THE NEW TESTAMENT TERMINOLOGY OF "REDEMPTION"

The most direct, but not the exclusive,[1] vehicle in the Greek of the New Testament of the idea which we commonly express in our current speech by the term "redeem" and its derivatives, is provided by a group of words built up upon the Greek term λύτρον, "ransom."[2] The exact implications of this group of words as employed by the writers of the New Testament have been brought into dispute.[3] It seems desirable therefore to look afresh into their origin and usage sufficiently to become clear as to the matter, and the inquiry may perhaps be thought to possess enough in-

---

[1] Compare, for example, the use of ἀγοράζω 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23, 2 Pet., ii. 1, Rev. v. 9, xiv. 3, 4; ἐξαγοράζω Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5; περιποιέομαι Acts xx. 28.

[2] λύτρον Matt. xx. 28, Mark x. 45; ἀντίλυτρον 1 Tim. ii. 6; λυτροῦσθαι Lk. xxiv. 2, Tit. ii. 14, 1 Pet. i. 18; λύτρωσις Lk. i. 68, ii. 38, Heb. ix. 12; ἀπολύτρωσις Lk. xxi. 28, Rom. iii. 24, viii. 23, 1 Cor. i. 30, Eph. 1, 7, 14, iv. 30, Col. 1, 14, Heb. ix. 15, xi. 35; [λυτρωτής] Acts vii. 35.

[3] Cf. what Johannes Weiss says in his comment on 1 Cor. i. 30b (Meyer series) : "Whereas heretofore the notion of ἀπολύτρωσις has been carefully investigated with reference to its shade of meaning (whether it is to be taken simply generally as = 'Deliverance,' or—because of the λυτρ—as = 'Ransoming') and also with reference to the particular relations of the notion (Who was the former owner? What is the ransom price? Who pays it? Why is it of so great value?), the tendency of the day is to push all these questions aside as wrongly put : Paul uses here a common *terminus technicus,* as a piece of current coin, with regard to which he reckons on a ready understanding; it is approximately = σωτηρία; accordingly it is translated simply 'Deliverance,' and no questions are asked with respect to a more exact explanation. This is generally right." . . . Weiss himself conceives the term to be used primarily of the eschatological salvation, but to have received (like others of the kind) a certain predating and not to have lost entirely the idea of ransoming, though laying the stress on the effects rather than the means.

trinsic interest to justify going a little farther afield in it, and entering somewhat more into details, than would be necessary for the immediate purpose in hand.

I

To begin at the beginning, at any rate, the ultimate base to which this group of words goes back seems to be represented by the Sanscrit LÛ, which bears the meaning of "to cut," or "to clip"; hence it is inferred that the earliest implication of the general Indo-European root LU was to set free by cutting a bond. The Greek primitive of this base, λύειν, has the general meaning of "to loose," which is applied and extended in a great variety of ways. When applied to men, its common meaning is " 'to loose, release, set free,' especially from bonds or prison, and so, generally, from difficulty, or danger." It developed a particular usage with reference to prisoners,[4] which is of interest to us. In this usage, it means, in the active voice, "to release on receipt of ransom," "to hold to ransom"; and in the middle voice, "to secure release by payment of ransom," "to ransom" in the common sense of that word,[5] passing on to a

---

[4] See Liddell and Scott, *Sub. voc.* I. 2. c.

[5] This distinctive usage of the active and middle may be excellently observed in the First and Twenty Fourth Books of the *Iliad*. In the opening lines of Book I we are told that Chryses came to the ships of the Achæans to ransom (λυσόμενος, line 13) his daughter, bearing a boundless ransom (ἄποινα); and that accordingly he supplicated the Achæans to ransom (λῦσαι [λύσατε], line 20) her to him and accept the ransom (ἄποινα). Agamemnon, however, declared roundly that he would not ransom (λύσω, line 29) her, and this was brought home to him in the subsequent council by Chalcas who charged him with not having ransomed (ἀπέλυσε) her and accepted the ransom (ἄποινα), and required him now (lines 95 ff) no longer to look for ransom but to give (δόμεναι) the maiden to her father unbought (ἀπριάτην) and unransomed (ἀνάποινον). Similarly, early in Book xxiv we read that Here despatched Thetis to Achilles (lines 115-116) to chide him for holding Hector's body and not ransoming (ἀπέλυσεν) it, and to see to it, that, respecting her, he now ransomed (λύση) it; and added that she will send Iris to Priam bidding him go and ransom (λύσας) his son bearing gifts to Achilles. Accordingly Thetis goes and chides Achilles (line 135) for holding Hector's body and not ransoming (ἀπέλυσας) it, and bids him ransom (λῦσαι) it, accepting the ransom

broader usage of simply "to redeem" (in which it is applied not merely to prisoners but to animals and landed property[6]) and even "to buy."[7]   It also acquired the sense of paying debts, and, when used with reference to wrong-doings, a sense of "undoing" or "making up for," which is not far removed from that of making atonement for, them.[8]

Naturally, the usual derivatives and compounds are formed from λύειν.   Among the former the abstract active substantive, λύσις, is especially interesting to us because among its various senses it reflects both of the usages of its primitive to which we have just called attention.   It is used of a release, deliverance, effected by the payment of a ransom—a "ransoming."[9]   And it is used of a cleansing from guilt by means of an expiation—an "atonement."[10]   Little less interesting, however, are the nouns of agent, of which

---

(ἄποινα) offered for the corpse: while Iris goes to Troy and urges Priam to go (line 140) to the ships and ransom (λύσασθαι) his son, carrying gifts to Achilles.   Stephens, Thesaurus, *sub voc.* observes that the French word *Deliverer* has the same two senses; "for *Deliverer au prisonier* is said both concerning him who redeems him and concerning him who releases him to a redeemer."   The same is true of the English word, "to deliver" and also, indeed, of the English word "to ransom."

[6] Liddell and Scott adduce ἵππον Xen. *An.* 7. 8. 6; τὸ χωρίον Dem. 1215.20.

[7] Liddell and Scott adduce "to buy from a pimp," Ar. *Vesp.* 1353.

[8] *Cf.* the usages classified by Liddell and Scott under III, = e.g. "to atone for, make up, like Latin *luere, rependere,*" as "to atone for sins," "to pay wages in full, to quit oneself of them," in the sense of "loosing" an obligation.   According to the Greek conception wrong-doing was inevitably followed by punishment.   "On the other hand, the punishment itself was sometimes regarded as an expiation of the guilt.   So the death of Laius' murderer was to 'loose' i.e. to undo the effect of the original deed (Sophocles, *Oed. Tyr.* 100 f.); so the chorus pray that Orestes' deed, a just manslaughter, may 'loose' the blood of long-past murders (Æsch. *Choeph.* 803 f.; cf. Eurip. *Her. Fur.* 40)"—Arthur Fairbanks, Hastings' *ERE,* V. p. 653a.

[9] *E.g.,* Homer. *Il.* xxiv. 655: "And there might be delay in the ransoming of the corpse (ἀνάβλησις λύσιος νεκροῖο)."

[10] *E.g.,* Plato, *Rep.* 364 E. where it is said that λύσεις καὶ καθάρμοι τῶν ἀδικημάτων—"expiations and atonements for sin" (Jowett)—are made by the Orphics both for the living and the dead.   *Cf.* E. Rohde, *Psyche,*[2] 1898, II. p. 127 f.

several are formed, bearing the general sense of "deliverer" —λύσιος (λύσειος), λυτήρ (λύτειρα), λύτωρ. Λύσιος was used in the Dionysiac myth as an epithet of Dionysus,[11] and in the Orphics a great part was played by the θεοὶ λύσιοι.[12] In the Second Book of the *Republic*,[13] Plato makes Adeimantos, performing the office of *advocatus diaboli*, urge in favor of being wicked and reaping its gains, that the penalties of wickedness may very easily be escaped: the Gods can be propitiated, and so we can sin and pray, and then sin and pray some more,—and if you talk of a dread hereafter, why, are there not mysteries and λύσιοι θεοί to whom we can look for deliverance? The form λυτήρ obtained sufficient currency to render it possible for the Christian poet Nonnus, the paraphrast of John, to employ it as a designation of our Lord, whom he calls "the Deliverer of the whole human race (ὅλης Λυτῆρα γενέθλης)."[14] But Nonnus was somewhat precious in his choice of words.

The prepositional compounds are numerous and appear to have been in wide use to express the many modifications which the general notion of "loosing" was capable of receiving from them.[15] We are naturally most interested in those of them which are employed of releasing men from chains or bondage, or broadly from other evils. Among these the special implication of ἀναλύειν is that the release effected is a restoration. In ἐκλύειν—the exact etymological equivalent of the German *Auslösung* (or its doublet *Erlösung,* which has become the standing German designation of the Christian Redemption)—the emphasis falls on the deliverance which is wrought by the release in question,

---

[11] See E. Rohde, as cited, p. 50 Note 2; and Roscher, p. 2211.

[12] *Cf.* Rohde, as cited, p. 124.

[13] P. 366. AB: Jowett, II, p. 187.

[14] On Jno. xvii. 21: Migne, xliii, p. 888. Nonnus is ordinarily assigned to the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century.

[15] Ἀναλύειν, ἀνάλυσις, ἀναλυτήρ, ἀναλυτής; ἀπολύειν, ἀπόλυσις; διαλύειν, διάλυσις, διαλυτής, διάλυτος, διαλυτικός; ἐκλύειν, ἔκλυσις, ἐκλυτήριος, τὸ ἐκλυτήριον, ἔκλυτος; ἐπιλύειν, ἐπιλύσισ, ἐπιλυτέον, ἐπλυτικός; καταλύειν, κατάλυσις, κατάλυμα, καταλυτήριον, καταλύτης, καταλυτής, καταλύσιμος, καταλυτέος, καταλυτικός ; παραλύειν, παράλυσις, παραλυτέον, παραλυτικός; προλύειν, προλύται; ὑπολύειν, ὑπόλυσις.

and this form tends to be employed when the idea of relief is prominent. It is, however, with ἀπολύειν—in itself a close synonym of ἐκλύειν—that we are most nearly concerned. It is employed alternatively with the simple λύειν, and like that term developed a discriminating use of the active and middle voices to express respectively releasing on the receipt or releasing by the payment of a ransom. Thus, like λύειν it came to mean not merely releasing but distinctively ransoming, and is used in that sense of the action of both of the parties involved.[16]

The particular derivative of λύειν with which we are at the moment directly concerned—λύτρον—belongs to that class of derivatives usually spoken of as "instrumental," which denote the instrument or means by which the action of the verb is accomplished.[17] The particular actions expressed by the verb λύειν for the performance of which λύτρον denotes the instrument are those to which we have called especial attention above,—ransoming and atoning— the former regularly and the latter by way of exception. It commonly means just a ransom; infrequently, however, it means an expiation;[18] and very rarely it passes over into

---

[16] See Liddell and Scott, *sub voc.*, II. "In *Iliad* always = ἀπολυτρόω *to set at liberty,* let go free *on receipt of ransom,* 24, 115, etc.; and in Med., *to set free by payment of ransom,* to *ransom, redeem,* χαλκοῦ τε χρυσοῦ τ᾽ ἀπολυσόμεθ᾽ at a price of. . . . *Il.* 22.50; so too in Att., ἀπολύεσθαι πολλῶν χρημάτων Xen. *Hell.* 4.8, 21." Th. Zahn (*Römerbrief,* p. 179, note 50) has a note illustrating this double usage of ἀπολύειν active and middle. *cf.* above note 5.

[17] *Cf.* W. E. Jelf, *A Grammar of the Greek Language,*[4] 1866, vol. I. p. 338 (§ 335, e) : "Instrumental: (signifying the instrument or means by which a certain end is obtained) in τρον and τρα (contracted from τήριον, τήρια), as σεῖσμον a rattle, δίδακτρον schooling-money, λοῦτρον bathing-water, bath." *Cf.* G. Hollmann, *Die Bedeutung des Todes Jesu,* 1901, p. 104, note 2: "That λύτρον is derived from λύω is certain. From λύτρον is λυτρόω then formed like μετρέω from μέτρον. Compare further χύω, χύτρα, ἰάομαι, ἰατρός etc., Brugmann, *Griech. Gramm.* 1900, p. 192 f. Numerous examples are given in Kühner-Blass, *Ausführl. Gramm. der griech. Sprache,* 1892, iv. 271."

[18] *Cf.* H. Cremer, *Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch,*[3] 1883 (E. T. p. 408), *sub voc.*: "Meanwhile it should be taken into consideration that λύτρον in profane Greek denotes also the means of expiation with reference to the intended result as in Æsch. *Choeph.* 48, λύτρον αἵματος, following λύειν in the sense of expiatory acts."

the general sense of a recompense.[19] "Λύτρον 'means of deliverance' (*Lösemittel*)," says Franz Steinleitner[20] quite accurately, "is employed by the old writers almost universally (mostly in the plural) in the sense of the ransom (*Lösegeld*) paid or to be paid for a prisoner, in accordance with the use of λύειν for the liberation (*Auslösung*) of prisoners, especially by ransoming (*Loskauf*)." It is only a special application of this general sense when the word is found in use in inscriptions and papyri as the technical term for the manumission-price of slaves.[21] Its occurrence on two late inscriptions of a piacular character found near Kônes in Lydia, on the other hand, illustrates its less common use of a means, an instrument, of expiation.[22] Both of

---

[19] Liddell and Scott, *sub voc.*: "3. generally, a *recompense*, καμάτων Pind. I. 8 (7). 1."

[20] *Die Beicht im Zusammenhange mit der sakralen Rechtspflege in der Antike.* 1913, p. 37.

[21] "The same word," continues Steinleitner, "in the plural, is employed in three documents of the first century after Christ, from Oxyrhynchus, in which slaves are emancipated; and stands in the same sense in the singular as well as in the plural in the Thessalian stone-records of slave-manumissions." He refers for the papyri to the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part I. ed. by Grenfell-Hunt (London 1898) p. 105. no. xlviii, . . . no. xlix; Part iv. (London 1904) p. 199, no. 722, line 24f . . . line 29/30 . . . line 39/40; and also to L. Mitteis, "Papyri aus Oxyrhynchus," in *Hermes*, vol. 24 (1889) p. 103 f. For the inscriptions he refers to Gualterus Rensch, *De Manumissionum Titulis apud Thessales*, Dissert. Inaugural. Philosophica, Halis Sax. 1908. *Cf.* also A. Deissmann, *Light from the East*, pp. 324ff., especially 331ff: he gives the literature.

[22] They are described and expounded by Steinleitner, as cited. The longer of the two inscriptions reads: "Ἔτους σκζ. Artemidorus, the son of Diodotus and Amia, together with his six kinsmen, witting and unwitting, λύτρον according to the command of Mem Tyrannos and Zeus Ogmenos and the Gods with him." Steinleitner explains: "Artemidorus and his kindred free themselves from the God to whom they have become indebted through a transgression, which had occurred partly wittingly and partly unwittingly, by means of a λύτρον to which the God had himself given the injunction through a dream-image or the mouth of the priest. This λύτρον consists in this case certainly not of money, but of the confession of guilt (*Schuld*) and the erection of this public expiatory monument." It is quite unnecessary, however, to labor to derive this expiatory usage of λύτρον from its use as the price of the manumission of slaves. The expiatory use

these are, however, only special applications serving rather
to illustrate than to qualify the essential meaning of the
term as just the price paid as a ransom in order to secure
release.[23]

The formation of λύτρον was not due to any serious need
of a term of its significance. It has synonyms enough.[24]
Its formation must be traced to the natural influence of its
primitive, λύειν, dominating the mind when the idea of ransoming occupied it, and leading to the framing from it of
derived vocables expressive of that idea. It "came natural"
to a Greek, in other words, when he wished to say ransom,
to say λύτρον, because when he thought of ransoming he
thought in terms of λύειν. This is an indication of the
strength of the association of the idea of ransoming with
λύειν; but, after all, the idea of ransoming was connected
with λύειν only by association. It was not the intrinsic
sense of that verb but only a signification which had—however firmly—been attached to it by usage. Accordingly the
process of word-formation which began with λύτρον did not
stop with it. It went on and built upon it a new verb with
the distinctive meaning of just ransoming,—λυτροῦν, λυτ
ροῦσθαι,—which meant and could mean nothing but to release
for or by a ransom.[25] If λύειν, by a convention of speech,

was current from the days of Pindar and Aeschylus. What these inscriptions show is that λύτρον was in use not only of the emancipation
price of slaves but also of the expiatory offering for guilt, until after
the Christian era. *Cf.* also *Deissmann*, p. 332, note 2.

[23] Stephens' definition very fairly describes its fundamental significance: "Redemptorium, Redemptionis Pretium, Pretium redempti,
sine adjectione, quod Bud. ex Livio affert; Quod pro redemptione
dependitur, Pretium quo captivi redimuntur; ab ea sc verbi λύεσθαι
signif. qua ponitur pro Redimo."

[24] ἄλλαγμα, ἀντάλλαγμα, τίμη, ποινή, ἄποινα, ζωάγρια, ἀντίψυχον·
Ἄποινα is regularly used in the *Iliad* in the sense of λύτρον, λύτρα;
perhaps also in that of ζωάγρια; the verb ἀποινάω formed from it and
used in the active of demanding the fine from the murderer, is in the
middle the synonym of λυτροῦν to hold to ransom.

[25] Jelf, *Grammar*, as cited, Vol. I, p. 332 (§ 330, *e*): "Verbs in όω
mostly from substantives and adjectives of the II decl . . . have a
factitive meaning, *making to be* that which the primitive expresses, as
πυρόω, *I set on fire* from πῦρ; χρυσόω, *I gild*, from χρυσός; δηλόω,
I make known from δῆλος."

had come to express the idea of ransoming, this remained a mere convention of speech: the word intrinsically meant nothing more than to loose, to release, and was used in this wider sense side by side with its employment in the sense of ransoming. But λυτροῦν meant intrinsically just to ransom and nothing else, and could lose, not the suggestion merely, but the open assertion of specifically ransoming as the mode of deliverance of which it spoke, only by suffering such a decay of its native sense as to lose its very heart. He who said λυτροῦν, λυτροῦσθαι said λύτρον, and he who said λύτρον not merely intimated but asserted ransom. The only reason for the existence of this verb was to set by the side of the ambiguous λύειν (ἀπολύειν) an unambiguous term which would convey with surety, and without aid from the context or from the general understanding ruling its use, the express sense of ransoming. We are not surprised to observe therefore that throughout the whole history of profane Greek literature λυτροῦν, λυτροῦσθαι maintained this sense unbrokenly. Its one meaning is just "to ransom"; in the active voice in the sense of to release on receipt of a ransom, and in the middle voice in the sense of to release by the payment of a ransom. We could ask no better proof of this than that neither H. Oltramare[26] nor Th. Zahn,[27] both of

---

[26] *Commentaire sur l'Épistre aux Romains,* 1881, I. p. 308.

[27] *Römerbrief*[1] p. 179. Zahn remarks that the regular meaning of the active λυτροῦν, ἀπολυτροῦν is *dimittere,* and of the middle λυτροῦσθαι, ἀπολυτροῦσθαι is *redimere,* the λύτρον being supposed in both cases. It is his view, however, that in the middle sense, "to ransom," the λύτρον may be neglected and the verb come to mean merely "to deliver." When he comes to give vouchers, however, (p. 181. note 52), he fails to find any in profane Greek for this loose sense. He cites indeed only three passages from profane Greek: Plato, *Theat.* 165. E; Polyb. 18 (al. 17), 16, 1; Plutarch, *Cimon,* 9; all of which expressly intimate a ransom-price as paid. Plato, *Theat.* 165. E (Jowett III. 368): "He will have got you into his net out of which you will not escape, until you have come to an understanding about the sum which is to be paid for your release." Polybius, 18 (al. 17), 16, 1 (Schuckburgh II. 216): "King Attalus had for some time past been held in extraordinary honor by the Sicyonians, ever since the time that he ransomed the sacred land of Apollo for them at the cost of a large sum of money." Plutarch, *Cimon* 9 (Perrin II. 432-3): "But

whom have sought diligently, has been able to discover an instance to the contrary.

Of course the derivatives and compounds of λυτροῦν, λυτροῦσθαι continue to convey the idea of ransoming. Impulse for forming them could arise only from a feeling out for unambiguous terms to express this idea. For the wider notion of deliverance the derivatives and compounds of the primitive, λύειν, λύεσθαι, lay at hand. Not many derivatives and compounds of λυτροῦν, λυτροῦσθαι seem, it is true, to have been formed, and those that were formed appear to occur only sparsely in profane Greek literature. Of the derivatives[28] we need concern ourselves only with λύτρωσις; of the compounds[29] only with ἀπολυτροῦν, ἀπολυτροῦσθαι and its derivative, ἀπολύτρωσις.

---

a little time after the friends and kinsmen of the captives came home from Phrygia and Lydia and ransomed every one of them at a great price, so that Cimon had four months pay and rations for his fleet, and besides that, much gold from the ransom (λύτρον) left over for the city."

[28] The Lexicons record no other uncompounded derivative as occurring in profane Greek except λυτρωτέον, Aristot. *Eth. Nic.* 9.2.4 (see next note). Other derivatives, for which no vouchers from profane Greek are given, include: λύτρωμα, from a Christian hymn— "the precious redemption of our Jesus"; λυτρώσιμος, Photius and Suidas, "redeemable"; λυτρωτήριος, *Chron. Pasch.*, "redeeming"; λυτρωτής, lxx. and Acts, "redeemer"; λυτρωτικός, Theodorus Prodromus, "of or for ransoming."

[29] The Lexicons record such compound derivatives as the following: Ἀντιλυτρωτέον Aristot. *Eth. Nic.* 9.2.4: "But perhaps this is not always the case: for instance, must a person who has been ransomed (λυτρώθαντι) from robbers, ransom in return (ἀντιλυτρωτέον) him who ransomed (λυσάμενον) him, whoever he may be? Or should he repay him who has not been taken prisoner, but demands payment as a debt? Or should he ransom (λυτρωτέον) his father rather than the other? For it would seem that he ought to ransom his father even in preference to himself." Διαλύτρωσις, Polyb. 6.58.11: "But they frustrated the calculations of Hanibal and the hopes he had formed of the ransoming of the men" (there is no suggestion of mutual ransoming— "exchange of prisoners" we should say: on the contrary, it is a distinctly one-sided transaction,—the Romans were to pay three minae for each man) ; 27.11.2 (al. 14) : "Just about the time when Perseus retired for the winter from the Roman war, Antenor arrived at Rhodes from him to negotiate for the ransom of Diophanes and those who were on board with him. Thereupon there arose a great dispute among the statesmen as to what course they ought to take. Philo-

Λύτρωσις is so rare in profane Greek that it appears to have turned up heretofore only in a single passage, Plutarch, *Aratus* II. There we read of Aratus that "having a present of five and twenty talents sent him from the king, he took them, it is true, but gave them all to his fellow-citizens who wanted money, among other purposes for the ransoming of those who had been taken prisoners (εἴς τε τἆλλα καὶ λύτρωσιν αἰχμαλώτων)."

Ἀπολυτροῦν (active voice) occurs somewhat more frequently, but ἀπολυτροῦσθαι (middle voice) and ἀπολύτρωσις are again very rare. How the active, ἀπολυτροῦν is employed, may be seen from the following examples, which are all that the lexicographers adduce. Plato, *Laws*, XI, p. 919 A (Jowett, IV, p. 430): He "treats them as enemies and captives who are at his mercy, and will not release (ἀπολυτρώσῃ) them until they have paid the highest, most exorbitant and base price." The Epistle of Philip to the Athenians in Demosthenes 159, 15: "He put Amphilochus to ransom (ἀπολύτρωσε) for nine talents." Polybius 2.6.6: "They made a truce with the inhabitants to deliver up all freemen and the city of Phoenice for a fixed ransom (ἀπολυτρώσαντες)." Polybius 22.21.8: "On a large sum of gold being agreed to be paid for the woman, he led her off to put her to ransom (ἀπολυτρώσαν)." Stephens

phenax, Theatetus and their party were against entering into such an arrangement upon any terms, Deinon and Polyaratus were for doing so. Finally they did enter upon an arrangement for their redemption." Ἐκλυτροῦσθαι, Scholium on Homer. *Odyss.* IV.35: When princely Telemachus and the proud son of Nestor arrived at Menelaus' palace, Eteoneus asks whether they are to be received or sent about their business. Menelaus replies that of course they are to be received: they had themselves often had to depend on the courtesy of strangers, "and we must look to Zeus henceforth to keep us safe from harm." The Scholium explains this as meaning that they would have to hope, "that after these things he (Zeus) may deliver (ἐκλυτρώσηται) us from the impending distress." There is no obvious implication of ransoming here, but Liddell and Scott quite naturally define the word, with this sole voucher, "to redeem by payment of ransom." Ἐπίλυτρος, set at liberty for ransom, Strabo, 11. p. 496: ἃ δ'ἂν λάβωσιν ἐπίλυτρα ποιοῦνται ῥαδίως. Παραλυτρούμενός is given by Athenaeus Grammaticus, p. 368, as the name of a comedy by Satades.

adds that Lucian somewhere says of Achilles that "he ran-
somed (ἀπολύτρωσας) the body of Hector for a small sum."

For the middle, ἀπολυτροῦσθαι only late passages are cited.
Th. Zahn, however, remarks very properly,[30] that while "the
middle ἀπολυτροῦσθαι is very rare, and is not to be found in
the Bible," it nevertheless "lies in essentially the same sense
as the middle λυτροῦσθαι at the basis of the use of the pas-
sive in Zeph. iii. 1 (iii. 3),[31] and in Plutarch, *Pompey*, 24."
In this passage of Plutarch[32] we read that Helo who had
been taken captive by pirates "was ransomed (ἀπελυτρώθη)
with a great sum." In these passages ἀπολυτροῦσθαι
is the passive of the middle, not of the active, sense. The
lexicographers cite only two passages in which the middle is
actually found. Pantaenus, a Macedonian rhetorician of
the time of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, relates how
Aristocrates the Athenian, entering a Spartan port in a ship
disguised as peaceful, was able by this ruse to slay some and
to abduct others as prisoners, which last, he adds, "Aristo-
cles ransomed with a great sum (οὓς πολλῶν χρημάτων Ἀρισ-
τοκλῆς ἀπολυτρώσατο)."[33] That is the manuscript reading.
Nevertheless the modern editors, adopting an emendation
of Casaubon's, print Ἀριστοκράτης for Ἀριστοκλῆς. By this

---

[30] *Römerbrief*[1]:[2], p. 181, Note 52.

[31] The LXX here reads, ὦ ἡ ἐπιφανὴς καὶ ἀπολελυτρωμένη πόλις—
"Alas, the glorious and ransomed city." Oltramare (on Rom. 3.24)
wishes to render, "relaxed, licentious." Morison supports Zahn quite
properly in insisting on the sense of ransomed.

[32] Reiske, p. 775.

[33] Strategemata. V. 40: Ed. Mursinna, Berlin, 1756 p. 326. In a note
it is said: "Read, Ἀριστοκράτης. For ἀπολυτρώσατο is not *redemit*,
but *pro redemptione exegit. Casaubon.*" Accordingly the Teubner
Ed. 1877, edited by Melber, p. 270, prints Ἀριστοκράτης in the text
with the note, "Ἀριστοκράτης Casaubon; Ἀριστοκλῆς F." "F" is the
archetype from which all extant MSS. are descended. It reads
Ἀριστοκλῆς which Casaubon in the *editio princeps* (Lugdunum Bata-
vorum 1589) already suggested should be changed to Ἀριστοκράτης
on the ground reported above. Whatever may be the true reading,
the reason assigned for the proposed emendation is a bad one. For
not only does the middle ἀπολυτροῦσθαι but the middle of the
simple λυτροῦσθαι and the middles λύεσθαι and ἀπολύεσθαι before
them, all mean distinctly not put to ransom but ransom.

correction the meaning of ἀπολυτρώσατο is transformed, and we are made to read it, "Extorted a great sum for their ransom": that is to say, the middle is given the active sense. This result is unacceptable in view of the regular middle sense preserved in λύεσθαι, ἀπολύεσθαι, λυτροῦσθαι, implied for ἀπολυτροῦσθαι in the passive use noted above, and actually appearing in the middle ἀπολυτροῦσθαι elsewhere. It must be held questionable, therefore, whether the text of the passage has been rightly settled by the editors: we need a different subject or else a different voice for the verb. There can be no question that in the only remaining passage in which it is cited, the Emperor Julian uses ἀπολυτροῦσθαι in its expected middle sense, and as the general equivalent of λυτροῦσθαι. "Whom, then," he says,[34] "are we to regard as slaves? Shall it be he whom we buy for so many silver drachmas, for two minae, or for ten staters of gold? Probably you will say that such a man is truly a slave? And why? Is it because we have paid down money for him to a seller? But in that case the prisoners of war whom we ransom (λυτρούμεθα) would be slaves. And yet, on the one hand, the law permits these their freedom when they have come safe home, but, on the other hand, we ransom (ἀπολυτρούμεθα) them, not that they may become slaves but that they may be free. Do you see, then, that in order to make a ransomed man (λυτρωθέντα) a slave, it is not enough to pay down a sum of money?"[35]

The noun ἀπολύτρωσις might express the action of either the active or the middle of the verb from which it is formed.[36] Zahn remarks:[37] "For the corresponding use of

[34] *Sixth Oration, to the Uneducated Cynics: Works,* ed. by C. Wright 1913. vol. ii. p. 44; ed. Teubner, 1875. vol. i. p. 253.

[35] Stephens cites also the late Christian writer Nicetas, *Paraphrasis carm. arcan. S. Gregorii Naz.* Ed Dronk, p. 26. 221; *i.e.,* Migne, *Patr. Graec.* 38. 705. Nicetas simply speaks of what Christ did that he might redeem (ἀπολυτρώσηται) men.

[36] Zahn, *Römerbrief*[1]. p. 179-181 says: "We must bear in mind that according as we take our start from the regular sense of the active λυτροῦν, ἀπολυτροῦν (dimittere) or from that of the middle, λυτροῦσθαι, ἀπολυτροῦσθαι (redimere), the derived substantive will

ἀπολύτρωσις"—that is to say for the use of it in a sense corresponding to the middle sense of the verb, "to secure release by paying ransom"—"it seems that undoubted examples are lacking. Polybius, 6.58.11 ; 27.11.3, uses διαλύτρωσις in its stead, and most writers content themselves with λύτρωσις." This is already to say that the use of ἀπολύτρωσις in this sense has the support of its cognates ; and certainly there is nothing in its own very rare usage to object. The lexicons give, it is true, only a single instance of the word's occurrence —Plutarch, *Pompey* 24[38]—and in this instance it expresses the action of the active voice of the verb.[39] "Music," we read, "and dancing and banquets all along the shore, and seizings of officers and ransomings of captured cities (καὶ πόλεων αἰχμαλώτων ἀπολυτρώσεις) were a reproach to the Roman supremacy."[40] Another instance, however, has turned up in an inscription from Kos of the first or second Christian century, in which the word expresses the action of the middle voice. The inscription is speaking of that form of

---

designate either the action of him who discharges or releases from duress" (there should be added : "on receipt of a ransom") "him that is in duress to him, or the action of him who by means of the payment of a ransom, or else without such a payment" (there is no justification in profane Greek for this last clause) "secures the release of one in duress to another, be it person or thing."

[37] P. 181. Note 52.

[38] Reiske. p. 754.

[39] So it is rightly taken both by Zahn (p. 181, note 52) and Oltramare (I. 310).

[40] Liddell and Scott refer also to Philo, 2. 463 Mangey, that is to say to *Quod Omn. Prob. Liber*, § 17. med.: "He judged a violent death preferable to the life that was before him, and despairing of ransoming (ἀπολύτρωσιν), he cheerfully slew himself." Here ἀπολύτρωσις expresses distinctly the action of the middle voice of the verb. In the account given by Aristeas in the earlier portion of his letter to Philocrates (*cf.,* also Josephus, *Antt.* XII. ii. 2 ff) of the liberation of the Jews by Ptolemy Philadelphus, the changes are rung on ἀπολύειν, ἀπόλυσις, ἀπολυτροῦν (20), ἀπολύτρωσις (12, 33) in the sense of securing release by payment of a ransom. The transaction was not a mere liberation, but involved the payment of a ransom—twenty drachmas for each (20 and 22),—the whole sum amounting to more than 400 talents (20) : "More than 400 talents τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως" that is to say "of redemption money," says Josephus (Niese III. 77, line 11.) *Cf.*, § 27 with Josephus XII. ii. 2 ad fin.

manumission of slaves, very widely current after the period of the Diadochi and illustrated by a great number of inscriptions at Delphi, in which the slave really purchased his own liberty, but did so through the intermediation of priests so as ostensibly to be purchased by a God. The purchase money deposited in the temple for the purpose is called the λύτρον or λύτρα. In the inscription in question, those who perform the ἀπελευθέρωσις are instructed "not to make formal record of the ἀπολύτρωσις until the priests have reported that the necessary sacrifice has been made."[41] Both Deissmann and Zahn apparently suppose that the paralleling of ἀπολύτρωσις here with ἀπελευθέρωσις empties it of its specific meaning. This is obviously unjustified: the transaction was a manumission (ἀπελευθέρωσις) which took place by means of a payment (λύτρον, λύτρα) and was therefore, more exactly described, a ransoming (ἀπολύτρωσις). We are clearly to interpret: those who make the manumission are not to record the sale until the whole transaction is actually completed; and the two terms are respectively in their right places.[42]

Throughout the whole history of the profane usage of the derivatives of λύτρον, we perceive, the intrinsic signifi-

---

[41] A. Deissmann, *Light from the East,* p. 331 note 4; *cf.,* Th. Zahn, *Römerbrief,*[1] p. 180 note 51. Both Deissmann and Zahn give the fundamental references.

[42] Naturally the details of the transactions in which slaves purchased their freedom varied endlessly. There are instances on record in which the money is paid down, but the manumission is to take effect only at some future time, say at the master's death. There are others in which the manumission is so far only partial that the slave remains bound to certain specified services. On the other hand there are instances in which the manumission is accomplished on credit, that is to say, it is enjoyed on sufferance until the price is paid in. This class of freedmen appears to have been known as πάλαι ἐλεύθεροι. "To such a suspended freedom," writes L. Mitteis (*Reichsrecht und Volksrecht,* etc. 1891, p. 388), "must be reckoned the remission of the purchase money (*Lösegelt*) in the will of the master, as in the testament of Lyko (Diog. Laert. V. 61-64), where we read: Δημητρίῳ μὲν ἐλευθέρῳ πάλαι ὄντι ἀφίημι τὰ λύτρα [to Demetrius who is a πάλαι ἐλεύθερος I remit the purchase-money]; E. Curtius has already recognized that a πάλαι ἐλεύθερος who is still in debt for his purchase money, is certainly no real freeman, but only a *statu liber* (*Anecdot.* p. 11)."

cance of λύτρον continuously determines their meaning.[43]
This was to be expected. The case is not similar to that of
such a word as, say, "dilapidated" in English which readily
loses in figurative usages all suggestion of its underlying
reference to stones; or even to that of such a word as "re-
deem" itself in English, which easily rubs off its edges and
comes to mean merely to buy out and even simply to release.
The bases of these words are foreign to English speech and
do not inevitably obtrude themselves on the consciousness of
every one who employs them. Λύτρον was a distinctively
Greek word, formed from a Greek primitive in everyday
use, according to instinctively working Greek methods of
word-formation, carrying with them regular modifications
of sense. No Greek lips could frame it, no Greek ear could
hear it, in any of its derivatives, without consciousness of its
intrinsic meaning. This is, of course, not to say that the
word could not conceivably lose its distinctive sense. But in
words of this kind the processes of such decay are difficult,
and illustrations of it are comparatively rare; especially
when, as in this instance, the terms in question stand out on a
background of a far more widely current use of their primi-
tive in the broader sense. A Greek might well be tempted
to use λύειν and its derivatives in the sense of λυτροῦν and its
derivatives; and in point of fact he did so use them copious-
ly. But it would not be natural for him to reverse the
process and use λυτροῦν and its derivatives in the sense of
λύειν. It may be natural for us, standing at a sales-counter,
to say "I will take that," meaning to "buy"; but it would
never be natural for us to say, "I will buy that," meaning
merely to "take." In the group of words built up around
λύτρον the Greek language offered to the New Testament a
series of terms which distinctly said ransom; and just in
proportion as we think of the writers of the New Testa-
ment as using Greek naturally we must think of them as
feeling the intrinsic significance of these words as they

---

[43] The only apparent exception which we have noted is the use of
ἐκλυτροῦσθαι in a scholium on Homer, *Odyss.* IV. 35; see above, note
29.

used them, and as using them only when they intended to give expression to this their intrinsic significance. It is safe to say that no Greek, to the manner born, could write down any word, the center of which was λύτρον, without consciousness of ransoming as the mode of deliverance of which he was speaking.

The fact is not to be obscured, of course, that the writers of the New Testament were not in the strict sense Greeks. At the most Luke enjoys that unique distinction; and even he may have been in the wide sense a Hellenist rather than in the strict sense a Hellene. The rest were Jews: even Paul, coming out of the Diaspora, yet was able to speak in Aramaic; and apart from him and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, they were all of immediate Palestinian origin and traditions. Moreover they all had in their hands the Septuagint version of the Old Testament and may be thought to have derived their Greek religious terminology from it. We must, therefore, ascertain, we are told, how the group of words built up on λύτρον are employed in the Septuagint before we can venture to pass upon the sense in which they are used in the New Testament. And in turning to the Septuagint, it must be confessed, a surprising thing confronts us. Words of this group are certainly employed in the Septuagint without clear intimation of ransoming. This remarkable phenomenon is worthy of our careful and discriminating attention.

II

A considerable number of words of this group occur in the Septuagint— λύτρον, [ἀντιλύτρον], λυτροῦσθαι, λύτρωσις, λυτρωτής, λυτρωτός, ἀπολυτροῦν, ἀπολύτρωσις ἐκλύτρωσις. Some of these, however, occur very seldom, and only one, λυτροῦσθαι, is copiously employed.

᾽Αντιλύτρον was printed in some of the early editions at Ps. xlviii. (xlix.) 9, but has been eliminated in the modern critical texts.

Λύτρον occurs nineteen times and always, of course, in the quite simple sense of a ransom-price. H. Oltramare gives

a very good account of its usage.[44] "Λύτρον, usually in the plural λύτρα, (=כפר, פדיון, גאלה)[45] designates an indemnification, a pecuniary compensation, given in exchange for a cessation of rights over a person or even a thing, *ransom*. It is used for the money given to redeem a field, Lev. xxv. 24—the life of an ox about to be killed, Ex. xxi. 30—one's own life in arrest of judicial proceedings, Num. xxxv. 31, 32, or of vengeance, Prov. vi. 35,—the first-born over whom God had claims, Num. iii. 46, 48, 51, Lev. xviii. 15, etc. It is ordinarily used of the ransom given for redemption from captivity or slavery, Lev. xix. 20, Is. xlv. 13, etc."

The adjective λυτρωτός occurs only twice, in a single connection (Lev. xxv. 31, 32), in which we are told that the houses in unwalled villages and in the Levitical cities were alike at all times redeemable (λυτρωταὶ διὰ παντὸς ἔσονται: representing גאלא).

The compound active noun, ἐκλύτρωσις, occurs only a single time (Num. iii. 49): "And for τὰ λύτρα . . . thou shalt take five shekels apiece . . . and thou shalt give the money to Aaron and to his sons as λύτρα of the supernumerary among them; . . . and Moses took the money, τὰ λύτρα of the supernumerary, for the ἐκλύτρωσις of the Levites . . . and Moses gave τὰ λύτρα of the supernumeraries to Aaron and his sons."

The compound verb, ἀπολυτροῦν occurs twice, once in the active voice (Ex. xxi. 8[46] for the Hiphil of פדה) and

---

[44] *Comm. sur l'épitre aux Romains*, 1881. I. p. 308.

[45] כפר six times: Ex. xxi. 30, xxx. 12, Num. xxxv. 31, 32, Prov. vi. 35, xiii. 8; פדיון seven times: Num. iii. 46, 48, 51, Ex. xxi. 30, Num. iii. 49, Lev. xix. 20, xviii. 15; גאלה five times, Lev. xxv. 24, 26, 51, 53; xxvii. 31; also מהיר once, Is. xlv. 13. *Cf.*, G. Hollmann, *Die Bedeutung des Todes Jesu*, 1901, p. 102. Hollmann notes that λύτρα occurs in the same sentence as the rendering both of כפר and פדיון in Ex. xxi. 30. "If there be laid on him a כפר he shall give for the פדיון of his life whatever is laid on him."

[46] A. Seeberg, *Der Tod Christi*, p. 218 says that in this passage "the master to whom the Israelitish maiden bought by him does not prove to be pleasing, is required והפדה, which the LXX translate ἀπολυτρώσει αὐτήν, and that of course cannot mean, 'he shall buy her

once in the passive voice (Zeph. iii. 1 (3) for the Niphal
of ‎נאל). In both instances the idea of ransoming is ex-
press; and, as Th. Zahn points out, the sense in which the
passive is used in Zeph. iii. 1 (3) presupposes the middle,
ἀπολυτροῦσθαι, in the sense of "to deliver by the payment of
a ransom." Thus this verb bears the distinctive active and
middle senses in the Septuagint which it and its congeners
bear in profane Greek.

So far the Septuagint usage shows no modification of
that of profane Greek. No modification can be assumed
even with reference to ἀπολύτρωσις, the active substantive de-
rived from ἀπολυτροῦν, ἀπολυτροῦσθαι. This term occurs only
in Dan. iv. 32 (29 or 30) LXX in a context which at first
sight might mislead us into giving it the undifferentiated
signification of just "deliverance." "And at the end of the
seven years," we read, "the time of my ἀπολυτρώσεως came,
and my sins and my ignorance were fulfilled in the sight of
the God of heaven." . . . The "deliverance" here spoken of,
however, must be held to be defined by the preceding context
as resting on a "ransoming." There is a manifest reference
back from this verse to iv. 24 where the king is exhorted to
pray God concerning his sins and "to redeem (λύτρωσαι) all
his iniquities with almsgiving."[47] No doubt the emphasis
is thrown on the result of the ransoming, on the deliverance
in which it has at last issued. This is doubtless the reason
why the compound term is used here—ἀπολύτρωσις,—the

_____

free' but only 'he shall free her.' " But verse 11 opposes "her going
out for nothing, without money," to the disposal of her required in
verse 8,—which therefore must be for money. Undoubtedly the E. V.
renders rightly: "Then shall he let her be redeemed," in accordance
with the proper sense of the active voice of the verb—"to release for a
ransom." Joseph Wirtz, *Die Lehre von der Apolytrosis*, 1906, p. 2 and
p. 3, note 2 has the right interpretation.

[47] *Cf.*, Dan. iv. 24, Theod.: "Therefore, O King, let my counsel be
acceptable to thee and λύτρωσαι thy sins with almsgivings and thine
iniquities with mercies to the poor." The Aramaic word rendered by
λύτρωσαι here is *p'rak*—to take away: λύτρωσαι accordingly represents
a term which does not specifically express a ransoming (*cf.* S. R.
Driver *in loc.*); *cf.* note 55. Nevertheless the purchase price is ex-
pressed and therefore λύτρωσαι is appropriate.

ἀπό in which, signifying "away from," shifting the emphasis from the process to the effects. The two terms, λυτροῦσθαι, verse 24 and ἀπολύτρωσις, verse 32, are respectively in their right places.

When we turn to the verb λυτροῦσθαι itself and its two substantival derivatives, λύτρωσις and λυτρωτής, we find ourselves in deeper water.

Λύτρωσις occurs eight times,[48] representing the Hebrew bases גאל and פדה , each four times. In four of its occurrences, it is employed in the simple literal sense of ransoming or redeeming (Lev. xxv 29, 29, 48; Num. xviii. 16); and in yet another (Ps. xlviii. (xlix.) 8),—"the price of the redemption of his soul"—it is used equally of ransoming by a price, although now in the higher, spiritual sphere. In the remaining three instances an implication of a ransom-price is less clear: Ps. cx (cix), 9, "He sent redemption to His people; He commanded His covenant forever"; Ps. cxxix (cxxx), 7, "For with the Lord is mercy, and with Him is plenteous redemption"; Is. lxiii. 4, "For the day of recompense (ἀνταποδόσεως) is upon them, and the year of redemption is at hand." Passages like these will naturally receive their precise interpretation from the implication of the usage of their more copiously employed primitive, λυτροῦσθαι.

Similarly the noun of agent, λυτρωτής, which occurs only twice (Ps. xviii (xix), 14; lxxvii (lxxviii), 35, representing גאל)—in both instances as an epithet of God, "our Redeemer"—will necessarily receive its exact shade of meaning from the general usage of its primitive, λυτροῦσθαι.

This verb, λυτροῦσθαι, occurs some hundred and five times. It usually has at its base either אל (about forty-two times) or פדה (about forty times), and rarely פרק (five times). Sometimes, of course, there is no Hebrew base (Sir. xlviii. 20, xlix. 10, l. 24, li. 2, 3; Zech. iii. 15; I Macc. iv. 11). It is employed in more than one shade of meaning.

---

[48] We do not concern ourselves with Judges i. 15.

First, it is used quite literally to express the redeeming of a thing by the payment for it of a ransom price. Thus, for example: Ex. xiii, 13, "Every one of an ass that openeth the womb, thou shalt exchange for a sheep; but if thou wilt not exchange, thou shalt *redeem* it; every first-born of a man of thy sons, thou shalt *redeem*"; Levit. xix. 20, "If any one lie carnally with a woman, and she is a house-slave, kept for a man, and she has not been *redeemed* with a ransom (λύτροις) and freedom has not been given to her, they shall not be put to death, because she was not set free"; Num. xviii. 15-17, "And everything which openeth the womb of all flesh, whatsoever they offer unto the Lord, from man unto beast, shall be thine; nevertheless the first born of men *shall be redeemed* with a ransom (λύτροις), and the first-born of unclean beasts thou shalt *redeem*. And its redemption (λύτρωσις) is from a month old; the valuation (συντίμησις) is five sheckels, according to the sacred sheckel —there are twenty obols." In this simple literal usage the word occurs about twenty-seven times; but it seems to be confined to Exodus (six times), Leviticus (eighteen times) and Numbers (three times).[49]

Sharply differentiated from this literal usage is a parallel one in which λυτροῦσθαι is applied to the deliverance from Egypt. Here there is at least no emphasis placed on the deliverance being in mode a ransoming. The stress is thrown rather on the power exerted in it and the mind is focussed on the mightiness of the transaction. This is so marked that B. F. Westcott is led by it to declare,[50] too broadly, of the use of λυτροῦσθαι and its derivatives in the Septuagint, that "the idea of the exertion of a mighty force, the idea that the 'redemption' costs much, is everywhere present." It is at least clear that the idea that the redemption from Egypt was the effect of a great expenditure of the divine power and in that sense cost much, is prominent

---

[49] Ex. xiii. 13 bis, 15, xxxiv. 20 bis; Lev. xix. 20, xxv. 25, 30, 33, 48, 49 bis, 54, xxvii. 13, 15, 19, 20 bis, 27, 28, 29, 31, 33; Num. xviii. 25 bis, 17. *Cf.* Dan. iv. 24.

[50] *Hebrews,*[3] p. 298, med.

in the allusions to it, and seems to constitute the central idea sought to be conveyed. The earliest passage in which this usage occurs is typical of the whole series: Ex. vi. 6, "Go, speak to the sons of Israel, saying, I am the Lord, and I will lead you forth from the tyranny of the Egyptians, and deliver (ῥύσομαι) you from your bondage and *redeem* (λυτρώσομαι) you with a high hand and a great judgment; and I will take you to myself for my people, and I will be to you a God and ye shall know that I am your God which bringeth you out from the oppression of the Egyptians." Other examples are: Deut. ix. 26, "And I prayed to God and said, O Lord, king of the Gods, destroy not thy people and thy portion which thou didst *redeem,* and didst lead forth out of Egypt by thy great might and by thy strong hand and by thy high hand"; Neh. i. 10, "And these are thy children and thy people, whom thou didst *redeem* by thy great power and by thy strong hand"; Ps. lxxvi (lxxvii) 15, 16, "Thou art the God that doest wonders, thou didst make known among the peoples thy power, thou didst *redeem* with thine arm thy people, the sons of Jacob and Joseph." This usage of the deliverance out of Egypt in might lies in the Pentateuch side by side with the former, occurring in Exodus (three times), and Deuteronomy (six times), and occurs on occasion in the later books.[51]

Similarly to its employment to express the fundamental national deliverance from Egypt in the divine might, λυτροῦσθαι is used of other great national deliverances in which the power of Jehovah was manifested. In "the praise of famous men and of our fathers which begat us," that fills the later chapters of Sirach, the word is employed repeatedly in this sense: (xlviii. 20), "But they called upon the Lord which is merciful and stretched out their hands towards him; and immediately the Holy One heard them out of heaven, and *delivered* them by the ministry of Esay";

---

[51] Ex. vi. 6, xv. 13, 16; Deut. vii. 8, ix. 26, xiii. 5 (6), xv. 15, xxi. 8, xxiv. 18; 2 Sam. vii. 23 bis; 1 Chron. xvii, 21 bis, Neh. i. 10, Esther iv. 17 (10); Ps. lxxvi (lxxvii.) 15, cv. (cvi.) 10, cvi. (cvii.) 2 bis; cxxxv. (cxxxvi.) 2; Mic. vi. 4 (Is. lxiii. 9?)

(xlix. 10), "And of the twelve prophets let the memorial be blessed, and let their bones flourish again out of their place; for they comforted Jacob, and *delivered* them by assured hope"; (l. 22, 24), "Now, then bless ye the God of all, which only doeth wondrous things everywhere. . . . That he would confirm his mercy with us and *deliver* us at his time." The general point of view finds clear expression in 1 Macc. iv. 10, 11, "Now, therefore, let us cry unto heaven, if peradventure the Lord will have mercy upon us, and remember the covenant of our fathers, and destroy this host before our face this day: that so all the heathen may know that there is one that *delivereth* and saveth (σώζειν) Israel."

Among these great deliverances wrought for Israel, the chief place is taken, of course, by its second great cardinal emancipation—that from the Babylonian captivity. The employment of λυτροῦσθαι to express this deliverance is naturally comparatively frequent, and as naturally it shades insensibly into the expression of the Messianic deliverance of which this liberation (along with that from Egypt) is treated as the standing type. We may find the key-note struck, perhaps, in Jer. xxvii. (l.) 33, 34: "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Oppressed have been the children of Israel and the children of Judah: all they that have taken them captive, together oppress them because they refuse to let them go. And *their redeemer* is strong, the Lord Almighty is his name; he shall judge judgment with his adversary, that he may destroy the land and disquiet the inhabitants of Babylon. A sword is upon the Chaldeans and upon the inhabitants of Babylon!" . . . How close the eschatological application lies may be illustrated by Is. li. 11 (9): "Awake, awake Jerusalem and put on the strength of thine arm; awake as in the beginning of day, as the generation of eternity. Art thou not she that dried the sea, the deep waters of the abyss? that madest the depths of the sea a way for the delivered (ῥυομένοις) and the *redeemed* to pass through? For by the Lord shall they return, and shall come into Zion with joy and eternal exultation." And we seem

fairly on eschatological ground in Is. xxxix. 9: "And there shall be no lion there, neither shall any of the evil beasts go up upon it, nor be found there, but the *redeemed* and the gathered on account of the Lord shall walk in it, and they shall return and come into Zion with joy and everlasting joy shall be over their heads."[52]

Not essentially different is the employment of the word to express the intervention of God for the deliverance of an individual either from some great specific evil or from evil in general—the term rising in the latter case fully into the spiritual region. A couple of very instructive instances occur in the Septuagint Daniel: iii. 88, "Bless ye the Lord, Ananias, Adzarias and Misael, hymn and exalt him forever; because he liberated ($\dot{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\dot{\iota}\lambda\epsilon\tau o$) us from hades, and saved ($\ddot{\epsilon}\sigma\omega\sigma\epsilon\nu$) us from the bonds of death, and delivered ($\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\rho}\dot{\rho}\dot{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\tau o$) us from the midst of the burning flame, and *redeemed* ($\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\dot{\omega}\sigma\alpha\tau o$) us from the fire"; vi. 27, "I, Darius, will worship and serve him all my days, for the idols made with hands cannot save ($\sigma\hat{\omega}\sigma\alpha\iota$) as the God of Daniel *redeemed* Daniel." Quite similarly we read in 2 Sam. iv. 9 (and 1 Kings i. 29): "And David answered Rechab and Baanah his brother, . . . and said unto them, As the Lord liveth, who hath *redeemed* my soul out of all adversity"; and in Ps. cxliii. (cxliv.) 10: "O God, I will sing a new song to thee, . . . who giveth salvation unto kings, who *redeemeth* David his servant from the hurtful sword" (*cf.* vii. 2). "I will thank thee, O Lord King," says the son of Sirach in his concluding prayer (li. 1 ff), "and I will praise thee, O God my Savior ($\sigma\omega\tau\hat{\eta}\rho\alpha$), I give thanks to thy name, because thou hast become my defender and helper, and hast *redeemed* my body from destruction, and from the snare of the slanderous tongue, from the lips that forge a falsehood, and hast become my helper against my adversaries and hast

---

[52] In this general class there may be counted such passages as Is. xli. 14, xliii. 14, xliv. 22, 23, 24, lx. 12, lxiii. 9, Jer. xv. 21, xxxviii. (xxxi.) 10, Hos. vii. 13, xiii. 14, Mic, 10, Zeph. (iii. 1) iii. 15, Zech. x. 8 and perhaps Ps. xxiv. (xxv.) 22, xliii (xliv.) 26, lxxiii. (lxiv.) 2, cxxix. (cxxx.) 8.

redeemed me, according to the multitude of thy mercies and name, from the teeth of them that were ready to devour me, from the hand of those that seek my life, from the manifold afflictions which I had. . ."[53] The Psalms afford a number of examples in which this individual redemption in the region of the spirit is spoken of. The note that sounds through them is struck in Ps. xxxiii. (xxxiv.), 22: "The Lord will *redeem* the souls of his servants, and none of them that hope in him shall go wrong."[54]

The redeeming power in all this range of applications of λυτροῦσθαι is uniformly conceived as divine. It is to God, the Lord God Almighty, alone that redemption is ascribed, whether it be the redemption of Israel or of the individual, or whether it be physical or spiritual. God and God alone is the Redeemer alike of Israel and of the individual, in every case of deliverance of whatever order. We hear in Sirach, it is true, of the Holy One redeeming Israel by the hand of Isaiah (xlviii. 20); and indeed, in a somewhat confused sentence, of the twelve prophets, or of their bones, redeeming Jacob (xlix. 10)—or are we to assume that God is understood as the nominative of the verbs and read: "But God comforted Israel and redeemed them by the faith of hope"? There are besides two negative statements which may seem to imply the possibility of a human redeemer. The one is found in Ps. vii. 2, and the other,—a very instructive passage—in Lam. v. 8.[55] In Ps. vii. 2 David prays: "O Lord, my God, in thee do I put my hope, save (σῶσον) me from all that persecute me, and deliver (ῥῦσαι) me; let him not seize my soul, like a lion, while there is none

---

[53] *Cf.* Ps. lviii. (lix.) 1, lxviii. (lxix.) 17, cxviii. (cxix.) 13.

[54] *Cf.* Ps. xxv. (xxvi.) 11, xxx. (xxxi.) 5, xxxi. (xxxii.) 7, xlviii (xlix.) 45, liv. (lv.) 18, lxx. (lxxi.) 23, lxxi. (lxxii.) 14, cii. (ciii.) 4, cxvii. (cxix.) 154: *cf.* Lam. iii. 58.

[55] In both cases the Hebrew word rendered by λυτροῦσθαι is פרק , as it is also in Ps. cxxxv (cxxxvi), 24; *cf.*, the corresponding Aramaic in Danl. iv. 24 (and Driver's note on it). On this word see Giesebrecht, *ZATW*, 1881, p. 285 and the note of Baethgen on Ps. vii. 3. It is literally "to snatch away," "to rescue"; *cf.*, Brown-Driver *in loc.* *Cf.*, note 47.

to redeem (λυτρουμένου) or to save (σώζοντος)." In Lam. v. 8
we read: "Slaves have ruled over us: there is none to re-
deem (λυτροῦμενος) out of their hand." In neither instance
is it intimated, however, that a human redeemer could be
found: despair is rather expressed, and the cry is for the
only Redeemer that can suffice. It is only in Dan. iv. 24
that we find a clear reference to a human redeemer. "En-
treat him concerning thy sins and redeem thine iniquities
with alms" (LXX); "redeem thy sins with alms and thy
iniquities with mercies to the poor" (Theod.). Here the
king is exhorted to ransom his own soul by his good works.
This conception, however, cuts athwart the whole current
of the usage of λυτροῦσθαι in the Septuagint elsewhere when
it is a matter of spiritual redemption. How little such a
point of view accords with that elsewhere connected with
λυτροῦσθαι may be learned from Ps. xlviii. (xlix.) 8: "A
brother redeemeth (λυτροῦται) not: shall a man redeem
(λυτρώσεται)? He shall not give to God an expiation
(ἐξίλασμα) for himself or the price of the redemption (τὴν
τιμὴν τῆς λυτρώσεως) of his soul though he labor forever and
live to the end, so that he should not see corruption." The
sense of ὁ λυτρούμενος in Prov. xxiii. 11: "Remove not the
ancient landmarks and enter not into the possession of or-
phans, for he that redeemeth them is a powerful lord, and
judgeth thy judgment with thee," may be open to some
question. It is probably the intention of the Septuagint
translators to intimate that the poor are under the especial
protection of the God who is the "redeemer" by way of
eminence of the needy.

The emphasis put upon the power of God manifested in
redemption which accompanies the entire usage of λυτροῦσθαι
except in its literal sense, may tempt us to suppose that the
notion of ransoming has been altogether lost in this usage.
This is in point of fact widely taken for granted. B. F.
Westcott, for example, writes:[56] "It will be obvious from
the usage of the LXX that the idea of a ransom received

---

[56] *Hebrews,*[3] p. 298.

by the power from which the captive is delivered, is prac-
tically lost in λυτροῦσθαι etc." Such a statement is in any
case fatally defective. It takes no account of the large use
of λυτροῦσθαι in the Pentateuch in the purely literal sense
(cf., Daniel iv. 24). It is doubtful, however, whether it
can be fully sustained even with respect to the use of
λυτροῦσθαι of the divine deliverance. No doubt, as has al-
ready been pointed out, the sense of the power of God ex-
erted in the deliverances wrought by Him comes so forcibly
forward as to obscure the implication of ransoming. This
is pushed so far into the background as to pass out of sight;
and not infrequently it seems to be pushed not only out of
sight but out of existence. In a passage like Dan. iii. 88
LXX, for example, there seems no place left for ransom-
paying; and the same may appear to be true of such pas-
sages as Dan. vi. 27 LXX, Lam. v. 8, Ps. vii. 2. Nor does
the synonymy in which the word sometimes stands en-
courage seeking for it such an underlying idea: Ex. vi. 6,
ῥύσομαι, λυτρώσομαι; Ps. vii. 2, σῶσον, ῥῦσαι, λυτρουμένου, σώζον-
τος; Ps. lviii.·(lix.) 1, ἐξειλοῦ, λύτρωμαι, ῥῦσαι; Ps. cv. (cvi.) 10,
ἔσωσεν, ἐλυτρώσεν; Hos. xiii. 14, λύσομαι, λυτρώσομαι; Dan. iii.
88 LXX, ἐξείλετο, ἔσωσεν, ἐῤῥύσατο, ἐλυτρώσατο; Dan. vi. 27 LXX,
σῶσαι, ἐλυτρώσατο; 1 Macc. iv. 10, 11, λυτρούμενος, σώζων.

Nevertheless, as Westcott himself perceives, there is an
abiding implication that the redemption has cost something:
"the idea that the redemption costs much," says he, "is al-
ways present." Perhaps we may say that, in this underly-
ing suggestion, the conception of price-paying intrinsic in
λυτροῦσθαι is preserved, and in this the reason may be found
why it appears to be employed only when the mind is filled
with the feeling that the redemption wrought has entailed
the expenditure of almighty power.

It is going too far, in any case, however, to say that the
idea of ransoming "is practically lost in λυτροῦσθαι etc." in
their Septuagint usage—as, to be sure the insertion of the
word "practically" may show that Westcott himself felt.
Whatever may be the implications of λυτροῦσθαι when used to
designate the intervention of God in His almighty power

for the deliverance of His people, there is evidence enough
to show that the feeling of ransoming as the underlying
sense of the word remained ever alive in the minds of the
writers. That could not in any event fail to be the fact,
because of the parallel use of λυτροῦσθαι in its literal sense;
we must not permit to fall out of memory that λυτροῦσθαι is
employed in its literal sense in more than a fourth of all its
occurrences in the Septuagint. Every now and then more-
over the consciousness of the underlying sense of ransom-
ing is thrown up to observation. This may be the case in a
passage like Ps. lxxiii. (lxxiv.) 2: "Remember thy syna-
gogue which thou didst acquire (ἐκτήσω = purchase) of old;
thou didst redeem (ἐλυτρώσω) the rod of thine inheritance."
It is more clearly the case in a passage like Is. lii. 3: "Ye
were sold for nought (δωρεάν) and ye shall not be redeemed
(λυτρωθήσεσθε) with money." There is an intimation here
that no ransom price (in the sense intended) is to be paid
for Israel; its redemption is to be wrought by the might of
Jehovah. But it is equally intimated that a redemption
without a price paid is as anomalous a transaction as a sale
without money passing. That is to say, here is an unexcep-
tionable testimony that the term λυτροῦσθαι in itself was felt
to imply a ransom-price. Another passage in point is pro-
vided by Psalm xlviii. (xlix.) 8: "A brother redeemeth
(λυτροῦται) not: shall a man redeem (λυτρώσεται)? He shall
not give to God an expiation (ἐξίλασμα) for himself, and the
price of the redemption (τὴν τιμὴν τῆς λυτρώσεως) of his soul,
though he labor forever." To redeem is distinctly set forth
here as the giving of a price which operates as an expia-
tion: and the inability of a man to redeem a man out of the
hand of God turns precisely on his inability to pay the
price. Perhaps the most instructive passage, however, will
be found in Is. xliii, 1 ff: "Fear not," Jehovah here says
to His people, "because I have redeemed (ἐλυτρωσάμην) thee.
. . . I have made Egypt thy price (ἄλλαγμα) and Ethiopia
and Soene in thy stead (ὑπὲρ σοῦ). . . . And I will give men
for thee (ὑπέρ σοῦ) and rulers for thy head." Such pas-
sages as these, it surely does not require to be said, could

not have been written by and to men in whose minds the
underlying implication of ransoming had faded out of the
terms employed.   They bear witness to a living conscious-
ness of this implication, and testify that, though λυτροῦσθαι
and its derivatives may be employed to describe a redemp-
tion wrought in the almighty power of God, that was not
in forgetfulness that redemption was properly a transaction
which implies paying a price.

III

The broader use of λυτροῦσθαι (λύτρωσις, λυτρωτής) by the
Septuagint of God's deliverance of His people, may not un-
fairly be said to throw the emphasis so strongly on the
almightiness of the power manifested as to obscure, if not
to obliterate, intimation of its mode as a ransoming.   The
assumption is frequently made that this usage is simply pro-
jected into the New Testament and determines the sense
of all the terms of this group which are found in the New
Testament.

This assumption is met, however, by the initial difficulty
that the usage of the New Testament is not even formally
a continuation of that of the Septuagint.   The usage of the
Septuagint in question is distinctly a usage of λυτροῦσθαι, and
affects only it and, to a limited extent, its two immediate
derivatives, λύτρωσις (Ps. cx. (cxi.) 7, cxxix. (cxxx.) 7,
Is. lxiii. 4) and λυτρωτής (Ps. xviii. cxix.) 14, lxxvii.
(lxxviii.) 35), which could not fail to be drawn somewhat
into the current of any extended usage of λυτροῦσθαι.   The
more proper usage of other members of the group, and in-
deed even of these members of it in a large section of their
employment, remains untouched.   On the other hand, the
usage of the New Testament is characteristically a usage
of ἀπολύτρωσις, an otherwise rare form, which appears never
to occur—itself or its primitive, ἀπολυτροῦν, ἀπολυτροῦσθαι,—
whether in profane Greek,[57] or in the Septuagint,[58] or in

---

[57] Plato, Laws, 919. A; Demosthenes 159, 15; Polybius 2.6.6, 22.21.8;
Lucian; Plutarch, Pompey, 24; Pantaenus, Strat. V. 40; Julian Imp.
Orat. vi, Teubner I. 253; Plutarch, Pompey, 24; Inscription from Kos.
The passages are given above.

[58] Ex. xxi. 8, Zeph. iii. 1 (3). Dan. LXX. iv. 32.

writers directly dependent on the Septuagint,[59] in any other than its intrinsic sense of ransoming. It would be plausible to suggest that the Septuagint usage in question is continued in the λύτρωσις of Luke i. 62, ii. 38 and λυτροῦσθαι of Luke xxiv. 21 where redemption is spoken of on the plane of Old Testament expectation. But the suggestion loses all plausibility when extended beyond this. It would be more plausible to argue that the form ἀπολύτρωσις was selected by the New Testament writers in part purposely to avoid the ambiguities which might arise from the Septuagint associations clinging to λυτροῦσθαι. The simple fact, however, is that the characteristic terminology in the two sets of writings is different.

This formal difference in the usages of the two sets of writers is immensely reinforced by a material difference in the presuppositions underlying what they severally wrote. Whatever may have been the nature of the expectations which the Old Testament saints cherished as to the mode of the divine deliverance to which they looked forward, the New Testament writers wrote of it, as a fact lying in the past, under the impression of a revolutionary experience of it as the expiatory death of the Son of God. It would have been unnatural to the verge of impossibility for them to speak of it colorlessly as to this central circumstance, especially when using phraseology with respect to it which in its intrinsic connotation emphasized precisely this circumstance. We must not obscure the fact that something had happened between the writing of the Old Testament and the New, something which radically affected the whole conception of the mode of the divine deliverance, and which set the development of Jewish and Christian ideas and expressions concerning it moving thenceforward on widely divergent pathways. It may sound specious when the Jewish eschatological conceptions are represented as supplying an analogy, according to which the New Testament

---

[59] Philo, Mangey, ii. 463; Josephus, Niese, III. 77. 11; Aristeas, Wendland, 4.12; 7.19; 12.8.

phraseology may be understood. We may be momentarily impressed when it is explained that, as the Jews have set the Messiah as the great Deliverer (גואל) by the side of Moses, the first Deliverer (גואל הואשון), and expect him, as Moses led Israel out of Egypt, to achieve the final Deliverance (נאלה) and bring Israel home, without any interruption by an expiatory suffering and death, and merely by the power of his own personal righteousness,[60]—so we must understand the New Testament writers, borrowing their language from the Jewish eschatology, to ascribe to Christ merely the Messianic deliverance, without any implication that it is wrought by an act of ransoming. But we can be only momentarily impressed by such representations. Between the Jewish and the New Testament conceptions of the Messianic deliverance there is less an analogy than a fundamental contradiction. There had taken place, first of all, on the part of the Christians what it is fashionable to speak of as a "predating" of the Messianic expectations: the redemption of God's people does not wait, with them, for the end-time, but has already been in principle wrought and awaits only its full realization in all its effects, in the end-time. And precisely what has already been wrought, contributing the very hinge on which the whole conception of the Messianic deliverance turns, is just that act of expiation which is wholly absent from the Jewish representation. If, in other words, the Jews looked only for a Deliverance, wrought by sheer power, the Christians put their trust precisely in a Redemption wrought in the blood of Christ. Of course so fundamental a difference could not fail to reflect itself in the language employed to give expression to the divergent conceptions. And that, again, may be, in part, the account to give of the adoption by the New Testament writers of the rare form ἀπολύτρωσις instead of the more current λυτροῦσθαι coloured by Septuagint conceptions, to describe the redemption in Christ. That

<hr />

[60] Cf. F. Weber, *Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandte Schriften*[2]. 1897. p. 359 f (§ 79.2) ; also p. 361.

they conceived this redemption in terms of ransoming is
made clear in any event by repeated contextual intimations
to that effect.[61]

The attempts which have been made to construe the
terms derived from λυτροῦσθαι, employed by the writers of
the New Testament[62] of the deliverance wrought by Christ,
as inexpressive of their intrinsic implication that the de-

[61] Even Johannes Weiss is constrained to allow that it is probable
that the idea of ransoming was felt in the New Testament usage, as
appears from his very instructive comment on 1 Cor. i. 30: "The
σωτηρία, the ζωή, is the benefit which is obtained for us by the
ἀπολύτρωσις. How far the conception of *ransom* is still felt in this is
not to be debated here. Paul thinks in our passage more of the *effect*
than of the *means* of the deliverance. But it is very probable (from
passages like Gal. iii. 13, 1 Pet. 1. 18) that this shade is still felt." How
impossible it is to eliminate the idea of purchase from the conceptions
of the New Testament writers is illustrated by the admission by
writers who argue for the wider notion of ἀπολύτρωσις that it lies
expressed in other language by the side of the general notion of de-
liverance expressed by ἀπολύτρωσις. This is done, for example, by
A. Ritschl. It is done also by H. Oltramare: "That the idea of
ransom is Scriptural," he says, "is incontestable; but who proves to
us that ἀπολύτρωσις is the equivalent of these expressions"—that is to
say, such as are found in Mt. xx. 28, 1 Tim. ii. 6, 1 Pet. 1, 18, 1 Cor.
vi. 20, Gal. iii. 13. Similarly B. F. Westcott (*Hebrews,*[3] p. 298), after
arguing that the idea of ransom has faded from "λυτροῦσθαι etc." in
the LXX and its place has been taken by that of power, is disinclined
to confine the expenditure which God makes in the New Testament
conception to that of might alone. Love or self-sacrifice, he suggests,
may be the thing expended. He therefore remarks that in "the spirit-
ual order" the idea of deliverance must be supplemented by that of
purchase; and he adduces the passages in which that is expressed.
He concludes with the dictum: "The Christian it appears is bought at
the price of Christ's blood for God." Like Ritschl he is only con-
cerned to show that the idea is not intrinsic in the term λυτροῦσθαι
(ἀπολύτρωσις): it is a fact that we are bought to God by the blood
of Christ, but this fact is not expressed by this term. The ingenuity
required to validate this position (see especially Ritschl here) is its
sufficient refutation.

[62] We remind ourselves that these include a somewhat rare use of
λυτροῦσθαι itself (Luke xxiv. 21; Tit. ii. 14, 1 Pet. i. 18) and its de-
rivative λύτρωσις (Luke i. 68, ii. 38, Heb. ix. 12), with a relatively
large use of ἀπολύτρωσις (Luke xxi. 28; Ro. iii. 24, viii. 20, 1 Cor.
i. 30; Eph. i. 7. 14; Col. i. 14, Heb. ix. 15, xi. 35). Λυτρωτής occurs
Acts vii. 35, but of Moses, not of Christ. Λύτρον occurs at Mat. xx.
28, Mar x. 45, and ἀντιλύτρον at 1 Tim. ii. 6.

liverance intimated was in the mode of a ransoming, were foreordained to failure in the presence of general considerations like this.   H. Oltramare's extended discussion in his comments on Rom. iii. 24 is often referred to as a typical instance of these attempts.[63]   This, however, is rather unfair to them.   Oltramare's argument is vitiated from the beginning by failure to discriminate between the differing usages of the active and middle voices of the whole series of verbs, λύειν, ἀπολύειν, λυτροῦν, ἀπολυτροῦν by which the active means "to put to ransom" and the middle "to ransom."   It loses itself speedily accordingly in mere paradoxes.   Of course he cites no passages from the Greek authors in which any of these terms is employed without intimation of a ransom-paying: to all appearance such passages do not exist.   He is compelled to rely entirely therefore on the Septuagint usage of λυτροῦσθαι mechanically treated.   He allows, of course, that λυτροῦσθαι (with which he confounds also λυτροῦν) "signifies properly and etymologically to release, to liberate an object by giving to its holder or to one who has rights in it, a sum in return for which he desists from his possession, or from his rights, to *ransom, to redeem.*"   He very strangely, because it thus signifies "to secure a release by paying a ransom," sets it in contrast with ἀπολυτροῦν which he represents as meaning "to put to ransom," without observing that he has thus set the purely middle use of the one over against the purely active use of the other.   Thus he parcels out between the two verbs the distinctive usages which obtain between the active and middle of each of them.   "'Ἀπολυτρόω,'" he says, "does not have the sense of the simple verb, 'to ransom' = redimere: we do not know a single example of it.   The prefix ἀπό (as in ἀπολύω, ἀφίημι) so emphasizes the idea of liberating, delivering, that in profane authors, ἀπολυτροῦν signifies properly to *release* for a ransom, to hold to ran-

---

[63] *E.g.,* by Sanday-Headlam, on Rom. iii. 24, whose own conclusion is that "the idea of the λύτρον retains its full force, that it is identical with the τιμή, and that both are ways of describing the Death of Christ. The emphasis is on the *cost* of man's redemption."

som." Even this is not all. For he now proceeds to conclude that "ἀπολύτρωσις designates therefore the action of releasing for a demanded ransom." "Its meaning is such," he continues gravely, "that if we absolutely insist on giving to ἀπολύτρωσις the sense of 'deliverance for ransom,' the expression διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ signifies 'by the *release*, the *ransom-taking* which is found in Jesus Christ'—that is to say that Jesus delivers us by demanding a ransom of us, far from by paying it for us." He sees but one way of escape from this conclusion. "Very happily," he concludes, "ἀπολύτρωσις is also used in the sense of *deliverance*, liberation, without any accessory idea of ransoming. All that it seems to have preserved of the radical is that it speaks principally of releasing from that which binds, confines, impedes, or shuts up." He has no evidence to present for this cardinal assertion, however, except the fact that Schleusner cites from the Old Testament the passage χρόνος τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως ἦλθε." As we know, this passage comes from Dan. iv. 32 LXX, where the context suggests that the deliverance had been purchased by almsgiving. To it Oltramare can add only certain New Testament passages in which he finds no accessory idea of ransoming notified. This is all quite incompetent.

Th. Zahn's discussion, distributed through his notes on the same passage, is free, of course, from such eccentricities, and constitutes in its several parts a careful presentation of all the evidence which can possibly be brought together for taking ἀπολύτρωσις in Rom. iii. 20 in the undifferentiated sense of deliverance. No evidence, of course, for this sense of the term is adduced from the usage of any derivative of λύτρον by a profane author: and no decisive instance is adduced from any quarter of the use of the term itself in this undifferentiated sense.[64] The force of the argument is de-

[64] The only vouchers cited (p. 181, note 52) are Rom. viii. 23, Eph. i. 14, iv. 30, and Clem. Alex. *Strom.* VII. 56, to which Dan. iv. 30 Theod: ὁ χρόνος τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως is added p. 179, note 49. Clement, *Strom.* VII. 10 (56) looks forward to a time when we shall live "with gods according to the will of God," "after we shall have been

pendent wholly on the cumulative effect of the discussion of the several terms λυτροῦσθαι, λύτρωσις, ἀπολυτροῦν, ἀπολύτρωσις successively. In these discussions the more utilizable passages from the Septuagint are skilfully marshalled; certain New Testament passages in which there is no express intimation in the context that the deliverance in question is a ransoming (as if the form of the word itself and its appropriate usage elsewhere counted for nothing!) are added; and a few Patristic passages are subjoined. Despite the thoroughness of the research and the exhaustive adduction of the material, the whole discussion remains unconvincing. The reader rises from it with the conviction that an unnatural meaning is being thrust upon the term on insufficient grounds, and that, after all is said, "redemption" continues to mean redemption.

Much more formidable than either Oltramare's or Zahn's argument is that which is developed with his usual comprehensiveness and vigor by Albrecht Ritschl in the second volume of his great work on *Justification and Reconciliation*.[65] Ritschl begins by speaking of the use of λυτροῦν and its derivatives by the Septuagint to render the Hebrew stems גאל and פדה . These stems, he remarks, had originally, like the Greek terms, the sense of delivering specifically by means of purchase. This implication of purchase

---

redeemed (ἀπολυθέντων) from all chastisement and punishment which we shall have had to endure as salutary chastening in consequence of our sins." "After which redemption (ἀπολύτρωσιν)," he continues, "the rewards and honors are assigned to those who have become perfect, when they have got done with purification, and ceased from all service, though it be holy service, and among saints." They enter into eternal contemplation and receive the name of Gods and live with other Gods who have before been elevated to this condition by the Savior. Here the ἀπολύτρωσις is conceived as a release from punishment and the moment of thought is fixed on the final removal of the soul to its rest. It is an instance of the so-called "eschatological sense" of the term, and "deliverance" would convey the main thought. But it does not follow that the idea of ransoming is eliminated, or that the term ἀπολύτρωσις is not employed because this "deliverance" is felt to rest at bottom on a ransoming.

[65] Edition 3. 1899. pp. 222 ff.

had been lost, however, in usage. Their etymological im-
plication was similarly lost, of course, by the Greek terms
which were employed to render them, through an assimila-
tion to the Hebrew terms which they rendered. These
Greek terms came to the New Testament writers, therefore,
with this broadened sense; and the New Testament writers
naturally continued to employ them in it. If they are some-
times used by the New Testament writers in connections in
which the original sense of purchasing might seem to be
intimated, it is nevertheless not to be assumed that their
original sense has reasserted itself. It is more natural to
read them in these passages too in the broadened sense in
which they have been inherited from the Septuagint. Paul,
for example, must be supposed to have had the Hebrew in
mind when he cited from the Septuagint, and to have taken
from it his religious phraseology. This would hold him,
when he used the Greek words, to the sense which they have
as renderings of the broadened Hebrew terms. Of course,
it may be argued that the Apostolic use of these words is
rather controlled by our Lord's declaration that He came
into the world to give His life as a ransom for many
(Mark x. 45). But there is really no proof that this say-
ing was known to Paul, to say nothing of its having de-
termined the sense in which he employed terms only re-
motely related to the word used. The impression is left on
the mind, rather, that Paul has chosen the compound term
ἀπολύτρωσις instead of the simple λύτρωσις of the Septuagint,
because by it the idea of separation from, or liberation, is
thrown into great emphasis: he wishes, in a word, to say
not ransoming but deliverance.

The steps in this argument are the successive assertions
that: (1) The Hebrew words גאל and פדה had lost
their original connotation of purchase; (2) The Greek
words used to translate them must as a consequence have
lost theirs; (3) The Septuagint usage of these Greek words
must have extended itself into the New Testament; (4)
The ordinary usage of these terms in the New Testament is

in point of fact of this undifferentiated sort; (5) The instances of their use which do not seem of this sort must be nevertheless interpreted in harmony with this usage.

No one of these propositions is, however, unqualifiedly true. (1) Though the original senses of גאל and פדה —
—to redeem and to ransom[66]—are sometimes submerged in their figurative use, they are so far from being wholly obliterated that the words are copiously employed quite literally, and it is repeatedly made clear that even in the most extreme extension of their figurative use their etymological significance does not wholly cease to be felt. (2) The Greek terms fitted to these Hebrew terms seem to have been selected to render them because they were their closest Greek representatives in their literal sense. The use of these Greek terms to render the Hebrew is evidence therefore that they retained their fundamental meaning of redemption, ransoming; and though they naturally acquired from the Hebrew terms their figurative meanings when they were used to express them, there is no evidence that they ever really lost their native implications. It is misleading to speak of "the Septuagint usage" of these Greek terms, as if this "extended" usage were the only usage they have in the Septuagint. Λυτροῦσθαι, the most important of the Septuagint terms, is used in twenty-seven out of the one hundred and five instances in which it occurs in its literal sense of ransoming, redeeming; λύτρωσις is used in five out of its eight occurrences in the sense of redemption, ransoming; all the compounds derived from λυτροῦν are used solely in this sense. (3) In point of fact, the New Testament usage is not a "projection" of the Septuagint usage. The terminology of the New Testament is different from that of the Septuagint, and therefore the terminology of the New Testament was very certainly not derived from that of the Septuagint. Are we to suppose that the New Testament writers carried over the senses of the Septuagint terms without carrying over the terms which were the ve-

---

[66] *Cf.* Driver, on Deut. vii. 8.

hicles of those senses? The fundamental assumption, more-
over, that the New Testament writers derived their whole
phraseology from the Septuagint—Ritschl even speaks of
Paul's "Greek speech, formed from the Septuagint"—can-
not be justified. The Greek speech of the New Testament
writers is the common speech of their day and generation
and their terminology more naturally reflects a popular
usage of the time. (4) It is not the fact that the ordinary
usage of the derivatives of λύτρον in the New Testament is
without modal implications. The contextual implications
rather show ordinarily that the modal implications are pres-
ent. (5) There is not only no reason why a broadened
sense should be made normative for these derivatives and
imposed upon them in defiance of their natural implication
to the contrary, but in several instances they are so recalci-
trant to it that it cannot be imposed upon them without in-
tolerable violence.

A brief survey of the New Testament passages seems to
be desirable in order to justify the last two of these
remarks.[67]

Despite Ritschl's protest we must take our starting-point
from our Lord's own description of His mission on earth
as to give His life a ransom for many (Mat. xx. 28, Mark
x. 45). This could not fail to determine for His followers
their whole conception of the nature of His redemptive
work.[68] We cannot be surprised, therefore, to find one of
them, echoing His very words, describing His work as a
giving of Himself as a ransom (ἀντίλυτρον) for all (1 Tim.
ii. 6). Nor can we profess to be doubtful of his meaning
when the same writer, writing at nearly the same time, but
using now the verbal form, tells us that "our great God
and Savior gave Himself for us that He might redeem
(λυτροῦσθαι) us from all iniquity and purify unto Himself a
people for His own possession, zealous of good works"

---

[67] For a fuller discussion of the implications of the New Testament
usage, see the Article, "Redemption" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the
Apostolical Church*.

[68] *Cf.* A. Deissmann, *Light from the East*, p. 331 and note 6.

(Tit. i. 14); or when another of the New Testament writers, closely affiliated with this one, and writing at about the same time, reminds the Christians that they "were redeemed (λυτροῦσθαι), not with corruptible things, with silver or gold, from their vain manner of life handed down from their fathers, but with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Christ" (1 Pet. i. 18). There is in these passages an express intimation that the deliverance described by the verb λυτροῦσθαι as wrought by our Lord, was wrought in the mode of a ransoming. He gave Himself in working it. He gave His blood, as a lamb's blood is given at the altar. We cannot fail to hear here the echoes of His own declaration, that He came to give His life a ransom for many, or to perceive that the verb λυτροῦσθαι is employed in its native etymological sense of a deliverance by means of a price paid. It is not less clear that the noun λύτρωσις is used in the same natural sense in Heb. ix. 12, where, as in 1 Pet. i. 18, the blood of Jesus is compared with less precious things—here with the blood of goats and calves—and He is asserted, by means of this His own blood, to have "procured eternal redemption." No subtlety of interpretation can rid such passages of their implication of ransoming.

The specialty of the New Testament usage lies, however, not in these simple forms, but in the large use made of the rare compound substantive, ἀπολύτρωσις. This unusual form occurs seven times in the Epistles of Paul, twice in the Epistle to the Hebrews and once in the Gospel of Luke.[69] The preposition ἀπό ("away from") with which it is compounded, no doubt, calls especial attention to the deliverance wrought by the ransoming intimated; and we are prepared, therefore, to see this form used when the mind is directed rather to the effects than to the process of the ransoming.[70]

---

[69] "This rare word," exclaims Deissmann (p. 331, Note 2) "occurs seven times in St. Paul!"

[70] This is what Chrysostom means, in his comment on Rom. iii. 24, when he says: "And he said not simply, λύτρωσις (ransoming) but ἀπολύτρωσις (ransoming away), so that we come not again into the

That does not justify us, however, in supposing the term to declare the effects alone, with a total neglect of the process, namely ransoming, by which they are attained. In point of fact, in a number of instances the deliverance declared is in one way or another distinctly defined by the context as having been obtained by the payment of a price. Thus, in Heb. ix. 15, we are told that this deliverance was wrought by a death; in Eph. i. 7 by the blood of Christ; in Rom. iii. 24 by His being offered as a propitiatory sacrifice.

The implications of the term being fixed by its usage in such passages, it is necessarily interpreted in accordance with them on the other occasions where it occurs. Some of these are so closely connected with these normative passages, indeed, as to be inevitably carried on with them in the same sense. Thus Eph. i. 14 must be read in connection with Eph. i. 7; and Col. i. 14 but repeats Eph. i. 14 and cannot bear a different meaning. From these passages, however, we learn that the effects of the ransoming intimated by ἀπολύτρωσις stretch into the far future and are not all reaped until the end itself. Thus the key is given us for the understanding of it in its "eschatological" application, as it occurs in Luke xxi. 28, Rom. viii. 23, Eph. iv. 30.[71] In such

same bondage." Our ransoming *removed* us from the bondage under which we had suffered so that we were in no danger of falling back into it. *Cf.*, R. C. Trench, *Synonyms of the N.T.*,[7] 1871, p. 273; A. Deissmann, *Light from the East*, p. 331, note 3. This is probably also all that Theophylact means when he defines ἀπολύτρωσις as "recall (ἐπανόκλητις) from captivity," not intending to deny that a ransoming is intimated (as Trench and Deissmann suppose) but emphasizing the reference to the effects of the transaction.

[71] *Cf.*, J. B. Lightfoot's comment on Eph. i. 7:—"The ἀπολύτρωσις may be two-fold: (1) it may be *initial* and *immediate*, the liberation from the consequences of past sin and the inauguration of a new and independent life, as here: so Rom. iii. 24, 1 Cor. i. 30, Col. i. 14, Heb. ix. 15; (2) *future* and *final*, the ultimate emancipation from the force of evil in all its forms, as in Luke xxi. 28. . . . Rom. viii. 23; comp. Heb. xi. 35. In the latter sense it is used below, ver. 14, and iv. 35. . . ." The point to be emphasized is that the only difference between these two classes of passages concerns the particular effects of the one "ransoming" by the blood of Christ which are for the moment engaging the mind of the writer as he thinks of what Christ has ran-

passages the ultimate effects of the ransoming wrought by Jesus in His death are spoken of, not some new and different deliverance, unconnected with that ransoming or with any ransoming, and most certainly not some ransoming distinct from that. The mind of the writer is on the death of Christ as the procuring cause of the deliverance which he is representing by his employment of this term as obtained only at such a cost.

No doubt there are a couple of passages in which there is less to go upon. There is nothing in 1 Cor. i. 30, for example,[72] which would independently fix the sense of the term as there used. But it is unnecessary that there should be, in the presence of so firmly established a significance for it. We must, of course, read it here in accordance with its etymological implications supported by its usage elsewhere: particularly in a writer like Paul whose whole thought of "redemption" is coloured through and through with the blood of Christ.[73] And there is certainly no reason why we should not conceive the deliverance spoken of in Heb. xi. 35 as one to be purchased by some price which the victims were unwilling to pay. That is indeed implied in the declaration that they would not accept deliverance, because they were looking for a better resurrection. Does it not mean that they would not accept deliverance, on the terms, say, apostasy, on which alone it could be had? It is quite clear in sum that ἀπολύτρωσις in the New Testament is conceived, in accordance with its native connotation, and its usage elsewhere, distinctly as a ransoming; and that that implication must be read in it on every occasion of its occurrence.

---

somed us *away from.* There is no specifically "eschatological sense" of ἀπολύτρωσις; there is only an eschatological application of the ransoming which has been wrought by Christ's gift of Himself.

[72] *Cf.* Johannes Weiss' comment on this passage.

[73] G. P. Wetter, *Charis,* 1913, p. 21, says strikingly: "Something great, something not to be understood, has happened to all men. And this great thing is an act of God, an ἀπολύτρωσις, a ransoming, of course out of the earlier condition of wrath and condemnation, and that means with Paul that it happened on the cross."

There remain, to be sure, three or four instances of the occurrence of the simple forms—λυτροῦσθαι Luke xxiv. 21, λύτρωσις Luke i. 68, ii. 38, λυτρωτής Acts vii. 35—all in writings of Luke—which have the peculiarity of standing on the plane of the Old Testament dispensation, and of being consequently unaffected in their suggestions by the new revelation which had come in the ransoming death of Christ. When Zacharias blessed the Lord, the God of Israel, because in the promise to him of a son, He had "visited and brought redemption for His people" (Luke i. 68) ; when Anna spoke of God "to all those that were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem" (Luke ii. 38) ; when the two disciples, on their journey to Emmaus, bewailed to one another the death of Jesus, because they had hoped that "it was He that should redeem Israel"—it is clear enough that we are still on Old Testament ground. The redemptive "death which Jesus was to accomplish at Jerusalem" is not in sight to illuminate and give precision to the ideas which inform the language. In these passages, belonging to the dawn of the new dispensation, the usage of the Septuagint may not unnaturally be thought to prolong itself. And this point of view may, no doubt, not unnaturally be extended to such a passage as Acts vii. 35, where Moses, thought of as a type of Christ, is called a "redeemer." Even this is not to say, however, that λυτροῦσθαι, λύτρωσις, λυτρωτής stand in these passages wholly without implication of ransoming. As they were written down by Luke, they doubtless were written down with Calvary read into their heart. As they were originally spoken they were doubtless informed with longings which though surer of the deliverance promised than instructed in the precise manner in which it should be wrought, were not without some premonitions, vague and unformed, perhaps, that it would be costly. Those who spoke these words were not mere Jews (as we might say) ; they were the "quiet in the land'" whose hearts were instructed above their fellows. After all, the main fact is that in the Old Testament, and in these few echoes of the

Old Testament usage "in the beginnings of the Gospel," before the light of the cross had shined upon the world, the great deliverance which was longed for from God, was spoken of, not in the use of terms which expressed merely deliverance—of which plenty to choose from lay at hand— but in the use of terms which enshrined in their heart the conception of ransoming.

Whatever we may think, however, of these few phrases preserved by Luke from the speech of men still only looking forward to the Gospel, they obviously stand apart from the general New Testament usage. That usage, whether of λυτροῦσθαι (Tit. ii. 14, 1 Pet. i. 18), λύτρωσις (Heb. ix. 12), or of ἀπολύτρωσις (Luke xxi. 28, Rom. iii. 24, viii. 23, 1 Cor. i. 30, Eph. i. 7, 14, iv. 30, Col. i. 14, Heb. ix. 15, xi. 35), is very distinctly a usage in which the native sense of this group of words—the express sense of ransoming—is clearly preserved. We shall not do justice to the New Testament use of these terms unless we read them in every instance of their occurrence as intimating that the deliverance which they assert has been accomplished, in accordance with the native sense of the words in which it is expressed, by means of a ransom-paying.

IV

It is not of large importance, but it is not without an interest of its own to observe how this group of terms is used in the earliest Patristic literature. Three currents of inheritance unite here, and the effect is naturally to impart to the resultant usage a certain lack of consistency and sureness. There was the general Greek tradition, which gave to all the members of the group the uniform connotation of ransoming. There was the Septuagint modification of the simple terms, which wrought the more powerfully because the Septuagint supplied a rich body of quotable passages that were everywhere employed as vehicles of Christian faith and hope. And there was the New Testament usage in which the deliverance wrought by Christ is distinctly presented as a ransoming, but in which also a certain ten-

dency is manifested to throw the emphasis on the effects of
this ransoming and especially on its ultimate effect in de-
livering us from the wrath of God at the end-time.   We
can observe the influence of all these currents at work.

In the first age, to be sure, there is no very copious use
made of this group of terms.   Only λύτρον, λυτροῦσθαι and
λύτρωσις occur, for example, in the Apostolic Fathers; and
they only sparingly.

Λύτρον occurs twice and in both instances, of course, in
its natural sense of "ransom."   "Thou shalt work with thy
hands," says Barnabas (xix. 10), commanding diligence in
business, "for a ransom for thy sins."   And in the Epistle
of Diognetus, the greatness and power of God in our salva-
tion is beautifully praised because "in pity He took upon
Himself our sins and Himself parted with His own Son as
a ransom for us, the holy for the lawless, the guiltless for
the evil, the just for the unjust, the incorruptible for the
corruptible, the immortal for the mortal."

Λυτροῦσθαι occurs nine times.   In some of these occur-
rences, it has reference to human rather than divine acts.
One of these is 1 Clem. lv. "Many among ourselves have
delivered themselves to bondage that they might ransom
others."   The native notion of ransoming intrinsic to the
verb is here expressed very purely.   This note is less clearly
struck in Hermas, *Mand.* viii. 10.   Hermas is giving a cata-
logue of Christian duties.   "Hear now what follow upon
these," he says: "To minister to widows, to visit the or-
phans and the needy, to ransom the servants of God from
their afflictions, to be hospitable."   And the note of ransom-
ing appears to have sunk into silence in another passage of
Hermas (*Vis.* iv. 1, 7).   Pursued by a dreadful beast, he
says, "And I began to cry and to beseech the Lord that He
would deliver me from him."   Dependence appears to be
put on the might of God.

In none of these instances is there reference to the great
normal deliverance which the redemption of God is.   This
is spoken of, however, in Ignatius' Christ-like prayer for

the persecutors of his friends (Phil. ii. 1) : "May those who treated them with dishonor be redeemed through the grace of Jesus Christ." And it is spoken of also in Barnabas' exhortation (xix. 2) : "Thou shalt glorify Him that redeemed thee from death." Neither passage gives clear intimation of how the redemption spoken of is supposed to be wrought. Nor indeed does the earlier passage in Barnabas (xiv. 4-8) in which, within the space of a few lines, he uses λυτροῦσθαι of the saving work of our Lord no less than four times. We quote Lightfoot's version with its odd variations in the rendering of the term: "Even the Lord Jesus, who was prepared beforehand hereunto, that, appearing in person, He might *redeem* out of darkness our hearts which had already been paid over unto death. . . . For it is written how the Father chargeth Him to *deliver* us from darkness. . . . We perceive, then, whence we are *ransomed*. Again the prophet saith, . . . 'Thus saith the Lord that *ransomed* thee, even God." The citation at the end is from Is. xlix. 6 ff where the Septuagint has ὁ ῥυσάμενος. Why Barnabas substitutes ὁ λυτρωσαμένος is a matter of conjecture. Possibly it was inadvertent. Possibly it was due to his having already written λυτροῦσθαι three times, and he adjusts his text to the language of the passage into which he brings it. Possibly he substitutes a term which more exactly describes what Christ actually did—Christianizes Isaiah's language, in a word. In the only remaining passage in which λυτροῦσθαι occurs in the Apostolic Fathers, 2 Clem. xvii. 4, it is used in the so-called "eschatological sense," illustrated in the New Testament by Luke xxi. 28, Rom. vii. 23, Eph. i. 14, iv. 30, Col. i. 14: "The Lord said, 'I will come to gather together all the peoples, tribes and tongues.' And He means by this the day of His epiphany, when, coming, He shall redeem us, each according to his works."

The only other form which occurs in the Apostolic Fathers is λύτρωσις and it occurs only twice (1 Clem. xii. 7, Did. iv. 6, *cf.*, Barn. xix. 10 as v.r. for λύτρον). In Did

iv. 6, the Christians are being exhorted to almsgiving, and quite after the Jewish fashion (*cf.,* Dan. iv. 24 Theod.) the exhortation takes the form: "If thou hast aught passing through thy hands, thou shalt give a ransom for thy sins." Almsgiving is a means of securing deliverance: it is the purchase-price paid for immunity from deserved punishment. In 1 Clem. xii. 7, the scarlet thread which Rahab hung out of the window is declared to have showed beforehand that "through the blood of the Lord there shall be redemption unto all them that believe and hope in God." Here also the sense is distinctly that of ransoming, and the price paid for redemption is noted as Christ's blood.

This is rather a meagre showing for the currency of the language of redemption in the first age of the Church. The Apostolic Fathers are notable, however, for poverty of doctrinal content: perhaps it is only natural that this doctrine too finds only occasional allusion in them. We receive no impression that λυτροῦσθαι and its derivatives are employed as technical terms, as established vehicles of a definite doctrine. They appear to be cursorily used in the several senses and applications in which they would naturally suggest themselves to writers of the varied inheritance of these first Christians. The term which comes nearest to a technical term in the New Testament—Paul's ἀπολύτρωσις—does not occur here at all. And the terms that do occur are dealt with freely and librate in their suggestion between the two extremes of a strict ransoming and an undifferentiated deliverance—with the balance falling, as was natural, in the direction of the stricter signification.

When we advance to the next age—the age of the Apologists—we meet with similar phenomena, though for a different reason. Apologies are no more natural receptacles of doctrinal terms than practical letters. No single term of our group of words occurs in a single Apology of this epoch. The whole period would be barren of these terms were it not that the Dialogue between Justin and Trypho happens to have been written in it. It this Dialogue, λυτ-

ροῦσθαι appears seven times, and λύτρωσις, λυτρωτής and ἀπολύτρωσις each once. Here it will be observed, first in Christian literature, is our Lord called "Redeemer" (λυτρωτής). And here first in uninspired Christian literature does Paul's ἀπολύτρωσις reappear—and it does not appear here of Christ's redemption of His people to which usage Paul had consecrated it, but only of the redemption of Israel through Moses.

It is clear that the mind of this writer is not on these terms as technical terms for the Christian salvation, described in its mode. Of the ten passages in which they occur six are citations from the Old Testament: xix. 6 (Ex. xx. 12, 13), "That ye may know that I am God who redeemed you" (LXX: "who sanctifieth you"); xxvi. 3 (Is. lxiii. 12), "And he shall call it a holy nation, redeemed by the Lord"; xxxiv. 5 (Ps. xxxii. 14); "He shall redeem their souls from usury and injustice"; cxix. 3 (Is. lxxii. 12), "And they shall call them the holy people, redeemed of the Lord"; xxvi. 4 (Is. lxiii. 5), "For the day of retribution has come upon them, and the year of redemption (λύτρωσις) is present"; xxiv. 3 (Ps. xviii. (xix.) 15), "For we call him Helper and Redeemer (λυτρωτής)." In two more of them the allusion is not to the Christian redemption but to the Deliverance of Israel from Egypt: cxxxi. 3, "Ye who were redeemed from Egypt with a high hand and a visitation of great glory, when the sea was parted for you"; lxxxvi. 1, "Moses was sent with a rod to effect the redemption (ἀπολύτρωσις) of the people; and with this in his hands at the head of the people he divided the sea."

Only two passages remain in which Justin uses λυτροῦσθαι at his own instance of the Christian redemption.

The first of these is lxxxiii. 3. Here Justin is commenting on the Jewish attempt to interpret Ps. cx. 1 ff of Hezekiah: "The Lord saith to my Lord, Sit at my right hand, till I make thine enemies my footstool. He shall send forth a rod of power over Jerusalem, and it shall rule in the midst of thine enemies. In the splendor of the saints before the

morning star have I begotten thee. The Lord hath sworn
and will not repent, Thou art a priest forever after the
order of Melchizedek." He asks scornfully, "Who does
not admit then, that Hezekiah is no priest after the order
of Melchizedek? And who does not know that he is not
the redeemer (λυτρούμενος) of Jerusalem? And who does
not know that he neither sent a rod of power over Jerusa-
lem, nor ruled in the midst of her enemies; but that it was
God who averted from him the enemies after he mourned
and was afflicted? But our Jesus. . ." . The reference to
Jesus here is only indirect and the exact nature of the re-
demption spoken of is not clear.

The other passage, lxxxvi. 6 is clearer. It runs: "Our
Christ by being crucified on the tree, and by purifying us
with water, has redeemed us, though plunged in the direst
offences which we have committed, and has made us a house
of prayer and adoration." Here it is from sin that we are
said to have been redeemed, both from its guilt and from its
pollution. The redeeming act is seen in the crucifixion; while
the cleansing by baptism is associated with that as co-cause
of the effect. The whole process of salvation is thus in-
cluded in what is called redemption; the impetration and
application of salvation alike. There is a price paid; and
there is a work wrought. So broadly does Justin conceive
of the scope of λυτροῦσθαι.

We need not pursue the matter further. With Justin we
are already a hundred years later than the New Testament
usage. We perceive that, under the varied influences
moulding its usage, the idea of redemption in the early
fathers is at once very deep and very broad. It has not lost
the implication of ransoming with which it began, but it
embraces the whole process of salvation, which, beginning
with our ransoming by the precious blood of Jesus, proceeds
with our purification from sin, to end only with our deliver-
ance from the final destruction and our ushering into the
eternal glory. The breadth of the reference is interestingly
illustrated in the opening words of the beautiful letter of

the Churches of Lyons and Vienne in Gaul. It is the New Testament word ἀπολύτρωσις which is used here. "The servants of Christ residing at Vienne and Lyons in Gaul," the letter begins, "to the brethern throughout Asia and Phrygia who hold with us the same faith and hope of redemption, peace and grace and glory from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Lord."[74] "Who have the same faith and hope in the redemption that we have"—οἱ αὐτὴν τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως ἡμῖν πίστιν καὶ ἐλπίδα ἔχοντες.

Adolf Harnack warns us against supposing that the terms σωτηρία, ἀπολύτρωσις and the like refer always—or regularly—to deliverance from sin. "In the superscription of the Epistle from Lyons, for example," he says, "it is manifestly the future redemption that is to be understood by ἀπολύτρωσις." Harnack's fault lies in introducing an illicit alternative. It is not a matter of *either* the redemption from sin *or* the future deliverance from wrath. Both are embraced. The writers of the letter speak not only of the common hope of redemption, but before that of the common faith in redemption: "to all that have the same *faith and hope* in redemption that we have." It is a redemption that has taken place in the past and that extends in its effects into the farthest future, of which they speak.

It was just this comprehensiveness of redemption, meeting all our needs here and hereafter, that filled the hearts of the fathers with adoring gratitude. They did not think of eliminating the fundamental ransoming in which it consisted on the one side, because their outlook on its effects extended on the other to the final deliverance from the wrath of God. There is therefore a marked tendency among the fathers to speak of Christ's work as double, past and future. Christ came, says Origen,[76] "in order that λυτρωθῶμεν καὶ ῥυσθῶμεν from the enemy"—not for the one or the other, but for both. "Christ endured death for our

---

[74] Eusebius, H. E. V. 1. 3.

[75] *History of Dogma,* E. T. I. p. 202 note (German ed. 1 I. p. 145 note).

[76] *Hom. XIV on Jer.* Ed. Klostermann, III. 116.1.

sakes," says Eusebius,[77] "giving Himself as a λύτρον καὶ ἀντίψυχον for those who are to be saved by Him." He died as a ransom certainly: but the salvation purchased by this ransom-price works itself out steadily in its successive stages unto the very end. This is the key to the "broad" use of λυτροῦσθαι and its derivatives of the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.[78]

Princeton.   BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

---

[77] Fragment on *The Theophany,* Migne, XXIV. 653 B.

[78] We have no concern here with the Patristic doctrine of the ransoming from Satan; see J. Wirtz, *Die Lehre von der Apolytrosis,* 1906, on the early history of that.