Bachelor of Divinity   Concordia Seminary Scholarship

The Term Lutron in the New Testament

Arthur Marion Vincent
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_vincenta@csl.edu

Recommended Citation

THE TERM LUTRON

IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

A Thesis Presented to

The Faculty of Concordia Seminary

Department of New Testament Theology

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Bachelor of Divinity

----

by

Arthur Marion Vincent

May 1946

Approved by: _Gordon Graebner_

Paul M. Bretscher

THE TERM LUTRON

IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

(Outline)

I. The use of _lutron_ in the periods prior to the New Testament.
    A. Introduction. Earliest traces and general overview.
    B. _Lutron_ in Classical Greek Literature.
    C. The Hebrew words rendered in the LXX with _lutron_.
    D. Usage of _lutron_ in the papyrii.
    E. Usage of _lutron_ in earliest patristic literature.

II. An exegesis of Matthew 20, 28 and Mark 10, 45.
    A. The relation of these two passages.
        1. Their differences and the significance of these variations.
        2. The textual criticism of these passages.
        3. The context of these passages.

    B. An exposition of the individual words and concepts.
        1. Translations, ancient and modern, of these two passages.
        2. "The Son of Man".
        3. "To minister".
        4. "To give His life".
        5. "For many".
        6. "A ransom".
            a. Significance of this term.
            b. To whom was the ransom paid?
            c. From what were the "many" ransomed?

III. Conclusion.
    A. Summarization.
    B. Conclusion.

THE TERM LUTRON IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Introduction.

The word <u>lutron</u> and its derivatives is the one the
Greeks used to convey the idea which we commonly express
with the word: "redeem". The concept of "redemption" is
fundamental in the Christian religion and its importance,
as we shall demonstrate, can hardly be overestimated.
While agreed on the importance of this concept, students
of the New Testament do not always agree on the exact
shades of meaning of this group of words in the New Tes-
tament. The term <u>lutron</u> itself occurs in only two passa-
ges in the New Testament: Matt. 20, 28 and Mark 10, 45.
For the New Testament derivatives and compounds of <u>lutron</u>,
Moulton and Geden give the following: λυτρώσαι (Lu. 24,
21; Tit. 2, 14); λύτρωσις (Lu. 1, 68; 2, 38; Heb. 9, 12);
λυτρωτής (Acts 7, 35); απολύτρωσις (Lu. 21, 28; Rom. 3,
24; 8, 23; I Cor. 1, 30; Eph. 1, 7; 1, 14; 4, 30; Col. 1,

14; Heb. 9, 15; 11, 35); $\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\lambda\nu\tau\rho\rho\nu$ (I Tim. 2, 6).[1] The

suffix $-\tau\rho\rho\nu$ shows lutron belongs to that class of deri-

vatives which we usually designate as "instrumental." "It

denotes the instrument or means by which the action of the

verb is accomplished."[2] It is the purpose of this paper to

give a detailed study of the term lutron. For the purpose

of elucidation or additional proof, the derivatives and

their uses will be cited.

B. B. Warfield traces the ultimate base of lutron back

to the Sanscrit L$\hat{u}$ which bears the meaning "to cut" or "to

clip"; hence "it is inferred that the earliest implication

of the general Indo-European root L$\hat{u}$ was to set free by

cutting a bond."[3] In the primitive Greek this word appears

with the stem, $\lambda\acute{\nu}\epsilon\iota\nu$, which has the general meaning, "to

loose." $\lambda\acute{\nu}\omega$ has many composites which give further col-

oration to the fundamental meaning of the word. Kittel

gives the following composites of $\lambda\acute{\nu}\omega$ in the LXX: $\alpha\nu\alpha-$

$\lambda\acute{\nu}\omega$ (but only in the Apocryphal books), $\alpha\pi\sigma\lambda\acute{\nu}\omega$, $\delta\iota\alpha-$

$\lambda\acute{\nu}\omega$, $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\acute{\nu}\omega$, $\epsilon\pi\iota\lambda\acute{\nu}\omega$, $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\acute{\nu}\omega$, $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\lambda\acute{\nu}\omega$, $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\lambda\acute{\nu}\omega$,

$\sigma\nu\lambda\lambda\acute{\nu}\omega$, $\acute{\nu}\pi\sigma\lambda\acute{\nu}\omega$.[4] Except for the last three, all these

1. Moulton and Geden, A Concordance To the Greek N. T.
passim.
2. Warfield, B. B., Biblical Doctrines, p. 331. So al-
so, Cremer, H., Biblico-Theological Lexicon of the N. T. p.
408.
3. Warfield, B. B., ibidem. p. 328.
4. Kittel, Gerhard, Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neu-
en Testament. IV, 329.

composites are found also in the New Testament. The simple word $\lambda \acute{v} \omega$ is used in the LXX to express the liberation of captive persons,[5] the opening of locked away things,[6] the destruction of foundations and walls.[7] At times it is used to denote that man has been freed of the shackles of sin, God being the Author. The common meaning of $\lambda \acute{v} \omega$ when applied to men is "to loose," "to release or to set free." This shade of meaning applied especially to liberation from bonds, or prison, but also came to designate freedom from difficulty or danger. With reference to prisoners, $\lambda \acute{v} \omega$ developed a special usage which must interest us because of its relation to lutron. "In this usage, it means, in the active voice, 'to release on receipt of ransom,' 'to hold to ransom;' and in the middle voice 'to secure release by payment of ransom', 'to ransom in the common sense of that word, passing on to a broader usage of simply 'to redeem' (in which it is applied not merely to prisoners but to animals and landed property) and even 'to buy'. It also acquired the sense of paying debts and when used with reference to wrong-doing, a sense of 'undoing', or 'making up for', which is not far removed from that of making atone-

---

5. Job 6, 14; Ps. 102, 21; 105, 20; 146, 7; Jer. 40, 4; Dan. 3, 25.
6. Gen. 42, 27.
7. Ex. 3, 5; Jos. 5, 15; Dan. 5, 12.

ment for, them."[8]

In the LXX three different Hebrew roots are used to translate the Greek word _Lutron_. These are: כ פ ר ;
ג א ל ; and פ ד ה (פ ד ר) .[9] In a later section of this paper we shall give the meaning of these Hebrew words.

Lutron as used by classical writers.

The Ancient Greek writers employed _lutron_, usually in the plural. Almost universally they used it in the sense of "the ransom paid or to be paid for prisoners, in accordance with the use of $\lambda \acute{u} \omega$ for the liberation of prisoners, especially by ransoming."[10] Kittel agrees with this by saying: "_Lutron_ ist vornehmlich das Loesegeld fuer einen Kriegsgefangenen, und fuer einen Sklaven, oder zur Loesung aus einer Buergschaft."[11] Other lexicographers concur with this statement. Preuschen-Bauer define _lutron_ as "Das Loesegeld, besonderlich auch das Loskaufgeld fuer freizulassende Sklaven, meist im plural."[12]

---

8. Warfield, B. B., op. cit. p. 329. He bases this classification on Liddell and Scott.
    9. Kittel, op. cit. IV, 330 ff.
    10. Warfield, ibid. p. 331.
    11. Kittel, G., op. cit. Band VI, 341.
    12. Preuschen-Bauer, _Griechisch-Deutsches Woerterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments_, p. 755.

Liddell and Scott give their examples from the classics under three headings: 1) ransom; 2) atonement; 3) recompense.[13] For <u>lutron</u> in the sense of "ransom" they cite: $\underline{\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \ \lambda \acute{u} \tau \rho \alpha \ \tau \tilde{\eta} \nu \ \delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha \tau \acute{\eta} \nu}$, the tithe of the ransom money, (Herodotus 5, 77); $\underline{\lambda \acute{u} \tau \rho \alpha \ \lambda \alpha \beta \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu \ \tau \acute{\iota} \nu o_j}$, receive as a ransom for, (Thucydides 6, 5); $\underline{\lambda \acute{u} \tau \rho \alpha \ \dot{\alpha} \pi o \delta \iota \delta \acute{o} \nu \alpha \iota, \ \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \theta \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu \alpha \iota}$, pay ransom, (Demosthenes 53, 11. 13); $\underline{\dot{\epsilon} \iota \sigma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \jmath \kappa \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu \ \dot{\epsilon} \iota s \ \lambda \grave{u} \tau \rho \alpha}$, contribute towards a ransom, (Demosthenes 53, 7); $\underline{\dot{\alpha} \varphi \iota \acute{\epsilon} \nu \alpha \iota \ \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \upsilon \ \lambda \grave{u} \tau \rho o \nu}$, release without ransom, (Xenophon "Historia Graeca", 7, 2. 16. Cf. also, Aeschylus "Alexandrinus", 2, 100; Demosthenes 19, 169, etc.) Liddell and Scott cite $\underline{\overset{\circ}{E} \kappa \tau o \rho o s \ \lambda \grave{u} \tau \rho \alpha}$, the title of Iliad, Book XXVI, and thus disagree with Kittel who claims the word <u>lutron</u> does not appear in Homer.[14]

To illustrate the classical usage of <u>lutron</u> in the sense of <u>atonement</u>, Liddell and Scott refer to Aeschylus (Choeph., 48) where he uses the phrase: $\underline{\tau \acute{\iota} \ \gamma \acute{\alpha} \rho \ \lambda \acute{u} \tau \rho \alpha \ \pi \epsilon \sigma \acute{o} \nu \tau o s \ \overset{\circ}{\alpha} \iota \mu \alpha \tau o s}$. H. Cremer also cites this example and stresses that <u>lutron</u> in classical usage "denotes the means of expiation with reference to their intended result."[15]

---

13. Liddell and Scott, <u>A Greek-English Lexicon</u>, p. 1067.
14. Kittel, G., ibid. p. 341. For an excellent discussion of this use of <u>lutron</u> by Homer in book XXIV, see B. B. Warfield, <u>Biblical Doctrines</u>, p. 328, footnote 6.
15. Cremer, H., <u>Biblico-Theological Lexicon of the N. T. Gr.</u>" p. 408.

As further examples he cites $\phi\acute{o}\nu o\nu$ $\phi\acute{o}\nu\omega$ $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\varepsilon\iota\nu$ (Sophocles. O. R., 100; Euripides, Or., 510; Aeschylus, Choeph., 803). In Greek pagan literature, however, lutron seldom occurs to denote the price of redemption to a deity to whom a person has forfeited his life.[16] The examples which do occur, however, show that "even according to classical usage, it is by no means strange that the death of our Lord, elsewhere designated as a sacrifice, should be called lutron, ransom..."[17] Lutron, according to Liddell and Scott, may be used in a third meaning; "recompense". Thus, Pindar 1. 9 (7) uses $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\tau\rho o\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$ reward for toil.[18]

Classical writers used a large number of synonyms for lutron,[19] but it is not within the province of this brief paper to discuss them.

O. T. Hebrew words rendered in LXX with Lutron

Lutron, the price of redemption, or ransom money, occurs in the LXX almost always in the plural.[20] Prov. 6,

---

16. Kittel, G., ibid. p. 341. Cremer also gives examples of religious or ritualistic expiation. He cites $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\varepsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{\varepsilon}$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\mu o\iota$ $\dot{\alpha}\delta\iota\kappa\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$. Plato Rep. 2, 364.

17. Cremer, H., op. cit. p. 408.

18. Liddell and Scott, Vol. 2, 1067. Kittel regognizes this use, also: "Endlich findet sich lutron auch noch in der Bedeutung: Entschaedigung." p. 341.

19. Warfield, B. B., op. cit. p. 332 gives the following: $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\mu\alpha$, $\tau\iota\mu\acute{\eta}$, $\pi o\iota\nu\acute{\eta}$, $\dot{\alpha}\pi o\iota\nu\alpha$, $\sigma\omega\acute{\alpha}\tau\rho\iota\alpha$, $\dot{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\psi\upsilon\chi o\nu$

20. "Lutron occurs 19 times in the LXX and always, of course, in the quite simple sense of a ransom-price." B. B. Warfield, op. cit. p. 341.

35; 13, 8 are the only exceptions from this rule. It is used in the LXX for three different Hebrew roots. These are: ‎כֹּפֶר, גְאַל, פִּדָה (פָּדָה)‎ .[21]

The first of these roots occurs six times: Ex. 21, 30; 30, 12; Num. 35, 31. 32; Prov. 6, 35; 13, 8. It means covering (German, "Deckung").[22] As a translation of ‎כֹּפֶר‎ the Greek word lutron, therefore, always denotes a gift given as compensation, whose purpose is to cover a guilt, the result being that the guilt is not simply canceled. Lutron when used for ‎כֹּפֶר‎ always has reference to a compensation for a human life. ("psyche")[23] A person has forfeited his life, whether it be to a human being (Ex. 21, 30), or to God. The price of redemption seems to be in all cases money. Of course, it lies within the free will of the creditor whether he wishes to accept the lutron (Ex. 21, 30). He cannot be forced to accept it. There are cases, however, when he may not accept the lutron. For a murderer there exists no lutra (Num. 35, 31). He cannot escape death.

Another Hebrew word translated in the LXX with lutron is ‎גְאַל‎ .[24] Basically, this word means "to redeem, to

---

21. Kittel, op. cit. p. 330, Band IV.
22. Kittel, G., op. cit. Band IV, p. 330.
23. So also, Alford, H., Greek New Testament, Vol. I, 205, "A payment as equivalent for a life destroyed." And J. Orr in Hastings Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, Vol. II, 468, "This leads to the idea, which is common in the O. T. of ‎כֹּפֶר‎ as a ransom, in the sense of something given in exchange for another as the price of that other's

ransom."[25]   Robert Dick Wilson points out that this verb occurs only in the Hebrew and is used specifically "to describe certain duties of the next of kin, such as vengeance for blood, marrying the widow of a deceased kinsman, and other duties, including also the redemption from captivity...."[26]   Thus, the word ‫גאל‬ refers to the Law as it operates in a family. The ‫גאל‬ is the nearest relative[27] who must protect the family interests. It is his duty to liberate the family if its life and property[28] has been brought into slavery. Used with ‫דם‬, ‫גאל‬ refers to a blood redemption, i. e., "to avenge bloodshed,

---

redemption, or for one's own redemption, or, what is at the bottom of the same idea, as satisfaction for a life."
    24.Kittel, G., ibid. p. 331. This word, used in various forms, occurs 122 times in the O. T. Hebrew. The participle which means "redeemer, avenger, nearest kinsman, occurs 48 times." Davidson, B., A Concordance of the Hebrew and Chaldee Scriptures, p. 171.
    25. Gesenius, W., Heb. and Eng. Dictionary, p. 170. "loskaufen, einloesen", Siegfried and Stade, Hebraeisches Woerterbuch Zum Alten Testament, p. 109.
    26. Wilson, R. D., Scientific Bible Criticism "Princeton Theological Review", July, 1919, p. 430.
    27. "As the right of redemption, or the duty of blood revenge belonged to the nearest relative, hence ‫גאל‬ denotes a blood relative, kinsman. Num. 5, 8; Lev. 25, 35; Ruth 3, 12." Gesenius, Heb. and Eng. Dictionary, p. 170.
    28. This applied also to things vowed to God and to tithes. These could be redeemed by paying a price (Lev. 27, 14ff; 27, 31). He may borrow money and redeem his property (from the sanctuary) and may redeem in installments." Marcus Jastrow, Dictionary of the Targunim, The Talmud Bible, etc. Cf. Talmud (Kiddushin, 20). Vol. I, 202.

to demand or inflict punishment for blood."[29]   The avenger of blood redeems, being the nearest relative, the blood of him who was slain.   The nearest relative is also held to purchase someone who has been made a slave.[30]

In a tropical sense, גאל , redeemer, often refers to God as a redeemer and deliverer of men, and especially of Israel.[31]   God redeemed Israel from Egypt (Ex. 6, 6); from Babylon (Is. 43, 1; 44, 42; 48, 20; 49, 7).   Kittel enlarges upon the word גאל as applied to God.[32]   גאל denotes the dignity of the nearest relative whose duty it is to redeem his elect one whether it be the ancestor Jacob (Gen. 48, 16) or the people Israel.   This usage of the Hebrew word is found in the second half of the prophet Isaiah where it is intended to express the great comfort which lies in the fact that God has chosen Israel (Is. 41, 14;

29. Gesenius, ibid. p. 170. This is used only in the participle גאל . (Num. 35, 12. 19. 24ff; Deut. 19, 6. 12; Jos. 20, 3. 5. 9; II Sam. 14, 11).

30. Gesenius, ibid. p. 170, l. (Lev. 25, 48. 49; Jer. 32, 7); Kittel, op. cit. p. 331; "Redeemed by relatives before six years of service." Jastrow, op. cit. on Ex. 21, 2. " גאלה , Lev. 25, 51 of the price paid for the release of one who had become a slave. (Num. 3, 46-51; Lev. 19, 20; Num. 18, 15)"; Cremer, H., Biblico-Theological Lexicon of the N. T. Greek, p. 408.

31. Gesenius, ibid. p. 170, I. "Has protected and redeemed our ancestors" (Pes. X, 6). "When Israel was redeemed from Egypt" Kiddushin 15 b, referring to Lev. 25, 54. Jastrow, op. cit. Vol. I, 202.

32. Kittel, op. cit. p. 331.

43, 14; 44, 24; 47, 4; 48, 17; 49, 7. 26; 54, 5. 8; 60, 16). Because He is the Holy One, who is at the same time its Redeemer (Is. 41, 14; 54, 5), as He is its Creator, therefore, Israel's redemption is assured with every measure of certainty, because by nature the Holy One of Israel stands in opposition to the sinfulness of the people which He Himself has sold into slavery. In a most profound and touching way God is conceived of as the גאל by Job (19, 25). Here the Hebrew word has the old meaning of blood avenger who rises over the dust of the one slain. But since God Himself slays Job, He rises against Himself as Job's avenger, by permitting Job to see Him after death. Job who was killed but resurrected is in the hand of the same God even though this God is still the "deus absconditus".

The third Hebrew word rendered by the LXX with <u>lutron</u> is פדיון,[33] the arrested one himself (Ex. 21, 30). But also someone else who is not related to him. פדיון is from the stem פדה which properly means "to cut (into two pieces), to cut loose"; hence, "to ransom, redeem".[34] (Ex. 13, 13. 15; 34, 20; Lev. 27, 27). Robert Dick Wilson says of this word: "A closer study reveals the fact that in Babylonian, Arabic, and Aramic, as well as in Hebrew,

_____

33. Kittel, op. cit. Band IV, 332. פדה occurs 57 times in the O. T.
34. Gesenius, <u>Heb. and Eng. Lexicon</u>, p. 834.

פָּדָה is used primarily and predominantly for the re-
demption from captivity...."[35]   To distinguish this word
from גָּאַל, Kittel says with פְּדֶיֹן the emphasis lies
on the _price_ paid. ("Der Ton liegt also auf dem Preis").[36]
The object of the פְּדֶיֹן is never an inanimate thing but
always an animal or human life which has been forfeited to
God and needs to be redeemed.[37]   Sometimes God Himself is
the פֹּדֶה (II Sam. 4, 9; I Kgs. 1, 29), the one who re-
deems. Thus, for instance, God is spoken of as the one
who redeemed Israel from the house of bondage in Egypt.
(Deut. 7, 8; 13, 6; II Sam. 7, 23; I Ch. 17, 21; etc).[38]

The original sense of גָּאַל and פָּדָה, to redeem
and to ransom, is sometimes submerged into a figurative
sense. This has lead some authorities to doubt whether

---

35. _Princeton Theological Review_, Jly, 1919, p. 430.
"With מִן , פָּדָה means 'to let go, set free from ser-
vitude'(Deut. 7, 8; 13, 6; Micah 6, 4; Ps. 130, 8." This
need not be physical captivity only. It may refer to lib-
eration from the wicked one (Jer. 15, 21; 31, 11; Job 6, 23)
from Sheol (Hos. 13, 14), or poetically, from death, (Ps.
49, 8). Gesenius, op. cit. p. 834.
36. Kittel, op. cit. Band IV, 332.
37. Marcus Jastrow gives examples from other Hebraic
writings which illustrate this usage: "If a slave has
been captured and (they) Jews redeem him." (Gittin IV, 4).
"Must not redeem captured persons for more than their val-
ue." (Gittin IV, 6). "Until I redeem him at any price
they ask." (Gittin 58 a). _Dictionary of the Targumim,
Talmud, etc._, Vol. II, 1136.
38. Gesenius, _Heb. and Eng. Dictionary_, p. 834, 3.

these words are employed in their original etymological
significance.[39]   After a study of the words concerned and
their use in the O. T., I feel more inclined to agree with
B. B. Warfield when he states: "....the words are copious-
ly employed quite literally, and it is repeatedly made
clear that even in the most extreme extension of their fig-
urative use their etymological significance does not cease
to exist."[40]   Lutron, as a translation of these words, is
used 19 times in the LXX and always, of course, in the
quite simple sense of a ransom price.[41]

A discussion of the O. T. Hebrew concepts and the LXX
usage of $\underline{\mbox{גאל}}$ and $\underline{\mbox{פדה}}$ is not complete without pausing
to note the use of $\lambda \upsilon \tau \rho o \acute{\upsilon} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$.[42]   Of all the deriva-
tives, $\lambda \upsilon \tau \rho o \acute{\upsilon} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ is the only one "copiously employed".
So frequent is its occurence that $\lambda \upsilon \tau \rho o \acute{\upsilon} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ rather
than lutron represents the "characteristic usage in the
LXX".[43]   Regarding the simple literal sense in which _____
$\lambda \upsilon \tau \rho o \acute{\upsilon} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ means "to redeem a thing by the payment for

---

39. "It is true that 'ransom' in the O. T. usually
includes the idea of rendering what may be termed an equi-
valent but it is more doubtful whether this can be read
into the etymological significance." J. Orr, Hastings
Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, Vol. II, 486.
     40. Warfield, B. B., op. cit., 360.
     41. Ibidem p. 341.
     42. גאל is rendered with lutroústhai 42 times in
the LXX; פדה , 40 times. Warfield, op. cit., p. 344.
     43. Ibidem p. 360.

it of a ransom price", there seems to be no disagreement
among scholars. (Ex. 13, 13; Lev. 19, 20; Num. 18, 15-17).
In later usage λυτρουσθαι often is used to describe
Jehovah's delivering Israel from Egypt and Babylon. This
throws the stress not on the mode or price of ransoming,
but on the power exerted in it and the mind is focused on
the mightiness of the transaction. Passages describing
the deliverance from Egypt made it clear that the redemp-
tion was the effect of a great expenditure of the divine
power and in this sense cost much. This has lead many to
believe that λυτρουσθαι conveys a central idea of de-
liverance wrought by Almighty power rather than the idea
of ransoming.

> "It is going too far, in any case, however, to say
> that the idea of ransoming 'is practically lost in
> lutrousthai in its LXX usage'--as to be sure, the in-
> sertion of the word 'practically' may show that West-
> cott himself felt. Whatever may be the implication
> of λυτρουσθαι when used to designate the inter-
> vention of God in His almighty power for the deliver-
> ance of His people, there is evidence enough to show
> that the feeling of ransoming as the underlying sense
> of the word remained alive in the minds of the wri-
> ters."[44]

44. Ibidem p. 351. "λυτρουσθαι is employed in its
literal sense in more than a fourth of all its occurences
in the LXX. Cf. esp. Ps. 73, 2; Is. 52, 3; Ps. 48, 8; Is.
43, 1ff. These passages bear witness....that redemption
was properly a transaction which implies paying a price."

It is important to establish the meaning of λυτρούσθαι
as ransoming and not merely the power of ransoming. The
assumption is often made that the power concept of λυτ-
ρούσθαι is projected into the New Testament and there-
fore determines this group in the N. T. This assumption
cannot be proved. The N. T. usage of this group is not
"even formally a continuation of that of the LXX."[45]
λυτρούσθαι is the characteristic usage of LXX while
άπολύτρωσις is the characteristic usage of the N. T.
"...The N. T. usage is not a 'projection of the LXX usage.
The terminology of the N. T. is different from that of the
LXX, and therefore the terminology of the N. T. was cer-
tainly not derived from that of the LXX...The Greek speech
of the N. T. writers is the common speech of their day and
generation and their terminology more naturally reflects a
popular usage of the time."[46] Even assuming the N. T. us-
age of the derivatives of lutron was a continuation of the
LXX we must note that in the N. T. the context whows ordi-
narily that the modal implications are present. This will
be discussed more thoroughly under the N. T. usage of lu-
tron.

Usage in Papyri

Papyri evidence shows that lutron and the other verbs

45. Warfield, op. cit., p. 352.
46. Ibidem p. 360.

in this family were well established in the vernacular of
the people contemporaneous with the Apostles and Evange-
lists who, by inspiration, wrote the books of our New Tes-
tament Canon. A proper understanding of its current, pop-
ular usage will help us understand the meaning of Jesus
when he says He came "to give His life a ransom for many"
(Matt. 20, 28) and the whole group of images which Paul
uses based on the Greek word lutron and its derivatives.
Preisigke gives two basic meanings for the word lutron as
found in the papyri manuscripts. After pointing out that
it is usually in the plural, he gives these two meanings:
"Ausloesegeld fuer Pfaender" and "Freilassungsgeld der
Sklaven".[47] To illustrate the first usage he cites three
phrases from the papyri: ἔχειν εἰς λύτρα.[48] τῆν λύτρα[49]
and λύτρα ἱερῶν ἐ Μουχεως φ..............[50]
This first meaning is not so important for our purpose as
the second, "the ransom price for a slave or other person

---

47. Friedrich Preisigke, Woerterbuch der griechischen
Einschusz der griechishen Inschriften, Aufschriften, Ostra-
ka, Mumienschilder, usw. aus Aegypten, Band II, 42.
    48. Ibidem p. 42. (Aegyptische Urkunden Aus den Museen
zu Berlin), 1260, 12. Also to prove this usage he cites
his "Sammebuch grieschischer Urkunden aus Aegypten", 5665,
4.
    49. Ibidem p. 42. (Ox. 784) "wohl verwechselt mit ἐπί
λύειν .
    50. Ibidem p. 42. "Naehreres zur Sache nicht ersich-
lich". Under the related verb λυτρόω , Preisigke gives
some valuable illustrations of this usage of lutron in the
vernacular. ἐξ ὧν δώσεις Σεραπίωνι τῷ φίλω λυτ-
ρώσεσα μου τὰ ἱμάτια δραχμὰς ἑκατόν "of which you will
give to my friend Serapion 100 drachmae and redeem my
clothes." P. Oxy III, 114, 2 (11/A. D.)

in captivity."[51]   This usage was quite common.   "The sing-
ular 'lutron' for a slave's redemption-money is found,
however, several times (together with the plural, lutra)
in inscriptions from Thessaly."[52]   The first century af-
ter Christ usage of lutron in this sense is well illus-
trated by three documents from Oxyrhynchus.[53]   Thus we
read of a slave Euphrosyne who had been set free ὑπό Διἀ
Γῆν Ἥλιον ἐπί λυτρο(ις)."under Zeus, Earth, Sun, for a
ransom."[54]   Another document from the year 211 A. D. has
this to say: Ἐλένην....ἠλευθέρωδα καί ἔδχον ὑπέρ λυτ-
ρ(ω)ν ἀυτῆς δραχμάς δεβαστάς διακειλίας διακοδια(ς).[55]
Deismann noted this common usage of lutron and then said,
"....when anybody heard the Greek word lutron, 'ransom',
in the first century, it was natural for him to think of
the purchase money for manumitting slaves."[56]   To sub-
stantiate this remarkable assertion, he refers, not only
to the three Oxyrhynchus papyri, but to a votive relief

---

51. Ox. 48, 6; 49, 8; 722, 24; 30; 40: S. B. 5616, 6
(Samtl. I): Chr. II, 362, 19, (III).

52. Deissman, A., Light from the Ancient East, p. 328.
"....lutron stands in the same sense in the singular as
well as in the plural in the Thessalian stone-records of
slave-manumission." B. B. Warfield, Biblical Doctrines,
p. 332.

53. Ibidem p. 327. Cf. Ox. P. Nos. 48, 49, and 722.
These are taken from the years 86, 100, and 91 or 107 A. D.

54. Moulton and Milligan, Vocabulary of the Greek N.
T., p. 383.

55. Ibidem p. 383. Chrest II, 362, 16.

56. A. Deissmann, op. cit., p. 327

from Koeres near Koula in Asia Minor. This inscription
says: *Γαλλικω Ασκληπιάς κώμης κερυζέων*
παιδισκη Διογένου λύτρον. [57] "Galliko, female slave of
the Askepian village of the Keryzeis, (dedicates this as)
ransom for Diogenes." [58]

"The plural use of lutron may be further illustrated
by "*Τιοιν δε των πολειτων ε(ις) λύτρα προτιθεις*
έδειξεν έαυτον προς πᾶσαν απάντησιν των [59]
σωζομένων ευμείλητον (59) and .... *λαβοῦσα λύτρα*
εκ πολεμίων [60]." These illustrations
given above demonstrate that lutron in the sense of "Frei-
lassungsgeld der Sklaven" was common in the N. T. period.
With Deissmann, we think this explains beautifully our
Lord's use of this word in Matt. 20, 28 and "Paul's pre-
dilection for this whole group of images"[61] centering a-
round lutron. "It is safe to say that no Greek, to the
manner born, could write down any word, the center of which
was lutron, without consciousness of ransoming as the mode
of deliverance of which he was speaking." [62]

_____

57. Ibidem p. 328. Deissmann has a photostatic copy
of this votive relief. Figure 60, p. 328.
58. This translation by W. M. Buckler, Annual of the
British School at Athens, 1914-16, p. 181. Deissmann pre-
fers this translation to: "To Gallicus (the God man) As-
clepias of the village of Ceryza, maidservant of Liogenes
(Diogenes?), presents this ransom." Moulton and Milligan,
Vocabulary of the Gr. N. T., p. 383 also give this in-
scription.
59. Moulton and Milligan, Vocabulary of the Gr. N. T.
p. 383; Syll. 325, 15 (1 B. C.).

Earliest Patristic Literature

Although the use of <u>lutron</u> by the early patristic Fathers is not of the greatest importance, nevertheless, for the sake of completeness, we may pause to note how they use this word. These men united the Greek tradition, the LXX modifications, and the New Testament usage. All of these currents at work cause their use of <u>lutron</u> and its derivatives to have a "certain lack of consistency and sureness."[63]

During the first century, the Church Fathers did not use the group of words based on <u>lutron</u> very copiously. "Only $\lambda \acute{u} \tau \rho o v$, $\lambda u \tau \rho o \acute{u} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, and $\lambda \acute{u} \tau \rho \omega \sigma \iota s$ occur, for example in the Apostolic Fathers; and they only sparingly."[64]

---

60. Ibidem. Syll, 863, 4 (Delph. 1 A. D.).
61. Deissmann, op. cit. p. 327.
62. Warfield, op. cit. p. 340.
63. Ibidem p. 366.
64. Ibidem p. 366. "<u>lutroosis</u>, a redeeming, ransoming, deliverance..particularly in a religious sense." Cf. Clement of Rome 1, 12; Irenius 664, A: 'Doctrina Orientalis, Patroligia Graeca IX; 'Clement of Alexander, II 664, C. E. A. Sophocles <u>Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods</u>, p. 724. For the use of $\lambda u \tau \rho \omega \tau \acute{\eta} s$ Sophocles cites Justin Martyr, 'Patrologia Graeca' VI, 540 B, and Eusibius II, 841 B. Ibidem p. 724.

We find that <u>lutron</u> occurs only twice, each time in the
sense of ransom. Barnabas exhorts the readers of his E-
pistle to be diligent in their business affairs by say-
ing: "Thou shalt work with thy hands, for a ransom for
thy sins."[65]   The Epistle of Diognetus praises the love of
God which caused Him to send His Only-begotten Son as a
ransom for our sins: "....in pity He took upon Himself our
sins and Himself parted with His own Son as a ransom for
us, the holy for the lawless, the guiltless for the evil,
the just for the unjust, the incorruptible for the corrup-
tible, the immortal for the mortal."[66]   As used by these
Fathers and the later Apologists <u>lutron</u> did not lose the
implication of ransoming, its original concept, The scope
of its meaning was broadening to include the entire plan
of salvation: our ransoming by the blood of Christ, our
justification from sin, and our deliverance from the fi-
nal destruction and our entrance into eternal glory.

II

The N. T. usage of the word <u>lutron</u> is confined to two
passages: Mk.10, 45 and Matt. 20, 28. "<u>Lutron</u> findet sich
im NT nur Mk. 10, 45 and Mt. 20, 28 in dem Worte, mit dem
Jesus den Sinn seines Todes verdeutlicht."[67]   The Greek

---

65. Barnabas (XIX, 10) quoted by Warfield, op. cit.
p. 366.
66. Quoted by Warfield, op. cit. p. 367.
67. Kittel, op. cit. p. 343.

text of Matt. 20, 28 reads: ὥσπερ ὁ υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώ-που οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι, ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν." [68]

When we compare the same passage in Mark 10, 45 we find them identical except for the introductory words. Instead of ὥσπερ Mark uses καὶ γάρ. This small difference, we believe, does not effect the exegesis of this passage; "....der einzige Unterschied im Wortlaute--Matt. knuepft mit ὥσπερ, Mark mit καὶ γάρ an das Vorhergehende an--belanglos ist, liegt die exegetische Aufgabe einfach: wir haben den Sinn des Wortes im Zusammenhange des Mr-Ev bei des Jesusbildes bei Mk. festzustellen; nach allem anderen kann est hinterher gefragt werden." [69]

The text of these two passages is well established. All manuscripts extant for critical study except one comparatively unimportant Latin translation [70] show the same words and the same order. [71] Therefore we can proceed to a study of these passages certain that we have before us the

---

68. Greek N. T. by Erwin Nestle, 16th edition.
69. Kittel, op. cit. p. 343.
70. After ὥσπερ manuscript x (codex bibliothecae universitatis Monacensis. Fragmenta sunt evangeliorum cum commentaris) adds γάρ. Tischendorf. "Novum Testamentus Graece". Editio Octava Critica maior, Vol. I, 126.
71. For a photostatic copy of this section as it actually appears in Codex Alexandrinus cf. "The Principle Uncial Manuscripts of the N. T." by Hatch, Wm. H. P., University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1939, plate xvii.

words as they were written by Matthew and Mark.[72]

The context is important for a full understanding of
these passages. Jesus was on his way to Jerusalem. He
was aware of the impending events which He must experience
as the Savior of the world. Jesus had said: "Behold, we

---

72. After Matt. 20, 28 *ἀντὶ πολλῶν* there is a long
insertion:" *υμεις δε ζατειτε εκ μικρου αυξησαι και
εκ μειζονος ελαττον ειναι. εισερχομενοι δε και παρα-
κληθεντες δειπνησαι μη ανακλινεσθε εις τους εξ-
εχοντας τοπους, μηποτε ενδοξοτερος σου επελθη
και προσελθων ο δειπνοκλητωρ ειπη Ετι κατω
χωρει, και καταισχυνθησ. εαν δε αναπεσης εις
τον ηττονα τοπον και επελθη σου ηττων, ερει
σοι ο δειπνοκλητωρ Συναγε ετι ανω, και εσται
σοι τουτο χρησιμον.*

." Tischendorf, op. cit. I,
126. This insertion is supported by D, φ, the Italian
tradition (a b c e ff₁ g₂ h m n), the Syriac curetonian and
palimpsest, and the Fathers Hilory, Leo, and Juven. These
codd. vary in detail but all give this insertion. Textual
evidence does not warrant the inclusion of this section in-
to the canon, but it bears a remarkable similarity to Lk.
14, 8ff. Máyer thinks this interpolation is "apocryphal,
no doubt." B. H. Streeter says regarding this interpolation
"It is a 'feebler' and, I would add, 'less Christian way'
of putting the maxim 'take the lowest place' as found in
Lk. 14, 3ff....." "This reading does not commend itself as
genuine." He says it seems to have been lacking in the
oldest Alexandrian, Caesarean, and Antiochene texts and is
absent from family θ, Syr. s, and Origen's 'Commentary on
Matt.' as well as B and ℵ . The Four Gospels, by B. H.
Streeter, p. 136.

go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be betrayed
unto the chief priests and unto the scribes, and they
shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to
death, and shall deliver him to the Gentiles to mock, and
to scourge, and to crucify him; and the third day he shall
rise again." Matt. 20, 18. 19. At this point the mother
of James and John asks Jesus to give her sons the most dis-
tinguished places of honor, the seats at his right and his
left, when He came into "His kingdom". When Jesus told her
this honor was reserved for "whom it is prepared of my Fa-
ther", the other disciples became indignant with James and
John. Then, Jesus tells on what basis greatness is to be
achieved by Christians. "You know that the rulers of the
Gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise
authority over them. Not so shall it be among you; but
whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and
whoever would be first among you must be your slave."
(Revised Standard Version). Matt. 20, 25-27. This is the
immediate context of the passages we have under consider-
ation. In this setting, then, Jesus gives Himself as the
"summum exemplum" of one who would attain true greatness
through "ministering" to all men. He, the Son of God,
"made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form
of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and be-
ing found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and be-

came obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."
Phil. 2, 5.

Let us now proceed to a study of the meaning of the
words as given us in these two passages. Scholars have
translated these verses in various ways. I submit the
following translations:

The Vulgate: "Nam et Filius hominis non venit
ut ministraretur ei, sed ut ministraret et daret ani-
mam suam redemptionem pro multis."[73] Mk. 10, 45.

Luther: "Denn auch des Menschen Sohn ist nicht
gekommen, dasz er sich dienen lasse, sondern dass er
diene, und gebe sein Leben zur Bezahlung fuer viele."[74]
Mk. 10, 45.

The French translation: "Car le Fils de l'homme
lm-mene n'est pas venu pour e tre servi, mais pour
servir, et pour donner sa vie en rancon pour plusieurs.[75]
Mk. 10, 45.

The Danish translation: "Belijk de Zoon des
Menschen niet is gekomen om gediend te worden, maar
om te dienen, en Zijne ziel te geven tot een rantsoen
voor velen."[76] Matt. 20, 28.

English translations

Wycliff: "As Mannus sone cam not to be seruyd,
but to serue, and to zyve his lijf redempcioun for
manye." Matt. 20, 28. "For whi mannus sone came
not, that it schulde be mynystrid to hym, but that he

---

73. Vulgate: Polyglotten-Bibel im uebersichtlicher
Nebeneinander: stellung des Urtextes, der LXX, Vulgata und
Luther-Uebersetzung...." Bearbeitet von R. Stier und K. G.
Theile, IV, Leipsig, 1875.
74. Luther, ibidem.
75. Biblica Hexaglatta, Ed. Rev. E. R. re Levante V,
N. Y., Funk-Wagnalls Co., 1906
76. Bijbel, "door last van de Hoog mog. Heeren, Sta-
ten General der vereenigde Nederlanden." British Bible
Society, 1924.

schulde mynystre, and zyue his lijf azenbiyng for manye."[77] Mk. 10, 45.

Weymouth: "Just as the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as the redemption-price for many." (Matt. 20, 28). "For the Son of Man also did not come to be waited upon, but to wait on others, and to give His life as the redemption-price for a multitude of people."[78] Mk. 10, 45.

Moffat: "Just as the Son of man has not come to be served, but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many."[79] Matt. 20, 28, and Mk. 10, 45.

Goodspeed: "Just as the Son of man has come not to be waited on, but to wait on other people, and to give his life to ransom many others." Matt. 20, 28. "For the Son of Man himself has not come to be waited on, but to wait on other people, and to give his life to free many others."[80] Mk. 10, 45.

Knox: "So it is that the Son of Man did not come to have service done him; he came to serve others; and to give his life as a ransom for the lives of many."[81]

Dounay Version: "Even as the Son of Man is not come to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a redemption for many."[82] Matt. 20, 28 and Mk. 10, 45.

---

77. The N. T. in English according to the version by John Wycliffe about A. D. 1380 and revised by John Purvey A. D. 1388. Edited by J. Forshall and Sir F. Madden. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1879.
78. The N. T. in Modern Speech. An idiomatic translation into everyday Eng. from the text of the resultant Greek Testament. Ed. and partly revised by E. Hampden-Dook, Boston, Sixth Impression.
79. The N. T., A New Translation, Moffat, James. New Ed. revised, Harper & Bro., N. Y., 1935.
80. The Complete Bible, An American Translation, the O. T. translated by J. M. Powis Smith; The N. T. & Apocrypha by E. J. Goodspeed. U. Of Chicago Press, 1944.
81. The New Testament. A New Translation, R. A. Knox Sheed and Ward, 1945, Fourth printing.
82. Dounay version. Holy Bible translated from the Latin Vulgate. Imprimatur John Cardinal Farley. Herden Book Co. St. Louis.

The New Testament: "Even as the Son of man has not come to be served, but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many."[83] Matt. 20, 28 and Mk. 10, 45.

British Revised of 1881-1885: "Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." Matt. 20, 28. "For verily the Son of Man came......" Mk. 10, 45.[84]

American Revised of 1901: "Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." Matt. 20, 28. Mark 10, 45 is the same, except first word is "for" rather than "even as".[85]

The N. T. in Basic English: "Even as the Son of man came not to have servants, but to be a servant, and to give his life for the salvation of great numbers of men." Matt. 20, 28. Mark 10, 45 ibidem.[86]

Revised Standard Version: "Even as the Son of man came not to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many." Matt. 20, 28. "For the Son of Man also came not to be served, but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many."[87] Mk. 10, 45.

---

83. The N. T. translated from the Latin Vulgate. A revision of the Challoner-Rheims Version. Episcopal committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. St. Anthony Guild Press, New Jersey, 1941.

84. Holy Bible, being the Version set forth A. D. 1611 compared with the most ancient authorities and revised, Ox. Un. Press, 1885.

85. The N. T. of our Lord and Savior, newly edited by the N. T. members of the American Revision Committee, A. D. 1900. Standard Edition N. Y., Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1901.

86. The New Testament in Basic English, N. Y., E. P. Dutton & Co., 1941. Committee headed by Mr. S. H. Hooke.

87. The New Covenant. Commonly called the N. T. of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Revised Standard Version. Thomas Nelson & Sons. N. Y., 1946.

In this passage Jesus designates Himself as *ὁ υἱός*
τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, "the Son of Man." This term has been
subject to a great amount of investigation and a variety of
interpretations have resulted. Some have watered this term
down to mean only "the ideal man" or "the flower of human-
ity" and other terms indicating only the humanity of Jesus.
We shall show that when Jesus used this term He did so with
a definite purpose and significance.

ὁ υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, the Son of man, is used in the
LXX for בֶּן אָדָם, Chald. בַּר אֱנָשׁ. "Properly
it is a periphrasis for 'man', especially common in the po-
etical books of the O. T. and usually carrying with it a
suggestion of weakness and mortality."[88] (Num. 23, 19;
Job 16, 21; 25, 6; Ps. 8, 5; Is. 51, 12). The plural oc-
curs only twice in the N. T. (Mk. 3, 28; Eph. 3, 5) and in
both passages refers evidently to human beings, and not to
the Messiah. This meaning of this phrase does not concern
us in the present discussion.

The O. T. concept of *ὁ υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* is
given very plainly in Dan. 7, 13. 14. "And I saw in the
night visions, and, behold, one <u>like the Son of Man</u> came
with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days,

---

88. Thayer, <u>Greek-English Lexicon of the N. T.</u> p. 635.

and they brought Him near before Him. And there was given Him <u>dominion</u>, and <u>glory</u> and a kingdom, that <u>all</u> people, nations, and languages, should serve Him: His dominion is an <u>everlasting</u> dominion, which shall not pass away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." In this passage Daniel stresses both the humanity of the Messiah and the universality of his kingdom. The son of man here "symbolically denotes the fifth kingdom, universal and Messianic; and by this term its humanity is indicated in contrast with the barbarity and ferocity of the preceding kingdoms (the Babylonian, the Median, the Persian, the Macedonian) typified under the form of beasts."[89] Some scholars deny that Daniel 7, 13. 14 refers to the humanity of Jesus. Von Hofman, Zahn and others take כְּ ＂בָר,
one <u>like</u> the Son of man, in this passage to mean that what Daniel saw resembled a man, but was not a man. We note, however, that in Rev. 1, 13 and 14, 14, two passages which by common consent speak of Jesus, this 'like' is carefully retained. We know that Jesus was a real man. When Daniel saw "one like the Son of man" God gave him a vision of the real Jesus. "When Daniel sees him 'like the Son of man', this, without saying in so many words that 'he is man'

_____

89. Thayer, op. cit. p. 635.

clearly intimates that the grand person described is also
man."[90] The N. T. usage of this term shows conclusively
that "the Son of man" refers not only to the divinity, but
also to the humanity of the Messiah.

In the New Testament this term was used exclusively
by Jésus, except in John 12, 34 where the people ask "Who
is the son of man?" and in Acts 7, 56 where Stephan the
first martyr said, "Behold I see the heavens opened, and
the Son of man standing on the right hand of God."[91] Je-
sus always used it as a subject or as an object, always
in the third person, and never as a predicate. Jesus was
fully aware that He was the Son of Man, yet He never says
explicity in the first person, "I am the Son of Man." When
this title is used we note that it occurs with two Greek

90. Lenski, Interpretation of St. Matthews Gospel,
p. 431.
91. Lenski, op. cit. says this term "was unknown be-
fore His (Jesus') time." Most authorities agree that this
term was not current among the Jews as a designation for
the Messiah, and that is probably one reason Jesus chose
this title for Himself: it was least suited to foster the
éxpectation of an earthly Messiah in royal splendor. How-
ever, we cannot say with Lenski that this term was unknown.
"Son of man..In Son of man Vision--destroys enemies with-
out labour by the Law (4 Ezra 13, 38); restoration of Lost
10 tribes under Son of man (4 Ezra 13, 41 seq); all judg-
ment committed to, (1 Enoch 69, 27) pre-existence of, (48,
2); to sit on God's throne (51, 3); universal dominion of,
(62, 1)....." The Apocrypha & Pseudepigrapha of the O. T.
in English with introductions and critical and explanatory
notes to the several books., Charles, R. H., II, 867.

articles.[92]   These two definite articles make the term
quite distinct from "a son of man", just a human being.
The _τοῦ ἀνθρώπου_ , never the plural, "of men", is evi-
dently generic. Christ was not begotten by a human father,
but, nevertheless, He had the nature of man. He was a son
of mankind. "The fact that the human nature of Christ is
thus indicated is beyond question."[93]   We know that this
term refers partly to the human nature of Christ, because
Scripture ascribes to the Son of man as subject the whole
number of attirbutes. The Son of man is poor (Mt. 8, 20),
eats and drinks (Mt. 11, 19), is defamed, suffers and dies
(Mt. 17, 12. 22. 23; 20, 18. 19).

On the other hand, the fact that Jesus calls Himself
"the Son of man" sets him apart as one man who has this hu-
man nature in a way in which no other man has it. Though,
He is true man, He is more than man. Jesus makes this per-
fectly clear in Matt. 16, 13-17. Here Jesus questions His
disciples on the identity of "the son of man." He rejects
the false definitions: John the Baptist, Elijah, Jeremiah,
or one of the prophets. Jesus accepts Peter's definition

---

92. Only once the term occurs without the article. Jn.
5, 27. Here, "doubtless in order that by recalling Dn. 7,
13ff....he might thus intimate his Messiahship, as is plain
from Matt. 26, 64; Mk. 14, 62 etc." Thayer, op. cit. p.
635.
93. Lenski, op. cit. p. 340.

that the Son of man, Jesus Christ, is "the Son of the Living God." This truth, "not flesh and blood, but the Father in heaven", revealed to Peter. The same definition follows from the predicates Scripture ascribes to the Son of man as subject. The Son of man must be divine because He sees the thoughts of men's hearts (Mt. 9, 2. 4), forgives sins (Mt. 9, 6), is Lord of the Sabbath (Mt. 12, 8), sits at the right hand of God as Ruler of the universe (Mt. 26, 63. 64), and returns in divine glory to judge the quick and the dead (Mt. 25, 31ff.).

Thus we see that Jesus' use of the title $\acute{o}$ $\acute{v}\iota\acute{o}s$ $\tau o\tilde{v}$ $\grave{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi o\upsilon$ is very significant. He wishes to indicate His divine and human natures which are united in His one person. "In the use Jesus makes of this title two lines of thought converge; the one is lowliness, suffering, etc.; the other greatness, power, and exaltion beyond men."[94] This God-Man was uniquely qualified for his work as the Messiah of the world, the promised Redeemer, who would give Himself as the lutron for men. Thus in Mk. 10, 45 and Matt. 20, 28, the two passages under consideration, "der Sinn dieser Selbstbezeichnung Jesus ist messianisch. Mk. 10, 45 deutet also das messianische Werk, die messianische Gesamtleistung Jesus."[95]

---

94. Lenski, op. cit. p. 340.
95. Kittel, op. cit. p. 343.

This Son of man, *ἦλθεν*, came into the world. He was the Son of God, equal with the Father, and enjoyed all the bliss of heaven. He was infinitely great in Himself, because He was the Omnipotent Lord of the universe. Yet, because of His great love for men, and in obedience to His Father, He "came" from heaven to earth. Eternity punctured time; God appeared in the flesh. "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us and we beheld His glory...." John 1, 14. "In the fulness of time, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman...." Gal. 4, 4. "He took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men...." Phil. 2, 7. In the humble stall at Bethlehem, Jesus "came"; He began His work of ministering to men.

The purpose of Jesus' coming is indicated by the words: *οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι, ἀλλα διακονῆσαι.* Jesus came to serve. *διακορέω* means: "to be a servant, attendant, domestic; to serve, wait upon. In the passive, to be served, ministered unto."[96] As the Son of God, Jesus could have demanded that all men render service to Him. He had the power to make them His servants (*διάκονοι*), or even His slaves (*δοῦλοι*), yet the text emphatically states that Jesus Himself came not to receive such service, but to serve. As a servant, Jesus did not forfeit His divine power and dig-

---

96. Thayer, op. cit. p. 137.

nity, but He merely refrained from using it except for oc-
casional instances. "In both verbs we have $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\kappa o\nu o s$, and
not $\delta o\tilde{\upsilon}\lambda o s$ because of the divine dignity of this great
Servant, a dignity which remained during His service, and
because of the exalted service which He rendered."[97]

G. Kittel makes this additional observation regarding
$\delta\iota\alpha\kappa o\nu\eta\theta\tilde{\eta}\sigma\alpha\iota$: "Dienst, und zwar im Vollsinne des Wortes,
im ausschlieszenden Gegensatz nicht zur Herrschaft, aber zu
dem Herrengebahren, das in der Welt vorzufinden ist. (Mk.
10, 42) Das Dienen, in dem der Koenigswille Jesus zur Er-
scheinung kommt, vollendet sich in der Hingabe seiner
selbst."[98]

$\kappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ $\delta o\tilde{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\iota$ $\tau\grave{\eta}\nu$ $\psi\upsilon\chi\grave{\eta}\nu$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau o\tilde{\upsilon}$. The $\kappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ in this pas-
sage can well be taken as epexegetical. In this case we
would translate "....to serve, namely, to give his life as
a ransom for many...."[99] The $\delta o\tilde{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\iota$ stresses the fact
that Jesus made the payment of His life voluntarily. "....
Es....drueckt die Hingabe, die Freiwilligkeit in Jesu Ster-

97. Lenske, op. cit. p. 792.
98. Kittel, op. cit. p. 343.
99. By taking this $\kappa\alpha\iota$ as epexegetical we do not
mean to isolate the death of Jesus from the life which pre-
cedes it. It is not the death only which Jesus offered as
a ransom, but his death which came as the culmination and
completion of a previous career of ministry. Or to put it
in dogmatical terms, we do not thereby exclude the active
obedience of Christ.

ben aus, wie Mark dieses beschreibt: als willige Gehor-
samstat Gott gegenueber, nicht als Erliegen gegenueber der
Feindschaft der Pharisaeer und des Synhedriums."[100]   Mark
says Jesus came to give ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. Some people argue
falsely that ψυχήν can be taken only in the sense of
person, and does not necessarily refer to an actual physi-
cal death. They cite such passages as Acts 2, 41: "....
and the same day there were added unto them about 3,000
souls (ψυχαί)." Also Acts 3, 23 where we find the same
usage. A close study shows us that ψυχήν in Mk. 10, 45
and Matt. 20, 28 means more than just "person" or "Indivi-
dual". ψυχή usually refers to the life which animates
the σῶμα and which is separated from it by death. It is
"the soul, as the principle of life in the body."[101]   Kit-
tel is very careful to state that ψυχήν is not a condi-
tion of the self, but the self itself. "ψυχή ist das
Leben, nicht als ein Zustand des Selbst, sondern als das
Selbst selber."[102]   Thus when Jesus gave His ψυχήν He
was offering Himself (δοῦναι ἑαυτόν) as a ransom. This
phrase δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ is synonymous with
τίθημι τὴν ἑαυτόν (John 10, 11. 15. 17). When Jesus

---

100. Kittel, op. cit. p. 344.
101. Meyer, H. A. W. Critical and Exegetical Commen-
tary of the N. T., translated by Wm. P. Dickson and Wm.
Steward. II, 51.
102. Kittel, op. cit. p. 343.

spoke of laying down His life for the sheep, He referred
to His death. When He says He has power to take up His
life again, He evidently is thinking of His resurrection
from the dead. We must agree with Kittel when he says:
"Es ($\delta o\tilde{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\iota$ $\tau\grave{\eta}\nu$ $\psi\upsilon\chi\grave{\eta}\nu$ $\alpha\grave{\upsilon}\tau o\tilde{\upsilon}$) kann hier nur auf das
Sterben Jesu gehn...." [103]   Also Zahn brings out the same
point very forcefully: "Es gibt aber ein Dienen im Voll-
masz, ein Hingeben des leiblichen Lebens bis zu dem Grade,
dasz dasselbe im Tode aufgeopfert wird....Und der Leser un-
seres Ev. welcher die widerholte Versicherung Jesus gele-
sen hatte, dasz er eines gewaltsamen Todes sterben werde,
konnte jenes Wort gar nicht anders deuten." [104]   Jesus gave
His life. He was obedient unto death, "even unto the death
of the Cross". Phil. 2, 8.

Jesus gave His life $\grave{\alpha}\nu\tau\grave{\iota}$ $\pi o\lambda\lambda\tilde{\omega}\nu$. This phrase,
has provoked a great amount of theological discussion. Al-
though the words Jesus uses are perfectly clear, the ideas
involved have proved repugnant to some modern exegetes.
Let us examine this phrase in detail and determine what Je-
sus evidently meant.

The basic idea behind the preposition $\grave{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}$ is "face
to face". $\grave{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}$ can be used in many different ways. Thay-
er gives three basic meanings each with numberous sub-divi-

---

103. Kittel, op. cit. p. 344.
104. Zahn, T., Kommentar Zum Markus, II, 289.

sions: 1) "Properly,it seems to have signified; over a-
gainst, opposite to, before, in a local sense. Hence, 2)
Indicating exchange, succession, for, instead of, in place
of (something) and 3) as a prefix."[105] Under (2), the mean-
ing obviously under which $\grave{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}$ as used in Matt. 20, 20
and Mk. 10, 45 must fall, Thayer gives these subdivision:
"(a) Universally, instead of; (b) that for which something
is given, received, endured; (c) of recompense; and (d) of
succession to the place of another." Here we see that $\grave{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}$
can have various shades of meaning, and by itself $\grave{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}$
would not prove conclusively the idea of substitution in-
volved in lutron with which it is used.

$\grave{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}$ with $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\tau\rho o\nu$ in the sense "instead of, for"
occurs only in Matt. 20, 28 and Mk. 10, 45, and in I Tim.
2, 6 in the word $\grave{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\tau\rho o\nu$.[106]

---

105. Thayer, op. cit. p. 49.
106. This is unusual because Paul's great theme is Re-
demption for all men won by Christ, offered freely in the
Gospel and accepted by faith. Paul usually used the prepo-
sition $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho$ to denote the relation of Christ's death to
mankind. Rom. 5, 6 "....Christ died for ($\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho$) the ungod-
ly." Titus 2, 14 "Who (Jesus) gave Himself for ($\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho$) us
...." So also Rom. 5, 8; 8, 32; II Cor. 5, 14. 15; I Tim.
2, 6; I Pet. 2, 21; 3, 18; 4, 1. Even Luke uses $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho$
when he recounts the words of Jesus in the last Supper:
"This is my body which is given for ($\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho$) you." Luke 22,
14; 22, 20. We also find the preposition $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$ used in
Matt. 26, 28 in the words of the Last Supper. Other examples:
Gal. 1, 4; Rom. 8, 13 and I Pet. 3, 18. We find $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$ used
with reference to Christ's death. I Cor. 8,11 "And through
Thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom ($\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$)
Christ died."

However, we find $\overset{\prime}{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}$ used in other phrases which cannot be taken in any other sense than "instead of", and "in the place of". "The idea of "in the place of" or "instead of" comes where two substantives placed opposite to each other are equivalent and so may be exchanged."[107] For examples of this common usage Robertson gives Matt. 5, 38ff. $\overset{\prime}{o}\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\grave{o}\nu \ \overset{\backslash}{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota} \ \overset{\prime}{o}\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu o\bar{\upsilon} \ \kappa\alpha\grave{\iota} \ \overset{\backslash}{o}\delta\acute{o}\nu\tau\alpha \ \overset{\backslash}{\alpha}\nu\tau\grave{\iota} \ \overset{\prime}{o}\delta\acute{o}\nu\tau o s$; Rom. 12, 17 $\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{o}\nu \ \overset{\backslash}{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota} \ \kappa\alpha\kappa o\bar{\upsilon}$; I Pet. 3, 9 $\lambda o\iota\delta o\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu \ \overset{\backslash}{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota} \ \lambda o\iota\delta o\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha s$; Matt. 2, 22 $\overset{\backslash}{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota} \ \tau o\bar{\upsilon} \ \pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{o}s$; James 4, 15 $\overset{\backslash}{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota} \ \tau o\bar{\upsilon} \ \lambda\acute{e}\mathcal{f}\epsilon\iota\nu$; and I Cor. 11, 15.[108] Also Lk. 11, 11; Heb. 12, 16; I Thess. 5, 15. Thus we see that when Jesus chose the preposition $\overset{\backslash}{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}$, to say the least, He was certainly not excluding the concept of substitution.. We will go farther and state the context and parallels demand the idea of substitution in the

---

107. Robertson, A. T., A Grammar of the Greek N. T. in the Light of Historical Research, 2nd Edition 1914, p. 573.
108. The Greek speaking world of Jesus' time had every reason to understand $\overset{\backslash}{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}$ in the sense of "instead of, in the place of". From Homer on down classical Greek is full of instances of this use of the preposition $\overset{\backslash}{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}$. Liddell and Scott give the following as typical examples: $\overset{\prime}{\epsilon}\kappa\tau o\rho o s \ \overset{\backslash}{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota} \ \pi\epsilon\varphi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ Illyiad 24, 254; $\overset{\backslash}{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota} \ \mathcal{f}\acute{\alpha}\mu o\iota o \ \tau\acute{\alpha}\varphi o\nu$ Od. 20, 307; $\pi o\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\mu o s \ \overset{\backslash}{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota} \ \varphi\acute{\iota}\lambda o\upsilon \ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\tilde{\eta}\nu\alpha\iota$ Heroditus 1, 87; $\overset{\backslash}{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota} \ \overset{\prime}{\eta}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha s \ \nu\grave{\upsilon}\mathcal{f} \ \overset{\prime}{\epsilon}\mathcal{f}\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau o$ Id. 7, 37; $\overset{\backslash}{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota} \ \varphi\omega\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu \ \sigma\pi o\delta o\acute{s}$ A. G. 434; $\tau\acute{o}\nu \ \pi\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\mu o\nu \ \overset{\backslash}{\alpha}\nu\tau' \ \epsilon\grave{\iota}\rho\acute{\eta}\nu\eta s \ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ Thucydides 1, 120 cf. 4, 20; 7, 75; $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu \ \overset{\backslash}{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota} \ \tau\acute{\iota}\nu o s$ Xenophon Anabasis 1, 114; $\overset{\backslash}{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota} \ \overset{\prime}{\alpha}\rho\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota \ \overset{\prime}{\upsilon}\pi' \ \overset{\backslash}{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\tilde{\omega}\nu \ \overset{\prime}{\alpha}\rho\chi\epsilon\iota\nu \ \overset{\prime}{\alpha}\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu$ Hdt. 1, 210. cf. 6, 32; 7, 170.

passages Matt. 20, 28 and Mk. 10, 45. "These two impor-
tant doctrinal passages teach the substitutionary concep-
tion of Christ's death, not because $\dot{\alpha}\nu\tau\dot{\iota}$ of itself means
"instead", which is not true, but because the context ren-
ders any other resultant idea out of the question."[109]   A-
bove we have called attention to $\dot{\alpha}\nu\tau\dot{\iota}\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\upsilon$ in I Tim. 2,
6.[110]   In this passage Paul uses both $\dot{\alpha}\nu\tau\dot{\iota}$, as a prefix,
and the preposition $\dot{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho$ to stress the idea of substi-
tution. "$\dot{\alpha}\nu\tau\dot{\iota}$ stresses the fact of Christ's coming and
suffering in the stead of all, and for their advantage (__
$\dot{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho$)."[111]   The best Bible Scholars agree that $\dot{\alpha}\nu\tau\dot{\iota}$ in
these passages must refer to Christ's giving His life as a
ransom in the substitution sense. "$\dot{\alpha}\nu\tau\dot{\iota}$ heiszt 'fuer',
nicht so sehr 'zum Besten' als 'anstelle'."[112]   "$\alpha\nu\tau\dot{\iota}$
denotes substitution. That which is given as a ransom takes
the place (is given instead of) those who are to be set free

---

109. Robertson, A. T., op. cit. p. 573.
110. The best N. T. scholars regard I Tim. 2, 6 as a
distinct echo of Christ's words in Matt. 20, 28; Mk. 10, 45.
"The distinction between $\dot{\alpha}\nu\tau\dot{\iota}$ and the more colorless $\dot{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho$
in applying the metaphor of purchase, is well seen in Mk.
10, 45 (Matt. 20, 28) $\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\upsilon$ $\alpha\nu\tau\dot{\iota}$ $\pi\upsilon\lambda\lambda\tilde{\omega}\nu$, and the
quotation of this logion in I Tim. 2, 6 $\dot{\alpha}\nu\tau\dot{\iota}\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\upsilon$ $\dot{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho$
$\pi\dot{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu$." Moulton, James Hope, A Grammar of N. T.
Greek, I, 105.
111. Cremer, H., Biblico-Theological Lexicon of the N.
T. Greek, p. 409.
112. Kittel, op. cit. p. 344.

in consideration thereof." The very fact that $\overset{\prime}{\alpha\nu\tau\iota}$
is used with $\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\upsilon$ stresses that it must be taken as
substitutional. "Das Loesegeldwort enthaelt auf jeden Fall
einen Stellvertretungsgedanken. Denn mag man $\overset{\prime}{\alpha\nu\tau\iota}$ mit
'anstelle' oder 'zum besten' deuten: indem Jesus sich
selbst in den Tod gibt, geschieht mit ihm, was mit den Vie-
len geschehen muszte, tritt er an ihre Stelle."[114] This
view is confirmed by the fact that in other parts of the N.
T. this ransom is usually spoken of as an expiatory sacri-
fice, (cf. Matt. 24, 28; Jn. 1, 29; I Jn. 4, 10; Rom. 3,
25; I Pet. 1, 18ff; 3, 18; and Is. 53, 10).[115]

In spite of this clear evidence both in the context
and parallels some modern exegetes have made efforts to o-
verthrow the substitutional import of these passages. For
dogmatical, and not for exegetical reasons they assert that
Jesus could not have said or did not say what His words e-
vidently do say. "But that is an easy way to get rid of

---

113. Meyer, H. A. W., op. cit. p. 51.
114. Kittel, op. cit. p. 344.
115. Kittel, op. cit. in footnote 22 believes that Is.
53, while a similar situation to the $\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\upsilon\nu\ \overset{\prime}{\alpha\nu\tau\iota}$
$\pi\upsilon\lambda\lambda\overset{-}{\omega}\nu$ in Matt. 20, 28 and Mk. 10, 45, is nevertheless
not an exact parallel. "Dasz das Loesegeldwort Aehnlich-
keit mit Is. 53 aufweist, ist nicht zu leugnen. Es ist
auch zuzugeben, dasz Is. 53 fuer seine Entstehung Bedeutung
haben kann. Aber jedenfalls nimmt es nicht ausdruecklich,
auch nicht deutlich Bezug auf Is. 53; deshalb ist es metho-
disch auf jeden Fall unrichtig, zur Erklaerung des Loese-
geldwortes von Is. 53 auszugehn."

passages that contradict one's theological opinions."[116]
We must conclude then, that $\overset{\cdot}{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}$ here is most intelli-
gible when we take it to refer to a substitutional death
of Christ _for many._

Christ's death was a substitutional death "for many".
Next the question arises as to the exact meaning of $\pi o \lambda \lambda \widetilde{\omega} \nu$.
Does this term indicate that Christ's death was intended to
ransom an exclusive minority or all men? We note first of
all, that $\pi o \lambda \lambda \widetilde{\omega} \nu$ occurs here without the article. In the
New Testament the plural masculine $\pi o \lambda \lambda o \acute{\iota}$ without the ar-
ticle occurs very frequently. In this form and use it us-
ually means "many, a large part of mankind."[117]   Matt. 7,
13, for instance, shows this meaning: "Enter ye in at the
strait gate; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way,
that leadeth to destruction, and many ($\pi o \lambda \lambda o \acute{\iota}$) there be
which go in thereat." " $\pi o \lambda \lambda o \acute{\iota}$ kann eine unbestimmte
Menge bezeichnen."[118]

Scripture, on the other hand, also describes the death
of Jesus as having taken place for all ($\pi \alpha \nu \tau \acute{\epsilon} s$). I Tim.
2, 6 $\overset{\cdot}{o} \quad \overset{\cdot}{\delta o \grave{\upsilon}s} \quad \overset{\cdot}{\epsilon} \lambda \upsilon \tau \grave{o} \nu \quad \overset{\cdot}{\alpha} \nu \tau \acute{\iota} \lambda \upsilon \tau \rho o \nu \quad \overset{\cdot}{\upsilon} \pi \epsilon \rho \quad \pi \alpha \nu \tau \widetilde{\omega} \nu$

116. Robertson, A. T., _Word Pictures in the N. T.,_Vol.
I, p. 163.
     117. Thayer, op. cit. p. 529. Cf. Matt. 7, 13. 22; 26,
28; Mk. 2, 2; 3, 10; 14, 24; etc.
     118. Kittel, op. cit. p. 344. Kittel shows that $o \acute{\iota}$
$\pi o \lambda \lambda o \acute{\iota}$, according to its Semitic usage, could refer to
those standing around Jesus within hearing distance ("die
in Rede stehende Gesamtheit"). The fact that the article
is here absent shows that Jesus did not thus limit the meaning of
$\pi o \lambda \lambda \widetilde{\omega} \nu$ in Matt. 20, 28 and Mk. 10, 45.

Rom. 5, 18 also reveals that God intended the <u>lutron</u> as a universal gift: *Ἄρα οὖν ὡς δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα, οὕτως καὶ δι' ἑνὸς δικαιώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς."*

From these parallels we see that *πολλῶν* as used in Matt. 20, 28 and Mk. 10, 45 can refer to all men rather than to just a large number only.

The fifth chapter of Romans referred to above is particularly instructive. In verses 12-19 Paul uses *οἱ πολλοί* (cf. 15 (2), 19 (2)). However, in Rom. 5, 18 the *οἱ πολλοί* are identified with the *πάντες*, and therefore one can say that Paul always has in mind the *πάντες*.

> "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin; and so death passed upon all *πάντας* men, for that *πάντας* have sinned: (for until the law sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come. But not as the offence, so also the free gift. For if through the offence of one many *οἱ πολλοί* be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many *τοὺς πολλούς* . And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many *πολλῶν*. For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ). Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all *πάντας* men to dondemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all *πάντας* men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many *οἱ πολλοί* were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many *οἱ πολλοί* be made righteous."

In this section we know that Paul means "all" when he uses

$\overset{\prime}{\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon s}$. The entire argument of the preceding four chap-
ters (especially up to Rom. 3, 20) shows conclusively,
first, that "all have sinned and come short of the glory of
God", and, secondly, that every man "is justified by his
grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus". Rom.
3, 23-24. Thus we conclude when Paul uses $\pi o\lambda\lambda o\acute{\iota}$ as a
synonymn for $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon s$ he shows conclusively that he inter-
preted Jesus' words "give my life a ransom for many", to
mean all men, not just an exclusive minority or the so-
called "elect". An attempt to make $\pi o\lambda\lambda\tilde{\omega}\nu$ fit a parti-
cularistic exegesis violates plain scripture that all men
are the objects of God's grace (Titus 2, 4; I Tim. 2, 4;
John 3, 16; I Jn. 2, 2), that the gratia universalis per-
tains to each and every individual (II Pet. 3, 9; Ezek. 33,
11; 18, 23. 32), and that even those who perish are inclu-
ded in those for whom Christ paid the ransom of His life.
(I Cor. 8, 11; Rom. 14, 15; II Pet. 2, 1; Matt. 23, 37)
Correctly Gerhard says in regard to the universality of di-
vine grace, that the Scripture attests it in words, Christ
with tears, God Himself with an oath.

The best commentators explain the fact that Scripture
uses both $\pi o\lambda\lambda o\acute{\iota}$ and $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon s$ to describe the vicarious
death of Christ by referring to the distinction between
objective and subjective justification. H. A. W. Meyer,
for instance, puts it this way:

"The vicarious death of Jesus may be described

as having taken place for all....or for many....according as we regard it as an objective fact (that fact being: Jesus has given His life a ransom for all men), or look at it in relation to the subjective appropriation of its results on the part of individuals (which happens only in the case of believers). So in the present case, where, accordingly, πολλῶν is to be understood as meaning all who believe now and will believe hereafter. Jn. 17, 20."[119]

Henry Alford states the same idea very effectively when he says:

"No stress should be laid on this word πολλῶν, as not being πάντων here; it is placed in opposition to the one life which is given--the one for the many--and not with distinction from πάντων. πάντων is the objective, πολλῶν the subjective designation of those for whom Christ died. He died for all objectively; subjectively, the great multitude whom no man could number, πολλοί will be saved in the end."[120]

We have shown previously (in the section dealing with the use of lutron in the Greek/papyrii of the first century A. D.) that the concept of ransom was a common one in the Greek speaking world. When Jesus used the word lutron in reference to His redemptive work, we must not think that He chose a word which would obscure His real meaning. On the contrary, in such a basic teaching as the purpose of His entire mission and work, certainly Jesus would pick words to describe His work accurately. Lutron is a case in point. In lutron the Master picked a word which "was admirably

119. Meyer, H. A. W. op. cit. II, 53 sub. Matt. 20, 28.
120. Alford, Henry, Greek New Testament. "A digest of various readings: marginal references to verbal and idiomatic usage; a critical and exegetical commentary". Vol. IV, 5th ed. Cambridge, 1865 sub. Matt. 20, 28.

suited to meet the requirements and intellectual capacity
of the lower classes."[121]   "In the group of words built a-
round lutron the Greek language offered to the New Testa-
ment a series of terms which distinctly said 'ransom'; and
just as in proportion as we think of the writers of the New
Testament as using Greek naturally, we must think of them
as feeling the intrinsic significance of these words as
they used them, and as using them only when they intended
to give expression to this their intrinsic significance."[122]

Jesus' own use of this phrase 'to give His life a ran-
some for many' to describe His mission on earth would na-
turally determine for His followers their whole conception
of His redemptive work. It is quite natural then, that we
find this sentiment echoed frequently by the disciples and
apostles. The Lord Jesus gave St. Paul an especially clear
understanding of the concept involved in lutron. Paul is
very fond of this concept in connection with the redemption.
He always thought of the redemption in connection with the
death, the sacrifice of Himself, which Jesus made. Refer-
ence has already been made to I Tim1 2, 6 ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτόν
ἀντίλυτρον ὑπέρ πάντων. Also, Eph. 1, 7: "In whom
we have redemption (ἀπολύτρωσις) through his blood,
the forgiveness of sins...." Titus 2, 14: "Who gave him-
self for us that he might redeem (λυτρώσηται) us from
all iniquity...."

121. Deissmann, A., op. cit. p. 328.
122. Warfield, B. B., op. cit. p. 340 & 341.

Deissmann demonstrates that Paul's predeliction for the ransoming concept as expressed in <u>lutron</u> and its derivatives was a particularly happy one for the lower classes. For instance, "for the poor saints of Corinth, among whom there were certainly some, slaves, he (Paul) could not have found a more popular illustration of the present and past work of the Lord...." In Corinth every slave knew of, and daily saw the pagan shrines "at which Apollos or Seraphis or Asclepius, the Healer, <u>bought slaves with a price,</u> for freedom."[123]   Therefore when Paul came preaching a spiritual freedom made by Jesus who had paid the price of His own life these people immediately grasp his meaning.

Peter, too, had this same concept of Christ's work. In his first Epistle he states: "For asmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed ($\underline{\stackrel{?}{\epsilon}\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\theta\eta\tau\epsilon}$) with corruptible things as silver and gold....but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without spot." I Pet. 1, 18-19. The writer to the Hebrews, whoever he may have been, concurs in the use of this concept. "....by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption ($\underline{\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\tau\rho\omega\sigma\iota\nu}$) for us." Heb. 9, 12. John, the Beloved Disciple, who was undoubtedly present on occasions when Jesus employed the word <u>lutron</u>, views the ransom

---

123. Deissmann, A. op. cit. p. 328

as paid and the saints already perfected in heaven: "....
thou (Jesus) wast slain, and hast redeemed $\eta\gamma o\rho\alpha\delta\alpha s$ us
to God, by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue and
people and nation." Rev. 5, 9. N. T. passages could be
multiplied indefinitely to show that $\alpha\pi o\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\omega\sigma\iota s$ and
$\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\omega\sigma\iota s$ are connected with lutron and echo the word
used by Christ in Matt. 20, 28 and Mk. 10, 45. "No subtlety
of interpretation can rid such passages of their implica-
tion of ransoming."[124]

Thus, the concept of a ransoming paid by Jesus with
His life is clearly set before us in both the Gospels and
Epistles of the New Testament. The question arises "Why did
God demand the death of Jesus for the freedom of many?"
Why could God not have freed them without such a ransom
price? Could God not have found some other way to redeem
mankind? The texts before us for consideration do not an-
swer these questions. We do well, however, to note the at-
titude Jesus maintained toward the "work" which the Father
had sent Him to do.

> "Diese Worte Jesu entschleiern nirgends die letz-
> ten Gruende fuer Gottes Verfahren mit seinem Sohne,
> zeigen vielmehr den Sohn bereit, sich unter Gottes
> Willen zu beugen, ihn zu ehren, ja sich ihm aufzuop-
> fern, auch wenn die Gruende fuer Gottes Willen nicht
> offenbar sind. (cf. Mt. 11, 25. 26; Mk. 13, 32; 14,

---

124. Warfield, B. B. op. cit. p. 361.

35. 36; 15, 34). Diese voellige Unterwerfung unter
Gottes Willen gehoert unaufgebbar zum Gottesdienst Je-
su. Gott ist fuer Jesus niemanden, auch seinem Sohne
nicht, eine Offenbarung seiner Grunde, geschweige ei-
ne Rechtfertigung seines Handelns und Verlangens
Schuldig."[125]

Everything that God wills and does, Scripture tells us He

does for holy, righteous and all-wise reasons. What these

reasons are, God does not always give to man. Man with his

finite mind can fathom the mind of God only when God re-

veals His reason to man and in so far as God makes them

clear to him. We are told in these passages (Matt. 20, 28

and Mk. 10, 45) that the death of Jesus is a service to God,

a substitution for many, on the basis of which the many are

free from their sins. The "Whys" we must leave to the love

of God which, though we see but darkly, we shall understand

perfectly in the light of eternity.

To complete the discussion of the ransom concept in-

volved with lutron we must consider the questions: "From

what were the many redeemed? and, "To whom was the ransom

paid?"

Neither Matt. 20, 28 nor Mk. 10, 45 tells us from what

Jesus redeemed the many. To answer this questionwe must re-

fer to parallel passages which enlarge upon this subject.

Since all doctrines of the Scripture are a "corpus doctri-

nae", a unified whole, we can be certain that an answer

drawn from these parallels will reveal God's answer. The

---

125. Kittel, op. cit. p. 346.

reader will recall that in the first section of this paper
we pointed out how lutron in the LXX is often translated
for the Hebrew פָּדָה which usually refers to payments
required under the Law to secure the release of persons
from slavery. The New Testament continues this usage when
it teaches that Jesus gave His life as a ransom price by
which He redeemed His disciples from bondage. Wherein did
this bondage consist? In answer we think of all those
statements of Scripture which speak of sin as slavery and
sinners as slaves. Take, for instance, Jesus' own state-
ment: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, whosoever commit-
teth sin is the servant of sin." (Jn. 8, 34) Or, in Rom.
6, 17 "....ye were the servants of sin." Peter states this
same idea very clearly: "....they themselves are the ser-
vants of corruption; for of whom a man is overcome, of the
same is he brought in bondage." When a man commits sin,
he becomes the slave of sin. From this slavery Jesus ran-
somed His followers. "If the Son shall make you free, ye
shall be free indeed." Jn. 8, 36.

When Paul describes deliverance from sin and the ces-
sation of bondage to sin he uses, as mentioned previously,
his characteristic word is ἀπολύτρωσις. The use of
the prepositional prefix ἀπο- is significant here be-
cause it stresses that we are redeemed "away from" some
state of misery or danger. From the parallels above we
see Jesus' redemption can be none other than redemption

from the guilt of sin. Paul himself defines this $\overset{\flat}{a\pi\acute{\omega}}$
when he states in Eph. 1, 7: "In whom (Christ) we have re-
demption through his blood, $\overset{\prime}{\eta}$ $\overset{\prime}{a\varphi\varepsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma}$ $\tau\overset{\frown}{\omega}\nu$ $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\pi\tau\omega\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$
(cf. also Col. 1, 14: $\tau\grave{\eta}\nu$ $\overset{\prime}{a\varphi\varepsilon\sigma\iota\nu}$ $\tau\overset{\frown}{\omega}\nu$ $\overset{\prime}{a\mu\alpha\rho\tau\iota\overset{\frown}{\omega}\nu}$; Rom.
3, 24; Heb. 9, 15; I Cor. 1, 30). Kittel agrees with this
conclusion when he says: "Ebensowenig ist gesagt, wovon die
Vielen frei werden. (That is, in Matt. 20, 28 and Mk. 10,
45) Da fuer Jesus das eigentliche Unglueck der Menschen
stets ihr Getrenntsein von Gott, ihr Verfallensein an Got-
tes Gericht, ihre Suende ist, kann hier keine andere Befrei-
[126]
ung als die von der Suende gemeint sein."

To whom was the ransom paid? Under section I we poin-
ted to the O. T. usage of כֹּפֶר (LXX, 'lutron') which
denotes a gift given as compensation whose purpose is to
cover guilt. In this case the lutron is paid by an offen-
der, either to a man (Ex. 21, 30; Num. 35, 30. 32) or to a
deity in order to save the life which the guilty forfeited
by his wrong doing. In other words, the lutron is a pro-
piatory gift to satisfy the offended. Whom, then, did Je-
sus propitiate when He gave His life a ransom for man? Ob-
viously, not any man as in Ex. 21, 30. Not exegetes to the
knowledge of this author ever offered such an explanation.
The only conclusion we can come to is that the ransom was

---

126. Kittel, op. cit. p. 344.

paid to an offended deity.

This deity is none other than God. This answer is
made perfectly clear in the O. T. (Ps. 49, 7. 8. 15; Job
33, 24) and continued in the N. T. with equal clarity. Je-
sus redeems man from eternal $\alpha\pi\omega\lambda\varepsilon\iota\alpha$ in which they had
the wrath of God abiding upon them (Jn. 3, 36). Moreover,
the N. T. states that men would remain imprisoned (II Cor.
5, 21; I Pet. 2, 24; Col. 1, 14; etc.) in a condition of
hopeless bondage (Heb. 2, 15) if Christ had not expiated to
God the guilt of their sins. "Here (in Mark 10, 45) Jesus
is speaking of a ransom that Jesus has paid, which enables
God to relieve man of the state of punishment which God by
virtue of His righteousness and holiness has to impend over
man."[127]   Of all the authorities the author found on this
subject Kittel states most uniquely and emphatically that
God is the receiver of the lutron offered by Jesus. "Nach
allem Ausgefuehrten kann nicht bezweifelt werden, dasz der
nicht genannte Empfaenger des Loesegelds Gott ist.   Denn
Jesus dient God in seinem Sterben, Gott verlangt das Leiden
von seinem Sohne unerbittlich. Gott schlaegt ihn."[128]
Christ, then rendered satisfaction or paid the ransom to
God because holiness and righteousness are His attributes.

---

127. Weiss, B., The Religion of the N. T. Translated
from the German by Prof. G. H. Schodde. Funk & Wagnalls
Co. N. Y. 1905, p. 229-230.
      128. Kittel, op. cit. p. 345.

Lutheran dogmaticians note that there are not three divine righteousnesses, however, but the one divine righteousness in number belonging to the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. This furnishes us the interesting conclusion that Jesus paid the ransom to Himself. "Inasmuch as Christ rendered the satisfaction He is regarded as the Mediator; inasmuch as He personally also demanded the satisfaction, He is to be regarded as God, as the Giver and Avenger of the Law, who according to His essence is as absolutely righteous as the Father and the Holy Ghost."[129] This statement agrees with II Cor. 5, 19 which states that the One who provides the satisfaction is the same as the One who receives it. "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself ..."

Earlier exegetes were divided on this question of who received the ransom. Anselm upheld the objective theory of satisfaction rendered to God. Abelard, on the other hand, advocated a subjective view of the atonement. According to his view a contemplation of the cross causes us to know God's love, repentance, and to lead a consecrated life. Certain theologians of the early Church, notably Origen and Gregory of Nyssa, gave currency to the view that Satan received the ransom paid by Christ. In his comments on Matt.

129. Baier, Compendium. y. 11, p. 455 quoted in Pieper, F., op. cit. p. 222.

20, 28 Origin denies the possibility that Christ paid His
life as a ransom to God, but suggests the Evil One who
"was our Lord, until the ransom for us was given him, the
life of Jesus." Satan was supposed to have acquired rights
over man through sin. God, who is righteous, Origin thought
could not ignore these just claims of the Devil. Christ's
soul, therefore, was given up to Satan as the price of the
surrender of these assumed rights over mankind. But Satan
was deceived in the bargain, for, although he had the pure
sould of Jesus in his possession, he could not hold it. Je-
sus' sinless soul was a torture to him. He gave it up, but
by this time the many were free. As grotesque as this theo-
ry is, subsequent theologians propounded it. During the
Middle Ages as far down as Bernard and the Schoolmen this
theory held sway as a serious explanation of the redemption.

Those theologians who followed Origin in this theory
made the mistake of adding a rationalistic deduction to a
scriptural truth. The truth is that God with a righteous
judgment delivers sinners into the power of Satan. "To de-
liver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the
flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord
Jesus." I Cor. 5, 5. (Cf. also Heb. 2, 14). The deduc-
tion is that Satan in his person has a right to the sinners
and therefore is in a position to demand a ransom. "The
devil is only the jailer of men through God's infliction,
not their lord and judge, to whom the ransom would have

been due.   Soli deo, non diabolo, <u>lutron</u> persolvendum er-
  130
at."

Kittel also argues very forcefully against the theory
that Satan received the ransom:

"Dasz der Satan der Empfaenger dieses Loesegelds
waere, ist gerade zu ausgeschlossen. Der Satan kommt
in der ganzen Leidengeschichte bei Mark und Matthaeus
nicht vor. Der Satan will das Sterben Jesu so wenig,
dasz er vielmehr Jesus von diesem Wege abzubringen
versucht. Mk. 8, 33; Matt. 16, 23. Mit dem machtvol-
len Gottesgedanken Jesus vertraegt es sich in keiner
Weise, dasz die Vielen aus einer Verhaftung durch den
Satan losegekauft werden mueszten. Er fordert viel-
mehr, dasz sie aus Verhaftung durch Gott losgekauft
werden muessen....Der Gott des loesegeldwortes ist der
von Ps. 90 der die Menschen wieder zu Staub werden
laeszt, von dessen Zorn als Wirklichkeit unseres Da-
seins unser Sterben uns zeugt, mit dem und von dem
man nicht anders reden kann, als 'aus der Tiefe'".
Ps. 130.[131]

III

The etymological study proves that <u>lutron</u> is best un-
derstood in the sense of redemption by paying a ransom.
The Sanscrit base of this word is LÛ, "to cut" or "to clip",
which has the derived meaning, "to set free by cutting a
bond". The primitive Greek base of <u>lutron</u> is $\lambda\acute{u}\epsilon\iota\nu$, "to
loose". The LXX usage of $\lambda\acute{u}\epsilon\iota\nu$ is universally "to lib-
erate a captive person". The classical writers used <u>lutron</u>
in the sense of the ransom paid or to be paid for prison-
ers. Although the classical writers seldom use <u>lutron</u> of a
ransom price paid to a deity, some examples do occur which

130. Quenstedt, quoted by Pieper, F., op. cit. Vol.
II, p. 223.
   131. Kittel, op. cit. p. 345.

makes this New Testament meaning not strange at all. The
translators of the LXX render כֹּפֶר, גָּאַל, and פִּדְיוֹן
with lutron. This shows that they, too, understood lutron
to designate a ransom or redemption, usually from captivi-
ty. We find these words used not only in the figurative
sense, but frequently and quite copiously in a literal
sense. The most common meaning of the papyrii, "ausloese-
geld fuer Pfaender und freilassungsgeld der Sklaven" is
supported by numerous examples in the papyrii, inscriptions,
votive reliefs, etc. Thus we know conclusively that in the
first century lutron suggested the purchase money for man-
umitting slaves, and that the Greeks of Jesus' times who
read lutron must have been conscious of ransoming as a mode
of deliverance from slavery or bondage. The early patris-
tic fathers did not take away the implication of ransoming
in the term lutron, but broadened it to include the entire
plan of salvation.

In Matt. 20, 28 and Mark 10, 45, then, the term lutron
must mean that Jesus, the God-man who united both divine
and human natures in one Person, entered the world as a
"Redeemer". He rendered a "service" which consisted in the
willing offering of Himself as a ransom-price. He climaxed
this service with His death on the cross. When Christ of-
fered His life He was acting as the substitute, not for a
minority of men, but for all men. This ransom, offered as
an expiation to God whose holiness and justice men had of-

fended with sin, freed men from the guilt and punishment
of sin. All the parallel passages which use the deriva-
tives of lutron, particularly those by St. Paul, support
this exegesis.

God has provided a Ransom for us in the person of His
Son. This is a wonderful truth, but the author of this pa-
per is aware of the considerable revolt against every form
of the ransom theory of the atonement. With collosal ar-
rogance some modern exegetes offer numerous objections a-
gainst the divine method of redemption. They sit in judg-
ment upon God's salvation in Christ Jesus, His Son. Christ's
ransom for many, they say, was unnecessary, or unworthy of
God, or ineffectual, or "too juridical". They offer their
own theories of the atonement. Example of this revolt a-
gainst Scripture we find in Hugo Grotius' "Rectoral or Gov-
ernmental Theory" (God mad Christ an example of his vindic-
tive justice to warn men and frighten them from sin); Bush-
nell's "Moral Influence" theory (Christ's mission was to
manifest the seeking love of God for sinners. This love
enters the hearts of men and overcomes their opposition to
God, moves them to repentance, and a return to their Father);
the "Declaratory Theory" of Ritschl, and A. Harnack (God
could forgive sins without a Mediator who paid a ransom.
God "declares", not His wrath, but His love through Christ);
the "Guaranty Theory" and many others.

It is not within the scope of this paper to discuss the

modern antithesis of the Biblical plan of salvation out-
lined in this paper. This study has convinced the author
that "there is the need of continually reverting from human
theories to the original statements in Scripture itself,
which, in their breadth, variety, and fullness, refresh and
satisfy as nothing else can."[132] We know what Jesus meant
when He tells us He "came to give His life a ransom for many".
We do not try to change His meaning, but accept His Word and
trust Him as our Savior. Now we understand better what joy
Luther must have had as he penned the explanation to the
second article: "I believe that Jesus Christ....has redeemed
me a lost and condemned creature, purchased and won me from
all evil, from death and from the power of the devil; not
with gold or silver, but with His holy precious blood and
with His innocent suffering and death...."

---

132. Orr, James, A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels,
II, 483.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALFORD? HENRY, The Greek New Testament, A digest of various readings: marginal references to verbal and idiomatic usage; a critical and exegetical commentary, fifth edition, Cambridge, 1865.

BAUER,D. WALTER-PREUSCHENS, E., Griechish-Deutsches Woerter buch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments, Goettingen, Germany, 1928.

CHARLES, R. H., The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, with introduction and critical and explanatory notes to the several books, 2 Vols., 1913.

CREMER, HERMAN, Biblico-Theological Lexicon of the N. T. Greek, translated by Wm. Urwick, 3rd English Edition with Supplement, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1886.

DAVIDSON, B., A Concordance of the Hebrew and Chaldee Scriptures, London, 1876.

DEISSMANN, ADOLF, Light From the Ancient East, The N. T. illustrated by recently discovered texts of the Graeco-Roman world. Translated by L. R. M. Strachan, N. Y., G. H. Doran Co., 1927.

DeLEVANTE, EDWARD R., The Hexaglot Bible, Comprising the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments in the Original Tongues, 5 Vols., N. Y., Funk-Wagnalls Co., 1906.

ECKHARDT, E., Homiletisches Reallexikon, nebst index Rerum, St. Louis, Success Printing Co, 1908.

EXPOSITOR'S GREEK NEW TESTAMENT, Edited by Nichol, W. Robertson. 5 Vols., Eerdman Pub. Company, Grand Rapids, Mich., n. d.

GESENIUS, WILLIAM, A Hebrew and English Lexicon, translated by Ed. Robinson, Boston and N. Y., Houghton Mifflin Co., 1892.

GOODSPEED, EDGAR, J.-SMITH, J. M. POWERS, The Complete Bible. An American Translation, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1944.

HASTINGS, JAMES, A Dictionary of the Bible, dealing with its language, literature, and contents, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902. New York.

HASTINGS, JAMES, A Dictionary of the Bible, T & T Clark,

Edinburgh, 1914.

HASTINGS, JAMES, A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels,
Charles Scribner's Sons, N. Y. 1917.

HATCH, WILLIAM HENRY PAINE, The Principle Uncial Manu-
scripts of the New Testament, University of Chicago
Press, Chicago, Ill., 1939.

INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPEDIA, Ed. by James
Orr, Howard Severance Co., Chicago, 1915.

JASTROW, MARCUS, Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud
Bible, and Yerushalmi, and the Midraschic Literature,
2 Vols., Title Publishing Co., N. Y. 1943.

KITTEL, GERHARD, Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Tes-
tament, W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, Germany, 1939.

LANGE, JOHN PETER, A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures:
Critical, Doctrinal and Homiletical, with special re-
ference to ministers and students. Translated from
the German, and edited, with additions, original and
selected by Philip Schaff. Revised by William G. T.
Shedd. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914.

LENSKI, R. C. H., The Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gos-
pel, Wartburg Press, 1943.

LIDDELL, HENRY GEO. and SCOTT, ROBERT, A Greek-English Lex-
icon, New Edition revised and augmented by Sir Henry
Stuart Jones and R. McKenzie. Oxford University Press,
1925.

MEYER, H. A. W., Critical and Exegetical Commentary of the
N. T., from the German, with the Sanction of the Au-
thor. Revised and edited by Wm P. Dickson and Wm.
Steward. Part I. Matt. Vol. II. Edinburgh, T. & T
Clark, 1897.

MOFFATT, JAMES, The New Testament, A New Translation, new
edition, revised, Harper Bros., N. Y. and London, 1935.

MOULTON, JAMES HOPE, A Grammar of the N. T. Greek, Vol. I
Prolegomena, 3rd Edition, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark,
1919.

MOULTON, JAMES HOPE and MILLIGAN, GEORGE, The Vocabulary of
the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyrii and Other Non-
literary Sources. London, 1930.

MOULTON, W. F. and GEDEN, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek
N. T., according to the texts of Westcott and Hort, Tis-

ohendorf and the English Revisors, 2nd Edition, T &
T Clark, Edinburgh, 1899.

PREISIGKE, FRIEDRICH, Weerterbuch der grieschischen Papy-
rusurkunden mit Einschusz der grieschischen Inschrift-
en, Aufschriften, Ostraka, Mumienschilder, usw. aus
Aegypten, Band II, Berlin, 1927.

ROBERTSON, A. T., Word Pictures in the N. T., Vol. I Rich-
ard R. Smith, 1930.

ROBERTSON, A. T., A Grammar of the Greek N. T. in the Light
of Historical Research, 2nd Edition, New York, 1914.

SOPHOCLES, E. A., Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine
Periods, (B. C. 146-1100 A. D.), New York, Chas. Scrib-
ner's Sons, 1887.

THAYER, JOSEPH HENRY, Greek-English Lexicon of the New Tes-
tament, being Grimm's Wile's Clavis Novi Testamenti,
Corrected Edition, New York, American Book Co., 1889.

THE NEW COVENANT, The New Sestament of our Lord and Savior
Jesus Christ, Revised Standard Version. Translated
from the Greek. Being the Version set forth A. D. 1611,
revised A. D. 1881 and A. D. 1901, Thomas Nelson and
Sons, New York, 1946.

THE NEW TESTAMENT, of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.
Translated from the Latin Vulgate. A Revision of the
Challoner-Rheims Version, edited by Catholic Scholars
under the patronage of the Episcopal Committee of the
Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. St. Anthony Guild,
New Jersey, 1941.

THE NEW TESTAMENT, A new translation by Ronald Knox, Sheen
and Ward, N. Y., 1945.

THE NEW-SHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE,
edited by S. M. Jackson. Funk Wagnalls, Co. New York,
1911.

TISCHENDORF, CONSTANTINUS, Novum Testamentum Graece, Ad an-
tiquessimos Testes Denuo Recensuit. Apparatum criti-
cum omni studio perfectum, Edition Octava Critica Maior,
Vol. I, Leipsig, 1869.

TRENCH, R. C., Synonymns of the New Testament, with etymo-
logical notes by A. L. Meyhew, London, 1915.

WARFIELD, B. B., "The New Testament Terminology of Redemp-

tion", Princeton Theological Review, (1917) pp. 201-250. This article was also printed in a collection of Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield's Essays under the title "Biblical Doctrines". The Oxford University Press, New York, 1929. The pagination of this thesis will refer to this latter publication.

WEYMOUTH, R. R., The N. T. In Modern Speech, an idiomatic translation into every day English from the text of the resultant Greek Testament. Edited and partly revised by E. Pampden Dook. The Pilgrim Press, Boston, 6th Impression, n. d.

WYCLIFFE, JOHN, The New Testament, the version of 1380 and revised by John Purvey, A. D. 1388. Edited by J. Forshall and Sir. Frederick Madden, Oxford, 1919.

YOUNG, ROBERT, Analytical Concordance to the Bible, 22nd edition American, Revised by Wm. B. Stevenson, Funk Wagnalls Co., N. Y., 1919.

ZAHN, THEODOR, Kommentar Zum Neuen Testament, Band II, Das Evangelium des Markus ausgelegt von Gustave Schlenburg, Leipsig, 1910.