

Saint Paul on the Redemption

ROBERT SHARP, O.P.

It is the words of God himself, declaring his merciful purpose to Moses and the people on Sinai, that tell us the principal elements in the concept of 'redemption' as significant for ancient Israel. 'You yourselves have seen what I did to the Egyptians, and how I bore you on eagles' wings, and brought you in to me. Now if you will heed my voice and keep my covenant you shall be my own special possession from among all the peoples . . .' (Ex. 19. 4 f). The first element is God's entirely gratuitous act of intervening in history to liberate the Hebrews from Egypt. The second characteristic, just as unconditional, is shown by the words 'and brought you in to me'. To set the enslaved people free, only to abandon them in the desert to starve or to be re-taken by their oppressors, would not be redemption. The notion is rather that of a slave redeemed and adopted as a son into the redeemer's household. The act of liberation is followed by the constitution of a new status for the former slave, a new relationship with his rescuer. Liberation is followed by covenant. Only at this stage is a condition imposed, demanding obedient co-operation of the redeemed with his new master's will. 'If you will heed my voice and keep my covenant, you shall be my own special possession . . .' Israel's obedience is now to be the condition of retaining the new favoured status of life. In the initial redemption of Israel the people's active co-operation plays a part only in the continuance of the covenant, once it has been freely granted by God.

There is one further feature of importance that is added when God again intervenes in history to rescue his people from captivity. When Cyrus conquers Babylon and the Israelites are allowed to return to the land of their inheritance, many of them prefer to stay in exile. Conditions of exile have been incomparably better than the brickfields of Goshen, and many of the Jews have not been slow to make use of their industry and commercial talents to make themselves comfortable among the Babylonians. Why return to desolate Jerusalem? Frantically the prophet whom we call Deutero-Isaiah cries of the blessings awaiting the repatriated people; salvation has come and they must grasp it. 'Go forth from Babylon, flee from Chaldea . . . Yahweh has redeemed his

servant Jacob!' (Is. 48. 20). The new feature is plain. Redemption now demands the people's co-operation even in the initial act of liberation. In this case, as in the original exodus, redemption is ultimately due to an intervention of God in history effecting the release of the Israelites, which they could not have accomplished for themselves. On the other hand, the active co-operation of the redeemed is necessary in both cases: at the exodus in the consolidation of their covenant status, and at the return from Babylon in the very liberation itself.

The application to Christ's passion, death and resurrection of these elements in the biblical concept of redemption has always been a centre of theological discussion both in the Church and outside it. The question I intend to consider here concerns the sense, if any, in which redeemed humanity can be said to share in Christ's redemptive act, either by moral identification with his death and resurrection, or even by presence in some way in his very person. Did our Lord, by his death, submit himself to the penalty deserved by men, so that by substituting his own suffering for ours he might atone for our sins? Did he, by offering himself in our place, pay a ransom for our redemption from slavery to sin? Or did he act on our behalf, in some way representing us in the redemptive act itself? All these speculations have a foundation, not only in scripture, but in the traditional teaching of the Church. None may be excluded, from which it follows that no one of them alone can represent the whole truth. For the present discussion I shall set aside the notion of ransom, since this is a biblical metaphor whose meaning resolves into the other theories to be considered. Although payment of a price is at the etymological root of the word 'to redeem' in the Greek Old Testament, never is this word used there in that sense when God is its subject. 'You were sold for nothing, you shall be redeemed without money' (Is. 52. 3). Instead the word is used for the Hebrew equivalents, 'set at liberty', 'save'. Redemption in the form of payment of a ransom or of a debt is a metaphor common enough in the New Testament, but it is one which cannot be pressed to the point of enquiry: to whom is the price to be paid? The main division in interpretation of the redemption which it is proposed to consider here, then, is that between the theories of what may, for brevity, be called 'penal substitution' and 'representation'. Did Christ die in our place, or somehow in solidarity with us? Was he bruised for our iniquities, taking upon himself the punishment which should in strict justice have been ours? Or did he place himself at the head of mankind and, bridging the abyss that separated men from God, lead

us back to the kingdom of the Father? Plainly, both these theories are somehow true. Here it is my intention to consider the balance of these elements in St Paul's conception of the redemption. It is the thinking of Paul, probably more than that of any other man, that has moulded the redemptive theology of the Church. Consequently it is by reference back to Paul's epistles (on the principles of *Humani generis*) that this theology can be kept fresh and living, as it was for him. One effect of this investigation should be to show how the Pauline ethic grows out of, and is continuous with Christ's redemptive sacrifice precisely as *representative*, rather than as *substitutional*.

Although Paul was a pioneer in the field of redemptive theology, he had nevertheless received a particular interpretation from the primitive Church: 'For I delivered to you first of all what I myself received, that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures' (1 Cor. 15. 3). Among the sayings of our Lord which he doubtless heard was that which we read in Mt. 20. 28 and Mk 10. 45: 'The Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many'. The preposition *for* here is the Greek *anti*, which gives the meaning 'instead of'. In other words Jesus gave his life as a sacrifice in the place of many who could not make expiation for themselves. The nearest approach to this saying in Paul's letters is 1 Tim. 2. 6: '. . . Jesus, who gave himself as a ransom for all'. It is significant that in this text and in all the frequent allusions of Paul to Christ's death 'for us', 'for sinners', etc., never once does he use the word *anti*. The preposition he uses most frequently is *huper*, which has the sense of 'on behalf of', an action done representatively. Admittedly it is possible for this word to bear a second meaning, 'in the place of', and there are a few Pauline texts which are sometimes translated so (e.g. 2 Cor. 5. 14). But in each one of these it is also possible to read it in the first sense, 'on behalf of'. There seems to me no doubt that the latter gives the correct sense, in view of the strongly representative character (which I hope to show) of Paul's whole approach to the redemption. This reaction of Paul's against substitutional teaching was carried further still in the later speculation of the Alexandrian Fathers, who took the representative interpretation to an extreme. Starting from Paul's theology of Christ summing up all things in himself, this line of thought stressed the atoning efficacy of the incarnation itself. By taking flesh, the Word raised up human nature, healing and reconciling it to God. According to this extreme teaching, all men are so far in solidarity with Christ's incarnation that the redemptive importance of his death is relegated to

second place.

St Paul's epistles reveal his theological thinking on the redemption as occurring principally in two distinct Old Testament contexts: that of the law, sin and death, and that of sacrifice. Here we shall consider these in turn. Trained rabbi as he was, the scandal of the cross was for Paul not exhausted by the death of the Messiah, who was to have brought a new and glorious age to Israel. The principal stumbling block lay in the *form* of that death. Crucifixion according to sacred law meant that the victim was outcast from Israel; he was under the ban, anathema. Paul's problem was to reconcile such a law with the certainty that Jesus, who had revealed himself as the Christ, had died precisely in this way. The solution could not for Paul lie in rejection of the law's validity. 'The law is holy' (Rom. 7. 12), it 'was our custodian until Christ came' (Gal. 3. 24). Jesus came to fulfil the law, not to abrogate it (Rom. 3. 21). And yet Paul also calls it 'the law of sin and death' (Rom. 8. 2). It is by understanding his use of these two extremes without contradiction that we shall find the key to his theology of the cross in its relation to the Jewish law.¹

The law that is 'holy, just and good' is for Paul at the same time the law that 'produces wrath', for 'where there is no law there is no transgression' (Rom. 4. 15). For one thing, the multitude of detailed ordinances of the Torah gives sin its opportunity. And besides, 'sin is not counted where there is no law' (Rom. 5. 13), since 'through the law comes awareness of sin' (Rom. 3. 20). To these rôles whereby the law gives occasion for sin and moral awareness of it must be added the fact that Paul refers to the régime of the law as 'the ministry of death' and 'the ministry of condemnation' (2 Cor. 3. 7, 9). What he means is that the law, being no more than an external rule, has no power to infuse an interior principle enabling men to observe it. It only commands, and imposes the death sentence for infringement. That is why 'the law produces wrath' (Rom. 4. 15). Contrary to contemporary Jewish belief, Paul saw that the law had of itself no power to give life. It was a neutral and objective system of retribution, ever ready to condemn. Essentially, the law was not impossible to observe perfectly, provided that reliance was placed on God's help. Judaism, however, had vitiated the law's purpose by striving to observe it by human effort alone. This explains why, for Paul, 'by works of the law no one shall be justified' (Gal. 2. 16). Because the Jews abused the law in self-reliance, instead of

¹On this question I am much indebted to the excellent article by P. Benoit, O.P., 'La Loi et la Croix' in *Revue Biblique*, 1938, pp. 481-509.

using it as intended by God, it could only react according to its own implacable logic and condemn those who had been so presumptuous. One and all, it cursed them. 'For all who rely on works of the law are under a curse; for it is written, Cursed be every one who does not abide by all things written in the book of the law, and do them' (Gal. 3. 10). The chosen race, through whom salvation was to be mediated to the world, was accursed. Pondering this seemingly inexplicable paradox, Paul saw that God in his providence had foreseen and willed that it should be so, that he might draw a greater good from the curse. 'Law came in *in order to* increase the trespass', as Paul puts it; 'but where sin increased, grace abounded the more' (Rom. 5. 20). The solution lay in the perception that Christ, being born under the law, bore in his flesh the curse that weighed on Israel; and the curse was realized on Calvary. By his death Christ rendered ineffectual the 'ministry of condemnation', 'having wiped out the bond that stood against us, with its ordinances; and he has set it aside, nailing it to the cross' (Col. 2. 14). His death and its consequence, suppression of the law's condemnation, were not, however, an end in themselves. When God raised Christ from the dead, what had been a curse was transformed into a source of grace and life: 'the last Adam became a life-giving Spirit' (1 Cor. 15). Paul explains it to the Galatians (3. 13 f): 'Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us (for it is written, Cursed be every one who hangs on a tree), so that in Christ Jesus the blessing of Abraham might come upon the nations, and that by faith we might receive the promise of the Spirit'.

At this point it might appear as though Paul had pursued a theory of penal substitution. In fact it is likely that at some stage in his thinking such a theory was a contributory element. But in his writings, as we have them, I believe it is little more than a trace, which is almost invisible when we view Paul's redemptive theology as a whole. One important aspect of this is the doctrine of the personal glorified body of Christ, in which all Christians live with his life. It is in this context that Paul explains the position of Christians in relation to the law; here we see that there is no question of substitution. Since Christ exhausted the law's consequences on Calvary, all his members, all Christians who are the limbs of his body, died to the law in him. 'Likewise, my brothers, through the body of Christ you have been put to death to the law, so that you may belong to another, to him who has been raised from the dead . . .' (Rom. 7. 4). There are many texts in Paul's letters asserting the real participation by Christians in the

death of their Saviour. 'I have been crucified with Christ' (Gal. 2. 20); 'Our old self was crucified with him' (Rom. 6. 6); '... one has died for all, therefore all have died' (2 Cor. 5. 14). This solidarity of action by Christ and by those who live with Christ's own life (cf. Phil. 1. 21) becomes plainer, and takes on a much fuller significance, when we consider the redemption in relation to sin. Just as Christ, being 'born under the law', identified himself with the curse on Israel, so too, being 'born of a woman' into the common stock of the sons of Adam, he identified himself with the sinful flesh of that human stock. Further, as in his death by crucifixion Christ realized the condemnation of the law's curse, so also God, 'sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, in order that the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not by the flesh but by the spirit' (Rom. 8. 3 f). 'For our sake he made sin him who did not know sin, so that we might become the righteousness of God in him' (2 Cor. 5. 21). By dying in the flesh Christ put to death the whole domain of the flesh, with which he had made himself one. In him died all human nature that is turned away from God. And by rising a life-giving Spirit he gave that death the eschatological validity which the condemnation due to sin demanded. He thus exhausted the consequences of sin, while giving life to sinners. Not that in this present age sin and death have disappeared. On the contrary, it is they that are most evident, while 'your life is hid with Christ in God' (Col. 3. 3). In this world it is by faith and the sacraments of faith that we live already the life that is proper to the eschatological era. But although it is when a man accepts the Lord Jesus in faith and baptism that he becomes a limb of his body and so dies, is buried and rises with him, still, once the sacramental economy is presupposed, it is true for Paul that on the basis also of the *solidarity of human flesh* all have died in Christ. The rôle of faith and the sacraments is to enable individual Christians here and now to appropriate to themselves by grace the efficacy of the one objective and universally valid redemptive act of Jesus.

It is worth noticing before we pass on that Paul's emphasis is strongly on the positive, creative side of redemption. He never speaks of 'punishment', 'chastisement', etc., as such in this context. 'Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us' is typical. The stressed point is that Christ acted to set Israel free from the law, and it was for this end that he fulfilled the law's just claim. Similarly in the universal context of sin: God 'condemned sin in the flesh' of his Son in order that we might be liberated from sin's tyranny.

Although the wages of sin is death, yet Paul insists that, objectively in Christ, 'death is swallowed up in victory' (1 Cor. 15. 54).

Now let us turn to look at St Paul's use of the categories of sacrifice in the development of his theology of the redemption. He is far from being prolific in his use of sacrificial terms in his letters. But this is what we might expect from a devout first-century rabbi, well aware of the limitations as well as of the higher spiritual significance of the Jewish sacrificial system. It will be necessary to take a look at this system if we are to follow Paul's thought where he speaks of the sacrifice of Christ in terms of it. We shall see that his thought is entirely consonant with the system that he must have known through and through from years of training in the temple at Jerusalem. From this question I hope to be able to proceed to what I believe to be the very heart of Paul's redemptive theology.

Much error in interpreting the New Testament references to Christ's sacrifice derives from confusing the differing types of sacrifice in Israel. In the ceremony of the scapegoat (Lv. 16. 20-22), which is not strictly sacrifice at all, the priest lays his hands on the goat's head, at the same time making a confession of the people's sins. The animal, bearing on its head all their sins, is then led away into the desert to die. Many Christian thinkers have interpreted Calvary in these terms. Jesus, bearing all our iniquities (Is. 53. 12) and a thing accursed, was led outside the city to die. But my point here is that Paul does not develop such a theology, nor does he seem to have the scapegoat in mind at all when he speaks of sacrifice. The types of sacrifice with which he is mainly concerned are the Passover, to which I shall return later, and expiation. It is mistaken to believe that in Israelite sacrifice the chief element is the slaying of the victim. In some pagan religions this is true enough, where the killing is conceived to be effective in appeasing the god. But in Israel, on the contrary, the death of the victim is not even a reminder of the death that has been deserved by the guilt of the offerer; it is only the necessary condition for what follows. The blood, in which is the life, is released when the animal's throat is cut: 'For it is the blood which expiates, by reason of the life that is in it' (Lv. 17. 11). The purpose of the victim's death is not destruction, but that the life, with which the offerer identifies himself, may be presented as a holy gift to God. In certain Old Testament sacrificial rites the offerer first lays his hands on the victim's head. This is not in token of a transference of guilt, but signifies that the offerer identifies himself with the life he is offering. Then, when the offerer has killed the victim, the priest

presents the blood to God by smearing it on the horns of the altar, that is to say on that part which is somehow particularly present to God. In the case of the annual Day of Atonement the high priest makes atonement for the whole people, who are so unclean in their transgressions of the covenant law that they have contaminated even the holy of holies in the temple. On that day the high priest goes alone into the sanctuary and sprinkles the mercy-seat itself, the throne of God, with the blood of the people's sacrifice (Lv. 16. 11-19). By this gift of life (not death), the offerer symbolizes the union he desires in a common life with God. The flesh of the carcase (or part of it, depending on what is being atoned for) is then burnt, and the remains, if any, are eaten by the priests and offerers. By burning, the flesh is transformed in such a way as to symbolize change of ownership. It is thereby set aside from any profane use, and ascends to God as a fragrant offering. It is essential to the Hebrew notion of sacrifice that the victim be a perfect specimen of its kind. So far from being accursed, through the change of state in which it passes into the divine ownership it becomes a holy thing, and any one who comes into contact with it is thereby sanctified. It is significant that the word 'sacrifice' can be used interchangeably with to 'consecrate' a victim (as in Ex. 13. 2; Dt. 15. 19; cf. Jn 17. 19). Through sacrifice the victim is penetrated with the divinity of its new owner, and becomes a source of holiness for whoever touches it (Lv. 6. 24-29). The consummation of the ritual by a communion meal therefore expresses anew and still more significantly the common life of holiness between God and his people. It is the whole of this ritual that constitutes the sacrifice, and not just a consecrated death. The essence of the action is transfer of an offered life to the divine sphere, and also, in most sacrifices, subsequent communion of the offerer in his divinized victim. What is effected is not of course a change in God, as though he needed to be delivered from his wrath against the sinner. By the rite of expiation men's sins are 'covered' or set aside, so that they are no longer an obstacle to union with the divine. Men are delivered from their hostility to God, and re-united with him after the separation caused by sin. Although, of course, temple sacrifice was all too often regarded as a legalistic system demanding no more than detailed and rigid practical observance, yet it did afford to the devout a vehicle for a truly spiritual approach to God. The prophetic tradition of 'love and not sacrifice' never disappeared. There must have been many who availed themselves of the higher symbolism of sacrifice, as signifying self-surrender in the transformation of a life offered to God.

This, then, is broadly speaking the nature of sacrifice in Israel, with which Paul was so well acquainted. If he writes of Christ's redemptive action in sacrificial terms, we can be sure that the real significance of the temple system, as I have tried to sketch it, will be a pointer to his meaning. In Rom. 3. 23-25 he writes: 'For all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God; and they have been justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as an expiation through faith in his blood . . .' And in Eph. 5. 2: ' . . . Christ gave himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice for a pleasing odour to God'. Christ, Paul is saying, made himself the victim of sacrifice and, being immolated, passed to the Father. This he did 'for us', so that all offerers of this supreme sacrifice are justified in him by faith, and ascend with the odour of his sacrifice to a common life of holiness with God. His death and resurrection were a sacrificial transformation, in which what was earthly in him, the flesh of the race of Adam, was changed into that heavenly body of which Paul has so much to say. What was sown a physical body was raised a spiritual one (1 Cor. 15. 44). In other words, in leaving the profane world and penetrating the divine sphere, Christ in his humanity crossed the gulf that divided sinful flesh from God. This bridging of the gulf due to sin consists in 'the painful abandonment of a profane state of life in order to achieve union with God'.² This painful transformation of Christ's human nature was perfectly accomplished in the glorious heavenward movement of his passion, death and resurrection. His own personal movement to God is redemptive for all men who are one with the sacrifice which carried Christ to the Father. In his body Christ opened the way for us (see Heb. 10. 19 f) to pass with him from the reign of sin and death to eternal life in God: 'In Christ Jesus you who once were far off have been brought near in the blood of Christ' (Eph. 2. 13).

These references to our Lord's blood are fairly frequent in St Paul, and have often been misinterpreted. We sometimes speak of violent death in terms of bloodshed: 'I am innocent of this man's blood', said Pilate. But when speaking of the blood of Christ Paul's meaning is not confined to the crucifixion. In his mind is the rich significance of blood in Jewish sacrifice, in which death is only an essential preliminary to life. Devout Jews regarded sacrificial blood as the symbol of a life surrendered and dedicated to God, with which they could identify themselves as the basis of communion with him. Surely it is this deeply spiritual view of Jewish sacrifice which Paul has in mind as antitype of

²Durrwell, F. X., *The Resurrection* (London 1960), p. 71.

the definitive fulfilment of all sacrifice in the risen Lord, when he asks: 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not communion in the blood of Christ?' (1 Cor. 10. 16). His blood is a principle of community, of fellowship, of covenant for all Christians with him in his risen life. It is the sacrificial gift of life with which we identify ourselves, and which is borne by the priest into God's holy presence.

It is remarkable that throughout 1 Cor. 10 and 11, where Paul writes of the Last Supper, it is the idea of community that is central. In the tradition which was handed down to Paul and which appears in our synoptic Gospels, two important theological ideas underlay the words by which Christ consecrated the cup: 'This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many'. It is generally agreed that the second point, 'shed for many', is associated with the redemptive theology of the Servant of Yahweh of Is. 53, in which representative and substitutional ideas are both present. All the more significant is it then that Paul, in his account of the Last Supper, entirely omits all reference to the blood being 'shed for many'. On the other hand, he gives a new emphasis to the notion of covenant: 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood' (1 Cor. 11. 25), as compared with the tradition, weaker in this respect, which we find in Matthew and Mark: 'This is my blood of the covenant'. For Paul therefore the Supper is the inauguration of the new covenant, ratified by the blood of Christ as the old covenant was ratified by the blood of oxen (Ex. 24. 4-8) and sealed in a communion meal (Ex. 24. 11). Whenever Paul speaks of the eucharist, he thinks of Christ's death almost exclusively in terms of covenant. 'Are not they who eat the victims in communion with the altar?' he asks (1 Cor. 10. 18). Even the note of the expiation effected by Christ's death is muted in these passages. The eucharist for Paul is like the Jewish passover festival. It is a ritual re-enactment in thanksgiving of a past event that led to the formation of the community. There are also passages not directly concerning the eucharist, where Paul writes of Christ's redemptive action in terms of the passover: e.g., 'Christ our Pasch is sacrificed' (1 Cor. 5. 7). The rôle of blood in the original passover sacrifice was of course that of averting destruction by the angel sent to kill the firstborn of the Egyptians. It looks as though Paul may be thinking of this primitive rôle when he writes: 'Now that we have been justified in his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him' (Rom. 5. 9). More commonly the implication attached by Paul to redemption by Christ's blood is forgiveness of sins: e.g., 'In him we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins' (Eph. 1. 7). Like the blood of the first

passover, the blood of Christ is effective in liberating the community from slavery (sin being now the taskmaster in place of the Egyptians), as a prelude to a new covenantal relationship with their Saviour-God. Thus redemption for Paul, as in the Old Testament, is an acquisition by God of a particular community as his private property. It is an acquisition for which the metaphor of purchase can be used, but, as already explained, not involving payment to anybody. Twice Paul writes: 'You were bought with a price' (1 Cor. 6. 20; 7. 23). On neither occasion is there a thought of actual payment to any third party. What is being said is simply: 'God has graciously set you free; you are therefore owned outright by God, and are committed to him absolutely. As his own possession your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit; so glorify God in your body' (cf. 1 Cor. 6. 19 f). This is not to say that Paul's references to a price are without meaning—far from it. Just what that price was for him is what we must now consider.

In a recent article, Fr Schillebeeckx has written of our Lord's crucifixion: 'His death is a sacrifice, an active self-dispossession or self-detachment for love of God—a death therefore diametrically opposed to the self-seeking of sin . . . We are redeemed by Christ's death as a loving sacrifice, not by Christ's death as a welter of pain and suffering'.³ This quotation is applicable especially to the thought of St Paul. For him the price paid by our Lord was the positive one of a supreme act of loving obedience, at no matter what cost to himself, so that for many life might arise from death. 'Who, being in the condition of God, did not reckon equality with God a thing to be snatched, but emptied himself, taking the condition of a slave, bearing the likeness of men. And presenting himself in human form he humbled himself, becoming obedient even to death, to death on a cross. Therefore God has exalted him . . .' (Phil. 2. 6-9). Notice the opposition here between reckoning 'equality with God a thing to be snatched', the sin of Adam, and the contrary course of deliberate, humble submission actually adopted by Christ. The significance of this point is brought out in the passage which seems to me to be central to Paul's thinking about the redemption. I refer to Rom. 5. To quote vv. 18-19: 'As one man's transgression led to condemnation for all men, so the just action of one leads to justification of life for all men. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so also by the obedience of one many shall be made just'. In these verses, indeed in the whole passage vv. 12-21, Paul makes a direct contrast between Adam and Christ. The

³LIFE OF THE SPIRIT, Jan. 1962 (pp. 277 ff.).

first Adam's act of disobedience brought condemnation to all men; the second Adam's act of obedience brought acquittal and life to all men. The actions and their consequences are unlike in that the second greatly outweighs the first (vv. 15-17). But they are alike too. In the much disputed v. 12 Paul explains in regard to Adam: '... through one man sin came into the world, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men inasmuch as all men sinned...' Adam's sin inaugurated the régime of death among men, which has taken its effect inasmuch as all men have in fact consented to it by themselves actually sinning. Parallel with this is the new régime of life instituted by Christ, as shown in the vv. 18-19 which I have already quoted. This latter régime too requires each man's active co-operation if it is to take its effect, as Paul explains at length in ch. 6. 'If we have been united with him in a death like his, we shall surely be so too in a resurrection like his...' If you yield yourselves to some one as obedient slaves, you are slaves of the one you obey, either of sin that leads to death or of obedience that leads to justice' (Rom. 6. 5, 16). The régimes established by the particular acts of Adam and Christ each provide a context of solidarity for men, to be subjectively appropriated and realized in each individual man.

What then is the nature of this solidarity and representative context instituted by Christ? It is a complex one. Since he personally represented all humanity in the incarnation, by which he assumed a human nature 'in the likeness of sinful flesh', i.e. of the common stock of Adam, he personally and objectively became the principle of new life lived in common in his glorified 'spiritual' body after his resurrection. The Pauline phrase for this latter solidarity is 'in Christ'. It is achieved by the ontological transformation which consists in being reborn a 'new creature' in Christ through baptism. This Pauline doctrine of sacramental rebirth is, of course, no less essential to his thought than the doctrine of redemption, and is indeed presupposed by the teaching of the involvement of individual Christians in redemptive action. However, it is not this sacramental aspect of his doctrine, nor the risen condition of Christians, which immediately concern us here. Our subject is centred rather on the idea of the creature's co-operation in the Saviour's redemptive act and representative sacrifice. On the basis of the incarnation there is a further dimension of redemptive solidarity, in that Christ was able to represent mankind morally before God. The whole of scripture that formed the background to Paul's thinking is the history of a dialogue between God and his people. It is an interplay

of divine power and human freedom, a struggle between God who calls and man who resists, that can only end either with the total rejection of man or else with a truly adequate response on man's part. This response of perfect reciprocating love was finally accomplished by man (not in his stead) in the person of the head of the human race, that is by Jesus in his willing acceptance of the death of the cross. An important reason, though not the only one, why Paul so often writes of the death rather than of the resurrection is because he sees in the crucifixion especially Christ's human act of freedom *par excellence*. The cross is the supreme expression of obedience and love, corresponding to the free gift of divine grace. It is this loving obedience of Jesus that men must freely appropriate to themselves; it is 'the obedience that leads to justice'. Immediately after quoting the hymn about Christ's obedience even to death, Paul uses it as an example to exhort the Philippians' imitation. 'Therefore, my dear friends, as you have always obeyed . . . work out your salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God who is working in you, both to will and to work for his good pleasure' (Phil. 2. 12 f). Paul teaches that through faith and the sacraments we live Christ's redemptive act, or rather Christ lives it in us. 'I am crucified with Christ', he says; 'it is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me' (Gal. 2. 20). Loving with his love and making his obedience our own, we 'share in his sufferings, becoming like him in his death, that if possible' we 'may attain the resurrection from the dead' (Phil. 3. 10 f).

I have attempted to sketch St Paul's thought on the representative nature of our redemption. Nowhere have I found a text of his demanding a predominantly substitutional interpretation. In view of the representative character of his redemptive theology as a whole, there seems no need to accept such an interpretation, even where it appears equally possible from the individual text itself. Certainly Paul must have been well aware of a tradition in the Church stressing Christ's death in our place, even though this notion is less prominent in scripture and contemporary rabbinic writings than in later theological speculation. But he seems to have deliberately avoided using it explicitly. Paul did indeed believe that Christ bore in his flesh the curse of the Jewish law and the condemnation of sin, and that both of these were consummately discharged in him on Calvary. However, we are now in a position to make three points which qualify and sharpen this statement, and which, it seems to me, deter us from finding any emphasis on a theory of penal substitution either at this point or anywhere in Paul's

writings. Firstly, Paul never writes of Christ's passion as a substitute for the curse on the Jews or the condemnation of sinners. Indeed, he sometimes goes out of his way to avoid doing so, as we have seen. Secondly, he never speaks of redemption in terms of punishment undergone precisely as punishment, but rather in terms of fulfilling the unavoidable consequences of the law and of sin, in order that the guilty, dying and rising in him, may have life. Paul's theology of the crucifixion is forward-looking; the death that terminates and fulfils the past is orientated to the future, to the resurrection. Christ's death 'in the flesh' was the essential prerequisite for the glorification of his humanity, and so also for our life in his body. Thirdly, Paul's redemptive theology centres on a positive principle, Christ's act of loving obedience in solidarity with all the redeemed. This solidarity at Calvary is achieved for all men in his person, firstly by his incarnation itself, and then by his representative response in love to the divine summons to men. In the sacramental era which dawned at Easter this solidarity is heightened by the open offer to all mankind of new life within his crucified and risen body. Finally, it is made effective for all who respond in and to his grace, freely ratifying and appropriating his redemptive action. True, Christ did for us what we could not have accomplished for ourselves. But he did so, according to St Paul's theology, not in our stead but rather as the 'firstborn among many brothers', to whose image we are predestined to be conformed (Rom. 8. 29). 'Therefore be imitators of God as beloved children; and walk in love, as Christ also loved us and gave himself up for us, an offering and sacrifice for a pleasing odour to God' (Eph. 5. 1 f). 'If we have died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him' (Rom. 6. 8).