

THE TYNDALE BIBLICAL THEOLOGY LECTURE, 1969\*  
CHRIST IN OUR PLACE—THE CONTRIBUTION  
OF THE PREPOSITIONS

By R. E. DAVIES

H. E. Guillebaud in his book *Why the Cross?*<sup>1</sup> suggests that the Scriptural understanding of the atonement can be summarized in the verse of a well-known hymn by Philipp Bliss:

Bearing shame and scoffing rude,  
In my place condemned He stood;  
Sealed my pardon with His blood:  
Hallelujah! What a Saviour!

Similarly, another writer<sup>2</sup> says that 'Charles Wesley correctly summarized New Testament doctrine when he wrote:

His death is my plea;  
My Advocate see,  
And hear the blood speak that hath answered for me:  
He purchased the grace  
Which now I embrace.  
O Father, Thou know'st He hath died in my place.'

Christ dying *in our place*, the substitutionary suffering of our Lord—this, according to these writers, is a key concept in the New Testament understanding of the saving work of Christ.

This view, however, is not without its critics, and it is often suggested that such an understanding involves a reading into, rather than a reading out of, Scripture. It is said that the New Testament knows nothing of a 'crude transactionalism',<sup>3</sup> and that even if certain elements which might suggest a vicarious, substitutionary idea appear, this is only one of many

\* Delivered at Tyndale House, Cambridge, 10th July, 1969.

<sup>1</sup> H. E. Guillebaud, *Why the Cross?*,<sup>2</sup> IVF, London (1945) 13.

<sup>2</sup> A. B. Crabtree, *The Restored Relationship*, Carey Kingsgate, London (1963) 67.

<sup>3</sup> Probably the most explicit statement of the viewpoint which rejects all forms of substitution is Hastings Rashdall, *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*, Macmillan, London (1919). However, the criticism appears in implicit or explicit form in many modern works. See below.

ideas which are put forward in the New Testament to explain Christ's death, and should not be made the controlling concept in our understanding of it.

It is not our purpose in this lecture to examine the whole of the New Testament teaching on the subject of Christ's work but merely to consider two of the prepositions used in New Testament statements on the subject to see what contribution they have to make. Nor, in doing this, is the lecture intending to set forth a 'theology of prepositions', with the thought that a vital doctrine can be based on such minute foundations. Our title is 'the *contribution* of the prepositions', and we would merely ask that their contribution should be used when any full account of the New Testament teaching on the subject is attempted.<sup>4</sup>

Four prepositions are used in the New Testament statements about the death of Christ:

*ἀντί* (Mk. 10:45/Mt. 20:28); *ὕπερ* with genitive (Mk. 14:24; Lk. 22:19, 20; Jn. 6:51; 10:11, 15; 11:50ff.; 15:13; 17:19; 18:14; Rom. 5:6, 8; 8:32; 14:15; 1 Cor. 1:13; 5:7 *var.*; 11:24; 15:3; 2 Cor. 5:14, 15 (twice), 21; Gal. 1:4; 2:20; 3:13; Eph. 5:2, 25; 1 Thes. 5:10 *var.*; 1 Tim. 2:6; Tit. 2:14; Heb. 2:9; 7:27; 10:12; 1 Pet. 2:21; 3:18; 4:1 *var.*; 1 Jn. 3:16); *περί* with genitive (Mt. 26:28; Rom. 8:3; 1 Cor. 1:13 *var.*; Gal. 1:4 *var.*; 1 Thes. 5:10; 1 Pet. 3:18; 1 Jn. 2:2; 4:10); *διὰ* with accusative (Rom. 3:25; 4:25; 1 Cor. 8:11). We shall confine ourselves to the first two, *ἀντί* and *ὕπερ* with genitive, and examine these in turn.

### I. THE PREPOSITION *ἀντί*

In the New Testament this word occurs twenty-two times as an independent preposition, but for our purpose the relevant passage is that in Mark 10:45/Matthew 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' (*λύτρον ἀντί πολλῶν*). [The RSV is quoted in all cases unless otherwise stated.] The normal

<sup>4</sup> This is not, of course, to imply anything derogatory about Dr B. F. C. Atkinson's Tyndale Lecture for 1943 with this title, which was concerned to bring out the theological significance and value of a number of Greek prepositions. See further on the 'theology of prepositions', the words of N. Turner cited in note 22 below.

meaning of *ἀντί* is 'instead of', or 'in exchange for', and so this passage appears to teach that the purpose of Jesus' coming into the world was to give up His life, *i.e.* to die (see the context, verses 33–34, 38–39), and that this would be accepted as the ransom price in the place of, and in exchange for, the lives of others (called here 'the many'). This understanding of the saying is disputed by many scholars, particularly with regard to the meaning of the preposition; it is maintained, that *ἀντί* can occasionally have the broader, more general meaning, 'on behalf of', the strict substitutionary meaning yielding to the general idea of something being done for a person's sake, rather in his place.<sup>5</sup>

Even if this were the case, the *λύτρον* concept would still have to be taken far more seriously than it often is by scholars who make this suggestion,<sup>6</sup> but we content ourselves with examining the statement regarding *ἀντί*. What is its basic meaning? Is there any evidence of a 'broadening' of meaning as is suggested?

### 1. *Original Meaning*

While James Barr<sup>7</sup> has warned us against committing the 'root fallacy', *i.e.* reading the 'root meaning' of a word into all its subsequent uses, it is nevertheless of interest to consider the original meaning of the word. The English word 'end' is etymologically related and supplies us with the basic concept.

A. T. Robertson<sup>8</sup> suggests the picture of two men, one at each end of a log, facing each other. 'Face to face' or 'opposite' is thus the basic meaning.

The idea of 'oppositeness' easily moves to include that of 'opposition', for example, two armies drawn up *opposite* each other to fight *against* each other. The concepts of *substitution*—two objects placed over against each other, one being taken *instead* of the other, or *exchange*—one object being taken in return for the other—also develop quite naturally. Similarly,

<sup>5</sup> Cf., e.g., W. Bauer, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments*<sup>4</sup> translated and adapted by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, University Presses of Chicago and Cambridge (1957) 73.

<sup>6</sup> See below, note 37.

<sup>7</sup> J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, Oxford University Press (1961) 100.

<sup>8</sup> A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*,<sup>3</sup> Hodder & Stoughton, London (1919) 572.

the notions of *equivalence*—one is as good as another, or *comparison*—one set over against another and compared with it, easily develop from the same root idea.

## 2. *ἀντί* in Classical Greek

'Koine' Greek of the New Testament era is different in many points of grammatical and lexical usage from that of the Classical Period. 'Koine' Greek is still, however, a lineal descendant of it, and so a brief look at the use of *ἀντί* in Classical Greek is relevant, especially as some find evidence of the broader meaning already present here.

In addition to the local meanings already mentioned, *i.e.* 'opposite, over against', its metaphorical use is also abundantly evident, and so we find examples of *ἀντί* with the meanings: 'instead of, in place of', 'in exchange for, in return for, at the price of', 'as good as', and 'compared with, in perference to'.<sup>9</sup> Liddell and Scott suggest that the meaning 'for the sake of' is also possible, especially with verbs of entreaty. In the eighth edition they cite a passage from Sophocles' *Electra* as an example (line 537): *ἀντί ἀδελφοῦ δῆτα Μενέλεω κτανόν.* . . . However, that the meaning is substitutionary is seen from the context. The words are those of Clytemnestra: 'And what right had they to kill my children? For Menelaus' sake, his brother? . . . Had not his brother children twain to serve as victims?'<sup>10</sup> While the translation cited has 'for . . . 's sake', Clytemnestra's children are clearly slain *in place of* Menelaus. In the ninth edition, this example is replaced by one from Plato *Menexenus* 237a: *καὶ τὴν τελευτὴν ἀντί τῆς τῶν ζώντων σωτηρίας ἡλλάξαντο*, 'and purchased the safety of the living by their deaths', literally 'and exchanged death in return for the safety of the living'; but this, too, is obviously substitutionary.

As an example of the meaning 'for the sake of' with verbs of entreaty Liddell and Scott<sup>11</sup> cite Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus* 1326, *ἀντί παιδῶν . . . ἱκετεύομέν σε*. Once again, how-

<sup>9</sup> *LSJ*, new (ninth) edition, Oxford University Press (1940) 153. The original local meaning also developed in a temporal direction and examples of this are found in the Classics, but we omit any consideration of this as not being relevant to our purpose.

<sup>10</sup> The translations of the Classical writers which are given are those of the *Loeb Classical Library* editions, Heinemann, London and Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. (various dates).

<sup>11</sup> In the eighth and ninth editions.

ever, an examination of the passage makes it clear that this is not a use of *ἀντί* with the meaning 'for the sake of'. The Loeb translation of the full line reads: 'Thus by thy children and thy life, my sire, we all adjure thee to remit thy wrath.' The comments from two standard editions of Sophocles are as follows: 'This rare use of *ἀντί* is to be explained by the notion of equivalence "At the price of your children", i.e. "as you love them"' <sup>12</sup> ' "By them", i.e. "as you love them", a very rare use of *ἀντί*, but one which comes easily from its ordinary sense "in return for, as an equivalent for". It would be as much as their lives are worth to refuse the prayer.' <sup>13</sup> Obviously, this is not a use of *ἀντί* in a 'broader' sense. The recent supplement to the ninth edition <sup>14</sup> gives no further material on this point, so it must be said that no evidence from the Classics has been presented for a 'broader' meaning of *ἀντί*.

### 3. *ἀντί* in Greek of the New Testament Period

With regard to the use in the Papyri and Inscriptions, J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, <sup>15</sup> after mentioning its local and temporal uses, remark: 'By far the commonest meaning of *ἀντί* is the simple "instead of"', and for this they give several examples, chiefly from commercial documents. They show also how this meaning shades into that of 'in exchange for' or 'in return for'. They give no examples of the meaning 'on behalf of' or 'for the sake of'.

In literary Greek of the period the same phenomenon appears. In Polybius (c. 210–130 BC) the usage is regular, <sup>16</sup> in Philo no exceptions are evident, <sup>17</sup> in Josephus the normal range of meanings are present. <sup>18</sup> Bauer <sup>19</sup> produces an example from

<sup>12</sup> L. Campbell, *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, I (1871) 353.

<sup>13</sup> R. C. Jebb, *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments*, Cambridge University Press, II (1889) 206.

<sup>14</sup> Oxford University Press (1968) 16.

<sup>15</sup> *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, Hodder & Stoughton, London (1930) 46.

<sup>16</sup> F. Krebs, *Die Präpositionem bei Polybius*, Schanz Beiträge, Würzburg (1882).

<sup>17</sup> An interesting parallel to Jn. 1:16 is often pointed out in Philo's *The Posterity and Exile of Cain*. See below.

<sup>18</sup> H. St John Thackeray, *A Lexicon to Josephus*, Geuthner, Paris, I (1930) 52. W. Bauer adduces a passage from Josephus, *Antiquities* 45. 107–108 as what he considers to be an example of *ἀντί* with the meaning 'for the sake of'. Josephus records that, when the Roman general Crassus entered the Temple at Jerusalem, a priest named Eliezar, seeing that the Roman was intent on plundering the Temple, 'gave him the bar of gold as a ransom for all the rest', *τὴν δοκὸν αὐτοῦ*

Aelius Aristides (c. AD 120–189), where he feels that *ἀντί* is equivalent to *ὑπέρ*, but once again the meaning is clearly substitutionary: *Φιλουμένην ψυχὴν ἀντὶ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματι ἀντὶ σώματος ἀντέδωκεν, τὰ αὐτῆς ἀντὶ τῶν ἐμῶν*. ‘Philoumene exchanged her soul and body for mine.’

#### 4. *ἀντί* in the Septuagint

In the Septuagint, which influenced the writers of the New Testament so profoundly in the realm of language as well as in that of theological ideas, the preposition occurs 318 times. It translates a number of Hebrew words, most frequently appearing as the translation of *חֲנֹכַח*, which, in its metaphorical uses, has the meaning ‘in place of, instead of’, and is used ‘in particular of things mutually interchanged, “in place of, in exchange or return for”’,<sup>20</sup> *ἀντί* appears in the Septuagint with the meanings ‘instead of’, in exchange for, at the price of’, ‘in preference to’.<sup>21</sup> There are no instances where it has the meaning ‘for the sake of’ or as the equivalent of *ὑπέρ*. Walter Bauer thinks that Genesis 44:33 shows how the meaning ‘in place of’ can develop into ‘in behalf of’ someone, so that *ἀντί* becomes equivalent to *ὑπέρ*. However, the meaning is clearly ‘in place of’ as is evident from a most cursory reading of the verse: ‘Now therefore, let your servant, I pray you, remain *instead of the lad* as a slave to my lord; and let the lad go back with his brothers.’

This brief survey of the background literature to the New Testament should suffice to show that the meaning of *ἀντί* is basically that of *substitution* or *exchange*. No instances have been found where the ‘broader’ meaning appears.

#### 5. *ἀντί* in the New Testament

Before we address ourselves again to the passage in Mark 10:45, in order to complete our survey it will be wise to examine the

---

*τὴν χρυσὴν λύτρον ἀντὶ πάντων ἔδωκεν*. This, however, is a clear example of the use of *ἀντί* with the meaning ‘instead of’, for as F. Buchsel (in *TDNT* I, 373) remarks: ‘It is incontestable that *ἀντί* means “in place of”. For the priest is not merely intending to give something for the good of the treasury. He is seeking to satisfy Crassus that the latter may take the ingot of gold instead of the (whole) treasury.’

<sup>19</sup> *s.v.*

<sup>20</sup> *BDB*, 1065.

<sup>21</sup> M. Johannesson, *Der Gebrauch der Prepositionem in der Septuaginta*, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, Berlin (1925) 198–200.

other New Testament examples of the use of *ἀντί* to discover whether in the New Testament writings themselves the broader meaning is present.<sup>22</sup> Apart from five occurrences of the phrase *ἀνθ' ὧν*, one occurrence each of *ἀντί τούτου* and *ἀντί* with the genitive of the articular infinitive, none of which is relevant to our present concern, the use of *ἀντί* in the New Testament may be classified as follows:

(a) '*instead of, in the place of*'.

This is the meaning in Matthew 2:22: 'Archelaus reigned . . . in place of his father Herod', and Luke 11:11, 'What father among you, if his son asks for fish, will instead of a fish give him a serpent . . . ?'

(b) '*in exchange for, in return for*'.

In Matthew 5:38 the preposition is used twice in quoting the 'lex talionis' of Exodus 21:23-25, 'an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth . . .', the wrong use of which Jesus forbids. Similarly in Romans 12:17, 1 Thessalonians 5:15 and 1 Peter 3:9 there is the prohibition of repaying evil for evil *κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ* (1 Pet. 3:9 adds 'or reviling for reviling' *λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας*). In Hebrews 12:16 the readers are warned not to 'be immoral or irreligious like Esau, who sold his birthright for a single meal', *ὅς ἀντὶ βρώσεως μιᾶς ἀπέδοτο τὰ πρωτοτόκια αὐτοῦ*. The meaning of *ἀντί* here is evidently 'in return for, in exchange for'. This is probably also the meaning of the preposition when it is used earlier in the same chapter of Hebrews (verse 2): Jesus 'for the joy that was set before him (*ἀντὶ τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς*, i.e. with a view to obtaining it) endured the cross, despising the shame, and is seated at the right hand of the throne of God'. Some scholars take the preposition here to have the sense of 'instead of', understanding the writer to mean either that Jesus chose the way of the cross instead of

<sup>22</sup> This is particularly necessary in view of the fact that in Koine Greek there is a blurring of the classical distinctions, cf. the words of N. Turner (in *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* by J. H. Moulton, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, III *Syntax* (1963) 3) who speaks of 'the almost complete absence of classical standards' in the writings of the NT, and says: 'He (i.e. the translator) will look askance at the "theology of prepositions", and will remember that Hellenistic writers . . . confuse the nice distinctions between prepositions . . . so that the exegete must look at the context.' In our study thus far we have examined the contexts where *ἀντί* has been used, but have not as yet met with any 'blurring' in the direction of *ὕπερ*.

continuing in the possession of the heavenly glory as the Son,<sup>23</sup> or that He chose the way of the cross instead of a more trouble-free life or the sort of 'short cut' which was offered to Him in the wilderness temptations.<sup>24</sup> Even if either of these is the meaning, it is still a perfectly regular use of *ἀντί*.

The phrase in John 1:16 *χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος* has been interpreted in various ways, although nearly all scholars understand *ἀντί* in the sense of 'instead of' or 'in exchange for' or as a combination of the two. The idea seems to be 'that Christian life is based at all points upon grace; as it proceeds one grace is exchanged only for another'.<sup>25</sup> The following passage from Philo's *The Posterity and Exile of Cain*<sup>26</sup> uses the preposition *ἀντί* three times with this meaning: 'Wherefore God ever causes his earliest gifts to cease before their recipients are glutted and wax insolent; and storing them up for the future gives others in their stead, and a third supply to replace the second, and ever new in place of earlier boons. . . .'

In 1 Corinthians 11:15, Paul uses the preposition *ἀντί* when he says that a woman's hair 'is given to her for a covering' *ἀντὶ περιβολαίου*. Some writers understand the meaning of *ἀντί* here to be 'instead of', although this would seem to stultify Paul's contention concerning the need for a veil. Possibly the preposition has here the idea of equivalence, which, as we have seen earlier, is a meaning it sometimes bears; Paul's point might then be that woman's hair is 'in the nature of a covering, thus to match the veil'.<sup>27</sup> C. K. Barrett accepts the idea of equivalence, but understands it rather differently and translates the clause: 'For her long hair has been

<sup>23</sup> So B. F. C. Atkinson, *The Theology of Prepositions*, Tyndale Press, London (1944) 7.

<sup>24</sup> So in general J. Calvin, *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews*, ET, Oliver & Boyd, Edinburgh & London (1963) 188, and N. Turner, *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament*, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh (1965) 173.

<sup>25</sup> C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John*, SPCK, London (1955) 140.

<sup>26</sup> Translation from the *Loeb Classical Library* edition. As already stated, other interpretations of the phrase have been offered, but all understand *ἀντί* in the sense of 'instead of' or 'in exchange for'. Calvin's suggestion is slightly different (see *The Gospel according to St. John*, 1-10, ET, Oliver & Boyd, Edinburgh and London (1959) 24); he thinks that the meaning is that the grace which the Christian receives corresponds or answers to the source of the grace in Christ, thus suggesting the idea of *correspondence*. If this is so, it still utilizes one of the basic meanings of the word. See also J. H. Bernard, *ICC St. John*, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, I (1928) 29 and J. M. Bover, *Bib.* 6 (1925) 454-460.

<sup>27</sup> G. G. Findlay, *Expositor's Greek Testament*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, II (n.d.) 876.



given to her to serve as a covering'; he comments: 'Woman has been given in her hair a primitive form of covering which man lacks. In this she has the advantage of him, and she must follow the hint her naturally long hair supplies.'<sup>28</sup> Once again, this still preserves the basic meaning of the word.

The use of *ἀντί* in Matthew 17:27 (the incident of the coin in the fish's mouth) is thought by some to be a clear example of the use of the preposition with the more general meaning 'on behalf of':<sup>29</sup> 'take that and give it to them for me and for yourself' (*ἀντί ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ*). The reference is to the payment of the tax the regulations for which are found in Exodus 30:11-16. The precise reason for the tax is not clear; it was to be paid 'that there be no plague among them when you number them' (verse 12) and was apparently to be used for the upkeep of the Sanctuary (verse 15). What is clear, however, is that the money was thought of as a 'ransom', Heb. כֶּפֶר, LXX λύτρα (verse 12), which was 'to make atonement' לְכַפֵּר, ἐξιλάσασθαι (verse 15). כֶּפֶר according to Brown, Driver and Briggs<sup>30</sup> is used of 'the price of a life, a ransom', and the concept of substitution is always present with כֶּפֶר according to O. Procksch.<sup>31</sup> There is thus the idea of 'substitution money' present in the original regulations. That the idea of redemption and atonement continued to be associated with the tax is clear from the reference in the Jewish tractate Tosephta Shekalim 1.6. 'The Israelites should be pledged for their (unpaid) shekels; in order that the community offerings should be bought with them; for the community-sacrifices reconcile the Israelites with their Father in heaven, and so we find it written: "Thou shalt take the money of the propitiation from the sons of Israel."'<sup>32</sup> Thus the use of *ἀντί* in Matthew 17:27 probably reflects an awareness of the tax as redemption money paid to absolve the lives of the people from the divine wrath. Jesus and His disciples are free from the need to pay this, but He suggests

<sup>28</sup> C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, A. & C. Black, London (1968) 257.

<sup>29</sup> E.g. C. Ryder Smith, *The Bible Doctrine of Salvation*, Epworth, London (1941) 157; Arndt, 73; F. Büchsel *TDNT* I, 373; C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*,<sup>2</sup> Cambridge University Press (1959) 71. See also the discussion by L. L. Morris, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*,<sup>3</sup> Tyndale Press, London (1965) 35f.

<sup>30</sup> *Op. cit.*, 497.

<sup>31</sup> *TDNT* IV, 331.

<sup>32</sup> Cited in G. Dalman, *Jesus-Jeshua*, ET Macmillan, New York (1929) 119.

that they should pay it 'not to give offence to them'. So the preposition bears its normal substitutionary sense.

Having examined all the other New Testament uses of *ἀντί* we return to a consideration of the ransom saying in Mark 10:45/Matthew 20:28. A number of writers deny that *ἀντί* here has the sense of 'instead of' or 'in exchange for',<sup>33</sup> but we have seen no evidence in the Greek of the period, nor of that before or after, to justify this idea. As we have discovered, in non-biblical Greek, in the LXX and in all its New Testament occurrences the ideas of substitution and exchange are present. Occasionally the idea is that of equivalence or comparison, but nowhere does the 'broader sense' appear.

In actual fact, a large number of lexicographers, grammarians and commentators hold that the ideas of equivalence, substitution and exchange are present in this passage,<sup>34</sup> even if some feel that a broader meaning is present elsewhere. A. M. Hunter, for example, says:<sup>35</sup> 'The preposition used . . . clearly implies substitution . . . at the very least then, we must say (it seems to me) that the death of Jesus takes the place of "the many"; and the most natural interpretation is that the death of the innocent One exempts the guilty.' Similarly, W. Manson comments:<sup>36</sup> 'The Son of Man here means Jesus on earth . . . and the claim is that he fulfils his vocation by accepting the sacrificial function of the Servant of the Lord who gives his life "in compensation for the sins of the people, interposing for them as their substitute".'

What we would add to this is that the preposition *ἀντί*

<sup>33</sup> E.g. C. Ryder Smith, *op. cit.*, 157; Arndt, 73, cf. also D. E. Nineham, *Pelican Gospel Commentaries: The Gospel of St. Mark*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth (1963) 285: 'The Greek word (*anti*) normally means "instead of", "in place of", and some commentators find that meaning here. . . . But there are passages where the word means no more than "on behalf of", and it is doubtful how far we should press the more exact meaning.'

<sup>34</sup> We note the following: Lexicographers—Grimm-Thayer, A. Souter, G. Abbott-Smith, F. Büchsel (in *TDNT* I, 373); grammarians—J. H. Moulton, A. T. Robertson, Dana and Mantey, W. D. Chamberlain, C. F. D. Moule, Blass-Debrunner-Funk, P. F. Regard (*Contribution à l'Étude des Prépositions dans la langue du NT*, Paris (1919), B. F. C. Atkinson; commentators—A. E. J. Rawlinson, V. Taylor, C. E. B. Cranfield, R. V. G. Tasker; other writers—F. J. Taylor, *A Theological Word Book of the Bible*, ed. A. Richardson, SCM, London (1950) 187; A. M. Hunter, *The Work and Words of Jesus*, SCM, London (1950) 98; L. L. Morris, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*, 29ff.; A. Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament*, SCM, London (1958) 221; W. Manson, *Jesus the Messiah*, Hodder & Stoughton, London (1943) 131; E. Best, *The Temptation and the Passion*, Cambridge University Press (1965) 143.

<sup>35</sup> *Op. cit.*, 98.

<sup>36</sup> *Op. cit.*, 131.

*demand*s this sort of interpretation. It *cannot* be understood otherwise.<sup>37</sup>

However, although it may be admitted that Mark 10:45 does teach substitution, it is often argued that our understanding of the work of Christ must not rest on a single passage which, according to some, is of doubtful authenticity anyway. It is said that we must take account of the fact that the preposition most frequently used in statements about the death of Christ is *ὕπερ* with the genitive, which means 'on behalf of' and cannot mean 'in the place of'. To this preposition we now turn.

## II. THE PREPOSITION *ὕπερ*

The use of *ὕπερ* in statements concerning the death of Christ occurs in most strands of New Testament literature, notably in Paul, John, Hebrews and 1 Peter, but also with an odd reference in Mark (the cup saying at the Last Supper) and Luke (in a similar position, if the longer text be accepted). *ὕπερ ἡμῶν* 'for us' is a phrase of frequent occurrence (*cf.* also *ὕπερ ὑμῶν*, *ὕπερ πάντων*, *etc.*). The general meaning appears to be 'on behalf of, for the sake of, for the benefit of'; Christ by His death secures our good. Is anything more present in these statements? Does *ὕπερ* sometimes include the sense of *ἀντί*? Does Christ's death *ὕπερ ἡμῶν* involve Him dying *ἀντί ἡμῶν*? These are questions we shall now try to answer.

Once again, it will be useful to examine the basic meaning and to see its use in non-biblical Greek and the Septuagint before looking at the New Testament uses.

### 1. *Original Meaning*

The English words 'over' and 'upper' are both etymologically

<sup>37</sup> A full consideration of the ransom saying would deal with a number of points including the following: the setting of the saying at the beginning of the passion narrative; the light shed by the *ἀντάλλαγμα* saying in Mk 8:35-37/Mt. 16:25-26; the use of *λύτρον* in the LXX for כֶּפֶר, חַטֹּאת and חַטָּאת; the probability that Is. 53: 10ff. with the thought of the חַטָּאת lies behind the passage; and the possible Aramaic origin of the saying (the Aramaic preposition חַטָּאת means 'instead of'). For a number of these points see R. T. France, *Tyndale Bulletin* 19 (1968) 32-37.

related to *ὑπέρ* (as are Latin *super*, German *über*, etc.) and convey the basic meaning of the word. Used originally in a local sense (as indeed were all prepositions) of one object being over or above another, it also came to be used in a temporal sense, 'before', and also metaphorically with the meaning of 'for one's benefit', 'on behalf of' someone, being 'over' them in the sense of defending or protecting them. Other metaphorical meanings developed (e.g. 'surpassing', 'superior to'—these meanings are found when *ὑπέρ* is used with the accusative) but our interest is with the development of meaning in the direction of *ἀντί*. To be 'over' someone in the sense of defending or protecting them naturally leads in this direction: one person standing over another to protect him, e.g. a mother over her child, may receive blows or injuries *instead of* him.

This, in fact, is what is found with *ὑπέρ*; a person doing or suffering something on behalf of someone else is often doing it in his place. As G. B. Winer says,<sup>38</sup> 'In most cases one who acts in behalf of another takes his place.'<sup>39</sup>

## 2. Classical Greek

Many examples of this may be given from the Classical writers; in Thucydides I. 141: 'And each one thinks no harm will come from his own negligence, but that it is the business of someone else to be provident on his behalf' *ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ*; in Plato *Gorgias* 515c and *Republic* 590a, answering *ὑπέρ* someone is answering instead of them;<sup>40</sup> in Xenophon *Anabasis* 7.4.9–10, *ὑπέρ* and *ἀντί* are used interchangeably;<sup>41</sup> in Euripides *Alcestis* 698–701, Admetus is rebuked for his cunning device in persuading his wife to die for him *ὑπὲρ σοῦ*, where the meaning is clearly 'instead of you' (cf. line 434, where he mourns Alcestis' death: 'for she alone hath died for me', *ἐπεὶ τέθνηκεν ἀντ' ἐμοῦ μόνη*).<sup>42</sup>

<sup>38</sup> G. B. Winer, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, ET, Macmillan, New York, (1889) 382.

<sup>39</sup> *ὑπέρ* is a preposition which overlaps in other directions also; sometimes it is more or less equivalent to the rather colourless *περί* or *διά* + acc.; with *ὑπέρ* there is a blurring of distinctions, but with *ἀντί* there is not.

<sup>40</sup> *ἐγὼ ὑπὲρ σοῦ ἀποκρῖνομαι; ἐγὼ γάρ σοι ὑπὲρ ἐκείνου ἀποκρῖνομαι.*

<sup>41</sup> Episthenes is first asked if he would be willing to die *ὑπὲρ τούτου* 'for this boy's sake'. His answer being in the affirmative, the boy is then asked by Seuthes whether he should strike Episthenes *ἀντ' ἐκείνου* 'in his stead'.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. A. T. Robertson, *Grammar*,<sup>3</sup> 630–632.

### 3. Greek of the New Testament Period

Many grammarians draw attention to the abundant use in the Papyri of *ὑπέρ* in the statement that one man has written a letter for someone else who was illiterate.<sup>43</sup> As they observe, *ὑπέρ* in these cases had the sense of *ἀντί*; the scribe does the writing *instead of* the man for whom he does it. *ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ἀγραμμάτου* is more or less a technical formula.

### 4. The Septuagint

There are clear uses of *ὑπέρ* with the meaning 'instead of' in the following passages in the Septuagint:

Deuteronomy 24:16 (twice). 'The fathers shall not be put to death for (*ὑπέρ*) the children, nor shall the children be put to death for (*ὑπέρ*) the fathers; every man shall be put to death for his own sin.'

Isaiah 43:3-4 (three times). 'I made Egypt and Ethiopia your ransom, and [I gave] Syene for you (*ὑπὲρ σοῦ*) . . . and I will give many men for you (*ὑπὲρ σοῦ*) and rulers for (*ὑπέρ*) your head.' The LXX as here translated differs from the MT in small points, but the central idea of *exchange* remains. (The Hebrew preposition which the LXX translates by *ὑπέρ* is *מִעַל* which, according to BDB,<sup>44</sup> when used metaphorically means 'instead of, in exchange for' never 'for the sake of'. Note the RSV translation of the whole verse.)

Judith 8:12. 'Who are you, that have put God to the test this day, and are setting yourselves up in the place of God (*ὑπὲρ τοῦ θεοῦ*) among the sons of men' (RSV margin reads 'above God', but this would probably be *ὑπὲρ τὸν θεόν*).

### 5. The New Testament

There are three examples in the New Testament where *ὑπέρ* is used in a substitutionary sense, of persons other than Christ.

<sup>43</sup> Moulton and Milligan, *Grammar*, 651; A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East* ET, Hodder & Stoughton, London (1927) 152f.; A. T. Robertson, *Expositor* (1920) 321ff.; E. Mayser, *Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, de Gruyter, Berlin and Leipzig, II, 2 (1934) 460.

<sup>44</sup> s.v.

In Romans 9:3, Paul expresses his deep love for his own nation with the words: 'For I could wish that I myself were accursed and cut off from Christ for the sake of my brethren (*ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου*), my kinsmen by race.' As James Denney says:<sup>45</sup> 'We might call it with Dorner "a spark from the fire of Christ's substitutionary love". There is a passion in it more profound even than that of Moses' prayer in Exodus 32:32. Moses identifies himself with his people, and if they cannot be saved would perish with them; Paul could find it in his heart, were it possible, to perish for them' (*i.e.* in their place).

In 1 Corinthians 15:29, where Paul refers to the practice of baptism for the dead, he uses the preposition *ὑπὲρ* twice. A local meaning has been suggested, *i.e.* Christians were baptized *over* the tombs of departed believers; but this is unlikely, as is also the suggestion<sup>46</sup> that it expresses *purpose*, *i.e.* the dead are departed Christians, those who are baptized are converts who accept Christianity in order that, at the resurrection, they may be united with their loved ones. The most natural understanding is that Paul is referring to a practice of Christians being baptized vicariously for other Christians who had died without being baptized. There is evidence for the practice at a later date and it is likely that this is what Paul is alluding to. He does not approve it, but merely uses it as an *ad hominem* argument. For our purpose it is sufficient to note that *ὑπὲρ* here has the sense 'instead of'. They were being baptized *in place of* departed believers.

The third example in Paul is his statement in Philemon 13 concerning Onesimus: 'I would have been glad to keep him with me, in order that he might serve me on your behalf (*ὑπὲρ σοῦ*) during my imprisonment for the gospel.' The AV translates *ὑπὲρ σοῦ* as 'in thy stead', and this is fairly obviously the meaning: Philemon himself would help Paul were he present with him; Paul would really have liked to keep Onesimus as Philemon's proxy, but he is sending him back, possibly with the hope that Philemon will return him again.

In the light of this brief survey, it is extremely strange that many scholars are so loth to admit the substitutionary meaning into those statements in the New Testament which speak of

<sup>45</sup> *Expositor's Greek Testament*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, II (n.d.) 657.

<sup>46</sup> M. Raeder, *ZNW* 46 (1955) 258ff.

Christ's death *ὕπὲρ ἡμῶν*, etc.<sup>47</sup> There are about twenty passages in the New Testament which speak of Christ suffering or dying for us using the preposition *ὕπὲρ* where the meaning includes 'in the place of' as well as 'for the sake of'.<sup>48</sup> We do not intend to mention them all, but merely to note the most important ones.

There is a clear example in John 11:50-51. Here Caiaphas, the politically minded ecclesiastic, says to the council: 'You know nothing at all; you do not understand that it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people (*ὕπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ*) and that the whole nation should not perish.' According to the Evangelist, he spoke wiser than he knew, for his words concerning political expediency were also words of God-given prophecy: 'He did not say this of his own accord, but being high priest that year he prophesied that Jesus should die for the nation, and not for the nation only. . . .' Raymond E. Brown<sup>49</sup> thinks that the words *ὕπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ* are a gloss as they are omitted by Augustine, Chrysostom, Theodoret and some Ethiopic witnesses, and also as this is the only use of *λαός* in the Fourth Gospel (apart from 18:14 where Caiaphas' words are again quoted). This, however, is extremely tenuous, and no other commentator even mentions the possibility of omission. It is, therefore, better to retain them. Brown notes that if the words are original then *ὕπὲρ* here means 'instead of'. R. Bultmann<sup>50</sup> also says that *ὕπὲρ* here means 'an Stelle von' (in place of, instead of). In the words of A. T. Robertson,<sup>51</sup> 'It is political substitution that Caiaphas has in mind and not theological, though John finds that in the words also . . . the author of the Fourth Gospel has no hesitation in employing *ὕπὲρ* for the idea of vicarious suffering in the mind of Caiaphas.'

<sup>47</sup> E.g. E. de W. Burton, *ICC Galatians*, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh (1921) 172: '*ὕπὲρ ἡμῶν* means "on our behalf". It cannot be pressed to mean "in our place" (*ἀντὶ*); J. H. Bernard, *EGT*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, III (1903) 70; '*ὕπὲρ* is not equivalent to *ἀντὶ* "instead of", and should not be so translated'.

<sup>48</sup> J. Jeremias (W. Zimmerli and J. Jeremias, *The Servant of God*, ET, SCM, London, revised ed. (1965) 88-94) claims that a number of these passages are, or at least contain echoes of, ancient formulae which are the result of early Aramaic-speaking Christian reflection on Is. 53. If he is right then this strengthens the probability that *ὕπὲρ* in these statements includes the meaning 'in the place of'.

<sup>49</sup> *The Anchor Bible: The Gospel according to St. John*, I, Doubleday, New York (1966) 440.

<sup>50</sup> *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, Göttingen (1941)

314.  
<sup>51</sup> *Grammar*,<sup>3</sup> 631.

In 1 Peter 2:21 and 3:18 the suffering of Christ is twice referred to as an example of the way in which Christians are to conduct themselves when they suffer, but in both cases the writer goes on to speak of the atoning efficacy of Christ's sufferings. His language is clearly moulded by Isaiah 53 as he speaks (2:22–25) of our 'straying like sheep' and being healed by His stripes, *etc.*, and so the reference in 2:21 to Christ suffering 'for you' *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* would be understood as vicarious suffering like that of the Servant.<sup>52</sup> In 3:18, the reference is similar: 'Christ also died (or "suffered") for sins once for all, the righteous for the unrighteous' (*δικαίως ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων*). Here, again, there are allusions to Isaiah 53<sup>53</sup> and so the *ὑπὲρ* is substitutionary. As A. M. Stibbs says:<sup>54</sup> 'His suffering . . . was also vicarious and substitutionary. . . . It was the penalty due to the sins of the unrighteous that He bore in their stead.'

Passing by other references such as Hebrews 2:9, where Christ is said to have been made for a little while lower than the angels that He might taste death for everyone *ὑπὲρ παντός γεύσεται*, and which the New English Bible renders '. . . so that . . . in tasting death he should stand for us all', we note briefly some of the Pauline uses of *ὑπὲρ* when speaking of the death of Christ.

In Romans 5:6–8 Paul uses the preposition four times: 'While we were yet helpless, at the right time Christ died for the ungodly (*ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν*). Why, one will hardly die for a righteous man (*ὑπὲρ δικαίου*)—though perhaps for a good man (*ὑπὲρ . . . τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ*) one will even dare to die. But God shows his love for us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us (*ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*).' In his discussion of whether or not men would die for a righteous man or for a good man, it seems unlikely that Paul is speaking merely of dying for the sake or for the cause of such a person, as many have been found who have been willing to lay down their lives in battle for the cause of a great hero, general or king. It seems more likely that Paul

<sup>52</sup> Cf. C. E. B. Cranfield, *I & II Peter and Jude*, SCM, London (1960) 83. 'His sufferings were vicarious.'

<sup>53</sup> J. Jeremias, *The Servant of God*, 92.

<sup>54</sup> *The First Epistle General of Peter*, Tyndale Press, London (1959) 141; cf. also C. E. B. Cranfield's words (*op. cit.*, 101), 'His death was vicarious; he died in our place.'



is speaking of dying in someone's place, which, he says, would be extremely rare and only likely in the case of a person of real 'goodness'. One thinks of Sydney Carton the wastrel in Dickens' *Tale of Two Cities* going to the guillotine instead of Charles Darnay the 'righteous' or 'good' man. This happens very rarely, says Paul; but Christ has actually died for the *ungodly*, for *sinner*s. Furthermore, it must be remembered that the whole discussion in Romans 5 is conducted against the background of the universal sinfulness of man and the wrath of God revealed against sin and demanding death as the punishment of sin (2:8-9; 5:12; 6:23). The death of Christ 'for us' which justifies us, saves us from wrath and reconciles to God when we were His enemies, is thus a death *in our place*. We should have died; He has died instead of us.

In Romans 5 the love of *God* is shown by giving Christ to die for us; In 2 Corinthians 5 it is the love of *Christ* which is thus shown; 'For the love of Christ controls us, because we are convinced that one has died for all (*ὅτι περ πάντων*); therefore all have died. And he died for all (*ὅτι περ πάντων*) that those who live might live no longer for themselves but for him who for their sake (*ὅτι περ αὐτῶν*) died and was raised.'

The statement that one died for all with the consequence that all may be said to have died must certainly mean more than the fact that he died for their sake or with a view to their good. It means at least that He died as their Representative if not as their Substitute. This is how it is understood by the vast majority of commentators and there are very few exceptions.<sup>55</sup> Among nineteenth century writers, C. Wordsworth<sup>56</sup> and H. Alford<sup>57</sup> both feel that *ὅτι περ* here means 'instead of' all, and C. Hodge<sup>58</sup> notes that this fact 'is admitted by the great body of even Rationalistic commentators'. R. H. Strachan<sup>59</sup> comments 'There can be little doubt that the words "one has died for all" bear a substitutionary meaning. . . .

<sup>55</sup> J. H. Bernard, *EGT* III, 70, dissents; A. Plummer, *ICC II Corinthians*, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh (1915) 174, is dubious; F. V. Filson, *IB*, Abingdon, New York and Nashville (1951) 334, feels that *ὅτι περ* here means 'for the benefit of', but says that verse 21 confirms that there is an element of substitution present.

<sup>56</sup> *St. Paul's Epistles*,<sup>5</sup> II, Rivingtons, London (1872) 161.

<sup>57</sup> *The Greek Testament*,<sup>7</sup> III, Rivingtons, London (1881) 663.

<sup>58</sup> *An Exposition of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh (1859) 135.

<sup>59</sup> *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, *MNT*, Hodder & Stoughton, London (1935) 107.

Paul means that Christ bore voluntarily a doom that should have been ours.' E. B. Allo<sup>60</sup> says: 'ὅτι' has a fluid sense which can mean "in the place of" as much as "for the good of". . . it is the first which is primary (here) . . . ὅτι has the meaning representation, going even as far as a sort of substitution.'<sup>61</sup> It is interesting to note that Athanasius of Alexandria, one of the early Fathers who had the advantage of the original New Testament in his mother tongue and who therefore possessed a native insight into the meaning of the language, has two sections in his treatise *De Incarnatione* where, with this passage from 2 Corinthians 5 obviously in mind, he shows that for him ὅτι πάντων and ἀντὶ πάντων are synonymous.<sup>62</sup>

In verse 21 of the same chapter Paul uses the preposition again with a substitutionary sense: 'For our sake (ὅτι ἡμῶν)

<sup>60</sup> *Saint Paul: Second Épître aux Corinthiens*,<sup>2</sup> Lecoq, Paris (1956) 165.

<sup>61</sup> P. E. Hughes, *Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, Marshall, Morgan & Scott, London and Edinburgh (1962) 193-194, feels that substitution is demanded by the context, and notes that Chrysostom understood ὑπὲρ χριστοῦ here to mean ἀντὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ; cf. also the words of J. Denney, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, EB, Hodder & Stoughton, London (1894) 194-195: 'Plainly, if Paul's conclusion is to be drawn, the "for" must reach deeper than this mere suggestion of our advantage: if we all died in that Christ died for us, there must be a sense in which that death of his is ours; He must be identified with us in it; there on the cross, while we stand and gaze at Him, He is not simply a person doing us a service; He is a person doing us a service by filling our place and dying our death.'

It is a fine point, but many modern writers prefer to speak of Christ as our Representative rather than our Substitute; they would feel that such an understanding does justice to Paul's statement here: He died as our Representative and so we are counted as having died. This, however, neglects the all-important point which is always in the background of NT thinking, especially with Paul, namely, that death is the penalty for sin, to which penalty all men are liable. In this context, Christ dying for us must mean Christ dying in our place. As Paul puts it here, this is counted as our having died, and so, having been absolved from the penalty of sin, we are now free to live to God.

Another way of stating the matter in a form which attempts to avoid the concept of substitution is to speak of 'salvation through participation'; cf. D. E. H. Whiteley, *The Theology of St. Paul*, Blackwell, Oxford (1964) 130ff. He states it thus: 'Christ shared our experience, sin alone excepted, including death, in order that we, by virtue of our solidarity with him, might share his life.' This also is inadequate in view of what we have just stated.

<sup>62</sup> Athanasius, *On the Incarnation*,<sup>2</sup> ET by A. Robertson, D. Nutt, London (1891) 14-16: 'And thus taking from our bodies one of like nature, because all were under penalty of the corruption of death he gave it over to death in the stead of all (ἀντὶ πάντων) and offered it to the Father—doing this, moreover, of his loving-kindness, to the end that firstly, all being held to have died in him, the law involving the ruin of all might be undone.' 'The death of all was accomplished in the Lord's body, and that death and corruption were wholly done away by reason of the Word that was united with it. For there was need of death, and death must needs be suffered on behalf of all (ὕπὲρ πάντων) that the death owing from all might be paid. . . . The Word . . . took to himself a body that could die, that he might offer it as his own in the stead of all (ἀντὶ πάντων) and as suffering, through his union with it on behalf of all (ὕπὲρ πάντων).' (Italics ours.)

he made him to be sin who knew no sin, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God.' In verse 19, he has suggested that God has not reckoned the sins of men against them, and this verse states in effect that God has reckoned them to Christ, so making Him 'sin' or a sin-offering in our place. Allo<sup>63</sup> comments: 'Verse 19 compared with verse 14, on the death of Christ and its effects, as also verse 21, gives precisely the idea of the "Vicarious Sacrifice", as Theology speaks.'

In Galatians 3:13 Paul uses the preposition again in the striking sentence 'Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us (*ὕπερ ἡμῶν*)'. He has shown in verse 10 that those 'who rely on works of the law are under a curse', from which position, he says, Christ has 'bought us out' (*ἐξηγόρασεν*) by becoming a cursed one<sup>64</sup> in our place.<sup>65</sup> P. Bonnard<sup>65</sup> says that the verse teaches 'substitution', '*ὕπερ ἡμῶν* = "en notre faveur" et "à notre place" '; cf. also H. N. Ridderbos:<sup>66</sup> 'What we have here, in other words, as is evident also from the phrase "for us", is the thought of substitution.'<sup>67</sup>

In the Pastoral Epistles, Titus 2:14 contains another possible instance of *ὕπερ* in the substitutionary sense: 'Who gave himself for us (*ὕπερ ἡμῶν*) to redeem us from all iniquity',<sup>68</sup> and clearly the reference in 1 Timothy 2:6 which speaks of 'the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself as a ransom for all, (*ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων*) has a substitutionary meaning. The prefixed *ἀντι-*reinforces the idea of substitution already present in the *λύτρον*

<sup>63</sup> *Op. cit.*, 171.

<sup>64</sup> J. Jeremias, *The Central Message of the New Testament*, SCM, London (1965)

57.

<sup>65</sup> *L'Épître aux Galatiens*, Delachaux et Nestle, Paris (1952) 69.

<sup>66</sup> H. N. Ridderbos, *The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia*, Marshall, Morgan & Scott, London and Edinburgh (1953) 128.

<sup>67</sup> The comment of A. T. Robertson (*art. cit.*) is lengthy, but worth citing: 'In this passage Paul draws a picture by means of three prepositions (*ὑπό*, *ὑπέρ*, *ἐκ*). . . . He is arguing that the real children of Abraham are those who believe, whether Jews or Gentiles, for all who try to be saved by the law are under a curse (*ὕπο κατάραν*). The curse of the law, like a Damascus blade, hangs over the head of everyone who lives not up to every requirement of the law. But Christ became a curse for us or over us (*γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάραν*), that is, the Damascus blade fell on Christ instead of upon us, Christ standing over (*ὑπέρ*) us and between us and the curse of the law under (*ὑπό*) which we lived. Thus Christ bought us out from under the curse of the law (*χριστός ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάραν τοῦ νόμου*). The curse had no longer power over us and we were set free because Christ became a curse in our stead (*ὑμέρ*).'

<sup>68</sup> Cf. D. Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles*, Tyndale Press, London (1957) 201.

concept, and so even if the *ὕπερ* were taken with the meaning 'for the benefit of', the concept of substitution would be present in the text.<sup>69</sup>

### Conclusion

In attempting to summarize what we have found, we would give the following statement: the preposition *ἀντί* *always* has the idea of equivalence, substitution or exchange present; it *never* has the more general meaning 'on behalf of, for the sake of'. Therefore Mark 10:45 can *only* mean that the life of Christ given up in death was given *in exchange for* the forfeited lives of the many. The preposition *ὕπερ* *may* and often *does* include the stricter idea 'instead of' and if the context warrants, we may so understand it.

If we ask why *ὕπερ* is used so much more frequently than *ἀντί*, the answer would appear to be twofold: firstly, in the New Testament period *ἀντί* suffered a great reduction in use;<sup>70</sup> secondly, in the words of R. C. Trench:<sup>71</sup> 'The preposition *ὕπερ* is the rather employed, that it may express both these meanings, and express how Christ died at once "for our sakes" . . . and "in our stead": while *ἀντί* would only have expressed the last of these.' In other words, while *ἀντί* could express the fact that Christ died in our place, it could not of itself state that this death was for our benefit and for our good, and therefore *ὕπερ*, which can express both these ideas, is used.

We would like to close with three quotations:

Firstly, the vigorous words of Karl Barth:<sup>72</sup> 'If someone gives his life a *λύτρον ἀντί πολλῶν* (Mark 10:45) then he neces-

<sup>69</sup> A substitutionary meaning may also be present to a greater or lesser degree in the following passages: Rom. 8:32; 14:15; 1 Cor. 5:7, *var.*; 11:24; Gal. 2:20; Eph. 5:2, 25; 1 Thes. 5:10; Mk 14:24; Lk. 22:19, 20, *var.*; Jn 10:11, 15. In a number of these, while the statement itself appears to state no more than the fact that Christ died for our sakes, the context suggest that the thought of substitution is present.

<sup>70</sup> F. Blass in the early editions of his *Grammar* spoke of it as 'one of the prepositions that are dying out' (*Grammar of New Testament Greek*,<sup>2</sup> ET, Macmillan, London (1905) 140). This was not true, because it survives in Modern Greek, but in the New Testament period, it certainly did suffer a reduction in usage, and the latest edition of Blass (F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, ET, by R. Funk, Cambridge and Chicago University Presses (1961) 110) states correctly that it is 'greatly reduced'.

<sup>71</sup> *Synonyms of the New Testament*,<sup>8</sup> Macmillan, London (1876) 300.

<sup>72</sup> *Church Dogmatics* I, ET, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh (1936) 230-231.

sarily acts in their place and as the representative of the πολλοί, paying on their account and without their co-operation what they cannot pay for themselves. If he sheds his blood *περὶ πολλῶν* (Mt. 26:28) that again is an act which is to the advantage of the πολλοί, but it is his blood which is shed and not a drop of theirs. . . . If according to the saying of the High Priest in John 11:50 it was expedient that one man should die *ὕπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ*, this expressly involves that the people should not die, but that he should die in place of the people to save the people.'

The second is from the Epistle to Diognetus.<sup>73</sup> This uses *ὕπὲρ* in the sense of 'instead of' or 'in exchange for', as is evident from the explicit use of *ἀνταλλαγή* ('exchange'): 'In pity for us He took upon Himself our sins, and Himself parted with His own Son as a ransom for us (*λύτρον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*), the holy for the lawless, the guileless for the evil, the just for the unjust, the incorruptible for the corruptible, the immortal for the mortal (*ὕπὲρ* is used in all these phrases). For what else but His righteousness would have covered our sins? In whom was it possible for us lawless and ungodly men to have been justified, save only in the Son of God? O the sweet exchange (*ὦ τῆς γλυκείας ἀνταλλαγῆς*), O the inscrutable creation, O the unexpected benefits; that the iniquity of many should be concealed in one Righteous Man, and the righteousness of One should justify many that are iniquitous.'

The doctrine and the doxological strain here are surely completely true to the New Testament; it is hoped that our study has shown this to be so, and therefore the Christian is able to sing with head and heart:

Bearing shame and scoffing rude,  
In my place condemned He stood;  
Sealed my pardon with His blood:  
Hallelujah! What a Saviour!

<sup>73</sup> J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers with Short Introduction and English Translations*,<sup>2</sup> Macmillan, London (1898) 508-509.