

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1946

The Term Lutron in the New Testament

Arthur Marion Vincent

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_vincenta@csl.edu

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



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Vincent, Arthur Marion, "The Term Lutron in the New Testament" (1946). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 170.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/170>

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 Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

**THE TERM LUTRON
IN THE NEW TESTAMENT**

**A Thesis Presented to
The Faculty of Concordia Seminary
Department of New Testament Theology**

**In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelor of Divinity**

**by
Arthur Marion Vincent
May 1946**

Approved by:

Thaddeus J. Gabel
Paul M. Bretcher

**THE TERM LUTRON
IN THE NEW TESTAMENT**

(Outline)

- I. The use of lutron in the periods prior to the New Testament.
 - A. Introduction. Earliest traces and general overview.
 - B. Lutron in Classical Greek Literature.
 - C. The Hebrew words rendered in the LXX with lutron.
 - D. Usage of lutron in the papyri.
 - E. Usage of lutron in earliest patristic literature.

- II. An exegesis of Matthew 20, 28 and Mark 10, 45.
 - A. The relation of these two passages.
 1. Their differences and the significance of these variations.
 2. The textual criticism of these passages.
 3. The context of these passages.

 - B. An exposition of the individual words and concepts.
 1. Translations, ancient and modern, of these two passages.
 2. "The Son of Man".
 3. "To minister".
 4. "To give His life".
 5. "For many".
 6. "A ransom".
 - a. Significance of this term.
 - b. To whom was the ransom paid?
 - c. From what were the "many" ransomed?

- III. Conclusion.
 - A. Summarization.
 - B. Conclusion.

THE TERM LUTRON IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Introduction.

The word lutron and its derivatives is the one the Greeks used to convey the idea which we commonly express with the word: "redeem". The concept of "redemption" is fundamental in the Christian religion and its importance, as we shall demonstrate, can hardly be overestimated. While agreed on the importance of this concept, students of the New Testament do not always agree on the exact shades of meaning of this group of words in the New Testament. The term lutron itself occurs in only two passages in the New Testament: Matt. 20, 28 and Mark 10, 45. For the New Testament derivatives and compounds of lutron, Moulton and Geden give the following: λυτρώμαι (Lu. 24, 21; Tit. 2, 14); λύτρωσις (Lu. 1, 68; 2, 38; Heb. 9, 12); λυτρωτής (Acts 7, 35); ἀπολύτρωσις (Lu. 21, 28; Rom. 3, 24; 8, 23; I Cor. 1, 30; Eph. 1, 7; 1, 14; 4, 30; Col. 1,

14; Heb. 9, 15; 11, 35); ἐκτίλυστρον (1 Tim. 2, 6).¹ The suffix -τρον shows lutron belongs to that class of derivatives which we usually designate as "instrumental." "It denotes the instrument or means by which the action of the verb is accomplished."² It is the purpose of this paper to give a detailed study of the term lutron. For the purpose of elucidation or additional proof, the derivatives and their uses will be cited.

B. B. Warfield traces the ultimate base of lutron back to the Sanscrit Lû which bears the meaning "to cut" or "to clip"; hence "it is inferred that the earliest implication of the general Indo-European root Lû was to set free by cutting a bond."³ In the primitive Greek this word appears with the stem, λύειν, which has the general meaning, "to loose." λύω has many composites which give further coloration to the fundamental meaning of the word. Kittel gives the following composites of λύω in the LXX: ἀνκ-λύω (but only in the Apocryphal books), ἀπολύω, ἑκ-λύω, ἐκλύω, ἐπιλύω, καταλύω, παρλύω, περλύω, συλλύω, ὑπολύω.⁴ Except for the last three, all these

1. Moulton and Geden, A Concordance To the Greek N. T. passim.

2. Warfield, B. B., Biblical Doctrines, p. 331. So also, Gremer, H., Biblico-Theological Lexicon of the N. T. p. 408.

3. Warfield, B. B., ibidem, p. 328.

4. Kittel, Gerhard, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, IV, 329.

composites are found also in the New Testament. The simple word λύω is used in the LXX to express the liberation of captive persons,⁵ the opening of locked away things,⁶ the destruction of foundations and walls.⁷ At times it is used to denote that man has been freed of the shackles of sin, God being the Author. The common meaning of λύω when applied to men is "to loose," "to release or to set free." This shade of meaning applied especially to liberation from bonds, or prison, but also came to designate freedom from difficulty or danger. With reference to prisoners, λύω developed a special usage which must interest us because of its relation to lutron. "In this usage, it means, in the active voice, 'to release on receipt of ransom,' 'to hold to ransom;' and in the middle voice 'to secure release by payment of ransom', 'to ransom in the common sense of that word, passing on to a broader usage of simply 'to redeem' (in which it is applied not merely to prisoners but to animals and landed property) and even 'to buy'. It also acquired the sense of paying debts and when used with reference to wrong-doing, a sense of 'undoing', or 'making up for', which is not far removed from that of making atone-

5. Job 6, 14; Ps. 102, 21; 105, 20; 146, 7; Jer. 40, 4; Dan. 3, 25.

6. Gen. 42, 27.

7. Ex. 3, 5; Jos. 5, 15; Dan. 5, 12.

ment for, them."⁸

In the LXX three different Hebrew roots are used to translate the Greek word Lutron. These are: לָדַן; לָדַן; and לָדַן (לָדַן). In a later section of this paper we shall give the meaning of these Hebrew words.

Lutron as used by classical writers.

The Ancient Greek writers employed lutron, usually in the plural. Almost universally they used it in the sense of "the ransom paid or to be paid for prisoners, in accordance with the use of λύω for the liberation of prisoners, especially by ransoming."¹⁰ Kittel agrees with this by saying: "Lutron ist vornehmlich das Loesegeld fuer einen Kriegsgefangenen, und fuer einen Sklaven, oder zur Loesung aus einer Buergerschaft."¹¹ Other lexicographers concur with this statement. Preuschen-Bauer define lutron as "Das Loesegeld, besonders auch das Loskaufgeld fuer freizulassende Sklaven, meist im plural."¹²

8. Warfield, B. B., op. cit. p. 329. He bases this classification on Liddell and Scott.

9. Kittel, op. cit. IV, 330 ff.

10. Warfield, *ibid.* p. 331.

11. Kittel, G., op. cit. Band VI, 341.

12. Preuschen-Bauer, Griechisch-Deutsches Woerterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments, p. 755.

Liddell and Scott give their examples from the classics under three headings: 1) ransom; 2) atonement; 3) recompense.¹³ For lutron in the sense of "ransom" they cite: τῶν λύτρα τῆν δεκατῶν, the title of the ransom money, (Herodotus 5, 77); λύτρα λαβεῖν τινος, receive as a ransom for, (Thucydides 6, 5); λύτρα ἰποφιδόμην καταθεῖναι, pay ransom, (Demosthenes 53, 11. 13); εἰσενεγκεῖν εἰς λύτρα, contribute towards a ransom, (Demosthenes 53, 7); ἰφιέναι ἄνευ λύτρον, release without ransom, (Xenophon "Historia Graeca", 7, 2. 16. Cf. also, Aeschylus "Alexandrinus", 2, 100; Demosthenes 19, 169, etc.) Liddell and Scott cite Ἔκτορος λύτρα, the title of Iliad, Book XXVI, and thus disagree with Kittel who claims the word lutron does not appear in Homer.¹⁴

To illustrate the classical usage of lutron in the sense of atonement, Liddell and Scott refer to Aeschylus (Choeph., 48) where he uses the phrase: τί γάρ λύτρα πρεβόντος ἁίματος. H. Cremer also cites this example and stresses that lutron in classical usage "denotes the means¹⁵ of expiation with reference to their intended result."

13. Liddell and Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, p. 1067.

14. Kittel, G., ibid. p. 341. For an excellent discussion of this use of lutron by Homer in book XXIV, see B. B. Warfield, Biblical Doctrines, p. 328, footnote 6.

15. Cremer, H., Biblico-Theological Lexicon of the N. T. Gr. p. 408.

As further examples he cites φόνον φόνω λύειν (Sophocles. O. R., 100; Euripides, Or., 510; Aeschylus, Choeph., 803). In Greek pagan literature, however, lutron seldom occurs to denote the price of redemption to a deity to whom a person has forfeited his life.¹⁶ The examples which do occur, however, show that "even according to classical usage, it is by no means strange that the death of our Lord, elsewhere designated as a sacrifice, should be called lutron, ransom..."¹⁷ Lutron, according to Liddell and Scott, may be used in a third meaning; "recompense". Thus, Pindar l. 9 (7) uses λύτρον κλημάτων, reward for toil.¹⁸

Classical writers used a large number of synonyms for lutron,¹⁹ but it is not within the province of this brief paper to discuss them.

O. T. Hebrew words rendered in LXX with Lutron

Lutron, the price of redemption, or ransom money, occurs in the LXX almost always in the plural.²⁰ Prov. 6,

16. Kittel, G., *ibid.* p. 341. Cremer also gives examples of religious or ritualistic expiation. He cites λύσεις τε καὶ καθαρμοὶ ἀδικημάτων, Plato Rep. 2, 364.

17. Cremer, H., *op. cit.* p. 408.

18. Liddell and Scott, Vol. 2, 1067. Kittel recognizes this use, also: "Endlich findet sich lutron auch noch in der Bedeutung: Entschädigung." p. 341.

19. Warfield, B. B., *op. cit.* p. 332 gives the following: ἀλλοιμα, τιμή, ποινή, ἄποινα, ἰωάννη, ἀκτίωλον

20. "Lutron occurs 19 times in the LXX and always, of course, in the quite simple sense of a ransom-price." B. B. Warfield, *op. cit.* p. 341.

35; 13, 8 are the only exceptions from this rule. It is used in the LXX for three different Hebrew roots. These are: לָדַן, לָנַחַל, לָטַח (לָטַח) ²¹

The first of these roots occurs six times: Ex. 21, 30; 30, 12; Num. 35, 31. 32; Prov. 6, 35; 13, 8. It means covering (German, "Deckung"). ²² As a translation of לָדַן the Greek word lutron, therefore, always denotes a gift given as compensation, whose purpose is to cover a guilt, the result being that the guilt is not simply canceled. Lutron when used for לָדַן always has reference to a compensation for a human life. ("psyche") ²³ A person has forfeited his life, whether it be to a human being (Ex. 21, 30), or to God. The price of redemption seems to be in all cases money. Of course, it lies within the free will of the creditor whether he wishes to accept the lutron (Ex. 21, 30). He cannot be forced to accept it. There are cases, however, when he may not accept the lutron. For a murderer there exists no lutra (Num. 35, 31). He cannot escape death.

Another Hebrew word translated in the LXX with lutron is לָנַחַח. ²⁴ Basically, this word means "to redeem, to

21. Kittel, op. cit. p. 330, Band IV.

22. Kittel, G., op. cit. Band IV, p. 330.

23. So also, Alford, H., Greek New Testament, Vol. I, 205. "A payment as equivalent for a life destroyed." And J. Orr in Hastings Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, Vol. II, 468, "This leads to the idea, which is common in the O. T. of לָדַן as a ransom, in the sense of something given in exchange for another as the price of that other's

ransom." ²⁵ Robert Dick Wilson points out that this verb occurs only in the Hebrew and is used specifically "to describe certain duties of the next of kin, such as vengeance for blood, marrying the widow of a deceased kinsman, and other duties, including also the redemption from captivity...." ²⁶ Thus, the word כִּנְיָן refers to the Law as it operates in a family. The כִּנְיָן ²⁷ is the nearest relative who must protect the family interests. It is ²⁸ his duty to liberate the family if its life and property has been brought into slavery. Used with קָנָה, כִּנְיָן refers to a blood redemption, i. e., "to avenge bloodshed,

redemption, or for one's own redemption, or, what is at the bottom of the same idea, as satisfaction for a life."

24. Kittel, G., *ibid.* p. 331. This word, used in various forms, occurs 122 times in the O. T. Hebrew. The participle which means "redeemer, avenger, nearest kinsman, occurs 48 times." Davidson, B., A Concordance of the Hebrew and Chaldee Scriptures, p. 171.

25. Gesenius, W., Heb. and Eng. Dictionary, p. 170. "loskaufen, einlösen", Siegfried and Stade, Hebraeisches Woerterbuch Zum Alten Testament, p. 109.

26. Wilson, R. D., Scientific Bible Criticism "Princeton Theological Review", July, 1919, p. 430.

27. "As the right of redemption, or the duty of blood revenge belonged to the nearest relative, hence כִּנְיָן denotes a blood relative, kinsman. Num. 5, 8; Lev. 25, 35; Ruth 3, 12." Gesenius, Heb. and Eng. Dictionary, p. 170.

28. This applied also to things vowed to God and to tithes. These could be redeemed by paying a price (Lev. 27, 14ff; 27, 31). He may borrow money and redeem his property (from the sanctuary) and may redeem in installments." Marcus Jastrow, Dictionary of the Targumim, The Talmud Bible, etc. Cf. Talmud (Kiddushin, 20). Vol. 1, 202.

to demand or inflict punishment for blood." ²⁹ The avenger of blood redeems, being the nearest relative, the blood of him who was slain. The nearest relative is also ³⁰ held to purchase someone who has been made a slave.

In a tropical sense, יָדָא, redeemer, often refers to God as a redeemer and deliverer of men, and especially of Israel. ³¹ God redeemed Israel from Egypt (Ex. 6, 6); from Babylon (Is. 43, 1; 44, 42; 48, 20; 49, 7). Kittel enlarges upon the word יָדָא as applied to God. ³² יָדָא denotes the dignity of the nearest relative whose duty it is to redeem his elect one whether it be the ancestor Jacob (Gen. 48, 16) or the people Israel. This usage of the Hebrew word is found in the second half of the prophet Isaiah where it is intended to express the great comfort which lies in the fact that God has chosen Israel (Is. 41, 14;

29. Gesenius, *ibid.* p. 170. This is used only in the participle יָדָא. (Num. 35, 12. 19. 24ff; Deut. 19, 6. 12; Jos. 20, 3. 5. 9; II Sam. 14, 11).

30. Gesenius, *ibid.* p. 170, 1. (Lev. 25, 48. 49; Jer. 32, 7); Kittel, *op. cit.* p. 331; "Redeemed by relatives before six years of service." Jastrow, *op. cit.* on Ex. 21, 2. "יָדָא, Lev. 25, 51 of the price paid for the release of one who had become a slave. (Num. 3, 46-51; Lev. 19, 20; Num. 18, 15)"; Gremer, H., Biblico-Theological Lexicon of the N. T. Greek, p. 408.

31. Gesenius, *ibid.* p. 170, 1. "Has protected and redeemed our ancestors" (Pes. X, 6). "When Israel was redeemed from Egypt" Kiddushin 15 b, referring to Lev. 25, 54. Jastrow, *op. cit.* Vol. I, 202.

32. Kittel, *op. cit.* p. 331.

43, 14; 44, 24; 47, 4; 48, 17; 49, 7. 26; 54, 5. 8; 60, 16). Because He is the Holy One, who is at the same time its Redeemer (Is. 41, 14; 54, 5), as He is its Creator, therefore, Israel's redemption is assured with every measure of certainty, because by nature the Holy One of Israel stands in opposition to the sinfulness of the people which He Himself has sold into slavery. In a most profound and touching way God is conceived of as the לֹדֵן by Job (19, 25). Here the Hebrew word has the old meaning of blood avenger who rises over the dust of the one slain. But since God Himself slays Job, He rises against Himself as Job's avenger, by permitting Job to see Him after death. Job who was killed but resurrected is in the hand of the same God even though this God is still the "deus absconditus".

The third Hebrew word rendered by the LXX with lutron is לִטְוֹן⁵³ the arrested one himself (Ex. 21, 30). But also someone else who is not related to him. לִטְוֹן is from the stem לִטְוֹן which properly means "to cut (into two pieces), to cut loose"; hence, "to ransom, redeem"³⁴ (Ex. 13, 13. 15; 34, 20; Lev. 27, 27). Robert Dick Wilson says of this word: "A closer study reveals the fact that in Babylonian, Arabic, and Aramic, as well as in Hebrew,

53. Kittel, op. cit. Band IV, 332. לִטְוֹן occurs 57 times in the O. T.

34. Gesenius, Heb. and Eng. Lexicon, p. 834.

יִטְּד is used primarily and predominantly for the redemption from captivity....³⁵ To distinguish this word from פָּדָה, Kittel says with יִטְּד the emphasis lies³⁶ on the price paid. ("Der Ton liegt also auf dem Preis"). The object of the יִטְּד is never an inanimate thing but always an animal or human life which has been forfeited to God and needs to be redeemed.³⁷ Sometimes God Himself is the יִטְּד (II Sam. 4, 9; I Kgs. 1, 29), the one who redeems. Thus, for instance, God is spoken of as the one who redeemed Israel from the house of bondage in Egypt.³⁸ (Deut. 7, 8; 13, 6; II Sam. 7, 23; I Ch. 17, 21; etc).

The original sense of פָּדָה and יִטְּד, to redeem and to ransom, is sometimes submerged into a figurative sense. This has lead some authorities to doubt whether

35. Princeton Theological Review, Jly, 1919, p. 430. "With יִטְּד, יִטְּד means 'to let go, set free from servitude' (Deut. 7, 8; 13, 6; Micah 6, 4; Ps. 130, 8." This need not be physical captivity only. It may refer to liberation from the wicked one (Jer. 15, 21; 31, 11; Job 6, 23) from Sheol (Hes. 13, 14), or poetically, from death, (Ps. 49, 8). Gesenius, op. cit. p. 834.

36. Kittel, op. cit. Band IV, 332.

37. Marcus Jastrow gives examples from other Hebraic writings which illustrate this usage: "If a slave has been captured and (they) Jews redeem him." (Gittin IV, 4). "Must not redeem captured persons for more than their value." (Gittin IV, 6). "Until I redeem him at any price they ask." (Gittin 58 a). Dictionary of the Targumim, Talmud, etc., Vol. II, 1136.

38. Gesenius, Heb. and Eng. Dictionary, p. 834, 3.

these words are employed in their original etymological significance.³⁹ After a study of the words concerned and their use in the O. T., I feel more inclined to agree with B. B. Warfield when he states: "...the words are copiously employed quite literally, and it is repeatedly made clear that even in the most extreme extension of their figurative use their etymological significance does not cease to exist."⁴⁰ Lutron, as a translation of these words, is used 19 times in the LXX and always, of course, in the quite simple sense of a ransom price.⁴¹

A discussion of the O. T. Hebrew concepts and the LXX usage of $\frac{\lambda \nu \lambda}{\tau}$ and $\frac{\sigma \tau \theta}{\tau \tau}$ ⁴² is not complete without pausing to note the use of λυτρούεθαι. Of all the derivatives, λυτρούεθαι is the only one "copiously employed". So frequent is its occurrence that λυτρούεθαι rather than lutron represents the "characteristic usage in the LXX".⁴³ Regarding the simple literal sense in which λυτρούεθαι means "to redeem a thing by the payment for

39. "It is true that 'ransom' in the O. T. usually includes the idea of rendering what may be termed an equivalent but it is more doubtful whether this can be read into the etymological significance." J. Orr, Hastings Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, Vol. II, 486.

40. Warfield, B. B., op. cit., 360.

41. Ibidem p. 341.

42. $\frac{\lambda \nu \lambda}{\tau}$ is rendered with lutróusthai 42 times in the LXX; $\frac{\sigma \tau \theta}{\tau \tau}$, 40 times. Warfield, op. cit., p. 344.

43. Ibidem p. 360.

it of a ransom price", there seems to be no disagreement among scholars. (Ex. 13, 13; Lev. 19, 20; Num. 18, 15-17). In later usage λυτρώσθαι often is used to describe Jehovah's delivering Israel from Egypt and Babylon. This throws the stress not on the mode or price of ransoming, but on the power exerted in it and the mind is focused on the mightiness of the transaction. Passages describing the deliverance from Egypt made it clear that the redemption was the effect of a great expenditure of the divine power and in this sense cost much. This has lead many to believe that λυτρώσθαι conveys a central idea of deliverance wrought by Almighty power rather than the idea of ransoming.

"It is going too far, in any case, however, to say that the idea of ransoming 'is practically lost in lytrousthai in its LXX usage'--as to be sure, the insertion of the word 'practically' may show that Westcott himself felt. Whatever may be the implication of λυτρώσθαι when used to designate the intervention of God in His almighty power for the deliverance of His people, there is evidence enough to show that the feeling of ransoming as the underlying sense of the word remained alive in the minds of the writers."⁴⁴

44. Ibidem p. 351. "λυτρώσθαι is employed in its literal sense in more than a fourth of all its occurrences in the LXX. Cf. esp. Ps. 73, 2; Is. 52, 3; Ps. 48, 8; Is. 43, 1ff. These passages bear witness....that redemption was properly a transaction which implies paying a price."

It is important to establish the meaning of λυτρώεθαι as ransoming and not merely the power of ransoming. The assumption is often made that the power concept of λυτρώεθαι is projected into the New Testament and therefore determines this group in the N. T. This assumption cannot be proved. The N. T. usage of this group is not "even formally a continuation of that of the LXX."⁴⁵

λυτρώεθαι is the characteristic usage of LXX while ἀπολύτρωσις is the characteristic usage of the N. T. "...The N. T. usage is not a 'projection of the LXX usage. The terminology of the N. T. is different from that of the LXX, and therefore the terminology of the N. T. was certainly not derived from that of the LXX...The Greek speech of the N. T. writers is the common speech of their day and generation and their terminology more naturally reflects a popular usage of the time."⁴⁶ Even assuming the N. T. usage of the derivatives of λυτρον was a continuation of the LXX we must note that in the N. T. the context shows ordinarily that the modal implications are present. This will be discussed more thoroughly under the N. T. usage of λυτρον.

Usage in Papyri

Papyri evidence shows that λυτρον and the other verbs

45. Warfield, op. cit., p. 352.

46. Ibidem p. 360.

in this family were well established in the vernacular of the people contemporaneous with the Apostles and Evangelists who, by inspiration, wrote the books of our New Testament Canon. A proper understanding of its current, popular usage will help us understand the meaning of Jesus when he says He came "to give His life a ransom for many" (Matt. 20, 28) and the whole group of images which Paul uses based on the Greek word lutron and its derivatives. Preisigke gives two basic meanings for the word lutron as found in the papyri manuscripts. After pointing out that it is usually in the plural, he gives these two meanings: "Auslösegeld fuer Pfaender" and "Freilassungsgeld der Sklaven".⁴⁷ To illustrate the first usage he cites three phrases from the papyri: ἔχειν εἰς λύτρα,⁴⁸ τῆν λύτρα⁴⁹ and λύτρα ἱερῶν ἐφ' Μουχέως φ.....⁵⁰. This first meaning is not so important for our purpose as the second, "the ransom price for a slave or other person

47. Friedrich Preisigke, Woerterbuch der griechischen Einschusz der griechischen Inschriften, Aufschriften, Ostrake, Mumienbilder, usw. aus Aegypten, Band II, 42.

48. Ibidem p. 42. (Aegyptische Urkunden Aus den Museen zu Berlin), 1260, 12. Also to prove this usage he cites his "Sammebuch grieschischer Urkunden aus Aegypten", 5865, 4.

49. Ibidem p. 42. (Ox. 784) "wohl verwechselt mit ἐπι λύτρα".

50. Ibidem p. 42. "Nachheres zur Sache nicht erreichbar". Under the related verb λυτροῦν, Preisigke gives some valuable illustrations of this usage of lutron in the vernacular. ἔφ' ὧν Σειραπίωνι τῷ φίλῳ μου λυτροῦσάρα μου τὰ ἱμάτια δραχμῶν ἑκατὸν "of which you will give to my friend Serapion 100 drachmae and redeem my clothes." P. Oxy III, 114, 2 (11/A. D.)

in captivity."⁵¹ This usage was quite common. "The singular 'lutron' for a slave's redemption-money is found, however, several times (together with the plural, lutra) in inscriptions from Thessaly."⁵² The first century after Christ usage of lutron in this sense is well illustrated by three documents from Oxyrhynchus.⁵³ Thus we read of a slave Euphrosyne who had been set free ὑπὸ Δία Πῆν Ἡλίου ἐπὶ λυτροῦς."under Zeus, Earth, Sun, for a ransom."⁵⁴ Another document from the year 211 A. D. has this to say: Ἐλένηκ... ἠλευθέρωσα καὶ ἔσχον ὑπὲρ λυτ-
(ῶ)κ αὐτῆς δεκάχμῖς ἑξαβαστῖς διακειλίας διακοσίων.⁵⁵

Deissmann noted this common usage of lutron and then said, "...when anybody heard the Greek word lutron, 'ransom', in the first century, it was natural for him to think of the purchase money for manumitting slaves."⁵⁶ To substantiate this remarkable assertion, he refers, not only to the three Oxyrhynchus papyri, but to a votive relief

51. Ox. 48, 6; 49, 8; 722, 24; 30; 40: S. B. 5616, 6 (Samtl. I): Chr. II, 362, 19, (III).

52. Deissman, A., Light from the Ancient East, p. 328. "...lutron stands in the same sense in the singular as well as in the plural in the Thessalian stone-records of slave-manumission." B. B. Warfield, Biblical Doctrines, p. 332.

53. Ibidem p. 327. Cf. Ox. P. Nos. 48, 49, and 722. These are taken from the years 86, 100, and 91 or 107 A. D.

54. Moulton and Milligan, Vocabulary of the Greek N. T., p. 383.

55. Ibidem p. 383. Chrest II, 362, 16.

56. A. Deissmann, op. cit., p. 327

from Koeres near Koula in Asia Minor. This inscription says: Γαλλικὴ Ἀσκληπιάδης κώμης Κερυζέων
παιδικὴ Διογένου λύτρον⁵⁷ "Galliko, female slave of the Askepian village of the Keryzeis, (dedicates this as) ransom for Diogenes."⁵⁸

"The plural use of lutron may be further illustrated by "ΤΙΣΙΝ ΔΕ ΤΩΝ ΠΟΛΕΙΤΩΝ ΕΙΣ) ΛΥΤΡΑ ΠΡΟΤΙΘΕΙΣ
ἔδειξεν ἑαυτὸν πρὸς πᾶσαν ἀπάντησιν τῶν⁵⁹
σω[σ]τήριων εὐμειλῆτων and... λαβοῦσα λύτρα⁽⁵⁹⁾
ἐκ πολειῶν⁵⁹." These illustrations given above demonstrate that lutron in the sense of "Frei-lassungsgeld der Sklaven" was common in the N. T. period. With Deissmann, we think this explains beautifully our Lord's use of this word in Matt. 20, 28 and "Paul's pre-dilection for this whole group of images"⁶⁰ centering around lutron. "It is safe to say that no Greek, to the manner born, could write down any word, the center of which was lutron, without consciousness of ransoming as the mode of deliverance of which he was speaking."⁶²

57. Ibidem p. 328. Deissmann has a photostatic copy of this votive relief. Figure 60, p. 328.

58. This translation by W. M. Buckler, Annual of the British School at Athens, 1914-16, p. 181. Deissmann prefers this translation to: "To Gallicus (the God man) Asclepias of the village of Ceryza, maidservant of Diogenes (Diogenes?), presents this ransom." Moulton and Milligan, Vocabulary of the Gr. N. T., p. 383 also give this inscription.

59. Moulton and Milligan, Vocabulary of the Gr. N. T. p. 383; Syll. 325, 15 (1 B. C.).

Earliest Patristic Literature

Although the use of lutron by the early patristic Fathers is not of the greatest importance, nevertheless, for the sake of completeness, we may pause to note how they use this word. These men united the Greek tradition, the LXX modifications, and the New Testament usage. All of these currents at work cause their use of lutron and its derivatives to have a "certain lack of consistency and sureness."⁶³

During the first century, the Church Fathers did not use the group of words based on lutron very copiously.

"Only λύτρον, λυτφούεθαι, and λύτρωσις occur, for example in the Apostolic Fathers; and they only sparingly."⁶⁴

60. Ibidem. Syll. 863, 4 (Delph. 1 A. D.).

61. Deissmann, op. cit. p. 327.

62. Warfield, op. cit. p. 340.

63. Ibidem p. 366.

64. Ibidem p. 366. "lutroosis, a redeeming, ransoming, deliverance..particularly in a religious sense." Cf. Clement of Rome I, 12; Irenius 664, A: 'Doctrina Orientalis, Patrologia Graeca IX; 'Clement of Alexander, II 664, C. E. A. Sophocles Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods, p. 724. For the use of λυτρωσις Sophocles cites Justin Martyr, 'Patrologia Graeca' VI, 540 B, and Eusibius II, 841 B. Ibidem p. 724.

We find that lutron occurs only twice, each time in the sense of ransom. Barnabas exhorts the readers of his Epistle to be diligent in their business affairs by saying: "Thou shalt work with thy hands, for a ransom for thy sins."⁶⁵ The Epistle of Diognetus praises the love of God which caused Him to send His Only-begotten Son as a ransom for our sins: "...in pity He took upon Himself our sins and Himself parted with His own Son as a ransom for us, the holy for the lawless, the guiltless for the evil, the just for the unjust, the incorruptible for the corruptible, the immortal for the mortal."⁶⁶ As used by these Fathers and the later Apologists lutron did not lose the implication of ransoming, its original concept. The scope of its meaning was broadening to include the entire plan of salvation: our ransoming by the blood of Christ, our justification from sin, and our deliverance from the final destruction and our entrance into eternal glory.

II

The N. T. usage of the word lutron is confined to two passages: Mk. 10, 45 and Matt. 20, 28. "Lutron findet sich im NT nur Mk. 10, 45 and Mt. 20, 28 in dem Worte, mit dem Jesus den Sinn seines Todes verdeutlicht."⁶⁷ The Greek

65. Barnabas (XIX, 10) quoted by Warfield, op. cit. p. 366.

66. Quoted by Warfield, op. cit. p. 367.

67. Kittel, op. cit. p. 343.

text of Matt. 20, 28 reads: ὡς περ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακομθῆναι, ἀλλὰ διακομῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντι πολλῶν.⁶⁸

When we compare the same passage in Mark 10, 45 we find them identical except for the introductory words. Instead of ὡς περ Mark uses καὶ γὰρ. This small difference, we believe, does not effect the exegesis of this passage; "...der einzige Unterschied im Wortlaute--Matt. knuepft mit ὡς περ, Mark mit καὶ γὰρ an das Vorhergehende an--belanglos ist, liegt die exegetische Aufgabe einfach: wir haben den Sinn des Wortes im Zusammenhange des Mr-Ev bei des Jesusbildes bei Mk. festzustellen; nach allem anderen kann est hinterher gefragt werden."⁶⁹

The text of these two passages is well established. All manuscripts extant for critical study except one comparatively unimportant Latin translation⁷⁰ show the same words and the same order.⁷¹ Therefore we can proceed to a study of these passages certain that we have before us the

68. Greek N. T. by Erwin Nestle, 16th edition.

69. Kittel, op. cit. p. 343.

70. After ὡς περ manuscript x (codex bibliothecae universitatis Monacensis. Fragmenta sunt evangeliorum cum commentaris) adds γὰρ. Tischendorf. "Novum Testamentum Graece". Editio Octava Critica maior, Vol. I, 126.

71. For a photostatic copy of this section as it actually appears in Codex Alexandrinus cf. "The Principle Uncial Manuscripts of the N. T." by Hatch, Wm. H. P., University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1939, plate xvii.

72

words as they were written by Matthew and Mark.

The context is important for a full understanding of these passages. Jesus was on his way to Jerusalem. He was aware of the impending events which He must experience as the Savior of the world. Jesus had said: "Behold, we

72. After Matt. 20, 28 ΑΝΤΙ ΠΟΛΛΩΝ there is a long insertion: "ΥΜΕΙΣ ΔΕ ΙΝΑΤΕΙΤΕ ΕΚ ΜΙΚΡΟΥ ΔΥΣΗΡΕΩΣ ΚΑΙ ΕΚ ΜΕΙΣΙΟΝΟΣ ΕΛΑΤΤΟΚ ΕΙΚΔΙ. ΕΙΣ ΕΙΡΧΟΜΕΝΟΙ ΔΕ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΘΕΝΤΕΣ ΔΕΙΠΝΗΣΑΔΙ ΜΗ ΑΝΑΚΛΙΝΕΘΘΕ ΕΙΣ ΤΟΥΣ ΕΦΕΧΟΝΤΑΣ ΤΟΠΟΥΣ, ΜΗΠΟΤΕ ΕΚΔΟΨΟΤΕΡΟΣ ΒΟΥ ΕΠΕΛΘΗ ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟΒΕΛΘΩΝ Ο ΔΕΙΠΝΟΚΛΗΤΩΡ ΕΙΠΗ ΕΤΙ ΚΑΤΩ ΧΩΡΕΙ, ΚΑΙ ΚΑΤΩΙΣΧΥΝΘΗΔΗ. ΕΑΝ ΔΕ ΑΝΑΠΤΕΘΗΣ ΕΙΣ ΤΟΝ ΗΤΤΟΚΑ ΤΟΠΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΠΕΛΘΗ ΒΟΥ ΗΤΤΩΝ, ΕΡΕΙ ΒΟΙ Ο ΔΕΙΠΝΟΚΛΗΤΩΡ ΣΥΝΑΨΕ ΕΤΙ ΔΥΩ, ΚΑΙ ΕΒΤΑΙ ΒΟΙ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΧΡΗΣΙΜΟΝ."

" Tischendorf, op. cit. I, 126. This insertion is supported by D, Q, the Italian tradition (a b c e ff₁ g₂ h m n), the Syriac Curetonian and palimpsest, and the Fathers Hilary, Leo, and Juven. These codd. vary in detail but all give this insertion. Textual evidence does not warrant the inclusion of this section into the canon, but it bears a remarkable similarity to Lk. 14, 8ff. Mayer thinks this interpolation is "apocryphal, no doubt." B. H. Streeter says regarding this interpolation "It is a 'fegbler' and, I would add, 'less Christian way' of putting the maxim 'take the lowest place' as found in Lk. 14, 3ff....." "This reading does not commend itself as genuine." He says it seems to have been lacking in the oldest Alexandrian, Caesarean, and Antiochene texts and is absent from family Q, Syr. s, and Origen's 'Commentary on Matt.' as well as B and N. The Four Gospels, by B. H. Streeter, p. 136.

go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be betrayed unto the chief priests and unto the scribes, and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to death, and shall deliver him to the Gentiles to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify him; and the third day he shall rise again." Matt. 20, 18, 19. At this point the mother of James and John asks Jesus to give her sons the most distinguished places of honor, the seats at his right and his left, when He came into "His kingdom". When Jesus told her this honor was reserved for "whom it is prepared of my Father", the other disciples became indignant with James and John. Then, Jesus tells on what basis greatness is to be achieved by Christians. "You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. Not so shall it be among you; but whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be your slave." (Revised Standard Version). Matt. 20, 25-27. This is the immediate context of the passages we have under consideration. In this setting, then, Jesus gives Himself as the "summum exemplum" of one who would attain true greatness through "ministering" to all men. He, the Son of God, "made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and be-

came obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."

Phil. 2, 5.

Let us now proceed to a study of the meaning of the words as given us in these two passages. Scholars have translated these verses in various ways. I submit the following translations:

The Vulgate: "Nam et Filius hominis non venit ut ministraretur ei, sed ut ministraret et daret animam suam redemptionem pro multis."⁷³ Mk. 10, 45.

Luther: "Denn auch des Menschen Sohn ist nicht gekommen, dasz er sich dienen lasse, sondern dass er diene, und gehe sein Leben zur Bezahlung fuer viele."⁷⁴ Mk. 10, 45.

The French translation: "Car le Fils de l'homme Im-mene n'est pas venu pour e tre servi, mais pour servir, et pour donner sa vie en rancon pour plusieurs."⁷⁵ Mk. 10, 45.

The Danish translation: "Belijk de Zoon des Menschen niet is gekomen om gediend te worden, maar om te dienen, en Zijne ziel te geven tot een rantsoen voor velen."⁷⁶ Matt. 20, 28.

English translations

Wycliff: "As Mannus sone cam not to be seruyd, but to serue, and to zyve his lijf redempcioun for manye." Matt. 20, 28. "For whi mannus sone came not, that it schulde be mynystrid to hym, but that he

73. Vulgate: Polyglotten-Bibel im uebersichtlicher Nebeneinander: stellung des Urtextes, der LXX, Vulgata und Luther-Uebersetzung.... Bearbeitet von R. Stier und K. G. Theile, IV, Leipsig, 1875.

74. Luther, ibidem.

75. Biblica Hexagatta, Ed. Rev. E. R. re Levante V, N. Y., Funk-Wagnalls Co., 1906

76. Bijbel, "door last van de Hoog mog. Heeren, Staten General der vereenigde Nederlanden." British Bible Society, 1924.

schulde mynystre, and zyue his lijf azenbiyng for manye."⁷⁷ Mk. 10, 45.

Weymouth: "Just as the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as the redemption-price for many." (Matt. 20, 28). "For the Son of Man also did not come to be waited upon, but to wait on others, and to give His life as the redemption-price for a multitude of people."⁷⁸ Mk. 10, 45.

Moffat: "Just as the Son of man has not come to be served, but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many."⁷⁹ Matt. 20, 28, and Mk. 10, 45.

Goodspeed: "Just as the Son of man has come not to be waited on, but to wait on other people, and to give his life to ransom many others." Matt. 20, 28. "For the Son of Man himself has not come to be waited on, but to wait on other people, and to give his life to free many others."⁸⁰ Mk. 10, 45.

Knox: "So it is that the Son of Man did not come to have service done him; he came to serve others; and to give his life as a ransom for the lives of many."⁸¹

Dounay Version: "Even as the Son of Man is not come to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a redemption for many."⁸² Matt. 20, 28 and Mk. 10, 45.

77. The N. T. in English according to the version by John Wycliffe about A. D. 1380 and revised by John Purvey A. D. 1388. Edited by J. Forshall and Sir F. Madden. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1879.

78. The N. T. in Modern Speech. An idiomatic translation into everyday Eng. from the text of the resultant Greek Testament. Ed. and partly revised by E. Hampden-Dock, Boston, Sixth Impression.

79. The N. T., A New Translation, Moffat, James. New Ed. revised, Harper & Bro., N. Y., 1935.

80. The Complete Bible, An American Translation, the O. T. translated by J. M. Powis Smith; The N. T. & Apocrypha by E. J. Goodspeed. U. Of Chicago Press, 1944.

81. The New Testament, A New Translation, R. A. Knox Sheed and Ward, 1945, Fourth printing.

82. Dounay version. Holy Bible translated from the Latin Vulgate. Imprimatur John Cardinal Farley. Herden Book Co. St. Louis.

The New Testament: "Even as the Son of man has not come to be served, but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many." ⁸³ Matt. 20, 28 and Mk. 10, 45.

British Revised of 1881-1885: "Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." Matt. 20, 28. "For verily the Son of Man came....." Mk. 10, 45. ⁸⁴

American Revised of 1901: "Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." Matt. 20, 28. Mark 10, 45 is the same, except first word is "for" rather than "even as". ⁸⁵

The N. T. in Basic English: "Even as the Son of man came not to have servants, but to be a servant, and to give his life for the salvation of great numbers of men." Matt. 20, 28. Mark 10, 45 *ibidem*. ⁸⁶

Revised Standard Version: "Even as the Son of man came not to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many." Matt. 20, 28. "For the Son of Man also came not to be served, but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many." ⁸⁷ Mk. 10, 45.

83. The N. T. translated from the Latin Vulgate. A revision of the Challoner-Rheims Version. Episcopal committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. St. Anthony Guild Press, New Jersey, 1941.

84. Holy Bible, being the Version set forth A. D. 1611 compared with the most ancient authorities and revised. Ox. Un. Press, 1885.

85. The N. T. of our Lord and Savior, newly edited by the N. T. members of the American Revision Committee, A. D. 1900. Standard Edition N. Y., Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1901.

86. The New Testament in Basic English, N. Y., E. P. Dutton & Co., 1941. Committee headed by Mr. S. H. Hooke.

87. The New Covenant. Commonly called the N. T. of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Revised Standard Version. Thomas Nelson & Sons. N. Y., 1946.

In this passage Jesus designates Himself as ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, "the Son of Man." This term has been subject to a great amount of investigation and a variety of interpretations have resulted. Some have watered this term down to mean only "the ideal man" or "the flower of humanity" and other terms indicating only the humanity of Jesus. We shall show that when Jesus used this term He did so with a definite purpose and significance.

ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου the Son of man, is used in the LXX for אִן תְּנַן אִן, Chald. אִן תְּנַן אִן. "Properly it is a periphrasis for 'man', especially common in the poetical books of the O. T. and usually carrying with it a suggestion of weakness and mortality." ⁸⁸ (Num. 23, 19; Job 16, 21; 25, 6; Ps. 8, 5; Is. 51, 12). The plural occurs only twice in the N. T. (Mk. 3, 28; Eph. 3, 5) and in both passages refers evidently to human beings, and not to the Messiah. This meaning of this phrase does not concern us in the present discussion.

The O. T. concept of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is given very plainly in Dan. 7, 13. 14. "And I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days,

88. Thayer, Greek-English Lexicon of the N. T. p. 635.

and they brought Him near before Him. And there was given Him dominion, and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve Him: His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." In this passage Daniel stresses both the humanity of the Messiah and the universality of his kingdom. The son of man here "symbolically denotes the fifth kingdom, universal and Messianic; and by this term its humanity is indicated in contrast with the barbarity and ferocity of the preceding kingdoms (the Babylonian, the Median, the Persian, the Macedonian) typified under the form of beasts." ⁸⁹

Some scholars deny that Daniel 7, 13, 14 refers to the humanity of Jesus. Von Hofman, Zahn and others take וְהוּא one like the Son of man, in this passage to mean that what Daniel saw resembled a man, but was not a man. We note, however, that in Rev. 1, 13 and 14, 14, two passages which by common consent speak of Jesus, this 'like' is carefully retained. We know that Jesus was a real man. When Daniel saw "one like the Son of man" God gave him a vision of the real Jesus. "When Daniel sees him 'like the Son of man', this, without saying in so many words that 'he is man'

89. Thayer, op. cit. p. 635.

clearly intimates that the grand person described is also man." ⁹⁰ The N. T. usage of this term shows conclusively that "the Son of man" refers not only to the divinity, but also to the humanity of the Messiah.

In the New Testament this term was used exclusively by Jesus, except in John 12, 34 where the people ask "Who is the son of man?" and in Acts 7, 56 where Stephan the first martyr said, "Behold I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God." ⁹¹ Jesus always used it as a subject or as an object, always in the third person, and never as a predicate. Jesus was fully aware that He was the Son of Man, yet He never says explicitly in the first person, "I am the Son of Man." When this title is used we note that it occurs with two Greek

90. Lenski, Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel, p. 431.

91. Lenski, op. cit. says this term "was unknown before His (Jesus') time." Most authorities agree that this term was not current among the Jews as a designation for the Messiah, and that is probably one reason Jesus chose this title for Himself: it was least suited to foster the expectation of an earthly Messiah in royal splendor. However, we cannot say with Lenski that this term was unknown. "Son of man..In Son of man Vision--destroys enemies without labour by the Law (4 Ezra 13, 38); restoration of Lost 10 tribes under Son of man (4 Ezra 13, 41 seq); all judgment committed to, (1 Enoch 69, 27) pre-existence of, (48, 2); to sit on God's throne (51, 3); universal dominion of, (52, 1)....." The Apocrypha & Pseudepigrapha of the O. T. in English with introductions and critical and explanatory notes to the several books., Charles, R. H., II, 867.

92
 articles. These two definite articles make the term quite distinct from "a son of man", just a human being. The του ἀνθρώπου, never the plural, "of men", is evidently generic. Christ was not begotten by a human father, but, nevertheless, He had the nature of man. He was a son of mankind. "The fact that the human nature of Christ is thus indicated is beyond question."⁹³ We know that this term refers partly to the human nature of Christ, because Scripture ascribes to the Son of man as subject the whole number of attributes. The Son of man is poor (Mt. 8, 20), eats and drinks (Mt. 11, 19), is defamed, suffers and dies (Mt. 17, 12, 22, 23; 20, 18, 19).

On the other hand, the fact that Jesus calls Himself "the Son of man" sets him apart as one man who has this human nature in a way in which no other man has it. Though, He is true man, He is more than man. Jesus makes this perfectly clear in Matt. 16, 13-17. Here Jesus questions His disciples on the identity of "the son of man." He rejects the false definitions: John the Baptist, Elijah, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets. Jesus accepts Peter's definition

92. Only once the term occurs without the article. Jn. 5, 27. Here, "doubtless in order that by recalling Dn. 7, 13ff....he might thus intimate his Messiahship, as is plain from Matt. 26, 64; Mk. 14, 62 etc." Thayer, op. cit. p. 635.

93. Lenski, op. cit. p. 340.

that the Son of man, Jesus Christ, is "the Son of the Living God." This truth, "not flesh and blood, but the Father in heaven", revealed to Peter. The same definition follows from the predicates Scripture ascribes to the Son of man as subject. The Son of man must be divine because He sees the thoughts of men's hearts (Mt. 9, 2. 4), Forgives sins (Mt. 9, 6), is Lord of the Sabbath (Mt. 12, 8), sits at the right hand of God as Ruler of the universe (Mt. 26, 63. 64), and returns in divine glory to judge the quick and the dead (Mt. 25, 31ff.).

Thus we see that Jesus' use of the title ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ
θεοῦ is very significant. He wishes to indicate His divine and human natures which are united in His one person. "In the use Jesus makes of this title two lines of thought converge; the one is lowliness, suffering, etc.;⁹⁴ the other greatness, power, and exaltation beyond men." This God-Man was uniquely qualified for his work as the Messiah of the world, the promised Redeemer, who would give Himself as the lutron for men. Thus in Mk. 10, 45 and Matt. 20, 28, the two passages under consideration, "der Sinn dieser Selbstbezeichnung Jesus ist messianisch. Mk. 10, 45 deutet also das messianische Werk, die messianische Gesamt-⁹⁵leistung Jesus."

94. Lenski, op. cit. p. 340.

95. Kittel, op. cit. p. 343.

This Son of man, ἦλθεν, came into the world. He was the Son of God, equal with the Father, and enjoyed all the bliss of heaven. He was infinitely great in Himself, because He was the Omnipotent Lord of the universe. Yet, because of His great love for men, and in obedience to His Father, He "came" from heaven to earth. Eternity punctured time; God appeared in the flesh. "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us and we beheld His glory...." John 1, 14. "In the fulness of time, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman...." Gal. 4, 4. "He took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men...." Phil. 2, 7. In the humble stall at Bethlehem, Jesus "came"; He began His work of ministering to men.

The purpose of Jesus' coming is indicated by the words: οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι, ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι. Jesus came to serve. διακονέω means: "to be a servant, attendant, domestic; to serve, wait upon. In the passive, to be served, ministered unto." ⁹⁶ As the Son of God, Jesus could have demanded that all men render service to Him. He had the power to make them His servants (διάκονοι), or even His slaves (δοῦλοι), yet the text emphatically states that Jesus Himself came not to receive such service, but to serve. As a servant, Jesus did not forfeit His divine power and dig-

96. Thayer, op. cit. p. 137.

nity, but He merely refrained from using it except for occasional instances. "In both verbs we have διδάκω, and not δοῦλος because of the divine dignity of this great Servant, a dignity which remained during His service, and because of the exalted service which He rendered."⁹⁷

G. Kittel makes this additional observation regarding διδασκωθησαι: "Dienst, und zwar im Vollsinn des Wortes, im ausschliessenden Gegensatz nicht zur Herrschaft, aber zu dem Herrengebahren, das in der Welt vorzufinden ist. (Mk. 10, 42) Das Dienen, in dem der Koenigswille Jesus zur Erscheinung kommt, vollendet sich in der Hingabe seiner selbst."⁹⁸

καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν. The καὶ in this passage can well be taken as exegetical. In this case we would translate "...to serve, namely, to give his life as a ransom for many...."⁹⁹ The δοῦναι stresses the fact that Jesus made the payment of His life voluntarily. "... Es....drueckt die Hingabe, die Freiwilligkeit in Jesu Ster-

97. Lenske, op. cit. p. 792.

98. Kittel, op. cit. p. 345.

99. By taking this καὶ as exegetical we do not mean to isolate the death of Jesus from the life which precedes it. It is not the death only which Jesus offered as a ransom, but his death which came as the culmination and completion of a previous career of ministry. Or to put it in dogmatical terms, we do not thereby exclude the active obedience of Christ.

ben aus, wie Mark dieses beschreibt: als willige Gehorsamstat Gott gegenueber, nicht als Erliegen gegenueber der Feindschaft der Pharisaeer und des Synhedriums." ¹⁰⁰ Mark says Jesus came to give ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. Some people argue falsely that ψυχὴν can be taken only in the sense of person, and does not necessarily refer to an actual physical death. They cite such passages as Acts 2, 41: "... and the same day there were added unto them about 3,000 souls (ψυχὰς)." Also Acts 3, 23 where we find the same usage. A close study shows us that ψυχὴν in Mk. 10, 45 and Matt. 20, 28 means more than just "person" or "Individual". ψυχὴν usually refers to the life which animates the σῶμα and which is separated from it by death. It is "the soul, as the principle of life in the body." ¹⁰¹ Kittel is very careful to state that ψυχὴν is not a condition of the self, but the self itself. "ψυχὴν ist das Leben, nicht als ein Zustand des Selbst, sondern als das Selbst selber." ¹⁰² Thus when Jesus gave His ψυχὴν He was offering Himself (δοῦναι ἑαυτὸν) as a ransom. This phrase δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ is synonymous with τίθημι τὴν ἑαυτὸν (John 10, 11. 15. 17). When Jesus

100. Kittel, op. cit. p. 344.

101. Meyer, H. A. W. Critical and Exegetical Commentary of the N. T., translated by Wm. P. Dickson and Wm. Steward. II, 51.

102. Kittel, op. cit. p. 343.

spoke of laying down His life for the sheep, He referred to His death. When He says He has power to take up His life again, He evidently is thinking of His resurrection from the dead. We must agree with Kittel when he says: "Es (ἑοῦρα τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ) kann hier nur auf das Sterben Jesu gehn...." ¹⁰³ Also Zahn brings out the same point very forcefully: "Es gibt aber ein Dienen im Vollmass, ein Hingeben des leiblichen Lebens bis zu dem Grade, dass dasselbe im Tode aufgeopfert wird....Und der Leser unseres Ev. welcher die wiederholte Versicherung Jesus gelesen hatte, dass er eines gewaltsamen Todes sterben werde, konnte jenes Wort gar nicht anders deuten." ¹⁰⁴ Jesus gave His life. He was obedient unto death, "even unto the death of the Cross". Phil. 2, 8.

Jesus gave His life ἀντιπληρῶν. This phrase, has provoked a great amount of theological discussion. Although the words Jesus uses are perfectly clear, the ideas involved have proved repugnant to some modern exegetes. Let us examine this phrase in detail and determine what Jesus evidently meant.

The basic idea behind the preposition ἀντι is "face to face". ἀντι can be used in many different ways. Thayer gives three basic meanings each with numerous sub-divi-

103. Kittel, op. cit. p. 344.

104. Zahn, T., Kommentar Zum Markus, II, 289.

sions: 1) "Properly, it seems to have signified; over against, opposite to, before, in a local sense. Hence, 2) Indicating exchange, succession, for, instead of, in place of (something) and 3) as a prefix."¹⁰⁵ Under (2), the meaning obviously under which ἀντί as used in Matt. 20, 20 and Mk. 10, 45 must fall, Thayer gives these subdivision: "(a) Universally, instead of; (b) that for which something is given, received, endured; (c) of recompense; and (d) of succession to the place of another." Here we see that ἀντί can have various shades of meaning, and by itself ἀντί would not prove conclusively the idea of substitution involved in lutron with which it is used.

ἀντί with λύτρον in the sense "instead of, for" occurs only in Matt. 20, 28 and Mk. 10, 45, and in I Tim. 2, 6 in the word ἀντὶ λύτρον.¹⁰⁶

105. Thayer, op. cit. p. 49.

106. This is unusual because Paul's great theme is Redemption for all men won by Christ, offered freely in the Gospel and accepted by faith. Paul usually used the preposition ὑπέρ to denote the relation of Christ's death to mankind. Rom. 5, 6 "...Christ died for (ὑπέρ) the ungodly." Titus 2, 14 "Who (Jesus) gave Himself for (ὑπέρ) us" So also Rom. 5, 8; 8, 32; II Cor. 5, 14, 15; I Tim. 2, 6; I Pet. 2, 21; 3, 18; 4, 1. Even Luke uses ὑπέρ when he recounts the words of Jesus in the last Supper: "This is my body which is given for (ὑπέρ) you." Luke 22, 14; 22, 20. We also find the preposition πρὸς used in Matt. 26, 28 in the words of the Last Supper. Other examples: Gal. 1, 4; Rom. 8, 13 and I Pet. 3, 18. We find διὰ used with reference to Christ's death. I Cor. 8, 11 "And through Thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom (διὰ) Christ died."

However, we find ἀντί used in other phrases which cannot be taken in any other sense than "instead of", and "in the place of". "The idea of "in the place of" or "instead of" comes where two substantives placed opposite to each other are equivalent and so may be exchanged." ¹⁰⁷ For examples of this common usage Robertson gives Matt. 5, 38ff. ὄφθαλμὸν ἀντί ὀφθαλμοῦ καὶ ὀδόντα ἀντί ὀδόντος; Rom. 12, 17 κακὸν ἀντί κακοῦ; I Pet. 3, 9 λοιδορίαν ἀντί λοιδορίας; Matt. 2, 22 ἀντί τοῦ πατρὸς; James 4, 15 ἀντί τοῦ λέγειν; and I Cor. 11, 15. Also Lk. 11, 11; Heb. 12, 16; I Thess. 5, 15. ¹⁰⁸

Thus we see that when Jesus chose the preposition ἀντί, to say the least, He was certainly not excluding the concept of substitution.. We will go farther and state the context and parallels demand the idea of substitution in the

107. Robertson, A. T., A Grammar of the Greek N. T. in the Light of Historical Research, 2nd Edition 1914, p. 573.

108. The Greek speaking world of Jesus' time had every reason to understand ἀντί in the sense of "instead of, in the place of". From Homer on down classical Greek is full of instances of this use of the preposition ἀντί. Liddell and Scott give the following as typical examples: ἐκ-τοπος ἀντί πεφάσθαι Illyiad 24, 254; ἀντί γάμοιο τάφορ Od. 20, 307; πόλεμος ἀντί φίλου καταστήσει Herodotus 1, 87; ἀντί ἡμέρας κύβ ἐρέετο Id. 7, 37; ἀντί φωτῶν σποδός A. G. 434; τὸν πόλεμον ἀντ' εἰρήνης μεταδιδυμίσειν Thucydides 1, 120 of. 4, 20; 7, 75; βασιλεύειν ἀντί τίνος Xenophon Anabasis 1, 114; ἀντί ἄρχεσθαι ὑπ' ἄλλῶν ἄρχειν ἀπάρτιω Hd. 1, 210. of. 6, 32; 7, 170.

passages Matt. 20, 28 and Mk. 10, 45. "These two important doctrinal passages teach the substitutionary conception of Christ's death, not because ἀντί of itself means "instead", which is not true, but because the context renders any other resultant idea out of the question." ¹⁰⁹ Above we have called attention to ἀντίλυτρον in I Tim. 2, ¹¹⁰ 6. In this passage Paul uses both ἀντί, as a prefix, and the preposition ὑπέρ to stress the idea of substitution. "ἀντί stresses the fact of Christ's coming and suffering in the stead of all, and for their advantage (ὑπέρ)."¹¹¹ The best Bible Scholars agree that ἀντί in these passages must refer to Christ's giving His life as a ransom in the substitution sense. "ἀντί heiszt 'fuer', nicht so sehr 'zum Besten' als 'anstelle'."¹¹² "ἀντί denotes substitution. That which is given as a ransom takes the place (is given instead of) those who are to be set free

109. Robertson, A. T., op. cit. p. 573.

110. The best N. T. scholars regard I Tim. 2, 6 as a distinct echo of Christ's words in Matt. 20, 28; Mk. 10, 45. "The distinction between ἀντί and the more colorless ὑπέρ in applying the metaphor of purchase, is well seen in Mk. 10, 45 (Matt. 20, 28) λύτρον ἀντί πολλῶν, and the quotation of this logion in I Tim. 2, 6 ἀντίλυτρον ὑπέρ πάντων." Moulton, James Hope, A Grammar of N. T. Greek, I, 105.

111. Cremer, H., Biblico-Theological Lexicon of the N. T. Greek, p. 409.

112. Kittel, op. cit. p. 344.

in consideration thereof." ¹¹³ The very fact that ἀντί is used with λύτρον stresses that it must be taken as substitutional. "Das Lösegeldwort enthält auf jeden Fall einen Stellvertretungsgedanken. Denn mag man ἀντί mit 'anstelle' oder 'zum besten' deuten: indem Jesus sich selbst in den Tod gibt, geschieht mit ihm, was mit den Vielen geschehen musste, tritt er an ihre Stelle." ¹¹⁴ This view is confirmed by the fact that in other parts of the N. T. this ransom is usually spoken of as an expiatory sacrifice. (cf. Matt. 24, 28; Jn. 1, 29; I Jn. 4, 10; Rom. 3, 25; I Pet. 1, 18ff; 3, 18; and Is. 53, 10). ¹¹⁵

In spite of this clear evidence both in the context and parallels some modern exogetes have made efforts to overthrow the substitutional import of these passages. For dogmatical, and not for exegetical reasons they assert that Jesus could not have said or did not say what His words evidently do say. "But that is an easy way to get rid of

113. Meyer, H. A. W., op. cit. p. 51.

114. Kittel, op. cit. p. 344.

115. Kittel, op. cit. in footnote 22 believes that Is. 53, while a similar situation to the λύτρον ἀντί ἡολήτων in Matt. 20, 28 and Mk. 10, 45, is nevertheless not an exact parallel. "Dass das Lösegeldwort Ähnlichkeit mit Is. 53 aufweist, ist nicht zu leugnen. Es ist auch zuzugeben, dass Is. 53 fuer seine Entstehung Bedeutung haben kann. Aber jedenfalls nimmt es nicht ausdruecklich, auch nicht deutlich Bezug auf Is. 53; deshalb ist es methodisch auf jeden Fall unrichtig, zur Erklarung des Lösegeldwortes von Is. 53 auszugehen."

passages that contradict one's theological opinions." ¹¹⁶

We must conclude then, that ἀντί here is most intelligible when we take it to refer to a substitutional death of Christ for many.

Christ's death was a substitutional death "for many". Next the question arises as to the exact meaning of πολλῶν. Does this term indicate that Christ's death was intended to ransom an exclusive minority or all men? We note, first of all, that πολλῶν occurs here without the article. In the New Testament the plural masculine πολλοί without the article occurs very frequently. In this form and use it usually means "many, a large part of mankind." ¹¹⁷ Matt. 7, 13, for instance, shows this meaning: "Enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many (πολλοί) there be which go in thereat." "πολλοί kann eine unbestimmte Menge bezeichnen." ¹¹⁸

Scripture, on the other hand, also describes the death of Jesus as having taken place for all (παντός). I Tim. 2, 6 ὁ ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων

116. Robertson, A. T., Word Pictures in the N. T., Vol. I, p. 163.

117. Thayer, op. cit. p. 529. Cf. Matt. 7, 13, 22; 26, 28; Mk. 2, 2; 3, 10; 14, 24; etc.

118. Kittel, op. cit. p. 344. Kittel shows that οἱ πολλοί, according to its Semitic usage, could refer to those standing around Jesus within hearing distance ("die in Rede stehende Gesamtheit"). The fact that the article is here ^{shows} shows that Jesus did not thus limit the meaning of πολλῶν in Matt. 20, 28 and Mk. 10, 45.

Rom. 5, 18 also reveals that God intended the lutron as a universal gift: Ἄρα οὖν ὡς δι' ἑνὸς παρὰ πᾶσι πάντων εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάρκειαν, οὕτως καὶ δι' ἑνὸς δικαιοσύνης εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαιοσύνην ζωῆς."

From these parallels we see that πολλῶν as used in Matt. 20, 28 and Mk. 10, 45 can refer to all men rather than to just a large number only.

The fifth chapter of Romans referred to above is particularly instructive. In verses 12-19 Paul uses οἱ πολλοί (cf. 15 (2), 19 (2)). However, in Rom. 5, 18 the οἱ πολλοί are identified with the πάντες, and therefore one can say that Paul always has in mind the πάντες.

"Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin; and so death passed upon all πάντας men, for that πάντας have sinned: (for until the law sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come. But not as the offence, so also the free gift. For if through the offence of one many οἱ πολλοί be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many τοὺς πολλοὺς. And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many πολλῶν. For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ). Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all πάντας men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all πάντας men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many οἱ πολλοί were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many οἱ πολλοί be made righteous."

In this section we know that Paul means "all" when he uses

ΠΑΝΤΕΣ. The entire argument of the preceding four chapters (especially up to Rom. 3, 20) shows conclusively, first, that "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God", and, secondly, that every man "is justified by his grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus". Rom. 3, 23-24. Thus we conclude when Paul uses πολλοί as a synonym for ΠΑΝΤΕΣ he shows conclusively that he interpreted Jesus' words "give my life a ransom for many", to mean all men, not just an exclusive minority or the so-called "elect". An attempt to make πολλῶν fit a particularistic exegesis violates plain scripture that all men are the objects of God's grace (Titus 2, 4; I Tim. 2, 4; John 3, 16; I Jn. 2, 2), that the gratia universalis pertains to each and every individual (II Pet. 3, 9; Ezek. 33, 11; 18, 23, 32), and that even those who perish are included in those for whom Christ paid the ransom of His life. (I Cor. 8, 11; Rom. 14, 15; II Pet. 2, 1; Matt. 23, 37) Correctly Gerhard says in regard to the universality of divine grace, that the Scripture attests it in words, Christ with tears, God Himself with an oath.

The best commentators explain the fact that Scripture uses both πολλοί and ΠΑΝΤΕΣ to describe the vicarious death of Christ by referring to the distinction between objective and subjective justification. H. A. W. Meyer, for instance, puts it this way:

"The vicarious death of Jesus may be described

as having taken place for all....or for many....according as we regard it as an objective fact (that fact being: Jesus has given His life a ransom for all men), or look at it in relation to the subjective appropriation of its results on the part of individuals (which happens only in the case of believers). So in the present case, where, accordingly, πολλῶν is to be understood as meaning all who believe now and will believe hereafter. Jn. 17, 20."119

Henry Alford states the same idea very effectively when he says:

"No stress should be laid on this word πολλῶν, as not being πᾶντων here; it is placed in opposition to the one life which is given--the one for the many--and not with distinction from πᾶντων. πᾶντων is the objective, πολλῶν the subjective designation of those for whom Christ died. He died for all objectively; subjectively, the great multitude whom no man could number, πολλοί will be saved in the end."120

We have shown previously (in the section dealing with the use of lutron in the Greek/papyri of the first century A. D.) that the concept of ransom was a common one in the Greek speaking world. When Jesus used the word lutron in reference to His redemptive work, we must not think that He chose a word which would obscure His real meaning. On the contrary, in such a basic teaching as the purpose of His entire mission and work, certainly Jesus would pick words to describe His work accurately. Lutron is a case in point. In lutron the Master picked a word which "was admirably

119. Meyer, H. A. W. op. cit. II, 53 sub. Matt. 20, 28.

120. Alford, Henry, Greek New Testament. "A digest of various readings: marginal references to verbal and idiomatic usage; a critical and exegetical commentary". Vol. IV, 5th ed. Cambridge, 1865 sub. Matt. 20, 28.

suites to meet the requirements and intellectual capacity of the lower classes."¹²¹ "In the group of words built around lutron the Greek language offered to the New Testament a series of terms which distinctly said 'ransom'; and just as in proportion as we think of the writers of the New Testament as using Greek naturally, we must think of them as feeling the intrinsic significance of these words as they used them, and as using them only when they intended to give expression to this their intrinsic significance."¹²²

Jesus' own use of this phrase 'to give His life a ransom for many' to describe His mission on earth would naturally determine for His followers their whole conception of His redemptive work. It is quite natural then, that we find this sentiment echoed frequently by the disciples and apostles. The Lord Jesus gave St. Paul an especially clear understanding of the concept involved in lutron. Paul is very fond of this concept in connection with the redemption. He always thought of the redemption in connection with the death, the sacrifice of Himself, which Jesus made. Reference has already been made to I Tim 2, 6 ὁ τοῦ σώματος ἑαυτοῦ ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων. Also, Eph. 1, 7: "In whom we have redemption (ἀπολύτρωσις) through his blood, the forgiveness of sins...." Titus 2, 14: "Who gave himself for us that he might redeem (λυτρώσεται) us from all iniquity...."

121. Deissmann, A., op. cit. p. 328.

122. Warfield, B. B., op. cit. p. 340 & 341.

Deissmann demonstrates that Paul's predilection for the ransoming concept as expressed in lutron and its derivatives was a particularly happy one for the lower classes. For instance, "for the poor saints of Corinth, among whom there were certainly some slaves, he (Paul) could not have found a more popular illustration of the present and past work of the Lord...." In Corinth every slave knew of, and daily saw the pagan shrines "at which Apollos or Seraphis or Asclepius, the Healer, bought slaves with a price, for freedom."¹²³ Therefore when Paul came preaching a spiritual freedom made by Jesus who had paid the price of His own life these people immediately grasp his meaning.

Peter, too, had this same concept of Christ's work. In his first Epistle he states: "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed (ἐλυτρώθητε) with corruptible things as silver and gold....but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without spot." I Pet. 1, 18-19. The writer to the Hebrews, whoever he may have been, concurs in the use of this concept. "....by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption (λύτρωσιν) for us." Heb. 9, 12. John, the Beloved Disciple, who was undoubtedly present on occasions when Jesus employed the word lutron, views the ransom

123. Deissmann, A. op. cit. p. 328

as paid and the saints already perfected in heaven: "... thou (Jesus) wast slain, and hast redeemed ἡγοράσας us to God, by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue and people and nation." Rev. 5, 9. N. T. passages could be multiplied indefinitely to show that ἀπολύτρωσις and λύτρωσις are connected with lutron and echo the word used by Christ in Matt. 20, 28 and Mk. 10, 45. "No subtlety of interpretation can rid such passages of their implication of ransoming."¹²⁴

Thus, the concept of a ransoming paid by Jesus with His life is clearly set before us in both the Gospels and Epistles of the New Testament. The question arises "Why did God demand the death of Jesus for the freedom of many?" Why could God not have freed them without such a ransom price? Could God not have found some other way to redeem mankind? The texts before us for consideration do not answer these questions. We do well, however, to note the attitude Jesus maintained toward the "work" which the Father had sent Him to do.

"Diese Worte Jesu entschleiern nirgends die letzten Gründe fuer Gottes Verfahren mit seinem Sohne, zeigen vielmehr den Sohn bereit, sich unter Gottes Willen zu beugen, ihn zu ehren, ja sich ihm aufzuopfern, auch wenn die Gründe fuer Gottes Willen nicht offenbar sind. (cf. Mt. 11, 25. 26; Mk. 13, 32; 14,

124. Warfield, B. B. op. cit. p. 361.

35. 36; 15, 34). Diese voellige Unterwerfung unter Gottes Willen gehoert unaufgebar zum Gottesdienst Jesu. Gott ist fuer Jesus niemanden, auch seinem Sohne nicht, eine Offenbarung seiner Grunde, geschweige eine Rechtfertigung seines Handelns und Verlangens Schuldig." ¹²⁵

Everything that God wills and does, Scripture tells us He does for holy, righteous and all-wise reasons. What these reasons are, God does not always give to man. Man with his finite mind can fathom the mind of God only when God reveals His reason to man and in so far as God makes them clear to him. We are told in these passages (Matt. 20, 28 and Mk. 10, 45) that the death of Jesus is a service to God, a substitution for many, on the basis of which the many are free from their sins. The "Whys" we must leave to the love of God which, though we see but darkly, we shall understand perfectly in the light of eternity.

To complete the discussion of the ransom concept involved with lutron we must consider the questions: "From what were the many redeemed? and, "To whom was the ransom paid?"

Neither Matt. 20, 28 nor Mk. 10, 45 tells us from what Jesus redeemed the many. To answer this question we must refer to parallel passages which enlarge upon this subject. ~~Since all doctrines of the Scripture are a "corpus doctrinae", a unified whole,~~ we can be certain that an answer drawn from these parallels will reveal God's answer. The

125. Kittel, op. cit. p. 346.

reader will recall that in the first section of this paper we pointed out how lutron in the LXX is often translated for the Hebrew כֶּתֹּוֹת which usually refers to payments required under the Law to secure the release of persons from slavery. The New Testament continues this usage when it teaches that Jesus gave His life as a ransom price by which He redeemed His disciples from bondage. Wherein did this bondage consist? In answer we think of all those statements of Scripture which speak of sin as slavery and sinners as slaves. Take, for instance, Jesus' own statement: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin." (Jn. 8, 34) Or, in Rom. 6, 17 "....ye were the servants of sin." Peter states this same idea very clearly: "....they themselves are the servants of corruption; for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage." When a man commits sin, he becomes the slave of sin. From this slavery Jesus ransomed His followers. "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." Jn. 8, 36.

When Paul describes deliverance from sin and the cessation of bondage to sin he uses, as mentioned previously, his characteristic word is ἀπολύτρωσις. The use of the prepositional prefix ἀπο- is significant here because it stresses that we are redeemed "away from" some state of misery or danger. From the parallels above we see Jesus' redemption can be none other than redemption

from the guilt of sin. Paul himself defines this ἀπὸν when he states in Eph. 1, 7: "In whom (Christ) we have redemption through his blood, ἡ ἀφένσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν" (cf. also Col. 1, 14: τὴν ἀφένσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν; Rom. 3, 24; Heb. 9, 15; I Cor. 1, 30). Kittel agrees with this conclusion when he says: "Ebensowenig ist gesagt, wovon die Vielen frei werden. (That is, in Matt. 20, 28 and Mk. 10, 45) Da fuer Jesus das eigentliche Unglueck der Menschen stets ihr Getrenntsein von Gott, ihr Verfallensein an Gottes Gericht, ihre Suende ist, kann hier keine andere Befreiung als die von der Suende gemeint sein."¹²⁶

To whom was the ransom paid? Under section I we pointed to the C. T. usage of לִטְרוֹן (LXX, 'lutron') which denotes a gift given as compensation whose purpose is to cover guilt. In this case the lutron is paid by an offender, either to a man (Ex. 21, 30; Num. 35, 30. 32) or to a deity in order to save the life which the guilty forfeited by his wrong doing. In other words, the lutron is a propitiatory gift to satisfy the offended. Whom, then, did Jesus propitiate when He gave His life a ransom for man? Obviously, not any man as in Ex. 21, 30. No^t exegetes to the knowledge of this author ever offered such an explanation. The only conclusion we can come to is that the ransom was

126. Kittel, op. cit. p. 344.

paid to an offended deity.

This deity is none other than ^{is of satisfaction} God. This answer is made perfectly clear in the O. T. (Ps. 49, 7. 8. 15; Job 33, 24) and continued in the N. T. with equal clarity. Jesus redeems man from eternal ἀπωλεία in which they had the wrath of God abiding upon them (Jn. 3, 36). Moreover, the N. T. states that men would remain imprisoned (II Cor. 5, 21; I Pet. 2, 24; Col. 1, 14; etc.) in a condition of hopeless bondage (Heb. 2, 15) if Christ had not expiated to God the guilt of their sins. "Here (in Mark 10, 45) Jesus is speaking of a ransom that Jesus has paid, which enables God to relieve man of the state of punishment which God by virtue of His righteousness and holiness has to impend over man." ¹²⁷

Of all the authorities the author found on this subject Kittel states most uniquely and emphatically that God is the receiver of the lutron offered by Jesus. "Nach allem Ausgefuehrten kann nicht bezweifelt werden, dass der nicht genannte Empfaenger des Loesegelds Gott ist. Denn Jesus dient God in seinem Sterben, Gott verlangt das Leiden von seinem Sohne unerbittlich. Gott schlaegt ihn." ¹²⁸

Christ, then rendered satisfaction or paid the ransom to God because holiness and righteousness are His attributes.

127. Weiss, B., The Religion of the N. T. Translated from the German by Prof. G. H. Schoedde. Funk & Wagnalls Co. N. Y. 1905, p. 229-230.

128. Kittel, op. cit. p. 345.

Lutheran dogmaticians note that there are not three divine righteousnesses, however, but the one divine righteousness in number belonging to the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. This furnishes us the interesting conclusion that Jesus paid the ransom to Himself. "Inasmuch as Christ rendered the satisfaction He is regarded as the Mediator; inasmuch as He personally also demanded the satisfaction, He is to be regarded as God, as the Giver and Avenger of the Law, who according to His essence is as absolutely righteous as the Father and the Holy Ghost." ¹²⁹ This statement agrees with II Cor. 5, 19 which states that the One who provides the satisfaction is the same as the One who receives it. "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself all."

Earlier exegetes were divided on this question of who received the ransom. Anselm upheld the objective theory of satisfaction rendered to God. Abelard, on the other hand, advocated a subjective view of the atonement. According to his view a contemplation of the cross causes us to know God's love, repentance, and to lead a consecrated life. Certain theologians of the early Church, notably Origen^E and Gregory of Nyssa, gave currency to the view that Satan received the ransom paid by Christ. In his comments on Matt.

129. Baier, Compendium, v. 11, p. 455 quoted in Pieper, F., op. cit. p. 222.

20, 28 ²Origen denies the possibility that Christ paid His life as a ransom to God, but suggests the Evil One who "was our Lord, until the ransom for us was given him, the life of Jesus." Satan was supposed to have acquired rights over man through sin. God, who is righteous, ³Origen thought could not ignore these just claims of the Devil. Christ's soul, therefore, was given up to Satan as the price of the surrender of these assumed rights over mankind. But Satan was deceived in the bargain, for, although he had the pure soul of Jesus in his possession, he could not hold it. Jesus' sinless soul was a torture to him. He gave it up, but by this time the many were free. As grotesque as this theory is, subsequent theologians propounded it. During the Middle Ages as far down as Bernard and the Schoolmen this theory held sway as a serious explanation of the redemption.

Those theologians who followed ⁵Origen in this theory made the mistake of adding a rationalistic deduction to a scriptural truth. The truth is that God with a righteous judgment delivers sinners into the power of Satan. "To deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." I Cor. 5, 5. (Cf. also Heb. 2, 14). The deduction is that Satan in his person has a right to the sinners and therefore is in a position to demand a ransom. "The devil is only the jailer of men through God's infliction, not their lord and judge, to whom the ransom would have

been due. Soli deo, non diabolo, lutron persolvendum er-
 130
 at."

Kittel also argues very forcefully against the theory that Satan received the ransom:

"Dass der Satan der Empfaenger dieses Loesegelds waere, ist gerade zu ausgeschlossen. Der Satan kommt in der ganzen Leidengeschichte bei Mark und Matthaeus nicht vor. Der Satan will das Sterben Jesu so wenig, dass er vielmehr Jesus von diesem Wege abzubringen versucht. Mk. 8, 33; Matt. 16, 23. Mit dem machtvol-
 len Gottesgedanken Jesus vertraegt es sich in keiner Weise, dass die Vielen aus einer Verhaftung durch den Satan losegekauft werden mueszten. Er fordert viel-
 mehr, dass sie aus Verhaftung durch Gott losgekauft werden muessen....Der Gott des loesegeldwortes ist der von Ps. 90 der die Menschen wieder zu Staub werden laeszt, von dessen Zorn als Wirklichkeit unseres Da-
 seins unser Sterben uns zeugt, mit dem und von dem man nicht anders reden kann, als 'aus der Tiefe'".
 Ps. 130. 131

III

The etymological study proves that lutron is best understood in the sense of redemption by paying a ransom. The Sanscrit base of this word is LŪ, "to out" or "to clip", which has the derived meaning, "to set free by cutting a bond". The primitive Greek base of lutron is ΛŪΕΙΝ, "to loose". The LXX usage of ΛŪΕΙΝ is universally "to liberate a captive person". The classical writers used lutron in the sense of the ransom paid or to be paid for prisoners. Although the classical writers seldom use lutron of a ransom price paid to a deity, some examples do occur which

130. Quenstedt, quoted by Pieper, F., op. cit. Vol. II, p. 223.

131. Kittel, op. cit. p. 345.

makes this New Testament meaning not strange at all. The translators of the LXX render ῥυτῶν, ῥυτῶν, and ῥυτῶν with lutron. This shows that they, too, understood lutron to designate a ransom or redemption, usually from captivity. We find these words used not only in the figurative sense, but frequently and quite copiously in a literal sense. The most common meaning of the papyrii, "ausloesegeld fuer Pfaender und freilassungsgeld der Sklaven" is supported by numerous examples in the papyrii, inscriptions, votive reliefs, etc. Thus we know conclusively that in the first century lutron suggested the purchase money for manumitting slaves, and that the Greeks of Jesus' times who read lutron must have been conscious of ransoming as a mode of deliverance from slavery or bondage. The early patristic fathers did not take away the implication of ransoming in the term lutron, but broadened it to include the entire plan of salvation.

In Matt. 20, 28 and Mark 10, 45, then, the term lutron must mean that Jesus, the God-man who united both divine and human natures in one Person, entered the world as a "Redeemer". He rendered a "service" which consisted in the willing offering of Himself as a ransom-price. He climaxed this service with His death on the cross. When Christ offered His life He was acting as the substitute, not for a minority of men, but for all men. This ransom, offered as an expiation to God whose holiness and justice men had of-

fended with sin, freed men from the guilt and punishment of sin. All the parallel passages which use the derivatives of lutron, particularly those by St. Paul, support this exegesis.

God has provided a Ransom for us in the person of His Son. This is a wonderful truth, but the author of this paper is aware of the considerable revolt against every form of the ransom theory of the atonement. With colossal arrogance some modern exegetes offer numerous objections against the divine method of redemption. They sit in judgment upon God's salvation in Christ Jesus, His Son. Christ's ransom for many, they say, was unnecessary, or unworthy of God, or ineffectual, or "too juridical". They offer their own theories of the atonement. Example of this revolt against Scripture we find in Hugo Grotius' "Rectoral or Governmental Theory" (God mad Christ an example of his vindictive justice to warn men and frighten them from sin); Bushnell's "Moral Influence" theory (Christ's mission was to manifest the seeking love of God for sinners. This love enters the hearts of men and overcomes their opposition to God, moves them to repentance, and a return to their Father); the "Declaratory Theory" of Ritschl, and A. Harnack (God could forgive sins without a Mediator who paid a ransom. God "declares", not His wrath, but His love through Christ); the "Guaranty Theory" and many others.

It is not within the scope of this paper to discuss the

modern antithesis of the Biblical plan of salvation outlined in this paper. This study has convinced the author that "there is the need of continually reverting from human theories to the original statements in Scripture itself, which, in their breadth, variety, and fullness, refresh and satisfy as nothing else can."¹³² We know what Jesus meant when He tells us He "came to give His life a ransom for many". We do not try to change His meaning, but accept His Word and trust Him as our Savior. Now we understand better what joy Luther must have had as he penned the explanation to the second article: "I believe that Jesus Christ...has redeemed me a lost and condemned creature, purchased and won me from all evil, from death and from the power of the devil; not with gold or silver, but with His holy precious blood and with His innocent suffering and death...."

¹³². Orr, James, A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, II, 483.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALFORD, HENRY, The Greek New Testament, A digest of various readings: marginal references to verbal and idiomatic usage; a critical and exegetical commentary. fifth edition, Cambridge, 1865.
- BAUER, D. WALTER-PREUSCHENS, E., Griechisch-Deutsches Woerter buch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments. Goettingen, Germany, 1928.
- CHARLES, R. H., The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, with introduction and critical and explanatory notes to the several books. 2 Vols., 1913.
- CREMER, HERMAN, Biblico-Theological Lexicon of the N. T. Greek, translated by Wm. Urwick, 3rd English Edition with Supplement, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1886.
- DAVIDSON, B., A Concordance of the Hebrew and Chaldee Scriptures. London, 1876.
- DEISSMANN, ADOLF, Light From the Ancient East. The N. T. illustrated by recently discovered texts of the Graeco-Roman world. Translated by L. R. M. Strachan, N. Y., G. H. Doran Co., 1927.
- DELEVANTE, EDWARD R., The Hexaglot Bible, Comprising the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments in the Original Tongues, 5 Vols., N. Y., Funk-Wagnalls Co., 1906.
- ECKHARDT, E., Homiletisches Reallexikon, nebst index Rerum. St. Louis, Success Printing Co, 1908.
- EXPOSITOR'S GREEK NEW TESTAMENT, Edited by Nichol, W. Robertson. 5 Vols., Eerdmans Pub. Company, Grand Rapids, Mich., n. d.
- GESENIUS, WILLIAM, A Hebrew and English Lexicon, translated by Ed. Robinson, Boston and N. Y., Houghton Mifflin Co., 1892.
- GOODSPEED, EDGAR, J.-SMITH, J. M. POWERS, The Complete Bible. An American Translation, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1944.
- HASTINGS, JAMES, A Dictionary of the Bible, dealing with its language, literature, and contents, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902. New York.
- HASTINGS, JAMES, A Dictionary of the Bible, T & T Clark,

Edinburgh, 1914.

HASTINGS, JAMES, A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. Charles Scribner's Sons, N. Y. 1917.

HATCH, WILLIAM HENRY PAINE, The Principle Uncial Manuscripts of the New Testament, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1939.

INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPEDIA, Ed. by James Orr, Howard Severance Co., Chicago, 1915.

JASTROW, MARCUS, Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Bible, and Yerushalmi, and the Midraschic Literature, 2 Vols., Title Publishing Co., N. Y. 1943.

KITTEL, GERHARD, Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, Germany, 1939.

LANGE, JOHN PETER, A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Critical, Doctrinal and Homiletical, with special reference to ministers and students. Translated from the German, and edited, with additions, original and selected by Philip Schaff. Revised by William G. T. Shedd. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914.

LENSKI, R. C. H., The Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel, Wartburg Press, 1943.

LIDDELL, HENRY GEO. and SCOTT, ROBERT, A Greek-English Lexicon, New Edition revised and augmented by Sir Henry Stuart Jones and R. McKenzie. Oxford University Press, 1925.

MEYER, H. A. W., Critical and Exegetical Commentary of the N. T., from the German, with the Sanction of the Author. Revised and edited by Wm P. Dickson and Wm. Steward. Part I. Matt. Vol. II. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1897.

HOFFATT, JAMES, The New Testament, A New Translation, new edition, revised, Harper Bros., N. Y. and London, 1935.

MOULTON, JAMES HOPE, A Grammar of the N. T. Greek, Vol. I Prolegomena, 3rd Edition, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1919.

MOULTON, JAMES HOPE and MILLIGAN, GEORGE, The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-literary Sources, London, 1930.

MOULTON, W. F. and GEDEN, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek N. T., according to the texts of Westcott and Hort, Tis-

ehendorf and the English Revisors, 2nd Edition, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1899.

PREISIGKE, FRIEDRICH, Weerterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden mit Einschusz der griechischen Inschriften, Aufschriften, Ostraka, Mumienbilder, usw. aus Aegypten, Band II, Berlin, 1927.

ROBERTSON, A. T., Word Pictures in the N. T., Vol. I Richard R. Smith, 1930.

ROBERTSON, A. T., A Grammar of the Greek N. T. in the Light of Historical Research, 2nd Edition, New York, 1914.

SOPHOCLES, E. A., Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods, (B. C. 146-1100 A. D.), New York, Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1887.

THAYER, JOSEPH HENRY, Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, being Grimm's Wile's Clavis Novi Testamenti, Corrected Edition, New York, American Book Co., 1889.

THE NEW COVENANT, The New Testament of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, Revised Standard Version. Translated from the Greek. Being the Version set forth A. D. 1611, revised A. D. 1881 and A. D. 1901, Thomas Nelson and Sons, New York, 1946.

THE NEW TESTAMENT, of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Translated from the Latin Vulgate. A Revision of the Challoner-Rheims Version, edited by Catholic Scholars under the patronage of the Episcopal Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. St. Anthony Guild, New Jersey, 1941.

THE NEW TESTAMENT, A new translation by Ronald Knox, Sheen and Ward, N. Y., 1945.

THE NEW-SHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE, edited by S. M. Jackson. Funk Wagnalls, Co. New York, 1911.

TISCHEENDORF, CONSTANTINUS, Novam Testamentum Graece, Ad antiquissimos Testes Denuo Recensuit. Apparatum criticum omni studio perfectum, Edition Octava Critica Maior, Vol. I, Leipsig, 1869.

TRENCH, R. C., Synonyms of the New Testament, with etymological notes by A. L. Mayhew, London, 1915.

WARFIELD, B. B., "The New Testament Terminology of Redemp-

tion", Princeton Theological Review, (1917) pp. 201-250. This article was also printed in a collection of Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield's Essays under the title "Biblical Doctrines". The Oxford University Press, New York, 1929. The pagination of this thesis will refer to this latter publication.

WEYMOUTH, R. R., The N. T. In Modern Speech, an idiomatic translation into every day English from the text of the resultant Greek Testament. Edited and partly revised by E. Pampden Dook. The Pilgrim Press, Boston, 6th Impression, n. d.

WYCLIFFE, JOHN, The New Testament, the version of 1380 and revised by John Purvey, A. D. 1388. Edited by J. Horshall and Sir. Frederick Madden, Oxford, 1919.

YOUNG, ROBERT, Analytical Concordance to the Bible, 22nd edition American, Revised by Wm. B. Stevenson, Funk Wagnalls Co., N. Y., 1919.

ZAHN, THEODOR, Kommentar Zum Neuen Testament, Band II, Das Evangelium des Markus ausgelegt von Gustave Schlenburg, Leipzig, 1910.