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PREFACE

At the beginning of 1986, just prior to commencing biblical and theological studies, the Lord deeply impressed upon me what I now consider to be the prayer of Paul's life: 'I want to know Christ and the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of sharing in his sufferings, becoming like him in his death, and so, somehow, to attain to the resurrection from the dead' (Phil 3:10–11; NIV). As well as becoming a regular part of my own devotional life, it grew into a consuming passion to study and explicate the motif of death and resurrection with Christ in Paul, with the ultimate goal of being able to encourage and challenge Christians in their discipleship of Christ to follow him more closely.

But the Lord never lets his people merely know about him; rather, he always wants us to know him and to experience him in our daily lives. And so, study of this motif in Paul's epistles (and specifically here in Romans 6) often became personal experience of dying and rising with Christ through the struggles and discouragements and through the joys and rewards of post-graduate research. I have often felt like one of those 'fragile earthen pots,' which are so common here in the Middle East, where God has called me (and Anne) to serve. It is perhaps quite significant that, not far from where I write, the transformation took place of one recalcitrant vessel (cf. Acts 26:14b) into one destined to display 'the surpassing greatness of God's power' (see Acts 9:1–22). Yet even he did not take long to reveal his 'earthenness' (Acts 9:23–25; 2 Cor 11:30–33). Perhaps this is what makes the apostle so approachable, but still such a compelling example. Since my own 'earthenness' has at times been all too evident in the course of these studies, I trust that, somehow between the lines of exegesis in the present work, some of the surpassing greatness of God's power and glory might be apparent. I hope also that increasingly this would be true in my own life.

Behind a work of this nature lies the context of supportive and understanding friends, family and colleagues. I want to express my particular appreciation to Dr Chris Marshall, Head of New Testament Department at the Bible College of New Zealand, who as my primary adviser has provided invaluable assistance, not only in helping me gain a deeper understanding of Paul's thought, but also in refining the expression of my own, and indeed through his consistent friendship, support and encouragement. My years of association with BCNZ have been especially enriching. Special thanks are also due to Dr Brendan Byrne SJ, Professor of New Testament at the Jesuit Theological College, who during a semester in Melbourne helped me greatly at a critical juncture in my studies. I am very grateful for the support and prayers of the Wednesday evening homegroup at St Margaret's, Auckland—particularly to Andrew and Kay, Andrea, John and Jocelyn—for the encouragement of Peter and Lois and friends, and the practical help at times from Vicki, Tim, Marcel and Theodore. With both our families, I really appreciated the fact that in their presence I never needed to wear a 'Don't ask me about my thesis!' T-shirt; their loving, prayerful support has been great. As for my beloved wife, Anne, she has been a tremendous encourager and a faithful, selfless helper. Post-graduate study involves significant sacrifices for the student; no less so for the spouse of such a student! Anne has been, and is, a wonderful blessing to me—who could ask more of a wife (Prov 31:10)? Finally, I give thanks to God for the One who died and rose again for me so that, since I thereby died with him, I believe I shall also live with him.

RICHARD J. WEYMOUTH
Damascus, March 1998
This study of the motif of death and resurrection with Christ in Romans 6:1–14 sets out primarily to examine the nature of the σιν εἰς Χριστῷ language, with which Paul usually expresses the motif, and to explore the interrelationship between its past, present and future tense aspects. An introductory chapter discusses the meaning and importance of the motif, key terminology, a brief history of interpretation, the role of Romans 6, aims and methodological issues. After this, the study considers the foundation of Christ's death and resurrection, beginning with the eschatological framework of Paul's thought and followed by a detailed exegesis of vv. 1–11 under the heading of union with Christ. It then turns to experiential aspects of the motif, firstly in conversion-initiation, providing an interpretation of βαπτίζειν εἰς Χριστόν and examining the relationship between baptism and dying with Christ, then considering the believer's faith in relation to baptism and in light of recent debate over the πίστευε Χριστῷ phrase. Following this, it examines the ethics of dying and rising with Christ, including exegesis of vv. 12–14 and comment on the indicative/imperative structure of Paul's ethics. Next the issue of resurrection with Christ in the passage is considered in some detail, with the implications of Paul's thought further illustrated by reference to Moltmann's *Theology of Hope*. An appendix contains a survey of σιν Χριστῷ language in the Pauline corpus to support the investigation. The study concludes by: (i) affirming the importance of the text for understanding the motif in Paul; (ii) confirming that his σιν- language (at least as found in Rom 6:1–14) is essentially participationist language and very closely linked to the events of Christ's death and resurrection; (iii) describing how the three tenses of the motif are interrelated in Paul's thought and held together in his eschatological perspective and understanding of the redemptive events as corporate and inclusive acts; and finally, (iv) offering suggestions for further research into the motif.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The task of this study is to examine the theological motif of death and resurrection with Christ in Paul as it finds expression in Romans 6:1-14. Our specific interest is in the participatory nature of the motif and in how its past, present and future aspects are related to each other. We will seek to find out if there is an underlying unity between these three tenses of participation in the events of Christ's death and resurrection and, if so, on what that unity is based.

I will be employing the term 'motif' throughout this study because it best conveys the sense of what 'death and resurrection with Christ' is in Paul's thought. By 'motif' is meant a pattern of thought employed for particular purposes. It is more concrete than an idea or concept, and more extensive than a formula or specific technical terminology.

1. The Motif of Death and Resurrection with Christ in Paul

In this section we shall discuss the meaning and importance of death and resurrection with Christ in Paul, in light of recent Pauline scholarship. This will involve comment on the language Paul uses to express the concepts associated with the motif and on key terminology employed by him. After this it will be necessary to consider the role Romans 6:1-14 plays within the overall motif of death and resurrection with Christ in Pauline theology. A final part will spell out more specifically the aims and scope of this study, incorporating methodological considerations and an outline of the remainder of the work.

---

1 Contra W. GRUNDMANN, 'ενίν - μετά ... κτλ.', TDNT VII, 782.
2 As will be discussed shortly, the motif, although usually associated with Paul's sinner-language, is not limited to the same. Cf. R. C. TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising with Christ: A Study in Pauline Theology (BZNW 32; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1967) 6.
(a) The Meaning and Importance of the Motif

The motif of death and resurrection with Christ is of central significance in Pauline theology. Few, if any, would dispute that Paul's gospel message primarily centres upon the death and resurrection of Christ. However, the focus of the motif is not so much upon Christ and his saving acts as upon believers who die and rise with Christ. The emphasis is thus upon the impact of the death and resurrection of Christ upon believers, particularly the participation of believers in those redemptive events.

A survey of συν Χριστῷ language in the Pauline corpus (see the Appendix below1) suggests that the essential meaning of Paul's 'with Christ' conception seems to be that of participation with Christ, particularly a participation in the career of Christ (specifically in his death and resurrection—to which other aspects are related2). However, it is pointed out that context must be determinative of meaning in each specific instance. By close exegesis of the text of Rom 6:1–14 (the context of five συν references), I hope to give weight to this suggestion and to show that the motif of death and resurrection with Christ in Paul is a very much a 'participationist' motif.

But by what criteria can we distinguish the motif in Paul's writings? Obviously a key feature of the motif is Paul's distinctive συν language: his συν Χριστῷ conception and related συν compounds. In fact this language provides the main, but not exclusive, vehicle for Paul to express the motif of death and resurrection with Christ. However, the motif of death and resurrection with Christ is broader in scope than the συν language. Associated themes such as 'power through weakness' (2 Cor 12:9) or the corporate sharing in Christ's death in the Lord's supper (1 Cor 10:16–17) should also be included in the motif.3 How may we identify the motif then? A simple demarcation will assist: it may be said to be present when Paul refers either to the believer's participation in

---

1 Pages 160–174 below.
2 Such as his sufferings, burial and resurrection–life.
3 These also speak of participation in Christ's death and/or resurrection.
Christ's death or to participation in his resurrection (or resurrection-life).\(^1\) or (most usually) to both aspects together.\(^2\) When both elements are present, they will be linked by a construction which parallels and relates to the contrast inherent in the concepts of 'death' and 'life.'\(^3\)

But what exactly does Paul have in mind when he speaks of 'death,' 'resurrection' and 'life'? How does he use these words in their various contexts? A brief survey of their usage and meanings for Paul, focussing specifically on what he means by the believer's death with Christ, resurrection with Christ and life with Christ, will assist in understanding the motif.\(^4\)

---

1. Participating in the resurrection-life of Christ, living with Christ and being with Christ in the future should be regarded as part of the motif as well, since they employ the same basic thought pattern as being raised or rising with Christ.

2. An exception, noted above, is 1 Cor 10:16-17, where only one element is present—sharing in the death (i.e. the body and blood) of Christ. That this concept is to be regarded as part of the motif is indicated by Paul's use of κοινωνία (10:16, twice) and κοινωνίας (10:18, 20), which should be interpreted, I believe, in 'participatory' (and not 'associative') terms and is thus closely related to Paul's συν- language. Cf. also J. SCHATTENMANN, 'κοινωνία,' NIDNTT 1, 643; F. HAUCK, 'κοινός ... κτλ..,' TDNT III, 806; P. T. O'BRIEN, 'Fellowship, Communion, Sharing,' DPL, 293-294.

3. Cf. TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 6. TANNEHILL's demarcation of the motif, however, excludes 1 Cor 10:16-17 (see the preceding note) from consideration since it requires that both elements be present simultaneously.

Death. The term θάνατος (and its related verbs ἀποθνῄσκειν, 'to die,' θανατοῖν, 'to kill, execute, condemn to death' ἀποκτείνειν, 'to kill') may refer to the cessation of earthly, physical, human life (e.g. Rom 7:2), but more often in Paul, it designates the spiritual-physical condition of humanity 'in Adam,' which came initially through the sin of Adam (Rom 5:12-21; 1 Cor 15:21-22). In Romans 5-8 particularly, Paul uses 'death' in close connection with 'sin,' 'flesh,' and even 'law,' as personified, cosmic powers of the old dominion, to which humanity had become enslaved (cf. Rom 6:6, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20). For Paul, death is described as the 'last enemy' (1 Cor 15:25-26) which will ultimately be 'swallowed up' in Christ's final victory (1 Cor 15:55-57).

In Romans 6 Paul uses ἀποθνῄσκειν to speak of both a past death to sin (v. 2 [of believers]; v. 10 [of Christ]) and the believer's death with Christ (v. 8). He uses θάνατος in Romans 6 to refer to Christ's death (on the cross) (vv. 3, 4, 5), and to the spiritual death resulting from sin (vv. 16, 21, 23). The adjective νεκρός is used four times to refer to the state of believers being dead to sin (v. 11; the end result of ἀποθνῄσκειν) and the state of physical death (vv. 4, 9, 13). Significantly, in no less than 28 places in the Pauline homologoumena (and 75 in the New Testament as a whole), νεκρός is the object of either ἐγείρειν, 'to raise, cause to rise,' or ἀνάστασις, 'resurrection' or other cognate words. This suggests that the state of death

---

1 In Romans 6 θάνατος is used seven times (vv. 3, 4, 5, 9, 16, 21, 23), ἀποθνῄσκειν six times (vv. 2, 7, 8, 9, 10 [twice]).
2 J. J. SCOTT, 'Life and Death,' DPL, 554.
4 In Rom 6:5, as we will see later, the 'form of Christ's death' has a slightly different nuance.
5 In v. 23 Paul may have in mind an eternal separation from God and final punishment as 'death.' So J. J. SCOTT, 'Life and Death,' 554.
6 As will be argued later, it is a mistake to regard the command 'consider yourselves to be dead to sin' (v. 11) as an ethical exhortation.
is no longer a final state for humankind, and must be viewed in the light of the resurrection of Jesus.¹

Of particular interest to the present study is the way Paul relates the idea of the believer’s ‘dying’ to the death of Christ. In Rom 6:1–11 he develops the idea of dying with Christ² with particular focus upon believers being dead to sin. But in other places Paul describes this dying also as a dying to the world (Gal 6:14), or to the law (Gal 2:19–20; Rom 7:4–6), to the flesh (Gal 5:24), or to living ‘for oneself’ (2 Cor 5:14–15).³ Most of these concepts refer primarily to a decisive transfer of believers from the old dominion into the new dominion. Of course, that is not to say Paul excludes a sense of ‘dying’ in the believer’s present experience, or that these references to dying have no implications for the believer’s life, for Paul plainly states that he dies ‘daily’ (1 Cor 15:31; cf. Rom 8:36) and is ‘always given over to death for Jesus’ sake’ (2 Cor 4:11). Significantly, Paul also relates his experience of suffering as a sharing or participation in the death of Christ in 2 Cor 4:7–12 (esp. v. 10) and Phil 3:10b (cf. Col 1:24). It is notable, however, that while Paul says that believers must ‘put to death’ the deeds of the body (Rom 8:13; cf. Col 3:5), nowhere does he exhort anyone to die ‘to sin’ because, as Rom 6:2 explains, believers have already ‘died to sin.’⁴

Thus the apostle regards death negatively as a cosmic power of the old dominion, as a spiritual state of death resulting from sin, and as the cessation of life. It can refer to Christ’s death on the cross, as well as the believer’s death or dying with Christ in that


² The expression is explicit in v. 8 (‘we have died with Christ’); cf. the related concepts of being ‘buried with’ Christ (v. 4), ‘united with the form of his death’ (v. 5) and ‘crucified with’ Christ (v. 6). These phrases will receive more detailed treatment in the exegesis of Section 3 below. Cf. also the similar expressions (to v. 8) in Col 2:20 and 2 Tim 2:11.

³ If Col 2:20 could be regarded as true to Paul’s thought, then one might also add dying to the enslaving powers (‘elemental spirits’) of the world.

⁴ That, of course, does not mean a believer lives a sin-free life or has no responsibility to deal with sin in his or her life, as Rom 6:12–23 clearly shows. It is a common and serious misunderstanding of Paul’s thought, however, to interpret Rom 6:1–11 in hortatory terms. As we will see later, the passage, when understood correctly, is thoroughly dogmatic in nature.
same event. Paul emphasizes in Romans 6 that the believer in sharing Christ's death has *died* to sin, and thus is now in the state of being *dead* to sin. However, just as Christ's death is intimately connected to his resurrection, so also the believer's death or dying with Christ is not to be separated from his or her resurrection or rising with Christ. The precise nature of the relationship between these two significant aspects of the motif is to be explicated in the remainder of this study.

**Resurrection.** Paul uses the nouns ἀνάστασις (Rom 6:5 and seven other references) and ἐπανάστασις (Phil 3:11 only) to describe both the resurrection of Christ himself and the general resurrection of believers which Christ's resurrection guarantees. In contrast to the remainder of the New Testament, Paul uses the related verb ἀνέστηκεν (‘to raise up’) and the even more frequently occurring ἐγείρεκεν (‘to raise,’ ‘to cause to rise’) almost exclusively to describe Christ’s resurrection from the dead or the general resurrection of the dead.1 Ἀνέστηκεν is used five times in the Pauline corpus, including two references to the resurrection of Christ and two to the resurrection of believers. Without any substantial difference in meaning to ἀνέστηκεν,2 the verb ἐγείρεκεν is employed forty times in the Pauline corpus with respect to the resurrection of either Christ (twenty-six references: nine in Romans, including Rom 6:4, 9; nine in 1 Corinthians 15) or the dead (fourteen references: ten in 1 Corinthians 15).3 Another verb, ἀναγείρειν (‘to bring up’), is used only once in Rom 10:7, also to describe the resurrection of Christ from the dead.

---

1 Outside Paul more ordinary meanings predominate; e.g. ‘to raise up [one lying down],’ ‘to introduce [a person on the stage of history],’ ‘to erect [a building],’ ‘to rise up [in order to do something],’ ‘to awaken [from sleep].’ Thus, A. OEPKE, ἀνάστησις ... κτλ., TDNT 1, 368-369 and ἐγείρει ... κτλ., TDNT II, 333-334. See also HARRIS, Raised Immortal, 269-270.

2 *OEPKE* (‘ἀφίλω,’ 335) has alleged that ἐγείρεκεν perhaps brings out better the concrete nature of the divine action than does ἀνέστηκεν. Similarly, C. BROWN & L. COENAN (‘Resurrection,’ NIDNTT 3, 276) suggest that ἐγείρειν is used predominantly, for ... the wakening of the Crucified to life, while ἀνέστηκεν and ἐπανάστασις refer more especially to the recall to life of people during the earthly ministry of Jesus and to the eschatological and universal resurrection.’ Against them, see L. J. KREITZER, ‘Resurrection,’ DPL, 807; HARRIS, Raised Immortal, 270.

3 In addition to this, one might add one use of ἐγείρειπέν (‘to raise up,’ 1 Cor 6:14) and three uses of συνεγείρειπέν (‘to raise up with’) in the deuterio-Paulines (Eph 2:6; Col 2:12; 3:1).
Life. Since resurrection, for Paul, is almost always a resurrection ‘from the dead’ (ἐκ νεκρῶν) or a raising of the dead, it is natural to suppose that ‘resurrection’ would be closely allied in his thought to death’s converse state, namely ‘life.’ In fact the two are intimately related; resurrection leads from death to life. Paul’s view of life is deeply affected by the resurrection of Christ from the dead, which being an accomplished fact, has proved the power of divine life over death (Rom 14:9). He regards Christ as the embodiment of God’s living power, conquering death and raising the dead (2 Cor 13:4). While he uses ἀιών (‘life’) and its cognates to refer to present, earthly existence which is bounded and transient (e.g. Rom 5:10; 7:1–2, 9; 8:12–13), Paul more frequently uses them to refer to a unique quality of life which comes through faith in and union with Christ. Such a life, for believers, is closely linked to Christ’s resurrection and post-resurrection life—what one might call his ‘resurrection-life.’ The life of believers is no longer their own life (Rom 14:7; 2 Cor 5:15) but the life of Christ: Christ lives in them (Gal 2:20; Phil 1:21); they live the life of Christ (2 Cor 4:10)—a life now lived both for God (Rom 6:10–11) and for Christ (Rom 14:8; 2 Cor 5:15).

In Romans the verb ζωή (‘to live’) is twice used with respect to Jesus’ resurrection and ‘resurrection-life’ (Rom 6:10; 14:9) in contrast to ‘the death that he died’ (Rom 6:10). In 2 Cor 13:4 it is similarly used, though contrasted there with the verb ‘to crucify.’ In the same verse ζωή is also applied to believers who will share in Christ’s resurrection-life (ζησομᾶς σων αὐτῷ). Such a goal is also described with the σων–compound verbs, συζησομᾶς (‘we shall live with [him]’) in Rom 6:8 (cf. 2 Tim 2:11), and συνδοξασομᾶς (‘we may be glorified with [him]’) in Rom 8:17. Another important verb, ζωοποιεῖν (‘to give life to’), occurs six times, sometimes to describe the future

---

2 LINK, ‘Life,’ 481.
3 J. J. SCOTT, ‘Life and Death,’ 553–554.
4 LINK, ‘Life,’ 481.
5 KREITZER, ‘Resurrection,’ 807. One can observe a significant contrast in the use of such language (when pertaining to resurrection concepts) between the undisputed Pauline epistles and the deutero-Pauline epistles, Colossians and Ephesians: in the former the future tense is used, whereas in the latter the aorist tense is employed (συναναστήσω [‘to rise up together’; Col 2:12; 3:1; Eph 2:6] and συνεζωοποιήσω [‘to make alive together with’; Col 2:13; Eph 2:5]).
resurrection of the dead (e.g. Rom 4:17), in other places to refer to the Spirit who raised Jesus from the dead giving life to believers (Rom 8:11; cf. 1 Cor 15:45; 2 Cor 3:6). In Romans 6 believers are said to be no longer living (ζησομεν) 'in sin' (Rom 6:1-2) or 'to sin' (Rom 6:6, 11) and now are enabled to walk in 'newness of life' (καινότητι ζωής; Rom 6:4). Their present state is also described as being 'alive to God' (ζωντας ... τῷ θεῷ; Rom 6:11) and 'alive from the dead' (ἐκ νεκρῶν ζωντας; Rom 6:13). It is notable also that Paul regards life—for believers—as not only following the state of physical or spiritual death, but paradoxically as being manifest in and through death itself (2 Cor 4:7-12): 'we are treated ... as dying yet behold, we live' (2 Cor 6:8-9).

The noun ζωή is sometimes combined with αἰωνίος in the Pauline corpus to mean 'eternal life,' a life that qualitatively belongs to the age to come (e.g. Rom 5:21; 6:22, 23) rather than the present age, yet is given to believers in and through Jesus Christ (cf. Rom 5:21; 6:23). However, for Paul (in marked contrast to the Johannine emphasis), 'eternal life' has a primary future orientation. In his thought it may thus be related to, though not equated with, the concept of 'immortality' (ἀθανασία; 1 Cor 15:53, 54; cf. 1 Tim 6:16) which essentially means immunity from spiritual and physical death. Paul insists that the immortality which God has promised to believers (1 Cor 15:53)—in the fullest sense of the term—is to be attained only at the time of the general and yet future resurrection of the dead (1 Cor 15:52-53).

In sum, we have observed that Paul uses ἀνάστασιν and ἐγείρειν and their cognates almost exclusively to refer to Christ's resurrection or the general resurrection of the dead. In most instances Paul describes resurrection as being 'from the dead.' Closely related to his resurrection language is ζωή with its cognates, which for Paul largely find a point of reference in Christ's resurrection and resurrection—life. The believer's life,

---

2 J. J. Scott, 'Life and Death,' 554.
3 Harris, Raised Immortal, 199-201. 273-275: J. J. Scott, 'Immortality,' DPL, 431-432.
which derives from his or her relationship with the risen Christ, manifests itself now as 'newness of life,' but at the time of the resurrection from the dead will include fullness of 'resurrection-life' with Christ.

It also appears that the idea of 'resurrection with Christ' does not match its complement of 'death with Christ' in all respects. The former is more carefully qualified by Paul and usually described in the future tense, whereas the latter is more often depicted with the aorist tense. An eschatological tension therefore exists for believers between the present and the future, and between the indicative and the imperative (Gal 5:25) of the Christian life. A fuller exploration of the contrasts and comparisons between dying and rising with Christ, and of the believer's relationship to Christ and the events of his death and resurrection forms the subject matter in the present investigation. We shall therefore leave more detailed discussion of these issues until later and turn now to some other introductory concerns.

The motif in its Pauline context. An important debate continues today about what may be regarded as the centre of Paul's theology. No clear consensus has emerged. If it is helpful to speak of a 'centre,' and this is debatable, my conviction is that it is to be found in Paul's theology of the cross (understood in its broader sense). While it may rightly be said that eschatology forms the essential framework of his theology, Paul's fundamental theological concern is soteriological, understood as God's salvation provided in Christ. Although it would need to be fully substantiated, a good case could be made for seeing the motif of death and resurrection with Christ as providing the main application of the coherent centre of Paul's thought (thus understood) to the contingent particularities of his teaching on the Christian life.  

---

1 I.e. not merely limited to crucifixion language in Paul.
Even a cursory examination of Paul's thought highlights the motif's importance: it is closely interrelated to, and has distinct implications for, Paul's soteriology, eschatology and christology (Rom 6:2-11, among many other references), his anthropology (Rom 6:6, 12-13; Phil 3:21), pneumatology (Rom 7:4-6; 8:9-11; Gal 5:24-25), ecclesiology (1 Cor 10:16-17), ethical theory (Rom 6:4-12-14), apostolic experience (2 Cor 4:7-14; 13:4) and personal spirituality (2 Cor 1:3-11; Phil 3:10-11). Clearly it is a very important motif within his thought as a whole.

**The motif in recent scholarship.** Given the obvious significance of the motif, it is surprising that in the last 60 years only one substantial scholarly study has been devoted to examining the entire motif (Tannehill, 1967).1 While some monographs have treated only part of the motif (notably the future tense aspect of resurrection with Christ, e.g. Dupont, 1952; Siber, 1976)2 or explored a specific aspect of Paul's teaching (such as baptism, e.g. Schnackenburg, 1950)3 or a specific text,4 other discussions dealing with the motif as a whole have all been of article length only, or less.5

---


4 Such as Rom 6:1-14; the most recent is P. L. STEPP's, *The Believer's Participation in the Death of Christ: 'Corporate Identification' and a Study of Romans 6:1-14* (MBPS 49; Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1996). This relatively short (112 pp.) but pertinent study only came to light during the final stages of the present work. Regrettably, it has not been possible to consult it.

How, then, has the motif been understood by the interpreters of Paul? An overview of some of the major contributions of this century will be a helpful backdrop for our examination of Romans 6.

A trend among a number of earlier interpreters was to understand Paul's teaching on dying and rising with Christ in terms of 'mysticism.' Adolf Deissmann and Johannes Schneider, for example, took up the term 'passion mysticism' to speak of a personal mystical union with Christ through experiences of suffering. Albert Schweitzer correctly emphasized the importance of eschatology and the redemptive-historical character of salvation for understanding Paul's thought. Within such an eschatological framework, Schweitzer claimed that Paul held to a 'Christ-mysticism' whereby, through baptism, the body of Christ—understood in terms of the concept of the predestined solidarity of the elect with the Messiah—participates realistically and corporeally in the eschatological events of the Christ's death and resurrection. However, in giving

1 Definitions of the term 'mysticism' can often be too generic to be useful. TANNEHILL (Dying and Rising, 3 n. 4) gives a clear definition of the term which is helpful: 'the doctrine that the individual can come into immediate contact with God through subjective experiences which differ essentially from the experiences of ordinary life.' On this definition Paul could be regarded as a 'mystic' (cf. 2 Cor 12:1-4), but he does not have a 'mystical' theology.

2 DEISSMANN, St Paul; SCHNEIDER, Die Passionsmystik.

3 SCHWEITZER, Mysticism of Paul.

4 SCHWEITZER, Mysticism of Paul, 113, 118.

5 SCHWEITZER, Mysticism of Paul, 109-110, 117.
principal emphasis to the idea of the body of Christ, Schweitzer inadequately considered Paul's use of dying and rising with Christ and failed to see important aspects of the function this motif plays in his eschatology. While others have continued to speak of death and resurrection with Christ in terms of mysticism, many scholars now reject this line of interpretation.

Other interpreters, such as Ernest Best, see the key to understanding the motif of death and resurrection with Christ in 'some form of corporate personality or racial solidarity.' However, as I will argue below, while the notions of Christ as an inclusive person and his death and resurrection as corporate acts are helpful to understanding Paul's thought, the term 'corporate personality' raises a number of problems and is best avoided.

Ernst Lohmeyer, in an earlier influential article, assumed that κόσμος Χριστού was a formula comparable to ἐν Χριστῷ in Paul's usage, deriving ultimately from Jewish and Christian apocalyptic. In his view 'with Christ' speaks not of a happening, but of an existence with Christ. However, he interpreted death and resurrection with Christ primarily on the basis of the phrase κόσμος Χριστοῦ εἶναι and tended to ignore the significance of Paul's other κόσμω- compounds. He also failed to see that the motif of death and resurrection with Christ is more extensive than references employing κόσμω-

---
1 Thus TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 5; cf. also the critique of RIDDERBOS, Paul: Outline, 29–32.
5 See pp. 26–28 below.
6 LOHMEYER, ἘΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ.
language would suggest. Both Jacques Dupont and Peter Siber, like Lohmeyer, focussed their attention on the future life of believers ‘with Christ.’ Dupont holds that the eschatological prospect of believers ‘living and reigning with Christ’ is primary, with Paul’s baptismal sayings being derived from that. Unfortunately, he has not published the second part of his research, which was to have dealt with present tense aspects of the motif in Paul. Siber also draws out the connection between the expectation of life or glorification with Christ and the idea of suffering with Christ, as well as showing how the future hope of being raised with Christ is grounded in other texts (notably Rom 6:1–14) upon the concept of a past death with Christ, which Paul never connects with suffering. Siber has thus highlighted Paul’s distinctive contribution in allowing the already past eschatological events of Christ’s death and resurrection to govern his understanding of the Christian hope.

Taking a different interpretation, Rudolf Schnackenburg finds the meaning of ‘with Christ’ in Paul’s sacramental thought, particularly in connection with baptism. It expresses ‘present sacramental unity with Christ, and the fulfilment with him of his once-for-all death.’ For Schnackenburg dying and rising with Christ are central to Paul’s understanding of baptism. However, Schnackenburg overemphasizes both the importance of baptism in Paul’s presentation of death and resurrection with Christ and the extent of reference to baptism in Romans 6.

Eduard Schweizer, while focussing his attention on the idea of ‘living with Christ,’ seeks to strike a balance between the positions represented by Lohmeyer and Schnackenburg. He places Paul’s ‘with Christ’ conception into three categories: uses found in apocalyptic contexts, uses found in baptismal contexts, and those found in combined apocalyptic-baptismal contexts. Schweizer helpfully focuses upon baptism as

---

1 See the criticisms of TANNEFILL, Dying and Rising, 6, 87–88 and SCHNACKENBURG, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 173.
2 DUPONT, ΣΥΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ; SIBER, Mit Christus leben.
3 SIBER, Mit Christus leben, 251–258.
4 SCHNACKENBURG, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 37.
both a foundational participation in Christ's death and an anticipation of eschatological life. But Schweizer both overemphasizes the role of baptism and oversimplifies the variety of ways in which Paul uses the motif of death and resurrection with Christ.

Although he has not written extensively on the subject, E. P. Sanders has put forward an important interpretation of the motif. In keeping with his concept of a 'participationist eschatology' Sanders believes that 'with Christ' in Paul should be seen as a 'transfer term' referring to the transfer of lordship that takes place through participation in the death of Christ. Sanders particularly emphasizes the participatory nature of Paul's thought in Romans 6–8 which pervades the text we will presently investigate.

A number of other studies have emphasized the idea of suffering with Christ, relating the motif of dying and rising with Christ in its present tense aspect to Paul's apostolic ministry (see especially Phil 3:7–11 and 2 Cor 4:7–14). Related to this is the idea of 'power through weakness' (cf. 2 Cor 12:9; 13:4). While these are important aspects of the overall motif in Paul, they are not present in Romans 6, and thus are beyond the scope of the present investigation.

1 SCHWEIZER, 'Dying and Rising,' 1–14.
The one substantial study of the motif is Robert C. Tannehill’s *Dying and Rising with Christ: A Study in Pauline Theology.* Although only 136 pages long, Tannehill’s monograph represents a fine exegetical study of Paul. Although his investigation commenced with very modest aims, he has highlighted the importance of the motif and produced a ‘benchmark’ for later scholarship on the topic. He divides the motif into its three temporal aspects (past, present and future) and within this structure offers a passage by passage exegetical sub-structure. At the end of Part II, Tannehill concludes that ‘Paul’s use of dying and rising with Christ is complex, emphasizing in turn the past entry into new life, the present participation in life through death, and the future participation in the life of the resurrection.’ Among the major contributions Tannehill makes are his appreciation of the eschatological framework that undergirds Paul’s theology (particularly in Romans 6) and embraces past, present and future aspects of the believer’s death and resurrection with Christ, and his understanding of the corporate and inclusive nature of both Christ and the events of his death and resurrection.

However, the study is not without its weaknesses. Although Tannehill covers the Pauline *homologoumena* fairly thoroughly and relates the motif to several areas of Paul’s thought, three significant aspects of the motif receive little or no treatment in his monograph: (i) the example of the apostle’s own life in dying and rising with Christ; (ii) the Spirit and resurrection with Christ; and (iii) the Lord’s Supper and participation.

---

1 See p. 1 n. 2 above for full reference.
2 To show ‘that dying and rising with Christ is not only a motif which might be fruitful for theological discussion today, but also is a key which opens the way to a better understanding of important areas of Paul’s thought’ (*Dying and Rising*, 1).
3 *Dying and Rising*, 129. Although Part III (on rising with Christ at his coming) follows, this probably represents TANNEHILL’s overall conclusion to his study. Similar in substance to TANNEHILL’s work, though shorter and less of an exegetical study, is SMEDES’ discussion in *Union with Christ*, 129-154. Also in large agreement with TANNEHILL’S conclusions is HARVEY’s brief but helpful survey of Paul’s ‘with Christ’ language (*‘With Christ’ Motif*, 329-340).
4 Texts examined include: (Part I: *Dying with Christ as the Basis of the New Life*) Romans 6: 7:1-6; Ephesians and Colossians; Gal 2:19-20; 5:24-25; 6:14-15; 2 Cor 5:14-17; (Part II: *Dying and Rising with Christ as the Structure of the New Life*) 2 Cor 4:7-14; 1:3-9 & 7:3; 13:4 & 12:9; 1 Thess 1:5-8 & 2:13-16; Rom 8:17; Phil 3:2-11; (Part III: *Rising with Christ at His Coming*) 1 Thess 4:14 & 5:10. Aspects of Paul’s thought discussed in relation to the motif include: eschatology (*passim*, but esp. pp. 14-20, 127-129), Paul’s use of *eisōma* (pp. 71-74), ethical exhortation (pp. 77-83), suffering (pp. 84-129), the motif of conformation to Christ (pp. 104-112) and righteousness by faith (pp. 123-126).
in the death of Christ. He also omits from consideration three important texts—2 Cor 3:4–6; 6:1–10 and Phil 2:5–11. In addition, Tannehill has not adequately explained the place of the motif within Paul’s theology as a whole—no attempt is made, for example, to relate the motif to debate concerning a cohesive centre to Paul’s thought.

It is not my intention to address these shortcomings in the present work. My intention is to pursue a parallel line of investigation with specific reference to Rom 6:1–14. This will entail interaction with Tannehill’s exegesis, where appropriate, as well as the incorporation of the fruits of more recent research on the subject.

(b) The Role of Romans 6:1–14

The material presented in Romans 6:1–14 provides an important key to interpreting the motif of death and resurrection with Christ in Paul’s theology elsewhere in his epistles. It is also pertinent to understanding the motif as it is found in the deuteronomy-Pauline epistles (and indeed in the pastoral epistles) whether or not the latter derive from the apostle himself. There are several strong grounds to support such an assertion. We may note:

(i) that this passage represents the most extended treatment of the motif in the Pauline corpus. As such it provides more detail for understanding the meaning and function of the motif within Paul’s thought than does any other passage.

(ii) Secondly, the passage contains no less than five instances of Paul’s στὶν Χριστῷ terminology (vv. 4a, 5a, 6a, 8a, 8b),2 representing the highest concentration of this language anywhere in his epistles. As mentioned above, this language is the main linguistic vehicle used by Paul to express the motif.

(iii) Not surprisingly, therefore, the passage focuses on the essential core of the motif.

The central thrust of Rom 6:1–14 is to explicate the meaning of the believer’s union

---

1 The latter passage is important to understanding better Phil 3:10–11, particularly the unusual ordering of resurrection—death in the text.

2 See p. 62 n. 1 below for citations from the Greek text. A sixth instance is implicit in v. 5b, since the στὶν Χριστῷ from v. 5a should be supplied there.
or participation with Christ in the redemptive-historical events of his death and resurrection.

(iv) Related to this, this passage, together with Rom 5:12-21 preceding it, forms one of Paul's most profound reflections upon the meaning of Christ's death and resurrection as eschatological, aeon-shaping events.\(^1\)

(v) Fifthly, the passage contains both components of the motif, death and resurrection with Christ, as well as all three of its tenses—past, present and future.\(^2\)

(vi) Within its rich theological depth Rom 6:1-14 incorporates what could be considered as the most important and foundational aspect of the motif for Paul. The past aspect of the motif is particularly significant for the apostle since it provides the theological foundation upon which both present and future aspects are based. As will be seen later, the believer's past participation in Christ's death (and resurrection)\(^3\) is particularly emphasized in the passage. It is this that forms the basis for the dying and rising with Christ in the believer's experience, both now and in the future.

A thorough grasp of the motif's meaning in Rom 6:1-14 is thus essential to understanding the motif elsewhere within the Pauline homologoumena. What exactly does Rom 6:1-14 have to say about it? Answering this question is a major part of the task at hand. The passage is a difficult one and has been variously understood by commentators.\(^4\) The following study is a fresh attempt to grapple with Paul's thinking in

---

1 Concerning this, see the discussion of Paul's eschatological framework in Section 2 below.

2 Aspects of the motif not explicit in Romans 6 include: the idea of suffering with Christ, the theme of power through weakness, the Lord's Supper as corporate participation in Christ's death; and the Spirit's relationship with participation in Christ's resurrection.

3 The bracketing of 'resurrection' here (and elsewhere in the study) is intended to express Paul's eschatological restraint from speaking about resurrection with Christ as an accomplished past event. In Romans 6 he rather puts resurrection with Christ explicitly in the future tense. However, since for Paul Christ's death and resurrection are inseparably linked a past resurrection with Christ may be implicit in his thought. Whether or not this is the case will be explored and discussed more fully in Section 7 below.

4 Among those who have made more significant contributions to the interpretation of Romans 6 and who have recognized the importance of the motif of death and resurrection with Christ, giving it more than a summary mention, one might include: WAGNER, *Pauline Baptism*; SCHNACKENBURG, *Baptism in the Thought of Paul*, 112-177; TANNEHILL, *Dying and Rising*, especially 7-43, 77-83; G. BORNKAMM, *Baptism and New Life in Paul*, *Early Christian*
Romans 6 and thus shed light upon the complex pattern of thought concerning the believer's death and resurrection with Christ.

(c) The Aims and Scope of this Investigation

Specifically, this study will seek to provide:

(i) a detailed explication of the motif of death and resurrection with Christ, as found in Romans 6:1-14;

(ii) an exegetical confirmation that Paul's ζωή language (at least in the case of Romans 6:1-14) is essentially 'participatory' language;

(iii) a coherent explanation of how past, present and future tenses of the motif (as found in Romans 6:1-14) are related in Paul's thought, including determination of the basis (if any) for an underlying unity between these three tenses, and discussion of the relationship between the events of Christ's death and resurrection and the believer's participation in them with Christ;

(iv) some suggestions, in light of the present study, for a more comprehensive treatment of the motif of death and resurrection with Christ in Paul.

Chapter II will focus upon Christ's death and resurrection and the past participation of believers in those events. It will discuss the overriding eschatological framework being used by Paul, including his use of corporate and inclusive thought. then present a

detailed exegesis of Rom 6:1–11 to explore the significance for Paul of the death and resurrection of Christ and the believer’s union with Christ.

Chapters III & IV will examine in turn four different aspects of death and resurrection with Christ in the experience of believers as found in Rom 6:1–14. Chapter III will consider the past experience of ‘conversion–initiation,’ beginning with the notion of baptism into Christ and his death. A more definitive explanation of the meaning of βαπτίζειν εἰς Χριστόν will be given, as well as an account of the theological significance of dying with Christ in baptism. Since faith (and the believer’s conversion) is closely related to baptism in Paul’s thought, we will then deal with the dual issue of this close relationship and of faith’s connection to death and resurrection with Christ.

In Chapter IV present and future aspects of the believer’s experience of dying and rising with Christ are to be treated. The ethical implications of Rom 6:1–14 will be examined first, including discussion of the indicative–imperative structure of Pauline ethics. A natural link to the notion of resurrection with Christ is provided by the reference to ‘walking in newness of life’ in Rom 6:4c. The chapter will thus explore also the issue of whether resurrection with Christ should be regarded as an accomplished fact or as an object of expectation.

Chapter V will present the conclusions of the investigation. It will discuss the participatory nature of the motif, the interrelation of past, present and future aspects of the believer’s death and resurrection with Christ in Rom 6:1–14, and then will offer suggestions for further study of the motif in Paul.

Finally, in a supporting appendix, I will provide a survey of the οὖν– language in the Pauline homologoumena, with particular emphasis upon Paul’s οὖν Χριστῷ (‘with Christ’) conception, its basic meaning, point of reference and character.
It is apparent that I have chosen to organize the material topically, rather than follow a strict verse by verse exegesis of the text of Rom 6:1-14. The ordering of discussing first Paul's eschatological framework (§ 2), then union with Christ (§ 3), baptism into Christ (§ 4), conversion/faith (§ 5), ethics (§ 6) and resurrection with Christ (§ 7) is a natural and logical arrangement. Since part of the interest of this paper is in the interrelation of past, present and future aspects of the believer's death and resurrection with Christ, it is appropriate that I am roughly following this temporal order. In fact the intention is to follow the sequence of the believer's redemptive history, endeavouring as far as possible to be true to Paul's thought. In addition, this approach will provide greater accessibility to the apostle's often complex theology as it applies to the believer's life and experience.

One other methodological matter requires mention: The use of texts outside Rom 6:1-14. In Section 4 three additional texts (Gal 3:27; 1 Cor 12:13; 10:2) will be examined. They are included because of their importance in determining the meaning of 'baptism into Christ' in Rom 6:3-4. Similarly, in Section 5 two passages from Galatians (2:19-20; 3:26-27) assist in exploring the relationship between baptism, faith and dying and rising with Christ. Among other references made from time to time to texts outside Romans 6, inclusion of material from Colossians and Ephesians is problematic. The authorship of these epistles is widely disputed. But a comparison between them and Romans 6 is

---

1 Section 3 will, however, contain a sustained exegesis of Rom 6:1-11.
2 Perhaps some might take issue with the placement of baptism before conversion/faith, but I am doing this because the believer's faith is only implicit in the argument of Rom 6:1-14, whereas baptism is explicitly mentioned in vv. 3-4.
valid whatever their origin. Indeed reference to these epistles is important in any treatment of the motif of death and resurrection with Christ, because in them, significantly, resurrection with Christ is in the aorist tense—in contrast with Romans 6 and elsewhere in the undisputed Pauline epistles where it is explicitly put in the future tense. Therefore, where it is useful to do so, I will occasionally make reference to texts from Colossians and Ephesians, but only where they will help to clarify what Paul is and is not saying and/or implying in Romans 6, and while maintaining, at the same time, an open position upon their authorship.

We now turn to examine exegetically and theologically the motif of death and resurrection with Christ in Rom 6:1–14.
CHAPTER II
THE FOUNDATION OF CHRIST’S DEATH AND RESURRECTION

It is appropriate to begin our treatment of the motif in Romans 6 with the salvific and eschatological events that are foundational to it, the death and resurrection of Christ himself. This chapter first examines the eschatological framework underlying Paul’s teaching and the nature of Christ’s death and resurrection (Section 2). This is prerequisite for understanding the concept of union with Christ in Romans 6:1-11. I will offer a detailed exegesis of that passage in Section 3. We will see that it focuses upon the past aspect of union with Christ, and gives greater emphasis to the believer’s death with Christ. An understanding of the decisive nature of the past participation of believers in Christ’s death (and resurrection) is crucial for rightly interpreting both the present experience of dying and rising with Christ for believers and the future aspect of resurrection with Christ.

2. The Eschatological Framework of Paul

We consider first the apocalyptic background to Paul’s theology—as modified by the Christ-event—and then the issue of corporate and inclusive thought in Paul which, we shall see, also has Jewish roots.

(a) Jewish Apocalyptic and Paul

Reflecting the idiom of Jewish apocalyptic, Paul considers history to be divided into two ages or dominions—this present Age, olam hazeh, and the Age to Come, olam habbah.1 But in a radical departure from Judaism, Paul understands that redemptive

events belonging to the Age to Come have taken place within recent history. Paul's whole concern is with the proclamation and explication of the eschatological time of salvation inaugurated with Christ's advent, death, and resurrection. It is of the greatest importance to see the significance of Christ's death and resurrection at the centre of Paul's proclamation as an inseparable unity; the significance of each is determined by the significance of the other. As Moltmann says, 'the risen Christ is the historical and crucified Jesus, and vice versa.' In these redemptive-historical events we find the breakthrough of the new aeon into the old.

The contrast between these two dominions or aeons and their respective lords is basic to Paul's thought, and particularly to Romans 6. Each of these aeons, 'unified spheres' or 'power fields' in Tannehill's terminology, is seen as having different ruling powers which determine its nature and mark it off from the other.

In the old aeon the powers include (most notably) sin (Rom 3:9; 5:12, 21; 6:6, 12, 14, 16–20; 7:23–8:2, etc.), death (Rom 5:14, 17, 21), Satan (2 Cor 4:4) and demonic powers (Rom 8:38; 1 Cor 15:24). The aeon is characterized by its evil (Gal 1:4), its transitoriness (1 Cor 7:31) and futility (Rom 8:20), and by human existence in bondage to these powers, described as being 'in sin' (Rom 6:1; cf. 6:2; and see the references.

---

2. RIDDERBOS, *Paul: Outline*, 44.
3. See for example 1 Cor 15:3–4.
6. TANNEHILL, *Dying and Rising*, 15, notes that the term 'dominion' is more true to the terminology of Romans 6 here, as he is speaking of the two sets of powers which 'reign' or 'have dominion over' humankind. 'Aeon', however, carries the same sense but has the advantage of making clear the eschatological setting of this pattern of thought.
8. Cf. also Eph 6:12 & Col 2:15 for the latter item.
9. Paul does not know a dualistic cosmology whereby two opposite aeons co-exist eternally.
above), 'in Adam' (1 Cor 15:22), 'under law' (Rom 6:15; Gal 4:5), or 'in the flesh' (Rom 7:5–6, 8:9).\(^1\)

The new aeon, by contrast, has as its ruling powers, grace (Rom 5:20–21; 6:14–15), obedience (Rom 6:16), righteousness (Rom 6:18–20) and, especially, God (Rom 6:10–13, 22–23). Life under the new dominion is characterized as life 'in Spirit' (Rom 7:6; 8:9) and 'in Christ' (Rom 6:11; 8:1–2; 2 Cor 5:17).\(^2\)

The connection Paul develops in Rom 5:12–21 between the two dominions and the two 'persons,' Adam and Christ, enables him to bring out clearly the christological and soteriological foundation of the new dominion or aeon. Christ as the founder of the new aeon is set against Adam of the old. More specifically, it is Christ's act that is the foundation of the new, just as Adam's act was the foundation of the old. Adam's 'transgression' and 'disobedience' (5:18–19) allowed sin and death to enter the world and to reign in it (5:12, 14, 17, 21). Contrastingly, Christ's 'righteous act' and 'obedience' (5:18–19), referring primarily to his death, but including his resurrection, brings an end to this reign of sin and death and establishes the new dominion. Thus this connection between the two dominions and their respective founders is closely linked to the idea of dying and rising with Christ in Romans 6, where Paul speaks of the decisive release of believers from the old dominion and their transfer to the new.\(^3\)

(b) Corporate and Inclusive Thought in Paul

Adam and Christ are both seen in Rom 5:12–21 as 'universal personalities ... construed cosmically and eschatologically,' who comprehend within and under themselves all the

---


\(^2\) See TANNEHILL, *Dying and Rising*, 16, 19–20; and discussion of this key Pauline phrase on pp. 58–60 below.

members of the generations of people pertaining to them.\(^1\) Paul says of each of these corporate persons; as the one, so the many (5:12, 15, 17, 18, 19; cf. 1 Cor 15:48). Each determines the existence of the many, so that the fate of the many is tied up with the fate of the one. To go on to say that the determinative acts of the two corporate persons are themselves corporate or inclusive acts is only a small step in Paul’s logic.\(^2\) But this I hope to demonstrate from a consideration of Rom 6:1–11 below.

Closely linked to Paul’s understanding of the nature of Christ’s death and resurrection is his distinctive ‘with Christ’ language.\(^3\) The underlying concept probably has Jewish roots. While there are no true parallels in the Old Testament – Jewish tradition to the ‘with Christ’ language in Paul, there is an obvious parallel to the idea in the Mishnaic text relating to the Passover, Pesahim 10.5:

In any generation a man must so regard himself as if he came forth himself out of Egypt, for it is written, ‘And thou shalt tell thy son in that day saying, “It is because of that which the Lord did for me when I came out of Egypt”’ (Exod 13:8). ... He brought us out from bondage to freedom, from sorrow to gladness, and from mourning to a festival day, and from darkness to light, and from servitude to redemption ... Not our ancestors alone did God redeem then, but he did us redeem with them as it is said (Deut 6:23): ‘And he brought us out from thence that he might bring us in to give us the land which he sware unto our fathers.’

Very similar to this is the idea embodied in the liturgical response of the Passover Haggadah: ‘We were slaves to the Pharaoh in Egypt, and the Lord our God brought us forth from thence ...’\(^5\) Comparable, but not as striking, is Amos 3:1: ‘Hear this word that the Lord has spoken to you, O people of Israel, against the whole family which


\(^{2}\) TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 27. Cf. GRUNDMANN, ‘σῶν – μετά,’ 789; BEST, One Body in Christ, 41–42, 203–207; D. J. Moo, ‘Exegetical Notes: Romans 6:1–14,’ TrinJ 3 NS no. 2 (1982) 217; THUSING, Per Christum in Deum, 74–75. Though we do not see this latter idea in Rom 5:12–21, we find it in the notion of death and resurrection with Christ in Romans 6.

\(^{3}\) See my survey of this language in the Appendix below.

\(^{4}\) Trans. DANBY: quotation from WEDDERBURN, Baptism and Resurrection, 343, 344.

\(^{5}\) W. D. DAVIES believes this was probably arranged by Gamaliel II in 80–120 CE and thus goes back to an earlier ritual. Thus WEDDERBURN, Baptism and Resurrection, 344.
I brought up out of the land of Egypt.' Schweizer believes this verse illustrates the concept that an event of the past can be ‘present’ for those whose life is founded on it.  

Certainly the solidarity and unity of the nation from generation to generation is clearly expressed in it. However, the phrase ‘he did us redeem with them’ in the Passover liturgy is perhaps the nearest example we have to Paul’s usage of ὄνν Ἰησοῦν.  

In the Mishnaic text we also find the idea of a ritual in which the participants find themselves in some sense involved, as it were, in past redemptive events experienced by a past generation of God’s people.  

It is possible that Paul and other early Christians viewed their rites against this background and saw themselves in their baptism as being one with the first generation of God’s re-created people, a first generation that consisted of but one person, the last Adam, Jesus of Nazareth.

The popular term ‘corporate personality’ is often invoked here, and many interpreters see in it a key to understanding certain aspects of Paul’s thought. It points to the figure of a progenitor or leader or king or spokesperson who represents a whole people or societal relationship and with whom the members of this group can be identified. But recent studies have shown that the anthropological theories upon which the term was originally formulated are not very sound. Its ambiguities and limitations must be recognized, and the term itself is probably best avoided. The background to Paul’s

---

1 E. SCHWEIZER, Lordship and Discipleship (SBT 28; London: SCM, 1960) 47.  
2 The ‘with them’ translates יַדְמוּ. Thus WEDDERBURN, Baptism and Resurrection, 344 n. 9.  
3 WEDDERBURN, Baptism and Resurrection, 344.  
5 It originates in the work of H. WHEELER ROBINSON (The Christian Doctrine of Man (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911) 8 & passim) who saw the term as indispensable for understanding ancient Hebrew thought.  
8 For example, is it the individual Christ or all those represented by him that are the ‘corporate personality’? Is it that one or a group is a ‘corporate personality’ or is it something one has? Usually one speaks of a person as having a certain character and personality. It may, then, be better
corporate or inclusive patterns of thought is more complicated than is assumed when understood in terms of 'corporate personality.'

Nevertheless, Paul does seem to conceive of Christ as an inclusive person, in that what happens to him also happens to Christians—through their solidarity with him. When Christ died, those identified with him died with him (cf. 2 Cor 5:14, 'one died for all, therefore all died'). If it is correct then that Paul sees the person and salvific acts of Christ as inclusive or corporate in nature, in this sense one could refer to Christ as a corporate person. If understood in terms of the Old Testament idea of the solidarity of the tribe or nation which could be manifested through one person who is representative of the whole, a concept of Christ as a 'corporate person' would help to clarify how Paul’s thought would have been (at least partly) intelligible to his readers. Best believes this conception can be found in Paul’s εν Χριστῷ and ον Χριστῷ references, as well as in the Adam–Christ parallels, mentioned above. It would certainly be wrong to say, though, that Paul believes Christians express the corporate personality of Christ. Paul always draws a clear distinction between Christ and Christians. If we do employ instead the term ‘corporate person’ to describe his understanding of Christ, we must recognize that, for Paul, Christ still holds quite a unique place: Christians die with Christ, but he dies for them—the latter being causal of the former. As Walter Grundmann says,

to speak of a group as a 'corporate person' rather than a 'corporate personality.' So WEDDERBURN, Baptism and Resurrection, 352 n. 4.

1 See those cited in n. 7 of the preceding page; also WEDDERBURN, Body of Christ in 1 Corinthians, 83–85, 95. TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 28–29 cautions, too, that there are problems associated with this term, 'corporate personality.' He notes that Paul’s interpretation of Adam and Christ has important aspects which are not derived from Old Testament ideas of corporate personality, such as the sharp dualism of earthly and heavenly in 1 Cor 15:45–49.

2 BEST, One Body in Christ, 56–57. See also RIDDERBOS, Paul: Outline, 38 & n. 89; and pp. 170–171 below.

3 Cf. n. 8 of the preceding page.

4 TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 28. On this cf. STEPP, Believer’s Participation, who speaks of a ‘corporate identification’ defined as: ‘the religious concept in which an individual is viewed as part of a corporate whole. The members of the group are understood to participate in the actions of the individual members, especially the actions of the leader or ruler of the group’ (citation from NT 41 no. 1 [1997] 162).


6 BEST, One Body in Christ, 57–58.
it is ‘Paul’s recurrent Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (Rom 5:6, 8, 10) which makes possible the ὑμεῖς σὺν Χριστῷ.’ The presupposition of Paul’s soteriological teaching, in the words of Paul Althaus, is his ‘conviction that Christ’s death and resurrection are facts which contain a comprehensive reality that affects the whole of humanity.’ It is this conviction to which Paul gives expression in his ‘with Christ’ language.

(c) Summary

In approaching the textual data of Romans 6, we need to be cognizant of the eschatological framework of Paul’s thought. Christ’s death and resurrection is an eschatological event that both effects and marks the breakthrough of the new aeon into the old. To understand the death (and resurrection) of believers with Christ as a past event, we must appreciate, in particular, the concept of the two dominions and the transfer of believers from the old to the new. Related to this is the acknowledgment that for Paul both the person of Christ and his salvific acts are corporate and inclusive in nature. Believers are included in the founding of the new dominion by the death (and resurrection) of Christ and participate, through this, in the bringing to an end of the reign of sin and death. But it is because Christ has died for believers that Christians can be said to have died with Christ (2 Cor 5:14b) and thus are able to share also in the resurrection-life of the new dominion.

---

3 Paul gives primary emphasis to the death of Christ as the founding event of the new dominion. However, this is not to the exclusion of the resurrection since, for Paul, the two are inseparably linked.
3. Union with Christ: An Exegesis of Romans 6:1–11

Romans 6:1–11 could well be described as the *locus classicus* of the motif of death and resurrection with Christ in Paul. Some see it more specifically as a *locus classicus* of his baptismal theology. While dealing with the motif as a whole, this passage represents the most significant treatment of the motif’s past tense aspect in the Pauline corpus. A good grasp of Rom 6:1–11 is a prerequisite for understanding the motif elsewhere in Paul.

(a) The Dominion of Sin (Rom 6:1–2)

We see in Rom 6:1–2 the immediate purpose of Paul’s teaching in this section of his epistle. The apostle has just stated that ‘where sin increased grace abounded all the more’ (5:21b). Now he presents a hypothetical objector as asking, ‘Are we to continue (ἐνένομον) in sin that grace might abound?’ This is one possible objection to the thesis of justification by grace through faith. His definitive answer, μὴ γένοιτο, shows his repugnance at such a thought. To the contrary, a Christian has made a decisive and irrevocable break with sin! There is something fundamentally inconsistent about a person who has died to sin living in sin any longer. The aorist ἀπεθάνομεν indicates a decisive, punctiliar separation from sin, and should be translated as ‘we died.’ The datives in τῷ ἀμαρτίᾳ are probably datives of ‘disadvantage.’ With the verb ‘die,’ they suggest that one has ‘changed one’s state to the detriment of’ sin. With the context of 5:21 (the two reigns or dominions of sin and grace) in mind, Paul is speaking of the

---

1. So SCHNACKENBURG, *Baptism in the Thought of Paul*, 30 among others. The extent and significance of reference to baptism in this passage is disputed though, and we shall discuss this issue shortly.
2. Verses 1–11 form a thematic subdivision within chapter 6, even though a literary subdivision of vv. 1–14, determined by the parallel questions in diatribe style in v. 1 and v. 15, is also observable. (So E. KÄSEMANN, *Commentary on Romans* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980] 163.)
reign, dominion, or aeon of sin. Believers have been transferred from the dominion of sin to the dominion of grace. Thus the aorist ἀπεθάνομεν is epochal, implying a shift in the ages. When did the death to sin take place? Paul does not answer this question explicitly. Some suggest it takes place in conjunction with the believer's conversion or baptism (based on the closeness to v. 3). But against this is the stress on participation in the redemptive events of Christ's death, burial and resurrection in vv. 4–6, 8, and the subordinate place of baptism in Romans 6. This suggests rather that believers died to sin when they died with Christ on Golgotha. This will be seen more clearly as our discussion proceeds. At this point, the important thing to note is that believers have decisively died to sin.

The consequence of this death to sin is that believers shall no longer live ἐν αὐτῇ (‘in it’). Where one might have expected another simple dative to follow ἐγγυσμεν (‘shall we live’), we find instead the preposition τῷ, which is another way in which Paul refers to the dominion of sin. The verb ἐγγυσμεν is best seen as a logical future here. Does the reference to ‘living in sin’ (v. 2b), then, refer to a lifestyle of sin, and thus ‘we

---

1 So here, J. D. G. DUNN, Romans 1–8 (WBC 38a; Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1988) 307; KÄSEMANN, Romans, 165; BEKER, Paul the Apostle. 215–216; R. C. H. LENSKI, The Interpretation of St Paul's Epistle to the Romans (Columbus, Ohio: Wartburg, 1945) 389–390; MURRAY, Romans, 213; LLOYD-JONES, Romans: The New Man, 20–23; L. L. MORRIS, The Epistle to the Romans (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988) 245; MOO, Romans 1–8, 374; TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 18–19. C. E. B. CRANFIELD (A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, [ICC; 2 vols; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1975, Vol I] 299–300), however, opts for an alternative interpretation of ἀπεθάνομεν: Still recognising the force of the aorist, he sees it as referring not to the believers actually having died to sin, but only as having died in God's sight. In other words the death is only juridical: God decides to see believers as having died in Christ's death. (The same position is reaffirmed in CRANFIELD's recent 'Rom 6:1–14,' 40–41.) But as DUNN points out, this fails to do justice to the eschatological or epochal force of the aorist (Romans 1–8, 308), particularly in view of the preceding context of 5:12–21. The creation of a divine fiction is surely not what Paul had in mind here! For a more detailed argument against this juridical (or ‘positional’) interpretation (although on a more popular level), see D. C. NEEDHAM, Birthright (Critical Concern; Portland: Multnomah, 1979) 239–263.


3 So TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 18; RIDDERBOS, Paul: Outline, 206; DUNN, Romans 1–8, 307–308.

4 TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 18–19; cf. KÄSEMANN, Romans, 165.

5 KÄSEMANN, Romans, 165.
Christians should realize that we must not live in sin' (a moral appeal)? Or does it refer to existing 'in the sphere of' sin and so under its 'lordship,' thus, 'we Christians are no longer able to live in sin' (a theological assertion)? Contrary to Douglas Moo, the latter is preferable on the grounds of: (i) the immediate context of v. 2a, where 'sin' is seen as a dominion that believers have died to; (ii) the wider context that shows that a past, unchangeable deliverance from sin's lordship has taken place (5:21; 6:6, 11, 14, 17–22; cf. vv. 7, 10); and (iii) the thoroughly dogmatic nature of 6:1–11. Thus Paul is saying that 'living in sin' is an impossibility. This is not to say that Christians no longer sin—Paul admits that they do in 6:12–23—but that believers are no longer in the realm or dominion of sin. Understanding this decisive transfer of believers from the dominion of sin to the new dominion of grace in Christ is fundamental to understanding the remainder of this section, which broadly develops this central idea (see particularly vv. 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11).

(b) Early Christian Traditions (Rom 6:3a)

In interpreting Paul, it is vitally important to appreciate the background and context of intelligibility in which his theological reflection occurred. How and in what ways was he influenced by the teachings he inherited from the primitive Church, by the prevailing Hellenistic culture and its mystery cults, and by his heritage of Judaism and the Hebrew Scriptures? To what extent may we attribute originality to Paul in his reflections on dying and rising with Christ, or in the very language he used? While we do not have the space here to deal adequately with all these issues, some discussion is necessary since it bears on the exegesis of Rom 6:3a.

The opening phrase of v. 3 has occasioned much debate over the extent to which Paul, in Romans 6, is drawing upon the existing (baptismal) beliefs and understanding of the

1 So MOO, Romans 1–8, 374–375.
2 Thus, DUNN, Romans 1–8, 307; TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 18–19; MURRAY, Romans, 213; LLOYD-JONES, Romans: The New Man, 23–25.
primitive church. Explaining his decisive rebuttal that one who died to sin can no longer still live in it (6:2), Paul begins by saying, ἠγνοεῖτε ...; (‘or do you not know ...?’). The phrase is repeated only in Rom 7:1, but a parallel phrase, ὃν ὁδηγεῖ, appears in several places. It is arguable that, at least in the majority of cases, the latter phrase implies that Paul was appealing to something which his readers should already know. In the other cases, Paul may be imparting new information, though this is not necessarily so.

In Rom 7:1 it is reasonable to assume that Paul’s readers would have known that death ends the authority of the ‘law.’ Many scholars therefore also take ἠγνοεῖτε in 6:3 to imply that Paul is referring to truths he assumed his readers already knew, i.e. familiar Christian traditions concerning baptism, allegedly traditions connecting baptism with the idea of dying with Christ. This may well be the case, though data from the pre-Pauline church that we can confidently claim has influenced this interpretation is scarce, if not entirely absent.

One now dubious explanation, held by a number of scholars, is that in Romans 6 Paul is correcting an enthusiastic view of an already realized resurrection. This pre-Pauline...

---

2 Rom 6:16; 11:2; 1 Cor 3:16; 5:6; 6:2, 3, 9, 15, 16, 19; 9:13, 24.
3 Namely, 1 Cor 3:16; 6:2, 3, 9, 15, 16, 19.
5 So Tannehill, Dying and Rising, 12–14; Morris, Romans, 246; Käsemann, Romans, 165; Cranfield, Romans Vol 1, 300; Lenski, Romans, 390; Murray, Romans, 214; D. Hellholm, ‘Enthymematic Argumentation in Paul: The Case of Romans 6,’ in Paul in His Hellenistic Context (ed. T. Engberg-Pedersen; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995) 151–157, among others.
6 Taking Tannehill, Dying and Rising, 12–14 as representative of a typical conclusion.
7 Notwithstanding O. Cullmann, Baptism in the New Testament (SBT 1; London: SCM, 1950), whose interpretation of Jesus’ baptism (by John) as being linked to his death, ‘a general Baptism,’ is strained, and reads far too much back into the baptismal narratives of the gospels.
8 Wedderburn (‘Hellenistic Traditions,’ 337) notes that usually—though not always—this enthusiastic view is regarded as being derived, at least indirectly (i.e. via the early Hellenistic church), from the sacramental theology of the Hellenistic mysteries. Outward similarities between Christian baptism and the initiatory rites of the mystery cults with their dying and rising gods, have
belief allegedly linked a past death and resurrection with Christ to the rite of baptism. In response Paul makes use of the existing baptism—death connection, speaking of dying with Christ as a past event, but pointedly puts rising with Christ in the future tense. In Colossians and Ephesians, however, resurrection with Christ is regarded as being a past event. Of particular significance here is Col 2:11–13, where the motif of dying and rising with Christ is explicitly connected with baptism. Tannehill therefore assumes that Col 2:11–13 represents a 'more primitive form' of baptismal understanding than that found in Romans 6, and that in the latter Paul is modifying this early tradition rather than creating a new idea. But, whatever one may decide as to the authorship of Colossians and Ephesians, it seems far more likely that they represent a development of views hinted at in Paul's own writings, than that they express ideas held by the Roman Christians, which Paul himself corrects in Romans 6. Thus it is improbable that we find in these epistles either the baptismal teachings of the primitive church or the background to Paul's interpretation of baptism in Romans 6.

1 Implying that the author of Colossians has 'returned' to this more primitive understanding.

2 TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 10.

3 On this difficult issue, see pp. 20–21 (& 20 n. 3, 21 n. 1) above.

4 So WEDDERBURN, Baptism and Resurrection, 70–84, here esp. pp. 70–72 (see also p. 5 n. 24); SIBER, Mit Christus leben, 194–199. Cf. R. BULTMANN, Theology of the New Testament (2 vols; London: SCM, 1852, Vol 1) 141; BETZ, 'Transferring a Ritual,' 110. It is likely that the idea of a past resurrection with Christ was formulated either to complete the broken parallelism of Romans 6 or, in the case of Colossians, to counter a Colossian tendency to belittle the significance of Christ. See WEDDERBURN, Baptism and Resurrection, 82–84 (cf. also his 'The Theology of Colossians,' in A. T. LINCOLN & A. J. M. WEDDERBURN, The Theology of the Later Pauline Letters [NTTh; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993] 50–51).
A more likely origin for a pre-Pauline connection between baptism and dying with Christ (or at least between baptism and the death of Christ) may be the dominical sayings which are found in Luke 12:50 and Mark 10:38. Later apostolic reflection upon these in light of the totality of Jesus’ ministry may have resulted in such a link being drawn. However, one can only really speculate on this.

Yet other scholars believe Paul is speaking in tones of ‘polite pedagogy’ in v. 3a and with the construction ἡ ἐγνώρισσα is really imparting new information. Perhaps a mediating position would seem more reasonable here: though no single element of what Paul says would have been completely novel, the significance of each is ‘deepened’ in Paul’s teaching. James Dunn, for example, suggests that Paul is appealing to something familiar, but that ‘some element of further or fuller teaching is in view’—either a point that is obvious (as soon as one thinks about it) rather than a point already familiar, or that Paul deduces an obvious corollary (“baptized into his death”) from an already accepted form of speech (“baptized into Christ”), or that he draws attention to an aspect of familiar teaching which has been overlooked or neglected. Hans Dieter Betz believes that Paul proposes ‘his interpretation as new but compatible and even agreeable with what [the Roman Christians] were familiar with thus far.’ Schnackenburg is probably right when he argues that the early Christians linked the sacrament of baptism to Jesus’ death only in a general way, and that Paul, deliberately perhaps, over-

---

1 In these Jesus refers to his coming suffering and death as a ‘baptism.’
3 The term from HANS LIETZMANN (An die Römer [HNT 3.1; Tübingen, 1906] 34), commenting on Rom 7:1, is taken up by KUSS, Römerbrief, 297 and by WAGNER, Pauline Baptism, 278. Unfortunately for their arguments, notes WEDDERBURN (‘Hellenistic Traditions,’ 337), LIETZMANN himself argued on Rom 6:3 that ἡ ἐγνώρισσα always refers to something that is already known (p. 30).
5 DUNN, Romans 1–8, 308.
6 BETZ, ‘Transferring a Ritual,’ 111.
7 TANNEHILL goes beyond the evidence when he asserts that an even more specific connection of the theme of dying with Christ and baptism originated with the early church and was known and accepted by the Roman Christians (Dying and Rising, 12–14). The explicit linking of this theme with baptism more likely originated instead with the apostle.
estimated his reader's awareness and gave his own deeper interpretation of the rite,\(^1\)
using his own characteristic terms.\(^2\)

(c) The Reference to Baptism (Rom 6:3-4)\(^3\)

In v. 3 we are given the first reason why a Christian is no longer able to 'live in sin':
'all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus have been baptized into his death.'
The significance of this mention of baptism, also explicit in v. 4, is disputed: similarly
debated is the *extent* of reference to baptism in Rom 6:1-11. Some see the whole
passage as referring to baptism. Since Romans 6 appears to go more deeply into the
question of baptism, they see here the uniquely Pauline doctrine of baptism.\(^4\) But to do
this is to miss the more central theme of the believer's union with Christ and the overall
context of the transfer that has taken place between the two dominions through the
believer's identification and union with Christ. Paul in fact refers to baptism only in
vv. 3-4, and after these verses he drops the subject, never to resume it in this chapter
(some scholars find allusions to baptism in many other verses, but none of them are
probable).\(^5\) It has been noted that Paul's reference to baptism, demonstrating that
believers were united with Christ in his death and burial, is surprising since Paul asserts
their union with Christ's death in other places without any reference to baptism.

---

MOO ('Rom 6:1–14,' 216; see also his *Romans 1–8*, 375–376): 'the Roman Christians ... perhaps
knew of the significance of baptism but had not drawn out some of its implications.' TANNEHILL's
arguments against this (*Dying and Rising*, 13–14) are fairly well dismissed by WEDDERBURN
(*Baptism and Resurrection*, 46–48; and 'Hellenistic Traditions,' 340) and BADKE ('Baptised into
Moses,' 24 n. 2).

2 WEDDERBURN, 'Hellenistic Traditions,' 350; cf. his *Baptism and Resurrection*, 67–68.

3 In line with the topical organization of material in this study I will examine baptism into Christ as
a participation in Christ's death in detail in the following section (§. 4). However, since it is an
important part of the argument of Rom 6:1–11, vv. 3–4 will be considered briefly here, although
discussion of the theological significance of the baptismal reference will be saved to Section 4.

4 So SCHNACKENBURG, *Baptism in the Thought of Paul*, 30, 32, 112; BEIZ, 'Transferring a
Ritual,' 86.

5 MOO, *Romans 1–8*, 380–381; WEDDERBURN, *Baptism and Resurrection*, 49–50 & n. 2; SIBER,
This suggests that baptism has a subordinate place in the chapter, and that Paul is not primarily concerned to set forth an interpretation of baptism.\(^2\)

Paul’s central concern in the passage is rather that the believer’s death and resurrection with Christ implies a death to the old dominion of sin and new life toward God. This concern is first shown in vv. 1–2, reinforced in vv. 3–4 with explicit reference to baptism, then further developed in vv. 5–10 without explicit reference to baptism.\(^3\)

Günther Bornkamm has shown that there is a parallel character to the sentences in vv. 5–7 and 8–10. These verses give an explanation of everything Paul has said up to this point. Both vv. 5 and 8 move from a conditional protasis, asserting participation in the death of Christ as a condition which is fulfilled, to the apodosis of future participation in the resurrection of Christ. Verses 6 and 9 provide the explanation and consequence, that of release from the power of sin (v. 6) or of death (v. 9). Then vv. 7 and 10 lend further support, in both cases showing the result of release from sin.

The major difference between vv. 5–7 and 8–10 is that vv. 6–7 focus on the believers’ release from the old dominion, while vv. 9–10 speak of Christ’s death to sin and new life to God.\(^4\)

Verse 11 simply summons believers to regard themselves in the way (οἵτως) that Paul has described in vv. 2–10: as dead to sin and alive to God.

Even the verses containing explicit reference to baptism (vv. 3–4) are intended to highlight the Christian’s present relation to sin (cf. v. 4bc, ‘in order that ... we may walk in newness of life’). Paul mentions baptism to ground his argument in the

---

\(^1\) MORRIS, Romans, 246; SIBER, Mit Christus leben, 192–193. Cf. J. D. G. DUNN, Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament (NTL; London: SCM, 1975) 335: ‘the major development of the theme of suffering and dying with Christ ... is not dependant upon the metaphor or event of baptism. It would be a mistake to seek elucidation of Paul’s experience by constantly harking back to his baptism; it was much too contemporary, too day-to-day an experience for that.’

\(^2\) So TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 7–10; MOO, Romans 1–8, 371–372; LLOYD-JONES, Romans: The New Man, 30; DUNN, Romans 1–8, 308.

\(^3\) TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 9.

\(^4\) BORNKAMM, ‘Baptism and New Life,’ 74–76.
experience of his readers, allowing them to understand more readily the reasoning behind his sharp response to the hypothetical objection of v. 1. As argued above, he assumes some knowledge about its meaning in his readers (ἡ ἀναφορά ...; v. 3a), specifically their awareness of a general connection between baptism and the death of Christ. Then he focuses their thought: those who have been baptized ‘into Christ Jesus’ have been baptized ‘into [Christ’s] death’ (v. 3). And it is because of that death that the believer is freed from the dominion of sin, a connection the Romans would also have been aware of. Paul’s interest, therefore, is not primarily in baptism at all, but rather in the believer’s relationship with Christ—specifically, with him in his death and resurrection—and in the results of that relationship, the transfer from the dominion of sin. With vv. 3–4 having served their purpose, Paul then continues the theme of union with Christ in vv. 5–11, but without reference to baptism.3

This conclusion is further strengthened by the argument below which establishes that ὑποίπωνα in v. 5 means ‘form’ in a nicht abbildlich sense, rather than ‘copy’ (Abbild).4 If correct this virtually rules out any possibility that baptism is in view in v. 5 and the following verses. Were ὑποίπωνα to be translated as ‘likeness’ and given an abbildlich meaning, it is possible, though even still not necessary, that v. 5 could be a further explication of the meaning of baptism.5 However, this is unlikely to be the case.

One further question requires attention before we move on: What does the reference to being ‘baptized’ in this passage refer to? Some commentators take it metaphorically to

---

1 The connection between the death of Jesus and sin was well established in early Christianity (cf. 1 Cor 15:3b, ‘Christ died for our sins’). Most scholars consider the formulaic statement contained in 1 Cor 15:3b–5 to be cited from a very early Christian creed. Thus G. D. Fee, The First Epistle to the Corinthians (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) 722–729. Moreover, Paul has already argued in Rom 5:12–21 that the death of Christ brings an end to the reign of sin and death.

2 Cf. TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 9, 12–14; LLOYD-JONES, Romans: The New Man, 30.

3 Cf. DUNN, Romans 1–8, 317.

4 See pp. 44–48 below.

5 See particularly the discussion of interpretative possibilities for v. 5a in F. A. MORGAN, ‘Romans 6:5a – United to a Death like Christ’s,’ ETZ. 59 no. 4 (1983) 278–299.
designate an incorporation into the Body of Christ or a Spirit-baptism. While a metaphorical interpretation is possible, and probably demanded in two other Pauline references, Paul's general usage elsewhere points toward the rite of water baptism as being in view. By the date of Romans this would have been the usual meaning given to \(\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\iota\varepsilon\iota\nu\). In the absence of convincing reasons for not taking it this way, the additional use of the noun \(\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\iota\mu\alpha\) in v. 4 makes a water baptism interpretation virtually certain. Of course, this does not exclude a deeper significance being accorded the rite, as we shall soon see.

(d) Incorporated into Christ (Rom 6:3-4a, 6a)

What does Paul mean in v. 3 when he says Christians were baptized \(\epsilon\iota\zeta\chi\rho\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\ 'I\eta\sigma\omicron\omicron\nu\nu\)? This is also a matter of some debate. Some see \(\epsilon\iota\zeta\) as an abbreviated form of \(\epsilon\iota\zeta\ \tau\omicron\ \dot{o}\nu\omicron\omicron\alpha\), representing either a formula for the transfer of ownership, or a specification of the baptismal act as Christian baptism, or as

1 Dunn, Romans 1-8, 311; see also his Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Spirit in relation to Pentecostalism today (SBT Second Series 15; London: SCM, 1970) 139-146. Although, with Dunn, I affirm the sense of incorporation inherent in the phrase \(\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\iota\varepsilon\iota\nu\ \epsilon\iota\zeta\chi\rho\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\), I believe he is wrong to dismiss the reference to water baptism here; though the Christian rite is in view here, that does not exclude seeing also the accompanying significance of the rite along similar lines to that which Dunn has suggested.

2 So Lloyd-Jones (Romans: The New Man, 35-36) who argues that baptism in Rom 6:3-4 is to be interpreted by 1 Cor 12:13, where the Spirit baptizes people into the body of Christ. For Lloyd-Jones, then, what is in view here in Romans 6 is the Spirit baptizing the believer into union with Christ's death and resurrection. It is not a baptism with the Spirit, but a baptism by the Spirit (cf. 1 Cor 12:13, RSV). Cf. also M. Eaton, Living Under Grace: Preaching Through Romans 6:1-7:25 (Milton Keynes: Word, 1994) 25-31; J. Brown (1857), cited by Morris, Romans, 246 n. 12.

3 It is apparent, for instance, from Mark 10:38 and Luke 12:50 that the verb \(\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\iota\varepsilon\iota\nu\) is capable of yielding both a literal and a figurative sense.

4 Namely, 1 Cor 10:2; 12:13. As I argue below, the former ('baptism into Moses') cannot be intended in a literal sense, though it is nevertheless formulated by analogy with the Christian rite (see pp. 78-80 below). In the case of 1 Cor 12:13, contextual arguments provide a strong case for seeing \(\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\iota\varepsilon\iota\nu\) there as a spiritual baptism at conversion (see pp. 72-75 below).

5 Cf. also 1 Cor 1:13, 14, 15, 16 (twice), 17; 15:29 (twice); Gal 3:27.

6 Moo, Romans 1-8, 376; and his 'Rom 6:1-14,' 218 and nearly all commentators.

7 Schnackenburg (Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 21) notes that the two main interpretations here stand in irreconcilable opposition.

8 The phrase \(\epsilon\iota\zeta\ \tau\omicron\ \dot{o}\nu\omicron\omicron\alpha\) is common in commercial contexts, where some property is transferred or paid 'into the name' of someone, hence the transfer of ownership. Thus, F. F. Bruce, The Book of
an indication of the goal of baptism.\(^1\) (Paul shows his awareness of such a formula in 1 Cor 1:13, 15 where he asks the Corinthians if any had been baptized 'in the name of Paul.'\(^2\) But this type of interpretation is inadequate. Any interpretation of baptism \(\epsilon\iota\zeta\ X\rho\upsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\) must be able to explain how Paul can move from this idea to the related idea of baptism \(\epsilon\iota\zeta\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \theta\acute{a}v\nu\tau\omicron\nu\ \alpha\iota\prime\omicron\nu\), and then interpret this as a participation in Christ's death, as he does in vv. 3–5. Baptism \(\epsilon\iota\zeta\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \theta\acute{a}v\nu\tau\omicron\nu\ \alpha\iota\prime\omicron\nu\) cannot mean one is baptized 'in the name of his death,' or 'with reference to his death.' For Paul further explains that Christians were 'buried with' Christ (v. 4) and were 'united with the form of his death' (v. 5). This clearly means that believers share in Christ’s death. Baptism \(\epsilon\iota\zeta\ X\rho\upsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\) must be understood in the same way, therefore, as a sharing or participation in Christ.\(^3\) Thus a local or spatial sense of \(\epsilon\iota\zeta\) should be seen here, carrying the idea of incorporation into, or union with, Christ.\(^4\)

One can begin to see here the idea of Christ as an inclusive or corporate person. Through baptism the believer is included in Christ and has entered Christ as the corporate person of the new aeon.\(^5\) This interpretation will gain further support when I later show the

---

\(^1\) Acts (NICNT; revised; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988) 168 n. 38; DUNN, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, 117; M. J. HARRIS, 'Appendix: Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament,' NIDNTT 3, 1209; based upon the work of W. HEIMMÜLLER.

\(^2\) For instance, SCHNACKENBURG, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 21–26; CRANFIELD, Romans Vol 1, 301; BEASLEY-MURRAY, Baptism in the New Testament, 128–129.

\(^3\) Baptism 'in the name of Jesus' appears in several places in Acts in slightly different forms (2:38; 10:48; 8:16; 19:5). From these references it is apparent that either \(\epsilon\iota\nu\) or \(\epsilon\iota\prime\nu\) can replace the \(\epsilon\iota\zeta\) in the formula without any essential change of meaning (so BEST, One Body in Christ, 65; H. CONZELMANN, 1 Corinthians (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975) 35 n. 38; J. D. G. DUNN, 'Baptism,' NBD, 122). It is unlikely then that 'to be baptized into the name of Christ' is hardly distinguishable from being 'baptized into Christ' as F. F. BRUCE (1 and 2 Corinthians [NCB; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1971] 33) would suggest. Rather, in light of the regular use of the phrase in commercial settings (see n. 8 of the preceding page), the meaning of \(\beta\alpha\tau\omicron\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu\ \epsilon\iota\zeta\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \sigma\nu\omicron\alpha\omicron\varrho\omicron\alpha\omicron\) is clearly 'to baptize into allegiance to the person named' and indicates that baptism in the name of Christ is the act wherein the baptized gives him/herself to Christ. Although this concept is implied in the more complex metaphor of 'baptism into Christ,' the two formulae cannot be regarded as equivalent. Cf. BETZ, 'Transferring a Ritual,' 107–108, 111 & literature cited in p. 108, n. 88. Thus 1 Cor 1:13, 15 contributes little to our understanding at this point.

\(^4\) TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 22.

\(^5\) So MOO, Romans 1–8, 376–377; KÄSEMANN, Romans, 165; TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 22–24; BEST, One Body in Christ, 65–73; MORRIS, Romans, 247 and DUNN, Romans 1–8, 311.
connection in Gal 3:27 and 1 Cor 12:13 of "προσπήκτων εἰς Τῷ" with corporate patterns of thought. It is also strengthened by v. 6a of the present text.

Frequently the 'old person' (παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος) of v. 6 is taken in an individual sense, and the crucifying and putting off of the old person as the personal breaking with and fighting against the power of sin. 'Old' and 'new' then designate the time before and after conversion or personal regeneration, and the corresponding manner of life. Many popular discussions of Paul's doctrine of the Christian life argue, or assume, that with the phrases 'old' and 'new person' Paul distinguishes between two parts or natures of a person. With this interpretation as the premise, it is then debated whether the 'old nature' is replaced by the 'new nature' at conversion, or whether the 'new nature' is added to the 'old nature.' But the assumption that ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος and ὁ καινὸς ἄνθρωπος refer to parts, or natures, of a person does justice neither to the text nor to Paul. Rather, as Herman Ridderbos notes, we should understand 'old' and 'new person' not firstly in the sense of the ordo salutis, but in that of the historia salutis. That is, it should be understood not in terms of personal faith and conversion, but in terms of that which once took place in Christ and in which his people also participate. The old person and new person, then, can be seen as eschatological entities.

---

1 See Section 4(b) (pp. 68-72, 75-76) below.
2 The translation 'old person' (or 'new person' for καινὸς ἄνθρωπος) is here preferred to 'old self' (RSV, NRSV, NASB, NIV) because the latter is too individualistic, obscuring the corporate sense of the term. 'Old man' is to be rejected as non-inclusive language.
3 For example; CRANFIELD, Romans Vol I, 309, MURRAY, Romans, 219-220.
4 Cf. for instance, CRANFIELD, Romans Vol I, 309-310; SCHNACKENBURG, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 54. Their position, though, must be strongly repudiated. They hold to a view of Rom 6:1-11 as being 'ethical and hortatory' and fail to see the thoroughly dogmatic nature of this passage. See KÄSEMANN, Romans, 163.
5 See MOO's evaluation of these arguments (Romans 1-8, 390-391). He rightly rejects these interpretations.
6 For an 'individual' interpretation that, in my judgement, does take seriously Paul's text (its Greek tenses and Paul's argument) see any of LLOYD-JONES, Romans: The New Man, 61-84; MURRAY, Romans, 219-221; (and of a more popular nature) NEEDHAM, Birthright, 39-86, 239-263; EATON, Living Under Grace, 41-43. However, it is my belief that Paul's thought here is primarily corporate, and the individual application of it only secondary or implicit.
7 RIDDERBOS, Paul: Outline, 63 and n. 65. The 'new person,' though not mentioned in Romans 6, is the counterpart to the 'old person.' Both expressions are found together in Eph 4:22-24 and Col 3:9-10.
We saw earlier that Adam and Christ were conceived in this way in Rom 5:12–21. There the term ἀνθρώπος is also used as ‘the one person’ (5:12, 15, 19). Clearer still is 1 Cor 15:45–49 which describes Adam and Christ as the first and the second ἀνθρώπος, as ἀνθρώπου in the sense that other people are not. In both these passages, each one determines the existence of the many. C. K. Barrett explains that ‘it is much more exact to say that the “old man” is Adam—or rather, ourselves in union with Adam, and that the “new man” is Christ—or rather, ourselves in union with Christ.’

The second clause of v. 6 speaks about the purpose of the crucifixion with Christ of the old person: that the ‘body of sin’ might be rendered powerless. But, while the ‘old person’ is undoubtedly therefore a corporate term, I will argue below that the phrase ‘body of sin’ should be seen in a narrower sense, though not without connotations of ‘corporateness.’ It is important to note, however, that a corporate interpretation of ‘old person’ in v. 6a does not rule out an implied application to individual Christians, for each individual believer is included in the ‘corporate person’ that is crucified with Christ.

This helps to confirm the preceding argument that baptism into Christ in v. 3 means an inclusion in Christ as a corporate person and entry into the new dominion. In v. 3b Paul further defines this baptism as a baptism into Christ’s death. Thus incorporation into Christ also implies an incorporation into his death, a participation in his death on the

1 TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 25.
2 C. K. BARRETT, The Epistle to the Romans (Black’s; London: Black, 1962) 125. Cf. DUNN, Romans 1–8, 318–319; MOO, Romans 1–8, 390–391; and MORRIS, Romans, 250–252. TANNEHILL (Dying and Rising, 25) adds that whilst Rom 6:6 does not specifically identify ‘our old person’ with Adam, the idea of a person who sums up the existence of the many, as do Adam and Christ, is present.
3 On this, see pp. 53–54 below.
4 In contrast to my position, though not markedly different in substance, is MOO, Romans 1–8, 390–391. Rather than accepting either the popular individualistic interpretation or the corporate interpretation advanced here, MOO opts for middle ground. He argues that ‘old person’ in this verse refers to the individual as a whole, but ‘always’ with ‘undoubted corporate associations’ (construed similarly to those described above). It is the person as a whole, but considered in relation to the ‘corporate’ structure (i.e the old dominion, ‘in Adam’) to which he or she belongs.
cross. Apart from the death of Christ, baptism is meaningless. This is a strong
affirmation of the centrality of the cross in Paul, and evidence of a certain link between
baptism εἰς Χριστόν and the motif of death and resurrection with Christ in his
theology.

(e) Newness of Life (Rom 6:4bc)

But what is the purpose of believers being baptized into Christ and incorporated into his
death? Paul supplies the answer to this in the purpose clause of v. 4bc; it is 'so that
(ἵνα), just as (οἵτινες καὶ ἠμείς) might walk in newness of life (κανόνεται ζωὴς
περιπατήσωμεν).' Paul always uses the words κανόνεται and κανόνες of the new era
of salvation that has come with the inauguration of the new covenant (cf. the use of
κανόνεται in Rom 7:6). Thus, being baptized into death with Christ has the aim of
enabling believers to live a new kind of life in the new aeon of redemption which has
dawned. While ζωή could be taken as an epexegetic genitive ('newness, that is,
life') or a genitive of quality ('new life'), the broader context of the two dominions in
Paul's argument and the meaning of κανόνεται suggest it is an objective genitive ('the
newness [the new era] that leads to, or confers, life'). The possibility of this life is
opened to Christians and made certain by the resurrection of Christ, and in the context
'newness of life' is clearly thought of as derivative from Christ's resurrection-life

1 MORRIS, Romans, 247.
2 MOO, 'Rom 6:1–14,' 216; cf. his Romans 1–8, 383.
3 Thus MURRAY, Romans, 217; cf. BORNTMANN, 'Baptism and New Life,' 74 n. 9.
4 Cf. CRANFIELD, Romans Vol I, 305; MORRIS, Romans, 249.
5 So MOO, Romans 1–8, 383; cf. RIDDLEBOS, Paul: Outline, 207; SCHNACKENBURG, Baptism in
the Thought of Paul, 163. On the meaning of 'life' (ζωή) in Paul, see the introductory discussion
of 'death' and 'resurrection/life' terminology above (pp. 7–9).
6 The purpose clause, ὀἵτινες ... οἵτινες καὶ, has a causal flavour to it. By adding that Christ was
raised through (ὅτι) the Father's 'glory' (δόξα), Paul, while undoubtedly alluding to the 'power'
of God (referring to the agent, and not the manner of Christ's resurrection), is also implying that this
power is specifically the power of the new dominion. So MOO, Romans 1–8, 384; BORNTMANN,
'Baptism and New Life,' 74.
Fuller treatment of this aspect of the motif will be provided later in Section 7.

Included also in the ‘newness of life’ is a demand. \(\Pi\epsilon\rho\upsilon\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\nu\) shows that this resurrection-life is to become apparent in the conduct of the one freed from sin.\(^2\) The term is used to designate a manner of life or lifestyle, which indicates that the life is not conceived of passively as a possession, but as engaging the believer’s activity.\(^3\) The aorist form indicates an actual beginning, a decisive transition to a new lifestyle following the death to sin.\(^4\) We will return to consider in more detail the ethical implications of Paul’s thought in Romans 6 in Section 6 below.

(f) United with Christ’s Death (Rom 6:4a, 5-7)

It is important to observe at this point that Paul speaks of the two components of dying and rising with Christ using different tenses: dying with Christ is put in the past tense, resurrection with Christ in the future. Because of this, it is methodologically appropriate to examine first the texts dealing with the believer’s past death with Christ, and later to consider the resurrection aspects of the passage.\(^5\) My approach from this point, therefore, will not follow exactly the sequence of the text, but will seek to elucidate in turn the two conceptions in the apostle’s mind.

The logical consequence (\(o\nu\nu\)) of being baptized into Christ’s death continues in v. 4. Not only do believers share in his death, but they ‘have been buried with him through baptism into death.’ It seems best to take \(\varepsilon\iota\gamma\zeta\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \theta\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\nu\) with \(\beta\alpha\pi\iota\pi\omicron\iota\mu\alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\zeta\) and

---

1 Dunn, Romans 1–8, 316. It is important to note, however, that Paul does not describe this as a resurrection with Christ—that he puts clearly in the future tense. HARRIS (Raised Immortal, 104) and GAFFIN (Centrality of the Resurrection, 46), however, suggest that the absence of specific ‘resurrection’ terminology in v. 4c might be explained by the fact that ‘walking in newness of life’ provides a more appropriate and pointed contrast to ‘continuing in sin’ in v. 1.


3 Murray, Romans, 217; MOO, Romans 1–8, 383.

4 So Dunn, Romans 1–8, 316; cf. MOO, Romans 1–8, 383.

5 See Section 7 below.
not with the verb, and 'death' as referring to Christ's death (v. 3b) rather than to 'death' generally. Accordingly baptism into Christ's death is further defined here as a burial with Christ. The mention of burial with Christ is probably an emphatic way of showing the decisiveness of the death that has taken place. Συμβάπτείν is the first of four συν− compounds (cf. also vv. 5a, 6a, 8b), which, together with the σιν Χριστῷ of v. 8a, dominate this text and form a characteristic and distinctive feature of Paul's theology and style. They show the solidarity believers have with Christ, so that what happens to Christ also happens to the believer. The aorist passive verb here suggests that when Christ was buried, Christians were buried with him. In other words, they died with him; they were included in his death and burial. The idea of Christ as corporate and inclusive person is probably implicit also.

Verse 5 repeats for clarification the ideas already expressed in v. 4. Believers 'have become united (συμβαπτομεν γεγοναμεν) with the ὁμοίωμα of his (Christ's) death.' It is generally agreed that the verbal adjective συμβαπτός derives from συμπαίην, meaning 'make to grow together,' and may best be translated 'united with.' Further, it seems best to take τῷ ὁμοίῳματι as an associative dative, dependent upon συμβαπτός, rather than an instrumental dative or a dative of respect and supplying an ἄπαντι after συμβαπτομεν γεγοναμεν, which would then refer to the rite of baptism. The meaning of

---

1 The verb in v. 4a sharpens v. 3b, and to speak of 'burial into death' would be strange. So CRANFIELD, Romans Vol I, 304; MOO, Romans 1–8, 378; ZIESLER, Romans, 157; LLOYD-JONES, Romans: The New Man, 46; BORNKAMM, 'Baptism and New Life,' 74 n. 6; KÄSEMANN, Romans, 166 (though KÄSEMANN has mixed up friend and foe here); MURRAY, Romans, 216; against DUNN, Romans 1–8, 314 and SCHNACKENBURG, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 34.

2 Thus, again, most commentators: see those cited in the preceding note.

3 CRANFIELD, Romans Vol I, 304.

4 DUNN, Romans 1–8, 313. See further the Appendix below.

5 Rather than from συμπαίην, 'plant along with/together.' So, DUNN, Romans 1–8, 316; CRANFIELD, Romans Vol I, 306–307; MORRIS, Romans, 250; TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 30–32; MORGAN, 'Rom 6:5a,' 268 n. 4, 298.

6 For support see MOO, Romans 1–8, 385; MORGAN, 'Rom 6:5a,' 272–276 (see also those cited in p. 275 n. 20); TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 30–32; BORNKAMM, 'Baptism and New Life,' 77–78; DUNN, Romans 1–8, 316; CRANFIELD, Romans Vol I, 307 and SCHNACKENBURG, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 36, 45–46 (rejecting his earlier view). The majority of commentators now agree. For the latter views here, see those mentioned in MORGAN, 'Rom 6:5a,' 272–274 nn. 11, 12, 16.
the term ὀμοιόμορpha, commonly translated 'likeness,' is contested. The linguistic evidence points to two basic meanings, either 'copy' (Abbild) or 'form' (Gestalt). Florence Morgan has argued that ὀμοιόμορpha in the LXX consistently denotes something abbildlich. However, in a reference such as Deut 4:12 ('Then the Lord spoke to you out of the fire. You heard the sound of words but saw no form [ὀμοιόμορπα]'), it can hardly have an abbildlich sense, but must denote 'form' in the sense of the outer appearance, or shape, of the reality itself (cf. the visionary forms seen by Ezekiel: e.g. Ezek 1:5, 16, 26; 8:2; 23:15). Thus, contrary to Morgan, Septuagintal usage does not exclude the possibility of ὀμοιόμορpha being used in a nicht abbildlich sense in Rom 6:5a.

Of those who do accept the abbildlich sense in Rom 6:5a (i.e. 'copy'), many tend to see a reference to baptism as the copy, image or imitation of Christ's death and resurrection. But this presents a problem with the interpretation of the second part of the verse, for it is clear that Paul intends the τῷ ὀμοιόμορπα of the first clause of v. 5 to be supplied in the second clause (v. 5b). However, if ὀμοιόμορpha in v. 5a refers to the past baptism of believers, it is very difficult to accommodate the future ἐσώμεθα of v. 5b. I will argue below that this should be taken as a temporal future; but even if it were a logical future and τῷ ὀμοιόμορπα τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ did refer to the baptismal rite, one would then expect τῷ ὀμοιόμορπα τῆς ἀναστάσεως to be clearly

---

1 Rare in classical Greek, ὀμοιόμορpha occurs about 40 times in the LXX; see SCHNACKENBURG, 
   *Baptism in the Thought of Paul*, 49–53; J. SCHNEIDER, ὀμοιόμορπα κτλ., *TDNT* V, 191.

2 MORGAN, 'Rom 6:5a,' 282. Unfortunately here, and for the interpretation of v. 5 in general, I have not had access to her unpublished doctoral dissertation, *United to a Death Like Christ's. A Study of Rom 6:5a* (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 1982); we must be content with her summary paper, just cited. Her survey, under eight broad categories, of twentieth century interpretations of v. 5a (pp. 278–302) is particularly useful.

3 Thus MOO, Romans 1–8, 385–386; SCHNACKENBURG, *Baptism in the Thought of Paul*, 50; cf. SCHNEIDER, ὀμοιόμορπα, 191.

4 Most recent, apparently, is STEPP, *Believer's Participation*.


6 So the vast majority of commentators (for a partial listing see MORGAN, 'Rom 6:5a,' 277 n. 31).

7 Cf. CRANFIELD, Romans Vol I, 307; BORNKAMM, 'Baptism and New Life,' 78 n. 19. BETZ ('Transferring a Ritual,' 116 n. 122) recognizes this problem but, while still holding to a baptismal interpretation of ὀμοιόμορπα, offers no satisfactory solution.
evident in the rite as well. But this cannot be so, for Paul finds it necessary to argue (εἰ γὰρ ..., ἀλλὰ καὶ ...) for the union of the believer with the ὀμοίωμα of Christ’s resurrection. A further argument against the view that ὀμοίωμα should be linked to baptism is that the perfect verb γεγόναμεν points to a punctiliar event as well as a continuing state or relationship resulting from it. Therefore the ὀμοίωμα must be something to which the believer once united can remain united, and this cannot be said of the rite of baptism. Thus a baptismal interpretation of v. 5 creates difficulties that make it ultimately implausible, aside from our earlier recognition that after vv. 3-4 Paul’s thought moves away from baptism.

With a similar abbildlich sense of ὀμοίωμα, Morgan’s own view (and that of some others) is that Paul is referring to the believer’s own death to sin, as a ‘copy’ of Christ’s death, which was itself a ‘death to sin’ (Rom 6:10). To support this idea she has to argue that σύμφωνος has ‘more of a comparative (a being like Christ) than a σύν Χριστῷ (a being with Christ) sense.’ However, I remain unconvinced of this. More compelling is the opposite case. The proximate σύν Χριστῷ terminology in the text and the resultant good sense which the translation ‘united with the form of his death’

---

1 TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 33; followed by MORGAN, ‘Rom 6:5a,’ 284.
2 MORGAN, ‘Rom 6:5a,’ 284; TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 34. In this context, MORGAN discusses the suggestion of U. VANNI that ὀμοίωμα means ‘perceptible expression’ and signifies both baptism and the post-baptismal life of the believer (see pp. 284–286). However, this seems to be stretching the meaning of the term too far; if Paul had intended a dual significance, surely he would have been more explicit in stating that. See further MORGAN’s own criticism of VANNI (p. 286).
3 For instance, RIDDERBOS, Paul: Outline, 207–208; DUNN, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, 142–143 (cf. his Romans 1–8, 317–318); MURRAY, Romans, 218; LLOYD-JONES, Romans: The New Man, 56–57; J. GEBEIS (summarized by MORGAN, ‘Rom 6:5a,’ 295–297); and see those cited by MORGAN (pp. 295–298 & n. 117). MORGAN (p. 295) claims this interpretation was widely held from the Patristic era through the 19th century.
5 The latter being only implicitly contained in v. 5a. So MORGAN, ‘Rom 6:5a,’ 268–272. MORGAN’s chief argument for this is that the presence of a ἄνευ ... ὑπόκτων clause in v. 4bc reveals that Paul’s immediate thought before writing v. 5 was directed to making a comparison between Christ or his death and believers, not to speaking of a direct union between Christ or his death and believers’ (p. 300) can hardly carry greater weight than the wider context of vv. 3–10 and the presence there of four other σύν Χριστῷ phrases (vv. 4a, 6b, 8a, 8b), the first three of which refer respectively to burial, crucifixion and death with Christ. See also TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 32, who argues that the position represented here by MORGAN is based on a misunderstanding of Paul’s purpose in v. 4bc.
obviously makes in the context offer ‘extremely persuasive evidence’\(^1\) for accepting the validity of the interpretation that v. 5a speaks about union with Christ in his death and v. 5b describes union with his resurrection.

But more decisive against the ‘death to sin’ interpretation is the rather strange and impossible sounding idea that thereby results: namely that \(συμφησα λόγω καταθέσεως τοτέ \) \(ομοιώματι τοις \) \(θανάτου αυτού\) speaks of ‘the union between the believer and something which copies Christ’s death, specifically the believer’s own death to sin.’\(^2\)

As Moo notes, the language ‘become united with’ is overly strong if the ‘union’ is with one’s own death to sin.\(^3\)

It is more reasonable then to accept the second meaning for \(ομοιώμα\): ‘form’ (Gestalt). We have already seen that the Septuagintal evidence does allow this possibility.\(^4\) From the passages where the term occurs in Paul himself (Rom 1:23; 5:14; 8:3; Phil 2:7), Rom 8:3 and Phil 2:7 are especially significant. They clearly show that \(ομοιώμα\) characterizes a concretum, not the abstract property of similarity or sameness.\(^5\) Thus \(ομοιώμα\) presents the essence of the image that is portrayed.\(^6\) Accordingly, the translation ‘form’ is to be preferred. What is intended is the form of the reality itself in

\(^{1}\) MORGAN’s own words (‘Rom 6:5a,’ 269)! See also pp. 268–269 of MORGAN’s article; and the preceding note.

\(^{2}\) Quoting MORGAN, ‘Rom 6:5a,’ 269 (italics mine).

\(^{3}\) MOO, Romans 1–8, 386–387.

\(^{4}\) In fact, the only argument that MORGAN produces against the interpretation presented here, is that, in her opinion, the linguistic evidence makes a \(nicht abbildlich\) sense for \(ομοιώμα\) ‘improbable’ (‘Rom 6:5a,’ 282–283, 300). This is despite her recognition that ‘it certainly offers an appealing solution to the meaning of this problematic verse and has become the explanation adopted by a good number of contemporary scholars’ (p. 282).

\(^{5}\) Rom 8:3 describes Christ as in the form marked by the flesh and sin, and does not say ‘in the body of sinful flesh.’ ‘Ομοιώμα expresses a relationship and a connection, but at the same time maintains a difference between Christ and believers. See BORNKAMM, ‘Baptism and New Life,’ 77. Cf. KASEMANN, Romans, 168 (but see also p. 217): ‘ομοιώμα thus distinguishes from the event of Golgotha as much as it connects with that event.’ In Phil 2:7, Christ was not just ‘like’ human persons (\(ενθρονόμενον\)): he really was human. Thus MOO, Romans 1–8, 386.

\(^{6}\) BORNKAMM, ‘Baptism and New Life,’ 77.
its outward appearance, rather than a second thing which is similar to this reality. Rom 6:5, then, refers to a direct union with Christ’s death.¹

If this is so, why does Paul speak of the ‘form’ of Christ’s death, rather than speaking simply of his death? It cannot be for nothing that Paul includes the word ὁμοιόμετα. Moo suggests that ὁμοιόμετα, while not differentiating the death to which we are joined from Christ’s, nevertheless qualifies it in its particular redemptive-historical “form.”² However, he contends that this ‘redemptive-historical association’ with Christ’s death takes place at the believer’s ‘conversion-initiation.’³ This I would dispute. Though baptism has been in view in the previous verse, it is not in view in v. 5. Paul has simply used baptism as an introduction to speaking of the believer’s union with Christ, particularly with his death. We have already seen that Paul regards believers as having been included in the event of Christ’s death and burial and that his συν- language carries thereby a sense of solidarity with Christ and participation with him in the salvific events. The essential thrust of συμφιλίας in v. 5 therefore is not on the believer’s ‘conversion-initiation,’ but on the believer’s participation in the death of Christ—with Christ when he died. This, of course, carries implications for the conversion-initiation of the believer, wherein the past participation in the death of Christ becomes concretely manifest in the believer’s life,⁴ but that is not primarily in view here. Thus the past event in mind when Paul uses the perfect verb γεγόναμεν is Christ’s death on the cross. But in using the perfect γεγόναμεν, in contrast to the previous aorist passives, it is obvious that he also wanted to draw attention to some continuing aspect of Christian experience.⁵ Hence the term ὁμοιόμετα allows Paul to draw out the sense of a past union with

¹ TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 35; BORNKAMM, ‘Baptism and New Life,’ 77-78; KÄSEMANN, Romans, 168; MOO, Romans 1-8, 385-387; SCHNACKENBURG, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 36, 53; see also those cited in MORGAN, ‘Rom 6:5a,’ 279-283 & nn.
² MOO, Romans 1-8, 387; cf. RIDDERBOS, Paul: Outline, 406-407; and n. 5 of the preceding page.
³ MOO, Romans 1-8, 387. MOO is here taking up DUNN’s term to describe the one unified experience for believers that combines the separate components of faith, the gift of the Spirit and water baptism (see pp. 382-383). Cf. the suggestion of H. W. BARTSCH (cited by MOO, Romans 1-8, 387 n. 56) that Paul uses ὁμοιόμετα to stress the faith aspect of the reality depicted.
⁴ I discuss this concept in detail in Section 4(d) below.
⁵ TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 39.
Christ's death, while at the same time maintaining sufficient distinction from that unique, once-for-all event (v. 10) to imply also an ongoing participation in his death.

Tannehill has helpfully explained this additional nuance of being united with the 'form' of Christ's death in the present (and with the 'form' of Christ's resurrection in the future\(^1\)). He suggests that Paul may have used \( \text{ὁμοιωμα} \) in v. 5 because 'the death and resurrection are connected with the two "forms" of Christ's existence, the earthly existence of the one who was subject to the powers and the heavenly existence of the exalted Lord.'\(^2\) This is shown by a comparison of \( \text{ὁμοιωμα} \) and \( \text{μορφή} \) in Phil 2:6-7 that reveals the two terms are basically synonymous.\(^3\) One may then fruitfully compare Rom 6:5b with Rom 8:29, 2 Cor 3:18 and Phil 3:21 which utilize compounds of \( \text{μορφή} \) to refer to the transformation of believers from earthly to heavenly existence through taking on the same form as the risen Christ.\(^4\) But closer in meaning to Rom 6:5a, and linking the ideas of conformation to Christ and dying with Christ, is Phil 3:10, where believers are being continually conformed to his death (\( \text{συμμορφεύομενος τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ} \)).\(^5\) Thus, by speaking of the 'form' of Christ's death and resurrection, Paul intends to show that the death and resurrection of Christ are continuing aspects of the 'form' of Christ and that they are present to believers in transforming power, so that believers take on the same 'form.' In this respect the 'form of his death' may be seen as a present reality within the new dominion founded upon Christ's death.\(^6\) Paul is thereby

---

1. Verse 5b is to be discussed more fully in Section 7(a) below.
2. TANNEHILL, *Dying and Rising*, 38.
3. See TANNEHILL, *Dying and Rising*, 35-38. So also MORGAN, 'Rom 6:5a,' 271; SCHNACKENBURG, *Baptism in the Thought of Paul*, 52; cf. SCHNEIDER, 'ἐμοικος,' 197; G. F. HAWTHORNE, *Philippians* (WBC 43; Waco, TX: Word, 1983) 87-88. The same usage of \( \text{ὁμοιωμα} \), argues TANNEHILL (pp. 36-38), is also found in Rom 8:3 (cf. my discussion of Phil 2:7 and Rom 8:5 on p. 47 & n. 5 above).
4. In Rom 8:29, believers are predestined to be conformed (\( \text{συμμορφευόμενος} \)) to the image of Christ; in 2 Cor 3:18 believers are being transformed into (\( \text{μεταμορφομένος} \)) the same image as Christ; and in Phil 3:21, a future conformation (\( \text{συμμορφων} \)) to the glory of Christ is in view.
reminding the Romans that ‘dying with Christ’ initiates a ‘conformity’ with Jesus’ death that is to have a continuing effect on their Christian existence.1

Verse 6 is related to the previous verse by a participle,2 and continues to show how believers have been freed from slavery to sin. This has occurred because ‘our old person was crucified with [him/Christ].’ The compound verb συνεσταυρωθῆ has picks up and brings to a climax the ‘death’ side of the union with Christ motif of vv. 3–5. Like συνεσταφθῆ αὐτῷ (v. 4a) and συμφιλττε γεγοναμεν τῷ ὁμοιόματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτῷ (v. 5a), ‘crucified with Christ’ refers not to the believer’s own burial, death or crucifixion, but to his or her (corporate) participation in Christ’s crucifixion (cf. also Gal 2:19). The aorist tense indicates a once-for-all definitive act, so that like Christ believers who are crucified with Christ are definitely and finally dead.3 The image of crucifixion is chosen not because Paul wants to suggest that ‘dying with Christ’ is a preliminary action that the believer must complete by daily ‘dying to sin’ (contra Cranfield),4 but because Christ’s death took the form of crucifixion.5

The definite image of crucifixion, combined with the preceding argument of vv. 3–5, is therefore used by Paul to highlight the union of believers with Christ, particularly with him in his death, as the cause of their transfer from the old dominion of sin to the new dominion. Because of this decisive transfer it is an impossibility for believers to continue to live in sin (v. 2). The second clause of v. 6 reintroduces this concern with the realm of sin. The purpose (ἵνα) of the participation of the ‘old person’ in the crucifixion of Christ is that ‘the body of sin might be rendered powerless.’ The word translated here ‘rendered powerless’ (καταργηθῇ) is sometimes translated ‘destroyed,’ but that is probably too strong a term in this context. Paul’s use of καταργεῖν in similar

---

1 MOO, Romans 1–8, 387.
2 Against MOO, Romans 1–8, who prefers to see v. 6 as the introduction to a new paragraph.
3 MOO, Romans 1–8, 389–390; MURRAY, Romans, 219–220.
4 CRANFIELD, Romans Vol 1, 309–310, takes the crucifixion in a juridical (not actual) sense (believers are crucified with Christ in God’s sight), thus allowing him to say the old person is still very much alive, since crucifixion is a process. However this does an injustice to the text.
5 MOO, Romans 1–8, 389.
salvation-historical contexts suggests rather the connotation of a power whose influence is taken away.¹

The phrase τὸ σώμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας is more problematic. A number of options present themselves, depending to some extent on the interpretations that have been adopted in the previous verses. Σώμα here has been regarded by some figuratively as the 'mass' or 'organism' of sin and corruption.² This view has a number of points that commend it, for it explains: (i) the lack of a possessive pronoun (cf. 'our old person ... the body of sin ... in order that we should no longer serve sin'), (ii) the singular σώμα, and (iii) the fact that σώμα is the subject of the passive verb καταργεῖν. But it suffers the defect of insufficient lexical support to substantiate so rare (for the New Testament) a use of the word.³ Many commentators adopt the most obvious meaning, taking σώμα to designate the physical body in its proneness to, and domination by, sin.⁴ While this cannot be ruled out altogether, a third more attractive option arises from Bultmann's influential interpretation of σώμα in Paul. He argues that Paul often uses the word to denote the person as a whole. Applied to this verse, σώμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας would not denote 'the physical body as dominated by sin,' but 'the person dominated by sin.'⁵ This includes the physical body, but is not reducible to it. Dunn, then, helpfully argues that the phrase denotes the person as belonging to the old dominion, the age ruled by sin and death. It is this belonging to the old age which has been brought to an end by believers having been crucified with Christ.⁶ When one takes into account the use of the singular σώμα and the preceding article (τὸ), together with the surrounding personal pronouns ('our old

¹ Cf. Rom 3:11; 4:14; 7:2, 6; Gal 3:17; 5:4; see also Eph 2:15. So MOO, Romans 1–8, 392; Lloyd-Jones, Romans: The New Man, 69; Dunnn, Romans 1–8, 319.
² So Calvin; Hodge; Whiteley, Theology of St Paul, 42.
³ Thus, MOO, Romans 1–8, 392; cf. Cranfield (Romans Vol I, 309) who rejects such figurative interpretations as being over-subtle.
⁴ So here Gundry, Soma in Biblical Theology, 29–31; Murray, Romans, 220–221; Lenski, Romans, 402; Lloyd-Jones, Romans: The New Man, 72–77; Morris, Romans, 251–252.
⁶ Dunnn, Romans 1–8, 319–320, (cf. p. 332 where he speaks more corporately of 'humanity in solidarity with Adam' as belonging to the old dominion of sin); see also Ridderbos, Paul: Outline, 63, 208.
person ... that we should'; v. 6a, c), it is easy then to observe a secondary sense of 'corporateness' in the phrase 'body of sin.' Ridderbos further aids this understanding when he comments that:

Paul regards sin not merely or in the first place from the individual and personal, but from the collective and supra-individual point of view. It is the fact of having been taken up into solidarity with sin, the fact that man is flesh, the fact of having been brought under the power of sin that surrounds him on every side and, as it were, occupies him, that governs the Pauline conception of sin. It is for this reason that such great emphasis can fall on the connection between sin and body (in the sense of concrete mode of existence subjected to sin).¹

Tannehill, however, goes further and argues that 'body of sin' does not speak of the body of each individual believer, but rather of a 'collective entity' which is destroyed by the death of Christ. By 'collective entity' he means that this body is at the same time the body which died on the cross and a corporate body, in which believers were included and put to death. He regards the dual interpretation—σώμα referring to both Christ's body and the corporate body of the old aeon—as being demanded by the text and its context,² and claims it is confirmed by Rom 7:4 and Col 2:11, which also make use of the motif of dying and rising with Christ in connection with the term σώμα. But when those texts are examined more closely, it appears that Tannehill has overstated his case. It is true that in both cases Christ's physical body on the cross is in view and, as we have observed, that Christ's death is regarded as an inclusive or corporate event in which believers share.³ But these two distinct facts do not thereby necessitate taking

¹ Ridderbos, Paul; Outline, 125-126. This is not to say that the body is the source or seat of sin and evil. Such a view would not be countenanced by the apostle.
² Tannehill, Dying and Rising, 24. On Rom 7:4 see pp. 45-47 of Tannehill's study; on Col 2:11 see pp. 48-50. For Rom 7:4 cf. also J. A. T. Robinson, The Body, 47-48; M. Black, Romans (NCB; London: Thomas Nelson, 1973) 100; Ziesler, Romans, 175 (with some hesitation). Tannehill is the only commentator I am aware of to assert that τοῦ σώματος τῆς σωματικῆς (Col 2:11) refers to a collective entity.
³ On Rom 7:4, see also Moo, Romans 1-8, 441; Ridderbos, Paul; Outline, 207, 210, 365; Dunn, Romans 1-8, 362; Murray, Romans, 243; Morris, Romans, 273; Cranfield, Romans Vol I, 336 (with the believer's death with Christ seen juridically). On Col 2:11, see also O'Brien, Colossians, 114-118; C. F. D. Moule, The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962) 95-96; Ridderbos, Paul; Outline, 212, 404-405; Beasley-Murray, Baptism in the New Testament, 152-155; Gundry, Soma in Biblical Theology, 40-42.
σῶμα to mean a corporate 'body' of believers as well. We have already seen in vv. 3–5 that Paul can speak of believers participating in the death of Christ without any such somatic reference. The fact that believers were put to death through 'the body of Christ' in Rom 7:4 does not then mean that τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ refers to a collective entity; indeed such a notion is totally unprepared for in Romans and lacks any contextual support. Rather the reference is to the body of the crucified Christ and inasmuch as that is the means (διὰ) of believers having died to the law, in that connection do we find the implication that Christ's death is a corporate event in which believers share. Similarly it is even harder to see why τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός in Col 2:11 should be interpreted collectively. The concept of union with Christ is even more evident in the immediate context (vv. 10–13) without needing to strain the meaning of σῶμα there to be the corporate body of the old aeon. Therefore, returning to the interpretation of Rom 6:6b, we cannot accept Tannehill's designation of 'the body of sin' as both the body on the cross and a corporate body in which believers were included. Tannehill has wrongly asserted both the equivalence of 'body of sin' with the 'body of Christ' of Rom 7:4 and the equivalence of the terms 'old person' and 'body of sin' in v. 6.

How then should we interpret the phrase of v. 6b? It is better to see the reference as being more anthropological in nature than soteriological. 'Body of sin' still contains a sense of 'corporateness,' but with a narrowing of meaning from the broader concept of 'old person' (v. 6a). Here it functions as 'a more individualizing description' of the old

---

1 Thus Moo, Romans 1–8, 441; KäSEMANN, Romans, 189; ZIESSLER, Romans, 175. Dunn, Romans 1–8, 362 argues rightly, I believe, that the definite article gives 'Christ' a more titular force, emphasizing that the crucified one is in view. To TANNEHILL's credit, and unlike some less cautious commentators, he wisely rejects any comparison with the somatic references of Rom 12:5 and 1 Cor 12:12–27, for they have a different function in Paul's thought: to bring out the relation of members to the whole; not to show how believers have died to either sin or the law (Dying and Rising, 45–46).
2 Of those cited in n. 3 of the preceding page, none see σῶμα here as a collective reference.
3 'You have been filled in him ... in whom you were circumcised ... you were buried with him ... in him you were raised with him ... he made you alive with him.' Cf. those cited in n. 3 of the preceding page.
4 Cf. BEKER, Paul the Apostle, 287–289.
5 Cf. Murray, Romans, 221.
Thus, whereas in v. 6a the 'old person' represents the corporate body of those who were crucified with Christ and only implicitly each individual believer, in v. 6b 'body of sin' refers more directly to each person (which includes their physical body) whose belonging to the dominion of sin has been brought to an end. The corporate solidarity in sin of those persons is implicit, but secondary.

The third clause of v. 6 states the purpose of being crucified with Christ and having the body of sin rendered powerless: 'that we should no longer serve sin.' While the infinitive τοῦ ... δουλεύειν could be epexegetic, expanding and restating the previous clause, or consecutive ('with the result that we are no longer servants of sin'), it is probably final ('with the purpose that we should no longer serve sin'). Thus here we find an imperative implicit in the indicative. The relationship between the indicative and imperative in Paul is an important one and will receive more detailed attention in Section 6 below. It is enough to say here that while Rom 6:1–11 is thoroughly dogmatic in nature, Paul is nevertheless concerned with the practical outworking of his teaching. But it is precisely and only because of the past death of believers with Christ, a death to the old dominion of sin, that believers are freed from serving sin and enabled to serve righteousness (cf. vv. 12–23).

Verse 7 provides the basis for the connection between death and freedom from sin that is the main point of v. 6. Here the perfect passive δεδικαιωμαι literally means 'has been justified.' But the idea of justification does not fit very well in the context; Paul nowhere else connects the dying of believers with their justification. So 'has been freed' or 'has been set free' is a better translation. The verse is most probably a general statement or truth or maxim, with the aorist relative clause οὗ ἀποκατανόω (the [one] having died)

---

1 To use MOO's expression ('Rom 6:1–14,' 218).
2 As pointed out before, the plural 'we' (ὑμῶν) helps bring out the implicit connotation of a corporate sense to the phrase 'body of sin.'
3 Thus MOO, Romans 1–8, 393–394; Dunn, Romans 1–8, 320; Morris, Romans, 252; Murray, Romans, 221–222; indeed most commentators.
4 MOO, Romans 1–8, 394.
not referring to anyone in particular. When a person dies he or she is automatically freed from the power and dominion of sin.¹

(g) Christ as Prototype for Believers² (Rom 6:8–10)

The third section (vv. 8–10) of Paul’s argument in Rom 6:1–11 is best seen as paralleling vv. 5–7, though the emphasis now is on the new life. ³ These verses express the reason why believers ‘died to sin’ (v. 2): ‘that we shall also live with him.’ The statement made in v. 8 is demonstrated in v. 9, and then fully explained in v. 10. While the focus of vv. 9–10 is on Christ, the σιγν Xριστῷ of v. 8 shows that what is true of Christ is true also of believers.⁴ We died with Christ, we shall also live with Christ. The aorist ἀπεθάνομεν belongs to the sequence of aorists beginning at v. 2, all of which are saying the same thing using different metaphors—‘baptized into his death’ (v. 3), ‘buried with him’ (v. 4), ‘crucified with him’ (v. 6). Paul intends v. 8 to recall the opening statement of v. 2 (ἀνεβασμένος), but now to strengthen the assertion, already repeatedly emphasized in vv. 3–6, that ‘we died to sin’ only by virtue of the fact that ‘we died with Christ.’⁵ The full σιγν Xριστῷ expression,⁶ used here, appears to convey the same meaning and force as the σιγν–compound verbs found in vv. 4a, 5a and 6a: that of a participation in the salvific and eschatological event of the death of Christ—that believers died with Christ when he died on the cross (cf. the σιγν–compounds in vv. 5b [implied], 8b which speak of participation in Christ’s resurrection in the future tense).⁷

¹ So Moo, Romans 1–8, 394–395; Dunn, Romans 1–8, 321; Kasemann, Romans, 170.
² For this designation of Christ, see Kasemann, Romans, 170.
³ Kasemann, Romans, 170; cf. p. 36 above.
⁴ Cf. Thüsing, Per Christum in Deum, 71–79, 83.
⁵ Dunn, Romans 1–8, 321.
⁶ Only four of the twelve cases where σιγν refers to Christ have this full expression.
⁷ Although finally rejected by Dunn (Romans 1–8, 321–322) in this case, I strongly doubt his suggestion (p. 321) that σιγν Xριστῶ ‘may denote simply “in the company of” rather than ... participation in the decisive eschatological events of Christ’s death and life (for which Paul seems to prefer the σιγν–compounds ...’ The basic idea of participation is seen in both the prepositional constructs and the compound verbs (see the Appendix below).
The believer's assurance of living together with Christ is grounded in v. 9 in what is known (εἰδοτεύς is a causal participle) to be true about the nature of Christ's resurrection. His resurrection is both irreversible and final. Having entered the first era in salvation history, Christ came under the influence of the powers of the old dominion of sin, the law, and death. Because of his resurrection from the dead, Paul can therefore say Christ is 'no longer' (οὐκέτα) under the 'lordship' (κυριεύειν) of death. Christ's resurrection not only ends the power of death over himself, but anticipates the ultimate defeat of death in all those who belong to him and will 'live with him' (v. 8b).  

The immediate purpose of v. 10 is to furnish further proof for the last statement of v. 9, that 'death no longer rules over him.' But in doing so, Paul also provides an important link in the chain of reasoning by which he argues that the death of believers 'with Christ' is a death 'to sin' (vv. 2–7, 8a, 11). For now he makes it clear that Christ's death is itself a death 'to sin.' The stress in v. 10a is on ἐφράσας ('once for all'), which expresses the definitiveness and unrepeatability of Christ's death. The phrase τῷ ἀμαρτίᾳ ἀπεθάνεν ('he died to sin') does not mean Christ died 'for sin,' though Paul says that elsewhere, nor that he needed to be freed from sin as humans experience it in their lives, for this was never true in his life (cf. 2 Cor 5:21a). It is best to see it in the same sense as the believer's death 'to sin' in v. 2, with the datives being 'datives of disadvantage' again. He died to the realm and reign of sin (a ruling power of the old aeon) in that, having won a decisive victory over sin, he was no longer living in the realm of sin.  

By contrast, ὅ δὲ ξῆ, ξῆ νῦ θεῶ contains datives of advantage and describes Christ's resurrection-life as a life lived for the benefit of, or to the glory of, God. Having finished with the realm of death and sin once and forever, his life is now entirely in the realm of God and his glory again. In Ernst Käsemann's words, these two verses (9–10) 'thus support v. 8b in such a way that out of the σὺν Χριστῷ the destiny

---

1 MOO, Romans 1–8, 395–396; cf. THÜRING, Per Christum in Deum, 72–73, 81–82, 87.
2 Thus, MOO, Romans 1–8, 396–397; THÜRING, Per Christum in Deum, 72, 82–83; LLOYD-JONES, Romans: The New Man, 102–103.
of the prototype is indicated to which we are destined to be conformed.'

We will return to examine in detail the resurrection aspect of the believer’s destiny (note the future tense of v. 8b; cf. v. 5b) in Section 7 below.

(h) Dead to Sin, Alive to God (Rom 6:11)

Although v. 11 has some verbal similarities with v. 10, it primarily acts as the necessary conclusion (οὕτως καὶ) to the preceding nine verses, counteracting the false reckoning of v. 1. The present imperative λογιζεῖτε ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι... summons believers continually to consider themselves as people who have been brought into this new state or position of being ‘dead indeed to sin, but alive to God’ (νεκροῖς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ). This is the first imperative in the entire epistle. It does not denote a pretending (‘as if’), but a deliberate and sober judgement. Therefore it is wrong to suggest that the ‘reckoning’ or ‘considering’ is part of the process of dying or of sharing Christ’s death. It is only in vv. 12–14 that Paul properly begins the practical outworking and application of the doctrinal arguments in 6:1–11. In v. 11 Paul only intends the sense: ‘recognize and believe the truth of what I have been saying

---

1 KÄSEMANN, Romans, 170; cf. THÜSING, Per Christum in Deum, 72.
2 Thus, KÄSEMANN, Romans, 170; DUNN, Romans 1–8, 305–306, 324; BORNKAMM, ‘Baptism and New Life,’ 78–79; CRANFIELD, Romans Vol 1, 314–315; cf. MOO, Romans 1–8, 371 (but note p. 397 where, according to MOO, v. 11 is only secondarily a concluding statement). But see also THÜSING (Per Christum in Deum, 71–76) who sees a unity between vv. 10 & 11.
3 DUNN, Romans 1–8, 324.
4 CRANFIELD. Romans Vol I, 315. Cf. LLOYD-JONES, Romans: The New Man, 118; MURRAY, Romans, 225–226; KÄSEMANN, Romans, 171; BORNKAMM, ‘Baptism and New Life,’ 78–79; RIDDERBOS, Paul: Outline, 209 & n. 9; GRAYSTON, Dying, We Live, 102 & n. 175.
5 Contra DUNN, Romans 1–8, 324. MOO’s implied suggestion that the ‘reckoning’ refers to believers appropriating what God has done for them in Christ (Romans 1–8, 398), while closer to the meaning I have expressed above, also misses the mark. Similar, but a little more helpful are the observations of H. THIELICKE: ‘The imperative does not refer to the dying. Over this we have no control, since Jesus Christ has died for us and we only receive the gift of his dying and are drawn into it. The object of the imperative is that we should take this death into account, take it seriously, and thus make the gift become a gift in which we participate’ (cited by MOO, Romans 1–8, 398).
6 On Rom 6:12–14, see Section 6(a) below.
The connection between the indicative and imperative in Paul in relation to dying and rising with Christ will be discussed more fully in Section 6(b) below.

1 Cf. MURRAY, Romans, 226-227; MOO, Romans 1-8, 397-398; MORRIS, Romans, 257; DUNN, Romans 1-8, 336-337 (contrast n. 5 of the preceding page).

2 Murray, Romans, 226.

3 See Section 7 below.


5 The Textus Receptus, following Μ Κ Π 33 81 614 1739= al, adds τῷ κυρίῳ ἠμῶν after ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ at the end of v. 11. However, this is probably a liturgical expansion (perhaps following Rom 6:23) of the above reading, preferred by the UBSGNT 3c, which has better external attestation (p46 A B D G Ψ 1739+ p565 syr εκα τόμα copia al). Thus TCGNT and most commentators. The theological difference is not significant, in any case.
‘in Christ’ (or ‘in the Lord’). As Dunn explains, it expresses an early and widespread Christian experience: ‘the religious experience of the Christian is not merely experience like that of Jesus. It is experience which at all characteristic and distinctive points is derived from Jesus the Lord, and which only makes sense when this derivative and dependent character is recognized.’ The ‘in Christ’ formula can have varying meanings in different contexts, and should not be interpreted mystically or individualistically. Rather, it should be seen in light of the eschatological or salvation-historical framework of Paul’s thought.

We saw in the previous section that Paul conceived of the two dominions being ruled by certain determining powers, and that human existence was characterized as being either ‘in sin,’ ‘in Adam,’ ‘under law,’ or ‘in the flesh,’ for those in the old dominion or, for those in the new dominion, ‘in Spirit’ or ‘in Christ.’ ἐν Χριστῶν, therefore, may be seen as signifying ‘the transfer to the new age that has been inaugurated with the death and resurrection of Christ’ and indicating that the new life is a reality in the dominion determined by Christ and his saving acts.

In this way the ἐν has an instrumental sense. However, it can have at the same time a local or spatial sense, whereby Christ is regarded as an inclusive person in whom believers are incorporated (cf. 1 Cor 15:22, ‘for as in Adam [ἐν τῷ Ἀδάμ] all die, so in Christ [ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ] all will be made alive’). Thus ἐν Χριστῶν is also open to corporate

---

1 Rom 3:24 does not have quite the same sense. Though similar in effect, the emphasis of the usage reflected in 3:24 is on the idea of redemptive power as enacted ‘in Christ,’ whereas here the emphasis falls on believers as being ‘in Christ.’ Thus Dunn, Romans 1–8, 324.

2 Dunn, Jesus and the Spirit, 342.

3 Best, One Body in Christ, 1–7. U. Schnelle (cited by Wedderburn, ‘"In Christ" and "With Christ,"’ 83) has observed that grammatical discussions cannot show that the phrase refers to one single concept; if they do seem to do so they will not in fact be doing justice to the variety of usage of the phrase. Rather, if one wants to really understand the phrase, its theological content must first be sought. This I intend to do briefly below. (With Wedderburn [p. 88 & n. 24], however, I reject Schnelle’s assertion that the theological content of the phrase in Paul may be elucidated with help from religio-historical parallels.)

4 As does, for example, Deissmann, St Paul, 128; Religion of Jesus, 171–172.

5 Beeker, Paul the Apostle, 272; Moo, Romans 1–8, 410.

6 Beeker, Paul the Apostle, 272.


8 Beeker (Paul the Apostle, 272–273) argues the phrase has a ‘participatory—instrumental’ meaning. Cf. also Tannehill, Dying and Rising, 19–20; Oeffke, ‘ἐν,’ 541–542; Moo, Romans 1–8, 410;
patterns of thought, as we have been seeing already in Romans 6. Paul’s ‘in Christ’ language (as found here) is therefore closely related to his ‘with Christ’ conception. However, whereas the ‘with (Christ)’ language is more suitable to action (dying, being buried, being raised), the ‘in (Christ)’ language fits better the continuing relationship of ‘deadness’ to sin and ‘aliveness’ to God which v. 11 describes. These states are achieved only in union with Christ, who himself died to sin and is alive to God.\(^1\) Hence one may say that being \(\epsilon^{\prime} \nu \chi_\text{pupr} \nu\) (as in v. 11) is the result of having been \(\sigma^{\nu} \chi_\text{pupr} \nu\) in his death (as at v. 8);\(^2\) the latter is logically, and perhaps in this case chronologically, prior to the former.

(i) Conclusions

Romans 6:1-11 represents Paul’s most significant and noteworthy treatment of the motif of death and resurrection with Christ. Perhaps the first thing to emerge from the foregoing examination is the thoroughly dogmatic nature of the passage. It is most definitely not exhortatory in purpose; Paul’s exhortation begins in vv. 12-14, then continues to the end of the chapter. To be sure, the imperatives of vv. 12-23 are grounded in the indicative nature of vv. 1-11—even inherent in it, to some extent—but Paul’s concern is with the objective transfer of believers from the old dominion to the new, in particular with their relationship to the realm of sin. Having died (with Christ) to sin, they have been freed from it and are enabled now to walk in newness of life. For Paul, Christ’s death and resurrection are conceived of as eschatological events that bring about a shift in the ages and effect this decisive transfer.

\(^1\) MOO, \textit{Romans 1-8}, 398; cf. BYRNE, ‘Righteousness of God,’ 563; DUNN, \textit{Romans 1-8}, 324; THUSING, \textit{Per Christum in Deum, 73-77}. The concept of an on-going personal relationship with Christ is included, but not primary.

Further, Rom 6:1–11 is not a baptismal passage, for the extent of reference to baptism is strictly limited to vv. 3–4. This fact is made clearer still by the conclusion that the ὁμοοόμα of v. 5a is to be interpreted in a nicht abbildlich sense as the ‘form’ of Christ’s death, ruling out any reference to baptism in v. 5. Rather, in vv. 3–4 Paul introduces baptism as a supporting argument to appeal to his readers’ own experience and awareness of the connection between that rite and the death of Christ. Thus even in v. 3 Paul states that the baptism of believers into Christ is a baptism into his death, implying a participation in the death of Christ.1

After the reference to baptism, Paul’s focus on the redemptive events continues with explicit reference to Christ’s burial (v. 4a), crucifixion (v. 6a) and death (repeatedly: vv. 5a, 8a, 9 & 10a) on the one hand, and to his resurrection from the dead (vv. 4b, 5b, 9) and consequent resurrection-life (vv. 8b, 10b) on the other. Paul is able to assert both the past participation of believers in Christ’s death—that they died with him—and a resurrection of believers, also with Christ, though to take place in its fullness in the temporal future. The passiness of participation in Christ’s death is emphasized by the string of aorist verbs in the passage (mostly in the passive voice),2 and the perfect verbs of vv. 5a & 7.3 The element of participation is most clearly brought out by Paul’s συν Χριστῷ terminology, which provides the main vehicle by which he expresses the motif of death and resurrection with Christ. There are four references to sharing in Christ’s death and one (or two)4 to resurrection with Christ in the passage. In each of these cases συν is either compounded with or closely linked to a verb (or noun, as in v. 5a) of

---

1 Additional exegetical results and conclusions concerning Paul’s understanding of baptism in Rom 6:3–4 will be discussed in Section 4(a) below.

2 Of verbs applying to believers, cf. ἀπεθάνομεν (v. 2); ἐβαστίσθημεν (v. 3, twice; passive); ἐνεκτήσαμεν (v. 4a; passive); ἐπετέλεσαμεν (v. 4c); ἐνεκπηγμέν (v. 6a; passive); κηρυχθη (v. 6b; passive); ἐποικεῖον (v. 7); ἀπεθάνομεν (v. 8a). (Ἀποθηκεῖν cannot take the passive voice.)

3 Thus, γενόμεθα (v. 5b); δεδεκακλήσατο (v. 7).

4 There are two if the implicit reference in v. 5b is counted (see the following note).
action—always related to the redemptive acts of Christ. The \( \alpha \nu \nu - \) language refers primarily to those redemptive events and not to concrete experiences in the lives of believers. Paul regards believers as having died with Christ when he died (i.e. at Golgotha). How this relates to the believer’s baptism and conversion or decision of faith will be discussed in Sections 4 and 5 below.

The motif is further elucidated by the presence in the text of corporate and inclusive thought. Paul conceives of Adam and Christ as ‘corporate persons’ who determine the existence of those belonging to them. It was suggested earlier that to regard the determinative acts of the two corporate persons as themselves corporate or inclusive acts is only a small step in Paul’s logic. The foregoing study of Rom 6:1–11 has borne this out. In v. 6 Paul claims the ‘old person,’ which is to be interpreted as the corporate body of the old Adamic humanity, was crucified with Christ. The incorporation language of vv. 3–4a reinforces this. Believers were baptized into Christ (\( \epsilon \iota \zeta \chi r\iota \sigma \tau \omicron \omicron \) ) and thus into his death (\( \epsilon \iota \zeta \tau \omicron \omicron \theta \iota \alpha \nu \alpha \tau \omicron \omicron \alpha \iota \rho \omicron \omicron \alpha \iota \) ). In its context \( \epsilon \iota \zeta \) carries the idea of incorporation into, or union with, Christ and his death. This is further strengthened by the inclusion language of v. 11, whereby believers are regarded as being (alive to God) ‘in Christ’ (\( \epsilon \nu \chi r\iota \sigma \tau \omicron \) ). In the theological context of v. 11, this phrase can take both an instrumental and a local sense (subsumed by Beker under the term ‘participatory-instrumental’). Thus Paul’s use of ‘in Christ’ here indicates a sense of inclusion in Christ as the corporate person of the new aeon and a being determined by Christ as the ruling power of the new aeon, so that the new life enjoyed by believers is a reality in this dominion inaugurated by the death and resurrection of Christ.

A related conclusion needs mentioning here. Paul’s use of the perfect tense in v. 5a (\( \gamma \varepsilon \omega \nu \alpha \mu \nu \epsilon \nu \) ), in contrast to the previous aorist passives, indicates that he regarded the

---

1 References to sharing in Christ’s death include three compound verbs (\( \sigma \nu \nu \tau \alpha \phi \mu \mu \mu \nu \epsilon \nu \dot{\mu} \omega \nu \alpha \omicron \nu \) (v. 4a, with the dative pronoun); \( \sigma \nu \nu \phi \mu \tau \omicron \nu \) \( \tau \alpha \mu \mu \mu \mu \mu \nu \dot{\mu} \omega \nu \alpha \omicron \nu \) (v. 5a); \( \sigma \nu \nu \tau \alpha \phi \mu \mu \mu \nu \) (v. 6a)) and the prepositional phrase \( \dot{\alpha} \pi \nu \delta \alpha \nu \alpha \nu \epsilon \nu \sigma \nu \chi r\iota \sigma \tau \omicron \) (v. 8a). Future participation in Christ’s resurrection is seen in the compound verb (with dative pronoun) \( \sigma \nu \nu \sigma \alpha \nu \alpha \nu \epsilon \nu \chi r\iota \sigma \tau \omicron \) (v. 8b). (A second reference to resurrection with Christ is implicit in v. 5b where the \( \sigma \nu \nu \phi \mu \tau \omicron \nu \) of v. 5a is to be supplied.)
form of [Christ’s] death’ to be another ongoing reality within the new dominion. Dying with Christ in the past therefore initiates a ‘conformity’ with Jesus’ death that is to have a continuing effect upon the lives of believers (cf. Phil 3:10). This is an important notion, because it relates death with Christ as a past event to dying with Christ as present experience, a concept Paul develops in more detail in other places (e.g. 2 Cor 4:7–15; Phil 3:2–11).

It is notable that Paul does not speak in Romans 6 of resurrection with Christ as an accomplished fact or past event. He does speak of the believer being set to walk in ‘newness of life,’ which is somehow derivative from Christ’s resurrection-life, but uses the future tense to describe resurrection with Christ. I will argue below that the future tense refers to the resurrection from the dead as the final outworking of the eschatological event of Christ’s resurrection when believers will then be fully conformed to the glory of Christ.1 If correct, it is a significant conclusion from Rom 6:1–11 that for Paul the believer’s past union with Christ has to do primarily with his or her participation in Christ’s death, not with participation in Christ’s resurrection. However, the foundational events of the death and resurrection of Christ are themselves inseparably linked, and such is the solidarity of believers with Christ in those redemptive events that Paul can say both that believers have died στὶς Χριστῷ and that their future resurrection will take place στὶς Χριστῷ.2

We might summarize the chain of logic thus far seen to be behind Paul’s thought in Romans 6 as follows: (i) Christ died ‘for us,’ making possible (ii) the believer’s participation in that death ‘with Christ,’ thereby enabling believers (iii) to be incorporated ‘into Christ’ and into his death, resulting in (iv) the state and experience of being ‘in Christ’ as corporate person of the new dominion, at the same time initiating (v) an ongoing conformity to the death of Christ in the life of the believer. However, the

1 See Section 7(a) below.
2 Cf. DUNN, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, 143.
chain of reasoning is not yet complete, for Paul has more to say about how the believer's union with Christ is concretely experienced in his or her life.

Exploring this from the time of a person's 'conversion-initiation' to their participation in the future resurrection from the dead is the task of the following two chapters.
CHAPTER III
DEATH AND RESURRECTION WITH CHRIST
IN CONVERSION-INITIATION

Having discussed the concept of union with Christ as a past event in general terms, we turn now to investigate participation in Christ's death (and resurrection?) more specifically in the concrete past experiences of the believer, in what may be termed 'conversion-initiation.' Thus we will examine in the next section the place of baptism within Paul's motif of death and resurrection with Christ. Following that we will consider how the motif relates to the believer's faith and conversion (§. 5). Although faith and baptism are inseparably linked in the complex of conversion-initiation, the two are not identical and may be treated separately.²

4. Baptism into Christ's Death

Although only vv. 3-4 of Romans 6 refer to baptism, these verses provide access to some of the central concepts in Paul's understanding of baptism. In the first part below (a), I will highlight the main conclusions concerning baptism from the previous exegesis. I propose then to examine three other places where Paul employs the construction βαπτίζειν with εἰς: Gal 3:27; 1 Cor 12:13; 10:2 (Part [b]),³ leading to an interpretation of βαπτίζειν εἰς Χριστοῦ in Paul in Part (c). In Part (d) I will look at the problem of understanding theologically the relationship between baptism and the death of Christ on the one hand and between baptism and the believer's dying with Christ on the other.

---

¹ Since Paul explicitly puts resurrection with Christ in the future tense, whether one can then speak of a concrete past participation in Christ's resurrection remains to be demonstrated. This question will be discussed in Section 7 below.
² Cf. the discussion of R. N. LONGENECKER, Galatians (WBC 41; Dallas: Word, 1990) 155-156.
³ One other passage does exist in Paul—1 Cor 1:13, 15—on it see pp. 38-39 (& 39 n. 2) above, where I conclude that βαπτίζειν εἰς and βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ δύναμι are not by any means equivalent. However, since this passage does not contribute anything of great significance to our study, it has been omitted from further consideration.
While Paul's purpose in Romans 6 is not to expound a doctrine of baptism, we can nevertheless gain some insights into his theological understanding of the rite and its significance. Paul uses this common experience of believers to evoke the general connection between baptism and the death of Christ that his readers already understand. They would have also known that baptism is an initiation into the Christian community that draws its meaning from the person of Christ and the relationship established with him. Paul takes this legacy and gives baptism a deeper theological significance: believers are baptized into Christ and thus into his death; baptism is a participation in the death of Christ.

I argued above that the preposition εἰς from 'baptism into Christ' is not an abbreviation of the early formula εἰς τῶν υἱῶν. The latter phrase cannot explain the related idea of 'baptism into [Christ’s] death' (v. 3b), or the concept of participation in Christ's death that Paul attributes to baptism in v. 4 and goes on to explicate in the following verses. Rather, εἰς has a local or spatial sense, carrying the idea of incorporation into Christ and his death. This coheres with the concept of Christ as an inclusive or corporate person and baptism as a way in which one is included in Christ as the corporate person of the new aeon. The element of participation in Christ’s death is reinforced by Paul’s statement that believers ‘have been buried with Christ through baptism into death’ (v. 4). ‘Baptism into death’, therefore, is instrumental (διὰ) in effecting a burial with Christ, with burial emphasizing the decisiveness of the death that has taken place. The presence of the συν-compound (συνδέσθησιν) indicates the solidarity of believers with Christ so that when Christ was buried they were buried with him, by implication, having died with Christ when he died.

---

1 I discuss in more detail the significance of the instrumentality of baptism in Part (d) below. It has crucial implications for seeing how baptism is related to the redemptive events.
Another significant conclusion from the preceding investigation is that although baptism means a sharing in Christ’s death, it is not related to Christ’s resurrection or to the believer’s resurrection with Christ. Paul carefully refrains from linking baptism to Christ’s resurrection, indeed from speaking about a past participation of believers with Christ in his resurrection. Rather, in vv. 5b & 8b he puts resurrection with Christ in the future tense, and in v. 4c speaks only of the believer being set to ‘walk in newness of life.’ For Paul, therefore, participation in the resurrection of Christ is not an effect or result of baptism; rather, it is predicated upon and made possible only because of one’s participation in Christ’s death (v. 5). We have already seen that the reference to walking in newness of life shows that being baptized into Christ’s death has the purpose of enabling believers to live a new kind of life in the new aeon of redemption which has dawned. The possibility of this new life is opened to believers and made certain by the resurrection of Christ, but that is not the same as saying that baptism and the resurrection of Christ are linked in Paul’s thought. This is a conclusion often missed by exegetes. As far as the theology of Paul is concerned, baptism is a rite that draws its efficacy and meaning primarily from the death of Christ and the participation of believers in that death. In Romans 6 it carries this significance through use of the metaphor of ‘baptism into Christ.’

---

1 Cf. KÄSEMANN, 'Theology of the Cross,' 175–176, who contends that Paul attacks such a view.
2 I will argue in Section 7(a) below that these must be taken as genuine eschatological future tenses, not logical ones.
3 Not merely being baptized; the prepositional addition is particularly significant! Believers only live the new life because they have died with Christ and in a partial way share his resurrection-life, not because in baptism they are somehow raised with Christ.
4 Cf. also DUNN, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, 143–144, 155. The only place in the letters bearing Paul’s name where this might be contradicted is in Colossians 2, specifically v. 12. But even if this could be confidently attributed to the apostle Paul, it would only represent a contradiction if the εὐ φυτήσας of v. 12b was taken as referring to baptism (‘in which’). While that is grammatically possible, I believe the arguments for taking it to refer instead to Christ (‘in whom’), as it must be taken in v. 11, are stronger, despite the resultant awkwardness of expression (on this see further DUNN, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, 154–156 & bibliography on p. 154 n. 7; BARTH & BLanke, Colossians. 320–322; LOHSE, Colossians, 104 n. 73; SIBER, Mit Christus leben, 197 & n. 18). Thus the verse should read: ‘having been buried with him in baptism, in whom you were also raised with him ... ’ Accordingly, the idea of resurrection, as in Romans 6, is to be separated from that of baptism, though not, of course, from death with Christ.
(b) Other \( \beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\zeta\varepsilon\iota\nu \varepsilon \iota \zeta \) ... References (Gal 3:27; 1 Cor 12:13; 10:2)

Several other texts in Paul’s letters use the phrase \( \beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\zeta\varepsilon\iota\nu \varepsilon \iota \zeta \) which help to elucidate the meaning of this phrase in Rom 6:3–4.

i. Galatians 3:27

Alongside Rom 6:3, Gal 3:27 is the only other New Testament text which contains the expression \( \beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\zeta\varepsilon\iota\nu \varepsilon \iota \zeta \) \( \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\omicron\nu \). In fact this verse is the only explicit reference to baptism in Galatians.

Galatians 3:26–29 forms a distinct and central unit within chapters 3 and 4, which defines the status of the Gentile Christians before God,\(^1\) together with the Jewish Christians. The main purpose of this unit is to support Paul’s overall case that Gentile Christians can be part of the ‘Israel of God’ not by circumcision and strict observance of the Law, but by their acceptance of Christ, specifically because they have been baptized into Christ.\(^2\)

In v. 26 Paul asserts that they all (\( \pi\acute{a}v\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma \), repeated in v. 28; cf. \( \delt\omicron\omicron\omicron \) in v. 27)\(^3\) are sons of God through (the) faith \( \epsilon\nu \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\omicron\nu \ \iota\varsigma\omicron\omicron\nu \). \( \Pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\epsilon\omicron\omicron\varsigma \) should be seen as syntactically distinct from \( \epsilon\nu \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\omicron\nu \ \iota\varsigma\omicron\omicron\nu \), so that the means by which one becomes a son of God is both through faith, and through incorporation into Christ.\(^4\) The latter phrase is repeated in v. 28d where Paul contends again that all are one (\( \varepsilon\iota \zeta \) \( \epsilon\nu \))

---

3. ‘All’ probably refers to both Jewish and Gentile Christians. It is repeated frequently throughout the entire epistle. So F. F. BRUCE, Commentary on Galatians (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) 183; R. N. LONGENECKER, Galatians, 151; contra BEITZ, Galatians, 185.
4. So BEITZ, Galatians, 186; F. F. BRUCE, Galatians, 184; R. Y. K. FUNG, The Epistle to the Galatians (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988) 171; BEASLEY-MURRAY, Baptism in the New Testament, 150 and also RV, RSV, NRSV, NEB; against AV, NASB, NIV, which link the two as one unit. TANNEHILL (Dying and Rising, 20) points out that Paul does not use the preposition \( \epsilon\nu \) to indicate the object of faith, in any case.
The context of these verses shows it to be an inclusive phrase. Those baptized have 'put on Christ' (v. 27b). Differences which divided people in the old dominion have been overcome; there is now neither Jew nor Greek, nor any other social distinctions, for they now form one new person: ‘You are all one (person)’ in Christ Jesus’ (v. 28). Verse 27 indicates that the inclusive unity which the Christians enter is Christ himself. They form one person because they are included in Christ. The phrase ‘in Christ Jesus’ (v. 28d) makes this clear: εν is both local and relational, and ‘Christ Jesus’ is viewed in both corporate and universal terms. It has the same function in v. 26, where it shows that the believers’ status as sons of God is a derivative one, based on their inclusion in Christ.

The second half of v. 27 asserts that all those who have been baptized into Christ, Χριστον Ἐνδύσαντε, ‘Putting on Christ’ thus further elucidates the expression ‘into Christ.’ It describes the Christian’s incorporation into Christ as an act of ‘clothing,’ whereby Christ is understood as the garment. The metaphor is probably derived from the Hebrew tradition where the figure of changing clothes to represent an inward and spiritual change was common (cf. Isa 61:10; Zech 3:3–4). The closest parallel to the phrase is Rom 13:14 (ἐνδύσασθε τὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν), but there believers are exhorted to do what they are here said to have done already. In the deutero-Pauline epistles ‘putting on the new person’ is mentioned to signify the assumption of a new

---

1 On this, cf. above, pp. 58–60, and for literature, p. 58 n. 5. It is not possible here to offer a full discussion of the phrase; I will limit its consideration to what seems to be its meaning in the context of Gal 3:26–29.
2 Since εν is masculine, something more than the simple idea of unity is expressed here. The masculine gender suggests that all who are in Christ form a corporate or inclusive unity (NEB 'one person'; RV 'one man'). So FUNG, Galatians, 176; TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 20 n. 30; cf. R. N. LONGENECKER, Galatians, 157–158.
5 BETZ, Galatians, 187. The liturgical exposition afforded by the putting on of a baptismal robe is first attested at a relatively late date (4th Century A.D.). But Paul’s meaning is most likely metaphorical or figurative, rather than literal. See SCHNACKENBURG, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 25 n. 28.
way of life (Col 3:10; Eph 4:24), whereas in Gal 3:27 the ethical aspect is not primarily in view; it is only present by implication. Here the new status, the new order of existence ‘in Christ Jesus,’ is emphasized. Dunn alleges that the connection between v. 27a and v. 27b is so close that we must take the phrases ‘to be baptized into Christ’ and ‘to put on Christ’ as alternative and interchangeable metaphorical expressions for the same reality. He argues that the sense is disrupted if we take the latter as a metaphor and the former as a literal description of a physical act. However, there is no such disruption if v. 27a describes a physical act (‘baptized’) and its spiritual meaning (‘into Christ’), and v. 27b then enlarges upon that meaning (‘you have ... put on Christ’).

Paul brings his argument to a conclusion in v. 29. On the basis of vv. 26–28 Paul is now able to say that ‘Christ’ includes all those who belong to Christ, because they constitute the ‘one body of Christ.’ Therefore, Gentiles and Jews are Abraham’s seed and heirs according to the promise (v. 29). Again, corporate patterns of thought are evident. In v. 16 Christ is spoken of as the one ‘seed’ of Abraham, and in v. 28 believers as ‘one (person) in Christ Jesus.’ Now in v. 29 they too are called ‘seed of Abraham,’ because they are included in Christ, the one seed.

ii. 1 Corinthians 12:13

The actual phrase βαπτίζειν εἰς Χριστόν is not found in 1 Cor 12:13, nor in the remaining text to be considered in this section (1 Cor 10:2). But similar expressions are used that also enhance our understanding of ‘baptism into Christ.’

In 1 Corinthians 12–14 Paul is speaking about spiritual gifts (πνευματικά). In 12:1–31, he emphasizes his central theme of the need for diversity in unity (and unity in

---

1. F. F. BRUCE, Galatians, 186. Cf. also RIDDERBOS, Paul: Outline, 225; Fung, Galatians, 172.
2. DUNN, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, 111.
4. BETZ, Galatians, 201.
Verses 12–26 look backward from the manifestations of the Spirit previously described (vv. 1–11) to the original act by which the Corinthians, and indeed all Christians, were incorporated into the body of Christ. Paul's argument here falls into three parts (vv. 12–14, 15–20, 21–26). The first paragraph sets forth the basic presupposition of the imagery (the body is one) and its urgency (but has many members). This is followed by a twofold elaboration of the metaphor, the first part emphasizing diversity, the second unity.3

Verse 12 introduces the figure of the body. Here Paul returns to using the imagery of the church as the ‘body of Christ,’ first used in 10:17 and picked up again in 11:29.4 The body is one yet has many members and all the members, though many, are one body. Paul concludes, ‘so also is Christ,’ though one might have expected ‘so also is the church.’ Paul is probably using a metonymy. Thus ‘Christ’ is a shortened form for the ‘body of Christ,’ the church.5 Certainly this does not amount to a simple identification of Christ with the body of believers, for Christ as Lord of the Church, remains eternally distinct from it. Yet believers are the body of Christ insofar as they are in Christ (Rom 12:5).6

1 The primary concern is diversity in unity, not the converse. So FEE, First Corinthians, 601.
2 R. E. COTTLE, "All were Baptized": JETS 17 no. 2 (1974) 75.
3 FEE, First Corinthians, 601.
4 FEE, First Corinthians, 602. The ‘body’ imagery was quite common in the ancient world, making discussion of the possible origin or sources of the term irrelevant (FEE, First Corinthians, 602 nn. 11–12). Cf. C. K. BARRETT, The First Epistle to the Corinthians (Black’s; London: Black, 1968) 287; CONZELMANN, 1 Corinthians, 211. The thought of the body as an organism is subsidiary to that of the church as the body of Christ. So CONZELMANN, 1 Corinthians, 211–212, following E. KASSELMANN.
5 Clear evidence for this is found in vv. 27–28 where the church is identified as the body of Christ. Thus FEE, First Corinthians, 603; BARRETT, First Corinthians, 287.
6 BARRETT, First Corinthians, 287–288. Whether Paul’s language is that of metaphor (most Protestant exegetes) or descriptive of a profound ontological reality (most Roman Catholic interpreters) has generated considerable debate. Following BEST, One Body in Christ, 98–101, I believe that the language is that of metaphor. But in any case Paul’s main purpose in v. 12 is not theological but functional; dealing with the need for diversity in unity. So FEE, First Corinthians, 602 n. 13 and D. A. CARSON, Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12–14 (Homebush West: Lancer, 1988) 42–43 & n. 77.
Verse 13 elaborates upon v. 12 and further explains the proposition that 'the body is one.' 1 Paul says in v. 13 'for ev evi pneumati we were all baptized eic ev soma2 ... and we were all saturated in ev pneuma.' 3 Again the expression baptezienv ... eic is used, but here with 'one body,' rather than with 'Christ.' However, the link just seen between soma and Christ in v. 12 shows that being baptized into one body is very similar to the idea of baptism into Christ. Thus, without needing to adopt any ontological identity (between Christ and the church), the passage is quite consistent with the notion of Christ as an inclusive person. In this respect the present passage bears similarities to the two already considered (Gal 3:27 and Rom 6:3). 4

What does Paul mean by 'baptism' in this context, and what sense should be given to each of the two key prepositions, ev and eic? Because of the presence of baptezienv it is often assumed that Paul is referring to the rite of water baptism, 5 and it is then often urged that this text supports the close tie of the reception of the Spirit with baptism itself. 6 Others have seen a reference to a spiritual baptism, either a baptism in the Spirit, 72

---

1 The connection between the two verses is made by a yap. As almost every word and syntactical unit in v. 13 is disputed, our discussion of it cannot do justice to each possible option, and thus it will be restricted somewhat for considerations of space.

2 Whether this should be translated as 'by/in one Spirit we were all baptized into one body' or as 'we were all baptized by/in one Spirit into one body' is disputed. The former translation links baptezienv more closely with eic ev soma, with the phrase ev evi pneuma qualifying the baptism into one body (So NASB; CONZELMANN, 1 Corinthians, 210, 212; BARRETT, First Corinthians, 288). The latter translation takes eic ev soma as a further qualification of baptism by/in one Spirit (So NIV; FEE, First Corinthians, 603-604; CARSON, Showing the Spirit, 47). The difference is important as it raises the question of just where the emphasis should be placed; is Paul referring to a spiritual baptism (admittedly possible with either translation), or to the rite of water baptism (possible only with the former translation)? We shall seek an answer to this shortly. In any case, a definite link between ev evi pneuma and eic ev soma is inescapable.

3 On this translation of eponiathmev, rather than the usual 'we were all given one Spirit to drink,' see p. 75 n. 1 below.

4 TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 23. See also n. 6 of the preceding page. We shall return to the idea of baptism into 'one body' again, after having determined what 'baptism' in this passage means.

5 So BULTMANN, Theology of the New Testament 1, 138, 311, 333; SCHNACKENBURG, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 26-29; BARRETT, First Corinthians, 288-289; CONZELMANN, 1 Corinthians, 212; WHITE, Doctrine of Initiation, 203 and not a few commentators. BEASLEY-MURRAY (Baptism in the New Testament, 167-171) provides a more detailed argument for this position.

6 Although, of those mentioned in the previous note, BEASLEY-MURRAY (Baptism in the New Testament, 170) backs away here, stating, 'there is nothing automatic about this association of baptism and the Spirit ...'
understood as a Pentecostal baptism or second blessing, or the reception of the Spirit at conversion; or as a further possibility, a baptism by the Spirit, comprising conversion.

The arguments for the Pentecostal interpretation have been soundly refuted. Principally against it is the fact that Paul does not elsewhere use the term found here and nothing in his writings clearly points to such a second experience in any case. Additionally, the emphasis in this context is not upon a post-conversion experience of the Spirit but rather upon the Corinthians' common reception of the Spirit.

The view that Paul is describing conversion as a baptism by the Spirit depends upon taking the τέλος instrumentally. However, in the New Testament, τέλος with βαπτίζειν never designates the agent of baptism but rather the medium or the element of baptism. 1 Corinthians 12:13 would then be the only place in the New Testament where the Spirit is depicted as the agent of baptism, which, although possible, is unlikely. Thus the

---

5 See FEE, *First Corinthians*, 605.
7 Except of course, when part of a fuller phrase like τέλος τῶν τελετών or τέλος τῶν δώρων. This is always true of 'water' (Matt 3:11; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:26, 31, 33; Acts 1:5; 11:16; cf. Matt 3:6; John 3:23); it is likewise true of the six other passages which speak of a 'Spirit-baptism,' which are always set in contrast to water baptism (Matt 3:11; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:33; Acts 1:5; 11:16).
8 LLOYD-JONES (*Romans: The New Man*, 35–37) believes Rom 6:3–4 is another instance of this. But he bases this interpretation upon conclusions drawn from the RSV reading for τέλος ('by') in 1 Cor 12:13.
usage is most probably locative, expressing the 'element' in which they have all been immersed.¹

The contention that Paul is speaking of water baptism has much scholarly support.² That the baptism is και εν σωματι does not decide the case, for being baptized into one body could equally describe the result of water baptism or a spiritual baptism at conversion.³ Since the verb βαπτισθεναι is capable of yielding both literal and figurative meanings, we should not automatically assume that the rite of water baptism is intended here.⁴ The context, and the linking of εν εις πνειματι with the verb 'baptize,' caution us against doing so. As Dunn explains, 'it is their experience of the Spirit (not of water baptism) which provides the jumping-off point for Paul’s appeal to the Corinthians for a right attitude towards the exercise of spiritual gifts. It is their experience of the one Spirit (not water baptism) which is the basis of their unity.'⁵ Probably Paul was familiar with the concept of Spirit baptism since the tradition was common to all four Gospels and prominent in the tradition of Pentecost.⁶ But the clearly metaphorical sense of v. 13c, 'and we were all saturated in one Spirit,' provides the strongest argument for a metaphorical (rather than literal) meaning for 'baptism' in the first part of v. 13.⁷ The aorist passive πνεισθεναι (cf. βαπτισθεναι) most likely refers to the Corinthians’ experience of the Spirit in conversion, and not to a second experience of the Spirit,⁸ nor

---

¹ See FEE, First Corinthians, 605–606; DUNN, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, 128; CARSON, Showing the Spirit, 46–47.
² See those cited in p. 72 n. 5 above. However, in many cases it is simply assumed to be water baptism without question (for instance BARRETT, First Corinthians, 288–289; CONZELMANN, 1 Corinthians, 212).
³ Cf. p. 72 n. 2 above.
⁴ Cf. pp. 37–38 above.
⁵ DUNN, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, 130. See also FEE, First Corinthians, 604 & n. 22. However, I disagree with DUNN as to whether baptism can form part of the basis of the Corinthians’ unity. Certainly it can and does, as will be noted in later discussion of the relationship between baptism and faith in Gal 3:26–27 (see pp. 98–101 below; cf. also Eph 4:5). Nevertheless, DUNN is right in saying the emphasis is clearly upon the Spirit in this present passage.
⁶ DUNN, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, 130. DUNN adduces Rom 5:5 and Titus 3:5–6 (if Pauline) as strongly suggesting that Paul was familiar with this tradition, and 1 Cor 6:11 as implying thought of baptism in the Spirit.
⁸ See CARSON, Showing the Spirit, 45–46 and FEE, First Corinthians, 604 for arguments against this.
to water baptism, the Lord’s Supper, or confirmation. So we conclude that Paul is probably referring to a baptism in the Spirit at conversion and not to water baptism.

What then is the significance of the εἰς in the present verse? The precise nuance of this preposition is not certain here. With verbs of motion like βαπτίζειν, εἰς most often has the sense of ‘movement towards so as to be in.’ Hence the idea of a purpose or goal could be prominent; ‘we were all baptized in the one Spirit, so as to become one body.’ But εἰς is often given a local sense and, if this is so here, the thought is that all are baptized ‘into’ the body, with the implication that there is a pre-existent entity, the body of Christ, into which believers are incorporated by being immersed in the Spirit. The local sense appears preferable; it more strongly emphasizes the ideas of incorporation and initiation, which we have found to be common and quite important in Paul.

This brings us to the meaning and significance of the baptism (in one Spirit) into one body. On my interpretation, the baptism mentioned in 1 Cor 12:13 is to be taken as a spiritual baptism at conversion. Yet, perhaps not surprisingly, the results of that baptism are similar in some respects to those predicated of the rite of water baptism.

---

1. So concludes DUNN, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, 130–131; FEE, First Corinthians, 604–605 & n. 26; CARSON, Showing the Spirit, 45–46. Cf. SCHNACKENBURG, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 83–86 (although he takes v. 13a as referring to water baptism). Πνεύμα is perhaps best taken in its second possible sense, meaning to ‘water or irrigate,’ rather than in the first sense, ‘to drink.’ This finds support particularly from Isa 29:10. So DUNN; SCHNACKENBURG; though FEE (p. 605 n. 28) demurs.

2. BRASLEY-MURRAY’s arguments that water baptism is intended here (Baptism in the New Testament, 167–171, esp p. 169), are less convincing. The strongest argument he advances, namely the similarity between Gal 3:27–28 and 1 Cor 12:12–13, appears less persuasive than the contextual arguments put forward above in favour of a spiritual baptism.


6. Indeed, for the Corinthians, the point of reference for understanding the meaning of εἴν εἰς πνεύμα ... εἰς εἴν αἷμα εἰσαξάνθημεν would be their own baptism (specifically their immersion) in water. However, this is not the same thing as suggesting either that Paul intended the rite here or that they would have thought him to be referring to it. So FEE, First Corinthians,
the oneness of the body depends upon the fact that all (πάντες, v. 13ac) have been baptized in one Spirit into one body. That is, all have been incorporated into one body, the body of Christ, and the basis of their unity is their common life in the Spirit.\(^1\) Just as in Gal 3:26-29, here too baptism obliterates all racial and social distinctions (v. 13b). In Christ the divisions of the old world have been overcome. Further, the linking of the body with Christ in v. 12 highlights similarities to the key idea of an inclusive Christ that we have observed before. Thus Christ also is a source of the unity of the body, not identical with the body, but neither to be separated from it.\(^2\) Yet here being incorporated into Christ, or into the body of Christ, is dependent upon believers’ ‘baptism in the Spirit.’ Paul’s purpose in 1 Cor 12:13 is to show that this unity of believers is based upon their common experience of the Spirit.

iii. 1 Corinthians 10:2

The context of this verse, which speaks of a ‘baptism into Moses (εἰς τὸν Μωϋξερνον) in the cloud and in the sea,’ is 1 Cor 10:1-11, a passage warning the Corinthians of the dangers of persisting in their present idolatry and sin and being rejected by Christ. Paul’s primary purpose in vv. 1-5 is not to make a typological statement of sacramental theology,\(^3\) but to give a midrashic exposition of Old Testament stories for the elucidation of Christian ethics.\(^4\) His main point is neither that the Israelites had sacraments, nor that

---

\(^1\) FEE, First Corinthians, 606, 607.
\(^2\) Cf. BEST, One Body in Christ, 95-96.
\(^3\) Contra BARRETT, First Corinthians, 221-223; BEST, One Body in Christ, 72; SCHNACKENBURG, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 93-94. Many commentators refer 10:1-5 directly to the Christian sacraments.
\(^4\) BEASLEY-MURRAY, Baptism in the New Testament, 181. Cf. also FEE, First Corinthians, 442-443 & nn. 5 & 9, 445 n. 18; DUNN, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, 124-127. Whether this material had a prior existence (as CONZELMANN, 1 Corinthians, 165-166 suggests) or not is nearly irrelevant since Paul has so thoroughly adapted it for his own purposes (see FEE, First Corinthians, 442 n. 5).
it is possible to partake of the Christian sacraments and yet be destroyed. Primarily he is contesting a failure to persevere and endure, and if a false sacramentalism is in view, it is secondary here. What Paul is saying is that the Israelites had mighty experiences of redemption and of God's grace (vv. 1–4), and yet fell into idolatry and sin and were destroyed (vv. 5, 7–10). These great redemptive acts of grace point to, and are an allegory of, the experience of redemption and grace in the new dominion and in Christ, and are intended to warn the Corinthians that they face similar dangers to those which faced the Israelites. Thus the whole passage is an illustration or example (τύποι, v. 6; τύποις, v. 11), part of an exhortation to discipline and perseverance based on vv. 24–27 of chapter 9.

By calling Israel 'our fathers' (1 Cor 10:1) Paul emphasizes the continuity of the Corinthians' experience with what God has done in the past. He then writes of the Israelites, 'all were under the cloud and all passed through the sea,' interpreting this as their 'undergoing baptism into Moses in the cloud and in the sea' (v. 2). His point is that just as the Corinthians' Christian life began with a baptism, so the Israelites'...
deliverance from Egypt began with a kind of ‘baptism’ but that did not keep them from falling into idolatry and thus falling short of the prize.

What should we make of this ‘baptism into Moses’? It is sometimes seen as a baptism into Moses’ leadership or into loyalty or allegiance to Moses. This would make it similar in meaning to that of the formula ‘baptism in the name of Christ.’ However, it is more commonly regarded as having been formulated by Paul on analogy with \( \beta\alpha\tau\tau\iota\zeta\epsilon\nu \ \varepsilon\iota\zeta \ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\tau\omicron\omicron\nu \), which, as we have seen, differs substantively in meaning to the former. In any case, it is generally agreed that we must not explain ‘baptism into Christ’ on the basis of the phrase ‘baptism into Moses.’ Paul is not interpreting baptism on the basis of the Old Testament and there is no evidence for the existence of such a formula there.

Certainly, the literal sense of \( \beta\alpha\tau\tau\iota\zeta\epsilon\nu \) cannot be pressed here, since while the Israelites ‘were all under the cloud, and all passed through the sea’ (v. 1), they came into contact with neither. There is no question of an actual baptism. They were all baptized ‘in (\( \epsilon\nu \)) the cloud and in the sea’ (v. 2), the cloud above and the sea on either side.

---

1 There is some evidence that the Jews also regarded the passage through the Red Sea as a kind of baptism, analogous to proselyte baptism (BARRETT, First Corinthians, 221). But the point is debatable, and therefore of uncertain value in explicating Paul’s thought. See FEE, First Corinthians, 444 n. 17 and BEASLEY-MURRAY, Baptism in the New Testament, 31 n. 1.

2 FEE, First Corinthians, 442, 444–445.

3 Thus F. F. BRUCE, Corinthians, 90; J. MOFFATT, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians (MNCS; New York, 1938) 129; BADKE, ‘Baptised into Moses,’ 28.

4 So SCHNACKENBURG, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 23. But this would have been expressed by \( \varepsilon\iota\zeta \ \tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu \ \tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu \ \tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu \ ) (see pp. 38–39 & 39 n. 2 above).

5 So BARRETT, First Corinthians, 221; BEST, One Body in Christ, 72; FEE, First Corinthians, 445; CONZELMANN, 1 Corinthians, 166; TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 23. SCHNACKENBURG, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 93 and F. F. BRUCE, Corinthians, 90 also admit this.

6 BARRETT, First Corinthians, 221. BEST (One Body in Christ, 72) adds that as a parallel, therefore, the latter throws no light upon the former, and need not be considered in determining its meaning.

7 CONZELMANN, 1 Corinthians, 166; BARRETT, First Corinthians, 221.

8 F. F. BRUCE, Corinthians, 90; RIDDERBOS, Paul: Outline, 405.

9 Although \( \epsilon\nu \) could in both instances be interpreted as instrumental, the use of \( \epsilon\nu \) with \( \beta\alpha\tau\tau\iota\zeta\epsilon\nu \) throughout the New Testament is locative, expressing the element into which one is baptized (FEE, First Corinthians, 445 n. 21). See also pp. 73–74 above.
together constituting their ‘baptism.’ The suggestion of Origen, followed by various exegesis, that the cloud represents the Holy Spirit and the sea the baptismal water is, as George Beasley-Murray notes, ‘gratuitous.’ It is more likely that the two images had become so interwoven as a way of speaking of the deliverance event that Paul himself did not give each image a distinct ‘meaning’ at all.

Remembering the overall context and purpose of this passage, Paul’s primary concern is not with Israel’s relationship to Moses, but with the Corinthians’ relationship to Christ. He is thinking of the Christian’s baptism into Christ and using the Exodus as an illustration of the Christian’s incorporation into Christ. As Moses was Israel’s deliverer, so Christ is for the Corinthians. It is quite possible that Paul intends Moses to be a prefigurement of Christ (cf. v. 4 ‘that rock was Christ’). Best, however, interprets the allegory too literally, claiming that the baptism into Moses was in fact a true baptism into Christ.

Nevertheless, with ‘baptism into Moses’ being fashioned on analogy to ‘baptism into Christ,’ the former phrase, like the latter, is open to being understood in a corporate and inclusive sense. Moses is seen here as a representative individual. The ‘baptism into Moses’ of ‘our fathers’ denotes the many as being brought under the one and the many saved in and through the one. Israel received Moses as its leader and participated in the

---

2 For example CONZELMANN, 1 Corinthians, 166; DUNN, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, 127 (seemingly contradicting his earlier remark of p. 126 n. 32).
5 FEE, First Corinthians, 445 & n. 19.
7 FEE, First Corinthians, 445.
saving operation of the cloud and sea that God accomplished for them through the ministry of Moses.\(^1\) It is possible, as Tannehill argues, for Moses as the founding figure of the Old Covenant to take on the same significance as Adam and Christ. Thus Moses is not merely an individual figure but represents the whole *Heilsordnung* of the law, and to be baptized into him is to enter this sphere of existence.\(^2\) While we should not press this latter point, seeing Moses as a representative figure helps confirm some of our conclusions concerning Paul's view of baptism into Christ.

\(\text{(c) Summary: } \text{Ba}_\text{p}_\text{t}_\text{i}_\text{e}_\text{i}_\text{v} \text{ e}_\text{i}_\text{g} \text{ Xr}_\text{i}_\text{o}_\text{st}_\text{on} \text{ in Paul} \)

Although in none of the texts considered above is Paul's primary purpose to explain a doctrine of baptism, we have been able to extract some valuable insights into his understanding of the meaning and significance of Christian baptism. From that basis, we can now draw some conclusions concerning 'baptism into Christ' in Romans 6.

Of the five Pauline texts employing the phrase \(\text{Ba}_\text{p}_\text{t}_\text{i}_\text{e}_\text{i}_\text{v} \text{ e}_\text{i}_\text{g} \text{ Xr}_\text{i}_\text{o}_\text{st}_\text{on} \) (Rom 6:3-4; Gal 3:27; 1 Cor 1:13, 15; 12:13 and 10:2),\(^3\) only the first two contain the full expression \(\text{Ba}_\text{p}_\text{t}_\text{i}_\text{e}_\text{i}_\text{v} \text{ e}_\text{i}_\text{g} \text{ Xr}_\text{i}_\text{o}_\text{st}_\text{on} \). In each of the texts, except 1 Cor 10:2,\(^4\) \(\text{Ba}_\text{p}_\text{t}_\text{i}_\text{e}_\text{i}_\text{v} \) in the aorist passive implies a decisive single past divine act. We have found that the verb is capable of yielding both literal and figurative meanings. In Romans 6, Galatians 3 and 1 Corinthians 1 it refers to the rite of water baptism, the meaning of which is then further explicated in differing ways. In 1 Corinthians 10 it clearly has a figurative meaning, and probably also in 1 Corinthians 12. In the latter case Paul is probably speaking of a spiritual baptism—a baptism in the Spirit—taking place at the time of a believer's conversion. In 1 Cor 10:2, the 'baptism into Moses' has a derivative significance for the

---


\(^3\) On 1 Cor 1:13, 15 see p. 65 n. 3 above.

\(^4\) In 1 Cor 10:2 \(\text{Ba}_\text{p}_\text{t}_\text{i}_\text{e}_\text{i}_\text{v} \) is aorist middle.
phrase is formulated by Paul on analogy with the metaphor of 'baptism into Christ.' Significantly, in these two texts, the effects of their respective 'baptisms' are seen to be very similar to those predicated of water baptism in the other texts.

With the one exception of 1 Cor 1:13, 15, the preposition \( \epsilon \iota \zeta \) with \( \beta \alpha \nu \nu \tau \iota \zeta \varepsilon \iota \nu \) denotes the constitutive element of a form of baptism, with a local or spatial notion being present. This is true whether \( \beta \alpha \nu \nu \tau \iota \zeta \varepsilon \iota \nu \) signifies the rite of baptism, or has a figurative meaning. In the more marginal case of 1 Cor 12:13, the local sense of \( \epsilon \iota \zeta \), referring to incorporation into an already existing body, is to be preferred on theological grounds to the other possible sense denoting the purpose of baptism as forming one body of all the baptized.\(^1\) In each text \( \epsilon \iota \zeta \) and its prepositional apodosis serve further to explicate the meaning of the rite or metaphor of baptism. Both \( \beta \alpha \nu \nu \tau \iota \zeta \varepsilon \iota \nu \, \epsilon \iota \zeta \) and \( \beta \alpha \nu \nu \tau \iota \zeta \varepsilon \iota \nu \, \chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau \omicron \omicron \nu \) in Pauline usage can be regarded as metaphors with deeper theological significance than the rite of baptism itself has.

What then of the theological significance of \( \beta \alpha \nu \nu \tau \iota \zeta \varepsilon \iota \nu \, \chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau \omicron \omicron \nu \)? It probably represents Paul's most basic and yet profound statement in his theology of baptism. The rite of baptism is christologically grounded by Paul, signifying a union with, or incorporation into, Christ. This seems to be the essential meaning of the metaphor. Believers are incorporated into Christ, and thus included in him.

Corporate or inclusive categories of thought are therefore very appropriate in describing Paul's ideas. This is evident in Rom 6:3-4 where the incorporative term \( \beta \alpha \nu \nu \tau \iota \zeta \varepsilon \iota \nu \) is linked to Christ's death (\( \tau \omicron \nu \, \theta \alpha \nu \alpha \tau \omicron \nu \, \alpha \tau \omicron \tau \omicron \omicron \omicron \nu \) and seen to be a participation in that death. The \( \sigma \omicron \nu \omicron \)–compound verb in the phrase 'we were buried with Christ through baptism' (v. 4) reinforces the participatory and inclusive thought, showing a solidarity of believers with Christ in his death and burial. In Gal 3:26, 28 Paul's use of \( \epsilon \iota \nu \)

---

\(^1\) Cf. BEST, *One Body in Christ*, 65-73 who supports these conclusions. OEPKE, "Βάπτισμα," 539, differs only by favouring the purpose sense of \( \epsilon \iota \zeta \) in 1 Cor 12:13. Cf. also HARRIS, 'Prepositions and Theology,' 1209-1210, who lists possibilities without stating any position.
clearly speaks of an inclusive reality: believers are all one (person) in Christ. They are also described as the ‘seed of Abraham’ (v. 29) because they are included in Christ, earlier described as the one ‘seed.’ All who have been baptized into Christ (v. 27) have thus been baptized into this corporate reality. The concept in 1 Cor 12:13 of Christians being baptized into the ‘one body’—the corporate body of Christ, the church—is shown to be similar to baptism into Christ (even though the ‘baptism’ here is Spirit-baptism) by the linking of σῶμα with Christ in v. 12. Corporate thought is also evident in the ‘baptism into Moses’ of 1 Cor 10:2, where Moses is seen as a representative individual. Derived from the metaphor of ‘baptism into Christ,’ it portrays the many being brought under the one and saved in and through the one in the Exodus deliverance. Thus each of the four passages mentioned above supports a corporate interpretation of baptism into Christ. In Paul’s thought, those who are baptized into Christ are incorporated into a corporate and inclusive Christ, whose redemptive acts, are themselves also inclusive acts.

The metaphor of baptism into Christ also plays a part in developing the motif of transfer between the two dominions. The main purpose in 6:1–11 is to show that Christians have made a decisive break with the dominion of sin, and thus can no longer continue in it. While baptism is not the dominant theme of the passage, it is used to support this main argument. Being baptized into Christ means that believers share in the founding act of the new dominion, Christ’s death, and thus are no longer under the old dominion of sin.

This new dominion, entered through baptism, is described in various ways. In Gal 3:27 believers, through baptism into Christ, have ‘put on’ or clothed themselves with Christ. This is linked with v. 26 which shows that they are all children of God through faith.

---

1 Recalling, however, that ‘the body of Christ’ is not to be ontologically identified with Christ. Believers are in the body of Christ only insofar as they are in Christ.

2 Implicit in this concept also is the idea of a new lordship or allegiance to Christ, which is the basic meaning of ‘baptism in the name of Christ.’
and 'in Christ.' Thus their baptism into Christ means they have a new status and order of existence in Christ Jesus. Romans 6 describes life in the new dominion as walking in 'newness of life'. Although sharing in Christ's resurrection is placed in the future tense, its power already rules believers and sets them in the new walk. For Paul this is to become apparent in the conduct of the one freed from sin.

A further consequence of Christians' baptism into Christ is that they are thus unitedly incorporated into Christ with the resultant abolition of any social, racial or gender barriers that formerly divided them. This significant ramification is seen in both Gal 3:28 and 1 Cor 12:13. Believers are united as one because they are all included in Christ and belong to him. In 1 Cor 12:13 this is the result of their common experience of Spirit-baptism; in Gal 3:28, of their common faith and water baptism.

To summarize: the Pauline metaphor of baptism into Christ is significant christologically, as it denotes incorporation into Christ; soteriologically, as it signifies incorporation into Christ's saving acts, which bring about the eschatological change of aeons; and ecclesiologically, as it portrays incorporation into the church, the body of Christ. The efficacy of baptism into Christ is solidly grounded upon the person of Jesus Christ and his death.

Two interrelated questions now emerge from the soteriological aspect of baptism into Christ, which are more controversial in nature: (i) if baptism into Christ is a participation in Christ's death, how does the rite of baptism mediate that participation; and (ii) how should we relate this participation in Christ's death through baptism to the conclusion drawn from Section 3 above, that Paul regards participation in Christ's death as an accomplished past event (i.e. that believers died with him when he died)? We now turn to attempt answers to these difficult questions.
(d) Dying with Christ in Baptism

The motif of dying and rising with Christ is strongly connected to Paul's conception of baptism and particularly to the metaphor of 'baptism into Christ' in Rom 6:3-4. Schnackenburg considers it to be central to Paul's understanding of baptism. However, this study has shown that baptism is not directly linked to resurrection with Christ; the two are only indirectly connected through the inseparable unity of the death and resurrection of Christ. For Paul the meaning of baptism is located only in the first element of the motif—participation in the death of Christ.

What, then, is the theological connection between baptism and the death of Christ? To unravel this connection, two important textual factors from Rom 6:4a ('we were buried with Christ through baptism into death') will help frame our analysis and discussion. The first factor is that believers were *buried with Christ* (*συνθάφασαν*). As we have seen Paul's use of the 'with Christ' language strongly conveys the notion of participation. It is important to recall that the determinative acts of Christ (his death and resurrection) are regarded by Paul as both historical and eschatological events. The implication of this is both that they happened to Christ himself *and* are themselves corporate and inclusive acts, inasmuch as believers participate in them with Christ. Paul's use of the aorist passive verb 'buried with' in v. 4 (cf. 'become united with' [v. 5]; 'crucified with' [v. 6, also aorist passive]; 'died with' [v. 8, also aorist]) indicates that this is not something done by believers, but is something done to believers by God. It shows additionally that this happened at the time it happened to

---

1 Schnackenburg, *Baptism in the Thought of Paul*, 205-206. The motif, of course, has broader significance and implications in Paul's thought.
2 On the possible exception to this provided by Col 2:12, see p. 67 n. 4 above.
3 This is in contrast with the views of not too few scholars and many popular writers and preachers who see baptism as both a dying and a rising with Christ; for example: Schnackenburg, *Baptism in the Thought of Paul*, esp. 139-177; Beasley-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament*, 126-146, 152-156; Wagner, *Pauline Baptism*, 276-294; Schweitzer, *Mysticism of Paul*, 250-263.
Christ. In Paul's eschatological perspective, believers participate in this past event with Christ; they were with him when he died.

The second factor is that this burial with Christ is through baptism (διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος) into death. διὰ has an instrumental sense here: baptism is the means of believers being buried with Christ into death. Being incorporated into Christ involves incorporation into his death; this is made possible by being baptized into Christ (v. 3). Hence something actually does happen in or through baptism!

The various approaches to answering the questions raised at the end of Part (c) above may be grouped into seven broad categories. We shall discuss them in turn under the following headings, representing different understandings of baptism in Romans 6: (1) Symbolic Approach; (2) Baptismal Regeneration; (3) Spiritual Baptism; (4) Baptism as Imitation or Repetition; (5) Sacramental Presence; (6) Contemporaneity; (7) Dual Perspective Approach.

(1) Symbolic Approach. Rather than positing that the divine act, implied by the passive ἐβαπτίσθησαν (v. 3), happens in and through the ritual act, this approach argues that it is only imaged by the ritual act. Proponents argue that the separate parts of the rite of baptism are meant to be connected symbolically to death, burial and resurrection. This is certainly the position of many interpreters, often seeking to avoid a sacramental sense in the meaning of baptism. Dating back as far as Tertullian, this approach sees baptism as a symbolic picture or representation either of the believer's union with Christ, or of his or her death to the old life and rising to new life at conversion. A typical conception is that:

---

1 See p. 83 above.
2 Including DUNN, Romans 1-8, 311-314 (though he notes rightly that baptism was not an obvious symbol for death [p. 312] and rejects any symbolism connected with resurrection [p. 314]); ZIESLER, Romans, 157; F. F. BRUCE, The Letter of Paul to the Romans (TNCC; Leicester: IVP, 1985) 129 (though he uses the term 'token' rather than symbol); FLEMINGTON, Doctrine of Baptism, 59; WAGNER, Pauline Baptism, 288-290; and in more popular writing and preaching.
• **immersion** is a symbol of death with Christ, or of the believer's death to the old life,
• **submersion** is a symbol of burial, the seal of death, and
• **emersion** is a symbol of resurrection with Christ, or of rising to newness of life.

But this can hardly be demonstrated from the text itself, on a number of counts. Firstly, Paul's focus in Romans 6 is not on the *ritual* of baptism itself, but on the simple *event* of baptism. If Paul were referring to the rite of baptism, he probably would have used the phrase εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (cf. 1 Cor 1:13) rather than εἰς Χριστοῦν Ἰησοῦν. The latter phrase refers to the idea of incorporation into Christ and participation in his death.¹ Secondly, there is no evidence in Romans 6, or elsewhere in the New Testament, that the actual physical movements, immersion and emersion are accorded symbolical significance.² There is no clear analogy between the act of entering the water and Christ's death—for Christ was not drowned—or with burial, for burial at sea was not the normal means of burial. Paul makes no use of any symbolism in the rite at all.³ Baptism is far more than a pictorial symbol, for in it believers are put into Christ. As we saw above Paul makes baptism the *means* of believers being buried with Christ ( δικτ.), not the *place* in which they are buried with him (ἐν),⁴ nor a picture of that place.

We can therefore say that baptism causes something to happen to the believer or, to be more precise in our language, in baptism God causes something to happen to the believer.⁵ However, this is not to say that baptism should be conceived of as operating *ex opere operato*, for there is certainly no special quality inherent in the sacrament of baptism.⁶ Finally, it is questionable whether the participationist 'with Christ' language

---

¹ TANNEHILL, *Dying and Rising*, 22–23. See also the discussion of 6:3 on pp. 38–39 above.
⁴ MOO, *Romans 1–8*, 379. Even in Col 2:12 where ἐν is used in a similar statement, the preposition is probably instrumental.
⁶ See TANNEHILL, *Dying and Rising*, 41–43.
can be stretched to account for a purely symbolical view of baptism—that believers were buried in their lives, as Christ was buried in his. If, therefore, there is any intended symbolism in the rite of baptism at all, it may only be understood in a secondary sense. It is certainly not the primary reason why Paul refers to baptism or burial with Christ in Romans 6.

(2) **Baptismal Regeneration.** This interpretation teaches that it is the act or rite of baptism that incorporates believers into Christ and joins them to him. This is usually included in a doctrine of baptismal regeneration. However this is contradicted by numerous examples in the New Testament where it is clearly *already regenerate* believers who are baptized. It is not the act of baptism that makes them believers. Baptism is not a rite that works *ex opere operato*; it has no independent significance of its own. Furthermore, nowhere in the undisputed Pauline epistles do we find a connection between baptism and regeneration or rebirth. This view also does not take seriously the idea of believers being ‘with Christ’ in his death and burial. It locates what happens to the believer only in baptism.

(3) **Spiritual Baptism.** This view, held by D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, takes the ‘baptism’ in 6:3–4 not as water baptism, but as a spiritual baptism at conversion—a baptism by the Spirit that results in believers being united with Christ and with his

---

1. **MOO, Romans 1–8, 379.**
2. Cf. for example, **BEASLEY-MURRAY, Baptism in the New Testament, 133.**
3. **Pace** paedobaptists—I do not thereby necessarily exclude the validity of paedobaptism. Protestant paedobaptists do not, in most cases, hold to this doctrine of baptismal regeneration. See, for example, (Anglican) **DAVID WATSON, I Believe in the Church** (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1978) 232–236.
4. **LLOYD-JONES, Romans: The New Man, 30–32.**
5. The epistle to Titus contains one reference (Tit 3:5) quite possibly linking the two. Many commentators believe *κηρυσσόν* is a reference to baptism, but this is not without doubt. In any case, the ‘regeneration and renewal’ mentioned there is more likely to be attributed to the agency of the Spirit, rather than baptism. Thus **DUNN, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, 165–170; BEASLEY-MURRAY, Baptism in the New Testament, 209–216; cf. SCHNACKENBURG, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 13; G. C. BERKOUWER, The Sacraments** (Studies in Dogmatics; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969) 126–128. On the reasons why Paul refrains from employing ‘rebirth’ or ‘regeneration’ terminology with baptism, see **WEDDERBURN, Baptism and Resurrection, 61–63, 388–389.**
death and resurrection. Lloyd-Jones interprets these verses in light of 1 Cor 12:13: 'for by (ἐν) one Spirit we were all baptized into one body' (RSV; note the use of ἑνὶς with ἑστι). But against his viewpoint, it is most unlikely in 1 Cor 12:13 that the preposition ἐν has an instrumental sense, so that the Spirit is the agent of the baptism. More seriously, this viewpoint locates death and resurrection with Christ at conversion, failing, again, to do justice to Paul's 'with Christ' language.

(4) Baptism as Imitation or Repetition. Here baptism is seen as either an imitation or repetition of Christ's death and resurrection. Like the symbolic approach, 'burial' is seen as a metaphor for the believer's complete break with the old life, but in this approach baptism is seen as the mediator of this. Thus in baptism the believer dies like Christ did. Usually this understanding is based upon an abbildlich interpretation of ὑμοίωμα in Rom 6:5. However, as we have seen, baptism is certainly not in view in v. 5 and ὑμοίωμα should be translated there in a nicht abbildlich sense as 'form,' which rules out any notion of imitation or repetition. This 'imitation/repetition' approach is sometimes drawn as a parallel to the initiations of the pagan mystery religions, whereby the initiate would ritually imitate the actions of the cult-god. But any connection between Christian baptism and the initiation rites of the Graeco-Roman mystery religions is now regarded as being untenable. Finally, Paul does not say here that the believer dies like Christ; he or she rather dies with Christ.

---

1 LLOYD-JONES, Romans: The New Man, 35–36; cf. also p. 38 n. 2 above.
2 See FEE, First Corinthians, 605–606; DUNN, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, 128; CARSON, Showing the Spirit, 46–47. See also p. 73–74 above.
3 MOO, Romans 1–8, 379–380.
4 For this and the following item on Sacramental Presence, see the discussions of Rom 6:5 in SCHNEIDER, Ἰσαονος, 192–195; RIDDERBOS, Paul: Outline, 406–410 and KÄSEMANN, Romans, 167–169. For a listing of scholars holding this viewpoint, with varying emphases, see MORGAN, 'Rom 6:5a,' 283 n. 59.
5 This is suggested by the RSV & NRSV rendering: 'For if we have been united with him in a death like his, we will certainly be united with him in a resurrection like his' (Rom 6:5).
6 See pp. 44–50 (especially 45–46) above.
7 See p. 32 n. 8 above.
8 Thus, BEST, One Body in Christ, 46; RIDDERBOS, Paul: Outline, 403–404; BEASLEY-MURRAY, Baptism in the New Testament, 131; TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 42; MOO, Romans 1–8, 379–380; SCHLINK, Doctrine of Baptism, 50.
5) **Sacramental Presence.** This approach sees a sacramental process making Christ and his death and resurrection somehow present in baptism. Like the preceding ‘Baptism as Imitation or Repetition’ approach, this has often been seen as a parallel to the Hellenistic mystery cults, though not by all. The idea of a sacramental presence, however, has some serious objections. First is Paul’s understanding of Christ’s death as \( \varepsilon \phi\alpha\tau\alpha\varepsilon \), ‘once for all’ (Rom 6:10). Christ died once in c. 30/33 CE, and does not die again in a Christian’s baptism so that he or she can die with him. Even though Christ’s death and resurrection are eschatological events, it is questionable that Paul’s stress on the \( \varepsilon \phi\alpha\tau\alpha\varepsilon \) nature of these events allows for them to be understood as present or repeated in the act of baptism. Similarly, argues Bornkamm, the aorist tenses used by Paul in Romans 6 clearly show that the Christ-event ‘does not mean any timeless myth; it is singular, unrepeatable, even in the cult.’ It is the believer who is present at Christ’s death, rather than this event somehow being made present in baptism. Further, baptism is not the point in time during which believers share in Christ’s death and resurrection. Nor does baptism first make possible this participation. Paul’s ‘with Christ’ language makes that clear; believers participated in those events with Christ when they happened to Christ. Finally, to locate death, burial and resurrection with Christ in baptism, gives a significance to baptism that does not fit the argument of Romans 6 and cannot be accommodated within Paul’s general conception of what it means to be ‘with Christ.’

The only verses in Romans 6 referring to baptism are vv. 3–4 and, even there, baptism is not introduced to explain how believers were buried with Christ, but to demonstrate that they were buried with Christ. The subsidiary role of baptism in union with Christ is

---

1. So for instance, with varying emphases: particularly ODO CASCHE, *Das christliche Kultmysterium* (Regensburg, 1935); V. WARNACH, ‘Taufe und Christusgeschichte nach Röm 6,’ *ALW* 3 no. 2 (1954) 284–366; KUSS, *Römerbrief*, 301–302; H. SCHLIER, *Der Römerbrief* (HTKNT 6; Freiburg, 1977) 195–196; SCHNEIDER, ‘\( \varphi\mu\alpha\varepsilon \)’, 195; BETZ, ‘Transferring a Ritual,’ 107–116; GRUNDMANN, ‘\( \sigma\nu\varepsilon - \mu\varepsilon\tau\alpha\varepsilon \),’ 790 & n. 112 [?].
2. MOO, *Romans* 1–8, 380.
confirmed by the fact that Paul elsewhere refers to a ‘being with Christ’ that is not related to baptism (Gal 2:19–20; cf. Eph 2:5–6).¹

(6) Contemporaneity. Under this hypothesis, introduced by W. Tr. Hahn, the historical redemptive death of Christ is not (as in item (5) above) located in the present in baptism, but, conversely, the one baptized is made ‘contemporaneous’ with Christ, so that the whole existence of the Christian is taken up into this redemptive event. In baptism temporal and spatial distance between these historical events and the Christian in the present is removed, so that the Christian has a real share in the unique event of the cross and resurrection of Christ.² Making use of Kierkegaard’s category of Gleichzeitigkeit, Hahn claims that ‘die Zeitkategorie ist im Christusgeschehen aufgehoben.’³ It must be said that this approach helpfully focuses on the historical event of Christ’s death (on Golgotha) and resurrection and satisfies the two interpretative requirements that must be met in order for an interpretation of baptism as a participation in Christ’s death in Romans 6 to be regarded as adequate.⁴ It further appears to be supported by the notion of the unity and solidarity of generations in Jewish thought (e.g. the participation of later generations in the events of the Exodus).⁵ However, the hypothesis of contemporaneity is weakened by two objections.

Firstly, Hahn draws support for his thesis from two synoptic texts (and their parallels): in the first, two criminals are ‘crucified with’ (συνεσταυρωμένοι) Jesus (Mark 15:32; cf. Matt 27:44; Luke 23:2); and in the second, Peter confidently speaks of his readiness

¹ MOO, Romans 1–8, 380–381; TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 43.
² HAHN, Miterben und Miterferstellen, here particularly pp. 96–97. As BERKOUWER (The Sacraments, 118) notes, some go further and speak even of believers being disciples contemporary with Christ.
⁴ I.e. (i) that believers participate in Christ’s death, with Christ (at Golgotha), and (ii) that baptism is seen to instrumentally effect the believer’s death and burial with Christ.
⁵ On this see pp. 25–26 above.
to ‘die with’ (συνεφοδημένον) Jesus (Mark 14:31; cf. Matt 26:35). According to Hahn, both occasions have in view the historical death of Jesus and concrete participation in it. A remarkable formal similarity between these texts and the Pauline sayings exists. Hahn goes on to claim that, with some modifications, Paul’s ‘dying’ with Christ should therefore be understood similarly—with the category of time removed. However the methodology here is fallacious. One cannot draw conclusions from formal similarities to agreements in content. In meaning, Paul’s sayings are entirely different. The second synoptic example underlines this point acutely: Peter did not die with Jesus in the sense that he intended, but rather fled with the other disciples. In Paul’s sense, Peter did nevertheless die with Jesus as one of those for whom Jesus died. In the synoptic texts we are dealing with natural Greek usage of συν and its compounds; in Paul the ‘with Christ’ language is anything but usual and the inherent sense of ‘participation’ quite removed from what is implied in the former texts. The synoptic texts do not therefore support a hypothesis of contemporaneity and Hahn does not specify any other proofs for it.

Secondly, as attractive as Hahn’s hypothesis may be, the telling question is whether Paul would have understood the role of baptism in this way. Tannehill, Ridderbos and Schnackenburg each criticize the concept of contemporaneity as being foreign to the apostle’s thought, arguing that one can scarcely say that for Paul baptism fulfils the function of removing the temporal and spatial distance between Christ’s death and the believer. The difficulty for the interpreter of Paul is that Paul himself does not seek to

---

1. Not, of course, in a literal physical sense. Thus HAHN, Mitsterben und Misaufstehun, 94–96.
2. Thus SCHNACKENBURG, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 152.
4. TANNEHILL (Dying and Rising, 4) criticizes the fact that HAHN ‘never gives serious exegetical study to the texts which refer to dying and rising with Christ, and so never gets far beyond ... general theological considerations.’
5. Thus TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 4; RIDDERBOS, Paul: Outline, 408–409; SCHNACKENBURG, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 151–154. Cf. also KASEMANN’S sharp dismissal of the concept (Romans, 162–163); and BERKOUWER, The Sacraments, 118–122. SCHNACKENBURG (p. 153) adds a further criticism that, strictly speaking, in a contemporaneity with the Christ event there could no longer be an eschatological future, an increase in the blessings of salvation, since Christ himself attained to full possession of the divine life in his resurrection. Paul’s explicit use of the
explain the relationship between the believer's past death with Christ and his or her baptism into Christ's death. However, as Tannehill rightly notes, in seeking to understand Paul here we must do so 'on the basis of Paul's own categories of thought, not from general theological considerations imported from modern times.' It is important to remember that Paul speaks elsewhere of the believer as having already died with Christ—often in completely non-baptismal contexts! Thus it is not beneficial to speak of the events of Christ's death and of baptism as being contemporaneous, as though they were one and the same. The solution, therefore, is probably not to be found in the idea of contemporaneity. Rather, it lies in the eschatological nature of the salvific events—seen by the apostle as being far more than merely historical events.

(7) Dual Perspective Approach. It needs to be recognised that two different foci or perspectives are operating in Paul's thought. Both are valid and necessary, and both have reference to the same thing: participation in the unique, once-for-all redemptive event of Christ. When understood in the context of Paul's eschatology, it is clear both that the death and resurrection of Christ are particular, past events and that believers participate in them with Christ—when these events happened to Christ (i.e. not at baptism). This is due to the eschatological nature of these events, which involve the old and new dominions as wholes, and so also those who are included in these dominions. What takes place at baptism is founded upon these historical and eschatological events. It is through baptism that one enters into Christ as a corporate person and into these inclusive events.

1 TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 4.
2 For example, Rom 7:4-6, 2 Cor 5:14-17; Gal 2:19-20; 5:24; 6:14.
3 As does SCHLINK (Doctrines of Baptism, 51): 'In spite of the interval between Christ's death and Baptism, both events are in their decisive point one event.'
4 Thus, RIDDERBOS, Paul: Outline, 408-410.
5 TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 30. Cf. also RIDDERBOS, Paul: Outline, 408-410; KASSEMAN, Romans, 168; BORNKAMM, 'Baptism and New Life,' 76-78; and MOO, Romans 1-8, 381-382.
The first perspective, therefore, is that believers, regarded as 'the many,' were already included in the death (and resurrection) of the one. That is to say, Christ's saving acts are understood as inclusive acts in which the new dominion as a whole participates. Paul's soteriology follows a logical progression: it is God's action (through Christ) on behalf of believers (Χριστίανος ἐν Χριστίανος) that makes possible their being already with Christ (σὺν Χριστίανος) in his death. This thereby enables entry into Christ (ἐν Χριστίανος) and the resultant state of being 'in Christ' (ἐν Χριστίανος).

Participation in the new dominion and being in Christ has validity only because believers were already with Christ on the cross. In response to the question of the Negro spiritual: 'Were you there when they crucified my Lord?' Paul would have answered, 'Yes, I was there, for I and all believers were crucified with him.' This is the essential nature of the first perspective.

The second aspect in Paul's understanding is that believers have been baptized into Christ, meaning that through baptism (διὰ τοῦ βαπτισμοῦ; Rom 6:4) they have become incorporated into a 'solidaric relationship' with Christ and thus into his death. They have entered the new dominion founded upon Christ. It is important to recognize here that it is only because of the reality of the first focus that the second focus is made possible; baptism is not a rite that works ex opere operato. Baptism thus accomplishes in its own way what has already been obtained in another way. Thus the baptized are not only 'with Christ' in their baptism, but that baptism points to the fact

---

1 Cf. the summary on pp. 63–64 above; also WEDDERBURN, 

Baptism and Resurrection, 348; BEST, One Body in Christ, 62: 'The "with Christ" formula describes the origin of the Christian life; the "in Christ" formula describes life as it is lived from day to day'; cf. GRUNDMANN, 'σὺν - μετά,' 789 (quotation on p. 28 above). However, GRUNDMANN sees the union with Christ as being brought about by baptism, which is proper to the second focus, but does not clearly recognize the first focus of a death already with Christ in his past death ('σὺν - μετά,' 783, 785, 789–790 & n. 112).

2 This concept is quite different from the previous approach that contended that baptism causes the removal of temporal and spatial distance so that the believer is made contemporaneous with Christ. Rather, the statement above alludes to the eschatological nature of the death of Christ, which Paul regards as a corporate and inclusive redemptive act.

3 RIDDERBOS, Paul: Outline, 409; TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 40. In Section 5(a) below I intend to show that faith, being inseparably linked with baptism, may also be said to effect this. However, cf. BYRNE, 'Righteousness of God,' 563, 573.
that they were already with him in his past death and resurrection. Thus, from Paul’s perspective there are clearly two foci here, and not one. To have died once with Christ and to be baptized into his death are two different points of view and it is a mistake to make them coincide.

How, then, does one rightly define the relationship between these two viewpoints? Although this Dual Perspective Approach is necessary for understanding Paul’s thought, the apostle himself does not seek to explain the connection between the two perspectives. A further question then emerges to aid us: How does participation in Christ’s death (and resurrection) manifest itself concretely in the individual’s life? Here one might speak, in particular, of the individual’s baptism, and of the decision of faith which accompanies it. Undoubtedly, one part of this is that baptism has the important noetic significance of a personal confirmation and assurance of what once took place in a corporate sense in Christ. But more significantly, as Tannehill explains, baptism has the prominent place in the concrete realization in the life of the individual believer, of death to the old dominion and entry into the new. In baptism the eschatological events of the death and resurrection of Christ reach their goal in the life of the individual. Käsemann agrees: ‘in baptism the new world initiated by Christ seizes the life of the individual Christian ... Baptism is projection of the change of aeons into our personal existence.’ Yet this is not to say that baptism thereby has an independent significance,

---

1 Wedderburn, Baptism and Resurrection, 347. Moo (Romans 1:8, 381–382) similarly expresses this when he writes: ‘Paul’s αὐτὸς refers to a redemptive–historical “withness” whose locus is both the cross and resurrection of Christ, where the “shift” in eras [from the old to the new] took place historically, and the conversion of every believer, when this “shift” becomes applicable to the individual’ (italics mine). (Following Dunn, he later specifies ‘conversion’ as ‘conversion–initiation’ involving a complex of faith, the gift of the Spirit, and water baptism [pp. 382–383]).

2 As do the Sacramental Presence and Contemporaneity approaches. Thus, Ridderbos, Paul: Outline, 409.

3 Tannehill (Dying and Rising, 40) adds to these two, particular situations of suffering. The link between baptism, faith and dying and rising with Christ is discussed in Section 5 below. As will be seen, the two are, not surprisingly, inseparably linked.

4 Ridderbos Paul: Outline, 409. He adds, because believers have been baptized they know, or at least they must and may know, that they have once died, been buried, and raised with Christ (cf. Rom 6:3, ἂν ἀναληθῇ).

5 Tannehill, Dying and Rising, 42–43.

6 Käsemann, Romans, 163.
supplementing the work of the cross, or that incorporation into Christ and participation in his death can be explained by referring to a special quality inherent in the sacrament of baptism.\(^1\) Maintaining the dual perspective helps to safeguard the unique once-for-all redemptive nature of the cross of Christ. It enables avoidance of attributing to baptism a second causality (even if that were understood instrumentally) for the salvific efficacy of the cross.\(^2\) Alongside faith in Christ, baptism does mediate redemption, but only because that redemption has already taken place. Käsemann has well understood this point: `only inasmuch as he died for us are we too brought into his death and does baptism arise as reception of his act and participation in his fate.'\(^3\) Participation in the death of Christ through baptism into Christ is only possible because of the eschatological nature of the cross of Christ. Baptism does not first make possible a participation in the death of Christ, for believers have already participated in that past death with Christ. But, through baptism, the powerful work of the cross is concretely realized in a person's life. In Paul's thought, baptism draws its significance and efficacy from both the person and the eschatological and inclusive redemptive death of Jesus Christ himself.\(^4\)

---

1. TANNEHILL, *Dying and Rising*, 42.
3. KÄSEMANN, *Romans*, 166, citing EICHHOLZ (italics mine).
5. Conversion/Faith and Death and Resurrection with Christ

The link between baptism and dying with Christ has been covered in depth in the previous section. Less explicit, but no less important in Paul, is the link between faith and death and resurrection with Christ. In this section we will explore this connection in the apostle’s thought. We begin by examining the relationship between baptism and faith, after which we will discuss how a subjective genitive reading of the πίστις Χριστοῦ formulation in Paul may contribute to a better understanding of the nature of faith in relation to the death (and resurrection) of Christ.

(a) Baptism and Faith

On the surface, it is surprising that Romans 6 makes no mention at all of faith in connection with the believer’s past death and resurrection with Christ. The verb πιστεύω is used only once in v. 8, and there it concerns the future life of believers with Christ (σταυροθεμεν). The noun πίστις is not employed at all. In the previous section we saw that the second of the two perspectives operating in Paul’s thought is that the believer’s past death with Christ and transfer from the old dominion to the new may now be concretely realized in the life of the believer through baptism. But surely Paul could have said this concrete realization also takes place through (or by) faith. Why then does he speak only of baptism? After all, faith is emblazoned upon almost every chapter of the book of Romans, whereas baptism is mentioned in only two verses (Rom 6:3, 4)!


2 Although there are 33 occurrences of πίστις and πιστεύω in Rom 1:18–4:25, only three uses are found in chapters 5–8. The absence of πίστις is perhaps simply a consequence of Paul’s structuring of his argument in Romans 5–8 by focussing in turn on different aspects of the whole. Thus DUNN, Romans 1–8, 301–302, 314; cf. MOO, Romans 1–8, 301–302.
The answer perhaps lies in the fact that baptism as an event that every believer has (or should have) objectively experienced is far more tangible than the more subjective, though no less real, decision of faith of the believer. In baptism God acts in the believer’s life, whereas faith is predominantly the human response to the saving activity of God in Christ. The decisive nature of the act of baptism better serves Paul’s purpose of emphasizing the decisive nature of the believer’s break with sin through his or her union with Christ. Linked to this is the additional fact that baptism was already regarded by the early Christian community as being very closely related to the death of Christ. Baptism is specifically a participation in the death of Christ, whereas faith appropriates more generally the salvation provided in Christ. Paul’s mention of baptism thus serves more pointedly, and with sharper focus, to confirm the truth of the believer’s past death with Christ than would a reference to the believer’s salvation-appropriating faith.

But does this mean that faith is absent from Paul’s thought in Romans 6? My γένοιτο! The obvious centrality of faith in Romans, as in Paul’s thought in general, as the means by which one’s relationship to Christ is appropriated, strongly suggests that faith is presupposed in his mention of baptism.

Confirmation is found by an examination of related material in Paul’s epistle to the Galatians. As with Romans, the death of Christ is central to the way Paul develops his argument there. Two passages are of particular interest: Gal 2:19–20 and 3:26–27. In the former one, there is an important link between faith and dying with Christ. Using his own life paradigmatically, Paul says in v. 19b, ‘I have been crucified with Christ’ (Χριστῷ συνεκταίρωμαι). Here again Paul’s σὺν Χριστῷ language is employed, but significantly—and unlike Romans 6—there is not a single reference to baptism in the

---

1. It is not unreasonable to posit that for Christians then, as now, coming to faith in Christ, unlike baptism, was not always attributable (from a human perspective) to a specific time or place.
2. So MOO, Romans 1–8, 382; DUNN, Romans 1–8, 314. This view is strengthened by the recognition that Rom 6:1–14 in fact deals with one of the problems raised by Paul’s assertion that justification is by faith, namely the problem of sin.
Because of this past death with Christ and its continuing shaping of Paul’s life, the resultant experience of the Christian is described as a life enlivened by the indwelling of the risen Christ: ‘it is no longer I who live, but it is Christ who lives in me. And the life I now live in the flesh I live ἐν πίστει ... τοῦ νεότ. τοῦ θεοῦ.’ Whether the latter phrase (cf. πίστεις Χριστοῦ in v. 16) is to be interpreted as referring to the faith of believers in Christ, or the faithfulness of Christ, or, as is quite likely, a combination of the two perspectives, the faith of the believer is involved, for it is certainly explicit in v. 16. The concluding phrase of v. 20 (‘the Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me’) creates a powerful bracketing of living by faith with the reference to crucifixion with Christ (v. 19b) on the one side, and the death of Christ on behalf of Christians (παραδόντος ἐαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ) on the other. Christ’s death for believers involves them in dying with him. This serves to highlight the close linkage between faith and the death and resurrection of Christ in Paul’s thought: those who put their faith in Christ are united with him by that faith, united so closely that his experience now becomes theirs, and they share his death to the old order (‘through the law, I died to the law,’ v. 19) and his resurrection to new life (‘Christ lives in me,’ v. 20). For Paul, faith is very much a participatory response to the work of Christ. Seeing such an explicit connection in Paul’s thought here reinforces the contention that the believer’s faith is implicit in his thinking in Romans 6.

The second text in Galatians that serves to confirm this point is Gal 3:26-27 where an explicit connection is made between faith and baptism. This passage was discussed in the previous section, where we noted the parallel use of βαπτίζειν εἰς Χριστόν in

---

1 The perfect tense, which is striking, renders an allusion to baptism here highly improbable. See J. D. G. Dunn, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians (Black’s; London: Black, 1993) 144 & n. 1; contra, particularly, H. Schlier, Der Brief an die Galater (MeyerK 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951) 99–101; Schnackenburg, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 62–67. One should not automatically read into the passage the baptismal ideas of Romans 6. Rather Gal 2:19 may contain the theological principle by which Paul interprets baptism in Romans 6. See Beitz, Galatians, 122–123.

2 On this phrase see Tannehill, Dying and Rising, 57–59.

3 See the discussion of the πίστεις Χριστοῦ phrase and its meaning in Part (b) below.

v. 27 with the same phrase in Rom 6:3-4. Although the death of Christ is not in view, the close association of baptism with Christ's death means it is not absent from Paul's thought here. But what of the relationship between faith and baptism? Faith is mentioned 15 times in Galatians 3, compared with only one reference to baptism. In v. 7 those who are \( \epsilon\kappa\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\gamma\eta\varsigma \) are 'sons of Abraham'; here in v. 26 an even higher status is accorded believers, for \( \delta\iota\alpha\iota\tau\iota\varsigma\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\gamma\eta\varsigma \) they are 'sons of God.' Faith, and not works, has enabled them to enter into this relationship 'in Christ.' 1 A significant link between faith and baptism is thus highlighted here, since union with Christ is ascribed both to faith (v. 26) and to baptism (v. 27). 2 Ridderbos rightly points out that 'there can ... be no suggestion that in Paul baptism can in any sense whatever be detached from faith'; for always in Paul, 'faith is the implicit presupposition of baptism.' 3 The strong emphasis on faith in both the immediate and wider context of v. 27 bears this out here, and again rules out any conception of baptism working \textit{ex opere operata} apart from faith. 4 Heinrich Schlier has argued that Paul is reminding the Galatians, as people whose subjective faith is wavering, of the objective basis of their Christian existence, namely baptism. 5 While this is essentially correct, it is not the whole story, for, as Betz points out, this basis is only the conclusion of previous events: the christological-soteriological events named in Gal 1:4; 2:20; 3:13; 4:4-5; the gift of the Spirit (3:2-5; 4:6); and the faith of the Galatians in Christ. ... In other words, the objective basis of which Paul speaks is faith in Christ, but not the sacrament as a \textit{ritus ex opere operato}. Faith in Christ can only be grounded in Christ himself, not in a reality outside of him. Paul does not share and would even oppose calling the ritual of baptism 'sacramentally objective' and faith in Christ 'subjective.' If one wants to employ these categories at all, Paul would call 'faith in Christ' the objective basis. 6

2 How close the connection is in Paul's thought becomes evident from the fact that elsewhere in his epistles everything ascribed to believers in virtue of their baptism is represented no less clearly as the fruit of faith. See the survey of relevant pronouncements in Beasley-Murray, \textit{Baptism in the New Testament}, 272-273. Cf. Ridderbos, \textit{Paul: Outline}, 410.
5 H. Schlier, \textit{Der Brief an die Galater}, cited by Betz (Galatians, 187).
6 Betz, \textit{Galatians}, 187-188. He adds that the Christian's subjectivity cannot be separated from the whole process, but is woven into it.
How then can the relationship between faith and baptism be formulated to explain the inseparable connection between the two? Certainly, from the standpoint of the practice of baptism in apostolic times, faith and baptism were not necessarily two distinct experiences separated by a period of time but two inseparable, almost coincident, parts of the one single experience of transition from the old aeon to the new.\(^1\) In terms of the believer's own experience of faith and baptism, the suggestion of Dunn is quite helpful. He points out that the first Christians conceived of faith, the gift of the Spirit and water baptism as components of one unified experience, which he calls 'conversion-initiation.'\(^2\) Just as faith is always assumed to lead to baptism, so baptism always assumes faith for its validity.\(^3\) The two belong together in complementary fashion; they are inseparably related as parts of the believer's conversion-initiation, yet each also has its own significance.\(^4\) A difference may be noted: although baptism presupposes faith, the place of faith is not only prior to baptism,\(^5\) but in and after baptism as well.\(^6\) For the Christian, faith is not only the initial response to the gospel at one's conversion, but also an ongoing response to God.

As far as the logical relationship between the two, it is better to see baptism as 'the normal but not necessary, the helpful but not indispensable sign and seal put upon the act of faith appropriating the gift of God in Christ.'\(^7\) As the Book of Common Prayer rightly explains, baptism is the 'outward and visible sign of (an) inward and spiritual grace.' In Gal 3:26, 27, then, as Ronald Fung observes, the apparent equation of faith

---

1. Fung, Galatians, 174; F. F. Bruce, Galatians, 186; though cf. R. N. Longenecker, Galatians, 155–156.
4. Schnackenburg, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 126.
5. The chronological priority of faith is apparently the normative New Testament experience, although not necessarily required absolutely.
and baptism may be explained as a natural transference of terms whereby the symbol (baptism) is said to effect that which it symbolizes or as a form of metonymy whereby what is strictly true of faith is predicated of baptism. Quite likely Paul's mention of baptism here is because he is about to emphasize the oneness of those who are in Christ (v. 28), the visible sign of which is not faith, but baptism; the oneness with Christ that is symbolized in baptism is the basis for the oneness in Christ.

It is clear, then, that in Romans 6 the believer's faith is implied alongside Paul's mention of baptism as a participation in the death of Christ. Both faith and baptism form part of the believer's 'conversion-initiation' and thus both can be regarded as means by which one's past death with Christ is concretely realized or manifest in the initial experience of the Christian believer. However, one's conversion or decision of faith should not be regarded as the temporal moment when one dies and rises with Christ. As has been consistently argued to this point, for Paul the believer has already died with Christ. But God's grace in the cross reaches its goal in faith (as also baptism), for in faith the eschatological power of Christ's death on the cross manifests itself in the life of the believer. In Paul's thought faith, together with baptism, appropriates and mediates the powerful work of the cross of Christ within the experience of the believer, not only at one's conversion but also (in the case of faith) throughout the Christian life.

---

1 Fung, Galatians, 174.

2 The connection between faith, baptism, death with Christ and even resurrection with Christ (in this case) is perhaps no more explicit in the corpus Paulinum than in Col 2:11-12, which, if not from Paul himself, may be seen as being a later development of his thought. This text illustrates the pervasiveness of such a close connection in the Pauline churches. The author writes 'in him you were also circumcised [a reference to dying with Christ] ... having been buried with him in baptism, in whom (ἐν οὗ) you were also raised up with him through faith in the power of God, who raised him from the dead.' However, due to the disputed authorship of Colossians I will not attempt to unravel the exegetical difficulties of this passage, nor make further comment here (though see pp. 33 & n. 4 & 67 n. 4 above).

3 Cf. Tannehill, Dying and Rising, 125.
(b) *Πίστις Χριστοῦ*: Some Implications¹

We move on now to consider a controversial issue in recent scholarship—the meaning of the *πίστις Χριστοῦ* phrase in Paul. An important debate concerning this formulation has been gaining momentum in the last two decades and offers some relevant insights into the relationship between the believer’s faith and death and resurrection with Christ. The debate is basically between those who regard *πίστις Χριστοῦ* (and its equivalents)² as an objective genitive (‘faith in Christ’)³ and those who interpret it subjectively (‘faithfulness of Christ’ or ‘Christ-faith’).⁴ While the debate has focussed upon stylistic and syntactical arguments it is now being recognized that grammatical arguments alone cannot fully resolve the dispute.⁵

---


² Seven (or eight) texts in the undisputed Pauline letters contain the expression or its equivalent: Rom 3:22; 3:26; Gal 2:16 (bis.); 2:20; 3:20; 3:26 in p46; Phil 3:9. To these Eph 3:12 may also be mentioned.


Douglas Campbell has commented that for the present discussion to avoid the danger of becoming largely irrelevant, the broader implications of the issue for Paul’s understanding of πίστις language, and for his basic understanding of salvation, need to be more clearly articulated.\(^1\) In this vein, I hope to adduce from the debate a few of the broader implications specifically for the motif of death and resurrection with Christ.

Two of the five key theological issues listed by Richard Hays as being at stake in the debate are relevant to this study: the relation between christology and soteriology in Pauline theology, and the cruciform character of Christian obedience.\(^2\) Although still opposed to the subjective genitive on exegetical grounds, Dunn has conceded that the theology of the subjective genitive reading is ‘powerful, important and attractive,’ as well as ‘wholly compatible with Paul’s theology.’\(^3\) Two scholars supporting the subjective reading of πίστις Χριστοῦ—Sam Williams and Morna Hooker—have offered some pertinent insights that deserve consideration here.\(^4\)

Williams’ essay first evaluates Arland Hultgren’s syntactical arguments for the objective genitive interpretation\(^5\) and finds them lacking evidential value. By contrast Williams finds persuasive the evidence that Paul is familiar with, and incorporates into his own theology, the notion of Christ’s own faith/obedience.\(^6\) However, the disputed formulation, he argues, should not be taken as a simple subjective genitive, but rather as a ‘genitive of quality’ that specifies Christian faith as ‘Christ-faith,’ that is, the kind of faith exemplified by, and even created by, Christ. Observing the parallel functioning of πίστις Χριστοῦ with πίστις when used in its absolute sense to denote the faith of believers (cf. Rom 3:21-22 & Rom 1:17; Gal 2:16 & Rom 3:28; Gal 3:14 & 22),\(^7\)

---

1. D. A. CAMPBELL, ‘Romans 1:17,’ 266-267. As well as this, he writes, the critical texts of the dispute need to be better isolated and addressed.
3. DUNN, ‘ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ,’ 744.
5. HULTGREN, ‘Pistor Christou Formulation,’ 248-263.
Williams concludes that when Paul wishes to direct focal attention to the source, the actualizer of faith, he uses the phrase \( \pi\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma\ X\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\). But when he wishes to emphasize the commitment of persons who have shared Christ's death and now live 'in Christ,' he can use the noun \( \pi\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma\) absolutely. Yet, Williams goes on, the \( \pi\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma\) of believers, by its very nature, is always nothing else than that way of responding to God which Christ first pioneered and created.\(^1\)

In leading up to this conclusion Williams discusses the participation of Christians \( \epsilon\nu\ X\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma\), arguing that the force of this phrase in texts such as 2 Cor 5:17; Phil 3:9 and Rom 8:1 is that the believer has come into the dominion ruled and determined by Christ:

> Christ rules as sovereign ... and the power of the living Christ is determinative for every believer. But \( \text{Christos} \) also names a domain of personal existence created by his historical deeds and God's saving response. This is Christ's 'field of force,' the sphere in which he is sovereign. To live in this power field and have one's life determined by its Lord is to be 'in Christ.'\(^2\)

With this incorporative language in mind, Williams then turns to Romans 6 for additional insights into what Paul means by being 'in Christ.' There Paul's refers to baptism as the means by which one is incorporated into Christ and his death (6:3–4). Williams contends that the \( \sigma\nu\nu\varsigma\) terminology in Romans 6 means 'like,' so that dying \( \sigma\nu\nu\ X\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma\) simply means "dying" in a way that corresponds to Christ's death.\(^3\)

However, here Williams betrays a basic misunderstanding of Paul's \( \sigma\nu\nu\varsigma\) language, which, as we have seen, is strongly participatory in nature. The believer's death with Christ is not a second 'death' that parallels Christ's death; it is a participation in the death of Christ, an entering into the history and destiny of Jesus Christ. This flaw is unfortunate, and may be attributed to what Williams himself calls a 'minimal reading' of Paul's metaphorical language of participation in Christ.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) WILLIAMS, 'Again \( \text{Pistis Christou,} \) ,' 446–447, cf. p. 443.

\(^2\) WILLIAMS, 'Again \( \text{Pistis Christou,} \) ,' 440–441; Cf. pp. 62–63 above; and also TANNEHILL, \( \text{Dying and Rising,} \) 19–20.

\(^3\) WILLIAMS, 'Again \( \text{Pistis Christou,} \) ,' 442 n.41. WILLIAMS is also criticized at this point for downplaying the vicarious elements of Paul's story of salvation by an otherwise sympathetic HAYS (\( \text{'PISTLE and Pauline Christology,} \) , 725): 'I would prefer to speak less of Jesus as "exemplar" and
Nevertheless, Williams goes on to make an illuminating and promising suggestion about the phrase πιστεύειν εἰς Χριστόν (Gal 2:16; cf. Rom 10:14; Phil 1:29; and also Col 2:5). Noting the clear and unique parallel with the phrase βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς Χριστόν in Rom 6:3 and Gal 3:27, he proposes that πιστεύειν εἰς Χριστόν, rather than designating Christ as the ‘object’ of faith (as is traditionally done), should be understood in the same way as ‘to be baptized into Christ’ is in the latter passages, in an incorporative sense, implying a transfer into the new dominion determined by Christ:

Just as Paul can say that one comes to be ‘in Christ’ by being baptized into Christ, so he can say that one believes into Christ. In this second expression, too, εἰς implies movement, change, the transfer from one order of existence to another. Thus, to ‘believe into Christ’ is the means by which one comes to be ‘in Christ.’ That means is adopting the life-stance, pists, which marked Christ’s own relationship to God, the life-stance of which he is the eschatological exemplar. To adopt this stance is to trust and obey Him who raised Jesus from the dead, to believe like Christ, and thereby to stand with Christ in that domain, that power field, created through his death and resurrection. To do so is to become the beneficiary of Christ-faith.

As we saw in Part (a) above, the believer’s faith, like baptism, is a means by which one’s past death and resurrection with Christ are concretely manifest in one’s life. The value of Williams’ interpretation of πιστεύειν εἰς Χριστόν and the phrase πιστεύειν εἰς Χριστόν, if correct, is that it helps clarify yet further the nature of the relationship between faith and death and resurrection with Christ, indeed with the events of Christ’s death and resurrection themselves and Christ’s own exemplary faith. In addition to this, it demonstrates a clear link between faith and the decisive transfer of believers to the new dominion in Christ. Thus, it serves also to highlight the close relationship between baptism and faith in Paul’s thought. Among other things, as Hays observes, Williams’

somewhat more of Jesus as the οἰκομένη whose apocalyptic destiny of death and resurrection reshapes the destiny of those who are now “in” him’ (cf. Gal 2:19b-20a; 6:14-15).

1 The phrase in Gal 2:16 reads ἡμείς εἰς Χριστόν ἠγέομαι εἰςπειτεύουμεν.

2 WILLIAMS (‘Again Pists Christou,’ 442 n. 42) observes that, as far as he can tell, these two expressions in Paul’s letters alone involve (i) a verb which designates a personal act or decision, (ii) the preposition εἰς, and (iii) Χριστόν as the object of the preposition.

3 WILLIAMS, ‘Again Pists Christou,’ 443.
approach further helps to account for the way in which Paul’s frequent appeals to the
cmpattern of Christ’s death and resurrection function in his ethics.\(^1\) Despite the flaw of
Wiliams’ ‘minimalist’ interpretation, which detracts from the power of his reading of
Paul, his proposal regarding \(\pi\iota\sigma\iota\iota\iota\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\iota\sigma\iota\tau\o\nu\) certainly deserves further
scholarly study. However, at this point, that must be left to other interpreters.\(^2\)

Hooker’s significant essay adds still greater clarification to understanding how faith
appropriates the death and resurrection of Christ in the believer’s experience.\(^3\) She
begins by reviewing and answering three reasons why scholars have found it difficult to
accept the subjective genitive interpretation of \(\pi\iota\sigma\iota\iota\iota\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\iota\sigma\iota\tau\o\nu\).\(^4\) The third reason given
is of interest here: resistance to any reference to Christ’s faith may be due to a dislike of
the principle of \textit{imitatio Christi}. Paul’s emphasis on God’s saving action in Christ has
often been held to exclude the idea that Christian discipleship can be described in terms
of imitation of the earthly Jesus. Hooker responds to this by stating,

paradoxically, however, this interpretation has diminished the close relationship of the
Christian to Christ: the believing response of the Christian to the gospel involves not only
faith in the resurrection, and confession of Christ’s lordship, but conformity to the death and
resurrection of Christ, and obedience to his rule. ... To be sure, participation is a much better
word than imitation. But this being so, should we not \textit{expect} there to be a logical link
between Christ’s faith and ours, just as there is between his death and ours, and between his
obedience and ours?\(^5\)

Such a link Hooker develops further in the remainder of her article.\(^6\) Approving of
Williams’ translation, ‘Christ-faith,’ she concludes that \(\pi\iota\sigma\iota\iota\iota\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\iota\sigma\iota\tau\o\nu\) must refer to
both Christ’s faith and that of the believer, ‘as a concentric expression, which begins

\(^1\) HAYS, ‘\textit{ΠΙΣΤΗ} and Pauline Christology,’ 725. On this point see further Section 6 below.
\(^2\) It is unfortunate that recent commentators on Galatians (e.g. R. N. LONGENECKER [1990]; DUNN
[1993]) have overlooked WILLIAM’s suggestion entirely.
\(^3\) HOOKER, ‘\textit{ΠΙΣΤΗ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ},’ 321–342.
\(^4\) HOOKER, ‘\textit{ΠΙΣΤΗ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ},’ 322–323. The first two deal with (i) the interpretation of phrase in
light of its juxtaposition, wherever it occurs, with a statement that Christians have believed in
Christ, and (ii) the christological appropriateness of speaking about Christ’s faith.
\(^5\) HOOKER, ‘\textit{ΠΙΣΤΗ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ},’ 323 (italics hers).
\(^6\) She does this by examining the Abraham passages in Romans 4 and Galatians 3, and then two of
the \(\pi\iota\sigma\iota\iota\iota\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\iota\sigma\iota\tau\o\nu\) passages (Gal 3:22; Phil 3:9) together with discussion of 2 Cor 1:17–22 and
always, from the faith of Christ himself, but which includes, necessarily, the answering faith of believers, who claim that faith as their own.' For Hooker Christian faith is nothing less than a sharing in the obedient, faithful response of Christ himself.¹

A subjective genitive reading of πίστες Χριστοῦ therefore has several important theological implications. Firstly, Hooker writes, faith, far from being a work of the believer, derives from the fact that he or she is already in Christ and identified with him. This acts to strengthen the doctrine of justification by faith, for the true antithesis is not between works and faith, but between the works of Law and the saving work of Christ; the believer's status of righteousness depends not on obedience to the Law, but on Christ's obedience to death.²

Secondly, this interpretation finds itself very much in accord with the participationist categories of Pauline soteriology. Not only is justification a matter of participation in Christ, so also is believing; the believer's initial response to Christ—faith—is a participation in the obedient, faithful response of Christ himself.³ A great strength of this, notes Hays, is that we may read Romans 1–8 as a theologically coherent discussion in which Paul's christology and soteriology are correlated in such a way that 'justification by faith' and 'participation in Christ' are virtually synonymous.⁴ For us the link between the believer's conversion—faith and Christ's death and resurrection is further emphasized: in Paul's thought faith is as equally participatory in the saving acts as is baptism. And as with baptism, the emphasis of faith's participation in Christ falls primarily upon his death or faithful obedience.

Finally, Hooker suggests that a subjective genitive interpretation of the disputed phrase maintains the unity between justification and sanctification:

¹ Hooker, ‘ΠΙΣΤΕ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ,’ 341.
³ Hooker, ‘ΠΙΣΤΕ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ,’ 341.
⁴ Hays, ‘ΠΙΣΤΕ and Pauline Christology,’ 724.
Those who share in Christ's faith share already in his righteousness; sanctification is indeed a matter of becoming what one is. Christian life is a matter of conformity to Christ from beginning to end—a sharing in what he is: this is the whole matter of justifying faith and sanctifying obedience.¹

For Paul, then, the whole of the Christian life, from the very first response of faith, is to be understood in terms of participation in Christ. Faith realizes the outworking of the believer's past death (and resurrection—in a qualified sense) with Christ in the believer's life and experience.

It needs to be repeated that how the πίστις Χριστοῦ formula should be interpreted is still the subject of a lively and ongoing debate.² The brief examination here cannot be said to have resolved the issue; conclusions reached must therefore be held circumspectly. It has served, however, to show how well the subjective genitive reading fits within Paul's overall theology, particularly in relation to the believer's participation in Christ and his death and resurrection.³ If adopted it demonstrates in explicit manner what other parts of Paul's writings say only implicitly, that not only is Christian faith closely linked with Christ's death and resurrection, but that the believer's faith also participates in Christ's faith, his obedience to death, to effect the realization in one's own experience of a past death (and resurrection) with Christ.

---

¹ Hooker, 'ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ,' 342.
² The arguments for and against a subjective reading are, needless to say, quite detailed and involved. Dunn ('ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ,' 744), while acknowledging that the theology of the subjective genitive reading is 'powerful, important and attractive,' even 'wholly compatible with Paul's theology,' finds himself 'rather puzzled as to why the subjective genitive interpretation is being pushed with such fervour.' He summarizes the case against the subjective reading as follows: (i) grammatically, there are good grounds for affirming the objective genitive reading and for denying the subjective reading; (ii) exegetically, 'faith in Christ' consistently makes good sense of Paul's thought in each case, whereas a subjective reading of πίστις Χριστοῦ runs the risk of confusing Paul's argument; and (iii) contextually, outside the disputed phrase there is nothing that can be called a clear reference to Christ's faith (as such). For proponents of the subjective genitive interpretation writing since Dunn's article, see B. W. Longenecker, 'Πιστις in Rom 3:25,' 478-480; D. A. Campbell, Rhetoric of Righteousness, 58-60; 'Romans 1:17,' 265-285.
³ Cf. the conclusion of C. D. Marshall, Justifying Righteousness, 104: 'It makes exegetical sense of the seven disputed texts in context and coheres well with Paul's wider theological emphasis on the believer's participation in the life and death of Christ as the very essence of Christian life and experience.'
(c) Conclusions

Although πιστις is not mentioned at all in Romans 6, and πιστεύειν only once in v. 8—there concerning the future life of believers with Christ as an object of faith—it is nevertheless implicit in Paul’s argument (cf. its frequent mention in Romans 1–4) and presupposed by the apostle when he speaks of baptism and death and resurrection with Christ. What Paul says concerning baptism as the means by which one’s past death with Christ is concretely realized in one’s life could also have been predicated of faith. The reason why Paul does not mention faith, however, is probably because baptism better serves his purposes in seeking to establish the foundation of the Christian life in the events of the death and resurrection of Christ and the believer’s past participation in those salvific acts. Baptism for Paul is a decisive and objective event in the life of a believer, whereas faith, although also foundational, is less tangible and therefore not quite as apposite to his argument as baptism. Paul was able to draw upon an early Christian link between baptism and the death of Christ to show that through baptism believers specifically participate in that death, whereas faith, in his understanding, appropriates more generally the salvation provided in Christ.

Examination of Gal 2:19–20 & 3:36–29 yielded some important results by way of confirmation. In the former text faith is shown to be closely linked to the death and resurrection of Christ—a participatory response to the work of Christ. In the latter passage Paul makes an explicit connection between faith and baptism, demonstrating that faith is always to be regarded as the implicit presupposition of baptism. The two are inseparable, almost coincident parts of the one single experience of transition from the old order into the new.

Dunn’s suggestion that faith, the gift of the Spirit and water baptism were regarded by the early Christians and Paul as components of the one unified experience, conversion—

1 Though cf. BETZ, Galatians, 187–188 (quotation on p. 99 above). His viewpoint may be affirmed together with the above statement.
initiation' helpfully clarifies the link between faith and baptism. Both belong together in complementary fashion and because of the eschatological power of Christ's death on the cross both can thereby mediate participation in that death. However, faith (unlike baptism) is seen by Paul to be an ongoing response to God as well, and not only the initial response to the work of the cross at one's conversion-initiation.

Having said this it is important to reaffirm that one's conversion or decision of faith is not to be taken as the temporal moment of one's death with Christ, just as baptism is not to be understood as such. As I have consistently maintained, in Paul's understanding the death of believers with Christ happened when Christ died (i.e. at the cross).

Our appreciation of how Paul sees faith with respect to dying and rising with Christ was also enlarged through a brief treatment of two significant contributions to the πίστες Χριστοῦ debate, those of Williams and Hooker. The interpretation of this phrase remains under dispute with no real consensus having been achieved to date. If the subjective genitive interpretation does accurately reflect Paul's intentions, then faith—like baptism—can be seen in a strongly participatory sense. If so, this provides some important and fresh insights into how Paul conceives of the relationship between the believer's faith and death and resurrection with Christ.

Of particular note is Williams' promising suggestion that the phrase πιστεύειν εἰς Χριστόν (Gal 2:16) should be understood in the same way as 'baptism into Christ'—in an incorporative sense, implying a transfer into the new dominion created through Christ's death and resurrection. If Williams is right, his interpretation highlights the similarity in efficaciousness of both baptism and faith, whereby both as part of the complex of the believer's conversion-initiation are regarded as means by which one concretely experiences participation in the death of Christ and new life 'in Christ' in the new dominion created by his death and resurrection.
The strength of Hooker’s article for our investigation is in her conclusion that for Paul Christian faith is to be seen in participatory terms as nothing less than a sharing in the obedient faithful response of Christ himself, primarily referring to Christ’s obedience to death. Hooker’s explication of the nature of Christian faith in its association with the person and faith of Jesus Christ himself is an important contribution to Pauline scholarship. Her insights lend much support and clarification to the arguments and position of the present study, that the faith of believers (both as decision of faith and ongoing faith) is also a participation in the death and resurrection of Christ. While not explicit in Romans 6, it seems very reasonable to posit that these ideas are implicit there, and in Paul’s theology generally.

For Paul, faith participates in the saving acts—as baptism does. They both solidly ground the eschatological outworking of Jesus’ death and resurrection within the initial Christian experience of each believer. However, faith is not only the initial response of the Christian to God’s salvation in Christ, but also an ongoing conformity to Christ, and to his death and resurrection, throughout the Christian life. This is well encapsulated by Alister McGrath, who concludes: ‘Faith transfers the history of Jesus Christ from outside our personal existence to within it, making it an essential and integral part of our living and dying.’

CHAPTER IV
ETHICS AND RESURRECTION WITH CHRIST
IN THE BELIEVER’S EXPERIENCE

In the previous chapter we examined two key aspects of death and resurrection with Christ in the believer’s experience: baptism and faith. Yet both of these refer primarily to the ‘conversion-initiation’ of the believer and as such have little to say directly to the present or future experience of Christians. The exception, of course, is faith which does have an ongoing significance as well. Paul, however, has much more to say about death and resurrection with Christ in the believer’s present experience, as well as about the future experience of resurrection with Christ. Most of the present tense aspects lie outside the scope of this investigation with its focus on Romans 6. For example, Paul refers to Christian experience of suffering and weakness as participation in the death and resurrection with Christ (e.g. Phil 3:10-11; 2 Cor 1:3-11; 4:7-15; 12:9-10; 13:4; Gal 6:11-18; Rom 8:17, 29), to experience of the Spirit as participation in the resurrection-life of Christ (e.g. Rom 8:9-11; 1 Cor 15:45) and to the corporate participation of believers in the death of Christ through the Lord’s Supper (1 Cor 10:16-17). However, one element of the Christian life that Paul does engage with in Romans 6, and that is related to the believer’s dying and rising with Christ, is his ethical exhortation to those who have been incorporated into the new dominion in Christ. The next section, therefore, considers the ethics of dying and rising with Christ, including discussion of Rom 6:12-14. Following this, the issue of the believer’s experience of resurrection with Christ will be explored in detail in Section 7. As we shall see, a natural link between these two sections is provided in Paul’s reference to the believer walking in ‘newness of life’ (Rom 6:4c).1

1 See my previous discussion of this verse on pp. 42-43 above.
6. The Ethics of Death and Resurrection with Christ

It is necessary to ask at the outset: What is meant when we speak of Paul’s ‘ethics’, or of a ‘Pauline ethic’? Used in an everyday sense one may refer to the pattern of conduct of an individual which characterizes one’s day-to-day living in terms of what is considered ‘right’ or ‘wrong.’ By contrast, ethical theory offers a systematic explanation of the nature, forms, principles, motives and goals of ‘right’ or ‘good’ conduct. In this philosophical sense, therefore, ‘ethics’ aims to provide a systematic account of judgements made about such conduct. It is abundantly clear from Paul’s epistles that he is not a systematic ethicist. While he does exhort, instruct, admonish and advise his readers, this is almost always done in an ad hoc fashion in relation to specific situations and cases. Thus one could speak of Paul’s ethics in the everyday sense. However, it is not possible to reduce the notion of ‘Pauline ethics’ to merely this, for Paul’s concern for the practical conduct of believers is inseparably related to the central themes of his preaching and writing. Although he does not elaborate on the nature of this relationship, significant connections between his ethical concerns and his theology do exist and must be regarded by the interpreter of Paul as part of his ‘ ethic.’ Accordingly, the study of the Pauline ethic, therefore, is not the study of his ethical theory, for he had none, nor of his code for Christian living, for he gave none. It is the study, first of all, of the theological convictions which underlie Paul’s concrete exhortations and instructions, and secondly, of the way those convictions shape his responses to practical questions of conduct.

With this in mind, we first turn to Romans 6:1-14 to consider the ethical implications contained in this passage, examining particularly vv. 12-14. After this, we will discuss the relationship between indicative and imperative in Paul’s theology. The main aim in this section is to elucidate how the motif of death and resurrection with Christ shapes Paul’s ethical teaching.

---

1 For what immediately follows I am much indebted to the helpful discussion of Furnish, *Theology and Ethics*, 208-212; though cf. Käsemann, *Romans*, 172-176.

2 Furnish, *Theology and Ethics*, 211-212.
Before examining vv. 12-14, let us recount the ethical implications already noted in vv. 1-11. While the whole of Romans 6 deals with the problem of sin, and thus has obvious ethical implications for the Christian life, it needs to be restated that vv. 1-11 are thoroughly dogmatic in nature and the label 'ethical and hortatory', which some have applied to the passage, is a misunderstanding of Paul's argument. What is traditionally called 'sanctification' in Romans 6 begins not at 6:2, but at 6:12, where Paul begins the practical outworking of his argument: 'Therefore (οὖν) do not let sin reign in your mortal body ...' The first imperative verb in the entire epistle is found in 6:11 and there it is only intended as a summary of vv. 2-10, calling Christians to believe what he has already argued. However, this is not to say that the indicative nature of vv. 1-11 means no ethical implications are contained within the passage; it is to say that they are only implicit in the text and not part of Paul's primary purpose. Paul's chief concern in vv. 2-11 is to show the decisive nature of the believer's transfer from the old dominion of sin into the new dominion (of grace; 6:14b). This is effected by the death (and resurrection) of Christ, which are corporate and inclusive events in which the believer participates. The believer is therefore no longer in the dominion of sin; it is an impossibility for the believer to 'still live in it' (6:1). This often confuses the interpreter of Paul, for do not all Christians still struggle with sin in their lives? Of course they do, as also did Paul. But Paul deals with the believer's duty to deal with sin in his or her life in vv. 12-14 (& 15-23), not in vv. 1-11. The apparent contradiction is resolved when one appreciates that for Paul the death of believers with Christ, a death to sin

---

1 Cf. e.g. SCHNACKENBURG, *Baptism in the Thought of Paul*, 32, or those commentators who see this passage as Paul's introduction to the idea of sanctification in chapters 6-8 after chapters 1-5 had dealt with justification (thus KOHL, CRANFIELD; BLACK; SANDAY & HEADLAM; LAGRANGE; GODET).

2 Cf. KASEMANN, *Romans*, 155 *apropos* of 6:11, which sums up vv. 1-10.

3 One common, popular misunderstanding of the text, for example, is that v. 6 calls believers to actively crucify the old person, when Paul is saying, to the contrary, that the (corporate) old person has already been crucified with Christ (κατακτησαντον; assim passive[!])—on the cross.

4 As Rom 7:14-25 clearly demonstrates, if it is taken to refer the post-conversion experience of the Christian (κύριο interpreted paradigmatically), which I am persuaded is the case. But even if not, the imperatives of vv. 12-13 make it clear that Paul accepts that believers do indeed have this struggle.
(v. 2b), is epochal in nature, implying a shift in the ages. But the believer, as 'mortal body' (πῶς θνητῷ ἐμῶν σώματι; v. 12), is still in the world, subject to the attacks of the powers of the old dominion, experiencing in the present an ongoing participation in the death of Christ (v. 5a), and partial participation in the resurrection-life of Christ (vv. 4c, 11b), while awaiting the yet future (somatic) resurrection with Christ from the dead (vv. 5b, 8b).\(^1\) The Christian is thus caught in the eschatological tension of the ages between the already (freed from the dominion of sin; 6:1-11 [the indicative]) and the not yet (while awaiting completion of the salvation process, the believer needs to resist actively the attacks from the old dominion; 6:12-23 [the imperative]).\(^2\)

In this connection, Käsemann helpfully explains Paul's ethical concern in writing Romans 6 (and 7):

> The apostle stands before the task of making intelligible in terms of the reality of everyday life, of the community and of the individual, the universal realization of eschatological life which he has set forth in ch. 5. He does this by characterizing it as freedom from the powers of sin and the law and therewith summons Christians with inner necessity to conform in their personal life the change of aeons that has been effected.\(^3\)

Paul's eschatological perspective of a transfer between the two dominions and union with Christ does have clear, and present, ethical consequences for the Christian who shares in the new life of Christ. It is the outworking of this past death with Christ and the partial sharing in the resurrection-life of Christ in the present that create a new ethical imperative for the Christian. Although made with respect to the case of Galatians, Chalmer Faw's comment on the metaphor of death and resurrection in Paul helps illustrate this:

> Almost imperceptibly the death and resurrection metaphor applied to conversion merges into a graphic symbol of ethical revitalization and a radical break with the world. In fact it is really one symbol with two spheres of reference. Death means the end of one set of relationships and new life the entering upon a whole new existence of ethical purity and righteous conduct. The

---

\(^1\) On this, see Section 7(a) below.

\(^2\) Dunn, Romans 1–8, 302–303 has well recognized this basic structure within Romans 6. The relationship between indicative and imperative in Paul is discussed in Part (b) below.

\(^3\) Käsemann, Romans, 158–159.
figure of speech is therefore more than a mere metaphor; it is a true symbol which points to a
reality and partakes of the nature of that reality. Paul believed that he and all Christians
participate in the sufferings, death and resurrection of Christ to the extent that there is effected
a change radical enough to be called a new creation (2 Cor 5:14-17 and Gal 6:15).1

We may recall here an earlier observation concerning Rom 6:4bc—that included in the
possibility of life opened up to believers and made certain by the resurrection of Christ
(‘just as Christ was raised from the dead ... so we too might walk [περιστρέφομαι] in
newness of life’) is an implicit demand. The aorist verb περιστρέφομαι shows that the
‘newness of life’ now experienced by those who have been freed from the dominion of
sin is to become apparent in their conduct and lifestyle. Similarly, we saw in v. 6c that
the purpose of being crucified with Christ is that believers ‘should no longer serve
sin’—another implicit imperative, but one that finds explicit outworking in vv. 12-14.

It is in 6:12-14 that one finds the explicit imperatives that deal with what can rightly be
called ‘sanctification.’ The section significantly begins with the word ‘therefore’ (οὕτως),
meaning: ‘on the basis of all I have said to you, now ...’ Thus, these verses provide the
immediate practical application to the doctrinal arguments (the indicatives) of 6:1-11
and, at the same time, introduce the next section of 6:15-23.

Recalling Rom 5:21 and answering the rhetorical question of 6:1 now in practical terms,
Paul says to the Roman Christians, ‘therefore, do not let sin reign (βασιλεύειν) in
your mortal body that you should obey its lusts’ (v. 12—though the exhortation continues into v. 13). It is because they are no longer in the old dominion that this
is now possible. But the imperative shows that the believer now has a responsibility in
sanctification. Sin is not to reign in τῷ θνητῷ υἱῷ σώματι (‘your mortal body’). Some see this as a clear reference to the physical body, and the description of the body
as θνητός, the reference to ‘its passions’ later in the verse and ‘members’ in v. 13
would seem to support this.2 But perhaps it is better to see the reference as designating

2 So MURRAY, Romans, 412-413; LLOYD-JONES, Romans: The New Man, 150-151; LENSKI, Romans, 227; GUNDRY, Sōma in Biblical Theology, 29-31.
the whole person (cf. the discussion of 'body of sin' [v. 6b] in Section 3 above; and Paul’s use of ‘yourselves’ in parallel to ‘members of your body’ here in v. 13). Thus, ‘the mortal body’ is the believer’s form of existence in this world and which still has a part in ‘this age’—it is the ‘person in contact with the world.’ The Christian is no longer ‘body of sin’ (6:6b) or ‘body of death’ (7:24), but he or she is still ‘mortal body’ and will be (in the future) ‘glorified body.’ The purpose or result of the command is that a believer should not obey ‘the lusts’ (ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς) of the mortal body—desires that are in conflict with God’s will.

Verse 13 elaborates on the previous one in more specific and practical terms. Paul has moved from the general ‘you’ (v. 11) to the more definite ‘body’ (v. 12) to the even more definite ‘members’ (μέλη) here. If σῶμα (‘body’) in v. 12 means ‘the whole person in contact with the world’ instead of ‘physical body,’ then μέλη also will mean ‘natural capacities’ or ‘capabilities’ rather than limbs, or parts, of the body (cf. also the linking of ‘members’ with ‘flesh’ [σάρξ] in 7:5 and 7:23).5

Significant for understanding the second half of Romans 6 is the dual use of the verb παράκοιταμι (v. 13a, present imperative; v. 13b, aorist imperative) which is also used in v. 19. It can mean ‘present,’ but in the context of the verse probably has the more active meaning ‘put at the disposal of’ or ‘use in service for.’ In v. 13a παράκοιταμι is used negatively in the present tense with μηδέ, meaning ‘stop ...’ or ‘do not go on ...’ Thus believers are to stop offering the natural capacities of their bodies to serve sin.

---

1 See pp. 51-52 above.
2 So DUNN, Romans 1–8, 336; MOO, Romans 1–8, 400; KÄSEMANN, Romans, 176; but not quite with CRANFIELD, Romans Vol I, 317, who sees it as referring to the whole of a person’s fallen nature.
3 MOO, Romans 1–8, 400 (citing H. SCHLIER); BEKER, Paul the Apostle, 288; KÄSEMANN, Romans, 176–177.
4 Four possible readings are found for the end of v. 12. The reading adopted above (ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς μελᾶνήματος; ‘that you should obey its the mortal body’s lusts) is preferred by most commentators on the grounds of both textual (M A B C* 81 1739 ad) and internal evidence. Thus UBSGNT3c; see further TCGNT.
5 So MOO, Romans 1–8, 401; DUNN, Romans 1–8, 337; KÄSEMANN, Romans, 177; CRANFIELD, Romans Vol I, 317–318 (against LENSKI, Romans, 414–416; MURRAY, Romans, 227–228; & LLOYD-JONES, Romans: The New Man, who take the more literal sense).
In v. 13b the aorist tense probably indicates a beginning in placing these 'members' at the service of God (τῶ θεῷ), but possibly also stresses the decisive nature or urgency of the action (cf. the fact that in 6:16–23 there can be no neutral ground between service of God and service of sin).

How the 'members' are to be used in their service to sin or God is defined further by the term ὀφλα, which may have the general meaning of 'instruments' or 'tools,' though Pauline usage suggests the more specific military meaning of 'weapons.' So Christians are exhorted negatively 'not to go on using the members of your body to serve sin (τῆ ἀμαρτία personified again as a power) as weapons of unrighteousness (αἰδικίας).' Positively, the members are to be used 'to serve God as weapons of righteousness (δικαιοσύνης).'</p>

But Paul also commands his readers to present 'yourselves' (ἐαυτοῖς) to God as 'those alive from the dead' (ὁσεὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας). This refers back to v. 11 and reminds them that the presenting of one's self to God can take place only because of the new status of believers through their union with Christ in his death and resurrection. The ὠσεὶ means not 'as if you were' but 'as you really are.' It is significant that Paul avoids saying do not present 'yourselves' to sin—that would be impossible, since believers have died to sin—he only says this of their 'members'.

The mention of δικαιοσύνη in v. 13 is the first occurrence of the term since Rom 5:21; but it occurs frequently in the rest of the chapter (vv. 16, 18, 19, 20). From the words with which it is associated (cf. 'obedience leading to righteousness', v. 16) and with which it is contrasted ('unrighteousness,' v. 13; 'sin,' vv. 16[?], 18, 20; 'impurity' and

---

1 So CRANFIELD, Romans Vol I, 317–318; MOO, Romans 1–8, 402.
2 MOO, Romans 1–8, 402.
3 Thus CRANFIELD, Romans Vol I, 318 in view of the later slave terminology.
4 So KASEMANN, Romans, 177; MOO, Romans 1–8, 401–402; DUNN, Romans 1–8, 337 and most commentators.
5 LLOYD-JONES, Romans: The New Man, 169–170.
'lawlessness,' v. 19) it is clear, as Moo argues, that δικαιοσύνη in these verses means 'behaviour pleasing to God.'\(^1\) Ωκαίοσύνη, then, does not have quite the same meaning in this chapter as in chapters 1–5, where it always denotes either an attribute or action of God (1:17: 3:5, 25–26) or the forensic act of justifying (or the results of that act). But these two uses of 'righteousness' are inextricably connected, for it is only the righteousness attained 'before God' that introduces the sinner into a new state from which he or she is able to be obedient to the righteousness that God demands.\(^2\)

That δικαιοσύνη has a different emphasis here than it has in the earlier chapters of Romans is sometimes denied by those commentators who associate δικαιοσύνη with the idea of God's power. For them δικαιοσύνη in Romans 6 is conceived as a power to which one submits (cf. vv. 18–19),\(^3\) and is thus paralleled with God (cf. v. 18 with v. 22). In this manner, δικαιοσύνη as God's power for salvation (Romans 1–5) can essentially be identified with δικαιοσύνη as that power to which believers are now joined and thus controlled by.\(^4\) However, while Paul does personify δικαιοσύνη and cast it in the role of a 'power' from which one can be free (v. 20) or enslaved, the word never completely loses its reference to concrete activity. This is especially clear in v. 19 where the contrast with 'impurity' and 'lawlessness' requires that δικαιοσύνη, while summarizing and personified, connotes specific acts in the world.\(^5\)

After the imperatives of vv. 11–13, the paragraph concludes with a return to the indicative (in v. 14). ἀμαρτία γὰρ ἥμων σι' κυριεύσει ('for sin will not be your lord') grounds the specific commands of vv. 12–13 (γὰρ) while summarizing the keynote of the chapter. The future κυριεύσει carries the sense 'be lord over' or 'have

---

\(^1\) This meaning for the word is well attested in both the LXX and the NT (eg. Matt 3:15; 6:33; James 1:20; Eph 4:24; 5:9; Phil 1:11[?]; 1 Tim 6:11; 2 Tim 2:22; 3:16; 4:8; Titus 3:5[?]). So MOO, Romans 1–8, 403; RIDDERBOS, Paul: Outline, 262 and most commentators.

\(^2\) MOO, Romans 1–8, 403.

\(^3\) We have earlier seen this to be true of ἀμαρτία ('sin') in Paul’s thought—see pp. 23–24 above.

\(^4\) So especially, KÄSEMANN, Romans (here particularly, pp. 171–186); but also DUNN, Romans 1–8 (particularly, pp. 333–357); REUMANN, Righteousness in the New Testament, 81–84; FURNISH, Theology and Ethics, 195–196; cf. BEKER, Paul the Apostle, 262–264.

\(^5\) MOO, Romans 1–8, 404.
dominion over,' and could be eschatological: 'sin will one day have no control over you.'

But the lack of a conditional particle, the γεχορ introducing the sentence, and the focus of the chapter on the freedom from sin enjoyed by the believer in this life, all point to interpreting these words as a promise: 'sin shall certainly not be your lord—now or ever!' There has already taken place in the life of the believer a 'change of lordship', because another Lord (Κύριος)—Christ—has taken dominion over them. This promise is confirmed (γεχορ) in a glorious conclusion 'you are not under law, but under grace' (οὐ ... ἐστε ὑπὸ νόμου ὀλλὰ ὑπὸ χάριν). Believers in Christ thus enjoy the freedom of being no longer in the dominion of sin or under the law. However, this is not a reason for permitting licentiousness (cf. v. 1), as Paul points out in v. 15 and explains in the remainder of the chapter, for Christians are now ruled by a new imperative, one that arises inherently from their new status in Christ.

(b) Indicative and Imperative: The Structure of Pauline Ethics

Recent interpretation of Paul believes the basic structure and balance of Pauline ethics is to be found in the connection he establishes between the indicative and imperative. Indeed many believe the relationship between his theology and ethics is to be seen in terms of indicative and imperative. It is worth recalling that Paul’s eschatology provides

---

1 Thus LLOYD-JONES, Romans: The New Man.
2 So MURRAY, Romans, 228; MOO, Romans 1–8, 404; CRANFIELD, Romans Vol I, 319.
3 Most likely, Paul is thinking of ‘law’ and ‘grace’ as contrasting salvation-historical powers. See further MOO, Romans 1–8, 406–407. On the meaning of ‘law’ (νόμος) here, see DUNN, Romans 1–8, 539; MOO, Romans 1–8, 405; KASEMANN, Romans, 178; ZIESLER, Romans, 165; space does not permit further consideration here.
the basic framework for his theology, and this is true also of his ethics. The indicative-imperative construction in Paul's letters reveals this underlying eschatological framework, as will be seen shortly. Importantly, for this study, Paul's ethics and the indicative-imperative structure are closely related to the motif of death and resurrection with Christ.

Of course, not all of Paul's ethical exhortations (his imperatives) are related directly to the motif of death and resurrection with Christ (e.g. exhortations to husbands and wives in 1 Corinthians 7), but virtually all of them have their overall basis in the theological foundations of Paul's thought (his indicatives). This is evidenced by the repeated use of linking words at the commencement of paraenetic sections following didactic sections in Paul's epistles, such as ὁτι, ὅτε, γιὰρ, διό, διότι, διὰ τὸ, which carry the essential meaning, 'on the basis of this, therefore [do/do not ...].' It is a well known fact that several of the Pauline epistles clearly comprise two sections using this basic indicative-imperative structure.

However, the connection between indicative and imperative is found in its most developed form in Romans 6. The whole chapter receives its structure from the linking of imperative with indicative: vv. 1-11 is the indicative section; vv. 12-23 the

---


1 Cf. DENNISON, 'Indicative and Imperative,' 56–57.

2 The most characteristic of these linking words is ὁτι, which opens some of the most important paraenetic sections: Rom 12:1; Gal 5:1; 1 Thess 4:1. Here, it begins Rom 6:12–23. Thus CRUZ, Christological Motives, 25 & n. 5.

3 In Romans this structure is observed in chapters 1–11 and 12–15, respectively; in Galatians, 1:1–5:1a and 5:1b–6:10; in 1 Thessalonians, chapters 1–3 and 4–5. It is interesting to note that the same structure is evident also in Colossians (1:12–2:23 and 3:1–4:6) and Ephesians (1:3–3:21 and 4:1–6:20).

4 So TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 77.
imperative,\(^1\) with the ὀφείλει of v. 12 presenting the imperative section as a logical inference from the preceding discussion.\(^2\) Fundamental to Paul’s exhortations in Romans 6 are the notions of death and resurrection with Christ, the transfer of believers between the two dominions, their death to sin and new life to God in Christ. His ethics seek to explain the implications of this new status and life for Christian behaviour. It is significant, though, that the practical exhortation from v. 12 onwards reflects the same patterns of thought found in vv. 2–10. The indicative of death to sin somehow implies the imperative of death to sin. The linking of the two is not only deliberate (not an unconscious slip on Paul’s part),\(^3\) but also demonstrates the inseparability of indicative and imperative in his thought. The indicative establishes the imperative, and the imperative follows from the indicative with an absolute unconditional necessity—a necessity that is determined by what has happened to believers through God’s activity.\(^4\)

To clarify further this relationship, two key questions arising from the text of Romans 6 require an answer:\(^5\) Why, if the believer has been decisively transferred from the old dominion of sin to the new dominion, is there a need for Paul’s exhortation, the imperative? Conversely, if there is a need for Paul to include ethics in his teaching does that mean that his teaching on the indicative is idealistic or merely true in principle, with no corresponding reality in the life of the individual?

---

1. Inside the imperative section itself there are several indicatives (vv. 13b, 14, 17, 18, 22a) and imperatives (vv. 12, 13, 19c). Thus, CRUZ, *Christological Motives*, 24 n. 4. On the reason why v. 11, which contains a verb in the imperative mood, is *not* to be regarded as part of the imperative section, see pp. 57–58, 114 above.

2. It is clear from this (and elsewhere in Paul’s letters) that the order of indicative and then imperative is not reversible. The former is the foundation for the latter. Thus DENNISON, ‘Indicative and Imperative,’ 72–73; RIDDERBOS, *Paul: Outline*, 254–255.


In answer of the second question it needs to be pointed out that for Paul the indicative possesses a certain finality independent of its realisation in subsequent conduct. Nevertheless, the imperative is not just the result of the indicative, it is implicit in the indicative—fully integral to it—as Allen Verhey explains,

The indicative mood has an important priority and finality in the proclamation of the gospel, but the imperative is by no means merely an addendum to the indicative or even exactly an inference drawn from the indicative. Participation in Christ's cross and resurrection (the important priority of the indicative) and anticipation of the new age of God's unchallenged sovereignty (the important finality of the indicative) are constituted here and now by obedience to God's will (the imperative).

Believers are not just given the possibility of a new life through their death (and resurrection) with Christ, but an actually and totally new existence. Not only have they been released from their former slavery in the dominion of sin, but they stand under a new Lord and in a new dominion. Now a new power determines their lives, a power by which they can 'put to death the deeds of the body' (Rom 8:13). For Paul obedience, in response to God's demand (the imperative), is a constitutive element of the gift of new life itself (the indicative); it is the concrete expression of the believer's belonging to the new dominion. Christ as Lord both gives and demands. Moreover, in Paul's view the life that believers are to live is not just the life to which Christ points; it is the life of Christ himself. As Brendan Byrne puts it, 'the on-going ethical life of Christians is simply the extension of [the] intimate association with Christ [dying in obedience on the cross]. It involves allowing the obedient Christ to live out his righteousness within oneself.' This recalls the discussion of the previous section concerning faith as a

1 WEBSTER, 'Imitation of Christ,' 106.
2 A point recognized by KÄSEMANN, Romans, 175; FURNISH, Theology and Ethics, 225; SCHRAGE, Ethics of the New Testament, 170; WEBSTER, 'Imitation of Christ,' 106.
4 FURNISH, Theology and Ethics, 225.
5 TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 81–82.
6 FURNISH, Theology and Ethics, 226; KÄSEMANN, Romans, 175.
8 STYLER, 'Basis of Obligation,' 186.
9 BYRNE, 'Righteousness of God,' 575 (cf. p. 563); cf. STYLER, 'Basis of Obligation,' 187; BORNKAMM, 'Baptism and New Life,' 82; FURNISH, Theology and Ethics, 218.
participation in Christ and in his righteous obedience. Expressed in terms of the motif of death and resurrection with Christ, the believer’s past union with Christ in his death (his righteous obedience) enables the present experience of union with Christ in his life. Through this the believer, having been set free from slavery to sin, actually shares in the righteous life of Christ and can ‘walk in newness of life’ (Rom 6:4c), with a new ‘aliveness’ to God ‘in Christ’ (Rom 6:11b).

However, Paul does not presume that the Christian’s obedience is a ‘spontaneous’ expression of the new life. The Pauline indicatives and imperatives are both to be taken seriously. Relating this to Romans 6, due emphasis must be given to both the objective and subjective elements in the believer’s dying and rising again with Christ in his death to sin and living again to God. In the objective aspect (indicative), believers are said to have been in Christ when he died and rose again.3 In the subjective aspect (imperative), the activity of the believers is clearly enlisted in the process, although this activity can be exercised only in the strength and grace of the Holy Spirit (cf. Rom 8:13).4 In Paul’s understanding, the imperative of death to sin in the exhortations of Rom 6:12–13 is thus directly related to and founded upon the basic soteriological conception of Christ’s death and resurrection and the believer’s participation in those events.5

This goes some way toward answering the first question mentioned above. But the necessity for the imperative in Paul’s thought is also to be seen as a result of the eschatological tension, in which believers find themselves, between the ‘already’ of the new creation and the ‘not yet’ of the final consummation. This was briefly discussed in

1 See pp. 106–108 above.
2 FURNISH, Theology and Ethics, 227.
4 MURRAY, Collected Writings, Vol 2, 295–296; TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 81–82; RIDDERBOS, Paul: Outline, 255; cf. FURNISH, Theology and Ethics, 227: ‘The apostle’s exhortations seek to summon believers to that kind of deliberate response to God’s claim without which faith forfeits its distinctive character as obedience.’
5 Cf. DENNISON, ‘Indicative and Imperative,’ 69.
Part (a) above. Otto Merk describes the interplay of indicative and imperative as 'the interweaving of the two aeons that pervades the Christian life.' In the death and resurrection of Christ an eschatological change of aeons has taken place in which the compelling might of the powers of sin, law and death, to which believers once had no choice but to serve as slaves, has been broken. Therefore, they can now be successfully resisted, and it is toward this that the imperative is directed to Christians.

However, the old age still continues and the powers of sin and death continue to exercise a certain, not yet ineffectual, influence upon the world—even against believers. The new dominion and the new life of believers are present realities, but they are hidden within the old world. The full influence of the new Lord upon concrete, physical life is not yet manifest. The Christian is no longer 'body of sin' (Rom 6:6b) or 'body of death' (Rom 7:24), but is still 'mortal body' (Rom 6:12). For Paul the redemption of the body (becoming 'glorified body') is tied up with the yet future redemption of the physical creation (Rom 8:19-23). While believers await the redemption of the body, it is not only still subject to death; the mortal body continues to be a point of battle between sin and God, between the rule of death and the rule of the Spirit—and both claim it and demand its obedience. To whom the believer presents him or herself as a slave through acts of obedience determines whose slave that one is (Rom 6:16), and so it is possible for a believer to be a slave of sin again through acts of sinning. It is against that

---

1 See pp. 114–116 above; cf. also RIDDERBOS, Paul: Outline, 257–258; LOHSE, Theological Ethics, 110; DENNISON, 'Indicative and Imperative,' 73.
3 LOHSE, Theological Ethics, 109–110.
4 VERHEY, The Great Reversal, 104; BORNKAMM, 'Baptism and New Life,' 80–81; TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 75.
5 TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 78; BORNKAMM, 'Baptism and New Life,' 80–81; LOHSE, Theological Ethics, 110.
6 Thus TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 78; BEKER, Paul the Apostle, 288; cf. VERHEY, The Great Reversal, 104–105.
possibility that Paul directs his exhortation: ‘Present ... your members to God as weapons of righteousness’ (Rom 6:13).

Thus, we may conclude that the Pauline imperative relates to the historical existence of believers ‘between the times’; it is meaningful ‘only in a world where death is still “the last enemy” and where hostile powers still threaten Christian existence.’ According to Beker, the ‘cosmic consummation’ of the Christ-event ‘will no longer have room for the imperative.’ The imperative, then, must be defined as an ‘interim ethic’; it is the scope of all that is ‘not yet,’ walking in obedience to the demands and commands of the new life, until the consummation of the present age. In other words, ‘although the interaction between indicative and imperative is based on the Christ-event, it looks forward to the theocentric confirmation of the Christ-event and to God’s coming glory in a redeemed creation.’ An indicative-imperative scheme that does justice to Paul must therefore move ‘from the indicative of the Christ-event to the imperative of Christian obedience in order to reach its goal in the final indicative of the glory of God.’

The motif of death and resurrection with Christ well exemplifies this: the believer’s past death (and resurrection) with Christ enables a present ‘walk’ in newness of life (with its associated ethical implications). But the new life, while clearly derivative from Christ’s resurrection life, is not yet ‘resurrection with Christ’ as Paul understands it and so it anticipates the ultimate goal when the ‘walk’ will no longer be necessary and Christian existence becomes fully ‘living with Christ.’ Moltmann correctly understands this notion; for him the imperative is not to be understood merely as a summons to demonstrate the indicative of the new life in Christ (‘become what you are’), but it has

---

1 TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 78–79.
2 BEKER, Paul the Apostle, 277, 288.
3 BEKER, Paul the Apostle, 277 (using SCHWEITZER’s description of the Sermon on the Mount).
5 BEKER, Paul the Apostle, 277.
6 BEKER, Paul the Apostle, 277–278. BEKER (p. 278) describes the indicative of the Christ-event as ‘not the full but the proleptic realization of the future indicative of God’s glory.’ Cf. VERHEY, The Great Reversal, 104–105.
also an eschatological presupposition in the future that has been promised to believers ('become what you will be').

But as mentioned above Christians are not left on their own in meeting the demands of the imperative; they need and are given the enabling strength and grace of the Spirit. William Dennison and Beker have separately suggested that Paul's eschatological and theocentric conception of the Spirit provides the continuity in the redemptive-historical work of God between the indicative of the Christ-event and its confirmation in the 'ultimate indicative' of God's coming glory. In Beker's exposition, the Spirit is related both to the future glory of God and to the believer's mortal body in the present; the first relationship centres upon God's ultimate 'indicative,' and the second formulates the nature of the 'imperative' in Paul. For Dennison, the Holy Spirit 'unifies the indicative and the imperative by bringing the fullness of life upon the believer through the actual historical-redemptive work of God.' Thus, the imperative expresses 'the total redemption of the believer because it is first grounded in the indicative and, secondly, through the Spirit of God the believer is obedient by rebelling against sin in the process of sanctification which reflects its definitive starting point.' Paul himself succinctly expresses the indicative-imperative relationship in terms of the Spirit in Gal 5:25: 'If we live by the Spirit, let us also walk by the Spirit.'

---


2 See Dennison, 'Indicative and Imperative,' 69–71, 74–78; Beker, Paul the Apostle, 277–291. Dennison is particularly indebted to the work of G. Vos at this point. For Dennison (pp. 71, 75–76), in opposition to a dialectical understanding of Paul's indicative-imperative structure maintained by Bultmann and others, such a conception of the Spirit removes any contradiction or antimony that may be apparent in Paul's ethical thought. Cf. Beker's dismissal of the 'faddish' terminology of 'paradox' and 'antimony' as 'a hermeneutical obfuscation' (Paul the Apostle, 276–278; quotation from 276–277).

3 Beker, Paul the Apostle, 277; cf. Tannehill, Dying and Rising, 80.

4 Dennison, 'Indicative and Imperative,' 76.

5 Dennison, 'Indicative and Imperative,' 73. Cf. the helpful comments of Ridderbos (Paul: Outline, 215, 223): 'Paul links the Spirit with the advent and person of Christ, and gives expression to the gift of the new life conferred in Christ not only in the categories of redemptive history (death and resurrection with Christ), but also in those of the Pneuma.' But as well as being linked with Paul's indicative in this way, the Spirit is 'also the principle and power of the new life in the moral sense of the word, the Spirit of sanctification.'
It has been rightly said that 'God’s saving eschatological act in Jesus Christ is the basis and root of Pauline ethics.' The foregoing study goes a long way toward confirming this. Because the death and resurrection of Christ are eschatological events, it is not surprising that the ethics which are based upon them are shaped by their eschatological character. This is most clearly reflected in the indicative and imperative of Paul’s ethics. And as we have seen in Romans 6, this indicative-imperative structure is closely related to the motif of death and resurrection with Christ. In the case of Romans 6, at least, Paul’s exhortations are integrally linked to this motif. John Murray well expresses this relationship:

The basis and the spring of sanctification are union with Christ, more specifically union with him in the virtue of his death and the power of his resurrection (cf. Rom 6:2-6; 7:4-6). It is by this union with Christ that the breach with sin in its power and defilement was effected (cf. Rom 6:14) and newness of life in the efficacy of Jesus’ resurrection inaugurated (cf. Rom 6:4, 10, 11). ... And not only is there this virtue in the death and resurrection of Christ, but since union with Christ is permanent, there is also the virtue that constantly emanates from Christ and is the dynamic in the growth unto holiness. ... This illustrates what is characteristic of Paul’s teaching, that ethics must rest upon the foundation of redemptive accomplishment. More specifically stated it is that ethics spring from union with Christ and therefore from participation in the virtue belonging to him and exercised by him as the crucified, risen and ascended Redeemer.

It is by means of the motif of death and resurrection with Christ that Paul makes clear that the ongoing life of the believer, including his or her ethical responsibilities, is directly related primarily to what took place in the saving events, but also to the future fulfilment of the eschatological process inaugurated by those events. Jesus’ history, abbreviated to the focal points of death and resurrection, thus furnishes for Paul the

---

2 Murray, Romans, 109-110.
3 Cf. Tannehill, Dying and Rising, 81.
objective possibility of the new life of the Christian believer and its integrating structure as a form of human conduct.¹

(c) Conclusions

It is important to reaffirm that Romans 6 is to be divided into two sections which reflect the eschatological tension of the believer’s life and coincident with this the basic structure of Paul’s ethics: vv. 1–11 represent the ‘already’ of the new creation and the indicative of Paul’s theology, a thoroughly dogmatic section; vv. 12–23, on the other hand, represent the ‘not yet’ of eschatological salvation and the imperative of Paul’s ethics. This exhortatory section has a dual inner necessity in Paul’s logic: it is not only rendered essential by the preceding indicative section, but is also necessitated by the believer’s existence being ‘between the times.’

We have now seen that imperative and indicative are inseparably linked to each other in Paul’s thought. Romans 6 provides a model example of this interrelationship. In the apostle’s thought the imperative is founded or based upon the indicative, as a logical inference from it. But more than this, it is also fully integral to the indicative, implicit in it. Paul regards the imperative as a constitutive element of the indicative. Expressed in another way, for him obedience is constitutive of the new life. The life that Christians are to live is in fact the life of Christ himself; by virtue of their union with the obedient Christ, the indwelling Spirit of Christ produces the fruit of righteousness within the believer (cf. Rom 8:9–13). Yet, as we saw, the Christian’s obedience is not presumed to be a spontaneous result of that union; it is for Paul as much the active responsibility of the believer to resist sin and the powers of the old aeon. Hence, while the indicative (what is already) has a certain finality about it that is independent of the imperative—yet, in view of the ‘ultimate indicative’ at the resurrection of the dead (what will be), also a

¹ WEBSTER, 'Imitation of Christ,' 113.
certain unfinishedness—Paul intends that the imperative be regarded with equal seriousness.

In this way the necessity for the imperative may also be seen as a result of the eschatological tension experienced by Christians living between the 'already' and the 'not yet.' While believers have been freed from the old dominion and experience new life in Christ, the old age still exerts its influence upon them. Christians who once were 'body of sin' are now 'mortal body' and still struggle with sin in their lives, and are still subject to physical death. But they await the future redemption of the body, when they will become 'glorified body.' Thus the imperative must be seen as an 'interim ethic' for the time between the inauguration of salvation and its fulfilment in the future resurrection. At the final consummation of the eschatological process set in motion by Christ's death and resurrection the imperative will lose the place it now has in the believer's life. Hence in Paul's eschatological schema the indicative of the death and resurrection of Christ (and the believer's participation in those events with Christ) which creates the new life both enables and requires the imperative of obedience until the ultimate indicative in the final revelation of God's glory. For Paul continuity between the primary and ultimate indicatives is also provided by the Holy Spirit who indwells the mortal body and helps work out in the believer the new demand of righteousness, the imperative that is part of new life in Christ.

Therefore by means of the motif of death and resurrection with Christ, Paul demonstrates that the change of aeons effected by the salvific events and the new life experienced by believers who have shared in Christ's death have certain ethical implications and consequences for the Christian. The apostle who asserts that believers have died with Christ to sin and no longer live in its dominion (Rom 6:2, 8) can thus demand of believers now 'alive to God in Christ Jesus' (v. 11) with an inner necessity, first negatively, 'do not let sin reign in your mortal body ... and do not go on using the members of your body to serve sin' (vv. 12-13a), then positively, 'but present
yourselves to God ... and your members as weapons of righteousness to serve God’ (v. 13b). In his understanding, the death and resurrection of Christ, in which believers participate, therefore constitute the integrating structure of Christian existence and the essential basis of Christian ethics.
7. Resurrection with Christ: Accomplished Fact or Object of Expectation?

Much of our study to this point has dealt with the death of Christ and participation of believers in that death (i.e. their death with Christ); that indeed has been the main focus of Rom 6:2–11. From that basis Paul makes his main point that believers have been set free from the old dominion of sin, and then goes on to speak of the implications for the Christian life both for the present and for the future. But these implications are particularly drawn out by Paul in connection with the resurrection of Christ and the relation of believers to that event. We saw this in the previous section. Paul’s ethics have two essential bases: the new life and status of believers—derived from the resurrection life of Christ—and their existence ‘between the times’ as they await their future resurrection with Christ. It is already evident that in Romans 6 Paul does not speak of participation in Christ’s resurrection in quite the same way as he speaks of dying with Christ. The latter is seen as having taken place in the past, whereas the former is put in the future tense (vv. 5b, 8b) or expressed in language that carefully avoids explicit reference to any past tense aspect of such participation (vv. 4c and 11b respectively speak only of Christians walking in ‘newness of life’ or as being ‘alive to God in Christ Jesus’). It is now our task to determine precisely what Paul means by these references to resurrection or (resurrection) life inasmuch as they apply to believers.

In this section we examine in more detail Paul’s treatment of resurrection with Christ in Romans 6. This will include seeking to resolve the extent to which believers participate in the resurrection or resurrection-life of Christ in past, present and future tenses of salvation, and considering this from Paul’s eschatological perspective. After this will follow a brief discussion of pertinent insights from Moltmann’s Theology of Hope into the meaning of Christ’s resurrection that articulate well the implications of Paul’s thought in Romans 6.

---

1 See the previous discussion of these verses on pp. 42–43 and pp. 57–60 above respectively.
(a) Resurrection with Christ in Romans 6:1–11

In Romans 6:1–11 four verses are related directly or indirectly to the idea of resurrection with Christ (vv. 4bc, 5b, 8b, 11b). In two of them Paul’s characteristic *συν-* formulation is used: believers who have become united with *(σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν)* the form of Christ’s death (v. 5a) ‘will certainly also be [united with the form] of [Christ’s] resurrection’ *(ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐκόμισα; v. 5b);* and, again, those who have died with Christ (v. 8a) may believe *(πιστεύομεν)* that [since this is true, therefore] they ‘shall also live with him’ *(καὶ συζήσομεν αἷμα; v. 8b). It is important to note that both of these references employ the future tense. In the other two verses Paul speaks of believers having been set to ‘walk in newness of life’ *(καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν; v. 4c)* and commands them to regard themselves as ‘alive to God in Christ Jesus’ *(ζῶντας ... τῷ θεῷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ισορρ.; v. 11b)*.

Both of the latter two references refer to a present experience of new ‘life.’ In the purpose clause of v. 4bc Paul clearly compares and links *(ὡσπερ ... σύντοι καὶ)* Christ’s resurrection with the new life experienced by Christians who have been baptized into Christ’s death: ‘just as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we too might walk in newness of life.’ It has already been observed that the ‘newness of life’ is to be thought of as derivative from Christ’s resurrection-life. But is it (together with the being ‘alive to God in Christ Jesus’ in v. 11b) an indicator that Paul regards Christians as in some sense having *already* been raised with Christ, or as participating in Christ’s resurrection-life in an on-going way in the *present*? An affirmative answer to this question, if permissible, must be carefully qualified because of the explicit future tense of resurrection with Christ in vv. 5 and 8; while Paul could have employed past (aorist), present or perfect tenses in those verses, he does not. One might

---

1 It is almost certain that *σύμφυτοι ... τῷ ὑποχόματι* is intended to be supplied in v. 5b with τῆς ἀναστάσεως. Despite the absence of ἀντικροντι, ἀνάστασις is certainly Christ’s resurrection. So most commentators.

2 At the beginning of v. 8 *καί* has the force of ‘since.’ Thus most commentators.
ask, however, should the future tenses be taken as genuine or temporal futures, or as logical futures? I will argue that they must be genuine futures. If this is correct, why then does Paul express such reservation about resurrection with Christ in the past or present, when death with Christ is repeatedly mentioned as a past event? Why is it that Paul appears to be implying, in some measure, a past resurrection with Christ—certainly a present sharing in Christ's resurrection-life—yet states explicitly that resurrection with Christ is still future? What is his understanding of the believer's resurrection with Christ? Such questions raise some crucial issues for understanding in Romans 6 the Pauline motif of dying and rising with Christ in its resurrection aspect. Consideration of Paul's thought in the passage within his overall eschatological framework will help provide us with some answers.

Significantly, participation in the resurrection of Christ is not mentioned in v. 4 as an effect of baptism. In v. 5, however, it is predicated on participation in Christ's death (ἀναστήσει ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν in the apodosis expresses the certainty that union with the form of Christ's death will mean union with the form of Christ's resurrection). This connection between dying with Christ and being raised with Christ is then reiterated by Paul in v. 8 with the purpose there of drawing out the significance of that connection as seen in the light of the nature of Christ's own death and resurrection (vv. 9-10).1 Because Christ died, was raised from death, and now lives to God, believers are assured in v. 8 that since it is true they have died with Christ, they will therefore also live with him. Thus according to Paul participation in Christ's resurrection is made possible only because of one's participation in Christ's death, and not as a direct result of baptism. The certain connection between the death of believers with Christ and their resurrection with Christ is, in Paul's understanding, solidly grounded upon the inseparable bond between Christ's death and resurrection.

---

1 Moo, Romans 1–8, 395.
As already mentioned, participation in the resurrection of Christ is put in the future tense (ἐσομαι, v. 5b; cf. συζητομεν, v. 8b). Is this to be regarded as a logical future, as some would suggest? In favour of that is the reference to walking in ‘newness of life’ in v. 4, and also the present participle ζωντας in v. 11. These show that life is awarded to the believer on the basis of the resurrection—the context of v. 4 particularly shows that this life is somehow derivative from Christ’s resurrection. As previously seen, the term ‘newness of life’ in v. 4c indicates the new era or aeon of salvation that has come with the inauguration of the new covenant, in which ‘life’ has been conferred, enabling believers to live a new kind of life. However, while vv. 4 & 11 therefore suggest that some sense of a past or present participation in Christ’s resurrection or resurrection-life might be implicit in Paul’s thought, they do not necessarily indicate that he had in mind a past resurrection with Christ in the same way as, in the text, he speaks explicitly of a past death with Christ. Thus on the basis of these verses alone the case for seeing logical futures in vv. 5b & 8b remains unproven.

Those who believe Paul intends the future tenses to be taken logically also point to references in Ephesians and Colossians that speak of rising with Christ as an accomplished past event (Eph 2:5-6; Col 3:1-4; and especially Col 2:11-13, which explicitly refers to baptism). However, due to unresolved issues concerning the authorship of these epistles, it is not possible to make a definitive claim about any support they offer to seeing logical futures in vv. 5b & 8b. Irrespective of who wrote Colossians and Ephesians, a good case can be made for regarding the above mentioned texts within these epistles as legitimate developments of Paul’s thought in Romans 6.

1 Those seeing a logical future here include LLOYD-JONES, Romans: The New Man, 57-58, 94-98; SCHNACKENBURG, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 38 (though contrast pp. 41-42 on v. 8); MOO, ‘Rom 6:1-14,’ 216, 218 (but contrast his later view in Romans 1-8, 388, 395). MURRAY (Romans, 219, cf. p. 223) and CRANFIELD (Romans Vol 1, 307-308, cf. pp. 312-313) see ἐσομαι in v. 5b as conveying certainty in an ethical sense, but this is improbable here.

2 On this see pp. 67 n. 4 & 101 n. 2 above.

3 In particular, Col 2:12-13 is regarded by most scholars as a later elaboration upon Romans 6 (see WEDDERBURN, Baptism and Resurrection, 72-73 & nn. 1-2; cf. MOO. Romans 1-8, 388 n. 60). Thus TANNEHILL’s assertion (Dying and Rising, 10) that Colossians 2 represents a more primitive form of baptismal teaching than does Romans 6 is most probably incorrect (see further pp. 32-33
If this is so (and the more so if they are not genuinely Pauline), it is methodologically invalid to use their data in support of seeing exactly the same concepts in Rom 6:1-11, expressed albeit in a different way. While they could help confirm the reasonableness of such a position, the data in Romans 6 itself must be decisive.

Construing the tenses as a real or genuine futures has better support from the text. First there is Paul’s hesitation to mention explicitly participation in the resurrection in v. 4. Secondly, had he wanted (in v. 5 or in v. 8) to express a sharing in Christ’s resurrection as something which had already taken place or was already in effect, he could have used an aorist, present or perfect tense. Thirdly, we may note that the future tense in v. 8 is made clearer by the addition of πιστεύωμεν, showing that life with Christ is an object of faith, not of sight. And finally, v. 9 continues the thought of v. 8 by referring to Christ’s release from the dominion of death through his resurrection, something believers clearly have not yet experienced. Therefore the future tenses in both vv. 5 and 8 are best understood as being eschatological or genuine futures. Most likely Paul has in mind the outworking of that epoch-introducing event, Christ’s resurrection, in the resurrection of the dead. The implied mention of a future union with the ‘form of [Christ’s] resurrection’ in v. 5b ([συμφωνεῖ τῷ ὁμοίωματι] τῆς ἀναστάσεως [αὐτοῦ] ἐσώμεθα) indicates that believers will then be fully conformed to the exalted Christ, having bodies that have been transformed into his image, taking on the same form as the resurrected and glorified Lord (cf. Rom 8:29; 2 Cor 3:18; Phil 3:21). As in v. 8b, Paul is evidently referring to the physical resurrection of believers ‘with Christ’ when God will transform their earthly bodies ‘making them conformed to the body of his [Christ’s] glory’ (συμμορφωθεῖ τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ; Phil 3:21).

---

1 Dunn, Romans 1-8, 318, 322; Tannehill, Dying and Rising, 10-11; Bornkamm, 'Baptism and New Life,' 78; Morris, Romans, 250; Käsemann, Romans, 169; Moo, Romans 1-8, 388, 395.
2 Dunn, Romans 1-8, 318; Moo, Romans 1-8, 388-389, 395; cf. Thüsing, Per Christum in Deum, 70.
3 See further pp. 49-50 above.
4 So Moo, Romans 1-8, 388 and most commentators.
Christians have yet to participate in that future resurrection from the dead, even though its power already rules them and sets them in the new walk.\(^1\)

As mentioned above, it is this present 'walk in newness of life' of v. 4 that permits us to say that in some sense the believer has already risen to new life. It would be reasonable then to posit that a past resurrection might be implicit in Paul’s thought, although his understanding of that would be a nuanced one since he speaks explicitly of rising with Christ as still future.\(^2\) It is certainly a logical deduction that if someone has died with Christ to sin and is now experiencing 'new life' then the intervening step to take that one from death to life must be some sort of resurrection,\(^3\) even if not in the fullest sense of what resurrection can and ultimately will mean.\(^4\) As Bornkamm further explains, 'God has indeed opened for us the possibility of new life in baptism, or in the resurrection. He has done even more: he has opened the reality of “life,” but this “life” is still hidden by lowliness and dying, a paradoxical reality, based entirely on faith (v. 8). Its revelation is the object of expectation.'\(^5\) Similarly, Tannehill writes, 'Paul chooses to speak of participation in Christ’s new life only as something which is now in progress as part of a life open to the attacks of the powers of the old dominion.'\(^6\)

Thus the Christian finds him or herself in the middle of an eschatological tension created by the epochal events of Christ’s death and resurrection, between a salvation process that has thus been inaugurated, but awaits its future fulfilment.\(^7\) Resurrection with Christ in Paul is primarily future oriented, being closely linked to the resurrection of believers from the dead. However, in a sense, that future resurrection with Christ is partially

---

\(^1\) KäSEMANN, Romans, 169; THÜRING, Per Christum in Deum, 71.

\(^2\) Cf. TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 10; MORRIS, Romans, 250; BEASLEY-MURRAY, Baptism in the New Testament, 155; MOO, Romans 1–8, 388; HARRIS, Raised Immortal, 104. Certainly, this does not mean, in the heretical terms of 2 Tim 2:18, that the resurrection is 'past already'!

\(^3\) See p. 7 above.

\(^4\) Cf. HARRIS, Raised Immortal, 103–104.

\(^5\) BORNKAMM, 'Baptism and New Life,' 78.

\(^6\) TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 11; cf. BEKER, Paul the Apostle, 217.

\(^7\) Cf. DUNN, Romans 1–8, 331–333.
realized in the believer’s experience in that Christians participate in and share the resurrection-life of Christ now. It may be possible to infer also that there is a logically prior sense in which believers participated in the very event of Christ’s resurrection, just as, in Paul’s thought, they died with Christ when he died. However, whereas the past death of believers with Christ was a decisive and complete participation in that event (though with ongoing consequences), any sense of a past rising with Christ in the event of his resurrection can only be regarded as partial in nature, a foretaste of its complete and final fulfilment in the eschatological resurrection from the dead. The unresolved eschatological tension created by this remains unresolved until the time of the final resurrection, when the fullness of resurrection-life will be experienced by all believers.

A distinction between ‘spiritual’ and ‘spiritual-somatic’ resurrection may help clarify the foregoing. For Paul the future resurrection with Christ (involving the resurrection of the dead) in its completeness is clearly both spiritual and somatic (cf. 1 Cor 15:44 where the resurrection body is described as σώμα πνευματικόν). Therefore, any sense of a past (partial) resurrection with Christ (which unquestionably cannot be somatic) can be understood as being only spiritual in nature.

Perhaps the reason why Paul carefully avoids in Romans 6 explicit mention of a past participation in Christ’s resurrection is to guard against the presumption of considering the eschatological fulfilment of being raised with Christ as being presently fulfilled. This was a difficulty he had to deal with at Corinth (cf. 1 Cor 4:8). Here he does assert that the believer participates in the new life now and is to walk in that newness of life. To say anything further than that, however, could lead his readers to a smug self-satisfaction, inimical to his purpose in the passage of countering a false antinomianism. Additionally, Paul’s use of the motif of dying and rising with Christ elsewhere shows

1 Cf. HARRIS, Raised Immortal, 104; GAFFIN, Centrality of the Resurrection, 46–50.
2 Cf. GAFFIN, Centrality of the Resurrection, 60–62, 67–68; HARRIS, Raised Immortal, 98–114. However, since both tenses of resurrection are spiritual, the spiritual nature of the past resurrection with Christ must, therefore, possess a degree of 'uncompleteness.'
that he regards participation in the death of Christ as a present reality also (e.g. 2 Cor 4:7-12; 13:4; Phil 3:10b), and this rules out any overrealized eschatology or spirituality in which there is a notion of complete present participation in the resurrection.¹

Let us draw together, then, the positive things Paul has to say about the believer’s future resurrection with Christ, supplementing this with a summary look at Paul’s teaching elsewhere. It has already been pointed out that the reference in v. 5b to believers being united (in the future) with the ‘form’ of Christ’s resurrection indicates that they will then be fully conformed to the exalted Christ, taking on the same form as the resurrected Lord. This is reaffirmed later in the text where, in the context of a prototype provided by Christ’s resurrection and resurrection-life in vv. 9-10, the \( \sigma\nu\nu \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omega \) of v. 8 indicates the destiny to which believers will be conformed. It is significant that, for Paul, such is the solidarity of believers with Christ in the events of his death and resurrection that he can not only say that believers have died \( \sigma\nu\nu \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omega \), but that their future resurrection will take place \( \sigma\nu\nu \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omega \) as well. The absolute certainty that believers who have died with Christ will be raised with Christ is shown both by Paul’s grammatical constructions (\( \varepsilon\iota\ldots \ \dd\lambda\lambda\alpha \ \kappa\alpha\i [v. 5]; \varepsilon\iota\ldots \ \pi\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\omega\mu\epsilon\nu \ \omicron \ \kappa\alpha\i [v. 8] \)) and also by the way he links what Christians will experience with the inseparable connection between the death of Christ and the resurrection of Christ.²

For Paul the goal of the process of assimilation to Christ’s death (cf. v. 5a) is the future resurrection of the dead, the redemption of the body (cf. Rom 8:11, 23; Phil 3:10-11, 21). Though a somatic resurrection is not mentioned in vv. 1-11, that Paul has this in mind when he refers to the eschatological resurrection of believers is made clear in other places (particularly, 1 Cor 15:35-54; 2 Cor 5:1-10; cf. also the references just cited). At this time, mortality will be swallowed up by (resurrection) life

¹ SCHWEIZER, ‘Dying and Rising,’ 8; TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 11-12. Cf. Rom 8:18-25 which demonstrates that aspects of redemption are yet to happen.
² Cf. DUNN, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, 143.
(2 Cor 5:4) and the body of each believer will be transformed into conformity to ‘the body of [Christ’s] glory’ (σώματα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ; Phil 3:21), thus putting on immortality and imperishability (1 Cor 15:51–54). Believers will behold the final defeat and abolition of death (1 Cor 15:23–26, 28, 50–57) and, indeed, will participate in the final and ultimate reversal of the death brought into the world through Adam’s sin: ‘as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive’ (1 Cor 15:22).

Having been ‘made alive’ at this future resurrection (of the dead) with Christ, the outcome is that believers will then ‘live’ with Christ (Rom 6:8b), fully ‘alive to God’ (Rom 6:11; cf. v. 10), enjoying the dynamic ongoing experience of fully sharing Christ’s resurrection—life—*with him!* It is helpful to consider what Paul envisages this future ‘life’ with Christ will be like. Although not stated in Rom 6:1-11, elsewhere we find it to be something both dynamic and eternal—a fullness of life—described by him in various ways as: ‘being glorified with’ Christ (συνδόξασθοῦμεν; Rom 8:17; cf. 2 Cor 3:6–11); always ‘being with the Lord’ (σὺν κυρίῳ ἐκόμεθα; 1 Thess 4:17; 2 Cor 5:8; Phil 1:23); ‘seeing face to face’ (1 Cor 13:12; cf. 2 Cor 5:7); perfect knowledge and the abiding of faith, hope and love (1 Cor 13:12–13); and fullness of righteousness, peace and joy (Rom 14:17).

This future resurrection—life sets the horizon toward which the believer is destined to become conformed by the eschatological power of the resurrection of Christ. The believer’s resurrection—life thus awaits its qualitative fulfilment and state of completeness in his or her resurrection with Christ—at the final resurrection of the dead.

---

1 On what ‘life’ means to Paul, see further the introductory discussion of pp. 7–9 above.
2 For some of the above I am indebted to L. K. ‘Life,’ 481–482.
(b) The Resurrection and the Future of Jesus Christ

In his *Theology of Hope* Moltmann puts forward several ideas germane to a treatment of resurrection with Christ. His powerful interpretation helpfully captures and articulates the implications of Paul's thinking in Romans 6. I propose to outline here key concepts from Moltmann's work that bear upon the present discussion.¹

At the outset of his influential treatise Moltmann states his basic thesis: 'From first to last, and not merely in the epilogue, Christianity is eschatology, is hope, forward looking and forward moving, and therefore also revolutionizing and transforming the present.'² Christian hope is hope in the God 'who raises the dead and calls into being the things which are not' (Rom 4:17) and looks from the promise given in the raising of the crucified Christ towards the future which will correspond to this. For Moltmann the resurrection of Jesus Christ is the central eschatological event in history: Christian eschatology 'sets out from a definite reality in history [the raising of Jesus] and announces the future of that reality, its future possibilities and its power over the future.'³ Thus Christian eschatology 'is at heart Christology in an eschatological perspective.' It speaks of 'Jesus Christ and his future'; it is related in content to the person of Jesus of Nazareth and the event of his raising and the future it speaks of is grounded in this person and this event.⁴

Moltmann believes the resurrection of Christ 'has set in motion an eschatologically determined process of history, whose goal is the annihilation of death in the victory of the life of the resurrection.'⁵ It has an 'inner tendency'—'for he must

---


² MOLTMANN, *Theology of Hope*, 16.

³ MOLTMANN, *Theology of Hope*, 17 (italics mine).

⁴ MOLTMANN, *Theology of Hope*, 17, 192.

⁵ MOLTMANN, *Theology of Hope*, 163.
reign ...' (1 Cor 15:25)—toward the future lordship of the risen Christ over every enemy, including death, until it finds rest in 'the resurrection of the dead and a totality of new being.' Thus the resurrection of Christ, for Moltmann, 'makes history'; it is 'the promise of that which is not yet, and for that reason it makes history. The promise which announces the eschaton, and in which the eschaton announces itself, is the motive power, the mainspring, the driving force and the torture of history.'

Further to this eschatological understanding of the event of Christ's resurrection, Moltmann correctly observes that Paul speaks of the participation of believers in the resurrection in the future tense, and notes that Paul's eschatological thinking 'always combines the perfect tense of the raising of Jesus with the future tense of the eschatological future.' Thus the future resurrection of believers with Christ finds its ground and cause in Christ's own resurrection from the dead. The former is nothing but the necessary outworking of the eschatological power inherent in the latter event.

But in case his interpretation of Paul should be misrepresented as being wholly concerned with Christ's resurrection and its future, Moltmann is careful to stress that 'the risen Christ is and remains the crucified Christ.' He argues that Paul's polemic against an overrealized eschatology, such as he encountered at Corinth, is marked with two focal points, which Moltmann sums up as an eschatological crucis: a new recognition of a truly futurist eschatology, an 'eschatological proviso' which he maintains against such a fulfilment ecstasy; and a new recognition of the cross of Christ, opposing an ecstatic abandonment of the earth on which the cross stands.

1 MOLTMANN, Theology of Hope, 194.
2 MOLTMANN, Theology of Hope, 196.
3 MOLTMANN, Theology of Hope, 165.
4 MOLTMANN, Theology of Hope, 161.
5 MOLTMANN, Theology of Hope, 162 n. 1.
6 MOLTMANN, Theology of Hope, 171; cf. pp. 197–202; and also his Crucified God, 160, written eight years after Theology of Hope, which provides further balance should the earlier work be seen as too one-sided.
7 MOLTMANN, Theology of Hope, 160.
Such an analysis is altogether compatible with Paul's thought in Romans 6. It highlights Paul's view of the death and resurrection of Christ as corporate eschatological events that affect the destiny of all who belong to Christ. It correlates with Paul's reference to the 'form' (óμοίωμα) of Christ's death and resurrection (Rom 6:5), which shows that the death and resurrection of Christ are continuing aspects of the 'form' of Christ and have an ongoing, transforming impact upon the lives of believers.

Moltmann has also powerfully expressed the essential argument of Rom 6:8–10, which shows the absolute certainty that believers will live 'with Christ' in the future. As Christ was raised from the dead and now lives to God, so too those who have died with Christ can believe they will also live with him. For Paul this is more than a trustworthy divine promise; it is an eschatological necessity—an irreversible eschatological process has been set in motion.

Correspondingly, Moltmann has well understood the eschatological tension created by the believer's past death with Christ, present partial sharing in the resurrection-life of Christ and the still future resurrection with Christ, involving the resurrection from the dead and full or complete participation in Christ's resurrection-life.¹ For Moltmann, the resurrection of Christ creates history, a history that remains unfulfilled until the promised resurrection from the dead and the redemption of all things.²

(c) Conclusions

It is significant that Paul does not speak in Romans 6 of resurrection with Christ as an accomplished fact or past event. Rather, he uses a genuine (not logical) future tense, referring to the resurrection from the dead as the final outworking of the eschatological

¹ MOLTLMANN also correctly sees this eschatological tension as being reflected in Paul's ethics (see pp. 126–127 above).
event of Christ's resurrection when they will then be fully conformed to the glory of the exalted Christ.

However, this being so, it may be inferred that believers have already risen to new life, in that Paul speaks of believers being set to walk in newness of life (v. 4c) and as participating in that new life in the present (v. 11b), and logically resurrection is the necessary bridge between a state of death and life. But such a view would be open to serious misunderstanding if taken in an overrealized way as though there was no further aspect of resurrection with Christ to be fulfilled. That would run counter to Paul's purpose in the passage of opposing a false antinomianism. This potential for misunderstanding on his readers' part helps explain the guarded nature of his language (i.e. his use of the future tense, but avoidance of aorist, present or perfect tenses) concerning resurrection with Christ. Perhaps, then, one may see the reference to walking in newness of life as a proleptic sharing in the power of the future resurrection with Christ. It is certainly to be seen as derivative from Christ's resurrection-life. However, if a past participation in Christ's resurrection or present participation in his resurrection-life is implicit in Paul's thought, it is clearly to be regarded as only a partial (and spiritual) participation for, though believers have been delivered from the power of sin that rules the old dominion, they still find themselves subject to the attacks of the powers of the old dominion, notably the power of death.

Paul conceives of the future resurrection from the dead as both a spiritual and somatic resurrection with Christ, involving the redemption of the body and conformation to the body of Christ's glory. In putting on immortality and imperishability believers will then be utterly free from the power of death. They will enjoy a fullness of life with Christ that will be dynamic and eternal—a state of completeness in Christ.

In the meantime, however, believers find themselves in a state of eschatological tension, a tension that will only be resolved at the yet future resurrection from the dead.
Nevertheless, an inexorable, irreversible eschatological process has been set in motion by Christ’s resurrection. The inseparable connection between the death and subsequent resurrection of Christ means the future resurrection of believers with Christ is both necessary and inevitable. The grammatical constructions in vv. 5, 8 and Paul’s portrayal of Christ as a prototype to which believers will be conformed (vv. 8–10) show his certainty in this. It is worth repeating also that resurrection with Christ is for Paul predicated upon prior participation in Christ’s death, and is not seen in any way as an effect of baptism. The essential solidarity of believers with Christ, in his understanding, is evident in that they have not only died σιν Χριστοῦ but will rise σιν Χριστοῦ as well; for Paul both inauguration and consummation occur in union with Christ. These events also set for believers the eschatological boundaries of the period in between the promise of resurrection–life with Christ and its fulfilment.

In Moltmann’s terms the future is none other than the future of Jesus Christ; his resurrection from the dead ‘creates history’ and ultimately results in the resurrection of the dead and the new creation at the end of this age. Believers are caught up into this history, through their past death with Christ and the concrete realization of this in faith and baptism, and in their present experiences of dying and rising with Christ. Ultimately the history of Christ becomes the destiny of the believer, which finds its fulfilment in future resurrection with Christ and complete participation in his resurrection–life.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS


In this final chapter, we will draw together the main threads of our investigation of Romans 6 to see how it has fulfilled the aims that were outlined in the introduction.1 Particular emphasis will be given to a confirmation of the participatory nature of Paul's language in the case of Rom 6:1–14, to explaining the relationship between past, present and future aspects of the motif and discussing what unifies them in Paul's thought. Then we will consider where the present study points in terms of a more comprehensive treatment of death and resurrection with Christ in Paul.

(a) Romans 6:1–14 and Interpretation of the Motif

What has been accomplished in the foregoing study? In the introduction (§. 1) we discussed the meaning and importance of dying and rising with Christ and examined the 'death,' 'resurrection' and 'life' terminology, which, together with Paul's λέγει language (surveyed in the appendix below), provide the linguistic vehicles for Paul to express the complex pattern of thought we have identified as the motif of death and resurrection with Christ. In that section we also noted some of the key contributions to the interpretation of this motif in Paul and commented upon the fundamental importance of Rom 6:1–14 for understanding the motif elsewhere in the Pauline homologoumena.

After discussion of the eschatological framework undergirding Paul's thought, including his corporate and inclusive understanding of Christ and his death and resurrection (§. 2), we then turned to the task of exegeting Rom 6:1–14, beginning with vv. 1–11 (§. 3). Although this third section represented the most sustained exegesis in the study, a topical approach was employed in Chapters II to IV to assist in making Paul's thought more

---

1 See p. 18 above.
accessible. Thus Section 3 covered the basic idea of union with Christ, considering the
events of Christ's death and resurrection and the relationship of the believer's dying and
rising with Christ to those events, focussing in particular upon past participation with
Christ in his death. Chapters III & IV then examined death and resurrection with Christ
in the believer's experience, exploring in turn the topics of baptism into Christ's death
(vv. 3-4; §. 4), the believer's faith (implicit in Romans 6) and death and resurrection
with Christ (§. 5), the ethics of dying and rising with Christ (vv. 12-14; §. 6) and the
largely future (yet-to-be-experienced) aspect of resurrection with Christ (vv. 4c, 5b,
8b, 11b; §. 7). In this way a detailed and comprehensive explication of the motif of
death and resurrection with Christ as found in Rom 6:1-14 has been provided by the
present work.

We are now in a position to confirm some of the points made in the introduction
concerning the significance of Rom 6:1-14 for study of the motif in Paul.1 The passage
is clearly the most extended treatment of the motif in the writings attributed to the
apostle.2 It has the highest concentration of Paul's ὀμν ἄρωταί language (vv. 4a, 5a,
[5b], 6a, 8a, 8b)3 among his epistles. We have seen that the focus of Rom 6:1-14 is
upon explicating the meaning of the motif, that is, upon the believer's union with Christ
in his death and resurrection and the effect of this on one's status in Christ, and one's
life and Christian experience. In observing this we have also encountered Paul's
profound understanding of the death and resurrection of Christ as corporate, inclusive
and eschatological events. We have seen, too, that both components of death and
resurrection with Christ are present in the passage, as well as all three tenses of the
motif—past, present and future. The past aspect of the motif is particularly important for
Paul, since in his thought it provides the basis for the present and future aspects. Thus
the full scope of the motif, including its most foundational aspect, is comprehended
within Rom 6:1-14.

1 See pp. 16-18 above.
2 Cf. the other texts where the motif is present (see p. 15-16 & 15 n. 4 above).
3 A ὀμν- compound is implicit in v. 5b (see p. 133 n. 1 above).
Certainly not all of the different facets of the motif are explicitly mentioned in Rom 6:1-14, but of those not stated, all have distinct theological links with the passage and can be said to be prepared for in the theology of the passage. For example, Romans 6 contains no reference to suffering with Christ, and yet a foundation for this is laid in v. 5a, which speaks of an ongoing process of conformity to Christ's death. The theme of power through weakness is also absent; however, v. 4 speaks of the presence of new life amidst such an ongoing conformity to Christ's death, which is conceptually very close. The Lord's Supper is not mentioned, although baptism is given explicit treatment in vv. 3-4 and, significantly, both sacraments have to do with participation in the death of Christ. Similarly, Paul does not speak of the Spirit in the passage, let alone relate the Spirit to participation in Christ's resurrection; but the reference to 'newness of life' in v. 4 is very similar to the reference to 'newness of Spirit' in Rom 7:6, and Paul's teaching on the Spirit in Romans 8 (particularly vv. 9-17) is well prepared for by chapter 6.

Thus Rom 6:1-14, while being significant for Pauline theology as a whole, is especially so for interpretation of the motif of death and resurrection with Christ. The present investigation therefore provides the essential groundwork for further exploration and study of the motif in the many passages in which it appears outside of Romans 6. Further, if the deuto-Pauline (and pastoral) epistles do indeed represent a development of Paul's thought, then interpretation of the motif in these epistles should only be attempted after it has first been understood in the passage we have now studied.

---

1 For the following, see the specific texts mentioned on p. 112 above.

2 In fact, no text in Paul's writings explicitly links the Spirit to 'resurrection with Christ,' but a good case can be made for the contention that such a theological link existed in his thought (cf. Gal 5:24-25). Unfortunately space does not permit this to be demonstrated here; although cf. G. D. Fee, God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994) 499-501; SCHNACKENBURG, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 164; TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 79-82.
(b) Paul’s Participatory $\sigma\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu$ Language

The $\sigma\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu$ expression and its equivalents, together with the related $\sigma\nu\nu$-compound verbs and nouns, represent the main vehicle with which Paul expresses the motif of death and resurrection with Christ. In the appendix below a survey of this language is provided. With the proviso that context be determinative in each case, the survey suggests that Paul understands the $\sigma\nu\nu$-terminology in essentially participatory terms, as a participation with Christ in his history, which for Paul means primarily Christ’s death and resurrection. To what extent has that been evident in the foregoing study? As already mentioned Paul’s $\sigma\nu\nu$-language appears in the text of Rom 6:1-14 five times explicitly (vv. 4a, 5a, 6a, 8a, 8b) and once in an implicit reference (v. 5b). I propose to summarize here exegetical conclusions concerning those references that give weight to interpreting the $\sigma\nu\nu$-language, and indeed the motif of death and resurrection with Christ, in participationist terms.

Naturally, the aforementioned references must be interpreted in the context in which Rom 6:1-14 appears. We saw in Section 2 that Rom 5:12-21 provides support for seeing Christ in corporate and inclusive terms and suggested that his death and resurrection were also to be seen in corporate and inclusive terms. Corporate thought appears in Romans 6 in the concept of the ‘old person’ that is crucified with Christ (v. 6) and the corresponding, though not mentioned, ‘new person’—the corporate body of the new aeon in solidarity with Christ. It is strengthened by the language of incorporation in vv. 3-4, where believers are said to be incorporated (by baptism) into Christ (εἰς Ἡρστούν) and into his death (εἰς Ἐν ἀνάλογον, or locally), and also by the inclusion language of v. 11, where believers are regarded as being alive to God ‘in Christ’ (ἐν Ἡρστού; with ἐν being taken in a both a local and instrumental sense). That Christ’s death is a corporate event in which believers are included is also evident in 2 Cor 5:14: ‘one died for all, therefore all died.’ Therefore, if believers are regarded by Paul as being included in the event of Christ’s death, it follows logically that they had
died with him. In other words they have participated with him in his death. Thus Paul’s corporate and inclusive thought is very closely aligned with the concept of participation. This is the context in which we encounter the συν- language of Rom 6:1-14.

It is significant that in each of the references συν is either compounded with or closely linked to a verb of action or, in the case of v. 5, to the realities inaugurated by Christ’s death and resurrection. Believers were ‘buried with’ Christ (v. 4a) and ‘crucified with’ him (v. 6a); they ‘died with Christ’ (v. 8a) and have become ‘united with’ the form of his death (v. 5a). In the future they will be ‘united with’ the form of his resurrection (v. 5b) and will ‘live with’ him (v. 8b). In each case the reference is related to a redemptive action of Christ. Three of the ‘death’ references are among a whole string of aorist verbs in the passage, and two of them in the passive voice (vv. 4a, 6a), emphasizing both the pastness of death with Christ and the divine action involved. It is difficult therefore to take these συν-compounds or the συν Χριστῷ of v. 8a in a non-participatory way. The point is strengthened with the appreciation that for Paul the redemptive events are seen as corporate and inclusive events. A review the previous analysis of these verses confirms that they do indeed exhibit such a participatory character.

In v. 4a συνθάκτητε is closely linked with the idea of incorporation into Christ and his death; the idea of burial is meant to show the decisiveness of this death. Since vv. 3-4 are intended to explain the previous verse where Paul states that believers have died to sin, it is easy to see the notion of participation in the concepts of death and burial. That ‘burial with Christ’ is described as taking place ‘through baptism’ is made explicable when it is understood that Paul is referring both to a past death and burial with Christ.

---

1 The Greek for these phrases is given in p. 62 n. 1 above.
2 See p. 61 & n. 2 above.
when Christ died and was buried and to the concrete manifestation of this death as its eschatological power is realized in the believer's experience through baptism.

The verbal adjective συμφωνοῦντος in v. 5a is best translated 'united with.' With it Paul is saying that believers 'have become united with the form of Christ's death.' We saw that Paul's use of the perfect verb γεγόναμεν implies that 'the form of Christ's death' is a continuing reality within in the new dominion founded upon Christ's death. Believers not only become united but remain united with this new reality. In addition συμφωνοῦντος must be supplied in v. 5b, which speaks of being united with 'the form of Christ's resurrection' in the certain future. Both parts of the verse thereby refer to experiential realities for the believer, now and in the future. As such συμφωνοῦντος can only have a participatory sense here.

Paul's train of thought concerning the union of believers with Christ in his death as the cause of their transfer from the old dominion of sin into the new dominion climaxes in v. 6 with the image of the crucifixion of the 'old person'. Since Paul understands the 'old person' as a corporate body, συνενεκταυρωθή, then, must refer to a corporate participation in Christ's death on the cross.

The fourth use of Paul's συν- language pertaining to Christ's death in the passage is the proper συν Χριστῷ expression of v. 8a: believers have 'died with Christ.' Significantly, it is also paired with a συν- compound in v. 8b, the latter being its inevitable consequence: believers 'will live with him' (συνζησομεν) (cf. v. 5b). This comes in the context of vv. 8-10, which portray Christ as a prototype for believers, showing that what happened to Christ has happened to, and will be the destiny of, believers, both in having died to sin with Christ in the past and in living to God with Christ in the future. With both past and future united by the συν Χριστῷ in this way, it is hard to take the essential solidarity of believers with Christ in anything other than a participatory sense. The future reference is obviously intended as something believers
will actually experience; the past reference, while antecedent to Christian experience, can therefore be no less real: in Paul's thought believers were included in Christ's death and thus participated in it with him.

Thus the text of Rom 6:1-14 provides strong contextual evidence for the assertion that Paul's συν- language is essentially participationist language. The question is, When does participation in Christ's death take place for the believer? At the point of faith or baptism (one's conversion-initiation), or is the participation antecedent to Christian experience? We saw in Section 4 above that Paul's thought is best understood by what I termed a dual perspective approach. That is to say, there are two perspectives operating in his thought. The first is that believers actually died with Christ when he died on the cross: they 'died in Christ's death.' The second is that through baptism and faith this past death with Christ is concretely realized in the believer's experience. Both perspectives can be described as participatory, although it must be stressed that the second is dependent upon the first; without a past participation in Christ's death, its realization in the believer's experience would be impossible. While both perspectives are present in Romans 6, the first perspective is given greater emphasis. This is made clear by the combination of corporate and inclusive thought, the repeated use of aorist (active and passive) verbs and the 'with Christ' language in the passage.

This understanding of Paul's συν- language rules out interpreting it merely in terms of 'fellowship with' Christ, or 'association with' Christ, whether in the believer's experience or prior to it. Paul's συν Χριστo\(\) certainly includes the ideas of fellowship, association and relationship with Christ, but, as we have seen, it cannot convey less than 'participation.' Additionally, it renders as inadequate the designation of the believer's death with Christ as juridical, meaning that God sees or regards believers as if they had died on the cross with Christ. On the contrary, Paul intends us to believe that Christians

---

1 As F. F. Bruce (Galatians, 143) puts it apropos of Gal 2:19-20.
2 Cf. my criticisms of Cranfield in this regard on p. 30 n. 1 and p. 50 n. 4 above. Surprisingly, Wedderburn appears to arrive at such a position in his Baptism and Resurrection, 348-351.
really did participate in Christ’s death when he died. One must also avoid the mistake of those who locate the believer’s ‘withness’ to Christ solely within Christian experience. As Tannehill comments, dying with Christ is misunderstood either ‘when it is thought to mean only that the believer repeats what Christ did’ or when it is ‘dissolved into subjective, mystical experience.’\(^1\) Paul’s thought is more complex than this—the motif of death and resurrection with Christ embraces both a past participation of believers in Christ’s death (and resurrection)—a participation antecedent to Christian experience—as well as participation in his death and resurrection within the life of each believer, not to speak of the future aspect of participation in Christ’s resurrection in the final resurrection from the dead.

Admittedly, it is difficult to understand the concept that twentieth century believers actually participated with Christ in his death on the cross too. The problem for us is that we tend to think in physical, spatial terms; and with those limitations the concept of a past participatory death with Christ is mind-boggling. However, Paul does not intend his readers to conceive of the cross in such a way. Certainly, participation in Christ’s death is not to be taken ontologically. As we have seen it will not do to introduce the modern concept of ‘contemporaneity’ either. Any explanation of the matter must stay within the bounds of what Paul actually says and what can legitimately be inferred as being true to his thought. Unfortunately Paul leaves us without explicit explanation as to how this past death with Christ happened, other than asserting that it really did happen and implying that the participatory ημετέρως συν Χριστῷ is only made possible by the Χριστῷ ὑπὲρ ημῶν (cf. 2 Cor 5:14). The modern reader’s acceptance of this by faith is ultimately no different to believing that events two thousand years ago affect people’s lives today. Our understanding is helped, however, with the realization that

\(^{1}\) TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 70, 71.
Paul's soteriology is essentially a *participationist* soteriology *with* an eschatological undergirding. For the apostle, Christ's death is both a historical event *and* an eschatological one; Christ died once for all at Golgotha, but that death was a corporate and inclusive event. It effected an eschatological change of aeons, bringing about an end to the reign of the old dominion and establishing the new dominion. In Paul's thought all believers were included in this eschatological transfer. We may surmise then that since the cross is an eschatological event it includes and affects believers in an eschatological way. Although he does not provide further elucidation it is clear that for Paul the past participation of believers with Christ in his death on the cross is an eschatological, or perhaps one could say spiritual, reality. This reality enables also an existential 'withness' in Christ's death (and resurrection) in the believer's life through faith and baptism and, although not examined in the present study, in Christian experience of suffering and weakness.

This brings us to considering the important issue of the interrelationship between past, present and future aspects of death and resurrection with Christ.

(c) The Inherent Unity of the Three Tenses of the Motif

The preceding discussion has highlighted some of the main concepts necessary for understanding how the motif's three tenses are related. Not surprisingly, the underlying factor is to be found in Paul's eschatology. This provides for him the framework within which his participationist soteriology is outlined. Paul conceives of Christ's death and resurrection as corporate and inclusive eschatological events. As eschatological, and not merely historical, events they set in motion within history an eschatologically determined process, which reaches its fulfilment and consummation at the end of the age in the final resurrection of the dead and the new creation of all things. The driving force of this process is not only inherent in the powerful, aeon-shaping events themselves, but also in

---

1 Cf. E. P. SANDERS' phrase, 'participationist eschatology.'
the eschatological tension created by the 'not yet' of the promised and certain future. Only a partial realization of God's salvation in Christ is achieved in the past and present; its fullness for believers lies in the yet future. What maintains the eschatological tension and holds both inauguration and consummation together is, for Paul, the inseparable bond between the death of Christ and the resurrection of Christ. In Paul's thought the history of Jesus Christ will, of necessity, be reproduced in the life of believers; they have died with Christ in his past death and it is their destiny to rise again with him at the future resurrection of the dead. The solidarity of believers with Christ both in the past and in the future is thereby unified by the inseparability of Jesus' death and resurrection. The main difference is the temporary disjunction experienced by believers in between the times.

However, union with Christ in his death and resurrection is also a present experience for believers. The eschatological process mentioned above reaches into and affects the lives of believers, initially through their faith and baptism. Both of these components of 'conversion-initiation' are participatory in nature, but their efficaciousness is due to the prior participation of believers in Christ's death (and resurrection) and the eschatological nature of those events. Unlike baptism, which for Paul is only linked to participation in the death of Christ and not to resurrection with Christ, the participation of the believer's faith in Christ's death and resurrection continues throughout one's life. But dying and rising with Christ is experienced in the ongoing life of Christians (cf. the ongoing conformity to Christ's death spoken of in Rom 6:5a and the presence of 'new life' in v. 4) in other ways, not mentioned in the text of Romans 6, as well. In addition, Paul's own life and apostolic ministry provide an example of what it means to die and rise with Christ on a daily basis (cf. his 'prayer' in Phil 3:10-11).

In terms of resurrection with Christ, it is clear that Paul regards this as primarily a future event. However, mention in the text of the believer walking in 'newness of life'

---

1 Four important examples are given on p. 148 above; see also p. 112 above.
(Rom 6:4) and being ‘alive to God’ (v. 11) provide good grounds for asserting that a (partial) spiritual resurrection with Christ in the past and a partial or proleptic participation in his resurrection-life in the present might be implicit in Paul's thought. If so, he has probably chosen not to express this explicitly in Romans 6 to avoid the danger of his readers falling into some kind of an overrealized eschatology. Had he stated it, he would have carefully qualified it. The future resurrection with Christ, which for Paul includes the somatic resurrection from the dead and conformation to Christ's glory, will enable believers to live with Christ and experience resurrection-life in its eschatological fullness. Hence, while the death aspect of the motif embraces only past and present tenses, resurrection with Christ probably encompasses all three tenses. The believer's past union with Christ provides the foundation and enabling for present participation in Christ's resurrection-life, which, because of its incomplete state, looks forward to future fulfilment in the resurrection of the dead with Christ.

We are well placed, therefore, to complete the summary of the chain of logic behind Paul's soteriology in Romans 6.1 It is now possible to say: (i) Christ died 'for us,' effecting (ii) the believer's participation in that death 'with Christ,' thereby enabling believers (iii) to be incorporated 'into Christ' and into his death, resulting in (iv) the state and experience of being 'in Christ' as corporate person of the new dominion. In the same way believers (v) participated 'with Christ' in his resurrection in a partial, spiritual sense.2 These antecedent or eschatological realities become existentialized or concretely realized in the experience of believers through (vi) their faith and baptism, which together constitute a person's 'conversion-initiation.' This is also regarded as participation with Christ in his death and resurrection (the latter applying only to faith, not baptism), though only by virtue of the redemptive and eschatological power of the salvific events themselves and their corporate and inclusive nature. The past death with Christ also initiates (vii) an ongoing conformity to the death of Christ in the life of the

---

1 Cf. my intermediary summary on pp. 63–64 above.
2 Assuming that this is indeed implicit in Paul's thought. It is not explicit in Romans 6.
believer, in which (and due also to the past, partial resurrection with Christ\(^1\)) (viii) one proleptically (and again only partially) shares in the future resurrection-life, experienced now as 'newness of life' and being 'alive to God.' (Paul speaks elsewhere of the latter two points in terms of suffering with Christ and experiencing God's power through human weakness.) Thus dying and rising with Christ constitute for him the basic structure of the Christian life. Paul intends this to be outworked, with inner necessity, (ix) in the ethical life and behaviour of believers, who find themselves in an eschatological tension, still subject to the powers of the old dominion, including death, but awaiting as a necessary and certain consequence of their past death with Christ (x) the final, future (spiritual-somatic) resurrection from the dead 'with Christ,' thereby completing (xi) a conformation to the resurrection glory of Christ and initiating (xii) the fullness of life 'with Christ' in the age to come.

Death and resurrection with Christ is certainly, therefore, a complex motif in Paul's thought. However, each of its component parts, including past, present and future tense aspects, are closely interrelated and logically connected. The motif is very much a unity for Paul with the past, present and future aspects bound together within an overarching eschatological framework and equally founded upon the historical, redemptive, eschatological events of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

(d) Beyond the Present Study

Where, then, does the present study point to in terms of a more comprehensive treatment of the motif of death and resurrection with Christ? The foregoing investigation has highlighted the importance of Rom 6:1–14 for an understanding of the motif in Paul. In so doing it has highlighted also the importance of the motif itself within Paul's theology as a whole. However, it has left untouched the many other texts in which the motif appears in his epistles. The scope is clearly there for a much larger treatment of

---

1 See n. 2 of the preceding page.
this pattern of thought in Paul. But in the last 60 years only Tannehill has attempted such a venture. Given the significance of the motif within Paul's theology and that it lies close to the heart of his gospel, this is a surprising state of affairs. Furthermore, Tannehill's 1967 study is not without its limitations.¹ Since its appearance, thirty years have passed and scholars and exegetes have gained many new insights into Paul's theology. Aside from the wealth of many new commentaries on Paul and their use of increasingly sophisticated exegetical techniques, significant recent advances and debates in Pauline theology have centred around issues such as the 'righteousness of God' in Paul, covenantal nomism and 'the new perspective on Paul,' Paul's Adam-Christology and Spirit-Christology, the search for a 'centre' to Paul's theology, J. C. Beker's proposed contingency/coherence model, the πίστις Χριστοῦ debate, sociological interpretations of Paul, and much more. Each of these issues have some distinct implications for interpreting the motif of death and resurrection with Christ in Paul. A fresh approach, of greater length and detail, incorporating the fruits of research since 1967 and remedying the shortcomings in Tannehill's work is well overdue.

Three key aspects of the motif not covered in Tannehill's study certainly merit scholarly investigation. These are: (i) the example of the apostle's own life in dying and rising with Christ; (ii) the Spirit and resurrection with Christ; and (iii) the Lord's Supper and corporate participation in the death of Christ.

Aside from these, three topics of interest to the study of Pauline theology also deserve further attention. The first concerns the relationship between Paul's undisputed epistles and the deuteroc-Pauline epistles with regard to the motif of death and resurrection with Christ. I have already stated that a case can be made for regarding material in Colossians (and Ephesians), particularly Colossians 2, as a legitimate development of Paul's thought in Romans 6. This, however, needs to be properly demonstrated so that the

¹ See my comments on this on pp. 15-16 above.
relationship between the two can be clarified. Such an endeavour would also have some bearing upon the thorny issue of the authorship of these epistles.

A second area concerns the place of the motif within Paul's theology as a whole—how does it relate to the centrum Paulinum (if it is possible to delineate a 'centre') and to other aspects of his theology? I mentioned in the introduction that the motif of death and resurrection with Christ has close links with several analytical components of Paul's theology; namely, his soteriology, eschatology, christology, anthropology, pneumatology, ecclesiology, ethical theory, apostolic experience and personal spirituality.\(^1\) It is easy to see that closer examination of these links could have important ramifications for the as yet unresolved debate over the centrum Paulinum. Even if a solution was not forthcoming, the effort would no doubt enrich the study of Paul and his theology.

Finally, the motif has much to say about the Christian life. Unfortunately, it has not received the treatment or exposure within the academy or the Church that it deserves. A good case could be made for seeing the motif as providing the main application of the 'coherent centre' of Paul's thought (which I maintain to be Paul's theology of the cross) to the 'contingent particularities' of his teaching on the Christian life.\(^2\) It would be interesting to see whether the following thesis could be demonstrated: that Paul's teaching on the status, life and experience of the Christian believer finds its coherent centre and point of integration in the Pauline motif of death and resurrection with Christ. To do so, and at the same time enable maximum accessibility for the student of Paul to the practical implications of his thought for the Christian life, a more comprehensive treatment of death and resurrection with Christ—perhaps employing a thematic, analytical structure (similar to that of the present work), rather than a purely passage by passage exegetical approach—may well be necessary.

---

\(^1\) See p. 10 above.

\(^2\) Using BEKER's formulation.
A Survey of Σὺν Χριστῷ Language in the Pauline Corpus

Within the Pauline corpus¹ there exists a significant body of texts which describe the concept of a union between Christ and believers. This σὺν– language or σὺν Χριστῷ (‘with Christ’) terminology in fact represents the main vehicle by which Paul expresses the motif of death and resurrection with Christ. A short survey of this language with some basic analysis will, therefore, be very useful for the present work.²

The texts themselves. I provide below a listing of the texts involved and then will arrange them into their approximate redemptive-historical order, with greater textual detail. There are a total of thirty three σὺν references within the Pauline corpus pertaining to the relation between Christ and believers,³ which may be grouped into two basic categories:

(i) The proper σὺν Χριστῷ expression and its equivalents occur twelve times. This formal construction includes the preposition σὺν followed by a name, title or pronoun referring to Christ in the dative case. In each case the (present tense) verb in construct

---

¹ For the purposes of this survey, references in the deuter-Pauline epistles, Colossians and Ephesians, and in 2 Timothy will be included without assuming that they were written by Paul. I include them because the specific texts themselves bear a thoroughly Pauline character and, even if not from Paul, are useful at least for comparative purposes. With the exception of these three letters, all other texts are from undisputably Pauline epistles. On the material in Colossians and Ephesians see further pp. 20–21 above. On the Pauline character of 2 Tim 2:11–13 see G. D. Fee, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus (NIBC; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988) 249–251; A. T. Hanson, The Pastoral Epistles (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) 132, 199(1); cf. also G. W. Knight, Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992) 402–408; E. E. Ellis, Paul and His Recent Interpreters (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961) 55; and his Pastoral Letters, DPL, 664; Harvey, "'With Christ' Motif," 331, 338–339 (citing J. H. Bernard); Grundmann, 'ςυν − μετά,' 793.

² Among previous surveys of Paul's σὺν– language, the reader may wish to consult Grundmann, 'ςυν − μετά,' 766–797; Harvey, "'With Christ' Motif," 329–340; Schnackenburg, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 170–177; Moo, Romans 1:8, 426–433; see also the works cited in p. 10 no. 1–5 above.

³ If one counts the σὺν– compound which is to be supplied in Rom 6:5b, from v. 5a, there are thirty four instances. Harvey ("'With Christ' Motif," 329, 331 & n. 17) has counted three of them twice to obtain thirty six. The category of 'dative association,' however, overlaps with those of Paul's σὺν– compounds. In any case, contrary to Harvey, there are more than three such associative datives.
with the expression will be included, since the actions that take place ‘with Christ’ are of particular significance to the present study. Texts involved are:

Rom 6:8a (ἀποθνῄσκειν σίν Χριστῷ, ‘to die with Christ’)
Rom 8:32b (σίν αὐτῷ χαρίζεσθαι, ‘to give freely with him’)
2 Cor 4:14 (σίν Ἡσυχία εἰληφεῖν, ‘to raise with Jesus’)
2 Cor 13:4b (ζην σίν αὐτῷ, ‘to live with him’)
Phil 1:23b (σίν Χριστῷ εἶναι, ‘to be with Christ’)
Col 2:13b (συζωοποιεῖν σίν αὐτῷ, ‘to make alive together with him’)
Col 2:20a (ἀποθνῄσκειν σίν Χριστῷ, ‘to die with Christ’)
Col 3:3b (κρίματεσθαι σίν τῷ Χριστῷ, ‘to be hidden with Christ’)
Col 3:4b (σίν αὐτῷ φανεροῦσθαι, ‘to be revealed with him’)
1 Thess 4:14b (αἰνεῖν σίν αὐτῷ, ‘to bring with him’)
1 Thess 4:17b (σίν κυρίῳ εἶναι, ‘to be with [the] Lord’)
1 Thess 5:10b (σίν αὐτῷ ζην, ‘to live with him’)

(ii) In addition there are fourteen συν- compounds (either verbs or nouns that have been compounded with the prefix συν), occurring twenty one times, which speak of the believer’s union with Christ. Texts include:

Rom 6:4a; Col 2:12a (συνάπτεσθαι, ‘to be buried with’)
Rom 6:5a (σύμφυος, ‘united with’)
Rom 6:6a; Gal 2:19b (συμαμορυγοῦσθαι, ‘to be crucified with’)
Rom 6:8b; 2 Tim 2:11c (συζην, ‘to live together with’)
Rom 8:17a (συγκληρονόμος, ‘joint-heir’)
Rom 8:17b (συμπάσχειν, ‘to suffer with’)
Rom 8:17b (συνδοξάζοσθαι, ‘to be glorified with’)
Rom 8:29b; Phil 3:21a (σύμμορφος, ‘having the same form as’ or ‘conformed to’)
Eph 2:5b; Col 2:13b (συζωοποιεῖν, ‘to make alive together with’)
Eph 2:6a; Col 2:12b; 3:1a (συνεγείρεσθαι, ‘to raise together with’; and συνεγείρεσθαι, ‘to be raised together with’)

---

1 The context of each reference will be given in the redemptive-historical arrangement below.

2 Harvey ("'With Christ' Motif," 331) claims there are 85 συν- compounds in the Pauline corpus, which occur some 158 times. Only the fourteen listed here refer to the union of Christians with Christ.

3 This example is implicit in Rom 6:5b as well, where it is to be supplied from v. 5a. The verbal adjective here derives from συμφύεω, meaning ‘make to grow together’ (see p. 44 above).
The texts in redemptive-historical arrangement. It is helpful also to see the references in their contexts arranged according to their approximate redemptive-historical order. The texts may be grouped naturally in past, present and future categories:

1. Past Aspects Antecedent to Christian Experience

(a) Dying with Christ:

Rom 6:8a  
\[\text{εἰ δὲ ἀπεθάνωμεν σὺν Χριστῷ}\]

'but if we have died with Christ'

Col 2:20a  
\[\text{εἰ ἀπεθάνετε σὺν Χριστῷ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου}\]

'If you died with Christ to the elementary principles of the world'

2 Tim 2:11b  
\[\text{εἰ γὰρ συναπεθάνωμεν}\]

'for if we died with [him]'

Rom 6:5a  
\[\text{εἰ γὰρ συμφαντοῦ οἰκονομεῖν τῷ ὄμοιῳματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ}\]

'for if we have become united with the form of his death'

(b) Being crucified with Christ:

Rom 6:6a  
\[\text{τούτῳ γινώσκοντες, ὅτι ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη}\]

'knowing this, that our old person was crucified with [him]'

Gal 2:19b  
\[\text{Χριστῷ συνεσταυρώμαι}\]

'I have been crucified with Christ'

(c) Being buried with Christ:

Rom 6:4a  
\[\text{συνεσταυρώμεν σὺν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θανάτον}\]

'therefore we were buried with him through baptism into death'

Col 2:12a  
\[\text{συνεσφάντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτισμῷ}\]

'having been buried with him in baptism'

---

1. While the temporal aspects are reasonably identifiable, some texts imply more than one temporal referent. In those cases, the texts have been placed in the category deemed to be the primary one.

2. Rom 6:5a also implies a present ongoing reality, and could be included in section 2 below as well.

3. Rom 6:4a and Col 2:12a are also relevant to section 2 below, in the rite of baptism.
(d) Being raised with Christ:

**Eph 2:6a**  
καὶ συνηγείρεν

**Col 2:12b**  
ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως

**Col 3:1a**  
eἰ σὺν συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ

‘and raised [us] up with [him]’

‘in whom [Christ] you were also raised together with [him] through faith’

‘if therefore you were raised together with Christ’

(e) Being made alive with Christ:

**Eph 2:5b**  
συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ

**Col 2:13b**  
συνεζωοποίησεν ὑμᾶς σὺν αὐτῷ

‘he made you alive together with him’

(f) Being seated with Christ in the heavenlies:

**Eph 2:6b**  
kαὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ

‘and seated us with [him] in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus’

2. Present Aspects Within Christian Experience

(a) Suffering with Christ:

**Rom 8:17a**  
συγκληρονόμοι δὲ Χριστοῦ

**Rom 8:17b**  
eἰπέρ συμπάσχομεν

‘and joint-heirs with Christ’

‘if, in fact, we suffer with [him]’

**Phil 3:10c**  
kαὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν τῶν παθημάτων αὐτοῦ, συμμορφωθήσομεν τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ

‘and the sharing of his sufferings, being conformed to his death’

(b) Being hidden with Christ in God:

**Col 3:3b**  
kαὶ ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κεκρυπταί σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ θεῷ

‘and your life is hidden with Christ in God’

---

1 On the interpretation of the particle ἐν ᾧ as ‘in whom [Christ]’ see p. 101 n. 2 above.

2 In Phil 3:10c the phrase συμμορφωθήσομεν τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ does not simply qualify [τὴν] κοινωνίαν τῶν παθημάτων αὐτοῦ (v. 10b), but looks back to τοῦ γινώσκας αὐτοῦ and qualifies the whole of v. 10ab. Thus ‘being conformed to Christ’s death’ links Paul’s experience of knowing Christ’s resurrection power in the fellowship of his sufferings with the death of Christ, explaining how he comes to know Christ. Cf. P. T. O’BRIEN, Commentary on Philippians (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991) 400–415; TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 119–123.
(c) Experiencing God’s power through weakness:

2 Cor 13:4b  
καί γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἁσθενοῦμεν ἐν αὐτῷ, ἀλλὰ ἔχουμεν σὺν αὐτῷ ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ εἰς ὑμᾶς  
‘for we also are weak in him, yet we shall live with him because of the power of God [directed] toward you’ ¹

3. Future Aspects Yet to be Experienced

(a) Being raised with Christ:

Rom 6:5b  
ἀλλὰ καὶ [σύμφωναν τῷ ὀμοιώματι τῆς ἀναστάσεώς ἡμῶν] ἐσώμεθα  
‘we will certainly be [united with the form of his] resurrection’

2 Cor 4:14  
ὁ ἐγείρας τῶν κυριῶν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἡμᾶς σὺν Ἰησοῦ ἐγερεῖ  
‘the one who raised the Lord Jesus will raise us also with Jesus’

1 Thess 4:14b  
ὁ θεὸς τοῖς κοιμηθέντες διὰ τού Ἰησοῦ ἀξεί σὺν αὐτῷ  
‘God will bring with him those who have fallen asleep through Jesus’

(b) Being glorified with Christ:

Rom 8:17b  
ἐὰν καὶ συνάδωσόμεθα  
‘so that we may also be glorified with [him]’

Rom 8:29b  
καὶ προώρισεν συμμορφώσων τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ  
‘he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son’

Phil 3:21a  
συμμορφώσον τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ  
‘conformed to the body of his glory’

Col 3:4b  
τότε καὶ ἡμεῖς σὺν αὐτῷ φανερωθήσεσθε ἐν δόξῃ  
‘then you also will be revealed with him in glory’

(c) Sharing in Christ’s resurrection-life:

Rom 6:8b  
πιστεύομεν ὅτι καὶ συζησόμεθα αὐτῷ  
‘we believe that we will also live together with him’

Rom 8:32b  
καὶ σὺ καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ᾧ ἡμῖν χαρίσεται  
‘will he not also with him give us freely all things?’

1 Thess 5:10b  
ἵνα εἴη γιορτοῖμεν εἴη καθευδομεν ἀμα σὺν αὐτῷ ξησομεν  
‘sor that, whether we are awake or asleep, we may live together with him’

2 Tim 2:11b  
καὶ συζησόμεθα  
‘we shall also live together with [him]’

¹ While some take ξησομεν as an eschatological future, the human context of εἰς ὑμᾶς locates the reference in Paul’s near future.
(d) Being (always) with Christ:

\[ \text{Phil 1:23b} \quad \text{καὶ οὕτως πάντοπε σήν κυρίω εἴσομεθα} \quad \text{′having the desire to depart and be with Christ′} \]

\[ \text{1 Thess 4:17b} \quad \text{καὶ οὕτως πάντοπε σήν κυρίω εἴσομεθα} \quad \text{′and thus we shall always be with the Lord′} \]

(e) Reigning with Christ:

\[ \text{2 Tim 2:12a} \quad \text{καὶ συμβασιλεύσομεν} \quad \text{′we shall also reign with [him]′} \]

The basic meaning of the σύν- language. The preposition σύν followed by the dative case has the basic meaning of ‘with.’ This is true whether one turns to Classical or Koine Greek, the LXX, or to the New Testament in general. Yet the term has a personal character, which Grundmann well explains:

It denotes the totality of persons who are together, or who come together, or who accompany one another, or who work together, sharing a common task or a common destiny, aiding and supporting one another. It can also denote sharing things or their possession, which brings into a connection with the owner.²

In Paul, the preposition always takes the sense ‘together with.’ However, in the way he uses σύν with ‘Christ’ (or its equivalent) or a σύν- compound in conjunction with ‘Christ’ (or equivalent), a special and unique character is evident.

Its point of reference. Commentators are divided as to which aspect of the language best explains the origin of the others. Some believe that the eschatological uses of the σύν- language (especially, ‘to be with Christ’) are primary—derived from apocalyptic—with the language then being brought back increasingly earlier in the believer’s experience until the allegedly post-Pauline ‘realized eschatology’ of Colossians and Ephesians has been reached.³ However, others maintain that the past

---

1 So GRUNDMANN, ‘σύν – μετά,’ 767-770.
3 For example, SCHWEIZER, ‘Dying and Rising,’ 1-14; BEKER, Paul the Apostle, 274-275; cf. LOMMEYER, ‘ΣΥΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ,’ 218-257; DUPONT, ΣΥΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ.
and present οὖν is the presupposition of the eschatological. My conviction is that Paul's reflection on the redemptive events of the death and resurrection of Christ is the chief source of his use of the language and that, if anything, the past aspects are primary, since eschatology is rooted in the events of the death and resurrection of Christ. As Grundmann notes, Paul's οὖν Χριστῷ 'is grounded in Christ's death for us and embraces the whole existence of the Christian.' This is especially clear in a text as early as 1 Thess 5:10, where an eschatological οὖν Χριστῷ reference is predicated upon Christ's death for us (τοῦ ἀποθανόντος ύπερ ἡμῶν ἔνα ... ὑμα οὖν αὐτῷ ζησόμεν) (cf. 1 Thess 4:14). One may also compare 2 Cor 4:14, where a future resurrection with Jesus is predicated upon Jesus' own resurrection. Thus it is Christ's death and resurrection that form for Paul the point of reference for his οὖν Χριστῷ language. It is significant that Paul never says believers were 'born with Christ,' 'circumcised with Christ' or 'baptized in the Jordan with Christ.' In the arrangement of the texts above there are fifteen past references, five present and thirteen future references. One is impressed by observing that the twenty different verbs or nouns Paul uses together with the οὖν- language—in past, present and future tenses—are virtually always related to the redemptive acts of Christ.

Of the Past Aspects Antecedent to Christian Experience we may note that believers have: died with Christ (Rom 6:8a; cf. Col 2:20a; 2 Tim 2:11b); become united with the 'form' of Christ's death (Rom 6:5a), which is similar to union with his death; been crucified with Christ (Rom 6:6a; Gal 2:19b); and been buried with Christ (Rom 6:4a; 2 Thess 2:13b contains two past οὖν references. If the implicit reference of Rom 6:5b is included, there are fourteen future references.

1 For example, SCHNACKENBURG, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 170–177; KUSS, Römerbrief, 323–326; W. KRAMER, Christ, Lord, Son of God (SBT 50; London: SCM, ET 1966) 147–148; WEDDERBURN, Baptism and Resurrection, 346–348. The former three scholars speak of the past and present references as 'sacramental'; but that gives too great an emphasis to baptism in the 'with Christ' motif. See pp. 13, 35–37 above.


3 Cf. SCHNACKENBURG, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 175–177; WEDDERBURN, Baptism and Resurrection, 346–348.

4 NB: Col 2:13b contains two past οὖν references. If the implicit reference of Rom 6:5b is included, there are fourteen future references.

5 See pp. 47–49 above.
cf. Col 2:12a). While Christ’s burial is not normally seen as a redemptive act, it is closely related to one. ‘Burial with Christ’ is probably intended to convey the decisiveness of the death that has taken place with Christ.\(^1\) In the deuter-Pauline epistles we observe also that believers have been: raised with Christ (Eph 2:6a; Col 2:12b; 3:1a); made alive together with Christ (Eph 2:5b; Col 2:13b); and seated with Christ in the heavenly places (Eph 2:6b). The references to being made alive together with Christ clearly relate to Christ’s resurrection, and the concept of being seated with Christ in the heavenly places (Eph 2:6b) describes the result of being raised with Christ (v. 6a) and the notion of sharing Christ’s exalted resurrection-life.\(^2\)

Among the Present Aspects Within Christian Experience we find believers: as joint-heirs with Christ (Rom 8:17a), suffering with Christ (Rom 8:17b). The idea here is that believers are heirs of God only by virtue of their union ‘with’ Christ; συγκληθησόμενοι Χριστοῦ holds together the various strands of Paul’s thought in vv. 14–17.\(^3\) Their future inheritance, described in v. 17c, is being ‘glorified with’ Christ, but this is made conditional upon ‘suffering with’ Christ (ἐνερ γεγονάσχομεν ἵνα ...) in the present (v. 17b). The future reference looks forward to the believer’s resurrection with Christ, as the yet unfulfilled aspect of sharing in the history of Christ (his death and resurrection) (cf. Rom 6:5, 8–10), whereas the present tense of συμπάσχομεν recalls the notion of Rom 6:5b, that participation in the death of Christ is an ongoing reality in the new dominion founded upon Christ’s death.\(^4\) Thus each aspect in the verse is related in some way to Christ’s death and resurrection. We also see Christians: being conformed to Christ’s death (Phil 3:10c); and living with Christ and so experiencing

\(^{1}\) See p. 44 above.

\(^{2}\) It is significant here, that the writer does not speak of being seated with Christ ‘at the right hand of God’ (Eph 1:20; cf. Rom 8:34; Col 3:1); that exalted status belongs to Christ alone. Hence the emphasis is not so much upon being ‘enthroned with Christ’ as in sharing the ‘spiritual blessings’ (Eph 1:3) of heavenly resurrection-life (cf. Eph 2:7), which are the outworking of Christ’s resurrection. Cf. HARRIS, Raised Immortal, 79, 85–86; T. G. ALLEN, ‘Exaltation and Solidarity with Christ – Ephesians 1:20 and 2:6,’ JSNT 28 (1986) 104–107 & n. 6.

\(^{3}\) Thus DUNN, Romans 1–8, 455–456; TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 113–114.

\(^{4}\) See pp. 48–50, 55–57, 148 above.
God's power through weakness (2 Cor 13:4b; cf. 12:9-10). Paul's weakness and living with Christ here parallels Christ's crucifixion and resurrection as experience respectively of weakness and power (v. 13a). It is clear then that Paul's 'living with Christ' is therefore an experience of sharing Christ's resurrection-life. In Col 3:3b, being hidden with Christ in God describes the present 'heavenly life' of believers as the outcome of their being raised with Christ (who is now 'above') (Col 3:1). In addition, it is paired with a reference to their past death with Christ (v. 3a; cf. 2:20a).

Of the Future Aspects Yet to be Experienced, believers will be: united with 'the form of Christ's resurrection' (Rom 6:5b, implicit); raised with Christ (2 Cor 4:14); and brought with Christ at his parousia (1 Thess 4:14b)—the certainty of this happening is based on the fact that Jesus died and rose again (v. 14a). The parallelism (εἰ'... αὐτος καί...) between Jesus' death and 'those who have fallen asleep' on the one hand, and Jesus' resurrection and believers being brought with him at his parousia on the other, also carries an implicit notion of resurrection with Christ. Several references then describe aspects that are related to the idea of resurrection with Christ—believers will be: glorified with Christ (Rom 8:17b); conformed to his image (Rom 8:29), which is best explained by Phil 3:21a as conformation to the body of his glory (cf. 1 Cor 15:49); and in Col 3:4b revealed with Christ in glory. Paul depicts glorification with Christ as coincident with the future resurrection with Christ (cf. 1 Cor 15:43); it is not intended that two separate stages are in view. The references to living together with Christ (Rom 6:8b; 1 Thess 5:10b; cf. 2 Tim 2:11b) describe the result of a resurrection with Christ as a sharing his resurrection-life. God giving believers freely all things with

---

1 With Paul's experience interpreted paradigmatically.
2 Cf. TANNEHILL, Dying and Rising, 132-133.
3 The aorist ἐμφάνισαν of Rom 8:30, in light of the emphasis on the believer's glory as something yet future (vv. 17a, 18, 19; cf. Phil 3:21a), is perhaps best taken as indicating the certain eschatological completion of salvation. Cf. DUNN, Romans 1-8, 485-486 (who cites B. MAYER and U. WILCKENS).
4 Notwithstanding the interpretation, by some (e.g. HARRIS, Raised Immortal, 98-101), of 2 Cor 5:1-10, that the believer immediately acquires a 'spiritual body' at death. Rather, that passage, as in 1 Corinthians 15, more likely affirms that the resurrection body is granted at the time of the parousia. So DUPONT, ΣΥΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ, 137-139: RIDDERBOS, Paul: Outline, 500-501 & n. 33; L. I. KREITZER, 'Eschatology,' DPL, 261.
Christ (Rom 8:32b) does not involve a redemptive action of Christ, but is predicated upon the death of Christ (Ἴπερ ἡμῶν πάντων, v. 32a; cf. the context of the death and resurrection of Christ in v. 34) and envisages a future sharing with Christ in the fullness of salvation, a fullness related to the resurrection-life of Christ. Of the two future references to being with Christ (Phil 1:23b; 1 Thess 4:17b), Phil 1:23b is not so obviously related to Christ's resurrection or to resurrection with Christ. In mind is probably the notion of fellowship or personal relationship (rather than mere association) with Christ after Paul's death. But the language is closely paralleled in 1 Thess 4:17b, where being with Christ clearly takes place in and after the parousia and is linked to, or the result of, resurrection with Christ (v. 14b). This may then suggest the idea of sharing Christ's resurrection-life, rather than mere existence with Christ. The final reference, in 2 Tim 2:12a, to reigning with Christ also does not refer to a redemptive action of Christ. But it is linked to the 'living with Christ' of v. 11b, which in turn is predicated upon a past death with Christ (v. 11a). One might even compare it to Rom 8:32b (under Dunn's interpretation of the latter text).

Thus, with the possible exceptions of Phil 1:23b and 2 Tim 2:12a, each of the συν-references associated with Christ has been shown to be related in some way to the central events of Christ's death and resurrection. In Paul's συν Χριστῷ conception, the

---

1 So most commentators. Dunn, Romans 1–8, 502 suggests a sharing in Christ's sovereignty over creation (cf. να κυρία).
2 So O'Brien, Philippians, 132–137; Harris, Raised Immortal, 161; Dupont, SYN XPIΣΤΩΙ; contra G. D. Fee, Paul's Letter to the Philippians (NICNT, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 146 n. 33.
3 The difficulties raised by the difference of being with Christ after death (Phil 1:23b) versus being with him after the parousia (1 Thess 4:17b) cannot be discussed here. They may suggest the notion of an 'intermediate state,' but this is not certain. See further Harris, Raised Immortal, 135–138; O'Brien, Philippians, 135–137.
4 See discussion of 1 Thess 4:14b above.
5 If my conclusion below is correct, that Paul's συν-language (when linked to Christ) is essentially participatory in nature, then one might also see the notion of participation in Christ here, which would imply sharing in his resurrection-life.
6 See n. 1 immediately above.
history of Christ (abbreviated to the focal points of his death and resurrection) thus becomes the destiny of believers in solidarity with him.¹

The basic character of the language. What then is the basic character or nature of the συν—language? Given the variety of texts above, context must be determinative of the nature of ‘withness’ in each instance. But some general observations and conclusions can be made here.

The vast majority of the verbs employed with the συν—references are verbs of action. Because they virtually all either refer directly to Christ’s death or resurrection, or in some way are related to those events, to be ‘together with’ Christ in those actions, whatever their tense and unless ruled out by the context, naturally implies a sense of participation or sharing.

Of the past aspects, three verbs employed in Romans 6 are in the aorist tense and two of these are in the passive voice. In the deuto-Pauline epistles eight aorist verbs are used, three in the passive voice. To these we may add two verbs in the perfect tense (Rom 6:5a; Gal 2:19b, passive). In at least the majority of these cases, the aorist tense indicates the pastness of the action involved, and the passive voice, where present, the divine agency involved. Since the events referred to in these actions are past, historical and unrepeatable, it is natural—in light of the συν—(‘together with’) language—to take the aorist tenses as implying a degree of co-temporality. This concept is strengthened considerably when it is recognized that Paul sees Christ and his death and resurrection in corporate and inclusive terms. This is particularly evident in Rom 5:12-21 in the depictions of Adam and Christ as respective founders of the old and new dominions.² It is perhaps clearest in 2 Cor 5:14bc: ‘one died for all, therefore, all died’ (εἰς ἀπέθανεν, ἡμεῖς οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον). In this text it is most natural to apply

¹ Cf. GRUNDMANN, 'συν — μετα'; 784 & n. 90; SCHNACKENBURG, Baptism in the Thought of Paul, 175; KÄSEMANN, Romans, 170.
² See Section 2 above.
both aorist verbs to death on the cross. Thus Paul explicitly infers the death of ‘all’ in or with Christ from the fact that Christ died for ‘all.’ The death Christ died is therefore regarded as the death of those who belong to him, those he represents.\(^1\) James Denney insists that what is being set forth is ‘something antecedent to Christian experience.’\(^2\)

If this is the case, then being ‘with Christ’ in his salvific actions must have a strongly participative sense. It is difficult to take it otherwise. Even if one resorts to forensic categories to explain the concept that believers participated with Christ in his death on the cross\(^3\)—and I am convinced that to do so does an injustice to Paul; his conception is more realistic, however difficult it may be to explain—then it is surely a forensic participation in Christ’s death (i.e. in God’s sight believers participated in Christ’s death).

A parallel to the concepts underlying Paul’s \(συν 
Χριστῷ\) terminology may be found in the Jewish Passover ritual, whereby participants could regard themselves as having participated in the past redemptive events of the Exodus.\(^4\) While this does not account for the specific language itself, it does make Paul’s thought more intelligible. We should note, however, that the actions brought together in the use of the language may not always be identical; a past resurrection ‘with’ Christ (whether implicit in Paul’s thought in, say, Romans 6,\(^5\) or explicit as in Eph 2:6a; Col 2:12b; 3:1a) obviously cannot be physical as Christ’s was.\(^6\)

---


3. As do, for example, Moo, *Romans 1–8*, 426–433; Cranfield, *Rom 6:1–14,* 40–43 (reaffirming the position taken in his *Romans*); Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection*, 348–351 (see my criticisms of the latter two on pp. 30 n. 1, 50 n. 4 and p. 152 n. 2 above respectively).

4. On this, see pp. 25–26 above.

5. See pp. 137–138, 144 above.

Since most of the present and future aspects considered above also involve actions that believers do with Christ (or are done to believers with Christ), then it is clear that most are or will be experiential in nature. And if they are actions that believers experience, then logically the notion of participation must be implicit in the associated ἐν- references also. In the specific texts placed in the present or future tense categories above, it must be noted that a present or future participation with Christ does not usually mean a participation in past salvific events; rather it normally means a present or future experiential participation with Christ in the action being described. For example, being raised with Christ in the future does not mean a participation in the past resurrection of Christ (cf. 2 Cor 4:14)—it means a future experiential being raised with Christ (although this is none other than the necessary eschatological outworking of Christ’s resurrection). In other words, the ἐν- language implies temporal (not trans-temporal) accompaniment (and participation). But, as we have seen, the present and future tense aspects are nevertheless related to the past redemptive events. Thus, while union with Christ can be regarded as already past in the death and resurrection of Christ, it is also a present (and future) reality and experience for believers.

To summarize the foregoing, Paul’s ἐν Χριστῷ language usually:

- is related to the redemptive events of Christ’s death and resurrection,

- implies a temporal accompaniment (according to the intended tense of the verb involved in its context),

- is participatory in nature.

---

1 The specification is important, for it excludes the two baptismal texts (Rom 6:4a; Col 2:12a), which have been placed in the past aspect category because in them the notion of a past participation in Christ’s death is primary. The relationship of Christian baptism to the death of Christ and the believer’s past death with Christ is more complex than the following ideas may suggest. The matter is discussed in detail in Section 4(d) above (see especially pp. 92–95).

2 This does not mean, of course, that Christ will be raised again in the future; it means the future resurrection with Christ will take place in union with or in solidarity with Christ, as the necessary outworking in the believer’s experience of Christ’s own resurrection.

3 Thus, for example, while a present infinitive is used in Phil 1:23b, the context indicates a future meaning. This caveat adequately meets Moo’s objections (Romans 1–8, 430–432) to the idea of ‘temporal accompaniment.’
involves the sense of personal togetherness, fellowship, or union (i.e. more than mere association) with Christ.

Of course, these are generalizations and the specific context of each text must be examined to determine to what extent they are true in each instance. It needs to be remembered that the συν Χριστῷ language is not reducible to a formula. It is more correct to see the thought behind it as a motif or theme that can be expressed in a variety of ways. But since the idea of participation does seem to be basic to the expressions, this means that Paul’s συν Χριστῷ language cannot be reduced to ideas of ‘modelling’ or ‘repetition.’ But neither should the language of union with Christ be taken too far, as implying an ontological union with Christ, for Paul seems to stop short of drawing that conclusion.

The uniqueness of the συν Χριστῷ language in Paul. There appears to be a growing unanimity among scholars that Paul’s συν Χριστῷ language, in the way he uses it, is uniquely and distinctly his own. While we find elsewhere the common motifs of death and restoration to life in the Jewish and Hellenistic world in their rites, we do not find a past death and resurrection with a deity—a dying and rising with Christ. It is this, that believers have already died and risen with Christ, when he died and rose, that separates Paul’s theology from the ideas of his contemporaries. True parallels

---

1 Cf. p. 1 above. Cf. WEDDERBURN (Baptism and Resurrection, 342 n. 1) who submits, ‘it is perhaps more than a motif; it is a novel use of language, more novel perhaps than the idea that it expresses.’ On the latter thought, see further pp. 25–28 above.

2 MOO, Romans 1-8, 430.

3 Cf. MOO, Romans 1-8, 432–433. Rather, one probably needs to introduce Paul’s conception of the Spirit at this point, but that cannot be done here. However, cf. p. 127 above in discussion of the indicative/imperative structure in Paul’s ethics.


5 WEDDERBURN, Baptism and Resurrection, 392, 394.
are entirely lacking, whether one searches in Greek literature, the LXX, Jewish apocalyptic, the Hellenistic mystery religions, or elsewhere in the New Testament. The \( \text{σωφρονεῖν} \) language is a striking adaptation of a natural Greek usage for a new purpose, to express an idea that nevertheless has old roots, in the solidarity of the many with a founding father or fathers of the race or group. Thus the language of death and resurrection with Christ is probably Paul's own contribution, the fruit of a brilliant, incisive mind. The concepts which he expresses with this language are not as novel, but are given their most detailed explication in his writings. If so, then the \( \text{σωφρονεῖν} \) language 'can be regarded as presenting us with a fully deliberate feature of Pauline thought and sensibility,' one of considerable import for the study of the apostle and his theology.

---

1. The expression \( \text{σωφρονεῖν} \) is a constantly recurring phrase among the Greeks. See GRUNDMANN, 'οὐ ἔστιος,' 773-774. But it is invariably an expression of the helpful assistance given to people by the gods, and thus bears little resemblance to Paul's concept.
2. The typical Old Testament usage is 'God with us,' rather than 'we with God.' The latter expression, however, is usually rendered by \( \text{μετὰ} \) with the genitive. Ps 139:14 (LXX) uses \( \text{σωφρονεῖν} \), but the sense is of eternal fellowship with God. See GRUNDMANN, 'οὐ ἔστιος,' 774-780.
3. The eschatological 'being with Christ' understood in terms of Jewish apocalyptic and the fellowship of the redeemed with the Messiah is considerably different in meaning to Paul's notion of a past death with Christ on the cross. So WEDDERBURN, *Baptism and Resurrection*, 347; TANNEHILL, *Dying and Rising*, 88 n. 14; SCHNACKENBURG, *Baptism in the Thought of Paul*, 173; cf. pp. 165-166 above.
4. WEDDERBURN, *Baptism and Resurrection*, 342-343, 356. On this whole issue, see p. 32 n. 8 above.
5. Verbal parallels such as Mark 14:31; 15:32 do exist, but these are in the sense of purely natural Greek usage, and not the way Paul uses the terminology. See pp. 90-91 (cf. p. 34) above.
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