

## DYING WITH CHRIST

JOHN V. DAHMS\*

Throughout the history of Christianity the major theories of the atonement have been (1) the ransom (classical; *Christus Victor*) theory, (2) the satisfaction theory, (3) the governmental theory, (4) the moral influence theory, and (5) the penal substitution theory. It is not my purpose to discuss the respective merits and/or demerits of these theories. It is my concern to draw attention to a Biblical emphasis concerning atonement that has suffered from comparative neglect—namely, the emphasis on dying with Christ.

It is to be noted, in the first place, that prior to the Sinaitic legislation there is no Biblical reference to sin offerings and/or guilt (trespass) offerings.

Cain and Abel are credited with what were apparently gift or tribute offerings (Gen 4:3-5).<sup>1</sup> The offering of drink offerings (35:14), peace (fellowship) offerings (Exod 20:34; 24:5)<sup>2</sup> and, probably, covenantal sacrifices (Gen 31:54) is also reported for this period. Of special prominence and significance, however, was the burnt offering (8:20; 22:1-13; Exod 10:25; 18:12; 20:24; cf. Job 1:5; 42:8),<sup>3</sup> the offering mentioned most frequently in the OT. But though the gravity of sin is emphasized (e.g. Gen 18:20; 39:9; Exod 10:17; 20:5) there is no indication that a consciousness of sin ever prompted the offering of sacrifice, nor is it ever suggested that sacrifice had any significance with respect to wrongdoing—unless it be in Job 1:5, which will engage my attention shortly.

The burnt offering and its significance are of special interest to us. Its first mention is in Gen 8:20, which states that Noah offered burnt offerings after he came forth from the ark. He is described as “a righteous man, blameless in his generation” (6:9). His offerings were not because of sin on his part or on the part of his family.<sup>4</sup> Likewise with respect to the offering

\* John Dahms is professor emeritus of New Testament at Canadian Theological Seminary, 4400 Fourth Avenue, Regina, Saskatchewan S4T 0H8, Canada.

<sup>1</sup> The term *minhâ* is used to describe them, a term that often means “gift” or “tribute” (e.g. Gen 43:11; Judg 3:15; 1 Sam 10:27; 2 Kgs 8:8; 2 Chr 17:11; Isa 39:1; Hos 10:6) but that is also the technical term for the cereal (grain) offering (Exod 29:41 and often thereafter). Since Abel offered “the firstlings of his flock,” he did not offer a cereal offering.

<sup>2</sup> The “sacrifices” mentioned in Exod 10:25; 18:12; and elsewhere were probably peace (fellowship) offerings, since the flesh of the victim was consumed at a feast (cf. Lev 7:11-27; Deut 12:7).

<sup>3</sup> The references in Job are included because some scholars hold that the book of Job is at least as ancient as the Sinaitic legislation.

<sup>4</sup> According to G. L. Carr in *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (ed. R. L. Harris) 2.667, they were an expression of “joy and . . . reverence [for] Yahweh.”

of Isaac (22:1–14). He was to be offered “as a burnt offering,” and the ram offered in his stead was offered “as a burnt offering.” It was not sin that called for the sacrifice but whether Abraham “fear(ed) God,” whether he was totally and unreservedly committed to him and to his will.

With respect to his demand that Pharaoh allow the Israelites to offer “sacrifices and burnt offerings” in the wilderness (Exod 10:25), Moses stated that they needed to do so “lest he (Yahweh) fall upon us with pestilence and sword.” But there is no suggestion that the sacrifices and burnt offerings were necessary because they had done wrong. The only reason given is that the Lord had commanded such sacrifices (8:27) and that to offer them was to “serve the Lord” (10:25–26; cf. 3:12; 4:23; etc.). When Jethro offered a burnt offering (18:12) there is no intimation that sin was in view. Likewise when Moses is instructed to build an altar for the offering of burnt offerings and peace offerings (20:24), and when burnt offerings and peace offerings were offered in connection with the establishment of the Sinaitic covenant (24:5–8), there is no intimation that any of the sacrifices had to do with sin. In the latter instance, what was significant was that the people said, “All that the Lord has spoken we will do, and we will be obedient.” What is important is thoroughgoing commitment to the will of God. As N. Micklem has observed: “The whole burnt offering signifies total self-oblation to God.”<sup>5</sup> The fact that the entire animal was consumed on the altar—the only sacrifice of which this is characteristic—suggests as much.

The statement that there is no reference to expiatory sacrifice prior to the Sinaitic legislation may need to be modified in light of the book of Job, which, in the view of some scholars, is more ancient than the Sinaitic legislation. Job is said to have offered burnt offerings, “for Job said, ‘It may be that my sons have sinned and cursed God in their hearts’” (Job 1:5). Rowley has commented on this verse: “It is clear that it was offered to expiate any sins that may have been committed.”<sup>6</sup> In my opinion, however, this interpretation is doubtful. That they “cursed God in their hearts” defines the nature of the sin in view and means that they turned away from God (“renounced God,” ASV), as the same phraseology in 1:11; 2:5, 9 indicates. If so, the sin in view is not that of wrongdoing but of giving up allegiance to God in their hearts, and the significance of the burnt offerings is that of consecration rather than expiation. Moreover Job’s three friends were exhorted to offer burnt offerings because “you have not spoken of me what is right” (42:8). This may mean that they were required to make such offerings as an expression of continued dedication to God, despite the fact that revision of their understanding of God’s dealings with people was necessary (see 42:7–8).<sup>7</sup> It is my opinion that the book of Job does not provide evidence of the offering of burnt offerings with expiation in view.

<sup>5</sup> In *IB* 2.15; cf. H.-J. Kraus, *Worship in Israel* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966) 116.

<sup>6</sup> H. H. Rowley, *Job* (rev. ed.; Greenwood: Attic, 1976) 30.

<sup>7</sup> According to J. G. Janzen, *Job* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1985) 264, 266, repentance was involved in the offering of these sacrifices by Job’s three friends. If repentance with respect to the position they had promoted (“You have not spoken of me what is right”) is meant, this interpretation accords with the one I have suggested.

There is considerable evidence that burnt offerings continued to be offered throughout OT times without the expiation of sin being intended. Jephthah's offering of his daughter as a burnt offering (Judg 11:31), the offering of burnt offerings at Beth Shemesh (1 Sam 6:14–15), Solomon's burnt offering at the dedication of the temple (1 Kgs 8:64; 2 Chr 7:1, 7), Elijah's burnt offering on Mount Carmel (1 Kgs 18:33, 38), Naaman's decision to offer burnt offerings (or sacrifices) to no God but Yahweh (2 Kgs 5:17)—all are evidence that burnt offerings were frequently offered without any thought of remedy for sin. Other examples could easily be adduced. What is at least primarily in view in the offering of the burnt offering was a gift in "honour and homage to . . . God."<sup>8</sup> And no doubt the fact that the whole animal was consumed by fire on the altar continued to signify "total self-oblation to God"—that is, "total consecration of the self."<sup>9</sup>

There are those who hold that the burnt offering also "atones for the worshipper's sins."<sup>10</sup> According to G. J. Wenham, it "does not remove sin or change man's sinful nature, but it makes fellowship between sinful man and a holy God possible. It propitiates God's wrath against sin."<sup>11</sup>

Attention is drawn in this connection to Lev 1:4: "It [his burnt offering] shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him" (cf. 16:24; Num 28:27–30; Ezek 45:15). In none of these verses, however, is there mention of atonement for sin(s) or of forgiveness (contrast Lev 4:26, 35; 5:6, 13; etc.). Moreover there is evidence that *kpr* ("atone," "make atonement") need not imply that there had been sinful conduct or that there was a sinful tendency. In Exod 30:11–16 the contribution required of each Israelite on the occasion of a census was "so as to make atonement for yourselves." Though it is described as a ransom so "that there be no plague among them when you number them," there is no intimation that the requirement was because of sinful conduct or a sinful nature. According to Lev 14:53, under certain circumstances a house in which there had been a "disease" could be cleansed by the performance of a prescribed ritual, "so he (the priest) shall make atonement for the house and it shall be clean."<sup>12</sup> In Num 31:50–54 army officers present a portion of the booty taken in a war as an offering to Yahweh "to make atonement for ourselves before the Lord." And the offering "was brought into the tent of meeting, as a memorial for the people of Israel before the Lord." The context indicates that the offering was in gratitude for the fact that "there is not a man missing from us."<sup>13</sup> It appears that "atonement" does not necessarily imply that there has been sinful conduct or a sinful nature. In Lev 1:4 it

<sup>8</sup> Carr in *Wordbook* (ed. Harris) 2.667.

<sup>9</sup> *Baker Encyclopaedia of the Bible* 2.1579.

<sup>10</sup> E.g. G. J. Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979) 57.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.* I find it difficult to understand God's wrath being propitiated without either the removal of sin or a change in sinful human nature.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* 213 suggests that there was thought to be a connection between such a "disease" and sin. There is no intimation of this, however, in the text. Purification with respect to childbearing, skin diseases, and certain bodily discharges (Leviticus 12–15) also required that the priest "make atonement." Though there may have been a perceived connection with sin, this is not made clear.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. P. J. Budd, *Numbers* (Waco: Word, 1984) 332, 334.

may simply imply the making or maintaining of "reconciliation between God and man."<sup>14</sup>

In addition to Job 1:5, which we have already considered, there are a few passages that may imply that the burnt offering had expiatory significance. In 1 Sam 7:6-10 and in 2 Sam 24:17-25 (1 Chr 21:17-26) there is confession of sin and the offering of a burnt offering but not the offering of a sin offering (cf. Judg 2:1-5). But it is possible that these burnt offerings were consecratory rather than expiatory.

Micah 6:7-8 ("Shall I come before him [Yahweh] with burnt offerings . . . ? Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?") is of special significance. In this passage the possibility that burnt offerings are expiatory is contemplated. But the inquiry may be representative of people relatively unfamiliar with the precise significance of the various sacrifices in general and of the burnt offering in particular (cf. Pss 15:1; 24:3; Isa 33:14).<sup>15</sup>

Another reason for thinking that the burnt offering had expiatory significance, at least in later Judaism, may be implied in Heb 7:27: "He [Christ] has no need, like those high priests, to offer sacrifices daily, first for his own sins and then for those of the people." Since only the burnt, cereal and drink offerings were offered daily, it may be that they—or one of them—were thought to be expiatory (as well as consecratory?).<sup>16</sup> It is more likely, however, that there is an error in the text,<sup>17</sup> because (1) Lev 16:11-15, part of the annual Day of Atonement ritual, is being reflected, and (2) in 9:7 ("Into the second [tent] the high priest goes, and he but once a year, and not without taking blood that he offers for himself and for the errors of the people") the author of Hebrews<sup>18</sup> shows that he is aware of the sin offering being offered annually on behalf of the people.<sup>19</sup>

It may be that the burnt offering came to be thought of as having expiatory significance. Nevertheless, it was originally and primarily consecratory. It may be noted that a burnt offering of a lamb was to be offered on behalf of the people twice each day, in the morning and in the evening (Exod 29:38-42; Num 28:1-10; 1 Chr 16:40). On special occasions an addi-

<sup>14</sup> Cf. L. Morris, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956) 148.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. J. L. Mays, *Micah* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976) 137: "The situation [is one] in which a layman . . . seeks to learn which [sacrifice] is adequate." Ezra 8:35 (MT) may suggest that "a sin-offering could be part of a burnt offering," but see H. G. M. Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah* (Waco: Word, 1985) 113-114. A cereal (grain) offering and a drink offering were associated with the continual burnt offering (Exod 29:38-42; Num 28:3-8). Numbers 15:24 ("a burnt offering . . . with its cereal offering and its drink offering") indicates that cereal offerings and drink offerings were also consecration offerings (cf. A. F. Rainey in *Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopaedia of the Bible* [ed. M. Tenney] 5.207).

<sup>16</sup> According to *Lev. Rab.* 3.3, the cereal offering was "expiatory."

<sup>17</sup> Cf. G. Stahlin, *TDNT* 1.383.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Heb 9:25; 10:3.

<sup>19</sup> For extensive discussion of the problem see G. W. Buchanan, *To the Hebrews* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1972) 129; H. W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989) 213-214; P. E. Hughes, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977) 276-277; R. Williamson, *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Leiden: Brill, 1970) 178-180.

tional burnt offering of various animals was to be offered (see Numbers 28, 29). Sin offerings on behalf of the people were to be offered only on the first of each month (28:15; cf. 29:5), on the fifteenth day of the first month (28:22), on the tenth day of the seventh month, the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:29; Num 29:11), and on each of the eight days of the Feast of Tabernacles, the first day thereof being the fifteenth day of the seventh month (29:16, 19, 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, 38). Not only were burnt offerings on behalf of the whole people of God many times more numerous than sin offerings on their behalf, but also on every occasion of the offering of any animal or animals for a sin offering on their behalf a considerably larger number of animals was offered on their behalf as a burnt offering.<sup>20</sup> One can only conclude that consecration to God—the chief, if not the only, significance of the burnt offering—is more important in OT theology than having one's sins forgiven, as important as forgiveness is.

In the next place, it is notable that “in New Testament times, the Passover was the principal feast in the Jewish year.”<sup>21</sup> Not only do all four gospels report that the crucifixion was at Passover time. The synoptic gospels all report that the Lord's supper was instituted in connection with eating the Passover meal. In addition there are six other NT passages where that Passover, or some other, is specifically mentioned. Though the Day of Atonement “was important enough to be called ‘The Day,’ without further qualification,”<sup>22</sup> Only the epistle to the Hebrews clearly refers to it.

The book of Exodus traces the Passover (Exod 12:1–20, 40–51; 23:15; cf. Deut 16:1–8) to the Israelite escape from Egypt under the leadership of Moses, its first observance being just prior thereto. Though the ritual underwent some alteration as time went on (cf. 16:1–8; 2 Chr 35:10–15), the observance on that occasion consisted of two major elements: (1) the application of the blood of a slain lamb to the doorposts and lintels of Israelite homes, and (2) the eating of the flesh of the slain lamb, in which the whole family shared and perhaps a neighboring family as well. Since the Lord had said, “When I see the blood, I will pass over you, and no plague shall fall upon you to destroy you” (Exod 12:13), the blood on the doorposts and lintels was evidently a way of saying, “We are the Lord's”—something that could only be truly said at great cost, the cost of a life. (Compare the self-dedication implicit in the worthy sacrifice of a burnt offering.) The eating of the lamb's flesh, on the other hand, is reminiscent of the peace (fellowship) offering, which signified peace with God and fellowship both with him and with his people. Though pardon for sin may have become associated

<sup>20</sup> When sacrifices were offered on behalf of individuals, at least at times the sin and/or trespass (guilt) offerings were more prominent and more costly than the burnt offerings (e.g. Lev 14:21–32; Num 6:9–12). It also appears that sometimes sin offerings or trespass offerings were offered on behalf of individuals without accompanying burnt offerings (e.g. Lev 4:1–35; 19:20–22).

<sup>21</sup> R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel* (New York/Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1965) 2.484. That it was not always the main feast is evident from Lev 23:39; Ezek 45:25; cf. Zech 14:16; Josephus *Ant.* 8.4.1.

<sup>22</sup> de Vaux, *Israel* 2.507.

with the Passover at a later date (cf. Ezek 45:22; Matt 26:28), such an association was evidently absent from its first observance. It was not prescribed because of Israelite wrongdoing but to express dedication to God (and the fellowship that ensues).

That total surrender to God is the foremost requirement for human salvation in the OT economy accords with the NT emphasis on the primacy of repentance—that is, on “total surrender, total commitment to the will of God”<sup>23</sup>—if eternal life is to be inherited (e.g. Luke 24:47; Acts *passim*; Rom 2:4; 2 Cor 7:10; 2 Pet 3:9; Rev 16:9).<sup>24</sup> Indeed, when repentance is distinguished from saving faith it is always mentioned first (Mark 1:15; Acts 20:21; Heb 6:1).<sup>25</sup>

The priority of repentance with respect to human salvation accords with the fact that preeminence is given to the Lordship of Christ when the NT deals with what is required if one is to secure salvation (Acts 16:31; Rom 10:9; cf. Acts 2:36; 5:31;<sup>26</sup> Rom 10:13; 1 Cor 1:2; 2 Cor 4:5; Phil 2:11; etc.). In this connection it is notable that in the NT Jesus is regularly said to be “Lord and Savior,” not “Savior and Lord” (2 Pet 1:11; 2:20; 3:2, 18; cf. “Leader [Prince?] and Savior” [Acts 5:31]; “God and Savior” [Titus 2:13; 2 Pet 1:1]; “Lord and Christ” [Acts 2:36]). Luke 2:11 (“To you is born this day in the city of David a Savior, who is Christ the Lord”) is not really an exception. “Who is Christ the Lord” identifies the Savior whose advent is being announced.<sup>27</sup> The priority of his Lordship is therefore implied.<sup>28</sup>

Moreover there are various passages that clearly state or imply that Christ died in order that he might be Lord (e.g. Rom 14:9, “To this end Christ died and lived again, that he might be Lord both of the dead and of the living”; 2 Cor 5:15, “He died for all, that those who live might no longer live for themselves but for him who for their sake died and was raised”; cf. Gal 2:20, “I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me”; Eph 4:8, “When he ascended on high he led a host of captives”).<sup>29</sup> In addition there are the passages that speak of Christ’s death as purchasing people for himself or for God (1 Cor 6:19–20, “You are not your own; you were bought [ēgorasthēte] with a price”; 1 Cor

<sup>23</sup> J. Behm, *TDNT* 4.1002.

<sup>24</sup> *Metanoō* (“repent”) or *metanoia* (“repentance”) occurs some 55 times in the NT. *Epistrephō* (“turn [to the Lord]”) occurs as a synonym some 13 times.

<sup>25</sup> J. Calvin, *Institutes* 3.3.1, reverses the order. In my view this is due to the influence of Platonic thought.

<sup>26</sup> Is it possible that in Acts 5:31 (“God exalted him at his right hand as Leader [Prince?] and Savior, to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins”) “repentance” answers to “Leader (Prince?)” and “forgiveness of sins” to “Savior”? Describing Jesus as “Leader [Prince?] and Savior” (Acts 5:31) is similar to the description of Moses as “ruler and deliverer” (Acts 7:35).

<sup>27</sup> S. J. Reiling and J. L. Swellengrebel, *A Translator’s Handbook on the Gospel of Luke* (Leiden: Brill, 1971) 113.

<sup>28</sup> In my view it is significant that in John 1 Christ is said to be “God” before he is said to be “the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world” (1:1, 29).

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Heb 9:14; 1 Pet 3:18; J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981) 149.

7:22–23, “He who was free when called is a slave of Christ. You were bought [*ēgorasthēte*] with a price”; 2 Pet 2:1, “The Master [*despotēn*] who bought [*agorasanta*] them”;<sup>30</sup> Rev 5:9 NIV, “You were slain, and with your blood you purchased [*ēgorasas*] men for God”; Rev 14:3–4, “The one hundred and forty-four thousand . . . had been redeemed [*ēgorasmenoi*] from the earth. . . . These have been redeemed [*ēgorasthēsan*] from mankind as firstfruits for God and the Lamb”; cf. Gal 3:13; 4:5).<sup>31</sup>

How he becomes Lord is set forth in Rom 6:4–11:

We were buried . . . with him by baptism into death. . . . If we have been united with him in a death like his. . . . We know that our old self was crucified with him so that the sinful body might be destroyed, and we might no longer be enslaved to sin. . . . If we have died with Christ. . . . The death he died he died to sin. . . . So you must consider yourselves dead to sin.

Similar Pauline teaching occurs in Gal 2:20, “I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I (*egō*) who live” (cf. 6:14); in Col 2:12, “You were buried with him in baptism”; in 3:3, “You have died [with Christ]”; and in 2 Tim 2:11, “If we have died with him, we shall also live with him” (cf. Rom 7:4; 14:9; Col 2:20). Likewise in John’s gospel Jesus is represented as referring to his impending death with these words: “For their sake [those ‘whom thou gavest me’] I consecrate myself, that they also may be consecrated in truth” (John 17:19).<sup>32</sup> And according to Heb 10:10 NEB: “We have been consecrated through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once and for all” (cf. 2:10–11; 10:29; 13:12).

According to Tannehill, “dying with Christ is misunderstood when it is thought to mean only that the believer repeats what Christ did.”<sup>33</sup> It “is also misunderstood when dissolved into a subjective, mystical experience.”<sup>34</sup> This is particularly clear in 2 Cor 5:14: “One has died for all; therefore all have died.” It might have been expected that the second of these clauses would read “therefore all live”<sup>35</sup> or the like (cf. Rom 5:18). But, as most scholars agree, Paul is giving expression to the understanding that Christ died as our “representative.”<sup>36</sup> F. Büchsel even uses the phrase “representative substitution” to describe what Paul is teaching

<sup>30</sup> According to K. H. Rengstorf, *TDNT* 2.49, a *despotēs* is “one who commands and exercises influence and power.” *Douloi* and *despotai* are contrasted in 1 Tim 6:1–2; Titus 2:9.

<sup>31</sup> F. Büchsel, *TDNT* 4.351, asserts that *lytrousthai* in Titus 2:14; 1 Pet 1:18–19 “must be translated ‘to buy back.’” If so, it would appear that these verses also imply that Christ’s death was so that he might be Lord.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. L. Morris, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971) 731–732.

<sup>33</sup> R. C. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising with Christ* (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1967) 70.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.* 71; contrast V. Taylor, *Forgiveness and Reconciliation* (London: Macmillan, 1960) 117–118, 136.

<sup>35</sup> E. Best, *Second Corinthians* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1987) 51.

<sup>36</sup> E.g. A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1956) 174; F. V. Filson, *IB* 10.335; Best, *Second Corinthians* 52; M. E. Thrall, *The First and Second Letters of Paul to the Corinthians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1965) 149. Similar doctrine is to be observed in Gal 6:14 (“the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which the world has been crucified to me, and I to the world”). Cf. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising* 62–65, 68.

here.<sup>37</sup> James Denney insists that what is being set forth is "something antecedent to Christian experience."<sup>38</sup> As F. F. Bruce has put it in commenting on Gal 2:20, we "died in Christ's death."<sup>39</sup> "The person we formerly were was crucified with him."<sup>40</sup>

I suggest that this was necessary because of the bondage of our wills (cf. Rom 7:14-23). Only Christ, whose will was not bound, could yield himself totally to God, which he did, the ultimate expression thereof being when he "became obedient unto death, even death on a cross" (Phil 2:8). And it is only by being united with him in his death that we can die to sin and self.<sup>41</sup> It is only thus that "the old selfish ego is dethroned,"<sup>42</sup> and we are no longer "helpless in sin's power."<sup>43</sup> Commenting on John 17:19 ("I [Christ] consecrate myself, that they also may be consecrated in truth"), L. Morris states: "He dies for them, to do for them that which they could not do for themselves. . . . He dies with a view to the disciples being sanctified, being set apart for God."<sup>44</sup>

A further point needs to be made: Dying with Christ is not just an occurrence at the time of new birth. The perfect tense in the Greek of Rom 6:5 ("If we have been united with him in a death like his"), of Gal 2:20 ("I have been crucified with Christ") and of 6:14 ("the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which the world has been crucified to me, and I to the world") implies that having died with Christ, we (normally?) continue to die or to be dead. And Paul repeatedly speaks of what that means in the life of the Christian. (1) It means suffering: He speaks of being "fellow heirs with Christ, provided we suffer with him" (Rom 8:17), of "sharing abundantly in Christ's sufferings" (2 Cor 1:5), of "always carrying in the body the death of Jesus. . . . For while we live we are always being given up to death for Jesus' sake" (4:10-11), of "shar(ing) his sufferings, becoming like him in his death" (Phil 2:10).<sup>45</sup> (2) It has moral implications: "You must consider [continuous present tense] yourselves dead to sin. . . . Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal bodies, to make you obey their passions" (Rom 6:11-

<sup>37</sup> TDNT 1.257. R. P. Martin, *2 Corinthians* (Waco: Word, 1986) 131, prefers the term "proxy" to "representative," since "it speaks of one authorized to act for others, yet one who has intimate connections with both parties."

<sup>38</sup> J. Denney, *The Death of Christ* (London: Tyndale, 1951) 84; cf. Thrall, *First and Second Corinthians* 149.

<sup>39</sup> F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) 143; cf. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising* 124.

<sup>40</sup> Rom 6:6 as rendered in Bruce, *Galatians* 144. In commenting on Gal 6:14, R. Y. K. Fung, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988) 307, states: "His [Paul's] transplantation [from one world to another] first took place in Christ, whose cross made it possible"; cf. C. B. Cousar, *Galatians* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1982) 150.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. P. T. Forsyth, *The Work of Christ* 134, quoted in L. Morris, *The Cross in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965) 224 n. 39; M. D. Hooker in *JTS* 22 (October 1971) 359.

<sup>42</sup> V. Taylor, *Forgiveness and Reconciliation* (2d ed.; London: Macmillan, 1960) 118.

<sup>43</sup> C. E. B. Cranfield, *Romans: A Shorter Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985) 139.

<sup>44</sup> Morris, *John* 732.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising* 127.

12). "If you put to death [continuous present tense] the deeds of the body you will live" (8:13).<sup>46</sup> Because "you have died (with Christ). . . . Now put them all away: anger, wrath, malice, slander, and foul talk. . . . Do not lie to one another" (Col 3:3–11).<sup>47</sup>

To be our Savior, Christ had to accomplish several things by his death. The first and foremost of these was to be our representative and, as such, actualize the full surrender to God that we could will but could not actualize.<sup>48</sup> This is already adumbrated in the consecration offerings of the OT, especially in the burnt offering and in the Passover sacrifice, both of which powerfully witnessed to the fact that there is no true and wholehearted commitment to God without the death of another. Christ's death was a death for our sins (thanks be to God!), but it was also a death of vicarious consecration.<sup>49</sup> And unless we have a self-centered religion, in which we value ourselves above God, that he died for our consecration is more important than that he died for our sins.<sup>50</sup> God's glory is more important than our escape from perdition. "Christ died and lived again that he might be Lord" (Rom 14:9).

<sup>46</sup> Though this is to be done "by the Spirit," v. 17 shows that the idea of dying with Christ is also in view. Cf. *ibid.* 80.

<sup>47</sup> In my view v. 5 reminds the readers of, if it does not quote from, the (baptismal?) instruction they had received when they had applied for recognition as members of the Christian community. In vv. 8 ff. they are being instructed as to what dying with Christ means for them "now (in emphatic position)," as members of the believing fellowship (cf. Rom 6:19).

<sup>48</sup> V. Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice* (London: Macmillan, 1959) 283. In contrast to Platonism, the ideal must be actualized to be fully real (cf. Gen 22:12).

<sup>49</sup> According to T. A. Hart, "Anselm of Canterbury and John McLeod Campbell: Where Opposites Meet?", *EvQ* 62/4 (October 1990) 311–333, McLeod Campbell had a view that "affirm(ed) the necessity for and the accomplishment of an *objective atonement* between God and man in which the divine wrath over human sin is dealt with" but that also insisted that Christ's death was "a total self-offering to God," a self-offering "which we were utterly unable to make, and [made] it on our behalf" (pp. 330–331). Whatever criticisms of Campbell's view of the atonement may be justified, emphasis on vicarious consecration is an essential element of a thoroughly Biblical understanding of Christ's death.

<sup>50</sup> Because his death meant that we died with him, it could also be a death for us (which it was) without catering to the flesh.