1. THE CONTROVERSIAL DOMAIN OF TERMINOLOGY

The subject of Christ's atoning death is so many-sided that the apostle Paul has to use a variety of metaphors and expressions in order to elucidate its profound depths.

The various terms pertaining to Christ's atoning work are interlocked and form a composite pattern (cf. Nicole 1964:193ff) so that it is impossible to keep them completely apart. However, this does not facilitate the task of the exegete. For a number of the key words, phrases and metaphors concerned can be, and have been, understood in more than one sense. In historical theology this has given rise to an impressive variety of theories of atonement. Gustav Aulén (1970) rightly reduces the various theories to three motifs of atonement, namely the classic motif; the objective motif; and the subjective motif.1)

Here our particular concern is with two soteriological terms, namely, atonement and reconciliation and a few comments on them may facilitate further discussion.

The word atonement is used in a few important senses:

a. It carries a so-called etymological meaning. The verb atone is said to have been derived from an earlier adverbial expression 'at one in accord', being the short form for 'to set at one, that is, to reconcile' (Oxford English Dictionary 1961:s.v.). In this sense atonement (i.e. at-one-ment) is a synonym of the term reconciliation. This 'etymological' meaning is regarded by many as the original one (Baillie 1973:187; Mitton 1962:309) and as the true meaning of the Authorized Version's translation of katallagē in Romans 5:11 by 'atonement'.2) However, concerning this 'etymological' meaning Carver points out that we have here a rare instance of a purely Anglo-Saxon theological term which 'like all purely English terms employed in theology, takes its meaning, ... from the theological content of the Continental and Latin-speaking Schoolmen who employed such English terms as seemed most nearly to convey to the hearers and readers their views' (1930 1:321).

b. Since the translation of the Authorized Version (1611) the word atonement has taken on certain historic overtones denoting the
satisfaction or reparation made for wrong or injury either by giving some equivalent or by doing or suffering something which is received in lieu of an equivalent' (Brown 1925:641).

c. Mackintosh points out that the word has now become a technical term in the English-speaking world, denoting not only the reconciliation itself, but the entire redemptive work of Christ (1920:73).

The first sense (a) is preferred by advocates of the subjective motif of atonement. In its second sense (b) under the objective motif, the term has come to convey the idea that Christ has made amends or reparation for our sins as our penal substitute through his death on the cross. Some want to abandon the word altogether because it says too much (Snaith 1971:94,98); others reject it because it says too little (Hodge 1974:33f).

We noted that the word atonement in one of its meanings is used as a synonym of another great redemptive term, reconciliation. The Oxford English Dictionary defines the verb reconcile as '1. trans. To bring (a person) again into friendly relations to or with (oneself or another) after an estrangement'. Reconciliation, then, belongs to the semantic domain of interpersonal relations; it is required in a situation where hostility or enmity or estrangement prevails since the word envisages the doing away with enmity, the bridging of a quarrel (Morris 1974:1077).

In the New Testament the term is peculiar to the Pauline Corpus where it is regarded as the proper rendering of the katallage- word-group. A crux interpretum, however, is included in the Pauline view of reconciliation. Three views are held. First, that reconciliation consists in a change of heart in man only, namely, in a transition from enmity to penitence and love. Here the term describes something inward only, namely a change in the subjective disposition and attitude of man. So in the subjective motif of atonement. A second view holds that the term describes a heils-geschichtlich event that occurred extra hominem and before anything happened within man. So in the objective motif. Under the former view reconciliation is taken as a purely subjective process, having its effects in a manward direction only; under the latter view as an objective, divine act, accomplished once for all by God through Christ's death on the cross whereby our sins are expiated, the wrath of God is propitiated, and man is delivered from a condition of estrangement that existed on God's side, and restored to friendship with God. Here the focus of the action is godward alone, namely that reconciliation is an event that transpired between God and Christ. The former view precludes the idea of a propitiation of the wrath of God and prefers to speak of the expiation of sin only; the latter maintains that both ideas are unquestionably involved (Morris 1974:1077; Platt 1973:301;
A third view holds that the reconciliation is a mutual affair having its effects both in a godward and a manward direction. Some of the questions involved will be considered in the exegesis below.

2. The word-group concerned is used theologically by Paul alone. The Christian origins of the terminology remains unexplained (Marshall 1978:117). The word-group is not used in the LXX in a theologically significant manner, although it does occur in the Apocrypha (Merkel 1981:645f). The verb *katalldssō* is found six times (Rm 5:10 bis; 1 Cor 7:11; 2 Cor 5:18,19,20). The substantive *katallage* occurs four times (Rm 5:11; 11:15; 2 Cor 5:18,19). The double compound *apakatalldssō* which could have been coined by Paul himself (Büchsel 1933:259, 6f; Dibelius-Greeven 1953:19), is used three times (Eph 2:16; Col 1:20,22).

If we wish to give a componential analysis of the word-group in Paul, our investigation will have to include a detailed exegesis of every passage where Paul deals with the restoration of man's relationship with God. In each case we should determine, strictly speaking, the structure of the pericope concerned (discourse analysis); the immediate constituents (Immediate Constituent Analysis) in order to determine the syntactical coherence on the surface structure; and finally, a semantic level analysis in order to determine its deep structure (Roberts 1973:81). Of course, space forbids dealing with all or any of the contexts concerned in such detail. I have done some of this elsewhere.

What I propose to do below, is first, to investigate Romans 5:1-11 in some detail including a colometric division and a brief discourse analysis of the pericope, some detailed exegesis, and a skeleton immediate constituent analysis of a few verses; next we shall give a brief componential analysis of the whole word-group in Paul; finally we shall draw out some salient points and observations.

3. **ROMANS 5:1-11**

3.1 Discourse analysis

3.1.1 The pericope can be divided into cola as follows:
The exultant joy and expectation of those justified through faith
Romans 5:1-11
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A Rejoicing in the hope of glory

B God’s love manifested in Christ’s death
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3.1.2 The pericope divides into eleven cola and three clusters:

A (cola 1-3)
B (cola 4-10)
C (colon 11)

It is impossible here to go into a thorough analysis of the above discourse analysis. A few observations must suffice.

Cluster B includes cola 4-10. Colon 4 (v.5) has something of a hinge character (cf. Fryer 1979:163ff). But it is probably better to take it with cluster B. In comma 4.1 the connecting δὲ appears to introduce a new phase of the Apostle's reasoning, that is of giving the grounds for our ἐλπίς. That ground lies in the manifestation of God's love in the death of Christ. Both in commata 4.2 and 8.1 the ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ is inseparably connected with the saving-event in Christ's death.

Cola 5-10 divide into two sub-sections:

B(1) consists of cola 5 to 8 (vv.6-8) which have a closely knit structure. The section has an explicative function, namely to indicate why the hope of the believers will not be put to shame.

B(2) includes cola 9 and 10 (vv.9ff). The discourse markers as well as the obvious parallelism between cola 9 and 10 affirm that they belong together. However, the discourse markers recalling the motifs of sin and atonement through Christ's death show that they are semiotactically also very closely linked with the preceding cola (5-8).

The exact syntactic relation of colon 11 with the rest of the pericope is difficult and it is possible to reach divergent conclusions. Various thoughts derived from the entire preceding pericope are resumed here. In fact, every word in colon 11 either repeats or alludes to some preceding event or phrase. The colon has the function of a solemn conclusion to the entire preceding pericope. I take it as a new cluster (C).

The structure of the pericope can be briefly schematized as follows:

MAIN THEME: The exultant joy and expectation of those justified through faith in Christ.

CLUSTER A: Rejoicing in the hope of glory.
(colon 1-3)

CLUSTER B: God's love manifested in Christ's death the ground of our ἐλπίς.
(colon 4-10)
CLUSTER C: We rejoice in God through Christ.
(colon 11)

3.2 Exegetical investigation

3.2.1 With reference to cluster A (cola 1-3) we need to note only two points of exegesis.

First, throughout this cluster God is depicted as the *agens praeveniens*. The divine initiative is expressed in various ways.6) Our own active involvement is by no means disparaged. But throughout cola 1-3 God is envisaged as the *prima causa*, the prevenient actant of the new condition in which the believers now find themselves. Our 'peace' with God (1.2), our 'access' (1.3), our 'exultant joy' (2; 3) rest upon and ensue from, the prevenient soteriological act of God through Christ (cf. *dià*, comma 1.2; *di' hoù* comma 1.3) whereby our justification has been accomplished.

Secondly, the motif of rejoicing in the 'hope' constitutes the theme not only of cluster A, but also of the whole pericope. Colon 2 is the pivotal colon of cluster A. The apostle has already declared (3:27) that all the sinful boasting of the legalist is 'excluded' (*exekleisthè*) with reference to the acquiring of the *dikaiosùné tou theou*. But once we have been justified through faith in Christ we have indeed found a ground for boasting, or exultant joy, namely the *elpis tès dôxes tou theou* (colon 2). Semantically *elpis* is an event-word (= 'we expect') denoting the confidence in something that one knows is going to take place. The term carries overtones of both confidence and expectation. This hope is orientated towards the future: those who have been put right with God through faith in Christ can look forward to nothing less than the *dôxa tou theou*.7) In the expectation of that glory, then, we rejoice exultantly. But, paradoxical as it may seem, we also exult in the midst of and on the basis of8) our present tribulations (colon 3). We can do this because9) we know what God's gracious purpose is by means of these tribulations (comma 3.2ff). The relation of all three sub-cola (3.2.1-3) is that of cause and effect.

3.2.2 In colon 4 the fulfilment of 'our' hope is considered as beyond doubt (cf. *ou kataischiñei*, comma 4.1) because the Holy Spirit has acted in a specific manner in 'our' hearts.

3.2.2.1 Cluster B(1) (cola 5-8)

*Christós* is the noun phrase of colon 5. The verb phrase (*xpe-ðhânèn*) is expanded by three adverbial adjuncts which are descriptive of that death. The whole colon can be reduced to a basic type like *ho anèr aci didòsi*, where the three adverbial extensions to the verb phrase, whether taken together or separately, have
the same syntactic function as aeí. Both the noun phrase and the verb phrase carry particular emphasis by their position. Further, every important word/phrase in colon 5 (excluding kata kai ron) is repeated in 8.2 where the entire hoti-clause is embedded in 8.1. This hoti-clause may indeed serve as a key to the meaning of colon 5 (cf. Kuss 1963:210) and we will have to take the two statements together in our discussion. The hoti is epexegetical. It may be understood either as descriptive of God's love or as indicating the means whereby he has shown us how much he loves us. For Paul, Christ's death is both the proof of the fact, and the manifestation of the nature of God's love. Colon 8 is, in fact, the pivotal colon of cluster B. The whole cluster founds the certainty of our 'hope' on the manifestation of God's love in the death of Christ.

Turning to the adverbial adjuncts of colon 5 we notice:

First, the apostle declares that Christ died (apèthanen). Here, as elsewhere, Paul uses the aorist form when the redemptive significance of Christ's death is in view. The aorist indicative (colon 5; 8.2) points back to the time of Christ's death on the cross.


In due season, then, Christ died ontōn hēmōn asthenōn eī (colon 5). The 'weakness' envisaged here is not a physical one, that is weak, powerless, without ability, as almost always in profane Greek (contra Cremer 1962:525f), nor weakness of faith (Rm 14:1, 2; 1 Cor 8:9; 11:12), but 'weakness' in a moral and spiritual sense. In this sense 'weak' in colon 5 describes the weakness of those who have not yet received the Holy Spirit (Denney 1970:624; Schmidt 1963:93), who are still en tē sarki, that is living in their unredeemed sinful state (Hodge 1964:136; Ridderbos 1959:109), and who are thus 'incapable' of working out any righteousness for themselves. This interpretation is affirmed by the chiastic correlate of ontōn hēmōn asthenōn eī (colon 5) in 8.2, namely eī hamartōlōn ontōn hēmōn. The term asthenēs in colon 5 is identical with hamartōloí ('sinners') (comma 8.2), asebeis ('ungodly') (colon 5) and echthroi ('enemies') (colon 10). In 5 and 8.2 these 'weak', 'ungodly', 'sinners' and 'enemies' of God are identified as 'we'.

The import of cola 5 and 8.2 is that in God's sovereignly appointed
time, Christ died for us while we were still (ἐτί) utterly estranged from God and hopelessly lost in our sins. Consequently, God's love for us, and its demonstration in Christ's death, was not motivated by anything good or righteous within ourselves.15)

The third adverbial adjunct to the verb phrase of colon 5 declares that Christ died ἡπέρ ἀσεβῶν. Throughout cola 5-8 the prepositional phrase ἡπέρ with the genitive is employed to describe the significance of Christ's death for us. The phrase occurs in a chiastic pattern, namely

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ἡπέρ ἀσεβῶν} & \quad \text{(colon 5)} \quad a \\
\text{ἡπέρ δικαίου} & \quad \text{(colon 6)} \quad b \\
\text{ἡπέρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ} & \quad \text{(colon 7)} \quad b \\
\text{ἡπέρ ἡμῶν (=θαμαρτόλων)} & \quad \text{(comma 8.2)}a
\end{align*}
\]

Closer investigation of Paul's usage of the ἡπέρ-formula shows, amongst other things, three important points:

First, that when the apostle is concerned with the benefits which accrue to us from Christ's redemptive work, he uses almost exclusively the preposition ἡπέρ with genitive (cf. Jeremias 1954: 707 note 435). Next, it is significant that in all of the twenty ἡπέρ-passages involved, the ἡπέρ-formula is invariably connected with the death of Christ. This indicates that for Paul, irrespective of the verb employed,16) it is above all Christ's death which dealt decisively with our sins and alienation from God. Finally, it is clear that the ἡπέρ-formula constitutes in Paul a 'formelhaft' (Riesenfeld 1969:512, 12) manner of speaking about the significance of Christ's death. The semiotactic environment of some of the key-passages concerned (e.g. Rm 3:24ff; 5:6ff; 1 Cor 11:24ff; 2 Cor 5:14ff; Gl 3:13) is essentially the same; similar and closely related, motifs, images and metaphors occur again and again. The semantic aspect of the ἡπέρ-formula in these soteriological contexts may for all practical purposes be regarded as identical throughout.

It is obvious that in all such passages ἡπέρ with the genitive can have the general meaning 'on behalf of', in commodum. Many would accept only this meaning in Paul. However, there can be no doubt that in the koine Greek ἡπέρ with the genitive came to be prevalently used instead of ἀντί with the genitive in the sense of 'instead of' (Bauer 1963:1659; ἡπέρ 1c; Mayser 1970:II/2, par. 124,5). Mayser groups under two extensive headings the examples of the substitutionary use of ἡπέρ with the genitive. The custom is well-known where the professional letter-writer acted for an illiterate person.17) That ἡπέρ carries the meaning of substitution in such cases is beyond doubt.18) It is therefore impossible on purely linguistic grounds to exclude a priori the possibility that
in Paul _hupér_ with the genitive can carry the notion of substitution as well. The context is decisive.

In cluster B the context admits of both 'on behalf of' and 'instead of'. Various considerations must be taken into account here. For instance:

(a) Christ's death is directly connected with our _sin_ and _estrangement_ from God: Christ died for 'us', the _asebeis_ (colon 5), the _hamartoi_ (comma 8.2), and the _echthroi_ (colon 10), and the weak and unredeemed (_asthenes_) (colon 5), who are by plain implication under the wrath of God and expecting the impending revelation of that wrath in the day of judgement (cf. colon 9 _sōthēsōmetha_ ktl. and 10).

(b) Next, for Paul, Christ's death has a very definite _sacrificial_ character. To say that Christ 'died' (_apēthanen_, cola 5; 8.2) for us while we were yet sinners (cola 5, 8.2) is equivalent to saying that we are 'justified' _en tō _haimaiti _autoi_ (9) and that we are 'reconciled with God' _días tou_ _thankōtou_ _tou_ _huiou_ _autoi_ (colon 10). As we shall see below the reference to Christ's blood (colon 9) has its background most probably in the _Levitical_ blood sacrifices and more in particular in the _sin-(guilt)-offerings._

In addition, the efficacy ascribed to Christ's death attests to its sacrificial nature. In the present pericope 'justification', 'expiation of sins', 'forgiveness', deliverance/redemption from the divine wrath and condemnation, and restoration of friendship with God (reconciliation) accrue from Christ's death. But, as Warfield maintains, 'This is the very language of the altar' (1958:194). For these are the very blessings which the people of God sought and obtained under the old dispensation by means of the Levitical sacrificial ritual.

(c) Next, the divine initiative which is so prominent in cluster A, pervades cluster B as well. The prevenient action of God in Christ is once again expressed by finite verbs, namely (_Christos_) _apēthanen_ (cola 5; 8.2); (_ho_ _theos_) _sunistēsin_, ktl. (comma 8.1); and by _passiva_ _divina_, namely _dikaiōthēntes_ (colon 9); _sōthēsometha_ (cola 9; 10); _katēllagentes_ and _kataallagentes_ (colon 10). It is also implicit in all the prepositional and participial phrases in cola 5, 8, 9 and 10. Especially noteworthy is the manner in which Christ's death is described in colon 8, which forms the pivotal statement of the cluster, namely as the supreme manifestation of God's love towards us. Now, all this corresponds with the setting within which the Levitical sacrificial ritual operated. The sole initiative was Yahweh's; it was he who gave 'the blood ... upon the altar to make atonement' for the sins of his people (Lv 17:11). The entire sacrificial cult originated from the _hesed_ of Yahweh and
was a manifestation of his covenant-love.

(d) The thought of Christ as the Mediator between God and man underlies the whole pericope. It is implicit in comma 1.1f and 11.1f where our 'peace' and 'reconciliation' with God are viewed as explicitly connected with Christ's mediatorial work; it underlies the concept of the ἑκτορίζω, where Christ acts as the go-between (col. 10; 11.2), as well as the semiotactically related thought of Christ as the one who overcame the alienation between God and men (cf. ἑκτορίζω, κτλ. col. 10). This is in accordance with the Levitical context where the High Priest acts as the divinely appointed mediator at the blood sacrifices in order to effect atonement for sin and the rectification in integrum of the sinners (cf. Ex 28:1f; 30:30; 40:13b,15; Lv 10:17).

(e) The thought of solidarity between 'the one' and 'the many' functions conspicuously in the pericope.19) In all the occurrences of 'we' in comma 1.2ff and 11.1ff the pronoun, ἡμῶν, depicts the intimate relationship of 'the one' (Christ) with 'the many' ('us'). In cola 5 and 8 it strikes us how explicitly 'the one' is set over against 'the many': Christ the righteous one, 'died' so that 'the many', 'we', who are described as ἀσθενεῖς, ἀσβεῖς and ἁμαρτῶν, may be 'justified' through his 'blood' (col. 9), and 'reconciled' through his 'death' (col. 10). The relationship envisaged here is one of solidarity, a thought which is even more marked in the pericope immediately following upon Romans 5:1-11; namely verses 12-21. An identical situation is envisaged in connection with the Levitical sacrificial ritual: the death of the sacrificial victim could benefit the offerer because the laying on of hands created such a solidarity between offerer and sacrificial victim that the latter became his representative and even substitute.

(f) Finally, we recognize unmistakable echoes of the ebed yahweh of Isaiah 53 throughout the pericope. All the crucial motifs referred to above as underlying the sin-offerings, underlie the work of the ebed as well. That Paul understood Christ's death in the light of Isaiah 53 as well, is evident from other passages (e.g. 2 Cor 5:11ff; Gl 3:13). In the present pericope, however, the priestly (sin- and guilt-offerings; Day of Atonement) and the prophetic (Is 53) strands of Old Testament thinking have merged together so completely that it is impossible to separate them from one another.

All this serves to affirm that Paul is here thinking along Old Testament lines of atonement. Christ's death is absolutely unique in that it is a sacrifice for the expiation of our sins. Our understanding of the sin-offerings and of the death of the ebed in the Old Testament will, therefore, decisively influence our interpretation of the overtones in the present pericope. On the basis of my
investigation elsewhere on the relevant Old Testament background (Fryer 1979), I am convinced:

(i) that the preposition *huper* carried a substitutionary sense in cola 5 and 8;
(ii) that Christ's death here effects not only the expiation of sins, but also the *propitiation* of the divine wrath which is implicit in our pericope.

3.2.2.2 Cluster B(2) (Cola 9, 10)

The immediate constituent analysis given on page 46 reflects the semantic grouping of words and the deep structure of cola 9 and 10.

Without going into any detailed discussion of the immediate constituent analysis on page 46 we simply notice a few salient points.21)

1. The event words of colon 9 represent four kernel sentences:

   a) (Since) (God) put us right.
   b) Christ died.
   c) Christ shall save us.
   d) (God) is angry.

Colon 10 contains six kernel sentences:

   a) We were (God's) enemies.
   b) (God) restored us to friendship.
   c) His Son died.
   d) (Because) God restored (us) to friendship.
   e) (Christ) shall save us.
   f) Christ lives.

2. The relationship between the above kernels are as follows:

   With reference to colon 9:
   (i) Kernel b is the means of the event in kernel a.
   (ii) Kernel c states the result of kernels b and a.
   (iii) Kernel d is the goal of the events in kernels a and c and states the reason for kernel b.

   With reference to colon 10:
   (i) Kernel a precedes kernels b and c in time and is the cause of kernel c.
(ii) Kernel b is the goal of the event in kernel c.

(iii) Kernel d states the result of the event in kernel c and the basis for the event in kernel e.

(iv) Kernel e is the result of the events in f and c.

(v) Kernel f is the means of the event in kernel e and is in contrast to that in c.

Colon 9 is a conclusion (οὖν) of the preceding. The connection of colon 9 with colon 10 is rather loose. The relational γὰρ (colon 10) represents an original γ' δρα (cf. Lenski 1961:351), and introduces a co-ordinate clause. Its function is the same as that of οὖν in colon 9, namely drawing a conclusion from cola 4-8. Cola 9 (οὖν) and 10 (γὰρ) are arranged paratactically each constituting a conclusion which follows a fortiori from the fact of Christ's death (cola 5-8). This has an important bearing on our understanding of cola 9 and 10.

Turning to some points of exegesis we may note:

Colon 9

The word dikaiōthē̂ntes (colon 9) resumes the dikaiōthē̂ntes (colon 1). Here (as in colon 1) it envisages a forensic situation underlining that justification is not an object of hope, but a grace already granted to the believer. It constitutes an event from which certain definite conclusions can be drawn. In colon 1 the conclusion concerns the present, namely 'we have peace with God'; here it concerns the future, namely 'we shall be saved through him from the wrath'.

Justification is said to have been achieved ἐν τῷ ἁιματὶ αὐτοῦ. It is a mistake to see the background of the 'blood' reference in the passover liturgy (contra Michel 1966:135; Schmidt 1963:94). Also Moore's contention is quite arbitrary that ἁίμα does not carry sacrificial overtones here (and in Rm 3:25), but that it could be employed here 'merely in allusion to Jesus' violent death' (1903: 4229f; Delling 1964:89). Christ's death was not an especially bloody death so that the particular emphasis on his 'blood' cannot be explained from the kind of death he died.

The formulation ἁίμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ has to be understood in soteriological categories. It describes a soteriological event, namely that Christ died as an atoning sacrifice for sins (Ridderbos 1974:80). As such it is a 'prägnantes Wortsymbol' (Behm 1933:174, 31) which is, 'wie "Kreuz" nur ein anderer, anschaulicher Ausdruck für die Tod Christi in seiner Heilsbedeutung' (173, 32ff). It does not speak of a life liberated, but is the symbol of 'vergossenes Blut, gewaltsam zerstörtes Leben, Tod, Mord'.
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I reject, then, Westcott's view (1892:35) that 'blood' in a sacrificial context represents Christ's life '(1) as rendered in free self-sacrifice to God for man, and (2) as brought into perfect fellowship with God, having been set free by death'. Denney (1964:149f) rightly speaks of 'the strange caprice which fascinated' Westcott in distinguishing in the 'blood' of Christ, '(i) His life laid down, and (ii) His life liberated and made available for men ...'

Nor is Deissman's contention acceptable that the 'cult-phrase', 'the blood of Christ' is 'a vivid way of realising the Living One who is also the Crucified, and with Whom we live in a mystical-spiritual "fellowship of blood"' (1957:198). The context is not concerned with such a Christ-mysticism of a 'mystical-spiritual "fellowship of blood"'.

It is possible to take the en as instrumental.25) To my mind, however, it is more in accord with the Old Testament background of Paul's thought here to take the preposition as reflecting the Hebrew bō-pértī, 'at the cost of'. In this sense Christ's 'blood', that is his sacrificial death in its Heilsbedeutung is the price whereby he has effected our justification (Barrett 1975:197; Greijdanus 1933:1, 269).

The phrase en tō haimatī authou, then, is a technical expression giving expression to Christ's death in all its redemptive significance. In a context like the present where the redemptive nature and efficacy of that death are concerned, we should not hesitate to give full cognizance to the sacrificial and redemptive overtones included.

It is plain from our observations on the immediate constituent analysis above that both in cola 9 and 10 the subject of the verb σώθησομεθα is Christ himself: the living Christ (colon 10) shall save us from God's anger (colon 9).

Colon 10

The two conclusions of cola 9 and 10 run parallel to each other. In addition, the statement of the first part of colon 10 is closely paralleled to that of comma 8.2 The parallelism involved can be set out in outline as follows:
We notice:

(1) Paul parallels the state of being 'sinners' in a(i) and being 'enemies' in b(i). However in context there is an important distinction as we shall see below.

(2) Christ's 'death' in b(iii) is synonymous with his 'blood' in a(iii). The particular characterization of his death in a(iii) as 'in His blood' brings out in what respect that death differs so radically from any other death, namely in its sacrificial quality.

(3) Some scholars would agree with Schlatter that dikaiôthênêtes in colon 9(ii) and the katallagêntes in 10(ii) signify 'inhaltlich dasselbe' (1965:183; Barrett 1975:108; Käsemann 1974:130; Nygren 1965:151ff). It is indeed impossible to separate the two metaphors in Paul's thought. But neither should we equate them. They describe two closely related, yet distinct facets of Christ's many-sided work of redemption (Sanday & Headlam 1971:128f; cf. Büchsel 1933:255, 39ff).

The terms katellagêmen and katallagêntes (colon 10) are real passives. Consequently, it is not correct to represent for example katellagêmen by an active, 'we laid aside our hostility to God', or, by what is virtually an active, 'we were won to lay aside our hostility' (Denney 1970 I:626). That the verb is indeed passive is affirmed by various considerations. We note a few salient points only: First, the phrase 'being reconciled (katallagêntes) by the death of His Son' (colon 10) evidently corresponds to 'being now justified (dikaiôthêntes) by His blood' (colon 9). There can
be no doubt that *dikaiοθέντες* is passive, expressing a forensic thought and not a subjective inner change in man (Büchel 1933: 256, 19; Greijdanus 1933:1, 268). It takes up the *dikaiοθέντες* from comma 1.1 and speaks *heiligeschichtlich* of the present age (*nun*) (Lekkerkerker 1974:82; Stählin 1942:1106, 21ff; Tachau 1972:82) which has been inaugurated by God's action in Christ (Rm 3:21ff). Like *dikaiοθέντες* the verbs *katallagentes* and *katellάgomen* indicate both the divine initiative and the fact that the 'we' are mere recipients of the results of the prevenient act of God in Christ.

Secondly, the context speaks decidedly in favour of the passive:

(i) We noted that throughout the passage (cola 1-11) Paul is absorbed in the *magnalia Dei*, showing forth carefully what God has done in Christ and what results have accrued for 'us' from that death. To take *katellάgomen* and *katallagentes* as indicating in any sense whatsoever some human activity is incompatible with the context which is concerned only with God's doings.27)

(ii) Throughout cola 5-11 (vv.6-11) the apostle describes how the entire work of redemption (including the *katallage*) is a manifestation of God's love (8). The point at issue is not whether 'we' too, afterwards lay aside our enmity towards God. This is the subjective side of the *katallage* and it does have its legitimate place (2 Cor 5:20). But in our present context (colon 10) Paul leaves the subjective side out of sight, 'completely and intentionally' (Denney 1970 I:626). Why? Because 'the laying aside of our hostility adds nothing to God's love. throws no light upon it: hence in an exposition of the love of God it can be ignored' (Denney 1970: cf. Hodge 1964:139f; Murray 1967:173).

(iii) Furthermore, I noted earlier that the phrases *en tō haimati autō* (colon 9) and *dīa tōu thanatōu tōu huioi autō* (colon 10) are semantic near-equivalents. Both phrases are concerned with God's dealings with reference to an objective situation which existed previous to Christian experience and with which Christian experience is in no way identical. In the former instance it is the *dikaiοθέντες* (colon 9), in the latter the *katallagentes* (colon 10), which is said to have resulted. However, 'justification' and 'reconciliation' are simply two facets of the very same new situation inaugurated by God's prevenient act in Christ.

(4) The words 'we shall be saved by his life' (b(iv)) carry a meaning inseparable from, but nevertheless, quite distinct from that of 'we shall be saved by him from the wrath' in a(iv). His 'life' is his resurrection life. What is in view is not the resurrection as an event, but Christ's resurrection life in exaltation (Murray 1967:174). Union with the living, glorified Lord is what saves 'us'
from the wrath to come (Sanday and Headlam 1971:129). Here, as in Romans 4:25 the apostle does not suggest that Christ's death effects one thing and his resurrection another. The a fortiori nature of the argument stresses the inseparable connection that exists between Christ's death and resurrection; and that just as these 'may never be dissociated so the benefits accruing from the one may never be severed from those accruing from the other' (Murray 1967:175; Schmidt 1963:95; Delling 1970:94, 98ff).

(5) Our understanding of the phrase ecdhroï óntes (colon 10) has decisive bearing on our understanding of the focus of the katallagē. The phrase can carry any of three overtones here. It can be used

(a) actively, that is of man's hostility towards God: hostile to, hating (God); or

(b) passively, that is of God looking upon man as enemies: hated of God; or

(c) to designate a mutual relationship between God and man.

The following considerations show conclusively, to my mind, that only the passive sense is admissible in our pericope:

(i) There are three occurrences of the word ecdhros in Paul which are relevant to our subject, namely Romans 5:10; 11:28; Colossians 1:21. I have concluded elsewhere that in both Romans 11:28 and Colossians 1:21 the context demands the passive sense (Fryer 1979:196ff; 255ff).

(ii) Also the context of Romans 5:10 demands the passive sense only (cf. Denney 1970:625; Murray 1967:172).

We noticed earlier that the designations astheneis (colon 5), asebeis (colon 5), hamartoloi (comma 8.2), and ecdhroï (colon 10) are all identified as the 'we' of the believers. The first three designations can only carry an active sense in the context. Consequently, it is easy to see why some have concluded that ecdhroï must also be active here. But the semiotactic environment is not the same. Cluster B(2) draws out conclusions from the preceding. Christ's death is portrayed as the causa meritoria/instrumentalis of both the 'justification' and the 'reconciliation'. 'At the cost of' his own life Christ removed the threat of the 'wrath of God' and secured the katallagē (colon 10).28) The wrath of God is undoubtedly more than a mere process of retribution at work in a moral universe (Dodd); also more than a mere dispassionate objective anger, as of a judge (Fryer 1979:10f; 12, 125ff).
On account of Christ's death God's wrath no longer threatens 'us'. On the contrary, the former objects of his wrath have now become the recipients of the choicest divine blessings, namely dikaiosùnê (colon 1, 9); prosagôge prós tôn theôn (comma 1.3); elpis (cola 2; 3.2.3; 4.1); the sôthesômetha apô tês orgês (colon 9); katallage (cola 10; 11.2). The whole pericope deals with what God the prevenient actant secured without 'us' through the mediation of Christ. The entire outcome of that divine act is envisaged here as accomplished objectively. In this gallery of blessings objectively secured through Christ's death the katallage constitutes simply one facet. What gives to the term (echthroi) its objective overtones here, is the fact that the reconciling death of Christ was in relation to the wrath of God. This implies that God was against man in his sin, and that it was first and foremost in relation to God that Christ suffered.

(iii) The sacrificial character of the context points in the same direction. Neither in the Levitical sacrificial cult nor in Isaiah 53 - both of which Old Testament trends of thought form the stubborn substratum of our pericope - was the result of the death of the 'victim' envisaged as directed primarily towards the subjective change of the attitude of the offerer/'the many'. In like manner, the new relationship with God which ensued was not regarded as primarily a subjective change of the feelings or attitude of the offerer/'the many' toward God. The sacrifice, alternatively, the work of the ebed, intended to remove the obstacles (sin, etc.) so that the sinner/'the many' might be restored to fellowship with God. 'Fellowship' (alternatively, katallage) and 'wrath' were the two 'faces' of God's personal relationship with his people. Both were above all objective realities which existed prior to and outside man. 'Fellowship' with God (alternatively, katallage) was something which man could enter into on certain conditions.

(iv) In favour of the passive sense, we see here that the attitude of man towards God was not changed by the fact of Christ's death (Ladd 1974:406). Separated from Christ men are still tekna phûsei orgês (cf. Eph 2:1ff; 4:17ff); it is only when a man has come to be 'in Christ' and Christ lives in him (2 Cor 13:5; Gl 2:20; Col 1:27) that he can experience the renewal of 'the inner man' by the Spirit of God (Rm 12:2; Eph 4:22ff; Col 3:9f).

(v) Finally, and closely connected with the previous points, is the fact that Paul is primarily thinking in terms of Heilsgeschichte when he speaks of reconciliation. It is God alone who acts in Christ, to change his relationship with 'us' from 'wrath' to 'friendship'; in Christ, he inaugurated the passing away of the 'old things', that is the former aeon of sin and wrath, and the revelation of the 'new' aeon of reconciliation (2 Cor 5:17; Col 1:21ff). These two aeons form two mutually exclusive relationships of God.
to man (Col 1:21ff). Christ's death, manifesting God's love for the former objects of his wrath, inaugurated the turning-point. Since his death effected the turning away of the wrath of God, it is obvious that, first and foremost, that death has a God-ward direction.

To my mind, then, the 'enmity' invisaged in Romans 5:10 is to be taken in the passive sense alone. It reflects primarily the attitude which existed on God's side; in addition, it speaks of God's relationship with man in terms of Heilsgeschichte. However, it does not go far enough to explain the passive sense as meaning only 'that God regards sinners as in a state of enmity toward him'\(^23\).

That relation includes feelings, emotions, as well. On God's side it meant that in the former state 'we' were in so real a sense objects of the divine displeasure that the apostle describes our condition as tékna phusei orgés (Eph 2: 3), and as elpída mē échontes kal átheoi en tō kósvo (Eph 2:12).

Provided that we take 'God's enemies' and 'God's friends' in the passive sense, Today's English Version's translation is acceptable, namely

colon 9 'By his death we are now put right with God: how much more, then, will we be saved by Him from God's wrath'

colon 10 'We were God's enemies, but he made us His friends through the death of His Son. Now that we are God's friends, how much more will we be saved by Christ's life!'

To be rejected, however, in the light of our discussion above, is Barclay's translation of colon 10, '... it was the death of His Son which restored us to friendship with God, even when we were hostile to Him ...'

Colon 11

The transition from colon 10 to 11 is not immediately clear. It is possible to take ou mónon dé with sótēsōmetha as the implied verb, namely 'not only (as reconciled shall we be saved) but also rejoicing...' (cf. Schmidt 1963:95). But this reading is awkward. Denney is right that 'there is no proportion between the things thus co-ordinated' (1970:626). It is better to take kauchōmenoi\(^30\) as adding an independent idea (Denney 1970:626; Lenski 1961: 355f). However, we noticed above that colon 11 also resumes basic motifs both from clusters A and B. The theme of the exultant rejoicing of the believer in the hope of glory and on the grounds of Christ's sacrificial death runs through the entire pericope. Within this structure colon 11 appears to have the nature of a solemn
conclusion to the whole preceding pericope.31)

Once again the prevenient activity of God in Christ is in view. Implicit in our 'rejoicing in God' (comma 11.1) is the thought that God through Christ (dia kti.) is the author of both the possibility and the occasion of that joy. In comma 11.2 the term eldbomen implies a condition of passivity on 'our' part with reference to the securing, the establishing, of the katallage. 'We' are simply the recipients of it. Our own activity lies in receiving, in appropriating, the katallage. The aorist indicative (eldbomen) looks at the katallage as a 'past realization' (Robertson 1931 IV:357) in Christ ante nos et extra nos.

The term katallage is an event-word carrying essentially the same semantic values as katelladgemen and katallagéntes (colon 10).

The nun (comma 11.2), resuming the nun of (3.2.1 and) colon 9, is the nun of God's heilsgeschichtlich present.

4. COMPONENTIAL ANALYSIS OF WORD-GROUP

We can now turn to a componential analysis of the relevant word-group in Paul. Our intention is not to deal with all the semantic features included in every occurrence of a particular word. We intend rather to establish the distinctive features of meaning only, that is the diagnostic semantic components.

4.1 The terms katallassein (1 Cor 7:11; 2 Cor 5:18,19,20; Rm 5:10 (bis)); katallage (2 Cor 5:18,19; Rm 5:11; 11:15); and apokatallasssein (Col 1:20,22; Eph 2:16) are all compound forms made from the simple verb alldsein, to change, that is to cause one thing to cease and another to take its place (Thayer 1961:28). In fact, the verb (alldsein) can be used of almost any kind of change (Barclay 1964:165). The preposition katá in katallassein accents the perfected idea, 'to effect a thorough or complete change'. The preposition apó in apokatallasssein is probably intensive in all three occurrences in Paul. The double compound, then, probably carries the same sense as katallassein, conveying the idea of a complete change (Robertson 1931:481).

4.2 Turning to the passages concerned we notice:

4.2.1 With reference to katallassein

(a) 1 Corinthians 7:11 envisages a situation where a husband and wife are at odds. The wife presumably feels offended by her husband. In her indignation she leaves him. The apostle now urges her to lay aside her feeling of offence, to seek the
restoration of friendly relations with her husband, and to resume the marriage relationship. The verb is used in the aorist passive imperative form. The sense is: 'X (the offended party, the wife) gives up her own anger against Y (the husband)'.

The following diagnostic semantic components are included:

(i) A husband and a wife are estranged from each other.
(ii) The wife leaves her husband.
(iii) One of the parties (the wife) takes the initiative in restoring the friendship.
(iv) A (lost) relationship of friendship is restored.

(b) In all five of the remaining occurrences of *katallasssein* the interpersonal relationship involved does not lie on the inter-human level as in 1 Corinthians 7:11, but on the divine-human level. In each case God is somehow directly involved. These five occurrences are found in two contexts (viz. 2 Cor 5:11-6:2 and 5:1-11) which in their soteriological contents are partly essentially identical and partly complementary to one another. The verb is used in an active as well as a passive sense.

There are two senses included: first, it is a reconciliation *qua deus nos sibi reconciliavit*, that is whereby God put away his wrath against our sins so that there is no longer any barrier on his side to receiving us into fellowship. In this 'narrow sense' (Marshall 1978:128) reconciliation is an objective event effected once for all through Christ's death. (So in 2 Cor 5:18,19; Rm 5:10(bis) Trench 1963:292). In this narrow sense the term is used in a meaning that seems to be unprecedented in secular Greek usage, namely 'X removes the cause of his own anger against Y, namely, Y's sin (active)' (Marshall 1978:127f).

Secondly, a 'broad sense' is found when 'God reconciled us to himself' means that 'God enters into the fellowship with men which the death of Jesus has made possible' (Marshall 1978:128). The objects of the finished work of Christ is variously identified as 'us' (2 Cor 5:18), the 'kosmos' in the sense of the totality of mankind (v.19b), and 'us' (Rm 5:10(bis)). In this sense reconciliation is an event *qua nos deo reconciliamur*. It includes the deposition on our side of our enmity and estrangement toward God. This is the meaning of the aorist passive imperative, *katallassete* (*tō theō*) in 2 Cor 5:20. Here the appeal is not directed to the Corinthians but is a brief summary of the contents of Paul's missionary preaching. The emphasis is on the response of mankind who is called upon to appropriate as its own God's 'Generalamnestie' (Windisch) which he now freely offers in his Son through the *diakonia tēs*
We can, thus, distinguish at least three stages in the process of reconciliation: First, there is God's prevenient act in the death of Christ whereby the *katallagē* was achieved once for all in both its narrow and broad sense. Next, there is the proclamation of reconciliation. The event and its proclamation belong together (2 Cor 5:18,19). Third, there is man's acceptance of and response to the proclamation of the *katallagē*. This includes man's laying aside his own enmity against God and accepting through faith God's gift of reconciliation in Christ.

The following diagnostic semantic components may be noted:

(i) An existing relationship of estrangement between God and man.

(ii) One of the 'parties' takes the initiative in restoring the friendship.

(iii) A lost relationship of friendship is restored.

An important semantic distinction from 1 Corinthians 7:11 concerns the *initiator* of the act of reconciliation. In 1 Corinthians 7:11 it is the wife. In 2 Corinthians 5:20 the response of mankind is in view. The aorist passive imperative indicates that man's part is that of recipient not inaugurator of the *katallagē*. The implied prevenient actant is God. The divine initiative is beyond doubt in 2 Corinthians 5:18,19. Both passives in Romans 5:10 (bis) are divine passives, reflecting God's prevenient act.

The *causa meritoria* of the reconciliation in both contexts (2 Cor 5:18ff and Rm 5:10 (bis)) is Christ's death (Rm 5:10) whereby the non-reckoning of sins has been secured (2 Cor 5:19). In both passages God himself is the subject of the action. (The second component (ii above) is formulated vaguely on purpose. In all cases (excluding 2 Cor 5:20) it is the offended 'party', who takes the initiative in restoring the relationship).

With reference to (iii) the verb would seem to be used in two senses in Romans 5:10. In verse 10a of God reconciling 'us' to himself (passive, of men); and in verse 10b of 'us' who have actually entered into the state of reconciliation (Marshall 1978:125).

The following diagram reflects the interrelationships where men are involved:
4.2.2 *Katallagē*

The term has essentially the same force in all three contexts. The substantive depicts an event of which God is the implied subject, that is '(God) reconciles'. In 2 Corinthians 5:18,19 the ministry of the *katallagē* entrusted to 'us' is the proclamation of the divine action whereby God in Christ restores 'us'/the 'kosmos' to his friendship. The *katallagē* that we 'received' (*eldibomen*) in Romans 5:11 would seem to include the same double sense as the verbs in 5:10. Included is the entry into the personal experience of this restored relationship with God. In the context of Romans 11:11-16 the *katallagē* (v.15) is used in contrast to the idea of God's rejection of unbelieving Israel. The focus is on the divine act of restoring mankind to his friendship.

4.2.3 *Apokatalldsein*

The essential diagnostic semantic components involved are identical to those of *katalladsein*. But two new emphases occur.

(a) As to the divine *agens*: in Colossians 1:20,22 God is the *actant*; in Ephesians 2:16 Christ is. However, this is not a diagnostic feature since in all cases the actant is a divine being.

(b) As to the objects or recipients of the divine act of reconciliation: in Colossians 1:20 the scope is cosmological, namely *tā*
pánta, which comprise εἰτε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἰτε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. In Colossians 1:22 the objects are ἡμᾶς, that is the believers in Colossae who 'were formerly alienated and hostile in mind, engaged in evil deeds' (v.21). In Ephesians 2:15ff Christ 'made both (Jews and Gentiles) into one' (v.15) and reconciled through his death 'both in one body to God through the cross' (v.16). Here the focus is on the inter-human as well as the divine-human level of the reconciliation.

Diagrammatically these interpersonal relations may be set forth as follows:

\[ \text{Apokatallásō} \]

Interrelationship

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Cosmological level} & \quad \text{Interpersonal level} \\
'\text{Colossians 1:20} & \quad \text{Divine-human level} \quad \text{Inter-human level} \\
\end{align*} \]

'\text{Colossians 1:22} \quad \text{Ephesians 2:16} \\
'\text{Ephesians 2:16} \\

4.3 Taking into account our entire preceding discussion we can now endeavour to integrate into one diagram all the Pauline uses of the word-group as a whole.
(Apo)katallásso, katallagē

interrelationship

divine-cosmological level  interpersonal level

'Apokatallásso
'Colossians 1:20

human level  divine level

inter-human relations

'katallαsso
'1 Corinthians 7:11
'apokatallásso
'Ephesians 2:16

'inter-divine' level  divine-human level

'katallαsso
'2 Corinthians 5:18,19
'Romans 5:10a

'katallagē
'(2 Corinthians 5:18,19)

'apokatallásso
'Colossians 1:20

(New) divine-human relations

'katallαsso
'2 Corinthians 5:18,19
'Romans 5:10a

(New) human-divine relations

'katallαsso
'2 Corinthians 5:18,19
'Romans 5:10b
'2 Corinthians 5:20

'katallagē
'Romans 5:11
'Romans 11:15
'Romans 5:11
'(Romans 11:15?)

'apokatallásso
'Colossians 1:22
'Ephesians 2:16
5. In conclusion we can reiterate a few salient points. First, in Paul the word-group concerned occurs almost exclusively in a soteriological context. The same basic meaning is found throughout, namely, that of the restoration of a lost relationship of friendship with God. The same terminology of reconciliation is used, however, to convey different facets of the interpersonal relations in view. Second, four distinct facets in the process of restoring the relationship between God and men can be distinguished in Paul's usage:

(a) a prevenient act of God. Here the focus of Christ's atoning death is God-ward only, that is propitiating God's wrath against sinners. This is the objective aspect of the katallage. As a result there ensues a change from enmity to friendship in God's attitude towards mankind.

(b) The object or recipient of the divine act of reconciliation in Christ is the 'kosmos' in the sense of mankind. The katallage as an accomplished event, objectively secured through Christ's death, prior to anything that man experiences subjectively, is a manifestation of God's love for 'us'; and this whole divine act now forms the contents of the diakonia tēs katallagēs, entrusted to Christ's messengers of the Gospel.

(c) Men are now appealed to to 'be reconciled to God', that is to avail themselves of God's free offer of entering through faith in Christ into a restored relationship of friendship with God. Men's subjective experiencing of the restored fellowship with God is dependent upon their response to the divine appeal.

(d) Those who avail themselves of God's offer of reconciliation can experience it here and now, 'rejoicing in God through our Lord Jesus Christ through Whom we now received the katallage' (Rm 5:11). This is the man-ward focus of reconciliation.

Third, to accomplish the event under (a) above, Christ, the one righteous man died 'for' 'the many' sinners. This 'for us' includes the idea of substitution. What Christ did on the cross was in our place. For Paul the man-ward aspect of Christ's death rests upon and ensues from that God-ward aspect.

Finally, facets (a), (b) and (d) are found in cluster B(2) and C (vv.9-11) of our pericope.

FOOTNOTES
1. The classification is to some extent arbitrary since elements which belong to more than one of these motifs have often been
combined with one another.


3. There is also an occurrence of the verb *katallássō* in Acts 12:22 (D pG w syH) with reference to Herod Agrippa I's reconciliation with the people of Tyre.


5. The words *ou mónon dé, allà kai kauchómenoi* (11.1) repeat comma 3.1 almost verbally; *dià tou kuriou ktl.* (11.1) is a verbal repetition of comma 1.2; *di' hou nûn tén katallagên elâbomen* (11.2) recalls both *di' hou kai tén prosagôgen eschékamen* (comma 1.3) and *eîrînên échomen prós tôn theôn* (comma 1.2); the adverb *nûn* (11.2) takes up the *nûn* of colon 3; and the term *katallagên* (comma 11.2) resumes *katêllagêmen* and *katallagêntes* (colon 10).

6. God (the Father) is the implicit subject of *dikaiôthêntes* (comma 1.1); Christ is actant of *di' hou ... eschékamen* (comma 1.3); in colon 1 the divine initiative underlies the phrases *ek pîsteôs, prosagôgen eschékamen* and *eîs tên charin ... hestêkamen*. In colon 2 we 'rejoice' on the grounds of the glory which God has promised; in colon 3 the thought underlying the whole chain-syllogism in 3.2.1ff rests upon the implicit presupposition that because of Christ's finished work the qualities involved are sure (cf. *eîdôtes*, comma 3.2) to accrue from our afflictions.

7. The nature of this *dôxa* may be variously viewed here, cf. Fryer 1979:390 note 209.

8. In this latter sense *en = eîpî* with the dative in colon 2; and = *kaukâsthai en* with the dative in comma 11.1. Cf. Cranfield 1975:260; Schmidt 1963:91.


10. I take the verb *sunistónaî* (8.1) in the sense of 'prove', 'establish'. Cf. Sanday & Headlam 1971:72f. Kasch 1964:896, 18ff who takes it as 'darlegen', 'darstellen', adding that it may also be rendered here by 'an den Tag bringen'.


16. The apostle Paul employs almost exclusively two verbs in this connection, namely apothanein (8 times), and (para) didônai (7 times). In Galatians 3:13 and 2 Corinthians 5:21 we find two other rare expressions. Cf. Fryer 1979:330ff.

17. The prevalent usage was to indicate that fact at the close of the letter or deed by the words gráphein hupér tinos me eiddénaí grámmata or gráphein hupér tinos agrammatóu.

18. Cf. Bauer 1963:1659, s.v. hupér: 'in Pap sehr häufig hupér autou als erklärung, dass der Schreiber in Stellvertretung eines Analphabeten geschrieben hat'; Moulton & Milligan 1963: 651 s.v. hupér, who regard this substitutionary sense of hupér in the papyri as 'an easy transition' from the meaning 'on behalf of'.


20. E.g. sin and estrangement; divine initiative; Covenant and mediator; solidarity between 'the one' and 'the many'; the vicarious death of the one for the many; a resultant restitutio in integrum.


22. So with Dodd 1965:98f; Godet 1900:239; Lenski 1961:349;

23 It is possible to take the participial phrase dikaiōthēntes ... autoû as a protasis, that is 'if we ...', Cranfield 1975:266. But we already noted that dikaiōthēntes here resumes the dikaiōthēntes from colon 1, carrying the same forensic overtones. It is, therefore, more probable that it has the same function as well, namely causal.

24. Behm 1933:172, 35; Cf. Vos 1963:182, 'the most eloquent symbol of death'.


27. Cf. Büchsel 1933:256, 30f, who points out that the context speaks 'vom Handeln Gottes an uns, nicht von unsern Handeln redet'.

28. Cf. dià toû thandtou ktl. colon 10. Käsemann 1974:130, rightly takes the prepositions en with the dative (colon 9) and dià with the genitive (colon 10) as rhetorical variations carrying the same meaning.

29. Ladd 1974:406. Here Ladd comes very close to Vincent Taylor. For Taylor (1960:75) the passive aspect amounts to a relationship in which 'God sees sinful men as enemies without feeling compelled to say that they are "hateful" to Him'. Under this view εὐθθρόι in Romans 5:10 means little, if anything, more than that in spite of the fact that God was aware of sinful man's enmity he, nevertheless, reconciles him to himself.

30. It is 'very unlikely' that kauchōmenoi is an imperatival participle, Barrett 1975:109 note 1. It is better to take it as a participium pro indicativo with Moulton 1967:223; Käsemann 1974:131; Lenski 1961:355f; Moule 1963:179f; Robertson 1934:1132ff.

31. The reference to the katallagē in colon 11 which plainly connects it with the immediately preceding sub-section B(2) should not be given undue weight. The equally explicit resumption of key-motifs from cluster A should receive proper recognition.

33. This was in line with social customs in contemporary Judaism where a wife could return to her husband before the bill of divorce had been received (Billerbeck 1926:374).
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