

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

5-1-1949

### In Christ Jesus An Approach to the **Ἐν Χριστῷ** Concept through the Pauline Use of the **Ἐν Χειδτῷ** Formula

Walter Bartling

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



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Bartling, Walter, "In Christ Jesus An Approach to the **Ἐν Χριστῷ** Concept through the Pauline Use of the **Ἐν Χειδτῷ** Formula" (1949). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 215.  
<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/215>

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](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

IN CHRIST JESUS  
An Approach to the Σωμν Τῶν Χειρῶν Concept  
through the Pauline Use of the Ἐν Χειρῶν Formula

---

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

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Sacred Theology

---

by  
Walter James Bartling  
May 1949

41290  
Approved by: W. Wendt

Martin H. Frauzenauer

52425



BV  
4070  
C69  
M3  
1949  
no.7  
C.2

52425

### Foreword

After finishing this paper, I was somewhat at a loss in choosing a title for it and finally fell back on the time-honored custom of using a title and sub-title. The hesitant phrasing of the sub-title should be enough to warn the reader not to look in this paper for a definite and conclusive answer to any specific problem. And I feel that an apology of some sort is in order.

I began my study with the somewhat delirious hope of arriving at a satisfactory interpretation of the *εἰμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ* concept. The concept is evidently a highly pregnant form of expression, requiring careful analysis. It was not long, however, before I discovered that the problem is more complex than I had anticipated. The difficulties confronting the student can be conveniently divided into two classes: those which arise out of the concept itself in its relationship to the Pauline thought-world as a whole, and those which have been imposed upon the study by scholarship. In the first class of difficulties, the following questions are the most insistent: How is one to account for the different form the concept takes in the captivity letters from that of the early letters?



What is the relationship of this concept to the Lord's Supper? How does this concept fit into Paul's understanding of the ἐκκλήσια? How does it effect his Christology? What light can be brought to bear on the concept through a study of Pauline anthropology? The second class of difficulties demands equally careful attention: Does the εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν concept lend support to, or furnish evidence against the disputed authorship of one or several of the captivity letters? Is the contention of some contemporary scholars justified, who insist that definite Gnostic and Mandaic influences can be traced in the εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν concept? Is the strictly mystical interpretation of the concept correct?

After scattering my energies promiscuously for some time, I decided against my original plan and chose instead the less ambitious task of examining one of the related problems more carefully and to offer my findings as a sort of prolegomena to the wider problem. The study which promised to be most fruitful was to review Paul's use of the ἐν Χριστῷ formula. Many scholars are convinced that the complex of ideas associated with the ἐν Χριστῷ furnish the best and most direct approach to the εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν. A study of the ἐν Χριστῷ formula has the further advantage of meeting squarely one of the difficulties listed in the second group above. The "mystical" interpretation of the εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν depends upon a distinctive understanding of the ἐν Χριστῷ. So much, then, by way of apology. My only hope is that some of the enthusiasm with which this study was pursued will be reflected here and there in the pages of this study.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Forword</u> -----	II
<u>Chapter I: The Spirit and Christ</u> -----	1
<u>Deissmann's interpretation of the ἐν Χειρῶν formula</u> -- Formal definition (ἐν has a local significance), 2-8; material definition (the "Pneuma-Christ"), 8-13.	2-13
<u>Resultant interpretation of the εἰς μὲν τοῦ Χειρῶν</u> --- Christ, as the Spirit, indwells the Church - Holtzmann, 14; Morrison, 14-16; Tr. Schmidt, 16-26.	13-26
<u>Modifications and criticisms</u> -----	26-43
Relationship of Christ to the Spirit, 26-30; Christ not to be identified with the Spirit, 31- 37; distinctions in use of ἐν Χειρῶν and ἐν πνεύματι 37-43.	
<u>Chapter II: The new creation "in Christ"</u> -----	44
<u>Formal modifications of Deissmann's theory</u> -----	44-52
<u>"Heilsgeschichtliche" ἐν Χειρῶν</u> ----- God's redemptive activity "in Christ", 52-54; objective facts of salvation personalized (preg- nant ἐν Χειρῶν), 54-56.	52-56
<u>Relation of ἐν Χειρῶν to baptism</u> -----	56-75
Gal. 3, 26f., 56-57; Rom. 6, 1-11 (dying and rising with Christ), 57-62; intellectual diffi- culties involved, 62-64; other passages, 64-66; the κοινωνία with Christ, 66-68; implications of the dying and rising with Christ, 69-73; the κοινωνία κτίσεως "in Christ", 73-75.	
<u>Relationship of ἐν Χειρῶν to πίστεως</u> -----	75-80
<u>Is Paul's teaching "mysticism"?</u> -----	80-83
<u>Chapter III: Christ, the Representative Personality</u> of the new creation -----	84
<u>The Inclusive Representative of a new humanity</u> --- The Adam/Christ typology, 85-93; relation to the ἐν Χειρῶν, 93-94	84-94
<u>"Inclusive" ἐν Χειρῶν</u> -----	94-100
The Church as the new creation "in Christ", 94- 96; ἐκκλησία ἐν Χειρῶν, 96-97; Gal. 3, 26ff., 97- 99; Rom. 12, 4f., 99-100; conclusion, 100.	



## I. The Spirit and Christ (ἐν Χριστῷ - ἐν πνεύματι)

"In der Vorstellung von der Gemeinde als dem Leib Christi (ist) die Verbundenheit der Gläubigen mit Christus das tragende Moment. Da nun diese Verbundenheit bei Paulus am häufigsten gerade durch die Formel ἐν Χριστῷ ausgedrückt wird scheint es deshalb am natürlichsten zu sein, das Verstaendnis der Vorstellung von der Gemeinde als Leib Christi aus jener Vorstellung, welche die erwaehte Formel zum Ausdruck bringt, abzuleiten."<sup>1</sup> This procedure, justified because of the obvious relationships between the verbal and thought patterns of the two expressions, ἐν Χριστῷ and ἑνωμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, is further suggested by the history of recent interpretation of the ἑνωμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. The majority of interpretations which have appeared during the past fifty years rest upon a distinctive understanding of the Pauline use of the formula ἐν Χριστῷ. It is this understanding of the ἐν Χριστῷ and the resultant interpretation of the ἑνωμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ which will engage our attention in this chapter.

---

1. Ernst Percy, Der Leib Christi in den paulinischen Homologumena und Antilegomena, p. 18.



All modern studies of the ἐν Χριστῷ formula have as their starting point the fascinating dissertation of Adolf Deissmann, which appeared in 1892.<sup>2</sup> It is hardly possible to overestimate the influence this book has had upon research in Pauline theology, not only upon study of the problem to which it is immediately directed, but especially also upon inquiries into the nature of Pauline "mysticism".<sup>3</sup> Its influence on interpreters of the εὐμα τῶν Χριστῶν concept will become apparent as we proceed somewhat at length to present Deissmann's argument.<sup>4</sup>

According to Deissmann's count the formula ἐν Χριστῷ or one of its variants (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἐν κρείω, ἐν αὐτῷ etc.) occurs 196 times in the New Testament. Of these 196 occurrences, 164 are to be found in the Pauline corpus.<sup>5</sup> The a

---

2. Adolf Deissmann, Die neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu."

3. See the end of the second chapter for a brief discussion of the alleged mysticism in Paul.

4. For the present we shall content ourselves with an objective presentation of Deissmann's views. At the end of the present chapter we shall discuss some of the material changes that must be made in his theory, and at the beginning of the next chapter we shall note some of the formal modifications which have been suggested.

5. Op. cit., p. 1ff. It is interesting to note that of the remaining 32 occurrences, 24 are in the Johannine writings, and 8 in Acts and 1 Peter. Deissmann uses these statistics to undergird his contention that Paul originated the formula. It is not found in pre-Pauline literature (synoptics and James are earlier, at least in their sources). Its use in post-Pauline literature (John, Acts) is explained as a borrowing from Paul, cf. p. 128ff. This reconstruction rests upon the view that the Gospel of John does not contain, in substance, original discourses of Jesus; against which see A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research, p. 527: "Paul's frequent use of ἐν κρείω ...



priori consideration arising from this remarkable fact is that the formula dare not be regarded as accidental when it is found in Paul and then be ignored as being of no special consequence. "Der Begründer der christlichen Theologie hat ein Anrecht darauf, dass man ein jedes seiner Worte, zumal seine Aussagen ueber Jesus Christus, mindestens beachtet."<sup>6</sup> But just this was not done with reference to the ἐν Χριστῷ formula. "Empirismus", "Libertinismus", "Willkuer", "dogmatisch interessierte Umdeutung" are the terms Deissmann uses to describe the current general attitude towards Paul's favorite phrase.<sup>7</sup> Deissmann wished to free the expression from this irrational and hampering methodology. He stated his problem as follows: "Wir haben hier eben einen oder besser den Lieblingsbegriff der religioesen Sprache des Apostels. Paulus hat ihn gebildet, um dadurch irgend etwas Eigentuemliches, was nur ihm interessierte, auszudruecken. Er ist der Bildner der Formel, nicht in dem Sinne, als haette er zum ersten Male ἐν mit dem persoenlichen Singular verbunden, sondern so, dasz er unter Benutzung eines bereits vorhandenen Sprachgebrauches einen ganz neuen terminus technicus schuf."<sup>8</sup> So wird das Problem dieser Untersuchung...folgendermassen lauten: Was hat Paulus, als er sich der Praeposition ἐν zur

---

may be compared with Jesus' own words (Jn. 15,4)...Moulton (Froleg. p. 103) agrees with Sanday and Headlam (Rom. 6,11) that the mystic indwelling is Christ's own idea adopted by Paul"

6. Op. cit., p. 74.

7. Op. cit., p. 75ff. Deissmann has a special word of praise for Winer, who, more than most, recognized the distinctive importance of the formula. See Geo. Benedict Winer, A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament, p. 388f.

8. Op. cit., p. 70.



Bildung jenes formelhaften Ausdruckes bediente, Eigentuemliches sagen wollen?"<sup>9</sup>

As Deissmann has stated the problem, the primary importance attaches to the use of the preposition ἐν. His is, in fact, a "Problem der 'Neutestamentlichen Grammatik'."<sup>10</sup> His first task is to fix the meaning and force of the preposition. But Deissmann realizes that this can only be the initiatory labor. More important than the formal task of fixing the meaning of the preposition, is the need for a material understanding of the phrase as a whole.

First, then, the formal task. Deissmann introduces his argument with the judgment of the grammarians that every Greek preposition has one basic meaning ("Grundbedeutung") which must in every instance be somehow preserved. "Diese eine Grundbedeutung der Praepositionen ist die lokale...Ihrer lokalen Grundbedeutung nach dient speciell die Praeposition ἐν zur Bezeichnung des 'In-, Auf- und Nebeneinander der Dinge.., indem es ueberhaupt eine wirkliche Vereinigung mit einem Gegenstande bezeichnet.' Von hier aus muessen also alle etwaigen uebertragenen Bedeutungen verstanden werden."<sup>11</sup> So far the road is clear. When we approach our formula, however, we are struck by an interesting phenomenon: the use of ἐν with the singular

9. Op. cit., p. 6.

10. Op. cit., forword, p. V.

11. Op. cit. p. 16f. The grammarian quoted is R. Kuehner, Ausfuehrliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, II, Hannover, 1870, p. 401.



personal dative, ἐν ἑαυτῷ. This usage, very uncommon in profane Greek,<sup>12</sup> is correspondingly frequent in the LXX.<sup>13</sup>

From this the self-evident conclusion would seem to be that Paul is borrowing a form of expression from the LXX. But this is evidently not the case. After examining all the passages in which Paul uses ἐν with the personal dative (with the exception of the ἐν ἑαυτῷ passages), Deissmann formulates these conclusions:

- 1) Die paulinische Literatur gebraucht ἐν mit persönlichem Singular wie die Profanliteratur.
- 2) Fast sämtliche Beispiele dieses ἐν sind pronominal.
- 3) Von geradezu un Griechischen Fügungen, speciell dem Gebrauche des ἐν als mechanischen Äquivalents fuer ein א, findet sich keine Spur.<sup>14</sup>

12. See Deissmann, op. cit., pp. 17-31 for references from profane literature, and p. 31f. for the conclusions Deissmann reaches.

13. See pp. 35-55, and the conclusions p. 55f.

14. Op. cit., p. 65. On this question of origins we shall have more to say later. By way of prophecy, we might say that syntactical and grammatical considerations are not able to speak the decisive word. To show either the presence or absence of analogous expressions in other literature is not necessarily to indicate the genealogy of Paul's phrase. All that can be said in this regard has been summed up and very guardedly presented by D. Weber, "Die Formel 'in Christo Jesu und die paulinische Christumystik", in Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift, 1920, p. 253: "Deissmann hat die Formel von der slavischen Wiedergabe des hebraeischen א in der Septuag. abgerueckt; Paulus ist der originale Bildner, die Profan-Literatur bietet die sprachliche Anknuepfung. J. Boehmer ist dagegen entschieden fuer dem Zusammenhang mit dem alttestamentlichen: in-mit, 'in der (innigsten) Beruehrung mit Gott', 'in der Gemeinschaft Gottes' (oder des "Namens") eingetreten (Das biblische "im Namen", 1898, S. 43-53). Aber auch ein Boehlig spricht von der Heruebernahme der (urspruenglicheren) Formel ἐν κεῖνῳ aus den LXX (Neut. Stud. 174) Man darf vielleicht von einer gewissen Vorbildung reden. Dadurch kann der Originalitaet kein Abbruch geschehen. Sie liegt in dem Inhalt und seiner praegnanten Fassung." Weber then goes on to show that also the Greek world can offer no more than imperfect analogies. With regard to the



The ἐν Χριστῷ must be treated as a significant and purposeful exception. Yet if it is correct that Paul is generally true to Greek idiom in his use of prepositions, and especially in his use of ἐν, then it must follow that when he formed this phrase he was availing himself of a genuine, if infrequent, Greek idiom and was not slavishly following the LXX. "Paulus hat ihn gebildet...unter Benutzung eines bereits vorhandenen Sprachgebrauches...um irgend etwas Eigentuemliches...aus zudruecken."<sup>15</sup>

If the argument for the originality of the expression is sound, then this circumstance alone demands a unified interpretation ("eine einheitliche Auffassung"). "Ueberall wo sie uns begegnet, muss sie als eben dieser paulinische terminus technicus erklart werden. Das ist jedenfalls an allen Stellen das Zunaechstliegende. Man hat also im einzelnen Falle nicht zu fragen: Haben wir hier ein Beispiel der paulinischen Formel?—sondern es kann sich bei gewissen Stellen hoechstens um die Frage handeln: Ist das ἐν hier vielleicht ausnahmsweise nicht das paulinische? Die Antwort darf nur dann eine bejahende

---

LXX influence, see also W. Moenkemoeller, "EN ΧΡΙΣΤΩ ΙΗΣΟΥ", in Lehre und Wehre, 1911, p. 243. He is in substantial agreement with Deissmann but objects to the blanket generalization of his conclusion: "Das Neue Testament weist einen fleissigen Gebrauch, ein haeufiges Zurueckgehen auf das Alte Testament, eine starke Abhaengigkeit von diesem auf, so dasz eine Beeinflussung des ersteren durch das letztere in dem ausgedehnten Gebrauch des ἐν gar wohl im Bereich der Moeglichkeit und Wahrscheinlichkeit liegen muss."

15. Cf. above, footnote 8. For special arguments on the originality of the expression, see pp. 70-74.



sein, wenn ein Sinn durch die erste Annahme absolut ausgeschlossen wird."<sup>16</sup> Among the passages cited as typical and completely without analogy in pre-Pauline literature, are the following: 1 Tess. 2,14; 3,8; 4,1; Gal. 3,28; 1Cor. 3,1; 4,15.17; 9,1; 15,58; 16,19; 2Cor. 2,12; 2,17; 5,17; 12,2; Rom. 8,1; 16,3-12; Col. 1,28; 2,6; 4,7; 4,17; Eph. 6,21; Phil. 1,14; 4,21; Philm. 23.

We now approach Deissmann's material understanding of the  $\epsilon\upsilon$   $\chi\epsilon\iota\tau\omega$ . At the head of his argument he places the question: "Wie musste ein griechisch redender Leser dieses  $\epsilon\upsilon$  auffassen?" His previous investigation has led him to the following positive and negative results:

- a) 1. In irgend einem Sinne muss das  $\epsilon\upsilon$  lokal gemeint sein und aufgefasst werden.
2. Der mit  $\epsilon\upsilon$  verbundene Personennamen muss eine lebende Person bezeichnen.
- b) Grundsätzlich abzuweisen sind im jeden Falle folgende Erklärungen:
  1.  $\epsilon\upsilon$  vertritt  $\delta\epsilon\iota$  oder eine andere Praeposition.
  2. Der Dativ der Formel bedeutet den "Historischen" Christus oder das "Werk" Christi.<sup>17</sup>

This much, then, can be said at the outset: "Die Formel charakterisiert das Verhaeltnis des Christen zu dem lebendigen Christus als ein lokales und ist daher zu uebersetzen 'in Christus'...Christus ist das Element, innerhalb dessen der Christ lebt und alle Aeusserungen des eigentuemlich christlichen Lebens zur Erscheinung kommen. Die Formel ist der technische Ausdruck

16. Op. cit., p. 77f.

17. Op. cit., p. 79f.



fuer den paulinischen Centralgedanken der *κοινωνία* mit Christus...Am unmissverstaendlichsten waere die Uebersetzung: 'innerhalb des Christus'."18

Thus it is evident that Deissmann interprets the *ἐν* in a pregnant sense, meaning as much as *ἐν χειρὶ εἶναι*. But that opens another question: Did Paul regard this relationship as in some sense actual, or merely as metaphorical, as "eigentlich" or "uneigentlich"?19 Deissmann answers this question by referring to the nature of the existence ("Existenzweise") of the living Lord and to His relation to the *πνεῦμα*. "Vielleicht wird sich dann die Eigenart des *ἐν* aus der Eigenart der mit *ἐν* verbundenen Person erklæren."20 This is the nexus of his argument and also the center of our interest in his theory.

Deissmann takes it for granted that Paul regarded the Lord's manner and mode of existence as "pneumatic".21 The Lord is the Spirit (2Cor. 3,17 and cf. Rom. 8,9ff.), yes, more, He is *πνεῦμα Ἰωαννοῦ* (1Cor. 15,45) and he who is united with Him becomes *ἐν πνεύμα* with Him (1Cor. 6, 17). These direct identi-

---

18. *Op. cit.*, pp. 81-84 *passim*. Later on we shall again take up Deissmann's significant hint about the *κοινωνία*. He does not himself follow through on this line of approach,

19. *Op. cit.*, p. 84.

20. *Loc. cit.* Cf. Moenkemoeller, *op. cit.*, p. 247: "Nicht in der Praeposition, auch nicht eigentlich darin, dass sie mit dem singularischen Dativ einer Person gebraucht wird, liegt das Besondere, das Eigentuemliche unserer Formel, sondern in dem Dativ selbst, eben in *χειρὶ εἶναι*." Though Moenkemoeller proposes a similar line of approach, he comes up with an entirely different solution. Not in the nature of the Lord's existence, but in the nature of His work lies the key to the solution.

21. The word "pneumatic" is a transliteration of the German "pneumatisch" and the Greek *πνευματικός*. The colorless English word "spiritual" does not immediately convey the sense of Deissmann's technical term. On what follows, see *op. cit.*, p. 84ff.



fications ("geradezu Identifikationen") justify and even demand consideration of the passages in which ἐν πνεύματι is used, as possibly shedding light on the ἐν Χριστῷ. The phrase ἐν πνεύματι is used 19 times by Paul, and in 15 of these instances it is used in connection with ideas which are otherwise associated with the ἐν Χριστῷ. These remarkable coincidences can be visualized in the form of a graph, put together from passages cited by Deissmann.

<u>Associated idea</u>	<u>ἐν Χριστῷ</u>	<u>ἐν πνεύματι</u>
πίστις	Gal. 3,26	1Cor. 12,9
δικαιοσύνη	2Cor. 5,21	Rom. 14,17
δικαιοῦσθαι	Gal. 2,17	1Cor. 6,11
εἶναι	1Cor. 1,30	Rom. 8,9
εὐχαριστεῖν	Phil. 4,1	Phil. 1,27
χαίρειν	Phil. 3,1	Rom. 14,17
χαλεπὰ ?	Rom. 6,23 (Eph 4,32)	1Cor. 12,9
ἀγάπη	Rom. 8,39	Col. 1,8
εὐεχὴν	Phil. 4,7	Rom. 14,17
ἡλικιωμένοι	1Cor. 1,2	Rom. 15,16
σφραγίσασθαι	Eph. 1,13	Eph. 4,30
πνευματώδη	Col. 2,11	Rom. 2,29
μακροθυμῶσθε	Eph. 4,17	Rom. 9,1
λαλεῖν	2Cor. 2,17	1Cor. 12,3
πληροῦσθε	Col. 2,10	Eph. 5,18
ἐν ᾧ ?	Rom. 12,5	1Cor. 12,13
Imperfect analogies	Eph. 2,21	Eph. 2,22
"	Col. 2,6	Gal. 5,16

The impression made by this comparison is strengthened by several other observations: the use of the two formulas in the same immediate context, without any apparent distinction in usage (Rom. 9,1; Eph. 2,22); the common antithesis to ἐν σαρκί (Phil. 3,3; Rom. 8,9); a similar use of the complementary ideas, Χριστὸς ἐν ἡμῶν and πνεῦμα ἐν ἡμῶν (Gal. 2,20; 2Cor. 13,5; Rom. 8,10, cf. Rom. 8,9; 1Cor. 3,16; 6,16); and, finally, the use of κοινωρῶν, both with Christ (1Cor. 1,9) and the



Spirit (2Cor. 13,13; Phil. 2,1). Thus the facts seem to bear out Gunkel's conclusion: "Alle Arten der Wirkungen des πνεύμα appear an anderen Stellen als Wirkungen Christi selbst."<sup>22</sup>

With the equation, Χριστός - πνεύμα, and the comparison, ἐν Χριστῷ - ἐν πνεύματι, Deissmann believes he has arrived at the point from which the peculiar ἐν Χριστῷ is to be understood. " 'In' Abraham oder 'in' Mose oder 'in' Plato kann man allerdings nicht sein, weder zu ihren Lebzeiten, noch nach ihrem Tode, auch 'in' dem synoptischen Jesus kann man nicht sein, wohl aber 'in' dem pneumatischen lebendigen Christus des Paulus. Die Eigenart der Sache bedingt und erklärt die Eigenart der Form."<sup>23</sup>

And yet, the question which was to be answered with the aid of the πνεύμα concept still remains unanswered: "Ist die lokale Beziehung des Christen zu Christus eigentlich oder uneigentlich zu verstehen?"<sup>24</sup> The question can be confidently answered only after another question has been dealt with: "Beruht das lokale ἐν auf einer materiellen oder auf einer immateriellen Vorstellung vom Pneumachristus?"<sup>25</sup> And the same question must be put of the πνεύμα. Now, Paul undoubtedly

---

22. H. Gunkel, Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes, 1888, p. 97ff., quoted with approval by Deissmann, op. cit., p. 87. Cf. H. B. Swete, The Holy Spirit in the New Testament, p. 301: "The Spirit in its work was found to be in effect the equivalent of Jesus Christ."

23. Op. cit., p. 88.

24. Loc. cit.

25. Loc. cit.



regarded the  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \delta\acute{\omicron}\xi\mu\varsigma$  of the risen Christ as in some sense material (Phil. 3,21). Hence, since  $\chi\epsilon\iota\omicron\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma = \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ , the  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  must also be in some sense material.<sup>26</sup> But if this is true, the way is open for an answer to the question posed at the beginning of this paragraph. Since Christ is material, probability favors the view that the local  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$  signifies a real, actual, unmetaphorical, "eigentliche" relationship to the "pneumatic" Christ. It, nevertheless, remains a probability, an hypothesis. "Jene Erkenntnis garantiert also nur die Moeglichkeit der eigentlichen Auffassung des  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$  ; aber auch in Verbindung mit dem in materieller Realitaet aufgefassten

---

26. This is a very brief condensation of Deissmann's argument, pp. 88-91, but we have stated it in such a way that its chief weakness is readily apparent. We have to do with a poorly disguised argumentum in circulo. The argument begins by explaining the "inChrist" through the "in the Spirit" and continues by explaining  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  through  $\chi\epsilon\iota\omicron\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ . Though Deissmann does not directly make the equation,  $\delta\acute{\omicron}\xi\alpha$  - materiality -  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ , it does, nevertheless, seem to be hovering in the background of his thoughts. When he wrote his Paulus, he left out the middle term in the above equation (materiality), but only by definition: "Pneuma ist jedenfalls etwas nicht Sarkisches, nicht Irdisches, nicht Materielles. Zwar der Pneuma-Christus hat ein 'Soma', einen Leib, aber eben eine pneumatische, dass heisst himmlische, aus goettlichem Lichtglanz bestehende Leiblichkeit. Die scharfe, philosophisch gefeilte Definition des Begriffes 'pneumatisch' fehlt zum Glueck bei Paulus," p. 113. It remained for Deissmann's pupil, Traugott Schmidt, to make the above identification explicit. See his Der Leib Christi, pp. 8-20, where this is developed at length, and cf. footnote 38 in this chapter and the reference there given. Also H. J. Holtzmann tries to prove the materiality of the Spirit in this manner. See Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie, II, p. 13f. It is significant that Paul Feine, who in the earlier editions of his Theologie des Neuen Testaments, contended for the materiality of the Spirit, now argues against this conception; see the fourth edition, p. 276.



Christus koennte das ἐν bewusst uneigentlich gemeint sein. Doch fehlt es nicht an Anhaltspunkten, welche die Moeglichkeit der eigentlichen Auffassung wenigstens zur Wahrscheinlichkeit erheben."<sup>27</sup> The chief such "Anhaltspunkt" is the apparent interchangeability of the forms of expression, ἐν Χειρωτῶ εἶναι ( ἐν πνεύματι εἶναι ) and Χειρωτός ἐν τινι ( πνεύμα ἐν τινι ). Of the πνεύμα ( Χειρωτός ) ἐν τινι Deissmann affirms, no doubt correctly, that Paul's readers would have understood him to mean an actual residence of the Spirit in the person or object designated. But if here, then also in the complementary formula, ἐν πνεύματι ( Χειρωτῶ ) εἶναι . All of which is neatly summarized as follows: "Wie man, ohne einer Absurditaet sich schuldig zu machen, gleichzeitig sagen kann, 'der Mensch ist in der Luft' und 'die Luft ist in dem Menschen', so kann ein Autor, der sich fuer die Existenzweise des πνεύμα an der Anologie der Luft bewusst oder unbewusst orientiert, zugleich sagen: ' τινι ἐν Χειρωτῶ ' und ' Χειρωτός ἐν τινι '. Beiden Formeln liegt sachlich dieselbe Vorstellung zugrunde; nur die Betrachtungsweise ist eine Verschiedene, in der ersten e specie Christi, in der zweiten e specie hominis. Sie schliessen sich also so wenig aus, dass sie einander vielmehr zu der im hoechsten Sinne lokalen Vorstellung des gegenseitigen Ineinander der Christen und des pneumatischen Christus ergaenz-en."<sup>28</sup>

With that we have presented the essentials of Deissmann's

27. Op. cit., p. 91. The etymological meaning of ( ) = "wind", may have suggested the above analogy.

28. Op. cit., p. 92f. For further arguments see pp. 93-97.



view. Its chief merit lies in its unity and simplicity, yet here, as so often, that which distinguishes is at the same time that which blemishes. But we shall leave that for a later point in our discussion. In summary we now give Deissmann's own conclusions:

Die von Paulus unter Benutzung eines vorhandenen Profan-sprachgebrauches geschaffene Formel ἐν κεντρῷ εἶναι charakterisiert das Verhaeltnis des Christen zu Christus als ein lokal aufzufassendes Sichbefinden in dem pneumatischen Christus. Dieser Gedanke, fuer welchen es in jedem sonstigen Verhaeltnisse des Menschen zum Menschen an einer Analogie voellig fehlt, koennen wir uns ver-deutlichen durch die Analogie der den Wendungen ἐν πνεύματι und ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ zugrunde liegenden Vorstellung des Verweilens in einem der Luft vergleichbaren Pneuma-Ele-  
- mente. Die Frage, ob man den lokalen Grundgedanken der Formel im eigentlichen Sinne oder nur als rhetorisches Huelfsmittel aufzufassen hat, kann nicht mit Sicherheit entschieden werden, doch hat die erstere Moeglichkeit den hoeheren Grad der Wahrscheinlichkeit. In jedem Falle, ob eigentlich oder uneigentlich zu verstehen, ist die Formel der eigentuemlich paulinische Ausdruck der denk-bar innigsten Gemeinschaft des Christen mit dem leben-digen Christus.<sup>29</sup>

This summarization of Deissmann's chief theses has been by way of extended introduction to a presentation of the view of the ἐκκλησία τοῦ κεντρῶν alluded to in the opening paragraph of this chapter. According to this view, Christ is the Spirit that informs the Church, His Body. The Church is in a very concrete sense the organ of Christ's operation on earth. The individual interpreters may differ in particulars, but they are agreed in the one area essential to their view: Christ, as

---

29. Op. cit., p. 97f. For a brief but comprehensive overview of Deissmann's theory, see his own Paulus, chapter 6, especially p. 110ff; also Schmidt, op. cit., pp. 84-91.



the Spirit, actually indwells the Body, His Church.

In the previous generation this view was espoused by no less a scholar than Holtzmann: "Durch Vereinigung der grossen Religionstypen der Vergangenheit ist ein neues Ganzes, Ein Leib geworden, welcher nichts anderes ist als der vom Geist des Herrn beseelte Leib des Christus selbst...Folglich ist Christus nicht als ein einzelnes Glied dieses Leibes...sondern als der den Leib beseelende Geist gedacht."<sup>30</sup> But this view is not limited to men of a previous generation, nor to German scholars. As recently as 1940, the quite representative American churchman, Charles Morrison, expressed himself in favor of this interpretation of the Body of Christ. It is true that his presentation is very tendential in character. He uses Paul's teaching of the Body of Christ to support his plea for a radical objectivisation of the Church as the living, historical medium of God's revelation, as itself the Revelation.<sup>31</sup> Yet his presentation merits our attention, not because it is typical, but because it shows the logical outcome of the theory we are here presenting.

---

30. Holtzmann, op. cit., p. 290f., passim. See also pp. 191-195. Holtzmann's argument is, of course, based on the equation with which we are now familiar:  $\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma = \pi\upsilon\epsilon\theta\mu\alpha$ . "Nur, wer ihn als Geist kennt auf Grund der paulin. Christologie, kann 'in Christus sein', d.h. so ganz von ihm durchwaltet und umschlossen, wie man physisch von der Luft umgeben ist und Luft atmen muss, um zu leben," p. 89.

31. Charles Morrison, What Is Christianity? See especially the chapter entitled "Revelation and Ideology", pp. 170-197. The many fine emphases in the book and the many valid criticisms of contemporary churchdom should not blind us to the fundamental misapprehension. When the Church is made to be Christianity and the Revelation is identified with the empir-



For Morrison the Body of Christ represents a "radical and thoroughgoing identification of Christ and the church."<sup>32</sup> In fashioning this phrase, Paul in one stroke broke through the particularism of the old Israel and transformed Jewish apocalyptic hopes to a present reality. Morrison employs the concept of Incarnation to implement his idea. "The messianic conception gave way to the conception of the Incarnation. The church is no longer implemented toward Israel; its implementation is now universal - toward all mankind. The church is the living body of the risen Christ. It no longer awaits the coming of the Messiah to make an end of history and to redeem the saints in a super-historical heaven. History is itself the continuing scene of the divine activity."<sup>33</sup> "Paul's conception of the Incarnation as the Body of Christ is thoroughgoing. He completely identifies Christ with the church, the church with Christ. He knows no church apart from Christ and no Christ apart from the church. The risen Christ who was revealed to him was the Christ whom he persecuted in persecuting the church...There was no exaltation of Christ in which the

---

ical Church, the revelation of God in Christ must suffer loss, as is abundantly clear from Morrison's book. We might note in passing the affinities between Morrison's view and Roman Catholic church theory, affinities which Morrison is frank to admit. For Roman teaching, see the encyclical Mystici Corporis Christi by Pope Leo XII.

32. Op. cit., p. 157. Morrison, too, cannot get along with his interpretation without identifying Christ and the Spirit. Paul's "profoundest insight" was "that what the church called the Holy Spirit was none other than the living presence of the Living Christ Himself," p. 155.

33. Op. cit., p. 153.



church did not share, and there was no empirical church in which Christ did not live. To be 'in Christ' was to be in the church which is his body. To be in the church was to be 'in Christ'. The Risen Christ was already at work creating a new Israel, a new 'race', a new humanity, in the church which is his body. Through him thus incarnate, God was reconciling the world unto himself."<sup>34</sup>

Of the studies which appeared between those of Holtzmann and Morrison, that of Traugott Schmidt deserves special attention at this point.<sup>35</sup> Following closely in the footsteps of Deissmann, he has developed what is, in many ways, the simplest and most consistent theory on the *ἐκμυσταρισμός* which has come to my attention. This alone would suggest a more thorough presentation of his argument. But there is another reason for dealing at length with Schmidt's book. Here, as nowhere else, the issues of this chapter are clearly drawn. A long and careful look at Schmidt's presentation convinces one of the crucial nature of his argument and that of his fellow interpreters. We are confronted by an either/or. Either Schmidt is entirely right, or he is almost entirely wrong.

It becomes apparent in Schmidt's study how basic is the conception of the "pneumatic" Christ for the view of the *ἐκμυσταρισμός*.

---

34. *Op. cit.*, p. 156f.

35. Schmidt, *op. cit.* Among recent German studies, that of A. Wikenhauser, Die Kirche als der mystische Leib Christi nach dem Apostel Paulus, follows in the tradition of Schmidt. Wikenhauser's study is known to me only at second hand.



τοῦ Χριστοῦ we are here discussing. Not only does he make this his starting point, but it is the ever-recurring theme throughout his book. Already the historical Jesus stood in a unique relationship to the πνεῦμα, which, as it were, constituted the spiritual part of His being. As mortal men consist of σάρξ and πνεῦμα (1Thes. 5,23; 1Cor. 5,3; 7,34), so Jesus was σάρξ and divine πνεῦμα. "Wie die Menschen eine leibliche und eine geistige Seite besitzen, so hat er vielmehr eine irdisch-menschliche, die σάρξ, und eine himmlisch-goettliche, das πνεῦμα... Man (hat) offenbar den Eindruck, dass bei Christus das goettliche Pneuma einfach an die Stelle des menschlichen Pneuma tritt."<sup>36</sup>

When we turn from the historical Jesus to the resurrected Christ, the relationship between Christ and the πνεῦμα verges on practical identity. While Jesus was still living in the flesh, He bore an inherent inconsistency at the center of His being. "Der menschlichen Leib, den er auf Erden trug, stand eigentlich im Widerspruch zu dem in ihm waltenden goettlichen

---

36. Op. cit., p. 26ff., passim. The analogy drawn above depends upon a discredited view of Pauline anthropology. Note the precarious nature of the passages listed above, and see Walter Gutbrod, Paulinische Anthropologie, pp. 80-85. After examining all of the passages in which πνεῦμα unmistakably refers to man, Gutbrod draws the conclusion that πνεῦμα is almost entirely irrelevant for determining Paul's anthropology. The only combination that can be justified from Pauline usage is σῶμα (σάρξ) and ψυχή. If we, now, introduce ψυχή for πνεῦμα in Schmidt's analogy, we see how impossible the construction is. In fairness to Schmidt, I should add that he does not deny a human spirit (whatever that may be) to Jesus, but he says that Paul is never concerned with this.



Pneuma, wie die Sarx aus der er besteht, als suendig und totverfallen ueberhaupt in Widerspruch steht zu dem heiligen, lebensschaffenden Gottesgeist. Dieser Fleischesleib war eine vergaengliche Huelle, die dem inneren Wesen Christi nicht entsprach."<sup>37</sup> The πνεῦμα requires a σώμα πνευματικόν (1Cor. 15, 44ff.), a σώμα τῆς δόξης (Phil. 3,1). Only then can it find full and free expression. "War Christus seinem Wesen nach Pneuma, Gottesgeist, so musste das zum Ausdruck kommen in einem Soma, einem Leibe aus Doxa, Himmelsglanz; war er innerlich pneumatisch, so musste er es auch aeusserlich sein."<sup>38</sup> Since these conditions have been met in the glorified Christ, we arrive at the conclusion: "Der erhoehnte Christus ist Pneuma in doppeltem Sinne, einerseits als der, dessen Wesen von goettlicher Kraft erfuehlt ist, andererseits als der, welcher im himmlischen Daseinsform existiert. Christus ist Gottesgeist und ist, in gewissem Sinne, auch Geistwesen."<sup>39</sup> Thus the Spirit is the link between the historical Jesus and the Living Christ. Because "the Lord is the Spirit", it is possible for Paul to speak of "Jesus-Christ".<sup>40</sup> With this reference to the historic person of Jesus, Schmidt tries to maintain a distinction between Christ and the Spirit. It is, however, admittedly

---

37. Op. cit., p. 32f. Even granting that Jesus' inner being was πνεῦμα, does the apodosis follow from the protasis? A false dualism seems to have prompted this statement. On the absence of metaphysical dualism in Paul, see Gutbrod, op. cit., p. 91ff.

38. Op. cit., p. 34, and cf. footnote 26 above.

39. Loc. cit.

40. See p. 106f.



only a formal distinction. "Inhaltlich und dem Umfange nach, materiell und substantiell decken sich beide Groessen voellig. Aber formell, der Gestalt nach, besteht doch ein Unterschied. Der Geist ist die persoenliche Kraft Christi, das Element, die Substanz, aus der er besteht. Und Christus ist so die Verkoerperung des Geistes, ist der Gottesgeist selbst in persoenlicher Gestalt."<sup>41</sup> But that even this distinction does not imply a great deal is evident when we consider what Schmidt says of the ubiquity of Christ's body. Since His body is substantially , it can in extended fashion fill the entire universe."Es erweitert sich mit dem Pneuma des irdischen Jesus notwendig auch sein Soma, das dessen Gefaess ist. Wie die Seele Jesus zum Element wird, das die Welt durchwaltet, so dehnt sich auch der verklaerte Leib des Erhoehten aus ueber die ganze Welt. Der Gedanke einer 'Ubiquitaet' des Leibes Christi entsteht notwendig, die Vorstellung eines Menschen, der die ganze Welt ausfuellt."<sup>42</sup> The identification of Christ and the Spirit could hardly be more radical.

As a further bridge to the concept, Schmidt examines the complementary ideas of and , making full use of what he has established concerning the "pneumatic" Christ. Through His indwelling in men, Christ takes the place of the human ego (Gal. 4,19; 2Cor. 13,3; Phil. 1,8; Col. 3,12). This is no pic-

---

41. Op. cit. p. 93.

42. Op. cit. p. 109.



ture, but a statement of objective fact, "so dasz der Mensch mit Christus eins, selber Christus ist."<sup>43</sup> To facilitate an understanding of this, Schmidt again takes recourse to the  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  concept. The human  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  is "das Gottverwandte im Menschen", with which the divine  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  can identify itself. "So ist das natuerliche menschliche Pneuma faehig, das goettliche Pneuma in sich aufzunehmen und sozusagen sein Organ zu werden."<sup>44</sup> But this  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  is the  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  τοῦ Χριστοῦ . Hence, if the Spirit actually takes up residence in man, then also Christ by the principle of identification. "Es ist nicht nur ein von Christus ausgehender, von ihm gesandter Geist, sondern sein eigenes Seelenleben, sein inneres Wesen, das in den Menschen eingeht und wieder mit dessen Person verschmilzt. Das goettliche Pneuma, das zum Pneuma Christi geworden war, wird nun auch zum Pneuma des Christen... So ist es dann klar: Christus wohnt und wirkt nicht nur vermittelt, sondern auch unmittelbar, persoendlich in den Christen...Wo dieser Geist wohnt, da wohnt auch Christus selbst."<sup>45</sup>

---

43. Op. cit., p. 76. On the "Christ in us" see pp. 73-84

44. Op. cit., p. 80. On the belief that the  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  is "das Gottverwandte im Menschen", see Gutbrod, op. cit., p. 84f. Of all such formulations he says: "Das sind unbeweisbare Konstruktionen, bei denen der Wunsch der Vater des Gedankens zu sein scheint." Such opinions, appealing though they may be, seem to be based on the desire to make Christianity psychologically and metaphysically tenable. Cf. also footnote 36 above.

45. Op. cit., p. 81ff., passim. Note what Gutbrod has to say on the probability that  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  describes the new spiritual nature of regenerate man: "Gegen die Fassung von  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  als dem neuen Geistesleben des Christen, oder wie man das nennen wolle, spricht vor allem die Moeglichkeit des Unterganges (1Cor. 5,5), die doch allem Anschein nach auch mitgedacht ist, und besonders der dann sehr seltene Gebrauch von  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  "(in this sense),



For Schmidt's view of the ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι and its relation to the Χριστὸς ἐν ἡμῖν, it will only be necessary to refer to Deissmann's argument, outlined above. Schmidt does little more than restate and elaborate Deissmann's view, now and then drawing the lines more sharply, and improving on his teacher by stating categorically what he left undecided.<sup>46</sup>

We are now ready to take up Schmidt's interpretation of the Body of Christ. He has laid his groundwork well. With his presuppositions the picture of the Church as a σῶμα presents no difficulties. The implications are obvious even before the relevant passages have been examined. "Es ist aber dabei offenkundig", says Percy, "dass diese Interpretation weniger durch die Texte veranlasst wurde, als dass sie aus anderen Gruenden den erwahnten Forschern als ganz selbstverstaendlich erschienen ist."<sup>47</sup> Just what are the implications? They can be summarized in one short sentence: If the Church is the σῶμα, then the πνεῦμα is the Spirit that informs that σῶμα. "Wie der Gottesgeist in den Geist des einzelnen Christen eingeht und mit ihm verschmilzt, so wird er auch zum Gemeingeist der Gesamtpersoenlichkeit der Gemeinde. Damit ist ohne weiteres die Vorstellung gegeben, dass er das Pneuma ist, welches das Soma

---

op. cit., p. 81. But if this is true, then Schmidt's entire structure is built upon an imaginary foundation.

46. See Schmidt, op. cit., pp. 84-91. For example, he no longer hesitates to ascribe materiality to the πνεῦμα, cf. footnote 26 above.

47. Percy, op. cit., p. 9.



der Gemeinde beseelt."<sup>48</sup> This divine Spirit creates the Church and is the principle of her unity (1Cor. 12,13). The Spirit introduces and incorporates the individual into the Body. He does this because He is himself the soul of the Body. Every

---

48. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 137. The criticisms made in footnotes 44 and 45 are applicable here, but a further remark should be made. Schmidt's formulation is manifestly dictated by a sharply dualistic view of man ( *σῶμα - πνεῦμα* ). The same is true of all of the theories discussed in this chapter. It is, however, a matter of grave doubt whether this does justice to Paul's anthropology. The scope of this paper does not permit a thorough investigation of Paul's use of *σῶμα*, but some of the conclusions to which such studies have led should be indicated. Paul throughout displays a thoroughly realistic view of the *σῶμα* and its frequent synonym *σῆμα*. It does not stand in any sharp antithesis to *πνεῦμα*, but can itself designate the whole man (Rom. 12,1; 1Cor. 6,13ff.). The force of this is in no way weakened when we observe that Paul frequently uses *σῶμα* to describe man in the visible, outward manifestations of his being (1Cor. 13,3; Phil. 1,20; 2Cor. 5,10; 1Cor. 6,12-20; 1Thess. 5,23). "Wenn auch der Leib des Menschen in saemtlichen angefuhrten Faellen als eine besondere Seite seiner Existenz in betracht kommt, so gibt uns doch anderseits nichts Grund zur Annahme, dass er dabei als ein der Seele gegenueber selbstaendiger Teil des Menschen vorgestellt wird, den man jener begrifflich nebenordnen koennte; wenn hier vom Leib des Menschen die Rede ist, so bedeutet dies nur eine besondere Sehweise, von der aus der Mensch betrachtet wird: vom 'Leib' des Menschen wird gesprochen, wenn er hinsichtlich seiner aeusseren Erscheinung in Betracht kommet, von seinem *πνεῦμα* (Rom. 3, 16; 1Cor. 2,11; 2Cor. 2,13; Phil. 4,23; Philm. 25) oder *ρῶς* (Rom. 7,23.25) oder *κρεῖσσ* (Rom. 2,29; 2Cor. 2,4; 3,2) dagegen, wenn sich der Blick auf sein Innenleben richtet," Percy, *op. cit.*, p. 12f. No matter which term is used or which combination of terms, the whole man is somehow thought of. Gutbrod is in full agreement with this and summarizes his findings in the following sentence: "Der Leib ist Grundlage und Mittel des Lebens im Zustaendlichen und im aktiven Sinn. So ist in der Leiblichkeit sowohl die Konkretetheit und Tatsaechlichkeit des menschlichen Daseins gegeben," *op. cit.*, p. 42f; and cf. Gerhard Kittel, Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, IV, p. 565f. (article on *σῶμα* by Horst).

Paul is indebted for his realistic view of the body to Hebrew, rather than to Greek thought. As Moffatt observes, "for one trained in Hebrew thought there was no sharp distinction between what we call body and soul. 'The soul is more than the



individual who has received the Spirit is of necessity a part of that larger organism which He comprehends. "Weil der Geist, trotz all seiner Verteilung auf verschiedene Personen und in verschiedene Charismen, doch der eine, ungeteilte, objektive Gottesgeist bleibt (1Cor. 12,4ff.), darum schliesst er alle, denen er zuteil wird, zu einer grossen Gesamtpersoenlichkeit, einem Leibe zusammen." And now, note well what conclusion this

---

body, but the body is a perfectly valid manifestation of the soul; indeed the body is the soul in its outward appearance' (Pedersen, Israel II, pp. 170ff.), quoted in Moffatt's Commentary on the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, p. 71. The most thorough investigation to date on the concept is that of Ernst Kaesemann, Leib und Leib Christi. He summarizes the Hebrew view of the body (  $\gamma\psi\chi$  =  $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\zeta$  =  $\epsilon\sigma\mu\alpha$  ) in the following words: "'Fleisch' ist im A. T. nicht scharf umrissen und einheitlich festgelegt. Was Fleisch ist, ergibt sich aus seiner jeweiligen konkret-geschichtlichen Bezogenheit. Darin besteht die dynamische Tendenz des at.lichen Begriffes. Fleisch ist Substanz; nie wird das geleugnet; aber es ist eben nicht nur das. Es kann darueber hinaus die individuelle Person bezeichnen. Es kann auch das besondere Fleisch im geschichtlichen Sinne sein. Es kann Traeger der Verwandtschaft und Exponent der Erde werden. Grundlegend ist es Erscheinungsform des Lebens. 'Alles Fleisch' ist alles Leben. Das Leben ist aber nicht nur ruhende Qualitaet, sondern geheimnisvolle aus der Transzendenz stammende 'Maechtigkeit', ausgezeichnet durch die Moeglichkeit entscheidungsvollen Handelns, bedroht durch die Moeglichkeit der Minderung oder gar des Verlustes seiner 'Maechtigkeit'. Als Leben ist das Fleisch nur zu verstehen aus seiner positiven oder negativen Einstellung zu Gott dem Schoepfer, d.h. als Schoepfung bzw. gefallene Schoepfung des Heidentums. So ist das hinter dem at.lichen Fleischbegriff stehende Daseinsverstaendnis nicht naturhafter, sondern rein geschichtlicher Art", p. 16. The average Greek mind may not have conceived of man in such sharply dualistic terms as is commonly assumed on the basis of Greek philosophical systems, and the divergence between the Greek and the Hebrew outlook may not have been, after all, so great (see Kaesemann, op. cit., p. 39ff. for a comparison). That is relatively unimportant for us here. What is important is that Paul, whatever his orientation, knew no such antithesis between  $\epsilon\sigma\mu\alpha$  and  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\sigma$  as is demanded by Schmidt's theory. See also L. S. Thornton, The Common Life in the Body of Christ, p. 254 and 260ff.



necessitates: "Darum kann dieser Geist sich nicht voll offenbaren im Individuum, das nur einen Teil von ihm fassen kann, sondern nur in der Summe aller, die ihn empfangen, in der Ecclesia. Darum ist diese das Soma, das er als Pneuma beseelt... Und so ist das Pneuma hier nicht nur der objektive Gottesgeist, sondern zugleich auch der Gemeingeist dieses Organismus" (1Cor. 12,13; Eph. 4,4; 2,18.16.).<sup>49</sup> Which, strictly speaking, means that the Spirit is not τὸ πνεῦμα in the many instances in which He in some manner approaches an individual. "Noch mehr als beim Individuum ist dieser Geist (Gemeingeist) nun identisch mit dem heiligen Geist."<sup>50</sup>

Here Christ and the Spirit are related in a similar manner as elsewhere in Schmidt's theory; it is a relationship of identity. Because Christ is the Spirit, that Body which the Spirit informs can properly be designated *σῶμα τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*. *Σῶμα τοῦ πνεύματος* would be an impossible expression, since only a person can have a body. "Beide Gedanken koennen nur so verbunden sein, dasz dieser Gottesgeist, der den Leib erfuehlt, eben der Geist Christi ist, so dasz durch den Geist Christus selbst den Leib beseelt."<sup>51</sup> We have, then, in this concept an extension of the *ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐν ἡμῖν*. And again, the presupposition fathers the interpretation: "Welches nun das Verhaeltnis Christi zu seinem Leibe ist, darueber wird nicht viel reflektiert; aber die Grundgedanken sprechen sich ja in dem Bilde

49. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

50. *Op. cit.*, p. 139.

51. *Op. cit.*, p. 145.



deutlich genug aus. Christus wohnt in der Gemeinde, das ist offenbar die Grundvorstellung. Sie ist der Organismus, in dem er lebt den er von innen heraus bewegt und treibt; die Funktionen dieses Leibes gehen also von Christus aus, er wirkt in ihnen, und die einzelnen Christen sind Christi Organe und Werkzeuge, als Glieder seines Leibes...Christus verkoerpert sich in der Gemeinde."<sup>52</sup> And so the picture is complete, the analogy to a human personality perfect, "wenn auch eine Persoenlichkeit von ueberindividuellder Ausdehnung, deren Geist die Fuelle des goettlichen Pneuma, deren Leib jene Gesamtpersoenlichkeit ist, die von diesem Geiste durchdrungen ist."<sup>53</sup> As with the , so here, logical considerations demand the conclusion that Christ cannot approach the individual believer in all the fulness of His Being. "Seine Persoenlichkeit ist zu umfassend gedacht, als dass sie in einem Menschen ihre Verkoerperung finden koennte."<sup>54</sup>

If the  $\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma \ \acute{\epsilon}\nu \ \acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$  answers to the  $\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha \ \tau\omicron\upsilon \ \lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$  , then the  $\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\iota\gamma \ \acute{\epsilon}\nu \ \lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$  has as its generalized counterpart the related picture of the Church as a gigantic universalized personality (Gal. 3,28; Col. 3,9ff.; Eph. 2,15; cf. Rom. 12,4f). "Es ist die Person des pneumatischen Christus, in der die Christen zu einem neuen Menschen werden. Und fast noch mehr, als der Gedanke  $\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma \ \acute{\epsilon}\nu \ \acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$  , enthuellet der des  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\chi\epsilon \ \acute{\epsilon}\nu \ \lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$  erst in dieser seiner Anwendung auf die Gemeinde sich voll in

52. Op. cit., p. 142f.

53. Op. cit., p. 144.

54. Op. cit., p. 143.



seinem eigentlichen Sinn. Erst hier wird es ganz klar, dass der Christus, in dem die Christen leben, nicht nur als Element oder als Kraft, sondern voll als Person gedacht ist, kann er doch nur als Persoenlichkeit in sich die Gemeinde zur Gesamtpersoenlichkeit schaffen... Sie, nicht der Einzelne, ist der neue Mensch, der in Christus lebt, der in seiner Person aufgeht und so mit ihm zusammenfaellt."<sup>55</sup> Here the Church is a person which lives in Christ; in the  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \chi\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  concept the Church is the Body in which Christ lives. The pictures are related in this way that in both the Church is a unified organism ("Gesamtpersoenlichkeit") with which the "pneumatic" Christ identifies Himself.<sup>56</sup>

So much for the interpretation of the  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \chi\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  as the Body which is inspired by the "pneumatic" Christ. If our presentation has been somewhat lengthy, our refutation can be correspondingly brief. For it is evident that the entire

---

55. Op. cit., p. 152f. In calling attention to the idea of an "inclusive personality", Schmidt points the way to a deeper understanding of the "in Christ". We shall return to this idea later.

56. See Schmidt, op. cit., p. 153f. The picture of the Body in Colossians and Ephesians confronts this interpretation with a problem which is best solved by assuming a different authorship; see, e.g., Schlier's article on  $\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\eta$  in Kittel, III, p. 679f. Briefly, the problem for this interpretation is this: In the undisputed Pauline letters Christ is conceived of as the indwelling Spirit of the Body, but in Colossians and Ephesians He is pictured as Himself an organ of the Body; namely, its head (see Percy, op. cit., p. 10ff.). Schmidt tries to solve the problem by employing the  $\kappa\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  concept. The concept, frequent in all of Paul's letters, is wedded to the picture of the Body in Colossians and Ephesians. Thus the immanence and transcendence of Christ are neatly balanced in one picture. As Spirit Christ is immanent, as Lord He remains transcendent.



structure is built upon the identification of Christ and the Spirit. If we can prove that this identification is based upon faulty premises, it will not be necessary to refute the theory in detail.<sup>57</sup>

It would, of course, be foolhardy to deny that there is an intimate and necessary relationship between Christ and the Spirit. The universal view of the apostolic Church was that Christ stood in a unique relationship to the Spirit. This is already attested to by the use of the phrase πνεῦμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. "The New Testament, as it speaks of the Spirit of God, speaks also of the Spirit of Jesus (Acts 16,7), of Christ (Rom. 8,9; 1Pet. 1,11), and of Jesus Christ (Phil. 1,19). The Spirit of the Father is also the Spirit of His Son (Gal. 4,6). These designations clearly indicate a relation between our Lord and the Holy Spirit which is not shared by the members of the Church. The Spirit is not correlated in like manner with any other name."<sup>58</sup> What the unique relationship is that exists between the Lord and the Spirit is briefly comprehended in the title Χριστός. "Christ" means "the Anointed One", and the Spirit of Christ is that with which He was anointed (Acts 10,38; 4,27).

---

57. Some detailed criticism will be found in the preceding footnotes.

58. Swete, op. cit., p. 295. On what follows in this and the following paragraph, see Herman Sasse, "Jesus Christ, the Lord", in Mysterium Christi, edited by G. Bell, pp. 112-120; A. E. J. Rawlinson, The New Testament Doctrine of Christ, p. 158ff.; Thornton, op. cit., pp. 130-145; and Theodor Zahn, Grundriss der Neutestamentlichen Theologie, p. 80ff.



In the Gospels this anointing is associated with Christ's baptism (Mt. 3,16f; Lk. 3,22), but the baptismal anointing was merely a visible demonstration and divine confirmation of a relationship which had existed since Christ's conception (Mt. 1,18.20; Lk. 1,35), and which continued throughout His earthly ministry (Mt. 12,28; Lk. 4,13ff. and parallels; Cf. Is. 61,1f.) And the expression  $\piνεμα τω υιου$  in the epistles is sufficient proof that this unique relationship was thought of as continuing after Christ's resurrection. Paul shared the view of the apostolic Church that the earthly Jesus was specially endowed with the Spirit. Though he does not in his letters explicitly refer to this fact, we may fairly infer from Gal. 4,6 that the "Spirit of His Son" means the Spirit of the Incarnate Son.<sup>59</sup>

But the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ in another sense. Not only was Christ anointed with the Spirit, but He Himself anoints men with His Spirit. The spiritual anointing by Christ was prophesied in connection with His baptism, and the imminent fulfillment of this prophecy formed the burden of His farewell discourse (Jn. 14-17). The Pentecostal effusion,

---

59. See Swete, op. cit., p. 302: "The Son is here the Incarnate Son, not the pre-existent Word... The Spirit of the Son is the perfect spirit of sonship which was displayed by Jesus Christ in His human life. It was this Spirit which made it His meat and drink to do His Father's will... That which was in Him the Spirit of sonship becomes in His members the Spirit of adoption. Sons such as He they cannot be, for He is the Only-begotten; adopted sons they can be and are, and the Spirit of the Only-begotten has been sent to give them the filial character which was in Him."



shortly thereafter, was the dramatic initiation of the new age of the Spirit. Joel's prophecy had come true. "Ye shall know that I am in the midst of Israel, and that I am the Lord your God, and that there is none else." Therefore, "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh" (Joel 2,27.28).<sup>60</sup> The promised gift, once give, was never again taken away. "The Spirit of God dwelleth in you," Paul writes to the Romans. "We have within us nothing less than the Spirit of God who made this promise and has kept it. But the Spirit who thus comes to us from God is the Spirit wherewith according to His promise God has anointed His Messiah. He is the Spirit through whose agency all the promises of the old covenant have been fulfilled in Jesus. We receive the Spirit, not as individuals, but as partakers of the Christ, as members of the One Man in whom all the purposes of God have been fulfilled. It is in this sense that a man 'has' the Spirit of Christ."<sup>61</sup> And "if any man have not the Spirit

---

60. It may be objected that the Spirit is here spoken of as sent by God. "At the same time," says Rawlinson, "inasmuch as it was in virtue of the new filial relationship to God which was established in Christ and made effectual through Baptism into His name that the Spirit, in the sense in which the Spirit was the distinctive endowment of Christians, was bestowed, it was possible in a secondary sense to regard Christ Himself as the bestower of the Spirit, and to speak of the Spirit as being not only the 'Spirit of God' but 'the Spirit of Christ'," *op. cit.*, p. 158. Cf. also 2Cor. 1,21.22 and Thornton's remarks on that passage, *op. cit.*, p. 139f. Here the spiritual anointing of believers follows immediately upon an evidently purposeful use of the title "Christ".

61. Thornton, *op. cit.*, p. 141f. The same twofold relationship between the spirit and Christ is found in John. Jn. 1,32 emphasises that the Spirit rested on Him; compare the promise in 14,17 that the Holy Spirit should rest upon His disciples. Note, in passing, how appropriate and meaningful the title "Christian" becomes in this connection.



of Christ, he is none of His."

"If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His" (Rom. 8,9). With this drastic sentence Paul calls attention to the vital connection between Christ and the Spirit for the new status of the believer. It is a frequently recurring thought in Paul. As the anointing with the Spirit was necessary for the initiation of Christ into His Messianic office, so the anointing with the Spirit is necessary for incorporation into the Messianic community (1Cor. 12,13). The possibility of the "adoption of sons" has been gained for us by the Son  $\kappa\alpha\tau' \ \epsilon\ \xi\ \circ\ \chi\acute{\alpha}\nu$ , but it is to be had only through the Spirit of Adoption (Gal. 4,5; Rom. 8,15; Eph. 1,5). Furthermore, "no man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost" (1Cor. 12,3). Sasse beautifully summarizes these thoughts:

"Ubi Christus, ibi Spiritus Sanctus: ubi Spiritus Sanctus, ibi Christus. Christ and the Holy Spirit belong together. Faith knows no experience of the actuality of the Holy Spirit which is not at the same time also an experience of the actual presence of Jesus Christ. There is no faith in the presence of Christ, no confession of Jesus the Lord, which is not mediated by the Holy Spirit."<sup>62</sup> But if this is true, is there not just one short step to the complete identification of Christ and the Spirit? And was not this step actually taken by Paul? These questions, reasonable as they appear to us now, would

---

62. Sasse, op. cit., p. 116. See also James Stewart, A Man in Christ, p. 154ff.



probably never have been asked except for a few ambiguous statements in Paul. The most arresting of these are found in the Corinthian letters, and it is to these that we now turn.

We shall, first of all, mention the most interesting of these passages. In 2Cor. 3,17 Paul makes bold to use the language of actual identification:  $\acute{\omicron}\ \delta\grave{\epsilon}\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota$ . At first glance, this text seems to decide the matter: "The Lord is the Spirit." But this conclusion can be reached only when the context is ignored. The simplest solution is that offered by Rawlinson. Verse 16 is a reference to Ex. 34,34, and verse 17 is Paul's comment upon that passage. It is as though Paul were saying, "Now  $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , in the passage which I have just quoted, denotes the Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."<sup>63</sup> There is, however, another possible solution, somewhat less simple, but perhaps more profound. Wendland's discussion is typical of this interpretation. The entire third chapter of 2Corinthians is a comparison of the old dispensation of the letter and the new dispensation of the Spirit. Israel has obstinately continued to adhere to the old dispensation and has failed to attain the true spiritual worship (v. 6ff). But this failure to attain

---

63. Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 155, footnote 6. Rawlinson mentions that this is the explanation of most of the Greek Fathers. Lietzmann's comment, though formally different, seems to tend in the same direction: "Lietzmann suggests that if Paul had left out the middle clause of his syllogism and simply said 'Now the Lord is liberty', he would have conveyed the truth he was aiming at, and avoiding an unnecessary ambiguity," quoted with approval by Stewart, op. cit., p. 309.



the Spirit is due to the rejection of Christ; for in Christ the veil is removed from the old covenant, thus revealing its spiritual significance (v. 14). "Allein durch Christus wird diese auf dem A. T. liegende Decke vernichtet, und also gibt es auch nur durch ihn die rechte geistliche Erkenntnis des Gesetzes, der die Erfuellung des Gesetzes und die Befreiung vom Gesetze ist. Hier ist ja die Gerechtigkeit, die Niemand aus dem Gottesdienst erlangt. Die grosse Kritik des Judentums, die Paulus in diesen Saetzen gibt, besagt also, dass nur vom neuen Bunde aus der alte verstanden werden kann."<sup>64</sup> In verse 16, Paul mentions the possibility that even Israel may yet reach beneath the letter if she turns to the Lord. As Moses unveiled his face when he personally confronted God, so Israel, too, will find the veil removed if they frankly approach Christ in faith. They will then reach a spiritual understanding of the old covenant and will progress to true spiritual worship. "Eben um dies Letztere begreifbar zu machen, fuegt Paulus als Erlaeuterung hinzu: der Herr ist der Geist. Hat er zuerst vom neuen Dienste des Geistes gesprochen und danach die Wirklichkeit des neuen Bundes in Christus gefunden, so schliesst er nun diese beiden Aussagen zusammen und beweist so die Anwendbarkeit der Bibelstelle in diesem Zusammenhang. Daraus ergibt sich, dass Paulus hier nicht eine besondere dogmatische Be-

---

<sup>64</sup>. Heinz-Dietrich Wendland, Die Briefe an die Korinther, p. 119.



trachtung ueber das Verhaeltnis Christi zum Geiste geben will."<sup>65</sup>  
 So the sentence might be paraphrased: "Where the Lord is, there you will find the Spirit." But only there, because the Spirit is πνεῦμα τοῦ κυρίου .<sup>66</sup> This last expression is significant: it definitely proves that Paul made an effort to distinguish between the Lord and the Spirit. Wendland summarizes as follows: "Paulus setzt also sowohl den Herrn und den Geist gleich als auch unterscheidet er beide von einander und ordnet den Geist Christus unter. Damit leistet Paulus ein Doppeltes: er bindet die Geistwirksamkeit an Christus, der die einmalige geschichtliche Versoehnung ist, in dem allein der neue Gnadensbund seine Wirklichkeit hat, und zweitens, er versteht Christus als den im Geist Gegenwaertigen, der jetzt und hier die Gerechtigkeit und das Leben seiner Gemeinde ist."<sup>67</sup>

"Christus, der im Geist Gegenwaertige." We miss Wendland's sense and that of Paul if we understand this phrase in the manner of Schmidt, et. al; namely, that Christ is present as the Spirit, and, as the Spirit, indwells His Church. Through the Spirit is quite a different thing from as the Spirit. And the distinction must be insisted upon. If we fail to distin-

---

65. Loc. cit., cf. Zahn, op. cit., p. 81 for a similar explanation.

66. In verse 18, this phrase is inverted. Schlatter uses this latter expression to shed light on the passage we are considering, and his conclusions agree substantially with those of Wendland: "Mit κύριος πνεύματος wird erklart, warum 'der Herr der Geist ist'. Er, kein anderer, sendet ihn; er und niemand sonst ist durch den Geist wirksam. Dieser ist da, wo der Herr ist, und ist nicht da, wo man den Herrn verwirft," Der Bote Jesu, p. 521.

67. Wendland, loc. cit.



guish, it must be, as Sasse observes, that "either the historical Jesus becomes a mere symbol and, in antithesis to the actuality of the Holy Ghost, loses all independent significance, or the Holy Spirit recedes into the background and becomes a mere 'power', a motus in rebus creatus, 'a created motion in creatures'; a conception against which the Augsburg Confession rightly protests. For the Holy Spirit is the pneuma only if it is not regarded as a power bestowed by God, but as God Himself present in His activity. If we deny the reality of the Holy Spirit, as of God actually present, then the unavoidable consequence follows: Jesus Christ also ceases to be the Lord, for He is only a man equipped with divine power... It is the belief of the New Testament that Jesus Christ is present in His Church because He is one with the Holy Spirit - one, not in the sense of unity of person, of identity, but in the sense of unity of nature, the Homousia."<sup>68</sup> But if it is wrong to say that Christ as the Spirit indwells the Church, then it is impossible to speak of the Body of Christ as the organ of His operation on earth, i. e. in anything but a metaphorical sense.

Another passage that has caused some difficulty is 1Cor. 15,45, where the last Adam is spoken of as πνεῦμα ζωοποιόν . It is again the context which must determine the interpretation.

---

68. Sasse, op. cit., p. 117. On the thought that Christ indwells individuals and the Church through the Spirit, cf. Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 153f; Zahn, op. cit., p. 30ff; Swete, op. cit., p. 301f; and Karl Mittring, Heilswirklichkeit bei Paulus, p. 155. On the difficulties involved in the view that Christ as the Spirit indwells the Church, see Percy, op. cit., p. 17; and Holtzmann, op. cit., p. 193f.



"It is possible," says Rawlinson, "that St. Paul in rabbinical fashion is making his own midrash upon the text, that the idea of the 'life-giving spirit' was suggested to his mind by the reference in Genesis a sentence earlier to the 'breath of life' breathed by God into man's nostrils, and further that the idea of the 'last Adam' and of the 'life-giving Spirit' appeared to him to be implicit by way of antithesis in the scriptural terms 'man' and 'living soul'. If this be so, then it follows that the phrase 'life-giving spirit' in 1 Corinthians was determined indirectly by the wording of the passage in Genesis, and ought not to be made the basis of an argument to the effect that St. Paul identified our Lord with the Spirit. The true meaning of the expanded quotation from Genesis in its Pauline connection is that as the first Adam is the source of the principle of life - that is to say, of the 'natural' life - in his descendents, so Christ, the 'last Adam', is the source of the 'life-giving spirit', on whose presence and activity in believers St. Paul bases his assurance that they shall one day be clothed with the new 'spiritual' body."<sup>69</sup> Paul himself has given the best commentary upon this passage in Rom. 8, 11: "If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead liveth in you, He that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you."

---

69. Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 131. Cf. also Zahn, op. cit., p. 71; Wendland, op. cit., p. 102f.; and Stewart, op. cit., p. 309.



The last passage we shall examine presents less difficulty than either of the preceding ones. In 1Cor. 6,17, Paul says that he who clings to the Lord is ἐν πνεύματι with Him. This expression is obviously employed for the sake of contrast. In the preceding verse Paul has said that the man who "is joined to a harlot is one body" with her, which is proved by Gen. 2,24. For the sake of emphasis Paul now employs a different word to express the relationship between Christ and the believer. The sense of the expression is ὅτι τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν μέλη Χριστοῦ ἔσονται (v.15).<sup>70</sup> There is, no doubt, the further thought that union with Christ is more intimate than any purely human fellowship.

In everything that we have thus said concerning Paul's teaching of the πνεύματι τῷ Χριστῷ, we have found nothing to distinguish it radically from Jesus' teaching of the ἄλλος τεράκιμος (Jn. 14,16.26; 15,26; 16,7). It is true, however, that what was prophecy in the mouth of Jesus has become an expression of experienced fact from the pen of Paul. This alone accounts for any apparent development in Paul's teaching. When we now return to the attempted explanation of the ἐν Χριστῷ through the ἐν πνεύματι, we are struck by the fact that John, who records Jesus' statements about the Paraclete, does not use this concept to explain his "mystical" expressions of the mutual indwelling of the believers and their God - and that, whether these statements are ascribed to Christ (Jn. 15.16),

---

70. So Percy, op. cit., p. 14f.; also Wendland, op. cit., p. 37.



or whether they are the expressions of John's personal piety (1Jn. 2,6.24.28; 3,6). "Die Erlaeuterung aus der Pneumavorstellung liegt hier fern," says Weber. "Bekanntlich hat Johannes den Geist und den lebendigen Herrn nie... zusammengeschaute; der 'andere Paraklet' hat eine eigentuemliche Selbstaendigkeit."<sup>71</sup> This becomes all the more remarkable when we consider that Paul's writings antedate those of John. Though it is perhaps impossible to prove that the writer of the Johannine corpus was acquainted with Paul's letters, it is almost certain that Paul's teaching on so important a point would be remembered in the congregations of Asia Minor, where in all probability John wrote. But if this is true, it appears in the highest degree probable that John would accommodate himself to Paul's teaching of the "Pneuma-Christ", in order to facilitate an understanding of his own "mystical" teachings. That John did not, in fact, do so, indicates that Paul was never understood to have taught a "Pneuma-Christ". And if it be objected that John was perhaps consciously repudiating Paul's teaching, we may counter with the fact that Paul's Christology was never attacked during his lifetime. Why, then, after his death? I am well aware that this argument has no independent merit. It does, however, add to the impression already formed, that the conception of a "pneumatic" Christ rests upon a misreading of Paul's letters.

But the question might still be asked: What of the parallel uses of ἐν ἁετοῦ and ἐν πνεύματι in similar con-

---

71. Weber, op. cit., p. 241f.



texts and with identical concepts? Do they not demand the interpretation we are attempting to invalidate?<sup>72</sup> This question must still be met. There are several general considerations which should not be overlooked. First, there is the self-evident fact, which has not, I believe, been sufficiently stressed, that the concomitance of two entities or beings does not necessarily imply their identity. To use a homely illustration: every child knows the rhyme that contains the verse, "everywhere that Mary went the lamb was sure to go", but no child has yet understood this to mean that Mary is the lamb. Secondly, it should be noted that in several contexts (especially with ἐν αὐτῷ and χεῖρ ) the number of instances in which ἐν χεῖρσιν is used far outbalances those in which ἐν πνεύματι is used. Then there are the almost countless contexts in which ἐν χεῖρσιν appears, for which there is no analogous use of ἐν πνεύματι . 164 instances of ἐν χεῖρσιν , only 19 of ἐν πνεύματι . One is tempted to pass as an a priori judgment the statement of Wendland, which for him is based on careful analysis: "Dann ist aber die Erklarung des paulinischen Gedankens falsch, die meint, Paulus habe zunachst eine 'mystische' Lehre vom Geist gehabt und diese dann erst zur Deutung der Person Christi verwendet. Vielmehr hat der Geist-Glaube des Paulus seinen Grund in seinem Christus-Glauben."<sup>73</sup>

When we look at the relevant passages more carefully, we can observe some significant differences in the use of the par-

72. See p. 6 above, where this argument is developed.

73. Wendland, op. cit., p. 119.



allel expressions, ἐν Χριστῷ - ἐν πνεύματι .<sup>74</sup> For example, consider the texts in which the "being in Christ" is directly spoken of (Rom. 8,1; 1Cor. 1,30; 2Cor. 5,17; Phil. 3,9). In all of these passages the ἐν Χριστῷ describes the objective condition or state which is the basis for participation in the salvation of God. When in the parallel passage (Rom. 8,9) the "being in the Spirit" is spoken of, this has a "being in the flesh" as its antithesis. "πνεῦμα bezeichnet somit hier jene Lebensmacht, die die Sphaere des Heils bestimmt, und gibt damit die Qualitaet dieser Lebenssphaere an im Gegensatz zu jener Sphaere, die als ἑσῆς bezeichnet wird. Es ist naemlich hier von der Gesinnung des Menschen, die entweder von der Sphaere der ἑσῆς oder derjenigen des πνεῦμα bestimmt ist, und nicht von der Tatsache des Heils als solcher die Rede."<sup>75</sup> Oepke states the same truth aphoristically: "Der Geist ist dauernd wirksames ethisches Lebensprinzip."<sup>76</sup> Similarly, ἐν ᾧ (Christ) περιπατεῖτε (Col. 2,6) refers to life as such in the sphere of God's redemptive activity, access to which is gained through faith (v.7), whereas πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε (Gal. 5,16) has again an ethical significance in contrast to the flesh. (Col.

---

74. For the following I am largely indebted to Percy, op. cit., p. 20ff.

75. Percy, op. cit., p. 20.

76. Kittel II, p. 537, article on ἐν. Note also Oepke's further remarks: "Mittels einer durch das Schwebende des Geistbegriffs erleichterten Metonymie wird der Geist mit dem durch ihn hervorgerufenen Zustand zusammengedacht. Lokal-zustaendlich, aber nicht fluidal ist die Vorstellung auch, wo ἐν ἑσῆς und ἐν πνεύματι als die beiden Grundrichtungen des Seins auseinandertreten (Rom. 8,8f.). Das fluidal-ekstatische Moment liegt hier bereits weit zurueck."



2,11 and Rom. 2,29 present a similar contrast.) This does not mean that ἐν Χριστῷ is not used with the same antithesis as the ἐν πνεύματι. When Paul writes of speaking "in Christ" or of experiencing certain psychological reactions, such as joy, "in Him" (2Cor. 2,17; 12,19; Phil 3,1; 4,4.10), he means that this speaking or rejoicing is determined by the new life in Christ, in contrast to all merely earthly reactions. But it is just in these expressions that another distinction can be made between the ἐν Χριστῷ and the ἐν πνεύματι. When Paul mentions speaking or rejoicing "in the Spirit", he is thinking of that speaking or rejoicing as the direct result of the Spirit's activity (1Cor. 12,3; Rom. 4,17). "It denotes... the condition of being possessed or inspired by the Spirit."<sup>77</sup>

1Cor. 6,11 presents a peculiar difficulty because the expression ἐν πνεύματι is used in connection with the objective facts of salvation, where one normally expects to find only ἐν Χριστῷ: "But ye are washed but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God." The difficulty, however is obviated when we note that ἐν τῷ ἰσχύματι τοῦ κυρίου stands before ἐν πνεύματι, and that, as Percy observes, "wir es hier offenbar mit

---

77. Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 160, footnote 1. "his function of the Spirit is especially prominent when the "manifestations" of the Spirit and the χρησμάτα are spoken of; see especially 1Cor. 12. Oepke, loc. cit., considers the ἐν in these cases to be rather instrumental than local. Thus Deissmann's analogy of the "Luftelement" becomes more and more insecure. See also Feine's discussion of these ἐν πνεύματι passages, op. cit., p. 276.



einer liturgisch-feierlichen Schlussformel zu tun haben, in der man gern eine gewisse Fuelle des Ausdrucks erstrebt."<sup>78</sup>

Moreover, there is a more or less explicit reference to baptism in this sentence, and Paul is evidently thinking of the gift of the Spirit which accompanies baptism.<sup>79</sup> The reference to the Spirit is especially appropriate in the context because Paul is contrasting the ethical life of his readers before and after their initiation into the Christian community. Drawing together the various threads of the argument in the preceding paragraph, we summarize with Percy:

Wir finden somit, dass von den beiden Formeln ἐν Χριστῷ und ἐν πνεύματι die ersterwähnte bei Paulus ueberall dort verwendet wird, wo die Sphaere des Heils, die objektive Voraussetzung des Heils als solche bezeichnet werden soll. Dagegen wird ἐν πνεύματι nur da verwendet, wo entweder vom sittlichen Leben des Glaebigen in seinem Gegensatze zum Leben des natuerlichen Menschen oder ueberhaupt von der neuen Lebenssphaere, worin der Glaebige lebt, in ihrem Gegensatz zu der Sphaere der ἔκτῃ oder endlich von den speziellen Wirkungen des Geistes im Innenleben des Glaebigen die Rede ist.<sup>80</sup>

It lies in the very nature of the case that the argument of this chapter be incomplete and perhaps even inconclusive. We have been dealing here with the mysteries of the Godhead and of relationships between the Beings within the Godhead. We can go no further than the Bible allows, and the Bible almost always describes the Persons of the Godhead in their active relationships with mankind. But within these limits I be-

---

78. Percy, op. cit., p. 21.

79. So Schlatter, op. cit., p. 197, and Wendland, op. cit., p. 35.

80. Op. cit., p. 22.



lieve it can be proved, even if I have failed to do so, that Paul shares the common biblical viewpoint of the Spirit as in some sense distinct from Christ. And it is in their respective relationships to mankind that the distinction is to be found. Christ is the objective ground of man's salvation, the Spirit, the medium in and through whom this salvation is appropriated by men. The Spirit is the Principle (for lack of a better word) of Christ's continuous activity on man's behalf. "If S. Paul's language is not always explicitly Trinitarian -" says Rawlinson, "and it would be absurd to expect to find in his writings a technical statement of the doctrine of the Trinity - his theology is nevertheless in a general sense Trinitarian in tendency, and in the passage in which he writes of the 'grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit' he has given classical expression to precisely those elements in the Christian experience of God which were in the long run to render a Trinitarian theology inevitable."<sup>81</sup>

Nor do I see what is to be gained by identifying Christ and the Spirit. Not only do we do despite to the Spirit of God, but we do irreparable damage to our conception of Christ. Christianity might very well be brought down to the level of the many nondescript spirit religions of the Hellenistic world, and Christ might in some sense become identified with the Stoic world-soul. Some of the exponents of the history of religion

---

81. Op. cit., p. 159f.



("religionsgeschichtliche Schule") have attempted to do just this.<sup>82</sup> The case of Johannes Weiss furnishes an instructive example. Following Deissmann in much of his interpretation, he does not hesitate to draw the conclusion that the ἐν Χελευτῶ has often a pronounced pantheistic coloring, and the conclusion seems to follow from the premises. "Da erleidet die Vorstellung und der Begriff von Gott," says Weiss, "den Zwang der Entpersoenlichung, und die Ausdrucksformen des Pantheismus stellen sich mit einer gewissen gesetzlichen Notwendigkeit ein."<sup>83</sup> But Weiss is not willing to grant that this is essentially Paul's viewpoint. Hence, he is driven to the conclusion that the ἐν Χελευτῶ, in certain instances, represents "ein in gewisser Weise sekundaeres, ja vielleicht geradezu fremdes Element."<sup>84</sup> Thus if Deissmann's opinion that the ἐν Χελευτῶ expresses the essentials of Paul's religion is to be maintained, it must receive a different interpretation than that which Deissmann himself proposed. In the next chapter we shall attempt such an interpretation.

---

82. For a brief presentation and refutation of some of these views, see Feine, Der Apostel Paulus, pp. 69-89, especially p. 76ff. on the ἐν Χελευτῶ.

83. Urchristentum, p. 357, quoted in Feine, op. cit., p. 565.

84. Urchristentum, p. 356ff., quoted by Weber, op. cit., p. 216.



## II. The New Creation "in Christ"

We remarked in the last chapter that the chief merit of Deissmann's theory - its simplicity - is likewise its chief failing. This was not said merely in the spirit of criticism. It is just because Deissmann's interpretation was so lucid and unified that it captured the imagination of New Testament scholars. And with interest in Deissmann's theory came interest in Paul's ἐν Χριστῷ formula. The phrase can never again be treated in an offhand manner. Yet Deissmann's view has been drastically modified, and necessarily so. We have already tried to show that his material understanding of the ἐν Χριστῷ is fundamentally unsound. But if that is true, the unity of Deissmann's interpretation has already been impaired. Sacrifice the conception of the "Pneuma-Christ" and you sacrifice the unified interpretation of the ἐν Χριστῷ. "Es war gefaehrlich," says Weber, "dass eine Vorstellung, die vom Pneumaelemente, sich wie von selbst zur Deutung darbietet. Man kann schwerlich bestreiten, dass die Formel ihre unmittelbar einleuchtende Einfachheit einbuesst, wenn wir ueber die einseitige Deutung hinausgehen. Aber wir haben kein Recht, die Christus-



anschauung, deren Reichtum und Tiefe kein einfaches Schema umfasst, auseinanderzureissen, von dem lokalen ἐν aus die Christusanschauung der Christumystik herauszuloesen, die dann die Erklarung der Formel waere. Die Christusanschauung gibt mit ihrem Reichtum auch der Formel ihre Inhaltsfuelle."<sup>1</sup>

We shall lift one phrase from Weber's statement and make it the basis of a further remark. "Die einleuchtende Einfachheit" says Weber of Deissmann's theory. The simplicity of the theory cannot be denied, but the question arises whether it is, after all, so "einleuchtend". How much does the conception of the "Pneuma-Christ" add to our understanding of the ἐν Χελευθῶ ? If one is of a mystical turn of mind, one might answer, "Much, indeed." But the question then becomes whether it is really Paul's phrase that is being interpreted, or whether it is the opinion of the interpreter that is finding expression. As I see it, Deissmann has merely succeeded in shifting the problem to which he addressed himself, not in solving it. He wished to free the ἐν Χελευθῶ from the caprice of commentators, but in doing so he himself burdened the phrase with an a priori interpretation. Far from freeing it, he has buried it so that it cannot yield up its treasures to the hands of the eager student. It has been the work of subsequent scholars once more to free the ἐν Χελευθῶ formula. More and more, scholars are coming around to the view of Blass, which Debrunner has taken over without modification: "Aeusserst

---

1. Weber, op. cit., p. 217f.



unbestimmter Deutung ist auch das ἐν Χριστῷ, das bei Paulus reichlichst zu den verschiedensten Begriffen hinzugefügt wird."<sup>2</sup>

Blass points the way to a fuller interpretation when he calls attention to the manifold contextual relationships of the formula.<sup>3</sup> It would certainly be very perverse to settle upon an interpretation and then force that interpretation into every context, no matter how uncongenial. Deissmann's insistence upon the peculiarity of the ἐν in our formula rests, no doubt, upon a proper grammatical insight, and the great majority of scholars who have busied themselves with the problem are in substantial agreement with him on this point. They disagree, however, when Deissmann makes this, in effect, the whole of the problem, as though everything were settled once the peculiar force of the ἐν has been determined. Not only does this procedure do violence to the second term of the formula, as should now be abundantly clear, but it issues in an ignoring of the context, an exegetical practice which is never justified. Moenkemoeller summarizes this very aptly when he says:

Nach unserer Ueberzeugung muss man... nicht von der engen, der rein lokalen Bedeutung, an die vorliegende Frage herantreten... Nun handelt es sich hier ja nicht um ver-

---

2. Albert Debrunner, Friedrich Blass' Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch, 219.4.

3. The word "formula" is a somewhat unhappy term. It suggests a finished and polished form of expression, and thus abets the interpretation we are here contending against. That our phrase is not so finished a formula is apparent when we consider the various Christological titles that are combined with the preposition. With this word of caution, we shall continue to use the customary term, if only for lack of a better one.



schiedene Begriffe, die von ἐν abhaengig waeren, sondern immer um ein und denselben Ausdruck: ἐν Χεουτῶ oder seine Aequivalente. Von dieser Seite aus angesehen, koennte man vielleicht meinen, es muesste also auch das Verhaeltniswort immer dieselbe Bedeutung haben. Aber es ist zu beachten, dass Verbindung und Zusammenhang nicht immer dieselben sind. Manchmal steht der Ausdruck attributiv, manchmal adverbial, und es kommt sehr darauf an, mit was fuer einem Substantiv oder Adjektiv, mit was fuer einem Verbalbegriff die Formel verbunden ist.<sup>4</sup>

The most recent exhaustive study of the ἐν Χεουτῶ is that of Werner Schmauch. Though I do not find myself in sympathy with Schmauch's method nor with many of his conclusions, I believe that he attacks Deissmann and followers at their vulnerable spot. "Deissmanns Ansatz bei dem ersten Glied der Formel, says Schmauch, "verwehrt ihre 'sachliche' Bestimmung, weil durch die Trennung der beiden Glieder die Formel selbst in ihrer Einheit preisgegeben ist." Thus Deissmann does not really succeed in arriving at a material understanding of the formula. "Denn auch dort, wo er zu einer 'sachlichen' Bestimmung der Formel fortzuschreiten scheint, handelt es sich nur um eine an die Eigentuemlichkeit der Praeposition gebundene Untersuchung... Damit ist deutlich, dass es sich in dem zweiten Abschnitt der Deissmannschen Untersuchung gerade nicht um die 'sachliche' Bestimmung der Formel handelt, sondern um die Frage nach der mit der Eigentuemlichkeit der Praeposition gege-

---

4. Moenkemoeller, op. cit., p. 245. See also pp. 299-305, where Moenkemoeller examined a number of passages in an attempt to determine whether the ἐν Χεουτῶ is adverbial or attributive (adjectival). It is not always easy to decide, and the decision that is made is frequently significant for the meaning of the passage. For example, see Gal. 3,26, a passage which we shall later consider.



benen 'Vorstellung'... Die Formel 'sachlich' bestimmen heisst, ihren Ort in dem Gefuege feststellen, dem sie zugehoert, heisst Antwort geben auf die Frage: 'Was hat Paulus mit dieser Formel gesagt?'"<sup>5</sup> And this question can only be answered by observing the context. "Zu bestimmen ist... ein Begriff nur durch die Aufzeigung der funktionalen Beziehungen, die ihm zugehoeren, oder, anders gewandt, durch die Analyse des gesamten Zusammenhanges, dem der Begriff zugeordnet ist."<sup>6</sup>

5. Werner Schmauch, In Christus, p. 2f., passim.

6. Op. cit., p. 16. But if Deissmann's method is suspect, I believe Schmauch's is, too, though on different grounds. He makes a strict division of the passages according to the respective Christological titles that are associated with the  $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  and then examines each group separately. This is not in itself objectionable, but Schmauch permits himself to be ruled by his method. He arrives at conclusions about the use of a given form of the phrase (ostensibly by an examination of all of the passages involved) and then reads these conclusions back into each of the given passages. The whole reconstruction is brilliantly pursued, but it fails to convince. If Deissmann leans too heavily on the first term of the formula, then the same can be said of Schmauch with regard to the second term. Now, it is true that a certain pattern can be observed in the use of the variant forms of the expression, and Schmauch is not the first to have called attention to this fact; see Weber, op. cit., pp. 254-258. In general,  $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$   $\text{Ἰησοῦ}$  is used when the formula is associated with the great facts or results of God's redemptive activity "in Christ" (2Cor. 5,19; Rom. 3, 24; 2Cor. 1,19f.; 3,14; Gal. 3,14; Rom. 8,39, etc.). On the other hand,  $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  is quite regularly found with apostolic functions and with Christian activity in general (Rom. 16,3ff.; Eph. 6,21; 1Cor. 15,58, etc.). What could be more natural? That Paul, when he thought of himself as slave, should have thought of Jesus Christ as "Lord"; and that, when he thought of himself as redeemed, he should have thought of the Lord as "Jesus Christ", is no more than one might expect. What one does not expect, and what one does not, in fact, find, is that Paul should have slavishly bound himself to any set of rules in a matter of such great liberty. So to bind him is to run the risk of binding one's own understanding.

We might note, in passing, that the  $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  shows certain affinities with LXX usage, especially when it is found in connection with certain verbs, such as, "hope", "rejoice". For



When the context is taken into account, several groups of passages can be more or less clearly distinguished. J. Weiss, the first to take up the study after Deissmann, believed that it is a mistake to find the same general emphasis and meaning in every use of the formula. He did not wish to overthrow Deissmann's findings entirely. In fact, as we have seen, he pushed the "mystical" ἐν Χριστῷ to the point of pantheism and the complete depersonalizing of Christ. But he, nevertheless, distinguished four groups of passages in which the full "mystical" sense has lost much of its color. These are:

- 1) a series of passages in which the redemptive activity of God is presented as objectively realized "in Christ",
- 2) passages in which the formula has a comprehensive, inclusive, representative force (1Cor. 15,22).
- 3) passages in which the formula is not independent, but closely related to a verb, such as "to boast", "to hope",
- 4) a group of passages in which it has an instrumental force (= δὲ ).<sup>7</sup>

To these four groups of passages, Weber adds a fifth: he introduces the ancient thought that in a number of passages the formula means as much as the adjective "Christian", e.g., when it is attached to a personal noun (Rom. 16,7.9.11).<sup>8</sup> But there are suggestions of quite a different grouping of passages in Weber's work. It is a tripartite division, not meant to exhaust all of the possibilities, but meant to lead to a deeper under-

---

example, cf. *Χαίρετε ἐν κυρίῳ* (Phil. 3,1; 4,4.10) with Ps. 32,1; Hab. 3,18; Ps. 33,3; and see, besides Weber, Deissmann's Paulus, p. 116.

7. See Feine, Paulus, p. 564f., and the literature there referred to.

8. Weber, op. cit., p. 214. Moenkemoeller allows the widest possible latitude to this group; see pp. 361-365.



standing of the more important passages. This grouping is as follows:

- 1) those passages (found especially with the  $\chi\upsilon\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  title) in which the Christian man is represented as being in the service of Christ, "in der Gewalt des Herrn", "im Dienst des Herrn",
- 2) the "heilsgeschichtliche Gebrauch" (corresponding roughly to 1 and 4 in Weiss' grouping),
- 3) the full "mystical" use, which still takes in the widest number of passages.<sup>9</sup>

Oepke's division is especially helpful because he is no longer hounded by the "mystical" interpretation. Before attempting a division he makes this general observation on the use of the various forms of the phrase: "Sie finden, selbst wenn wir von feineren Unterschieden absehen, sehr mannigfaltige Verwendung."<sup>10</sup> He then makes the following fivefold division:

- 1) "allgemein zur Bezeichnung der Zugehoerigkeit zu Christus und der Gemeinde" (corresponding in general to the "mystical" use in Weiss' and Weber's groupings, but not interpreted in a mystical manner),
- 2) "eine Taetigkeit oder Lage als christlich charakterisierend" (cf. 5, above),
- 3) "bei Werturteilen, die Geltungssphaere umschreibend," e.g., Rom. 16,10.13,
- 4) "zur Bezeichnung der objektiven Begrueudung der Gottesgemeinschaft" (corresponding to the "objective" and "heilsgeschichtliche" groups above),
- 5) "komprehensiv, eine Vielheit zur Einheit zusammenfassend" (cf. 2 in Weiss' division).<sup>11</sup>

Now, within these groups Oepke finds two modifications of the strictly local-spatial meaning of the preposition  $\epsilon\gamma$ . In groups

---

9. Weber, op. cit., pp. 218-225, and see passages there listed. There is no adequate English rendering for the German "heilsgeschichtlich". We shall hereafter simply employ the German word when occasion demands. On Weber's first group, see footnote 6.

10. Kittel II, p. 537.

11. Op. cit., p. 537f.



1-3, the ἐν κελεύσει often signifies or more closely defines a condition or state ("ein zustaendliches Moment"); and in groups 4 and 5, there is often an instrumental significance ("ein instrumentales Moment" - cf. Gal. 3,11 with Gal. 2,16.17). "Nur dasz doch immer wieder oertliche Vorstellungen durchblicken. Das griechische unterscheidet nicht so scharf wie wir."<sup>12</sup> Thus even Deissmann's formal definition cannot be accepted without modification.<sup>13</sup>

Yet it remains true that the ἐν κελεύσει has generally some sort of local force and frequently also a pregnant sense = ἐν κελεύσει εἶναι. Only Schmauch has seen fit to deny this. With what difficulty can be seen by taking one glance at such passages as 1Cor. 1,30; Rom. 16,16; Rom. 8,1; 2Cor. 5,17.<sup>14</sup> Especially Gal. 3,26ff. shows that the ἐν is to be taken as in some sense local. The κελεύσει ἐν δούλου of v. 27, is equivalent

12. Loc. cit.

13. Gutbrod's criticisms of Deissmann's strictly local interpretation are also helpful, op. cit., p. 198f. Deissmann's contention that the preposition ἐν always retains its original local force, says Gutbrod, is simply not borne out by the facts. For example, ἐν in the New Testament has at least in 290 instances a temporal force. He then lists a number of passages (Rom. 8,2.39; 16,13; 2Cor. 1,19f.; 5,19) where the ἐν κελεύσει can evidently not be taken as strictly local. "Oder schreibt Paulus," he continues, "diesem Christus, in dem man sich realiter lokal befindet, auch ἐν λέγουσιν zu, da ja dann der Ausdruck Phil. 1,8, auch lokal und zwar ohne bildlich gemeint zu sein, aufzufassen ist? Zu was fuer grotesken Gedanken diese lokale Deutung fuehrt, zeigt etwa bei Deissmann die Anm. S. 81: ist wirklich etwa 1Thess. 2,14 der Charakter des ἐν in gleicher Weise lokal aufzufassen bei ἐν κελεύσει und bei ἐν τῇ ἰουδαίᾳ? Das 'lokale' ἐν anders als bildhaft zu verstehen, geht also nicht an." For further modifications, see Feine, Theologie, op. cit., p. 232f., and Moenkemoeller, op. cit., p. 244f.

14. See Schmauch, op. cit., p. 18ff.



to the  $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\iota$   $\delta\epsilon\omega\delta\omicron\upsilon$ ...  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$   $\chi\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma$  of v. 26, and the  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\varsigma$   $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\tau\epsilon$   $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$   $\chi\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma$   $\text{'}\text{I}\acute{\eta}\varsigma\omega\delta\omicron\upsilon$  of v. 28. The question is how this "being in Christ", in a local sense, is to be understood. The  $\chi\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma$   $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\acute{\omicron}\nu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\delta\epsilon$  suggests again the "Pneumaelement" and the mystical interpretation. But the expression  $\delta\upsilon\alpha\delta\iota\varsigma$   $\chi\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma$  of v. 29, comes to our aid. The context shows that the expression is parallel to  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$   $\chi\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma$ .<sup>15</sup>

"Dass aber Paulus das 'in Christus sein' auch als 'des Christus sein' ausdruecken kann, warnt vor dem Ausdruck 'Mystik' zur Bezeichnung dieses Verhaeltnisses und warnt vor allem davor, das 'in Christus sein' und das 'Christus angezogen haben' zu sehr des Bildhaften zu entkleiden, um es ernsthaft 'lokal' aufzufassen."<sup>16</sup> To discover Paul's meaning in his use of the pregnant  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$   $\chi\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma$  - that is the task of the remainder of our study, for it is this use of the  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$   $\chi\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma$  that is basic for all of the others and that touches very closely the  $\omega\delta\mu\alpha$   $\tau\omicron\upsilon\delta$   $\chi\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma$  concept. In the rest of this chapter we shall discuss what is above called the "objective", "heilsgeschichtliche"  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$   $\chi\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , and in our final chapter we shall attempt a fuller explanation of this use by means of the concept of the "representative personality", closing with an examination of the "inclusive" use of  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$   $\chi\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma$ .

When we now examine the "objective" or "heilsgeschichtliche" group more carefully, we find ourselves in the heart

---

15. See Ernest DeWitt Burton, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, p. 208.

16. Gutbrod, op. cit., p. 189.



of Paul's thought-world. We begin to see why ἐν Χριστῷ is Paul's "Lieblingsbegriff". Everything that God has planned for the salvation of fallen man, everything that He has done in history for man's redemption, He planned and executed "in Christ Jesus", in His person, in His work. The ἐν in these passages is clearly local, but the Χριστῷ is certainly not a "Pneuma-Christ". In the concrete, historical person of Christ and in His work on the plane of history is man's redemption. "In Christo tritt die Offenbarung, das heilsschaffende Handeln Gottes, tritt sein Heil in die Geschichte, 'In ihm' ist es beschlossen, in ihm ist es das. Auf die geschichtliche Begründung blickt die alte 'objektive' und 'instrumentale' Fassung."<sup>17</sup> A listing of the passages in which this use of the ἐν Χριστῷ is found should be sufficient to convince us of its central importance.<sup>18</sup>

Redemptive fact

with nouns

Passage

Χρῆσις	2Tim. 2,1
σωτηρία	2Tim. 2,10
ἀπολύτωση	Rom. 3,24; Eph. 1,7
ἰσὺς αἰώνιος	Rom. 6,23; 2Tim. 1,1
ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ	Rom. 8,39
κενοτότης	Eph. 2,7
τὸ νῦν	2Cor. 1,19f.
κλήδεα	Eph. 4,21
δέλημα Θεοῦ	1Thess. 5,18
κλήσις	Phil. 3,14
εὐλογία	Gal. 3,14
ἑπαγγελία	Eph. 3,6

17. Weber, op. cit., p. 220. On the "heilsgeschichtliche" ἐν Χριστῷ, see also Moenkemoeller, op. cit., p. 305f., Gutbrod, op. cit., p. 198f., and Percy, op. cit., p. 23.

18. This list is from Oepke, loc. cit.



with verbs

δικαιοῦσθαι	Gal. 2,17
ἀγαθεεῖν	1Cor. 1,2
ζωοποιεῖν	1Cor. 15,22
δοῦναι	1Cor. 1,4
πλουτεῖν	1Cor. 1,5
ἐλευθεῖν	Gal. 2,4
ἰεραβεύειν	2Cor. 2,14; Col. 2,15
ἐρεχεῖν	Eph. 1,20
καταχεῖν	2Cor. 3,14
κτεῖν	Eph. 2,10

But this "Heilsgeschichte", this history of God's redemptive activity, is not merely history; it is redemption; it is salvation. The historical Christ in whom God accomplished His saving design is the Living Christ, both God and Lord. Yet He is and ever remains ἐταυρωμένος (Gal. 3,1; 1Cor. 1,23; 2,2). "It is not that Jesus was first the Crucified, then became the Risen, and is now the Exalted; but as the Exalted is the Risen so He is the Crucified. His death is not merely something which belongs to history, though it is indeed a historical fact. But He is now present as the Crucified."<sup>19</sup> Or with Deissmann: "Durch das participium perfecti ist doch wohl angedeutet, dass das Kreuz nicht eine nackte Tatsache der Vergangenheit ist, sondern wirksam hineingeragt in die Gegenwart; der 'Gekreuzigte' ist eine Realitaet, die taeglich erlebt werden kann."<sup>20</sup> "In Christ", today and every day, there is salvation. This is beau-

19. Sasse, "Jesus Christ, the Lord", *op. cit.*, p. 109f.

20. Paulus, p. 153. Only that we should not take the "erlebt werden kann" too literally. As we shall see, it is a mistake to attempt to explain this fact psychologically. The "Pneuma-Christ" concept makes this a self-evident step for Deissmann. Cf. also Paul Althaus, "The Cross of Christ", in Mysterium Christi: "The fact of the Cross is both perfectum and praesens: it is a past event and yet a present event," p. 217.



tifully expressed in those passages where the objective facts of salvation, above associated with the "heils-geschichtliche" ἐν Χριστῷ are brought into relationship with individuals, again by means of the ἐν Χριστῷ. These facts are daily actualized for those who are "in Christ". "There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8,1).<sup>21</sup> εἰς ἡμᾶς δὲ ὑμεῖς ἐγενε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, whom God made our wisdom, our righteousness and consecration and redemption" (1Cor. 1,30). "If any man is in Christ, he is a new creation; the old has passed away, behold the new has come" (2Cor. 5,17). "You also must consider yourselves dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 6,11). "In Christ Jesus you are all the sons of God, through faith" (Gal. 3,26). "For our sake he made him to be sin who knew no sin, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God" (2Cor. 5,21; cf. Phil. 3,8f.). We state the inescapable conclusion: to be "in Christ" is to be taken up into the sphere of God's redemptive activity. "Wir sehen deutlich," says Percy, "wie das Sein in Christus fuer Paulus zunaechst als die entscheidende, alles in sich begreifende Voraussetzung des Heils in Betracht kommt, dass somit alles, was zum Heil gehoert, in und mit dem Sein in Christus unmittelbar gegeben ist... Sie stellt offenbar das Zentrum der ganzen paulinischen Gedankenwelt dar."<sup>22</sup> "Das 'in Christus' ist der

21. All English biblical quotations in this paper are from the Revised Standard Version.

22. Percy, op. cit., p. 23f. In the following paragraphs we shall in general follow the outline suggested by Percy's valuable discussion.



heilsgeschichtliche 'Ort', in dem das Heil Gottes da ist... So ist damit schon gegeben, in welcher Weise die lokale Formulierung dieser Verbindung das Verstaendnis der Formel zu bestimmen hat."<sup>23</sup> If this is true, it is a gross misunderstanding to say that the  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \chi\epsilon\iota\tau\omega$  expresses a mystical, esoteric, highly subjective experience.<sup>24</sup> "Being in Christ" is simply the expression of a fact - universal, objective Christian fact. We shall perhaps never know in this life everything that this fact implies. As all Christian facts, it is a fact of faith, for faith. And yet Paul can help us on to a fuller understanding of this fact.

Gal. 3,26f. again offers itself as a starting point. Here the "putting on" of Christ and the "being in Christ" is associated with baptism. In baptism the believer has put on Christ as a garment and is henceforth a son of God "in Christ", through faith. "Die Taufe (ist) der Grund fuer dieses Sein und das ihm zugrunde liegende Verhaeltnis."<sup>25</sup> How or why baptism

---

23. Mittring, *op. cit.*, p. 129. Cf. the quotation from Schmitz on that page: "Das 'in Christus' bedeutet fuer Paulus den mit dem Heilsereignis gegebenen Heilsbereich, in den er sich und alle, die Christus angehoren, unmittelbar hineingestellt weiss," Die Christusgemeinschaft des Paulus im Lichte seines Genetivgebrauch, Guetersloh, 1924, p. 244.

24. This gives the lie to the theory that Paul's teaching on this point is rooted in his conversion experience. So Deissmann, *op. cit.*, especially p. 103ff. and Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 23ff., also Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 249.

25. Gutbrod, *op. cit.*, p. 190. Cf. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 195: "In der Taufe beginnt das  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \chi\epsilon\iota\tau\omega$ ." Some authorities believe that baptism and the baptismal formula  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \chi\epsilon\iota\tau\omega$  -  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\omega\ \delta\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\ \chi\epsilon\iota\tau\omega$  furnished Paul with the background material for his  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \chi\epsilon\iota\tau\omega$  formula; see Schmidt, p. 198 and Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 253. However this may be, there is a close relationship in content between the two thought patterns.



effects this "being in Christ", "das ihm zugrunde liegende Verhaeltnis", is not disclosed in the Galatians passage. Apparently the Galatian Christians needed no instruction on this point. But we do not have to search long for a commentary on our text. Rom. 6,1-14 comes to mind immediately as an obvious parallel. In Rom. 6, as in Gal. 3, baptism is represented as the starting point of a stream of consequences which issues in "being alive to God "in Christ" (v. 11).

In Rom. 6, baptism εἰς Χριστόν is more closely defined as baptism εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ (v. 3). Paul is opposing the opinion which would make a mockery of God's grace by finding in it the occasion for renewed sinning. He does so by reminding the Roman Christians, not so much of their baptism, but of what there took place. "Baptism symbolizes death, burial and resurrection with Christ. But not only so; it is the means through which we are actually identified with these events of the Messianic life-story."<sup>26</sup> "Die Taufe 'bedeutet'," says Mittring, "ein ganz reales Teilhaben, Beteiligtsein an Tod und Auferstehung Christi, aber nicht im Sinne eines symbolischen Significat, sondern im Sinne des Sakraments, das ein sichtbares Signum einer unsichtbaren Wirklichkeit ist. Es handelt sich nicht nur um ein Miterleben dessen, was an Christus geschah, sondern die Taufe versetzt uns... als ganz existentiell Be-

---

26. Thornton, op. cit., p. 59. On this passage, see especially Mittring, op. cit., pp. 32-62, Gutbrod, op. cit., pp. 191-196, Percy, op. cit., p. 25ff., Althaus, Der Brief an die Roemer, pp. 47-55, all of whom support in general the interpretation we are adopting.



teiligte in die Situation der Kreuzigung, des Begräbnisses und der Auferstehung 'am dritten Tage'."27 Baptism implies far more than a mere symbolical drowning. It is in the deepest possible sense a means of grace - the means by which the believing initiate is actually identified with Christ in His redemptive work.<sup>28</sup>

Any other interpretation does not do justice to the text as a whole. The  $\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\psi\mu\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\omega}$  of v. 4, the  $\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\tau\alpha\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\omega\mu\epsilon\upsilon$  of v. 6, and the  $\alpha\pi\epsilon\delta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\tau\acute{\omega}$  of v. 8, cannot mean that what Christ experienced on a specific occasion is repeated symbolically in the believer at the time of his baptism.<sup>29</sup> The

---

27. Mittring, op. cit., p. 43. Cf. Theodor Zahn, Römerbrief, p. 297.

28. On the relative unimportance of the "Ertraenkungssymbolik" in our passage, see Gutbrod, op. cit., p. 191f. Cf. Schweitzer: "Baptism is the beginning of the being-in-Christ and the process of dying and rising again which is associated therewith. He makes no use of the symbolism of the ceremony to explain what happens. He does not make it an object of reflection. In Rom. 6,3-6 he nowhere suggests that he thinks of Baptism as a being buried and rising again with Christ just because the baptized plunges beneath the water and rises out of it again. These ingenious interpretations have been read into his words by interpreters; Paul himself follows no such roundabout ways. Baptism is for him a being buried and rising again, because it takes place in the name of Jesus Christ, who was buried and rose again," The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 19.

29. It is here that Christian baptism differs essentially from the manifold baptisms of the mystery religions. To use Schweitzer's terminology, the difference is between a "realistic" and "symbolic" interpretation of baptism, op. cit., p. 16. In the mysteries "everything is founded upon the symbolic ceremony. The rite effects that which it represents." For Paul, "the believer experiences the dying and rising again of Christ in actual fact, not in an imitative representation. And he does not become in a sense the same as Christ. Paul goes no further than the thought that he has fellowship with Christ and in this way shares the experiences of Christ," p. 16ff.



ὁὖρ ( Χεῦρατῶ ) stands stubbornly in the way of this interpretation. "Eine solche Wiederholung haette nicht als ein Sterben usw. zusammen mit Christus bezeichnet werden koennen. Andererseits wird das Mitauferstehen mit Christus in Roem 6 nicht dargestellt als sei es durch die Taufe als solche bewirkt wor-

The difference between the realistic Christian view of baptism and the symbolic view of the mysteries is thus twofold: first, the Christian believer is actually identified with Christ. In the mysteries this could not be the case because the experiences of the gods, which the initiate was to relive, were themselves symbolical (nature myths) and not rooted in history. Secondly, baptism does not, as in the mysteries, signify or effect deification, but fellowship ( *κοινωνία* ). Percy (footnote on p. 43, *op. cit.*) considers the essential difference to be that Christ's death was substitutionary and inclusive, whereas the gods of the mysteries died only for themselves, the initiates merely imitating their experiences. To which we might add another distinction: the baptism of the mysteries worked ex opere operato; Christian baptism (Schweitzer notwithstanding) does not work ex opere operato, but is conditioned by faith. Furthermore, how can one explain the fact that Paul can use the language of dying and rising again with Christ outside the context of baptism, if it is baptism that effects these results ex opere operato? On all of this, cf. Althaus, *op. cit.*, p. 51ff. and Radford, The Epistle to the Colossians, p. 231f.

For the consequences which result when these differences are ignored, note what Mittring has to say: "Es kann nicht stark genug unterstrichen werden, dass - zunaechst im Zusammenhang des Abschnitts Roem. 6, 1-14 - von keiner anderen Verbindung mit Christus (weder von einem massiv-substantiellen Einswerden mit ihm noch von einer geistig-ethischen Gemeinschaft mit ihm, abgesehen von dem Mitgestorben- und Mitauferwecktsein mit ihm) die Rede ist als von einem Hineingestelltsein in den Tod Jesu am Kreuz und in seine Auferstehung am dritten Tage. Das ist die Einsicht, die wir gewinnen, wenn wir die religionsgeschichtliche Umgebung des Paulus zu seinem Verstaendnis heranziehen, eine Einsicht, die freilich einen Gegensatz zur Mysterienfroemmigkeit ausspricht. Auch in den Mysterien handelt es sich zunaechst um ein Beteiligtsein am Geschick des Gottes, aber dieses *συγγενεῖσθαι τῷ θεῷ* muss, da ein Heilsgeschehen, eine Heilsmacht, ein Heilsereignis wie das des Kreuzes fehlt, zu einem mystischen Verwachsen mit dem Gotte selbst werden. Und so ist es kein Zufall, wenn die Versuche, die eine Strukturgleichheit zwischen Paulus und seiner religionsgeschichtlichen Hellenistischen Umgebung nachzuweisen suchen, wie es scheint, unvermeidlich an dem selbsterstaend-



den, sondern als eine Folge des Mitgestorbenseins mit Christus; soll aber dieses jenes zur Folge haben, dann muss das Mitsterben als ein Teilhaben am eigenen Tode Jesus gedacht sein."<sup>30</sup>

Gal. 6,14 lends solid support to this interpretation of Rom. 6: "Far be it from me to glory except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which (ὁ ὧν - through whom?) the world has been crucified to me, and I to the world." The apostle's own death to the world has its source, its locus, in the cross of the Crucified. But also Rom. 6,10 shows that Paul has in mind throughout the once-for-all event of Calvary: "The death he died he died to sin, once for all (ἐφ' ἅπαντας); but the life he lives he lives to God." Verse 11 then shows what this once-for-all event means for the believer: "So you must consider yourselves dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus." "Wie naemlich dieser Gekreuzigte durch die Herrlichkeit des Vaters von den Toten auferweckt wurde und nicht im Tode blieb, so bleibt es auch fuer uns nicht bei diesem in der Taufe vollzogenen Tode, denn dieser war ja eben ein Mitsterben mit diesem gekreuzigten, aber nicht im Tode gebliebenen Christus."<sup>31</sup>

---

lichen und einfachen Sinn des Mitsterbens vorbeifuehren, weil der Weg zu der Christusgemeinschaft in Wirklichkeit dann gar nicht mehr ueber das Mitsterben am Kreuz geht; vielmehr wird dieses Umfasstwerden vom Kreuz Christi umgesetzt in eine Art mystische Vereinigung mit Christus abgesehen vom Kreuz," op. cit., p. 38f. For valuable general criticisms on the thesis of some of the adherents of the "religionsgeschichtliche" school, that Paul was creatively influenced by the mysteries, see Feine, Paulus, p. 72ff., and J. Gresham Machen, The Origin of Paul's Religion, especially pp. 279-291.

30. Percy, op. cit., p. 26. For the last sentence in the quotation, cf. Radford, op. cit., p. 232.

31. Gutbrod, op. cit., p. 192.



In Rom. 6,11, we again meet our formula: ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ . It is obviously intended to show in which respect it is true that the readers are alive to God. It is true, inasmuch as they are "in Christ". In other words, their sharing in the life of Christ, a fact of which Paul had spoken in vv. 4.5.8, has its source in their "being in Christ".<sup>32</sup> "Da nun aber," says Percy, "dies Teilhaben der Glaebigen am Leben des Auferstandenen nach V.V. 4.5.8 zugleich als eine Folge ihres Teilhabens am Tode Jesu angegeben wird, so duerfte die am naechsten liegende sich daraus ergebende Schlussfolgerung sein, dass auch dies Teilhaben der Glaebigen am Tode Jesus in ihrem Sein in Christus seinen Grund hat."<sup>33</sup> And so we have come full circle and are back at Gal. 3,26f. The "putting on Christ" or the "being in Christ", which is the result of baptism, is a compact expression for the dying and rising again of the believer with Christ in baptism. We summarize with Percy:

---

32. The validity of the identification of the life "in Christ" (v. 11) with the statements of vv. 4.5.8, is not materially affected if the futures (ἐσομεθα v. 5, and εὐδωξασμεν v. 8) be held to have primarily an eschatological significance (so Gutbrod, p. 199). The κεινότης ζωῆς of v. 4 must, at all events, ring through as a prominent overtone. And it is more than likely that Percy is correct in holding these futures to be merely logical futures, viewed from the standpoint of the ἐνεστανέντων, op. cit., footnote 62, p. 26.

33. Op. cit., p. 26. Sanday and Headlam (A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans) correctly observe that the phrase ἐν Χριστῷ "is a summary expression of the doctrine which underlies the whole of the section," p. 160. But since they follow Deissmann in his interpretation of the phrase, it is to be expected that they fail to appreciate the "realism" of Paul's teaching and explain it somewhat psychologically. See especially the extended paraphrase, p. 154ff.



Das Mitsterben des Glaebigen mit Christus in der Taufe, wovon Roem 6, 1-12 spricht, kommt somit dadurch zustande, dass der Glaebige durch die Taufe in das, was einmal mit Christus geschah, hineingegliedert wird, und dies kann seinerseits nichts anderes bedeuten, als dass er in Christus selbst und zwar in ihn nicht nur als den Auf-erstandenen, sondern in ihn schon als den, der am Kreuz starb, auf eine ganz reale Weise eingegliedert wird.<sup>34</sup>

That this is a hard teaching is not to be denied. We shall later develop briefly the idea that Christ is the representative and, in a sense, inclusive personality of the new creation. This idea helps us somewhat in overcoming the difficulty of conceiving the identification of believers with Christ. But there is still that other problem, equally intense for our limited minds: that is the problem of the time relationships involved. "The messianic events of Christ's death and resurrection," remarks Thornton, "took place once for all in history and can never be repeated as historical events." And not only in the sense that this is true of all historical events. "The messianic events are unique, final and unrepeatable in a sense proper to them alone. For in them the whole plan of God's redemptive action, as unfolded in Holy Scripture, came to its fulfillment. In them, on the Christian reading of history, God did once for all that which, whilst this world-order lasts, will never need to be done again; that which, when this world-order is ended, will be manifestly brought to its fruition."<sup>35</sup> Yet this one event, far away and long ago, is an ever present

---

34. Op. cit., p. 27f.; see also the quotations from Thornton and Mittring on p57, above; and cf. Gutbrod, op. cit., p. 193ff., and Althaus, op. cit., p. 49.

35. Thornton, op. cit., p. 64.



reality: "I am crucified with Christ" (Gal. 2,20). That is the crux. We may succeed in making this hard fact more acceptable to our minds by inventing concepts of "super-history", and the like, but the hard fact remains. If the explanation offered is that the time thought of in the embarrassing aorists is the moment of baptism, then we must remember that baptism only effects the identification with the once-for-all event of Calvary (not to mention the fact that Paul can speak of dying with Christ outside the context of baptism - Gal. 2,19f.; 6,12ff.; 2Cor. 5,14). Deissmann has coined the phrase "Passionsmystik" to take away from the hardness of Paul's teaching. There is, indeed, according to Deissmann, an identification of the believer with the great events of Christ's life, but this identification is made psychologically explicable through the mystical experience of communion with the "Pneuma-Christ".<sup>36</sup> Feine, too, interprets the identification psychologically: "Der Glaeubige soll sich dergestalt in das Leiden und den Tod Christi versenken, dass er mit diesen Erlebnissen Christi innerlich zusammenwaechst und sie so stark empfindet, als seien sie auch an ihm vollzogen."<sup>37</sup> All such explanations, while taking away from the hardness of Paul's teaching, at the same time rob it of much of its power. All that we can say is that this teaching of Paul implies a complete overthrow of the usual time

---

36. Op. cit., p. 143.157.

37. Feine, Theologie, p. 193; but see his Paulus, especially p. 574: "Alle Menschen sind im Tode Christi gestorben. Man soll nur nicht versuchen, von der Haerte und Groesse dieser Aussage irgend etwas abzubrechen, so raetselhaft auch die Worte Klingen."



relationships. And we must leave it at that. "Angesichts der Bestimmtheit der paulinischen Aussagen kommt eine unbefangene Betrachtung gar nicht um das Zugestaendnis herum, dass das exklusive Verhaeltnis, das fuer das empirische Urteil zwischen verschiedenen Subjekten, Raumpunkten und Zeitpunkten besteht, in diesen Saetzen aufgehoben ist."<sup>38</sup>

The picture that we have just drawn from Rom. 6 is substantiated by a number of other passages in the Pauline letters. Col. 2,11f. differs only in form from Rom. 6, "wird somit das Mitsterben des Glaebigen mit Christus ausdruecklich als etwas, was 'in Christus' geschehen ist, dargestellt, wenn es hier heisst, dass die Adressaten des Briefes in Christus beschnitten worden sind durch eine Beschneidung, die nicht mit Haenden gemacht und die 'im Ausziehen des Fleischesleibes' besteht, was durch V. 12: συνταφέρτες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι naeher erkluert wird."<sup>39</sup> And here again, death with Christ is followed by ressurection to new life "in Him" (ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ συν-

---

Note what Thornton has to say of all such attempts to make the great facts of faith reducible to human experience: "they substitute "religious experience for the object of that experience, namely God. This is perhaps the most dangerous of all religious cults. It is indeed a form of idolatry. For it substitutes the ever-changing conditions, limited horizons and finite activities of our minds for the One Reality which we should adore. This is to put our trust in ourselves rather than in God," op. cit., p. 84.

38. O. Schnitz, Das Lebensgefuehl des Paulus, Muenchen, 1932, p. 45, quoted with approval by Percy, op. cit., p. 28, footnote 65.

39. Percy, op. cit., p. 29. The reference to circumcision is, no doubt, metaphorical, suggested by antithesis to the Colossian heretics. See Mittring, op. cit., p. 106ff., who also sees in this text "ein Ausdruck fuer die Existenzverbundenheit mit Tod und Auferweckung Christi." Cf. Schmauch, p. 143.



γένησθε). Rom. 7,4 is also relevant: "You have died to the law through the body of Christ, so that you may belong to another, to him who has been raised from the dead." "Here the reference to the risen Christ fixes the meaning of the phrase 'the body of Christ' in the preceding clause. Our deliverance was accomplished, not simply through the crucifixion, but through the crucified body of Christ... For his death is ours; we died when he died upon the cross. This took effect in each of us in baptism, when 'our old man was crucified with Christ'. For we were then grafted into the organism of the Crucified Man" (εὐμψύχου, 6,5).<sup>40</sup> Another passage worthy of mention is Eph. 2,15.16 (cf. Col. 1,22). Christ, in His flesh, abolished the law, "that he might create in himself (ἐν ἑαυτῷ) one new man in place of the two, so making peace, and might reconcile us both to God in one body through the cross, thereby bringing the hostility to an end." "Zweierlei geht... deutlich aus dieser Stelle hervor: einerseits, dass die beiden durch das Gesetz geschiedenen Teile der Menschheit durch ihre Eingliederung in Christus eins geworden sind, andererseits, dass dies schon zu jener Stunde stattfand, als Christus um ihretwillen am Kreuze starb" (δὲ τὸ ἐσταυρωθῆναι ; cf. v. 13, ἐν χεῦρα)

40. Thornton, *op. cit.*, p. 148. So also Althaus on this passage: "Auch hier ist ein Todesfall eingetreten: die Christen sind in dem Tode Christi, der stellvertretend seinen Leib hingegeben hat, als Getauften mitgestorben. Dadurch sind sie rechtmässig von dem Gesetze los und Christus, dem aus dem Tode Lebendigen, zu eigen geworden," *op. cit.*, p. 58.



ἡμεῖς... ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ ).<sup>41</sup> Finally, we turn to 2Cor. 5,14:

"One died for all; therefore all have died." Ἄνε ἰσθού must mean a real, not merely a metaphorical or imputed, dying. We can do no better than to quote Thornton on this passage:

The crucial words are 'therefore all died'. St. Paul submits his whole life to the sovereign control of that love which was embodied in action when the Messiah died for all mankind upon the Cross. The purpose of that act was that the law of Christ's sacrificial self-giving might be reproduced in all for whom he died. Their lives are to be wholly dedicated to him and to his service, precisely as he dedicated himself utterly for their sakes. So far all is clear. But the words 'therefore all died' are more mysterious. They refer, not merely to the consequences of Christ's death, but to something effected there and then, in and through the death upon the Cross. When Christ died something happened once for all, not only to him who died, but to all for whom he died. They also died with him upon the Cross. In some sense they were identified with him upon the Cross.<sup>42</sup>

Wir haben somit... gefunden," concludes Percy, "dass der Glaeubige nach Paulus am Tode Jesus real teilhaft ist und dass dies Teilhaben durch seine ganz real gemeinte Eingliederung in Jesus Christus selbst als jene geschichtliche Person, die am Kreuze starb, zustandekommt, und schliesslich, dass es gerade der Zustand dieses Eingegliedertseins ist, der von Paulus als ein Sein des Glaeubigen in Christus bezeichnet wird."<sup>43</sup>

A one word description for all of this is the highly pregnant New Testament concept of *κοινωνία*. "God is faithful, by

41. Percy, *loc. cit.* Stoeckhardt's interpretation of the *ἐν αἵματι* ("so dass sie in ihm, dem verklaerten und erhoehten Heiland, ihre Einheit haben, vereinigt in ihm leben, weben und wohnen sollten") though certainly true, does not, I believe, exhaust the meaning. Kommentar ueber den Brief Pauli an die Epheser, p. 146f.

42. Thornton, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

43. *Op. cit.*, p. 30.



whom you were called into the *κοινωνία* of his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord" (1Cor. 1,9). The essence of *κοινωνία* in the New Testament is a life shared in common.<sup>44</sup> Now, manifestly, the life we share in common with Christ is His glorified life as Lord and as Head of the Church. Only this should not be understood to mean that we do not have *κοινωνία* with what, for lack of a better term, we may call the historical Christ. Our *κοινωνία* is with the crucified, and with the risen, as well as with the ascended and glorified Christ. It is not by accident that the text quoted above uses the full title - Jesus, Christ, and Lord, who is, however, only one, the Son. Thus *κοινωνία* with Christ includes a real sharing in the great events of Christ's historical life, the events of which we have been speaking. This is admirably expressed in the host of passages in which the believer is drawn into these events by means of a *σύν*.<sup>45</sup>

Event

συνπράξει  
 συνεταρσεύσασθε  
 συνκτοῦσθε  
 συνδιπτεῖτε  
 συνεχέετε  
 συνῴασι  
 συνδοξάσετε  
 συνκληρονομήετε  
 συνβαλετέ

Passage

Rom. 8,17  
 Rom. 6,6; Gal. 2,19  
 2Cor. 7,3  
 Rom. 6,4; Col. 2,12  
 Col. 2,12; 3,1; Eph. 2,6  
 Col. 2,13; Eph. 2,5  
 Rom. 6,8; 2Cor. 7,3  
 Rom. 8,17  
 Rom. 8,17  
 2Tim. 2,12

The ideas are often paired (Rom. 6,4ff.; 8,17). Present shar-

44. See especially Thornton, p. 75ff.

45. Carr remarks that the "preposition *σύν* is in close etymological connection with *κοινός*," in "The Fellowship of Acts 2, 42 and Cognate Words", in The Expositor, 1913, p. 463.



ing in Christ's suffering brings with it the assurance of a future sharing in His glory. But even the sharing in glory is future only inasmuch as it awaits its consummation. In essence, it has already begun, for, as we shall see, the New Age is already upon us. We see how realistically all this is to be viewed, especially when we consider what Paul has to say of our sharing in Christ's suffering. "Diese ist nicht nur," says Hauck, "ein Nacherleben von Christi Leiden, auch nicht bloss eine persoенliche Gleichmaessigkeit, noch viel weniger bloss rueckwaertsschauende Passionsdogmatik ueber Christus, sondern durch die mystische Teilnahme an Christus sind die Leiden des Apostels ein wirklicher Teil an dem Gesamtleiden, das Christus auferlegt ist (Kol. 1,24). Durch die wirkliche Anteilchaft am Leiden Christi erhofft Paulus gerade die analoge Anteilchaft an seiner Herrlichkeit (Phil. 3,10; Rom. 8,17)."<sup>46</sup>

---

46. Kittel III, p. 806. The entire first half of Thornton's admirable volume has the *κοινωνία* with Christ as its central theme. But see also Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 238.248; Zahn, *op. cit.*, p. 118; Feine, *op. cit.*, p. 571ff.; Mittring, *op. cit.*, p. 101ff. For Schweitzer's characteristically unique views, see especially the chapter entitled "Dying and Rising again with Christ", *op. cit.*, pp. 101-140. Schweitzer, too recognizes the intimate relationship between the two expressions, "in Christ" and "with Christ". Indeed, he believes that "in Christ" is derived from "with Christ". He is compelled to hold this because of his peculiar view that Christ and the elect share a common corporeity, in the sense that the *σῶμα τοῦ θεοῦ* is actually a material mass in which all share: "Since the fundamental conception of the Pauline mysticism is that the Elect and Christ share in the same corporeity, it is most accurately expressed by those terms in which it is still recognisable that they refer to an experience which is common to Christ and the Elect. These expressions, accordingly, in which 'with Christ' becomes 'in Christ' diverge from the original idea," p. 121



Perhaps one is of the opinion that this doctrine is unpreachable, if not absolutely unteachable. If the example of Paul is not sufficient to squelch this opinion, we shall call on no less a teacher and preacher than Luther for support. We shall quote but two passages from his sermons:<sup>47</sup>

W. A. 10, I, 2, S. 220.9.-Wie es nicht gnug ist, daz ich wissz und glaube, das Christus gestorben ist, also ist auch nicht gnug, das man hye wisse uns glaub, wie Christus aufferstanden sey mit clarificiertem leib und sitze da und hab lust und freude und sey nun nicht meer der sterblikait underworffen, denn das bessert mich nichts oder gar wenig, Aber da komm ich darzu, das alles das werck, welchs Gott in Christo thut, mir geschyhet, ja myr geschenckt und geben sey, so das sein auffersteung inn mir das wuercke, das ich auch aufferste und lebendig werd mit jme, das schmecket denn, Man muss es jns hertz hinein schlagen und nicht allein mit den leiblichen oren hoeren oder mit dem mund reden.

W. A. 46, S. 337.24. - also sihestu, das ers nichtewil bey dem lassen bleiben, das die Historia geschehen ist, und ers fur seine person ausgericht hat, Sondern mengets unter uns und machet eine Bruederschafft daraus, das es ein gemein gut und erbe unser aller sein soll, Setzets nicht in predicamento absoluto, sondern Relationis, das ers gethan habe als unser Bruder, Und wil nicht anders angesehen und erkand werden, denn als der mit diesem allen unser sey, und wir widerumb sein, und also gar zusammen gehoeren auff's aller nehest, das wir nicht neher verbunden sein kuenten.

We have perhaps lingered too long already with this doctrine of Paul. Yet we cannot resist the temptation to pursue it a little further and to see what this "being in Christ", this sharing in His death and resurrection means for the life of the believer. The teachings of Paul on this point form a complex whole, yet they can be conveniently divided for dis-

---

47. Taken from the selection made by Mittring in an appendix to the book we have frequently quoted, pp. 156-165.



cussion purposes. The results of "being in Christ" are both negative and positive, the negative associated with "dying with Christ", the positive with "living with Christ".<sup>48</sup>

According to Rom. 6, the death of Christ, in which the believer shares, is a death which releases from sin: "The death he died he died to sin, once for all" (v. 10). "Our Lord was identified with us in our sinful state and we were identified with him in his death" (cf. 2Cor. 5,21; Rom. 8,3).<sup>49</sup> The result for us is that the *παραδότης ἁρτοῦ*, the *ἔσχατος τῆς ἁμαρτίας* has been destroyed; and with its destruction, the power of sin over us has also been destroyed.<sup>50</sup> In Rom. 7,4ff. and Gal. 2, 19, the death that we died with Christ is described as bringing freedom from the law. The implication in both of the passages is that the law has power over a man only so long as he lives. If he dies (as we have with Christ), that power is finally and effectually broken. Finally, and in summary fashion, the death with Christ is a death to the world, to the Old Age, to everything that is associated with fallen and depraved *κόσμος*. "Far be it from me to glory except in the cross of our Lord

---

48. We again, in general, follow Percy's discussion.

49. Thornton, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

50. This is expressed very well by Althaus: "Das Ziel des in der Taufe geschehenen Sterbens - Paulus bezeichnet es hier, mit einem auch Gal. 2,19 verwandten Ausdrücke, als Mitgekreuzigtwerden des alten Menschen, d.h. des ganzen Menschen, sofern er von Adam her stammt, nach Seele und Leib - ist die Vernichtung des Sündenleibes, d.h. des Leibes, sofern er Werkzeug der Sünde ist: dieser Leib ist in der Taufe abgetan, in Christi Tod gegeben; das bedeutet aber, dass die Untertänigkeit des Menschen unter die Sünde aufhört," p. 49.



Jesus Christ, by which the world has been crucified to me, and I to the world" (Gal. 6,14).

"Die Taufe εἰς Χριστόν bedeutet aber nicht nur reales Teilhaben am Tode Jesu von dieser Weltordnung, von diesem Aeon und den sie beherrschenden Mächten, Gesetz, Sünde, und Tod, weg, sondern so ipso auch Teilhaben an dem, was auf seinen Tod folgte, naemlich seiner Auferstehung und dem neuen Leben, das er als Auferstandener lebt: gerade dies ist es doch, worauf es fuer Paulus letzten Endes ankommt."<sup>51</sup> Even as Christ's death would be meaningless if He "be not risen" (1Cor. 15, 14ff.; cf. Rom. 4,25), so the "dying with Christ" would be meaningless without the "rising with Him". Death is but the necessary entrance part to the new life. We have found this expressed in Rom. 6, 5.5.8.11, to which we may compare Gal. 2,19 and especially Col. 2,12: "You were buried with him in baptism, in which you were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead."

When we now inquire into the implications of this resurrection to new life, we find that basic for everything else is the acquisition of a new righteousness, a faith-righteousness which will hold its own before the holy God, thus opening the way to fellowship with God "in christ" (2Cor. 5,21; Gal. 2,17; Phil. 3,9). "In Christ" this righteousness is ours. There is not merely a causal relationship between righteousness and

---

<sup>51</sup>. Percy, op. cit. p. 31.



the new life, between justification and sanctification, the ethical correlate of the new life, as though the new life were a thank offering for righteousness, or as though justification imposed a moral obligation to lead a sanctified life. There is a certain truth in these statements, but we must avoid the danger of separating the two moments in our minds in such a way that their necessary relationship is lost sight of.<sup>52</sup>

Righteous before God, we are free from the judgment of wrath. "There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ" (Rom. 8,1). More, we are now the children of God "in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3,26). As dutiful children, we offer willing and happy obedience to God (Rom. 6,4.11) and are assured of everlasting salvation (Rom. 8,39). Finally, the identification with Christ in His resurrection gives us a share in the vital forces of Christ's resurrection, forces which, as the

---

52. Gutbrod's remarks on the relationship between "being in Christ" and "righteousness in Christ" are so helpful that I feel justified in quoting him at length: "Anscheinend ist die Gerechtigkeit die Voraussetzung zu diesem in Christus erfunden werden (in Phil. 3,8f.) oder mindestens der wesentliche Begleitumstand. Wenn Voraussetzung, dann jedenfalls nicht als zeitlich notwendig vorausgehend, sondern eben so, dass der sachliche Zusammenhang das Wesentliche ist... Indem man Gerechtigkeit auf Grund des Glaubens hat, ist man in Christus, wird man in ihm erfunden. Und dieses Leben, das gleichbedeutend ist mit dem in Christus erfunden werden, hat man also, wenn man die Gerechtigkeit aus Gott auf Grund des Glaubens hat, hat man durch den Glauben an Christus Beides kann also nichts wesentlich verschiedenes meinen... Beide, das In Christus sein und die Glaubensgerechtigkeit, meinen also wesentlich denselben Tatbestand, wenn auch vielleicht in etwas verschiedener Hinsicht, das eine spezieller auf die Stellung des Menschen vor Gott sehend, das andere mehr auf die Auswirkung im Lebensstand des Menschen, aber selbstverstaendlich beides im Wechsel," p. 204ff.



Living Lord and Savior, He even now gives to strengthen us in our weakness (2Cor. 4,7-15; Phil. 3,10), and which will become manifest in us at that great Day (Rom. 8,11; Phil. 3,11; 2Cor. 4,14).

All of these various lines of thought may be summed up in one word - *κἀνὰ κἀίας*, the eschatological, the new creation of God. "If any one is in Christ, he is a new creation" (2Cor. 5, 17). "Wenn die Auferstehung von den Toten," says Sasse, "nach der Lehre der juedischen und der urchristlichen Eschatologie die Wende der Aionen, den Anfang der neuen, ewigen Schoepfung bedeutet, dann hat mit der Auferstehung Christi, insofern sie der Anfang der allgemeinen Auferstehung ist (1Kor., 15,20.23), der neue Aion bereits begonnen, wenn auch verborgen von den Augen der Menschen."<sup>53</sup> The New Age has impinged itself upon the old through the creative power of Christ's resurrection. As suggested in the quotation from Sasse, Paul is moving in the Jewish thought world when he uses the terminology of the two ages. The content of the Christian gospel has, however, materially altered the old Jewish conception. "Dem Juden bedeutete der kommende Aion in erster Linie Freiheit von Tod und Leiden und ewige Herrlichkeit und Seligkeit (IIBaruch 51,

---

53. Kittel I, p. 207 (article - *διών*). Cf. also Behm's statement: "Neuschöpfung ist das herrliche Ende der Heils-offenbarung Gottes, das Hochziel urchristlicher Hoffnung, das aus der Heilszukunft schon in die Gegenwart die Christen auf der alten Erde hineinleuchtet, weil sie durch Christus Heils-gegenwart geworden ist; der neue Aeon, der mit Christus angebrochen ist, bringt eine neue Schoepfung, die Erschaffung eines neuen Menschen mit sich," Kittel III, p. 451 (article - *κἀίας*).



iff.: IVEsra 8,52ff. u. oe.) Fuer Paulus bedeutete er aber vor allem neben Freiheit von Tod auch Freiheit von Suende und Gesetz; sein Inhalt war naemlich fuer Paulus ganz vom Glauben an den Gekreuzigten und Auferstandenen bestimmt, ja war im Grunde mit ihm selbst identisch (Gal. 2,20; Phil. 1,21; 3,8; Kol. 3,4)."<sup>54</sup> The man "in Christ" has been transferred into the new creation. This implies, as Gutbrod so well observes, not only a new state of being ("Sein"), but a new life ("Leben") in the active sense, a life from God and for God. The old world, however, exists side by side with the new. And even the believer, insofar as he is still *ἐν τῷ* (Gal. 2,20), has one foot in the old world. It is the old story, at once glorious and dreary, of the "even now" and the "not yet", of the "arrived" and the "still afar off".<sup>56</sup> This means tension for the man "in Christ", tension and strenuous effort. Every indicative in the new life becomes an imperative; what the new man is he must be and, in a sense, become. We shall let Althaus have the final word:

Durch Christi Tod sind die Seinen schon in den neuen Aeon versetzt (Kol. 1,13) und dem jetzigen boesen Aeon (Gal. 1,14) gestorben. Daher gelten die groszen Aussagen von ihnen. Aber diese neue Wirklichkeit der Christen ist eine verborgene. Denn die neue Weltzeit ist unter der alten noch verhuellt. Die alte Welt ist grundsatzlich

54. Percy, op. cit., p. 33.

55. Gutbrod, op. cit., p. 211.

56. Thornton speaks here of a double polarity: "Those who have died with Christ are to rise with him,; those who have arisen are to ascend. Yes; but we now see that those who have died, risen and ascended with Christ, have yet to begin the infinite task of learning how to die, rise and ascend with Christ anew," op. cit., p. 60f.



abgetan, aber tatsaechlich noch vorhanden. Die Christen, in die neue Welt versetzt, hoeren nicht auf, zugleich in dieser alten Welt zu stehen. Der neue Aeon ersetzt den alten noch nicht. Aber er zeigt seine Wirklichkeit als ein staendiges Nein des Kampfes zu dem alten. Das heisst: eben weil der Christ mit Christus in den neuen Aeon versetzt ist, erneuert er sich. Weil er als alter Mensch grundsatzlich getoetet ist, toetet er das, was an ihm dem alten Aeon angehoert. Weil er neu ist, erneuert er sich. Nur so ist sein Totsein hier und jetzt wirklich... Die Sittlichkeit der Christen ist also nichts anderes als das Bekenntnis zu der geschehenen Erloesung, die tathafte Anerkennung des neuen Seins. Als solche ist die Sittlichkeit auf das Ende hin gespannt. Das Handeln streckt sich der Stunde entgegen, da die neue Wirklichkeit des Christen in Christus aus der Verborgtheit herausbricht und in Herrlichkeit offenbar wird.<sup>57</sup>

We have thus arrived at a point from which it should be clear how central in Paul's thought-world was the "being in Christ". "In Christ" God has revealed His eternal purpose to redeem mankind. And stated from man's viewpoint: he who is "in Christ" has been taken up, miraculously but really, into the sphere of God's redemptive activity "in Christ". In the closing paragraphs of this chapter we shall briefly refer to the all-important moment of faith and shall then ask ourselves whether it is proper to call Paul's teaching "mysticism".

I believe it is a profound intuition of the truth which has led many interpreters to discuss the ἐν Χριστῷ in the context of Paul's teaching on πίστις.<sup>58</sup> Schweitzer condemns this procedure: "All attempts hitherto undertaken to pass from the

---

57. Althaus, *op. cit.*, p. 54f. On the ethical implications of the new life, see also Gutbrod, *op. cit.*, pp. 210-216.

58. See Feine's discussion on faith, *Theologie*, p. 232f: "Erst in diesen Aussagen (ἐν Χριστῷ - ἐν Χριστῷ) tritt uns die ganze Tiefe des paulinischen Glaubenserlebnisses entgegen."



concept of belief in Christ to the being-in-Christ have proved a failure; and all that may be made in the future are equally without prospect of success. They all come to the same point, that the belief in Christ, growing in depth, is by verbal ingenuity made to figure as a being-in-Christ. That the being-in-Christ arises out of such an enhancement of belief in Christ is nowhere indicated by Paul and is nowhere presupposed by him."<sup>59</sup> With the last sentence in the quotation we may wholeheartedly agree, but the rest of Schweitzer's statement is a caricature of the truth. What is faith, if it is not just this "being in Christ", this taking hold of Christ and being caught up in Him into the redemptive activity of God? And who is there, who has ever really believed, who has not held this to be true? "Die ganze Wirklichkeit des Heils fasst sich, wie wir gesehen haben, fuer Paulus zusammen in dem Sein der Glaubenden in Christus, d.h. in dem Hineingenommensein im Kreuz und Auf-erweckung Christi und damit in das ewige Erwaehltsel von Gott in Christus und in das endgueltig rettende Eingreifen Gottes am Ende."<sup>60</sup> But is this is true, then the "being in Christ" describes not only the content of faith, but is itself a beautiful description of faith. "Nicht nur: ich glaube, dass ich in Christus bin, sondern: als Glaubender bin ich in Christus. Das existentielle Einbeschlossensein in das Heil in Christus ist nur da, wo der Glaube sich in Christus erkennt, weil er

---

59. Schweitzer, op. cit., p. 116f.  
 60. Mittring, op. cit., p. 147.



von Christus ergriffen, von Gott erkannt ist."<sup>61</sup> There may be some fear that this implies a complete subjectivisation of the Christian religion. Not so. The pregnant ἐν Χριστῷ has the objective ἐν Χριστῷ as its basis. God's redemptive activity in Christ is objective fact. Yet the moment that faith is created in a man's heart, he is brought into a vital relationship with that fact. "Ist dieses auch vor dem Glauben und unabhaengig von ihm da, so doch zugleich fuer ihn."<sup>62</sup> Faith is man's Amen to God's Yea "in Christ".<sup>63</sup>

It is in this way, I believe, that the passages in which πᾶσις is modified by ἐν Χριστῷ should be interpreted. But, since it is true that πᾶσις and ἐν Χριστῷ are but different ways of ex-

61. Mittring, op. cit., p. 150.

62. Althaus, op. cit., p. 51.

63. In this connection we might mention the influence that Schmitz's study (see footnote 23 for reference) has had upon the interpretation of the expression πᾶσις τοῦ Χριστοῦ. He combines the two terms into one concept, "Jesus-Christus-Glaube". "Darin liegt die richtige Empfindung," says Feine, "dass die Mehrzahl der Stellen es verbietet, an einen Genetivus subjecti zu denken, dass aber auch das Verstaendnis des Genetivs als objecti den Begriff nicht voll ausschopft. Der Christusglaube des Paulus stellt nicht ein Beziehung zu Christus her, die den Segen seines in der Vergangenheit geschehenen Handelns vermittelte, sondern sie ist die Lebensverbindung des Menschen mit dem lebendigen Christus. Glauben heisst fuer Paulus, mit dem einst irdischen, gekreuzigten, auferstandenen und nunmehr himmlischen Christus zur Einheit zusammenwachsen. Der Christusglaube hat den ganzen Christus zu eignen," Paulus, p. 572f.; cf. Mittring, op. cit., p. 150f. It is apparent how near this interpretation of πᾶσις τοῦ Χριστοῦ is to our interpretation of πᾶσις ἐν Χριστῷ. Schmitz did not deem it necessary to invent a new name for the genitive with πᾶσις. Deissmann, however, calls this the genetivus communionis, or genetivus mysticus, op. cit., p. 126. I question (if it, indeed, be proper in the case of so great a scholar to question) the need of a new nomenclature. Grammar can certainly not be expected to perform the work of the interpreter.



pressing the same idea, then it should not surprise us that there are relatively few passages in which the two are immediately connected. "Im Gegenteil," remarks Mittring, "wird man das verstaendlich finden, wenn man sich vergegenwaertigt, das eben das In-Christus-sein das Hineingenommensein in das, was Gott in Christus getan hat, ist, wie es dem Glauben geschenkt ist, der dazu Ja sagt. Das eine ist mit dem anderen gegeben, und eine traegt das andere."<sup>64</sup> There are no examples of the  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma \epsilon\upsilon\ \chi\epsilon\iota\tau\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  construction in the four early epistles.<sup>65</sup> In the captivity letters there are two instances (Eph. 1,15; cf. v. 13; Col. 1,4), and in the pastorals there are several more (1Tim. 3,13; 2Tim. 3,15, and probably also 1Tim. 1,14 and 2Tim. 1,13). There are those who hold that this is not properly an instance of our formula, but that  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \chi\epsilon\iota\tau\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  means as much as  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \chi\epsilon\iota\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$  in this context (Col. 2,5; Gal. 2,16; Phil. 1,29; Rom. 10,14). But why, then, did Paul choose to express himself dif-

64. Loc. cit.

65. Gal. 3,26, is, I feel certain, no exception. The  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \chi\epsilon\iota\tau\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  should be taken with  $\nu\epsilon\omicron\iota\ \delta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \xi\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ . Most commentators are agreed that this is the correct interpretation. See Burton: "That  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \chi\epsilon\iota\tau\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  does not limit  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  is evident because Paul rarely employs  $\epsilon\upsilon$  after  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ , and in this epistle always uses the genitive (2,16.20; 3,22), but especially because vv. 27 and 28 take up and dwell upon the fact that the Galatians are in Christ. And this fact in turn shows that, unless Paul shifts his thought of the meaning of  $\epsilon\upsilon$  after he has used it before with  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \chi\epsilon\iota\tau\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  I. it has here its metaphorical spatial sense, marking Christ as one in whom the believers live, with whom they are in fellowship," op. cit., p. 202f. So already Philippi: "Nebst der subjektiven Vermittlung der Kindschaft durch die  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ , das  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \chi\epsilon\iota\tau\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  ihre objektive Begrueudung in Christo Jesu bezeichnet," Erklaerung des Briefes Pauli an die Galater, p. 135.



ferently? It is my conviction that Percy (together with most of the interpreters of the formula) is perfectly correct when he maintains that this, too, is a conscious use of the formula.

"Wenn hier wirklich -und das scheint mir das Wahrscheinlichste zu sein - unsre Formel verwendet ist, so sagt uns aber diese Verbindung nur, dass der Glaube in das Sein in Christus mit hineingeheort; sie gibt uns aber keinen Aufschluss ueber den Sinn jener Formel."<sup>66</sup> By which he means that the ἐν Χριστῷ should be independently interpreted and not be burdened with an a priori definition of faith.

We can clarify the relationship of πίστις to the ἐν Χριστῷ for ourselves by viewing side by side the parallel expressions δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως and δικαιοσύνη ἐν Χριστῷ.<sup>67</sup> The "righteousness of God" is God's gift to faith (Rom. 1,16ff.; 3,21ff.), and he who has become righteous "in Christ" (Gal. 2,17; 2Cor. 5,21) has this righteousness διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (Gal. 2,16). But differently expressed: if I desire τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει (Phil. 3,9), then all depends on "gaining Christ" (v. 8), and being "found in Him"(v. 9), on being "apprehended of Christ" (v. 12). Both moments are beautifully expressed in Rom. 3,24f.: "They are justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption which is in Christ Je-

66. Op. cit., p. 24. Cf. Moenkemoeller, op. cit., p. 402, and Deissmann, op. cit., p. 126.

67. On which, see Mittring, op. cit., pp. 146-154, to whom I am deeply indebted for the material in this paragraph; and cf. Gutbrod, op. cit., reference in footnote 52, above.



sus, whom God put forward as an expiation by his blood, to be received by faith." In that Paul describes the righteousness "in Christ" as faith-righteousness - thus calling attention to the intimate interrelationship between δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως (Rom. 3,30; 5,1; Gal. 2,16; 3,8.24; 5,5) and δικαιοσύνη ἐν Χριστῷ - he himself sheds light on the relationship between πίστις and ἐν Χριστῷ. We may, without doing violence to Paul, cut out the middle term in the parallel expressions and state the matter as follows: according to Paul, a man is "in Christ" only as a believer; and conversely, faith comes to rest "in Christ", who is at once its source and its goal.

We ask, in conclusion, whether the teaching of the Apostle, presented in this chapter, can be fairly called "mysticism", "Christ-mysticism".<sup>68</sup> In our presentation we have studiously avoided the use of the term, except in quotations. Was this caution

---

68. It would take us too far afield to discuss the doctrine of the unio mystica. There is really only an indirect relationship between that doctrine, as it has been traditionally presented, and the Pauline teaching which we have presented in this chapter. The doctrine of the unio mystica depends almost entirely on the "Christ in us" expression, and it leans far more heavily on John than on Paul. "Christ in us", says Althaus, "found expression in the doctrine of the 'unio mystica', but that was indeed far removed from the doctrine of Christ's Cross," "The Cross of Christ", op. cit., p. 217. But in discussing Paul's teaching of the "in Christ", we have found ourselves directly at the foot of the Cross; more, we have found ourselves on the Cross. The "Christ in us" obviously depends upon this "in Christ". As we noted in passing in the last chapter the "Christ in us" as found in Paul is closely related to the "Spirit in us". But we shall do no more than mention the fact here. For more information, see Percy, op. cit., p. 34ff., Zahn, op. cit., p. 118, Sasse, "Jesus Christ, the Lord", op. cit., p. 115ff., Feine, op. cit., p. 589ff., Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 157ff.



necessary? Now, it is apparent to even a superficial reader that there are definite points of contact between Paul's teaching and the mystical beliefs of the ages. And the chief such point of contact is his teaching of "being in Christ". Paul's whole life and that of every Christian is conditioned by this relationship to Christ. Yet it is my contention that it is best not to apply the word "mystical" to this relationship. The word has a strange way of confusing counsel and of introducing false elements into the discussion. Only by definition can Paul's teaching be called "mysticism". Even when the definition is sufficiently precise, however, false notions keep slipping in around the definition.<sup>69</sup> It must be so, for if common usage means anything, then the word mysticism refers to something essentially different from the "being in Christ", despite the points of contact. For a working definition, we may quote Mehlis: "Mystik ist eine Form des religioesen Bewusstseins, in welcher die Ueberwindung der Trennung zwischen der irrationalen Gottheit und der reinen Seele schon in diesem Leben bis zur vollkommenen Wesensvereinigung ersehnt und gefordert wird."<sup>70</sup>

Without even attempting anything like an exhaustive enumeration, we can find points of difference in every item of the

---

69. See, for example, Deissmann's definition, *op. cit.*, p. 118ff., or that of Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 235f. Some of the scholars who have taken issue with the use of the word mysticism in this connection are Mittring, *op. cit.*, p. 132ff., Rawlinson, *loc. cit.*, and above all Feine, *op. cit.*, pp. 559-587.

70. G. Mehlis, *Die Mystik in der Quelle ihrer Erscheinungsformen in allen Zeiten und Kulturen*, 1926, p. 22, quoted by Feine, *op. cit.*, p. 563, footnote 2.



above definition with Paul's teaching of "being in Christ".

- "Mystik ist eine Form des religiösen Bewusstseins" - Though the "being in Christ" becomes part of a man's conviction through faith, it does not have its source or reality in man's consciousness. The "being in Christ" is objectively rooted in a cross and an open grave. It is not psychologically explicable.<sup>71</sup>

- "In welcher die Ueberwindung der Trennung zwischen der irrationalen Gottheit und der reinen Seele... ersehnt und gefordert wird" - In the Christian religion, God is far from an irrational something, Pure Being, the All, or whatever it may be called. God is intensely personal and rational (human language fails!). He has planned man's reconciliation to Himself "in Christ", and "in Christ" has carried out His plan. It is not man who longs for God, but God who, mirabile dictu, longs for man. All of the emphasis in Christian salvation lies on the side of God. - "Schon in diesem Leben" - "In Christ" the New Age has, indeed, already begun, the new life has driven out the old. But the eschatological element, that part of faith which we call hope, is still a characteristic part of the life "in Christ". - "Zur vollkommenen Wesensvereinigung" - In the "being in Christ" and the "living with Christ", the I-thou relationship is never destroyed. In fact, the I-thou relation-

---

71. For one more example see Schmidt, op. cit., p. 85: "Die religiösen Erfahrung, die sich hierin ausspricht, kann man wohl am besten bezeichnen als das Gefuehl einer neuen Lebensphaere, in der sich Paulus und der Christ ueberhaupt findet."



ship has been raised to the ultimate level in the  $\kappa\rho\upsilon\sigma\alpha\varsigma - \delta\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  antithesis. "In Christ", yes, but never Christ.

If someone is still inclined to use the term "Christ-mysticism", it is his privilege. It is finally largely a matter of semantics. The distinctions, however, between "Christ-mysticism" (if so it must be called) and classical mysticism must be strenuously maintained.



### III. Christ, the Representative Personality of the New Creation

We are now ready to take up Hunter's significant hint as to the meaning of the ἐν Χριστῷ: "The clue is to be found in the Hebrew concept of corporate personality: in passages like these Paul conceives of Christ as the Inclusive Representative of a new humanity; so that to "be in Christ" is to be one of the New People of God of which Christ is Head."<sup>1</sup> Oepke points in the same direction. After rejecting the "mystical" interpretation, he says: "Grundlegend ist die Vorstellung von Christus als Universalpersoenlichkeit."<sup>2</sup> It will not be necessary to go into very great detail in this chapter, for everything that can be said in this connection has already been implicitly stated. We have shown that "being in Christ" implies a real participation of the believer in everything that Christ has suffered and done as the divine agent of reconciliation. Furthermore, we have seen that this participation of the believer in Christ is not merely the result of imputation, but that the believer is in a very real sense incorporated into the histor-

---

1. Hunter, The Message of the New Testament, p. 73.

2. Oepke, op. cit., p. 538; cf. Schmidt, op. cit., p. 232ff.



ical person of Christ, who died on Calvary and rose the third day. But this is possible only because all men were, in principle, already from the beginning (i.e., already on Good Friday and Easter) incorporated in Christ, their Representative and Substitute. 2Cor. 5,14 cannot very well be understood in any other way: "One died for all; therefore all have died." Or Rom. 5,6.10: "While we were yet helpless, at that time Christ died for the ungodly... While we were yet enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son." Thus the *ἕν Χριστῷ* is already contained in the *ὅτι ἐν Χριστῷ*. "Der paulinische Gedanke des Seins der Gläubigen in Christus wurzelt also letztthin," says Percy, "Im Gedanken der stellvertretenden Selbsthingabe Christus um unsertwillen; dieser Gedanke ist das Zentrum der ganzen paulinischen Theologie, von dem aus sich diese erst recht verstehen laesst."<sup>3</sup>

Paul himself helps us to an understanding of the idea of Christ as a Representative Man by means of the familiar analogy of the First and Second Adam (Rom. 5,12.19; 1Cor. 15, 22.45). "Die Entsprechung und das Gegenueber von Adam und Christus ist ein wichtiger Gedanke der Theologie des Paulus; Adam der 'erste', 'irdische', 'seelische' Mensch, Christus der 'zweite', 'geistliche', 'himmlische'. Adam ist Vorbild Christi, er weist ueber sich hinaus auf Ihn."<sup>4</sup> Paul uses the Adam/Christ typology to implement three different, but closely related ideas:

---

3. Percy, op. cit., p. 43.  
 4. Althaus, op. cit., p. 45f.



- 1) graphically to present the fact of universal grace, Rom. 5, 12-21,
- 2) to show the certainty of the resurrection, 1Cor. 15, 22,
- 3) to make somewhat understandable the nature of the resurrection body, 1Cor. 15, 44ff.

In this form, the typology is of Paul's fashioning.<sup>5</sup> Rabbinic literature speaks of Adam  $\text{יְהוֹנָתָן בֶּן־נָח}$ , but nowhere refers to

5. So Althaus: "In dieser Gestalt ist der Gedanke eigene Schoepfung des Paulus," *op. cit.*, p. 46; cf. Jeremias in Kittel I, article on 'Adam', p. 143. There are those who have found Gnostic influences in this analogy, not to speak of the  $\text{κεφαλὴ-σώμα}$  combination of Colossians and Ephesians. The problem is too complicated to warrant a discussion in this chapter, and anything but an intensive study would not do justice to the problem. My premature judgment is that the entire theory is no more than a brilliant reconstruction, based on widely scattered and mostly very late verbal parallels, in most of which it is not impossible to conjecture an influence of the New Testament. I shall attempt no more here than to list some of the books which should be consulted on the problem, especially where it concerns the  $\text{κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος}$  concept. The theory is that Paul borrowed heavily from the Primal Man and Aion-Redeemer mythologies of some of the Gnostic formulations. The most common form of the theory limits the Gnostic influence to Colossians and Ephesians. See especially Schlier's article on  $\text{κεφαλὴ}$  in Kittel III, pp. 672-681 and note the special studies there referred to; cf. also K.L. Schmidt's article on  $\text{ἐκκλησιαστικόν}$ , Kittel II, p. 512ff. Kaesemann is much bolder in ascribing Gnostic influences to Paul. Though Kaesemann does not accept the Pauline authorship of Colossians and Ephesians, Paul, nevertheless, emerges from the pages of his book as the first Christian Gnostic. According to Kaesemann's almost painfully scientific reconstruction, the entire Pauline corpus is shot through with Gnostic thought-patterns. For a very readable summary of the relevant Gnostic speculations, see Tr. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, pp. 236-248, and for a more sober treatment, from a slightly different angle, see Lohmeyer, Die Briefe an die Philipper, Kolosser und an Philemon, pp. 3-8. For references to further literature on Gnosticism, especially to the works of Reitzenstein, Dietrich, *et. al.*, see recent encyclopaedias, and do not overlook Lietzmann's discussion of the Gnostic texts in Geschichte der alten Kirche, I, pp. 282-317. By no means all scholars, however, uphold this theory. The study is in its infancy and has (most scholars will frankly admit) by no means passed beyond the theory stage. For arguments upon the inadmissibility of the major assumptions of the theory, see especially Schweitzer,



the Messiah as the Second, or Last Adam.<sup>6</sup> There were, however, traces in contemporary Judaism of the first- and second-man scheme, notably in Philo. Had these speculations perhaps influenced Paul? "Philo interpreted the two accounts of the creation of man in Gen. 1 and 2 as representing two separate creations: first the ideal, archetypal Man in Heaven, and then, Adam, the actual historical man" (De. Leg. Alleg. I, 12.13 and De Mundi Opif. 46).<sup>7</sup> But if Paul was acquainted with this type of speculation, then it is far more reasonable to assume that he consciously set himself in opposition to it, than that he was positively influenced by it. The whole point of the analogy in the latter half of 1 Corinthians is that the earthly Adam

---

op. cit., the chapter entitled "Hellenistic or Judaic", pp. 26-40. One of Schweitzer's chief contributions has been that he re-emphasized the essentially Jewish background of Paul's writings. See also Feine, Paulus, pp. 65-133, Machen, op. cit., pp. 247-251, Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 125ff., Oepke, op. cit., p. 438, Sasse, Kirche und Herrenmahl, p. 17f., and for a scientific investigation and critical examination, see above all, Percy, Untersuchung ueber den Ursprung der Johanneischen Theologie, chapter 6.

Disregarding the above theory, is it not reasonable to assume that the roots of Paul's inclusive thinking are to be found in Hebrew thought generally? We have only to remind ourselves of the manner in which the twelve tribes came to be identified, in a sense, with their tribal ancestors, or of how the entire race came to be known by the name of one of the patriarchs, Israel. For a particularly illuminating example of this type of thinking, see Heb. 7,10. For further remarks on this aspect of the problem, see Percy, Der Leib Christi, p. 41f., Stauffer, Kittel II, p. 433 (article - εϛ), and Tr. Schmidt, loc. cit.

6. Jeremias, loc. cit.; cf. Strack-Billerbeck, Kommentar zum neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash III, p. 477f., and Schlatter, op. cit., p. 437.

7. Knox, Christ the Lord, p. 103. On this and on what follows, see Jeremias, loc. cit., Althaus, loc. cit., and Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 129. Philo, no doubt, was influenced by Iranian speculations; assumed of course, is the influence of Plato.



came first, the heavenly second. Moreover, the Heavenly Man was no Platonic idea for Paul, but He was the pre-existent Son of God, who, as Son of Man, had already come to judge the world for righteousness, and who would come again to gather the harvest from the seed He had sown at His first coming.<sup>8</sup>

But what, regardless of origin, did Paul wish to say with his typological analogy? In answering this question, we shall attempt to do no more than draw some of the obvious inferences. Basic is the view that Adam and Christ, as representative men, determine the fate of the entire race. "Der erste und der letzte Adam bedeuten als Urmenschen, als Anfaenger einer schoepfungsmuessig gesetzten Reihe jeder eine Welt, eine Lebens- bzw Todesordnung und befassen die ihn angehoerenden unter sich, in sich."<sup>9</sup> The heritage of the first Adam is sin and death; the heritage of the Second, forgiveness, righteousness, and life. "In either case," says Thornton,

individuals enter a system of relationships which they did not originate, but which was constituted by actions other than their own. Yet in either case the individual is identified with the consequences of such acts. In these two organisms there are, as it were, two contrasted biological sequences. Or again we might say that from each fountain-head there flows a stream, one for evil and the other for good. The first stream flows from sin to death, the second from death to life. The sinner as member of Adam's race falls short of the glory of God for which he

---

8. Jeremias may be quite right when he conjectures that Paul uses this antithesis to bring out what Jesus meant by His self-designation, Son of Man, "dass Jesus der Erstling der neuen Schoepfung ist," p. 143. On the traces of the Son of Man concept in this analogy, see also Knox, op. cit., p. 96, and Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 127.

9. Oepke, loc. cit.



was created. He lives 'after the flesh', that is, he lives for the aims of the natural self; and these come to an end with death. He is therefore under the reign of death, whether he be aware of his situation or not. The second stream flows from Christ; its starting point is his death on Calvary. For there 'one man's act of redress issued in acquittal and life for all.' In his death our Lord identified himself with the evil consequences of our sins in an act of expiation. In his resurrection the victorious consequences of this act become manifestly effectual; for his resurrection showed that the reign of death had been brought to a close. Now all of this Christ effected in his representative capacity, as the One Man who is Abraham's seed, 'Israel my Servant'. By his self-identification with us sinners in his 'act of redress' we may be said to be identified with him in that act.<sup>10</sup>

The Fall is not merely a story, that may or may not be told. In the Fall something happened, once for all, to determine the fate of mankind. It alone explains the human situation. "Die Geschichte Adams ist die Geschichte vom Ursprung der Sünde und ihren Folgeerscheinungen, die sich wie eine Lawine durch die Weltgeschichte waelzen... Nur wer von dem Ernst des Einmaligen weiss, vermag die geschichtliche Bestimmtheit und die Unentrinnbarkeit des Zustandes zu verstehen in dem der Mensch der Gegenwart sich verfindet. Das ist das Werk des Einen."<sup>11</sup>

"As sin came into the world through one man and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all men sinned" (Rom, 5,12). No long philosophical dissertation on the relative importance or significance of "inherited guilt" or "personal guilt". Simply: all have sinned like Adam; all share the consequences of Adam's Fall. So all-pervasive was/is this human wickedness, that nature herself has been tainted (Rom, 8,

10. Thornton, op. cit., p. 58f.

11. Stauffer, op. cit., p. 435.



18ff.). "So steht alle Schoepfung in einer grossen Schicksals-  
gemeinschaft, das Geschlecht Adams aber steht darueber hinaus  
in einer Gemeinschaft der Schuld. Es ist mit dem Stammvater  
eins in der Suende und damit der Verantwortung fuer die Welt-  
not. Keiner steht ausserhalb. Alle stehen sie ἐν Ἀδὰμ."<sup>12</sup>

If Knox is correct when he says that an adequate concep-  
tion of the Fall and of sin depends upon a realistic appraisal  
of man's situation,<sup>13</sup> then Sanday and Headlam press closer to  
the heart of the matter when they say that it is "impossible  
to have an adequate conception of sin without an adequate con-  
ception of God. The Hebrew in general, and St. Paul in parti-  
cular had this; and that is why Sin is such an intense reality  
to them. It is not a mere defect, the coming short of an ideal,  
the mark of an imperfect development. It is something more  
than negation; it is a positive quality, calling forth a posi-  
tive reaction. It is a personal offence against a personal  
God."<sup>14</sup> Paul always views man in his relationship to God, be  
that positive or negative. Man does not and cannot exist out-  
side that relationship. Either he is obedient to God and is  
taken into fellowship with God, or he is disobedient and is  
rejected from that fellowship. But always it is man's rela-  
tionship to God that determines the whole of his existence.

ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσι (1Cor. 15,22). Man made his

---

12. Ibid.

13. Knox, op. cit., p. 109ff.

14. Sanday, op. cit., p. 144.



choice; he willed to be separated from the divine fellowship. Sin is the expression of that separation, death its result. But ἐν τῷ Χειρῶ πάντες ζωοποιουμένων . Something has happened to break the chain of consequences that had its rise ἐν Ἀδάμ and to start a new chain of consequences. It is that something, that everything, which formed the core of our last chapter. That something is God's redemptive activity ἐν Χειρῶ .

Adam is the εἶκος τοῦ μέλλοντος, the πρῶτος ἀνθρώπος . He points beyond himself to the ἕρκτος Ἀδάμ, the δευτερος ἀνθρώπος - he points to Christ. "Die Masse der Menschheit," says Stauffer, "die in der Zwischenzeit lebten und starben, zaehlt gar nicht gegenueber diesen beiden Menschen κατ' ἐξοχῶν . In diesem Vollsinn ist Adam der erste, Christus woertlich und wirklich der zweite Mensch... In ihm, der Antityp Adams, ist der Menschenwelt noch einmal ein Anfang und Prinzip gesetzt."<sup>15</sup> "In Christ" there is a new creation. He is the Head of a new humanity.<sup>16</sup> He is the ἀρχῆ (1Cor. 15,20.23), the πρῶτοτοκος (Rom. 8,29; Col. 1,18). But Christ is the Beginning in a fuller sense than Adam was. The analogy is not a just as - even so. Rather it is ὡς πρῶ - πολλῶ ἀλλοῦ (Rom. 5, 12.17). Christ is not only the first Member of the new creation; He is Himself its Creator (πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν ). He is not only the First; He is the ἕρκτος, towards whom the entire new creation tends, until all things are again summed

15. Stauffer, *op. cit.*, p. 435.

16. Adam, as noted above, was known as the Head of the αἰῶν ὀυτοῦ . Thus Christ of the αἰῶν μέλλον .



up "in Him" (Eph. 1,10).<sup>17</sup> In fine, "He has the Creator's prerogative of originating life, not merely the creature's privilege of generating it."<sup>18</sup> "So wird mit immer neuen Wuerdenamen, in immer neuen Formen die Beziehung des Einen zu allen und zugleich noch die Einzigartigkeit des Einen unter allen sichergestellt... Immer steht Jesus zunaechst in einer Reihe mit anderen, immer steht er schliesslich an einem ausgezeichneten Punkt dieser Reihe. Er bildet gewissermassen bei jeder Reihengbildung den Grenzfall, der schon aus der Reihe herausfaellt."<sup>19</sup> We shall summarize and conclude our discussion of the Adam/Christ typology by quoting Althaus:

Christus steht Adam und der ganzen von ihm bestimmten Menschheit gegenueber. Durch ihn wird offenbar, von ihm her erkannt, was Adam und Adams-Menschheit heisst: "Fleisch", Fall, Empoerung wider Gott, Tod. Alles vor Christus, alles ausser ihm ist eben "Adam", verloren ohne ihn. Von Christus her wird Adam verstanden, und Christus will von Adam her gesehen werden. Um Adams und seiner Wirkung willen ist Christus gesandt. Fuer Alle, die von Adam herkommen, also fuer die ganze Menschheit ist er noetig und bestimmt: er hebt den ganzen Schaden, den Adams Fall gebracht, auf mit der Schoepfermacht der Gnade Gottes fuer Alle, die es auf seine Wirklichkeit wagen und in solchem Glauben gleichsam von ihm herkommen. So wird er, der zweite Adam, der Anfaenger einer neuen Menschheit der Gerechtigkeit, des Geistes, des Lebens. Niemand hoert auf, Adams Kind zu sein, der Suende und dem Tod verfal-

---

17. Note, in this connection, the prominence of the  $\epsilon\rho\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$  in the captivity letters, a strong argument for their Pauline authorship and also for the close relationship of the  $\epsilon\rho\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$  to the  $\epsilon\omega\nu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$  concept, so important in those letters. See especially the opening hymn of Ephesians, and note what Lohmeyer says on Colossians 1,2: "'In Christo' ist... das wahre Thema dieses Schreibens, und alles Folgende gleichsam nur Exegese dieses goettlichen Textes," p. 19, op. cit.

18. Thornton, op. cit., p. 267.

19. Stauffer, op. cit., p. 436f.



len. Die Christus-Menschheit ist und bleibt bis zum Tode Christi auch Adams-Menschheit (1Kor. 15,48f.) - aber sie hat aufgehört, nichts als Adams Geschlecht, alte Menschheit zu sein, sie ist von Christus her neue Menschheit geworden, und dieser ihr neuer Charakter wird den alten so gewiss tilgen und abtun, wie die Gnade und das Leben mächtiger ist als die Sünde und den Tod. (Rom. 5,20)<sup>20</sup>

The implications of the above analogy for an understanding of the ἐν Χριστῷ are as obvious as they are significant. "Der paulinische Zentralgedanke des Seins der Gläubigen in Christus," says Percy, "bedeutet somit nichts als die Uebertragung dieser Denkweise, die uns in der Vorstellung von dem einen Individuum begegnet, der als Vertreter einer Gruppe von Menschen, mit denen es durch Blutbande verbunden ist, als Christus als den Stellvertreter der Gläubigen in seinem Tode und seiner Auferstehung, die das Einbrechen des neuen Aeons fuer die mit ihm Verbundenen darstellen."<sup>21</sup> To this Oepke lends welcome support: "Die Gläubigen sind durch die Taufe aus der Sünden- und Todesregion des ersten Urmenschen in die Gerechtigkeits- und Lebensregion des zweiten versetzt worden. Aus dieser lokalen Grundvorstellung laesst sich die gesamte Praegnanz der Formel ἐν Χριστῷ und ihrer Parallelformeln ableiten."<sup>22</sup> With his reference to baptism Oepke takes us back to the heart of our argument in the last chapter. Baptism is normally the means of incorporation into the Second Adam and the new creation, which He represents, as well as creates (Rom. 6; Gal. 3,26f.). Through baptism a man is "in Christ", and "if any man is in Christ, he is a new creation" (2Cor. 5,17 and cf. Gal. 6,15). But before

---

20. Althaus, op. cit., p. 46f.

21. Percy, op. cit., p.42.

22. Oepke, op. cit., p. 538.



54

closing our discussion, we shall push our argument one step further.

The new creation which is essentially realized "in Christ", not only concerns the new life of individuals: the new creation is the community which Christ has established and which has its life and reality in Him, in what He did, in what He is. The "heilsgeschichtliche" ἐν Χριστῷ, expanded, becomes the "inclusive" ἐν Χριστῷ. The καθὼς κτίσας is an intensely personal matter. That is never denied. But it is also and always a communal matter. When a man is baptized into Christ, he is at once baptized into the Church. "To belong to the community is to be 'in Christ'; to be 'in Christ' is to belong to the community... Its ( ἐν Χριστῷ ) primary meaning is eschatological. It designates membership in God's final and new creation."<sup>23</sup> Once more, when a man is "in Christ", he is in the Messianic community (Gal. 3,26ff.; 1Cor. 12,13). Thus it is that Paul can speak of the Church, as well as of individuals, as being the κτίσις

---

23. Cf. Brunner, The Divine-Human Encounter: "While the individual is released from his I-isolation, out of the sin which estranges him from God and man, he is taken into fellowship with God and at the same time with man. And, contrariwise, he will not be released in any other way from his I-isolation, except as he is taken into the concrete fellowship," p. 161. See also Stauffer, op. cit., p. 438, and note what Sasse has to say on the relationship of baptism to incorporation into the Church: "Man wird weder in die Kirche hineingeboren, noch wird man ihr Glied durch freiwilligen Beitritt. Man wird in die Kirche hineingetauft... Denn die Taufe ist nicht ein Symbol fuer etwas, was der Mensch tut oder was an ihm getan wird, sondern sie ist die Tat Gottes selbst, der einen Menschen als sein Kind und Miterben Christi annimmt, ihm seine Sunden vergibt und ihn zum Glied der Kirche macht," op. cit., p. 36f.



23

ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ : "He is our peace, who has made us both one, and has broken down the middle wall of hostility, by abolishing in his flesh the law of commandments and ordinances, that he might create in himself one new man in place of the two, so making peace, and might reconcile us both to God in one body through the cross, thereby bringing the hostility to an end" (Eph. 2, 13ff.). With this we may compare Col. 3,9ff.; where in the νέος ἄνθρωπος there seems to be (at least in its practical implications) a mingling of the individual and corporate aspects of the new creation: "Do not lie to one another, seeing that you have put off the old nature with its practices and have put on the new nature, which is being renewed in knowledge after the image of its creator. Here there can be neither Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave, free man, but Christ is all, and in all." (cf. Eph. 4,24) Rawlinson again states admirably what we are struggling to express:

In the case of those who are 'in Christ' - for to be baptized 'into Christ' was to be henceforth 'in Christ' and to belong to God's renewed Israel - the renewal, the eschatological 'creation afresh', has already, as it were by way of anticipation begun. To be 'in Christ' and to belong to the New Israel are from henceforth the same thing. The New Israel, according to the New Testament thought, is 'in Christ' as the Jews were in Abraham, or as mankind was in Adam. The Messiah, the Christ, is at once an individual person - Jesus of Nazareth - and He is more: He is, as the representative and (as it were) the constitutive Person of the New Israel, potentially inclusive. He includes, He is one with, the New Israel; and the New Israel is one with, is united to, Him, as its Head.

---

24. Rawlinson, "Corpus Christi", in Mysterium Christi, p. 234ff.



In Ephesians 2,15, we have an example of the "inclusive" ἐν Χριστῷ, or to use Oepke's terminology, "komprehensiv, eine Vielheit zur Einheit zusammenfassend."<sup>25</sup> Already Deissmann found the opinion quite congenial that ἐν Χριστῷ might very well mean "in der christlichen Gemeinde".<sup>26</sup> I believe he was right, however, in not taking this definition as a clue to the solution of the entire problem. That he, in fact, chose a more objectionable clue is beside the point. "In the Church", yes; but "in the Church" only because "in Christ". The two are inseparable, but "in Christ" is logically first. Hence, it would be a reversal of the proper order to attempt to arrive at an understanding of the ἐν Χριστῷ by means of ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, or one of its equivalents. In one sense ἐν Χριστῷ = ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ.<sup>27</sup> "Aber jenes ist die Voraussetzung fuer dieses, die Gemeinde hat ihr Dasein ueberhaupt erst durch Christus und in ihm, er bleibt immer die uebergeordnete Groesse und die Zugehoerigkeit zur Gemeinde ist immer erst die Folge des Seins in Christus."<sup>28</sup>

The new creation, and the Church as the new creation, we said, has its being and reality "in Christ". This is remarkably well expressed in the passages where the "inclusive" ἐν Χριστῷ is immediately connected with ἐκκλησίᾳ (Gal. 1,22; 1Thess.

25. See p. 50, above. On the "inclusive" ἐν Χριστῷ, cf. Moenkemoeller, p. 308ff., and Weber, op. cit., p. 223, and see passages there listed.

26. Deissmann, "In Christo Jesu", op. cit., p. VI.

27. Hence, it is quite appropriate for Hunter to discuss the ἐν Χριστῷ in the same paragraph in which he examines Paul's teaching of the Church, loc. cit. So also Knox, loc. cit.

28. Tr. Schmidt, op. cit., p. 154.



1,1; 2,14; 2Thess. 1,1; cf. Eph. 3,21). The ἐκκλησία is "die erfuellte at.liche Versammlung Gottes," the New Israel, or, differently expressed, the new creation - and that "in Christ."<sup>29</sup> Paul's churches are ἐκκλησία ἁγίων (1Cor. 14,33), and these saints, who are the Church, are ἁγιασμένοι ἐν ἁγιασματι (1Cor. 1,1; cf. Col. 1,2; Eph. 1,1). Whether ἐκκλησία is modified by ἐν ἁγιασματι or not, the ἐν ἁγιασματι is always understood. "Im Sinne der Urjuenger," says Schmidt, "der richtigen Juenger, die hier besonders auf der Hut sein muessen, steht und faellt fuer Paulus die Versammlung Gottes damit, dass nur Christus ihr Herr ist und nicht Menschen in theokratischer Anmassung, auch wenn diese Menschen mit dem Geschenk der Offenbarung in besonderer Weise ausgezeichnet worden sind."<sup>30</sup>

Two more passages are to be noted in this connection. The first is the already oft-cited text in Gal. 3:

In Christ Jesus you are all sons of God, through faith. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus. And if you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's offspring, heirs according to promise.

The phrase which is of greatest interest to us is ὑμεῖς ἐστὶς ἕστε ἐν ἁγιασματι Θεοῦ, and in that phrase it is the ἐστὶς which demands

29. K.L. Schmidt, Kittel II, p. 516. On Paul's concept of the ἐκκλησία, see, besides Schmidt's invaluable discussion, Feine, Theologie, p. 283, Tr. Schmidt, op. cit., pp. 117-124, and also Lock's helpful excursus in The Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 69ff.

30. K.L. Schmidt, op. cit., p. 511.



attention. Burton's remarks on the word are at once a history of its interpretation:

ἐἷς may be taken distributively and qualitatively, or inclusively and numerically. In the former case the meaning is: once in Christ Jesus, whether you are Jew or Gentile, slave or master, man or woman, all these distinctions vanish (there is no respect of persons with God); it is as if it were always the same person reappearing before him... In the latter case the thought is that all those in Jesus Christ merge into one personality.<sup>31</sup>

And that personality, we might add, is Christ. There is no essential difference in the two interpretations; in either case, Christ is the Principle of the Church's unity. In the first case, great emphasis must be placed on the ἐν Χριστῷ; in the second, the ἐἷς becomes the prominent word. In view of the contextual relationships, however, I am inclined to favor the second interpretation. "Hier kommt der Ausdruck offenbar von Vers 27," says Koehler. "Wir haben Christum angezogen. Nun sind das nicht so viele Christi, wie es gläubige Einzelpersonen gibt, sondern Christus ist eben nur Einer."<sup>32</sup> The wider context, too, favors this interpretation. The entire third chapter is, generally speaking, an excursus on the promise concerning the Seed (σπέρμα) of Abraham (v. 8). This Seed is identified with Christ in verse 16, and in verse 29, the concept is expanded to include all who are Christ's (τοῦ Χριστοῦ = ἐν Χριστῷ!). Verse 28 would then be a sort of "middle term"

---

31. Burton, *op. cit.*, p. 307f. So already Philippi, *op. cit.*, p. 139. But while Burton seems to favor the second interpretation, Philippi decides for the first.

32. J. P. Koehler, Der Brief Pauli an die Galater, p. 90.



between vv. 16 and 29.<sup>33</sup> But if this is true, we have in the *σῶμα* concept and especially also in the phrase *ἐν ἡμῖν ἐν Χ.* a definitive form of the "inclusive" *ἐν ἡμῖν* and of the inclusive type of thinking, illustrated above by the Adam/Christ typology.

The last passage we shall consider is Rom. 12,4f.: "As in one body we have many members, and all the members do not have the same function, so we, though many, are one body in Christ (*ἐν ὧμα ἐν ἡμῖν*), and individually members one of another." This is the only passage in which the *σῶμα* concept is followed by *ἐν ἡμῖν*. Evidently the idea of a "body" is nothing more than a picture in this context. Yet even as a pure metaphor, the *σῶμα* concept is highly significant. Stoeckhardt's comments are excellent: "Wir die Vielen, wir Christen alle ein Leib sind in Christo, in der Lebensgemeinschaft mit Christo, im Einzelnen aber Glieder, jeder einzelne Christ ein Glied an dem geistlichen Leib, der Gemeinde der Glaebigen."<sup>34</sup> By virtue of their incorporation into Christ, all believers form a corporate whole.<sup>35</sup> The new creation, the *ἐκκλῆσια*, is

33. Cf. Burton, op. cit., p. 307f. So also Thornton, op. cit., p. 48ff. See also Zahn and Schlatter, ad. loc.

34. Stoeckhardt, Kommentar ueber den Brief Pauli an die Roemer, p. 563.

35. For parallels from the classics, see the commentaries. The distinctive element in Paul's use of the picture of the body is the manner in which it is related to an individual, to Christ, be that with a genitive, as in 1Cor. 12, or with a prepositional phrase, as here, or by means of the *κεφαλή* idea, as in Colossians and Ephesians. Thus the Christian content all but obliterates the familiar pattern. For the relation of the *σῶμα τῷ ἡμῖν* concept to the Sacrament, see Sasse, op. cit.,



united under Christ, the Head, because all believers, individually and corporately, are "in Christ Jesus."

With that our investigation comes to a close. In the last two passages (in the Galatians perhaps even more so than in the Romans passage) we have come face to face with the  $\epsilon\omega\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \chi\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$ . We have at length arrived at a point of departure for a study of the wider problem to which this study is but a prolegomenon. It should be clear from our investigation that the  $\epsilon\omega\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \chi\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$  is not the body in which Christ lives as the Spirit of that body. The Church, in other words, is not the measure of Christ's objective reality. Nor is the believer, individually or as a member of the  $\epsilon\omega\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \chi\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$ , to be identified absolutely with Christ. Fundamental, I believe, is the idea of incorporation into Christ, and its correlate, incorporation into the New Israel, the new creation of God. This idea, we have seen, is basic in Paul's thought. It is already implicit in the central Pauline belief in the substitutionary work of Christ. Whatever more the  $\epsilon\omega\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \chi\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$  is meant to express, this much certainly it contains.<sup>36</sup>

---

especially p. 37ff., and Rawlinson, "Corpus Christi", op. cit., pp. 225-244.

36. The final solution is, no doubt, not as simple as Percy suggests. He believes that incorporation into Christ becomes identification with the body of Christ, by a slight turn of expression. Yet it seems to me that he comes very close to a satisfactory solution of the problem in 1Cor. 12. He believes that there is a mixing of two related ideas, incorporation into Christ and the idea of the Christian community as a corporate whole, op. cit., p. 43ff.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALTHAUS, PAUL, Der Brief an die Roemer, in Das neue Testament Deutsch, Goettingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1946.
- BELL, G., and DEISSMANN, ADOLF, Mysterium Christi, Christological Studies by British and German Theologians, London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1930.
- BRUNNER, EMIL, The Divine-Human Encounter, Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1943.
- BURTON, ERNEST DEWITT, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, in the ICC, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920.
- DEBRUNNER, ALBERT, Friedrich Blass' Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch, Goettingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1913.
- CARR, ARTHUR, "The Fellowship of Acts 2,42 and Cognate Words", The Expositor, series eight V, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1913.
- DEISSMANN, G. ADOLF, Die neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu", Marburg, N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1892.
- DEISSMANN, G. ADOLF, Paulus, Eine kultur- und religionsgeschichtliche Skizze, Tuebingen, J. C. B. Mohr, 1925.
- DODD, C. H., The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, in the Moffatt New Testament Commentary, New York, Harper and Brothers, preface dated 1932.
- FEINE, PAUL, Der Apostel Paulus, Das Ringen um das geschichtliche Verstaendnis des Paulus, Guetersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1927.
- FEINE, PAUL, Theologie des neuen Testaments, fourth edition, Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1922.
- GUEBROD, WALTER, Die paulinische Anthropologie, Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1934.



- \*SHAHN, TR., Das Mitsterben und Mitaufsterben mit Christus  
Guetersloh, 1937.
- HOLTZMANN, HEINRICH JULIUS, Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen  
Theologie II, second edition, Tuebingen, J. C. B. Mohr,  
1911.
- HUNTER, ARCHIBALD M., The Message of the New Testament, Phila-  
delphia, The Westminster Press, 1944.
- KAESEMANN, ERNST, Leib und Leib Christi, Tuebingen, J. C. B.  
Mohr, 1933.
- KITTEL, GERHARD, Theologisches Woerterbuch zum neuen Testament,  
Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer, 1933f.
- KNOX, JOHN, Christ the Lord, The Meaning of Jesus in the Early  
Church, Chicago, Willett, Clark and Co., 1945.
- KOEHLER, JOH. PH., Der Brief Pauli an die Galater, Milwaukee,  
Northwestern Publishing House, 1910.
- LIEBZMANN, HANS, Geschichte der alten Kirche I, Berlin, Verlag  
Walter de Gruyter, 1937.
- \*LINTON, B. O., Das Problem der Urkirche in der neuen Forschung,  
Uppsala, 1932.
- LOCK, WALTER, The Epistle to the Ephesians, in the Westminster  
Commentaries, London, Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1929.
- LOHMEYER, ERNST, Die Briefe an die Philipper, an die Kolosser  
und an Philemon, in Meyer's Commentary II, eighth edition,  
Goettingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1930.
- MACHEN, J. GRESHAM, The Origin of Paul's Religion, New York,  
The Macmillan Co., 1923.
- MITTRING, KARL, Heilswirklichkeit bei Paulus, Ein Beitrag zum  
Verstaendnis der unio cum Christo in den Paulusbriefen,  
Guetersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1929.
- MOENKEMOELLER, W., " ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ", in Lehre und Wehre, 57B,  
St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1911.
- MOFFATT, JAMES, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians,  
in the Moffatt New Testament Commentary, New York, Harper  
and Brothers, no date.



- MORRISON, CHARLES CLAYTON, What Is Christianity? Chicago, Willett, Clark and Co., 1940.
- MOULTON, W. F., and GEEDEN, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament, second edition, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1913.
- NESTLE, ERWIN, Novum Testamentum Graece, ed. 18, Stuttgart, Privilegierte Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1948.
- THE NEW TESTAMENT OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOR JESUS CHRIST, Revised Standard Version, New York, Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1946.
- PERCY, ERNST, Der Leib Christi in den paulinischen Homologomena und Antilegomena, Lund, C. W. K. Gleerup, 1942.
- PERCY, ERNST, Untersuchungen ueber den Ursprung der Johanneischen Theologie, zugleich ein Beitrag nach der Entstehung des Gnostizismus, Lund, Gleerupska Universitetsbokhandel, 1939.
- PHILIPPI, FRIEDRICH A., Erklaerung des Briefes Pauli an die Galater, Guetersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1884.
- POPE PIUS XII, Mystici Corporis Christi, New York, The Paulist Press, no date.
- RADFORD, LEWIS B., The Epistle to the Colossians and the Epistle to Philemon, London, Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1931.
- RAWLINSON, A. E. J., The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ, London, Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1926.
- ROBERTSON, A. T., A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research, New York, Hodder and Stoughton, 1915.
- SANDAY, WILLIAM, and HEADLAM, ARTHUR C., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, in the ICC, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903.
- SCHMIDT, TRAUOGOTT, Der Leib Christi, Eine Untersuchung zum urchristlichen Gemeindegedanken, Leipzig, A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1919.
- SASSE, HERMANN, Kirche und Herrenmahl, Ein Beitrag zum Verstaendnis des Altarsakraments, Muenchen, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1938.
- SCHLATTER, ADOLF, Paulus der Bote Jesu, Eine Deutung seiner Briefe an die Korinther, Stuttgart, Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1934.



- SCHMAUCH, WERNER, In Christus, Eine Untersuchung zur Sprache und Theologie des Paulus, Guetersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1935.
- SCHWEITZER, ALBERT, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, New York, Henry Holt and Co., 1931.
- STEWART, JAMES S., A Man in Christ, The Vital Elements of St. Paul's Religion, New York, Harper and Brothers, no date.
- STOECKHARDT, G., Kommentar ueber den Brief Pauli an die Eoheser, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1910.
- STOECKHARDT, G., Kommentar ueber den Brief Pauli an die Roemer, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1907.
- STRACK, HERMANN L., and BILLERBECK, PAUL, Kommentar zum neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch III, Muenchen, C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926.
- SWEET, HENRY BARCLAY, The Holy Spirit in the New Testament, London, Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1921.
- THORNTON, L. S., The Common Life in the Body of Christ, Westminster, Dacre Press, first published 1942.
- \*WAGENFUEHRER, M. A., Die Bedeutung Christi fuer Welt und Kirche, Leipzig, 1941.
- WEBER, D., "Die Formel 'in Christo Jesu' und die paulinische Christumystik", Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift XXI, Leipzig, A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1920.
- WENDLAND, HEINZ-DIETRICH, Die Briefe an die Korinther, in Das neue Testament Deutsch, Goettingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1946.
- \*WIKENHAUSER A., Die Kirche als der mystische Leib Christi nach dem Apostel Paulus, Muenster i. W., 1940.
- WINER, GEO. BENEDICT, A Grammar of the New Testament Idiom, seventh edition, tr. Thayer, J. Henry, Andover, Warren F. Draper, 1889.
- ZAHN, TH., Grundriss der neutestamentlichen Theologie, Leipzig, A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1928.
- ZAHN, TH., Der Brief des Paulus an die Roemer, Leipzig, A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1910.

Note: Books prefixed by an asterisk (\*) have not been cited in the body of the paper, but have been added for the sake of completeness.