

5-1-1975

Pauline Anthropology: The Old and New Man

Jerry Lee Cripe

APPROVED BY:

Major Professor: Wayne M. Carr

Cooperative Reader: Philip S. Clapp

PAULINE ANTHROPOLOGY: THE OLD AND NEW MAN

A Research Project
Presented to
the Faculty of
Western Evangelical Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts in Religion

by
Jerry Lee Cripe
May 1975

PORTLAND CENTER LIBRARY
GEORGE FOX UNIVERSITY
PORTLAND, OR. 97223

PAULINE ANTHROPOLOGY: THE OLD AND NEW MAN

The purpose of this research project is to determine how the Pauline terms the "old man" and "new man" are to be interpreted and translated. Do these terms refer to the "old self" (unregenerated person) and "new self" (regenerated person), or to the "old race" (as in Adam) and "new race" (as in Christ)? In addition to answering these questions, considerable attention is spent in determining what Paul means in Romans 6:6; that is, whether the crucifixion of the old man refers to the individual believer's conversion (Romans 6:1 ff.) or to the accomplished fact of the provisional universal atonement (Romans 5:12 ff.). Exegesis of Ephesians 4:22-24 and Colossians 3:9,10, likewise, is developed to determine the proper interpretation of the infinitives "put off" (ἀποθέσθαι) and "put on" (ἐνδύσασθαι) and the participles "ye have put off [?] or put off" (ἀπεκδυσάμενοι) and the participles "ye have put on [?] or put on" (ἐνδυσάμενοι). Consideration, also, is given to possible alternate marginal translations of Ephesians 4:22-24, and Colossians 3:9,10 for the benefit of the English reader.

The entire scope of this project is predicated upon having a proper definition of terms. Thus chapter two is devoted to the development of the proper definition of the "old man" and "new man". By means of comparison the corporate significance of these terms is brought to the fore. Hence, the "old

man" and "new man" are understood as the "old race" (as in Adam) and "new race" (as in Christ). The eschatological meaning of the terms the "old man" and "new man" is revealed in chapter three, where it is demonstrated that believers at the moment of conversion are neither all of Christ ("new man", Romans 8:29) nor all of Adam ("old man", Romans 8:10). Thus two forms of co-existence may be experienced by the believer who is both a part of the "old man" (old race) and "new man" (new race). The first is the unavoidable co-existence of the believer's physical, mental, and emotional impairments as the result of sin which until the resurrection are experienced simultaneously with the spiritual nature of the "new man". The second form of co-existence is that both the moral nature of the "old man" and "new man" may simultaneously exist (Romans 6:1 ff.; 6:2,6,12,13). However, this second form of co-existence is dangerous and may be dealt with.

Since the physical nature of the "old man" will continue to exist with the spiritual nature of the "new man" until the resurrection, chapters four and five concern themselves with the second form of co-existence. Chapter four sets forth the writer's reasons for believing that the crucifixion of the "old man" with Christ (Romans 6:6) has reference to the atonement itself rather than to conversion; and that the infinitives (ἀποθέσθαι, ἐνδύσασθαι) in Ephesians 4:22-24 and the participles (ἀπεκδυσάμενοι, ἐνδυσάμενοι) in Colossians 3:9,10 ought to be understood as ethical imperatives to believers (not as historical affirmatives). A theological

rationale is provided in chapter five to test the validity of the exegesis done in chapter four.

In the concluding chapter, the writer expresses his concern over the unliteral and inconsistent translation of the terms the "old man" and the "new man" by the various versions. Likewise, the writer suggests that because of the obvious parallel theological content of Ephesians and Colossians that the infinitives in Ephesians 4:22-24 and the participles in Colossians 3:9,10 ought to be translated uniformly (whether as imperative or affirmative). Additional suggestions are also made concerning the advisability of the standard versions such as the R.S.V., N.A.S.B., etc. furnishing alternate marginal translations for the benefit of those understanding only the English translation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. THE OLD AND NEW MAN DEFINED	3
THE "OLD MAN" AND "NEW MAN" COMPARED	3
THE "OLD MAN" AND "NEW MAN" CONTRASTED	6
SUMMARY	8
3. THE "OLD MAN" AND "NEW MAN" IN PARTIAL CO-EXISTENCE	9
4. EXEGESIS OF ROMANS 6:6; EPHESIANS 4:22-24; AND COLOSSIANS 3:9,10	12
EXEGESIS OF ROMANS 6:6	12
EXEGESIS OF EPHESIANS 4:22-24	17
EXEGESIS OF COLOSSIANS 3:9,10	23
5. A THEOLOGICAL RATIONALE FOR THE IMPERATIVE	31
SYNONYMITY OF THE "OLD MAN" AND "FLESH"	31
Table 1: The "Old Man" and the "Flesh"	32
SYNONYMITY OF THE "NEW MAN" AND "SPIRIT"	37
Table 2: The "New Man" and the "Spirit"	39
6. COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS	41
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	46
APPENDIX A	49

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The problems posed for this research are (1) the determination of the right definitions of Paul's terms the "old man" and "new man," and (2) a careful analysis of the verbs associated with these terms (Romans 6:6; Ephesians 4:22-24; and Colossians 3:9,10). Do these terms the "old man" and "new man" refer to the "old self" (unregenerate person) and "new self" (regenerate person), or to the "old race" (as in Adam) and "new race" (as in Christ)? How are the aorist infinitives (ἀποθέσθαι, ἐνδύσασθαι, Ephesians 4:22, 24) and aorist participles (ἀπεκδυσάμενοι, ἐνδυσάμενοι, Colossians 3:9,10) to be interpreted and translated? Should alternate marginal translations of these infinitives and participles have been placed in the major translations such as the A.S.V., N.A.S.B., and R.S.V.? What does Paul mean by the affirmation, "our old man was crucified with him" (Romans 6:6)?

The method of investigation will be inductive and exegetical. Therefore a conscious effort will be made to avoid dependence on word studies, commentaries, and theological writings of others. Works of this nature will be considered secondary sources. They will be cited only if they are deemed appropriate either in clarifying a problem to be

investigated, or in supportive amplification of the writer's independent findings. The basic tools to be employed in this research will be the Bible and concordances. The English biblical text employed will be the 1901 American Standard Version, while the Greek text will be that jointly published by the United Bible Societies. The principal reason for choosing the 1901 American Standard Version as the English text is its consistent and literal translation of the terms "old man" and "new man" in all texts where they occur. The standard concordances to be employed will be Moulton and Geden's A Concordance to the Greek New Testament, and Hatch and Redpath's A Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament. Arndt and Gingrich's A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, Liddell and Scott's A Greek-English Lexicon, and Barclay Newman's A Concise Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament will be consulted for word meanings. For the writer's present purposes, Kittel's Theological Dictionary of the New Testament will be regarded not as a lexical source, but as a theological work of importance (by virtue of the varying opinions of the different contributors) and a secondary source. It should be noted that this research will attempt to develop only these areas directly related to the stated questions of this introductory chapter.

Chapter 2

THE OLD MAN AND NEW MAN DEFINED

In order to follow a logical course in the study of the "old man" and "new man" it will be necessary to define these terms inductively. The total development of this research necessarily will follow from these definitions.

Any study of the "old man" and "new man" must be carried out not only individually, but also in comparison and contrast with each other. Any attempt to study them separately and independently of each other will leave out at least some important details of definition.

THE "OLD MAN" AND "NEW MAN" COMPARED

The outstanding point of comparison between these terms is that both have corporate as well as individual significance. That the "old man" is a corporate term is hinted at in Romans 6:6 where Paul refers to the "old man" as "our old man". But this, in itself, is not sufficient evidence for interpreting the "old man" as a corporate term. It may, however, be clearly demonstrated by a comparison with its counterpart the "new man". In several related passages in which the "new man" is in view, it is obvious that the "new man" is a corporate term.

But now in Christ Jesus ye that once were far off are made nigh in the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who made both one, and brake down the middle wall of partition, having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; that he might create in himself of the two one new man, . . . (Ephesians 2:13-15).

. . . the new man, that is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him: where there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman; but Christ is all, and in all (Colossians 3:10,11).

For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye all are one man in Christ Jesus (Galatians 3:27,28).

From these scripture passages it is evident that the "new man" refers to a new humanity, a new race, in which there can be no division, racial or religious. In the "new man" the Jew and Gentile are made "one new man". Therefore the "new man" is a corporate term which legitimately could be translated the "new race". It thus follows that if the "new man" is a corporate term, so also is the "old man".

In support of this view we quote the remarks of C.K. Barrett, who has written:

The interpretation which commends itself by its simplicity is that the "old man" is the nature of the unconverted man, which upon conversion and baptism is replaced by a new nature, the "new man". But careful reading of Col. iii, and of the present passage, makes this interpretation impossible. . . It is much more exact to say that the "old man" is Adam--or rather, ourselves in union with Adam, and that the "new man" is Christ--or rather, ourselves in union with Christ.¹

¹C.K. Barrett, "The Epistle to the Romans," Harper's New Testament Commentaries (New York: Harper and Row, 1957), p. 125.

Since, therefore, the "old man" and "new man" are corporate terms, they must be regarded as terms which are broader in definition than any individual unbeliever or believer. Consequently, it is inadequate to translate them either as the "old nature" and "new nature", or as the "old self" and "new self" as many translations have done. Such translations fall short of the full truth of Paul's message. An example of the failure of translating the "old man" as the "old self" is exemplified by the R.S.V. in Romans 6:6. In this text it would be more exact to translate the "old man" as the "old race" rather than as the "old self". An individual may be part of the "old man" or "new man"; but these terms refer to the whole of the old and new races and not to the individual members of such. The only individuals who may be referred to uniquely as the "old man" and "new man" are Adam and Christ (Romans 5:12-6:11; I Corinthians 15:45-49). Adam and all those in him with all of their fallenness represent the "old man", and Christ and all those in him represent the "new man". Dr. William Greathouse expresses it this way:

Christ's death was "potentially the dying of the whole human race, just as his resurrection was potentially the re-creation of all mankind."

In Adam, that is, in their solidarity with fallen humanity in its sinfulness, all must die; but in Christ, that is, through incorporation into the redeemed humanity of the body of Christ, all are made alive (5:12-6:11). In Christ's death on Calvary the whole human race died, because Christ is the representative Man: "one died for all, therefore all died" (II Corinthians 5:14, NASB; the latter clause is ara hoi pantes apethanon).

In Christ's resurrection the new man was created
(Ephesians 2:15; Colossians 3:9-11).²

Corporateness, then, is an essential part of the definition of these terms. This must always be kept in view.

THE "OLD MAN" AND "NEW MAN" CONTRASTED

It is not difficult to contrast the "old man" and "new man". The very adjectives, old and new, which modify the noun, man, are in as striking a contrast as black and white, night and day. In reality, the spiritual contrast between the "old man" and the "new man", if possible, even exceeds that between black and white.

Paul's references to the "old man" refer to nothing less than to our total fallen Adamic racial condition (Romans 5:12-21; 8:10,11,18-23) which is caused by sin (Romans 3:9; 5:12; 6:6; 8:10). The "old man" is described in Ephesians 4:22 as the "old man, that waxeth corrupt after the lusts of deceit." Deceit (ἀπάτη) is obviously a synonym for sin (ἁμαρτία); and the entire phrase "the lusts of deceit (τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης)" appears synonymous with the phrase, "the sinful passions (τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν)" in Romans 7:5.³

²William Greathouse, "The Epistle to the Romans," Beacon Bible Commentary, ed. A.F. Harper, VIII (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1968), pp. 133-34. The quotation is taken from Alan Richardson's An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958), p. 35.

³Cf. also Colossians 3:9, "the old man with his doings (τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ); and Galatians 5:19, "the works of the flesh (τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός)."

Thus the moral character of the "old man" is that of sin.

In sharp contrast to the "old man" of sin (ἁμαρτία) is the "new man" of righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) and holiness (ὁσιότης). In contrast to the image (εἰκὼν) of the "old man" (Adam, I Corinthians 15:49) is the glorious image of the "new man" (Christ, Colossians 3:10; Romans 8:29; II Corinthians 3:18). Alan Richardson writes:

. . . the sense of having been re-made in Christ pervades the NT writings. The Christian is a new creation (II Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15); he walks in newness of life (Rom. 6:4) and serves in newness of spirit (Rom. 7:6); his "inward man" is renewed day by day (II Cor. 4:16); his mind is renewed (Rom. 12:2): in short, he is recreated in the original image of the Creator (Col. 3:10). Jew and Gentile have become one new man in Christ (Eph. 2:15; Gal. 3:28).⁴

This entire picture of contrast between the "old man" and "new man" may be summed up in the relationship of Christ to both. The "old man" was crucified with Christ (συνεσταυρώθη, Romans 6:6). The "new man" was created by him (κτίσθαι Ephesians 2:15; κτισθέντα Ephesians 4:24; κτίσαντος Colossians 3:10). The aorist tense of these verbs denotes the completion of redemption from the standpoint of divine omniscience and in relationship to the finished work of Christ himself.

⁴Alan Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament (New York: Harper and Row, 1952), p. 35.

SUMMARY

In summation then, the "old man" must be understood corporately as the old race, and not as the old nature or old self. The "old man" refers not to an individual's former unregenerate self merely, but also to his identity with the old race in its entirety. The danger in translation is done by substituting the part for the whole, the individual for the race. The "old man" refers to the total, immediate, and cumulative effect of the Fall upon the whole man (racially and individually). The "old man" has reference to the disorientation of man in every aspect of his being which is the result of both sin (Romans 5:12-6:23) and sins (Rom. 7:15-20).

The "new man" refers to the new race, and to what man can be in Christ. The "new man" is the total erasure of every defect of the "old man". This redemptive process begins in conversion (II Corinthians 5:17) and is completed in the resurrection (I Corinthians 15:49-57).⁵

Thus it must ever be kept in mind that the terms, "old man" and "new man" refer to the total fallenness (the spiritual and physical consequences of sin) of the race in Adam, and to the consummate redemption (spiritual and physical) of all those who are in Christ.

⁵It should be noted that the resurrection deals with the physical defects caused by sin (Romans 8:10). I Corinthians 15:49-57 also speaks in reference to a physical transformation.

Chapter 3

THE "OLD MAN" AND "NEW MAN"

IN PARTIAL CO-EXISTENCE

The aorist tense is used of the relationship of Christ to the "new man" (ἡτιθέμενος, Ephesians 4:24; ἡτίσαντος, Colossians 3:10) and the "old man" (συνεσταυρώθη, Romans 6:6) because in him the work of redemption is complete (Colossians 2:10). The present tense, however is used of the believer's relationship to the "old man" and "new man". This indicates that in us the redemptive process (ἀνανεοῦσθαι "be renewed", Ephesians 4:23; ἀνακαίνουμενον "being renewed", Colossians 3:10) is not yet complete. The word, renew (ἀνακαίνω, II Corinthians 4:16; Colossians 3:10; ἀνανεόω, Ephesians 4:23), is always used in the present tense, denoting a process. The noun form (ἀνακαίνωσις, Romans 12:2; Titus 3:5) with the -σις ending also denotes process. We are "being renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him" (Colossians 3:10). Likewise:

. . . we all, with unveiled face beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed (μεταμορφούμεθα "are being changed", R.S.V.) into the same image from glory to glory . . . (II Corinthians 3:18).

Thus, the "new man" is in process in believers, but in the resurrected Christ is the manifested ultimate "new man" (Romans 8:29; I Corinthians 15:47-49; and Philippians 3:21).

It is this change of tense (the aorist as it relates to Christ, the present in reference to the believer) which suggests the co-existence of the "old man" and "new man" in the life of the believer. At present, those who have the firstfruits of the Spirit (Romans 8:10,11,23) are neither all of Christ (Romans 8:29) nor all of Adam (Romans 8:10). This co-existence may be manifested in two forms in this present life.

First, if the "old man" is defined as our fallen Adamic racial condition, consideration must be given to the physical results of sin. It is clearly evident that in the physical realm the "old man" has not yet been superseded by the "new man" (Romans 8:10,18-23). Thus the "old man" with regard to the universally inherent physical defects of sin co-exists with the spiritual nature of the "new man". Evidence of this may be seen in II Corinthians 4:16 where Paul writes:

. . . though our outward man is decaying (διαφθείρεται, cf. Ephesians 4:22, τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν φθειρόμενον), yet our inward man is renewed (ἀνακαίνουται, cf. Colossians 3:10, τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακαίνουμένον) day by day.

The second form of co-existence possible, is the co-existence of the "old man" and "new man" in the moral nature of man. Though "old man", as Paul uses the term, is broader in scope than sin (the "old man" encompasses the results of sin), yet sin itself is the moral nature of the "old man". It is this particular form of co-existence of the "old man" and "new man" that so concerned Paul in the lives of the believers. Unmistakeably Paul teaches that sin may reside in the heart

of the justified man (Romans 5:1; 6:1-23; Galatians 5:17); and this is so in spite of the fact that "if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature" (II Corinthians 5:17), and "as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ" (Galatians 3:27). The fact remains that for Paul the believer may still have the moral nature of the "old man" (sin, Romans 6:2,6) while at the same time possessing the spiritual nature of the "new man" (righteousness, Romans 6:12,13,18,19; cf. Ephesians 4:24).

This brief statement concerning the co-existence of the "old man" and "new man" sets the stage for our next chapter, which is the consideration of the proper exegesis of the Scripture passages in which these terms are found. If indeed the "old man" may, and in the physical sense must co-exist with the "new man" until our resurrection, how then are we to interpret the passages such as Ephesians 4:22-24, and Colossians 3:9,10? If we treat them as imperatives, in what sense are we exhorted to put off the "old man"? If we treat them as affirmatives, it is obvious that this transaction, though stated affirmatively, is not complete. In what sense then is the "old man" put off and the "new man" put on? What then of Romans 6:6 which speaks of the crucifixion of the "old man"? Does this refer to the believer's conversion, or to the atonement itself?

Chapter 4

EXEGESIS OF ROMANS 6:6;

EPHESIANS 4:22-24; AND

COLOSSIANS 3:9,10

In this phase of the study, it will be our primary concern (having previously defined the terms, "old man" and "new man") to determine: (1) whether Romans 6:6 refers to the crucifixion of the "old man" as the believer's conversion experience, or to the atonement at Christ's passion; (2) whether in Ephesians 4:22-24 the infinitives (ἀποθέσθαι, ἐνδύσασθαι) are affirmative ("that ye did put off . . . and put on") or imperative ("put off . . . and put on"); and (3) whether, also, in Colossians 3:9,10 the participles (ἀπεκδυσάμενοι, ἐνδυσάμενοι) are affirmative ("having put off . . . and having put on") or imperative ("putting off . . . and putting on"). The chapter will proceed according to the arrangement of the chapter title, first with the exegesis of Romans 6:6, then with that of Ephesians 4:22-24, and then with that of Colossians 3:9,10.

EXEGESIS OF ROMANS 6:6

Our purpose in the exegesis of Romans 6:6 is to determine whether, when Paul speaks of "our old man" as being "crucified with him", he is referring to the believers' con-

version experience (which is referred to in the chapter, Romans 6:1-8 ff.), or to the atonement for the race (Romans 5:12-21). If it can be established that Paul is referring to the conversion experience, then obviously the argument that the infinitives (Ephesians 4:22-24) and participles (Colossians 3:9,10) are affirmative is much stronger. On the other hand, if it can be established that Paul has reference to the atonement at the time of Christ's crucifixion, the question of affirmation or command in Ephesians 4:22-24 and Colossians 3:9,10 remains an open question.

The argument that the phrase, "our old man was crucified with him", has reference to the conversion experience of believers' may be based partially upon the proposition that "we (-μεν) of Romans 6:1-8 is thought to be the equivalent of the "our" in the expression "our old man" (ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος). Likewise, the preposition "with" (σύν) which indicates the "we . . . with" union to Christ (συνετάφημεν, 6:4; σύμφυτοι, 6:5; ἀπεθάνομεν σύν Χριστῷ . . . συζήσομεν, 6:8) is also found in relation to "our old man" which "was crucified with him" (συνεσταυρώθη, 6:6). Additionally, it may be thought that since the aorist tense is used to denote the crisis of the believers' conversion in the expressions "we . . . died to sin" (ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, 6:2), "we who were baptized into Christ Jesus" (ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, 6:3), etc., throughout Romans 6:1-8 ff., that similarly, the aorist expression "was crucified" (συνεσταυρώθη) is used to point back to the believers' conversion.

However, it does not necessarily follow from these reasons that the expression "our old man was crucified with him" refers to the conversion experience. Indeed, for the following reasons, it is this writer's opinion that the phrase "our old man was crucified with him" in Romans 6:6 does not refer to the believer's conversion or baptismal experience, but to the provisional and universal atonement previously outlined in Romans 5:12-21.

1. The term the "old man" is bigger in scope than either the "we" or the "our" of Romans 6:1-8. It is a universal term referring to the old race (not just to the Roman believers' former way of life), and therefore necessarily to the provisional and universal atonement outlined in Romans 5:12-21.

2. That expression, "our old man was crucified with him" is referring to conversion may be doubted when the word, "was crucified with" (συνεσταυρώθη) is put in perspective with the verbs "hath been created" (κτισθέντα) in Ephesians 4:22, and "created" (κτίσαντος) in Colossians 3:10 (in relation to the "new man"). As we have previously commented in chapter two, the aorist tense of these verbs (συνεσταυρώω and κτίζω in relation to the "old man" and the "new man") denote the completion of redemption from the standpoint of divine omniscience and in relationship to the finished work of Christ. This may be clearly demonstrated because Paul uses only the present progressive tense in referring to the believer's relationship to the "new man" (τὸν νέον) that is being renewed (τὸν ἀνακαλνύμενον) in Colossians 3:10. In Christ the "new man" is created in total perfection, "the image of him that created him" (εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν, cf. I Corinthians 15:49); while in the believer the "new man" is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him" (τὸν ἀνακαλνύμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν).

3. Against a referral to the conversion experience is the fact that in the expression, "our old man was crucified with him", Paul is referring to objective truth, not subjective personal experience. Compare the following expressions.

. . . knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be done away, that so we should no longer be in bondage to sin . . . (Romans 6:6).

. . . knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him, For the death that he died, he died unto sin once: but the life that he liveth, he liveth unto God (Romans 6:9,10).

From this comparison it is evident that Romans 6:9,10 is simply a repetition of Romans 6:6 and relates not to the believers subjective experience, but to the objective facts of Christ's resurrection. To be noted is Paul's instruction to the believers concerning the purpose of the crucifixion of the "old man". It is that "the body of sin might be done away, that so we should no longer be in bondage to sin." If indeed, then, this purpose had been fulfilled at the time of conversion the following question and exhortations are superfluous.

. . . Shall we continue in sin . . . ? (Romans 6:1).

Even so reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus (Romans 6:11).

Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey the lusts thereof: neither present your members unto sin . . . (Romans 6:12,13).

4. The word "crucified with" (συνεσταυρώθη, Romans 6:6), and the similar expressions found in Galatians 2:20; 5:24; and 6:14 are not used in reference to the believer's conversion experience alone, but to the believer's fullest possible identity with the redemption of the cross. In Romans 6:6 Paul is not referring to the believer's subjective experience, but rather to the objective content of his preaching.

. . . we preach Christ crucified . . . (I Corinthians 1:23).

For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified (I Corinthians 2:2).

Indeed, when Paul does refer to the believer's own subjective experience by the use of the word "crucify" (συνεσταυρόω, σταυρόω) as he does in Galatians, he is not referring simply to conversion, but to a total and settled identification with the cross (Galatians 6:14), the atonement, which symbolizes the truth that "our old man was

crucified with him." For by the cross (I Corinthians 1:18, 22-24,30), Christ is "made unto us wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification, and redemption" so that Paul might exclaim:

I have been crucified with Christ (συνεσταύρωμαι); and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me: and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me (Galatians 2:20).

Certainly, this total identification with the work of the cross of which Paul could speak was not the experience of all the Galatian converts. Paul must chasten them:

O foolish Galatians . . . Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit are ye now perfected in the flesh? (Galatians 3:1-3).

and exhort them:

And they that are of Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with the passions and lusts thereof (Galatians 5:24).

Obviously, this "crucified" experience is not yet that of all the Galatian believers (Galatians 3:3; 5:16-24,25).

Therefore, when the word crucify is used in relation to the believer's own subjective experience it does not refer to his conversion. Thus, the crucifixion spoken of in Romans 6:6 does not refer to conversion, but to the objective fact of the accomplished atonement (Romans 5:12-21).

We conclude this section with the comments of H.C.G. Moule on Romans 6:6 written in the Expositor's Bible:

This knowing, that our old man, our old state, as out of Christ and under Adam's headship, under guilt and in moral bondage was crucified with Christ, was as it were nailed to his atoning Cross, where He represented us. In other words, He on the cross, our Head and Sacrifice, so dealt with our fallen state for us, that the body of sin, this our own body viewed as sin's stronghold, medium, vehicle, might be cancelled, . . .¹

¹H.C.G. Moule, "The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans", The Expositor's Bible, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll (6th ed.; New York: Hodder and Stoughton, [n.d.]), pp. 164-165.

EXEGESIS OF EPHESIANS 4:22-24

In Ephesians 4:22-24, we are concerned primarily with the problem of the interpretation of the two Greek infinitives ἀποθέσθαι and ἐνδύσασθαι. Are they to be interpreted as statements of fact (that "ye did put away" and "ye did put on"), or as imperative in meaning ("put away" and "put on")? The problem is well stated by Willard Taylor in his comments on this Ephesian passage in the Beacon Bible Commentary.

Each of verses 22-24 is introduced with an infinitive, the translation of which can be variable. The KJV appears to translate them in a simple declarative mode with the use of the conjunction that. Salmond says of the infinitive, "it has something of the force of the imperative, but is not to be taken as the same as the imperative."

An important question is raised as a result of this grammatical problem. Is the apostle simply asserting that when they came to know Christ in saving grace they had at that time put off the old man and put on the new man? Or is he exhorting them to engage in a spiritual activity which is subsequent to that initial experience? Are the putting off, the renewing, and the putting on spiritual exercises to which the newly born must give themselves? The answer is decided by the way one interprets the infinitives. In this case the grammatical construction is not decisive. The interpreter therefore must rely on the context and the related teaching of the entire New Testament . . .²

Thus, the task before us is to examine more comprehensively the Ephesian context and New Testament theology (particularly Paul's).

²Willard H. Taylor, "The Epistle to the Ephesians", Beacon Bible Commentary, ed. A.F. Harper, IX (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1965), pp. 217-218.

In reference to context, it should be observed that Ephesians 4:22-24 is in an exhortatory section of Ephesians. Beginning at 4:1 and continuing through 6:20, Paul exhorts the Ephesians in regard to their Christian walk. The fact that these infinitives (ἀποθέσθαι and ἐνδύσασθαι) are in this exhortatory section strengthens the possibility of considering them imperative in force.

However, a matter of important consideration and difference of opinion arises in regard to which verb in the context is the leading verb of these infinitives. Is it "I say" (λέγω) in 4:17 as Bengel asserts?

That ye put off--This word depends on I say, verse 17: and thence the force of the participle. Henceforth-not--Is resumed as it were, after a parenthesis, without a conjunction, in the equivalent verb, put off: for the reverse of those things, mentioned in verse 18,19, has already been disposed of in verse 20,21; and yet this verb put off, has some relation to the words immediately preceding verse 21, (This is wrong; that ye put off, depends on have been taught, ver. 21. Alf.). Putting on, ver. 24, is directly opposed to putting off.³

Or is it the "ye were taught" (ἐδιδάχθητε) in 4:21 as Alford proposes?

. . . the infinitive depends on ἐδιδάχθητε [not on λέγω, ver. 17, as Bengel and Stier] . . .⁴

³John Albert Bengel, New Testament Word Studies, trans. by Charleton T. Lewis and Marvin Vincent, II (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1971), p. 408.

⁴Henry Alford, The Greek New Testament, III (4th ed.; London: Rivingtons, 1865), p. 123.

If ἀποθέσθαι and ἐνδύσασθαι are attached to "I say" (λέγω) in 4:17, then it must be determined how the present active infinitive "walk" (περιπατεῖν), which is also attached to λέγω is to be interpreted. Is it an affirmation or an imperative (as either seems possible) in the N.A.S.B. translation?

This I say therefore, and affirm together with the Lord, that you walk no longer just as the Gentiles also walk, in the futility of their mind . . . (Ephesians 4:17).

Or is it a strong imperative as the R.S.V. interprets it?

Now this I affirm and testify in the Lord, that you must no longer live as the Gentiles do, in the futility of their minds; . . .

For the following reasons, the writer understands περιπατεῖν to be imperative in nature.

1. It closely parallels 4:1 in content and form which clearly is imperative in meaning.

I therefore, the prisoner in the Lord, beseech you to walk (περιπατήσαί) worthily of the calling wherewith ye were called . . . (Ephesians 4:1).

This I say therefore, and testify in the Lord, that ye no longer walk (περιπατεῖν) as the Gentiles also walk, in the vanity of their mind . . . (Ephesians 4:17).

2. The imperative sense is in better harmony with the more usual usage of the word "walk" (περιπατέω) as it is used in Ephesians (particularly in the exhortatory section).

. . . created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God afore prepared that we should walk in them (ἵνα . . . περιπατήσωμεν) (Ephesians 2:10).

. . . walk in love (περιπατεῖτε ἐν ἀγάπῃ) . . . (Ephesians 5:2).

. . . for ye were once darkness, but are now light in the Lord: walk as children of light (ὡς τέκνα φωτός περιπατεῖτε) . . . (Ephesians 5:8).

Look therefore carefully how ye walk
(περιπατεῖτε) . . . (Ephesians 5:15).

3. It is characteristic for Paul to warn Christians to walk worthily in contrast to their past life or pagan environment (Galatians 5:16; Colossians 1:10; 2:6; 4:5; I Thessalonians 2:12; cf. I Peter 4:1-3, and I John 2:6).

4. The use of the adverb of time "no longer" (μηκέτι) found in Ephesians 4:14, 28 tends to confirm the sense as imperative. In 4:14 and 4:28 this adverb emphasizes that the Ephesians in the future are not to be marked by an unsettled faith or a reversion to theft. In effect μηκέτι speaks in terms of prohibition with regard to the future in place of μή (not). If this were a statement of affirmation we would expect to see οὐκέτι (as in Mark 12:34; John 21:6; and Ephesians 2:19).

Hence, there is strong presumptive evidence that the infinitives in 4:22,24 (ἀποθέσθαι and ἐνδύσασθαι) are imperative in meaning if attached to the "I say" in 4:17.

Some hold with Alford that ἀποθέσθαι and ἐνδύσασθαι should be attached to the "ye were taught" (ἐδιδάχθητε) of 4:21 as "the substance of the teaching".⁴ But even if so, the question still remains: Are ἀποθέσθαι and ἐνδύσασθαι affirmative or imperative? If they are affirmative, the Ephesians were instructed about their conversion. If ἀποθέσθαι and ἐνδύσασθαι are imperative, the Ephesians were instructed that subsequent to their conversion they were to put off the "old

⁴Alfred Barry, "The Epistles to the Ephesians, Philip-
pians, and Colossians", A New Testament Commentary: for
English Readers, ed. Charles J. Ellicott, III (New York:
Cassel and Co., 1884), p. 43.; Henry Alford, The Greek New
Testament, III (4th ed.; London: Rivingtons, 1865), p. 123.;
and S.P.F. Salmond, "The Epistle to the Ephesians",
Expositor's Greek Testament, ed. W.R. Nicoll, III (Grand
Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., [n.d.]), p. 342.

man" and to put on the "new man". Either interpretation is possible (see Galatians 3:27 in comparison with Romans 13:14)⁵ if (ἐδιδάχθητε) "ye were taught" is the leading verb of ἀποθέσθαι and ἐνδύσασθαι.

However, it seems more likely in the opinion of this writer that Bengel is correct in asserting that "I say" (λέγω) in 4:17 is the leading verb. In either case, it is the view of this writer that ἀποθέσθαι and ἐνδύσασθαι are to be interpreted as imperative for the following reasons.

1. ἀποθέσθαι and ἐνδύσασθαι correspond well with the other infinitives in chapters 4 and 5 which are imperative in sense: to walk (περιπατῆσαι), 4:1; to keep (τηρεῖν), 4:3; to walk (περιπατεῖν), 4:17; and to love (ἀγαπᾶν), 5:28. Indeed, it is not uncommon for Paul to use the infinitive for an imperative. This is particularly true in exhortatory sections of his epistles. Note Romans 12:1 (παραστήσαι); 12:3 (ὑπερφρονεῖν, φρονεῖν, σωφρονεῖν); and 12:15 (χαίρειν, κλαίειν).⁶ For other

⁵"The original may be interpreted either of the teaching of a fact, 'that ye did put off . . . and are being renewed', and c., or of a duty, 'that ye put off . . . and be renewed.' The latter is on the whole, the more probable . . ." Charles J. Ellicott (ed.), Ellicott's Commentary on the Whole Bible, VIII (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1970), p. 43.

⁶" . . . The thing which has now occurred to me, after a careful reading of Romans 12, is that Paul seems to use participles, infinitives, imperatives, and just plain adjectives, all with the same thrust of command or exhortation. . . ." Personal correspondence from Dr. Philip S. Clapp, Professor of New Testament Greek, Western Evangelical Seminary, Portland, Oregon, to the author, January 7, 1974. See also A.T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament: in the Light of Historical Research (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), p. 944.

Pauline usages of the infinitives with an imperative sense see Philippians 3:16 (στοιχεῖν); II Timothy 2:14 (μὴ λογομαχεῖν); Titus 2:9 (ὑποτάσσεσθαι); II Thesalonians 3:14 (μὴ συναναμίσγυσθαι).⁷

2. In all of Paul's other usages of ἀποτίθημι, it is with an imperative or exhortative sense.

. . . let us therefore cast off (ἀποθώμεθα) the works of darkness, and let us put on (ἐνδυσώμεθα) the armor of light (Romans 13:12).

Wherefore, putting away (ἀποθέμενοι) falsehood (Ephesians 4:25).

. . . but now do ye also put them all away (ἀπόθεσθε, Colossians 3:8; cf. 3:12 ἐνδύσασθε).

So also there is a general imperative usage of ἀποτίθημι in the other New Testament epistles where the participle form ἀποθέμενοι is used (Hebrews 12:1; James 1:21; and I Peter 2:1). The only other usages found in the New Testament (Matthew 14:3; Acts 7:58) are exceptions to this general imperative sense. But they are in the indicative mood and located in narrative sections of the New Testament. Outside of these instances, all other usages of ἀποτίθημι (with the possible exception of ἀποθέσθαι which is under consideration) are imperative in sense. Thus, if ἀποθέσθαι, (which is found only once in the entire New Testament, and not at all in the Septuagint)⁸ is not imperative, it is indeed a rare exception to this word's normal imperative usage in the New Testament epistles.

3. Similar to the New Testament imperative usage of ἀποτίθημι, is the general Pauline usage of ἐνδύω. Note that these words are often put in an imperative juxtaposition by Paul (Romans 13:12; Colossians 3:8,12; and also Ephesians 4:22,24 if understood imperatively). Only once (Galatians 3:27) does Paul clearly use ἐνδύω referring to a past event. In no other instance does he use the indicative mood with ἐνδύω. Three times he

⁷Robertson, Ibid., pp. 943,944,1046 and 1047. See also C.F.D. Moule, An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek (2d ed.; Cambridge: University Press, 1971), pp. 126,127.

⁸E. Hatch and H. Redpath, A Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including Apocryphal Books), (3 vols.; Oxford, Clarendon, 1897-1906; 2 vols. photomechanical reprint; Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck--u. Verlagsanstalt, 1954), pp. 148,149.

uses it with the subjunctive mood (Romans 13:12, exhortatory, cf. 13:14, and twice in I Corinthians 15:54, definitively futuritive). Additionally, Paul uses this same infinitive form (ἐνδύσασθαι) twice in I Corinthians 15:53. There, the aorist infinitive has a definite futuritive sense. Thus ἐνδύσασθαι may be understood as referring to a future (momentary or distant) crisis event. There is no clear instance in the New Testament where this first aorist middle infinitive form (ἐνδύσασθαι)⁹ becomes a substitute for the indicative. On the other hand there is clear example of ἐνδύσασθαι being used as a negative imperative (Mark 6:9, μὴ ἐνδύσασθαι). The participle form of ἐνδύω is considered in the exegesis of Colossians 3:9,10 (where there is strong evidence of its imperative sense). Thus it seems apparent, that from the standpoint of inductive word usage, the infinitive ἐνδύσασθαι is to be considered as imperative rather than as affirmative.

4. Another matter that needs to be considered is the possible textual variant of ἐνδύσασθε for ἐνδύσασθαι. This textual variant is supported by p 46 (III), B* (IV), and X (IV).¹⁰ Indeed it would be difficult to find earlier or better textual support for this variant. Thus, if the variant is correct, it would be ἐνδύσασθε juxtaposed to ἀποθέσθαι. This lends a great weight to interpreting ἐνδύσασθαι and ἀποθέσθαι imperatively, if indeed, the earlier text reflects the proper interpretation of ἐνδύσασθαι.

EXEGESIS OF COLOSSIANS 3:9,10

Having concluded that the infinitives ἀποθέσθαι and ἐνδύσασθαι in Ephesians 4:22-24 are imperative in meaning, we turn our attention to the participles ἀπεκδυσάμενοι (put off) and ἐνδυσάμενοι (put on) in the parallel passage, Colossians 3:9,10. Again, our primary concern is to determine whether these participles are to be considered as affirmative (only

⁹Cf. ἐνδύσασθαι in Leviticus 21:10. Ibid., p. 471.

¹⁰Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland, Novum Testamentum Graece (Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1960), p. 496.

possible in a partial and eschatological sense) or as imperative. Do they refer to a past "putting off" and "putting on", or to a present, urgent, ethical command, to "put off" and "put on"? Do they refer to the motive for, or the means of, fulfilling Paul's exhortation, "lie not to one another (3:9,10)"? The answer to this question is vital to a proper understanding of Paul in this passage, as well as in the parallel passage (Ephesians 4:22-24).

As it was noted that ἀποθέσθαι and ἐνδύσασθαι were in an exhortatory section (4:1-6:20) of Ephesians, so also it is noted that ἀπεκδυσάμενοι and ἐνδυσάμενοι are in an exhortative section of Colossians (3:1-4:6). This advances presumptive evidence that these participles (ἀπεκδυσάμενοι, and ἐνδυσάμενοι) lend themselves to a plausible imperative interpretation.

However, for those who favor the affirmative interpretation of ἀπεκδυσάμενοι and ἐνδυσάμενοι there might appear to be confirmation of their point of view found in the relationship between the ἀπεκδύσει of 2:11 and ἀπεκδυσάμενοι of 3:9.

. . . in whom ye were also circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands, in the putting off (ἀπεκδύσει) of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ . . . (Colossians 2:11).

. . . lie not to one another; seeing that ye have put off (ἀπεκδυσάμενοι, putting off) the old man with his doings . . . (Colossians 3:9).

Obviously, the noun "putting off" (ἀπεκδύσει) connected with the aorist indicative "ye were circumcised" (περιετμήθητε)

refers to a past occurrence. Thus, if ἀπεκδύσει (2:11) which is definitely referring to a past transaction is considered parallel to ἀπεκδυσάμενοι, then ἀπεκδυσάμενοι is affirmative in character. Furthermore, it may be asserted that the translation, "seeing that ye have put off", is in harmony with the aorist participle ἀπεκδυσάμενος in 2:15.

. . . having despoiled (ἀπεκδυσάμενος) the principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it (Colossians 2:15).

However, it is this writer's opinion that this line of argumentation is not strong enough to counterbalance the evidence that ἀπεκδυσάμενοι and ἐνδυσάμενοι are imperative in meaning. In the estimation of the writer the following reasons dictate an imperative interpretation of these participles.

1. In Colossians 3:9 the participle ἀπεκδυσάμενοι is obviously used as a synonym for ἀποθέμενοι, put off (cf. Colossians 3:8,12; see also Romans 13:12; and Ephesians 4:22,24) which is commonly juxtaposed with ἐνδύω, put on. The use of ἀπεκδυσάμενοι here instead of ἀποθέμενοι may have been deliberate, not with the intent to simply reiterate ἀπεκδύσει (2:15), but rather to remind the Colossians of their "putting off (ἀπεκδύσει) of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ" (2:11), and of their victory and example in Christ's "having despoiled (ἀπεκδυσάμενος) the principalities and powers" (2:15). Since ἀπεκδυσάμενοι is here used as a synonym for ἀποθέμενοι it is important to note that in every instance where ἀποτίθημι is juxtaposed with ἐνδύω, it is imperative in force. Also to be noted is the fact that this particular form ἀπεκδυσάμενοι (1st aorist middle participle nominative plural masculine) when carried over to ἀποτίθημι is ἀποθέμενοι. ἀποθέμενοι is in every instance in the New Testament used imperatively. Likewise the participle ἐνδυσάμενοι is in every instance outside of II Corinthians 5:3

(which is futuritive) used in the imperative sense.¹¹
Lightfoot comments at this point:

Do these aorist participles describe an action coincident with or prior to the ψεύδεσθε? In other words are they part of the command, or do they assign the reason for the command? Must they be rendered "putting off", or "seeing that ye did (at your baptism) put off"? The former seems the more probable interpretation; for (1) Though both ideas are found in St. Paul, the imperative is the more usual; e.g. Rom. xiii.12 sq. ἀποθώμεθα οὖν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σκότους, ἐνδυσώμεθα δὲ τὰ ὄπλα τοῦ φωτός . . . ἐνδύσασθε τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, Ephes. vi. 11 ἐνδύσασθε τὴν πανοπλίαν with ver. 14 στῆτε οὖν . . . ἐνδυσόμενοι κ.τ.λ., I Thess. v. 8 νήσσωμεν ἐνδυσόμενοι κ.τ.λ. The one exception is Gal. iii 27 ὅσοι γὰρ ἐς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε. (2) The "putting on" in the parallel passage, Ephes. iv. 24, is imperative, not affirmative, whether we read ἐνδύσασθαι or ἐνδύσασθε. (3) The participles here are followed immediately by an imperative in the context, ver. 12 ἐνδύσασθε οὖν, where the idea seems to be the same. For the synchronous aorist participle see Winer § xlv. p. 430. St. Paul uses ἀπεκδυόμενοι, ἐνδυσόμενοι (not ἀπεκδυόμενοι, ἐνδυόμενοι), for the same reason for which he uses ἐνδύσασθε (not ἐνδύεσθε), because it is a thing to be done once for all.¹²

Eduard Lohse writes concerning ἀπεκδυόμενοι and ἐνδυσόμενοι:

The verb forms "put off" (ἀπεκδυόμενοι) and "put on" (ἐνδυσόμενοι) emphatically stress the relationship to baptism. Since both participles are aorist, they could describe the past event of baptism, which should be determinative of the present; thus they would be construed as genuine

¹¹This comment is based on the author's inductive study of the participle ἐνδυσόμενοι in every New Testament instance where it occurs. For this study see Appendix A.

¹²J.B. Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon (rev. 1879 ed., 6th printing; Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1970), pp. 214-215.

participles. Nevertheless, it is far more plausible to understand these verb forms as imperatives continuing a sequence of admonitions. The imperative "do not lie" (μὴ ψεύδεσθε) precedes them (v.9) and the command "put on" (ἐνδύσασθε, v.12) follows. The parallel Eph. 4:24 clearly supports translating them as imperatives: "put on the new man, created after the likeness of God" (. . .), which agrees with the use of "to put on" (ἐνδύεσθαι) in the context of the baptismal exhortation: "put on the Lord Jesus" (ἐνδύσασθε τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Rom. 13:14); "let us put on the armor of light" (ἐνδυσώμεθα δὲ τὰ ὅπλα τοῦ φωτός Rom. 13:12). The doubly composite verb "to put off" (ἀπεκδύεσθαι) occurs only in Col. (cf. 2:15) where it recalls the phrase "putting off the body of the flesh" (ἀπέκδυσις τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός 2:11). In other instances the verb ἀποτίθεσθαι ("to take off") which is put in contrast with "to put on" (ἐνδύεσθαι) appears more frequently in exhortatory contexts.¹³

2. Another strong reason for believing that ἀπεκδυσάμενοι and ἐνδυσάμενοι are imperative in sense is the great number of participles used as imperative-complements of the preceding imperatives. Particularly is this true in chapters three and four. The following are cited as examples:

3:9,10	<u>μὴ ψεύδεσθε</u>	<u>ἀπεκδυσάμενοι</u> <u>ἐνδυσάμενοι</u>
3:12,13	<u>ἐνδύσασθε</u>	<u>ἀνεχόμενοι</u> <u>χαρίζόμενοι</u>
3:16	<u>ἐννοεῖτω</u>	<u>διδάσκοντες</u> <u>νουθετοῦντες</u> <u>ᾄδοντες</u>
3:17	<u>ποιοῦτε</u> (implied)	<u>εὐχαριστοῦντες</u>

¹³Eduard Lohse, "A Commentary on the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon", Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible, ed. Helmut Koester (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), p. 141.

3:22	<u>ὑπακούετε</u>	<u>φοβούμενοι</u>
4:2,3	<u>προσκαυτερεῖτε</u>	<u>γοηγοροῦντες</u> <u>προσευχόμενοι</u> (request)
4:5	<u>περιπατεῖτε</u>	<u>ἐξαγοραζόμενοι</u>
4:6	<u>ἔστω</u> (implied)	<u>ἡρτυμένος</u>

Observing this format of imperative with the participle-complements following has led the writer to the conclusion that ἀπειδυσάμενοι and ἐνδυσάμενοι are imperative in nature. While the writer notes that of the participle-complements exemplified in Colossians 3:5-4:6 that all are in the present tense except ἀπειδυσάμενοι and ἐνδυσάμενοι, yet he would also point out that these particular verbs do not occur in the present tense (in any form) in the N.T. Hence, the writer concludes that since this is true, their being in the aorist tense does not imply past indicative meaning. Indeed for Paul to have used these particular aorist participles to express past indicative meaning in this hortatory section of Colossians 3:5-4:6 (where there are so many participle-complements) would invite almost certain confusion. For a further study of this particular form of the aorist participle ἐνδυσάμενοι see Appendix A.¹⁴ Rather it is the writer's understanding that the aorist participles ἀπειδυσάμενοι and ἐνδυσάμενοι are imperative-complements to the prohibition μὴ φεύδεσθε. Furthermore, the writer understands ἀπειδυσάμενοι also to be complementary to νεκρώσατε (3:5) and ἀπόθεσθε (3:8); and ἐνδυσάμενοι to be complementary to ἐνδύσασθε (3:12). Surely the characteristics which are to be "put to death, νεκρώσατε" (3:5) and "put off, ἀπόθεσθε" (3:8) are the subject matter of "the old man with his doings" (3:9). Hence, the "old man" needs to be "put off, ἀπειδυσάμενοι." Likewise, the characteristics which are to be "put on, ἐνδύσασθε" (3:12) surely are the characteristics of the "new man" who is to be "put on, ἐνδυσάμενοι" (3:10). Thus, the writer would chart ἀπειδυσάμενοι and ἐνδυσάμενοι as imperative participle-complements in the following manner.

¹⁴Cf. "Appended Note: Participle and Imperative in I Peter" by Dr. David Daub in Selwyn's commentary on I Peter. Edward G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of Peter, (New York: St. Martins Press, 1969), pp. 467-488.

3:5	<u>νεκρώσατε</u>	(<u>ἀπεκδυσόμενοι</u>)
3:8	<u>ἀπόθεσθε</u>	(<u>ἀπεκδυσόμενοι</u>)
3:9,10	<u>μὴ φεύδεσθε</u>	<u>ἀπεκδυσόμενοι</u> <u>ἐνδυσόμενοι</u>
3:12	<u>ἐνδύσασθε</u>	(<u>ἐνδυσόμενοι</u>)

3. A close examination of the context of the prohibition "lie not to one another" (μὴ φεύδεσθε) suggests that it is not lying that is to be discontinued, but false living. Liddell and Scott, and Barclay Newman instruct us that the word φεύδομαι may express to "play false"¹⁵ or "be false, live a lie".¹⁶ In James 3:14 and Revelation 21:27 we find parallel expressions:

But if ye have bitter jealousy and faction in your heart, glory not and lie not against the truth (μὴ . . . φεύδεσθε κατὰ ἀληθείας) (James 3:14).

But nothing unclean shall enter it, nor any one who practices abomination or falsehood (πολῶν βδέλυγμα καὶ φεῦδος), but only those who are written in the Lamb's book of life (Revelation 21:27, R.S.V.).

We draw this conclusion because the Colossians had "died with Christ from the rudiments of the world"; yet, in actual practice some had subjected themselves "to ordinances . . . after the precepts and doctrines of men" (Colossians 2:20-23). They had been "raised with Christ", yet they were seeking after the transient "things that are upon the earth" (Colossians 3:1-3). Their walk did not coincide with their conversion. Therefore the previous admonition:

As therefore ye received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk in him (Colossians 2:6).

and the exhortations:

¹⁵H.G. Liddell and Robert Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, rev. Henry Jones (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), p. 2021.

¹⁶Barclay Newman, A Concise Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament (London: United Bible Societies, 1971), p.200.

Put to death therefore your members which are upon the earth (τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς): fornication, uncleanness, passion, evil desire, and covetousness, which is idolatry; for which things' sake cometh the wrath of God upon the sons of disobedience: wherein ye also once walked, when ye lived in these things; but now do ye also put them all away: anger, wrath, malice, railing, shameful speaking out of your mouth . . . (Colossians 3:5-8).

Obviously this listing of fornication, uncleanness, passion, evil desire, etc. (Colossians 3:5,8), corresponds to the "old man with his doings". Therefore it seems highly inconsistent to make such strong prohibitions as "put to death" and "put away" when in the next breath it is asserted that they had already done so. Therefore, the prohibition, μὴ ψεύδεσθε, is to be fulfilled by putting "on the new man, that is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him". To do otherwise would be to play false (ψεύδομαι) to one another, and to live a lie against the truth (cf. James 3:14).

Chapter 5

A THEOLOGICAL RATIONALE FOR THE IMPERATIVE

Chapter four endeavored to discover inductively the proper interpretation of ἀποτίθημι ("put off"), ἀπεκδύομαι ("put off"), and ἐνδύω ("put on"). It was concluded from this investigation that both the infinitives (ἀποθέσθαι, ἐνδύσασθαι) in Ephesians 4:22-24, and the participles (ἀπεκδυσάμενοι, ἐνδυσάμενοι) in Colossians 3:9,10 were to be interpreted imperatively. The purpose of this chapter is to test the validity of that interpretation. Therefore, in this chapter the question is asked: Is there an adequate Pauline theological rationale for this imperative interpretation?

SYNONYMY OF THE "OLD MAN" AND "FLESH"

In our study of the "old man", it is well to note the synonymous phrases:

. . . the old man that waxeth corrupt after the lusts of deceit . . . τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπατῆς (Ephesians 4:22).

. . . the old man with his doings . . . σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ (Colossians 3:9).

. . . the works of the flesh . . . τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός (Galatians 5:19).

The table on the following page illustrates how closely the characteristics of the "old man" and "flesh" parallel each other.

Table 1

The "Old Man" and the "Flesh"

Ephesians 4:22 (4:19-5:4) "the old man . . . after the lusts of deceit"	Colossians 3:9 (3:5-9) "the old man with his doings"	Galatians 5:19 (5:19-21) "the works of the flesh"
5:3 fornication (<u>πορνεία</u>) uncleanness (<u>ἀκαθαρσία</u>) 4:19 lasciviousness (<u>ἀσελγεία</u>)	3:5 fornication (<u>πορνεία</u>) uncleanness (<u>ἀκαθαρσία</u>)	5:19 fornication (<u>πορνεία</u>) uncleanness (<u>ἀκαθαρσία</u>) lasciviousness (<u>ἀσελγεία</u>)
4:31 wrath (<u>θυμός</u>) anger (<u>ὀργή</u>) railing (<u>βλασφημία</u>)	3:8 wrath (<u>θυμός</u>) anger (<u>ὀργή</u>) railing (<u>βλασφημία</u>)	5:20 wraths (<u>θυμός</u>)
4:26 wrath (<u>παροργισμός</u>) 4:28 steal (<u>κλέπτω</u>) 4:29 corrupt speech (<u>λόγος</u> <u>σαπρός</u>) 4:31 all bitterness (<u>πᾶσα</u> <u>πικρία</u>) 5:4 filthiness (<u>ἀίσχροτης</u>) foolish talking (<u>μωρολογία</u>) jesting (<u>εὐτραπεία</u>)	3:5 passion (<u>πάθος</u>) evil desire (<u>ἐπιθυμία κακή</u>) covetousness (<u>πλεονεξία</u>) 3:8 malice (<u>κακία</u>) shameful speaking (<u>αἰσχρολογία</u>)	5:20 idolatry (<u>εἰδωλολατρία</u>) sorcery (<u>φαρμακεία</u>) enmities (<u>ἔχθρα</u>) strife (<u>ἔρις</u>) jealousies (<u>ζήλος</u>) factions (<u>ἐριθεία</u>) divisions (<u>διχοστασία</u>) parties (<u>αἵρεσις</u>) 5:21 envyings (<u>φθόνος</u>) drunkenness (<u>μέθη</u>) revellings (<u>κῶμος</u>)
5:5,6 For this ye know of a surety that no fornicator, nor un- clean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and God. Let no man deceive you with empty words: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the sons of disobedience.	3:5,6 Put to death therefore your members which are upon the earth: . . . ; for which things' sake cometh the wrath of God upon the sons of disobedience [translated from Greek].	5:21 . . . I forewarn you even as I did forewarn you, that they who practice such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

Obviously in all three lists, Paul is talking about the same thing though the lists are somewhat different. This is further borne out by the fact that in all three epistles Paul is concerned about the walk (περιπατέω,στοιχέω) of the Christians (Galatians 5:16,25; Ephesians 4:1,18; 5:2,8,15; Colossians 2:6; 4:5). Both before and after he catalogues these vices, he instructs them to walk (in the Spirit, worthily, in love, as children of light, etc.) as becomes those who are Christ's. Thus, the terms "flesh" and the "old man" are synonymous terms. Further evidence of their being synonymous may be seen by the use of the word "crucify" (σταυρόω) and its cognate "crucify with" (συσταυρόω) being used with both the "old man" and "flesh" (Romans 6:6; Galatians 2:20; 5:24).

Additional evidence that the terms the "old man" and "flesh" are synonymous, may be noted in that their common animating principle is "the sin" (ἡ ἁμαρτία) (Romans 6:6; 7:14-20). It is this principle of sin in the believers that causes Paul great concern. Therefore in Romans 6:1 Paul asks the rhetorical question:

What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin,
that grace may abound?

It is this question which underlies all of his theology in regard to "the sin" in Romans 6-8, in regard to the "old man" in Ephesians and Colossians, and in regard to the "flesh" in Romans 7,8, and Galatians 5.

Paul's intense and deep desire for his converts, and all converts, was that they should not return to or participate

in acts which were representative of their pre-regenerate life. But the dual nature of these converts posed a real problem. They possessed the nature of Christ (Galatians 3:27), and the nature of sin (Romans 6:1-3, ff.). They were in the Spirit (Romans 7:5; 8:9), but the dilemma remained that even those who were in the Spirit had the problem of the "old man" and the "flesh" (sin, cf. Romans 6:6; 7:14-20; Ephesians 4:22; Colossians 3:9) in opposition to the Spirit. Thus Paul's classic exhortation in Galatians 5:25,

If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us also walk (ἐὰν ζήμεν πνεύματι, πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν)

shows that one can be made alive or be living by (in) the Spirit (Galatians 5:25; cf. Romans 8:9-12), and yet not actually be walking in the Spirit (Galatians 5:16,18,24,25; cf. Romans 8:14). Thus the believer finds that:

. . . the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; for these are contrary the one to the other; that ye may not do the things that ye would (Galatians 5:17).

And this was so even though as Christians at conversion they had died to sin (Romans 6:2,3,7-10; cf. I Peter 2:24), were freed from sin (Romans 6:18,22), and were no longer to be subjected to it (Romans 6:14). By commitment at conversion, believers obligate themselves not to commit sin (Romans 6:15).

But how is this to be accomplished in those with both the nature of Christ and the nature of sin? Paul's answer is that the Christians must not only die with Christ to sin (Romans 6:2,7,8, etc.), they must also live with Christ to God (Romans 6:8,10). They must "walk in newness of (resurrection) life"

(Romans 6:4,5). As believers they are to reckon themselves not only as dead to sin, but also as alive to God (Romans 6:11). As those who died to sin they are not to let sin continue its reign (Romans 6:12), or to yield their bodily members as instruments of unrighteousness to sin. As resurrected persons they are to yield (παραστήσατε vs. μηδὲ παροιστάνετε) their members as instruments to righteousness and to God (Romans 6:13; cf. Romans 12:1,2). Or as Paul wrote in Galatians 5:25, "If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us also walk" (cf. Romans 7:5,8:9,12,14). Subsequent to conversion, therefore, the believer must determine to serve righteousness, not sin (Romans 6:15,16). He must determine to live after the Spirit, and not after the flesh (Romans 8:9, cf. Galatians 5:16,17,25).

Hence, Paul warned Christians that because they were alive in the Spirit (Romans 8:9-11) they were:

. . . debtors not to the flesh, to live after the flesh: for if ye live after the flesh, ye must die; but if by the Spirit ye put to death the deeds of the body, ye shall live. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God (Romans 8:12-14).

and that:

. . . the mind of the flesh is death, but the mind of the Spirit is life and peace: because the mind of the flesh is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can it be: . . . (Romans 8:6,7).

Emphatically, then, by command and exhortation, Paul responds to his own question, "Shall we continue in sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) . . . ?" "God forbid" is his response.

Even so reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus (Romans 6:11).

Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey the lusts thereof . . . (Romans 6:12).

Neither present your members unto sin as instruments of unrighteousness; but present yourselves unto God . . . (Romans 6:13).

. . . for as ye presented your members as servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity, even so, now present your members as servants to righteousness unto sanctification (Romans 6:19).

But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provision for the flesh, to fulfill the lusts thereof (Romans 13:14).

But I say, walk by the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lusts of the flesh (Galatians 5:16).

If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us also walk (Galatians 5:25).

And they that are of Christ Jesus have crucified (ἐσταύρωσαν¹) the flesh with the passions and lusts thereof (Galatians 5:24).

Therefore, since the "flesh" (sin, Romans 7:14-20) is still a problem to those who are made alive by the Spirit (Romans 8:9-12; Galatians 5:25), by comparison it is very likely then that the "old man" (which is synonymous with "flesh") yet remained a problem for those addressed by Paul in Ephesians and Colossians. Note that in Ephesians 2:3

¹The Gnostic Aorist. "A generally accepted fact or truth may be regarded as so fixed in its certainty or axiomatic in its character that is described by the aorist, just as though it were an actual occurrence . . . ii. A clear case of the gnostic aorist appears in Galatians 5:24, οἱ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν which may be rendered, it is the normal disposition of those who are Christ's to crucify the flesh . . ." H.E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1963), pp. 197-198.

(cf. 2:1-3), Paul reminds the Ephesians that they (as also all other Christians) had prior to conversion:

. . . lived in the lusts of . . . the flesh
(ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς σαρκός) doing the desires of
the flesh (τὰ θελήματα τῆς σαρκός) and of the mind . . .

Likewise in Colossians 3:5-8 Paul points out the Colossians' past:

. . . fornication, uncleanness, passion, evil desire, and covetousness, which is idolatry; for which things sake cometh the wrath of God upon the sons of disobedience: wherein ye also once walked when ye lived in these things; but now do ye also put them all away: anger, wrath, malice, railing, shameful speaking out of your mouth: . . .

Therefore since the Galatians and Romans who were already Christians had to be warned about the flesh (Galatians 5:17; Romans 8:12,13), and since they were exhorted to walk in the Spirit (Galatians 5:17-25) to avoid the works of the flesh catalogued in Galatians 5:19-21, it is concluded that Paul's exhortations and commands in Ephesians and Colossians are parallel to those in Galatians and Romans. Thus in Ephesians and Colossians, Paul is instructing the Christians to put off the "old man" (according to the lusts of deceit, with his doings) in the same manner as in Galatians he expects them to crucify the flesh (Galatians 5:24). He exhorts the Ephesians and Colossians to put on the "new man" as he does the Galatians and Romans to walk in the Spirit (Galatians 5:25; Romans 8:13,14).

SYNONYMITY OF THE "NEW MAN" AND "SPIRIT"

That putting on the "new man" is the equivalent to walking by the Spirit may be shown by the fact that as the

"works of the flesh" correspond closely to the "old man" with his traits, so also the "fruit of the Spirit" corresponds to the "new man" with his traits (note the table on the following page).

On the basis then of the comparisons between the "old man" and the "flesh" and between the "new man" and the "Spirit", it appears that there is indeed a theological rationale for the imperative understanding of ἀποθέσθαι and ἐνδύσασθαι (Ephesians 4:22-24), and of ἀπεκδυσάμενοι and ἐνδυσάμενοι (Colossians 3:9,10). That the "old man" and the "flesh" are in some sense dealt with at conversion (Galatians 3:27; Romans 8:8,9) is not to be disputed, but that the "old man" and "new man", and that the "flesh" and "spirit" do also co-exist in the believer is clearly evident (Romans 6:1-3 ff.; 13:14; 8:12-14). Therefore as Christians are to crucify the flesh and walk by the Spirit, so also they are to put off the "old man" and put on the "new man". Thus the issue of the dual natures of sin ("old man", Romans 6:6; "flesh", Romans 7:14-20) and holiness ("new man", Ephesians 4:24; "Spirit", Galatians 5:22-24) is to be resolved.

In conclusion then, it is necessary to recognise that it is the moral nature of the "old man" (sin, Romans 6:6; the lusts of deceit, Ephesians 4:22; and his doings, Colossians 3:9) which Paul exhorts the Ephesians and Colossians to put off. It is the moral nature of the "new man" (righteousness and holiness of truth, Ephesians 4:24) that they are exhorted to put on.

Table 2

The "New Man" and the "Spirit"

Ephesians 4:24-5:9 "the new man . . . created in righteousness and holiness of truth"	Colossians 3:10-15 "the new man . . . after the image of him that created him"	Galatians 5:22,23 "the fruit of the Spirit"
5:2 Walk in love (<u>ἀγάπη</u>)	3:14 love (<u>ἀγάπη</u>) 3:15 peace (<u>εἰρήνη</u>) 3:12 longsuffering (<u>μακροθυμία</u>)	5:22 love (<u>ἀγάπη</u>) 5:22 peace (<u>εἰρήνη</u>) 5:22 longsuffering (<u>μακροθυμία</u>)
4:32 be ye kind (<u>χρηστός</u>) 5:9 goodness (<u>ἀγαθωσύνη</u>)	3:12 kindness (<u>χρηστότης</u>) 3:12 meekness (<u>πραΰτης</u>) 3:12 a heart of compassion (<u>σπλάγγνα οἰκτιρμοῦ</u>)	5:22 kindness (<u>χρηστότης</u>) 5:22 goodness (<u>ἀγαθωσύνη</u>) 5:23 meekness (<u>πραΰτης</u>)
4:32 tenderhearted (<u>εὐσπλαγχνος</u>) 4:32 forgiving each other (<u>χαρίζομαι</u>)	3:13 forgiving each other (<u>χαρίζομαι</u>)	
5:4 thanks (<u>εὐχαριστία</u>) 5:9 righteousness (<u>δικαιοσύνη</u>) 5:9 truth (<u>ἀλήθεια</u>)	3:12 lowliness (<u>ταπεινοφροσύνη</u>) 3:13 forbearing one another (<u>ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων</u>)	5:22 joy (<u>χαρά</u>) faithfulness (<u>πίστις</u>) 5:23 self control (<u>ἐγκράτεια</u>)

Possibly other attributes could be added to this Ephesian list, but this is deemed sufficient for its comparative purposes.

No doubt this was done in some sense at conversion (II Corinthians 5:17), but subsequent to conversion the believer must decisively settle the question,

What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin [old man, flesh], that grace [new man, Spirit] may abound (Romans 6:1)?

Paul's answer is:

God forbid. We who died to sin, how shall we any longer live therein (Romans 6:2)?

The eschatological truth of II Corinthians 5:17 must be morally implemented by the will of the believer:

Wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature; the old things are passed away; behold they are become new.

Thus, Paul must instruct believers to make their lives coincide with their privileges (Romans 6:11, 12, 13, 19; 13:14; Galatians 5:16, 24, 25; Ephesians 4:22, 24; and Colossians 3:9, 10). To say that the Ephesian and Colossian Christians had already put off the "old man" and put on the "new man" would deny the dualism of their nature which needed to be dealt with by an act of the will through a moral appropriation of the grace made available by Christ (Romans 6:6).

Chapter 6

COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS

In this final chapter the writer wishes to comment about some conclusions he has drawn from his investigations which were set forth in chapters two through five. The purpose of this chapter is not exegesis, but rather to deal with the pragmatic and practical problems pertaining to matters of translation and interpretation.

In regard to matters of translation the writer is particularly concerned about (1) the unliteral and inconsistent translation of the terms the "old man" and "new man"; and (2) the importance of translating uniformly both the infinitives (ἀποθέσθαι, ἐνδύσασθαι) and the participles ἀπεκδυόμενοι, ἐνδυσάμενοι) as either imperative or affirmative in the parallel texts (Ephesians 4:22,24; Colossians 3:9,10). The writer likewise is concerned about the difficulty of interpretation for those acquainted only with English. It is certain that most will base their interpretation on the English translation before them. Therefore it is extremely important to place possible alternate translations before them so that they may be made aware that (at least in some instances) alternate translations also are possible. Failure to do so is an imposition of the translator's interpretation upon the English reader who is unaware of the alternatives in the original language.

The writer is aware that many of the better versions do follow this procedure in some instances. But the definite absence of this procedure in Ephesians 4:22,24 and Colossians 3:9,10 on the part of major English translations such as the A.S.V., N.A.S.B., R.S.V., and others is highly regrettable.

The problem of the inconsistent and unliteral translation the terms "old man" and "new man" may be observed in the R.S.V., which translates the phrase (ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος) "the old man" as "the old self" in Romans 6:6, but as "the old nature" in Colossians 3:9,10. Other versions such as the N.E.B. and Phillips, likewise, are inconsistent at this point. The writer objects to this type of translation because in these particular instances nothing of literary or interpretative significance is gained by these paraphrasings. Secondly, the writer objects to these unliteral paraphrasings because the terms "self" and "nature" do not lend themselves to a generic sense as well as the term "man" does. Thus, the corporate significance of the terms "old man" and "new man" (as the writer demonstrated in chapter two) is obscured. Furthermore, the writer wonders what purpose is served for the English reader by depriving him of the knowledge that the phrases "the old self" (Romans 6:6) and "the old nature" (Colossians 3:9,10) are in actuality one and the same, and that both if translated literally would read "the old man". Such alternation in translation, in the mind of the writer, should be used only in marginal notations or footnotes.

Concerning the translation of the infinitives

(ἀποθέσθαι, ἐνδύσασθαι) and the participles (ἀπεκδυόμενοι, ἐνδυσόμενοι), the writer advances the proposition (based upon chapters four and five) that they ought to be translated uniformly. In other words, if the infinitives of Ephesians 4:22, 24 are translated imperatively, then because of the obvious parallelism between Ephesians 4:22,24 and Colossians 3:9,10, the participles should also be translated imperatively. The writer's belief is that whichever way the translator chooses to translate Ephesians 4:22,24; or Colossians 3:9,10 (whether affirmative or imperative), the parallel text should be translated accordingly. Again (not to single out a particular version, but to illustrate inconsistency), the writer doubts the validity of the R.S.V.'s translation of the participles in Colossians 3:9,10 as affirmative:

Do not lie to one another, seeing that you have put off (ἀπεκδυόμενοι) the old nature with its practices and have put on (ἐνδυσόμενοι) the new nature, . . .

while translating the infinitives in Ephesians 4:22,24 as imperative:

Put off (ἀποθέσθαι) your old nature which belongs to your former manner of life and is corrupt through deceitful lusts, and be renewed in the spirit of your minds, and put on (ἐνδύσασθαι) the new nature, . . .

The obviously parallel theological content (as illustrated in chapters four and five) of both Ephesians and Colossians makes it difficult for the writer to accept a translation which renders Ephesians 4:22-24 one way while translating Colossians 3:9,10 another. Furthermore, there is no grammatical evidence

compelling enough to warrant such a distinction between these infinitives and participles.

Connected to matters of translation are also matters of interpretation. Unfortunately for the English reader, the English translation of a passage will often be the only means available to him in determining his interpretation of that passage. Thus, interpretation for the English reader will depend in many instances upon the particular translation of the passage his English version furnishes him. Hence, while it is the firm belief of this writer that the infinitives (ἀποθέσθαι, ἐνδύσασθαι) and participles (ἄπεκδυσάμενοι, ἐνδυσάμενοι) are best understood as imperatives, and he would so translate them, yet in deference to the opinions of others who would prefer an affirmative translation of them, and for the sake of the English reader, the writer would put the affirmative alternate translations in marginal notations. This would provide the English reader with at least an awareness that more than one interpretation is possible in these passages. Such alternate translations would also assure the translator that he is not imposing his own interpretation upon others. The failure of the major English translations at this point with regard to Ephesians 4:22,24 and Colossians 3:9,10 is truly disappointing.

In brief and final summation, the writer believes that his interpretation of Romans 6:6; Ephesians 4:22-24; and Colossians 3:9,10, when measured by grammatical possibility and theological probability, is highly credible. Furthermore, the writer believes that he has explored avenues of exegesis in regard to

these passages not found in the work of others. One such example is the investigation of the complementary imperative-participle format found throughout Colossians. Another example would be the parallel theological content demonstrated by the charts comparing the "old man" with the "flesh", and the "new man" with the "Spirit".

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BIBLES: ENGLISH AND GREEK

1. English Bibles

American Standard, The Holy Bible Containing the Old and New Testaments. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1901.

New American Standard Bible. Carol Stream, Illinois: Creation House, Inc., 1971.

New English Bible New Testament. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Phillips, J.B. The New Testament in Modern English. New York: MacMillan Company, 1958.

Revised Standard Version, The Bible Containing the Old and New Testaments. New York: American Bible Society, 1952.

2. Greek New Testaments

Aland, Kurt, Matthew Black, Bruce Metzger, and Allen Wikgren. The Greek New Testament. Stuttgart: Württemberg Bible Society, 1966.

Nestle, Erwin, and Kurt Aland. Novum Testamentum Graece. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1960.

B. GREEK CONCORDANCES AND LEXICONS

1. Concordances

Hatch, E., and H. Redpath. A Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books). 2 vols. Photomechanical reprint; Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck--u. Verlagsanstalt, 1954.

Moulton, W.F., and A.S. Geden. A Concordance to the Greek Testament according to the Texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf and the English Revisers. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1897. 3rd ed., 1926; rev. J. Recks, 1963.

2. Lexicons

- Arndt, W.F., and F.W. Gingrich. A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1957.
- Kittel, G., and G. Friedrich. The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. 9 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964-1974.
- Liddell, H.G., and R. Scott. A Greek-English Lexicon. rev. Henry Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Newman, Barclay. A Concise Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament. London: United Bible Societies, 1971.

C. GREEK GRAMMARS

- Dana, H.E., and Julius R. Mantey. A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament. New York: MacMillan Co., 1963.
- Moule, C.F.D. An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek. Cambridge: University Press, 1971.
- Robertson, A.T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934.

D. COMMENTARIES AND N.T. THEOLOGY

- Alford, Henry. The Greek New Testament. Vol. III. London: Rivingtons, 1865.
- Barrett, C.K. "The Epistle to the Romans", Harper's New Testament Commentaries. ed. Henry Chadwick. New York: Harper and Row, Publisher, 1957.
- Barry, Alfred. "The Epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians", A New Testament Commentary: for English Readers. ed. Charles J. Ellicott. Vol. III. New York: Cassel and Co., 1844.
- Bengel, John Albert. New Testament Word Studies. trans. Charleton T. Lewis and Marvin Vincent. Vol. II. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1971.
- Ellicott, Charles J. (ed.). Ellicott's Commentary on the Whole Bible. Vol. VIII. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1970.

Lohse, Eduard. "A Commentary on the Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon", Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. ed. Helmut Koester. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

Moule, Handley C.G. "The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans", The Expositor's Bible. Vol. XXVII. ed. W.R. Nicoll. 6th ed.; New York: Hodder and Stoughton, [n.d.].

Richardson, Alan. An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament. New York: Harper and Row, 1952.

Salmond, S.D.F. "The Epistle to the Ephesians", Expositor's Greek New Testament. ed. W.R. Nicoll. Vol. III. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, [1897-1910].

Selwyn, Edward G. The First Epistle of Peter. New York: St. Martins Press, 1969.

Taylor, Willard. "The Epistle to the Ephesians", Beacon Bible Commentary. ed. A.F. Harper. Vol. IX. Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1965.

E. PERSONAL CORRESPONDENCE

Clapp, Philip S. Personal Correspondence. Western Evangelical Seminary, Portland, Oregon, January 7, 1974.

APPENDIX A

AN INDUCTIVE STUDY OF 'ΕΝΔΥΣΑΜΕΝΟΙ

The study of ἐνδυσάμενοι is necessarily based upon the Greek text. For the sake of convenience the reader is asked to refer to the appropriate scripture passages in his Greek Testament (the writer is using the text of Kurt Aland, 1966; cf. bibliography).

The aorist middle participle nominative plural masculine ἐνδυσάμενοι is found only four times in the New Testament: II Corinthians 5:3; Ephesians 6:14; Colossians 3:10; and I Thessalonians 5:8. It is in every instance used by Paul. Inductive study of ἐνδυσάμενοι has led to the conclusion that in all but one instance (II Corinthians 5:3) this aorist participle form is a general idiomatic expression with the imperative meaning "put on" (cf. ἀποθέμενοι, Ephesians 4:25; Hebrews 12:1; James 1:21; and I Peter 2:1). Even in II Corinthians 5:3 the futurity of the context indicates that ἐνδυσάμενοι refers to a future (not past) momentary event.

The Ephesians 6:14 and I Thessalonians 5:8 references are parallel texts to each other. Ephesians 6:14 speaks of:

. . . having put on (putting on? ἐνδυσάμενοι) the breastplate of righteousness . . .

while I Thessalonians 5:8 speaks of:

. . . putting on (having put on? ἐνδυσάμενοι, cf. νήφωμεν) the breastplate of faith and love . . .

To the writer, making of ἐνδυσάμενοι affirmative in Ephesians 6:14, but imperative in I Thessalonians 5:8 is unwise. Thus the writer suggests that since the general content of both passages is similar, if ἐνδυσάμενοι is imperative in one passage it should be understood as imperative in the other passage as well.

The writer believes that the translators are correct in translating ἐνδυσάμενοι as imperative in I Thessalonians 5:8 for the following reasons:

- (1) It seems logical that ἐνδυσάμενοι is a participle-complement to the hortatory subjunctive νύμφωμεν (5:8).
- (2) Not only is I Thessalonians 5:8 parallel to Ephesians 6:14; it is also parallel to Ephesians 6:17.

. . . putting on (ἐνδυσάμενοι) . . . for a helmet, the hope of salvation (I Thessalonians 5:8).

And take (δέξασθε) the helmet of salvation . . . (Ephesians 6:17).

Notice that here the aorist participle ἐνδυσάμενοι is parallel in position to the aorist imperative δέξασθε. Therefore, if ἐνδυσάμενοι (I Thessalonians 5:8) is parallel to δέξασθε (Ephesians 6:17), then it seems logical to conclude that ἐνδυσάμενοι in Ephesians 6:14 ought to be understood as imperative.

Additional evidence that ἐνδυσάμενοι in Ephesians 6:14 ought to be understood as imperative is found in its obvious conjunction with ἐνδύσασθε (Ephesians 6:11) even as ἀναλαμβάνετε (Ephesians 6:16) is in conjunction with ἀναλάβετε (Ephesians 6:13). Thus it is improper to translate ἐνδυσάμενοι as affirmative "having put on", while translating ἀναλαμβάνετε as imper-

ative (note: R.S.V. and N.A.S.B. have erred here). Indeed, all of these aorist participles περιζωσάμενοι (6:14), ένδυσάμενοι (6:14), ύποδησάμενοι (6:15), and άναλαβόντες (6:16) are best understood as imperative participle-complements to the imperatives ένδύσασθε (6:11), άναλάβετε (6:13) and στῆτε (6:14) as the N.E.B. translates them.

Thus, it seems questionable to translate ένδυσάμενοι in Colossians 3:10 as an indicative affirmation rather than as an imperative participle-complement (in like manner as the above aorist participles) closely allied to ένδύσασθε in Colossians 3:12. Particularly is this true in light of the great number of participles which imperatively complement the true imperatives in chapters three and four of Colossians.