

“THE MIND OF CHRIST” AND “THE LIKENESS OF SINFUL FLESH”

Paul E. Penno, Jr.

October 29, 2008

Consider an exposition of some of the key words and phrases of Romans 8:3. “God sending his own Son.” When did God send his Son? “But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman” (Gal. 4:4). “The aim of Christ’s sending by God is to judge and destroy sin. This is the meaning of the incarnation.”¹ At Jesus’ birth God sent his Son “in the likeness of sinful flesh.”

The word “likeness” has received considerable attention in the history of interpretation. Basically the debate ranges around the sense of unlikeness in nature, similarity in nature, or identical in nature? If like means similarity, then the flesh God sent the Son in was inwardly weakened physically both inwardly and in outward appearance by the ravages of thousands of years of sin. His moral nature was that of Adam’s before the Fall without inclination to sin. If likeness means identity, then God sent the Son in a weakened physical frame after thousands of years of sin, and God sent him in a moral nature which inclined him to sin like Adam’s nature after the Fall.

The word “likeness” ὁμοιώματι, as used by Paul in Romans is nuanced. In some instances it means similar. For example, “And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man” (Rom. 1:23). An image cannot be an exact replica of man. Again, “For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also *in the likeness of his* resurrection” (Rom. 6:5). His death was by crucifixion. Our death is by baptism into his death. Finally, “Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression” (Rom. 5:14). Here “similitude” is used to contrast the sin of Adam’s descendants with his transgression.

¹ Gerhard Kittel, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Vol. I (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1969), P. Grundmann, Art., “Sin in the NT,” p. 312.

There is a parallel use of ὁμοιώματι² in Philippians 2:7. It is appropriate to discuss Philippians 2:7 at this point and return to Romans 8:3 because of this verbal linkage and the same subject matter. Philippians (63 A.D.) was written after Romans (57-58 A.D.), and the Christ-hymn which he quotes was probably taken from the hymnology of “the gentile mission.”³ This would indicate a common understanding among the Gentile Christians regarding the nature of Christ’s humanity. Romans would be Paul’s first written venture into the arena of Christ’s anthropology, but the Christ-hymn in Philippians was in his mind prior to the writing of Romans.

The Philippian text reads: Christ was “made in the likeness of men” (Phil. 2:7). Ομοιώματι here means full identity. First, ὁμοιώματι sharpens the meaning of “form of a servant” (μορφὴν δούλου), and is followed by “being found in fashion as a man” (σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος).⁴ These three phrases line up as deepening expressions of Christ’s identity with man.

Second, the Christ-hymn (Phil. 2:6-11) is “an expression of Adam christology.”⁵ Christ was “in the form of God” (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ, v.

² Many interpreters see this parallel. Only a couple are to be cited: “Paul must mean the same with ομοίωμα in Rom. 8:3 as he did in Ph. 2:2 [*sic* Phil. 2:7], that God sent his son in the form of sinful flesh which means that he actually became flesh and sin. Paul cannot have meant both the identity of appearance and a difference in being by the same word.” Robert Jewett, *Paul’s Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971), p. 152. “In Phil 2:7 the term again describes Christ, this time ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων.” Vincent P. Branick, “The Sinful Flesh of the Son of God (Rom 8:3): A Key Image of Pauline Theology,” *CBQ* 47, 2 (April, 1985), p. 250.

³ “If we agree that the hymn is non-Pauline in origin, and that the Adam/Christ typology underlies v. 8, it follows that this typology is not a Pauline creation, but the common stock of the gentile mission.” Reginald H. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1965), p. 211.

⁴ “The coming into existence is accomplished in the ‘likeness’ of men. Here ‘*homoïoma*’ signifies identity; Christ identifies himself with humanity.” Jean-Francois Collange, *The Epistle of Saint Paul to the Philippians* (London: Epworth Press, 1979), pp. 103, 104.

⁵ James D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry Into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1980), p. 115. “All the statements of Phil. 2.6ff. are to be understood from the standpoint of the Old Testament history of Adam. Adam was created in the

6), which is contrasted with “form of a slave” (μορφήν δούλου, v. 7). The words “equal with God” (τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, v. 6) are in contrast with “the likeness of men” (ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων, v. 7). Adam was made in the image of God, but the Fall resulted in his becoming a slave. Adam and Eve were tempted to be equal with God (Gen. 3:5), but “became as men are” (Phil. 2:7c, JB).

Christ was “born” (γενόμενος) (vs. 7c) “into this world as all men are.”⁶ At his birth he “took upon him the form of a servant” (v. 6). Although he was equal with God he did not consider it something to be grasped as Adam sought. He emptied himself of Adam’s glory and took the form of a servant,⁷ which was Adam’s fate. He exchanged the immortality and incorruption of God for the mortality and corruption of a servant.

On Christ being born in “the likeness of men,” ὁμοιώματι indicates full congruence. Karl Barth concurs: “There must be no turning and twisting of the *ekenose* (emptied) and the *homoionoma* (like [men]). The second term, too, stresses the likeness, and not in some way the hidden unlikeness. What we see is a man, the form of one exposed to all the dubiousness, ambiguity, and darkness of an individual human existence, the form not of a lord but of a servant.”⁸

Having established that “likeness” in Philippians 2:7 means full identity to men,⁹ we return to Romans 8:3. That here too, “likeness” may be established as meaning full identity with humanity’s “sinful flesh,” can be demonstrated on internal grounds within the text.

A compelling reason why “likeness” means “full congruence” is to be found in the phrase “in the flesh” (vs. 3). Whose flesh was

image of God, but he lost that image because he wanted to grasp equality with God.” Oscar Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), p. 181.

⁶ F. W. Beare, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1869), p. 83.

⁷ Christ took the form of a servant, but not the character, for he had the character of a servant in his preexistence.

⁸ Karl Barth, *The Epistle to the Philippians* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), pp. 63, 64.

⁹ Florence Gillman cites Phil. 2:7 as an example of “his full congruence with humans.” Florence Morgan Gillman, “Another Look at Romans 8:3: ‘In the Likeness of Sinful Flesh’,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49, 24 (October, 1987), p. 600.

condemned? It was Christ's flesh that God condemned. Paul did not intend to say that God condemned sin as a power in all humans, but not as it exists in non-flesh sentient beings.¹⁰ So then, God condemned the flesh of Christ with sin as its power. Now if God condemned the flesh of Christ with sin as its source of power, then "likeness" does not bear the meaning of "similarity" to "sinful flesh," but "full identity." "Likeness" is not being used as "a differentiating term" to distinguish Christ's "sinful flesh" from all of humanity's flesh;¹¹ otherwise, God would not condemn his sinless flesh. But, Paul affirms, God did condemn his flesh. Therefore, his flesh was such as was under the power of sin.

This leads to the question, When did God condemn "the flesh"? Christ took on the power of sin in its very lair, the flesh, and by dependence upon His Father, he denied its control of his life. He said, "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth these also doeth the Son likewise" (John 5:19). "I do nothing of myself but as my Father hath taught me" (John 8:28). "I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me" (John 5:30). Thus God condemned sin in his flesh. The whole of Christ's life from the incarnation to his death was the condemnation of the flesh.¹²

¹⁰ "Ἐν τῇ σαρκί is to be connected not with τὴν ἁμαρτίαν (Paul surely did not mean to suggest that only sin dwelling in man's flesh was affected, and that in so far as sin is a power external to man it was unscathed), but with κατέκρινεν. It tells us where God's 'condemnation' of sin took place. It took place in the flesh, i.e., in Christ's flesh, Christ's human nature." C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, Vol. I, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Limited: 1985), p. 382.

¹¹ Gillman states, ". . . Ἐν τῇ σαρκί is thus a reference to Christ. But in this expression Paul did not find it necessary to repeat ὁμοίωμα, probably, it may be suggested, because in the previous phrase it had already served its purpose of denoting Christ's full identity with humans. Had Paul intended the word to be a differentiating term and had he used it because he did not want to say that Christ was sent ἐν σαρκί ἁμαρτίας, it seems he would also have had to repeat ὁμοίωμα with the ἐν τῇ σαρκί phrase. That he does not repeat it indicates that ὁμοίωμα basically has an emphatic sense in v 3 and simply serves to underscore Christ's identity with all others." Florence Morgan Gillman, "Another Look at Romans 8:3: 'In the Likeness of Sinful Flesh'," *CBQ* 49, 24 (October, 1987), p. 601.

¹² "That Paul had in mind Christ's death as the event in which the full weight of God's wrath against sin was, in the flesh of Christ, that is, in His human nature, so effectively brought to bear upon all the sin of all mankind, as to rule out its

If ἐν τῇ σαρκί is understood as Christ's flesh, then Paul's use of the word ὁμοιώματι is not for the purpose of implying the unreality of Christ's flesh,—that he only appeared as a man, but in reality was not. This is docetism. Neither does ὁμοιότης imply that he really took human flesh, but not sinful human flesh. This would mean that Christ took sinless flesh. But it was not sinless flesh that needed redeeming. It was sinful flesh that needed redemption. Christ actually assumed fallen human nature because that is what needed redemption. It was that nature which God condemned to death. Furthermore, for Christ to have taken the moral nature of Adam before the fall would not have subjected him to death, for a sinless nature does not die.¹³

Today's English Version has a popular rendering of Romans 8:3: "What the Law could not do, because human nature was weak, God did, He condemned sin in human nature by sending his own Son, who came with a nature like man's sinful nature to do away with sin." The translators defend this rendering. "Paul is only affirming that even though Christ possessed a human nature like that of all other men, he himself remained sinless because he never yielded to the impulses of this nature."¹⁴

ever having to be brought to bear upon it in any other flesh—this is scarcely to be doubted. But, if we recognize that Paul believed it was fallen human nature which the Son of God assumed, we shall probably be inclined to see here also a reference to the unintermittent warfare of His whole earthly life by which He forced our rebellious nature to render a perfect obedience to God." C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, Vol. I, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Limited: 1985), p. 383.

¹³ "A little thought will be sufficient to show anybody that if Christ took upon himself the likeness of man, in order that he might suffer death, it must have been sinful man that he was made like, for it is only sin that causes death. Death could have no power over a sinless man, as Adam was in Eden; and it could not have had any power over Christ if the Lord had not laid on him the iniquity of us all. Moreover, the fact that Christ took upon himself the flesh, not of a sinless being, but of sinful man, that is, that the flesh which he assumed had all the weaknesses and sinful tendencies to which fallen human nature is subject, is shown by the very words upon which this article is based. He was 'made of the seed of David according to the flesh.' David had all the passions of human nature." E. J. Waggoner, "God Manifest in the Flesh. Romans 1:3," *The Signs of the Times* 15, 3 (January 21, 1889), p. 39.

¹⁴ "The clause who came with a nature like man's sinful nature is rendered in some languages as 'who came to earth with a heart like the hearts of men who sin' or 'he came having a body just like men's bodies which tend to sin.'" Barclay

2 Corinthians 5:21 is even stronger than Roman 8:3 in its affirmation of Christ's full congruence with sin.¹⁵ “Τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν.” “He who knew no sin was made sin for us.” In what sense is the double use of ἁμαρτίαν to be understood? Is it sin as an act, a sin-offering, or sinful nature?

Here the second use of ἁμαρτίαν (first use in the Greek text) has been traditionally understood as meaning sin-offering. Christ was made sin-bearer in order to offer himself as a sacrifice for our sins. Since the phrase “he who knew no sin” obviously does not mean sin-offering and it is the same word ἁμαρτίαν as in “was made *sin* for us,” it is better to understand both uses of the word ἁμαρτίαν as meaning the same thing instead of dividing their meanings,—namely, the first as “sin” and the second as “sin-offering.”¹⁶

Second, there are no examples of ἁμαρτίαν meaning sin-offering in the New Testament.

Third, the chiasm of the verse has contrasting elements. The sinless Christ is made sinful in parallelism to sinful humans who are made righteous. Being “made the righteousness of God” (γενώμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ) is the complement of “hath made him to be sin” (ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν). If “hath made him to be sin” means sin-offering, then the parallelism is lost with being “made the righteousness of God.” In view of these reasons, “sin” does not mean sin-offering (its first use in the Greek text), but God “made him to be sin.”¹⁷ That is,

M. Newman and Eugene A. Nida, *A Translator's Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Romans* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1963), p. 147. Underlining theirs.

¹⁵ “This is much stronger than the statement that he was made ‘in the likeness of sinful flesh.’ He was *made to be sin*.” E. J. Waggoner, “God Manifest in the Flesh. Romans 1:3,” *The Signs of the Times* 15, 3 (January 21, 1889), p. 39.

¹⁶ “Why ἁμαρτία? . . . Does it mean ‘sin-offering’? Attractive as this interpretation has been to some commentators, it must be rejected: Paul can hardly have used ἁμαρτία with two different meanings almost side by side.” Morna D. Hooker, “On Becoming the Righteousness of God: Another Look at 2 Cor. 5:21,” *Novum Testamentum* 50, 4 (2008), p. 369.

¹⁷ B. Hudson McLean, *The Cursed Christ. Mediterranean Expulsion Rituals and Pauline Soteriology* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press Ltd, 1996), p. 109.

God made him to be sin-nature. It should be obvious that God did not make him an active sinner.

Ἐποίησεν, “made,” can mean that God “make[s] something into something (else).” Or it can have the sense of appointment, where “God *caused* the sinless one *to be* sin.”¹⁸ The former meaning is indicated in 2 Cor. 5:21. “With ἀμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν the abstract is used for the concrete. . . .”¹⁹ “God made the sinless one into sin” (JB). “God made him one with the sinfulness of man” (NEB). “God made him share our sin” (GNB). So God made Christ sin, i.e., fallen human nature.

In this case, “for us,” (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν) means that his representative nature was not merely vicarious; in the sense of divine appointment,—exempt from full identity with his constituents. Rather, he was by divine creation, made the actual representative of his constituents; in the reality of their sin,—experienced as a *humanly* irresistible force.

Paul is really saying the same thing here that he writes in Romans 8:3. “The righteousness of God” (2 Cor. 5:21), is perfect conformity to the law of God. “The righteousness of God in him” condemned the sin he was made for us. More specifically, human sin is the fallen human nature referred to in the double use of ἀμαρτίαν.²⁰ Thus, Christ who had no pre-existent sin-nature, was made by God to be sin in nature. Christ perfectly performed the law of God in the sin-nature which God made him, that we might “be made the righteousness of God in him.”

The writer of Hebrews makes reference to the “flesh” of Christ. “Who in the days of his *flesh*, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared; though he were a Son, yet *learned* he obedience by the things which he suffered; and being made perfect. . . .” Hebrews 5:7-9. His flesh of weakness was so prone to sin that Christ spent agonizing hours in

¹⁸ Murray J. Harris, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.: Grand Rapids, 2005), p. 451.

¹⁹ Rudolf Karl Bultmann, *The Second Letter to the Corinthians* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1985), p. 165.

²⁰ Jan Lambrecht, *Second Corinthians* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1999), pp. 100, 101.

communion with his Father for deliverance from sin and death.²¹ There was a learning curve for the Son, in that he experienced what all men go through in their battles with temptation. The inherited moral weakness of his flesh made such an impression upon him that his obedience was wrought out in complete dependence upon his Father. He would not allow himself the luxury of one moment of self-dependence. It was thus that his education was made complete. The workmanship which God accomplished in his flesh was perfected. Had Christ's human nature been exempt from propensities to sin, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to claim for it the necessity of learning obedience; for it would already be in full harmony with God and his law. Such a divine affinity would already be perfect with no necessity to learn. His learning obedience by dependence upon the Father (John 5:30), indicates a fleshly nature that is morally weakened.

What is the role of the mind of Christ with respect to his flesh? "Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the *flesh*, arm yourselves likewise with the same *mind*: for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin." 1 Peter 4:1. The suffering involved in the flesh is with sin. This is a battle that is unique to human existence "in the flesh." Christ allowed himself to suffer the desires of the flesh.²² Christ resisted the temptations of the lower nature with his mind.²³ It is by the same "mind" that his followers are to resist the temptations of their lower nature.

²¹ "It was thus that He learned obedience; for suffering caused Him (as does everyone) to know His own weakness; and as He was continually conscious of having no power in Himself (John v. 30), He rested on the Father for support; and this trust is obedience." E. J. Waggoner, "The Bible Class. Learning Obedience Through Suffering. Heb. v. 8-14," *The Present Truth* 19, 26 (June 25, 1903), p. 405.

²² "He who arms himself with the same mind as Christ, will not, even while remaining in the flesh, live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lusts of the flesh; because although Christ suffered in the flesh, being tempted in all points like as we are, yet it was without sin." E. J. Waggoner, "Confessing Christ in the Flesh," *The Present Truth* 10, 10 (March 8, 1894), p. 149.

²³ ". . . The Christian is to be armed with the same *resolve* (ἐννοια, *ennoia*) that Jesus Christ himself had (cf. Phil. 2:5). In the LXX Proverbs the noun *ennoia* often refers to that mind-set or disposition that issues in right moral action (e.g., Prov. 2:11; 3:21; 16:22; 23:19). Therefore, Peter exhorts his readers to have the same resolve that characterized Christ." Karen H. Jobes, *1 Peter* (Grand Rapids: Baker Publishing Group, 2005), p. 262.

To “walk . . . after the flesh” (Rom. 8:1, 3, 4), is to commit one’s “mind” (φρονοῦσιν) to “the things of the flesh (Rom. 8:5). “To be carnally minded (φρόνημα) is death” (Rom. 8:6). “The carnal mind (φρόνημα) is enmity against God” (Rom. 8:7). The “carnal mind” is “the flesh’s (i.e., fallen human nature’s) mind, that is, its outlook, assumptions, values, desires and purposes. . . .”²⁴

The mind concedes the truthfulness of service to God’s law. “So then with the mind (νοῖ) I myself serve the law of God” (Rom. 7:25). However, there is “another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind (νοός)” (Rom. 7:23). Hence, “the law of sin” is more powerful than the human mind can control. The force of sin inevitably overwhelms and corrupts the human mind.

Christ crucified “the body of sin” that it “might be destroyed” (Rom. 6:6). This is the meaning of Paul’s statement in Colossians. “In the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreprouable in his sight. And having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it” (Col. 2:14, 15). “The body of his flesh”²⁵ is the beachhead by which the assaulting powers of evil²⁶ has gained

²⁴ C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, Vol. I, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Limited: 1985), p. 386.

²⁵ “It is one of the central ideas of Paul’s theology that the sinful principle has its seat in the ‘flesh,’ by which he means not only the material of which man’s body is composed but the lower nature as a whole. All motives and thoughts and desires which belong to the mere earthly existence are included in the flesh. In order to do battle with sin on its own ground Christ assumed a body of flesh; as Paul boldly expresses it in 2 Cor. 5:21, ‘He who knew no sin was made sin for us.’ Thus his physical death on the Cross had a moral value, and was universal in its effect. By the destruction of his own flesh he destroyed the principle of flesh which involves the whole race in sin.” E. F. Scott, *The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon and to the Ephesians* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1942), pp. 27, 28.

²⁶ “When he cut away the angelic Rulers and Powers from us, may also be translated, ‘having stripped off from himself.’ This rendering is accepted by the R.V., and a strong case for it is presented in Lightfoot’s commentary. If the words are so taken the meaning must be that the powers of evil had entrenched themselves in Christ’s fleshly nature. ‘He that knew no sin was made sin for us,’ and in his death assumed for our sakes, thus breaking free from his enemies.” E. F. Scott, *The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon and to the Ephesians* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1942), p. 48.

access to humanity.²⁷ His crucifixion was the stripping²⁸ off (the circumcision) of “the body of his flesh.”²⁹

The fallen human nature cannot be converted, changed or renovated. Hence Paul’s categorical statement, “knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin.” Romans 6:6. It is the carnal mind that is converted by the Spirit of God. “For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace” (Rom. 8:6).

Christians have “the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him?” Paul makes the claim that he and his associates “have the mind of Christ” (1 Cor. 2:16). Paul exhorts the Philippians to demonstrate the attitude of Christ. “Let this mind (φρονεῖτε) be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus” (Phil. 2:5). The mind which they are to have already belongs to Christ,³⁰ and it is his to impart.

Not only are Christians exhorted to “arm” themselves with the “mind” of Christ (1 Peter 4:1), but Paul admonishes them “likewise

²⁷ “All motives and thoughts and desires which belong to the mere earthly existence are included in the flesh. In order to do battle with sin on its own ground Christ assumed a body of flesh; as Paul boldly expresses it in 2 Cor. 5:21, ‘He who knew no sin was made sin for us.’ Thus his physical death on the Cross had a moral value, and was universal in its effect. By the destruction of his own flesh he destroyed the principle of flesh which involves the whole race in sin.” E. F. Scott, *The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon and to the Ephesians* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1942), pp. 27, 28.

²⁸ “Having stripped the principalities and the powers” (World English Bible); “Having stripped the principalities and the authorities” (Young’s Literal Translation).

²⁹ “Jesus put off the fallen flesh of the first Adam, *the armour which he had not proved*, and having done so, he destroyed the destroyer and led the captivity captive. [This appears to be the meaning of that word ἀπεκδυσάμενος in Col. ii. 15. The fallen flesh has been taken possession of by the powers and principalities of evil: it is the armour in which they have made themselves strong; and, therefore, when Jesus overcame them, he put off that flesh, the armour in which they had intrenched themselves.]” Thomas Erskine, *The Brazen Serpent* (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1879), pp. 132, 133.

³⁰ “Our position is that the call is to activate in Philippi the mind which ‘in Christ Jesus’ they necessarily have, but this does not exclude the idea that that ‘mind’ was first of all and preeminently in Christ himself. It was in him before it could be the constitutive principle of the community formed under the lordship of Christ.” Frank Stagg, “The Mind In Christ Jesus Philippians 1:27-2:18,” *Review and Expositor* 77, 3 (Sum 1980), p. 340.

reckon (λογίζεσθε) ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord” (Rom. 6:11). Here sin is considered to be a living force in the life (almost personified), that must be accounted dead. This “deliberate and sober judgment . . . a reasoning,”³¹ is the function of the mind which is divinely imparted to the Christian.

In the survey of fallen human nature the following descriptors emerged as to the common lot of all humanity. Sin is an enslavement. It is prolific. It is an inherited state or nature. It is a demonic rule. It is indwelling. It is a body of sin. It is an old man,—the law of her husband. It is an operational force. It is “the flesh the law of sin.” The nexus of these concepts of sin as a power, reign, and law of sin, indicate that the flesh or body are not to be taken as the literally physiological structure, but rather the “supra-individual”³² power of evil to which humanity is subjected.

Those descriptors which Christ took as to his humanity include: 1) an inherited fallen nature through his mother from Adam; which became, 2) a lair for evil with propensities to sin; and 3) this power to sin within him was such that it could be characterized as; 4) a “body of sin”; or, 5) an “old man”; and, 6) “the flesh the law of sin.”

Christ did not have the pre-fall human nature of Adam. God “made him to be sin” (2 Cor. 5:21). What he did have in common with the pre-fall Adam was his mind.³³ This mind he retained throughout

³¹ C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, Vol. I, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Limited: 1985), p. 315.

³² Florence Morgan Gillman, “Another Look at Romans 8:3: ‘In the Likeness of Sinful Flesh’,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49, 24 (October, 1987), p. 601. Vincent P. Branick, “The Sinful Flesh of the Son of God (Rom 8:3): A Key Image of Pauline Theology,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 47, 2 (April, 1985), p. 257.

³³ “Now as to Christ’s not having ‘like passions’ with us: In the Scriptures all the way through he is like us, and with us according to the flesh. He is the seed of David according to the flesh. He was made in the likeness of sinful flesh. Don’t go too far. He was made in the likeness of sinful flesh; not in the likeness of sinful mind. Do not drag his mind into it. His flesh was our flesh; but the mind was ‘the mind of Christ Jesus.’ Therefore it is written: ‘Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus.’ If he had taken our mind, how, then, could we ever have been exhorted to ‘let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus?’

“Adam had the mind of Jesus Christ in the garden; he had the divine mind,—the divine and the human were united, sinlessly. Satan came in, and offered his inducements through the appetite, through the flesh. Adam and Eve forsook the mind of Jesus Christ, the mind of God, that was in them, and accepted the

all of his life and through the crucifixion without taint or corruption. This he did, not with his own divine power, but by his faith in the Father's power to deliver him from the power of sin, as well as external temptation to sin. Thus, he was fully identified with his constituents as to their fallen human nature.

The nature of his representation was not alone by divine appointment: vicariously bearing sin; but also, actually experiencing the assaults of evil from within; and finally stripping off the body of sin at the crucifixion. In short, Christ was an actual substitute for mankind, with full congruence in their common plight of sin, "yet without sin" (Heb. 4:15).

suggestions and the leadings of this other mind. Thus they were enslaved to that, and so are we all." A. T. Jones, "The Third Angel's Message—No. 17," *The General Conference Bulletin* 1, 13 Extra (February 25, 1895), p. 327.