

RECONCILIATION AND HOPE

*New Testament Essays on
Atonement and Eschatology*

presented to

L. L. Morris on his 60th Birthday

edited by

Robert Banks

*Research Fellow, History of Ideas,
Institute of Advanced Studies
Canberra, Australia*

WILLIAM B. EERDMANS PUBLISHING COMPANY
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Copyright © 1974, The Paternoster Press Ltd
First American edition, July 1974, published by arrangement with
The Paternoster Press, Exeter, England

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Main entry under title:

Reconciliation and hope.

CONTENTS: Hubbard, D. A. Leon Lamb Morris: an appreciation.—Williams, D. Select bibliography of L. L. Morris (p. 15-)—Reconciliation: Gerhards-son, B. Sacrificial service and atonement in the Gospel of Matthew. [etc.]

1. Bible. N. T.—Addresses, essays, lectures.
2. Morris, Leon. 3. Morris, Leon—Bibliography.
I. Banks, Robert J., ed. II. Morris, Leon.

BS2395.R4 234 74-5370

ISBN 0-8028-3349-3

Printed in Great Britain

CHAPTER X

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONCEPT OF REDEMPTION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

I. HOWARD MARSHALL

POSTERITY MAY WELL RECKON THAT THE MOST IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTION of Leon Morris to New Testament scholarship is his study of the vocabulary of atonement. His careful linguistic scholarship provides the exegetical foundation for a systematic statement of the meaning of the death of Christ, and the work of subsequent scholars has shown that the foundation is essentially secure. For example, his discussion of the meaning of the *ἰλάσκομαι* word group, in which he demonstrated that it refers to propitiation rather than to expiation,¹ has been confirmed by the work of R. Nicole and D. Hill.² Similarly, his interpretation of the terminology of redemption,³ though open to some correction, is essentially sound, and there is not much more to be said on the matter.⁴ Since,

¹ L. L. Morris, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross* (London, 1955), pp. 125-85; ² 1965, pp. 144-213, incorporates his article "The Meaning of 'ἰλαστήριον in Romans iii. 25'", *NTS* 2 (1955-56), pp. 33-43.

² R. Nicole, "C. H. Dodd and the Doctrine of Propitiation", *WTJ* 17 (1954-55), pp. 117-57; D. Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings* (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 23-48. The opposite view was defended by C. H. Dodd, "'ἰλάσκεσθαι, its cognates, derivatives and synonyms in the Septuagint", *JTS* 32 (1931), pp. 352-60, reprinted in *The Bible and the Greeks* (London, 1935), pp. 82-95.

³ L. Morris, *op. cit.*, pp. 9-59 (3rd. edition references are added in brackets, here 11-64); "The Vocabulary of Atonement 1. Redemption", *Themelios* 1:1 (1962), pp. 24-30.

⁴ Following the example of B. B. Warfield ("Redeemer" and "Redemption", *PTR* 14 (1916), pp. 177-201; "The New Testament Terminology of Redemption", *PTR* 15 (1917), pp. 201-49 (both essays reprinted in *The Person and Work of Christ* (Philadelphia, 1950), pp. 325-48, 429-75; the latter also in *Biblical Foundations* (London, 1958) 199-245); art. "Redemption" in *HDAC* II, 302-309), Morris is particularly concerned to show that the terminology of redemption invariably conveys the idea of release on payment of a price or ransom. He concludes: "Both inside and outside the New Testament writings the payment of a price is a necessary component of the redemption idea. When the New Testament speaks of redemption, then, unless our linguistics are at fault, it means that Christ has paid the price of our redemption." (*The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*, p. 58 (61).)

While this view of the extra-biblical evidence is correct (cf. D. Hill, *op. cit.*, p. 52; E. K. Simpson, *Words worth weighing in the Greek New Testament* (London, 1946), pp. 8 f.), it is not quite true for the OT. Although the meaning of *koper* (and of *λύτρον*) is uniformly that of a payment which secures release, this is not always the case with the verbs *ga'al* and *padah*. D. Hill (*op. cit.*, pp. 62 f.) has rightly observed that they are sometimes rendered into Greek by words which simply indicate release and deliverance (e.g., *ῥύομαι*). This is particularly the case when Yahweh is the subject and the theme is the deliverance of His people. Here there is often reference to the mighty power which Yahweh displays in order to deliver His people, but this is in no sense a price.

We would suggest that the discussion has been befogged by a failure to define terms. Morris implies that "price" and "cost" are synonymous: "there is reference to price in the

however, his treatment is concerned mainly with the *linguistics* of the word group, there is room for a consideration of the *concept* of redemption in the New Testament, tracing its origins and development.¹ Our aim will be to discover how the concept is used by Luke, by Paul and other writers, by the writer to the Hebrews and by Jesus, and then to frame a hypothesis regarding the development of the usage.

I

Like many other terms in New Testament theology the concept of redemption has its roots in the Old Testament. The divine act of deliverance from Egypt became the "type" for understanding God's future acts of salvation for his people. In Luke 24:21 the disciples "clearly are using 'redeem' in the typically Jewish manner of the long awaited intervention by Almighty God when his power would free his people from all their enemies and bring in a period of blessing and prosperity".² This Jewish hope finds further expression in Lk. 1:68 where God redeems his people by delivering them from the hand of their enemies, a thought which is not purely material in content, for in the same context there is reference to the forgiveness of sins (Lk. 1:77). Similarly, in Lk. 2:38 the author himself speaks of those who were awaiting deliverance for Jerusalem; the phrase should be taken with Lk. 2:25 where Simeon is said to be waiting for the

¹ Cf. D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (London, 1956), pp. 268-84; J. D. M. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament* (London, 1970), pp. 389-460 (with bibliography).

² L. Morris, *op. cit.*, p. 35 (38).

insistence that Yahweh's redemption is at the cost of the exertion of His mighty power" (*op. cit.*, p. 19 (26)). It would be more precise to use the term "price" for those cases where some *payment* or exchange is *received* by the person from whom the captive is delivered, and to use the term "cost" for whatever *expenditure* of money, life and effort is *demand*ed on the part of the redeemer; obviously "price" and "cost" will often coincide, but it is possible to have "cost" without payment of a "price".

One should perhaps also distinguish more clearly between the meanings of words and of concepts. Thus Is. 52:3 expressly states that Israel will be ransomed without money (cf. Is. 45:13). Here the word "ransom" is used in a context which denies that Yahweh pays any kind of price for the deliverance of his people from their enemies; rather he forcibly sets them free by the exercise of his power.

It may be failure to make this distinction clearly which leads to Morris's strange comment on Lk. 24:21, where he admits in effect that there was a Jewish expectation of divine deliverance which did not lay any stress on the payment of a price; but, he goes on, "the passage is not of first importance for our purposes; for clearly a redemption rendered impossible by the cross can tell us little about the redemption effected by the cross" (*op. cit.*, p. 35 (38 f.)). D. Hill rightly objects that the consideration adduced here is irrelevant to the meaning of the word as used here (*op. cit.*, pp. 67 f.). The passage may say nothing about the cross, but it does show that the word "redeem" may be used without the idea of price being present. In fact, however, the passage does say something about the cross, for so far from the text showing that the expected redemption was "rendered impossible by the cross" it indicates that it was rendered possible precisely by the suffering of the Messiah (Lk. 24:26). The cross and resurrection are the means of redemption, although the ideas of "price" and "cost" do not appear to be present or to receive any stress.

comfort of Israel, and behind both phrases should be seen Isa. 52:9: "For the Lord has comforted his people, he has redeemed Jerusalem".¹ What is of significance is that this redemption is linked to the coming of the Messiah, the "horn of salvation . . . in the house of his servant David" (Lk. 1:69). Deliverance requires a deliverer; just as Moses was called a deliverer (Acts 7:35),² so Jesus is the deliverer, and the role ascribed to God in the OT is transferred to him.³ For Luke this hope of deliverance has been actually fulfilled in the coming of Jesus.⁴

Elements of future redemption are also to be found. In Acts 3:19-21 there is a reference to future times of refreshing and the establishment of "all that God spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets from of old", a phrase which gives a verbal link with Lk. 1:70. Thus the future completion of salvation is tied to the person of Christ who is to come again. The link between past and future redemption is to be found in the person of Christ rather than in an implicit reference to the cross.⁵

This leaves Lk. 21:28 for consideration. The verse has no parallels in the other versions of the apocalyptic discourse, and the vocabulary and style are distinctively Lucan.⁶ Although, therefore, the verse may be based on a source other than Mark, it appears to be a Lucan formulation,⁷ and the idea of redemption here should be discussed against the background of Luke's thought. The reference is to the deliverance of God's people from the tribulation and distress of the last days by the coming of the Son of man (cf. 1 En. 51:2). It is noteworthy that Luke here uses the compound ἀπολύτρωσις, whereas in his other references he uses the simple forms. The compound form is found only once in the LXX (Dn. 4:32, with no Hebrew equivalent). It seems likely that normally Luke has used the common LXX terminology, but here he has used a word which was in fairly common Christian use.⁸ The difference in terminology may simply

¹ Cf. H. Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium* I (Freiburg, 1969), p. 131.

² Moses is so described in the Samaritan *Memar Marqah* 1:4 and in rabbinic sources from A.D. 300 onwards; parallelism between Moses and the Messiah is found earlier. Cf. J. Jeremias, *TDNT* IV, p. 860.

³ In the OT the redemption of Israel is always ascribed to Yahweh and not to any other figure.

⁴ The aorist in Lk. 1:68 f. should be taken literally and not as equivalent to a prophetic perfect (H. Schürmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 86 f.).

⁵ Cf. F. Büchsel's comment on Luke's use of λύτρωσις: "The reference is not to a ransom but to a redeemer". (*TDNT* IV, p. 351).

⁶ Note the use of the genitive absolute (H. Schürmann, *Der Paschamahlsbericht* (Münster, 1953), p. 94); ἀνακύπτω is found elsewhere in the NT only in Lk. 13:11 (narrative) and Jn. 8:7, 10; ἐπαίρω occurs 6 times in Lk. and 5 times in Acts; δῖότι occurs 3 times in Lk. and 5 times in Acts, never in the other Gospels; ἐγγίζω occurs 18 times in Lk., 6 times in Acts, 7 times in Mt. and 3 times in Mk.

⁷ The verse is regarded as belonging to a non-Markan source by L. Gaston, "Sondergut und Markusstoff in Lk. 21", *ThZ* 16 (1960), pp. 161-72; T. Schramm, *Der Markus-stoff bei Lukas* (Cambridge, 1971), pp. 180 f. The linguistic considerations above, however, show that any source has been revised by Luke, and it must remain open whether the use of ἀπολύτρωσις is due to the source or to Luke himself.

⁸ In Paul the use of ἀπολύτρωσις appears to be traditional; see below.

be due to Luke's source (if he had one), but it may also be intended to reflect a distinction between the redemption inaugurated and achieved by the first coming of Christ and the final redemption consummated by his second coming.¹

To sum up: Luke takes up the OT idea of deliverance from tribulation by Yahweh and finds it fulfilled typologically in Jesus Christ who fulfilled Jewish hopes by his incarnation, suffering and entry into glory and who will bring about final redemption and "times of refreshing" at his second coming. The language is that of OT piety, and there is little reflection over the means of redemption.

II

A much more concrete use of the terminology is found elsewhere in the NT, especially in Paul. There are some grounds for thinking that Galatians is the earliest of the Pauline Epistles.² In 3:13 and 4:5 Paul uses *ἐξαγοράζω* to describe the action of Christ in redeeming believers. The word is found with this sense only here in the NT, and it has no background in LXX usage. The fact that the usual terminology of redemption has an OT background makes the choice of word here all the more significant, and suggests that Paul had some definite reason for it.

The picture is one of release from a state of slavery under the law or the "elements" (Gal. 4:3 f.), as a result of which men are under the curse of the law (Gal. 3:13). The curse is pronounced upon those who fail to keep the law (Gal. 3:10) and consists in the sentence of death. But Christ has delivered men from the curse by himself being crucified, since to be crucified is a sign of standing under the curse of the law (Dt. 21:23). The verb used indicates that a purchase has taken place, leading to the release of slaves. The idea of "cost" is definitely present. So also is the idea that a ransom or "price" has been paid. A background may be sought in OT ideas of the redemption of a life that is forfeit by a payment of money,³ but in this case it is the life of another man that is the ransom. If we are right in seeing the notion of "price" here, there remains the problem of the recipient, and there can be no doubt that it is God, if anybody, who receives the ransom.⁴

¹ Elsewhere in the NT, however, the same word is used for both aspects of redemption.

² F. F. Bruce, "Galatian Problems. 4: The Date of the Epistle", *BJRL* 54 (1971-1972), pp. 250-67. Even if this dating is questionable, Galatians should certainly be placed before Romans; it may be dated after 1 Corinthians, but this point does not greatly affect our argument.

³ The first-born of men were redeemed (Ex. 13:13; 34:19 f.) by the consecration of the Levites to God and the payment of a ransom price (Num. 3:44-51; cf. 8:16-19); a ransom was payable by all Israelites at a census (Ex. 30:11-16).

⁴ It is improbable that the elements are the recipients of the ransom, since Paul's thought is basically related to the law rather than to the elements.

As a result of this act, men are justified (Gal. 3:8, 11); they receive the gift of the Spirit (Gal. 3:14; 4:6), and they are set free from slavery to become the free sons of God (Gal. 4:5-7; cf. 5:1).¹ Thus the accent lies on the deliverance of sinners and their entry into freedom, and the metaphor used is that of the ransoming of slaves.²

In 1 Cor. 1:30 Paul uses the same kind of abstract language as in Gal. 3:13 (Christ becoming "a curse", i.e. accursed) by speaking of Christ becoming "our wisdom, our righteousness and sanctification and redemption". The use of "wisdom" arises from the context (1 Cor. 1:18 ff.), but the reason for the introduction of the other terms is less obvious.³ It seems probable that Paul has utilised a set of familiar concepts in order to make the meaning of wisdom clearer. For Paul true wisdom is associated with the cross and its effects. It is significant that righteousness and redemption occur together in Gal. 3⁴ and also in Rom 3:24. Paul does not give any further explanation of these terms, and hence it may be concluded that they were familiar to his readers from his preaching. They all clearly refer to what Christ means in the present time to his people (cf. the use of *ἐγενήθη*). A redemption achieved by the cross is clearly indicated, although the precise content attaching to the word is no longer clear to us.

A fresh term is used in 1 Cor. 6:20; 7:23 in what is evidently another stereotyped phrase, no doubt so familiar to the readers that this brief allusion was an adequate means of expression:⁵ *ἠγοράσθητε τιμῆς*. The implication is that previously believers served themselves and men. Now they have been bought for a price, a word which suggests that an irrevocable transaction has taken place,⁶ and which can refer only to the death of Christ. Consequently, they belong to God, so that paradoxically they are God's slaves and yet at the same time his freedmen (1 Cor. 7:22).⁷ The emphasis, however, is not on deliverance leading to freedom, but on purchase leading to slavery.⁸

¹ At this point the terminology of redemption is linked to that of liberation and freedom: cf. Rom. 8:21; 1 Cor. 7:22 f.; Gal. 5:1, 13; Rom. 6:18, 22; 8:2; Jn. 8:32, 36 (H. Schlier, *TDNT* II, pp. 487-502).

² Cf. Diodorus Siculus 36:2:2: *ἐξηγόρασεν αὐτὴν . . . τάλαντων Ἀττικῶν ἐπτά*.

³ J. Bohatec has claimed that the four terms in v. 30 correspond to those in vs. 27 f. ("Inhalt und Reihenfolge der 'Schlagwörter der Erlösungsreligion' in 1 Kor. 1, 26-31", *ThZ* 4 (1948), 252 ff., as reported in H. Lietzmann and W. G. Kümmel, *An die Korinther I, II* (Tübingen, 1949), p. 169).

⁴ It is curious that words associated with the third member of the set (*ἀγιασμός*) are entirely absent from Galatians.

⁵ T. Holtz, *Die Christologie der Apokalypse des Johannes*, TU 85 (Berlin, 1962), p. 67.

⁶ A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East* (London, 1910), p. 329, notes how in sacred manumission it is expressly forbidden that the enfranchised may be re-enslaved.

⁷ Although Paul is here speaking of two groups of people who have their status reversed when they become Christians, both groups are simultaneously free and slaves on a spiritual level, since the *ἀπελεύθερος* owes a certain duty to the *κύριος* (cf. C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (London, 1968), p. 171).

⁸ Thus *ἀγοράζω* is used of simple purchase, *ἐξαγοράζω* of a purchase that leads to freedom.

The concept of redemption here is found in the OT and Judaism¹ but also stands close to secular analogies. A. Deissmann compared the process to sacral manumission whereby a slave was purchased from his earthly master by a god and thus became the fictitious property of the god.² The analogy is highly suggestive, but it has come under attack. In the commercial sphere the price was actually paid by the slave himself to the god who then used it to buy the slave from his master, but in Paul it is Christ who pays the price; moreover, the slave was only in a fictitious sense the property of the god – the point of the transaction being that he no longer had an earthly master – but the Christian is the slave of God in a real sense. These differences may be readily admitted, but they are in no way a decisive objection to the use of this metaphor.³ A preacher would surely have delighted to point out the differences between sacral manumission and Christian redemption, and especially to contrast the price paid by the slave in the secular world with the free gift of God in Christ.⁴

W. Elert has proposed that a different idea may be present, namely *redemptio ab hostibus*.⁵ In the ancient world the normal fate of prisoners of war was to become slaves, but it was possible for them to be released and returned to their native land on payment of a ransom by a fellow-citizen. The freedman stood under certain obligations to the person who had redeemed him, as a *libertus* to his *patronus*, until he had paid back the cost of his ransom.⁶ So the Christian has been delivered from bondage to an enemy by Christ and now stands under obligation to him.

It is difficult to make an exclusive choice between these two possible backgrounds. Nor, in the present case, should one rule out the further possibilities of ordinary (non-sacral) manumission or even of simple sale of a slave from one master to another.⁷ Thus it may be wrong to look for one specialized background to the NT concept of redemption;

¹ Is. 43:1; cf. D. Daube, *op. cit.*, pp. 272–84.

² A. Deissmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 322–34.

³ Cf. H. Lietzmann, *Die Briefe des Paulus I* (Tübingen, 1910), p. 257.

⁴ A number of further details form evidence that sacral manumission helps to provide the background to the NT statements. Deissmann (*ibid.*) notes: 1. The association of a sacrifice with the act of manumission; 2. the phrase ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ (Gal. 5:13, cf. 1) in the records of manumission; 3. the fact that slavery could be for debt shows the affinity between redemption and remission or forgiveness.

⁵ W. Elert, "Redemptio ab Hostibus", *ThLZ* 72 (1947), pp. 265–70.

⁶ F. Lyall, "Roman Law in the Writings of Paul – The Slave and the Freedman", *NTS* 17 (1970–71), pp. 73–79, also notes the duties of a freed slave to his *patronus*, but states that the slave's former master was his *patronus*. But it seems unlikely that this Roman practice provides the background to Paul's thought, since the believer's duty is to the new *patronus* who has bought him, not to the old master from whom he has been released; Paul's point is that the old relationship has entirely ceased.

The term ἀπελευθερός may be understood as equivalent to the Latin *libertus* (or *libertinus*), a "freedman" owing service to his manumitter as his *patronus*. Lyall is thinking of a process in Roman law whereby a master might release his slaves. It is more likely that sacral manumission or *redemptio ab hostibus* is in Paul's mind.

⁷ However, simple sale from one master to another is unlikely, because the new status is one of freedom and not simply of a change of master.

rather, the general concept of manumission forms the background, and different aspects of it contribute to the detailed understanding of the various NT passages. What is important is that along with the OT background this secular background is certainly present, so that redemption in these passages is to be thought of in terms of change of ownership as a result of payment of a price. Whereas in Galatians the rationale of the price in relation to the former state of the Christian is clear, in 1 Corinthians the former state of the Christian has retreated into the background, and the stress is now on the payment of the price as a sign that the Christian now belongs to a new master.

This stress on redemption as a change of ownership rather than as simply the setting free of slaves lived on. It is present in 2 Pet. 2:1 where Christ is described as the slave-master (*δеспότης*; cf. Jude 4) who has purchased Christians for himself.¹ But the most important development is in Revelation where a series of references (1:5; 5:9; 14:3 f.) take up the idea. The verb *ἀγοράζω* is used in 5:9 to describe the act of Christ in purchasing Christians from every race² for God. Here again the thought of service to God is expressed, notably in the idea of men as priests (Rev. 1:6; 5:10) and as an offering of first-fruits to God (Rev. 14:4).³ At the same time, however, the release of Christians from sin (Rev. 1:5)⁴ and their privilege of reigning (Rev. 1:6; 5:10) are stressed.

The association here of redemption with release from sin is based on Ps. 130:8: "And he will redeem Israel from all his iniquities".⁵ The means is the death of Christ. The verb used, *σφάζω*, conveys the sense of a sacrificial offering (cf. Rev. 6:9 with reference to the martyrs),⁶ especially since Jesus is presented as the lamb who is slain (Rev. 5:6, 12; 13:8). This introduces us to the fundamental point that redemption is accomplished by the offering of a sacrifice.

At first sight the collocation of redemption and sacrifice appears to indicate a confusion of imagery. In fact it is strongly rooted in the OT and Judaism. The following three factors are relevant: 1. The death of the

¹ The background of *δеспότης* as a master of slaves is described clearly enough by K. H. Rengstorff (*TDNT* II, pp. 44-49), but he fails to make use of it in explaining the present text, and hence finds the association of *ἀγοράζω* with *δеспότης* surprising.

² The *ἐκ* is partitive, and does not indicate the owner from whom Christians have been delivered.

³ In the OT the first-fruits are specially dedicated to God for use in his service; hence the thought of dedication to his service is probably present here also.

⁴ In a paper read at the meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association in Los Angeles in 1972 Miss E. Fiorenza defended the view that Rev. 1:5 represented a traditional formula and Rev. 5:9 the seer's reworking of it. If this view is correct, it shows that the use of *λύω* to express release from sin is early.

⁵ *λύω* is also used with reference to sin in Job 42:9; Is. 40:2 and Sir. 28:2, but in these cases it is the sin which is "released", i.e., pardoned, and not the person who is released from the sin; F. Büchsel, *TDNT* IV, p. 336, n. 8.

⁶ It can be used non-sacrificially of murder or the slaughter of animals. In Rev. 6:9 the death of the martyrs is compared with the slaughter of sacrificial animals whose blood flows from the altar (O. Michel, *TDNT* VII, pp. 934 f.).

passover lambs was seen as an element in the redemption of Israel from Egypt: "May we eat there of the sacrifices and of the Passover-offerings whose blood has reached with acceptance the wall of thy Altar, and let us praise thee for our redemption and for the ransoming of our soul" (Pesahim 10:6).¹ Hence J. Jeremias comments: "As once the blood of the Passover lambs played a part in the redemption from Egypt, so by the atoning power of His blood He has accomplished redemption . . . from the bondage of sin . . ."² 2. L. Morris claims that the Hebrew verb *kipper* often has the denominative sense "to offer a *koper*". Atonement is thus made by the payment of a ransom or the offering of a gift to Yahweh.³ Admittedly the way in which atonement and ransom are here brought together is not the same thing as the idea of redemption by the offering of a sacrifice, but it shows that the two ideas were closely associated in the Hebrew mind. 3. The thought of the deliverance of Israel from its sin and its consequences by the death of the martyrs, conceived as a propitiatory offering to God, developed in Judaism and is to be seen in 4 Macc. 17:22.

This complex of ideas lies behind the imagery in Revelation. Jesus is the slain lamb, and we should probably think of Him as specifically the passover lamb.⁴ He is also described as "the faithful witness" (Rev. 1:5), a phrase which implies his death as well as his testimony by word of mouth.⁵ Hence the comparison of Jesus' death to that of a martyr and its understanding in sacrificial terms has already taken place. We have moved beyond the simple idea of a commercial ransom price to the Jewish concept of redemption by means of a sacrificial offering to God.

It follows that the phrase "by his blood" in Rev. 1:5; 5:9 must be understood in sacrificial terms, just as in 4 Macc. 17:22. It expresses the "cost" of redemption⁶ in terms of laying down of life, and the "price" is paid to God, if to anybody.

We are moving in the same circle of ideas when we turn to 1 Pet. 1:18 where the readers are told that they were redeemed from their former (sinful) way of life not with silver and gold but with the precious blood of

¹ Even if the annual passover offering was not regarded as atoning in effect, the original Exodus passover offering and the eschatological passover were so regarded (J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (London, 1966), pp. 225 f.; E. Lohse, *Martyrer und Gottesknecht* (Göttingen, 1963), p. 142). However, it is possible that by NT times all sacrifices were regarded as having expiatory power to some extent (L. L. Morris, *op. cit.* (3rd ed.), pp. 131 f.).

² J. Jeremias, *TDNT* I, p. 340.

³ L. L. Morris, *op. cit.*, pp. 143-52 (161-70); cf. BDB s.v.; D. Hill, *op. cit.*, p. 32. F. Büchsel (*TDNT* IV, p. 341) shows that in rabbinic thought a ransom is an expiation for sin (see b.Bab.Kamm. 40a, cited in Strack-Billerbeck III, 644).

⁴ Paul regards Jesus as the passover (lamb) (1 Cor. 5:7) and 1 Pet. 1:18 should be interpreted in the same way; the same allusion may also be meant in the Johannine tradition (Jn. 1:29, 36), although L. L. Morris, *op. cit.* (3rd ed.), pp. 129-43, points out the weaknesses of this interpretation. Other ideas may well have been drawn into the concept in Rev., but this one alone seems sufficient to explain the sacrificial imagery.

⁵ T. Holtz, *op. cit.*, pp. 55-57.

⁶ T. Holtz, *op. cit.*, p. 64; L. L. Morris, *op. cit.*, p. 51 n. (55 n.).

Christ, as of a lamb without blemish or spot. Again the thought of deliverance from a past state of captivity and entry into sonship is linked to that of belonging to God (1 Pet. 2:9) and rendering him service. Martyrological ideas are not explicitly present here, and Christ's death is compared directly to that of a sacrificial lamb. In all probability the passover lamb is meant,¹ and this is confirmed by the presence of other Exodus terminology in the Epistle.² The verb *λυτρόω* takes us into the realm of OT ideas, especially the deliverance from Egypt.³ The greatness of the sacrifice thus rendered by Christ ought to move the readers to godly fear (1 Pet. 1:17), and the contrast with silver and gold⁴ shows that the idea of a ransom "price" is well to the fore.

The same thought of believers becoming the possession of God through redemption is found in Acts 20:28 where we read of the church of God which he obtained (*περιποιέομαι*) with the blood of his own One.⁵ The verb is found in the LXX, but it translates a variety of Hebrew words, none of which is closely connected with redemption.⁶ But the corresponding noun, *περιποίησις*, is used in stereotyped phraseology to signify Israel as Yahweh's special possession.⁷ As Israel became God's special people at the Exodus, so he has acquired the church to be his people. That this is indeed the background may be deduced from the use of the noun in 1 Pet. 2:9; in both passages we may see the influence of Is. 43:20, and its seems that a piece of imagery traditional in the church is being used (cf. Tit. 2:14). J. B. Bauer has linked the concept of redemption here with that of the covenant whereby God made Israel his people.⁸

Eph. 1:14 now claims our attention. There are two main ways of understanding the passage. Some hold that it speaks of the way in which believers have received the Spirit as an earnest or foretaste (v. 14a) of the inheritance which will become fully their possession at the future day of

¹ The description of the lamb as "unblemished" (*ἄμωμος*) and "spotless" (*ἄσπιλος*) is, however, not sufficient to identify it as the passover lamb, since the former adjective is used freely of various offerings.

² See the references to the sprinkling of blood in 1:2 and to loins girt in 1:12. Paschal imagery has been found more widely by F. L. Cross, *1 Peter: a Paschal Liturgy* (London, 1954), but the picture has been over-drawn.

³ Ex. 6:6; 15:13; Ps. 76 (77):15; 105 (106):10; Is. 63:9; Dt. 7:8; 9:26 and frequently.

⁴ Observe the same contrast between money and divine provision in Acts 3:6.

⁵ The text is uncertain. Some MSS have "the church of the Lord" (i.e. Christ), but this looks like an attempt to avoid the difficulty. There is in fact no difficulty about taking *τοῦ ἰδίου* to mean "of his own One" (MH I, pp. 90 f.); alternatively, one may supply *ὁ Χριστός* as the subject of *περιποίησατο* (E. Lohse, *op. cit.*, p. 180 n.).

⁶ *περιποιέομαι* most frequently translates *hayah* with the meaning "to preserve alive" (10 times) and *hamal* "to have compassion on". It also translates 8 other roots, including the noun *segullah* "property", 1 Chr. 29:3.

⁷ *περιποίησις* is found 3 times; it translates *segullah* at Mal. 3:17. This Hebrew word is more frequently rendered in the LXX by the adjective *περιούσιος* (Ex. 19:5; Dt. 7:6; 14:2; 26:18; Ps. 135:4; Ecc. 2:8).

⁸ J. B. Bauer, *Encyclopaedia of Biblical Theology* (London, 1969), II, pp. 738-41. Note the link with the idea of the covenant in Heb. 9:15, and the association of Moses with redemption in Acts 7:35.

full redemption (Eph. 4:30).¹ Others argue that it refers to the way in which believers have been sealed with the Spirit (v. 13) as the sign that God will one day enter upon full possession of the property which has already become his. There is little doubt that this second view is better. It alone does justice to the background of the term *περιποίησις*; it fits in neatly with the idea of the saints being God's portion (Eph. 1:11) whom he purposes to make holy (Eph. 1:4) in order that his glory may be praised (Eph. 1:14).² There will thus be a day of final redemption when God enters into full possession of his people.

It must be noted, however, that this future sense is not the primary one in Pauline thought. The idea is of the completion of an act already begun by God's sealing of believers with the Spirit; the same is true in Rom. 8:23 where it is those who already possess the first-fruits of the Spirit who look forward to the redemption of the body. The point is strengthened by the fact that here the promised redemption is equated with divine sonship which, as we have already seen, was the gift of God to believers when they were justified and redeemed from the curse of the law (Gal. 4:5-7). For the believer future redemption means the deliverance of the body from the corruption and pain of the world into the glorious freedom of the children of God (Rom. 8:18-22); for God it means the completion of the process whereby believers become his possession.

In none of the passages just discussed is redemption directly related to the death of Christ; the thought is primarily of deliverance, and neither the agent nor the means is stated. Nevertheless, the use of the term forces us back to a consideration of that which is primary in Pauline thought, namely the redemption already wrought by Christ and received by believers.

We come finally in this section to the passages in which Paul uses the term *ἀπολύτρωσις* in connexion with the cross. We have already seen that 1 Cor. 1:30 should be interpreted of the redemption already achieved by Christ, although the meaning of the term is not spelled out in any detail. In Rom. 3:24 Paul explicitly applies it to the cross in a context which is so closely similar to Gal. 3 that we are justified in considering the one passage in the light of the other, and hence seeing *ἀπολύτρωσις* here as in some sense equivalent to *ἐξαγοράζω* in the earlier passage. The context in Rom. 3 is one of universal sinfulness and liability to judgement, inability to keep the law, and the impossibility of being saved by the law anyhow. The thought of being in bondage under the law is not expressed

¹ RSV; T. K. Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians* (Edinburgh, 1922), pp. 23 f.; M. Dibelius and H. Greeven, *An die Kolosser, Epheser an Philemon* (Tübingen, 1953), pp. 62 f.; H. Schlier, *Der Brief an die Epheser* (Düsseldorf, 1957), p. 39; cf. F. Büchsel, *TDNT* IV, p. 353.

² NEB; L. L. Morris, *op. cit.*, p. 57 (60); J. A. Robinson, *The Epistle to the Ephesians* (London, 1922), pp. 147-49; J. Gnilká, *Der Epheserbrief* (Freiburg, 1971), pp. 86 f.; cf. Arndt s.v. *ἀπολύτρωσις*. Gnilká observes that the former view requires that something be read into the text.

here (see, however, Rom. 6:15), and it is the idea of slavery to sin which is to the fore; men are under bondage to sin (Rom. 7:14; cf. 6:16-23) and hence to death.¹ Their need is justification, and this is made possible, as in Gal. 3, by means of an act of redemption. Justification is provided freely by divine grace; there is nothing for us to pay (*δωρεάν*), from which we may conclude that the cost has been borne by God. Redemption is secured "in Christ", i.e. by God's action in Him, and the means is his being offered as a propitiation by his blood. The language here is close to the martyrological terminology in 4 Macc. 17:21, which D. Hill thinks may have directly influenced Paul.² Hence the death of Christ, viewed as that of a martyr, is expounded in sacrificial terms,³ redemption being secured by means of the offering of a sacrifice through which sin is forgiven and men are delivered from its power.⁴ The "cost" of redemption is thus the death of Christ, seen as the gift of divine grace, and the "price" of it is the sacrificial offering made to God. Thus we find again the paradox that the redemption terminology can be used to express a "cost" borne by God and an offering or "price" made to God.

The question arises whether Paul is here using a traditional formulation upon which he has superimposed his own comments.⁵ Opinions vary

¹ O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer* (Göttingen, 111957), pp. 91 f.

² D. Hill, *op. cit.*, pp. 41-48.

³ F. Hahn (*Der urchristliche Gottesdienst* (Stuttgart, 1970), p. 53, n. 29) has argued that the concept of sacrifice is applied to the death of Jesus only in Eph. 5:2; 1 Pet. 1:19 and Hebrews: "the presentation as an atoning death ('for us') must not be equated with this, since it is based on a non-cultic atonement tradition". Even, however, if the death of Jesus is understood in terms of the atoning effects of the martyr's death, the theology of martyrdom had already applied the terminology of sacrifice to the death of the martyr. Hence Hahn's conclusion is erroneous.

⁴ H. Lietzmann, *Die Briefe des Paulus I* (Tübingen, 1910), p. 19, emphasises that *ἀπολύτρωσις* should be taken here in its full sense to signify "loskaufen", and should not be weakened to mean simply *πηρῖα*. K. Kertelge ("*Rechtfertigung*" bei Paulus (Munster, 1971), pp. 48 f.), claims that the passage is to be understood against the background of the covenant and the OT usage of "redemption" which signifies the eschatological deliverance wrought by God for his people in order that the covenant may be restored; Paul has taken over this concept from a traditional formulation and widened its meaning in order to indicate the free justification of all men by grace. It is unnecessary to bring in Hellenistic ideas of manumission in order to explain a biblical concept. Similarly, F. Büchsel (*TDNT IV*, pp. 354 f.) holds that no real idea of ransom is present here.

This view is to be rejected: 1. *ἀπολύτρωσις* is hardly a biblical term, since it occurs only in Dan. 4:34 LXX. 2. The biblical idea of redemption itself retains the metaphorical sense of deliverance from slavery in Egypt. 3. In the present context the notion of the cost of deliverance is present in the use of *δωρεάν*. 4. Whatever be the traditional formula which Paul is using (see next note), the present passage must be understood against the background of Gal. 3:13 and 2 Cor. 5:14-21; in the former of these passages the idea of redemption at the cost of the death of the redeemer is clearly present, and it is quite impossible that this idea should be absent from the parallel passage in Romans (cf. Paul's use of *ἀίμα*!). Kertelge has failed to take the significance of this earlier, parallel passage into account.

⁵ See especially the discussion in K. Kertelge, *op. cit.*, pp. 48-62, 71-84; also R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament I* (London, 1952), p. 46; E. Käsemann, "Zum Verständnis von Römer 3, 24-26", *ZNTW* 43 (1950-51), pp. 150-54; K. Wegenast, *Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen* (Neukirchen, 1962), pp. 76-80; P. Stuhlmacher, *Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus* (Göttingen, 1966), pp. 86-91; H. Thyen, *Studien zur Sündenvergebung* (Göttingen, 1970), pp. 163-72. There is general agreement that one may isolate a

regarding the precise content of such a formulation. As we have seen, similar ideas are expressed by Paul himself in Gal. 3, but the fact that here he uses the term ἀπολύτρωσις rather than ἐξαγοράζω suggests that he is using a piece of traditional terminology; again the fact that he does not need to explain the meaning of ἀπολύτρωσις in 1 Cor. 1:30 indicates that a familiar idea is being used. There is, however, no good reason for believing that the term "redemption" had a different meaning in its pre-Pauline use from that which Paul himself assigns to it; the use of the word here fits in with the general pattern of thought which we have already discovered in 1 Peter and Revelation, as well as with Paul's own usage in Gal. 3. Hence, if traditional formulations are being used here, this is evidence for the early currency of the idea of redemption, but not for the existence of a concept different in content from the Pauline one.¹

Two Pauline passages remain for consideration, Col. 1:14 and Eph. 1:7. In Col. 1:14 redemption is linked with deliverance from the power of darkness into the kingdom of God's Son,² but it is stressed that redemption is to be equated with the forgiveness of sins.³ It is thus a present possession

¹ See p. 163 n. 4.

² Here the verb ῥύομαι becomes associated with the concept of redemption, although the association is not very close. The verb is used in a very similar way to the words at present under consideration to express various forms of deliverance. There is no suggestion of cost or price in the usage; the accent falls on the dangers from which God delivers men in order that they may enter into salvation. Cf. W. Kasch, *TDNT* VI, pp. 998-1003.

³ The question arises as to why "redemption" is glossed by "forgiveness of sins". J. B. Lightfoot (*Colossians and Philemon* (London, 1886), p. 141) drew attention to later Gnostic perversions of the concept so that it was equated with initiation into mystical secrets; he suggested that some similar perversion at Colossae may have made it necessary for Paul to define the term more closely. C. F. D. Moule (*Colossians and Philemon* (Cambridge, 1957), p. 58) suggests that the Colossians may have held "fancies about 'escape' into immortality without a corresponding change of character." This view might be supported by reference to the pre-heretical heresy reflected in 1 Cor., 1 Jn. and 2 Pet., according to which the practice of sin and immortality was thought to be compatible with claims to the possession of the Holy Spirit and the experience of salvation.

pre-Pauline formula more or less as follows: "being justified by the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God set forth as a propitiation by his blood to show his righteousness through the remission of past sins in the forbearance of God." On this view the terms "justified", "redemption", "propitiation" and "blood" are from pre-Pauline tradition. "Redemption" is then understood as in the previous note.

It seems doubtful to me whether we can delineate the content of the pre-Pauline formula so precisely, and whether we can indeed speak of a formula at all. For some proponents of this view "justified" is a pre-Pauline concept; thus P. Stuhlmacher (*op. cit.*, p. 219) claims - without offering any evidence - that δικαιοῦν is pre-Pauline in Rom. 3:24; 5:9; 6:7; 8:30 and 1 Cor. 6:11. The indications are rather that "to justify" in the sense of "to forgive" was introduced into Christian theology by Paul (cf. H. Thyen, *op. cit.*, p. 164). At most we can speak of a use of pre-Pauline phraseology in which some important concepts were beginning to be brought together.

It is noteworthy that "blood" appears frequently in the context of redemption (Acts 20:28; Eph. 1:7; Heb. 9:12; 1 Pet. 1:18; Rev. 1:5; 5:9). It has been argued that the term "blood" found its way into Christian theology through the influence of the Lord's Supper formulae; covenant associations are also present there. Hence it has been suggested (E. Käsemann, *op. cit.*) that the present formula is to be traced back to the Lord's Supper. The association of blood and covenant may well have led to a further link with the idea of redemption as part of an Exodus typology; see below.

of believers (ἔχομεν), and it is linked to a concept which is closely related to justification. But, as in Rom. 3:24, the thought of redemption is mentioned in passing, and Paul moves on to the idea of reconciliation by means of the blood of the cross. If vs. 15-20 form part of a pre-Pauline hymn,¹ then Paul's introduction of the reference to the blood of the cross in v. 20 may be more closely related to the idea of redemption – as is certainly the case in Eph. 1:7 where redemption is directly linked to the blood of Christ. The parallels elsewhere justify us in regarding the blood as a reference to the sacrificial death of Jesus; it indicates the cost of redemption, especially since the grace of God is also mentioned in the context (cf. Rom. 3:24), and it also indicates the "price" paid to God in terms of sacrifice.² It is against this background that the idea of future redemption in Eph. 1:14 should be seen; it refers to the consummation of what has already been achieved.

III

The Epistle to the Hebrews uses the concept in two passages. In 11:35 we read of the martyrs who refused to accept deliverance for themselves in order that they might attain to a better resurrection. The word thus relates to deliverance from death and the captivity which was associated with it at the "cost" or "price" of denying their faith. Here the elements of "cost" and "price" are clearly present, although the use is obviously metaphorical.

The other passage is 9:11 ff. Christ entered into the "holy place" above, like the high priest on the day of atonement, not with the blood of animals but with his own blood and "found" eternal redemption.³ Similarly, the writer says that a death has taken place for the redemption of sins (9:15). Here redemption is closely associated with the forgiveness of sins; believers are delivered from their sins, i.e. from their penal effects.⁴ The

¹ Most reconstructions of the hymn assumed to underlie this section of Colossians start from v. 15 and do not include v. 14 (see E. Lohmeyer and W. Schmauch, *Die Briefe an die Philipper, Kolosser und an Philemon* (Göttingen, 1964), pp. 47-55; E. Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon* (Philadelphia, 1971), pp. 41-46). If vs. 15-20 are based on such a hymn, then Paul's thought of redemption in v. 14 and his addition to the hymn of the words "by his blood" in v. 20 may perhaps be linked more closely to each other. Further, the concepts of redemption and reconciliation are brought together, being linked by the common idea of the means involved, namely the death of Christ viewed sacrificially.

² D. Hill (*op. cit.*, pp. 73 f.) has objected that the phrase *διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ* can hardly refer to a price paid for redemption, since "the shedding of blood is hardly to be regarded as the price paid for the release from sins." He is no doubt correct in asserting that the phrase indicates "means" rather than "price", but the objection seems pedantic: the NT evidence as a whole shows a close association between the ideas of redemption and sacrifice, just as in the OT atonement and "ransom-price" are closely linked. We, therefore, prefer the exegesis of F. F. Bruce (*The Epistle to the Ephesians* (London, 1962), p. 31) at this point.

³ M. McNamara *Targum and Testament* (Shannon, 1972), p. 139 draws attention to a parallel to the phrase "eternal redemption" in Ps.Jon. (Gen. 49:18).

⁴ The genitive is one of separation.

means of deliverance is the death of Christ, "blood" being clearly used in a sacrificial sense. As in 1 Pet. 1:18, any thoughts of martyrdom have passed completely into the background, and the idea of redemption has been fully assimilated into the author's sacrificial thinking. The influence of other ideas traditionally associated with redemption may be seen in the references to the covenant and inheritance (9:15). The idea of the "mediator" may also form part of this traditional complex in view of its reappearance in 1 Tim. 2:6.

Hebrews shows us an individual development of the idea of redemption in which it is closely linked with the sacrificial ritual of the tabernacle (rather than with the passover sacrifice, as in Rev. and 1 Pet.). It shows the continuing strength of the idea, although to some extent it has lost its original force.

IV

The "ransom" saying of Jesus (Mk. 10:45)¹ reappears in 1 Tim. 2:6 in a text which has been demonstrated to be a less Semitic form of expression.² It has become one of the fixed formulae used by the author of the Pastoral Epistles, and he offers us his own further interpretation of the text in Tit. 2:14. In 1 Tim. 2:6 Christ acts as mediator between God and man,³ and performs his task by giving himself as a ransom for the lives of all. His death is an offering to God and serves as a ransom payment to free all men from death and so to reconcile them to God. The author's understanding of this is made clearer in Tit. 2:14 where the word *ἀντίλυτρον* is replaced by *ἵνα λυτρώσῃται*, using language based on Ps. 129 (130): 8 LXX (cf. Rev. 1:5). Men are thus delivered from lawlessness, i.e. they receive forgiveness and deliverance from the power and penalty of sin, and they are cleansed in order to become God's special people (*λαὸς περιούσιος*); hence the redemption has the effect of purchasing men to be the property of God. All this is achieved by Christ who is described as "Saviour", thus

¹ The wording in Mt. 20:28 is identical, with *ὥσπερ* replacing *καὶ γάρ*.

² J. Jeremias, "Das Lösegeld für Viele (Mk. 10:45)", in *Abba* (Göttingen, 1966), pp. 216-29, especially pp. 225 f. H. Thyen (*op. cit.*, p. 158) admits the Semitic colouring, but claims that it does not establish the priority of Mk. 10:45 over against 1 Tim 2:6. On the contrary, the secondary use of "Son of man" and the use of *ἦλθεν*, which presupposes the Hellenistic *μεσίτης* concept, indicate that Mk. 10:45 is the later form. These arguments are to be rejected. The first rests on a blanket rejection of the Son of man sayings (*op. cit.*, p. 156) which is totally unjustified; it is possible in any case to argue for the authenticity of Mk. 10:45b as a saying of Jesus as an independent logion separate from v. 45a. Nor does the use of *ἦλθεν* speak against authenticity: cf. J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology I* (London, 1971), p. 293, n. 6; "Die älteste Schicht der Menschensohn-Logien", *ZNTW* 58 (1967), pp. 159-72, especially pp. 166 f.

³ The verse should perhaps be taken as an expression of the divinity and humanity of Christ (rather than as a two-member credal statement): "There is one who is God, one who is also (*καὶ*) the mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." Thus the mediatorial office of Christ depends on his double qualification as God and man. In favour of this view is the way in which in the parallel passage Tit. 2:13 f. the writer can speak of "the glory of our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ" (not "the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ").

linking the concept of deliverance with the closely associated one of salvation.¹ The further linking of redemption with cleansing suggests that behind the author's thought lies the idea of the sacrificial blood of Christ which liberates and cleanses men (cf. Heb. 9:12-14).

Behind these developments lies the simpler wording in Mk. 10:45 in which Jesus serves men by giving his life as a ransom for many. Mark no doubt intends the saying to be seen against the background of 8:37 where the question is raised whether a man can give any exchange for his life. Behind the question lies Ps. 49 (48):7-9: "Truly no man can ransom himself, or give to God the price of his life, for the ransom of his life is costly, and can never suffice, that he should continue to live on for ever, and never see the Pit". What man cannot do has been done by Christ. We are surely justified in discerning here the thought of human mortality as the result of human sin, and in seeing in the death of Christ the ransom "price" paid to God² for the redemption of mankind from death.³ We may also see here a reference to the death of the suffering Servant which benefits the "many" when he makes himself an offering for sin.⁴ The saying may thus contain a sacrificial idea, since the ransom is an offering to God for the lives of others, and the intermediate link may be found in the idea of martyrdom.⁵

V

It is time to draw together the threads of our discussion and see whether we can sketch the development of the idea of redemption more precisely.

In his book on the atonement in the NT, E. Lohse has argued that the theology of the earliest church regarding the death of Christ is to be found in the kerygma in I Cor. 15:3-5; the "sayings of the Lord" in Mk. 10:45 and 14:24; the formal statements based on these; the use of the term "blood" and the comparison of Jesus with the passover lamb. Behind these various uses Lohse finds the influence of Is. 53. He claims that the oldest form of the cup-saying omitted the reference to the covenant and spoke of the death of Jesus in terms of Is. 53 as the giving of his life many. Originally the thought was not sacrificial, but referred to the atoning death of the Servant. Then at a very early stage the thought of the

¹ See especially Rom. 5:9; Phil. 1:19; Heb. 5:7; Jas. 5:20; 1 Pet. 4:18; Jude 5; W. Foerster and G. Föhner, *TDNT* VII, pp. 965-1024.

² F. Büchsel, *TDNT* IV, p. 344. The arguments of E. Lohse (*op. cit.*, p. 121, n. 3) to the contrary fail to convince.

³ F. Büchsel (*TDNT* IV, p. 343) stresses that the deliverance is from sin rather than merely from death.

⁴ The influence of Is. 53 is rejected by H. Thyen, *op. cit.*, pp. 158-60, but he is unable to demonstrate that it is impossible. On the other side see R. T. France, "The Servant of the Lord in the Teaching of Jesus", *Tyndale Bulletin*, 19 (1968), pp. 26-52, summarised in *Jesus and the Old Testament* (London, 1971), pp. 116-21.

⁵ We have utilised Mk. 8:37 to help elucidate the meaning of Mk. 10:45 in its Marcan context. Some such background must be presupposed for the saying in its original setting.

covenant was attached to the saying, and hence the blood of Jesus was interpreted in terms of the covenant sacrifice.¹

Whatever be the truth regarding the details of this description, there is sufficient substance in it for us to build upon it and to claim that in this material available to the early church we have the necessary and sufficient presuppositions for the development of the concept of redemption. The decisive point is the association of Mk. 10:45 with 14:24, an association that lay easily to hand in their common dependence on Is. 53. This association would be all the easier if Mk. 10:45 were also linked with the Lord's Supper.²

From Mk. 10:45b a direct line leads to the formal expressions in the Pastoral Epistles. The saying itself speaks of the martyr death of the Servant, and hence gave rise to a. sayings which speak of Christ giving himself or handing himself over (Jn. 6:51; Gal. 1:4; 2:20; Eph. 5:2, 25; cf. "laying down one's life", Jn. 10:11, 15, 17 f.); b. sayings which interpret the death of Jesus as having the atoning power of a martyr's death (Rom. 3:24).

The association with Mk. 14:24 brings in the idea of the blood of Christ, again taken in a martyrological sense. Again two lines of thought develop: a. Paul uses the idea of manumission to express the idea of redemption in a more tangible form, perhaps especially for Christians in the Hellenistic world. The same idea is found in Rev. and 1 Pet. b. Once the martyr death of Jesus has been seen to have atoning power, the way lies open for a further understanding of it in terms of the Jewish sacrificial system. This operated in three ways: i. Sacrificial ideas (*ἱλαστήριον*) were already bound up with the idea of martyrdom (4 Macc.; Rom. 3:24); ii. The concept of the covenant, already associated with the cup-saying, led to the understanding of the death of Jesus in terms of the sacrifices associated with the Exodus, namely the sacrifice of the passover, which in Jewish thought wrought redemption for Israel, and also the covenant sacrifice (1 Pet. 1:2); iii. The death of Jesus was associated with the sacrificial ritual of the tabernacle on the day of atonement, and this sacrifice was thus regarded as a means of redemption.

The motif which does not fit into this development is the concept of a still future redemption (Lk. 21:28; Rom. 8:23; Eph. 1:14; 4:30). This may serve as a warning against trying to force the evidence into one rigid pattern.³ It is best to see here a development from the Jewish idea of

¹ E. Lohse, *op. cit.* Pt. 2.

² In its present context Mk. 10:45 appears in an ethical context unconnected with the Lord's Supper. But the parallel tradition in Lk. 22:24-27 does appear in a Supper tradition, and hence it is possible that the tradition in Mk. 10:42-45 was originally linked to the Supper. On the other hand, some scholars regard Mk. 10:45b as an isolated saying, about whose origin it is difficult to be certain.

³ This warning also holds good for the attempt to see the element of "price" in every, or almost every, use of the phraseology. We have been able to observe in the course of our study that this element is not universally present. In a number of cases the idea is that of

eschatological redemption, quite distinct from the Christian idea based on the theology of the cross. It takes two forms. In Luke the eschatology is seen to be essentially "realised" in the coming of Jesus, and hence this idea of redemption can be easily linked to the main line of development. But the thought of a future redemption also persisted, though in a specialized sense, and it plays a modest part in NT thought; again, however, the terminology leads to the future redemption being seen to some extent in the light of the past redemption at the cross.

On this view Mk. 10:45 represents the simplest form of the concept and lies at the base of the development. The saying is free from ideas of blood, covenant, sacrifice and manumission, but depends on Is. 53, a text which is not taken up elsewhere in the development. Again, the saying undoubtedly comes from the earliest tradition of the church, as is shown by its Semitic form and the fact that it has been handed down as a Son of man saying; there is in fact good reason to argue that it is an authentic saying of Jesus.¹

It may be objected that the influence of Mk. 10:45 is attested only in the Pastorals, and that Paul's terminology is different. In fact, however, Paul's choice of ἀπολύτρωσις, a word with no significant precedent in the LXX, and other associated words, suggests that the λύτρον saying lies at the root of the development. Paul's vocabulary expresses the result of Christ's death rather than its character, and this fits in with NT thought in general, which is more concerned with the nature of salvation than the precise way in which it has been achieved. Moreover, if ἀπολύτρωσις is a traditional term in Paul, this pushes the date of the entry of the idea into Christian theology still earlier.²

Thus the concept of redemption is to be traced back to the teaching of Jesus³ and has undergone a rich development, leading to its use with various shades of meaning and in different associations of thought. It is one of the most frequently used categories of interpretation of the death of Jesus in the NT and excellently expresses its meaning. We may cordially agree with L. Morris: "In the Scripture we see the price paid, the curse borne, in order that those who are redeemed should be brought into the liberty of the sons of God, a liberty which may paradoxically be called slavery to God. The whole point of this redemption is that sin no longer has dominion; the redeemed are those saved to do the will of their Master."⁴

¹ See R. T. France, *op. cit.*

² The other formative element in the redemption tradition, namely the cup-word at the Last Supper, is also of early date, as is seen in its attestation by Paul in 1 Cor. 11:25.

³ So also W. Mundle (with J. Schneider and L. Coenen), *TBNT* I, pp. 258-72, especially p. 263.

⁴ L. L. Morris, *op. cit.*, p. 59 (62).

"cost" rather than "price". Nevertheless, when this *caveat* has been observed, it remains true that in about half of the texts the element of "cost" or "price" is fairly explicit. No less than seven times is redemption associated with the blood of Christ, and in a further four cases with his death.