JongHyun Kwon

The Historical Jesus' Death as 'Forgiveness of Sins'

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 467

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

467

JongHyun Kwon

The Historical Jesus' Death as 'Forgiveness of Sins'

A Comparative Study of Paul and Matthew

Mohr Siebeck

JongHyun Kwon, born 1976; 2016 PhD in Theology at the University of Nottingham; currently working as a Pastor at Hanbeet Korean Church.

ISBN 978-3-16-156017-0 / eISBN 978-3-16-156374-4
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-156374-4

ISSN 0340-9570 / eISSN 2568-7484 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Gomaringen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

Acknowledgements

I always wondered why PhD candidates have so many people to appreciate. Refraining from reading their long acknowledgement, I set my mind that I would not write a long one. Now a few days before submission, I should confess that my decision was simply wrong because there are lots of people who have helped me.

My *Doktorvater*, Prof. Roland Deines, has been always my side, encouraging me to keep on researching this important topic. I sometimes want to open his brain to know where his endless knowledge comes from. Together with his academic support, he and Frau Renate Deines often invited my family (with two male monsters!) over, and made us feel at home. Without their hospitality, my wife and I would not have survived the long journey of this PhD. I also would like to mention Dr. Steven Travis, Mark Wreford, and Chae Eun Park who carefully read my entire writing, gave me useful feedback, and helped me improve my clumsy English. I also want to mention Tim Murray, Peter Watts, Christopher Ochs, and John Rabone and other English consultants based at Nottingham University. They all read a good portion of my work, and kindly corrected errors for me. Particularly for reading German, Eva Günther spent a lot of her precious time. German reading at Tübingen (through Prof. Deines' financial support) was also helpful. Therefore, this thesis is my work, but I can only say that because of those who helped me finish it.

I will miss time with members of the Informal Biblical Seminar (most of them already mentioned above) in the Theology and Religious Studies Department. I would like to express my gratitude towards my parents and in-laws in South Korea who have supported me with ALL the finances for my studies. I am deeply indebted to them. The members (especially for my teachers and pupils of Sunday School) of Nottingham Korean Church also are worthy of mention because of their encouragement. Throughout the study, three pastors kept praying for me, and giving me thoughtful advice: Rev. Ee-Seok Shim (S. Korea), Rev. Richard Y. Park (US), and Rev. WooSong Kwak (UK).

Finally, WonJun, and Eugene, my treasures, and my wife, YoonJung. I will never disappear again to study in the evenings (for some time from now)! To them, I dedicate this little work. I love you.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

Abbreviations follow those suggested in Billie Jean Collins, Bob Buller, and John F. Kutsko, *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Biblical Studies and Related Disciplines*, 2nd ed. (Atlanta: SBL, 2014), with exception of the abbreviations listed below.

AJEC	Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity
AKG	Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte
CTHP	Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy
HSHJ	Tom Holmén and Stanley E. Porter, eds. *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, 4 vols (Leiden: Brill, 2011).
JHC	*Journal of Higher Criticism*
JSHJ	*Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus*
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
JTCT	Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies
JVG	N.T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, vol. 2 of *Christian Origins and the Question of God* (London: SPCK, 1996).
NCC	New Covenant Commentary
NGS	New Gospel Studies
NTT	New Testament Theology
PNTC	Pillar New Testament Commentary

Chapter 1

Thesis and Introduction

1.1. Thesis

This volume aims to discover whether the historical Jesus understood his death as a means of forgiveness by comparing Paul and Matthew's treatment of these themes. Despite the strong tie between Jesus' death and forgiveness of sin in nascent Christianity, of the close connection of the two themes is treated as a subsidiary issue in much historical Jesus research. This obvious attenuation of the significance of their close relationship leads us to question whether their close relationship originated with the historical Jesus: is this interpretation a true understanding of the historical Jesus, or a post-Easter theology? This central question demands an in-depth examination of their relationship in the historical Jesus' mind. The investigation will be conducted through a comparison of the earliest Christian documents written by Paul and the Gospel of Matthew. The result will then be compared against Jewish writings contemporary to Jesus, to uncover whether any martyrdom accounts attribute an expiatory effect to the deaths of the martyrs.

Therefore, the aim is twofold: (1) to trace the historical Jesus' understanding of his own death, and (2) to compare Paul and Matthew's treatment of Jesus' forgiving death. Just as current scholars express a diverse range of views on the relationship between Jesus' death and the forgiveness of sins, scholarly comparisons between Paul and Matthew yield diverse results. More importantly, none deals with the connection between Jesus' death and remission in Paul and Matthew as a discussion topic. Through comparing the views of Paul and Matthew on this specific issue, this volume aims to show that Paul and Matthew correspond to one another on the issue of the strong affinity between Jesus' death and forgiveness, and that the historical Jesus may have understood his death as a means of forgiveness, as they describe.

1.2. The Necessity of the Study

1.2.1. The Importance of Forgiveness for Early Understandings of Jesus' Death

1.2.1.1. The Earliest Confession – 1 Corinthians 15:3

"Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures," together with "he was buried, that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the scriptures" (1 Cor 15:3b, 4) are among the first Christian confessions. The NT gives ample evidence that the earliest Christian communities felt it was important to summarize their essential convictions in short creedal formulae. The confession in 1 Corinthians 15 is not only one of the earliest confessions but also one of the most important. The first portion of the received tradition is the so-called "dying formula" (see section 4.3.2). Hengel accurately indicates that this "is the most frequent and most important confessional statement in the Pauline epistles and at the same time in the primitive Christian tradition."[1]

It must be noted that this significant confessional statement is "the recitation of a very ancient Christian creed."[2] Two words require attention: 'recitation' and 'ancient.' First, the statement is probably Paul's *recitation* of an established tradition. The words "I handed on to you as of first importance what I in turn had received" (1 Cor 15:3a) indicate that, following the practice of Jewish teachers, Paul passed on to his converts the tradition that he received from others at the beginning of his Christian experience. This implies that the content was probably well-preserved in its original form. Because of this, the confessional statement naturally includes some un-Pauline idioms: "'sins' in the plural" and "'according to the scriptures.'"[3]

---

[1] Martin Hengel, *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 37.

[2] John P. Meier, *The Roots of the Problem and the Person*, vol. 1 of *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus* (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 46.

[3] Dale C. Allison, *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History* (London: SPCK, 2010), 405n69. In his *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, trans. Norman Perrin (London: SCM, 1966), 104, Joachim Jeremias comments that these terms are "*foreign to Paul*." Gerd Theissen and Annette Merz also put these terms under '*un-Pauline phraseology*' (*The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide*, trans. John Bowden [London: SCM, 1998], 487), and contend that "its pre-Pauline origin is certain" (488). Other scholars who understand that the language of the text is not typically Pauline include, Paul J. Brown, *Bodily Resurrection and Ethics in 1 Cor 15: Connecting Faith and Morality in the Context of Greco-Roman Mythology*, WUNT II/360 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 116; Hans Conzelmann, "On the Analysis of the Confessional Formula in I Corinthians 15:3–5," *Interpretation* 20 (1966): 15–25, 18; Birger Gerhardsson, "Evidence for Christ's Resurrection according to Paul: 1 Cor 15:1–11," in *Neotestamentica et Philonica: Studies in Honor of Peder Borgen*, ed. David E. Aune, Torrey Seland, and Jarl Henning Ulrichsen, NovTSup

Second, the tradition is *ancient*. Paul clarifies that he also *received* this tradition as the first half of v.3 indicates. Since Paul explicitly introduces this as a received tradition, it is a pre-Pauline tradition. It is likely Paul delivered the tradition while he visited Corinth (ca.51 CE).[4] If so, its existence can demonstrate that, "within twenty years of Jesus' death, the belief that his death somehow dealt with sins was already widespread."[5] Moreover, it is likely Paul received this tradition in the 30s CE. As an option for the time of Paul's reception, Sim stresses that "it is probable that Paul received it when he visited Jerusalem some three years after his conversion around the year 36 CE."[6] Alternatively, considering the importance of the tradition, Paul may have received the tradition at the time of his conversion.

This well-preserved and widespread belief shows a close relationship between the concepts of Jesus' death and sin, through the assertion that Jesus' death was "for our sins": a direct correlation between the death of Jesus of Nazareth and the remission of sin. The widespread existence of this conviction in the rest of the NT[7] strongly supports the argument that the early church equated the death of Jesus on the cross with the solution to the abolition of sin. This inextricable link between the two continued well into the earliest post-NT literature.

---

106 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 73–91, 80. If Paul himself formulated this traditional statement, then he would have used different expressions. Günther Bornkamm, *Paul*, trans. D.M.G. Stalker (1971; repr., Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 133, states, for Paul, "sin practically always occurs in the singular." For Paul's use of ἁμαρτία, see Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 101–2. Moreover, instead of 'according to the scriptures,' Paul normally says 'as it is written' or similar utterances.

[4] That Paul "handed on to [the Corinthians believers]" hints at the time of his receiving the tradition.

[5] Tobias Hägerland, *Jesus and the Forgiveness of Sins: An Aspect of His Prophetic Mission* (Cambridge: CUP, 2011), 92. This received tradition is the very first and earliest creed of the early church and it "became the bedrock of [her] faith" (Bornkamm, *Paul*, 113).

[6] David C. Sim, "The Family of Jesus and the Disciples of Jesus in Paul and Mark: Taking Sides in the Early Church's Factional Dispute," in *Paul and Mark: Comparative Essays Part I Two Authors at the Beginnings of Christianity*, ed. Oda Wischmeyer, David C. Sim, and Ian J. Elmer, BZNW 198 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014), 73–97, 75. For a detailed discussion of the date of Paul's receiving the tradition, see section 4.4.1.1.

[7] For example, Matthew 26:28; Mark 10:45; Acts 5:30–31; Ephesians 1:7; Titus 2:14; Hebrews 9:28; 1 Peter 2:24; 3:18; 1 John 1:7; Revelation 1:5. Indeed, as Roland Deines states, "the atoning death of Jesus on the cross for the remission of sins is the core of the message of salvation in the New Testament" ("Biblical Viewpoints on Repentance, Conversion, and Turning to God," in *Acts of God in History: Studies Towards Recovering a Theological Historiography*, ed. Christoph Ochs and Peter Watts, WUNT 317 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013], 255).

1.2.1.2. The Early History – the Epistle of Barnabas 5:1, 7:3

The Epistle of Barnabas, which is generally dated sometime between 70 and 135 CE, "was probably a popular text in the early Church."[8] Seen as the "[summary of] the events of the cross, [and being] inspired literally by Mt,"[9] this epistle closely relates the death of Jesus and forgiveness of sins in line with the *kerygma* preserved in 1 Corinthians 15. If this is "one of the earliest contributions outside the New Testament to the discussion of questions that have confronted the followers of Jesus since the earliest days of his ministry,"[10] and the idea of Jesus' death granting forgiveness was vital for them, we would expect to find the link between Jesus' death and forgiveness of sins expressed in this epistle.

In *Barnabas* 5:1, the author states that "it was for this reason that the Lord endured the deliverance of his flesh to corruption, so that we might be cleansed by the forgiveness of sins, that is, by his sprinkled blood (Εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ὑπέμεινεν ὁ κύριος παραδοῦναι τὴν σάρκα εἰς καταφθοράν, ἵνα τῇ ἀφέσει τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἁγνισθῶμεν, ὅ ἐστιν ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ ῥαντίσματος αὐτοῦ)."[11] There can be little doubt that this verse assumes a clear connection between the two concepts, Jesus' death and forgiveness. The phrases 'his flesh to corruption' and 'his sprinkled blood' denote the death of Jesus, and the ἵνα-clause, which contains the traditional NT phrase of 'forgiveness of sins,' sees the purpose of Jesus' death specifically in terms of forgiveness. Therefore, as Massaux puts it, "the destruction of the flesh of the Lord is related to the remission of sins as it is in Paul."[12]

---

[8] James Carleton Paget, "The *Epistle of Barnabas*," in *Writings of the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Paul Foster (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 72–80, 72. Bart D. Ehrman cautions that "the Epistle of Barnabas was a popular writing in *some circles* of early Christianity" (*The Apostolic Fathers II: Epistle of Barnabas, Papias and Quadratus, Epistle to Diognetus, The Shepherd of Hermas*, LCL 25 [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003], 3 [emphasis mine]). However, "the fourth-century Codex Sinaiticus, an important early version of the New Testament, concludes with the texts of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas," which "suggests that they too were held in very high esteem" (Clayton N. Jefford, *The Apostolic Fathers: An Essential Guide* [Nashville: Abingdon, 2005], 7, 8 respectively).

[9] Édouard Massaux, *The First Ecclesiastical Writers*, vol. 1 of *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Saint Irenaeus*, trans. Norman J. Belval and Suzanne Hecht, ed. Arthur J. Bellinzoni, NGS 5 (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1990), 64.

[10] Michael W. Holmes, ed., *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 370. Unless otherwise stated, quotations and English translation of *Barnabas* are taken from Holmes's volume.

[11] Ibid., 390–93. Anthony C. Thiselton interprets this text as referring to "the substitutionary death of Christ" (*The Hermeneutics of Doctrine* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007], 40).

[12] Massaux, *First Ecclesiastical Writers*, 79.

The same interconnection between forgiveness and Jesus' death is apparent in *Barnabas* 7:3b. In the context of Jesus' crucifixion, it states "[the Lord] himself was planning to offer the vessel of his spirit as a sacrifice for our sins (αὐτὸς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἁμαρτιῶν ἔμελλεν τὸ σκεῦος τοῦ πνεύματος προσφέρειν θυσίαν)." Here one can easily find two shared features with 1 Corinthians 15: (1) the phrase "for our sins" with a slight difference, and (2) its connection to Jesus' death ("a sacrifice," and clearly implied by the third word of v.3a 'crucified [σταυρωθεὶς]').[13] On the close link between Jesus' death and forgiveness, Hvalvik comments on the effects of Jesus' suffering for the Christians and for those who refuse to believe its effects:

> almost everywhere when Christ's suffering is mentioned, it is related to this topic: the forgiveness of sins (cf. 7:2, 3, 5; 14:5) or the fulfilment of their sins (cf. 6:6–7; 14:5). This reveals a basic theological dogma in *Barnabas*: to "us" the cross of Christ means salvation; to "them" the cross means damnation.[14]

In chapters 5 and 7 of *Barnabas*, its author "pays particular attention to Christ's passion and death,"[15] and his death is closely linked to the concept of forgiveness. Hence, in the epistle, the author intends to "connect [Jesus' death] very clearly with the forgiveness of the believer's sin."[16]

If we follow "the developing consensus . . . for a Hadrianic date some time in the 130s,"[17] about a century after Jesus' crucifixion, an inseparable link between his death and remission of sins appears to be fully established and undisputed.

Given that the earliest written confession clearly expresses that Jesus' death is for "our sins" and this was still valid some time later in early church history, the very close relationship between the two seems to have been natu-

---

[13] Moreover, it is likely that by employing αὐτὸς, the author emphasizes Jesus' own willingness to die.

[14] Reidar Hvalvik, *The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant: The Purpose of the Epistle of Barnabas and Jewish-Christian Competition in the Second Century*, WUNT II/82 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 145.

[15] Carleton Paget, "*Barnabas*," 79. Moreover, Jefford, *Apostolic Fathers*, 88, also puts it, "while our author is largely concerned that each reader should pay particular attention to a triptych of key Christian virtues (faith, righteousness, joy), the role of the Messiah's death is central to an understanding of these elements."

[16] James Carleton Paget, "The *Epistle of Barnabas* and the Writings that later formed the New Testament," in *Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew Gregory and Christopher Tuckett (Oxford: OUP, 2005), 229–49, 247.

[17] James Carleton Paget, "The *Epistle of Barnabas*," *ExpTim* 117 (2006): 441–46, 442–43. Concerning the date, John Dominic Crossan, *Jesus: A Revolutionary Biography* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1994), 149, prefers its early date and states, it is written "toward the end of the first century." After limiting its dating to between AD 70 and 135, Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers*, 373, admits that "within these limits, it is difficult to be any more precise."

ral and crucial in primitive Christianity. They did not dispense with the issue, but rather had been proactively talking and writing about it.[18] This confessional statement has been positioned as one of the firmest and innermost convictions of the followers of Jesus, which was not changed one iota. It never appeared ahistorical or unrealistic for individuals in the days of the historical Jesus. If so, historical Jesus research should consider "forgiveness of sins" as a relevant topic. However, the volumes written by the contemporary questers do not reflect this.

1.2.2. The Unimportance of Forgiveness for Contemporary Understandings of Jesus' Death

1.2.2.1. Post-Easter Theology?

The connection between Jesus' death and forgiveness of sins is a neglected feature in Jesus scholarship. In fact, the explicit correlation between the two so evident in the early church has almost disappeared. What is more, there are many scholars who contend that the traditional confession, "Christ died for our sins," is post-Easter theology.

It is not too strong to say that this close correlation has been deliberately sidelined since the beginning of the so-called First Quest. Hermann Samuel Reimarus (1694–1768), who can be considered one of the intellectual forerunners of the modern quest for the historical Jesus, states that "the new system of a suffering spiritual saviour, which no one had ever known or thought of before, was invented after the death of Jesus," and one of its core beliefs was "that Christ or the Messiah was bound to die in order to obtain forgiveness for mankind."[19] Reimarus thus suggests that the historical Jesus did not relate his death and forgiveness in his own mind.

---

[18] In addition to Barnabas, there are numerous texts from the writings of the Apostolic Fathers which explicitly or implicitly connect Jesus' death to forgiveness: 1 Clem. 7:4; 12:7b; 16:5a, 9, 13b–14; 21:6a; 49:6; 2 Clem. 1:2; Did. 9:3; 10:3; Diogn. 9:2b; Herm.Sim. 5.6.2–3(59.2–3); Ign.*Eph*. 18:1; Ign.*Magn*. 9:1; Ign.*Phld*. 9:2a; Ign.*Rom*. 6:1; Ign.*Smyrn*. 2:1a; 6:2b; Ign.*Trall*. 2:1b; Mart.Pol. 17:2b; Pol.*Phil*. 1:2; 8:1; 9:2b; *Fragment of Papias* 24:8. Having consulted these writings, one can concur with Charles E. Hill: "the saving effects of Jesus' death are, of course, a common theme in early Christian writing. That Christ died 'for us' or 'for our sins' is taught repeatedly by Paul and is echoed by Barnabas (*Barn*. 5.5; 7.3), Ignatius (*Pol*. 7.1) and others." (*From the Lost Teaching of Polycarp: Identifying Irenaeus' Apostolic Presbyter and the Author of* Ad Diognetum, WUNT 186 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006], 140). Moreover, in the Apostolic Fathers, a significant correlation is found between forgiveness of sins and Jesus' death, but not between Jesus' healing ministry and forgiveness. Forgiveness through Jesus' death remained significant, but surprisingly forgiveness by his healing vanished.

[19] Charles H. Talbert, ed., *Reimarus: Fragments*, trans. Ralph S. Fraser (London: SCM, 1971), 151. According to Reimarus, it was "clearly not the intention or the object of Jesus to suffer and to die, but to build up a worldly kingdom, and to deliver the Israelites from

According to Albert Schweitzer, Jesus "did not regard [his death] as an atonement which in any way effected the forgiveness of sins."[20] His reasoning is based on the 'forgiveness' in the Lord's prayer (LP hereafter), where Jesus mentions divine forgiveness prior to his death; if Jesus himself states that God's forgiveness can be given without his own death, Jesus did not feel the necessity of a means of forgiveness, and thus he did not need to die for the forgiveness of sins.

Rudolf Bultmann, who was a contemporary of Schweitzer, shows his scepticism regarding the idea of Jesus' death as remission originated with the historical Jesus, by saying "we cannot know how Jesus understood his end, his death."[21] For him, it is a primitive mythology "that a divine Being should become incarnate, and atone for the sins of men through his own blood."[22]

---

bondage" (150). Furthermore, he contends that Jesus' intention was different from that of the disciples, and thus it was his disciples who "brought out a new creed of Jesus as a spiritual, suffering Savior" (242). According to Reimarus, the disciples invented it because they faced "poverty and disgrace" after Jesus' death.

In a similar vein, David Friedrich Strauss (1808–1874) includes Jesus' atoning death as an example of "the dogmatic import of the life of Jesus" (*The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined*, trans. George Eliot [London: Chapman, 1846], 758). He further comments that in addition to Jesus' atoning death and the tenets of Christology, "every trait in the image of the Messiah as sketched by the popular expectation, was attributed with necessary or gratuitous modifications to Jesus; nay, the imagination, once stimulated, invented new characteristics" (759). Again, it was the earliest community which invented this dogma. However, he suggests the possibility that Jesus might have come "to the idea that his messianic death would have an expiatory efficacy," but still contends that the notion of Jesus' death "as a sin offering . . . belong[s] rather to the system which was developed after the death of Jesus" (573).

[20] Albert Schweitzer, *The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity*, ed. Ulrich Neuenschwander, trans. L.A. Garrard (London: Black, 1968), 128. He states that "Jesus cannot regard his death as a sacrifice necessary for the forgiveness of sins. His view of the unconditional forgiveness that comes from God's compassion precludes it" (127–28). Schweitzer argues that "the real meaning of his death, however, he finds in its effect in meeting the conditions needed for the coming of the Kingdom" (128, see also 123–25).

[21] Rudolf Bultmann, "The Primitive Christian Kerygma and the Historical Jesus," in *The Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ: Essays on the New Quest of the Historical Jesus*, ed. Carl E. Braaten and Roy A. Harrisville (Nashville: Abingdon, 1964), 15–42, 23. Similarly, but more broadly, Bultmann also asserts that "we can now know almost nothing concerning the life and personality of Jesus" (*Jesus and the Word*, trans. Louise P. Smith and Erminie H. Lantero, 2nd ed. [1934; repr., New York: Scribner's Sons, 1958], 8). In this sense, he is considered a representative of the 'No Quest' period. However, Bultmann traces the origin of Jesus' atoning death to the Palestinian and the Hellenistic Church because of the *Kerygma* (especially 1 Cor 15:3).

In some sense, Marcus J. Borg adopts Bultmann's pessimistic and sceptical view of the significance of historical Jesus' death. Conceding that "the stories of Jesus' death took shape very early," Borg claimed those stories "have also been affected by the faith of the church to such a degree that it is difficult to separate historical happening from theological

The list could go on. These scholars express their negative views on the issue, but seldom provide proof for their overarching premise. Their views on the issue actually originate from their overarching proposition rather than the result of their argumentation. It is true that unlike mathematicians, historians "cannot formulate proofs for our theorems."[23] However, it is fair to request that theologians and historians provide plausible reasons for their basic proposal. Most scholars who see the matter as an innovation of Jesus' followers after Easter do not suggest any plausible reasoning for their claim. Most of all, they do not provide sufficient reasons why the followers of Jesus, after his death on the cross, felt the need to tell the message of Jesus in the manner as 1 Corinthians 15:3 suggests. The reasons given by Reimarus are hardly sufficient for such a dramatic prioritization of the kerygma. What about the most recent historians in the field of Jesus studies? Do they see this differently?

1.2.2.2. 'Third Questers' on the Relationship between Jesus' Death and Forgiveness

After pointing out that the 'New Quest' had "downplayed to a large extent the significance of Jesus' death," N. T. Wright continues by saying, "the present 'Third Quest', by and large, will have none of this."[24] His contention seems to be right because the significance of Jesus' death can easily be found in most of the recent monographs and articles on the historical Jesus. With "the renaissance in Jesus research,"[25] most recent historical Jesus academics consider Jesus' intention towards, and understanding of, his own death.

---

interpretation" (*Jesus, a New Vision: Spirit, Culture, and the Life of Discipleship* [San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1987], 178).

[22] Rudolf Bultmann, "New Testament and Mythology," in *Kerygma and Myth: A Theological Debate*, ed. Hans Werner Bartsch, trans. Reginald H. Fuller (London: SPCK, 1953–62), 1: 1–44, 7. Bultmann presents as an example of the mythical worldview of the New Testament the notion that: Jesus "dies the death of a sinner on the cross and makes atonement for the sins of men" (1:2). For Bultmann, the event of redemption itself is mythical, and is a syncretized product of Jewish eschatology and Greek Gnosticism. Therefore, "*the kerygma is incredible to modern man, for he is convinced that the mythical view of the world is obsolete*" (1:3).

[23] Dale C. Allison, *Jesus of Nazareth: Millenarian Prophet* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998), 35.

[24] *JVG*, 86.

[25] Marcus J. Borg, "Portraits of Jesus in Contemporary North American Scholarship," *HTR* 84 (1991): 1–22, 1. Ben Witherington has recently indicated that "though interest in the topic of the Historical Jesus continues, its celebrity status has waned a bit in the last few years" ("The Historical Jesus – Sean Freyne's View," Beliefnet http://www.beliefnet.com/-columnists/bibleandculture/2010/11/the-historical-jesus-sean-freynes-view.html, accessed December 2, 2011,).

To survey forgiveness in relation to Jesus' death in the recent historical-Jesus research trend, I have selected several volumes which can be considered the most relevant historical Jesus books.[26] This is not to say that these constitute a representative sample of the historical Jesus guild, nor that other contributions are insignificant, but the books and scholars considered here are well-known and influential in recent historical Jesus research.[27]

Each author's views on the following questions are significant for this study: (1) Did Jesus acknowledge that his death was impending? If so, did he intend to die? (2) How did Jesus understand his death, with regard to forgiveness of sins? Did he interpret his death as means of bestowing forgiveness? There can be three possible sets of answers: 'No' and 'No'; 'Yes' and 'No'; 'Yes' and 'Yes.' If an author gives a negative answer to the first question, it is almost certain that the author answers 'No' to the second question because he is not interested in the meaning which Jesus may have attached to his own death. Yet an author who answers 'Yes' to the former question can answer either 'No' or 'Yes' to the latter.

Thus, these questions can sort the opinions of these scholars regarding the relationship between Jesus' death and forgiveness in his own understanding

---

[26] Allison, *Jesus*; Borg, *Jesus*; Maurice Casey, *Jesus of Nazareth: An Independent Historian's Account of His Life and Teaching* (London: T&T Clark, 2010); John Dominic Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (New York: HarperCollins, 1992); John P. Meier, *Mentor, Message, and Miracles*, vol. 2 of *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus* (New York: Doubleday, 1994); E.P. Sanders, *The Historical Figure of Jesus* (London: Penguin, 1993); Jens Schröter, *Jesus of Nazareth: Jew from Galilee, Savior of the World*, trans. Wayne Coppins and S. Brian Pounds (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014); Geza Vermes, *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels* (London: SCM, 1998); Wright, *JVG*.

The subject index and (sub)headings in the works are helpful for locating the topic of Jesus' death. Then portions related to Jesus' death were further examined to investigate whether his death is linked to the forgiveness-theme. Alternatively, one can look at the treatment of the New Testament passages below, which should give at least a slight hint about the author's view on the relationship between the two themes: the Ransom passage (Mark 10:45; Matt 20:28), the cup-saying (Mark 14:24; Matt 26:28; Luke 22:20), 'saving from sins' (Matt 1:21), and Luke 24:46–47, where Jesus' suffering and forgiveness appear together. Moreover, the passages concerning healing and forgiving like "your sins are forgiven" were consulted in case an author related it to Jesus' death, or made his view known about the issue of forgiveness. Finally, the treatment of the passages in which Jesus predicts his suffering and death (Mark 8:31; 9:9–10, 31; 10:32–34 and parr.; Luke 13:33) were also consulted.

[27] Moreover, these scholars' reconstructions of Jesus have become the most iconic, e.g. Allison's Jesus is an apocalyptic prophet, Crossans' a Galilean peasant and Jewish Cynic, Meier's a "marginal Jew", Vermes' a charismatic Jew, and Wright's Messiah of Israel. Mark Allan Powell, *Jesus as a Figure in History: How Modern Historians View the Man from Galilee* (Louisville: WJK, 1998), presents a similar list: The Jesus Seminar, Crossan, Borg, Sanders, Meier, and Wright.

into three main categories: no relation, no direct relation, and direct relation. According to the scholars in the first group who answer 'No' to both questions, Jesus did not know of his impending death, and so he might not have intended to die. Consequently, the early church *made up* a fictional story that Jesus "died for our sins," misleadingly claiming it as Jesus' interpretation of his own impending death.[28] 'No direct relation' group members would say that Jesus expected to die, or that he at least allowed death to occur to him. However, it was not Jesus' intention to "die for our sins," implying that this death "for our sins" again is a later interpretation of the early church. The scholars in the last class argue that Jesus envisaged his death and embraced this death wholeheartedly as a part of his mission, and, more than likely, with an assurance that his death is "for our sins."[29] To begin with, let us turn to the 'No relation' group.

1.2.2.2.1. No Relation – Jesus Did Not Intend to Die at All

First in this group is Geza Vermes, who appropriately calls attention to the Jewishness of Jesus in historical Jesus study. In his *Jesus the Jew*, he accepts the possibility of Jesus' passion prediction in the light of Peter's rebuking his master (suggesting that Luke 9:44 is closer to the original saying), but he dismisses Jesus' prediction of his resurrection.[30]

However, in a later paper which shows his "latest stage of thinking on controversial issues,"[31] Vermes completely denies the possibility of Jesus' foreknowledge of his impending death. He states that "the apostles, and even Jesus himself, had no foreknowledge of the passion and the resurrection and that anything stating the contrary in the Gospels must be qualified as inauthentic."[32] He found a dilemma in the contradictory ideas of Jesus clearly

---

[28] Strauss, *Life of Jesus*, 566, states that "the minute predictions . . . must be regarded as a *vaticinium post eventum*." Cf. Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. Kendrick Grobel (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007), 29. For a fuller discussion, see Hans F. Bayer, *Jesus' Predictions of Vindication and Resurrection: The Provenance, Meaning, and Correlation of the Synoptic Predictions*, WUNT II/20 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986).

[29] This does not mean that they share the same understanding what "for our sins" signifies to Jesus. For the probable meaning of 'forgiveness of sins,' see chapter 3.

[30] Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 37–38. However, he further indicates that the suffering of the Messiah, his death and resurrection do not "appear to have been part of the faith of first-century Judaism" (38; cf. Bultmann, *Theology of the NT*, 31). Therefore, Vermes seems negative towards the possible authenticity of Jesus' passion prediction, although he does not completely negate its possibility.

[31] Geza Vermes, *Jesus in the Jewish World* (London: SCM, 2010), xi.

[32] Ibid., 234–35. Here he also suggests that "Jewish tradition knew nothing of a dying and rising Messiah." As Vermes mentions, this view is not without opponents (e.g. Israel Knohl, *The Messiah before Jesus: The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, trans. David Maisel [London: University of California Press, 2000]).

mentioning his death to his disciples and the disciples acting as if they had never heard of it when Jesus was seized: either Jesus did not know of his death and so did not mention it to his disciples or his disciples acted in a strange way although despite having heard Jesus' prediction of his death. Vermes chose the first option because "[rejecting] the authenticity of the predictions provides the easiest resolution of the dilemma."[33] Because Jesus did not expect his impending death, according to Vermes, Jesus might not have had time to place any significant meaning on his death.

Marcus Borg who while being a member of the Jesus Seminar differs from them on some topics. Speaking of Jesus' death, he clearly states that "the *outcome* was not the *purpose* of the journey,"[34] which means that Jesus did not intend to die in Jerusalem. Borg strongly agrees that Jesus would have found himself confronted by death,[35] but nevertheless his tragic death was not

[33] Vermes, *Jesus in the Jewish World*, 234. Vermes also comments on the earthly Jesus forgiving sins whilst healing the sick, stating "for Jesus . . . the phrase 'to forgive sins' was synonymous with 'to heal'" (Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 68). His proof comes from the *Prayer of Nabonidus*. In this Aramaic fragment from Qumran (4Q242, or 4QPrNab), Vermes noted the close association between pardoning and healing of sickness in the passage "I was afflicted with an evil ulcer for seven years . . . and a *gazer* pardoned my sins" (67). Yet, Eric Eve points out that due to its severely fragmentary form, "the translation of the phrase 'an exorcist pardoned my sins' is far from certain" (*The Jewish Context of Jesus' Miracles*, JSNTSup 231 [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2002], 183). According to him, there are three possible renderings: (1) a Jewish exorcist/soothsayer "pardoned the [King's] sins," (2) "God forgave the king's sins," (3) "the king confessed his sins and God sent him the Jewish soothsayer" (ibid.).

For Vermes, the historical Jesus is a charismatic figure. He draws attention to two charismatic Jews in the days of Jesus: Hanina ben Dosa and Honi the Circle Drawer (Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 69–78). However, his classification of Jesus as a charismatic Jew like the other two is not convincing. Jesus himself acknowledges the existence of charismatic Jews who do wondrous things. More importantly, he distinguishes himself from them: "and if I by Beelzebub cast out devils by whom do *your* sons [οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν] cast them out? Therefore shall they be your judge" (Luke 11:19, Matt 12:27). By calling them "*your* sons," Jesus identifies the Jewish miracle workers as belonging to the Pharisees (Matt 11:24), and it seems probable that the historical Jesus did not want himself to be categorized with them.

Moreover, Vermes contends that Jesus did not feel any danger because there was no serious conflict between Jesus and other Jews. Because of this, Vermes cannot "give a convincing explanation of why Jesus was crucified" (Casey, *Jesus*, 14). Indeed, it is difficult to find an immediate cause for Jesus' death in his work. Although Vermes contributes to Jesus scholarship by correctly emphasizing the Jewishness of Jesus, this is a weak point in his interpretation.

[34] Borg, *Jesus*, 172. Later, he clearly states that "his death was not his primary intention" (184).

[35] Borg argues that because of his deeds in Jerusalem, "it became more apparent [to Jesus] that the outcome would be his death" (ibid., 177). Elsewhere, he states that "in all likelihood, I think [Jesus] realized that if he kept doing what he was doing, he risked execution. He knew what had happened to his mentor, John the Baptizer. He may well have

his intention. Borg's Jesus went up to Jerusalem to persuade the crowd in the religio-political capital of Israel, and he "was killed because he sought, in the name and power of the Spirit, the transformation of his own culture."[36] Borg depicts Jesus as a nonviolent social leader,[37] and appraises him as one of the prophets sent by God. Here Borg is constructing an historical image: a prophetic rebel, or a social prophet.

In the volume co-authored with Wright, Borg contends that Jesus did not see his death having a forgiving efficacy. At first, he correctly articulates a view of Jesus' being a 'sacrifice for sin' as one of the "five primary understandings of the death and resurrection of Jesus in the New Testament."[38] Yet, regarding the question: "'do you think Jesus saw his own death as a sacrifice for sin?' or 'do you think that God can forgive sins only because of Jesus' sacrifice?,'" he clearly states that his "answer is no."[39] Therefore, Borg "does not suppose that [Jesus] deliberately died for the sins of the world."[40]

According to John Dominic Crossan,[41] Jesus might have perceived adverse circumstances which may eventually cause his death, but did not intend his death. More clearly in his later work than in his infamous *The Historical Jesus*, Crossan suggests that Jesus did not intend his death in Jerusalem in commenting on cleansing of the temple:

> Jesus' symbolic destruction [of the Temple] simply actualized what he had already said in his teachings, effected in his healings, and realized in his mission of open commensality. But the confined and tinderbox atmosphere of the Temple at Passover, especially under

---

known that his journey to Jerusalem could end in his death. But that is very different from saying that he saw his death as central to his purpose" (Marcus J. Borg, and N.T. Wright, *The Meaning of Jesus: Two Visions* [San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999], 82). Concerning the Last Supper, he also confirms his view again by stating, "Jesus may have spoken of his upcoming death; my hunch is that he knew he was in great danger" (ibid., 87; however, he sees the word of Jesus on bread and wine as "an early Christian ritualization of the death of Jesus").

[36] Borg, *Jesus*, 183–84.

[37] Ibid., 179, where he says, "the most certain fact about the historical Jesus is his execution as a political rebel."

[38] Borg and Wright, *Meaning of Jesus*, 141.

[39] Ibid., 140.

[40] *JVG*, 76.

[41] Crossan relies heavily on his claim that some of the apocryphal gospels are prior to the canonical gospels (*Historical Jesus*, 427–34). Craig A. Evans regards Crossan's argument that some apocryphal gospels were available earlier than the Synoptic Gospels as problematic: "these early dates and hypothetical sources are not widely accepted among scholars" (*Fabricating Jesus: How Modern Scholars Distort the Gospels* [Nottingham: Inter-Varsity, 2007], 59). For two critiques of Crossan's claims, see Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 1:122–23; *JVG*, 44–65.

Pilate, was not the same as the atmosphere in the rural reaches of Galilee, even under Antipas, and the soldiers moved in immediately to arrest him.[42]

On the other hand, another of Crossan's works clearly shows his view that Jesus may well have anticipated his death because of his dangerous surroundings: "there is no reason, after John's execution, that Jesus might not have imagined some similar fate for himself, but those precise prophecies were created and placed on Jesus' lips by Mark himself."[43] Accordingly, it can be argued that Crossan understands Jesus as expecting his death but not intending it, which is close to Borg's view.[44]

In a later interview, Crossan clarifies his stance: Jesus "was crucified because he threatened Roman stability – not as a sacrifice to God for humanity's sins."[45] Therefore, for him, Jesus' crucifixion was not related to remis-

---

[42] Crossan, *Jesus: Revolutionary Biography*, 133. Cf. idem, *Historical Jesus*, 360. Crossan provides a clever reason why Jesus was not killed in Galilee, his main sphere of activity. After quoting *Ant*. 18.114, 116, Crossan, *Jesus: Revolutionary Biography*, 49, suggests that "popular resentment for the death of John probably persuaded Antipas not to move against Jesus."

[43] John Dominic Crossan, *Who Killed Jesus?: Exposing the Roots of Anti-Semitism in the Gospel Story of the Death of Jesus* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996), 67.

[44] Jesus' conflict with the Jewish authorities splits Borg and Crossan: Borg recognises the conflict, but Crossan does not. For Borg's view on the conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees, see his *Conflict, Holiness, and Politics in the Teachings of Jesus*, 2nd ed. (London: Continuum, 1998), 151–55. He specifically notes that "the conflict was real," and suggests that "ultimately, the conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees was a hermeneutical battle between compassion and holiness, a struggle concerning the correct interpretation of Torah" (153, 154 respectively). Cf. Borg, *Jesus*, 177–82.

[45] John Blake, "John Dominic Crossan's 'blasphemous' portrait of Jesus," CNN, February 27, 2011, http://edition.cnn.com/2011/LIVING/02/27/Jesus.scholar, accessed November 25, 2014. In the same place, Crossan claims "Jesus was an exploited 'peasant with an attitude' who didn't . . . die as punishment for humanity's sins." However, this claim seems to contradict *Cross Gospel* 4:13, where one of the criminals crucified with Jesus calls him the "saviour of men" (σωτὴρ τῶν ἀνθρώπων) on the cross. Crossan regards *Cross Gospel* as an independent source "composed by fifties C.E." and contends that this was embedded in the Gospel of Peter (*Historical Jesus*, 429; idem, *The Cross that Spoke: The Origins of the Passion Narrative* [San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988]), although Crossan himself admits that he maintains his theory "despite its almost universal scholarly rejection" ("The *Gospel of Peter* and the Canonical Gospels," in *Das Evangelium nach Petrus: Text, Kontexte, Intertexte*, ed. Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas, TU 158 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007], 117–34, 134; cf. Bart D. Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery: The Use of Literary Deceit in Early Christian Polemics* [Oxford: OUP, 2013], 327–28, where he describes Crossan's theory as "the famous but rather uninfluential proposal"). This 'independent' source seems to witness that Jesus' death was a redemptive death, supporting the crucifixion narrative in the canonical gospels. Therefore, among Crossan's earliest sources, four Pauline epistles (1 Thess, Gal, 1 Cor, Rom) and another independent source (*Cross Gospel*) multiply attest Jesus' redemptive death against his statement in the recent

sion. In sum, Crossan claims that although Jesus anticipated his approaching death, he did not intend his death in Jerusalem and his death was not for forgiveness.

1.2.2.2.2. No Direct Relation – Jesus Expected to Die, but Not for Forgiveness

The scholars who can be grouped together include Dale C. Allison, E.P. Sanders, and Jens Schröter. They contend that the historical Jesus expected to die, but the purpose of his death was not forgiveness.

Allison states that Mark 10:45 contains two conflicting ideas: "it involves a concrete prediction of death and harmonizes with the post-Easter understanding of Jesus' death as atonement."[46] For Allison, that Jesus foresaw his imminent death is a fact, but the assigning of a redemptive meaning to his death was a later work by the early church.[47] He is hesitant to confirm Jesus' intention: "Mk 10:45, with its soteriological interest, might go back to Jesus; and, . . . it is a reasonable surmise that Jesus, at least near the end, envisaged

---

interview. Despite this, he flatly rejects the historicity of the narrative in the *Cross Gospel* by stating that "it is, in my terms, not history remembered but prophecy historicized" ("*Gospel of Peter*," 118. For his "four major reasons for preferring Koester's choice of *prophecy* rather than Brown's choice of *memory* as the matrix for [the details of the passion-resurrection narrative]," see ibid., 128–29). Crossan also states that the Eucharist, in which many scholars find a hint towards Jesus' foreknowledge of his death, "does not derive from the historical Jesus" (*Historical Jesus*, 360). Rather, he regards it as a product of "the liturgical creativity of the early communities" (ibid.). Consequently, in Jesus' last supper scene, he discovers no connection to Jesus' death. His proof-texts are from two different sources. Firstly, in *Didache* 9–10, which covers the ritual of the Eucharist, Crossan discerns no evidence of institutionalization of the gospel tradition. If Jesus established this ritual, Crossan argues, it should be institutionalized in the early church tradition. However, *Didache* 10 does not mention the cup at all, whilst describing the Eucharist. *Didache* 9 mentions it, but, according to Crossan, this is a late addition. Moreover, the order of bread and cup is reversed in *Didache* 9 as well as 1 Cor 10:15, 21. For Crossan, this shows that this meal was not well established as a ritual at the time the *Didache* was written, implying that Jesus did not establish the liturgy. Secondly, Crossan remarks that there are no Eucharistic paintings in catacombs (398), even though there are a number of scenes portraying the meal of bread and *fish*. However, against his assertion, there was a Supper tradition with bread and new wine (not fish) even before Jesus which occurs in 1QS 6:4–5 and 1QSa 2. Whether or not this tradition was fully established in a later stage of Christianity, we can find a parallel to Jesus' final meal.

[46] Allison, *Jesus*, 57n205.

[47] In his earlier book (*The End of the Ages Has Come: An Early Interpretation of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987], 117), Allison concludes that "Jesus anticipated suffering and an untimely death." On Mk 10:45b, John Nolland also prefers "to see it as a secondary development, elucidating the service of the Son of Man in light of developing church understanding of the passion." (*Luke 18:35–24:53*, WBC 35C [Dallas: Word, 1993], 1063).

his death and gave some meaning to it."[48] Allison allows that Jesus may have projected some meaning onto his death, but does not clarify forgiveness as its meaning. As there are no further hints on Allison's view of Jesus' intention towards his death in the two books, which is why he belongs in this set.

Sanders' Jesus, however, "thought that God would intervene before he was arrested and executed. . . . He hoped that he would not die, but he resigned himself to the will of God."[49] Jesus definitely foresaw his death, but he was open to whatever result he would face. He did not actively intend to die, although he did not avoid it. Sanders' portrait of Jesus near his death is similar to Schweitzer's as he claims, "[Jesus] thought that the kingdom would arrive immediately. After he had been on the cross for a few hours, he despaired, and cried out that he had been forsaken"[50]. Furthermore, Sanders notes that Jesus "prayed to be spared, but he did so completely privately."[51] Jesus did not want this miserable death, and is depicted as a figure who took on a passive attitude rather than acting aggressively.

The direction of Sanders' argument is unclear in this specific volume, but a quote from his earlier book is enough to clarify his understanding. He states that the idea of death for sins is rather unreasonable: "the view that [Jesus] plotted his own redemptive death makes him strange in any century."[52] The Jesus of Sanders definitely expected to die in Jerusalem, but it would have been absurd for him to plan a death which would achieve forgiveness.

The last scholar in this category is Jens Schröter, a German theologian who shows a keen interest in early Christianity. He clearly states that "Jesus himself did not understand his death as a salvific death for the forgiveness of sins or as a sacrifice that was to be offered to God."[53] For him, Jesus' atoning death is "a primitive Christian interpretation."[54] He includes the ransom logion (Mark 10:45; Matt 20:28) as one of the "post-Easter interpretations," and sees the cup-saying in the Last Supper (Mark 14:24; Matt 26:28) as "a summarizing interpretation of the life and death of Jesus."[55]

Schröter contends instead that the historical Jesus expected to die in order to bring the reign of God: "in the face of his looming death [Jesus] held fast

---

[48] Allison, *Jesus*, 65.

[49] Sanders, *Historical Figure*, 264.

[50] Ibid., 274–75.

[51] Ibid., 264.

[52] E.P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 333.

[53] Schröter, *Jesus*, 198.

[54] Ibid., 196. Later, he labels the texts presenting Jesus' atoning death, such as 1 Corinthians 15:3, Galatians 1:4, and Romans 3:25 "innovative interpretations" (199).

[55] Ibid., 197, 194 respectively. Schröter also regards those passages which emphasize the divine necessity of Jesus' death as "post-Easter interpretations" because "neither Jesus himself nor his first followers reckoned with the fact that God had planned such a cruel fate for his representative from the beginning" (197).

to the conviction that God would complete the establishment of his reign. He interpreted his own fate in the horizon of the prophets who were sent to Israel but were rejected and killed by it."[56] On this basis, he states, all the interpretations of Jesus' death were later developed. In other words, Jesus' understanding of "his fate in the framework of his activity for the reign of God led to . . . the interpretation of his whole existence, including his death, as an existence for others–for 'many.'"[57]

1.2.2.2.3. Direct Relation – Jesus Intended to Die for Forgiveness

Unlike the scholars who have been discussed so far, those who follow find expiatory efficacy in the historical Jesus' intention towards his death. In the second volume of his *magnum opus*, J. P. Meier does not particularly concern himself with the topic of forgiveness of sins. One of the endnotes taken from the work of J. A. Fitzmyer is noteworthy, though:

> Jesus thus uses the moment of his arrest as the occasion for manifesting his healing power even toward one of those who is among his enemies. It betokens the symbolic value of his passion; through his arrest and death will come forgiveness. As God's agent he reverses the evil done by human beings.[58]

Meier seems to agree with what Fitzmyer states. Thus, for Meier, Jesus' death would bring forgiveness.

In Wright's reconstruction, Jesus foresaw his coming death and intended to die. For Wright, the Last Supper is "the central symbolic action which provides the key to Jesus' implicit story about his own death."[59] Wright states that through this symbolic meal Jesus was showing that he was about to die. Therefore, his Jesus "knew, somehow, that he was to suffer and die."[60] Following Schweitzer, Wright confirms that Jesus went up to Jerusalem in order to die.[61]

The question of what Jesus aimed to accomplish through his death remains, and Wright's answer is that he "intended that his death should in some sense

---

[56] Ibid., 196.

[57] Ibid., 199.

[58] J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, AB 28A (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 1449, as quoted in Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 2:761–62n171. Moreover, in his *Law and Love*, vol. 4 of *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 641–42n302, whilst Meier accepts "the idea of a 'mainstream' Christianity," he argues that one of its shared positions is "the necessary and saving nature of [Jesus'] death (viewed, at least at times, as a sacrifice for sins)."

[59] *JVG*, 554.

[60] Ibid., 573.

[61] Ibid., 609. He also states that Jesus "believed [his death] was his vocation" (593).

function sacrificially."[62] Wright strongly denies the claim that the idea of Jesus' death as a vicarious sacrifice is a post-Easter explanation and places sacrificial meaning and redemptive significance within Jesus' own understanding. Among the Third Questers, Wright is the only scholar who deals with forgiveness of sins under a separate heading.[63]

Maurice Casey completes this category. He does not hesitate to use the word 'certain' for Jesus' prediction of his death: "there is an authentic prediction of Jesus' death and Resurrection behind Mk 8.31 and . . . Jesus' expectation that he would die in Jerusalem should therefore be regarded as a certain fact."[64] The ground for his argument is two-fold: (1) the criterion of embarrassment, and (2) the hostile atmosphere. Regarding the former, he states: "Neither Peter rebuking Jesus, nor this serious criticism of Peter would be found in Mark's Gospel if this did not represent approximately what happened. But if Jesus' rebuke is authentic, and Peter's reaction is authentic, Peter must have had something like Mk 8.31 to react to, including Jesus' unwelcome reference to his forthcoming death."[65] Secondly, Casey reasons that Jesus could have expected his death because of the atmosphere surrounding him: "the conflicts during Jesus' ministry were quite sufficient for [Jesus] to have expected to die."[66]

For Casey, similarly to Wright, it was Jesus' own will to die: "it is equally certain that he *intended* to die, and that he interpreted his death as an atoning sacrifice for the sins of Israel."[67] He contends that Jesus saw himself as a martyr, in line with the martyrdom theology seen in the Maccabean writings.

---

[62] Ibid., 604. Although Wright acknowledges that Jesus intended to die, he argues that knowing the intention of Jesus is not enough: "whether or not one concludes that Jesus himself intended to die, it does not follow that this intention was a sufficient cause of his crucifixion. Ignatius fully intended to die as a martyr, but envisaged the possibility that meddling Christians in Rome might prevent him" (106). For him, "Pilate's decision was a both a necessary and a sufficient cause of Jesus' crucifixion" (552).

[63] However, his definition of the 'forgiveness of sins' is different from the traditional view. Jesus' death was an atoning death not for each individual but for the community as a whole. Therefore, he can even assert that "there was, then, no such thing as a pre-Christian Jewish version of (what we now think of as) Pauline atonement theology" (592). In this sense, Wright is more in line with Krister Stendahl who sees Israel "as a people, not in each and every individual" ("The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West," *HTR* 56 [1963]: 199–215, 201). For a detailed description of Wright's view on forgiveness, see below, section 3.3.

[64] Casey, *Jesus*, 407. In regard to the Lord's Supper, he claims, Jesus "had interpreted the bread and wine of his body and blood, thereby looking forward to his sacrificial death, he made a prediction" (221). However, Casey takes the term itself as the later development of Christian tradition.

[65] Ibid., 378.

[66] Ibid., 401, contra Vermes and Sanders who think there was no clash between Jesus and his opponents.

[67] Ibid., 408. Again, for Casey, Jesus' willingness to die is a certain fact.

Both 2 Maccabees 7:37–38 and 4 Maccabees 17:20–22 describe the martyrdom story of seven brothers. From these two well-known passages, Casey draws a connection to the death of Jesus, and he regards this connection as "a very close parallel."[68] Because the annual celebration of Hanukkah kept reminding the Jews of the story of these Maccabean martyrs, "martyrdom theology was part of living Jewish culture."[69] Therefore, Jesus would have had it in his mind when he went willingly to die. Casey depicts Jesus' death as an exemplary martyr's death.

1.2.2.2.4. Concluding Remarks

What does this short survey of Jesus research show? The strong connection between Jesus' death and the forgiveness of sins has been dramatically weakened. In contrast with the beginning of Christianity, the strong correlation between the two themes was attenuated in the beginning of the historical Jesus quest. In current research, the correlation is again emphasized by some, but remains much less influential than it was in earliest Christianity. The idea of the historical Jesus' death effecting forgiveness was the consensus of the earliest communities, but this is not true of the current quest.

This state of affairs may be due to the lack of any recent in-depth study of forgiveness of sins in regard to Jesus' death. After reviewing the history of research on forgiveness, Hägerland mentions that it is "remarkable that no thorough investigation of the topic of forgiveness in primitive Christian literature seems to have been made."[70] He himself deals mostly with the specific issue that the earthly Jesus forgave sins whilst healing the sick, but a similar conclusion regarding the relation between Jesus' death and forgiveness is warranted: in recent historical Jesus research, no painstaking examination of the topic of forgiveness through Jesus' death seems to have been made.

Although they consider the topic, most Jesus scholars deal with it only marginally. Some 'third questers' do link forgiveness with the death of Jesus, but most of them restrict themselves to a passing comment and move quickly

---

[68] Ibid., 406.

[69] Ibid., 407. David A. deSilva states, "the observance of Hanukkah in Judea and its environs provided an annual opportunity for the telling of the story not only of the victorious Hasmoneans but also of the noble martyrs who offered their lives in obedience to the covenant and on behalf of the nation and, thus, for the stories and their interpretation to enter into Jesus' consciousness" (*The Jewish Teachers of Jesus, James, and Jude: What Earliest Christianity Learned from the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* [Oxford, OUP, 2012], 164). He also indicates that "2 Maccabees came to be used as a kind of festival etiology or festal scroll (like Esther in regard to Purim) and was sent out from Jerusalem to the Jewish community in Egypt to promote the wider observance of Hanukkah" (163). Cf. Josephus, *Ant*. 12.412; *JVG*, 582.

[70] Hägerland, *Jesus and Forgiveness*, 85.

to another subject.[71] Accordingly, LaVerdiere is correct in arguing that "the forgiveness of sins is something one rarely hears anyone talk about anymore."[72] This is true particularly in historical Jesus studies. How can we understand this surprising silence and disinterested stance? What was once a vital topic in the embryonic Christian movement has become scarcely important enough to dwell upon at any length. To verify whether this idea of forgiving death was vital to the historical Jesus in the face of his impending death, the following methodology is adopted.

1.3. Methodology

1.3.1. Paul the Starting Point

1.3.1.1. Paul as the Oldest Source for Jesus' Death

Akenson accurately states that "virtually every recent Quest for the Historical Jesus . . . tries to extract accurate 'facts' or uncover hidden or 'primitive' shards of texts from within [the] Gospels," and he continues, "this is the wrong place to start."[73] According to him, the right place to start is the Paul-

[71] Among the scholars who interpret Jesus' death is intertwined with forgiveness, their definitions of 'forgiveness of sins' do not correspond to one another. This will be discussed in chapter 3.

[72] Eugene A. LaVerdiere, *The Eucharist in the New Testament and the Early Church* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1996), 65. He continues, "today's silence regarding forgiveness and the forgiveness of sins contrasts with the New Testament, where 'the forgiveness of sins' is associated with the preaching of John the Baptist, the mission and ministry of Jesus, the preaching of the apostles, conversion (*metanoia*), baptism, and even the Eucharist." This phenomenon may be caused by the current status of sin as "an endangered species" (John Portmann, *A History of Sin: Its Evolution to Today and Beyond* [Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007], xvi).

[73] Donald Harman Akenson, *Saint Saul: A Skeleton Key to the Historical Jesus* (Montreal, QC: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000), 3. As Akenson states, "one of the strangest aspects of all the literature on the 'Search for the Historical Jesus'" is that "almost nobody wants to deal with Saul" (122). In the early twentieth century, the first questers and the scholars of the 'no quest' period together claimed that the Pauline letters could not be a source for the study of the historical Jesus. William Wrede states that "for [Paul] Jesus' earthly life means nothing apart from death and resurrection" (*The Messianic Secret*, trans. J.C.G. Greig [Cambridge: Clarke, 1971], 224). Likewise, Bultmann, *Theology of the NT*, 35, asserts that "the teaching of the historical Jesus plays no role, or practically none, in Paul and John." However, this claim was partially refuted by Ernst Käsemann. He confirms that "we only make contact with life history of Jesus through the kerygma of the [primitive Christian] community" ("The Problem of the Historical Jesus," in *Essays on New Testament Themes*, SBT 41 [London: SCM, 1964], 15–47, 24). Even though his effort left the door open for the new quest, the opening was not wide enough to prompt a new understanding of Paul as a source for the quest. In the third quest, Gerd

ine corpus because it gives "[the] earliest view of the historical Yeshua."[74] Though the canonical Gospels are the basic sources for historical Jesus research, they are not the oldest sources: these are Paul's epistles. Chronologically, these epistles probably include the information closest to the historical Jesus. Bornkamm states, "written in the fifties of the first century, [Paul's epistles] are also historical sources of the first rank; indeed, they are the oldest and, for the historian, the most trustworthy of all the earliest Christian writings."[75]

On the other hand, the Pauline literature cannot simply be called the oldest evidence concerning Jesus, but it is "the earliest preserved written documentation of *the crucifixion* of Jesus."[76] Because Jesus' death is one of the central themes which Paul highlights, his comments on Jesus' death become highly valuable. If Paul retains the message of Jesus, comments from Paul can certainly be accepted as a source for understanding the significance of Jesus' death.

1.3.1.2. Paul as a Reliable Interpreter of Jesus' Death

1.3.1.2.1. Paul the Follower, not the Founder

The earliest documents do not necessarily contain the most reliable information about the historical Jesus. In recent decades, the very old notion that Paul should be seen as the actual founder of Christianity has been resumed by a number of scholars. Following the classical approach of Wrede (1859–

Lüdemann has recently argued that "Paul cannot be considered a reliable witness to either the teachings, the life, or the historical existence of Jesus." ("Paul as Witness to the Historical Jesus," in *Sources of the Jesus Tradition: Separating Jesus from Myth*, ed. R. Joseph Hoffmann [Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 2010], 196–212, 212). In the same vein, Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 1:45, is cautious about using the Pauline writings as reliable sources for Jesus research: "since the center of Paul's theology is the death and resurrection of Jesus, the events and sayings of the earthly Jesus simply do not play a large role in his letters." This tendency of avoiding Paul in historical Jesus study seems universally agreed.

[74] Akenson, *Saul*, 261n3. Larry W. Hurtado also argues that "Pauline Christianity is thus the earliest sector of the Christian movement to which we have direct access through firsthand sources" (*Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003], 81). Cf. James D.G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998], 2; Beverly Roberts Gaventa, "Interpreting the Death of Jesus Apocalyptically: Reconsidering Romans 8:32," in *Jesus and Paul Reconnected: Fresh Pathways into an Old Debate*, ed. Todd D. Still (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 125–45, 126; Ben Witherington III, *The Paul Quest: The Renewed Search for the Jew of Tarsus* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1998), 12.

[75] Bornkamm, *Paul*, xiv.

[76] Peder Borgen, "Crucified for His Own Sins—Crucified for Our Sins: Observations on a Pauline Perspective," in *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context: Studies in Honor of David E. Aune*, ed. John Fotopoulos, NovTSup 122 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 17–35, 21 (emphasis mine).

1906), who spots "an enormous gulf between [Jesus] and the Pauline Son of God" and calls Paul "*the second founder of Christianity*,"[77] Hyam Maccoby even asserts that "Paul, not Jesus, was the founder of Christianity."[78] The basic argument is that Paul "create[d] a religion far different from that of Jesus."[79] Therefore, it is not surprising that the keyword of these scholars "on the Jesus-Paul relationship has been 'discontinuity.'"[80] This famous "Jesus-Paul debate"[81] has continued without ceasing until now, and if the arguments above are true, Pauline letters cannot be reliable sources for Jesus' understanding of his own death.

To argue against this position, one has first to engage with the two reasons given in favour of 'discontinuity': (1) Paul was not interested in the pre-passion Jesus; (2) the theology of Paul is different from that of Jesus. First, with regard to the claim Paul lacked interest in Jesus' life, it should not be forgotten that "other writers of New Testament letters rarely cite teachings of the earthly Jesus, and the Apocalypse and the apostolic speeches in Acts also

---

[77] William Wrede, *Paul* (London: Green, 1907), 147, 179. Dunn regards the designation of Paul as second founder "as an overblown assessment of Paul's significance" (*Theology of Paul*, 3).

[78] Hyam Maccoby, *The Mythmaker: Paul and the Invention of Christianity* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1986), 113. Cf. P.M. Casey, *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God*: *The Origins and Development of New Testament Christology* (Cambridge: Clarke, 1991), 97; James D. Tabor, *Paul and Jesus: How the Apostle Transformed Christianity* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2012). In line with these scholars, John Dominic Crossan challenges the traditional view: "*if you begin with Paul, you will interpret Jesus incorrectly; if you begin with Jesus, you will interpret Paul differently*" (*The Birth of Christianity* [New York: HarperCollins, 1998], xxi [emphasis his]). However, Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ,* 83, refutes Crossan's argument: "Crossan considers Paul part of the 'growth' of Christianity, not its 'birth.' But Paul's conversion is most likely to be dated within a couple years (at most) of Jesus' execution, that is, within what in terms of social history must be regarded as the 'birth' of the Christian movement."

[79] Gerd Lüdemann, *Paul: The Founder of Christianity* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 2002), 246.

[80] Paul Barnett, *Paul: Missionary of Jesus*, vol. 2 of *After Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 11. For recent advocates of such discontinuity, cf. the list in David Wenham, *Paul: Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 3n7.

[81] This issue is discussed not only in the theological field but also outside biblical scholarship. Even Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, *Daybreak: Thoughts on the Prejudices of Morality*, ed. Maudemarie Clark and Brian Leiter, trans. R.J. Hollingdale, CTHP (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), 42, calls Paul "the *first Christian*, the inventor of Christianness!" For the history of the discussion, see J.M.G. Barclay, "Jesus and Paul" in *DPL*, 492–503; Barnett, *Paul*, 2:11–15. These two scholars see in the work of F.C. Baur a precursor to this Jesus-Paul question. For some of the main contributions on the issue, see Markus Bockmuehl, "Peter between Jesus and Paul: The 'Third Quest' and the 'New Perspective' on the First Disciple," in Still, *Reconnected*, 67–102, 67n1.

make scant reference to them."[82] Even though this paucity of reference is well known, "surprisingly few have seen its significance for the Jesus-Paul debate."[83] If other authors of the rest of the NT epistles did not use Jesus' sayings often and that is a general phenomenon in their writing, one should not expect extensive citation and a large number of references to Jesus traditions in the Pauline corpus. Stuhlmacher presents a plausible explanation of this scarcity: "die Gattung des Apostelbriefes bedingt eine nur beiläufige und gelegentliche Bezugnahme auf die Jesusüberlieferung. Die ausführliche oder gar vollständige Reproduktion der Jesustradition war nicht Aufgabe oder Anliegen der brieflichen Kommunikation."[84] That there are few direct citations of Jesus tradition in Paul's letters is probably due to the genre of the epistles and their function for the addressees, which was clearly not an introduction into what Jesus was and did.

The fact is that, for reasons that are not fully understood, first-century Christians seem to have regarded the 'gospel tradition' and the letters of the apostles as two distinct categories. Thus, for example, although the Gospel and letters of John came from the same 'circle' of believers if not the same author, the letters make no allusion to events of Jesus' life reported in John's Gospel. Although Paul is silent for the most part in his letters on the sayings and stories of Jesus,[85] he takes a profound interest in Jesus' death and resurrection. Indeed, Paul frequently refers to the death of Jesus, and even the scholars who see Paul as the true founder of Christianity agree that "the unchanging focus of [Paul's] proclamation is Jesus' death and resurrection."[86]

With respect to the second reason – that the two figures have different theologies – there are two authors from widely different theological perspectives who have recently compared the theologies of Paul and Jesus: Wenham and Lüdemann.[87] Both deal with the common themes in Jesus and Paul, and also the allusions to the sayings of Jesus in Paul and then draw opposite conclusions. Wenham argues that the theology of Paul and that of Jesus are similar;

---

[82] E. Earle Ellis, "Traditions in 1 Corinthians," *NTS* 32 (1986): 481–502, 485. Cf. Michael B. Thompson, *Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12.1–15.13*, JSNTSup 59 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991), 37–63.

[83] Thompson, *Clothed*, 62.

[84] Peter Stuhlmacher, "Zum Thema: Das Evangelium und die Evangelien," in *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien: Vorträge vom Tübinger Symposium 1982*, ed. Peter Stuhlmacher, WUNT 28 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 1–26, 18–19.

[85] This is not, however, to say that Paul never mentions the sayings and stories of Jesus. For Paul's awareness of those traditions, see Wenham, *Paul: Follower*. Furthermore, one cannot ignore the fact that "despite the apparent lack of interest in Jesus' earthly life and ministry [in Paul], details sometimes turn up almost by accident" (Powell, *Jesus*, 35). Powell is one of the few scholars who concur that the Pauline letters are important sources for historical Jesus study.

[86] Lüdemann, *Paul: Founder*, 198; idem, "Paul as Witness," 200.

[87] Wenham, *Paul: Follower*; Lüdemann, *Paul: Founder.*

Paul is more likely a follower of Jesus than the founder of a totally different religion. Lüdemann, though, asserts that "[t]he unavoidable conclusion is that these two men had very different visions of the role and function of religion in human life."[88]

Bornkamm already provided an intermediate view ahead of them: "it is true that between the preaching of the historical Jesus and the gospel not only of Paul but of the post-Easter church in general there is a fundamental difference: only the unthinking can miss it."[89] To him, there is a clear tension from the outset. However, he continues:

> this difference consists in the fact that while Jesus in his own words and actions proclaimed the dawning of the kingdom of God, for the post-Easter gospel – without prejudice to all the changing and even opposed concepts of it – through Jesus' death, resurrection, and exaltation, the turning point of the ages, the establishment of salvation, and God's advent and lordship have become actual fact."[90]

According to Bornkamm, the time at which Paul lived is an essential factor in the difference between Jesus and Paul. Paul's experience and theology is based on a post-Easter perspective, and he was able to form his own theology based upon the development which was already under way:[91] as Bornkamm acutely points out that "Paul was not the creator and founder of the church. It was in existence before his conversion and initially moved him to zealous persecution."[92]

Bornkamm's view can be summarised as follows: there is difference between Jesus and Paul, but Paul nevertheless carefully preserves the message of Jesus. Although it predates Wenham and Lüdemann by almost thirty years, his view seems more balanced than any other, and we can ask the same question as Bockmuehl, "has recent scholarship on Jesus and on Paul taught us

---

[88] Lüdemann, *Paul: Founder*, 211–12.

[89] Bornkamm, *Paul*, 110.

[90] Ibid., 112. In this sense, Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer, *Paul between Damascus and Antioch: The Unknown Years* (London: SCM, 1997), 309, call Paul "the Second founder of Christianity." Despite the identical wording used, their position is different to Wrede's (see page 21).

[91] See Martin Hengel, *Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity*, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM, 1983), 31. Wenham, *Paul: Follower*, 155, also concurs that the difference between Jesus and Paul was caused by time: "for Jesus the cross lies ahead, and is in a real sense an unknown and, as the Gospels suggest, almost impossible to explain to his followers in advance. For Paul the cross has happened and is now a massively important datum to be explained."

[92] Bornkamm, *Paul*, 177. However, for him, neither Paul nor the historical Jesus is the founder of the church. For "the church did not originate in Jesus' own lifetime, but with the resurrection of the Crucified. Its 'founder' is not the 'historic' Jesus" (178).

anything new about the relationship between them, beyond the classic treatments of the past century?"[93]

It should not be forgotten that the Pauline "letters do come from someone irrefutably acquainted with the leaders of the original community."[94] If Paul tried to significantly alter the essential messages of Jesus, the 'early church' would not have allowed him to do so. One should not forget that the 'early church' was made up of the followers of the man Jesus of Nazareth and the members of his family, who were alive and active when Paul started his mission. Paul actively sought a relationship with Jerusalem and the followers of Jesus during his lifetime. Contending that Paul founded Christianity seems to isolate the text from the context. If there is a development in Paul's theology, the development is in line with the theology of the historical Jesus; this development is *with* continuity, not without. Accordingly, it is safe to conclude, as Barclay does, that "Paul did develop the central insights of the teaching of Jesus and the central meaning of his life and death in a way that *truly represented* their dynamic and fullest significance."[95]

Moreover, it must be noted that "Paul was aware that the preaching of the cross is a scandal and a folly."[96] If he substantially modified and adjusted the theology of Jesus for his Gentile missions, Paul would have avoided preaching the cross to make his mission more effective. The cross would be the first thing to abandon if Paul wanted to alter the message of Jesus. However, he kept on preaching the folly of the cross and this may speak against the idea that Paul modified what Jesus said and did. Rather, it supports arguments that Paul considered Jesus' death and resurrection the central events of the ministry of Jesus. In this sense, the focus of the Gospel writers and the central message of Paul show an interesting congruity: the Passion narrative.[97]

---

[93] Bockmuehl, "Peter," 67.

[94] Paula Fredriksen, *From Jesus to Christ*: *The Origins of the New Testament Images of Jesus* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), 52. She confirms that "the Pauline letters are the primary source for the Christian tradition *par excellence*" (53), but also finds discontinuity between Jesus and Paul, stating that "Paul cannot take us as close to the historical origins of the Jesus movement as we might expect" (52).

[95] Barclay, "Jesus and Paul," 502 (emphasis mine). Bornkamm, *Paul*, 113, rightly cautions, "in his own view, Paul was one in a succession and accordingly – especially in the matter of his Christology, although it does have its own special features – we should not raise the question of any particular 'originality' he may have."

[96] Rudolf Bultmann, "Jesus and Paul," in *Existence and Faith: Shorter Writings of Rudolf Bultmann* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1961), 183–201, 201.

[97] Indeed, the Gospels can be viewed as "passion narratives with extended introductions" (Martin Kähler, *The So-called Historical Jesus and the Historic Biblical Christ* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964], 80n11). Petr Pokorný similarly states that "from the literary view, all the canonical Gospels culminate with the story of Jesus' passion" ("Jesus' Death on the Cross: Literary, Theological, and Historical Comments," in *Jesus Research: New Method-*

Therefore, it can be argued that "one cannot flee from Paul and return to Jesus. . . . All that one can do is to go to Jesus through Paul."[98] In terms of Jesus' death at least, the Pauline letters provide the earliest documentation. Moreover, Paul probably preserves the traditions regarding Jesus' death without notable difference. Hence, they are clearly the *best* place to start so that they can be compared with later Gospels.

1.3.1.2.2. Pre-Pauline Jesus Traditions in Paul

Having accepted that Paul has not distorted the message of Jesus, another question arises: where can we find a detailed description of the *death* of the historical Jesus which is in line with the early followers? The Jesus traditions in Paul are the prime option. If Paul "does indeed know and make use of Jesus traditions"[99] concerning Jesus' death, these traditions probably uncover certain aspects of the *death* of the historical Jesus. Moreover, because he preserves the tradition which he received, it appears probable that Paul is a reliable witness.[100]

Indeed, Paul's knowledge concerning the historical Jesus itself can only be considered as dependent because most of it probably stems from the apostles (Acts 9:26–28; Gal 1:18–19) and he presents himself as in continuity with those who followed Jesus during his ministry and to whom Jesus appeared at Easter. Whilst stating that Paul's letters can "only serve as checks on the Synoptic tradition, not sources of new information,"[101] Meier maintains that certain texts within the Pauline corpus can serve as sources only when they have a counterpart in the Synoptics. Most researchers, including Meier, are hesitant to say that Paul is an independent source because they are not certain Paul saw the historical Jesus, or even witnessed his death. Conceding this,

---

ologies and Perceptions, ed. James H. Charlesworth, Brian Rhea, and Petr Pokorný [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014], 897–909, 898).

[98] Bultmann, "Jesus and Paul," 201. Michael Labahn contends that "there is no justification for a rigorous denial . . . of traces of the narrative Jesus tradition in the Pauline letters" ("The Non-Synoptic Jesus: An Introduction to John, Paul, Thomas, and Other Outsiders of the Jesus Quest," in *HSHJ*, 3:1933–96, 1951).

[99] Labahn, "Non-Synoptic Jesus," 3:1939. Cf. Bornkamm, *Paul*, 114. It is likely that, as Seyoon Kim suggests, "Paul's persecution of the Church presupposes that before his conversion he knew at least part of the Hellenist Jewish Christian kerygma." (*The Origin of Paul's Gospel*, WUNT II/4 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981], 51).

[100] By calling Paul as a witness, I do not mean that he is a 'firsthand' witness, but that as "a 'secondhand' witness, Paul did know and communicate with 'firsthand' witnesses" (Kathy Ehrensperger, "At the Table: Common Ground between Paul and the Historical Jesus," in Charlesworth, Rhea, and Pokorný, *Jesus Research*, 531–50, 540).

[101] Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 1:47. On this point, Akenson, *Saul*, 124, does not concur with Meier and he states, "Saul's letters are used to confirm or expand upon material – the Four Gospels – that was produced later than the letters. It should be the other way around."

however, the portions on Jesus' death in his letters can better be seen as a tradition-dependent witness. If, therefore, Paul's message has a strong emphasis on the expiatory significance of Jesus' death, it is safe to assume that Paul had this understanding in agreement with the Jerusalem church.

Moreover, it can be suggested that the pre-Pauline tradition regarding Jesus' death preserved in Paul can be used to comprehend the historical Jesus' understanding of his death. As mentioned earlier (1.3.1.1), Paul's epistles are the earliest written materials concerning Jesus' death. Particularly, the pre-Pauline traditions in them show the earliest documentary evidence we can trace back to Jesus' death. It is likely that the older a document is the more reliable it is as a source. The reliability of these traditions is not dependent solely on their age, though: it is possible to trace their origin back to the historical Jesus. These traditions had been transmitted through a strict process of transmission as the use of 'received' and 'handed down' indicates. These verbs were also used to describe the careful transmission of rabbinic tradition[102] which rabbinic tradition often makes use of them to indicate that the tradition was received in its original condition. If the pre-Pauline tradition was transmitted in this way, the tradition itself represents a valid source for the historical Jesus. Thus, any tradition which is sufficiently early and reflects the intention of Jesus well enough should be considered a valid source. Certainly, it is plausible that "the historical facts about Jesus Christ [were] the object of tradition."[103] Therefore, Paul and "the former 'outsiders' . . . have now become insiders" in the study of Jesus, and thus "it is obvious that we must listen to the [voice] of Paul."[104]

In sum, Paul can certainly serve as the legitimate starting point for this examination of the historical Jesus' understanding of his own death whether he himself considered it as a means of divine forgiveness. The reasoning is twofold: (1) the Pauline corpus is probably the oldest source for the historical Jesus' understanding of his death, including as it does significant pre-Pauline formulae; (2) the Pauline corpus is a reliable source at least for Jesus' death because Paul shares a similar view on Jesus' death with the earliest followers of the historical Jesus who carefully preserved Jesus traditions.

1.3.2. Matthew the Conversation Partner

It is generally agreed that Mark is the primary source for the historical Jesus because of the majority view that it was written first among the Synoptics. Why then is it not the perfect comparison text against which to consider the Pauline writings as the earliest documentary evidence for Jesus' death? If the

[102] Cf. 162n288.
[103] Kim, *Origin*, 70.
[104] Labahn, "Non-Synoptic Jesus," 3:1996.

claim that "Mark [is] inherently Pauline"[105] has any validity, it may only supply a similar line of proof to the Pauline letters. Comparing Paul and Mark has a long history of research, and even an entire monograph is devoted to discuss this topic.[106] Even scholars who argue against heavy Pauline influence in Mark would still hold that their theological outlooks are corresponding — particularly on the issue of Jesus' atoning death. Therefore, because it possibly offers a dependent view, Mark is not an ideal conversation partner for this study.[107]

On the contrary, comparing Paul and Matthew is among the "new issues"[108] in the field. Recently, there have been various investigations into

[105] David C. Sim, "Matthew's Use of Mark: Did Matthew Intend to Supplement or to Replace His Primary Source?" *NTS* 57 (2011): 176–92, 187. As Simon J. Joseph contends, "the idea that Paul influenced the composition of the Gospel of Mark is the dominant view in Markan studies" (*The Nonviolent Messiah: Jesus, Q, and the Enochic Tradition* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014], 126). For the scholars who interpret in this direction, see ibid., 127n7; Joel Marcus, "Mark – Interpreter of Paul," in *Mark and Paul: Comparative Essays Part II For and Against Pauline Influence on Mark*, ed. Eve-Marie Becker, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, and Mogens Müller, BZNW 199 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014), 29–49, 30n5.

[106] For a brief history of research, see Heike Omerzu, "Paul and Mark – Mark and Paul," in Becker, Engberg-Pedersen, and Müller, *Mark and Paul*, 51–61. For a review of the argument of Gustav Volkmar, who initiates the issue of Paul and Mark, see Anne Vig Skoven, "Mark as Allegorical Rewriting of Paul: Gustav Volkmar's Understanding of the Gospel of Mark," in Becker, Engberg-Pedersen, and Müller, *Mark and Paul*, 13–27. Cf. Joel Marcus' seminal essay, "Mark – Interpreter of Paul," *NTS* 46 (2000): 473–87.

[107] Interestingly, for most exegetes, there are clear overlaps between Paul and Mark on Jesus' atoning death. Marcus, "Mark – Interpreter of Paul," 36, states: "both Paul and Mark lay *extraordinary* stress on the death of Jesus." Moreover, "Mark builds on and continues Paul's interpretation of the earliest traditions about Jesus' death. He constructs his narrative on the basis of Paul's interpretation of Christ's obedience as a willingness to give his life for the sake of our sins" (Jesper Tang Nielsen, "The Cross on the Way to Mark," in Becker, Engberg-Pedersen, and Müller, *Mark and Paul*, 273–94, 294.). See also C. Clifton Black, "Christ Crucified in Paul and in Mark: Reflections on an Intracanonical Conversation," in *Theology and Ethics in Paul and His Interpreters: Essays in Honor of Victor Paul Furnish*, ed. Eugene H. Lovering Jr., and Jerry L. Sumney (Nashville: Abingdon, 1996), 80–104.

[108] Daniel M. Gurtner includes the question of the relation between Matthew and Paul under the section heading, New Issues, together with three other topics: 'Matthew and Empire,' 'Ulrich Luz and *Wirkungsgeschichte*,' and 'A Sapiential Reading of Matthew' ("The Gospel of Matthew from Stanton to Present: A Survey of Some Recent Developments," in *Jesus, Matthew's Gospel and Early Christianity: Studies in Memory of Graham N. Stanton*, ed. Daniel M. Gurtner, Joel Willitts, and Richard A. Burridge, LNTS 435 [London: T&T Clark, 2011], 23–38, 32–38). After scholarly consensus on Markan priority emerges, Jesus research concentrates mainly on the Gospel written first. David C. Sim correctly indicates "the diminishing interest in [Matthew's] Gospel" in current research ("The Rise and Fall of the Gospel of Matthew," *ExpTim* 120 [2009]: 478–85, 481. He even overemphasizes this phenomenon as "Matthew's demise" [478]).

Matthew's community: some argue that the community was separated from Judaism, *extra muros*;[109] others voice their objections that the Matthean community was still within the boundary of Judaism, *intra muros*.[110] The scholars in the latter group contend that Matthew's community was strictly observant to Torah. Therefore, Sim suggests a "gulf between Matthew and Paul," and argues that "a number of Matthean texts . . . were included and/or redacted in order to counter either the person or the theology of [Paul]"[111] Having argued this, he justifies the claim that Matthew wrote his gospel to replace Mark, the Paulinist gospel. Therefore, Matthew, which could even be seen as a counterattack on a law-free Pauline gospel, is the outstanding candidate for conversation partner: if a consensus could be found between Paul and Matthew, it is fair to assume it would represent a widespread attitude throughout the earliest Christian community.

There are two more reasons to nominate Matthew as a comparison partner: (1) it is another major source for the historical Jesus; and (2) Jesus' expiatory death is seldom researched in Paul and Matthew. Firstly, after examining Matthew as a historical source, Casey concludes that "the Gospel of Matthew is a major source for our knowledge of the life and teaching of Jesus."[112] Though not all scholars are as confident as Casey, we may take Matthew seriously as a source for our question. Secondly, a lack of painstaking research on the link between Jesus' death and forgiveness in Paul and Matthew requires such a study. Just as Mohrlang stresses that no-one "provides a really comprehensive comparison of the two writer's ethical thought,"[113] no-one provides a comprehensive comparison of their views on Jesus' death and its significance.

The strong parallel between Paul and Mark perceived by current scholarship makes the earliest Gospel a less appropriate conversation partner. Moreover, if it is true, as some claim, that Matthew is at some points deliberately anti-Pauline, that will make for a robust debate between the two.

---

[109] John P. Meier, *Law and History in Matthew's Gospel: A Redactional Study of Mt 5:17–48*, AnBib 71 (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1976); Graham N. Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992); Paul Foster, *Community, Law and Mission in Matthew's Gospel*, WUNT II/177 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).

[110] For the contributors of this view, see Roland Deines, "Not the Law but the Messiah: Law and Righteousness in the Gospel of Matthew—An Ongoing Debate," in *Built upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew*, ed. Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 53–84, 53n2.

[111] David C. Sim, "Matthew's Anti-Paulinism: A Neglected Feature of Matthean Studies," *HvTSt* 58 (2002): 767–83, 771; idem, "Matthew, Paul and the Origin and Nature of the Gentile Mission: The Great Commission in Matthew 28:16–20 as an anti-Pauline tradition," *HvTSt* 64 (2008): 377–92, 380, respectively.

[112] Casey, *Jesus*, 93.

[113] Roger Mohrlang, *Matthew and Paul: A Comparison of Ethical Perspectives*, SNTSMS 48 (Cambridge: CUP, 1984), 6.

1.4. Conclusions

In contrast to the strong tie between Jesus' death and forgiveness of sin in earliest Christianity (section 1.2.1), the close connection of the two themes has been strikingly weakened in early and current historical Jesus research (1.2.2). This notable contrast necessitates and demands a serious study of their relationship in the historical Jesus' understanding. To answer the question of whether the historical Jesus understood his impending death in relation to forgiveness, the following methodology is adopted (1.3): Paul and Matthew's writings will be examined in turn, before the results of these examinations are compared and contrasted. This will give us a plausible suggestion as to whether and how the historical Jesus' understood his own death as forgiving sins.

Before proceeding, in the next chapter, we will discuss the history of the relationship between Paul and Matthew: how scholars interpret their theologies, and whether their theological outlooks are viewed as consonant or conflicting.

Chapter 2

Critical Survey of Studies on Paul and Matthew

Almost a century ago, Johannes Weiss (1863–1914) took the lead in raising the question of Matthew's anti-Paulinism. Specifically, he claimed that Matthew 5:17, 19 "is best understood as a tacit opposition to the works and teachings of Paul."[1] It was not until the 1950s that the issue of whether Matthew is anti-Pauline resurfaced and began attracting serious attention, though. Brandon, claiming that Matthew is anti-Paulinist, contended that "the magnification of Peter's position and authority" in the gospel of Matthew is "[t]o combat the rising reputation of Paul."[2] About the same time, however, after comparing certain passages in the First Gospel and in the Pauline epistles, Dodd found "significant agreements between them."[3] The debate is still ongoing, even if it is not a major issue in Matthean studies. "The sad reality"[4] is that there are few or no detailed studies on this issue.

2.1 The Current (Confusing) Groupings

Sim[5] and Willitts[6] categorize scholarly views into three groups: Matthew is (1) anti-Pauline, (2) un-Pauline, or (3) pro-Pauline. Even though the two scholars coin exactly the same three-division categorization, their definition

[1] Johannes Weiss, *Earliest Christianity: A History of the Period A.D. 30–150*, trans. Frederich C. Grant (New York: HarperTorchbooks, 1937), 2:753. The German version was published in 1917.

[2] S.G.F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church* (London: SPCK, 1951), 232.

[3] C.H. Dodd, *New Testament Studies* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1953), 65. His book was published two years later than Brandon's, but Dodd presented the chapter as an essay in 1947. Cf. his "Matthew and Paul," *ExpTim* 58 (1946–47): 293–98.

[4] David C. Sim, "Paul and Matthew on the Torah: Theory and Practice," in *Paul, Grace and Freedom: Essays in Honour of John K. Riches*, ed. Paul Middleton, Angus Paddison, and Karen Wenell (London: T&T Clark, 2009), 50–64, 50.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Joel Willitts, "Paul and Matthew: A Descriptive Approach from a Post-New Perspective Interpretive Framework," in *Paul and the Gospels: Christologies, Conflicts, and Convergences*, ed. Michael F. Bird and Joel Willitts, LNTS 411 (London: T&T Clark, 2011), 62–85, 84.

of 'un-Pauline' (or non-Pauline[7]) differs. Willitts clarifies his second division as follows:

> if 'un-' is meant to imply that Matthew and Paul do not have a common theological foundation, that they represented 'two different, parallel traditions' of early Christianity, then I think this view should also be rejected. Alternatively, if by 'un-' one means Paul's rhetorical concerns are not Matthew's and that Matthew seems wholly disinterested in Paul then the prefix seems appropriate.[8]

In Willitts' understanding, Stanton is the representative proponent of Matthew's un-Paulinism and Stanton views Matthew as having different *perspectives* from Paul.

Sim, on the other hand, adopts the definition of 'un-Pauline' Willits rejected. He defines the view of the second group in this way: "Matthew's gospel . . . is simply un-Pauline and therefore represents a completely independent stream of thought."[9] Here Sim also quotes Stanton as representative of the 'un-Pauline' group, but, in Sim's understanding, Stanton sees Matthew and Paul as representing different *Christian groups*.

These two distinctive 'un-Pauline' concepts stem from the different approaches of the two scholars who are investigating difference between Paul and Matthew in terms of either context, or content. In Sim's case, assuming that Matthew's community was exposed to the influence of Pauline ideas, his intention is to examine how Matthew reacts to the influence of Paul (thus, his approach is more nuanced toward context). On the contrary, Willitts' crucial principle is that "*the interpreter must limit herself primarily to the descriptive task and resist the urge to draw speculative conclusions*"[10] (thus, his approach is more about content).

---

[7] For 'non-Pauline,' see Daniel J. Harrington, "Matthew and Paul," in *Matthew and His Christian Contemporaries*, ed. David C. Sim and Boris Repschinski, LNTS 333 (London: T&T Clark, 2008), 11–26, 24; Jürgen K. Zangenberg, "Matthew and James," in Sim and Repschinski, *Matthew*, 104–22, 120.

[8] Ibid., 85. Willitts concludes that this is "un-Pauline in the Stanton sense."

[9] Sim, "Paul and Matthew," 50. Therefore, Dodd, *NT Studies*, 54, who insists that the two biblical writers were "independent of one another," but share a similar theology, can be placed in Sim's 'un-Pauline' group, Willitts' 'pro-Pauline' at the same time.

[10] Willitts, "Paul and Matthew," 65. He states, "the wisest course of action methodologically is to take a descriptive approach and then only very cautiously draw conclusions about things, such as the type of Christianity represented by both, or whether and to what extent Paul's influence is felt in Matthew or Matthew is a reaction to Paul" (66). Paul Foster also characterizes any approach which attempts to find influence from one on the other, and discern the reaction of the latter, which is similar to Sim's, as "a *non sequitur*" ("Paul and Matthew: Two Strands of the Early Jesus Movement with Little Sign of Connection," in Bird and Willitts, *Paul*, 86–114, 86). Further, he plainly states, "Matthew's agenda was not to write a polemical tractate in relation to Paul, nor to pen a positive statement concerning the Pauline theology" (87). For Sim's recent response to Willitts and Foster, see his "Conflict in the Canon: The Pauline Literature and the Gospel of Matthew,"

Of these two different concepts, the 'un-Pauline' of Willitts will be employed in this study.[11] Therefore, the argument of the second grouping would be: the contents of Matthew are neither against nor for those of Paul: they are simply different. By defining Matthew as independent of Paul (more precisely "[Matthew] and his community were completely uninfluenced by [Paul]"),[12] Sim's un-Pauline categorization seems to assume one of the "unknowns of history"[13] as a factual situation. Having adopted Willitts' version of 'un-Pauline,' it remains to categorize scholarly views into the three existing groups arguing that Matthew's perspective is: (1) anti-Pauline, or (2) un-Pauline, or (3) pro-Pauline.[14]

2.2 Three Views on Matthew and Paul

2.2.1 Anti-Pauline Matthew

2.2.1.1 Earlier Studies by Weiss and Brandon

As mentioned before, Weiss first noticed an anti-Pauline stance in Matthew. Weiss begins his argument indirectly, reasoning from the "extraordinary exaltation of Peter over the other Apostles" in the First Gospel.[15] Next, he suggests that Matthew elevates Peter over against Paul, and thus claims that Matthew wrote to demote Paul. Moreover, Weiss proposes another indirect

---

in *Religious Conflict from Early Christianity to the Rise of Islam*, ed. Wendy Mayer and Bronwen Neil, AKG 121 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013), 71–86, especially 79–85. However, the approach Willitts and Foster take seems to establish a better ground from which to discuss Paul and Matthew because of "the lack of a sound definition of Paulinism" (Omerzu, "Paul and Mark," 58; he further argues that "any definition of 'Paulinism,' 'Pauline thought' or 'Pauline theology' will by nature be based on subjective decisions of the respective interpreter." Cf. ibid., 58n46).

[11] Willitts' concept is more appropriate for this research because it eventually examines the significance of Jesus' death in Paul and Matthew and compares their views on this specific topic. Since no scholar examines the significance of Jesus' atoning death in Paul and Matthew, the following survey in 2.2 covers the scholarly studies which compare Paul and Matthew in general.

[12] David C. Sim, "The Reception of Paul and Mark in the Gospel of Matthew," in Wischmeyer, Sim, and Elmer, *Paul and Mark*, 589–615, 589.

[13] Foster, "Paul and Matthew," 114.

[14] Again, the 'un-Pauline' means that their contents and perspectives are just different (in the sense that "difference is not opposition" in R.T. France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher* [Exeter: Paternoster, 1989], 110).

[15] Weiss, *Earliest Christianity*, 2:752. He follows up with the claim that "St. Peter is valued as *the* Apostle," and "he represents the correct tradition in opposition to others."

reason for Matthew's opposition to Paul: "in 28:19 the Twelve were sent to all nations," which represents a "complete ignoring of St. Paul."[16]

Brandon accepted Weiss' thesis wholeheartedly. According to him, in the gospel of Matthew, there is "a thinly veiled polemic against Paul"[17] Brandon offers three arguments for his case: (1) Matthew's special attention to Peter over against Paul, (2) the personal attack on Paul in Matthew 5:17–19, and (3) an identification of Paul as the 'enemy' in the parable of the Tares (13:24–30).

What follows is a further explanation and evaluation of Brandon's arguments. Brandon's first argument is from Weiss, who identifies Peter in the first gospel as "the *first*" of the Twelve (10:2), and as the rock which alone has "the power of binding and loosing"[18] (16:19). Brandon simply takes over Weiss' explanation without developing his own argument. The second is a passing comment rather than an argument. Again Brandon borrows Weiss' view that Matthew 5:19 is an implicit attack against Paul.[19] The third point, however, is his own. For Brandon, the ἐχθρὸς ἄνθρωπος (13:28) in the parable is a hint towards Paul even though Jesus' elaboration of the parable unveils its identity as ὁ διάβολος (v.39). To avoid this clear identity of enemy in the text, Brandon suggests the explanation spoken by Jesus is "a later interpolation."[20]

Even Sim, the prominent contemporary scholar of anti-Pauline persuasion, correctly evaluates Brandon's threefold argument as "a mixture of the weak and the unconvincing"[21] and concedes twice that Brandon made a "failed attempt"[22] to prove his case. Concerning Brandon's first argument, Sim judges that Brandon "provided no supporting evidence for his claim."[23] It is true that Peter is sometimes seen as the head of the twelve in Matthew, but at other points, Peter is depicted as a disgraced figure. In the eyes of Matthew,

---

[16] Ibid., 2:753. However, Matt 28:19 seems to be Matthew's plain description of the scene rather than a purposeful slight to Paul, since Paul was not a Jesus-follower at that time, and was not at the scene.

[17] Brandon, *Fall*, 233.

[18] Weiss, *Earliest Christianity*, 2:752. He also carefully notes that the power "belongs to all the disciples in 18:18."

[19] On this, Brandon and Sim seem to misread Weiss. Like Brandon, Sim, "Anti-Paulinism," 769, mentions Weiss' view "that the least in the kingdom of heaven is a reference to Paul, the least of the apostles (cf 1 Cor 15:9)." However, Weiss, *Earliest Christianity*, 2:753, states that "the word 'least' is not an allusion to the Apostle's designation of himself in I Cor. 15:9." See also W.D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: CUP, 1964), 335n1.

[20] Brandon, *Fall*, 235.

[21] Sim, "Anti-Paulinism," 769. Again, Sim, "Conflict," 76, accepts that "Brandon's meagre arguments were not especially persuasive."

[22] Ibid., 777, 781.

[23] Ibid., 778. Actually, Brandon does provide evidence, which is insufficient.

Peter is a man of little faith (14:31), a criticism which other evangelists never mention.[24] Moreover, Peter was called 'Satan' by the Matthean Jesus in the pericope immediately after Matthew 16:19. If Matthew intends to present Peter as a superlative authority over against Paul, he should have omitted this part deliberately.[25] The second argument, which is actually a comment rather than an argument, will be dealt with while evaluating Sim's argument. On the third argument, Sim rightly dismisses it because "there is no textual evidence whatsoever for his claim."[26] Therefore, it is not surprising that Brandon's argument struggled for acceptance.

2.2.1.2 Recent Studies by Sim

Sim does not buy into Brandon's reasoning, but he does adapt and develop it so that he can "resurrect the thesis of Brandon."[27] As the most prominent adherent of this view, he carefully crafts his thesis that Matthew "was vehemently anti-Pauline."[28] His main supporting texts in the first gospel are the following: (1) 16:17–19, (2) 5:17–19, (3) 7:21–23, and (4) 28:16–20.

Sim's first two arguments are modified versions of Brandon's. Sim admits that the evidence of his first proof text, (1) above, is "indirect."[29] On the basis of this text, he argues that "in promoting the primacy of Peter, Matthew openly and savagely attacks Paul and his law-free gospel."[30] He follows Weiss and Brandon on this argument, which was criticised above. However, Sim approaches this issue more systematically than his predecessors. Firstly, he describes the Matthean elevation of the disciples, and then its elevation of Peter over the disciples.

This argument is based on redaction criticism. According to Sim, compared to the descriptions of the disciples in the Markan narrative, those in the

---

[24] In Matthew 15:15f., Peter is mentioned as a representative of the *foolish* disciples while Mark sees all the disciples as foolish without specifying Peter (Mark 7:17f.). In Luke's gospel, the whole passage (Matt 15:1–20; Mark 7:1–23) is entirely omitted. Yet there is an equivalent in Acts 10–11, where again it is Peter who needs to understand that purity is no longer the dividing line between Jews and Gentiles. Cf. Roland Deines, "Das Aposteldekret—Halacha für Heidenchristen oder Christliche Rücksichtnahme auf Jüdische Tabus?" in *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World*, ed. Jörg Frey, Daniel R. Schwartz and Stephanie Gripentrog, AJEC 71 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 323–395.

[25] Luke skipped this scene of Peter being called Satan entirely (Luke 9:22; cf. Matt 16:21–23; Mark 8:31–33).

[26] Sim, "Anti-Paulinism," 769.

[27] Ibid., 776. For Sim's detailed discussion, see David C. Sim, *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism: The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Community*, SNTW (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 188–213.

[28] David C. Sim, "Matthew and Ignatius of Antioch," in Sim and Repschinski, *Matthew*, 139–54, 148

[29] Sim, "Anti-Paulinism," 778. See also his *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 188–99.

[30] Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 213.

Matthean gospel were improved to portray them in a more positive light.[31] Sim suggests that the unfavourable descriptions of Mark originate from its pro-Pauline author's criticism of the disciples. Therefore, Sim contends that Matthew makes it clear that "despite their personal failings, [the disciples] knew intimately the teachings of Jesus and faithfully transmitted them."[32] In Sim's view, the depiction of the disciples in Matthew is more favourable overall. Assuming that the disciples and the family of Jesus were the main antagonists of Paul, Sim finds that Matthew rehabilitates them whilst Matthew's source, the gospel of Mark, presents them critically. After setting up this line of argument, Sim employs the classical argument that "Peter is specifically designated first"[33] in the Matthean list of disciples (10:2) to propose the primacy of Peter over even all other disciples. On this basis, Sim finds an antagonistic relationship between Peter and Paul in the first gospel.[34]

Regarding the second proof text, Matthew 5:17–19,[35] Sim sees 5:17 ("do not think that I have come to abolish the law or the prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfil them") as the crucial verse whereas for Brandon it is v.19, in which he takes 'least' as an allusion to Paul. Sim argues that Matthew emphasizes the importance of the Torah in v.17 to polemicize against the Pauline law-free perspective. To do so, almost every time Sim

[31] Despite this, he correctly concedes that "in some cases Matthew has been to depict the disciples in a more unfavorable light than they appear in Mark" (ibid., 194). For the interpretation of Mark's negative description of the apostles, however, Finn Damgaard argues that it is "wrong to identify the portrait of Peter with Mark's portrait of Jesus' family . . . thoroughly negative" ("Persecution and Denial – Paradigmatic Apostolic Portrayals in Paul and Mark," in Becker, Engberg-Pedersen, and Müller, 295–310, 309). Indicating that "there is no scholarly consensus about [Mark's picture of Peter]" (295), he maintains that the negative portrait "is primarily a literary device" rather than polemic against Peter (309).

[32] Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 196.

[33] Ibid., 197. However, if the disciples were listed according to their primacy, the list would look more like the Markan version (3:16–19). Mark seems to order disciples in line with their rank in the early church: Peter, James, and John are placed first, and then Andrew and others follow. Andrew is distanced from Peter although they are brothers. Jesus probably considered the three as an inner circle of the Twelve (Matt 17:1; 26:37). Hence, from the Markan list, one may argue that Peter was over the others by the fact that he is the first-mentioned disciple. However, it is less probable that the Matthean list reflects a similar ordering.

[34] Sim advances his claim on the basis of the verbal similarities between Matthew 16:17 and Galatians 1:12, 16–17, contending that "Matthew is making the point that it was Peter and not Paul who experienced divine revelations and who was commissioned by Jesus to lead the church" ("Anti-Paulinism," 778).

[35] Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 207, asserts that the Sermon on the Mount is "the greatest concentration of Matthew's anti-Pauline material."

discusses v.17, he unfailingly cites Paul's claim that Christ is the end of the law (Rom 10:4; cf. Gal 3:23–25).[36]

It should be noted that in Matthew's perception, the law is understood as something less than what Jesus said. There are striking verbal similarities between two Matthean verses: Matthew 5:18 and 24:35.[37]

Table 1: Comparison between Matthew 5:18 and 24:35

Matthew 5:18 (rearranged)	Matthew 24:35
. . . ἕως ἂν ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ	ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ
παρέλθῃ	παρελεύσεται
ἰῶτα ἓν ἢ μία κεραία ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου	οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου
οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ . . .	οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσιν

A word by word comparison forces us to conclude that at least the law may have the same authoritative value as 'my words' (24:35b). More than that, Jesus' words have higher value than the law has: The law is temporary, but Jesus' words are eternal. This being the case, the Matthean Jesus is proclaiming a new interpretation of the Torah through the Sermon on the Mount.

[36] David C. Sim, "Christianity and Ethnicity in the Gospel of Matthew," in *Ethnicity and the Bible*, ed. Mark G. Brett, BibInt 19 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 171–95, 179, 188; idem, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 21, 208; idem, "Anti-Paulinism," 779; idem, "Matthew 7.21–23: Further Evidence of its Anti-Pauline Perspective," *NTS* 53 (2007): 325–43, 325; idem, "Matthew, Paul," 381; idem, "Paul and Matthew," 51; idem, "Conflict," 77.

In Sim's reading, end means 'termination,' and to him there seems no other possible meaning. But there is another possibility, denoting 'goal,' or 'aim.' Therefore, the 'end of the law' need not necessarily mean the termination of the law. If the Pauline Jesus can be understood as the goal of the law, he might claim that he came to fulfil it. As Michael F. Bird puts it, "Jesus speaks about the law and acts towards the law as if he is, in some sense, to be identified with the God who legislated it. . . . Jesus was the eschatological fulfiller of the law, he provided its proper interpretation, and he spoke about it with a divine authority. This is paralleled by Paul, who announced that Christ was the 'end of the law' (Rom. 10.4)" ("Jesus as Law-breaker," in *Who Do My Opponents Say That I Am?: An Investigation of the Accusations against Jesus*, ed. Scot McKnight and Joseph B. Modica, LNTS 327 [London: T&T Clark, 2008], 3–26, 26).

[37] 24:35 can be "a (perhaps intentional) reference back to 5:18" (Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 21–28: A Commentary*, trans. James E. Crouch, ed. Helmut Koester, Hermeneia [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005], 208).

Most commentators find these resemblances and end up concluding that Jesus is over the law.[38]

Sim does not deny this point and comments, "I would agree with those commentators who interpret 5:17 in the sense that Jesus the Messiah provides the authoritative and definitive exegesis of the law; he fulfils the law by bringing out its original intention and meaning."[39] Sim accepts Jesus' authority over the Mosaic Law, but contends, "since Jesus has not come to abolish the law, his fulfilment of it must in some manner entail its continuity."[40]

On the third text in Matthew 7, Sim argues elsewhere that the "redactional pericope in Matt 7.21–23 . . . can and should be viewed as an anti-Pauline text."[41] He states this on the grounds that (1) Paul's claim in 1 Corinthians

---

[38] W.D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–97), 3:368; R.T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 185; Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew*, WBC (Dallas: Word, 1993–95), 2:715–16; John P. Meier, *Matthew*, NTM 3 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1990), 289; David L. Turner, *Matthew*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 583. For a different view that the value of Torah is same as Jesus' words, see Luz, *Matthew 21–28*, 208; John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 988.

Petri Luomanen is especially helpful here: "the fact that in Matthew's view Jesus' words are actually more important tha[n] the traditional OT law becomes evident in the form of the following antitheses" (*Entering the Kingdom of Heaven: A Study on the Structure of Matthew's View of Salvation*, WUNT II/101 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998], 87). In Matthew's gospel, the antitheses repeat 'But I say,' and thus Jesus is the authority who can teach the true meaning of the Torah. As Deines, "Not the Law," 64, states, the antitheses here "do not abrogate the Torah of Moses, but they make it in a way superfluous." That the Matthean Jesus redefines the law with authority concurs with the concluding remark of the Sermon. At the end of the Sermon, the evangelist carefully describes how Jesus is recognised as someone 'having authority' by the people around him (Matt 7:29). All these facts give the impression that the Matthean Jesus is over the law, and one can concur with Foster that "the Matthean Jesus is view[ed] by the community as having authority to redefine or even overturn Torah" (*Community, Law*, 21n70; cf. Élian Cuvillier, "Torah Observance and Radicalization in the First Gospel. Matthew and First-Century Judaism: A Contribution to the Debate," *NTS* 55 [2009]: 144–59, 159).

[39] Sim, *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 124.

[40] Ibid. This is understandable, but the degree of the continuity matters. Jesus and the disciples broke the law during Jesus' ministry. According to Matthew 9:14–17, the disciples of Jesus do not fast, as the Pharisees and the disciples of John do. In 12:1–8, Matthew pictures Jesus' disciples breaking the Sabbath law, which makes them law-breakers. Moreover, Jesus was conscious of himself as having authority over the Torah. Accepting these two suggestions, it is hard to agree that Jesus urged his people to be a law-observant community as Sim claims. If Jesus came to the Matthean community reconstructed by Sim, even he would have been counted as a law-breaker.

[41] Sim, "Matthew 7.21–23," 325. Here Sim construes Paul and his circle as "the intended targets" of Matthew 7:21–23. This argument seems to contradict his previous elaboration of Matthew 5:17–19. Sim contends that both passages are intended by the evangelist

12:3 and Romans 10:9–13 can be summarized as a claim that "the mere confession of Jesus as Lord guarantees salvation,"[42] without observing the law; (2) the false prophets and miracle-workers who only confess Jesus as the Lord (v.22) are carefully designed to point to Paul; and (3) there are verbal similarities between the text and Mark 9:38–40 which mentions a 'strange exorcist,' whose identity is probably Paul.

Finally, the commission passage in Matthew 28 is Sim's last proof.[43] For him, the Great Commission is a law-observant mission on the basis that it is for both the Jews and the Gentiles. According to Sim, the Matthean community was based on Christian Judaism. Therefore, if the Great Commission was intended also for the Jews who believe Jesus as the Messiah, it should be a law-observant mission. Moreover, Jesus said, 'teach the people to observe all that I commanded' (v. 20). On this, Sim remarks: "what Jesus has commanded can only apply to his teachings earlier in the Gospel . . . . While the Matthean Jesus teaches on a wide range of subjects, an integral part of his message concerns the Torah."[44]

Harrington shows sympathy with Sim that "at the very least he has provided a stimulus for us to rethink our largely canon-influenced tendency to har-

---

to oppose Paul's anti-Torah attitude. On Matthew 5:19, Sim proposes that Matthew attacks Paul and the Paulinists by calling them 'the least.' If they are the least, they are *inside* the Kingdom of Heaven (5:19). In contrast, the workers of ἀνομία in 7:23 are *outside* the Kingdom of Heaven. Sim's interpretations demand that Paul and his group should be both inside and outside of the Kingdom. This is unlikely, given that Matthew clearly divides those within the Kingdom and those outside. Therefore, if Sim equates Paul and his co-workers with the least, he cannot and should not equate them with the workers of lawlessness. On Sim's argument on Matthew 7, Zangenberg aptly remarks ("Matthew and James," 120): "Sim proposes that Mt. 7.21–23 rejects Paul and his group on the charge of lawlessness. It is true that Paul employs a different approach towards the Law and it is also true that his communities prophesied, worked miracles and performed exorcisms (1 Cor. 12.3; Rom. 10.9–13), but they were not the only ones! How *specifically* anti-Pauline are these passages? It is entirely conceivable that judaizing opponents of Paul could charge him with lawlessness, but how *exclusively* Pauline is such a position (even James was executed on the charge of 'lawlessness')?" ([emphasis his]; cf. Foster, "Paul and Matthew," 102). This vital evidence of James being charged as a law-breaker is "often neglected" (Deines, "Not the Law," 54n3. Besides James, Deines provides two more cases from early Christian literature in which the Christians were considered as 'law-breakers' by contemporary Jews).

[42] Sim, "Matthew 7.21–23," 342.

[43] Sim, "Matthew, Paul," 377–92.

[44] Ibid., 386. The claim that Jesus' message concerns the Torah is acceptable, but the most important thing is *how* it concerns it, and *how* Jesus sees the relationship between the law and himself. As previously established, Jesus is the authoritative figure over the Mosaic Law. In the finale, the Matthean Jesus does not say, "obey what the Torah says," but "obey what *I* commanded." The redefined Torah is to be taught according to its new interpretation by Jesus.

monize Paul and Matthew."[45] Sim challenges Matthean scholarship to rethink a certain tendency, and to rethink the possibility of Matthew as the anti-Pauline. Whilst Sim vigorously disseminates his thesis through articles and books, Catchpole joins the club. His intention is not to elaborate the relationship between Matthew and Paul, but he comments, "Matthean Christianity is fundamentally at variance with Pauline Christianity and . . . the real Christian threat which concerns the evangelist may well come from the direction of the Pauline tradition."[46] Despite this "unexpected"[47] support, the scholars in this classification seem to be fighting an isolated battle compared to the numerous advocates for the other two options.[48]

2.2.2 Un-Pauline Matthew

As Sim recognizes that the un-Pauline stance "is generally conceded" and is "a growing consensus,"[49] most scholars can easily be categorized in this set. Among them, three scholars may be taken as examples: Roger Mohrlang,[50] Ulrich Luz,[51] and Paul Foster.[52]

The most comprehensive comparison of Paul and Matthew was published by Mohrlang. As its subtitle – *A Comparison of Ethical Perspectives* – indi-

[45] Harrington, "Matthew and Paul," 25.

[46] David Catchpole, *Resurrection People: Studies in the Resurrection Narratives of the Gospels* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 2000), 59.

[47] Sim, "Anti-Paulinism," 780. For a recent brief comparison between Romans and Matthew, see Thomas L. Brodie, "Countering Romans: Matthew's Systematic Distillation and Transformation of Paul," in *The Letter to the Romans*, ed. Udo Schnelle, BETL 226 (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 521–42, where he argues that "while Matthew had a copy of Romans to hand, he countered some of its ideas or emphases." (521). In my opinion, Brodie's view can be included in the 'un-Pauline' group, although the title of his essay seems to suggest it is 'anti-Pauline.'

[48] However, it should be noted that Sim correctly indicates that Paul and Matthew agree on the significance of Jesus' death: "they jointly regarded [Jesus] as messiah and Lord, as crucified and vindicated, as the fulfiller of the ancient prophecies," (Sim, "Conflict," 76) and more specifically, "it goes without saying that the Christian Matthew and the Christian Paul agreed on many important issues, especially the significance of the Christ event" (idem, "Anti-Paulinism," 771). Cf. his *Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 200.

[49] Sim, "Matthew 7.21–23," 343; idem, "Paul and Matthew," 50 respectively. It is Stanton who coins this category, but he does not cover much about the differences and similarities between Paul and Matthew (*Gospel for a New People*, 314). Moreover, by his terminology itself, it is not completely clear whether his 'un-Pauline' designation denotes differences caused by one's disinterest in the other (perhaps because one did not feel any need to respond the other even though one knew the stance of the other), or a lack of direct connections between them.

[50] Mohrlang, *Matthew and Paul*.

[51] Ulrich Luz, *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew*, trans. J. Bradford Robinson (Cambridge: CUP, 1993).

[52] Foster, "Paul and Matthew."

cates, his comparison is mainly of their ethical perspectives, and he compares the "five topics of major importance to the motivation of ethics in their writings."[53] In his conclusion, he finds the different perspectives of Paul and Matthew on the five topics, but he states that "it is a difference of focus and emphasis."[54] Whilst balancing out between the two extremes (Paul and Matthew being conflicting or corresponding), he finally comments, "the emphases of the two are complementary."[55] Is is more important for this present study that Mohrlang argues that "it is clear that both writers attach soteriological significance to Jesus' death."[56]

Concerning the next scholar, Luz, it is understandable that his view of the relationship between the texts has been labelled "incompatible"[57] – a concept similar to 'anti-Pauline' – because Luz claims, "Matthew and Paul, had they known one another, would certainly not have struck up a strong friendship."[58] In fact, Luz sees an evident tension between the two biblical authors, and describes the tension as "perhaps even an abyss."[59] After this comment, however, he proposes that their differences were caused by their different experiences, and then concisely enumerates several points of similarity. Finally he summarizes what he finds: "between Matthew and Paul, then, there is a fruitful and productive field of tension. They are not antipodal. Neither are they simply brothers. They can complement one another by pointing up, with their strength, the other's weakness."[60] This summary statement clarifies that Luz belongs to the 'un-Pauline' camp rather than the 'anti-Pauline.'

---

[53] Mohrlang, *Matthew and Paul*, 1–2. In each chapter, he discusses them in the following order: law, reward and punishment, relationship to Christ and the role of grace, love, and inner forces.

[54] Ibid., 126. At the end of every chapter, where he compares the views of Paul and Matthew on each topic, he repeats this idea that "in the end, it is essentially a difference of focus and emphasis" (92; see also 42, 71, 107, 124).

[55] Ibid., 132. Concerning the tendency of drawing no distinction between the two biblical authors, he calls it an "error": "just as we must beware, therefore, of drawing too sharp a distinction between the two writers, so we must beware of failing to draw a distinction at all (i.e., of falling into the common error of reading Matthew through the eyes of Paul)" (92).

[56] Ibid., 91. According to him, "Matthew clearly portrays Jesus' death . . . as the ground of forgiveness" (79). Moreover, in Paul's case, he states, "Christ's death is a point of central importance, therefore, not only for Paul's theology, but also for his ethics" (88).

[57] Joel Willitts, "The Friendship of Matthew and Paul: A Response to the Recent Trend in the Interpretation of Matthew's Gospel," *HvTSt* 65 (2009): 1–8, 1.

[58] Luz, *Theology of Matthew*, 148.

[59] Ibid., 149.

[60] Ibid., 153. According to Luz, Matthew and Paul were not close friends, but had at least some mutual friends (146). Concerning influence from one to another, Luz contends, "Matthew and Paul seem to have no points of contact with each other" (146).

Lastly, for Foster, Sim's definition of 'un-Pauline,' which concerns literary dependence of Paul and Matthew, is somewhat implausible. Instead, he suggests that "it is possible to compare and contrast respective outlooks in relation to similar themes."[61] He explores 5 common themes in the two authors for comparison: the purpose of OT citation, attitudes towards Torah observance, the usage of Christological titles, participation in gentile mission, and forms of community leadership. After comparing the five topics, he concludes that "the five topics for comparison have revealed some striking similarities between the theological outlooks of Paul and Matthew as well as some notable differences."[62] In connection with his comment that "there is no way of establishing the case of dependence,"[63] his conclusion is clearly at home in the 'un-Pauline' group.

2.2.3 Pro-Pauline Matthew

2.2.3.1 Earlier Studies from Dodd to Meier

As mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, Dodd sees Paul and Matthew as sharing common theological ground because of a 'common tradition' behind them rather than because of 'literary dependence.'[64] Dodd opposes the argument that the Matthean gospel has an anti-Gentile and anti-Pauline bias, and his keen interest lies in a comparison of common themes in Matthew and Paul. The three shared issues which he compares are their eschatological schemes, views on the Church, and polemic against Judaism. From his com-

---

[61] Foster, "Paul and Matthew," 87. For Sim's definition of 'un-Pauline,' see section 2.1.

[62] Ibid., 113. However, he makes it clear that where the similarity between the two authors seems more noticeable than their difference, the similarity does "not establish dependence" (92). Moreover, where the degree of their difference is somewhat superior to that of similarity, he claims they are "different, but not antithetical" (102). For the first theme, the use of Scripture, Foster suggests Paul and Matthew use it "for Christological and salvation-historical purposes" (91). Regarding their attitudes towards the role of Torah, he finds differences between them, but sees the understanding of Paul's "wholesale rejection of the law" as an "oversimplified" view (95) and also denies that "Matthew advocates complete observance of the Jewish law" (94). On the third theme, Foster claims both "use similar Chiristological formulations," (e.g. κύριος, son of God), but "there are differences in the frequency of use of certain titles between Matthew and Paul, as well as potentially different understandings" (102). For the last two topics, Foster argues that "both affirmed Gentile mission in some form" (110), and that both share an egalitarian tendency in community hierarchy because "pastoral care and group discipline are community responsibilities and not entrusted to certain officials in the respective communities" (111).

[63] Ibid., 114.

[64] Dodd, *NT Studies*, 65, summarises: "there is nothing to suggest either literary dependence or derivation from a common written source; but . . . behind both writers there lies some kind of common tradition." Against their 'literary dependence,' Dodd states, "in Matthew traces of [Pauline] influence are indeed difficult to find" (54).

parative investigation, Dodd concludes that Matthew and Paul shared a common perspective on the three issues.

After Dodd, three other scholars have argued that the theological outlooks of Paul and Matthew are common in many ways: W.D. Davies,[65] M.D. Goulder,[66] and J.P. Meier.[67] To begin with, Davies, in his treatment of the Sermon on the Mount, discusses whether the Sermon is composed to polemicize against the teachings of Paul. To do so, Davies lists three questions to investigate whether Matthew has an anti-Pauline viewpoint: (1) does Matthew express its particularistic mission to Jews as anti-Pauline propaganda?[68]; (2) what are the specific anti-Pauline passages in the first gospel, and are they really so?; and (3) did Matthew elevate Peter over against Paul to discredit the latter?

To answer the first question, Davies focuses on 'particularism' of Matthew, i.e., the ministry of Jesus being limited to the Jews. This particularism is used as a basis of the argument that the primitive Jewish Church in Jerusalem

---

[65] Davies, *Setting*, 316–66. Davies finds Brandon's *Fall of Jerusalem*, as "a convenient starting point" (317). He sketches Brandon's historical reconstruction as follows. Brandon assumes that the early Church was divided, and that each party competed with each other. When Paul died, the Palestinian churches became the mainstream because their arch-rival had disappeared. However, after the fall of Jerusalem, the lesser Pauline circle tried to rehabilitate Pauline Christianity. The first gospel was written against this movement. Because there is no strong evidence for Brandon's reconstruction, Davies boldly states that "Brandon has to make bricks without straw" (322). Davies considers Brandon's 'rehabilitation of Paul' wording problematic, as it suggests that there was a 'dehabilitation' of Paul in the early Church and a continuous battle between Pauline Christianity and Jewish Christianity. Against this, Davies states that "the Jerusalem leaders accepted the Gentile mission of Paul with few conditions. The missionary activity of Paul and Barnabas went under way with the full consent of the Jewish-Christian leaders at Jerusalem. . . . Paul was more at one with Peter and James, the brother of the Lord, than Brandon allows" (325). Davies finds more of a connection between Paul and Jerusalem: "Paul shared much in common with [the early] Church. . . . Paulinism was not a peculiarity in primitive Christianity but a profundity" (323).

Scot McKnight also comments: "when Paul trots out the gospel tradition in 1 Corinthians 15 he is not tossing out a new idea or a new crystallization of fragments that needed to be put together. Paul is involved in a form of *Vergegenwärtigung*, reactualizing and revisualizing for his audience a rock-solid, historic understanding of the word and substance of 'gospel.' In other words, what Paul speaks of in 1 Corinthians isn't Pauline. It is catholic and apostolic, and furthermore it is as early as it is catholic and apostolic" ("Matthew as 'Gospel,'" in Gurtner, Willitts, and Burridge, *Jesus*, 59–75, 61).

[66] M.D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* (London: SPCK, 1974), 153–70; idem, *The Evangelists' Calendar* (London: SPCK, 1978), 223–40.

[67] J.P. Meier, "Antioch," in *Antioch and Rome*, ed. R.E. Brown and J.P. Meier (New York: Paulist, 1983), 11–86.

[68] Actually, the first question is about "the general character of Matthew" (Davies, *Setting*, 325). Because this issue is too broad to be treated, Davies concentrates on this specific issue.

does not allow the Gentile mission, which was under the leadership of Paul. Davies identifies the passages which point out Matthew's 'universalism' along with those showing his particularism. After examining these passages, he confidently states, "'universalistic' no less than 'particularistic' sayings were congenial to Matthew."[69] Therefore, he concludes that "the 'character' of Matthew can no longer be used in support of any anti-Paulinism it may be claimed to contain."[70]

On the second question, Davies concludes that there is no serious anti-Pauline polemic in Matthew 5:17–19 (cf. section 2.2.1.2), but allows that "while v. 17–19 *may* have been directed against Paul, unless there is evidence elsewhere in Matthew for anti-Paulinism it would be unwarranted to claim that it certainly was so."[71]

Concerning the last question, Peter's significance over against Paul (cf. also section 2.2.1.2), Davies admits the primacy of Peter in Matthew. However, to the question "can this be connected with anti-Paulinism?" his answer is a resounding, 'no!': "the pre-eminence here accorded to Peter is undisputed both in the Gospels and in Paul, so that it could not of itself suggest anti-Paulinism."[72] On the basis of his three answers outlined above, Davies concludes that the Sermon on the Mount "is not to be explained as a reaction against Paulinism."[73]

Goulder agrees with Dodd and Davies that the theologies of Matthew and Paul are close, but he does not side with their view that there is no literary dependence between Paul and Matthew. He lists a good number of parallels between the two and then draws the conclusion that "Matthew was expounding the Pauline epistles."[74] In his earlier work, *Midrash and Lection in Mat-*

---

[69] Ibid., 330. Davies even indicates that texts like Matthew 12:18, 21 which mention of the Gentile mission positively are only in Matthew (328). As a reason for the existence of the particularistic tradition in Matthew, he suggests that "it represented the historical realities of Jesus' ministry, which was confined to Israel."

[70] Ibid., 333. For Davies, "it is not possible to set Matthew in opposition to Paul on the Gentile mission" (331). He further suggests that "while it would be to go too far to describe Matthew as pro-Gentile, it is not Jewish-Christian in its attitude to the Gentiles."

[71] Ibid., 336. Davies introduces Weiss's view that the verses are designed as an implicit attack to Paul on this. However, for Davies this polemic against Paul is not so obvious in v.19. Therefore, he warns that "it is unjustifiable to discover anti-Paulinism in v.19, and then to read it back into v.18" (335).

[72] Ibid., 338.

[73] Ibid., 340. He stresses that "with Paul we are near the fountain-head of the Christian movement." Davies also considers it unlikely Matthew knew any Pauline epistles.

[74] Goulder, *Evangelists' Calendar*, 239. Goulder also comments, "nothing is more natural than that Matthew should have read the whole Pauline corpus" (*Midrash*, 155). He further contends that "Matthew should make [the Pauline teaching] a part of the doctrinal basis of his midrash" (170). However, it should be noted that no scholar in the 'pro-Pauline' group accepts his view of Matthew's literary dependence of Paul.

thew, he enumerates the common doctrines such as Christology, ethical teaching, Missiology, Ecclesiology, Anti-Pharisaic Polemic, and Eschatology. Among these, the first two are worthy of mention. As for Christology, Goulder finds the "Pauline teaching of *saving* from sin" and the "Pauline emphasis on faith" in the first gospel.[75] When discussing ethics, Goulder indicates several Matthaeo-Pauline terms, which occur only in Matthew and Paul, but not in Mark and Luke. Taking these terms as the critical clues, he makes the case for both literary dependence and theological closeness.

Lastly, Meier concurs with Davies and Goulder and states that "for all theological differences, the practical results of Paul's theology and Matthew's theology are surprisingly similar."[76] But he warns against making either a false harmonization or a facile antagonism between them. For Meier, the time gap between Paul and Matthew makes it problematic to harmonize simplistically their theological outlook. On the other hand, because their theologies are similar, Meier argues that they were not enemies.[77] Furthermore, he argues that "Paul and Matthew could probably have worked together in a mission to the Gentiles."[78]

2.2.3.2 Recent Studies

Sim contends that this 'pro-Pauline' view is now subsumed by the 'compatibility' view, which is similar to the 'un-Pauline' view. However, the opposite is true.[79] About a decade ago, Shin and Aarde commented that "Matthew was theologically close to Paul: they were not in opposition to one another."[80] They acknowledge that there are some differences between Matthew and Paul,

---

[75] Goulder, *Midrash*, 157.

[76] Meier, "Antioch," 62.

[77] Meier remains unconvinced of "the existence of organized opposition by a group of schismatic Christians" in Matthew (40).

[78] Ibid., 63. Meier depicts Matthew as a "liberal conservative" (51, 59).

[79] Considering the fact that characterizations of Paul "are polarized in contemporary scholarship" (Willitts, "Paul and Matthew," 66), Sim's image of Paul appears to be oversimplified. Moreover, as Magnus Zetterholm states, there exist scholars who find "an almost absolute opposition between Paul and Judaism, have during recent decades been profoundly challenged by those who argue that Paul remained faithful to the Torah, but believed that non-Jews should refrain from involving themselves in Torah observance" ("The Didache, Matthew, James—and Paul: Reconstructing Historical Developments in Antioch," in *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*, ed. Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen K. Zangenberg [Atlanta: SBL, 2008], 73–90, 74). Due to this recent reconstruction of Paul (although it does not command a consensus), researchers who interpret Matthew as pro-Pauline would not cease to exist.

[80] In-Cheol Shin and Andries van Aarde, "Matthew's and Paul's Inclusive Tendencies: A Comparison," *HvTSt* 61 (2005): 1353–72, 1354. As the title indicates, strictly speaking, their aim is a comparison of a specific issue, the inclusive tendencies of Matthew and Paul, not a comparison of their theologies.

but state, "their theological core seems to be the same, even though they might have stressed and emphasized certain issues in different ways."[81]

In his published *habilitationsschrift*, Deines suggests the soteriological views of each author correspond, although there are differences in their interpretation of the law: "Paulus und Matthäus zwei unterschiedliche, exemplarische Wege zu Christus . . . repräsentieren, die gleichwohl das eine Christuszeugnis bekennen."[82] He clarifies, however, that their difference is not on their soteriological view, stating: "der Unterschied zwischen Matthäus und Paulus ist darum nicht im soteriologischen Verstandnis des Gesetzes in der Gegenwart des Reiches Gottes zu suchen, sondern in der geschichtlichen Interpretation des Gesetzes."[83] In a later essay, he maintains that "the prominence of the forgiveness motif is visible throughout the whole Gospel . . . and it is nowhere connected to the Torah."[84] According to Matthew, the Torah is "kein Hindernis auf dem Weg zu Jesus, sondern ein Wegweiser, der immer schon auf seine Erfüllung vorausdeutete."[85] Matthew, therefore, did not see in Jesus a "Bruch mit dem Gesetz", but a way "der über die 'Tora' als Gesamtheit des Willen Gottes führt."[86] In his overall comparison between Paul and Matthew, and specific comparison of their soteriological stance, Deines can perfectly be categorized in this 'pro-Pauline' view.

Wenham sides with this view whilst discussing the Sermon on the Mount.[87] At first glance, this famous Sermon may seem antagonistic to Pauline theology due to "the stringent demand of the Sermon."[88] However, Wenham dismisses this naive reading of the Sermon for three reasons: the existence of grace throughout the first Gospel, the structure of the Beatitudes

---

[81] Ibid.

[82] Roland Deines, *Die Gerechtigkeit der Tora im Reich des Messias: Mt 5,13–20 als Schlüsseltext der matthäischen Theologie*, WUNT 177 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 654.

[83] Ibid., 651. In the same place, he comments, "in ihr hat das Gesetz keine soteriologische Funktion mehr, sondern wie bei Paulus 'seinen neuen Ort in Christo.'" It is remarkable that he draws our attention to what we can easily see: clearly the law in Matthew is "Gottes guter Gabe und guter Weg für Israel bis zum Anbruch der Königsherrschaft Gottes" (652). That is why this good gift from God can in no way be responsible for death of Jesus on the cross. Rather, the Jewish elite (Pharisees and scribes), who "als Vertreter der Tora gelten, (...) und das Volk, das auf seine blinden Führer (Mt 23,17) vertraut . . ." (652) are responsible.

[84] Deines, "Not the Law," 71. In this sense, his view can be called a "somewhat Pauline reading of Matthew" (David Wenham, review of Deines, *Gerechtigkeit der Tora*, *JSNT* 28 [2006]: 48).

[85] Deines, *Gerechtigkeit der Tora*, 652.

[86] Ibid., 653.

[87] David Wenham, "The Rock on which to Build: Some Mainly Pauline Observations about the Sermon on the Mount," in Gurtner and Nolland, *Built*, 187–206.

[88] Ibid., 197.

showing "grace coming before works,"[89] and lastly the intention of Matthew 5:17–20 as a response to the accusation of Jesus as a Law-breaker. After presenting these three observations, he concludes that Paul "uses language and ideas that are much closer to that of the Sermon on the Mount than is sometimes observed."[90] Based on this conclusion, he further comments that "there turns out to be no gulf fixed between Matthew and Paul; rather, the opposite."[91]

Though Willitts concludes that "Matthew was either pro-Pauline in the Davies sense or un-Pauline in the Stanton sense," he can be viewed as one of the 'pro-Pauline' scholars because he argues that Paul and Matthew "show a basic theological affinity with one another."[92] Willitts adopts the following 3 steps: (1) critique of the current comparisons between Paul and Matthew, which eventually compare the *relationship* between the two instead of their perspectives in their extant writings, (2) presentation of an alternative interpretative framework to which Paul and Matthew might have belonged ("apostolic Judaism"), and (3) comparison of their perspectives on the two common topics, Davidic Messianism and judgement according to works.

Concerning the current comparison methodology, (1) above, he argues that the result obtained from the method can be described as "speculative reconstruction," or "educated guesses."[93] Moreover, he carefully differentiates a comparison of the perspectives of Paul and Matthew on an overlapping topic depicted in their works from a comparison of their relationship deriving information from their writings, stating:

> it is one thing to describe each author's particular presentation of a topic they share in common and compare them; it is another thing entirely to draw definitive conclusions about their relationship based on the comparison; or, as some have done, to assume some kind of direct engagement by Matthew against Paul's theology.[94]

Therefore, he suggests that "it can be constructive to compare Paul and Matthew on topics they have in common."[95]

Willitts next presents his interpretative context for reading Paul and Matthew, (2) above.[96] Based on his comparison method and delineation of this

---

[89] Wenham, "The Rock," 199.

[90] Ibid., 205.

[91] Ibid. He states, "the Sermon on the Mount is addressing different questions from Paul's letter to the Romans, but its emphasis on beautiful, godly living does not contradict Paul's gospel of grace at all" (205–6).

[92] Willitts, "Paul and Matthew," 85, 62 respectively. More clearly, "if Matthew and Paul had been contemporaries," he argues, "they could have struck up a splendid friendship" (Willitts, "Friendship," 7).

[93] Willitts, "Paul and Matthew," 64, 65 respectively. Foster, "Paul and Matthew," 87, deems it "mere speculation" (87).

[94] Willitts, "Paul and Matthew," 64.

[95] Ibid., 65.

contextual understanding, he begins his comparison on the selected issues, (3) above.

In discussing both topics, Davidic Messianism and judgement according to works, Willitts basically attempts to uncover the shared perspective of Paul and Matthew. His investigation of the second topic is of importance because he deals with Jewish soteriology. Here Willitts embraces Gathercole's understanding that "eschatological vindication was based on *both* election and obedience."[97] Whilst concluding the unit which compares the soteriological schemes of Matthew and Paul, Willitts sees them as sharing the same perspective as wider ancient Jewish soteriology, stating that Matthew and Paul "seem to line up perfectly on this point, although their appeal to it might be made in different ways given their unique rhetorical purposes."[98]

At the end of his argument, he easily dismisses the anti-Pauline viewpoint. Together with the conclusion he draws after comparison of the two themes in this essay and the conclusion from his earlier article, his view can fairly be perceived as pro-Pauline.

2.3 Conclusions

Scholarly views on the comparison of Paul and Matthew are diverse, but can be divided into three distinct groups: anti-Pauline (section 2.2.1), un-Pauline (2.2.2), and pro-Pauline (2.2.3). Defining the categories (2.1) is also an important matter because they may be (and actually are) understood differently by different scholars. Investigating the influence of one on the other and possible literary dependence between Paul and Matthew is a comparison of their historical *context*. On the other hand, to discuss the similarities and differences of the overlapping themes in their writings is more about their *content*. Notwithstanding Sim's claim that one must consider the historical

---

[96] I am partially sympathetic to his reconstruction of the social settings of Paul and Matthew (see the table in ibid, 68–69), and his basic assumptions regarding apostolic Judaism, but think that there is a more logical method of argumentation than his placement of an interpretive framework before a comparison of Paul and Matthew. It appears to me that this is putting the cart before the horse. Willitts does not accept Sim's comparison methodology that compares the context of Paul and Matthew, and carefully argues for another method: a comparison of the contents of Paul and Matthew. However, by setting a social context before his comparison of their contents, Willitts seems to assume a possible afterthought stemming from a comparison, their contexts, before comparing the contents. In the essay following Willitts' in the same volume, Foster also argues for comparison of contents of Paul and Matthew, and then – without suggesting any framework – he compares five topics which occur in the writings of both authors.

[97] Ibid., 78.

[98] Ibid., 83.

question of the relationship between Paul and Matthew (which compares their contexts), it seems safe and proper to compare the contents of their writings. More specifically, comparison of overlapping themes is the best way to begin a comparison, and this method will be employed in this research.

Irrespective of how 'un-Pauline' and 'pro-Pauline' are defined, the majority of scholars support one of these two views, with the 'anti-Pauline' view garnering significantly less support. To investigate the relationship between Paul and Matthew, scholars like Mohrlang, Foster, and Willitts compare specific themes in each biblical author. More interestingly, Sim, who claims Matthew is anti-Pauline, stresses that Paul and Matthew agree with one another on the significance of Jesus' death.[99]

Appreciating that Jesus' bloodshed is "on behalf of the redemption and forgiveness,"[100] Bockmuehl states:

"s*omehow* his own suffering and rejection would be instrumental."

"Jesus also affirmed the idea that his suffering would be *somehow* redemptive, would contribute to the salvation of Israel."[101]

These quotes highlight the rather 'blurry' status of the question of the relationship between Jesus' death and the forgiveness of sins — especially when one considers that Bockmuehl is more forthright than many other scholars. Comparing the perspectives of Paul and Matthew in detail will shed more light on this important issue so that this '*somehow*' relation can become a '*plausible*' connection.

[99] See 45n48 above.

[100] Markus Bockmuehl, *This Jesus: Martyr, Lord, Messiah* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1996), 94. He argues that Jesus foresaw his death ("*Jesus began to act much more deliberately with a view to his approaching suffering and death*" because "this awareness and affirmation of future suffering is evident also in his well-attested reply to the request of James and John" [89]), and intended his death. As well as Wright, he points out that the last supper can provide a hint towards Jesus' intention.

[101] Bockmuehl, *This Jesus*, 89, 90 respectively (emphasis mine).

Chapter 3

"Forgiveness of Sins" – Terminological Clarifications

Before comparing Paul and Matthew on the relationship between forgiveness and Jesus' death, the meaning of 'forgiveness of sins' needs to be defined, given the range of scholarly views on its significance in the setting of first-century Palestine. It is important to ask which view the historical Jesus could most plausibly have held. In what follows, the traditional view of forgiveness (3.1), Crossan's de-spiritualized understanding (3.2), and Wright's corporate understanding (3.3) will be assessed. Then, I will attempt a reconstruction of the historical understanding of forgiveness in the mind of the historical Jesus (3.4).

3.1 The Traditional View of Forgiveness

Shogren defines forgiveness as "the wiping out of the offense from memory by the one affronted, along with the restoration of harmony."[1] This effectively represents the quintessential traditional view on forgiveness. While this definition includes reconciliation ("along with the restoration of harmony"), Taylor sharply distinguishes forgiveness from reconciliation. Nontheless, Taylor's definition of forgiveness is similar: "the removal of the barriers to reconciliation."[2] Traditionally, forgiveness is understood as "cancelling sins and offenses"[3] with the aim of reconciliation.

Although Taylor contends that forgiveness is not identical to justification, or reconciliation, the latter two themes seem to be intertwined with forgiveness. The first weakness of Taylor's interpretation is that his choice of terms for forgiveness is not comprehensive. In fact, his treatment is confined to a limited set of terms such as ἄφεσις, ἀφίημι, and χαρίζομαι. Therefore,

[1] Gary S. Shogren, "Forgiveness (NT)," in *ABD*, 2:835–38, 835.

[2] Vincent Taylor, *Forgiveness and Reconciliation: A Study in New Testament Theology* (London: Macmillan, 1946), 23. He clarifies his distinction between forgiveness and reconciliation as follows: forgiveness "is a stage antecedent to reconciliation; it is that which makes reconciliation possible" (3). Taylor even claims that "Jesus never taught that forgiveness was the purpose of His death" (25), although he does not deny the crucial role of Jesus' death in justification and reconciliation. This surprising statement is mainly due to his sharp differentiation between forgiveness, reconciliation, and justification.

[3] Ibid., 25.

his discussion of forgiveness omits other important terms (e.g. πάρεσις, ἵλεως ἔσομαι). Particularly, compared to his approach to reconciliation, his dealing with the topic of forgiveness predominantly on the basis of these three words is insufficient. Initially, Taylor deals with reconciliation by considering καταλλάσσω and its cognates, but then extends his investigation of the topic beyond the word group.[4] As equivalents to reconciliation, he lists the following terminology: peace with God, freedom, sonship, fellowship, and sanctification. If this is "a comprehensive inquiry"[5] into reconciliation, his treatment of forgiveness is less than comprehensive, as his word choice for forgiveness is much more limited.

Not only is his treatment of forgiveness incomprehensive, it is also incorrect. First, one of his selected words for forgiveness χαρίζομαι is used in connection with Jesus' death. In Colossians 2:13, the participial χαρίζομαι appears to describe God's forgiveness, and the next verse mentions the cancellation of an obstacle between God and man. The instrument of this divine action is clearly shown as the 'cross,' which means Jesus' death. Secondly, Taylor offers a passing comment on the texts which directly relate forgiveness and Jesus' death (specifically, Col 1:14, Eph 1:7, and Matt 26:28),[6] but does not provide sufficient elaboration for his dismissal of these texts. Thirdly, Paul does link forgiveness to Jesus' death, and Taylor himself accepts it by contending that the account in Romans 4:25a (Jesus "was handed over [to death] for our trespasses") refers to the "forgiveness of sins."[7] Therefore, his mechanical and sharp distinction between forgiveness and reconciliation is not helpful in providing an effective understanding of forgiveness.

---

[4] Taylor correctly suggests that "there is every reason to think that [Paul] describes reconciliation in cases where he does not use the word, and this is certainly true of other New Testament writers who do not use the terminology at all" (ibid., 84).

[5] Ibid.

[6] Although he easily dismisses "for the forgiveness of sins" in Matthew 26:28 as the redaction of its author (ibid., 11), the origin of the '(new) covenant' concept in the text and its parallel (Mark 14:24; Luke 22:20) is probably from Jeremiah 31:31–34, where the new covenant and the forgiveness of sins are closely linked. This is also supported by the appearance of the 'new covenant' in 1 Corinthians 11:25, which depicts the last supper scene. Moreover, the author of Hebrews seems extremely familiar with Jeremiah 31:31–34 because he blockquotes the text in 8:8–12, and quotes a part of Jeremiah 31:33–34 again elsewhere (10:16f.). It is even more significant that the 'new covenant' (which is closely related to forgiveness), and Jesus' death are inseparably intertwined throughout Hebrews 8 to 10.

[7] Ibid., 42. Moreover, he seems to correctly identify forgiveness with justification on the basis of v.25. For forgiveness as integral to justification, see 4.2.2.

3.2 Crossan's "Politico-religious Forgiveness"

Against the traditional understanding of forgiveness, Crossan proposes a different view of its meaning. He locates the 'forgiveness of sins' in the physical realm, rather than the spiritual; Jesus' speaking of forgiveness of sins deals with social problems, which produced social injustice.

For him, Jesus' claim that "your sins are forgiven" (ἀφίενταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι [Mark 2:5; Matt 9:2], ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου [Luke 5:20]) is a correction of wrong theology. According to him, in Jesus' Judaea, it was excessive taxation which left "poor people physically malnourished or hysterically disabled. [However,] the religiopolitical ascendancy . . . blamed sick people themselves by claiming that their sins had led to their illness."[8] Hence, Jesus' forgiving was meant as a liberation of the poor and directed against the priests. In Judaism, the temple cult was the major means of 'forgiveness'; thus, to be forgiven and become pure, the Israelites had to provide sacrifices and pay the temple tax, whereas Jesus forgave freely. In Crossan's interpretation, the spiritual aspect of forgiveness cannot be found in Jesus.

Another aspect of Crossan's view on forgiveness is found in his interpretation of the LP, where he gives salience to the term 'debt' in Matthew's version. After discussing debt and slavery due to debts in ancient societies, and the OT, and comparing the result of the discussion to the NT, Crossan draws three conclusions, two of which deserve attention. His first conclusion is that 'debts' in the LP "was originally intended quite literally."[9] Therefore, according to Crossan, Jesus was declaring that the slavery system based on debt and the debt itself should be removed for the sake of distributive justice. Secondly, he argues that the understanding of 'debt' is progressively changed

---

[8] Crossan, *Historical Jesus*, 324. In his *Birth of Christianity*, 293–96, and *Jesus: Revolutionary Biography*, 80–82, Crossan goes further in distinguishing disease and illness: disease is a biological bodily sickness, whereas illness is a psychological experience caused by sickness. Hence, curing a disease and healing an illness are different matters, and what Jesus provided was the latter. Regarding Jesus' healing of paralysis in the beginning of Mark 2, Crossan's presumption is that Jesus "did not and could not cure that disease or any other one, [but] healed the poor man's illness by refusing to accept the disease's ritual uncleanness and social ostracization." (*Jesus: Revolutionary Biography*, 82. Therefore, what Jesus was doing was "healing the illness without curing the disease"). Strictly speaking, by saying this, Crossan even moves the idea of 'your sins are forgiven' from the physical realm to the psychological realm, though the *spiritual* aspect of forgiveness is still missing.

[9] John Dominic Crossan, *The Greatest Prayer: Rediscovering the Revolutionary Message of the Lord's Prayer* (New York: HarperOne, 2010), 159. He also mentions that the line "'forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors' should be taken literally and not metaphorically" (154). For his interpretation of the 'forgiveness' section in the LP, see ibid., 143–62.

in the Synoptics. Crossan contends that from Mark through Matthew to Luke, the idea of debt became trespass, then sin.[10]

His claim that forgiveness pertains only to the physical world seems dissatisfactory. His assertion, which is based on two pericopae faces strong opposition from the accounts in the Synoptics. Crossan's interpretation of forgiveness as a correction of wrong theology is a possible, but not probable theory, for it can hardly explain Jesus' granting remission of sins to a sinful woman who does not seem to be sick or ill (Luke 7:36–50). The author of the Lukan gospel claims that she was considered a sinner by the public (vv.37, 39), and that even Jesus knew her sins were 'many' (v.47). To the sinful woman who was not sick, the Lukan Jesus repeats the statement "your sins are forgiven" (v.48), which is almost identical to the wording of Luke 5:20 in the previous page.

Crossan's view of forgiveness of sins as liberation of debtors from slavery also does not seem apposite. Though he suggests that the sequential change from debt to sin appears in the Synoptic Gospels, their authors use 'debts' and 'sins' interchangeably.[11] It is more plausible to assume they borrowed the idea of 'debt' to explicate 'sin' effectively. Indeed, this explication fits

[10] See Crossan, *The Greatest Prayer*, 160.

[11] As Kenneth E. Bailey puts it, "in Aramaic, Jesus had available to him the word *khoba* which means both *debts and sins*" (*Jesus through Middle Eastern Eyes: Cultural Studies in the Gospels* [Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2008], 126). This comparison of two versions of the LP suggests that Matthew employs sins and debts interchangeably because "he could assume his readers' knowledge of the equation, 'sin' = 'debt'" (Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:611. Cf. Gary A. Anderson, *Sin: A History* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009], 31–32; Magaret Davies, *Matthew: Readings: A New Biblical Commentary*, 2nd ed. [Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009], 62; France, *Gospel of Matthew*, 250; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1–7: A Continental Commentary*, trans. Wilhelm C. Linss [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992], 371; Turner, *Matthew*, 188 [debt as "nuance of sin"]).

This observation seems plausible on the basis of two passages: (1) Matt 6:14–15, and (2) Matt 18:21ff. In 6:14–15, which is situated in the immediate context of the Matthean LP, ἀφίημι is used with παράπτωμα. Moreover, one of the subsequent Matthean 'forgiveness' texts, Matt 18:21ff., supports this interpretation. This text, known as the parable of the unforgiving servant, answers Peter's question of how many times to forgive. In Peter's question (v.21), ἁμαρτάνω and ἀφίημι are joined, and in Jesus' answer (v.35), ἀφίημι and παράπτωμα are paired. Therefore, given that the dialogue concerns forgiveness of sins, it is significant that ἀφίημι and ὀφειλή are coupled together in the parable itself (v.32), in addition to high frequency of occurrence of ὀφείλ-terminology throughout the parable. Consequently, it can surely be argued that the phrase τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν in Matt 6:12 is "a metaphor for our 'sins'" (Maurice Casey, *An Aramaic Approach to Q: Sources for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*, SNTSMS 122 [Cambridge: CUP, 2002], 55. Cf. idem, *Jesus*, 231).

perfectly well with Matt 18:21-35 and Luke 7:36-50: in the context of sin, Jesus uses an analogy of debt, and then returns to the issue of sin.[12]

Therefore, Matthew and Luke do not portray Jesus employing the wording 'forgiveness of sin' as a physical and religio-political phrase, as Crossan claims. The word 'revolutionary' often occurs in the title of his books based on his understanding of forgiveness and many other themes, but it appears that Crossan projects the modern-day image of revolutionaries onto the historical Jesus although he was actually not one.

3.3 Wright's "Corporate Forgiveness"

3.3.1 A Brief Summary of Wright's View

In his *JVG*, Wright states, "the return from exile will mean forgiveness of sins, and vice versa,"[13] thus equating 'return from exile' with 'forgiveness of sins.' This equation was proposed about two decades ago, but his stance remains the same.[14] His proof texts are the OT texts which emphasize their inseparable correlation: texts in which the God of Israel forgives, and Israel returns.[15]

On this basis, Wright argues that "from the point of view of a first century Jew, 'forgiveness of sins' could never simply be a private blessing, though to be sure it was that as well, as Qumran amply testifies. Overarching the situation of the individual was the state of the nation as a whole."[16] Therefore,

---

[12] In particular, Matthew 18 strongly suggests that Crossan's second conclusion is hardly possible because the three terms 'sin' (ἁμαρτάνω in v.21), 'debt' (the ὀφειλ-terms in v.24, 28, 30, 32, 34; the word δάνειον [v.27] is also an alternative term for ὀφειλή), and 'trespass' (παράπτωμα in v.35) appear in conjunction with the verb ἀφίημι. In addition, Luke 11:4 has καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίομεν παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν. Note the parallel of ἁμαρτία and ὀφείλοντι in the Lukan LP. Pace Crossan's claim that the idea of a literal debt progressed towards the idea of a figurative debt, they appear virtual synonyms here.

[13] *JVG*, 269. Wright repeats it again on the same page: "return from exile *means* that Israel's sins have been forgiven – and vice versa."

[14] Wright wrote the same thing for his later sermon which was delivered in 2007: "but 'forgiveness of sins' was never simply a random individualistic concept. For any first-century Jew, it was much bigger: it involved the whole notion of a people in exile because of their sins, so that when God forgave them at last this would mean the restoration of national fortune." See http://ntwrightpage.com/sermons/Easter07.htm (accessed September 17, 2012).

[15] For his proof-texts, see *JVG*, 268–71.

[16] *JVG*, 271 (cf. his *Climax of the Covenant: Christ and The Law in Pauline Theology* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991], 142). Wright goes on, "[h]ad [people] wanted to find 'forgiveness' as private individuals within the existing system, the means were available. The sacrificial system and the means of purification were in principle open to them" (272).

Wright understands forgiveness as corporate redemption: Israel the nation, or the New Israel as a community will be forgiven. Wright tries to offer a bigger picture of forgiveness of sins. Although he leaves room for forgiveness as an individual blessing, Wright emphasizes the idea of corporate forgiveness, as he considers first century Palestine "a far less individualistic society than our modern western one."[17]

3.3.2 A Response to "Corporate Forgiveness"

3.3.2.1 Causal Relation between 'Forgiveness' and 'Return from Exile'

Wright substitutes forgiveness of sins for return from exile, one of the main themes in *JVG*. What Wright confuses here is the relation between the two. Wright sees the one as equivalent to the other, but in fact, they stand in causal relation: forgiveness is the cause and return from exile is the effect. Put differently, the claim 'the return from exile means forgiveness' can be accepted, but adding 'vice versa' at the end, which makes them identical, cannot.

Wright correctly observes the causal connection between Israel's sin and the exile, but then "misleadingly offers a simple equation of [forgiveness of sins and return from exile]."[18] Since "Israel's sin [w]as the *cause* of the exile,"[19] Wright may still argue that the return from exile was caused by forgiveness of sins, as he in fact does when he writes that "[t]he promise of forgiveness and that of national restoration were thus linked causally, not by mere coincidence."[20] Forgiveness of sins is inseparable from the return as its

---

Therefore, Wright describes individual forgiveness as "a detached, dehistoricized or privatized application" (273n121). Based on this, he continues, "Jesus, therefore, was not offering an abstract atonement theology; he was identifying himself with the sufferings of Israel" (592). Wright wrote later that "Matthew is not suggesting that Jesus' death will accomplish an abstract atonement, but that it will be the means of rescuing YHWH's people from their exilic plight" (561). Therefore, Wright understands Jesus as a righteous martyr who died for the sins of Israel (579–91). He develops his argument on the basis of the Maccabean literature, Wisdom of Solomon 2:12–20, and Qumran documents such as 1QpHab 5:10–11; 8:1–3; 11:4–7, and 1QS 8:1–4. Especially with regard to 2 and 4 Maccabees (581–84), he points out that the fate of the martyr and that of Israel are germane to one another. In Wright's view, it is corporate forgiveness which gives individual forgiveness its basis. On the contrary, I argue that Jesus sees individual forgiveness as the basis of corporate forgiveness.

[17] *JVG*, 192. He explains the reasons for this understanding of corporate forgiveness in ibid., 246–64.

[18] Nathan Eubank, *Wages of Cross-Bearing and Debt of Sin: The Economy of Heaven in Matthew's Gospel*, BZNW 196 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013), 112n9.

[19] *JVG*, 271 (emphasis mine). Wright continually describes, "Israel's exile precisely as the *result* of . . . her sins" (268), and reiterates that "the exile . . . was caused by Israel's sin" (270).

[20] N.T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, vol. 1 of *Christian Origins and the Question of God* (London: SPCK, 1992), 300.

cause, not its twin. Strictly speaking, therefore, to say that the forgiveness of sins *is* the return from exile seems to be an overstatement.

In my opinion, Isaiah 27:8–9, which describes punishment (exile) itself granting *forgiveness* of sins, not *return* is decisive for understanding forgiveness. Verse 8 depicts the exile of Israel by her God, and the first half of v.9 declares: "therefore *by this* the guilt of Jacob will be expiated, and this will be the full fruit of the removal of his sin." Thus, the text of Isaiah 27 denotes that even *before* the Israelites came back from exile, their sins would be forgiven. Based on v.9, some even argue that "the Exile will expiate the guilt of Jacob."[21] On the grounds of the text above, we can suggest the following sequential process: sin → punishment (exile) → forgiveness of sins → restoration (return). All the biblical texts which Wright provides to demonstrate the synonymity of return and forgiveness do not specifically prove their identity, although the texts indeed suggest their mutuality.

3.3.2.2 Individual Forgiveness over Corporate Forgiveness

The aim of this section is to show the idea of individual forgiveness is not "ahistorical"[22] as Wright claims. Although individual and group identity were both important in the first century, it seems more probable that in the common understanding of forgiveness in the period, individual forgiveness is primary and provides a basis for corporate forgiveness. If Wright's equation of forgiveness and return from exile is not on the right track, then his reconstruction of corporate forgiveness, which is based on the equation, loses its logical grounds. Moreover, scholars who disagree with the idea of corporateness among first-century Jews have argued that this term is so ambiguous that it can be used anywhere.[23] Even though this ambiguous corporate redemption

---

[21] Jože Krašovec, *Reward, Punishment, and Forgiveness: The Thinking and Beliefs of Ancient Israel in the Light of Greek and Modern Views*, VTSup 78 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 795.

[22] *JVG*, 268. To be fair, Wright does not completely dismiss the idea of personal forgiveness (271), but his line of argument is that for the historical Jesus, corporate forgiveness was primary, and based on this corporate forgiveness, individual forgiveness could be formulated by his followers ("early Christian atonement-theology is only fully explicable as the post-Easter rethinking of Jesus' essentially pre-Easter understanding" [592]). On the contrary, Jesus' focus on forgiveness seems to me to have been on a more individual level.

[23] See J.R. Porter, "The Legal Aspects of the Concept of 'Corporate Personality' in the Old Testament," *VT* 15 (1965): 361–80, 361, where he comments that the concept of corporate personality "tends to become applied to aspects of the subject under discussion for which it was never really suited." J.W. Rogerson, "The Hebrew Concept of Corporate Personality: A Re-examination," *JTS* 21 (1970): 1–16, 2, agrees with him stating that "this ambiguity has enabled other scholars to make use of the theory in a way for which it was never really suited." Half a century ago, these two scholars felicitously warned of the ambiguous characteristic of corporate personality. For a brief history of scholarly discus-

might be in the mind of first century Jews, Jesus' main focus regarding forgiveness of sins may have been on the redemption of individuals anyway.

This is not to claim that individualism overwhelmed collectivism in first-century Palestine, but, particularly in soteriological understanding, 'individual' seems to weigh more than 'corporate,' although, more generally, they are more balanced. To the question, "does Judaism centre on the people or on the individual?" Jacobs gives a simple answer: "it centres on both."[24] It is worth quoting from his conclusion: "some have seen Judaism as centring on the group, others as on the individual. To take any aspect of Judaism and to treat it as the norm by quoting proof-texts is to court failure since texts can easily be multiplied on the other side. Ultimately, it is not a question of either/or but of both[/and]."[25] As Wright does, one can enlist many texts which perfectly fit to the collective understanding, but the appearance of texts concentrating on individuals are so frequent that the concept of 'individual' cannot be regarded as of lesser historical importance. Indeed, the question of individual-corporate should be approached with a 'both/and' understanding. Hence, claiming that corporate forgiveness is the only plausible meaning for the Herodian period (37 BCE–70 CE) does not do justice to the texts.

Even though both aspects are important, and a balanced approach to this 'individual-corporate' issue is needed, the idea of individual forgiveness had a more prominent place with regard to forgiveness of sins in the Judaism of the period. Regarding human destiny, Jacobs argues that "it is clear that the

---

sion on the concept, cf. Andrew Perriman, "The Corporate Christ: Re-assessing the Jewish Background," *TynBul* 50 (1999): 241–63, 242–46; Donald E. Gowan, *The Bible on Forgiveness*, Princeton Theological Monograph Series 133 (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2010), xv, where he even argues that "the New Testament focuses entirely on the individual, rather than national relationship with God." He also cites David's *personal* prayer to be forgiven (Ps 51). Cf. Hartmut Gese, *Essays on Biblical Theology*, trans. Keith Crim (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981), 132, who describes it as, "the traditional lament of the individual." For a detailed analysis of Gese's view of atonement, see Richard H. Bell, *Deliver Us from Evil: Interpreting the Redemption from the Power of Satan in New Testament Theology*, WUNT 216 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 190–200.

[24] Louis Jacobs, *Religion and the Individual: A Jewish Perspective* (Cambridge: CUP, 1992), 6. Even before *JVG* was published, Jacobs warned that "both apologists for Judaism and hostile critics have erred in relegating the individual to a less than central place" (xi). Throughout his monograph, Jacobs argues for "interdependence between the individual and the 'world'" (7) and contends that "for all the admitted emphasis on peoplehood, there are equally powerful individualistic tendencies in Judaism" (2). His balanced view concerning Judaism is also observed in Elliot N. Dorff, "Individual and Communal Forgiveness," in *Autonomy and Judaism: The Individual and the Community in Jewish Philosophical Thought*, ed. Daniel H. Frank (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992), 193–218, where the author mentions that "the Jewish tradition is confident that God will forgive both individual Israelites and the people Israel as a whole" (195).

[25] Jacobs, *Religion*, 119.

individual *qua* individual counts, according to Judaism, in the eyes of God."[26] Jacobs observes the existence of *both* individual and corporate understanding in Judaism, but he emphasizes the Jewish eschatological salvation of each individual.

In line with Jacobs' argument, a good number of NT scholars have recently discerned individualistic salvation in Paul, whilst observing that both aspects of individual/corporate are equally important. Similar to Jacobs, Thielman raises an important question: "when the New Testament speaks of salvation, does it refer primarily to the salvation of the individual or to the salvation of a people?"[27] After examining three letters ascribed to Paul,[28] he concludes that "the individual is critically important in the soteriology of Paul."[29] Furthermore, Burnett comments, "Paul was concerned with the individual qua individual, irrespective of social or, indeed, historical identity."[30]

---

[26] Ibid., 14. He points out that "ultimately the question of the significance of the individual in Judaism can best be discussed by considering his part in the Jewish eschatological scheme" (94).

[27] Frank Thielman, "The Group and the Individual in Salvation: The Witness of Paul," in *After Imperialism: Christian Identity in China and the Global Evangelical Movement*, ed. Richard R. Cook and David W. Pao (Cambridge: Lutterworth, 2012), 136–53, 136. He pinpoints Wright as one who emphasizes "social concerns as primary in Paul's soteriology" (139).

[28] He chose Galatians, Romans, and Ephesians "for brevity's sake" (ibid., 139). Even excluding his argument from Ephesians for this study, the case from Galatians and Romans is convincing.

[29] Ibid., 153. Thielman remarks further: "this individual element is as important as the social element in Paul's soteriology. Whereas . . . [overemphasis on] the individual side of Paul's soteriology . . . is in need of correction, the individual element is nevertheless both prominent and important in the apostle's understanding of the human plight and God's solution to it (139). Bornkamm, *Paul*, 146, elaborates the individualistic nature of faith in Paul, stating: "where the subject is faith, one has no alternative but to speak of the individual, his lost condition, and his deliverance. Faith is never the matter of a body of people, but of the individual. . . . This has nothing to do with modern subjectivism, individualism, and existentialism, and in no way restricts the outward reach of the Pauline doctrine of justification: it is for all the world and all time. On the contrary, making faith an individual matter allows salvation to be universal and gives it its basis."

[30] Gary W. Burnett, *Paul and the Salvation of the Individual*, BibInt 57 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 10. N.B. the use of 'individual qua individual' as in Thielman. Similarly, Ben C. Dunson argues that "faith is the divinely appointed means of *the salvation* of the individual as well as of *the building up* of the believing community in love and self-sacrifice. Faith is therefore a foundationally important bridge between individual and communal (as well as participatory) aspects of Paul's theology" ("Faith in Romans: The Salvation of the Individual or Life in Community?" *JSNT* 34 [2011]: 19–46, 22. [emphasis mine]). However, differently from Burnett, he maintains that the two ideas are intertwined, stating, "it is truly the salvation of the individual, but it is not the salvation of the individual simply qua individual" (41). For a list of scholars who are for and against an individual focus and their views, see Dunson, "Faith in Romans," 20–22).

If this is Paul's understanding of forgiveness, what could Jesus' understanding be? Israel could corporately repent and be forgiven, but what Jesus emphasized was "an essential and decisive individual act [of] repentance."[31] As Vermes correctly states, Jesus' teaching on, and his own attitude towards, repentance "being personal, the ensuing pardon was also naturally so."[32]

Further, individual forgiveness is present in certain important texts from the NT and Josephus: (1) In the LP, Jesus taught his disciples how to pray and mentioned forgiveness. Thus, the value of this prayer to a comprehensive understanding of what forgiveness meant to Jesus and his followers cannot be overstated. The LP reads: καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίομεν παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν (Luke 11:4). In the same way an offended person forgives an offender, God forgives; human interpersonal forgiveness is an analogy of divine forgiveness. Here Jesus is clearly concerned with individual forgiveness. If interpersonal forgiveness basically occurs in a one-to-one basis, corporate forgiveness does not fit into this saying which is ascribed to Jesus. Moreover, Jesus mentions "your (singular) sins are forgiven" (Mark 2:5 and par.) whilst healing the sick.[33] This also strongly suggests that forgiveness is given to the individual.

(2) Baptism is an *individual* rite to become a believer. To become a follower of Jesus, baptism, which assures one's conversion,[34] is of central importance. Although Peter wanted the entire house of Israel to know that Jesus the crucified is the Messiah (Acts 2:36), he urged every one (ἕκαστος) of them to repent, and be baptized so that their sins might be *forgiven* (v.38). Likewise, the baptism of John the Baptist, which was a baptism of repentance for the *forgiveness of sins* (Mark 1:4), was individualized. The corporate aspect of his baptism can be found: people from the *whole* Judean countryside and *all* the people of Jerusalem came to him (1:5), and the Lukan parallel contains the additional quote from Isaiah, "*all* flesh shall see the salvation of God" (Luke 3:6). However, John did not baptize all Israel because he refused to baptize many Pharisees and Sadducees (Matt 3:7). If baptism is related to

[31] Geza Vermes, *The Religion of Jesus the Jew*, (London: SCM, 1993), 191. He indicates that "unlike the communal act of repentance, an integral part of liturgy such as the Qumran ceremony of the renewal of the Covenant, the *teshuvah* displayed by Jesus at his baptism by John was personal. So also was Jesus' appeal to repentance" (192).

[32] Ibid., 192.

[33] In addition to forgiveness being an individual concept, here sin is also treated as an individual and introspective concept. Jesus' saying is directed to an individual who is sick (contra Stendahl, "Paul and the Introspective Conscience"), and the single person, not all Israelites, suffers from the sickness. Although this is not to deny "there is good reason also to think of [sin] as a communal, societarian, or racial state of alienation from God . . . from which we need to be delivered" (Taylor, *Forgiveness*, xvii), the individual aspect of sin must be considered as a historical understanding.

[34] On conversion as a change of loyalty from one master to another, see Deines, "Biblical Viewpoints," 227–61.

forgiveness of sins, as Mark 1:4 and Acts 2:38 suggest, it appears that Jesus' followers understanding of forgiveness is not confined to corporate forgiveness; rather they emphasize individual forgiveness.

(3) Jewish eschatology seems to be individualistic. Referring to "a better life" after death, Josephus proposes that this is what each individual (ἕκαστος) will receive.[35] First century Palestine could have been more of a collective society than modern Western civilization, but people did consider the after-life individualistically. If they saw forgiveness of sins as a condition for receiving this better life, then they considered forgiveness a personal blessing. The eschatology of Wright tends to downplay the aspect of 'afterlife,' stressing the wider historical context, e.g. the exile. Yet, first-century Jews appear to have had a keen interest in having a blessed *personal* after-life. In terms of forgiveness and afterlife, therefore, the individual understanding is primary, and the corporate understanding can be established on the basis of the individual.[36]

If the literary investigation seems insufficient to prove whether the governing idea of first-century Jewish society was individualistic or corporate, the argument can be strengthened by archaeological discoveries which are "fragments of human culture and may reflect connections between individuals and societies."[37] Therefore, together with literature of the period, the archaeological findings can show the social orientation of the time.

---

[35] Josephus, *Ag.Ap.* 2.218. Thielman, "Group and Individual," 145, 148, also indicates Paul's usage of ἕκαστος in 2 Cor 5:10, Rom 14:12, and Rom 2:6, where the eschatological recompense is mentioned. Furthermore, Jesus' eschatology seems to be grounded in individuals (Matthew 24:40f.).

[36] Pharisaic eschatological belief sharply distinguishes between the righteous and the unrighteous, and this distinction is based on actions (Josephus, *Ant.* 18.14). If Pharisees believed that an individual's deeds decided their eschatological reward (new life) or judgment (eternal punishment), an individual eschatological perspective was clearly important in Jesus' days (n.b.: the Pharisaic sect was popular among people [*Ant.* 12.298]). Roland Denies further claims: "of fundamental importance for an appreciation of the Pharisaic influence on religious practice is the linkage . . . between the genesis of Pharisaism and the emerging *individualism* of Hellenistic culture, which expresses itself as a *personal decision* for a particular form of piety" ("The Pharisees Between 'Judaisms' and 'Common Judaism,'" in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*, vol. 2 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, ed. D.A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid, WUNT II/140 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001], 443–504, 497 [emphasis his]). Cf. also Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM, 1974), 1:116–17; Jörg Rüpke, ed., *The Individual in the Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean* (Oxford: OUP, 2013).

[37] Eyal Regev, "The Individualistic Meaning of Jewish Ossuaries: A Socio-anthropological Perspective on Burial Practice," *PEQ* 133 (2001): 39–49, 42. As Steven Fine puts it, "no area of Jewish life in the Graeco-Roman period is better represented in archaeological and literary remains than death" ("Death, Burial, and Afterlife," in *The*

In the late Second Temple period, the burial rites underwent a "drastic change," namely "the change in the customs from primary burials to *ossilegium*."[38] The general burial practice until towards the end of the first century BCE was "burial in charnel pits,"[39] but it was abruptly discontinued and replaced by secondary burial into a stone container called ossuary. These two forms of burial custom share a common procedure: initially, a dead body is laid on a bench in a rock-cut tomb, and then the skeletal remains are later relocated to another place. Yet, the difference between the two rites is significant. In the earlier form, by relocating the remains of the dead into a charnel pit, where those of the ancestors were, his remains were mingled with the ancestors' debris (in this way, the Lukan description of David's burial, προσετέθη πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας αὐτοῦ [Acts 13:36], is literally true). In the later form, however, the remains were *individually* kept in a separate ossuary. This strongly suggests that ossuaries "emerged when special attention to the individual attained a certain climax."[40]

Oxford Handbook of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine, ed. Catherine Hezser [Oxford: OUP, 2010], 440–62, 440).

[38] Rachel Hachlili, *Jewish Funerary Customs, Practices and Rites in the Second Temple Period*, JSJSup 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 524, 526–27 respectively. She describes this rite as "a deliberate procedure of gathering the skeletal remains of an individual after the decay of flesh and placing them in a special container, an ossuary, while retaining this individual burial within the family tomb to await the individual's physical resurrection" (483).

[39] Fine, "Death, Burial," 447. This ancient practice follows two steps: "at first, bodies were placed in individual loculi (Hebrew: *kokhim*) to decompose, and later the bones were deposited in a charnel pit." For Fine, it was "a significant transition" from this to secondary burial. It seems that "the need for Jews in the Herodian period to change the old burial practice indicates a certain change in their social perception" (Regev, "Individualistic Meaning," 43).

[40] Regev, "Individualistic Meaning," 45. Although ossuaries were still placed in a family tomb, thus suggesting that the individual was as important as the corporate, one can still argue that "the ossuary may be seen as an expression of a social or cultural tendency towards individual burial practice" (39). Regev distinguishes "three tangible representations of individualization" on ossuary inscriptions: "name, biographical details, and ornamentation" (43). By these distinctive characteristics of individualization, he succinctly states that the appearance of ossuaries indeed reflects "a new sense of self" (44). Ossuaries were used by the upper class in urban areas such as Jerusalem and Jericho because only the rich could afford the hewn caves. Yet, the individualistic tendency can also be observed in the burial of the lower class: "the poorer classes were buried in simple individual trench graves dug into the ground" (Jodi Magness, "Ossuaries and the Burials of Jesus and James," *JBL* 124 [2005]: 121–54, 121).

In his later article, Regev examines the family structure of Herodian Jerusalem based on the number of niches in the family tomb ("Family Burial, Family Structure, and The Urbanization of Herodian Jerusalem," *PEQ* 136 [2004]: 109–31). He summarises his investigation as follows: "*it seems that the average family became smaller during the Herodian period. It is suggested that this process was due to the urbanization of Jerusalem, and that the change in family structure accelerated the growth of individualism in Jerusalem society*"

In the sectarian movement at Qumran, moreover, the bodies were also buried individually, arrayed in a cemetery-like setting: "Qumran Second Temple period burials will most likely . . . contain a *single* skeleton lying on its back."[41] The members of the community left their family, and may have regarded the community members as their family. Eschatological individualism seems to be more important in the sectarian movement.

Jesus and his followers can certainly be considered members of a new nonconformist movement. It should be noted that Jesus spoke against kinship, and "encouraged his disciple[s] to demonstrate total obedience to the sect at the expense of the duty of family burial."[42] In the end, his own body was laid in a new tomb which belongs to a different family. If Jesus' early followers were willing to leave their traditional social affiliations (e.g., their families) to become a part of this new community through an act of individual conversion and subsequently individual baptism, then their communal faith was grounded on personal faith, not the other way around. Again, a balanced view of individual/corporate is still needed, but in a newly established movement, the understanding of individual salvation must have been emphasized.

In sum, one cannot overemphasize either individual or corporate over the other in the general milieu of Herodian period, but if confine our investigation to forgiveness, the individual aspect is primary without downplaying the corporate. Therefore, Culpepper is correct to state that "through Jesus' example and teaching his followers came to a new appreciation for the possibility of their experience of God, not merely through their corporate identity as Israel, the people of God, but individually in light of and as a consequence of Jesus' relationship to God."[43]

---

(109). Of a total 306 caves, according to him, "about 113 caves (37%) reflect nuclear families; 137 (45%) caves reflect small extended families" (122), which leaves only 18% of caves as belonging to a large extended family. If this is correct, individualisation has significantly progressed.

[41] Brian Schultz, "The Qumran Cemetery: 150 Years of Research," *DSD* 13 (2006): 194–228, 214 (emphasis mine). Hachlili, *Funerary Customs*, 479, states, "the importance of the individual rather than the family is indicated by the burial customs at Qumran." Cf. also Andrea M. Berlin, "Jewish Life Before the Revolt: The Archaeological Evidence," *JSJ* 36 (2005): 417–70, where she maintains that "the single shafts [at Qumran] mean that the deceased was treated not as a member of a family or any larger social unit, but instead as a lone individual laid to rest" (463).

[42] Regev, "Family Burial," 114. He indicates Matt 8:22, and Luke 9:60 as proof-texts.

[43] Culpepper, "Contours of the Historical Jesus," in *The Quest for the Real Jesus: Radboud Prestige Lectures by Prof. Dr. Michael Wolter*, ed. Jan van der Watt, BibInt 120 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 67–85, 83–84.

3.4 Forgiveness of Sins in First-century Palestine

It should be admitted that the question of how to define forgiveness "is less easy to answer than one might suppose, especially if we desire to relate our answer to the teaching of the New Testament."[44] However, after defining the concept of 'sin' (3.4.1), it is possible to suggest a plausible meaning for 'forgiveness of sins' that reflects a first century CE Palestinian setting (3.4.2).

3.4.1 Defining Sin

The presentation of forgiveness as socio-political subversion (Crossan) and corporate forgiveness (Wright) partly results from the downplaying of the seriousness of sin.[45] If, in defining of forgiveness, sin is properly treated as an object of forgiveness, then forgiveness can be presented in a more appropriate sense. As Taylor warns, "if sin is lightly esteemed, a shallow treatment of forgiveness and reconciliation is inevitable."[46] To discuss the 'forgiveness of sins' properly, therefore, sin must first be defined, as misconceptions about 'sin,' can certainly cause misconceptions about 'forgiveness of sins.'

Thus, another obstacle emerges because "it is not easy to define a sin."[47] Moreover, if there were "dramatic mutations in Christian ideas about sin,"[48] its identification becomes more complicated. Therefore, it is important to focus on how the inhabitants of first-century Palestine would understand this term 'sin.'

---

[44] Taylor, *Forgiveness*, 1.

[45] Wright, *JVG*, 264, delimits 'sinners' as a part of "people of the land (the *amme-ha'aretz*)," but does not define "sin(s)" at all. This might be behind his unsatisfactory explanation of forgiveness of sins, especially as "Judaism tended to dissociate [sin] from the community and to fix the burden of it upon the individual" (Gottfried Quell et al., *Sin*, vol. 3 of *Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel's* Theologisches Wörterbuch Zum Neuen Testament [London: Black, 1951], 40).

[46] Taylor, *Forgiveness*, xiv. Later in the monograph, he also states that "the doctrine of sin is the necessary foundation to the understanding of God's redemptive work" (xvii).

[47] Anderson, *Sin*, 3. He further comments, "the definition of a sin has proved far more complicated than one might have imagined" (13).

[48] Paula Fredriksen, *Sin: The Early History of an Idea* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), 1. Recently, two scholars, Anderson and Fredriksen, have independently discussed the evolution of the concept of sin in ancient Jewish and Christian writings. Anderson, *Sin*, 13, argues: "sins are like stains that require cleansing, burdens that must be removed, or debts that have to be repaid. All of these metaphors can be found in the Bible. But it was not the case that biblical authors had all these options before them and freely chose among them as the occasion might merit. Quite the opposite was true. During the early periods one particular metaphor dominated, that of sin as a weight. But at the beginning of the Second Temple period a new metaphor emerged that would take center stage, that of sin as a debt. Sin, I wish to claim, does have a history."

The observations of Anderson and of Fredriksen can be a good starting point. Anderson argues that in the late Second Temple period, the predominant metaphor of sin had become "a debt to be repaid," having developed from "a burden to be borne" in the First Temple period.[49] In the OT, according to him, sin is depicted as something to carry, or a type of pollution to be purified, but in the NT and late second temple literature, it is mainly treated in a figurative monetary sense. Based on this observation, he defines 'sin' in the late Second Temple period as indebtedness. Viewing 'sin' from a different angle, Fredriksen argues that Jesus "defined sin as breaking God's commandments."[50] Whereas Anderson magnifies sin as status, Fredriksen understands it as action. Both aspects are helpful to understand sin in its full sense.[51]

To begin with, one can hardly escape the notion that "sin, it is rightly and widely recognized, is a distinctively religious concept."[52] For this reason, the two previous scholars' views are more persuasive than Crossan's sociopolitical idea of sin in Jesus' days. One should remember that "the entire Bible, the Hebrew and the Greek, treats error or sin as the major cause of a disruption in the relationship between human beings and God."[53]

For the purpose of this research, I will adopt Brand's definition of sin as, "a transgression against God's will."[54] Whereas Fredriksen confines God's commandments to the Ten Commandments (or Torah),[55] Brand extends it to

---

[49] Anderson, *Sin*, 15, 27 respectively. He does not suggest that the idea of sin as a burden completely disappears though (see ibid., 7).

[50] Fredriksen, *Sin*, 16 (similarly, ibid., 135). According to her, this is "a clearer understanding of Jesus' own convictions about sin" (11). This recent view on 'sin' corresponds to the traditional view on sin. After reviewing 'sin' and 'forgiveness' in the OT and early Judaism including the LXX and Qumran literature, Chong-Hyon Sung concludes that "Sünde ist der Verstoss gegen das *Gesetz Gottes*" (*Vergebung der Sünden: Jesu Praxis der Sündenvergebung nach den Synoptikern und ihre Voraussetzungen im Alten Testament und frühen Judentum*, WUNT II/57 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993], 182). Cf. Michael L. Morgan, "Mercy, Repentance, and Forgiveness in Ancient Judaism," in *Ancient Forgiveness*, ed. Charles Griswold and David Konstan (Cambridge: CUP, 2011), 137–57, 139.

[51] Paul understands sin *both* as transgression of a law or standard (Rom 3:23; 5:13), *and* as a power which can control human beings (cf. Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 112n46).

[52] Taylor, *Forgiveness*, xvi.

[53] David Konstan, *Before Forgiveness: The Origins of a Moral Idea* (Cambridge: CUP, 2010), 123.

[54] Miryam T. Brand, *Evil Within and Without: The Source of Sin and Its Nature as Portrayed in Second Temple Literature*, JSJSup 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 26.

[55] She claims that "we can best reconstruct Jesus' ideas on sin by turning to a core tradition of the covenant, the Ten Commandments" (*Sin*, 14). It must also be noted that in Fredriksen's understanding, Jesus' idea of sin differs from Paul's because of the different audiences: the Jewish audience for the former, Gentile for the latter. Therefore, she sees

'God's will,' "whether this will is made explicit or not."[56] For Jesus, a suitable Torah for a newly redefined Israel is the reinterpreted Torah in himself. Because Jesus himself, according to the Jewish authorities, broke the law and was probably called "friend of sinners" by them, his view of God's law must have been different from them. Moreover, his understanding of God's will seems not to be confined to Torah obedience (cf. the Antitheses of Matt 5:21–48).

3.4.2 Defining Forgiveness of Sins

If sin, in the first century Jewish understanding, is basically a religious concept ("a transgression against God's will"), the 'forgiveness of sins' should be regarded as a religious and a moral concept (contra Crossan).[57] Discussions of forgiveness as a religious concept, which is closer to the traditional view, are legion, but we can safely define it as Shogren does, as "the wiping out of the offense from memory by the one affronted, along with the restoration of harmony."[58]

Moreover, if sin is a relational concept, as Krötke defines it ("a human breach of relationship with God"),[59] the forgiveness of sins can also be regarded a religious and a relational concept. Discussing the usage of forgiveness-terminology in the OT and the NT, Gowan defines forgiveness as "renewing a broken relationship."[60] After his reading of the OT, Morgan also comments that "there is more to divine forgiveness than acts of pardoning justified punishment. The biblical conception takes God to be merciful, which means that he is disposed not to destroy the sinful person but to reconcile with her."[61] By saying this, he includes the concept of reconciliation

---

sin "as violation of the covenant (for Jews)" and "as idolatry with all its attendant violations of decency (for pagans)" (50).

[56] Brand, *Evil*, 26.

[57] Similarly, Konstan, *Before Forgiveness*, 2, does "maintain that the moral, as opposed to the economic and judicial or political sense of the term, is clear and distinct enough to constitute an independent object of investigation."

[58] As in 57n1 above.

[59] Wolf Krötke, "I. Terminology," in idem, et al. "Sin, Guilt, and Forgiveness," Religion Past and Present. Brill Online, accessed December 2, 2014, http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/religion-past-and-present/sin-guilt-and-forgiveness-COM_025015.

[60] Gowan, *Bible on Forgiveness*, 19. In this sense, he maintains that "forgiveness not only removes the sin but changes the sinner, leading to healing" (5). If so, the mechanical distinction between forgiveness and reconciliation disappears because the two terms concern restoration of divine-human relationship.

[61] Morgan, "Mercy, Repentance," 141. As Morgan understands that forgiveness "includes a change of attitude" (142), Krašovec, *Reward, Punishment*, 771, notes that forgiveness, in its negative sense, "means the overcoming of feelings hostile to the evil-doer" and "a change of heart . . . which in turn ultimately makes reconciliation possible."

with forgiveness. Therefore, although one may not regard reconciliation as a synonym for forgiveness, forgiveness cannot simply be considered a precondition of reconciliation. Rather, it seems best to understand the concept of forgiveness as integral to that of reconciliation.[62]

In this relational idea of forgiveness, there are two dimensions of divine-human relation: corporate and individual. Divine forgiveness was given to corporate Israel, but individual responsibility was also emphasized in the Hebrew Scripture and the NT. Further, in terms of salvation, individual forgiveness can weigh more heavily than corporate (cf. section 3.3.2.2).

To conclude, if 'sin' is a religious concept, then the 'forgiveness of sins' can certainly be defined as "removal of sin which impairs the divine-human relationship," by which restoration of the broken relationship is begun. With this definition, we will examine Paul's understanding of Jesus' death and forgiveness in the following chapter.

Krašovec makes it clear that forgiveness is a relational term, by stating that in the OT texts related to forgiveness, the term "is essentially an aspect of the intimate relationship between God and the chosen people. It is not surprising, therefore, that the most profound statements on forgiveness are found in the context of the covenant relation" (793).

[62] Despite Taylor's argument that forgiveness is not identical to justification, or reconciliation (3.1), the distinction between the three concepts is not a clear-cut. As forgiveness is inextricably linked to sin, and thus a proper understanding of sin is the essential prerequisite for fathoming the meaning of forgiveness, reconciliation and forgiveness appear to be closely related. Particularly for Paul, "forgiveness is an element of the fundamental renewal of the individual through justification (Rom 3:21–26; 4:1–12) and reconciliation (2 Cor 5:14–21)" (Rainer Metzner, "V. New Testament," in Krötke, et al. "Sin, Guilt, and Forgiveness," Religion Past and Present. Brill Online).

Chapter 4

The Soteriological Meaning of Jesus' Death in the Pauline Corpus

To compare Paul's and Matthew's perspectives on Jesus' understanding of his own death (chapter 6), the perspective of each author needs to be examined. In this chapter, we will first examine the writings of Paul in order to grasp how he recognises and presents Jesus' understanding of his imminent death. Further, we will discuss whether Paul's presentation of Jesus' understanding can truly originate from the historical Jesus.

4.1 The Seven Undisputed Epistles as Sources

Paul was a letter writer, and the NT attributes 13 epistles to him. However, scholars are well aware that there are more letters penned by him. For example, Paul mentions another epistle which he wrote in the *first* letter to the Corinthian congregation (1 Corinthians 5:9). In fact, when we make reference to the 'first' letter, it actually signifies the first of the letters to the Corinthians that has been *preserved* in the canon. Moreover, the earliest list of Pauline epistle by Marcion mentions the epistle to the Laodiceans.[1] Therefore, Paul probably wrote more letters than we have now in the New Testament canon. Although in his era "only about two of every ten people could read,"[2] Paul had to write letters to communicate his messages to the specific recipients with whom he was not in direct physical contact. Philippians is a prime example because Paul wrote this during his imprisonment.

---

[1] Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.11, 17, identifies the epistle with canonical Ephesians, but another attestation of Marcion's list by Epiphanius seems to differentiate Ephesians from it. Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 42.9.4, introduces the ten epistles of Marcion's Pauline letters including Ephesians, and then states that Marcion "also has parts of the so-called Epistle to the Laodiceans" (Frank Williams, trans., *The* Panarion *of Epiphanius of Salamis*, 2nd ed. [Leiden: Brill, 2009], 1:302). The reference to "the epistle from Laodicea" in Colossians 4:16 seems to indicate that Paul wrote another letter to Laodicea. However, another interpretation is also possible, namely that Ephesians became (or, was) a circular letter, and the letter was in Laodicea at the time Paul was writing Colossians.

[2] Witherington, *Paul Quest*, 89. At that time, the letters were probably read aloud by a reader to a recipient community.

Of the 13 letters in the NT, the epistles to be discussed here are confined to the undisputed 7 letters: Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians (which are the so-called *Hauptbriefe*), Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, and Philemon.[3] On the one hand, if the Pauline corpus is reconstructed based on a critical approach, only the *Hauptbriefe* can survive. According to this reconstruction, the four main letters alone may be established as the Pauline corpus. On the other hand, a conservative approach establishes the 10 (except the pastorals), or even the 13 letters[4] as sources for this investigation. Between these two approaches, the seven undisputed letters still have an important role as a forum for discussion.[5]

4.2 The Forgiveness-Theme in Paul

4.2.1 How Rare is "Forgiveness of Sins" in Paul?

In every letter, except the short personal letter to Philemon, Paul makes constant reference to Jesus' death (and resurrection). Therefore, it can certainly be argued that "Paul is widely recognized as the quintessential theologian of the cross"[6] considering that "the death and resurrection of Christ are two

[3] I do not consider these seven letters to be the only letters written by Paul. However, these letters can surely be the common ground for scholarly discussion of the Pauline corpus. Moreover, it is convenient to discuss these letters alone because space does not permit me to deal with the authenticity of the other epistles. However, it should be noted that if there is consensus on the Pauline corpus, it is a "crumbling consensus" as Paul Foster states ("Who Wrote 2 Thessalonians?: A Fresh Look at an Old Problem," *JSNT* 35 [2012]: 150–75, 150). He also argues that "the question of the authorship of the Pauline letters deserves re-examination" (151). In the appendix of this article, Foster presents the result of the Pauline authorship survey. More than half of the scholars surveyed answered that Colossians was penned by Paul (170–71). Moreover, in his *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, vol. 4 of *Christian Origins and the Question of God* (London: SPCK, 2013), 61, N.T. Wright succinctly puts it, "Colossians is certainly Pauline, and to be used [as a source] without excuse or apology." Cf. Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, 392; Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 504; Peter T. O'Brien, *Colossians, Philemon*, WBC 44 (Waco, TX: Word, 1982), xli–xlix; Witherington, *Paul Quest*, 11. In addition, Werner Georg Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, rev. ed. (London: SCM, 1975), 241, indicates several features of the style of Colossians that appears only in Paul's letters in the NT.

[4] Gordon D. Fee, *Pauline Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Study* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007), 5, defines "Pauline" as "all the letters in the canonical Pauline corpus."

[5] It may be true that "it is in fact possible to find scholars who hold to the authenticity of nearly every possible number of Pauline epistles between seven and thirteen" (Foster, "Who Wrote?" 153).

[6] John T. Carroll and Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus in Early Christianity* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 113.

sides of the same coin"[7] for Paul. Consequently, it is not difficult to find the texts which mention the significance of Jesus' crucifixion in his letters.

After limiting the corpus of the Pauline epistles to the seven uncontested letters, however, another problem emerges: "the word 'forgiveness' (*aphesis*) and the verb 'to forgive' (*aphienai*) are spectacularly absent from those works of Paul which are authentic and genuinely of his own writing."[8] Indeed, the seven letters have few passages mentioning 'forgiveness of sins.' The word ἄφεσις does not occur in the commonly acknowledged epistles, and its verb form ἀφίημι only appears in Romans 4:7. Moreover, as appropriate synonyms for ἄφεσις/ἀφίημι,[9] πάρεσις appears only once in Rom 3:25b, and παρίημι is absent in the seven epistles.[10] It is to be acknowledged, therefore,

---

[7] Michael Bird, "Raised for our Justification: A Fresh Look at Romans 4:25," *Colloquium* 35 (2003): 31–46, 44. He further states, "Jesus' death and resurrection should be regarded as being inseparably part of the one salvific event." In his *The Epistle to the Romans: the English Text with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 157, John Murray also comments on their inseparability: "the death and resurrection of Christ are inseparable." Cf. Cilliers Breytenbach, "Salvation of the reconciled (With a Note on the Background of Paul's Metaphor of Reconciliation)," in *Salvation in the New Testament: Perspectives on Soteriology*, ed. Jan G. van der Watt, NovTSup 121 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 271–86, 280; Ole Davidsen, "Adam-Christ Typology in Paul and Mark: Reflections on a *Tertium Comparationis*, Preliminary Remarks," in Becker, Engberg-Pedersen, and Müller, 243–72, 253–54; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 32 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 546; Ernst Käsemann, *Perspectives on Paul* (London: SCM, 1971), 94; Scot McKnight, *Jesus and His Death: Historiography, the Historical Jesus, and Atonement Theory* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2005), 342; Douglas J. Moo, "The Christology of the Early Pauline Letters," in *Contours of Christology in the New Testament*, ed. Richard N. Longenecker (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 169–92, 183; Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1998), 264.

[8] Krister Stendahl, "Justification Rather Than Forgiveness," in *Paul among Jews and Gentiles and Other Essays* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1976), 23–40, 23 (In the original, *aphienai* is misspelt as *apheinai*). He speaks of "the apparent lack of emphasis on forgiveness and the apparent emphasis on justification in Pauline thought" (25).

[9] χαρίζομαι can also be regarded as a synonym. It occurs nine times in the uncontested Pauline epistles. However, these verses have nothing to do with forgiveness by Jesus' death except for Romans 8:32 (see section 4.3.1.2 below). The verb χαρίζομαι means to either 'freely give' (1 Cor 2:12; Gal 3:18; Phil 1:29; 2:9; Phlm 1:22), or 'forgive (interpersonally)' (2 Cor 2:7, 10; 12:13). Outside the seven letters, forgiveness between Christ and humanity based on the verb is certainly present in Ephesians 4:32 and Colossians 3:13 (cf. Col 2:13).

[10] Even the two passages on forgiveness, Romans 3:25b and 4:7, do not provide a satisfactory solution for this chapter as a whole. This chapter aims to investigate the relationship between Jesus' death and forgiveness in Paul. In the case of Rom 4:7, Jesus' death is not present; the passage simply does not link forgiveness with Jesus' death. In Rom 3:25, although the 'forgiveness' terminology is present, the scholarly opinions on the meaning of πάρεσις are divided; some understand it as 'forgiveness,' and others considers it as 'pass-

that the forgiveness-lexemes hardly appear in Paul. As Bornkamm puts it, "it may be thought surprising that Paul hardly ever speaks of the forgiveness of sins, though this is central not only to the preaching of Jesus but to the faith of primitive Christianity as well."[11] If so, Paul does not provide a single text to examine the relationship between Jesus' death and forgiveness.

The reason for Paul's silence on forgiveness could demonstrate either his flagrant disregard for the issue,[12] or his particular preference for a certain terminology which includes the idea of forgiveness. At this point, therefore, the central question should be whether there is an *idea* of forgiveness of sins in Paul. The absence of the forgiveness-terms in Paul can lead the reader to two possible options: either the absence of the idea as well as the absence of the terms, or the presence of the idea despite the absence of the terms. If the idea or theme is present, the next step will be an examination of its relationship with Jesus' death. If not, it will be a dead end in this study.

4.2.2 Forgiveness as Integral to Justification

To find an answer, Romans 4:6–8 is a good place to start because of the word ἀφίημι. In Romans 4:7–8, Paul cites Psalm 32:1–2 (LXX-Ps. 31:1–2) "exact-

---

ing over.' For those who see it as forgiveness, see Kim, *Origin*, 280; Thomas H. Tobin SJ, "The Use of Christological Traditions in Paul: The Case of Rom 3:21–26," in *Portraits of Jesus: Studies in Christology*, ed. Susan E. Myers, WUNT II/321 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 229–45, 236n11; Stephen H. Travis, "Christ as Bearer of Divine Judgment in Paul's Thought about the Atonement," in *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 332–45, 340; John Ziesler, *Paul's Letter to the Romans*, TPINTC (London: SCM, 1989), 115–16. For those who see it as passing-over, see Richard H. Bell, "Sacrifice and Christology in Paul," *JTS* 53 (2002): 1–27, 20; Simon J. Gathercole, "Justified by Faith, Justified by His Blood: The Evidence of Romans 3:21–4:25," in *The Paradoxes of Paul*, vol. 2 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, ed. D.A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, Mark A. Seifrid, WUNT II/181 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 147–84, 180–81; Gaventa, "Interpreting," 137; Hägerland, *Jesus and Forgiveness*, 95.

[11] Bornkamm, *Paul*, 151. Ernst Käsemann also describes the absence of forgiveness in Paul as "surprising" (*Commentary on Romans*, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980], 113). However, Bornkamm states that forgiveness "closely approximates to what Paul calls justification or reconciliation." His reasoning is that "justification does not relate to actual sins committed in the past but to release from sin as a power which makes men its slaves." In this regard, I would not state, "Paul seems to avoid so completely the thought of God's forgiveness" (James D.G. Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, WBC 38A [Dallas: Word, 1988], 1:206). Rather, it might be better to suggest that Paul prefers justification to forgiveness.

[12] In this regard, Stendahl, "Justification," 23, comments that in Romans 4:7, "poor Paul could not avoid using a verbal form, 'were forgiven,' because he had to quote Psalm 32:1 in which it occurs."

ly according to the LXX, which is almost a literal translation of the MT."[13] This quotation is important for understanding the flow of Paul's argument. In particular, it demonstrates the fact that he sees *forgiveness as integral to justification*, as a careful reading of the passage reveals.

At first, in verses 6 and 8, Paul develops his argument with an intentional repetition of λογίζομαι, which is the "key word."[14]

v.6 καθάπερ καὶ Δαυὶδ λέγει τὸν μακαρισμὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ᾧ ὁ θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χωρὶς ἔργων

v.8 μακάριος ἀνήρ, οὗ οὐ μὴ λογίσηται κύριος ἁμαρτίαν

Verse 6 presents a person whom God *reckons* righteous, and then elaborates the blessedness of the person. The following two verses, 7 and 8, continue the elaboration of the blessedness. Especially in v.8, using the strongest possible negation in the form of οὐ μὴ with subjunctive, the person is described as an individual whose sins God never *reckons* against them. A comparison of verses 6 and 8 provides this equation: 'the man whom God *reckons* righteous' = 'the man to whom the Lord never *reckons* sins.' Therefore, it seems, scholars are justified in taking the two ideas as synonyms.[15] From this equation, one can extract a shorter equation: 'reckoning righteous' = 'not reckoning sins.' This equation is true because God "grants righteousness to the

---

[13] Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 33 (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 375. Cf. Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 266n57. Even though Paul's quintessential "brief introductory formulas such as γέγραπται (e.g., Gal 3:10) or ἡ γραφὴ λέγει (e.g., Rom 4:3)" are not used here, it is clear that this is a quotation from the Psalms because of Δαυὶδ λέγει in v.6 (The citation is from Jeremy Punt, "Identity, Memory, and Scriptural Warrant: Arguing Paul's Case," in *Paul and Scripture: Extending the Conversation*, ECL 9, ed. Christopher D. Stanley [Williston, VT: SBL, 2012], 25–53, 42).

[14] Moo, *Romans*, 266. For others who indicate λογίζομαι as the keyword, consult Dunn, *Romans*, 1:207; Benjamin Schliesser, *Abraham's Faith in Romans 4: Paul's Concept of Faith in Light of the History of Reception of Genesis 15:6*, WUNT II/224 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 314–15 (Both Käsemann, *Romans*, 113, and Charles B. Cousar, *A Theology of the Cross: The Death of Jesus in the Pauline Letters*, OBT 24 [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990], 68, label λογίζομαι as the "catchword," and similarly Schreiner, *Romans*, 212, describes it as the "link word"). Interestingly, the verb repeatedly occurs in the immediate context of Romans 4:7f. Particularly in vv.3–6 and 9–11, the word appears in every verse (The word reappears again at the end of the chapter, 4:23–24). This 'keyword' links not only Romans 4:6–8 to LXX-Psalm 31, but also, in the fourth chapter of Romans, "connects as a keyword the two passages LXX-Gen 15:6 and LXX-Ps 31:1–2" (Schliesser, *Abraham's Faith*, 314).

[15] Mark A. Seifrid argues that "a righteousness reckoned apart from 'works' is nothing other than the forgiveness of sins, a not-taking-them-into-account. It is undeserved favour where there ought to be retribution and punishment" ("Romans," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G.K. Beale and D.A. Carson [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007], 607–94, 624). Cf. Cousar, *Theology*, 68.

sinner, if he does not reckon his sins to him."[16] Here, 'reckoning righteous' (v.6) and 'not reckoning sins' (v.8) are paralleled as a synonymous pair.

In fact, there is a certain rabbinic tradition which argues that if two different passages contain a shared word, these two passages can have a similar meaning on the ground of the shared word. This tradition is called '*gezerah shawah*,' and commentators mention this technique while commenting on vv.6–8.[17] In our case, the shared verb λογίζομαι in both Romans 4 and LXX-Psalm 31 shows the relation between forgiveness and justification: "justification is also forgiveness."[18]

It is in this literary context that verse 7 can be examined properly. At first glance, it is clear that v.7 is composed of synonymous parallels:

μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι

καὶ ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι·

---

[16] Adolf Schlatter, *Romans: the Righteousness of God* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 111.

[17] According to Thomas Kazen, *Scripture, Interpretation, or Authority?: Motives and Arguments in Jesus' Halakic Conflicts*, WUNT 320 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 47, "*gezerah shawah* is an argument from analogy, which exploits verbal similarities in order to use one text to interpret another." For an exhaustive list of the scholars who agree that Paul utilizes the technique '*gezerah shawah,*' see Schliesser, *Abraham's Faith*, 314n693. Yet, Friedrich Avemarie does not agree that Paul utilizes *gezerah shawah* here even though he agrees that there is the 'lexematic association' of λογίζομαι which supports the similar meaning between Psalm 32:1–2 and Romans 4:6 ("Interpreting Scripture through Scripture: Exegesis Based on Lexematic Association in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pauline Epistles," in *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*, ed. Florentino Garcia Martinez, STDJ 85 [Leiden: Brill, 2009], 83–102).

[18] Schliesser, *Abraham's Faith*, 314. He also argues that "Paul positions forgiveness within the wider framework of justification (Rom 4:6–8)" (312). However, he carefully states that "translating δικαιοσύνη (Rom 4:5) with 'forgive' . . . goes too far, since justification includes, apart from forgiveness, the element of 'new creation'" (314n697). Martinus C. de Boer similarly argues that it is "possible for Paul to include the notion of forgiveness in the meaning of justification" ("Paul's Use and Interpretation of a Justification Tradition in Galatians 2.15–21," *JSNT* 28 [2005]: 189–216, 210; cf. Dunn, *Romans*, 1:206; Schlatter, *Romans*, 97; Schreiner, *Romans*, 212; Ben Witherington III, *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Galatians* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998], 195).

Yet, Joachim Jeremias states twice that "justification is forgiveness, nothing but forgiveness" (*The Central Message of The New Testament* [London: SCM, 1965], 57, 66). He does suggest that forgiveness "is not only negative, i.e., an effacement of the past, but it is an antedonation of God's final gift (the word 'antedonation' . . . means a 'donation made in advance'). As an antedonation of God's final acquittal, justification is pardon in the fullest sense" (64). He continues: "justification is forgiveness in the fullest sense. It is not only a mere covering up of the past. Rather, it is an antedonation of the full salvation" (66). Bird, "Raised," 45, also argues that "the forgiveness of sins and justification are inseparable, almost indistinguishable, and are simply different ways of describing the one event."

The word ἀνομία in the first half connotes the meaning of lawless deeds. If "ἀνομία was another word associated with the ἁμαρτωλός,"[19] we are justified in claiming that Paul perceives ἀνομία as very similar to ἁμαρτία. Moreover, the fact that ἀνομία in v.7a is paralleled with ἁμαρτία in v.7b supports this interpretation. Fitzmyer also argues that the verb "'covering up' in the last half is merely another way of saying 'forgiven.'"[20] Following this line of argument, one can say that ἀνομία and ἁμαρτία are used interchangeably and the two verbs, 'forgiven' and 'covered up,' are synonyms. Then, it is apparent that v.7 is speaking of the blessedness of forgiveness of sins.

Noting that verse 6 mentions the blessing of being reckoned righteous, Dunn correctly argues that Paul "equates the blessing of forgiveness (v 7) with the blessedness of being reckoned righteousness (v 6)."[21] Furthermore, comparing verses 7 and 8, it is more than likely that the passage "closely associates the forgiveness of sins . . . with the Lord's 'not reckoning' a person's sins."[22] Therefore, v.7, in itself and in the context, provides a hint that *forgiveness is justification*, or rather, *forgiveness is integral to justification*. 'Forgiveness' denotes the remission of sins committed by an offender with a view to reconciliation. Justification is a more comprehensive term, denoting the restoration of someone to a right relationship with the person offended.[23]

---

[19] Dunn, *Romans*, 1:206. In the undisputed letters of Paul, ἀνομία appears in Romans 6:19 and 2 Corinthians 6:14. Interestingly, in both cases, ἀνομία is used as an antonym of δικαιοσύνη. This is striking because "the antithesis to 'lawlessness' is not obedience to the law, but once again righteousness" (ibid., 1:347).

[20] Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 376.

[21] Dunn, *Romans*, 1:206.

[22] Moo, *Romans*, 266.

[23] It is noteworthy that Acts 13:38–39, which is presented by Luke as a portion of Paul's sermon, closely links forgiveness to justification by juxtaposing forgiveness of sins (v.38) and justification (v.39). In his *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996), 88–89, Jacob Jervell argues that "this forgiveness is also justification, understood as the acquittal of sin." Cf. Joseph Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 31 (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 146. Contra C.K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994–1998), 1:651. If justification in v.39 can be understood as "the act of clearing someone of transgression" (Martin M. Culy and Mikeal C. Parsons, *Acts: A Handbook on the Greek Text* [Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2003], 264), the case that forgiveness is integral to justification in Romans 4 is confirmed again in Acts 13. Yet there is a debate over whether this sermon was actually preached by Paul or dramatized by the author of Acts. Most scholars would argue that forgiveness in v.38 is "non-Pauline" (Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, trans. James Limberg, A. Thomas Kraabel, and Donald H. Juel, ed. Eldon Jay Epp and Christopher R. Mathews [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987], 106). Edvin Larsson, "Paul: Law and Salvation," *NTS* 31 (1985): 425–36, 426, also states that Acts 13:38 "is genuinely Lukan." However, it must be noted that the reasoning for its non-Pauline aspect is solely based on the absence of 'forgiveness' in the seven Pauline letters, and thus this reasoning alone is not sufficient to argue against its

So far, it has been demonstrated that forgiveness is integral to justification, and so the forgivenss-theme is certainly present in Paul. It should be stressed that Paul intentionally introduces 'forgiveness' at this point of his argument. In some sense, the addition of Psalm 32:1 (Rom 4:7) actually interrupts the well-structured repetition of λογίζομαι in v.6 and v.8, and thus Paul's quotation of Psalm 32:1 seems unnecessary in Paul's amplified wordplay.[24] Yet Schliesser rightly argues for the necessity of Paul's quoting Psalm 32:1:

> the explicit notion of "forgiveness" was so crucial for [Paul] in this context that he could not leave the verse unmentioned. Possibly, in case already at the time of Paul Ps 32:1 was associated with the Day of Atonement, he wanted to introduce the idea of atonement and establish a close connection to Rom 3:25. On that day, atonement was effected and all sin extinguished; for post-exilic Judaism the importance of this day can hardly be overrated.[25]

According to Schliesser, Paul wants to make forgiveness explicit in Romans 4. Moreover, Paul tries to show the idea of atonement which is not apparent in v.8. Certainly, it might be better to quote Psalm 32:2 alone in order to parallel the λογίζομαι in vv.6 and 8. The distancing of the two identical verbs by Paul's insertion of Psalm 32:1 can make the parallelism of 'reckoning' less effective. If indeed Paul cites Ps 32:1 in order to make forgiveness ex-

---

authenticity. As discussed above, forgiveness-terminology does appear in Romans 4:7–8. In this pericope, moreover, it is explained in terms of justification, which is also the case in Acts 13:38–39. It is admitted that Paul hardly uses forgiveness, but when he uses it, he relates it to justification. This usage of 'forgiveness' in conjunction with justification is uniquely Pauline, and occurs both in Romans 4 and Acts 13. Therefore, despite the scholarly opinion on the inauthenticity of the missionary sermon based on non-Pauline 'forgiveness,' the unique usage of forgiveness in both texts may even provide a reason to consider Acts 13:38 as 'Pauline.' Since Paul does employ forgiveness in relation to justification in one of his letters (Rom 4), Acts 13:38–39, where the two concepts are related, cannot be dismissed as the non-Pauline expression. Against this conclusion that the missionary sermon is inauthentic, Daniel Marguerat contends that "the vocabulary [of v.38] is very Pauline!" (*First Christian Historian: Writing the Acts of the Apostles*, trans. Ken McKinney, Gregory J. Laughery and Richard Bauckham, SNTSMS 121 [Cambridge: CUP, 2002], 137). Marguerat later calls Acts 13:38–39 a "very Pauline soteriology fragment" and maintains that the portion "would in fact fit into one of the apostle's letters without difficulty!" (*Paul in Acts and Paul in His Letters*, WUNT 310 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013], 38, 37 respectively). John Eifion Morgan-Wynne also argues that "it cannot be said that what we have before us is in all respects positively unPauline" because it is possible that Paul "might emphasise forgiveness of sins in contexts where the issue of Gentile acceptance into the people of God was not at stake" (*Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech [Acts 13]* [Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2014], 213). Cf. Christie A. Joachim Pillai, *Early Missionary Preaching: A Study of Luke's Report in Acts 13* (Hicksville, NY: Exposition University Press, 1979), 77–111. Paul's understanding forgiveness as justification is also supported by the idiom 'justified from sin' (Romans 6:7).

[24] Indeed, this 'keyword' repeatedly occurs in every verse from v.3 through v.11 except v.7.

[25] Schliesser, *Abraham's Faith*, 353.

plicit at the expense of the clear parallelism, it can be argued that forgiveness was such a weighty topic for Paul that he had to mention it. Paul's quoting of Ps 32:1 *per se* means that he fathoms the vast significance of forgiveness.

Combining v.7 with vv.6, 8, Dunn correctly grasps Paul's argument in the beginning of Romans 4 and presents various equations: "reckon righteous = forgive acts of lawlessness = cover sins = not reckon sins."[26] Certainly, the idea of forgiveness is present in Romans 4. Hence we can conclude that in Romans 4, both the forgiveness-lexeme and the forgiveness-theme are clearly expressed, and that forgiveness was not insignificant for Paul. Moreover, the text also provides another angle by which the Pauline usage of forgiveness can be approached. More specifically, for Paul, forgiveness of sins is integral to justification.

We have seen that Romans 4:6–8 presents the notion that forgiveness can be understood in terms of justification. In the same vein, Gathercole correctly argues that forgiveness is "much neglected in most studies of Paul's thought" on the grounds of "a strong connection between justification and forgiveness."[27] In addition to a synonymous parallelism of justification and forgiveness in Paul, he provides two more arguments for the presence of the forgiveness-theme in Paul:[28] (1) "the description of the death of Jesus as a sin offering" in Romans 8:3, and (2) "the term ἄφεσις" in Ephesians 1:7 and Colossians 1:14.[29]

---

[26] Dunn, *Romans*, 1:207. Similarly, Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 376, states that the verbs "'forgive, cover up, take no account of' simply are literary ways of expressing the same thing, the pardon of sin." However, I disagree with Dunn's argument that "it is less clear here than in the other beatitudes of the NT that 'eschatological salvation' is in view" (206). On Psalm 32, Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 1–59: A Commentary*, trans. Hilton C. Oswald (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988), argues that "this song from the very beginning takes the hearer and reader into the cheering reality of forgiveness and the bestowal of salvation." Because the background of the quote in Romans 4 suggests that forgiveness means eschatological redemption, forgiveness (v.7) clearly means eschatological salvation. Against Dunn, Jeremias, *Central Message*, 55, states that "as in the Pauline letters *dikaiosynê (tou) theou* must be translated, 'God's salvation.'"

[27] Gathercole, "Justified," 158, 159 respectively.

[28] Gathercole actually presents four reasons, but the first two reasons are very similar. By discussing Paul's use of the two themes, justification and forgiveness, he distinguishes the cases according to whether justification is identical to forgiveness, or is analogous to forgiveness. For the "identification of justification and forgiveness" (159), he provides the above-mentioned Romans 4:6–8 as an example. On the other hand, 2 Corinthians 5:18–21 is an example for the similar relationship between the two themes. I prefer to conflate Gathercole's first two reasons.

[29] Ibid., 160. Outside of the undisputed Pauline letters, the two passages contain "forgiveness of sins" in relation to Jesus' death: ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν (διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ), τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν (Ephesians 1:7 has παραπτωμάτων instead of ἁμαρτιῶν, and Colossians 1:14 does not contain the wordings in the brackets).

Firstly, on Jesus' death as 'sin offering,' Gathercole pays attention to the effect of the sin offering in Leviticus. The sin offering is a primary ritual for effecting forgiveness of certain sins. As Gathercole suggests, if the phrase περὶ ἁμαρτίας in Romans 8:3 can be taken as "sin offering"[30] rather than a simple "for sins," this would imply God sent his son to die, which logically suggests that Jesus' death could effect forgiveness.

The subsequent point of the presence of ἄφεσις in two of the so-called deutero-Pauline letters is also significant. Certainly, the language used to express forgiveness in Ephesians 1:7 and Colossians 1:14 is very similar to that in the undisputed letters (particularly, Rom 3:24–25).[31] If these two letters are penned by Paul, the problem of the 'absence of forgiveness in Paul' is no longer legitimate. If this is the case, "it cannot be said that Paul overlooks this important aspect of Christianity, but he makes rather less use of it than we might have anticipated."[32]

Simply put, therefore, in the Pauline corpus, the forgiveness-theme is present although direct use of 'forgiveness' terms is rare. Together with the Pauline parallel of justification and forgiveness as synonymous, his presentation of Jesus' death as a 'sin offering' provides a good case for the presence of the forgiveness-theme in Paul. More than that, the forgiveness-theme is not a minor topic, but a significant concept: "for Paul then forgiveness is important, though he does not often refer to it in set terms. But he sees it as significant that, because of what Christ has done, believers' sins are no longer counted against them."[33]

At this juncture, the preliminary conclusion that if forgiveness is integral to justification, the idea of there being a lack of 'forgiveness' passages in Paul is misleading is warranted. The way is cleared to raise the central question: 'did Paul consider Jesus' death with regard to forgiveness?' Before answering this question in the next section, one should bear in mind that alt-

---

[30] On the translation of περὶ ἁμαρτίας, see especially Bell, "Sacrifice," 5–8; Wright, *Climax*, 220–25. I will discuss on this passage later in section 4.3.4.3.2.

[31] The shared wordings among the texts in Romans, Ephesians, and Colossians are as follows: the relative pronoun (ὅς), ἐν [Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ], ἀπολύτρωσις, χάρις, "his blood (αἷμα)" ('grace' and 'blood' are present only in Romans 3 and Ephesians 1), the 'forgiveness' terms (πάρεσις and ἄφεσις), and various words denoting sin. Rainer Riesner states Colossians 1:12–14 is "probably by Paul" ("Back To the Historical Jesus through Paul and His School [the Ransom Logion—Mark 10.45; Matthew 20.28]," *JSHJ* 1 [2003]: 171–99, 198). For a robust argument in favour of Pauline authorship, see Harold W. Hoehner, *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 2–61; O'Brien, *Colossians, Philemon*, xli–xlix. For a mediating position claiming that Colossians may have been written by Timothy under Paul's influence or direction, see James D.G. Dunn, *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, NIGNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 35–39. Nonetheless, my argument is not reliant on these texts.

[32] Leon Morris, "Forgiveness," in *DPL,* 311–13, 312.

[33] Ibid.

hough the forgiveness-theme is visible in Romans 4:7–8, this passage is not related to Jesus' crucifixion. However, the conclusion from this text does provide a hint of what to look for. We are no longer to be confined to search only for 'forgiveness' lexemes connected to Jesus' death, but to search also for 'forgiveness' themes, including 'justification,' connected to his death.[34] If forgiveness is indeed "a basic component of justification,"[35] of integral importance, the Pauline texts that connect justification and Jesus' death (Rom 3:24–25; 5:9; 2 Cor 5:21) can certainly be considered as sources for our question. Further, because justification is also portrayed using several different terms such as reconciliation, the 'forgiveness' themes can be investigated more broadly than the specific terms for justification.

4.2.3 Other Terms Related to Forgiveness

It has become clear that justification-language (that is the '*dikaio*-terminology') can represent the presence of the forgiveness-theme in Paul. However, there are still only a few texts which associate this terminology and similar terms with Jesus' death. Among these texts, Romans 5:8–9 gives a hint where to look for other phrases that denote the idea of 'forgiveness of sins.' In Romans 5:9, δικαιόω is directly linked to "by/in his blood," which is, Jesus' blood. The expression 'justified by his blood' can surely be understood as 'forgiven through the death of Jesus' if my suggestion that forgiveness is integral to justification is holds.[36] In addition, Romans 5:8 parallels being "justified (that is, being forgiven) by Jesus' death" in v.9 with 'Christ died for us, while we were (still) sinners.' The syntagm 'ἀποθνήσκειν ὑπέρ τινος (died for someone)' is widely recognized as the 'dying(-for) formula,' the use of it in v.8 in preparing for the conclusion drawn in v.9 indicates that Christ died for sinners, that is *in order to forgive sins*, and as a result "we shall be saved through him from the wrath (of God)." As God's ὀργή is the result of humananity's sinful attitude towards God (Rom 1:18) it is evident that the any rescue from this wrath is based on overcoming sin as

---

[34] Jörg Frey correctly argues that a study of Sühne-lexemes alone is not sufficient for the study of the Sühne-theme ("Probleme der Deutung des Todes Jesu in der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft: Streiflichter zur exegetischen Diskussion," in *Deutungen des Todes Jesu im Neuen Testament*, ed. Jörg Frey and Jens Schröter, WUNT 181 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005], 37).

[35] Moo, *Romans*, 266.

[36] Cf. Michael Wolter, *Der Brief an die Römer*, EKK VI/1 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2014), 1:332. Paul can identify "justification by faith" (5:1) with justification "through his blood" (5:8) because of 3:25. "Er kann beides in eins setzen, weil es der Glaube ist, der den Tod Jesu als Tod für die Sünder deutet und ihn dadurch zu einer Wirklichkeit werden lässt, die aus Sündern Gerechte macht." It is not possible, however, to turn sinners into righteous ones without forgiving their sins. Even if one agrees that justification is not just forgiveness of sins, forgiveness is at least an inseparable part of it.

the destructive force in the relation between God and creation. It follows, therefore, that the dying-for formula can be discussed within the category of Pauline forgiveness texts.[37]

This is most clearly the case in the expression Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν in 1 Corinthians 15:3 and the adjectival participle τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν in Galatians 1:4. The combination of the prepositional phrase with either of the two verbs, ἀποθνῄσκω or (παρα)δίδωμι, closely connects Jesus' death and forgiveness, and presents forgiveness as the benefit of Jesus' death. The latter is termed "the giving-up formula."[38] The verb (παρα)δίδωμι meaning 'give (up),' or 'hand (over)' is a common word, and is often used in the NT (overall, δίδωμι occurs 415 times, and παραδίδωμι 119 times). Of the two verbs, παραδίδωμι seems to bear greater meaning as the technical term to designate Jesus' passion and death.[39] Therefore, this technical term (and its cognate δίδωμι) with the ὑπέρ-phrase can signify Jesus' death dispensing forgiveness of sins. For the latter verb ἀποθνῄσκω, without further elaboration, one can say that this verb signifies the death of its subject. Therefore, combined with with ὑπέρ, it plays the same role as the 'giving-up formula.' On this basis, it can be argued that these two verbs in conjunction with the prepositional expression closely connect Jesus' death and forgiveness.

The cases where the two verbs appear only as 'ὑπέρ + person(al pronoun)' can be understood as "an abbreviated form"[40] of a longer expression such as

---

[37] Already in v.6 Paul has mentioned that Christ 'died for the ungodly' (ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανεν), that is for sinners (who are also called 'the weak ones' [ἀσθενοί] in the same verse). Paul uses ἀσεβής only here and in Romans 4:5. For parallel usages of ἀσεβής with ἁμαρτωλός, see 1 Timothy 1:9 and 1 Peter 4:18 (in a quote from LXX-Ps 11:31). For the different aspects of ἀσθενής and ἀσεβής in this context, see Wolter, *Römer*, 329.

[38] It is usually translated as "Jesus 'gave himself (or was given) up' for others" (Victor Paul Furnish, "'He Gave Himself [Was Given] Up. . . .': Paul's Use of a Christological Assertion," in *The Future of Christology: Essays in Honor of Leander E. Keck*, ed. Abraham J. Malherbe and Wayne A. Meeks [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993], 109–21, 109). He introduces the giving-up formula as follows: "typically, the verb (παρα)διδόναι with ἑαυτὸν, followed by ὑπέρ and (variously) ἡμῶν, ἡμῶν πάντων, τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, etc" (109n2).

[39] In 1 Corinthians 11:23, Paul attests παραδίδωμι as the traditional term connected with the last supper and Jesus' arrest: "the night when Jesus was handed over." Moreover, Jesus' second and third passion predictions also have παραδίδωμι in the passive form to describe his being handed over (Mark 9:31; 10:33). Of the 20 appearances of παραδίδωμι in Mark, 14 occurrences are related to Jesus' passion.

[40] Martin Hengel, *The Atonement: A Study of the Origins of the Doctrine in the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1981), 36. Likewise, M. de Jonge, "Jesus' Death for Others and the Death of the Maccabean Martyrs," in *Text and Testimony: Essays on New Testament and Apocryphal Literature in Honour of A.F.J. Klijn*, ed. T. Baarda et al. (Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1988), 142–51, 145, affirms, "the longer expression [ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν] gives an explanation of the shorter one [ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν]." Cf. Joost Holleman, *Resurrection*

ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν. However, 'died for someone' does not always mean 'died for forgiveness.' For example, in Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 13.6, the meaning of 'to die for them' (ἀποθνήσκειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν) is clarified earlier by 'dying for their freedom' (ἀποθανόντος ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκείνων ἐλευθερίας; 13.5). Therefore, the prepositional phrase such as "for us" cannot always automatically be taken as a synonym of "for our sins."[41] Moreover, the range of the benefits of Christ's death is far wider than just forgiveness, although this is certainly one important benefit. Moule correctly states that when considering ὑπέρ, "*in itself* it neither teaches nor denies the doctrine of a vicarious and substitutionary work. . . . But ὑπέρ of course amply allows for such an application of its meaning, where the context suggests the idea."[42] Similarly, Breytenbach argues that "the verbs ἀποθνήσκειν or (παρα)διδόναι were all to refer to an action of atonement (Sühne), as long as they were followed by the preposition ὑπέρ or in some cases by διά and the accusative."[43] Therefore, the texts which contain these formulae can be legitimate texts for this study as long as the context suggests the forgiveness-theme.

The last group of texts that can be adduced here are those passages that contain the phrase 'ὑπέρ + person' with alternative expressions for Jesus' death than the two specific verbs. Among these other expressions are, for instance, 'in his blood,' or 'crucified.' As such passages present Jesus' death as a means of forgiveness, they too will be discussed (section 4.3.4). To conclude, justification-language, the giving-up formula, the dying formula, and other 'death' expressions with the ὑπέρ-phrase have all been identified as phrases that communicate the forgiveness-theme in Paul. The texts which include these expressions will be discussed in the following section.

---

and Parousia: A Tradition-historical Study of Paul's Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15, NovTSup 84 (Leiden, Brill: 1996), 181–82.

[41] Harald Riesenfeld, "ὑπέρ," *TDNT*, 8:507–16, 512n12, differentiates the shorter form from the longer form.

[42] Handley C.G. Moule, *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans*, 2nd ed. (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1894), 135n. Likewise, Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 1192, states that its meaning "rests mainly on *contextual* considerations." Cf. Archibald Robertson and Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1911), 333.

[43] Cilliers Breytenbach, "The Septuagint Version of Isaiah 53 and the Early Christian Formula 'He Was Delivered for Our Trespasses,'" *NovT* 51 (2009): 339–51, 339. He shows that these two formulae are "stylistic alternatives/variants" (344).

4.3 'Forgiveness Passages' Related to Jesus' Death

Of the seven uncontested letters, five clearly show the indissoluble connection between Jesus' death and forgiveness: seven passages from Romans, four from 1 Corinthians, three from Galatians, and one from 2 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians each. Altogether, the following sixteen texts are selected as the relevant texts for this study: Romans 3:24–25; 4:25; 5:6–10; 6:10a; 8:3b, 32; 14:15; 1 Corinthians 1:13; 8:11; 11:23–26; 15:3; 2 Corinthians 5:14–15, 21; Galatians 1:4; 2:20; 3:13; 1 Thessalonians 5:9–10. These texts can be listed under four categories (see Table 4–1 below). Both the giving-up formula and the dying formula usually contain the preposition ὑπέρ, with a governing verb (παραδίδωμι or ἀποθνῄσκω). The combination of these particular verbs and ὑπέρ makes these texts convey the soteriological meaning. Therefore, together with the third category, 13 texts out of 16 come under the umbrella of "the ὑπέρ-formulae."[44] Whether the preposition is used independently or is governed by specific verbs, most of the selected texts contain the soteriological ὑπέρ.

Table 2: The Pauline 'forgiveness' passages related to Jesus' death

Category	Text
1. Giving-up formula	Rom 4:25; 8:32; Gal 1:4; 2:20
2. Dying-for formula	Rom 5:6–10; 14:15; 1 Cor 8:11; 15:3; 2 Cor 5:14–15, 21; 1 Thess 5:9–10
3. Other 'death' terms + ὑπέρ	1 Cor 1:13; 11:23–26; Gal 3:13
4. the other texts	Rom 3:24–25; 6:10a; 8:3b

4.3.1 The Giving-up Formula

4.3.1.1 *Romans 4:25*

ὃς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν καὶ ἠγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν

Most scholars, if not all, agree that the first half of this verse is from LXX-Isaiah 53:12b, διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη.[45] Isaiah 53:12b and Ro-

[44] Ibid., 339. Romans 4:25 and 1 Corinthians 8:11b contain διά instead of ὑπέρ, but the preposition διά seems to play a role of ὑπέρ in their contexts.

[45] Although Morna Hooker rejects the view that Mark 10:45 is influenced by the fourth Servant Song in the Isaiah, she accepts its influence on Romans 4:25: "there is one clear echo of Isaiah 53 in Paul, and that is in Romans 4:25" ("Did the Use of Isaiah 53 to Inter-

mans 4:25a share the passive form of παραδίδωμι and the preposition διά. Therefore, the influence of Isaiah 53 on Romans 4 cannot be ignored. Although there are slight differences in both texts (the word order and the nouns conjoint with διά), the differences seem not to provide a significant change in meaning. The difference in the word order indicates the difference in emphasis, and the difference in the word choice is probably because of both the relationship between παράπτωμα (v.25a) and δικαίωσις (v.25b),[46] and the vivid repetition of the *para*-prefix devised by its author(s).[47]

4.3.1.1.1 Romans 4:25a in Context

It is correct to claim that "taking into account the Old Testament context of quotations in the New Testament while studying the text of the New Testament should be a *sine qua non* for analysing these quotations."[48] If Romans 4:25 is indeed influenced by the fourth Servant Song, the meaning of 4:25a

---

pret His Mission Begin with Jesus?" in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*, ed. William H. Bellinger and William R. Farmer [Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998], 88–103, 101). As Dunn, *Romans*, 1:224, notes, "the influence of Isa 53 LXX is hard to dispute." However, C.K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (London: Black, 1957), 93, is not fully satisfied with the discernment of influence from LXX-Isaiah 53. In spite of this minority opinion, the interest of the majority of the exegetes lies in the discussion of whether 4:25a alone or the entire verse is pre-Pauline. This presupposes that the influence of Isaiah 53 on Romans 4:25a is the uniformly acknowledged argument. Cf. Frey, "Probleme," 33–34, especially 34n147.

[46] The rare word δικαίωσις is used here for justification. This does not necessarily have a different connotation from δικαιοσύνη (cf. Moo, *Romans*, 288n8). Paul makes use of the rare noun here because of its correlation to παράπτωμα. Also in Romans 5:18, where Paul contrasts παράπτωμα with righteousness, he chooses δικαίωσις instead of δικαιοσύνη.

[47] If v.25a is indeed "pre-Pauline" formula, the original author(s) who formulated this short sentence might prefer παράπτωμα to ἁμαρτία for easy memorization because παράπτωμα rhymes with παραδίδωμι (cf. 1 Thess 5:27, where Paul mentions the reading out of his letters). It should be noted that "the Jesus tradition is designed for easy recollection. Prominent features are various kinds of parallelism, alliteration, assonance and paronomasia, all of which can be justly regarded as aids to remembering" (James D.G. Dunn, "Social Memory and the Oral Jesus Tradition," in *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity*, ed. Stephen C. Barton, Loren T. Stuckenbruck, and Benjamin G. Wold, WUNT 212 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 179–94, 186. Werner H. Kelber enlists mnemonic devices "such as alliteration, appositional equivalence, proverbial and aphoristic diction, contrasts and antitheses, synonymous, antithetical and tautological parallelisms, rhythmic structures" ("The Works of Memory: Christian Origins as MnemoHistory—A Response," in *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity*, ed. Alan Kirk, and Tom Thatcher [Atlanta: SBL, 2005], 221–48, 233).

[48] Ronald H. van der Bergh, "Differences Between the MT and LXX Contexts of Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament: Isaiah 45:18–25 as a Case Study," in *Septuagint and Reception: Essays Prepared for the Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa*, ed. Johann Cook, VTSup 127 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 159–76, 159.

can fully be understood through the prism of Isaiah 52:13–53:12. Here is Isaiah 53:4–12.[49]

Table 3: The Fourth Servant Song

MT	LXX	Targum
4 Yet it was our sickness that he was bearing (נָשָׂא), / Our suffering that he endured. / We accounted him plagued, / Smitten and afflicted by God;	4 This one carries (φέρω) our sins (ἁμαρτία) / and suffers pain for us, / and we realized that he underwent trouble, / calamity, and ill-treatment.	4 Then he will beseech concerning our sins / and our iniquities for his sake will be forgiven; / yet we were esteemed wounded, / smitten before the LORD and afflicted.
5 But he was wounded because of our sins (פֶּשַׁע), / Crushed because of our iniquities (וְעָוֹן). / He bore the chastisement that made us whole, / And by his bruises we were healed.	5 But he was wounded because of our transgressions (ἀνομία) / and has been weakened because of our sins (ἁμαρτία): / the punishment of our peace was upon him; / by his bruise we were healed.	5 And he will build the sanctuary which was profaned for our sins, / handed over for our iniquities; / and by his teaching his peace will increase upon us, / and in that we attach ourselves to his words our sins will be forgiven us.
6 We all went astray like sheep, / Each going his own way; / And the Lord visited upon him the guilt (עָוֹן) of all of us.	6 We all have wandered like sheep, / [each] man has wandered in his own way; / and the Lord gave (παραδίδωμι) him over to our sins (ἁμαρτία).	6 All we like sheep have been scattered; / we have gone into exile, every one his own way; / and before the LORD it was a pleasure to forgive the sins of us all for his sake.

[49] The Hebrew translation is from Adele Berlin, Marc Zvi Brettler, and Michael Fishbane, eds., *The Jewish Study Bible* (Oxford: OUP, 2004), 891–92. The LXX translation is from Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000), 215–27. The Targum translation is from Bruce D. Chilton, *The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes* (Collegeville, MI: Liturgical, 1990), 104–5. The words with grey shading are sin-related words, and the vocabulary related to forgiveness and to death are presented in rectangular boxes, and underlined respectively. I do not suggest that only Isaiah 53 influences the formation of pre-Pauline traditions including Romans 4:25, but due to the astonishing similarity between Romans 4:25 and Isaiah 53:12, textual comparison of the three texts can surely help the readers to grasp subtle changes of emphasis in the texts.

MT	LXX	Targum
7 He was maltreated, yet he was submissive, / He did not open his mouth; / Like a sheep being led to slaughter (טֶבַח), / Like a ewe, dumb before those who shear her, / He did not open his mouth.	7 And because of his affliction / he does not open his mouth: / like a sheep he was led to the slaughter (σφαγή), / and as a lamb is silent before the one shearing it, / so he does not open his mouth.	7 He beseeches, and he is answered, / and before he opens his mouth he is accepted; / the strong ones of the peoples he will hand over like a lamb to the sacrifice, / and like a ewe which before its shearers is dumb, / so there is not before him one who opens his mouth or speaks a saying.
8 By oppressive judgment he was taken away, / Who could describe his abode? / For he was cut off from the land of the living / Through the sin (פֶּשַׁע) of my people, who deserved the punishment.	8 In [his] humiliation his [fair] judgment was taken away: / who will describe his generation? / Because his life is being taken from the earth; / he was led to death (θάνατος) because of the transgressions (ἀνομία) of my people.	8 From bonds and retribution he will bring our exiles near; / the wonders which will be done for us in his days, who will be able to recount? / For he will take away the rule of the Gentiles from the land of Israel; / the sins which my people sinned he will cast on to them.
9 And his grave (קֶבֶר) was set among the wicked (רָשָׁע), / And with the rich, in his death (מָוֶת) / Though he had done no injustice (חָמָס) / And had spoken no falsehood (מִרְמָה).	9 And I will give the wicked (πονηρός) for his burial (ταφή) / and the rich for his death (θάνατος), / because he did not commit transgression (ἀνομία), / nor was deceit (δόλος) found in his mouth.	9 And he will hand over the wicked to Gehenna / and those rich in possessions which they robbed to the death of the corruption, / lest those who commit sin be established, / and speak of possessions with their mouth.

MT	LXX	Targum
10 But the Lord chose to crush him by disease, / That, if he made himself an offering for guilt (אָשָׁם), / He might see offspring and have long life, / And that through him the Lord's purpose might prosper.	10 And the Lord desires to cleanse him from the blow: / if you give [an offering] for sin (περὶ ἁμαρτίας), / your soul will see a long-lived seed. / Moreover, the Lord desires to take away	10 Yet before the LORD it was a pleasure to refine and to cleanse the remnant of his people, / in order to purify their soul from sins; / they shall see the kingdom of their Messiah, they shall increase sons and daughters, they shall prolong days; / those who perform the law of the LORD shall prosper in his pleasure;
11 Out of his anguish he shall see it; / He shall enjoy it to the full through his devotion. / "My righteous servant makes the many righteous (צַדִּיק), / It is their punishment (עָוֹן) that he bears (סָבַל);	11 from the distress of his soul, to show him light, / and to mold him with understanding / to justify (δικαιόω) a righteous man who is serving many well; / and he himself will bear (ἀναφέρω) their sins (ἁμαρτία).	11 from the slavery of the Gentiles he shall deliver their soul, they shall see the retribution of their adversaries. / They shall be satisfied with the plunder of their kings; / by his wisdom shall he make innocents to be accounted innocent, to subject many to the law; / and he shall beseech concerning their sins.
12 Assuredly, I will give him the many as his portion, / He shall receive the multitude as his spoil. / For he exposed himself to death (מָוֶת) / And was numbered among the sinners (פֹּשְׁעִים), / Whereas he bore (נָשָׂא) the guilt (חֵטְא) of the many / And made intercession (פָּגַע) for sinners (פֹּשְׁעִים)."	12 Therefore, he will inherit many / and he will distribute the spoils of the powerful, / because his soul was given over (παραδίδωμι) to death (θάνατος), / and he was reckoned among the transgressors (ἄνομος). / And he himself bore (ἀναφέρω) the sins (ἁμαρτία) of many, / and because of their sins (ἁμαρτία) he was given over (παραδίδωμι).	12 Then I will divide him the plunder of many peoples, / and he shall divide the spoil, the possessions of strong fortresses; / because he handed over his soul to the death, / and subjected the rebels to the law; / yet he will beseech concerning the sins of many, / and to the rebels it shall be forgiven for him.

This pericope clearly shows that it is forgiveness of sins that the servant died for. Three words need attention: sin, forgiveness, and death. Firstly, it is forgiveness of *sins* that the Servant died for. In the text above, various sin-related words (in grey shading) repeatedly appear: the root עשׁפ four times, עָוֹן

three times,[50] and רָשָׁע, חָמָס, and חָטָא once each. The presence of numerous words denoting 'sin' in the Hebrew text demonstrates the importance of the theme in the text.[51]

The more compelling fact is that the Greek translation exhibits one more occurrence of 'sin' words, and thus this already predominant theme is even more magnified. On top of the above-mentioned Hebrew words, the translator rendered the non-sin-denoting word חֳלִי in v.4 as ἁμαρτία. This Hebrew word "commonly means 'illness,' occasionally 'wound,' . . . but more often 'weakness.'"[52] Therefore, the exact word in v.3 is translated as μαλακία, which is the most common translation.[53] If the translator certainly discerned in μαλακία a precise translation for חֳלִי in the previous verse, חֳלִי in v.4 may also have been rendered as μαλακία. However, he selects ἁμαρτία in v.4 instead of μαλακία. This fact suggests that in v.4, "the translator resolves the Hebrew metaphor of sickness by using the moral term ἁμαρτία."[54] In essence, the Hebrew version of Isaiah 53:4a presents a *physical* reading of חֳלִי, but the Greek version provides its *spiritual* reading.

This emphasis on 'sin' in the Greek translation shows that the translator underscored the idea of sin more than the original author of the last Servant song. This is significant because the time when the translation was made is closer to Paul's time than the Hebrew original to him. Together with the fact

---

[50] The word מִרְמָה (v.9) can also be considered as a synonym of iniquity (עָוֹן), as *DCH*, 5:489, suggests.

[51] It is especially significant that in the Hebrew text "the emphasis lies on '*their* wrongdoing'" (John Goldingay and David Payne, *Isaiah 40–55*, ICC [London: T&T Clark, 2006], 2:327). It is not for his sins but for their sins, and thus one can say that the Servant died for sins of others.

[52] John Goldingay, *The Message of Isaiah 40–55: A Literary–Theological Commentary* (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 498.

[53] The word חֳלִי occurs 24 times in 22 verses in the MT, and is translated in the LXX as follows: μαλακία nine times (Deut 7:15; 28:61; 2 Chr 16:12 [2 times]; 21:15 [2 times], 18; Isa 38:9; 53:3), ἀρρωστία eight times (1 Kgs 17:17; 2 Kgs 1:2; 8:8, 9; 13:14; Ps 41:4 [ET 41:3]; Eccl 5:16 [ET 5:17]; 6:2), νόσος three times (Deut 28:59; 2 Chr 21:19; Hos 5:13), πόνος twice (Isa 1:5; Jer 6:7), τραῦμα (Jer 10:19) and ἁμαρτία (Isa 53:4) once each. Except for the last case, its translations are exclusively within the semantic domain of physical suffering.

As Goldingay, *Message*, 499, observes, Isaiah 53:4a actually "takes up [the] key words from v.3, 'weakness', 'suffering.'" As discussed above, the word 'weakness (חֳלִי)' in vv.3–4 is rendered in two different ways: μαλακία (v.3) and ἁμαρτία (v.4). This may indicate that the translator intends to emphasize the 'sin' aspect of the passage. One may argue that the translator does not intend to highlight a certain aspect, but simply his word choice is not consistent because suffering (מַכְאֹב), the other word which repeats in vv.3–4, is translated πληγή and ὀδυνάω. However, this seems to be not the case. Whilst 'suffering' is translated within the identical semantic domain of 'physical suffering,' that of 'weakness' is interpreted in the different domains of 'physical weakness,' and 'spiritual weakness.'

[54] Jobes and Silva, *Invitation*, 221.

that the LXX translation was "an adaptation of the text to events contemporary to the time of the translators,"[55] it can mean that the translator and his contemporaries in that period considered this chapter to be dealing with the theme of sin rather than sickness.

More interestingly, this interpretive trend was continued and even enhanced after Paul's days. This sin-focused interpretation also occurs in Targum Isaiah 53:4a: "*Then* he *will beseech concerning our sins* and our *iniquities for his sake will be forgiven*." Like the LXX translator(s), the Isaiah Targum translates חֳלָי in verse 4a as 'sin' (חוב). In addition to this, the Targumic interpretation reads the latter portion of v.4a in a spiritual sense by interpreting 'suffering' (MT; cf. 'pain' [LXX]), as '*iniquities*.' Because of "the spiritualized LXX and Targum,"[56] it is probable that Jesus, Paul, and other contemporaries would have considered Isaiah 53 with this all-encompassing idea of sin in mind.

Secondly, it is *forgiveness* of sins that the Servant died for. Concerning the two verbs related to forgiveness, נָשָׂא and נִּעְתַּר, which appear twice each, it can be argued that the forgiveness-concept is amplified in the Targum. The former (נָשָׂא) is often translated as 'to take away,' and thus, it can mean 'forgive' as in Isaiah 2:9; 33:24. The LXX translator rendered the verb by employing (ἀνα)φέρω. Concerning this rendering, Ekblad indicates that "the LXX associates the servant's bearing of sins with the language of atonement in a way that is far clearer than the MT."[57] In the same vein, Wyclif translates its second appearance in 53:12 as "he dide awey þe synne of many men (he did away the sin of many men)."[58] It is clear that Wyclif understood 'bearing the sin of others' as '*forgiving* the sin of others.' Likewise, the Targumist provides the imagery of 'intercession for sin.'

The other Hebrew verb פָּגַע "is rather unusual in hip'il. Of a total of five occurrences, three are in the book of Isaiah and two of these are in the fourth

---

[55] van der Bergh, "Differences," 159. Jobes and Silva, *Invitation*, 89, also state that the Septuagint "has the potential of enlightening our understanding of how the Hebrew Bible was used at the time it was translated into Greek." LXX scholars name this phenomenon as 'contemporization,' or 'actualization.' For the historical discussion of this "contemporizing" interpretation of the LXX-Isaiah translator, see Ronald L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*, JSJSup 124 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 4–19.

[56] Richard Beaton, "Isaiah in Matthew's Gospel," in *Isaiah in the New Testament* ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J.J. Menken (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 63–78, 69. Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40–55*, 2:307, also observe "the stress on sin" in both translations.

[57] Eugene Robert Ekblad Jr., *Isaiah's Servant Poems According to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study*, CBET 23 (Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 213.

[58] Conrad Lindberg, ed., *King Henry's Bible, MS Bodley 277: The Revised Version of the Wyclif Bible*, Stockholm Studies in English 98 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1999–2004), 3:217. Wyclif translates the *Vulgate* into English, but even the Latin version has it as "et ipse peccatum multorum tulit (and he *bore* the sin of many)."

servant song."[59] Although the two appearances of the verb denote slightly different meanings in the MT ('*visited upon* him the guilt of all of us' [v.6b], and '*made intercession* for sinners' [v.12b]), these two expressions can imply the forgiveness of sins. It should be admitted that the LXX translation seems to be less clear in this regard because it alters the forgiveness-theme to the death-theme by employing παραδίδωμι in both verses. The targumist, however, understood the expression in verse 6b "in the sense of an atonement that produces divine forgiveness."[60] Moreover, the Targumist interprets its second appearance (v.12) also as forgiveness.

In addition to the two verbs, there are more images for 'forgiveness' which deserve brief mention. All three versions of v.5, particularly its third and fourth line, seem to exhibit the 'forgiveness' concept, with the Targum especially highlighting the concept. Moreover, 'being righteous' and one more 'sin-bearing' word (סָבַל) in v.11 can serve as further evidence of the presence of the forgiveness-theme. Furthermore, as generally understood, both אָשָׁם and περὶ ἁμαρτίας (v.10) refer to the means of atonement.[61] All this imagery is shared throughout the textual traditions, but the unique Targumic interpretation of 'forgiven' (the second line of v.4 and the last line of v.5) which MT and LXX-Isaiah do not present suggests that the clearest idea of forgiveness is found in the Targum.

Lastly, it is forgiveness of sins that the Servant *died* for. It should be admitted that "the majority view has consistently been in the affirmative"[62] regarding the crucial question of whether the Servant actually died. In the MT, words directly related to 'death' appear four times: מָוֶת twice (vv. 9, 12), טָבַח and קֶבֶר once each (v.7 and v.9 respectively). Regarding their appearance after v.7, Blenkinsopp states that "at this point (beginning with Isa 53:7) the

---

[59] Fredrik Hägglund, *Isaiah 53 in the Light of Homecoming After Exile*, FAT II/31 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 78.

[60] Jintae Kim, "Targum Isaiah 53 and the New Testament Concept of Atonement," *JGRChJ* 5 (2008): 81–98, 89. He states that "the Targum wanted to make the implicit idea of atonement in the Hebrew text explicit" (86).

[61] It is noteworthy that guilt offering (Isa 53:11 in the MT) is translated as a sin offering in th LXX. It is a bit odd because the two sacrificial rituals have different specifications: (1) their use of different animal victims, (2) the setting of offerings is in a different combination. However, the significant shared feature between them is their effect: atonement. To name a few verses, Exodus 29:36; 30:10; Leviticus 4:20; 5:6, all show that sin offerings effect atonement, and thus dispenses the forgiveness of sins. For guilt offerings bringing about atonement, see Leviticus 5:18; 14:21. Irrespective of how the expression is understood in each period, the author of the Hebrew text and the LXX-Isaiah translator seem to hold fast to the forgiveness-theme. Moreover, in the Targum, the idea of atonement is outstanding.

[62] David J.A. Clines, *I, He, We and They: A Literary Approach to Isaiah 53*, JSOTSup 1 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1976), 27. However, he concludes that Isaiah 53 "does not speak of the servant's death" (29).

language points unmistakably to physical violence resulting in death."[63] Of the three words, the first word literally means death and needs no further explanation.[64] The next word, 'slaughter' (טֶבַח), results in the death of cattle or men, and 'tomb' (קֶבֶר) in v.9 signifies death. Moreover, there are at least two more words and one phrase in the MT which can be understood as 'death.' In v.4, the word נָגַע is translated as "smitten," but in other places (cf. Isaiah 66:3) it is rendered as "to kill," or "to slay." Figuratively, the third line in v.8, "for he was cut off from the land of the living," probably suggests 'death' as well.[65] Finally, since the famous אָשָׁם in v.10 is indeed a kind of an offering, it also signifies 'death' because the sacrificial ritual reminds the reader of the death of a sacrifice. Consequently, most scholars concur that the Servant in Isaiah died.[66]

Moreover, the LXX-Isaiah translator(s) intensifies the concept of death in comparison to the MT author(s). The literal term for death θάνατος appears three times: twice for מָוֶת, once for נֶגַע. It is noteworthy that the latter, which appears at the end of v.8 in the Hebrew text, does not directly convey the meaning of 'death.' However, the LXX translation of נֶגַע as θάνατος makes v.8 clearer than in the MT. Whilst Sapp reads the MT version as, "the stroke (נֶגַע) was upon him,"[67] the LXX makes the 'death' imagery vivid: "he was led to death (ἤχθη εἰς θάνατον)." As discussed in the previous paragraph, the third line of v.8 ("he was cut off from the land of the living") may also intend the meaning of 'death.' The parallelism between the third line and "he was led to death" in the next line developed by the usage of a passive verb and ἀπό also supports the claim that the translator indeed understood the third line in the MT as implying the Servant's 'death.'

The other words which related to the idea of 'death' are translated as death-related words in Greek as well. It should be noted that there is the double reference of παρεδόθη (passive) in v.12. Its first occurrence is clearly

---

[63] Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40–55: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 19A (New York: Doubleday, 2002), 353.

[64] The Hiphil of עָרָה (v.12) in conjunction with מָוֶת conveys 'delivered to death.'

[65] On this specific phrase, R.N. Whybray, *Isaiah 40–66*, NCB (London: Oliphants, 1975), 177, and Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40–55*, 2:314, conclude that it does not necessarily mean death. Although Whybray admits that "interpreted literally, this phrase almost certainly means that the Servant died," he asserts that "a literal translation is not mandatory." His interpretation of this phrase is "the Servant's nearness to death: he was 'as good as dead.'" Against this reading, Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah*, OTL (Louisville: WJK, 2001), 416, states that "these are tortuous interpretations and run against the plain sense of the text." Moreover, as Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40–55*, 354, puts it, "that the Servant actually died and was not just left 'as good as dead' . . . is stated plainly enough by his being cut off from the land of the living."

[66] Contra Whybray, *Isaiah 40–66*, 176–82; Goldingay, *Message*, 507–9, 518.

[67] David A. Sapp, "The LXX, 1QIsa, and MT Versions of Isaiah 53 and the Christian Doctrine of Atonement," in Bellinger and Farmer, *Jesus*, 170–92, 183.

linked to death (παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον), and thus it is more likely that the second παρεδόθη can be understood as "he was given over (to death)." Hence, it is not odd that even Clines, who argues against the Servant's death in MT, states, "the LXX clearly understood the servant to have died."[68]

However, Targum Isaiah substitutes the Servant's death for that of others in the relevant text. Therefore, it is 'the strong ones of the peoples (v.7)' who will be sacrificed, and 'the wicked' and the 'rich' (v.8) will be dead. In the MT and LXX, the subject of death in the above-mentioned verses is the Servant, but the Targum radically transforms the identity of the dead from the Servant to sinful Israelites. Yet, 'the death of the Servant' does not completely fade from view; the Targum explicitly expresses the voluntary death of the Servant in v.12: "he handed over his soul to the death." Hence, although the concept of the Servant's death is weakened in the Targumic interpretation, the concept is still visible.

Therefore, it can be argued that the understanding that *the Servant died for the forgiveness of sins* is retained (and even amplified) through the different interpretations (LXX and the Targum) of the last Servant Song. That his death was for the remission of sins appears to have been a widely held interpretation represented by textual witnesses from the different time-periods. This is how the Hebrew text and translations of the fourth Servant Song interpret the meaning of his death. Consequently, this is probably what Paul intends to refer to in quoting this text.

4.3.1.1.2 Romans 4:25a Alone

The Greek translation of Isaiah 53 is a striking and evident example of the adage that 'all translation is interpretation.' It emphasizes the fact that the Servant dies for the forgiveness of sins above and beyond a literal interpretation of its *vorlage*. This emphasis is embraced by Paul in his identification of the Servant with Jesus. For Paul, therefore, it is Jesus' death which gives remission. Significantly, Paul retains the LXX translation which highlights the forgiveness element in this text. In particular, the texts of LXX-Isaiah 53:12 and of Romans 4:25a are almost identical if one considers the fact that "Paul uses παράπτωμα as an equivalent to ἁμαρτία."[69]

διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη (LXX-Isaiah)

ὃς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν (Romans)

---

[68] Clines, *I, He*, 29n25.

[69] Moo, *Romans*, 288n4. As Robert Jewett states, παράπτωμα is "the nearly synonymous term" for sin (*Romans: A Commentary*, ed. Eldon Jay Epp, Hermeneia [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007], 342). Cf. Wilhelm Michaelis, "παραπίπτω, παράπτωμα," in *TDNT*, 6:161–73, 172, who argues that "παράπτωμα and ἁμαρτία are synonyms" based on their paralleled usage in Romans 5:20.

In Romans 4:25, the shared verb παραδίδωμι carries more than a general sense of 'handing over' because the fact "that the early Christians did use the verb as a technical term in connection with the passion is uniformly acknowledged."[70] Since the first word, ὃς, in Romans 4:25 is "referring to Christ in the previous verse,"[71] παραδίδωμι conveys the significant meaning of "the delivering up of Christ, his crucifixion."[72]

Furthermore, the interpretation of παραδίδωμι (v.25) as 'Jesus' death' is confirmed by its (1) context, and (2) intertext. In the immediate context, mentioning of 'Jesus' being raised up from *the dead*' (v.24) suggests that the concept of Jesus' death permeates the text. Therefore, the context demands the translation of παρεδόθη as referring to Jesus' being handed over *to death*. Moreover, in its intertext, LXX-Isaiah 53, the first occurrence of παραδίδωμι (παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον in v.6 [note the same passive voice as in Rom 4:25a]) is directly linked to death. Therefore, based on the context and the intertext of Romans 4:25a, it is legitimate to translate the verb παρεδόθη in v.25a as: "*was handed over (to death)*."[73]

The verb is expressed in the passive form, which means "being delivered up." On the one hand, it is understood as the "divine passive,"[74] and thus the principal agent is God. On the other hand, it is Judas who 'handed over' Jesus to the Romans (1 Cor 11:23). Therefore, this verb portrays specifically Jesus' being betrayed and handed to death by humanity. Hence, it can be argued that this passive verb "has the double sense of both the divine 'handing over' and the human act of Judas."[75] The divine side of 'handing over' signifies that it is God's gracious gift. By putting the verb in the passive

---

[70] Norman Perrin, *A Modern Pilgrimage in New Testament Christology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 99. Cf. 90n39 above. However, while suggesting the origin of this specific verb and the development of its usage, Perrin states that in its earliest use, the verb "does not of itself have any particular theological significance. . . . [I]t is simply wholly appropriate and vividly descriptive." If παραδίδωμι is indeed a *technical term* for Jesus' passion, there must be a theological significance in the verb itself when it is used in connection with Jesus.

[71] Arland J. Hultgren, *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 191.

[72] Murray, *Romans*, 154. Cf. Dunn, *Romans*, 1:225; Jewett, *Romans*, 342.

[73] Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 389. Joshua W. Jipp, "Rereading the Story of Abraham, Isaac, and 'Us' in Romans 4," *JSNT* 32 (2009): 217–42, 238, also supplies "[to death]" after 'handed over.'

[74] See Dunn, *Romans*, 1:224; Moo, *Romans*, 288; Gerhard H. Visscher, *Romans 4 and the New Perspective on Paul: Faith Embraces the Promise*, StBibLit 122 (New York: Lang, 2009), 215. Similarly, Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 389, describes the two verbs in Romans 4:25 as "theological passives" (cf. Pasquale Basta, "Paul and the *Gezerah Shawah*: A Judaic Method in the Service of Justification by Faith," in *Paul's Jewish Matrix*, ed. Thomas G. Casey and Justin Taylor [Rome: Gregorian & Biblical, 2011], 123–65, 155).

[75] Gathercole, "Justified," 182.

voice, Paul implies that the forgiveness of sins is accomplished by grace: God initiates forgiveness for the undeserving sinners. As Käsemann puts it, God "has acted graciously toward us through Jesus' sacrificial death, with no co-operation on our part."[76]

The combination of the verb παραδίδωμι and the word παράπτωμα indicates that Jesus' death is related to sins, and the preposition διά is the key to understand how they are related.[77] Much ink has been spilled on the meaning of the preposition in v.25. Many exegetes regard Romans 4:25 as difficult because of this single word. The two "difficult διά + accusative clauses"[78] can be understood in a prospective (final) sense or a retrospective (causal) sense, and the debate is still ongoing although interest in its meaning has diminished with time. Whilst the former can be translated as 'with a view to,' or 'for the sake of,' the latter can be understood as 'because of,' or 'on account of.' Bird summarizes three different interpretive ways for the two prepositional clauses: "(1) Prospective + Prospective; (2) Retrospective + Retrospective; and (3) Retrospective + Prospective."[79] Furthermore, he indicates that "by far the majority of commentators and Bible translations prefer to take the first clause as retrospective and the second as prospective."[80]

More important is the fact that the two different construals, regardless of whether διά means 'because of' or 'with a view to,' ultimately refer "to the atoning significance of Jesus' death."[81] Both the final reading and the causal

---

[76] Käsemann, *Romans*, 129.

[77] By stating that διά is the key, this is not to disagree with Breytenbach, "Septuagint Version," 340, when he states that it is "not possible to detach the prepositional phrase from the ruling verbs. Rather it is the ruling verb which signifies the broader frame which forms the backdrop of the prepositional phrase."

[78] Jipp, "Rereading," 230. Bruce A. Lowe, "Oh διά! How Is Romans 4.25 to Be Understood?" *JTS* 57 (2006): 149–57, 149, also calls it "the difficult expression." Cf. Schreiner, *Romans*, 243.

[79] Bird, "Raised," 39. The proponents of (1) are Murray, *Romans*, 155–56; Eduard Lohse, *Der Brief an die Römer*, KEK 4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 159; Jipp, "Rereading," 230. Because of the parallel between v.25a and v.25b, Murray argues that "if the one is retrospective so must be the other or if the one is prospective so must be the other" (Murray, *Romans*, 154). However, the parallel does not seem to demand the exact same translation for the prepositional phrase. For the advocates of (2), see Bird, "Raised," 40n35. The following are the main supporters of (3): Barrett, *Romans*, 93; Bird, "Raised," 42–44; C.E.B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1975), 252; Dunn, *Romans*, 1:225; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 389; Hultgren, *Romans*, 192; Craig S. Keener, *Romans*, NCC (Cambridge: Lutterworth, 2011), 69; Moo, *Romans*, 289; Visscher, *Romans 4*, 216.

[80] Bird, "Raised," 42.

[81] Furnish, "He Gave," 116. Irrespective of their choice regarding the meaning of διά, scholars universally agree that 4:25a describes Jesus' death (and resurrection) as "atoning" (Cranfield, *Romans*, 252; Hultgren, *Romans*, 191), "expiatory" (Furnish, "He Gave," 120), "justifying" (Moo, *Romans*, 290), "redemptive" (Jewett, *Romans*, 342), "saving" (Dunn,

reading describe Jesus' death atoning sins: Murray, the representative of the former view, states, "Jesus was delivered up in order to *atone* for our sins," and Bird, a typical scholar of the latter view, similarly contends that "Jesus' death is the means of *atoning* for sin."[82] Moreover, based on v.25 in its entirety, the two scholars portray Jesus' death and resurrection as "redemptive."[83] Hence, these two varied elucidations of the διά clause in v.25a eventually mean "forgiveness of sins."[84] If so, Paul is presenting the idea of Jesus' death effecting forgiveness based on the pre-Pauline tradition.

Even if the interpretation of διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν as 'for *forgiveness* of our sins' were refuted, Jesus' death for forgiveness of sins in v.25 can undoubtedly be argued based on "the inseparability of Christ's death and resurrection."[85] Indeed, v.25 should not be understood as mechanically associating Jesus' death with forgiveness and his resurrection with justification.[86] Rather, Jesus' death and resurrection should be considered as Jesus' death-and-resurrection, and it was for τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν and for justification. Earlier in section 4.2.2, it was argued that forgiveness is integral to justification based on Romans 4:6–9. If Paul understands justification in this way earlier in Romans 4, he probably keeps the same perspective while writing verse 25. Then, the notion that Jesus' death-and-resurrection effects justification can certainly be understood as meaning that Jesus' death-and-resurrection effects – among other things – forgiveness. Hence, it seems likely that here Jesus' death is indissolubly related to forgiveness and one can find a "reference to the saving significance of Christ's death in v.25a."[87] Therefore, whatever the precise meaning of the διά may be, the expression 'for our transgressions' can securely be interpreted as including a notion of 'forgiveness of sins.' To be more exact, the διά prepositional clauses can include both final and causal senses; the "traditional questions of prospective and retrospective prepositional phrases fade into the background. It is not so

---

Romans, 1:198), or "soteriological" (Käsemann, *Romans*, 129; Perrin, *Modern Pilgrimage*, 96). By employing a full range of these soteriological adjectives, the exegetes concur that Jesus' death in Romans 4:25a is closely related to the forgiveness-theme.

[82] Murray, *Romans*, 155, and Bird, "Raised," 45 (emphasis mine).

[83] Murray, *Romans*, 156, and Bird, "Raised," 45.

[84] Schreiner, *Romans*, 243. Bird, "Raised," 45, also seems to understand the prepositional phrase in v.25a as "forgiveness of sins."

[85] Bird, "Raised," 46. This understanding is shared by all scholars (except Hultgren who simply does not mention it) who support the 'Retrospective + Prospective' rendering of Romans 4:25. For the scholars who see their inseparability, see 79n7 above.

[86] Cranfield, *Romans*, 252, provides a proof from the context that Romans 5:9 "makes it clear that there is a connexion between Christ's death and our justification."

[87] Furnish, "He Gave," 116.

much whether Jesus was raised with *a view to* 'our' justification or *because of* it that is crucial."[88]

Bird also argues that the meaning of the διά clause in v.25a should be understood in relation to the dying formulae:

> the first clause should be taken in continuity with the early Christian understanding of the sacrificial nature of Jesus' death with Jesus being crucified on behalf of (i.e., because of) others. For even if Paul is using the preposition διά only because it is part of traditional material, he is unlikely to be departing from his normal emphasis of Christ dying 'for' others.[89]

By stating this, Bird takes the prepositional clause as one of the *Stellvertretung* terms. If one considers that the phrase 'dying for others' contains not just the causal meaning as seen above, it seems that the διά can surely contain both senses. Therefore, it might be better to interpret the διά clause in v.25a as "in consequence of our sins and in order to expiate them" because "the purely causal sense of διά with the acc[usative] cannot be shown from the *koine*."[90]

What has been argued here is not whether the phrases can be understood either retrospectively or prospectively, but *both* retrospectively *and* prospectively. This is truly "to let those διά's have their full force."[91] Moreover, even if one has to choose either a retrospective, or a prospective sense, in either way Romans 4:25a links Jesus' death and forgiveness of sins. More significant is that this understanding is probably pre-Pauline.[92] This means that the understanding of Jesus' atoning death was shared by the early Chris-

---

[88] Lowe, "Oh διά!" 151. Lowe's argument is more about the idea of '*for us*' rather than its causal or final meaning.

[89] Bird, "Raised," 40. Breytenbach, "Septuagint Version," 339, does not hesitate to categorize both the dying formula and the giving-up formula under the same group "the ὑπέρ-formulae," which "refer to an action of atonement (Sühne)." Oddly enough, however, in his earlier essay, Breytenbach asserts that the Son being delivered or having handed himself over "is not expiation of sins but vicarious suffering" ("The 'For Us' Phrases in Pauline Soteriology: Considering Their Background and Use," in Watt, *Salvation*, 163–85, 176).

[90] Albrecht Oepke, "διά," in *TDNT*, 2:65–70, 70.

[91] Daniel P. Leyrer, "Exegetical Brief: Διά + the Accusative in Romans 4:24,25—More Than 'For,'" *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 108 (2011): 129–31, 130–31.

[92] It is generally agreed that v.25a is pre-Pauline. Although some scholars doubt the formulaic character of the last half, they do not deny that the first half is probably from a pre-Pauline source. Whilst Barrett, *Romans*, 93, Käsemann, *Romans*, 128, and Schliesser, *Abraham's Faith*, 388–89, accept the entirety of Romans 4:25 as a traditional formula, Dunn, *Romans*, 1:224–25, and Hultgren, *Romans*, 191, see only v.25a as having been used before Paul. However, Jewett, *Romans*, 342, and Moo, *Romans*, 288, are cautious to label this verse as pre-Pauline, but the latter admits that "Paul has fully integrated the elements of the tradition into his exposition" (similar to Jewett). Therefore, one can say at least that v.25a is either a direct citation from a traditional formula, or a product under the heavy influence of a pre-Pauline tradition.

tian community.[93] In sum, it is safe to state that Romans 4:25 "calls attention to the soteriological significance of the passion,"[94] which was generally agreed among the early followers of Jesus.

4.3.1.2 *Romans 8:32*

ὅς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν, πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ἡμῖν χαρίσεται;

This, the second 'giving-up' text, also probably alludes to Isaiah 53, especially 53:6, 12. The last portion of v.32a is surprisingly similar to LXX-Isaiah 53:6, in sharing παρέδωκεν αὐτόν.[95] Moreover, since it is most likely that Isaiah 53 exerts a strong influence on Romans 4:25a and in consideration of "the generally parallel Christological assertions of 4:25a and 8:32,"[96] one can also argue that "if Isaiah 53:12 forms the backdrop for Rom 4:25 this might as well be the case in Rom 8:32."[97] It is hardly possible that Paul could have

---

[93] Against a formulaic understanding, see Wolter, *Römer*, 312. However, this does not exclude that the content is traditional. With regard to Romans 3:24–25, Wolter writes that we have to be content with the assumption that Paul "Deutungen des Todes Jesu wiedergibt, die in der frühen Christenheit schon vor und auch neben ihm verbreitet waren" (246).

[94] Perrin, *Modern Pilgrimage*, 96.

[95] Perrin argues that this passage is "an independent allusion to the LXX of Isa. 53:6" (ibid., 103).

[96] Furnish, "He Gave," 117. Compared to Romans 4:25, the pre-Pauline character of Romans 8:32 is less discussed. However, most exegetes accept that Romans 8:32 is either pre-Pauline, or Paul's rewriting of the pre-Pauline tradition. Cf. Dunn, *Romans*, 1:509; Furnish, "He Gave," 117n29; Hultgren, *Romans*, 337–38; Käsemann, *Romans*, 247.

[97] Breytenbach, "Septuagint Version," 341. Similarly, Shiu-Lun Shum sees the influence of Isaiah 53 as "reasonable" because of "the frequent influence of the Suffering Servant Song upon Paul in the previous chapters of *Romans*" (*Paul's Use of Isaiah in Romans: A Comparative Study of Paul's Letter to the Romans and the Sibylline and Qumran Sectarian Texts*, WUNT II/321 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002], 200). Cf. J. Ross Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul in Concert in the Letter to the Romans*, NovTSup 101 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 23, who maintains Paul's "*knowing scriptural texts by heart*," without denying his use of written texts.

In the context of the Isaianic influence, the last phrase in v.34 (ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν) is striking. By the verb, ἐντυγχάνω, Jesus is depicted as the one who 'makes intercession' for us. Considering that "this is the only place where [Paul] says that the risen and exalted Christ intercedes for believers" (Hultgren, *Romans*, 339), it seems to be an allusion to MT-Isaiah 53:12 (the Servant "made intercession for the transgressors") rather than a part of his own Christology. This verb can confirm that Romans 8:32 is influenced by the fourth Servant Song. Although LXX-Isaiah reads it quite differently as "because of their sins he was handed over (παρεδόθη)," Paul's knowledge of both the original reading and the Greek translation probably led him to provide both readings in Romans 8:32, 34. Therefore, it is plausible that Romans 8:32 "echoes the language of Isa 53:6, 12" (Jewett, *Romans*, 538).

completely forgotten the fourth Servant song after writing Romans 4. Moreover, Paul alludes to Isaiah 50:8 in the very next verse, Romans 8:33, and thus one can certainly discern the importance of Isaianic influences in Romans 8 as well as Romans 4. If Romans 8:32 is indeed influenced by Isaiah 53, this suggests that the Servant's dying for forgiveness of sins is still of enormous importance for this verse.

Interpreters also agree that there is a scriptural allusion to LXX-Genesis 22:16, and based on this, it has been argued that the Aqedah (or Akedah) "provided the precedent for understanding the atoning death of Jesus."[98] However, the rabbinic understanding of the binding of Isaac as *atoning* sacrifice is now regarded as a later, that is post-NT, development.[99] Whether or not Romans 8:32 is inspired by the rabbinic tradition, however, "it is difficult to avoid seeing in the first clause an allusion to Gen 22:16."[100] In both texts, the verb φείδομαι follows the negative particle οὐκ, and it takes υἱός as the object. Despite the similarity, there exists one noteworthy difference between Romans 8:32 and the Genesis passage: "although Abraham did not have to go through with the sacrifice of his son, God has indeed done so in the sacrifice of his own Son."[101] As discussed in the previous section, where παραδίδωμι is employed in the passive form with Jesus as an object (Rom 4:25, cf. 1 Cor 11:23), it has the specific meaning of Jesus' being handed over to death. By stating that God delivered (παρέδωκεν) his own son in Romans 8, although the verb appears in the active voice, "Paul has Jesus' death in view."[102]

As in the case of Romans 4:25, where the death is mentioned clearly in the immediate context, the immediate context of Romans 8:32 evidently indicates Jesus' death ("ὁ ἀποθανών" [v.34]). Furthermore, after arguing that in Romans 8:32 the context is forensic, du Toit proposes two interpretive possibili-

---

[98] Jewett, *Romans*, 537.

[99] Since the initial contribution of Hans Joachim Schoeps, "The Sacrifice of Isaac in Paul's Theology," *JBL* 65 (1946): 385–92, scholars are divided pro and contra. For an updated list of the divided scholarly opinions, consult Brown, *Bodily Resurrection*, 126n77–78. For a detailed bibliography, cf. Lukas Kundert, *Die Opferung / Bindung Isaaks*, WMANT 78–79, 2 vols. (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1998).

[100] Dunn, *Romans*, 1:501. He affirms his argument by saying that "a Jew as familiar with OT language as was Paul could hardly have been unaware that he was echoing Gen 22:16." Cranfield, *Romans*, 436, also finds "an intentional echo of Gen 22.12, 16." However, one can also find scholars "hesitating about the allusion" (Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 531). Objecting to the allusion to Gen 22, however, Jewett, *Romans*, 537, draws a "sceptical conclusion" because "the vocabulary [φείδομαι] is ordinary." However, this ordinariness does not seem to be a decisive factor for whether the text is influenced or not. Any ordinary vocabulary can be used under the influence of other texts.

[101] Hultgren, *Romans*, 337. Cf. Cranfield, *Romans*, 436.

[102] Furnish, "He Gave," 118. Here he also indicates that v.34 clearly states Jesus' having died. Wiard Popkes, "παραδίδωμι," *EDNT*, 3:20, concisely states that the description of 'handing Jesus over' "refers to the death on the cross." Cf. Dunn, *Romans*, 1:509.

ties for the verb παρέδωκεν: "either to be tried or to be punished."[103] He prefers the second option, and understands this punishment as the death penalty. Hence, the understanding of the verb παραδίδωμι as 'handing over to death' can easily be established.

The central focus of Romans 8:32 undoubtedly lies in the expression 'for us' (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν).[104] That God is for us is actualized in his handing his son over to death. While Paul drives this focus home, he exposes his understanding of Jesus' death. Granted that "what the language emphasizes [in Romans 8:32] is less the idea of Jesus' death as sacrifice, and more the thought of God's commitment to his own in and through Christ (God for us)," ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν still does signify "the vicariously representative death of sacrifice."[105] Moreover, if Paul alludes to LXX-Isaiah 53:6 whilst writing Romans 8:32, it is significant that Paul alters 'to/for our sins' in LXX-Isaiah to 'for us.' This alteration provides a significant clue in understanding 'for us' in Romans 8 as 'for our sins,' which conveys the meaning of 'forgiveness of sins.'[106] Therefore, this phrase ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν can certainly imply 'forgiveness of sins.'

Two verbs in Romans 8 support this interpretation: (1) δικαιόω in v.33, and (2) χαρίζομαι in v.32. Firstly, the verb δικαιόω describes God as the one who justifies. The conclusion of section 4.2.2 that forgiveness is integral to justification may shed light on the issue. God who handed his son over to

---

[103] Andrie B. du Toit, "Forensic Metaphors in Romans and Their Soteriological Significance," in Watt, *Salvation*, 213–46, 220. Likewise, Dunn, *Romans*, 1:511, sees "the courtroom metaphor" in vv.33–34.

[104] Concerning Romans 8:31b–34, Hultgren, *Romans*, 336, states, "the message of Paul in this entire section is that God is 'for us.'" Cf. Dunn, *Romans*, 1:509; Furnish, "He Gave," 118.

[105] Dunn, *Romans*, 1:509, and 1:501 respectively.

[106] Considering the fact that "atonement can be made for sins (Exod 32:30; Num 29:11) or for people (Lev 4:20; 16:30; 23:28)" (Hultgren, *Romans*, 210), one can surely argue that 'for us' in Romans 8:32 means 'forgiveness of our sins.' As we will see, its context confirms this reading.

Furthermore, Isaiah 53:12b can support this line of argument. If there was a significant difference between 'for us' and 'for our sins,' the Greek translator would have rendered 'intercession for the transgressors' as 'because of *them* he was handed over.' However, the original reading, the servant's 'intercession for individuals,' is actually rendered as his 'being handed over because of *the sins* of the individuals,' which provides grounds for understanding 'for us' as 'for our sins.' If Paul had known the two textual traditions, Paul may have understood the remarkable interchangeableness between 'intercession *for a person*' and 'being handed over *for his/her sins*.' Hence, acknowledging this interchangeability in MT-Isaiah 53:12 and its Greek translation would have allowed Paul to interchange 'to our sins' in LXX-Isaiah 53:6 with 'for us all' in Romans 8:32. In Romans 8:32, Paul seems to identify 'to our sins' as 'for us all.' However, this shortened form does not necessarily mean the loss of the atoning significance of the term. This train of proof-verbs supports the claim that 'for us' in v.32 conveys more than a mere beneficial effect of Jesus' death. Rather, 'for us' presents the idea of forgiveness.

death is the one who justifies – the one who *forgives*. As argued in the previous section, the agent of this 'handing over' in Romans 4:25 is implicit, but by the divine passive, "God [is] the (implied) subject of the act of atonement."[107] Here in Romans 8:32, the identity of its agent is readily discernible because the 'handing over' is in the active form. Therefore, as Hurtado states, "Romans 8:32 emphasizes God's hand in Jesus' redemptive death."[108] If so, Jesus' death *for us* is a means of divine forgiveness. In Romans 8:32, therefore, "the idea of δικαιοῦν as God's final vindication and *acquittal* is certainly present."[109]

The second verb, χαρίζομαι, merits careful attention. Based on the forensic context of Romans 8:32, du Toit prefers to translate the phrase τὰ πάντα ἡμῖν χαρίσεται as "*grant us a complete pardon/acquit us totally*."[110] Just as du Toit contends, this interpretation is definitely possible: "surely this understanding, which falls completely within the semantic range of χαρίζομαι, fits the context excellently."[111] Additionally, the phrase needs to be compared with Colossians 2:13b (χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα). The expression in Colossians 2 closely resembles the last phrase of Romans 8:32b, τὰ πάντα ἡμῖν χαρίσεται. If πάντα in Romans 8:32 qualifies "transgressions" as in Colossians 2:13b, the interpretation of the verb as 'pardon/acquit' seems more than possible. This means that 'for us' in Romans 8:32 is set in the context of forgiveness of sins, and so, it is plausible that 'for us' can mean 'for our sins.'

Against this reading, Furnish contends that "it is not, however, the expiatory significance of Jesus' death that is being emphasized, even though the idea is present in the wider context," and he continues, "only in Rom 4:25 does Paul seem to use the παραδιδόναι formula as a statement about the expiatory significance of Jesus' death."[112] Therefore, Furnish does not consider 'for us' as another term denoting 'for our sins.' Yet most scholars concur that "the

---

[107] Schliesser, *Abraham's Faith*, 389.

[108] Larry W. Hurtado, "Jesus' Divine Sonship in Paul's Epistle to the Romans" in *Romans and the People of God: Essays in Honor of Gordon D. Fee on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. Sven K. Soderlund and N.T. Wright (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 217–33, 232.

[109] Dunn, *Romans*, 1:503 (emphasis mine).

[110] du Toit, "Forensic," 221. Contra Cranfield, *Romans*, 436, who sees the understanding of the verb "in the sense 'forgive' as problematic because of σὺν αὐτῷ." However, more than half a century ago, D.M. Baillie suggests this interpretation by asking whether "in the context of which he is talking of 'justification,' ought we perhaps to translate the remainder of the verse: 'Will he not also with him forgive us everything?'—a meaning which the Greek (χαρίσεται) can easily bear?" (*God was in Christ: An Essay on Incarnation and Atonement* [London: Faber & Faber, 1948], 178n2). As he presents his translation, the phrase 'with him' can go along with the subject.

[111] du Toit, "Forensic," 221.

[112] Furnish, "He Gave," 118, 120 respectively.

saving significance is emphasized; the death took place because of our sins or for our good."[113]

Death is inescapable in the text as discussed above, and this death of God's son is inextricably linked to forgiveness of sins ('for us,' χαρίζομαι, and δικαιόω). Still, this relatedness has a foundation in God's grace even though χαρίζομαι is translated as 'forgive' rather than 'freely give.' It is due to the fact that humanity has nothing to do with God's sending his son. This gracious act of God is "the saving act centered in the death of Jesus."[114] This is not only Paul's understanding of Jesus' death but also the understanding of the original author(s) of the tradition embedded in Romans 8:32.

4.3.1.3 *Galatians 1:4*

τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, ὅπως ἐξέληται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν

Admittedly, this text has δίδωμι instead of παραδίδωμι, the specific verb which is traditionally used for Jesus' being handed over to death. However, it is probable that "the parallelism of meaning between Galatians 1:4, which uses *dontos*, and 2:20, using *paradontos*, shows that the two forms of the verb are synonymous."[115] Based on this observation, the giving-up formula is applicable to this text. Most, if not all, scholars who mention the three texts that have παραδίδωμι, Romans 4:25, 8:32, and Galatians 2:20, never fail to refer to this passage alongside them.[116]

4.3.1.3.1 The Kernel of Paul's Gospel Unveiled

The normal setting of the letter opening in the Pauline epistles consists of three sections: sender(s), receiver(s), and grace (in short, 'A to B Greeting').[117] All the generally-agreed Pauline letters, except for 1 Thessaloni-

[113] Popkes, "παραδίδωμι," 3:20.

[114] Käsemann, *Romans*, 247.

[115] Perrin, *Modern Pilgrimage*, 103.

[116] Furnish, "He Gave," 109; Carroll and Green, *Death of Jesus*, 119. Perrin, *Modern Pilgrimage*, 101, calls the four texts "a soteriological *(para)didonai* tradition." Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 175, terms these texts "'handed over (*paradidomi*)' formulae." For Hengel, *Atonement*, 35, and Green, *Death of Jesus*, 3, it is the "surrender formula."

[117] Most scholars prefer the tripartite structure and place 'thanksgiving' in the letter body. For the literature of "the opening of the NT letters in the context of Greco-Roman epistolography," and of Galatians 1:1–10, consult Robert E. Van Voorst, "Why Is There No Thanksgiving Period in Galatians? An Assessment of an Exegetical Commonplace," *JBL* 129 (2010): 153–72, 153–54n1.

ans,[118] exhibit the typical Pauline grace section which is composed of 12 words: χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Besides, in every Pauline epistle, the section is immediately followed by "the epistolary thanksgiving period."[119] In this regard, Galatians 1:4 is an unexpectedly expanded portion which includes "the christological-soteriological statement."[120] It expands the grace section and this unusual phenomenon is found in none of the other six letters.[121] Hence, compared to the other undisputed Pauline epistles, this abnormal verse stands out. If Paul's letters were circulated among the churches (cf. Col 4:16), the Galatian believers might have known that the normal Pauline epistolary format includes the thanksgiving. However, its absence and the enlarged grace section differentiate the letter opening of Galatians from the remaining letters. It is not unlikely that this particular change was noticed by the recipients, although this cannot be certain.[122]

Regardless of whether the addressee recognized the abnormal grace section or not, it seems certain that this alteration in the opening reflects Paul's intention in writing this letter. This atypical letter-opening is caused by Paul's intention to clarify what he shared with the Galatian church members because of the different gospel which they had followed. In this emergency situation, Paul had to remind the believers in Galatia of the thrust of *the* gos-

---

[118] According to the 28th edition of Nestle-Aland, 1 Thessalonians does not omit the section but truncates the normal form as χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη. However, a good number of manuscripts support the reading of the typical Pauline grace section.

[119] Van Voorst, "Why?" 154. For the explanation of the terms, 'epistolary,' and 'period,' see idem, 154n2. In the case of 2 Corinthians, *Berakhah* (blessing) instead of thanksgiving follows.

[120] Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 37.

[121] For a convenient summary of the Pauline prescript of the undisputed letters, see Philip L. Tite, "How to Begin, and Why? Diverse Functions of the Pauline Prescript within a Greco-Roman Context," in *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Sean A. Adams, Pauline Studies 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 57–99, 68–69. Tite observes that "additions or expansions in the prescript [in letters in antiquity] are common" (64). He points out that, however, of the seven undisputed Pauline letters, Galatians "is the only letter to extend the *salutio*'s expansions beyond ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ" (74).

Moreover, another oddity is that "the regular εὐχαριστῶ thanksgiving is omitted" (David Cook, "The Prescript as Programme in Galatians," *JTS* 43 [1992]: 511–19, 512). According to Stanley E. Porter, "this lack of a thanksgiving after the letter opening and before the body has been widely noted" ("A Functional Letter Perspective: Towards a Grammar of Epistolary Form," in Porter and Adams, *Paul*, 9–31, 24).

[122] Most exegetes concur that the Galatian believers acknowledged the absence of a thanksgiving section. However, there are voices that disagree with the majority view. See Peter Arzt, "The 'Epistolary Introductory Thanksgiving' in the Papyri and in Paul," *NovT* 36 (1994): 29–46, and Van Voorst, "Why?" 160–66.

pel which he had preached to them.[123] With this central gospel in danger in Galatia, Paul had no choice but to wield the pen. The grace section was extended by this very intention, and it seems probable that this expanded portion is the kernel of the Pauline gospel.

4.3.1.3.2 The Kernel of Paul's Gospel Interpreted

As mentioned, the atypically expanded portion exposes the typical Pauline gospel. Either consciously or unconsciously the central Pauline gospel is unveiled in verse 4. Martyn correctly indicates the thrust of Paul's gospel by stating that v.4a "has two basic elements: an *affirmation of Christ's death* and a prepositional phrase pointing to the *significance* of that death or to the persons for whom it was enacted."[124] The first element, Jesus' death, is carried by the first three words, τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν, which are universally interpreted as death. The phrase 'handing himself over' "may perfectly well refer to a devotion of one's self in service, but the general usage of Paul . . . associates [it with] the death of Christ."[125] There is apparently no exegete who argues against the notion that "Paul announces that when Jesus died on the cross he gave himself for our sins."[126] Therefore, it is safe to argue that in v.4a, Jesus' death is in view.

The significance of Jesus' death, the second element, can be found in the next phrase, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν.[127] As in the case of the first element, the second element enjoys virtually universal agreement that it means the "forgiveness of (our) sins."[128] This soteriological reading has support from

---

[123] Cf. Ernest de Witt Burton, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1921), 14; Van Voorst, "Why?" 170.

[124] J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 33A (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 89 (emphasis mine).

[125] Burton, *Galatians*, 11. Friedrich Büchsel, "δίδωμι, κτλ.," *TDNT*, 2: 166–73, 166, states, "this expression is traditional for the death of martyrs among the Jews and soldiers among the Greeks."

[126] Wright, *Paul*, 2:1068. As Cook, "Prescript," 516, concisely states, "the crucifixion is presented in Galatians as Christ's handing over of himself." In this sense, Ronald Y.K. Fung, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 40, translates τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν as "sacrificed himself."

[127] Instead of ὑπέρ, some early manuscripts read περί. However, it is not a serious problem to understand its meaning. It should be noted that "this same interchangeability of [the two] prepositions appears in the extant Koine Greek materials outside the NT" (Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, WBC 41 [Dallas: Word, 1990], 8). If so, whether the original reading was ὑπέρ, or περί, the preposition does not significantly change the meaning of the phrase.

[128] F.F. Bruce, *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Exeter: Paternoster, 1982), 75; Fung, *Galatians*, 40; Martyn, *Galatians*, 90; Thomas R. Schreiner, *Galatians*, ZECNT (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 76. Most scholars opt for this prospective meaning of the preposition without mentioning the discus-

the following clause, 4b. As most scholars concur that v.4b is the purpose of v.4a, verse 4a can be understood "soteriologically."[129] The "Pauline *hapax legomenon*,"[130] ἐξαιρέω (v.4b), conveys the meaning of saving from the power of Sin. This word itself signifies the idea of redemption, which includes forgiveness, and thus v.4b interprets the purpose of Jesus' death as including forgiveness. Therefore, in this salvific context, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν can certainly be understood as forgiveness.

The central message of Paul's previous preaching to the recipients can be summarized as the significance of the "voluntary act of self-sacrifice" of Jesus.[131] It is noteworthy that unlike Romans 4:25 and 8:32, where the agent of handing over is God, this text suggests "[Jesus'] own consciousness."[132] Most scholars suggest that v.4a is based on one of the early traditional formulae, but scholarly opinions differ on whether Paul quoted the expression almost exactly from the formula,[133] or Paul himself formulated the phrase based on the formula.[134] However, one can say that at least, the early formulaic expression had formed the backbone of v.4a. If Bruce is right to suggest that Galatians was written before the Jerusalem Council, it follows that "this is probably the earliest written statement in the NT about the significance of the death of Christ. . . . Moreover, it relates his death to the forgiveness of his people's sins."[135]

---

sion of causal and final meaning (for the discussion in the use of διά, see the section 4.3.1.1.2). For the discussion of causal and final, see Bruce, *Galatians*, 75; Fung, *Galatians*, 40, 42. They cautiously maintain that both meanings of ὑπέρ can be present together in the verse. Witherington, *Grace*, 76, prefers the causal reading.

[129] Both Longenecker, *Galatians*, 8, and Betz, *Galatians*, 42, use this adverb in order to describe v.4b. By the conjunction ὅπως, "in order that," or "so that," v.4b naturally becomes a purpose clause.

[130] Betz, *Galatians*, 42n59.

[131] James D.G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, BNTC (London: Black, 1993), 34. The following scholars mention "voluntar(il)y," and/or "self-": Betz, *Galatians*, 41; Bruce, *Galatians*, 75; Burton, *Galatians*, 12; Carroll and Green, *Death of Jesus*, 121; Cook, "Prescript," 516; Fung, *Galatians*, 41; Furnish, "He Gave," 113; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 10; Schreiner, *Galatians*, 76; Van Voorst, "Why?" 170; Witherington, *Grace*, 76; Wolter, *Römer*, 311.

[132] Longenecker, *Galatians*, 8.

[133] Cf. Betz, *Galatians*, 41; Bruce, *Galatians*, 75, 77; Cook, "Prescript," 516; Dunn, *Galatians*, 35; Hengel, *Atonement*, 37; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 7; Martyn, *Galatians*, 87, 89; Witherington, *Grace*, 76.

[134] As a representative voice, Schreiner, *Galatians*, 76, states that "it is equally possible that Paul himself formulates the significance of Jesus death here" although v.4a "has a confessional ring." Cf. Matthew S. Harmon, *She Must and Shall Go Free: Paul's Isaianic Gospel in Galatians*, BZNW 168 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 56–57n39.

[135] Bruce, *Galatians*, 77. However, it should be noted that scholarly opinion is divided between those favouring a date before the Jerusalem Council and those placing it in the early or mid-fifties CE.

Again, as the last bit of v.4b indicates, this redemptive Jesus' *self*-giving is "according to God's *will*." Martyn states, "the death of the Son is therefore a sacrifice enacted both by him and by God; and as such it breaks the mold of the old sacrificial pattern. The cross, that is to say, is not a sacrifice human beings make to God; it is fundamentally God's act, and as such the inversion of the sacrificial system."[136] In this new sacrificial system, humanity has nothing to contribute. Moreover, it should be noted that this expansion is located in the *grace* section. For Paul, Jesus' forgiving death is about grace; it is all about grace.

4.3.1.4 *Galatians 2:20*

ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός· ὃ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί, ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ.

In the previous section, it was suggested that Galatians 1:4 shows the kernel of Paul's gospel preached in Galatia, but this is not the only text which presents the core of his gospel. One can also find "the essence of the gospel here in 2:20 with an emphasis on Christ's love and sacrificial self-giving."[137] As repeatedly shown in the previous sections (4.3.1.1–4.3.1.3), the verb παραδίδωμι in v.20b "refers to Christ's death on the cross."[138] This interpretation has support also from the immediate context of Galatians 2:20 since the context elaborates the effect of Jesus' death. In particular, it is clearly shown in v.19 and v.21, which mention 'crucified with Christ,'[139] and 'Christ died' respectively. Particularly for v.21, Shauf correctly argues that logically speaking, "the mention of Christ's death in v.21 makes sense only because of the reference to his crucifixion and giving of himself (παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν) in v.20."[140] Therefore, it seems clear that "the death of Christ is described by Paul as his being 'given up.'"[141]

---

[136] Martyn, *Galatians*, 91.

[137] Longenecker, *Galatians*, 94. Similarly, according to de Boer, "Paul's Use," 189, Galatians 2:15–21 "is a contextualized summary of 'the gospel.'" Cf. Schreiner, *Galatians*, 150.

[138] Betz, *Galatians*, 125.

[139] Galatians 3:1, which is the next verse after Galatians 2:21, also describes Jesus Christ as ἐσταυρωμένος.

[140] Scott Shauf, "Galatians 2.20 in Context," *NTS* 52 (2006): 86–101, 96.

[141] Bruce, *Galatians*, 145. Cf. Victor Paul Furnish, *II Corinthians: Translated with Introduction, Notes, and Commentary*, AB 32A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984), 326. Dunn, *Galatians*, 146, points out that "as elsewhere in Paul (Rom. v.10; viii.32), the thought of Jesus as God's Son is tied in to the thought of Jesus' death." Moreover, if the phrase ἐν πίστει . . . τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ is taken as subjective genitive ("by faith[fulness] of the Son of God"), this can be interpreted as "a summary description of Christ's faithful death" (Richard B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1—4:11* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002], 287). However, Jermo van Nes cau-

The last two words in the passage ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ personalize the significance of Jesus' death. Other giving-up formulae contain ὑπὲρ/διὰ (. . .) ἡμῶν, but this text changes the personal pronoun from plural to singular, especially to first person singular.[142] This short prepositional expression does not include sin or trespass as in Romans 4:25, and Galatians 1:4. Therefore, one may contend that "the expiatory significance of Jesus' death is even less in view here than in the salutation."[143] However, even if the words for sin are missing, there is a good reason to take ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ as 'for the forgiveness of my sins.' The context speaks of justification "by using δικαιόω ('justify') three times in verse 16, one in verse 17, and then the related noun δικαιοσύνη ('righteousness') in verse 21."[144] The text is overwhelmingly surrounded by the idea of justification. As shown earlier, forgiveness is indeed integral to justification, and thus, this 'for me' phrase within the context of justification probably means 'forgiveness of my sins.'

Moreover, the interpretation that justification is integral to forgiveness is drawn from Romans 4:6–8 (section 4.2.2). At the beginning of Romans 4, Paul cites Genesis 15:6 and Psalm 32:1–2 in order to develop his argument. For Paul, therefore, the idea of justification and the Genesis text are indispensable to each other. Interestingly enough, Genesis 15:6 does appear in the immediate context of Galatians 2:20. In Galatians 3:6, Paul cites the Genesis text to elaborate the core of his preaching, that is, justification by faith in Jesus. Therefore, Paul's conception of forgiveness as justification is also in effect in the context of Galatians 2:20. This probably suggests that the context projects the meaning of forgiveness onto the text.

The giving-up formulae in Romans are expressed in the passive form, but those in Galatians are in the active form. From this change, most scholars concur with Hooker that "Jesus' own role is understood as less passive and more active: he is not only 'given up' by God on our behalf . . . but 'gives himself up' for our sakes."[145] From the twin facts that "Christ is the subject

---

tiously reminds the readers of the fact that the debate on whether the *pistis Christou* phrase would better be interpreted as a subjective genitive or an objective genitive "still continues to be debated among NT scholars" ("'Faith[fullness] of the Son of God'? Galatians 2:20b Reconsidered," *NovT* 55 [2013]: 127–39, 128–29).

[142] As Dunn, *Galatians*, 147, states, the significance of Jesus' death is "radically personalized."

[143] Furnish, "He Gave," 120.

[144] Debbie Hunn, "Pistis Christou in Galatians: The Connection to Habakkuk 2:4," *TynBul* 63 (2012): 75–92, 80. See also Thomas D. Stegman SJ, "Paul's Use of *Dikaio*-terminology: Moving beyond N.T. Wright's Forensic Interpretation," *TS* 72 (2011): 496–524, 507, where he indicates that the immediate context of Galatians 2:20 exhibits "a flurry of instances of the verb *dikaioō* (four times in 2:16–17)."

[145] Morna D. Hooker, "Interchange and Atonement," *BJRL* 60 (1978): 462–81, 480. Both Bruce, *Galatians*, 146, and Longenecker, *Galatians*, 94, concur with her by quoting the exactly same citation.

and the action is reflexive," it can be argued that "it is the active role of the Son of God that is emphasized."[146] According to Paul, Jesus willed to die on the cross. The prevailing scholarly view seems to be that Paul "modified a formula concerning this atoning death."[147] If so, it can be concluded that the basic content of the formula in Galatians 2:20 is at least pre-Pauline.

Concerning the pre-Pauline aspect and its development, Perrin proposes that Romans 4:25 is the oldest form of the soteriological *(para)didonai* tradition and the active *(para)didonai* version (Gal 1:4; 2:20) is developed later because Romans 4:25 "has the passive of *paradidonai* and it uses *dia* rather than the *hyper* which established itself so strongly in the Hellenistic Christian."[148] However, Galatians was written before Romans irrespective of whether Galatians is dated by the early date or the late date. If the passive παραδίδωμι with διά were employed in Paul's earlier epistles, and the later epistles predominantly presented the active verb form with ὑπέρ, this argument could be persuasive. However, this is not the case in the Pauline corpus. Moreover, one of the early confessional formulae in 1 Corinthians 15:3, "Christ died for our sins," also has Christ as the subject. Therefore, this hypothesis is possible, but not fully satisfying.

Rather, it seems more plausible that the understanding of the passive and the active originate together. Jesus' second and third passion-predictions of his death have παραδίδωμι, usually in the passive form, and when it is in the active form, the subject is 'the high priest and the scribes' (Matthew 20:19; Mark 10:33). However, if the historical Jesus indeed spoke of his being handed over by himself and he did not flee from his fate, his followers probably understood Jesus' death as both active and passive: active according to his action, passive according to God's will. Originally, this self-sacrifice is caused by God's will, and thus this act can be understood as passive. However, Jesus does this not reluctantly at all, but willingly. In this sense, Dunn's argument that "the main inspiration [of the formula] will probably have been the recollection of Jesus' own willing self-sacrifice for his own"[149] is very

---

[146] Bruce, *Galatians*, 145. Just as in Galatians 1:4, therefore, the following scholars mention either "voluntary," or "self-" for this act of Jesus: Betz, *Galatians*, 126; Burton, *Galatians*, 139; Dunn, *Galatians*, 147; Furnish, "He Gave," 115; Hays, *Faith*, 155; Jonathan A. Linebaugh, "The Christo-Centrism of Faith in Christ: Martin Luther's Reading of Galatians 2.16, 19–20," *NTS* 59 (2013): 535–44, 543; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 94; Martyn, *Galatians*, 259; Schreiner, *Galatians*, 173; Stegman, "Paul's *Dikaio*-terminology," 509.

[147] de Boer, "Paul's Use," 205, where he links Galatians 2:20 with 1 Corinthians 15:3. For the view that formula is modified, see Dunn, *Galatians*, 147; Martyn, *Galatians*, 259.

[148] Perrin, *Modern Pilgrimage*, 101. He even includes Mark 10:45 in the "soteriological *[para]didonai* tradition."

[149] Dunn, *Galatians*, 147. He also finds another line of influence from "the idea of the martyr's willingly giving his life." Witherington, *Grace*, 192, states, "Dunn may well be right that the main inspiration for these phrases comes from the Jesus tradition."

likely. The letter to Galatia is an important epistle since in it Paul defends himself and his gospel. Particularly, "the Christology and soteriology of Galatians 2 are profound. Christ is none other than the Son of God, who died to save sinners (2:20)."[150]

4.3.1.5 *Concluding Remarks*

So far, the four texts which can be grouped in the giving-up formula in Paul's letters have been discussed.[151] According to the analysis, there are three common features they share. First and foremost, the formulaic texts undoubtedly indicate Jesus' death and clarify its significance. The significance of his death is described in such a way that the forgiveness of sins is either directly mentioned (Rom 4:25; Gal 1:4) or clearly included in the benefits of Jesus' death (Rom 8:32; Gal 2:20). This effect is well reflected by the ὑπέρ-prepositional phrase (and διά in Romans 4:25), either of a shorter form, 'for me/us,' or of the fullest form, 'for our sins.'

The next shared feature is that all four texts are considered as pre-Pauline, or Paul's reworking of pre-Pauline kerygmatic formula: they contain pre-Pauline elements, if not the formula itself. Thus, it appears that the central point of the formula, Jesus' death granting forgiveness, had been formulated prior to the time when Paul wrote his letters. This means that this formula must have been formed in the earliest Christian era, that is, in the first 10-15 years at the latest.

The last feature is that Jesus' death is understood as God's gracious gift. It seems that "Paul understands Christ's death to entail that salvation is free."[152] It is God and Jesus who act for humanity, rather than vice versa. Again, therefore, it is all about grace. As Betz states, "for Paul there is no possibility of conceiving of Christians as living outside of the realm of God's grace."[153]

4.3.2 The Dying Formula

The dying formula (or dying-for formula)[154] which consists of ἀποθνήσκω with the ὑπέρ-prepositional phrase, usually has Χριστός as a subject.[155]

---

[150] Maureen W. Yeung, "Boundaries in 'In-Christ Identity': Paul's View on Table Fellowship and Its Implications for Ethnic Identities," in Cook and Pao, *After Imperialism*, 154–74, 158.

[151] There are four more texts which include the giving-up formula in the disputed Pauline epistles: Ephesians 5:2, 25; 1 Timothy 2:6; Titus 2:14. All of them are expressed in the active voice.

[152] David E. Garland, "Paul's Defense of the Truth of the Gospel Regarding Gentiles (Galatians 2:15–3:22)," *RevExp* 91 (1994): 165–81, 170.

[153] Betz, *Galatians*, 120.

[154] Hengel, *Atonement*, 36, uses the term, but he includes Gal 2:21, which does not have ὑπέρ. For an alternative designation, see Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 175, who calls it the

Therefore, the formula itself refers to Jesus' death, and his death and its significance are indissolubly linked in the formula. The texts containing the dying formula show Jesus' death more clearly than the 'giving-up' formula texts do. The two formulae exhibit this ostensible difference, but what they describe is same: the significance of Jesus' death. In this sense, Breytenbach argues that these two are "alternative ways of referring to the same action."[156] The texts which can be categorized in this group are Romans 5:6–10; 14:15; 1 Corinthians 8:11; 15:3; 2 Corinthians 5:14–15, 21; 1 Thessalonians 5:9–10. Of these six texts, 1 Corinthians 15:3 is crystal clear that Jesus died *for the sins of humanity* by employing ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν. The other 5 passages contain the shorter form, 'ὑπέρ + person(al pronoun).'[157]

4.3.2.1 *Romans 5:6–10*

Ἔτι γὰρ Χριστὸς ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν ἔτι κατὰ καιρὸν[158] ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανεν. μόλις γὰρ ὑπὲρ δικαίου τις ἀποθανεῖται· ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τάχα τις καὶ τολμᾷ ἀποθανεῖν συνίστησιν δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός, ὅτι ἔτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν. πολλῷ οὖν μᾶλλον δικαιωθέντες νῦν ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ σωθησόμεθα δι' αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς. εἰ γὰρ ἐχθροὶ ὄντες κατηλλάγημεν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, πολλῷ μᾶλλον καταλλαγέντες σωθησόμεθα ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ·

"'died for' formulae," and Karl P. Donfried, "The Theology of 1 Thessalonians," in *The Theology of the Shorter Pauline Letters*, ed. Karl P. Donfried, and I. Howard Marshall, NTT (Cambridge: CUP, 1993), 28–63, 35, who translates "*Sterbensformel*" as "death formula."

[155] Hurtado indicates that "the term 'Christ' [is] frequently used by Paul in creedal-like statements referring to Jesus' death and resurrection" ("Divine Sonship," 228). More specifically, Gerhardsson, "Evidence," 81, indicates that "the appellation Christ is closely connected with the death of Jesus in the Pauline material." Cf. Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, trans. James W. Leitch, ed. George W. MacRae, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 254.

[156] Breytenbach, "Septuagint Version," 344. He also considers the usage of προαποθνήσκω and περιδίδωμι in the writing of Philo, *Spec.Laws* 3.154, where he seems to employ both verbs as synonyms. (cf. the verb ἀποθνήσκω in 3.153). Breytenbach also points out that Aelius Aristides (*Panathenaicus*, 118–119 [I.87]) matches ἐπιδίδωμι ὑπέρ to ἀποθνήσκω ὑπέρ. Also see Aelian, *Varia Historia*, 12.28, where the same story of Leo's three daughters is told. In this early third-century writing, the giving-up formula is still used to denote the death of its subject because the verb ἐπιδίδωμι is paralleled to σφαγιάζομαι (to sacrifice). By the daughter's sacrifice, moreover, the city is saved (σωθῆναι).

[157] Comparing the other dying formula texts with 1 Corinthians 15:3, which has the longer ὑπέρ-prepositional phrase, Hengel, *Atonement*, 36, argues that "ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν means 'for the forgiveness of our sins.'"

[158] If we take κατὰ καιρὸν (v.6) as "at that time," as Käsemann, *Romans*, 137, argues, the verse can be translated as "for while we were still weak, at that time Christ died for the ungodly." Then, it means the death of Jesus "happened at a most *inappropriate* moment" (Cousar, *Theology*, 44). Again, it is about grace.

There can be no doubt that Paul speaks of Jesus' death in this text because for Paul, "what has made a difference is the death of Jesus."[159] More than that, he is striving to emphasize it, and not simply express it. The repetition of ἀποθνήσκω in vv.6–8 is not just a plain deployment of the verb; rather, Paul seems to locate them strategically. As Dunn states, "the emphasis is striking: the thematic repetition of the word 'die' at the end of each of the four sentences would scarcely be missed by those hearing the letter read out."[160]

Based on its context, 'ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν' in Romans 5:8 can certainly mean 'for our sins.' In the immediate context of Romans 5, Romans 4:25 is located at the end of the chapter four, and so the physical location of Romans 4:25 is very close to Romans 5:6–10. As clearly seen in 4.3.1.1, Romans 4:25a closely links Jesus' death with forgiveness of sins by employing one of the earliest creedal formulae, 'handed over for our sins.' This logical flow continues from the end of Romans 4 to the beginning of Romans 5, and the idea of Jesus' death as a means of forgiveness remains the same. Therefore, it is safe to argue that the benefits of Jesus' death 'for us' can include forgiveness in this context.[161]

Just as the literary context provides good logical grounds for equating 'for us' with 'for our sins,' the historical context also suggests that this is the case. Verse 7 seems to indicate the martyr's death which is usually for religious and patriotic purposes. It should be mentioned that Paul "must have known and cherished the example of the heroes of the Maccabean revolution whose deaths had been interpreted as sacrifices for the benefit of the people."[162]

---

[159] Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 399. Verse 9 also mentions 'his blood,' which "signifies Christ's death as a sacrifice for sins" (Moo, *Romans*, 310). The word ἐκχέω in v.5, which is common in the last supper narrative (Matt 26:28; Mark 14:24; Luke 22:20; cf. Matt 23:35; Luke 11:50), also supports the 'sacrificial death' image. Moreover, the noun form of (ἀπο)θνήσκω, θάνατος (v.10) linked with τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ reinforces the 'death' imagery.

[160] Dunn, *Romans*, 1:266. Especially for v.6, Dunn contends that "the sentence is awkwardly constructed, partly because Paul chooses to put the subject and verb at the two places of emphasis (beginning and end of the sentence)" (254). Cf. Anthony J. Guerra, *Romans and the Apologetic Tradition: The Purpose, Genre and Audience of Paul's Letter*, SNTSMS 81 (Cambridge: CUP, 1995), 128; Käsemann, *Romans*, 138; Moo, *Romans*, 306.

[161] Murray, *Romans*, 169, also admits that in vv.6 and 8 "there is no further amplification of the specific character of the work accomplished in Jesus' death or of the kind of benefit accruing to the ungodly from that accomplishment" (similar to John Ziesler, *Paul's Letter to the Romans*, TPINTC [London: SCM, 1989], 140–41). However, Murray continues, "the apostle had done that earlier in 3:21–26; 4:25. And that delineation was to be assumed in verses 6 and 8."

[162] Klaus Haacker, *The Theology of Paul's Letter to the Romans*, NTT (Cambridge: CUP, 2003), 133. Dunn, *Romans*, 1:255, contends that Paul and "his contemporaries were familiar with this thought of dying for the law(s) or for the nation." In addition, Käsemann, *Romans*, 134, also points out that the wording in 5:3b "may have its origin in the days of the Maccabean persecution."

Besides, it can be argued that the benefit of their death to the people included forgiveness because they 'became a ransom for the sin of the nation' (ἀντίψυχον γεγονότας τῆς τοῦ ἔθνους ἁμαρτίας; 4 Macc 17:21, cf. 2 Macc 7:32, 33, 37). If, in v.7, Paul is comparing and contrasting the martyr's noble death with Jesus' death to show the superiority of the latter, 'died for us' can be understood as a short form of 'died for our sins.'

Moreover, the text itself seems to suggest this idea as well. The identity of the 'us' for whom Jesus died is 'sinners' as in v.8b. Therefore, it is plausible that Christ died "for us, sinners"[163] means Christ died 'for our sins.' Verse 8 elaborates the benefits of Jesus' vicarious and representative death for sinners. If this death is indeed vicarious – Jesus died on behalf of sinners – this probably indicates that Jesus' death "accomplished atonement for sinners, in that he took the punishment [they] deserved."[164] Furthermore, 'justified through his blood' (v.9) means that "justification is effected by the death of Jesus,"[165] and thus, it can be interchangeable with 'forgiven through Jesus' death' based on the fact that justification is integral to forgiveness (4.2.2).

The next verse can warrant this interpretation of v.9 on the grounds of the parallel in vv.9 and 10.[166] To begin with, this parallel can be noticed by "the close connexion . . . between reconciliation and justification."[167] Moreover, 'his blood' (v.9) is in parallel with 'the death of his son' (v.10), and it is most likely that the latter "is synonymous with the [former]."[168] Further, πολλῷ μᾶλλον and σωθησόμεθα are repeated. Recognising this clear parallelism between the two verses, Morris argues that reconciliation "is a concept Paul uses a number of times to bring out the significance of the cross . . . . From this point of view the cross meant doing away with sin, breaking down the barrier that kept God and people apart."[169] This being the case, 'reconciled by his death' (v.10) can also convey the meaning of forgiveness. If v.9 and v.10 may speak of the same event, forgiveness, by utilizing different metaphors, this fact allows 'died for us' (v.8) to mean 'died to forgive our sins.' All these interpretations connect Jesus' death with forgiveness of sins as its

[163] Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 400. Cf. Leon Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 223. Moreover, it should be noted that in Jesus' time, a sinful human being seemed to be naturally identified with his/her sin: personal wrongdoing was interchangeable with the person as a sinner (see 111n106). Therefore, as in Romans 5, where the context clarifies the identity of 'us' as sinners, the expression 'died for us' is another expression of 'died for our sins.'

[164] Schreiner, *Romans*, 260. This suggests that their sins are forgiven.

[165] Käsemann, *Romans*, 138. Ziesler, *Romans*, 141, also finds "the link between cross and justification," and interprets the phrase in v.9 as "Christ's dying for our sins."

[166] Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:265, calls the two verses "two parallel statements." Cf. Murray, *Romans*, 172.

[167] Ibid., 1:267 (but he does not interpret the two terms as synonyms).

[168] Murray, *Romans*, 174. Cf. Barrett, *Romans*, 100; Dunn, *Romans*, 1:259, 268.

[169] Morris, *Romans*, 225.

result. Therefore, it is plausible to interpret 'died for us' in Romans 5:8 as 'died for our sins.' The dying formula in Romans 5:6–10 can clearly show that Jesus' death effects forgiveness of sins.

Before moving on, it should be mentioned that Jesus' death as "oboedientia passiva"[170] should not be confused with the idea that Jesus' attitude towards the cross was passive, not active. The noble death for the righteous and the good (v.7) can be understood as the martyr's death. If so, generally speaking, the death of a martyr is not passive, but rather it is active.[171] The point in v.7 is that this noble death can hardly be seen because the occurrence of this death is rare, rather than that this death is passive, and thus, unwilling. By juxtaposing v.6 and v.7, Paul is "comparing Christ's readiness to die with the unreadiness men would show in more favourable circumstances."[172]

4.3.2.2 *Romans 14:15 and 1 Corinthians 8:11*

Romans 14:15 εἰ γὰρ διὰ βρῶμα ὁ ἀδελφός σου λυπεῖται, οὐκέτι κατὰ ἀγάπην περιπατεῖς· μὴ τῷ βρώματί σου ἐκεῖνον ἀπόλλυε ὑπὲρ οὗ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν.

1 Corinthians 8:11 ἀπόλλυται γὰρ ὁ ἀσθενῶν ἐν τῇ σῇ γνώσει, ὁ ἀδελφὸς δι' ὃν Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν.

Romans 14:15 may also suggest that Jesus' death effects forgiveness, as the phrase ἀποθνήσκω ὑπέρ in Romans 5:6–10 is understood in this way. Here, the passage includes the shorter form of the ὑπέρ-phrase, and thus the context decides whether this phrase means 'for the person' generally, or 'for the sins' specifically. Acknowledging the phrase as "the echo of the well-established creedal and evangelistic formula," Dunn states that "as all recent commentators agree, what is in view in ἀπόλλυμι is final eschatological ruin, the oppo-

---

[170] Karl Barth, *Der Römerbrief* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1933), 136. Richard N. Longenecker, *Introducing Romans: Critical Issues in Paul's Most Famous Letter* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 342, also calls it "passive obedience." This theological idiom can confuse readers, but it originates from Latin *passivus* which can mean both suffering and passive. In this case, accurately speaking, the idiom means 'Passion(al) obedience.'

[171] Eleazar, one of the Jewish martyrs, willed to 'die happily' (ἀπευθανατίζειν; 2 Macc 6:28). The seven martyred brothers were 'ready to die' (ἕτοιμοι ἀποθνήσκειν; 2 Macc 7:2), and their mother threw herself into the fire (4 Macc 17:1).

[172] Barrett, *Romans*, 99. Cf. Dunn, *Romans*, 1:257. If Jesus' death is described as obedience, this is active and willing obedience because this is "the act of self-giving" (Schreiner, *Romans*, 260), and "self-sacrifice" (Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:264; Richard B. Hays, "Christ Died for the Ungodly: Narrative Soteriology in Paul?" *HBT* 26 [2004]: 48–68, 58). It should be noted that the text presents this active death as the expression of the love of God (Rom 5:8). In this regard, Ralph P. Martin succinctly states that "it is the gift of God which no one can merit or earn" ("Reconciliation: Romans 5:1–11," in Soderlund and Wright, *Romans*, 36–48, 42). Dunn, *Romans*, 1:260, similarly states, "Paul sees the initiative wholly as God's."

site of the final judgment of acquittal."[173] If 'destroy' can be interpreted as 'eschatological destruction,' and as the antonym of 'eschatological acquittal,' it is plausible that 'died for' can be seen as the saving effect, which affects even the future, and as the antonym of 'destroy.' Therefore, this 'Christ died for' expression may show "the saving significance of the death of Christ."[174] If so, forgiveness is already assumed.

In Romans 14, Paul develops his argument firmly based on Jesus' death and its significance, although the focus of his argument is not on the elaboration of the significance of Jesus' death. This fact indicates that Jesus' death was central for Paul and for the Christians in Rome. Paul and they shared this idea, and its significance was seared into their consciousness. Therefore, Paul used Jesus' death as the starting point of his argument because he knew that the Roman Christians would entirely agree to this common ground. If this is the case, while developing his argument, Paul unconsciously uncovers the center of his gospel, Jesus' death and its significance.

According to Reasoner, there is considerable overlap between Romans 14:15 and 1 Corinthians 8:11 because of "the combination of ὑπὲρ οὗ/δι' ὃν Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ('one for whom Christ died') with a form of ἀπόλλυμι ('destroy')."[175] In addition to that, three more words are significant: ὁ ἀδελφός, ἀσθενέω, and βρῶμα. Whilst the first noun appears in each text,[176] the second and the third words are incorporated only in one or other of them, but appear in the broader contexts of both.[177] More importantly, βρῶμα is seldom used in the uncontested Pauline writings.[178] Other than the above-mentioned passages, these are the only places that the word can be found: 1 Corinthians 3:2; 6:13 (twice); 10:3 (cf. 1 Tim 4:3). This also indicates the

---

[173] Dunn, *Romans*, 2:821.

[174] Käsemann, *Romans*, 138. Black, *Romans*, 168, also interprets 'Christ died for' as "Christ had saved." Cf. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 696.

[175] Mark Reasoner, *The Strong and the Weak: Romans 14.1–15.13 in Context*, SNTSMS 103 (Cambridge: CUP, 1999), 28. As in Romans 14, commentators consider this 'destruction' as "the opposite of the effect of Christ's death" (Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 348).

[176] Here one can find "a strong assertion of [Paul's] sense of responsibility for his brother" (William F. Orr and James Arthur Walther, *I Corinthians: A New Translation*, AB 32 [Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976], 235) because the brother is the one for whom Jesus died.

[177] The second word ἀσθενέω is present in 1 Corinthians 8:11, and can also be found in both contexts: 1 Corinthians 8:12, and Romans 14:1–2. Some manuscripts do contain the verb in Rom 14:21 as a textual variant. Moreover, the other ἀσθεν-words appear in the context of both texts: ἀσθενής in 1 Corinthians 8:7, 9–10, and ἀσθένημα in Romans 15:1. The third word βρῶμα occurs two times only in Romans 14:15, but, in their contexts, Romans 14:20, and 1 Corinthians 8:8, 13 contain the noun.

[178] Speaking of rarity of word occurrence in Paul, two rare words πρόσκομμα and σκανδαλίζω appear in the context of both texts. Outside Rom 14 and 1 Cor 8, the former occurs only in Rom 9:32–33 and the latter appears only once in 2 Cor 11:29.

close relationship of these passages in Romans and 1 Corinthians, which share unique terms.

Based on these surprising similarities between the two texts, 'Christ died for' in both texts probably has the same meaning. No scholar denies that this simple notion of 'Christ died for' in both texts signifies the "redemptive and saving death"[179] of Jesus. Even though these texts involve no more than a passing remark on 'Christ died for,' it seems to speak about Jesus' redemptive, therefore forgiving, death and his "act of self-giving love."[180]

4.3.2.3 *1 Corinthians 15:3*[181]

παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις, ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον, ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφάς

As mentioned earlier (4.3.2), this is the text that most clearly shows the indissoluble relationship between Jesus' death and 'forgiveness of sins' in the Pauline literature. If only a single pericope were chosen to investigate their relationship, this must be the text. Simply and clearly, it states that 'Christ died for our sins.' As most scholars agree, this phrase can be interpreted as "he died to take away our sin,"[182] or more specifically, as he died "for the

---

[179] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 654. For similar views which find the saving significance of Jesus' death in this text, see Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 149; Victor Paul Furnish, *The Theology of the First Letter to the Corinthians*, NTT (Cambridge: CUP, 1999), 4 (Furnish places 1 Cor 8:11 together with 1 Cor 15:3, 'Christ died for our sins' [127], which indicates that he understands 1 Cor 8 in the light of 1 Cor 15); Michael Li-Tak Shen, *Canaan to Corinth: Paul's Doctrine of God and the Issue of Food Offered to Idols in 1 Corinthians 8:1–11:1*, StBibLit 83 (New York: Lang, 2010), 148.

[180] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 654. Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Louisville: WJK, 1993), 242, describes it as "the ultimate self-sacrifice." This means that at least these two exegetes find Jesus' own initiative in his death from 1 Corinthians 8.

[181] Robert M. Price, "Apocryphal Apparitions: 1 Corinthians 15:3–11 as a Post-Pauline Interpolation," *JHC* 2 (1995): 66–99, contends that 1 Corinthians 15:1–11 is an interpolation, based on the comparison of the text with Galatians 1. However, except for Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 546, commentators usually do not mention Price's proposal at all. This suggests that Price has not won support for his proposal. As Dale C. Allison states, "Price unpersuasively argues that the tension between 1 Cor 15:3–11 (Paul's gospel is tradition) and Gal 1:1, 11–12 (Paul did not receive his gospel from human beings) demands that the whole section be excised as secondary" (*Resurrecting Jesus: The Earliest Christian Tradition and Its Interpreters* [New York: T&T Clark, 2005], 234n134).

[182] Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 724. Moreover, he clarifies that this phrase "is the language of atonement." Fee continues, "in Pauline theology this includes not only forgiveness from past sins, but in a very real sense deliverance from the bondage of one's sinfulness as well" (724–25).

forgiveness of our sins."[183] Therefore, it seems obvious that "the kerygma affirms the salvific effect of Jesus' death."[184]

According to 1 Corinthians 15:3–4, the essence of the Pauline gospel is Jesus' death and resurrection. Moreover, v.2 seems to indicate that "salvation depends upon *holding fast* to this gospel."[185] Therefore, belief in Jesus' death and resurrection can be the means of salvation, and consequently this affirmation is of critical importance for Paul. In this regard, the translation of ἐν πρώτοις in v.3a as "as of prime importance"[186] logically makes sense. For Paul, this "gospel summary"[187] was so vital that he had to inculcate the Corinthian believers with the centerpiece of the gospel and its utmost importance.

The appearance of Jesus' death in v.3, where Paul argues mainly for the historicity and the veracity of Jesus' resurrection, shows that Jesus' death is indispensable for Paul.[188] At first glance, in 1 Corinthians 15 Paul seems to

---

[183] Hengel, *Atonement*, 36. Concerning the expression Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, Frank J. Matera rightly contends that Paul "indicates that Christ's redemptive work involves the forgiveness of sins" (*God's Saving Grace: A Pauline Theology* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012], 115). Furthermore, regarding the text, Robertson and Plummer, *First Corinthians*, 333, clearly state that "there is a real connexion, beyond our comprehension, between Christ's death and the forgiveness of men's sins." Cf. McKnight, *Jesus and His Death*, 345; Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 1191n107. The following scholars find 'atonement' in this phrase: Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 255, 255n59; Orr and Walther, *I Corinthians*, 320; Ben Witherington III, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 299.

[184] Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 546. Hays, "Christ Died," 52, states that in this text and Romans 5, Paul "makes explicit soteriological claims." Although he indicates that "in 1 Cor 15:3b–5 the soteriological claim is stated but not explained," Hays understands that this pericope shows "the saving significance of Jesus' death and resurrection" (54).

[185] Orr and Walther, *I Corinthians*, 320. Since v.2 is "one of the relatively infrequent places where Paul uses the verb *sozō*" (Hays, "Christ Died," 53), v.3 is located within the soteriological context. In this regard, Hays, ibid., argues that "the content of the salvation-bringing good news is articulated in the confessional formula of vv 3b–5."

[186] Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 539, 545. Moreover, Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 1186, also understands that this phrase has "logical rather than temporal force." Similarly, Fee, *First Corinthians*, 722, and, Witherington, *Conflict*, 299, prefer its translation as "of first importance" to 'in the first place.' Likewise, Orr and Walther, *I Corinthians*, 316, render it as "with top priority." Pace Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 251, who understands the phrase ἐν πρώτοις "as referring to order." For the tripartite division (time-related, priority-related, and both aspects) of the scholarly opinions and their representatives, see Brown, *Bodily Resurrection*, 114n24.

[187] Brown, *Bodily Resurrection*, 118.

[188] Considering that in the Pauline epistles Jesus' death and resurrection are "the twin events" (N.T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, vol. 3 of *Christian Origins and the Question of God* [London: SPCK, 2003], 219; see 79n7 above), Paul could have employed 'resurrection' alone in the text. However, he would not like to omit 'death,' and this shows the crucial significance of Jesus' death in his gospel. For Paul, Jesus' death by itself has immense significance. However, Jesus' death is repeatedly linked with his resur-

mention Jesus' death in passing, but actually that is not the case. Compared with Paul's mention of Jesus' burial (v.4), which is stated indeed in passing, the description of his death cannot be considered as a passing remark although it is short.[189] The phrase κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς at the end of v.3 and v.4 indicates that this is not a passing comment. Paul assigns this phrase only to death and resurrection and makes it clear that each event is individually 'according to the Scriptures.'[190] Paul cannot undermine Jesus' death and its significance, and thus pays due attention to it even in a short remark. Therefore, it can be argued that the phrase 'died for our sins' also "expresses the heart of the gospel."[191]

The fact that this crucial essence of his gospel is not Paul's creative invention is well known by exegetes. As mentioned in section 1.2.1, 1 Corinthians 15 contains a pre-Pauline tradition. Especially for 15:3–5, "it is generally agreed that . . . Paul is repeating a very early creedal formulation."[192] Paul

---

rection. In 1 Corinthians 15:17, Paul says, "if Christ is not raised . . . you are yet *in your sins*." This verse suggests that Christ's resurrection is somehow needed to accomplish what Jesus' death effects. Death without resurrection is in vain. For a later Jewish text (Mekhilta Exod 20:7) suggesting that "without the resurrection the death has no expiatory force," see Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 255–56n66.

[189] The text contains the four verbs, died-buried-resurrected-seen. Of the four, Gerald O'Collins SJ, "Peter as Witness to Easter," *TS* 73 (2012): 263–85, 271, states Jesus' death and resurrection are "the two key affirmations." Similarly, Conzelmann, "Analysis," 21, understands the two as "the two fundamental statements." Cf. also Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 541; David Hellholm, "The Impact of the Situational Contexts for Paul's Use of Baptismal Traditions in His Letters," in Aune, Seland, and Ulrichsen, *Neotestamentica*, 147–75, 155; Theissen and Merz, *Historical Jesus*, 487. Contra W.L. Craig, "The Historicity of the Empty Tomb of Jesus," *NTS* 31 (1985): 39–67, 40, who argues "against subordinating the burial to the death." It seems that what Paul is doing here is not prioritizing the verbs. In the context, his main concern is to show that Jesus indeed died and rose again. In this sense, death and resurrection can surely be the two important statements.

[190] Regarding the scriptural basis for this phrase in relation to Jesus' death, Brown, *Bodily Resurrection*, 121, summarizes: "Isa 52:13–53:12 is typically cited as the most probable passage." Although it is true that many exegetes argue in this way, Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 546, concedes that this is possible, but asks for the evidence. Most exegetes also understand that those who formulated the creedal formula had in mind the whole OT scripture.

[191] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 1189.

[192] Fee, *First Corinthians*, 718. Cf. also William Baird, "What Is the Kerygma? A Study of I Cor 15:3–8 and Gal 1:11–17," *JBL* 76 (1957): 181–91, 186; Conzelmann, "Analysis," 18 (see ibid., 18n17 for modern scholars who contend in this direction), and Martin Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, trans. Bertram L. Woolf (London: Nicholson & Watson, 1934), 18; Reginald H. Fuller, *The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives* (London: SPCK, 1972), 10; David M. Moffitt, "Affirming the 'Creed': The Extent of Paul's Citation of an Early Christian Formula in 1 Cor 15,3b–7," *ZNW* 99 (2008): 49–73, 73; Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Paul and the Early Church*, vol. 2 of *Early Christian Mission* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004), 961; Wright, *Resurrection*, 319. Contra Robert-

preached this gospel to the Corinthian believers (v.1), and they heard him preach before he wrote this letter. More importantly, v.3a points out that this gospel is what Paul 'also received (καὶ παρέλαβον).' Therefore, this creedal formula is established not only before Paul's writing of this epistle, but also before his preaching of this gospel. This traditional formula may go back to the time of Paul's conversion. In this regard, Witherington asserts that "the creedal fragment that Paul has been citing is surely one that he taught when he was in Corinth in 51–52 and one that he received at least as early as 35."[193] If Paul received this essence soon after his conversion, it is plausible that the formulation of 'died for our sins' – the interpretation of Jesus' death as forgiveness – was established a very short time after Jesus' death. Moreover, this interpretation has not been changed since then. This very early phenomenon will be discussed later in more detail (see 4.4.1.1 below).

This old formula, which shows Jesus' forgiving death, is about grace. Verse 10 mentions χάρις three times, which underlines the importance of God's grace. This grace transforms Paul into who he is now. In fact, the expression κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς "does indeed relate this divine act of vindication and sovereign action to *the theme of promise*."[194] The God of Israel had promised this blessing before it happened. If this is "an outworking of the divine plan"[195] no matter what is done by humanity, then this can be called God's saving grace. While Paul "imbues the cross with more specifically soteriological meaning,"[196] he does not forget to mention that this redemptive work is initiated by the divine grace.

---

son and Plummer, *First Corinthians*, 333, who assert this text "is almost a creed; but we need not suppose it had already been formulated. Rather, this passage supplied material for the formulating of creeds." Their argument is possible, but it can hardly explain the existence of "un-Pauline phraseology" (Theissen and Merz, *Historical Jesus*, 487) in the pericope (see 2n3 above).

[193] Witherington, *Conflict*, 301. This is probable because "the 'creed' predates [Paul]" (Moffitt, "Affirming," 69). Conzelmann, "Analysis," 22, even maintains that "it was already widespread in Syria before the conversion of Paul." Cf. Brown, *Bodily Resurrection*, 118; Craig, "Historicity," 39. The majority of the Jesus Seminar members "think the components of the list reported [in 1 Corinthians 15] were formed prior to Paul's conversion, which is usually dated around 33 C.E." (Robert W. Funk and the Jesus Seminar, *The Acts of Jesus: The Search for the Authentic Deeds of Jesus* [San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1998], 454). However, the Fellows of the Jesus Seminar do not regard the authenticity of the phrase 'for our sins.' In vv.3b–4, the portion "Christ died" alone is colored red (which "indicates the Fellows had a relatively high level of confidence that the event actually took place" [1]), the rest is entirely in black (which the scholars see "largely or entirely fictive" [1]).

[194] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 1195.

[195] Carroll and Green, *Death of Jesus*, 128.

[196] Ibid.

4.3.2.4 *2 Corinthians 5:14–15, 21*[197]

ἡ γὰρ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ συνέχει ἡμᾶς, κρίναντας τοῦτο, ὅτι εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον· καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἵνα οἱ ζῶντες μηκέτι ἑαυτοῖς ζῶσιν ἀλλὰ τῷ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀποθανόντι καὶ ἐγερθέντι . . . τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ.

Again in this text, as in 1 Corinthians 15, "the two great elements in the gospel, Christ's death and resurrection"[198] appear as a pair. Indeed, the two essential components recur frequently in Paul's letters. Because their significance was a shared consensus among early Christians, including Paul and the followers in Corinth, Paul could argue from the firm basis of these two elements. Moreover, as mentioned in 4.3.2.3, Paul preached this message which he also had received. This means that this fundamental basis of the gospel had remained the same from the time Paul had received it to the moment of his writing of it in 1 and 2 Corinthians. Therefore, these 'great elements' are the indispensable and immovable constituent parts of the primitive Christian faith.

The death of Christ is certainly present in the passage because of the dying formula in vv.14 and 15 and two more expressions. Regarding the phrase 'through Christ' (v.18), which is located between vv.14–15 and v.21, Furnish argues that "the parallel passage, Rom 5:10, shows that *dia Christou* is to be interpreted as *dia tou thanatou tou Christou*, 'through the death of Christ.'"[199]

---

[197] Even though some commentators argue that 2 Corinthians is not entirely Pauline, the argument does not affect the current discussion. Most scholars conceive the logical break between chapters 1–9 and 10–13 as a literary problem, "however, the 'problems' are not so great for the modern interpreter that he or she cannot grasp the autobiographical and theological thrust of the present canonical form of the material" (Mark Gignilliat, *Paul and Isaiah's Servant: Paul's Theological Reading of Isaiah 40–66 in 2 Corinthians 5:14–6:10*, LNTS 330 [London: T&T Clark, 2007], 31n2). Moreover, the debate over a possible interpolation in 2 Corinthians concerns mainly chapters 10–13. The current text is thus unaffected.

[198] Paul Barnett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 287. He also states, these are "the central gospel affirmations" (320).

[199] Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 317. Furnish's argument seems convincing because of the parallel between Rom 5 and 2 Cor 5. In the NT, Paul alone employs the rare 'reconciliation' words (καταλλάσσω, and καταλλαγή), and the claim that reconciliation is accomplished through Jesus as its agent occurs only in these two texts. For scolars who interpret reconciliation as being accomplished through Jesus' death, see Barnett, *Second Corinthians*, 302; Frank J. Matera, *II Corinthians: A Commentary*, NTL (Louisville: WJK, 2003), 139; Stanley E. Porter, "Reconciliation as the Heart of Paul's Missionary Theology," in *Paul as Missionary: Identity, Activity, Theology, and Practice*, ed. Trevor J. Burke, and Brian S. Rosner, LNTS 420 (London: T&T Clark, 2011), 169–91, 175, 179; C.A. Wanamaker, "Christ as Divine Agent in Paul," *SJT* 39 (1986): 517–28, 526. Differently from this view, Cilliers Breytenbach, "Salvation of the Reconciled," in Watt, *Salvation*, 280, sees that "the διὰ Χριστοῦ phrase in verse 18 might refer to the death of Christ . . . but

Another possible way in which Paul refers to the significance of Jesus' saving death is 'made sin' (v.21). Thrall suggests that "it is to [Jesus'] death that Paul's assertion must primarily refer."[200] Because Christ's 'being made sin' occurs in the event of his death, the expression can certainly refer to Jesus' death. All three expressions point out that the idea of Jesus' death is unquestionably present in the scene.

Along with the death of Jesus, the forgiveness-theme lies at the base of this text as Paul employs (1) justification-terminology, and (2) reconciliation-language. The wording "becoming God's δικαιοσύνη" (v.21) can definitely mean 'justification.'[201] Furthermore, the participial expression μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν (v.19) can certainly be another expression for justification and can signify the meaning of forgiveness.[202] More important is that 'becoming God's righteousness' is directly linked to 'made sin,' which can imply Jesus' death.[203] Therefore, the text not only

---

it is more likely that the phrase refers to the role of the risen Christ during his encounter with Paul." However, he does not deny the 'death' image in the text by indicating that in ἐν Χριστῷ (v.19), "the reference to the death of Christ in verse 14 is reiterated."

[200] Margaret E. Thrall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark 1994–2000), 1:439. Cf. also Barnett, *Second Corinthians*, 312–13n56; Morna D. Hooker, "On Becoming the Righteousness of God: Another Look at 2 Cor 5:21," *NovT* 50 (2008): 358–75, 368; Moo, "Christology," 181. Likewise, Bell, "Sacrifice," 14, accepts that "the reference obviously includes the cross" (he indicates that it also "refers to Christ's preexistent state").

[201] Timothy Milinovich, *Now is the Day of Salvation: An Audience-Oriented Study of 2 Corinthians 5:16–6:2* (Cambridge: Lutterworth, 2012), 139n28, distinguishes and summarises the four scholarly opinions on the wording.

[202] As Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 319, suggests, the participial expression 'not reckoning their trespasses to them' in 2 Corinthians 5:19 "is doubtless an echo of Ps 31(32):2." As seen earlier in 4.2.2, this Psalm is also quoted in Romans 4:8, and the parallel between Romans 4:7a and 8 clearly equates 'being forgiven' with 'not reckoning sin.' Therefore, the expression in 2 Corinthians 5:19 can be understood in terms of Romans 4, and thus it probably means "verdict of acquittal" (Milinovich, *Now*, 136; he also comments regarding vv.19–20 that "Christ's death on the cross for all has the effect of wiping away the transgressions of the world"). Moreover, the expression is also connected to reconciliation (v.19), another expression which conveys forgiveness. Considering that "the language of 5:19 recalls Ps. 32:2 (LXX 31:2)," Cousar, *Theology*, 80, comments that "the reconciled can count on forgiveness."

[203] The phrases 'made sin' and 'becoming God's righteousness' are connected by the ἵνα, which clarifies that the purpose of 'made sin' is 'becoming God's righteousness.' The expression 'made sin' is also directly connected to another ὑπέρ-phrase 'for us,' and in this soteriological context, the 'for us' seems to signify forgiveness. Even though 'made sin' is a preferred translation to 'made sin-offering,' the theme of sin offering is certainly in vv.14f. Bell, "Sacrifice," 13, is the representative scholar who argues *against* the rendering of 'sin-offering,' but argues *for* the presence of the theme in the text. See ibid. for his four-fold argument against the translation of 'sin-offering.'

indicates Jesus' death but also links the idea to the concept of justification, to which forgiveness is integral.

Moreover, 'reconciliation through Christ' (v.18) can obviously suggest Jesus' death effecting forgiveness. The reconciliation-terms (καταλλάσσω and its cognate) convey a similar meaning of justification because v.19 juxtaposes the justification-motif ('not reckoning their trespasses to them') with the reconciliation-terms (both a noun and a verb).[204] Since forgiveness is integral to justification, one can argue that forgiveness and reconciliation are also closely related (section 3.4.2). Consequently, it is likely that in Paul's mind, 'reconciliation through Christ('s death)' signifies the forgiveness of sins through Jesus' death.

Since the terms related to justification and reconciliation are directly linked to Jesus' death in 2 Corinthians 5, it can be said that the context of the ὑπέρ-phrases in vv.14–15, 21 denotes Jesus' death as the medium of eschatological salvation.[205] As argued previously in section 4.2.3, the preposition ὑπέρ "cannot in and of itself bear the weight of any particular theory of the

---

[204] Milinovich, *Now*, 113n11, argues that "justification and reconciliation are nearly synonymous."

[205] In addition to justification and reconciliation, the term 'new creation' (v.17) can also be considered as a soteriological term. The trend which discusses the term has been from the perspective of Isaianic influence (Barnett, *Second Corinthians*, 296–97n44, 297n49; note the shared terms in Isa 42–43, 48 and 2 Cor 5 such as τὰ ἀρχαῖα, ἰδού, καινά) and the Second Temple Judaism literature (L.L. Welborn, *End to Enmity: Paul and the 'Wrongdoer' of Second Corinthians*, BZNW 185 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011], 211n1023). Based on these texts, therefore, 'new creation' has been understood as cosmological soteriology. Differently from this trend, two recent studies have been published by Moyer V. Hubbard and T. Ryan Jackson (*New Creation in Paul's Letters and Thought*, SNTSMS 119 [Cambridge: CUP, 2002]; *New Creation in Paul's Letters: A Study of the Historical and Social Setting of a Pauline Concept*, WUNT II/272 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010] respectively). The former emphasizes individualistic soteriology which has been disregarded by the major trend, and the latter suggests a balanced approach to embrace both cosmological and individualistic soteriology. On the grounds of these two recent studies, one can argue that at least the 'new creation' includes the individualistic approach to salvation. Personally speaking, the context seems to be more about individual salvation. The word τις (v.17) seems to signify the individual level of Pauline soteriology because Paul's usage of the indefinite pronoun "designates a specific individual in 2:5, 10:7, etc" (Welborn, *End to Enmity*, 210; Hubbard, *New Creation*, 178–79, also argues that its parallel with ἡμεῖς [v.21b] suggests the anthropological-soteriological emphasis). There is no doubt that Pauline soteriology has to do with individual believers, but the effect of salvation overcomes anthropological boundary; salvation affects communal and cosmological dimensions as well. The 'new creation' (or new creature) in Galatians 6:15 supports this broader understanding of communal soteriology, as Jackson, *New Creation*, 6, 83, 137, argues that by καινὴ κτίσις, Paul means "infused soteriology" in triple aspect: individual, communal, and cosmological. Even if the Pauline soteriology found in this text has a triple spectrum, one particular spectrum is essential for this study: individual.

atonement."[206] Again, the decisive factor for its meaning is the context. Hence, based on *its soteriological context*, the shorter ὑπέρ-phrases 'for all/them' (vv.14–15) and 'for us' (v.21) can be seen as the specifically soteriological ὑπέρ-phrase, rather than the generally beneficial ὑπέρ.

Most, if not all, scholars consider vv.14–15 as Paul's restatement of the traditional formula. Among those scholars, some even find "its most complete form in 1 Cor 15:3."[207] If so, the Corinthian believers would understand the shortened prepositional clauses ('for them/us') as implying the longer form ('for their/our sins'). It seems that although the clause is in a short form, to mention the brief form might be enough for Paul to communicate his intent because Paul quoted the renowned tradition including 'for our sins' in his previous letter to the Corinthians and the context of this text is soteriological. Therefore, the short form of the ὑπέρ-phrases in the text may represent the full form to denote forgiveness of sins on the grounds that the ὑπέρ-clauses in vv.14–15 seem to "[refer] to Christ's vicarious death."[208]

If so, all three expressions for Jesus' death – the dying formula, 'through Christ,' and 'made sin' – are directly linked to the expressions for forgiveness. Hence, one can argue that the forgiveness-theme is fully present in this episode, and the theme is linked with Jesus' death.[209] Concerning Jesus' death

---

[206] Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 310. He further states that "one cannot be certain, on the basis of the traditional formula alone, whether the statement that one has died for all presupposes a 'substitutionary' interpretation of Christ's death" (327). For the scholars who emphasize the importance of context for deciding the meaning of the the shorter ὑπέρ-phrases, see 91n42 above.

[207] Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 310, 325. The following scholars argue that the dying formula in v.14 originates specifically from 1 Cor 15: Barnett, *Second Corinthians*, 288n9; Murray J. Harris, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 420. Regarding 2 Cor 5:21, Travis, "Christ as Bearer," 336, argues that Paul "is probably reworking traditional material." Cf. Martyn, *Galatians*, 318. If vv.14–15 and/or v.21 are the adaptations of pre-Pauline tradition, this presupposes the existence of the pre-Pauline traditions.

[208] Barnett, *Second Corinthians*, 288–89n9. The discussion on the precise meaning of ὑπέρ – whether it is substitutive, or representative – still continues. In either interpretation, however, scholars end up suggesting that the phrase means 'atoning,' or 'redemptive.' Jeffrey W. Aernie also understands ὑπέρ to denote both meanings (*Is Paul Also among the Prophets? An Examination of the Relationship between Paul and the Old Testament Prophetic Tradition in 2 Corinthians*, LNTS 467 [London: T&T Clark, 2012], 146, 149). Cf. Hubbard, *New Creation*, 172; Wright, *Paul*, 2:865. Pace J.D.G. Dunn, "Paul's Understanding of the Death of Jesus as Sacrifice," in *Sacrifice and Redemption: Durham Essays in Theology*, ed. S.W. Sykes (Cambridge: CUP, 1991), 35–56, 50–52, who accepts the representative meaning of ὑπέρ as a better reading than the substitutionary.

[209] Therefore, for Augustine (*Civ*. 20.6), it is not odd at all to link 5:14–15 with Romans 4:25 (section 4.3.1.1).

dispensing forgiveness in this text, a final brief comment can be made: this love of Christ (v.14) stems from God's 'grace' (6:1).[210]

4.3.2.5 *1 Thessalonians 5:9–10*

ὅτι οὐκ ἔθετο ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ὀργὴν ἀλλ' εἰς περιποίησιν σωτηρίας διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀποθανόντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἵνα εἴτε γρηγορῶμεν εἴτε καθεύδωμεν ἅμα σὺν αὐτῷ ζήσωμεν.

So far, it has been shown that the dying formulae consistently speak of the significance of Jesus' redemptive death. As he did by employing the formula in Romans, and 1 and 2 Corinthians, Paul reiterates its significance in 1 Thessalonians. According to Fee, this text "presents us with all the essential data for Paul's understanding of 'salvation in Christ.' In Paul's own order – the *goal*: 'the obtaining of salvation'; the *agent*: 'through our Lord Jesus Christ'; and the *means*: 'who died on our behalf.'"[211] Of these three essential data, the most important datum for this section is the last: the means.

As in the two previous texts, 1 Corinthians 15:3, and 2 Corinthians 5:14–15, 21, Paul takes advantage of this dying formula to "supply a firm base for [his] exhortation."[212] At the beginning of 1 Thessalonians 5, Paul urges the Thessalonian Christians to be aware of the final judgment. To reinforce his argument, Paul presents the dying formula in a simple form as grounds for his argument.[213] Interestingly, Paul does not belabor this vital formulaic expression. Moo elaborates this phenomenon well:

> to be sure, Paul says little about the death of Christ in the Thessalonian letters – the only direct references being 1 Thess 4:14, 'we believe that Jesus died and rose again,' and 5:10, 'he died for us so that, whether we are awake or asleep, we may live together with him.' But this relative silence indicates not that the death of Christ was unimportant in Paul's

---

[210] This forgiving death emphasizes divine grace and Jesus' own initiation. Because this text also highlights "divine initiation" (Aernie, *Is Paul?* 148), forgiveness through Jesus' death can be seen as God's gracious gift. Barnett, *Second Corinthians*, 303, also comments that this is "independent of subsequent human response." Cf. Welborn, *End to Enmity*, 452. Moreover, this divine initiation is accomplished by "the voluntariness of Jesus' death" (Barnett, *Second Corinthians*, 292n20; he indicates that this is what the "aorist active participle ἀποθανόντι implies").

[211] Gordon D. Fee, *The First and Second Letters to the Thessalonians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 198.

[212] Ernest Best, *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*, BNTC (London: Black, 1972), 216.

[213] According to Henk J. de Jonge, "in order to back up [his] assertion, Paul uses the formula" ("The Original Setting of the Χριστός ἀπέθανεν ὑπέρ Formula," in *The Thessalonian Correspondence*, ed. Raymond F. Collins [Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990], 229–35, 233).

interaction with the Thessalonians. Rather, it suggests that the death of Christ was the assumed foundation for all the other issues that he addresses.[214]

Because this is such a fundamental confession, the mere mention of it should be enough. Moreover, the fact that "Paul does not have to elaborate on the significance of Jesus' death here suggests that his audience has already been instructed on this matter."[215] If this is indeed so, what are the characteristics of this fundamental and well-known foundation? This will be the focus for the rest of this section.

Above all, the first meaning is that this death is "atoning."[216] The formula is in a short form, and thus the context is the decisive factor for its meaning. However, the text itself hints that this short formula specifically denotes a soteriological meaning. In particular, σωτηρία (v.9) indicates that 'died for us' can be understood as 'died to save us.' For this σωτηρία is accomplished 'through our Lord Jesus Christ who died for us.' This text suggests that Jesus' death is directly linked with salvation, and this death can bring about its purpose: salvation. 'Being saved' can reasonably presuppose that sins are forgiven. Furthermore, by stating that "the One who died 'for us' (5:10) died 'for our sins' (1 Cor. 15:3)," Paddison understands Jesus' death 'for us' in 1 Thessalonians 5 as death for forgiveness of sins.[217] Hence, it can be argued that 1 Thessalonians 5 speaks of Jesus' forgiving death.

Secondly, Paul claims that this death for us is given through God's grace. Morris indicates two expressions which highlight God's initiative in the sal-

---

[214] Moo, "Christology," 181. Cf. Leon Morris, *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*, NICNT, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 161.

[215] Ben Witherington III, *1 and 2 Thessalonians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 152. Likewise, Best, *First and Second Thessalonians*, 218, maintains that "its casual introduction without any explanation of how Christ's death does benefit men shows that it was a phrase well known to the Thessalonians."

[216] Morris, *First and Second Thessalonians*, 161. The following are the alternative adjectives which the exegetes employ to describe the effect of Jesus' death: "redemptive" (Fee, *First and Second Thessalonians*, 196; Charles A. Wanamaker, *The Epistles to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009], 189), "salvific" (Angus Paddison, *Theological Hermeneutics and 1 Thessalonians*, SNTSMS 133 [Cambridge: CUP, 2005], 149, 154–55, 159; Witherington, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, 152), "saving" (Paddison, *Theological Hermeneutics*, 155, 161; Joseph Plevnik, "1 Thess 5,1–11: Its Authenticity, Intention and Message," *Biblica* 60 [1979]: 71–90, 79), and "soteriological" (Donfried, "Theology," 36; Paddison, *Theological Hermeneutics*, 150, 155).

[217] His *Theological Hermeneutics*, 148. In like manner, Donfried, "Theology," 35, puts it, "the formula in its original form probably read 'Christ died for our sins' and in I Thess. 5:10 the Apostle undoubtedly modified this tradition . . . so that it would apply to the unique situation in Thessalonica concerning the unexpected deaths of some." Cf. Paul A. Rainbow, "Justification according to Paul's Thessalonian Correspondence," *BBR* 19 [2009]: 249–74, 263.

vation of humanity: 'appoint' (ἔθετο) and 'through Lord Jesus Christ.' The verb τίθημι "rests our salvation on the divine initiative."[218] God already set the plans for pouring out his grace to sinful humanity. Therefore, human beings have nothing to do with taking part in this divine plan. Moreover, Morris continues, the fact "that nothing in the way of human merit or initiative is meant is made very clear by the following 'through our Lord Jesus Christ.'"[219] According to him, the full title "shows that the salvation spoken of is one that comes through Christ's work for us and not through anything that we do."[220] In this regard, Paddison is correct to state that "Jesus' death 'for us' is a demonstration of God's radically *complete* grace."[221]

4.3.2.6 *Concluding Remarks*

It is Paul who says, "to write the same things to you is not troublesome for me, but safe for you" (Phil 3:1). In terms of the dying formula, he did exactly what he wrote. It seems that the contents which have been written in each dying formula section are quite repetitive. By employing the dying formula, Paul repeats three basic ideas: (1) Jesus' atoning death, (2) pre-Pauline tradition, and (3) God's sublime grace. First of all, the dying formula signifies not only Jesus' death but also this death being atoning. The formula in its full form (as in 1 Cor 15:3) explicitly shows that Christ's death is for forgiveness of sins. Other short forms can also carry this meaning as their contexts suggest. Every context indicates that 'dying for us/you/them' is not just generally beneficial to the recipients. Rather, the shorter formula is specifically soteriological. Therefore, Paul underscores the theme of Jesus' redemptive death by utilizing the dying formula, as he does by employing the giving-up formula.

Secondly, this important theme is a pre-Pauline tradition. The significance of this pre-Pauline tradition is twofold. If this important Pauline theme is indeed a *pre*-Pauline tradition (which Paul himself concedes clearly in 1 Cor 15:3), this confessional formula existed in a fixed form before Paul wrote his epistles, and even before he preached this central gospel. This means that the traditional formula had been established before Paul's missionary journey. It is even likely that this persistent tradition was firmly fixed before Paul was

[218] Morris, *First and Second Thessalonians*, 160. Paddison, *Theological Hermeneutics*, 153, also points out the emphasized "God's initiative" in the text.

[219] Morris, *First and Second Thessalonians*, 160.

[220] Ibid. See also Plevnik, "1 Thess 5,1–11," 90.

[221] Paddison, *Theological Hermeneutics*, 154. He asserts that "Jesus' death is a prevenient act of God" (155).

converted at Damascus.[222] Further, this is a pre-Pauline *tradition*. If we are dealing here with an already existing tradition, its content can be regarded as well-known to and embraced by most of the early believers. This is why Paul can even use an abbreviated form without the need to elaborate its meaning further. In all cases, the shorter form of the dying formula is a passing comment. This never indicates that Paul is indifferent to the important theme, but rather that Paul was sure that the recipients knew what he meant. Moreover, Paul employs the formula as a firm basis of his argument. Therefore, this tradition was not only well-known, but also well-accepted.[223]

Finally, this atoning death of Jesus is accomplished by divine grace. According to Paul, it is God who initiates, performs, and finishes this salvific event with Jesus. In this respect, humanity cannot earn this gracious gift without God's grace, and thus cannot boast. If Paul can confess, 'By the grace of God, however, I am what I am' (1 Cor 15:10), it is *grace of God* by which Saul became Paul, and sinful humanity can be transformed into forgiven humanity. Indeed, "Paul's conversion can be viewed as an act of the grace of God."[224] By employing the dying formula, Paul maintains the idea of God being "the author and initiator of salvation . . . through [Jesus'] death."[225]

4.3.3 Other 'Death' Terms + ὑπέρ

If the context of the ὑπέρ-prepositional phrase can certainly convey soteriological significance, the phrase with other terms indicating Jesus' death can be discussed as well for this analysis. 1 Corinthians 1:13, 11:23–26, and Galatians 3:13 may give another textual evidence of Paul's presentation of Jesus' death as a means of forgiveness.[226] Particularly for the texts from 1

---

[222] Wright, *Resurrection*, 319, argues that "it was probably formulated within the first two or three years after Easter itself, since it was already in formulaic form when Paul 'received' it." Cf. section 4.4.1.1.

[223] Halvor Moxnes states that "'tradition' was not something outside of Paul's own theology; rather it was a resource that he shared with his fellow-Jews and fellow-Christians" (*Theology in Conflict: Studies in Paul's Understanding of God in Romans*, NovTSup 53 [Leiden: Brill, 1980], 31). From the tradition, Moffitt, "Affirming," 68, finds "the common ground they share with him." Cf. Labahn, "Non-Synoptic Jesus," 3:1943.

[224] Richard H. Bell, *The Irrevocable Call of God: An Inquiry into Paul's Theology of Israel*, WUNT 184 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 44.

[225] Wanamaker, "Divine Agent," 526. Frank Thielman emphasizes this aspect as follows: "if one theological theme is more basic than others in Paul's letters, therefore, it is this notion that God is a gracious God and that he has shown his grace preeminently in his arrangement of history to answer the problem of human sinfulness in the death and resurrection of his Son, Jesus Christ" (*Theology of the New Testament: A Canonical and Synthetic Approach* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005], 479).

[226] Some manuscripts include the ὑπέρ-prepositional phrase in 1 Corinthians 5:7b (γὰρ τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστός), but the most recent version of the Nestle-Aland does not take it as original. Whether the phrase is original or not, its context describes

Corinthians, the short form of the ὑπέρ-phrase can be understood as the meaning of the longer form, 'for the forgiveness of our sins,' based on 1 Corinthians 15:3b. Moreover, their contexts also point out that the texts treat soteriological issues, which will be discussed in each section.

4.3.3.1 *1 Corinthians 1:13*

μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός; μὴ Παῦλος ἐσταυρώθη ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ἢ εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Παύλου ἐβαπτίσθητε;

The best translation for v.13b would be "'Paul was not crucified for you, was he?'"[227] Virtually, all exegetes concur that this rhetorical question "expects a negative answer."[228] Therefore, Paul's intention is clear: he "plainly intended that the Corinthians should answer the questions in the negative and thereby be reminded of who in fact had been crucified *for their salvation*."[229] Underneath this question, as Pascuzzi suggests, there exists "the unstated premise," which "may be formulated thus: . . . Christ was crucified for you."[230]

More importantly, "Paul is certain of the validity of his [premise] and confident that his audience also accepts [its] validity."[231] The last portion of v.13 ('Or you were not baptized in the name of Paul, were you?') can serve as convincing evidence for the fact that the Corinthians instantly knew what Paul intended by the rhetorical question of v.13b. It is likely that in v.13c

---

eschatological salvation ('being saved in the day of the Lord Jesus' in 1 Cor 5:5), and the text itself indicates Jesus' sacrificial death. Therefore, this text can be one of the prime candidates for this study. However, 1 Corinthians 5:7 is omitted from this study because the texts which indicate Paul's understanding of Jesus' death effecting forgiveness seem enough and the space is limited. See also 161n286 below.

[227] Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 146. For an almost identical translation, see John Paul Heil, *Rhetorical Role of Scripture in 1 Corinthians* (Atlanta: SBL, 2005), 29; Duane Litfin, *St. Paul's Theology of Proclamation: 1 Corinthians 1–4 and Greco-Roman rhetoric*, SNTSMS 79 (Cambridge: CUP, 1994), 181; Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 137 (As Thiselton remarks, "to translate 'Was Paul crucified for you?' . . . is simply too bland, and remains capable of being read as an open question, which the Greek explicitly excludes").

[228] Witherington, *Conflict*, 103. Cf. C.K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, BNTC (London: Black, 1968), 46; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 146; Maria Pascuzzi, "Baptism-based Allegiance and the Divisions in Corinth: A Reexamination of 1 Corinthians 1:13–17," *CBQ* 71 (2009): 813–29, 814; Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 137. Of them, Pascuzzi succinctly states that "it is generally recognized that here Paul employs the rhetorical strategy *reductio ad absurdum*."

[229] Litfin, *Paul's Theology*, 181 (emphasis mine). In v.13b, Litfin finds "the cross and its salvific meaning" (182). In this regard, Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 137–38, argues that dying for someone "is perhaps among the closest parallels to crucified for . . . ."

[230] Pascuzzi, "Baptism-based Allegiance," 815n8. Cf. Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul: A Study in Pauline Theology*, trans. G.R. Beasley-Murray (Oxford: Blackwell, 1964), 18.

[231] Pascuzzi, "Baptism-based Allegiance," 815.

"Paul is parodying an early Christian formula, *baptizesthai eis to onoma tou*,"[232] and thus, the Corinthian Christians would understand it as 'It is not in my name but in Christ's name that you were baptized.'[233] In v.13c, two characteristics need attention: Paul's use of the rhetorical question, and an absence of any further comment. The well-known early baptismal formula in v.13c probably gives rise to these characteristics. Since the Corinthians could easily notice this renowned formula, Paul could freely modify the formula without worrying about their misunderstanding his intention.[234]

If this is indeed the case for v.13c, it can probably be the case for v.13b as well. As in v.13c, v.13b includes another rhetorical question, but no further explication for it. Therefore, it seems plausible that the rhetorical question in v.13b is also from a well-known formula. In this case, without doubt, the most probable candidate for the formula behind v.13b is 1 Corinthians 15:3b, "Christ died for our sins." If indeed "he molds his question [in v.13b] on the confessional formula,"[235] Paul assumes that the Corinthians would understand this shortened expression as the longer form. As shown in 1 Corinthians 15:3, Paul already preached the forgiving power of the cross to the Corinthians. Whilst they were reading (or probably listening to the reading of) this short question in v.13b, it would instantly remind them of Christ's death for the forgiveness of sins. If this is the background of Paul's unstated premise in v.13b, it can certainly be argued that the text presents Jesus' forgiving death.

Its context, the decisive factor for the meaning of crucifixion *for* someone in v.13b, also supports this line of argument.[236] On the surface level, its context is about Paul warning the Corinthian believers about internal divisions (σχίσμα in v.10), but in order to warn them effectively, Paul "establishes the foundation from which he argues."[237] Verse 18 mentions that the cross of

---

[232] Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 146. Pascuzzi, "Baptism-based Allegiance," 815n9, also contends that "the formula εἰς τὸ ὄνομα . . . recalls what is likely the oldest Christian baptismal formula." Cf. Hellholm, "Baptismal Traditions," 171.

[233] The question in v.13c "is meaningful only since the Corinthians were baptized not into the name of Paul but into the name of Jesus Christ!" (Hellholm, "Baptismal Traditions," 150).

[234] These formulae are not only well-known but also well-accepted. As Lars Hartman puts it, "the underlying idea is not particularly Pauline, for the adherents of the other 'parties' would also accept it; otherwise they would refuse to follow him in his argument" (*Into the Name of the Lord Jesus: Baptism in the Early Church*, SNTW [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997], 60).

[235] Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 146. Witherington, *Conflict*, 100, understands Paul's intention in v.13b as "no 'called agent' of Christ died for their sins," which suggests that he also presumes that 1 Corinthians 15:3b ('died for our sins') is behind 1:13b.

[236] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 137, correctly indicates that "a number of nuances occur in different contexts." See 91n42 above.

[237] Raymond Pickett, *The Cross in Corinth: The Social Significance of the Death of Jesus*, JSNTSup 143 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 61. Moreover, as Hellholm,

Christ indeed divides those who are perishing from those who are being saved, but it does not necessarily cause unnecessary internal divisions. If Paul is "using the cross as an identity marker"[238] for who are saved in v.18, one can argue that the effect of Jesus' death on the cross is salvation and his death is saving death.

Therefore, the above-mentioned two factors (a well-known tradition behind v.13b, and its soteriological context) suggest that Jesus' crucifixion *for* the believers can surely mean his forgiving death. Even this short rhetorical question reveals the meaning and significance of Jesus' death *for you*.

4.3.3.2 *1 Corinthians 11:23–26*

Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ᾗ παρεδίδετο ἔλαβεν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ εἶπεν τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι λέγων· τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὁσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. ὁσάκις γὰρ ἐὰν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον πίνητε, τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ.

"Baptismal Traditions," 175, argues, "Paul uses these traditional formulas as basis for his argumentation, especially since his technique in using them is that of a 'reminder.'"

[238] Corin Mihaila, *Paul-Apollos Relationship and Paul's Stance toward Greco-Roman Rhetoric: An Exegetical and Socio-historical Study of 1 Corinthians 1–4*, LNTS 402 (London: T&T Clark, 2009), 106. For the scholars who see the cross as the identity marker, cf. also Pickett, *Cross*, 61; C.K. Robertson, *Conflict in Corinth: Redefining the System*, StBibLit 42 (New York: Lang, 2001), 136–39. For the list of scholars who see baptism as the marker, see Mihaila, *Paul-Apollos Relationship*, 105n203. In addition to these scholars, Witherington, *Conflict*, 103, notes that "it is fair to say that early Christians, including Paul, viewed baptism as a boundary marker." In v.13, Jesus' death pairs up with baptism, and scholars thereby suggest that these two can be viewed as the identity markers for Christians. However, Paul does not seem to suggest that they are the two independent pillars of Christian existence. Rather, the latter seems to be intrinsically linked with the former, and the significance of baptism is derived from Jesus' crucifixion. The following scholars find the centrality of crucifixion in v.13: Vincent P. Branick, "Source and Redaction Analysis of 1 Corinthians 1–3," *JBL* 101 (1982): 251–69, 268; James D.G. Dunn, *1 Corinthians* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995), 104; Pascuzzi, "Baptism-based Allegiance," 815. For Paul, baptism is based on Jesus' death, and his conflating the two provides significance. Everett Ferguson notes: "Paul's characteristic teaching relative to baptism is to connect it with the death and resurrection of Christ and draw out its moral consequences. The association of baptism with the death of Christ ties it to the means of *forgiveness of sins* . . ." (*Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009], 164). According to him, it is Jesus' death which allows baptism to carry out forgiveness. Later, he indicates that "baptism promised forgiveness" in Acts (185). Because of Paul's juxtaposition of crucifixion and baptism, the concept of forgiveness is "in the background of the text, in that it is one of the effects of Jesus' saving work and is implicit in the formula 'for you'" (Hartman, *Into the Name*, 61).

The text contains three different expressions which signify Jesus' death. The most apparent expression for his death appears almost at the end of the passage: τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου (v.26b). Paul makes it clear here that the Eucharistic ritual is about remembering the death of Jesus. Besides, παρεδίδοτο (v.23b) also indicates Jesus' death because in the Jesus tradition, the verb is specifically used for Jesus being handed over to die on the cross (see section 4.3.1). These two expressions explicitly connote Jesus' death in the text, and these seem by themselves sufficient to present the death concept. However, Paul employs another phrase which denotes Jesus' death: ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι. In particular, the third word ἐμῷ emphasizes that it is the blood of none other than Jesus. 'Blood' itself can figuratively refer to death as it does elsewhere in Paul (section 4.3.2.1).[239] Therefore, it seems an inescapable fact that the idea of Jesus' death is present in the text.

Moreover, the expression ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη (v.25b) effectively conveys the forgiveness-theme embedded in the Pauline ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (v.24). This 'new covenant' idea is undoubtedly influenced by Jeremiah 31:31–34 (LXX-Jer 38:31–34). Jeremiah 31:34 ends this famous new covenant passage with a message of forgiveness: "I will forgive their iniquity, and remember their sin no more." Therefore, it is highly likely that the 'new covenant' includes the idea of forgiveness. Based on this, one can argue that forgiveness is "the *sine qua non* for the new covenant."[240] The LXX also renders סָלַח ('to forgive') as ἵλεως ἔσομαι, which can certainly mean ἀφήσω. LXX-Numbers 14:19–20 seem to show that the meaning 'to be merciful' is equivalent to 'to forgive.' The Hebrew word in v.19 is rendered as a form of 'ἀφίημι,' but the following verse interprets the same word as 'ἵλεως εἰμι.' This shows that the translators considered 'to be merciful' as another expressions for 'to forgive.'[241]

---

[239] Orr and Walther, *I Corinthians*, 273, confirm, "*blood* in this context represents Christ's death."

[240] Joshua N. Moon, *Jeremiah's New Covenant: An Augustinian Reading*, JTISup 3 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 241. He further comments that "Jer 31:31–34 promises nothing other than the gospel: forgiveness of sins and the Holy Spirit" (62). In this sense, Jeremiah 31 also suggests God's grace wiping out the sins of sinful Israelites.

[241] As a whole, the OT contains 46 apperances of סָלַח. If three cases related to 'vow annulment (Num 30:5[6], 8[9], 12[13], where the Hebrew verb is rendered as 'καθαρίζω')' are ruled out, 43 cases remain relevant. Generally speaking, the translation of those 43 cases can be divided as 'to be merciful' (27 times total: ἵλεως εἰμι/γίνομαι [17 times], ἱλάσκομαι [8 times including one incidence of ἐξιλάσκομαι], εὐιλατεύω [twice]), or 'to forgive' (16 times total: ἀφίημι [14 times], ἀφαιρέω [once], and οὐ μή + μιμνήσκω [once]). However, based on 2 Chronicles 6:21, 25, 27, 39, where the 'to be merciful' expression (ἵλεως εἰμι) can be better understood as 'to forgive,' the two renderings signify a similar meaning because the last three verses links ἵλεως εἰμι with sin(ning). In Hebrews 2:17, ἱλάσκομαι is linked to sin (ἁμαρτία), and its best rendering seems to be 'to forgive.' Therefore, 'to be merciful' and 'to forgive' are not two distinct translations, but actually convey a similar meaning.

Throughout LXX-Jeremiah, ἵλεως ἔσομαι is the default option for translation of סָלַח.[242] However, if "the Greek Torah would influence the translation of the subsequent books,"[243] it seems certain that the Greek expression means 'to forgive,' in line with the Hebrew original. Through the lens of 'new covenant' in Jeremiah 31, therefore, 1 Corinthians 11 can be viewed as one of the 'forgiveness' texts in Paul.

Hence, the expression ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (v.24) in the context of ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη discloses the forgiveness-theme. Regarding the expression, Hofius states that it "specifies Jesus' self-surrender unto death as [the] expiatory and reconciliatory event," which means, "the forgiveness of sins and the communion with God" respectively.[244] As discussed above, because of its being within a soteriological context, the expression 'for you' can surely be understood as 'for your sins.' Therefore, it is not wrong to argue that what Paul wrote in 1 Corinthians 11:24 is 'this is my body which is for the forgiveness of your sins.'

More significantly, these two expressions of the forgiveness-theme are linked to Jesus' death. The first forgiveness-related phrase, ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη, is connected to Jesus' blood: "the new covenant in my blood." The early Christian ritual retained in Paul connects Jesus' death closely with the forgiveness-concept. As Paul mentions, this tradition is what he also received. This vital pre-Pauline understanding of their correlation is revealed ironically through Paul's rebuke of the Corinthians' participation in the Lord's Supper in an unworthy manner (v.27). The next forgiveness-related expression, 'ὑπέρ + person(al pronoun)' is linked to a symbol for death: bread being broken. In the text, Jesus deploys a simile that compares *broken* bread to his body, and according to Mark 14:25,[245] Jesus declares he would not keep the

---

[242] Particularly in Jeremiah, the unified rendering of סָלַח is ἵλεως εἰμι. Five out of six occurrences (5:1, 7 [verse 7 actually renders it as ἵλεως γίνομαι, but this seems another expression for the former due to the close location of the latter to the former in Jer 5, and general interchangeability between γίνομαι and εἰμι]; 31:34; 33:8; 36:3; 50:20) are translated as ἵλεως εἰμι, except for 33:8 (LXX 40:8). LXX-Jer 40:8 translates the Hebrew word as οὐ μὴ μνησθήσομαι. In this case, however, the influence from the new covenant passage cannot be ignored. LXX-Jer 38:34b (MT 31:34b) reads as follows: ἵλεως ἔσομαι ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ ἔτι. The expression 'not remembering sins' is paralleled with ἵλεως εἰμι, which indicates the two different expressions can convey a similar meaning.

[243] Emanuel Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, VTSup 72 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 183. For scholars who agree with Tov's view, see ibid., 183n1. Later in his *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays*, TSAJ 121 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 328, Tov adheres to this view by stating that "the post-Pentateuchal books were clearly based on the Greek version of the Torah."

[244] Otfried Hofius, "The Lord's Supper and the Lord's Supper Tradition: Reflections on 1 Corinthians 11:23b–25," in *One Loaf, One Cup: Ecumenical Studies of 1 Cor 11 and Other Eucharistic Texts*, ed. Ben F. Meyer, NGS 6 (Leuven: Peeters, 1993), 75–115, 98–99.

[245] See 168n311 below.

annual Jewish Passover meal tradition. All these factors point out Jesus' impending death, and the disciples at the scene must have known that Jesus' simile was not a good sign and would have been disturbed by their teacher's action.

It seems likely that this text implies Jesus' death, and links it with the forgiveness-motif. This text will be further discussed in 4.4.1.2 as one of the key texts which uncovers the historical Jesus' understanding of his own death.

4.3.3.3 *Galatians 3:13*

Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα, ὅτι γέγραπται·ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὁ κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου

The two themes at issue, Jesus' death and the forgiveness of sins, do appear in the text. For the death of Christ, the first verse of Galatians 3 already mentions the centrality of the one *crucified* in the gospel. More specifically, the text describes Jesus as one "who hangs on a tree." It seems likely that Paul here depicts Jesus as the one who was crucified on a wooden cross. There are some passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls where 'hung on a tree' can suggest "being crucified."[246] Whether the Qumran documents specifically indicate crucifixion or not, Deuteronomy 21 obviously shows the person hanging on a tree is cursed and dead. In this regard, the expression of Jesus' becoming a curse is itself enough to reveal Jesus' death in the text. The other point, the forgiveness-theme, can noticeably be seen by wordings such as ἐξαγοράζω (v.13)[247] and the *dikaio*-terminology (δικαιοῦται and ὁ δίκαιος [v.11]). Hence,

---

[246] David Lincicum carefully states, "the association of Deut 21:22–23 with crucifixion rather than post-mortem impalement may also be seen in 11Q19 64.6–13; cf. 4Q524 frag. 14; 4QpNah 3+4 1.6–8" (*Paul and the Early Jewish Encounter with Deuteronomy*, WUNT II/284 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010], 146n86; cf. Timothy W. Reardon, "'Hanging on a Tree': Deuteronomy 21.22–23 and the Rhetoric of Jesus' Crucifixion in Acts 5.12–42," *JSNT* 37 [2015]: 407–31, 409). For a bibliography for the interpretation of hanging as crucifixion, see George J. Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and The New Testament: Essays in Mutual Illumination* (London: SPCK, 2005), 98n3. Although Joseph M. Baumgarten is against this line of interpretation ("Does *TLH* in the Temple Scroll Refer to Crucifixion?" *JBL* 91 [1972]: 472–81), he is aware of Philo's description of crucifixion as 'hanging' (476n20). It should not be forgotten that "for Paul 'tree' means 'cross'" (Martyn, *Galatians*, 320). See also Betz, *Galatians*, 152; Normand Bonneau, "The Logic of Paul's Argument on the Curse of the Law in Galatians 3:10–14," *NovT* 39 (1997): 60–80, 76; Bruce, *Galatians*, 164–66. Therefore, as Peder Borgen comments, "without the word itself being used, crucifixion is also mentioned in 3:13" ("Openly Portrayed as Crucified: Some Observations on Gal 3:1–14," *Christology, Controversy, and Community: New Testament Essays in Honour of David R. Catchpole*, NovTSup 99, ed. David G. Horrell and Christopher M. Tuckett [Leiden: Brill, 2000], 345–53, 347).

[247] Martyn, *Galatians*, 317, interprets the word similarly to justification, stating, it becomes "a synonym for the verb 'to rectify,' 'to make right.'" Cf. Bruce, *Galatians*, 166.

these terms form a soteriological context within which to understand ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν (v.13) in its full form.

The two themes are not only clearly explained in the text, but also closely related to one another. The portion γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα (v.13a) shows their interconnectedness: Jesus' death (γενόμενος κατάρα) is nothing but for the forgiveness of our sins (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν). Fung simply puts it, "Christ in his death is described as 'having become a curse,'"[248] and there is no scholar who disputes this line of interpretation. In the soteriological context, the short form of the ὑπέρ-phrase can mean the long form signifying "for the forgiveness of sins." Therefore, it is easy to concur with Hurtado that "in Gal. 3 Paul presents Jesus' cursed death as redemptive."[249] More specifically and explicitly, Marguerat states that "Jesus' death not only results in *forgiveness of sins*, but in deliverance from the power of the curse inherent in the Law."[250]

Paul's employing a number of citations in the immediate context indicates the underlying theme of grace behind Jesus' death.[251] Of these, the citation from Genesis 15:6 (v.6) is of importance, with Romans 4:3 containing a virtually identical citation. Paul's main thrust in employing the same OT citation in both Romans 4 and Galatians 3 is to show that the true gospel is by faith, not by works. In Galatians 3:11b, Paul's argument is clearly shown by quoting Habakkuk 2:4 ('The one who is righteous will live by faith'),[252] and

---

[248] Fung, *Galatians*, 147. He also comments that v.13 is "Paul's Christian interpretation of Christ's death on the cross" (150). According to Burton, *Galatians*, 172, the word γενόμενος "is probably a participle of means, the whole phrase expressing the method by which Christ redeemed us from the curse." Moreover, Hooker, "Becoming," 361, translates v.13a as "'Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law' *by* becoming 'a curse' for our sake" (emphasis mine), which suggests that Jesus' death 'for us' is the means of redemption. For other scholars who find this modal sense of γενόμενος-clause, see Hays, *Faith*, 104; Moises Silva, "Abraham, Faith and Works: Paul's Use of Scripture in Galatians 3:6–14," *WTJ* 63 (2001): 251–67, 251.

[249] Larry W. Hurtado, "Resurrection-Faith and the 'Historical' Jesus," *JSHJ* 11 (2013): 35–52, 50n36. Virtually all commentators employ the words, redemption or redemptive.

[250] Marguerat, *Paul*, 190 (emphasis mine). Schreiner, *Galatians*, 216, similarly comments that "forgiveness is obtained through the cross of Christ."

[251] It seems that Paul carefully cites the OT texts to advance his argument so that the section of Galatians 3:6–14 can be called "Arguments from Scripture" (Longenecker, *Galatians*, 107–8; Schreiner, *Galatians*, 58, 200, or similarly, "Appeal to Scripture," [Witherington, *Grace*, 216]). In fact, its context is full of quotes from the OT. Throughout vv. 6–14, there exist 6 quotes. Arithmetically (and actually), 2 quotes are found in every 3 verses, and thus Silva, "Abraham, Faith," 252, points out "the sheer number of citations within such short compass."

[252] For a recent discussion of the LXX translation and the NT citation of Habakkuk 2:4, see Wolfgang Kraus, "Hab 2:3–4 in the Hebrew Tradition and in the Septuagint, with its Reception in the New Testament," in Cook, *Septuagint*, 101–17, who argues that Paul's "understanding becomes clear through the alterations he made. He left out μου and in this

the passive form of δικαιόω in the same verse "emphasizes righteousness as bestowed by another rather than as achieved by one's own effort."[253] In the case of Romans 4, moreover, Paul implies that being counted righteous by faith is due to God's grace (v.4), and thus those who are justified by faith have nothing to boast about (v.2). If he emphasizes the same topic 'justification by faith' in both Romans 4 and Galatians 3, the emphasis on grace in the former suggests that the same theme underlies the argument in the latter. In Galatians 3, therefore, Paul maintains that the death of Christ which entails forgiveness is a product of grace.[254]

4.3.3.4 *Concluding Remarks*

Again, the selected passages show that Paul explicates Jesus' death in terms of the forgiveness of sins. Therefore, for Paul, Jesus' death is closely linked to the theme of forgiveness. Moreover, this understanding is probably based on pre-Pauline traditions. In 1 Corinthians 11:23–26, it seems certain that Paul is employing the tradition directly. 1 Corinthians 1:13b also appears to originate from a pre-Pauline tradition, and one can further argue that "there is widespread agreement that Gal 3:13 preserves a Jewish-Christian christological tradition."[255] This means that the idea of Jesus' death effecting forgiveness is widely accepted, and this idea occurs with Paul's constant reminder of God's grace (1 Cor 11 and Gal 3) which underlies Jesus' offering his life.

---

way he emphasises πίστις, which is in his understanding *the faithfulness of the believers* in God" (116–17; emphasis mine).

[253] Longenecker, *Galatians*, 118. As Bell, *Irrevocable Call*, 161, comments, "the central section of Galatians, 2.15–5.12, concerns the superiority of the gospel over the law." Contra E.P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 26, who argues that "Gal. 3:13 is not actually an argument against righteousness by the law." Interestingly enough, he states "Gal. 3:13 is not the keystone of the argument, but has a subsidiary place in explaining how the curse (3:10) is removed" (25). However, it seems that vv.13 and 14 indeed "form the climax of Paul's argument" (Graham Stanton, "The Law of Moses and the Law of Christ Galatians 3:1–6:2," in *Paul and the Mosaic Law*, WUNT 89, ed. James D.G. Dunn [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996], 99–111, 111).

[254] The grace idea which is behind the scene is also supported by the repetition of the word ἐπαγγελία (vv.14, 16–18). Because God's blessing had been promised before the Law was given, his blessing "*antedated the Law's curse*" (Martyn, *Galatians*, 326).

[255] Hays, *Faith*, 79. He also mentions three more scholars who agree to this view. In addition to these scholars, see also Longenecker, *Galatians*, 108–9, 121; Marguerat, *Paul*, 190; Martyn, *Galatians*, 335. However, Dunn, *Galatians*, 177, is negative towards this view.

4.3.4 Other Significant Texts

The following three texts can be included in this section: Romans 3:24–25; 6:10a; 8:3b. These texts do not contain the giving-up formula, nor the dying formula, nor the ὑπέρ + person(al pronoun) phrase, but these passages do enclose the other Pauline 'forgiveness' concepts in relation to Jesus' death. All these texts are from Romans, the latest of Paul's undisputed letters. From these texts, one can expect Paul's theology of Jesus' death, which was ripening into full maturity.

4.3.4.1 *Romans 3:24–25*

δικαιούμενοι δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ [τῆς] πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων

It is not easy to address this text because "there are few verses in the New Testament about which more ink has been spilled."[256] Indeed, diverse scholarly opinions have been piled up, and many more will be. Faced with a plethora of information, it is rather easy to lose one's way. However, one can find a way without drowning in a swamp of information by focusing on the current issue of the connection between Jesus' death and forgiveness. Before discussing their relationship, an essential prerequisite is to see whether these themes are present in the text, and to understand how these themes are used if present.

To get straight to the point, the text includes both Jesus' death and remission of sins as an important Christian message. Moreover, the two concepts are not remote from one another at all, but rather are directly and inseparably linked. In the present text, Jesus' death "is indicated by the [phrase] 'in his blood' (ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι)."[257] The majority of the commentators reach a consensus on the fact that the expression means Jesus' death.[258] Therefore, it is relatively easy to find Jesus' death in the passage.

The forgiveness-theme seems prevalent in the text due to the following terms: two *dikaio*-terms, ἀπολύτρωσις, ἱλαστήριον, and πάρεσις. The last two words have been hotly debated. For the current study, ἱλαστήριον needs focused attention, for this word is not only connected directly to the phrase

---

[256] Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity: The Day of Atonement from Second Temple Judaism to the Fifth Century*, WUNT 163 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 197.

[257] Gathercole, "Justified," 179 (as Cousar, *Theology*, 63n27, indicates, "'by *his* blood' in 3:25 reads 'ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι' with emphasis in 'his'"). Gathercole also notes "the parallelism of 'blood' and 'death' in Romans 5:8–9," which can support this interpretation of the phrase. Jesus' 'blood' as an imagery for Jesus' death is not exceptional in Paul (cf. 1 Cor 11:23–26 [section 4.3.3.2] in addition to Rom 5 [section 4.3.2.1]).

[258] To name a few, Dunn, *Romans*, 1:170; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 348; Jewett, *Romans*, 343.

"by faith in his blood," which indicates faith in Jesus' death, but its background can also surely refer to the forgiveness of sins. The current scholarship advances the translation of this "extremely rare"[259] word towards the meaning of 'mercy seat.' After discussing three main objections to this translation, Bell successfully defends its translation as 'mercy seat.'[260] It should be noted that the mercy seat is "the place where the forgiveness of sins was effected."[261] Moreover, Tiwald describes further scholarly progress from the interpretation of ἱλαστήριον based on martyr theology to interpretation in connection with Yom Kippur.[262] If Paul intended ἱλαστήριον as 'mercy seat,' and the Greek word alludes to the Day of Atonement, it can be concluded that ἱλαστήριον conveys 'forgiveness.'

The remaining words also suggest the forgiveness of sins. On the interpretation of πάρεσις, however, scholars are divided into two camps: either 'forgiveness' or 'passing over.'[263] However, the meaning of πάρεσις inclines to the side of 'forgiveness' based on its basic meaning and the context. The context is not about passing over sins, but more about forgiving past sins. Moreover, this Greek word is encompassed by other forgiveness terms. Morphologically and semantically, the word ἀπολύτρωσις is closely related to λύτρον, which appears only in the Ransom saying (Mark 10:45; Matt 20:28). In Ephesians 1:7 and Colossians 1:14, ἀπολύτρωσις is directly linked to αἷμα of Jesus, and this redemption is described as the forgiveness of sins. The last terms to be considered as 'forgiveness' are the two *dikaio*-terms, δικαιούμενοι, and δικαιοσύνης. It has been suggested above (4.2.2) that forgiveness is integral to justification. Therefore, as Williams suggests, in this Romans text "this act of justification is understood in terms of forgiveness of sins."[264]

Two significant aspects (again already repeated in the other sections) of this text are as follows: (1) an emphasis on grace, and (2) the plausible existence of pre-Pauline tradition behind the text. The nature of forgiveness as grace is pointedly emphasized by this double expression, δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι. According to Paul, this forgiving work is truly done through grace.

---

[259] Markus Tiwald, "Christ as Hilasterion (Rom 3:25): Pauline Theology on the Day of Atonement in the Mirror of Early Jewish Thought," in *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretations in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, ed. Thomas Hieke and Tobias Nicklas, TBN 15 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 189–209, 193.

[260] Bell, "Sacrifice," 18–19.

[261] Mark Reasoner, *Romans in Full Circle: A History of Interpretation* (Louisville: WJK, 2005), 40.

[262] Tiwald, "Hilasterion," 189–90.

[263] See 80n10 above.

[264] Sam K. Williams, *Jesus' Death as Saving Event: The Background and Origin of a Concept*, HDR 2 (Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1975), 54. Jewett, *Romans*, 343, similarly states that this text presents "Christ's blood as the new means of atonement."

For the second aspect, some scholars even reconstruct the probable pre-Pauline tradition as a backbone of Romans 3:24–25.[265] If so, this is not Paul's understanding alone, but can certainly be another handed-down tradition of earliest Christians, which was shared by Paul and the recipients of his letter.

4.3.4.2 *Romans 6:10a*

ὃ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ

The image of death is evident in the repetition of ἀπέθανεν. Paul does not use this verb in a figurative sense, but in a literal sense: death. The context (vv.8–9) informs the reader that this text is about the death of *Jesus*. The wordings for death frequently appear in 6:2–9: a total of 13 occurrences of death-related terms in 8 verses.[266] This frequent appearance is at its zenith in 6:9. The three death-related terms ἀποθνῄσκω, θάνατος, and νεκρός appear as if 6:9 is confirming the fact that 6:10 describes a *literal* death.

Another aspect of this death needing attention is that this death is related to sin. The expression 'died to sin' (v.10) appears elsewhere in the immediate context (vv.2, 7; cf. 'dead to sin' [v.11]). This death to sin is death to a "destructive force,"[267] and thus if an individual dies to sin, he lives "to God through Jesus" (v.11). Therefore, this expression seems to suggest that it is about liberation from sin, and thus one can presume that sins are forgiven. Morris argues that "the context makes clear that Christ died for our sins; he had none of his own to which he might die. But dealing with our sins meant coming into this world of sin and then dying the death that put sin away."[268]

This forgiveness-concept is supported by this decisive verse: ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας (v.7). Most English translations render the verb δεδικαίωται as analogous to "has been set free." However, the literal translation would be 'has been justified.' Therefore, the verse can better be rendered as follows: "the one who died [to sin] is *justified* from

---

[265] As Jewett, *Romans*, 343, contends, what one can see is "Paul's editing of the atonement hymn in 3:25-26."

[266] ἀποθνῄσκω and θάνατος four times each, νεκρός twice, and συνθάπτω, καταργέω, and συσταυρόω once each.

[267] Jewett, *Romans*, 395.

[268] Morris, *Romans*, 255. The interpretation of this text by Moo, *Romans*, 379, seems less satisfactory: "Christ's separation from the power of sin." His interpretation is quite different from Morris' (cf. Murray, *Romans*, 225; Schreiner, *Romans*, 320). In Moo's view, Christ becomes the recipient of the benefit of his death whilst Schreiner seems to suggest the recipient is probably the believers. Although "the emphasis here is not on the atonement but on the unrepeatable dimension of Christ's life and death" (Jewett, *Romans*, 407), the expression 'died to sin' indeed "has a soteriological meaning" (Hultgren, *Romans*, 251).

sin."[269] As suggested before (4.2.2), forgiveness is integral to justification in Paul. Therefore, it can be said that according to Paul, those who died to sin are forgiven, and 'death to sin' is another example of forgiveness-vocabulary.

It should be noted that Romans 6:10 implies God's grace. This text is located in the process of answering the question of "should we remain in sin in order that grace might increase?" (6:1). Moreover, the 'answer' portion ends with the Roman Christians "under grace" (6:14), which denotes that this text deals with the 'grace' question. If so, Christ's dying to sin can be understood as an act of grace. Regarding the answer section, vv.2–14, many exegetes note "the indicative-imperative juxtaposition in Romans 6,"[270] and more importantly, v.10 is in the 'indicative' section (vv.2–10), which elaborates God's gracious gift.

4.3.4.3 *Romans 8:3b*

ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί

4.3.4.3.1 A Sending Formula

At first sight, this short passage does not seem to belong to the text group which links forgiveness and Jesus' death. To find the link between Jesus' death and forgiveness in the text, the so-called sending formula needs attention. The following are generally considered as the texts which are probably based on the traditional sending formula: Galatians 4:4b–5 in the Pauline corpus; John 3:17, and 1 John 4:9–10, 14. The common features of these formulaic texts are the verb for God's 'sending (usually [ἐξ]ἀποστέλλω),' and the phrase 'his (own) son.' Although the present text does not contain the specific verb, it can surely be considered as a sending formula because it does have the participle of πέμπω, which is equivalent to ἀποστέλλω, and the verb follows the phrase τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν.

Yet, another common feature is outstanding: the purpose of the sending. The purpose in all these sending formulae is obviously indicated "sometimes

---

[269] The HCSB (Holman Christian Standard Bible) version translates the verb δεδικαίωται as "is freed," and annotates it as "or *justified*; lit *acquitted*." More correctly, it should be annotated as "or *acquitted*; lit *justified*." For the interpretation of 'has been set free,' Paul may have employed his usual verb ἐλευθερόω (Rom 6:18, 22; 8:2, 21; Gal 5:1). Dunn, *Romans*, 1:320, states that "a better rendering [for δεδικαίωται] would be 'declared free from (responsibility in relation to) sin.'" Cf. Jewett, *Romans*, 395. Contra Hultgren, *Romans*, 241, who asserts that "to render the verb 'has been justified from sin' does not work here."

[270] Teresa Kuo-Yu Tsui, "Reconsidering Pauline Juxtaposition of Indicative and Imperative (Romans 6:1–14) in Light of Pauline Apocalypticism," *CBQ* 75 (2013): 297–314, 299. For a brief list of scholars who evince this juxtaposition, see ibid., 297n1.

by means of a ἵνα-clause, sometimes by a phrase in apposition," and these literary devices explain "the saving significance of the 'sending.'"[271] Therefore, according to Paul and the Johannine writings, God sent his son in order to save. In the Johannine literature, the ἵνα-clause in John 3:17 directly indicates that the son is sent in order to save the world. Through this salvation, those who believe will be exempted from the judgment, and thereby v.17 seems to suggest that the sins are forgiven. In 1 John 4, the son is sent to confer eternal life, to be the forgiveness (ἱλασμός) of sins, and to be the saviour of the world. Therefore, the salvific aim of the sending is evident in the Johannine literature. Moreover, it is significant that based on 1 John 4:10, salvation can be understood as the forgiveness of sins.

If the forgiveness-concept is present in the Johannine sending formulae, can the death-imagery also be found in them? It is certainly possible to find Jesus' death in the context of John 3:17 because of the expression ὑψωθῆναι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (v.14). If one considers the *double entendre* in John's gospel, the passive infinitive of ὑψόω can certainly signify both meanings of 'to be glorified,' and 'to be crucified.'[272] For this study, the latter meaning of the double-meaning is important. If the verb definitely means the death of Jesus as the Son of Man, John 3:17 indicates God's sending Jesus to save by means of Jesus' death. Although 1 John 4 does not contain an explicit expression for death, the apparent parallel, including the rare word μονογενῆ, between 1 John 4 and John 3:16–18 can indicate that they share a similar background. Therefore, the Johannine sending formulae can convey forgiveness as the purpose and Jesus' death as a means of this forgiveness.

This Johannine understanding of the salvific purpose of the formula remains the same in Paul. Another Pauline sending formula in Galatians 4:4 mentions God's sending, and the next verse indicates its purpose again by the

---

[271] Werner Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God*, SBT 50 (London: SCM, 1966), 113. John 3:17 and 1 John 4:9 contain the ἵνα-clause, and 1 John 4:10, 14 explain the purpose of the sending by a phrase in apposition. Similarly, Martin Hengel indicates "the soteriological significance of the sending" (*The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*, trans. John Bowden [London: SCM, 1976], 11).

[272] For understanding 'ὑψόω' as one of the *double entendre* expressions in John's gospel, consult James H. Charlesworth, "The Symbology of the Serpent in the Gospel of John," in *Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel*, vol. 2 of *John, Jesus, and History*, ed. Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just SJ, and Tom Thatcher (Atlanta: SBL, 2009), 63–72, especially 68–69, where he mentions the word '*double entendre*,' and lists the scholars who find the double meaning of the verb. For scholars who maintain that the Johannine 'lifted-up' sayings definitely signify the *death* of Jesus, but not his ascention, see Craig R. Koester, "Aspects of Historicity in John 1–4: A Response," in Anderson, Just, and Thatcher, *John*, 93–103, 100; Francis J. Moloney, "The Johannine Son of Man Revisited," in *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel: Essays by the Members of the SNTS Johannine Writings Seminar*, ed. G. Van Belle, J.G. van der Watt, and P. Maritz, BETL 184 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), 177–202, 186–89.

ἵνα-clause. Here Paul communicates the idea that God sent forth his son in order to redeem (ἐξαγοράζω) those under the law. To understand Galatians 4:4b–5 fully, Galatians 3:13 needs to be considered because of the parallel between 3:13a and 4:5a.[273] It has been shown earlier (4.3.3.3) that whilst elaborating the same redemptive action (ἐξαγοράζω) in Galatians 3:13, this redemption is definitely linked to forgiveness and salvation. Moreover, Jesus' death is clearly displayed by the phrase 'hang on a tree' (3:13). Accordingly, the idea of forgiveness by Jesus' death is certainly present in Galatians 3. Based on the terminological similarity between Galatians 3:13 and 4:4b–5, and their nearness to one another, it is likely that the divine redemption in 4:4b–5 conveys the forgiveness-theme and Jesus' death, and that they are connected to one another.

If both the Pauline and the Johannine sending formulae presume the related ideas of forgiveness and Jesus' death, it seems plausible that a likely sending formula in Romans 8:3 conveys both ideas.[274] Although the present text, Romans 8:3, contains the common pattern of God's sending of his (own) son, the purpose clause as another common feature of the sending formula seems to be missing from the text at first glance. There are three possibilities which can be drawn from this observation: (1) Romans 8:3 is not based on the sending formula, or (2) it is a partial sending formula without the purpose clause, or (3) it is a full-fledged formula with a 'soteriological' expression as its purpose. On this issue, Kramer astutely points out that in Romans 8 "we cannot be so sure about the clause which interprets the saving significance of the sending, for although this is indeed spoken of, the language seems to be Paul's own."[275] According to him, Romans 8 does carry the salvific purpose

[273] Compare 3:13a (Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα) and 4:5a (ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ). In addition to the shared verb ἐξαγοράζω, the two passages contain the same noun νόμος which likely means the oppressor from which the redeemed are released.

[274] Concerning the Pauline sending formula in Galatians 4:4–5 and a possible formulaic text, Romans 8:3, Jewett, *Romans*, 482, argues that "the close parallel with Gal 4:4 indicates that Paul substituted the wording 'likeness of sinful flesh' in place of 'born of a woman, born under the law,'" but, he states, "the parallels [between the sending formulae] are restricted to the sending language and sonship." There is another phrase which shows the close relationship of Romans 8 and Galatians 4 in a broader context. The rare expression 'Abba, father' only appears two times in the Pauline literature: Romans 8:15 and Galatians 4:6.

[275] Kramer, *Christ, Lord*, 113. Therefore, he prefers the option (2). Similarly, Jewett, *Romans*, 483, comments that "Paul alludes here to a formula that was probably familiar to Roman believers." Kramer and Jewett observe that the Romans 8:3b is Paul's adaptation of an existing formula. If this is indeed based on the sending formula, this signifies that God's sending and its salvific aspect accomplished by Jesus' death must have been shared by the Pauline and the Johannine circles.

expressed by a Pauline phrase even though the phrase seems not to be from a tradition.

If so, where is the purpose clause of the likely sending formula? The first candidate would be the ἵνα-clause in 8:4. The clause is certainly a clause which can connote purpose. Yet, this clause actually signifies "the purpose of the redemptive action depicted in v.3"[276] rather than the purpose of the sending. If the ἵνα-clause elaborates the purpose of *the redemptive action*, then this means 8:3 by itself speaks of the redemption as a purpose of the sending formula. This leads the reader to study 8:3.

4.3.4.3.2 περὶ ἁμαρτίας Resulting in Forgiveness

The prime candidate for the saving significance in v.3b is καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας. There are two distinct interpretations of the phrase περὶ ἁμαρτίας. A traditional interpretation is "for (dealing with) sins," but a growing number of modern scholars interpret it as "as a sin offering."[277] The scholars who argue for the latter meaning indicate that the phrase can be translated in either way on the grounds of the LXX-Leviticus translation, and its interpretation seems dependent on the context.[278] It seems more plausible to see the phrase as in the second sense. However, more significant is that in either interpretation, the sins are dealt with, which means that sin are expiated.[279] This indicates that the expression can play the role of providing the saving purpose of the sending formula in 8:3b as a phrase in apposition. According to Fitzmyer, this expression is "the purpose of the sending of the Son."[280]

If περὶ ἁμαρτίας can be interpreted as 'a sin offering,' it can surely convey Jesus' death and forgiveness because a sin offering naturally suggests both senses of forgiveness and victim's death. By offering a sin offering, the victim is sacrificed and the sins of an offerer are forgiven. Even if the better rendering of the expression is 'for (dealing with) sins,' this expression in-

---

[276] Jewett, *Romans*, 485.

[277] For two important scholars who adopt this interpretation, see 87n30. If this translation is correct, then "this text demonstrates a clear link between Christology and sacrifice" (Bell, "Sacrifice," 5–6). Cf. Richard H. Bell, "Sin Offerings and Sinning with a High Hand," *JPJ* 4 (1995): 25–59, 56n5, where he confidently argues against scholars who deny the notion that "Jesus' death was viewed by Paul as an atoning sacrifice."

[278] The decisive factor for its translation is the context. For the translation of 'sin offering,' see the following clear examples: Philo, *Spec.Laws* 1.194; Hebrews 10:6, 8, where the different offerings are classified according to the type of sacrifice. For 'for sins,' see John 16:8, 9, where sin is juxtaposed with other nouns such as righteousness and judgment.

[279] Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 486, correctly puts it, "although the image would be different, the underlying idea would still be the same. Through Christ's mission humanity's sin has been taken away."

[280] Ibid.

cludes the redemptive purpose. Therefore, the saving significance is provided by either rendering of the phrase περὶ ἁμαρτίας.

If one prefers to interpret 'περὶ ἁμαρτίας' as 'for (dealing with) sin,' it appears that the forgiveness-theme alone is evident in v.3. However, the following word 'κατέκρινεν' indicates that the death image is still in view because "the 'condemnation' which 'sin' required has been meted out in the Messiah's death."[281] Moreover, later in the same chapter (v.34), this word is connected to death.[282] This death in v.34 is not of an ordinary person, but of Jesus. If the word is connected to Jesus' death in the context, it is not hard at all to apply this link to the present text. Most commentators interpret this main verb 'κατέκρινεν' (v.3b) as focusing on Jesus' death.

In the text, therefore, Paul implicitly elaborates Jesus' death and the forgiveness-theme by the sending formula and the above-mentioned terms such as περὶ ἁμαρτίας and κατέκρινεν. More than that, Jesus' death and remission of sins are tightly linked, if we take περὶ ἁμαρτίας as the purpose of God's sending his son. Moreover, if the rendering 'as a sin offering' is legitimate, the early Christians do understand Jesus' death in terms of sacrifice.[283]

As always, Paul does not forget to leave a sign for God's grace behind this Christological and soteriological text. As Hultgren suggests, Romans 8:3a can be understood as follows: "because of the weakness due to the flesh (human weakness), God has entered into the human sphere for a saving purpose."[284] When human beings are unable to save themselves, God shows his initiative, and graciously sends his own son to remove the sins.

4.3.4.4 *Concluding Remarks*

The two texts in this section, Romans 3:24–25, and 8:3b, make it readily visible that Paul does portray Jesus' death in a sacrificial tone. The mercy-seat in Romans 3 with 'blood' inevitably reminds the reader of the Day of Atonement (Lev 16), which includes the cult of sin offering and burnt offering. In Romans 8, if περὶ ἁμαρτίας is rendered as 'as a sin offering,' the text highlights the sacrificial idea based on sin offering. This means that "Paul sees Jesus' death as a sacrifice,"[285] as Dunn has already indicated. This sacri-

---

[281] Wright, *Paul*, 2:1024. Cf. Dunn, *Romans*, 1:422; Hultgren, *Romans*, 299; Kim, *Origin*, 275.

[282] Rom 8:34 seems to indicate that there is none who can condemn God's elect *because* Jesus is already condemned to death.

[283] Lester L. Grabbe states: "the central Christian metaphor is, after all, the *sacrifice* of Christ – which has little meaning if the Israelite sacrificial system is not taken into account" (*An Introduction to Second Temple Judaism: History and Religion of the Jews in the Time of Nehemiah, the Maccabees, Hillel and Jesus* [London: T&T Clark, 2010], 41).

[284] Hultgren, *Romans*, 298.

[285] Dunn, "Paul's Understanding," 43.

ficial interpretation of Jesus' death is also justified by 1 Corinthians 5:7b: γὰρ τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστός.[286]

Two aspects of the theme of Jesus' death dispensing forgiveness recur: pre-Pauline tradition and grace. Again, it has been argued that the two texts above are probably from a traditional confession. This signifies that the understanding of Jesus' death as a sacrifice probably expresses a pre-Pauline consensus of the early Christians. Moreover, the texts in this group suggest that Jesus' forgiving death is an act of grace. Romans 3:24–25 includes an emphasis on grace, and Romans 6:10a is located in the inclusio frame of grace (v.1 and v.14), and the first half of Romans 8:3b implies that Jesus' forgiving death is gracious gift from God.

4.4 Paul on Forgiveness of Sins through the Historical Jesus' Death

4.4.1 Two Christ-Traditions in 1 Corinthians

Among the pre-Pauline traditions in the first letter to the Corinthians are two Christ-traditions: the Supper-tradition in chapter 11 and the well-known *kerygma* in 15.[287] Both traditions have παραλαμβάνω and παραδίδωμι, which are "technical terms used in connection with a carefully preserved tradition."[288]

---

[286] On the textual level, it should be mentioned that the Byzantine text-type of this text contains the soteriological ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, which seems original in my judgment. Since another ΗΜΩΝ precedes this ΥΠΕΡΗΜΩΝ, the easiest solution for this variable reading would be 'omission by homeoteleuton.' If this Byzantine reading is original, then the sacrificial image in Paul is strengthened, and this image should not be ignored in Pauline studies. Although a number of scholars indicate the fact that the slaughtered Passover lamb itself does not atone, in the festive tradition of Israel, the ritual for the feast of Unleavened Bread which follows the Passover contains a sin offering (Lev 23:19; Num 28:32). Interestingly, as Mark 14:1 and Luke 22:1 indicate, the distinction between the feast and the Passover might have been unclear in Jesus' days. Moreover, the image of 'rescue from Egypt' is strong enough to support this atoning role of Jesus' sacrifice as *the* (τό) Passover Lamb.

[287] Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 1:46, pinpoints these two texts to argue "for a certain fund of teachings from and about Jesus circulating among first-generation Pauline churches." Meier asserts that these few clear cases serve as "an independent source," but only "for checking the Synoptics." On the two passages in 1 Corinthians, David Wenham also states, "most scholars (though not quite all) agree that in [1 Corinthians 7:10, 11; 9:14; 11:23–26; 15:3–8] and in the verses from 1 Timothy and 2 Peter we have conscious use of traditions of Jesus that were passed down in the early church" ("Jesus Tradition in the Letters of the New Testament," in *HSHJ*, 3:2041–57, 2042).

[288] Ronald J. Sider, "St. Paul's Understanding of the Nature and Significance of the Resurrection in I Corinthians XV 1–19," *NovT*, 19 (1977): 124–41, 133. See m. Avot 1:1; Josephus, *Ant*. 13.297. For a pagan usage of the two Greek verbs in the first century BCE, see Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca Historica*, 5.2.3. Cf. Samuel Byrskog, "The Transmis-

These two words are the marker for handling a tradition. By using the technical terms, Paul indicated his role as a link within the transmission of the tradition, and thus it is clear that Paul did not formulate the wordings of these two traditions. If so, the two pre-Pauline traditions above must be used for historical Jesus study, specifically for Jesus' thought regarding his own death. From these two traditions, a fairly good case can be made: the historical Jesus probably thought that his death had expiatory significance, that is, it was the forgiveness of sins. It will be demonstrated by examining the two above-mentioned traditions in 1 Corinthians, specifically 15:3 and 11:23–26.

4.4.1.1 *1 Corinthians 15:3*

This text is "one of the most important passages with regard to Paul's knowledge of the earthly Jesus."[289] When considering it initially, along with the use of the technical terms for the handling of Jewish tradition, there are un-Pauline wordings.[290] Therefore, most scholars concur that "Paul claims not a message that he created or invented but a message whose content has been prescribed."[291] Because Paul "imparts a formula and . . . he does it word for word,"[292] the portion 'Christ died for our sins' can surely be the original wording of the pre-Pauline tradition.

Hence, it is not surprising that there is no scholarly debate whether or not 15:3–5 is a genuine and well-received tradition. There is debate, however, concerning two other issues: (1) the boundary of the earliest tradition, which means, whether the tradition is continued after v.5, (2) its origin, more specifically, whether the tradition originated from a Diaspora community or a Palestinian community. The first debate is about the genuineness of the tradition, and there is virtually universal agreement that at least 15:3–5 is original.[293]

---

sion of the Jesus Tradition: Old and New Insights," *Early Christianity* 1 (2010): 441–68, 449–51; Dibellius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, 21; Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus: Tradition and Interpretation in the Passion Narrative*, WUNT II/33 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988), 206; Richard A. Horsley, *1 Corinthians* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1998), 160; Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 101; Seyoon Kim, *Paul and the New Perspective: Second Thoughts on the Origin of Paul's Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 205, 286. F.F. Bruce argues that when Paul "speaks of his gospel as *tradition*, 'received' by him from those who were 'in Christ' before him, he speaks of a message which begins with the historical Jesus" (*Paul: Apostle of the Heart Set Free* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977], 100).

[289] Stanley E. Porter, "Images of Christ in Paul's Letters," in *Images of Christ: Ancient and Modern*, ed. Stanley E. Porter, David Tombs and Michael A. Hayes (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 95–112, 99.

[290] See 2n3 above.

[291] Schnabel, *Early Christian Mission*, 2:961. Cf. Green, *Death of Jesus*, 206.

[292] Dibelius, *Tradition*, 18.

[293] Sider, "Paul's Understanding," 133, asserts that "vv.3–5 would seem to be the minimum which can be designated with certainty as part of that which Paul had received." For

Therefore, the issue which will be considered is the second one, the origin of the tradition. To answer this question is important because it is indissolubly related to the date of its formulation. By stating that the tradition "was very probably in use before AD 50 in Antioch,"[294] Wilckens suggests that the year 50 is the *terminus ad quem* for Paul's sharing of the tradition, for it was when Paul visited Corinth as generally agreed. Therefore, it is clear that Paul shared this *kerygma* with the Corinthian believers in 50 CE at the latest.

If Paul shared it in 50, when did Paul receive it, and when was it fixed? If the confessional tradition quoted by Paul is indeed pre-Pauline and is in line with the Jerusalem apostles, the latest date for Paul to receive the tradition would be before his first missionary journey around 44 CE. Because the Jerusalem apostles grasped the ultimate significance of Jesus' death, they probably delivered it to Paul before he set out on that journey, at the latest. Alternatively, Paul could have received it shortly after his conversion (some time between 32–35 CE). If this tradition is indeed "of first importance," the primitive Christian community may well have shared it with him at that early stage.

Considering these two possibilities for Paul's reception of the tradition, Leon-Dufour simply summarizes the options for the provenance and the dates of its origin: "if the text is Greek in origin, it goes back to the period of his stay at Antioch (ca. 42), whereas if the formula is of Palestinian origin, it can be dated from the time of his conversion in Damascus (ca. 35)."[295] This reflects the debate between Jeremias and Conzelmann regarding the original language of the *kerygma*. Jeremias argues for the Semitic language and Conzelmann for Greek.[296] Yet, they did not argue about the original birthplace of the tradition. Conzelmann argue against the Semitic language background, but does not deny the possibility of its origin even in Jerusalem, even though he prefers Antioch, a Hellenistic community, to Jerusalem. On the other hand, Jeremias does not deny that the tradition could have sprung from the Hellenistic community.

---

the scholars who minimalize the tradition only as vv.3–4, see Fee, *First Corinthians*, 723n49. Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 1203nn189–90, lists the two groups of scholars respectively according to their acceptance or rejection of vv. 6–7 as the part of the tradition (Thiselton suggests that the pre-Pauline tradition is "probably vv.3–5" [1177]). This broad scholarly acceptance of vv.3–5 as a tradition is against Bultmann, *Kerygma and Myth*, 112, who asserts that "I cannot accept I Cor 15:3–8 as kerygma."

[294] Ulrich Wilckens, "The Tradition-history of the Resurrection of Jesus," in *The Significance of the Message of the Resurrection for faith in Jesus Christ*, ed. C.F.D. Moule, SBT 8 (London: SCM, 1968), 51–76, 57.

[295] Xavier Léon-Dufour, *Resurrection and the Message of Easter* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1974), 6–7. Similarly, Green, *Death of Jesus*, 3, states that "the soteriological interpretation of Jesus' death ('for us') can be traced back at least as far as the earliest Greek-speaking Christian community."

[296] Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 101–5; Conzelmann, "Analysis," 15–25.

On this point, Lüdemann correctly states, "on the whole, the dichotomy of 'Jerusalem or Antioch' seems to be an exaggeration, for even if Christians in Antioch mediated the tradition to Paul, they would only have reproduced what they had received from Jerusalem."[297] Likewise, Hengel suggests that the tradition of 1 Corinthians 15:3 "first arose in Antioch or go[es] back to Aramaic originals by looking for their real point of origin in the 'Hellenist' community in Jerusalem." [298]

If the creedal formulation was fixed by the Hellenists in Jerusalem, which is probable, it is correct to argue that this 'pre-Pauline' confession "was already a traditional formula within a few years of crucifixion."[299] This early interpretation of Jesus' death can indeed be regarded as a very rapidly developed confession. Indeed, the time lag between his death and this confession was so short, thus, "the development which takes place within it can only be called amazing."[300]

Again by referring to 'what I received' in 15:3, Paul expressed the idea that he did not abandon those who handed on the early tradition to him. Paul was not alone: he absorbed the kerygma from and in line with the Jerusalem apostles. It should be noted that Marcion omitted this wording from his canon because indeed he did not wish to acknowledge the pillars of the Jerusalem church. Yet Paul was a link between the donor and the recipient of the tradition. Therefore, Ellis correctly argues, "by that designation [Paul] represents himself not as an innovator *de novo* but as one who stands within the context of a tradition."[301]

So far, it is safe to say that the line 'Christ died for our sins' originated from within the Jerusalem community. If this expression is a part of the genuine tradition, it is a historical fact that the early Christians related forgiveness of sins to the death of Jesus of Nazareth from very early on. As in 15:3, the so-called 'dying formula' consists of ἀποθνήσκω with the preposi-

---

[297] Lüdemann, *Paul: Founder*, 170. Also, Hengel, *Atonement*, 38, states, "thus one could say that the form of the paradosis goes back to the early period of Paul's activity in Antioch and Syria, and indeed even back as far as Damascus, but that its content in nearly all its statements refers back to Jerusalem."

[298] Hengel, *Jesus and Paul*, 27. Correspondingly, Wilckens, "Tradition-history," 57, also argues that "it is perfectly possible that this formula was common to the oldest missionary communities of the diaspora and goes back to the circle of the 'Hellenists.'"

[299] *JVG*, 109. Gerhard Delling also argues that Paul "had received [it] sometime in the fourth decade of the century—and in all probability during the first half of that decade" ("The Significance of the Resurrection of Jesus for Faith in Jesus Christ" in Moule, *Significance*, 77–104, 78). Cf. Hengel, *Jesus and Paul*, 31; O'Collins, "Peter," 271; Riesner, "Historical Jesus," 196.

[300] Hengel, *Jesus and Paul*, 31. Similarly, Ellis, "Traditions," 496, states, "it also shows in surprising ways how widespread and varied was the literary expression of Christianity in its earliest stages."

[301] Ellis, "Traditions," 495.

tion ὑπέρ. It occurs 6 times in the undisputed Pauline letters (see the texts under 4.3.2).

The phrase ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν in 15:3 is "a phrase which Paul uses in identical form in Gal 1:4."[302]

Gal 1:3b–4a	κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν
1 Cor 15:3b	Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφάς,

In Galatians, Paul quotes a portion of the formulaic statement. It should be noted that ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν in Galatians 1:4 is identical with "the 'bare bones' content of the gospel"[303] in 1 Corinthians 15:3. There are other texts which mention that the subject of the sentence is either God or Jesus' betrayer. Therefore, Paul could have used here either a divine passive form (as in Rom 4:25), or God as the subject (as in Rom 8:32). However, in the Galatians text, Paul placed Christ as the subject, and thus, it is the Lord Jesus Christ who *gave himself* for forgiveness of sins. Because of ἑαυτὸν, the subject is explicit. As Cousar correctly puts it, Galatians 1:4 indeed "affirms Jesus' own initiative."[304] From the two Pauline writings, one can identify the historical Jesus' intention: He died for the forgiveness of sins. Now if the understanding of 'died for our sins' is from the historical Jesus himself,[305] it can imply that the historical Jesus had in mind that he himself gave his life for forgiveness of sins. To prove whether this is correct, we now look at the Supper-tradition.

---

[302] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 1191.

[303] Fee, *First Corinthians*, 722.

[304] Cousar, *Theology*, 26. Similarly, Breytenbach, "Septuagint Version," 348n39, states that "1 Cor 15:3 expresses the death of Christ as his own action" (cf. Gal 2:20, "τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ . . . παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ"). Therefore, Perrin, *Modern Pilgrimage*, 103, claims it shows "the central figure actively 'giving himself.'" Moreover, while 1 Maccabees 6 describes "Eleazar's *voluntary* death" (Paul Middleton, *Martyrdom: A Guide for the Perplexed* [London: T&T Clark, 2011], 128 [emphasis mine]), the author uses the expression ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν (6:44), which corresponds to Galatians 1:4. Likewise, Marie-Françoise Baslez indicates this death as "an example of *intended* martyrdom" ("The Origin of the Martyrdom Images: From the Book of Maccabees to the First Christians," in *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology*, ed. Géza Xeravits, and József Zsengellér, JSJSup 118 [Leiden: Brill, 2007], 113–30, 126 [emphasis mine]). Cf. Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, 402; Hengel, *Atonement*, 35.

[305] Based on Galatians 1:4, Bruce, *Galatians*, 77, argues that this is the case: "but if this interpretation of the death of Christ was widely held among his followers within twenty years after the event, it is antecedently probable that he himself gave the impetus to it. The earliest evangelist represents him as accepting his death in this spirit: speaking of himself as giving his life as 'a ransom for many' (Mark 10:45), speaking of his 'covenant blood' as 'poured out for many' (Mark 14:24; the epexegetic εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν in Matt 26:28 makes explicit what is implicit in Mark's account)."

4.4.1.2 *1 Corinthians 11:23–26*

So far, it has been argued that there is a shared understanding of Christ's death for forgiveness (1 Cor 15:3; Gal 1:4) and that the prominent grammatical subject, Christ, makes clear that this is the historical Jesus' understanding of his death. However, the grammatical usage of the pronoun ἑαυτὸν may not be enough in itself to attest the historical Jesus' intention. It is true that "it is still debated whether Jesus ascribed an atoning efficacy to his death."[306] So we proceed to examine the Lord's Supper *paradosis* to see if there is another piece of evidence. As mentioned above, the technical terms for careful handling of a tradition reappear as in 1 Corinthians 15. Therefore, it can be affirmed that this is also an authoritative tradition.[307]

In this text, both Jesus' death and the forgiveness-theme are reiterated and they are closely linked to one another (see 4.3.3.2). Concerning ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, an expression denoting the forgiveness-theme, although it should be admitted that "whether it belonged originally to this saying is much debated,"[308] what is common in all the Eucharist texts is that they share the forgiveness-theme. This debate is caused by subtle differences. The phrase is linked to the cup-saying in Matthew 26 and Mark 14 in contrast to 1 Corinthians 11 and Luke 22, where it belongs to the bread saying. Another difference is that in Matthew and Mark ὑπὲρ πολλῶν appears whilst the other two texts contain ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν.[309] Based on these observations, the focus of the debate is not whether the 'forgiveness' is original in the tradition but to which part within the tradition it belongs. Therefore, we can at least argue that 1 Corinthians 11 includes the forgiveness-theme.

If this text is undeniably a tradition, it is fair to say that this stemmed from the earliest followers of Jesus who were present at the last supper scene with the historical Jesus.[310] If, however, they formulated the tradition, does it mean that they themselves invented it? One may claim that after Jesus' death, the followers formulated the confessional formula even though Jesus had

---

[306] Otto Knoch, "'Do This in Memory of Me!' (Luke 22:20; 1 Cor 11:24–25): The Celebration of the Eucharist in the Primitive Christian Communities," in Meyer, *One Loaf,* 1–10, 8.

[307] Akenson, *Saul*, 218, contends: "the Eucharist involved a formula but, unlike the creedal formulae, it is embedded in an event that is reported as being specific to Yeshua's life story. And, very unusually for Saul, he warrants the historic authenticity of this occurrence – he has 'received of the Lord' (1 Cor. 11:23) the facts and words he passes on to his disciples.'"

[308] Fee, *First Corinthians*, 551.

[309] In Matthew, περί is used instead of ὑπέρ, but it is clear that Matthew here means ὑπὲρ πολλῶν in Pauline sense because he clarifies this by adding the wording 'for forgiveness of sins.'

[310] Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 608, also argues, "there need be little doubt . . . that the tradition itself stemmed ultimately from the event now known as the last supper itself."

never said something like the tradition.[311] It seems that Paul did not want to leave room for this line of thought. He cautiously used a preposition to show the originator of the Eucharistic words. According to Jeremias, "παρά indicates those who hand on the tradition; ἀπό, on the contrary, [indicates] the originator of the tradition. Paul therefore stressed in I Cor. 11.23 with the help of the preposition ἀπό that the eucharistic words cited by him out of the tradition go back to Jesus himself."[312] On this issue, Hengel is correct: "it was not primarily [the followers'] own theological reflections, but above all the interpretative sayings of Jesus at the Last Supper which showed them how to understand his death properly."[313]

The last question that should be asked is this: When Paul mentions 'Lord Jesus' in 1 Corinthians 11:23, does he mean the historical Jesus or the Risen Lord? If he means the latter, this text would become an unreliable source for the study of the *historical* Jesus. Yet, Lüdemann points out the "characteristic Pauline merger of personae," which is, "when Paul speaks of the Resur-

---

[311] For example, Crossan, *Historical Jesus*, 360–67. Concerning the historicity of the event, the scholars are divided. We can start from the minimalistic approach of Gerd Lüdemann who considers that Mark 14:25 alone can be authentic (*Jesus After 2000 Years: What He Really Said and Did* [London: SCM, 2000], 97). His approach is different from the Jesus Seminar Fellows who assert that nothing authentic is behind the Markan narrative of the last supper (Robert W. Funk, Roy W. Hoover and The Jesus Seminar, *The Five Gospels: The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus* [New York: Macmillan, 1993], 118). Mark 14:25 ("I will never again drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.") implies that Jesus sensed his impending death, and this implication corresponds to what I have discussed in 1.2.2.2. If the historical Jesus "did this at a time when he knew he was in mortal danger" (Akenson, *Saul*, 219), he might have commented something similar to Mark 14:25. Moreover, he probably must have had time to ponder over his approaching death, and to project particular significance to it, and more than that, might have tried hard to communicate the significance of his death at the table with his followers. Therefore, one can confidently argue that "Jesus spoke about the meaning of his death during his last meal" (Petr Pokorný, "Jesus Research as Feedback on His *Wirkungsgeschichte*," in *HSHJ*, 1:333–59, 340). Contra Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, 393, who argues that Romans 3:25; 5:9; 1 Corinthians 10:16; 11:25, 27; Colosians 1:20 "make theological points, not historical observations, they do assume that Jesus' execution was not bloodless." For a recent detailed argument for the historicity of the last supper, see I. Howard Marshall, "The Last Supper," in *Key Events in the Life of the Historical Jesus: A Collaborative Exploration of Context and Coherence*, ed. Darrell L. Bock and Robert L. Webb, WUNT 247 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 481–588.

[312] Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 202–3. Hofius, "Lord's Supper," 76n3, affirms, "the expression ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου in 11:23a indicates the originator of the tradition." Lüdemann, "Paul as Witness," 202–3, agrees to this by claiming that the expression 'from the Lord' "indicates the ultimate source of the communion ritual in which the Lord is present. He himself has established the holy rite of eating and drinking." Cf. Clay Ham, "The Last Supper in Matthew," *BBR* 10 (2000): 53–69, 54; Helmut Koester, "The Memory of Jesus' Death and the Worship of the Risen Lord," *HTR* 91 (1998): 335–50, 344.

[313] Hengel, *Atonement*, 73.

rected Lord, the man Jesus is at the same time in his mind."[314] Therefore, there is no need to deny on the basis of the title, 'Lord Jesus,' that the Pauline letters are valuable sources for information regarding the final days of the historical Jesus. Bruce states that "Paul's gospel as tradition bridges whatever gulf may be felt to separate the [historical Jesus] from the [exalted Christ], for it includes both within its scope, and affirms their continuity and identity."[315]

Furthermore, it seems more plausible that Paul received this tradition from the earthly Jesus through the chain of tradition than from the Risen Lord through direct revelation. Two reasons which are related to one another can be given for this: (1) his use of the tradition-handling verbs, and (2) the issue of credibility. First, Fee comments that "Paul uses the language for transmitting 'tradition' to refer to these words of institution, and does not suggest that it came to him 'by revelation.'"[316] Because its context is keeping the tradition alive, it would be odd if Paul was saying he received it from outside the process of its transmission. Second, it is less credible for Paul to claim revelation than communication with witnesses. Paul could have said that this tradition was from the risen Jesus, but anybody can make that claim. Even today, it can occur that an ordinary person claims that s/he is Jesus, or they saw Jesus in person. When one hears this kind of claim, a normal response would be dismissal (cf. Exod 4:1). If Paul claimed the good news which he

---

[314] Lüdemann, "Paul as Witness," 199. He presents 1 Corinthians 11:23 as one of the examples which shows Paul's understanding of 'Lord Jesus' as "both the man Jesus *and* the Risen Lord" (198). In a similar fashion, Pokorný, "Jesus Research," 1:340–41, states that 'from the Lord' means both from the man Jesus and the Lord: "Paul claimed that he had received this tradition from the Lord. Since Paul never met Jesus during his earthly life, his assertion must be understood in a spiritual sense, as representing the Risen Lord's confirmation of the tradition regarding Jesus. Nevertheless, Paul used the verb *paradidonai* (to hand over) here (as well as in 1 Cor 15:1–3 where he presents the 'formula of faith'). In this case, *paradidonai* is obviously related to the chain of transmission (in Latin, *traditio*). This means that in 1 Corinthians 11, *paradidonai* has a double meaning. Paul had learned the tradition about the Institution of the Lord's Supper from Jesus' closest disciples, and the Risen Lord had confirmed that it was his living heritage (in prayer and through his epiphany)." Cf. Francis Watson, "'I Received from the Lord . . .:' Paul, Jesus, and the Last Supper," in Still, *Reconnected*, 103–24.

[315] Bruce, *Paul*, 101. As Akenson, *Saul*, 202, indicates, because Paul "most definitely was not present at the original Last Supper[,] what I think he is doing here is saying [by mentioning 'Lord'] that this is an historical event for which he gives the highest warrant of authenticity: it is as true as if Jesus Christ were telling it himself."

[316] Fee, *First Corinthians,* 548. Cf. Günther Bornkamm, *Early Christian Experience*, NTL (London: SCM, 1969), 130–31. When Paul mentions his reception of Jesus tradition directly through Jesus, he employs the word ἀποκάλυψις as in Galatians 1:12. Kim Huat Tan indicates that "the absence of the mention of 'revelation' supports [his reception through transmission]" (*The Zion Traditions and the Aims of Jesus* [Cambridge: CUP, 1997], 200n14).

preached was from a resuscitated Jew, the Corinthians would not accept Paul's claim, but consider him as someone suffering from hallucination.

Concerning the issue of credibility, Farmer asks a novel question, "'by what authority does the Apostle to the Gentiles assure the Corinthian church that the tradition concerning the Lord's Supper he had received and had in turn passed on to them, originated with Jesus himself?'"[317] He answers as follows: "by the authority of those who were apostles before him." Paul claimed that Jesus gave his body for the forgiveness of their sins, and then some Corinthians believed and accepted it. Because Paul's teaching was dependent on the witnesses in Jerusalem, it seemed more reliable to the Corinthians. Paul was confident in listing the witnesses in chapter 15. Perhaps in his mind, he was thinking, 'If you don't believe me, go figure! In Jerusalem, there are over 500 people who say the exact same thing.'

Therefore, it is probable that he shared this *paradosis* by leaning on the authority of the Jerusalem apostles who directly saw the earthly Jesus. He brought his helpers when he visited Corinth. Among them is one who came from Jerusalem. As Hengel states, "we should not forget that when he founded the community in Corinth, Paul was accompanied by a missionary partner from Jerusalem, Silas-Silvanus (I Thess. 1.1; Acts 15.40)."[318] If Paul acted like an independent missionary on his own, his partner from Jerusalem would have left him right away. Furthermore, the whole Corinthian church would not accept his gospel as credible and authoritative. Therefore, we can concur with Farmer that Paul "is not just an independent apostle who has seen the Risen Jesus. He is an independent apostle who stands in a close relationship to Peter."[319]

In conjunction with 1 Corinthians 15, the Last Supper tradition shows the inseparable relationship between the historical Jesus' death and forgiveness of sins. Moreover, due to the preposition ἀπό, one can trace back this relation up to the historical Jesus himself. According to Paul, it is *the historical Jesus* who finds the inextricable tie between his death and forgiveness. Therefore, "it is fair to say that whoever made that connection is the 'founder of Christianity.' All the evidence points to Jesus himself."[320]

---

[317] William R. Farmer, "Peter and Paul, and the Tradition concerning 'The Lord's Supper' in 1 Cor 11:23–26," in Meyer, *One Loaf,* 35–55, 54.

[318] Hengel, *Atonement*, 38.

[319] Farmer, "Peter and Paul," 43. He even asserts that "Paul is passing on a pro-Petrine tradition."

[320] Fee, *First Corinthians*, 724. Likewise, Green, *Death of Jesus*, 206, says, "according to Paul the Eucharistic words go back to Jesus himself."

4.5 Conclusions

After confining the Pauline corpus to the undisputed seven epistles (section 4.1), one can observe that the vocabulary related to 'forgiveness' occurs a few times in the epistles (4.2.1). However, because the idea of forgiveness is integral to Paul's favourite concept of justification (4.2.2; cf. Rom 4:6–8), it can definitely be argued that the forgiveness-theme is prevalent in Paul. In addition to the *dikaio*-terms denoting justification, terminology which communicates the meaning of salvation such as reconciliation, rescue, deliverance, adoption, redemption, release and etc. may be included as broad justification-vocabulary (4.2.3). In fact, the abundance of the forgiveness-theme in Paul facilitates the study on the relationship between the theme and Jesus' death.

Among the texts containing the forgiveness-theme, the sixteen texts which also encompass Jesus' death were selected (4.3) and discussed under the following four sections: the giving-up formula (4.3.1), the dying formula (4.3.2), other death-denoting terms with the preposition ὑπέρ (4.3.3), and other significant texts (4.3.4). Jesus' death is one of the critical and valuable subjects, if not *the* subject, in the Pauline literature because for Paul, the death of Jesus, "often mentioned in tandem with his resurrection, occupies the central position in Paul's representation of the gospel."[321] Paul not only reiterates the significance of this subject, but also relates it to the forgiveness-theme.[322] Their inseparable correlation, which Paul presents, is that Jesus' death is a means of the forgiveness of sins. Although there are differences in the degree of explicitness regarding how Jesus' death and the forgiveness-theme appear in each text and the way the two concepts are linked, the strong connection between the concepts is evident.

The contents of the 'Summarizing Remarks' sections (4.3.1.5, 4.3.2.6, 4.3.3.4, and 4.3.4.4) contain a recurrent pattern in mentioning the close correlation between Jesus' death and the forgiveness-theme. In addition to their close relationship, the following three features recur frequently in the texts: (1) (traces of) pre-Pauline tradition, (2) the preposition ὑπέρ, and (3) the idea of grace. To begin with, most selected texts are probably either a direct quote of, or Paul's reworking of, pre-Pauline traditional formulae: Romans 3:24–25; 4:25; 8:3b, 32; 1 Corinthians 1:13; 11:23–26; 15:3; 2 Corinthians 5:14–15, 21; Galatians 1:4; 2:20; 3:13. Perhaps these formulae were recited in congregational worship, or were memorized for oral transmission of its content. Whatever the purpose of the confessional formulae was, the central theme of Paul, the immeasurable significance of Jesus' death on the cross, was *the*

[321] Joel B. Green, "Death of Christ," in *DPL,* 201–9, 201.

[322] This is not to say that Paul relates Jesus' death exclusively to the forgiveness-theme alone.

consensus of the earliest Christian community.[323] The concept of Jesus' forgiving death was shared by the early Christian communities, and was not seriously doubted.

The second recurrent feature is that most selected texts contain the preposition ὑπέρ. More than half of the texts are the dying formula and the giving-up formula, and furthermore ὑπέρ itself is often utilized for expressing the soteriological significance of Jesus' death. In this regard, this specific preposition in its soteriological context can be called 'soteriological ὑπέρ.' After the passages containing these two formulae and the 'soteriological ὑπέρ' passages are considered, there are only three passages left.[324] Therefore, the preposition 'ὑπέρ' is definitely one of the favourite words of the author(s) of the pre-Pauline traditions to discuss the significance of Jesus' death.

The final aspect of Jesus' death for the forgiveness of sins is God's gracious gift. Käsemann states: "what [Paul] is establishing is our incapacity to achieve salvation for ourselves. Salvation is always open to us without our doing anything for it – as a gift according to Rom 3:24, and as Rom 5:6ff. stresses with immense emotion, before we have fulfilled the will of God."[325] Paul keeps reminding the recipients of his letters that Jesus' death for forgiveness is given freely as a gracious gift, irrespective of every line of human endeavour.

Concerning the first aspect, (traces of) pre-Pauline tradition which link Jesus' death and forgiveness, Tobin's argument on Romans 3:24–25 is noteworthy: "whatever the relationship to the 'historical' Jesus may or may not have been, what is illustrated by this passage is the extent to which the Christology of the passage is already traditional by the time Paul uses it."[326] Whilst accepting the status of the tradition as established, he does not relate its Christology to the historical Jesus. Its relationship to the historical Jesus has been discussed in section 4.4.

---

[323] Longenecker, *Introducing Romans*, 366, correctly points out that "what Paul writes in [Romans] 3:21–4:25 was part and parcel of the shared faith of his Christian addressees at Rome." Especially for the tradition in 1 Corinthians 15:3, "Paul presupposes that the confession of faith is acknowledged in Corinth" (Conzelmann, "Analysis," 24). Therefore, Paul was not a religious genius who invented all the Christian doctrine for the primitive Christian groups. He was not the second founder, but a 'secure-foundation' follower. His idea of Jesus' death was not isolated from the mainstream of the early Christianity.

[324] Romans 3:24–25; 6:10a; 8:3b. Of the texts discussed under the dying formula and the giving-up formula, there is one text each for both formulaic texts which contain διά rather than ὑπέρ. For the interchangeability between διά and ὑπέρ in both formulae, see 91n43, and 105n77 above.

[325] Käsemann, *Perspectives*, 39.

[326] Tobin, "Christological Traditions," 244. Similarly, Breytenbach, "'For Us,'" 171, notes that "Paul was not the only one to express the meaning of Christ's death and was not the first to do so. In fact, in quite a number of cases he drew on interpretations of Christ's death that were made by others."

This has been accomplished through the two Christ-traditions in 1 Corinthians 15:3 (4.4.1.1) and 11:23–26 (4.4.1.2), where Paul pinpoints the origin of the tradition as the historical Jesus. In both texts, two verbs describing the transmission of tradition: παραλαμβάνω and παραδίδωμι, are employed, which suggests that the tradition is pre-Pauline. In the case of 15:3, because the wording 'Christ died for our sins' probably originates from within the Jerusalem community, one can argue that "the derivation and age of the formula point to the earliest period, close to the events themselves."[327] This suggests that the historical Jesus is the origin of the idea of the 'died for our sins.' Moreover, his willingness to embrace death can be observed in the texts. Verse 3 contains Christ as the subject, and comparison of the verse to Galatians 1:4 confirms the historical Jesus' willingness to die. Galatians 1:4 includes the identical phrase 'for our sins' with giving-up formula, and the giving-up formula consist of the verb δίδωμι and the personal pronoun ἑαυτὸν. The phrase 'giving himself' highlights the will of the subject, the historical Jesus.

In the text on the last supper, the verbs for the chain of transmission also appear and Paul clearly points out the origin of the tradition by using the preposition ἀπό. The question emerging from the phrase ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, of whether the Lord means the historical Jesus (if so, Paul receiving the tradition through transmission) or the risen Lord (its reception through direct revelation), has been answered based on the two tradition-handling verbs, and the credibility issue. If Paul employs the same tradition-handling verbs as in 15:3, it is plausible that its usage in 11:23 can also indicate the same intention: transmission of the tradition. Moreover, if the Corinthian believers recognise the important status of Peter as well as Paul and Apollos (1:12; 3:22), and Paul also acknowledges that the Corinthians trust the Jerusalem apostles including Peter (9:5),[328] then it is easier for the Corinthians to believe traditions transmitted from the Apostles than directly from Paul. Furthermore, the fact that Paul was absent from the last supper supports the proposal that in 11:23 Paul's argument is based on the transmitted tradition, which originates from the historical Jesus.

So far therefore, we have observed that Paul closely links Jesus' death and the forgiveness-theme on the basis of pre-Pauline traditions, and indicates that, for him, the origin of the tradition was the historical Jesus. We now move on to how Matthew understands the relationship between Jesus' death and forgiveness.

---

[327] Theissen and Merz, *Historical Jesus*, 488.

[328] This situational context is different from the Galatian church, where some doubted Paul's apostleship itself, and thus Paul had to contend that he also had a direct revelation from the risen Lord (1:12).

Chapter 5

Matthew on Forgiveness of Sins through Jesus' Death

To discuss Matthew's understanding of the relationship between Jesus' death and forgiveness, three 'forgiveness-texts' are selected (5.1). The three Matthean 'forgiveness-texts' are 1:21, 20:28, and 26:28. The aspects of each text that will be examined are how Matthew links forgiveness to Jesus' death, and what the soteriological implications are (5.2–5.4). This will lead to a discussion of whether Matthew's understanding of the relationship can be that of the historical Jesus (5.5).

5.1 The Forgiveness-Texts in Matthew

After suggesting that "to save his people from their sins (1:21)" expresses "forgiveness for their sins," Deines states that "the prominence of the forgiveness motif is visible throughout the whole gospel."[1] With a slight change in his list of Matthean forgiveness-texts, the following eight texts can potentially be seen as passages of forgiveness in Matthew: 1:21; 3:6; 6:12, 14–15; 9:2–6; 12:31f.; 18:21ff.; 20:28; 26:28. Of these texts, only the three pericopae already mentioned, which relate the forgiveness-theme to Jesus' death, will be dealt with as the relevant texts for this analysis.

The reasoning for the exclusion of the other five texts is as follows. Matthew 3:6 speaks of 'confessing their sins' in relation to baptism by John the Baptist. By juxtaposing baptism with confession of sins, this text can be considered as a forgiveness-text. In the text, however, the issue is more about repentance and confession in harmony with the baptism by *John*, rather than Jesus. The following four texts can be considered as Matthean forgiveness texts unconnected with Jesus' death. In 6:12ff., important words related to the forgiveness of sins such as ἀφίημι, ὀφείλημα, ὀφειλέτης,[2] and παράπτωμα appear. Moreover, 9:2–6 (healing) and 12:31f. (unpardonable sin) contain

[1] Deines, "Not the Law," 71. According to him, the forgiveness texts are Matthew 1:21; 3:6; 9:2–6, 13; 12:31; 20:28; 26:28.

[2] In the Matthean LP (6:9–13), two occurrences of ἀφίημι are linked with the ὀφειλ-terminology, ὀφείλημα and ὀφειλέτης. However, the Lukan version (Luke 11:2–4) connects the first ἀφίημι to ἁμαρτία. This notable difference can successfully be explained by the notion that the original language of the pre-Matthean LP is Aramaic. Cf. section 3.2 above.

ἀφίημι and ἁμαρτία, and the successive text, 18:21ff. (the parable of the unforgiving servant), incorporates ἀφίημι, ἁμαρτάνω, παράπτωμα, and ὀφείλterminology. Yet they all have another thing in common: no direct relation to Jesus' death.[3] Therefore, these four texts are not pertinent to the relationship between Jesus' death and forgiveness.

However, the three selected texts seem to link the forgiveness-theme to Jesus' death. Of them, Matthew 26:28 is self-evident on the relation between the two. The so-called cup-saying in the Last Supper connects Jesus' blood being poured out, which is his death, directly to forgiveness of sins. In Matthew 1:21 and 20:28, one of the themes, either death or forgiveness, is explicitly demonstrated, but it can be argued that the other theme is implicitly expressed. In 1:21, the forgiveness-theme (salvation from sins) is clearly present, and the 'death' imagery is also present, although implicit, because Jesus' future salvific ministry certainly includes his death. 20:28 evidently conveys the 'death' imagery ("giving his life"), and the implied forgiveness-theme can also be applicable because of the word 'ransom.' The term λύτρον is "a cognate of *apolytrōsis*, 'redemption,' which plays a significant part in Paul's theology of salvation through the forgiveness of sins as a result of the death of Christ."[4] Accordingly, these three texts are the relevant passages for studying the Matthean view of the relation of Jesus' death and forgiveness.[5]

[3] As we will see in section 5.2.2, forgiveness in Matthew is related to Jesus' death and ministry. The four 'forgiveness' texts above which are not related to Jesus' death do not deny the close relationship between forgiveness and Jesus' death in Matthew. Rather, these four texts and the selected three texts simply present 'forgiveness of sins' as related to the two activities of Jesus: his death and (healing) ministry. This study will concentrate on the relationship between his death and forgiveness.

[4] France, *Gospel of Matthew*, 761.

[5] Besides these three texts, there are more soteriological images in Matthew: 'entering the Kingdom' (5:3, 10, 19–20; 7:21; 18:3; 19:23f.; 23:13), 'rescue from the evil' (6:13), and 'eternal life' (19:17; 25:46). These texts can be omitted for this study because they have nothing to do with Jesus' death. Of these other texts, however, 5:20 and 19:17 need to be mentioned briefly because some exegetes understand them as if they present soteriology based on torah obedience. However, their contexts clarify this possible misunderstanding. 5:20 should be understood in line with v.19, where people who obey the law are presumed to be already 'in the Kingdom,' and thus, 5:20 is not about entering the kingdom by Torah obedience (see also 192n53 below). The context of 19:17, moreover, describes 'entering the Kingdom' as work of God, not a reward for torah obedience (19:23–24).

5.2 "Salvation from Sins" (Matt 1:21)

τέξεται δὲ υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν.

5.2.1 Who Saves from What, and How?

In the very first chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, the forgiveness-theme is present. Matthew 1:21b has "he *himself* will save his people from their sins."[1] This text clearly shows Jesus' saving efficacy. Matthew interprets the meaning of Jesus' name in the sense of redeemer. Matthew 1:21 is crystal clear on (1) *who* does the saving work, and (2) *from what* he saves.

Firstly, the text clearly presents the main agent of the saving activity. The subject αὐτός is emphatic, as the majority of commentators point out.[2] Brown asserts that this text derives from pre-Matthean material.[3] If Matthew used pre-Matthean material, this presupposes that this statement was established before the first Gospel was written and Matthew agreed with it. This means that Jesus' saving activity was an idea shared by Matthew with other believers. Therefore, the content of v.21b was probably well received within the earliest Christian communities, and it would not be unfair to say that this interpretation of Jesus' name, that it is Jesus who saves, was widely accepted in the early Christian communities.

Secondly, historically for Jews, the Messiah would save his people from their oppressors, presumably the Roman rulers in the days of Jesus.[4] However, the Matthean Jesus will save his people from their sins. Here, sins are their 'inside' problem while the Roman rulers are an 'outside' problem. From the beginning, Matthew clarifies that Jesus' saving work is about the 'inside' problem of his people rather than the 'outside' problem. This Jesus

---

[1] David D. Kupp, *Matthew's Emmanuel: Divine Presence and God's People in the First Gospel*, SNTSMS 90 (Cambridge: CUP, 1996), 58. Cf. Frederick Dale Bruner, *The Christbook, Matthew 1–12*, vol. 1 of *Matthew: A Commentary*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 29; Charlene McAfee Moss, *The Zechariah Tradition and the Gospel of Matthew*, BZNW 156 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 15.

[2] France, *Gospel of Matthew*, 47; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:210; Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:19; Turner, *Matthew*, 75.

[3] Raymond E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*, rev. ed., ABRL (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 109.

[4] For one important scholar who emphasizes the political side of Messianism, see John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010). For this school of thought, the Messiah at best mediates forgiveness, but does not provide the basis for it, as Otfried Hofius, *Neutestamentliche Studien*, WUNT 132 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 104, argues: "der Messias *erwirkt* und *vermittelt* die Sündenvergebung, aber er *wirkt* und *gewährt* sie nicht."

is primarily not a political leader but a spiritual redeemer from the beginning of Matthew.[5]

As we have seen, the 'who' and the 'from what' are clear in the text. Yet, it "is not very illuminating with regard to *how* Jesus saves."[6] Matthew finds a clear connection between Jesus and forgiveness of sins here;[7] however, this clear connection does not secure a close relationship between Jesus' *death* and forgiveness. Gerhardsson acutely observes that "the interpretation of Jesus' name says nothing about the way in which Jesus saves his people from their sins. There is no suggestion that this is to happen exclusively through his sacrificial death."[8] It is a fair observation: one can find the forgiveness-theme here, but the text does not necessarily mean that this 'saving from sins' is closely linked to Jesus' death.

Recognizing this missing link to Jesus' death in the text, Luomanen states that "we should not too hastily presuppose that 1:21 refers to Jesus' sacrificial death," and then continues, "in Matthew's mind the omen of Jesus' name was

---

[5] Against this, Warren Carter argues, "to save Israel from its sin requires the defeat of Rome" (*Matthew and Empire: Initial Explorations* [Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2001], 82; he equates sin with the worldly power). However, Thomas R. Blanton disputes Carter's claim: "it is not the sins of Roman rulers or those of Judean collaborators that are primarily in view in Matthew's Gospel but those of Jesus' own people, the nonelite populace of Judea. Carter's exegesis contradicts . . . the references to sin and cognate terms in Matthew's narrative, which relate not to Rome or to Roman collaborators but to the Judean populace" ("Saved by Obedience: Matthew 1:21 in Light of Jesus' Teaching on the Torah," *JBL* 132 [2013]: 393–413, 400).

[6] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:210. Cf. Howard Clarke, *The Gospel of Matthew and Its Readers: A Historical Introduction to the First Gospel* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2003), 8; Eubank, *Cross-Bearing*, 13–14.

[7] By saying this, I do not equate 'saving' to 'forgiving.' Otto Betz differentiates the two by stating, "salvation from sins is somewhat different from forgiveness of sins, which can be granted to those who repent and believe" ("Jesus and Isaiah 53," in Bellinger and Farmer, *Jesus*, 70–87, 81). However, I agree more with Lidija Novakovic than Betz when she states that "it should not be forgotten that in 1:21 Matthew does not speak about the forgiveness of sins, but the salvation from sins. The idea of salvation presupposes divine forgiveness, but should not be identified with it" (*Messiah, the Healer of the Sick: A Study of Jesus as the Son of David in the Gospel of Matthew*, WUNT II/170 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003], 72; cf. Carroll and Green, *Death of Jesus*, 44). It appears that forgiveness is presupposed in the text. Moreover, b. Meg 17b supports this idea: "redemption and healing come after forgiveness."

[8] Birger Gerhardsson, "Sacrificial Service and Atonement in the Gospel of Matthew," in *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology Presented to L.L. Morris on His 60th Birthday*, ed. Robert Banks (Exeter: Paternoster, 1974), 25–35, 26. Cf. Bruner, *Christbook,* 31–32; McKnight, *Jesus and His Death*, 354; Boris Repschinski, "'For He Will Save His People from Their Sins' (Matthew 1:21): A Christology for Christian Jews," *CBQ* 68 (2006): 248–67, 257. Daniel M. Gurtner, *The Torn Veil: Matthew's Exposition of the Death of Jesus*, SNTSMS 139 (Cambridge: CUP, 2007), 128, even states that "Matthew leaves it open deliberately."

not connected to his sacrificial death but to his prophetic mission among the people of Israel."[9] If his claim were right, the text would not be an appropriate text for this study. Contra Luomanen, Powell, after indicating 1:21 as one of the three "direct statement[s] of purpose" in Matthew, argues that "the plot of Matthew's Gospel describes how this purpose came to be fulfilled, to some extent in Jesus' ministry, but ultimately, only in his death."[10] Powell understands the 'how' issue in two ways: Jesus saves by his ministry (9:13) and death (20:28).

The "standard view"[11] on this discussion is much closer to Powell's argument: Jesus saves his people from their sin both by his ministry and his death.

---

[9] Luomanen, *Entering*, 225, 226 respectively. He correctly indicates that "Matthew understood Jesus' mission to Israel by and large in the terms of the deuteronomistic motive of a rejected prophet," but incorrectly asserts that "death is not what Jesus is sent for." This is quite an unsatisfactory explanation because the Matthean Jesus clearly mentioned that the fate of rejected prophets was death (23:29–36; cf. 21:37–39). According to Matthew, rejected prophets very likely expected a brutal end. If Luomanen holds that Matthew depicts Jesus as a rejected prophet, it might be better for him to argue that this Jesus expects his impending death, for the issue of rejected prophets and their death is so closely related that the two cannot be divided. On this basis, it is hard to agree with Luomanen. Moreover, Luomanen states, "in Matthew's view, Jesus was not sent to die for his people, but to heal their diseases, preach repentance, and lead them into eternal life through his authoritative interpretation and proclamation of the law." In Matthew, healing and death are the only two activities which are explicitly linked to forgiveness of sins. However, Luomanen does not reason plausibly why Jesus' death has nothing to do with forgiveness, and why healing and other ministries alone have a lot to do with forgiveness. Yet he rejects Jesus' death as an option for 'how to save,' and accepts Jesus' other ministries including healing. Repschinski, "'He Will Save,'" 260n52, portrays Luomanen's view as a "deficient description of Matthew's narrative." Cf. Novakovic, *Messiah, the Healer*, 74n250.

[10] Mark Allan Powell, "The Plot and Subplots of Matthew's Gospel," *NTS* 38 (1992): 187–204, 195, 196 respectively. The other two purpose statements are 9:13 and 20:28. Here Powell does not limit 'ministry' to Jesus' healing ministry as many do. A number of commentators view Jesus' healing of a paralytic (Matthew 9:2–8) in relation to forgiveness of sins, and thus, they argue that Jesus' saving work is done by his *healing* ministry and his death. In contrast to them, mentioning 9:13, Powell specifies Jesus' ministry as a ministry of calling sinners.

[11] Blanton, "Saved by Obedience," 394. For the representatives of this view, see ibid., 395n4. However, Blanton himself disagrees partially with this view. After identifying the "three modes by which Jesus saves people from their sins: his teaching of the Torah, his healing activities, and his death on the cross" (412), Blanton contends that Jesus saves "not primarily by forgiving sin or by his death on the cross but by exhorting his audience to follow the Torah with perfect obedience" (393). Yet his claim seems to be a product of neglecting the intended meaning of Matthew 1:21. As Benno Przybylski, *Righteousness in Matthew and His World of Thought*, SNTSMS 41 (Cambridge: CUP, 1981), 106, argues, "the clearest statement in the Gospel of Matthew to the effect that salvation is the gift of God is found in 1:21." He claims the text presents Jesus' saving act as basically a gift

In this scholarly consensus, there is a slight difference over whether or not there is a primary means to accomplish the saving work. Davies and Allison argue that "Matthew thought that Jesus saved his people from their sins in a variety of ways"[12] and they do not indicate a central factor. Likewise, Gurtner affirms that "Jesus offers forms of 'salvation' through various aspects of his ministry as well as through his death; otherwise Jesus' ministry itself would be reduced to a means of arriving at his death."[13] However, on the other side of the consensus, Powell, Senior, and Hagner regard Jesus' death as a primary means, but not as the sole factor. Similarly to Powell, Senior maintains that "the name 'Jesus' points to the intent of his messianic mission to save God's people from their sins (1:21), a mission to be carried out in Jesus' teaching, healing, and, above all, in his death and resurrection."[14] Hagner also argues, "the deliverance from sins . . . depends finally upon the pouring out of Jesus' blood (26:28)."[15] Even though there is a minor difference among the consensus-view holders, all of them do agree that "salvation is accomplished through the ministry and death of Jesus."[16]

5.2.2 An Examination of How Jesus Saves

To see whose argument, Luomanen's or Powell's, is more plausible, one must examine (1) the Matthean usage of "salvation from sins," and (2) the historical context of Matthew.

5.2.2.1 Matthean Usage of "Salvation from Sins"

Concerning the literary context of how Jesus saves, Bruner properly states: "the 'how' must be read from the context of the whole Gospel."[17] By this, he means that 'how Jesus saves' should be understood in the way in which the Gospel of Matthew describes eschatological salvation. This is a good reminder of the importance of literary context. As Repschinski indicates, however, "after 1:21 Matthew does not link the words σῴζειν and ἁμαρτία

based on grace. Blanton's inserting 'Torah obedience' as the primary factor for salvation contradicts this basic intention of the text. Contra Blanton's argument, Deines, "Not the Law," 71, correctly states that, throughout Matthew, the forgiveness motif "is nowhere connected to the Torah."

[12] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:210.

[13] Gurtner, *Torn Veil*, 128.

[14] Donald Senior, *The Gospel of Matthew*, Interpreting Biblical Texts (Nashville: Abingdon, 1997), 89.

[15] Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:19.

[16] Powell, "Plot and Subplots," 196n27. Likewise, McKnight, *Jesus and His Death*, 361: "one can theologize that Matthew envisions forgiveness and healing in the cross, but one might just as easily argue that he sees *Yeshua* as the forgiving agent in all his ministries."

[17] Bruner, *Christbook,* 32.

again."[18] This seems to be a major obstacle to understanding Jesus' saving act throughout Matthew, but it is not insurmountable. It appears that "throughout his Gospel Matthew prefers the verb ἀφίημι in connection with the forgiveness of sins. It is probable, though, that Matthew was persuaded to use σῴζειν in 1:21 because of the possibility of the wordplay on the name of Jesus."[19] It seems safe to say that to know how Jesus saves from sins is to know how Jesus forgives sins.[20]

For 'salvation from sins' in Matthew, therefore, we will alternatively look at 'forgiveness of sins.' In this gospel, 'forgiveness of sins' appears in two passages, namely 9:2–8 and 26:28. The former is in the context of healing, and the latter in the Last Supper. For Matthew, forgiveness of sins is related to Jesus' healing and death. Matthew's usage of forgiveness of sins seems to indicate that these two activities of Jesus give an answer to the *how* question. Luomanen's argument which takes one option out of the two[21] is less satisfactory than the majority view that considers both options viable because Luomanen cannot successfully refute the connection between Jesus' death and the forgiveness of sins. Kupp argues that 26:28 is an "elaboration of the angel's first explanation of 'Jesus' in 1:21 . . . . Here the implied reader sees in part the material shape to one of the fundamental questions of the opening narrative frame: *how* will Jesus bring salvation to his people?"[22] Therefore, the solution of both/and seems better than that of either/or, and so it would be

[18] Repschinski, "'He Will Save,'" 257.

[19] Ibid., 255. Moreover, Joachim Gnilka claims, "it is informative that according to the Synoptic Gospels Jesus said little about sin. It is probably even more significant that he always speaks of forgiveness when he refers to sin" (*Jesus of Nazareth: Message and History* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997], 102).

[20] Luke 1:76–77 also supports this understanding. The similarities of the Lukan text with Matthew 1:21 are remarkable: angelic prophecy, and verbal agreement. These Lukan verses introduce an angel's prophecy about the future work of John the Baptist, and Matthew presents an angel's prophecy about the future ministry of Jesus. Moreover, Luke 1:77 has 'his people,' 'their sins,' and salvation terminology in common with the Matthean text. In this similar setting, "the stress of the [Lukan] verse is on the intimate connection between salvation and forgiveness of sins" (Darrell L. Bock, *Luke*, BECNT [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994–96], 1:190). If both Gospel writers understood that salvation presupposes forgiveness (see 180n7 above), which seems to be the case, Matthew probably saw the interconnectedness between salvation from sins and forgiveness of sins.

[21] See 181n9 above.

[22] Kupp, *Matthew's Emmanuel*, 96–97. Gurtner, *Torn Veil*, 127, also suggests that 1:21 and 26:28 serve as an "inclusio, for [Matthew's] entire discussion of the relationship between Jesus' death and the forgiveness of sins." John P. Meier even states that "the infancy narrative becomes a proleptic passion narrative" (*The Vision of Matthew: Christ, Church, and Morality in the First Gospel* [New York: Paulist, 1979], 53; cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:210; Ulrich Luz, *Studies in Matthew* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005], 22).

more plausible to argue that in Matthew 1:21, "the atoning death must be in view."[23]

5.2.2.2 Matthew in Context

The first Gospel was not written in a vacuum. Luz claims that Matthew "is a result of the history of effects of the Gospel according to Mark, the Saying Source, other Jesus-traditions, and indirectly the history of Jesus itself."[24] Hence, the author of the first Gospel probably communicated with and among Christians who had received a shared tradition. If we do not consider this historical factor, the search for how Jesus saves may end up isolating the text from the historical background. In such a study, there can be an exegesis, but one without a proper historical framework.

In the historical setting of Matthew, the early Christian kerygmatic tradition, defined above on the basis of its early fixation in 1 Corinthians 15:3ff., very likely played a foundational role.[25] Several of the earliest Christian communities were out there in Matthew's time. No matter how diverse the belief of the communities, no matter how Jewish the Matthean communities, the pre-Pauline tradition containing 'Christ died for our sins' was already fixed even in them. James, Peter, and Paul are often viewed as the representative of – roughly speaking – conservative, moderate, and liberal wings of Christian communities respectively. Yet it is noteworthy that all three agreed on the tradition of 1 Corinthians 15. The Jerusalem apostles including James and Peter probably took part in establishing this statement, and Paul wholeheartedly received it.[26] Therefore, the confessional statement, 'Christ died for our sins,' was a portion of *the* tradition, not just a tradition. Thus, it is natural to think that the statement was a universal consensus and was wholeheartedly accepted in most, if not all, Christian communities. When the early Christians, who knew the *kerygma*, probably by heart, read Matthew 1:21, it is plausible that "the passion already comes into the picture."[27]

---

[23] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:210.

[24] Ulrich Luz, *Matthew in History: Interpretation, Influence, and Effects* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004), 23.

[25] James D.G. Dunn notes that Paul "did not regard the teaching on Jesus' death 'for our sins' as distinctively his own, nor did he see any need much to elaborate it. In short, more than in any other matter of earliest Christian doctrine, we can read a consensus in early Christian theology about Jesus' death from Paul's writings" ("When Did the Understanding of Jesus' Death as an Atoning Sacrifice First Emerge?" in *Israel's God and Rebecca's Children: Christology and Community in Early Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Honor of Larry W. Hurtado and Alan F. Segal*, ed. David B. Capes et al. [Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008], 169–81, 170–71).

[26] Paul's introducing of the *kerygma* in 1 Corinthians 15 is followed by the names of the two apostles and then of himself.

[27] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:210.

Luomanen's analysis ignores this significant historical background of Matthew and so his approach offers a less satisfactory understanding of Matthew 1:21. It is strange when he states that "the idea of forgiveness of sins in Jesus' blood . . . [is] isolated in relation to other convictions about forgiveness and the basic elements of Matthew's view of salvation history and Christian *kerygma*."[28] His argument is hard to agree with because "Matthew and his readers knew well the Kerygmatic significance of this verse."[29]

The kerygma was widespread in Matthew's time, but Matthew also frequently quotes from the Jewish Scriptures. In particular, it is well recognized that whilst writing 1:21, Matthew has Psalm 130:8 in mind on account of verbal similarities between the two.[30] However, there is another verse which could have been in Matthew's mind, namely Judges 13:5 where Samson's birth is foretold: "for you shall conceive and bear a son. . . . It is he who shall begin to deliver Israel from the hand of the Philistines." LXX-Judges 13:5b and Matthew 1:21 share words such as αὐτός and σῴζειν. In addition, compared to Psalm 130:8 and Matthew 1:21b, Judges 13:5b and the Matthean verse have one more feature in common: "in both passages, the angel announcing the birth of the hero gives a description of his future task."[31] Therefore, if Psalm 130:8 can be considered as a source for Matthew 1:21b, Judges 13:5 should also be considered as a source.

More significant is that Samson's willing death supports the idea that for Matthew, Jesus willingly embraced his death, and his crucifixion is a crucial means of salvation from sins. Samson is indeed one of "six characters that are often put forward as examples of voluntary death in the Old Testament,"[32] and his death was the climax of his activity ("those he killed at his death were more than those he had killed during his life" [Judg 16:30b]). Matthew must have known this famous story of Samson's death. If Matthew had the birth narrative of Samson and his willing death in his mind whilst writing 1:21, he probably connected Jesus' birth narrative and his voluntary death. Moreover,

---

[28] Luomanen, *Entering*, 227 (emphasis mine).

[29] Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:19.

[30] Robert H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel: With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope*, NovTSup 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1967), 127–28. Cf. Tucker S. Ferda, "The Soldiers' Inscription and the Angel's Word: The Significance of 'Jesus' in Matthew's Titulus," *NovT* 55 (2013): 221–31, 228n34.

[31] Maarten J.J. Menken, *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist*, BETL 173 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2004), 172. Cf. Benjamin J.M. Johnson, "A Nazorean and a Nazirite: Jesus and Samson in Matthew 1–2," *ExpTim* 126 (2015): 586–92.

[32] J.K. Elliott, "Imitation in Literature and Life: Apocrypha and Martyrdom," in *The Routledge Companion to Early Christian Thought*, ed. D. Jeffrey Bingham, Routledge Religion Companions (Abingdon: Routledge, 2009), 87–107, 92. The rest are Abimelech, Saul and his armour-bearer, Ahithophel, and Zimri.

as Samson's death was the climax of his activity, Jesus' death has crucial significance of his saving ministry.

1 Maccabees 6 can also support this line of interpretation. This text has two important features for this investigation. The first is that the Maccabean text uses the phrase σῶσαι τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ (6:44), which is almost identical to σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ in Matthew 1:21b. Their contexts, a birth narrative (Matt) and a war account (1 Macc), are different, but both texts speak of 'saving his people.' Another feature is that Eleazar *died* (ἀπέθανεν; 1 Macc 6:46) to save his people. The author of 1 Maccabees depicts Eleazar willingly sacrificing his life.[33] Willingness 'to save his people' led him to die as a martyr for his people. If Matthew alludes to 1 Maccabees 6 here, he definitely has martyrdom in his mind. This can also confirm that in the Matthean text, Jesus' death is in view, and that Jesus obediently embraced his fate.

From the observations above, one can make a good case that the means of 'salvation from sins' is Jesus' crucifixion, and that Jesus probably embraced his violent death. If so, "save his people from their sins" (Matthew 1:21) forms a nice inclusio with "saved others" (27:42). The latter phrase is mentioned at the crucifixion scene, and thereby in 27:42 the imagery of Jesus' death coexists with the concept of his being a saving agent. If "saved others" is strategically placed almost at the end of his gospel by Matthew, then "the angel's declaration that Jesus 'will save his people from their sins' is one element of Matthew's larger effort to associate the death of Jesus more closely with the forgiveness of sins."[34] To argue in this way is not to dismiss completely the view of Jesus' (healing) ministry conveying salvific efficacy. The 'both/and' approach must be applied to this, but more weight should be given to Jesus' death.

In Matthew 1:21, the relationship between Jesus' death and forgiveness can be found. So far, we have seen that the means of Jesus' bringing salvation is implicit, but it does include Jesus' death as its means. Moreover, bringing salvation can certainly presuppose the forgiveness of sins. Matthew implicitly demonstrates that Jesus' death and forgiveness are closely related.

5.3 The Ransom Saying (Matt 20:28; Mark 10:45)

ὥσπερ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν

[33] See also 167n304.

[34] Ferda, "Soldiers' Inscription," 229.

5.3.1 Exegesis

The literary context of the Matthean ransom saying is identical to its Markan parallel. The ransom saying is located at the end of the request of Zebedee's two sons for high rank, and is followed by the miracle story of healing the blind in Jericho.[35] Moreover, the two texts agree verbatim, except for the introductory word(s) at the beginning of each text. In this almost identical text in the same context, Jesus uses the title "the Son of Man" to designate himself. In the immediate context, the title is employed to indicate *his* imminent death (Matt 20:18; Mark 10:33; again the texts are identical). If, in the flow of the narrative, Matthew employs the title for Jesus, then in the narrative framework, the title in the current text would remind the reader that the Son of Man who will serve and give his life is Jesus.

The phrase δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ can certainly denote the death of its subject. Similar to δόντος ἑαυτὸν in Galatians 1:4 (section 4.3.1.3), Matthew 20:28 employs the identical verb with τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ, which specifies what is given.[36] The martyrdom of the seven brothers in 2 Maccabees also contains a similar wording σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν προδίδωμι (7:37) when depicting the death of the youngest. In this context of martyrdom, the imagery of death by 'giving up body and soul' is self-evident. In the Matthean narrative, Jesus as the Son of Man announces his forthcoming death in the context (20:18–19), and the metaphor of 'drinking the cup' (v.22) also implies Jesus' death.[37] Following this overarching narrative flow of passion prediction, moreover, the death of Jesus can clearly be seen in δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ.[38]

More significant than the presence of the 'death' imagery in the text is the interconnectedness between the imagery and the forgiveness-theme, which can be shown by λύτρον. This specific term is used only in Matthew 20:28 and its equivalent Markan text.[39] Since the postfix '-τρον' "usually has the

---

[35] The only differences are the person who asks the favour, and the number of the blind. In Matthew, the mother of the two asks, and two blind men are healed. In Mark, however, the two disciples ask, and only one blind man is mentioned. For a discussion of the differences in vv.24–28 between Matthew and Mark, see Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:579.

[36] F. Büchsel suggests that "δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ is to be taken as the equivalent of δοῦναι ἑαυτόν" ("λύω, κτλ.," *TDNT*, 4: 335–56, 342). For δίδωμι + ἑαυτοῦ, see Galatians 1:4; 1 Timothy 2:6.

[37] It is noteworthy that "Matthew omits Mark's second metaphor to describe Jesus' death" (Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:578). It appears that Matthew sees enough imagery for death in the pericope, and feels no need to describe Jesus' death by another metaphor of baptism.

[38] See also the similar expression δότε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν in 1 Macc 2:50, where Mattathias encourages his sons to "give your lives for the covenant of our ancestors." For other notable examples of (παρα)δίδωμι + ψυχή, see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:95n67.

[39] However, its cognate ἀντίλυτρον appears in 1 Timothy 2:6, and it is significant that the word is also directly linked to "δοὺς ἑαυτὸν," which is similar to Matthew 20:28,

sense of payment for something," λύτρον is often translated as "money paid as a ransom."[40] Seeley correctly points out that "by using [λύτρον], Mark invites his audience to understand this death as a liberation."[41] Many exegetes concur that "the liberation is obviously liberation from sin."[42] Moreover, the two similar texts, Galatians 1:4 and 2 Maccabees 7:37, also carry the forgiveness-theme (ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν and ἵλεως ταχὺ τῷ ἔθνει γενέσθαι[43] respectively), and link the theme to the 'death' imagery. Therefore, all these texts convey the death of the subject and connect the concept to its significance, namely the forgiveness of sins.

However, recently Dowd and Malborn have argued that the liberation is rather "liberation *from* bondage to oppression" and "ransoming the majority from the tyranny of the elite,"[44] which is a possible proposal based on the original meaning of λύτρον. In their article, they strive to provide their reasoning, but Collins' response to them is more persuasive. Admitting that

---

where λύτρον is linked to 'giving his life' (cf. ἀπολύτρωσις particularly in Rom 3:24; Eph 1:7; Col 1:14; Heb 9:15).

[40] Büchsel, "λύω, κτλ.," 4:340.

[41] David Seeley, "Rulership and Service in Mark 10:41–45," *NovT* 35 (1993): 234–50, 248. However, he also states, "there is no indication, except at 10:45, that Mark conceives the Son of Man's death specifically as a liberating event" (248). In terms of *the Son of Man*'s death, his claim is right, but the Markan text and par. (Matt 20:28) make clear that the identity of the Son of Man is Jesus. Because "the audience knows that it is Jesus who makes the declaration in 20:28" (Warren Carter, "Jesus' 'I Have Come' Statement in Matthew's Gospel," *CBQ* 60 [1998]: 44–62, 61) and Jesus' death is apparent in the Second Gospel, Seeley's claim is not entirely correct.

[42] Büchsel, "λύω, κτλ.," 4:343. Eubank, *Cross-Bearing*, 155, identifies 'the many' as "those trapped by the debt of sin."

[43] The phrase can be rendered as "God will quickly forgive (or be merciful to) our nation." For interpretation of ἵλεως εἰμι/γίνομαι as ἀφίημι, see 147n241 and 147n242 above.

[44] Sharyn Dowd and Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, "The Significance of Jesus' Death in Mark: Narrative Context and Authorial Audience," *JBL* 125 [2006]: 271–97, 271, 287 respectively. They maintain that "the Gospel of Mark makes no explicit connection between the death of Jesus and the forgiveness of sins" (271). They also contend that "the Markan Jesus makes it plain that forgiving sins is part of his healing ministry and is apparently not dependent on the cross" (276). The biggest problem raised by their argument is that Jesus is not remembered mainly as those who died to release the underprivileged, or the prisoners. Furthermore, their own interpretation of Mark's understanding of Jesus' death contradicts their argument. They find "Mark's most explicit advice on how to understand the meaning or significance of Jesus' death" (278) from *the three passion predictions*. From the three units of prediction, they extract three recurring patterns. The first is related to the purpose of God. However, whilst explaining this point, they end up suggesting that "all-too-human desire of 'lording over' is satanic, that is, *opposed to the desire of God*" (279n24, my emphasis). The last phrase does denote the meaning of sin (Brand, *Evil*, 26, states, "any action *opposed to God's (understood) desire is sin*" [my emphasis]), and if this is one of the recurring features of the Markan passion predictions, it is natural to conclude that Jesus' death dealt with sin.

"since the term is used metaphorically in Mark 10:45, [and] . . . the notion of redeeming captives may have been one of [a variety of responses among its first audiences],"[45] Collins convincingly supplies Exodus 21:29–30; 30:11–16 and inscriptions from Asia Minor that can show λύτρον being related to atonement. Moreover, she correctly says, "the issue is not the oppression of the followers of Jesus and others by the tyrants and rulers of Judea and Rome. The issue is how the alternative society constituted by the followers of Jesus will organize and conduct itself."[46] As the context indicates, serving is the issue for the Kingdom, in contrast with the aspirations of the contemporary society of the audience of Matthew and Mark. Therefore, we can confidently conclude that despite the ambiguity of λύτρον, the text connotes Jesus' forgiving death.

5.3.2 Soteriological Implications

From the exegesis above, the two following implications can be drawn: "the emphasis on a willingness to suffer,"[47] and the overwhelming priority of Jesus' saving action. Firstly, that this death is Jesus' self-offering should be emphasized. In Galatians 1:4, by using the infinitive δοῦναι, Paul intends to show Jesus' own will to die on the cross. This Pauline idea can be observed in 2 Maccabees 7:37 because facing his death, the youngest of the seven brothers expresses his willingness to lay down his life. Similarly, Matthew 20:28 "expresses the element of voluntariness or self-sacrifice in the death of Jesus . . . as an act of willing obedience to God, not as a mere succumbing to the hostility of the Pharisees and the Sanhedrin."[48] According to the ransom saying, Jesus' death is not an unwilling death or an unforeseen result, but a consequence of his willing obedience.

Matthew describes how dangerous and risky Jesus' going up to Jerusalem was. Hostility from the other religio-political parties was getting more intense, and the time Jesus went to Jerusalem was near the Passover. The opponents of Jesus could not miss his presence there, and he became an easy prey to those who were eager to seize him. According to Matthew, Jesus went to Jerusalem facing these circumstances, and it was his voluntary decision to risk his life: he accepted this as part of his mission (Matt 16:21; 17:22–23; 20:17–19; 21:37–39; 23:37–39). Indeed, the ransom saying

[45] Adela Yarbro Collins, "Mark's Interpretation of the Death of Jesus," *JBL* 128 (2009): 545–54, 548. As Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:100, state, the text is "an unexplained affirmation" of the atonement.

[46] Yarbro Collins, "Mark's Interpretation," 546.

[47] Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, WBC 34B (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001), 115.

[48] Büchsel, "λύω, κτλ.," 4:342. France, *Gospel of Matthew*, 763, considers Jesus' death "not as a historical accident but as his deliberate goal."

plainly shows Jesus' intention because it is "the last word he speaks before going up to Jerusalem."[49]

The second implication is that a high priority is given by Matthew to the fact that Jesus took the initiative for "the many" *before* requiring them to do likewise. This can be seen from the fact that the imperative of faithful living is based on the indicative of Jesus' work of salvation.[50] If we take ἔσται in v.26b–27 as "quasi-imperatival use of the future,"[51] the saying of Jesus can imply the Matthean imperative. More significantly, this imperative has the indicative basis of Jesus' serving to the point of death. Since the opening word in v.28 is ὥσπερ,[52] the imperative in v.26f. is to imitate what Jesus does for his disciples; the sequence of demand following Jesus' prior action is significant. If Jesus does something for them before they do, and thus they have something to follow, then it can be said (although Matthew does not use this language) that the gift was *graciously* given first. The context tells the reader that the disciples still have a secular understanding of the Kingdom of God, and do not know how it operates. Jesus taught these blind disciples the ethics of the Kingdom which flowed from his forgiving death.[53] Therefore, this passage accentuates Matthew's understanding of the priority of Jesus' action in dying a forgiving death, which is close to Paul's understanding of Jesus' atoning death based on God's grace.

Both the Matthean Jesus' readiness to die and the status of his death as an 'antedonation'[54] can be discerned in the ransom saying. Now we are to examine the Last Supper tradition to find the Matthean Jesus' understanding of his own death.

---

[49] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:94.

[50] On the history of the discussion on the relationship between the imperative and indicative in Matthew, see Luomanen, *Entering*, 7–23; Talbert, "Indicative and Imperative," 95–101.

[51] Nolland, *Matthew*, 823.

[52] Based on the Markan introductory phrase καὶ γὰρ ("for even"), scholars argues that Jesus' service to death can serve as "a warrant and a model" (Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary*, Hermeneia [Minneaplois: Fortress, 2007], 499). To some degree, the Markan text emphasizes the model of Jesus to be imitated more than the redacted Matthean text. "For even" in Mark 10:45 highlights Jesus' death for forgiveness, whilst "just as," or "even as" (ὥσπερ) in Matthew 20:28 seems to place more weight on the followers' service in vv.26–27. Despite this difference on emphasis, Jesus' death for forgiveness is certainly present in both texts, and this indicative provides the basis for the imperative.

[53] Jesus here talks about the Kingdom's ethics, and he answers that the decision of rank in the Kingdom belongs to God. Moreover, he mentions how 'the great' in the Kingdom should behave, and this is similar to 5:19, where Jesus speaks of 'the great' *in* the Kingdom of heaven. This means that here Matthew reports how a person in honour *in the Kingdom* should behave, rather than how to enter the Kingdom; the idea of salvation is already presupposed in the context.

[54] For this term, see 82n18 above.

5.4 The Cup-Saying (Matt 26:28; Mark 14:24)

τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν

5.4.1 Exegesis

This is the clearest text in Matthew that shows the indissoluble relationship between Jesus' death and the forgiveness of sins. For Jesus' death, the two words αἷμα and ἐκχυννόμενον clearly signify the 'death' imagery. Considering the usage in the OT, the word 'blood' itself can easily be interpreted as death. As Nolland indicates, "when blood is used with a possessive pronoun in the OT, the reference is almost always to death, and nearly always to violent death."[55] The blood is not just an imaginary blood, but the poured-out blood, which denotes the literal meaning of death. The combination of blood and ἐκχυννόμενον, which is "a sacrificial word which connotes a violent death,"[56] intensifies the 'death' imagery. For this interpretation, Matthew 23:35 is a strong support, where φονεύω (to kill, to slay) appears in addition to 'blood' and 'shed.' This 'killing' recurs in the context (vv.31, 34, 37) by employing φονεύω and ἀποκτείνω. Therefore, "in his saying over the cup, Jesus also speaks of his violent death."[57]

Moreover, the 'forgiveness of sins' follows right after ἐκχυννόμενον, and thereby linking the death-imagery to remission of sins. This expiatory motif is also supported by "covenant," which many scholars see as derived from Exodus 24:8. Whereas the Exodus text does not present the expiation motif, "in Jewish tradition the Sinai offering [in Exodus 24:8] becomes explicitly expiatory."[58] This phrase 'blood of covenant' appears also in Zechariah 9:11, where the liberation-motif ("I will set your prisoners free") is present. If Jesus, through his blood of covenant, makes another covenant of expiation, then it can be considered as a new covenant. Following this line of argument, one can argue that the new covenant in Jeremiah 31 is behind the tradition. Irrespective of whether the Markan/Matthean version or the Lukan/Pauline version of the bread and the cup-sayings is older, the latter presents the 'new

[55] Nolland, *Matthew*, 1078. He further states, "the first person form, 'my blood,' is used several times with the prospect of a violent death."

[56] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:474. Among those who see here sacrificial death are Maurice Casey, "The Original Aramaic Form of Jesus' Interpretation of the Cup," *JTS* 41 (1990): 1–12, 8; Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 226.

[57] Ham, "Last Supper," 58. Note the repeated adjective 'violent' modifying 'death' in the descriptions of Nolland, Davies and Allison, and Ham.

[58] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:475.

covenant' in relation to the 'blood' and the forgiveness-theme.[59] As mentioned in 4.3.3.2, the forgiveness-theme is evident in both the Hebrew text and the LXX-Jeremiah 31:31–34. If the new covenant in Jeremiah 31 is indeed a background of the 'blood of (new) covenant,' the expiatory motif becomes evident in the Matthean cup-saying.

Concerning εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, Matthew makes explicit what is implicit in Mark.[60] As LaVerdiere puts it, "for Matthew, 'the forgiveness of sins' was a primary purpose of the Eucharist," because the intention of Matthew's addition 'for the forgiveness of sins' is "giving the *purpose* for the shedding of Jesus' blood."[61] It appears that Matthew *exposes* the forgiveness-theme in the Last Supper whilst Mark exhibits it less clearly. Matthew probably might have thought that some may not notice the significance of Jesus' forgiving death, and consequently, he made the theme vivid. This clearly shows that the pre-Pauline traditions that emphasize Jesus' atoning death are not forgotten at all after the Pauline epistles have been written. What the first evangelist did was re-emphasize the significance of forgiveness of sins in Jesus' death.

On the other hand, one may contend that by the addition of the phrase, Matthew changes the meaning of Mark. Dowd and Malbon assert that "Mark's story of Jesus does not link Jesus' death with the forgiveness of sins,"[62] and that "Matthew's 'strong reading' of his source"[63] changes the meaning of Markan cup-saying. According to them, because Mark 14:24 alludes solely to Exodus 24:8, which does not present the expiatory motif, the Markan version of the Last Supper does not contain the motif. If their argument were true, the Markan view of Jesus' death is significantly different from the Matthean view.

Again, Collins' counter-argument is helpful here. She rightly observes that "the Markan phrase is to pour *out* blood, whereas Exod 24:6 speaks about pouring blood *against* (προς) the altar. The same phrase as the Markan 'to pour *out* blood,' in contrast, occurs repeatedly in Leviticus 4 in relation to

[59] Davies and Allison maintain that "Luke and Paul [preserve] a more primitive word for the cup" (Ibid., 3:466), but concerning other parts, they consider the Markan version being more primitive.

[60] Cf. Hägerland, *Jesus and Forgiveness*, 74.

[61] LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 66.

[62] Dowd and Malbon, "Significance," 297. Although they "do not deny that the forgiveness of sins was an early and influential interpretation of the meaning of the death of Jesus" (294), they claim that this is not the case in Mark. They maintain that "those whom God had liberated were in covenant relationship with God, not because their sins had been forgiven, but because God had liberated them," and thus forgiveness "was not accomplished by the 'blood of the covenant'" (292–93). For their argument, see 190n44 above.

[63] Ibid., 293.

the expiation of sin (vv.7b, 18b, 20b, 25b)."[64] Moreover, Dowd and Malbon do not introduce the idea that Judaism also interprets the blood of covenant and that of circumcision as having expiatory effect.[65] Therefore, without the phrase 'the forgiveness of sins,' the Markan Last Supper tradition also manifests Jesus' death bestowing forgiveness. Consequently, as Schlatter states, "the thought that the surrender of Jesus' blood occurred for the forgiveness of sins cannot be denied because only Matthew reports it."[66]

Therefore, we can concur with Mohrlang that in Matthew 26:28 "Matthew clearly portrays Jesus' death . . . as the ground of forgiveness."[67] If 20:28 is the first comment of Jesus on his impending death and its soteriological significance, 26:28 is "Jesus' most careful verbal and visual definition of what his death *means*."[68]

5.4.2 Soteriological Implications

Again as in 20:28, Matthew lets Jesus speak of his impending death, and imparts soteriological meaning to it to indicate *Jesus' willingness to die*. Whilst in 20:28 Jesus speaks of this on the way to Jerusalem, now in this text Jesus announces this in Jerusalem after the Temple incident, which roused the indignation of the Jewish religious leaders. The Matthean Jesus entered Jerusalem, being welcomed by the Jerusalemites and the pilgrims from the diaspora. According to Josephus, almost three million Jews gathered in the city to celebrate the Passover.[69] The Romans might not appreciate what Jesus did in front of the crowd irrespective of how many saw his marching in. Jesus

---

[64] Yarbro Collins, "Mark's Interpretation," 549–50. She also points out that "it is also interesting, in light of the usage of Leviticus 4, that Matthew changes Mark's preposition (υπέρ) to περί" (550n28).

[65] Cf. Eubank, *Cross-Bearing*, 176, and Exodus 4:25.

[66] Adolf Schlatter, *The History of the Christ: The Foundation for New Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997), 356n37. He further states: "it would be a vapid notion to propose that Jesus had never considered what Jeremiah said about the new covenant, and that Matthew was the first to see this link."

[67] Mohrlang, *Matthew and Paul*, 79.

[68] Frederick Dale Bruner, *The Churchbook: Matthew 13–28*, vol. 2 of *Matthew: A Commentary*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 620. Because of the repetition of 'for many,' Matthew 20:28 and 26:28 are closely related. Even though many commentators indicate that the former text does not provide further elaboration of the short statement of 'ransom for many,' the phrase 'for the forgiveness of sins' in Matthew 26:28 "overwhelms the ambiguity of the ransom saying (20:28)" (Dowd and Malbon, "Significance," 293).

[69] Josephus, *J.W.* 6.420. He confirms the number again in 2.280. Against this estimation, E.P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE–66 CE* (London: SCM, 1992), 126, puts it, "these numbers obviously do not lead to accurate figures." Whether this estimation is exaggerated or not, Jerusalem must have been overcrowded in this festive season.

arrived on a donkey the very day the Romans rode in on horses, indicating that he was either a man of strong will, or of split mind.[70] Jesus' entry was probably seen as a potential threat to the empire. The Romans suppressed insurrectionists who would otherwise be a threat to the stability of the Roman rule, and the final place for them was on the cross. The Matthean Jesus maximizes the risk of death, and thus one can say that he even *controls* the time for his death.

In this dangerous situation, surrounded by strong hostility Matthew 26:18, 29 clearly shows that Jesus foresaw his death approaching. Faced with death, Jesus announces the significance of his own death: forgiveness of sins. If he himself felt his forthcoming death, and imparted this meaning to it, then one can argue that Jesus "offers himself willingly,"[71] and that Jesus firmly decided to meet his death for forgiveness. This is the first implication from the Matthean Jesus' understanding of his own death.

The Matthean Jesus is the giver in the Last Supper, and thus one can argue that Jesus is stressing his taking of the initiative. In the Last Supper narrative, the verb δίδωμι recurs in vv.26–27. Considering "the extensive"[72] parallelism between two verses, Jesus is the giver of his body, and blood, and above all, he did it willingly. In this situation, the disciples are the receivers.

In relation to the first implication, Jesus' readiness to die is contrasted with the cowardice of his followers, which supports the emphasis on Jesus' prior action for the unworthy. One of them betrayed Jesus, the rest abandoned him, and one of them who was called the Rock denied him three times. To these cowardly followers, Jesus explained the meaning of his death, and showed his willingness to die, and finally "the risen Lord does not reject [the disciples] after what has happened, but reveals himself to them and gives them his renewed confidence (26:32; 28:10, 16–20) [which] signifies, *de facto*, fundamental forgiveness."[73] The Matthean Jesus authorized the followers who had failed him to act for him, and Jesus graciously granted this fundamental forgiveness even though some of the eleven disciples still doubted (28:17). Jesus was willing, and took initiative.

---

[70] Justin J. Meggitt, "The Madness of King Jesus: Why was Jesus Put to Death, but His Followers Were Not?" *JSNT* 29 (2007): 379–413. It must be noted that Meggitt does not himself claim that Jesus was mad. Rather, the Romans considered him as a mad man even though Jesus was perfectly normal.

[71] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:464.

[72] Ibid., 3:471. This parallel of 'giving' is clearer in the Markan version, where the 'giving' of bread and cup is described by ἔδωκεν, whereas the Matthean version employs the same verb in different forms (ἐδίδου in 26:26, and ἔδωκεν in 26:27).

[73] Gerhardsson, "Sacrificial Service," 34.

5.5 Tracing back to the Historical Jesus

5.5.1 Forgiveness through the Matthean Jesus' Death

As seen above in 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4, the three Matthean texts on forgiveness (1:21; 20:28; 26:28) call attention to Jesus' death as dispensing forgiveness. The last text is clear on the relationship between Jesus' death and forgiveness. The death-imagery ('blood') is clear in the text, and the imagery is directly linked to the phrase 'for the forgiveness of sins.' This single text opens up Matthew's understanding of Jesus' death. Whilst using his source, Mark, Matthew adds the phrase so that the significance of Jesus' death is more glaringly obvious than in the Last Supper in Mark. For Matthew, Jesus' death is for the forgiveness of sins.

Concerning the remaining two texts, some exegetes contend that one or other of the two themes, 'death' and 'forgiveness,' is absent in the text. In 1:21, the forgiveness-theme is evident by 'saving from sins,' but Jesus' death is not clearly demonstrated. However, we have seen that Jesus' future sin-forgiving ministry is accomplished through his healing ministry and death in the Matthean narrative. Therefore, it is not an exaggeration that one of the ways of 'saving from sins' is Jesus' death. This is especially the case if we accept that the intended audience of Matthew acknowledged the widespread earliest Christian creedal traditions which communicate Jesus' death as a means of forgiveness. To this one can further add the possible influence of Judges 13:5 (Samson's birth; cf. his *death* later in 16:30) and 1 Maccabees 6:44 (Eleazar's *death* later in v.46) on 'saving his people' (Matt 1:21), which can be seen as a Matthean corroboration of the pre-Matthean kerygmatic tradition that Jesus "died for our sins *according to the Scriptures*."

In 20:28, Jesus' death is in view by 'giving his life,' but the presence of the forgiveness-theme seems less evident. The word 'ransom,' a candidate for indicating the theme, itself is not clear on what kind of liberation it suggests. Originally, λύτρον displays liberation from slavery, or imprisonment, not from sins, and Matthew does not elaborate the word further. Scholars maintain that ransom or ransom-price is not clear at first sight, and that Matthew does not provide his systematic atonement theology here. The debate between Collins (liberation from sins), and Dowd and Malbon (liberation from social oppression) is helpful in this regard. Both sides have a strong argument, but as discussed in 5.3.1, it might be better to interpret the ransom-price as paid for liberation from sins. If so, Matthew's understanding of Jesus' forgiving death in 26:28 is shared by the other two 'forgiveness' texts, and his understanding is maintained throughout the three texts.

The three 'forgiveness' texts exhibit certain implications as seen in 5.3.2 and 5.4.2. Among the implications, the following two are noteworthy and are to be discussed further in this section to show the significance of Jesus' for-

giving death. (1) *Jesus went actively towards his death*. The announcement of Jesus' birth and his future mission by an angel (1:21) highlights the fact that *Jesus* saves by employing the emphatic αὐτός. If we understand that the means of *how* Jesus saves includes his death, his willingness can be found in his salvific death. As mentioned above, Judges 13:5 and 1 Maccabees 6:44 show verbal similarity with Matthew 1:21. The former, where Samson's birth and his future mission are announced by an angel, even shares a similar context with Matthew 1:21, and the audience of Matthew are probably reminded of Samson's brutal but willing death and can match it to the meaning of "to deliver (σῴζειν) Israel" (Judg 13:5). In 1 Maccabees 6:44–46, in order "to save his people" (v.44; which is almost identical with Matthew 1:21), Eleazar willingly died (v.46).

Moreover, the ransom logion and the cup-saying in the Last Supper indicate Jesus' willingness to die *for many*. The phrase 'came to give his life as ransom-price,' which shows Jesus' understanding of the purpose of his mission, presupposes his willingness to die. Although Jesus knew that it would not be easy to accomplish this mission (Matt 26:39, 42), he embraced his fate, and went up to Jerusalem. Even in Jerusalem, facing open hostility from his opponents, he announced his understanding of his own death again at the table of the Last Supper: it is for forgiveness of sins. Acknowledging the imminence of his death (26:29), Jesus did not flee from Jerusalem, and still envisaged his death as a means of forgiveness. All these three 'forgiveness' texts disclose Jesus' death as a willing death.

(2) *Matthew describes Jesus as taking the initiative in dying an expiatory death*. The connecting word ὥσπερ (just as, even as) in Matthew 20:28 signifies Jesus' providing a model and a warrant for his disciples to follow. His disciples were completely wrong in their understanding of the Kingdom's ethics, and the two sons of Zebedee even requested to be the greatest in the Kingdom. Jesus still taught these blinded followers how to be 'great' in the Kingdom. Therefore, the priority of Jesus' action is present in the ransom logion. The Matthean Jesus told his disciples three times that his death was approaching, but they did not understand it. He, for the first time, taught them the meaning of his death, but they still misunderstood. They, the recipients of the benefits of Jesus' death, are to act likewise; this strongly supports my argument that, in Matthew's account, Jesus takes the initiatve.

The announcement of Jesus' birth and the Last Supper also suggest this line of understanding. In 1:21, Jesus saves his people from sins, which presupposes that his people are under the debt-bondage of sin. Therefore, it is for sinners that Jesus' future rescue mission will be carried out. The promise of forgiveness of sins without any mention of demand is given not to the righteous, but to the sinners. For the Last Supper, the verb 'give' (δίδωμι) recurs in 26:26–27, and the giver is Jesus. Jesus is the one who *gives* and *gives* for his early followers who *receive* and *receive*. Moreover, his blood

(=death) is blood of the covenant, which suggests that it is promised beforehand. Before the followers of Jesus act and give, they receive this 'antedonation' of Jesus' forgiving death. Therefore, in terms of Jesus' forgiving death, Matthew shows Jesus' initiative.

5.5.2 Forgiveness through the Historical Jesus' Death according to Matthew

5.5.2.1 Authenticity of the Ransom Saying

According to the majority view, the ransom logion "is an interpretive saying coined by the community in reflection on Jesus' death."[74] Again as in 1.2.2.1, scholarly opinion on the authenticity of the saying leans towards it being a post-Easter reflection. Admitting the difficulty of historical reasoning for its authenticity, Dowd and Malbon argue that the notion that "the saying goes back to the historical Jesus . . . can be neither proved nor disproved."[75] However, after comparing the argument both for and against, a good case can be made for its authenticity.

To begin with, its context seems to be a record of a historical event. Evans argues that the context – which is humiliating for the two prominent apostles in the early church – speaks in favour of authenticity because of the criterion of embarrassment.[76] The early church would not have added such a story unless it was historical. The Jesus Seminar decides that all the pericope 10:38–45 is predominantly inauthentic, a mixture of grey and black, because the disciples are often depicted negatively in Matthew and Mark, and thus the description of James and John is not so embarrassing for the original readers.[77] Yet, this explication seems unsatisfactory due to Matthew's altering the subject of requesting high rank from the two disciples to their mother (v.20). Hagner correctly observes that "Matthew softens the objectionable character of the request by making the ambitious mother . . . mainly responsible."[78] If Matthew here tries to ease the negative impression of James and John, it appears that even Matthew thought the story embarrassing. The fact that Matthew does not remove the entire story but alters the subject of the request can

---

[74] Peter Stuhlmacher, *Reconciliation, Law, and Righteousness: Essays in Biblical Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 16. Concerning the authenticity of a certain logion, it has been taken for granted that the "sayings which must be disregarded here are those which interpret Jesus' death in terms of its salvific significance" (Virgil P. Howard, "Did Jesus Speak about His Own Death," *CBQ* 39 [1977]: 518).

[75] Dowd and Malbon, "Significance," 283.

[76] Evans, *Mark*, 114.

[77] Funk, Hoover and the Jesus Seminar, *Five Gospels*, 95–96, 226–27. Together with reasoning based on the similarity of Matthew 20:28 and Mark 10:45 to Luke 22:27, these two reasons are the only arguments offered by the Jesus Seminar. Indeed, the Fellows do not provide a systematic argument against the authenticity of the ransom saying.

[78] Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:578.

indicate this story is authentic. More embarrassing is that 'drinking a cup' (vv.22–23) "stands somewhat in tension with Jesus' later prayer . . . that he not have to drink this cup."[79] This can suggest that Jesus' willingness to die was less firm than the Maccabean martyrs who even died happily (section 6.4.2 below). On the basis of 'criterion of embarrassment,' this context appears historical.

If the context is authentic, and Jesus' teaching in Matthew 20:28 is naturally linked to its flow to correct the disciples' wrong understanding of Kingdom, then the text can be authentic. The argument against its authenticity can be summarized as follows: (1) the abrupt transition from 'service' to 'ransom,' (2) the aorist ἦλθεν describing Jesus' ministry as a past event, (3) no further use of λύτρον by Jesus, (4) no combination of 'Son of Man' with salvific death elsewhere, and (5) the Lukan parallel which includes the 'service' portion (v.28a) only. These objections are convincingly disputed by Gundry,[80] and Page.[81] Particularly for Page, these five reasons are "inconclusive."[82]

Concerning the 'abrupt transition' in (1) – the argument that the idea of 'service' (v.28a) and that of 'ransom' (v.28b) are not related, and so v.28b would not be authentic even if v.28a is – it must be noted that both ideas are "hardly mutually exclusive."[83] Moreover, the extensive semitisms throughout v.28 demostrate the coherence of this verse. The consideration of verbal tense, (2) above, is weak because the Greek tense does not strictly indicate the past-ness of the event. Even if the portion 'I have come' is an embellishment by the early followers of Jesus, the purpose clause that follows the portion cannot automatically be considered as their reflection. In the case of Luke 12:49 ("I came to bring fire to the earth, and how I wish it were already kindled!"), which contains ἦλθεν, the Fellows of the Jesus Seminar deny the authenticity of the entire verse.[84] For this judgment, their simple reasoning is that "the 'I have come' form of I-statements announce Jesus' mission, which the Fellows believe Jesus did not do."[85] Oddly enough, however, many Fellows regard *Gospel of Thomas* 10 ("Jesus said, 'I have cast fire upon the world, and look, I'm guarding it until it blazes"), which is very similar to

[79] Evans, *Mark*, 114.

[80] Robert H. Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 587–93.

[81] Sydney H.T. Page, "The Authenticity of the Ransom Logion (Mark 10:45b)," in *Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*, vol. 1 of *Gospel Perspectives*, ed. R.T. France and David Wenham (Sheffield: JSOT, 1980), 137–61.

[82] Ibid., 153.

[83] Ibid., 148.

[84] Funk, Hoover and the Jesus Seminar, *Five Gospels*, 342, decide it as 'grey.'

[85] Ibid., 343.

Luke 12:49, as authentic.[86] This suggests that the presence of ἦλθεν cannot rule out the authenticity of the entire saying.

For consideration (3), because λύτρον does not occur in the teaching of Jesus elsewhere, and its cognates repeatedly occur in the writings of Paul, some contend that this saying originated from Paul. However, as we will see on the next page, Paul's usage of the cognates (especially in 1 Timothy 2:6) is quite different from Jesus' usage, and it seems likely that Paul slightly altered a received tradition. Concerning issue (4), it is true that the Son of Man is usually linked to future glory, and indeed, this title is seldom related to suffering or death. However, this rather supports the authenticity, because of the criterion of dissimilarity, as will be discussed below. The last point (5), which Page describes as the "most formidable"[87] argument, is not so impressive either because "it has often been effortlessly discarded by the majority, who point to the overwhelming consensus that Luke used Mark, including [Mark 10:45b]. Luke's possession of Mark [10:45b] throws the originality of Luke's version into doubt."[88] Moreover, it is likely that the Lukan version (22:27) which is related to the Last Supper and the Markan/Matthean saying stem from different traditions. If Edwards' main thesis, that the Last Supper tradition and the ransom saying have a different reception history, is correct,[89] then the Lukan 'service' text and the ransom saying represent distinct traditions.

The arguments for authenticity are (1) "the semitic argument,"[90] (2) a different usage of 'Son of Man' from the early church, and (3) the high probability of Jesus' acknowledging his forthcoming death, and the influence of the martyr tradition. In relation to (1), Casey introduces "Six Authentic Sayings" based on the Aramaic reconstruction of the 'Son of Man' texts, and he includes the ransom saying in the authentic sayings.[91] Throughout Matthew 20:28, one can find examples of semitisms: the title Son of Man, giving τὴν ψυχὴν, the phrase ἀντὶ πολλῶν. This suggests that this saying must have been preserved from early on, and is at least pre-Markan. Compared to what

---

[86] 'Pink' in ibid., 478.

[87] Page, "Authenticity," 148.

[88] J. Christopher Edwards, *The Ransom Logion in Mark and Matthew: Its Reception and Its Significance for the Study of the Gospels*, WUNT II/327 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 20. Pace Funk, Hoover and the Jesus Seminar, *Five Gospels*, 95, who state, "the saying in Luke is a one-liner; in Mark it is a two-liner."

[89] Edwards, *Ransom Logion*. However, his "own opinion about the authenticity of the logion is very uncertain" (2n5). Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:99, also argue that "there is little evidence that Mk 10.45 par. was created out of or influenced by the last supper tradition."

[90] Gundry, *Mark*, 587.

[91] Maurice Casey, *The Solution to the 'Son of Man' Problem*, LNTS 343 (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 116–43, especially 131–34.

Stuhlmacher calls "a Hellenized variant"[92] of the ransom saying – 1 Timothy 2:5b–6 (ἄνθρωπος Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων Christ Jesus, himself human, who gave himself a ransom for all) – the semitic character of the saying in Matthew 20:28 is evident. In 1 Timothy 2, The title is reduced to 'human,' because the title 'Son of Man' would not make sense to a Greek-speaker.[93] Moreover, the combination of δίδωμι and the reflexive pronoun (cf. Galatians 1:4) and the preposition ὑπέρ (frequently used in the pre-Pauline traditions in the Pauline epistles) replace 'giving one's life' and the preposition ἀντί.

The second reason, (2) the different usage of 'Son of Man,' revolves around the first reason. As mentioned above, 1 Timothy 2:6 contains ἄνθρωπος instead of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, while this construction of 'Son of Man' surprisingly disappears except the single case in Acts 7:56.[94] This very limited usage of the title by the early church strongly indicates that they are probably not the origin of this saying. Their preferred title for Jesus is 'Son of God,' or 'Lord' rather than 'Son of Man.'[95] More than that, in the OT the Son of Man is not the one who suffers and dies, but one who conquers and rules, and the early church never uses this title in relation to Jesus' death. Due to the criterion of dissimilarity, this abnormal usage of the title can suggest the authenticity of the saying.

The final argument, (3) above, concerns historical plausibility. It has been claimed that Jesus' prediction of his impending death is a post-Easter reflection. However, as Wilcox argues, "it seems reasonable to suppose that any intelligent person living in Galilee or Judaea in the period from the death of Herod the Great in 4 BCE to 30 CE would know very well that would happen to him or her if he or she behaved as Jesus did in that volatile political and social situation."[96] It is highly probable that Jesus saw his death approaching (see 6.3 below). If indeed so, on the way to Jerusalem, and even in Jerusalem, what would he imagine the significance of his death to be? The prime candidate is expiatory, as found in the Maccabean literature. This will be dis-

---

[92] Stuhlmacher, *Reconciliation, Law*, 17.

[93] Schröter, *Jesus*, 168, argues that "Paul already no longer uses ['Son of Man'] because it would have remained incomprehensible to his addessees in the cities of the Roman Mediterranean world."

[94] However, the combination of υἱός and ἄνθρωπος without the definite articles before each noun appears in Hebrews 2:6; Revelation 1:13; 14:14.

[95] Evans, *Mark*, 114.

[96] Max Wilcox, "On the Ransom-Saying in Mark 10:45c, Matt 20:28c," in *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Hubert Cancik, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Peter Schäfer, 3 vols. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 3:173–86, 184. Furthermore, Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:580, states, "if Jesus knew of, indeed purposely went to, his death (note the threefold announcement), it is unimaginable that he would not have meditated upon the meaning of his death."

cussed more in 6.4.3, but briefly speaking, throughout the first century CE, the following notion was well established: the death of the righteous martyrs will atone sins of others. We are reminded that Jesus' preaching was predominantly about the Kingdom of God, and the aim of Jesus' ministry was fulfilling and following the will of God. If Jesus was well aware of the martyr tradition, which he probably was, and understood the will of God towards his people is to forgive, he would willingly suffer and die for many to be forgiven so that God's will was fulfilled.

Jeremias comments that "it is naturally not possible, 1,900 years later, to determine with absolute certainty in every single instance what the purpose of Jesus was in an action reported in our sources, nor can we say how the disciples understood it," but he continues, "it is by no means hopeless . . . ."[97] It appears that the argument for and against the authenticity of the ransom saying is a difficult task. However, the case for its authenticity seems stronger than the case against. Even though there are further arguments for its authenticity, the three above are enough to present a strong case. If this is an authentic saying of the historical Jesus, "for the first time in the Gospel the meaning of his death is articulated by Jesus himself."[98]

5.5.2.2 Historicity of the Last Supper

Considering that Marshall has recently defended the historicity of the Last Supper in his exhaustive essay over a hundred pages long,[99] this relatively short section cannot present a full discussion of its historicity; as Klawans notes, "it is not possible to review or even properly cite the vast scholarship on [the subject]."[100] However, reviewing the arguments for and against its historicity can show that the evidence favours in one direction: the arguments for its historicity.

There are a number of scholars who contend that the Lord's Supper "cannot be used as a historical event to explain anything about Jesus' own death" on the basis that "neither the *Gospel of Thomas* nor the *Q Gospel* exhibits any awareness of a Last Supper tradition."[101] Above all, however, it should be noted that absence of evidence does not automatically mean evidence of absence.[102] Against this argument, moreover, Neufeld correctly states, "one

[97] Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 232.

[98] Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:583. France, *Gospel of Matthew*, 755, also states that here "for the first time, almost in passing, is an epigrammatic explanation of its *purpose*."

[99] Marshall, "Last Supper," 481–588. In the introduction, he lists the scholars who are for and against the historicity of the event.

[100] Jonathan Klawans, "Interpreting the Last Supper: Sacrifice, Spiritualization, and Anti-Sacrifice," *NTS* 48 (2002): 1–17, 3n7.

[101] Crossan, *Jesus: Revolutionary Biography*, 130.

[102] Klawans, "Interpreting," 4, rightly argues that "*Didache* 7.1–4 speaks of the rules for baptism without recalling the narrative gospel setting, mentioning neither John the Baptist

must be careful about using a hypothetically reconstructed Q to argue for a 'crossless' Christianity at the beginnings of the Jesus movement. The date for the *Gospel of Thomas* is too uncertain to provide strong support for such a proposal."[103] Particularly *Thomas* should not be used as evidence against the historicity of the Last Supper; if, as has been recently argued, this apocryphal gospel is indeed influenced by the canonical gospels, its author did not include the Last Supper narrative although he knew the story.[104]

In addition to the lack of mention of the event in *Thomas*, and *Q*, there are other reasons why some historians deny its historicity: the differences in the Last Supper narratives, and the scandalous aspect of blood-drinking. To show the different descriptions in the narrative, scholars often point out the odd order of cup-bread-cup in Luke 22, the opposite order of sharing cup and bread in *Didache* 9, and the lack of mention of bread and cup in *Didache* 10. However, despite the presence of differences, the core of the narrative (breaking the bread, and sharing it and the cup) remains the same. Therefore, the difference in detail needs not nullify the historicity of the event.[105]

Others suggest that drinking blood is absurd in the mind of Hebrews, and it is too scandalous to be credible. They rather assert that this rite arose under Hellenistic influence. Yet, this argument also loses its ground because of the simple historical fact that Paul's congregation which heard the scandalous blood-drinking story "consisted of a mix of Jewish and Gentile Christians."[106]

---

nor the fact that Jesus himself was baptized. While the *Didache* is clearly interested in the regulations for baptism and eucharist, it is equally uninterested in the narratives behind those rites. The silence of the *Didache*, therefore, should not be considered to be a decisive argument against the historicity of the Last Supper traditions."

[103] Thomas R. Neufeld, *Recovering Jesus: The Witness of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2007), 251. Cf. Marshall, "Last Supper," 512.

[104] Casey, *Jesus*, 529, states that "the arguments for Thomas being secondary and dependent on the synoptic tradition should be regarded as decisive." Recently, two scholars, independently of each other, have argued similarly that the Gospel of Thomas is influenced by the canonical Gospels. See Mark Goodacre, *Thomas and the Gospels: The Case for Thomas's Familiarity with the Synoptics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012); Simon Gathercole, *The Composition of the Gospel of Thomas: Original Language and Influences*, SNTSMS 151 (Cambridge: CUP, 2012).

[105] Some advocates who argue against its historicity contend that Paul simply provides the established rite of the Eucharist in the Christian churches. This argument and the argument based on different orders of the rite are contradictory to each other. One can argue either that despite the differences, the tradition was well established for Paul to copy the ritual, or that because of the differences, the tradition was not uniformly established, and so Paul could not simply quote it as a tradition.

[106] Marshall, "Last Supper," 507. Classifying this as an "ostensible violation of Jewsih purity laws," Klawans, "Interpreting," 17, also provides his reasoning against this argument: "during the Last Supper, the disciples drank wine, not blood, and . . . ancient Jews could recognize a metaphor when they encountered one." Contra Michael J. Cahill, "Drinking Blood at a Kosher Eucharist? The Sound of Scholarly Silence," *BTB* 32 (2002):

As Wenham argues, therefore, the fact "that the shocking eucharistic words came to be accepted by Jewish Christians (including Matthew) may suggest . . . that they had a strong claim to authenticity, since they would not easily have been accepted if they were not in the Jewish Christian tradition."[107]

Therefore, we can start with what McKnight states: "most scholars today, the Jesus Seminar included, attribute some historical core to the last supper."[108] A large majority of Jesus scholars agree that the last meal of Jesus is a historical event. Consequently, one can concur with Nolland that "though it would be too much to claim that any scholarly consensus has emerged, the main drift of recent scholarship has been to enhance confidence that in some form the words of institution go back to the historical Jesus."[109] Based on the criteria of multiple attestation, and historical plausibility, one can argue its historicity.

On the *multiple attestation* of the Last Supper, even Crossan, who argues against its historicity, does not deny it. According to Sanders, the Last Supper tradition has "reached us through two independent channels," and he simply comments on its historicity: "the passage in general has the strongest possible support, putting it on a par with the saying on divorce in terms of certainty."[110] It is significant that the Pauline version is often considered an "independent attestation"[111] even though Paul is generally regarded as a dependent witness of the historical Jesus (section 1.3.1.2.2). Moreover, based

---

168–81, 176, who stresses that Jews "were well aware that wine was not really blood. It is conceivable that Jesus could have spoken metaphorically of his blood as wine, but this does not extend to the injunction to take and drink."

[107] Wenham, *Paul: Follower*, 156n39.

[108] McKnight, *Jesus and His Death*, 276. Or more correctly, "the bulk of the so-called 'New Questers' deny the essential historicity of the Last Supper traditions while many, but not all, of the so-called 'Third Questers' accept the historicity of some type of Last Supper event" (Klawans, "Interpreting," 4).

[109] Nolland, *Matthew*, 1072.

[110] Sanders, *Historical Figure*, 263. According to him, the Last Supper tradition is multiply attested, and he finds two strands of the tradition: the Synoptics and Paul (whilst most scholars usually see the two strands as follows: Mark and Matthew, and Paul and Luke). Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 2:302, also concurs: "suffice it to say that the historicity of a final farewell meal held by Jesus with his disciples is generally accepted by scholars across the spectrum," and he adds his reasoning, "since its existence is supported both by the criterion of multiple attestation and the criterion of coherence." Overall, the main storyline of each narrative seems to be the same: Jesus broke a piece of bread, and shared it, and then took a cup, and shared it. He did this to show the meaning of his death to the people in his inner circle.

[111] Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 2:302.

on the appearance of two cups and bread in Lukan narrative, Fitzmyer argues that the Lukan form is independent.[112]

On the ground of *historical plausibility*, if we accept the ransom logion is authentic, the historicity of the Last Supper would be highly plausible.[113] In other words, if the historical Jesus regards his death as a ransoming death, and he senses strongly that his death is approaching, he would say something similar to the cup-saying at the table of the Last Supper. This meal would be high time to repeat the expiatory effect of his death. Timewise, it was after the temple cleansing incidence, by which he stirred the city. Historically, the vast majority of scholars recognise that Jesus invited sinners to his table fellowship. If he welcomed sinners to his table so that the table metaphorically plays a role as a place to forgive and to be forgiven, the historical Jesus would probably speak a message of forgiveness in face of his own death.

If this event is historical as discussed, and the historical Jesus said something similar to the cup-saying, then we can interpret "the way in which he approached his death," because "the narrative anchors the significance of death in his own understanding of it."[114] It is perfectly plausible that the historical Jesus embraced his own death, and attached an expiatory effect to it. According to Matthew, the historical Jesus imparted the meaning of forgiveness of sin to his impending death.

5.6 Conclusions

Among the Matthean forgiveness-themed texts, the following passages were selected for this study: 1:21; 20:28; 26:28 (section 5.1). In the three selected texts, Matthew describes Jesus' death as an event of bestowing forgiveness. The clearest text which shows this is 26:28, and the other two texts do it implicitly. As seen in 5.2.1, the first text exhibits the forgiveness-theme by speaking of 'salvation from sins,' and shows that the one who does the salvific work is Jesus. Yet how Jesus accomplishes this future task is not clearly portrayed. To find an answer for this *how* question, the first Gospel itself (5.2.2.1) and its historical context (5.2.2.2) should be considered. Throughout Matthew's narrative, 'salvation from sins' never appears again, but if this phrase can include the idea of the 'forgiveness of sins,' then one can conclude that Jesus' healing ministry and his death are the means of for-

[112] Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1386.

[113] Moreover, If the historical Jesus forgave sins in his lifetime, it is clear that he had an agenda concerning sin and forgiveness. For a recent argument in favour of historical Jesus' forgiving sins (as following a line of prophets), see Hägerland, *Jesus and Forgiveness*.

[114] Marshall, "Last Supper," 578.

giveness. Therefore, Jesus' death can certainly be one of the options for how Jesus saves.

In addition, the pre-Pauline traditions (e.g., 1 Corinthians 15:3), which link Jesus' death and the forgiveness-theme, are established in the early communities as a consensus. More than that, two other stories may have influenced Matthew and his readers, Samson's birth and death, and the death of martyrs as the means of 'saving his people.' These two stories share common features with Matthew 1:21, and can lead the readers to the 'death' imagery of Samson and of Eleazar. When all is said and done, Jesus' death can indeed be an answer, if not *the* answer, as to how Jesus saves his people from sins.

The second forgiveness-text is the ransom saying (20:28), which is almost identical to its Markan parallel. In the text, the 'death' imagery is clearly portrayed by δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. Traditionally, moreover, the word ransom-price is interpreted as a forgiveness-themed term. Despite the recent challenge by Dowd and Malborn, who claim that this redemption was for the lowly in the society, it seems better to interpret the term as ransoming from sins (5.3.1). The last is the cup-saying in the Last Supper, where Matthew directly links Jesus' death (blood) to the forgiveness of sins. By adding 'for the forgiveness of sins,' Matthew does not alter the Markan Last Supper, but rather he makes the forgiveness-theme vivid, and links it to Jesus' death so that the readers cannot misunderstand the original meaning of Jesus' saying on the cup (5.4.1). These texts give us two identical implications: that Jesus was ready to die and that Jesus took the initiative in arranging his death (5.3.2 and 5.4.2).[115] If Jesus himself gives meaning to his own impending death without fleeing from it, then it is safe to say that Jesus is willing to suffer and die for the forgiveness of sins. Moreover, Jesus grants this forgiveness to those who are not worthy of it without demanding anything of them.

We have seen so far that in the three texts, the Matthean Jesus interprets his death as a means of forgiveness (5.5.1). Can this interpretation derive from the historical Jesus? This was the aim of section 5.5.2. It should be admitted that to prove a certain logion is authentic is difficult, and may need a monograph. However, by discussing the authenticity of the ransom saying (5.5.2.1) and the historicity of the last supper (5.5.2.2), a plausible case can be made for their authenticity and historicity. Therefore, if we can concur with the statement that "the passion narratives are theological discourse grounded in the narrative *history* of the passion of Jesus,"[116] the ransom logion and the cup-saying in the Last Supper tradition in particular can certainly

[115] Matthew 20:28 also implies that the Matthean Jesus is a model to follow. This is significant because Paul emphasizes participation in Jesus' death, and the martyr tradition also provides a model to follow. As Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:100n102, state, "Eleazer and the brothers in 2 and 4 Maccabees and Jesus in Paul are models in their martyrdom." This is another feature which the martyr tradition, Paul, and Matthew share.

[116] Carroll and Green, *Death of Jesus*, 7 (emphasis mine).

be employed as sources for the historical Jesus' understanding for his own death. If we can accept that the historical Jesus said something similar to these sayings, it is probably true that he interpreted his death as a means of forgiveness of sins.

Chapter 6

Forgiveness through the Historical Jesus' Death according to Paul and Matthew

This chapter brings together the results from chapters 4 and 5, comparing the evidence from Paul and Matthew on the historical Jesus' understanding of the significance of his own death. The main question to be asked is whether their views, and the implications, are consonant or conflicting. After the comparison, the result will then be compared to the writings of contemporary Jewish authors. We may not find in them a description of Jesus' intention towards, and understanding of, his own death from those writings. However, as neutral observers, their presentation of the Jewish martyrs' deaths will provide hints from another angle. If the literature shows the Jewish martyrs as having a similar understanding of their death to Jesus, it is highly likely that Paul and Matthew provide a historically correct presentation of the historical Jesus' intention towards his death.

6.1 Limits of the Study: Comparing Perspectives

As we have seen in section 2.1, it appears that a comparison of Paul's and Matthew's perspectives on common themes is methodologically wiser than a comparison of their circumstances, such as one's influence on the other. To suggest what Paulinism means is a difficult task because there is no scholarly agreement on it. Scholars still debate how to understand Paul either through the New Pespective or the traditional approach. Moreover, to articulate Paul's system of theology itself needs a (series of) monograph(s). Acknowledging this difficulty, comparing the whole theology of Paul with that of Matthew would be over-ambitious. Therefore, comparing their circumstances can be the second step. After the comparison of the common themes they share is successfully accomplished, and their similarities and differences in relation to each theme are shown, we can proceed to compare their circumstances.

The strategy of comparing their common themes is adopted by Willitts and Foster, and that of comparing their circumstances is Sim's approach.[1] In this

[1] See section 2.1, especially 36n10.

thesis also, comparison of common themes is adopted. So far, Paul and Matthew's understandings of the relationship between Jesus' death and forgiveness have been discussed in chapters 4 and 5 respectively. In this chapter, I will compare the two biblical authors' perspectives on the issue.

6.2 Comparison of Forgiveness through Jesus' Death in Paul and Matthew

To begin with, both Paul and Matthew closely relate Jesus' death to the forgiveness of sins. For Paul, Jesus' death is the centre and the basis of his argument, and more than that, he connects the death of Jesus to the forgiveness-theme (e.g., Rom 4:25; 1 Cor 15:3; Gal 1:4). Although the terms for forgiveness (such as ἄφεσις and πάρεσις) are scarcely mentioned in his letters, the theme of forgiveness underlies Paul's argument. In all the texts selected in chapter 4, Jesus' death is clearly linked to the forgiveness-theme. In Matthew, the forgiveness of sins is explicitly present in relation to Jesus' death (most clearly in 26:28). Concerning the common theme, the relationship between Jesus' death and forgiveness, the two biblical authors share the same idea: Jesus' death is for forgiveness of sins.

Moreover, the 'forgiveness' texts in Paul and Matthew, discussed in chapters 4 and 5, share the following aspects: Jesus' willingness to die, and Jesus' initiative in granting forgiveness through his death. The most obvious Pauline passage of forgiveness which shows Jesus' willingness is Galatians 1:4a: Jesus "gave himself for our sins to set us free from the present evil age." As discussed in 4.3.1.3, Paul describes this as Jesus' own act, which signifies Jesus' self-sacrifice. Of the Matthean 'forgiveness' texts, especially in 20:28 and 26:28, it is Jesus who speaks of his death and its significance including forgiveness. If Jesus himself mentions his death dispensing forgiveness, it is likely that he decided to die for the forgiveness of sins. Therefore, in these two texts, Jesus "offers himself willingly."[2]

In regard to Jesus' taking the initiative, Paul explicitly highlights grace in the forgiveness-themed texts, but in the case of Matthew the this aspect is more implicit. Paul often underlines the importance of grace in Jesus' forgiving death, as in Romans 3:24 ('justified by his grace as a gift') and other passages, where "the terms *dōrea* ('gift') and *dōrean* ('as a gift, undeservedly') are usually linked with the concept of *charis*."[3] Particularly in Romans 3:24, Paul doubles the concept of grace when 'justified by his grace,' or 'jus-

[2] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:464. Actually, their comment is concerning 26:28, but they find Jesus' willingness in 20:28 as well.

[3] Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 322. For the passages containing δωρεά, or δωρεάν with χάρις, see ibid., 322n24.

tified as a gift' would be enough. However, for Paul, who confessed that 'by the grace of God I am what I am' (1 Cor 15:10), it is not an overemphasis at all, because he cannot emphasize enough the overwhelming significance of grace. The importance of grace in Jesus' forgiving death frequently recurs in Paul, and Paul can be called "the apostle of grace."[4] For Paul, it is God who initiates divine-human reconciliation.

Matthew also emphasizes the divine initiative. To the sinful people, salvation is promised ahead of time when it is given (1:21). Therefore, Przybylski argues that the angelic announcement of Jesus' name and his ministry is "the clearest statement" which shows that "salvation is the gift of God."[5] In the two remaining texts, Jesus also explains and promises forgiveness through his death to his followers who still do not understand what it is and how it will happen. This means that Jesus is described as following a plan for the salvation of his people despite their rejection and hostility, and the misunderstanding of his disciples. Thus, although the word 'grace' is not used, the story is told in a such a way that Jesus' self-sacrificial acts comes first.[6] Paul is more explicit than Matthew, but it is a difference of emphasis rather than understanding:[7] Paul's frequent usage of 'grace' terminology makes explicit his understanding of Jesus' forgiving death as centered on God's grace; Matthew expresses this theme implicitly, as the context indicates Jesus' prior action on behalf of those who come to believe in him.

Is this shared depiction of Jesus' death a creation of his early followers, or does it stem from the historical Jesus? From the observations in 4.4 and 5.5, it is possible and even plausible that the historical Jesus would understand that his own death would bring forgiveness, and thus willingly embrace his death.

In sum, the common theme of Jesus' death and its significance is understood in the same way by Paul and Matthew: both authors closely link Jesus' death and the forgiveness of sins. Moreover, two implications are shared by the two authors. They show Jesus' readiness to die for forgiveness of sins,

---

[4] James R. Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context* WUNT II/172 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 13.

[5] Przybylski, *Righteousness in Matthew*, 106. This is similar to the Pauline thought in Romans 5, where he explains Jesus' death is for the weak, the ungodly (v.6), the sinners (v.8), and the enemies (v.10). Again in the immediate context (vv.15, 17), Paul employs the duplex of δωρεά and χάρις twice.

[6] Similarly Charles H. Talbert states, "like Paul, [Matthew's] soteriology is by grace from start to finish. He just uses a different conceptual repertoire" ("Indicative and Imperative in Matthean Soteriology," in *Getting 'Saved': The Whole Story of Salvation in the New Testament*, ed. Charles H. Talbert and Jason A. Whitlark [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011], 95–118, 118).

[7] Cf. Deines, *Gerechtigkeit der Tora*, 649–54.

and that this forgiveness through his death is granted as a gift.[8] More significant is that according to Paul and Matthew, the origin of this understanding is the historical Jesus. In the case of Jesus' understanding of his own death, Matthew is pro-Pauline.

6.3 A Plausible Case for Jesus' Understanding of His Death

The main problem for research on Jesus' intentions is that there is no direct source. Paul left his epistles, thus, Pauline scholarship has a direct resource to investigate Paul's thoughts and his intention. However, Jesus' case is a completely different story. Jesus "left no writings of his own"[9] and thus, one can trace Jesus' mind and mentality only through indirect resources.

Hence, it is not surprising that "the *Leben–Jesu* investigations of the nineteenth century reached the negative conclusion that . . . it is no longer possible to reconstruct with methodological certainty any development in Jesus' self-understanding."[10] In the same vein, Green states that "it is both virtually impossible to segregate Jesus' understanding of his death from the view of his followers and ill-advised to speculate how far down the interpretive path Jesus himself had gone."[11] These two quotes share the idea of the 'impossibility' of reconstructing Jesus' own understanding. Between the two, the latter needs to be revisited because its concern is confined to Jesus' own understanding *of his death*, which is the current topic of this thesis. In fact, Green does not deny that the clear sacrificial interpretation and imagery of Isaiah 52:13–53:12, and "texts related to the Maccabean martyrs . . . were available to Jesus and within Jesus' world."[12] Therefore, Green agrees that the historical setting around Jesus was enough for him to consider his demise in terms of sacrifice. Yet, Green carefully indicates that there is still a difficulty in differentiating Jesus' intention from his followers' interpretation.

Despite this difficulty, an area of theological debate which still needs to be examined is the indirect sources. Although it is an indirect route to the historical Jesus, there is a hint of Jesus' intention when examining these works. Socrates left none of his writings just as Jesus did. However, Plato and Xen-

[8] The idea of forgiveness flowing from grace is found in the OT as well (Exod 34:9; Neh 9:17). Both Paul and Matthew preserve this idea from the OT, which signifies that they did not invent a new idea, and Paul is not 'a religious genius' as some argue. The difference from the OT is that both authors found forgiveness through grace in Jesus' death.

[9] John P. Meier, "Basic Methodology in the Quest for the Historical Jesus," in *HSHJ*, 1:291–331, 297.

[10] Matthias Kreplin, "The Self-understanding of Jesus," in *HSHJ*, 3:2473–516, 2493n75.

[11] Joel B. Green, "The Death of Jesus," in *HSHJ*, 3:2383–408, 2407. Cf. Schröter, *Jesus*, 176–77.

[12] Green, "The Death of Jesus," 3:2407.

ophon, who were his pupils as well as his friends, wrote about his trial and his attitude to his death.[13] It is their works that provide hints of Socrates' intention while facing the death. Even though those texts may be considered as the subsidiary source, we would know nothing of Socrates' mind without them. Similarly, if we do not examine the indirect sources for the historical Jesus, we have no other resources to look at and end up knowing nothing of Jesus' understanding of his own death. As discussed, the first written source for the historical Jesus' understanding of his death is the Pauline epistles. Paul wrote how Jesus died, and left hints about Jesus' understanding. Matthew, another major source, also provides hints, which show a similar perspective on Jesus' understanding as Paul.

To make a more plausible case for Jesus' understanding of his death, the first question to be asked is, 'Did the historical Jesus foresee his imminent death?' If the historical Jesus never reflected on the threat of his imminent death at the hands of the authorities he challenged, it is implausible to say that he assigned a significant meaning to his death. Furthermore, it is impossible to draw a conclusion as to how Jesus might have interpreted his death if he did not expect and did not in some form embrace his coming death. Only if this first question can be answered in the affirmative, the next questions, 'Did Jesus accept his death as his fate?' and 'What kind of meaning and significance did the historical Jesus place on his death?' can be asked sequentially. The first two questions concern Jesus' prescience of death and his willingness to die. If one of the answers is a resounding 'no,' our journey towards Jesus' understanding should stop there. An affirmative response to the two questions is a precondition for probing into the main question. The debate on Jesus' prediction of his death is a contested question even though the debate revolves around a simple yes-or-no question.

6.3.1 Jesus' Prediction of His Imminent Death

Regarding the questions above, we have discussed the contemporary scholarly views in section 1.2.2.2, and thus the thrust of the argument only needs to be presented. Against Wrede's pessimism that we "cannot discuss Death Prediction,"[14] Jesus' prediction of his own death is quite probable. This is based on both historical and textual grounds. Before exploring the textual reasoning, it should be noted that there are good historical reasons: (1) the

[13] It is admitted that each of them provide a slightly different view on Socrates' attitude in his trial, though. For the philosophical guild, there is "the quest for the historical Socrates," or more commonly called "the Socratic Problem . . . [which is] the attempt to excavate the historical Socrates from the soil of those who wrote about him" (Robin Waterfield, "The Quest for the Historical Socrates," *The Bloomsbury Companion to Socrates*, ed. John Bussanich and Nicholas D. Smith [London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013], 1–19, 1).

[14] Wrede, *Messianic Secret*, 224.

clash between the Pharisees and Jesus, and (2) the tragic fate of a righteous man.

Firstly, Jesus' antagonistic circumstances mean he could have expected his death. According to Casey, there was "vigorous and large-scale opposition to Jesus' ministry, in the context of which he was to meet his death."[15] Even an ordinary person in Jesus' days could tell that Jesus was in danger, and the prediction "requires absolutely no 'miraculous knowledge.'"[16] It should not be forgotten that one of the disciples carried a dagger with him (μάχαιρα; Mark 14:47). Secondly, Bockmuehl argues that Jesus' death was more than "the tragically inevitable outcome of his career as a righteous prophet."[17] The fate of a righteous man who speaks out for the God of Israel is well known in the first century CE. As deSilva correctly argues, "Jesus' predictions of his death need not be doubted on the basis of the reluctance of historians to believe that the future can be foreseen: Jesus had ample precedent for expecting his own demise without any recourse to the prophetic gift."[18] John the Baptist was the precursor of the historical Jesus. His message of repentance was analogous to that of Jesus. If John was killed brutally after having proclaimed a similar message, it is natural to accept that Jesus predicted his death. Matthew 17:12f. supports this line of thought by mentioning that Jesus said the Son of Man would suffer as John the Baptist did. On the basis of historical reasoning, therefore, it is plausible to argue that Jesus foresaw his looming death.

Textual reasoning also provides conceivable evidence: Jesus' direct prediction of death, and his indirect allusion. Concerning the first evidence, Zolondek presents a comprehensive case based on Mark 8:31–33.[19] Acknowledging that "Jesus would have been well aware of the great danger he was facing and the probability that he would be killed as a result of his ministry," he suggests, "the context of the passion prediction provides significant evidence for its authenticity."[20] Due to the embarrassing situation of Peter rebuking Jesus, and Jesus calling Peter Satan, his argument seems plausible.

---

[15] Casey, *Jesus*, 351.

[16] Michael Vicko Zolondek, "The Authenticity of the First Passion Prediction and the Origin of Mark 8.31–33," *JSHJ* 8 (2010): 237–53, 242.

[17] Bockmuehl, *This Jesus*, 90. He also lists the evidence which was widespread in the Jewish tradition like the Psalms of Lament, the book of Job, Wisdom 2, again, the story of Maccabean martyrs, and Isaiah 53.

[18] David A. deSilva, "Jewish Martyrology and the Death of Jesus," in *The Pseudepigrapha and Christian Origin: Essays from the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas*, ed. Gerbern S. Oegema and James H. Charlesworth, JCTC 4 (New York: T&T Clark International, 2008), 51–67, 59. deSilva provides three proofs for his claim: the classical prophets, John the Baptist, and Honi the Circle-Drawer (ibid., 59n22).

[19] Zolondek, "Authenticity," 237–53.

[20] Ibid., 242, 251. Casey also argues that Jesus' prediction of his death is "a certain fact" (*Jesus*, 407) based on the criterion of embarrassment (378). Cf. page 17 above.

As shown in 5.5.2.1 and 5.5.2.2, the ransom logion and the Eucharistic words can be another line of proof for Jesus' prediction of his imminent death. If the historical Jesus said something similar to the ransom logion and the cup-saying, then it means that he discerned his impending death. Pokorný states, "in Mark 14:25 . . . we are offered a comprehensive interpretation of the action. Jesus foretells his death: he will drink no more in this life."[21] By and large, this Markan verse is generally considered to be an authentic saying of the historical Jesus. From this text and parallels, it can be inferred that Jesus foresaw his death.

In sum, the research so far has presented probable hints for Jesus' prediction of his death both from historical reasoning and the textual evidence. The former accounts for the antagonistic surroundings around Jesus, and the presumed destiny of the righteous. The latter includes Jesus' own prediction, and his allusion at the Last Supper. Both the historical and the theological evidence make a strong case. Therefore, that Jesus predicted his coming death is probable.

6.3.2 Jesus' Readiness to Embrace His Death

If we recall Borg's statement that "the *outcome* was not the *purpose* of the journey,"[22] it is still possible that the death of the historical Jesus might not have been his intention even though he foresaw his imminent death. Jesus could have been pushed towards death; his death could have been through force of circumstance, rather than personal choice. If this can be considered a valid claim, we no longer need to investigate Jesus' recognition of his death in relation to forgiveness of sins. Had he been reluctant to die, then he probably would not have placed any important meaning on his death.

Nevertheless, from Jesus' works and his words, one can detect evidence of the historical Jesus' intention. Initial attention will be given to his works. Bauckham states, "probably the best-known historical fact about Jesus is that he died on a Roman cross."[23] Indeed, the most concrete *historical fact* about the historical Jesus is his death on the cross. If he saw his coming death and he then died on the cross, it is safe to say that Jesus embraced his death and he was willing to die. Again, we can recall the well-known story of Socrates.

---

[21] Petr Pokorný, *The Genesis of Christology: Foundations for a Theology of the New Testament*, trans. Marcus Lefébure (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), 48.

[22] Borg, *Jesus*, 172.

[23] Richard Bauckham, *Jesus: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: OUP, 2011), 95. Green, "The Death of Jesus," 3:2383, also asserts, "that Jesus was 'crucified under Pontius Pilate,' as the Creed affirms, is historically the most stable datum we have concerning Jesus." Cf. Crossan, *Jesus: Revolutionary Biography*, 145; N.T. Wright, *The Original Jesus: The Life and Vision of a Revolutionary* (Oxford: Lion, 1996), 18; Leander E. Keck, *Who is Jesus?: History in Perfect Tense* (Columbia, University of South Carolina Press, 2000), 113; Meggitt, "Madness of King Jesus," 379; Schröter, *Jesus*, 184–85.

He knew that he would be killed, but he refused to escape. He had known that his brutal fate was awaiting, but Socrates did not run away and died for justice. From these facts, it is plausible to conclude that Socrates was willing to die.

What about the case of the historical Jesus? He knew that he provoked the Jewish religious leaders, hence it is more than likely that Jesus felt their hatred towards him reaching an extreme. In this hostile environment, he decided to go to Jerusalem. His "decisive and final move toward Jerusalem"[24] itself is an act of exposing himself to danger. This very action clearly shows Jesus' attitude toward death: "we should qualify the (last) journey to Jerusalem as the product of a decision that was meant to serve the offer of salvation. He wanted to appear in Jerusalem at the appropriate time, as has already emerged in part from our reflections on the cleansing of the temple."[25] Jesus firmly decided to go to Jerusalem even though it was clear to him that he would end up dying. Undoubtedly, entering Jerusalem means more than a high risk of death.

In the so-called Lukan "travel narrative (or journey narrative)," Jesus said that "it cannot be that a prophet should perish outside of Jerusalem" (Luke 13:33b). While he was on the way to Jerusalem (v.31), he noticeably mentioned this. It is plausible that he knew that death stared him in the face, but he resolved to embrace it. This explanation is consistent with the beginning of the travel narrative, Luke 9:51b, where it says, "he was determined to go to Jerusalem." Likewise, Matthew 16:21a ("from that time Jesus began to show his disciples that he *must* go to Jerusalem") strongly supports the assertion that Jesus was actively accepting of his death. The word 'must' (δεῖ) needs attention. Its basic meaning is, 'it is necessary.'[26] The Lukan and the Matthean Jesus emphasize his willingness to go up to Jerusalem. It seems that he foresaw where his mission would end and what the last event of his mission was. Indeed, as Keck rightly states, "the combination of foreknowledge and necessity shows the reader that Jesus willingly accepted his death – stated theologically, he was obedient even to the point of death (Phil 2:8)."[27]

The premise that Jesus was ready to embrace his death could possibly be countered by the account found in Matthew 26:39b, 'My Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me; yet not as I will, but as you will.' Taken at face value, this text sounds like Jesus was unwilling to die. However, here

---

[24] Eubank, *Cross-Bearing*, 144.

[25] Pokorný, *Genesis*, 52.

[26] Jeremias, *Proclamation of Jesus*, 277–78, indicates that "the community was concerned to stress that Jesus was not surprised by his suffering, but foresaw it and deliberately trod the road of his passion in obedience to the scriptures."

[27] Keck, *Who is Jesus?*, 118. Here he portrays this necessity as "a God-given necessity." This is similar to "the divine necessity of what had happened" (James D.G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, vol. 1 of *Christianity in the Making* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003], 790).

Jesus obeyed the Heavenly *abba*. Although he did not want this violent death, he chose to submit himself to follow the will of God. This suggests that Jesus did embrace his death as his fate.

So far, it has been argued that the historical Jesus embraced his death. Generally speaking, his decision to go to Jerusalem itself shows that he intended to die. Therefore, there can be little doubt that Jesus knew that his fate was not a happy ending, but did not run from the inevitable. Textual evidence supports this general reconstruction of Jesus' intention.

6.3.3 Jesus' Understanding of His Own Death

It has been suggested that the historical Jesus anticipated his impending death and that he actively accepted it as his fate. The last question which has to be answered is this: how did the historical Jesus regard his death? Did he think that he forgave sins by his violent death? This correlation of his death and remission of sins could be the post-Easter interpretation (or invention) by his early followers. Hence, we should ask whether this can really be from the mouth of Jesus. Could he have considered his death as a necessary action to forgive people's sins?

Before starting the examination, it can certainly be argued that investigating Jesus' understanding of his demise is a legitimate subject of historical studies. Historical Jesus study is a historical study, but self-understanding or the inner thought of Jesus seems to "[fall] outside the bounds of all legitimate historical investigation."[28] As a matter of fact, at the first sight, it sounds more like "*The Psychiatric Study of Jesus*."[29] Can this current investigation be a historically legitimate study? Old questers would not regard this topic as legitimate historical research, and it is true that "for many questers still today, the subquest for the inner aims or 'self-consciousness' of Jesus remains a nonstarter."[30] We cannot go any further until the question of legitimacy is solved because the study of the self-understanding of Jesus indeed seems to be the "last tabu" or a "'no go' area."[31]

Through his work, *The Aims of Jesus*, however, Meyer opens the door for the investigation of the current topic. As the title clearly indicates, his research is interested in reconstruction of Jesus' intention. He concludes:

---

[28] Alexander J.M. Wedderburn, *Jesus and the Historians*, WUNT 269 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 275.

[29] Albert Schweitzer, *The Psychiatric Study Of Jesus: Exposition And Criticism*, trans. C.R. Joy (Boston: Beacon, 1958).

[30] Paul Rhodes Eddy and James K. Beilby, "The Quest for the Historical Jesus: An Introduction," in *The Historical Jesus: Five Views*, ed. James K. Beilby and Paul Rhodes Eddy (London: SPCK, 2010), 9–54, 51.

[31] John A.T. Robinson, *Twelve More New Testament Studies* (London: SCM, 1984), 155.

we may formulate numerous historical probabilities about Jesus and his death. It is probable, owing to the nexus between 'prophet' and 'violent fate' in contemporary religious tradition (cf. Luke 13.33), that the prospect of a violent death belonged unthematically to his self-understanding from the start and that under the impact of the Baptist's execution, the deadly hostility of his critics, and the consequent threats to his life, this early became thematically conscious. It is probable that he conceived his death in sacrificial terms. It is probable that despite a powerful instinct of recoil he went willingly to his death.[32]

Through the opened door, Wright comes in, and he asserts that history "includes the study of aims, intentions and motivations. This does not mean that history is covert psychology."[33] Following these two scholars, current questers need not avoid enquiring into Jesus' recognition of his death. Hence, the volumes which deal with Jesus' self-understanding and his own thoughts are flooding current scholarship.[34] It seems that for now at least the question of legitimacy has been answered in the affirmative.

After passing through the question of legitimacy, that of methodology awaits us. How, then, do we start examining this question? Can it be possible to look into the brain of a person who lived two thousand years ago? Bultmann asserts that "we can now know almost nothing concerning the life and personality of Jesus, since the early Christian sources show no interest in either, are moreover fragmentary and often legendary; and other sources about Jesus do not exist."[35] Dunn also affirms that "to 'get inside' the head

[32] Ben F. Meyer, *The Aims of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1979), 252.

[33] Wright, *New Testament*, 111.

[34] For example, Peter Balla, "What Did Jesus Think about His Approaching Death?," in *Jesus, Mark and Q: The Teaching of Jesus and its Earliest Records*, ed. Michael Labahn and Andreas Schmidt, JSNTSup 214 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001), 239–58; Craig A. Evans, "Jesus: Sources and Self-understanding," in *Jesus and Philosophy: New Essays*, ed. Paul K. Moser (Cambridge: CUP, 2009), 27–40; Rudolf Hoppe, "How Did Jesus Understand His Death?: The Parable in Eschatological Prospect," in *Jesus Research: An International Perspective*, ed. James H. Charlesworth and Petr Pokorný (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 154–69; Wedderburn, *Jesus and the Historians*, 275–321; Sigurd Grindheim, *God's Equal: What Can We Know About Jesus' Self-Understanding?* (London: T&T Clark, 2011).

[35] Bultmann, *Jesus and the Word*, 8. Henry J. Cadbury also mentions that "the gospel narratives do not often disclose the motives of Jesus" (*Jesus, What Manner of Man?: The Shaffer Lectures for 1946* [New York: Macmillan, 1947], 64). This negative perspective of the theologians seems awkward and odd, when compared to that of the philosophers. As mentioned before, Socrates wrote no document by himself, as Jesus. The philosophers and the theologians are left only with the indirect sources by the followers of Socrates and Jesus. The situations for both parties are the same. However, under the same situation, their attitudes are significantly different. On the one hand, the philosophers are positive about discovering Socrates' understanding of his death by the indirect sources. They drew their conclusion from the works mostly by Plato. On the other hand, theologians and historians look too carefully at the indirect sources such as the Synoptic gospels when making conclusions. It should be either the philosophers and the theologians take an

of a historical figure" is "impossible" and so, this investigation can only be speculative.[36] However, he admits that "the speculation is rooted in and grows directly from . . . the earliest formulated memories of [Jesus'] mission."[37]

Conceding that "what took place in the depths of Jesus' soul will always remain a mystery no source will be able to uncover," Fridrichsen cautiously states that "we may draw certain conclusions, nothing more."[38] It is a slightly more positive view than that of Bultmann. It is quite an abstruse subject to research, but it is not impossible to draw certain inferences, and there are sources which can be uncovered by probability and plausibility more than mere possibility; we may find some hints and some concrete conclusions about what was in Jesus' mind by considering these works.

If the historical Jesus sensed his imminent death, and he was ready to embrace it, what kind of meaning did he place on his own death? Modern history tells us that Japanese kamikaze pilots did not learn how to land the plane, because they were willing to die in order to explode the enemy's battleship by colliding their plane with the ship. They clearly knew that they were going to die, and this imparts a specific meaning to their death: death for the Japanese emperor and the country. They found a reason to die, and it made them sacrifice their lives. If the historical Jesus clearly knew that he was going to die soon, and was willing to sacrifice his life, then it is perfectly plausible that he would place a specific meaning on his own death. It is highly questionable that he embraced his impending death without a clear reason. Without it, his entry to Jerusalem should be understood as madness, or recklessness.

As concluded in section 6.2, Paul and Matthew commonly present the historical Jesus as understanding his death as a means of forgiveness of sins. If we accept they are legitimate sources for historical Jesus research, this case can certainly be considered a good argument. The historical Jesus probably spoke of his ransoming death for sins, and considered his death as bringing the forgiveness of sins (section 5.5). Moreover, Paul indicates the origin of the Last Supper tradition is the historical Jesus (section 4.4.1.2). Acknowledging that his death was approaching and determining in his mind to embrace it, the aim of the historical Jesus through his death was to make possible the forgiveness of sins so that the people of God could enjoy a renewed relationship with their God.

---

optimistic stance or both adhere to a negative view. If the philosophers are positive on that they can trace Socrates' thoughts, the theologians can also take an optimistic stance.

[36] Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 818.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Anton Fridrichsen, *The Problem of Miracle in Primitive Christianity*, trans. Roy A. Harrisville and John S. Hanson (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), 72.

6.4 Paul and Matthew among Contemporary Jewish Writings

If Paul and Matthew are the only sources to be discussed and compared with regard to Jesus' understanding of his death, some may question as Marxsen does: "did the historical Jesus understand himself the way these people said he understood himself?"[39] Indeed, as he suggests, "there were various people and groups who could talk of Jesus: followers, opponents, and neutral observers."[40] If the view of Jesus' followers (Paul and Matthew) and that of neutral observers and/or opponents can converge, the case that the historical Jesus may have interpreted the significance of his death in such a way is strengthened. One problem when seeking a comparison with broadly contemporary Jewish documents to Jesus is that they do not articulate Jesus' intention of dying and his understanding of his death.[41]

Although there is no direct mention of Jesus' understanding of his death, from the writings of the neutral observers of his era, we may find a predominant cultural norm to understand martyrdom. Some authors left comments on Jewish religious martyrdom, and described the way that martyrs embraced their death and what they accomplished through their deaths. If this literature correlates with Jesus' appreciation of his death as a means of forgiveness, the understanding of Jesus the Jew concerning his death in Paul and Matthew I have argued for will seem correct. For the roughly contemporary documents on Jewish martyrdom, the works of Josephus, Philo's *Legatio ad Gaium*, Tacitus' *Historiae*, and *2* and *4 Maccabees* will be discussed.

6.4.1 Definition of Religious Martyrdom

Before we observe the evidence, two types of 'willing' death can be differentiated: a willing death in a battle field and a religious martyrdom. Whilst discussing noble death and/or martyrdom, scholars often mix up these two distinct types of willing death. Religious martyrdom contains one significant element which directly leads to either life or death. This vital element is the *decision* of the martyr. Under the circumstances where a martyr is being forced to relinquish his religious conviction, the martyr can only have two choices. Discard your faith, and live. If not, you will die. The Jewish martyrs certainly knew, "to be, or not to be – that is the question." It is wholly their decision which determines their fate, either life or death. In the case of a willing and heroic death in a battle field, however, the choice of heroic

[39] Willi Marxsen, *New Testament Foundations for Christian Ethics*, trans. O.C. Dean Jr. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 36.

[40] Ibid., 35.

[41] b. Sanh. 43a-b describes Jesus' death, but the comment is made "only in passing, as part of a broader halakhic discussion that has nothing to do with Jesus as a historical figure" (Peter Schäfer, *Jesus in the Talmud* [Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2007], 63).

warriors is not the only factor which affects their fate, for they can be killed whether they are willing or not. Despite their determination to escape the battle alive, they may die.

According to Klawans, another notable difference between the two types of death is that death in a battle field does not bring about a victorious future, whereas a martyrdom story, more than likely, is followed by a victorious outcome. Therefore, the pericopae which will be observed are confined to examples of martyrdom. Before we move on, religious martyrdom can be defined as "the self-chosen premature violent (but non-battlefield) deaths of the heroes whose reverence for God and divine law is placed far above their love of life."[42]

6.4.2 Jewish Readiness to Die

First of all, we need to heed what Josephus, almost a contemporary of Jesus, said about the Jewish zeal for keeping the law. According to him, an innate instinct of the Jews is their willingness to die for the law. As he writes in his *Against Apion* 1.42b, "it is innate [σύμφυτον] in every Judean, right from birth, to regard them [=the Scriptures, the laws] as decrees of God, to remain faithful to them, and, if necessary, gladly to die on their behalf."[43] Here what

[42] Jonathan Klawans, *Josephus and the Theologies of Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: OUP, 2012), 122. It should be noted that in *Ag.Ap.* 2.232–233, Josephus also distinguishes death in battle from death by torture: "I mean not that easiest of deaths, which comes to those in battle, but that accompanied by physical torture, which seems to be the most hideous of all. I myself think that some of our conquerors have applied this to those in their power . . . ." Unless stated, translations of *Ag.Ap.* which follow are from John M.G. Barclay, *Against Apion: Translation and Commentary*, vol. 10 of *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*, ed. Steve Mason (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

[43] The word σύμφυτον (=innate, instinct) "reflects [Josephus's] emphasis on the universality and thoroughness of Judean commitment" (Barclay, *Against Apion*, 31n172). Josephus comments similarly elsewhere in the work: 1.190–91 (the Jews "choose to suffer anything rather than transgress [the laws]. . . . They face on behalf of these both tortures and the most terrible of all deaths rather than deny their ancestral ways"); 2.218 ("each individual . . . has come to believe . . . that to those who keep the laws and, should it be necessary to die for [ὑπέρ] them, meet death eagerly [προθύμως], God has granted renewed existence and receipt of a better life"); 2.234a ("one should not be amazed if we face death on behalf of the laws [ὑπὲρ τῶν νόμων] more courageously than everyone else").

By these repeated examples of Jewish bravery, Josephus exhibits (1) the universal acknowledgement of, (2) the underlying cause of, and (3) the uniqueness of the Jewish willingness to die for the law. In the account in 1.190, Josephus indicates that this comment is by a Greek author, Hecataeus the Abderite (1.183). Accordingly, it is not just Josephus saying these things; Greek authors and Roman readers are familiar with this Jewish braveness. The next passage, 2.218 unveils the main motivation of Jewish voluntary death: a better afterlife. This understanding is followed by Tacitus, *Hist*. 5.5 (see page 193194), and Philo, *Legat*. 117 (cf. As. Mos. 9.1–7). In the last passage (2.234a), Josephus emphasizes the superiority of Jewish heroic death.

is translated as 'them' and 'their' is the Jewish Scriptures, the Jewish laws, as the context indicates (1.38–40). Josephus describes his ethnic group as people who die "cheerfully" for the laws.[44] In the immediate context (1.44), he distinguishes the Jews from the Greeks in this aspect.[45] Josephus' belief was that for the Jews, the spirit of martyrdom was in their blood from their very birth, and there was no other comparable ethnic group.

On the other hand, this description of the Jewish readiness to die for the law could be fiction penned by Josephus. As indicated before, the book which contains the quote is called *Against Apion*, and the title itself clearly shows polemical nature of its content.[46] The authorial intent is to defend the Jewish people. In the beginning, moreover, Josephus makes this evident when he says: "I thought it necessary to write . . . to convict those who insult us as guilty of malice and deliberate falsehood, to correct the ignorance of others, and to instruct all who wish to know the truth on the subject of our antiquity" (*Ag.Ap.* 1.3). Josephus dismisses portions of Apion's claim by saying that "some things he has added in an extremely artificial manner; but most is of the nature of burlesque and contains, if truth be told, gross ignorance" (2.3).[47] Yet, this dismissal of Apion's claim can be applied to Josephus himself. There is a possibility that Josephus wrote this particular work to glamorize his own race in order to defend them. If he engages in a fierce polemic through his writing,[48] Josephus may have altered some stories to glamorize the lives of the Jews.

However, this seems not to be the case. The Jewish willingness to embrace death described by the Jewish historian is also observed by a Roman historian. Tacitus, who was a contemporary of Josephus, depicts their boldness as Jewish "disregard for death" (*Histories*, 5.5: "they think that the souls of those who die in battle or by execution are eternal. This explains their

---

[44] H. St.J. Thackeray, trans., *The Life, Against Apion*, vol. 1 of *Josephus*, LCL (London: Heinemann, 1926), 181.

[45] Philo, *Legat*. 117, 208–210, also supports Josephus's description of Jewish brave mentality.

[46] However, the title is not given by Josephus himself. For useful information on its title, see Barclay, *Against Apion*, xxviii–xxx. It should be admitted that the title does not fit well with the contents of Book 1, where Josephus does not deal with Apion's work.

[47] It is clear that Josephus wrote "to prove false the libels and insults that certain people have aimed at our people (*Ag.Ap.* 1.219)," and he also polemicizes "against the many false accusations against [the Jews]" by other authors such as Apollonius Molon and Lysimachus.

[48] Josephus seems to engage in a serious polemic. As Barclay, *Against Apion*, 172n23, comments, "Josephus repeatedly accuses Apion of lying: (κατα)ψεύδομαι: 2.14, 28, 29[bis], 32, 121, 122, 144; ψεῦσμα (2.6, 12, 115); *mentio* (2.79, 85, 90); *mendacium* (2.82, 98, 111); *fallacia verba* (2.88)." Another ψεύδομαι in 2.295 in an infinitive form can be added in the list. Moreover, *Ag.Ap.* 2.37 demonstrates Josephus' strong hatred towards Apion: Apion "was malicious, . . . [or] he was an ignoramus."

passion for having children and their contempt for death").[49] Moreover, as Tacitus explains, in a forced situation where they were ejected from the Holy land, they "fear life more than death" (5.13).

Therefore, we can accept Josephus' account of Jewish enthusiasm to keep the laws to the point of death as a true claim.[50] His depiction of Jewish boldness is not an artful fabrication, but is rather supported by a Roman historian. According to a Jewish historian and a Roman historian, the Jews were noted for their fearlessness towards death. For Jews, faced with the question "to be, or not to be," to avoid death by abandoning the laws was out of the question.

6.4.3 The Noble Deaths of the Maccabean Martyrs

In a similar vein, one British historian states that the Jewish martyrs in the late Second Temple period "invent [religious] martyrdom."[51] Among the Jewish martyrs, this notable historian pinpoints the Maccabean martyrs, specifically from 2 Maccabees. The following passages from the Maccabean literature share a common feature with Josephus. Both describe 'death for the laws' as the characteristic motivation of the martyrs. The Second Book of Maccabees[52] presents two religious martyrdoms: old Eleazar and the young seven brothers. Eleazar, the ninety-year-old scribe, was one of the Jews who were ready to die for the law. According to 2 Maccabees 6:19, he chose, "rather to die gloriously, than to live stained." Although he knew that he "might have escaped from death" (v.30, cf. v.22), he did not hesitate to die. By employing temporal adverbs 'quickly,' or 'immediately' (ταχέως [v.23], εὐθέως [v.28]), the author shows the firm resolution of Eleazar.

Verse 28 explicates Eleazar's intention in dying: leaving "a noble example (ὑπόδειγμα) to the youth [of how] to die willingly and nobly for the revered and holy laws." Again in v.31, the author repeats this intention of leaving an example (ὑπόδειγμα) behind. From his intention, two significant aspects can be extracted: (1) Eleazar's readiness to die 'for the laws' (ὑπὲρ τῶν . . . νόμων), and (2) his establishment of a good precedent. As mentioned previously, the first aspect is also found in Josephus. The reason for the Jews to decide to die is to keep the laws and the tradition, eventually to receive a

---

[49] The translation is from Tacitus, *The Histories*, trans. Kenneth Wellesley, rev. Rhiannon Ash (London: Penguin, 2009), 282.

[50] Josephus himself mentions that "I did not choose to write an encomium of ourselves" (2.147). Although there can be exaggerating comments in his defense, the argument for Jewish bravery to die for the laws seems still true.

[51] Paul Johnson, *A History of the Jews* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1987), vii. Later in the monograph, he further states that "it is from this date, indeed, that the concept of religious martyrdom appears, and the writings of the Maccabees, in which the sufferings of the faithful were fed into the propaganda of religious purity and Jewish nationalism, contain the first martyrologies" (104).

[52] Cf. 1 Macc. 1:56–64.

better afterlife (Josephus, *Ag.Ap.* 2.218; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5; 2 Macc 7:9, 14, 23, 36). The second aspect is important for this research. If Eleazar left a good precedent to follow, then his successors could copy this precedent. In fact, the story right after Eleazar's martyrdom (2 Macc 6:18–31) is the martyrdom of the seven courageous brothers and their mother (7:1–42).

After the noble model established by aged Eleazar, the youthful seven brothers also bravely embraced their brutal destiny; the last son even scolded Antiochus the tyrant for not killing him swiftly (7:30). The conviction of these brothers is unshakable, and they died for the laws as 2 Maccabees chapter 7 repeatedly points out (vv.9, 11, 37). They firmly decided to die, not to transgress the law (v.2).

Interestingly enough, in 7:6, the author quotes one passage from Deuteronomy 32. This is the exact quote from the LXX-Deut 32:36, "the Lord will comfort the servants." In the context of Deuteronomy 32, a significant text appears. At the end of v.43, the Hebrew text reads, the Lord "will atone for His land and His people."[53] In the context of Deuteronomy 32, there exists the theme of forgiveness. This significant theme in Deuteronomy 32 reappears in 2 Maccabees. The young martyrs knew that the suffering of Israel was caused by their sins (vv.18, 32). It seems plausible that they believed that their death would bring about God's forgiveness of the sins committed by the Israelites. In 7:38, the author of 2 Maccabees clearly shows that the last martyr asked God to remove his anger towards his people. The reason he could ask for the removal of God's anger can certainly be found in the fact that their deaths could draw God's forgiveness. The last son asked for forgiveness based upon "[the act] by me and my brothers" (v.38). The act referred to was definitely their deaths.

Verse 37a is decisive in this respect: "I, following my brothers' example, give up my body and soul for the sake of the laws of our forefathers, praying to God that he speedily have mercy upon our nation." This verse contains both themes of death and forgiveness. The "giving up both body and soul" refers to the voluntary death of the last son, and "have mercy" signifies the forgiveness-theme. Goldstein argues that the phrase "*have mercy upon* in the boy's prayer is probably a paraphrase of 'relent' at Deut 32:36."[54] This is an understandable interpretation. However, considering that 'have mercy upon' (ἵλεως γίνομαι/εἰμι) is used as a synonym of 'forgive' (ἀφίημι) in LXX-Num 14:19–20, the meaning of the phrase is closer to forgiveness.

[53] The LXX slightly alters it as "will purify/cleanse his people's land."

[54] Jonathan A. Goldstein, *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 41a (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983), 317.

6.4.4 Martyrs' Deaths as a Sacrifice

4 Maccabees 17:21–22 confirms this understanding: "the tyrant was punished, and the homeland was purified, as they became a ransom (ἀντίψυχον) for the nation's sin, and divine providence saved Israel, who was beforehand mistreated, through the blood of these pious ones and through the propitiatory offering (θεία) of their death."[55] The two words of prime importance are ransom and offering. These terms are sacrificial language. Before discussing the importance of the terms, it should be noted that the language of dying for the sake of others "lends itself naturally to the cultic, sacrificial language that the author employs to draw out the significance of the martyrs' deaths in 17:20–22."[56] If these terms are used as sacrificial terms, then the closest parallel would probably be the sin-offering, which is given as a means of forgiveness.

If some notable Jews, including those who lived in the late Second Temple period, do not hesitate to give up their lives for the nation and the Torah, and Jesus was one of those extraordinary Jews, then it is not hard to argue that Jesus may have died because his obedience to God led him inexorably in that direction. What exactly was the connection which drove him to death? It can be explained, as in the case of the Maccabean martyrs, by the concept of 'sin-offering': by his death, sins are forgiven.[57]

6.4.5 Jesus' Death as a Sacrifice

In numerous passages, Paul wrote of Jesus' forgiving death. The understanding that Jesus' death as sacrifice would deal with sin is prevalent in the NT writings such as the Pauline epistles (and Hebrews).[58]

---

[55] One objection can be made regarding the legitimacy of 4 Maccabees as a source for this study. The reasoning is that 4 Maccabees was written at the end of the first century CE, or the beginning of the second, and thus, its martyrdom narrative was written after Jesus' death. Nevertheless, this can still be an important source. The description of the martyrs' death in 2 Maccabees is similar to that in 4 Maccabees. The author of 4 Maccabees does not seem to provide a different view of the martyrs' noble death. Although we do not project a sacrificial image onto the martyrs' deaths solely based on 4 Maccabees, it is clear that the Jewish martyrs understood that through their deaths, the God of Israel would atone sins. Cf. deSilva, *Jewish Teachers of Jesus*, 64.

[56] David A. deSilva, *4 Maccabees: Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Sinaiticus*, Septuagint Commentary Series (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 249.

[57] A martyr's death, according to some Jews for whom the evidence is cited above, was a non-cultic sacrifice which atones for sins. This development of non-cultic sacrifice was probably caused by the defilement of the temple. Due to the uncleanness of the Jerusalem temple, alternative equivalents to sacrifice were developed.

[58] The clearest Hebrews passage which depicts Jesus' death as sacrifice is 10:10. In the text, a term for sacrifice, προσφορά, appears, and this word is modified by the phrase "the body of Jesus Christ." Here, 'body' signifies dead body of a sacrificial victim (Heb 13:11),

In 1 Corinthians 5:7, Paul wrote, "Christ our Passover Lamb has been sacrificed." Therefore, Paul presents Jesus as a Passover lamb which is sacrificed. The significance of Jesus' death is outstanding because it is used as Paul's "*logical* proof"[59] to keep corporate purity. In this text, Paul employs Jesus' death as his grounds to argue his case. This connotes that Paul and the Corinthians share this common belief. Therefore, the Corinthians must have understood the text as, "our lamb has been sacrificed; through his death we have received forgiveness from the past and freedom for new life in Christ."[60] This indicates that Paul and the Corinthian believers perceive Jesus' death as sacrifice.

Two Romans texts, 3:24–25a and 8:3, can also support this line of understanding. The former has "they are justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as a mercy-seat (ἱλαστήριον) by his blood, to be received by faith." The word translated as mercy-seat usually is rendered as "expiation," but the usage in Hebrew 9:5, which is the only other appearance of this word in the entire NT, clearly refers to the mercy-seat, the ark's cover. It is significant that this mercy-seat is used for the sacrificial ritual of the Day of Atonement. Therefore, Paul links Jesus' death (blood) to a sacrificial image (mercy-seat). The two words in 3:24, justified and redemption, definitely include the meaning of forgiveness. This means that "as the earliest Christian writer, Paul was already aware of a sacrificial interpretation of Jesus' death."[61]

---

and thus eventually means Jesus' death. The author clearly presents Jesus' death as sacrifice. The verb form of this noun (προσφέρω) appears in 10:12 with another noun for sacrifice θυσία. Interestingly, the sacrifice in 10:12 is offered for sins. Therefore, Hebrews 10:10 itself and its context shows the author's understanding of Jesus' death: sacrifice for sins.

Hebrews 9:26b confirms this view introduced above. It says that it is the sacrifice of himself which abolishes sin: εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ πεφανέρωται. (Verse 28a points out that "in this manner, Christ *was offered* [προσενεχθεὶς] once to bear the sins of many." That Jesus was offered [as a sacrifice] in a passive sense can affirm that Jesus himself was sacrifice; the author understood Jesus' death as sacrifice). Here again, Jesus' death is described as sacrifice (θυσία), and the theme of abolition of sin (ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας) reappears. In these two passages which clearly depict the sacrificial nature of Jesus' death, the understanding of removing sins is present. Therefore, it is evident that its author saw Jesus' death as sacrifice and that his sacrificial death is closely related to forgiveness of sins.

[59] Matthew R. Malcolm, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reversal in 1 Corinthians: The Impact of Paul's Gospel on His Macro-Rhetoric*, SNTSMS 155 (Cambridge: CUP, 2013), 228.

[60] Fee, *First Corinthians,* 218. See also 161n286 above.

[61] George Heyman, *The Power of Sacrifice, Roman and Christian Discourses in Conflict* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2007), 122.

Similarly, Jesus' death as a sacrifice, which can be seen in Rom 3:24–25, is explicitly shown in Rom 8:3. The 'sin offering' in the OT is regularly translated as 'περὶ ἁμαρτίας' as here in Rom 8. If this phrase was understood by the early Christians as a sin offering, it inevitably leads the readers to consider this phrase as Jesus' sacrificial death. Because of this sacrifice, there is no punishment (v.1). Therefore, one can argue that this effects forgiveness.

One of the later Pauline writings, Ephesians 5:2 says, παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας. This deutero-Pauline text contain two terms for sacrifice, προσφορά and θυσία, simultaneously. Oftentimes Paul employs παραδίδωμι as a technical term for Jesus' death (Rom 4:25; 8:32; Gal 2:20). Irrespective of the authorship debate on Ephesians, and considering the Pauline usage of παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν with ὑπέρ in Galatians 2:20, this is a very Pauline idiom.[62] Moreover, the wording "the pleasing odor ([εἰς] ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας)" in LXX almost always describes the sacrifice, specifically a burnt offering (Num 15:10; 28:6).

Paul and the author of Hebrews share the idea of Jesus' death as sacrifice, echoing the theme of sacrifice by death in the Maccabean literature. Moreover, they share the concept that his death, as sacrifice, purges sin. The authors who wrote before Jesus' death (the authors of 1 Macc and 2 Macc) and after (Paul, the author of Hebrews, and that of 4 Macc) understood that death suffered because of obedience to God's will gives expiation. Moreover, the authors post-Jesus' death understood such death as sacrifice. This can certainly show that the historical Jesus may have imparted the meaning of forgiving sacrifice to his impending death.[63]

6.5 Conclusions

As we have seen, the writings of Paul and the Matthean Gospel contain the shared feature of depicting a close affinity between Jesus' death and forgiveness. Moreover, two common implications are noteworthy: Jesus' willingness to die, and the divine initiative underlying forgiveness. Based on this result of the comparison, the Pauline understanding of Jesus' forgiving death is in line with the Matthean understanding. Through their presentation, one can certainly argue that the historical Jesus understood his death as a means of forgiveness.

Thus, a systematic approach has been presented to discern whether Jesus foresaw his impending death, and whether he embraced this death and im-

[62] Ephesians 5:25 repeats this specific idiom, ἑαυτὸν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς.

[63] Bockmuehl, *This Jesus*, 76, also states, "Jesus probably *did* use sacrificial symbolism to interpret his impending death."

parted certain significance to it (6.3). The circumstances surrounding the historical Jesus probably led him to accept that his death was forthcoming, and he embraced his death bravely because he did not flee from it. Moreover, because of the prevalent martyr tradition in first-century Palestine, it is historically plausible that Jesus interpreted his death as a means of forgiveness.

To demonstrate that this is a plausible case, a description by contemporary neutral observers of the Jewish martyrs has been provided. As non-Christian historians, a Jewish author (Josephus) and a Roman author (Tacitus) similarly depict Jewish willingness to die. More specifically, according to Josephus, Philo, and the Maccabean literature, Jewish willingness to die was for the laws. As martyrs who were willing to die to keep the law, the Maccabean martyrs (Eleazar, and the seven brothers and their mother) understood the meaning of their death as a means of asking God's forgiveness of Israel's sin. The martyrs left a noble example of dying for the laws for forgiveness (as a sacrifice), and thus this model was probably taught by ordinary Jewish families.[64] Similarly, the early Christians understood that Jesus died in the same sense. Having learned the noble example of his ancestors, the historical Jesus probably saw his death as an act of forgiveness, effected through his sacrifice.

[64] Interestingly, in the ransom saying in Matthew 20:28, Jesus' ransoming death is presented as a 'model' for his disciples to follow. Therefore, comparing Jesus' willingness to die with the martyrs' willingness is significant for this study.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

In chapter 1, the need for this volume and its method of enquiry were demonstrated. The strong connection between Jesus' death and forgiveness of sins was a major issue in primitive Christianity (1 Cor 15:3; *Epistle of Barnabas* in section 1.2.1), but has been seriously questioned in recent research, and especially in historical Jesus research. In the earlier historical Jesus quests, most scholars attributed to the early church (rather than to Jesus himself) the connection between forgiveness and Jesus' death. Moreover, many of the 'third questers' deny that Jesus intended to die, or maintain that even if he intended it, he did not understand his death as a means of forgiveness (1.2.2).[1] This attenuated status of the link between Jesus' death and forgiveness led us to focus on the question whether their close relationship in the NT can be shown by thorough scholarly research to have originated with the historical Jesus. To examine this surprising phenomenon, the following methodology has been adopted: a comparison between the views of Paul and Matthew (1.3). Although Paul is not generally considered as a prime source for the life of the historical Jesus, he can be seen not only as the oldest source but also a reliable source for his death, especially for Jesus' understanding of his own death (1.3.1). Matthew is carefully chosen as Paul's dialogue partner: in view of the Pauline nature of Mark, the first-written Gospel, a comparison between Paul and Matthew becomes the more legitimate discussion than a comparison between Paul and Mark (1.3.2).

Following this, Chapter 2 reviews the literature which compares Paul and Matthew, and the three main current perspectives on their relationship (anti-Pauline, un-Pauline, and pro-Pauline) and their advocates have been presented. There is no in-depth comparative study which specifically explores the relationship between forgiveness and Jesus' death in Paul and Matthew.

Chapter 3 aimed to clarify the idea of forgiveness in the mind of the historical Jesus. The traditional concept of the 'forgiveness of sins' is challenged by scholars from diverse backgrounds. Crossan's view seems to be a Christianized version of Marx's socialism. Denying expressly the traditional view which sees the term as a religious term, Crossan contends that the forgiveness which Jesus offered was liberation of the poor from wrong theology and liberation of debtors from slavery (3.2). In contrast, Wright construes for-

[1] Among numerous monographs on Jesus, Wright is the only author who treats the forgiveness of sins under a proper subheading. This shows the decreasing interest in the topic.

giveness as 'return from exile,' and by this, he maintains that in Jesus' mind, forgiveness was considered corporate concept so that the true Israel which Jesus redefined were all forgiven together (3.3). Therefore, for him, the modern atonement theology reflects a post-Easter transformation of corporate forgiveness, and is thus unhistorical. Against these interpretations, I have argued that the historical Jesus probably viewed forgiveness according to the traditional view (3.4). It is more plausible that the historical Jesus' concept of forgiveness works at both corporate and individual levels.

In chapters 4 and 5, we have observed the indissoluble link between Jesus' death and expiation in Paul (chapter 4) and Matthew (chapter 5). In chapter 4, to discover Paul's view on the relationship between Jesus' death and forgiveness, the sources are confined to the 7 undisputed Pauline epistles (section 4.1). Of the 7, 5 epistles clearly demonstrate their inseparable relationship. It is fairly easy to find passages which dealt with Jesus' death in the writings of "the quintessential theologian of the cross."[2] For the 'forgiveness of sins,' it has to be admitted that Paul does not employ the wording often. Despite the fact, the theme of forgiveness is prevalent in Paul (4.2). Based on Romans 4:6–8, where the forgiveness of sins and justification are paralleled as a synonymous pair, one can surely argue that forgiveness is integral to Paul's favourite term 'justification.'[3] This extends the range of the 'forgiveness' idea in Paul beyond the semantic domain of forgiveness. Based on the close relationship between justification and forgiveness, the traditional formulae (the giving-up formula and the dying formula) themselves can be included into the Pauline 'forgiveness' texts, and there are other significant texts which do not contain the formulae.

From this line of observation, the 'forgiveness' texts in Paul can successfully be extracted. The passages and their exegesis can be found in section 4.3. These texts are grouped as follows: the giving-up formula, the dying-for formula, other 'death' terms with ὑπέρ, and finally the remaining important texts. Except the last group, the texts contain the preposition ὑπέρ, and it can be argued that some of these texts are from pre-Pauline traditions. From the passages which contain both Jesus' death and the forgiveness-theme, the following statement can be made: the forgiveness-theme is entirely germane to Jesus' death, which suggests that Paul understood Jesus' death as an act which achieves forgiveness.

Aside from this conclusion concerning Paul, the question arises whether the same conclusion can be applied to the historical Jesus (section 4.4). From the two Jesus traditions in 1 Corinthians, 11:23–26 and 15:3, the following conclusion was drawn: the historical Jesus attaches the meaning of forgiveness to his death. As a pre-Pauline tradition, 15:3 clearly states that Jesus

---

[2] Carroll and Green, *Death of Jesus*, 113. Cf. Gaventa, "Interpreting," 126.

[3] For this interpretation, see section 4.2.2.

died for our sins, which indirectly but clearly suggests that this tradition was established on the basis of Jesus' forgiving death. This interpretation can be strengthened by the Last Supper tradition in 11:23, where it states that the tradition is 'from the Lord.' If these two traditions truly originated from the historical Jesus as the earliest NT author implies, the historical Jesus probably understood his death as effecting forgiveness.

From the Gospel of Matthew (chapter 5), a similar conclusion was drawn. From early on, its author depicts Jesus as the saviour of his people from sins (1:21). Moreover, in the Matthean Gospel Jesus understands his death as effecting a ransom (20:28). More directly, the Last Supper tradition is also preserved in this Gospel. In the pericope, Matthew adds the phrase 'for the forgiveness of sins' after the cup-saying. It seems that Matthew is not creatively adding the wording, but making explicit what is implicit in Mark (if Matthew was written after Mark). Based on these three texts, therefore, the Matthean Jesus attaches the meaning of forgiveness to his death. Moreover, these texts share the common features of Jesus' readiness to die, and Jesus' taking of the initiative in his forgiving death. It is historically plausible that Jesus spoke something similar to the ransom logion (20:28), and the cup-saying (26:28) as seen in 5.5.2.1 and 5.5.2.2. If so, Matthew carefully preserves and highlights the historical Jesus' understanding of his impending death (a means of dispensing forgiveness).

By comparing the two authors, and with support from contemporary Jewish authors (chapter 6), it was concluded that Paul and Matthew shared the same view, and this close link between the two themes can tentativley be traced back to the historical Jesus. It is significant that Paul shares the same idea on the relation of the two themes as Matthew, whom one scholar (Sim) regards as an arch-enemy of Paul. Moreover, they share common implications: (1) Jesus' voluntary death, and (2) his taking the initiative. Considering the argument that the two biblical authors may have represented different strands within emerging Christianity, and that some areas of the developing Christian belief system were being established throughout the first century CE, the strong affinity between the two authors' treatment of this theme becomes outstanding. Even if there were factions in early Christianity, and some aspects of their theological understanding were being developed in different directions, the close relation of the two themes was so vital that it remained constant, and belonged, as it seems, to the undisputed traditions of the early church. After the comparison, a systematic approach to this issue was presented (section 6.3): it is historically plausible that Jesus expected, and intended to die, and ascribed an expiatory efficacy to his death.

This reconstruction of the historical Jesus' understanding of his death is solely grounded in his followers' description. Some scholars assert that Jesus of Nazareth might not have expected forgiveness to be available through his death because Jesus' understanding of his death is different from the early

Christians' understanding. However, the evidence from ancient literature, mainly the Maccabean literature implies the opposite: because this literature offers evidence that the death of Jewish martyrs was seen as making atonement for the sins of others, it is quite plausible that Jesus attached forgiving significance to his death.

These pieces of evidence are important because they are from *outside* the NT. If the portrayal of the non-Christian writings influenced Jesus' understanding of his own death, and the influence has a similar meaning to what the NT authors depict, then this can strongly suggest that the historical Jesus might have regarded his death as a means of forgiveness. If so, the understanding of Jesus' death by the early Christians is not the product of a sophisticated religious dogma but a probable historical representation.

Both Josephus and Tacitus uniformly describe the unique Jewish readiness to die. A further observation can be made that their brave death was "for the law" (6.4). To keep and obey the ancestral law, they risked their lives. There were a number of Jews of this era who were intrepid enough to give up their lives for the law. Particularly, the story of the Maccabean martyrs was probably remembered well by the public through the annual celebration of Hanukkah.[4] At the point of death, some prominent martyrs expressed the intended achievement of their brutal deaths. One of the recurring concepts expressing their intention is expiation (the clearest text being 4 Macc 17:21f.). If Jewish authors roughly contemporary with Jesus understood that those remarkable Jews embraced their deaths as a means of forgiveness, this could perfectly well be a stimulus for Jesus' own self-understanding. It is historically plausible that, as an extraordinary Jew in the first century CE who was reared in the traditions of God's history with his people and who might have heard the Maccabean martyrs' stories more than once,[5] Jesus should come to the conclusion that his death would effect forgiveness of sins.

[4] See 21n69 above.

[5] Cf. Roland Deines, "Jesus and Scripture: Scripture and the Self-Understanding of Jesus," in *All That the Prophets Have Declared: The Appropriation of Scripture in the Emergence of Christianity*, ed. Matthew R. Malcolm (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2015), 39–70, esp. p.66 on the religious atmosphere in Jesus' family, which Deines assumes, reflects "an Israel-centered perspective and perhaps a certain militant zealous messianism."

Bibliography

1. Primary Sources

Aelian, *Historical Miscellany*. Edited and translated by N.G. Wilson. LCL 486. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 28th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.

Augustine, *Concerning the City of God against the Pagans*. Translated by Henry Bettenson. London: Penguin, 2003.

Barclay, John M.G. *Against Apion: Translation and Commentary*. Vol. 10 of *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*. Edited by Steve Mason. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Chilton, Bruce D. *The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes*. Collegeville, MI: Liturgical, 1990.

Colson, F.H. and G.H. Whitaker, trans. *Philo*. LCL. 3 vols. London: Heinemann, 1929–1953.

Ehrman, Bart D. *The Apostolic Fathers II: Epistle of Barnabas, Papias and Quadratus, Epistle to Diognetus, The Shepherd of Hermas*, LCL 25. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Elliger, Karl, and Wilhelm Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. 4th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.

Evans, Ernest, ed. *Tertulian: Adversus Marcionem, Books 4 and 5*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.

Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud, Edited by I. Epstein, 30 vols. London: Soncino, 1983–1990.

Holmes, Michael W., ed. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.

Neusner, Jacob. *The Mishnah: A New Translation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987.

–., ed. *The Babylonian Talmud: A Translation and Commentary*. 22 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006.

Rahlfs, Alfred., ed. *Septuaginta: id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004.

Siculus. Diodorus, *Library of History, Volome III: Books 4.59–8*. Translated by C.H. Oldfather. LCL 340. London: Heinemann, 1939.

Tacitus, *The Histories*. Translated by Kenneth Wellesley. Revised by Rhiannon Ash. London: Penguin, 2009.

Thackeray, H. St.J., Ralph Marcus, and L.H. Feldman, eds and trans., *Josephus*. LCL. 10 vols. London: Heinemann, 1926–1965.

The Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version with Apocrypha. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1990.
Williams, Frank, trans. *The* Panarion *of Epiphanius of Salamis*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

2. Secondary Literature

Aernie, Jeffrey W. *Is Paul Also among the Prophet? An Examination of the Relationship between Paul and the Old Testament Prophetic Tradition in 2 Corinthians*. LNTS 467. London: T&T Clark, 2012.
Akenson, Donald Harman. *Saint Saul: A Skeleton Key to the Historical Jesus*. Montreal, QC: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000.
Allison, Dale C. *The End of the Ages has Come: An Early Interpretation of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987.
–. *Jesus of Nazareth: Millenarian Prophet*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998.
–. *Resurrecting Jesus: The Earliest Christian Tradition and Its Interpreters*. New York: T&T Clark, 2005.
–. *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History*. London: SPCK, 2010.
Anderson, Gary A. *Sin: A History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
Anderson, Paul N., Felix Just SJ, and Tom Thatcher, eds. *John, Jesus, and History: Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel*. Atlanta: SBL, 2009.
Arzt, Peter. "The 'Epistolary Introductory Thanksgiving' in the Papyri and in Paul." *NovT* 36 (1994): 29–46.
Aune, David E., Torrey Seland, and Jarl Henning Ulrichsen, eds. *Neotestamentica et Philonica: Studies in Honor of Peder Borgen*. NovTSup 106. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
Avemarie, Friedrich. "Interpreting Scripture through Scripture: Exegesis Based on Lexematic Association in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pauline Epistles." In *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*. Edited by Florentino Garcia Martinez. STDJ 85, 83–102. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
Bailey, Kenneth E. *Jesus through Middle Eastern Eyes: Cultural Studies in the Gospels*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2008.
Baillie, D.M. *God was in Christ: An Essay on Incarnation and Atonement*. London: Faber & Faber, 1948.
Baird, William. "What Is the Kerygma? A Study of I Cor 15:3–8 and Gal 1:11–17." *JBL* 76 (1957): 181–91.
Balla, Peter. "What Did Jesus Think about His Approaching Death?" In *Jesus, Mark and Q: The Teaching of Jesus and its Earliest Records*. Edited by Michael Labahn and Andreas Schmidt. JSNTSup 214, 239–58. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.
Balz, Horst., and Gerhard Schneider, eds. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990–1993.
Barclay, J.M.G. "Jesus and Paul." In *DPL*, 492–503.
Barnett, Paul. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
–. *Paul: Missionary of Jesus*. Vol. 2 of *After Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
Barrett, C.K. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. London: Black, 1957.
–. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. BNTC. London: Black, 1968.

–. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. ICC. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994–1998.

Barth, Karl. *Der Römerbrief*. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1933.

Baslez, Marie-Françoise. "The Origin of the Martyrdom Images: From the Book of Maccabees to the First Christians." In *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology*. Edited by Géza Xeravits and József Zsengellér. JSJSup 118, 113–30. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Basta, Pasquale. "Paul and the *Gezerah Shawah*: A Judaic Method in the Service of Justification by Faith." In *Paul's Jewish Matrix*. Edited by Thomas G. Casey and Justin Taylor, 123–65. Rome: Gregorian & Biblical, 2011.

Bauckham, Richard. *Jesus: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: OUP, 2011.

Baumgarten, Joseph M. "Does *TLH* in the Temple Scroll Refer to Crucifixion?" *JBL* 91 (1972): 472–81.

Bayer, Hans F. *Jesus' Predictions of Vindication and Resurrection: The Provenance, Meaning, and Correlation of the Synoptic Predictions*. WUNT II/20. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986.

Beaton, Richard. "Isaiah in Matthew's Gospel." In *Isaiah in the New Testament*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J.J. Menken, 63–78. London: T&T Clark, 2005.

Becker, Eve-Marie, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, and Mogens Müller, eds. *Mark and Paul: Comparative Essays Part II For and Against Pauline Influence on Mark*. BZNW 199. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.

Bell, Richard H. "Sin Offerings and Sinning with a High Hand." *JPJ* 4 (1995): 25–59.

–. "Sacrifice and Christology in Paul." *JTS* 53 (2002): 1–27.

–. *The Irrevocable Call of God: An Inquiry into Paul's Theology of Israel*. WUNT 184. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

–. *Deliver Us from Evil: Interpreting the Redemption from the Power of Satan in New Testament Theology*. WUNT 216. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

Bellinger, William H., and William R. Farmer, eds. *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998.

Berlin, Adele, Marc Zvi Brettler, and Michael Fishbane, eds. *The Jewish Study Bible*. Oxford: OUP, 2004.

Berlin, Andrea M. "Jewish Life Before the Revolt: The Archaeological Evidence." *JSJ* 36 (2005): 417–70.

Best, Ernest. *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*. BNTC. London: Black, 1972.

Betz, Hans Dieter. *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*, Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Betz, Otto. "Jesus and Isaiah 53." In Bellinger and Farmer, *Jesus*, 70–87.

Bird, Michael. "Raised for our Justification: A Fresh Look at Romans 4:25." *Colloquium* 35 (2003): 31–46.

–. "Jesus as Law-breaker." In *Who Do My Opponents Say That I Am?: An Investigation of the Accusations against Jesus*. Edited by Scot McKnight and Joseph B. Modica. LNTS 327, 3–26. London: T&T Clark, 2008.

Bird, Michael F., and Joel Willitts, eds. *Paul and the Gospels: Christologies, Conflicts, and Convergences*. LNTS 411. London: T&T Clark, 2011.

Black, C. Clifton. "Christ Crucified in Paul and in Mark: Reflections on an Intracanonical Conversation." In *Theology and Ethics in Paul and His Interpreters: Essays in Honor of Victor Paul Furnish*. Edited by Eugene H. Lovering Jr. and Jerry L. Sumney, 184–206. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.

Blanton, Thomas R. "Saved by Obedience: Matthew 1:21 in Light of Jesus' Teaching on the Torah." *JBL* 132 (2013): 393–413.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Isaiah 40–55: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 19A. New York: Doubleday, 2002.

Bock, Darrell L. *Luke*. BECNT. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994–96.

Bockmuehl, Markus. *This Jesus: Martyr, Lord, Messiah*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1996.

–. "Peter between Jesus and Paul: The 'Third Quest' and the 'New Perspective' on the First Disciple." In Still, *Reconnected*, 67–102.

Bonneau, Normand. "The Logic of Paul's Argument on the Curse of the Law in Galatians 3:10–14." *NovT* 39 (1997): 60–80.

Borg, Marcus J. *Jesus, a New Vision: Spirit, Culture, and the Life of Discipleship*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1987.

–. "Portraits of Jesus in Contemporary North American Scholarship." *HTR* 84 (1991): 1–22.

–. *Conflict, Holiness, and Politics in the Teachings of Jesus*. 2nd ed. London: Continuum, 1998.

Borg, Marcus J. and N.T. Wright. *The Meaning of Jesus: Two Visions*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999.

Borgen, Peder. "Crucified for His Own Sins—Crucified for Our Sins: Observations on a Pauline Perspective." In *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context: Studies in Honor of David E. Aune*. Edited by John Fotopoulos. NovTSup 122, 17–35. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

–. "Openly Portrayed as Crucified: Some Observations on Gal 3:1–14." In *Christology, Controversy, and Community: New Testament Essays in Honour of David R. Catchpole*. NovTSup 99. Edited by David G. Horrell and Christopher M. Tuckett, 345–53. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Bornkamm, Günther. *Early Christian Experience*. NTL. London: SCM, 1969.

–. *Paul*. Translated by D.M.G. Stalker. 1971. Reprint, Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.

Botterweck, G. Johannes and Helmer Ringgren, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. 15 vols. Translated by John T. Willis. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–.

Brandon, S.G.F. *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*. London: SPCK, 1951.

Branick, Vincent P. "Source and Redaction Analysis of 1 Corinthians 1–3." *JBL* 101 (1982): 251–69.

Breytenbach, Cilliers. "Salvation of the reconciled (With a Note on the Background of Paul's Metaphor of Reconciliation)." In Watt, *Salvation*, 271–86.

–. "The 'For Us' Phrases in Pauline Soteriology: Considering Their Background and Use." In Watt, *Salvation*, 163–85.

–. "The Septuagint Version of Isaiah 53 and the Early Christian Formula 'He Was Delivered for Our Trespasses.'" *NovT* 51 (2009): 339–51.

Brodie, Thomas L. "Countering Romans: Matthew's Systematic Distillation and Transformation of Paul." In *The Letter to the Romans*. Edited by Udo Schnelle. BETL 226, 521–42. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.

Brooke, George J. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and The New Testament: Essays in Mutual Illumination*. London: SPCK, 2005.

Brown, Paul J. *Bodily Resurrection and Ethics in 1 Cor 15: Connecting Faith and Morality in the Context of Greco-Roman Mythology*. WUNT II/360. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

Brown, Raymond E. *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*. Rev. ed. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

Bruce, F.F. *Paul: Apostle of the Heart Set Free*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.
–. *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Exeter: Paternoster, 1982.
Bruner, Frederick Dale. *Matthew: A Commentary*. Rev. ed. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
Büchsel, Friedrich. "δίδωμι, κτλ." In *TDNT* 2:166–73.
–. "λύω, κτλ." In *TDNT*, 4:335–56.
Bultmann, Rudolf. "New Testament and Mythology." In *Kerygma and Myth: A Theological Debate*. Edited by Hans Werner Bartsch. Translated by Reginald H. Fuller. 2 vols, 1:1–44. London: SPCK, 1953–62.
–. *Jesus and the Word*. Translated by Louise P. Smith and Erminie H. Lantero. 2nd ed. 1934. Reprint, New York: Scribner's Sons, 1958.
–. "Jesus and Paul." In *Existence and Faith: Shorter Writings of Rudolf Bultmann*, 183–201. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1961.
–. "The Primitive Christian Kerygma and the Historical Jesus." In *The Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ: Essays on the New Quest of the Historical Jesus*. Edited by Carl E. Braaten and Roy A. Harrisville, 15–42. Nashville: Abingdon, 1964.
–. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007.
Burnett, Gary W. *Paul and the Salvation of the Individual*. BibInt 57. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
Burton, Ernest de Witt. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1921.
Byrskog, Samuel. "The Transmission of the Jesus Tradition: Old and New Insights." *Early Christianity* 1 (2010): 441–68.
Cadbury, Henry J. *Jesus, What Manner of Man?: The Shaffer Lectures for 1946*. New York: Macmillan, 1947.
Cahill, Michael J. "Drinking Blood at a Kosher Eucharist? The Sound of Scholarly Silence." *BTB* 32 (2002): 168–81.
Carleton Paget, James. "The *Epistle of Barnabas* and the Writings that later formed the New Testament." In *Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew Gregory and Christopher Tuckett, 229–49. Oxford: OUP, 2005.
–. "The *Epistle of Barnabas*." *ExpTim* 117 (2006): 441–46.
–. "The *Epistle of Barnabas*." In *Writings of the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Paul Foster, 72–80. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
Carroll, John T., and Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus in Early Christianity*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995.
Carter, Warren. "Jesus' 'I Have Come' Statement in Matthew's Gospel." *CBQ* 60 (1998): 44–62.
–. *Matthew and Empire: Initial Explorations*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2001.
Casey, Maurice. "The Original Aramaic Form of Jesus' Interpretation of the Cup." *JTS* 41 (1990): 1–12.
–. *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God: The Origins and Development of New Testament Christology*. Cambridge: James Clarke, 1991.
–. *An Aramaic Approach to Q: Sources for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*. SNTSMS 122. Cambridge: CUP, 2002.
–. *The Solution to the 'Son of Man' Problem*. LNTS 343. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
–. *Jesus of Nazareth: An Independent Historian's Account of His Life and Teaching*. London: T&T Clark, 2010.

Catchpole, David. *Resurrection People: Studies in the Resurrection Narratives of the Gospels*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 2000.
Charlesworth, James H. "The Symbology of the Serpent in the Gospel of John." In Anderson, Just, and Thatcher, *John*, 63–72.
Charlesworth, James H., Brian Rhea, and Petr Pokorný, eds. *Jesus Research: New Methodologies and Perceptions*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.
Childs, Brevard S. *Isaiah*. OTL. Louisville: WJK, 2001.
Clarke, Howard. *The Gospel of Matthew and Its Readers: A Historical Introduction to the First Gospel*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2003.
Clines, David J.A. *I, He, We and They: A Literary Approach to Isaiah 53*. JSOTSup 1. Sheffield: JSOT, 1976.
–. ed. The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew. 6 vol. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993–.
Collins, John J. *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
Conzelmann, Hans. "On the Analysis of the Confessional Formula in I Corinthians 15:3–5." *Interpretation* 20 (1966): 15–25.
–. *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Translated by James W. Leitch. Edited by George W. MacRae. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
–, Hans. *Acts of the Apostles*. Translated by James Limberg, A. Thomas Kraabel, and Donald H. Juel. Edited by Eldon Jay Epp and Christopher R. Mathews. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
Cook, David. "The Prescript as Programme in Galatians." *JTS* 43 (1992): 511–19.
Cook, Johann, ed. *Septuagint and Reception: Essays Prepared for the Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa*. VTSup 127. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
Cook, Richard R., and David W. Pao, eds. *After Imperialism: Christian Identity in China and the Global Evangelical Movement*. Cambridge: Lutterworth, 2012.
Cousar, Charles B. *A Theology of the Cross: The Death of Jesus in the Pauline Letters*. OBT 24. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
Craig, W.L. "The Historicity of the Empty Tomb of Jesus." *NTS* 31 (1985): 39–67.
Cranfield, C.E.B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1975.
Crossan, John Dominic. *The Cross That Spoke: The Origins of the Passion Narrative*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988.
–. *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant*. New York: HarperCollins, 1992.
–. *Jesus: A Revolutionary Biography*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1994.
–. *Who Killed Jesus?: Exposing the Roots of Anti-Semitism in the Gospel Story of the Death of Jesus*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996.
–. *The Birth of Christianity*. New York: HarperCollins, 1998.
–. "The *Gospel of Peter* and the Canonical Gospels." In *Das Evangelium nach Petrus: Text, Kontexte, Intertexte*. Edited by Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas. TU 158, 117–34. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.
–. *The Greatest Prayer: Rediscovering the Revolutionary Message of the Lord's Prayer*. New York: HarperOne, 2010.
Culpepper, R. Alan. "Contours of the Historical Jesus." In *The Quest for the Real Jesus: Radboud Prestige Lectures by Prof. Dr. Michael Wolter*. Edited by Jan van der Watt. BibInt 120, 67–85. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Culy, Martin M., and Mikeal C. Parsons. *Acts: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2003.

Cuvillier, Élian. "Torah Observance and Radicalization in the First Gospel. Matthew and First-Century Judaism: A Contribution to the Debate," *NTS* 55 (2009): 144–59.

Damgaard, Finn. "Persecution and Denial — Paradigmatic Apostolic Portrayals in Paul and Mark." In Becker, Engberg-Pedersen, and Müller, *Mark and Paul*, 295–310.

Davidsen, Ole. "Adam-Christ Typology in Paul and Mark: Reflections on a *Tertium Comparationis*, Preliminary Remarks." In Becker, Engberg-Pedersen, and Müller, *Mark and Paul*, 243–72.

Davies, Magaret. *Matthew: Readings: A New Biblical Commentary*. 2nd ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.

Davies, W.D. *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*. Cambridge: CUP, 1964.

Davies, W.D. and Dale C. Allison. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. ICC. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–97.

de Boer, Martinus C. "Paul's Use and Interpretation of a Justification Tradition in Galatians 2.15–21." *JSNT* 28 (2005): 189–216.

de Jonge, Henk J. "The Original Setting of the Χριστός ἀπέθανεν ὑπέρ Formula." In *The Thessalonian Correspondence*. Edited by Raymond F. Collins, 229–35. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990.

de Jonge, M. "Jesus' Death for Others and the Death of the Maccabean Martyrs." In *Text and Testimony: Essays on New Testament and Apocryphal Literature in Honour of A.F.J. Klijn*. Edited by T. Baarda, A. Hilhorst, G.P. Luttikhuizen, and A.S. van der Woude, 142–51. Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1988.

Deines, Roland. "The Pharisees Between 'Judaisms' and 'Common Judaism.'" In *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Vol. 2 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*. Edited by D.A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid. WUNT II/140, 443–504. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.

–. *Die Gerechtigkeit der Tora im Reich des Messias: Mt 5,13–20 als Schlüsseltext der matthäischen Theologie*. WUNT 177. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

–. "Das Aposteldekret—Halacha für Heidenchristen oder Christliche Rücksichtnahme auf Jüdische Tabus?" In *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Daniel R. Schwartz and Stephanie Gripentrog. AJEC 71, 323–95. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

–. "Not the Law but the Messiah: Law and Righteousness in the Gospel of Matthew—An Ongoing Debate." In Gurtner and Nolland, *Built*, 53–84.

–. "Biblical Viewpoints on Repentance, Conversion, and Turning to God," in *Acts of God in History: Studies Towards Recovering a Theological Historiography*. Edited by Christoph Ochs and Peter Watts, WUNT 317. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

–. "Jesus and Scripture: Scripture and the Self-Understanding of Jesus." in *All That the Prophets Have Declared: The Appropriation of Scripture in the Emergence of Christianity*. Edited by Matthew R. Malcolm, 39–70. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2015.

Delling, Gerhard. "The Significance of the Resurrection of Jesus for Faith in Jesus Christ." In Moule, *Significance*, 77–104.

deSilva, David A. *4 Maccabees: Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Sinaiticus*, Septuagint Commentary Series. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

–. "Jewish Martyrology and the Death of Jesus." In *The Pseudepigrapha and Christian Origin: Essays from the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas*. Edited by Gerbern S. Oegema and James H. Charlesworth. JCTC 4, 51–67. New York: T&T Clark International, 2008.

–. *The Jewish Teachers of Jesus, James, and Jude: What Earliest Christianity Learned from the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*. Oxford, OUP, 2012.
Dibelius, Martin. *From Tradition to Gospel*. Translated by Bertram L. Woolf. London: Nicholson & Watson, 1934.
Dodd, C.H. "Matthew and Paul." *ExpTim* 58 (1946–47): 293–98.
–. *New Testament Studies*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1953.
Donfried, Karl P. "The Theology of 1 Thessalonians." In *The Theology of the Shorter Pauline Letters*. Edited by Karl P. Donfried, and I. Howard Marshall. NTT, 28–63. Cambridge: CUP, 1993.
Dorff, Elliot N. "Individual and Communal Forgiveness." In *Autonomy and Judaism: The Individual and the Community in Jewish Philosophical Thought*. Edited by Daniel H. Frank, 193–218. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.
Dowd, Sharyn, and Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, "The Significance of Jesus' Death in Mark: Narrative Context and Authorial Audience." *JBL* 125 (2006): 271–97.
du Toit, Andrie B. "Forensic Metaphors in Romans and Their Soteriological Significance." In Watt, *Salvation*, 213–46.
Dunn, James D.G. *Romans 1–8*, WBC 38A. Dallas: Word, 1988.
–. "Paul's Understanding of the Death of Jesus as Sacrifice." In *Sacrifice and Redemption: Durham Essays in Theology*. Edited by S.W. Sykes, 35–56. Cambridge: CUP, 1991.
–. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. BNTC. London: Black, 1993.
–. *1 Corinthians*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.
–. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
–. *Jesus Remembered*. Vol. 1 of *Christianity in the Making*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
–. "Social Memory and the Oral Jesus Tradition." In *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity*. Edited by Stephen C. Barton, Loren T. Stuckenbruck, and Benjamin G. Wold, 179–94. WUNT 212. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
–. "When Did the Understanding of Jesus' Death as an Atoning Sacrifice First Emerge?" In *Israel's God and Rebecca's Children: Christology and Community in Early Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Honor of Larry W. Hurtado and Alan F. Segal*. Edited by David B. Capes, April D. DeConick, Helen K. Bond, and Troy Miller, 169–81. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2008.
Dunson, Ben C. "Faith in Romans: The Salvation of the Individual or Life in Community?" *JSNT* 34 (2011): 19–46.
Eddy, Paul Rhodes, and James K. Beilby, "The Quest for the Historical Jesus: An Introduction." In *The Historical Jesus: Five Views*. Edited by James K. Beilby and Paul Rhodes Eddy, 9–54. London: SPCK, 2010.
Edwards, J. Christopher. *The Ransom Logion in Mark and Matthew: Its Reception and Its Significance for the Study of the Gospels*. WUNT II/327. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
Ehrensperger, Kathy. "At the Table: Common Ground between Paul and the Historical Jesus." In Charlesworth, Rhea, and Pokorný, *Jesus Research*, 531–50.
Ehrman, Bart D. *Forgery and Counterforgery: The Use of Literary Deceit in Early Christian Polemics*. Oxford: OUP, 2013.
Ekblad, Eugene Robert, Jr. *Isaiah's Servant Poems According to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study*. CBET 23. Leuven: Peeters, 1999.
Elliott, J.K. "Imitation in literature and life: Apocrypha and martyrdom." In *The Routledge Companion to Early Christian Thought*. Edited by D. Jeffrey Bingham. Routledge Religion Companions, 87–107. Abingdon: Routledge, 2009.
Ellis, E. Earle. "Traditions in 1 Corinthians." *NTS* 32 (1986): 481–502.

Eubank, Nathan. *Wages of Cross-Bearing and Debt of Sin: The Economy of Heaven in Matthew's Gospel*. BZNW 196. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013.
Evans, Craig A. *Mark 8:27–16:20*. WBC 34B. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001.
–. *Fabricating Jesus: How Modern Scholars Distort the Gospels*. Nottingham: Inter-Varsity, 2007.
–. "Jesus: Sources and Self-understanding." In *Jesus and Philosophy: New Essays*, Edited by Paul K. Moser, 27–40. Cambridge: CUP, 2009.
Eve, Eric. *The Jewish Context of Jesus' Miracles*. JSNTSup 231. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2002.
Farmer, William R. "Peter and Paul, and the Tradition concerning 'The Lord's Supper' in 1 Cor 11:23–26." In Meyer, *One Loaf,* 35–55.
Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
–. *Pauline Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Study*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007.
–. *The First and Second Letters to the Thessalonians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
Ferda, Tucker S. "The Soldiers' Inscription and the Angel's Word: The Significance of 'Jesus' in Matthew's Titulus." *NovT* 55 (2013): 221–31.
Ferguson, Everett. *Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
Fine, Steven. "Death, Burial, and Afterlife." In *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine*. Edited by Catherine Hezser, 440–62. Oxford: OUP, 2010.
Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. AB 28. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1981–1985.
–. *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 33. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
–. *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 31. New York: Doubleday, 1998.
–. *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 32. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
Foster, Paul. *Community, Law and Mission in Matthew's Gospel*. WUNT II/177. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
–. *The Gospel of Peter: Introduction, Critical Edition and Commentary*. TENTS 4. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
–. "Paul and Matthew: Two Strands of the Early Jesus Movement with Little Sign of Connection." In Bird and Willitts, *Paul*, 86–114.
–. "Who Wrote 2 Thessalonians?: A Fresh Look at an Old Problem." *JSNT* 35 (2012): 150–75.
France, R.T. *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*. Exeter: Paternoster, 1989.
–. *The Gospel of Matthew*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
Fredriksen, Paula. *From Jesus to Christ*: *The Origins of the New Testament Images of Jesus*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.
–. *Sin: The Early History of an Idea*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.
Freedman, David Noel, ed. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
Frey, Jörg. "Probleme der Deutung des Todes Jesu in der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft: Streiflichter zur exegetischen Diskussion." In *Deutungen des Todes Jesu im Neuen Tes-*

tament. Edited by Jörg Frey and Jens Schröter. WUNT 181. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
Fridrichsen, Anton. *The Problem of Miracle in Primitive Christianity*. Translated by Roy A. Harrisville and John S. Hanson. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972.
Fuller, Reginald H. *The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives*. London: SPCK, 1972.
Fung, Ronald Y.K. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
Funk, Robert W., Roy W. Hoover, and The Jesus Seminar. *The Five Gospels: The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus*. New York: Macmillan, 1993.
Funk, Robert W., and the Jesus Seminar. *The Acts of Jesus: The Search for the Authentic Deeds of Jesus*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1998.
Furnish, Victor Paul. *II Corinthians: Translated with Introduction, Notes, and Commentary*. AB 32A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984.
–. "'Gave Himself [Was Given] Up. . . .': Paul's Use of a Christological Assertion." In *The Future of Christology: Essays in Honor of Leander E. Keck*. Edited by Abraham J. Malherbe and Wayne A. Meeks, 109–21. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
–. *The Theology of the First Letter to the Corinthians*. NTT. Cambridge: CUP, 1999.
Garland, David E. "Paul's Defense of the Truth of the Gospel Regarding Gentiles (Galatians 2:15–3:22)." *RevExp* 91 (1994): 165–81.
Gathercole, Simon J. "Justified by Faith, Justified by His Blood: The Evidence of Romans 3:21–4:25." In *The Paradoxes of Paul*. Vol. 2 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*. Edited by D.A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid. WUNT II/181, 147–84. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
–. *The Composition of the Gospel of Thomas: Original Language and Influences*. SNTSMS 151. Cambridge: CUP, 2012.
Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. "Interpreting the Death of Jesus Apocalyptically: Reconsidering Romans 8:32." In Still, *Reconnected*, 125–45.
Gerhardsson, Birger. "Sacrificial Service and Atonement in the Gospel of Matthew." In *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology Presented to L.L. Morris on His 60th Birthday*. Edited by Robert Banks, 25–35. Exeter: Paternoster, 1974.
–. "Evidence for Christ's Resurrection according to Paul: 1 Cor 15:1–11." In Aune, Seland, and Ulrichsen, *Neotestamentica*, 73–91.
Gese, Hartmut. *Essays on Biblical Theology*. Translated by Keith Crim. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981.
Gignilliat, Mark. *Paul and Isaiah's Servant: Paul's Theological Reading of Isaiah 40–66 in 2 Corinthians 5:14–6:10*. LNTS 330. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
Gnilka, Joachim. *Jesus of Nazareth: Message and History*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997.
Goldingay, John. *The Message of Isaiah 40–55: a Literary–Theological Commentary*. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
Goldingay, John, and David Payne. *Isaiah 40–55*. ICC. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
Goldstein, Jonathan A. *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 41a. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.
Goodacre, Mark. *Thomas and the Gospels: The Case for Thomas's Familiarity with the Synoptics*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.
Goulder, M.D. *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*. London: SPCK, 1974.
–. *The Evangelists' Calendar*. London: SPCK, 1978.

Grabbe, Lester L. *An Introduction to Second Temple Judaism: History and Religion of the Jews in the Time of Nehemiah, the Maccabees, Hillel and Jesus*. London: T&T Clark, 2010.

Green, Joel B. *The Death of Jesus: Tradition and Interpretation in the Passion Narrative*. WUNT II/33. Tübingen: Mohr, 1988.

–. "Death of Christ." In *DPL,* 201–9.

–. "The Death of Jesus." In Holmén and Porter, *Handbook*, 3:2383–408.

Grindheim, Sigurd. *God's Equal: What Can We Know About Jesus' Self-Understanding?* London: T&T Clark, 2011.

Guerra, Anthony J. *Romans and the Apologetic Tradition: The Purpose, Genre and Audience of Paul's Letter*. SNTSMS 81. Cambridge: CUP, 1995.

Gundry, Robert H. *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel: With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope*. NovTSuppS 18. Leiden: Brill, 1967.

–. *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.

Gurtner, Daniel M. *The Torn Veil: Matthew's Exposition of the Death of Jesus*. SNTSMS 139. Cambridge: CUP, 2007.

–. "The Gospel of Matthew from Stanton to Present: A Survey of Some Recent Developments." In Gurtner, Willitts, and Burridge, *Jesus*, 23–38.

Gurtner, Daniel M., and John Nolland, eds. *Built upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

Gurtner, Daniel M., Joel Willitts, and Richard A. Burridge, eds. *Jesus, Matthew's Gospel and Early Christianity: Studies in Memory of Graham N. Stanton*. LNTS 435. London: T&T Clark, 2011.

Haacker, Klaus. *The Theology of Paul's Letter to the Romans*. NTT. Cambridge: CUP, 2003.

Hachlili, Rachel. *Jewish Funerary Customs, Practices and Rites in the Second Temple Period*. JSJSup 94. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Hägerland, Tobias. *Jesus and the Forgiveness of Sins: An Aspect of His Prophetic Mission*. Cambridge: CUP, 2011.

Hägglund, Fredrik. *Isaiah 53 in the Light of Homecoming After Exile*. FAT II/31. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Hagner, Donald A. *Matthew*. WBC. 2 vols. Dallas: Word, 1993–95.

Ham, Clay. "The Last Supper in Matthew." *BBR* 10 (2000): 53–69.

Harmon, Matthew S. *She Must and Shall Go Free: Paul's Isaianic Gospel in Galatians*. BZNW 168. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010.

Harrington, Daniel J. "Matthew and Paul." In Sim and Repschinski, *Matthew*, 11–26.

Harris, Murray J. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

Harrison, James R. *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*. WUNT II/172. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Hartman, Lars. *Into the Name of the Lord Jesus: Baptism in the Early Church*. SNTW. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.

Hawthorne, Gerald F., Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G. Reid, eds. *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1993.

Hays, Richard B. *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1—4:11*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

–. "Christ Died for the Ungodly: Narrative Soteriology in Paul?" *HBT* 26 (2004): 48–68.

Heil, John Paul. *Rhetorical Role of Scripture in 1 Corinthians*. Atlanta: SBL, 2005.

Hellholm, David. "The Impact of the Situational Contexts for Paul's Use of Baptismal Traditions in His Letters." In Aune, Seland, and Ulrichsen, *Neotestamentica*, 147–75.

Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. Translated by John Bowden. 2 vols. London: SCM, 1974.

–. *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*. Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM, 1976.

–. *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.

–. *The Atonement: A Study of the Origins of the Doctrine in the New Testament.* London: SCM, 1981.

–. *Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity*. Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM, 1983.

Hengel, Martin, and Anna Maria Schwemer. *Paul between Damascus and Antioch: The Unknown Years*. London: SCM, 1997.

Heyman, George. *The Power of Sacrifice, Roman and Christian Discourses in Conflict*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2007.

Hill, Charles E. *From the Lost Teaching of Polycarp: Identifying Irenaeus' Apostolic Presbyter and the Author of* Ad Diognetum. WUNT 186. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

Hoehner, Harold W. *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.

Hofius, Otfried. "The Lord's Supper and the Lord's Supper Tradition: Reflections on 1 Corinthians 11:23b–25." In Meyer, *One Loaf,* 75–115.

–. *Neutestamentliche Studien*. WUNT 132. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

Holleman, Joost. *Resurrection and Parousia: A Tradition-historical Study of Paul's Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15*. NovTSup 84. Leiden, Brill: 1996.

Holmén, Tom, and Stanley E. Porter, eds. *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus*. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Hooker, Morna D. "Interchange and Atonement." *BJRL* 60 (1978): 462–81.

–. "Did the Use of Isaiah 53 to Interpret His Mission Begin with Jesus?" In Bellinger and Farmer, *Jesus*, 88–103.

–. "On Becoming the Righteousness of God: Another Look at 2 Cor 5:21." *NovT* 50 (2008): 358–75.

Hoppe, Rudolf. "How Did Jesus Understand His Death?: The Parable in Eschatological Prospect." In *Jesus Research: An International Perspective*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth and Petr Pokorný, 154–69. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

Horsley, Richard A. *1 Corinthians*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1998.

Hubbard, Moyer V. *New Creation in Paul's Letters and Thought*. SNTSMS 119. Cambridge: CUP, 2002.

Hultgren, Arland J. *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.

Hunn, Debbie. "Pistis Christou in Galatians: The Connection to Habakkuk 2:4." *TynBul* 63 (2012): 75–92.

Hurtado, Larry W. "Jesus' Divine Sonship in Paul's Epistle to the Romans." In Soderlund and Wright, *Romans*, 217–33.

–. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

–. "Resurrection-Faith and the 'Historical' Jesus." *JSHJ* 11 (2013): 35–52.

Hvalvik, Reidar. *The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant: The Purpose of the Epistle of Barnabas and Jewish-Christian Competition in the Second Century*. WUNT II/82. Tübingen: Mohr, 1996.

Jackson, T. Ryan. *New Creation in Paul's Letters: A Study of the Historical and Social Setting of a Pauline Concept*. WUNT II/272. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Jacobs, Louis. *Religion and the Individual: A Jewish Persepective*. Cambridge: CUP, 1992.

Janowski, Bernd, and Peter Stuhlmacher, eds. *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 2004.

Jefford, Clayton N. *The Apostolic Fathers: An Essential Guide*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2005.

Jeremias, Joachim. *The Central Message of The New Testament*. London: SCM, 1965.

–. *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. Translated by Norman Perrin. London: SCM, 1966.

Jervell, Jacob. *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles*. Cambridge: CUP, 1996.

Jewett, Robert. *Romans: A Commentary*. Edited by Eldon Jay Epp. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.

Jipp, Joshua W. "Rereading the Story of Abraham, Isaac, and 'Us' in Romans 4." *JSNT* 32 (2009): 217–42.

Jobes, Karen H., and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000.

Johnson, Paul. *A History of the Jews*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1987.

Joseph, Simon J. *The Nonviolent Messiah: Jesus, Q, and the Enochic Tradition*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014.

Kähler, Martin. *The So-called Historical Jesus and the Historic Biblical Christ*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964.

Käsemann, Ernst. "The Problem of the Historical Jesus." In *Essays on New Testament Themes*. SBT 41, 15–47. London: SCM, 1964.

–. *Perspectives on Paul*. London: SCM, 1971.

–. *Commentary on Romans*. Translated and Edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.

Kazen, Thomas. *Scripture, Interpretation, or Authority?: Motives and Arguments in Jesus' Halakic Conflicts*. WUNT 320. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Keck, Leander E. *Who is Jesus?: History in Perfect Tense*. Columbia, University of South Carolina Press, 2000.

Keener, Craig S. *Romans*. NCC. Cambridge: Lutterworth, 2011.

Kelber, Werner H. "The Works of Memory: Christian Origins as MnemoHistory—A Response." In *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity*. Edited by Alan Kirk and Tom Thatcher, 221–48. Atlanta: SBL, 2005.

Kim, Jintae. "Targum Isaiah 53 and the New Testament Concept of Atonement." *JGRChJ* 5 (2008): 81–98.

Kim, Seyoon. *The Origin of Paul's Gospel*. WUNT II/4. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981.

–. *Paul and the New Perspective: Second Thoughts on the Origin of Paul's Gospel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

Kittel, Gerhard and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1976.

Klawans, Jonathan. "Interpreting the Last Supper: Sacrifice, Spiritualization, and Anti-Sacrifice." *NTS* 48 (2002): 1–17.

–. *Josephus and the Theologies of Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: OUP, 2012.

Knoch, Otto. "'Do This in Memory of Me!' (Luke 22:20; 1 Cor 11:24-25): The Celebration of the Eucharist in the Primitive Christian Communities." In Meyer, *One Loaf,* 1–10.

Knohl, Israel. *The Messiah before Jesus: The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Translated by David Maisel. London: University of California Press, 2000.
Koester, Craig R. "Aspects of Historicity in John 1–4: A Response." In Anderson, Just, and Thatcher, *John*, 93–103.
Koester, Helmut. "The Memory of Jesus' Death and the Worship of the Risen Lord." *HTR* 91 (1998): 335–50.
Konstan, David. *Before Forgiveness: The Origins of a Moral Idea*. Cambridge: CUP, 2010.
Kramer, Werner. *Christ, Lord, Son of God*, SBT 50. London: SCM, 1966.
Krašovec, Jože. *Reward, Punishment, and Forgiveness: The Thinking and Beliefs of Ancient Israel in the Light of Greek and Modern Views*. VTSup 78. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Psalms 1–59: A Commentary*. Translated by Hilton C. Oswald. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988.
Kraus, Wolfgang. "Hab 2:3–4 in the Hebrew Tradition and in the Septuagint, with its Reception in the New Testament." In Cook, *Septuagint*, 101–17.
Kreplin, Matthias. "The Self-understanding of Jesus." In Holmén and Porter, *Handbook*, 3:2473–516.
Kümmel, Werner Georg. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Rev. ed. London: SCM, 1975.
Kundert, Lukas. *Die Opferung / Bindung Isaaks*. WMANT 78–79. 2 vols. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1998.
Kupp, David D. *Matthew's Emmanuel: Divine Presence and God's People in the First Gospel*. SNTSMS 90. Cambridge: CUP, 1996.
Labahn, Michael. "The Non-Synoptic Jesus: An Introduction to John, Paul, Thomas, and Other Outsiders of the Jesus Quest." In Holmén and Porter, *Handbook*, 3:1933–96.
Larsson, Edvin. "Paul: Law and Salvation." *NTS* 31 (1985): 425–36.
LaVerdiere, Eugene A. *The Eucharist in the New Testament and the Early Church*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1996.
Léon-Dufour, Xavier. *Resurrection and the Message of Easter*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1974.
Leyrer, Daniel P. "Exegetical Brief: Διά + the Accusative in Romans 4:24,25—More Than 'For.'" *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 108 (2011): 129–31.
Lincicum, David. *Paul and the Early Jewish Encounter with Deuteronomy*. WUNT II/284. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
Lindberg, Conrad, ed. *King Henry's Bible, MS Bodley 277: The Revised Version of the Wyclif Bible*. Stockholm Studies in English 98. 4 vols. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1999–2004.
Linebaugh, Jonathan A. "The Christo-Centrism of Faith in Christ: Martin Luther's Reading of Galatians 2.16, 19–20." *NTS* 59 (2013): 535–44.
Litfin, Duane. *St. Paul's Theology of Proclamation: 1 Corinthians 1–4 and Greco-Roman rhetoric*. SNTSMS 79. Cambridge: CUP, 1994.
Lohse, Eduard. *Der Brief an die Römer*. KEK 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003.
Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. WBC 41. Dallas: Word, 1990.
–. *Introducing Romans: Critical Issues in Paul's Most Famous Letter*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
Lowe, Bruce A. "Oh διά! How Is Romans 4.25 to Be Understood?" *JTS* 57 (2006): 149–57.
Lüdemann, Gerd. *Jesus After 2000 Years: What He Really Said and Did*. London: SCM, 2000.
–. *Paul: The Founder of Christianity*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 2002.

–. "Paul as Witness to the Historical Jesus." In *Sources of the Jesus Tradition: Separating Jesus from Myth*. Edited by R. Joseph Hoffmann, 196–212. Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 2010.

Luomanen, Petri. *Entering the Kingdom of Heaven: A Study on the Structure of Matthew's View of Salvation*. WUNT II/101. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 1–7: A Continental Commentary*. Translated by Wilhelm C. Linss. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

–. *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew*. Translated by J. Bradford Robinson. Cambridge: CUP, 1993.

–. *Matthew in History: Interpretation, Influence, and Effects*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004.

–. *Matthew 21–28: A Commentary*. Translated by James E. Crouch. Edited by Helmut Koester. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.

–. *Studies in Matthew*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

Maccoby, Hyam. *The Mythmaker: Paul and the Invention of Christianity*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1986.

Magness, Jodi. *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

–. "Ossuaries and the Burials of Jesus and James." *JBL* 124 (2005): 121–54.

Malcolm, Matthew R. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reversal in 1 Corinthians: The Impact of Paul's Gospel on His Macro-Rhetoric*. SNTSMS 155. Cambridge: CUP, 2013.

Marcus, Joel. "Mark — Interpreter of Paul." *NTS* 46 (2000): 473–87.

–. "Mark — Interpreter of Paul." In Becker, Engberg-Pedersen, and Müller, *Mark and Paul*, 29–49.

Marguerat, Daniel. *First Christian Historian: Writing the Acts of the Apostles*. Translated by Ken McKinney, Gregory J. Laughery and Richard Bauckham. SNTSMS 121. Cambridge: CUP, 2002.

–. *Paul in Acts and Paul in His Letters*. WUNT 310. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Marshall, I. Howard. "The Last Supper." In *Key Events in the Life of the Historical Jesus: A Collaborative Exploration of Context and Coherence*. Edited by Darrell L. Bock and Robert L. Webb. WUNT 247, 481–588. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

Martin, Ralph P. "Reconciliation: Romans 5:1–11." In Soderlund and Wright, *Romans*, 36–48.

Martyn, J. Louis. *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 33A. New York: Doubleday, 1997.

Marxsen, Willi. *New Testament Foundations for Christian Ethics*. Translated by O.C. Dean Jr. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

Massaux, Édouard. *The First Ecclesiastical Writers*. Vol. 1 of *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Saint Irenaeus*. Translated by Norman J. Belval and Suzanne Hecht. Edited by Arthur J. Bellinzoni. NGS 5. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1990.

Matera, Frank J. *II Corinthians: A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville: WJK, 2003.

–. *God's Saving Grace: A Pauline Theology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.

McKnight, Scot. *Jesus and His Death: Historiography, the Historical Jesus, and Atonement Theory*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2005.

–. "Matthew as 'Gospel.'" In Gurtner, Willitts, and Burridge, *Jesus*, 59–75.

Meggitt, Justin J. "The Madness of King Jesus: Why was Jesus Put to Death, but His Followers Were Not?" *JSNT* 29 (2007): 379–413.

Meier, John P. *Law and History in Matthew's Gospel: A Redactional Study of Mt 5:17–48*. AnBib 71. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1976.

–. *The Vision of Matthew: Christ, Church, and Morality in the First Gospel*. New York: Paulist, 1979.
–. "Antioch." In *Antioch and Rome*. Edited by R.E. Brown and J.P. Meier, 11–86. New York: Paulist, 1983.
–. *Matthew*. NTM 3. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1990.
–. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*. 4 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1991–2009.
–. "Basic Methodology in the Quest for the Historical Jesus." In Holmén and Porter, *Handbook*, 1:291–331.
Menken, Maarten J.J. *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist*. BETL 173. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2004.
Meyer, Ben F. *The Aims of Jesus*. London: SCM, 1979.
–., ed. *One Loaf, One Cup: Ecumenical Studies of 1 Cor 11 and Other Eucharistic Texts*. NGS 6. Leuven: Peeters, 1993.
Michaelis, Wilhelm. "πίπτω, κτλ." In *TDNT*, 6:161–73.
Middleton, Paul. *Martyrdom: A Guide for the Perplexed*. London: T&T Clark, 2011.
Mihaila, Corin. *Paul-Apollos Relationship and Paul's Stance toward Greco-Roman Rhetoric: An Exegetical and Socio-historical Study of 1 Corinthians 1–4*. LNTS 402. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
Milinovich, Timothy. *Now is the Day of Salvation: An Audience-Oriented Study of 2 Corinthians 5:16–6:2*. Cambridge: Lutterworth, 2012.
Mitchell, Margaret M. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. Louisville: WJK, 1993.
Moffitt, David M. "Affirming the 'Creed': The Extent of Paul's Citation of an Early Christian Formula in 1 Cor 15,3b–7." *ZNW* 99 (2008): 49–73.
Mohrlang, Roger. *Matthew and Paul: A Comparison of Ethical Perspectives*, SNTSMS 48. Cambridge: CUP, 1984.
Moloney, Francis J. "The Johannine Son of Man Revisited." In *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel: Essays by the Members of the SNTS Johannine Writings Seminar*. Edited by G. Van Belle, J.G. van der Watt, and P. Maritz. BETL 184, 177–202. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005.
Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
–. "The Christology of the Early Pauline Letters." In *Contours of Christology in the New Testament*. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker, 169–92. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
Moon, Joshua N. *Jeremiah's New Covenant: An Augustinian Reading*. JTISup 3. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011.
Morgan, Michael L. "Mercy, Repentance, and Forgiveness in Ancient Judaism." In *Ancient Forgiveness*. Edited by Charles Griswold and David Konstan, 137–57. Cambridge: CUP, 2011.
Morgan-Wynne, John Eifion. *Paul's Pisidian Antioch Speech (Acts 13)*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2014.
Morris, Leon. *The Epistle to the Romans*. PNTC. Leicester: Apollos, 1988.
–. *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*. NICNT. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
–. "Forgiveness." In *DPL,* 311–13.
Moss, Charlene McAfee. *The Zechariah Tradition and the Gospel of Matthew*. BZNW 156. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
Moule, C.F.D., ed. *The Significance of the Message of the Resurrection for faith in Jesus Christ*. SBT 8. London: SCM, 1968.

Moule, Handley C.G. *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans*. 2nd ed. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1894.
Moxnes, Halvor. *Theology in Conflict: Studies in Paul's Understanding of God in Romans*. NovTSup 53. Leiden: Brill, 1980.
Murray, John. *The Epistle to the Romans: the English Text with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
Neufeld, Thomas R. *Recovering Jesus: The Witness of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2007.
Nielsen, Jesper Tang. "The Cross on the Way to Mark." In Becker, Engberg-Pedersen, and Müller, *Mark and Paul*, 273–94.
Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm. *Daybreak: Thoughts on the Prejudices of Morality*. Edited by Maudemarie Clark and Brian Leiter. Translated by R.J. Hollingdale. CTHP. Cambridge: CUP, 1997.
Nolland, John. *Luke 18:35–24:53*. WBC 35C. Dallas: Word, 1993.
–. *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
Novakovic, Lidija. *Messiah, the Healer of the Sick: A Study of Jesus as the Son of David in the Gospel of Matthew*. WUNT II/170. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
O'Brien, Peter T. *Colossians, Philemon*. WBC 44. Waco, TX: Word, 1982.
O'Collins, Gerald., SJ. "Peter as Witness to Easter." *TS* 73 (2012): 263–85.
Oepke, Albrecht. "διά." In *TDNT*, 2:65–70.
Omerzu, Heike. "Paul and Mark — Mark and Paul." In Becker, Engberg-Pedersen, and Müller, *Mark and Paul*, 51–61.
Orr, William F., and James Arthur Walther, *I Corinthians: A New Translation*. AB 32. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976.
Paddison, Angus. *Theological Hermeneutics and 1 Thessalonians*. SNTSMS 133. Cambridge: CUP, 2005.
Page, Sydney H.T. "The Authenticity of the Ransom Logion (Mark 10:45b)." In *Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*. Vol. 1 of *Gospel Perspectives*. Edited by R.T. France and David Wenham, 137–61. Sheffield: JSOT, 1980.
Pascuzzi, Maria. "Baptism-based Allegiance and the Divisions in Corinth: A Reexamination of 1 Corinthians 1:13–17." *CBQ* 71 (2009): 813–29.
Perriman, Andrew. "The Corporate Christ: Re-assessing the Jewish Background." *TynBul* 50 (1999): 241–63.
Perrin, Norman. *A Modern Pilgrimage in New Testament Christology*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
Pickett, Raymond. *The Cross in Corinth: The Social Significance of the Death of Jesus*. JSNTSup 143. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.
Pillai, Christie A. Joachim. *Early Missionary Preaching: A Study of Luke's Report in Acts 13*. Hicksville, NY: Exposition University Press, 1979.
Plevnik, Joseph. "1 Thess 5,1–11: Its Authenticity, Intention and Message." *Biblica* 60 (1979): 71–90.
Pokorný, Petr. *The Genesis of Christology: Foundations for a Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Marcus Lefébure. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987.
–. "Jesus Research as Feedback on His *Wirkungsgeschichte*." In Holmén and Porter, *Handbook*, 1:333–59.
–. "Jesus' Death on the Cross: Literary, Theological, and Historical Comments." In Charlesworth, Rhea, and Pokorný, *Jesus Research*, 897–909.
Popkes, Wiard. "παραδίδωμι." In *EDNT*, 3:20.

Porter, J.R. "The Legal Aspects of the Concept of 'Corporate Personality' in the Old Testament." *VT* 15 (1965): 361–80.

Porter, Stanley E. "Images of Christ in Paul's Letters." In *Images of Christ: Ancient and Modern*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter, David Tombs and Michael A. Hayes, 95–112. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.

–. "A Functional Letter Perspective: Towards a Grammar of Epistolary Form." In Porter and Adams, *Paul*, 9–31.

–. "Reconciliation as the Heart of Paul's Missionary Theology." In *Paul as Missionary: Identity, Activity, Theology, and Practice*. Edited by Trevor J. Burke, and Brian S. Rosner. LNTS 420, 169–91. London: T&T Clark, 2011.

Porter, Stanley E., and Sean A. Adams, eds. *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form*. Pauline Studies 6. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Portmann, John. *A History of Sin: Its Evolution to Today and Beyond*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007.

Powell, Mark Allan. "The Plot and Subplots of Matthew's Gospel." *NTS* 38 (1992): 187–204.

–. *Jesus as a Figure in History: How Modern Historians View the Man from Galilee*. Louisville: WJK, 1998.

Price, Robert M. "Apocryphal Apparitions: 1 Corinthians 15:3–11 as a Post-Pauline Interpolation." *JHC* 2 (1995): 69–99.

Przybylski, Benno. *Righteousness in Matthew and His World of Thought*. SNTSMS 41. Cambridge: CUP, 1981.

Punt, Jeremy. "Identity, Memory, and Scriptural Warrant: Arguing Paul's Case." In *Paul and Scripture: Extending the Conversation*. ECL 9. Edited by Christopher D. Stanley, 25–53. Williston, VT: SBL, 2012.

Quell, Gottfried, Georg Bertram, Gustav Stählin, and Walter Grundmann, *Sin*. Vol. 3 of *Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel's* Theologisches Wörterbuch Zum Neuen Testament. London: Black, 1951.

Rainbow, Paul A. "Justification according to Paul's Thessalonian Correspondence." *BBR* 19 (2009): 249–74.

Reardon, Timothy W. "'Hanging on a Tree': Deuteronomy 21.22–23 and the Rhetoric of Jesus' Crucifixion in Acts 5.12–42." *JSNT* 37 (2015): 407–31.

Reasoner, Mark. *The Strong and the Weak: Romans 14.1–15.13 in Context*. SNTSMS 103. Cambridge: CUP, 1999.

–. *Romans in Full Circle: A History of Interpretation*. Louisville: WJK, 2005.

Regev, Eyal. "The Individualistic Meaning of Jewish Ossuaries: A Socio-anthropological Perspective on Burial Practice." *PEQ* 133 (2001): 39–49.

–. "Family Burial, Family Structure, and The Urbanization of Herodian Jerusalem." *PEQ* 136 (2004): 109–31.

Repschinski, Boris. "'For He Will Save His People from Their Sins' (Matthew 1:21): A Christology for Christian Jews." *CBQ* 68 (2006): 248–67.

Riesenfeld, Harald. "ὑπέρ." In *TDNT*, 8:507–16.

Riesner, Rainer. "Back To the Historical Jesus through Paul and His School (the Ransom Logion—Mark 10.45; Matthew 20.28)." *JSHJ* 1 (2003): 171–99.

Robertson, Archibald, and Alfred Plummer. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1911.

Robertson, C.K. *Conflict in Corinth: Redefining the System*. StBibLit 42. New York: Lang, 2001.

Robinson, John A.T. *Twelve More New Testament Studies*. London: SCM, 1984.

Rogerson, J.W. "The Hebrew Concept of Corporate Personality: A Re-examination." *JTS* 21 (1970): 1–16.
Rüpke, Jörg, ed. *The Individual* in the *Religions* of the *Ancient Mediterranean*. Oxford: OUP, 2013.
Sanders, E.P. *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
–. *Jesus and Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
–. *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE–66 CE*. London: SCM, 1992.
–. *The Historical Figure of Jesus*. London: Penguin, 1993.
Sapp, David A. "The LXX, 1QIsa, and MT Versions of Isaiah 53 and the Christian Doctrine of Atonement." In Bellinger and Farmer, *Jesus*, 170–92. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1998.
Schäfer, Peter. *Jesus in the Talmud*. Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2007.
Schlatter, Adolf. *Romans: the Righteousness of God*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995.
–. *The History of the Christ: The Foundation for New Testament Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997.
Schliesser, Benjamin. *Abraham's Faith in Romans 4: Paul's Concept of Faith in Light of the History of Reception of Genesis 15:6*. WUNT II/224. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
Schnabel, Eckhard J. *Paul and the Early Church*. Vol. 2 of *Early Christian Mission*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004.
Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul: A Study in Pauline Theology*. Translated by G.R. Beasley-Murray. Oxford: Blackwell, 1964.
Schoeps, Hans Joachim. "The Sacrifice of Isaac in Paul's Theology." *JBL* 65 (1946): 385–92.
Schreiner, Thomas R. *Romans*, BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1998.
–. *Galatians*. ZECNT. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010.
Schröter, Jens. *Jesus of Nazareth: Jew from Galilee, Savior of the World*. Translated by Wayne Coppins and S. Brian Pounds. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014.
Schultz, Brian. "The Qumran Cemetery: 150 Years of Research." *DSD* 13 (2006): 194–228.
Schweitzer, Albert. *The Psychiatric Study Of Jesus: Exposition And Criticism*. Translated by C.R. Joy. Boston: Beacon, 1958.
–. *The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity*. Edited by Ulrich Neuerischwander. Translated by L.A. Garrard. London: Black, 1968.
–. *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. Edited by John Bowden. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
Seeley, David. "Rulership and Service in Mark 10:41–45." *NovT* 35 (1993): 234–50.
Seifrid, Mark A. "Romans." In *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G.K. Beale and D.A. Carson, 607–94. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
Senior, Donald. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Interpreting Biblical Texts. Nashville: Abingdon, 1997.
Shauf, Scott. "Galatians 2.20 in Context." *NTS* 52 (2006): 86–101.
Shen, Michael Li-Tak. *Canaan to Corinth: Paul's Doctrine of God and the Issue of Food Offered to Idols in 1 Corinthians 8:1–11:1*. StBibLit 83. New York: Lang, 2010.
Shin, In-Cheol and Andries van Aarde, "Matthew's and Paul's Inclusive Tendencies: A Comparison." *HvTSt* 61 (2005): 1353–72.
Shogren, Gary S. "Forgiveness (NT)." In *ABD*, 2:835–38.
Shum, Shiu-Lun. *Paul's Use of Isaiah in Romans: A Comparative Study of Paul's Letter to the Romans and the Sibylline and Qumran Sectarian Texts*. WUNT II/321. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.

Sider, Ronald J. "St. Paul's Understanding of the Nature and Significance of the Resurrection in I Corinthians XV 1–19." *NovT*, 19 (1977): 124–41.

Silva, Moises. "Abraham, Faith and Works: Paul's Use of Scripture in Galatians 3:6–14." *WTJ* 63 (2001): 251–67.

Sim, David C. "Christianity and Ethnicity in the Gospel of Matthew." In *Ethnicity and the Bible*. Edited by Mark G. Brett. BibInt 19, 171–95. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

–. *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism: The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Community*. SNTW. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.

–. "Matthew's Anti-Paulinism: A Neglected Feature of Matthean Studies." *HvTSt* 58 (2002): 767–83.

–. "Matthew 7.21–23: Further Evidence of its Anti-Pauline Perspective." *NTS* 53 (2007): 325–43.

–. "Matthew and Ignatius of Antioch." In Sim and Repschinski, *Matthew*, 139–54.

–. "Matthew, Paul and the Origin and Nature of the Gentile Mission: The Great Commission in Matthew 28:16–20 as an anti-Pauline tradition." *HvTSt* 64 (2008): 377–92.

–. "Paul and Matthew on the Torah: Theory and Practice." In *Paul, Grace and Freedom: Essays in Honour of John K. Riches*. Edited by Paul Middleton, Angus Paddison, and Karen Wenell, 50–64. London: T&T Clark, 2009.

–. "The Rise and Fall of the Gospel of Matthew." *ExpTim* 120 (2009): 478–85.

–. "Matthew's Use of Mark: Did Matthew Intend to Supplement or to Replace His Primary Source?" *NTS* 57 (2011): 176–92.

–. "Conflict in the Canon: The Pauline Literature and the Gospel of Matthew." In *Religious Conflict from Early Christianity to the Rise of Islam*. Edited by Wendy Mayer and Bronwen Neil. Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 121, 71–86. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013.

–. "The Family of Jesus and the Disciples of Jesus in Paul and Mark: Taking Sides in the Early Church's Factional Dispute." In Wischmeyer, Sim, and Elmer, *Paul and Mark*, 73–97.

–. "The Reception of Paul and Mark in the Gospel of Matthew." In Wischmeyer, Sim, and Elmer, *Paul and Mark*, 589–615.

Sim, David C., and Boris Repschinski, eds. *Matthew and His Christian Contemporaries*. LNTS 333. London: T&T Clark, 2008.

Skoven, Anne Vig. "Mark as Allegorical Rewriting of Paul: Gustav Volkmar's Understanding of the Gospel of Mark." In Becker, Engberg-Pedersen, and Müller, *Mark and Paul*, 13–27.

Soderlund, Sven K. and N.T. Wright, eds. In *Romans and the People of God: Essays in Honor of Gordon D. Fee on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

Stanton, Graham N. *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992.

–. "The Law of Moses and the Law of Christ Galatians 3:1–6:2." In *Paul and the Mosaic Law*. WUNT 89. Edited by James D.G. Dunn, 99–111. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.

Stegman, Thomas D., SJ. "Paul's Use of *Dikaio*-terminology: Moving beyond N.T. Wright's Forensic Interpretation." *TS* 72 (2011): 496–524.

Stendahl, Krister. "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West." *HTR* 56 (1963): 199–215.

–. "Justification Rather Than Forgiveness." In *Paul among Jews and Gentiles and Other Essays*, 23–40. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1976.

Still, Todd D., ed. *Jesus and Paul Reconnected: Fresh Pathways into an Old Debate*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

Stökl Ben Ezra, Daniel. *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity: The Day of Atonement from Second Temple Judaism to the Fifth Century*. WUNT 163. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Strauss, David Friedrich. *The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined*. Translated by George Eliot. London: Chapman, 1846.

Stuhlmacher, Peter. "Zum Thema: Das Evangelium und die Evangelien." In *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien: Vorträge vom Tübinger Symposium 1982*. Edited by Peter Stuhlmacher. WUNT 28, 1–26. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.

–. *Reconciliation, Law, and Righteousness: Essays in Biblical Theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

Sung, Chong-Hyon. *Vergebung der Sünden: Jesu Praxis der Sündenvergebung nach den Synoptikern und ihre Voraussetzungen im Alten Testament und frühen Judentum*. WUNT II/57. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993.

Tabor, James D. *Paul and Jesus: How the Apostle Transformed Christianity*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2012.

Talbert, Charles H. ed. *Reimarus: Fragments*. Translated by Ralph S. Fraser. London: SCM, 1971.

–. "Indicative and Imperative in Matthean Soteriology." In *Getting 'Saved': The Whole Story of Salvation in the New Testament*. Edited by Charles H. Talbert and Jason A. Whitlark, 95–118. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.

Tan, Kim Huat. *The Zion Traditions and the Aims of Jesus*. Cambridge: CUP, 1997.

Taylor, Vincent. *Forgiveness and Reconciliation: A Study in New Testament Theology*. London: Macmillan, 1946.

Theissen, Gerd, and Annette Merz. *The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide*. Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM, 1998.

Thielman, Frank. *Theology of the New Testament: A Canonical and Synthetic Approach*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.

–. "The Group and the Individual in Salvation: The Witness of Paul." In Cook and Pao, *After Imperialism*, 136–53.

Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

–. *The Hermeneutics of Doctrine*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

Thompson, Michael B. *Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12.1–15.13*. JSNTSup 59. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991.

Thrall, Margaret E. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. ICC. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994–2000.

Tite, Philip L. "How to Begin, and Why? Diverse Functions of the Pauline Prescript within a Greco-Roman Context." In Porter and Adams, *Paul*, 57–99.

Tiwald, Markus. "Christ as Hilasterion (Rom 3:25): Pauline Theology on the Day of Atonement in the Mirror of Early Jewish Thought." In *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretations in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Edited by Thomas Hieke and Tobias Nicklas. TBN 15, 189–209. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Tobin, Thomas H., SJ. "The Use of Christological Traditions in Paul: The Case of Rom 3:21–26." In *Portraits of Jesus: Studies in Christology*. Edited by Susan E. Myers. WUNT II/321, 229–45. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Tov, Emanuel. *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. VTSup 72. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

–. *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays*. TSAJ 121. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Travis, Stephen H. "Christ as Bearer of Divine judgment in Paul's Thought about the Atonement." In *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology*. Edited by Joel B. Green and Max Turner, 332–45. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

Troxel, Ronald L. *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*. JSJSup 124. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Tsui, Teresa Kuo-Yu. "Reconsidering Pauline Juxtaposition of Indicative and Imperative (Romans 6:1–14) in Light of Pauline Apocalypticism." *CBQ* 75 (2013): 297–314.

Turner, David L. *Matthew*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.

van der Bergh, Ronald H. "Differences Between the MT and LXX Contexts of Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament: Isaiah 45:18-25 as a Case Study." In Cook, *Septuagint*, 159–76.

Van Nes, Jermo. "'Faith(fullness) of the Son of God'? Galatians 2:20b Reconsidered." *NovT* 55 (2013): 127–39.

Van Voorst, Robert E. "Why Is There No Thanksgiving Period in Galatians? An Assessment of an Exegetical Commonplace." *JBL* 129 (2010): 153–72.

Vermes, Geza. *The Religion of Jesus the Jew*. London: SCM, 1993.

–. *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels*. London: SCM, 1998.

–. *Jesus in the Jewish World*. London: SCM, 2010.

Visscher, Gerhard H. *Romans 4 and the New Perspective on Paul: Faith Embraces the Promise*. StBibLit 122. New York: Lang, 2009.

Wagner, J. Ross. *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul in Concert in the Letter to the Romans*. NovTSup 101. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Walker, William O., Jr. "Interpolations in the Pauline Letters." In *The Pauline Canon*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter, 189–235. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Wanamaker, Charles A. "Christ as Divine Agent in Paul." *SJT* 39 (1986): 517–28.

–. *The Epistles to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

Waterfield, Robin. "The Quest for the Historical Socrates." In *The Bloomsbury Companion to Socrates*. Edited by John Bussanich and Nicholas D. Smith, 1–19. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013.

Watson, Francis. "'I Received from the Lord . . .:' Paul, Jesus, and the Last Supper." In Still, *Reconnected*, 103–24.

Watt. Jan G. van der, ed. *Salvation in the New Testament: Perspectives on Soteriology*. NovTSup 121. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Wedderburn, Alexander J.M. *Jesus and the Historians*. WUNT 269. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Weiss, Johannes. *Earliest Christianity: A History of the Period A.D. 30–150*. Translated by Frederich C. Grant. 2 vols. New York: HarperTorchbooks, 1937.

Welborn, L.L. *End to Enmity: Paul and the 'Wrongdoer' of Second Corinthians*. BZNW 185. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.

Wenham, David. *Paul: Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

–. "The Rock on which to Build: Some Mainly Pauline Observations about the Sermon on the Mount." In Gurtner and Nolland, *Built*, 187–206.

–. "Jesus Tradition in the Letters of the New Testament." In Holmén and Porter, *Handbook*, 3:2041–57.

Whybray, R.N. *Isaiah 40–66*. NCB. London: Oliphants, 1975.

Wilckens, Ulrich. "The Tradition-history of the Resurrection of Jesus." In Moule, *Significance*, 51–76.

Wilcox, Max. "On the Ransom-Saying in Mark 10:45c, Matt 20:28c." In *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Hubert Cancik, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Peter Schäfer. 3 vols, 173–86. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.

Williams, Jarvis J. *Maccabean Martyr Traditions in Paul's Theology of Atonement: Did Martyr Theology Shape Paul's Conception of Jesus's Death?* Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010.

Williams, Sam K. *Jesus' Death as Saving Event: The Background and Origin of a Concept*. HDR 2. Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1975.

Willitts, Joel. "The Friendship of Matthew and Paul: A Response to the Recent Trend in the Interpretation of Matthew's Gospel." *HvTSt* 65 (2009): 1–8.

–. "Paul and Matthew: A Descriptive Approach from a Post-New Perspective Interpretive Framework." In Bird and Willitts, *Paul*, 62–85.

Wischmeyer, Oda, David C. Sim, and Ian J. Elmer, eds. *Paul and Mark: Comparative Essays Part I Two Authors at the Beginnings of Christianity*. BZNW 198. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.

Witherington, Ben, III. *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

–. *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Galatians*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.

–. *The Paul Quest: The Renewed Search for the Jew of Tarsus*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1998.

–. *1 and 2 Thessalonians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.

Wolter, Michael. *Der Brief an die Römer (Teilband 1: Röm 1–8)*. EKK VI/1. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2014.

Wrede, William. *Paul*. London: Green, 1907.

–. *The Messianic Secret*. Translated by J.C.G. Greig. Cambridge: James Clarke, 1971.

Wright, N.T. *Christian Origins and the Question of God*. 4 vols. London: SPCK, 1991–2013.

–. *Climax of the Covenant: Christ and The Law in Pauline Theology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.

–. *The Original Jesus: The Life and Vision of a Revolutionary*. Oxford: Lion, 1996.

Yarbro Collins, Adela. *Mark: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneaplois: Fortress, 2007.

–. "Mark's Interpretation of the Death of Jesus." *JBL* 128 (2009): 545–54.

Yeung, Maureen W. "Boundaries in 'In-Christ Identity': Paul's View on Table Fellowship and Its Implications for Ethnic Identities." In Cook and Pao, *After Imperialism*, 154–74.

Zangenberg, Jürgen K. "Matthew and James." In Sim and Repschinski, *Matthew*, 104–22.

Zetterholm, Magnus. "The Didache, Matthew, James—and Paul: Reconstructing Historical Developments in Antioch." In *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*. Edited by Huub van de Sandt and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, 73–90. Atlanta: SBL, 2008.

Ziesler, John. *Paul's Letter to the Romans*. TPINTC. London: SCM, 1989.

Zolondek, Michael Vicko. "The Authenticity of the First Passion Prediction and the Origin of Mark 8.31–33." *JSHJ* 8 (2010): 237–53.

Index of References

Old Testament

Deuterocanonical Books

Pseudepigrapha

Dead Sea Scrolls

Ancient Jewish Writers

New Testament

Rabbinic Works

Apostolic Fathers

Ancient Christian Writings, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

Greco-Roman Literature

Index of Modern Authors

Subject Index