444-46 [hereafter TDNT]; and W. Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 2nd ed., trans. W. F. Arndt and F. W.

obedience of one man, Christ, "the many" (all those belonging to Him) shall be constituted justified ones who are destined for righteousness and life. For Paul, people are actually "made" sinners in solidarity with Adam, and deservedly so because all commit sins; and people are actually "made" righteous in solidarity with Christ, but undeservedly so because His righteousness is freely and graciously given to those who receive it by faith (5:17). To round off the discussion, verse 20 introduces the role of the Mosaic Law in multiplying sin in redemptive history, and verse 21 brings the section to a conclusion with a comparison (*ὡσπερ . . . οὕτως*) emphasizing the surpassing power of God's grace over sin and death.<sup>13</sup>

Several items are of special interest here in setting the literary context for Romans 6. First, the emphasis on "the one man" (*εἷς ἄνθρωπος*) and his effect on "all men" (people, *πάντες ἄνθρωποι*) or "the many" (*οἱ πολλοί*) is striking in reference to both Adam and Christ.<sup>14</sup> In each case the act of one determines the existence and destiny of "the many." On one side stands Adam, his disobedient act, and its consequences for all those in solidarity with him (5:12, 15a, 16a, 17a, 18a, 19a). On the other side stands Christ, His obedient act, and its consequences on all those in solidarity with Him (5:15b, 16b, 17b, 18b, 19b). In light of verse 14 in which Adam is said to be a type of the One who was to come (Jesus Christ, 5:15, 17), these texts clearly show the division of humanity into two groups. Each is determined by its

---

Gingrich, rev. F. W. Gingrich and F. W. Danker (Chicago / London: University of Chicago Press, 1979) s.v. *καθίστημι*, 3 [hereafter BAGD].

<sup>13</sup>For a good summary of the structure of this passage, see G. Bornkamm, "Paulinische Anakoluthe in Römerbrief," in *Das Ende des Gesetzes: Paulusstudien*, BEvT 16 (Kaiser, 1952) 76-92, esp. 81-82. I. H. Thomson, *Chiasmus in the Pauline Letters*, JSNTSup 111 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995) 186-212, views this passage as a masterful chiasmus similar to the pattern proposed by de Boer, *Defeat of Death*, 158-62. With de Boer, he concludes that the broken construction of 5:12 is completed conceptually by 5:21b, emphasizing that "the reign of sin is superseded by the reign of grace through *δικαιοσύνη* resulting in eternal life" (212).

<sup>14</sup>The connection of *ἄνθρωπος* with "the one" and "the many" relationship used here is even clearer in 1 Cor. 15:45-49 where Paul begins with a scriptural text (Gen. 2:7 LXX) that uses the term *ἄνθρωπος* and then designates Adam as the *first ἄνθρωπος* and Christ as the *last* (eschatological) *Ἀδάμ* (representative man), ignoring all the men who came between them. Clearly, Adam and Christ are *ἄνθρωποι* in a sense that other men are not because "the many" wear the "image" of the one or the other (vv. 48-49).

solidarity with the two divinely-appointed, representative-corporate figures of Adam and Christ. Paul sees human beings as either belonging to Adam, "in Adam," or belonging to Christ, "in Christ."<sup>15</sup> His perspective here is redemptive-historical, corporate, and disjunctive.

Second, in spite of a consistent third person perspective and a corporate emphasis on "the many," Paul does not lose sight of the individuals who make up the sum total of each solidarity. On one hand, he makes it clear that every person without exception is "in Adam" (5:12-14, 18a, 19a), although he also declares that every person sins knowingly and culpably (5:14, 16, 20; cf. 3:23). On the other hand, he also makes it clear that only those who receive the gift of righteousness are "in Christ" (5:17b, i.e., those who believe, 1:16-17; 3:21-4:25; 5:1-2), although he maintains the parallelism with Adam by using universalist language to emphasize how certainly Christ has secured the benefits of righteousness and life for all who belong to Him.<sup>16</sup> In fact, with the *πολλῶ μᾶλλον* constructions (5:15b, 17b; "it is all the more certain that"), he highlights the superiority of Christ over Adam and the eschatological triumph of the Christ-solidarity (5:17).

Third, Paul portrays sin (*ἡ ἁμαρτία* in the singular) and grace (*ἡ χάρις*) as two antithetical personified powers that determine human existence and destiny in their respective realms. On one hand, sin plays an active ruling role: it "entered" into the world of humanity (5:12a), and through Adam "has established its rule" in the realm of death (5:21a). Similarly, death "entered" into the world through sin (5:12c),

---

<sup>15</sup>M. D. Hooker, "Interchange and Atonement," in *From Adam to Christ: Essays On Paul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990) 26-41, states: ". . . it is arguable that for Paul the idea of human solidarity is a vitally important factor in the substructure of his thought, more fundamental than all the images he uses; and that for him, man's redemption is seen primarily in terms of moving from the sphere of Adam to the sphere of Christ" (41).

<sup>16</sup>At this point an exact parallel between Adam and Christ breaks down. Although Paul seems to hold the view that all people sinned when Adam sinned (cf. 5:12, 18-19), he does not take the position that all people "obeyed" when Christ obeyed (cf. 5:17; 3:22, 26; 4:23-25; 5:1-2, 6-8) otherwise it would nullify the gracious, vicarious nature of Christ's death and the need for personal faith in response (cf. Käsemann, *Romans*, 165-66).

and "came to rule" by the trespass of the one man, Adam (5:17a). In verse 12, Paul makes clear the causal connection between sin and death for every human being—"no one . . . escapes the reign of death because no one escapes the power of sin."<sup>17</sup> On the other hand, God's grace in Christ is also active: it "abounded" unto "the many" connected with Him (5:15b), and "overwhelmed" sin wherever it flourished (5:20b) in order that it "might establish its rule" by way of righteousness leading to eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord (5:21b).

For Paul, then, Adam and Christ have epoch-making significance. Using the imagery of reigning with its associations of power and sovereignty, Paul sees two "realms" or "dominions" founded by two divinely-appointed representative men (Adam and Christ), in which two contrasting sets of powers (sin / condemnation / law vs. grace / righteousness / Spirit) rule or exercise dominion over people, and whose outcome is two contrasting destinies (death / life). On the redemptive-historical level, Adam and his realm stand at the beginning of history, and Christ and His realm stand at its center, the point from which both past and future must be understood. In His coming (Gal. 4:4-5; 1:4), Christ inaugurated what is "new" and, thereby, rendered "old" all that is connected with Adam. From this perspective, we can speak in temporal categories and call Adam's realm the "old age" (*αἰών*) and Christ's realm the "new age" (*αἰών*). Because of Adam's disobedience, sin / law / flesh / death determine and dominate human existence in the "old realm" leading to eternal death. By reason of their participation in Adam's sin, all people start out and continue in the "old realm" (5:12, 18-19). Because of Christ's obedience, grace / righteousness / Spirit / life determine and dominate human existence in the "new realm" leading to eternal life. By reason of their participation with Christ, as we shall see in chapter 6, only

---

<sup>17</sup>Moo, *Romans*, 323, summarizes various interpretations of ἐφ' ᾧ in the last clause of v. 12 and, along with many modern interpreters, adopts a causal meaning, which coheres best with Paul's emphasis here. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 413-17, says that a causal translation is not certain and argues for a consecutive sense meaning "'with the result that' all have sinned."

believers (5:1-2, 17b, 18b) are transferred from the "old realm" of condemnation into the "new realm" of redemption. All this relates to the "old" and "new" in the "old man / new man" metaphor.

The contrast of the two realms connected with Adam and Christ is basic to Paul's discussion in Romans 6 because it enables him to develop the christological and soteriological foundation of the new realm. To do this, he refers explicitly to the death and resurrection of Christ and makes clear that they are events that include other people. Thus, he takes up the theme of the believer's dying and rising with Christ and applies it first to the important issue of the Christian's relationship to sin, the ruling power of the "old realm." Romans 6:6 is of particular importance because it makes this relationship clear. We now turn to this text in the context of Romans 6:1-14.

### 2.3 Structural Form of Romans 6:1-14

Before observing the structure of this text, we must first establish its limits. Does this pericope close at 6:11 or 6:14? Some interpreters argue that verses 12-14 open a new section by the use of imperatives that develop the premise given in 6:1-11.<sup>18</sup> Also, the similarity between verses 13 and 19 ties verses 12-14 to verses 15-23. However, the imperative verb forms of 6:12-13 do not serve as the signal for the opening of a new section since an imperative form actually appears first in verse 11. Furthermore, Paul's use of *οὖν* (v.12) followed by a command often does not introduce a new section but simply serves to introduce a command that is based on what precedes.<sup>19</sup> Thus, verses 12-14 do not give a clear signal that they begin a new pericope.

A much clearer criterion for determining the limits of this pericope is found in

---

<sup>18</sup>Käsemann, *Romans*, 163, 172, 175; Murray, *Romans*, 1:211, 226; O. Kuss, *Der Römerbrief*, 3 vols., RNT (Regensburg: Pustet, 1963-1978) 1:295-96; Dunn, *Romans*, 1:305-06; and Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 431-32.

<sup>19</sup>BAGD, s.v. *οὖν*, 1.b. See Rom. 11:22; 13:12; 14:16; 1 Cor. 4:16; 10:31; 16:11; 2 Cor. 7:1; Gal. 5:1b; Phil. 2:29; 1 Thess. 5:6; and Phlm. 17 where *οὖν* introduces a command based on what has preceded but does not introduce a new unit. Two possible exceptions to this occur in Rom. 14:13 and Col. 2:16. For further discussion, see ch. 4, 201 n14.

the structural parallels between 6:1-14 and 6:15-23. Both sets of verses contain: 1) a question formed with the interrogative  $\pi\acute{\iota}$  plus  $οὐν$  (vv. 1a, 15a); 2) a second question formed with the deliberative subjunctive (vv. 1b, 15b); 3) a strong denial to the second question (vv. 2a, 15c); and 4) a third question that calls attention to the reader's knowledge or lack of it (vv. 3, 16) and introduces Paul's exposition (vv. 4-11 and 17-23). The fact that 6:2b contains an additional rhetorical question that has no parallel in 6:15 does not diminish the overall parallelism. Since 6:1-2 clearly opens a new pericope, it is quite natural to expect the parallel form in 6:15 to do the same. Thus, Paul's style in chapter 6 indicates that the proper limits of this passage are verses 1-14.<sup>20</sup> This results in binding together the indicatives (vv. 3-10) with the imperatives (vv. 11-13), a connection that is characteristic of Paul (cf. 1 Cor. 5:7; Gal. 5:25) and is basic to his argument here.<sup>21</sup>

Structurally, Romans 6:1-14 contains an introduction (vv. 1-2) and two main sections (vv. 3-11 and vv. 12-14). In the introduction, Paul presents a false inference and strong denial (vv. 1-2a) plus a further question (v. 2b) that grows out of what he claimed in 5:20-21. This question states the thesis of the passage in question form: "How shall we [Christians] who "died to sin" still live in it? Section one (6:3-11), marked by continual references to "knowing" ( $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\nu\omicron\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon$ , v. 3;  $\gamma\iota\nu\acute{\omega}\sigma\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ , v. 6;  $\epsilon\iota\delta\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ , v. 9), is Paul's answer to this question. The indicative mood and first person plural expressions dominate this section. It contains the following subsections: 1) a general statement about baptism "into Christ" and "into his death" (vv. 3-4) that serves as the answer to the basic question of verse 2b, 2) two parallel arguments that elucidate

---

<sup>20</sup>This view is held by W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 5th ed., ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902) 153, 167; Cranfield, 1:296-97, 321; Barrett, *Romans*, 120, 127; Michel, *Römer*, 199-201; H. Schlier, *Der Römerbrief*, HTKNT 6 (Freiburg: Herder, 1977) 190; Wilckens, *Römer*, 2:7-8; and Moo, *Romans*, 350-51. Pace Käsemann, *Romans*, 163. A similar stylistic parallelism occurs at Rom. 7:7 (7:7-12) and 7:13 (7:13-25).

<sup>21</sup>R. C. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising with Christ: A Study in Pauline Theology*, BZNW 32 (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1967) 8-9.

and support the statement regarding baptism (vv. 5-7, 8-10), and 3) a transitional exhortation (v. 11). Günther Bornkamm has laid out and explained the syntactical parallelism between verses 5-7 and verses 8-10.<sup>22</sup> Both sets of verses contain: 1) a conditional protasis (vv. 5a, 8a); 2) a concluding apodosis with future tense verbs (vv. 5b, 8b); 3) an explanation stating a consequence (vv. 6, 9); and 4) a *γάρ* clause giving the basis for the explanation and the result (vv. 7, 10). Verses 5-7 focus on the believer's release from slavery to sin, while verses 8-10 focus on Christ's death to sin and life to God. Verse 11 serves as a "bridge" in which Paul's theological argument in verses 3-10 is drawn together so that the transition to exhortation can be made.<sup>23</sup>

Section two of this passage (6:12-14) consists of exhortations following the inferential conjunction *οὖν* in verse 12. In marked contrast to the constant use of the indicative mood and the first person plural in verses 3-10, the imperative mood and the second person plural dominate verses 12-13. In these verses Paul gives his Christian readers general directions for daily conduct based on what was highlighted in verse 11. Finally, verse 14 closes this unit with two *γάρ* clauses that elucidate the imperatival instructions of verses 12-13 and pick up the concepts of grace and sin from verse 1. At the same time the antithesis, "not under law" but "under grace," serves as a springboard for the opening of the next section, 6:15-23, which extends and enriches the basic idea of 6:1-14. Both paragraphs look at the Christian's transfer from the realm of sin to the realm of righteousness and life. Verses 1-14 focus on the negative side—release from sin, while verses 15-23 focus on the positive side—dedication to righteousness. It is the former paragraph that contains the first Pauline reference to the "old man" that we will examine more closely.

---

<sup>22</sup>G. Bornkamm, "Baptism and New Life in Paul: Romans 6," in *Early Christian Experience*, trans. P. L. Hammer (New York: Harper & Row, 1969) 71-86, esp. 74-75; see also Michel, *Römer*, 200-01; Dunn, *Romans*, 1:305-06. Moo's argument that it is better to connect v. 5 closely with v. 4 is valid (*Romans*, 354), but it does not destroy the parallelism between vv. 5-7 and vv. 8-10.

<sup>23</sup>Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:315.

## 2.4 Exegesis of Romans 6:1-14

### 2.4.1 Romans 6:1-2a: False Inference and Strong Denial

Paul begins with the question: *τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν*, The inferential *οὖν* provides the logical link with the preceding context.<sup>24</sup> Here it occurs in an interrogative formula that in Romans usually raises questions and objections about what he has taught and leads to further discussion (cf. 3:1, 3, 5, 9; 4:1; 6:15; 7:7; 8:31; 9:14, 30; 11:7). It could be paraphrased: "What conclusion, therefore, shall we draw from what I have said?" This leads to a second question: "Shall we [Christians] remain in sin in order that (*ἵνα*)<sup>25</sup> grace might increase?"

These questions present an inference evolving out of Paul's argument in 5:12-21, and especially his assertion in 5:20b: *οὐ δὲ ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία, ὑπερπερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις*. These words proclaim the triumph of God's grace over sin in redemptive history. If God acted this way in history, is He not bound in principle to give more grace to Christians while they remain "in sin"? In this regard, does not sin take on a positive role in the new order of things?

It is difficult to determine precisely why Paul raised this issue here. Did he anticipate an antinomian distortion of grace,<sup>26</sup> a legalistic objection to it,<sup>27</sup> or, are both problems facing him?<sup>28</sup> In light of Paul's negative reference to the Law in 5:20b and his arguments involving Jewish issues elsewhere in Romans (cf. 3:1-9; 4:1; 7:7; 9:14, 30; 11:7), one might be inclined to think that this is a Jewish or Jewish Christian

---

<sup>24</sup>BAGD, s.v. *οὖν*, 1; BDF, §451; Robertson, *Grammar*, 1191-92.

<sup>25</sup>The conjunction *ἵνα* introduces a purpose (final) clause; see C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1959) 142-43.

<sup>26</sup>Käsemann, *Romans*, 165; Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:297 n1. Cranfield's claim is probably due to his attempt to make *ἀγιασμός* "the key-word of the section [6:1-23], though it does not occur till v. 19 (cf. v. 22)" (*Romans*, 1:295).

<sup>27</sup>Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 153-55.

<sup>28</sup>Murray, *Romans*, 1:212; Barrett, *Romans*, 120-21.



objection, or both.<sup>29</sup> In their view, Paul's understanding of sin, law, and grace would encourage moral irresponsibility. On the other hand, libertarians might have agreed with Paul's statements and used them to justify complacency about sin and even sinful practices. Either way, the objection is real and not hypothetical. It was probably one that Paul has heard along the way in his missionary labors from opponents of the gospel he preached. He may be quoting or paraphrasing a critic, but it is more likely that he himself raised this question in order to make his gospel clear on this issue.<sup>30</sup> In his answer, he wanted to show Christians that the gospel of grace, properly understood, leads to ethical righteousness and not to lawlessness and sin (6:19).

The words ἐπιμένωμεν<sup>31</sup> τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ<sup>32</sup> introduce the subject of the paragraph, namely, the Christian's relationship to sin. As in chapter 5, Paul understands ἁμαρτία (singular) here not as an act of transgression but as a personified power that rules over humanity in the "old realm" of existence inaugurated by Adam's transgression

---

<sup>29</sup>See Michel, *Römer*, 152-53, and Beker, *Paul*, 86, for a Jewish objection; Wilckens, *Römer*, 2:10, for a Jewish Christian objection; and for both, Dunn, *Romans*, 1:306-07, who states: "The interlocutor is thus not depicted particularly as a Jew, . . . but objection from the Jewish or Jewish Christian side is certainly included."

<sup>30</sup>Bornkamm, "Baptism," 73; Moo, *Romans*, 356.

<sup>31</sup>BAGD, s.v. ἐπιμένω, 2: used figuratively meaning "continue, persist (in), persevere" followed by the dative case (cf. *T. Levi* 4.1; Josephus, *Vita*, 143). On this use of this verb in the Pauline corpus elsewhere, see Rom. 11:22-23; Col. 1:23; and 1 Tim. 4:16. It is instructive to compare the *present* tense of the deliberative subjunctive verb ἐπιμένωμεν in v. 1 with the *aorist* tense of the deliberative subjunctive verb ἁμαρτήσωμεν in v. 15. The former indicates an ongoing course of action, that is, continuing to live in a given state, viz., sin; while the latter indicates a given action in and of itself, i.e., to commit sin; see J. H. Moulton, W. F. Howard, and N. Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 4 vols. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908-1976) 3:71-72 [hereafter MHT]. Paul seems to reserve the deliberative subjunctive for rhetorical questions that call for a negative response (cf. Rom. 6:15; 10:14-15; 1 Cor. 11:22). See also MHT, 3:98-99; BDF, §366; Wallace, *Grammar*, 467-68.

<sup>32</sup>This is the first of ten occurrences of ἁμαρτία in 6:1-14 showing the prominent role it plays in this passage. The article τῇ is anaphoric (cf. Wallace, *Grammar*, 217-20) pointing back to "sin" in 5:21 where it is said to reign as a ruling power, and ultimately back to 5:12 (cf. Stählin, *TDNT*, 1:295-96; Käsemann, *Romans*, 165; Dunn, *Romans*, 1:306; and Moo, *Romans*, 374). Paul uses the dative case instead of a complementary participle (i.e., "sinning") following ἐπιμένω (cf. John 8:7; Acts 12:16; also 2 *Clem.* 10.5 and *Hermas, Sim.* 9.27.3). The dative τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ indicates sphere or realm following this verb (BAGD, s.v. ἐπιμένω, 2).

(cf. 5:12; 6:14). To remain "in sin" is to continue to live in its realm. To live in its realm means to live under its rule; to live under obligation to sin as one's master; to live as a slave to sin (cf. 6:6, 17a, 20a, 22a). Such a relationship, of course, includes continuing to commit acts of sin and to display sinful attitudes. But Paul's concern here is with the believer's objective status in relationship to sin.<sup>33</sup> Thus the question in verse 1b asks: Shall we Christians remain in the "old realm" ruled by sin in order that (*ἵνα*, purpose) grace might become more abundant<sup>34</sup> since grace as a ruling power far exceeds the deadly grip and disastrous results of sin (cf. 5:15, 17, 20-21)?

Paul finds such an inference drawn from his teaching to be false and emphatically rejects it with his familiar *μὴ γένοιτο* (v. 2a).<sup>35</sup> In itself, the inference has formal logic for support, but Paul's strong denial makes it clear that such an inference is a fundamental misunderstanding and misinterpretation of his gospel of grace. Now he moves on to support his repudiation of such false thinking and to explain why Christians do not to live under the rule of sin.

---

<sup>33</sup>Pace K. S. Wuest, "Victory Over Indwelling Sin in Romans Six," *Bib Sac* 116 (1959) 43-50, who states: ". . . sin [is] seen here . . . in the concrete, as indwelling sin . . . the sinful nature. This is the key to understanding Romans six. Where the word *sin* is found as a noun [in Rom. 6], reference is made to the totally depraved nature" (43). This anthropocentric view of "sin" is too restrictive and is difficult to sustain in the exegesis of this passage creating questionable statements such as: "The apostle says that the believer when he was saved died off to the sinful nature. That means he was separated from it. At the moment of entrance into salvation, God performs a major surgical operation in the inner spiritual being of the sinner, cutting him loose from the sinful nature, yet allowing that nature to remain in him until his death" (44).

<sup>34</sup>BAGD, s.v. *πλεονάζω*, 1: "be or become more . . ., be present in abundance, grow, increase." W. Bauder and D. Müller, "*πλεονάζω*" in *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, 4 vols. trans. with revisions, gen. ed. C. Brown (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976) 2:131 [hereafter *NIDNTT*], note that Paul uses *πλεονάζω* with reference to grace in 6:1 in contrast to *[ὑπερ]περισσεύω* in 5:20 and explain that here "Paul is concerned with the process of grace becoming greater. It cannot be stimulated by a conscious persistence in sin."

<sup>35</sup>*Μὴ γένοιτο* is a formula of strong denial and in Paul it always follows a question. Fourteen of fifteen NT instances are in his writings, and in twelve of these it expresses his repudiation of a false inference drawn from a correct premise in his argument. In Romans, this formula occurs at 3:4, 6, 31; 6:2, 15; 7:7, 13; 9:14; and 11:1, 11. See E. D. Burton, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*, 3rd ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898) 79; and A. J. Malherbe, "*ΜΗ ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ* in the Diatribe and Paul," *HTR* 73 (1980) 231-40. For the significance of the voluntative optative (also used in Rom. 15:5, 13), see Robertson, *Grammar*, 936-40, and Wallace, *Grammar*, 481-83.

## 2.4.2 Romans 6:2b: Christians Have "Died to Sin"

Paul reinforces his strong denial in verse 2a with an explicit question in verse 2b that emphasizes an important fact regarding Christian existence. Again, he makes the point in rhetorical question form: *οἵτινες*<sup>36</sup> *ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ*; This brief rhetorical response to the false inference of verse 1 sets forth the main point of 6:1-14: Christians have died to sin as a master and this precludes continuing to live under its rule. This is the subject Paul explains and applies in verses 3-14.<sup>37</sup>

Several observations will serve to identify the main issues in this text. First, Paul introduces a new theological idea into his argument by declaring *ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ*. Prior to this he has said that Christ died a salvific death that has particular benefits for those who believe (cf. 3:24-25; 4:25; 5:6-8, 9-11; 18-19), and the only mention of the death of others came in 5:15 where he stated that "the many died" because of the trespass of the one man, Adam. "Death" came as the accomplice of sin (5:12, 14, 16, 21). Thus his claim that "we [Christians] died to sin" signals a movement into a new area of thought.

The image of "dying" is useful to Paul because in the following verses he connects the Christians' "dying to sin" with Christ's death on the cross, one who *τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ* (6:10). It is also useful because the basic idea behind dying, when used figuratively as here, is not annihilation but separation or the severance of

---

<sup>36</sup>The distinction between *οἵτινες* (long form) and the simple relative pronoun *οἷ* (οἷ, plural), while not generally observed in the NT, is appropriate here for emphasis. *Οἵτινες* is a relative of quality (vs. quantity) and carries the sense of "being characterized by;" thus: "We who are characterized by having died to sin" (BDF, §293; Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 123-25 and BAGD, s.v. *οἷ*, 2.b). Burton, *Syntax*, §294 states: "A definite relative clause may imply a relation of cause, result or concession without affecting the mood or tense of the verb." *Οἵτινες* likely has a causal force here. Thus: "Since we died, or rather, since we are those who have died . . .;" Robertson, *Grammar*, 727-28, 960. Christians are, by definition, people who have "died to sin."

<sup>37</sup>Murray, *Romans*, 1:213-14; Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:298-300; Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 7-10; and J. D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, SBT 15, 2nd series (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970) 140, who states: ". . . verse 2 is the key without which the meaning of the passage cannot be unlocked and opened up."

a relationship.<sup>38</sup> When a person dies physically the bond of life that unites him to activity in this world is severed. The person is no longer active in the realm or the relationships to which he or she has died. Death pictures a separation or release from one realm of existence and a transfer into a different realm. This imagery serves Paul well in explaining the believer's objective relationship to sin. In fact, the logic of the passage runs as follows: Christ died to sin (6:10), believers died with Him (6:8), therefore believers died to sin (6:2) and no longer remain / live in sin (6:1).

Second, Paul continues to view sin (*ἁμαρτία*) as a personified power that rules over a realm in which (cf. *ἐν αὐτῇ*, v. 2b) people live. The dative *τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ* following *ἀπεθάνομεν* is not simply a dative of reference or relationship<sup>39</sup> but more specifically a dative of advantage in the sense of that which claims or possesses someone or something to use for its own advantage.<sup>40</sup> For Paul, then, the fact that Christians "died to sin" means that they have been released (separated) from subjugation to sin as a master; they have been transferred out of the realm in which they were slaves of sin; they are no longer "under sin" (Rom. 3:9) because their relationship to sin has changed decisively. The aorist indicative, *ἀπεθάνομεν*, points to a decisive past event. Where death has already occurred, sin's rule has ended. The time and nature of this death is yet to be determined in Paul's explanation to follow. It is important to note in passing, however, that he does not say that *sin* died or that

---

<sup>38</sup>BAGD, s.v. *ἀποθήσκω*, 1.b; de Boer, *Defeat of Death*, 83-84.

<sup>39</sup>So Wallace, *Grammar*, 144-46, 154. C. F. D. Moule, "Death 'to sin,' 'to law' and 'to the world': A Note on Certain Datives," in *Mélanges Bibliques*, ed. A. Descamps and A. de Halleux (Gembloux: Duculot, 1970) 367-75, suggests that the origin of such a dative of relationship is to be found in the older use of *ζάω* with the dative of advantage. Cf. footnote 32 above.

<sup>40</sup>BDF, §188, 2; Robertson, *Grammar*, 539; BAGD, s.v. *ἀποθνήσκω*, 1.b.γ. "dat. of the person or thing from which one is separated by death." The dative after *ἀποθνήσκω* occurs only five times in Paul: Rom. 6:2, 10; 14:7-8 and Gal. 2:19. It also occurs in similar constructions in Rom. 6:11; 7:4; 2 Cor. 5:15; and Gal. 6:14b. In each case the dative expresses the possessor, i.e., controlling power, from which one is separated by death. This is a dying to the controlling powers of the "old realm"—sin, law, flesh, the world—i.e., release from servitude to these masters. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 18-19, is right to stress the notion of ownership and lordship as essential to this dative. Cf. Col. 2:20 where *ἀπό* with the genitive follows this verb.

it died to Christians but that Christians died to it.

Third, based on the fact that Christians "died to sin," Paul asks: *πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν*<sup>41</sup> ἐν αὐτῇ (i.e., ἁμαρτία); Does this rhetorical question have the force of a theological assertion (the indicative)<sup>42</sup> or an ethical appeal (the imperative)?<sup>43</sup> The following factors combine to indicate that the first alternative (the indicative force) is more likely. The interrogative *πῶς*<sup>44</sup> calls into question and implicitly rejects the assumption that Christians "will still (ἔτι) live in sin," a clause that corresponds to "shall we remain in sin" in verse 1b.<sup>45</sup> As noted above, to "remain in sin" means to continue to exist in the realm of sin, namely, to live under its rule as one's master. To "live in sin" (ἐν αὐτῇ), then, also means to exist in the realm of sin under its authority.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup>The construction *ζάω ἐν* occurs ten times in the Pauline corpus (BAGD, s.v.), but it is used in a metaphorically local sense, as here, only in Col. 2:20 and 3:7. In these passages *ζάω* refers to the objective theological status of one's life, not the subjective manner of it. In Rom. 6:2, Paul is not concerned with *how* believers live but in *what* sphere or relationship they locate their life, and here the sense is negative, i.e., it is not "in sin."

<sup>42</sup>F. L. Godet, *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, trans. A. Cusin, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1880-81; reprint, Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1979) 1:236; Murray, *Romans*, 1:213; and Dunn, *Romans*, 1:307, who says: "What Paul had in mind is a death which puts the individual beyond the power of sin (as in 6:7, 10), and so unable (because dead!) to 'live' in it, that is, in its realm under its authority."

<sup>43</sup>Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:299; and Morris, *Romans*, 246. Moo, *Romans*, 358-59, discusses both options but prefers the imperatival force describing a lifestyle of sin. However, for the reasons given above, this does not seem to fit the immediate context the best, although it is a logical implication. The ethical sense is reflected in the NIV: "Shall we go on sinning?" In this view, to remain / live in sin is merely "morally incongruous" for the Christian.

<sup>44</sup>BAGD, s.v. *πῶς*, 1.d, this word is used ". . . in questions that call an assumption into question or reject it altogether;" thus, "it is impossible that."

<sup>45</sup>Burton, *Syntax*, §60, points out that the progressive future affirms that an action will be in progress in future time. The future indicative *ζήσομεν* stands parallel to the aorist subjunctive *ἐπιμένωμεν* in v. 1 and functions exactly like it (note Mark 6:36 and 1 Cor. 11:22 where both verb forms are used in a deliberative question); see BDF, §366, 2; and Wallace, *Grammar*, 570. Some manuscripts (P<sup>46</sup> C F G L Ψ 33 81 et al.) have made this parallel explicit by reading *ζήσωμεν* instead of *ζήσομεν*.

<sup>46</sup>Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 19, states: "The importance of this phrase [ἐν αὐτῇ] becomes clear when we see that the idea of living 'in' sin is part of a broader Pauline pattern of expression . . . (such) as 'in law,' 'in flesh,' or 'in spirit.'" The preposition *ἐν* could be interpreted as meaning: "under the influence of" or "under the dominion of" (see Rom. 2:12; 3:19; 7:5-6; 8:1, 8, 9; Gal. 3:11; 5:4; Phil. 3:6); cf. Michel, *Römer*, 153.

The adverb ἔτι in this question anticipates a negative answer and indicates that something "no longer" is in effect as it once was.<sup>47</sup> Thus, the logical force of this question is the theological truth (the indicative) that Paul emphasizes in this passage (vv. 1-10, 14, 17-22): "we Christians are those who no longer live under the authority and controlling power of sin." Christians "lived in sin" *once* for they were slaves of sin (6:17, 20a) but *now* they do so no longer for they died to sin (6:2). In this sense, it is impossible for a Christian to remain / live in sin (6:1-2).

But these verses (6:1-2) should not be interpreted to mean that it is impossible for a Christian to commit acts of sin in life experience.<sup>48</sup> The necessity of sinning is gone, but not the possibility of it.<sup>49</sup> It is clear from the imperatives in verses 11-14 that Paul viewed sin as an ever-present threat to the Christian. Nevertheless, in the indicatives of verses 2-10, he makes it clear that Christians have been delivered from sin's power and thus no longer live as slaves under its authority. This is the necessary theological basis and incentive for subsequent moral appeal.

### 2.4.3 Romans 6:3-4: Christians Died to Sin Through Baptism

In 6:3-4 Paul begins an explanation of his thesis in verse 2 that Christians are those who died to sin (v. 2a) and thus no longer live in its realm (v. 2b). In these verses he answers the "how" and "when" questions by linking Christian baptism with Christ's death, a death that itself was a "death to sin" as he will state in verses 9-10.

---

<sup>47</sup>BAGD, s.v. ἔτι, 1.b: used in negative statements "to denote that something is stopping, has stopped, or should stop" depending on the context. Here "life in sin" has stopped for the Christian.

<sup>48</sup>Pace Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 153, who paraphrase v. 2 as: "The baptized Christian cannot sin. Sin is a direct contradiction of the state of things which baptism assumes . . . [This at least is the ideal, whatever may be the reality.]" Also see J. Knox, "Romans," in *The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick et al. (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1954) 9:471-73, 479.

<sup>49</sup>Beker, *Paul*, 215-18. The fact that a Christian *does not live* (exist) "in sin" does not negate the fact that he / she *will commit* sins in life experience.

The use of baptismal language raises two preliminary issues. First, to what act or event is Paul referring by such language? Is it a reference to "baptism in / by the Spirit,"<sup>50</sup> "immersion" as a metaphor for incorporation into Christ,<sup>51</sup> or Christian water baptism?<sup>52</sup> Without denying the significance of all these ideas, the primary reference here seems to be water baptism as shorthand for the conversion-initiation event as a whole. Moo argues that all but one (1 Cor. 10:2) of Paul's eleven other uses of βαπτίζω (1 Cor. 1:13, 14, 15, 16 [twice], 17; 12:13 [debated]; 15:29 [twice]; Gal. 3:27) denote Christian water baptism. Furthermore, by the time Paul wrote Romans, βαπτίσμα "appears to have become almost a technical expression for the rite of Christian initiation by water, and this is surely the meaning the Roman Christians would have given the word."<sup>53</sup> A good case can be made for the view that, for Paul and the early church, water baptism stood for "conversion-initiation" as one unified experience presupposing faith and the gift of the Spirit who, in fact, effects the spiritual reality associated with baptism.<sup>54</sup>

Second, why does Paul refer to water baptism here? It is important to note that baptism is not the subject of this passage even though this text has played a major role in discussions of baptism. There is no so-called "baptismal section" (6:3-4) that can be isolated from the rest of the chapter because it is an exposition of water baptism.<sup>55</sup> As noted above, the theme of the passage is death to sin and newness of

---

<sup>50</sup>D. M. Lloyd-Jones, *Romans. An Exposition of Chapter 6: The New Man* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1973) 35-36.

<sup>51</sup>Dunn, *Baptism*, 139-46; id., *Romans*, 1:311-13; Michel, *Römer*, 149.

<sup>52</sup>Moo, *Romans*, 359, and most interpreters.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., 359. Moo states that the one exception, 1 Cor. 10:2, is probably used in analogy to Christian water baptism. Similarly also the debated text, 1 Cor. 12:13; see pp. 86-87.

<sup>54</sup>Dunn, *Baptism*, 145-46; G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1972) 272-73.

<sup>55</sup>Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 7-10; Dunn, *Baptism*, 139-40; pace Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 126-46. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 430-31, calls baptism a secondary topic in vv. 1-11 that

life under grace in answer to the false inference of verse 1. Paul's reference to baptism in verses 3-4 contributes to his explanation of this theme as does further elaboration in verses 5-10 without mention of baptism again. Elsewhere he can make the same point about dying with Christ to sin and other "old realm" powers without mentioning baptism (cf. Rom. 7:4, 6; 2 Cor. 5:14-15; Gal. 2:19; 5:24; 6:14). Thus, it is more likely that in Romans 6 the language used of Christian existence in general is applied to baptism, the rite that, for Paul, marks the beginning of that existence for all Christians. No Christian, then, is exempt from the decisive break with sin that Paul affirms with the words "we died to sin" (v. 2) because such a break is a constitutive part of one's existence if he or she is a Christian.

**2.4.3.1 Romans 6:3.** Paul introduces his explanation with the clause *ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι . . .* (cf. 7:1). It could simply be a polite way of introducing new knowledge.<sup>56</sup> However, the fact that Paul makes his point without much elaboration seems to indicate that he is appealing to something already familiar to his readers to which he gives further development, making them aware of consequences they ought to recognize.<sup>57</sup> The only New Testament parallel, which occurs in 7:1 where he adds *γινώσκουσιν γὰρ νόμον λαλῶ*, supports this.

---

contain "the main discussion of baptism by Paul in his letters." Some interpreters find allusions to baptism in other verses in Rom. 6, but none of them is likely. See Kaye, *Romans 6*, 58-65, and P. Siber, *Mit Christus leben. Eine Studie zur paulinischen Auferstehungshoffnung*, ATANT 61 (Zürich: TVZ, 1971) 217-27.

<sup>56</sup>H. Lietzmann, *An die Römer*, HNT 8 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1933 [1906]) 67, 72; Kuss, *Römerbrief*, 1:297; G. Wagner, *Pauline Baptism and the Pagan Mysteries: the Problem of the Pauline Doctrine of Baptism in Romans VI. 1-11 in the Light of Its Religio-Historical 'Parallels,'* trans. J. P. Smith, ATHANT 39 (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1967) 278; H. Frankemölle, *Das Taufverständnis des Paulus: Taufe, Tod und Auferstehung nach Röm 6*, SBS 47 (Stuttgart: KBW, 1970) 40; also Dunn, *Romans*, 1:308.

<sup>57</sup>Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 128; Barrett, *Romans*, 121-22; Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:300; A. J. M. Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection: Studies in Pauline Theology Against Its Greco-Roman Background*, WUNT 44 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1987) 46-48. The idea is: assuming you believe "x" based on your baptismal instruction, then you must also believe "y," which Paul goes on to provide.



Most interpreters think Paul is appealing to familiar tradition at least from early Hellenistic Christianity if not from the primitive church itself.<sup>58</sup> This has fueled a debate about the sources of these ideas. Were they familiar because they were specifically Christian ideas known to Paul's readers in Rome through preaching and teaching, or, were they well-known in the wider religious world of that time? Specifically, the debate has focused on the possible influence of Hellenistic mystery cults either directly or indirectly. Some have argued that Paul interpreted baptism on the analogy of the initiation rites of the mystery cults.<sup>59</sup> After a thorough collection and evaluation of religio-historical material, Günter Wagner concluded that the mystery cults had no *direct* influence on the Pauline doctrine of baptism and are of no help to us in interpreting Romans 6.<sup>60</sup>

Others, however, claim that there was *indirect* influence from these cults mediated to Paul via Hellenistic Christian baptismal traditions, which he modified or corrected in the light of his own theology.<sup>61</sup> After a thorough investigation and evaluation of this claim, A. J. M. Wedderburn concludes that Paul's view of baptism and the idea and language of dying and rising with Christ were not derived from nor

---

<sup>58</sup>E.g., Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:300; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 431; Käsemann, *Romans*, 160-64; Michel, *Römer*, 130; Murray, *Romans*, 1:214; Ridderbos, *Paul*, 397 n4; Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 9-14; Wilckens, *Römer*, 2:11, 50; and R. Schnackenburg, *Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul. A Study in Pauline Theology*, rev. ed. trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray (New York: Herder and Herder, 1964) 32.

<sup>59</sup>W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos. A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*, trans. J. E. Steely from the 5th German ed. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970) 140, 158-72, 223-27; R. Reitzenstein, *Hellenistic Mystery-Religions: Their Basic Ideas and Significance*, trans. J. E. Steely, PTMS 15 (Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1978) 40-42, 78-80, 85-86; R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, 2 vols., trans. K. Grobel (London: SCM Press, 1956) 1:140-44, 311-13; Lietzmann, *Römer*, 30-31; Bornkamm, "Baptism," 85 n5; Michel, *Römer*, 139.

<sup>60</sup>Wagner, *Pauline Baptism*, 268, 277-80, 286-87. Also, Dunn, *Romans*, 1:308-11, who focuses on the initiation into the Isis cult as described by Apuleius in *Metamorphoses* 11.21-24 and concludes that "a direct influence from any mystery cult or from the Isis cult in particular, on Paul or on the theology of Romans 6:3-4, is most unlikely" (*Romans*, 1:310); and A. J. M. Wedderburn, "The Soteriology of the Mysteries and Pauline Baptismal Theology," *NovT* 29 (1987) 53-72.

<sup>61</sup>Käsemann, *Romans*, 160-63; Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 2, 9-14; J. Jervell, *Imago Dei: Gen. 1,26f im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen*, FRLANT 76 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960) 257.

indirectly influenced by the initiation rites of the mystery cults of his day.<sup>62</sup> Though it is difficult to determine how much of what Paul says in Romans 6 the Roman Christians already knew, Wedderburn makes a good case for the view that, even though Paul's language is probably his own, the background to his thought is most likely the ideas of solidarity with and representation by prototypical figures in ancient Israel and Jewish tradition.<sup>63</sup>

Verse 3 exhibits a chiastic arrangement in which Paul joins together the baptismal formula "into Christ" and the further idea of baptism "into Christ's death":  
 [a] ὅσοι<sup>64</sup> ἐβαπτίσθημεν [b] εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, [b'] εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ [a'] ἐβαπτίσθημεν;  
 It appears that he constructed the verse in this way in light of his use of baptismal formulae in other places in which the *εἰς* prepositional phrase *precedes* the aorist passive form of the verb *βαπτίζω* (cf. 1 Cor. 1:13, 15; 10:2; 12:13; Gal. 3:27). If so, he altered his use of the baptismal formula here so that the initial *εἰς* phrase *follows* the verb (v. 3a) in order to highlight the close association that exists between the baptism of the Christian and Christ's death. The past event of the Christian's baptism is now closely linked with the past event of Christ's death itself (cf. 5:6-8) and all that it accomplished.

At this point we must consider the meaning of *ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν*. Some scholars treat the phrase as an abbreviation of "we were baptized into the name of Christ Jesus," and interpret *εἰς* to mean "with reference to," or, in a purpose sense of "with a view to belonging to." Thus the phrase is simply a formula showing transfer of ownership or religious identity. For example, Cranfield states: "All

---

<sup>62</sup> Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 342-43, 356-59, 391-93. In fact, Wedderburn believes that "the interpretation of Paul's doctrine of union with Christ as derivative from the mystery-cults of his day [is] a 'dead-end' in Pauline studies" (396). For a counter opinion, see H. D. Betz, "Transferring a Ritual: Paul's Interpretation of Baptism in Romans 6," in *Paulinische Studien: Gesammelte Aufsätze III* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1994) 240-71.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid., 343-56. This concurs with our general assessment in ch. 1, 46-52.

<sup>64</sup>BAGD, s.v. ὅσος, 2. The relative adjective ὅσοι is used substantively as a relative of quantity (vs. quality as with ὅτινες in v. 2); thus: "As many individuals as," or, in this context, "All we who" with the antecedent embodied in the first person plural of the verb.

that Paul wishes to convey in this clause is the simple fact that the persons concerned have received Christian baptism."<sup>65</sup> This interpretation, however, is inadequate. Paul never refers to baptism, "in the name of Christ Jesus" elsewhere, although he was probably acquainted with this formula that refers primarily to the baptismal rite (1 Cor. 1:13). Transfer of ownership takes place, but Paul means more than this here.

Most scholars, therefore, hold the view that to be baptized *εἰς Χριστόν* (6:3a) refers to union with Christ.<sup>66</sup> Three lines of argument support this interpretation. First, in light of 5:12-19, Christ is viewed here as the second / last Adam, the representative corporate figure for all those who belong to Him. Second, the "with (*σύν*) Christ" concept dominates verses 4-8, and *εἰς* (v. 3) has an "incorporative" meaning indicating Paul has believers' union with Christ in mind. Third, the "incorporative" idea is reinforced by other Pauline passages where *βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς* is used (cf. Gal. 3:27-28; 1 Cor. 12:12-13). These parallel passages indicate that "baptism into Christ" is connected with entry into Christ as an inclusive

---

<sup>65</sup>Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:301. See also Wagner, *Pauline Baptism*, 8-57, for various views of baptism in Romans 6, esp. 287 n121; Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 128-29; Wilckens, *Römer*, 2:11, 48-51; Siber, *Mit Christus leben*, 206-07. For a treatment of these formulae, see Oepke, *TDNT*, 1:538-43; Bietenhard, *TDNT*, 5:274-76; and Beasley-Murray, *NIDNTT*, 1:146-47.

<sup>66</sup>Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 22-24; Käsemann, *Romans*, 165; Dunn, *Baptism*, 112, who states: "On each of the three occasions which are decisive for its meaning the context requires *βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς* to bear the sense of 'baptized into'—baptized so as to become a member of the Second Adam (Rom. 6:3), of the Body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:13), of Christ the sole seed of Abraham (Gal. 3:27);" Oepke, *TDNT*, 1:539; E. Best, *One Body in Christ: A Study in the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul* (London: SPCK, 1955) 56-57; Murray, *Romans*, 1:214; Ridderbos, *Paul*, 401-03; Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 54-60; and Moo, *Romans*, 376-77. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 128-30, objects to giving *εἰς* a local "incorporative" meaning on the basis of *πάντες εἰς Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσθησαν* in 1 Cor. 10:1-2. But, that whole passage is an illustration (*τύπος*, v. 6) of Christian experience where the lesser Moses typifies the greater Moses, and Paul uses the exodus event as an illustration of the Christian's incorporation into Christ and exhorts believers to perseverance in light of 1 Cor. 9:24-27. Thus, when a person is the object, it is inadequate to take *εἰς* as denoting the goal desired, or to translate Rom. 6:3b as "baptized with reference to His death." Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:301 n3, objects to deriving the sense of the first clause in 6:3 from the second one but offers no definitive reasons.

"corporate" person.<sup>67</sup> This also means entry into the realm of grace since Christ, as an inclusive person, represents and embodies this new realm in Himself. In this way, Paul supported his declaration in verse 2 that believers "died to sin" and thus no longer live under its dominion.

This raises the question about whether being "baptized into Christ" contains within itself a definite reference to water baptism or whether it is a metaphorical way of describing the Christian's incorporation into Christ. James Dunn argues that *βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς Χριστόν* is "a metaphor drawn from the rite of baptism to describe . . . the entry of the believer into the spiritual relationship of the Christian with Christ, which takes place in conversion-initiation."<sup>68</sup> If so, this may account for the fact that other New Testament writers do not speak of the rite of baptism as dying and rising with Christ apart from Pauline influence.<sup>69</sup>

This view is supported by Galatians 3:27: "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ." It seems clear that *ἐνδύσασθαι Χριστόν* is a metaphor,<sup>70</sup> and if so, the same could be claimed (though it is not logically necessary) for the parallel phrase *βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς Χριστόν*. The two phrases are interchangeable expressions for the same reality, that is, "to be baptized into Christ" is "to put on Christ." Both metaphors have an incorporative significance. The same could be said of *ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς* in 1 Corinthians 12:13, where Paul is not speaking of water baptism but about baptism in the Spirit. That he is using the metaphor of baptism is confirmed by his reference to Old Testament imagery in describing the Corinthians'

---

<sup>67</sup>On this view see Michel, *Römer*, 148-49; Grundmann, *TDNT*, 7:789-92; and Best, *One Body*, 66-67.

<sup>68</sup>Dunn, *Baptism*, 109; id., "The Birth of a Metaphor: Baptized in Spirit," *ExpTim* 89 (1977-78) 134-38, 173-75; Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 41-43, 52-54; and Wagner, *Baptism*, 287.

<sup>69</sup>Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 127, cites this as a difficulty in adopting the view that Paul quotes a baptismal liturgy in Rom. 6:1-11; pace Michel, *Römer*, 128-29.

<sup>70</sup>*Ibid.*, 147-48. See ch. 1, 43-45.

experience of the Spirit in conversion as "we all were baptized into one body by one Spirit" (12:13c; cf. Isa. 32:15; 44:3; Ezek. 39:39; Joel 3:1ff).<sup>71</sup>

We conclude, then, that the phrase *ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν* is best understood as a metaphor describing the act of putting a believer "into Christ," an inclusive / corporate figure. The *εἰς* is local (incorporative) rather than referential, and the implied agent of the action in *ἐβαπτίσθημεν* is God (see 2 Cor. 1:21-22). It is He who effects incorporation into Christ (cf. also the passive verbs of Gal. 3:27 and 1 Cor. 12:13). This union was effected invisibly and inwardly by divine grace through faith, and this, in turn, is visibly and outwardly expressed and ratified in water baptism. Being baptized into solidarity with Christ describes entrance into the state (relationship) of being "in Christ." Those who are "baptized into Christ" are those who afterwards have life "in Christ" (cf. 6:11). In this sense, baptism identifies and designates those who are Christians.

**2.4.3.2 Romans 6:4.** In this verse, Paul draws a conclusion (inferential *οὖν*) from verse 3. If baptism into Christ includes participation in His death on the cross, then it is also true that Christians have been buried with Him (*αὐτῷ*) through (*διὰ*) this (*τοῦ*) baptism into (*εἰς*) His (*τόν*) death. This rendering of verse 4a is based on two syntactical considerations: 1) the articles *τοῦ* (with *βαπτίσματος*) and *τόν* (with *θάνατον*) are anaphoric, referring to the baptism and death described in verse 3; and 2) the prepositional phrase *εἰς τὸν θάνατον* is adjectival and is to be connected with *διὰ*

---

<sup>71</sup>In itself, *βαπτίζω* does not specify water baptism. Primarily it means "dip in or under, immerse in" (BAGD, s.v. *βαπτίζω*; Oepke, *TDNT*, 1:529-30, 538-43) and in non-Christian literature it is used in the sense of "plunge into, overwhelm" (e.g., Josephus, *J.W.* 1.22.2, 2.18.4; *Ant.* 4.4.6). Dunn makes the point that there would be a contradiction in sense in Mark 10:38; Luke 12:50; Acts 1:5; 1 Cor. 10:2; 12:13 and a tautology in John 1:26, if *βαπτίζειν* always demanded immersion in water, even in a metaphorical use (Dunn, *Baptism*, 129). Indeed, for Paul, it has both a literal (the water-rite, e.g., 1 Cor. 1:13-17) and a metaphorical (incorporation into Christ, e.g., Gal. 3:27; 1 Cor. 12:13) usage. Though the metaphor is drawn from the rite, it does not include the ritual act within itself. What makes Rom. 6 distinct is that only here (v. 4) and in Col. 2:12 does Paul explicitly relate the rite to the spiritual reality involved. All this does not mean that water baptism was a "bare symbol" or an "optional extra." For Paul and the early Christians, there were no "unbaptized believers" since water baptism followed almost immediately upon one's confession of faith in Christ (cf. Acts 8:30-39; 16:13-15, 22-34).

βαπτίσματος (cf. v. 3b) rather than the verb συνετάφημεν.<sup>72</sup> This verb recalls the kerygmatic statement *καὶ ὅτι ἐτάφη* in 1 Corinthians 15:4 (cf. also Col 2:12). Just as burial confirmed the real, corporeal death of Christ, so also to be "buried with Him" confirms that the believer "died with Him."<sup>73</sup> Thus Paul applied the terminology of the past Christ-event to baptism, a natural usage since he had just claimed that Christians were baptized into Christ's death (v. 3).

This compound σύν- verb introduces us to Paul's σύν Χριστῷ language and imagery in this passage (cf. also vv. 5, 6, 8). It is probable that he is the originator of this concept,<sup>74</sup> although some scholars claim that he has taken it from Jewish apocalyptic.<sup>75</sup> His use of σύν to describe the relationship between Christ and the Christian can refer to the Christian's past, present, and / or future experience.<sup>76</sup> Not every occurrence has the same meaning, thus the phrase is not a set formula but a motif Paul uses. Consequently, temporal "witness" is not always in view, and his intended meaning goes beyond ideas of correspondence ("as Christ, so also we") and causality ("because Christ, so we also") to the idea of "association or participation

---

<sup>72</sup>Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:304; Murray, *Romans*, 1:216; Käsemann, *Romans*, 166. Pace Dunn, *Romans*, 1:314; Kuss, *Römerbrief*, 1:298; Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 133; and B. Frid, "Römer 6:4-5: εἰς τὸν θάνατον und τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ als Schlüssel zu Duktus und Gedankengang in Röm 6, 1-11," *BZ* 30 (1986) 188-203, who claim the phrase is adverbial and connect it with συνετάφημεν (i.e., "buried unto death") because there is no article preceding εἰς tying the phrase to βαπτίσματος. However, Koine Greek often omits an article before adjectival prepositional phrases (BDF, §272; Robertson, *Grammar*, 784, and MHT, 3:221). Moulton notes that "in written style the ambiguous position of εἰς τὸν θάνατον . . . would have been cleared up by prefixing τοῦ, if the meaning was (as seems probable) 'by this baptism into his death'" (MHT, 1:83-84). On the anaphoric article, see Wallace, *Grammar*, 217-20.

<sup>73</sup>Bornkamm, "Baptism," 74; Leenhardt, *Romans*, 156; Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:304.

<sup>74</sup>Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 50-52, 342-56; Siber, *Mit Christus leben*, 191-213.

<sup>75</sup>E. Schweizer, "Dying and Rising with Christ," *NTS* 14 (1967-68) 1-14; Käsemann, *Romans*, 160-63; Beker, *Paul*, 274-75.

<sup>76</sup>Past: e.g., Rom. 6:4, 6, 8a; Gal. 2:19-20a; Col. 2:12-13, 20; 3:1; Eph. 2:5-6; cf. 2 Tim. 2:11a; present: e.g., Rom. 6:5a; 8:17, 29; 2 Cor. 13:4b; Phil. 3:10; Col. 3:3; future: e.g., Rom. 6:5b, 8b; 8:17b, 32b; 2 Cor. 4:14; Phil. 1:23; 3:21; 1 Thess. 4:14b, 17; 5:10b; Col. 3:4; cf. 2 Tim. 2:11b.

with" ("we . . . with Christ").<sup>77</sup>

It is probable that the basis for Paul's *σὺν Χριστῷ* language is his understanding of Christ as a representative, inclusive figure.<sup>78</sup> As noted above, Romans 5:12-21 has made clear that His obedient act (i.e., His death, 5:19) affects all those people who belong to Him. From this, one can deduce that Christ's death is a representative, inclusive act, that is, it is at one and the same time the death of those who are united "with Him." As Douglas Moo points out, Paul appears to make this deduction in 2 Corinthians 5:14: *εἰς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον [σὺν αὐτῷ]*. If both aorist verbs point to Christ's death on the cross, as is likely, then from the fact that One died for "all," Paul concludes that "all" died with Him. The death Christ died as a representative of others can also be considered the death of all those He represents.<sup>79</sup>

What, then, is the meaning of being "buried with Christ," and how is it related to baptism? In light of Paul's *σὺν* language and the *διὰ* phrase (v. 4a), which makes baptism the *occasion* (not the sacramental means) of God's activity by which Christians were buried with Christ, this concept describes the believer's participation in Christ's own burial at one's baptism.<sup>80</sup> This does not mean that the redemptive-

---

<sup>77</sup>Grundmann, *TDNT*, 7:781-86.

<sup>78</sup>See discussion in ch. 1, 40-41. Also, see W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*, 4th ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980) 101-08; Best, *One Body*, 55-57; Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 132-38; Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, passim; Ridderbos, *Paul*, 57-62; 206-14; Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 343-48; and Moo, *Romans*, 391-95.

<sup>79</sup>Moo, *Romans*, 394.

<sup>80</sup>Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 130, states: "Paul's first thought in this passage . . . is not that the believer in his baptism is laid in his own grave, but that through that action he is set alongside Christ Jesus in *His* [grave]." Paul apparently does not see baptism as symbolical of resurrection, although Col. 2:12 suggests that he does. However, the *ἐν ᾧ καὶ* that begins v. 12 repeats the *ἐν ᾧ καὶ* of v. 11 and refers to Christ ("in whom also") as the antecedent and not baptism ("in which also"). The theme and emphasis of vv. 9-12 that redemption and fullness of life are accomplished in Christ seem to demand this interpretation. These things took place "in Him." See Dunn, *Baptism*, 153-57, for the arguments supporting this view. On the other hand, Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 133-34, 152-69, takes baptism to be the antecedent of *ἐν ᾧ*, and thus he argues that Paul draws an analogy between baptism and the death (immersion), burial (submersion) and resurrection (emersion) of Christ. See also Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 153, 162-63.

historical event is "timeless," allowing it to be understood as repeated in, or present in, the rite of baptism as an efficacious sacrament.<sup>81</sup> Baptism is not the *means* by which Christians are buried with Christ but the *occasion* (*διά*) when this participation / identification takes place.<sup>82</sup> Nor does this mean that the time of their burial with Christ was the time of His own burial (AD 30/33) such that they were *already* "in Him" and thus have already participated individually in the redemptive events "with Him."<sup>83</sup>

Paul, then, draws the conclusion (*οὖν*) that believers were "buried with Christ" (6:4a) because, as in the kerygma summary (1 Cor. 15:3-4), burial confirmed the reality and finality of His death. The Christian's death with Christ to sin is definitive and final. But why does Paul make baptism the occasion when the Christian becomes identified with these redemptive events, especially in light of the centrality of faith (Rom. 1:17; 3:28; 4:4-5, 24-25) as the means by which the believer's relationship to Christ is established? As noted above, the early church viewed faith, baptism, and the gift of the Spirit as components of one unified experience that Dunn calls "conversion-initiation."<sup>84</sup> In these verses (6:3-4), then, we assume that baptism for Paul stands for the whole conversion-initiation experience

---

<sup>81</sup>Pace Schneider, *TDNT*, 5:195; Kuss, *Römer*, 298-300. In 6:10, Paul emphasizes the "once-for-all" nature of Christ's death with the word *ἐφάπαξ*.

<sup>82</sup>BAGD, s.v. *διά*, III.1.e. This tends to rule out the popular view going back to Tertullian (4th century) in ch. 3 of his *Homily on Baptism*, trans. and ed. E. Evans (London: SPCK, 1964) that gives symbolic significance to the actual physical movements of immersion and emersion involved in baptism (cf. Moo, *Romans*, 361-62). Baptism, then, is not the means by which believers die and rise with Christ, nor is it *primarily* a symbol or picture of dying and rising with Christ as Paul presents it in Rom. 6. He emphasizes the historical event and the believer's participation in it, not the ritual of baptism (cf. Frankemölle, *Taufverständnis*, 52, 55-56). However, Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 133-34, 139 argues for a secondary allusion to such symbolism in the rite of baptism (cf. footnote 80 above). It is likely that early Christian baptism was usually by immersion (cf. *Did.* 7.1-4).

<sup>83</sup>Pace Ridderbos, *Paul*, 63, 207.

<sup>84</sup>Dunn, *Baptism*, 145. This gives the term "baptism" a metonymic sense here marking the decisive turning point in a person's life. On metonymy, see G. B. Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1980) 136-37.



presupposing faith and the gift of the Spirit. Baptism is mentioned not to give a symbolic picture explaining *how* Christians were buried with Christ, but to call attention to the fact *that* they were buried with Him at conversion-initiation.

This perspective contributes to our understanding of the "old man" and the *σύν*-verb found later in verse 6 as we shall see. Baptism and many of Paul's *σύν Χριστῷ* statements point to events in the life of Christ and in the life experience of the individual believer. This leads us to conclude that we are dealing with a relationship that takes place in time, but it is also one that transcends present time. There is a temporal tension between the historical accomplishment of redemption at the cross of Christ and the subsequent application of it to individual people. The Christian's participation in the redemptive events "with Christ" transfers him / her from the "old" to the "new" age / realm established by Christ. This transition, accomplished in redemptive history by Christ's salvific work on the cross, is realized individually at the conversion of each believer. Paul's *σύν* language, therefore, "refers to a 'redemptive-historical' 'witness' whose locus is *both* the cross and resurrection of Christ—where the 'shift' in ages took place historically—and the conversion of every believer—when this 'shift' in ages becomes applicable to the individual."<sup>85</sup>

The purpose (*ἵνα*, v. 4b) of identification with Christ through baptism into His death is that *ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν*. This is the main point of verse 4. Paul expressed this purpose in the form of a comparison denoted by *ὥσπερ* . . . *οὕτως καί* with *ὥσπερ* having causal force in this context (i.e., "because Christ has been raised . . ."). With the *ὥσπερ* clause he relates our identification with Christ to the

---

<sup>85</sup>Moo, *Romans*, 365. The nature of this participation with Christ is objective (positional) and transformational rather than mystical (cf. Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 153) in any ontological sense because He is the inclusive representative for all those who belong to Him (Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 343-48). In light of this, Paul's "participationist" language is compatible with his "judicial" language. They are not in conflict (cf. Käsemann, *Romans*, 165; Ridderbos, *Paul*, 169; pace Sanders, *Paul*, 463-68).

resurrection of Christ from the dead *διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς*.<sup>86</sup> On the basis of his other uses of this construction in Romans<sup>87</sup> and his linking of baptism with both Christ's death and burial in verses 3-4a, one might expect Paul to declare that Christians have also been raised with Christ in verse 4b. But he does not. It is striking that he breaks the parallelism between the protasis and apodosis in 6:4b, and instead of stating that believers were raised with Christ, he declares that they "walk in newness of life," thereby focusing on the new kind of life that results from Christ's resurrection.<sup>88</sup> Though Paul does not directly speak of the Christian's participation in Christ's resurrection as already realized (cf. Col. 2:12; 3:1 and Eph. 2:5-6), he nevertheless makes clear that the Christian already benefits from the life and power of His resurrection in this life (cf. 6:11, 13).<sup>89</sup> The reason for this "shift" is because Paul's main concern arising out of verse 1 is to give a pointed, yet positive, contrast to "remaining in sin." A definitive break in the Christian's relationship to sin as an

---

<sup>86</sup>The "glory of the Father" seems to echo a doxological formula (1:23; 3:23; 5:2), which may be further indication that Paul is drawing upon traditional teaching in his argument. The concept of "glory" has eschatological associations for Paul (e.g., 2:7, 10; 5:2; 8:17, 21), suggesting that he sees Christ's resurrection as an eschatological event inaugurating the "age to come" in God's plan and purpose. The "glory of God" is a summary expression for all of His character perfections that were displayed gloriously in Christ's resurrection; see Murray, *Romans*, 1:217; Dunn, *Romans*, 1:315; and Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:304, who relates glory to God's use of His power since glory and power are often associated in the Bible (cf., e.g., the exodus miracles in Exod. 15:7, 11; 16:7, 10). This phrase may also allude to the power of the Spirit who is the agent at work behind the glory that raised up Jesus Christ (Rom. 8:11), and it may also imply that this same power is the power of the new age that has dawned with Christ's resurrection.

<sup>87</sup>In the other uses of *ὡσπερ . . . οὕτως* in Romans (5:12, 19, 20; 6:19; 11:30-31), the protasis and apodosis are parallel in terms of terminology and imagery. Thus, the reader would expect to find the same pattern here. Since these conjunctions were prominent in the preceding section on Adam and Christ (5:12-21), they call one's attention to that train of thought here "with the purpose of emphasizing that the new head of the line is not Adam but Christ," Leenhardt, *Romans*, 159; also Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:272 n5. The connection between the two here is not merely to show similarity but rather to show logical relationship: the apodosis is based on the protasis.

<sup>88</sup>This unexpected shift in the apodosis of v. 4b by Paul has been emphasized correctly by Dunn, *Baptism*, 143-44, and Käsemann, *Romans*, 166-67, who lists scholars who have not fully recognized Paul's "eschatological reservation" here.

<sup>89</sup>Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 138-39; and Moo, *Romans*, 367. Pace Wuest, *Victory*, 45, who views v. 4b as the impartation of a new (divine) nature such that the believer has "two natures in him, the sinful and the divine."

authoritative power over him / her has occurred. Instead of saying that we were raised with Christ in baptism, Paul points to His resurrection by the power of God to a new life and status as the basis for the believer's new life status and consequent conduct in "newness of life."

The implicit assertion is that Christians now walk in newness of life.<sup>90</sup> The verb *περιπατέω* is used exclusively in a figurative sense in Paul's letters to denote a person's present way of life or lifestyle (e.g., Rom. 8:4; 13:13; 14:15).<sup>91</sup> The phrase *ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς* depicts the new realm (the "new creation," 2 Cor. 5:17) in which Christians now stand and in which they now conduct their lives empowered by the realities of the new age, especially God's Spirit (cf. Rom. 7:6; 8:4). It stands in direct contrast to *ἐπιμένωμεν τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ* in 6:1 and *πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ* in 6:2. Paul consistently uses *καινότης* (Rom. 7:6) and *καινός* (1 Cor. 11:25; 2 Cor. 3:6; 5:17; Gal. 6:15; Eph. 2:15; 4:24) in reference to the "new age" of salvation inaugurated by Jesus Christ.<sup>92</sup> The genitive noun *ζωῆς* has been understood in several ways: 1) an *attributed* genitive where *ζωῆς* becomes the principal word and *καινότητι* provides a descriptive attribute normally supplied by an adjective, thus: "new life;"<sup>93</sup> 2) an

---

<sup>90</sup>See BDF, §337, 1, on the use of the aorist subjunctive verb *περιπατήσωμεν* instead of a present imperative verb. Here, the aorist may well be ingressive, stressing the beginning of a new way of life in the new age of salvation that contrasts with the old. See B. M. Fanning, *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek*, OTM (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990) 357-64, esp. 361, for a discussion of Paul's use of the (ingressive) aorist rather than the present in certain contexts as a reflection of the "old life-new life" motif in Pauline literature.

<sup>91</sup>Seesemann, *TDNT*, 5:944-45. Paul's use of this verb, unknown in classical Greek, is taken from the OT and Jewish writings where *לָלַךְ* is used this way (e.g., Exod. 18:19-20; 2 Kgs. 20:2-3; Ps. 86:11; Prov. 8:20). It serves as an appropriate metaphor for him because there is a dynamic element implicit in his concept of life: the believer, who has already become new, moves step by step toward the goal God has set before him (cf. Bultmann, *TDNT*, 2:870-71; Dunn, *Romans* 1:315-16). See ch. 4, 210-11 and ch. 5, 251.

<sup>92</sup>BAGD, s.v. *καινότης*; Behm, *TDNT*, 3:447-51. *Καινός* denotes what is new in nature and superior in value when compared with what is old. See ch. 3, 175 n84; ch. 4, 227-29; and ch. 5, 279.

<sup>93</sup>Wallace, *Grammar*, 89-90, who notes, however, that semantically "'newness of life' has stronger force than 'new life.'" See also MHT, 3:213; Robertson, *Grammar*, 496, 651; and BDF, §165, who call this use a genitive of quality or an attributive genitive that should be rendered "living / lively newness," although MHT, 3:213, translate it as "new life." On the difference between an *attributive* and *attributed* genitive, see Wallace, *Grammar*, 86-90.

epexegetical genitive where *καινότητι* remains the principal word and *ζωῆς* gives its defining essence, thus: "newness [the new realm], that is, life;"<sup>94</sup> or, 3) an objective genitive where *καινότητι* is given a verbal nuance and *ζωῆς* is its object, thus: "newness [the new realm] that leads to, or, confers life."<sup>95</sup> Either of the last two options serves Paul's meaning well here because both maintain the emphasis on *καινότητι*. As Christ entered a new order of existence following His death, burial and resurrection, so Christians also, by virtue of their participation in these redemptive events, have entered a new realm of existence in the present. They have been transferred out of the "old realm" to the "new realm" in which they are empowered and summoned to live a new kind of life according to the values and standards of the new realm. A concept that relates to this newness following upon resurrection is "the new man," even though Paul does not use the term here.<sup>96</sup>

Having discussed Paul's argument in 6:3-4, we are now better able to address the question of when believers "died to sin" (v. 2). Typically, either the time of their baptism,<sup>97</sup> or, the historical event of Christ's death on Golgotha<sup>98</sup> are given as the moments of this death. However, to make this into an either / or point in time is

---

<sup>94</sup>E.g., Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 20; and Murray, *Romans* 1:217.

<sup>95</sup>E.g., Moo, *Romans*, 366 n71.

<sup>96</sup>See the discussion of this topic in ch. 3, 174-81; ch. 4, 227-42; and ch. 5, 278-84.

<sup>97</sup>Barrett, *Romans*, 121; Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 140; Kuss, *Römerbrief*, 1:296; Schnackenburg, *Baptism*, 33; Käsemann, *Romans*, 168; Wilckens, *Römer*, 2:16; and Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 434.

<sup>98</sup>Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:300, although he acknowledges the possibility that Paul already had baptism in mind in 6:2, 8; Ridderbos, *Paul*, 63; Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 24. Cranfield discusses four different senses in which Christians may speak of dying and rising with Christ: juridical, baptismal, moral and eschatological. Each sense has to do with *both* dying *and* rising with Christ resulting in an eightfold scheme. He argues that Paul presupposes this scheme and 6:1-14 cannot be fully understood unless it is kept in mind (*Romans*, 1:299-300; id., "Romans 6:1-14 Revisited," *ExpTim* 106 [1994] 40-43). While this scheme may be theologically correct, there is considerable exegetical debate about whether all of these different senses actually appear in this passage. Cranfield himself acknowledges that at least five of the items in the eightfold scheme are only implicit or else absent. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 432-33, follows Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:299-300 here.

to pull apart what Paul has placed together. Certainly it can be said that in their baptism (conversion-initiation) Christians died to sin since that is one of the reasons why Paul brings baptism into this discussion. Baptism, however, can only be a death to sin because it is an incorporation into Christ's death itself in which sin was judged. It is the past historical event of Christ's once-for-all death that gives baptism its meaning and significance. Hence, it is not enough to say that Christians died to sin in baptism. They only died to sin in baptism because through it they were incorporated into Christ and thereby included in His liberating death. For Paul, the two are interrelated, especially as he has affirmed in the chiasm of 6:3 (see p. 86 above).

#### 2.4.4 Romans 6:5-7: Union With Christ in His Death

As noted above, verses 5-7 and 8-10 contain two structurally parallel supporting arguments in which Paul gives the explanation (*γάρ*, v. 5a) and basis for the fact that believers have died to sin (v. 2b) in order that they might walk in newness of life (v. 4b). At the same time, these verses present the results of being "baptized into Christ" (vv. 3-4). Verses 5-7 amplify the significance of the believer's death with Christ by means of a brief reference to being united with His resurrection (v. 5b). Verses 8-10 begin with a brief reference to death with Christ (v. 8a) and focus on the christological basis for life with Him.

**2.4.4.1 Romans 6:5.** This verse supports and explains the main point of verse 4, namely, believers now walk in newness of life because Christ was raised from the dead. The explanatory *γάρ* (v. 5a) introduces a conditional sentence in which the protasis states the basis for the conclusion drawn in the apodosis, namely, the believer's participation with Christ in His death assures participation with Him in His resurrection. Paul goes on to state: "For if (*εἰ γάρ*) we have become united (*σύμφυτοι*) with the likeness (*τῷ ὁμοιώματι*) of his (*αὐτοῦ*) death, certainly also (*ἀλλὰ καί*)<sup>99</sup> we

---

<sup>99</sup>The protasis clause containing *εἰ* plus the indicative mood asserts a factual condition that Paul considers to be fulfilled or assumes to be true (BDF, §372; Wallace, *Grammar*, 690-94).

shall be [united with the likeness] of [his] resurrection."<sup>100</sup> Four issues must be resolved in order to arrive at the meaning of this verse.

First, the lexical meaning of *σύμφυτος* must be determined. This verbal adjective is a New Testament *hapax legomenon* and is derived from *συμφύω* (*συμφύομαι*), meaning "to grow together with, join, be united with, become assimilated," rather than from *συμφυτεύω*, meaning "to plant together."<sup>101</sup> It has passive force ("been joined / united") here and continues the series of theologically significant words and phrases using *σύν* in this passage (cf. 6:4, 6, 8). The imagery is biological rather than horticultural, depicting the fusing together of the broken edges of a bone or wound.<sup>102</sup> Paul uses the metaphor to describe the union of believers with the "likeness" of Christ's death.

Second, the syntactical relationship of *τῷ ὁμοιώματι* must be determined. That with which believers have been united is a matter of debate. Some scholars claim that the dative pronoun *αὐτῷ* should be supplied by the reader following *σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν*, and that *τῷ ὁμοιώματι* should be taken as an independent instrumental dative or a dative of reference.<sup>103</sup> Thus Paul is claiming that we have

---

The *ἀλλά καί* introducing the apodosis after *εἰ* (or, *ἐάν εἴπερ*) is not adversative here; instead it signifies certainty and means "yet, certainly also" (BDF, §448, 5).

<sup>100</sup>The protasis-apodosis structure of this conditional sentence necessitates supplying the words *σύμφυτοι . . . τῷ ὁμοιώματι* and *αὐτοῦ* in the apodosis from the protasis; see BDF, §482; Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:306; Schnackenburg, *Baptism*, 36. The elements of the first clause that remain the same in the second clause are precisely those that are not expressed (pace Grundmann, *TDNT*, 7:792). Curiously, BDF, §194, 2, suggest that *σύμφυτοι* is to be supplied but not *τῷ ὁμοιώματι*.

<sup>101</sup>Grundmann, *TDNT*, 7:786, 789-92; Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:307; and Dunn, *Romans*, 1:316. Pace Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 157, who claim that the grafting imagery of Rom. 11 is present here since this word has a horticultural background. On the background of *σύμφυτος*, see J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-literary Sources* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1952) 593 [hereafter MM].

<sup>102</sup>H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, rev. H. S. Jones (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958) s.v. *συμφύω*, [hereafter LSJ]; Best, *One Body*, 51; and Dunn, *Romans*, 1:316; pace Murray, *Romans*, 1:218; and Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 435.

<sup>103</sup>BAGD, s.v. *ὁμοίωμα*, 1; *αὐτῷ* is presumed in the translations of the JB, NEB, NRSV, NAS and NIV; Michel, *Römer*, 154; and P.-E. Langevin, "Le baptême dans la mort-résurrection. Exégèse de Rm 6, 1-5," *SciEccl* 17 (1965) 29-65, esp. 57-58.

been united with Christ in the same death that He died. In support of this, it is pointed out that this makes 6:5a parallel to 6:4a where an explicit *αὐτῷ* is found so that this inclusion of *αὐτῷ* would be the logical complement of *σύμφυτοι*.<sup>104</sup> While it is true that *σύμφυτοι* has an affinity for a dative word, one need not be supplied here because a dative is explicitly given in the text itself that adequately completes the construction, namely, *τῷ ὁμοιώματι*.<sup>105</sup> Nevertheless, some interpreters still want to supply *αὐτῷ* following *σύμφυτοι* and treat *τῷ ὁμοιώματι* as a dative of reference/respect, thus: "for if we have been united *with him (αὐτῷ)* in a death like his . . . ." <sup>106</sup> However, the nearness of *τῷ ὁμοιώματι* as an associative dative seems decisive for taking it directly with *σύμφυτοι*, thus: "for if we have become united with the likeness of His death . . . ." <sup>107</sup>

Third, what is the meaning of *ὁμολοῖα* (cf. Rom. 1:23; 5:14; 6:5; 8:3; Phil. 2:7)? And, what does it mean to be united with the *ὁμολοῖα* of Christ's death? The three possible meanings usually given for *ὁμολοῖα* are: 1) copy or imitation, 2) likeness, and 3) form.<sup>108</sup> Some interpreters understand verse 5 in terms of "copy or imitation" and

---

<sup>104</sup>Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 435.

<sup>105</sup>Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 30-31; and Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:307.

<sup>106</sup>This is the translation given by the NRSV; also, Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 435. For a discussion of this view and a refutation, see Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 30-31, and Schneider, *TDNT*, 5:192.

<sup>107</sup>Cranfield, *Romans*, 307; Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 32; Bornkamm, "Baptism," 77; Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 134; Dunn, *Romans*, 1:316; Schneider, *TDNT*, 5:192; Murray, *Romans*, 1:218; Käsemann, *Romans*, 168; Wilckens, *Römer*, 2:13; and F. A. Morgan, "Romans 6:5a: United to a Death Like Christ's," *ETHL* 59 (1983) 267-302, esp. 272-76. Cf. BDF, §194, 2; and MHT, 3:220.

<sup>108</sup>For a survey of views on *ὁμολοῖα*, see Schneider, *TDNT*, 5:192-95; Beyreuther and Finkenrath, *NIDNTT*, 2:501-05; and Morgan, "Romans 6:5a," 267-302. The word occurs infrequently in classical Greek, meaning, "a copy of an original, likeness, image" (LSJ and MM, s.v. *ὁμολοῖα*). It appears in the LXX 42 times, but in addition to the sense of "copy" or "image" with reference to idols (e.g., Exod. 20:4; Deut. 4:16, 25; Isa. 40:18-19), it is also used in the sense of "form," i.e., a concrete form that is not only similar to that of another but fully conforms to the other (e.g., Deut. 4:12, 15). Paul used the word five of its six occurrences in the NT (Rom. 1:23; 5:14; 6:5; 8:3 and Phil. 2:7). The sixth occurrence is Rev. 9:7 where it means "likeness, appearance": "The locusts resembled horses in appearance;" cf. BAGD, s.v. *ὁμολοῖα*, 3.

refer *ὁμολῶμα* to the baptismal rite viewed as the imitation or representation of Christ's death by which believers become joined with His death.<sup>109</sup> This interpretation is unacceptable, however, because the verb *γεγόναμεν* in verse 5a is in the *perfect* tense while Paul has only used verbs in the aorist tense to discuss the event of baptism (*ἐβαπτίσθημεν*, v. 3; *συνετάφημεν*, v. 4; and by implication *ἀπεθάνομεν*, v. 2). Also, such an understanding of *ὁμοιώματι* would not fit with its implied use in verse 5b.<sup>110</sup> Finally, the identification of *ὁμοιώματι* with baptism is dependent upon the inclusion of *αὐτῶ*, which has already been rejected. Thus, *ὁμοιώματι* is not to be understood as "copy or imitation" and equated with baptism.<sup>111</sup>

It is more difficult, however, to make a clear distinction between the other two meanings, "likeness" and "form."<sup>112</sup> If "likeness" is reserved for the sense of "similar to reality" (cf. Rom. 1:23; 5:14) and "form" is reserved for "identical with reality" (cf. Rom. 8:3; Phil. 2:7), the meaning in verse 5 seems to be somewhere in between. It is more than "similar" but less than "identical." Of the five Pauline references containing *ὁμοιώμα*, perhaps Romans 8:3 and Philippians 2:7 best illustrate Paul's use of it here. In these verses *ὁμοιώμα* refers to a concrete "form," not merely an abstract "similarity." For Paul, Christ's presence in the world was not a mere outward "likeness" to the "flesh of sin" (Rom. 8:3), but a real participation as a man in

---

<sup>109</sup>So Barrett, *Romans*, 123-24; Kuss, "Röm 6, 5a," 160; Betz, "Transferring a Ritual," 266-70; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 435; Bultmann, *TDNT*, 3:19 n80; and Schneider, *TDNT*, 5:192-93, 195.

<sup>110</sup>This has been noted correctly by Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 22-24, 34-35; Dunn, *Baptism*, 143; Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:306; Murray, *Romans*, 1:218-19.

<sup>111</sup>A modification of the baptismal reenactment view is to see the death of Christ as sacramentally present in baptism, that is, in the baptismal event the Christ-event is present. For a discussion of these views, see Schneider, *TDNT*, 5:192-95. There are three convincing objections to both of these views: 1) the perfect tense verb *γεγόναμεν* (BDF, §318, 4; §340) in v. 5a and the future tense verb *ἐσόμεθα* in v. 5b rule out equating *ὁμολῶμα* with baptism at all, even if the future were only a logical future, as some believe; 2) it is unnatural to take *ὁμοιώματι* as an instrumental dative and interpret it as a synonym for baptism; and 3) in vv. 5-7, Paul moves away from the imagery of baptism, choosing instead other images to explain his argument (cf. Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:307).

<sup>112</sup>See Käsemann, *Romans*, 167-69, and Schnackenburg, *Baptism*, 49-59, for an extensive discussion on the difficulties involved in this issue.



human existence (Phil. 2:7) that is determined by this "flesh of sin," yet, unlike all other humans, He lived without sin (2 Cor. 5:21).<sup>113</sup> Taking this sense in Romans 6:5a, *ὁμολῶμα* refers to the death of Christ and believers' participation in it directly, but their death is not identical with His in every respect. This view is held by many recent interpreters.<sup>114</sup>

To be united with the "form" (commonly rendered "likeness") of Christ's death, then, means that Christians have truly become united with Christ's death by crucifixion as the historical event in which sin's rule was broken. Likewise, to be united with the "form" of Christ's resurrection means that they will be united with Christ's resurrection as the event in which death's hold is broken and life in glory begins.<sup>115</sup> At conversion-initiation (baptism) Christians were united with the death of Christ and thus are now in the state of being "conformed" to that death (Phil. 3:10). In light of verse 2, this additional element (*ὁμολῶμα* as "form") indicates that "death to sin" characterizes the continuing existence of Christians. Thus, Paul goes on to say in verse 5b that if this is the present existence of believers, then certainly (*ἀλλὰ καί*, see footnote 99 above) their future existence will be one in which they are united with the "form" of Christ's resurrection. This will include their being glorified with Christ and living with Him (Rom. 8:17-18, 23, 30).

Fourth, the preceding discussion leads us to consider the verb tenses in verse 5. In verses 3 and 4 Paul used aorist tense verbs, but in the protasis of verse 5

---

<sup>113</sup>Hooker, *From Adam to Christ*, 18, says that Rom. 8:3 is "surely a reference to the incarnation, and an attempt to affirm that Christ shared fully in human experience," that is, "in the condition of Adam" (27).

<sup>114</sup>Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 35, 38-39; Ridderbos, *Paul*, 207, 406-08; Frankemölle, *Taufverständnis*, 65-70; Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:308; Dunn, *Romans*, 1:317; Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 47 n7; Moo, *Romans*, 369 n84, 370; and Morgan, "Romans 6:5a," 295-302. Tannehill appeals to Phil. 2:7 and argues that Paul used *ὁμολῶμα* as a synonym for *μορφή* and both of these terms were connected with the idea of transformation from one mode (form) of existence to another (cf. Rom. 8:29; 2 Cor. 3:18; Phil. 3:21). Thus *ὁμολῶμα* in Rom. 6:5 means conformation to Christ in the two modes (forms) of His existence: the crucified Jesus and the resurrected Lord (38-39).

<sup>115</sup>Wilckens, *Römer*, 2:14-15.

he changed to a perfect tense (*γεγόναμεν*). This perfect takes in the past punctiliar event to which the aorists referred and affirms the continuing existence of the resultant state.<sup>116</sup> Being united with Christ's death does not restrict it to a past event but is a resultant state (condition) that continues to characterize the ongoing life of the Christian (cf. Phil. 3:7, 10; Gal. 2:19; 6:14). So Paul used the perfect tense, even though he was referring to dying with Christ as a past event, because he had its present significance and benefits in mind.

In the apodosis clause (6:5b), Paul stressed the certainty (*ἀλλά καί*) that our union with the form of Christ's death will include union with the form of His resurrection. In this clause he used the future tense verb *ἐσόμεθα*. Interpreters have understood this tense in three ways: 1) as a purely logical future, that is, the idea of logical certainty (if A is true, then B will follow), referring to the already realized "spiritual" resurrection of believers "with Christ" as stated in Colossians 2:12; 3:1 and Ephesians 2:6;<sup>117</sup> 2) an existential future, that is, a reference to conformity to the resurrection in the ongoing moral life of the believer who has begun to walk in newness of life;<sup>118</sup> or, 3) an eschatological future, that is, a reference to the physical resurrection of believers at the parousia of Christ (Phil. 3:20).<sup>119</sup> Views 1 and 2 refer

---

<sup>116</sup>BDF, §318, 4; §340; Wallace, *Grammar*, 574-76.

<sup>117</sup>For example: Murray, *Romans*, 219, who cites 5:17, 19 as parallels; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 435; Oepke, *TDNT*, 1:371 n14; Frid, "Römer 6:4-5," 198-99; and S. E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament with Reference to Tense and Mood*, SBG 1 (New York: Peter Lang, 1989) 422-23.

<sup>118</sup>For example: Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:308, who claims this rendering fits best with vv. 4b and 6c: "For if (in baptism) we have become conformed to his death, we shall certainly also be conformed (in our moral life) to his resurrection;" in a later article he suggests a "future of obligation" for 6:5b, "we are to be," and 6:8b, "we are to live with" ("Romans 6:1-14 Revisited," 43 n7). Also, Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 435; Schnackenburg, *Baptism*, 37-38; and Schneider, *TDNT*, 5:194, who points to v. 11: "alive to God in Christ" as support.

<sup>119</sup>For example: Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 10-12; Siber, *Mit Christus leben*, 242-43; Bornkamm, "Baptism," 78; Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 135; Barrett, *Romans*, 124; Käsemann, *Romans*, 169; Wilckens, *Römer*, 2:15; Michel, *Römer*, 154; Kuss, *Römerbrief*, 1:303; Dunn, *Romans*, 1:318; Moo, *Romans*, 371. Many who take this view treat the references to a past (spiritual) resurrection of believers with Christ in Col. 2:12; 3:1 and Eph. 2:5-6 as a post-Pauline departure from Paul's eschatological position (see Frankemölle, *Taufverständnis*, 63-64, 72-73). However,

to the Christian's past resurrection with Christ and present new life while view 3 refers to his or her future existence with Christ.

That *ἐσόμεθα* points to an eschatological future can be seen in the following observations: 1) Paul changed the comparison (parallelism) in the *οὕτως καί* clause of verse 4b; 2) he previously used aorist tense verbs to refer to the past event of baptism in verses 2-4, and a perfect tense verb to refer to the believer's present existence in verse 5a, but now a future tense verb in verse 5b; and 3) the parallel structure between verses 5 and 8 indicates, in light of the addition of the verb *πιστεύομεν* in verse 8, that verse 5b is a reference to the future.<sup>120</sup> Moreover, it is relatively easy for Paul to go from present participation in newness of life to future resurrection, as he does in verses 4 and 5. For him, these are simply two aspects of the Christian's participation in eschatological life, and he can easily move from one to the other as he does elsewhere (cf. 2 Cor. 4:10-14 and Phil. 3:10-11). Thus, the Christian's identification with Christ's death is perfective in force, that is, it was inaugurated in the past event of baptism (conversion-initiation) and now marks his / her present existence, while, on the other hand, his / her identification with Christ's resurrection is "less realized" and oriented to the future.

An eschatological future makes good sense in this context for at least three reasons. 1) The powers of the old age, namely, sin and death, are closely related, and 5:21 and 6:9 show that death's rule, to which the Christian is still subject, is not far from Paul's mind. The last enemy, death, has not yet been destroyed, and "though Christians have died with Christ, it cannot be said of them, as it is of Christ, that

---

although these texts emphasize "realized eschatology" more than Rom. 6, they need not be viewed as a departure from an earlier perspective but, rather, can be viewed as Paul's own application of one aspect of his eschatology to a new situation (so Moo, *Romans*, 371 n97). Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 70-84, has persuasively argued that Paul did not write Rom. 6 to "correct" these so-called pre-Pauline ideas that are reflected in these later writings. See also, M. J. Harris, *Raised Immortal: Resurrection and Immortality in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983) 101-05. See ch. 4, 197 n6.

<sup>120</sup>Bornkamm, "Baptism," 74-75. As noted above (p. 73), Bornkamm has observed a structural parallel between vv. 5-7 and vv. 8-10.

they 'will never die again.'<sup>121</sup> 2) New life is now in progress, is still open to the attacks of the powers of the "old realm," and is still future. The believer participates in new life in the present, but he or she does not yet possess it in its fullest and final form. It still remains God's gift for the future (Rom. 6:23b). 3) The reference to the future here may also reflect Paul's awareness of the danger of Christian triumphalism (cf. 1 Cor. 4:8). Since Paul did not want to give a footing to those who would deny future resurrection, he apparently presupposed past resurrection with Christ even though he chose to speak of it as still future (cf. vv. 4b, 11, 13).<sup>122</sup> The reason for this is to remind believers that complete and final victory over sin and death is yet future. Until then, they live in the power of Christ's resurrected life under the imperative of making it manifest in their daily conduct (cf. 2 Cor. 4:10). This is a prime example of the "already / not yet" tension in Paul's eschatology.

**2.4.4.2 Romans 6:6.** In verse 6 and following, Paul sets forth the significance of the Christian's death with Christ (cf. vv. 3b-4a, 5a) and highlights its result. In so doing, he explains further his thesis in verse 2: we Christians died to sin.

The initial words *τοῦτο γινώσκοντες ὅτι*<sup>123</sup> introduce additional information

---

<sup>121</sup>Hooker, *From Adam to Christ*, 44.

<sup>122</sup>Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 133, 139. G. M. Styler, "Obligation in Paul's Christology and Ethics" in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament: Studies in Honour of C. F. D. Moule*, eds. B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973) 175-87, esp. 181-83, argues that Paul understands the Christian's union with Christ's resurrection as past and present as well as future. That Christians "walk in newness of life" (v. 4b) and are "alive to God" (v. 11) "out of the dead" (v. 13) is the *present* redemptive-historical "form" (v. 5b) in which they are identified with Christ's resurrection (cf. footnote 119 above).

<sup>123</sup>The present participle *γινώσκοντες* is difficult to classify. It could be understood as an adverbial participle of cause introducing the premise of known, accepted fact on which Paul built his argument in v. 5, thus: "Since we know this, namely, that . . ." (Robertson, *Grammar*, 1128; Tannehill, *Dying and rising*, 13-14). Or, it could be understood as a participle of attendant circumstance (cf. Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 173-74) introducing a thought logically paratactic to a previous idea or another fact relevant to the argument, thus: "And we know this, namely, that . . ." (Cranfield, *Romans*, 308; Moo, *Romans*, 372; cf. NRSV, NIV). The latter view loosely linking *συνετάφημεν αὐτῷ* (v. 4a) with *ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη* (v. 6a) is preferred in this context. The neuter demonstrative pronoun *τοῦτο* refers to what follows in the *ὅτι* clause that introduces a statement in apposition to *τοῦτο* giving the content of what is known (BAGD, s.v. *οὗτος*, 1.b; Robertson, *Grammar*, 699; Wallace, *Grammar*, 458-59).

relevant to Paul's explanation. What his readers knew and how they obtained this knowledge is difficult to determine. On one hand, some claim that it was not derived from traditional Christian teaching or experience but is something Paul deduced from the preceding argument and now makes known to his readers.<sup>124</sup> On the other hand, as in verse 3 and in light of his reference to baptism, others argue that Paul is appealing to information already generally familiar to his readers. As such he develops it further using his own terminology and making them aware of implications they should recognize.<sup>125</sup> The latter view is probably more likely. This implies that Paul's readers were already familiar with the "old man" designation perhaps through first-hand exposure to Paul's missionary preaching elsewhere earlier, or, for most readers, at second hand, since Paul himself had not yet been to Rome (see pp. 64-65 above).

An understanding of verse 6 revolves around its three verb clauses. First, Paul says: ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν<sup>126</sup> ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη [Χριστῷ].<sup>127</sup> The compound verb *συνεσταυρώθη* continues the sequence of σύν- compounds (vv. 4a, 5a) and resumes the aorist passive following the perfect (*γεγόναμεν*) and future (*ἐσόμεθα*) tense verbs in

---

<sup>124</sup>Dunn, *Romans*, 1:318. The abrupt mention of the "old man," a non pre-Pauline designation, and the continued use of the *σὺν Χριστῷ* motif, a distinctive Pauline formulation, are two arguments used to support this view.

<sup>125</sup>Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:300, 309-10; Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 46-48. Paul apparently assumes his readers have received a standard core of instruction at the time of their baptism or soon after (cf. Gal. 6:6) and thus are familiar with his language without further explanation. See ch. 4, 229-31. Käsemann's claim (*Romans*, 169) that the "old man" is a pre-Pauline term, however, is questionable because he must rely on later Pauline material (Eph. 2:15; 4:22-24; Col. 3:9-10) for this postulated pre-Pauline tradition.

<sup>126</sup>The plural possessive pronoun *ἡμῶν* with the singular noun *ἄνθρωπος* may have distributive force: "the old man of each one of us" (MHT, 3:23-24; cf. 1 Cor. 6:19-20; 2 Cor. 4:10; Rom. 8:23), or, collective force: "the old man of (including) all of us" (BDF, §139-40; cf. Matt. 12:35). The former option is preferred in light of a more individualized vs. corporate emphasis in this passage as compared with 5:12-21. With this Semitism Paul follows the Hebraic preference for a distributive singular in which something is applicable to each person in the group. See pp. 107-11 for further discussion.

<sup>127</sup>Supplying *Χριστῷ* ("with Christ") here is supported contextually by *συνετάφημεν . . . αὐτῷ* referring to Christ in v. 4 and *ἀπεθάνομεν σὺν Χριστῷ* in v. 8. A parallel passage in Gal. 2:19 has *Χριστῷ* preceding *συνεσταύρωμαι*. There, as here, the act of crucifixion is not to be separated from the death that follows it. So, one could say, "our old man was put to death with Christ."

verse 5. Since Christ's death took the form of crucifixion, this imagery serves Paul well in bringing to a climax the "death side" of his "participation with Christ" discussion in verses 3-5. The figure emphasizes the decisive finality of the death so described rather than the initiation of a process of dying.<sup>128</sup> This finality is expressed negatively by the words, "dead to sin," and positively by the words "alive to God" in verse 11.

In light of this, then, to be "crucified with Christ" refers to the Christian's participation in Christ's crucifixion.<sup>129</sup> It is God's act in light of the believer's faith as attested in baptism whereby He considers the believer to have died the same death Christ died.<sup>130</sup> And the decisive, epoch-changing death He died, as Paul stresses in verse 10, He died to sin, breaking its power once for all. Consequently, just as Christ's crucifixion meant His release from the realm of sin (6:10), so also the Christian's crucifixion with Christ means his / her release from the realm of sin. Once again, Paul's language of "death" in relation to believers is objective (positional) and relational, not physical, mystical or ethical (cf. 6:2, 4). By God's act, "death with Christ" has brought them into a new status and realm (aorist passive indicative verbs) that hold definite consequences for daily living (present active imperatives). Paul did not say precisely when or how this crucifixion with Christ took place, but, as argued above, it took place in redemptive-history at the cross on the corporate / representative level and at conversion-initiation (baptism) on the individual / personal level. The latter in light of the former is primarily in view here.

---

<sup>128</sup>Pace Godet, *Romans*, 244; Dunn, *Romans*, 1:332; and Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:310.

<sup>129</sup>The only other use of *συσταυρόω* by Paul is in his own testimony in Gal. 2:19 where it occurs in the perfect tense. This indicates that participation with Christ crucified has enduring effects; it governs one's present way of life. He applies *σταυρόω* to Christ five times: 1 Cor. 1:23; 2:2, 8; 2 Cor. 13:4; and Gal. 3:1.

<sup>130</sup>Divine agency is reflected in the aorist passive. The parallel in Gal. 5:24 is striking in that Christians are the *agents* of crucifixion whose *object* is the flesh: *οἱ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ [Ἰησοῦ] τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν* (aorist tense)." Paul probably alludes to baptism (conversion-initiation) as the time when this took place.

It is, however, *ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος* that was crucified with Christ. The adjective *παλαιός* makes this designation distinctive to Paul and gives it theological force.<sup>131</sup> The same expression occurs in Colossians 3:9-10, where it is the antithesis of *τὸν νέον [ἄνθρωπον]*, and in Ephesians 4:22, 24, where it is the antithesis of *τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον*. Behind this antithesis is the contrast between Adam and Christ, the "first" and "last" *ἄνθρωπος* (1 Cor. 15:45; Rom. 5:15-19) and the prototypical "old man" and "new man" respectively.<sup>132</sup> In light of this, the "old man / new man" metaphor appears to function at two levels: corporate and individual.

In Romans 6, Paul mentions only the "old man." On the corporate level, in light of 5:12-19, the "old man" refers to the solidarity of all those who are "in Adam," the prototypical "old man" and representative "head" of the old age in redemptive history. The corporate "old man" is humanity "in Adam" outside of Christ under the tyranny of sin and death. On the individual level, the "old man" refers to the person who is "in Adam," that is, in solidarity with Adam, a member of humanity outside of Christ, one who belongs to the old age and lives under the rule of sin and death. In this condition the "old man" engages in a multiplicity of sinful practices, though these are not in view here. Thus, the "old man" is the designation of a person in terms of his or her identity and relationship to Adam and the powers of the old age in redemptive history.

Is, then, "our old man" in verse 6 corporate or individual? Some interpreters understand the "old man" here in a corporate sense as a collective entity that was

---

<sup>131</sup>See BAGD, s.v. *παλαιός*; Seesemann, *TDNT*, 5:717-20; Delling, *TDNT*, 1:486-87; Haarbeck, *NIDNTT*, 2:713-16; also ch. 4, 227-28 and ch. 5, 269-73. *Παλαιός* is commonly used in secular Greek, meaning "old" in two senses: 1) that which has existed for a long time and thus is venerable or held in high esteem (cf. Antipho 6.4); and 2) that which is antiquated, obsolete or worn out and thus is worthless or unusable (cf. Sophocles, *Oed. Tyr.* 290). The latter negative sense is the predominant meaning found in both the LXX and the NT. The synonym *ἀρχαῖος* has the predominant sense of "original" or "venerable," but in the NT the distinction is not maintained (cf. 2 Cor. 5:17). The main antonyms are *καινός* and *νέος*. The significance of the term lies in the redemptive-historical-eschatological antithesis of old and new.

<sup>132</sup>See the discussion in ch. 1, 38-41, and footnote 134 below for supporting arguments.

put to death with Christ. Tannehill advocates this view and supports it in three ways.<sup>133</sup> First, he equates "our old man" and "the body (*σῶμα*) of sin" and then claims that Romans 7:4 ("through the body of Christ") and Colossians 2:11 ("the body of the flesh") illuminate Romans 6:6 because they use the motif of dying and rising with Christ in connection with the term *σῶμα* and speak of it as a collective entity. Both of these verses, he argues, refer, at the same time, to the body that died on the cross and to a corporate body in which believers were included. Second, the corporate sense of the concept in Romans 6:6 is shown by its similar use in Colossians 3:9-10, where it is clear that many individuals have "put off" the old man and "put on" the new man just as they have "put on" Christ (Gal. 3:27). But there is only one Christ, not one for each individual person, so there must also be only one "old man" and one "new man." These, like Christ and Adam, are corporate figures. Accordingly, the "new man" includes Jew and Greek, circumcision and uncircumcision, etc. (cf. Eph. 2:15; Col. 3:11). Third, additional support is derived from the Adam and Christ parallel in the preceding section, Romans 5:12-21, where, the word *ἄνθρωπος* has special significance. The phrase "the one man" (vv. 12, 15, 17, 18, 19) is connected with the phrases "all men" (vv. 12, 18) and "the many" (vv. 15, 17, 19) to show that "the one man" determines and sums up the existence of all people who are related to him.<sup>134</sup>

---

<sup>133</sup>Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 24-30, 45-50, 59; also Ridderbos, *Paul*, 62-64, 205-14; and R. A. Harrisville, *Romans*, ACNT (Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1980) 92-93. Ridderbos, *Paul*, 208, states: "Then [in Christ's death] was 'our old man' crucified with him; and 'old man' intended here not as the individual past of particular believers in their unconverted state but as the supra-individual sinful mode of existence . . . ." Thus the "old man" is a corporate figure for the old mode of existence in sin that was judged once for all in the death of Christ on the cross. For counter arguments, see Schweizer, *TDNT*, 7:1065 and K.-A. Bauer, *Leiblichkeit - das Ende aller Werke Gottes. Die Bedeutung der Leiblichkeit des Menschen bei Paulus*, SNT 4 (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1971) 149-52.

<sup>134</sup>The use of *ἄνθρωπος* in this same sense also occurs in 1 Cor. 15:45-49 where Paul describes Adam and Christ as the first and the second *ἄνθρωποι*, and the many share in their nature, whether earthly or heavenly (v. 48), and wear the "image" of the one or the other (v. 49). This ignores all other men between them. These two are determinative for the many. This passage also makes clear the connection of *ἄνθρωπος* with a corporate figure since in Rom. 6:6 "our old man" is not specifically identified with Adam. Further, *ἄνθρωπος* can be treated as a distributive singular with the plural *ἡμῶν* indicating "the old man of each one of us," or, as a collective singular indicating "the old man of (including) all of us" (BDF, §139-40; see footnote 126 above). The former option is



This interpretation, however, is problematic in this context. Paul clearly says that "our old man was crucified." Adam, who is the corporate "old man," was *not* crucified and Christ, who was crucified, is *not* the corporate "old man." The aorist *passive verb* (*συνεσταυρώθη*) points to what has happened *to* believers rather than to an action they took. It points to God's action in a decisive past event rather than a present experience. The "old man" was put to death with Christ in His death, and for those who would come to be united with Christ by faith as attested in baptism, this ended their subjugation to sin as members united with Adam and the old order.

Even though it has corporate associations here, the "old man" in verse 6 refers to the individual person. The presence of *ἡμῶν* and other "we / our" statements in this passage, the reference to *σῶμα* in the next clause, the enslavement to sin no longer in the last clause, and the connection of conversion-initiation (baptism) with Paul's *σύν*- language in this passage supports an individual interpretation. Ernest Best has observed that the "with Christ" motif is more individualistic than corporate in application. Each believer and not the whole corporate community is said to die and rise to newness of life. Even though Christians are regarded as "with Christ" and are included "in Him," Paul always draws a clear distinction between them. Believers share in Christ's experience and its benefits, but they do not help to create it. That is totally the work Christ does for them.<sup>135</sup> While the corporate dimension is prominent in Romans 5 and related to what follows, the individual dimension is prominent in Romans 6, which deals with the intersection of redemptive history, eschatology, and individual existence.

"Our old man" in verse 6, then, is a reference to individual believers as they once were when they belonged to the old age and lived as slaves under the power of sin

---

preferred even though a collective singular does not preclude individuation. The distributive singular can be seen in Pauline uses elsewhere: Rom. 6:12; 8:26; 1 Cor. 6:19-20; and Phil. 3:21. See R. H. Gundry, *Sōma in Biblical Theology with Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology*, SNTSMS 29 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976) 220.

<sup>135</sup>Best, *One Body*, 57-58; also Grundmann, *TDNT*, 7:781-86.

(6:17).<sup>136</sup> That "our old man was crucified with Christ" is a vivid portrayal of the fact that, for Christians, the power of sin has been broken through their incorporation into Christ's death. It means their release from the realm of sin, and thus it is equivalent to "we Christians died to sin" (6:2). It also means that they no longer live *ἐν σαρκί* (7:5; 8:8-9) and their former identity and status "in Adam" has been done away.<sup>137</sup> This change in relational status (position) took place for the individual at conversion-initiation.

There is little in this text to support the view that Paul used the words "our old man" to personify indwelling sin (cf. Rom. 7:17, 20),<sup>138</sup> or, to designate fallen human nature either in regard to the whole person or an aspect of a person, that is, the "old nature" counterbalanced or replaced by the "new nature" (new man).<sup>139</sup> This leads to misunderstanding because it confuses relational status with ontological (one's essential being) or ethical categories and tends to ignore the eschatological framework (old / new

---

<sup>136</sup>Murray, *Romans*, 219-20; id., *Principles of Conduct* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957) 211-19; Jeremias, *TDNT*, 1:365-66; Frankemölle, *Taufverständnis*, 74-76; C. K. Barrett, *From First Adam to Last: A Study in Pauline Theology* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962) 98-99; id., *Romans*, 125; Käsemann, *Romans*, 169; Leenhardt, *Romans*, 161; Dunn, *Romans*, 1:318-19; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 436; Moo, *Romans*, 373-75; Wilckens, *Römer*, 2:16-17. Seesemann, *TDNT*, 5:719, says that Paul uses the antithesis of old and new "to express the incompatibility between the previous life in sin and the newly begun Christian life." He also states: "In R. 6 Paul says that he who is baptized is baptized into Christ's death (v. 3, 5); the old man he previously was has been crucified and put to death. . . . The old and the new are mutually exclusive."

<sup>137</sup>Caird, *Language*, 44, states: "To be 'in the flesh' is the same thing as to be 'in Adam,' in the old humanity, enslaved to sin and death. Christians are not, in this sense, 'in the flesh' (Rom. 8:9) . . . ." On the other hand, J. D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998), 464, appears to mix categories when he states: "Believers are 'in Adam' and continue to be 'in Adam'; they have not yet died. But they are also 'in Christ,' and have begun to experience life, though they have yet to share in the full experience of Christ's resurrection—in the resurrection of the body."

<sup>138</sup>Pace J. Owen, *The Works of John Owen*, 16 vols. ed. W. H. Goold, reprint ed. (London: Banner of Truth, 1966) esp. vol. 6; also id., *Sin and Temptation*, abridged and ed. by J. M. Houston (Portland: Multnomah Press, 1983). Owen states: "This 'old man' is the corruption of our nature" (*Works*, 3:222), and, "Indwelling sin is compared to a person, a living person, called 'the old man,' with his faculties, and properties . . ." (*Works*, 6:8).

<sup>139</sup>Pace Godet, *Romans*, 1:415; C. Hodge, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 2nd ed. reprint (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980) 177-98; L. S. Chafer, *He That Is Spiritual*, reprint (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1967 [1918, rev. ed. 1924]) 113-14.

age) of Paul's discussion. Cranfield, for example, makes a confusing statement when he says that the "old man" denotes "the whole of our fallen human nature, the whole self in its fallenness."<sup>140</sup> He adds that this does not imply that the "old man" no longer exists because the old fallen nature lingers on in the believer. For support, he appeals to Colossians 3:9 where he thinks believers are exhorted to put off the "old man."<sup>141</sup> However, Paul makes it clear in Galatians 2:20 that the pre-Christian "I" (*οὐκέτι ἐγώ*) is not an aspect (part / nature) of the person but constitutes the whole person in a particular relationship, namely, "under sin" (Rom. 3:9).

The second clause of Romans 6:6 gives the immediate purpose (*ἵνα*)<sup>142</sup> for the crucifixion of "our old man" with Christ: *ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας*. This is the first mention of *ἁμαρτία* since verse 2, suggesting that this clause and the following infinitive clause that also mentions *ἁμαρτία* round off the line of argument begun in verse 2 and meet the problem posed in verse 1.

The words *τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας* have been understood in four main ways. First, some Church Fathers and early commentators understood the phrase figuratively, without any anthropological reference, to mean "the mass [consisting] of sin" or sin viewed under the figure of a body as an organized whole having members that were destroyed.<sup>143</sup> This view claims support in the fact that there is no

---

<sup>140</sup>Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:308-9. Barrett, *Romans*, 125, refutes the view that regards the "old man" as the nature of the unconverted man; so also Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 52.

<sup>141</sup>The imperatival view of the aorist participles in Col. 3:9 is unlikely; see ch. 4, 215-22. Furthermore, believers ("we") are not said to have died to the "old man," thereby implying "he" still exists. Rather, "our old man" has come to an end with Christ in His death. In Pauline usage, the "old man" is never personified in an active sense the way "sin" is. The designation is either the subject of a passive verb (Rom. 6:6) or the object of a transitive active verb (Col. 3:9; Eph. 4:22).

<sup>142</sup>This *ἵνα* purpose clause introduces a transaction that occurs at the same time as (not subsequent to) v. 6a and is an essential corollary to it.

<sup>143</sup>H. A. W. Meyer, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 2 vols., KEKNT (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1881, 1884) 1:289, cites some early Church Fathers and early commentators among others who held more or less to this view. See also Hodge, *Romans*, 197-98; cf. D. E. H. Whiteley, *The Theology of St. Paul*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1974) 42.

possessive personal pronoun with the phrase (i.e., "our body of sin") and that *σῶμα* is singular and serves as the subject of the passive verb *καταργηθῆ*. However, there is little lexical support for such a use of *σῶμα* in this context (especially 6:12-13) or in the whole New Testament.

Second, more recently some interpreters, especially those who understand the "old man" in a corporate sense, also understand *σῶμα* in a corporate sense as the collective entity of all those who are under sin's power that was destroyed in the death of Christ, and not as a reference to the "body" of each individual Christian. Again, using Romans 7:4 and Colossians 2:11 as parallels to Romans 6:6, Tannehill argues that the body of sin "is put to death in Christ's death, and the believers are put to death by means of the death of this body, and so it is understood as a corporate entity."<sup>144</sup> However, the purpose (*ἵνα*) clause indicates that "our old man" and "the body of sin" are at least two aspects of the same entity since the former was crucified in order that the latter might be "destroyed." This suggests that both concepts must be understood in the same way, either both individually or both corporately. We argued above that it is best to take "our old man" here in an individual sense, so "the body of sin" should also be understood in the same way.

Third, even though the phrase is understood in an individual sense, some interpreters seek to limit it to the physical body as controlled by sin.<sup>145</sup> The body is not regarded as evil in itself but is viewed as easily dominated by sin. However, while *σῶμα* includes the physical body, it is not necessarily limited to it in Pauline usage. The frequent parallels between *σῶμα* and words denoting the whole person (cf. 6:12-13)

---

<sup>144</sup>Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 24, 45-50, 72; also Ridderbos, *Paul*, 113, 229; and M. Barth, *Ephesians*, 2 vols. AB 34, 34a (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1974) 2:538 n203.

<sup>145</sup>Gundry, *Sōma*, 29-31, 57-58, appeals to the distinction drawn in 6:13 between *τὰ μέλη* and *ἑαυτοῦς*; Godet, *Romans*, 416; Murray, *Romans*, 1:220-21, "the body as conditioned and controlled by sin;" and R. Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms. A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings*, AGJU 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1971) 291-92.

provide good reason to interpret *σῶμα* in a broader sense in some places. This leads, then, to the following option as the best one.

Fourth, many recent interpreters understand "the body of sin" to denote the whole person as controlled by the ruling power of sin.<sup>146</sup> This would include the physical body in spite of the tendency of some to downplay or even eliminate any such reference in Paul's use of *σῶμα* (e.g., Bultmann et al.). The *σῶμα* constitutes a person as a social being in his / her particular environment, one who acts and can be acted upon by something else. Hence, *σῶμα* is often defined more precisely by an adjective or other modifying genitive phrase (cf. Romans 6:12; 7:24; 8:11; Phil. 3:21 (twice), Col. 1:22; 2:11). In this case the phrase *τῆς ἀμαρτίας* is best understood as a genitive of possession ("the body belonging to / controlled by / enslaved to sin")<sup>147</sup> rather than the commonly held genitive of quality ("sinful body").<sup>148</sup> The "body of sin," then, is the person of the old age who, in his or her bodily existence with all his / her human capacities (faculties), is under the controlling power and domination of sin. Such a person—the "old man"—is a slave of sin.

---

<sup>146</sup>On this view of *σῶμα* see Bultmann, *Theology*, 1:192-203; Schweizer, *TDNT*, 7:1060-66; Motyer, *NIDNTT*, 1:235-45; Ridderbos, *Paul*, 115-17; specifically, Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:309, "the whole man as controlled by sin;" Michel, *Römer*, 155; Käsemann, *Romans*, 169; Dunn, *Romans*, 1:319-20; Moo, *Romans*, 375-76; and Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 436, "the whole person considered as earth-oriented, not open to God or His Spirit, and prone to sin." There is some papyrological evidence that *σῶμα* was rendered "slave": e.g., Hibe Papyri 54.20 (ca. 245 BC), "and if you have taken the slave (*τὸ σῶμα*), deliver him to Semphtheus . . .;" also an inscription at Delphi (ca. 200 BC), "Apollo . . . bought . . . for freedom, a female slave (*σῶμ[α]*) . . ." (Dittenberger, *Sylloge*<sup>2</sup>, no. 845). A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, rev. ed., trans. L. R. M. Strachan (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978) 323 n7, states: "The passage in Rom. vi.6, 'that the body of sin might be destroyed,' is ambiguous, since 'body' (*σῶμα*) may also mean 'slave' . . ." Though it is unlikely that Paul used *σῶμα* to mean "slave," such a connection does illumine the meaning of the phrase *τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἀμαρτίας*. The plural *σώματα* was rendered "slaves" in a wider range of ancient literature (cf. BAGD, s.v. *σῶμα*, 2; Rev. 18:13).

<sup>147</sup>Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 38, "the sin-possessed body." Cf. Wis. 1.4, *ἐν σώματι κατάχρεω ἀμαρτίας*, "in a body indebted (enslaved) to sin." A subjective genitive ("the body sin controls / rules") is not appropriate since *σῶμα* is not a verbal noun.

<sup>148</sup>BDF, §165; MHT, 2:440 and 3:213, treat this phrase as a "Hebraic genitive" because of the frequent use of the Hebrew construct state in place of an adjective; thus in NT Greek an attributive genitive is frequently used in place of an adjective of quality. The expression "sinful body," however, is misleading to the extent that it suggests the physical body is inherently sinful, a notion rejected by Paul (cf. 1 Cor. 6:12-20).

Understood in this way, "the body of sin" and "our old man" are closely related, the former emphasizing more directly and vividly the binding relationship of the "old man" to sin.<sup>149</sup> If this is so, then "the body of sin" should be understood in the same individual sense as the "old man" as argued above. Though Paul does not use a personal pronoun with *τῆς ἀμαρτίας*, the article *τῆς* could be understood as the equivalent of a possessive pronoun: "our body of sin," especially in light of *ἡμῶν* in the preceding clause and *ἡμᾶς* in the following clause.<sup>150</sup>

What happens to "the body of sin" is expressed by the aorist passive verb *καταργηθῆ*. This verb, found twenty-seven times in the New Testament, occurs twenty-five times in the Pauline corpus. It has a broad spectrum of meaning ranging from "make ineffective, powerless; nullify, render inoperative or impotent" (cf. Rom. 3:3, 31; 4:14; 1 Cor. 1:28; Gal. 3:17) to "abolish, bring to an end, destroy" (cf. 1 Cor. 6:13; 15:24, 26; 2 Thess. 2:8; Eph. 2:15; 2 Tim. 1:10). In between are a range of uses whose precise meaning is difficult to pin down (cf. "release," Rom. 7:2, 6; "remove, bring to an end," Gal. 5:4, 11; 2 Cor. 3:14; "pass away, put away, fade," 1 Cor. 2:6; 13:8 (twice), 10, 11; 2 Cor. 3:7, 11, 13, 14).<sup>151</sup> Where does Romans 6:6 fit within this range? Some translate the verb with the strong sense of "destroy,"<sup>152</sup> while others

---

<sup>149</sup>Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:309, states that apart from a difference in stress, the two phrases are "identical;" Käsemann, *Romans*, 169, says: "Here the 'old man' is Adam individualized and represented in us . . . *σῶμα τῆς ἀμαρτίας* means the same thing from the standpoint of fallenness. The expressions are not collective . . ."

<sup>150</sup>Robertson, *Grammar*, 769-70; Wallace, *Grammar*, 215-16; cf. similarly Rom. 7:25; 16:23; 1 Cor. 5:1; 2 Cor. 8:18; 12:18; Phil. 1:7. Again, the phrase should be treated as a distributive singular: "the body of each one of us controlled by sin" (cf. footnotes 126 and 134 above). Note the distributive force of the following plural possessive pronouns: *τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν* in Phil. 3:21 and *ἐν τῷ θνηστῷ ὑμῶν σώματι* in Rom. 6:12; also 1 Cor. 6:19-20.

<sup>151</sup>BAGD, s.v. *καταργέω*; LSJ, s.v.; MM, 331; Delling, *TDNT*, 1:452-54, "to make completely inoperative, or, to put out of use;" Packer, *NIDNTT*, 1:73; and Ridderbos, *Paul*, 208-210. This verb rarely occurs in classical Greek, where it means "to leave unemployed or idle" (e.g., Euripides, *Phoenissae*, 753) and appears only four times in the LXX where it means "to cease, destroy" (2 Esdr 4:21, 23; 5:5; 6:8). Regarding Rom. 6:6, BAGD have the strong sense of "destroy." The two non-Pauline NT texts are Luke 13:7 and Heb. 2:14.

<sup>152</sup>E.g., Murray, *Romans*, 1:221; Schnackenburg, *Baptism*, 39-40; and Frankemölle, *Taufverständnis*, 76.

employ the weaker sense of "render powerless / impotent / inoperative,"<sup>153</sup> but neither of these fits the language of verse 6 very well. The subject is "the (our) body of sin" understood as "the person of the old age / realm under the controlling power of sin." This person is not destroyed nor rendered powerless by God's action in conversion-initiation. Instead, the person is "released" from sin as a controlling power. What is destroyed is not the person nor sin but the binding relationship between the two. The meaning "release, remove, discharge" is clearly evident in Romans 7:2, 6<sup>154</sup> and fits the argument here even though the construction there (with *ἀπό*) is slightly different. Romans 6:7 confirms the same thought using the phrase *ἀπό τῆς ἀμαρτίας* although it follows a different verb. Thus, the crucifixion of "our old man" on the cross with Christ has the purpose of releasing sin-controlled individuals from sin as a ruling power. The believer's solidarity with Adam, which bound him or her to sin as a controlling power, has ended. The believer's *σῶμα* ceases to be a "body of sin." What this means for Christian existence is spelled out in the concluding clause.

The third clause presents the climax of verse 6: *τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ*.<sup>155</sup> This is the goal and result to which the first two clauses point. The genitive articular infinitive *τοῦ . . . δουλεύειν* could be epexegetical (explanatory), final (purpose) or consecutive (result) in relation to these clauses.<sup>156</sup> It is preferable to

---

<sup>153</sup>E.g., Dunn, *Romans*, 1:319; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 436; and Moo, *Romans*, 375, who states that "Paul's use of this verb in similar salvation-historical contexts . . . suggests rather the connotation of a power whose influence is taken away" (375 n116).

<sup>154</sup>In Rom. 7:2 Paul speaks of a married woman who, when her husband dies, is released from the marriage law that bound her to him. In 7:6 he speaks of Christians who, having died with Christ, have been released from the Mosaic Law. In both cases *ἀπό* ("from") follows a passive form of *καταργέω*, and in both cases someone is released from a binding relationship to a controlling power.

<sup>155</sup>The negative adverb *μηκέτι* is Paul's answer to *ἔτι* in v. 2. The dative *τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ* is a dative direct object following the verb *δουλεύω* identifying the master that one obeys and serves (BAGD, s.v. *δουλεύω*, 2.c; BDF, §187, 2). Grundmann, *TDNT*, 1:309-13, summarizes how Paul sees the reality of sin in Rom. 5-8.

<sup>156</sup>According to Robertson, *Grammar*, 1067, this *τοῦ* infinitive clause could be either purpose or result. BDF, §400, argue that this construction is epexegetical in usage because its

take this infinitive clause as *result* in light of 1) the preceding aorist passive verbs (v. 6ab), 2) the emphatic *μηκέτι* in this clause, 3) the anaphoric article *τῇ* with *ἀμαρτία* in this clause, 4) the treatment of *ἀμαρτία* as a ruling power in this context along with statements that believers have been set free from it (6:18, 20, 22), and 5) the following *γάρ* clause of confirmation in verse 7. Also relevant is the explicit result clause (introduced by *ὥστε*) involving the same verb in 7:6b. The result that comes from what Paul said in the preceding *ὅτι* and *ἵνα* clauses of verse 6 is that Christians are no longer (*μηκέτι*) slaves to sin as a ruling power in the old age / realm.

The verb *δουλεύω* may denote relationship ("be a slave to, be subjected to"), or action / conduct ("serve, obey").<sup>157</sup> The former sense is best in this context. Cranfield, however, adopts the latter sense and believes that this clause refers to the daily moral life of Christians, that is, they should serve sin no longer in their daily living.<sup>158</sup> Paul certainly stresses this elsewhere, but to understand this clause on the moral level here is to undermine the very basis on which he builds his ethical exhortations later in this chapter. Here his concern is relational—being a slave to sin as a power. That binding relationship has been broken. The Christian's enslavement to sin has ended. He or she has been liberated. On the basis of this soteriological reality, Paul exhorts believers later in this passage (vv. 12-13) and elsewhere not to serve sin in their daily living. Paul's language throughout this text (as also in vv. 2,

---

relationship to other elements in the sentence is very loose. MHT, 1:217-18, take it as final (purpose) or explanatory (epexegetical) of the previous *ἵνα* clause as in Phil. 3:10. At MHT, 3:141, however, this infinitive is taken in a weakened consecutive (result) sense. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 436, takes this infinitive clause as result; Moo, *Romans*, 376 n123, prefers purpose, but acknowledges it could be either purpose or result (112 n100).

<sup>157</sup>BAGD, s.v. *δουλεύω*; Rengstorf, *TDNT*, 2:261, 274-76; Tuente, *NIDNTT*, 3:595-98. Some claim that Paul's view of sin as bondage or enslavement is "Hellenistic," not Jewish or apocalyptic. See E. R. Goodenough and A. T. Kraabel, "Paul and the Hellenization of Christianity" in *Religions in Antiquity. Essays in Memory of E. R. Goodenough*, ed. J. Neusner, SHR 14 (Leiden: Brill, 1968) 23-68; and S. Sandmel, *The Genius of Paul: A Study in History* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979) 8-14. However, Paul's view seems to reflect the Jewish apocalyptic notion of two ages (cf. Sanders, *Paul*, 553-54; de Boer, *Defeat of Death*, 235 n33).

<sup>158</sup>Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:310. He appears to miss Paul's intention in Rom. 6:6 when he claims that Paul is dealing mainly on the moral level. Also, Dunn, *Romans*, 1:320.



4a) is objective (positional), not ethical, although it carries ethical consequences. It is about Christian existence, relationship, and status. His point is that the believer's participation in the crucifixion of Christ brought release from the controlling power of sin resulting in his or her no longer being a slave to sin.

**2.4.4.3 Romans 6:7.** To support the theological argument of verse 6, Paul explains: *ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας* (6:7). This underscores and illustrates his claim that Christians are no longer slaves to sin. Precisely what this verse means, however, is debated. Some interpreters understand *ὁ ἀποθανὼν* as "the one who has died [with Christ]," that is, the Christian (cf. v. 8a), and they give *δεδικαίωται* the meaning Paul usually ascribes to *δικαίωω*, namely, "justify, acquit."<sup>159</sup> This person who died with Christ has been justified from sin, that is, acquitted. The "old man" has been put to death so the verdict of "guilty" that he deserves cannot be passed. The person is acquitted and set free from sin's power through God's judicial judgment on it in the death of Christ. Thus, in verses 6 and 7, Paul brings together two elements: 1) the one who died with Christ not only has been forgiven and restored to a right relationship to God (v. 7), but 2) he / she also has died to sin and been freed from its rule (vv. 2, 6). Justification is at the same time liberation from the tyrant of sin (cf. 6:18, 22).

Though this view is attractive, there are several objections: 1) Paul's concern in this passage is with the power, not the guilt, of sin; 2) the combination *δικαίωω* plus *ἀπό* does not occur elsewhere in Paul even though it appears in other New Testament writings with a different meaning (cf. Matt. 11:19; Luke 7:35; Acts 13:38-39); and 3) he does not connect the believer's dying with Christ directly with the

---

<sup>159</sup>Schrenk, *TDNT*, 2:218; Bornkamm, "Baptism," 85 n11; Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:310-11; Best, *One Body*, 44; Murray, *Romans*, 1:222; Dunn, *Romans* 1:320-21; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 437; Ridderbos, *Paul*, 208 n7. K. G. Kuhn, "Romans 6.7," *ZNW* 30 (1931) 305-10, refers to *Sifre Num.* §112 on Num. 15:31, which speaks of physical death as making atonement. Though Kuhn gives the verb a forensic rendering, he treats *ἁμαρτία* as meaning "obligation to the law" which is out of place in this context. Furthermore, it is unlikely that Paul would have regarded the physical death (martyrdom) of a person as making atonement for sin.

believer's justification elsewhere.

As an alternative to the last objection, some interpreters have suggested that *ὁ ἀποθανών* is primarily a reference to Christ who obtained justification through His death and only secondarily a reference to the baptized person.<sup>160</sup> But, in addition to the first two objections mentioned above, this option creates a further problem by introducing an abrupt, unexpected change in subject from verse 6.

It is more likely, then, that *ὁ ἀποθανών* should be taken in a general way like *τις* in Romans 5:7 and *τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* in 7:1, and that *δικαίω* should be translated with the less common meaning of "to be free, to be set free."<sup>161</sup> The whole statement is probably a general, proverb-like maxim from a larger stock of community wisdom. Nevertheless, Paul applies it to the believer who has died with Christ; thus: "the one who died [with Christ] has been set free from sin." This translation is appropriate in this passage where Paul views sin as a power from which the believer has been set free (cf. 6:18, 22; similarly *ἀπό* in 7:2, 3, 6). Furthermore, the perfect passive verb *δεδικαίωται* indicates that the liberation effected, namely, a change in status and relationship to sin, has enduring results in the believer's present state of existence. Paul's point is that "death with Christ" severs sin's claims on a person and frees him / her from its bondage.

The remaining verses of this passage, 6:8-14, will require less detailed treatment. Nevertheless, they provide the necessary christological basis and ethical consequence of Paul's affirmations in verses 1-7 and thus are worthy of careful consideration.

---

<sup>160</sup>C. Kearns, "The Interpretation of Romans 6, 7," in *SPCIC*, 1:301-07; R. Scroggs, "Romans VI.7," *NTS* 10 (1963-1964) 104-08; and Frankemölle, *Taufverstandnis*, 78-80. For further evaluation of various views, see Scroggs' article.

<sup>161</sup>BAGD, s.v. *δικαίω*, 3.c; Schnackenburg, *Baptism*, 41; Käsemann, *Romans*, 170; Leenhardt, *Romans*, 162-63; Michel, *Römer*, 155; Kuss, *Römerbrief*, 1:304; and Moo, *Romans*, 376-77. The combination *δικαίω ἀπό* has the meaning "set free from" in Sir. 26:29; *T. Sim* 6.1; and *CH* 13.9. The use of this verb here with reference to the power of sin suggests that, for Paul, righteousness is not only forensic but also transformative (cf. 6:18, 22; 2 Cor. 3:8-9, 18).

### 2.4.5 Romans 6:8-10: Union with Christ in His Life

We have already noted that verses 8-10 are structurally parallel to verses 5-7. There is, however, an important shift in Paul's focus. In verse 8 he reiterates the link between death with Christ and life with Him, which he established in verses 4b and 5b. The significance of this connection is made clear in light of the nature of Christ's own death and resurrection, which is the unique focus of verses 9 and 10. In these verses, then, Paul sets forth the christological basis of the indicative affirmations he made in verses 2-7 and, at the same time, lays the foundation for his imperatival appeal in verses 11-13.

**2.4.5.1 Romans 6:8.** In verse 8 Paul says specifically that believers died "with Christ," but he shifts the emphasis from the believer's participation in Christ's death to participation in His resurrection with the words: *εἰ δέ<sup>162</sup> ἀπεθάνομεν σὺν Χριστῷ, πιστεύομεν ὅτι καὶ συζήσομεν αὐτῷ*. The aorist verb *ἀπεθάνομεν* in the protasis clause repeats the same verb found in verse 2 and underscores the fact that "we died to sin" by virtue of the fact that "we died with Christ." The former is bound up with the latter. In fact, a sequence of aorist verbs in verses 3-6 emphasizes the same thing using various images: "baptized into His death" (v. 3), "buried with Him" (v. 4), and "crucified [with Him]" (v. 6). The *σὺν Χριστῷ* phrase itself occurs only here in Romans, but its meaning of "participation" agrees with the *σὺν* language already discussed in verses 4-6 (cf. pp. 90-93 above).

The future tense of *συζήσομεν* in the apodosis clause gives rise to the same discussion as the future tense of *ἐσόμεθα* in verse 5b and should also be interpreted as

---

<sup>162</sup>The mildly adversative conjunction *δέ* signals the shift in emphasis from participation in "death" to participation in "life." A variant reading has *γάρ* instead of *δέ* in P<sup>46</sup> and G. The *γάρ* reading seems unsuitable in this context and can be explained as parablepsis on account of the *γάρ* that begins v. 7 and the *εἰ γάρ* construction in v. 5 (Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:311 n3). As in v. 5, the protasis (*εἰ* and the indicative) asserts a condition that Paul considers to be fulfilled in this context, thus: "But if (since) we died with Christ . . .," BDF, §372, *ἀποθνήσκω*, 2.b; Wallace, *Grammar*, 690-94; BAGD, s.v. *εἰ*, III.

a genuine future.<sup>163</sup> Once again Paul points to the eschatological fulfillment of the new life already begun. In light of this, the full revelation of "life with Christ" remains for the present an object of faith rather than sight. The striking addition of *πιστεύομεν* in verse 8 (the only occurrence of this verb in Rom. 5–8) makes this clear. Furthermore, Paul goes on in verse 9 to mention Christ's release from physical death through His resurrection, but this is something believers have not, nor are not yet experiencing (cf. Rom. 8:10-11, 18-25). At the same time, to regard "life with Christ" as an eschatological blessing is not to negate or minimize the new kind of life believers receive and participate in even now. This new life is spoken of in *both* a genuine present *and* genuine future sense. For Paul, ethical life with Christ now and eschatological life hereafter with Him are inseparable. His reference to the future, however, resolves the problem of the believer's continued subjugation to physical death, which was linked with his / her subjugation to sin in 5:21. Release from the power of sin is accomplished by the believer's participation in Christ's death, a past event with present implications for living. Release from the power of death is based on participation in the resurrection of Christ, but this is not fully accomplished until His parousia. Yet, this expectation also has present implications for living because Paul is setting the stage for the imperatives of 6:12, where he urges believers: "Do not let sin reign (you died to it) in your mortal (still subject to death) bodies . . ." (v. 12).

**2.4.5.2 Romans 6:9.** The confidence Christians have that they will share fully in Christ's resurrection is based on what they know about Him. The initial participle *εἰδότες*<sup>164</sup> indicates that something about the nature of Christ's

---

<sup>163</sup>See discussion on pp. 102-04 above. Some, among others, who hold this view are: Bornkamm, "Baptism," 78; Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 10-12; Barrett, *Romans*, 126; Käsemann, *Romans*, 170; Kuss, *Römerbrief*, 1:305; Dunn, *Romans*, 1:322; Moo, *Romans*, 377; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 437; and Schnackenburg, *Baptism*, 41. Both Fitzmyer and Schnackenburg agree that the future is temporal in 6:8b, though they claim it has logical function in 6:5b. Pace Cranfield, *Romans* 1:312-13; and Murray, *Romans*, 1:223. A few manuscripts (D\* F G) replace *αὐτῷ* with *τῷ Χριστῷ* but the pronoun has much stronger external support.

<sup>164</sup> The use of the participle *εἰδότες* is parallel to *γινώσκοντες* in v. 6 and is equally

resurrection in relation to sin and death was included in early Christian preaching. Paul and his readers know that it was an irreversible past event that meant a decisive conquest of death. The life Christ now lives, one inaccessible to death, will be the same kind of life they will share with Him. This knowledge is the ground and motivation for their faith mentioned in verse 8.

Since God raised Him from the dead,<sup>165</sup> Christ is never going to die again.<sup>166</sup> This, Paul explains, means that "death no longer rules over Him."<sup>167</sup> The figurative use of the verb *κυριεύω* indicates that Paul thinks of death, as well as sin (vv. 2, 10, 11), as a ruling power in this context.<sup>168</sup> Because He is alive from the dead, Christ has ended the power of death over Himself and has anticipated its defeat for all those who belong to Him. The negative adverb *οὐκέτι*, which occurs twice in verse 9, implies that death did at one time rule over Christ. For a time, the period of His pre-resurrection life on earth during which He identified Himself with the human race, Christ placed Himself under the power of death. But His resurrection from the dead is the proof that He broke death's power with irrevocable finality, and Paul can say

---

difficult to classify. It could be understood as a participle of attendant circumstance (introducing a thought logically paratactic to a preceding one) and thus simply Paul's way of introducing another fact relevant to his argument. This usage would be translated: "And we know that . . ." (Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:313; Michel, *Römer*, 148). Other interpreters take *εἰδότες* as an adverbial participle of cause modifying *πιστεύομεν* (v. 8) and thus introducing the basis for the belief that we shall live with Christ. It would be translated: "Since we know that . . ." (Wallace, *Grammar*, 631). In view of the fact that Paul sheds light on the meaning of *συζήσομεν αὐτῷ* (v. 8b) in vv. 9 and 10, the causal usage is preferred (cf. NIV).

<sup>165</sup>The aorist passive participle *ἐγερθείς* is understood as an adverbial participle of cause modifying *ἀποθνήσκει* giving the reason why Christ will die no more. The aorist tense points to the historical event of the resurrection, and the passive voice suggests that His resurrection was effected by another, namely, the Father (cf. Rom. 4:24-25; Eph. 1:20).

<sup>166</sup>The verb *ἀποθνήσκει* is a futuristic present depicting an emphatic force; thus: "Christ . . . is not going to die again . . ." (Wallace, *Grammar*, 536).

<sup>167</sup>The genitive pronoun *αὐτοῦ* functions as the direct object of *κυριεύει*, a verb of ruling (Robertson, *Grammar*, 510; BDF, §177). The independent statement as a whole can be understood as causal (introduced by an implied *γάρ*) or as appositional to the whole preceding *ὅτι* clause.

<sup>168</sup>This verb is also used in a figurative sense with the term *ἀμαρτία* in 6:14 and the term *νόμος* in 7:1. It should be linked with the figurative sense of *βασιλεύω* in ch. 5 where it is used with death (5:14, 17a), sin (5:21a, 6:12), and grace (5:21b). Paul views all of these as ruling powers in their respective realms of authority.

that death no longer (*οὐκέτι*) rules over Him. He has moved from a condition of mortality to one of immortality. The implication is that Christ's destiny is also the believer's destiny. This confirms the view that Paul's primary thought in the words *συζήσομεν αὐτῷ* in verse 8b is eschatological. The believer's resurrection to life that is beyond death's power is yet future. Thus, by linking the thought of verse 9 closely with the apodosis of verse 8, Paul supports his claim that Christians will live with Christ.

**2.4.5.3 Romans 6:10.** This verse furnishes further proof (*γάρ*) that "death rules over Him no longer" (v. 9b).<sup>169</sup> It has to do with the death Christ died and its connection with sin, namely, *τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ*. To this point Paul has argued that the Christian's death "with Christ" is a death "to sin" (vv. 2-8a). Now he makes clear that Christ's death itself was a death "to sin." The adverb *ἐφάπαξ* emphasizes the uniqueness and decisive finality of His death.<sup>170</sup> This once-for-all character of Christ's death in regard to sin highlights again the definitive dealing with sin as a power that marks Paul's discussion in this passage. What is true of Christ must also be true of those who died with Him. And, this, in turn, provides the answer to the questions raised in verses 1-2.

The meaning of the expression, *τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν*, is debated. The grammatical construction is the same as that used in verse 2, where it was applied to believers. Previously it was noted (under v. 2) that this dative depicts advantage in

---

<sup>169</sup>The *γάρ* links v. 10 with v. 9, explaining why death's dominion has ended and giving further confirmation that death has no power over Christ. The constructions *ὁ γάρ* and *ὁ δέ*, beginning each clause of v. 10, are abbreviated forms of *τὸν γὰρ θάνατον ὃν . . .* and *τὴν δὲ ζῶην ἣν . . .* respectively, where the relative pronoun substantizes the verbal idea in *ἀπέθανεν* and *ζῆ* (BDF, §153-54; Robertson, *Grammar*, 178-79, 471; BAGD, s.v. *ὅς*, 7.c; pace Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 131, who takes it as an adverbial relative). For a similar construction, see Gal. 2:20 and 2 Cor. 12:13.

<sup>170</sup>This adverb may mean "once in time" (1 Cor. 15:6) or "once for all time, decisively unique" (Rom. 6:10); cf. BAGD, s.v. *ἐφάπαξ*. Stählin, *TDNT*, 1:383, states: "In the New Testament this is a technical term for the definitiveness and therefore the uniqueness or singularity of the death of Christ and the redemption thereby accomplished. . . ." This same emphasis with *ἄπαξ* is also found in Heb. 7:27; 9:12, 26, 28; 10:10; 1 Pet. 3:18, and with *εἰς* in Heb. 10:12, 14. The "once" of Christ's death distinguishes it from all preceding and subsequent sacrifices offered.

the sense of that which has claim on something as a possessor to use for its own advantage.<sup>171</sup> Throughout this passage sin is viewed as a master that rules over humankind and to whose advantage people live. But in verse 2, Paul declared that believers died to sin, that is, they were released from its lordship. Sin's power over them was broken and they were transferred out of its realm. Is this also the meaning when the same expression is applied to Christ in verse 10?

While acknowledging that the grammatical construction is the same in both verses, some interpreters claim that the expression, when applied to Christ in verse 10, is used in a different sense than in verse 2, where it is applied to believers. Cranfield, for example, takes the phrase "He died to sin" as referring to Jesus' dying *for sin* in that He bore its *penalty* (e.g., Rom. 3:24-26; 5:6-8; 8:3; 2 Cor. 5:21; Gal. 3:13).<sup>172</sup> But such a view seems out of place in a context where the leading thought concerns release from the *power of sin* (6:2-11). It misses a crucial aspect of Jesus' identification with sinners and the benefit that His victory over sin as a power has for them. If, for a brief time, death exercised its power over Christ (v. 9), could not Christ also in some sense have lived for a time under sin as a power (v. 10) since both are closely connected in this context?

In light of this observation, other interpreters have aptly explained the meaning of "He died to sin" along the same lines as that applied to believers in verse 2. For example, Murray says: "Christ was identified in such a way with the sin which he vicariously bore that he dealt not only with its guilt but also with its power. So sin may be said to have ruled over him in that his humiliation state was conditioned by the sin with which he was vicariously identified, . . . ."<sup>173</sup> To be sure, sin did not rule

---

<sup>171</sup>BDF, §188, 2; pace MHT, 3:238, and Wallace, *Grammar*, 144-46, who take it as simply a dative of reference; see the discussion above, p. 80.

<sup>172</sup>Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:314; also Kaye, *Thought Structure of Romans*, 49-52.

<sup>173</sup>Murray, *Romans*, 1:225; also Michel, *Römer*, 132; Kuss, *Römerbrief*, 1:306; Frankemölle, *Taufverständnis*, 78-79; Dunn, *Romans*, 1:323; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 438; and Moo,

over Christ in the same sense in which it rules over people. Though fully human, He was innocent of sin (2 Cor. 5:21) and was not a slave to it, yet He participated fully in human existence (Phil. 2:6-8) in order to serve God's redemptive purpose through His death (Gal. 4:4-5; 2 Cor. 8:9; Rom. 8:3).<sup>174</sup> He died, however, not because of His own sin, but because of the sin of fallen humanity. Through His death, not only are guilty people justified and their sins forgiven (Rom. 3:25; 5:9), but they are also set free from sin's power over them. It is because Christ broke the power of sin in His death that those united with Him in His death have died to sin's power and thus have become "dead to sin" (6:2, 11).

Though Christ suffered the payment of sin's wages (6:23, i.e., its penalty) in His death on the cross, sin did not destroy Him, for God raised Him from the dead and He entered into life at a level not conditioned by sin or death. For Christ, this transfer to a new realm was a definitive and final separation from sin and shows why death, the product of sin, no longer rules over Him (6:9b). The life that He now lives He lives "to God" (6:10b). The dative construction, which we have already noted in verses 2 and 10a, also occurs in 10b, namely, ζῆν τῷ θεῷ. Again, the dative word denotes the lord or master (power) who conditions the life of his subjects and to whose advantage one lives or dies.<sup>175</sup> Christ died to sin once for all (v. 10a), that is, He effected release from the sphere of life conditioned by the ruling power of sin and subjugation to death. He broke sin's power. But (δέ) in the risen life He lives, he lives to God (v. 10b), that is, He lives in the sphere of resurrected life conditioned by the ruling power of God and

---

*Romans*, 378-79. Pace Wuest, *Victory*, 47, who states: "He [Christ] died with respect to our sinful nature. . . . in that His death effected the separation of the believer from that sinful nature." Since Christ's death to sin did not involve an ontological change in His nature, neither does the believer's death to sin, if it is viewed as a participation in Christ's death.

<sup>174</sup>Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 27-28, 36-37, demonstrates this by highlighting the purpose (telic) constructions in Gal. 4:4-5; 2 Cor. 8:9; and Rom. 8:3.

<sup>175</sup>The same construction using the verb ζάω with the dative occurs also in other passages where Paul refers to living for God: 2 Cor. 5:15; Gal. 2:19; 5:25. A connection with the idea of lordship occurs in Rom. 14:7-9 (cf. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 18).



inaccessible to death. He broke death's power as well. Verse 10b, then, stands as the counterpart of 10a: Christ's death to sin entails life to God. It is this antithesis that Paul applies to the Roman Christians in verse 11.

The finality of Christ's death to sin and His risen life to God is the basis for Paul's argument in response to the false inference of verse 1. Those who belong to Christ have participated in these events by faith, as attested in baptism. For Paul, dying and rising with Christ means release from the old master, sin, and entry into a new existence under a new master, God, in order to live in newness of life now. In this Pauline sense, a believer no longer lives "in sin" (6:2), and for this reason it is totally inconsistent for him to continue committing sins on the presumption that where sin is present in abundance, grace is present in much greater abundance (6:1).

#### 2.4.6 Romans 6:11: Dead To Sin / Alive to God

Verse 11 is a crucial hinge between Paul's argument in the preceding verses and his exhortations in the verses that follow. It links indicative statements about Christ and believers—Jesus died to sin (v. 10), believers died with Him (v. 8), they, too, died to sin (v. 2), and, thus, they are no longer slaves to sin (v. 6)—and imperative appeals addressed to believers—do not let sin reign (v. 12), do not present your members to sin (v. 13a), but present yourselves to God (v. 13b). Such a connection is characteristic of Paul (e.g., Rom. 8:9, 12-13; 1 Cor. 5:7; Gal. 5:25; Phil. 2:12-13; Col. 2:20–3:11) and is necessary to his argument here. The introductory phrase *οὕτως καί* is problematic but is best understood in an inferential sense: "So then, or, therefore. . . ." As such, this verse draws a concluding inference from the teaching of the passage as a whole.<sup>176</sup>

---

<sup>176</sup>BAGD, s.v. *οὕτως*, 1.b; Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:314-15. Dunn, *Romans*, 1:323, and Moo, *Romans*, 380, argue for a comparative sense: "Likewise also, or, so also." As such, *οὕτως καί* sets up a comparison between the significance of Christ's death and life (v. 10) and the believer's understanding of his / her Christian existence (v. 11). Though this comparison is conceptually fundamental to this passage, this view is less likely grammatically since there is no corresponding *ὡς / ὡσπερ* clause (as in 5:15, 18, 19, 21 and 6:4) and Paul moves to the imperative in this verse

With the present imperative verb *λογίζεσθε*,<sup>177</sup> Paul summons believers (emphatic *ὑμεῖς*, "you"), based on the indicative facts just presented, to view themselves as "dead to sin" and "alive to God." The force of the present tense is that this "reckoning" should be the abiding judgment of faith in the Christian's life always influencing his or her attitudes and actions. As a result, the informed reckoning urged in verse 11 counters the false reckoning mentioned in verse 1. It points in two directions: 1) back to what believers are to conclude is true about themselves in light of the preceding indicatives; and 2) forward to the active demonstration of being dead to sin and alive to God as demanded in the following imperatives. As always for Paul, the indicative serves as the basis and motivation for the imperative.<sup>178</sup>

Specifically, believers are to recognize as true and real the fact that they are "dead to sin" on one hand (*μέν*), but, on the other hand (*δέ*), that they are "those who are alive to God." On the negative side of the exhortation, Paul uses the predicate adjective *νεκρούς* in a figurative sense to denote the believer's state of separation from the realm of sin consequent upon his / her death to sin with Christ once for all (vv. 8a, 10).<sup>179</sup> The dative *τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ* once again denotes the slave master involved (as in vv. 2 and 10) whose power and right to rule over the Christian was broken in Christ's death.

---

based on the indicatives of 6:1-10.

<sup>177</sup>This is a strong word meaning "consider as a result of (prior) calculation, reckon, acknowledge the reality of;" BAGD, s.v. *λογίζομαι*, 1b; Heidland, *TDNT*, 4:286-88; see also Rom. 3:28; 4:3-8; 8:18; 14:14; Phil. 3:12. "Reckoning" is not exerting intense moral will to achieve something but recognizing and acting properly on what has already been achieved. The reflexive pronoun *ἑαυτοῖς* serves as the accusative subject of the infinitive *εἶναι*, emphasizing that the governing verb *λογίζεσθε* and the infinitive *εἶναι* have the same subject (MHT, 3:147-48). If the textual reading without the infinitive *εἶναι* is adopted, the construction is a double accusative (MHT, 3:246 and 3:137; see also Wallace, *Grammar*, 182-87, 419). This is the first second person imperative verb in Romans (*γινέσθω* in 3:4 is a third person imperative).

<sup>178</sup>Käsemann, *Romans*, 172-76. See the discussion on the indicative / imperative construct in Paul, ch. 6, 314-22.

<sup>179</sup>BAGD, s.v. *νεκρός*, 1.b. Though the figurative use of *νεκρός* is not common in Paul, it is used in Rom. 7:8 and 8:10 in antithesis to *ζωή*.

On the positive side of the exhortation, Paul uses the participle ζῶντας as a predicate adjective to emphasize that those who "died to sin" are, in fact, those who are "alive to God in Christ Jesus," consequent upon their being raised to walk in newness of life (v. 4b). As noted above, this exhortation assumes the present benefit of new life already as a result of Christ's resurrection, yet it does not cancel the expectation of future resurrection. Again, the dative τῷ θεῷ points to God as the new master under whom the believer now lives. The great difference between the "once" and the "now" in the believer's life lies in the change of masters—from sin to God.

Paul concludes verse 11 with the phrase ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.<sup>180</sup> This is a variation of the important "in Christ" motif that is used extensively by Paul in several ways and has been the subject of much discussion.<sup>181</sup> Three interconnected uses are prominent in Romans: 1) God's redemptive purpose and power accomplished "in / through Christ" (e.g., Rom. 3:24; 6:23; 8:2, 39); 2) believers being "in Christ" (e.g., Rom. 6:11; 8:1; 12:5; 16:3, 7, 9, 10); and 3) believers doing something "in / through Christ" (e.g., Rom. 9:1; 15:17).

In this passage, Paul's reference to "in Christ" must be seen in light of his repeated use of "with Christ" language in verses 4-10 where this motif was useful in describing the believer's exit from the old realm and its powers and entrance into new life. In making the transition from the indicative to the imperative, Paul makes the point that those who died "with Christ" are those who are now dead to sin and alive to God "in Christ." This motif emphasizes the new sphere of existence and relationship

---

<sup>180</sup>This is the second occurrence of this important Pauline phrase in Romans (cf. 3:24). A variant reading adds the words τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν at the end of v. 11, but it is to be rejected on the grounds of assimilation to v. 23 where the longer phrase occurs. Its absence in v. 11, if original, is harder to explain than its presence. See B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (London and New York: United Bible Societies, 1994) 453-54.

<sup>181</sup>Extensive bibliographies are given in Oepke, *TDNT*, 2:534, 541-43; Harris, *NIDNTT*, 3:1190-93; and BAGD, s.v. ἐν, I.5.d; see also F. Neugebauer, *In Christus (EN ΧΡΙΣΤΩ)*. *Eine Untersuchung zum paulinischen Glaubensverständnis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961) 18-33; Ridderbos, *Paul*, 57-62; and A. J. M. Wedderburn, "Some Observations on Paul's Use of the Phrases 'in Christ' and 'with Christ,'" *JSNT* 25 (1985) 83-97.

in which Christians now live as opposed to their previous existence "in sin" (v. 2) or "in Adam." In this realm their life is determined by the risen Christ and the benefits of His saving acts. In this sense they are a "new creation" (2 Cor. 5:17), and even now new life is a reality.

Verse 11 also relates to Paul's question in 6:2. The new existence of the Christian means one is dead to sin so that continuing to live in its realm in order that grace might increase is clearly impossible. Instead, Christians are alive to God in Christ Jesus.<sup>182</sup> For believers to be "in Christ" means to belong to Him as the inclusive, representative head of the new age / realm with the result that the actions and decisions predicated of Him here are applicable to them also. It is to be in a new solidarity of life and righteousness "in Christ" as opposed to the old solidarity of sin and death "in Adam" (Rom. 5:12-21; 1 Cor. 15:22). Thus, it is "in Christ" that believers are dead to sin (the old master) and alive to God (the new master).

#### **2.4.7 Romans 6:12-14: Do Not Let Sin Reign**

Because believers are no longer under sin's lordship according to the indicatives of grace (6:2-10), they are to manifest this freedom in daily experience according to the imperatives of grace (6:11-14; cf. 12:1-2). In verses 12-13, Paul calls on Christians to resist sin, to refuse to obey it, to reject its attempts to reestablish its control over their lives for, in fact, it has no right to rule. His exhortation is supported by the promise in verse 14 that "sin will not be lord over you."

**2.4.7.1 Romans 6:12.** In verse 12, Paul gives a general exhortation regarding sin's rule and the believer's present conduct. The logical inference (*οὖν*) to be drawn from the preceding discussion as summed up in verse 11 is that believers, given what God has made them in Christ, are able to treat sin differently than they

---

<sup>182</sup>If *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* in v. 11 is meant to be the antithetical parallel to *ἐν αὐτῇ* in v. 2, then it designates our new existence in the dominion of Christ. See Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 19-20; Käsemann, *Romans*, 220-23; Kuss, *Römerbrief*, 1:306-307; and Wilckens, *Römer*, 2:19.

did before (cf. 6:1). The present imperative *βασιλεύτω* with the accompanying negative *μὴ* urges believers to make it their practice not to allow sin to reign over them in their life experience.<sup>183</sup>

Four observations are worth noting in understanding the meaning of this exhortation as it relates to those who are "dead to sin and alive to God" (v. 11). First, Paul does not say, "Do not sin." He does not deny the possibility or the reality of sinning in the believer's life, but he does command the believer not to let sin gain control over his / her conduct and lifestyle. Second, the present tense suggests that this command is to be an abiding precept in the Christian's life—it is to characterize his / her new way of life. Third, the present tense does not imply that Paul's Christian readers were allowing sin to reign and, therefore, they needed to "stop letting sin reign." Nor does Paul call on them to terminate the reign of sin. Rather, the point of departure for his exhortation is conversion-initiation, and its premise is that sin does not reign over them (6:2-10). For this reason the present imperative has validity and appeal.<sup>184</sup> Sin must not be allowed to have control in the believer's life now as it once did prior to conversion. Fourth, Paul often bases his imperative (exhortation) on an indicative (affirmation) having the same object (cf. Gal. 3:27 with Rom. 13:14). In

---

<sup>183</sup>For the significance of the present imperative in prohibitions, see BDF, §§336-37, MHT, 3:74-77; Wallace, *Grammar*, 487, 714-17, 724-25; K. L. McKay, "Aspect in Imperative Constructions in New Testament Greek," *NovT* 27 (1985) 201-26; J. Louw, "On Greek Prohibitions," *AC* 2 (1959) 43-57; Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 350-54; and Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 330-37. The difference between the present imperative (vv. 12a, 13a) and the aorist imperative (v. 13b) is one of aspect, not time. The former is durative in force, and the latter is undefined or possibly ingressive relating to action that is to be commenced. The context must determine if the aspect has special significance. The *third person* imperative (v. 12a; cf. Col. 3:15-16) expresses a strong command that something be done (refuse to obey) by someone (the believer) to a third party (sin). The presence of *βασιλεύω* in v. 12a is another indication that Paul personifies sin in Rom. 6.

<sup>184</sup>Murray, *Romans*, 226-27; pace Cranfield, *Romans*, 316-17 n2, and Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 446. Cranfield introduces the word "unopposed," i.e., "do not let sin go on reigning unopposed," because, in his view, sin continues to reign and Paul did not think of the Christian's obedience to this command as actually bringing to an end sin's reign over his "fallen nature." All it brings to an end is sin's "unchallenged, unresisted reign." However, this seems to overlook the eschatological tension in Paul's ethics, to undermine the force of his argument in 6:2-11, 14 (the indicative), and to invalidate the imperative by urging believers to stop allowing sin to reign over them if in reality they remain under its mastery.

verse 6 he declares that believers have been released from slavery to sin, that is, sin no longer has dominion over them (cf. v. 14). Consequently, the believer is not to obey it and allow it to reign in his life experience (vv. 12-13). In this way Paul makes clear that the ongoing life of the Christian is directly and inseparably related to what took place in the saving events of Christ's cross. The indicative and imperative must be held together in this sequence without separation or conflation. The former is the basis and motivation for the latter.

Paul described the location of the battle against sin as ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι.<sup>185</sup> Σῶμα here has been understood in one of two ways: 1) a narrow sense in which it refers only to one's physical body;<sup>186</sup> and 2) a broader sense in which it refers to the human person as a whole, including his physical body.<sup>187</sup> The preposition ἐν, the adjective θνητός and the reference to "its passions" in verse 12, as well as the parallel terms μέλη and ὄπλα in verse 13 appear to support the narrow sense of "physical body." However, in verse 13 the term μέλη, as a synonym for σῶμα, alternates with the personal reflexive pronoun ἐαυτοίς (cf. v. 16a) and, for Paul, sin certainly affects more than just the physical side of a person (cf. 2 Cor. 7:1; Gal. 5:19-21). It is preferable, then, to take σῶμα here, as in 6:6, as a reference to the whole person, including the physical body.

---

<sup>185</sup>The plural possessive pronoun ὑμῶν has distributive force with the singular dative noun σώματι, "the mortal body of each one of you" (MHT, 3:23-24; cf. footnotes 126, 134, and 150 above).

<sup>186</sup>E.g., Murray, *Romans*, 1:227, "The mortal body is without question the physical organism as subject to dissolution." Gundry, *Sōma*, 29-31, argues against the holistic anthropology (monistic unity) of Bultmann and presents a case for anthropological duality, a unity of parts (body and soul / spirit), see also *Sōma*, 79-84; 201-203, 222; and ch. 1, 25; and pp. 111-16 above.

<sup>187</sup>E.g., Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:317; cf. Bultmann, *Theology*, 1:192-203. Sometimes this definition is qualified by treating σῶμα as referring to the whole person by metonymy or synecdoche from the perspective of one's physical body. Käsemann, *Romans*, 176-77, is right in noting that the θνητὸν σῶμα is not simply the σῶμα τῆς ἀμαρτίας (v. 6, pace Bultmann, *Theology*, 1:197-200) since believers are no longer "in sin" but still remain in mortal bodies.

Significantly, in 6:12 Paul does not say your "body of sin" (6:6), or, your "body of this death" (7:24). Rather, he describes the Christian's *σῶμα* at present as *θνητόν* ("mortal"). The same *σῶμα* that has been released from bondage to sin (6:6) is still, nevertheless, a *σῶμα* that participates in the mortality of this age and is confronted by its influences and powers (cf. Rom. 8:10-11; 1 Cor. 15:53-54; 2 Cor. 4:11; 5:4).<sup>188</sup> This will continue until the future redemption of the body (Rom. 8:23) when it puts on immortality (1 Cor. 15:53-54). Even though the believer's new life existence is one in which he or she is "dead to sin" and "alive to God" in Christ, his or her present corporeal existence is still a mortal one in a fallen world, and this is the very arena in which sin seeks to gain control. Nevertheless, this does not mean a believer must submit to sin because sin is not inherent in the *σῶμα* but operates through control of it from without (influences of the present evil world) and from within (one's own thoughts and desires). Thus, Paul exhorts believers not to let sin reign over them.

Verse 12 concludes with an infinitive clause that states the consequence of allowing sin to reign in one's mortal body: *εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν*<sup>189</sup> *ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ*. The result is that believers yield to and carry out the passions that belong to the mortal body. Although *ἐπιθυμῖαι* (plural) may have a neutral meaning in Paul (Phil. 1:23; 1 Thess. 2:17), they often are aligned with sin or "the flesh" and have a sharp negative sense of evil desires (cravings) or lusts, desires that have been lured away

---

<sup>188</sup>On this distinction, see Beker, *Paul*, 288, and Moo, *Romans*, 491-92 n104. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 446, who does not make this distinction, states: "Christians may still be in the 'sinful body' (6:6) and may be seduced or swayed by 'its cravings.' The 'body of sin' denotes the state in which even baptized Christians may find themselves; with such a body they too can still be subject to the dominion of sin. . . ." This view seems to confuse the objective accomplishment of freedom from sin (the indicative) with the subjective experience of it (the imperative).

<sup>189</sup>The *εἰς τὸ* plus the infinitive could express purpose but is probably result here. See BAGD, s.v. *εἰς*, 4.e; Wallace, *Grammar*, 592-94; pace MHT, 3:143, who claim that this construction is almost always purpose in Pauline usage. The words *ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις* serve as the dative direct object of *τὸ ὑπακούειν*, a verb that often takes a dative object (BAGD, s.v. *ὑπακούω*, 1).

from obedience to God (e.g., Rom. 1:24; 7:7-8; 13:14; Gal. 5:16-24).<sup>190</sup>

The presence of the possessive pronoun *αὐτοῦ* is disputed textually. However, it is the preferred reading.<sup>191</sup> If accepted, it qualifies *σώματι* and indicates that sin channels its attack through the desires of the *σῶμα*. Sin-dominated desires become a driving force in one's *σῶμα*, seeking their own gratification (Gal. 5:16). If these sinful desires capture a believer's attention and he / she yields to them (i.e., obeys them), they may soon enslave him / her so that even his / her best intentions and actions are controlled by them. The result is that sin reasserts its rule in the believer's present life experience, something Paul urges his Christian readers not to allow to take place.

**2.4.7.2 Romans 6:13.** Following a general exhortation in verse 12, Paul gives two specific commands in verse 13 that are antithetically parallel to one another in structure and content. The first one introduced by the present imperative prohibition *μηδὲ παριστάνετε* continues the negative side of Paul's exhortation begun with *μὴ βασιλεύτω* in verse 12, while the second command introduced by the adversative *ἀλλά* and the aorist imperative *παραστήσατε* sets forth the positive side. The interpretation of verse 13 is governed partly by the interpretation adopted for verse 12. If *σῶμα* refers to the whole person in relation to the world, including but not limited to the physical body, then *μέλη* ("members") in this verse must refer to one's human faculties and natural capacities (cf. 7:5, 23) rather than simply the physical

---

<sup>190</sup>BAGD, s.v. *ἐπιθυμία*, 3; Büchsel, *TDNT*, 3:171, "The essential point in *ἐπιθυμία* is that it is desire as impulse, as a motion of the will (cf. Eph. 2:3)."

<sup>191</sup>The external evidence is split along textual family lines geographically between 1) *αὐτοῦ*, referring to *σώματι* (mostly Alexandrian support, ⱼ B A C L vg); 2) *αὐτῆ*, referring to *ἀμαρτία* (mostly Western support, D G it, plus P<sup>46</sup>); and 3) *αὐτῆ . . . αὐτοῦ*, referring to both (mostly Byzantine support). The third reading appears to be an attempt to conflate the other two readings. We might consider *αὐτῆ* alone as original since *αὐτοῦ* might arise because *σώματι* is nearer than *ἀμαρτία* or because some copyists with ascetic notions felt that lusts belong to the body. However, this latter observation may account for the absence of *αὐτῆ* in an attempt to clarify the sense. Thus, *αὐτοῦ* is preferred because it has early and weighty external evidence, and internally it makes good sense in that the result (infinitive clause) of sin reigning in (*ἐν*) one's mortal body is that the person obeys its (the body's) sinful desires. See Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 453-54.



parts of the body.<sup>192</sup>

The transitive verb *παριστάνω* (a later form of *παρίσθημι*) has a broad spectrum of usage, but in this context, where it occurs in verse 13 (twice), 16, 19 (twice), it has the general active meaning: "put at the disposal of," or, "give in service to."<sup>193</sup> Regardless of whether the imagery is that of a military commander (*ὄπλα* as "weapons" in v. 13),<sup>194</sup> a slave-owner (*δοῦλος* and *ὑπακούω* in vv. 16, 19),<sup>195</sup> or a king (*βασιλεύετω* in v. 12 and *κυριεύσει* in v. 14),<sup>196</sup> the basic sense of the verb here is the same, namely, the "acknowledgment of a superior power and authority to whom the only proper response is submission and obedience."<sup>197</sup> In this case, sin (dative, *τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ*) is the power to which believers are not to submit.<sup>198</sup>

The word *ὄπλα* (plural) has both a general meaning of "instruments or tools" and a more specific military meaning of "weapons." The former meaning gains some support from the references to the service of slaves to a master in this chapter (6:6, 16-20, 22).<sup>199</sup> However, the latter meaning is common in early Greek literature,

<sup>192</sup>The basic meaning of *μέλη* (plural) is "parts of the body," i.e., "limbs" or "organs," but the word is also used by Paul in a wider sense of all human faculties and in the metaphorical sense of individuals as members of a community (cf. 1 Cor. 12:12-27), so it is best translated "members" (BAGD, s.v. *μέλος*, 1; Horst, *TDNT*, 4:555-62, esp. 561). For more on *τὰ μέλη*, see ch. 4, 202-05.

<sup>193</sup>BAGD, s.v. *παρίσθημι*; Bertram and Reicke, *TDNT*, 5:838-39. This verb governs an object (*τὰ μέλη*)-complement (*ὄπλα*) construction here (Wallace, *Grammar*, 182-87).

<sup>194</sup>E.g., Käsemann, *Romans*, 177, who cites Polybius, *Historia* 3.109.9 in support; see also LSJ, s.v. *παρίσθημι*, C.II.

<sup>195</sup>E.g., Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:318, who appeals to the service of slaves in this chapter (vv. 6, 16-20, 22) and to *ὄπλα* as "instruments" or "tools" in v. 13.

<sup>196</sup>E.g., Moo, *Romans*, 384 n168, who appeals to the idea of "reigning" or "ruling" in the LXX use of this verb (e.g., 1 Kgs. 10:8) and in this context (vv. 12, 14); thus: "Our natural capacities are 'weapons' that we are not to 'offer in service' to the tyrant sin" (384).

<sup>197</sup>Dunn, *Romans*, 1:337.

<sup>198</sup>The dative of advantage in the sense of a possessor has occurred several times in this passage (see 6:2, 10a, 11). Again, *ἀμαρτία* is not merely a series of separate acts of transgression, nor an abstract principle, but a diabolical power that claims obedience from people.

<sup>199</sup>BAGD, s.v. *ὄπλον*, 1; Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:318; also Murray, *Romans*, 1:228; and

appears elsewhere in Paul where it occurs only in the plural (Rom. 13:12; 2 Cor. 6:7; 10:4; cf. Eph. 6:11), and is appropriate in verse 13.<sup>200</sup> Thus, the meaning "weapons" is preferred. Sin is regarded as a ruthless commanding officer who uses a person's "members" as weapons for the purpose of doing unrighteousness (*ἀδικίας*).<sup>201</sup> The word *ἀδικία* represents all that stands in opposition to God's righteousness (cf. Rom. 1:29). By comparison with *ἀμαρτία*, it describes more forcefully the outward, visible characteristics of one who stands under the power of sin. In verse 13a, then, Paul commands believers to make it their practice not to submit their human capacities ("members") to sin as weapons for doing unrighteousness as they once did.

In verse 13b by contrast (*ἀλλά*), Paul sets forth the positive counterpart by exhorting believers to give themselves in service to their new master, God. As in the prohibition given in verses 12 and 13a, there is movement from the general to the specific in verse 13b also. In the general positive command, Paul uses the aorist imperative *παραστήσατε* followed by the reflexive pronoun *ἐαυτούς* as the object and *τῷ θεῷ* as another dative of advantage (cf. vv. 2, 10a, 11, 13a). Given the fact that the aorist imperative is used here in contrast to the present imperatives in the negative commands of verses 12 and 13a, and that the point of departure is conversion-initiation in this context, it is best viewed in an ingressive and yet urgent sense.<sup>202</sup>

---

modern translations: NRSV, NEB, NAS, NIV.

<sup>200</sup>Oepke, *TDNT*, 5:294; Käsemann, *Romans*, 177; Dunn, *Romans*, 1:337; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 446-47; and Moo, *Romans*, 384. The word *ὀψώνια* in v. 23 refers primarily to the wages of a soldier.

<sup>201</sup>This genitive could be taken in several ways: 1) an objective genitive expressing purpose, "tools or weapons for [doing] unrighteousness," BDF, §166; Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:318; 2) a genitive of quality, "unrighteous weapons", Oepke, *TDNT*, 5:294; Michel, *Römer*, 157 n2; or 3) a subjective genitive, "weapons employed by unrighteousness," Horst, *TDNT*, 4:561; Schrenk, *TDNT*, 1:155-56. The first option is preferred.

<sup>202</sup>BDF, §337; MHT, 3:76, "start yielding yourselves to God;" Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 358-61; Wallace, *Grammar*, 485-86, 719-20; Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:318; cf. the use of the aorist subjunctive in 6:4. Pace Murray, *Romans*, 1:228, and Morris, *Romans*, 258, who suggest a "once-for-all" connotation here; and Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 357, who sees the aorist as less important than the present. See F. Stagg, "The Abused Aorist," *JBL* 91 (1972) 222-31, who effectively argues against the "once-for-all" idea but who occasionally overstates his case in arguing only for the "unaffected" use of the aorist tense, i.e., its use apart from relevant factors in a contextual environment.

The pronoun *ἐαυτοῦς* ("yourselves")<sup>203</sup> encompasses the whole person and indicates that *σῶμα* and *μέλη* (vv. 12-13a) should not be limited to the physical body as shown above. The words *τῷ θεῷ* are in direct contrast to *τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ* in verse 13a identifying God as the ruling Lord in opposition to sin. It is God to whom believers are "enslaved" when living "under grace" (vv. 14-15) as "slaves of obedience" (v. 16) and "slaves of righteousness" (vv. 18-20).

Connected with this general positive exhortation is a key clause depicting the believer's new status as a result of union with Christ in His death and resurrection: *ὥσει ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας*. This clause recalls the thought of 6:11 where the believer's new position is described as being "dead to sin" and "alive to God" and may account for the use of *ἐαυτοῦς* here instead of *σῶμα* as in verse 12. In light of verse 11, the connective *ὥσει*, though formally a comparative, has a causal ("since you really are") rather than a comparative ("as if you were") force.<sup>204</sup> It gives the basis and motivation for Paul's exhortation. As in verse 11, this clause points to the judgment of faith (cf. *λογίζεσθε*, v. 11), which understands that in Christ believers have been rescued from moral / spiritual death under the ruling power of sin (deadness) and have been made alive to God who now has claim on their life. In this sense they can be described as "those who are alive from the dead" in this life (cf. Eph. 2:1).<sup>205</sup> It is not a reference to bodily resurrection that is still future.

---

<sup>203</sup>In the plural, the 3rd person reflexive pronoun is used for the 2nd person in Koiné Greek (MHT, 3:42).

<sup>204</sup>The particle *ὥσει* is often interchanged with *ὥς* (BAGD, s.v. *ὥσει*). When *ὥς* is used with a participle, as *ὥσει* is in 6:13b, it gives the reason for an action (BAGD, s.v. *ὥς*, III. 1.b). However, BDF, §425, 3; BAGD, s.v. *ὥσει*, and Robertson, *Grammar*, 1140, list *ὥσει* in this verse as a comparative: "as if." Robertson, in fact, claims that "the use of *ὥσει* . . . is limited to condition or comparison" (1140). Nevertheless, in this context the causal use of *ὥσει* is preferred, "submit yourselves to God, since you are alive from the dead;" so Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:318; Käsemann, *Romans*, 177; Moo, *Romans*, 385; pace Wilckens, *Römer*, 2:21-22.

<sup>205</sup>In light of this *ὥσει* clause and vv. 4b and 11, one could argue that a "moral / spiritual" resurrection that rescues the believer from "moral / spiritual" death under sin's power and puts him / her in a new life of service to God has already taken place (cf. Col. 2:12; Eph. 2:6); see Beker, *Paul*, 224; footnotes 85 and 119 above; and ch. 4, 197 n6.

The last part of verse 13 contains a more specific positive command. Following *καί*, the verb *παραστήσατε* is to be understood from the previous clause and is followed by a carefully formulated antithetical parallel to the negative command in verse 13a. The "members" that are not to be put at sin's disposal as "weapons" for the purpose of doing unrighteousness (v. 13a) are, instead, to be submitted to God (*τῷ θεῷ* vs. *τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ*) as "weapons" for the purpose of doing righteousness (*δικαιοσύνης* vs. *ἀδικίας*). This is the first occurrence of *δικαιοσύνη* since 5:21, but it appears four more times in the rest of chapter 6 (vv. 16, 18, 19, 20). In these verses it is associated with *ὑπακούω* and *ὑπακοῆς* (v. 16) and is contrasted with *ἀδικίας* (v. 13), *ἀμαρτία* (vv. 18, 20), *ἀκαθαρσία* and *ἀνομία* (v. 19). This indicates that here *δικαιοσύνη* has an ethical meaning denoting conduct that is well-pleasing to God.<sup>206</sup> Even though the meaning shifts here from its usage in chapters 1–5, particularly with reference to the forensic act of justifying sinners, "these two 'righteousnesses,'" as Moo points out, "are inextricably bound, for it is only the righteousness attained 'before God' that introduces the sinner into a new state from which he is able to be obedient to the righteousness of life that God demands."<sup>207</sup>

By accepting an ethical use, one does not overlook the fact that, like *ἀμαρτία*, Paul also personifies *δικαιοσύνη*. He views it as a power from which a person can be free or to which one can be enslaved (vv. 18-20) and places it parallel with *θεός* (v. 18 with v. 22). However, also like *ἀμαρτία*, it retains its ability to refer to specific acts of conduct (cf. v. 19, put in contrast to "uncleanness" and "lawlessness"). Thus, without denying that *δικαιοσύνη* is God's power to save and keep the believer in His service, in this context it is the outward manifestation of one's obedience to God (v. 16).<sup>208</sup>

---

<sup>206</sup>BAGD, s.v. *δικαιοσύνη*, 3; Seebass, *NIDNTT* 3:362-65; and Ridderbos, *Paul*, 260-61. This ethical meaning is attested elsewhere in the Pauline corpus (cf. 2 Cor. 6:7, 14; 9:10; Phil. 1:11; Eph. 4:24; 5:9; 1 Tim. 6:11; 2 Tim. 2:22; 3:16; 4:8). See ch. 5, 282-83.

<sup>207</sup>Moo, *Romans*, 386-87.

<sup>208</sup>*Ibid.*, 386 n182. For righteousness as a power, see Käsemann, *Romans*, 177; and

**2.4.7.3 Romans 6:14.** Following the imperatives of verses 11-13, Paul returns to the indicative in verse 14 to conclude this paragraph. He summarizes the indicatives of 6:2-10 and at the same time supports the imperatives of 6:11-13 in the initial explanatory *γάρ* clause: *ἁμαρτία γὰρ ὑμῶν*<sup>209</sup> *οὐ κυριεύσει*. The negative *οὐ* with the future indicative *κυριεύσει* serves as a categorical prohibition regarding the Christian's relationship to sin as a ruling power.<sup>210</sup> The introductory *γάρ* and the emphasis of the chapter on the believer's status of freedom from the power of sin in this life indicate that the future tense should be understood as a logical future expressing assurance: "sin shall certainly not rule over you."<sup>211</sup> This applies to the future course of the believer's present life because a change of lordship has already taken place at conversion-initiation (6:2-3). With the assurance that this change remains in effect, the believer can confidently wage war against sin.

Paul expressed this assurance in the negative to emphasize that, for believers, the ruling power of sin has been broken and it will not be lord over them. This does not mean that Christians will never again yield to sin and fall under its

---

Dunn, *Romans*, 338-39, who argues that *δικαιοσύνη* does not so much denote concrete acts as a personified superhuman agency, namely, "the power of God to retain the individual (believer) under his sway" (339).

<sup>209</sup>The pronoun *ὑμῶν* serves as a genitive direct object following *κυριεύσει*, a verb of ruling (BDF, §177; Robertson, *Grammar*, 510).

<sup>210</sup>BDF, §362; Foerster, *TDNT*, 3:1097. The verb *κυριεύω* is also used with *θάνατος* (6:9) and *νόμος* (7:1). The verb *βασιλεύω* is used with *θάνατος* (5:14, 17a), *ἁμαρτία* (5:21a; 6:12), and *χάρις* (5:21b). There seems to be no significant distinction in meaning between these two verbs—merely a lexical variation. Paul viewed all of these as ruling powers that determine the existence and destiny of all those under their control.

<sup>211</sup>Murray, *Romans*, 1:228; Moo, *Romans*, 387. Here, as in 6:2, the future tense builds on an event that occurred so definitively in the past (death to sin) that its consequences can be viewed as always holding true from that point onward into the future. The future tense here has been taken in three other ways: 1) an imperatival sense, "sin is not to have sway over you" (e.g., Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 447), but this is unlikely since it would destroy the force of the first *γάρ* and be a weak repetition of v. 12; 2) a conditional sense, ". . . granted that you dedicate yourselves to God; then sin will have no hold over you" (e.g., Dodd, *Romans*, 114), but there is no conditional particle here; and 3) an eschatological future sense, "sin will one day have no control over you" (e.g., Dunn, *Romans*, 1:339, "a promise of what will certainly be for believers when they fully and finally share in Christ's resurrection"), but this is unlikely since it would destroy the force of the second *γάρ* clause (v. 14b) and weaken the emphasis of 6:2-10.

control periodically in their daily experience, otherwise Paul's exhortations are meaningless.<sup>212</sup> Through acts of sinning it is possible for believers to serve sin again in their conduct (6:16). They may submit themselves to the dethroned master, but if they do, it is by choice and not by necessity (compulsion) as was once the case when they were under the lordship of sin. Now, however, believers, as subjects of God, stand free from sin's ruling power and are thus free to resist its attacks with the assurance that sin has no right to be lord over them (v. 14a).

The second and concluding *γάρ* clause gives the reason for the promise made in the initial *γάρ* clause. Sin will not be lord over believers ever again because (causal *γάρ*) they are now *οὐ . . . ὑπὸ νόμον ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ χάριν*.<sup>213</sup> The latter concept (*ὑπὸ χάριν*) is expanded and explained in 6:15-23 while the former (*οὐ ὑπὸ νόμον*) is expanded and explained in 7:1-6. The reference to *νόμος* in verse 14b is unexpected, but its inclusion here confirms that Paul is discussing the believer's present existence from the perspective of Romans 5:12-21, where the Law was linked with sin and death as the dominant powers of the old age that rule over humanity (5:13, 20-21). At the same time, this reference is one of several statements about the negative role of the Law in redemptive history that culminates in chapter 7 (cf. 3:19-20, 21, 27-28; 4:13-15; 5:13-14, 20). In light of this, *νόμος* refers, as in all these references, to the Law given by God to Israel through Moses at Sinai.<sup>214</sup> Even though it plays a largely negative role

---

<sup>212</sup>Conzelmann's statement that 6:14a means that "it is impossible to sin" is a misinterpretation of Paul's teaching here; see H. Conzelmann, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament*, trans. J. Bowden (London: SCM Press, 1969) 229. The imperatives of 6:12-13 imply that the Christian still *can* sin; otherwise, if sinning were not an option, the imperatives would be irrelevant. On the other hand, these imperatives indicate that the Christian *need* not sin; otherwise, if sinning were the only option, the imperatives would be impossible to obey.

<sup>213</sup>The omission of the article before *νόμος* and *χάρις* is probably stylistic (BDF, §§ 252, 258, 2; Robertson, *Grammar*, 793) in connection with their function as objects of *ὑπό* (BDF, §255). The lack of the article does not generalize *νόμος* to mean any law (Kuss, *Römerbrief*, 2:384; pace MHT, 3:176-77), nor does it give the words qualitative force since both are viewed as ruling powers (cf. 5:20-21). Paul frequently uses *ὑπό* plus its object to denote the power / control under which one exists (see Rom. 3:9; 7:14; Gal. 3:22, 23, 25; 4:5; 5:21).

<sup>214</sup>Dunn, *Romans*, 1:339; Moo, *Romans*, 388; pace Murray, *Romans*, 1:228, and Barrett,

in redemptive history, it still remains God's holy, just and good Law (Rom. 7:12, 14).

These texts provide the context for interpreting the cryptic, much-debated phrase *οὐ . . . ὑπὸ νόμον*. For our purposes, it is sufficient to treat this phrase along with its antithetical counterpart *ὑπὸ χάριν* and observe that Paul views "law" and "grace" here as contrasting ruling powers that exercise authority over people. Several lines of evidence support this view: 1) the use of *ὑπό* with the connotation "under the rule / power of" (cf. 3:9; 7:14) and the prominence of slavery language in Romans 6; 2) the strong contrast (*ἀλλά*) between *ὑπὸ νόμον* and *ὑπὸ χάριν* fits the "transfer of realm" language that is prominent in Romans 5–8; 3) the *ὑπό* phrases and the present tense verb *ἐστέ*, introduced by *γάρ*, explain why "sin will not rule over you" (v. 14a); 4) Paul's other uses of the phrase *ὑπὸ νόμον* all denote the objective situation of being "subject to the rule of the Mosaic Law" (cf. 1 Cor. 9:20; Gal. 3:23; 4:4, 5, 21; 5:18); and 5) here as in other texts in Romans noted above, Paul speaks of the Law as God gave it in redemptive history, not as Israel or anyone else misunderstood or misused it.<sup>215</sup>

For Paul, then, *ὑπὸ νόμον* and *ὑπὸ χάριν* are abbreviated ways of depicting the "old age" of bondage (cf. Gal. 3:25) and the "new age" of freedom (cf. Gal. 4:1-7) respectively in redemptive history. To be *ὑπὸ νόμον* is to be subject to the sin-dominated regime of the old age;<sup>216</sup> but to be *ὑπὸ χάριν* is to be subject to the Spirit-

---

*Romans*, 129, who claim it refers here to "law" in general. The absence of the article with *νόμος* does not undermine this view. The presence or absence of the article is of little help in determining the meaning of *νόμος* in Paul; see D. Moo, "'Law,' 'Works of the Law,' and Legalism in Paul," *WTJ* 45 (1983) 73-100; and S. Westerholm, "*Torah, nomos, and law: A Question of 'Meaning,'*" *SR* 15 (1986) 327-36.

<sup>215</sup>So Moo, *Romans*, 388-89; see also S. Westerholm, *Israel's Law and the Church's Faith: Paul and His Recent Interpreters* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988) 205-09. In light of the evidence cited above, it is unlikely that in v. 14b Paul is referring to 1) the legalistic abuse of the Law by making it a means of salvation (e.g., Barrett, *Romans*, 128-29); 2) the condemnation or curse of the Law because of inevitable failure to obey it (e.g., Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:320); or 3) the Jewish effort to turn the Law into their own "national guardian angel" (e.g., Dunn, *Romans*, 1:339). For further discussion on Paul and the Law, see ch. 3, 172-74.

<sup>216</sup>de Boer, *Defeat of Death*, 167, summarizes Paul's polemical reappraisal of the Law: "To be 'under the Law' (6.14-15; cf. Gal. 3.23; 4.5, 21; 5.18), therefore, is for Paul to be 'under sin' (3.9; 7.14; cf. Gal. 3.22), an equation that, as 6.14-15 demonstrates, is a presupposition of the

dominated regime of the new age in which there is freedom from the power and lordship of sin and the law. The Christian is οὐ ... ὑπὸ νόμον, meaning he / she has been released from the bondage of the old realm and transferred to the freedom of the new realm. Because the Mosaic Law has a sin-producing and sin-intensifying function in salvation history (3:19-20; 4:15; 5:13-14, 20; 7:5, 8) and is even called "the power of sin" (1 Cor. 15:56), Paul can point to release from the Law (Rom. 6:14b) as the reason (or, basis) for the Christian's freedom from sin's power (6:14a). Although most of the Christians in Rome were Gentiles and had never actually lived "under the [Mosaic] Law," Paul apparently used the situation of the Jews under the Mosaic Law "as representative of the situation and need of all people" in the old realm (cf. 7:4-6).<sup>217</sup>

In a striking way, verse 14 is also part of the answer to the question posed in verse 1. Paul concludes the passage with the assurance that believers are "under grace," where they are not only liberated from sin and its ally, the Law, but where they are also made alive to a new master, God. Because of their new status of freedom from sin and life from God (6:11), they are obligated to wage war against sin and live in obedient service to God (6:12-13, 19, 22).

## 2.5 Concluding Observations on "Our Old Man"

As noted above, the designation ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος occurs rather abruptly in Romans 6:6 for the first time in the Pauline corpus. Since it is not a pre-Pauline metaphor in early Christian tradition or other sources, it appears that Paul is the originator of the figure in his missionary preaching prior to Romans (cf. p. 105). In this passage he deals with the Christian's present status and its implications from the perspective of Romans 5:12-21, where he sees humanity divided into two groups.

---

whole argument found in the preceding section (6.1-7.5)."

<sup>217</sup>Moo, *Romans*, 388; see 4 Ezra 7:37; 8:60; and 2 Bar. 15.5; 48.40,46-47, which suggest that the Law was meant to apply universally.



Each group is conditioned and determined by its solidarity with two divinely-appointed, representative figures: Adam and Christ, the "first" and "last" *ἄνθρωπος* (1 Cor. 15:45). Those in solidarity with Adam belong to the old order of human existence that is in bondage to the ruling powers of law, sin, and death; while those in solidarity with Christ belong to the new order of existence with its freedom in righteousness and life. The "old man" is aligned with Adam and the old order of existence established by him.

In 6:1-10 Paul argues that Christians have died *σὺν Χριστῷ* to sin as a master, which precludes remaining under its rule. Once (*ποτέ*) they "lived in sin," for they were slaves of sin (6:17), but now (*νῦν*) they no longer (*μηκέτι*) live under its authority and controlling power because they "died to sin" (6:2, 11). In verse 6, Paul amplified this and set forth its result: "our old man" was crucified with Christ in order that believers in their bodily existence might be released from sin's controlling power with the result that they are no longer enslaved to it.

In keeping with the language of the passage in its context, the "old man" refers to the person who belongs to the corporate structure of the old order / realm that was established by Adam and is dominated by the power of sin and death. This corporate structure has: 1) a "founding father" in the inclusive representative figure, (fallen) Adam, the prototypical "old man" (5:12-14); 2) a "solidarity group" comprised of those who belong to Adam, the old humanity (5:15-19); 3) a way of life that those "in Adam" pursue (6:19b, 21); and 4) a destiny to which they go—eternal death (6:21b, 23). Given these corporate associations, the "old man" metaphor functions at a representative, corporate level as a reference to human existence in Adam. However, Paul did not lose sight of the individuals who make up the corporate solidarity of the old order / realm. Consequently, the "old man" also functions at a personal, individual level.

In verse 6, Paul uses the designation "our old man" in reference to individual persons who belong to the corporate structure of the old order / realm and who, through dying with Christ and rising to walk in newness of life, are released from it and transferred to the corporate structure of the new order / realm "in Christ." Several factors in the passage support this "individual" view: 1) the connection of conversion-initiation (baptism) with Paul's *σὺν Χριστῷ* language points to the life history of the individual believer (vv. 3-8); 2) much of the language throughout the passage relates to *individual* actions done or received (vv. 1-8); 3) "our old man" and "the body of sin" are two designations that relate to the same person (v. 6); 4) believers are enslaved to sin "no longer" (*μηκέτι*) as a result of the crucifixion of "our old man" (v. 6); 5) the transfer from the corporate structure of the old order to that of the new order in Christ requires personally receiving His grace and the gift of righteousness by faith (5:1-2; 17); and 6) the argument of the passage involves the intersection of redemptive history and realized eschatology with individual Christian experience.

Prominent in Paul's discussion is the movement from indicative statements about Christ and believers' participation with and incorporation into Him (6:1-10) to imperative appeals to believers who walk in newness of life (6:4b, 12-13). The reference to "our old man" occurs in the indicative section. In making the transition from indicative affirmation to imperative exhortation, Paul makes the point that those who died "with Christ" are those who are now "dead to sin" and "alive to God in Christ Jesus" (6:11). The great difference between "once" (*ποτέ*) and "now" (*νῦν*) in the believer's life lies in the change of masters—from sin to God—and the transfer from the old realm of existence, where one is under the power of sin and death to the new realm, where one is under the power of righteousness and life. This definitive break with sin as a ruling power took place in redemptive history in Christ's death and resurrection and is applied personally / individually at conversion-initiation.

The "old man" is associated with slavery to sin and refers to one's existence in its realm. But the crucifixion of "our old man" with Christ (6:6) on the individual level at conversion signals a person's release from sin's power, and thus this action is functionally equivalent to "we died to sin" (6:2). Believers no longer belong to sin's realm; consequently, their "old man" was brought to an end. At the same time, there is a basic difference between the believer's death to sin and the crucifixion of "our old man." The Christian's death to sin does not put an end to sin, rather it severs his / her relationship to sin as a ruling power / authority. Sin continues its existence as a ruling power of the old realm, and the rest of humankind remains under its authority. It also remains a threat to the Christian, and thus there is a need for the imperative—putting sin to death as an ongoing duty (Rom. 8:13; Col. 3:5).

By contrast, "our old man was crucified with Christ," indicates that the "old man" has come to an end for Christians and such a designation is no longer applicable to them. Their solidarity with Adam has ended; they now belong to a new solidarity with Christ. Paul does not say, "we were crucified to the old man" (cf. Gal. 6:14, "I have been crucified to the world"), or, "we died to the old man;" otherwise, we could speak of crucifixion / death as simply the severance of our connection to the old man. Furthermore, unlike his treatment of "sin," Paul does not personify the "old man" as an acting agent separate from one's "self." Nor does the "old man" have an ontological point of contact with the human person like other anthropological terms (e.g., body, flesh, heart, mind, soul, spirit). In this regard, the "old man" is unique. The distinguishing modifier *παλαιός* refers to factors outside of *ἄνθρωπος* itself, factors that are redemptive-historical and eschatological rather than anthropological.

There is also no indication in this passage that the "old man" refers to fallen human nature. The metaphor operates in relational (status) rather than ontological (constitutional) or ethical categories. Throughout the indicative section (6:1-11) surrounding the reference to the "old man" in verse 6, Paul's language concerns

Christian existence, relationship, and status with respect to sin and God—not human nature or moral conduct. Believers are not exhorted to crucify the "old man" or to free themselves from the "old man." With various imperatives, Paul exhorts believers to battle against sin, not the "old man," and he describes the location of the battle as their "mortal body" (6:12), not their "body of sin" (6:6).

In this text, then, the "old man" is a metaphor for the person who belongs to the corporate structure of the old order of human existence established by Adam, through whom sin as a ruling power entered into the world of humanity. When this person is set free from sin as a master and made alive to God through dying with Christ and rising to walk in newness of life, he / she enters into and belongs to the corporate structure of the new order of existence—the new creation—established by Jesus Christ. This person is no longer designated an "old man" in Adam but a "new man" in Christ.

Later we must consider whether this view of the "old man" will hold up in the ethical passages of Colossians 3:9-10 and Ephesians 4:22-24 where the "old man" is coupled with the concept of the "new man" and is the object of the verb "put off." But first, we must investigate a reference to the "new man" only in Ephesians 2.

**CHAPTER 3**  
**EPHESIANS 2:15**  
**ONE NEW MAN CREATED**

The words "in order that in himself he [Christ Jesus] might create the two into one new man" occur in Ephesians 2:15. This text is a primary reference to the "new man" in the *corpus Paulinum* and the only one to mention the "new man" without its counterpart, the "old man." In light of this, an exegetical study of this text is important to our investigation. We shall speak of the author as the Apostle Paul. Despite some difficulties, we hold the view that he wrote Ephesians as a general, circular or "open" letter to several churches of western Asia Minor, including Ephesus.<sup>1</sup> This chapter contains a brief discussion of the historical setting of Ephesians (3.1), the literary context of Ephesians 2 (3.2), the structural form of Ephesians 2:11-22 (3.3), and the conceptual background and structural form of Ephesians 2:14-18 (3.4). This sets the stage for an exegesis of Ephesians 2:14-18 (3.5) and concluding observations on the "one new man" (3.6).

**3.1 Historical Setting of Ephesians**

The general, circular nature of Ephesians makes it difficult to determine with any certainty its occasion or purpose from the circumstances of the readers. Having accepted Pauline authorship as noted above, we are left to ascertain these things from the circumstances of Paul and the content of the letter. We assume that what he wrote is what his Christian readers needed to hear and know. Many refined literary, historical, and / or liturgical statements of occasion, genre and purpose have been proposed for Ephesians—some more helpful and illuminating than others.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See the discussion and support for this view in ch. 1, 11-22.

<sup>2</sup>For a survey of various proposals and their advocates, see M. Barth, *Ephesians*, AB 34, 34A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1974) 1:56-69, and A. T. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, WBC 42 (Dallas: Word Books, 1990) xxxv-xlvi, lxxiii-lxxxvii; and, more recently, E. Best, *Ephesians*, ICC (Edinburgh:

Since the document exhibits epistolary traits, it seems best to treat it as a general pastoral letter. It could be argued that because of the report he received from Epaphras regarding conditions in the Lycus Valley (cf. Eph. 6:21-22 with Col. 1:6-9; 2:5-8; 4:7-8, 12), Paul envisioned the need for a more general letter than Colossians to be sent to various other churches of western Asia Minor, especially if these had been spawned from his ministry in Ephesus (cf. Acts 19:1-10). It would be in accord with the circular letter hypothesis that there are no references to specific problems or false teaching. Without the tension of a specific threat or crisis weighing on his mind, Paul had time to reflect on God's purposes in Christ involving the Church. As the apostle to the Gentiles, he had been given insight into the mystery of God's plan and had been commissioned to make it known to all people (Eph. 3:3-11, cf. 1:9-10). With elements of the Colossian letter still fresh on his mind, Paul used similar language and concepts to instruct his Gentile readers concerning their new status as Christians united with all other Christians, Jews and Gentiles alike, in the Church, to put before them the ethical implications of all this for living in the world, and to urge them to stand firm against the strategies of "the devil." This important statement of Christian truth was no doubt needed in more than one first-century location in Asia Minor.

### **3.2 Literary Context of Ephesians 2**

Most interpreters have observed that Ephesians has two main parts: exposition in 1:3–3:21 and exhortation in 4:1–6:22, framed by the address (1:1-2) and the closing blessing (6:23-24). In part one (chs. 1-3), Paul gives praise to God for all the spiritual blessings believers have received in Christ (1:3-14). Cast in hymnic form, this opening "berakah" provides a sweeping insight into the eternal plan of God for humankind, with the focus of attention centered on Christ who is the agent

through whom God's plan is to be realized. Ultimately, His plan is to bring all creation, everything in heaven and on earth, under the headship of Jesus Christ (1:10). In 1:15-23 Paul prays that his readers would comprehend the significance of God's plan, especially as it related to the surpassing greatness of His power in raising Christ from the dead and exalting Him as head over all things, even the Church, which is His body. Paul's readers had direct, personal experience of God's power, for by it they had been rescued from the spiritual deadness of their sinful past to be, by God's grace, His workmanship created in Christ Jesus for good works (2:1-10). Jew and Gentile alike have been given a share in the new life of Christ and in His supremacy over evil forces.

Throughout 2:1-10 Paul views human beings from the standpoint of what God has done for them in Christ. In verses 1-3, using *ποτέ*, he describes the pre-Christian existence of his Gentile ("you," *ὑμᾶς*, 2:1) readers and all humanity ("we all," *ἡμεῖς πάντες* in 2:3 includes Jews). The "old humanity" living in the "old age / realm" was dominated by the forces of "this world age," the devil, and the "flesh." Their existence was characterized as bondage, condemnation, and death (cf. Col. 2:13). Left in this fallen condition, they deserved and were liable to God's righteous judgment.

In verses 4-7 following the contrastive conjunction *δέ* (implying *νῦν* in contrast to *ποτέ* in vv. 2-3), Paul sets forth his Jewish and Gentile readers' present Christian existence. He focuses on God's gracious, decisive action in Christ that rescued them from their plight. This rescue involved making them alive with Christ (*συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ*, v. 5), raising them and seating them (*συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν*, v. 6) with Him in the heavenly realms. What God's power accomplished for Christ in those events (cf. 1:19-21) it accomplished for Him as the representative of a new humanity that is vitally related to Him. Believers have been transferred to a "new realm" inaugurated by Christ's resurrection in which they enjoy new life and liberation from the powers that previously enslaved them. All this demonstrates the

surpassing richness of God's grace (v. 7).

In verses 8-10 Paul summarizes the gracious nature of salvation. By God's grace his readers have personally been delivered from their previous state (vv. 1-3) through faith. Salvation comes from God as a gift that excludes human merit, effort and boasting. Believers are said to be the product of God's work, that is, His new creation, created (*κτισθέντες*) in Christ Jesus unto a life of goodness expressed in specific deeds, which was God's original design for humanity. This new way of living (*ἐν αὐτοῖς περιπατήσωμεν*, v. 10) completes the contrast with the old way of living in trespasses and sins (*ἐν αἷς ποτε περιεπατήσατε*, v. 2). By grace through faith, Paul's Christian readers enjoy a privileged relationship with God—they have been raised from spiritual death to new life in Christ.

The contrast between their pre-Christian past and their Christian present is also important to Paul's discussion in 2:11-22. It enables him to remind Gentiles of another change in their situation as it relates to the Jew-Gentile relationship and membership in the newly created community of Christians. The designation "one new man" in 2:15 is of particular importance because it clarifies this relationship. We turn to this text in the context of 2:11-22.

### 3.3 Structural Form of Ephesians 2:11-22

The contrast schema *ποτέ . . . νῦν* provides an important structural feature in the thought of this pericope.<sup>3</sup> Whereas in 2:1-10 the *νῦν* element was implicit, here both temporal elements are explicit. The pre-Christian past (i.e., the period prior to the coming of Christ) is signaled by *ποτέ* in verses 11 and 13 and by its equivalent *τῶ*

---

<sup>3</sup>P. Tachau, "Einst" und "Jetzt" im Neuen Testament. *Beobachtungen zu einem urchristlichen Predigtschema in der neutestamentlichen Briefliteratur und zu seiner Vorgeschichte*, FRLANT 105 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972) 79-85, 133-43, concludes that this schema depicts a contrast between the pre-Christian past and the Christian present and is usually but not always expressed by *ποτέ* and *νῦν*. He suggests that it was often used in early Christian preaching associated with conversion-initiation (133). He sees this contrast in the following Pauline passages: Rom. 5:8-11; 6:15-23; 7:5-6; 11:30-32; 1 Cor. 6:9-11; Gal. 1:23; 4:3-7, 8-10; Eph. 2:1-22; 5:8; Col. 1:21-22; 2:13; 3:7-8; Phlm. 11; 1 Tim. 1:13-14; Titus 3:3-7 (79-85, 94).



*καιρῶ ἐκέλευ* in verse 12. It stands in contrast to the Christian present (i.e., the present inter-advent period) signaled by *νυνὶ δέ* in verse 13 and by its negative counterpart *οὐκέτι* in verse 19, a key summarizing verse beginning with *ἄρα οὖν*. This contrast reminds Paul's Gentile readers of their past religious deprivation as Gentiles compared with Jews in order to emphasize Christ's reconciling work on their behalf to change this situation and to grant them the privileges they now enjoy.

As noted by Andrew Lincoln, "some aspects of the contrast are completed in verses 11-13, but verses 14-18 intervene before other aspects of the pre-Christian past mentioned in verse 12 are shown to have been reversed in verse 19."<sup>4</sup> The contrasts could be arranged as follows:

<u>Pre-Christian Past</u>	<u>Christian Present</u>
1. <i>χωρὶς Χριστοῦ</i> (v. 12)	<i>ἐν Χριστῶ Ἰησοῦ</i> (v. 13)
2. <i>ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραήλ</i> (v. 12)	<i>συμπολιῖται τῶν ἀγίων</i> (v. 19)
3. <i>ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας</i> (v. 12)	<i>οὐκέτι ἐστὲ ξένοι καὶ πάροικοι</i> (v. 19)
4. <i>ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες</i> (v. 12)	_____
5. <i>ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ</i> (v. 12)	<i>οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ</i> (v. 19)
6. <i>οἳ ποτε ὄντες μακρὰν</i> (v. 13)	<i>νυνὶ δέ ... ἐγενήθητε ἐγγύς</i> (v. 13)

These contrasts emphasize the separation and alienation that existed between Jews and Gentiles.<sup>5</sup> The last contrast indicates that spatial categories (*μακρὰν* and *ἐγγύς*) can be interwoven with temporal ones (*ποτέ* and *νῦν*).<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup>Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 125; also Best, *Ephesians*, 236; and R. Schnackenburg, *Ephesians. A Commentary*, trans. H. Heron, EKKNT 10 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991) 105; pace Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:275, who puts v. 13 with vv. 14-18 rather than vv. 11-12.

<sup>5</sup>See W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*, 4th ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press) 113-15, for a discussion of the significance of the terms *ξένοι* (vv. 12b, 19a; Heb. נכרים) and *πάροικοι* (v. 19; Heb. גרים) to Jews.

<sup>6</sup>It should be noted that the temporal antithesis has not been collapsed into a spatial

These contrasts relate directly to the readers Paul addressed. The second person plural ("you") in verses 11-13 and 19 stands in contrast to the third person singular ("he," Christ) and the first person plural ("we") that begins and concludes the material in verses 14-18. He identifies his readers as Gentiles in verse 11 and as Christians in verse 13. In verse 17, *τοῖς μακράν* ("to those far"—Gentiles) are referred to as *ὑμῶν* ("to you"), but *τοῖς ἐγγύς* ("to those near"—Jews) are *not* referred to as *ἡμῶν* ("to us"). Rather, "we both" in verse 18 refers to Jewish and Gentile Christians. Thus, in this context, "you" refers to Paul's Gentile addressees, and "we" refers to all Christians, Gentiles and Jews, including the author.<sup>7</sup> The contrasts are between his Gentile readers' pre-Christian past in relation to Israel's privileges and their own Christian present. On one hand, they once were "far"—alienated both from Israel and from Israel's God. Now, on the other hand, through the death of Christ and in Him they are "near"—at peace both with God and with Jewish Christians in the Church.

The purpose of the contrast schema and of this paragraph as a whole is to remind (*Διὸ μνημονεύετε*, v. 11) these Gentile readers of their former deprived religious status and their present privileged position as members of the Christian community. They now participate in God's salvation through Christ's death on an equal basis with Christian Jews (cf. 3:6).<sup>8</sup> No longer do they have an inferior status when compared with Israel in the present outworking of God's plan. It is important to recognize that

---

one; pace Tachau, *"Einst" und "Jetzt"*, 143. C. E. Arnold, *Ephesians: Power and Magic* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992) 150-51, recognizes the spatial emphasis in Ephesians but demonstrates that it does not displace the author's use of the Jewish two-age concept: present (2:2) and future (2:7).

<sup>7</sup>Best, *Ephesians*, 236, 251, 270; also D. B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996) 397-98.

<sup>8</sup>E. Percy, *Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe*, ARSHLL 39 (Lund: Gleerup, 1946) 278-86; also Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 132. This passage is not meant to be an argument for ecclesiastical unity, pace C. L. Mitton, *The Epistle to the Ephesians: Its Authorship, Origin and Purpose* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951) 101; nor an argument against the arrogance of Gentile Christians and their feelings of superiority toward Jewish Christians, pace E. Käsemann, "Ephesians and Acts," in *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn (London: SPCK, 1968) 291; also R. P. Martin, *Reconciliation: A Study of Paul's Theology*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1989) 160-67.

it is the *soteriological* status of Gentiles (and Jews) that has changed, not their ethnic status.<sup>9</sup> Gentiles are not incorporated into historical Israel but into Christ along with Jewish Christians (cf. v. 15).

In light of these observations, the overall structure of thought in 2:11-22 can be divided into three sections. First, in verses 11-13 Paul uses the contrast between their pre-Christian past as it relates to Israel (*ποτέ*) and their Christian present (*νυνὶ δέ*) to remind his Gentile readers that through Christ's death they have come "near." Verse 13 describes their present situation in spatial language (*μακρὰν / ἐγγύς*) as well as temporal language (*νυνὶ / ποτέ*). What all this means calls for an explanation. So, second, in verses 14-18 Paul explains how this coming "near" is made possible through Christ who embodies peace and reconciles Jews and Gentiles in "one new man," providing access to the Father for both alike. Third, verse 19 begins with *ἄρα οὖν* introducing the logical conclusion that follows naturally from verse 13. In verses 19-22 Paul summarizes the Gentile readers' new privileged position in the new community, the Church, variously described as God's household, a building in which Christ is the cornerstone, a holy temple in the Lord, and God's dwelling place.<sup>10</sup>

Our main interest lies in verses 14-18 because they contain the reference to the "one new man." These verses have been the focal point of considerable debate regarding their conceptual background and tradition history. We turn to a brief consideration of these matters.

---

<sup>9</sup>Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 109, states: "the author is concerned with the *Church* made up of former Jews and Gentiles in which earlier distinctions such as circumcision (cf. v. 11) and the Law (cf. v. 15) have lost their meaning, and he is concerned about their proper relationship, the unity of Jewish- and Gentile-Christians in the Church . . . not with the relationship to Judaism outside the Church" (italics his). The word "former" could be misleading in an otherwise lucid comment.

<sup>10</sup>I. H. Thomson, *Chiasmus in the Pauline Letters*, JSNTSup 111 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995) 84-115, argues that the structure of 2:11-22 is best portrayed as a chiasmus supplemented by material beyond the chiastic pattern. Verse 15, which mentions the "one new man," is at the center of the pattern indicating that it, along with vv. 14-18, contains "the central point of the passage . . ." (86). See Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 126, for a critique of chiastic patterns.

### 3.4 Background and Form of Ephesians 2:14-18

Since verses 14-18 contain several unusual elements (e.g., *hapax legomena*, concepts unique to Ephesians), a number of interpreters have argued that they have a Gnostic background, but others see Jewish antecedents. At the same time, the fact that these verses form a distinct unit within 2:11-22 leads many to contend that they are based on existing tradition, allegedly a preformed hymn, but others deny this.<sup>11</sup> What warrant is there for these claims and what contribution, if any, do they make to our understanding of this passage?

#### 3.4.1 Conceptual Background of 2:14-18

**3.4.1.1 Gnostic Background.** In 1930, Heinrich Schlier published a detailed study of the relationship of Gnostic texts to Ephesians in which he consistently and systematically interpreted the thought of Ephesians against the backdrop of a Gnostic cosmological myth.<sup>12</sup> Subsequently, other scholars accepted Schlier's view and expanded or modified it by expressing their own ideas of its significance.<sup>13</sup> However, under the pressure of criticism, some of these, including Schlier himself, modified their views to allow for a broader range of traditional

---

<sup>11</sup>For a summary and assessment of these debates, see C. Colpe, "Zur Leib-Christi-Vorstellung im Epheserbrief," in *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche*, ed. W. Eltester, BZNW 26 (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964) 172-87; W. Rader, *The Church and Racial Hostility: A History of Interpretation of Ephesians 2:11-22*, BGBE 20 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1978) 177-96; and M. S. Moore, "Ephesians 2:14-16: A History of Recent Interpretation," *EvQ* 54 (1982) 163-68.

<sup>12</sup>H. Schlier, *Christus und die Kirche im Epheserbrief*, BHT 6 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1930, reprint 1966) esp. 18-37, where he discusses several Gnostic sources behind *ἄνθρωπος* that he applies to Eph. 2:15. He also wrote *Der Brief an die Epheser. Ein Kommentar* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1957, 1971<sup>7</sup>) as well as other articles on Ephesians. He assumes that the creation of the "one new man" comes from an already developed Gnostic myth and that the "new man" is to be identified with the Urmensch-Redeemer (*Epheser*, 133-36), all of which the author (Paul) adapted.

<sup>13</sup>E.g., E. Käsemann, *Leib und Leib Christi*, BHT 9 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1933), 156-58; id., "Das Interpretationsproblem des Epheserbriefes," in *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, 3rd ed., 2 vols. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970) 2:253-61; G. Schille, *Frühchristliche Hymnen*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1965) 24-31; K. Wengst, *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1972) 181-86; and K. M. Fischer, *Tendenz und Absicht des Epheserbriefes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973) 131-37. In particular, Fischer attempts to place the Urmensch-Redeemer view of Schlier and Käsemann on firmer footing in light of the Nag Hammadi texts (*Tendenz*, 132).

materials from various sources.<sup>14</sup>

Schlier argued that the close proximity of several images in Ephesians 2:11-22—such as the dividing wall, the one body, the one new man, the building—could only be explained on the basis of an underlying Gnostic myth that combined these images. According to him, such a myth was that of the cosmic Urmensch-Redeemer.<sup>15</sup> He claimed that the author of Ephesians, in line with Pauline tradition that focused on the cross, reinterpreted and adapted this myth to proclaim the abolition of the enmity that divided Jews from Gentiles and humanity from God because this imagery was part of the conceptual world of his audience.

In recent years, however, the Gnostic Redeemer myth as a possible background for this and other New Testament passages has been thoroughly examined and discredited. Numerous scholars have concluded that it is post-Christian and cannot legitimately be treated as background material for the New Testament.<sup>16</sup> In studies based on the Dead Sea Scrolls, other scholars have found similarities in language, style, and thought patterns between Ephesians and the Qumran literature that, for them, is strong evidence against Schlier's Gnostic

---

<sup>14</sup>For example: Schlier, *Epheser*, 122-23; Käsemann, "Ephesians and Acts," 288. Under the pressure of criticism, Schlier modified his position in his commentary to allow for some Jewish sources and the Jewish character of the Gnostic ideas he saw behind Ephesians (a Jewish Gnosticism). However, his attempt to integrate Jewish and Gnostic backgrounds has been criticized by J. T. Sanders, *The New Testament Christological Hymns* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1971) 90.

<sup>15</sup>Schlier formulated his theory based on the work of R. Reitzenstein who described the Gnostic Redeemer myth in *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium* (Bonn: Markus, 1921). This reconstruction has been seriously questioned in the work of C. Colpe, *Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, FRLANT 60 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961) 199-208. See also Sanders, *Christological Hymns*, 88-89.

<sup>16</sup>For example: C. Colpe, *Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, FRLANT 60 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961) 199-208; Sanders, *Christological Hymns*, 88-90; M. Wolter, *Rechtfertigung und zukünftiges Heil* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1978) 62-73, who criticizes Fischer's refurbished Gnostic Redeemer myth (*Tendenz*, 131-37). Recent data from the Nag Hammadi Library has given no positive evidence of a pre-Christian Gnostic redemption myth.

thesis.<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, Gnostic cosmology is not congruent with Paul's view of heaven and earth in Ephesians (cf. 1:20-21; 4:9-10; 6:12).

**3.4.1.2 An Old Testament / Jewish Background.** Strong opposition to a Gnostic background comes from scholars who argue for a Old Testament / Jewish background to this passage.<sup>18</sup> Proponents of this view often point to the Isaiah texts echoed in this passage (Isa. 52:7; 57:19), Jewish discussions of Adam, and the Old Testament concept of "corporate solidarity" as a more probable background than the Gnostic Urmensch-Redeemer.<sup>19</sup> Ernst Percy, a strong advocate of this concept in the interpretation of Ephesians 2:14-18, states that the idea of representation, that one person acts in the place of and for the sake of others, is the crucial feature missing in the Gnostic myth and other pagan religions or philosophical "parallels."<sup>20</sup>

Franz Mussner believes that the parallel between the Jewish concept of new creation and the reference to the "new man" of Ephesians 2:15 is one of the most impressive evidences for a Jewish background.<sup>21</sup> He uses material gathered by Erik Sjöberg in which Jewish texts speak of the Gentile proselyte as "formed anew" and of Israel herself as "created into a new being."<sup>22</sup> Just as individual Gentiles were

---

<sup>17</sup>F. Mussner, "Contributions Made by Qumran to the Understanding of the Epistle to the Ephesians," in *Paul and Qumran. Studies in NT Exegesis*, ed. J. Murphy-O'Connor (Chicago: Priory Press, 1968) 159-78; and K. G. Kuhn, "The Epistle to the Ephesians in the Light of the Qumran Texts," in *Paul and Qumran*, 115-31.

<sup>18</sup>E. Percy, *Der Leib Christi (Sōma Christou) in den paulinischen Homologoumena und Antilegomena* (Lund: Gleerup, 1942); S. Hanson, *The Unity of the Church in the New Testament: Colossians and Ephesians* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1946); F. Mussner, *Christus, das All und die Kirche*, 2nd ed. TTS 5 (Trier: Paulinus-Verlag, 1968); J. J. Meuzelaar, *Der Leib des Messias* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1961) 59-101; J. T. Sanders, "Hymnic Elements in Ephesians 1-3," *ZNW* 56 (1965) 214-32; id., *Christological Hymns*, 14-15, 88-92; and Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:261-62.

<sup>19</sup>On the concept of "corporate solidarity" see ch. 1, 40-42; on rabbinic thought about humanity in Adam, see W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 36-57.

<sup>20</sup>Percy, *Der Leib Christi*, 41-43.

<sup>21</sup>Mussner, *Christus*, 88-96.

<sup>22</sup>E. Sjöberg, "Wiedergeburt und Neuschöpfung im palästinensischen Judentum," *StTh* 4 (1950) 44-85. See, ch. 1, 51-52.

brought "near," incorporated into Israel, and given access to the worship of Yahweh, so also by extended application, the Gentiles in Ephesians 2:13 are said to have been brought near by the blood (death) of Christ and made real fellow-citizens, members of the household of God with the Jews (2:19-20; cf. 3:2-6).

**3.4.1.3 A Diversified Background.** Several scholars have suggested a mediating position between a Gnostic and an Old Testament / Jewish background for Ephesians 2:14-18.<sup>23</sup> They are convinced that its background cannot be limited to one or the other since Judaism of the first century had become influenced by Hellenistic and Gnostic ideas and Adam had come to be viewed as a cosmic figure filling the universe. This suggests a milieu where Christianity was more readily exposed to the influence of Hellenistic Jewish speculation.

Joachim Gnilka acknowledges with appreciation the interpretation of Schlier, the hymnic investigations of Schille, and the Jewish parallels offered by Percy, Mussner and others. As a result, he believes that the author of 2:14-18 critically interprets and adapts a cosmologically oriented Christian hymn about "peace and the redeemer" by aligning it with Christ's redemptive work on the cross and then relating it to the relationship between Jews and Gentiles.<sup>24</sup> Peter Stuhlmacher claims, however, that Gnilka's analysis is not satisfactory because he still maintains a "Gnostic" understanding of the text and gives little attention to the christological interpretation of the Isaiah texts reflected in this passage.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup>E. Schweizer, "Die Kirche als Leib Christi in den paulinischen Antilegomena," in *Neotestamentica* (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1963) 293-316; D. C. Smith, "The Two Made One: Some Observations on Eph. 2:14-18," *OJRS* 1 (1973) 34-54; C. Burger, *Schöpfung und Versöhnung: Studien zum liturgischen Gut im Kolosser-und Epheserbrief*, WMANT 46 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1975) 117-57; and J. Gnilka, *Der Epheserbrief*, 2nd ed. HTKNT 10.2 (Freiburg: Herder, 1977) 147-52.

<sup>24</sup>Gnilka, *Epheserbrief*, 147-52.

<sup>25</sup>P. Stuhlmacher, "'He is our Peace' (Eph. 2:14). On the Exegesis and Significance of Eph. 2:14-18," in *Reconciliation, Law, and Righteousness: Essays in Biblical Theology*, trans. E. R. Kalin (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986) 182-200, esp. 184-87.

After examining the Gnostic material cited by Schlier as well as relevant traditions in Greek philosophy, Hellenistic Judaism and rabbinic literature, Derwood Smith concluded that the background of Ephesians 2:14-18 was not a unified Gnostic myth but was actually composed of a variety of Jewish and Greek concepts that reinterpret each other when they are combined to express the author's message. He argues that the background of this passage can be found simultaneously in Jewish traditions about proselytes, in Greek philosophical traditions about overcoming divisions, and in Jewish cosmological traditions.<sup>26</sup> He paid particular attention to the classical problem of the "one" and the "many" in Greek philosophy that often involved the idea of bringing unity out of duality. He argues that this idea was taken up by Hellenistic Judaism and early Christianity, and from it one finds the background for the idea of "the two being made one" in Ephesians 2, especially the statement in verse 14 that Christ made *τὰ ἀμφοτέρα ἓν*.<sup>27</sup> For the author of Ephesians the duality is occasioned by the Mosaic Law that separates Jews from Gentiles, and ultimately both from God. Through Christ and the cross the "two" become "one new man."

Interestingly, the idea of overcoming duality and establishing unity is not missing from Jewish thought. It is reflected in various prophecies concerning the reuniting of the North and South kingdoms of Israel that were separated following the death of King Solomon in Jewish history (cf. Jer. 3:18; Ezek. 37:15-28; Hos. 1:11). In Ezekiel 37, the uniting of two sticks of wood, symbolizing Judah and Ephraim, pictured God restoring and reuniting the people in the land as a single nation (cf. Hos. 1:11).<sup>28</sup> But this passage is a remote parallel, if one at all. In Ephesians 2:14-15, the term "one new man" is used instead of terms such as *ἔθνος*, *λαός*, or *βασιλεία* that are

---

<sup>26</sup>Smith, "The Two Made One," 46-47. He argues that "there is not simply one unified thought system lying behind Ephesians but rather that the author has brought together traditional materials of various origins in order to express his theological concerns" (34).

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., 36-37.

<sup>28</sup>Martin, *Reconciliation*, 190, discusses the possible link between Ezek. 37 and Eph. 2.



used in LXX Ezekiel 37. Furthermore, the Ephesian text is concerned with unity between Jews and Gentiles, not Jews with Jews.

In our view, the most relevant and helpful background for Paul's terminology and imagery in this passage comes from the Old Testament and Jewish antecedents as mentioned above.<sup>29</sup> Along with the discussion of the conceptual background, however, scholars have also given attention to the form analysis of these verses to which we now turn.

### 3.4.2 Structural Form of 2:14-18

The literary structure of Ephesians 2:14-18 is also a subject under debate. Is the passage a preformed hymn written in celebration of cosmic peace, which the author of Ephesians used, either completely or with suitable modifications, in this context? If so, what is the extent of this traditional material—verses 14-18 or verses 14-16 only? Or, is there no redaction of traditional, liturgical material at all, and has the author simply formulated an explanation that stands in direct continuity with Pauline teaching (e.g., Rom. 3:30-31; 12:5; 1 Cor. 12:13; 2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 3:26-28; 6:15)?

**3.4.2.1 A Quoted Hymn.** Following the lead of Ernst Käsemann,<sup>30</sup> who claimed there was quoted liturgical material behind 2:14-18, Gottfried Schille made a pioneering form critical analysis of this passage.<sup>31</sup> He drew attention to several unusual literary features in the passage that indicated to him it was a quoted confessional hymn drawn from early Christian literature. He accepted Schlier's thesis about the presence of language from a Gnostic Urmensch-Redeemer myth, but

---

<sup>29</sup>See pp. 154-55 above and the discussion on conceptual background in ch. 1, 46-52.

<sup>30</sup>Käsemann, *Leib und Leib Christi*, 1933; and later, "Epheserbrief," in *RGG*, ed. K. Gallig et al., 3rd ed., 7 vols. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1957-65) 2:517-20, esp. 519.

<sup>31</sup>Schille, *Frühchristliche Hymnen*, 24-31, 47-52; also Wengst, *Christologische Formeln*, 177-86.

he claimed that the early church used it first in composing a hymn about Christ reconciling people to God, and then the author of Ephesians adapted it to proclaim reconciliation between Jews and Gentiles as well.

Since Schille's work, other scholars have attempted to understand Ephesians, or portions of it, by connecting it with the liturgy of the early church. On the basis of similarities to Jewish liturgy, especially that of Qumran, J. C. Kirby developed the thesis that Ephesians is actually the substance of a Pentecost worship service used by the church in Ephesus with some epistolary additions to put it into the form of a letter.<sup>32</sup> Within this liturgical framework, he sees Ephesians 2:11-22 as an independent, distinct unit, having the form of an elaborate chiasm with verse 15 at the center. Thus he rejects Schille's thesis that only verses 14-18 are an independently composed piece.

Markus Barth agrees with the view that Ephesians 2:14-18 is a hymn. He claims that the hymnic traits in these five verses are more obvious and complete than in most other hymnic passages of Ephesians and he goes on to mention seven such traits. After briefly describing Schille's theory concerning the origin of the hymn and evaluating it, Barth concludes that, though it is probable that preformed hymnic material was used, the diverse elements of 2:14-18 do not necessarily disprove a Pauline origin.<sup>33</sup>

Against those who include verses 17 and 18 in the borrowed hymnic material,<sup>34</sup> Andrew Lincoln argues that these two verses were formulated by the

---

<sup>32</sup>J. C. Kirby, *Ephesians, Baptism and Pentecost: An Inquiry into the Structure and Purpose of the Epistle to the Ephesians* (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1968) 150-61.

<sup>33</sup>Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:261-62. Others who acknowledge the use of hymnic material that has been reworked are Schlier, *Epheser*, 122-23; Schille, *Frühchristliche Hymnen*, 24-31; Fischer, *Tendenz*, 131-37; Gnülka, *Epheserbrief*, 147-52; Burger, *Schöpfung*, 117-33; Wengst, *Christologische Formeln*, 181-86; G. Giavini, "La structure littéraire d'Eph. II, 11-22," *NTS* 16 (1969-70) 209-11; and Martin, *Reconciliation*, 168-71.

<sup>34</sup>E.g., Schlier, *Epheser*, 123; Schille, *Frühchristliche Hymnen*, 24-31; Gnülka, *Epheserbrief*, 147-52; Fischer, *Tendenz*, 132; Burger, *Schöpfung*, 128-33; Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:276.

writer himself, and therefore the extent of traditional material is limited to verses 14-16.<sup>35</sup> He associates this material with the hymn to the cosmic Christ that may lie behind Colossians 1:15-20, the last part of which deals with cosmic reconciliation. Several striking points of contact with this Colossians passage lead him to conclude that "the original hymnic material behind Ephesians 2:14-16 also has a cosmic context, and that the two entities mentioned (*τὰ ἀμφοτέρα*, "both," v. 14; *τοὺς δύο*, "the two," v. 15; *τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους*, "both," v. 16) are the two parts of the cosmos, heaven and earth."<sup>36</sup> The writer of Ephesians, then, adapts the idea of Christ as the bringer of cosmic reconciliation to his theme of how Christ overcame the barrier that existed between Gentiles and Jews and brought Gentiles near. The adaptation has left its mark in the form of several glosses and cumbersome syntax (e.g., vv. 14-15) in the present form of the material. Verses 14-16, then, constitute the final form of the traditional material in its new context.

**3.4.2.2 Not a Quoted Hymn.** Although there is a growing consensus that Ephesians 2:14-18, or at least part of it, is a hymn, some scholars have disagreed and criticized the view. Reinhard Deichgräber does not think that these verses form a separate quoted hymn and even questions whether they ever had independent status as Schille and others claim.<sup>37</sup> He raises several text-based objections. Furthermore, the parameters of the hymn as well as the identification of the author's omissions and / or additions continue to be disputed. No two reconstructions agree. Similar criticisms have been made by others. Helmut Merklein develops and widens Deichgräber's critique in his treatment of Ephesians 2:11-18.<sup>38</sup> Peter Stuhlmacher

<sup>35</sup>Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 128. He lists several indications that "hymnic material could lie behind this section" (127).

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., 128-29.

<sup>37</sup>R. Deichgräber, *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit*, SUNT 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967) 165-69.

<sup>38</sup>H. Merklein, *Christus und die Kirche: Die theologische Grundstruktur des Epheserbriefes*

claims there is no redaction of traditional, liturgical material at all because all of 2:14-18 should be viewed as a Christian exegesis of several Isaiah texts (9:5-6; 52:7; 57:19).<sup>39</sup> In his recent full-scale commentary, Ernest Best presents the case for an alleged piece of preformed tradition such as a hymn underlying these verses and offers some general criticisms. Then he sets forth several points that militate against such a view claiming that the issues involved are explicable in context as the work of the author.<sup>40</sup>

In light of the above discussion on form, we take the view that this passage is the explanatory composition of Paul himself as author and is not based on an underlying, pre-Pauline hymn. In addition, Paul does not use Gnostic language or imagery to express his ideas. Since we do not see an underlying hymn here, there is no need to sift redaction from tradition for possible clues to Paul's meaning in our exegesis of the passage. It is to that exegesis that we now turn.

### 3.5 Exegesis of Ephesians 2:14-18

The flow of thought in Ephesians 2:11-22 moves naturally from exhortation and description (vv. 11-13), to explanation (vv. 14-18), to conclusion (vv. 19-22). In verses 11-13, Paul's Gentile Christian readers are in view. In light of what he said in verses 1-10,<sup>41</sup> he exhorts them to remember the religious condition in which they once

---

nach *Eph 2,11-18*, SBS 66 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1973) 38-40; id., "Zur Tradition und Komposition von Eph 2,14-18," *BZ* 17 (1973) 79-102.

<sup>39</sup>P. Stuhlmacher, "'He is our Peace' (Eph 2:14)," 187-91; and Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 106-07, 112, who, agreeing with Stuhlmacher, concludes that "vv. 13-18 are a christological exegesis of Is. 9.5f.; 52.7; 57.19" (112). Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 127, says it is difficult to substantiate the claim that v. 14 refers to Isa. 9:5-6 and thereby provides the link between a reference to Isa. 57:19 in v. 13 and its combination with Isa. 52:7 in v. 17; see also Wolter, *Rechtfertigung*, 62-73, esp. 72; and Mussner, *Christus*, 100-03, who argues that these verses should be viewed as an explanation in which Isa. 57:19 plays a subordinate role.

<sup>40</sup>Best, *Ephesians*, 247-50; also Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 107, who states: ". . . the various attempts which have been made to reconstruct an underlying hymn seem superfluous and hardly convincing."

<sup>41</sup>Verse 11 begins with the inferential conjunction *διό* (BAGD, s.v. *διό*; BDF, §451, 5) that links vv. 11-22 with vv. 1-10. What Paul has already written concerning the change God has

lived. He contrasts their past alienation from God and from Israel with their present situation, stating that they who were once far off have come to be near through Christ's death. In verses 14-18 he explains how this took place. Then in verses 19-22 he concludes that in Christ his Gentile Christian readers are no longer strangers and aliens but fellow-citizens with Jewish Christians and members of the household of God. Both together have now become "the temple" in which God dwells. The concluding pronouncements in verses 19-22 connect most naturally with verses 11-13, but in between verses 14-18 provide an important explanation of verse 13. We will examine these verses and the meaning of "one new man" in verse 15.

### 3.5.1 Ephesians 2:14a: Christ Himself Is Our Peace

The passage begins with the words: *Αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν*. This programmatic statement sets the stage for the following discussion because: 1) it forges an explanatory link (*γὰρ*) with the preceding context; 2) it designates Christ as the doer of the following action; 3) it identifies the recipients of His action, namely, Christian Jews and Gentiles; and 4) it introduces the topic of discussion, namely, peace.

The connecting word *γὰρ*<sup>42</sup> indicates that Paul intends to give an explanatory confirmation of his statement in verse 13, especially in reference to the words *ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ* that conclude the verse. In the Old Testament the Gentile nations were sometimes described as "far off," those who did not belong to God's people, Israel (e.g., Deut. 28:49; 1 Kings 8:41; Isa. 5:26; Jer. 5:15), while Israel was described as "near" to God (e.g., Ps. 148:14). Paul used the "far off" language to sum up the pre-Christian (before Christ) existence of his Gentile readers and to remind them that

---

wrought in their lives becomes the point of departure for further reflection on the pre-Christian state from a wider redemptive-historical perspective.

<sup>42</sup>The conjunction *γὰρ* is taken in an explanatory rather than a causal sense here; see A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek in the Light of Historical Research*, 4th ed. (Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1934) 1190. Barth and others make no special mention of it.

through what Christ had accomplished on the cross they who once (ποτέ) were "far off" (μακράν) have now (νυνί) been brought "near" (έγγύς) to God and His salvific blessings. Their position relative to God and His people had changed. For the "far" to come "near," peace needed to be made not only between God and humankind but also between Jews and Gentiles.

This, Paul explained, is where Christ enters the picture—He Himself (αὐτός) is "our peace." The emphatic pronoun αὐτός picks up the reference to Jesus Christ in verse 13, and He becomes the major actor and focus of attention in verses 14-18.<sup>43</sup> This pronoun emphasizes the fact that peace is to be identified with Jesus Christ<sup>44</sup>—He is its source, or, even stronger, He embodies peace because at the cost of His life He procured it (cf. 1:7, 20). Because He embodies peace and bestows it as a salvific blessing (ποιῶν εἰρήνην, v. 15), it can be said that He is "the Peacemaker." This identification of Christ with one of the salvific blessings He brings occurs elsewhere in the Pauline corpus also (cf. 1 Cor. 1:30—wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, redemption; Col. 1:27, hope; 3:4, life).

The word εἰρήνη is qualified by ἡμῶν. To whom does this first person pronoun refer? In verse 11 Paul identifies the second person pronoun ὑμεῖς ("you") as Gentile Christians (cf. 2:1-10); thus one might argue that first person pronouns ("we / our") would refer to Jewish Christians, but such an identification is not made. In verse 17, where the "far" (Gentile Christians) are referred to as ὑμῖν ("to you"), there is no corresponding reference to the "near" (Jewish Christians) as ἡμῖν ("to us"). In verse 18, the first person pronoun "we," embodied in the construction ἔχομεν . . . οἱ

---

<sup>43</sup>In each of the three preceding sections of this letter (1:3-14; 1:15-23; 2:1-10) God the Father has been the major actor with Christ as His agent. Here Christ is the major actor. This change in subject may be due to the use of a christological hymn at this point (cf. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 140), but the hymnic structure is not very clear and the content itself need not be confined to a hymnic form.

<sup>44</sup>Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:262, adds the words "in person" three times in his translation of vv. 14-16 (v. 14a, 15b, 16b) to bring out the emphasis αὐτός has; see also Gnllka, *Epheserbrief*, 138.

*ἀμφότεροι*, refers to both Jewish and Gentile Christians. This suggests that *ἡμῶν* in verse 14 also refers to all Christians, Jews and Gentiles alike, including Paul himself (cf. 1:3-9 where "we" refers to all Christians).<sup>45</sup> These first person pronouns form a pronominal *inclusio* encompassing verses 14-18: Christ is *our* peace (v. 14) and through Him *we* have access to the Father (v. 18).

The presence of the article *ἡ* with *εἰρήνη* ("peace") strengthens *αὐτός*, gives added emphasis to *εἰρήνη* as a quality, and sharpens the contrast with *τὴν ἔχθραν* ("hostility") in verse 15. The term is appropriate here because Paul is referring to One who abolishes hostility and reconciles two estranged parties. In the Greco-Roman world, *εἰρήνη* primarily signified the absence of war or the cessation of conflict, especially in a political or military sense. In the LXX, the term acquired a positive religious usage. It is often used to translate *שלום*, which in the Old Testament has a wide semantic range involving several nuances such as fulfillment, completion, wholeness, well-being, harmony, security, and prosperity depending on the context (cf., e.g., Judg. 6:24, *יהוה שלום*, "Yahweh is peace / salvation"). Numerous Old Testament texts anticipate messianic peace as an eschatological blessing (cf. Isa. 9:5-6; 52:7; 53:5; 57:19; Mic. 5:4-5; Hag. 2:9; Zech. 9:10). Drawing on this wide range of usage, New Testament writers also use *εἰρήνη* to express ideas of well-being, wholeness, reconciliation with God and others, and even salvation in its fullest sense depending on the context.<sup>46</sup> The peace of Old Testament expectation exists now.

In this context, Christ in His person is the embodiment of peace (v. 14), the One who makes peace (v. 15) and the One who proclaims peace (v. 17). He is the

---

<sup>45</sup>R. A. Wilson, "'We' and 'You' in the Epistle to the Ephesians" in *Studia Evangelica* 2, ed. F. L. Cross, TU 87 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964) 676-80, argues that in Ephesians "we" refers to all Christians and "you" to newly baptized converts, Jewish or Gentile. His identification of "you," however, does not reflect the evidence in this context correctly (e.g., 2:11) even with the qualification that most new converts were Gentiles. The fact that "us" is missing in v. 17b indicates that Paul does not see himself as a representative of the Jewish Christians only.

<sup>46</sup>BAGD, s.v. *εἰρήνη*; von Rad, *TDNT*, 2:402-06; Foerster, *TDNT*, 2:406-17; Beck and Brown, *NIDNTT*, 2:776-83.

Peacemaker reconciling hostile parties. As such, *εἰρήνη* here denotes primarily the overcoming of hostility, the bringing together of separated groups, and the resultant relationship of harmony and unity. He who embodies and mediates peace has overcome the alienation (vv. 12-13) and hostility (v. 15) that exists between Jews and Gentiles. While peace between these two groups is mentioned first, it is based on peace between God and humankind as shown later in the passage (vv. 16-17; cf. Rom. 5:1). Verse 14a is likely too general for the claim that Paul refers to Isaiah 9:5-6 or Micah 5:4-5 directly here or that, through the catchword *εἰρήνη*, they provide the link between an allusion to Isaiah 57:19 in verse 13 and its combination with Isaiah 52:7 in verse 17.<sup>47</sup>

In explaining the contrast between the present status of his Gentile Christian readers and their past alienation from God and Israel, Paul declares that Jesus Christ is "the peace" between Jews and Gentiles who have become Christians. Now he moves on to state *what* has taken place and *how* it came about.

### 3.5.2 Ephesians 2:14b-15a: The Means By Which Christ Is Our Peace

Both the syntactical arrangement and the punctuation of the clauses in these verses are difficult. Three participial clauses, *ὁ ποιήσας . . . λύσας . . . καταργήσας . . .*, carry the thought along, but they are not precisely parallel in form or function. The main problem is whether the words *τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ* (v. 14c) are to be connected 1) with the preceding participle *λύσας* in verse 14 as an elaboration on the breaking down of the dividing wall, or 2) with the following participle *καταργήσας* in verse 15 as an elaboration on abolishing the law of commandments with regulations.

---

<sup>47</sup>A. T. Lincoln, "The Use of the OT in Ephesians," *JSNT* 14 (1982) 26; id., *Ephesians*, 127; pace Stuhlmacher, "'He is our Peace' (Eph. 2:14)," 187-91; Wolter, *Rechtfertigung*, 72; Barth, *Ephesians* 1: 261 n36; and Best, *Ephesians*, 251-52.



Syntactical considerations favor the second option. The article  $\acute{o}$  governs both  $\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  and  $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ ,<sup>48</sup> which are linked together by  $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ . As such, both (articular) participles as noun units are placed in apposition to  $\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  in the preceding statement (i.e.,  $\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  serves as their subject). Its referent, Jesus Christ, is thus the subject of these participial clauses. The third participle,  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\gamma\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ , without a connecting word (like  $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ ) present, modifies the  $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  clause and functions as an adverbial participle of means.<sup>49</sup> It seems better syntactically to regard both  $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  and  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\gamma\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  as occurring at the end of the clauses they govern. Consequently,  $\tau\eta\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\chi\theta\rho\alpha\nu$  (v. 14c) is in apposition with the following  $\tau\acute{o}\nu\ \nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\nu$  in verse 15 (rather than  $\tau\acute{o}\ \mu\epsilon\sigma\acute{o}\tau\omicron\iota\chi\omicron\nu$  in the previous  $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  clause in v. 14) and both words and their accompanying phrases are connected with  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\gamma\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  in verse 15.<sup>50</sup> In light of this arrangement, verses 14-15a could be translated as follows: "For He Himself [Jesus Christ] is our peace. He [is the One who] made both [to be] one in that ( $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ ) He broke down the dividing wall, that is, the fence [separating Jews and Gentiles], by abolishing in His flesh [through His death on the cross] the [source of] hostility [between Jews and Gentiles], namely, the Law of commandments with regulations . . . ."

---

<sup>48</sup>The use of one article ( $\acute{o}$ ) with two singular substantival participles ( $\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\alpha\varsigma\ .\ .\ .\ \lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ ) qualifies as an example of the Granville Sharp rule for the use of the article in Greek grammar; see MHT, 3:181-82; C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959) 109-10; Wallace, *Grammar*, 270-77, esp. 275.

<sup>49</sup>Wallace, *Grammar*, 628-30; Eadie, *Ephesians*, 174-75; C. C. Caragounis, *The Ephesian Mysterion: Meaning and Content* (Lund: Gleerup, 1977) 71, holds that  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\gamma\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  expresses either means or gives an exegetical addition to  $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  and both clauses express the means for the action of the  $\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  clause. The resultant step parallelism relates all three participial clauses grammatically to the main clause: "He is our peace."

<sup>50</sup>J. A. Robinson, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, 2nd ed. (London: James Clark & Co., 1904) 161; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984) 298; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 124; pace Eadie, *Ephesians*, 173-74; Thomson, *Chiasmus in the Pauline Letters*, 103-04; and Best, *Ephesians*, 257-59, who discusses and evaluates several options and prefers to take  $\tau\eta\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\chi\theta\rho\alpha\nu$  with  $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  (v. 14) and  $\tau\acute{o}\nu\ \nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\nu$  with  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\gamma\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  (v. 15), and to treat  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta\ \sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\iota\ \alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\upsilon$  as parenthetical. But this seems less likely syntactically.

**3.5.2.1 The *ὁ ποιήσας* Clause (2:14b).** This clause states *what* Jesus Christ has done: He has made "the both" to be "one."<sup>51</sup> Here the substantival adjectives *τὰ ἀμφοτέρα* and *έν* are in the neuter gender denoting entities, while in verses 15-18 both words appear in the masculine. This sudden use of neuter forms seems to be an awkward intrusion in this context because in verses 11-13 and 15-18 Paul speaks of two groups of people, namely, Jews and Gentiles.<sup>52</sup>

Markus Barth points out that the neuter adjective *ἀμφοτέρα* is probably used like the neuter substantival adjectives "the foolish, the weak, the strong, the ignoble, the despised, and the 'not being'" mentioned in 1 Corinthians 1:27-28, where Paul means distinct categories of "people" and not "things" (cf. also 1 Cor. 3:8; Gal. 3:22, 28; Col. 3:11).<sup>53</sup> So it appears that here "the two things made one" refers to two general categories of people: the uncircumcision and the circumcision (v. 11), those "far" and those "near" (vv. 13, 17), that is, Gentiles and Jews. Following the statements in 2:1-10, the words *νυνὶ δὲ έν Χριστῶ Ἰησοῦ* (v. 13), the word *ἡμῶν* (v. 14a), and the sentence *έχομεν . . . οἱ ἀμφοτεροι* (v. 18, "we both have . . ."), the two categories are even more narrowly defined as Christian Gentiles and Christian Jews in this context.

---

<sup>51</sup>*Έν* functions as a double accusative object-complement following the participle *ποιήσας*. The second accusative (*έν*) asserts something about the first accusative (*τὰ ἀμφοτέρα*) in connection with the action of the participle; see Robertson, *Grammar*, 480; and MHT 3:246-47. The participle *ποιήσας* alludes to a creative act by Jesus Christ in bringing peace (cf. Eph. 2:10, 15).

<sup>52</sup>The use of neuter forms is one of the items in this passage that prompted Schlier, Schille and others to see the Gnostic Redeemer myth behind these verses. Both "things" here are viewed as a reference to the heavenly spirit world that is in conflict with the earthly material world and separated from it by a "wall." But, as Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:262, points out, the context, linguistic evidence, the meaning of "the wall" (v. 14), and Col. 1:20 do not support this theory.

<sup>53</sup>Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:262; Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 114; also Abbott, *Ephesians*, 60-61, and BDF, §138, 1; §263, 4; and §275, 8. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 128-29, 140, believes that the neuter forms are best explained as a remnant of traditional hymnic material that originally referred to the two parts of the cosmos, heaven and earth; also Gnllka, *Epheserbrief*, 139, 148. While this may be the case, it does not explain why these forms were retained in the final form of the traditional material used in this context (cf. Deichgräber, *Gotteshymnus*, 165-67).

Paul anticipated a twofold thrust in his explanation: the reconciliation of Jews and Gentiles and the reconciliation of humankind and God. Since he is concerned to explain the overcoming of the division between Jews and Gentiles on one hand, and the overcoming of the separation between humankind and God on the other hand, the neuter words *τὰ ἀμφοτέρα ἐν* may well serve as a general expression to the effect that Christ has overcome the division and established unity. As we shall see, however, Paul speaks about reconciling people to God, not about uniting them with God in the sense of merging humanity into divinity. Similarly, Jews and Gentiles do not merge into one or the other, nor does one triumph over the other.<sup>54</sup> Thus, the term *τὰ ἀμφοτέρα* must refer to both categories of people: the Jews, "those near," and the Gentiles, "those far," who are now in Christ Jesus (v. 13).

Jesus Christ made the two groups, Christian Jews and Christian Gentiles, into one new group—a unity where both are no longer distinctly what they once were in relation to God (cf. vv. 15-18). In so doing, He abolished one of the major religious divisions of the ancient world, a prototype of all human hostility. This is *what* has taken place. Now Paul goes on to state *how* it took place.

**3.5.2.2 The [δ] λύσας Clause (2:14c).** This clause, introduced by an epexegetical *καί* ("in that"),<sup>55</sup> explains generally how Christ made "the both one." He

---

<sup>54</sup>Pace Wilson, "'We' and 'You,'" 678, who says: "St. Paul is describing the salvation of his hearers in terms of their incorporation into Israel;" and Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:314, who concludes that "God's household" (v. 19), to which both Jews and Gentiles belong, is "the community of Israel." On the contrary, A. T. Lincoln, "The Church and Israel in Ephesians 2," *CBQ* 49 (1987) 615, rightly concludes: "the Gentiles' former disadvantages have been reversed not by their being incorporated into Israel, even into a renewed Israel of Jewish Christians, but by their being made members of a new community which transcends the categories of Jew and Gentile, an entity which is a new creation, not simply a merging of the former groupings."

<sup>55</sup>*Καί* here appears to be epexegetical (explanatory) in function since the thought of the second participial clause supports and explains the first one. For this function of *καί*, see BAGD, s.v. *καί*, I.3; BDF, §442, 9; Robertson, *Grammar*, 1181; MHT, 3:335; Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 172-73; and examples: Rom. 1:5; 1 Cor. 3:3b, 5; 11:2; 15:38; 2 Cor. 2:9a; Eph. 1:1; 2:14; 4:24; 5:1-2; and 6:10. See also J. A. Eadie, *A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians*, 3rd ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1883) 171; and T. K. Abbott, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians*, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897) 61; Schlier, *Epheser*, 124; pace Best, *Ephesians*, 253. See ch. 1, 21 n58 on Eph. 1:1, and ch. 5, 278 n99 on Eph. 4:24.

has broken down "the dividing wall, that is, the fence" separating Jews and Gentiles. The compound *μεσότοιχον* is an architectural term not found elsewhere in the New Testament. The adjective *μέσος* meaning "middle" along with the noun *τοιῶχος*, a common word for "wall," suggests that this compound word refers to a dividing wall, such as a privacy fence between two houses or a partition between two rooms inside a house.<sup>56</sup> The primary thought conveyed in this context is *separation*. This idea is strengthened by the word *φραγμός*, which means a "fence" or "enclosure" that was set up either for protection or separation.<sup>57</sup> The juxtaposition of these two words yields the sense of a barrier that prevents people from entering a certain area and, as such, it is a dividing wall of separation. The genitive noun *τοῦ φραγμοῦ* is probably best taken in apposition to *μεσότοιχον*: ". . . the dividing wall, namely, the fence . . . ." <sup>58</sup> The participle *λύσας* has the sense of something being "demolished" rather than "breached" in this context (cf. John 2:19; Acts 27:41; also 1 Esdr. 1:52).<sup>59</sup>

The aorist tense of *λύσας* suggests that Paul spoke of a historical, completed destruction of the barrier separating Jews and Gentiles. This has given rise to various attempts to identify and explain the meaning of "the dividing wall."<sup>60</sup> For our purposes, we will simply mention the four most common views of these puzzling words. First, some interpreters, mostly earlier in this century, took the words as a reference to the stone balustrade (4-5 feet high) that separated the Court of the Gentiles from the inner

---

<sup>56</sup>BAGD, s.v. *μεσότοιχον*, Schneider, *TDNT*, 4:625; Hillyer, *NIDNTT*, 3:948-50.

<sup>57</sup>BAGD, s.v. *φραγμός*; Hillyer, *NIDNTT*, 3:950-51; Abbott, *Ephesians*, 61; Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:263.

<sup>58</sup>BDF, §167; MHT, 3:215; Robertson, *Grammar*, 498; Wallace, *Grammar*, 95-98; also Abbott, *Ephesians*, 61; Schlier, *Epheser*, 124; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 141; Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 113; and Best, *Ephesians*, 257.

<sup>59</sup>BAGD, s.v. *λύω*, 3; Büchsel, *TDNT*, 4:335-38; Brown, *NIDNTT*, 3:181-89. The compound *καταλύω* was used for the destruction of the temple (Matt. 26:61; 27:40; Acts 6:14) and metaphorically for the demolishing of the Jewish understanding of salvation (Gal. 2:18).

<sup>60</sup>Various options are discussed and evaluated by Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:283-86; Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 113-14, and Best, *Ephesians*, 253-57.

courts and sanctuary of the Jerusalem temple and carried inscriptions in both Greek and Latin threatening death to any Gentile who trespassed beyond it.<sup>61</sup> However, none of the usual architectural terms for the temple or its surroundings are used here (e.g., *ἱερόν, ναός, περιβόλος, δρύφακτος*). Specifically, Paul uses *μεσότοιχον* (v. 14) for the wall instead of *δρύφακτος*, the term found in the warning inscriptions and the references in Josephus. Conversely, no known document uses *μεσότοιχον* to refer to the temple balustrade.<sup>62</sup> Furthermore, it is unlikely that Christians in Asia Minor would have recognized and understood such an allusion.

Second, a number of interpreters see a Gnostic derivation for these words and view them as a metaphorical reference to a non-material, impenetrable barrier that separates two opposing cosmic regions, the heavenly and the earthly sphere.<sup>63</sup> However, the evidence set forth for this view is often late (post 1st century) or not directly applicable, and the key word *μεσότοιχον* is missing from all the literature cited. Furthermore, this view does not fit with Paul's concept of heaven and earth in Ephesians (cf. 1:20-21; 2:2; 4:9-10; 6:12), nor with the "wall," "fence," and "law" linkage in this passage, and it is not an illuminating explanation of the Jew-Gentile

---

<sup>61</sup>Robinson, *Ephesians*, 159-60; Abbott, *Ephesians*, 61-62; Mussner, *Christus*, 82-84; and Mitton, *Ephesians*, 106. If our pre-70 AD dating of Ephesians is correct, then this wall was still standing. See Josephus, *Ant* 15.11.5 [§417] and *War* 5.5.2 [§193-94]; 6.2.4 [§124-25] for mention of the stone balustrade and its inscriptions. Two such notices in Greek have been discovered, one in 1871 and the other in 1934. For references see Bruce, *Epistles*, 297 n115. The 1871 inscription reads: "[Let] no one of another nation enter within the fence and enclosure around the temple [sanctuary]. And whoever is caught will have himself to blame that his death ensues" (Robinson, *Ephesians*, 60).

<sup>62</sup>Madvig, *NIDNTT*, 3:795; Best, *Ephesians*, 254. A few interpreters in the past took the word as a reference to the veil in the Jerusalem temple that was torn from top to bottom at the time of Jesus' crucifixion (cf. Mark 15:38). But this curtain (not a wall) separated the holy of holies from the holy place in the sanctuary, not Jews from Gentiles. In fact, it excluded both Jews and Gentiles.

<sup>63</sup>See pp. 152-54 above; also Schlier, *Epheser*, 113-14, 124-33; and Fischer, *Tendenz*, 133. In addition to Gnostic texts, the metaphor of a wall between heaven and earth also appears in a few Jewish apocalyptic writings (cf. *1 Enoch* 14.9; *3 Bar.* 2.1-2; *2 Bar.* 54.5), but these are not exact parallels.

relationship.<sup>64</sup>

Third, in light of verse 15, many interpreters see "the dividing wall, namely, the fence" as a metaphorical reference to the Mosaic Law viewed as a barrier separating Jews from Gentiles and the source of hostility between them.<sup>65</sup> The idea that the oral tradition of the elders provided a fence around the Law was a familiar one,<sup>66</sup> but the Law itself was also viewed as a protective fence around Israel.<sup>67</sup> Jewish adherence to the Law, then, created the barrier between Jews and Gentiles. Again, the word *μεσότοιχον* does not appear in the sources cited and this view seems to describe the Law itself as the "enmity / hostility," which is problematic.<sup>68</sup>

Fourth, other interpreters, who find none of the above views entirely satisfactory, see "the dividing wall" as a general metaphor for the division between Jews and Gentiles without reference to any specific literal or theological barrier.<sup>69</sup> Much on both sides kept Jews and Gentiles apart and fostered many personal and social antagonisms in the ancient world.<sup>70</sup> This view seems to fit this complex

<sup>64</sup>See criticisms in Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 113; Merklein, *Christus und die Kirche*, 38-40; and Best, *Ephesians*, 254.

<sup>65</sup>Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:264; Gnllka, *Epheserbrief*, 140; Bruce, *Epistles*, 296; Martin, *Reconciliation*, 185-87; Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 114; and Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 141.

<sup>66</sup>In the rabbinic document *Pirke Aboth*, which probably contains elements from the NT era, there is the command to "make a fence around the law" (*m. 'Abot* 1.1-2; cf. 3.17). CD 4.12, 19; and 8.12, 18 refer to "builders (Pharisees?) of the wall" but not in reference to the Law itself. See further the material in Str-B, 1:693-94; 3:587-88.

<sup>67</sup>The Letter of Aristeas (2nd century BC), 139, states: "[Moses, the lawgiver,] surrounded us (*περιέφραξεν ἡμᾶς*) with unbreakable palisades and iron walls to prevent our mixing with any of the other peoples in any matter . . .," and 142 says: "to prevent our being perverted by contact with others . . . he hedged us in (*ἡμᾶς περιέφραξεν*) on all sides with strict observances . . . after the manner of the Law." The Greek verb noted here comes from the same root as *φραγμός* in 2:14. Similar sentiments are found in *1 Enoch* 89.2; 93.6 and 3 Macc. 3:3-4.

<sup>68</sup>See criticisms in Best, *Ephesians*, 256.

<sup>69</sup>Best, *Ephesians*, 256-57, takes this view. He notes that *μεσότοιχον* was an ordinary architectural term well-known in Asia Minor and sometimes used metaphorically (257).

<sup>70</sup>See Str-B, 1:359-63; 3:139-46; and 3:588-91, for examples of Jewish hostility toward Gentiles, and Tacitus, *Historiae*, 5:1-13, for an example of Gentile hostility and prejudice toward

passage best and to raise the fewest problems. In and of itself "the dividing wall" is simply a general metaphor for the division between Jews and Gentiles. It derives theological significance from what follows.

Thus, the *λύσας* clause (v. 14c) is a general statement requiring further clarification. Christ made "the both" to be "one" in that (*καί*) He broke down (destroyed) the dividing wall, a general reference to the long-standing division between Jews and Gentiles. The following *καταργήσας* clause (v. 15a) states more specifically *when* and *how* this took place.

**3.5.2.3 The *καταργήσας* Clause (2:15a).** As argued above, this clause begins with *τὴν ἔχθραν* (v. 14c) and provides further clarification of the *λύσας* clause. As such, *καταργήσας* functions as an adverbial participle expressing the means by which Christ broke down the dividing wall.<sup>71</sup> The distinctively Pauline verb *καταργέω* has the strong meaning of "destroy" or "abolish" in this context.<sup>72</sup> Thus, the thought is that Jesus Christ abolished or removed the hostility between Jews and Gentiles that is connected with the Law, as made clear by *τὸν νόμον* that stands in apposition to *τὴν ἔχθραν*, the object of *καταργήσας*.<sup>73</sup> The Mosaic Law about which Paul speaks consists of commandments expressed in the form of authoritative decrees or

---

Jews. Also, see "P.Lond, 1912, A Letter of the Emperor Claudius to the Alexandrians, AD 41," in C. K. Barrett, *The New Testament Background: Selected Documents*, rev. ed. (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989) 47-50; N. J. McEleney, "Conversion, Circumcision and the Law," *NTS* 20 (1974) 319-41, esp. 337-40; and L. H. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993) 84-176.

<sup>71</sup>Wallace, *Grammar*, 628-30.

<sup>72</sup>For references and comments, see BAGD, s.v. *καταργέω*; Delling, *TDNT*, 1:452-54; Packer, *NIDNTT*, 1:73. In 2 Cor. 3:6-15 *καταργέω* is used several times of doing away with the Old Covenant (cf. vv. 7, 11, 13, 14), though the term *νόμος* itself is not used. See ch. 2, 114-16 for the use of this verb in Rom. 6:6 and 7:2, 6.

<sup>73</sup>Pace S. D. F. Salmond, "The Epistle to the Ephesians," in *Expositor's Greek Testament*, 5 vols., ed. W. R. Nicoll, reprint (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983) 3:295; and Abbott, *Ephesians*, 62, both of whom mention that *ἔχθραν* is not an appropriate object for *καταργήσας*; however, note a similar connection in 1 Cor. 15:26 where the object is concrete: "the last enemy."

regulations.<sup>74</sup> These revealed the differences between Jews and Gentiles and created hostility. But the removal of this hostility took place *ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ*, a phrase that is parallel in form and content to *ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ* in verse 13, and *διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ* in verse 16. It refers to the crucifixion of Christ's physical body on the cross (cf. Col. 1:21-22).<sup>75</sup> In His death, Christ abolished the hostility between Jews and Gentiles by doing away with the basic cause of it, namely, the Law consisting of commandments expressed in specific regulations such as circumcision, the Sabbath, and food laws among others.

In what sense and how much of the Law has been abolished in Christ's death? This issue continues to be debated. Some claim that it was only the ceremonial and not the moral Law that was annulled.<sup>76</sup> Others believe that it was only those regulations that separated Jews from Gentiles that were removed.<sup>77</sup> Others insist that it was the legalistic (mis)use of the Law that was abolished.<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup>The words *τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν* taken together modify *τὸν νόμον*, with *ἐντολῶν* considered as a genitive of apposition denoting the contents of the Law, and the descriptive dative phrase *ἐν δόγμασιν* viewed as a reference to the legal form in which the commandments were given (cf. Col. 2:14); see MHT, 3:242, 265; Robertson, *Grammar*, 589; Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 45, 79. The phrase *ἐν δόγμασιν*, omitted in P<sup>46</sup>, is probably not a later gloss as argued by C. J. Roetzel, "Jewish Christian-Gentile Relations: A Discussion of Ephesians 2:15a," *ZNW* 74 (1983) 81-89. The piling up of phrases is characteristic of the style in Ephesians and in this case may convey a sense of the burdensomeness of all the Law's commandments. The Mosaic Law is mentioned only here in Ephesians, although see OT quotations in 5:31; 6:2-3; and note ch. 1, 16.

<sup>75</sup>Christ's "flesh" is mentioned only here in Ephesians. The parallel with Col. 1:22, "in the body of his flesh," suggests that Paul refers to Christ's death by the same but shorter phrase in Eph. 2:15. It does not refer to Christ's incarnation, pace J. Calvin, *Sermons on the Epistle to the Ephesians*, rev. trans. (London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1973) 195-96, nor to "what he said and did" (pace Mitton, *Ephesians*, 107), nor to the Gnostic idea of the Redeemer overcoming the power of matter (pace Käsemann, *Leib*, 140-41). Paul likely used *σὰρξ* here instead of *σῶμα* in view of his distinctive use of *σῶμα* in v. 16.

<sup>76</sup>E.g., Calvin, *Sermons on Ephesians*, 196-97; W. Hendricksen, *Exposition of Ephesians*, NTC 11 (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1967) 133-35. The distinction between ritual and moral laws was not made by the Law itself nor the early Church.

<sup>77</sup>E.g., K. Snodgrass, *Ephesians*. NIVAC (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996) 133; P. Balla, "Is the Law Abolished According to Eph. 2:15?" *EuroJTh* 3 (1994) 9-16; and many interpreters. Nothing in this passage indicates Paul is referring only to circumcision, Sabbath-keeping, or regulations about food and ritual purity.

<sup>78</sup>E.g., Schlier, *Epheser*, 126. Paul clearly rejects any idea of salvation through (Law-



Apparently this refers to the traditions that were added to the Law. Still others believe that only the Law in its divisiveness, not the Law itself, was done away.<sup>79</sup> What was abolished are the regulations that cause divisiveness. While this context warrants drawing a close link between the Law and its divisiveness, to make the regulations that cause divisiveness the only aspect of the Law that was abolished overlooks the emphasis of verse 15. The language of this verse indicates the Law itself and all its regulations are in view.<sup>80</sup> As suggested above, divisiveness and antagonism were produced by the fact that Israel possessed the Law, which served as a wall of separation dividing Gentiles and Jews. Thus, in order to remove these negative *effects*, Christ had to deal with the *cause*, namely, the Law itself. In His death, He abolished the Law, breaking its condemnation and power (cf. Gal. 3:13; Rom. 7:4-6; 10:4) and removing it as a barrier to harmony between Jews and Gentiles as well as between God and humanity.

Paul's view of the Law is a complex and highly disputed issue that is beyond the scope of our discussion.<sup>81</sup> For our purposes, it is sufficient to note that his

---

keeping) works in Eph. 2:8-10, and nothing in this passage indicates he is concerned about legalism or added traditions.

<sup>79</sup>E.g., Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:287-91; Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 115. This distinction is difficult to maintain since Paul points to the whole Law itself as the source of the problem and not simply how it was used.

<sup>80</sup>E.g., Eadie, *Ephesians*, 170; Abbott, *Ephesians*, 64-65; Best, *Ephesians*, 260-61; and Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 142. Lincoln, "The Church and Israel," 611, points out that some interpreters shy away from interpreting this clause as a statement about the abolition of the Law, motivated by a desire to "harmonize" this view of the Law with that in the undisputed Pauline letters, or to avoid an alleged antinomianism. See ch. 1, 16.

<sup>81</sup>The subject of "Paul and the Law" has been the focal point of renewed interest in Pauline studies in recent years sparked by the work of E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977). A good orientation to the historical background and various issues in the modern debate is provided by S. Westerholm, *Israel's Law and the Church's Faith: Paul and His Recent Interpreters* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988). For surveys and evaluations of the critical discussion, see N. T. Wright's discussion in S. Neill and T. Wright, *The Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861-1986* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988) 403-30; J. M. G. Barclay, "Paul and the Law: Observations on Some Recent Debates," *Themelios* 12 (1986) 5-15; D. J. Moo, "Paul and the Law in the Last Ten Years," *SJT* 40 (1987) 287-307; H. Hübner, "Paulusforschung seit 1945. Ein kritischer Literaturbericht," *ANRW*, II.25.4:2649-2840, esp. 2668-2694; and D. Luciani, "Paul et la Loi," *NRT* 115 (1993) 40-68.

unqualified language here is in line with his emphasis on discontinuity regarding the Law's validity for the new people of God made up of Jews and Gentiles that is found elsewhere (cf. Gal. 2:19; 3:24-25; Rom. 6:14; 7:4-6; 10:4). The Mosaic Law as such no longer governs life in the new realm of Christian existence. The dividing wall between Jews and Gentiles has been broken down and the hostility between them removed by the abrogation of the Law.<sup>82</sup> This has cleared the way for something new in redemptive history, something in which believing Gentiles share with believing Jews on an equal basis with equal benefit, and something not present prior to Christ's death and resurrection but now established, namely, the Church.

To this point Paul has been explaining the negative side of the action by which his Gentile Christian readers, who once were "far off" from Israel and Israel's God, have now, in Christ Jesus, come to be "near." Now he turns to the positive side of the process.

### **3.5.3 Ephesians 2:15b-16: The Purpose For Which Christ Is Our Peace**

The *ἵνα* clause introducing these verses consists of two parts with *καί* at the beginning of verse 16 linking the verbs *κτίσις* (v. 15b) and *ἀποκαταλλάξις* (v. 16). Grammatically, this clause is to be connected with the immediately preceding participle *καταργήσας* stating the purpose (*ἵνα*) behind the abrogation of the Mosaic Law and the removal of the hostility between Jews and Gentiles. But, conceptually, the clause relates to all of verses 14-15a, especially to what was said about Christ being "our peace," confirming and defining it more precisely in positive terms.

**3.5.3.1 Purpose: To Create the Two into One New Man (2:15b).** In verse 14, the neuter form *τὰ ἀμφοτέρα* was used to identify Jews and Gentiles as two

---

<sup>82</sup>See the discussion of Rom. 6:14 in ch. 2, 137-40. The abolition of the Mosaic Law as a system and the "ruling" authority of the OT era is not to say that Christians are not subject to "commandments" at all, or have no obligation to any of the commandments of the Law as may be separated from the Old Covenant system as a whole and caught up in New Covenant ethical demands. See T. J. Deidun, *New Covenant Morality in Paul*, AnBib 89 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1981) 204-10; and ch. 1, 16 n46.

distinct categories of people. Here, Jews and Gentiles are viewed as two individuals, one of whom represents the Jews (the "near") and the other the Gentiles (the "far") and thus the masculine form *τοὺς δύο* occurs. Out of these two formerly alienated "individuals," Christ has created *ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον*. The adjective *ἓνα* emphasizes numerical *oneness* in contrast to *τοὺς δύο* and is picked up again in verses 16 and 18 with other nouns.<sup>83</sup> In contrast to the old situation denoted by *ἔχθρα*, the adjective *καινόν* stresses the qualitative (and temporal) new situation that has come about by the death of Christ.<sup>84</sup>

The verb *κτίση* with Christ as its subject indicates that His purpose in removing the hostility by abolishing the Law was to bring about a new creation. This verb was used back in verse 10 where believers were described as God's work, those who have been created in Christ Jesus (cf. also 3:9; 4:24). Here, *Christ* is said to be the one who has created "one new man" in Himself or "in His person."<sup>85</sup> The *ἐν αὐτῷ* phrase involves a textual problem,<sup>86</sup> but regardless of the variant reading adopted, it functions as a reflexive since Jesus Christ is the subject of the verbal action. It is to

---

<sup>83</sup>Paul used various word pairs to convey this unifying work of Christ: "many-one" (Rom. 12:4-5; 1 Cor. 10:17a; 12:12); "all-one" (1 Cor. 10:17b; 12:13; Gal. 3:28); "both-one" (Eph. 2:14, 16, 18); "two-one" (Eph. 2:15); or, simply, "one" (Eph. 4:4-6; Col. 3:15).

<sup>84</sup>On the term *καινός*, see BAGD, s.v. *καινός*; Behm, *TDNT*, 3:447-51; Haarbeck, Link, and Brown, *NIDNTT*, 2:669-74; and further discussion in ch. 4, 227-32, and ch. 5, 278-84. Also, see R. A. Harrisville, *The Concept of Newness in the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1960) 1-11, 62-91; and W. Barclay, "The One, New man" in *Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology*, ed. R. A. Guelich (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 73-81. P<sup>46</sup> F G read *κοινόν* ("common") for *καινόν* ("new") but the latter has much better external and internal support.

<sup>85</sup>See BAGD, s.v. *κτίζω*; Foerster, *TDNT*, 3:1028-35; Esser, *NIDNTT*, 1:383-87. References to creation in the Pauline corpus can be placed in two groups: 1) those concerning the first (old) creation begun with Adam (e.g., Rom. 1:20, 25; 8:19a, 20, 22), and 2) those concerning the new creation begun in Christ (e.g., 2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15). Paul usually speaks of God as the creator with Christ as the mediator of creation both "old" and "new" (cf. Col. 1:16). See further discussion in ch. 4, 233-39 and ch. 5, 280-84.

<sup>86</sup>The Majority Text tradition has *ἐαυτῷ* with  $\aleph^c$  D G K L and most minuscules, a scribal interpretation designed to make the reflexive sense clear. The reading of P<sup>46</sup>  $\aleph$  A B P is *αυτῷ*, which some editors write *αὐτῷ* (Tischendorf, UBS<sup>4</sup>, NA<sup>27</sup>) and others *αὐτῷ* (Westcott-Hort, UBS<sup>2</sup>). The former is preferred since in Hellenistic usage *αὐτῷ* could also function as a reflexive, see BDF, §564; Wallace, *Grammar*, 324-25, esp. 325 n22.

be understood in a local (sphere) rather than an instrumental sense here,<sup>87</sup> and as such it affirms that the unity brought about out of the "two" by the creation of the "one new man" was founded in Christ Himself. He is the source and basis of its existence and continuance.

The reference to Christ as creator in a mediatorial sense sets up a contrast with the first creation involving the first man, Adam. Christ, the last Adam, has created in Himself "one new man." This idea is related to Paul's Adam christology that views Christ as an inclusive, representative figure of the new age and the idea of believers being incorporated into Him (cf. 1 Cor. 12:12-13; 15:22, 45-49; Gal. 3:27-28). Through His death, Christ is the creator of a new humanity viewed as a corporate entity. This leads to several observations: 1) the nature of Christ's redemptive work was to bring about the creation of something new through the participation of believers with Him (Eph. 2:5-6, 10; Gal. 3:28; 2 Cor. 5:17); 2) the "new corporate entity" He created transcends the divisiveness between Jews and Gentiles bringing about what would later be called "a third race"—Christians—in the new creation (Gal. 6:15; 1 Cor. 10:32)<sup>88</sup> without erasing the ethnic distinction between Jews and Gentiles (cf. Rom. 1:16; 9:24; 1 Cor. 1:24; 12:13; Gal. 2:14-15); 3) this creative work is not a *creatio ex nihilo*, because Christ used existing "peoples," namely, Jews and Gentiles; and 4) on the human level, this new creation embodies the summing up of all things in unity, which is a major part of Paul's concern in Ephesians (cf. 1:10).

Among several suggestions offered for the meaning of the "one new man," the following views are the most common. First, the "one new man" is Christ

---

<sup>87</sup>Best, *Ephesians*, 263; pace F. Büchsel, "In Christus' bei Paulus," *ZNW* 42 (1949) 141-58, esp. 145.

<sup>88</sup>Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 144; pace Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:310. *The Preaching of Peter*, quoted in Clement of Alexandria, *Strom* [6.5.39-41] has the words: "we who worship God in a new way, as the third race (*τρίτῳ γένει*), are Christians." This is not to deny any sort of continuing validity for Israel as an ethnic, national people as Paul himself affirms in declaring that God's election of Israel still stands and there will be a future for her in fulfillment of OT promises (cf. Rom. 11).

Himself, the prototypical "new man."<sup>89</sup> In this view, Christ demonstrates that, by His life of total obedience and His victory over death in resurrection, He is the true man, the real image of God in contrast to the first Adam. However, elsewhere, Paul calls Christ "the firstborn over all creation" (Col. 1:15), "the firstborn from among the dead" (Col. 1:18) and "the firstborn among many brothers" (Rom. 8:29). He, who is not created, creates the "one new man." Thus it is difficult to conceive of Christ creating the "new man" in Himself (Eph. 2:15) if the "new man" is simply and only Christ Himself. This also applies to the creation of the "new man" *κατὰ θεόν* in righteousness and holiness of truth in 4:24.

Second, the "one new man" is the "new nature" of the Christian in contrast to the "old sinful nature."<sup>90</sup> In this view, Christ, by abolishing the Law and introducing a new principle of spiritual life, has given to both Jew and Gentile the "one new nature" of the Christian person. In light of 4:24, the "new man" is viewed as the "new nature," which is the foil of the "old nature," the referent of the "old man." However, in the context of 2:15 there is no basis for describing the "new man" as a "new nature" or capacity belonging to an individual person. Furthermore, this view does not reflect the reconciling emphasis in this passage. The "one new man" is formed by the reconciliation of Jews and Gentiles in Christ, not by the implanting of a "new nature."

Third, the "one new man" is the individual Christian person.<sup>91</sup> In this view, the "new man" is a qualitatively new kind of person, previously unknown, and recognized as neither a Jew nor a Gentile but a Christian. Ernest Best discusses this view by noting that in Ephesians 2 a genuinely new man is formed in verse 15 that is

---

<sup>89</sup>Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 116; however, he qualifies his view: "The new 'man' is Christ insofar as he represents and realizes the Church in himself." This may put him more in line with view 4 below.

<sup>90</sup>J. A. Allen, *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, TBC (London: SCM, 1959) 87.

<sup>91</sup>Salmond, "Ephesians," 3:295-96; Mussner, *Christus*, 87, 94-96; Mitton, *Ephesians*, 108; E. Best, *One Body in Christ: A Study of the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul* (London: SPCK, 1955) 152-54; id., *Ephesians*, 261-63.

no longer described with the neuter gender, as in verse 14, but with the masculine. Though he acknowledges that this may signify two peoples—Jews and Gentiles—who have become one new corporate *person*, that is, the Church, he prefers the view that this denotes two types of individuals—the Jew and the Gentile—who have given way to a third type, the "new man," namely, the Christian.<sup>92</sup>

In favor of this view, Best argues that: 1) the identification of "one new man" (v. 15) with "one body" (v. 16) is not certain because the "one" of verse 15 could refer back to the "one" in verse 14, which could be understood as a reference to "a single individual;" 2) the phrase, the "new man," occurs again in 4:24 and in Colossians 3:10, and in these two places the interpretation is individualistic in that it does not mean to "put on" or enter a "corporate solidarity" but to adopt a new character or status; and 3) the contrast of "two" and "one" (v. 15) suggests that each of the two, the Jew and the Gentile, is made into the "one new man" who is the same type for both. The *τοὺς δύο* of verse 15 is masculine, that is, two different "men" are each being made into the *same* kind of "new man." Thus Best concludes that the "one new man" is not a corporate entity but a genuine Christian individual.

However, the "one new man" of 2:15 is created in Christ (*ἐν αὐτῷ*) and is the outcome of both Jewish and Gentile persons (*τοὺς δύο*) being created into (*εἰς*) this "one new man." Indeed, the individual Christian is a new creation in one sense (2 Cor. 5:17), but he is not created by the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile into one new entity, and it is this reconciliation that forms the "one new man" here. In 4:24 the "new man" is contrasted with the "old man" of 4:22, whereas in 2:15 the "one new man" is contrasted with two "old" groups, Jews and Gentiles; therefore, the key addition of "one" (*ἓνα*) in 2:15 is perfectly natural. The *ἐν* of verse 14, which states that the two groups were made one, appears to be a reference to "one new group"

---

<sup>92</sup>Best, *One Body*, 152-54; id., *Ephesians*, 261-62.

referred to later as "one body" (v. 16). More than just the individual Christian was created here. This leads, finally, to the most likely view.

Fourth, the "one new man" is the Church as the new humanity.<sup>93</sup> In this view the Church is the new creation in Christ. The formation of one people consisting of Jews and Gentiles suggests that the "one new man" is by origin and constitution a community of many persons, both Jews and Gentiles together, reconciled to one another and to God by Jesus Christ who has come and died to redeem both. The "new man" is not merely an individual, though he includes individuals, both Jews and Gentiles. Nor is he an amalgamation of identical individuals since Jews do not become Gentiles and Gentiles do not become Jews, although both become Christians. Nor are Christ and the Church identical, for Christ creates the "one new man" (2:15), is the Head of the Church, His Body (1:22; 4:15; 5:23), and remains the Church's foundation (2:20) as well as the source of her life and growth through the Spirit (2:18, 22; 4:4a, 13-16). This is in harmony with later references in Ephesians where believers collectively are depicted as growing into "a fully mature man" (*εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον*), into the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ (4:13), and where the Church is described as the "bride" of Christ (5:25-27, 32). Equally supportive is the apparent equivalence of the "one new man" with *ἐν σῶμα* (4:16), that is, the Church.

This view of the "one new man" also garners support from the *σύν*-language and distinctive imagery of verses 19-22: 1) Gentiles and Jews are now fellow citizens (*συμπολίται*) and "members of the household of God" (v. 19); 2) they are built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets and in Christ, the cornerstone, "the whole building" being joined together (*συναρμολογουμένη*) is growing "into a holy temple in the Lord" (vv. 20-21); and 3) in Christ also, Gentiles and Jews are being built together (*συνοικοδομείσθε*) "into a dwelling place of God in the Spirit" (v. 22).

---

<sup>93</sup>Eadie, *Ephesians*, 168; Barth, *Ephesians* 1:309; Robinson, *Ephesians*, 65; Stuhlmacher, "He is our Peace' (Eph. 2:14)," 190; and Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 143-44.

Additional support can be derived from other Pauline passages. In Galatians 3:21-29, for example, Paul deals with some of the same themes that occur here, even though the context and emphasis are different. According to verses 23-24, the Mosaic Law served its purpose until Christ came. Since that time the essential thing for all people is faith in Christ, for through faith in Him all become sons of God (v. 26). All those who were baptized into Christ and now are "in Christ" have "put on Christ" (v. 27); and these are all one (εἷς, "one new man"?) in Him, whether Jew or Greek, slave or free, male or female (v. 28). One element not found in the Ephesians 2 passage is the clothing imagery in the statement, "you have put on (or, 'clothed yourselves with') Christ." Another example occurs in 1 Corinthians 12:12 where Paul declares that as the physical body is one (εἷς) and has many members, οὕτως καὶ Χριστός. Here "Christ" by metonymy is a shortened form for "the body of Christ" and refers to the Church. These passages support the view that the "one new man" of Ephesians 2:15 is not simply to be found in Christ as an individual but in Christ as an inclusive person in whom all believers, Jew and Gentile alike, are united in a new creation.

In summary, the reality of Christ as a representative and inclusive person who incorporates others in Himself interprets the "one new man" concept the best here.<sup>94</sup> This view recognizes that Jews and Gentiles together are united in Christ who is their peace. We might say that the "one new man" is *prototypically* Jesus Christ, the source, standard, and goal of new life for all believers, but not *exclusively* Jesus Christ because He includes all those He represented in His redemptive work and they (individually) with Him form the new humanity (corporately).

---

<sup>94</sup>Percy, *Der Lieb Christi*, 41-43, is one of the chief advocates of the OT "corporate personality" (solidarity) concept against the Gnostic redeemer myth in the interpretation of Eph. 2:11-22. On this concept in the OT and on rabbinic thought about humankind in Adam, see R. P. Shedd, *Man in Community: A Study of St. Paul's Application of Old Testament and Early Jewish Conceptions of Human Solidarity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964) 132-38; C. F. D. Moule, "The Corporate Christ," in *The Phenomenon of the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Implications of Certain Features of the New Testament*, SBT 1, 2nd series (Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1967) 21-42; and Bruce, *Epistles*, 299-300. See the discussion of this concept in ch. 1, 40-41.



The new creation has removed the old hostility and in so doing peace has been made. The concluding participial clause of verse 15 *ποιῶν εἰρήνην* qualifies *κτίση* and declares this result.<sup>95</sup> In contrast to the three previous *aorist* participles, this *present* participle indicates that at the same time that Jesus Christ created the "two" into "one new man," He brought about a condition of peace between "the two" old enemies, Jews and Gentiles, which is the opposite of enmity in this context (v. 15). Thus, in the abrogation of the Law, the removal of enmity, and the creation of the "one new man," Jesus Christ made peace, or brought about reconciliation, an idea that is taken up immediately in verse 16.

**3.5.3.2 Purpose: To Reconcile Both To God (2:16).** The second half of the *ἵνα* clause (v. 16) is linked to the first half (v. 15b) by *καί*, indicating that *ἀποκατάλλαξις* is coordinate with *κτίση* rather than a consequence of it.<sup>96</sup> This verse, then, expresses the second part of Christ's purpose in making peace. Up to this point the emphasis has been on establishing peace on the horizontal, sociological level between Jews and Gentiles *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* (v. 13). Now this is related to peace or reconciliation on the vertical, theological level of both Jews and Gentiles to God. This comprehensive understanding of peace as (double) reconciliation is a basic contribution of this passage. The fact that Paul mentioned reconciliation between Jews and Gentiles before reconciliation with God simply reflects the sequence of thought he set up in verses 11-13 in terms of the contrast between Gentile and Jew. He treated that issue first and now shows that it is fundamentally bound up with reconciliation to God. Lincoln states correctly that it is going too far to argue that this order reflects "a major theological distinctive of Ephesians, whereby ecclesiology

---

<sup>95</sup>*Ποιῶν* is considered an adverbial participle of result; see Robertson, *Grammar*, 1115; Wallace, *Grammar*, 625-26, 637-39.

<sup>96</sup>Pace Abbott, *Ephesians*, 65, who suggests a consecutive or resultative force for *καί*.

absorbs soteriology."<sup>97</sup>

The double compound verb *ἀποκαταλλάσσω* is found only here and in Colossians 1:20, 22. Since it is not found prior to Paul, it is probably a word coined by him. Its meaning and use are basically the same as those of the simpler form *καταλλάσσω*, though with perhaps added emphasis.<sup>98</sup> Paul is the only New Testament writer to use these terms, and in every instance they have the sense of "to reconcile," or "to be reconciled" (passive).<sup>99</sup> Though not used frequently, these terms provide one of the basic concepts of his theology. To reconcile is to end a relationship of enmity and replace it with one of peace and goodwill.<sup>100</sup> For Paul, reconciliation has been effected by the work of Christ and usually relates to the restoration of sinful humanity to a favorable relationship with God both from an objective and a subjective standpoint (Rom. 5:9-11; 2 Cor. 5:18-20).<sup>101</sup>

In this passage, Paul applies the term to Jews and Gentiles. Through His death on the cross, Christ reconciled *both* (*τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους*) to God in *one* (*ἐνί*) body. Three items call for further comment. First, Christ, rather than God (as usual in

---

<sup>97</sup>Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 144; Arnold, *Ephesians*, 162-65; pace Merklein, *Christus*, 62-71. The theological aspect of reconciliation to God from Eph. 1 has not been forgotten in Eph. 2.

<sup>98</sup>While the prefix *ἀπό* may denote the idea of "again," it is probable that it simply strengthens the basic meaning of the verb here without suggesting that there is restoration of an earlier state of peace with God (Abbott, *Ephesians*, 66; Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:265).

<sup>99</sup>The verb *καταλλάσσω* is used of the reconciliation of people with one another (1 Cor. 7:11) and with God (Rom. 5:10 [twice]; 2 Cor. 5:18-20; and in Col. 1:20, 22 and Eph. 2:16 using *ἀποκαταλλάσσω*). The noun *καταλλάγη* is also found in the sense of reconciliation only in Paul (Rom. 5:11; 11:15; 2 Cor. 5:18, 19).

<sup>100</sup>BAGD, s.v. *ἀποκαταλλάσσω* and *καταλλάσσω*; Büchsel, *TDNT*, 1:255-59; Vorländer and Brown, *NIDNTT*, 3:166-74. Positively, this verb means "to make peace," while negatively, it means "to remove enmity." The latter clears the way for the former in effecting reconciliation.

<sup>101</sup>On reconciliation in Paul, see J. A. Fitzmyer, "Reconciliation in Pauline Theology," in *No Famine in the Land*, ed. J. W. Flanagan and A. W. Robinson (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1975) 155-77; I. H. Marshall, "The Meaning of 'Reconciliation,'" in *Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology*, ed. R. A. Guelich (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 117-32; P. Stuhlmacher, "The Gospel of Reconciliation in Christ—Basic Features and Issues of a Biblical Theology of the New Testament," *HBT* 1 (1979) 161-90; Martin, *Reconciliation: A Study of Paul's Theology*, 160-67; and S. E. Porter, *Katallassō in Ancient Greek Literature with Reference to the Pauline Writings* (Córdoba: Ediciones El Almendro, 1994).

Paul), is the One who reconciles. As the one who brings peace, He effects reconciliation with God through the cross. This is not a problem in view of the high christology of this letter and the fact that Christ is the agent of the Father.<sup>102</sup> He is also the subject of *κτίση* in the previous clause (v. 15b), indicating that the reconciliation of Jews and Gentiles "in one (*ἐνί*) body" is a parallel thought to the creation of the two groups into "one (*ἕνα*) new man" resolving the situation of hostility between them.

Second, the phrase *ἐν ἐνί σώματι* preserves the horizontal perspective of the previous clause and is best taken as a reference to the Church as the Body of Christ<sup>103</sup> rather than the physical crucified body of Christ<sup>104</sup> or a combination of both ideas.<sup>105</sup> This is supported by the qualifying adjective *ἐνί* (cf. Eph. 4:4; Col. 1:18; 3:15) instead of *αὐτοῦ* and the accompanying phrase *διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ*, a reference to Christ's death that was the means by which the reconciliation took place. Also, the entity called "one" (*ἕν / εἷς*) in verses 14-18 refers to the Church and, throughout Ephesians, the Church is often referred to as the Body of Christ (1:23; 4:4; 12, 16; 5:23, 30).

Third, the reconciliation of *both* Jews and Gentiles to God (*τῷ θεῷ*) adds a key element to Paul's argument. It is clear from verse 12 that the Gentiles were alienated from God as well as from Israel. But verses 12-13 give the impression that Israel is near to God and not alienated from Him. Nevertheless, in verse 16, Paul

<sup>102</sup>Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:266.

<sup>103</sup>Abbott, *Ephesians*, 66; Gnllka, *Epheserbrief*, 143-44; Merklein, *Christus und die Kirche*, 45-47; Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 117; Gundry, *Sōma*, 239; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 144-45; and Best, *Ephesians*, 265. For a helpful discussion of the Church as the Body of Christ, see Schweizer, *TDNT*, 7:1067-80, Best, *One Body*, 83-159; and J. D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998) 548-61.

<sup>104</sup>Pace E. Haupt, *Die Gefangenschaftsbriege*, 8th ed., KEKNT 8-9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902) 85-87; Percy, *Probleme*, 280-84; and Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:297-98, esp. 297 n194. This view picks up on *τῷ αἵματι* (v. 13) and *τῇ σαρκί* (v. 14), but these words are qualified by *τοῦ Χριστοῦ* and *αὐτοῦ* respectively.

<sup>105</sup>Pace Schweizer, *TDNT*, 7:1073, 1077-78; Schlier, *Epheser*, 135-36; and Stuhlmacher, "He is our Peace' (Eph. 2:14)," 190.

speaks about the reconciliation of *both* to God through the death of Christ. This makes clear that Christ's death and resurrection not only affected the Gentiles' status (v. 13) but also put Israel's status in a different light. Paul has already declared that all humanity, both Jews and Gentiles alike, are under God's wrath (v. 3). The same Law that was like a wall separating Gentiles from Israel and Israel's God also confirmed Israel's sinful separation from God as Paul pointed out elsewhere (cf. Gal. 3:10-22; Rom. 3:19-20; 9:30-10:4). Both Jews and Gentiles, then, were in a state of enmity not only with each other but also with God. Christ, through His death, has reconciled both to God, and at the same time, having reconciled them to each other, He created a new humanity, the "one new man."

The concluding clause of verse 16 containing *τὴν ἔχθραν* reinforces the same thought found in the *τὴν ἔχθραν . . . καταργήσας* clause of verses 14c-15a, and reiterates the negative side of *ποιῶν εἰρήνην* in the preceding clause (v. 15b). The aorist participle *ἀποκτείνας* is fitting following a reference to the cross, which is an instrument of death. It probably expresses antecedent time to *ἀποκαταλλάξῃ*: "He reconciled both . . . to God . . . after putting to death (i.e., killing) the hostility in Himself." Though personified here, *τὴν ἔχθραν* is to be understood as it was used in verse 14c, namely, as a reference to the hostility between Jews and Gentiles<sup>106</sup> rather than hostility between humanity and God,<sup>107</sup> or a reference to both kinds of hostility. Nevertheless, the enmity between Jews and Gentiles is removed by their common status of peace with God. The *ἐν αὐτῷ* phrase could refer to the cross, the closest antecedent,<sup>108</sup> but, in keeping with the use of *αὐτός* as masculine in its various

---

<sup>106</sup>Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 146; Best, *Ephesians*, 266.

<sup>107</sup>Pace Haupt, *Gefangenschaftsbriefe*, 85-87; and Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:264, 291. This view overlooks the fact that the aorist participle, *ἀποκτείνας*, refers back to Christ's action before He reconciled both in one body to God.

<sup>108</sup>Robinson, *Ephesians*, 65; Gnllka, *Epheserbrief*, 144; Bruce, *Epistles*, 300 n127; Best, *Ephesians*, 266. This view takes the dative pronoun *αὐτῷ* as neuter rather than masculine, but this is unusual in christological texts without further warrant.

forms in verses 14-16, it is better to understand the phrase reflexively as a reference to Christ Himself as the One who killed the enmity and brought reconciliation by His death on the cross.<sup>109</sup> At this point, Paul proceeds to present the results of Christ's reconciling activity.

### 3.5.4 Ephesians 2:17-18: The Results of Christ Being Our Peace

Not only does Christ embody peace and not only has He secured it for others, but He has also proclaimed it to Jews and Gentiles, and through Him they both as "one new man" have access to God.

**3.5.4.1 Proclamation of Peace (2:17).** The words *καὶ ἐλθῶν* (aorist participle) provide a transition that links verse 17 to the programmatic statement about peace in verse 14a and its subsequent development in verses 14b-16. The understood subject continues to be Jesus Christ, and His work as proclaimer is the focal point. This raises the question about what specific occasion of His ministry is in view. When did Christ preach peace? Was it before, during, or after His death and resurrection? Several different solutions have been offered.<sup>110</sup> Most likely a inter-related cluster of events is in view. If *καὶ ἐλθῶν* is a transitional reference back to verses 14-16, then the "coming" was Christ's incarnational coming that culminated in His death bringing reconciliation, and the "proclamation" was the good news of peace that He secured by His death in which He made peace and in so doing proclaimed it to Gentiles and Jews. But Christ's death and resurrection was also the content of the proclamation that continued through the apostles and other messengers.<sup>111</sup> For

---

<sup>109</sup>Abbott, *Ephesians*, 66; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 146; and Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 117. Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:297, concludes that the two interpretations "in his own person" and "on the cross" must be held together and combined. In context, these are not mutually exclusive ideas, but the personal reference is more likely.

<sup>110</sup>For a discussion and evaluation of various views, see Best, *Ephesians*, 271-73. If forced to choose, the view Best prefers is either the proclamation of Christ's earthly life itself, or the proclamation of the risen Christ through the preaching of the apostles and others.

<sup>111</sup>Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 149, concludes that it is "the effect of that accomplishment on the

Paul, then, Christ embodies peace both in deed (vv. 14-16) and word (v. 17).

The remaining language of verse 17 takes up the terms *μακράν* and *έγγύς* used in verse 13 and combines the verb *εὐαγγελίζω* from Isaiah 52:7 with the wording of Isaiah 57:19.<sup>112</sup> The original reference of *τοῖς μακράν . . . τοῖς έγγύς* in Isaiah 57:19 referred to two groups of Jews, namely, those who lived "afar" in exile and those who remained "near" in the land. In later Jewish interpretations of this text, the terms *μακράν* and *έγγύς* came to refer to other divisions within Israel, including a line of interpretation that understood *μακράν* of Isaiah 57:19 as a reference to Gentile proselytes. They were those who came "near" (קרר, i.e., entered) the community of Israel and shared in its blessings.<sup>113</sup>

In light of Paul's comments in verses 11-12, it may well be along the lines of traditional proselyte terminology that he formulates his statement in verse 13. The difference, signaled by *νυνὶ δέ*, is that now, because of Christ's death on the cross, Paul can broaden the scope of the "far" who have come "near" from proselytes to Judaism to all Gentiles who have become Christians. In the same way, in light of Christ's reconciling work, when the "far" and "near" terminology prompted the allusion to Isaiah 57:19 in verse 17, Paul applied it to his Gentile readers and Jews.<sup>114</sup>

---

cross (v. 16) which can be identified as a preaching of the good news of peace to the far off, the Gentiles, and a preaching of that same good news to the near, the Jews." The aorist participle, *έλθών*, following *καί* is adverbial, either antecedent temporal ("And after He came . . ."), or contemporaneous temporal ("And when He came . . ."), or attendant circumstance ("And He came and . . .") to *εὐηγγελίσατο* (cf. Wallace, *Grammar*, 614-15, 624-25, 640-43). The first option is preferred.

<sup>112</sup>Gnilka, *Epheserbrieff*, 150, pays minimal attention to these Isaiah texts and assumes that, in his reconstructed hymn, the terms "far" and "near" designated cosmic powers originally. But Stuhlmacher, "He is our Peace' (Eph. 2:14)," 187, shows that this assumption has no support in Jewish interpretation of these Isaiah texts.

<sup>113</sup>Lincoln, "The Use of the OT in Ephesians," 27-28, and id., *Ephesians*, 146-47. The verb קרר is also used in Qumran literature for the idea of bringing a person into the community (cf. 1QH 14.14; 1QS 6.16, 22; 8.18; 9.15f).

<sup>114</sup>Ibid., 28; pace D. C. Smith, "The Ephesian Heresy," in *Society of Biblical Literature: 1974 Proceedings* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974) 45-54; and Martin, *Reconciliation*, 191-92.

Lincoln points out several differences in the wording of Ephesians 2:17 when compared to the wording of LXX Isaiah 57:19: *εἰρήνην ἐπ' εἰρήνην τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ τοῖς ἐγγύς οὖσιν*. One important variation is that the double reference to peace at the beginning of the LXX text has been split up so that *εἰρήνην* occurs with both *τοῖς μακρὰν* and *τοῖς ἐγγύς*, emphasizing that the peace Jesus Christ procured is to be proclaimed to both groups, Gentiles and Jews. Is this peace primarily peace between the two groups (vv. 14b-15) or peace with God (v. 16)? Lincoln argues that the wording of the verse, which has peace being preached to the two groups separately, makes it harder to take a horizontal, sociological need for peace as the primary reference. The emphasis of the rewording indicates that peace on the vertical level—peace with God—has now become the primary concern.<sup>115</sup> Verse 16 has already combined the two perspectives by speaking of a reconciliation of the two groups *ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι* and *τῷ θεῷ*. The first is horizontal; the second is vertical. Both "the near" as well as "the far" require reconciliation with God.<sup>116</sup> Then, verse 17, by talking of a proclamation of peace by Christ to each of the two groups, makes the vertical reference dominant. This is further reinforced in verse 18 by the statement that through Christ the two groups now have access *πρὸς τὸν πατέρα*. So, Christ proclaims peace with God to both Jews and Gentiles, but as verses 14-15 make clear, this has profound implications for peace between Jews and Gentiles on the horizontal level.

A further modification is Paul's addition of *ὑμῖν* before *τοῖς μακρὰν*. Here, he takes up again the second person plural pronoun from verse 13, where he addressed his Gentile Christian readers. This reminds them specifically of the new situation into which they have now come as Christians. This also suggests that the material in

---

<sup>115</sup>Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 148; also Mussner, *Christus*, 101-102; Burger, *Schöpfung*, 155; and Wolter, *Rechtfertigung*, 71; pace Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:278.

<sup>116</sup>Paul does not say how it is that Jews also are alienated from God and need reconciliation, but elsewhere he points out that transgression of the Law had separated them from God and confined them to a state of condemnation and slavery (cf. Gal. 3:10-22; 2 Cor. 3:7-11; Rom. 2:17-27; 3:9-20; 9:30-10:4). See discussion on pp. 183-84 above.

verses 14-16 provides a preparation for the christological interpretation of Isaiah 52:7 and 57:19 in verse 17, where Paul uses this Old Testament language to address them.

**3.5.4.2 Access To God (2:18).** Verse 18 reinforces verse 17 by emphasizing that Christ provides access to God for *both* groups to whom He preached peace and who constitute the "one new man." The theological distance between both the "far" and "near" and God no longer exists. The introductory *ὅτι* with its clause could be taken in apposition to *εἰρήνη* (v. 17) giving the content of the peace that was proclaimed.<sup>117</sup> But the content has already been expressed in verses 14-16. Alternatively, *ὅτι* could be understood in a loosely causal or confirmatory sense<sup>118</sup> modifying *εὐηγγελίσαστο* and introducing the basis for the statement in verse 17. However, verse 18 appears to provide the result rather than the basis for verse 17. Consequently, it is better to understand *ὅτι* in a consecutive sense ("with the result that") modifying *εὐηγγελίσαστο* and introducing the effect for both Jews and Gentiles coming from the proclamation of peace with God in verse 17 (cf. Rom. 5:1-2).<sup>119</sup>

The subject of this clause, *οἱ ἀμφότεροι*, stands in apposition to the pronoun "we" in the present tense verb *ἔχομεν*, which emphasizes the abiding privilege of *προσαγωγή*. This word could be understood in the transitive sense of "an introduction" or the intransitive sense of "access, approach." In all three New Testament uses (Rom. 5:2; Eph. 2:18; 3:12) the intransitive sense is best.<sup>120</sup> Christ acts to create access to God (cf. 3:12). The idea of access to God in contrast to alienation (cf. 2:12) has cultic associations from the Old Testament even for Gentiles who come and pray

---

<sup>117</sup>BAGD, s.v. *ὅτι*, 1.b; Eadie, *Ephesians*, 186.

<sup>118</sup>BAGD, s.v. *ὅτι*, 3; BDF, §456; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 149. Abbott, *Ephesians*, 67, treats *ὅτι* in a confirmatory sense, giving the proof of what precedes in v. 17.

<sup>119</sup>BAGD, s.v. *ὅτι*, 1.d.γ, pace Best, *Ephesians*, 273, who says v. 18 "summarizes and explains what has gone before."

<sup>120</sup>BAGD, s.v. *προσαγωγή*; Schmidt, *TDNT*, 1:130-34; Abbott, *Ephesians*, 67; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 149; Best, *Ephesians*, 273; pace Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:268.



toward the temple (1 Kings 8:41-43), and are seen prophetically as coming to Zion to offer sacrifices, seek the Lord, and pray (Isa. 56:6-8; Zech. 8:20-23).

Now, apart from the temple and legal prescriptions, the privilege of access to God—formerly enjoyed in a limited way only by the Jews—has been provided in a new way for both Jews and Gentiles together. This new arrangement, which replaces the old, is amplified by the three phrases that modify the statement *ἔχομεν τὴν προσαγωγήν*. First, access is provided through Christ (*δι' αὐτοῦ*, emphatic position) who has reconciled both to God thereby putting an end to the enmity between them (v. 16). Second, both have access *ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι*.<sup>121</sup> In the sphere of the flesh (v. 11) there was division between Jew and Gentile, but now in the sphere of the same Spirit there is peace (vv. 14b-15) and access to God (v. 18). This phrase is parallel to *ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι* in verse 16, suggesting a link between "one body" and "one Spirit," a theme that Paul develops elsewhere (cf. 4:4; 1 Cor. 12:4-13). It confirms that Christ has created something new (v. 15) since the realm of the Spirit replaces the Jerusalem temple as the place of access into God's presence. Third, the access both Jews and Gentiles have is *πρὸς τὸν πατέρα*, a new relationship to God as Father (cf. 1:5; 4:6; Gal. 4:6; Rom. 8:15-16). Access to the presence of God as Father through Christ in one Spirit, then, is the remarkable result derived from the proclamation of peace with God to both Jews and Gentiles. Those "far off" have indeed been brought "near." The enjoyment of this new privilege by *both* groups is also evidence of the peace established between them.

---

<sup>121</sup>Word order and contextual parallels indicate that this phrase has a locative (sphere), or possibly an instrumental means function here, but not agency (Wallace, *Grammar*, 372-74). Some interpreters understand *πνεύματι* as a reference to the *human* spirit or disposition, but this ignores a reference to the Father, Son and Spirit that appears to be intentional since several such associations occur in Ephesians (cf. 1:4-14; 2:22; 4:4-6). The unifying power of the Spirit reflects Paul's understanding that the resurrected Lord continues to be active and effective in His Church through the Spirit (3:16), giving and sustaining life (1 Cor. 15:45) and freedom (2 Cor. 3:17-18). On the relation between the Body of Christ and the Spirit, see Best, *Ephesians*, 274.

### 3.6 Concluding Observations on the "One New Man"

The designation *εἰς καινὸς ἄνθρωπος* in Ephesians 2:15 occurs in a context in which Paul contrasts his Gentile readers' pre-Christian past with their Christian present. The contrast schema *ποτέ . . . νῦν* (v. 13) is explicit and significant to the whole passage. Once (*ποτέ*) Gentiles were "far off" (*μακράν*), alienated from Israel's covenant privileges and Israel's God. Previously, because of the special covenant status of the Jews in relation to God in redemptive history, there was a fundamental difference and deep-seated enmity between Jews and Gentiles. This distinction in religious existence affected all other social relationships as well. But now (*νῦν δέ*), through Christ, the Peacemaker, they have been brought "near" (*ἐγγύς*) to God and His salvific blessings. In His death, Christ removed the cause of hostility between Jews and Gentiles in order that in Himself He might create "the two"—the formerly alienated Jew and Gentile—into "one new man," thus making peace.

The reference to Christ as the creator of something new that overcomes and transcends old divisions sets up a contrast with the first creation involving the first man, Adam, the inclusive representative of the old order. The corporate structure of the old order / realm, established by fallen Adam and dominated by the power of sin and death, has a "solidarity group" comprised of all those who belong to him, namely, the "old (fallen) humanity." By contrast, through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, a new order / realm has been established that has a "solidarity group" comprised of all those, Jew or Gentile, who are incorporated into Christ, namely, a new creation, the "new (redeemed) humanity." This is the "one (vs. "two") new (vs. "old") man" Christ has created by incorporating reconciled Jews and Gentiles in Himself. He has made the two—believing Jews and Gentiles—into one reconciled community where both are no longer what they once were in relation to God. Corporate solidarity with Christ comes to dominate the concept of the "new man" so strongly that believers as the Body of Christ can be called the "one new man" (Eph.

2:15; cf. Gal. 3:28). This is a redemptive-historical, not an individual, change although it involves individuals. It is a change in soteriological, not ethnic, status that transcends the age-old division between Jews and Gentiles, the prototype of all human hostility.

The word *καινός* stresses the qualitative newness brought about by Jesus Christ. Through the cross He put the Mosaic legal system out of operation for it had served its purpose, killed the enmity between Jew and Gentile, and united them in a "oneness" (ἕν, v. 14). In making peace where once there had been deep religious and social division, He created the two into "one new man" and at the same time reconciled both to God. Now, together, Jewish and Gentile believers share equally in the blessings of the new era of salvation. *Καινός* denotes the new things that have come through Christ and highlights the contrast between the old situation represented by *ἔχθρα* and the new situation represented by *εἰρήνη*, bringing a new religious unity of Jew and Gentile in Christ.

In keeping with the language of this passage, the "one new man" refers to the new redeemed humanity that belongs to the corporate structure of the new order / realm established by Jesus Christ and dominated by the power of righteousness and life. This corporate structure has: 1) a "founding father" in the inclusive representative figure, Jesus Christ, the prototypical "new man" (2:14-16; cf. Rom. 5:15-19); 2) a "solidarity group" comprised of those who belong to Him, the new humanity (2:14-16; cf. Rom. 5:15-19); 3) a way of life that those "in Christ" pursue (2:10; 4:1–6:20); and 4) a destiny to which they go—eternal life (1:13-14; 2:6-7; cf. Rom. 6:22-23). Given these associations, the "new man" metaphor functions primarily at the corporate level in this passage. The designation is appropriate because it comes about by the uniting of Jews and Gentiles in the inclusive, prototypical new man, Jesus Christ. Together they (individually) form the new humanity (corporately), of which Christ is the Head. This new corporate entity is

also depicted as "one body" (2:16), which earlier was identified as the "Body of Christ," namely, the Church (Eph. 1:22-23). The "one new man," then, is created and constituted a community of many persons, both Jews and Gentiles together, who are reconciled to one another and to God by Jesus Christ.

At this point, we turn our attention to Colossians 3:9-11 and Ephesians 4:22-24, two passages in paraenetic contexts that use clothing imagery and contain a reference to both the "old" and the "new man." We must examine these texts to see how Paul uses this double metaphor. We look first at Colossians 3:9-11.

## CHAPTER 4

### COLOSSIANS 3:9-11

#### THE OLD MAN PUT OFF / THE NEW MAN PUT ON

The words "having put off the old man . . . and having put on the new [man]" occur in Colossians 3:9-10. This text is a primary reference to the "old man" and the "new man" in the *corpus Paulinum* and the first to mention both the terms together along with the "put off / put on" imagery. In light of this, an exegetical study of this text in its context is important to our investigation. Once again we shall speak of the author as the Apostle Paul.<sup>1</sup> Following a discussion of the historical setting of Colossians (4.1), the literary context of Colossians 3 (4.2), and the structural form of Colossians 3:1-11 (4.3), the chapter proceeds with an exegesis of Colossians 3:5-11, especially 3:9-11 (4.4), and concludes with observations on the "old man / new man" (4.5).

#### 4.1 Historical Setting of Colossians

The town of Colossae was located on the banks of the Lycus River in western Asia Minor, about 100 miles inland from Ephesus. Like other towns in the region at that time, it had its share of religious syncretism, including the presence of Judaism in one form or another. It is reasonable to suppose that Christianity was introduced to Colossae by Epaphras, a native of the town (Col. 4:12). Though not stated directly, it is probable that he was converted to Christianity and trained by the Apostle Paul during Paul's two- to three-year stay in Ephesus (Acts 19:10; 20:31). Later, as Paul's representative, Epaphras carried the Christian gospel to his own hometown (Col. 1:7-8) and exercised painstaking pastoral care there and in the neighboring towns of Laodicea and Hierapolis (4:13). Apparently through his

---

<sup>1</sup>See the discussion and support for this view in ch. 1, pp. 6-11.

preaching and teaching, the Colossian Christians were well instructed in the Christian faith (2:6-7).

Paul writes this letter to the predominantly Gentile Christian congregation in Colossae (cf. 1:12, 21, 27; 2:13). It appears to be prompted by a visit from Epaphras who informs Paul about the spread of the gospel in the Lycus Valley region and brings an encouraging report of events there (Col. 1:6, 8, 9; 2:5). But his report also includes some troublesome news about "false teaching" that was threatening the Colossian Christians (2:8, 16-23). Paul takes Epaphras' report seriously and by means of the Colossian letter sets out, with some restraint, to refute this erroneous teaching that he regarded as a denial of the apostolic gospel. Apparently, Epaphras was not free to return to Colossae when the letter was sent, so Tychicus was commissioned to carry it there and to convey news concerning Paul and his associates, especially Epaphras (4:12; cf. Eph. 6:21-22).

Since Paul gives no formal exposition of the "error" facing the Colossian Christians, modern interpreters are forced to reconstruct it from the counter-arguments he puts forward and the meaning of the terms and slogans he apparently takes up from his opponents and uses for apologetic purposes. The identification of what some call "the Colossian heresy" has long occupied the attention of New Testament scholars, and the discussion has produced a variety of opinions.<sup>2</sup>

For our purposes, it is sufficient to say that this erroneous teaching probably grew out of the intellectual and religious syncretism of the Greco-Roman

---

<sup>2</sup>For a survey of the discussion with references, see W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, rev. ed., trans. H. C. Kee (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975) 338-40; also F. O. Francis and W. A. Meeks, eds., *Conflict at Colossae: A Problem in the Interpretation of Early Christianity Illustrated by Selected Modern Studies*, 2nd ed., SBLSPS 4 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1975); M. D. Hooker, "Were There False Teachers in Colossae?" in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament*, eds. B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973) 315-31; and J. J. Gunther, *St. Paul's Opponents and their Background. A Study of Apocalyptic and Jewish Sectarian Teachings* (Leiden: Brill, 1973). That Gunther lists 44 different views indicates there is no consensus on the nature of the false teaching (3-4). In addition, see the discussions in the major commentaries.

culture of the period. Phrygia, the region in which Colossae was located, was well suited to the amalgamation of various beliefs and practices.<sup>3</sup> Free-thinking diaspora Judaism was open to speculative ideas from the Hellenistic world. Against this background, Christianity would have been readily viewed by some as another new cult to be assimilated with both Hellenistic Judaism and Hellenistic religious philosophy and mysticism. Thus, "the Colossian error" appears to be composite in nature.<sup>4</sup> Paul describes the false teaching as "deceptive philosophy" that rests upon "human tradition" and "the elements (*τὰ στοιχεῖα*) of the world" (2:8; cf. 2:20; Gal. 4:3, 9).<sup>5</sup> It minimized the person and work of Christ, viewing Him as one among many mediating beings between God and man, and it prescribed a program of rigorous asceticism and self-denial in order for a person to participate in heavenly visions, to observe angelic worship, and thereby to gain "fullness of life" (2:16-18, 23). This made one privy to the wisdom of God and demonstrated that one possessed the special knowledge necessary for salvation. In short, the "Colossian heresy" appears to have been an innovative attempt to attain "divine fullness" (*πλήρωμα*).

Paul, however, repudiated the heresy because it denegated Christ. All the fullness of the Godhead was in Him, and in Him were all the treasures of wisdom and

---

<sup>3</sup>On the intellectual and religious syncretism of Greco-Roman culture, see H. Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982) 1:164-203.

<sup>4</sup>This is challenged by N. T. Wright, *The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians and to Philemon*, TNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986) 24-30, who argues that all the elements of Paul's polemic in Colossians make sense as a warning against the claims of Judaism by portraying Judaism itself as if it were just another pagan religion, that is, a "philosophy" (2:8) developed by human tradition (2:8, 22). To follow it would be to return to the same type of religion the new converts had recently abandoned.

<sup>5</sup>What precisely Paul meant by the phrase *τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου* is still debated. Does he mean: 1) "elementary instruction" of this present world (cf. Heb. 5:12); 2) "divinized elemental substances," viz., powerful spirit beings or heavenly powers who control the present world order; or 3) "basic elements" on which the existence of pre-Christian man rests, viz., the powers of law, flesh, and sin that dominate people in this world? We incline toward the second view. Cf. Philo, *Aet.* 107, and *Cont.* 3. For a survey of views with references, see H.-H. Esser, "Law-στοιχεῖα," *NIDNTT*, 2:451-56; J. Blinzler, "Lexikalisches zu dem Terminus *τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κοσμοῦ* bei Paulus," in *SPCIC 1961*, AnBib 17-18 (Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1963) 429-43; and P. T. O'Brien, *Colossians, Philemon*, WBC 44 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1982) 129-32.

knowledge (Col. 2:3, 9-10). One did not need secret knowledge from visions to learn the mystery of God's purposes and activities. Asceticism, adherence to the calendar, and circumcision were all unnecessary. Submission to these things was an attempt to find completion and fulfillment apart from Christ. All this is superfluous. Christ is the true reality, and all these prescriptions are merely shadows (2:16-23). In Christ believers are complete in their standing before God, and, thus, they need nothing else for Christian living. All this is important to the "new man."

#### **4.2 Literary Context of Colossians 3**

Many interpreters recognize that Colossians has three main parts: exposition in 1:3–2:5, refutation of error in 2:6–3:4, and exhortations in 3:5–4:6, framed by an opening salutation (1:1-2) and the closing greetings and blessing (4:7-18). In part one (1:3–2:5), Paul offers a prayer of thanksgiving for the Christians in Colossae (1:3-8) that turns into a splendid intercession on their behalf (1:9-14). Then he forthrightly presents the unique and complete preeminence and power of Jesus Christ as creator and reconciler, both in relation to "all things" in general and in relation to the new creation, the Church, in particular (1:15-20). Out of this grows his initial statement of purpose for writing. By drawing on his overall theological understanding, he writes to help the Colossian believers develop the genuine Christian maturity that God wills for His people (1:21–2:5). He wants them to have a proper understanding of God's mystery, namely, the indwelling Christ in whom the totality of wisdom and knowledge is found and is made available to all (2:2-3).

At this point the second part of the letter (2:6–3:4) begins to unfold. Paul turns to the relationship of the Colossian believers to Christ. He confirms the teaching that they already have been given (2:6-7) and issues the command to "walk (live) in Christ." He then attacks certain teachings that would prevent them from doing this in the mature way he desires to see (2:8-19). As these verses



suggest, they were being pressured to "complete" their conversion by accepting rigorous ascetic regulations, but Paul protests against this. Negatively, the legalism of such "philosophy" is empty and irrelevant since believers "died with Christ" and have been set free from the control of all hostile powers (2:16-23, especially 20). By faith as proclaimed in baptism, the believer accepts Christ's death as his own and commits himself to the fact that his former life in bondage to these spiritual powers and regulations has come to an end with Christ at the cross. Positively, believers have been "raised with Christ" to a new life that unites them with Him (3:1-4). The outcome of dying and rising with Christ brings with it the obligation to live as citizens of the kingdom of God's Son into which they have been transferred (cf. 1:13). They must set their minds on the things that are above—the hidden realities of glorified life in the world above—not things that belong to the earth. Paul's emphasis on the present realization of resurrection life for believers is probably designed to counter the claims of the false teachers for a fuller, more complete salvation. However, even though they have entered upon this life already, its consummation and full manifestation will not take place until Christ, who is its embodiment, appears (3:4).<sup>6</sup>

In part three (3:5–4:6), Paul shifts his emphasis from doctrinal indicatives to ethical imperatives. However, he does not leave the indicative behind for it is

---

<sup>6</sup>Much has been made of the fact that in Colossians (and Eph. 2:5-6) Paul speaks of believers as having already been raised with Christ, whereas in Rom. 6 he views resurrection with Christ as an event still future. Some interpreters see this as a sign of a post-Pauline author for Colossians: e.g., E. Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon*, trans. W. R. Poehlmann and R. J. Karris (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971) 104, 134 n13, 180; R. C. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising with Christ. A Study in Pauline Theology*, BZNW 32 (Berlin: Töplemann, 1967) 47-54; and E. Grässer, "Kol 3,1-4 als Beispiel einer Interpretation secundum homines recipientes," *ZThK* 64 (1967) 139-68. In both passages, however, both elements—the "already" and the "not yet"—are represented, though with different degrees of emphasis. The "already" aspect is implicit in Rom. 6:4, 10, 11, 13 and explicit in Col. 3:1-2, while the "not yet" aspect is expressed in Rom. 6:5, 8, and Col. 3:4, 6, 24. See O'Brien, *Colossians*, 165-69; and A. T. Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet: Studies in the Role of the Heavenly Dimension in Paul's Thought with Special Reference to His Eschatology*, SNTSMS 43 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981) 122-34.

interwoven with his exhortations.<sup>7</sup> The double assertion—"since you died with Christ . . . since you have been raised with Christ . . ." (3:1)—is amplified in 3:5-11 and 3:12-17, concluding with the command in 3:17 to do all things in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through Him, which is more or less the sum and substance of his whole appeal. In 3:5-11, Paul describes the life of the "old age / realm" and urges the Colossian believers to make a clean break with it; and in 3:12-17 he encourages them to embrace the lifestyle of the "new age / realm." He applies it in more detail to three areas: the home (3:18-21), the workplace (3:22–4:1), and in witness to the world (4:2-6). In the final section (4:7-18) he conveys greetings from fellow workers who are with him and expresses greetings to other churches in the region of Colossae. In light of this contextual overview, we turn our attention to 3:1-11 to set the stage for an exegesis of 3:5-11.

### 4.3 Structural Form of Colossians 3:1-11

Colossians 3:1-4 serve as an important transition section in the letter.<sup>8</sup> On one hand, they conclude Paul's polemic against the "philosophy" of the false teachers (2:8-23) and provide the true alternative to their erroneous teaching. The inferential *οὖν* (v. 1) indicates that what follows draws upon the preceding line of argument. On the other hand, these verses provide the theological basis (the "indicative") for the

---

<sup>7</sup>Though this shift in emphasis is characteristic of Paul (e.g., Rom. 1:18–11:36 and Rom. 12:1–15:13), it should not be pressed rigidly. It is not to be explained by a tension between the ideal and the actual, pace A. S. Peake, "The Epistle of Paul to the Colossians" in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, vol. 3, ed. W. R. Nicoll (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1903) 3:537, who states, "Clearly these assertions of verses 1-4 are idealistic. The death and resurrection potentially theirs are to be realized in the putting to death of their members." For a balance, see C. F. D. Moule, *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon*, 3rd ed., CGTC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968) 113; G. B. Caird, *Paul's Letters From Prison (Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon) in the Revised Standard Version*, NCB (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976) 203; and Wright, *Colossians*, 21.

<sup>8</sup>F. Zeilinger, *Der Erstgeborene der Schöpfung. Untersuchungen zur Formalstruktur und Theologie des Kolosserbriefs* (Wien: Herder Verlag, 1974) 60-62; E. Schweizer, *The Letter to the Colossians: A Commentary*, trans. A. Chester (Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1982) 130-31; O'Brien, *Colossians*, 157-58.

immediate exhortations (vv. 1b-2) and the main hortatory part of the letter (the "imperative") that follows (3:5–4:6). The exhortations relate to the way a Christian thinks and lives as summarized in a number of imperatival clauses (cf. 3:1b, 2, 5, 8, 12 et al.). The basis for these exhortations is twofold. First, the Colossian believers have "died with Christ" (3:3a, cf. 2:11-12, 20) to the old order and way of life. Second, as those who have been raised with Christ (3:1a),<sup>9</sup> they now participate in His resurrection life (3:3b) and await the full and open manifestation of their life with Him in the future (3:4).

Verses 5-11 begin the main paraenetic section of the letter (3:5–4:6). This paragraph has been called the "negative paraenesis" since it contains two negative commands, *νεκρώσατε* (v. 5) and *ἀπόθεσθε* (v. 8), along with two catalogs of vices (vv. 5, 8), followed by *μὴ ψεύδεσθε* (v. 9a).<sup>10</sup> The inferential *οὖν* (v. 5) recalls the theological basis for these commands given in verses 1-4. The object of the first imperative (*νεκρώσατε*, v. 5) is *τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, which is defined more precisely by the first catalog of five vices followed by three relative clauses describing the pagan past of the readers. The object of the second imperative (*ἀπόθεσθε*, v. 8) is *τὰ πάντα*, which is defined more precisely by the second catalog of five vices. The *ποτέ / νῦν* ("once-now") contrast schema is used to link the second catalog of vices with the first in a chiastic arrangement: [a] *ἐν οἷς* (cf. v. 5) *καὶ ὑμεῖς* [b] *περιεπατήσατε ποτε . . .* [b'] *νῦν δὲ ἀπόθεσθε* [a'] *καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα . . .* (cf. v. 8b).<sup>11</sup> By this means Paul shows the Colossian Christians how they ought to conduct themselves *now* in contrast to their pre-Christian past (*once*). The third imperative (*μὴ ψεύδεσθε*, v. 9a) is followed by two

<sup>9</sup>The conditional clause introduced by *εἰ* does not express doubt, but means "if, as is the case," "since," denoting an assumption relating to what has already happened; see BAGD, s.v. *εἰ*, I.1; BDF, §372; Delling, *TDNT*, 7:686. This point is confirmed by *ἀπεθάνετε γάρ* in 3:3.

<sup>10</sup>Zeilinger, *Der Erstgeborene*, 63; O'Brien, *Colossians*, 174-75.

<sup>11</sup>P. Tachau, "*Einst*" und "*Jetzt*" im Neuen Testament. *Beobachtungen zu einem urchristlichen Predigtschema in der neutestamentlichen Briefliteratur und zu seiner Vorgeschichte*, FRLANT 105 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972) 124.

parallel aorist participial clauses (*ἀπεκδυσάμενοι . . . καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι . . .*, vv. 9b-10) that contrast the "old man" and the "new man." Finally, verse 11 declares that, within the realm of the "new man," the barriers that separate people from one another are done away, leaving the focus solely on Christ who is "all and in all." As a whole, this paragraph stands in antithetical parallelism with the following section of "positive paraenesis" in 3:12-17. We now turn our attention in more detail to 3:5-11 and Paul's use of the terms "old man" and "new man" in verses 9 and 10.

#### 4.4 Exegesis of Colossians 3:5-11

This section of Paul's ethical appeal is primarily negative. The general exhortation to "set your mind . . . not on earthly things" (v. 2b) finds concrete application in this paragraph. Its focal points are the commands *νεκρώσατε* (v. 5), *ἀπόθεσθε* (v. 8), and *μὴ ψεύδεσθε* (v. 9a). As those who have died and risen with Christ (3:1-4), the Colossian believers are to rid themselves of the vices of their sinful, pre-Christian life (3:5-11) and to clothe themselves with Christian virtues (3:12-17).

It is generally accepted that much of the paraenetic material in the Pauline letters had already been collected and used in the life of the early Church before Paul and others made use of it. Philip Carrington and E. G. Selwyn have done the pioneer work in this area.<sup>12</sup> They have shown that passages of ethical instruction have several things in common, such as agreement in subject matter, distinctive style (e.g., the presence of lists), and a distinctive vocabulary including catchwords that serve as summary headings of ethical teachings. These similarities, they claim, are the result not of literary borrowing, but of the author's drawing on and developing this traditional material in his own way. In compiling such material, use was made of

---

<sup>12</sup>P. Carrington, *The Primitive Christian Catechism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940) 31-65; and E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of Saint Peter*, 2nd ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1947) appended essay II, 363-466, where he compares the ethical sections of Romans, Colossians, Ephesians, 1 Peter and James. Carrington states that this material could be classified under four headings: "put off," "submit," "watch," and "resist." See also G. E. Cannon, *The Use of Traditional Materials in Colossians* (Macon, GA: Mercer Press, 1983) 73-82.

appropriate ideas available from various sources such as Stoic teaching, rabbinic instruction, and the words of Jesus. Judging by New Testament usage, such ethical teaching was post- rather than pre-baptismal instruction.<sup>13</sup>

#### 4.4.1 Colossians 3:5-7: Put To Death What Is Earthly

**4.4.1.1 Colossians 3:5a.** With an inferential *οὖν*,<sup>14</sup> Paul emphasizes the logical connection between theological affirmation and ethical exhortation. This connection introduces the ethical duties stemming from the instruction set forth in 2:20–3:4 with perhaps special reference to the theological basis summarized in 3:3-4. The sense is this: the Colossian believers have a new status (position) before God in the risen Christ, therefore they are to conduct their life in conformity with it. Though the believer's life is "hidden with Christ" at present (v. 3) and is yet to be openly displayed at His parousia (v. 4), it must find authentic expression in his / her present conduct, both negatively (3:5-11) and positively (3:12-17).

Paul's first command in this paraenetic section is the aorist imperative *νεκρώσατε*, which should be taken in an ingressive sense.<sup>15</sup> The verb *νεκρώω*, meaning "to put to death," occurs in an active sense only here (v. 5) in the New Testament.<sup>16</sup> It is used figuratively in accord with the emphasis on "death" in the context (2:11-12,

---

<sup>13</sup>See A. M. Hunter, *Paul and His Predecessors*, rev. ed. (London: SCM Press, 1961) 52-57, 128-31; J. D. G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament*, 2nd ed. (London: SCM Press, 1990) 141-47; and id., *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998) 661-67.

<sup>14</sup>BAGD, s.v. *οὖν*, 1; BDF, §451, 1; A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek in the Light of Historical Research*, 4th ed. (Nashville, TN: Broadman, 1923) 1191-92; W. Nauck, "Das *οὖν*-paräneticum," *ZNW* 49 (1958) 134-35, points out that an *οὖν* frequently connects theological discussion with subsequent paraenetic exhortation that gives the ethical responsibilities stemming from the theological instruction.

<sup>15</sup>B. M. Fanning, *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek*, OTM (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990) 358-61. For further discussion, see ch. 2, 134 n202.

<sup>16</sup>BAGD, s.v. *νεκρώω*; Bultmann, *TDNT*, 4:892-94; Coenen, *NIDNTT*, 1:445. The perfect passive participle form (*νεκρωμένος*) is used in a literal sense in Rom. 4:19 and Heb. 11:12, where in both instances it describes Abraham's body in old age as being "as good as dead," indicating that his procreative capabilities had come to an end.

13, 20; 3:3)<sup>17</sup> and is more appropriate with τὰ μέλη as its object than the verb ἀπόθεσθε used in verse 8 (cf. Rom. 13:12). It appears to be selected with special reference to the aorist indicative ἀπεθάνετε in verse 3: "you died [with Christ] . . . therefore, put to death the members . . . ." The force of this command must be seen in light of its object τὰ μέλη.

Considerable discussion has taken place over the meaning of τὰ μέλη, which was used in the ancient world with a broad range of meaning, including reference to various parts of the human body (cf. Rom. 6:11-13; 8:13).<sup>18</sup> A further difficulty involves the catalog of five vices that is placed rather abruptly in simple apposition to τὰ μέλη. In fact, it is this appositional construction that has given rise to various attempts to explain the words τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.<sup>19</sup> Proposals include taking τὰ μέλη as a vocative subject of the sentence;<sup>20</sup> 2) putting a period after τῆς γῆς and taking the following "vice" nouns as "prospective accusatives" governed by the verb ἀπόθεσθε in verse 8;<sup>21</sup> 3) taking the following five "vice" nouns themselves as the μέλη

---

<sup>17</sup>The figurative use of the adjective νεκρός in Rom. 6:11 has probably been influential here also, except that the governing verb λογίζεσθε is present tense, and Paul makes a different point there than he does here; pace F. F. Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984) 140 n49, who claims that the idea here is synonymous with the statement in Rom. 6:11. See ch. 2, 126-27 at Rom. 6:11.

<sup>18</sup>BAGD, s.v. μέλος; Horst, *TDNT*, 4:555-68; Schütz, *NIDNTT*, 1:229-32. Μέλος occurs 34 times in the NT, of which 29 are in the Pauline corpus. See ch. 2, 133 n192 at Rom. 6:13.

<sup>19</sup>See the survey of proposals in O'Brien, *Colossians*, 176-78. Manuscripts  $\aleph^2$  A C<sup>3</sup> D F G H and most cursives insert ὑμῶν after τὰ μέλη, but it is omitted by P<sup>46</sup>  $\aleph^*$  B C\*  $\psi$  and several cursives. This addition, however, appears to be an accommodation to Pauline usage elsewhere (cf. Rom. 6:13, 19) and is not preferred. Nevertheless, the translation "your members" is acceptable due to the presence of the article τὰ preceding μέλη. The τὰ following μέλη together with the following prepositional phrase may be translated by a relative clause, "which are upon the earth," or the article may make the phrase equivalent to an adjective; thus: "earthly members." See D. B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996) 211-16.

<sup>20</sup>C. Masson, *L'épître de Saint Paul aux Colossiens*, CNT 10 (Paris/Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1950) 142. For the vocative use he appeals to BDF, §147, 2; thus the Colossian believers are being addressed: "Members [of the Body of Christ] put to death . . ." Similarly, N. Turner, *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1965) 104-05. Such a technical use of μέλη is quite improbable in this context.

<sup>21</sup>J. B. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, reprint of 9th ed.

and claiming that the author borrowed this arrangement either from an Iranian "pentaschema" of anthropology,<sup>22</sup> or, from the Gnostic myth of the two cosmic "men," each of whom had five "members" (limbs);<sup>23</sup> 4) taking the "vice" nouns to be "members" of the "old man" as a corporate entity that must be put to death;<sup>24</sup> and 5) taking the "vice" nouns in apposition to τὰ μέλη but treating μέλη by metonymy as a reference to the deeds performed by the bodily members when they are used as instruments of sin (cf. Rom. 8:13).<sup>25</sup>

---

(Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1959) 209-11. With the troublesome accusatives accounted for in this way, Lightfoot states that each person has in himself a two-fold moral potentiality—the "old man" and the "new man" (vv. 9-10). The "old man" with all his members (μέλη, i.e., bodily faculties that cause one to sin) must be "pitilessly slain" (cf. Matt. 5:29) For critique, see Peake, "Colossians," 3:538; Bruce, *Epistles*, 141; note also Moule, *Colossians*, 116.

<sup>22</sup>Lohse, *Colossians*, 137, who follows R. Reitzenstein, *Hellenistic Mystery-Religions: Their Basic Ideas and Significance*, trans. J. E. Stealy from the 3rd German edition, PTMS 15 (Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1978) 338-51. According to Iranian ideas, a person's members are his good or bad deeds out of which his destiny is decided. Reitzenstein claims that a parallel can be found for comparing an abstract quality to a limb in CH 12.21, "life and immortality" are, as a variant reads, μέλη of God. But these parallels come from a later period and are remote from this passage.

<sup>23</sup>E. Käsemann, *Leib und Leib Christi: Eine Untersuchung zur paulinischen Begrifflichkeit*, BHT 9 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1933) 137-59, esp. 150; but see Lohse, *Colossians*, 137. J. Gnllka, *Der Kolosserbrief*, HTKNT 10.1 (Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 1980) 179-81, argues for a complex background that combines elements of Greco-Roman, Jewish, and Iranian thought. Schweizer, *Colossians*, 182-88, combines ideas from Philo and apocalyptic literature as the background. J. D. G. Dunn, *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) 213 n19, states that this text does not require these complex views, both of which are dependent on studies by Reitzenstein. J. R. Levison, "2 Apoc. Bar. 48:42-52:7 and the Apocalyptic Dimension of Colossians 3:1-6," *JBL* 108 (1989) 93-108, provides an incisive critique of both Gnllka's (104-05) and Schweizer's (105-06) proposal. Instead, he shows that "the unified, consistent background of apocalyptic eschatology, which 2 Apoc. Bar. 48:42-52:7 preserves, explains the allusive language of Col. 3:1-6" (94).

<sup>24</sup>Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 50-52. He argues that Paul understands Christ's death as an inclusive event in which a corporate entity was put to death, so when he refers to dying with Christ or stripping off the "old man," he is speaking about what has taken place in Christ's cross, a connection associated with baptism during an early, pre-Pauline period (7-14, 22-28). For further discussion of this view see ch. 2, 107-09. See also O'Brien, *Colossians*, 178; pace J. A. T. Robinson, *The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology*, SBT 5 (London: SCM Press, 1952) 30.

<sup>25</sup>Bruce, *Epistles*, 141; see also Peake, "Colossians," 3:538. T. K. Abbott, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians*, ICC, reprint of 7th ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1974 [1897]) 280; and Moule, *Colossians*, 115, who states that they are "to be dead as regards their [your] limbs' immoral use." This metonymic use of μέλη is similar to the use of σῶμα in Rom. 6:6 ("the body of sin"); 7:24 ("the body of this [moral] death," cf. 7:13); and 8:10 ("the body is dead because of sin"). R. H. Gundry, *Sōma in Biblical Theology with Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology*, SNTSMS 29 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976) 42 n1, states that τὰ μέλη sometimes means or refers to τὸ σῶμα, but the definition of τὰ μέλη here by "sins" that are to be put to death militates against taking it as a synonym for σῶμα.

The last option fits this context best. In a vivid and forceful way, Paul comes near to identifying his readers' bodily members with the sins of which they were once the vehicles of expression. But his focus of attention is on the *use* to which they had been devoted in their pre-Christian life. He does not regard a person's physical constitution, one's anatomy, one's instincts, or one's desires as sinful in themselves. He does not advocate a radical self-denial in the form of suppressing basic human needs in an attempt to control one's body or gain merit as practiced by the legalistic asceticism of the false teachers (cf. 2:18, 23).<sup>26</sup> Furthermore, sin itself, in its totality, is not to be thought of as a "body" and its various elements as "members." This is unacceptable in light of Romans 6:6 and Colossians 2:11 as well as this text.<sup>27</sup>

The phrase *τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* picks up the identical expression used in verse 2 and qualifies the *τὰ μέλη* as "belonging to the earth," the sphere for the existence and operation of the vices listed in verses 5 and 8, though the material "earth" itself is not sinful. This is the sphere permeated by "the elements of the world" (2:20) or "the dominion of darkness" (1:13) from which believers have been delivered. Since believers have died with Christ, the power of sin over them has been broken (Rom. 6:1-14; Col. 2:11-12; 20-23). The old relationship to sin as a master is severed by this death, and it no longer has the right to enforce its claims as it once did. This liberation must now be employed in their new life experiences by refusing to place their bodily members at the disposal of sin under whose lordship they no longer serve. To the Colossian believers, who were relatively recent converts from paganism, Paul calls for decisive action in "putting to death" (aorist) the sinful actions and attitudes of the

---

<sup>26</sup>Pace BAGD, s.v. *μέλος*, 2, who paraphrase as follows: "put to death whatever in your nature belongs to the earth;" and id., s.v. *νεκρώω*, "put to death . . . what is earthly in you." These glosses appear to go too far unless "earth / earthly" are understood as "what is sinful," which is unlikely for Paul. See ch. 2, 130-32 at Rom. 6:12.

<sup>27</sup>See the discussion in ch. 2, 111-16, and pp. 222-27 below.



old life that may remain or reappear in their new life in Christ. This "death" is consistent with the "death with Christ" already accomplished (3:3) as the necessary action of corresponding Christian morality. The idea of "death" as "severing connections with," or "putting an end to" that operates at conversion-initiation is also to characterize the life of the Christian subsequently in a negative ethical sense.<sup>28</sup>

**4.4.1.2 Colossians 3:5b.** There are several lists of vices and virtues in the New Testament, especially in the Pauline letters.<sup>29</sup> Various views have been advanced regarding the origin and background of these lists.<sup>30</sup> Such lists were a common form among moralists to distinguish faithful insiders from outsiders. In particular, Jews reproached pagans for sexual sins, covetousness, and idolatry (e.g., Wis. 14:25-26; 4 Macc. 1:26-27; 2:15; 1QS 4.9-11; CD 4.17-19; 2 *Enoch* 10.4-5).<sup>31</sup> The New Testament vice and virtue lists reflect the ethical dualism of the Old Testament and are descriptive of opposing ways of life.<sup>32</sup> The vice list in verse 5

---

<sup>28</sup>Moule, *Colossians*, 114-15; Bruce, *Epistles*, 140 n49; O'Brien, *Colossians*, 176.

<sup>29</sup>E.g., Rom. 1:29-31; 1 Cor. 6:9-10; Gal. 5:19-21. See the lists in Cannon, *Traditional Materials*, 54-60; and in D. E. Aune, *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987) 194-96. See also E. Schweizer, "Traditional Ethical Patterns in the Pauline and Post-Pauline Letters and Their Development (List of Vices and the Housetables)," in *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black*, ed. E. Best and R. McL. Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979) 195-209.

<sup>30</sup>Some trace their origin to similar lists in Stoicism, e.g., B. S. Easton, "New Testament Ethical Lists," *JBL* 51 (1932) 1-12; and A. Vögtle, *Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament*, NTAbh 16 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1936). Others trace their origin to an early Jewish proselyte catechism, e.g., Carrington, *Catechism*, 13-21, and W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 4th ed. with new preface (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980) 123-29; to Iranian influences mediated through sectarian Judaism such as Qumran (1QS 4), e.g., S. Wibbing, *Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament und ihre Traditionsgeschichte unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Qumrantexte*, BZNW 25 (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1959); or to the Hellenistic syncretism of the mystery religions, e.g., E. Kamlah, *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament*, WUNT 7 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1964). For a survey with references and evaluation, see O. J. F. Seitz, "Lists, Ethical," in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick et al., 4 vols. (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962) 3:137-39; D. Schroeder, "Lists, Ethical," *IDBSup* (1976) 546-47; and O'Brien, *Colossians*, 179-81.

<sup>31</sup>Cannon, *Traditional Materials*, 58-59; Dunn, *Colossians*, 213-14.

<sup>32</sup>Martin, *NIDNTT*, 3:928-29; cf. Deut. 30:15-20; Josh. 22:5; Ps. 1:1-6; Jer. 21:8; Ezek. 18:1-32. Note also subsequent Christian use: *1 Clem.* 35.5; *Did.* 2-5; *Barn.* 18-20.

shows strong influence from Judaism in making idolatry its climax and in seeing sexual sins as related to idol worship (cf. Deut. 31:16; Hos. 4:12). Lohse believes that this list was simply part of traditional paraenetic material and was not related to any specific problem in the Colossian church.<sup>33</sup> But this is probably going too far. Even though Paul does not say that such behavior was extant among the Colossian Christians, this does not reduce the significance of the list in this context nor its application to them. They were continually exposed to the sins of their former pagan life and tempted by them. Perhaps also, Paul placed these lists (vv. 5, 8) over against lists that were used by the false teachers (cf. 2:21-23).

The vice list in verse 5 moves from acts to attitudes, from the outward to the inward, with each item logically following what precedes. First on the list is *πορνεία*, a general term denoting any kind of sexual intercourse outside of marriage.<sup>34</sup> The second word, *ἀκαθαρσία*, is used figuratively in a moral sense to mean "moral uncleanness or impurity."<sup>35</sup> It points to the immoral activity of pagan life. In this context, the third word, *πάθος*, denotes the kind of shameful passion that leads to uncontrolled sexual desires or even sexual perversion (cf. 1 Thess. 4:5; Rom. 1:26).<sup>36</sup> The fourth word, *ἐπιθυμία*, could be used by itself in a neutral sense, meaning "a

---

<sup>33</sup>Lohse, *Colossians*, 137-38; also Easton, "Ethical Lists," 9-10.

<sup>34</sup>BAGD, s.v. *πορνεία*; Hauck and Schulz, *TDNT*, 6:579-95; Reisser, *NIDNTT*, 1:499-501; and Vögtle, *Die Tugend*, 223-25. B. Malina, "Does *Porneia* Mean Fornication?" *NovT* 14 (1972) 10-17, questions this general understanding of *πορνεία*; however, J. Jensen, "Does *Porneia* Mean Fornication? A Critique of Bruce Malina," *NovT* 20 (1978) 161-84, argues that the term describes wanton sexual behavior, including fornication, in the NT. In the LXX the word was used to denote unchastity, prostitution, and fornication (cf. Gen. 34:31; 38:15; Lev. 19:29; Deut. 22:21); also in Jewish literature (e.g., *T. Reub.* 1.6; 3.3, 4.6-8—it leads to idolatry) and the DSS (e.g., 1QS 1.6; 4.10; CD 2.16).

<sup>35</sup>BAGD, s.v. *ἀκαθαρσία*; Hauck, *TDNT*, 3:427-29; Link and Schattenmann, *NIDNTT*, 3:102-108. Note Wis. 2:16; 1 Esdr. 1:42; *1 Enoch* 10.11; *T. Jud.* 14.5; *T. Jos.* 4.6.

<sup>36</sup>BAGD, s.v. *πάθος*; Michaelis, *TDNT*, 5:926-30; Lohse, *Colossians*, 138. Note *T. Jud.* 18.6; *T. Jos.* 7.8.

longing that compels one to action."<sup>37</sup> But the action may be good or evil; hence, *ἐπιθυμία* must be contextually defined. Here it is qualified by the adjective *κακή*, indicating it is "evil desire" (cf. Prov. 12:12; 21:26).<sup>38</sup>

The climax of the present list is *πλεονεξία*. It is set off by *καί* ("and especially"), the definite article *τήν*, and an explanatory relative clause beginning with *ἥτις*.<sup>39</sup> The addition of the relative clause accounts for the use of the article with *πλεονεξίαν*, making it definite, whereas the article is lacking before the other nouns in the list. This is a kataphoric article pointing forward to a subsequent adjunct (cf. Acts 19:3; 26:27; 2 Cor. 8:18); consequently, one could translate these words: "And that chief vice, covetousness, which is idolatry."<sup>40</sup> Perhaps this extra emphasis by Paul is designed to highlight the root cause of all the other vices. The normal sense of *πλεονεξία* is, literally, "an insatiable desire to have more."<sup>41</sup> Here the word refers to unchecked desire for personal pleasure that becomes a breeding ground for more specific evil desires. It involves the "ruthless assumption that all other persons and things exist for one's own benefit. It is tantamount to idolatry, because it puts self interest in the place of God."<sup>42</sup> The close link with idolatry stresses the subtle danger

---

<sup>37</sup>BAGD, s.v. *ἐπιθυμία*; Büchsel, *TDNT*, 3:168-71; Schönweiss, *NIDNTT*, 1:456-58.

<sup>38</sup>The adjective *κακήν* is omitted in P<sup>46</sup>, F and G. However, strong, early (despite P<sup>46</sup>) and wide attestation would argue for its inclusion here.

<sup>39</sup>Robertson, *Grammar*, 727-28, 960; see also MHT, 3:311 and BDF, §132, 2, who state: "In explanatory phrases Koine employs the neuter *ὃ ἐστίν* [vernacular], *τοῦτ' ἐστίν* or *τουτέστιν* [literary] 'that is to say,' a formulaic phrase used without reference to the gender of the word explained or to that of the word which explains. . . ;" and C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959) 130. Often the gender is readily assimilated to the antecedent, as is the case here (cf. also Rev. 4:5; 5:6, 8).

<sup>40</sup>BDF, §258, 1; Wallace, *Grammar*, 220-21. See also Robertson, *Grammar*, 522-23, 758, who states that the relative clause in Col. 3:5 explains the use of the article with *πλεονεξίαν*.

<sup>41</sup>BAGD, s.v. *πλεονεξία*; Delling, *TDNT*, 6:266-74; Selzer, *NIDNTT*, 1:137-38. In Plato, *Symp.* 182 D, this word is used of sexual greed and, as Dunn, *Colossians*, 215, notes, "[it] sums up what is primarily a list of sexual sins: the ruthless insatiableness evident when the sexual appetite is unrestrained in a man with power to gratify it (cf. 1 Thess. 4:4-6)."

<sup>42</sup>Caird, *Paul's Letters*, 205; also Moule, *Colossians*, 116-17; Lightfoot, *Colossians*, 210.

of covetousness. It leads a person to set his desires on earthly things (cf. 3:2), draws him away from God who is the source of life, and drives him to use God for his own ends and, thus, to worship false gods instead. This may be directly related to the false teaching threatening the Colossians (cf. 2:18).

All these expressions of self-seeking gratification, characteristic of the pagan ethos in which the Colossian Christians lived, are to be put to death because they have no place in their new life in Christ. Those who follow these paths are actually pursuing death (cf. Rom. 1:21-32; 6:21). These vices themselves must be "put to death," i.e., removed from their conduct. Their presence is evidence of sin controlling and ravaging human character and relationships. In verses 6 and 7 Paul gives two reasons why Christians should not practice these sins.

**4.4.1.3 Colossians 3:6.** People who practice these vices (v. 5)<sup>43</sup> incur the wrath of God. Pauline lists of ethical vices often conclude with a sobering reference to divine judgment that comes on those who practice these things (cf. 1 Thess. 4:3-6, 1 Cor. 5:10-11; 6:9; Rom. 1:18-32; and Eph. 5:5-6). The expression *ἡ ὀργή τοῦ θεοῦ* denotes the outward manifestation of God's judicial displeasure at evil and the retribution that comes upon evil in vindication of His righteousness rather than merely an emotion of vindictive anger.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup>The variant reading, *δι' ὃ*, in C D F G is no doubt secondary. The *δι' αὐτήν* in the text has better attestation externally and is more appropriate internally as a reference to all the vices listed in v. 5 rather than simply the last one only, in which case the feminine singular relative pronoun would be required grammatically.

<sup>44</sup>Stählin, *TDNT*, 5:419-47, esp. p. 425: "As in the Old Testament so in the New Testament *ὀργή* is both God's displeasure at evil, His passionate resistance to every will which is set against Him, and also His judicial attack thereupon." The genitive *τοῦ θεοῦ* is subjective: "the wrath God exhibits." See also Hahn, *NIDNTT*, 1:107-13; and G. H. C. MacGregor, "The Concept of the Wrath of God in the New Testament," *NTS* 7 (1960-61) 101-09. It is not sufficient to claim that the wrath of God denotes merely an impersonal principle of retribution that is not closely associated with God as in C. H. Dodd, *The Epistle to the Romans*, MNTC (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1932) 21-23; or to claim that the wrath of God denotes nothing other than His judgment as in R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. K. Grobel, 2 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951, 1955) 1:288.

In view of the ethical context, correlation with Colossians 3:4, and the parallel in Ephesians 5:6, it is likely that this is a reference to future judgment and thus ἔρχεται could be rendered as a futuristic present—"God's wrath is going to come."<sup>45</sup> It is on account of the vices listed in verse 5 (δι' αὐτοῦ) that culminate in idolatry that God's wrath will come upon "the sons of disobedience." But the future judgment of God to be executed on sin is already in process of revealing itself in history and in personal life experience (Rom. 1:18). In light of this, ἔρχεται should probably be understood as a gnomic present—"God's wrath comes,"<sup>46</sup> that is, it takes effect in the tragic and degrading effects of sin itself at present (Rom. 1:18-32) and leads to final judgment (Rom. 1:32; 2:1-16).

The ἐπί phrase ("upon the sons of disobedience") may have been added from Ephesians 5:6, but the manuscript authority for its inclusion is strong.<sup>47</sup> It is probable that the omission occurred because of an oversight in transmission. On internal grounds, the sentence is quite abrupt without the phrase, and the ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς of verse 7 seems to build on a previous mention of unbelievers that would be supplied by this phrase. For these reasons, the longer reading is preferred.<sup>48</sup> In the Semitic idiom, "sons of disobedience," υἱός is used metaphorically to denote membership in a particular group of people. In this case, it is people who are disobedient to God in contrast to those who trust in Him. They are non-Christians, and this lack of

---

<sup>45</sup>BDF, §323; Dunn, *Colossians*, 216-17. Note Isa. 34:8; Dan. 7:9-11; Joel 2:1-2; Mal. 4:1; also *Jub.* 5.10-16; *1 Enoch* 90.20-27.

<sup>46</sup>Wallace, *Grammar*, 523-25; Caird, *Paul's Letters*, 205.

<sup>47</sup>Lohse, *Colossians*, 139 n30. The phrase is omitted by P<sup>46</sup> B D\* it<sup>b</sup> cop<sup>sa</sup> syr<sup>pal</sup> and a few Church Fathers. Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 281, notes that in D this phrase is written in smaller script at the end of the line, an apparent indication that it was not present in its archetype. It is possible, then, that the phrase was added at an early stage in the transmission under the influence of Eph. 5:6, as indicated by its omission in P<sup>46</sup>, our earliest piece of evidence.

<sup>48</sup>Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 557, records that the UBS committee was divided. Most commentators favor omission, but Wright, *Colossians*, 135 n1, and Dunn, *Colossians*, 210, 216-17, are exceptions. Translations are divided; for omission: RSV, NEB, NAS, NIV; for inclusion: GNB, NJB, NRSV.

trust in God is the normal situation of a person outside of Christ (Rom. 11:31-32; Eph. 2:2).<sup>49</sup> This is the "old realm" in Adam, the realm of the "old man."

**4.4.1.4 Colossians 3:7.** With the words *καὶ ὑμεῖς*, Paul reminds his readers about their pre-Christian life when these vices characterized their own behavior not so long ago.<sup>50</sup> A similar reminder follows a catalog of vices elsewhere in Paul's writings (cf. 1 Cor. 6:9-11; Rom. 6:19-21; Eph. 5:7). If the disputed *ἐπί* phrase of verse 6 ("upon the sons of disobedience") is omitted, then *οἷς* and *τούτοις* would of necessity both be neuter and refer to *δι' ἃ* in verse 6 and, thus, to the vices mentioned in verse 5.<sup>51</sup> However, if this phrase is retained, as is preferable, it allows *ἐν οἷς* and *ἐν τούτοις* in verse 7 to refer to different antecedents. Under this arrangement, verses 6-7 could be translated: "Because of these things (*δι' ἃ*, i.e., the vices of v. 5), God's wrath is coming upon the sons of disobedience, among whom (*ἐν οἷς*) you also once (*ποτέ*) walked, when you were living in these things / ways (*ἐν τούτοις*, i.e., the vices of v. 5)."

The verb *περιπατέω*, a favorite Pauline metaphor used thirty-one times by him, is borrowed from Old Testament Jewish tradition, denoting a way of life (cf. 1:10; 2:6) or daily conduct in general (cf. Deut. 13:4-5; Prov. 28:18; Isa. 33:15, etc.).<sup>52</sup> Once (*ποτέ*), namely, in their pre-Christian past, they also (*καί*, i.e., along with other godless

---

<sup>49</sup>Fohrer, *TDNT*, 8:345-47; Becker, *NIDNTT*, 1:593. In the Ephesians parallel, the "sons of disobedience" (unbelievers, 5:6) are contrasted with the "sons of light" (believers, 5:8).

<sup>50</sup>Lohse, *Colossians*, 140; R. P. Martin, *Colossians and Philemon*, 3rd ed., NCB (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981) 104; and J. Jervell, *Imago Dei: Gen. 1,26f im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen*, FRLANT 76 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960) 235.

<sup>51</sup>So O'Brien, *Colossians*, 173, who prefers the shorter reading in v. 6; see Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 624-25. Lightfoot, *Colossians*, 211, argues that, even if the *ἐπί* phrase of v. 6 is retained, it is still better to take both pronouns in v. 7 as neuter ("in which"), referring to the vices of v. 5. On balance, however, it is best to take *οἷς* as masculine and relate *ἐν οἷς* to the *ἐπί* phrase of v. 6, which is its nearest antecedent. For a discussion of other options if the *ἐπί* phrase in v. 6 is retained, see Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 282; and if the phrase is not retained, see O'Brien, *Colossians*, 186.

<sup>52</sup>BAGD, s.v. *περιπατέω*, 2; Seesemann and Bertram, *TDNT*, 5:944-45; Ebel, *NIDNTT*, 3:943-45; O'Brien, *Colossians*, 22, 106. For the Pauline uses of *περιπατέω* in this way, note Rom. 6:4; 8:4; 13:13; 14:15; Col. 1:10; 2:6; 3:7; 4:5; Eph. 2:2, 10; 4:1, 17; 5:2, 8, 15. See ch. 2, 95 n91 for use at Rom. 6:4.

Gentiles) were included among the "sons of disobedience," and participated in these evil vices (v. 5) when they were in their pre-Christian sphere of life that was dominated by such things. The contrast in the verb tenses is vivid. The aorist (*περιεπατήσατε*) sums up as a whole their participation in these ungodly acts in the past, while the imperfect (*ἐζήτητε*) views the course of their former way of life from which such conduct comes.<sup>53</sup> To "live" appears to be a more fundamental concept for Paul (cf. Gal. 5:25), while to "walk" refers to one's actual conduct that manifests the "life" that is one's settled state of existence. The Colossian believers did evil while they were living in bondage to its power in contrast to dying with Christ out from under its power (cf. 2:20; 3:3; Rom. 6:2-6, 19-21; 1 Cor. 6:9-11). Their sinful lifestyle (i.e., walking in old ways) was conditioned by living in a sinful state. They were "dead" in their sins (cf. Col. 2:13). Only a change of realm, being transferred into the kingdom of the beloved Son (1:13) and obtaining "life," made a new lifestyle possible (2:6; 3:1-2). This has important implications with respect to the "old" and "new man."

#### 4.4.2 Colossians 3:8: Put Off All [These] Things

The *ποτέ / νυνί* antithesis of verses 7 and 8 is a classic Pauline way of indicating the fundamental transition from the old life to the new: "you were *once* (*ποτέ*, pre-Christian existence) . . . but *now* you are (*νυνί* *δέ*, Christian existence).<sup>54</sup> Paul used this contrast as his transition to the exhortation that follows. This turn of events, effected by God's gracious act in Christ, demands obedient loyalty to Him. As noted above (p. 197), verses 7a and 8a are arranged in chiastic order emphasizing the contrast (*δέ*) between what the Colossians' lives as Christians must now (*νυνί*) be, compared to what they once (*ποτέ*) were before they entered their present

---

<sup>53</sup>Wallace, *Grammar*, 503, states: "*ζάω* ("I live") occurs as a present or imperfect indicative 29 times in the NT, all of which have a stative meaning (eg., . . . Col. 3:7)." These sins (3:5) marked their conduct when they used to live in that state.

<sup>54</sup>Cf. Gal. 4:8-9; 1 Cor. 6:9-11; Rom. 3:26; 6:17-22; 7:5-6; 11:30; Col. 1:21-22; 2:13-14; Eph. 2:13.

Christian state at conversion-initiation.<sup>55</sup>

Just as the *καὶ ὑμεῖς* of verse 7 reminded Paul's readers of the immoral pagan situation in which they were once (*ποτέ*) involved, so the *καὶ ὑμεῖς* of verse 8 reminds them of the moral Christian situation in which they also (*καί*) along with other Christians are now (*νυνί*) involved. In light of this, Paul exhorts them to "put off" all these things (*τὰ πάντα*), namely, the whole gamut of sins that precedes (v. 5) and that follows (v. 8) this command regardless of the kind of expression they take.<sup>56</sup>

With the aorist imperative, *ἀπόθεσθε*, Paul uses a garment metaphor related to the divestiture of clothing. It was commonly used metaphorically in an ethical sense.<sup>57</sup> Just as important as decisively "putting to death" the sins characteristic of their old way of life (v. 5) is the need for the Colossian believers to "put off" decisively, as an old, worn-out garment, the sins of the tongue (v. 8b), which are no longer fitting for them and threaten the unity of the Christian community. These activities and expressions of communication by which one Christian can sin against another suggest that Paul's concept of the "new man" (v. 10) has a corporate as well as a personal dimension.

The two aorist imperatives *νεκρώσατε* (v. 5) and *ἀπόθεσθε* (v. 8) reinforce each other and are two metaphors for the same ethical reality.<sup>58</sup> This leads to the

---

<sup>55</sup>Tachau, "*Einst*" und "*Jetzt*," 124-26.

<sup>56</sup>Peake, "Colossians," 3:538; Lohse, *Colossians*, 140; Kamlah, *Form*, 183; Gnllka, *Kolosserbrieff*, 184; and O'Brien, *Colossians*, 174, 186. The verb *ἀποτίθημι* is also linked with *πάς* in Heb. 12:1; Jas. 1:21; and 1 Pet. 2:1. The object of the putting off is thus designated as a totality, all sinful behavior done in connection with the "old man."

<sup>57</sup>For references and further discussion, see ch. 1, 43-45.

<sup>58</sup>Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 357-64, gives *νεκρώσατε* (v. 5) an ingressive nuance (361) and *ἀπόθεσθε* (v. 8) a constative (summary) nuance (363). He points out that clothing imagery verbs ("put off / put on") occur most often in the *aorist* tense in biblical Greek (see Table 5.4, 362) and states that "in usage these ideas are uniformly regarded not as ACTIVITIES but as ACCOMPLISHMENTS, not as processes, but as events" (362). Such imperatives emphasize the fact of the action commanded *as a whole* without focusing on duration, repetition, etc., even though in obeying the command repeated action would surely be involved. Many contexts exhibiting this linguistic feature lend a sense of urgency or decisiveness to an aorist imperative.



inference that the indicative verbs on which these imperatives are based refer to the same theological reality, namely, for believers to have died with Christ (3:3a) includes having "put off" the "old man" (3:9b; Rom. 6:6). If so, then it follows that to have risen with Christ (3:1a) includes having "put on" the "new man" (3:10). All this takes place at conversion-initiation for the individual believer.

The five-member vice list in verse 8 begins with *ὀργή*, the underlying human emotion of anger and hatred directed vindictively toward others.<sup>59</sup> Together with *θυμός*, an uncontrolled outburst of rage,<sup>60</sup> both expressions of temper destroy harmony in human relationships and must be put away (cf. 2 Cor. 12:20; Eph. 4:31). *Κακία* is a general term whose meaning ranges from "trouble" to "moral wickedness" or "malice," and so it must be contextually defined.<sup>61</sup> Here it likely depicts the havoc to interpersonal relationships caused by evil-speaking (cf. Rom. 1:29; 1 Corinthians 5:8; 14:20; Eph. 4:31). The word *βλασφημία* means "slander" in the sense of deliberately telling lies (cf. Mark 7:22; Eph. 4:31; 1 Tim. 6:4; 2 Tim. 3:2).<sup>62</sup> In this context it refers to defamation of character by which someone is damaged rather than a curse directed against God.<sup>63</sup> This, also, a Christian must avoid completely (cf. Titus 3:2).

---

<sup>59</sup>BAGD, s.v. *ὀργή*; Stählin, *TDNT*, 5:420-21; Hahn, *NIDNTT*, 1:110-13.

<sup>60</sup>BAGD, s.v. *θυμός*; Büchsel, *TDNT*, 3:167-68; Schönweiss, *NIDNTT*, 1:105-06. In the LXX *ὀργή* and *θυμός* appear to be virtually synonymous terms; note this combination of words for human anger in Sir. 45:18; *Pss. Sol.* 2:23; 16:10; Eph. 4:31; also Josephus, *Ant.* 20:108.

<sup>61</sup>BAGD, s.v. *κακία*; Grundmann, *TDNT*, 3:482-84; Achilles, *NIDNTT*, 1:561-64; Moule, *Colossians*, 118. Note also *Did.* 5:1; *Barn.* 20:1.

<sup>62</sup>BAGD, s.v. *βλασφημία*; Beyer, *TDNT*, 1:621-25; Währisch and Brown, *NIDNTT*, 3:341-45; Moule, *Colossians*, 118-19; Martin, *Colossians*, 105.

<sup>63</sup>Lohse, *Colossians*, 140; Schweizer, *Colossians*, 145; Martin, *Colossians*, 105; O'Brien, *Colossians*, 188; pace Beyer, *TDNT*, 1:624, who claims that it is blasphemy against God, the most common use of this word in biblical Greek.

Finally, *αἰσχρολογία*, which occurs only here in the New Testament, likely refers to obscene or abusive language, which is a form that slander may take.<sup>64</sup> It suggests crude talk or even recourse to foul expletives, thus, "foul-mouthed abuse." The final phrase in the verse, *ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν* (an emphatic *ὑμῶν* recalling them to their Christian profession), is dependent upon *ἀπόθεσθε* rather than the last noun in the list and is to be understood with all the sins that are mentioned rather than the last two only.<sup>65</sup> The singular of *στόμα* is a Semitism where Paul follows the Hebraic preference for a distributive singular in which the item under discussion is applicable to each person in the group.<sup>66</sup> The behavior outlined in verses 5-8 is characteristic of fallen humanity. These sins poison and destroy human relationships. What was once characteristic of the Colossian believers' conduct must now be put off.

#### 4.4.3 Colossians 3:9-11: The Old Man / New Man

**4.4.3.1 Colossians 3:9a: Do not lie.** The present imperative of verse 9a continues the series of imperatives (vv. 5, 8), and this clause is connected closely with the preceding sins of the tongue.<sup>67</sup> Only here and in Ephesians 4:25 in the Pauline

---

<sup>64</sup>BAGD, s.v. *αἰσχρολογία*; Bultmann, *TDNT*, 1:190-91; Link, *NIDNTT*, 3:564. Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 283, claims that the sins mentioned here are those lacking love rather than those expressing moral uncleanness, as in v. 5, but Bruce, *Epistles*, 146, understands the term here to mean "foul talk." The word is used in the sense of abusive language by Homer, *Il.* 3.38; Polybius 8.13.8; 12.13.3; 31.10.4; and Plato, *Rep.* 3.395e. If pre-Pauline tradition reflects non-Christian material, this would lend support to that supposition. Later Greek literature used the word to mean: "obscene, disgraceful speech" (Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 2.6.52; Diodorus Siculus 5.4.7).

<sup>65</sup>Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 283; Caird, *Paul's Letters*, 205; Moule, *Colossians*, 117-18; pace Peake, "Colossians," 3:538; O'Brien, *Colossians*, 187.

<sup>66</sup>BDF, §140; MHT, 3:23-25; 4:91. See ch. 2, 105 n126 and 108-09 n134. A few manuscripts (F G lat<sup>v</sup>g) add the words *μη̅ ἐκπορευέσθω* to this verse probably from Eph. 4:29, but they are, no doubt, an addition attempting to clarify and smooth out the construction.

<sup>67</sup>P<sup>46</sup> places the present subjunctive (*ψεύδησθε*) after the negative *μη̅*. S. E. Porter, "P. Oxy. 744.4 and Colossians 3, 9," *Bib* 73 (1992) 565-67, makes a plausible case for the present subjunctive reading at Col. 3:9 and 1 Cor. 11:33 in P<sup>46</sup>. However, BDF, §364, 3 state that the present subjunctive is not correct here, presumably meaning that this variant is an incorrect reading in Col. 3:9. The use of the aorist subjunctive with *μη̅* for the negative aorist imperative corresponds to classical usage. The *present* subjunctive with *μη̅* to express a prohibition is not used in the NT. See Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 20-21. Here is a prohibition against a course of action, i.e., a habit of conduct: "Do not tell lies to one another," or, "Make it your habit not to lie to one another."

corpus does Paul express a strong concern about lying to others. Such a prohibition may seem anticlimactic, but the social effects of untrustworthy promises and deceitfulness are great. It is especially destructive and inappropriate in the Christian community as suggested by the important phrase *εἰς ἀλλήλους* (cf. 1 Thess. 3:2; 5:15; 2 Thess. 1:3; Rom. 12:16; 14:19; Eph. 4:32).

The difference in meaning between the *aorist imperative* (vv. 5, 8) and the *present imperative* (v. 9a) is not one of time, but of aspect. The present imperative commands an activity that is to be *an ongoing habitual action*. When used in a prohibition with *μή*, it is a general negative precept, or, if the context allows, it may command someone to stop doing what he or she is doing. The aorist imperative commands an activity that is viewed *as a whole action* and, if the context allows, it may be ingressive in force. It is rarely used with negatives (only 8 NT instances) since its place is taken by the aorist subjunctive.<sup>68</sup> The prohibition here refers to resisting a course of action, a habit that begins and continues. Paul urges his readers not to be going about lying to one another (cf. Gal. 1:20; 2 Cor. 11:31; Rom. 9:1; 1 Tim. 2:7). All these sins, which disrupt the harmony of the Church, are to be replaced by corresponding virtues that promote harmony (Col. 3:12-15).

**4.4.3.2 Colossians 3:9b-10a: Aorist Participles.** Paul undergirds his ethical appeal with a strong theological affirmation. The aorist participles in verses 9b-10a (*ἀπεκδυσάμενοι . . . ἐνδυσάμενοι*) have been understood in two ways: 1) as *imperatival* in force either as independent imperatival participles continuing the sequence of admonitions, or, as adverbial participles having imperatival force, thus: "[you] put off . . . put on . . . ;" or 2) as adverbial causal participles with *indicative*

---

<sup>68</sup>See the discussion on commands and prohibitions with a critique of the traditional view (i.e., present: "stop doing what you are already doing," and aorist: "do not start doing what you have not yet begun") in Wallace, *Grammar*, 714-25. Pace MHT, 1:122; 3:76-77, 94; and Robertson, *Grammar*, 851-54, 980, who, however, notes many exceptions to the traditional view. BDF, §335-37, 362-64, 387 provide a helpful discussion; see also Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 327-32, 336.

force, providing the ground and reason for the preceding and the following admonitions, thus: "Since you have put off . . . put on . . . ."

Most recent New Testament grammarians recognize that Greek participles can be and were used independently as imperatives in the New Testament.<sup>69</sup> Part of the debate on this subject centers on whether this is to be accounted for as a genuine Hellenistic development,<sup>70</sup> or as an indication of Semitic influence, which seems most likely.<sup>71</sup> Some interpreters hold the imperatival view of the participles here and defend it with several arguments.<sup>72</sup> First, the participles are preceded (v. 9a) and followed (v. 12a) by imperative verbs; thus, they should be understood in an imperatival sense also. Lohse points out that the participle appears several times with an imperatival function in early Christian exhortation.<sup>73</sup> Second, the parallel in Ephesians 4:22-24 using aorist infinitives rather than aorist participles appears to

---

<sup>69</sup>MHT, 1:180-83, 223-24; Robertson, *Grammar*, 944-46, 1134; BDF, §468, 2; Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 179-80; Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 386-87; Wallace, *Grammar*, 650-53; S. E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament* (New York: Peter Lang, 1989) 374-76. Note the use of the participle as an independent imperative in Rom. 12:9-14, 16-19; 2 Cor. 8:24; 1 Pet. 2:18; 3:1, 7; and possibly Phil. 2:3.

<sup>70</sup>MHT, 1:180-83, 232-35; H. G. Meecham, "The Use of the Participle for the Imperative in the New Testament," *ExpTim* 58 (1946-47) 207-08; and A. P. Salom, "The Imperative Use of the Participle in the New Testament," *ABR* 11 (1963) 41-49.

<sup>71</sup>D. Daube, "Participle and Imperative in 1 Peter," in *The First Epistle of Saint Peter*, by E. G. Selwyn, 2nd ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1947) 467-88; C. K. Barrett, "The Imperatival Participle," *ExpTim* 59 (1948) 165-66; Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 179-80; M. Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, 4th ed. (Rome: Pontifical Institute, 1963) 130; Lohse, *Colossians*, 141; Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 130-31, 329.

<sup>72</sup>This view was held by earlier interpreters such as Luther, Bengel, Olshausen, de Wette, and Ewald, according to Lightfoot, *Colossians*, 212-14, who also holds this view. More recent proponents include M. Dibelius and H. Greeven, *An die Kolosser, Epheser, an Philemon*, 3rd ed., HNT 12 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953) 42; E. Lohmeyer, *Die Briefe an die Philipper an die Kolosser und an Philemon*, 13th ed., KEKNT 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964) 135, 139; F. W. Eltester, *Eikon im Neuen Testament*, BZNW 23 (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1958) 157; Oepke, *TDNT*, 2:318-19; Lohse, *Colossians*, 141; Schweizer, *Colossians*, 194 n43; P. Pokorny, *Colossians: A Commentary*, trans. S. S. Schatzmann (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991) 168-69; and, with hesitation, M. Barth and H. Blanke, *Colossians. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, trans. A. B. Beck, AB 34B (New York: Doubleday, 1994) 409-10.

<sup>73</sup>Lohse, *Colossians*, 32 n1. He contends, for example, that translating *εὐχαριστοῦντες* in Col. 1:12 as an imperative is justified since it is only loosely attached to the preceding verses and there is a change in subject matter. See footnote 69 above.

support an imperatival translation: "Put off the old man . . . put on the new man . . . ." <sup>74</sup> Third, an imperatival translation for ἐνδύω, the clothing metaphor, is more common in the Pauline corpus (e.g., Rom. 13:12, 14; 1 Thess. 5:8; Eph. 6:11; cf. also 1 Pet. 2:1 and Jas. 1:21), though Galatians 3:27 is a significant exception. <sup>75</sup> Fourth, the addition of the phrase σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ (v. 9) and the present participle ἀνακαινούμενον (v. 10) indicate that contemporaneous rather than antecedent action is intended by the participles. In light of this, Paul is stressing the obligation, which the Colossian Christians must accept and act upon, to put away the habits of their "old man" by stripping off all sinful behavior that relates to their former life and putting on a new manner of conduct. <sup>76</sup>

Other interpreters, however, defend the second view that treats these participles as true adverbial participles that express antecedent causal action to the preceding exhortations and assign a twofold reason or basis for them. <sup>77</sup> Again, several arguments are put forward. First, there is nothing in what precedes to

---

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., 141 n49. Lohse maintains that Eph. 4:24 clearly supports the imperatival translation no matter whether one reads the aorist infinitive or the imperative (ἐνδύσασθε), which is found in P<sup>46</sup> & B\* K and other manuscripts and a few Church Fathers. See also Lightfoot, *Colossians*, 213; Bruce, *Epistles*, 357-58; Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:505-506; and Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 199-200. However, see the discussion in ch. 5, 263-69.

<sup>75</sup>Lightfoot, *Colossians*, 213. He admits that both indicative and imperative uses are found in Paul (cf. Gal. 3:27 with Rom. 13:14).

<sup>76</sup>Ibid., 213.

<sup>77</sup>H. A. W. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Part IX: The Epistles to the Philippians and Colossians*, trans. J. C. Moore from the 4th German ed., trans. rev. and ed. W. P. Dickson (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1875) 431; J. A. Eadie, *A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Colossians* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1856; reprint, Klock & Klock, 1980) 227-28; Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 283-84; Peake, "Colossians," 3:539; Masson, *Colossiens*, 143 n6; Martin, *Colossians*, 106; Caird, *Paul's Letters*, 204-205; Gnilka, *Kolossierbrief*, 186; Cannon, *Traditional Materials*, 72; O'Brien, *Colossians*, 189; and Dunn, *Colossians*, 210 n6, 220. See also Maurer, *TDNT*, 6:644 n5; Merk, *Handeln*, 205; Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 50-52, esp. 52 n14; Jervell, *Imago*, 235-36; E. Larsson, *Christus als Vorbild: Eine Untersuchung zu den paulinischen Tauf- und Eikontexten* (Lund: Gleerup, 1962) 197-98; and most modern English versions. Schweizer, *Colossians*, 194 n43, views these as adverbial participles describing the means by which the preceding imperatives are carried out. But this requires that they be contemporaneous with the present imperative ψεύδεσθε, a sense normally conveyed by present participles (cf. e.g., Col. 2:6-7; 3:13, 16). Bruce, *Epistles*, 146, seems to vacillate between the indicative and the imperative force in this passage.

correspond with *ἐνδυσάμενοι* since none of the Christian virtues are mentioned until verse 12.<sup>78</sup> Second, verse 11 fits with verses 9b-10 better when the participles are understood as assigning the ground for heeding the preceding admonitions rather than viewing them as continuing the exhortations. This is in keeping with Paul's presentation earlier in Colossians (cf. 2:6-7; 2:16–3:4).<sup>79</sup> Third, the imperative of verse 12 is introduced by the inferential conjunction *οὖν*. The same clothing metaphor is used in verse 12 as in verses 9b-10, but in paraenetic form by way of inference from what has been said in verses 9-10 in non-paraenetic form.<sup>80</sup> Fourth, the participles are aorist, and as such cannot be contemporaneous in time with the preceding controlling verb, which is the present imperative *ψεύδεσθε*.<sup>81</sup> None of the studies nor the grammars cited above (footnotes 69-71) list Colossians 3:9-10 as a possible instance of an independent imperatival participle. All of the cases cited are *present* participles with the exception of *ἀρξάμενοι* in Luke 24:47.<sup>82</sup> Fifth, this view is in keeping with Paul's teaching elsewhere in Colossians where he refers back to the reader's conversion-initiation by means of an aorist indicative or an aorist participle (cf. 1:6-7, 13, 22; 2:6-7, 11-15, 20; 3:1, 3).<sup>83</sup> Paul is reminding the Colossians of an event in the past that has affected them so dramatically that it has become the basis and reason for heeding the exhortations to put off sinful ways (vv. 5 and 8) and put on righteous ways (vv. 12ff).

---

<sup>78</sup>Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 283.

<sup>79</sup>Meyer, *Colossians*, 431; also Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 283-84.

<sup>80</sup>Ibid., 431.

<sup>81</sup>Ibid.

<sup>82</sup>Moulton (MHT, 1:182) includes this exception with "great hesitation," and both Meecham ("Use of the Participle," 207) and Salom ("Imperative Use," 46) dismiss it as too suspect because of its probable dependence on the preceding verb. Salom ("Imperative Use," 48-49) cites two instances in the papyri of aorist participles used as independent imperatives; nevertheless, this use is considered very rare.

<sup>83</sup>O'Brien, *Colossians*, 189.

It must be admitted that conceptually either view can be harmonized with Paul's attested teaching because he uses the "put off / put on" clothing metaphor with both an aorist indicative pointing to conversion-initiation and an aorist imperative pointing to subsequent ethical conduct (cf. Gal. 3:27 with Rom. 13:12-14). The context of this passage, then, must determine his meaning here.

First, to argue that the participles are imperatival because imperative verbs surround them implies that they derive their tense and mood from these finite verbs, specifically the immediately preceding *μὴ ψεύδεσθε* to which the participles are attached grammatically. This overlooks two grammatical difficulties. The first difficulty is the fact that the participle is non-finite (time dependent and non-modal) and gains its time relationship and mood from its relationship to other elements in the sentence, especially the principal or controlling verb.<sup>84</sup> In and of itself, the function of the aorist tense participle is not to express antecedent time but to indicate that the action of the verb involved is viewed as a simple event undefined as to duration or completion. However, even though the aorist participle does not automatically denote antecedent action, it is most frequently used for an action that is antecedent in time to the action of the controlling verb where the antecedence is implied not by the aorist tense as a tense of past time (as it is in the indicative mood), but in some other way in the context. An aorist participle will not normally be used if a resultant state, contemporaneity, or futurity in relationship to the action of the controlling verb is intended since these kinds of actions are not expressed by the aorist, but by the perfect, present, and the future tenses respectively.<sup>85</sup> The major exception is that the aorist participle may denote contemporaneous action if the controlling verb itself

---

<sup>84</sup>Robertson, *Grammar*, 946; Wallace, *Grammar*, 614-16.

<sup>85</sup>Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 59-63 (§§132-34).

is in the aorist tense.<sup>86</sup> In this passage, however, the main verb is in the *present* tense (*μὴ ψεύδεσθε*) followed by aorist participles. This suggests that Paul does not intend the participles to be understood as contemporaneous with the preceding imperative verb, and, consequently, does not intend them to have imperatival force.<sup>87</sup>

The second grammatical difficulty with this argument is the fact that a genuine imperatival participle stands independently, that is, grammatically unrelated to a finite imperative verb in the sentence (cf. Rom. 12:9ff; 1 Peter 2:18; 3:1, 7).<sup>88</sup> This is not the case here. Even if the participles were viewed adverbially as attendant circumstance to *ψεύδεσθε*, they would borrow the mood of this imperative, and the two sets of verbal ideas would be considered logically paratactic.<sup>89</sup> However, this is not likely here since the tense / aspect of the finite verb is present, and the participles are aorist. The two verbal ideas, though related, are not necessarily logically coordinate. It would be difficult to hold that the participial actions are merely an accompaniment of the action of the controlling verb.

Second, to argue from the parallel in Ephesians 4 is not convincing because the best manuscript evidence for *ἀποθέσθαι* (v. 22) and *ἐνδύσασθαι* (v. 24) indicates that both verbs are infinitives and not imperatives in form. Whether these infinitives are imperatival in force or not must be decided in that context.<sup>90</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup>Robertson, *Grammar*, 860-61; 1112-14; BDF, §339; Wallace, *Grammar*, 614. As a result, when the aorist participle is used for contemporaneous action, the controlling verb is either in the aorist or perfect tense (cf. e.g., Eph. 5:26).

<sup>87</sup>Pace Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 358 n35 with 363, who allows for the imperatival force of these participles.

<sup>88</sup>Robertson, *Grammar*, 944-46, 1134; Wallace, *Grammar*, 650-53. Though the imperatival participles in Rom. 12 occur in the middle of imperatives or infinitives acting as imperatives (e.g., 12:15), the syntactical construction makes it impossible to connect them with any stated finite verb.

<sup>89</sup>Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 173-74 (§§449-50).

<sup>90</sup>See the discussion of the infinitives in Eph. 4:22-24 in ch. 5, 263-69.



Third, to argue that the imperative is normal usage for *ἐνδύω* in the Pauline corpus falters on the fact that Paul used the verb in both the indicative (Gal. 3:27) and the imperative (Rom. 13:14), and both with Jesus Christ as the object. Furthermore, *ἀπεκδύω* (as opposed to *ἀποτίθημι*, v. 8 and elsewhere) occurs earlier in Colossians 2:15 and in its noun form in 2:11, and in both places it is non-imperative and non-paraenetic.

The indicative use of *ἐνεδύσασθε* in Galatians 3:27 and the imperatival use of the same verb in Romans 13:14 (*ἐνδύσασθε*) highlights a fundamental element in Pauline ethics: the indicative, pointing to conversion-initiation and its benefits, serves as the necessary basis and motivation for the imperative that calls for subsequent ethical conduct.<sup>91</sup> This relationship between the "baptismal" indicative and the ethical imperative occurs several times in Colossians (1:6-7, 13, 22; 2:6-7, 11-15; 2:16-3:4). And, it can be readily observed in the oscillation between the indicative and the imperative in 3:1-12: 1) *συνηγέρθητε* (v. 1a) . . . *ζητεῖτε* (v. 1b); 2) *φρονεῖτε* (v. 2) . . . *ἀπεθάνετε* (v. 3); and 3) *ἀπεθάνετε* (v. 3) . . . *νεκρώσατε* (v. 5) . . . *ἀπόθεσθε* (v. 8) . . . *ἐνδύσασθε* (v. 12).

In light of all this, it seems most likely that the participles *ἀπεκδυσάμενοι* (v. 9b) and *ἐνδυσάμενοι* (v. 10a) between the imperatives of verses 8-9a and 12 are not to be taken as continuing the commands (imperatival), or as a description of how the commands are to be accomplished (means), but, rather, as a return to the indicative, stating the basis in the past for the imperatives in the present. It is best, therefore, to understand both aorist participles in a causal sense, providing the reason and thus the motivation for heeding Paul's admonitions. This implies that they express

---

<sup>91</sup>Jervell, *Imago*, 236. On the subject of the relationship of Pauline ethics to conversion-initiation, see V. P. Furnish, *Theology and Ethics in Paul* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968) 214-17; G. Bornkamm, "Baptism and New Life in Paul: Romans 6," in *Early Christian Experience*, trans. P. Hammer (New York: Harper & Row, 1969) 71-86; W. D. Dennison, "Indicative and Imperative: The Basic Structure of Pauline Ethics," *CTJ* 14 (1979) 55-78, esp. 72; and J. M. G. Barclay, *Obedying the Truth. A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988) 212-15. See ch. 6, 316-24 for further discussion of the indicative and imperative relationship.

antecedent action. This view also receives support from the larger context in Colossians as we shall see next.

**4.4.3.3 Colossians 3:9b-10a and 2:11, 15.** Most interpreters recognize a connection between 3:9 and 2:11, 15. The doubly composite verb *ἀπεκδύεσθαι* occurs in only these three verses in the New Testament. It is a more forceful word than the verb *ἀποτίθημι* used in 3:8, in other paraenetic contexts (e.g., 1 Thess. 5:8; Rom. 13:12), and in the parallel clause in Ephesians 4:22. The meaning of the two verbs can be represented by the English expressions "to put off" (*ἀπόθεσθαι*) and "to strip off" (*ἀπεκδύεσθαι*).<sup>92</sup> In Colossians 2:11 and 15, *ἀπέκδυσις* and *ἀπεκδύεσθαι* are used in connection with Christ's death and resurrection and the believer's dying and rising with Him.<sup>93</sup> The "stripping off" language in these verses suggests that "stripping off the old man" in 3:9 has some connection with this motif.

In 2:11, the phrase, *ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός*,<sup>94</sup> follows the words "in him [Christ] also you [Colossian Christians] were circumcised with a circumcision made without hands." It has been interpreted in three main ways. The first view takes the phrase as a reference to the physical body of Christ that He "stripped off" (removed) *ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, that is, in His own "circumcision,"

---

<sup>92</sup>The middle voice may have an active or a reflexive sense, i.e., "to strip off from one's self," see MHT, 2:310. The noun *ἀπέκδυσις* occurs nowhere else in the NT and is also rare outside the NT; see BAGD, s.v. *ἀπέκδυσις*; Oepke, *TDNT*, 2:321; and note Josephus, *Ant.* 6.14.2. Thus, Paul perhaps coined the word on account of the circumcision figure he was using in Col. 2:11-12; so Bruce, *Epistles*, 104 n66, 107 n82; and Robinson, *Body*, 42.

<sup>93</sup>Death, burial, and resurrection themes are commonly associated with the motif of union (participation) with Christ in Paul's letters: Rom. 6:3-6; 7:1-6; 8:17; 2 Cor. 1:3-9; 4:7-14; 5:14-17; 7:3; 13:4; Gal. 2:19-20; 6:14-15; Phil. 3:9-11; Col. 2:20; 3:1-4, 9-10; 1 Thess. 4:14; 5:10; Eph. 2:5-6.

<sup>94</sup>The manuscripts  $\aleph^2 D^1 C$  with a majority of cursives and the Syriac versions insert the words *τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν* ("of the sins," cf. KJV: "the body of the sins of the flesh"), but this is surely a secondary reading. The word *σαρκός* is a qualitative genitive that is put in the place of a descriptive adjective, thereby ascribing a characteristic quality to *σῶμα*, the noun it modifies, i.e., "fleshly body;" see MHT, 2:440; and Wallace, *Grammar*, 86-88.

understood metaphorically as a concise reference to His death.<sup>95</sup> This view appeals to the allusions to Christ's death and resurrection in verses 12-15. It treats the phrase, "in the circumcision of (undergone by) Christ," as a reference to the crucifixion of Christ and views it as defining in an appositional sense the phrase "in the stripping off of the body of flesh." The words *τοῦ Χριστοῦ* are understood as an objective genitive, making clear that it is Christ's body of flesh that was "stripped off" in physical death.

This view also looks back to the phrase "body of His flesh" (*αὐτοῦ*) in Colossians 1:22, which clearly has a physical meaning with reference to the death of Christ (cf. Rom. 7:4) and so claims the same significance here, even though the possessive pronoun *αὐτοῦ* is absent. This qualifier is not needed here because of the following defining phrase, "in the circumcision of Christ." It also looks ahead to the stripping off of the "principalities and powers" clause in 2:15 as a reference to the fact that Christ (regarded as the subject of the sentence) "stripped off" from Himself the evil powers by "stripping off" His flesh (i.e., His frail humanity), which was attacked by the evil powers. This line of interpretation gives full weight to both the grammar and imagery of *ἀπεκδυσάμενος* in verse 15. It regards the middle voice as a true deponent in the reflexive sense instead of giving it an active and transitive sense rendered "disarm."<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup>This was the general view of the Latin Fathers and has been held by Käsemann, *Leib*, 139; Moule, *Colossians*, 94-96, who gives a helpful summary of major views; Martin, *Colossians*, 81-83; Robinson, *Body*, 41-42, 46; Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 49-50; Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 152-53; O'Brien, *Colossians*, 116-17; and J. D. G. Dunn, "The 'Body' in Colossians," in *To Tell the Mystery: Essays on New Testament Eschatology in Honor of Robert H. Gundry*, eds. T. E. Schmidt and M. Silva, JSNTSup 100 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994) 163-81, esp. 169-70. This represents a change of mind from Dunn's earlier view as stated in *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, SBT 15, 2nd series (Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1970) 153, in which he followed the prevailing consensus (the second view) that "'body of flesh' was in effect synonymous with 'body of sin' (Rom. 6:6) and 'body of death' (Rom. 7:24)."

<sup>96</sup>Pace BAGD, s.v. *ἀπεκδύομαι*, 2; Oepke, *TDNT*, 2:319. Schlier, *TDNT*, 2:31 n2, takes the imagery from a royal court where public officials are disgraced by being stripped of their honor rather than from the battlefield where an enemy is disarmed (as rendered in the NRSV). He treats the verb as a "divestment of dignity" rather than a "disarming of weapons." See also Lohse, *Colossians*, 112, and Martin, *Colossians*, 87.

In this first view, then, the ἀπέκδυσις depicts Christ's radical "stripping off" of His physical body in death on the cross. Like verse 10, verse 11 also deals with what happened inclusively in the person of Christ, that is, His action included believers in it. The transition to what has happened in the individual life history of believers comes through faith, as depicted in baptism, when Christians were united with Christ as mentioned in verse 12. At conversion-initiation they share in *His* "circumcision-death;" it is not an independent act focusing on their own "circumcision-death." Thus, the whole statement (2:11-12) is a vivid figure for death, meaning that Christ's fleshly body was "stripped off" when He died by crucifixion, which included believers' participation in that saving event. However, several objections have been raised against this view.<sup>97</sup>

A second view understands ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός in 2:11 as a reference to the believer's sinful, unredeemed nature (i.e., his flesh-dominated self), which he or she stripped off (removed) "in the circumcision of (effected by) Christ," namely, Christian baptism, the substitute for the Jewish rite of circumcision.<sup>98</sup> This view appeals to the harmartiological use of σάρξ in 2:18 ("the mind of the flesh"), to the similar use of τὸ σῶμα with other qualifying genitives, as in Romans 6:6 ("body of sin"), 7:24 ("body of this death"), and Philippians 3:21 ("the body of our humble state"), and to a parallel description in the phrase, "putting off the old man" in Colossians 3:9. In this view, ἀπέκδυσις depicts the believer's radical break with the old life in bondage to the flesh. The cutting free from this bondage is the work of God

---

<sup>97</sup>See Caird, *Paul's Letters*, 193-94, who presents four objections that lead him to decide for the second view; also Lohse, *Colossians*, 103.

<sup>98</sup>This view is held by BAGD, s.v. ἀπέκδυσις; Lightfoot, *Colossians*, 182; Lohse, *Colossians*, 102-03; Masson, *Colossiens*, 126-27; Caird, *Paul's Letters*, 192-94; Bruce, *Epistles*, 103-06; Schweizer, *Colossians*, 143; id., *TDNT*, 7:136; R. Schnackenburg, *Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul. A Study in Pauline Theology*, rev. ed., trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray (New York: Herder and Herder, 1964) 68; J. Lähnemann, *Der Kolosserbrief: Komposition, Situation and Argumentation*, SNT 3 (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1971) 121-22; Zeilinger, *Der Erstgeborene*, 144-45; and Wright, *Colossians*, 104-08. Martin, *Colossians*, 81-83, discusses this view as the one that "our interpretation requires," but he finally opts for the first view.

experienced in conversion-initiation, which marks a new beginning for the believer. Corresponding to this but not required by it, the *ἀπεκδυσάμενος* clause of 2:15 can be taken as a reference to the fact that God (regarded as the subject of the sentence)<sup>99</sup> completely stripped the principalities and powers of their authority in Christ's cross (*ἐν αὐτῷ*, v. 15), the very place where they appeared to be triumphant over His purposes (1 Cor. 2:6-8). In this way, *ἀπεκδυσάμενος* depicts God's action of disarming the ruling powers of their power and authority. The middle voice is taken in an active and transitive sense and indicates the personal interest of the subject (i.e., God) in the action of the verb.<sup>100</sup> Thus, the whole statement (2:11-12) focuses on "Christian baptism" in which believers "put off" the old sinful nature.<sup>101</sup> There are, however, some objections to the second view also.<sup>102</sup>

A third view presents a mediating position. It takes the *ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει* phrase in 2:11 as a reference to the flesh-dominated person (i.e., the sinful, unredeemed self, as in view two) that is stripped off by union with Christ's own circumcision (i.e., His death, as in view one).<sup>103</sup> The death of Christ underlies the spiritual experiences about which Paul is speaking. Christ is the One through whom the "circumcision made without hands" is brought about. So, believers by

---

<sup>99</sup>Meyer, *Colossians*, 380-81; Masson, *Colossiens*, 143-44; Lohse, *Colossians*, 112; Wright, *Colossians*, 115. Pace Lightfoot, *Colossians*, 187-89; Robinson, *Body*, 41-42; Moule, *Colossians*, 101; G. H. C. MacGregor, "Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought," *NTS* 1 (1954-55) 23; Bruce, *Epistles*, 107 n81; Martin, *Colossians*, 86-87; and Larsson, *Christus*, 85.

<sup>100</sup>BAGD, s.v. *ἀπεκδύομαι*, 2; BDF, §316, 1; Robertson, *Grammar*, 804-05; Oepke, *TDNT*, 2:319; see also Bruce, *Epistles*, 107 n82; Schweizer, *Colossians*, 143-44.

<sup>101</sup>Bruce, *Epistles*, 104, says this is described in Rom. 6:6 as the crucifixion of "the old self" and the destruction of "the sinful body." However, this comparison seems to confuse positional and moral categories.

<sup>102</sup>See Dunn, "The 'Body' in Colossians," 168-70; Gundry, *Sōma*, 40-43; and Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 251. The issue at the Jerusalem Council in Acts 15 was not baptism instead of circumcision, but the requirement of baptism *and* circumcision. Baptism did not put a stop to the circumcision of Jews (e.g., Timothy). Paul's readers do not need "circumcision of the flesh" because they have already received "circumcision of the heart," a spiritual reality effected by God.

<sup>103</sup>Moule, *Colossians*, 95-96.

participation with Him in His death through faith, as depicted in baptism, were stripped (*ἀπέκδυσις*, understood in a passive sense here) of the "body of flesh." The flesh, while still a threat to believers, has been stripped of its controlling power over them in the "cutting off" (death) of Christ on the cross (cf. Gal. 5:24).<sup>104</sup> In this way, *ἀπέκδυσις* depicts the radical removal of the flesh-dominated self (i.e., the person as dominated by the flesh) through union with Christ. This view, however, suffers from the same objections as the second view (see footnote 102 above).

In light of the preceding discussion, the first view is preferred. All of the *σάρξ* references so far in Colossians have denoted physical flesh or bodily presence (1:22, 24; 2:1, 5), and so the phrase "body of flesh" in 2:11 focuses attention on the physical body and its susceptibility to death.<sup>105</sup> The whole phrase, "the removal of the body of flesh," applies to Jesus' death defined by the next phrase, "in the circumcision of Christ," a reference to Christ's death under the metaphor of circumcision. As indicated by the initial relative clause of verse 11 (*ἐν ᾧ καί*), conversion-initiation is understood as participating in His "circumcision-death."

It seems likely that by using the aorist participles in Colossians 3:9-10, especially *ἀπεκδυσάμενοι*, Paul intended his readers to make the connection with 2:11-15 and to refer the action of these participles to the events of the cross and to their own baptismal confession of participation with Christ in His death. In both 2:11-12 and 15, the emphasis lies on the completeness and radical nature of the break that is

---

<sup>104</sup>For Paul, *σάρξ* had several different associations, and thus its meaning may vary considerably from context to context; see BAGD, s.v. *σάρξ*, 1-8; Schweizer, *TDNT*, 7:125-38; Thiselton, *NIDNTT*, 1:674-76, 678-82. See also the discussion by Barclay, *Obeying the Truth*, 178-215, esp. 206-09, where he suggests the gloss "*what is merely human*" as a generalizing definition of *σάρξ*, a definition that accommodates Paul's apocalyptic perspective and his various uses of the term, but one that must be nuanced contextually. See ch. 6, 313-16 for further discussion of *σάρξ*.

<sup>105</sup>Dunn, "The 'Body' in Colossians," 169; pace NEB, "lower nature;" NIV, "sinful nature;" NJB, "your natural self;" and GNB, "sinful self." *Τοῦ σώματος* occurs in the genitive following the noun *ἀπεκδύσει* and *τῆς σαρκός* can be understood as an attributive genitive following *τοῦ σώματος* ("fleshly body") or, better, as a genitive of material ("body made out of flesh"), see Wallace, *Grammar*, 86-88, 91-92, 135.

made with a former state of affairs.<sup>106</sup> In 2:11-12, there is explicit mention of faith and baptism, suggesting that "stripping off" the "old man" (3:9) and "putting on" the "new man" (3:10) has connections with baptismal patterns of thought. Some have suggested that Paul may be alluding to the action of the candidate for baptism who exchanges his old clothes for new ones, thereby symbolizing this transfer of solidarity. But this practice is unlikely at this early stage.<sup>107</sup>

**4.4.3.4 Colossians 3:9b-10a: The Old Man / New Man.** What has been stripped off is "the old man,"<sup>108</sup> and what has been put on is "the new man."<sup>109</sup> The RSV and NEB somewhat restrict the scope of Paul's thought by using the word "nature" to translate *ἄνθρωπος*. Similarly, the JB, NJB, NAS, NIV and NRSV use "self" in an individualistic sense, which could imply the erroneous idea that one's "self" or "person" and Christ are actually opposed to one another. Paul's use of *ἄνθρωπος*, however, suggests a wider range of meaning, one that can include a representative, corporate, and an individual person sense.<sup>110</sup>

In 3:9b, Paul says that the "old man" has been stripped off *σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ*, that is, along with his conduct and actions.<sup>111</sup> The *σὺν* phrase draws attention

<sup>106</sup>Bruce, *Epistles*, 146 n77, suggests that *ἀπεκδυσάμενοι* in Col. 3:9 gives much the same sense as *συσταυρόω* in Rom. 6:6, and the same idea is repeated in different language in Rom. 8:12-13.

<sup>107</sup>See discussion of this in ch. 1, 47-48, and pp. 229-31 below.

<sup>108</sup>On the term *παλαιός*, see BAGD s.v. *παλαιός*; Seesemann, *TDNT*, 5:717-20; Delling, *TDNT*, 1:486-87; Haarbeck, *NIDNTT*, 2:713-16; ch. 2, 107-11; and ch. 5, 269-73.

<sup>109</sup>On the term *καινός*, see BAGD, s.v. *καινός*; Behm, *TDNT*, 3:447-51; and Haarbeck, Link, and Brown, *NIDNTT*, 2:669-74; and on the term *νέος*, see BAGD s.v. *νέος*; Behm, *TDNT*, 4:896-901; and Haarbeck, *NIDNTT*, 2:674-76. Note also R. A. Harrisville, "The Concept of Newness in the New Testament," *JBL* 74 (1955) 69-79, who concludes: "the terms *kainos* and *neos* are synonymous in the NT. Both terms imply a qualitative as well as a temporal significance" (79). Also see footnote 116 below; ch. 3, 174-81; and ch. 5, 278-84.

<sup>110</sup>Jeremias, *TDNT*, 1:364-67, esp. 366 n12; and Vorlander, *NIDNTT*, 2:564-69. See ch. 1, 42.

<sup>111</sup>On the term *πράξεις*, see BAGD, s.v. *πράξεις*; Maurer, *TDNT*, 6:642-44; and Hahn, *NIDNTT*, 3:1158, who refers to the term here as "the deeds of the old man viewed as a whole (Acts 19:18; Col. 3:9)."

to the whole way of life associated with the "old man," a way of life prior to and without Christ and characterized by the sort of vices listed in verses 5 and 8.<sup>112</sup> As expressed in verse 5, the list of vices stands in apposition to τὰ μέλη, that is, these vices could be viewed as the "members" of the "old man." Similarly, the virtues of verse 12 and following could be called "members" of the "new man."<sup>113</sup>

This σύν phrase brings into sharp focus the already recognized tension between the indicative and the imperative. If the "old man" along with (σύν) his practices has already been stripped off (v. 9b), as we have argued, then it seems to make the imperatives of verses 5 and 8 unnecessary, or at least less significant. However, the indicative relates to the believer's status or relationship with respect to the "old man" who has been "put off"; while the imperative relates to the conduct of the "old man" that believers are to "put off," i.e., remove from their lives.

With the putting off of the "old man," there has been a putting on of τὸν νέον [ἄνθρωπον] as stated in 3:10<sup>114</sup>. The action of the aorist participle ἐνδυσάμενοι, which is also causal and antecedent in force, is connected by καί to the preceding ἀπεκδυσάμενοι and is contemporaneous with it, as argued above. Having put off the "old man," the believer has at the same time been clothed with the "new man." This is a "new and distinctively Christian application of this metaphor."<sup>115</sup> The presence of νέον instead of καινόν (as in the Eph. 4:22 parallel) in contrast to παλαιός may emphasize newness in point of time (temporal). If so, this would suggest that Paul's

---

<sup>112</sup>The σύν phrase links the "old man" with his deeds without turning the "old man" metaphor itself into a figure for sinful attitudes and deeds that believers must put off.

<sup>113</sup>See discussion of μέλη on pp. 202-05 above.

<sup>114</sup>See ch. 1, 43-45, for a discussion of the "put off / put on" verbs.

<sup>115</sup>Dunn, *Colossians*, 220-21; cf. Eph. 2:15. See also Jervell, *Imago*, 240; Lohse, *Colossians*, 142 n60; O'Brien, *Colossians*, 189-90; Gnllka, *Kolossierbrief*, 187-88; R. Schnackenburg, "Der neue Mensch - Mitte christlichen Weltverständnisses (Kol 3, 9-11)" in *Schriften zum Neuen Testament. Exegese in Fortschritt und Wandel* (Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1971) 392-413; and M. Thompson, *Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12:1-15:13*. JSNTSup 59 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991) 149-58.



Colossian readers were relatively new (recent) converts. However, *νέος* is probably synonymous with *καινός* here and appears simply as a stylistic change since the distinctive idea of *καινός* (qualitative freshness), if maintained, is supplied by the participle *ἀνακαινούμενον* that follows immediately.<sup>116</sup> Before discussing the identity of the "old" and "new man," we shall give consideration to the setting for these designations.

It is generally recognized among scholars that 3:9-11 alludes to a baptismal setting.<sup>117</sup> This judgment is often based on parallels in wording between this text and other Pauline texts where baptism is explicitly mentioned. One such passage is Galatians 3:27-28 where three parallels are evident: 1) the clothing metaphor—"put on / put off" (Col. 3:9-10, 12; Gal. 3:28); 2) the language of "neither Greek nor Jew, slave nor free" (Col. 3:11; Gal. 3:28), including the unusual expression *οὐκ ἔστι* in both texts (elsewhere in the NT only 1 Cor. 6:5 and Jas. 1:17); and 3) the fact that the object of the verb "put on" is a "person," not a moral quality (Col. 3:10; Gal. 3:27). The masculine *εἷς*, "you are all one (*εἷς*) in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:28), could well be an

---

<sup>116</sup>Until recently, most scholars and lexicographers maintained a fairly rigid distinction between *νέος* and *καινός* by regarding *νέος* primarily as a temporal adjective and *καινός* as a qualitative adjective. For example, Behm, *TDNT*, 3:447, states: "*Νέος* is what is new in time or origin, i.e., young, with the suggestion of immaturity or lack of respect for the old. *Καινός* is what is new in nature, different from the usual, impressive, better than the old, superior in value or attraction. . . ." In *TDNT*, 3:449 n15, he says that the context of both Col. 3:9-10 and Eph. 4:22-24 shows that the ideas of the new time and the new quality (mode) of life for the Christian are closely related and complementary. However, MM, 314-15, demonstrate that papyrus usage does not support this distinction. After a thorough investigation, R. A. Harrisville, *The Concept of Newness in the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1960) 1-11, concluded that the distinction arose relatively late (1820-40). Lexicographers and exegetes who believed classical literature supported such a distinction applied it to the LXX and the Koiné of the NT. However, the two terms appear to be used interchangeably (synonymously) in the LXX and the Koiné, with the temporal and qualitative aspects attributed to both *νέος* and *καινός* as determined by the context (cf. 1 Cor. 5:7; 2 Cor. 3:6, 14). Pace R. C. Trench, *Synonyms of the New Testament*, 9th ed., 1880 (reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953) 219-25.

<sup>117</sup>Lohse, *Colossians*, 141; O'Brien, *Colossians*, 189; Jervell, *Imago*, 231-35; and A. J. M. Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection: Studies in Pauline Theology Against its Graeco-Roman Background*, WUNT 44 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1987) 338-39. However, the verb *ἐνδύω* in and of itself does not refer to baptism as imperatival usage elsewhere addressed to already baptized people makes clear (Rom. 13:12, 14; Col. 3:12; Eph. 6:11); pace Merk, *Handeln*, 204-05; and J. Ernst, *Die Briefe an die Philipper, an Philemon, an die Kolosser, an die Epheser*, RNT (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1974) 226. See ch. 1, 45 n130.

abridged way of saying "you are all *one new man* in Christ Jesus" (cf. Col. 3:10-11; 1 Cor. 12:13; Eph. 2:15).<sup>118</sup>

In Colossians itself, Paul exhorts the readers to continue in the teaching they received in the beginning (2:6), and he reminds them of the meaning of baptism (2:12) even though he had never visited the church there (cf. 1:4, 7-8; 2:1). This suggests that he is referring to specific instruction they received in connection with baptism itself. This may explain why concepts introduced in connection with baptism are not otherwise explained in the letter. Paul apparently assumes that the audience is already familiar with these ideas derived from a standardized core of instruction that all Christian converts received at the time of their baptism or soon after. This may well account for the presence of the "old man" / "new man" here within a wider paraenetic context. This may also help explain the abrupt and rather casual reference to the "old man" in Romans 6, even though Paul had not yet been to Rome either. He apparently assumed the readers were already familiar with it; hence the words, "do you not know?" (6:3) as well as "and (or, since) you know" (6:6).<sup>119</sup> The statement in Ephesians 4:21, "you heard and were taught in him" (i.e., Christ), presumably at the time of conversion seems to refer to standardized baptismal instruction also.<sup>120</sup> Thus, we hold the view that the "putting off / putting on" in

---

<sup>118</sup>Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:309; E. Best, *One Body in Christ: A Study in the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul* (London: SPCK, 1955) 79; pace F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians. A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) 190; and H. D. Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979) 187-88, who wants to supply *σῶμα* here. However, this would require the neuter *ἐν* instead of *εἰς* (cf. Rom. 12:5; 1 Cor. 10:17; 12:12, 20; Eph. 2:14-15; also cf. John 10:30; 17:11, 23; 1 Cor. 3:8).

<sup>119</sup>See the comments in ch. 2, 84-86 and 104-05; also A. J. M. Wedderburn, "Hellenistic Christian Traditions in Romans 6?" *NTS* 29 (1983) 337. Dunn, *Baptism*, 144 n17, sees this as Paul's way of introducing new information, but it makes better sense to view it as a reminder of what they already know based on their baptismal instruction. This does not preclude the notion that Paul originated the "old man / new man" metaphor and early on contributed it to Christian instruction through his missionary preaching.

<sup>120</sup>See ch. 5, 258-63 for a discussion of this text.

Colossians 3:9-10 relates to something accomplished in "baptism" (conversion-initiation) and something concerning which the converts received instruction.

If this is a baptismal "putting off / putting on," did Paul associate it with dying and rising with Christ? Three items in this context and elsewhere suggest that he did. First, dying with Christ and entrance into new life are associated with baptism earlier in this letter (cf. Col. 2:11-13; 3:1-4), and the reference to baptism through the clothing metaphor in 3:9-10 is probably another way of referring to the same event.<sup>121</sup> Second, the indirect parallel between Colossians 2:11 and 3:9, in which Christ's physical body is pictured as a garment and His death is viewed as the stripping off of that garment, forges another link between the clothing metaphor and dying with Christ (*ἀπεκδύσῃς* in 2:11 and *ἀπεκδύομαι* in 3:9). Third, since the "old man" crucified with Christ is in a baptismal setting in Romans 6:3-6, it appears that having "put off the old man" here refers to the same basic occasion.<sup>122</sup>

The identity of the "old man / new man" has been understood and expressed in various ways by interpreters of Paul.<sup>123</sup> In light of various factors in this passage as discussed above, we may summarize the meaning of the "old / new man" as follows. At conversion-initiation, believers have put off the "old man" as those who have been crucified and buried with Christ (Col. 2:11), and have put on the "new man" as those who belong to the new creation that has come about in Christ's resurrection. The "old man" refers to the status and conduct of the individual person who lives under the power and rule of sin prior to faith in Christ. At the same time it signifies

---

<sup>121</sup>The association of baptism with death is not unique to Paul since Jesus' death and that of His disciples is termed a "baptism" in Mark 10:38-39 (cf. Luke 12:50). See R. Scroggs and K. I. Groff, "Baptism in Mark: Dying and Rising with Christ," *JBL* 92 (1973) 536-37.

<sup>122</sup>See discussion in ch. 2, 82-84, 92-93, and 96-97. Those who accept this linkage include Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 52-54; Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 149; Dunn, *Baptism*, 158; P. W. van der Horst, "Observations on a Pauline Expression," *NTS* 19 (1973) 182; Zeilinger, *Der Erstgeborene*, 152; and Scroggs and Groff, "Baptism," 539-40.

<sup>123</sup>See the survey of views in ch. 1, 52-60.

that one belongs to the old humanity in Adam, the representative embodiment of the old humanity. On the other hand, the "new man" refers to the status and conduct of the individual who lives under the power and rule of the new creation and is being continually renewed in the Creator's image. At the same time, it signifies that one belongs to the new humanity in Christ, the representative embodiment of the new humanity.<sup>124</sup>

**4.4.3.5 Colossians 3:10b: The Renewal of the New Man.** It is the "new man" who is constantly being renewed with a view to (*εἰς*) his progressive increase in knowledge.<sup>125</sup> The participle *ἀνακαινούμενον* is a present *passive* (not middle) adjectival participle that occurs only in this passage and 2 Corinthians 4:16 in the New Testament. In the latter text, the "inner man" (vs. the "outer man") is being renewed day by day, which reflects the force of the present tense, while the passive voice suggests that the emphasis should be placed on divine activity. It is a reference to the moral and spiritual renewal of the Christian, the opposite of *διαφθείρεται* used in reference to the "outer man."<sup>126</sup> Likewise, it is the "new man," not the "old man," who is being renewed.<sup>127</sup> This is confirmed by the contrasting descriptive clause, "who is being corrupted," that modifies the "old man" in the Ephesians 4:22 parallel.

---

<sup>124</sup>See O'Brien, *Colossians*, 190-91. This viewpoint grows out of the Adam-Christ typology, a fundamental motif in Pauline theology (Rom. 5:12-21; 1 Cor. 15:22). See ch. 1, 40-41.

<sup>125</sup>Behm, *TDNT*, 3:452-53. The preposition *εἰς* could express purpose, "with a view to" (Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 70); result, "which results in knowledge or perception—the response of the whole person to God or Christ" (Moule, *Colossians*, 121); or, be equivalent to a locative *ἐν*, "in the sphere of knowledge, in knowledge" (BAGD, s.v. *ἐπίγνωσις* and *κτίζω*; Lohse, *Colossians*, 142; O'Brien, *Colossians*, 191-92). The first option is preferred. See Rom. 12:2 for the equivalent noun.

<sup>126</sup>Behm, *TDNT*, 2:698-99. On the contextually nuanced "divine passive," see Wallace, *Grammar*, 437-38; BDF, §130, 1; and S. E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press) 65-66. See further discussion on *ἀνακαινώω* and *ἀνανεώω* (Eph. 4:24) in ch. 5, 272-73; and on the "outer / inner man" in ch. 6, 301-07.

<sup>127</sup>Jervell, *Imago*, 244 n254. He correctly rejects Käsemann's interpretation of the renewal as the renewal of the fallen primeval man (*Leib*, 148). The participle *ἀνακαινούμενον* cannot be connected with the "old man" grammatically or conceptually.

It is more natural to connect *εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν* with the participle *ἀνακαινούμενον* rather than the following *κατά* phrase, and to supply the content for this absolute use of *ἐπίγνωσις* from the larger context, namely, the knowledge of God's will (Col. 1:9; Rom. 12:2) and His purposes in salvation through Christ (Col. 2:2; Eph. 1:9-12, 17; 4:13).<sup>128</sup> *Ἐπίγνωσις* is often used in reference to the knowledge of God and His will following conversion because it charts the path on which the "new man" progresses toward the goal of conformity to Christ.<sup>129</sup> This knowledge is the determining factor in the conduct of the "new man." However, it is not gained once for all or in a flash of insight but continues to increase and grow in the life of the Christian indicating that the "new man" is not a static but a dynamic figure. He is not yet complete and perfect but is continually being renewed in understanding and moral character.<sup>130</sup> The passive suggests that the renewal is the work of an agent (divine) not intrinsic to the believer, although the believer bears active responsibility (2 Cor. 7:1; Rom. 12:2). In addition, this is not only an individual renewal but also a corporate renewal of the new humanity in the creator's image (cf. 3:11).

Similarly, the phrase *κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν* should also be connected with the participle *ἀνακαινούμενον* rather than the phrase *εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν*.<sup>131</sup> The "new man" is being constantly renewed in accord with the image (*κατ' εἰκόνα*) of the one who

---

<sup>128</sup>Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 284; Lohse, *Colossians*, 143; Jervell, *Imago*, 255-56.

<sup>129</sup>BAGD, s.v. *ἐπίγνωσις*; Bultmann, *TDNT*, 1:706-07; Schmitz, *NIDNTT*, 2:397-403; Bruce, *Epistles*, 46 n30; O'Brien, *Colossians*, 192; Dunn, *Colossians*, 222. Moule, *Colossians*, 159-64, concludes that in the NT *ἐπίγνωσις* is specifically concerned with the knowledge of Christ and conformity to His likeness.

<sup>130</sup>Pace J. C. Dillow, *The Reign of the Servant Kings: A Study of Eternal Security and the Final Significance of Man* (Miami Springs, FL: Schoettle Publishing, 1992) 170, who says: "When the Christian is viewed as 'one born of God,' the reference is evidently to his true identity as a new man in Christ. The new man is *sinless* (Eph. 4:24; Col. 3:10), and no sin in the life of the Christian ever comes from who he really is, a new creation" (italics mine). Further, he says: "How can a *perfect* new man in Christ be 'renewed'? The renewal is 'into' (eis) knowledge and 'according to' (kata) the image of God. The new man while *without sin* is not mature" (178, italics mine). These statements about the new man are erroneous.

<sup>131</sup>Jervell, *Imago*, 248-49; Larsson, *Christus*, 198; O'Brien, *Colossians*, 191.

created him (*αὐτόν*). Three items call for special attention here. First, what is the antecedent of *αὐτόν*? This pronoun refers to the "new man," the redeemed person of the new creation, not to Christ or redeemed humanity in general.<sup>132</sup> In turn, *αὐτόν* serves as the object of the substantival aorist participle *τοῦ κτίσαντος*. The "new man" has been created and is now being renewed in accord with (*κατά*) the image of his creator.

Second, who is the creator of the "new man"—Christ or God? Some interpreters have put forth several reasons for taking Christ as the creator of the "new man."<sup>133</sup> The argument is based on: 1) Paul's references elsewhere to the Christian putting on Christ (Gal. 3:27; Rom. 13:14); 2) the statement of Colossians 3:11 that Christ is "everything" (*πάντα*) and "in all" (*ἐν πᾶσιν*, i.e., indwelling all members of His Church); 3) the parallel in Ephesians 2:15 where Christ is said to create the "one new man" in Himself; and 4) the parallel in Ephesians 4:24 where the "new man" is said to be created *κατὰ θεόν*, viewed as "according to the image of God," i.e., Christ.<sup>134</sup>

On the other hand, most recent interpreters have brought forward reasons for taking God as the creator of the "new man."<sup>135</sup> The argument is based on: 1) the allusion to Genesis 1:26-27, where the first Adam is said to have been created by God

---

<sup>132</sup>Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 284; Lightfoot, *Colossians*, 214-15; Moule, *Colossians*, 120; Masson, *Colossiens*, 144; Scroggs, *Last Adam*, 69-70.

<sup>133</sup>Lohmeyer, *Kolosser*, 140-42; Behm, *TDNT*, 3:453; M. Black, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam," *SJT* 7 (1954) 170-79, esp. 175; S. G. Wilson, "New Wine in Old Wineskins: IX. Image of God," *ExpTim* 85 (1973-74) 356-61, esp. 358; see further discussion in Eltester, *Eikon*, 158-64. Chrysostom and others in the early church took this view.

<sup>134</sup>On these passages, see pp. 241-42 below; ch. 3, 174-77; and ch. 5, 280-82.

<sup>135</sup>Lightfoot, *Colossians*, 214-15; Moule, *Colossians*, 120; Peake, "Colossians," 3:539; Scroggs, *Last Adam*, 69; Masson, *Colossiens*, 144; Jervell, *Imago*, 219, 249-50; Larsson, *Christus*, 205-06; Martin, *Colossians*, 107; Merk, *Handeln*, 207; Lohse, *Colossians*, 143; O'Brien, *Colossians*, 191; Barth and Blanke, *Colossians*, 413; Dunn, *Colossians*, 222; Gnllka, *Kolosserbrief*, 188. In Eph. 4:24, the "new man" is created *κατὰ θεόν*, literally, "according to God," but the phrase can be understood as "after the likeness (image) of God" (cf. Col. 3:10; 2 Cor. 3:18; 4:16; Phil. 3:21).

"in his own image . . . in the image of God" (1:27); 2) the fact that God is usually the subject of *κτίζω* in its New Testament uses and the act of creating is almost always represented as the work of God;<sup>136</sup> and 3) the claim that God is the logical subject of the passive verbs *ἐκτίσθη* and *ἐκτισται* in Colossians 1:16.

Apart from the unique christological contribution of Ephesians 2:15, the weight of evidence favors designating God as the creator of the "new man" here. The *aorist* participle *κτίσαντος* indicates that His creative act is antecedent to the present process of renewal (*τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον*), and either contemporaneous with, or, in light of verse 11, antecedent to the putting on (*ἐνδυσάμενοι*) of the "new man" at conversion-initiation. If antecedent, the emphasis lies on the prior existence of the corporate "new man" created in connection with the redemptive-historical death of Jesus (cf. Eph. 2:14-18). Then, at conversion-initiation the "new man" was "put on" by the believer and is now being renewed. If contemporaneous, which is most likely here in light of verse 10, the emphasis is on the individual "new man" created at conversion-initiation (cf. 2 Cor. 5:17) when the "new man" was "put on" by the believer and is now being renewed.<sup>137</sup>

Third, who is the referent of *εἰκῶν* in this phrase—Christ or God? Is Paul referring to the renewal of the "new man" according to the "image of Christ" or the "image of God"?<sup>138</sup> Understandably, the interpreters who take Christ as the creator

---

<sup>136</sup>See Rom. 1:25; 8:19-22, 39; 1 Cor. 11:9; Col. 1:15-16, 23; Eph. 2:10; 3:9; 4:24; 1 Tim. 4:3; also Matt. 19:4; Mark 13:19; 1 Pet. 4:19; Rev. 4:11; 10:6. In Eph. 2:15, *Christ* is said to have created "the one new man in Himself." This, however, is in keeping with the emphasis on Christ's mediatorial work in that passage. Paul usually speaks of God as the creator with Christ as the mediator of creation both "old" and "new" (cf. Col. 1:16).

<sup>137</sup>The antecedent use of the *aorist* participle is most common; however, if the controlling verb or verbal is also *aorist* (i.e., *ἐνδυσάμενοι* here), the action of the participle is often contemporaneous with the action of the verb; see Robertson, *Grammar*, 1112-14; and Wallace, *Grammar*, 614-15. See additional discussion in ch. 3, 175-76, and ch. 5, 281-82.

<sup>138</sup>On the word *εἰκῶν*, see BAGD, s.v. *εἰκῶν*, 1.b, 2; Kittel et al., *TDNT*, 2:381-97; Flender, *NIDNTT*, 2:286-88, 292-93; Eltester, *Eikon*, 156-64; and Jervell, *Imago*, esp. 214-16. This word appears 23 times in the NT: 15 denote physical representations, 1 refers to the Law (Heb. 10:1), 5 relate humans to the image of God or Christ (Rom. 8:29; 1 Cor. 11:7; 15:49; 2 Cor. 3:18;

of the new man also take Christ as the referent of *εἰκῶν*.<sup>139</sup> Consequently, the "new man" is being renewed after the image of Christ, that is, he is a copy of Christ's image. Some interpreters who take God as the creator of the new man, nevertheless, take Christ, who is the image of God (Col. 1:15), as the middle term between God and man.<sup>140</sup> However, while Christ is the image of God, the "new man" is being renewed *κατ' εἰκόνα* with reference to the one who created him, that is, God, as argued above. Thus, other interpreters take God not only as the creator of the new man but also as the referent of *εἰκῶν*.<sup>141</sup> The "new man" is being renewed according to the image of (belonging to) God his creator.<sup>142</sup>

The last view appears to reflect Paul's meaning best for several reasons. First, the allusion to Genesis 1:26-27 is unmistakable, suggesting that Paul draws on the "image of God" concept from the old (Genesis) creation to describe a reality of the new creation.<sup>143</sup> Second, the reference to renewal implies that the "image of God" was severely damaged and corrupted (but not lost) and is now being restored in the

---

Col. 3:10), and 2 denote Christ as the image of God (2 Cor. 4:4; Col. 1:15).

<sup>139</sup>See adherents to this view in footnote 133 above. Some take the *κατά* phrase to mean "according to Christ," but the parallel *κατὰ θεόν* (Eph. 4:24) makes this improbable; and, one would expect the article before *εἰκόνα* if "the image of Christ" were Paul's meaning according to Peake, "Colossians," 3:539, and Lightfoot, *Colossians*, 214.

<sup>140</sup>Jervell, *Imago*, 276-78, insists that Christ is the *εἰκῶν τοῦ θεοῦ* (Col. 1:15) and the Christian is renewed *κατ' εἰκόνα*, that is, "according to His image;" Christ is *Vorbild*, the believer is *Abbild*; also, Masson, *Colossiens*, 144-45.

<sup>141</sup>Scroggs, *Last Adam*, 69-70; O'Brien, *Colossians*, 191-92.

<sup>142</sup>The aorist substantival participle *τοῦ κτίσαντος* is a genitive of possession modifying *κατ' εἰκόνα*, thus: "according to the image of (belonging to) the One (God) who created him (the "new man," i.e., the redeemed man of the new creation)." On the substantival participle, see Wallace, *Grammar*, 619-21. For *κατά* denoting pattern or standard, "in accordance with, corresponding to," see BAGD, s.v. *κατά*, 5.

<sup>143</sup>Pace W. G. Kümmel, *Man in the New Testament*, rev. ed., trans. J. J. Vincent (London: Epworth Press, 1963) 67-68 n78; Merk, *Handeln*, 207. The allusion does not imply an identity of the new creation with the Genesis creation, but only an analogy between the two. Dunn, *Colossians*, 222, states: ". . . the understanding of creation as God imprinting his image on humanity remained fundamental to both Judaism and Christianity. . . ."



"new man."<sup>144</sup> Third, this passage connects back with Colossians 1:15-20 where, among other things, it is said that Christ is "the image of the invisible God" (1:15, cf. 2 Cor. 4:4).<sup>145</sup> He exists as the image of God. The "new man" is being renewed *κατ' εικόνα* of God. He does not become the image of Christ but the image of God. For Paul, people in the new creation will one day be fully restored to the image of God.<sup>146</sup> Fourth, this restoration of the divine image is nothing other than the "new man" being transformed into the same image in which Christ now exists as Paul states elsewhere (Rom. 8:29; 1 Cor. 15:49; 2 Cor. 3:18). Since Christ is the image of the invisible God, Paul can also describe the goal of redemption as that of bringing believers into conformity with the image of God's Son (Rom. 8:29) and of changing them more and more into His likeness both individually and corporately (2 Cor. 3:18; cf. Eph. 4:7-16).<sup>147</sup> Nevertheless, the "new man" does not become an "image of Christ" but the fully restored "image of God." His renewal is in conformity to Christ who now already exists as that image perfectly. It is only through Christ, then, that the "new man" is renewed according to God's image so that both are the image of God.<sup>148</sup> Fifth, the

---

<sup>144</sup>Kittel, *TDNT*, 2:392-94; cf. Wis. 2:23; 13-15. Pace Gnllka, *Kolossierbrief*, 188, the divine image has not been lost or entirely effaced by the Fall. In fact, Gen. 5:1-3; 9:6; 1 Cor. 11:7; and Jas. 3:9 indicate that God's image, to some degree, remains in all humans even after the Fall.

<sup>145</sup>According to Paul, the invisible God has become visible in Christ. He perfectly embodies and reveals the very nature and character of God (O'Brien, *Colossians*, 42-43). As the image of the God who is invisible (cf. Rom. 1:20; John 1:18; Heb. 1:3; 11:27; Acts 14:17; 15:23-28; 1 Tim. 1:17), Christ does not belong to the created order but stands with the creator who through Christ acts upon and in the whole creation. See Ridderbos, *Paul*, 69-73. On Jewish interpretations of the Genesis texts, see Scroggs, *Last Adam*, 16-28, 32-37, 70.

<sup>146</sup>Scroggs, *Last Adam*, 68-70. Scroggs notes that Paul also uses the "image of God" concept "as an eschatological term and looks ahead, rather than to primeval time, for its realization" (70). Paul, then, interprets the concept eschatologically rather than protologically. See discussion of the *Urzeit / Endzeit* theme in ch. 1, 49-51.

<sup>147</sup>S. Kim, *The Origin of Paul's Gospel*, WUNT 4 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992) 233, states: "Only in the light of the epiphanic phenomenon [the Damascus christophany] can we understand how Paul can speak of Christ as the 'image of God' on the one hand and speak at the same time of the 'image of Christ' (cf. Rom. 8:29; 1 Cor. 15:49) on the other."

<sup>148</sup>Scroggs, *Last Adam*, 68-69; Kim, *Origin*, 232-33, 320-29; O'Brien, *Colossians*, 191. In each of the texts cited, Paul stresses a certain identity between Christ and the believer (e.g., 2 Cor.

parallel passage in Ephesians 4:24 does not use *εἰκῶν* but refers instead to being created *κατὰ θεόν . . . ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας*. It is likely that *κατὰ θεόν* is to be understood as "like God" or "after the likeness (image) of God."<sup>149</sup> If the "image" is something that believers and God share, then this text identifies "righteousness and holiness that come from the truth" as central features of that image. And, it indicates that the image must be fully restored for the "new man" to be like God.

Theologians and biblical scholars continue to debate the nature of the image of God in humanity.<sup>150</sup> They attempt to answer the question: What do humans and God have in common that sets human beings apart from the rest of created life? The major problem with the biblical data is that Scripture nowhere explicitly defines or describes what the image of God comprises. Many scholars believe it has several aspects. The Reformers, especially Luther and Calvin,<sup>151</sup> appealed to such texts as Colossians 3:10 and Ephesians 4:24, and proposed "righteousness and holiness" as the essence of God's image. Since these and other communicable attributes of God are also "relational," perhaps, as a starting point, it is fair to speak of God's image in humanity as at least "moral and relational" in nature. As such, the image of God, though corrupted by the Fall, is being increasingly renewed and perfected in redeemed humanity—the individual and corporate "new man."

The allusion to Genesis 1:27 in Colossians 3:10 seems to justify interpreting Paul's use of the "old man" as a reference to the first Adam, the prototypical "old

---

3:18, "being transformed into the same image"). But these texts also reveal the "already-not yet" tension in Pauline eschatology, namely, the tension between partial realization in the present (2 Cor. 3:18; Col. 3:10) and full possession in the future (Rom. 8:29; 1 Cor. 15:49). The Christian is a "new person" (realized) who is still in the process of renewal (not yet fully realized).

<sup>149</sup>See the discussion in ch. 5, 280-82.

<sup>150</sup>For a discussion of this topic in biblical scholarship with references to recent literature, see G. Bray, "The Significance of God's Image in Man," *TynB* 42 (1991) 195-225.

<sup>151</sup>M. Luther, *Luther's Works*, eds. J. Pelikan and H. T. Lehman (Philadelphia: Muhlenburg Press, 1958) 1:61-63; and J. Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. J. T. McNeill, trans. F. L. Battles, LCC (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960) 1:15.3-4.

man," and humanity's standing in him, and his use of the "new man" as a reference to the last Adam, the prototypical "new man," and believing humanity's standing in Him. For Paul, the identity of the last Adam is Christ (1 Cor. 15:45-46). One might argue that the "new man," then, refers to Christ Himself since Paul states that believers have put on Christ in baptism (conversion-initiation), instead of saying that they have put on the "new man" (Gal. 3:27), and he also urges them to put on Christ in ethical renewal (Rom. 13:14).<sup>152</sup> However, the "new man" has been created (Col. 3:10) and Christ is not created (Col. 1:15-16). This suggests that Paul orients the "new man" figure toward the members rather than the head of the new creation even though Christ is the prototype of the new humanity both at its inception and in its continuance.

**4.4.3.6 Colossians 3:11: The Sphere of the New Man.** In the opening words of this verse, *ὅπου οὐκ ἔτι*, the relative adverb *ὅπου*, whose antecedent is the substantival *τὸν νέον [ἄνθρωπον]* in verse 10, denotes "place where." It is used figuratively here to designate the sphere of the "new man," the new creation realm in Christ, and to introduce some things that are found in it.<sup>153</sup> The barriers that separated people from one another in the old creation, and which still exist there, have been put aside in the new creation. This new situation is objectively real and historically present in the new humanity, the corporate new man, the Body of Christ (Rom. 10:12; 1 Cor. 12:13; Gal. 3:28; Eph. 2:15), since all believers were baptized by one Spirit into the one Body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:13). The thought of Galatians 3:28 is, in fact, repeated and modified according to the needs of the Colossian readers.<sup>154</sup>

---

<sup>152</sup>Lohmeyer, *Kolosser*, 140-42; thus Behm, *TDNT*, 3:453, states: "The Christian is to become a new man as Christ is the new man."

<sup>153</sup>BAGD, s.v. *ὅπου*, 2. Robertson, *Grammar*, 712, brings out the force of *ὅπου* by calling it "almost personal" in that *ὅπου* equals *ἐν ᾧ*. Dibelius-Greeven, *Kolosser*, 42, describe it as "in the realm of the new man."

<sup>154</sup>Lightfoot, *Colossians*, 214-15; Martin, *Colossians*, 108; Jervell, *Imago*, 251; O'Brien, *Colossians*, 192; pace Lohse, *Colossians*, 143, who regards the verse as traditional material.

There is equality in Christ because all believers, regardless of race, religious tradition, class, or social status, have been baptized into Christ. All these distinctions that put people in separate categories are no longer relevant in the community of the new creation "in Christ." Thus the force of *ὅπου* and the antitheses in this verse indicate that Paul now speaks of the "new man" on the corporate level.

The word *ἐνι* is the longer form of the preposition *ἐν* with *ἔστιν* understood (*ἐνεστιν*). It appears in the New Testament with the meaning "there is" and always occurs with a negative (*οὐκ*) serving to point out an objective fact (cf. Gal. 3:28). It negates not merely the fact—something "does not exist"—but also the possibility—something "cannot exist."<sup>155</sup> This leads us to consider the barriers that can no longer exist in the corporate "new man" based on the gospel Paul preached.

First, national and racial barriers—Greek and Jew—are transcended in the new creation by the gospel, which is addressed to all (Rom. 1:16). Here, as elsewhere, *Ἕλληνα* is used in the wider comprehensive sense of Gentile as opposed to Jew (cf. e.g., Rom. 1:16; 2:9-10; 3:9-12; 1 Cor. 1:22-24; 12:13; Gal. 3:28).<sup>156</sup> Second, religious privileges such as circumcision, whether inherited by birth or adopted later, have lost their significance and have been disregarded in the new creation (Gal. 6:15; 5:6; 1 Cor. 7:19; Rom. 2:25-29; 4:9-12).<sup>157</sup> Third, while to the Jew the world was divided into Jews and Greeks (privileged and unprivileged religiously), to the Greeks and Romans, the world was divided into Greeks and barbarians (privileged and unprivileged

---

<sup>155</sup>BDF, §98; BAGD, s.v. *ἐνι*; Lightfoot, *Colossians*, 214; see also Martin, *Colossians*, 108; Dunn, *Colossians*, 223; pace Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 285.

<sup>156</sup>On the word *Ἕλληνα* in Paul, see Windisch, *TDNT*, 1:551-53; 2:512-16; Bietenhard, *NIDNTT*, 2:124-27; and on *Ἰουδαῖος* in Paul, see Gutbrod, *TDNT*, 3:380-82. Manuscripts D\* F G it vg<sup>mss</sup>, and a few Church Fathers insert *ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ* ("male and female" probably from Gal. 3:28) at the beginning of the series, but the addition is, no doubt, secondary. The singular nouns are generic and so may be rendered "Greeks and Jews." See ch. 3, 170-71 n70.

<sup>157</sup>On the word *ἀκροβυστία*, see Schmidt, *TDNT*, 1:225-26; and on *περιτομή*, see Meyer, *TDNT*, 6:82-83; and Hahn, *NIDNTT*, 1:307-12. These terms, "the circumcised (Jews) and the uncircumcised (Gentiles)" form an a b b' a' chiasmus with the first word pair, "Greeks and Jews."

intellectually and culturally). But such cultural barriers are also disregarded in the new creation (Rom. 1:14; 1 Cor. 14:11; Acts 28:2, 4). Here *βάρβαρος* is probably meant to cover Gentiles of non-Greek culture, while the *Σκύθης* is cited as the roughest and most uncivilized type of barbarian.<sup>158</sup> Fourth, social barriers (slave vs. free) are also disregarded in the new creation (Gal. 3:28; 1 Cor. 7:22; Philemon).<sup>159</sup> For Greeks and Romans alike, the slave was a piece of property legally speaking. But within the Christian community, the slave, as much as the free person, was considered a Christian "brother or sister." The conversion of Onesimus and his return to Philemon would provide a fitting illustration of this to the Colossian Christians. This series, then, points to the equality and unity of all believers in Christ, both of which are grounded in their baptism into Christ (Gal. 3:27). It is a theological rather than a sociological profile of the new humanity.

In contrast (*ἀλλά*) to the old order of things where divisive barriers separate people in the world, Christ (emphatic position) is *πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν*.<sup>160</sup> It is difficult to determine whether *ἐν πᾶσιν* is neuter or masculine. The neuter word *πάντα* and Colossians 1:15-20 would support understanding it as neuter: Christ is "everything and in everything."<sup>161</sup> However, if the phrase is analyzed as a whole, the parallel in Galatians 3:28 and the immediate context would support treating it as masculine:

---

<sup>158</sup>On the word *βάρβαρος*, see Windisch, *TDNT*, 1:546-53; and on *Σκύθης*, see Michel, *TDNT*, 7:447-50. The only other NT occurrence of *βάρβαρος* is in Acts 28:2, 4 (rendered "islanders," NIV), where it is used of the people of Malta who were probably of Phoenician descent. According to Josephus, *Ap.* 2.269, Scythians "differ little from wild beasts."

<sup>159</sup>On the word *δούλος*, see Rengstorf, *TDNT*, 2:261-64, 274-76, and Tuente, *NIDNTT*, 3:595-97; and on *ἐλεύθερος*, see Schlier, *TDNT*, 2:487-88, 501, and Blunck, *NIDNTT*, 1:717-20. The slave was described as "one who does not belong to himself but to someone else" (Aristotle, *Pol.* 1.1254a.14), as "one who does not have power to refuse" (Seneca, *De ben.* 3.19), and as one whose constant prayer was that "he be set free immediately" (Epictetus 4.1.33). Manuscripts A D\* F G insert *καί* between *δούλος* and *ἐλεύθερος* to emphasize the contrast as in the first two pairs.

<sup>160</sup>Manuscripts B D G place the article *τά* before *πάντα*. The UBS<sup>4</sup> text places square brackets around it indicating dubious textual validity.

<sup>161</sup>Lightfoot, *Colossians*, 217; Dunn, *Colossians*, 227. *Ἐν πᾶσιν* is neuter in 2 Cor. 11:6; Phil. 4:12; 1 Tim. 3:11; 2 Tim. 2:7; 4:5; and Eph. 4:6; 6:16.

Christ is "all and in all," specifically, He is "all that matters," all that people need to enter the new creation realm, and He indwells all who believe in Him, irrespective of their status in the old creation realm, binding them together into one.<sup>162</sup> The named barriers that were so influential and regulative of their life previous to the putting on of the "new man" have now in Christ lost their former meaning and value—a fact that was not recognized and accepted by the false teachers. Loyalty to Christ is to take precedence over all sociological elements.

**4.4.3.7 Colossians 3:12a: Put On Virtue.** In Colossians 3:12 and following, the emphasis changes from the negative (vices) to the positive (virtues), and Paul moves on to exhort those who have put on the "new man" to put on those moral qualities that are characteristic of the "new man." An inferential *οὖν* (cf. v. 5) makes the connection with the preceding by introducing the direct summons that follows as a consequence of having stripped off the "old man" with his characteristic practices (v. 9) and having put on the "new man" who is being renewed (v. 10) and to whom Christ is all and in all (v. 11). The ethical consequences of having put on the "new man" are now drawn out in more detail, but once again, as in 3:9b-10, Paul first reminds his readers of their standing before God as (*ὡς*) those who are "God's elect, holy and beloved ones."

Five virtues that are to be "put on" (acquired) are listed in a catalog-like series as the behavior through which the "new man" expresses his identity. In contrast to the vices of verses 5 and 8, these qualities promote harmony in the Christian community. The "new man" owes his capability for such action to the enabling grace God has given him in Christ. In fact, all five of the qualities that describe the new man's conduct designate acts of God or Christ in other passages:

---

<sup>162</sup>Martin, *Colossians*, 108; O'Brien, *Colossians*, 193. Lohse, *Colossians*, 145 n85, remarks that with this pleonastic expression the author wants "to draw attention to the Lordship of Christ which embraces all things. Thus, he is not concerned with the distinction between masculine or neuter, people or things."

compassion (cf. Rom. 12:1; 2 Cor. 1:3); kindness (Rom. 2:4; 11:22; Eph. 2:7; Titus 3:4); humility (Phil. 2:8); meekness (2 Cor. 10:1); and longsuffering (Rom. 2:4; 9:22). In putting on these virtues along with forbearance, forgiveness and love (vv. 13-14), the renewal that the "new man" experiences comes to light. These qualities were perfectly and permanently displayed in Jesus' character and conduct. So when Paul wishes to sum up and commend the whole body of Christian graces, he says, "Put on the Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 13:14).

The imperative verb *ἐνδύσασθε* (v. 12) links the virtues that follow with the idea of putting on the "new man" (v. 10), showing that a close relationship exists between them. This imperative, like those in verses 5 and 8, is in the aorist tense, signifying the decisive, holistic action that is to be taken.<sup>163</sup> Although the putting on of the "new man" has taken place at conversion-initiation, there are acts of renewal that must continue to take place (cf. *τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον*, v. 10, and *ἐνδύσασθε*, v. 12), that is, the putting on of virtues characteristic of the "new man." Once again, the imperative is based on and develops out of an indicative dealing with the same subject. While the indicative statements refer back to the passing from death to life effected at conversion and to what is already present (Col. 3:1a, 3, 9b, 10a, 11, 13b), the imperatives point ahead from conversion to the expression of the new life by those who have been raised with Christ to new life and are being renewed in order to discern and fulfill God's will (3:1b, 2, 5, 8, 9a, 10b, 12).

#### 4.5 Concluding Observations on the "Old Man / New Man"

In Colossians 3:9-11, the designations *ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος* and *ὁ νέος [ἄνθρωπος]* appear together probably for the first time in the Pauline corpus. They occur near the outset of a predominantly paraenetic section of the letter. Four factors influence Paul's use of these terms here: 1) verses 1-4 serve as the

---

<sup>163</sup>Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 362-64; also see discussion on pp. 201 and 212-13 above.

"indicative" theological basis for the immediate (vv. 5, 8, 9a) and subsequent (vv. 12ff) "imperatives" of exhortation; 2) the contrast schema *ποτέ . . . νῦν* (vv. 7-8) is evident as Paul reminds the Colossian Christians how they ought to conduct themselves now (*νῦν*) in contrast to their pre-Christian past (once, *ποτέ*); 3) corporate associations are evident implicitly not only in the sins that characterize the "old man" (vv. 5, 8) but also in the virtues that characterize the "new man" and in the new realm where old barriers that separate people from each other have been put aside (v. 11); and 4) the clothing metaphor ("put off / put on") involving aorist participles is descriptive of a contextually-defined change from "old" to "new."

The aorist participles *ἀπεκδυσάμενοι* (v. 9) and *ἐνδυσάμενοι* (v. 10) are viewed as lending indicative rather than imperative force to the clothing metaphor. The strong theological affirmation in these participles (vv. 9-10) links up with the indicative verbs of verses 1-4 and refers to the same theological reality. For believers to have "died with Christ" includes having "put off the old man;" to have "risen with Christ" includes having "put on the new man." This imagery pictures the change of status and mode of existence from "old" to "new" that took place at conversion-initiation on the individual level. This theological reality (the indicative) serves as the necessary basis and incentive for the ethical exhortations (the imperative, 3:5, 8, 9a, 12ff).

The conversion (baptismal) setting for the "old man / new man" and their link with "dying and rising with Christ" allow Paul to use the terms on an individual level. But such a connection also allows him to assume that his readers are familiar with the corporate associations of these terms through the instruction they received at the time of their baptism (conversion-initiation). Thus, the "old man / new man" stand over against each other in a redemptive-historical and eschatological sense with corporate as well as individual connections.



As argued previously (cf. chs. 2 and 3), the corporate associations stem from the connection of all people to Adam or Christ. Adam is the prototypical "old man" who through the Fall established and now represents the old order of existence under sin and death for all in the corporate "old humanity," each member of whom is an individualized "old man." Christ is the prototypical "new man" who through His death and resurrection established and now represents the new order of existence under righteousness and life for all in the corporate "new humanity," each member of whom is an individualized "new man." The invasion of the "old" by the "new" took place redemptive-historically at the cross and resurrection of Christ, and individually at conversion-initiation when the believer "put off the old man" and "put on the new man." Thus the two, "old man" and "new man," do not coexist at the individual level. The believer is now identified as a "new man" and belongs to the corporate structure of the "new man."

Nevertheless, the believer as a "new man" encounters the corporate structure of the "old man" and all its effects in present life experience. Consequently, the "new man" is being renewed with a view to a progressive increase in the knowledge of God in accord with the image of the One (God) who created him. This implies that the "new man" is a dynamic (vs. a static) figure. This means that the believer, though genuinely "new," is not yet complete and perfect. He / she is *already* "new" but *not yet* perfectly so; thus he / she is subject to the imperatives of grace and is continually being conformed to the image of Christ, the prototypical "new man."

This renewal takes place within the corporate structure of the new order / realm of existence in Christ, within the new humanity, where the various racial, religious, cultural, and social barriers that separate and divide people from one another in the old order / realm of existence are no longer relevant. In the new creation realm of redeemed humanity there is equality of status because all believers regardless of race, religious tradition, culture, class, or social standing have been incorporated into

Christ (Gal. 3:27-28; 1 Cor. 12:13) who is Lord over all and who by the Spirit dwells in all who believe binding them together as one.

In this passage, then, Paul takes up a common clothing metaphor depicting a change of status and identity and uses as its object the "old man / new man" metaphor out of his own theological thinking in order to sum up and set forth certain key ideas of his theology. The fact that believers have put off the "old man" and put on the "new man" at conversion-initiation serves as a theological summary for the definitive transfer of the individual from the old solidarity of being "in Adam" to the new solidarity of being "in Christ." This, in turn, is the necessary basis and incentive for conduct that comports with the "new man."

Now we turn to Ephesians 4:22-24, the last passage where the "old man / new man" metaphor occurs in the Pauline corpus. We must investigate this text to see whether this double metaphor is used in the same way as stated above, or whether a different grammatical construction indicates it functions in a different way.

## CHAPTER 5

### EPHESIANS 4:22-24

#### THE OLD MAN PUT OFF / THE NEW MAN PUT ON

The words "to put off . . . the old man . . . and to put on the new man" occur in Ephesians 4:22-24. This text is the last reference to the "old man" and the "new man" in the *corpus Paulinum*. As in Colossians 3:9-10, it also mentions both terms together along with the "put off / put on" imagery. Since relevant introductory issues concerning Ephesians have already been treated in chapter three (see ch. 3, 145-46), we begin our study of this text with a discussion of the literary context of Ephesians 4 (5.1) and the structural form of Ephesians 4:17-24 with additional attention to 4:17-19 (5.2). This sets the stage for an exegesis of Ephesians 4:20-24 (5.3) and concluding observations on the "old man / new man" (5.4).

#### 5.1 Literary Context of Ephesians 4

As noted in chapter 3, Ephesians is usually understood to consist of two main parts: exposition in 1:3–3:21 and exhortation in 4:1–6:22, framed by the address (1:1-2) and the closing blessing (6:23-24). In part two (chs. 4–6), signaled by *παρακαλῶ οὖν* (4:1), Paul's emphasis moves from contemplative exposition to straightforward exhortation, although this is not a rigid shift because expositional elements are intermingled with the exhortations (e.g., 4:4-16, 30, 32; 5:25b-27).<sup>1</sup> He gives traditional ethical material a distinctly theological basis. However, his clear intention in this section is to impress upon his readers that their daily conduct must be consistent with the Christian calling he has just expounded to them (4:1). His imperatives are addressed to people already freed from slavery to sin and enslaved to God as His chosen possession (cf. Rom. 6). Most of his readers were first-generation

---

<sup>1</sup>M. Barth, *Ephesians*, AB 34, 34A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1974) 1:53-55, and 2:453-57, rightly speaks out against driving a wedge between the "indicative" and "imperative" and the misunderstandings that result. See ch. 4, 198 n7.

Christians and some were probably recent converts.

The admonitions of part two could be grouped under four headings. First, there is Paul's exhortation to maintain unity in the diversity of the Body of Christ (4:1-16). Second, in light of this, he gives specific admonitions, based on the motif of the "old" and "new man" (4:17-24), in which a vice characteristic of the "old man" and harmful to the unity of the Church is paired with an opposite virtue that is characteristic of the "new man" and beneficial to the unity of the Church (4:25–5:5). This is continued by the antithesis between the "children of light" and the "children of darkness" (5:6-14) and between the "wise" and the "foolish" (5:15-20). Third, there are the *Haustafeln*—admonitions relating to the domestic life of believers (5:21–6:9),<sup>2</sup> involving wives and husbands, children and parents, and slaves and masters. Finally, fourth, there are admonitions for believers to arm themselves for the moral battle against spiritual powers of evil and to pray continually for one another and for Paul (6:10-20). He closes this section with a brief commendation of Tychicus (6:21-22) in the same terms as those given in Colossians 4:7-8. In light of this overview, we turn our attention to the structure of Paul's argument in 4:17-24.

## 5.2 Structural Form of Ephesians 4:17-24

In terms of the structure and sequence of argument, this pericope has two parts: 4:17-19 and 4:20-24. In 4:17-19 Paul gives a penetrating description of the status and conduct of pagan Gentiles and exhorts his Christian readers not to live like

---

<sup>2</sup>Summaries of domestic duties are found here and elsewhere in the NT: Col. 3:18–4:1; 1 Tim. 6:1-2; Titus 2:1-10; and 1 Pet. 2:13–3:7. This suggests that such instruction formed part of a fairly well-defined body of instruction imparted to converts from early times. While many of the ethical emphases in these summaries have parallels in Jewish and Stoic sources, they are presented here on the basis of and in the context of Christian theology. From the rich bibliography on the subject, mention may be made of J. E. Crouch, *The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafeln*, FRLANT 109 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972); W. Schrage, "Zur Ethik der neutestamentlichen Haustafeln," *NTS* 21 (1974-75) 1-22; D. Lührmann, "Neutestamentlichen Haustafeln und Antike Ökonomie," *NTS* 27 (1980-81) 83-97; and D. L. Balch, "Household Codes," in *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament*, ed. D. E. Aune (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988) 25-50.

them any longer (*μηκέτι*). By contrast, in 4:20-24 he sets forth the status and manner of life that is in accord with Christian truth and teaching.

### 5.2.1 Ephesians 4:17-24: Contrasts and Comparisons

Throughout 4:17-24 one finds several contrastive features: 1) the contrast between pagan Gentiles and Christians (vv. 17, 20); 2) the basic exhortation that Christians are no longer to conduct their lives as the pagan Gentiles (v. 17); 3) the temporal references "no longer" (v. 17) and "your former way of life" (v. 22); 4) a description of pagan thinking and conduct (vv. 17b-19) set over against Christians who have "learned Christ" (v. 21) and were taught "truth in Jesus" (v. 22); 5) the antithesis between putting off the "old man" (v. 22) and putting on the "new man" (v. 24); and 6) the antithesis between "desires that come from deceit" (v. 22) and "righteousness and holiness that come from truth" (v. 24). In essence, this is the contrast between two types of existence: non-Christian (4:17-19) and Christian (4:20-24).

This type of material appears elsewhere in the New Testament (cf. Rom. 1:21-25; 1 Thess. 4:3-8; 5:1-11; Col. 3:5-11; Eph. 5:3-20) and there are parallels in the Old Testament and Jewish literature<sup>3</sup> as well as in the paraenesis of Hellenistic philosophical literature.<sup>4</sup> Specifically, the contrast between two ways of life has Jewish antecedents and appears in other early Christian catechetical material.<sup>5</sup> Andrew Lincoln suggests that 4:17-24 reflects three features from an underlying early Christian baptismal catechesis: 1) the imagery of the new life entered upon through conversion-initiation, namely, the "new man" and new creation in verse 24 (cf. Rom. 6:4; Gal. 6:15; 2 Cor. 5:17; Col. 3:10; Titus 3:5); 2) the imagery of "put off"

---

<sup>3</sup>E.g., the Holiness Code of Leviticus, particularly 18:1-5, 24-30; 20:23; Wis. 14:22-31; 4 Macc. 1:26-27; 2:15; 1QS 4.2-11; CD 4.17-19; Philo, *Sac.* 27, 32; *Virt.* 182; Josephus, *Ap.* 2.146.

<sup>4</sup>E.g., Crates, *Epist.* 6-7, 18-19, 21; Plutarch, *Mor.* 441A; Epictetus 2.18.15, 19; 4.1.122; see K. Berger, "Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament" in *ANRW* 2.25.2 (1984) 1340-41.

<sup>5</sup>This contrast is found, for example, in the following texts: Deut. 11:26-28; 30:15-20; Ps. 1; Jer. 21:8; 1QS 3-4; Matt. 7:13-14; *1 Clem.* 35.5; *Did.* 1-5 and *Barn.* 18-20.

(ἀποτίθημι) and "put on" (ἐνδύω) that appears in verses 22 and 24 (cf. 1 Thess. 5:8; Rom. 13:12-14; Gal. 3:27; Col. 3:8-12; 1 Pet. 2:1; Jas. 1:21); and 3) the listing of vices to be put away in verses 19 and 22 and virtues to be acquired in verse 24.<sup>6</sup>

Upon comparison, it is evident that there is a close relationship between this passage and the language and thought of Colossians 3:5-11. The similarities can be set out as follows:

Ephesians 4:17-24

4:17 μηκέτι ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν καθὼς  
καὶ τὰ ἔθνη περιπατεῖ

4:19 εἰς ἐργασίαν ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης  
ἐν πλεονεξία

4:22 ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς κατὰ τὴν  
προτέραν ἀναστροφὴν τὸν παλαιὸν  
ἄνθρωπον

4:24 καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν  
ἄνθρωπον

4:23 ἀνακαινοῦσθαι δὲ τῷ πνεύματι  
τοῦ νοῦς ὑμῶν

4:24 τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα

Colossians 3:5-11

3:7 ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιεπατήσατέ  
ποτε

3:5 πορνείαν, ἀκαθαρσίαν, πάθος,  
ἐπιθυμίαν κακὴν, καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν

3:8 νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς  
3:9 ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν  
ἄνθρωπον

3:10 καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον  
ἄνθρωπον

3:10 τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν

3:10 κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν

In addition to the similarities, there are also some significant differences. In 4:22, the infinitive ἀποθέσθαι (cf. Col. 3:8) is used in reference to the "old man" instead of the participle ἀπεκδυσάμενοι as found in Colossians 3:9. Similarly, in 4:24, the infinitive ἐνδύσασθαι is used in reference to the "new man" instead of the participle ἐνδυσάμενοι as found in Colossians 3:10. In reference to the "new man" and being "renewed" in 4:23-24, the use of καινός and νέος and their respective cognate verbs is reversed in Colossians 3:9-10. Where Colossians has νέος for the "new man" and a

---

<sup>6</sup>A. T. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, WBC 42 (Dallas: Word Books, 1990) 272. See also P. Carrington, *The Primitive Christian Catechism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940) 31-65; and E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1947) 363-466. Note the discussion of Col. 3:5-8, 12 in ch. 4, 200-14, and 242-43.

participial form of ἀνακαινόω for "renew," Ephesians has καινός for the "new man" and an infinitival form of ἀνανεόω for "renew." In 4:24, the idea of the creation of the "new man" in relation to God is expressed by the phrase κατὰ θεόν rather than the more explicit κατ' εἰκόνα phrase in Colossians 3:10. Finally, the additional material about pagan Gentiles in 4:17c-19a and the discussion about Christians having learned Christ and having been taught truth in Jesus in 4:20-21 have no parallel in Colossians 3:5-11. On the other hand, the corporate emphasis and the abolition of various barriers that divide people mentioned in Colossians 3:11 have no parallel in the Ephesians passage. Nevertheless, by using similar language but relating it to the sharp contrast between pagan Gentile life and life in accord with Christian truth, Paul gives his paraenesis its distinctive emphasis in this passage.

The resumptive οὖν<sup>7</sup> and the double use of περιπατέω in verse 17 provide a major link to 4:1-16. In 4:1-3 following παρακαλῶ οὖν, Paul exhorts his readers to live a life in keeping with their Christian calling using περιπατέω (in infinitive form), one of his favorite metaphors denoting one's way of life.<sup>8</sup> In 4:4-16 he develops the theme of unity and diversity in the Church and the role of ministers in contributing to the maturing of the Body of Christ so that it attains to the unity of the faith (4:13a), εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον (4:13b), and grows up into Christ (4:15). Then in verse 17 he returns to exhortation, making it clear that the way of life appropriate to his readers' calling was not that of pagan Gentiles. The use of περιπατέω also provides a key link to subsequent sections of Paul's paraenesis: 4:25–5:2 (περιπατεῖτε in 5:2), 5:3-14 (περιπατεῖτε in 5:8), and 5:15-20 (περιπατεῖτε in 5:15). The exhortations in 4:25–5:2 specify what it means to put away the vices characteristic of the "old man" and put on the virtues characteristic of the "new man," while 5:3-14 and 15-20 reinforce the

---

<sup>7</sup>BDF, §451, 1; A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek in the Light of Historical Research*, 4th ed. (Nashville, TN: Broadman, 1923) 1191-92; note the same use of οὖν in 1 Cor. 8:4; 11:20. See ch. 4, 201 n14.

<sup>8</sup>See ch. 4, 210 n52 for references; also note ch. 2, 95 n91.

need to distinguish between the thinking and conduct of Christians and non-Christians. Thus, it is important to note that 4:17-24, along with the emphasis on the nature of the Church in 4:1-16, provide the theological basis and frame of reference for the rest of Paul's paraenesis in this letter.

### 5.2.2 Ephesians 4:17-19: Description of Pagan Gentiles

Several additional observations on 4:17-19 are important before we proceed further. Paul resumes his hortatory material with added emphasis using the demonstrative pronoun *τοῦτο*,<sup>9</sup> employing a compound predicate involving two verbs of speaking in which the second verb (*μαρτύρομαι*) has a more forceful meaning, namely, "to implore or insist,"<sup>10</sup> and repeating the phrase *ἐν κυρίῳ* from 4:1 (cf. 5:8).<sup>11</sup> He insists that they should no longer (*μηκέτι*) live (*περιπατεῖν*) just as (*καθὼς καί*) the pagan Gentiles live (*περιπατεῖ*).<sup>12</sup> The infinitive *περιπατεῖν* with an accusative *ὑμᾶς* (4:17) cannot properly be called an imperatival infinitive.<sup>13</sup> Rather, it stands in apposition to *τοῦτο*, which serves as the direct object of the compound predicate mentioned above. Robertson treats the infinitive clause as indirect discourse (after *λέγω*) in apposition to *τοῦτο*, although he says it is indirect command, not indirect

---

<sup>9</sup>*Τοῦτο* here is prospective pointing to what follows, BAGD, s.v. *οὗτος*, 1.b.β; cf. Eph. 3:8; 5:5; E. Best, *Ephesians*, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998) 416.

<sup>10</sup>BAGD, s.v. *μαρτύρομαι*, 2; Strathmann, *TDNT*, 4:510-11; see also BDF, §392, 1.d for *λέγω* used to denote giving a command. The only other NT occurrence of this usage is in 1 Thess. 2:12.

<sup>11</sup>W. Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God*, SBT 50 (London: SCM, 1966) 177-79. Paul prefers this formula in ethical contexts regarding relationships and actions in the day-to-day life of believers (cf. 1 Thess. 4:1; 5:12; 1 Cor. 7:22, 39; 9:1-2; 11:11; 15:58; Gal. 5:10; Phil. 3:1; 4:1-2, 4; Eph. 4:1, 17; 5:8; 6:1, 10, 21). The phrase refers to life under the authority of Christ the risen Lord.

<sup>12</sup>BAGD, s.v. *καί*, II.3; in sentences denoting a contrastive comparison *καί* strengthens *καθὼς* but often is pleonastic and can be omitted in translation. The verb is singular following a neuter plural subject (cf. BDF, §133).

<sup>13</sup>Pace Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:499, who implies this by citing BDF, §389. However, BDF state that this usage is limited in the NT to two passages in Paul, both without a subject, i.e., Rom. 12:15 and Phil. 3:16.



assertion.<sup>14</sup> This is also because of *μαρτύρομαι*, a verb of beseeching that Paul added in order to create a construction here similar to the one he used in 4:1.

However, it is better to take the infinitives in 4:1 and 4:17 as epexegetical (complementary) of content to the immediately preceding verbs of exhortation with *ὑμᾶς* as the direct object of these verbs rather than treating them as conveying indirect discourse or, more specifically, indirect command.<sup>15</sup> Indirect discourse is reported speech or thought, but Paul is not quoting himself or anyone else directly in these verses.<sup>16</sup> Rather, he implores his readers declaring what he wants them to do positively (4:1) and negatively (4:17) by the respective infinitive clauses. The imperatival sense, therefore, lies in the finite verb and other contextual elements rather than in the infinitive itself.

The tenses of the infinitive refer to different aspects or kinds of action, and if time is involved, it must be inferred from the immediate context.<sup>17</sup> In 4:1, Paul uses the *aorist* infinitive to represent the verbal action as a whole and as undefined (no reference to duration, completion, or resultant state) in regard to Christians "walking" worthily of their calling. But, in 4:17, he uses the *present* infinitive to represent the verbal action as durative in specific regard to their "walking no longer" (as they once did) as pagan Gentiles "walk" (*περιπατεῖ*, a durative or customary present tense). This discussion has some bearing on our understanding of the infinitives used in 4:22

---

<sup>14</sup>Robertson, *Grammar*, 700, 1078, but note 1034-36, 1046; see also BDF, §392, 1.d for *λέγω* followed by *ἵνα* or an accusative with an infinitive in which *λέγω* is used as a verb of command.

<sup>15</sup>D. B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996) 652.

<sup>16</sup>Robertson, *Grammar*, 950, claims, however, that when a command is not quoted directly (cf. 2 Thess. 3:10), it may be expressed as an indirect command either by an infinitive as in Acts 21:21, by *ἵνα* (not *ὅτι*) as in Mark 6:8, or by using a deliberative question as in Luke 12:5. This is true if a command is being reported (thus it is indirect discourse as in 2 Thess. 3:10 where a *ὅτι* occurs), but not if a command is being given by the speaker or writer. In this case, a *ἵνα* clause or an infinitive clause give the content of the command or exhortation.

<sup>17</sup>*Ibid.*, 1080; 856-58.

and 24 as we shall see later.

It also appears that Paul resumed his presentation of hortatory matters in a rather general, foundational way in 4:17-24 before launching into specific exhortations in 4:25ff. He perhaps did this because he was somewhat removed from his exposition of the believer's personal and corporate standing in Christ given in chapter 2, and he perceives the need for a summary recall of it. Thus, 4:17-19 reflects 2:1-3 and 11-12, and 4:20-24 reflects 2:4-10 and 14-18. Furthermore, since he anticipates drawing upon traditional paraenetic material,<sup>18</sup> his concern is to give his readers a proper theological base. There seems to be more and closer integration of theological themes with ethical teaching in Ephesians than in Romans and Colossians, although ethical teaching is theologically based there as well. This may be due to the fact that in Ephesians Paul is not directing his comments to any specific moral crisis and thus is giving general ethical instruction to Gentile Christians.<sup>19</sup> The basic danger facing many of them was a moral relapse into their former pre-Christian ways.

Consistent with this observation is the fact that, in his description of pagan Gentiles in 4:17-19, Paul refers *both* to their status *and* to their conduct. In fact, the former is the basis of the latter and is the reason he could speak about them in such strong terms without qualification. He says they live in (έν, sphere) purposeless futility (ματαιότητι) resulting from their "mind-set";<sup>20</sup> and they exist in a state of

---

<sup>18</sup>It is widely recognized that some of Paul's ethical instructions come from common ethical material contemporary with him. See V. Furnish, *Theology and Ethics in Paul* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968) passim; Martin, "Haustafeln," *NIDNTT* 3:928-32; and J. D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998) 661-67.

<sup>19</sup>See J. L. Houlden, *Paul's Letters from Prison: Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians*, WPC (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977) 316-17.

<sup>20</sup>BAGD, s.v. ματαιότης; Bauernfeind, TDNT, 4:522-23; Tiedtke, NIDNTT, 1:551-52; Best, *Ephesians*, 418. This noun forms part of the vocabulary for Jewish and early Christian polemic against pagan idolatry. In the LXX it is a description of the emptiness of those who reject God and go after false gods (cf. Esth. 4:17 and Jer. 2:5; 8:19).

darkened understanding (perfect passive paraprastic participle, *έσκοτωμένοι . . . ὄντες*)<sup>21</sup> that causes blindness to the truth. They are excluded (perfect passive participle, *άπηλλοτριωμένοι*) from the life of God<sup>22</sup> because of (*διά*) the ignorance of God inherent in them, and because of (*διά*) the hardness (*πώρωσιν*) of their hearts.<sup>23</sup> Because they are in a morally calloused or insensitive state (*άπηληγkότες*), they have given themselves over (*έαυτούς παρέδωκαν*) to wicked conduct:<sup>24</sup> licentiousness (*τῆ άσελγεία*), the pursuit of immorality (*έργασίαν άκαθαρσίας*), and insatiable greed (*πλεονεξία*).<sup>25</sup> Each of these nouns is comprehensive in character involving the whole

---

<sup>21</sup>BAGD, s.v. *σκοτώω*; Conzelmann, *TDNT*, 7:441-43; Hahn, *NIDNTT*, 1:423-25; for this imagery note *T. Dan.* 2.4; *T. Levi* 14.4; Josephus, *Ant.* 9.4.3; 1QS 3.3; 1QM 11.10; 15.9-10; *1 Clem.* 36.2; *2 Clem.* 19.2. It is "walking in darkness" as opposed to "walking in light" (Eph. 5:8). The perfect passive participle puts the focus on an existing state or condition (BDF, §§341, 352).

<sup>22</sup>BAGD, s.v. *άπαλλοτριώω*; Büchsel, *TDNT*, 1:265-66; Bietenhard, *NIDNTT*, 1:684-85. The translation "excluded" or "without a share in" is justified because they had never before been included in the "life of God" as the usual rendering "alienated" might imply; see Col. 1:21; Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:257. The perfect passive participle puts the focus on an existing state. The *ζωή* of God is "life that comes from God" and is likely equivalent to salvation in light of 2:1-5; see Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:502; and Best, *Ephesians*, 420.

<sup>23</sup>The first *διά* phrase (v. 18b) is paratactic to the second *διά* phrase (v. 18c) and they are to be taken together as a unified statement; see R. Schnackenburg, *Ephesians. A Commentary*, trans. H. Heron, EKKNT 10 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991) 197. Both are causal in force, and in combination they provide the reason for the preceding three clauses that relate to the status of the Gentiles. Ignorance of God is a volitional (vs. intellectual) lack of knowledge that amounts to repudiating God and His revelation and thus ignoring Him. The noun *πώρωσις* is derived from *πώρωω*, which means "to harden or petrify," and in medical terminology refers to calloused, insensitive tissue; see BAGD, s.v. *πώρωσις*; Schmidt, *TDNT*, 5:1026-28; Becker, *NIDNTT*, 2:155-56; Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:501-502; and Best, *Ephesians*, 420-21. Paul sees pagan ignorance of God and immorality as willful and culpable—a deliberate refusal of God's revelation to them in creation and conscience (cf. Rom. 1:18-25 and *έαυτούς παρέδωκαν*, Eph. 4:19).

<sup>24</sup>The perfect passive participle *άπηληγkότες* points to the present state of pagan Gentiles and is taken in a causal sense; see BAGD, s.v. *άπαλγέω*. This verb occurs only here in the NT. In Rom. 1:24, 26, 28, God delivered the rejectors over to their behavior, whereas here they have given themselves (*έαυτούς παρέδωκαν*, consummative aorist) to wicked behavior, which shows their "death" in sins even though they are physically alive (Eph. 2:1-5).

<sup>25</sup>The word *άσελγεία* means "debauchery, sensuality," and often alludes to sexual depravity but is not limited to it; see BAGD, s.v. *άσελγεία*; Bauernfeind, *TDNT*, 1:490; also, Mark 7:22; Rom. 13:13; 1 Pet. 4:3. The word *άκαθαρσία* means "impurity" and is used of sexual vices, although not exclusively; see BAGD, s.v. *άκαθαρσία*, 2; Hauck, *TDNT*, 1:427-29; Link and Schattenmann, *NIDNTT*, 3:102-08. The word *πλεονεξία* is preceded by *έν*, suggesting that their wicked conduct is carried out in the sphere of an insatiable desire to have one's own way regardless of the consequences (note, however, 5:3, 5 where it denotes a vice, i.e., greed); see BAGD, s.v. *πλεονεξία*; Delling, *TDNT*, 6:271-74; Selter, *NIDNTT*, 1:137-38.

person. For Paul, the whole person outside of Christ is in a state of futility without the life of God and under judgment (cf. 2:3). This person in his or her totality is called the "old man" in verse 22. The "old man" cannot be repaired or restored but only relinquished and replaced by the "new man," as Paul makes clear in verses 22-24. The difference between the "old" and the "new" is like that between "death" and "life" (2:1-5) or between "darkness" and "light" (5:8). Both non-Christian and Christian existence are thus described in absolute (vs. relative) terms from a theological (vs. sociological) perspective.

### 5.3 Exegesis of Ephesians 4:20-24

We now turn to Ephesians 4:20-24 where we might expect Paul to describe Gentile Christians in a manner parallel to his description of Gentile pagans in 4:17-19, presenting both their status and conduct.

#### 5.3.1 Ephesians 4:20: You Learned Christ

The beginning words *ὑμεῖς δέ* take up the *μηκέτι ὑμᾶς* of verse 17. In emphatic (*ὑμεῖς* is emphatic by its presence and position) contrast to the status and conduct of pagan Gentiles just described (vv. 17-19), Paul's Gentile Christian readers have learned something entirely different (*οὐχ οὕτως*).<sup>26</sup> The description in verses 17-19 is not the life that answers to their calling in Christ (4:1). A change has occurred so that now they are not to live in the same way they once did. However, Paul did not present the contrast by discussing the change itself or giving a corresponding description of Christian conduct. Instead, he reminded them of what they had learned, which was the reason for the change and the basis for their conduct.

---

<sup>26</sup>*Οὐχ οὕτως* is an emphatic litotes, a figure that indicates a more forceful contrast than is expressed; see T. K. Abbott, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians*, 7th ed. ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897) 134; and S. D. F. Salmond, "The Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians," in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, vol. 3, ed. W. R. Nicoll (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1903) 3:340. Codex Claromontanus followed by some recent commentators places a full stop after *οὕτως*: "but not so you. You have learned Christ . . . ." This makes the statements uncharacteristically abrupt.

The object of what they learned is said to be τὸν Χριστόν. In light of the following τῷ Ἰησοῦ (v. 21), the form Χριστός probably indicates that His office as the Anointed One is in view here. He is the One through whom believers have been set free from both the bondage and the guilt of sin described in verses 17-19. The use of μαθήνω with an accusative of person as the object is most unusual, being without parallel in the New Testament and in pre-Christian Greek literature.<sup>27</sup> This has given rise to the view that Christ is the content of what is learned in the same sense that other texts declare that Christ is "preached" (Acts 5:42; Gal. 1:16; 1 Cor. 1:23; 15:12; 2 Cor. 1:19; 4:5; 11:4; Phil. 1:15); "gained" (Phil. 3:8); "known" (2 Cor. 5:16; Phil. 3:10; cf. John 14:7, 9); "received" (Col. 2:6); or "believed" (1 Cor. 15:1-2, 11; Phil. 4:9; Eph. 1:13).<sup>28</sup> The closest parallel is Colossians 2:6 where παρελάβετε τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον could be rendered "you received [the tradition about] Jesus Christ the Lord" (cf. Col. 1:6-7). In both these passages, then, "Christ" stands for traditional teaching about Him that is directly related to Christian conduct, and both these items are associated with being taught (cf. Col. 2:7). But probably more is intended.

The statement "assuming you have heard Him and were taught in Him" in verse 21 further explains "you learned Christ" in verse 20. Christ was preached and believed; He was taught and became known; and all this is summarized as "you learned Christ." Since the living, risen Christ is the sum and substance of the gospel, "to learn Christ" is not only to know about Him but to be reoriented and shaped by Him, the mediator of a new relationship with God and the source of a new way of life. This unique use of μαθήνω is appropriate for in no other learning is a person so

---

<sup>27</sup>Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 134; Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:529; A. van Roon, *The Authenticity of Ephesians*, trans. S. Prescod-Jokel, NovTSup 39 (Leiden: Brill, 1975) 177. The clause μάθετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, spoken by Jesus, occurs in Matt. 11:29 in a call to discipleship, but nowhere else is this verb followed by an accusative object of person as here.

<sup>28</sup>Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 134-35; H. Schlier, *Der Brief an die Epheser: Ein Kommentar*, 7th ed. (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1971) 216; BAGD, s.v. μαθήνω, 1, "Christian teaching." Salmond, "Ephesians" in *EGT*, 3:340-41, says the sentence cannot refer to the doctrine of Christ or to learning to know Christ for there are no relevant examples of such uses.

directly and fully the object. It can also be argued that the aorist tense points to the time of conversion, and thus Christ was the content of the preaching they heard then as well as the substance of the instruction and knowledge they gained subsequently.<sup>29</sup> To learn Christ, then, is to accept Him as the One through whom Christians have redemption (cf. 1:7) and are freed from the bondage of their former pagan condition and way of life (4:17-19).

### 5.3.2 Ephesians 4:21: Truth in Jesus

The emphatic conditional clause introduced by *εἰ γέ*<sup>30</sup> implies that Paul did not know his readers personally nor had instructed them personally (cf. 3:2), but he did not call into question the fact that they had learned Christ because he assumed that "they had heard him and were taught in him" by others. The object of the verb *ἠκούσατε* is *αὐτόν*,<sup>31</sup> a reference to *τὸν Χριστόν*. Paul was not suggesting that his readers actually heard Jesus during His earthly ministry. Rather, it is to be understood that Christ was the One about whom they heard from those who proclaimed the gospel to them, and in that sense they heard Christ since this proclamation was ultimately His own proclamation (cf. Luke 10:16; 2 Cor. 13:3; Eph.

---

<sup>29</sup>Best, *Ephesians*, 426-27. However, Salmond, "Ephesians" in *EGT*, 3:341, states that the aorists are not to be pressed as a reference to the time of conversion. Rather, they indicate the past without further definition since the context does not fix a particular moment. Yet *μηκέτι* of v. 17 seems to have conversion as its point of reference (cf. Rom. 6:6) unless we assume that the description in vv. 17-19 was true of Paul's Gentile readers for a time following their conversion. But this undermines the contrast (*ὑμεῖς δέ*) he established between 4:17-19 and 4:20-24.

<sup>30</sup>This restrictive conjunction has the idea "if at least . . .," pointing to the minimal amount of content required or assumed by a writer of his readers, cf. 3:2. It could be translated "if indeed, or assuming that;" see Robertson, *Grammar*, 1027 and 1147-49; BAGD, s.v. *γέ*, 3.a; and Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:504, who suggests, "if as I assume to be the case."

<sup>31</sup>The verb *ἀκούω* is usually followed by the genitive case when referring to a person. Here the accusative is used. BDF, §173, 1, state: "The classical rule for *ἀκούειν* is: the person whose words are heard stands in the genitive, the thing (or person: E4:21 *αὐτόν ἠκούσατε*) about which (or whom) one hears in the accusative . . ." This classical distinction is not always intended in NT usage but seems admissible here; see also Robertson, *Grammar*, 506-07.

2:17).<sup>32</sup> In light of 1:13 and the aorist tense of *ἤκούσατε* in this verse, to hear Christ primarily refers to the initial reception of the message, that is, to accept Christ as proclaimed in the gospel and thus to become a Christian. In Romans 10:17 Paul declared that "faith comes from hearing" (*ἐξ ἀκοῆς*). Hearing awakens faith, a heeding (*ὑπακοή*) of the proclaimed gospel whose content is Christ (cf. 1 Thess. 1:8; Rom. 1:8 with 16:19; 1:5 with 10:16).

Not only is Christ the subject matter of their initial hearing (and receiving), but He is also the sphere within which (*ἐν αὐτῷ*)<sup>33</sup> subsequent instruction was given (*ἐδιδάχθητε*, aorist passive). The underlying idea points to union with Christ. The teaching given was in the context of fellowship with Christ as members of His Body, that is, as believers incorporated in Him they were instructed by Christian teachers in Christian truth.<sup>34</sup> A significant part of what they were taught is summarized in verses 22-24. If these verses are linked to 2:5-6 and the parallel passage in Colossians 2:20–3:11, then it could be argued that Paul assumed his readers had learned that union with Christ was participation with Him in His death and resurrection, and that those who received (learned, v. 20) Christ accepted the crucifixion of the "old man" and his practices with Him (cf. Rom. 6:6; Gal. 5:24; Col. 3:9-10) and also a resurrection to newness of life (Rom. 6:4; Col. 3:1, 10, 11). This is possible only because of the historical death and resurrection of Jesus, which seems

---

<sup>32</sup>Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:530; C. L. Mitton, *Ephesians*, NCB (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981) 163; and Best, *Ephesians*, 427. See also ch. 3, 185-86.

<sup>33</sup>An instrumental *ἐν*, translated "by him" (AV) and making an explicit reference to Christ as the teacher, is less likely. Following a passive verb such as *ἐδιδάχθητε*, one would expect a *ὑπό* or *διά* phrase instead of *ἐν* if an instrumental meaning were intended. If a reference / respect meaning were meant, then *περί* (concerning) would be more suitable.

<sup>34</sup>Salmond, "Ephesians" in *EGT*, 3:341; J. A. Robinson, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. A Revised Text and Translation with Exposition and Notes*, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1909) 190; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984) 357. Best, *Ephesians*, 428, claims that this interpretation would be strengthened if *ἐδιδάχθητε* were to be taken as a divine passive, "you were taught by God in Christ;" but this is not a credible option here.

to be the reason for the reference to "truth in Jesus" in verse 21.

The latter part of verse 21 contains the clause: *καθώς ἐστὶν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ*. This clause is somewhat ambiguous and so unusual in Paul's letters that it has proved difficult to understand. Some interpreters have wished to treat it as a marginal gloss,<sup>35</sup> but there are no manuscripts that omit the difficult clause. Others take it as part of the original text but understand its connection and meaning in several different ways.<sup>36</sup>

For our purposes, several observations are appropriate. First, the *καθώς* clause is integral (not parenthetical)<sup>37</sup> to the thought of verse 21. Barth takes *καθώς* as introducing a quotation rather than a comparison or a reason.<sup>38</sup> This view assumes that Paul is about to quote traditional material. *Καθώς ἐστὶν* is seen as a formula in which a past participle such as "affirmed," or "said" has been omitted and the quotation begins with the exclamation, "Truth in Jesus!" and ends with the words "in righteousness and holiness of the truth" in verse 24. Despite Barth's observations in support of this view, it is syntactically awkward and artificial here, and it ignores the relationship of these verses to Colossians 3:9-11. A similar objection can be made for

---

<sup>35</sup>B. F. Westcott, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, ed. J. M. Schulhof (London: Macmillan, 1906) 70-71, records a dialog with F. J. A. Hort who held this view on v. 21.

<sup>36</sup>C. A. Scott, "Ephesians IV.21: 'As the truth is in Jesus,'" *Expositor*, 8th Series, III (1912) 178-85. Salmond, "Ephesians" in *EGT*, 3:341, notes 12 different views including his own, viz., the clause indicates that the instruction these believers received, as expressed in the following infinitive clauses, was in accord with truth embodied in Jesus. Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:533-36, enumerates and critiques three distinct views: 1) Jesus Christ is the saving truth to be trusted in faith and followed in obedience. 2) Jesus' teaching during His ministry on earth is the essence of the Church's proclamation and doctrine and as such is the "truth." And, 3) truth in v. 21c denotes an ethical attitude, i.e, conduct true and faithful to Jesus.

<sup>37</sup>Pace Westcott, *Ephesians*, 67.

<sup>38</sup>Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:505, 533-36, where he contends that the whole quotation (vv. 21c-24) had its origin, place, and function among wise men, and Paul used it to urge believers to conduct themselves "not as fools but as wise men (5:15)." He cites 1:4; 5:2, 25 as possible parallels for this use of *καθώς*.



linking the *καθώς* clause with the following infinitive clauses.<sup>39</sup>

It is better to connect the *καθώς* clause with both *ἠκούσατε* and *ἐδιδάχθητε* of the preceding clause. As such, rather than a comparison with ("just as . . .")<sup>40</sup> or an explanation of ("for . . .") the verbal action, *καθώς* is causal introducing the reason for ("because . . .")<sup>41</sup> the action of these verbs, and this clause stands in contrast to *οὐχ οὕτως* in verse 20. Paul's readers had heard about Christ and had been taught in Him because Christian truth is summed up and found in Jesus. This instruction contrasts sharply with the pagan Gentile pattern of life depicted in 4:17-19.

Second, *ἀλήθεια* is an anarthrous abstract noun.<sup>42</sup> In light of this, some interpreters claim that it has to be the subjective complement (predicate) following *ἔστιν* and, if so, a subject needs to be supplied from the context.<sup>43</sup> An impersonal subject, "there is truth in Jesus," seems too indefinite here.<sup>44</sup> The only other possibility would be a reference to Christ from the preceding clause, "He [Christ] is truth in Jesus."<sup>45</sup> But, as Lincoln argues, without further unwarranted punctuation changes, this translation makes little sense even on the unlikely assumption that

---

<sup>39</sup>Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 135. C. A. A. Scott, *Christianity According to St. Paul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927) 36-37, connects the clause with the following verses and translates: "that, as was actually the case with Jesus, ye put off the old man . . .;" see also G. B. Caird, *Paul's Letters from Prison: Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon in the Revised Standard Version*, NCB (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976) 80-81.

<sup>40</sup>BAGD, s.v. *καθώς*, 1; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 283. It is difficult to see with what a comparison is being made here.

<sup>41</sup>BAGD, s.v. *καθώς*, 3; Best, *Ephesians*, 429; cf. causal *καθώς* in 1:4. Robinson, *Ephesians*, 148, sees the *καθώς* clause as explanatory but such a use is not attested elsewhere.

<sup>42</sup>BDF, §258; Wallace, *Grammar*, 243-45, 249-50. The article is often omitted with abstract nouns such as "grace" or "faith" in the Pauline corpus.

<sup>43</sup>Caird, *Paul's Letters*, 80; J. Gnllka, *Der Epheserbrief*, 2nd ed., HTKNT 10.2 (Freiburg: Herder, 1977) 228, n3; I. de la Potterie, "Jésus et la vérité d'après Eph 4,21," *AnBib* 17-18 (1963) 45-57, esp. 48.

<sup>44</sup>Westcott, *Ephesians*, 67, 70. Hort calls the impersonal subject as proposed by Westcott "a strange understatement" (cf. Westcott, *Ephesians*, 71).

<sup>45</sup>De la Potterie, "Jésus et la vérité," 48; also Schlier, *Epheser*, 216.

this is a polemical statement against a Gnostic christology.<sup>46</sup> Alternatively, there is no compelling grammatical reason why *ἀλήθεια* could not be taken as the subject of the *καθώς* clause: "truth is in Jesus."<sup>47</sup> This translation appears to make the most sense (cf. NKJV, NRSV, NAS) and correctly conveys the thought of the clause that the content of Christian truth is summed up in Jesus. Here it is probably equivalent to the gospel (cf. 1:13).

Third, the change from *τὸν Χριστόν* (v. 20) to *τῷ Ἰησοῦ* (v. 21) seems to be deliberate and theologically significant.<sup>48</sup> This is the only occurrence of the name "Jesus" by itself in Ephesians (cf. "Lord Jesus" in 1:15).<sup>49</sup> In fact, it rarely occurs without qualification in Paul's writings, but when it does, it is used to call attention to the central events of the gospel.<sup>50</sup> Here, Paul evidently used the name by itself for a theological reason. There are two views of what this reason is. The first view argues that the *καθώς* clause is a polemic against Gnostic teaching that drove a wedge between the heavenly Christ and the earthly Jesus of history.<sup>51</sup> However, such a cryptic polemical point is unlikely in a letter that does not appear to combat

---

<sup>46</sup>Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 281.

<sup>47</sup>C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959) 111-12, states concerning the use or non-use of the Greek article that "each instance needs to be discussed on its own merits. . . ." See also Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 280-81, and Best, *Ephesians*, 429.

<sup>48</sup>Pace Bruce, *Epistles*, 357, who states: ". . . it is difficult to discern any distinction in emphasis between 'in Christ' and 'in Jesus,'" and Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 282, who views the use of the name as a stylistic variation and concludes: "to learn the gospel tradition is to be taught in Christ or to be taught the truth in Jesus."

<sup>49</sup>In the NT Epistles the name "Jesus" always stands without the article, except for 2 Cor. 4:10-11 (D F G omit the article); Eph. 4:21; 1 Thess. 4:14; and 1 John 4:3; see MHT, 3:167. The use of the article in these passages probably puts some emphasis on the historical Jesus.

<sup>50</sup>Foerster, *TDNT*, 3:298. See 1 Thess. 1:10; 4:14; Gal. 6:17; 1 Cor. 12:3b; 2 Cor. 4:5, 10, 11, 14; 11:4; Rom. 3:26; 8:11; and Phil. 2:10. In some of these texts Paul is likely drawing on a traditional formulation.

<sup>51</sup>Schlier, *Epheser*, 217; Gnllka, *Epheserbrieff*, 228; opposed by de la Potterie, "Jésus et la vérité," 53-55.

Gnosticism elsewhere. Furthermore, a misguided christology is not at issue in this context. The second view is more compelling. It argues that Paul wished to link the [risen] Christ to the earthly Jesus in order to focus attention on the central events of His earthly ministry: His teaching, redemptive death, and resurrection.<sup>52</sup> The point is that Christian instruction in all its aspects, including ethical teaching, has its roots in the historical Jesus who experienced the humiliation of the cross and the exaltation of the resurrection. The tradition about Christ that Paul considered true and legitimate was the one that acknowledged Him as the incarnate, crucified and resurrected Jesus.

The *καθώς* clause, then, declares that the truth as found in Jesus was the standard for the instruction received by Paul's readers. Though he used *ἀλήθεια* in various ways,<sup>53</sup> in this context it points to ethical teaching rooted in the gospel (cf. 1:13; Col. 1:5-6). This truth stands in contrast to the deception and delusion of pagan futility (cf. 4:17; Rom. 1:25) that underlies the description of pagan Gentiles in 4:17-19. Paul's Christian readers had heard about Christ and had been taught in Him according to the proper content of the apostolic tradition, namely, the truth as summed up and found in Jesus. Consequently, their lives should now be different from what they once were.

### 5.3.3 Ephesians 4:22-24: The Three Infinitives

In contrast to the parallel passage in Colossians 3:9-10 where two aorist participles are used to express the "put off / put on" imagery, the Greek text in this passage has three infinitives: *ἀποθέσθαι*, an aorist middle infinitive (v. 22), *ἀνανεοῦσθαι*,

---

<sup>52</sup>Robinson, *Ephesians*, 107; Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 135; Mitton, *Ephesians*, 163; Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 199; and Best, *Ephesians*, 429-30. See footnote 50 above for references.

<sup>53</sup>Various uses of *ἀλήθεια* are discussed by Bultmann, *TDNT*, 1:238-47; Thiselton, *NIDNTT*, 3:874-901, esp. 884-88; and J. Murphy-O'Connor, "Truth: Paul and Qumran," in *Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1st ed., ed. J. Murphy-O'Connor and J. H. Charlesworth, COL (New York: Crossroad, 1990) 179-230, esp. 208-10.

a present passive infinitive (v. 23), and ἐνδύσασθαι, an aorist middle infinitive (v. 24). This sequence of infinitives is tied together by δέ (v. 23) and καί (v. 24). Thus, they are to be viewed as paratactic having the same contextual connection with ὑμᾶς in verse 22 that serves as the "subject" of all three.<sup>54</sup> What is the syntactical connection of these infinitives in this context? Four main options have been proposed.

First, these infinitives are sometimes viewed as equivalent to independent imperative verbs expressing commands.<sup>55</sup> However, in the few places in the New Testament that have an imperatival infinitive, it is either completely independent of a finite verb and without an expressed subject (only Rom. 12:15, twice; and Phil. 3:16), or it follows an explicit imperative and takes on its mood (e.g., Luke 9:3; Acts 23:23-24; Titus 2:1-2).<sup>56</sup> Neither of these alternatives is the case here. Furthermore, it is unlikely that an imperatival infinitive would have an expressed accusative "subject" as here (ὑμᾶς, v. 22). These observations eliminate this option.

Second, these infinitives could be dependent on ἐμάθετε (v. 20), specifying the content acquired when Paul's readers "learned Christ."<sup>57</sup> However, the distance between ἐμάθετε and ἀποθέσθαι is substantial (though not prohibitive), and if this

---

<sup>54</sup>Most grammarians speak of this use of the accusative as the "subject" of the infinitive, although Robertson, *Grammar*, 489-90, prefers to call it an accusative of general reference. We shall use the convenient designation "subject," but with the understanding that it refers to the agent associated with the action of the infinitive since the infinitive, being non-finite, cannot have a subject in the technical sense.

<sup>55</sup>RSV, JB, TEV translations; D. Daube, "Participle and Imperative in I Peter" in Selwyn, *St. Peter*, 480-81, argues that a variety of imperatival forms, including participles and infinitives, is typical of Hebrew ethical codes. The infinitive as an imperative is common in Pseudo-Phocylides (ca. 30 BC–AD 40). Several MSS (e.g., P<sup>46</sup>) and Latin and Greek versions understood the infinitives here as having imperatival force. The RSV starts a new sentence at v. 22, treating ἀποθέσθαι as though it were a direct command to the readers: "Put off your old nature . . ."

<sup>56</sup>BDF, §§387, 3; 389; also Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 126-27; Robertson, *Grammar*, 943-44; and E. D. Burton, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*, 3rd ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898) 146. See previous footnote.

<sup>57</sup>J. Murray, *Principles of Conduct: Aspects of Biblical Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957) 214-19, esp. 217 n6. However, he does not think the governing thought is affected if the infinitives depend on ἐδιδάχθητε (v. 21) instead.

connection is granted, it tends to make verse 21 parenthetical to the argument. This is not an impossible view, but unlikely, since ἀποθέσθαι would be dependent on a negatively qualified verb (οὐχ οὕτως ἐμάθετε), and this could confuse or even contradict Paul's intended meaning. In addition, οὕτως points back to the preceding verses rather than ahead to the following ones, and ἐμάθετε already has τὸν Χριστόν as its object. These objections seem strong enough to eliminate this option.

Third, these infinitives could be dependent on ἀλήθεια in the preceding καθὼς clause (v. 21c) and taken in an appositional sense making explicit its content.<sup>58</sup> Despite the analogous formations cited by Barth,<sup>59</sup> the major objection to this possible connection is that it minimizes the role of καθὼς (v. 21c) that relates the clause to what precedes rather than to what follows it. The connection of the infinitive to a noun rather than a finite verb is less common, and here it is less natural syntactically. These objections seem strong enough to eliminate this option.

Fourth, there remains the view that these infinitives are dependent on ἐδιδάχθητε (v. 21), making explicit the content and effect of what Paul's readers were taught.<sup>60</sup> It might be objected that this connection makes ὑμᾶς (v. 22) superfluous, but the New Testament writings show a marked increase in the use of the accusative case as "subject" of the infinitive even though the governing verb and the infinitive have the same subject.<sup>61</sup> The accusative ὑμᾶς with the infinitive is what would be

---

<sup>58</sup>H. A. W. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Ephesians*, trans. J. C. Moore, KEKNT 9 (New York: Funk & Wagnalls 1884) 244-46; Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 135; Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:506; Gnllka, *Epheserbrief*, 229. Both Abbott and Barth wish to retain an imperatival sense for the infinitives.

<sup>59</sup>Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:506 n38; see also BDF, §393.3, 5-6; 400.1-2.

<sup>60</sup>G. B. Winer, *A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament*, 7th ed., trans. and rev. J. H. Thayer (Andover: Draper, 1874) 321-22; Robertson, *Grammar*, 1089; Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 150-51; Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 127, 139; Robinson, *Ephesians*, 190; Westcott, *Ephesians*, 67; Salmond, "Ephesians" in *EGT*, 3:342; Caird, *Paul's Letters*, 80; Houlden, *Paul's Letters*, 318; Mitton, *Ephesians*, 164; Bruce, *Epistles*, 358 n127; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 283-84; and Best, *Ephesians*, 430. Note a similar construction in Luke 1:54, 72-73, 79; Eph. 3:6; and Heb. 5:5.

<sup>61</sup>Robertson, *Grammar*, 1038; MHT, 3:148; pace Caird, *Paul's Letters*, 80; and Abbott,

expected in this use of the infinitive clause following a verb like *ἐδιδάχθητε*. In addition, *ὑμῶς* clarifies the agent involved in the verbal action following the reference to Jesus in the intervening *καθώς* clause.

On balance, it seems that relating these three infinitives to *ἐδιδάχθητε* (v. 21) is the most natural and suitable syntactical connection. How, then, do they function in relation to this verb? There are three reasonable possibilities. First, the infinitives could be part of a lengthy purpose (final) clause: "You were taught . . . in order that you might put off the old man (v. 22) . . . be renewed (v. 23) . . . and put on the new man (v. 24) . . . ." This rendering gives the infinitives imperatival force. However, it is doubtful that Paul intended to give the purpose or goal of the teaching here. Furthermore, the infinitival construction serves as an alternative to the use of *ἵνα* introducing an object clause, especially following verbs of commanding, exhorting, teaching, etc. in which case the *ἵνα* clause expresses "what" (content) rather than "why" (purpose).<sup>62</sup>

Second, the infinitives could be part of a lengthy result (consecutive) clause: "you were taught . . . with the result that you have put off the old man (v. 22) . . . are being renewed (v. 23) . . . and have put on the new man (v. 24) . . ."<sup>63</sup> This rendering gives the infinitives indicative force. Even though one might have expected Paul to use *ὥστε* ("so that") to make clear he intended to give the actual result of the teaching here, the result use of the simple infinitive is an acceptable but less common alternative.<sup>64</sup>

---

*Ephesians and Colossians*, 135. Cf. Acts 25:21; *Hermas, Man.* 12.6.4 and *1 Clem* 62.3. In light of this, the construction here should not be labeled "not at all clear" as is done in BDF §406.2.

<sup>62</sup>Robertson, *Grammar*, 991-94; Wallace, *Grammar*, 475; BAGD, s.v. *ἵνα*, II.

<sup>63</sup>J. Eadie, *A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians*, 3rd ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1883) 346; Murray, *Principles of Conduct*, 214-19, esp. 215 n5, however, he favors relating the infinitives to *ἐμάθετε* (v. 20). On the infinitive of result, see BDF, §391; Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 147-51; Robertson, *Grammar*, 1089-91; and Wallace, *Grammar*, 592-94.

<sup>64</sup>BDF, §391; Robertson, *Grammar*, 1089-91, claims that the NT has but twelve

Third, these infinitives, then, could be understood as infinitives of indirect discourse related to *ἐδιδάχθητε* (v. 21), giving the content of the instruction that Paul assumed they had received: "You were taught . . . that you put off the old man (v. 22) . . . you are being renewed (v. 23) . . . and you put on the new man (v. 24) . . ." <sup>65</sup> The fact that the *καθώς* clause of verse 21 already modifies *ἐδιδάχθητε* makes it likely that these infinitives are to be viewed as providing the content of the teaching Paul's readers received. These infinitives could also be understood as epexegetical of content following *ἐδιδάχθητε*, <sup>66</sup> but the lexical nature of this verb makes the indirect discourse function a better choice.

Granted that the infinitives of verses 22-24 provide the content of the instruction given (v. 21), there is still the question as to whether they refer to 1) the teaching of a prospective ethical duty—"that you are to (should) put off . . ." (imperative force), <sup>67</sup> or, 2) the teaching of an accomplished theological fact—"that

---

examples of the simple infinitive with the notion of result and these are usually hypothetical (intended) rather than actual result.

<sup>65</sup>Wallace, *Grammar*, 603-605, states that this use of the infinitive follows a verb of perception or communication and, technically, it is a subcategory of the direct object function; further, he says that the infinitive of indirect discourse usually "*retains the tense of the direct discourse and usually represents either an imperative or indicative*" (*Grammar*, 604, emphasis his). Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 53, claims: "There is apparently no instance in the New Testament of the Aorist Infinitive in indirect discourse representing the Aorist Indicative of the direct form." So also Robertson, *Grammar*, 858. However, Wallace points out that, even though all the aorist infinitives used in indirect discourse in the NT (ca. 150) appear to support Burton's claim, "*all of the controlling verbs in such instances imply a command or exhortation*" (*Grammar*, 605, emphasis his). This is not the case here with *διδάσκω*.

<sup>66</sup>Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 127, 139.4; cf. BDF, §394; Robertson, *Grammar*, 1086-89; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 283-84; and Best, *Ephesians*, 430. See discussion of the infinitives in 4:1, 17 on pp. 252-53 above.

<sup>67</sup>Robinson, *Ephesians*, 190; Bruce, *Epistles*, 357-58, esp. n127; Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 199-200; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 283-84; Best, *Ephesians*, 430-31; C. E. Arnold, "Letter to the Ephesians," in *DPL* (1993) 118-20, 143; B. M. Fanning, *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek*, OTM (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990) 358 n35 with 363; D. L. Bock, "'The New Man' as Community in Colossians and Ephesians" in *Integrity of Heart and Skillfulness of Hands: Biblical and Leadership Studies in Honor of Donald K. Campbell*, eds. C. H. Dyer and R. B. Zuck (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994) 162-63; and most English translations of 4:22-24. The imperatival force could possibly be understood as the initial gospel summons (i.e., an alternate way of saying, "repent and believe") that the Ephesian believers obeyed in conversion-initiation, but this is unlikely following *ἐμάθετε* (v. 20) and *ἐδιδάχθητε* (v. 21).

you have put off . . ." (indicative force).<sup>68</sup> The first option can claim support from the wider ethical context of Ephesians 4–6, the more immediate paraenetic material in 4:17–5:2 where 4:25ff spell out in detail the general exhortation given in 4:22–24, and the order of the infinitive tenses: aorist (v. 22), present (v. 23) and aorist (v. 24). In this view, the *παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος* and the *καινὸς ἄνθρωπος* are usually taken as a metonymy of subject depicting the *behavior* (deeds) of one's pre-conversion and post-conversion life respectively.<sup>69</sup> However, following *ἐδιδάχθητε* (a non-command verb) one would expect the use of *δεῖ* (or a similar word) if the idea of obligation were intended.<sup>70</sup> As noted above, 4:17–19 deal with *both* the status *and* conduct of pagan Gentiles, so such a combination would not be out of place in 4:20–5:2. The order of the infinitives and the use of the *παλαιὸς / καινὸς ἄνθρωπος* metaphor will be discussed in due course (see pp. 269–73 and 278–84).

The second option can claim support from the aorist tense of the "put off / put on" infinitives, other contextual factors, and the parallel passage in Colossians 3:9–11. The aorist infinitives represent an indicative base of instruction concerning their *status* that Paul assumed his readers had been given. Upon this base he gave specific exhortations regarding their conduct in 4:25ff, beginning with *διό* (v. 25) that

---

<sup>68</sup>Eadie, *Ephesians*, 338; Murray, *Principles of Conduct*, 214–19; Wallace, *Grammar*, 605; H. C. G. Moule, *Studies in Ephesians*, KPCS reprint (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1977) 118–20; R. E. Howard, "Some Modern Interpretations of the Pauline Indicative and Imperative," *WThJ* 11 (1976) 38–48, esp. 39 n15, 46; and H. W. Hoehner, "Ephesians," in *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: New Testament Edition*, ed. J. F. Walvoord and R. B. Zuck (Wheaton: Victor Books, 1983) 636–37.

<sup>69</sup>Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 363. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 285, acknowledges that both Rom. 6:6 and Col. 3:9 declare that "the definitive break with the old person has been made in the past" (indicative), but Ephesians shifts the emphasis and extends the indicative / imperative tension to the idea of putting off the old person (imperative force). This is not an exhortation to repeat what has already taken place in conversion-initiation, he says, but an exhortation "to continue to live out its significance by giving up on that old person that they no longer are. They are new people who must become in practice what God has already made them, and that involves the resolve *to put off the old way of life* as it attempts to impinge" (285–86, italics mine). However true this may be theologically, it can be questioned exegetically whether this is the author's point in this text and it calls into question the discontinuity between the "old" and the "new man."

<sup>70</sup>For discussion of *δεῖ*, see Robertson, *Grammar*, 919–20; BAGD, s.v. *δεῖ*.



introduces a strong inference drawn from 4:20-24. *Διό* may well have been chosen instead of *οὖν* because *οὖν* was used in a resumptive sense in verse 17; but in verse 25 Paul clearly intended an inferential sense and so to avoid confusion used *διό*.<sup>71</sup> This approach is consistent with Paul's thinking elsewhere, especially in the context of the parallel passage in Colossians 3:9-10. In Colossians 2:7 *ἐδιδάχθητε* refers to teaching that established the Colossian believers in the faith, and what they received concerning Jesus Christ the Lord (2:6a) was the basis for Paul's imperative: *ἐν αὐτῷ περιπατεῖτε* (2:6b). The "put on / put off" imagery itself in Colossians 3:9b-10 is expressed by aorist participles conveying antecedent action that serves as the basis for Paul's imperative in verse 9a.<sup>72</sup> Furthermore, implicit in the assumption Paul makes in Ephesians 4:21 is the fact that when his readers were taught as those in Christ, they learned that they had put off the "old man" and had put on the "new man." The strong antithesis between their former life (4:17-19) and their present existence as believers (4:20-24) indicates that the description of their former pre-conversion life is not an appropriate one for believers and is not applicable to them. For these reasons this option makes good sense in this context, and, thus, it is preferable to hold that these infinitives have indicative force rather than direct or indirect imperatival force.

#### 5.3.4 Ephesians 4:22: The Old Man Put Off

The infinitive *ἀποθέσθαι* is the first member of the triad of infinitives occurring in verses 22-24. As argued above, it is dependent on *ἐδιδάχθητε* (v. 21); its "subject" is *ὑμᾶς* (v. 22); formally it is an aorist middle, stressing the punctiliar, reflexive nature of the verbal action; and it has the character of an indicative in this context. Again, as in Colossians 3, there appears to be a combination of two images

---

<sup>71</sup>BAGD, s.v. *διό*; see footnote 117 below.

<sup>72</sup>For discussion of this passage see ch. 4, 215-22.

here that functioned independently for Paul earlier, namely, the "put off / put on" clothing metaphor<sup>73</sup> and the "old man / new man" metaphor.

As discussed in chapter 1 (pp. 51-58), the identity of the "old man / new man" has been understood and expressed in various ways by interpreters of Paul. The fact that the context here (as in Colossians 3) is ethical and that the "new man" is being renewed (v. 23) points to the individual person who is identified either with the old order of existence along with all those who share in it (old humanity), or, with the new order of existence along with all others who share in it (new humanity).<sup>74</sup> The "old man" (v. 22), then, refers to the person who is identified with and conducts his or her life under the dominion of this present evil age and its powers along with all others who share this existence. For the believer, this "old" identity and status have been decisively put off at conversion.<sup>75</sup> This indicates that the "old man" with reference to the individual believer no longer exists.

The *κατά* phrase of verse 22 qualifies the infinitive *ἀποθέσθαι*, not the following *τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον*. It supplies the fact that the putting off was related to (*κατά*) their former manner of life.<sup>76</sup> This suggests that in their former way of life believers were clothed with the "old man." The adjective *προτέραν* has temporal force, denoting the idea of a time previous to the present.<sup>77</sup> The noun *ἀναστροφή* means "way of life, conduct, behavior," and, depending on contextual modifiers, it can denote

---

<sup>73</sup>For a discussion of the clothing metaphor in the ancient world, see ch. 1, 43-45.

<sup>74</sup>Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 285. Pace Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:538-39, who identifies the old / new man as Adam and Christ as representatives of the old and new orders. See ch. 1, 50 n149.

<sup>75</sup>See the discussion of the "old man" in Rom. 6:6 in ch. 2, 105-11, and Col. 3:9 in ch. 4, 227-28.

<sup>76</sup>*Κατά* is used here in the sense of "with regard to," or "in reference to," not "in conformity with," or "in accordance with;" see BAGD s.v. *κατά*, II.6; Salmond, "Ephesians" in *EGT*, 3:342.

<sup>77</sup>This is the only NT use of *πρότερος* as an adjective. It has surrendered the meaning "the first of two" to *πρώτος*, and now simply means "earlier, or formerly existing;" see BDF, §62; Robertson, *Grammar*, 280, 283, 662; and Hermas, *Man.* 4.3.1, 3.

either good or bad behavior.<sup>78</sup> In this passage the modifier *προτέραν* indicates that it is a reference to behavior prior to the time when *ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν* (v. 20), which behavior is described in verses 17-19 (cf. 2:3). Such conduct arises out of a corresponding pagan condition in which they once conducted their life, and thus "former behavior" has a negative connotation.

Markus Barth claims that this *κατά* phrase (v. 22a) is the poetic antithetical parallel to the *κατὰ θεόν* phrase of verse 24, and each phrase depicts the essence of the "old" and "new man" respectively.<sup>79</sup> But this is not likely since the *κατά* phrase of verse 22a precedes the reference to the "old man," is attached to the infinitive, and is not a conceptual parallel with the *κατά* phrase of verse 24. A much more likely parallel occurs between the adjectival participle *τὸν φθειρόμενον* with the *κατά* phrase of verse 22c, and the adjectival participle *τὸν . . . κτισθέντα* with the *κατά* phrase of verse 24b as we shall see. With the first *κατά* phrase in verse 22a, Paul picks up the main thrust of his topic in this paragraph. He urges his readers to live no longer (*μηκέτι*) as the pagan Gentiles live (v. 17)—in futility, etc. They did not learn Christ in this way (*οὕτως*, v. 20), assuming they were taught (v. 21) that with regard to (*κατά*) the former (*προτέραν*) way of life they have put off the old man . . . (v. 22).

The "old man" is described by a present passive adjectival participle and a second *κατά* phrase (v. 22c). The present tense of the participle *φθειρόμενον* expresses action that is taking place at the same time as the action of *ἀποθέσθαι*.<sup>80</sup> If the

---

<sup>78</sup>BAGD, s.v. *ἀναστροφή*; Bertram, *TDNT*, 7:716-17; Ebel, *NIDNTT*, 3:933-35. The word originally meant "a turning back to" and thus "dwelling in a place;" hence, Aeschylus (5th century BC) used it of a "haunt." But it occurs later in the sense of "way of life," "behavior" (Polybius 4.82.1; Epictetus 1.9.5; 3.15.5) and human conduct (Tob. 4:14, 19 and 2 Macc. 6:23).

<sup>79</sup>Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:506.

<sup>80</sup>Essentially, the participle is timeless, denoting instead the kind of action (*Aktionsart*) as either completed, durative, or a resultant condition. However, the tenses of the participle may be used to express relative time in relationship to the principal verb (Wallace, *Grammar*, 614-15). The *present* participle expresses durative action with relative time that is simultaneous with the action of the controlling verb, although sometimes this relative time may be antecedent to the action of the main verb (a classical idiom), especially where an adverb or adjective of time (i.e., *πρότερον*, cf. John

infinitival action has occurred, then the time of the descriptive clause must be seen from that standpoint. The "old man" Paul's readers have put off *was being corrupted* by desires that came from deceit. The adjective *προτέραν* (v. 22a) confirms this past time orientation. The RSV (but not the NRSV) translates the participle as durative action in present time, suggesting that the "old man" lingers on and is the cause of all kinds of former evils to reappear in the lives of believers. That sins occur in believers' lives corresponds to human experience and is recognized by Paul (e.g., Gal. 5), but this does not seem to be what he intended by this formulation.

In light of the *κατά* phrase following it, *φθειρόμενον* here carries the thought of moral pollution (cf. 2 Cor. 11:3) and decay leading to divine judgment (cf. 1 Cor. 3:17b; 2 Pet. 2:12).<sup>81</sup> It carries on the idea implied in *παλαιός*. The "old man" walks on the pathway of moral decay and ruin that eventually leads to (final) destruction. Paul gave a detailed description of this destructive moral decay in Romans 1:20-32. The corrupting process occurs "in accordance with" or "because of" (*κατά*)<sup>82</sup> the desires of deception (*ἀπάτης*).<sup>83</sup> This is the cause of which *τὸν φθειρόμενον* is the effect. The genitive noun *ἀπάτης* can be viewed as an attributive genitive, "deceitful desires"<sup>84</sup> or, preferably as a subjective genitive, "deceit that governs desires," in which *ἀπάτη* is personified as a deceptive power (cf. Col. 2:8; 2 Thess. 2:9-10; Heb. 3:13; 2 Pet. 2:13;

---

9:8) helps to show this. See Robertson, *Grammar*, 1115-16.

<sup>81</sup>BAGD, s.v. *φθείρω*, 2; Harder, *TDNT*, 9:102-05; Merkel, *NIDNTT*, 1:467-70.

<sup>82</sup>BAGD, s.v. *κατά*, II.5.a.δ, state that often the norm is at the same time the reason for something so that "in accordance with" recedes, leaving *κατά* to mean "because of, as a result of, on the basis of" (cf. Rom. 2:5; 1 Cor. 12:8; Eph. 1:5; Phil. 4:11; 1 Tim. 5:21; 2 Tim. 1:9; Titus 3:5; Phlm. 14).

<sup>83</sup>BAGD, s.v. *ἀπάτη*, 1; pace Oepke, *TDNT*, 1:385, "pleasant illusion;" Günther, *NIDNTT*, 2:459-60. See also 2 *Clem.* 6.4; Hermas, *Man.* 8.5; 11.12; *Sim.* 6.2.1; 6.3.3; 6.4.4.

<sup>84</sup>MHT, 2:440, 445, treat this as a "Hebraic genitive," a non-idiomatic use of the genitive of definition; BAGD, s.v. *ἐπιθυμία*, 3, call it a genitive of quality, thus: "deceptive desires;" also Best, *Ephesians*, 434, "deceitful desires . . . [that] bring corruption and ultimate destruction."

Matt. 13:22 / Mark 4:19) that uses "desires" as its means of expression.<sup>85</sup> The "old man" is in a process of moral corruption and advancing ruin that exists and ends in death (cf. Eph. 2:1, 5) because of desires controlled by the deceptive power of sin. This reflects Paul's earlier portrayal of his Gentile readers' past in which the desires of the flesh characterized their old life (Eph. 2:3; 4:17-19). This corrupt condition on account of deception stands in sharp contrast to the "new man" and its renewal effected by truth (4:21, 24).

This contrast is reinforced by the parallel participial clauses and prepositional phrases attached to the terms "old man" (v. 22) and "new man" (v. 24). In both cases these explanatory additions help to describe these terms more precisely. This observation plus the fact that these terms do not occur elsewhere in New Testament paraenesis point to the probability that these designations were not in common use (at least not in the sense Paul intended) and that Paul was the first to use them in ethical contexts. They are appropriate for him because they serve as a cogent theological summary on which to base his ethical exhortations.

### 5.3.5 Ephesians 4:23: Being Renewed In Your Mind

The *δέ* of 4:23 introduces additional material that Paul assumed his readers were taught, but it also signals a contrast to verse 22, focusing attention on the other side of the picture.<sup>86</sup> The movement is from a negative to a positive condition. The present tense infinitive *ἀνανεοῦσθαι*<sup>87</sup> is the second member of the triad of infinitives

---

<sup>85</sup>Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 137; Salmond, "Ephesians" in *EGT*, 3:342. The verbal noun *ἐπιθυμίας* would support such a view of the genitive. It could also be a genitive of source, "desires which come from deceit," Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 286; also Murphy-O'Connor, "Truth," 207-10. See comments on *ἐπιθυμία* in Rom. 6:12 in ch. 2, 131-32.

<sup>86</sup>A contrast is evident between vv. 22 and 23 that justifies translating *δέ* as "but" (BAGD, s.v. *δέ*, 1); thus: "you were taught (v. 21) . . . that you put off . . . the old man (v. 22) . . . but you are being renewed (v. 23) . . .;" although in an indirect discourse construction, "and" for *δέ* is also possible.

<sup>87</sup>P<sup>46</sup> D<sup>1</sup> K 33 17 47 69 it and the Syriac, Coptic and Vulgate versions have the imperative verb *ἀνανεοῦσθε* here, but this is clearly an interpretive modification designed to make

in verses 22-24. With indicative force, as argued above, it stresses the continual process of renewal that is now going on with regard to Paul's Christian readers. It is also dependent on *ἐδιδάχθητε* (v. 21), its "subject" is *ὑμᾶς* (v. 22), but in form this infinitive could be either middle or passive voice. The passive sense, "are being renewed," is preferred because the active voice is not often found with the transitive meaning "renew;" consequently, the middle voice serves in this transitive capacity rather than in a reflexive sense ("renew yourselves") as might be expected.<sup>88</sup> Paul did not say who the agent of the renewal is unless *τῷ πνεύματι* be interpreted in an instrumental sense as a reference to the Spirit of God, but this is unlikely (see below). However, he did make clear that his readers, those who have "learned Christ," are the objects of the renewal since the *ὑμᾶς* of verse 22 is to be read as the subject of this infinitive as well. He stressed the importance of present renewal by making it an independent (paratactic) element in his discussion here in contrast to its dependent role in Colossians 3:10.

The verb *ἀνανεόω* occurs only here in the New Testament, although the concept of renewal occurs elsewhere: *ἀνακαινίζω* (Heb. 6:6, to renew again to repentance), *ἀνακαινόω* (2 Cor. 4:16, renewal of the inner person; Col. 3:10, renewal of the new man), and *ἀνακαίνωσις* (Rom. 12:2, renewal of the mind; Titus 3:5, renewal of believers). *Ἀνανέωσις* does not appear in the New Testament. The qualitative significance of these words gives expression to the new character of life brought about by the death and resurrection of Christ. In spite of the prefix *ἀνά*, one must not think of this renewal as the restoration to a former state of affairs or a lost primitive state. Such a meaning is doubtful in New Testament usage because the newness it depicts

---

clear an imperatival sense.

<sup>88</sup>BAGD, s.v. *ἀνανεόω*, 1; Behm, *TDNT*, 4:900-01; Salmond, "Ephesians" in *EGT*, 3:342; and Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 200 n21. Originally *ἀνανεόω* emphasized the temporal ("recent") while *ἀνακαινόω* (Col. 3:10 parallel) stressed the qualitative ("superior in value") element of change, but, like the adjectives *νεός* and *καινός*, this distinction is not maintained and the two terms are likely used interchangeably; see ch. 4, 227 n109 and 229 n116.

is unprecedented. What Paul had in mind in this passage is a change from "old" to "new," and renewal is attached to the new condition (cf. Col. 3:10), not to the restoration of a former (old) condition. His readers are undergoing renewal as those who have put on the "new man." The *ἀνά* prefix simply emphasizes the change involved that, for Paul, is nothing less than a new identity and status, not the renewal of the old status. In his writings he did not speak of the glory of Adam before the fall, but of Christ, the "last Adam," and the glory of the new creation (cf. 2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 3:27; 6:15).<sup>89</sup>

The process of renewal is said to take place *τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοῦς ὑμῶν* (v. 23b). Some recent interpreters understand *τῷ πνεύματι* as a reference to the divine Spirit.<sup>90</sup> In this view, *τῷ πνεύματι* is taken as an instrumental dative and *τοῦ νοῦς* as an objective (or, place where) genitive; thus, the clause would be translated: "but you are being renewed by the Spirit bestowed upon (or "in") your mind." Several reasons are given in support of this view. First, nowhere else in Ephesians does *πνεῦμα* refer to the human spirit, and elsewhere in the letter it is always the divine Spirit who controls believers (cf. 1:17; 3:16; 4:3; 5:18; 6:18). Second, the absence of a preposition (e.g., *ἐν*)<sup>91</sup> preceding *τῷ πνεύματι* is analogous to 1:13 where unmistakable modifiers make it a clear reference to the divine Spirit. Since a simple instrumental dative is used there to describe the Spirit's work, the same could be true of 4:23 also. Third, Paul made a distinction between "my spirit" and "my mind" in 1 Corinthians 14:14 and between the Spirit Himself (divine Spirit) and "our spirit" in Romans 8:16. Fourth, in Titus 3:5 the divine Spirit is the explicit agent of renewal (also Rom. 7:6; 2

---

<sup>89</sup>See further comment on p. 282, esp. footnote 108.

<sup>90</sup>E.g., Schlier, *Epheser*, 220; Gnllka, *Epheserbrieff*, 230; Houlden, *Paul's Letters*, 319; F. Mussner, *Der Brief an die Epheser*, OTKNT 10 (Wurzburg: Echter Verlag, 1982) 137.

<sup>91</sup>P<sup>49</sup> B 33 1175 1739 1881 and a few others actually do insert the preposition *ἐν*, probably as an attempt to resolve the problem, but this does not automatically indicate that they understood this as a reference to the Spirit (pace Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:508 n50).

Cor. 3:6, 18). And, fifth, the human spirit and mind are corrupt and cannot be the *means* of spiritual renewal (cf. Eph. 4:17; Rom. 1:21, 28). Thus, in this view, the imparted Holy Spirit is the agent of renewal who renews believers by enlightening their mind and empowering their new way of life (cf. *πνεῦμα* in Gal. 5:16, 18, 25; Rom. 8:6, 13-14, all verses in which *πνεῦμα* is unqualified).<sup>92</sup>

Because of the strength of these reasons and yet the presence of the troublesome modifier *τοῦ νοῦς ὑμῶν*, some argue that this clause is a reference to the divine Spirit united with the regenerate human spirit.<sup>93</sup> In this variation of the above view, *τῷ πνεύματι* is taken as an instrumental dative and *τοῦ νοῦς* as a possessive genitive; thus, the clause would be translated: "but you are being renewed by the Spirit possessed by your mind." The *νοῦς*, then, is the receptacle of the *πνεῦμα*.

However, most of the above arguments do not apply to *πνεῦμα* in 4:23. Against this view it can be said that the Holy Spirit is never called *τὸ πνεῦμα ὑμῶν* or even the *τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ νοῦς ὑμῶν* elsewhere in the New Testament, nor would this be an acceptable designation for Paul.<sup>94</sup> Neither is the Holy Spirit said to be in union with a believer's spirit, although the Spirit dwells in believers (Rom. 8:9; 1 Cor. 6:19-20). Here the text refers to "the spirit *of* your mind," not "the Spirit *in* your mind." Also, had Paul intended "renewal of the mind by the Spirit," he likely would have used the words *ἐν πνεύματι τοῦ νοῦς ὑμῶν* in keeping with the standard *ἐν πνεύματι* phrase for instrumental usage elsewhere in Ephesians (cf. 2:22; 3:5; 5:18; 6:18). Even so, the genitive *τοῦ νοῦς ὑμῶν* still remains problematic. Though the Holy Spirit is the means

---

<sup>92</sup>These references tell against Barth's argument (*Ephesians*, 2:508) that if Paul intended a reference to the Holy Spirit renewing the mind, he would have qualified *πνεῦμα* with clear modifiers, as in Eph. 1:13 and 4:30.

<sup>93</sup>Schweizer, *TDNT*, 6:445 n773; Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 200, states: "What must be meant is the Christian mind guided by the divine Spirit (cf. 3.16; 4.3; 5.18; 6.18)."

<sup>94</sup>Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 137; and Mitton, *Ephesians*, 165. Also, it must be noted that an objective genitive view of *τοῦ νοῦς* is suspect because *πνεῦμα* is not a verbal noun and the idea of "bestowed upon" is imported into the phrase.



of renewal as seen from other texts (e.g., 2 Cor. 3:18), Paul's emphasis here is not on the means—hence, he does not mention it—but on the *location* of renewal.

In light of this, many interpreters understand *πνεῦμα* as a reference to the human spirit that is distinguishable from, but related to, the mind. In this view, *τῷ πνεύματι* is understood as a dative of reference / respect and *τοῦ νοός* as an appositional genitive; thus, the clause would be translated: "but you are being renewed with reference to the (human) spirit, namely or specifically, your mind."<sup>95</sup> Both terms, spirit and mind, then, are a pleonasm for a person's inner being, that is, the "inner person" (cf. Eph. 3:16; 2 Cor. 4:16) that requires and experiences ongoing renewal (cf. Rom. 12:2).<sup>96</sup> Though not problem free, this view provides the best resolution for the various exegetical difficulties, and, thus, it is preferred.

Though the focus for renewal at present is the inner person, the mind (cf. Rom. 12:2) and not the physical body, such renewal has determinative consequences for external actions expressed by the body (cf. Eph. 4:24, 25-32; 5:1-5). This renewal stands in contrast to the determinative role given to the futility of the mind in 4:17. Though the means for effecting this moral change is not stated directly in verse 23, the present passive infinitive and verse 24 indicate that renewal is a continuous process that involves agents from outside the believer himself, including above all the

---

<sup>95</sup>Schweizer, *TDNT*, 6:444-49; Dunn, *NIDNTT*, 3:693-707; see also Robinson, *Ephesians*, 191; Westcott, *Ephesians*, 68; Mitton, *Ephesians*, 165; van Roon, *Authenticity*, 325; Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:509; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 287; and Best, *Ephesians*, 436. Pace BAGD, s.v. *νοῦς*, 3, "you must adopt a new attitude of mind;" similarly, NIV. Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 137, and Salmond, "Ephesians" in *EGT*, 3:343, take *τοῦ νοός* as a subjective genitive, i.e., "renewed with respect to the spirit by which your mind is governed," but *πνεῦμα* is not a verbal noun and, further, the translation reverses the order. If the genitive is subjective, it should read: "the mind that governs the spirit." As stated by these commentators, the genitive is actually objective: "the spirit that governs your mind," but, again, *πνεῦμα* is not a verbal noun.

<sup>96</sup>Van Roon, *Authenticity*, 327; R. H. Gundry, *Sōma in Biblical Theology with Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology*, SNTSMS 29 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976) 135-37. In Philo, *Cong.* 97, "the person within the person" is related to the *νοῦς*. See ch. 6, 301-07.

Spirit (cf. 2 Cor. 3:17-18).<sup>97</sup> So, it can be noted that the believer as a "new man" is genuinely though not yet totally and finally "new." He is "new" and is being renewed. Note also that the (human) spirit and the mind continue from the "old" to the "new man," thus the change from "old" to "new" is not a constitutional (ontological) change in a human being.

### 5.3.6 Ephesians 4:24: The New Man Put On

The infinitive *ἐνδύσασθαι*<sup>98</sup> is the third member of the triad of infinitives occurring in verses 22-24. As with its antithetical counterpart, *ἀποθέσθαι* (v. 22), it is dependent on *ἐδιδάχθητε* (v. 21), its "subject" is *ὑμᾶς* (v. 22), it has the character of the indicative, and formally it is an aorist middle, stressing once again the punctiliar, reflexive nature of the verbal action. This contrasts with the durative, passive nature of *ἀνανεοῦσθαι* (v. 23) and makes the connecting *καί* (v. 24) awkward if it is understood as a coordinating conjunction ("and"). If that were the case, one might expect verse 24 to precede verse 23. However, as argued above, verse 24 is the theological basis for verse 23, and thus *καί* could well be understood as having an epexegetical function, meaning "in that."<sup>99</sup> Thus it would be translated: "But (*δέ*) you are being renewed in your inner person in that (*καί*) you have put on the new man . . . ." It should be noted from the parallel in Colossians 3:10 that it is, in fact, the "new man" who is being renewed.

The placement of *ἀνανεοῦσθαι* (present infinitive) in 4:23 preceding *ἐνδύσασθαι* (aorist infinitive) and the mention of the "new man" in 4:24 probably occurs because

---

<sup>97</sup>R. Scroggs, *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966) 70-71; and Harrisville, *Newness*, 77.

<sup>98</sup>The imperative *ἐνδύσασθε* is read by some important manuscripts: P<sup>46</sup> B\* D<sup>2</sup> K 104 323 1241 1881 it syr. Again, as in v. 23, it appears to be an interpretive modification. See the discussion of this verb in ch. 1, 43-45.

<sup>99</sup>For epexegetical *καί*, see BAGD, s.v. *καί*, I.3; BDF, §442, 9; Robertson, *Grammar*, 1181; and Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 172-73. See ch. 1, 21 n58 on Eph. 1:1, and ch. 3, 167 n55 on Eph. 2:14 plus additional references.

of the present participle *φθειρόμενον* in 4:22 that describes the "old man," a description that does not appear in the Colossian parallel. In contrast to the decaying "old man" who has been put off, Paul's Christian readers were taught that they are now undergoing renewal. The whole process is reversed because they have put on the "new man." Like the perishing of the "old man," who has been put off, the renewal of the "new man," who has been put on, is a gradual process. It may be noted that the clothing metaphors in verses 22 and 24 and the renewal mentioned in verse 23 mutually interpret one another. The "put off / put on" infinitives affirm an event (vs. a gradual process) and convey the instruction that a decisive change has occurred: the "old man" has been put off, the "new man" has been put on, and, in light of this, the believer as a "new man" is being renewed in "the spirit of your mind," affirming a gradual process (vs. an event).

The adjective *καινός* (4:24), denoting qualitative newness as a characteristic of that which exists, and *νέος* (Col. 3:10), denoting temporal newness as a coming into being of that which was not or not yet in existence, appear to be used as synonyms (e.g., 1 Cor. 5:7; Col. 3:10 with Eph. 4:24).<sup>100</sup> It could be argued, however, that Paul intends both ideas in Colossians 3:9-10 and Ephesians 4:23-24.<sup>101</sup> In the former passage he speaks about having put on the *τὸν νεὸν [ἄνθρωπον] τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον*, and in the latter passage he speaks about the fact that *ὑμᾶς ἀνανεοῦσθαι* (presently) having already put on the *τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον*. Thus, both terms (and their cognate verbs) are used in these texts: *νέος* stresses the reality of newness in the present as compared with a former time, and *καινός* stresses the quality of newness in the new condition created by divine initiative as compared with a previous condition. On

---

<sup>100</sup>R. A. Harrisville, "The Concept of Newness in the New Testament," *JBL* 74 (1955) 69-79, argues that both of these words can have either qualitative or temporal connotations; also Haarbeck, Link, and Brown, *NIDNTT*, 2:669-76; Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:309; Bruce, *Epistles*, 358 n126; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 286; and Best, *Ephesians*, 435. See discussion in ch. 4, 227-32.

<sup>101</sup>Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 138; and Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 200.

balance, however, the variation is probably stylistic since both words can have either a qualitative or a temporal connotation.

The identity of the "new man" corresponds antithetically to the identity of the "old man" discussed in verse 22. The "new man" (v. 24), then, is a reference to the person who is identified with and conducts his or her life under the dominion of the new creation and its powers along with all others who share this existence. For the believer, this "new" identity and status have been decisively "put on" at conversion-initiation. This indicates that the "new man" with reference to the individual believer presently exists. So does the corporate aspect of the "new man" mentioned in 2:15, where Christ Jesus created the two—Jews and Gentiles—into "one new man."<sup>102</sup>

In 4:24, the "new man" is described as τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα. The κατὰ θεόν phrase also occurs in 2 Corinthians 7:9-11 where it means "according to God," that is, "in a godly manner" (cf. NRSV, "godly"). Abbott, among others, sees this as the proper interpretation of this phrase here and suggests that it be translated: "according to God's will" or "in God's way."<sup>103</sup> However, Barth rejects this as a tautology because God as creator always carries out His creative work in His own way and according to His own plan (e.g., Eph. 2:10; 3:9). He prefers, correctly, to understand the phrase as a reference to the "new man" created after the "image" of the creator in light of the Colossians 3:10 parallel, κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν, with its allusion to the language of Genesis 1:26-27 and its use of the word εἰκών.<sup>104</sup>

The preposition κατὰ can also be used to express "similarity" or "likeness" (cf. Gal. 4:28; Heb. 8:5; 1 Pet. 1:15; 4:6),<sup>105</sup> and thus here the phrase κατὰ θεόν would

---

<sup>102</sup>See ch. 3, 174-81, for treatment of Eph. 2:15 and ch. 4, 227-32, for the parallel in Col. 3:10.

<sup>103</sup>Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 138; Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 59, takes the κατὰ in a transferred sense of "in accordance with;" see also MHT, 3:268; and Mitton, *Ephesians*, 165.

<sup>104</sup>Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:509; Bruce, *Epistles*, 359; and Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 287.

<sup>105</sup>BAGD, s.v. κατὰ, II.5.b; and Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 59. See Josephus, *Ant.* 4.6.10.

mean created "like God" or "after the likeness (image) of God." This is supported by the use of the aorist passive participle *κτισθέντα*, a term already marked by the use of *κτίζω* in 2:10 (a creative act of God in Christ) and 2:15 (a creative act of Christ Himself). In the New Testament this verb and its derivatives are used almost exclusively of God's creative work and in the Pauline epistles, though there are references to the first creation (e.g., Rom. 1:20, 25; 8:19-22, 39), references to the new creation begun in Christ predominate (e.g., 2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15; Col. 3:10; Eph. 2:10, 15; 4:24).<sup>106</sup> The new creation is new by virtue of a new relationship to God that is bound up with Christ through whom it has entered into and become history. The decisive factor for entrance into the new creation is the acceptance in faith of this new relation to God and in that sense becoming a "new creature" or a "new man." This new relationship status, in turn, affects one's present conduct.

This passage emphasizes the creative activity of God with regard to the genesis of the "new man." The *aorist* participle *κτισθέντα* suggests that this creative act could be either antecedent to or contemporaneous with the action of *ἐνδύσασθαι*. If antecedent, the emphasis lies on the prior existence of the "new man," as in Ephesians 2:15 ("one new man" corporately), in connection with the redemptive-historical death of Jesus, assuming *ἐνδύσασθαι* is given indicative force. Otherwise, it is a reference to the believer's conversion-initiation (faith / baptism), if *ἐνδύσασθαι* is given imperatival force. More likely, however, the aorist participle *κτισθέντα* expresses contemporaneous action<sup>107</sup> and is a reference to the believer's conversion since *ἐνδύσασθαι* has indicative force as argued above. At conversion-initiation the "new man," created after the likeness of God, is put on by the Christian. This participial clause implies the creation of the "new man" by God after the original

---

<sup>106</sup>BAGD, s.v. *κτίζω* and *κτίσις*; Foerster, *TDNT*, 3:1028-35; Esser, *NIDNTT*, 1:383-87. See further discussion in ch. 3, 174-76, and ch. 4, 233-39.

<sup>107</sup>Robertson, *Grammar*, 1112-14; Wallace, *Grammar*, 614-15. See ch. 4, 235.

pattern in Christ, the prototypical "new man." It is not stated or implied, however, that the image of God in which man was first created was totally lost and is only recovered in Christ. Rather, this new creation, like the first, stands in conformity with the divine image and likeness.<sup>108</sup>

The "new man" has been created by God to be like Him "in (έν, with regard to) righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) and holiness (όσιότητι) of the truth (άληθείας)." Several observations show the importance of this phrase here. First, both δικαιοσύνη and όσιότης are used in an ethical (vs. forensic) sense in this context.<sup>109</sup> They refer to the moral and spiritual uprightness of life appropriate to the person who has been put right with God and set apart to Him, that is, one who has put on the "new man." Some interpreters see a distinction between the terms whereby δικαιοσύνη is doing what is right in relation to humanity (moral uprightness) and όσιότης is doing what is right in relation to God (personal piety).<sup>110</sup> But such a distinction cannot be sustained because each term has both moral and religious connotations. Within the New Testament, όσιότης occurs only here and in Luke 1:75 where it is again linked with δικαιοσύνη. When used together, these two terms probably had become familiar as "a

---

<sup>108</sup>Salmond, "Ephesians" in *EGT*, 3:334. Pace E. F. Scott, *The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*, MNTC (New York: Harper & Row, 1930) 219, who suggests that the upright and pious character that was originally man's before the Fall has been restored to man through Christ. That κτίζω recalls the original creation (cf. Gen. 1:26-27) and is used to designate the genesis of the "new man" does not mean that the "new man" shares an identity with Adam before the Fall. For Paul, the image of God in Christ is more glorious than anything Adam had. See further discussion in ch. 1, 49-52, and ch. 4, 233-39.

<sup>109</sup>See BAGD, s.v. δικαιοσύνη, 2; Schrenk, *TDNT* 2:202-10; Seebass and Brown, *NIDNTT*, 3:362-73. On όσιότης, see BAGD, s.v. όσιότης; Hauck, *TDNT*, 5:491-93, who says the meaning is "'personal piety' which acts out of regard for eternal [divine] ordinances" (5:493); and Seebass, *NIDNTT*, 2:236-38. Characteristically, Paul used δικαιοσύνη in reference to God's activity of putting people in a right relationship with Himself, or to His gift of a right relationship (cf. Rom. 1:17; 3:21-22, 26; 9:30; 10:3; 2 Cor. 5:21); but here and elsewhere (cf. Rom. 6:13, 16, 18-20; 2 Cor. 6:7, 14; 9:10; Phil. 1:7; 4:8; Eph. 5:9; 6:14) he uses the term in the ethical sense of moral uprightness. See ch. 2, 136.

<sup>110</sup>E.g., Schlier, *Epheser*, 221-22. This distinction can be found earlier in Plato, *Gorg.* 507B; Polybius 20.10.7; and Philo, *Abr.* 208.

summary of human virtue."<sup>111</sup> This may also explain why a form of *ἀγιασμός*, a more common Pauline term for "holiness," is not used here.

Second, this phrase follows immediately after *κτισθέντα* ("created"), suggesting that Paul viewed these ethical qualities as originating in God's creative work in line with 2:10 where believers are said to be "created in Christ Jesus for good works that God prepared beforehand in order that we might walk in them." In light of this, righteousness and holiness serve as a summary of Christian virtue specifically.<sup>112</sup>

Third, the use of righteousness and holiness as the ethical qualities that summarize Christian virtue underscores Paul's point that the "new man" has been created to be like God because both are characteristic of God Himself (cf. LXX Deut. 32:4 and Ps. 144:17; also Rev. 16:5). The "new man" created in God's likeness, then, is to be righteous and holy even as God is.<sup>113</sup> These qualities are essential to the "new man," forming the content of his renewal (v. 23) and thereby demonstrating that the one who has already put on the "new man" (v. 24) has not yet attained final salvation or glory. Here, the ethical (moral) aspect of the divine image is emphasized, while in the Colossians 3:10 parallel the intellectual aspect (knowledge) is emphasized.

Fourth, the virtues that characterize the "new man" come from the truth. The genitive *ἀληθείας*<sup>114</sup> modifies both preceding nouns (pace AV) and is best

<sup>111</sup>Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 139; also Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:510-11; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 288; and Best, *Ephesians*, 437, who calls them an ethical word pair "describing personal piety in accordance with God's will." This usage appears in Plato, *Ap.* 35D; *Cri.* 54B; *Th.* 172B; *Wis* 9:3; and Philo, *Sac.* 57; *Spec. Leg.* 1.304; *Virt.* 50 where both terms together denote virtuous living.

<sup>112</sup>Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 201.

<sup>113</sup>R. A. Wild, "Be Imitators of God': Discipleship in the Letter to the Ephesians," in *Discipleship in the New Testament*, ed. F. F. Segovia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985) 127-43, esp. 134-35.

<sup>114</sup>D\* F G it and a few other manuscripts read *καὶ ἀληθεία*, but this appears to be a deliberate attempt to make this term parallel to the two preceding dative nouns. The better attested reading is the genitive *τῆς ἀληθείας* that stands as the antithesis of *τῆς ἀπάτης* (v. 22).

understood as a genitive of source ("righteousness and holiness that come from the truth")<sup>115</sup> rather than an attributive genitive ("true righteousness and holiness," e.g., NRSV, NIV).<sup>116</sup> As argued above, the truth is found in Jesus as disclosed in the gospel and the apostolic tradition (cf. Eph. 1:13; 4:21; also Gal. 2:5, 14; 5:7; 2 Cor. 4:2; 13:8). It stands in sharp contrast to the deceit (*ἀπάτη*) that corrupts the "old man" (v. 22), and is the source and support of righteousness and holiness that characterize the "new man" (v. 24).

### 5.3.7 Ephesians 4:25a: Falsehood Put Off

Having laid the necessary theological groundwork using the "old man / new man" antithesis in 4:17-24, Paul moves on in 4:25ff to give specific exhortations. The *διό* of verse 25a is a strong inferential conjunction (*δι' ὅ*)<sup>117</sup> that introduces a collection of ethical injunctions on various topics that are based on and specific applications of the information given in 4:20-24. The repetition of a form of *ἀποτίθημι* (from v. 22), the contrast between *τὸ ψεῦδος* and *ἡ ἀλήθεια* (v. 24), and the repetition of *ἀλήθεια* in verse 25 from verses 21 and 24 provide additional links between these two paragraphs.

If what Paul's readers were taught as expressed by the infinitive triad (vv. 22-24) is imperatival in character, then the inferential *διό* would lose much of its force. The exhortations of 4:25ff would be based on the "indirect" exhortations of verses 22-24, and this would be an unusual procedure for Paul. Even if *διό* were related back to *ἐδιδάχθητε* in verse 21, one cannot escape the problem since verses 22-

---

Truth often stands in opposition to "sin, deceit" in the Qumran documents: e.g., 1QS 4.17, 24; 5.10; 1QH 1.26-27, 30; 4.10; 7.14, 28-30; 1QM 4.6.

<sup>115</sup>Salmond, "Ephesians" in *EGT*, 3:344; Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 138; and Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 288. On the genitive of source, see Wallace, *Grammar*, 109-10.

<sup>116</sup>Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 174-76; and Best, *Ephesians*, 438.

<sup>117</sup>BAGD, s.v. *διό*; BDF, §451, 5; *δι' ὅ* is literally, "on account of which," and refers here specifically to 4:22-24 as the basis for what follows.



24 spell out what was taught. Furthermore, the aorist middle participle ἀποθέμενοι (v. 25a) would be somewhat presumptuous, if based on infinitives with imperatival force. It denotes antecedent action in relation to the following present tense imperative λαλεῖτε; thus, it should be rendered: "since you have put off."<sup>118</sup> What has been put off is summarized as τὸ ψεῦδος (collective singular). This term is not only an appropriate antithesis to τῆς ἀληθείας in verse 24 (cf. Rom. 1:25; 2 Thess. 2:11-12; 1 John 2:21, 27), which is the source of the conduct of the "new man," but it is also an apt description of the whole former existence under the auspices of the "old man." Paul measured a believer's present existence by "truth in Jesus," while his whole former existence is defined as "the lie / falsehood." Since believers have put off "the lie," they are to speak truth to one another in daily conversation. In Colossians 3:9 Paul exhorted his readers not to lie one to another since they had put off the "old man." This points to a link between τὸ ψεῦδος and ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος, both of which believers have put off (same verb in vv. 22a and 25a).

Paul probably encountered some of the ethical material in 4:25ff in various Jewish, Hellenistic, and Christian sources.<sup>119</sup> It is generally acknowledged that he did not change the conventional ethical wisdom of his day (such as lists of virtues and vices) to reflect ethical values that could be considered exclusively Christian. What is

---

<sup>118</sup>It cannot be translated as an imperative since it precedes and modifies the present imperative λαλεῖτε, pace Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:511; Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, 206; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 300; and Best, *Ephesians*, 445. Lincoln acknowledges that the aorist participle can be translated as a participle with indicative force but decides against it because "the infinitive form in which [putting off the old person] occurred in 4:22 had imperatival force" (*Ephesians*, 300). But this view of the infinitive in 4:22 has been called in question above.

<sup>119</sup>The material in Eph. 4:25–5:2 is a collection of ethical sentences, often using imperatives, that give rules for conduct in daily life. Composition of such material was common among Hellenistic philosophers (e.g., Democritus, Isocrates, Plutarch, Diogenes Laertius, Epictetus, Seneca; cf. Berger, "Hellenistische Gattungen," 1049-74) and had been adopted by Hellenistic Judaism (e.g. Wis. 14:25-26; Philo, *Sac.* 20-45). The route by which this material entered into Christian usage continues to be debated (see Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 296-97). This pericope (Eph. 4:25ff) continues to show correspondence with Col. 3 (specifically 3:8-9, 12-14) along with additional traditional material from the OT (e.g., LXX Zech. 8:16 and Ps. 4:5 in 4:25-26) and traditional ideas from Hellenistic Judaism (e.g., for the idea of the imitation of God in 5:1, see Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 4.73; *Virt.* 168). See Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 661-67 for additional discussion and references.

distinctive is the overall context in which they are placed, one that relates them to the christological and eschatological dimensions of his gospel. Vices are manifestations of the old sinful order of life and are to be "put off." Virtues are manifestations of the new spiritual order of life inaugurated through Christ and are to be "put on." For Paul, the accomplishment of these ethical demands does not depend on mere human resolve and effort but has already been set in motion because of every believer's new situation in Christ.

In light of these things, it is reasonable to conclude that Ephesians 4:20-24 (if not 4:17-24) serves as the theological backdrop and basis (the indicative) for the following ethical material (the imperative). This observation is reinforced by Paul's use of additional imagery later in the letter to serve the same purpose, such as *ἦτε γάρ ποτε σκότος, νῦν δέ φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ* (5:8), which is the basis for the exhortations of 5:3-7. This aligns the "old man / new man" metaphor with Paul's "once / now" motif rather than his "already / not yet" motif, although the "new man" also functions within the latter motif.

#### **5.4 Concluding Observations on the "Old Man / New Man"**

In this passage, which has several parallels to the "old / new man" text in Colossians 3, the designations *ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος* and *ὁ καινὸς ἄνθρωπος* appear together once again at the outset of a predominantly paraenetic section of the letter. Four factors influence Paul's use of these terms here: 1) the contrast between the status and conduct of pagan Gentiles (vv. 17-19) and the status and conduct of Christians who are exhorted to live ("walk") no longer (*μηκέτι*) like them; 2) a reference to the fact that believers have "learned Christ" (v. 20), which suggests a conversion (baptismal) setting; 3) corporate associations that are implicitly evident in the vices that characterize the old pagan way of life and in the virtues of the "new man" created according to divine design (v. 24); and 4) the clothing metaphor ("put off

/ put on") involving aorist infinitives that are descriptive of a contextually-defined change from "old" to "new."

The aorist infinitives *ἀποθέσθαι* (v. 22) and *ἐνδύσασθαι* (v. 24) along with the intervening present infinitive *ἀνανεοῦσθαι* (v. 23) are viewed best as having indicative force, giving the content of what Paul's readers were taught as relatively new Christians, namely, the affirmation of an accomplished theological reality rather than a prospective ethical duty. In their former pagan existence they were clothed with the "old man" who was being corrupted by desires originating in deceit and leading to divine judgment. They were active participants in the corporate structure of the old order or realm. But at conversion they "put off the old man" (v. 22). Now instead of being corrupted by desires that come from deceit, they are being renewed inwardly (v. 23) in that (*καί*) at conversion they "put on the new man" who is being renewed in righteousness and holiness that come from truth as found in Jesus (v. 24). They are now active participants in the corporate structure of the new order / realm. This is what they were taught, presumably at or near the time of their conversion-initiation.

Upon comparison, it is evident that there is a connection between Ephesians 2:15 and 4:24. The similarities include the designation "new man" and the creation motif. But there are some significant differences. In 2:15, the emphasis is corporate. Christ, through His death on the cross, created the two alien groups—Jews and Gentiles—into "one new man," making peace. The corporate entity is the Body of Christ, the Church. In 4:24, the emphasis is on the individual within the corporate community. The Christian at conversion-initiation "put on the new man" created to be like God in His moral perfections. Thus, for Paul, the "new man" concept has both corporate and individual associations—the corporate new humanity embodies each individual "new person."

Once again, as in Colossians 3 though less explicitly, the change from "old" to "new" is aligned with the contrast between the believer's former ("once") and

present ("now") existence with conversion-initiation as the point of transfer.

Similarly, renewal is attached to the present condition of the believer who is already a "new man" though not yet in the complete and perfect eschatological sense. Thus, when used with the common clothing metaphor depicting change as is the case here, the "old man / new man" metaphor is aligned with Paul's "once / now" rather than his "already / not yet" motif even though the latter comes into play in the renewal of the "new man." Similarly, the "once / now" connection places the "old man / new man" metaphor on the side of the "indicative" rather than the "imperative" in Paul's ethical teaching although the latter also comes into play in the renewal of the "new man." Since this metaphor does not occur elsewhere in New Testament paraenesis, Paul was likely the first to use it in ethical contexts where it serves as a cogent theological summary on which he bases his ethical exhortations.

In this passage, then, the "old man" refers to the believer in his or her *former* (pre-Christian) state of existence aligned with Adam and the corporate structure of the old order / realm. The "new man" refers to the believer in his or her *present* state of Christian existence aligned with Christ and the corporate structure of the new order / realm. At their conversion-initiation believers "put off the old man" and "put on the new man." They made a definitive change from "old" to "new." This is the theological reality, Paul claims, about which they were taught as Christians and it serves as the necessary basis and motivation for conduct that befits the "new man."

At this point we are ready to gather together the findings of our study in this and the other "old man / new man" texts, and draw some conclusions in answer to the programmatic questions raised in chapter one.

## CHAPTER 6

### CONCLUSION: THE OLD MAN / NEW MAN IN PAUL

Our study of the "old man / new man" in the Pauline corpus has focused on a detailed investigation of the four passages in which one or both of these designations has appeared. The results of our study of each passage have been summarized in the last section of each corresponding chapter: Romans 6 (2.5), Ephesians 2 (3.6), Colossians 3 (4.5), and Ephesians 4 (5.4). We are now in a position to use these results to answer the questions raised in chapter one and to shed light on a few related issues in Pauline theology. We begin by reviewing the setting for this motif in Paul's theology (6.1). Then we shall present our conclusions on the meaning and function of the "old man / new man" metaphor (6.2), the relationship of this antithesis to other *ἄνθρωπος* antitheses used by Paul (6.3), the role of the indicative and the imperative in Paul's ethics (6.4), and, finally, a brief summary of the argument of our thesis (6.6).

#### 6.1 Setting in Paul's Theology

At the outset of this study we noted the redemptive-historical, eschatological character of Paul's theology.<sup>1</sup> He saw the advent, death, resurrection, and exaltation of Jesus Christ as the revelation of God's fulfilling activity in history and as the inauguration, though not yet completion, of the time of salvation (Gal. 4:4; 2 Cor. 6:2). With the Christ-event, a great change has come about that Paul referred to as a "new creation" in which "old things have passed away and new things have come" (2 Cor. 5:17). That which is "old" and "new" is derived from the eschatological perspective and framework within which he uses these terms: in the light of God's activity in Christ that inaugurated and established the new age / realm, all that is

---

<sup>1</sup>See ch. 1, 38-41.

tied to the previous and existing age / realm is "old." It is a matter of two different worlds, in both a redemptive-historical, eschatological sense and in an individual salvific sense. The "old things" relate to the unredeemed world in its sin and distress under the control of diabolical powers; the "new things" relate to the new creation realm of salvation and renewal that has dawned with Christ's resurrection and operates under His lordship. From this perspective, individual existence is never isolated but is always viewed from the perspective of the world to which one belongs. This means that humanity—individually and corporately—is always caught up in the cosmological conflict of opposing powers. Since the new creation has been inaugurated through Christ and the Spirit, the person who is "in Christ" is a new creation, that is, one who participates in and belongs to this new world order from God (cf. Eph. 2:10, 15; 4:24; Col. 3:10).

This distinctive character of Paul's theology emerges from the tension that exists between aspects of fulfillment and expectation in his eschatology. On one hand, he speaks of the fullness of time that has taken effect and of the new creation that has begun; but, on the other hand, he is clearly conscious of still living in the present world and the time corresponding with it (e.g., Rom. 8:18; 12:2, et al.). In one place he speaks of "the present evil age" as a situation from which Christ has delivered believers (Gal. 1:4; cf. Col. 1:13), while elsewhere he speaks of the present age and of the world as the place where believers must live godly lives in the service of the Lord (Phil. 2:15; cf. Tit. 2:12-14). Thus in certain contexts Paul qualifies life prior to the redemptive event as "once" (*πότε*) or "at that time" (Rom. 11:30; Gal. 4:8-9; Col. 1:21-22; 3:7-8; Eph. 2:1-2, 11-13; 5:8), in contrast with the present "now" (*νῦν*) of the new creation, the time of redemption and fulfillment (Rom. 3:21, 26; 6:21-22; 7:5-6; 11:30; 1 Cor. 15:20; 2 Cor. 6:2; Col. 1:22; 3:8; Eph. 2:13). This reflects his "once / now" motif. Elsewhere, however, the "at present" or "now" (*νῦν*) indicates the

continuation of the mode of existence defined by the present world over against the "then" (τότε) or "not yet" of the glory still to come (Rom. 8:18-25; 1 Cor. 3:22; 4:5; 13:10, 12; 15:54; Phil. 3:10-14; Col. 3:4). This reflects Paul's "already / not yet" motif. It is this unusual flexibility of the "now," namely, the "already now" of salvation time that has begun and the "even now" of present world time that still continues, that gives to Paul's eschatology its distinctive character. An "overlap of the two ages" takes place, since he views the first advent of Christ as the breaking through of the coming age into the present age that is passing away. All this takes place through Jesus Christ who has come and is yet to come again (Gal. 4:4-5; 1 Thess. 1:9-10; 4:13-18).

In Christ's resurrection the new creation dawns, bringing at the once / now level for believers individually and corporately a decisive transfer from the old to the new age / realm (2 Cor. 5:17; cf. v. 15). This transfer derives its meaning and stands out in passages in which Christ is set over against Adam. In 1 Corinthians 15:45-47 Paul speaks of Adam as "the first man" and of Christ as the "second man," "the last Adam." His resurrection from the dead established Him as the "last Adam," and through it the new life of the new creation has already come to light and become a reality in this present era. In this regard, Christ and Adam stand over against one another as the divinely appointed representatives of two realms—life and death. Just as Adam is the one through whom sin entered into the world and death through sin (Rom. 5:12), so Christ is the One who brings righteousness and life (Rom. 5:15-19). In his role of representing humanity, Adam is called the type of "him who was to come" (5:14), namely, a type of the second man, the last Adam, who represents the new humanity. Christ, the One who was to come and who has come, is the head of the coming age that has broken into the present.

The Adam-Christ typology not only casts light on the significance Paul gives to Christ Himself, but it also illuminates the way in which he sees those who belong to Christ as involved in Him and with Him in His redemptive work. This comes to expression in the words of 1 Corinthians 15:22: ". . . for as in Adam all died, so also in Christ shall all be made alive." "In Christ" is parallel to "in Adam." Just as "in Adam" all who belong to him died, so "in Christ" all who belong to Him shall live. It is this corporate connection of the "all in one" that Paul applies to Christ and His people and from which the statements concerning dying and rising "with Christ" should be interpreted as is evident from the close connection between Romans 5:12-21 (Adam and Christ) and Romans 6:1-14 (being crucified with Christ and walking in newness of life).<sup>2</sup>

The death and resurrection of believers with Christ is, however, a matter of God's decision to see them as having died and risen (proleptically) with Him in His death and resurrection at the redemptive-historical, corporate level until through faith / baptism (conversion-initiation) they are united with Him and accept the divine provision as it personally applies to them at the individual level. Because Christ died and rose as the representative of redeemed humanity, they also were "buried with Him and raised with Him" in faith / baptism (Col. 2:12). When through faith as attested in baptism they are united with Him as the founder of the new humanity, they participate in that which happened to Him: His death becomes their death, and His resurrection becomes their resurrection to walk in newness of life now (Rom. 6:4) and to share His resurrection life fully in the future (Rom. 8:18-25). This puts an end to the old life separated from God, and begins a new one established in Christ.

---

<sup>2</sup>See ch. 2, 67-73.



The Adam / Christ typology, then, with its redemptive-historical, "realized" eschatological, and corporate associations provides the point of departure and frame of reference for Paul's use of the "old man / new man" metaphor. We now turn to present our conclusions on the meaning and function of this dual metaphor in the Pauline corpus.

## **6.2 The "Old Man / New Man" in Paul's Theology**

Our investigation of the "old man / new man" metaphor confirms that a Jewish milieu provides the best conceptual background for this motif in Paul's thought. He draws on the Adam / Christ typology within his distinctive redemptive-historical, eschatological perspective to formulate the "old man / new man" terminology. Then he uses these terms as objects of the verbal action in the common "put off / put on" clothing metaphor representing in this case a change of status (condition) and identity. As such, without antecedent parallels, the "old man / new man" metaphor is probably an original formulation that Paul contributed to Christian thought.<sup>3</sup> Now we offer the results of our study to answer the questions raised in chapter one.<sup>4</sup>

### **6.2.1 The Meaning of the "Old Man / New Man" Metaphor**

The meaning of the "old man / new man" metaphor is complicated by the fact that these terms have both corporate and individual associations that Paul derived from the Adam / Christ typology. Adam is the prototypical "old man," though Paul does not use the term in this way. All those in solidarity with Adam (Rom. 5:12, 19a), namely, all humanity "in Adam," constitute the corporate "old man;" and each

---

<sup>3</sup>See ch. 1, 42-52.

<sup>4</sup>See ch. 1, 60-61.

person as he / she exists "in Adam" is viewed as an individual "old man." At the corporate level, the "old man" refers to unredeemed humanity that belongs to the ongoing corporate structure of the old order / realm of existence established by Adam at his fall and dominated by the power of sin and death leading to divine judgment in the end. In short, the corporate "old man" is the world of unredeemed humanity. At the individual level, the "old man" refers to the unredeemed person who belongs to this corporate structure of existence. It entails a futile way of life and ultimately leads to eternal death (Rom. 5:12, 19a; 6:6, 17-23). In short, the individual "old man" is the person of "this present age" that is passing away (1 Cor. 7:31).<sup>5</sup>

On the other hand, Christ is the prototypical "new man," though Paul does not use the term in this way. All those in solidarity with Christ by faith (Rom. 5:17, 19b), namely, the new humanity "in Christ," constitute the corporate "new man;" and each believer as he / she exists "in Christ" is viewed as an individual "new man." At the corporate level, the "one new man" (Eph. 2:15) refers to redeemed humanity that belongs to the ongoing corporate structure of the new order / realm established by Jesus Christ in His death and resurrection and dominated by the power of righteousness and life through the Spirit leading to divine glory in the end. In it the barriers of race, culture, and social status that separate people from one another in the old order / realm are no longer relevant (Col. 3:11). In short, the corporate "new man" is the Church.<sup>6</sup> At the individual level, the "new man" refers to the redeemed person who belongs to this corporate structure of existence. It involves a worthy way of life and leads to life eternal (Rom. 5:17-19; 6:17-23). In short, the individual "new man" is the person of "the age to come" that in Christ is now here and is yet to be

---

<sup>5</sup>See ch. 2, 140-44.

<sup>6</sup>See ch. 3, 190-92.

fully and finally established.<sup>7</sup> The individual as a whole person exists in a dynamic, determinative relationship to this corporate structure without losing his / her distinctive individuality. The terms "old man / new man," then, have both corporate and individual application. The context in which they are used is determinative.

This corporate / individual relationship is confirmed by the fact that "old" and "new" for Paul are both redemptive-historical, eschatological terms (corporate) and personal conversion terms (individual). On one hand, reference to the "old man" in Romans 6:6 and to the "new man" in Ephesians 2:15 relate to redemptive-historical categories with respect to all that took place once in Christ's death on the cross. On the other hand, the "put off / put on" references to the "old" and "new man" in Colossians 3:9-11 and Ephesians 4:22-24 relate to personal appropriation at conversion-initiation and the subsequent continuous renewal of the "new man." For the believer to have "died with Christ" means that the "old man" has been "put off" (the negative side of personal conversion). This is possible because "our old man" (Rom. 6:6) was crucified with Christ at the cross (corporate solidarity), even though Paul focuses on individual participation in this event at conversion-initiation in Romans 6.<sup>8</sup> To have been "raised with Christ" to walk in newness of life means that the "new man" has been "put on" (the positive side of personal conversion). This is possible because the "one new man" (Eph. 2:15) has been created in Christ at the cross (corporate solidarity). In light of this, the terms "old man / new man" refer to the whole person in a particular condition or mode of existence rather than a person who manifests a particular set of characteristics, habits or deeds in his / her conduct, although the former includes and influences the latter.

---

<sup>7</sup>See ch. 1, 57; ch. 4, 243-46, and ch. 5, 286-88.

<sup>8</sup>See ch. 2, 107-11, 142.

Though the "old man / new man" are linked with Adam and Christ respectively, they do not refer to Adam and Christ directly as individuals.<sup>9</sup> The "old man" was crucified with Christ, but Adam was not. The "new man" is said to be created "after the likeness of God" (Eph. 4:24), but Paul does not use the verb *κτίζω* to describe Jesus Christ, nor is it used with Him as the object. Also, the "new man" is said to be presently undergoing renewal "according to the image of God" (Col. 3:10; Eph. 4:23), which is something Paul does not say of Jesus Christ. However, he does speak of Christ as the image of God (2 Cor. 4:4; Col. 1:15) who, like the "first Adam," transmits His image to those who belong to Him (1 Cor. 15:49) and he speaks of believers being conformed to His image (Rom. 8:29; 2 Cor. 3:18).

Thus, it may be said that the "old man / new man" metaphor fits the structure of Paul's "once / now" motif. The time of change between "old" and "new" occurred in redemptive history at the death and resurrection of Christ on the corporate level (Rom. 6:2-10; Eph. 2:15) and at faith / baptism in the life history of each believer on the individual level (Col. 3:9-10; Eph. 4:22-24). This leads us to consider a related question: Does the eschatological tension in Paul's theology require or even allow him to regard the believer as both an "old man" and a "new man" at the same time?

### **6.2.2 Discontinuity Between the "Old Man" and "New Man"**

It could be argued that Paul is dealing with the definitive crucifixion of the "old man" in Romans 6:6 and Colossians 3:9-10 (indicative force), but in Ephesians 4:22-24 he regards the "old man" as still alive and active and in need of being put off or put to death in daily ethical action (imperative force). The ethical context of Ephesians 4:22-24 suggests an ethical interpretation of these verses. Thus the time

---

<sup>9</sup>See ch. 1, 50 n149.

of change would not only be at faith / baptism but also throughout the believer's life, and the emphasis would be on the present daily struggle of believers against the vices of the "old man" and their continual transformation by taking on the virtues of the "new man." As such, this reflects Paul's "already / not yet" motif in present ethical action.

If this is the case, it would be analogous to other Pauline constructions that involve the "already / not yet" motif (see pp. 290-91). Does the "old man / new man" metaphor fit this motif? Does Paul say: You have "put off the old man" and have "put on the new man" (indicative); therefore, "put off the old man" and "put on the new man" (imperative)? Must believers be exhorted to continually "put off the old man" and "put on the new man"? Similarly, are the clothing metaphor verbs "put off / put on" with the "old man" and "new man" as objects used as transfer terms (moving out of one condition and into another), or as transformation terms (remaining in and maturing in a given condition), or are they to be defined contextually and thus are capable of being applied to either of these situations?

While an ethical application of the clothing imagery is appropriate in some contexts (e.g., Rom. 13:12-14; 1 Thess. 5:8; Eph. 6:11, 13), we must question the ethical interpretation of the words "put off the old man" and "put on the new man" for several reasons. First, in the paraenetic passages, Paul uses *both* "put off / put on" verbs together with indicative force along with the "old man / new man" as the holistic but contrastive objects respectively.<sup>10</sup> This usage does not lend itself to the view that the believer is both an "old man" and a "new man" at the same time. With such associations the imagery does not indicate a process of gradually taking off the "old man" and gradually putting on the "new man." Rather, believers have put off the "old

---

<sup>10</sup>For the arguments supporting the "indicative force" view of the aorist participles in Col. 3:9-10, see ch. 4, 217-22, and of the aorist infinitives in Eph. 4:22-24, see ch. 5, 267-69.

man" and they are clothed with the "new man." They do not progressively become the "new man."

Second, in Ephesians 4, Paul characterizes the "old man" (4:22) in such a way as to link him with the description of pagan unbelievers given in 4:17-19. Yet he never characterizes believers in this way despite the fact that he was aware of sinfulness among them (e.g., 1 Cor. 3-11, *passim*). In fact, the antithesis between the past and the present is clearly drawn in verse 20 (*ὑμεῖς δέ*) where he viewed his believing readers as answering to a much different identification. The description he gives of the "new man" (4:24) shows that the "new man" is antithetical to the "old man" and is to be understood in terms of the new creation (cf. Eph. 2:10; 2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15). The "old man" designation is no longer applicable to the Christian.

Third, renewal is predicated solely of the "new man." As the use of *ἄνθρωπος* suggests, it relates to the whole person, not simply the behavior of a person. Accordingly, this double metaphor does not depict two opposing moral components in a person as implied by the designations "old nature / new nature." Rather, the "old man" depicts a person of "this present age" who is "dead to God" and "alive to sin" and who in that condition is in the process of being continually corrupted. On the other hand, the "new man" depicts the same individual person with a new identity in a new condition in Christ, a person of "the age to come" who is "dead to sin" and "alive to God" (Rom. 6:11) and undergoing renewal in that condition (Col. 3:10; Eph. 4:24).

This progressive renewal necessitates the continuously operative grace of God and enlists the responsible activity of the believer (Rom. 8:12; 12:2). But it is not represented by Paul as putting off the "old man" and putting on the "new man," nor is the putting off to be construed as the progressive crucifixion of the "old man."<sup>11</sup> It is

---

<sup>11</sup>See ch. 2, 105-07.

the "new man" already "put on" who is in the process of constantly being renewed. Though Paul identifies the "I" (ἐγώ) both with sin (Rom. 7:14, 20a, 25b) and with righteousness (Rom. 7:17a, 20b, 25a), he does not call the former the "old ego" and the latter the "new ego." Similarly, he does not call sin (or, the "flesh") in believers the "old man." The "daily struggle" of the new life goes on for the believer as a "new man" in the conflict of the flesh versus the Spirit (see pp. 313-16), not the "old man" versus the "new man."

In light of these factors, we maintain the view that the "old man / new man" metaphor fits the structure of the "once / now" rather than the "already / not yet" motif in Pauline theology. At the individual level, the "old" and the "new man" reflect two successive stages in a person's life: pre- and post-conversion. Paul's holistic terminology plus the "put off / put on" clothing metaphor indicate that, for him, the "old" and the "new man" do not coexist at the individual level. Though there is continuity of person because the same person puts off the "old man" and puts on the "new man," the emphasis of the metaphor lies on discontinuity—a radical change in which the "new man" displaces the "old man." The change constitutes the one who believes a genuine "new man," although a "new man" not yet eschatologically perfect. It is the progressive renewal of the "new man" that takes place within the structure of the "already / not yet" motif. Thus, the "old man" and "new man" must be considered soteriological-eschatological as well as anthropological categories.

### **6.2.3 The Purpose of the "Old Man / New Man" Metaphor**

Paul used a variety of metaphors to describe the multi-faceted significance of the Christ-event and the crucial transition from "old" to "new." The "old man / new man," though not prominent, was one of them. It could function in either a corporate, redemptive-historical setting (Rom. 6 implicitly; Eph. 2; Col. 3 partly) or an individual,

conversion-initiation (baptismal) setting (Rom. 6; Col. 3; Eph. 4).

The metaphor served at least three purposes for Paul. First, in Romans 6:6 the crucifixion of "our old man" emphasizes the believer's definitive break with sin as a power and thus also with his / her old identity and status "in Adam" enslaved to sin.<sup>12</sup> The result is that the believer is no longer a slave to sin but a "slave" to God (Rom. 6:20-22). Second, in Ephesians 2:15 the creation of the "one new man" emphasizes the corporate solidarity with Christ of two alien groups—Jews and Gentiles—who were reconciled to God and to each other.<sup>13</sup> In this redemptive-historical change effected by Christ, Jews and Gentiles now share equally the blessings of the new era of salvation in the Church. Third, in the paraenetic passages, Colossians 3:9-11 and Ephesians 4:22-24, the "old man" put off and the "new man" put on at conversion-initiation emphasizes the definitive transfer from the old realm under sin and eternal death to the new realm under righteousness and eternal life. This alignment with Paul's "once / now" motif places the "old man / new man" metaphor on the side of the "indicative" (doctrinal affirmation) in Paul's paraenesis. As such, it serves as the theological basis and motivation for the "imperative" (pastoral exhortation).<sup>14</sup> At the same time, the "new man" who is being renewed is the new identity of the Christian.

Having set forth the meaning and function of the "old man / new man" in the Pauline corpus, we wish to comment on the relationship of this antithesis to other *ἄνθρωπος* antitheses that Paul uses.

---

<sup>12</sup>See ch. 2, 104-17.

<sup>13</sup>See ch. 3, 174-85.

<sup>14</sup>See ch. 4, 215-22, 227-32; and ch. 5, 269-73, 278-84, and pp. 316-24 below.



## 6.3 Relationship to Other Pauline *ἄνθρωπος* Themes

### 6.3.1 Outer / Inner Man

The adverb *ἔξω* occurs five times in the Pauline corpus (1 Cor. 5:12, 13; 2 Cor. 4:16; 1 Thess. 4:12; Col. 4:5),<sup>15</sup> and the adverb *ἔσω* appears four times (Rom. 7:22; 1 Cor. 5:12; 2 Cor. 4:16; Eph. 3:16).<sup>16</sup> Only in 2 Corinthians 4:16 is *ἔξω* used with *ἄνθρωπος* (*ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος*) where it stands in contrast with *ἔσω ἄνθρωπος*, implied from the preceding construction (*ὁ ἔσω ἡμῶν [ἄνθρωπος]*). In addition, *ἔσω* occurs alone with *ἄνθρωπος* in Romans 7:22 and Ephesians 3:16. All the remaining Pauline uses refer to those "outside" the church (1 Cor. 5:12-13; 1 Thess. 4:12; Col. 4:5) or to those "within" the church (1 Cor. 5:12) respectively. Our interest lies with the *ἄνθρωπος* uses and their relationship to the "old / new man."

The contrast between the outer and inner man was common in Hellenistic thought.<sup>17</sup> Some scholars claim the antithesis has a Gnostic background.<sup>18</sup> Others acknowledge Hellenistic terminology but discount Hellenistic influence in favor of

<sup>15</sup>BAGD, s.v. *ἔξω*, 1.β, used substantively with the article (*οἱ ἔξω*) meaning "those who are outside" with reference to non-Christians (1 Cor. 5:12, 13; 1 Thess. 4:12; Col. 4:5; cf. Mk. 4:11); 1.γ, used as a substitute for an adjective with *ἄνθρωπος* meaning "outer, outside" with reference to "our outer man," i.e., the body . . . (1 Cor. 4:16); and s.v. *ἄνθρωπος*, 2.c.a, . . . "the outer man, i.e., man in his material, transitory, and sinful aspects 2 Cor. 4:16 . . . ."

<sup>16</sup>BAGD, s.v. *ἔσω*, 2; used substantively with the article (*οἱ ἔσω*) meaning "those within" with reference to Christians (1 Cor. 5:12); and used as a substitute for an adjective with *ἄνθρωπος* meaning "inner, within" with reference to "the inner nature" (Rom. 7:22; Eph. 3:16) and "our inner man" (2 Cor. 4:16); and s.v. *ἄνθρωπος*, 2.c.a, . . . "the inner man, i.e., man in his spiritual, immortal aspects, striving toward God Rom. 7:22; 2 Cor. 4:16; Eph. 3:16 . . . ."

<sup>17</sup>E.g., Plato, *Rep.* 9.589a, *ὁ ἐντὸς ἄνθρωπος*; Plotinus, *Enn.* 5.1.10, *ὁ εἴσω ἄνθρωπος*; Epictetus 2.7.3; 2.8.12-14; Seneca, *Mor. Ep.* 41.4-5; 102.23-27. Philo, *Cong.* 97; *Det.* 22-23; *Plant.* 42; *CH* 1.15, 18, 21; 13.7-8. See further references in BAGD, s.v. *ἄνθρωπος*, 2.c.a; Jeremias, "*ἄνθρωπος, ἀνθρώπινος*," *TDNT*, 1:365; and Behm, "*ἔσω*," *TDNT*, 2:698-99.

<sup>18</sup>R. Reitzenstein, *The Hellenistic Mystery-Religions: Their Basic Ideas and Significance*, trans. J. E. Stealy from the 3rd German ed., PTMS 15 (Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1978 [1910]) 354-56, argues that anthropological dualism influenced Paul directly via Gnosticism. Jeremias, *TDNT*, 1:365, accepts Gnostic influence as mediated through Hellenistic Judaism. This view also receives the support of R. Jewett who provides a useful history of research in *Paul's Anthropological Terms. A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings*, AGJU 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1971) 391-95. See ch. 1, 22-25.

Hebrew thought with its holistic rather than dualistic viewpoint.<sup>19</sup> Others see Hellenistic influence, but the terminology is derived from Hellenistic Judaism and has only formal significance for Paul, such that the outer / inner contrast refers to a whole person viewed from two perspectives.<sup>20</sup>

What Paul calls "the inner man" corresponds to לֵב ("heart") in the Old Testament and has formal parallels in the sayings of Jesus (cf. Matt. 23:28; Mk. 7:21; Lk. 11:39), but the expression itself and the "outer / inner man" antithesis likely come from Hellenistic terminology and popular use. However, though he takes up the language, Paul uses it within the framework of his own theology. Unlike Hellenistic thinkers, he does not denigrate the "outer man" as evil and elevate "the inner man" as the essential good part of a person so that immortal life is gained only when the mortal "outer man" is put off in the end. Also, his redemptive-historical, eschatological frame of reference contrasts with Hellenistic thinking. The "inner man" is undergoing renewal—not by absorption into pure spirit as in Hellenistic and Gnostic thought—but by moral transformation by the Spirit with the hope of resurrection that includes a future for the "outer man" in his bodily existence (1 Cor. 15:20-28, 35-57; 2 Cor. 3:18; 4:16–5:10; Rom. 12:2).

In spite of these differences, however, Paul maintains "the same basic distinction between the physical and the non-physical," between the visible corporeal and the invisible non-corporeal, which in combination constitute the whole person as

---

<sup>19</sup>E.g., W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man in Relation to its Judaic and Hellenistic Background* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1956) 211-13, who concludes that Paul is not a dichotomist, even though "on rare occasions the language of dichotomy creeps into his letters" (213).

<sup>20</sup>R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. K. Grobel (London: SCM Press, 1956) 1:203; C. K. Barrett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, BNTC (London: A. & C. Black, 1973) 146-47; V. Furnish, *II Corinthians*, AB (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984) 288-89; et al.

a psychosomatic unity.<sup>21</sup> Robert Gundry declares that for Paul: "The true man is the whole man—corporeal and incorporeal together, the incorporeal acting through the corporeal, each equally deficient without the other. Hence, the true man is not the inner man alone, for although the body is outward, it is not unessential. The body is to be sanctified and will be resurrected."<sup>22</sup>

Some interpreters deny this dichotomy in Paul by making both "the outer and the inner man" refer to the indivisible whole person as seen from without and from within respectively.<sup>23</sup> This sometimes includes equating the "inner man" with the "new man," which, in turn, requires equating the "outer man" with the "old man." This raises the issue of the relationship between the outer / inner man and the old / new man in the Pauline corpus.<sup>24</sup>

First, is the "outer man" the "old man"? We have argued above that the "old man" on the individual level is the human person living under the dominion of sin prior to faith in Christ. For the Christian, the "old man" has already been crucified

---

<sup>21</sup>R. H. Gundry, *Sōma in Biblical Theology with Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology*, SNTSMS 29 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976) 135-40. He argues convincingly for anthropological duality, i.e., a living person as a unity of parts, both body and soul along with synonymous and synecdochic expressions for the whole person. He finds evidence for a dichotomy within the unity of the human constitution in the OT, the Judaism of NT times, and early Christian writers including Paul as well as in Hellenistic thought (83-156). See also ch. 1, 25.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., 84.

<sup>23</sup>Bultmann, *Theology*, 1:203; U. Schnelle, *The Human Condition. Anthropology in the Teachings of Jesus, Paul, and John*, trans. O. C. Dean, Jr. (Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1996) 106-07.

<sup>24</sup>Some believe the two sets of contrasts are to be equated or closely related: e.g., J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, reprint of 9th ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1959) 213; Barrett, *Second Corinthians*, 145-47; S. Kim, *The Origin of Paul's Gospel*, WUNT 4 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) 321-26; J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8, 9-16*, 2 vols., WBC 38A, 38B (Dallas: Word Books, 1988) 1:394; J. K. Chamblin, *Paul and the Self: Apostolic Teaching for Personal Wholeness* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993) 88, 173, ". . . 'the inner man' (Rom. 7:22) is the self in Christ, what Paul elsewhere calls 'the new man,' in contrast to 'the outer man,' or 'the old man,' man in Adam . . . ." On the other hand, others argue that they are not related: Jeremias, *TDNT*, 1:365-66; Gundry, *Sōma*, 135-40; A. T. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, WBC 42 (Dallas: Word Books, 1990) 204-06.

with Christ (Rom. 6:6) and put off (Col. 3:9; Eph. 4:22). In 2 Corinthians 4:16, however, the "outer man" is said to be presently wasting away in contrast to the "inner man" who is being renewed day by day. In this context the "outer man" is not linked to the enslaving power of sin but to physical frailty, hardship and mortality (cf. 2 Cor. 4:7-11, 17). The designation correlates with the expression "earthen vessels" (2 Cor. 4:7), a figure for the physical bodies of those who preached the gospel.<sup>25</sup> Thus, "our outer man" is not to be equated with "our old man" enslaved to sin. Rather, the expression designates the corporeal side of people, including believers, that is subject to hardship, deterioration and physical death.

Second, is the "inner man" the "new man"? We have argued above that the "new man" on the individual level is the Christian living under the dominion of grace subsequent to faith in Christ and undergoing renewal in the knowledge of God and righteousness. The "new man" has been "put on" at conversion and is being renewed (Col. 3:10; Eph. 4:23-24) in anticipation of final glory (Rom. 8:18, 22-25). In 2 Corinthians 4:16, however, the "inner man," subject to psychological feelings (the emphasis in this context), is being revitalized day by day not in sanctification but "in buoyancy of spirit" with the result that "we do not lose heart" (4:16a; cf. "our hearts," 4:6; and "in the heart," 5:12).<sup>26</sup> Thus, "our inner man" is not to be equated with the "new man" that Christians have put on. Rather, it designates the non-corporeal side of people, including believers, that is subject to psychological feelings as well as character formation and life.

---

<sup>25</sup>Gundry, *Sōma*, 136.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., 136-37. Gundry, however, views the "old man" as the former sinful way of life that is to be put off and the "new man" as the new style of righteous conduct that is to be put on by the Christian.

Similarly, the "inner man" of Ephesians 3:16 correlates with "your hearts" in 3:17 and the "spirit of your mind" in 4:23.<sup>27</sup> In this passage this expression designates the invisible inward side of a person with reference to believers where the strengthening and renewing power of the Holy Spirit is already at work. The referent of the "inner man" in Romans 7:22 is debated yet the "inner man" correlates with "my mind" and stands in contrast with "my members" in 7:23.<sup>28</sup> Again, it designates the inward side of a person and, as determined by context, may apply to either a believer or an unbeliever. The correlations and contrasts mentioned above seem to indicate that for Paul the "inner man" is native to the human constitution as a counterpart to the "outer man." As such, the "inner man," though used with reference to Christians in 2 Corinthians 4:16 and Ephesians 3:16 is not a technical designation for a Christian or the "new man." Romans 7:22 is disputed, but this conclusion still holds.

In these Pauline passages, therefore, the *ἔξω ἄνθρωπος* and *ἔσω ἄνθρωπος* are anthropological designations reflecting an anthropological duality, but not an ethical dualism in which the body or the corporeal side of a person is evil in and of itself. Every person possesses both an "outer / inner man" at the same time that together constitute the unity of a living human being. The *ἔξω ἄνθρωπος* is not to be identified

---

<sup>27</sup>See Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 204-06, for further discussion; also ch. 5, 273-78.

<sup>28</sup>Rom. 7:13-25 is a widely debated passage. A vigorous conflict occurs between the "I" and indwelling sin. The Mosaic Law, though holy, just, and good, is powerless to deliver the "I" from the power of sin (Rom. 8:3). In 7:13-8:4 there is a consistent contrast between "inner man / mind" and "members / physical flesh / body" that together constitute the "I" in conflict with sin. It is likely that this conflict relates primarily to the devout Jewish person under the Law, like pre-Christian Paul himself. Compare 6:12-7:6 with 7:7-25 that presupposes subjection to the Mosaic Law, which is not true of Christians; and 7:13-25 with 8:1-4 that asserts freedom from the law of sin and death for the whole person now and yet to come fully in the future (8:10-11) through the life-giving Spirit, something the Mosaic Law was powerless to effect. For further discussion see Gundry, *Sōma*, 137-40, and D. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) 409-96; pace C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 2 vols., ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975-79) 1:363; and Dunn, *Romans*, 1:393-94; id., *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998) 472-76.

as the "old man" or the whole person in relation to the present old age / realm. Nor is the *ἔσω ἄνθρωπος* to be identified as the "new man" or the whole person in relation to the new age / realm.

Though these contrasts are not to be equated, they are, nevertheless, related. The unity of the "inner / outer man" constitutes a living person, and it is the "whole person" who has put off the "old man" and put on the "new man." Thus, the "new man"—both "outer and inner man" together—stands as a whole human being set apart to God for His service even though in the present age the "outer man" is wasting away physically. The powers of the new age mediated by the Spirit are already at work in the "new man" but not yet in a way that transforms the outer corporeal side visible to others. The "outer man" is deteriorating and subject to death as a lingering consequence of the Adamic Fall, but the "inner man," the non-corporeal side not visible to others except in the behavior it effects outwardly, is being revitalized and renewed in character formation by the power of the Spirit who is already at work in believers.

An important element in the instruction that Paul's readers have received is that they are undergoing renewal in the "spirit of your mind" (Eph. 4:23). Though renewal of the "mind" is not explicitly mentioned in the Colossians 3:9-10 parallel, the emphasis given to *ἐπίγνωσις* seems to make a similar point. This does not mean, however, that the "new man" is to be identified as an inner spiritual nature or a person's inner self. What these passages indicate is that at present the individual's renewal after the image of Christ does not take place in his physical body, which is the *ἔξω ἄνθρωπος* (2 Cor. 4:16), but takes place in his / her heart or mind that constitute the *ἔσω ἄνθρωπος*. At the same time the "new man" does not reside in the heart / mind of the believer, nor does the "old man" reside in the "flesh." The "outer / inner man" as a whole person is "old" through sin and liability to death. Similarly, the

whole person has become "new" through grace and the gift of life by the Spirit. At present, the person as a whole, excluding the physical body that is deteriorating, is being transformed by the renewal of the *ἔσω ἄνθρωπος* (cf. Rom. 12:2). At the parousia this present transformation into the image of Christ, which takes place now on the level of the "inner man" and its outward expressions, will be extended to the "outer man"—the physical body—when Christians put on a resurrection body fully conformed to the image of Christ and share fully His resurrection (Phil. 3:21; 1 Cor. 15:49). The Christian's hope is that his / her "outer man" will be changed according to the pattern of the physical transformation that took place in Jesus' resurrection so that sin, decay and death will no longer touch him / her (Rom. 8:11-23; Phil. 3:20-21). This earthly life is running down and wasting away, but eternal life and the destiny set for the believer is already in the making and moving forward.

Thus for Paul the *ἔξω / ἔσω ἄνθρωπος* antithesis is describing an anthropological duality rather than a functional soteriological (non-believer vs. believer) and eschatological (old vs. new) contrast. In this regard this contrast is not parallel to the "old man / new man" antithesis in Paul's theology. In light of this, we turn to consider the relationship between the "old man / new man" and the *ψυχικός / πνευματικός* antithesis that Paul uses.

### 6.3.2 Natural / Spiritual Man

The adjective *ψυχικός* occurs only four times in the Pauline corpus (1 Cor. 2:14; 15:44 twice, 46)<sup>29</sup> while the adjective *πνευματικός* occurs twenty-one times in various connections.<sup>30</sup> In each of the four uses of *ψυχικός* it is contrasted with

---

<sup>29</sup>BAGD, s.v. *ψυχικός*, "pertaining to the soul or life, in our lit. always denoting the life of the natural world and whatever belongs to it, in contrast to the supernatural world, which is characterized by *πνεῦμα* . . . ." Elsewhere in the NT it only occurs in Jas. 3:15 and Jude 19.

<sup>30</sup>BAGD, s.v. *πνευματικός*, "pertaining to the spirit, spiritual . . . 2. In the great majority

πνευματικός. In 1 Corinthians 15:44, 46, these adjectives modify σῶμα setting up a contrast between the σῶμα ψυχικόν and the σῶμα πνευματικόν in Paul's discussion of the nature of the body in the resurrection. In 1 Corinthians 2:14-15, these adjectives modify ἄνθρωπος (implied with πνευματικός in 2:15) setting up a contrast between the ψυχικός ἄνθρωπος and the πνευματικός [ἄνθρωπος] in Paul's discussion of God's wisdom revealed by the Spirit to those who have the Spirit. Our concern is with the latter antithesis and its relationship to the "old man / new man."

In spite of considerable investigation, no satisfactory parallels to Pauline usage have been found that establish in a convincing way the origin of the ψυχικός / πνευματικός language, and specifically this antithesis. Some scholars claim the antithesis has a Gnostic background.<sup>31</sup> While some comparative material can be found in Gnostic thought,<sup>32</sup> several objections undermine its value for establishing the origin of Paul's terminology or understanding his usage. First, the "pneumatic man" of the mystery religions is fundamentally different from the "spiritual man" of Paul.<sup>33</sup> Second, such material requires that Gnosticism be presupposed for the Corinthian situation, but this is doubtful.<sup>34</sup> Third, there is no parallel where these adjectives are contrasted in a single passage.

Others have sought the background solely in the Old Testament and / or

---

of cases it refers to the divine πνεῦμα . . . ." Elsewhere in the NT it only occurs in 1 Pet. 2:5 twice.

<sup>31</sup>R. Reitzenstein, *Hellenistic Mystery Religions*, 68-70, claimed that the ψυχικός / πνευματικός contrast can be found in Gnostic and in Hellenistic mystery religion texts where in the mystery of rebirth the divine spirit enters a person and replaces the ψυχή producing a new self. Jewett, *Anthropological Terms*, 340-46, 352-56, provides a useful history of research along with references to others who have accepted the Gnostic hypothesis and have attempted to provide further support for it.

<sup>32</sup>E.g., *Hyp. Arch.* 138.13-15; *Soph. Jes. Chr.* 121.4-6; and *Hipp. Ref.* 5.26.8, 25.

<sup>33</sup>See the critique in Stacey, *Pauline View*, 151.

<sup>34</sup>E.g., E. M. Yamauchi, *Pre-Christian Gnosticism: A Survey of the Proposed Evidences* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973) 39-44. Additional references to ψυχή and πνεῦμα in Gnostic literature are post-Christian and are likely derived from Christianity.



LXX parallels.<sup>35</sup> Even though Paul's use of *ψυχή* and *πνεῦμα* reflects the Old Testament, there is little to support this view. This literature contains no contrast between the man of נַפְשׁ / *ψυχή* and the man of רִיחַ / *πνεῦμα* nor do the derivative adjectives appear.<sup>36</sup> Still others have attempted to show that this terminological distinction developed out of the interpretation of Genesis 2:7 in Hellenistic Judaism as seen in Philo and the Wisdom of Solomon.<sup>37</sup> But neither of these sources uses the *ψυχικός* / *πνευματικός* antithesis. Nor do they make an anthropological distinction between *ψυχή* and *πνεῦμα*, such that the latter is the higher part of the soul.<sup>38</sup>

In light of this, Birger Pearson assigns the terminology to Paul's opponents in Corinth but still points to a strand of Hellenistic Jewish exegesis of Genesis 2:7 put forth by Philo as the proper contextual background.<sup>39</sup> He suggests that Paul's

---

<sup>35</sup>H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul and Mystery Religions* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1913) 156; W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*, 4th ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980) 193; and W. Gutbrod, *Die paulinische Anthropologie*, BWANT 67 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934) 75.

<sup>36</sup>Stacey, *Pauline View*, 152. The adjective *ψυχικός* does appear in 4 Macc. 1:32, "Some desires are mental, others are *physical* (*ψυχικαί*), and reason obviously rules over both."

<sup>37</sup>J. Dupont, *Gnosis. La connaissance religieuse dans les épîtres de Saint Paul* (Paris: Gabalda, 1949) 172-80. B. A. Pearson, *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians: A Study in the Theology of the Corinthian Opponents of Paul and Its Relation to Gnosticism*, SBLDS 12 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1973), revives Dupont's view and develops it. He sees the origin of this contrast made by Paul's opponents in Corinth in the distinction between the mortal soul and the immortal spirit reflected in the interpretation of Gen. 2:7 in some references in Philo and the Wisdom of Solomon.

<sup>38</sup>R. A. Horsley, "Pneumatikos vs. Psychikos: Distinctions of Spiritual Status Among the Corinthians," *HTR* 69 (1976) 270-73, gives a critique of this aspect of Pearson's view.

<sup>39</sup>Pearson, *Pneumatikos-Psychikos*, 38-39, appeals to Philo's discourse in *Det.* 86 and his interpretation of Gen. 2:7 in *Leg. All.* 1.36 as grounds for the possibility of knowing God and His wisdom. Thus, for Philo, "man has a higher soul, a *νοῦς* or *πνεῦμα*, which enables him to rise above the level of his earthly and sense-perceptive soul and to receive impressions from the heavenly sphere" (39). According to Pearson, this distinction between man's higher soul and his earthly soul account for the distinction between the *ψυχικός* and *πνευματικός* natures reflected in 1 Cor. 2:13-15. See, however, Horsley, "Pneumatikos," 276-78, 284-86; and J. A. Davis, *Wisdom and Spirit. An Investigation of 1 Corinthians 1:18-3:20 Against the Background of Jewish Sapiential Traditions in the Greco-Roman Period* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984) 117-25, who argues that the Corinthian error comes from Torah-wisdom speculation found in Sirach and Qumran.

opponents in Corinth were claiming that they had "the potentiality of becoming *πνευματικοί* within themselves by virtue of the *πνευματικός* nature given them by God, and by cultivation of Wisdom they could rise above the earthly and 'psychic' [*ψυχικός*] level of existence and anticipate heavenly glory."<sup>40</sup> In a Christian setting *πνεῦμα* was considered appropriate in describing one's God-given endowment and was set against the natural endowment of *ψυχή*. Paul, then, takes up this terminology current among the Corinthians and uses it against the very people who claimed a superior spiritual wisdom and regarded themselves as *πνευματικοί*.

This may be the background of this terminology since Paul never uses the *ψυχικός* category outside of 1 Corinthians, indicating it was not an integral part of his thought. Apparently he took up the term for polemic purposes and then dropped it when the conflict at hand was over.<sup>41</sup> Elsewhere he prefers to use some form of *σάρξ* when making a contrast with *πνεῦμα* (cf. 1 Cor. 3:1, 3).

Nevertheless, Paul's use of *ψυχικός* is distinct. It reflects the general background of *ψυχή* in the Old Testament where it translates *נֶפֶשׁ* and often denotes humanity in its natural, physical existence.<sup>42</sup> Furthermore, Paul places it within the redemptive-historical, eschatological framework of his own theology when he uses it in antithesis to *πνευματικός*. Also, *πνεῦμα* refers to God's Spirit, not a higher spiritual capacity that is part of one's makeup even as "natural man." New Testament parallels to Paul's usage are illuminating. In Jude 19, it is the *ψυχικοί*, described as "those who do not have the Spirit" (*πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες*), who are causing divisions that

<sup>40</sup>Pearson, *Pneumatikos-Psychikos*, 39. This kind of distinction is similar to contrasts in Philo between heavenly and earthly, mature and immature, and the idea that a person attains the former exalted status through possession of wisdom (cf. e.g., *Migr.* 26-40; *Leg. All.* 1.90-95).

<sup>41</sup>Jewett, *Anthropological Terms*, 355-56, rightly makes this point, although in the interest of a Gnostic background.

<sup>42</sup>See the discussion in Schweizer, "*ψυχικός*," *TDNT*, 9:661-63; and Harder, "Soul, *ψυχή*," *NIDNTT*, 3:676-87.

affect the Christian community. In James 3:5, *ψυχικοί* is used in a wisdom context to describe "wisdom" that does not originate from God. Wisdom in James may well function in a way that corresponds to Paul's use of *πνεῦμα*, which fits nicely with the *ψυχικός / πνευματικός* contrast in the wisdom context of 1 Corinthians 2.

In 1 Corinthians 2:14-15, Paul is designating people who are not believers in contrast to those who are. The *ψυχικοί* cannot understand the things of God because they do not have the Spirit of God. They know only the "wisdom of this age" (2:6) and conduct their lives on a merely human level (2:13). They are those who do not have the Spirit and who belong to this age (cf. Jude 19). By contrast, the blessedness of the age to come has already been revealed and opened up by the Spirit (2:9-10). The *πνευματικοί* are able to understand the things of God because they have the Spirit and know the mind of Christ, that is, His thoughts are revealed by the Spirit (2:15-16). The *πνευματικὸς ἄνθρωπος*, the person with the Spirit, can make judgments about all God's ways (2:10), matters formerly hidden by God but now revealed through the Spirit. Thus for Paul the *ψυχικός / πνευματικός* antithesis is not describing an anthropological duality, but rather the contrast between one who has received the Spirit and one who does not have the Spirit, all of which reflects his redemptive-historical / eschatological perspective. In this regard the *ψυχικός / πνευματικός* antithesis is parallel to the "old man / new man" antithesis in Paul's theology. The *ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος* corresponds to the "old man," and the *πνευματικὸς ἄνθρωπος* corresponds to the "new man" at the individual level.

However, when Paul addresses the Corinthians in 1 Corinthians 3:1-4, he uses *σὰρξ* language in contrast to *πνεῦμα*. For some interpreters this indicates that *ψυχικός* is synonymous with *σαρκινός* and *σαρκικός* (1 Cor. 3:1, 3).<sup>43</sup> But the change

---

<sup>43</sup>E.g., Stacey, *Pauline View*, 148, and also Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms*, 354, who states that "he [Paul] could not talk to the Gnostics as *πνευματικοῖς* but only as *σαρκινοῖς*. It

appears to be deliberate and Paul gives the latter terms a different nuance here.

*ψυχικός* was used to describe the person who lacks the Spirit (2:14). But the Corinthians had received the Spirit (2:12 with 2:7-10), an indispensable sign that they were Christians (cf. Rom. 8:9); consequently, Paul could not call them *ψυχικοί* even though they were acting like unbelievers, namely, those who lack the Spirit. So the shift to *σάρξ* language is appropriate. On one hand, Paul avoids telling the Corinthians that they do not have the Spirit; but, on the other hand, he forces them to confront their sinful behavior. They are not only "fleshy" (*σαρκινοί*, made of flesh, 3:1), a word emphasizing especially their humanness and the human side of their existence, but even yet their behavior is "fleshly" (*σαρκικοί*, in the manner of the flesh, i.e., derived from the "flesh," 3:3).<sup>44</sup> They are living from the perspective of this age with its sin-dominated values and therefore they are exhibiting human sinfulness.

The Corinthians had received the Spirit—they are *πνευματικοί*—but they are behaving like those who do not have the Spirit. Their behavior reflects the present, fallen age so Paul calls them *σαρκικοί* (not *ψυχικοί*). He clarifies this term by adding that they are behaving like "mere humans" (*κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*, 3:3). Being human, of course, is not bad or sinful in itself and neither is being *σαρκινοί* (3:1). What is not acceptable to Paul is for believers who have received the Spirit, which makes them more than "merely human," to continue to live as though they were nothing more than *ψυχικοί ἄνθρωποι*. Receiving the Spirit puts one in the new realm in which life is

---

is apparent from this that Paul thought of *ψυχικός* as synonymous in significance with *σαρκινός* or *σαρκικός*. The basic meaning of these terms is adherence to the realm of mortality." But Paul did not call his readers *ψυχικοί* (2:14) nor address them as Gnostics but presumably as believers (*ἀδελφοί*, 2:1; 3:1). He could not speak to them *ὡς πνευματικοῖς* (i.e., as he would speak to *πνευματικοί*) but *ὡς σαρκίνοις*, namely, *ὡς νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ* (rather than *τελείοις*, 2:6). They are still not ready for "solid food" for they are still *σαρκικοί* behaving *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον* (3:2-3).

<sup>44</sup>BAGD, s.v. *σαρκικός*, "means 'belonging to the *σάρξ* [opp. *πνευματικός*], 'fleshly;' on the other hand, *σάρκινος* is 'consisting' or 'composed of flesh,' 'fleshy.' Our lit., or at least its copyists, did not observe this distinction in all occurrences of the word. The forms are interchanged in the tradition." In 1 Cor. 3:1-4, however, Paul appears to preserve a distinction between the two terms to make his point.

to be lived according to the Spirit and not according to the flesh. Consequently, Paul elsewhere states the basic imperative for Christian existence: walk (live) by the Spirit and you will not gratify the desires of the flesh (Gal. 5:16).

Thus Paul uses *σάρξ* language in contrast to *πνεῦμα* in relation to those who have received the Spirit but who are behaving as "mere humans," that is, in a self-centered, this-world-oriented manner. One who has "put off the old man" and "put on the new man" has ceased to be the *ψυχικός ἄνθρωπος* of 1 Corinthians 2:14 and has become the *πνευματικός ἄνθρωπος* of 2:15 (cf. Gal. 6:1), one whose life comes under the control of the indwelling Spirit as distinct from the natural person who lives under the control of sin and the flesh (Rom. 8:5-9; 1 Cor. 2:14; Eph. 2:3). Consequently, the "old man / new man" is parallel to the *ψυχικός / πνευματικός ἄνθρωπος* but not the *σαρκικός / πνευματικός ἄνθρωπος*. This sets the stage for a brief consideration of the "flesh" in relationship to the "old man / new man."

### 6.3.3 The Flesh and the Old Man

At this point it is worth considering the relationship of the "old man" to the "flesh" since in Romans 6:6 it is the "old man" who was crucified with Christ, and in Galatians 5:24 it is those who belong to Christ who have crucified the "flesh." Is then the "old man" to be identified with the "flesh," or, the sinful nature that is often labeled the "flesh"?

The noun *σάρξ* occurs ninety-one times in the Pauline corpus. Two key prepositional phrases, *ἐν σαρκί* and *κατὰ σάρκα*, occur twenty-three and twenty times respectively, and the *σάρξ / πνεῦμα* contrast occurs twenty times. *Σάρξ* is one of Paul's most prominent and controversial anthropological terms. The main reason for this is its wide semantic usage ranging from a literal sense of the physical material of the

body to the morally negative sense of a force hostile to God.<sup>45</sup> Over the past century scholars have attributed this spread of usage to a combination of Jewish (flesh as material body) and Hellenistic (flesh as hostile power vs. God) influences. Which influence is more dominant and more significant for understanding Paul's usage has been debated.<sup>46</sup> An examination of Pauline usage, however, indicates a Hebraic background in which *σάρξ* denotes human frailty and mortality is the most credible approach. The whole person, subject to human weakness and corruptibility, gives *σάρξ* its spectrum of meaning and connects Paul's various uses of the term.<sup>47</sup> Sin is the pervasive power that exploits and manipulates the "flesh."

A representative sampling of Pauline usage supports this perspective. In Galatians 2:20 Paul sees no contradiction between living by faith and living *ἐν σαρκί* (cf. also Phil. 1:22, 24 in contrast to 3:3-4), and in 2 Corinthians 10:2-4 he distinguishes between living *ἐν σαρκί*, which is acceptable, and living *κατὰ σάρκα*, which is not acceptable for Christians. Nevertheless, in Romans 8:4-9 the same two phrases appear to be interchangeable and equally negative. In Galatians 5, *σάρξ* refers to the whole person in his fallenness living apart from God rather than a corrupted constituent part of each person. This is consistent with Old Testament (cf.

---

<sup>45</sup>BAGD, s.v. *σάρξ*, list 8 categories of use ranging from the literal use to the view, esp. in Paul's thought, that "the *flesh* is the willing instrument of sin, and is subject to sin . . .;" see also Schweizer, *TDNT*, 7:98-151, esp. 125-38; and Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 64-66; and ch. 4, 226 n104.

<sup>46</sup>For rival views with references, see Jewett, *Anthropological Terms*, 50-54, and Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 62-70, who argues that Paul's range of usage grows out of *בשר*; so also Stacey, *Pauline View*, 154-73.

<sup>47</sup>Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 66, states: "The spectrum [of meaning] runs from human relationships and needs, through human weakness and desires, through human imperfection and corruption, to the fully deprecatory and condemnatory tone of the *sarx-pneuma* antithesis."

Isa. 40:5-8) and Qumran usage (cf. 1QS 11:9). Paul sees *σάρξ* as a continuing threat to be avoided (Gal. 5:16-17) even by Christians who have "crucified" it with its passions and desires (5:24). His concern is not with a "fleshly" part of each individual, such as one's physical being or a "sin nature" component, but with the pervasive influence of the present age / realm with its human-centered perspective and values. His reference to crucifying the flesh (5:24) points to a decisive break with such an influence for all those who enter the new creation. However, at present, since the old age continues as the sphere in which Christians as "new" people in Christ must live, there is always the danger that they will be enticed by the "flesh" and drawn into adopting its perspective and values leading them into sinful behavior.

In light of this, Paul appears to distinguish the *παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος* from the *σάρξ* although they are related. The Adam-Christ comparison in Romans 5:12-21 makes clear that no one has escaped the disastrous effects of Adam's fall. This theme enables Paul to talk of the crucifixion of the "old man" (Rom. 6:6) and the "flesh" (Gal. 5:24), which stands behind his description of Christians as those who are no longer living *ἐν σαρκί* (Rom. 7:5-6; 8:8-9). For Paul, to be "in the flesh" in this sense is the same thing as to be "in Adam," and thus a member of the old humanity (corporate "old man") enslaved to sin and death. Christians are not *ἐν σαρκί* in this sense (Rom. 8:9), though by this he does not mean that they are disembodied spirits or that they have thrown off their (fallen) human nature. Neither is the "old man" to be equated with the designation "I am fleshly" (Rom; 7:14) or "my flesh" (Rom. 7:18).<sup>48</sup>

For Paul, "flesh" is often associated with the present evil age since it stands in contrast to the Spirit and the eschatological events of the gospel. Several times in

---

<sup>48</sup>Pace T. K. Abbott, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians*, ICC, reprint of 7th ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1974 [1897]) 136. Gundry, *Sōma*, 137-39, argues that beginning in Rom. 7:13 Paul uses *σάρξ* for *σῶμα* and views *σάρξ* not as inherently evil but as weak because of physical needs and desires, making it easy prey for sin to control and use as an instrument for doing evil.

Galatians the cross serves as the symbol of the end of the old era / realm (cf. 2:19-20; 5:11; 6:14-15). In light of the cross and the gift of the Spirit, Paul can *already* announce the crucifixion of the flesh (5:24) and the world (6:14). But, *σάρξ* and the *κόσμος* have not in reality disappeared. The eschatological tension in Paul's thought that recognizes the overlap of the two ages accounts for the fact that *σάρξ* continues as a threatening reality, even though the crucifixion of the flesh indicates that it no longer has controlling or dominating authority over the Christian's behavior.

Furthermore, the "self," understood negatively as the egocentric, self-centered life that the Christian is to deny (Mark 8:34), is not the "old man," and neither is the "self" understood positively as the person one must affirm in order to have a positive self-image. On the other hand, accepting one's self as created, cared for, and redeemed by God is not the "new man." In Christ, the "old man," one who used to conduct his / her life in accord with his / her pre-conversion mode of existence, is gone, and the "new man" has *already* come, but even in the new order of life, the "self" and the "flesh" continue their negative influence. Since the conflict inaugurated by the resurrection has *not yet* been resolved, it can be easily understood why the flesh continues to threaten and to tempt the Christian and why the eschatological conflict continues to be worked out in the daily obedience of walking in the Spirit. The *σάρξ*, then, fits within the "already / not yet" motif, but the *παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος* does not. The *καινὸς / νέος ἄνθρωπος*, however, operates within this motif but has the Spirit who opposes and wages war against the "flesh." This leads, finally, to a brief investigation of a key construct that shapes Pauline ethics on a broader scale.

#### **6.4 Indicative and Imperative in Paul's Theology**

A major component of Paul's theology is his dynamic theological ethic.

Scholars often use the indicative-imperative grammatical construct as a theological



paradigm to describe the tension in his ethics between theological declaration (indicative) and moral exhortation (imperative).<sup>49</sup> In brief, the "indicative" presents what God in Christ has done for believers, while the "imperative" sets forth what believers must do in response. Customarily, Paul rests his moral imperatives on theological indicatives. A characteristic example of this is found in Romans 6 and elsewhere, as we have seen earlier in our study.<sup>50</sup> The nature of the relationship between the indicative and the imperative in Paul's thought has an extended history of debate. We shall touch on a few high points to set the context for our comments on the relationship of this construct to the "old / new man."

Near the end of the 19th century, Paul Wernle took the position that there was an irreconcilable tension between the indicative and the imperative, creating a double-ethic—an ethic of miracle (indicative) and an ethic of will (imperative) that Paul simply placed beside one another.<sup>51</sup> This was a radical conclusion at the time. Prior to Wernle, most interpreters viewed the new life in Paul's writings as sort of a spontaneous result of a "fusion" of God's power and human will.<sup>52</sup> Wernle rejected such an interpretation by positing two separate ethical ideals that essentially

---

<sup>49</sup>See V. P. Furnish, *Theology and Ethics in Paul* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968) 242-79 for a survey of 19th and 20th century attempts to interpret Paul's ethic; also H. Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*, trans. J. R. DeWitt (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975) 253-58; W. Schrage, *The Ethics of the New Testament*, trans. D. E. Green (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988) 167-72; R. Bultmann, "The Problem of Ethics in Paul" (1924), trans. C. W. Stenschke, 195-216, and M. Parsons, "Being Precedes Act: Indicative and Imperative in Paul's Writing" (1988), 217-47, both essays in B. S. Rosner, ed., *Understanding Paul's Ethics: Twentieth Century Approaches* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans / Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995); and Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 626-31.

<sup>50</sup>See ch. 2, 125-27; ch. 4, 221; and ch. 5, 268-69, 285-86. Note esp. Gal. 5:25 where this same construct applies to Paul's teaching on life in and by the Spirit: "Since we live by the Spirit [indicative], let us also walk by the Spirit [imperative]."

<sup>51</sup>P. Wernle, *Der Christ und die Sünde bei Paulus* (Freiburg im Breisgau: J. C. B. Mohr, 1897) 89. See also the assessment of Wernle in Furnish, *Theology and Ethics*, 247.

<sup>52</sup>E.g., H. von Soden, "Die Ethik des Paulus," *ZThK* 2 (1892) 145. Also, Furnish, *Theology and Ethics*, 245.

contradicted each other. His double-ethic set the stage for a debate about the relationship between the indicative and the imperative.

Shortly after, Hermann Jacoby rejected Wernle's view and concluded that Paul used the imperative to exhort believers to accomplish in fact what God's grace had provided for them in principle (indicative).<sup>53</sup> Rather than two separate contradictory concepts, Jacoby saw Paul's ethic as a contrast of "principle" (indicative) and "actuality" (imperative) operating within a single ethical framework of the believer's relationship with God. "Principle" (the indicative) referred to the benefits of God's grace that the believer can never in fact realize or experience unless he / she brings them into actualization (imperative) by submission to the presence of the Spirit in his / her life.

Wernle's double-ethic and Jacoby's dialectical distinction of "principle" and "actuality" as well as the understanding that the indicative and the imperative were merely one aspect of Paul's total ethical structure continued into the 20th century. In 1924, however, Rudolf Bultmann wrote an article in which he described the indicative and the imperative as the basic structure of Pauline ethics. This essay is widely recognized as a turning point in the interpretation of this construct.<sup>54</sup> Since Bultmann, most scholars agree on the centrality of the indicative and the imperative, namely, that which God has done is the basis for that which believers must do. Indeed, Paul's moral exhortations cannot be separated from his theological affirmations.

---

<sup>53</sup>H. Jacoby, *Neutestamentliche Ethik* (Königsberg: Thomas und Oppermann, 1899) 291, 316-17. Also Furnish, *Theology and Ethics*, 250.

<sup>54</sup>R. Bultmann, "Das Problem der Ethik bei Paulus," *ZNW* 23 (1924) 123-40, trans. and reprinted as "The Problem of Ethics in Paul," in Rosner, ed., *Understanding Paul's Ethics*, 195-216. See also Bultmann's later treatment in *Theology of the New Testament*, 330-40.

Bultmann opposed Wernle's formulation of a contradictory double-ethic by insisting that Paul based the imperative on the fact of justification, deriving the imperatives from the indicatives. The believers' new creation is an accomplished fact in which the "old man" has actually passed away so that the believer is a "new man," and from this newness comes ethical behavior. In light of this, Bultmann saw Jacoby's concept of "principle" (indicative) that must be realized in the ongoing ethical process of "actualization" (imperative) as influenced too much by idealism. Rather, the indicative is the foundation for the imperative. On the other hand, the indicative appears to depend in some sense on the imperative in Bultmann's view. That is, the indicative can only be realized in the Christian's experience by the imperative—the daily existential decision to walk in obedience to God. The new creation becomes a reality only insofar as love is really present via obedience to God.<sup>55</sup> In essence, then, the indicative and the imperative become merged in each ethical decision a Christian makes. Ultimately, then, Bultmann's interpretation is dialectical and distinctively existential. He appears to see less of the transforming effect of the indicative in the Christian's life experience than Paul affirms.<sup>56</sup> Nevertheless, his formulation is an advance on those previous to him and, most significantly, he saw the indicative and the imperative as the basic structure of Pauline ethics. From Bultmann's 1924 essay onward, most Pauline interpreters have attempted to reformulate his understanding in either structure or content.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup>R. Bultmann, *Existence and Faith*, trans. and ed. S. M. Ogden (London: SCM Press, 1964) 145, 245; id., *Theology*, 1:332-33. See the critique in W. D. Dennison, "Indicative and Imperative: The Basic Structure of Pauline Ethics," *CTJ* 14 (1979) 55-78, esp. 60-63, and in Parsons, "Being Precedes Act," in Rosner, ed., *Understanding Paul's Ethics*, 221-24.

<sup>56</sup>Bultmann, *Theology*, 1:338-39, 156. See also the critique in Furnish, *Theology and Ethics*, 138, 264.

<sup>57</sup>Concerning structure, some, though acknowledging both the indicative and imperative, emphasized one over the other. For example: A. Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*,

The key issue in subsequent discussion on this subject is the nature of the relationship between the indicative and the imperative. Specifically the question is: How do the "indicatives of the faith" justify the "imperatives of the faith"? Michael Parsons has sketched the history of the research since Bultmann and in response to this question classified the positions of Pauline scholars into the following three broad, but distinct, categories.<sup>58</sup> First, some maintain that the indicative and the imperative are so distinct that they are virtually unrelated to each other.<sup>59</sup> Second, some maintain that the indicative and the imperative are so closely related that they virtually become fused into a unity reflected in words and deeds of love.<sup>60</sup> Third, others maintain that the indicative and the imperative are closely related in Paul's thought but remain distinct without separation or fusion.<sup>61</sup> Following an analysis of

---

trans. W. Montgomery (London: A. & C. Black, 1931) 293-96, stressed the indicative, while H. Windisch, "Das Problem des paulinischen Imperativs," *ZNW* 23 (1924) 265-81, emphasized the imperative. Of those who accepted Bultmann's conclusion regarding the basic, balanced structure of Paul's ethics, some did not agree with his dialectical existential understanding so they reformulated the content; for example: Furnish, *Theology and Ethics*, 224-27; and Ridderbos, *Paul*, 253-58.

<sup>58</sup>Parsons, "Being Precedes Act," in Rosner, ed., *Understanding Paul's Ethics*, 218-32.

<sup>59</sup>Parsons justifiably places C. H. Dodd, *Gospel and Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963) 3-20, 66-67, in this category as an influential example. See also the critique in Furnish, *Theology and Ethics*, 106-14, 273. Though Dodd believed both the indicative and imperative were essential to Paul's thinking and of equal importance, he held them apart as distinct, separate aspects of Paul's thought.

<sup>60</sup>Parsons correctly places Bultmann, *Theology* 1:332-33, 338-39, in this category. Though Bultmann argues that the imperative stems from the indicative, his existential framework makes the indicative depend on the imperative in the end. The indicative gets "fused" into the imperative as the "indicative imperative." Furnish, *Theology and Ethics*, 137-38; 225-26; 239; 262, who takes a more moderate position, also belongs in this category. He argues that the imperative is not based on the indicative nor the result of it, but is fully integral to it. Progressive "achievement" in the Christian life is wholly given, not attained. The imperative gets "fused" into the indicative as the "imperative indicative." This is the opposite of Bultmann's emphasis, even though Furnish agrees with Bultmann that love is the command inherent in the gift (indicative).

<sup>61</sup>Parsons places several scholars in this category though he acknowledges that the interrelatedness of the indicative and imperative is expressed in various ways. For example: G. Bornkamm, *Paul*, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (New York: Harper & Row, 1971) 201-205; R. N. Longenecker, *Paul: Apostle of Liberty* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1964) 174-80; and T. J. Deidun, *New Covenant Morality in Paul*, AnBib 89 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1981) 78. However, Deidun's emphasis on "letting God be what he is" in effecting his demands moves one close to

three key examples (Rom. 12:1-2; Phil. 2:12-13; Gal. 5:25) and a longer passage (1 Cor. 6:12-20), Parsons concludes that the relationship between the indicative and imperative in Paul's writing is best reflected by the third position mentioned above. He states: ". . . the indicative and the imperative are closely linked yet distinct aspects of the apostle's thought and writing. The connection is indissoluble—they cannot be separated. This position seems warranted by Pauline usage and also strongly counters the possibilities of the fusion of the indicative and the imperative, on one hand, and their virtual irrelation, on the other."<sup>62</sup>

In light of all this, the answers to two important questions assist us in understanding the interrelatedness of the indicative and the imperative. First, why are both the indicative and the imperative needed? The answer lies in the "eschatological tension" of redemptive history in Paul's thought. We have noted above the redemptive-historical, eschatological framework of Paul's thought.<sup>63</sup> For him, the indicative is grounded in the reality of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ and the fact that believers have been united with Him so that with Him they have died to sin in order that they might walk in newness of life now (Rom. 6:2-4). Christians have entered the "new creation" established in Christ already and believe that they will yet live with Christ where He resides in a glorified existence (Rom. 6:8; Col. 3:1-4). Meanwhile, the "old age / realm" continues as the sphere in which the Christian life must be lived, and there is the constant danger that Christians will be enticed by the powers and perspectives of "the present evil age." Paul's imperative, grounded on the indicative, expresses the proper response to this in the experiences of

---

"fusing" the imperative into the indicative. To this category could be added J. M. G. Barclay, *Obedying the Truth: A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians*, ed. J. Riches (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988) 212-15; 225-27.

<sup>62</sup>Parsons, "Being Precedes Act," in *Understanding Paul's Ethics*, 246-47.

<sup>63</sup>See ch. 1, 38-41; and pp. 289-93 above.

life (Rom. 6:11-13; Col. 3:1-2). Thus it is the "eschatological tension" between the present and the future—the "already" and the "not yet"—that necessitates the imperative as well as the indicative.<sup>64</sup> Both must be held together without diminishing the force of either. John Barclay makes this point: "The indicative declares what God has done in Christ (set us free, given us life in the Spirit) or what believers have done in their involvement in this act (crucified the flesh); and this does not appear to be contradicted by, or to render any less necessary, the imperative which appeals for the preservation of freedom or continual resistance to the flesh."<sup>65</sup> Consequently, one cannot reduce the indicative to opening up the mere "possibility" of new life (the tendency of Bultmann), nor reduce the imperative to a passive acceptance of divine action (the tendency of Deidun).

Second, what unifies this indicative-imperative construct and safeguards it from "separation" on one hand or "fusion" on the other hand? The answer lies in Paul's understanding of the Spirit as the fulfillment of new covenant promise. Life in the "new age" is life in the Spirit who is the source and power of new life. The Spirit is the link between the indicative of Christian reality and the imperative of life experience. He is at once the new covenant gift of the former and the motivating enabler of the latter. Since believers have the life God gives by the Spirit (indicative), they are to live the life God demands by the Spirit (imperative). What He demands He effectively enables. Thus the indicative enters into the realization of the imperative—the power of the Spirit enables what God demands. In this sense we can appreciate the usefulness of Ernst Käsemann's insight that the lordship of Christ includes both gift and demand—the necessity of obedience and the empowering of the

---

<sup>64</sup>Various scholars emphasize this point: Bornkamm, *Paul*, 201-205; Longenecker, *Paul*, 174-76; Barclay, *Obeying the Truth*, 212-15.

<sup>65</sup>Barclay, *Obeying the Truth*, 226.

believer to obey.<sup>66</sup> In light of this, Paul's overall indicative is a dynamic concept. It is not only what God through Christ *has done* for the believer but also what He *continues to do* in and for the believer through the Spirit. Though distinct, yet equally important, his imperative is grounded on the reality of the indicative and brings its demands to expression in life experience by divine enablement.

What, then, is the relationship between the indicative-imperative construct and the "old man / new man" metaphor? We have concluded above (pp. 291-98) that the transfer from "old man" to "new man" constitutes an important element in Paul's indicative that serves as the basis and motivation for his imperative. But the *indicative-imperative construct* itself does not signal such a transfer from the "old" (once) to the "new" (now). Rather, it operates on the "already / not yet" side of Christian existence. As such, it applies fully to the "new man" who is being renewed under the lordship of Christ while living out his / her earthly life and service in the midst of the enticements of the "old age." For the "new man," Paul's indicative declares what God has done for him / her in Christ and continues to do through the Spirit as well as what he / she has received and continues to receive as a result of participation with Christ and the work of the Spirit. At the same time, with undiminished urgency, Paul's imperative appeals to the "new man" to enjoy his / her freedom in Christ responsibly and to resist the desires of the "flesh" continually. This constant interplay between the sovereign grace of God and the obedience of the "new man" is a characteristic feature of Paul's ethics (cf. Phil. 2:12-13; 1 Cor. 15:9-10). What unifies and at the same time safeguards the indicative and imperative from contradiction, separation, or fusion is his eschatological understanding of the Spirit

---

<sup>66</sup>E. Käsemann, "'The Righteousness of God' in Paul," in *New Testament Questions of Today*, trans. W. J. Montague (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969) 168-82, esp. 175. He argues that at faith / baptism the gift of the Spirit establishes Christ's lordship that both transforms a person's life and requires continual obedience from the believer.

who unifies the indicative and the imperative by bringing life to the believer through the redemptive-historical work of God through Christ and sustaining it through the work of the Spirit.

### **6.5 Summary of the Argument**

Paul himself formulated the "old man / new man" terminology by drawing on the Adam / Christ typology within his own redemptive-historical, eschatological perspective. This metaphor fits the structure of his "once / now" motif and operates at two levels. On the corporate level, the "old man" is the world of unredeemed humanity in solidarity with Adam, the prototypical "old man," while the "new man" is the Church, the world-wide community of redeemed humanity in solidarity with Christ, the prototypical "new man." On the individual level, the "old man" is the person who is identified with Adam, the head of the old era / realm under the rule of sin and death. He / she belongs to "the present age." Correspondingly, the "new man" is the believer who is identified with Christ, the head of the new era / realm under the rule of the Spirit and life. He / she belongs to the "age to come" that, in Christ, has now begun. The person in Christ is no longer an "old man," but is now a "new man" who is being progressively renewed in the knowledge of God and His ways.

Putting off the "old man" and putting on the "new man" are actions the believer has already taken at conversion-initiation. They are not actions he or she must still be exhorted to do. The conflict with sin in the Christian life is not to be understood as a struggle between the "old man" and the "new man," but, rather, as a struggle between the "flesh" and the Spirit who indwells the "new man." All this takes place within the corporate structure of the "one new man" created in the Christ-event and constituted a community of many persons, both Jews and Gentiles together, who have been reconciled to one another and to God by Jesus Christ.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sections:	1. Primary Sources and Translations . . . . .	325
	2. Reference Works, Commentaries and Books . . . . .	328
	3. Essays in Books . . . . .	356
	4. Periodical and Major Dictionary Articles . . . . .	366

### 1. PRIMARY SOURCES AND TRANSLATIONS

Aland, B., K. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C. M. Martini, and B. M. Metzger, eds. *The Greek New Testament*, 4th rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft / New York: United Bible Societies, 1993.

Apuleius. *The Golden Ass: Being the Metamorphoses of Lucius Apuleius*. Translated by W. Adlington (1966). Revised by S. Gaselee. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977.

Barrett, C. K. *The New Testament Background: Selected Documents*. Rev. ed. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989

Barthélemy, D. and J. T. Milik et al., eds. *Discoveries in the Judean Desert*. 5 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955-68.

Black, M., ed. *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*. PVTG 3. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Braude, W. G., ed. *Pesikta Rabbati*. 2 vols. YJS 18. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1969.

Brenton, Sir Lancelot C. L., ed. *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English*. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1851. Reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986.

Charles, R. H., ed. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

Charlesworth, J. H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983-85.

Colson, F. H. et al., trans. and eds. *Philo*. 10 vols. with two supplements. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929-62.

Danby, H., trans. and ed. *The Mishnah*. 8th ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.

De Jonge, M., ed. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. PVTG 1/2. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

- Dionysius. *The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus*. Translated and edited by E. Cary. 7 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1937-50.
- Dittenberger, W., ed. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*. 3rd ed. 4 vols. Leipzig: A. S. Hirzel, 1915-24. Reprint, New York: G. Olms, 1970.
- Dupont-Sommer, A. *The Essene Writings From Qumran*. 2nd ed. rev. and enlarged. Translated by G. Vermès. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1973.
- Elliger, K., and W. Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1977.
- Epictetus. *The Discourses as Reported by Arrian. The Manual and Fragments*. Translated and edited by W. A. Oldfather. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928-29.
- Epstein, I., ed. *The Babylonian Talmud*. 35 vols. London: Soncino Press, 1935-52.
- Eusebius. *Ecclesiastical History*. Translated by K. Lake et al. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- Freedman, H., and M. Simon, trans. and ed. *Midrash Rabbah*. 3rd ed. 10 vols. London: Soncino Press, 1983.
- Freedman, H., and I. Epstein, eds. *The Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud*. 20 vols. to date. London: Soncino Press, 1969–.
- García Martínez, F., trans. and ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*. 2nd ed. trans. with corrections and additions from 1992 Spanish ed. by W. G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill / Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Griffiths, J. G. *Apuleius of Madauros: The Isis-Book (Metamorphoses, Book XI)*. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Hennecke, E., and W. Schneemelcher, eds. *New Testament Apocrypha*. 2nd ed. Translated and edited by R. McL. Wilson. 2 vols. Cambridge: Clarke / Louisville: Westminster / John Knox, 1991-92.
- Horsley, G. H. R., ed. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*. 5 vols. Marrickville, N. S. W.: Southwood Press, 1981-89.
- Layton, B., ed. *The Gnostic Scriptures. A New Translation with Annotations and Introductions*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1987.
- Lightfoot, J. B., and J. R. Harmer, trans. *The Apostolic Fathers. Greek Texts and English Translations of Their Writings*. 2nd ed. Edited and revised by M. W. Holmes. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992.

- Metzger, B. M., and R. E. Murphy, eds. *The New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha / Deuterocanonical Books*. NRSV. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Meyer, M. W., ed. *The Ancient Mysteries: A Source Book. Sacred Texts of the Mystery Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean World*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987.
- Migne, J. P., ed. *Patrologia Graeca*. Paris: Migne, 1857-66.
- Nestle, E., and E. Nestle, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 27th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.
- Neusner, J. *The Tosefta Translated from the Hebrew*. 6 vols. New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1977-81.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Talmud of the Land of Israel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Talmud of Babylonia: An American Translation*. 26 vols. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Genesis Rabbah*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Mishnah: A New Translation*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1988.
- Nock, A. D., and A.-J. Festugière, trans. and eds. *Corpus Hermeticum*. 4 vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1938-54. Vols. 1-2, 2nd ed., 1960.
- Plato. *The Republic*. Translated by P. Shorey. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1943.
- Preisendanz, K., ed. *Papyri Graecae Magicae*. 2 vols. Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1928-31.
- Rahlfs, A., ed. *Septuaginta*. 8th ed. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1965 [1935]. Two volumes in one, 1979.
- Roberts, A., and J. Donaldson, eds. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. 10 vols. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.
- Robinson, J. M., ed. *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981.
- Scott, W., trans. and ed. *Hermetica. The Ancient Greek and Latin Writings Which Contain Religious or Philosophic Teachings Ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus*. 4 vols. Boston: Shambhala, 1985.
- Sparks, H. F. D., ed. *The Apocryphal Old Testament*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Tertullian. *Homily on Baptism*. Translated and edited by E. Evans. London: SPCK, 1964.

Thackeray, H. St. J. et al., *Josephus*. 9 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926-65.

Vermès, G., trans. and ed. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. New York: Allen Lane / Penguin Press, 1997.

Whiston, W., trans. *The Works of Josephus*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1987.

Yonge, C. D., trans. *The Works of Philo*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993.

## 2. REFERENCE WORKS, COMMENTARIES AND BOOKS

Abbott, T. K. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians*, 7th ed. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897. Reprint, 1974.

Achtemeier, P. J. *Romans*. Interpretation. Atlanta: John Knox, 1985.

Alexander, D. *Christian Spirituality: Five Views of Sanctification*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1988.

Allen, J. A. *The Epistle to the Ephesians*. TBC. London: SCM Press, 1959.

Allison, D. C. *The End of the Ages Has Come*. SNTW. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.

Althaus, P. *Der Brief an die Römer*, 10th ed. NTD 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966 [1932].

Arnold, C. E. *Ephesians, Power and Magic: The Concept of Power in Ephesians in Light of Its Historical Setting*. SNTSMS 63. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Aune, D. E. *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987.

Balz, H. R., and G. Schneider, eds. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.

Bamberger, B. J. *Proselytism in the Talmudic Period*. New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1968.

Barclay, J. M. G. *Obedying the Truth. A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians*. Edited by J. Riches. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Colossians and Philemon*. NTG. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Barrett, C. K. *From First Adam to Last. A Study in Pauline Theology*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. BNTC. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1973.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. HNTC. New York: Harper & Row, 1957; 2nd ed. BNTC. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1991.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Paul: An Introduction to His Thought*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994.

Barth, K. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Translated by E. C. Hoskyns from 6th German edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 1933.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Adam and Christ: Man and Humanity in Romans 5*. Translated by T. A. Smail. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.

Barth, M. *Ephesians*. AB 34, 34A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1974.

\_\_\_\_\_, and H. Blanke. *Colossians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Translated by A. B. Beck. AB 34B. New York: Doubleday, 1994.

Bassler, J. M., ed. *Pauline Theology. Volume 1: Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, Philemon*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.

Bauer, K.-A. *Leiblichkeit - das Ende aller Werke Gottes. Die Bedeutung der Leiblichkeit des Menschen bei Paulus*. SNT 4. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1971.

Bauer, W. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated and adapted from Bauer's 4th edition by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich. 2nd edition. Revised and augmented from Bauer's 5th edition by F. W. Gingrich and F. W. Danker. Chicago / London: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Baumgarten, J. *Paulus und die Apokalyptik: Die Auslegung apokalyptischer Überlieferungen in den echten Paulusbriefen*. WMANT 44. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1975.

Baur, F. C. *Paul. The Apostle of Jesus Christ*. Translated by A. Menzies. 2 vols. London: Williams and Norgate, 1876.

Bavinck, H. *Magnalia Dei*, 2nd ed. Kampen: Kok, 1931.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Our Reasonable Faith*. Translated by H. Zylstra. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956.

Beasley-Murray, G. R. *Baptism in the New Testament*, 2nd ed. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1972.

- Beker, J. C. *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Triumph of God. The Essence of Paul's Thought*. Translated by L.T. Stuckenbruck. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.
- Bengel, J. A. *Gnomon Novi Testamenti*. 3rd ed. Edited by P. Steudel. London: Williams & Norgate, 1862.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *New Testament Word Studies*. Translated by C. T. Lewis and M. R. Vincent. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1971.
- Berkouwer, G. C. *Man: The Image of God*. Translated by D. W. Jellema. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Sin*. Translated by P. C. Holtrop. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.
- Best, E. *One Body in Christ: A Study in the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul*. London: SPCK, 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Letter of Paul to the Romans*. CBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Paul and His Converts*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Essays on Ephesians*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ephesians*. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998.
- Betz, H. D. *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Black, M. *Romans: Based on the Revised Standard Version*. 2nd. ed. NCBC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.
- Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated and revised from the 9th and 10th German editions (1959) by R. W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Bornkamm, G. *Paul*. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
- Botterweck, G. J., H. Ringgren, and H.-J. Fabry, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Translated by J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromiley, D. E. Green, and D. W. Stott. 8 vols. to date. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–.
- Bousset, W. *Kyrios Christos. A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*. Translated by J. E. Steely from 5th German ed. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970.
- Bouttier, M. *Christianity According to Paul*. Translated by F. Clarke. SBT 49. Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1966.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *L'Épître de saint Paul aux Éphésiens*. CNT 9b. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1991.
- Brandenburger, E. *Adam und Christus. Exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Röm 5:12-21 (1 Kor. 15)*. WMANT 7. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Fleisch und Geist. Paulus und die dualistische Weisheit*. WMANT 29. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968.
- Braude, W. G. *Jewish Proselytizing in the First Five Centuries of the Common Era. The Age of the Tannaim and Amoraim*. Providence, RI: Brown University Press, 1940.
- Bromiley, G. W., ed. *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. 4 vols., rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979-88.
- Brown, C., gen. ed. *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. Translated with additions and revisions from *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament*, ed. L. Coenen, E. Beyreuther, and H. Bietenhard. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975-78.
- Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.
- Brown, R. E. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_, J. A. Fitzmyer, and R. E. Murphy, eds. *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990.
- Bruce, F. F. *Paul: Apostle of the Heart Set Free*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Epistle to the Galatians. A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Letter of Paul to the Romans: An Introduction and Commentary*. 2nd ed. TNTC 6. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985.
- Bujard, W. *Stilanalytische Untersuchungen zum Kolosserbrief als Beitrag zur Methodik von Sprachvergleichen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973.
- Bultmann, R. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by K. Grobel, 2 vols. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Presence of Eternity: History and Eschatology*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Existence and Faith*. Translated and edited by S. M. Ogden. London: SCM Press, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Old and New Man in the Letters of Paul*. Translated by K. Crim. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *New Testament and Mythology and Other Basic Writings*. Translated and edited by S. M. Ogden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Burger, C. *Schöpfung und Versöhnung. Studien zum liturgischen Gut im Kolosser- und Epheserbrief*. WMANT 46. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1975.
- Burton, E. de W. *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*, 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898. Reprint, 1966.
- Bury, J. B., S. A. Cook, F. E. Adcock et al., eds. *The Cambridge Ancient History*. 12 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928-39.
- Buttrick, G. A. et al., eds. *The Interpreter's Bible*. Vol. 9. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. 4 vols. plus a supplementary volume, ed. K. Crim. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962 and 1976.
- Caird, G. B. *Paul's Letters from Prison (Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon) in the Revised Standard Version*. NCB. London / New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1980.
- Calvin, J. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Edited by J. T. McNeill and translated by F. L. Battles. LCC. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians*. Translated by R. Mackenzie. Edited by D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance. Vol. 8. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians*. Vol. 11. Translated by T. H. L. Parker. Edited by D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Sermons on the Epistle to the Ephesians*. Rev. ed. London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1973.
- Cannon, G. E. *The Use of Traditional Materials in Colossians*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1983.
- Caragounis, C. C. *The Ephesian Mysterion: Meaning and Content*. Lund: Gleerup, 1977.



- Carradine, B. *The Old Man*. Chicago: The Christian Witness Company, 1896; reprint 1965.
- Carrington, P. *The Primitive Christian Catechism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940.
- Carson, D. A., D. J. Moo, and L. Morris. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992.
- Chafer, L. S. *He That Is Spiritual*. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Sunday School Times, 1924; reprint, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1967.
- Chamblin, J. K. *Paul and the Self: Apostolic Teaching for Personal Wholeness*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993.
- Charlesworth, J. H., ed., with R. E. Whitaker. *Graphic Concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991.
- Chestnut, R. D. *From Death to Life: Conversion in Joseph and Aseneth*. JSPS 16. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Chrysostom, J. *Saint Chrysostom: Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Romans*. NPNF 9. New York: Christian Literature Co., 1889, 9:416-39.
- Colpe, C. *Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule. Darstellung und Kritik ihres Bildes vom gnostischen Erlösermythus*. FRLANT 78. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961.
- Comrie, B. *Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Conzelmann, H. *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by J. Bowden. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.
- Cooper, J. W. *Body, Soul, and Life Everlasting: Biblical Anthropology and the Monism-Dualism Debate*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 2 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975-79.
- Cross, F. L., ed. *Studies in Ephesians*. London: A. R. Mowbray, 1956.
- Crouch, J. E. *The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel*. FRLANT 109. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.
- Cullmann, O. *Baptism in the New Testament*. Translated by J. K. S. Reid. SBT Chicago: H. Regnery Co., 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History*. Rev. ed. Translated by F. V. Filson. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Salvation in History*. Translated by S. G. Sowers. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.
- Daube, D. *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*. London: Athlone Press, 1956.
- Davies, W. D. *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*. 4th ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.
- Davis, J. A. *Wisdom and Spirit. An Investigation of 1 Corinthians 1:18–3:20 Against the Background of Jewish Sapiential Traditions in the Greco-Roman Period*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984.
- De Boer, M. C. *The Defeat of Death. Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5*. JSNTSup 22. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.
- Deichgraber, R. *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit*. SUNT 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.
- Deidun, T. J. *New Covenant Morality in Paul*. AnBib 89. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute Press, 1981.
- Deissmann, A. *Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History*. 2nd ed. Translated by W. E. Wilson. Reprint, New York: Harper & Row, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Light From the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World*. Translated by L. R. M. Strachan. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978.
- De Maris, R. E. *The Colossian Controversy. Wisdom in Dispute at Colossae*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.
- Denney, J. "St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans." In *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, ed. W. R. Nicoll. 5 vols. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1903. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974, 2:555-725.
- Dennison, W. D. *Paul's Two-Age Construction and Apologetics*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1985.
- Denniston, J. D. *The Greek Particles*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.
- Dibelius, M. *An die Kolosser, Epheser an Philemon*. 3rd ed. Revised by H. Greeven. HNTC 12. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953.
- Dickson, W. P. *St. Paul's Use of the Terms Flesh and Spirit*. Glasgow: Maclehose, 1883.
- Dillow, J. C. *The Reign of the Servant Kings: A Study of Eternal Security and the Final Significance of Man*. Miami Springs, FL: Schoettle Publishing, 1992.
- Dodd, C. H. *The Epistle to the Romans*. MNTC. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1932.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments*. 2nd ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Gospel and Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- Dodds, E. R. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.
- Donelson, L. R. *Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles*. Edited by H. D. Betz, G. Ebeling, and M. Mezger. HUT 22. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1986.
- Donfried, K. P., ed. *The Romans Debate*. Rev. ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Doty, W. G. *Letters in Primitive Christianity*. GBS, NT Series. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973.
- Duncan, G. S. *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry. A Reconstruction with Special Reference to the Ephesian Origin of the Imprisonment Epistles*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1929.
- Dunn, J. D. G. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. SBT 15, 2nd series. Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Romans 1-8, 9-16*. 2 vols. WBC 38A, 38B. Dallas: Word Books, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Dupont, J. *Gnosis. La connaissance religieuse dans les épîtres de saint Paul*. Paris: Gabalda, 1949.
- Eadie, J. *A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Colossians*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1856. Reprint, Klock & Klock, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians*. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1883.
- Ellis, E. E. *Paul and His Recent Interpreters*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991.

- Eltester, F. W. *Eikon im Neuen Testament*. BWANT 23. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1958.
- Elwell, W. A., ed. *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984.
- Engberg-Pedersen, T., ed. *Paul in His Hellenistic Context*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.
- Ernst, J. *Die Briefe an die Philipper, an Philemon, an die Kolosser, an die Epheser*. RNT. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1974.
- Evans, C. A., and D. A. Hagner, eds. *Anti-Semitism and Early Christianity: Issues of Polemic and Faith*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_, R. L. Webb, and R. A. Wiebe, eds. *Nag Hammadi Texts and the Bible: A Synopsis and Index*. Leiden / New York: Brill, 1993.
- Even-Shoshan, A. *A New Concordance of the Old Testament Using the Hebrew and Aramaic Text*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984.
- Ewald, P. *Die Briefe des Paulus an die Epheser, Kolosser und Philemon*. 2nd ed. KNT 10. Leipzig: Deichert, 1910.
- Fanning, B. M. *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek*. OTM. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Faust, E. *Pax Christi et Pax Caesaris. Religionsgeschichtliche, traditionsgeschichtliche und sozialgeschichtliche Studien zum Epheserbrief*. NTOA 24. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.
- Fee, G. D. *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Feinberg, J. S., ed. *Continuity and Discontinuity*. Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1988.
- Feldman, L. H. *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Fischer, K. M. *Tendenz und Absicht des Epheserbriefes*. FRLANT 111. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Major Publications and Tools For Study*. SBibSt 8. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1975, addendum, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Romans. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 33. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Foulkes, F. *The Letter of Paul to the Ephesians. An Introduction and Commentary*. 2nd ed. TNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.
- Fraine, J., de. *Adam and the Family of Man*. Staten Island, NY: Alba, 1965.

- Francis, F. O., and W. A. Meeks, eds. *Conflict at Colossae: A Problem in the Interpretation of Early Christianity Illustrated by Selected Modern Studies*. SBibSt 4. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1975.
- Frankemölle, H. *Das Taufverständnis des Paulus: Taufe, Tod und Auferstehung nach Röm 6*. SBS 47. Stuttgart: KBW, 1970.
- Freedman, D. N., ed. *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Furnish, V. P. *Theology and Ethics in Paul*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *II Corinthians*. AB. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984.
- Gale, H. M. *The Use of Analogy in the Letters of Paul*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.
- Galling, K. et al., eds. *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*. 3rd ed. 7 vols. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1957-65.
- Gamble, H. Y. *The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans: A Study in Textual and Literary Criticism*. SD 42. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.
- Gaugler, E. *Der Romerbrieft*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Zürich: Zwingli, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Der Epheserbrieft*. ANS 6. Zürich: EVZ, 1966.
- Gäumann, N. *Taufe und Ethik: Studien zu Römer 6*. BEvT 47. München: Kaiser Verlag, 1967.
- Gibbs, J. G. *Creation and Redemption: A Study in Pauline Theology*. NovTSup 26. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Gillman, F. M. *A Study of Romans 6:5a: United to a Death Like Christ*. San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press, 1992.
- Gnilka, J. *Der Epheserbrieft*, 2nd ed. HTKNT 10.2. Freiburg: Herder, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Der Kolosserbrieft*. HTKNT 10.1. Freiburg: Herder, 1980.
- Godet, F. *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*. 2 vols. Translated by A. Cusin. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1880-81. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1979.
- Goodspeed, E. J. *The Key to Ephesians*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.
- Goppelt, L. *Theology of the New Testament*. 2 vols. Translated by J. E. Alsup, edited by J. Roloff. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*. Translated by D. H. Madvig. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.

- Guerra, A. J. *Romans and the Apologetic Tradition: The Purpose, Genre, and Audience of Paul's Letter*. SNTSMS 81. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Gundry, R. H. *Sōma in Biblical Theology with Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology*. SNTSMS 29. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Gunther, J. J. *St. Paul's Opponents and Their Background: A Study of Apocalyptic and Jewish Sectarian Teachings*. NovTSup 35. Leiden: Brill, 1973.
- Gutbrod, W. *Die paulinische Anthropologie*. BWANT 67. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934.
- Guthrie, D. *The Authorship and Integrity of the New Testament*. ThCol 4. London: SPCK, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *New Testament Introduction*. 4th ed. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1990.
- Hagner, D. A. and M. J. Harris, eds. *Pauline Studies*. FS for F. F. Bruce. Exeter: Paternoster / Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Hammond, N. G. L., and H. H. Scullard, eds. *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.
- Hanson, S. *The Unity of the Church in the New Testament: Colossians and Ephesians*. ASNU 14. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1946.
- Harris, M. J. *Raised Immortal: Resurrection and Immortality in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Harris, W. H. III. *The Descent of Christ: Ephesians 4:7-11 and Traditional Hebrew Imagery*. AGJU 32. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Harrison, P. N. *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*. London: Oxford University Press, 1921.
- Harrisville, R. A. *The Concept of Newness in the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Romans*. ACNT. Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1980.
- Hatch, E., and H. A. Redpath. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament including the Apocryphal Books*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983.
- Haupt, E. *Die Gefangenschaftsbriefe*. 8th ed. KEKNT 8-9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902.
- Hawthorne, G. F., R. P. Martin, and D. G. Reid, eds. *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993.

- Hay, D. M., and E. E. Johnson, eds. *Pauline Theology. Volume 3: Romans*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.
- Hays, R. B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Heckel, T. K. *Der Innere Mensch: die paulinische Verarbeitung eines platonischen Motivs*. WUNT 53. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1993.
- Hendricksen, W. *Exposition of Colossians and Philemon*. NTC 11. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Exposition of Ephesians*. NTC 10. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Exposition of Paul's Epistle to the Romans*. 2 vols. NTC 6. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980-81.
- Hengel, M. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*. 2 vols. Translated by J. Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Pre-Christian Paul*. Translated by J. Bowden. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1991.
- Hoch, C. B., Jr. *All Things New: The Significance of Newness for Biblical Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995.
- Hodge, C. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians*. London: Nisbet, 1856. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 2nd ed. revised and rewritten. New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1886. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950.
- Hoehner, H. W. "Ephesians." In *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: New Testament Edition*. Edited by J. F. Walvoord and R. B. Zuck. Wheaton: Victor Books, 1983, 613-45.
- Hoekema, A. A. *A Christian Looks at Himself*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Created in God's Image*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Hooker, M. D. *A Preface to Paul*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *From Adam To Christ: Essays on Paul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and S. G. Wilson, eds. *Paul and Paulinism*, FS for C. K. Barrett. London: SPCK, 1982.

- Houlden, J. L. *Paul's Letters from Prison: Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians*. WPC. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1977.
- Howard, R. E. *Newness of Life: A Study in the Thought of Paul*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1975.
- Hunter, A. M. *Paul and His Predecessors*. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961.
- Jacoby, H. *Neutestamentliche Ethik*. Königsberg: Thomas und Oppermann, 1899.
- Jervell, J. *Imago Dei: Gen. 1,26f im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen*. FRLANT 76. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.
- Jervis, L. A. *The Purpose of Romans: A Comparative Letter Structure Investigation*. JSNTSup 55. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Jewett, R. *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings*. AGJU 10. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Johnson, A. R. *The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1942.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1949.
- Jonas, H. *Gnosis und spätaniker Geist*. FRLANT 63. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954.
- Kabisch, R. *Die Eschatologie des Paulus in ihren Zusammenhängen mit dem Gesamtbegriff des Paulinismus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1893.
- Kamlah, E. *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament*. WUNT 7. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1964.
- Käsemann, E. *Leib und Leib Christi: Eine Untersuchung zur paulinischen Begrifflichkeit*. BHT 9. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1933.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Epheserbrief." In *RGG*, ed. K. Galling et al. 3rd ed. 7 vols. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1957-65, 2:517-20.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Essays on New Testament Themes*. Translated by W. J. Montague. SBT 41. Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *New Testament Questions of Today*. Translated by W. J. Montague. NTL. London: SCM Press, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Perspectives on Paul*. Translated by M. Kohl. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.



- \_\_\_\_\_. *Commentary on Romans*. Translated and edited by G. W. Bromiley from 4th German edition. HNT 8a. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Kaye, B. N. *The Thought Structure of Romans with Special Reference to Chapter 6*. Austin, TX: Schola Press, 1979.
- Keck, L. E. *Paul and His Letters*. 2nd ed. PC. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- Kennedy, H. A. A. *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1913.
- Kiley, M. *Colossians as Pseudepigraphy*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986.
- Kim, S. *The Origin of Paul's Gospel*. WUNT 4. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Kirby, J. C. *Ephesians, Baptism and Pentecost: An Inquiry into the Structure and Purpose of the Epistle to the Ephesians*. Montreal: McGill University Press, 1968.
- Kittel, G., and G. Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated and edited by G. W. Bromiley. Index volume by R. Pitkin. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-76.
- Knox, J. "Romans." In *The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick et al. Vol. 9. New York: Abingdon Press, 1954.
- Knox, W. L. *Saint Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1939.
- Koester, H. *Introduction to the New Testament*. 2 vols. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.
- Kohlenberger, J. R. III, E. W. Goodrick, and J. A. Swanson, eds. *The Exhaustive Concordance to the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995.
- Kramer, W. *Christ, Lord, Son of God*. SBT 50. London: SCM Press, 1966.
- Krietzer, L. J. *Jesus and God in Paul's Eschatology*. JSNTSup 19. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- Kruse, C. G. *Paul, the Law and Justification*. Leicester: Apollos, 1996.
- Kuhn, K. G. *Konkordanz zu den Qumantexten*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.
- Kümmel, W. G. *Man in the New Testament*. Rev. ed. Translated by J. J. Vincent. London: Epworth Press, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of Its Problems*. Translated by S. M. Gilmour and H. C. Kee. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Theology of the New Testament According to Its Major Witnesses: Jesus, Paul, John*. Translated by J. E. Steely. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Rev. ed. Translated by H. C. Kee from 14th German ed. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975.
- Kuss, O. *Der Romerbrieff*. 3 vols. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1957, 1959, 1978.
- Laato, T. *Paul and Judaism: An Anthropological Approach*. Translated by T. McElwain. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Ladd, G. E. *A Theology of the New Testament*. Edited by D. A. Hagner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Lagrance, M. J. *Saint Paul: Épître aux Romains*, 6th ed. EB. Paris: Libraire Lecoffre, 1950.
- Lähnemann, J. *Der Kolosserbrief: Komposition, Situation und Argumentation*. SNT 3. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1971.
- Laidlaw, J. *The Bible Doctrine of Man*. Rev. ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895.
- Lambrecht, J. *The Wretched "I" and Its Liberation: Paul in Romans 7 and 8*. LThPM 14. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Lampe, G. W. H. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961-68.
- Larsson, E. *Christus als Vorbild. Eine Untersuchung zu den paulinischen Tauf- und Eikontexten*. Lund: Gleerup, 1962.
- Leenhardt, F. J. *The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary*. Translated by H. Knight. London: Lutterworth Press, 1961.
- Levison, J. R. *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch*. JSPSup. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.
- Liddell, H. G., and R. Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed. Revised and augmented by H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie, with supplement edited by E. A. Barber (1968). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.
- Lietzmann, H. *Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus. An die Römer*. 4th ed. HNT 8. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1933.
- Lightfoot, J. B. *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*. Rev. ed. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd, 1890. Reprint of 9th ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1959.
- Lincoln, A. T. *Paradise Now and Not Yet. Studies in the Role of the Heavenly Dimension in Paul's Thought with Special Reference to His Eschatology*. SNTSMS 43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ephesians*. WBC 42. Dallas: Word Books, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and A. J. M. Wedderburn. *The Theology of the Later Pauline Letters*. NTT. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Lindemann, A. *Die Aufhebung der Zeit. Geschichtsverständnis und Eschatologie im Epheserbrief*. SNT 12. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Der Kolosserbrief*. ZBK 10. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Der Epheserbrief*. ZBK 8. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1985.
- Lloyd-Jones, D. M. *God's Way of Reconciliation: Studies in Ephesians Chapter 2*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Romans: An Exposition of Chapter 6, The New Man*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1973.
- Lohmeyer, E. *Die Briefe an die Philipper, an die Kolosser, an Philemon, und an die Epheser*, 13th ed. KEKNT 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.
- Lohse, E. *Colossians and Philemon. A Commentary on the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*. Translated by W. R. Poehmann and R. J. Karris from the 14th German edition. Edited by H. Koester. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
- Long, A. A., and D. N. Sedley. *The Hellenistic Philosophers*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Longenecker, R. N. *Paul, Apostle of Liberty*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1964.
- Louw, J. P., and E. A. Nida et al., eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
- Lovering, E. H., and J. L. Sumney, eds. *Theology and Ethics in Paul and His Interpreters*. FS for V. P. Furnish. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996.
- Lüdemann, H. *Die Anthropologie des Apostels Paulus und ihre Stellung innerhalb seiner Heilslehre*. Kiel: Universitäts-Buchhandlung (P. Toeche), 1872.
- Luther, M. *Luther's Works*. Edited by J. Pelikan and H. T. Lehman. Philadelphia: Muhlenburg Press, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Lectures on Romans*. Translated and edited by W. Pauck. LCC. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961.
- Lyonnet, S. *Études sur l'épître aux Romains*. AnBib 120. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1989.

- Machen, J. G. *The Origin of Paul's Religion*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Christian View of Man*. Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1965. Reprint, 1984.
- Malherbe, A. J. *Paul and the Popular Philosophers*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Moral Exhortation: A Greco-Roman Sourcebook*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986.
- Martin, J. L. *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997.
- Martin, R. P. *Colossians and Philemon*. 3rd ed. NCB. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Reconciliation: A Study of Paul's Theology*. Rev. ed. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon*. Interpretation. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1991.
- Masson, C. *L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Colossiens*. CNT 10. Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Éphésiens*. CNT 9. Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1953.
- Matlock, R. B. *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul: Paul's Interpretation and the Rhetoric of Criticism*. JSNTSup 127. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Mayer, G. *Index Philoneus*. Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1974.
- Mayser, E. *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1934.
- Meade, D. G. *Pseudonymity and Canon: An Investigation into the Relationship of Authorship and Authority in Jewish and Earliest Christian Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Meeks, W. A. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983.
- Mell, U. *Neue Schöpfung. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Studie zu einem Soteriologischen Grundsatz paulinischer Theologie*. BZNW 56. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1989.
- Merk, O. *Handeln aus Glauben: Die Motivierungen der paulinischen Ethik*. MThSt 5. Marburg: Elwert, 1968.

- Merklein, H. *Christus und die Kirche. Die theologische Grundstruktur des Epheserbriefes nach Eph 2, 11-18*. Stuttgart: KBW Verlag, 1973.
- Metzger, B. M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. London/New York: United Bible Societies, 1994.
- Meuzelaar, J. J. *Der Leib des Messias*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1961.
- Meyer, H. A. W. *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Part IX: The Epistles to the Philippians and Colossians*. Translated from the 4th German edition by J. C. Moore. Translation revised and edited by W. P. Dickson. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1875.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Ephesians*. Translated from the 3rd German edition by J. C. Moore. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1884.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Romans*. Translated by J. C. Moore and E. Johnson from the 5th German edition. Edited and revised by W. P. Dickson with supplementary notes by T. Dwight. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1884. Reprint, Winona Lake, IN: Alpha, 1979.
- Michel, O. *Der Brief an die Römer*, 5th rev. ed. KEKNT 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.
- Mills, W. E., ed. *Bibliographies For Biblical Research*. 7 vols. to date. Lewiston, NY: Mellen Press, 1993-.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *An Index to Periodical Literature on the Apostle Paul*. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- Minear, P. S. *The Obedience of Faith. The Purposes of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans*. SBT 19, 2nd series. London: SCM Press, 1971.
- Mitton, C. L. *The Epistle to the Ephesians: Its Authorship, Origin and Purpose*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Formation of the Pauline Corpus of Letters*. London, Epworth Press, 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ephesians*. NCB. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.
- Moo, D. J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Moore, G. F. *Judaism in the First Three Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim*. 3 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927-30. Reprint, New York: Schocken Books, 1971.
- Morgan, R. *Romans*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Morison, J. *St. Paul's Teaching On Sanctification: A Practical Exposition of Romans VI*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1886.

- Morris, L. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Moule, C. F. D. *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Phenomenon of the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Implications of Certain Features of the New Testament*. SBT 1, 2nd Series. Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon*. 3rd ed. CGTC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Essays in New Testament Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Moule, H. C. G. *Studies in Ephesians*. KPCS Rreprint. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1977.
- Moulton, J. H., W. F. Howard, and N. Turner. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. 4 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908-76.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and G. Milligan. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930. Reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997.
- Moulton, W. F., A. S. Geden, and H. K. Moulton. *A Concordance to the Greek Testament*. 5th rev. ed. with supplement. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978.
- Mueller, J. T. *Christian Dogmatics*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1934.
- Munck, J. *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*. Translated by F. Clarke. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1959.
- Murphy-O'Conner, J. and J. H. Charlesworth, eds. *Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. COL. New York: Crossroad, 1990 [1968].
- Murray, J. *Principles of Conduct: Aspects of Biblical Ethics*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Epistle to the Romans*. 2 vols. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959, 1965.
- Mussner, F. *Christus, das All und die Kirche. Studien zur Theologie des Epheserbriefes*, 2nd ed. TTS 5. Trier: Paulinus, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Epistle to the Colossians*. Translated by R. A. Wilson. NTSR 17. New York: Herder and Herder, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Der Brief an die Epheser*. OTKNT 10. Wurzburg: Echter Verlag, 1982.

- Nanos, M. D. *The Mystery of Romans: The Jewish Context of Paul's Letter*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.
- Neill, S. and T. Wright. *The Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861-1986*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Neugebauer, F. *In Christus. Eine Untersuchung zum paulinischen Glaubensverständnis*. Berlin: EVA, 1961.
- Neumann, K. J. *The Authenticity of the Pauline Epistles in the Light of Stylostatistical Analysis*. SBLDS 120. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Nicoll, W. R., ed. *The Expositor's Greek Testament*. 5 vols. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1903. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Niebuhr, R. *The Nature and Destiny of Man: A Christian Interpretation*. 2 vols. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1964.
- O'Brien, P. T. *Colossians, Philemon*. WBC 44. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1982.
- Owen, J. *The Works of John Owen*. 16 vols. Edited by W. H. Goold. London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Sin and Temptation*. Abridged and edited by J. M. Houston. Portland, OR: Multnomah Press, 1983.
- Pagels, E. C. *The Gnostic Paul: Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- Pate, C. M. *The End of the Ages Has Come: The Theology of Paul*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995.
- Patzia, A. G. *Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon*. NIBC 10. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1990.
- Peake, A.S. "The Epistle of Paul to the Colossians." In *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, ed. W. R. Nicoll. 5 vols. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1903. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974, 3:475-547.
- Pearson, B. A. *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians: A Study in the Theology of the Corinthian Opponents of Paul and Its Relation to Gnosticism*. SBLDS 12. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1973.
- Pedersen, J. *Israel: Its Life and Culture*. London: Oxford University Press, 1959 [1926, 1940].
- Penna, R. *Paul the Apostle 1: Jew and Greek Alike, 2. Wisdom and Folly of the Cross*. Collegeville: Liturgical / Glazier, 1996.
- Percy, E. *Der Leib Christi in den paulinischen Homologoumena und Antilegomena*. Lund: Gleerup, 1942.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe*. ARSHLL 39. Lund: Gleerup, 1946.
- Peterson, D. *Possessed by God. A New Testament Theology of Sanctification and Holiness*. NSBT 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Pfleiderer, O. *Paulinism. A Contribution to the History of Primitive Christian Theology*. 2 vols. Translated by E. Peters. London: Williams & Norgate, 1877.
- Pokorny, P. *Der Epheserbrief und die Gnosis*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Colossians: A Commentary*. Translated by S. S. Schatzmann. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Porter, S. E. *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament with Reference to Tense and Mood*. SBG 1. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and D. A. Carson. *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics. Open Questions in Current Research*. JSNTSup 80. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Katallassō in Ancient Greek Literature with Reference to the Pauline Writings*. Córdoba: Ediciones El Almendro, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and C. A. Evans, eds. *The Pauline Writings*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Prat, F. *The Theology of Saint Paul*. 2 vols. Translated by J. L. Stoddard. Westminster, MD: Newman Bookshop, 1956.
- Rader, W. *The Church and Racial Hostility: A History of the Interpretation of Ephesians 2:11-22*. BGBE 20. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1978.
- Reitzenstein, R. *Hellenistic Mystery-Religions: Their Basic Ideas and Significance*. Translated by J. E. Steely from the 3rd German edition (1927). PTMS 15. Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium*. Bonn: Markus, 1921.
- Rengstorf, K. H. *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus*. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1973-83.
- Reumann, J., ed. *Corporate Personality in Ancient Israel*. FBBS 11. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.
- Rey, B. *Créés dans le Christ Jesus. La création nouvelle selon saint Paul*. LD 42. Paris: Les Éditions Du Cerf, 1966.



- Richards, E. R. *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul*. WUNT 2.42. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1991.
- Riches, J. K. *A Century of New Testament Study*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1993.
- Ridderbos, H. *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*. Translated by J. R. de Witt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.
- Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek in the Light of Historical Research*. 4th ed. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1934.
- Robinson, H. W. *The Christian Doctrine of Man*. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1947.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Corporate Personality in Ancient Israel*, rev. ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.
- Robinson, J. A. T. *The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology*. SBT 5. London: SCM Press, 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Wrestling with Romans*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1979.
- Robinson, J. A. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. A Revised Text and Translation with Exposition and Notes*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1909.
- Roels, E. D. *God's Mission: The Epistle to the Ephesians in Mission Perspective*. Franeker: T. Wever, 1962.
- Rogerson, J. W. *Anthropology and the Old Testament*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979.
- Röhser, G. *Metaphorik und Personifikation der Sünde*. WUNT 2.25. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1987.
- Rosner, B. S., ed. *Understanding Paul's Ethics: Twentieth-Century Approaches*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans / Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995.
- Rowland, C. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- Russell, D. S. *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic. 2000 BC-AD 100*. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.
- Safrai, S. et al., eds. *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*. Section One: *The Jewish People in the First Century*, ed. S. Safrai and M. Stern, 2 vols. Section Two: *The Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud*, ed. M. J. Mulder, M. E. Stone, and S. Safrai, 3 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress Press / Assen: Van Gorcum, 1976-87.
- Salmond, S. D. F. "The Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians." *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, ed. W. R. Nicoll. 5 vols. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1903. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974, 3:201-395.

- Sampley, J. P. *Walking Between the Times: Paul's Moral Reasoning*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Sand, A. *Der Begriff "Fleisch" in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen*. Regensburg: Pustet, 1967.
- Sanday, W., and A. C. Headlam. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 5th ed. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902.
- Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. London: SCM Press / Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Paul*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE–66 CE*. London: SCM Press / Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1992.
- Sanders, J. T. *The New Testament Christological Hymns: Their Historical Religious Background*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- Sandmel, S. *The Genius of Paul: A Study in History*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Schaff, P., and H. Wace, eds. *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. New ed. 14 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Schille, G. *Frühchristliche Hymnen*. 2nd ed. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1965.
- Schlatter, A. *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser, Kolosser und Philemon*. 6th ed. ENT 7. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Romans: The Righteousness of God*. Translated by S. S. Schatzmann. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995.
- Schlier, H. *Christus und die Kirche im Epheserbrief*. BHT 6. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1930. Reprint, Nendeln: Kraus Reprint, Ltd., 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Der Brief an die Epheser: Ein Kommentar*, 7th ed. Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Der Römerbrief: Kommentar*. HTKNT 6. Freiburg: Herder, 1979.
- Schnackenburg, R. *Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul. A Study in Pauline Theology*. Rev. ed. Translated by G. R. Beasley-Murray. New York: Herder and Herder, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ephesians. A Commentary*. Translated by H. Heron. EKKNT 10. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991.

- Schnelle, U. *The Human Condition. Anthropology in the Teachings of Jesus, Paul, and John*. Translated by O. C. Dean, Jr. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1996.
- Schoeps, H. J. *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History*. Translated by H. Knight. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961.
- Schrage, W. *The Ethics of the New Testament*. Translated by D. E. Green. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- Schreiner, T. R. *The Law and Its Fulfillment: A Pauline Theology of Law*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Romans*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998.
- Schürer, E. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*. 4 vols. Translated by T. A. Burkill et al. Revised and edited by G. Vermes and F. Millar. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973-87
- Schweitzer, A. *Paul and His Interpreters. A Critical History*. Translated by W. Montgomery. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1912. Reprint, New York: Schocken Books, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. Translated by W. Montgomery. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1931. Reprint, New York: Seabury Press, 1968.
- Schweizer, E. *The Letter to the Colossians: A Commentary*. Translated by A. Chester. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1982.
- Scott, C. A. A. *Christianity According to St. Paul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927.
- Scott, E. F. *The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*. MNTC. New York: Harper & Row, 1930.
- Scroggs, R. *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.
- Segal, A. F. *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Selwyn, E. G. *The First Epistle of St. Peter*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1947.
- Shedd, R. P. *Man in Community: A Study of St. Paul's Application of Old Testament and Early Jewish Conceptions of Human Solidarity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Showers, R. E. *The New Nature*. Neptune, NJ: Loizeaux Brothers, 1986.
- Siber, P. *Mit Christus leben. Eine Studie zur paulinischen Auferstehungshoffnung*. ATANT 61. Zurich: Theolischer Verlag, 1971.

- Smedes, L. B. *Union With Christ: A Biblical View of the New Life in Jesus Christ*. 2nd rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Smith, R. G. *The New Man*. London: SCM Press, 1955.
- Smyth, H. W. *Greek Grammar*. Translated and revised by G. M. Messing. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- Snodgrass, K. *Ephesians*. NIVAC. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Spicq, C. *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament*. 3 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Stacey, W. D. *The Pauline View of Man in Relation to Its Judaic and Hellenistic Backgrounds*. London: Macmillan, 1956.
- Stauffer, E. *New Testament Theology*. Translated by J. Marsh from the 5th German edition. London: SCM Press, 1955.
- Stendahl, K. *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles, and Other Essays*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Final Account: Paul's Letter to the Romans*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.
- Stern, M. *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. 3 vols. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1976, 1980, 1984.
- Stott, J. R. W. *Men Made New. An Exposition of Romans 5–8*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1966.
- Stowers, S. K. *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans*. SBLDS 57. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Re-Reading of Romans: Justice, Jews and Gentiles*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994.
- Strack, H. L., and P. Billerbeck. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. 4 vols. Index vol. 5 (1956) and 6 (1961), ed. J. Jeremias. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1922-61.
- Strolz, W., ed. *Vom alten zum neuen Adam: Urzeitmythos und Heilsgeschichte*. WR 13. Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 1986.
- Stuhlmacher, P. *Paul's Letter to the Romans. A Commentary*. Translated by S. J. Hafemann. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.

- Tachau, P. *"Einst" und "Jetzt" im Neuen Testament. Beobachtungen zu einem urchristlichen Predigtschema in der neutestamentlichen Briefliteratur und zu seiner Vorgeschichte.* FRLANT 105. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.
- Tannehill, R. C. *Dying and Rising with Christ. A Study in Pauline Theology.* BZNTW 32. Berlin: Töplemann, 1967.
- Taylor, B. A. *The Analytical Lexicon to the Septuagint. A Complete Parsing Guide.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.
- Taylor, L. H. *The New Creation: A Study of the Pauline Doctrines of Creation, Innocence, Sin, and Redemption.* New York: Pageant, 1958.
- Taylor, W. "The Epistle to the Ephesians." In *Beacon Bible Commentary.* Edited by A. F. Harper. Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1965.
- Temporini, H., and W. Haase, eds. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung.* Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1992–.
- Tenney, M. C., gen. ed. *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976.
- Theissen, G. *Psychological Aspects of Pauline Theology.* Translated by J. P. Galvin. FRLANT 131. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Social Reality and the Early Christians. Theology, Ethics, and the World of the New Testament.* Translated by M. Kohl. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Thielman, F. *Paul and the Law: A Contextual Approach.* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1994.
- Thompson, M. *Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12:1–15:13.* JSNTSup 59. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Thomson, I. H. *Chiasmus in the Pauline Letters.* JSNTSup 111. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Thrall, M. E. *Greek Particles in the New Testament. Linguistic and Exegetical Studies.* NTTS 3. Leiden: Brill, 1962.
- Thüsing, W. *Per Christum in Deum. Studien zum Verhältnis von Christozentrik und Theozentrik in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen.* 2nd ed. NTAbh, N. F. 1. Münster: Aschendorff, 1969 [1965].
- Trebilco, P. *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor.* SNTSMS 69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Trench, R. C. *Synonyms of the New Testament,* 9th ed., 1880. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953.

- Turner, N. *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1965.
- Usami, K. *Somatic Comprehension of Unity: The Church in Ephesus*. AnBib 101. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1983.
- Van der Horst, P. W., and G. Mussies. *Studies on the Hellenistic Background of the New Testament*. UTR 10. Utrecht: Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid van de Rijksuniversiteit, 1990.
- Van Roon, A. *The Authenticity of Ephesians*. Translated by S. Prescod-Jokel. NovTSup 39. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Vögtle, A. *Die Tugend- und Lasterkatalog im Neuen Testament: Exegetisch, religions- und formgeschichtlich untersucht*. NTAbh 16. Münster: Aschendorff, 1936.
- Von Rad, G., H. Schlier, E. Schlink, and E. Wolf. *Der alte und der neue Mensch Aufsätze zur theologischen Anthropologie*. BEvT 8. Theologische Ubhandlungen-hrsg. von E. Wolf. München: Kaiser Verlag, 1942.
- Votaw, C. W. *The Use of the Infinitive in Biblical Greek*. Chicago: By the author, 1896.
- Wagner, G. *Pauline Baptism and the Pagan Mysteries: The Problem of the Pauline Doctrine of Baptism in Romans 6:1-11 in the Light of Its Religio-Historical Parallels*. Translated by J. P. Smith. Edinburgh/London: Oliver & Boyd, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *An Exegetical Bibliography of the New Testament*. 4 vols. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1983-96.
- Wahlstrom, E. H. *The New Life in Christ*. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1950.
- Wall, R. W. *Colossians & Philemon*. IVPNTCS. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993.
- Wallace, D. B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics. An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Wallis, R. *The New Man*. Neptune, NJ: Loizeaux Brothers, 1931.
- Watson, F. *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles. A Sociological Approach*. SNTSMS 56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Way, D. V. *The Lordship of Christ. Ernst Käsemann's Interpretation of Paul's Theology*. OTM. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Wedderburn, A. J. M. *Baptism and Resurrection: Studies in Pauline Theology Against its Graeco-Roman Background*. WUNT 44. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Reasons For Romans*. SNTW. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988.

- Wengst, K. *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums*. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1972.
- Wernle, P. *Der Christ und die Sünde bei Paulus*. Freiburg im Breisgau: J. C. B. Mohr, 1897.
- West, A. *The Old Man and the New Man, or, Sin and Salvation*. Nashville: Southern Methodist Publishing House, 1886.
- Westcott, B. F. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*. Edited by J. M. Schulhof. London: Macmillan, 1906.
- Westerholm, S. *Israel's Law and the Church's Faith: Paul and His Recent Interpreters*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Whiteley, D. E. H. *The Theology of Saint Paul*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1974.
- Whitelocke, L. T., ed. *An Analytical Concordance of the Books of the Apocrypha*. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1978.
- Wibbing, S. *Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament und ihre Traditionsgeschichte unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Qumrantexte*. BZNW 25. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1959.
- Wikenhauser, A. *Pauline Mysticism: Christ in the Mystical Teaching of St. Paul*. 2nd ed. Translated by J. Cunningham from the 2nd German edition (1956). New York: Herder and Herder, 1960.
- Wilckens, U. *Der Brief an die Römer*. 3 vols. EKKNT 6. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978-82.
- Wiley, H. O. *Christian Theology*. Kansas City: The Nazarene Publishing House, 1940.
- Winer, G. B. *A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament*, 7th ed. Translated and revised by J. H. Thayer. Andover: Draper, 1874.
- Witherington, B. *Paul's Narrative Thought World*. Louisville: Westminster / John Knox, 1994.
- Wolff, H. W. *Anthropology of the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
- Wolter, M. *Rechtfertigung und zukünftiges Heil. Untersuchungen zu Röm. 5,1-11*. BZNW 43. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1978.
- Wrede, W. *Paul*. Translated by E. Lummis. Reprint. Lexington, KY: American Library Association, 1962.
- Wright, N. T. *The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians and to Philemon*. TNTC 12. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Yamauchi, E. M. *Pre-Christian Gnosticism: A Survey of the Proposed Evidences*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973.
- Zahn, T. *Introduction to the New Testament*. 3 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.
- Zeilinger, F. *Der Erstgeborene der Schöpfung. Untersuchungen zur Formalstruktur und Theologie des Kolosserbriefes*. Wien: Herder Verlag, 1974.
- Zerwick, M. *Biblical Greek. Illustrated by Examples*. Translated and revised by J. Smith. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963.
- Ziesler, J. A. *Paul's Letter to the Romans*. London: SCM Press / Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Pauline Christianity*. Revised ed. OBS. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Zuntz, G. *The Text of the Epistles; A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum*. SL. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.

### 3. ESSAYS IN BOOKS

- Balch, D. L. "Household Codes." In *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament*, ed. D. E. Aune. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988, 25-50.
- Barclay, W. "The One, New Man." In *Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology: Essays in Honor of George E. Ladd*, ed. R. A. Guelich. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978, 73-81.
- Barth, K. "The New Man." In *The Writings of St. Paul*, ed. W. A. Meeks. New York: W. W. Norton, 1972.
- Beker, J. C. "Recasting Pauline Theology: The Coherence-Contingency Scheme as Interpretive Model." In *Pauline Theology. Volume I: Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, Philemon*, ed. J. M. Bassler. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991, 15-24.
- Benoit, P. "Qumran and the New Testament." In *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis*, ed. J. Murphy-O'Connor. Chicago: Priory Press, 1968, 1-30.
- Berger, K. "Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Vol. II.25.2. Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1984, 1326-63.



- Best, E. "Recipients and Title of the Letter to the Ephesians: Why and When the Designation 'Ephesians'?" In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Vol. II.25.4. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1987, 3247-79.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ephesians i.1." In *Text and Interpretation*, ed. E. Best and R. McL. Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979, 29-41.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ephesians 1.1 Again." In *Paul and Paulinism*, ed. M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson. London: SPCK, 1982, 273-79.
- Betz, H. D. "Transferring a Ritual: Paul's Interpretation of Baptism in Romans 6." In *Paulinische Studien. Gesammelte Aufsätze III*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1994, 240-71.
- Blinzler, J. "Lexikalisches zu dem Terminus τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κοσμοῦ bei Paulus." In *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus 1961*. Part I. AnBib 17-18. Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1963, 429-43.
- Bock, D. L. "'The New Man' as Community in Colossians and Ephesians." In *Integrity of Heart and Skillfulness of Hands: Biblical and Leadership Studies in Honor of Donald K. Campbell*, ed. C. H. Dyer and R. B. Zuck. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994, 157-67.
- Bock, E. "Der alt und der neue Adam." In *Urchristentum IV Paulus*. Stuttgart: Verlag Urachhaus, 1954, 211-28.
- Bornkamm, G. "Paulinische Anakoluthe in Romerbrief." In *Das Ende des Gesetzes: Paulusstudien*. BEvT 16. München: Kaiser, 1952, 76-92.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Baptism and New Life in Paul: Romans 6." In *Early Christian Experience*. Translated by P. L. Hammer. New York: Harper & Row, 1969, 71-86.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Heresy of Colossians." In *Conflict at Colossae: A Problem in the Interpretation of Early Christianity*, rev. ed., ed. F. O. Francis and W. A. Meeks. SBLSPS 4. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1975, 123-45.
- Boyer, C. "ΚΑΙΝΗ ΚΤΙΣΙΣ (2 Cor 5.17; Gal 6.15)." In *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus 1961*. Part I. AnBib 17-18. Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1963, 487-90.
- Brandenburger, E. "Alter und neuer Mensch, erster und letzter Adam—Anthropos." In *Vom alten zum neuen Adam*, ed. W. Stolz. WR 13. Freiburg: Herder, 1986, 182-223.
- Brauch, M. T. "Perspectives on 'God's Righteousness' in Recent German Discussion." In *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: Comparison of Patterns of Religion* by E. P. Sanders. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977, 523-42.

- Bultmann, R. "Adam and Christ according to Romans 5." In *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation. Essays in Honor of Otto A. Piper*, ed. W. Klassen and G. F. Snyder. New York: Harper & Row, 1962, 143-65.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Christ the End of the Law." In *Essays Philosophical and Theological*. Translated by J. C. G. Greig. London: SCM Press, 1955, 36-66.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Problem of Ethics in Paul." In *Understanding Paul's Ethics: Twentieth Century Approaches*, ed. B. S. Rosner, trans. C. Stenschke. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995, 195-216.
- Burchard, C. "Joseph and Aseneth." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985, 2:1878-88.
- Casey, R. P. "Gnosis, Gnosticism and the New Testament." In *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology. Festschrift for C. H. Dodd*, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956, 52-80.
- Collins, J. J. "The Apocalyptic Context of Christian Origins." In *Backgrounds for the Bible*, ed. M. P. O'Conner and D. N. Freedman. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1987, 257-71.
- Colpe, C. "Zur Leib-Christi-Vorstellung im Epheserbrief." In *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias*, ed. W. Eltester. BZNW 26. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1964, 172-87.
- Cousar, C. B. "Continuity and Discontinuity: Reflections on Romans 5-8." In *Pauline Theology. Volume III: Romans*, ed. D. M. Hay and E. E. Johnson. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995, 196-210.
- Dahl, N. A. "Christ, Creation and the Church." In *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology: Festschrift for C. H. Dodd*, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956, 422-43.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Particularity of the Pauline Epistles as a Problem in the Ancient Church." In *Neotestamentica et Patristica: Freundegabe Oscar Cullmann*. NovTSup 6. Leiden: Brill, 1965, 261-71.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Eschatology and History in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Future of our Religious Past: Essays in Honour of Rudolf Bultmann*, ed. J. M. Robinson. London: SCM Press, 1971, 9-28.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Missionary Theology in the Epistle to the Romans." In *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1977, 70-94.
- Daube, D. "Participle and Imperative in 1 Peter." In *The First Epistle of St. Peter* by E. G. Selwyn, 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1947, 467-88.

- Davies, W. D. "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit." In *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl with J. H. Charlesworth. New York: Crossroad, 1992, 157-82.
- De Boer, M. C. "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology." In *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*, ed. J. Marcus and M. L. Soards. JSNTSup 24. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989, 169-90.
- Dibelius, M. "The Isis Initiation in Apuleius and Related Initiatory Rites." In *Conflict at Colossae: A Problem in the Interpretation of Early Christianity*, 2nd ed., ed. F. O. Francis and W. A. Meeks. SBLSPS 4. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1975, 61-121.
- Dinkler, E. "Römer 6:1-14 und das Verhältnis von Taufe und Rechtfertigung bei Paulus." In *Battesimo e Giustizia in Rom. 6 e 8*, ed. L. de Lorenzi. Rome: Abbazia S. Paolo, 1974, 83-103.
- Dunn, J. D. G. "Paul's Understanding of the Death of Jesus." In *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology Presented to L. L. Morris on his 60th Birthday*, ed. R. J. Banks. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974, 125-41.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "How New Was Paul's Gospel? The Problem of Continuity and Discontinuity." In *Gospel in Paul. Studies on Corinthians, Galatians and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker*, ed. L. A. Jervis and P. Richardson. JSNTSup 108. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994, 367-88.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The 'Body' in Colossians." In *To Tell the Mystery: Essays on New Testament Eschatology in Honor of Robert H. Gundry*, ed. T. E. Schmidt and M. Silva. JSNTSup 100. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994, 163-81.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "In Quest of Paul's Theology: Retrospect and Prospect." In *Pauline Theology. Volume 4*, ed. D. M. Hay and E. E. Johnson. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997, 95-115.
- Ellis, E. E. "Paul and His Opponents. Trends in the Research." In *Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty. Part I: New Testament*, ed. J. Neusner. SJLA 12. Leiden: Brill, 1975, 264-98.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Pseudonymity and Canonicity of New Testament Documents." In *Worship, Theology and Ministry in the Early Church: Essays in Honor of Ralph P. Martin*, ed. M. H. Wilkins and T. Paige. JSNTSup 87. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992, 212-24.
- Epp, E. J. "Paul's Diverse Imageries of the Human Situation and His Unifying Theme of Freedom." In *Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology: Essays in Honor of George E. Ladd*, ed. R. A. Guelich. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978, 100-16.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. "Reconciliation in Pauline Theology." In *No Famine in the Land: Studies in Honor of John L. McKenzie*, ed. J. W. Flanagan and A. W. Robinson. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1975, 155-77.

- Funk, R. "The Apostolic Parousia: Form and Significance." In *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox*, ed. W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, and R. R. Niebuhr. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967, 249-68.
- Furnish, V. P. "Pauline Studies." In *The New Testament and Its Modern Interpreters*, ed. E. J. Epp and G. W. MacRae. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989, 321-50.
- Gnilka, J. "Christus unser Friede - ein Friedens-Erlöserlied in Eph 2,14-17: Erwägungen zu einer neutestamentlichen Friedenstheologie." In *Die Zeit Jesu. Festschrift for H. Schlier*, ed. G. Bornkamm and K. Rahner. Freiburg: Herder, 1970, 190-207.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Paränetische Traditionen im Epheserbrief." In *Mélanges Bibliques en hommage au R. P. Béda Rigaux*, ed. A. Descamps and A. de Halleux. Gembloux: Duculot, 1970, 397-410.
- Goodenough, E. R., and A. T. Kraabel. "Paul and the Hellenization of Christianity." In *Religions in Antiquity. Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*, ed. J. Neusner. SHR 14. Leiden: Brill, 1968, 23-68.
- Hartman, L. "Code and Context: A Few Reflections on the Parenthesis of Col. 3:6-4:1." In *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament: Essays in Honor of E. Earle Ellis for his 60th Birthday*, ed. G. F. Hawthorne with O. Betz. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989, 237-47.
- Haulotte, E. "La Formule paulinienne: 'Revêtir le Christ.'" In *Symbolique du vêtement selon la Bible. Théologie 65*. Paris: Aubier, 1966, 210-36.
- Hickling, C. J. A. "Center and Periphery in the Thought of Paul." In *Studia Biblica 1978, III. Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Authors*, ed. E. A. Livingstone. JSNTSup 3. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980, 199-214.
- Hoch, C. B., Jr. "The New Man of Ephesians Two." In *Dispensationalism, Israel and the Church: The Search for Definition*, ed. C. Blaising and D. Bock. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992, 98-126.
- Hooker, M. D. "Were there false teachers in Colossae?" In *Christ and the Spirit in the New Testament. In Honour of C. F. D. Moule*, ed. B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973, 315-31.
- Howard, J. E. "The Wall Broken: An Interpretation of Ephesians 2:11-22." In *Biblical Interpretation: Principles and Practices: Studies in Honor of Jack Pearl Lewis*, ed. F. F. Kearley, E. P. Myers, and T. D. Hadley. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1986, 296-306.
- Hübner, H. "Paulusforschung seit 1945. Ein kritischer Literaturbericht." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Vol. II.25.4*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1987, 2649-2840.

- Johnson, S. L. "Romans 5:12—An Exercise in Exegesis and Theology." In *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, ed. R. N. Longenecker and M. C. Tenney. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974, 298-316.
- Käsemann, E. "On the Subject of Primitive Christian Apocalyptic." In *New Testament Questions of Today*. Translated by W. J. Montague. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969, 108-37.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'The Righteousness of God' in Paul." In *New Testament Questions of Today*. Translated by W. J. Montague. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969, 168-82.
- Kaye, B. N. "βαπτισθεῖν εἰς with Special Reference to Romans 6." In *Studia Evangelica VI*, ed. E. A. Livingstone. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1973, 281-86.
- Kearns, C. "The Interpretation of Romans 6,7." In *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus 1961*. Part I. AnBib 17-18. Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1963, 301-307.
- Klijn, A. F. J. "An Ancient Syriac Baptismal Liturgy in the Syriac Acts of John." In *ΧΑΡΙΣ ΚΑΙ ΣΟΦΙΑ. Festschrift for K. H. Rengstorf*, ed. U. Luck. Leiden: Brill, 1964, 216-28.
- Kuhn, K. G. "New Light on Temptation, Sin, and the Flesh in the New Testament." In *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl. New York: Harper & Row, 1957, 94-113.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Epistle to the Ephesians in the Light of the Qumran Texts." In *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis*, ed. J. Murphy-O'Connor. Chicago: Priory Press, 1968, 115-31.
- Ladd, G. E. "Apocalyptic and New Testament Theology." In *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology Presented to L. L. Morris on His 60th Birthday*, ed. R. Banks. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974, 275-84.
- Longenecker, R. N. "On the Concept of Development in Pauline Thought." In *Perspectives on Evangelical Theology*, ed. K. S. Kantzer and S. N. Gundry. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979, 195-207.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "On the Form, Function, and Authority of the New Testament Letters." In *Scripture and Truth*, ed. D. A. Carson and J. D. Woodbridge. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983, 101-14.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ancient Amanuenses and the Pauline Epistles." In *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, ed. R. N. Longenecker and M. C. Tenney. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974, 281-97.
- Lyonnet, S. "The Terminology of 'Salvation.'" In *Sin, Redemption and Sacrifice: A Biblical and Patristic Study*, ed. S. Lyonnet and L. Sabourin. AnBib 48. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1970, 63-78.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "St. Paul's Adversaries in Colossae." In *Conflict at Colossae: A Problem in the Interpretation of Early Christianity*, ed. F. O. Francis and W. A. Meeks. SBL SBS 4. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1975, 147-61.
- Manson, W. "Notes on the Argument of Romans (Chapters 1-8)." In *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson*, ed. A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959, 150-64.
- Marshall, I. H. "Is Apocalyptic the Mother of Christian Theology?" In *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament*, ed. G. W. Hawthorne with O. Betz. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989, 33-42.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Meaning of 'Reconciliation.'" In *Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology*, ed. R. A. Guelich. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978, 117-32.
- Miner, P. S. "The Crucified World: The Enigma of Galatians 6,14." In *Theologia Crucis, Signum Crucis. Festschrift für Erich Dinkler*, ed. C. Andresen and G. Klein. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1979, 395-407.
- Moule, C. F. D. "Obligation in the Ethic of Paul." In *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox*, ed. W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, and R. R. Niebuhr. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967, 389-406.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Death 'to sin', 'to law' and 'to the world'. A Note on Certain Datives." In *Mélanges Bibliques en hommage au R. P. Béda Rigaux*, ed. A. Descamps and A. de Halleux. Gembloux: Duculot, 1970, 367-75.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Corporate Christ." In *The Phenomenon of the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Implications of Certain Features of the New Testament*. SBT 1, 2nd series. Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1967, 21-42.
- Munck, J. "Pauline Research Since Schweitzer." In *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, ed. J. P. Hyatt. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965, 166-77.
- Murphy, R. E. "Bsr in the Qumran Literature and Sarx in the Epistle to the Romans." In *Sacra Pagina*, vol. 2, ed. J. Coppens, A. Descamps, and E. Massaux. Gembloux: Duculot, 1959, 60-76.
- Murphy-O'Conner, J. "Truth: Paul and Qumran." In *Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. J. Murphy-O'Conner and J. H. Charlesworth. COL. New York: Crossroad, 1990, 179-230.
- Mussner, F. "Taufe auf Christus (Rom. 6,1-14)." In *Tod und Auferstehung*. Regensburg: Pustet, 1967, 46-57.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Zur paulinischen Tauflehre in Röm 6:1-6: Versuch einer Auslegung." In *Praesentia Salutis. Gesammelte Studien zu Fragen und Themen des Neuen Testaments*. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1967, 189-96.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Contributions Made by Qumran to the Understanding of the Epistle to the Ephesians." In *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis*, ed. J. Murphy-O'Connor. Chicago: Priory Press, 1968, 159-78.
- Nineham, D. E. "The Case Against Pauline Authorship." In *Studies in Ephesians*, ed. F. L. Cross. London: A. R. Mowbray, 1956, 21-35.
- Parsons, M. "Being Precedes Act: Indicative and Imperative in Paul's Writing." In *Understanding Paul's Ethics: Twentieth Century Approaches*, ed. B. S. Rosner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans / Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995, 217-47.
- Peterson, E. "Theologie des Kleides." In *Marginalien zur Theologie*. München: Kösel-Verlag, 1956, 41-55.
- Potterie, I. de la. "Jésus et la vérité d' après Eph 4,21." In *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus 1961*. Part II. AnBib 17-18. Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1963, 45-57.
- Pryke, J. "Eschatology in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Scrolls and Christianity: Historical and Theological Significance*, ed. M. W. Black. TC 11. London: SPCK, 1969, 45-57.
- Quek, S. H. "Adam and Christ According to Paul." In *Pauline Studies: Essays Presented to Professor F. F. Bruce on His 70th Birthday*, ed. D. A. Hagner and M. J. Harris. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980, 67-79.
- Richardson, P. "Colossians and Ephesians: The Relaxation of Hope." In *Israel in the Apostolic Church*. SNTSMS 10. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969, 147-58.
- Robinson, H. W. "Hebrew Psychology in Relation to Pauline Anthropology." In *Mansfield College Essays: Presented to the Reverend Andrew Martin Fairbairn, D. D., on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1909, 265-86.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality." In *Werden und Wesen des AT*, ed. P. Volz et al. BZAW 66. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1936, 49-62.
- Rogerson, J. W. "Corporate Personality." In *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman. Vol. 1. New York: Doubleday, 1992, 1156-57.
- Ryrie, C. C. "Contrasting Views on Sanctification." In *Walvoord: A Tribute*, ed. D. K. Campbell. Chicago: Moody Press, 1982, 189-200.
- Sanders, E. P. "Paul." In *Early Christian Thought in Its Jewish Context*, FS for M. D. Hooker, ed. J. Barclay and J. Sweet. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Sanders, J. N. "The Case for Pauline Authorship." In *Studies in Ephesians*, ed. F. L. Cross. London: Mowbray, 1956, 9-20.

- Saunders, E. W. "The Colossian Heresy and Qumran Theology." In *Studies in the History and Text of the New Testament in Honor of Kenneth Willis Clark*, ed. B. L. Daniels and M. J. Suggs. Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press, 1967, 133-45.
- Schille, G. "Epheser 2:14-18." In *Frühchristliche Hymnen*, 2nd ed. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1965, 24-37.
- Schlier, H. "Von Menschenbild des Neuen Testaments." In *Der alte und der neue Mensch*, ed. G. von Rad, H. Schlier, E. Schlöcker, and E. Wolf. BEvT 8. München: Kaiser Verlag, 1942, 24-36.
- Schnackenburg, R. "Dying and Rising with Christ: A Pauline Notion." In *Present and Future: Modern Aspects of New Testament Theology*. COS 3. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966, 101-21.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The 'New Man' According to Paul." In *Present and Future: Modern Aspects of New Testament Theology*. COS 3. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966, 81-100.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Der neue Mensch - Mitte christlichen Weltverständnisses (Kol 3, 9-11)." In *Schriften zum Neuen Testament. Exegese in Fortschritt und Wandel*. München: Kösel-Verlag, 1971, 392-413.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Zur Exegese von Eph 2,11-22: Im Hinblick auf das Verhältnis von Kirche und Israel." In *The New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke*. Vol. 2, ed. W. C. Weinrich. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1984, 467-91.
- Schweizer, E. "Die Kirche als Leib Christi in den paulinischen Antilegomena." In *Neotestamentica*. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1963, 293-316.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Traditional Ethical Patterns in the Pauline and Post-Pauline Letters and Their Development (List of Vices and Housetables)." In *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black*, ed. E. Best and R. McL. Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979, 195-209.
- Smith, D. C. "The Ephesian Heresy." In *Society of Biblical Literature: 1974 Proceedings*, ed. F. Francis. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974.
- Smith, D. M. "The Pauline Literature." In *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*, ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988, 265-91.
- Stanley, D. M. "Baptismal symbolism derives from Christ's redemptive work: Rom. 6,3-11." In *Christ's Resurrection in Pauline Soteriology*. AnBib 13. Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1961, 181-86.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Christ Our Peace: New Variations on the Reconciliation Theme. Eph. 2,14-18." In *Christ's Resurrection in Pauline Soteriology*. AnBib 13. Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1961, 224-28.



- Stuhlmacher, P. "'He is our Peace' (Eph. 2:14). On the Exegesis and Significance of Ephesians 2:14-18." In *Reconciliation, Law, and Righteousness: Essays in Biblical Theology*. Translated by E. P. Kalin. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986, 182-200.
- Sturm, R. E. "Defining the Word 'Apocalyptic': A Problem in Biblical Criticism." In *Apocalyptic and the New Testament. Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*, ed. J. Marcus and M. L. Soards. JSNTSup 24. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989, 17-48.
- Styler, G. M. "The Basis of Obligation in Paul's Christology and Ethics." In *Christ and the Spirit in the New Testament. In Honour of C. F. D. Moule*, ed. B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973, 175-87.
- Thyen, H. "Glaube und Taufe nach Röm. 6." In *Studien zur Sündenvergebung im Neuen Testament und seinen alttestamentlichen und jüdischen Voraussetzungen*. FRLANT 96. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970, 194-217.
- Vlainic, J. "Be What You Are: A Study of the Pauline Indicative and Imperative with Special Reference to Romans 6." In *Kerygma and Praxis: Essays in Honor of Stanley R. Magill*, ed. W. Vanderhoof and D. Basinger. Winona Lake, IN: Light and Life Press, 1984, 55-76.
- Wedderburn, A. J. M. "Adam in Paul's Letter to the Romans." In *Studia Biblica 1978, III. Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Authors*, ed. E. A. Livingstone. JSNTSup 3. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980, 413-30.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Paul and 'Biblical Theology.'" In *New Directions in Biblical Theology*, ed. S. Pederson. NovTSup 76. Leiden: Brill, 1994, 24-46.
- Wenham, D. "The Christian Life: A Life of Tension? A Consideration of the Nature of Christian Experience in Paul." In *Pauline Studies. Essays Presented to Professor F. F. Bruce on His 70th Birthday*, ed. D. A. Hagner and M. J. Harris. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980, 80-94.
- Wild, R. A. "'Be Imitators of God': Discipleship in the Letter to the Ephesians." In *Discipleship in the New Testament*, ed. F. F. Segovia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985, 127-43.
- Willis, W. "The Discovery of the Eschatological Kingdom: Johannes Weiss and Albert Schweitzer." In *The Kingdom of God in 20th Century Interpretation*, ed. W. Willis. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1987, 1-14.
- Wilson, R. A. "'We' and 'You' in the Epistle to the Ephesians." In *Studia Evangelica II, Part I*, ed. F. L. Cross. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964, 676-80.
- Wright, N. T. "Adam in Pauline Christology." In *SBL 1983 Seminar Papers*, ed. K. H. Richards. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983, 359-89.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Putting Paul Together Again." In *Pauline Theology. Volume I: Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, Philemon*, ed. J. M. Bassler. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991, 183-211.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Romans and the Theology of Paul." In *SBL 1992 Seminar Papers*, ed. E. Lovering, Jr. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992, 184-213.

#### 4. PERIODICAL AND MAJOR DICTIONARY ARTICLES

Aageson, J. W. "'Control' in Pauline Language and Culture: Study of Romans 6." *NTS* 42 (1996) 75-89.

Alexander, P. S. "Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament." *ZNW* 74 (1983) 237-46.

Argyle, A. W. "'Outward' and 'Inward' in Biblical Theology." *ExpTim* 68 (1956-57) 196-99.

Arnold, C. E. "Ephesians, Letter to the." *DPL* (1993) 238-48.

Aune, D. E. "Apocalypticism." *DPL* (1993) 25-35.

Averbeck, R. E. "The Focus of Baptism in the New Testament." *GTJ* 2 (1981) 265-301.

Badke, W. B. "Baptized into Moses—Baptized into Christ: A Study in Doctrinal Development." *EvQ* 60 (1988) 23-29.

Balla, P. "Is the Law Abolished According to Eph. 2:15?" *EuroJTh* 3 (1994) 9-16.

Bandstra, A. J. "Paul and the Law: Some Recent Developments." *CTJ* 25 (1990) 249-61.

Barclay, J. M. G. "Paul and the Law: Observations on Some Recent Debates." *Themelios* 12 (1986) 5-15.

Barker, M. "Slippery Words: Apocalyptic." *ExpTim* 89 (1977-78) 324-29.

Barrett, C. K. "The Imperatival Participle." *ExpTim* 59 (1948) 165-66.

Barrosse, T. "Death and Sin in Romans." *CBQ* 15 (1953) 438-59.

Barth, M. "Traditions in Ephesians." *NTS* 30 (1984) 3-25.

Bauckham, R. "Pseudo-Apostolic Letters." *JBL* 107 (1988) 469-94.

Baumgarten, J. "*καινός, κτλ.*" *EDNT* 2 (1991) 229-32.

Beasley-Murray, G. R. "The Holy Spirit, Baptism, and the Body of Christ." *RExp* 63 (1966) 177-85.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Baptism." *DPL* (1993) 60-65.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dying and Rising with Christ." *DPL* (1993) 218-22.
- Behm, J. "ἔσω." *TDNT* 2 (1964) 698-99.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "καινός." *TDNT* 3 (1965) 447-54.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "νέος." *TDNT* 4 (1967) 896-901.
- Beker, J. C. "Contingency and Coherence in the Letters of Paul." *USQR* 33 (1978) 141-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Paul's Theology: Consistent or Inconsistent?" *NTS* 34 (1988) 364-77.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Paul the Theologian. Major Motifs in Pauline Theology." *Interp* 43 (1989) 352-65.
- Best, E. "Dead in Trespasses and Sins (Eph. 2:1)." *JSNT* 13 (1981) 9-25.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ephesians: Two Types of Existence." *Interp* 47 (1993) 39-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Who Used Whom? The Relationship of Ephesians and Colossians." *NTS* 43 (1997) 72-96.
- Black, C. C. "Pauline Perspectives on Death in Romans 5–8." *JBL* 103 (1984) 413-33.
- Black, D. A. "The Peculiarities of Ephesians and the Ephesian Address." *GTJ* 2:1 (1981) 59-73.
- Black, M. "The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam." *SJT* 7 (1954) 170-79.
- Bonnard, P. S. "Mourir et vivre avec Jesus Christ selon saint Paul." *RHPR* 36 (1956) 101-12.
- Bouttier, M. "Complexio Oppositorum: sur les Formules de 1 Cor. xii.13; Gal. iii.26-8; Col. iii.10,11." *NTS* 23 (1976-77) 1-19.
- Boyer, J. I. "The Classification of Infinitives: A Statistical Study." *GTJ* 6 (1985) 3-27.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Classification of Imperatives: A Statistical Study." *GTJ* 8 (1987) 35-54.
- Bradley, J. "The Religious Life-Setting of the Epistle to the Colossians." *StBibT* 2 (1972) 17-36.
- Brandenburger, E. "Cross (σταυρός)." *NIDNTT* 1 (1975) 391-403.
- Branick, V. P. "Apocalyptic Paul?" *CBQ* 47 (1985) 664-75.
- Bratcher, R. G. "The Meaning of SARX ("Flesh") in Paul's Letters." *BiTr* 29 (1978) 212-18.
- Bratsiotis, N. P. "ἴσ." *TDOT* 1 (1974) 222-35.

- Bray, G. "The Significance of God's Image in Man." *TynB* 42 (1991) 195-225.
- Briggs, F. J. "Ephesians 4:20-21." *ExpTim* 39 (1927-28) 526.
- Bromiley, G. W. "Psychology." *ISBE* 3 (1986) 1043-48.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sin." *ISBE* 4 (1988) 518-25.
- Brown, C., H. Vorlander and J. S. Wright. "Man (*άνήρ* and *άνθρωπος*)." *NIDNTT* 2 (1976) 562-72.
- Brown, R. B. "Ephesians Among the Letters of Paul." *RExp* 60 (1963) 373-79.
- Bruce, F. F. "St. Paul in Rome. 3. The Epistle to the Colossians." *BJRL* 48 (1966) 268-85.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "St. Paul in Rome. 4. The Epistle to the Ephesians." *BJRL* 49 (1967) 303-22.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The New Testament and Classical Studies." *NTS* 22 (1976) 229-42.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Romans Debate—Continued." *BJRL* 64 (1982) 334-59.
- Büchsel, F. "In Christus' bei Paulus," *ZNW* 42 (1949) 141-58.
- Bultmann, R. "Das Problem der Ethik bei Paulus." *ZNW* 23 (1924) 123-40.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "History and Eschatology in the New Testament." *NTS* 1 (1954) 5-16.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "*θάνατος, κτλ.*" *TDNT* 3 (1965) 7-25.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "*νεκρός, κτλ.*" *TDNT* 4 (1967) 892-95.
- Byrne, B. "Living Out the Righteousness of God: The Contribution of Rom. 6:1–8:13 to an Understanding of Paul's Ethical Presuppositions." *CBQ* 43 (1981) 557-81.
- Cadbury, H. J. "The Dilemma of Ephesians." *NTS* 5 (1959) 91-102.
- Campbell, D. A. "Unraveling Colossians 3:11b." *NTS* 42 (1996) 120-32.
- Campbell, W. S. "The Romans Debate." *JSNT* 10 (1981) 19-28.
- Canales, I. J. "Paul's Accusers in Rom. 3:8 and 6:1." *EvQ* 57 (1985) 237-46.
- Carlson, R. P. "The Role of Baptism in Paul's Thought." *Interp* 47 (1993) 255-66.
- Carson, D. A. "Pauline Inconsistency." *Churchman* 100 (1986) 6-45.
- Chambers, C. D. "On a Use of the Aorist Participle in Some Hellenistic Writers." *JTS* 23 (1922) 183-87.

- Chamblin, J. K. "Freedom/Liberty." *DPL* (1993) 313-16.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Psychology." *DPL* (1993) 765-75.
- Clark, D. K. "Interpreting the Biblical Words for the Self." *JPT* 18 (1990) 309-17.
- Clark, G. H. "The Image of God in Man." *JETS* 12 (1969) 215-22.
- Clines, D. J. A. "The Image of God in Man." *TynB* 19 (1968) 53-103.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Biblical Doctrine of Man." *JCBRF* 28 (1976) 9-38.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Image of God." *DPL* (1993) 426-28.
- Cocks, H. F. L. "Doctrine of Man: The Divine Image in Man." *ExpTim* 61 (1949-50) 43-46.
- Colijn, B. B. "Paul's Use of the 'in Christ' Formula." *ATHJ* 23 (1991) 9-26.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Three Tenses of Salvation in Paul's Letters." *ATHJ* 21 (1991) 29-41.
- Collins, J. J. "Jewish Apocalyptic against its Hellenistic Near Eastern Environment." *BASOR* 220 (1975) 27-36.
- Conn-Sherbock, D. "Paul and Rabbinic Exegesis." *SJT* 35 (1982) 117-32.
- Cook, R. R. "The Nature of Man—Has the Ghost In the Machine Finally Been Exorcised?" *VoxEv* 13 (1983) 67-77.
- Cook, S. A. "The Solidarity of the Group and Its God." *CAH* 3 (1929) 437.
- Cooper, E. J. "Sarx and Sin in Pauline Theology." *LTP* 29 (1973) 243-55.
- Coune, M. "Revêtir l'homme nouveau (Ep 4,23-28)." *AsSeign* 74 (1963) 16-32.
- Coutts, J. "The Relationship of Ephesians and Colossians." *NTS* 4 (1957-58) 201-07.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. "Romans 6:1-14 Revisited." *ExpTim* 106 (1994) 40-43.
- Cuvillier, E. "Évangile et traditions chez Paul. Lecture de Romains 6,1-14." *Hokhma* 45 (1990) 3-16.
- Dahl, N. A. "In What Sense Is the Baptized Person 'simul justus et peccator' according to the New Testament?" *LW* 9 (1962) 219-31.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Interpreting Ephesians: Then and Now." *CThM* 5 (1978) 133-43.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Gentiles, Christians, and Israelites in the Epistle to the Ephesians." *HTR* 79 (1986) 31-39.
- Davidson, J. E. "The Patterns of Salvation in Paul and in Palestinian Judaism." *JRelSt* 15 (1989) 99-118.

- Dellagiacomma, V. "Induere Christum." *RivBib* 4 (1956) 114-42.
- Delling, G. "καταργέω." *TDNT* 1 (1965) 452-54.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "καίρος." *TDNT* 3 (1965) 459-61.
- Dennison, W. D. "Indicative and Imperative: The Basic Structure of Pauline Ethics." *CTJ* 14 (1979) 55-78.
- Derrett, J. D. M. "New Creation: Qumran, Paul, the Church, and Jesus." *RevQ* 13 (1988) 597-608.
- Diaz, J. R. "Targum Palestinense y Nuevo Testamento." *NovT* 6 (1963) 75-80.
- Dockery, D. S. "An Outline of Paul's View of the Spiritual Life." *CThR* 3 (1989) 327-39.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "New Nature and Old Nature." *DPL* (1993) 628-29.
- Drane, J. W. "Theological Diversity in the Letters of St. Paul." *TynB* 27 (1976) 3-26.
- Dunn, J. D. G. "Rom. 7,14-25 in the Theology of Paul." *TZ* 31 (1975) 257-73.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Birth of a Metaphor—Baptized in Spirit." *ExpTim* 89 (1977-78) 134-38; 173-75.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Salvation Proclaimed VI: Romans 6:1-11: Dead and Alive." *ExpTim* 93 (1982) 259-64.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The New Perspective on Paul." *BJRL* 65 (1983) 95-122.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Romans, Letter to the." *DPL* (1993) 838-50.
- Eaches, O. P. "Paul's Use of the Term 'Man.'" *RExp* 5 (1908) 522-29.
- Easley, K. H. "The Pauline Usage of Pneumati as a Reference to the Spirit of God." *JETS* 27 (1984) 299-313.
- Easton, B. S. "New Testament Ethical Lists." *JBL* 51 (1932) 1-12.
- Eckert, J. "Die Taufe und das neue Leben: Rom 6:1-11 in Kontext der paulinischen Theologie." *MThZ* 38 (1987) 203-22.
- Erickson, R. J. "Flesh." *DPL* (1993) 303-306.
- Espy, J. M. "Paul's 'Robust Conscience' Re-examined." *NTS* 31 (1985) 161-88.
- Evans, C. A. "The Colossian Mystics." *Bib* 63 (1982) 188-205.
- Fasekas, L. "Taufe als Tod in Rom 6,3ff." *ThZ* 22 (1966) 305-18.
- Feinberg, C. L. "The Image of God." *BibSac* 129 (1972) 235-46.

- Feinberg, P. D. "Mind." *EDT* (1984) 718-20.
- Feine, P. "Epheser 2, 14-16." *TSK* 72 (1899) 540-74.
- Feuillet, A. "Mort du Christ et mort du chrétien d'après les épîtres pauliniennes." *RB* 66 (1959) 481-513.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Le règne de la mort et le règne de la vie (Rom V, 12-21)," *RB* 77 (1970) 481-521.
- Flusser, D. "The Dualism of 'Flesh and Spirit' in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament." *Tarb* 27 (1958) 158-65.
- Foerster, W. "κτίζω." *TDNT* 3 (1965) 1028-35.
- Fraine, J. de. "Adam and Christ as Corporate Personalities." *TD* 10 (1962) 99-102.
- Frid, B. "Römer 6,4-5, *Εἰς τὸν θάνατον* und τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ als Schlüssel zu Duktus und Gedenkengang in Röm 6,1-11." *BZ* 30 (1986) 188-203.
- Fryer, N. S. L. "Reconciliation in Paul's Epistle to the Romans," *Neotest* 15 (1981) 34-68.
- Furnish, V. P. "Development in Paul's Thought." *JAAR* 38 (1970) 289-303.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "On Putting Paul In His Place." *JBL* 113 (1994) 3-17.
- Gachter, P. "Zur Exegese von Rom 6.5." *ZKTh* 54 (1930) 88-92.
- Gardner, P. D. "Circumcised in baptism--raised through faith: a note on Col. 2:11-12." *WTJ* 45 (1983) 172-77.
- Gasque, W. W. "Images of Paul in the History of Biblical Interpretation." *Crux* 16 (1980) 7-16.
- Getty, M. A. "An Apocalyptic Perspective on Rom 10:4." *HBT* 4-5 (1982-83) 79-131.
- Giavini, G. "La structure littéraire d'Eph. 2:11-22." *NTS* 16 (1969-70) 209-11.
- Glasson, T. F. "Dying and Rising with Christ." *LQHR* Sixth Series 30 (1961) 286-91.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Schweitzer's Influence—Blessing or Bane?" *JTS* 28 (1977) 289-302.
- Godsey, J. D. "The Interpretation of Romans in the History of the Christian Faith." *Interp* 34 (1980) 3-16.
- Grant, R. M. "The Anthropology of St. Paul." *ATHR* 22 (1940) 199-203.
- Grässer, E. "Kol 3,1-4 als Beispiel einer Interpretation secundum homines recipientes," *ZThK* 64 (1967) 139-68.
- Grundmann, W. "ἁμαρτάνω. Sin in the New Testament." *TDNT* 1 (1964) 302-16.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "σύν / μετά, κτλ." *TDNT* 7 (1971) 766-97.
- Gundry, R. H. "Grace, Works, and Staying Saved in Paul." *Bib* 66 (1985) 1-38.
- Günther, W. "Sin (ἁμαρτία)." *NIDNTT* 3 (1978) 577-83.
- Haarbeck, H. "Old (πάλαι)." *NIDNTT* 2 (1976) 713-16.
- Hafemann, S. J. "Paul and His Interpreters." *DPL* (1993) 666-79.
- Hagner, D. A. "Paul and Judaism. The Jewish Matrix of Early Christianity: Issues in the Current Debate." *BBR* 3 (1993) 111-30.
- Hale, C. B. "The Meaning of 'In Christ' in the Greek New Testament." *NOT* 52 (1974) 1-49.
- Hansen, P. V. "Det nye Menneske." *DTT* 13 (1950) 192-202.
- Harrisville, R. A. "The Concept of Newness in the New Testament." *JBL* 74 (1955) 69-79.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Is the Coexistence of the Old and New Man Biblical?" *LuthQ* 8 (1956) 20-32.
- Hartman, L. "'Into the Name of Jesus.'" *NTS* 20 (1974) 432-40.
- Harvey, J. D. "The 'With Christ' Motif in Paul's Thought." *JETS* 35 (1992) 329-40.
- Hauck, F. "κοινός, κοινωνός." *TDNT* 3 (1965) 804-09, 820-25.
- Hoch, C. B. "The Significance of the Syn-compounds for Jew-Gentile Relationships in the Body of Christ." *JETS* 25 (1982) 175-83.
- Hoekema, A. A. "The Struggle Between Old and New Natures In the Converted Man." *BETS* 5 (1962) 42-50.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Already, not yet: Christian living in tension." *RefJ* 29 (1979) 15-18.
- Horsley, R. A. "Pneumatikos vs. Psychikos: Distinctions of Spiritual Status Among the Corinthians." *HTR* 69 (1976) 270-73.
- Horst, J. "μέλος." *TDNT* 4 (1967) 555-68.
- Howard, J. K. "Into Christ: a study of the Pauline concept of baptismal union." *ExpTim* 79 (1968) 147-51.
- Howard, R. E. "Some Modern Interpretations of the Pauline Indicative and Imperative." *WThJ* 11 (1976) 38-48.
- Howard, W. F. "On the Futuristic Use of the Aorist Participle in Hellenistic Greek." *JTS* 24 (1923) 403-06.



- Hübner, H. "Pauli Theologiae Proprium." *NTS* 26 (1979-80) 445-473.
- Jacoby, J. C. "An Exegetical Study of Rom. 6:1-6." *LuthQ* 39 (1909) 582-92.
- Jensen, J. "Does *Porneia* Mean Fornication? A Critique of Bruce Malina." *NovT* 20 (1978) 161-84.
- Jeremias, J. "ἄνθρωπος, ἀνθρώπινος." *TDNT* 1 (1964) 364-67.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Adam." *TDNT* 1 (1964) 141-43.
- Jewett, R. "Major Impulses In the Theological Interpretation of Romans Since Barth." *Interp* 34 (1980) 17-31.
- Johnson, S. L. "Christian Apparel. Studies in the Epistle to the Colossians." *BibSac* 121 (1964) 22-33.
- Joüon, P. "Note sur Colossiens III, 5-11." *RSR* 26 (1936) 185-89.
- Karlberg, M. W. "Israel's History Personified: Romans 7:7-13 in Relation to Paul's Teaching on the 'Old Man.'" *TrinJ NS* 7 (1986) 65-74.
- Kaufmann, P. "The One and the Many: Corporate Personality in the Old Testament and Paul." *Worship* 42 (1968) 546-58.
- Keck, L. E. "Paul and Apocalyptic Theology." *Interp* 38 (1984) 229-41.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Rethinking 'New Testament Ethics.'" *JBL* 115 (1996) 3-16.
- Kilner, J. F. "A Pauline Approach to Ethical Decision-making." *Interp* 43 (1989) 366-79.
- Klaar, E. "Rom 6:7: Ho gar apothanōn dedikaiōtai apo tēs hamartias." *ZNW* 30 (1931) 131-34.
- Klug, E. F. "The Doctrine of Man: Christian Anthropology." *CTQ* 48 (1984) 141-52.
- Kourie, C. E. T. "'In Christ' and Related Expressions in Paul." *ThEv* 20 (1987) 33-43.
- Kraftchick, S. J. "Creation Themes in Pauline Literature." *ExAu* 3 (1987) 72-87.
- Kreitzer, L. J. "Adam as Analogy: Help or Hindrance?" *NBl* 70 (1989) 341-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Christ and Second Adam in Paul." *CV* 32 (1989) 55-101.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Adam and Christ." *DPL* (1993) 9-15.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Body." *DPL* (1993) 71-76.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Eschatology." *DPL* (1993) 253-69.
- Kruse, C. G. "Virtues and Vices." *DPL* (1993) 962-63.

- Kuhn, K. G. "Rom 6:7, ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανῶν δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας." *ZNW* 59 (1968) 305-10.
- Laeuchli, S. "Monism and Dualism in the Pauline Anthropology." *BR* 3 (1958) 15-27.
- Lambrecht, J. "Man Before and Without Christ: Rom. 7 and Pauline Anthropology." *LouvSt* 5 (1974) 18-33.
- Lampe, G. W. H. "The Evidence in the New Testament for Early Creeds, Catechisms and Liturgy." *ExpTim* 71 (1959-60) 359-63.
- Langevin, P. E. "Le baptême dans la mort-résurrection. Exégèse de Rm. 6,1-5." *ScEc* 17 (1965) 29-65.
- Lattey, C. "Vicarious Solidarity in the Old Testament." *VT* 1 (1951) 267-74.
- Lea, T. D. "The Early Christian View of Pseudepigraphic Writings." *JETS* 27 (1984) 65-75.
- Légasse, S. "Être baptisé dans la mort du Christ. Étude de Romains 6, 1-14." *RB* 98 (1991) 544-59.
- Lemcio, E. E. "Ephesus and the NT Canon." *BJRL* 69 (1986) 210-34.
- Lester-Garland, L. V. "Sequence of Thought in the Pauline Epistles." *Theol* 33 (1936) 228-38.
- Levison, J. R. "2 Apoc. Bar 48:42-52:7 and the Apocalyptic Dimension of Col. 3:1-6." *JBL* 108 (1989) 93-108.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Creation and New Creation." *DPL* (1993) 189-90.
- Lincoln, A. T. "The Use of the OT in Ephesians." *JSNT* 14 (1982) 16-57.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Church and Israel in Ephesians 2." *CBQ* 49 (1987) 605-24.
- Lofthouse, W. F. "Singular and Plural in St. Paul's Letters." *ExpTim* 58 (1946-47) 179-82.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'I' and 'We' in the Pauline Letters." *ExpTim* 64 (1953) 241-45.
- Lombard, H. A. "The Adam-Christ 'Typology' in Romans 5:12-21." *Neotest* 15 (1981) 69-100.
- Longenecker, R. N. "Old Man." *ZPEB* 4 (1975) 518.
- Louw, J. "On Greek Prohibitions," *AC* 2 (1959) 43-57.
- Lowe, J. "An Examination of Attempts to Detect Development in St. Paul's Theology." *JTS* 42 (1941) 129-42.

- Luciani, D. "Paul et la Loi." *NRT* 115 (1993) 40-68.
- Lührmann, D. "Neutestamentlichen Haustafeln und Antike Ökonomie." *NTS* 27 (1980-81) 83-97.
- MacGregor, G. H. C. "Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought." *NTS* 1 (1954-55) 17-28.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Concept of the Wrath of God in the New Testament." *NTS* 7 (1960-61) 101-109.
- MacLeod, D. "Paul's Use of the Term 'The Old Man.'" *BanT* 92 (1971) 13-19.
- Maddox, R. "The Use of the Aorist Tense in Holiness Exegesis." *WThJ* 16 (1981) 106-18.
- Malherbe, A. J. "*MN ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ* in the Diatribe and Paul." *HTR* 73 (1980) 231-40.
- Malina, B. "Does *Porneia* Mean Fornication?" *NovT* 14 (1972) 10-17.
- Marcus, J. "The Evil Inclination in the Letters of Paul." *IBSt* 8 (1986) 8-21.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Let God Arise and End the Reign of Sin! A Contribution to the Study of Pauline Parenthesis." *Bib* 69 (1988) 386-95.
- Marshall, G. "Some Implications of Pauline Anthropology." *VoxEv* 17 (1987) 23-34.
- Marshall, I. H. "Palestinian and Hellenistic Christianity: Some Critical Comments." *NTS* 19 (1972-73) 271-87.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Slippery Words: Eschatology." *ExpTim* 89 (1977-78) 264-69.
- Martin, R. P. "An Epistle In Search of a Life Setting." *ExpTim* 79 (1968) 296-302.
- Martyn, J. L. "Apocalyptic Antinomies in Paul's Letter to the Galatians." *NTS* 31 (1985) 410-24.
- Matsuda, L. "Personification in Paul's Letters." *NOT* 105 (1985) 19-33.
- Matthias, W. "Der alte und der neue Mensch in der Anthropologie des Paulus." *EvTh* 17/18 (1957) 385-97.
- Maurer, C. "*πρᾶξις*." *TDNT* 6 (1968) 642-44.
- Mauser, U. "Paul the Theologian," *HBT* 11 (1989) 80-106.
- McDonald, H. D. "Man, Doctrine of." *EDT* (1984) 676-80.
- McEleney, N. J. "Conversion, Circumcision and the Law," *NTS* 20 (1974) 319-41.
- McGrath, B. "Syn-Words in Paul." *CBQ* 14 (1952) 219-26.

- McKay, K. L. "Aspect in Imperatival Constructions in New Testament Greek." *NovT* 27 (1985) 201-26.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Time and Aspect in New Testament Greek." *NovT* 34 (1992) 209-28.
- Meechum, H. G. "The Use of the Participle for the Imperative in the New Testament." *ExpTim* 58 (1946-47) 207-08.
- Meeks, W. A. "The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of A Symbol in Earliest Christianity." *HR* 13 (1974) 165-208.
- Merk, O. "Paulus-Forschung 1936-1985." *ThR* 53 (1988) 1-81.
- Merklein, H. "Zur Tradition und Komposition von Eph 2,14-18." *BZ* 17 (1973) 79-102.
- Metzger, B. M. "Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha." *JBL* 91 (1972) 5-12.
- Meyer, R. "σάρξ, κτλ." *TDNT* 7 (1971) 109-18.
- Mezzacasa, F. "El hombre nuevo." *RivBib* 36 (1974) 1-16.
- Monte, W. D. "The Place of Jesus' Death and Resurrection in Pauline Soteriology." *StBibT* 16 (1988) 39-98.
- Moo, D. J. "Exegetical Notes: Romans 6:1-14." *TrinJ* NS 3 (1982) 215-20.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Paul and the Law in the Last Ten Years." *SJT* 40 (1987) 287-307.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'Law,' 'Works of the Law,' and Legalism in Paul." *WTJ* 45 (1983) 73-100.
- Moore, H. "Paul and Apocalyptic." *IBSt* 9 (1987) 35-46.
- Moore, M. S. "Ephesians 2:14-16: A History of Recent Interpretation." *EvQ* 54 (1982) 163-68.
- Morgan, F. A. "Romans 6,5a: United To A Death Like Christ's." *ETHL* 59 (1983) 267-302.
- Morris, L. "Sin, Guilt." *DPL* (1993) 877-881.
- Motyer, S. "Inner Man." *EDT* (1984) 562.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Man, Old and New." *EDT* (1984) 680-81.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "New Creation, New Creature." *EDT* (1984) 759-60.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Outward Man." *EDT* (1984) 810.
- Moule, C. F. D. "'The New Life' in Colossians 3:1-17." *RExp* 70 (1973) 481-93.

- Murray, J. "Definitive Sanctification." *CTJ* 2 (1967) 5-21.
- Nauck, W. "Das *οὐν*-paräneticum." *ZNW* 49 (1958) 134-35.
- Neary, M. "Creation and Pauline Soteriology." *IThQ* 50 (1983-84) 1-34.
- Nelson, W. R. "Pauline Anthropology. Its Relation to Christ and His Church." *Interp* 14 (1960) 14-27.
- Neugebauer, F. "Das Paulinische 'en Christō.'" *NTS* 4 (1957-58) 124-38.
- Neusner, J. "Comparing Judaisms." *HRel* 18 (1978-79) 177-91.
- Noll, S. F. "Qumran and Paul." *DPL* (1993) 777-83.
- O'Brien, P. T. "Colossians, Letter to the." *DPL* (1993) 147-53.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Mysticism." *DPL* (1993) 623-25.
- Oepke, A. "*άνήρ, άνδρίζομαι*." *TDNT* 1 (1964) 360-63.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "*δύω, κτλ*." *TDNT* 2 (1964) 318-21.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "*έν*." *TDNT* 2 (1964) 537-43.
- Osei-Bonsu, J. "Anthropological Dualisms in the New Testament." *SJT* 40 (1987) 571-90.
- Oudersluys, R. C. "Paul's Use of the Adam Typology." *RefR* 13 (1960) 3-12.
- Packer, J. I. "'Keswick' and the Reformed Doctrine of Sanctification." *EvQ* 27 (1955) 153-67.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Abolish, etc. (*καταργέω*)." *NIDNTT* 1 (1975) 73.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Old Nature, Old Self." *ISBE* 3 (1986) 587.
- Parsons, M. "The New Creation." *ExpTim* 99 (1987) 3-4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'In Christ' in Paul." *VoxEv* 18 (1988) 25-44.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Being Precedes Act: Indicative and Imperative in Paul's Writing." *EvQ* 88 (1988) 99-127.
- Patzia, A. G. "The Deutero-Pauline Hypothesis: An Attempt at Clarification." *EvQ* 52 (1980) 27-42.
- Peake, A. S. "The Quintessence of Paulinism." *BJRL* 4 (1917-18) 285-311.
- Pelser, G. M. M. "The Objective Reality of the Renewal of Life in Romans 6:1-11." *Neotest* 15 (1981) 101-17.

- Percy, E. "Zu den Problemen des Kolosser- und Epheserbriefes." *ZNW* 43 (1950-51) 178-94.
- Perkins, P. "Pauline Anthropology in the Light of Nag Hammadi." *CBQ* 48 (1986) 512-22.
- Pinnock, C. H. "The Structure of Pauline Eschatology." *EvQ* 37 (1965) 9-20.
- Piper, J. "The Image of God: An Approach from Biblical and Systematic Theology." *StBibT* 1 (1971) 15-32.
- Plevnik, J. "The Center of Pauline Theology." *CBQ* 51 (1989) 461-78.
- Polhill, J. B. "The Relationship Between Ephesians and Colossians." *RExp* 70 (1973) 439-50.
- Porter, J. R. "The Legal Aspects of the Concept of 'Corporate Personality' in the Old Testament." *VT* 15 (1965) 361-80.
- Porter, S. E. "Two Myths: Corporate Personality and Language/Mentality Determinism." *SJT* 43 (1990) 289-307.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "P. Oxy. 744.4 and Colossians 3.9." *Bib* 73 (1992) 565-67.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Holiness, Sanctification." *DPL* (1993) 397-402.
- Pratt, D. M. "Old Man." *ISBE* 4 (1939) 2183.
- Ramaroson, L. "'Le Christ, notre paix' (Ep 2,14-18)." *ScEs* 31 (1979) 373-82.
- Reed, J. T. "Indicative and Imperative in Rom 6, 21-22." *Bib* 74 (1993) 244-57.
- Rey, B. "L'homme nouveau d'après S. Paul. Exégèse de Rm. 6, 4-11; Col. 3, 5-15; Ep. 2,11-22; Ep. 4,22-24." *RSPR* 48/49 (1964) 603-29, 161-95.
- Roberts, J. H. "The Enigma of Ephesians." *Neotest* 27 (1993) 93-106.
- Roetzel, C. J. "Jewish Christian-Gentile Christian Relations: A Discussion of Ephesians 2,15a." *ZNW* 74 (1983) 81-89.
- Rogerson, J. W. "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality: A Re-examination." *JTS* 21 (1970) 1-31.
- Rollins, W. G. "The New Testament and Apocalyptic." *NTS* 17 (1970-71) 454-76.
- Rowley, H. H. "Jewish Proselyte Baptism and the Baptism of John." *HUCA* 15 (1940) 313-34.
- Sahlin, H. "'Die Beschneidung Christi': Eine Interpretation von Eph 2,11-22." *SymBU* 12 (1950) 5-22.

- Salom, A. P. "The Imperative Use of the Participle in the New Testament." *ABR* 11 (1963) 41-49.
- Sand, A. "ἄνθρωπος, ου, ό." *EDNT* 1 (1990) 100-104.
- Sanders, E. P. "Literary Dependence in Colossians." *JBL* 85 (1966) 28-45.
- Sanders, J. T. "Hymnic Elements in Ephesians 1-3." *ZNW* 56 (1965) 214-32.
- Schmithals, W. "Death (θάνατος)." *NIDNTT* 1 (1975) 430-41.
- Schneider, G. "νέος, κτλ." *EDNT* 2 (1991) 462-63.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "παλαιός." *EDNT* 3 (1991) 7-8.
- Schneider, J. "ὅμοιος." *TDNT* 5 (1954) 191-2.
- Schrage, W. "Zur Ethik der neutestamentlichen Haustafeln." *NTS* 21 (1974-75) 1-22.
- Schroeder, D. "Lists, Ethical." *IDBSup* (1976) 546-47.
- Schutz, H. G. "Body, Member, Limb (μέλος)." *NIDNTT* 1 (1975) 229-32.
- Schweizer, E. "Dying and Rising with Christ." *NTS* 14 (1967-68) 1-14.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "πνεῦμα, πνευματικός." *TDNT* 6 (1968) 332-455.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "σάρξ, κτλ." *TDNT* 7 (1971) 98-151.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "σῶμα, κτλ." *TDNT* 7 (1971) 1024-94.
- Scott, C. A. "Ephesians IV.21: 'As the truth is in Jesus.'" *Expositor*, 8th Series, III (1912) 178-85.
- Scott, J. J., Jr. "Life and Death." *DPL* (1993) 553-55.
- Scroggs, R. "Romans 6:7. ho gar apothanōn dedikaiōtai apo tēs hamartias." *NTS* 10 (1963) 104-08.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and K. I. Groff. "Baptism in Mark: Dying and Rising with Christ." *JBL* 92 (1973) 531-48.
- Seebass, H. "Flesh (σάρξ)." *NIDNTT* 1 (1975) 671-82.
- Seesemann, H. "πάλαι, κτλ." *TDNT* 5 (1967) 716-20.
- Seifrid, M. A. "In Christ." *DPL* (1993) 433-36.
- Seitz, O. J. F. "Two Spirits in Man: An Essay in Biblical Exegesis." *NTS* 6 (1959-60) 82-95.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lists, Ethical." *IDB* 3 (1962) 137-39.

- Simpson, J. W., Jr. "Spiritual; Spiritually." *ISBE* 4 (1988) 601-02.
- Sjöberg, E. "Wiedergeburt and Neuschöpfung im palästinensischen Judentum." *StTh* 4 (1950) 44-85.
- Smith, D. C. "The Two Made One: Some Observations on Eph. 2:14-18." *OJRS* 1 (1973) 34-54.
- Smith, J. Z. "The Garments of Shame." *HR* 5 (1965) 217-38.
- Stagg, F. "The Abused Aorist." *JBL* 91 (1972) 222-31.
- Stählin, G. "ἀμαρτάνω, κτλ. Linguistic Usage and History." *TDNT* 1 (1964) 293-96.
- Stegemann, E. "Alt und Neu bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen (Kol-Eph)." *EvTh* 37 (1977) 508-36.
- Stendahl, K. "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West." *HTR* 56 (1963) 199-215.
- Stout, J. C. "Paul's Use of καταργέω." *BR* 2 (1917) 447-52.
- Strecker, G. "Indicative and Imperative According to Paul." *ABR* 35 (1987) 60-72.
- Stuhlmacher, P. "Erwägungen zum ontologischen Charakter der kaine ktisis bei Paulus." *EvTh* 27 (1967) 1-35.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Gospel of Reconciliation in Christ—Basic Features and Issues of a Biblical Theology of the New Testament." *HBT* 1 (1979) 161-90.
- Theron, D. J. "Αλήθεια in the Pauline Corpus." *EvQ* 26 (1954) 3-18.
- Thiselton, A. C. "Flesh (σάρξ)." *NIDNTT* 1 (1975) 671-82.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Schweitzer's Interpretation of Paul." *ExpTim* 90 (1978-79) 132-37.
- Turner, G. A. "'Shall We Continue in Sin?' An Exposition of Romans Six." *AsbSem* 29 (1974) 21-28.
- Van der Horst, P. W. "Observations on a Pauline Expression." *NTS* 19 (1973) 181-87.
- Venetz, H.-J. "Christus anziehen." *FZPhTh* 20 (1973) 3-36.
- Von Soden, H. "Die Ethik des Paulus." *ZThK* 2 (1892) 140-48.
- Vorländer, H. "Man (ἄνθρωπος)." *NIDNTT* 2 (1976) 564-67.
- Wadkins, T. H. "Christian Holiness: Positional, Progressive, and Practical. Martin Luther's View of Sanctification." *TrinJ* 7 (1978) 57-66.
- Wansbrough, H. "Corporate Personality in the Bible. Adam and Christ – a biblical use of the concept of personality." *NBl* 50 (1969) 798-804.



- Webb, R. A. "Man, Natural" and "Man, New." *ISBE* 3 (1929) 1974-75.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and J. I. Packer. "New Nature." *ISBE* 3 (1986) 528.
- Wedderburn, A. J. M. "Hellenistic Christian Traditions in Romans 6?" *NTS* 29 (1983) 337-55.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Some Observations on Paul's Use of the Phrases 'in Christ' and 'with Christ.'" *JSNT* 25 (1985) 83-97.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Soteriology of the Mysteries and Pauline Baptismal Theology." *NovT* 29 (1987) 53-72.
- Wessels, G. F. "The Eschatology of Colossians and Ephesians." *Neotest* 21 (1987) 183-202.
- Westerholm, S. "*Torah, nomos*, and law: A Question of 'Meaning.'" *SR* 15 (1986) 327-36.
- Wibbing, S. "Body ( $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ )." *NIDNTT* 1 (1975) 232-38.
- Wilson, S. G. "New Wine in Old Wineskins: IX. Image of God." *ExpTim* 85 (1973-74) 356-61.
- Windisch, H. "Das Problem des paulinischen Imperativs." *ZNW* 23 (1924) 265-81.
- Wright, N. T. "The Paul of History and the Apostle of Faith." *TynB* 29 (1978) 61-88.
- Wuest, K. S. "Victory over Indwelling Sin in Romans Six." *BibSac* 116 (1959) 43-50.
- Ziesler, J. A. "Anthropology of Hope." *ExpTim* 90 (1978/79) 104-09.
- Zurcher, J. R. "The Christian View of Man: I." *AUSS* 2 (1964) 156-68; II. *AUSS* 3 (1965) 66-83; III. *AUSS* 4 (1966) 89-103.

