

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

6-1-1956

Paul's Baptismal Theology with Special Reference to Rom. 6

Walter Keller

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Keller, Walter, "Paul's Baptismal Theology with Special Reference to Rom. 6" (1956). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 158.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/158>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

51794

PAUL'S BAPTISMAL THEOLOGY
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO ROM. 6

A thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of New Testament Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

by
Walter E. Keller

May 1956

Approved by:

Victor Bartling
Advisor

Martin H. Franzmann
Reader

51794

BV
4070
C69
M3
1956
no. 4
c. 2

51794

CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter | Page |
|--|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. PARALLELS IN THE PAULINE CONCEPTION TO THAT OF THE REST OF EARLY CHRISTENDOM | 4 |
| Baptism as a Washing of Purification | 4 |
| Baptism as a Washing of Regeneration | 11 |
| Baptism as That by Which We Become Christ's Possession | 15 |
| Baptism as Incorporation into the Body of Christ | 22 |
| III. PAUL'S UNIQUE CONTRIBUTION TO THE UNDERSTANDING OF BAPTISM AS A REDEMPTIVE EVENT <i>ΕΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΩ</i> | 27 |
| The <u>Locus Classicus</u> : Rom. 6:1-11 | 27 |
| Rom. 6:5 More Closely Examined | 46 |
| <i>σύνφυσος</i> | 47 |
| <i>ὁμοίωμα</i> | 50 |
| The Verse as a Whole | 52 |
| The Significance of <i>συνεσταυρωθήναι</i> , Rom. 6:6 | 60 |
| Related Texts | 62 |
| IV. MISCELLANEOUS BAPTISMAL REFERENCES | 77 |
| V. THE THEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF BAPTISM | 86 |
| Baptism as a Means of Grace | 86 |
| Christ's Redemptive Act as the Foundation of Baptism | 90 |
| Baptism and Faith as Receptive Organs | 95 |
| The Understanding of Baptism as a Sacramental Dying and Rising with Christ | 102 |
| The Mystery Religions | 103 |
| Casel's "Mysteriongegenwart" | 106 |
| Hahn's "Gleichzeitigkeit" | 109 |
| The Limits Within Which the Solution is to be Sought | 113 |
| The Ethical Thrust of Baptism | 120 |
| Baptism in its Eschatological Aspect | 124 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 127 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The soil from which the seed of this thesis has grown is the writer's Bachelor of Divinity thesis, in which the attempt was made to uncover the theological relationship between the baptism of John and Christian baptism. At that time it became quite apparent that an exegetical study of the New Testament baptismal references was by no means without its complexities. This became all the more apparent when it was discovered that Christ's historical death and resurrection constituted the basic difference which distinguished them from one another, a feature which lies at the very heart of Paul's unique description of baptism in Rom. 6:1-11. The original intention was then to undertake an exegetical investigation of this passage. However, it soon became obvious that, to understand the thought of the Apostle, it is impossible to confine one's study to a single passage. And so, though the original intention continued to remain the foremost concern, the problem assumed a broader scope, as the title of the thesis indicates. Very naturally therefore, references to baptismal sayings outside the Pauline corpus lie outside the scope of this thesis, inasmuch as the purpose of the investigation is to ascertain the mind of Paul with regard to this sacrament. Whenever they occur, they

are introduced merely as a point of departure or as corroborating evidence. It was primarily the Acts of the Apostles that was used for this purpose.

The primary interest throughout is a theological one. Historical questions receive only a passing nod of acquaintance. The Pastoral Epistles and the Epistle to the Ephesians are unblushingly assigned to the Pauline corpus. The Greek text on which this investigation is based is that adopted by Nestle.¹ Textual variants in the passages examined were found to be of insufficient importance to warrant any discussion of them. The method follows the traditional pattern of exegesis by using lexicographical aids, words studies, parallel passages, and the witness of men whose works have accorded them a place of recognition in the world of scholarship. Among these latter particular acknowledgement is hereby given to Rudolph Schnackenburg, whose penetrating insights have given this thesis the direction it has taken.²

Chapter II examines those passages which speak of baptism as mediating the forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. These blessings make of baptism a significant principle for the unity of the Church. But they are

¹Eberhard Nestle, editor, Novum Testamentum Graece (Nineteenth edition; Stuttgart: Priv. Wuertt. Bibelanstalt, 1949).

²Rudolph Schnackenburg, Das Heilsgeschehen bei der Taufe nach dem Apostel Paulus (München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1950).

that only because the foundation of baptism is the redemptive work of Christ. For the specific relationship between Christ and the baptized Christian chapter III turns to Romans 6 and the passages suggested by the concept of dying and rising with Christ. Chapter IV briefly includes for the sake of completeness a glance at the remaining baptismal references in the Pauline corpus. The final chapter attempts to draw the significant theological conclusions under the headings listed in the table of contents.

The propriety of considering βαπτίζω a baptismal reference is collected by comparing its use in Acts 22:16, the only other New Testament passage in which it occurs, that implies an uncomprehensive act of incorporation into the Church in view from Acts 2:41. The addition of evidence, especially from the Septuagint, is clearly riddle, and Paul states that he describes baptism in the passive voice.

The propriety of considering βαπτίζω a baptismal reference is collected by comparing its use in Acts 22:16, the only other New Testament passage in which it occurs, that implies an uncomprehensive act of incorporation into the Church in view from Acts 2:41. The addition of evidence, especially from the Septuagint, is clearly riddle, and Paul states that he describes baptism in the passive voice.

This text, the text of a letter, simply reproduces the original text of the Lutheran dogmatism expressed by materialism. It is a text that refers to the use and application of water. Cf. *Die Lutherische Dogmatik* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1933), III, 238.

St. Louis, Mo., U.S.A. 1933.

Salvador Gualter, *Die Lutherische Dogmatik* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1933), III, 238.

CHAPTER II

PARALLELS IN THE PAULINE CONCEPTION TO THAT OF THE REST OF EARLY CHRISTENDOM

Baptism as a Washing of Purification

One of the passages in which Paul most explicitly bases his teaching on the "material" of baptism¹ is 1 Cor. 6:11. It can be disputed whether ἀπελούσασθε refers to baptism, chiefly on two grounds. The word λούεσθαι is in the Septuagint a terminus technicus for ritual washings, and could therefore be a simple metaphor for purification from sin.² Secondly, ἀπελούσασθε is clearly middle, and Paul otherwise describes baptism in the passive voice.

The propriety of considering ἀπελούσασθε a baptismal reference is validated by comparing its use in Acts 22:16, the only other New Testament passage in which it occurs.³ That baptism is the comprehensive act of incorporation into the Church is seen from Acts 2:41. The addition of ἀπόλουσαι,

¹This term, for want of a better, simply reproduces in English what the Lutheran dogmaticians expressed by materiale Baptismi when they referred to the use and application of water. Cf. Francis Pieper, Christian Dogmatics (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1953), III, 256.

²E.g., Lev. 8:6; 11:40.

³Alfred Schmoller, Handkonkordanz zum Griechischen Neuen Testament (Tenth edition; Stuttgart: Privileg. wuertt. Bibelanstalt, 1953), p. 58.

in accordance with its meaning, gives a graphic description of the effect resulting from baptism: a washing away of sin. Again, the fact that this washing occurs ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ demonstrates quite conclusively that baptism is meant.⁴

Though ἀπελούσασθε occurs in the middle, it does not set man's act in opposition to God's. The comment of Robertson and Plummer may be entirely correct: "Their seeking baptism was their own act, and they entered the water as voluntary agents."⁵ But any synergistic inference is illegitimately drawn in view of the two passives which follow, which emphasize God's activity. Hence the words of Bachmann are entirely appropriate:

. . . das Medium [weist] auf die Selbsttätigkeit, welche im Empfang der Taufe enthalten ist. Dieselbe wurzelt aber ihrer Natur nach in der gläubigen Hin- nahme der von Gott ausgehenden Wirkung.⁶

It should also be mentioned in passing that the aorists of these three verbs argue for a once-for-all, decisive event

⁴Cf. Hans Lietzmann, "An die Korinther I.II," Handbuch zum Neuen Testament (Tübingen: Verlag J. C. B. Mohr, 1949), IX, 26.

⁵Archibald A. Robertson and Alfred Plummer, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians," The International Critical Commentary (Second edition; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1914), p. 119.

⁶Philipp Bachmann, "Der Erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther," Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, herausgegeben von Theodor Zahn (Leipzig and Erlangen: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1921), VII, 234.

in the past, and therefore again point to baptism.

The washing of baptism is paralleled with ἡγιάσθητε and δικαιώθητε. These are simultaneous acts of God's grace effected in the past, but with obvious significance for the present.⁷ In view of this circumstance and in view of the context, ἡγιάσθητε especially ought not to be confused with the meaning of the ecclesiastical term "sanctification" in the sense of daily renewal. In a context where Paul addresses himself to former grossly immoral people (vv. 9-10), it is probably more accurate to understand it in the sense of "consecrated, set apart," (cf. 1:2), so that it becomes practically synonymous with δικαιώθητε. Both preserve their own picture, however. In contrast to the life they once lived, they have now, since the time of their baptism, been set apart from that kind of life. In contrast to their former life as ἄδικοι (v. 9), they have now, since the time of their baptism, been declared δίκαιοι. In either case though, Paul calls them to the remembrance of the change which God has effected in them. This passage does not state that these acts of God were performed in baptism, but simply says that the washing of baptism, consecration, and justification are all synchronous and are essentially the same act

⁷Cf. Adolph Schlatter, Paulus der Bote Jesu: Eine Deutung seiner Briefe an die Korinther (Stuttgart: Calver Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1934), pp. 196-197: "Waschung, Heiligung, Rechtfertigung sind nicht drei voneinander trennbare Vorgänge, sondern sind dieselbe Gottestat, durch die ihr früherer Zustand beseitigt worden sind."

of God. Other passages will have to clarify the relation of baptism to these acts.

Before leaving this passage, it must yet be noted that the washing-consecration-justification occurs in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God. Paul does not think of baptism apart from the Name of Christ or without the Holy Spirit. These are essential in his understanding of baptism and give it a continual Trinitarian overtone.

The other passage in which Paul thinks of baptism as a washing of purification is Eph. 5:26-27. Baptism is not expressly mentioned, but the term $\tau\hat{\omega}$ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος can refer to nothing else, especially when the cleansing it effects ($\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\varsigma$) is joined to Christ's act of consecrating the Church. Christ's love and Self-sacrifice for the Church have an immediate purpose (ἵνα, v. 26): that He might consecrate the Church, that is, set it apart. He does this by cleansing the Church. The aorist participle ($\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\varsigma$) may denote either a contemporaneous act,⁸ or antecedent action. If the latter alternative were pressed, it would make an even stronger case for the instrumentality of baptism for consecration. However, it is probably safer to

⁸So E. F. Westcott, St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians (London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1906), p. 84.

conclude with Abbott: "Logically, καθαρίξεν precedes ἀγιάζειν, chronologically they are coincident."⁹ It is interesting that he quotes 1 Cor. 6:11 in support of his statement. The cleansing which Christ affords the Church is accomplished by the washing of water. The fact that the definite article (τῷ) is joined to λουτρῷ speaks eloquently for it as a baptismal reference. The genitive (τοῦ ὕδατος) is genitivus materiae. The ῥῆμα, on the basis of which and by whose power the cleansing is effective (ἐν),¹⁰ is the same as that to which Paul refers in Eph. 6:17. The word ῥῆμα seems for Paul to mean a word proceeding directly or indirectly from God.¹¹ This would preclude the view held by men like Scott.¹²

With v. 27 an exegetical problem arises with the two ἴδι-

⁹J. K. Abbott, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians," The International Critical Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905), p. 168.

¹⁰For this use of ἐν, cf. S. D. F. Salmond, "The Epistle to the Ephesians," The Expositor's Greek Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., n.d.), V, 369. See also Friedrich Blass, Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch, edited by Albert Debrunner (Ninth edition; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1954), para. 219:2.

¹¹Salmond, loc. cit., includes a good survey in support of this view.

¹²B. F. Scott, "The Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians," The Moffatt New Testament Commentary (New York and London: Harper and Brothers, n.d.), XI, 239: ". . . the bath of water accompanied with the word.' There is an evident reference to some solemn utterance which formed part of the baptismal ceremony and made it fully valid . . ." See also Westcott, loc. cit.: ". . . accompanied by a confession of the Christian Faith."

clauses. Westcott holds that the three ἴρα -clauses (v. 26, v. 27a, v. 27b) are all independent of one another, and all depend upon παρ' ἑδωκεν in v. 25.¹³ A conflicting view is upheld by Stoeckhardt, who makes the second ἴρα -clause dependent on the first.¹⁴ One consideration would seem to decide in favor of the latter. Christ presents the Church to Himself glorious, without spot or wrinkle, holy and blameless. This description of the Church would seem metaphorically to fit better with the picture of cleansing than with the Self-sacrifice. This is especially true of σπιλον. Christ cleansed the Church, in order that He might present it to Himself without spot. Ultimately, however, it makes little difference, so far as Paul's baptismal theology is concerned. For Paul it is not a question of an either/or. The presentation of His Church to Himself must not result either from His Self-sacrifice or from the cleansing with water. In fact, the strength of this passage lies in this, that it points to the Self-sacrificing death of Christ as the presupposition of the purification which the washing of baptism effects.

A few more observations with regard to this passage need to be made. The Church as a whole has received this washing. Hence Paul can also speak of baptism as a safeguard of the

¹³Westcott, loc. cit.

¹⁴George Stoeckhardt, Kommentar über den Brief an die Epheser (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1910), p. 242.

Church's unity (Eph. 4:4). Then, too, baptism portrays the concern which Christ has for His Church, since its basis is His sacrificial death. Finally, baptism is the source of the Church's splendor, inasmuch as it is an act of Christ Himself.

In picturing baptism as a washing and a cleansing from sin Paul identifies his teaching with that of the rest of the Apostolic Church. Already on the day of Pentecost Peter preached the necessity of baptism for the remission of sins (Acts 2:38). That this forgiveness was associated with the cleansing of water is readily seen from Acts 22:16 and the Ethiopian eunuch's rather spontaneous question (Acts 8:36). Paul's conception of baptism as a washing also has the metaphor of washing in common with other lustrations current in his day, such as the Jewish proselyte baptisms and the numerous heathen ritual washings.¹⁵ But two considerations distinguish them sharply from the Christian sacrament. First, Apostolic baptism always involved calling on the Name of Jesus (Acts 22:16), whose sacrificial death was the basis for the baptismal washing. Second, Christian baptism also involved the gift of the Holy Ghost. That these were essential also to Paul's doctrine appears from 1 Cor. 6:11 and Eph. 5:26-27. For this reason Paul and the other Apostles (cf. 1 Pet. 3:21) never carried the illustration

¹⁵Cf. Rudolph Schnackenburg, Das Heilsgeschehen bei der Taufe nach dem Apostel Paulus (München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1950), pp. 6-7.

beyond the internal cleansing from the filth of sin as did later fathers, notably Tertullian, who constructed an elaborate symbolical system with inferences drawn from the initial tertium of the washing.

Baptism as a Washing of Regeneration

In Tit. 3:5 Paul's conception of baptism as a washing is framed in a different context from that of a washing of purification from sin. Here he views it as a washing of regeneration and a renewing of the Holy Spirit.

Again in this passage baptism is not explicitly mentioned, and hence it is by no means undisputed that it constitutes a reference to the Christian sacrament. Markus Barth, for example, contends that λουτρόν cannot possibly be interpreted as the baptismal washing.¹⁶ In support of his claim he appeals, first of all, to the context of the Pastoral Epistles, specifically to Tit. 2:14: Christ Jesus gave Himself for us to redeem us from all iniquity and to purify (καθαρίσῃ) for Himself a people of His own. From this he then concludes that purification is the purpose and effect of the death of Christ, and that, therefore, the source and the means of the washing is the Cross.¹⁷ With

¹⁶Markus Barth, Die Taufe--Ein Sakrament? (Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag A. G. Zollikon, 1951), p. 45+ ff.

¹⁷Barth, op. cit., p. 462: "In Tit. 2:14 wird die

this in mind he finally approaches Tit. 3:5 and posits a three-fold possibility for interpretation: 1) purification means a second bath, in addition to the Cross of Christ; 2) the concept "bath" signifies and interprets the purification effected on the Cross; and 3) the text contains the teaching of a ritual realization, actualization, contemporization (Vergegenwärtigung), or application of the Cross.¹⁸ He rejects the first and the third on the grounds that they imply that the purification effected in the death of Christ in and of itself is neither complete, nor real, nor actual, nor present, nor effective for the individual.¹⁹ He adopts the second of his possibilities and cites Heb. 9:14,23 for support.²⁰ On this basis he further divests Eph. 5:26 and 1 Cor. 6:11 of any sacramental significance.²¹ His final conclusion he states thus:

Das Kreuz ist notwendigerweise eine unvollkommene Reinigung, wenn erst die Taufe vollkommen reinigt! Nicht nur an den Gekreuzigten, sondern auch an die Taufe muss dann glauben, wer rein werden und sein will!²²

Reinigung als Zweck und Wirkung des Todes 'des grossen Gottes und Heilandes Christus Jesus' bezeichnet. Der Preis und das Mittel der Reinigung ist demnach laut diesem Texte das Kreuz."

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Ibid., p. 462; 471 ff.

²²Ibid., p. 463.

In reply to these objections, it must be said that Barth throughout very laudably defends the completeness and all-sufficiency of Christ's death. But despite, or perhaps even because of, this persistent and consistent view, he continually finds in baptism, sacramentally conceived, a second, essentially different purification, which violates the *ἐφάπαξ* character of the event on Calvary.²³ However, this is not the case either in Paul or in the rest of the New Testament. It has been shown thus far, and will be demonstrated more conclusively throughout the remainder of this thesis, that Paul never considers baptism as being independent of, or different from, Christ's atoning death on Calvary. Christ's death and resurrection is in every instance the ground and presupposition for all that Paul has to say on baptism. It is strange indeed that Barth advances the reason that he does in rejecting the third possibility which he lists; namely, that baptism is the ritual (or sacramental) application of the Cross. If baptism is to be rejected as a sacrament because it vitiates the completeness or the reality of Christ's death, then the same must be said for any appropriating means, even for faith, inasmuch as His redemptive work requires faith to bring it to its salutary effects.²⁴

²³Ibid., p. 462: ". . . eine zweite, andere Reinigung neben das Kreuz."

²⁴Barth himself makes this quite emphatic, ibid., p. 463: ". . . an den Gekreuzigten . . . muss dann glauben, wer rein werden und sein will!"

But also and primarily on exegetical grounds Tit. 3:5 must be seen as a baptismal reference. The word λουτρόν occurs only here and in Eph. 5:26 in the New Testament. In the Ephesians passage it is explicitly stated that the λουτρόν is the means by which Christ cleanses the Church. It is furthermore said to be a washing τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι. The only washing of water which the New Testament knows is baptism.²⁵ Hence the hermeneutical principle of clarifying a less explicit passage by the more explicit leads to the conclusion that the λουτρόν of Tit. 3:5 is also a reference to baptism.

In Tit. 3:5 Paul is not speaking of two means of salvation, but only of one. This is seen, first of all, from the fact that the rest of the New Testament knows of only one initial means of salvation (cf. Acts 2:38; 16:31,33; Jn. 3:3-5; 1 Pet. 3:20; Mk. 16:16). In addition to that, the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost are both dependent on the single verb ἔσωσεν. This also seems to lend the connecting καί an exegetical character. At least there is a strong similarity in the meaning of the two words παλιγγενεσία and ἀνακαίνωσις. The active concept

²⁵Barth, *op. cit.*, p. 421 ff., quotes Jn. 1:7,9: "The blood of Jesus, His Son, cleanses (καθαρίζει) us from all sin." He thereby excludes any cleansing by water. Then to account for the reference to water in Eph. 5:26-27 he makes it a natural extension of the metaphor implicit in καθαρίζειν; *ibid.*, p. 472. This appears to be an obvious dodging of the text.

καίρωσις describes a creative activity in contrast to διαφθείρειν (2 Cor. 4:16), of which the passive idea in γενεσία forms the complement.²⁶ The addition of πνεύματος ἁγίου as a subjective genitive designates the Holy Spirit as the author of the renewal. πάλιν (again) is also complemented by ἀνά (again, from above; cf. ἀνωθεν, Jn. 3:3 ff.). Thus, from this passage we learn the following concerning Paul's concept of baptism: 1) the creation of a new man is involved (καινός); 2) it is a rebirth (πάλιν, ἀνά); 3) it is effected by the Holy Spirit; and 4) it is the result of a washing (λουτρόν). The parallels with other Apostolic teaching will be seen readily in a comparison with the doctrine of rebirth in 1 Pet. 1:3,23; Jas. 1:18; cf. v. 17, ἀνωθεν; and Jn. 3:3-8, which emphasizes particularly the role of the water and the Spirit.

Baptism as That by Which We Become Christ's Possession

In contrast to the passages adduced to this point, 1 Cor. 1:12-13 places the person baptized in direct relation to Christ. Again, this is not yet spelled out expressly, but it is the obvious inference which the Apostle Paul wants drawn.

²⁶Schnackenburg, *op cit.*, p. 9: ". . . die aktive Bildung καίρωσις (von καινώω) besagt eine schöpferische Tätigkeit im Gegensatz zu διαφθείρειν, vgl. 2 Kor. 4:16, dürfte also zu der Vorstellung einer γενεσία die passende Ergänzung liefern."

In rebuking the various factions that had arisen in Corinth Paul makes three assertions in the form of rhetorical questions: 1) Christ is undivided and indivisible; 2) Christ, and only Christ, was crucified for you; and 3) you were baptized into Christ's Name, and His Name alone.

The gist of Paul's argument is that all party-spirit is out of place in the Christian congregation. The force of his argument lies in the assumption underlying his first assertion; namely, that the Christian congregation represents or portrays Christ. Their very factiousness, however, gives the lie to the fact of Christ's undivided and indivisible unity. The reason that any sort of party-spirit is impossible among Christians is the fact that in His death Christ has bought them all for Himself, and that, therefore, they are to direct their allegiance solely to Christ. This fact is further undergirded in their baptism into Christ's Name. The Name of Christ, called upon them in their baptism, shows that henceforth they belong exclusively to Christ, their Lord.²⁷

²⁷Wilhelm Heitmüller, Im Namen Jesu (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1903), p. 109: "Fassen wir das Ergebnis unseres Ausflugs in das Gebiet der Profangräcität zusammen, so ist es dieses: εἰς τὸ ὄνομα ζῆσους als Bestimmung des Verbums (oder Satzes) war eine in der hellenistischen Welt-sprache sehr geläufige Formel, in der Umgang-, spez. Geschäfts-sprache lange vor der Entstehung des N. T. kursierend, in der Litteratursprache, wie es scheint, erst später auftauchend; sie bezeichnet die Zueignung an eine Person, die Herstellung des Verhältnisses der Zugehörigkeit; zu beachten ist dabei, dass das ὄνομα in der Formel seine eigentliche Bedeutung nicht verloren hat." In distinguishing between the different

The claim of the Name upon them is fittingly described by

Bachmann:

Die Erinnerung an die auf diesen Namen vollzogene Taufe war daher geeignet, einen Getauften daran zu erinnern, dass ausschliessliche und völlige Gebundenheit an Christo ein unverbrüchliches Lebensgesetz für ihn sei.²⁸

With this understanding of εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, it becomes even easier to understand Paul's horror at the claims of the factions: εἰς τὸ μὲν εἶμι Παύλου. Robertson and Plummer show that such a statement implies the slave-master relationship.²⁹ Such a claim stood in direct opposition to the meaning of their baptism, for the claim which their baptism made upon them was none other than the claim which Christ's death made upon them. Schlatter points out this connection very concisely:

Binzig mit seinem Namen ist gesagt, dass und wie der Menschheit die Sünden vergeben sind.³⁰

For Paul baptism into the Name of Christ always presupposes the death of Christ.

prepositions found in this expression in the New Testament, he has this to say, *ibid.*, p. 127: "Die Phrasen βαπτίσειν εἰς und ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι bieten eine Beschreibung des Vorganges der Taufe; sie besagen, dass das Taufen sich vollzieht unter Nennung des Namens Jesu. βαπτίσειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα dagegen giebt einen (den) Zweck und einen (den) Erfolg des Taufens an; es besagt, dass der Täufling in das Verhältnis der Zugehörigkeit, des Eigentums zu Jesus tritt. Aber auch in βαπτίσειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα ist das Moment der Namensnennung enthalten."

²⁸Bachmann, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

²⁹Robertson and Plummer, *op. cit.*, p. 13: "To be a slave is ἄλλου εἶναι, another person's property (Aris., Pol. I.)."

³⁰Schlatter, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

In pointing gratefully to the fact that he himself had, with only a few exceptions, not baptized anyone, Paul strengthened his argument. The decisive factor is the Name into which you have been baptized. Had he done more baptizing, he would only have confirmed some in their error that the all-important matter was the person who had done the baptizing.³¹ But Paul does not here minimize or belittle baptism.³² All of his congregations had been baptized (cf. 1 Cor. 12:13; Gal. 3:27; Rom. 6:3), and on this fact he builds his doctrine of the Body of Christ, which dominates his ecclesiology. Hence it was for him also one of the important principles of the unity of the Church (Eph. 4:5).

In Gal. 3:27 we meet the expression βαπτίζεσθε εἰς Χριστόν. The question arises whether the εἰς indicates merely an external connection similar to εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, or whether perhaps it ought to be construed locally, thus paving the way for a deeper, mystical understanding. That the Χριστόν ἐνεδύσαθε describes a profound, essential relationship to Christ, is obvious; but does the ὅσοι εἰς Χριστόν ἐβαπτίσθητε already signify a mystical "dipping into" Christ? Fundamentally, it

³¹This ancient misconception finds its modern counterpart in the popular expression, "I was baptized Lutheran, Catholic, Presbyterian, etc."

³²So, e.g., Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 9: ". . . so sehr legt er stets den Nachdruck auf die persönliche Aneignung des 'Evangeliums' d. h. den 'Glauben'. Das Taufen ist demgegenüber Nebensache . . ."

is a question of whether or not this mystical sense is necessarily contained in the expression βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς . If so, then it must be postulated also for Rom. 6:3.³³

In the first place, it is not demonstrable that βαπτίζεσθαι necessarily connotes a "dipping in." The New Testament almost uniformly uses it in its technical sense, to baptize (72 times), while the word for "dipping in" is βάπτειν (cf. Lk. 16:24; Jn. 13:26; Rev. 19:13). The few exceptions are Mk. 10:38 and Lk. 12:50, where Christ refers to His death as a baptism; in Lk. 11:38 and Mk. 7:4 it refers to Jewish ritual purifications. Otherwise βαπτίζεσθαι refers either to John's baptism or to Christian baptism.³⁴

In the second place, εἰς locally conceived dare not be universally applied. In 1 Cor. 10:2 we are told that all εἰς τὸ Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο. If βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς necessarily has the mystical connotation of "dipping into", this passage results in sheer nonsense. The expression most probably indicates the dependence of the Israelites upon Moses as God's chosen leader.³⁵ Hence this locus indicates a close connection between βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς and βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς τὸ ὄνομα.

³³For this definition of the issue and for help in solving the problem I am indebted to Schnackenburg, op. cit., p. 18-23.

³⁴Cf. A. Oepke, "βαπτίζεσθαι, βάπτειν," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1933), I, 528.

³⁵Schnackenburg, op. cit., p. 20.

This same conclusion is reached by the parallel expression used in Acts 19:3-5: εἰς τι ἐβαπτίσθητε; εἰς τὸ Ἰωάννου βάπτισμα; ἐβαπτίσθησαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ.

Finally an examination of the parallel between βαπτίσειν εἰς and πιστεύειν εἰς proves instructive. The latter indicates the direction of faith, though not expressing a mystical movement into Christ. The practical identity in meaning between εἰς and εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, at least with πιστεύειν, can be seen by comparing their use in Jn. 3:18.

This is all to say that the "dipping in" idea is not necessarily contained in the phrase βαπτίσειν εἰς, though it need not necessarily be excluded. So if the idea of "dipping into" Christ is present in Gal. 3:27, it is inherent not in the expression itself, but is supplied by the context. In this case it is there because the Χριστόν ἐνεδέξασθε presupposes and suggests it. The importance of this distinction is seen when it is borne in mind that the same phrase βαπτίσεσθε εἰς Χριστόν is applied specifically to Christ's death in Rom. 6:3. If βαπτίσεσθε εἰς Χριστόν (τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ) is there interpreted to mean a "dipping into" the death of Christ, justification would have to be supplied by the context. Whether such justification would be forthcoming is doubtful, since there the context favors the metaphor of immersion as a burial with Christ.

The same thought is expressed by Zahn:

Durch βαπτίσειν εἰς τινα (τι) ist die besondere Art der Beziehung zu einem anderen, welche die Taufe stiftet, noch nicht bestimmt; diese ist vielmehr je nach der Bedeutung der Person oder Sache, zu welcher die Taufe in Beziehung setzt, eine sehr verschiedene.³⁶

The context of Gal. 3:27, then, permits the interpretation of βαπτίσειν εἰς as a "dipping into" Christ. The picture which governs the whole passage (3:26-28) is that of clothing oneself with Christ. All (πάντες, v. 26; ὅσος, v. 27a; πάντες, v. 28b) dip into this baptism (a reference to the ritual immersion) as into a flowing, all-covering robe, which covers all national, social and sexual differences, and makes them all one in Christ. It would seem as though immersion suggested to Paul the metaphor of dipping into Christ conceived as a robe in which all as a result of their baptism are clothed. The question as to the source of the figure of the robe is not of great consequence. Rendall's conjecture that it stems from the contemporary Roman ceremony of investing a youth with the toga virilis³⁷ appears to be more remote than Duncan's suggestion that it

³⁶Theodor Zahn, "Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater," Kommentar zum Neuen Testament (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf., 1905), IX, 186.

³⁷Frederic Rendall, "The Epistle to the Galatians," The Expositor's Greek Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., n.d.), III, 174: "The conception of spiritual manhood is here associated with baptism by a figure borrowed from Greek and Roman usage. At a certain age the Roman youth exchanged the toga praetexta for the toga virilis and passed into the rank of citizens."

has its roots in the Old Testament.³⁸ In thus interpreting the βαπτίσεισθαι εἰς Χριστόν by the metaphor included in the ἐνεδύσαθε, the "dipping into Christ" is preserved from any sort of mystical discoloration, in the sense of an absorption into the divine. As a summary of what Paul includes under that metaphor, this quotation from Schlatter is apropos:

Er heisst hier, wie Röm. 13:14, Christus das Gewand, in das wir gekleidet sind, um uns zu zeigen, wie reich und völlig uns Christus Anteil gibt an allem, was er hat, wie er seine eigene Art auf uns überträgt, und uns zu seinem Abbild macht. Wie er Sohn Gottes ist, so führt er auch uns zur Kindschaft Gottes. Seine Gerechtigkeit, seine Heiligkeit, sein ewiges Leben umfassen auch uns. Wie er im Geiste lebt, so durch ihn auch wir³⁹

Baptism as Incorporation into the Body of Christ

In 1 Cor. 12:13 βαπτίσεισθαι εἰς has another object, distinct from that of the personal Christ. Here it is the mystical Body of Christ. While the passages heretofore adduced spoke of the baptized person as being brought into

³⁸George S. Duncan, "The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians," The Moffatt New Testament Commentary (New York and London: Harper and Brothers, n.d.), IX, 123: ". . . in Scripture it denotes that the wearer becomes in a subtle way identified with what he puts on (cf. the Old Testament thought of clothing oneself with righteousness, with strength, etc., and Paul's use of the same metaphor in Rom. 13:12; Eph. 4:24). Thus, when a man is baptized, he becomes so thoroughly identified with Christ that it is no longer he who lives, it is Christ who lives in him. No matter what that person was before, in Christ he is a new creation (cf. 6:15)."

³⁹Adolph Schlatter, Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament (Stuttgart: Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1921), II, 71.

relation with Christ, this one speaks of the relationship of the baptized individuals to each other in forming the Body of Christ. This idea was already hinted at in Gal. 3:27, where in Christ individual differences are no longer recognizable, but all are one in Christ. The present passage advances the thought to the point where all members are formed into one Body of Christ of which they are individually members. This Body of Christ is built by the same baptism of the many, and the agent of this unity is the Spirit.

Rudolph Schnackenburg in his treatment of the subject asks the question whether the πνεῦμα is to be thought of personally as the agent of unity, or as an impersonal principle of unity, and decides in favor of the latter.⁴⁰ His case rests on two grounds. 1) The activity of the personal πνεῦμα is described in vv. 4-11 by the scarcely distinguishable prepositions διὰ, κατὰ, and ἐν, each time with the article. If in v. 13 the personal πνεῦμα were meant, how is one to explain its anarthrous use? 2) With v. 12 a new paragraph begins and here πνεῦμα is to be understood in correspondence to σῶμα, as the life-principle of the Body. But inasmuch as the Body is impersonal, the soul (πνεῦμα) must also be impersonal. Hence he concludes that the πνεῦμα indicates rather the power, impersonally conceived, which upbuilds and quickens the Body of Christ.

⁴⁰Schnackenburg, op. cit., pp. 24-25.

In reply it ought to be noted that the anarthrous πνεῦμα does not necessarily imply an impersonal spirit, even though it be set in a context where πνεῦμα is used with the article.⁴¹ By omitting the article attention is fixed upon the character of the Spirit as Spirit.⁴² The person of the Spirit has been amply described. Here in v. 13 His role as Spirit is emphasized without robbing Him of His personality. Furthermore, it seems highly questionable whether the σῶμα-πνεῦμα contrast is the prominent one in the Apostle's mind. The foregoing context is at pains to describe the unity amid the diversity which the Spirit creates. Amid the diversity of gifts the unity of the congregation is seen in the one and the same Spirit who apportions the diverse gifts. Now in v. 12 the analogy of the human body is introduced to substantiate this very point (ἕν). The point is that many members constitute a unity in the body. The tertium is the unity which the Spirit effects (vv. 4-11) conceived in terms of a human body. But the illustration fails in its purpose of reinforcing the activity of the Spirit as the unifying agent, if now suddenly the πνεῦμα is conceived impersonally.

⁴¹Cf. Gal. 5:16-18, where even the anarthrous πνεύματι, vv. 16, 18, refers to the personal Spirit of God, as well as τὸ πνεῦμα, v. 17. Cf. also Blass-Debrunner, op. cit., para. 257:2: "Auslassen des Art. auch bei Präpos. (ἐν πν. ἁγίου)"

⁴²For a discussion of the force of anarthrous nouns, cf. B. F. Westcott, The Epistle to the Hebrews (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1955), p. 7.

Besides, it is difficult to identify the impersonal spirit of God, much less to conceive of it, apart from the personal Spirit of God, especially in view of Tit. 3:5.

And so Paul here again appeals to baptism as a principle of unity in the Church, here described as the Body of Christ. This is a recurring theme, specifically formulated in Eph. 4:5. Baptism has as its goal the one Body. The instrument by which this unity is effected is the one Spirit.⁴³ As this excludes the view that sees in $\pi\nu\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha$ the sphere or the element in which the person is baptized,⁴⁴ so it also complements the teaching of the Spirit's role in baptism derived from Tit. 3:5. His work, begun in the hearts of each individual, takes on this social dimension as each is placed by the one Spirit into the one Body of Christ.

We have seen thus far that Paul's view of baptism runs parallel with that of the rest of Apostolic teaching, particularly in the thought of baptism as a purification from sin on the basis of Christ's death, as the transfer into the possession of Christ, and the role of the Holy Spirit. Baptism plays a powerful role in his doctrine of the Church, for it constitutes the unifying principle of the Church by

⁴³For the instrumental use of ϵ^v , cf. Blass-Debrunner, op. cit., para. 219:1: ". . . auch die persönliche Tätigkeit wird so ausgestellt."

⁴⁴Robertson and Plummer, op. cit., p. 272: "The Spirit is the element in (ϵ^v) which the baptism takes place."

rendering visible the unity of all in Christ and in the Spirit. Yet for all this, baptism is not for him an adjunct to his theology, but is internally bound up with the redemptive act and plays an equally decisive role in his soteriology. This leads to the heart of the peculiarly Pauline conception of baptism as a redemptive event with Christ, particularly as a dying and rising with Christ.

CHAPTER III

PAUL'S UNIQUE CONTRIBUTION TO THE UNDERSTANDING OF BAPTISM AS A REDEMPTIVE EVENT ΣΥΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΩ

The Locus Classicus: Rom. 6:1-11

In Rom. 3:21 ff. Paul states his fundamental thesis regarding the way of salvation for sinful men, who are devoid of God's glory. God, exclusive of the Law, justifies both Jew and Greek by grace through faith on the basis of Christ's atoning death. In Rom. 4 Abraham is shown to be the example of how God justifies a man by counting his faith to him for righteousness. As the physical progenitor of the Jews, as well as the father of the uncircumcised, he became the prototype of all who are justified by faith. The glory of which men were once destitute is now once again a possession in hope, made possible by the death of the Mediator. This at once gives perspective to the whole religious history of man. Sin and salvation each have their respective ancestor. Through one man's trespass death reigned; in Adam all died. But in a far greater degree through the one Man, Jesus Christ, life reigns. The salvation won by Christ possesses certainty (πολλῶ μᾶλλον, 5:17), fullness (περισσεία, 5:17), and universality (εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, 5:18). Thus, where sins abound, grace abounds much more.

The false conclusion drawn from this principle is the problem to which Paul addresses himself in ch. 6. It by no means follows that the doctrine of God's grace is intended as an encouragement for libertinism. Such an immoral attitude is a contradiction to the whole scheme of the plan of salvation, as it unfolds in history and as it is applied to the individual in baptism. This context gives to Paul's understanding of baptism its ethical direction. This ethical concern overshadows his whole presentation and breaks in from time to time (e.g., περιπατήσωμεν v. 4) and furnishes the climax and culmination of the section (λογίζεσθε, κ.τ.λ., v. 11). In vv. 12-14 Paul draws the practical conclusions from this presentation, and hence, strictly speaking, these verses do not enter this discussion concerning his view of baptism.

V. 1. What conclusion shall we draw then? Let us continue in sin, so that grace may abound?

This verse is occasioned by Paul's statement in 5:20. Once before (3:8) he had met the same objection. The sense remains the same whether the subjunctive be construed as hortative or deliberative. Lenski is quite emphatic in behalf of the latter,¹ although the hortative better voices a false conclusion.

¹R. C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (Columbus: Wartburg Press, c.1945), pp. 387-388.

V. 2. Never! Since we are such as have died to sin, how is it possible for us to continue in it?

Paul objects strenuously to such a perversion of the doctrine of grace. It is utterly impossible. The *οἰτινες*, as a relative of quality,² emphasizes that it is a characteristic feature of Christians that they have died to sin. It may, therefore, be translated with a causal conjunction. The dative is *dativus incommodi*,³ and so Althaus comments fittingly:

Die Christen sind in Beziehung auf die Sünde gestorben ihre Beziehung zur Sünde ist durch ein Sterben gelöst.⁴

Stoeckhardt renders this somewhat more explicit:

. . . wir sind von der Macht, Gewalt, Herrschaft, vom Bann und Zwang der Sünde befreit.⁵

Since we have died to sin, it is an impossibility to live in sin. The *ἐν αὐτῇ* pictures sin as the sphere which is

²William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans," The International Critical Commentary (Second edition; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n.d.), p. 156.

³Friedrich Blass, Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch, edited by Albert Debrunner (Ninth edition; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1954), para. 188.

⁴Paul Althaus, "Der Brief an die Römer," Das Neue Testament Deutsch (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1949), VI, 50.

⁵George Stoeckhardt, Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Römer (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1907), p. 283.

"out-of-bounds" for Christians.⁶ That the Apostle already anticipates his whole train of thought and refers to baptismal death is indicated in the following verse, since the rhetorical question would lose its force unless this were already known to his readers.

V. 3. Or are you ignorant of the fact, that all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus have been baptized into his death?

The phrase βαπτίζω εἰς has already been discussed. Paul here lays the groundwork for his own interpretation of baptism. Baptism εἰς Χριστὸν ἠησοῦν was known to the early Church, and though it cannot be ascertained positively whether baptism εἰς τὸν θάνατον formed a part of early Apostolic teaching prior to Paul, Paul's rhetorical question seems to imply it.⁷ Furthermore, the relation between baptism and the death of Jesus seems to be a presupposition, as is evidenced by the fact that the next verse continues with ὁῦν rather than γάρ. At any rate it serves as a point of

⁶Rudolph Schnackenburg, Das Heilsgeschehen bei der Taufe nach dem Apostel Paulus (München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1950), p. 29.

⁷Schnackenburg, loc. cit., makes the following conjecture: "Dasz die von Paulus gegebene Sinndeutung der Taufe als ein Mitsterben mit Christus (und Mitaufstehen) in der Urkirche schon erfolgt war, dafür gibt es keinen Anhaltspunkt. Die späteren Zeugnisse gehen offensichtlich gerade auf Röm. 6 zurück. So bleibt noch die Möglichkeit, dasz der Taufunterricht der Urkirche das erste Sakrament nur allgemein zum Tode Jesu in Beziehung setzte, etwa im Sinne der Sühnwirkung zur Vergebung der Sünden."

departure for Paul's further development of the idea.

V. 4. We have been buried, then, with Him through baptism into death, so that, as Christ has been raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, we also might walk in an entirely new life.

Immediately the problem arises whether to construe εἰς τὸν θάνατον with the verb or with βαπτίσματος; whether we have been buried into death through baptism, or whether we have been buried through baptism-into-death. The factor which decides some exegetes in favor of the latter is the difficulty involved in conceiving a burial prior to death, and hence by asserting that baptism is a baptism-into-death which results in burial they remove this conceptual difficulty.⁸ Markus Barth emphasizes this point. It is his contention that v. 3 does not render explicit the exact relationship between baptism and death, but that in this verse Paul clarifies it. Thus, by understanding baptism-into-death as baptism that stands in an undefined relation to death,⁹ he finds the definition of that relationship in this verse. Baptism presupposes a prior death, since burial, i.e., baptism, presupposes death. Thus, baptism defined as a burial merely confirms and

⁸So, e.g., Joseph Sickenberger, "Die Briefe des Hlgen. Paulus an die Korinther und Römer," Die Heilige Schrift des Neuen Testaments, edited by Fritz Tillmann (Fourth edition; Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1932), ad loc.

⁹Markus Barth, Die Taufe--Ein Sakrament? (Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag A. G. Zollikon, 1951), p. 228.

seals a death that has already previously taken place.¹⁰ This constitutes, then, a very respectable exegetical defense of the Calvinistic view of the sacrament.¹¹ It is interesting to note in this connection that Roman Catholic exegetes,¹² as well as Lutheran exegetes,¹³ prefer reading εἰς τὸν θάνατον with the verb, treating burial and death as correlatives. "Burial is only death sealed and made certain."¹⁴

¹⁰Ibid.: ". . . der Täufling stirbt nicht in der Taufe. Man liest nicht: durch die Taufe wurden wir getötet; oder: in der Taufe starben wir. Sondern: 'Durch die Taufe wurden wir begraben;' ibid., p. 229: "Werden also die Täuflinge 'durch die Taufe begraben', so ist vorausgesetzt, dass sie schon getötet, gestorben und tot sind, ehe sie getauft wurden;" ibid., p. 232: "Die Taufe bestätigt dann seinen Tod, sie bewirkt oder bezweckt ihn aber nicht."

¹¹Cf. John Calvin, Commentary upon the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, edited from the original English translation of Christopher Rosdell, Preacher, by Henry Beveridge (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Printing Company, 1844), p. 149: "Moreover, it forceth not that this virtue /mortification and newness of life/ doth not appear in all those that are baptized. For Paul, after his manner, because he speaketh unto the faithful, conjoineth the substance and effect with the external sign. For we know that by their faith is established and ratified whatsoever the Lord offereth by the visible pledge. To be brief, he teacheth what is the verity of baptism rightly received. So to the Galatians he testifieth, that all they, whosoever are baptized in Christ have put on Christ. For so a man must say so long as the institution of the Lord and the faith of the godly agree together; for we never have bare and idle signs but when our unthankfulness and wickedness hindereth the working of God's bountifulness."

¹²E.g., Schnackenburg, op. cit., p. 30.

¹³E.g., Stoeckhardt, op. cit., p. 287.

¹⁴Sanday-Headlam, op. cit., p. 157.

How shall the problem be solved? In the first place the $\hat{\sigma}\hat{\nu}$ argues for the fact that v. 4 unfolds an idea latent in, or suggested by, the preceding verse. If, as Barth suggests, v. 4 constitutes an explanation of v. 3, one would expect $\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$ more properly. Furthermore, it is Zahn who points out the fact that if $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$ belonged to $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$, the absence of the attributive article is almost inexplicable.¹⁵ Finally, the fine distinction between v. 3 and v. 4 must be noted. In v. 3 the reference is to Jesus' death ($\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$) into which we have been baptized. But in v. 4, the $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ is lacking, indicating a shift in focus. In baptism we also died and were buried with Christ. Hence also the emphatic position of $\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\ \epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\phi\eta\mu\epsilon\nu$ in v. 4. This shift of emphasis is also a progression of thought, however. If we are baptized into the death of Christ, then that involves also our death in the sacrament, for we are buried with Him.¹⁶ The figure of

¹⁵Theodor Zahn, "Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer," Kommentar zum Neuen Testament (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf., 1910), VI, 298. This, however, is not a decisive argument; cf. Blass-Debrunner, op. cit., para. 272.

¹⁶Sanday-Headlam, op. cit., p. 157, prefer "into that death (of His)," rather than death in the abstract; so also James Denney, "St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans," The Expositor's Greek Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans publishing Co., n.d.), II, 632. The possessive pronoun, found in v. 3, but not in v. 4, however, argues rather decisively for the distinction; so, e.g., Adolph Schlatter, Gottes Gerechtigkeit: Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief (Stuttgart: Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1935), p. 202; Stoeckhardt, op. cit., p. 287; and Schnackenburg, op. cit., p. 30.

baptism as a burial is suggested by the immersion of the baptismal rite. Yet though the act of immersion symbolizes the burial, the significance of baptism is not thereby exhausted. Althaus notes this:

Dieser Ritus stellt sinnbildlich ein Begrabenwerden (im Wasser) dar. Aber es ist eben mehr als Sinnbild, nämlich wirkliche Beteiligung an Christi Tod, Übertragung des Todes.¹⁷

Paul teaches that being baptized into Christ and into His death implies that baptism is the means ($\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$) by which we have been buried with Christ into a death of our own. Thus he undergirds his earlier statement in v. 2 that we have died to sin.

But death immediately suggests life. Paul never conceives of death as the end in the redemptive plan. Just as Christ has been raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so also we are to walk in an entirely new life. This life is qualitatively different ($\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\acute{o}\tau\eta\tau\epsilon\varsigma$) from the living in sin described in v. 2, and is a life in contrast to death, v. 4a. However, Paul does not in the first instance speak of the resurrection to the new life mediated by baptism, but rather proceeds directly to the manner of life which is the goal and the obligation of baptism. The $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ betrays the ethical concern in the mind of the Apostle. Stoeckhardt, therefore, seems to feel that the

¹⁷Althaus, op. cit., p. 50.

passage does not imply a sacramental rising again with Christ.¹⁸ However, this practical directive presupposes also a sacramental resurrection as the next verse shows. Paul's whole emphasis in this passage is on the contrast: death-life, dying-rising. In Paul's theology the $\epsilon\iota\upsilon\omega\alpha\iota$ and the $\gamma\iota\upsilon\sigma\sigma\omicron\upsilon\alpha\iota$ always belong together in the sense of becoming what you already are.¹⁹

The force of Paul's argument depends on the fact of Christ's death and resurrection. The guarantee of rising to life from death does not lie in the fact that after immersion the person again comes to the surface, however instructive that symbolism might be. It lies rather in uniting sacramentally with the historical death and resurrection of Christ. The dominant note in the argument from this point on is the twin concept: dying-rising and death-life.

V. 5. For if we have become such as have grown together with Him through the likeness of His death, even more, we shall also be such as have grown together with Him through the likeness of His resurrection.

¹⁸Stoekhardt, *op. cit.*, p. 288: "Mit seiner Auferstehung ist Christus aber in ein neues Leben eingetreten. Und dem entspricht das neue Leben, in dem die getauften Christen stehen. Das ist das tertium comparationis, nichts Anders. Das $\epsilon\kappa\ \upsilon\epsilon\kappa\theta\acute{\omega}\nu$, das von der Auferweckung Christi gilt, hat kein Correlat in der Parallele. . . . davon \angle von dem geistlichen Sterben/kann fuglicherweise nicht gesagt werden, dasz wir davon auferstanden sind."

¹⁹Cf. Schnackenburg, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

This verse contains a number of difficulties and will, therefore, be discussed in greater detail in the next section. Here the discussion is limited to the general course of the argument, and of necessity presupposes some of the conclusions reached below.²⁰

This verse introduces the reason for the expectation of life after death (γάρ). This progression from death to life, which Christ first experienced, is now applied to the believing and baptized Christian. In v. 4 "walking in newness of life" was the purpose and goal of being buried with Christ, a conclusion reached from the similarity to Christ's prior experience (ὡσπερ-οὕτως καί). Here in v. 5 Paul wants to exclude a mere external parallelism between Christ's experience of death and resurrection and ours.²¹ There is an internal connection and an organic union between Christ's experience and ours indicated in the word σὺμφυτοί.²²

²⁰Infra, p. 46 ff.

²¹So Calvin, *op. cit.*, p. 151, in commenting on the word ὁμοίωμα: ". . . it seemeth to tend unto this, not that we should die like Christ by a natural death, but that we have this congruency with his death, that as he died in the flesh which he received of us, so we should die in ourselves that we may live in him. Then it is not the same death but the like; for the resemblance, or proportion, between the death of this present life and spiritual renovation is to be noted."

²²Schnackenburg, *op. cit.*, p. 31: "Gerade dieser plastischer Terminus fordert die Verknüpfung mit einem Objekt, mit dem man in einem organischen Zusammenhang treten kann. Ein solches homogenes Objekt kann für Personen (v. 5 'wir') nicht ein Abstraktum wie 'Tod' oder 'Bild' bzw. 'Ähnlichkeit des Todes' sein. Deswegen dürfte die Ergänzung ὅτι, aus v. 4 herausgenommen, die beste Erklärung sein."

With this word Paul reaches back to *συνετάφημεν* where he has introduced the *σύν*-concept to the passage. But this internal-organic union is not to be conceived as a mystical experience of sharing with Christ His actual death on the Cross. The *ὁμοίωμα* excludes such a concept. Our experience is like His, but the likeness lies not in the mode of death, since He shed His blood on Calvary and we die the sacramental death in baptism. It lies rather in the fact of death through which we attain to union with Christ.

The thoughts are rather compressed in vv. 4-5. But they are composed of these elements: 1) we are internally and organically united with Christ; Christ died, and through our connection with Him (*σὺν αὐτῷ*) we also died together with Him (*συνετάφημεν αὐτῷ*); 2) at the same time Paul portrays for us the final outcome of Christ's experience; Christ did not remain in death, but was raised again; 3) this process of dying-rising is also experienced by us (*ὡςπερ - οὕτως καί*); but in line with the trend of Paul's thought in this pericope, the fact of Christ's resurrection is bent for us toward the ethical "ought" of walking in an entirely new life. But they all belong together. Through baptism we become such as are internally and organically united with Christ; but this becomes for us a simultaneous ethical imperative.

It follows, therefore, that v. 5b does not refer

immediately to the future physical resurrection,²³ but merely indicate the logical conclusions of the dying.

ἔσομεθα ist das futurum logicum und bezeichnet das, was vom Standpunkt unseres geistlichen Sterbens, des Mitsterbens mit Christo, aus zukünftig ist, in Wirklichkeit an der Vergangenheit zurückliegt. Denn Paulus weist in diesem ganzen Abschnitt v. 3-11 auf das zurück was wir in unserer Taufe erfahren haben.²⁴

This would not exclude a physical resurrection from the concept of life, but it falls outside the purview of this passage. The emphasis rests solely on the indissoluble bond between death and resurrection.

Now that Paul has outlined our sacramental "re-living"²⁵ of Jesus' death and resurrection and our internal and organic union with Christ, he returns to his original thesis: ἀπεδάναμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ v. 2; and he unfolds more explicitly what significance these redemptive acts have for the baptized person. In a sense Paul adds nothing new hereafter, but merely repeats and draws the inferences from the foundation he laid in vv. 3-5.

V. 6. We know this: our old man has been crucified with Him, so that the body, as a possession of sin, might be destroyed, that we no longer be slaves to sin.

From the discussion thus far, it is clear that in

²³So, e.g., Denney, op. cit., p. 633.

²⁴Stoeckhardt, op. cit., p. 289; so also Zahn, op. cit., p. 301; and Schnackenburg, op. cit., p. 33.

²⁵Schnackenburg, loc. cit., uses the term "Wacherleben."

baptism we in a sacramental manner have undergone a process like to that of our Lord in the historical event. Since this has been clarified, Paul no longer employs the figure of immersion. This external symbolism plays little, if any, role in Paul's thoughts concerning baptism. The rite may have furnished the point of contact for his discussion, but when he has advanced beyond it, it becomes quite unessential and he dispenses with it. The significant theological features are the historical redemptive events in the life of Christ with which the baptized person has become connected. Hence he can now employ the expression *συνεσταυρώθη*, which aptly denotes His decisive redemptive deed for us, although it in no way relates itself to the external symbolism of baptism.

For an interpretation of this verse it is necessary to note the chiasmic parallel:

ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος ἡμῶν - συνεσταυρώθη
ἵνα καταργηθῇ - τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας

This has the force of placing the emphasis on *καταργηθῇ*. There is a final, effective destruction experienced in baptism. We share the violent death of crucifixion with Christ, who died once-for-all, and who dies no more (vv. 9-10). More explicitly, it is the old man who has been crucified, the body of sin which has been utterly destroyed. The difficulty which leads some exegetes to deny that a destruction of the body of sin actually takes place in baptism, or to

conceive of the total destruction as taking place first at the Parousia,²⁶ is the fact that sin still exists even after baptism. But Paul in the present passage nowhere claims that sin has been destroyed; it is the body belonging to sin, otherwise defined as the old man, that has been destroyed. It is important that this distinction be observed, for in this whole pericope, as also elsewhere,²⁷ Paul personifies sin, so that Sin is conceived as an objective, ruling power, whose domain is this mortal body with its members. (6:12-13). This *σῶμα* is the body of Sin, that is, the body which belongs to Sin. This body is destroyed, crucified together with Christ in baptism.²⁸ That Sin was not destroyed, but rather the body, insofar as it was subject to Sin, also explains the fact that further sinning is possible. Sin still is present and active; but its old sphere of power is no longer subject to it, since it has in fact died with Christ. Hence the statement of Stoeckhardt is entirely appropriate:

Wo der alte Mensch gekreuzigt, die Macht der Sünde gebrochen ist, da ist auch der Leib der Sünde, der Leib eben als solcher, als Werkzeug, Organ der Sünde ausser Kraft und Wirksamkeit gesetzt.²⁹

²⁶Schnackenburg, *op. cit.*, p. 34, lists B. Weiss and Delling among these.

²⁷E.g., Rom. 5:12: "ἡ ἁμαρτία entered the world."

²⁸This also renders inadequate the statement of Sanday-Headlam, *op. cit.*, p. 158, that it is "reduced to a condition of absolute impotence and inaction, as if it were dead."

²⁹Stoeckhardt, *op. cit.*, p. 291.

The thought in this verse then indicates that crucifixion with Christ has this purpose (ἵνα), that the body belonging to Sin be completely destroyed, with the result that we no longer serve Sin.³⁰

V. 7. For he who has died is declared free from sin.

This verse is cast axiomatically and employs a figure taken from legal language.³¹ "A dead man has his quittance from any claim that Sin can make against him."³² This proverbial saying is injected as support (γάρ) for Paul's statement in the previous verse. Death destroys all bonds, an argument he again employs in 7:3. In this sense δικαιόσθαι is not here used as the theological terminus for justification, but rather has the meaning "declare free" or even "make free".³³ Schlatter gives an illuminating interpretation of this verse:

Mit ἀπό τινος bedeutet δεδικαίωται : jeder

³⁰The genitive articular infinitive is either final or consecutive. Since the purpose of the συναρπάσει has been clearly indicated by the ἵνα, a thought progression could be observed by making the τοῦ δουλεύειν final; so Schnackenburg, op. cit., p. 35; see also Blass-Debrunner, op. cit., para. 400:2,5. However, purpose may also be here indicated, thus making it parallel to the ἵνα -clause; so Sanday-Headlam, op. cit., p. 159.

³¹Whether or not this saying has parallels in Rabbinic literature is a question of small consequence. For a discussion of this point, cf. Schnackenburg, op. cit., p. 35.

³²Sanday-Headlam, op. cit., p. 159.

³³Walter Bauer, Worterbuch zum Neuen Testament (Fourth edition; Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1952), col. 358.

rechtliche Anspruch ist abgetan; alles, was die Gegenseite mit Recht zu fordern hatte, ist ihr geworden. Die Sünde verlangt den Tod ihres Täters; mehr kann sie nicht verlangen, aber auch nicht weniger. Wer sie tat, kann und darf nicht leben. Dieses Gesetz, das unverletztliche Geltung hat, ist aber zur Erfüllung gekommen, weil der, der bisher gesündigt, nun aber sich dem Christus ergeben hat, von ihm in seinem Tod mit eingeschlossen ist.³⁴

This verse, as it stands, speaks primarily of a freeing from the rule of Sin, not in the first instance from the guilt of sin. Death of itself does not constitute an expiation for sin. That is effected only by the death of Christ (8:3). But since Paul's end in view is ultimately an ethical one, his concern is to demonstrate the freedom from the rule of Sin. Yet it is also a freeing from the guilt of sin, inasmuch as the death that effects freedom from Sin is the death of Christ. The full force of the verse, however, is lost, unless it be referred also secondarily to our death, insofar as we have died with Him.

Now death is the passage to life. Whereas the emphasis since v. 5 has been on death, Paul now turns to the positive aspect of the redemptive event. His first thesis was that we have died with Christ and are now dead so far as sin is concerned. He now develops his second thesis, already stated in v. 4 in terms of "walking in an entirely new life": we have been raised with Christ and now live to God.

³⁴Schlatter, op. cit., p. 210.

V. 8. But if we have died with Christ, we confidently believe that we shall also live with Him.

Christ died and rose again. But if we have shared Christ's death in that we died with Him, then we shall also certainly rise with Him, since union with Christ at any one point involves total and complete union with Him. The acquisition of this life is the acquisition of something certain and abiding. Yet this certainty is not based on any empirical proof, but is rather perceptible only to faith. Hence Paul uses πιστεύομεν, which connotes conviction, confidence, and trust.

Whether the future (συστήσομεν) ought to be taken logically, as in v. 5,³⁵ or as a reference to the future resurrection,³⁶ is a little difficult to determine. It is perhaps a question of both/and. The term "life" is for Paul a rather fluid one with several meanings, and it "glides backwards and forwards from one to another almost imperceptibly."³⁷ The ultimate concern of Paul is an ethical one, which he calls "walking in newness of life" in v. 4; but this presupposes the possession of a new life (v. 5); this possession will not be consummated until the final day of resurrection. This latter is probably the sense most prominent in this verse.

³⁵So Stoeckhardt, op. cit., p. 292.

³⁶So Sanday-Headlam, op. cit., p. 159.

³⁷Ibid.

Schnackenburg's remarks at this point are instructive:

Der Lebensbegriff findet also eine verschiedene und dem jeweiligen Gesichtspunkt angepasste Verwendung. Geht es Paulus zunächst um das sittliche Leben ohne Sünde für Gott (v. 2), so ist dieses Leben doch auf den realen Lebenserwerb in der Taufe durch die Auferstehung "mit Christus" gegründet. Es ist ein wesentlich neues Leben, dessen Andersartigkeit sich in einem neuen Lebenswandel (v. 4) zeigen soll. Als sakramentales Gottesgeschenk wird dieses Leben ein Heilsgut, das als solches etwas Bleibendes und idealerweise Unverlierbares ist. In dem συσήσομεν (v. 8) weitet sich der Blick auf die Vollendung des Lebensbesitzes; das endzeitliche und unangefochtene Besitzen des Gotteslebens wird in den Gedankengang zum mindesten miteingeschlossen.³⁸

V. 9. For we know that, since Christ has been raised from the dead, He will never die again; death no longer has any dominion over Him.

This verse belongs grammatically to the preceding verse, hence the participle is best understood causally. Bearing in mind the ethical direction of this pericope, Paul asserts most emphatically the decisive character of Christ's redemptive act with the classic term for its once-ness: ἐφάπαξ (v. 10). For this is the experience which we undergo with Him, and in this manner he seeks to demonstrate our decisive dying to sin and our unquestionably certain living to God. Hence the use of οὐκέτι twice. That which gave Death its hold on Christ was Sin, which He assumed as His own in His incarnation.³⁹ But once He had yielded to Death, its claim

³⁸Schnackenburg, op. cit., p. 36.

³⁹Sanday-Headlam, loc. cit.

upon Him was forever invalidated. Death no longer has any power over Him.

V. 10. For the death He died, He died to overthrow sin, once-for-all; but the life He lives, He lives to God.

This verse undergirds (γέρ) v. 9 by stating the reason why Death no longer has power over Christ. Death could have dominion over Christ only because of the sin which Christ assumed. But by that very death of His Christ overthrew Sin.⁴⁰ This assertion supports the statement that Christ shall never die again, inasmuch as it was Sin that gave Death its hold. The relatives (ᾶ) are cognate or internal accusatives.⁴¹ The logical continuation of the thought would be: So also you have died (in baptism) once-for-all to sin, and live irrevocably to God. But Paul reaches the climax and conclusion of this whole consideration with a different expression.

V. 11. So also you, consider yourselves dead so far as sin is concerned, but living, so far as God is concerned, in fellowship with Christ Jesus.

This concluding verse does not weaken the parallel which Paul has been constructing. The fact that we have died to sin and live to God has been fully established by our sacramental union with Christ. This is also borne out by the

⁴⁰The German can render the dat. incommodi much better with "zuungunsten der Sünde".

⁴¹Blass-Debrunner, op. cit., para. 153.

emphasis placed on νεκρούς - ζῶντας through the μέν - δέ . But from this fact Paul proceeds directly to its application, thus betraying his chief concern throughout: that which has in fact happened to us, we are now to realize in our personal lives. You are dead to sin and alive to God; now view yourselves as such. Become what you are! The inference stated in v. 1 is entirely impossible. The νεκρούς, which in turn lends its force to ζῶντας, shows that Paul here no longer thinks of the sacramental dying. νεκρούς describes a condition rather than a process. The sacramental dying now lies in the past; the effect of that dying continues. There we have died, so that we are now permanently dead to sin. That is the fruit of the ἐφάπαξ event. This is also brought out in the substitution of ἐν for σὺν Χριστῷ ἠγαθῶν . The preposition σὺν has described our sacramental relationship to Christ; but by concluding with ἐν Paul thinks of the abiding condition.

Thus Paul has countered the false inference of v. 1 by stating that we are dead to sin, but alive to God. This has occurred in baptism, where we became irrevocably united with Christ in His great redemptive acts. Our sacramental dying and rising which effects our death and life is grounded by baptism in the historic events in the life of Christ.

Rom. 6:5 More Closely Examined

The interpretation of this verse depends on an

understanding of principally three items: 1) *σύμφυτοις*; 2) *ἑμοσίωμα* ; and 3) the syntactical relation of the various elements in the verse. They are herewith discussed in that order.

σύμφυτοις

In his study of this word Schwarzmann concludes that it is a terminus technicus from the language of horticulture.⁴² He observes this progression in the process: 1) *ἐκκόπτειν* , the cutting of a slip from its stock; 2) *ἐγκεντρίψειν* , the grafting of this slip into a new stock; 3) *συμφύεσθαι* , the growing together of the slip with the new stock; and 4) *σύμφυτος* , the slip after it has finally and fully grown to the stock. It is this last stage which Paul employs metaphorically to describe the union of the baptized person with Christ, a term entirely appropriate because the Apostle here thinks of the end result of baptism. In support of his contention Schwarzmann points to a similar use of the metaphor in this same epistle in ch. 11. The Jews, who were cut off from the noble olive tree of God's people because of their unbelief, were replaced by the Gentiles. They were cut (*ἐκκόπτειν* , vv. 22, 24) from the wild olive tree of heathenism to which they formerly belonged, and grafted into

⁴²Heinrich Schwarzmann, Zur Tauftheologie des Hl. Paulus in Röm. 6 (Heidelberg: F. H. Kerle Verlag, 1950), p. 29 ff.

(ἐγκεντρίσειν) the noble olive tree of God's people. They then grew together and shared the rich sap of the root, just as the old branches had done (συγκοινωνὸς τῆς ῥίζης τῆς πίστεως, v. 17). Schwarzmann feels that this is significant not only for the formal, but also for the material understanding of Rom. 6:5. There is this difference, however. Rom. 6:5 speaks of the union of the baptized person with Christ, whereas Rom. 11:17-24 speaks of the union of the believer with the people of God. The comparison is apt, nevertheless, for it points out a very significant feature; namely, that *σύμφυτος*, regardless of how the metaphor is applied, indicates a growing together, and thus a union, of two similar or identical things: plants with plants, persons with persons, etc.

Schnackenburg, in tracing the use of the word, claims a broader usage of the term.⁴³ He stands in agreement with Schwarzmann that it is derived from *συμφύειν* (*συμφέεσθαι*) rather than *συμφυτεύειν*. He points out that *σύμφυτος* is used in classical Greek in the technical sense of "innate," "congenital," or "hereditary."⁴⁴ He cites Theophrast as saying: *σύμφυτον πᾶν τὸ ζῶν τῷ ζῶντι*.⁴⁵ This is a striking

⁴³Schnackenburg, *op. cit.*, p. 42 ff.

⁴⁴Cf. also Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, *A Greek English Lexicon* (Ninth edition; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1953), p. 1689.

⁴⁵Schnackenburg, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

example of its use, because it expresses an organic relation. Further examples are cited by him to show that *σύνφυτος* can apply also to such matters in the field of medicine as the growing together of broken bones; in philosophy, to the togetherness of the body and soul; and also to sexual union.⁴⁶ But again it is to be noted that in such instances the word denotes a connection between similar or identical things. The only other place where the verb is used in the New Testament itself is in Lk. 8:7, where the thorns grow with the good seed and choke it. Hence, it need not necessarily denote an internal-organic connection, but it consistently implies the growing together of similar persons or things.

Schnackenburg seems to feel a difficulty in connecting Rom. 11:17-24 with the present passage,⁴⁷ and it is true that they are not exactly parallel. But they are not mutually exclusive. In Rom. 11:17-24 Paul stresses the whole process of grafting in his use of the metaphor, while in Rom. 6:5 he is concerned only with the end result. This is obvious also from his use of the perfect with which this verbal adjective is combined. *γερόναμεν* emphasizes the enduring result. A clumsy English paraphrase might read something like this: We have become such as have grown together, with the added idea that we stand in a very close, internal, and vital

⁴⁶Ibid.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 44.

connection with whatever it is that we are *σύμφυτος*. This latter question will engage our attention a little later.⁴⁸

ὁμοίωμα

The first question that confronts the interpreter is whether *ὁμοίωμα* in the present passage ought to be conceived concretely or abstractly. Then it must, in the second place, be determined what the term specifically denotes.

The word occurs forty-four times in the Septuagint. It refers principally either to images and idols (Deut. 4:16-25; 1 Sam. 6:5; Ps. 105:20), or to less palpable and tangible forms, such as the visionary forms which the prophet Ezekiel saw in his prophetic vision (Ez. 1:5,16,26; 8:2).

Schnackenburg in his study of the word concludes that in every Septuagint reference *ὁμοίωμα* indicates something visible, and conjectures that this is the reason why dictionaries commonly stress the concrete in *ὁμοίωμα*.⁴⁹

Also its background in Greek philosophical language indicates a strong concrete usage. Schneider says that in Plato, Aristotle, and Epicurus the word is not used in the sense of an abstract similarity or agreement, but always concretely in the sense of "das gleichgemachte Abbild."⁵⁰

⁴⁸Infra, p. 52.

⁴⁹Schnackenburg, op. cit., p. 45.

⁵⁰Johann Schneider, "*ὁμοίωμα*," Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1933), V, 191.

Trench concurs by pointing out that εἰκόν and ὁμοίωμα "are convertibly used by Plato . . . to set forth the earthly copies and resemblances of the archetypal things in heaven."⁵¹

In the New Testament a departure from this concrete usage is demonstrable. In Rom. 1:23 and Rev. 9:7 ὁμοίωμα harks back to its Old Testament usages. In Rom. 8:3 God's Son is sent forth ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας; in Phil. 2:7 He is born ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων. In both these passages a complete identification is precluded by the term ὁμοίωμα. The external form is contrasted to the internal essence. Jesus Christ is like sinful flesh, but is essentially far removed from its taint. Though He is like men, He is essentially more. Yet even in these passages ὁμοίωμα is given a graphic concrete sense, well established in Old Testament usage. However, a look at Rom. 5:14 will show that this understanding cannot be forced upon this occurrence of the word. The difference from the other passages is that here it speaks of an event, of which an image or a form is hardly thinkable. Here ὁμοίωμα is used abstractly, inasmuch as one event resembles another and so possesses its likeness; or negatively stated, as in 5:14, one event may differ from another, and so not possess its likeness. But in either case ὁμοίωμα here does not denote a concrete image or copy.

⁵¹R. C. Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament (Ninth edition; London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., Ltd., 1915), p. 47.

Hence we can draw this conclusion. The Septuagint, classical usage, and even the New Testament itself overwhelmingly support the meaning of a concrete image or form whenever the reference is to persons or things. This is almost always the case. The one passage which permits of an exception is Rom. 5:14, and there, in the very nature of the case, because it refers to an event, it is used as an abstract noun. With this conclusion we approach the term in Rom. 6:5. The question ought not to be what *ἐνοσίωμα* means in the majority of cases, and then transfer this meaning to 6:5 according to the law of probability. The question is rather whether this preponderant meaning fits the case in 6:5. The door has at least been opened to the possibility that *ἐνοσίωμα* in 6:5 may be used abstractly, if the reference is to the happening, to the baptismal event.

The Verse as a Whole

The way has now been paved for an understanding of the verse as a whole. A number of possibilities present themselves.

The first of these concerns itself with how *σύνεσθαι* is to be complemented. Some exegetes connect it with *τῷ θανάτῳ*, so as to make it read: we have grown together with His death. Schwarzmann adopts this interpretation.⁵² In support of his

⁵²Schwarzmann, *op. cit.*, p. 39 ff.

claim he cites Blass-Debrunner, who states that adjectives compounded with σύν, if they express participation, require a genitive.⁵³ However, even Blass-Debrunner concedes an improbability of applying that rule in this case.⁵⁴ The probability of this interpretation is considerably reduced, since it would leave ὁμοίωμα without a genitive, a circumstance which would render this passage unique in that respect.⁵⁴ A further difficulty in this interpretation stems from the fact that σύμφυτοι denotes a union of similar or identical things. Since it is persons (γεγόναντες) who have "grown together with", the sense demands union with another person. This makes a union of people with such an abstraction as death impossible. Schwarzmann takes account of this difficulty by noting that it is τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, and he interprets this as a Hebraism akin to ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς in v. 4.⁵⁵ Hence, though the literal meaning is "the baptized person has grown together with the death of Christ," the sense is rather "the baptized person has grown together with the crucified Christ," thus fulfilling the requirements of σύμφυτοι.

⁵³Blass-Debrunner, op. cit., paras. 182 and 194.

⁵⁴Ibid., para. 194: ". . . doch ist die Verbindung des Gen. mit dem vorangehenden Wort natürlicher, und ὁμοίωμα hat sonst bei Paulus immer einen Gen."

⁵⁵Schwarzmann, op. cit., p. 41, cites Blass-Debrunner, op. cit., para. 165, and comments: "Die Umkehrung besteht hier darin, dass das Attribut zum regierenden Substantivum und dieses zum Attribut gemacht wird."

This strikes one as being somewhat forced and artificial, but it must be conceded as a possible interpretation. Yet the fact that this leaves ὁμοίωμα without a genitive makes this interpretation seem dubious, and it may safely be rejected, particularly if a more natural solution to the interpretation of τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ can be found.

Another group of exegetes solve the problem by joining ὁμοιώματι to σύμφυτοι.⁵⁶ The meaning would then be this: we have grown together with the likeness of his death. This interpretation has the advantage that the genitive is construed with ὁμοιώματι, but the difficulty still remains: how can the organic connection, demanded by σύμφυτοι, be conceived with an abstraction like death or the likeness of His death? Regardless of whether the ὁμοιώματι be interpreted to denote the baptismal rite, or the event of death, be it Christ's or ours, these possibilities do not furnish an adequate object for σύμφυτοι, since its subject is persons.

The third possibility then looms large and appears to be the best; namely, that of supplying an αὐτῷ with σύμφυτοι.⁵⁷ This satisfies the requirement of σύμφυτοι for an organic connection; we have grown together with Him, viz., Christ.

⁵⁶E.g. Schlatter, op. cit., p. 206; Althaus, op. cit., p. 50; and Zahn, op. cit., p. 300.

⁵⁷This view is adopted by Schnackenburg, op. cit., p. 41; suggested by Bauer, op. cit., col. 1030; and underlies the translation of the RSV.

Complementing *σύνφυτοι* in this way is also very natural in view of the preceding context; v. 4 contains the *αὐτῶ*, and both vv. 4 and 5 begin with a *σύν*-compound. The ellipsis is made all the more natural because v. 5 does not express itself with a verb, but with a verbal adjective plus a verb. The German can reproduce the force of this construction more adequately than English: *wir sind zusammengewachsene geworden*. Then, too, v. 5 would lose much of its causal force (*γάρ*) in substantiating v. 4, which clearly speaks of a *σύν Χριστῶ*, if *σύνφυτοι* were complemented with something or someone other than Christ. Finally, the *σύν*-concepts need no explicit complement if the sense is clear.⁵⁸ Ultimately, however, the deciding factor is that *σύνφυτοι* demands an organic connection, here with a person. This case is different from Phil. 3:10, which denotes merely a conforming, not a growing together. It also stands in contrast to Phil. 4:14, which speaks of a sharing, not of the more intimate union.

The second major problem to be solved is the specific denotation of the phrase *τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ*. If *αὐτῶ* is supplied to complement *σύνφυτοι*, this frees *ὁμοιώματι* to be understood instrumentally: through the likeness of His death. This has the additional advantage of supplying the *ὁμοιώματι* with a genitive. The question then

Cf. 2 Tim. 2:11-12:

resolves itself into how the *ἑορταίωσις* is to be understood. To what does it refer? There are basically three possibilities.

The first of these views *ἑορταίωσις* in its usual concrete sense and refers it to the baptismal rite itself with its symbolism. Thus the immersion and rising out of the water are the image or likeness, and so the portrayal, of Christ's death and resurrection. This view is adopted by Schwarzmann.⁵⁹ He is quick to say, however, that the baptismal rite not only symbolizes, but actually effects, a dying and rising with Christ.⁶⁰ This interpretation, on the basis of v. 4, is subject to serious question. Paul is not basing his doctrine of baptism on the external rite, nor is it even the point of departure for his teaching of a dying and rising with Christ. The immersion serves as a point of departure for him in portraying baptism as a burial, but then the Apostle does not return again to the symbolism of the baptismal rite. Our sacramental rising is based on the fact of Christ's resurrection, and just as He did not remain in death but rose again, so also we who have in baptism been buried with Him shall rise with Him. Already in v. 4 it is apparent that Paul has

⁵⁹Schwarzmann, *op. cit.*, p. 40, calls attention to the definite article, and from this concludes: "Es handelt sich also nicht um irgendein Nachbild des Todes Christi, sondern um ein ganz bestimmtes, nämlich um die von Herrn selbst angeordnete und den Lesern des Briefes bekannte symbolhafte Taufhandlung."

⁶⁰*Ibid.*, p. 34.

discarded any further reference to the external rite of baptism, and there is here no compelling reason for him to resume it.⁶¹

The second way in which *ὁμοίωμα* has been construed is as a reference to the sacramentally present death of Christ, as distinct from His historical death on the Cross, for which reason it is called a *ὁμοίωμα*. This view is espoused by Johann Schneider.⁶² This introduces a distinction which, at least potentially, destroys the *ἐφάπαξ* character of Christ's death. Rom. 6:9 categorically rules out any further dying of Christ in any sense. This interpretation, doubtful

⁶¹If this interpretation were correct, then the mode of baptism would not be a matter of such indifference. For then Paul would be saying that our union with Christ in His death is effected by the external act of immersion (which symbolizes Christ's death) and that our union with Him in His resurrection (assuming the parallelism between 5a and 5b) is effected by the external act of coming up out of the water (which symbolizes Christ's resurrection). In the practice of baptism in the greater part of the Church, however, this symbolical instrument is lacking, since the common mode is some form of sprinkling. Are we then to conclude that to the greater portion of Christendom throughout the greater part of its history the blessing of dying and rising with Christ has been denied? Or is it perhaps safer from this point of view to assume that *ὁμοίωμα* is used abstractly, and that the reference is to an event occurring in baptism, which makes of the mode a matter of secondary importance? This is, of course, an argumentum ad hominem, and the proponents of this view do not adopt it in this interest. Yet it seems to be the logical conclusion of the view.

⁶²Schneider, op. cit., pp. 194-195: "Vielmehr denkt Paulus an den in der Taufe gegenwärtigen Tod und die in der Taufe gegenwärtige Auferstehung Christi. Dieser sakramental gegenwärtige Tod Christi und diese sakramental gegenwärtige Auferstehung sind das *ὁμοίωμα* seines geschichtlichen Todes und seiner geschichtlichen Auferstehung."

as it is on its own merits, is, however, superseded by the third possibility, which excludes it.

This third view of *ὁμοίωσις* refers it to our sacramental dying, which is a likeness to Christ's death.⁶³ That this is possible has already been shown, in that *ὁμοίωσις* is conceived abstractly when it refers to an event, in this case the similarity between Christ's death and our sacramental death. That this is also the most probable view can be seen from the general trend of Paul's argument. In combating libertine tendencies, he assumes a fact that is universal among all baptized Christians: we have died to sin (v. 2) and are in fact dead to sin (v. 11). The whole pericope revolves around this concept. The reason for this condition is that we have been baptized into Christ, that is, into His death. The fact of this death of ours is reiterated in v. 4: buried with Christ through baptism into death. The present verse substantiates v. 4. That it is our sacramental dying that is referred to is seen quite conclusively from the way in which v. 6 continues the same thought by explaining in

⁶³So Schlatter, *op. cit.*, p. 206: "Das Abbild des Todes Jesu besteht darin, dass der Glaubende durch die Taufe in einen Zustand versetzt wird, der dem Totsein Jesu gleicht, in den Zustand dessen, an dem das göttliche Urteil über die Sünde geschehen ist mit der Wirkung, dass ihm der Eingang in das Leben geöffnet ist. Darum sagt Paulus, das Abbild Jesu hatte nicht auswendig an den Getauften, sondern sie seien mit ihm verwachsen;" so also Zahn, *op. cit.*, p. 300: "Nicht die Taufhandlung, sondern das durch die Taufe gewirkte *ἐπὶ θανάτῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας* (v. 10) ist das Abbild des Sterbens Christi."

what sense we can be said to have died. Our old man was crucified, our body of sin destroyed. Again, the axiomatic saying in v. 7 loses most of its force in this connection, if it be applied solely to Christ. The fact that Paul seeks to establish is our death. This death of ours, then, also provides a basis for the intimate union with Christ described by the word *σύνφοροι*. Our union is with Him in a fellowship which is made possible because we have in a similar manner experienced a death in this sacrament.

The logical sequel in v. 5 is that our sacramental rising unites us with Christ in a fellowship of the resurrection, just as our sacramental dying unites us with Him in a fellowship of death. The major problem connected with v. 5b is the construction of *ἐσόμεθα*, since commentators are generally agreed that v. 5b constitutes an elliptical parallel to v. 5a. They differ, however, on whether the future is logical or temporal. It would seem that v. 11 argues decidedly in favor of the former.⁶⁴ There in the climax of the argument Paul urges Christians to consider themselves dead to sin, to become what they in fact are. The appeal is based on the fact that in baptism they have died with Christ. The same appeal is made to consider themselves alive to God, an appeal possible only on the basis of what they already possess, namely, a sacramental resurrection to life.

⁶⁴Cf. Schneider, *op. cit.*, p. 194.

By way of concluding this section the following would seem to be the best understanding of this verse: For if we have become such as have grown together with Christ through the likeness of His death (namely, our sacramental dying with Him), even more, we shall (as a logical necessity) be such as have grown together with Christ through the likeness of His resurrection (namely, our sacramental rising with Him).

The Significance of *συνεσταυρώθη*, Rom. 6:6

If Paul were constructing his baptismal theology on the basis of the external mode of baptism, i.e., on the liturgical practice of immersion and again rising to the surface, then the expression *συνεσταυρώθη* would be rather striking, if not well-nigh inexplicable. For it is reminiscent of what happened to Christ, and no longer fits the symbolism of the baptismal rite. Burial with Christ may have had as a corresponding external symbol the immersion, but in the rite of baptism there is nothing that corresponds to our crucifixion with Christ. It is completely detached from any symbolism and refers back directly to Christ's death on the Cross. Yet the aorist, as in v. 3 (*ἐβαπτίσθημεν*) and as in v. 4 (*συνετέφημεν*), indicates the single act of baptism. Hence we remain within the temporal framework of the baptismal event and cannot refer our crucifixion with Christ to the time of Golgatha.

The question then arises, why this expression? Paul has already established the fact that we experience a real death in baptism, but that this is a dying with Christ. The death of Christ which we share was, however, a death by crucifixion. Therefore, the death which we share is the death by crucifixion of the old man.⁶⁵ The chiasm of this verse shows that the emphasis does not lie on the experience of suffering; the whole point is rather the utter destruction (*καταργηθῆ*) of the body belonging to Sin, a destruction which is graphically portrayed as a crucifixion. The Apostle here says that the old man, who was a servant of Sin, and insofar as he was such, died by crucifixion with Christ; that is to say, he was totally destroyed in order to yield to a new man. The picture is not, however, that of a general crucifixion, but specifically the Cross of Christ. We are set into the most intimate fellowship (*σύν*) with the crucified Lord in baptism. Thus it is important to note again that the

⁶⁵Schnackenburg, *op. cit.*, p. 49: "Der Ausdruck *παλιὸς ἄνθρωπος* hat an den anderen Stellen, an denen er vorkommt (Eph. 4:22; Kol. 3:9), ein moralisches Profil. Der 'alte Sündenmensch,' der 'nach den trügerischen Begierden verdorben ist,' muss in der sittlichen Anstrengungen überwunden, 'abgelegt werden' (Eph. 4:22). Hier zeigt sich, dass die paulinische Ethik auf dem Sein in Christus aufruht. Die sündliche Sphäre, die der Christ grundsätzlich in der Taufe hinter sich gelassen hat (Röm. 6:6), muss er in steten sittlichen Kampf noch persönlich in seinem streblichen Leib niederringen (Röm. 6:12; Eph. 4:22; Kol. 3:9). In Eph. 4:24 und Kol. 3:10 tritt als Kontrast zu dem 'alten Sündenmenschen' der 'neue Mensch' hinzu, so dass auch hier nicht, so wenig wie in Röm. 6 (vgl. *ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς* v. 4), der Gedanke im Negativen stecken bleibt."

liturgical and symbolical external mode of baptism has receded completely into the background. In its place there appear the theologically significant concepts of Paul's redemptive theology.

Hence the word *συνεστασπύθη* is significant because it removes the discussion of Paul's baptism from the accidental circumstance of immersion and coming up again from the water. Paul's train of thought proceeds, as vv. 4-5 already indicate, from the "redemptive scheme"⁶⁶ of Christ's death and resurrection. The contrast of death and life in Rom. 6 is not taken from the symbolism of the external mode, but rather from the reality of the death and resurrection of Christ. This fact is important, because by placing baptism on this plane a number of other passages in the Pauline corpus may be viewed sacramentally and thus build a bridge to a fuller understanding of its import.

Related Texts

The concept of being crucified with Christ in Rom. 6:6 leads directly to one similarly expressed in Gal. 2:19. Here Paul discusses freedom from the law, which provides no basis for justification or salvation, and the consequent entrance into the life of God. The decisive turn in Paul's life was

⁶⁶Schnackenburg, *op. cit.*, p. 53, uses the term "Heils-schema."

his baptism (Acts 9:18; 22:16), though that is not explicitly stated here. But does he here think of it? The perfect (συνεστάδρωμαι) does not establish a fixed time as does the aorist in Rom. 6:6. But just previously he has employed the contrast ἀπέθανον - ζήσω, again strongly reminiscent of Rom. 6. The correspondence between Christ's experience and ours in Rom. 6 justifies a comparison between Rom. 6:10 and Gal. 2:19.

Rom. 6:10

Gal. 2:19

Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν
ἕνεκα τῆς θεῆς

ἐγὼ ἀπέθανον
ἵνα θεῷ ζήσω

The correspondence between these two passages is further evidenced in this, that Gal. 2:19 speaks of a dying to the Law, as though it were personified, just as Rom. 6 speaks of a dying to Sin personified.⁶⁷

Gal. 2:19 adds the thought that the dying occurred *διὰ νόμου*. This is quite apparently the same law to which he died.⁶⁸ There are basically two ways of understanding this phrase. The first is that which sees the law in its forbidding, judging, demanding, and condemning character, which has

⁶⁷In both cases the dative *incommodi* is used; cf. Herman N. Ridderbos, "The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia," The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953), p. 104.

⁶⁸Theodor Zahn, "Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater," Kommentar zum Neuen Testament (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Nachf., 1905), IX, 132.

the effect upon the man who stands under it of beating him to death.⁶⁹ This interpretation fails in this respect, that in itself the law does not provide the bridge to the life to God. The effect of the law is to keep men in bondage to itself, to say nothing about freeing them from its bondage.

Hence the other interpretation is more tenable, which views the next phrase as its exegesis: *Χριστῷ συνεστύρωμαι*.⁷⁰ Paul's dying is included in the Cross of Christ, who in our stead took the curse of the law on Himself (3:13). The curse of the Law expended its energy on Christ and exhausted itself.⁷¹ Over those whom Christ then represented this power no longer has any authority. Fundamentally and objectively this includes all, but actually it includes only those who believe in Christ (2:16; 3:14), who, like Paul, have died to the law when they were crucified with Christ. Paul's death to the law is one that the law itself effected, for in its

⁶⁹So, e.g., Zahn, *op. cit.*, p. 133: "Denn wodurch anders als durch das Leben unter dem Gesetz und durch die vergebliche Bemühung, es zu erfüllen, also *διὰ νόμου* hat er die erfahrungsmässige Erkenntnis gewonnen, die ihn zum Glauben an Christus trieb (vgl. Röm. 3:20; 7:7)?"

⁷⁰So, e.g., Hermann W. Beyer, "Die kleineren Briefe des Apostels Paulus: an die Galater," edited by Paul Althaus, *Das Neue Testament Deutsch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1949), VIII, 20, who comment: "Durch den Kreuzestod Christi, den die Gesetzesmacht heraufgeführt hat (daher durch das Gesetz), hat das Gesetz die Macht über Christus, damit aber auch über alle, die ihm im Glauben angehören, verloren."

⁷¹Schnackenburg, *op. cit.*, pp. 57-58: "Er [Paulus] ist in ein Geschehen hineingezogen worden, in dem der Nomos sich selbst entthronte und seiner Herrschaft beraubte."

defeat on the Cross of Christ, with whom Paul was crucified, it had to relinquish all further claims upon him. And this crucifixion with Christ provides the bridge for living to God, its guarantee being the resurrection of Christ from the dead.

The question that now concerns us is when this dying occurred. The perfect does not fix the time, but rather stresses the present state and the continuing power of this event. The purpose and immediate result of dying to the law is the living to God, which is both realized in, and consists of, the close spiritual fellowship with Christ. As in Rom. 6, dying is not to be thought of apart from rising again to life. And as Paul here thinks of the continued living to God in the continuing fellowship of the crucified and risen Christ, which continually presupposes a dying with Christ with its enduring result, he here uses *συνεστασίνωμαι*.

In order, then, to determine the time of occurrence, we are thrown back upon *ἀπέθανον*. This cannot refer to the historical plane of Christ's death.⁷² It is true that Paul enjoys the closest communion with Christ Crucified, but his personal entry into that union occurred with faith in Christ (2:16). Also those to whom Paul wrote had the beginning of their salvation in the radical reversal effected by the spirit of God (3:9), which in Paul's view is imparted at baptism.

⁷²So, e.g., Ridderbos, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

Schnackenburg comments:

Paulus verlegt nicht existentiell sein Mitgekreuzigtwerden in die Kreuzigung Jesu; aber er betrachtet sein "Sterben" bei der Christwerdung, weil es nur als "Sterben mit Christus" Kraft und Sinn empfängt, als eine Kreuzigung, weil Christus diesen Tod erlitt. Auf ihn persönlich angewendet, geschah in der Stunde seiner Glaubensgeburt (Damaskus) und seiner Taufe (beides gehört heilstheologisch zusammen) dasselbe, was Christus in der Stunde seines Kreuzestodes und seiner Auferstehung widerfuhr. Er stellt seine Taufe neben das Kreuz.⁷³

This assertion finds further confirmation in a comparison of this passage with Rom. 7:4-6. Also here believers in Christ have been made dead to the law, and that through the body of Christ. This happened fundamentally and objectively for all on Calvary. But the following context shows that Paul has in mind rather the dying in baptism. For this dying to the law in order to belong to the Risen One and to live for God is given its foundation (γάρ) in these verses, so that no doubt remains as to when this personal reversal took place. Thus ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ is based on κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου ἀποθανόντες; εἰς . . . τῷ . . . ἐγεγενθύνει is based on ὥστε . . . ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος. The ἀποθανόντες is fixed temporarily by νυνί, which contrasts a present Christian existence to a former (ὅτε) heathen life. The turning point has occurred within their life-time, that is, in their baptism when they died to those powers which had previously enslaved them. That they died to the law within their own life-time is

⁷³Schnackenburg, op. cit., pp. 58-59.

obvious from this passage, and the inference that it was at the time of their baptism is justified in that Paul applies to these baptized persons the effects and results of the Christ-events which are explicitly posited for baptism in Rom. 6. This at the same time establishes the reference to the baptismal event in the Gal. 2:19 passage.

Another point may now be noted. It is possible to distinguish three different "levels" of crucifixion with Christ. 1) There is the historical crucifixion of Christ Himself, which occurred fundamentally and objectively for all men. 2) There is the Christian's crucifixion with Christ which occurs at his conversion and baptism. 3) There is the state of continued fellowship with the Crucified Christ. This last-mentioned "level" sheds light also on another Galatians passage. In 6:14 Paul glories only in the Cross of Christ, by which the world has been crucified to him, and he to the world. As he has died to Sin and to the Law, so here the world no longer exists for him, nor he for the world.⁷⁴ He is a new creature (v. 15). This is a fundamental principle in his life, and it is this feature of his theology which may properly be termed mystical.⁷⁵

⁷⁴The ἐμοί and κόσμῳ are again dative incommodi.

⁷⁵The term "mystical" as used here is designed to convey this thought, that the foundation for living to God is a logically prior, though continually concomitant, dying with Christ. The subjective entry into this mystical fellowship with Christ is the baptismal dying and rising with Christ.

This frame of reference lends itself to yet another possibility, found in Gal. 5:24. They that are Christ's have crucified ($\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\acute{\iota}\rho\omega\sigma\alpha\nu$) the flesh. The aorist points to a definite event in the past. This, together with the concept of crucifixion in Galatians, validates this passage as a baptismal reference. It is striking that the active is here employed, but this is certainly not to be construed as an act originating in the initiative of the candidate for baptism. Other texts rigorously exclude such a possibility. It is rather the corresponding, or better, the responding human act to the divine grace in baptism. Nor are their ascetic overtones in this word; but there is an ethical imperative implicit in the active voice. Because the Christian has been crucified with Christ, therefore he ought at the same time crucify his flesh with its passions and desires. This is the same thought that underlies the exhortation in Rom. 6:11-12: Become what you are!

This discussion had grown directly out of Paul's identification of the sacramental dying as a crucifixion with Christ in Rom. 6:6. For that reason it is necessary to be sensitive to the baptismal ring of these crucifixion passages.

The description of baptism as a burial with Christ in Rom. 6:4 leads to the parallel in Col. 2:11-13. The crux in interpreting this baptismal reference occurs in v. 12b.

Shall the $\epsilon\nu\ \hat{\epsilon}\phi$ be referred to $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ immediately

preceding?⁷⁶ Or shall it be referred back to Χριστόν in v. 8, analogous to ἐν αὐτῷ in v. 10a and ἐν ᾧ in v. 11a?⁷⁷ The problem is insoluble on purely linguistic or syntactical grounds, and so it must be solved on other grounds. These are herewith presented in favor of the latter view.

Schnackenburg in his volume schematizes the pertinent verses in the manner here reproduced:⁷⁸

| | | | |
|--------|----------|---------|-----------------------------|
| v. 10a | καὶ ἐστὲ | ἐν αὐτῷ | πεπληρωμένοι |
| b | | | ὅς ἐσιν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης |
| . | | | ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας, |
| 11a | | ἐν ᾧ | καὶ περιετμήθητε |
| . | | | περιτομῇ ἀχειροποιήτῳ |
| b | | | ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος |
| . | | | τῆς σαρκός, |
| c | | | ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ |
| 12a | | | συντεμέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ β. |
| b | | ἐν ᾧ | καὶ συνηρέθητε |
| . | | | διὰ τῆς πίστεως . . . |
| . | | | τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐρείσαντος |
| . | | | αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν |

⁷⁶So, e.g., J. K. Abbott, "The Epistle to the Ephesians and to the Colossians," The International Critical Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905), p. 251.

⁷⁷So, e.g., Paul Bwald, "Die Briefe des Paulus an die Epheser, Kolosser, und Philemon," Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, edited by Theodor Zahn (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf., 1905), X, 377; and Heinrich Rendtorff, "Die kleineren Briefe des Apostels Paulus: an die Epheser," Das Neue Testament Deutsch (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1949), VIII, 115.

⁷⁸Schnackenburg, op. cit., pp. 62-63.

Thus structured upon the ἐν αὐτῷ, v. 12a belongs to the preceding rather than the following, as the versification would suggest.

The spiritual circumcision not made with hands in v. 11a is shown to consist of the three phrases beginning with ἐν .

1) It is a putting off of the body of flesh. Circumcision is thus a symbol of the putting off of the body belonging to the flesh or sin as described in Rom. 6:6. That Christian "circumcision" is meant is seen from the fact that it is further described as 2) the circumcision of Christ, one possible only in Christ. 3) Finally, this circumcision is a burial with Christ in baptism. συντεφέντες is not only connected grammatically with περιεσμήθητε, but also by an analogy in which the ἀπεκδύσει provides the tertium comparationis: baptismal burial also signifies a complete putting off of the body of sin. Thus vv. 11a-12a form a grammatically as well as a symbolically complete unit. Paul carries out with increasing clarity a comparison between Jewish circumcision and Christian baptism, which is the ideal fulfillment of the Old Testament rite. In line with the context of Colossians, it is also fitting that it should be thus Christologically fulfilled.

Granted the above scheme, v. 12b begins a new thought. As in Rom. 6, the grave leads to the thought of the resurrection. Paul undoubtedly thinks of baptism with the συν-
 γέρθητε, though formally the means is faith (διὰ τῆς πίστεως)

in the working of God, who has unlimited power to bring life from death (Rom. 4:17), a power demonstrated decisively in the resurrection of His Son.⁷⁹ What faith asserts of Christ, that it also affirms of those who have been buried with Christ in baptism.

The thought of Christ's resurrection ἐκ νεκρῶν leads to a slightly different contrast as it occurs in the life of a believer. The following verse sets in juxtaposition νεκρούς-συνεβωποίησεν. Here the νεκρούς indicates a condition of death which prevailed up to the turning-point. Hence the συνεβωποίησεν, though not a formal reference to baptism, at least has baptismal overtones, since it denotes the point of time in which they became Christians, which in fact occurs in baptism. Paul's chief concern is the effect: those who were previously dead have been made alive again in a redemptive event σὺν Χριστῷ. This tends to confirm once again Paul's dogmatic interest above the liturgical.

A comparison of Col. 2:12 with Rom. 6:4 yields these results. 1) The ritual of baptism symbolizes a burial, which effects the death of the old man to sin and the flesh. But faith is confident (Rom. 6:8) that, since Christ rose to a new life, and since baptism binds us in a fellowship σὺν Χριστῷ, we also do not remain in death; but we are raised.

⁷⁹Cf. also Eph. 1:19 ff.: δύναμις, ἐνέργεια, κράτος ἰσχύς, τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μεγαθός.

to a new life by the same power of God. 2) Baptism is seen in a new light when compared to circumcision. Both times something is put off. In the Jewish rite it was a physical piece of flesh; in baptism, a sacramental, nevertheless real, putting off of the body of the flesh. This comparison demonstrates that a rigid correspondence between the external mode (immersion and rising again to the surface) and the sacramental event (dying and rising with Christ) was foreign to Paul and only incidental. Baptism is a baptism into death; and because it is connected with the death of Christ who rose again, it is also a sacrament unto life for us. 3) The use of *συνσπασμοί* as a term for entrance into fellowship with Christ indicates that the concept "dying and rising with Christ" is only one of several possibilities for describing personal appropriation of salvation and redemption. It can be described equally well as being made alive with Christ or as the circumcision of Christ. The decisive matter is the result: Fellowship with Jesus Christ, indicated also in Rom. 6:11 with the phrase *ἐν Χριστῷ ἠγροῦ*.

A difference between the two passages is also apparent. In Rom. 6 the rising with Christ is a logical inference, since Paul's immediate concern is the ethical application of living the new life. In Col. 2:12 the rising with Christ is expressly mentioned as something which has in fact been accomplished sacramentally.⁸⁰

⁸⁰To this interpretation the aorist bears witness.

Yet the connection between baptism and ethics is not ignored in Colossians; it comes first in 3:1-4. Christians have died with Christ, which means a death away from the στοιχεῖα of the world. This provides a basis for the prohibitions in 2:16-23. These "elements" are characteristic of the earth below, to which they no longer belong. But because they have also been raised with Christ, they now belong to the world above, where Christ is seated, to whom they belong in the sacramental union with Him. And because they share Christ's δόξα, which, though hidden, will be fully revealed in His coming, they stand under the ethical imperative to seek those things which are above.

This unfolds still another aspect of our union with Christ, by introducing a spatial contrast between τὰ ἄνω and τὰ ἑνὲ τῆς γῆς. Believers still exist here below on earth, though their life⁸¹ is hidden⁸² with Christ in God above. This life, attained through our resurrection with Christ, does not have its full fruit in us as in Christ, because we walk about on earth in our lowly bodies (Phil. 3:21).⁸³ Its full glory is reserved for us above in our transcendent Lord, whose historical life lies in the past. This, then, provides

⁸¹Here conceived as a redemptive possession in contrast to mere physical existence.

⁸²The perfect indicates the present condition resulting from a prior act, in this instance baptismal conversion.

⁸³The same local concept prevails in Phil. 1:23.

the bridge to our eschatological relationship with Christ. For our life is not only above with Christ; Christ Himself is our life. Therefore when Christ appears again, believers will also appear with Christ as the bearers of God's life in the fullness of His δόξα. And so the line of our relationship with Christ is drawn from the sacramental event, through a present though hidden union with Him, to its consummation in the Parousia. The sacramental redemptive event is not yet something complete in itself, in that it initiates the believer into an ongoing life in union with Christ to be consummated only at the end. The true salvation which Christ secured remains as something hidden for those who are bound to Him, and thus partakes of a "not yet" character. Yet it is present for the believers in their transcendent Lord during this intervening time, and hence they will partake of it when He appears at the end of time. There is then a close bond between baptism and eschatology, in which the common denominator is the formula: σὺν Χριστῷ. The beginning and the consummation of salvation alike stem from God, and that σὺν Χριστῷ.

Col. 2:13 leads to an examination of an almost verbatim parallel in Eph. 2:5 and its context. As in Colossians, so also here Paul contrasts their former (ποτε, v. 2) sinful life under the rule of demons to their present life of salvation, a change possible only by God's grace (ἔλεος, ἀγάπη,

v. 4; χάρις , v. 5). The transition is described by three σύν -compounds, which identify this removal from the sphere of God's wrath as a redemptive act of God σύν Χριστῷ. Note the verbal identity of the two passages:

Col. 2:13

Eph. 2:5

καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας

καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς

τοῖς παραπτώμασιν

τοῖς περὶ πτώμασιν

συνεξωποίησεν σὺν αὐτῷ

συνεξωποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ

The only difference is the interchange of ὑμᾶς - ἡμᾶς . The similarity is so great that the same redemptive act is undoubtedly meant, and Col. 2:13 makes it quite clear that the reference is to baptism.

This Ephesians passage does not merely restate what was already said in Colossians, but it advances the thought. This occurs in v. 6. It is striking that after συνεξωποίησεν in v. 5 συνήχειρεν appears in v. 6. This would seem to indicate that a difference in meaning is to be understood, the former as a reference to the sacramental event, the latter as a proleptic reference to the future resurrection. The argument that stands against this view is that in Col. 2:12 συνηρέθητε , in parallel to burial with Christ in baptism, is clearly a sacramental event without particular reference to its eschatological consummation, though, of course, it is never divorced from that. However, that this difference ought to be considered in the present passage can be demonstrated from the framework of Ephesians itself.

That a new thought is intended in v. 6 is already indicated by the parenthetical insertion after the thought unit of v. 5. More conclusive, however, is a comparison of Eph. 1:20 and 2:6:

| 1:20 | 2:6 |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|
| ἔγειρας αὐτὸν (Χριστὸν) ἐκ νεκρῶν | καὶ συνήγειρεν |
| καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ | καὶ συνεκάθισεν |
| ἐν τοῖς οὐρανόις | ἐν τοῖς ἔπ. |

Quite clearly the same that is predicated earlier of Christ is then transferred also to Christians, with this difference, that God resurrects and enthrones us with Christ. But these two concepts form a unit and constitutes a progression of thought beyond anything that Paul has yet posited for baptism. For if we in baptism have really entered into such an intimate union with Christ that we with Him have attained unto life, then we also partake in the triumph of the Risen One and in His heavenly enthronement. This is proleptic, however, as a look into the future, because the resurrection and heavenly enthronement have not yet taken place for the believers personally.⁸⁴ This again establishes a strong bond between sacrament and eschatology by way of the formula *σὺν Χριστῷ*.

⁸⁴Parallels to this proleptic use of the aorist in Paul are found in Eph. 1:3 (cf. 1:14) and Rom. 8:30 (cf. 8:18).

CHAPTER IV

MISCELLANEOUS BAPTISMAL REFERENCES

This short chapter is devoted to a brief discussion of a few baptismal references which are difficult to categorize. Of these the most important for an understanding of Paul's concept of baptism is an Old Testament prefiguring of baptism, to which Paul calls attention in 1 Cor. 10:1 ff.

Paul draws upon the history of Israel and finds in their reaction to their sacramental experiences a warning for those who receive the New Testament sacraments. In v. 6 he uses the word τύπος in reference to ταῦτα . This, together with the ταῦτα τυπικῶς συνέβαινεν of v. 11 would suggest that the events which they experienced are the types to which Paul refers. He is not concerned to establish an abstract and philosophical correspondence in the Platonic sense between the passage through the Red Sea and Christian baptism. He rather issues a solemn warning against false conclusions in their thinking on the means of grace. Thus vv. 1-5 form the text for the earnest sermon of vv. 6-11, not to repeat the sad mistake of God's Old Testament people.

Many exegetes find the tertium comparationis in the passing through the water, as reminiscent of the external

mode of immersion.¹ But it has already been shown that this feature was for Paul quite accidental, and that his concern was rather for the sacramental event and its salutary results. Hence, though this provided an external correspondence, it would seem more likely that Paul saw beyond that to a foreshadowing of the baptismal event as a means of grace. The miracle, which Israel experienced in an hour of utmost need when their very existence was at stake, was God's gracious act of rescue. This is the same miracle which Christians experience in baptism, with the difference that the latter works a rescue, not merely from physical destruction but from eternal damnation.²

The main line of thought, however, is quite obvious.

¹So, e.g., Heinz Dietrich Wendland, "Die Briefe an die Korinther," Das Neue Testament Deutsch (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1948), VII, 58: "Der Vergleichnispunkt kann also nur in dem völligen von Wasser Ungeben-sein gesehen werden;" so also Hans Lietzmann, "An die Korinther I. II," Handbuch zum Neuen Testament (Tübingen: Verlag J. C. B. Mohr, 1949), IX, 44.

²That Paul uses the incident only by way of analogy is evidenced by his use of βαπτίζεῖν εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν. This phrase shows that Paul is influenced by Christian baptism with its formula βαπτίζεῖν εἰς Χριστόν (Rom. 6:3; Gal. 3:27). James Moffatt, "The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians," The Moffatt New Testament Commentary (New York and London: Harper and Brothers Publishers, n.d.), p. 129, explains it by reference to Moses' divine appointment as mediator. However that may be, Paul does not orient this event Christologically, as he does in 10:4 with the spiritual Rock. This confirms the fact that Paul uses this event merely as a τύπος, portrayed and adduced from the New Testament point of view. Baptism into Moses was indeed a kind of baptism, but it was not a baptism in the Name of Jesus with all its effects.

Baptism is not a magical happening with automatic or unfailling effectiveness.³ He who has been baptized can, despite its reception, lose the salvation with which God has graced him (vv. 6-11). It is a false notion to assume that baptism necessarily guarantees salvation. God's gift, which endows us with the indicative, also places us under the ethical imperative to become what we are. Though all Israel had been baptized with the same baptism, and though all had partaken of the same spiritual food and drink, nevertheless, with most of them God was not well-pleased. The tacit inference is quite simply this: baptism alone and as such does not yet guarantee God's pleasure and His final salvation. There must follow the ethical life which corresponds and responds to the grace of God, lest it be received in vain (2 Cor. 6:1). At the same time the effect of baptism is not thereby made dependent on the recipient. It is and remains God's gracious act. God's deliverance of Israel through the Red Sea was a blessing which they all received out of His love. The judgment of God descended (vv. 8-10) because of their failure to conduct their lives in accordance with, and in spite of, the blessing received.

In view of this it is striking that the middle $\epsilon\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\omicron$ is used. Barth seizes on this to show that a human act was

³Wendland, op. cit., p. 57: "Die Taufe ist kein magisch, d. h. durch sich selbst unfehlbar wirkenden Wundermittel."

involved, and hence excludes the divine working ascribed by Lutheran and Roman Catholic theologians to the sacrament of baptism.⁴ However, this interpretation must fall in the face of the event this verb describes. God's miracle of dividing the waters of the Red Sea to effect deliverance for His people is an act which stands apart from, and independent of, any human cooperation. The matter is aptly concluded by Schnackenburg:

Nicht beim Sakramentenempfang selbst ist eine persönliche Bemühung gefordert--er steht ganz unter dem Gesichtspunkt der göttlichen Tat--, sondern neben dem Genuss der göttlichen Wohltaten und als Frucht derselben verlangt Paulus die sittliche Bewahrung.⁵

Thus Paul rejects any magical conceptions of the sacrament, and also combats libertinism in the wake of God's gracious act.

The baptismal reference in 1 Cor. 15:29 raises problems too numerous for any detailed discussion in this thesis. In the first place, a good many of the problems encountered here are of an historical nature, and the answers to those questions would not contribute materially to an understanding of Paul's baptismal theology. Then, secondly, it is doubtful,

⁴Markus Barth, Die Taufe--Ein Sakrament? (Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag A. G. Zollikon, 1951), p. 369.

⁵Rudolph Schnackenburg, Das Heilsgeschehen bei der Taufe nach dem Apostel Paulus (München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1950), p. 89.

in view of the host of differing interpretations adduced by an equal host of commentators, whether the exegetical problems are capable of final solution. This circumstance urges caution a priori in venturing any radical departure from Pauline baptismal theology which is more certainly grounded on clearer passages. Therefore, a few general observations and a tentative conclusion must suffice.

1. The passage occurs in a chapter which from v. 12 down teaches the doctrine of the physical resurrection. The preceding context (vv. 20-28) is kerygmatic, as is the following context (vv. 35-58).

2. The paragraph consisting of vv. 29-34 seems to be a series of three ad hominem arguments designed to reinforce the doctrine of the resurrection: a) baptism for the dead in v. 29; b) Paul's own life of hardship, which would be senseless without the hope of a resurrection (vv. 30-32a); and c) the evil moral consequences of hedonism, if death ends all (vv. 32b-34).

3. There was obviously a practice, current at least among some of the Corinthians, of being baptized for the dead. In the context, the force of this argument is felt only in the inconsistency of this practice, which presumably secured some eternal benefits for the dead (ὄψέρ), with the denial of a resurrection life hereafter.

4. Again, the context of the chapter makes it quite obvious that Paul is speaking of physically dead people. His

theme is the eschatological resurrection from the dead.

Therefore, the force of the argument remains the same, whether the *ὑπέρ* be understood in the sense of "to the advantage of" or "in the place of."

5. Paul speaks no word of censure regarding the practice; but at the same time he does not endorse it.

Ultimately, it is the last point which causes the theological difficulty. If Paul does not oppose the practice, is it necessary to assume that he endorses it? At the outset, it must be said that 1 Cor. 10:1 ff. makes it emphatically clear that the Apostle rejects any kind of magic in connection with the sacrament. How then can Paul's position best be understood? The following considerations seem to point in the direction of an argumentum ad hominem without personal endorsement.

1. The third person suggests a certain aloofness from the practice.

2. It is characteristic of the Apostle to use every legitimate device at his command to undergird his dogmatic assertions.

3. He was concerned not to restrict unduly Christian liberty. So he permitted the private use of the glossalalia in 1 Cor. 14:1-5, 39. Even the public use of "tongues", with certain restrictions, was tolerated in v. 27. These he allowed, despite the fact that he personally did not seem to favor using them, even though he was more gifted than many

another also in this respect (vv. 18-19). Historical evidence is completely lacking that baptism for the dead was ever a wide-spread custom.⁶ If, then, this custom was limited to only a few people, or even practiced throughout the local church at Corinth, but only there, Paul could probably tolerate it. That he offers no word of criticism, however, leads to the assumption that the practice was conducted under such circumstances which did not essentially endanger saving faith.

One final series of passages which may include baptism in its scope is that which designates the Holy Spirit as a seal. Cullmann unhesitatingly makes the statement, "Baptism is even in New Testament times, and not only later, designated as σφραγίς."⁷ This is based on three passages: 2 Cor. 1:22; Eph. 1:13; 4:30. The Ephesians passages express the concept in the aorist passive (ἐσφραγίσθητε), a circumstance which argues strongly in favor of considering these as baptismal references. That the Corinthians passage uses the aorist middle (σφραγισάμενος) offers no theological difficulty, since the subject is clearly God. To consider them as references to baptism involves no contradiction to what can be positively ascertained concerning Paul's

⁶Ibid., pp. 90-98.

⁷Oscar Cullmann, Baptism in the New Testament, translated by J. K. S. Reid (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1950), pp. 46-47.

teaching of baptism as a means for conferring the Spirit. Nor does it add materially to Paul's baptismal theology. Yet it cannot be stated with certainty that Paul here has baptism in mind. Cullmann's interest is through the *σφραγίς* concept to establish a theological connection with the Old Testament rite of circumcision, which is specifically called a *σφραγίς* in Rom. 4:11. There he finds support for his position in his debate over infant baptism against Karl Barth. His polemical concern perhaps makes him too dogmatic on this score.

Ultimately the problem is historical rather than exegetical. Exegetically a baptismal interpretation is at least not excluded. Whether this possibility is excluded historically is a question to which Dölger addresses himself.⁸ After first examining the origin and content of the concept, both in the Oriental and in the Hellenistic world, he urges caution in reading the patristic use of *σφραγίς* as a terminus technicus for baptism back into Paul.

Das älteste unbestrittene Zeugnis für die Beziehung der Taufe als einer Sphragis begegnet in der ersten Hälfte des zweiten Jahrhunderts im Pastor des Hermas.⁹

From the wide currency which the term enjoyed in the middle of the second century, he ventures a tenable hypothesis:

⁸Franz Joseph Dölger, *Sphragis* (Paderborn: Verlag von Ferdinand Schöningh, 1911).

⁹*Ibid.*, p. 70.

Mit Sicherheit darf angenommen werden, dass das Wort *σφραγίς* als Taufbezeichnung um die Mitte des Zweiten Jahrhunderts bereits eine Vergangenheit hinter sich hatte; sonst könnte es nicht so gleichmäßig auftauchen in Kleinasien (Acta Pauli), Lyon (Irenaeus), in Karthago (Tertullian), Alexandrien (Klemens), Korinth? (II Klemens) und in Rom (Hermas).¹⁰

From this it seems safe to assume the probability of referring Paul's sayings concerning the seal of the Spirit to baptism. And if the reference lacks historical certainty, then the baptismal overtone is at least exegetically perceptible.

It will be noted that every baptismal reference adjoined makes an idea of salvation. Baptism as a washing is paralleled in 1 Cor. 6:11 with sanctification and justification and stands in contrast to a previous immoral life. Thus it involves the prerequisite, as well as the guarantee, of entrance into the Kingdom of God (v. 10). The phrase *ἐν ᾧ* used in connection with baptism indicates that those who are baptized have thereby become the possession of God, the *ἀγαπῆται* (1 Cor. 1:13), a fact which results in their sanctification (v. 15). In baptism we put on Christ and are thus brought into close union with Him, a status which makes us heirs of the promise given to Abraham (Gal. 3:27-29). Baptism is a burial with Christ. But we are buried with Him in order also to rise with Him (Rom. 6:4, 8; Col. 2:12-13). The fullness of this resurrection glory will be revealed to us and in us at the Parousia (Col. 3:3-4).

CHAPTER V

THE THEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF BAPTISM

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize briefly the theological significance of baptism on the basis of the conclusions drawn from the exegetical investigation of the pertinent passages.

Baptism as a Means of Grace

It will be noted that every baptismal reference adduced speaks in some way of salvation. Baptism as a washing is paralleled in 1 Cor. 6:11 with sanctification and justification and stands in contrast to a previous immoral life. Thus it becomes the prerequisite, as well as the guarantee, of entrance into the Kingdom of God (v. 10). The phrase εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ used in connection with baptism indicates that those who are baptized have thereby become the possession of Christ who died for us (1 Cor. 1:13), a fact which rescues us from damnation (v. 18). In baptism we put on Christ and are thus brought into close union with Him, a status which makes us heirs of the promise given to Abraham (Gal. 3:27-29). Baptism is a burial with Christ. But we are buried with Him in order also to rise with Him (Rom. 6:4,8; Col. 2:12 ff.). The fullness of this resurrection glory will be revealed to us and in us at the Parousia (Col. 3:3-4).

Baptism as a washing of regeneration effects its purpose as it confers justification by grace and makes us heirs according to the hope of eternal life. These passages, therefore, show that baptism is fundamentally a means of grace. It is the act of rescue in the New Testament redemptive aeon, a fact which tends to confirm the point of comparison discovered in 1 Cor. 10:1 ff.

The grace thus mediated comes alone from God. This fact is borne out predominantly by the use of the passive voice which is used uniformly in almost all the passages. God is the Initiator of this divine rescue, and the purely passive role played by man rules out all thought of synergism. Paul uses the active voice only once, and that in 1 Cor. 1:16-17 where he speaks of his own activity of baptizing others without any thought of detracting from the divine monergism. Two other exceptions are also only apparent. In 1 Cor. 10:1 ff. and 1 Cor. 6:11 the middle is used. However, here the contexts forbid any assumption of human cooperation. The Red Sea rescue was God's miracle; ἀπελούσατο is paralleled with passives designated to describe God's exclusive role as Justifier and Sanctifier. God alone is the Savior and Quickener (Col. 2:12 f.; Eph. 2:5). This thought is especially forceful in Tit. 3:5, particularly in view of the antithesis which it excludes, when Paul pointedly declares that God saves us, not because of deeds done by us in righteousness, but in virtue of His own mercy. This same idea is emphasized

in those passages where the active voice is used, but where God is the subject, either explicitly or implicitly, especially Col. 2:13 and Eph. 2:5-6. The Ephesians passages underscore God's activity unequivocally with the parenthetical insertion of the phrase *χάριτί ἐστε σφραγισμένοι*.

When speaking of the effects of baptism the book of Acts shows that the early Church thought in terms of the forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost (Acts 3:38). With regard to the first of these, the figure of washing away the filth of sin is particularly prominent in Acts, as for example in 22:16. The same idea is expressed by Paul when he speaks of baptism as a washing (1 Cor. 6:11, cf. 9-10) and as a purification (Eph. 5:26, *καθάρσις*). With regard to the second, Acts speaks of the Holy Ghost as a gift (2:38; 8:16 f.; 19:2-6). Paul brings the Spirit into close connection with Christ as the Mediator of sanctification and justification (1 Cor. 6:11). Acts speaks of the pouring out of the Spirit, especially when contrasting it to John's baptism (1:5; 19:2-6). Paul gives continuity also to this idea in Tit. 3:6. But Paul at the same time develops the idea and shows the relation between Christ and the Spirit. The Spirit is the effective instrument of Christ (1 Cor. 12:13).

These two effects of baptism in turn work another result, that of setting the baptized believer into the fellowship of the Church. Acts teaches this social dimension of baptism without spelling out the internal connection (2:41, 47;

10:47). Paul renders this more explicit, especially in Gal. 3:27-28. We are all one congregation of believers, regardless of national, social, or sexual differences. This unity is realized in baptism, for Christ through His Spirit (1 Cor. 12:13) not only unites Himself with him who has been baptized, but also through His Spirit incorporates all in one body. Hence he says that we are all one in Christ Jesus. For this blessing Paul in 1 Cor. 12:13 uses the graphic description of the Body of Christ. In baptism the Body of Christ, whose members the individual believers constitute, is being built. We enter not into a closed, completed fellowship, but each individual adds to this fellowship, since by his entry he helps to complete its building. The individual, however, is not personally active, but it is the Spirit who includes him within the Body.

Finally, all efforts to regard baptism as a means of grace are futile unless there be a clear recognition of the significance of Christ. Paul unquestionably preaches salvation for all only through Christ (Rom. 3:23-26). Hence he also recognizes but one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, through whom we exist (1 Cor. 8:6). Therefore, he is at pains to relate baptism to Christ, as is seen from his description of baptism as one *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (1 Cor. 1:13; 6:11); *εἰς Χριστὸν* (Gal. 3:27); *εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν* (Rom. 6:3a); *εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ* (Rom. 6:3b). The same line of thought underlies the phrase *περὶ τομῆς Χριστοῦ*

(Col. 2:11). But the profoundest expression of this relation to Christ occurs in Rom. 6:3 ff. There the entry into fellowship with Christ is described as an experience together with Christ of those events which He once underwent. Here the historic events which lie in the past gain a direct significance for the appropriation of salvation in the present. It is the union with Christ which baptism effects which makes it a means of grace. But it should be noted already at this point, that while it is only union with Christ that effects salvation for us, it is also union with the total Christ, in his decisive, once-for-all historicity, in His present reality as the transcendent and glorified Lord, and in His awaited coming at the Parousia, that He is for us the way of salvation.

Christ's Redemptive Act as the Foundation of Baptism

It is significant that in Paul's description of baptism in Rom. 6:6 he uses the verb *συνεστύρωσθαι*, for it evidences that fact that he bases the redemptive event in the sacrament on the historic redemptive act of Christ on Calvary. It underscores once more a fundamental thesis in his theology: the one source of salvation is Christ's redemption effected on the Cross of Calvary. Hence it is also not without its significance that ch. 6 follows upon ch. 5 with its exposition of the Adam-Christ parallel, for it shows how it is possible for the salvation procured objectively and fundamentally

by the One, Jesus Christ, to avail for the Many. This forms a vital presupposition for Paul's baptismal theology.

The exegetical difficulties are largely of a formal nature. The sense of the passage in Rom. 5:12-21 is quite clear. "It was through one man, Adam, that all men are sinners and are subject to death."¹ So also it was through one Man, Jesus Christ, that many are made righteous unto eternal life. One of the emphases in the passage is the solidarity of the human race. One man sinned and thereby released sin and death into the world. That this act included the entire human family can be seen from the circumstance that ever since death has reigned, despite the fact that prior to Sinai there was no specific divine law to define transgression. This simply underscores the cosmic character of Adam's fall, an act which was uniquely his own, yet in its dire consequences included every individual that was to follow. By one man's disobedience many were made sinners (5:19); one man's trespass brought condemnation to all (5:18); in Adam all die (1 Cor. 15:22). Thus, from the point of view of redemptive history, Adam becomes the inclusive representative of the old humanity.

The opposite member of the parallel has equally cosmic proportions and equally universal consequences. One Man was

¹Anders Nygren, Commentary on Romans, translated by Carl C. Rasmussen (Philadelphia: Muhlenburg Press, 1949), p. 214.

obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross (Phil. 2:8), and, while death reigned as a consequence of Adam's transgression, as a consequence of His obedience those who receive the free gift of righteousness shall reign in life (5:17). This act of righteousness was uniquely Christ's own, yet in its blessed, salutary results it includes fundamentally and objectively the entire human race. His obedience made the many righteous (5:19);² one Man's act of righteousness brought acquittal to all men (5:18); in Christ shall all be made alive (1 Cor. 15:22). Thus from the point of view of redemptive history, Christ is the inclusive Representative of the new humanity.

The significance of this parallel is concisely stated by Althaus:

Allumfassende Wirkung der Sünde und des Todes,
allumfassende Wirkung der Gnade und des Lebens:
Adam und Christus--das ist die grosse Polarität
und doch zugleich Parallelität der Weltgeschichte in
ihrem Doppelcharakter als Unheils- und Heilsgeschichte.³

He continues by saying:

Adam und Christus sind die wesentlichen Epochen; von diesen Polen gehen die entscheidenden Mächte, der Tod und das Leben, auf alle aus.⁴

²That *κατεστραθῆσονται* here has more than simply the juridical, forensic meaning is shown by the fact that the same verb is used of Adam's transgression with respect to the many, who are in actual fact sinners.

³Paul Althaus, "Der Brief an die Römer," Das Neue Testament Deutsch (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1949), VI, 43.

⁴Ibid., p. 45.

Yet the second member of the parallel retains its superiority over the first in two ways. The first is in the greater proportion of its salutary effects than the infernal consequences of the other. On the Adam-side there is a verdict of strictest justice; on the Christ-side there is the addition of unalloyed grace. This real difference is explicitly stated in 5:15: ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς παράπτωμα, οὕτως καὶ τὸ χάρισμα, and further emphasized in πολλῶν μᾶλλον (5:15,17), περισσεύων (5:17), and ὅπερ ἐπερίσσευσεν (5:20). The other difference which preserves the uniqueness of the Christ-side of the parallel is expressed in 1 Cor. 15:45-49. Adam, the first man, was a living being; Christ, the last Adam, became a life-giving spirit. Adam is our physical ancestor, the progenitor of our dust. Christ is our spiritual ancestor, the progenitor of our heavenly life. Hence the basis of our solidarity with Adam is physical life through physical descent. But though Christ is related to us by virtue of His human nature,⁵ the basis of our solidarity with Him is something other than the dust of which we are composed in common with Adam. Our solidarity with Christ derives from the fact that we together with Him are of heaven (οἱ ἐπουρανίου, 1 Cor. 15:48). Though this as yet says nothing about our entry into solidarity with Christ, it nevertheless forms both the

⁵It is interesting in this connection to note the emphasis on Christ's humanity: ἀνθρώπου (Rom. 5:15); δι' ἀνθρώπου (1 Cor. 15:21); ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος (1 Cor. 15:47).

complement of Paul's theology of baptism as entry into the salutary estate $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, as well as its presupposition.

A closely related theme in Paul's theology is the vicarious atonement. Though this is taught in many passages, it is concisely and unequivocally stated in 2 Cor. 5:14: One died for all; therefore, all have died. The debate whether $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho$ carries with it the substitutionary idea, or whether it has the broader meaning "for the benefit of", is, at least in this passage, silenced in face of the inference which Paul draws; namely, that all have died. The satisfactio vicaria here expressed has its roots in the Old Testament, particularly in Is. 53, with its concept of the Suffering Servant of God. But the point to be observed here is that Christ's vicarious death did not merely remove the necessity of our dying, but rather His death, the death of the One, is a reality of such dimension, that Paul can conclude: All have died, fundamentally and objectively. This in itself is significant, for Christ's vicarious death posits for all men a death prior to, and apart from, baptism.

Yet the mere fact that in Christ's death all have objectively and fundamentally died, so that His death avails for all, does not warrant the inference that all actually attain the saving effect of His death. Paul continues by stating the purpose (*iv^a*, v. 15) of Christ's substitutionary death: that they who live might live unto Him who died and was raised. This idea is repeated in v. 21: that we might

become the righteousness of God in Him. A difference is immediately noticeable. In speaking of the scope of Christ's death he speaks universally and inclusively (*ὅπερ πάντων, πάντες*); whereas in describing the blessed results, he narrows the *πάντες* to the *οἱ ζῶντες*. At this place Paul does not elaborate on the reason why Christ's death for all does not benefit all. Here he simply asserts the fact that Christ died for all in order that they might live. How this happens is not his concern at the moment. For that we are thrown back upon the baptismal references.

Thus the idea of the vicarious atonement supports the Adam-Christ parallel in this respect, that both these themes portray the fact that the redemptive deed of the one Representative and Substitute is valid for the many. The salvation procured by Christ is open to all fundamentally and objectively; in practice, however, it is attained only by those who appropriate it subjectively through the means of grace.

Baptism and Faith as Receptive Organs

Lutheran theology has been at pains to defend the definition of faith as a medium *ληπτικόν*, "the receptive organ for apprehending the forgiveness of sins offered in the Gospel."⁶ It requires no extensive documentation to find support

⁶Francis Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1953), II, 437-438. His full discussion under this heading continues to p. 445.

for this from the Pauline corpus. The redemption which is in Christ Jesus is received through ($\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$) faith (Rom. 3:24-25); through ($\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$) faith Christ takes up His abode in the hearts of the believer (Eph. 3:17); life in communion with Christ is a life in ($\epsilon\upsilon$) faith (Gal. 2:20); from ($\epsilon\kappa$) the hearing of faith the Spirit proceeds (Gal. 3:5); and we receive the promise of the Spirit through ($\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$) faith (Gal. 3:5).

On the other hand, the Apostle ascribes the appropriation of these same blessings to the instrumentality of baptism. We are justified by baptism (Tit. 3:5-7); baptism mediates a dying and rising with Christ (Rom. 6:1-11); a communion with Christ is nowhere in such a profound manner posited for faith; baptism mediates the Spirit (1 Cor. 6:11); and it effects a cleansing from sin (Eph. 5:26).

It is this phenomenon which leads to the problem of the relation of the two to each other. Lutheran theology has solved the problem by assigning the priority to faith. Salvation and all spiritual blessings are received by faith. That the New Testament says the same for baptism is explained by the fact that baptism confers these blessings because "Christ will provide . . . the medium $\lambda\eta\eta\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$, faith, by which alone they can accept the blessing and the kingdom of heaven."⁷ This assertion has its confessional basis in the

⁷Ibid., p. 285. This is from his discussion of infant

Apology of the Augsburg Confession, XIII, para. 18-20:

Da müssen wir frei verdammen den ganzen Haufen der scholasticorum und ihren Irrtum strafen, dasz sie lehren, dasz diejenigen, so die Sakrament schlecht gebrauchen, wenn sie nicht obicen setzen, ex opere operato Gottes Gnade erlangen, wenn schon das Herz alsdenn kein guter Gedanken hat. Das ist aber stracks ein judischer Irrtum, so sie halten, dasz wir sollten durch ein Werk und äusserliche Ceremonien gerecht und heilig werden ohne Glauben und wenn das Herz schon nicht dabei ist, und diese schädliche Lehre wird doch gepredigt und gelehrt weit und breit, durchaus und überall im ganzen Pabsts Reich und Pabsts Kirchen. Paulus schreit dawider und sagt, dasz Abraham sei für Gott gerecht worden, nicht durch die Beschneidung, sondern die Beschneidung sei ein Zeichen gewesen, den Glauben zu üben und stärken. Darum sagen wir auch, dasz zum rechten Brauch der Sakramenten der Glaube gehöre, der da gläube der göttlichen Zusage, und zugesagte Gnade empfahe, welche durch Sakrament und Wort wird angeboten. Und dies ist ein gewisser, rechter Brauch der heiligen Sakrament, da sich ein Herz und Gewissen auf wagen und lassen mag. Denn die göttliche Zusage kann niemands fassen, denn allein durch den Glauben, und die Sakrament sein äusserliche Zeichen und Siegel der Verheiszung. Darum zum rechten Brauch derselbigen gehört Glaube.⁸

It will readily be seen that in the final analysis this is no solution at all, since it merely removes the problem one step farther back. For if faith is the medium ληπτικόν that receives the blessings of baptism, what is the hand which

baptism, where this issue is brought into sharp focus. This priority of faith as the receiving hand receives even stronger emphasis, ibid., p. 284: "Any doctrine that would put the child in possession of the blessing of baptism without faith (opus operatum) as the receiving hand on the part of the child is anti-Christian; for the blessing of baptism consists in the remission of sins, and this can be appropriated through no other means than faith." (Emphasis mine).

⁸"Apologie der Konfession," Die Bekenntnisschriften der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche (Second edition; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1952), p. 295.

receives the blessing of faith? Paul nowhere in listing the blessings of baptism mentions faith, and this is corroborated by the baptismal references in the rest of the New Testament. Their import is uniformly that salvation and all spiritual blessings are mediated directly by baptism.⁹

Ultimately we are confronted by an insoluble problem, for we are thrown back upon the mystery of conversion. How are we then to understand the confessional position in the light of the New Testament, particularly the Pauline corpus?

In Paul there is no contrast between faith and baptism; faith is always set in opposition to works. If the question concerns itself with the basis for our hope of salvation, the answer is this: we are justified freely for Christ's sake by God's grace through the means of faith, which excludes any human endeavor. If, on the other hand, the question concerns itself with the decisive turn of a man's life and his entry into that life in which he stands before God as a forgiven sinner, Paul consistently points back to baptism (cf. Rom. 6:2-3; 1 Cor. 1:13). Moe makes this significant observation:

We must not forget the question that he [Paul] is discussing in Romans, chapters 3-5 (and Galatians 2-4) in distinction to the one in Romans 6-8 (and Galatians 5);

⁹This is perhaps most clearly evidenced in a passage like 1 Pet. 3:21, where Peter expressly states that baptism saves. He safeguards this from being simply a magical operation by relating it directly (as Paul does) to the resurrection and enthronement of Christ.

namely this: Is the state of grace that follows baptism assured just by faith, or must faith be supplemented by fulfillment of the law if the Christian is to be sure of his justification and salvation? And there the Apostle had no reason to refer to baptism itself. But when he comes to the question as to whether the believer needs to apply himself to living a holy life, Paul turns back to baptism as the beginning of the Christian life, because baptism so clearly shows the nature of the new life as a living in communion with the death and resurrection of Christ.¹⁰

Thus, though baptism and faith are correlative and parallel, they each respectively preserve their unique emphasis in the Christian's life.

The close relation between the two is evidenced in Gal. 3:26-27 and Col. 2:12. In the first passage Paul had previously pictured the law in its destructive role as the multiplier of transgressions (v. 19; cf. Rom. 5:20), as the jail-keeper (v. 23), and as the stern pedagogue (v. 24). In contrast to it Paul portrays the liberating and saving power of faith. The point of view is faith in antithesis to the law. But as soon as he has based our freedom as sons of God in Christ Jesus on faith, he makes an easy and unforced transition over to baptism, in which and by which we have put on Christ. It might be noted in passing that this text speaks of the continuing, enduring status of sonship in the present tense, while the decisive baptismal event is spoken of in

¹⁰Olaf Moe, The Apostle Paul, translated by L. A. Vigness (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, c.1954), II, 336-337.

the aorist. This tends to confirm the thought that faith continues to appropriate what once was initially appropriated in baptism as the past and decisive turning-point. Col. 2:12 in joining baptism and faith inverts the order. Where Gal. 3:26-27 spoke of faith and baptism, Col. 2:12 first mentions baptism as the circumcision of Christ and burial with Christ. As soon as Paul describes the resurrection with Christ, we note the same easy and unforced transition over to faith, for the power of God to quicken the dead presupposes faith (Rom. 4:17).

Hence faith and baptism belong together in the normal course of a Christian life. Both mediate the same spiritual blessings.¹¹ To pit them against one another is to put asunder what God has joined together.¹² As little as the New Testament knows of salvation apart from faith, so little does it know of unbaptized Christians. In every instance if either states expressly or implies that believers have been

¹¹For a summary of the attempts to attribute separate blessings to each of these respectively, cf. Nae, op. cit., p. 335.

¹²This lies at the root of the distinction between water baptism and Spirit baptism, in which the former is the external rite which expresses either the hope that the latter will take place, or the confession that the latter already has been experienced; cf. Markus Barth, Die Taufe-- Ein Sakrament? (Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag A. G. Zollikon, 1951), p. 524. But in either case the "baptism of water" never mediates the blessings which come only through Spirit baptism.

baptized.¹³ Baptism without faith is unthinkable; conversely, genuine faith submits to baptism in obedience to God's Word. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mk. 16:16).

If, now, for the purpose of systematic construction a priority be assigned to faith, this can be rightly understood. The blessings once received initially in baptism must necessarily be continually received in faith as the continuing medium ληπτικόν. Without subsequent faith¹⁴ the baptismal blessing of salvation avails nothing, for we stand in perpetual dependence upon the grace of God (1 Cor. 15:10). In the Confessional passage cited above the polemical antithesis was an ex opere operato understanding of the sacraments. To preserve the sacrament against the misunderstanding that it is efficacious as an external rite or ceremony, the confessors taught that faith must accompany the sacrament. The intention of the confessors was entirely in accordance with the Scriptures: faith and baptism dare not be divorced. This, however, by no means precludes other

¹³The thief on the cross is an apparent exception. Aside from the fact that the argument that he was not baptized is a silentio, it must be borne in mind that Christ spoke His words of promise to this penitent before He gave His command, which binds the Church, at His ascension.

¹⁴Cr. Oscar Cullmann, Baptism in the New Testament, translated by J. K. S. Reid (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1950), p. 48: ". . . this unrepeatable baptismal act itself, this 'birth', is not dependent on faith, and neither stands nor falls with faith. Only the subsequent life is so dependent."

possibilities for describing the relation between the two, since on this subject the Scriptures are mute.¹⁵

The Understanding of Baptism as a Sacramental Dying and Rising With Christ

The burden of this chapter thus far has been to demon-

¹⁵In this connection the question must be asked whether the doctrine of the opus operatum need carry with it the opprobrium attached to it by Lutheran theology, especially in reference to the sacrament of baptism. According to the Lutheran Cyclopedia, edited by Erwin L. Luecker (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, c.1954), pp. 762-763, it expresses the doctrine that the sacraments confer the grace of God "by the performance of the outward sacramental act, apart from the spiritual condition of the recipient." The same doctrine is anathematized in the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, XIII, para. 18, as quoted above. The pertinent Latin reads thus: "Haec simpliciter iudaica opinio est sentire quod per ceremoniam iustificamur, sine bono motu cordis, hoc est, sine fide." Implicit in the Lutheran position is that faith together with the Word makes the sacrament, for faith receives the blessings of baptism. However applicable this may be in the case of adult baptisms, the question still remains what prior bonus motus (faith) can be said to be brought by infants? Must it not be said that in such an instance, where the doctrine of original sin declares them to be utterly devoid of any spiritual life and, in fact, opposed to God's gracious will, the sacrament of baptism mediates to them directly salvation and all spiritual blessings simply in the performance of the act in accordance with Christ's command? Or, if in the interest of securing the priority of faith as the medium διπλικόν, it be said that baptism creates faith which in turn receives the baptismal benefits (a statement impossible to document from the New Testament Scriptures), must it not be granted that the blessing of faith to believe the promises attached to baptism is bestowed "ex opere operato?" Ultimately, logically and chronologically, we are forced back to a point where we are included in God's gracious plan apart from, and without, any good intention or receptive organ on our part. In the final analysis this occurs in God's gracious election in Christ. But the New Testament gives us warrant to see the realization of that inclusion both in faith (apart from baptism) and in baptism (apart from faith). Yet in either case, the one leads immediately to the other.

strate that baptism, founded as it is upon Christ's once-for-all redemptive deed, is a real means of grace by which the individual appropriates the blessings of salvation. Here the attempt will be made, especially on the basis of Paul's unique understanding of the sacrament as a dying and rising with Christ, to discover what the inner workings of baptism are.

The Mystery Religions

The similarity between the initiatory rites of the mystery religions and Christian baptism, with respect both to the rite itself and to the terminology, led the school of Comparative Religion to investigate them as a possible source and explanation of Paul's thought. A comparison, however, will readily show the differences and support the uniqueness of the Christian sacrament.¹⁶

In the mystery religions a rebirth through dying and rising is experienced analogously to the process of nature. In Christian baptism the prototype, whose experiences we "re-enact", is the historical figure of Jesus Christ, who died and rose again. And so the new life of the mystery religions can under certain conditions and circumstances be renewed. There is little genuine concern about the question of whether

¹⁶The following comparison is a summary of the material gathered by Althaus, op. cit., pp. 51-53.

the new life can be lost, even less about its moral obligations. In contrast, Christian baptism is under all circumstances a once-for-all, never-to-be-repeated act; and the seriousness with which the new life thus acquired is to be taken can be seen from the ethic which baptism demands. This is the burden of Rom. 6:1-11: become what you are. And 1 Cor. 10:1 ff. warns against a false trust in the mere fact of having been baptized without observing the ethical response which baptism requires.

In the mystery religions everything depends on the rite. The rite as such, through its symbolism, can create the corresponding reality. The particular sacramental usage of itself effects the relation to God. The focal point of the whole act is the initiate and what happens to him. But with Paul the reverse is the truth. In the Cross of Christ and His resurrection the whole human race has been included a priori. This historic redemptive event of Christ's is the primary thing; what the baptized person experiences is secondary. For this same reason Paul is not bound to the external symbolism, however instructive it may be. If he were, it would be difficult to explain the complete abandon with which he changes pictures: baptism as a dying and rising with Christ, the circumcision of Christ, and the putting on of Christ. Hence Paul's concern is not with the rite as such by which men in some sense complete the initiation, but always as God's act in Christ by which we are included in His

gracious plan $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}$.

The initiate of the mystery religions is introduced to the life of God in such a way that he himself becomes a god. In the mysteries of Mithras and Isis he was invoked as God. In baptism we are incorporated into Christ, set into fellowship with Him; but we are not absorbed into Him, nor do we become Christ. We remain as sinners before Him and await the consummation of our redemption. Similarly, the initiate of the mystery religions is taken out of this world with the result that he remains completely aloof and detached from the world. In baptism, though we are set into the coming aeon, we nevertheless remain in this world as part and parcel of its history. Our baptismal regeneration is for us the in-breaking of the powers of the age to come, but it is bound up with the eschatological hope of a physical resurrection, at which time this corruptible will put on incorruption; this mortality, immortality.

These differences strike at the very heart and essence of the respective rites, because the Christian religion is a historical redemptive religion in contrast to the mysteries, which attempt to mediate supra-temporal mystic experiences. Christianity thinks in terms of redemptive history, the mysteries in terms of myth and mysticism. Hence the heathen mystic attempts to be transported into another world through a subjectively experienced process. The Christian is indeed transformed in baptism, but this occurs by an act of God in

which he in this world is placed on the way of salvation with Christ, a way which reaches its final destination in the Parousia. This brief comparison suffices to show that in his thinking with regard to the baptismal event, Paul does not proceed from the symbolism of the act; baptism not only symbolizes the redemptive event, but actually effects it. On the other hand, he does not conceive it to be a wonder-working magic, but rather the gracious working of God's redemptive act. The uniquely sacramental character of baptism is in either instance preserved because it is seen as a redemptive dying and rising with Christ, who once in history was crucified and rose again.

Thus we are brought face to face with one of the most perplexing problems confronting the exegete in Paul's baptismal theology; namely, how are we to conceive of the dying and rising with Christ? The debate centers especially in Rom. 6:1-11, and the problem is whether this dying and rising with Christ can be fitted into our temporal framework.

Casel's "Mysteriengegenwart"

One attempt to bridge the temporal gap between the historical events in the life of Christ and our dying and rising with Him is offered by Odo Casel, whose conception has been described as a "Mysteriengegenwart."¹⁷ By this he means that

¹⁷For Casel's position I am dependent on its presenta-

the redemptive deed of Christ is actually present in the sacramental symbol. He says:

Sakrament und Urheilstat sind nicht zwei getrennte Dinge, sondern eins, wobei das Bild so sehr von der Wirklichkeit der Urtat erfüllt ist, dass es mit Recht als Gegenwart dieser bezeichnet wird.¹⁸

This is further explained thus:

. . . der historische Tod (Jesu) Wird wieder hingestellt, gegenwärtig gemacht.¹⁹

Again he says:

. . . nicht nur den Heilsgehalt und das Heilsgeheimnis, sondern die Heilstat gegenwärtig (will er wissen).²⁰

This must be viewed in the context of a dominant "Effectuslehre," according to which the significance of the sacrament lies essentially in its effects.²¹ By this he means to say that one who is enlightened by faith can see beyond the rite and perceive the reality of Christ's redemptive deed in the recipient of baptism.²² His own words, as quoted by Schnackenburg, read:

So wie Jesus Christus das sichtbare Bild des un-

in a secondary source, Rudolph Schnackenburg, Das Heilsgeschehen bei der Taufe nach dem Apostel Paulus (München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1950), pp. 122-126; 139-144.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 141.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Ibid., pp. 141-142.

²²Ibid., p. 123.

sichtbaren Gottes ist, so sind die Sakramente Christi sichtbare Symbole der unsichtbaren Heilstat. So wie der Gläubige in Christus unmittelbar den Vater sieht, so schaut er im Sakrament Christi unmittelbar die Erlösungstat.²³

Such a theory betrays Casel's bias as a Roman Catholic, for whom such a doctrine is made the more palatable by the analogy of the doctrine of the Mass, where Christ is repeatedly offered as an unbloody sacrifice, even though it be in a "sacramental" manner. In critique of such a position, in which the death of Christ is "sacramentally" repeated with each new baptism, the following consideration is offered.

Paul always thinks in terms of redemptive history. "In the fullness of time God sent forth His Son" (Gal. 4:4). The events enacted within history are unrepeatable. Even so, the decisive events in redemptive history, the death and resurrection of Christ, are forever the basis and foundation of baptism. But at the same time these are and remain forever in the past. "We know that Christ, being raised from the dead, will never die again. The death He died, He died to sin $\epsilon\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ " (Rom. 6:9-10). To replace or superimpose upon this scheme such a supra-temporal, supra-historical concept is to do violence to the historical fidelity which not only Paul, but also the entire Scripture, evidences. Once the redemptive act of Christ is loosed from its historical moorings, it drifts into indistinct abstraction.

²³Ibid., p. 124.

Hahn's "Gleichzeitigkeit"

Another attempt to explain the dying and rising of the Christian with Christ is offered by Wilhelm Traugott Hahn. He himself designates his view as "die Gleichzeitigkeit des Christen mit Christus."²⁴ His position represents the opposite of Casel's. Whereas Casel sought to bridge the temporal gap by setting Christ's redemptive act in the present, Hahn solves the problem by including the individual's subjective experience of dying and rising in Christ's, and thus makes Christians contemporaries of Christ.

Hahn, in opposition to Barth, defends the historicity of Christ's resurrection on the ground that it is impossible to speak of an event and at the same time to divest that event of its historicity.

Ein Übergeschichtliches Faktum ist kein Faktum, sondern Idee oder Mythos.²⁵

But in the development of his argument, he goes a step farther. Since the Christ-event was a particular historical event in which God was present, it simultaneously transcends the realm of history.

Damit ist deutlich, dass für Paulus dieses Ereignis zwar geschichtliches, aber nicht nur geschichtliches Ereignis ist.

²⁴Wilhelm Traugott Hahn, Das Mitsterben und Mitaufstehen mit Christus bei Paulus (Gütersloh: Verlag C. Bertelsmann, 1937), p. 96.

²⁵Ibid., p. 54.

When it comes to applying the passages that speak of our burial and resurrection with Christ, he introduces his concept of "Gleichzeitigkeit":

. . . so ist der Sinn der paulinischen Aussagen vom Mitsterben usw. mit Christus das reale Hineingenommenwerden in das einmalige, konkrete, geschichtliche Leiden, Sterben und Auferstehen Christi. Er ist die Einbeziehung der ganzen Existenz des Christen in dieses Heilsereignis.²⁶

This idea is fully developed in these words:

Paulus sieht sich durch das "mit Christus" in die Gleichzeitigkeit mit dem Kreuz und der Auferstehung Jesu Christi versetzt, und zwar so, dass er persönlichen realen Anteil an diesem einmaligen Geschehen unter Ausschaltung alles räumlich und zeitlich Trennenden gewinnt.²⁷

And, as if to remove all doubt concerning the meaning of "Gleichzeitigkeit", he states:

Wir sind in das Christusgeschehen so einbezogen, dass wir real mit Christus ans Kreuz von Golgatha "vor dem Tor" geschlagen sind, mit ihm ins Grab gelegt, am dritten Tage mit ihm auferweckt sind, und alles das unter Pontio Pilato.²⁸

This study commends itself very highly, not the least for so strongly urging the once-for-all character of Christ's death and resurrection. But this very emphasis leads to the other extreme in solving the temporal problem involved in our dying and rising with Christ. As a solution to that problem, the theory of a "Gleichzeitigkeit" is open to a number of

²⁶Ibid., p. 90.

²⁷Ibid., p. 97.

²⁸Ibid., p. 95.

objections.

In the first place, does Paul really overleap all spacial and temporal bounds? Or is this again a superimposition of foreign categories of thought upon one who consistently thinks in terms of redemptive history? Hahn's own investigation leads him to the conclusion that Paul's thinking is bound historically and temporally. Thus he concedes:

Die Aussage vom Mitsterben usw. ist einzigartig. Nur in Beziehung auf das Christusgeschehen kann von jener Raum und Zeit durchbrechenden Beziehung gesprochen werden.²⁹

This at least urges caution in adopting his view.

Secondly, if the conclusions reached in the exegesis of Gal. 2:19; Col. 2:12; and Eph. 2:5 are valid, the historical point to which the $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ -compounds must be referred is the turning-point in the individual's life, which normally occurs in baptism. For they described the transition at a later date of one who turned from a previous evil life to a new life in Christ. This excludes projecting them back to the point in time at which Christ died and rose.

Finally, Hahn is quite emphatic in asserting the inseparability (and quite rightly so) of the death and the resurrection of Christ.³⁰ Therefore, quite consistently he main-

²⁹Ibid., p. 103.

³⁰Ibid., p. 62: "Er betont vielmehr in gleicher Weise die Faktizität von Tod, Grab, und Auferstehung Jesu. Alle drei sind Geschichte Gottes mit seinem Christus und haben deshalb grundsätzlich keinen verschiedenen Charakter."

tains that we share in the entire Christ-event.³¹ However, if this contemporaneity with Christ is carried through to its logical conclusions, it eliminates all eschatological consummation, for Christ upon His resurrection and ascension entered into the fullness of His glory. According to this theory, then, His contemporaries also should have entered into that fulness, a fact, which if not successfully contradicted by human experience, makes it exceedingly difficult to interpret many of the future tenses which the Apostle uses. Hahn refers the future tenses in such passages as 2 Cor. 13:4 and 1 Thess. 5:10 to the present.³² But he does not treat such passages as Rom. 8:17, which, because it describes us as heirs, stands in an eschatological context; Phil. 3:11, where the resurrection of the dead is expressly mentioned; or 2 Tim. 2:11-12, where Paul speaks of an eschatological reigning with Christ. It is true, Hahn takes account of the "not yet" character of our union with Christ, but in doing so he must resort to the category of time,³³ a concession which represents an inconsistency with his hypothesis of the "Gleichzeitigkeit des Christen mit Christus."

³¹Ibid., p. 96: "Diese Beteiligung bezieht sich nicht nur auf das Sterben, sondern zugleich auf das Begräbnis und Auferstehung, ja, das neue Leben, also das ganze Christus-geschehen."

³²Ibid., p. 44 f.

³³Ibid., p. 111: "Sachlich bilden Auferstehung und Parusie eine Einheit, wenn sie auch zeitlich auseinanderfallen."

The Limits Within Which the Solution is to be Sought.

As with so many theological concepts, it is easier to say what the dying and rising with Christ are not than to offer a positive solution. Ultimately we are again confronted with the mystery of the workings of the divine gracious will. Hence we shall have to content ourselves with circumscribing the limitations beyond which we cannot go and still maintain fidelity to Paul's thought.

In the first place, the idea that baptism is a means of grace by which the individual subjectively appropriates the salvation objectively procured by Christ applies also to the passages which speak of baptism as a dying and rising with Christ. Salvation is the fellowship with Christ. The way into this fellowship is baptism (as well as faith). So, for example, in Rom. 6 the train of thought culminates in v. 11, where it states that we are alive to God $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega} \text{ } ^\prime \text{ } \eta\sigma\acute{\omega}\tilde{\upsilon}$. All the preceding verses describe the baptismal process by which we attain the goal of the $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota \acute{\epsilon}\nu \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega} \text{ } ^\prime \text{ } \eta\sigma\acute{\omega}\tilde{\upsilon}$. This pericope is distinct from all others, however, in this respect, that here Paul discusses so very thoroughly the baptismal process. It also clearly evidences this fact, that Paul did not consider baptism merely as an external condition for entry into the fellowship of Christ. Not only is the result related to Christ as an $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota \acute{\epsilon}\nu \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}$, but also the inner working of baptism itself is an event $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}$.

Secondly, Rom. 6:1-11 makes it quite clear that Paul's concern is not to construct a logical, reasoned, intellectually satisfying account of the mystery he here has in mind. The numberless different interpretations of this crucial passage bear eloquent testimony to that fact. What is discernible, however, is that in his emphasis on baptism as an event $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ Χριστῷ leading to a being $\epsilon\grave{\nu}$ Χριστῷ, he betrays an earnest zeal that one's entire existence be determined by Christ. This Christ appeared to him and "confronts" all New Testament Christians as the risen and glorified Lord, and it is fellowship with this Christ into which the baptized person is set (Rom. 6:9-10). Yet He is and forever remains the Lord who once was crucified, and is at the same time the Lord whom we await at the Parousia. The $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ passages must be referred to the point in time at which the individual's turning-point took place.³⁴ And from that temporal coign of vantage Christ appears as the risen and glorified Lord.³⁵ With equal emphasis Paul characterizes the baptized believer's fellowship with the once-crucified Christ, for he is careful to relate baptism to His death (6:3), whereby we are also dead to sin.

³⁴Supra, p. 65 ff.

³⁵It is the lasting merit of the book by Oscar Cullmann, Christ and Time, translated from the German by Floyd V. Filson (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1950), that it shows the historical consciousness of the primitive Church, and that it took time seriously. "The apostolic consciousness of Paul is founded in redemptive history," p. 224.

As surely as baptism unites us with the living Lord, so surely it relates us to the once-crucified (συνεσταυρωθῆς, v. 6) Christ. But the point to be observed is that the line of thought proceeds from the redemptive event in baptism back to its basis in the historic redemptive act of Christ. Paul starts with the given fact: you are dead to sin (6:2); traces this dying to their baptism into the death of Christ (6:3); then develops the thought of dying and rising with Christ (6:4-10); and concludes finally at the point where he started: consider yourselves dead to sin (6:11).

The correlative of this line of thought appears immediately preceding in Rom. 5:12-21, supported by the concept of the vicarious atonement (2 Cor. 5:14). This line of thought proceeds from the redemptive act of Christ. In parallel with Adam, Christ is the Head of a new humanity; and before God He substitutes Himself for all. Through Him we were, objectively and in principle, released from the dominion of sin and death and set under the rule of grace and life. This Christ effected in two inseparable acts: death and resurrection (cf. Rom. 4:25). The connection can be stated thus: what happened to Christ, and in Him objectively to all, ought and shall happen also subjectively to all who are joined to Him in faith.³⁶ The death and resurrection of Christ as

³⁶Althaus, *op. cit.*, p. 43: ". . . von Christus her ~~kommt~~ / Gerechtigkeit und Leben über die ganze, ihm im Glauben angegliederte Menschheit."

the Head of the new humanity and as the divinely ordained Substitute form the indispensable presupposition and foundation of every aspect of the Christian's life, including also (and, in Rom. 6, especially) the baptismal entry into that life. This is confirmed by our findings in chapter II, where not only our baptismal entry into the fellowship of Christ is described as a dying and rising with Christ, but also our continuing fellowship with Christ (Gal. 2:19-20), as well as the eschatological consummation as an event $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}$. In this connection a caution must be urged. This ought not to be conceived in purely forensic terms, as though Christians merely receive the benefits or fruits of Christ's act in a legal transfer. Objectively they have undergone that experience. Subjectively they have experienced it in baptism; they ought to experience it ethically; and they shall experience it eschatologically. Again, as in Rom. 6, so also in the broader aspects of the $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}$ concept, the dominant temporal point of view is from the point in history at which the individual stands.

Another point of departure for this same thought is the formula $\acute{\omega}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ — $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omega\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$ (Rom. 6:4). Whatever happened to Christ, shall happen in a similar way to the Christian. Here it is applied to the sacramental sphere, but it is also found in ethical and eschatological contexts. Hence Paul can with apparent abandon use the expressions dying and rising with Christ in the past (Rom. 6:4;

Col. 2:12,20); in the present (2 Cor. 4:10 f.; 1 Thess. 5:10); in the indicative (Rom. 6:5,8; Col. 3:1,3); in the imperative (Rom. 6:11; Col. 3:5); partly in the present and partly in the future (Rom. 6:8; 8:17; Phil. 3:10 f.; Col. 3:3 f.; 1 Thess. 4:14; 2 Tim. 2:11 f.). This again reflects a view from his point in history. But the basis for all these sayings is the once-for-all Christ-event in His death and resurrection, and His subsequent eternal glorification (Rom. 8:17), enthronement at the right hand of God (Eph. 2:6), and rulership (2 Tim. 2:12). These are the prior events in which all are included who are joined to Him as the Head of a new humanity.

Thus to follow Paul's thought is to think in terms of redemptive history. Christ's death and resurrection for all time remain fixed at a specific, historical moment. At the same time we who are united with Him in His death and resurrection remain fixed temporally at a later time. Hahn, who is so emphatic on the first point, could well afford, in the interest of a consistent view of redemptive history, to be equally emphatic on the second.³⁷ If this leaves a temporal gap to be bridged, it cannot be done at the expense of divesting either the fundamental Christ-event of its historicity (Casel) or of our appropriation of, and entry into, fellowship with Christ of its temporal locus within our

³⁷Supra, p. 109 f.

lives (Hahn). To "elevate" either of these beyond time into a supra-temporal, supra-historical sphere is to reduce them to myth or ideal, and so into abstraction.³⁸

The bridging of this temporal gap is possible only in the figure of Jesus Christ Himself. He is the second Adam, the Head of a new humanity. His descendants by faith and baptism are inseparably included in His decisive act, as surely as the physical descendants of the first Adam are inclusively represented in him. Christ is the divine-human Substitute of the whole human race. Because He died for all, therefore, all have died. Objectively this includes the whole human race; subjectively this is effective only in those who are joined to Him in faith and baptism. The Christ, into whose fellowship we are set, is, on the one hand, forever the historical Jesus, who at a specific point in time died and rose again; on the other hand, He is the risen and

³⁸We are not here thinking of the pre-temporal, eternal decrees of God. Yet even these become fact in history. In this connection we refer again to Gullmann, Christ and Time, especially p. 27: ". . . 'redemptive history' is the heart of all New Testament theology. This has been more correctly and more sharply seen by those who reject Christianity than by many Christians, more sharply even than by many Christian theologians. For it simply is not true that one can give up this entire redemptive history of the New Testament with a perfectly free conscience and yet hold fast to the Christian faith. This attitude, held by many, proceeds from the false presupposition that the redemptive history is only an external framework which the Christian faith can unhesitatingly discard. In reality that which remains as alleged 'kernel' is not at all a particularly characteristic feature of the Christian revelation."

glorified Lord, who lives eternally through all time, not timelessly or beyond time, until He appears again at the Parousia.

The Christian, for his part, is set into redemptive history during his life. He attains fellowship with the risen and glorified Lord; but at the same time he looks backward to the decisive redemptive act of Christ in history and forward to the awaited coming of the Lord. Between these two events in redemptive history his personal Christian existence is determined by the same double movement that was decisive for Christ: death and resurrection. He becomes a Christian through the sacramental death and resurrection; his existence as a Christian is a continued ethical dying and rising; and he consummates his Christian existence in an eschatological death and resurrection. And all this $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ Χριστῷ.

Ultimately, it does not solve the problem to say that our sacramental dying and rising with Christ is based upon Christ as the second Adam and the great Substitute.³⁹ It

³⁹Schnackenburg, *op. cit.*, pp. 159-163, bridges the gap with the $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ -concept. In brief the argument runs like this: Since His resurrection Christ is $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ (2 Cor. 3: 17) and henceforth lives as the pneumatic Lord. Since Christ imparts His Spirit to the baptized believer, the whole baptismal process takes place in the pneumatic sphere. The connection with Rom. 6 is the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$, which presupposes the Spirit. Thus the Pneuma is both the means and the fruit of this process. "Nur wenn der Mensch im sakramentalen Heilsgeschehen auch mit Pneuma erfüllt wird, ist für Paulus jene Verbindung des Getauften mit Christus möglich, die als eine bleibende innige Gemeinschaft beschrieben wird," p. 159.

This lends itself quite well as a further theological

only raises the further problem in what sense it can be said that in Christ all (objectively) died. If that be answered with the solidarity of the human race, a clear conceptualization is still lacking. We finally arrive at a point where knowledge fails, and faith confesses: To Him who by the power at work within us is able to do far more abundantly than all that we ask or think, to Him be glory in the Church and in Christ Jesus to all generations, for ever and ever. Amen. (Eph. 3:20-21).

The Ethical Thrust of Baptism

Baptism has real, internal significance for the Christian's ethical life only if it is seen as a work of God. If it is nothing more than an act of human obedience to a divine command, it is essentially nothing more than an act of confession.⁴⁰ It then has meaning for an ethically directed life only insofar as it is a public and personal commit-

explication of the mystery confronting us in the sacrament, without, however, actually solving it. But it could be adopted only with two reservations. In the first place, the *πνεῦμα* -concept is for Schnackenburg primarily the impersonal working power of God, and only secondarily the third Person of the Holy Trinity. Whether such an idea with reference to the baptismal sayings is exegetically tenable is open to serious question (supra, p. 23 ff.). In the second place, while Christ is undoubtedly *πνεῦμα*, He lives henceforth also as the Incarnate Lord (Jn. 1:14; Col. 2:9). The difference between Christ then and now is not a *σῶμα-πνεῦμα* contrast, but rather what Lutheran theology has termed humiliation-exaltation.

⁴⁰So, e.g., Barth, *op. cit.*, p. 524.

ment,⁴¹ But as such it does not confer the divine power necessary to execute the ethical demands of baptism. At the same time the ethical impetus of baptism does not derive from any intrinsic magical or supernatural properties residing in the rite itself and as such, so that its workings depend upon the proper disposition of the administrator and recipient.⁴² The opus operatum thus defined is rightly anathematized. Christian baptism has, at best, only a superficial resemblance to that idea, inasmuch as the baptized person through its instrumentality does receive supernatural power. But the essential difference lies in this, that this power derives not from the rite but from God who is there operative.⁴³ Althaus summarizes the determinative character of God's activity for baptism thus:

Die Taufe hat also keineswegs nur die Bedeutung eines vergewissernden Symbols für ein von ihr unabhängiges Geschehen. Sie bildet die Heilstatsache für den Einzelnen nicht nur ab, sondern sie wirkt sie. Nicht um ein inneres Erleben beim Taufakte handelt es sich dabei, sondern um die Mächtigkeit des Aktes als solchen von Gott her, vor und unabhängig von der Haltung und dem Erleben des Menschen. Aber diese Mächtigkeit hat mit magischer Wirkung der Taufe nichts zu tun. Gottes

⁴¹So, e.g., James S. Stewart, A Man in Christ (New York and London: Harper and Brothers Publishers, n.d.), p. 191: "Not that baptism created a saving relationship to Christ . . . to be baptized was to be committed publicly and for ever."

⁴²Supra, p. 79 f. This understanding of the opus operatum is most emphatically rejected by the Roman Catholic exegete, Rudolph Schnackenburg, as the historic Roman Catholic position; cf. Schnackenburg, op. cit., pp. 186-187.

⁴³Supra, p. 87 f.

Art in der Taufe hat die personhafte Art alles seines Erlöserhandelns mit dem Menschen So versteht Paulus die Taufe weder nur symbolisch noch andererseits magisch.⁴⁴

This basis provides the ethical thrust of baptism. For in baptism God sets us in closest fellowship with Christ. The effective result of this divine act is that we attain a state of $\epsilon\iota\upsilon\alpha\iota\epsilon\ \epsilon\nu\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}$, Rom. 6:11, in which we are in fact dead to sin and alive to God (Col. 2:12). This is the indicative which proclaims salvation as a gift here and now. But side by side with the indicative Paul lays down the imperative. Baptism is the event $\sigma\upsilon\nu\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}$ which initiates us into a continued existence of dying and rising with Christ, until it be consummated eschatologically, for salvation also possesses a "not yet" character. To this aspect of baptism Luther has given classical expression in his Small Catechism:

Wassertaufe bedeutet, das der alte Adam in uns durch tägliche Reu und Busse, soll ersäuft werden und sterben mit allen Sunden und bösen Lüsten, und wiederum täglich erauskommen und auferstehen ein neuer Mensch, der in Gerechtigkeit und Reinigkeit für Gott ewiglich lebe.⁴⁵

Baptism makes its demands, but it demands only what it has already given. Baptism confers fellowship with Christ in His death and resurrection, which, on our part, spells the crucifixion of the old man and the utter destruction of the

⁴⁴Althaus, op. cit., p. 51.

⁴⁵Martin Luther, "Der kleine Katechismus," Die Bekenntnisschriften der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche (Second edition; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1952), p. 516.

body belonging to sin (Rom. 6:6). Baptism confers the gift of the Holy Spirit, Christ's effective instrument (1 Cor. 12:13), through whom we are given new life (Tit. 3:5).

Hence the imperatives--consider yourselves dead to sin and live to God (Rom. 6:11); walk by the Spirit (Gal. 5:16)--are essentially different from the demands of the law. The law does not bring with it the means for fulfilling its requirements (Rom. 8:3-4). The ethical demands of the Gospel, on the contrary, afford also the power with which to observe them, for they are rooted in what God has already given, initially at baptism, continuously with faith.

On the one hand, this concept excludes any and all forms of libertinism, which views the indicative as a fully consummated reality. Rom. 6:1-11 was occasioned by a flippant attitude toward sin; 1 Cor. 10:1 ff. shows that baptism, divorced from a corresponding and responding ethical life, does not guarantee salvation. Baptismal grace may also be received in vain. On the other hand, this concept also excludes any legalistic ethical standards, founded on the assumption that baptismal grace is an incomplete reality, which needs to be supplemented by observances for which no provision is made in God's gift. Col. 2:10-12 states that we are complete in Christ, with whom we have been buried and raised. This excludes all human regulations (Col. 2:16-23). Paul's ethics is simply, yet profoundly expressed: Become what you are, no less and no more.

Baptism in its Eschatological Aspect

"A piety to which 'being saved' is the goal of all ambition, the climax beyond which it is unnecessary and impossible to go, is totally unlike that of Paul."⁴⁶ Because Paul thinks in terms of redemptive history, his backward look to the Christ-event where the new aeon broke in decisively is followed by the forward look to the Parousia where the old aeon will finally be left behind. Without denying the reality of salvation as a present possession, he eagerly awaits its final consummation in the future.⁴⁷

In baptism we have risen to a new life with Christ sacramentally (Col. 2:12); ethically we continually ought to rise (and have in fact risen) with Christ to newness of life (Rom. 6:4). Yet this is not yet the full glory of the divine life. We believe that we shall also live with Christ (Rom. 6:8). "If the Spirit of Him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in us (and by baptism and faith He does), He who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through His Spirit which dwells in us" (Rom. 8:11). Then we shall also be glorified with Him (Rom. 8:17). This hope is given superlative expression in Eph. 1:18 ff. and is based on Christ's exalted position not only in this

⁴⁶Stewart, op. cit., p. 264.

⁴⁷This is the burden of Nygren's exposition of Romans, op. cit., pp. 329-346.

age, but also in that which is to come (Eph. 1:21). That baptism is understood without express mention as the entry into that fellowship with Christ is shown from Eph. 2:5 ff. The Apostle betrays similar eschatological longing in Phil. 3:10-11, 20-21. Even though Christians have been raised with Christ in baptism (Col. 2:12), their true life is hid with Christ in God and will appear in its full glory first at the Parousia (Col. 3:1-4).

The same sense of expectation and consummation appears with regard to the gift of the Spirit received in baptism. The Spirit is given as the Guarantee ($\acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\alpha\beta\acute{\omega}\nu$, 2 Cor. 1:22; 5:5), the Down-Payment on our future inheritance (Eph. 1:14). We have been sealed by the Spirit for the day of redemption (Eph. 4:30). As surely as we have received the Spirit of sonship by whom we cry, "Abba, Father," we nevertheless possess merely the first-fruits of the Spirit ($\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\rho\chi\acute{\eta}$, Rom. 8:15) and groan inwardly as we await the adoption of sons. We long for the redemption of our bodies (Rom. 8:15), which shall rise as Spiritual bodies (1 Cor. 15:44). God's plan of salvation as it unfolds as redemptive history will reach its consummation when our lowly bodies, still beset by Sin and Death, are changed and fashioned like Christ's glorious body (Phil. 3:21), when they shall be determined by the Spirit alone, when this corruptible has put on incorruption; this mortal, immortality (1 Cor. 15:53). Then first shall the final victory over death and sin be attained (1 Cor.

15:54 ff.).

Thus, if the gift of the Spirit is essentially bound up with baptism, then the day of baptism has an obvious relationship to the eschatological Day of the Lord. The sacramental dying and rising with Christ leads finally to the physical death and resurrection with Christ at His Parousia, when God will give us all things $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}$ (Rom. 8:32).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, J. K. "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians." The International Critical Commentary. XXXV. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.
- Althaus, Paul. "Der Brief und die Roemer." Das Neue Testament Deutsch. VI. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1949.
- Bachmann, Philipp. "Der Erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther." Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. VII. Herausgegeben von Theodor Zahn. Leipzig und Erlangen: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1921.
- Barth, Markus. Die Taufe--Ein Sakrament?. Zuerich: Evangelischer Verlag A. G. Zollikon, 1951.
- Bauer, Walter. Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Fourth edition. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Toepelmann, 1952.
- Die Bekenntnisschriften der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche. Second edition. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1952.
- Beyer, Hermann W. "Der Brief an die Galater." Edited by Paul Althaus. Das Neue Testament Deutsch. VIII. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1949.
- Blass, Friedrich. Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch. Ninth edition. Edited by Albert Debrunner. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1954.
- Calvin, John. Commentary upon the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Edited from the original English translation of Christopher Rosdell, Preacher, by Henry Beveridge. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Printing Company, 1884.
- Gullmann, Oscar. Baptism in the New Testament. Translated by J. K. S. Reid. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1950.
- Christ and Time. Translated from the German by Floyd V. Filson. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1950.

- Denney, James. "St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans." The Expositor's Greek Testament. II. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., n.d.
- Dodd, C. H. "The Epistle of Paul to the Romans." The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. VI. New York and London: Harper and Brothers, n.d.
- Doelger, Franz Joseph. Sphragis. Paderborn: Verlag von Ferdinand Schoeningh, 1911.
- Duncan, George S. "The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians." The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. IX. New York and London: Harper and Brothers, n.d.
- Ewald, Paul. "Die Briefe des Paulus an die Epheser, Kolosser, und Philemon." Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. X. Herausgegeben von Theodor Zahn. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sch Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf., 1905.
- Flemington, W. F. The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism. London: SPCK, 1953.
- Hahn, Wilhelm Traugott. Das Mitsterben und Mitaufstehen mit Christus bei Paulus. Guetersloh: Verlag C. Bertelsmann, 1937.
- Heitmüller, Wilhelm. In Namen Jesu. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1903.
- Kittel, Gerhard, et al. Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament. 4 Vols. Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, c.1938.
- Kusz, Otto. "Die Briefe an die Roemer, Korinther und Galater." Das Neue Testament. VI. Edited by Alfred Wikenhauser and Otto Kusz. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustot, 1940.
- Lenski, R. C. H. The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Columbus: Wartburg Press, c.1945.
- Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott. A Greek-English Lexicon. Ninth edition. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1953.
- Lietzmann, Hans. "An die Korinther I.II." Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. IX. Fourth edition. Tuebingen: Verlag J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1949.

- Luecker, Erwin L., editor-in-chief. Lutheran Cyclopedia. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, c.1954.
- Moe, Olaf. The Apostle Paul. II. Translated by L. A. Vigness. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, c.1954.
- Moffatt, James. "The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians." The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. VII. New York and London: Harper and Brothers, n.d.
- Nygren, Anders. Commentary on Romans. Translated by Carl C. Rasmussen. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1949.
- Pieper, Francis. Christian Dogmatics. 3 Vols. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, c.1953.
- Rendall, Frederic. "The Epistle to the Galatians." The Expositor's Greek Testament. III. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, n.d.
- Rendtorff, Heinrich. "Der Brief an die Epheser." Das Neue Testament Deutsch. VIII. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1949.
- Ridderbos, Herman N. "The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia." The New International Commentary on the New Testament. IX. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953.
- Robertson, Archibald A. and Alfred Plummer. "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians." The International Critical Commentary. Second edition. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1914.
- Salmond, S. D. F. "The Epistle to the Ephesians." The Expositor's Greek Testament. V. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., n.d.
- Sanday, William, and Arthur C. Headlam. "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans." The International Critical Commentary. Second edition. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n.d.
- Schlatter, Adolph. Erlaeuterungen zum Neuen Testament. II. Stuttgart: Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1921.
- , Gottes Gerechtigkeit: Ein Kommentar zum Roemerbrief. Stuttgart: Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1935.

- , Paulus der Bote Jesu: Eine Deutung seiner Briefe an die Korinther. Stuttgart: Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1934.
- Schmoller, Alfred. Handkonkordanz zum Griechischen Neuen Testament. Tenth edition. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1953.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolph. Das Heilsgeschehen bei der Taufe nach dem Apostel Paulus. Muenchen: Karl Zink Verlag, 1950.
- Schwarzmann, Heinrich. Zur Tauftheologie des Hl. Paulus in Roemer 6. Heidelberg: F. H. Kerle Verlag, 1950.
- Scott, B. F. "The Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians." The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. XI. New York and London: Harper and Brothers, n.d.
- Sickenberger, Joseph. "Die Briefe des Heiligen Paulus an die Korinther und Roemer." Die Heilige Schrift des Neuen Testaments. VI. Fourth edition. Edited by Fritz Tillmann. Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1932.
- Stewart, James S. A Man in Christ. New York and London: Harper and Brothers Publishers, n.d.
- Stoeckhardt, George. Kommentar ueber den Brief Pauli an die Epheser. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1910.
- , Commentar ueber den Brief Pauli an die Roemer. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1907.
- Trench, R. C. Synonyms of the New Testament. Ninth edition. London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., Ltd., 1915.
- Wendland, Heinz Dietrich. "Die Briefe an die Korinther." Das Neue Testament Deutsch. VII. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1948.
- Westcott, B. F. St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1906.
- , The Epistle to the Hebrews. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1955.

Zahn, Theodor. "Der Brief des Paulus an die Roemer." Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. VI. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. (Georg Boehme), 1910.

-----". "Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater." Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. IX. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf., 1905.