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Abstract of Thesis.

The view taken in this thesis is that the theme of Romans is basically the relationship of Jew and Gentile in the purpose of God. The letter should be understood as Paul's response to a division in the Christian community at Rome. The Roman Christians did not form a united church of Jews and Gentiles, because the 'Kulturkampf' prevalent in first century Rome, as in many other cities at that time, prevented them from expressing their common faith in a united fellowship.

In the Introduction we note that scholars have generally tended to interpret Romans as a theological treatise and have made little attempt to relate its contents to a specific historical situation. In Chapter I we find that apart from the length of the letter, there is nothing in its format to authorise the interpretation of it in a manner distinct from the other Paulines.

When Romans is viewed as a theological treatise, there is a tendency to regard chs.i-viii as the essence of the letter, and chs.ix-xi as an appendix. But a study of the connections between iii:1-8 and ix:1 ff. shows that Paul has had the themes of chs.ix-xi in mind since the beginning of the letter, and that this is a carefully constructed document. Support for the latter is found in Paul's use of questions and objections at decisive stages in his argument. These are not merely rhetorical or theoretical, but reflect for the most part problems in the Christian community at Rome. Thus chs.vi-vii deal with antinomianism and chs.ix-xi with anti-Judaism. When chs.ix-xi are seen to be addressed to a specific problem at Rome, instead of being considered as an appendix, they emerge as the climax of the letter.

In chs.ix-xi Paul lays the theological foundations on which in chs.
xiv-xv he bases his exhortation to Jewish and Gentile Christians for mutual acceptance. In this section (ix-xi) as in most of the letter the argument is primarily directed against Gentile Christians. These consider themselves as the 'elect' over against the Jews as the 'rejected'. They think of themselves as the 'strong' and despise their fellow Jewish Christians because they are 'weak'. Paul's use of Old Testament quotations in ch.xv:8.ff. clearly implies that the basic cause for the division among the Christians at Rome was, as suggested, the conflict between Jew and Gentile. When we interpret the letter in the light of what we know of the situation that existed at Rome, and of Paul's teaching in chs.ix-xi, we are able to give relevance and coherence to the whole of its contents.

In i:18-ii:29 Paul discusses the theme of Jew and Gentile in such a way as to show that, in the Divine judgement, these distinctions in which men boast are not really significant. Paul deliberately blurs the distinction between Jew and Gentile (cf. ii:28.f.). This suggests that he wishes to counteract the emphasis of those in Rome who stress such distinctions. In iii:21.ff. Paul shows that the revelation of God's righteousness in Christ means that real unity between Jew and Gentile is now possible. By the fact that Christ has fulfilled the Law and that salvation is to be found through faith in Him, He has removed the barrier which the Law created between men.

In ch.iv by means of the Abraham tradition Paul maintains that the Covenant was always intended to include all nations and that therefore all Christians, whether Jews or Gentiles, may truly call Abraham 'father'. The emphasis upon human solidarity in Adam and in Christ in ch.v can be seen as another attempt to minimize distinctions between Jew and Gentile. Although chs.v-viii are not so obviously related to the Jew-Gentile question, the
fact that the Law plays a dominant role in this section means that they are closely related to the suggested theme. The way in which Paul upholds the goodness of the Law in ch.vii, relates the Law and the Spirit in ch.viii and interprets it Christologically in ch.x:4.f. suggests that his purpose is to demonstrate the continuity in the Divine purpose both in the history of Israel and in the Christ event.

Although the theme of Jew and Gentile in the purpose of God was a vital issue at Jerusalem, Romans is best understood as directed to a specific situation at Rome. The presentation of the argument in which Paul at various points actually warns against antinomianism etc., means that it is most unlikely that it was directed to Jewish Christians in Jerusalem. Nor is this a circular letter intended for all the Gentile churches; the omission of the name Rome in some manuscripts is no proof that Paul intended to write a general circular letter. It is also incorrect to describe Romans as an assertion of Paul's apostolic authority. This view is not in accord with Paul's understanding of his apostleship, and the deficiency of the Roman Christians was not that they lacked apostolic foundation. Despite the fact that Paul mentions his future visit to Rome en route for Spain, this is also not a sufficient reason to account for the writing of the letter.

From a survey of the various interpretations it is apparent that it is desirable to establish an equivalence between the purpose of the letter, Paul's visit to Jerusalem and his future visit to Rome. It is also necessary to posit a problem of sufficient magnitude to account for the composition of a letter of such theological profundity. Because the division between Jew and Gentile was not simply a local issue but one affecting the whole church and because the weaknesses of the Gentile Christians at Rome were symptomatic of
Gentile Christianity in general, Paul felt obliged to undertake a discussion of the purpose of God for both Jew and Gentile in the old and new aeon. This explains the frequent use of the Old Testament and the almost continuous discussion of the Law throughout the letter. Faced with Gentile Christians who regarded the Jews as rejected and who were lacking in an appreciation of the purpose of God, Paul was forced to undertake an exposition of the Christ event that gave positive meaning to the election of Israel; this he did by interpreting the Christ event as the annulling fulfilment of the Old Covenant.
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The Approach to the Thesis.

The aim of this thesis is to show that Romans is a real letter and that it should be interpreted in the same way as the other Paulines. Because the information in the letter concerning the actual historical situation addressed is less precise than in others such as I Corinthians, it is imperative to use all available methods of investigation of the text in order to discover the purpose of the letter. For this reason we have undertaken what we have termed a 'survey' of chs.i-xi. This approach has been chosen because it offers more freedom than a straight-forward exegesis of the text.

In this survey we seek to discover by means of a study of the structure, style and thematic connections of the letter, all possible information concerning the situation to which it is addressed, and hence also Paul's purpose in writing. Because of our emphasis on the literary form of the letter it has been felt advisable to commence the study with a preliminary investigation of the letter form. Chs.vi-vii are investigated early in the thesis because they offer a good example of the question/objection style which we believe is of fundamental importance for the understanding of the structure and thought of the letter.

We have also felt it necessary to include some references to the general historical situation in Rome as we know it from the remainder of the New Testament and also from other literature. Since, however, Paul's letter remains the primary source for our information concerning the Christian community at Rome at this period, we have included the study of the general historical situation only after the investigation of the letter itself. This does not imply, however, that exegesis can take place without relation to what is known of the 'Sitz im Leben' of the text. It is our contention
that exegesis is only valid if undertaken in the light of the relevant information which is normally included under the general heading of 'Introduction to the Text'.

One other factor has also played a decisive part in the execution of this study. It has been recognised that since we are dealing here with a New Testament book on which many eminent scholars have written commentaries or articles, the scope for original research is therefore necessarily limited. But since there is so little general agreement as to the occasion and purpose of the letter, research is obviously still necessary in order to make further progress towards a better understanding. By virtue of the fact that the modern literature both in commentaries and periodical articles is so extensive, the co-ordination and evaluation of this literature is a necessary and instructive task.

For this reason we will endeavour in our exegesis, whatever our own interpretation of the text, to take into account the views of other scholars on the same subject. This has the disadvantage that a huge quantity of literature has at times to be listed and discussed. But the merit of the approach is that it sets our exegesis in the light of contemporary understanding of the subject. This gives us at the same time an insight into the direction in which modern scholarship is heading, and prevents us, we hope, from repeating errors of interpretation already discredited by other scholars. It is also essential where a new interpretation is being attempted, to indicate at all points its connection with other views which differ from it to a greater or lesser extent. Thus in our final chapter on "The Purpose of Paul in the Letter to the Romans", we precede our conclusion with a discussion of the more significant contemporary understandings of the occasion and purpose of the letter.
Introduction.

The decisive interpretations of the letter to the Romans in the history of the church make it difficult for exegetes to interpret its content objectively. Historically Romans has always tended to be a popular area for systematic theologians and this makes it very hard for New Testament exegetes to see the letter by itself apart from the varied emphases of many great theologians. Thus we could easily allow ourselves to build uncritically upon the interpretations deriving from Luther or Calvin in the same way as they in their day were dependent upon Augustine. Such procedure needs, we submit, to be called in question.

Karl Barth, whose own commentary on Romans brought about such a reversal in the trend of scholarship provides us with a good illustration here. Emphasizing the need for a fresh approach to the study of the doctrine of election, Barth argues that we ought not to commence the study of the subject from where Calvin left off; for if we accept Calvin's presuppositions, we must inevitably arrive at the same conclusions as he did. The letter to the Romans, no less than the doctrine of election, requires a fresh approach.

Our concern in this study is to try to look at Romans as a real letter and to allow its content to speak for itself, thus freeing our minds from those preconceptions concerning its content which derive more from those who have studied the letter than from the text itself. Too often the text has been approached as if it contained timeless theological truth or answers to

abstract questions concerning theodicy etc.\(^1\) This tendency can only be
counteracted by seeking to understand the letter first of all historically
and only then theologically.

Recently H.J. Schoeps, writing from the standpoint of Jewish faith,
has called for a 'de-Lutheranization' of Paul, in order to rediscover the
real historical person and his opinions.\(^2\) The presuppositions with which
we normally approach Pauline studies have also been strongly criticized by
K. Stendahl in his article "Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the
West".\(^3\) Stendahl's contention is that the Western world since Augustine
has tended to look to Paul for answers to questions reflecting their own
cultural milieu rather than Paul's. We too readily make Paul 'one of us'
and expect to find in his writing answers to questions Paul never asked.\(^4\)

By generalizing and changing the frame of reference to Paul's statements
we may even arrive at the opposite interpretation of Paul's words from
that which he originally intended. Stendahl gives as an example Luther's
understanding of the "Second Use of the Law".\(^5\) The Law is here no longer
regarded as a "Tutor until Christ" but as a "Tutor unto Christ", and the
original argument of Paul that the Gentiles must not come to Christ via
the Law has been turned into a statement that all men must come to Christ
with consciences convicted by the Law. Even the Law itself has been re-
interpreted to mean the general moral imperative in the form of the will

---

1. Cf. the general introduction to chs.ix-xi, (Thesis pp.304.f.).
   New College Bulletin IV (2), 1968. Cf. also Munck's contention that to
   secularize Paul is in fact to dehistoricize him, (PSM p.52 n.2).
of God rather than "the Law" to which Paul originally referred.

Probably no other part of the Pauline epistles has suffered so much from previous theological misrepresentations of its content as Rom. ix-xi. The merit of Barth's approach to election as 'election in Christ' is that it has shown scholars the possibility of taking a new approach to these chapters, so often surrounded by great controversy and much misunderstanding. Despite this advantage, Barth's interpretation of these chapters is still too 'theological' to satisfy the requirements of many New Testament exegetes.

In order to give an adequate interpretation of Paul's 'Romans', we need to 'get behind' the systematic theologians and their pre-suppositions and attempt to understand the letter in its original setting, intention and purpose. This requires a reconsideration of its origin, unity, aim and destination. It means following out the historical-contextual understanding of Romans advocated by F.C. Baur in 1834 and continued by W. Lügert in 1913.

Although Baur and Lügert both stressed the need to interpret Romans historically, for various reasons this task has never been satisfactorily carried through. The tragedy of Baur's work is that his great exegetical insights were marred by his adoption of Hegelian philosophy in which he believed he had found a key to the understanding of the history and development of the early church. Lügert's emphasis also did not meet with the acclaim which it might have had and which we believe it ought to have had. This is partly due to the fact that he did not write a complete commentary.

2. Der Römerbrief als historisches Problem. BFChTh, 17, (2), Gütersloh, 1913.
on the letter to the Romans, and also because of the arrival on the scene of Barth's epoch-making commentary which brought a completely different perspective to bear on the exegetical approach to the New Testament.

In reaction against the analytical historicism of the previous generation, Barth sought to re-discover the theological understanding of the Word of God by moving theology away from absorption in the subsidiary disciplines of archaeology, philology or textual criticism which in his view should serve only as a preamble to the true interpretation of the Word.¹ The interpreter's real task is to expose 'the Word in the words', to describe and define the 'religious content' of the Bible documents. The logical outcome of this emphasis was the replacement of 'historical exegesis' by 'theological exegesis'.² We must hasten to add, however, that Barth himself was not opposed to historical study, textual criticism etc., but was concerned to show that historical science and all other human categories are unable to grasp the reality of Jesus Christ. Barth's attitude can be summarized in the words of R. Kroner "Analytical historicism kills the soul and retains the corpse."³

From another perspective than Barth and some years later, C.H. Dodd in his Cambridge inaugural lecture deplored the barrenness of much analytical New Testament scholarship.⁴ Dodd called for a study of the process which created the parts in order to discover an inner unity in the deeper meaning of the separate parts. The distress felt by scholars like Dodd was very similar to that which William Wordsworth had felt earlier about

---

the application of scientific principles to the world of nature - "We murder to dissect".

This reaction against the 'piecemeal treatment'\(^1\) of the New Testament was no doubt a timely and necessary protest. Nevertheless so far as the subject of our study in Romans is concerned it has had its drawbacks. Whatever Barth may have intended and however significant was the change that his 'Romans' effected, Rigaux's summary still contains a great deal of truth - "Pour le théologien suisse, la critique littéraire et historique n'est qu'un premier pas, vite oublié."\(^2\)

Although Barth's was a useful and necessary reaction in the early part of this century we believe that we can retain his emphasis on the theological content of the New Testament without neglecting or minimizing those very necessary disciplines which go to make exegesis possible. Properly understood there should be no real contradiction between historical exegesis and theological exegesis; the one is as necessary as the other.

The drive for a unifying synthesis of the hitherto dissected themes of the New Testament was met in a way which Barth did not relish. Rudolf Bultmann was originally sympathetic to the Barthian emphasis. He himself was indifferent to historical events in their pastness and sought to bridge the gap between the first century and our own and to provide a unified understanding of the New Testament and of life in an 'existentialist' understanding of both. Holding that the human self-consciousness is the same across the centuries, Bultmann saw this as the common denominator between our era and apostolic times. The purpose of exegesis is, in Bultmann's

---

understanding, to lead one to a new 'Selbstverständnis'. The words lead to a reality beyond themselves. This new 'Selbstverständnis' which for Bultmann is the Pauline gospel's essential content, emphasizes the present being and existence of man.

But Paul's letter to the Romans deals with much more than the present being and existence of man as an individual. It has a great deal to say about past history, particularly God's dealing with the Jewish nation as outlined in chs.ix-xi. The existentialist view of man as an isolated individual, of authentic human existence as composed of broken and unrelated moments of encounter and decision - thereby denying to it any temporal continuity - takes no account of the fact that every man's present is always compounded with his past and grows out of it. It fails to see existence as a continual movement from one web of human relation to another, and that man is, in fact, related to his world, his nation, his race, his religion and his family. To see man only as an individual and to consider his justification only in an individualistic sense, is to yield to a limited and partial understanding of human existence.

Thielicke is correct in his complaint that the existentialist interpretation of the New Testament denudes it of one essential aspect, i.e. the 'extra nos'. Although this aspect of salvation is not emphasized to a great extent in Rom.i-viii, it is particularly to the fore in chs.ix-xi.

Rom. ix-xi is significant because in this section Paul discusses not just individual Christians and their personal faith. His interest centres on 'the people of God'. This theme includes both the new community of faith, composed of Jews and Gentiles, and also unbelieving Israel. Paul speaks here of the salvation of 'all Israel' and the salvation of the 'full number' of the Gentiles. His interest embraces not just the present reality of salvation in the new aeon but also the antecedents of the church, the 'root' and 'trunk' on which the 'branches' grow or into which they have been grafted. Because of their concern with the 'Heilsgeschichte' of Israel, with God's purpose in the past as well as in the present, chapters ix-xi of Romans are particularly unsuitable for existentialist interpretation. The limitations of this type of interpretation become particularly noticeable at this point.

Recently in reaction to existentialist theology and what are considered to be its limitations, a new climate of opinion has developed. One of the main exponents of this post-Bultmannian view is Ernst Käsemann of Tübingen. In a series of articles from 1954 onwards, he has pointed out the weakness of Bultmann's understanding of Pauline theology. Käsemann complains that Bultmann has reduced Paul's theology exclusively to an anthropology, whereas anthropology is only part of it. For Käsemann anthropology has a definite and significant function in Pauline theology, but he refuses to regard it either as the sum total or as the focal point. It is subservient

---

to Paul's doctrine of God and also to his Christology. For Paul human existence is defined in terms of whatever controls it, of whatever 'lord' we serve. In his view man cannot be a free autonomous agent, he must be someone's slave - he can only choose between the 'regnum Christi' and the 'regnum Satanae'. Baptism witnesses to a 'Herrschaftswechsel' - a change of lord.\(^1\) Existence for Paul is primarily \textit{theologically} orientated; the sense of the parenetic imperative "as the logical implication and verification of the indicative is much better described in terms of the formula 'Abide by the Lord who has been given to you and by his lordship!'......"\(^2\)

Käsemann also finds Bultmann's understanding of human existence inadequate; the Pauline conception of the body means much more than simply the personality of man - it indicates his capacity for communication and his corporeality within a world which limits him.\(^3\) The lordship of Christ means in practice the rule of Christ over the human body: Christian obedience "expresses the fact that, in us and with us, God has recalled to his service the world of which we are a part."\(^4\)

Anthropology here performs its proper function when it is seen not as the dominant theme,\(^5\) but as witnessing to the coming to power of Christ as 'Kosmokrator', God at work in this world as the God of resurrection and the new creation. Anthropology is also subordinate to cosmology. The whole

\begin{itemize}
\item 3. "Worship and Everyday Life", \textit{NTQT}, pp.188-95(191).
\item 4. Ibid.
\item 5. Käsemann probably has in mind here Bultmann's claim that even in his understanding of history Paul is determined by anthropology. According to Bultmann, Paul "interpreted the apocalyptic view of history on the basis of his anthropology" - so for Paul history is interpreted anthropologically. \textit{History and Eschatology}, The Gifford Lectures 1955, Edinburgh 1957, (p.41).
\end{itemize}
world is related to God's redemptive purpose which involves not merely a new 'Selbstverständnis' for the individual but the beginning here and now of that new creation one day to be consummated in the resurrection of the dead and the renewal of all things, (I Cor.xv). The same Paul who wrote about the justification of the individual in Romans i-viii could also write about the righteousness of God in the fulfilment of His promises to Israel in Romans ix-xi.1

Similar criticisms of Bultmann's understanding of Pauline theology have been voiced by N.A. Dahl.2 He agrees that the general outline of Bultmann's exposition, 'Man prior to Faith' and 'Man under Faith', is in keeping with the structure of Romans which we might divide into the two corresponding parts, chapters i-iii and iv-xi. Dahl notes that Bultmann neglects chapters ix-xi in which the Pauline doctrine of justification, already expounded in the earlier chapters, is now set in the wider context and framework of redemptive history.3 Dahl criticizes Bultmann for locating the redemptive work of God exclusively in the individual and not referring to the people of God as a continuing historical reality. By this neglect of chapters ix-xi which are really the basis and key to a proper understanding of Pauline theology, Bultmann has 'dehistoricized' Paul.4 R.H. Fuller asks whether in fact this 'dehistoricizing' of the New Testament is not more characteristic of Bultmann's theology than his demythologizing.5 A New Testament divorced from the cultural, social and economic background out of which it emerged cannot

4. Ibid. On this see Thesis pp.311-12.
reveal to us the Lord God of Israel, bound in a covenant with a particular people in a purpose worked out in the history of mankind. For it is not any God or an unknown God who addresses man in the kerygma, but it is the God who was already known in the Old Testament, and who exists in and for Himself, prior to His calling and justification of the ungodly. He is the God of creation who directs history and who is the goal of history.

What is most significant is that the very weakness of Bultmann's understanding which has been noted by Dahl and others, has shown the need to study afresh the relationship of chs.ix-xi to the remainder of the letter, and the message of the whole in relation to its historical context. The rather one-sided emphasis of Bultmann has in a negative way resulted in a fresh appreciation of chs.ix-xi for their distinctive and significant contribution to Pauline theology. This is particularly evident in connection with Bultmann's opposition to the influence of apocalypticism in Pauline theology.

In Rom.ix-xi Paul is thinking of his forthcoming visit to Jerusalem with the collection and, however we consider the significance of his actions, it appears that an apocalyptic element is very much part of Paul's missionary activity. In an extended debate with Bultmann, Käsemann has maintained that Paul was, and remained, an apocalyptist even as Jesus Himself.

---

3. Cf. "'The Righteousness of God' in Paul", NTQT, p.181. The essay listed on the previous page and those in the next two notes also relate to this debate with Bultmann.
was a second John the Baptist, the forerunner of the end of the world. In
Küsemann's opinion, there is no conflict in Paul between "präsen
tentische Eschatologie" and apocalyptic - only in Bultmann does this occur.\(^1\)

This emphasis upon the apocalyptic views of Paul is a strong correct-
ive to the acosmic outlook of existentialist theology. It prevents the
gospel from being reduced to a mere 'Innerlichkeit'\(^2\) and invites us to focus
more on the crucial significance of Romans ix-xi. Because of his neglect of
these chapters Bultmann has been unable to interpret Romans in its whole-
ness. This weakness is evident when we note how much stress he lays on chs.
i-viii, and how little constructive comment he has to make on chs.ix-xi,\(^3\)
which should perhaps be regarded as the climax of the argument (especially
when interpreted historically).\(^4\) Again the denigration of history could
also have been avoided by the realization that chs.i-viii express not merely
abstract theological truth about man's existence, but are to be understood
in relation to the concrete history of Israel noted in chs.ix-xi.

This point has been fully appreciated in the work of Johannes Munck
who places great emphasis on the actual 'historical Paul' whom he believes
to have been very much an apocalyptically orientated missionary. Munck
follows Manson's view that Romans is an encyclical letter\(^5\) - a sort of balance
sheet drawn up at the end of the third missionary journey. It can no longer

---

2. "Gottesdienst im Alltag der Welt (zu Röm.xii)", *Judentum-Urchristentum
   (p.191).
3. This is clearly demonstrated by the large number of scriptural references
   listed for Rom.i-viii, and the comparatively few for ix-xi, cf. *Theology
   I*, (pp.363-5).
5. On this see Appendix I (on ch.xvi), Thesis pp.515.ff. also pp.456.f.
be regarded as a "theological presentation unaffected by time and history", but it is to be seen instead as "a missionary's contribution to a discussion" concerning the successes and failures of the Gentile and Jewish missions in Paul's own day. Munck's contribution to the study of Paul and to our understanding of Rom.ix-xi has been most significant. He has successfully freed these chapters from the traditional emphases of dogmatic theology and has concretely related them to the historical development of the early church. He has, however, shifted the historical reference from Rome to Paul's own situation and plans. Although Munck does see in Romans a quite definite historical situation, this has to do with Paul's work as a missionary to the Gentiles and his forthcoming visit to Jerusalem rather than the situation in any one congregation. It is clear that a knowledge of the situation of Paul at the time of writing is necessary for the understanding of his letter to Rome, but this is only one side of the total 'Sitz im Leben', and we must also investigate the situation that exists in the church at Rome in order to give a truly historical exegesis of the letter.

What is involved in this kind of exegesis has become more apparent to scholars in recent times. It is now becoming evident that even when we fully investigate the background of a document, including the situation of the author and the recipients, the cultural milieu etc., we still have not done all that is necessary for a proper exegesis of the text. This is because it has become increasingly clear that in Paul's letters we have only one side of a debate, the other side of which is known to us usually only through the brief and uncomplimentary references of the one who wishes

2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., pp.196-200.
In order to take into account both sides of the argument the procedure we should adopt is as follows. Starting from Paul’s statements in the text before us, we must try to reconstruct the argument of Paul’s opponents from what Paul says. This reconstructed argument will in turn throw more light on the significance of what Paul is saying. The problems inherent in this method are obvious. Since we know only Paul’s side of the dialogue, the reconstruction is necessarily rather speculative and in danger of being circular. It is imperative, however, to take into account Paul’s "conversation partners" and their opinions as well as his. The difficulty of this task may well be illustrated by Schweizer’s claim that Paul was mistaken in attributing to the Corinthian Christians the view that they denied a future life; what the Corinthians did in fact hold was that the resurrection was past already since the new age had dawned with Christ’s resurrection. The problem of this kind of claim is that it is equally possible that Paul was not mistaken but Schweizer is. The essence of the problem is our lack of precise information either way. This difficulty, however, is not peculiar to the kind of exegesis we have in mind here since the dangers of speculation and circular argument are common to all exegesis to a greater or lesser extent. But here, as indeed in all kinds of exegesis, strict discipline is required in allowing the text to speak for itself and in not forcing it into the mould which we would prefer.

A good example of the latter tendency is given by R.H. Fuller. In a recent review Fuller notes that in discussing the relation of Paul to the Gnostics, Schmithals has fallen into the error of the circular argument and made Paul himself too much of a Gnostic, thus obliterating the distinctive 'theologia crucis' typical of Paul. Another problem of this exegesis is that where several factions or groups are involved, it is almost impossible to distinguish the different groups and their viewpoints from each other. This seems to be one of the weaknesses in Minear's understanding of the views of the five factions which he believes he can identify in the Roman Christian community.  

Despite its difficulties this historical-contextual exegesis is absolutely necessary for the clarification of the particular content and contribution of the individual Pauline letters. It could prove to be especially useful in connection with Romans where so little explicit information is given as to the actual situation Paul addresses at Rome. Its significance may be even greater if H. Köster is correct in his assertion that "Paul's theological vocabulary is not that of his own theology but is intimately related to the controversies with his opponents."  

This new approach has been most clearly explained and illustrated in


2. Minear identifies five factions or differing theological positions and three main groups of Christians in Rome. Cf. op.cit., pp.8-15 and p.45 n.8).  

the recent study by R. Jewett. In his approach to the study of Paul's anthropological terms Jewett acknowledges the need for a comprehensive examination of the anthropological terms in relation to the concrete historical situation in which they are used. Jewett hopes to achieve a fully contextual analysis of Paul's anthropological terms. In order to attain this he undertakes three specific tasks:

(a) to take account of the literary context of the sentence, the paragraph and the letter as a whole;
(b) the terms are to be analysed in relation to the historical situation which is being addressed; this means also taking into account the chronological framework of Paul's life etc.;
(c) to relate the term to the linguistic horizon of the First Century.

Although this study is very different from that of Jewett, the outline sketch of his proposed method by which he hopes to attain "truly historical exegesis" is very similar to that which we propose in this thesis. In particular we note Jewett's emphasis upon the relevance of the linguistic, literary and historical contexts. We agree with Jewett that it is necessary to see each verse in the context of the section or chapter in which it stands and each chapter in relation to the entire letter. It is also clear that the letter itself ought to be viewed in the light of the full context of the historical situation from which it emerges and to which it is addressed. Even more significant is Jewett's approach to the study

3. Cf. Ibid., pp.7-8.
4. Ibid., p.7.
of the various anthropological terms in the Pauline letters. He studies each term separately in the particular context of each letter in which it occurs. In order to clarify his presuppositions about chronology, content etc., he provides a brief introduction to each of the Pauline letters under discussion. By this means he attempts to discover what is specific in the use of the anthropological terms in each letter and eventually, after having studied these separately in particular contexts, he is able to go on to draw conclusions as to the meaning and development of the terms in Pauline theology.

It may readily be acknowledged that the attempt by Jewett to study the terms in the particular context of the letter in which they occur is, by itself, no radical departure from the normal procedure of studying the various occurrences of a term in the immediate context in which they stand. This has been a generally accepted procedure of lexicography, and, provided the inherent dangers of the (latter) method are avoided, it remains, as D. Hill has demonstrated, still a valid approach to Biblical Studies. ¹

What is distinctive in Jewett's case, however, is that he doesn't approach the study with the assumption that there is a standard 'Pauline' meaning for a specific term throughout all of Paul's letters. For this reason Jewett's approach is especially relevant to the study of Romans. Too often scholars have regarded this letter as simply a later and larger edition of Galatians; they have tended to emphasize the similarities at the

¹. Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies on the Semantics of Soteriological Terms. SNTSMS, 5, Cambridge 1967. In his discussion of the views of J. Barr in The Semantics of Biblical Language, Hill accepts some of Barr's criticisms of Kittel's Wörterbuch but rejects the view that the principles underlying the entire project are in error. Cf. pp.5 f. and 294 f.
expense of the differences. We believe that the precise significance of each letter is best understood when its own distinctive contribution is emphasized. As J.C. Hurd has stated "Just as the 'harmonizing' of the letters with Acts is illegitimate, so too is the harmonizing of the letters with one another. Both types of harmonization are the result of a faulty historical method."

A similar view has been expressed by Munck in his outline of the principles underlying his research on Paul.2 Paul's letters are to be interpreted as such; statements from other sources, especially Acts and the post-Pauline letters may be used only if they agree with or are not in contradiction to the content of the letters. But these statements must not determine the exposition of the letters. Paul's individual letters, and the situation that forms the background of each letter must be viewed on their own merits in each case. Munck stresses that the material in the letters and behind the supposed situations may be unified only if such a procedure does not violate the individual nature of the particular letter and of the situation that lies behind it.3

When Romans is read as a genuine letter addressed to a certain situation which existed in Rome about 57 A.D., there is no reason to assume that Paul's statements in the letter should harmonize with those which he has already made elsewhere. The presupposition which underlies the view that the statements made in individual Pauline letters ought to harmonize with each other, is that Paul's letters set forth his theology. This view ought, we submit, to be called in question.

2. Cf. PSM, p.85.
3. Ibid.
In opposing this view we do not align ourselves with the opinion expressed by Munck and Minear, that Paul was no theologian. This opinion is entirely without foundation. It is probable that what Munck meant to stress by this statement about Paul, is similar to what we have just stated, i.e. that Paul did not consciously set out to express his 'theology' in his letters to the churches.

The basis for the position adopted in this study is that for Paul the ethical principle begets the theological and not the reverse. Paul makes theological statements not because he is concerned to promote an understanding of 'theology' amongst his congregations but because he wishes to influence the life and behaviour of the Christian community. "His theology arises from his work as apostle and directly serves that work." The fact that Paul put his theological statements in letter form is additional proof of his parenetic intention.

Support for this view is also found in the fact now widely recognised that no one Pauline letter contains a full account of all the cardinal tenets of Christian doctrine. Even Romans is lacking in several important emphases. What requires to be stressed, however, is that even if Romans did actually cover the full spectrum of Christian doctrine, this would still not entitle us to regard the letter as a presentation of Pauline theology. That the contents of the letters do not supply the raw material for a theology of Paul need not be disputed. The point is that the permanent 'theological content' of the particular statements can only be discovered by the

application of the proper hermeneutical principles after a full exegesis of the text has been undertaken.¹ Beginning with the particular (and differing) theological statements originating in response to various situations and circumstances, we can go on to formulate Paul's theology on the basis of which these particular statements were expressed.

Paul formulated his theological statements, we believe, by considering contemporary events in the light of the Cross of Christ (as the climax and consummation of the Christ event). It was God's grace revealed through this event that gave Paul understanding of the divine will in all the other lesser events of life. Käsemann holds that although Paul had no fixed exegetical method and developed no dogmatic system of theology, one particular theme dominated his entire theology i.e. "die Rechtfertigungslehre".²

We are not concerned here with the question as to whether the doctrine of justification can be rightly described as Paul's hermeneutical principle. What we wish to stress is that even if this view is correct (as is possibly the case), and even though the clearest exposition of the doctrine is found in Romans, this fact still gives us no adequate basis for regarding the letter as in essence distinct from the other Paulines. It still remains as one letter among others of a similar kind, and it ought therefore not to be used as a measuring line or norm by which to test or evaluate the contents of the other Pauline letters.

To treat the letter to the Romans in this way is, we suggest, to do less than justice to the significance of its contents. It is our contention that it is only when Romans is understood as a particular document

¹ Cf. Hill, op.cit., p.300.
addressed to a specific set of circumstances that its real content can be fully appreciated. Only thus can its distinctive contribution be adequately assessed.

One other factor requires mention at this stage. If we are correct in emphasizing those features of a letter that are peculiar to it, then the fact that chs. ix-xi represent a unique contribution within the Pauline literature immediately suggests that these chapters are of central importance in the interpretation of the letter.

1. Cf. G. Bornkamm, Paulus, UB, Kohlhammer 1969, p.109. Bornkamm does not consider that the uniqueness of these chapters is a pointer to the situation in the church at Rome, but relates them instead to Paul's forthcoming visit to Jerusalem.
The Letter Form in Paul.

There has been a strong tendency among scholars to regard Paul's letter to the Romans more as a theological treatise than as a real letter. In view of this, we propose first of all to look at the Pauline letters as literature in order to discover to which literary 'Gattung' they belong. It is then proposed to pay particular attention to the letter to the Romans in order to ascertain whether there are any literary factors which justify the interpretation of this letter in a manner different from that applicable to the other Pauline letters.¹

It was Adolf Deissmann who first made a definite distinction between non-literary letters and literary epistles.² Deissmann confesses that he himself did not appreciate the main lines of the literary development of Christianity until he took up the study of the papyri. "Then it was that the great difference between literary and non-literary writing impressed itself on me, and I learnt to appreciate the characteristics of the non-literary letter."³ A comparison of the formulae of Paul's letters with those of the papyri led Deissmann to the conclusion that Paul's letters are non-literary, private, and addressed to specific, unrepeateable circumstances - as confidential and personal as a conversation by telephone.⁴ The epistle however is completely different from the letter. According to Deissmann,

1. This approach is similar to that proposed by T.Y. Mullins in a comment on the interpretation of Romans "... something in our interpretation of Romans is wrong; and the way to straighten it out is to establish as much objective data as possible before using the evidence supplied by the contents of the letter." "Greetings as a New Testament Form." JBL, LXXXVII (1968), pp.418-26(426).
the epistle is "an artistic literary form, a species of literature just like the dialogue, the oration or the drama. It has nothing in common with the letter except its form; apart from that one might venture the paradox that the epistle is the opposite of a real letter .... The main feature of the letter, viz. the address and the detail peculiar to the letter, becomes in the epistle mere external ornament, intended to keep up the illusion of epistolary form."¹

Although he does not preclude the possibility that Paul may have written epistles, Deissmann passionately disclaims that he did in fact do so. It is plain that in his sharply defined distinction between the spontaneous and unartificial nature of Paul's letters and the self-conscious productions of the epistolographer, Deissmann overstates his case.² Nevertheless we must not overlook the strong evidence which he has produced in favour of his thesis that Paul's letters are non-literary and that they are representative of the normal occasional correspondence of every-day life in the ancient world.

The close similarity between the papyri and the letters of Paul is obvious to those who compare them. Jack Finnegan describes the longer papyrus letters as comprising "an opening address or greeting, a thanksgiving and prayer, special contents and closing salutations and valediction."³ He could have given an identical description of the letters of Paul. The fact that the body of the Pauline letters is generally longer than those of the papyri, coupled with the less stereotyped pattern of the body in both types of letters

has meant that scholars seeking to make comparisons have tended to concentrate their attention on the opening and closing formulae of the letters.¹

The most thorough investigation of formulae common to Paul's letters and the papyri is Paul Schubert's study of the Pauline thanksgiving.² Despite the prolific discussion aroused by Deissmann's radical thesis concerning the nature of the Pauline letters, Schubert considered that prior to his research there existed no comprehensive study which either proved or disproved Deissmann's unequivocal judgement. As a result of a detailed comparative analysis of the form and function of the thanksgiving formulae in Paul with those of the non-Christian Hellenistic writers, the non-Pauline Christian literature, the Septuagint, the inscriptions and the papyri, Schubert concluded that the thanksgivings of the papyrus letters exhibit basically "the same essential, structural characteristics as do the Pauline thanksgivings."³ Direct exegesis of the Pauline thanksgivings with reference to their respective

---


2. Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings. BZNW, 20, 1939.

letters convinced Schubert of their "strictly epistolary form and function."^1 This fact was further confirmed by reference to the extra-Pauline Hellenistic thanksgiving.

From this it is evident that the thanksgivings of Paul's letters conform to certain conventional patterns of fixed syntactical construction which were current in the first century.2 Although Schubert found general confirmation of the genuine epistolary form of Paul's letters, his researches led him to regard them as something more than merely private, personal correspondence. Schubert found that in addition to the parallel with the non-literary papyri a number of inscriptive documents, both political and religious, exhibit very close functional and structural resemblances to the Pauline thanksgivings.4 On the basis of this similarity he places Paul's letters in a position somewhere between these humble, though formal and intimate, private letters and the epigraphical documents which were specifically intended for general publication.5 The fact that Paul's letters were preserved and finally published gives added support to this designation of them.

From this it would appear that although Paul's letters are real letters in their format and function, they are also something more than merely occasional documents of a purely transitory nature. C.F. Evans takes up Deissmann's neat comment that Paul's letters differ from the homely papyrus

---

2. Op.cit., p.161. This conformity does not exclude but occurs in conjunction with intimacy and personal rapport between sender and recipient - as Schubert says "the writings of the epistolary thanksgivings is with Paul a matter of firm and meaningful habit." (p.183).
3. Schubert does not use the same terminology as Deissmann with regard to the clear-cut distinction between epistle and letter. Since these terms are not normally distinguished in current New Testament scholarship, there will be no attempt at systematic usage.
5. Ibid. See especially n.2 on this page.
leaves of Egypt not as letters but only as letters of Paul. He agrees with this but adds that a great deal is involved in the qualification 'only as letters of Paul'.¹ Evans draws attention to the uniqueness of Paul's letters and quotes in support the words of the classical scholar Wilamowitz, who said of them "The style of the letters is Paul, no one but Paul. They are not private letters, nor are they literature, but something inimitable, even though they were again and again imitated."²

The distinctively Pauline aspect of these letters is the tremendous authority with which he teaches, commands, exhorts or reprimands his congregations.³ Paul writes not simply as a private person to private individuals. He writes with all the authority of his apostolic office to those who as members of Christ are no longer independent, private individuals but who, as a congregation of believing people, are committed to all the obligations involved in the gospel of Christ. This mutual obligation of Paul and the congregation is probably one of the basic reasons for the inclusion of much that does not at first glance appear to be normal 'letter' material.⁴ Because of the manifest variety of material in Paul's letters, M. Dibelius appealed for a fuller application of the form critical method to the Pauline literature as well as the gospels.⁵ He believed that this would enable us to understand

---

2. Ibid.
4. This has been an increasing recognition of the great variety of materials which comprise the letters of Paul - credal confessions, hymns, Old Testament quotations and their exegesis, catechetical material, benedictions, doxologies, salutations, etc. Attention has also been directed to the structure and style of the Pauline letters especially the varied literary devices which he frequently uses. See the excellent survey of the relevant literature by B. Rigaux in St. Paul et ses Lettres. Studia Neotestamentica II, Ch.vi, (Les Lettres Devant La Formgeschichte), pp.163-99.
and interpret the message of the letters much better than we are able to do at present.

Dibelius also had something to say about another important section of the Pauline letter - the parenetic section. He considered that this is one of the less typically epistolary parts of the letters. But the recent study of C.J. Bjerkelund does not support Dibelius' viewpoint.¹ This author holds that the παρακαλη clauses which often introduce the parenetic sections at the end of the letter are characteristically epistolary and that many parallels can be found in the papyri. He also maintains that the authoritative exhortations of Paul are very similar in type to the official communications between Hellenistic kings and the free cities as demonstrated by the various inscriptions.

From this survey we may conclude that Paul's letters are generally typical of the common letters of the non-literary papyri. They differ from these only on account of the apostolic authority and divine commission by which Paul demands obedience from the congregation addressed. But although they contain much that is not normal for the simple letter type, Paul's letters are not for this reason to be regarded as theological treatises. As Professor Evans states, "in the case of Paul's epistles, we have something of a new creation; that is, letters which, without ever ceasing to be letters, become something more, and yet in becoming something more never become epistles."² In the light of this conclusion we now turn our attention to Paul's letter to the Romans and seek to discover in it the marks of a genuine letter of Paul.

The Letter Form in Romans:

With Reference to Rom.i:1-17 and Rom.xv:14-33.

As we have already noted, there is a strong body of opinion which holds that Romans is more like a treatise or literary epistle than the other letters of Paul. This is due to several factors chief of which we may list as follows -

(a) the content of the letter which is generally acknowledged as being predominantly doctrinal;
(b) the length of the letter;
(c) the systematic method of presentation of the argument;
(d) the fact that Paul has not previously visited Rome and therefore cannot write such an intimate letter as he would normally write to churches which he himself has founded;
(e) the accumulative evidence resulting from the omission of the name Rome in i:7,15 and the varying endings of the epistle, suggesting that this was probably a circular letter.

It is proposed that these arguments should be borne in mind as we consider the opening and closing chapters of the letter with particular reference to what we have already discovered of the normal letter pattern. The purpose of the study will be to show that Romans conforms to this pattern, and that none of these arguments which we have noted necessarily implies that Romans is a theological treatise which should therefore be interpreted differently from the other letters of Paul.1 We also hope that as a result

1. J. Munck notes that because of the older view that "Paulinism" originated independently from the rest of the New Testament world, Romans, as the essential presentation of Paul's gospel, has not been related by commentators to the remainder of the New Testament. (FSM, p.196).
of our survey of the introduction to the Roman letter, it may be possible for us to establish at which point the transition from the introductory thanksgiving to the body of the letter actually takes place. This ought to give us a clear indication which verses should be regarded as the statement of Paul's theme.

The introduction to Romans (i:1-17) is basically similar to the normal pattern which introduces the other Pauline letters. In v.1 Paul, as the sender of the letter, begins by stating his name and authority for writing. As a slave of Jesus Christ he has, by divine call to the apostolate, been set apart for the proclamation of the gospel. This gospel is not something which arrived entirely unexpectedly, but was previously promised (προετοιμασθέντος) through the prophets in the scriptures of the Old Testament (v.2). The gospel concerns God's Son in whom the promises have been fulfilled. A two-fold description of Jesus Christ is then given. In the sphere of the flesh (κατὰ φ�ρακα) He is of the seed of David; in the sphere of the Spirit (κατὰ πνευμα) He is appointed Son of God (vv.3-4) in power by the resurrection from the dead.

Paul is apparently using a pre-Pauline formula which already contained

---

1. Opinion is greatly divided as to whether Paul's call to be apostle to the Gentiles originated at the same time as his Damascus road experience. J. Munck (FEM, pp.11-35) makes out a good case for this view but one hesitates to disagree with A. Fridrichsen who holds that conversion and vocation are two chronologically separate events ("The Apostle and His Message", p.26). The deep unity between the apostle and his message suggest that even if the two events were not simultaneous the one is a direct outcome of the other. We believe that Wilckens is correct in his assertion that Paul realized on the Damascus road that Jesus is the end of the Law and that this knowledge determined the course of his life. "Die Bekehrung des Paulus als religionsgeschichtliches Problem." ZThK, LVI (1959) 273-93. R. Bring also relates Paul's understanding of the Law, and his apostleship to the Gentiles. "The Message to the Gentiles". STh, XIX (1965), pp.30-46.

2. ἐξ is taken to mean 'by' or 'on the ground of', cf. Barrett, p.20. See also S.H.Hooke, "The Translation of Romans ii:4." NTS, IX (1963) 370.f.
this description of Christ. It seems unlikely that any contrast between
the physical origin of Jesus and His heavenly appointment as Son of God is
intended here. It is more likely that these were originally complementary
(and not contradictory) descriptions of Jesus Christ. As a typical early
confession this formula contains an adoptionist type of Christology. If
it is true that Paul quotes this confession in order to commend his orth-

1. Cf. E. Schweizer "Röm.i:3f. und der Gegensatz von Fleisch und Geist
vor und bei Paulus", EvTh, XV (1955) pp.563-71. R. Bultmann (Theology,
I, p.49) and N.A. Dahl ("Die Messianität Jesu bei Paulus". SP, pp.
83-95) consider that the phrases κατὰ σώμα καὶ κατὰ πνεῦμα
ἀγιωστώνης were added by Paul. Michel claims that the addition of
these phrases decisively modified the original Palestinian confession
although he admits the possibility that these phrases were part of the
confession from the beginning (pp.36-39). More recently R. Jewett has
identified three stages in the development of this confession. The
confession originated in the Palestinian church. To the original
confession the Hellenistic church added κατὰ σώμα καὶ κατὰ πνεῦμα
and finally Paul himself added the word ἄγιωστωνης "as a prelude to
his massive correction of the Hellenistic pneumatic Christology in
viii:3f." Paul's Anthropological Terms. (p.138).

2. Jewett rightly criticizes Schweizer's article because it reveals that
it is most improbable that the two phrases κατὰ σώμα καὶ κατὰ πνεῦμα
ἀγιωστώνης originate from a single source (op.cit.,p.137). This is because Schweizer still allows for some contrast between the
two spheres of existence - even though he does deny that any absolute
contrast is intended since he considers that the fleshly sphere is
limited and obsolete rather than demonic. (TWNT, VII, p.126). But if
no contrast is intended there is no longer any need to maintain that
both phrases cannot have originated from a single source. This raises
the further objection that Paul uses flesh and spirit differently in
Rom.i:3f. and Rom.viii:1f. This is not an insurmountable problem since
Paul is quoting earlier material which may differ greatly in vocabulary.
Rom.iv:25 offers a good parallel to this verse. In both cases Paul is
happy to use earlier material which expresses itself in non-Pauline
terminology.


suggests that Paul may have added ἐν δυνάμει with the intention of
softening the adoptionism in the words he quotes. (p.20).
odoxy to persons who he knew would recognize the formula, then this means that Paul wished to stress the connection of his gospel with the Old Testament or with the 'Urgemeinde' in Jerusalem or possibly both. In any case it is plain that Paul's gospel and the Messiah whom it concerns are both depicted in such a way as to emphasize fulfilment of, and continuity with, the promises of the Old Testament. This emphasis has great significance for our interpretation of Paul's gospel in Romans. The gospel which is described as "promised beforehand" (v.2) and the reference to the Davidic descent of the Messiah (v.3) give us the impression that Paul is concerned to emphasize the continuity of the church with Israel. It is for this reason that he spends so much time in elaborate description of his gospel.

2. We assume that Paul had a good reason for including this formula in the introduction to the letter. G. Dix is not correct when he claims that there is no reason in the remainder of the letter why Paul should refer to Jesus' Jewish origin. (Jew and Greek. London, 1953, p.19). H.W. Bartsch suggests that this formula is intended to remind Gentile Christians that in believing they have adopted a Jewish apocalyptic hope. "Zur vorpaulinischen Bekenntnisformel im Eingang des Römerbriefes". TZ, XXIII (1967), pp.329-39 (339).
3. P. Minear draws attention to the length of the salutation in Romans and claims that the reason for this is similar to that which prompts the christological references in xv:1-21 - i.e. to show that the interdependence of Jews and Gentiles is integral to God's plan. Minear also points out the close correspondence in content between the introduction and concluding sections of the letter. He tabulates them as follows -

- thanksgiving and commendation i:8 xv:14f.
- the centrality of the gospel of God i:1,15f. xv:16
- Paul's policy in going to new areas i:13 xv:20
- his desire to visit Rome i:10 xv:23
- the frustration of that desire i:13 xv:22
- his assignment to Gentiles i:5 xv:15f.
- the mutuality of indebtedness i:12,14 xv:27
- his wish to strengthen their faith i:11 xv:13; xvi:25.

The grace and apostleship which Paul has received is intended for the specific purpose of bringing about obedient faith\(^1\) among all the Gentiles (v.5). Most translations opt for the term 'nations' rather than 'Gentiles'. This suggests that the purpose of the verse is to emphasize the universality of the gospel. The question may be asked, does nations really mean 'all nations' including the Jews, or does it mean simply all the Gentile world? It seems preferable to hold to the latter interpretation in view of the fact that elsewhere in Romans we have what appear to be clear indications that a division of labour had taken place among the apostles (cf. xi:13, xv:16,18).\(^2\) Paul, as apostle to the Gentiles is specifically concerned with bringing the gospel to the Gentile world\(^3\) and the Christians in Rome are part of that world. This means that the Roman Christians must be either completely or predominantly

---

1. Following Barrett's translation - 'believing obedience', (p.21). Although the theme of obedience is not, at first glance, a dominant one in Romans, passages such as vi:15 ff. and the general tenor of the letter provide strong support for Minear's view that Romans concerns the obedience of faith. See also Michel on i:17 (pp.54 ff.).
3. But this does not prevent him from preaching to the Jews as Fridrichsen rightly points out (op.cit., p.26). Schmithals' suggestion of a parallel mission to Jews in the same area places too much emphasis on the distinction within the church and too little on the unity of Jew and Gentile in the gospel, (Paul and James, STH, XLVI , p.53). We have no reason to doubt that the picture of Paul's evangelistic work in Acts is correct. In accord with his emphasis "to the Jew first and also to the Greek" (Rom. i:16), Paul, on visiting a new city, took his gospel first to the Jewish synagogue and only then did he go to the Gentiles (contra Schmithals, op.cit., pp.57-60). The great merit of J. Munck's book Paul and the Salvation of Mankind is that it gives a full and fresh investigation into this problem of the division of territory and peoples in the apostolic period. See especially pp.270-81. As a corrective to Munck, cf. J. Knox, "Romans xv:14-33 and Paul's Conception of his Apostolic Mission". JBL, LXXXIII (1964), pp.1-11.
of Gentile origin.\(^1\)

These Christians are further described as God's beloved, who are called to be saints (v.7). We note the absence of any mention of the Christian church in Rome such as we have in the corresponding position in I and II Corinthians. Perhaps this is due to the fact that there were divisions

---

1. In i:13, Paul says he wishes to reap some harvest "among you as well as among the rest of the Gentiles" (similarly xv:15f.), and in xi:13 he writes "I am speaking to you Gentiles". We cannot agree with those who suggest that this section (ix-xi) is addressed to a Gentile group within the Roman community or with Minear's suggestion that in various places Paul speaks only to one or more of the five groups which he discerns within the Roman Christian community (op.cit., p.45 n.5). In ix:3f., xi:1f., and xi:23,28,31, Paul speaks to non-Jews about his own people. W. Manson (The Epistle to the Hebrews. Edinburgh (1951), pp.172-84), has claimed that the Roman congregation is basically Jewish and T. Fahy ("St.Paul's Romans were Jewish Converts". ITQ, XXVI (1959), pp.182f.), holds a similar opinion. N. Krieger ("Zum Römerbrief". NovT, III (1959), pp.146-48) has a slightly modified version of this in his view that Paul seeks to win support from the Jewish Christians in Rome for the Gentile mission. Michel believes that Paul battles against Jewish Christians who had returned to Rome and were seeking to reassert their authority (p.9). But as W. Kümmel notes, the only support for a Jewish majority in Rome lies in the fact that this letter is basically a dialogue of the Pauline gospel with Judaism and that Paul includes in it many discussions, with Jewish arguments, as in ii:17, iii:1, iv:1,4. There is no text in this epistle which characterizes the majority of the Roman Christians as former Jews (Introduction to the New Testament. ET (1966), p.218). Munck has ably demonstrated that although the questions with which Paul deals in Romans are of a Jewish nature, this is no reason to suppose that the congregation was predominantly Jewish, since Galatians includes similar material addressed to Gentile Christians (PSM, p.205). But we cannot agree with Munck that this congregation is exclusively of Gentile origin. The question of 'weak' and 'strong' in ch.xiv and the exhortation to accept one another in ch.xv would be pointless if both groups were not presupposed in the congregation. The possibility that some of the Roman Gentile Christians had been circumcised prior to baptism is noted by W. Michaelis, (Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Bern 1946, p.153), G. Harder, ("Der konkrete Anlass des Römerbriefes." ThV, 6 (1959), pp.13f.) and W. Marxsen, (Introduction to the New Testament. ET. Oxford 1968, pp.98f.). This interesting suggestion must be considered in more detail later.
among the Christians in Rome and Paul wished to include all parties in the salutation to "all God's beloved in Rome".\(^1\) Whether there were several different congregations, as Minear suggests, or whether, because of divisions of opinion, no united Christian church had as yet been formed in Rome, is difficult to discern. All that we can say with reasonable certainty is that there is no reference to an existing united Christian church in the Roman letter,\(^2\) and that there is much in the letter to suggest that Paul was deeply concerned that such a body should be formed.\(^3\)

The omission of the references to Rome in several manuscripts cannot be taken as proof that this is a general letter intended as a circular for the whole church. The main body of evidence is for the inclusion of the name Rome.\(^4\) If we do not find this evidence convincing, this requires us to decide which other well-known and important church was originally addressed, and Rome

1. Cf. I Cor.1:2 and Minear, op.cit., pp.43-44. We cannot agree with Minear's suggestion that Paul first of all addressed only the Gentile Christians and then went on to salute "all God's beloved" (as if these were a different body) "and thus intimated that he expected his letter to be read in some congregations which were Gentile, in some which were Jewish, and in some where both would be present". (p.44).

2. The word ἐκκλησία occurs only in ch.xvi and there only "in a purely episodic way", (F.J. Leenhardt, The Epistle to the Romans, p.16 n*.) The view taken in this thesis is that ch.xvi was not part of the original letter to Rome, (see Appendix I). E.A. Judge and G.S.R.Thomas provide an excellent survey of the biblical and extra-biblical evidence concerning the foundation of the church in Rome and conclude that there is no real evidence for the existence of a church prior to Paul's arrival, ("The Origin of the Church at Rome: A New Solution?" RThR, XXV (1966), pp. 81-93. A similar view is proposed by H.W. Bartsch, "The Concept of Faith in Paul's Letters to the Romans". BR, XIII (1968), pp.41-53(44).


4. The words 'in Rome' in 1:7,15 are omitted by G, and also probably by Origen. For manuscript evidence see Manson, op.cit., pp.227.f.
fits here at least as well as any other.\(^1\) The best explanation of the manuscript evidence is that the original particular reference to Rome was later omitted with a view to giving the letter a wider, more general application.\(^2\)

In v.7 Paul gives the Romans his customary salutation - "Grace and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ..." and thereby completes the circle which the normal Pauline letter presupposes - sender, recipient, and both bound together under God. This is followed by the introduction in v.8 of the thanksgiving formula with the customary verb \(\varepsilon\hbar\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\varepsilon\nu\).\(^3\) The basic structure of this thanksgiving is similar to the thanksgivings in I Cor.i:4, II Thess.i:3, and I Thess.ii:13 where the principal clause comprises the verb in first person singular or plural of present indicative, modified by \(\tau\nu\) ὧδὲ , followed by a temporal adverb, adverbial phrase, and concluding with a causal ὅτι clause which expresses the reason for gratitude.\(^4\) Apart from a certain laboriousness and ruggedness in style the basic

---


2. The omission of particular addresses in some manuscripts is best explained by a desire to make the letters more catholic. N.A. Dahl is of the opinion that I Corinthians, Romans and Ephesians may all have stood at different times at the beginning of some old editions of the Corpus Paulinum. The particularity of the Pauline epistles was felt as a problem from a time before the Corpus Paulinum was published until it had been incorporated into a complete canon of the New Testament scriptures. Dahl concurs with Cullmann's opinion that the argument of the Muratorian fragment was based on the false assumption that the canonicity and catholicity of the epistles can be stressed only at the expense of their particularity. "The Particularity of the Pauline Epistles as a Problem in the Ancient Church". Neotestamentica et Patristica, Eine Freundesgabe, O. Cullmann zu seinem 60 Geburtstag überreicht. Leiden (1963), pp.260-71. (271).

3. On this pattern see Schubert, op.cit., p.33.

4. Cf. Schubert, op.cit., pp.51-52. Schubert claims that although the ὅτι in Rom.ii:8 may be simply recitative and not causal grammatically, logically it is causal, since the clause following describes the reasons which Paul had in mind when he offered thanks to God (pp.44-45). See also the attached photostat copy of Schubert's table illustrating the syntactical units of the \(\varepsilon\hbar\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\varepsilon\nu\) period of the Pauline thanksgivings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. principal verb</th>
<th>II. pers. obj. III, temp. adv.</th>
<th>IV. pron. obj. phrase</th>
<th>V. temp. ptc. clause with temp. adv. phrase</th>
<th>VI. causal ptc. clause or adv. phrase</th>
<th>VII. &quot;final&quot; clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE 1a:</strong> Phlm 4ff. εὐχαριστῶ</td>
<td>τῷ θεῷ μου πάντωτε</td>
<td>περὶ πάντων ὁμοίων</td>
<td>μελαν σου πτοιοῦμεν ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου</td>
<td>ἐκόψας σου τῇ ὀψῃ τῇ ἀγάπῃ</td>
<td>ὃποις...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Thess 1 2ff. εὐχαριστῶμεν</td>
<td>τῷ θεῷ πάντωτε ἀδιαλείπτως</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>μελαν σου πτοιοῦμεν ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου</td>
<td>ἔκους...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 1 10</td>
<td>(ὁς ἀδιαλείπτως πάντωτε)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>μελαν σου πτοιοῦμεν ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου</td>
<td>ἔκους...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eph 1 16ff.</td>
<td>(οὐ πασομαι) εὐχαριστῶν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὃποις...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὃποις...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil 1 2ff. εὐχαριστῶ</td>
<td>τῷ θεῷ μου πάντωτε</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
structure of the Roman thanksgiving conforms to type.¹

First of all,² Paul gives thanks that the faith of the Roman Christians is spoken of throughout the world (v.8). Although we cannot be sure just how much information Paul possessed about the situation in Rome, it is clear that he does feel sufficiently well informed to comment on the quality of their faith. It is probable that there were Christians in Rome for some time prior to the writing of this letter otherwise their reputation would not have been so widespread.³ It would appear from the content of the other Pauline thanksgivings that their intimate descriptions give a clear indication of some important aspect of the actual situation of the churches which Paul addresses in these letters.⁴ We have no reason to doubt that this applies to the Roman letter also. This means that when Paul speaks of the Romans' faith, he is not simply being polite, but is genuinely referring to some outstanding characteristic of this particular group of Christians.

1. Schubert divides the Pauline thanksgivings into two categories - Ia and Ib. Romans belongs to the latter although it has certain affinities with the first group, (op.cit., pp.33-35.) See also photostat copy of Table II, p.14b. (Schubert op.cit., pp.54-55). We cannot agree with R.W. Funk's view that because Paul has worked the ingredients of the apostolic 'parousia' (the reference to Paul's apostolic presence to the congregations whether in person, by emissary or by letter) into the thanksgiving in Rom.1:8f. and has given a parallel treatment of the 'parousia' in xv:14-33, that Romans is not to be regarded as a typical, specific letter, but a general letter to be particularized and dispatched as occasion demands. Op.cit., pp.267-68. H.W. Bartsch also notes the repetition (and intensification) of the thanksgiving (op.cit., p.43) but still considers that "Paul wrote this letter as he did all the others, because he wants to help the Roman Christians to solve a vital problem of their own", (op.cit., p.42).

2. The reason for πρότον μέν in place of the normal πάντοτε in this verse is probably the unusually lengthy 'opening formula' in vv.1-7. At this stage Paul realised that it was desirable, if not necessary, for him to make a transition to the thanksgiving and in view of this it was quite natural for him to introduce the thanksgiving in this way. (Schubert, op. cit., p.57).

3. G. Eichholz holds the view that the Roman church was in existence for ten years or more prior to Paul's letter to them, ("Der Ükumenische und Missionarische Horizont der Kirche: Eine exegetische Studie zu Röm.1:8-15". Tradition und Interpretation. TB. 29, (München 1965), p.86).

cies is to emphasize his unity with the Romans and their unity with one another. This is the reason for his unremitting prayers on their behalf. This is also the reason why in xv:30f., he reverses the procedure and calls upon the Romans to unite with him in prayers for the success of his Jerusalem visit.¹

We have already indicated that the thanksgiving in Romans has affinities with both types of thanksgivings as outlined by Schubert. Although the Roman thanksgiving has closest parallels with the second type of thanksgiving, Ib, in vv.9f the pattern is closer to the first type, Ia. Instead of the pattern previously noted in v.8 (where the principal ἐχαριστῶ clause is followed by a causal ὅτι clause) we find the fuller pattern common to Philemon 4f., Eph.ii:15f., I Thess.ii:2f., Phil.ii:3f. and II Cor.ii:11. In this pattern the principal ἐχαριστῶ clause is followed by participial clauses (nominative, masculine, singular or plural) and a final clause subordinate to them (introduced by ὅπως, ὅπως or ἐπί τὸ ὑπο. Inf.).² In Rom.ii:9f., in the construction μετὰ ἔμοι ποιοῦμαι — δεσμιωθοῦμεν εἰ πως the conjunction εἰ πως is structurally in the same position as the final εἰς τὸ ὑπο. Inf. in type Ia. This construction indicates that one specific aim of Paul's prayers is that he may be enabled to visit Rome. The significance of the fact that Romans has a mixture of the two main types of thanksgivings is to emphasize his unity with the Romans and their unity with one another. This is the reason for his unremitting prayers on their behalf. This is also the reason why in xv:30f., he reverses the procedure and calls upon the Romans to unite with him in prayers for the success of his Jerusalem visit.¹

1. Dahl suggests that the whole argument of the Roman letter is designed to prepare for Paul's forthcoming visit to Rome and particularly to lead up to the climax of the letter which is the appeal that the Roman Christians join in prayer for Paul's Jerusalem visit and thus 'solidarize' themselves with the Gentile churches in the East. By this the unity of Jews and Gentiles in the church would be fully recognized, op.cit., p.269.
giving patterns is that it has the merit of relating this letter very closely to the other letters of Paul.¹

The γὰρ in v.11 indicates that this verse explains the reason for Paul's prayer in v.10. Paul has prayed that he might be able to visit the Romans with a view to imparting to them some spiritual benefit. In his concern to stress the strength of his desire to visit them, Paul has said more than diplomacy allows. If the Romans are to receive some benefit from his visit, does this not imply that they are lacking in something which he can supply? Realizing the way his words might be interpreted, Paul hastily modifies what he has just said by stating in v.12 that they will mutually encourage one another in their common faith. We note again how careful Paul is not to give offence or to give the impression that he is coming to force his views or his authority upon these Christians whom he himself has not led to faith in Christ.

According to our analysis Paul's introductory thanksgiving is completed in v.12. Schubert holds that vv.11-13 and vv.14-15 are part of the thanksgiving since intimate personal topics enter into all thanksgivings.² He himself admits however, that he has great difficulty in determining the point of termination of the thanksgiving in Romans.³ His reason for including vv.14-15 in the thanksgiving along with vv.11-13 is because he sees a parallel between these two sections. In vv.14-15 Paul informs the Romans that he feels

---

¹ Cf. Schubert's comment on the second type of thanksgiving, pattern Ib - "we have discovered a truly surprising example of 'fixed' form and of uniform function over a representative cross-section of the Pauline letters, binding together the early letters to the Thessalonians and the two important 'main' letters, Romans and I Corinthians", (op.cit.,p.53). Although this comment refers only to pattern Ib, we believe that the fact that the Roman thanksgiving is also related to the other thanksgiving type Ia, does not invalidate this statement but rather confirms it.


an apostolic obligation to preach the gospel to them whereas in v.11 he has spoken with great tact merely of his personal desire to do so.¹ Schubert also includes v.16 along with vv.11f., since this verse is closely connected both in vocabulary and thought with the preceding verses. He regards v.17 as the topic sentence of the doctrinal theme i.e. as the beginning of the body of the letter.²

We believe that Schubert could have resolved the problem of the thanksgiving better if he had located the termination of the thanksgiving at an earlier point in these verses. That this is correct is indicated by the 'disclosure' formula in vv.13f. - ἐὰν ὅπως ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὦτι..... This construction exhibits all the normal characteristics of the 'disclosure' formula as noted by J.T. Sanders and J.L. White.³ Following Schubert's pioneer work on the Pauline thanksgivings, Sanders notes that the point of termination of the thanksgiving is marked by another clearly discernible formula of transition. This formula is not limited to this specific place in Paul's letters but is also employed elsewhere. Sanders describes it as comprising⁴ -

(1) a verb in the first person of the present action stem which states the author's enjoining, usually παρακαλῶ (alternative form - a verb of wishing with an infinitive of knowing attached to item 3);

(2) the particle δέ;

(3) the recipients of the injunction in the accusative ὑμᾶς;

². Ibid.
(4) the vocative ἄδελφοι;

(5) an appeal to the authority of the Lord for the saying, introduced with ὅτα;

(6) a prepositional phrase, introduced by ὑπὲρ, stating the topic of the injunction (which may be omitted);

(7) the injunction itself introduced by ὅπι or Ἰνα, this clause being occasionally replaced by an infinitive phrase.

In a more recent study J.L. White holds that although Sanders is substantially correct in his investigation of the transition formula, he has combined what are really two separate formulae in the common letter tradition and collapsed them into one form. White describes these two formulae as the 'disclosure' formula and the 'request' formula.1 It is the former of these with which we are concerned since it normally marks the end of the thanksgiving and the introduction of the body of the letter. If we are correct in the assertion that v.12 marks the end of the thanksgiving in Rom.i., then vv.13f. ought to comprise the transitional disclosure formula introducing the body of the letter. When we compare vv.13f. with the pattern of the transition formula as outlined by Sanders, there appears to be no reason to doubt that it is at this stage that the body of the letter is introduced. According to White the body of the letter to the Romans consists of Rom.i:13-xi:36.2

Paul introduces the body of the letter by drawing specific attention to (or disclosing) the fact that he has often purposed to visit Rome but has until now been hindered, (v.13). As apostle to the Gentiles, he wishes to

reap some harvest among them as among the rest of the Gentiles. What was hinted at in v.11 is now more positively stated. Not only does Paul wish to visit Rome, but he now confesses that he is obliged to all men and hence to the Romans as much as others. Both personal inclination and apostolic vocation demand that Paul should visit Rome as soon as circumstances permit.¹

The specific form in which this universal obligation of Paul is stated is most interesting. Humanity in its totality comprises the Hellenist and the barbarian, the cultured and the uncultured respectively.² It is probable that Paul was frequently accused of partiality in the continuing conflict of Jew and Gentile.³ The Jews suspect him of betraying Jewish traditions in his evangelization of Gentiles. It is also probable that some Gentile Christians suspected him of being secretly a Jewish sympathizer. Perhaps the Roman Christians had accused Paul of a preference for the uncultured provincials and Orientals, or claimed that he did not dare to venture to this metropolis of Hellenism.⁴ If a division existed between the Jewish and Gentile Christians in Rome, it is possible that Paul had this problem in mind here. Because of this delicate situation he cannot speak out clearly of his

---

¹ We take ὡς οὖν ἐμῷ to mean 'so far as it rests with me', cf. 'in the will of God', (v.10). W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, Romans. ICC, 5th ed., (London 1907), p.21.

² The reference is to those Greek speaking people who inhabit the city states of the inner Mediterranean world and those outside that circle. Cf. Barrett, p.26. Michel notes the fact that there were many Orientals, Africans etc., residing in Rome but still regarded as barbarians because of their lack of fluency in the Greek language, (p.50).

³ Cf. W. Lütgert's claim that when Paul contrasts other peoples with the Jews, it is normally the religious rather than the national distinctions which are primarily intended. "Die Juden im Neuen Testament". Schlatter aus Schriften und Geschichten. Theologische Abhandlungen Adolf Schlatter zu seinem 70 Geburtstag. Stuttgart (1922) pp.142-43. On the conflict of Syriac and Greek cultures, see G. Dix, Jew and Greek, pp.1-18.

equal obligation to Jew and Gentile. By the reference to the great cultural division of mankind, Paul implies that he is aware of, but is not determined by, those barriers which have traditionally separated people. This declaration may be regarded as a discreet apology for Paul's concern for the 'weak' Jewish Christians in Rome and particularly for his journey to Jerusalem with the collection.\(^1\) To the Gentile Christians in Rome it must have seemed strange that Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles, is not now coming to visit them, but is going to Jerusalem to visit the Jews.

This situation probably accounts for the fact that a definite climax to the thanksgiving appears to be lacking in Romans.\(^2\) Paul emphasizes his concern for the Romans and his desire to visit them, but instead of proceeding, as he does in I Thessalonians, to talk of his forthcoming visit, he turns instead in vv.16f. to a description of his gospel. The reason for this is that Paul is not, at this moment, intending to visit Rome. He cannot (or dare not) tell the Romans that, in spite of his acknowledged concern for them, he is going to Jerusalem with the collection and accompanying representatives. It is only in xv:25 that Paul feels able to disclose the fact that he is really going to Jerusalem instead. As John Knox points out, a reader of Rom.i:8f. would not have learned much of Paul's immediate plans. They would learn only that he wishes to come to Rome, but they would not learn until ch.xv that he is actually coming and then only via Jerusalem with all the delay that this entails.\(^3\)

\(^1\) Cf. A. Schlatter's assertion that the problem of disunity among the Roman Christians is closely connected with the purpose of Paul in the composition of this letter. *Gottes Gerechtigkeit*, pp.363f. Paul Minear notes correctly that Paul had the Jew-Gentile controversy (ch.xiv) in mind when he composed the early paragraphs of the letter. (op.cit.,p.36).

\(^2\) Cf. Schubert, op.cit., p.5.

\(^3\) "A Note on the Text of Romans". *NTS*, II (1956), pp.191-93.
This explains certain peculiarities of chs. i and xv. The clear parallels between the two sections are best explained by the fact that Paul can give full information about his plans only in ch. xv. The delicate situation in Rome and Paul's fear that his Jerusalem visit may be misunderstood mean that the introduction to the letter is necessarily left incomplete. When Paul eventually states that he is going to Jerusalem rather than Rome, he precedes the giving of this information by the claim that he has hitherto been unable to come because of his particular apostolic vocation (xv: 19- f.). Paul has made it his ambition not to preach the gospel where Christ's name is already known lest he should build on another man's foundation (xv: 20). He bases his practice on Is. iii:15 "They shall see who have never been told of him, and they shall understand who have never heard of him." It is this which has hitherto prevented Paul coming to Rome (xv: 22 Weymouth). Until he had fully proclaimed the gospel in the east he could not feel free to take

1. Contra R.W. Funk's view that the parallel treatment of the apostolic 'parousia' in i: 8f. and xv: 14-33 means that Romans i: 1 - xv: 13 is a general letter which was readapted to suit different occasions (op.cit., pp. 267-8). Against Funk's view it may be asserted that the lack of references to the disposition and reason for writing, to Paul's sending a chosen emissary and to the announcement or promise of a visit do not of themselves constitute a reason for regarding Romans as different in kind from the other letters. These can best be explained as originating from the particular circumstances of Paul and of the recipients of the letter. It is also open to dispute whether the double treatment of the apostolic 'parousia' is unique in Romans, as Funk himself realizes. If this latter point is in doubt so also must the entire construction which Funk bases upon it, (op.cit., pp. 257 n.1; 263 n.1; 267 n.4). On the formation of Rom. i: 16-xv: 13 and its relation to the rest of the letter, see also E. Trocmé, "L'Épître aux Romains et la méthode missionnaire de l'apôtre Paul". NTS, VII (1960/61), pp. 148-53.

2. Paul's motive is not simply to avoid possible rivalry with other apostles but to cover as wide an area as possible, cf. Barrett, p. 277. A. Fridrichsen states that although Paul fully respects other evangelists and makes it a rule not to encroach upon their sphere of work, he does consider himself responsible for the entire Gentile mission field. "The Apostle and his Message". ASNU, Uppsala (1947) III, pp. 7-8.
time to visit Rome. But as there is now no unoccupied ground in that part of the world (xv:23 Weymouth), Paul is able to fulfil his longstanding desire to come to the West.¹ Firstly, however, he must go to Jerusalem with the collection.

From this it would appear that the best way to interpret Romans is that it is the explanation from Paul's gospel (a) why he has not yet visited the Romans; (b) why he is going to Jerusalem with the collection and (c) why he still intends to visit Rome at the earliest opportunity. One other factor ought to be included i.e. the situation in Rome itself, which prompted Paul to write a letter rather than wait until he could deal with it in person. Regarded in this way Rom.i:8-17 and xv:14-33 are truly the brackets which enclose the rest of the letter.² To some extent Rom.xv:14 does continue directly from the introduction in ch.i, as if there were nothing in between. But this is deceptive. The body of the Roman letter is absolutely necessary and is presupposed throughout ch.xv. In theory, we may surmise that if the Roman Christians had been able to accept it without any misunderstanding, Paul's news about his visit to Jerusalem would have been given, as we would have expected it to be, in i:8f. and the body of the letter might

¹ As Eichholz points out, Paul is not the master of his own plans. Mission is God's work and Paul, the servant, must do his Master's will (op.cit., pp.92-93). Paul is compelled by the gospel - it is his 'destiny' (E. Käsemann, "A Pauline Version of the 'Amor Fati'". NTQT, pp. 217-35(231). It appears that Paul thought of his missionary work as expanding in ever enlarging circles from Jerusalem, the centre of the church, to the ends of the earth. Paul does not mean that he has evangelized every town or every individual in the East. He thinks representatively - of provinces, of nations. (Cf. Munck, FSM, pp.277f.). H. Lietzmann states "er (Paul) Überblickt die Welt in apokalyptischer Perspektive und schaut das bekehrte Morgenland in seinen Repräsentanten." An die Römer. NTW, VIII, 3 Aufl., (Tübingen 1928), p.121.

² Cf. Michel, p.362.
never have been written. But this ideal situation did not exist, and the situation in Rome was such that Paul felt compelled to intervene by letter and not to wait until his return from Jerusalem.

The effect of this interpretation is apparently to demote Rom.11:16-17 from the title page of the letter. This is not necessarily so. We bear in mind that the γὰρ at the beginning of vv.16,17 and 18 designates them as an explanation of the argument of the preceding verses i.e. vv.13-15. What we suggest is that v.16 is, in fact, a good title to the theme of the body of the letter but only if we bear in mind that the reason for the body of the letter is found not in vv.16f. but rather in vv.13f. This is simply to claim that the so-called doctrinal section (vv.16f.) originates out of the practical situation outlined in the previous verses (vv.13f.). This confirms what Dahl says on the subject of Paul's intention in writing his letters. "To the apostle himself, letters to particular churches, written on special occasions were the proper literary form for making theological statements".2

The picture of Paul which emerges from Romans is of a man whose life is dominated by the gospel of which he has been made a minister, (xv:16).3 This gospel determines his travels, his plans, his whole life. By it he is obligated completely, and therefore equally, to all men. He is obligated to Jews just as much as to Greeks - to Jerusalem as well as Rome. Up to now

3. Paul acts as a priest in presenting to God an offering which consists of the Gentile Christians who have been converted in his missions - they are the living sacrifice of xiii:1, cf. Barrett, p.275. Whether, or in what sense Paul regarded himself as 'the eschatological messenger' is very uncertain. Although we cannot fully agree with Munck's somewhat exaggerated portrait of Paul, some features offer an excellent interpretation of certain New Testament texts, cf. Munck, PSM, pp.36-68.
Paul has not been able to come to Rome because the gospel which determines the priorities of his life has not permitted him. At the present time, the same gospel obligates him to go to Jerusalem with the collection for the poor saints there. In Paul's mind there is no contradiction between his organizing a collection for the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem\(^1\) and, as apostle to the Gentiles, planning a visit to Rome and hence to Spain. The gospel which he preaches demands both these actions.

This is borne out by xv:26f. Here Paul introduces the idea that the Gentiles are obligated to the Jews. He begins by stating that the Macedonian and Achaian Christians have voluntarily offered a contribution for their poor Jewish brethren. Then Paul discreetly comments that even though it was voluntary, these Gentile Christians were actually obligated to do this, because since the Gentiles share in the spiritual blessings of the Jews they should also be of service to them in material things (v.27). For Paul it is the gospel itself which firmly unites Jew and Gentile in mutual obligation in one body.

This is why he can say in i:16 that he is not ashamed of the gospel because it is God's power that leads to salvation everyone who believes - the Jew first and also the Greek.\(^2\) Paul sees no reason for competition or

---

1. On the question of the collection see Munck, *PDM*, ch.10 (pp.282-308), and especially K.F. Nickle's study, *The Collection: A Study in Paul's Strategy*, SBTh, 48 (1966). Nickle summarizes the theological significance of the collection as "(1) an act of Christian charity among fellow believers motivated by the love of Christ; (2) an act expressing the solidarity of the Christian fellowship by presenting irrefutable evidence that God was calling the Gentiles to faith; (3) an eschatological pilgrimage of the Gentile Christians to Jerusalem by which the Jews were to be confronted with the undeniable reality of the divine gift of saving grace to the Gentiles and thereby be themselves moved through jealousy to finally accept the gospel." (p.142). Cf. Eichholz, op.cit., pp.82-90.

distinction between Jew and Gentile. Since the gospel comes via the Old Testament, and since Christ Himself became a servant to the circumcision (xv:7), the gospel is first of all for the Jew. This is another way of emphasizing the dependence of Gentiles upon Jews. The covenant and promises were made to Israel, and Gentiles participate in their benefits only in association with believing Jews. But since the gospel is universal, the Gentiles are also included. It is not a question of Jew or Gentile, but Jew and Gentile. "Christ became a servant to the circumcised ... in order that the Gentiles might glorify God for His mercy", (xv:8-9).

From this survey we have arrived at several conclusions which we may summarize as follows -

(1) In the light of the investigation and comparison of the letter to the Romans with the non-literary papyri and the other Pauline letters, there is no reason whatever for regarding Romans as a departure from the normal letter form.

(2) The length of the body of this letter does not constitute a sufficient reason for regarding it as other than a real letter since the body of Paul's letters is normally substantially longer than those of the non-literary papyri.¹

(3) The omission of the references to Rome is not to be explained as an indication that this was originally a general letter, but rather by the tendency to make particular letters into general, catholic epistles by the removal of the address.

¹. This still leaves us with the problem of the dictation of such a long letter, but, in common with many other difficulties concerning the letter to the Romans, this objection applies equally to I Corinthians. Cf. Michel, p.7.
(4) The fact that Paul has not yet visited Rome does not of itself provide an adequate basis for the view that Romans is a draft of his gospel or theology sent in letter form as a means of self-introduction. It does provide however, an explanation of several features peculiar to this letter.

(5) A study of the normal pattern of introductory 'thanksgiving' and 'dislosure' formulae leads us to the conclusion that the introduction of the body of Romans begins in i:13 and not in i:16. This reminds us that in Pauline thought the doctrinal exists to serve the practical and that the theological teaching of Romans has a practical orientation.

(6) In view of (5), although the body of the Roman letter is predominantly doctrinal in content, since this originated out of, and is designed to influence a practical situation it does not undermine the view that this is a real letter.
Romans i:18-32.

The γάρ with which v.18 commences indicates that this section is connected with and should be understood in relation to the immediately preceding verses. The chain of sentences in vv.16-18 is joined together by a four-fold use of γάρ which connects back to v.15, where Paul declares his readiness to extend his service of the gospel to all the world.¹ The connection with what precedes is also plainly indicated by the parallelism between vv.17 and 18.² In v.17 ἀποκαλύπτεται refers to the righteousness of God and in v.18 it refers to the wrath (ὀργή) of God.

If we follow through the parallel between vv.17 and 18 this would suggest that it is in the gospel that the wrath of God is revealed.³ The term 'is revealed' indicates that the reference here is to eschatological salvation-events. Whilst it is perfectly appropriate to say that the righteousness of God is revealed in the gospel, it is quite another matter to suggest that the wrath of God is also revealed in the same gospel. Some scholars have sought to avoid this interpretation by attributing an adversative force to γάρ thereby indicating that a certain contrast is intended between the righteousness and the wrath of God.⁴ This means, of course, that these two opposing revelations⁵ cannot both be revealed in the gospel.

C.H. Dodd has argued that by 'the wrath of God' Paul did not mean a personal reaction of God but "some process of cause and effect in a moral

universe."¹ F.F. Bruce considers that the wrath of God is revealed not in the gospel but in "the facts of human experience."² C.K. Barrett disagrees with Dodd's impersonal interpretation and argues for "a close positive relation between vv.17 and 18."³ In Barrett's view both the revelation of righteousness and the revelation of wrath are eschatological events which are anticipated in history. Just as the revelation of wrath can be demonstrated so can the revelation of righteousness. The proof of the latter originates from "the observable situation in the latter part of the chapter."⁴ Cranfield disagrees with this interpretation on the grounds that the 'observable situation' would require to be something new in world history - an assumption which Paul is unlikely to have shared. According to Barth it is unnecessary to interpret the wrath of God as something contrary to His burning, consuming love. "The death of Jesus Christ on the cross is the revelation of God's wrath from heaven."⁵ Cranfield believes that this view alone gives an adequate interpretation of the text. Just as the preaching of the gospel is preceded by the revelation of the righteousness of God on the cross, so too the preaching of the gospel presupposes the revelation of God's wrath in the gospel-events.⁶ It is actually in the proclamation of the gospel that both the righteousness and the wrath are now being revealed. A modification of this interpretation would be to understand the gospel itself as exposing the radical

¹ p.23. Dodd comes to this view partly on the basis that God must be thought of in the highest ideals of human personality (p.24) and so we cannot attribute to Him the irrational passion of anger. But see Cranfield's reply to this, op.cit.,p.333.
⁴ p.34.
⁶ p.334.
failure of the religion and ethics of man, thereby indicating the eschatological judgement of God. As Leenhardt says "With the gospel there begins for every man the great assize of God, the eschatological and ultimate age."¹ Bornkamm appears to be in agreement with this view when he declares that Paul's intention in Rom.1:18.f. is not to "infer God's being from the world", nor to "prove the revelation of God before the judgement of the world", but to "unveil the judgement of God over the world revealed in the Law."²

Grammatically and exegetically the view of Barth and Cranfield appears to be the better interpretation. The view of those who consider that the gospel reveals man's present state to him as a demonstration of God's wrath upon sin has also much to commend it.³ In both cases the gospel is understood as revealing to man in a new way the judgement of God upon his sin.

In v.19 Paul declares that the wrath of God justly falls upon men⁴ because that which can be known of God is manifest among them, since God Himself made it manifest to them. In the following verse the justification for this statement is provided. That which can be known of God can be clearly seen from the things which He has made.⁵ The εἰς τὸ εὖν of v.20 indicates not only result but purpose. God has revealed Himself as Creator and Lord so that men might be without excuse. This key statement in v.20 is the essence of the thought in vv.18-23.

1. p.61. Similarly Cranfield (p.334).
3. Some scholars feel that a distinction may be intended between the way in which righteousness is revealed in the gospel (ἐν ἀληθείᾳ cf. Pallis, p.40), and that in which wrath is revealed (ἐν ὀργῇ cf. Pallis, p.40). But if the latter is taken as a respectful designation for God (not as implying universality as Bornkamm holds, p.49) then the distinction is not valid. Cf. Leenhardt, pp.60-61(note).
5. It will be necessary for us at a later stage in this section to consider in more detail what Paul understands by this knowledge of God.
The διὸτι which introduces v.21 indicates that this and the following verses (vv.22-23) are meant to be a setting forth of the reasons why men are without excuse for their conduct. Barrett describes vv.21.f. as "the root of the matter". The basic sin of men is that "although they knew God, they did not honour Him as God, or give thanks to Him." Minear develops this emphasis pointing out that "the root sin of the Gentiles was not the lusts of i:24, or the dishonourable passions of i:26, or the evils of i:29:" These were penalties to which God gave them up because of an earlier, more serious betrayal, described as not honouring God, giving of thanks etc. Men refused to acknowledge themselves as God's creatures, to recognize His Lordship, or to serve Him in grateful trust and obedience. "Unwilling to recognize a Lord, man chose to be Lord himself, and to glorify himself." The connection between the sin and the resulting judgement is clearly illustrated by v.22, - "Claiming to be wise, they became fools."

In v.22 the sin of which men are guilty is stated first, followed by the statement concerning the appropriate judgement. In this respect v.22 sets the pattern for what is to follow. Verses 23 and 24 are similar to

---

1. p.36.
2. p.49.
3. Bornkamm believes that Paul may be deliberately contrasting his understanding of 'giving thanks' and 'glorifying' (thankful salvation to the Creator) with that of Philo (the mind's last possibility of completion in ecstatic ascent), op.cit., pp.56-57. Minear draws attention to the fact that the accusation here corresponds in a reverse way to Paul's description of two major factions in Rome. 'The strong' and 'the weak' both give thanks to God (σὺχαρος κτητορ, xiv:6). Both follow their diverse practices in "honour of the Lord", (xiv:6.f.). From this observation, Minear concludes that "the Gentiles whose behaviour and fate are described in i:18-32 were to be sharply distinguished from the strong in faith (Gentile Christians) whose behaviour is described in xiv:1-9. The weak in faith often failed to make that distinction, but rather identified the two groups of Gentiles as grounds for their condemnation of lawless Christians." (p.49). The question as to how Rom.i:18.f. is related to the actual situation reflected in the letter will be discussed later in this chapter.
v.22, with the addition of the key word παραδόθηκαν in v.24. The pattern appears to be this: (a) description of men's sins (b) statement that because of (διό ) these sins God gave them up (c) the description of the ensuing judgement which is directly related to the sins committed. In view of this we should subdivide vv.22-28.f. somewhat differently from that what is normally done. The grouping would be as follows: vv.22-24, 25-27, 28.f.  

This arrangement illustrates very clearly how in Paul's view the punishment fits the crime. Where men exchange the divine glory (δόξα ) for the worship of idols in the form of beasts etc., God gives them up to the dishonouring (ἀτιμίασθαι ) of their bodies, (vv.23-24). Those who exchange the truth of God for a lie receive the judgement that consists in the exchange of their natural functions for those contrary to nature; those who pervert God's truth, become perverted themselves in the use of their own bodies, (vv.25-27). Those who did not see fit (οὐχ ἔκοψαν ) to take

1. Cf. the significant study by E. Klostermann, "Die adäquate Vergeltung in Röm.i:22-31" ZNW, XXXII (1933), pp.1-6. Klostermann is critical of the tradition in Greek texts of the New Testament (and modern translations of same) which commence a new paragraph at v.24. Barrett (p.32) makes no break at v.24 but begins a new paragraph after vv.25 and 27 as in the RSV. J. Jeremias ("Zu Röm.i:22-32", ZNW, XLV (1954), pp.119-21) expresses surprise that Klostermann's view has not met with wide acceptance since only Nestle has followed his suggestion as to the arrangement of the text. As to why this is so see S. Lyonnet "Notes sur l'exégèse de l'épitre aux Romains" Bibl XXXVIII (1957), pp.35-61(35-40).

2. Cf. Klostermann, op.cit., pp.1.f. As to whether v.28 is to be taken with vv.29-32 as a single unit, or stand as a separate verse see Lyonnet, op. cit., pp.35.f. and J. Dupont "Le probléme de la structure littéraire de l'épitre aux Romains." RB, LXII (1955), pp.365-97(392 n.3), and A. Feuillet "Le plan salvifique de Dieu". RB, LVII (1950), pp.336-87 and 469-529(345).

3. As the title "Die adäquate Vergeltung .." suggests, Klostermann emphasizes this point. See especially pp.5-6.

4. R. Jewett states that when Paul insists that the body is the place where God's wrath is expressed he is addressing himself to Christian libertins who degrade their bodies in the same way as the heathen consigned to wrath. Paul's Anthropological Terms, p.288.
cognizance of God, God handed over to an unfit (ἀδόξιον) mind, (v.28).1

Barrett sees in the consignment of sinners to their sin a sign that the divine judgement has already broken forth.2 But in view of Cranfield's criticism of this view, we would understand the reference to mean that the gospel reveals that the consequences of sin (which already operate prior to the coming of Christ) are to be understood as God's judgement upon sin (and not simply as the result of a natural process of cause and effect).3 Verses 29-32 consist of a concluding catalogue of vices which has parallels in, and may even be based upon Hellenistic and Hellenistic-Jewish lists.4

The final verse (v.32) is particularly difficult to interpret in the context and raises fundamental questions concerning the structure, content and theme of Rom.i:18--ii:29. For the sake of clarity we will now consider these issues in more detail under several headings. The first question concerns the sources upon which Paul draws in this section and the use which he makes of them. Since the latter has specific reference to his view of natural revelation, we will investigate it in the course of our discussion of this topic.

---

1. See Barrett's translation of this verse (p.39). According to Jewett the use of ὕπο in the singular in connection with the preposition ἐν makes it clear that Paul thought of the 'reprobate mind' as a demonic, super-individual reality to which one who rejected God was given over (op.cit., p.387).
2. p.38.

What can be known of God is described as "His invisible nature, namely His eternal power and deity." The knowledge of God through nature is not used by Paul as an argument to show that any man has ever by means of this knowledge actually found God.

The reference here is to what is perceptible by the normal processes of observation and thought. The aim is to show that by "contemplating God's works, man can grasp enough of His nature to prevent him from the error of identifying any of the created things with the Creator, enabling him to keep his conception of the deity free from idolatry." There is no necessity for man to confuse the creature with the Creator, but by the fact that he has done so he has thereby rendered himself guilty - without excuse, (v.20b).

We note here a clear distinction between Paul's argument and that of the author of the Book of Wisdom, whose work Paul apparently had in mind when writing Romans i (particularly chs.xiii-xv). Paul is in basic agreement with opinions frequently expressed in contemporary literature in his belief that "idolatry and immoral life are the results of irrational and

---

1. On this see R. Bultmann, TDNT, I, p.71 and H.P. Owen "The Scope of Natural Revelation in Rom.i and Acts xvii," NTS, V (1959), pp.133-43. Owen makes a distinction between knowing God as Creator, and a knowledge of Him as an invisible eternal power of great majesty, (an emphasis entirely in keeping with the outlook of the Old Testament). Gentiles are capable of the latter but not of the former, (pp.138-41).


3. The ἔν in v.19 is taken as instrumental, Cf. Barrett, p.35.


5. Cf. Barrett's comment "Observation of created life is sufficient to show that creation does not provide the key to its own existence." (p.35).


7. Bornkamm believes that the influence of Stoic terminology and apologetic trains of thought, such as are characteristic of Hellenistic Judaism (especially the Book of Wisdom, and Philo) is so striking that one must ask the question about literary dependence. Op.cit., p.50. Cf. Lietzmann, pp.31 f.
deficient knowledge of God."¹ But although he uses the language and terminology of Hellenistic-Jewish apologetics, he uses them not as apologetic but as accusation.² This natural revelation is made by Paul the basis for the inexcusability of man.³

But although creation is the revelation of the Creator "this belief is not based in the affirmation that the 'world' itself is God's 'image', but in the fact that God has willed it so."⁴ Any revelation that man may achieve is thus to be understood as divine revelation and not as the attainment of their rational faculties.⁵ This section shows that Paul is quite willing to use the concepts of Stoic or other philosophies,⁶ but that he always adapts them to suit his own use.⁷ Hooker believes that much of the confusion that has surrounded this passage has arisen from the (incorrect) assumption that Paul

3. Bornkamm, pp.54.f.
4. Bornkamm contrasts Rom.i:19 (For what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown it to them) with the uncertain fashion in which Wisdom xiii:6.f. decides the question whether the godless world can be said to be guilty.
5. Paul's emphasis is different from that of Hellenistic doctrines of God in that he does not operate (as they do) from below to above but vice versa, cf. Bornkamm, op.cit., pp.50.f.
6. Verse 26 shows that Paul agrees with the Stoics - that certain things are unseemly. The background here is the Stoic technical term ξαθήξον describing the morally good action. When Paul enumerates the vices in vv. 25.f., he begins with those that are against nature, (vv.26-27). This probably reflects Stoic teaching on morality as based on φύσις. On this see Pohlenz, "Paulus und die Stoa." ZNW, XLII (1949), pp.69-104(80), and McKenzie, op.cit., p.6. The latter comments "The first fruits of morality based on 'Physis', Paul seems to hint, are deeds contrary to 'Physis'."
7. Cf. M. Pohlenz's conclusion on this "Paulus hat gewisse Anregungen aus der stoischen Philosophie empfangen, aber er gestaltet sie aus eigenem Geiste um, und die Innersten berühren sie kaum." op.cit., p.80.
is here affirming a belief in natural revelation.1 Barrett provides an excellent summary of this discussion in the statement "it is not Paul's intention here to establish a natural theology, nor does he create one intentionally; he is concerned with the moral principles of God's judgement and in order to vindicate these he makes use of terminology which he draws mainly from the field of Hellenistic Judaism."2

From this survey it is apparent that Paul knows and makes use of current Hellenistic and Hellenistic-Jewish literature. The fact that he has modified it to suit his own purpose has led some scholars to the view that it is basically the Old Testament which determines the course of Paul's argument in Rom.i:18.f. We must now look more closely at this possibility since the source of Paul's thought may throw light on the situation Paul addresses in this section.

Paul and Adam in Rom.i.

We have already emphasized the close parallels between certain Hellenistic literature and Rom.i:18.f. If on the other hand we emphasize the differences which we have already noted between these, then we must take into consideration the view of Hooker that Paul bases his argument in Rom.i. on the story of Adam as outlined in the early chapters of Genesis. Hooker claims that despite the numerous parallels with Wisdom the literary affinity

2. Barrett, p.35. For similar views on this subject see Bornkamm's opinion that Paul is not terribly concerned with how the knowledge of God actually occurs (op.cit.,p.54) and similarly the statement of J.L. McKenzie "It never crossed Paul's mind that the knowledge of God through the things made and the works of the Nomos written in the heart were as good as the oracles of God and the Nomos given by Moses." (op. cit., p.11). See also C.H. Dodd "Natural Law in the New Testament" included in New Testament Studies (Manchester 1967), pp.129-42.
between Rom.i:18.f. and Gen.i:20.f. shows that the decisive factor in Paul's argument in Rom.i is the Old Testament narrative of the Fall.1

Paul's thought in Rom.i:23 is apparently based on Ps.105 especially v.20 (LXX).2 The fact that Paul's version is somewhat longer than that of the LXX indicates that he has supplemented this description of idolatry from another source. This source Hooker takes to be Gen.i:20.f.3 N. Hyldahl had previously pointed out the similarity between the description of living creatures in Gen.i:20-25 and that of Paul in Rom.i.4 According to Hooker both the language, order of events and content of i:18.f. are based on the Genesis account of the Fall.5

The word παρέδωκεν around which Paul builds the latter part of Rom.i (vv.23.f.) occurs in Ps.105 v.41 (LXX). Paul uses this word to describe the judicial sentence6 which God has passed on sinful men for their idolatry, the sin which the author of the Book of Wisdom regarded as "the beginning, the cause and the end of all evil" (ch.xiv:27). The real sentence of God Paul understands to be not the one referred to in Ps.105 (LXX) but the sentence passed as a result of Adam's disobedience as described in Genesis. The παρέδωκεν of Rom.i is equivalent to the ἐξαπέστειλεν, ἐξέβαλεν of Gen.iii:23.f.7

3. Hooker emphasizes Paul's use of the word ἐξέβαλεν and regards this as a clear indication that Paul has Gen.i-iii in mind. Working on the basis of this assumption Hooker finds many parallels between these chapters.
6. "The force of παρέδωκεν is not merely permissive, through God permitting men to have their way; or privative, through His withdrawing His gracious aid; but judicial, the appropriate punishment of their defection." Sanday and Headlam, p.45.
Paul has read Ps.105 in the light of Genesis and supplemented its thought accordingly. Although it is not specifically stated in Genesis that Adam ever offered sacrifice to idols, it is true that he served the creature (i.e. the serpent) rather than the Creator (cf.v.25). By placing himself in subservience to a creature, Adam failed to exercise his God-given dominion over the creature and thus opened up the way for idolatry. Other aspects of the Genesis story fit in well with Rom.i. Adam desired to be as God, to attain knowledge of good and evil (Gen.iii:5), so that claiming to be wise he became a fool (v.21). He thereby failed to give glory to God, but according to Rabbinic tradition, he himself lost the glory of God reflected in his face. The reference to the story of Adam helps to explain the problem verse, Rom.i:32, where it is stated concerning the Gentiles who commit these sins that although they know God's decree (δικαιώματι) that those who do such things deserve to die, they not only do them but approve of those who practise them. This verse has constituted a problem in that it appears to refer to Gentiles and yet it speaks of a specific knowledge of a divine decree. The latter means that it is unlikely that the verse refers to Gentiles unless Paul means by it simply the awareness of God of which he has already spoken in vv.18.f. But if the statement is taken to refer to Adam then there is no such problem since Adam was fully aware of the commandment which he disobeyed.

Similarly the reference in v.32 to those who not only commit these sins but approve of those who practise them, has troubled commentators exceedingly. These people who approve the sins of others could conceivably

2. Ibid., p.305.
3. Ibid., p.301.
be Roman moral philosophers of a rather obtuse kind, or even libertinistic Gentile Christians. The suggestion Hooker makes is that the reference here is to Adam's tacit agreement with the action of Eve who had already eaten the forbidden fruit.

It would appear that a good case has been made for the influence of the Genesis narrative on Paul's thought. This leaves us however with the problem of accounting for the parallels with Wisdom, Stoic ideas, and other extra-biblical literature. One possibility is that Paul received some of his Old Testament teaching by way of the Book of Wisdom. We might even go so far as to claim that the influence of Stoic philosophy also came by this route. This point will be raised again after a discussion of another difficult issue in this section, i.e. the relation of ch.i to ch.ii and the place of i:32.

The Relation of Rom.i to Rom.ii with Reference to i:32.

Until recently there has been fairly widespread agreement among commentators that Rom.i:18-32 refers to God's judgement upon Gentiles. Paul intends to prove that Gentiles are sinners and that they need the salvation declared in the gospel. Ch.ii is considered in the same light with regard to the Gentiles. This view is in harmony with Paul's own summary of the theme of i:18 - iii:20, in which he states that he has "already charged that all men, both Jews and Greeks, are under the power of sin" (iii:9). The connection of v.32 with ii:1 raises a question concerning the validity of this interpretation which requires a break between the two chapters.

The η:6 with which ch.ii commences indicates that it is a continuation of i:32 and not a completely new section. Several scholars have been

so convinced that ch.ii ought to begin a new section that they have in various ways succeeded in disregarding the manner in which it is introduced.\(^1\) But to do this seems to be forcing the text to say what we wish it to say. If we accept v.1 at its face value we must connect ch.i and ch.ii. As Lietzmann states, "Wenn das διό seine logische Bedeutung behalten soll, kann zwischen ii:1 und i:32 kein Gegensatz irgendeiner Art beabsichtigt sein."\(^2\) If it is objected that grammatically it is quite possible for διό to be taken simply as a conjunctive particle then we must argue that we ought not to resort to this procedure unless attempts to explain it otherwise are unfruitful.\(^3\)

The best solution is to regard i:32b as a parenthesis and connect the particle with i:32a.\(^4\) The argument then runs like this: Men are aware of God's verdict on those who behave as described in vv.29.f., therefore they ought not to judge for in the act of judging they prove that they know what is right and prove that their sin is without excuse.\(^5\) If we accept this interpretation, we must regard ch.ii:1.f. as being addressed to Gentiles, since it is obviously the sins of Gentiles that are described in i:18.f. This conflicts with the common view that Rom.ii is addressed to Jews.

F. Flückiger has sought to overcome the problem here by claiming

---

1. Leenhardt points out that commentators in general (with Zahn as a notable exception) have not insisted on the logical relation which διό establishes between ii:1 and what precedes (p.73). (But see Barrett p.43.)
2. p.37. Lietzmann however does not accept the view we propose here, (pp.37-39).
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
that a new section addressed to Jews begins at i:32.\(^1\) In order to reconcile the fact that most commentators believe that Paul addresses Jews in ii:1 and that ii:1 follows on consecutively from i:32, Flückiger claims that it is in i:32 that Paul first turns his attention to the Jews. The \(\text{o}^\text{\iota\tau\iota\upsilon\varepsilon\varsigma}\) which introduces v.25 refers to the characteristic sins of a specific group i.e. the Gentiles and so likewise does v.32, but this time the reference is to the Jews.\(^2\) Gentiles are characterised by the sin of idolatry, Jews by the sin of transgressing the Law of God entrusted to them. The two groups are here clearly distinguished from each other by the description of their sins.\(^3\)

In favour of this view it must be acknowledged that full weight is given to the transition from i:32 to ii:1 and to the meaning of \(\text{δ}^\text{iχαλωμα}\) as the specific divine decree in the Law.\(^4\) On the other hand one cannot but feel that if Flückiger were not already persuaded that ii:1 relates to Jews, he would not be so concerned to put a break after i:31. There is very little indication in the text that this should be so and in the parallel case in v.25 the group referred to as \(\text{o}^\text{\iota\tau\iota\upsilon\varepsilon\varsigma}\) is the same group as pre-

---

2. Op.cit., pp.155-7. In support of his interpretation Flückiger makes the following points (a) The similarity in vocabulary between i:32 and ii:1-3 e.g. \(\alpha\nu\tau\iota\tau\iota\upsilon\nu\) in 32 and \(\alpha\nu\tau\iota\tau\iota\upsilon\nu\) \(\pi\rho\ amph\) and \(\tau\iota\nu\nu\ \alpha\nu\tau\iota\) in ii:1.f. (b) In i:28 the Gentiles did not see fit to acknowledge God whereas i:32.f. speaks of a definite knowledge of God (c) The parallel in Wisdom xiii - xv contains a sudden shift from Gentiles to Jews and Paul had this in mind in Rom.i:32, (d) The word \(\text{δ}^\text{iχαλωμα}\) in i:32 can only apply to the Law which Jews have and Gentiles have not (e) i:32 differs from what has preceded in that idolatry and its consequences are no longer under discussion.
4. Op.cit., p.157. P. Richardson, one of the most recent interpreters of Romans finds Flückiger's interpretation quite convincing, Israel and the Apostolic Church. SNTSMS, 10, p.137 n.2.
viously described and not a new one.\textsuperscript{1} Again it seems strange that Paul should stress so strongly the fact that he specifically addresses Jews in ii:17.f. if in fact he has already been addressing them since i:32.\textsuperscript{2}

It is also doubtful whether the parallel which Flückiger notes in Wisdom can bear as much weight as he suggests. He notes that in Wisdom xiii:1.f. the subject is the sins of the Gentiles - more specifically idolatry, whereas in Wisdom xv:1 the privilege of the Jews in their knowledge of God is described. Flückiger believes that the parallel in Wisdom gives good grounds for Paul's sudden switch from Gentiles to Jews at Rom.i:32. But if we look more closely at Wisdom, we find that ch.xv does not in fact devote the same attention to the Jews as to the Gentiles and that because of this it really does not give a good parallel to Rom.i nor a sufficient reason why Paul should change his subject with so little indication.

From this we conclude that ii:1 follows in logical sequence from i:32 and that there is insufficient reason for positing a change of addressee between chs.i:32 and ii:1. Nor do we feel that this problem is overcome by Flückiger in spite of certain advantages which his interpretation offers. But a full explanation of the reasons why we do not follow his proposal will require a discussion as to which group Paul addresses in ch.ii. This we must now investigate in our survey of ii:1-11.

\textsuperscript{1} Flückiger's interpretation follows closely on that proposed by Klostermann who writes his article with reference to Rom.i:18-31 (not 32). Lyonnet disagrees with Klostermann and feels that the result of his rearrangement of the text in Rom.i is that too much stress is placed on i:32. "Notes sur l'exégèse de l'épître aux Romains" Bibl, XXXVIII (1957) pp.35-40. Lyonnet's criticisms also apply to Flückiger's emphasis upon i:32.

\textsuperscript{2} Cf. Leenhardt, p.74.
Romans ii:1-ll.

The direct vocative ἀνηραματικός of ii:1 indicates that Paul is not merely talking in purely general terms. He is using the diatribe style but we get the impression that he has some information about certain people in Rome who are actually judging those of another group. We note here the frequent reference to judging. This emphasis has already been in evidence since i:16 in that the sins of the Gentiles are regarded as the divine judgment for disobedience. Jews were not the only people who believed that they lived a superior moral life to the lawless pagan world around them. Some philosophers of Gentile birth also led a very upright moral life and despised the degradation of contemporary pagan society. There is no necessity therefore to hold that in ii:1 Paul must be addressing Jews. That Jews and Jewish Christians were prone to judge and did in fact do so, the Pauline epistles amply illustrate, particularly Rom.xiv-xv.

It may also be granted that the passing of critical judgements upon the behaviour of the more liberal Christians by others who had scruples about certain foods etc. suggests that those judging were probably Jewish Christians. It is not certain however that this is as clear as Minear believes.

We may question whether it is correct to claim that Paul always has Jewish

4. Cf. Minear, pp.46.f. The parallel which this author notes between ii:1.f. and chs.xiv-xv is not so fanciful as might appear at first glance. In both sections there is a strong condemnation of judging which is related in both instances to the final judgement of God (cf.ii:6.f. and xiv:10.f.). This is in addition to the other parallels which Minear notes, cf. p.49.
Christians in mind when he condemns judging and whether he always intends to refer to Gentiles when he speaks of those who despise their fellow Christians. It is significant that in xiv:13 Paul exhorts Christians not to judge one another suggesting that both groups do in fact condemn each other. That Paul intends to refer to Gentiles also is made clear when he goes on to emphasize his point by stating "but rather make this simple judgement: that no obstacle or stumbling-block be placed in a brother's way." (NEB). If we wish to relate this part of v.13 to a specific group it is less likely to refer to the 'weak' Jewish Christians than to the 'strong' Gentile Christians since the danger of the latter's liberal views (all things are pure, etc. xiv:20) is that they should destroy the faith of less enlightened Christians.

On the other hand it must be acknowledged that Jewish Christians could be intended in the description of those who judge others and yet do the same themselves as set out in vv.4.f. The Jew is most likely to presume upon God's kindness, forbearance and patience (v.4) and not to realize that "the kindness of God is meant to lead to repentance"(v.5). Barrett believes that the full force of this accusation is understood only in the light of Wisdom xiv-xv. In Wisdom xiv the list of pagan vices is similar to that which Paul gives at the end of Rom.i. The next chapter (xv) commences "But thou, our God, art gracious and true, long-suffering and in mercy ordering all things. For even if we sin we are thine..."2 It is plain from these verses and their context that the Jew believes he is God's favourite. Even if he should sin, he never succumbs to the dreaded sin of idolatry, and in his opinion, in spite of his (minor) sins, he still belongs to God and is distinct from the

---

1. The words χρηστός and μικρόθυμος in Wisdom xv also occur in Rom.ii:4.
2. Cf. Barrett, p.44.
pagan world. He looks forward to the day of God's wrath quite assured that it is destined for others but not for him. 1

But if we allow that Paul addresses himself to Jews from i:32.f., then it would appear that he intends to deal very severely with them. This is indicated by the recurrence of the word ἀναπολύγητος in ii:1. 2 In i:20 the same word was first used to describe the Gentiles. Jews would agree that God's judgement rightly falls on such people (ii:2). This every Jew (and possibly every Christian) ought to know. 3 According to this interpretation Paul has been laying a trap for the Jew. 4 He describes the sins of the Gentiles and gives the normal verdict from Jewish teaching about such things. The Jewish audience heartily endorses all that Paul has said up to this point. 5 But to their surprise he now reverses the roles and claims that the Jews also are without excuse since they know God's judgement, consent to it and yet do the same things themselves. The latter does not imply that the Jews worship idols of wood and stone as the Gentiles do. Paul means that in the very act of judging (ἐν θυσίας ii:1) the judge commits the same

1. Cf. Barrett, p.44. Barrett suggests that Paul subtly inverts the common belief that the wicked receive their rewards in this life and punishment in the next, whereas the good receive their punishment now and rewards later. Paul claims that the Jews are now being spared from God's judgement in order that they may receive their full share of wrath hereafter.

2. These are the only occurrences of this word in the New Testament, cf. Minear, p.48. Pohlenz notes this connection between chs.i and ii, and also the reference to the revelation of wrath in i:18 and ii:5, op.cit., p.73.

3. Paul frequently uses οὐσιωθεὶς Σέ to refer to generally accepted (Christian) truth, cf. on vi:3.f. (pp.71-2).


5. Ibid., Minear suggests that Paul deliberately uses the form and vocabulary of traditional attacks on idolatry with which they were familiar. His catalogue of vices were those which spokesmen of the synagogues had long employed.
There are several reasons however why we do not believe that Paul intends to speak specifically to the Jews in ii:1-ff. We have already indicated the problem of the logical connection between ii:1 and i:32. In addition to this the laying of a trap specifically for Jews\(^2\) (and not for Gentiles) early in the letter does not fit in well with the overall emphasis and tone of the letter. As we have previously noted from ch.i Paul is most tactful and cautious in his approach to the Roman Christians. In chs.ix-xi he shows extreme concern for the future of unbelieving Israel and in chs.xiv-xv he seeks to protect a minority of weak Jewish Christians from a proud Gentile Christian majority. If Romans were specifically intended to be an anti-Jewish document, then it would be quite fitting for ii:1-ff. to be addressed only to the Jews; but since this view of Romans cannot possibly be sustained in a letter which emphasizes "To the Jew first" we must reconsider our interpretation of this point.

Proceeding on the basis that ch.ii connects directly to ii:32 we would maintain that the group spoken of in ch.i is still in view in ii:1-ff. If this group is obviously Gentile as is indicated by the sins described, then Gentiles must also be included in ii:1-ff. The view proposed here is that ii:1-ii is addressed to those judging themselves to be morally superior to ordinary sinful men. Those judging are not exclusively of Jewish origin, but may also be pagan moral philosophers.\(^3\)

The view that ii:1-ff. is not specifically addressed to the Jew has

---

1. Cf. Barrett, p.44.
2. Contra Minear, p.48; Jewett, p.442.
been increasingly recognized in the more recent studies of Romans. M. Barth goes further and suggests that all of i:18 - ii:16 is quite general and not specifically to Jews or Gentiles. But this is to overlook the particular reference to Jews and Gentiles in ii:9-11. We agree with Barth that Rom.i:18.f. is addressed to all men and not just man in the abstract - it is specifically addressed to Gentiles and Jews and (ii:1.f.) those within those groups who look down on their fellow men. We might describe the latter more specifically as those who make distinctions (cf. ii:11, iii:22). Three groups may be discerned among those who emphasized in what respects they differed from their fellows. Jews and Jewish Christians emphasized their

1. Cf. this interpretation owes much to the work of W.J. Schniewind who pointed out that Paul possibly addresses himself in ii:1.f. to the view of popular Stoic philosophy derived from Wisdom xv. Schniewind believes that Paul may have thought of Jews and Stoics as a similar religious type. Cf. "Diktate zum Römerbrief," p.3 as quoted by H.W. Bartsch in "Die historische Situation des Römerbriefes" SEv IV, TU 102, (1968), p.286 n.3. Barrett has followed the outline of Rom.i:18 - ii:29 originally suggested by Schniewind i.e. i:18-32 Judgment and the Gentile; ii:1-11 Judgement and the Critic; ii:12-16 Conscience; ii:17-29 Judgement and the Jew; (cf. Bartsch, op.cit., p.286 n.3). Michel describes ii:1-16 as "Der Richter und der Massstab des Gerichts" (p.73); similarly Schmidt, "Der entscheidende Massstab beim Endgericht" (p.41). The latter provides a good survey of the various interpretations of ii:1.f.

L. Goppelt holds that i:18 - ii:16 describes both the amoral and the moral man, the first living in a relationship to God by nature, the second by retributive justice, Jesus Paul and Judaism, p.137. Leenhardt stresses that mankind is addressed in i:18.f. and natural man in ii:12, and that if ii:1.f. is taken to refer to Jews, this section becomes an intrusion in the context. In addition he finds that the vocabulary of this section is not typical of that which Paul uses when he normally addresses Jews and that ii:1.f. would duplicate what is stated in ii:17.f. if it is regarded as addressed to Jews (p.74). In a recent article on Romans, J.P. Martin regards i:18-32 as addressed to the Greek religious type, man without special revelation, and ii:1.f. as addressed to the Jewish religious type, man with special revelation. "The Kerygma of Romans" Int, XXV (1971), pp.303-28(311). 


superior standing over lawless Gentiles and Gentile Christians. The latter emphasized their intellectual ability and their culture over these Oriental barbarians. It seems that a third group also existed, those who prided themselves on the moral quality of their life and their superiority over their fellows.\(^1\) Perhaps we ought not to regard these as three separate groups of people, since the groups we have described probably overlapped. In fact one gets the impression that Paul deliberately blurs the accepted distinctions between the different groups just to show how irrelevant they are in the light of the gospel.\(^2\) As Flückiger states "Indem er Heiden und Juden gleichermassen als 'Menschen unter dem Zorn Gottes' zeichnet, zeigt er, dass der Unterschied zwischen beiden von Gott nicht entscheidend ist."\(^3\)

What is decisive is not the distinction that men make among nations but the distinctions which God makes. This is how Paul combats the problem of the differing consciences of Christians in xiv:1.f. and this is the answer that he also supplies here. The judgement of God is the only judgement that Christians should be concerned about and this is made on the basis of obedience and not on favouritism. This is the point of ii:9.f. There will be tribulation and distress for every human being (πᾶσιν ψυχήν ἀνθρώπου) who does evil. God's judgement is not partial (v.11) neither is it racial.\(^4\) God is no respecter of persons and where men are obedient to Him and do good their reward will be glory and honour and peace (v.10).

For those with greater knowledge of God's will who continue in disobedience,

---

1. Cf. Paul's references to "all nations" in i:5, to "Greeks and to barbarians", "to the wise and the foolish" ii:14, all ungodliness and wickedness of men i:18, man ii:1, all flesh iii:20, all men and one man Adam v:12.f., and (possibly) Adam in Rom.i:18.f. and Rom.vii:7.f.
3. Ibid.
God's impartial judgement will fall even more severely and that which could have been their advantage will in fact become their judgement. By the repetition of the phrase "to the Jew first and also to the Greek", Paul reverses what may have appeared to be a racial advantage into what seems exactly the opposite. But Paul does not mean to be a racialist in any sense of the term. He wants to draw attention away from such judgements to the way God judges.

Paul has now reached a high point in the discussion begun at i:18. One stage has been completed in the course of the argument which will eventually introduce in iii:21.f. the exposition of God's grace as revealed in the Christ-event. Since this discussion is both preceded and succeeded by an emphasis upon the grace of God in the gospel, it is unlikely that Paul will say anything in it which does not harmonize with the context. If we bear this in mind, it will be easier to understand what Paul means to say and what he does not mean to say. We should therefore regard his references to doing good and seeking honour etc. as a paraphrase for obedience to God and they should not be understood as an alternative to the obedience of faith.¹

His argument is specifically designed to refute the opinions of those who emphasized human distinctions among men. Paul states that he is not ashamed of the gospel because it overcomes all unimportant distinctions among men and brings to light those which are really decisive. By the repetition of the phrase "to the Jew first" Paul relates back to i:16. There the subject was the relation of Jew and Gentile in the gospel, here it is the same with regard to the final judgement. His argument has come full circle. It is an example of 'Ringkomposition' whereby the section concludes with the theme with which it began, thereby indicating the rounding off of the

enclosed portion as a completed argument.\(^1\) As Barrett notes "the analysis of works presupposed by vv.7.f. has the important consequence of dissolving the barrier between Jew and Gentile"\(^2\) This same function, we believe is attributable to the next short section, vv.12-16 and the longer one which follows it, vv.17-29.

**Rom. ii:12-16.**

In these verses Paul turns to look more closely at the religious differences between Jew and Gentile rather than the more ethnic concern evidenced by the phrase "Jew and Greek".\(^3\) Jews could quite rightly object that the real difference between Jew and Gentile is the revelation of God, the possession of the Law. Paul takes up this point and uses it in the same drastic way as when he reversed the phrase "the Jew first" and applied it to judgement as well as salvation. First of all he says "All who have sinned without the Law will also perish without the Law" (v.12a). To this the self-righteous Jew might have given a ready assent. But Paul immediately removes all opportunity to gloat over other men's sins by continuing "and all who have sinned under the Law will be judged by the Law", (v.12b). "What the Jew had to learn was that 'the Law' is not a talisman calculated to preserve those who possess it. It is an instrument of judgement and sin is not less sin, but more, when it is wrought within the sphere of the Law".\(^4\) The mere possession of the Law is not something which one can boast of (v.23) since it is not the hearers of the Law who are righteous before God but the doers of the Law who will be justified (v.13). We note in passing that the references to being

\(^1\) Cf. Pohlenz, pp.73-74.  
\(^2\) p.47.  
\(^3\) Cf. Pohlenz, p.74; Barrett, p.49.  
\(^4\) Barrett, p.49.
righteous before God and being justified arise from the discussion of the
difference between Jew and Gentile, and the Law in particular.

The reference to Gentiles who do not have the Law and yet do by nature
what the Law requires (v.14) is introduced in the same way as the three pre-
ceding verses by γὰρ. This indicates that v.14 is also part of this chain
sequence of verses in which each is either confirmed or elucidated by the one
following. The connection with what precedes is indicated by the fact that
the νοῦς of v.14 takes up again the νοησις of v.13. Thus Paul's
avowed intention is not to confirm a doctrine of natural revelation but to
emphasize to the Jews that possession of the Law is not enough; in good Old
Testament fashion he reminds the Jews that it is the doing of the Law that
is required.

But it would appear from v.15 that Paul intends by his reference to
the conscience to show that Gentiles also are responsible human beings, that
they sometimes do the things which the Law requires, and hence there is for
them as well as for the Jews the possibility of sin and judgement. Here
Paul's intention is not to confirm the virtue of the Gentiles but rather the

---

1. It is possible that Paul refers here not simply to Gentiles, but to
Gentile Christians, cf. Barth, p.36. The type of argument Paul uses
here however does not necessarily require that this should be so.
Cf. Leenhardt's criticism of this view (p.83). B. Reicke holds that
Paul allows for the possibility but not the actuality of a natural theo-
logy, op.cit., p.165.
3. Cf. Pohlenz's comment on the same kind of warning to the Jew in v.27-
"Diese scharfe Warnung an die Juden ist das Ziel, den die ganze Erörter-
zung zustrebt, und der Abschnitt über die Heiden, den er v.14-16 voraus-
schickt, ist nur als Gegenbild gemeint." op.cit., p.75.
4. G. Schrenk claims that although the Gentiles do not know the δικαιο-
ma they may still be able to keep some of the δικαιωματα. Cf. TDNT, II,
p.221.
5. Barrett points out that although the Gentile is outside the sphere of
the Law of Moses he is not really outside the sphere of law, (p.51).
justice of God's judgement over them.¹

The reference to the Gentiles as being a Law unto themselves and as doing by nature what the Law requires has close parallels in Stoic thought. Hellenistic Judaism had gone so far as to relate the Stoic concept of natural Law and the revealed Law of God, the latter being the supreme expression of the former.² In his understanding of conscience Paul differs from the Stoics and Philo who often described the conscience as an accuser or convictor. Paul understands it as a witness.³ For Paul the conscience is an independent witness⁴ the existence of which is additional proof that the Gentiles have the Law and are therefore justly subject to judgement.⁵ It is on the note of judgement that this short section ends at v.l6 where Paul refers to the final judgement when God will judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ.⁶

In this section Paul's intention is to show that in spite of the difference which the possession of the Law appears to make between Jew and Gentile, this still does not invalidate his thesis that before God there is no distinction between them. He endeavours to level out the difference that exists between Jew and Gentile⁷ "by demonstrating the different ground of judgement for those who have a superior revelation and those who are

4. According to Paul the conscience is independent not only from the person but also is distinguishable from his thoughts acting independently even from his heart, cf. Jewett, op.cit., p.444. See also Jewett's survey of the interpretation of v.15 in relation to the working of the conscience, (pp.442-5).
6. On the problem of v.16 cf. Barrett, p.53; Pohlenz, p.79.
7. Cf. Müller, p.80; Michel, p.73.
lacking it.\footnote{1} Since the divine judgements are based on moral principles\footnote{2} there can be no such thing as racial discrimination with God.\footnote{3}

Once again it is clear that in this section Paul uses the terminology and concepts of Stoic philosophy.\footnote{4} But again we note that he has used them for his own purpose and not allowed them to determine his thought. The significance of Paul's use of traditional statements from other sources e.g. the Jewish missionary preaching and the book of Wisdom in i:18-32, and these frequent parallels with Stoic philosophy, will be discussed after the next section.

---

1. Richardson, op.cit., p.137.
Romans ii:17-29.

We come now to a section which commentators generally agree may correctly be called "Judgement and the Jew". More positively we may see the theme here as 'the true Jew'. Possibly Paul has this contrast in mind when he speaks to those who bear the name 'Jew'. If one bears this name then to be consistent a certain course of behaviour ought to follow. If in fact this does not follow then those who boast in the name they bear are judged because they are not really what they profess to be. Such seems to be the argument in this section.

We note that the picture of the Jew in vv.17.f. is a rather idealized one, at least it gives a very good picture of that which the self-righteous Jew fancied himself to be. He enjoys the title 'Jew', trusts in the Law and boasts in God. This reference to boasting in God is probably to be taken as slightly ironic or else it is to be understood as the Jew's own estimation of his religious life since, in actual practice he tended to boast in the Law (v.23) and in the works of the Law (cf. iv:1.f.), but not in God. Properly understood the Law is not something to trust in or boast about as it will accuse the Jew before God who will judge all improper boasting.

The Jew is also convinced that he knows the will (i.e. will of God) and is able to approve what is excellent because he is instructed in the Law (v.18). He is confident that he is a guide to the blind, a light to those who sit in darkness, a corrector of the foolish and a teacher of children (vv.19-20). All this self-confidence arises from one source, at the mention

1. E.g. Barrett, p.54.
2. Cf. Paul's references to true Christian boasting in v:2,3,11. It is most significant that immediately after the reference to the redemptive work of Christ in iii:21.f. Paul says in iii:27 - "then what becomes of our boasting?"
of which Paul concludes rather abruptly the list of the Jew's self-attributed epithets. This source is the belief of the Jew that in the Law he possesses "the embodiment of knowledge and truth", (v.20). Here the Law is thought of as a concrete entity the mere possession of which is a security against judgement. In Paul's view quite the reverse is true. But he does not say so directly. He refutes the proud self-confidence of Judaism not by changing the subject but by heightening the demands of the Law. By so doing he again shows that those very things which set the Jew apart (ii:17-23) become a judgement to him and a cause of offence to others when misused.

By a radical interpretation of the Law's demands Paul seeks to show in vv.21-23 that the Jew is guilty of the very sins he preaches against. Thus he accuses the Jew of theft, adultery and sacrilege. Israel has robbed God of the honour due to Him (cf. Mal.iii:8.f.). As in Old Testament times, Israel can be said to have committed adultery by being unfaithful to God. They who so abhor idols have idolized themselves. Because of all this transgression of the Law those who boast in the Law are actually dishonouring God and as a result "The name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles...." 

1. Cf. Barth, p.37. Barth states that the fault of the Jews was that "they did not realize that they possessed only the form of knowledge and truth and not these themselves... For Jesus Christ is knowledge and truth, the essence and the sum total of the Law." (Ibid).
3. Cf. Barrett, pp.56-57. Barrett is correct not to take these sins literally. If Jews only occasionally did these things this would destroy the force of Paul's argument completely and in any case it is simply not true that the average Jewish missionary acted in this way (p.56). See also Barth, p.37.
4. In this verse Paul follows the LXX text of Is.liii:5, but he makes a shift in meaning away from the original reference. The Isaiah text refers to the time of the Babylonian captivity when God's name was despised among the Gentiles because fortune had turned against the Israelites and it looked as if their God had failed. Here God's name is blasphemed because of the failure of the Jews themselves to observe the Law. On this see J.A. Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament." NTS, VII (1960/61), pp.297-333(324) and B. Lindars New Testament Apologetic London 1961, p.22.
In a closing paragraph (vv.25-29) Paul turns to one other distinction in which the Jews might have boasted - that of circumcision. A point that is often overlooked here is that Paul's first comment upon circumcision is a favourable one. He begins "circumcision indeed is of value if you obey the Law" (v.25). It may be objected that Paul is only speaking hypothetically here assuming that no one does in fact keep the Law. This does not remove his favourable reference to the rite and may at least be taken as evidence that Paul would only oppose circumcision if it were being used legalistically as a means of winning favour before God. As at so many other points in the letter, Paul's attitude towards Judaism is never merely negative. The stance Paul adopts here probably indicates that circumcision was not in danger of being regarded as necessary for salvation among the Roman Christians. Rather it probably indicates that it was considered as one item in a general list of attributes of things Jewish which distinguished them from Gentiles.

But circumcision is only of value if one keeps the Law - it is not an automatic benefit of itself. If this condition is not met, it becomes the same as uncircumcision. Once again Paul succeeds in blurring the distinctions which Jews considered set them apart from Gentiles. Verse 26 continues in this vein. When an uncircumcised Gentile keeps the precepts of the Law his uncircumcision is reckoned as circumcision.

---

1. On this see Str/Bill. IV, pp.31-40.
4. In the parallel case in vv.14.f. we have ὄντωσι (when), not ἕως, and we understand this verse (v.26) in the same way, cf. Pohlenz, op.cit., p.75; Barrett, p.58.
5. On λοιπὸν see Heidland TDNT, IV, pp.284-92. This is a very significant word in Romans. Here it refers to God's estimate (or counting) of circumcision as distinct from what men think (or count) it to be.
Paul's point is that "what circumcision is thought to produce is actually available to the man who is not circumcised". The man who is reckoned as righteous (or as truly circumcised) is not ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Ἰουδαίος but ἐν τῷ χρυσῷ Ἰουδαίος (v.28). The true Jew is not one who is circumcised in the flesh, but in the heart (v.29). The latter inward or heart-circumcision can only be performed by God Himself and thus emphasizes man's dependence and the need for faith.

What Paul has done here is to loose the concepts of Jew and circumcision from the Jewish understanding of them. He wishes to interpret them eschatologically so that they are no longer fixed entities but fluid concepts. The result is that the true Jew may in fact actually be a Gentile.

In the same radical vein, Paul goes on to claim that the Gentile who is physically uncircumcised but keeps the precepts of the Law, will actually judge circumcised Jews, (v.27). The reference to Gentiles ἐὰν φόροις uncircumcised reminds us of vv.14.f. Once again we note the oscillation between Jew and Gentile and the blurring of the traditional distinctions.

---

1. Richardson, p.136. Paul's radical interpretation of the Law is vastly different from that of contemporary Judaism, cf. Michel, pp.86.f.
2. The contrast between ἐν σωφρί and ἐν πνεύματι sets the tone for the polemic in Romans whereby flesh gets associated with the letter of the Law and that which is outwardly visible in contrast to the Spirit which works invisibly cf. Jewett, p.139. See also Käsemann, "Geist und Buchstabe" PP (1969), pp.237-85.
3. On the Old Testament background for circumcision of the heart and circumcision being reckoned as uncircumcision, see especially Deut.x:16, Jer. iv:14, ix:25. For other references see Richardson p.139 n.2.
4. Cf. Jewett, p.333, who holds that the χαράδρα is thought as the centre of man which is encountered by God. See also Michel, p.93.
5. Whilst we emphasize this aspect here, we do not agree with those who seem to believe that eschatological Israel is completely distinct from historical Israel. See the discussion of this in connection with chs. ix-xi (pp.335-6).
between them. Richardson notes the stages in the development of Paul's argument in vv. 23-29. First he (Paul) limits the advantage of circumcision by showing the need to keep the Law; then he shows the effect of not keeping the Law and finally he opens up the term 'circumcision' to include the un-circumcised. 

Richardson concludes "the end result of this dual movement of closing down and opening up the category 'Israelite', under the guise of the term 'circumcision' is that the single criterion of belonging to God's people is now the receptivity of one's heart to the work of the Spirit." 

In the last part of this statement Richardson has anticipated a later stage in the development of Paul's argument which is first introduced in ch. viii. To be more exact we should describe Paul's emphasis here as being that there is no racial discrimination with God, that the word Jew is not a racial word at all, but signifies one who keeps the Law. 

Richardson is correct however in that Paul's statement really does presuppose the argument in chs. iii:21-viii:29. 'Keeping the Law' implies faith and reliance on the power of the Holy Spirit, the ground of both these being the Christ event. But the discussion of 'the true Jew' would not be complete without reference

1. Barrett states that Paul continues to give great significance to words like 'Jew' and 'circumcision' but with him they require new definitions (p.59).
to those who actually bear the name 'Jew' and this subject Paul mentions initially in iii:1-9, thereby indicating his intention to deal with it more fully at a later stage, in chs.ix-xi.

1. 'Ἰουδαίος is restricted to chs.i-iii except for ix:25 and x:12 in formulae borrowed from chs.i-iii. In chs.ix-xi Paul normally uses the term 'Israel' rather than 'Jew'. This signifies the different level on which the discussion is carried on in the latter section. In ix-xi Paul considers the Jewish people not as a distinct race but as that people to whom God chose to reveal Himself, hence the religious term 'Israel' rather than the ethnic 'Jew'. Cf. P. Richardson, op.cit., p.138 n.1. L. Goppelt notes that Paul does not normally refer to himself as a Jew; if he does so he qualifies the statement as in Gal.ii:15 - 'Jew by birth'. But even as a Christian Paul can still continue to call himself 'a Hebrew' (Phil.iii:5; II Cor.xi:22) as a child of a Jewish-Palestinian family, and an 'Israelite' (II Cor.xi:22; Rom.xi:1; cf. Phil.iii:5) as a member of the nation standing within God's covenant. Cf. Jesus, Paul and Judaism, pp.135-6.
The Situation to which Rom.i:18-ii:29 appears to be addressed.

We have already acknowledged the possibility that this section may be simply a theoretical argument with no particular reference to an actual situation in Rome. It may be purely hypothetical. From the survey of this section it must be granted that basically it does have the character of a reasoned argument which has as its main function the purpose of repudiating the view that normal human distinctions among men are relevant in salvation. Positively we may summarize Paul's argument as being to show that there is no distinction, and that Jew and Greek are equal before God in the face of the gospel.

But the connections we have noted between this section and chs.xiv-xv suggest that Paul was not being purely theoretical in his discussion at this point. The parallel between the discussion of the true Jew in ii:25.f. and chs.ix-xi is too strong to be dismissed as coincidence. If chs.ix-xi refer to an actual situation in Rome (as we believe they do) this means that at least part of chs.i:18-ii:29 is related to this situation.

Our conclusion at this stage is that although Paul follows through a theological argument to show that there is no distinction, he does so in the light of a situation at Rome where such distinctions were being stressed to the detriment of the Christian community. We believe that this understanding helps to explain the use of Stoic terminology and traditional Jewish repentance preaching.

1. Richardson regards chs.i-iv as a statement of theoretical and theological first principles, (p.126).
2. Cf. Lietzmann, p.40. Bornkamm (op.cit. p.65 n.6) notes Schlatter's argument with Ritschl on this interpretation.
Bornkamm understands Paul's procedure in this way, "Paul in the first part (i:18.f.) frees the natural understanding of God and the world from its Greek presuppositions through specific Jewish terms and thoughts, and again in the second part bursts the boundaries of the Jewish understanding of law and judgement through the reference to the law that the Gentiles know..."¹ Paul does not try to prove that there is no distinction by ignoring the actual facts of the situation in which glaring differences of culture and outlook are manifest. Instead he uses the terms and traditions of both Jew and Gentile and shows that in the light of the gospel their greatest distinctions are not really decisive. By his declaration of God's judgement upon Gentiles, Jews and moralists, he shows that none of these has any cause to boast before God. By dealing separately with the outlook and practice of different groups (even if he does so in the rather stereotyped pictures which we find in this section), Paul has sought to show that it is not one's past, whether Jewish or Gentile, which is decisive for Christian life, but one's present obedience to the divine demand.²

From this it would appear that Paul intends to prevent Gentiles from boasting in their pre-Christian culture and Jews from glorying in their pre-Christian understanding of the Law and circumcision.

The other possibility is that by describing the sins of the past (the 'then' of the Christian life), Paul intends to lead the Romans to repentance in the present (the 'now' of the Christian life). Being made aware

---

of God's judgement upon their past, Christians will be prevented from glorying in it and be led to rejoice in the grace of God in the present whereby Jew and Gentile are called into one community in Christ. Paul's emphasis is ably described by Marxsen in the statement "From the standpoint of the new aeon the Jew (in the former aeon) has no advantage over the Gentile (in the former aeon)." In Paul's view it is just as meaningless for Gentile Christians to boast over their Hellenistic cultural heritage as it is for Jewish Christians to boast in the Law and circumcision. In the new light of the Christ-event all the past must submit to a fresh evaluation, and hence the emphasis upon judgement in the gospel.

From this investigation into the situation which Paul apparently addresses in Rom.i:18.f. one notable fact emerges. In his approach Paul reveals a clear awareness of the deep distinctions between Jews and Gentiles; yet at the same time it is plain that he wishes to draw attention away from these and to emphasize the equality of all men before the righteous judgement of God. We feel that this seemingly contradictory approach can be adequately explained only by positing the existence of the sort of situation depicted in Rom.xiv-xv.

If some such division did exist in Rome, this would help us to under-

stand Paul's reference to Abraham as "the father of us all" (iv:16.) \(^1\) It would also account for the frequency of reference to all men both Jews and Greeks and the strong emphasis on the impartiality of God. \(^2\) The latter emphasis would in turn help to explain why Paul feels obliged to discuss the priority of Israel \(^3\) which is introduced immediately after this section in iii:1f. and is fully dealt with in chs.ix-xi. As Paul understands it, the gospel reveals God's judgement upon Israel's sin and to this extent it is a factor producing discontinuity in Israel's history. But since God's present judgement does not annul but actually confirm His (previous) grace to Israel, in this respect the gospel brings out the continuity of God's grace to Israel and confirms the validity of her election. This interpretation has the merit of connecting Rom.i-iv, ix-xi, and xiv-xv.

---

1. This might also suggest an explanation of Paul's use of the diatribe style in Romans. As a Jew he demonstrates to Gentiles that he is not unaware of their cultural heritage.
3. "Paul's aim is to bring about peace in a church in which there is tension between the weak and the strong because they are divided over the Jewish question and it is to this situation that he addresses himself." Marxsen, op.cit., p.103.
Paul's Use of Questions and Objections in the Construction of Romans.

In a very instructive article on the thought sequence in the Pauline letters, Jeremias draws attention to the frequent objections that intrude into the course of the argument in the letter to the Romans.¹ Jeremias considers that in these objections we get a picture of Paul in his missionary activity. Paul preaches to Jews who at first listen to him but who soon refuse to allow him to proceed with such teaching. He is interrupted; objections and protests come in from all sides. We feel that we are in the midst of a lively discussion, and we can almost feel the hot breath of the participants on our cheeks. A letter with such content cannot possibly be a dogmatic treatise. It has more the character of a living letter - as Jeremias puts it, "Dieser Brief ist in ersten elf Kapiteln nicht eine dogmatische Abhandlung, sondern ein Sendschreiben, das erwachsen ist aus einem vielfach geführten Dialogus um Judaeis."²

We are in accord with Professor Jeremias' emphasis upon the living missionary character of the Roman letter. We would agree with him that many of these objections may recall Paul's frequent discussions with Jews. But we must stress that it is quite possible for Paul to use material from actual discussions in his previous missionary experience without necessarily addressing the same type of audience (i.e. Jews) or using it in the same context (i.e. of Law versus Gospel).³ This becomes particularly relevant in

---

¹ Zur Gedankenführung in den paulinischen Briefen. SP, Haarlem 1953, p.146.
³ Bornkamm notes that many of the topics listed in Romans have already been discussed in other letters. He believes however that the treatment is different in that the original opponents are now no longer visible and the sense of urgency is lacking. But we cannot find any real evidence for Bornkamm's claim that what Paul had previously stated in concrete situations is now systematically stated in a letter which was to become the final statement of his theology. Paulus, (Kohlhammer 1969), pp.110.f. and Geschichte und Glaube, 2, BEvTh 53 (München 1971), pp.120.f.
any comparison of Romans and Galatians. Paul may have used certain material in relation to the problems in the church in Galatia, but the fact that he uses similar material in Romans does not mean that he fights the same opponents or speaks in the same angry tone of Galatians.² It is easy to consider Romans merely as a larger and later edition of Galatians without noting in which respects the similarities are offset by the differences. It is only as we appreciate these differences that we can properly evaluate the specific contribution of Romans.²

Jeremias sees in the objections a clue to the understanding of the thought sequence of the letter. He notes that Paul deliberately interrupts his proceedings with these objections. In fact the thought sequence of Rom. i-xi is determined by these objections and the answers occupy the greater part of these chapters.³ If this thought pattern is basic to the structure of Rom.i-xi, perhaps it may be possible by a fuller study of Paul's use of these objections throughout the letter to arrive at the central theme which these objections are designed to serve.⁴


2. The danger of interpreting terms without proper reference to their original context or with reference to an artificial context (created by the lexicographer's compilation of the various occurrences of the term) has been high-lighted by J. Barr's study The Semantics of Biblical Language. (See especially pp.206.f.). The merit of Barr's work is that it has led some scholars to develop a new methodology in New Testament research. This new approach is well exemplified by R. Jewett's recent book Paul's Anthropological Terms. Jewett first of all investigates the term in the context of each letter in which it occurs before seeking to understand its significance in Pauline theology.


4. Dupont considers that chs.vi-xi can be viewed as the answer to three questions set out in vi:1; vii:7; ix:14 respectively. Cf. "Le problème de la structure littéraire de l'épitre aux Romains." RB, LXII (1955), pp.365-97(388/9).
Jeremias notes a certain pattern of phraseology in the use of the objections. They are usually introduced by τὴν ἐποιμὴν (iii:5; iv:1; vi:1; vii:7; viii:31; ix:14,30). Paul recoils with deep loathing from the objections put forward. How could anyone infer such a thing—μὴ γένοιτο. This is his normal response to these perverse opinions, and it recurs in iii:4,6, 31; vi:2,15; vii:7,13; ix:14; xi:1,11. Jeremias also lists a number of objections introduced by the phrase τὸ σῶν. We find these in iii:1, iii:9, vi:15, xi:7. Some phrases do not fit so clearly into these patterns and yet, despite the linguistic differences, in content and usage they serve much the same purpose. We note here iii:27 ποῦ σῶν and xi:1 and xi:11 λέγω σῶν. Less definite in form but having the same function are those questions such as τὸ σῶν ἐγνωσόν (vii:13) and ἔρεις μοι σῶν (ix:19).

In a few places Jeremias believes that Paul is answering objections which are not specifically mentioned in the text itself i.e. in v:20, where Paul claims that the Law was only an interim measure in the Adam-Christ 'Heilsgeschichte', serving the increase of sin. This may have been Paul's answer to an unspoken objection—τὸ σῶν δὲ νόμος; (cf. Gal.iii:19). A previous objection may also be posited at iv:1-2; this was probably that Abraham was justified on the ground of his works and hence a contradiction of Paul's views on salvation. Paul refutes this by quoting from the scriptural account of Abraham. Another objection may be understood behind viii:18 where the question may have been "Does suffering not destroy the certainty of salvation?" This is probably related to the objection the content of which is indicated by πρὸς ταῦτα (viii:31).² The next section ix-xi be-

2. Ibid.
gins with what seems to be a criticism of Paul himself - "You are a traitor to your own people."¹

We note that there are none of these objections in chs.i-ii. If Jeremias is correct in his proposals concerning hidden objections, we may assume that there is one objection implied in each of chs.iv, v and viii.² The objections are more numerous in chs.iii, vi-vii, ix and xi. The greatest number of objections occurs in ch.iii (vv.1,3,5,7,8,9,27,31) and to a lesser extent in ch.ix (vv.1,6,14,19,30). These sections have a definite argumentative style. This is very different from the kerygmatic or declarative style which we find in passages such as iii:21-26. In fact Rom.i-xi may be divided up into alternating sections on the basis of style i.e. argumentative and kerygmatic.³ It seems to us that these sections which are described as kerygmatic have been traditionally regarded as the more

---

2. Jeremias suggests that there may be 'hidden' objections behind iv:2, v:20 and viii:18 (and possibly ix:1), op.cit., p.148.
3. The differing styles have also been noted by H.E. Stoessel ("Notes on Romans xii:1-2". Int, XVII (1963), pp.161-175). Stoessel notes that in some sections declarative verbs control the tone, whereas other sections are dominated by questions. Which passages are declarative and which are argumentative becomes evident when the incidence of questions is charted. Stoessel sets out his chart (p.168) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Number of Questions</th>
<th>Type of Passage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i:18-32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii:1-iii:8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Argumentative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii:9-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii:21-26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii:27-iv:25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Argumentative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v:1-21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi-vii</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Argumentative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii:1-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii:31-39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Argumentative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix-xi</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Argumentative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
important parts of the letter and the argumentative sections as somewhat secondary. In view of the content of these objections, however, we must be careful to maintain an open mind in determining what is primary for the understanding of the original purpose of the letter. In order to obtain a clearer picture of the content of these objections the themes which they deal with will be listed as follows:

The priority of the Jews, (iii:1,2,9).
The faithfulness of God and the unbelief of the Jews, (iii:3).
The right of God to punish those whose evil actions He uses for His own glory, (iii:5-7; ix:14,19).
Is God the God of Jews only? (iii:29).
The place of boasting and the significance of Abraham, (iii:27; iv:1.f.).
Continuing in sin and the increase of grace, (iii:8; iv:1,15).
The rejection of the Jews, (xi:1,11).

This list reveals that the themes of these objections are substantially those of the whole letter.

Our next task is to make a more thorough investigation of a typical argumentative section with a view to discovering its relative importance within the context of the total letter.
We have already drawn attention to Paul's frequent use of questions and objections in Romans. The purpose of this study is to consider what particular use Paul makes of the question-objection method in the structure and thought sequence of chapters vi and vii. By keeping in mind in our survey of the letter the pattern which we discover to be operative in these chapters, it may be possible for us to obtain a clearer picture of the structure and thought sequence of the whole letter. The reason for selecting chapters vi and vii as an example of Paul's method is that these chapters form a reasonably compact and self-contained unit where Paul's usage of questions and objections appears to be systematic and is clearly discernible.

Romans vi:1-14.

Chapter v ends on the theme of the victorious reign of grace in righteousness, resulting in eternal life. Ch. vi begins with the question τί οὖν ἐρωτήματι; as we have already discovered Paul often uses this phrase in Romans to introduce the repudiation of wrong inferences from his teaching. We note how closely Paul's style here resembles that of the diatribe in that the progress of his argument is interrupted by frequent objections in the form of false deductions from his previous statements.2

1. Cf. N.A. Dahl, "Two Notes on Romans v." STh, V-VI (1951/52), p.40. Dahl regards chs.vi and vii as the answers to questions which might be raised concerning sin (vi:1,15) and the Law (vii:7,13). Together they form a useful 'digression' from the theme of ch.v which is continued in ch.viii. Michel and Dupont also agree on this view of vi and vii in opposition to that proposed by Nygren who relates chs.vi and vii equally to ch.v and viii in the rather artificial scheme: Ch.v - "Free from Wrath", ch.vi - "Free from Sin", ch.vii - "Free from the Law", ch.viii - "Free from Death". (p.38).

2. R. Bultmann, Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe. (Göttingen 1910), p.11.
These deductions are to be considered false, not because they have no logical connection with the views expressed, but because they draw conclusions that are contrary to the intention and spirit of the speaker.¹

Ch. vi:1 is a good example of this. This is an inference originating from Paul's declaration in v:20 οὐ δὲ ἐπλέοναυ ἣ ἡμαρτία ὑπερεπλέοναυ ἣ ἡχάρις.² But the proposal put forward in vi:1 is exactly the opposite of what Paul understood by the victory of grace over sin and he expresses his abhorrence of such an inference by his customary μὴ γένοιτο. A brief positive answer is then advanced in the form of a rhetorical question.³

Surely, argues Paul, it is inconsistent for those who in baptism have died to sin, to continue to live in it (vi:2). This tentative answer is followed by ἣ γενοιτε by which Paul introduces his answer proper.

The purpose of this form of introduction is to emphasize that Paul is not promulgating some new doctrine or practice. His intention is to remind believers of what they should already know. It would appear that at a relatively early date baptism became an accepted basis for Christian exhortation.⁴

In baptism the Christian community enters once and for all into a new knowledge, a new understanding of life in which henceforth they must grow up, assimilating and practising more and more the knowledge which they already

---


Selwyn is in basic agreement with the important work of P. Carrington, The Primitive Christian Catechism (Cambridge 1938) and comes to the conclusion, "that common catechetical and liturgical sources underlie most of the epistles of the New Testament seems to me proven beyond a doubt." Selwyn is much more cautious however about the specific identification of these sources - "But the isolation and differentiation of the sources, and the attribution of particular pieces of teaching to this or that source, are a more difficult and more dubious matter." (p.459).
possess. This is the reason for Paul's repeated emphasis that what he is telling the Christian community is something which they already know or should know. Already they know 'the truth' and need only to be reminded of it. As Dahl states "une communauté de baptisés qui ont participé à l'Évangile et à la doctrine chrétienne fondamentale, savent déjà ce qui est nécessaire. Ils ont reçu le Saint Esprit et sont dans la bonne voie. Ce dont ils ont besoin est de conserver ce qu'ils ont reçu et de s'en souvenir afin de vivre de cette réalité, dans laquelle ils ont été introduits."

By drawing out the implications of the baptism which they have all experienced Paul reminds the Roman Christians that in baptism they have left their former self-determined existence behind them and entered into a new sphere of existence which imprints a common pattern of life upon all who participate in it. They cannot consistently regard themselves as united with Christ and at the same time continue in the practice of sin. Baptism

1. Cf. N.A. Dahl, "Anamnesis: Mémoire et Commémoration dans le christianisme primitif." STh, I (1947), pp.69-95. Dahl notes how frequently the phrase καθώς οἶκος occurs in the Pauline letters particularly in I Thessalonians. He notes that Paul does not simply remind the Christian community that they must live in conformity with the traditions transmitted to them and the precepts which he has given them, but he goes on to claim that they already know these things and need only to be reminded of them. (pp.74-76).

2. Several scholars have drawn attention to Paul's frequent references to what Christians already know or ought to know. M. Bouttier comments concerning I Cor. iii:16-20 (where Paul asks the Christian community - "do you not know that you are the temple of God?") - "This reproof appears wherever Paul has to come back to the essentials of what he has taught his converts". Christianity according to Paul. STh, 49, London 1966, p.106. This cannot apply however to the Roman Christians since Paul has not yet taught there. E.E. Ellis is more correct when he claims that the frequent use of οἴκος "suggests that the teaching introduced is not novel, probably not even uniquely Pauline but a well-known Christian concept to which he calls attention." Paul and his Recent Interpreters, (Grand Rapids 1961), p.41. Cf. also E.C. Selwyn, op.cit.,p.190 and F.W. Beare, "On the Interpretation of Rom.vi:17." NTS, V (1958), pp.206-209.

really means identifying oneself with Christ's death — ἀνεκτάρμησιν οὖν ἀνεκτάρμησιν (vi:4) and if we were συμμετοίχισεν τῷ δομοίῳ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ it follows that we should walk ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς.

The τούτο γινώσκοντες of vi:6 and the εἴδοτες ὅτι of vi:9 are thus seen to be a continuation of the method of teaching begun with ἢ ἐγένοντε in vi:1. All three references are concerned with the significance of baptismal teaching for the believer’s use of the ὁμιλήματος. In v.3 Christians are reminded that baptism means baptism into Christ's death; in baptism they are buried with Christ in His death. In v.6 "the old self" is said to have been crucified and the sin-dominated body destroyed. By "the old self" or "the old man", Paul probably intends to refer to Adam, or rather human beings in union with Adam — in contrast to the "new man" i.e. Christ, or human beings in union with Christ.¹ The destruction of the σῶμα τῆς ἀμαρτίας cannot be taken to refer to the destruction of sin as a world-wide power, but to the body of the individual person which is dominated by sin.² Baptismal 'death' is a step towards the putting out of action of the old Adamic nature where sin and death have reigned (vv.14, 17, 21). How this death is related to sin is explained in v.7, which we may translate as "the one who dies has

2. Paul unlike the Gnostics does not speak of redemption from the body. The reference to the destruction of the sinful body is closer however to gnostic views rather than to Rabbinic or Hellenistic Judaism (cf. Michel, p.155 n.1). In view of this Jewett concludes that Paul has taken over the gnostic understanding of baptism at this point but has corrected it by the insertion of the decisive word 'sin'. This not only serves to exclude the libertinistic idea that he who has transcended the bodily existence in baptism is free to sin but it also implicitly shifts the blame for man's plight from the physical body to sin as a power in the old aeon. By his emphasis upon the somatic character of redemption Paul opposes both the gnostic depreciation of the body and the libertinistic actions which proceed from this, (op.cit., pp.290-95).
atoned for his sin."¹ It seems that Paul intends ὅλην θανάτον to refer primarily to Christ and His atoning death as a martyr.² This phrase does refer to the believer but only in so far as he has died with Christ in baptism. By participating through baptism in this particular death believers are justified from their sin.³ Paul's concern here however is not simply with death, or even with death to sin but with life, and in the succeeding verses he returns to the theme of Jesus Christ as the true pattern for the Christian use of the body.

The ἡμιστεὶς ὁτι (vi:9) points to the emphasis of apostolic Christianity upon the finality of the death of Christ. He died once for all, ἰδιότης (v.10), and because of this, death could have no more dominion over Him. The reference to Christ's 'once for all' death to sin has a parenetic function; it is a preparation for Paul's exhortation for the Roman

---

¹ Cf. R. Bultmann, Theology, I, p.246. R. Scroggs in an article on Rom. vi:7 (NBS, X, (1963/64), pp.104-8) has pointed out the weakness of the common interpretation of this verse where ἰδιότης is understood in the sense of 'to be free from something'. But in view of Acts xiii:39, Sir. xxvi:29 etc., Leenhardt still feels justified in translating v.7 "For he who has died is freed from sin." (p.163). Cf. also Michel, p.155; Schmidt, p.111.

² Scroggs disagrees with K.C. Kuhn's view (Röm.vi:7", ZNW, XXX (1931) pp.305-10) that this verse is evidence of a popular Jewish belief that death itself is a means of atonement, irrespective of the ethical or religious quality of the person or his death. Scroggs can find no proof that such a view was in fact held, and, in any case it is contrary to Paul's view that redemption comes only through Christ (p.105). Kuhn is not completely wrong however. There was one kind of death that did have atoning significance attributed to it - the death of the righteous martyr (IV Macc.xvii:22). Rom.vi:7 is not a general statement about any person's death but a specific statement about the martyr's death, and more specifically still, the death of Jesus.

Christians likewise to die to sin.  

This leads to the conclusion of the section in v. 11 - οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς λογίζεσθε ἑαυτούς... The oútwc here corresponds to the ὁσπερ - oútwc argument of vi:4. The method of argument reveals the theme ἡ σκέψη ὁσπερ...Χριστὸς...οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς.  

As Michel says "Das Schicksal des Glaubenden hängt an dem Schicksal Jesu Christi, 'in den' ( εἰς ) der Mensch hinein getauft wird".  

This decisive unity between believers and their Lord is further borne out by the construction of vv. 5-10. These are composed of two parallel series of texts each of which may be divided into four parts i.e.

5a. εἴ γὰρ σύμφωνοι γεγόναμεν τῷ οὐμολογεῖτι τοῦ Θανάτου αὐτοῦ...  
5b. ἄλλα καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα.  
6. τοῦτο γινώσκοντες, ὃτι ὁ καλαίτος ἀνθρώπος...σωσταρμωθῇ...  
7. ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεσιμαίνεται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας.

8a. εἴ δὲ ἀπεθάνομεν σὺν Χριστῷ...  
8b. πιστεύομεν ὅτι καὶ συζήσομεν αὐτῷ.  
9. εἰσόδες εἰς Χριστὸς ἐγερθείς ἐκ νεκρῶν...  
10. ὁ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν...

1. Paul insists over and over again that the death of Christ for sin in which these Christians shared in baptism, has been also a death to sin, so that baptism requires on their part a corresponding death to sin. This emphasis upon dying to sin which is the fulcrum of the whole chapter arises from the fact that some members interpreted their death with Christ as conveying to them freedom from sin in a sense which the apostle deplored (vi:7). Cf. Minear, p. 62.

2. Λογίζεσθε is a key word in Romans, e.g. iv:1-12; iii:28, viii:18. Cf. Thesis p.57 n.5 and p.143 n.2.

3. Bornkamm notes that there is very often a connection between Paul's literary construction and the theme with which he is dealing, cf. "Paulinische Anakoluthe im Römerbrief" Das Ende des Gesetzes. BEvTH 16 (München 1966), pp.76-92.


5. Michel, p. 150. Feuillet (p.364 n.3) omits 5a and 8b but is otherwise identical.
By its inclusion in the double series of texts the εἴδωτες ὄτι of vi:9 is shown to be a parallel to the τοῦτο γινώσκετε of vi:6. In this way both these texts can be regarded as a further application of the ἂν ἀγνωσίτε of vi:3 and the whole of vi:3-11 may be regarded as a unified exposition of the Christian understanding of baptism, by which Paul seeks to counter the misunderstanding of sin and grace suggested in vii:1. Verses 12-14 summarize and apply the exposition given in vv.3-11. The Christian community must not allow sin to reign in their mortal bodies: they must not continue to offer their bodies to sin as instruments of unrighteousness but must surrender themselves once for all to God as His instruments for righteousness. The baptized must present their bodies to God "as men alive from the dead." (v.13). The real force of Paul's injunction lies in this phrase. This is the emphasis of the entire chapter. The death in baptism is the gateway to newness of life. To die means to leave the dominion in which one is the slave of a particular master. Through baptism men leave the 'power field' of sin and enter that of Christ. The importance of this theme in Romans is evidenced in that it provides the opening words

1. Feuillet, p.364. See also Jewett, op.cit., p.292. Jewett suggests that the reason for Paul's use of γινώσκετε rather than γνωρίζει to describe the σωμα of the baptized may be that Paul wishes to insist on the continued presence of the mortal body in opposition to 'enthusiasts' who held that those who have died with Christ have also been resurrected with Him so that they now enjoy immortal life (op.cit., pp. 293-4).
2. Michel regards vv.12-14 as the positive counterpart of iii:10-18, i.e. baptism means the re-utilization of our bodies for God's service. (p.157).
3. Cf. Barrett, p.126. Barrett notes that the 'as' is not easy to define. "It is neither 'as if you were' nor 'as in fact you are'; or perhaps rather it is both of these." Cf. also Bultmann Theology.I, p.351.
of the parenetic section in xiii:1 f., where Paul says "I beseech you therefore brethren ... to present your bodies a living sacrifice ..." Two emphases are common to chs. vi and xii - that of surrendering one's body to the service of another and that of the new kind of life which results from this.¹

The concluding verse (v.14) is at once the end of one section and the linking or introductory verse for succeeding themes.² The word ἐντεύκτεοι introduces the theme of the next section vi:15-23 which is centred around the analogy of slavery (already hinted at in the verb σουλασεῖν, vi:6).³ The introduction of νόμος (in v.14) keeps an underlying theme in view,⁴ and prepares for the new section which begins at vii:1 and deals with Christian life in relation to the Law.

---

1. The links between chs. vi and xii have been noted by Michel, (p.149 n.2) and V. Furnish, Theology and Ethics in Paul. (Nashville 1968), pp.7 and 105.
2. Dahl notes how often it happens in Romans that the concluding words of one section form at the same time the 'theme' of the following one; cf. i:16b-17; ii:11(-13); iii:31(?); v:20-21; vi:14; vii:5-6; cf. ix:24; x:4. "Two Notes on Romans V". STh, V-VI (1951/52), p.42 n.1.
3. Ibid.
4. Dahl notes how the questions dealt with in vi and vii have been hinted at (but not answered) in iii:8; iii:31; and iv:13-15. (op.cit., p.41).
Romans vi:15-23.

A second section in ch.vi is introduced by the question τι οὖν (vi:15), followed, as in vi:1 by a wrong inference διαφθοράματος ὡς οὖν εὐσκεμέν ὡς νόμον ἀλλὰ νομίζω χάριν; This objection appears to be merely a repetition of that which was originally proposed in vi:1. Dodd considers that there is no real advance in principle in v.15; it is a restatement of the theme of vv.1-14 in order to drive home the falsity of the wrong inference by means of a different analogy. Whereas in vv.1-14 this was expressed by means of the analogy of baptism, in vv.15-23 the illustration is drawn from the institution of slavery.

It may be questioned whether there is not a slight advance in thought in v.15 in that the Law is now introduced into the discussion. One's opinion in this matter is significant in any attempt to identify the audience Paul has in mind in this section. There is no real basis in the text for regarding these libertinistic suggestions as purely theoretical inferences drawn by Jews or hostile Jewish Christians from Paul's doctrine of justification apart from the Law.

Since there is no mention of the Law until v.14 it would appear that in vv.1-13 Paul is addressing antinomian Gentile Christians. It is also

1. Cf. iii:1; iii:9; xi:7 where this phrase also marks stages in the progress of the argument.
3. Dodd, pp.96-97.
4. See W. Lütgert's useful discussion in Der Römerbrief als historisches Problem, pp.69-79. Lütgert claims that Paul's statements here are not protests made in self defence against those who reproach him for holding these opinions, but exhortations and warnings directed against those who themselves actually hold such views. (p.76).
5. Lütgert believes that the antinomian and libertinistic behaviour condemned here points to Gentile Christians as the most likely exponents of this way of life. It is quite possible that they justified their views and conduct by reference to the Pauline teaching on grace. (op.cit., pp.78-79).
reasonable to assume that Jewish Christians would be unlikely to practise sin simply because they are no longer under the Law. This leads us to the suggestion proposed by Marxsen and others that some of the Roman Christians may have formerly been proselytes. These proselytes, on becoming Christians see no reason for retaining the fetters of Judaism which they have previously adopted and proceed to cast off the yoke of the Law in no uncertain manner. They may even go so far as to break the Law on principle just to show they are no longer under its jurisdiction. Although it is not possible to come to any definite conclusion as to whether former proselytes are indicated by the references to the Law in vv.14.f., we may state that there is some indication that there is a certain development in thought in vv. 15.f. and this may indicate the sort of situation that Marxsen envisages. The manner in which v.15 is introduced also gives some slight support to this view.

We have already noted that in the introduction of the new section in vi:1 the objection took the form of a wrong inference from what Paul had already stated. So too, in v.15 the closing words of the previous section ὅτι νόμον ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ χάριν (vi:14) are hurled back at Paul. The parallel to vi:1.f. is continued by the μὴ γένοιτο and ὅπως οἴδατε (cf. ἦς ἀναφέρετε vi:3). The answer Paul supplied in vi:3.f. referred to the proper understanding of baptism which he obviously expected all Christians to acknowledge. Here the answer is purely a human analogy for which Paul apologizes in vi:19. He is however arguing from something that the Christian

2. Bultmann notes numerous parallels between Paul's method and that of the diatribe, but also makes the distinction, that whereas the diatribe addresses questions to the (ideal) individual, Paul addresses his questions to the whole congregation. Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe, p.65.
community would easily understand. His contention is that the exclusive nature of allegiance to Christ is similar to that of slavery. It is, as the Romans knew well, impossible to be the slave of more than one master at once. The Christians have been freed from slavery to sin in order to become slaves of Obedience (v.16), of The Pattern of Teaching (τύπος διδαχῆς) (v.17), of Righteousness (v.18), or of God (v.22). These are simply different ways of describing the exclusive demand of Christ. To yield one's body in obedience to sin means that one is, in practice, a slave of sin, and this would be completely impossible in view of the absolute demand involved in being a slave of Christ.

Paul is not too happy with his description of the Christian life as slavery (lest his imagery should lead to misconceptions) and after having

1. οἴδαμεν γὰρ (cf. ii:2, iii:19; vii:14; viii:22,28) is also used with reference to commonly accepted knowledge. Michel regards this as "eine Anspielung auf ein gemeinsames Wissen, ohne dass die Herkunft dieses Wissens fest stünde." (p.204 n.2).

2. The meaning of this phrase has been much disputed. R. Bultmann believes that the omission of v.17b leaves a well-balanced couplet in vv.17a and 18 and therefore holds that this phrase is a later interpolation ("Glossen im Römerbrief". ThLZ, LXXII (1947) pp.201-2). F.W. Beare disagrees however. His view is that many commentators have been misled by the feeling that παραδίδωμι must carry with it some connotation of the transmission of a tradition. But this is not so. In the context of ch.vi this verb can be interpreted wholly in relation to the figure of the transfer of the slave from one master to another without any reference whatsoever to the transmitting of tradition. Both New Testament and profane Greek support this understanding - the fact is that the notion of handing over by tradition is a specialized secondary use (op.cit., pp.206/7). As to the proper interpretation of this phrase within the theology of Paul - this can be appropriately understood as the didache which belongs to the gospel and which, when obeyed, imparts to believers' lives a specific character and pattern, moulding them into the likeness of Christ (op.cit., pp.209-10). On this pattern of teaching see also C.H. Dodd, "The Primitive Catechism and the Sayings of Jesus." New Testament Essays in Memory of T.W. Manson, Ed. A.J.B. Higgins, (Manchester 1959), p.108.
contrasted the outcome (τέλος) of slavery to sin and slavery to Christ, he prepares for another section in which he shows that the Christian bondage is different from all other kinds of bondage, (vii:6).^2

1. Outcome seems preferable to 'end' in both these verses (21,22). The image of fruit suggests a gradual process which eventually leads to a harvest. The two ways of life - the way of slavery to sin and the other of slavery to Christ, are contrasted both as to their course and their outcome. It seems that here as in x:4 the translation of τέλος as end-termination is not really suitable. Although we may state that the present relationship of obedience to Christ will eventually 'end' in the sense that it will attain its goal of full communion with Christ, it is not correct to state that the relationship will thereby be terminated. As in x:4 'end' is only meaningful if used in the context of a new relationship arising from the fulfilment (and not the termination) of a previous one. Cf. Schmidt's interesting translation 'Endziel' in v.22 (p.114).

2. Cf. Dodd, p.102. Beare is rather critical of Paul's analogy from slavery. Paul's sense of total commitment and his own eagerness to offer a willing obedience has carried him from the thought of free obedience given without stint or limit to the blind obedience of a slave - similar to the former only in that it is equally without limits of obligation. Michel and others have softened the force of Paul's analogy by using phrases such as 'freier Gehorsam', 'free obedience' etc. - but Beare refuses to do this and states baldly "We have here a fundamental contradiction". (op.cit., p.208). Beare fails to realize that the basic point of the slave analogy is on the exclusive nature of the service - no slave can serve two masters, and that Paul, even though he realizes the imperfection of the analogy still considers it useful in order to underscore this point.
Romans vii:1-6.

Another sub-section (vii:1-6) is introduced by ἡ ἁγνοεῖται (cf. ἡ ἁγνοεῖται (vi:3) and οὐκ ἔδωκε (vi:16)). Feuillet notes how these three questions mark out the progress of the argument in chs. vi and vii.¹ The commencement of this section differs from that of the two previous (vi:1 and vii:15) in that the introductory question τι οὖν the wrong inference, and the subsequent μὴ γένοιτο οὐκ are all absent. Why has Paul dispensed with the preliminary parts of his introductory formula? The reason may be that he is not really introducing a significant new theme or an important re-statement of a previous one. It may also be that he wanted to state the Christian’s freedom from the Law without appearing to disparage the Law and its function any more than necessary.² Perhaps he felt that the Gentile Christians in Rome were already too critical of the part played by the Law in the history of salvation.

The immediate connection with ch. vi is found in the theme of the slave/master relationship with which Paul has just been dealing in vi:22. The alternatives mentioned in vi:22 i.e. slaves of sin or slaves of God, are the background of the thought in vii:1. Here however it is neither ἐδώκατος (v.9) nor ἡ ἁμαρτία (v.14) but rather ἡ νόμος which κυριεύει τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (viii:1).³ This connection (i.e. with vi:22) in turn refers back to vi:14 (the summary-conclusion of the first section) where Paul stated that sin shall not rule (κυριεύει) over the Christians because they are not under Law but under grace. These connections illustrate

²  Cf. Feuillet, p.375.
the close relation between vii:1-6 and the preceding sections. This is the third illustration used by Paul to show the obligation of the Christian no longer to continue in the practice of sin. The image is centred around marriage and marriage law. Paul begins by emphasizing the common ground he assumes in his argument. He speaks to those who know 'law'. It is not essential to Paul's argument that this should refer to 'the Law' i.e. the Torah. The fact that Paul referred to the analogy of slavery for his illustration in vi:15.f. prevents us from assuming that he normally refers to Christian doctrine or Old Testament parallels to assist his arguments.

Paul's point appears to be that since the reign of sin over man was effected through man's bondage to the Law, therefore in order that a man may be completely freed from sin he must also be completely free from the Law. His one line of reasoning is that death alone releases a woman from the law of her husband, i.e. of those legal commitments that are related to having a husband. "The main point of the illustration is that the death of her husband releases the woman from the bond of the marriage. Attention is focussed upon the woman as bound and as released, bound as long as the husband lives, released on the event of his death".

2. "The provisions of both Laws (Mosaic and Roman) are the same so far as this particular matter is concerned." Dodd, p.100.
3. According to J.D.M. Derrett vii:1-4 is best understood against the background of Old Testament thought in which the Jews are regarded as betrothed to God through the Torah. God is the husband of His people and Torah is the marriage-instrument. This marriage proved to be unfruitful and so by participation in Christ's death the Christian community is freed from the Law and joined to Christ in a new union which will bring forth the harvest originally intended. Law in the New Testament (London 1970), pp.465-70.
4. Cf. Murray, p.241. Such a view avoids the maze of contradictions which Dodd discovers both here and in the grafting analogy in ch.xi. All analogies are in some sense imperfect by their very nature; Dodd looks for an exact parallel in the various parts of the analogy which Paul did not intend to provide (cf. Dodd, pp.100.f. and 179.f.).
The marriage law analogy is introduced here not as a separate item of teaching, but only to supplement and amplify the conception of the Christian's freedom from sin already illustrated through the imagery of baptism and slavery. This view is borne out by the application of the marriage law analogy in vii:4.f. Apart from a brief hint in v.5 Paul does not clarify the position of the Law itself. He does not develop his analogy to say that the Law died or is dead - his interest is rather in the Christian congregation and their freedom. Since the Law provides the opportunity ἐπιτελεῖν ² for sin (vii:11), to be free from sin demands also freedom from the Law. It is in this context that vii:1-6 should be understood.³

Paul's argument is that just as a woman whose husband has died is free to marry another, so those who through Christ have died to the Law are free - free that is in order to ( σήμερον ) belong to another. In Paul's view, men are freed from the Law only for the purpose of being joined to Christ. There is an end to the Law only in Christ (cf.x:4). Discharge from the Law is not an end in itself; it is directed to a goal beyond itself - the new union with the resurrected Christ the outcome of which is a harvest of fruit for God (vi:4-5). Whilst we are in basic agreement with R. Jewett's statement that the purpose of Rom.vii:1-6 is "to show the non-jurisdiction of the Law in the new aeon"⁴ and that it "substantiates the proposition

1. Paul has already hinted at the problem of the Law in iii:20; iv:14.f; v:20; vii:14; but his intention is to deal with it in more detail in vii:7.f. Cf. Michel, p.177 n.2.
3. It is plain that all of ch.vii is in some sense dealing with the Law and in this sense Michel's title "Der Todesweg des Menschen unter dem Gesetz" is not inappropriate; it is questionable however whether the positive emphasis of vii:1-6 is adequately described by this title.
stated in vi:14 that you are not under Law but under grace", we would furth-
er emphasize that the interest here centres not on freedom from the previous
unfruitful marriage but on the fruitful outcome of the new union with Christ.

Viewed in this light the total argument of vii:1-6 is seen to be
closely related to that of ch.vi and the emphasis of the three sections
(vi:1-14, vi:15-23, vii:1-6) is on the practical outcome of grace,¹ not in
lawlessness and impiety, but in good works in the life of those who are
justified. This conclusion helps us to see why Paul did not give a full in-
troductory formula in vii:1, but included only his positive directive to
commonly accepted knowledge i.e. ἐγνωσίτε.

A new development is introduced in the concluding verse - vii:6.
This verse like the concluding verses of ch.vi i.e. vv.19-23, deals with
Christian life in the present (cf. νῦν in vi:19, 22; vii:6) contrasted
with the previous existence under sin (vii:5). Here however, the present
is contrasted with the past, not only in relation to the master whom we
serve, but also in relation to the manner in which we serve (in the 'letter'
or in the Spirit.).

The contrast between the old and the new aeon is basic to vv.5-6;
'while we were in the flesh' is contrasted with the 'now' of life in Christ.
Life in the old aeon is characterised by the inter-action between the Law
and sinful human nature so that the Law is perverted and, instead of produc-
ing life, results in bondage and brings forth fruit for death. In contrast
to this, life in Christ in the new aeon is not slavery 'in oldness of letter'
- παλαιότητος γράμματος. Having been discharged from the Law by 'death' the
baptised belong to Christ as His slaves in a relationship characterised by

¹. Cf. Dodd, p.100.
Käsemann has drawn attention to the error of assuming that these verses (vv.5-6) mean that Paul has a high regard for the unwritten Law in contrast to the fixed, written code of the Jewish Torah. There need be no doubt that by 'letter' Paul does intend to refer here to the Mosaic Torah in its written documentation; it may also be granted that 'letter' is normally used by Paul as a description of life in the old aeon and therefore carries a certain derogatory connotation. But the harsh Pauline antithesis in v.6 cannot be fully explained in this way. In viii:7-25 Paul deliberately stresses that the Law itself is holy but is capable of being perverted into a demand for good works as in Judaism. It is only in this perversion that 'letter' and Law are identical. Basically, Paul does not identify 'letter' with the Law - in fact he is most careful to avoid doing so. Since for Paul the Law is holy and intended for life, it cannot be fundamentally the same as 'letter'. But 'de facto' it has become identical with it because of the sin-dominated life and world of mankind.

According to Käsemann the decisive criterion which determines whether the Law is 'letter' or 'Spirit' is participation or non-participation in the Christ event. Only in Christ can freedom be found. "Wir mussten nach v.4 eines anderen, nämlich des Auferstandenen, eigen und durch die Taufe in seinen Tod hineingezogen werden, um dem Todesschicksal unter dem Buchstaben zu entrinnen und von diesem selbst eschatologisch getrennt zu werden."
Perhaps the marriage analogy was chosen to aid the transition from the imagery of slavery to that of the freedom of the Spirit. Dodd regards vii:6b as an explanatory footnote to what is said in vi:15-23 about 'slavery' to righteousness - "it is not slavery in the sense of a blind and irresponsible subservience to a written code, but one informed by the spontaneity of the Spirit - and therefore not properly 'slavery' at all, but allegiance to a God 'whose service is perfect freedom.'"  

While agreeing with Dodd's excellent summary of this verse, we would prefer to see it as the climax of the entire section i.e. vi:1 - vii:6, of which it stands as the conclusion.  

In vii:6 however the immediate connection is not with vii:7f. but with viii:1f. Here, as happens often in Romans, Paul comes to a concluding statement which sums up all that has gone before and at the same time also introduces the theme of another section - but just as he seems about to move on, he circles back to pick up some theme or argument that requires to be discussed before he can proceed with the argument.  

The result of emphasizing the connection between vii:6 and viii:1 is

1. Dodd, pp.102-3.  
2. There is general agreement among commentators as regards this division. See Dupont, op.cit., p.384 n.1.  
4. Note the mention of the Spirit in vii:6 - pointing forward to the central theme of ch.viii.  
in effect to cause vii:7-25 to be regarded as a digression.\(^1\) It is true that we could read directly and continuously from vii:6 to viii:1, but in Paul, this simplicity is often deceptive. As Dahl has noted, even though vii:7-25 is a digression, it is a necessary and deliberate one and, in fact, must be related to viii:1-17. The latter is the positive counterpart of vii:7-25 (service in oldness of the letter). In this sense even vii:7-25 is not a real digression, but can only be called a digression simply to indicate the formal position of the sections\(^2\) since neither vii:1 - vii:6 nor vii:7-25 directly develop the themes of v:1-11.

The formal connecting link between vi:1, vi:15 and vii:7 is that they all begin as the answer to objections. This contributes to their designation as 'digressions'. The important question that must be kept in mind however, is whether these 'digressions' may not in fact prove to be the real theme of Paul and the kerygmatic sections somewhat subsidiary in that they arise only out of the former.

---

1. The use of this word can only be relative here in that both vii:1-vii:6 are themselves regarded as digressions. Cf. Dahl "Two Notes on Romans V", \(\text{STRA}, \ V-\text{VI} \ (1951/52), \ p.41\). Jeremias goes further and connects chs.v and viii thereby putting vi-vii in parentheses (p.148).

The introduction to a new and important section is heralded as in vi:1 by τί οὖν ἐρωμύν - i.e. what are we to infer from what has just been stated? Are we to infer that because the Law is misused so as to become 'letter' instead of Spirit, the Law itself is sin?¹

This wrong inference is immediately followed by its normal counterpart μὴ γένοιτο. It is not until verses 13 and 14 that the full pattern is followed through (i.e. question or objection, wrong inference, exclamation of horror, detailed reply). The provisional answer which Paul gives in v.13b explains how sin working through the commandment, by means of the good brought death. Then the full answer begins with οἵτινς γὰρ in v.14.

Why does Paul not bring in his detailed answer in v.7 instead of waiting until v.13? The reason appears to be that Paul's absolute denial that the Law is sin seems to be a contradiction of v.5, where the Law is closely associated with the origin of sinful desires. Verses 7b-12 should be regarded therefore as a preliminary explanation of the relation of the Law to sin. Paul feels obliged to clarify his position immediately, even before he can commence a detailed answer.

Although his primary concern is to defend the Law, initially Paul has to concede the point that the Law has in fact provided the opportunity for sin to bring death to mankind (v.11). "The Law itself is not sin but it is impossible to deny a certain connection between it and sin".² The Law can act

---

¹. In addition to vii:5-6 several verses earlier in the epistle have come near to suggesting this. See especially iii:20, iv:15, v:13,20, vi:14, cf. Barrett, p.140.
². Ibid.
as a catalyst which may aid or even initiate the action of sin upon man, and apart from the Law sin is dead (v.8). Paul is careful to assert that in the final outcome it is not the Law which kills a man but sin which uses the commandment as its instrument (v.11). He acknowledges however that "if it had not been for the Law I should not have known sin", (v.7b). It is possible to interpret this part of the verse (v.7b) as referring to past (pre-Christian) experience and the final part (v.7c) as referring to present (Christian) experience i.e. "I should not now know desire if the Law did not now say ...". But the fact that the two statements stand side by side makes this interpretation unlikely and the two clauses taken together probably mean "I should never have known sin had it not been for the Law", no precise limits being attached to this knowledge whether forward or backward. This interpretation indicates the great difficulty of determining whether Paul is speaking in this chapter of Christian or pre-Christian experience.

1. Leenhardt notes a parallel between this and Gen.iii - "The suggestion that sin is 'dead' apart from the Law reminds us of the serpent lying inactive, motionless, hidden, and as it were dead in the garden." (p.187).
3. Barrett notes that Paul uses the aorist tense in v.7b and the imperfect in v.7c (pluperfect ἔγνω, used with the force of the imperfect) (p.142).
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
7. Advocates of this position include Origen, Wesley and J. Weiss. Its most significant exposition in recent study is that of W.G. Kūmmel, Römer vii und die Bekehrung des Paulus. UNT, 17 (Leipzig 1929). Kūmmel is strongly supported by Bultmann, "Romans vii and the Anthropology of Paul". ET in Existence and Faith, (Cleveland 1960), pp.147-57. See also P. Althaus, Paulus und Luther über den Menschen: Ein Vergleich. Studien der Luther-Akademie, 14, (Gütersloh), 1951.
or even both.1

To facilitate his explanation of the connection between the Law and sin, Paul chooses the tenth commandment as an example.2 The prohibition of covetousness instead of preventing actually encourages man to covet (v.7c). Paul does not quote the whole commandment, merely the prohibition. This is no accident; he intends to give as wide a reference as possible in order to emphasize the wrongness of the covetous attitude (irrespective of the objects desired).3

The fact that Paul makes only a general reference to the tenth commandment gives support to the view that the references to the commandment in this section refer not to the Mosaic Law as Kümmel believes,4 but to the Genesis iii account of Adam's sin. It seems preferable to regard Paul's statement in v.9 -"I was alive once apart from the Law, but when the commandment came, sin revived and I died," as also referring to Gen.iii.5 Some commentators con-

1. Cf. C.L. Mitton, "Romans vii Reconsidered." ExT, LXV (1953/54) pp.78-81; 99-103; 132-5. Mitton emphasizes the στόχος ἐχθρικός of v.25 and takes it to mean 'man on his own' or as Moffatt translates 'left to myself'. Ch.vii: 14-25 may therefore be understood as referring to man on his own (whether Christian or non-Christian) attempting to live up to the commandments of God (p.133). A similar emphasis was put forward by J.C.K. von Hofmann and T. Zahn in their commentaries on Romans (cf.Ellwein's survey of interpretations of Rom.vii, op.cit., pp252-55), and also by J. Kurzinger, "Der Schlüssel zum Verständnis von Röm.vii". BZ,VII (1963), pp.270-274. For an excellent survey of modern interpretations see O. Kuss, Der Römerbrief I, (Regensburg 1963), pp.462-85 (Zur Geschichte der Auslegung von Röm.vii:7-25) and K. Kertelge, "Exegetische Überlegungen zum Verständnis der paulinischen Anthropologie nach Römer vii." ZNW, LXII (1971), pp.105-114.

2. Leenhardt points out that Paul deliberately chooses covetousness because this has to do with one's fundamental attitude towards existence, (p.187).
4. Op.cit., p.86. Kümmel holds that if Paul had been thinking of Gen.iii he would not have said ὁ ἄγνωρος ἡμεῖς but ὁ ἄγνωρος or μὴ ἀγνωστός. See also S. Lyonnet, "Tu ne convoiteras pas", (Rom.vii:7) NTP, (Leiden 1962), pp.157-65 (158).
5. 'Sprang to life' is probably the meaning of ἀνέζησεν here rather than 'become active once more' as Leenhardt suggests (p.188). Cf. Schmidt, p.124.
sider this statement as autobiographical and seek to locate the experience in Paul's adolescence. Barrett gives a summary of this autobiographical interpretation, "In the first innocence of youth Paul was alive. Death is the consequence of sin, and there was at that time no sin to incur it ... Then came the moment when the Jewish boy became a 'son of the commandment', and assumed responsibility before the Law. With this new legal responsibility sin took its place in the boy's experience. The forbidden world appeared upon his horizon and he longed to enter it ... This was death."¹

This interpretation has two basic defects which militate against its acceptance. Paul is not so introspective as the view suggests and, in any case, this picture does not fit in with what we know of Pharisaic religion under the Law.² With regard to the first criticism Leenhardt correctly points out that the study of Rom.vii has been too much influenced by the recollection of the inner drama of the young Luther in his despairing struggles to attain an unattainable obedience to the divine Law.³ "The conversion of Paul was not that of a heart devoured by remorse for its acts of disobedience, but rather of a proud soul exalting itself before God because of its obedience to the Law."⁴ It is Phil.iii:6 and not Rom.vii:7.f. which

reveals the attitude of Paul towards the Law prior to his conversion.¹

Since the publication in 1929 of Kümmel's detailed investigation of Paul's conversion the autobiographical interpretation has fallen out of favour,² and a majority of scholars now opt for the view that although Rom. vii does refer to Paul's pre-Christian life it does so from a general and normative rather than a personal and psychological viewpoint.³ More particularly, this chapter depicts the non-Christian man not as he appears to himself but as he is seen from the point of view of the new aeon; it is the old man 'in Adam' as seen by the new man 'in Christ'.⁴

A notable exception to the general trend of interpretation concerning Rom.vii:7-13 is Anders Nygren who strongly advocates the view that this chapter only makes sense if it is related to the experience of the mature Christian. Before we come to any definite conclusions concerning the nature of the 'I' in Rom.vii, the points made by Nygren must be considered.⁵

---

1. Because of the dissimilarity of Rom.vii and the two other notable references to pre-Christian existence, Nygren feels justified in regarding Rom.vii:14-25 as a description of the struggle which is a normal and permanent aspect of Christian experience (p.286). See also Mitton's critique of Nygren's viewpoint, op.cit., pp.100-101.

2. See especially Kümmel, op.cit., pp.118-32. In his essay, "Romans vii and the Anthropology of Paul" (first published in 1932) Bultmann follows Kümmel's interpretation of the 'I' in Rom.vii and states "It seems to me that these questions have been sufficiently discussed and that there can be no doubt as to the answer: the situation characterized here is the general situation of man under the Law and, to be sure, as it appears to the eye of one who has been freed from the Law by Christ." Existence and Faith, p.147.


4. Cf. Bultmann on vii:24. "The cry ... was not uttered by Saul-Paul struggling and groaning in time past under the Law - how that Paul regarded himself, Phil.iii:4-6 says. Not that Paul utters this cry, but Paul the Christian who puts it into the mouth of the Jew and thereby exposes the situation of the Jew which is not visible to himself." Theology, I, p.266.

5. See pp.284-303. In this discussion of Nygren's position we will follow in the main the summary by C.L. Mitton, op.cit., pp.99-103.
Nygren's strongest point is that the change of tense from past to present in v.14 requires that the two sections (vv.7-13 and 14-25) describe two different stages in man's existence. If as the text indicates the first period is already past, then vv.14.f. must be understood as referring to present (Christian) experience. Against this it may be argued that the transition in v.14 from past to present is made almost imperceptibly\(^1\) and, in any case, the present tense can sometimes be used in a historic sense especially where a past event is being vividly and dramatically described.\(^2\)

We can, however, find no similar example of this in Paul's extant writings.\(^3\) Since the position concerning the significance of the change of tense is basic to the interpretation of the whole section, we must return to deal with it in more detail later.

We have already noted in this discussion that Romans vii is not meant to be taken as the normative picture of pre-Christian existence under the Law. The acknowledgement of this fact diminishes the force of Nygren's contention that since the contents of this chapter differ from the descriptions of pre-Christian man in Rom.i-iii and Phil.iii, then vv.14-25 must be taken as referring to Christian man. In any case even if there were no adequate explanation for the different outlook of these scriptural passages the lack of this does not require us to hold that Rom.vii refers to Christian existence.

---

3. Ibid.
Nygren holds that since the subject matter of Rom.v-viii is specifically that of the Christian life, then Rom.vii:14-25 must also deal with Christian life because it is found within this particular context. That this is not necessarily so Nygren's own exposition demonstrates; he himself holds that vii:7-13 describes a period that is past - i.e. pre-Christian existence.\(^1\) If it is permissible for Paul to refer to this in one part of the chapter, there is nothing to prevent him doing so in another. In any case Nygren's outline of chs.v-viii is itself of doubtful merit. Althaus points out that whilst ch.v may adequately be described as "Free from the Wrath of God", ch.vi as "Free from Sin", and ch.viii as "Free from Death" it is not correct to describe ch.vii as "Free from the Law".\(^2\)

Few commentators agree with Nygren's combination of vii:1-6 and vii:7-25 under one chapter heading.\(^3\) It is noteworthy that in his summary of the similarities between the two chapters all the parallels with ch.vi are located in vii:1-6 and not in vii:7-25.\(^4\) This concurs with what we have previously stated i.e. that vii:1-6 forms one unit with ch.vi. This is further indicated by the fact that vii:1-6 is virtually a doublet of vi:16-22.\(^5\)

Nygren seems to have a better case in his assertion that ch.vii:14-25 depicts the struggle and the measure of dissatisfaction which is a necessary and permanent part of true Christian life. He notes that even amidst

---

1. "In vv.7-13 he discusses what the Christian was before and in vv.14-25 he sets forth what the Christian is now", (p.276).
3. Michel's title for this chapter, "Der Todesweg des Menschen unter dem Gesetz", is similarly inadequate although he sub-divides the chapter into four sections instead of the usual three - vv.1-6, 7-12, 13-17, 18-25, (pp.165 and 169).
4. p.268.
the triumphant exultation of ch.viii, v.23 stands as a witness to the incompleteness of our redemption in this world. There is no need to disagree with Nygren's claim that the Christian life is not all victorious overcoming and that humility as well as watchfulness is demanded of the Christian community. But however true this insight may be, there is no necessity for us to find it expressed in Rom.vii. Althaus goes even further - he disagrees with the picture of the Christian which Nygren portrays.¹

Althaus allows that whilst there will be tension and struggle in the Christian life, this is not of the same kind as that in Rom.vii. If this chapter describes the Christian's life in this world, it is a totally different picture from that which Paul gives elsewhere in his letters.² Despite certain similarities, Gal.v:17 does not say the same as Rom.vii:14.f., and Nygren is guilty of misrepresenting Paul's teaching in Galatians by referring only to the conflict between flesh and Spirit in v:17 and omitting any reference to the previous verse³ where it is stated "lead the life of the Spirit and you will never satisfy the passions of the flesh", (v.16,Moffatt).

In spite of Nygren it must be emphasized that "Romans vii is saying something fundamentally different from Rom.viii:23".⁴ There is too much defeat and despair in ch.vii for us to equate it with ch.viii. As Dodd notes "Paul would have thought it quite abnormal that any Christian should feel so, and there is nothing in his own confessions elsewhere to lead us

---

3. "Romans vii portrays the mastery of the flesh in unaided man, and Gal. v:17 the persisting strength of the flesh in the Christian". Mitton, op.cit., p.100.
to suppose that, with all his own sense of struggle and insecurity, he ever had such an experience as this after his conversion." We have found none of these arguments very convincing so we must now take another look at the question of the relation of vii:7-13 to vii:14-25, and Nygren's views on the matter.

Nygren strongly emphasizes the break that occurs between vv.13 and 14. That there is some difference between the two main sections of Rom.vii:7-25 is shown by the fact that a majority of commentators make a sub-division. On the other hand, the transition occurs so unobtrusively that some scholars treat the whole as one unit. The way to a better understanding of the relation of vv.7-13 to vv.14.f. may be indicated by the summary which Paul gives in vii:5-6. Nygren correctly refers to vii:5 as describing what we once were, and vii:6 as depicting what we henceforth are, as Christians, and that these two verses provide an outline of what is to follow. But he fails to see that v.5 is the summary of vii:7-25 rather than vii:7-13 and that v.6 is the summary of viii:1-17 and not vii:14-25.

It should be noted that the words in v.14 - ἐγὼ δὲ σαρκίνος ἐμι take up again the summary of v.5 - ὅτε ἦμεν ἐν τῷ σαρκί. This would point to the fact that the singular 'I' in vv.14.f. cannot be limited to

1. p.108.
2. A large number subdivide into vv.7-13 and 14-25. E. Gaugler, Der Brief an die Römer. I (Zürich 1945), puts the break at the end of v.12 and not at the end of v.13 (p.197). Michel also puts a break between v.12 and v.13 and divides again between vv.17 and 18 (p.167). The question as to whether the main division should be at the end of v.12 will be discussed later in this section.
3. Cf. Schlatter, p.231; Dodd, pp.103.f.
Paul's experience since it is parallel to the first person plural in v.5. Althaus holds that the γὰρ in v.14 is to be seen as proof that there is not such a decisive break between the two sections of the chapter as Nygren thinks. If we connect v.5 and vv.14.f., this has the effect of making vv. 7-13 a parenthesis which accords well with their content and with their function in the immediate context. In these verses Paul gives a necessary preliminary clarification before he embarks on his answer proper in v.14. Verses 7.f. are a necessary preamble to vv.14-25. Both logically and temporally, vv.7-13 precede vv.14-25 since the situation described in vv.7-13 is one which precedes man's living under the Law as outlined in vv.14.f. The change in tense also denotes a change of scene. The ὁμοέτατον of vv.17 and 20 refers not to the Christian man's pre-Christian experience but describes a situation prior to life under the Law. That this is so is corroborated by a certain difference between the 'I' in the two sections. Kertelge notes that the 'I' in vv.14.f. is described differently from that in vv.7.f. and also that the 'I' is more to the fore in the second part of the chapter.

In vv.7-13 the 'I' is described as being alive until the commandment came and sin found its opportunity to seduce. But the 'I' in vv.14.f. is

---

1. The repetition in v.13 of the objection concerning the goodness of the Law previously stated in v.7 gives us reason to believe that vv.7b-12 are thereby designated as a parenthesis. This is another indication that the division between the two sections should really occur at v.12 and not at v.13.
3. Althaus (op.cit., p.477) holds that the 'now ... no longer' has a logical and not a temporal reference. Nygren emphasizes the 'now ... no longer' implies that vv.7-13 relate to a time prior to that described in the next section but goes on to conclude that this means that vv.14-25 must refer to Christian existence (pp.285-86). See also Ellwein, op.cit., p.252.
"sold under sin". The 'I' here is no longer in control but is only a house or frame in which sin dwells. The 'I' seems to have lost its real identity. It certainly has lost its power to control its own actions - the good that it desires to do it cannot do but instead it does what it detests (vv.15 and 19). This is not the real 'I' which was once alive apart from the Law (v.9). This active agent is now sin and the 'I' has lost its identity to such an extent as not to be able to understand its own actions (v.16).

The 'I' however is not totally destroyed. Paul goes so far as to say that there is no good in this 'I' (v.18), but he qualifies this immediately by stating that he means the 'I' which is totally under the power of sin - the 'not-I' which is better described as 'my flesh' (οντός). The 'I' has not completely lost its identity in that it still has the ability to will the good though not to perform it (vv.21-22). The 'I' is in fact a split 'I' - a divided self and its problem is a lack of power, which only Jesus Christ (and not the Law) can remedy (cf.i:17). Paul holds that man under the control of sin is not only alienated from God but also from his true self. The great difference between ch.vii and ch.viii is that the 'I' in ch.vii is indwelt and controlled by sin whereas the 'I' in ch.viii is indwelt and controlled by the Spirit.

2. "This mysteriousness consists in my no longer being at home in myself. Rather, sin is at home in me and therefore I bear my own murderer (vii:11 and 13) in me." Bornkamm, op.cit., p.98.
3. E. Fuchs believes that Paul is using a gnostic hymn as the basis for his anthropology in vii:7-25, (Die Freiheit des Glaubens, pp.60.f.). Bornkamm can find no trace of this but believes that all expressions in the text are drawn from the theme 'Law and sin' and do not allow for the use of a gnostic poem (op.cit., p.102 n.20). He is of the opinion however that Paul makes use of gnostic and dualistic terminology which has unfortunately led to his anthropology being misunderstood, (p.98).
In view of the loss of identity of the 'I' in the second part of the chapter, it seems best to regard Paul's picture of the 'I' in vv.14-25 as a description of a condition which is actually the outcome of the pre-history of the 'I' outlined in vv.7-13. The past tense of vv.7.f. is to be explained by the fact that they are the necessary presupposition which is required to make vv.14-25 intelligible. We can only understand the self-contradiction of the 'I' of 14-25 when we are given the information concerning the 'I' who was alive prior to sin in vv.7.f.

This interpretation explains the continuity of theme between these two sections of the chapter and also accounts for the change in tense which Nygren emphasizes so strongly. Continuity is also evidenced by the repeated use of the 'I' throughout the two sections. This leaves us with the problem of the identity of the 'I' in vv.7-13, which precedes the 'I' of pre-Christian man in vv.14.f. Many commentators are of the opinion that Paul has the Gen.iii incident very much in mind in vv.7.f. The reference to the commandment may not be simply a loose way of referring to the Law but rather a clear pointer to the commandment of Gen.iii. The sin which seduces is clearly

2. Ibid.
3. "In beiden Stücken handle es sich um die Stellung und Bedeutung des Gesetzes." Althaus, op.cit., p.476. See also Bornkamm's claim that "the connection between the two sections (vv.7-13 and 14-25) cannot be over-emphasized." op.cit., p.95.
a reminder of the serpent in the Genesis story.¹

But if Paul has the story of Adam in mind in vv. 7-13, why does he continue to use the first person singular throughout the chapter? This is not such a difficult problem if we recognize that the 'I' is a supra-individual (überindividuelle) 'I'.² The 'I' in the first part of the section is 'Adam' and the 'I' of the second part (vv. 14-25) is every man becoming his own Adam in yielding to sin,³ this latter resulting admittedly as a consequence of the former. Paul feels justified in using the first person singular throughout because the statements of both sections (vv. 7-13 and 14-25) are necessary presuppositions to his own self-understanding.⁴

We may affirm then that the 'I' in Rom. vii is not the 'I' of Christian but rather of pre-Christian man. In as much as Paul looks at this man's situation from the vantage point of the new life in Christ and in

¹. Cf. Leenhardt, pp. 186-8. Lyonnet shows that Paul's vocabulary in these verses has distinct echoes of the Genesis iii account of man's first sin. The Neofiti recension of the Targum and Rabbinic literature show that covetousness was regarded as the prototype of all other sins, (p. 161). The Jews believed that they had been delivered from this sin by the gift of the Law at Sinai, but that it continued to be the characteristic sin of Gentiles (particularly in its sexual manifestation), (p. 162). Lyonnet concludes that if Paul had wished to indicate one sin which enveloped all others, and especially the sin of Eden, he could not have chosen a more appropriate formula, (p. 165).


³. Cf. Lyonnet, op. cit., pp. 161-2. Lyonnet believes that what M. Hooker has noted concerning "Adam in Rom. i." NTS, VI (1959/60), p. 303, is even also applicable to Rom. vii. Bornkamm states the "the Adam of Rom. vi:12.f. speaks in the 'I' of Rom. vii:7.f.", (op. cit., p. 94). He disagrees however, with the view that the 'I' is to be identified with Adam - the name Adam is deliberately not included (op. cit., pp. 93-94).

⁴. Bornkamm points out that even if the reference of the 'I' to Adamic man is valid, it is still not correct to speak of man or mankind. It is "only under law, sin and death that man really becomes an 'I'." (p. 94). Paul continues to use the first person singular because "the reality of one lost under law, sin and death can be referred to only as my 'reality'." (Ibid).
view of the parallel between the 'I' of vv.14.f. with the 'we' of v.5, we must emphasize that the 'I' here is a supra-individual 'I'. This does not rule out the fact that it may also be a personal 'I'.

Michel notes the parallel between the 'I' style of Rom.vii and some of the Qumran writings. In the Hodayoth personal experience goes hand in hand with general statements concerning the corruption of mankind. The personal lament or confession of the Hodayoth offers a good parallel to Paul's style in Rom.vii. In both the general validity of a theological statement is underlined by reference to personal experience.

Paul's statements in Rom.vii are clearly those of the Christian man fully aware of his pre-Christian existence. They are not meant to be the expression of Paul's introspective psychology but to express the general

1. Michel is particularly interested in the parallels between Rom.vii and the Thanksgiving Scroll (p.171). See also H. Braun, "Röm.vii: 7-25 und das Selbstverständniss des Qumran-Frommen." Gesammelte Studien zum Neuen Testament und Seiner Umwelt. (Tübingen 1962), pp.100-19. Braun finds that Paul and Qumran agree in asserting the extreme sinfulness of man and that salvation comes to men only through the action of God's grace (p.112). In both Paul and Qumran the recognition of these two facts can only be made in faith (p.117). This shows that the idea of justification only through God's grace is not an exclusively Pauline doctrine (p.112). But Paul and Qumran differ in their evaluation of the role of the Torah in salvation (p.117). In Qumran, salvation means freedom to follow the Law. God's grace is to strengthen the faithful in whom the tendency to disobedience still remains (p.113). In Paul, salvation means freedom from the Law and the ego is so dominated by sin that the intent to follow the Law is perverted and leads to death. Thus in Paul the condition of man is more serious and the need of God's grace more deeply founded. Braun concludes that the similarities between Paul and Qumran indicate not a direct dependence of Paul on Qumran but that both drew from a common source, a gnostically influenced Judaism (p.117.f.). M. Wilcox agrees that Paul and Qumran show some gnostic influence but maintains that this is confined to a borrowing, or coming to grips with its terminology. "Dualism, Gnosticism, and Other Elements in the Pre-Pauline Tradition". The Scrolls and Christianity. Ed. M. Black, SPCK Theological Collections II, (London 1969), pp.83-96(90).

2. Cf. Michel, p.177.
situation of unredeemed man under the Law as Paul sees him. This does not mean, however, that Paul's own self-awareness may not be taken as a concrete example of the universal situation of man under Law and sin. The use of the personal 'I' and the dramatic presentation remind us that Romans vii:14.f. is not theoretical or philosophical speculation about life but a description of man in the actual world of reality where not only what he wills, but what he does determines his destiny. To agree with the Law that it is good is not all that is required. In v.21 Paul begins to summarize his findings in the previous verses, (13-25). In order to appreciate his conclusions we will now refer back briefly to vv.13.f. in order to determine the structure as well as the content of Paul's argument.

Despite the view of many commentators who, as we have noted, hold that the new section begins at v.14, it is more likely that it begins at v.13. The reason for locating the break at v.14 is chiefly because of the change of tense from past to present in that verse. But Paul's use of questions and objections in Romans gives us good reason to expect that a new section or sub-section would begin as in v.13 with a question.¹

In v.13 we find a similar pattern to v.7. This is not surprising since the latter is almost an exact repetition of the former. The suggestion that the Law itself is sin, rejected by Paul in v.7., recurs in a slightly different form in v.13. Granted that the Law is good, is it not still the conveyor of death to mankind? Because v.13 repeats v.7 the initial ἄν οὖν ἥν ἁπάντησεν is omitted and the wrong inference is directly introduced

¹. As we have already noted. Michel and Gaugler support the division suggested here. This is probably because both of these authors draw attention to Paul's use of questions and objections in the structure of the letter. Cf. Michel, pp.152.f., 158, 169; Gaugler, p.197.
in question form. This is followed by the customary exclamation of horror, and the reply begins in v.14, where Paul puts the blame firmly on sin and not on the Law. In view of the fact that vv.13-14 follow Paul's normal introductory pattern as in vi:1,15 etc., the change of tense cannot be considered as of sufficient importance for us to regard v.14 as the beginning of the new sub-section. 1

As we have previously noted, Paul's response to objections usually takes the form of a reference to generally accepted truths - what Christians know or ought to know as members of Christ. It seems preferable to regard ὁκομεν as the proper reading in v.14 since the esteem in which the Law is properly held is not merely the personal opinion of Paul but the faith of all - the credal confession of the community. 2 In v.18 however, Paul is expressing a rather non-complimentary self-knowledge and it is therefore more appropriate to speak in the first person singular.

Irrespective of whether vv.14 and 18 begin with the first person singular or plural, there is no doubt that a certain similarity does exist between them. 3 Paul deliberately repeats the content of vv.14-17 in vv.18-20 in order to stress his point, 4 namely the divided self of man which results from the operation of sin in relation to the Law. This is more explicit when the Greek text is set out in parallel columns. 5

1. The fact that the break occurs between vv.12 and 13 and not at the end of the following verse is further evidence that Nygren lays too much stress on the change of tense in v.14 (as indicating the change from pre-Christian to Christian life).
2. Cf. Leenhardt, p.190. Michel allows the possibility that both v.14 and v.18 may originally have been in the first person singular. (p.175 n.3).
4. Ibid. Feuillet comments "comme les passages précédents où l'Apôtre veut prouver quelque chose, la présente est rédigée avec soin et présente deux séries de textes parallèles."
5. Ibid.
The repetition coupled with the rhythmic style of this section\(^1\) may indicate that Paul is basing his thought upon some well-known credal statement or hymn.\(^2\) This accords well with the pattern whereby he tends to answer objections by referring to the commonly accepted knowledge of the Christian community. In this case the commonly accepted knowledge may have taken the form of a confession of human sinfulness, ending with the triumphant affirmation of v.25a.\(^3\)

Verse 21 reminds us again that the discussion originated with the question concerning the Law, and that it is with this subject that we must conclude. Throughout the section Paul's thought has revolved around the problem - either the Law is bad or else 'I' am!\(^4\) The Law has simply served the function of throwing into relief the true nature of sin in all its ugliness. The reason why the Law brings death is because of a defect in 'me' rather than in the Law. The Law is spiritual; it is God's Law, but 'I' am

---

2. Several scholars have commented upon the peculiarities of this passage. Leenhardt notes the occurrence of a number of rare words and concludes that this suggests that Paul is borrowing from another source and possibly that he is adopting a viewpoint which is not familiar to him (p.183). The possibility that the source is a Gnostic hymn has been outlined by E. Fuchs, Die Freiheit des Glaubens, pp.61.f. There is insufficient evidence for us to specify the exact nature of Paul's source. In view of the parallels with the Hodayoth there seems to be no necessity to conclude that the source-hymn is necessarily a Gnostic one.
3. The view taken here is that v.25b ought to follow v.23. Cf. Michel, pp.179-81.
The opposite - carnal. The holy Law is weakened because of 'the flesh' (viii:3). Sin as an active power not only causes a divided self but perverts all God's gifts into demonic forces. This appears to be Paul's meaning in the reference to a different Law \( \text{νόμος} \) (v.23). With respect to the Law I find that when I want to do right (i.e. to obey the Law) evil lies close at hand. Because of man's involvement in a world into which sin has made its entry, the Law which was given for life becomes an instrument of death. In the end however, it is sin and the weakness of man which causes this holy Law to become perverted. This is Paul's defense of the Law. Mere-ly to defend the Law however, is not sufficient and for this reason the way to deliverance must be fully outlined in ch.viii, where Paul proclaims the Law of the Spirit which leads to life.

We may summarize our observations on Rom. vii:7-25 as follows - The passage is misunderstood if we look in it expecting to find a systematic

1. Jewett holds that Paul chose \( \text{ονομωσ} \) rather than \( \text{ονομωώς} \) in this verse because he meant to imply that the physical substance of man is responsible for the incapacity to follow the spiritual law. According to Jewett the "gnostic dualistic associations" are painfully evident in this verse, being softened only by the typically Pauline expression "sold under sin". Op.cit., p.155.


3. This is one of the possible interpretations of this verse discussed (but not accepted) by Sanday and Headlam (pp.163-4). In view of Paul's discussion in this chapter and the continuing theme of the Law (and the Spirit) in viii:2.f., this appears to be the most acceptable interpretation.

4. Michel designates viii:7-25 as a Christian apologetic against the Jewish view that "das Gesetz Leben schafft", (p.167). In view of the fact that Paul is Jewish 'Gesetzeslehre' is not to be denied, but the question is - is it his primary aim to oppose it?
outline of Pauline anthropology. Paul did not set out to provide this.\(^1\) Neither did he set out to paint an exact picture of man under sin etc. All his theological observations in Rom.vii stem from the basic question concerning the goodness of the Law in vii:7.\(^2\) The development of Paul's thought in this section appears to go as follows - Is the Law sin? God forbid! But I will grant you this that one cannot absolutely deny a certain connection with sin (vv.7b-12). These verses refer back to Gen.iii and show how sin got its opportunity through the Law and by it killed mankind, (vii).

Having preliminarily shown the connection between Law and sin, Paul returns in v.13 to the original question of the goodness of the Law. This time he exonerates the Law, first by showing that it is sin which takes the good Law and uses it to bring death. He exonerates the Law and blames sin. In vv.14.f. Paul enlarges on his explanation by showing that sin not only perverts the good Law but does this by taking over the life of man and forcing him to be its slave. This results in man agreeing on the one hand with the Law and its goodness, but on the other actually practising the dictates of sin. For man on his own\(^3\) there can be no deliverance from this dilemma; only through Jesus Christ can freedom and life be found. (v.25a; viii:1.f.). This brings us to another aspect of ch.vii which helps to explain some of its peculiarities. It is important to remember that when Paul was writing ch.vii

2. In a summary conclusion concerning vv.7-25, Barrett claims that the exegesis has shown that the primary question in Paul's mind here is not psychological or anthropological, but one which arose from specific questions concerning the goodness of the Law and its connection with sin. It is in order to answer these that Paul wrote this section. He is only "incidentally involved in an analysis of human nature." (p.152).
he wrote it with the knowledge that it would be succeeded by the contrast of ch.viii. In spite of its character as a 'digression' it may also be stated that vii:7-25 forms with ch.viii:1-17 a unity, so that the dark background of ch.vii - the weakness of man before and without Christ, is offset in ch. viii by the freedom and security of man in Christ. It is fair to say that vii:5 gives a preview of vii:14-25 - the 'then' when we were in the flesh and viii:1. f. speaks of the 'now' that we are in the Spirit.

Although we have not been convinced by the argument that Rom.vii: 7-25 describes Christian experience, it must be allowed that this background knowledge is necessary even for the Christian. The unredeemed man cannot be aware of his dilemma except in the light of his deliverance in Christ. Conversely it is essential for the development of the life of the Christian that he should appreciate that from which he has been delivered. The 'then' is necessary to Christian experience in order to appreciate the 'now'. In this respect Nygren's view of vii:7-25 as describing a necessary continuing aspect of Christian experience has a useful contribution to make.

Let us now summarize what we have discovered concerning Paul's use of questions / objections in chapters vi and vii. These are usually divided into two major sections, vi:1 - vii:6 and vii:7-25. When we examine the text

2. Cf. Dahl, op.cit., pp.41-42. "The self-understanding of the redeemed (Rom.viii) and the self-understanding of the sinner (Rom.vii) are most firmly linked to one another." (Bornkamm, op.cit., p.101).
3. Bornkamm sees the unredeemed past as "the precipitous foundation of the new being in Christ." (p.101).
4. Kertelge holds that the dark background of the Christians unredeemed past remains a factor to be reckoned with - "als seiner negativen Möglichkeit auch in der Gegenwart." (p.113). But this past also exercises a positive function "Indem sich der Christ seiner früheren Situation bewusst wird, gewinnt sein Bewusstsein als Ich in der vom πνεύμα Christi bestimm- ten Gegenwart Klarheit über seine neue Existenz." (Ibid).
with a view to finding a pattern of usage, we discover that the introduction to each of these sections is more or less similar. We find that they both begin with the question τι οὖν ἐργοῦμεν, which we might paraphrase as "what are we to infer from this" i.e. what inference do we draw from what has just been stated? Then comes the suggested false inference, which although usually having a verbal connection with Paul's previous statements, is quite foreign to his intention.

The third part of this pattern is also similar in both vi:1 and vii:7 - Paul's repudiation of such improper suggestions by an adamant μὴ γένοιτο

But not only the major divisions of these chapters are marked out by the intrusion of question and objection. A similar pattern emerges also in the sub-sections. As we have noted, it is normal to subdivide ch.vi into vi:1-14 and vi:15-23. Chapter vii:1-6 is also related to these two sub-sections as being the third illustration which Paul employs in the portrayal of the Christian's emancipation from sin. The division in ch.vi is marked by the repetition in v.15 in a slightly different form of the wrong inference suggested in vi:1. Again we find the pattern - question (this time τι οὖν), wrong inference and μὴ γένοιτο as in vi:1 (and vii:7). From this it would appear that Paul introduces these questions and objections to mark out or introduce important stages in the development of his argument.

Chapter viii:1 marks the commencement of the third sub-section in vii-viii:6. The illustrations drawn from baptism and slavery in ch.vi were clearly identified by the question / objection pattern. The fact that the objection of vii:1 was repeated in a slightly different form in viii:15 points to the fact that these two sections are complementary to one another, both dealing with a similar theme. In vii:1, we find that the normal introductory pattern
is missing. We do not find the question, the false inference or the repudiation expressing horror. We find only ἡ γνωσίς. If we look again at the objection in vi:1 and vi:15 we discover that what might be termed a fourth element in the introductory formula occurs in both cases. Paul's answer to the false inference of vi:1 begins in vi:3 with ἡ γνωσίς - the same phrase which begins vii:1 f. After the false inference of vi:15, Paul again commences his answer by a reference to something with which he expects his readers to be familiar. He says ὦκ σΩδατε and he illustrates his answer not by means of baptism as in vi:1-14 but in terms of the slave/master relationship.

Chapter vii:1 then actually begins with the fourth part of Paul's normal four-point formula. The reason we have suggested for this is that vii:1-6 is closely related to the two sections of ch.vi already fully introduced in the normal pattern. Since this section continues the theme already so well introduced, the third illustration bypasses the preliminary parts of the introductory formula and proceeds only with the positive illustration from generally accepted truth.

What we have already noted is borne out by the remainder of ch.vii i.e. vv.7-25. In v.7 the first three parts of the formula - question, wrong inference and expression of horror are all present. We do not find the fourth part - i.e. the full answer to the false inference by means of an exposition of generally accepted truth. As has already been stated, the possible reason for this is that Paul felt obliged to offer some clarification of his absolute denial of the sinfulness of the Law in view of how he had already connected the Law with the whole process of sin. Ch.vii:7-12 is thus to be regarded as a brief interim explanation of how Paul can simultaneously
claim that the Law is good and holy and yet also an instrument used by sin to bring death.

It is only in vii:13 that Paul can resume the full course of his discussion and he indicates this by repeating the objection already introduced in vii:7. This time the full pattern is followed through i.e. question, wrong inference, expression of horror and answer drawing out the consequences of something which we already know (or should know).

1. Paul uses questions and objections to mark out new and important stages in the progress of his argument.

2. The content of these objections defines the theme to which Paul is about to address himself in the succeeding section.

3. The objections are sometimes repeated in order to allow Paul to deal more fully with the problems they introduce. This means that not only major but minor sub-divisions are also headed by these objections.

4. Although the sudden introduction of objections into the flow of Paul's argument gives the impression that what follows is a digression, we should realize that this is the deliberate literary method of a thoughtful writer. Hence what seems to be digression in its formal context, may in fact be the central issue which Paul wishes to bring to his reader's attention. Paul's argument in Romans is not cyclical, but always progressive — progressive not with digressions, but through digressions.

---

1. This is not to deny the excellent suggestion by Jeremias (p.148) that the Roman letter has the character of a lively missionary dialogue. The suggestion we wish to make here is that Paul in Romans re-uses patterns of argument which were developed in endless confrontations with his own people, and also with the Gentile Christians in the Hellenistic world.
5. The fact that Paul usually begins his answer by reference to what he expects both he and his audience have in common, shows how much he wished to emphasize the continuity with the Old Testament and with the pre-Pauline exposition of the Christian faith. He does not wish to be regarded as an innovator of new ideas or doctrine.

6. The deliberate use of question and objection in obvious parallel with the Stoic-Cynic Diatribe points to the apologetic character of Paul's letter to the Romans. Because he has not yet visited Rome and is unsure as to how his authority will be received there, Paul chooses the diatribe style as a convenient and diplomatic means of introducing those issues on which he feels these Christians need guidance.

7. These questions and objections are not purely theoretical deductions drawn by hostile (Jewish) opponents from Paul's doctrine of justification by faith. Nor do they represent a repudiation by Paul of possible wrong inferences from his doctrine. Instead they constitute the real issues and reflect the actual historical situation to which the Roman letter is addressed. As it is of decisive importance, this point has been deliberately placed at the end of the list in order that we may discuss it in greater detail.
Questions and Objections as a Guide to the Situation which Paul addresses in Chapters vi-vii.

Chapters vi-vii are normally divided into two main sections, vi:1-vii:6 and vii:7-25. As already noted these begin with objections which delineate the stages of the argument and indicate at the same time the subject for discussion in the succeeding verses. If we regard the questions and objections as pointers to the real issues which Paul has in mind, this means that the first section (vi:1-vii:6) should have as its main theme the non-continuance of Christians in the practice of sin after baptism. On this basis the second section ought to deal with the goodness of the Law and its relation to sin. From our exegesis we have already established that this is in fact so.

It is now necessary to consider two other possible interpretations of the significance of these objections. These have to do with the question of the origin of the objections. It may be suggested that the objections denote the malicious misrepresentation of Paul's doctrine of grace by hostile Jews or by Judaizing Christians. The weight of evidence however, shows that the Roman Christians were predominantly Gentile in origin. What would be the point of refuting in a letter to Gentile Christians the objections made by Jews? Only if it could be shown that these Gentiles were in need of support against such opinions, could a case be made out for Paul's discussion of such issues. But the evidence of the Roman letter suggests that these Christ-

1. Cf. W.C. Kümmel's comment on the actual situation Paul addresses in Rome, "we can say with certainty only that Paul set forth his views against the Jewish teaching of salvation and against antinomian charges against his message of the gospel." Introduction to the New Testament (p.221).
ians were inclined to despise the Jews and to boast over them, rather than be influenced by their opinions.¹

Again it might be argued that Paul is forestalling any possible misunderstanding of his teaching by outlining in advance the error of certain likely misinterpretations.² In this case the inferences are still purely theoretical, or may reflect Paul's experiences in Corinth or elsewhere but have no immediate connection with the Christians in Rome.³ We note however, that in ch.iii:8 some Roman Christians are referred to as having slanderously reported Paul as commending the doing of evil in order that good may ensue. We must bear in mind the possibility that this was not a deliberate slander but that it may have been made by those who believed they were sincerely following the teaching of Paul.⁴ Whether or not this is so, there is evidence that Paul is addressing a specific situation in vi:11.f., in that he uses the second person plural and directly exhorts the Roman Christians

---


2. W. Lütgert criticizes Weizsäcker's opinion that the view suggested in vi:1 could be arrived at by readers of the previous chapters simply by logical deduction. Lütgert shows that this is not what a sincere reader would logically conclude, but exactly the opposite. Hence vi:1.f. is concerned with actual misrepresentations of Paul's doctrine and not merely theoretical deductions from it, (op.cit., p.72).


4. Cf. Lütgert, op.cit., pp.76 and 79. We do not rule out the possibility that there may be some distortion of views because of tension between the 'weak' and the 'strong' in Rome, (cf. Minear, op.cit., p.8). We believe however that Paul is reasonably well-informed of the actual situation.
not to let sin reign in their bodies.\(^1\) The use of the second person plural continues throughout the chapter and is further strengthened by the direct address \(\delta \varepsilon \chi \varphi \omicron \iota\), in viii:1 and 4. If Paul's case were purely theoretical, it would appear rather unwise of him to warn the Roman Christians against a way of life as yet quite foreign to them.

Again it may be pointed out that if Paul were merely intent on protecting his doctrine or his character from being misrepresented, his assertions ought to have something of the nature of apology, or self-defense. But chs.vi and vii show little sign of Paul defending himself. As Lütgert points out, they are for the most part characterized by exhortations and warnings rather than apology.\(^2\) Even in vii:7-25, where there is an element of apology, this is on behalf of the Law which is not a specifically Pauline possession, nor a central part of his preaching especially in a Gentile community such as Rome.

On the positive side, the suggestion that the Roman Christians were predominantly Gentile fits in much better with the content of chs.vi and vii than the proposal that they were mainly Jewish in origin. The error Paul opposes in ch.vii:1f. appears to be some form of libertinism. Lütgert describes it as continuing in the practice of sin on principle.\(^3\) These are not weak Gentile Christians who unwillingly fall into sin but these are mature enlightened Christians who are fully confident as to the legitimacy

---

1. Minear believes that Paul's use of 'you' and 'your' in the hortatory section vii:11-23 means that Paul is separating himself from the libertinarian extremists, (op.cit., p.63).
of their style of life. It is quite possible that they attribute to Paul the promulgation of such doctrines.\(^2\)

The only part of chs.\(vi\) and \(vii\) which appears to give some support to the view that Jewish Christians are being addressed is \(vii:1-6\) where Paul states that he is speaking to those "who know the Law", (v.1). In order to properly evaluate these verses we must bear in mind that they are the third part of an argument which began in \(vi:1\) against Christians continuing in sin. The interest is not in a negative freedom from the Law but on the outcome of this freedom in a new kind of 'slavery' to Christ. We must not forget that this slave image is carried over from \(vi:15\).f. and that there we believed that it might refer to proselytes who, on becoming Christians, were tempted to despise the Judaism they had formerly embraced.

In any case, the fact that \(vii:1-6\) is only a short section in the total argument of the two chapters, would appear to indicate that the Jewish Christians were very much in the minority. Despite Michel's view that \(vii:7-25\) is Paul's defense against the Jewish belief that the Law brings life,\(^3\) this does not seem to be a good description of its function and content. The strongest emphasis is placed on the divine origin of the Law\(^4\) and the whole argument is designed to exonerate the Law whilst admitting its undoubted connection with sin and its weakness due to the 'flesh'. Just as Jewish Christians are less likely than Gentile Christians to hold antinomian

---

1. Cf. the 'strong' Christians of chs.\(xiv\) and \(xv\). Although we do not agree with Minear's description of the Roman Christians as composing five different groups, his picture of the 'strong in faith' is quite convincing, (op.cit., pp.10-12). Although the 'strong' were probably for the most part of Gentile origin, we note that Paul identifies himself with them except in their scorn for the 'weak', (xv:1).
or libertinistic opinions, so here too we must stress that the content of
the main objection in vii:7 - that the Law is sin and of the subsidiary one
in vii:13 - that the good Law is an agent of death, are more likely to have
originated from Gentile Christians than Jewish.

Although we hold this view we do not overlook the fact that the dis-
cussion in Rom.vii demands a Jew-Gentile context and not simply a Gentile
one. It is only in a situation where the Law is or has been an issue that
the discussion in Rom.vii is intelligible. This means that Paul may be
writing with Jerusalem and Judaism in mind;\(^\text{1}\) as a Jew, Paul could hardly
be expected to discuss the gospel apart from its Jewish background.\(^\text{2}\) But
this is not sufficient to account for Rom.vii.

If we are correct in regarding the objections as clues to the real
situation then it means that in Rome people were actually saying that the
Law is sin, or something similar.\(^\text{3}\) It is to meet their objections that
Paul embarks on his description of man under the Law, a subject admittedly
which must relate primarily to Jews and Jewish Christians. It is not on
account of Jews however that this subject is introduced but on account of
Gentile Christians, or possibly Christians who formerly were proselytes.

Since the problem of antinomianism was a constant threat to Gentile

---

1. Bornkamm, Paulus, pp.110-11. Bornkamm is typical of many recent studies
which emphasize that Romans was written in the light of Paul's impending
visit to Jerusalem. Cf. also Suggs, op.cit., pp.296-98, 311-12.
Apostels über seine religiöse Vergangenheit. Dementsprechend zeigt die
Stelle zugleich auch den tiefsten Grund für das Antichristentum der
Juden überhaupt." It is interesting that Schmidt also notes that Paul's
choice of covetousness in vv.7.f. is particularly relevant to Gentile
Christians as well as Jewish. (p.123).
Christianity, these aspersions on the Law are best understood as emanating from a Gentile source. The shades of Marcionism are already apparent in Rome. We concede to Michel, however, that although Paul is specifically refuting objections made by Gentiles, he may also have in mind legalistic (Jewish) Christians who perhaps placed too much significance on the keeping of the Law as the way to life. In a situation where there were some Christians who had previously been Jewish proselytes and some of Gentile extraction holding hyper-Pauline views, the evaluation of the Law would be a burning issue. This understanding of the situation helps to account for Paul's approach in Rom.vii. He upholds the divine origin of the Law, but shows that it does not in fact lead to life, and that it is only by faith in Christ through the Spirit that the Law is fulfilled, (viii:1.f.).

From this study we may conclude that in chs.vi-vii, Paul's use of questions and objections has proved to be a useful clue towards understanding the situation which he addresses. Our investigation has verified for this section at least, the observations of Jeremias that the answer to objections accounts for the content of a large proportion of the letter.

If this observation holds good for chs.ix-xi as we believe it does, then chs.vi-vii and ix-xi reveal a literary and structural unity. This is

---

2. Cf. H. Braun, op.cit., p.101. Braun holds that vii:7-25 is Paul's apologia for the Law on account of criticisms that had been levelled against it.
3. Although he does not specifically identify the views of the Roman Christians with those of Marcion, Gaugler in common with several other commentators considers it relevant to make reference to him at this point, (pp.197-8).
4. Jewett relates vv.13-25 to x:1-8 and sees both as demonstrating that since Christ has come "it is a sinful rejection of grace to attempt to vindicate oneself by the method of the old aeon", (pp.146-7).
5. According to Lütgert the identification of the objector and the source of the objections marks the separation of the ways in the interpretation of Romans. Op.cit., p.73.
all the more interesting in that this unity is observed in sections that are not normally related to each other in any very definite thematic connection. We have already noted the list of objections that occurs in iii:1-8. We now establish a connection between ch.iii and ch.vi in that the objection put forward in iii:8 is repeated and answered in vi:1.f.

In our survey of the remainder of chs.1-xi it will be necessary for us to consider whether in fact these objections do give a clear pointer to the actual situation which Paul addresses. Although these objections do not occur to the same extent in every chapter, it will still be necessary for us to look for signs of the actual historical situation even in chapters that are not in the argumentative style.

If our proposal that the objections are clear pointers to the actual situation fits in with what we eventually discover to be the content of the letter as a whole, this would require a revision of the normal estimate of what is primary and what is secondary in the letter. From this initial investigation it would appear that the argumentative sections interspersed with objections are the main stream of the letter. The more dogmatic and theological sections, however valuable as expositions of Pauline theology, are to be regarded as secondary within the original purpose of the letter in that they are included only on account of the problems indicated by the objections in the argumentative sections. Our tentative suggestion at this stage is that the kerygmatic sections originate from the argumentative as Paul's positive exposition of the gospel in response to specific problems among the Christians at Rome.
Many commentators have noted a connection between Rom.iii:1-8 and Rom.ix:1f.1 Some have simply mentioned this, others have made some brief comment, but few have emphasized the relationship and its significance for the interpretation of the letter.2 The purpose of this section is to attempt to show that there is a definite connection between chs.iii and ix. If this can be established, since chs.ix-xi are generally regarded as one unit, then we will have succeeded in connecting this whole section with ch.iii, thereby refuting the argument that chs.ix-xi are independent of the rest of the epistle.

Ch.iii:1-2 proceeds directly from Paul's argument in ch.ii. As a result of what Paul has said there, it appears that he has so successfully levelled out the differences between Jew and Gentile that he has abolished the God-given priority of the Jew first mentioned in i:16. But Paul has not forgotten this and the fact that he now returns to the subject shows that to a certain extent i:18 - ii:29 may be regarded as a digression.3

Paul returns to this theme with the question "then what advantage has the Jew or what is the value of circumcision?" (v.1). In v.2 he gives a positive reply to this question and commences what appears to be a list of the advantages of the Jew. "To begin with" he says "the Jews are entrusted

1. Cf. Lietzmann, p.89; Schlatter, p.122; Dodd, p.149, etc.
2. Schlatter is somewhat of an exception in that he does attempt to relate the two sections in his interpretation of the righteousness of God, (cf. pp.113f. and 291f.).
with the oracles of God." But the πρῶτον is not continued because, having listed only one advantage, Paul fails to complete his list at this stage.¹ Why does Paul not continue the proposed list? Is it simply because of forgetfulness or is it a deliberate change of plan? If the latter view is accepted then the real answer to the question concerning the advantage of the Jew is found in iii:9 - "Are we Jews any better off? No, not at all!" This, according to Dodd, is the logical answer to the question of the superiority of the Jew;² but Paul could not quite escape his Pharisaism (or his patriotism) and the view that the divine covenant had a "most favoured nation" clause. The result is that Paul is faced with his own inconsistency. As Dodd sees it "his case is inevitably a poor one, since he is trying to show that, although there is no partiality about God, yet the Jew's superiority is somehow, much in every way."³

In Dodd's opinion the reason why Paul does not complete his list at this stage is because he realizes the weakness of his own argument and "becomes embarrassed and in the end dismisses the subject awkwardly."⁴ But is this an adequate solution? Two arguments may be proposed in opposition to it. Firstly, it is not beyond question that v.9 is in fact a complete denial of v.2. In view of Paul's positive answer in v.2, we would not expect a direct denial in answer to the same question in the space of a few verses. It seems preferable therefore to translate προεχόμεθα as "Are we setting (one group) ahead of the other?"⁵ This avoids an apparent

---

¹ Contra Barrett who states that Paul never follows out to its conclusion the argument begun here (p.62). We believe it is concluded in chs.ix-xi.
² P.43.
³ P.46.
⁴ Ibid.
⁵ For a fuller discussion of this interpretation see later on v.9. (p.134).
contradiction in Paul's argument and also fits in better with Paul's positive appreciation of the privileges of the Jews in chs.ix-xi.

Secondly it may also be pointed out that it seems very strange that Paul should introduce into his discussion a question which he finds so embarrassing. 'Straw men' are normally introduced only by those who are quite confident of their ability to demolish them. In view of this is it not more likely that Paul introduces the question in iii:1 because he intends later to deal with the subject of Jewish advantage and is quite confident that he is competent to discuss the question?

The reason why Paul does not dwell upon the difficult issue raised in iii:1 is that he simply does not wish to deal with it at this point - he only wishes to note the problem to show that he is not unaware of it. But if he does not intend to pursue it, why does he introduce the subject? The reason is that Paul did not have the advantage offered the modern writer by footnotes. If he had had this possibility, Paul would probably have added a footnote saying that he was aware of the problem and would deal with it fully in a later section. By doing this he would have avoided any misunderstanding of his own position. As a Jew Paul was fully aware of the privileged position of Israel the recipient of God's revelation in history; at the same time, as a Christian, he wished to show that this was not a valid reason for the failure of the Jews to acknowledge Christ as Messiah. If

he had not been concerned about the feelings of the Jews or of Jewish Christians, Paul could have omitted any reference to Jewish priority at this point and proceeded immediately to outline the grace of God in justification in Christ.

But this course is probably ruled out because of the attitude of the Roman Christians. The majority of these are Gentile Christians and some of them hold strong anti-Semitic beliefs (cf. xi:17.ff.)¹ They tend to think of themselves as a completely new creation - a 'creatio ex nihilo'- forgetting their dependence on the root of Abraham, on the historical Israel of God.² These Gentile Christians are proud of their freedom in the gospel; they regard themselves as 'strong in faith' and despise their 'weaker' brethren with Jewish scruples concerning food, feast days etc.³ Paul dare not encourage these Gentile Christians in their mistaken views of Judaism and of the historical background of the faith they profess. He has to show right at the beginning of his argument that he is not unaware of the special history of the Jews and of their place in the 'Heilsgeschichte' of God. In fact, he has already given notice of this in the title to the letter in i:16 where he claims that he is not ashamed of the gospel because "it is the power of

---

¹ This view was first proposed by W. Lütgert in Der Römerbrief als historisches Problem in 1913. We cannot agree with E. Käsemann's opinion that Rom.xi:17.f. depicts a hypothetical situation which only materialized much later in the Ephesian church ("Ephesians and Acts." SLKA, (1966), p.291). The growth in numbers and influence of Gentile converts in the church took place some time prior to the writings of Romans. Cf. L.Goppelt's statement - "already at the time of the letters to the Corinthians, Paul had to protect conscience-bound Jewish Christians against Gentile Christians". (Jesus, Paul and Judaism, p.127).

² Cf. Leenhardt, pp.286-87.

³ Despite the fact that the picture of the 'weak' Christian in ch.xiv is not very representative of normative Judaism (vegetarianism etc.) it is now widely accepted that the division between the weak and the strong is basically one between Jewish and Gentile Christians. Cf. W.G. Kümmel Introduction to the New Testament, p.219. Cf. Thesis pp.480.ff.
God for salvation to everyone who has faith, to the Jew first and also to the Greek.\(^1\) Paul does not wish to give needless offence to people of Jewish background, and this is the reason why he acknowledges in iii:1-2 the privileges of the Jew and thereby disassociates himself from all suggestion of anti-semitism.

Support for this interpretation is found in iii:3-8. Dodd claims that the argument of the epistle would go much better if this whole section were omitted.\(^2\) Is Professor Dodd justified in his poor opinion of iii:1-8? We agree that the contribution of these verses adds little to the total argument of the epistle. But we do not believe that they are irrelevant. Why these verses appear to contribute little to the total argument is because they are, in fact, just a series of questions. Apart from vv.2 and 4 the rest of the verses in iii:1-8 are either totally or partially in question form. By introducing a series of questions or objections at this stage, Paul indicates his awareness of certain problems, and his intention to deal with them later.\(^3\) He should not be criticized for failure to give detailed

1. B. Noack notes the striking fact that the phrase "To the Jew first" occurs only in this epistle (i:16, iii:9-10) - the same epistle which also adamantly asserts that there is no difference between Jew and Greek. Noack suggests that this phrase (possibly pre-Pauline) is used in self-defence because it was not at all self-evident why Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles, should be delayed by a visit to Jerusalem instead of going direct to Rome. So Paul has to defend his journey to Jerusalem and this necessitates a defence of the preaching of the gospel to the Jews and of Paul's obligation towards them. ("Current and Backwater in the Epistle to the Romans." St.Th, XIX, Fasc. 1-2 (1965) pp.163-4).

2. P.46.

3. We must keep in mind here what we have already noted concerning Paul's use of questions and objections in connection with chs.vi-vii. We noted there how Paul introduces objections at decisive stages in his argument as a possible inference from what he has just stated and as an introduction to the next section of the letter. Ch.iii:1-8 seems to consist simply of a preliminary list of objections which will be used later to introduce and mark out distinct sections of the letter i.e. in chs.vi-vii and ix-xi.
answers at this point in the argument.

Theoretically Paul could have dealt with these problems in ch.iii, but this is not his intention. He prefers to deal with them later, in the light of the accumulated benefits of chs.iii:21 - vili:39. Even in the two verses (4 and 6) where Paul gives some kind of reply to the questions asked, there is no attempt at a proper answer. To questions suggesting that the faithfulness of God is endangered by the unbelief of His people (v.3) or that God is unjust to judge those whose wickedness serves His own purpose (v.5), Paul retorts, "God forbid!" (μὴ γένοιτο), (vv.4 and 6). He sometimes counters one question with another which implies the falsity of the first - God cannot be unjust in His judgement - "For how then could God judge the world?" (v.6). He counters false deductions from the contemporary situation (i.e. that the general unbelief of the Jews means that God is unfaithful) by quoting from the Old Testament scriptures (v.4b) and when he comes to the most preposterous suggestion of all - to do evil that good may come - he simply contents himself with the verdict upon such people "their condemnation is just." (v.8).

From this we see that Paul makes little effort in iii:l-8 to provide a significant contribution to the argument of the epistle. In this conclusion we are in agreement with Professor Dodd. But we go further and suggest that in spite of this, the section is not irrelevant but that the questions it tentatively introduces, prepare us for their fuller treatment in ix:1.f.

1. It is strange that whilst we disagree with Professor Dodd's criticisms of Paul's argument in iii:l-8, it was C.H. Dodd who, according to O. Michel, first noted Paul's habit of giving a brief preview of a subject some time before dealing with it in detail. See Dodd on v:1.f. (p.74) and Michel (p.22).
Professor Dodd has himself noted certain connections between iii:1-8 and ix-xi, but he has not, we feel, drawn the proper conclusions from them.  

This is due chiefly to his view that ix-xi may have existed as an independent sermon on the Jewish problem which Paul decided to include in the (otherwise complete) letter to the Romans.  

If, in fact, chs.ix-xi are not an integral part of the letter, then we must admit that the argument of iii:1-8 would be entirely insignificant and of no consequence to the argument of the epistle as a whole.  

But the view of ix-xi as a sort of appendix added almost as an afterthought is not now generally accepted and this means that the content and significance of iii:1-8 must be reviewed in the light of the renewed emphasis upon the unity of Romans i-xi.

Since there has been some difference of opinion as to the connections between chs.iii:1-8 and ch.ix:1.f., let us now seek to clarify these connections with a view to obtaining a better understanding of their significance.

As Professor Dodd notes, iii:1-2 is really completed in ix:4-5 where the gifts pertaining to the true Jew (the Israelite) are listed as the sonship,

---

1. Dodd notes that the issue raised in ix:1.f. has already been raised in iii:1 (op.cit.,p.148); even though he holds the view that ix-xi may have existed as a separate sermon, he notes that it is likely that Paul already knew he was going to use his sermon when he briefly dismissed the difficulties raised in iii:1-9 (p.149); on iii:1-8 he says that to understand it properly we must have recourse to the extended treatment of the same problem in ix-xi (p.44).

2. op.cit., pp.148-150.


4. In his commentary on Romans in 1944, A. Nygren strongly emphasized that chs.ix-xi are a consistent development of the thought of chs.i-viii and not in any sense a parenthesis or digression. Commentary on Romans, ET (London 1952), pp.35f. Since then there has been an increasing tendency to regard chs.i-xi as a unity. See Noack, op.cit., pp.155-158.

5. Dodd, p.43. The following also note the connection between these two sections: Dupont, op.cit., pp.393; Schlatter, pp.113 and 122; Michel, p.22; Dahl, op.cit., p.41 n.2; C. Müller, Gottes Gerechtigkeit und Gottes Volk, p.22.
the glory, the covenants, the giving of the Law, the worship and the promises, the patriarchs, and by human descent, the Messiah. This long list of God's gifts to the Jew is ample proof that Paul was not embarrassed in iii:2. The proper connection between iii:1-2 and ix:4-5 is established when iii:1-2 is regarded as a preliminary mention of something which is to be dealt with in greater detail later in the letter.¹

The same applies to most of the other objections raised in iii:1-8. The second question in ch.iii is introduced in v.3 - What if some were unfaithful? Does their faithlessness nullify the faithfulness of God? This objection is not dealt with again in chs.iii-viii. It is only in ix:6-13 that Paul returns to the problem. His answer is that God has not failed to keep faith, neither is He inconsistent in any way. His word has not failed (ix:6). His promise was originally given to Israel, but Israel is not a title that belongs indiscriminately or inalienably to all the descendants of Abraham.² The Israel of God is composed of those descendants of Abraham, who like Isaac, are children of God's promise, children of faith, and God's faithfulness is not impaired by the fact that some of the descendants of Abraham are not heirs of the promise given to Abraham.

The third question in ch.iii comes in v.5 - "But if our wickedness serves to show the justice of God, what shall we say? That God is unjust to inflict wrath on us?" If our thesis concerning the connection with ch.ix is correct we should expect this objection to be met in ix:14.f., and this is actually the case. Ch.ix:14 continues the theme of iii:5 with the

¹. Cf. H. Lietzmann, "mit Kap.ix beginnt ... die Ausführung des iii:1.f. kurz angeschlagenen Themas". (p.89).
². Cf. C. Müller, op.cit., chs.iii and vi, and P. Richardson, Israel in the Apostolic Church, pp.126-146.
question "Is there injustice on God's part?"¹ In both sections (iii:5 and ix:14f.) there is the presupposition that God disposes of man as He wills in His sovereign freedom, and in both a related objection occurs; if God uses men as He wills, how can He still judge men as if they were responsible for their own destiny? The answer which Paul gives in ix:14-18 is that man's life depends on the free mercy of God (not we note simply on the freedom of God). God exercises the right to have mercy on whom He wills and within His purpose of mercy He uses men as His instruments on the stage of history, whether it is Pharaoh or Moses.²

In order to clarify the progress of our discussion we will now set out these parallels in tabular form. Already we have noted connections between:

| iii:1-2 | ix:4-5, |
| iii:3-4 | ix:6-13, |
| iii:5-6 | ix:14-18. |

Our previous findings are strengthened by the fact that the fourth objection in ch.iii (v.7) also exhibits a close connection with ch.ix.³ The similarity in theme between iii:7 "But if through my falsehood, God's

---

¹. We note that the objection raised in ix:14 is not only similar in content to iii:5 but that they are both introduced by the same formula. Cf. Jeremias, op.cit., p.146.
². The older view that Paul is dealing with the predestination of individuals to their final destiny cannot be regarded as an adequate interpretation of ch.ix. The individuals who are mentioned are leaders of nations such as Pharaoh or Moses, or patriarchs who, without exception, became founders of peoples. Cf. Leenhardt, pp.249-50. See also the discussion of this theme in connection with ix:14-18. Cf. Thesis, pp.338 ff.
³. There is some doubt as to whether iii:8 should be regarded as a continuation of the objection in iii:7 (note the connecting καί), or whether these two verses should be regarded as related but separate objections against Paul's teaching. They are sometimes taken together - Jeremias speaks of the objection in iii:7f. (p.146) and Dahl connects iii:7-8 and chs.vi-vii (p.42 n.2). It seems best however to separate iii:7 and iii:8 and to view them as separate objections.
truthfulness abounds to His glory, why am I still being condemned as a sinner?", and ix:19 "Why does He still find fault? For who can resist His will?", is fairly plain. In ix:19.f., Paul reminds his critics of man's creatureliness and that man's function as creature is to serve the purpose of his Creator. The good purpose of the Creator to make known His glory to a people not from Jews only but also from Gentiles is Paul's answer to human criticism of the pattern of God's dealings with mankind.

The claim to find a parallel between iii:1-8 and ix seems to be invalidated by the fact that one other objection mentioned in ch.iii:8 is not specifically referred to or answered in ch.ix. In iii:8 Paul mentions the slanderous inference from his understanding of the message of grace in the gospel "and why not do evil that good may come?". He does not trouble to answer it but sharply retorts "Their condemnation is just!" We note that Paul does not give his usual reply μη γένοιτο, nor does he give a provisional answer to be elaborated later. Paul makes no attempt here to meet this slander. This is not simply because it is such a preposterous suggestion, but because he intends to consider the matter in detail in chs.vi and vii. These chapters are the real answer to the slander in iii:8. We discover

1. It is easy to understand how this caricature of Paul's gospel ("why not do evil that good may come"), could have originated from unsympathetic Jews. But the majority of the Roman Christians are of Gentile origin. It would appear that we cannot avoid the conclusion that some deliberate mis-representation of Paul is intended by the use of the word βλασφημοσύνη. If this is so it may have arisen from a legalistic Jewish minority among the Roman Christians or possibly from unbelieving Jews. But there is no necessity to regard all those who misrepresent Paul as his deliberate antagonists. When Paul says "and so some say that we say", he may be referring to Gentile Christians who quite innocently misinterpret his gospel. By emphasizing their freedom from the Law and that salvation is by grace these Roman Gentile Christians may have come to a one-sided understanding of the gospel which they mistakenly believe to be typically Pauline. If this is so then Paul may have been forced to intervene in the discussion at Rome in order to demonstrate that his gospel is neither antinomian nor anti-Jewish. Cf. W. Lütgert, op.cit., pp.69-90.
then the objection of vi:1 - "Are we to continue in sin that grace may abound?", and vi:15 - "Are we to sin because we are not under law but under grace?", reiterate the objection of iii:8, and chs.vi and vii provide a detailed answer to it.\(^1\) This is why we do not find an answer to the objection of iii:8 in chs.ix-xi - it has been fully answered in chs.vi-vii. Although iii:8 connects directly with vi:1.f. and does not relate to ch.ix, this fact does not invalidate our thesis since this instance also follows the pattern whereby an earlier objection is mentioned in passing and discussed in detail in a later chapter.

In order to clarify the pattern and the connections which we have proposed, we will set out in diagram form the parallels between the two sections.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{iii:1-2} & \text{ is related to } \text{ix:4-5,} \\
\text{iii:3-4} & \text{ " } \text{ " } \text{ ix:6-13,} \\
\text{iii:5-6} & \text{ " } \text{ " } \text{ ix:14-18,} \\
\text{iii:7} & \text{ " } \text{ " } \text{ ix:19-29,} \\
\text{iii:8} & \text{ " } \text{ " } \text{ vi:1 - vii:6.}
\end{align*}
\]

From this comparison of ch.iii:1-8 and ch.ix we note that Paul's intention at the beginning of his letter seems to be to note briefly certain specific problems with which he intends to deal in more detail later in the letter.\(^2\) This fact is extremely relevant in any discussion of the structure of the

---

whole letter as Dupont and Jeremias have clearly shown.  

More recently U. Luz has arrived at a similar conclusion concerning the construction of Romans i-viii.  

Luz pays particular attention to ch. iii:1-9. This section appears as an excursus in i:19 - iv:25, a section dominated by the traditional antithesis between the old and new ways of life.  

The briefly indicated and sharply repudiated questions which occur in iii:1.f. are taken up again in chs. vi-vii and ix-xi. According to Luz, the abbreviated themes of iii:1-9 are finally expanded and clarified only in chs.ix-xi.  

This is further indicated by parallels in the vocabulary of the two sections.  

No doubt Paul had the question of 'Israel' in mind right from the beginning of the letter - his intention all along has been to bring the 'heilsgeschichtlich' prerogative of Israel into the centre of the discussion.  

In any case the subject of Israel is for Paul a constitutive element of the theme - the righteousness of God.  

1. In broad outline these inner structural and thematic connections are in agreement with the views of Dupont and Jeremias. The connections will be clearer if we set them out as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iii:1-4 is related to ix:6</td>
<td>iii:1 is related to ix:6^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii:5-6 &quot; &quot; ix:14</td>
<td>iii:5^b &quot; &quot; ix:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii:7-8 &quot; &quot; ix:19</td>
<td>iii:7 &quot; &quot; ix:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii:8 &quot; &quot; vi:1.f.</td>
<td>iii:7.f&quot; &quot; vi:2-vii:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.392).</td>
<td>(p.148).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. This section was almost completed when Luz's article was first published in June 1969.  


5. Ibid. Luz notes the following words common to both sections: τά λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ Rom.iii:2,4, ix:6,9; ἀλήθεια, ἐκκλησίαν Θεοῦ iii:5, ix:14,30.f.; ἑδραὶ Θεοῦ iii:7, ix:23.  


7. Ibid.
In view of this connection which we have discovered between chs. iii: 1-8(9) and ch. ix what conclusions may we draw concerning the structure and purpose of the letter? We may state as our first point that Rom. i-xi ought to be regarded as a unity. Chs. ix-xi cannot be regarded as a digression or appendix. The subject of the Jewish prerogative is of primary importance and it has been Paul's intention to deal with it from the outset. Instead of it being regarded as an after-thought, added when the high point of ch. viii had already been reached, this theme must be viewed as a presupposition in Paul's mind prior to the writing of any of the important truths in iii: 21-viii: 39.

These parallels in chs. iii and ix point to the fact that the letter to the Romans is a carefully constructed document; if we take this fact seriously it requires us to give an explanation of the relation between chs. i-viii and ix-xi of such a nature that Paul's reason for thus constructing the letter is adequately explained. This requires that the thought of chs. ix-xi be regarded as equally, if not more significant than that of the preceding chapters.

In conclusion we may assert that the prerogative of the Jew is a prevailing theme in Paul's mind throughout Romans i-xi - cf. i: 16, ii: 9, iii: 1, 2, 9, ix-xi. Taken in association with the corresponding emphasis upon Jew and Gentile in the purpose of God in chs. i-iv, ix-xi and xiv-xv, it would appear that no adequate interpretation of Romans can omit this subject from any discussion of the theme and purpose of the letter.
Romans iii:9-20.

We have already noted that ch.iii begins with two verses referring to the advantages of the Jews. Attention has also been drawn to the fact that these verses and the subsequent group of questions in vv.3-8 are not dealt with in ch.iii, but only much later in the letter. Feuillet's outline of the thought of iii:1-20 has the merit of illustrating the connection between iii:1-2 and iii:3-20. Since ch.ii has shown the guilt of the Jews, and iii:23 relates both Jews and Gentiles in a similar failure to attain the glory of God, then iii:1-2, emphasizing the privileges of the Jews, introduces an element of contradiction into the context.¹ Feuillet explains this as follows "les raisonnements de iii:3-20 tendent à réduire à néant toutes les fausses conclusions qu'on pourrait tirer de cette contradiction apparente." Ch.iii:9 repeats the question concerning Jewish privileges previously put in iii:1.

There appears to be a contradiction between v.2 and v.9. This is difficult to decide since neither the reading nor the meaning of the Greek of this verse is clear. It is possible to arrive at two contradictory meanings simply on the basis of a different translation of ὄν τάντας. We may translate it as 'absolutely not' or 'not absolutely'.² Since Paul has accorded the Jews a certain advantage in v.2 of this chapter, it is unlikely that he would apparently contradict himself by an outright denial of the same in v.9. If we translate this phrase as 'not entirely' or 'not absolutely', this saves Paul from a direct self-contradiction in the space of a few

verses and is more in keeping with chs.ix-xi. Possibly because of the habit of contrasting the Jews and their Law with the church of Christ and the gospel, Gentile Christians have too readily believed that Paul denies all advantage to the Jew.

On the other hand Barrett reminds us that Paul's attitude on the question of Jewish advantage is very paradoxical - "the Jew has an advantage and he does not have an advantage". In any case the meaning here ought to be decided in relation to the understanding of προέχομαι. We may take this as is often done as middle but with active meaning i.e. "are we better off than they?" But if Paul had meant this he should have written the verb in the active voice (προέχομαι ). We are left then with a choice between the middle and the passive.

It seems that the difficulties of this verse have been magnified by the assumption that the "we" refers to Jews i.e. "Are we Jews any better off?" (RSV). In a recent article F.C. Synge has shown that this is an unwarranted assumption. It is Paul who is speaking and by the "we" he actually means "I", as in fact the RSV acknowledges in translating v.9b - "For I have already charged..." The question Paul is asking is simply "Am I setting one group ahead of the other, am I setting Jew before Gentile?" The answer to this must be an emphatic no. This interpretation allows an advantage to the Jews but denies that Paul is setting them above Gentiles. The answers of iii:2 and iii:9b may be combined as follows: "Much in every way except in the matter of racial discrimination". This interpretation reconciles two apparently conflicting emphases in Romans i.e. "To the Jew first" and "There is no distinction".

2. p.68. See Barrett's survey of the possible interpretations of v.9 (pp.66-8).
We note also in v.9 the repetition of τι ὁδῦ denoting that another stage in the argument has been reached.\(^1\) This time however, having already shown his awareness of the contradictory situation of the Jews (in vv.3-8) and having decided to deal with this problem later in the letter (i.e. in ix-xi) Paul contents himself with a concluding summary confirming the sinfulness of both Jews and Gentiles. Verse 9\(^b\) gives Paul's own summary of the content of the first two chapters of his letter\(^2\) - his thesis is that all men both Jews and Greeks are under the power of sin. The same scriptures that appear to give to the Jews a certain superiority (cf.iii:1-2), show that this advantage is purely relative because these scriptures also witness to the universal sinfulness of all men.\(^3\) This fact is borne out by the composite quotations comprising vv.10-18.\(^4\) The reference to the understanding, the direction (all have turned aside), the throat, the lips, the tongue, the mouth and the feet show that men are sinful in every part of their being - that all their members are being used in the service of sin.\(^5\)

It is noteworthy that Paul inserts the term ὑφαίνοντα in the first quotation. The word occurs neither in the Hebrew nor the LXX text of Ps. xiv:1ff. (or Ps.111:1f.).\(^6\) This brings the discussion within his own specific terminology. The reference to sin in v. 9 is also typical of Paul. In

---

2. Cf. Michel, p.98.
4. These quotations are mostly from the Psalms (with exception of v.17 from Isa.liix:7ff., cf.Prov.i:16). It is possible that Paul put these quotations together himself but it is more likely that he drew them from an already existing florilegium first used by Jews and then readapted for use in Christian catechetical and apologetic purposes, (cf. Michel, p.100). Some parts of this 'haraz' are adapted rather freely away from their original Psalm context, where they apply to the enemies of the righteous in Israel and not to universal wickedness (e.g. Psalm v:19 in v.13).
this, his first direct reference to sin in the letter, Paul speaks of sin in a personified form, as a power which holds men slaves or captives. Lest it should be argued by Jews that the scriptures quoted refer to the sins of Gentiles, Paul declares in v.19 that what the Law says, it says to those who are under the Law i.e. to the Jews. He begins his argument in this verse by a reference to accepted fact - that the scriptures speak firstly to God's covenant people - and he uses as he normally does the introductory formula o'c'a'v o'c'. Verses 19-20 round off the argument that Paul has been pursuing since 1:18. Using the analogy of the Old Testament Lawsuit with God, he finds every mouth is stopped and the whole world called to account before the Creator. The effect of universal bondage to sin is expressed by the thought of Genesis iii - man is excluded from the paradise of God. This is the thought expressed by "ơstơrơqνταν τῆς ὁδοκος τοῦ θεου. This concept of ὁδοκος τοῦ θεου is another dominant theme in Paul's theology and plays a significant role in this letter.

A brief reference to the function of the Law in v.20 reminds Paul's readers that the Law could not of itself justify anyone, but only brings knowledge of sin. Paul does not wish to deal with this theme in detail now, intending to deal with it later in the epistle.

3. Cf. P. Stuhlmacher, "Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus", pp.86 ff. Paul has altered the citation from Ps.143:2 by the addition of ἐς ἐργῶν νομον and by the substitution of πᾶς θρηςτος instead of πᾶς ζων. Jewett is probably correct in his view that these changes are due to the fact that Paul wished to counter the Judaizer's claim that flesh was acceptable as righteous by God, cf. pp.98 and 141 ff.
5. The word occurs no less than sixteen times in Romans. According to Stuhlmacher, Paul bases his conception of ὁδοκος on a Jewish tradition where men are considered to have lost their God-given likeness by the Fall. ὁδοκος may also be equated with ὁμαλοσυνη (v.20) and human ὁδοκος corresponds to the ὁδοκος of God. (op.cit., p.87).

The main argument of the first section of the epistle i.e. from i:18f. has been completed, and having added the scriptural demonstration in iii:10-16, Paul now proceeds to give a positive declaration of God's redeeming activity on behalf of sinful men. The νυνί δέ introducing vv.21-26 designates iii:21f. as the eschatological antithesis to i:18-iii:20. ἐν τῷ νῦν καὶ ῥήμα (v.26) again underlines the new era and activity of God in Christ. The antithesis to what has preceded is also marked by a striking change in style. Instead of ever-recurring questions and objections, we find in iii:21f. a great positive affirmation of God's saving activity in Jesus Christ. Throughout vv.21-26 we find a kerygmatic declaratory note. Paul is proclaiming the positive good news of the gospel - that now (as distinct from the past) and through faith (as distinct from the Law) the righteousness of God has been revealed. The immediate deduction that Paul makes from this declaration is that there is now no distinction between Jew and Gentile since salvation is χάρις νόμου (v.21). This emphasis will be developed in iii:25ff., but Paul is concerned not to overstate his case and he adds

1. It seems preferable to regard νυνί δέ as giving a temporal as well as a logical contrast. Cf. Barrett, p.72; Michel, p.104.
He does not wish to belittle the Old Testament revelation or the special history of God's dealing with the Jewish people.  

Paul also reveals his appreciation and understanding of the past by quoting from an early Christian confession concerning the death of Christ and its meaning. The liturgical overtones and the specialized vocabulary point to the Lord's Supper as the most likely 'Sitz im Leben' for this confession.  

As in Paul's own theology, the death of Christ is central for the confession

---

2. Cf. Stuhlmacher, p.87. G. Friedrich draws attention to the fact that when Paul's attitude to the Law is under consideration, it is normally his negative statements which are most emphasized. Friedrich agrees that Paul does lay strong emphasis upon this aspect of the Law, but he also notes that in the very places where Paul most disparages the Law i.e. in places such as Rom.vii and Gal.iii, he gives at the same time a positive evaluation of the Law. Unfortunately this positive evaluation of the Law is often neglected. Friedrich believes this is partly because of the misunderstanding that the Law can be equated with the Decalogue. The Torah includes the commandments, but much more besides and it is only when we appreciate that Paul has in mind this wider understanding of Law that we can give an adequate interpretation of verses such as iii:21 and iii:27. "Das Gesetz des Glaubens". TZ, X (1954), pp.401-17 (410/11). Cf. also C.E.B. Cranfield, "St. Paul and the Law". SJt, XVII (1964), pp.43-68.  
and it is regarded as the action of God, rather than the action of Christ.¹

The purpose of the formula appears to be to give an explanation of how God Himself is righteous and how He at the same time also makes men righteous. Believers are justified by the ἀπολύτρωσις of God which is in Jesus Christ whom God has set forth as ἠλασθήμενον.² Paul adds to the original confession two characteristic phrases δώραν τῷ αὐτοῦ χάριτι (v.24) and διὰ πίστεως (v.25)³ thereby emphasizing that the actualization of justification for men is made possible only through faith. He also adds the second part of v.26 (i.e. from πρὸς τὴν ἐνδεικνύω to the end of the verse) as his own explanation of the revelation of God in the Christ event.⁴

1. W.G. Kummel rejects the view that τάρσεως means 'passing over', and ἐνδεικνύω - 'demonstration of proof'. He notes that certain ideas, quite foreign to Paul are associated with this (traditional) understanding - namely that God must prove His righteousness; that God had hitherto let sins go unpunished; that God makes His righteousness known as something to be recognised (p.2). Kummel holds that the lexicographical evidence shows that τάρσεως here means 'remission' and διὰ ἐνδεικνύω means 'as a display'. He concludes, "It may be considered certain, therefore, that in Rom.iii:25f., Paul indeed regards the death of Jesus as a sacrifice of atonement and sees in it precisely God's saving righteousness at work". (p.12). "Πάρσεως and ἐνδεικνύω. A Contribution to the Understanding of the Pauline Doctrine of Justification." JThCh, III (1967) pp.1-13. Cf. also S. Lyonnet "Notes sur l'exégèse de l'Épître aux Romains." Bibl. XXXVIII (1957), pp.35-61 (pp.40ff.).

2. Barrett suggests a reference here to the 'Suffering Servant' of Is.liii. He also has a favourable opinion of the traditional view of the 'mercy-seat' which to a Jew represented at once the place and means of atonement. He concludes however "we can go with certainty no further than the translation 'God set forth Christ as the means of dealing with sin'." (p.78). G. Friedrich is more specific "ὁ ἠλασθήμενος ist die aus dem alten Kult bekannte kapporeth ... Was im AT nur angedeutet war, hat in Christus seine Vollendung gefunden." op.cit., p.413.


4. The Pauline additions are clearly set out by Conzelmann, "Current Problems in Pauline Research". Int, XXII (1968), pp.171-86 (177 n.3).
There are three emphases in this Pauline statement (i.e.v.26) which are significant for our study of the theme of Romans. (i) We have already noted the emphasis upon the present activity of God (ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ); (ii) God justifies the believer (διὰ δικαιοτητα τοῦ ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ); (iii) But the revelation of God's righteousness also has the purpose of showing that He Himself is righteous - εἶς τὸ εἶναι αὐτῶν δίκαιον.

It is our contention that where justification by faith is emphasized without reference to and intrinsic connection with the righteousness of God, then this interpretation takes into account only chs.1-viii, but neglects ix-xi. Justification is not to be regarded simply as a new self-understanding of the individual. The righteousness of the individual ought not to be divorced from the righteousness of God. Käsemann describes this righteousness as "that faithfulness with which the Creator persists in His work of creation in spite of, and beyond, the falling away of His creatures and with which He preserves His creation and gives it a new foundation... God's sovereignty over the world revealing itself eschatologically in Jesus." When justification is viewed in this light chs.1-viii are rightly seen to be important but chs.ix-xi attain a special significance because in them the faithfulness of God is specifically brought into question. This means that both justification and the content of chs.1-viii are imperfectly understood when they are not related to chs.ix-xi.2

2. Schlatter is aware of this problem and seeks to overcome it by making the faithfulness of God the ground of faith, thereby connecting i-viii and ix-xi, cf. pp.117 and 302.

In ch.iii:27f., the style changes again and reverts to the rhetorical/dialogue style of iii:1-9.¹ Paul turns his attention to objections and misunderstandings that are likely to follow from his exposition. The interruptions here are similar to those in chs.vi-vii but closer still to iii:1-9 in that they follow immediately upon one another.² The ποιεῖν of iii:27 corresponds to the τέλειον in iii:1 and iii:9 since both phrases are used as introductory formulae for new sections.³

This righteousness that has been revealed excludes all boasting not because it is by works but precisely because it is through faith. The contrast between the two ways is paradoxically emphasized by Paul's use of the phrase διὰ νόμου πίστεως.⁴ Michel considers that this phrase is only understandable as a 'Kampfformel' in the debate over the meaning of the Law. He compares this phrase with νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος (viii:2) and concludes "Vielleicht kämpft Paulus an beiden Stellen um die eschatologische Ordnung, die der Ordnung des atlichen Gesetzes gegenübertritt. Glaube und Geist sind die 'Gesetze' des neuen Aeons, wie das mosaische Gesetz an den alten Aeon gebunden ist."⁵

2. Cf. Barth, p.47.
4. G. Friedrich does not accept the view that Paul is using νόμος here in the general sense of norm or system (cf. Sanday and Headlam, p.95). He holds that v.27 is to be interpreted in the light of iii:21 and not from vii:21f. In vv.19-31 νόμος occurs eleven or twelve times and up until v.27, Paul is certainly speaking about the Torah. This is also true for vv.28-31. There is no real reason why Paul should suddenly change his use of the word in v.27 (op.cit., pp.402-5).
5. Cf. Michel, p.111. In the emphasis upon the difference between the old and new 'Heilsordnung', Michel is typical of many German scholars who specifically relate νόμος πίστεως to the new "Heilsordnung ... die Glauben verlangt", cf. Friedrich, op.cit., pp.402-3.
We concur with Michel in relating iii:27 and viii:2. This verse ought to be interpreted in the light of Paul's positive statements about the Law rather than his negative ones. Some scholars become very suspicious of any interpretation which regards the Christian as being under 'the Law of Christ' or Christ Himself as a new Law. Friedrich emphasizes that in the expressions νόμος πληνος and νόμος τῶν ἁγίων, Paul is not referring to two laws, but to one and the same Law - that of the Old Testament. The Law rightly understood witnesses to righteousness by faith and not legal righteousness.

It is probable that by use of the paradoxical expression, the Law of faith, Paul wishes to remind the Roman Christians that there is no inherent contradiction between Torah and faith. The eschatological revelation of God's righteousness in Christ and the Pauline gospel which proclaims this event are both in accord with the revelation of God as contained in the Old Testament. Paul's gospel is neither anti-semitic nor antinomian and those Roman Christians who may have looked to Paul for support for such views are here given a clear indication that these hopes will meet with disappointment.

It is significant that the denunciation of boasting occurs so early in the letter. This may be interpreted as a sign that this was a serious

---

3. The nature of the Law itself is the real issue- of. ἐν τῷ νόμῳ νόμος; (v.27). Friedrich suggests that there are two sides to the Law and the meaning depends on which side you are stressing i.e. in ch.iv Paul stresses the positive aspect of the Law but designates it not as νόμος πληνος but as ἐπαγγελμα, op.cit., pp.415-16.
problem in the Christian community at Rome (cf.xi:18). The answer of v.27b is continued in v.28 which repeats the previous argument that justification is by faith apart from 'law-works'. The verse is introduced by λογίζεσθαι. We have already noted the occurrence of this verb in ch.viii:11. Its use in several places demonstrates the important role the concept played in Paul's thinking. Here the introduction of the word serves as a connecting link that leads on to the discussion of Abraham in ch.iv.

Prior to this however, two other considerations arise - if salvation were through the Law, God would then be the God only of those under the Law i.e. of Jews only (v.29). But since salvation is through faith, then its universality is thereby assured. God is God not of Jews only, but of Gentiles also. As the Jews themselves confess, God is one and so there can be only one way of salvation for both circumcised and uncircumcised - the way of faith.

But in repudiating the Rabbinic doctrine that God recognizes the already existing righteousness of Israel and denying the synagogal view of

1. C.F.D. Moule distinguishes "two different attitudes to and uses of Law - on the one hand, the recognition of Law as a revelation of God's will and purpose and on the other hand, the attempt to use it 'legalistically' to establish one's own righteousness." "Obligation in the Ethic of Paul". CHINT, pp.389-406(393).
2. According to Paul's theology in Romans, faith is reckoned as righteousness (cf.ch.iv). Believers are then expected to reckon men as justified by faith apart from works of law (iii:28). They should also reckon themselves to be dead to sin and alive to God in Christ (vi:11), and they should reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the coming glory (viii:18). Because of the revelation of God's righteousness in Christ, a whole new evaluation of life is opened up to men. Cf. Bultmann, Theology, I, pp.217.f., 351.
3. We note here how Paul always argues - not Jews or Gentiles - but Jews and Gentiles, cf. i:16.
Israel's exclusive claim upon God, Paul has left himself open to another objection - that he thereby undermines the Law (v.31). This is far from Paul's intention and he immediately gives his customary retort to serious objections - μὴ γένοιτο, and follows up with a provisional answer ἀλλὰ νόμον ἵστατον. Ch.iv is really the full answer to this series of questions from iii:27.f. It may be better to assert in general terms that the whole of ch.iv, centred around the example of Abraham is the reply to iii:27-31. Similarities in theme do suggest however, that iii:27-28 = iv:1-8 (the denial of boasting), and iii:29-30 = iv:9-12 (God is God of Jews and Gentiles.) Ch. iii:31 may then be regarded as the point of transition setting out an introductory objection which leads into the argument of ch.iv.

To summarize our conclusions concerning ch.iii, we note firstly in how great measure this chapter is composed of questions and objections in a rhetorical/dialogue style. We have already stated that iii:1-8 is answered later in the letter (mostly in chs.ix-xi) and that the questions in iii:27-31 are answered in ch.iv. The remainder of ch.iii consists of the O.T. composite quotation iii:10-18 and the important section iii:21-26, in kerygmatic/proclamatory style.

Thus the greater part of ch.iii is similar in style to chs.vi-vii (question/objection style). Ch.iii:21-26 however has closest affinities with chs.v and viii and we note in passing that these chapters also deal predominantly with God's activity and its meaning for the present in contradistinction to the old aeon where the Law, sin and death hold sway.

1. Strack/Billerbeck III p.185.
4. This however is very much open to dispute and will be discussed in detail in connection with ch.iv:1f.
We must not draw conclusions at this stage, but from our review of this chapter we may tentatively suggest that we have found two dominant types of literary style. The greater part of the chapter is in dialogue form dealing with possible objections and their repudiation. The central section however (vv.21-26) is very different with its positive proclamatory style. It may be asked which of these sections is primary? Do we regard chs. vi-vii as a digression between the important chapters of v and viii as Jeremias suggests? Is Paul's real theme the proclamation or exposition of the gospel i.e. did he write Romans because he wished to acquaint them with his gospel, outlined chiefly in iii:21-26, v and viii, or did he write because of certain practical problems and misunderstandings of the gospel among the Roman Christians? If the latter were the case then those sections that deal with these particular problems should be regarded as of primary significance i.e. iii:1-8 (and hence ix-xi), iv, vi and vii.

Our suggestion is that the questions and objections represent the problems against which and to which Paul is addressing himself. The positive kerygmatic sections such as iii:21-26 represent Paul's exposition of the Christ-event by which all misunderstandings of the gospel may be corrected. In the light of this argument, we should regard the passages dealing with objections and misunderstandings as primary and of first importance in that it is for their sake that the more 'theological' or 'dogmatic' sections were written. 

1. By this we mean to ask is ch.v (which corresponds to the style of iii, vv.21-26) for example, the high-point of the letter, thereby regarding the theologically-profound sections as containing the high-point or crux of Paul's message to the Roman christians? Or should we regard sections such as chs. vi-vii where Paul addresses the Romans directly as brethren (cf.vii) as being central in Paul's message?


The relevance of this can be appreciated when we bear in mind Dupont's criticism of Feuillet.¹ Dupont maintains that the whole point of ch. vi is to show that the Christians can no longer live in sin. To develop his thesis Paul makes use of arguments drawn from baptism (as our incorporation into Christ). As in Phil. ii:6-11 and II Cor. viii:9, Paul uses the most elevated doctrines for the most ordinary purposes. The danger is that theologians should become interested in these great themes for their own sake and forget that they were introduced to serve a practical purpose, which the theologian finds less interesting than the means employed to reach this end. According to Dupont, Feuillet thus becomes more interested in the doctrine of baptism itself than in the purpose for which it was originally introduced (i.e. to show that by being united with Christ we have died to sin and hence can live no longer in it).

What we have said here concerning doctrine and practice in Romans applies, of course, to the other New Testament letters. But the case is more serious in this letter, since very often no attempt is made to relate the doctrines to a historical context and hence to understand the purpose which they were originally designed to serve.

¹ Cf. p.367 n.1.
Romans iii:31 and the Relation of Ch.iii to Ch.iv.

Romans iv begins with a question in the diatribe style τῷ οὖν ἐρωτήσεται; As we have already noted, this introductory phrase often commences the repudiation of an objection and represents the beginning of a new and significant stage in the argument, cf. also vi:1 and vii:7. In view of the pattern of argument we have found common for Paul (i.e. in chs.vi and vii), we would expect this phrase (τῷ οὖν ἐρωτήσεται) to be followed firstly by a wrong inference and then by μὴ γένοιτο before the answer proper would begin. Here however, if we associate iii:31 with ch.iv as some commentators do,¹ the order is reversed and the μὴ γένοιτο in iii:31 precedes the τῷ οὖν ἐρωτήσεται of ch.iv:1. It would seem more fitting therefore to regard iii:31 as a sort of isolated objection such as iii:3 or iii:5.

For this reason alone it would be unwise to regard iii:31 simply as the question to which the whole of ch.iv provides the answer.² It is much better to follow the suggestion of Jeremias that an objection should be understood behind iv:2.³ It might also be better to connect this objection to

1. Schmidt designates iii:31-iv:25 as one section under the heading "Das Gesetz als Verheissung" (p.75). J. Knox also follows this division - iii:31-iv:25 is entitled "This Justification the Fulfiment of the Old Covenant." The Epistle to the Romans. IntB, IX (New York 1954), p.437. It is more common, however, to retain iii:31 in ch.iii, whatever relation it may be considered to have to ch.iv, cf. Michel, pp.113-4, Barrett, pp.84-5, who locate v.31 in the section iii:21-31.


3. P.147 n.2.
iv:1, i.e. when Paul in iii:31 claims that νόμον ἰστάνομεν, an objector may have pointed out that Paul with his Gentile-orientated gospel had no connection with Abraham and his seed. If this were the case then iv:1 implies the existence of an objection related to the content of iii:31 thereby introducing a new subject from that pursued in ch.iii. By regarding ch.iv as the answer to an objection, we connect it more closely to the style of chs.vi, vii and ix-xi. It is thus characterized as a chapter in which a subject of practical consideration is investigated rather than as purely an illustration, amplification or scriptural proof of ch.iii. Although iii:31 may be considered as the reason for the objection posited in iv:1, the actual content of iii:31 relates back to iii:21-30 rather than forward to iv:1.f. This is similar to the view expressed by Murray who considers that iii:31 is a conclusion of the argument of ch.iii, and at the same time an introduction.

1. By this phrase Paul does not mean that by faith believers fulfil the Law i.e. in the sense of love being the fulfilment of the Law as in ch.xiii:8-10. He appears rather to mean that the proper function of the Law is realized only in the realm of faith. For Paul the idea that the Law of itself could lead to life was a misunderstanding of the proper function and nature of the Law. "Seine (Paulus) Verkündigung von Gottes Gerechtigkeit durch Glauben ohne Gesetz gibt vielmehr dem Gesetz erst Bestand und Gültigkeit.", cf. Andrea van Dülmen, Die Theologie des Gesetzes bei Paulus, STH, V (Stuttgart 1967), p.88; cf. also Müller, p.51.

2. Luz claims that "der Aufbau von R.iv wird zeigen, dass dort nicht die Aufrichtung des 'nomos' thema ist", and supports this statement by the fact that the introduction in ch.iv:1 denotes a new beginning (cf.p.172). P. Althaus also sees the commencement of a new subject in ch.iv:1, Römerbrief. 9, Erweiterte Auflage, Göttingen, 1959, p.33.

3. Cf. Bultmann's view that ch.iv offers the scriptural proof that a man is justified by faith alone (Theology, Vol.I, p.280).

to the theme of ch.iv.¹ The πίστως in v.31² may then be taken as referring to the faith based upon the revelation of God's righteousness in iii:21-26 and further outlined in iii:27-30. If we separate v.31 completely from what follows we are thereby left with a rather poor conclusion², which is introduced into the argument without much warning. Luz, after a detailed investigation of the context and function of iii:31, concludes "dass sich Themastellung und Aufriss von R.4 nicht aus R.3:31 ergeben. Dieser Vers ist vielmehr Zwischengedanke".³ This rather negative view is contrary to the large majority of commentators who, in various different ways relate iii:31 and iv:1.f. to iii:21-26 as the illustration of how the righteousness of faith validates the Old Testament revelation.⁴ The fact that Paul omits the article before νόμος in v.31 does not make the problem any easier. Paul does not seem to have any clearly defined system in his use of the article.⁵

Many commentators following the interpretation first suggested by Erasmus, have understood νόμος in v.31 as referring to the whole of the Old Testament, which is then (in ch.iv) shown to have proclaimed justification by faith since the time of Abraham.⁶ Barrett writing on this verse says that Paul is not thinking so much of the scriptures themselves as of

---

³ Cf. Barrett (p.84); Nygren (p.166); Barth (pp.44-6).
⁴ In this Paul is similar to the translators of the LXX who seem to have no unified pattern in the use of the article, cf. F. Bläser, Das Gesetz bei Paulus. MTA 19.1/2, Münster 1941, pp.14f.
⁵ Cf. Althaus, p.32.
"the whole system of religious thought and practice based upon this revelation - in a word, the religion of Judaism."\(^1\) The essence of Judaism is, in Paul's opinion, not that it is a religion of law, but rather that it is a religion of faith.\(^2\) This interpretation has the advantage of linking closely with what follows in ch.iv. The line of reasoning would go something like this. By his declaration of a righteousness apart from Law, Paul has placed in jeopardy the very basis of Judaism - he has imperilled that unique God-given position which is her pride. The objection in iii:31 expresses the critical reaction of the Jews and iv:1 introduces Abraham as a key figure in the debate. If only we could ascertain exactly why Abraham is introduced at this point, it would greatly facilitate our understanding of the whole argument. Because of Paul's use of stylistic devices such as questions/objections etc. reflecting his own missionary experience, it is difficult to envisage the actual circumstances in which the figure of Abraham might have been considered relevant to the debate. Let us look again at the context in which the question of Abraham is first mentioned.

Because of the obvious significance of iii:21-26, it has been customary to regard this as the context into which the figure of Abraham is introduced. The theme in iii:21-26 is the revelation of God's righteousness in the present (in antithesis to the revelation of His wrath already described in i:16-iii:20). Abraham is thus considered under the theme of righteousness, by faith or by works. As we have already noted, although there is a debate

---

1. p.04.
2. R. Bring emphasizes that when Paul looked at the scriptures in the light of God's revelation in Christ "he saw that the Scriptures witness to a justification by faith and not by law." "The Message to the Gentiles. A Study to the Theology of Paul the Apostle". STh, XIX (1965), p.37.
as to the function and meaning of iii:31, there is a measure of agreement that iii:27-30 relates to iv:1-12. The "law of faith" in iii:27 excludes all boasting and the question of whether Abraham had a basis for boasting is raised in iv:2. The faith and works antithesis is continued in iii:28. This would require us to view Abraham as a witness in the question of salvation by faith or by works. There is no doubt that Abraham is a helpful witness in this respect. But what of iii:29-30? Here the consequence of works - righteousness is seen to make God a God of Jews only and the question arises - whose God is He?

As we view the content of chs.i-iii, we note that in addition to the theme of righteousness, the question of Jew and Gentile has been always in the foreground, even in the thematic verses of 1:16-17, (cf. also ii:9,10, 13,14,17,24,26-29; iii:1,2,9,22n,29,30). The introduction of the Jew-Gentile theme in iii:29,30 is thus no new subject. If Paul has already declared that all boasting is excluded, in iii:27,28, why introduce another theme at this particular point? It may be argued that vv.27-28 and 29-30 represent two separate, though not unrelated themes which Paul also deals with in iv:1-8 and iv:9-12 respectively.

In our opinion there is another way of connecting vv.27-28 and 29-30 to one another, to vv.21-26 and also to ch.iv. Professor Käsemann in his essay "The Righteousness of God in Paul" relates both Rom.iii:5 and iii:25 to the Covenant theme - "the context however, seems to me to show quite unambiguously that in both cases Paul is speaking of the triumphant saving faithfulness of God, which maintains the Covenant against those who transgress it and in so doing, remains, and expresses his nature as, true = con-

sistent". The revelation of God's righteousness in iii:21-26 is thus to be considered as the fulfilment of the Covenant in the Messianic realization of the promises of God. Goppelt also emphasizes the Cross as the fulfilment of the Covenant – "Justification is not a polemic doctrine propounded by Paul to counter the Judaizers. Instead it is an expression of the core of the Gospel which depicts that Gospel as the goal of Old Testament redemptive history. 'The Cross' is the revelation of the righteousness of God since in the Cross God has executed the sentence called for by the order of Law and has fulfilled the promise (Gal.iii:13.f.). Good Friday is the eschatological day of Atonement .... God has demonstrated that He is righteous, that He is the One who acts in accordance with His Covenant".

This Covenant was made with Abraham and it was with him that God's special relationship to Israel began. Yet Paul relates the Gentiles to this covenant-faith in iii:29-30. When Paul declared in iii:31 "we establish the Law", he was affirming his agreement with the covenant-faith. In such a situation we can understand how a Jew might retort – You have forgotten Abraham, the Covenant was made with him and his seed because of the favour

---

2. In attributing the covenant teaching of iii:21-26 to Paul, we are not overlooking the fact that he is using earlier material here. It is assumed however that he is in broad agreement with the content of the citations he uses.
3. Jesus, Paul and Judaism, p.147.
5. Ibid. Schlatter claims that since Paul's message was "Für jeden Glaubenden ... Das gab ihm und der ganzen Christenheit, vor allem aber ihrem jüdischen Teil, ein brennendes Interesse an Abraham. Schwerstes Gewicht hing an der Frage: sind wir mit Abraham eins und ist Abraham eins mit uns?".
he won from God; he did have something to boast about. Paul's view of Abraham is one that distinguishes between his faith and his works. This is the point of Paul's reasoning in ch. iv:2-5. Work and wages belong to the sphere of merit and just reward. He who works deserves his wages; but he who hopes for what he does not deserve, lives in the opposite sphere of faith and free gift. Paul locates Abraham in the latter realm. What Abraham found was χάρις (Gen.xviii:3) and this destroys boasting of every kind. This is one of the reasons for Paul's argument in Rom.iv, cf. v.16 "διὰ τοῦτο ἐξ πίστεως, ἵνα κατὰ χάριν". By this we see that in Rom.iv we are concerned with Abraham's faith; but we are concerned with more than this - with the grace behind the faith. Rabbinic scholars would have agreed with Paul that Abraham had faith, but they would have related faith and works together in such a way as to claim faith as a meritorious achievement. In order that boasting may be completely excluded, not only faith but the grace preceding the faith had to be emphasized. Prior to Abraham's faith, circumcision, and good works, lay the prevenient grace of God. Faith, grace, covenant, election are a unity for Paul. Only in the light of grace (and election) is

1. There is a textual problem in iv:1 - εἴρηκανι is omitted in some manuscripts (B 1739) or put in a different position (ω group). The reading adopted here is that of the group of MSS (ΚΑΣ). What then shall we say that Abraham (on human terms, our ancestor) has found? (cf. Barrett p.85). With Michel we regard Paul as having in mind the LXX text of Gen.xviii:3 χάριν εἴρηκεν (Heb. ἐν); (p.115). For a different solution of the textual problem here see R. Jewett op.cit., pp.142-4. Jewett links κατὰ σωτρία with εἴρηκανι. We do not agree with Jewett's view of σωτρία nor with his opinion that the reason for the placing of κατὰ σωτρία in the emphatic position at the end of v.1 may have been motivated by Paul's desire to evoke an unmistakably negative answer from the Hellenistic hearers in Rome. (p.144).

2. The Rabbinic view was that Abraham was reckoned as righteous exclusively on the ground of his works and therefore he had reason to boast not only before men but also before God, (Sir 44:19f. heb. Jub.24:11), cf. Strack-Billerbeck III, pp.186f. Michel states that in Rabbinic thought "Gesetz und Werke, Glaube und Gehorsam, Gehorsam und Verdienst, Lohn und Segen sind eine Einheit". (p.115).


faith seen to be faith - only in this light can men experience faith as faith in Him who creates ex nihilo, and resurrects the dead (v.17).

For Paul Abraham is a man under grace; the opposite opinion is illustrated in Jesus ben Sirach. Abraham "kept the law of the Most High, and was taken into covenant with Him ... Therefore He assured him by an oath that the nations should be blessed in his seed", (Ecclus. xliv:20-21). But Abraham is much more than a man under grace. Paul does not refer to Abraham here only as a man of great faith, as if Isaac or Moses or Jeremiah would do equally well. He refers to Abraham precisely because it was with him that God first entered into covenant. As Wilckens says "Dass mit Abraham die Erwählungsgeschichte Gottes mit Israel eigentlich beginnt, setzt Paulus von der alttestamentlich-jüdischen Überlieferung her als völlig selbstverständ-

1. As quoted by Dodd, p.67.
2. The Hebrew equivalent of χάριν εὐφροσύνη is τὸν χάριν. According to N. Snaith τὸν means primarily "Determined faithfulness to a covenant. τὸν and χάρις should be distinguished from πνευμα and ἀγάπη where the emphasis is more on the freedom whereby one elects to love another where there is no prior bond between them.

If this distinction were a consistent one, then it would be wrong to maintain that the question of election is involved when Abraham is said to have 'found favour' before God." But Snaith goes on to say "We have spoken of God's election-love and God's covenant-love separately, as though they were two different loves. This, of course, is not the case. The love which chose Israel in the first place is also the love which preserved the Israel that had been chosen. 'Chesed' is God's love as Israel experienced it, whilst 'rahabah' is God's love which first enabled Israel to experience it. In the same way God's 'agape', His election-love for the New Israel, is also His Grace (charis). Paul tends to use the two words interchangeably." The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament. London 1944, pp.173f. By this we may see that it is not wrong on linguistic grounds to associate the thought of election with the favour which Abraham found.
Abraham was significant because he was the one to whom the Covenant was given - he thus became the forefather of all God's people and archetype of all believers. No one else could ever occupy the same place as Abraham "dabei gilt der Patriarch nicht mehr bloss als Exempel des glaubenden Menschen, sondern im jüdischen Sinne als der Verheissungsträger schlechthin, der durch keine andere Gestalt auswechselbar ist".

If Abraham is a believing man who occupies a unique place in the history of Israel, then he can no longer be regarded only as an example. Abraham as the one to whom the promise was given, is the representative of Judaism - the man who gave to the Jews their uniqueness among the nations. Viewed in this light we can see iii:21 - iv:25 as a unity. The underlying theme is the Covenant fulfilled and renewed in the Cross of Christ.

The Jewish argument was that the Covenant was for Jews only and that Abraham belonged exclusively to them. He was a representative of obedient faith and good works, who by the sign of circumcision, kept the precepts of the Law even before it had been given.

---

3. Cf. Goppelt who considers Romans i-viii not as a polemic against Judaism, but rather as the conclusive statement of Paul's gospel, which is "the message of the Christ-event as the annulling fulfilment of the Old Covenant." Jesus, Paul and Judaism, p.147.
If the Covenant was made with Abraham and fulfilled in Christ, this did not necessarily involve the inclusion of Gentiles. When we keep this opinion in mind, it helps us to understand the point of iii:27-30. These verses give the impression that they are clarifying or amplifying what has already been stated in iii:21-26. A basic assumption of Gentile Christianity has been that when the righteousness of God is declared to have been revealed apart from Law, then this automatically proves that salvation is also for the Gentiles. For a Jew this was by no means obvious⁠¹ and it is for this reason that Paul has to make two assertions in vv.27-30.⁠² We maintain that they are assertions because, as yet, their validity has not been fully demonstrated.⁠³ The first assertion, that all boasting is excluded, will be dealt with in iv:1-8 and the second, that God is God of Gentiles also, will be explained in iv:9-12.

1. To claim that the uncircumcised may share in the blessing reserved for those who kept the Law was pure blasphemy. To say this was to take away any distinction between good and evil .... How could Gentiles know God, when they did not know His Law? Some Jewish teachers taught that Gentiles had not been given the Law because they had not been found worthy of it. Cf. Bring, pp.33f; Strack-Billerbeck III, p.203.

2. That we may not accept these verses as Paul's only argument for the inclusion of the Gentiles is shown by the fact that they can quite properly be designated as "a short series of disconnected interruptions similar to iii:1-9f." (cf. Barth, p.47). The merit of this view is that these verses are then quite clearly separated from vv.21-26 which are in a completely different style, as we have already noted. To include iii:21-31 as one unit is to emphasize the connections in content but to overlook the discontinuity in style.

3. In no previous place in ch.iii has Paul specifically argued that salvation is also for Gentiles. It is only in these verses that Paul gives interim notice that he is about to deal with this subject. The inclusion of ch.iv cannot then be regarded as optional since, if it were omitted, there would be no argument in chs.i-viii for the inclusion of the Gentiles on the same basis as the Jews. The fact that Paul has an apostleship to preach the gospel to all nations (i:5) and hopes to reap a harvest among Gentiles in Rome (i:13) should not be regarded as proof that the gospel is also for Gentiles, but rather presupposes the argument of ch.iv. The same may be said of verses such as i:16, ii:10,14 etc.
It would have been quite reasonable for a Jew to accept Paul's declaration in iii:21-26 but not to suppose that this meant the inclusion of Gentiles within the sphere of the Covenant, although Paul has already given many hints since ch.i:16 that this is to be expected (cf.iii:11, iii:22). The fact that Paul makes certain additions to the material he used in iii:24-26 in order to emphasize the gratuitous nature of God's righteousness, does not prove the availability of this righteousness for Gentiles, but only that those who receive it must do so by faith. Thus vv.27-30 presuppose the necessity of an argument such as that of ch.iv. All that needs to be said has not already been said in the declaration of iii:21-26. If it had been, the case of Abraham would not be terribly important for the argument in Romans. It would be helpful to have scriptural proof of what has been stated in iii:21-31, but it is not really necessary and ch.iv is, in fact, a digression. It was this type of opinion that led C.H. Dodd to write "the discussion of the case of Abraham was, no doubt, important in Paul's apologetic against Jewish opponents within and without the church; but for us it throws little light, except incidentally, on his main theme."

If, as we have argued, Paul intended to relate the gospel to the Gentiles in ch.iv, why did he delay so long in giving an exposition of this

2. The most recent exponent of this view is Professor Käsemann in his essay on Rom.iv, op.cit., p.141.
3. Cf. J. Knox who calls iii:31-iv:25 a digression or excursus which in some measure advances the argument! He does however go on to say that this section is more than an excursus in that it could not really be omitted (p.437). Cf. also Jeremias who views iii:31b-iv:25 as a digression in answer to the objection in iii:31a (p.147).
4. P.92. The opposite opinion has been stated by Käsemann, "Röm.iv hat eine Schlüsselstellung im Brief", op.cit., p.140.
great theme? He has already emphasized in i:16 that the gospel is God's power of salvation "to the Jew first and also to the Greek". It might be suggested that Paul should have stated explicitly for whom the Gospel was intended before he made his kerygmatic declaration in iii:21-26. But Paul could not have presented his argument in this order. The declaration of the act of God which achieves redemption must precede the explanation of whom it is to benefit. Paul could not speak of the inclusion of the Gentiles until the barrier which divided Jews and Gentiles had been removed.¹ This division was constituted by the Law.

Paul does not claim that the Law has been abolished but rather that it has been fulfilled in the Christ event. His emphasis upon the universality of the gospel presupposes the arrival of the Messiah, when the old barriers erected by the Law would be broken down.² Ragnar Bring emphasizes that Paul was the first to see that the Gospel is universal not through emancipation from the Law, but through the fulfilment of the Law in Christ.³ "The Law which distinguishes between Jews and Gentiles became, in the form in which it had been completed by Christ, nothing else than the message to the Gentiles." It was only when Paul had first declared that the Messianic promises had been fulfilled and that the 'now' of God's day of salvation

2. W.D. Davies investigates the concept of Torah in the Messianic age and finds several different streams of thought on this subject. He concludes that the Christian concept of a new Torah or a new understanding of the old Torah must have had some precedent in Jewish thought. "Torah in the Messianic Age and/or The Age to come." JBLMS, VII (1952). pp. 84-94.
3. Bring's view is that Paul realized that the real meaning of the Law's fulfilment in Christ was that Gentiles were now on an equality with the Jews and that the gospel message could now be taken to them so that they, without having to observe the Law, might be able to find salvation. The Law had existed only to serve righteousness, which could not be attained by keeping its statutes, but only through Christ. Life in Christ meant immediate participation in the righteousness which the Law existed to serve. (pp. 36f.)
had come, that he could claim the inclusion of the Gentiles on the same basis as the Jews.

Because Paul writes from the standpoint of the present - from that of the eschatological 'now', we can appreciate that iii:21-26 necessarily precedes iii:27-iv:25. On the other hand, a theological understanding of grace, election and promise such as we find in ch.iv, is concerned with what preceded the historical revelation of God's righteousness (iii:21-26), the gracious covenant-love of God which alone accounts for the revelation of His righteousness. When Paul, the Christian, looked back to the beginning of the Covenant, he saw that its purpose was not to foster pride or exclusiveness, but rather that it was God's divinely intended means of bringing salvation to all men.

In this survey we have found that there is a unified theme throughout iii:21-25. The central concern is the righteousness of God in His giving, maintaining and fulfilling the Covenant, and the people to whom it was given. Ch.iii:27-30 should not be regarded as kerygmatic exposition of the same kind as iii:21-26. These verses are rather Paul's way of giving preliminary notice of his subject in ch.iv. Moreover ch.iv is not dependent on ch.iii. It is every bit as important as ch.iii, and is not adequately described when understood as scriptural proof or illustration of what has already been demonstrated in ch.iii. The function of iii:31 is best understood as that of an interim verse which at once relates back to what has already been stated and forward to what is about to be argued. If we think of its content as the wider reference of covenant (as opposed to the narrower concept of the Mosaic Torah) then it makes good sense for Paul to say in the mid-stream of his argument "do we thereby annul the Law" (in the sense of
Covenant)? Rather his whole argument in iii:21 - iv:25 is that, by this understanding alone does the Covenant (and therefore both promise, Law and circumcision) find its proper function and fulfilment.
Romans iv:1-12.

Let us now look in more detail at the arguments used by Paul in ch.iv, in order to discover whether or not they fit into this pattern of thought that we have found in iii:21 - iv:25. We have already noted that the Covenant theme is basic to this section. We have had some indication that the argument of ch.iv does not consist merely of illustrations or examples of what has already been established in ch.iii. In view of this we expect that Abraham's unique status as the one to whom the Covenant was originally given, will play a significant role in the argument, particularly with regard to the question - who are truly children of Abraham, and therefore of the promise?¹ For Gentiles who had not become proselytes it is understandable that the question of their connection with Abraham would be a vital issue.

As noted previously, the point of iv:2-5 is to make a distinction between faith and works.² In order to show that Abraham had nothing to boast about before God, Paul uses a Rabbinic type of exegesis. He makes use of the biblical record of Abraham in Gen.xv:6 where the word λογίζεσθαι ³ is used in the LXX text in connection with Abraham. Paul uses the 'Gezera Shawa' rule by which the occurrence of identical words in different parts of scripture may be used as a reason for exegeting the one in the light of the

2. But in view of the emphasis we have already made upon the context we would not limit the boasting in iii:27 to that of good works only. Rather it does refer to good works, but those done by the Jews who performed them in response to the Law - so that it is not just a boasting of performance but of initial superiority of the Jew over against the Gentile; cf. A.van Dülmen, who says "der Gesetzesweg den Juden allein vorbehalten, und gerade in dieser Ausschliesslichkeit liegt das primär Moment ihrer χαταγγελία", (p.174 n.50).
3. Paul's method in the use of this term is very similar to the methods of scriptural exegesis commonly used in Rabbinic theology, cf. Michel, pp.116f.
other. The word χρηζομακαρω in ocurs both in Gen.xv:6 and Ps.xxxii:1-2 (LXX, xxxii:1-2), so Paul exegetes Gen.xv:6 by use of Ps.xxxii. By doing this he equates the non-reckoning (or forgiveness) of sin (Ps.xxxii:1-2) with the blessing in Gen.xv:6. Abraham must have been justified by faith and not by works since this exegesis implies that he was blessed because his sins were not reckoned. Grace, not merit, marked the beginning of God's covenant with Abraham. Abraham himself was justified by faith in Him who justifies the ungodly.

In v.9 Paul introduces a new section by the use of the question - Upon whom is this blessing pronounced - upon Jews only or also upon Gentiles? To answer the question Paul reverses the procedure from that of vv. 1-8. Here he exegetes Ps.xxxii:1-2 with the help of Gen.xv:6. He directly opposes the Rabbinic belief that the blessing of Ps.xxxii:1 was meant to apply exclusively to Israel and not to the Gentiles. The blessing of Ps.xxxii is equated with Abraham's finding favour with God in Gen.xv:6. Paul maintains that Abraham found favour with God before he was circumcized. Therefore he received the blessing as a Gentile and God's favour cannot be limited to Jews but must be available for Gentiles also. Abraham's circumc-

1. This was contrary to the view of the synagogue, cf. Strack-Billerbeck, III, p.203. Michel emphasizes that in Rabbinic thought the relation of faith and works was always determined by the covenant concept, (p.117, continuation of n.4).
2. The fact that Paul must still ask this question in ch.iv proves that it has not already been settled in ch.iii. This question supports our understanding of the Jewish interpretation of Paul's declaration in iii:21-26.
cision was originally considered as σημεῖον διαθήκης. Here it is called σημεῖον περιτομῆς - a sign 'consisting in circumcision'.

According to Friedrich this indicates that in Paul's opinion even the cult is not in opposition to righteousness by faith. The repetition of the purpose clauses (εἰς τὸ εἶναι, εἰς τὸ λογισθῆναι) in v.11 show how important for Paul was the concept that the uncircumcised Gentiles should be included within the people of God. The emphasis here shows that it is a point towards which Paul has been arguing. This supports our thesis that it is only in ch.iv that Paul shows how salvation had always been intended for the Gentiles also.

It was as a Gentile that Abraham attained his 'fatherhood'. Michel claims that this argument is designed to show that Abraham is not first of all father of Israel (and with certain reservations of proselytes also) but first of all the father of Gentile believers. Paul however does not say this. If he were writing in the polemical anti-Judaistic tone that is so often associated with the Roman letter, then we would expect Paul to reverse the Rabbinic argument entirely and show that Abraham is first of all father of Gentiles and only secondarily of Jews. Paul does not wish to antagonize

---

1. "Even circumcision, the strongest mark of Jewish separation, in St.Paul's view looked beyond its immediate exclusiveness to an ultimate inclusion of Gentiles as well as Jews. It was nothing more than a ratification of Abraham's faith." Cf. Sanday and Headlam, p.107.


3. Cf. Michel, p.120.

4. Ibid.

5. "In one of the prayers for the Day of Atonement Abraham is called 'The first of my faithful ones.'" Delitzsch, as quoted by Sanday and Headlam, p.107.

the Jews any more than is necessary and he pursues no selfish advantage, even when it would have been possible for him to do so. The same holds true for his treatment of circumcision; he does not condemn circumcision (as he does in Galatians in a different context) but his intention is only to remove every ground of human achievement from the account of the origin of the Covenant with Abraham.

Paul's purpose is not to argue for the exclusion of the Jews but rather for the inclusion of the Gentiles (cf. father of uncircumcised and circumcised vv.11-12). So he shows that the account of Abraham is precisely orientated to those believers who are not even proselytes. As Käsemann writes "Der Proselyt erhält allein kraft der Beschneidung Anteil am Gottesbund und seiner Gerechtigkeit. Abraham hat aber solchen Anteil vor seiner Beschneidung erlangt und ist infolgedessen Vater der Glaubenden welche nicht Proselyten wurden".


2. Paul certainly does not show "theologisch Indifference von Juden und Heiden" as Klein asserts, ("Römer iv und die Idee der Heilsgeschichte." EvTh, XXIII (1963), p.441). It is certainly not Paul's intention that by his exposition "radikal entheiligt und paganisiert wird die Geschichte Israels". Käsemann criticizes Klein's statements claiming that he thereby formalizes the doctrine of the justification of the ungodly and shows that very presumption against which Rom.xi:20 warns. (Cf. "Der Glaube Abrahams in Röm.iv." PP, p.153.)

3. Op.cit., p.151. While agreeing in principle with Käsemann's statement, we also bear in mind that in Judaism Abraham was viewed as the father of all proselytes, (Str/Bill, III, p.203). If Marxsen is correct in his suggestion that some of the Roman Christians had become proselytes prior to their conversion, the figure of Abraham is relevant to Paul's argument as a unifying figure who combines in one person the differing backgrounds of Christians, whether Gentile, proselyte or Jewish. Introduction to the New Testament, pp.98f.
Romans iv:13-17a.

Following the outline of K. Barth we might subdivide the first part of the chapter as follows - iv:2-8, Abraham is righteous by his faith and not through his works; iv:9-12, not because of his circumcision, and iv:13-17a, not as one who knows the Law.\(^1\) Paul may have had in mind here the line of argument which claimed that Abraham kept the Law in intention even before it was given. His circumcision could be understood as his submission to the demands of the Law.\(^2\) This argument could have been reversed and understood as an argument for the circumcision of those who, like Abraham, believed first but were circumcized after.

In Gal.iii where Paul argues in a very similar vein, he emphasizes the temporal priority of the promise over the giving of the Law. Here (v.13) he puts the negation (οὐ γὰρ διὰ νόμου) in the place of emphasis at the beginning of his sentence. Nevertheless this kind of negation is not so strong as when Paul uses a wrong inference and then repudiates it with a μὴ γένοιτο.\(^3\) Paul wishes to make it clear that the promise is not mediated via the Law (διὰ νόμου).\(^4\) For Paul the promise is prior to and independent of the Law - the Law is embraced in the promise, but not vice versa as the Jews tended to think.\(^5\) The Judaism of Paul's time stood in a Mosaic and

---

3. We note that this kind of argument does occur in Gal.iii:21. But there it is used to emphasize that the Law is not against the promise.
4. Barrett translates "διὰ" as "in the context of." The question here is whether the promise falls within the domain of Law or of the righteousness of faith (p.94).
5. Bonsirven considers that the Law so dominated the thinking of Rabbinic Judaism that it had even replaced the covenant theme which formerly was central to all Jewish thinking. Cf. Le Judaïsme Palestinien au temps de Jésus-Christ. I, Paris 1934, p.179.
Abrahamic tradition, but for Paul the Abrahamic is primary. In the argument in vv.13f. Paul uses the content of the promise to support his thesis. The promise was that Abraham and his seed should be heirs of the world (Gen.xvii:4-8, xviii:18, Sir.xliv:21). This is also to be seen as the Messianic promise and thus the whole argument of this section assumes the fulfilment of that promise in the coming of the Messiah, so that truly all nations can now be blessed in Him. As we have already noted in iii:21-26, Paul is writing from the viewpoint of the Christian 'now'.

We note that the promise was to Abraham and to his seed. We are not dealing here with Abraham as an isolated individual, but rather with the opposite - with Abraham and his 'house'. Abraham is the head of a house, a heritage, a family which continues from generation to generation to which belong all who believe - "You and your family will be blessed." For Paul the promise goes from Abraham's seed, or son, and hence to house and to nation and to the world. The Abraham, Isaac, Jacob tradition was a tradition of the father's house and it is in the light of this that we must understand the meaning of Abraham and his seed. From this we see that the blessing to Abraham was not so much a blessing upon an individual as upon a group - a 'house'. The use of the plural in v.14 ( οἱ ἐκ νόμου ) and the collective singular in v.16 ( οὗ τῷ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου μόνον ἄλλα καὶ τῷ ἐκ πίστεως ) supports this view. Abraham cannot be lifted as an isolated individual from

3. For this conception of 'the father's house' in Abraham, I am dependent on the class notes of the lectures on Romans given by Professor Michel at Tübingen in the summer semester, 1969.
4. Cf. Klein "Gerade auch der Plural zeigt ja, dass die angehörigen einer bestimmten empirischen Gemeinschaft im Blick stehen." We disagree with Klein however, when he goes on to claim that the whole of empirical Israel has been excluded. Cf. EvTh XXIII, (1963), p.437.
The corporate setting of his 'house' and so we emphasize here that the central issue in this section is "who are Abraham's seed?" He has been made the heir of a promise and to his seed will come the inheritance so that his 'house' will continue to all generations. But who are his seed - what is it that constitutes the people of God?

The fact that Paul has denied that righteousness originates either in the Law or through circumcision forces him to deal with the question of who actually constitute the people of God. For Paul it is the promise of the Divine word, which alone is the origin and basis of the people of God. Paul argues that it must be this way because if the promise were mediated through the Law then the promise itself could never be realized by this method for the Law brings not blessing but only wrath (v.15). The content of the promise was that Abraham should become the father of many nations, by which Paul

1. Cf. Käsemann who sees the catchword of this third section as "Welterben". It is a question of "Abrahamkindshaft". "Abrahamkindhaft bleibt nicht länger das Privileg des Judentums und ist nicht einmal bloss die Auszeichnung der Judenchristen. Welterbe ist der Patriarch, sofern in Gestalt der Heidenchristen auch die Heiden seine Kinder, sein 'Same' werden, und zwar eben nicht bloss als Proselyten." "Der Glaube Abrahams in Römer iv." PP, p.156.
2. There may be some doubt as to which promise is referred to here. It is probably the whole series of promises i.e. that Abraham should have a son, that his son should have numerous descendants, that in one of these the whole world would be blessed and that through him Abraham's seed should enjoy world-wide dominion. Cf. Sanday and Headlam, p.111.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Schlatter noted that Paul seems to have a clearly defined use for \( \chiατηρυ\gamma\zeta\ο\ισθα\) cf. pp.167/8. We find this verb in Rom.i:27, ii:9, iv:15, v:3, vii:8,13,18. It usually refers to man under the power of sin, or the results produced by sin, but it can also be used in a situation where a good result is realized, cf. v:3 "suffering produces patience."
doubtless understood specifically 'Gentile nations'.

But if the promise was granted within the context of the Law, then not only would it lose its character as promise (or grace) but its content could never be realized as Gentiles would thereby be excluded. For Paul it is grace alone which enables the realization of the promise (cf. $\chi\alpha\tau\alpha\chi\acute{\alpha} \omicron\upsilon \nu\omicron\upsilon\acute{\omicron}$ v.16) and the effect of having the promise mediated via the Law would be to empty faith of all meaning and nullify the promise (v.14). Paul saw very clearly that if any prerequisite qualification is required for the reception of the promise, then its character is no more gift or grace, and it cannot be guaranteed to all the seed but only to $\tau\omicron$ $\epsilon\xi$ $\tau\omicron$ $\nu\omicron\upsilon\omicron$ (v.16). A difficulty of interpretation arises with this last phrase. In v.14 Paul states that if $\omicron$ $\epsilon\xi$ $\nu\omicron\upsilon\omicron$ are to be the heirs, then faith and the promise are made void. It would seem that in v.14 $\omicron$ $\epsilon\xi$ $\nu\omicron\upsilon\omicron$ should mean those who rely on the Law as a means of salvation, i.e. the


2. Cf. Barrett's translation of $\omega\nu\omicron\omicron\upsilon\omicron$ in v.13 (p.94).

3. Cf. Dodd on iv:16 "if it (the promise) was given to Abraham on the score of what he did, i.e. as a reward for his keeping the Law, then only those who kept the Law could have any share in it, and in any case the Gentiles were excluded". (p.91).

4. Paul's use of the verb $\chi\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\gamma\omicron\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\upsilon$ in Romans is most interesting. Here it emphasizes the mutual exclusiveness of the ways of Law and promise. The way of Law annuls the promise. We note also the possibility in iii:3) that the Jews might by their faithfulness annul the faithfulness of God. Paul however does not agree that this is a real possibility. Neither does he allow that his doctrine annuls the Law (iii:31). Paul's teaching is that by being united with Christ, we are 'annulled' or discharged from the Law (i.e. the Law itself is not annulled). It is only $\tau\omicron$ $\omicron\omicron\omicron$ $\tau\omicron$ $\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron$ $\delta\omicron\mu\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron$ $\omicron$ that is annulled (vi:6).

5. Paul's view of the gospel was that it was basically and essentially for all men. "Die Gerechtigkeit Gottes, dessen Offenbarung Christus ist, gilt allen Menschen; sie ist nichts anderes als der Heilswille Gottes für die ganze Menschheit. Diese Universalität des Heils in Christus gehört zum wesentlichsten Inhalt des Paulinischen Evangeliums." A. van Dülmen, p.215.
non-believing Jews. Otherwise we must presume that Paul envisaged the possibility of salvation for a limited number of people (i.e. the Jews) who were privileged in possessing the Law.

In v.16 however, Paul speaks of the promise being confirmed οὐ τῷ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραὰμ. To interpret these phrases as two different ways of describing Jews does not make good sense in the context.¹ There seems no doubt that Paul in v.16 means to refer to a seed composed of both believing Jews and Gentiles. This interpretation is strengthened by the addition of the clause ὦ ζονίν πατήρ πάντων ἱμῶν (v.16b).² τῷ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου in v.16 has therefore no pejorative sense but refers simply to the Jews as those who in fact possess the Law as in ii:20, iii:1, viii:10,14, ix:4.³ It is another way of describing the Jewish people for whom the danger of trusting in the Law is a real possibility.⁴ If we do not regard Paul as anti-Jewish or opposed to the Law itself, there is no reason why he should not refer, in this natural fashion, to the Jews as the people of the Law, because although the Law could not provide salvation for

---

¹ Cf. Müller, p.52 n.20.
² Despite the tendency to regard Abraham as the first member of the Jewish people - that people separated from other nations by the Law, it was also possible following Gen.xvii:5 (also Sir.xliv:19) to regard Abraham as the father of proselytes and of all men. It was disputed however whether or not Gentiles should call Abraham 'our father'. Cf. Strack-Billerbeck III, pp.185 and 211.
⁴ Cf. Barrett who translates v.16b "so that the promise might be secure for all the seed - not only to that part of the seed which is able to rely on the Law." He also says "It is clear that if the promise had been based upon the Law, only those who had the advantage of possessing the Law could hope to inherit the promise" (p.96). The reference here is to those who have the possibility of trusting in the Law, but in fact do not. Cf. also Wilckens who criticizes Klein for not connecting v.16 back to v.13 in order to appreciate its meaning. (EvTh,XXIV,(1964), pp.602-604). Cf. also Schmidt, p.85.
them, its possession certainly did not exclude them from the sphere of God's grace.

This interpretation of v.16 leaves us with a problem as to the meaning of οἱ ἐκ νόμου in v.14, because we are now suggesting that Paul uses the same phrase with a different meaning in the space of three verses. This solution implies a certain inconsistency in Paul's terminology in one or other of these verses. But no other interpretation seems tenable for v.16. and since v.14 has the more normal use of οἱ ἐκ νόμου (as the opposite of believers), we must, it seems, allow that Paul did vary his usage in this brief section.

Since this solution is not altogether satisfactory, yet another possibility must be investigated. As we have already noted, it is clear that the phrase οἱ ἐκ νόμου in v.16 is neutral, referring to the Jews simply as 'those of the Law'. Since the meaning of the term here is relatively explicit, it is preferable to interpret v.14 in the light of v.16, and to regard both verses as using οἱ ἐκ νόμου in a neutral sense. What stands condemned in v.14 is not that the Jews are of the Law, but that those of the Law regard themselves as solely and exclusively heirs, and thereby invalidate faith and promise. Since faith and promise take precedence over Law, it is absolutely necessary for οἱ ἐκ νόμου to recognise that not they alone have the exclusive right to be κληρονόμοι. This is then brought out in v.16 by the οἱ μόνοι...Ἀλλὰ καὶ , i.e. not solely and exclusively οἱ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου but 'those who share the faith of Abraham' are heirs. So in v.14 there

2. A partial explanation of the problem is that Paul is using in vv.13-16 a very curt Rabbinic type of argument (cf. v.16A) which may account for the fact that not all of the expressions used are clearly explained. Cf. Michel, p.122. n.3.
is no special emphasis on οἱ ἑκ νόμοι and no condemnation is implied in the phrase itself: rather the condemnation is in the predicate κληρονόμοι — when they regard themselves as sole heirs.

This gives us a satisfactory explanation of vv.14 and 16, but it leaves us with the question as to why Paul uses οἱ ἑκ νόμοι in a neutral rather than a negative sense. In answer to this it could be argued that Paul has deliberately used οἱ ἑκ νόμοι in a neutral sense in vv.14 and 16 in order to emphasize that salvation by faith is not intended to exclude the Jews from the eschatological people of God.

The διὰ τοῦτο of v.16 refers back to the argument of vv.13.f. and shows that these verses, referring in particular to the Law, are not without their significance for the total argument. Paul did not believe that any salvation could be obtained by adherence to the Law (v.14 has hypothetical οἱ'). The Law produces not promise but wrath, and the very presence of the Law brings the reckoning of sin (which is not reckoned where there is no Law) and introduces transgression (παράβασις), (which does not exist where there is no Law). The argument of vv.13.f. may be summarized as saying that the Law never did and never could produce promise or life. The function of the Law in the 'Heilsgeschichte' was to serve in

1. Some commentators find problems in this section and fail to see that it has any useful function in the context, cf. Klein,EvTh, XXIII(1963) pp. 437f. and Luz, p.176. It seems that these verses are best understood by some kind of 'heilsgeschichtlich' interpretation. These verses also serve to keep in view a thin line of thought on the Law and its function, cf. iii:20; iv:15; v:13,20; vii:7f. Cf. Müller, p.53 n.24, contra Michel, p.122.


a negative way the realization of grace "Der Nomos soll das Gottesvolk (niemals Abraham selbst!) unter die ορνη führen, damit es sich zur χάρις wende".\(^1\) In an argument where Paul wishes to show that the promise is the all-embracing factor, he must of necessity take the Law into account. In a chapter which dwells on the continuity between Abraham and the eschatological people of God, the references to the giving of the Law in this interim period, between the giving and fulfilment of the promise, are not without significance for our understanding of God's purpose in history.

The existence of the Law and its effect on sinful humanity is another reason for showing the necessity of salvation by grace. The Law could not achieve the fulfilment of the promise to the Jewish people and if the Gentiles were to be excluded, then no one would be able to find salvation.\(^2\) On the contrary, however, it is grace alone that guarantees the promise for all - for Jews and for Gentiles "Das Sola Gratia verbürgt auch Israel die Gültigkeit der Verheissung."\(^3\) As Dodd says, "in v.16 we come to the point which

\[1\] Müller, p.53 n.24.

\[2\] Cf. Müller "Beides hängt zusammen: Wenn wirklich die Verheissung für das ονόμα υπό νόμον ungültig wäre, dann fiele Verheissung und χάρις auch für das universale ονόμα υπό πίστευκα dahin." p.53.

\[3\] The question of the certainty of salvation is also under discussion in this section. Schmidt entitles vv.13-17 as "Der Grund der Heilsgewissheit". (p.82). In the realm of faith where Law has no jurisdiction, then this certainty can be assured. The use of the word βέβαιον with the εἰς expressing the purpose intended in v.16 also witnesses to this same theme - "that the promise might be as secure in its historical realization as it was in its divine origination". (Leenhardt, p.122). This emphasis helps us to see that Paul is seeking for a secure salvation for both Jews and Gentiles, and not one that excludes the Jews as Klein thinks. Paul is concerned more with the fulfilment than with the abolition of the covenant, or as Goppelt says "with the annulling fulfilment" (Jesus, Paul and Judaism, p.147). Cf. also his discussion of 'the old and new' in the light of the Gospel in Christologie und Ethik. Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament. Göttingen 1968, pp.178f.

\[4\] Müller, p.53.
shows the real importance and significance of the case of Abraham.\(^1\) This is indicated by the construction - διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ πλούσεως, ἢμα κατὰ χάριν, εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαιών τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ποιοῦ ὑπὸ σπέρματι. For Paul it had to be by grace so that the purpose of the promise should be realized - that Abraham should become the father of many nations, Jews as well as Gentiles. This is the high point of his argument, towards which the arguments about works in verses 1-8, circumcision in 9-12, and Law in 13f. have been tending. Now Paul has succeeded in uniting both Jews and Gentiles in a common salvation by God's grace which binds both groups inseparably together, and this was at least one of the aims which Paul had in mind when he wrote the letter to the Romans (cf. ch.xi:13f. and ch.xv:7f.)

---

1. *The Epistle to the Romans*, p.69.
It is only in vv.17^b^f.^1 that the example of Abraham's faith is closely studied. It is studied with a view to understanding how one believes.^2 We have already found that the purpose of God was that Gentiles as well as Jews should be members by faith of the people of God. Now the example of Abraham's faith helps us to see what faith is and how it originates. We agree with Luz here that the emphasis is upon us in the present, on Abraham and his faith in relation to the church,^3 cf. "not for his sake alone". (v.23).

For Paul the faith of Abraham was characterized by two phrases familiar to the Jews. Abraham believed in a God who gives life to the dead^4 and calls into existence the things that are not.^5 By using these two citations, Paul may have meant to impress upon the Jews that his doctrine of justification by faith is in accordance with biblical and Jewish teaching.^6 Paul's chief concern however is to demonstrate the real nature of the God with whom faith unites us and this is why he uses the strongest possible description -

1. Although commentators subdivide the second part of ch.iv in several different ways, we feel that this is the best division. Cf. Barth, p.49; Feuillet, pp.355-6.
3. "Paulus blickt nicht auf Abraham, sondern mit Hilfe Abrahams blickt er auf 'uns'." p.177. Luz however makes little contribution to a better understanding of Rom.iv. Like ix-xi, its content is not fully explained by reference to the present only.
4. This expression is found in the Old Testament, Dt.xxxii:39; I Sm.ii:6; II Kg. v:7; in the New Testament, II Cor.i:9; I Tim.vi:13; also the Second Benediction of the 18th Prayer closes with these words. Michel finds a confessional-liturgical style in the descriptive participles in v.17, (p.124).
5. This phrase is found in Apocalypse of Baruch xlviii:8 and II Mac.vii:28 among others. Käsemann notes the wide discussion of this theme in various writings including those of Philo, cf. op.cit., PP, pp.160-1.
the two supreme manifestations of divine sovereignty.  

In this sense it is true that Abraham is cited as an example and we would also admit that there is no thorough-going interest in his historical context.  

We must be careful not to overstate this aspect of these verses, because Paul does connect Abraham in a very real way with the church and the question of the meaning of this history may show that Abraham is, even here, more than an example.

Using the story of Abraham in Gen. xv and xvii, Paul elaborates the meaning of the faith which trusts in a God who gives life to the dead and calls into existence the things that are not. Having been told that he should have descendants as numerous as the stars of heaven, Abraham did not disbelieve in spite of the advanced age of himself and Sarah. He was fully convinced that God was able to do what He had promised. Paul summarizes this story by the epigrammatic phrase \( \pi\alpha\rho\' \varepsilon\lambda\iota\delta\alpha \varepsilon\lambda\iota\delta\iota \). This is the paradox of true faith which, in Käsemann's words, still believes "wo es irdisch nichts mehr zu hoffen gibt." Abraham is thus the archetype of the

1. Leenhardt, p.123.
2. Cf. Klein, EvTh, XXIV (1964), p.682. Leenhardt notes Paul's strange use of the history of Abraham in Genesis, particularly the supposed incapacity of Abraham, which is contradicted by his relations with Hagar. "Abraham is considered by the Apostle from a purely theological angle, not a historical one .... the idea concerns him more than the historical facts." (p.125).
3. The Koine reading (MSS. D. G it) which adds an \( \omega \) before \( \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\varepsilon\nu\rho\omega\gamma\omicron\nu \) should not be followed, (Michel p.126). Käsemann criticizes this reading as an inferior understanding of the nature of true faith. Cf.op.cit.PP, p.162.
4. This phrase emphasizes the paradoxical nature of hope - "contrary to all human expectation - which turned on its own axis alone", Leenhardt, p.124. We note here, in Paul's usual manner he introduces hope for the first time as a sort of preview of the theme which will become dominant in chs.v and viii.
Christian; he believed in the God who provided him with a son, the God of the New Creation.

To conclude his argument, Paul quotes Gen.xv:6 a third time, (v.22). Abraham's faith was effective because it led him to depend upon the power of God and so his faith was reckoned to him as righteousness. The illustration of Abraham shows that the promise depends not upon human merit or endeavour, but upon God both for its initiation and its accomplishment. Abraham's faith was not only effective for himself, but has also a relation to ours. Paul sees that, in the divine purpose, the Gen.xv passage was not only valid for Abraham but for those who have the same faith as Abraham - it will also be reckoned to them as righteousness, (v.23.f.). As Abraham believed that in spite of all human incapacity, God would raise up for him a son, so those who have Abraham's faith today are those who believe in Him who raised from the dead our Lord Jesus. This is the reason for Paul's choice of descriptive


2. This aspect of redemption has been very closely linked with the doctrine of righteousness by faith in the thought of Professor Käsemann, cf. "The Righteousness of God in Paul". NTOT, pp.163-182. This emphasis has been worked out in detail by P. Stuhlmacher, a former student of Professor Käsemann, (Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus. Göttingen 1966.)

phrases for God in v.17 - he wished to identify Abraham's faith in God with
the Christian's faith in God. Despite the separation in time, there is a
unity in faith. Therefore Abraham is truly 'father' of all believers,¹ and
believing Gentiles as well as Jews may call him 'our father'.

This understanding makes Abraham not just an isolated archetype or
model for the believer, as Klein and Luz wish to believe.² Abraham is not sep¬
ate from the new community of faith;³ not only has he the same kind of faith
as us, but he is related to us in that peculiar form of history - salvation
history - in which God and his people are related to each other in covenant
faith. The God who called forth Abraham and who by His creative word also
called forth the Christian community is not One who acts in isolated events
having no relation to each other.⁴ He is a God who moves with His people
through history in faithfulness to His covenant promise.⁵ This history in¬
cludes the election of Israel, the history of the Law from Sinai to the Cross
(cf.vv13-15), the patient tolerance of human wickedness (both Jews and Gent¬
iles) and above all, the conclusive act of the revelation of His righteou¬
ness through the Christ event.⁶

¹. F. Neugebauer, In Christus. Berlin 1961, also designates Abraham as "Typus
des neuen Gottesvolkes" and "Praeexistentes Glied der Ekklesia", (p.168).
3. Cf. Käsemann, "Er (Abraham) hat nicht nur repräsentative, sondern als
Annherr auch der glaubenden Heiden kosmische Bedeutung. Er ist wie
Moses in Röm.v:12.f. Schicksalträger, allerdings nicht in Antithese zur
5. This is not to claim that God acts in direct historical continuity. God's
continuity is determined by the promise and his own faithfulness. His
acts are manifested in and through history but are not to be identified
G. Eichholz "Verkündigung und Tradition", Tradition und Interpretation,
TB, 29, München 1965, pp.11-35 (pp.17f.).
geschichte im Römerbrief". PP, pp.108-139 (122).
It is this very theme of the continuity and steadfastness of God's activity, of His faithfulness to His covenant people, that raises such problems for Paul in Rom. ix-xi. For the church, no less than Israel, the continuity of faith and the faithfulness of God was a vital issue, (cf. Rom. iii:3-7 and xi:1.f.). Schlatter notes the seriousness of this question "Nun musste aber die neue Gemeinde den Beweis dafür führen, dass sie mit allem, was sie über ihr Verhältnis zu Gott sagte und als ihr Ziel und ihre Norm vertrat, mit dem Anfang der von Gott berufenen Gemeinde einstimmig blieb. Entstand dagegen durch Jesus oder Paulus eine Trennung von Abraham, so ergab dies einen Widerspruch gegen seine Botschaft, der unüberwindlich war."²

Let us now summarize what we have found concerning Abraham in ch. iv. We discovered that the question/objection style is not so obvious as it is in ch. iii. The style of ch. iv and the objection with which the figure of Abraham is introduced, connect this chapter in style and construction to chs. iii:1-9, 27-31, vi - vii, and ix - xi, rather than to chs. iii:21-26, v and viii.

1. Cf. Cullmann, Salvation in History, pp.261.f. The existence and the meaning of this continuity is the centre of the problem. To certain theologians of an existentialist outlook, the emphasis upon this continuity has not been very acceptable, cf. the debate between Klein and Wilckens in EvTh, XXIII and XXIV (1963 and 1964). Cullmann thinks however that it is wrong to contrast Christian existence and salvation history as opposites (cf. Foreword p.1). Cullmann believes that scholarship has produced an increasing amount of evidence to support his view of 'Heilsgeschichte', cf. pp. 28.f. Käsemann's appreciation of a 'heilsgeschichtlich' understanding of Rom. iv and ix-xi is most interesting especially the comment "Die Antithese 'historisch-eschatologisch' war einmal für unsere kritische Forschung ausserordentlich hilfreich. Prinzipiell lässt sie sich im Neuen Testament kaum irgendwo halten." (op.cit., p. 164). This change in opinion may be most helpful for the further understanding of Rom. ix-xi.

2. p.158.
We found that to describe this chapter as the scriptural proof of what preceded, whether of iii:21-26, iii:21-31, or of iii:31 alone, does not give an adequate understanding of its relevance and function within the letter. This view gives the chapter a rather arbitrary position in the letter, and enables commentators to understand its content not from itself but rather from ch.iii. A lack of appreciation of ch.iv has originated largely from a Gentile understanding of iii:21-26 which assumes that Gentiles are automatically included because the way to salvation is by faith.

Another problem was the understanding of the significance of Abraham and his faith. We have found that Abraham's faith as our example does have an illustrative function in the final section of the chapter. But Abraham is not only an example, but "the father of us all". He is more too than "an example of an outstanding religious personality."\(^1\) As an individual Abraham was confronted by God, but we have found that his significance in ch.iv is not so much as an individual as that he stands at the beginning of God's covenant of election.\(^2\) The use of the plural in referring to those of his faith, or his descendants shows that it is with Israel and the church that Paul is dealing and Abraham's connection with both. The emphasis is corporate rather than individualistic.\(^3\) We agree with Müller that "Abraham ist

nicht nur Vorbild oder Beispiel des Glaubenden ... Hier geht es um die Struktur des Gottesvolkes..."\(^1\) Positively we have found that the figure of Abraham marks the beginning of that special 'Heilsgeschichte', the apex of which is the historical revelation of God's righteousness in Christ.\(^2\) The oneness of the church (especially the church becoming increasingly composed of Gentiles)\(^3\) with Abraham "the first of the faithful" and with the historical people of God is basic to this chapter, as is witnessed by the central issue - who may call Abraham father, or who are Abraham's seed? We may put it this way - how does the church begin and how does it continue? This solidarity with Abraham connects both believing Jews and believing Gentiles to one originator and by this they should see that they are not two peoples but one, as God is One. The inclusion of the Gentiles does not mean the exclusion of the Jews.\(^4\)

Secondly this same unity is further cemented by the out-working of the theme in iii:21-26 - that God's people are always constituted by His redeeming grace, and this grace alone assures the guarantee of salvation to all, both Jews and Gentiles. Jews and Gentiles have in Abraham a common

---

1. P.53 n.24. Müller's characteristic emphasis in Romans ix-xi (which he also relates to ch.iv) is illustrated by this quotation "Gottesvolkexistenz und Charakterisierung durch die δικαιοποιησθεν besagen für Paulus dasselbe." (p.107).


4. Cf. Bring, "If the word universalism is to be used at all, it must not exclude from its scheme the election of one nation recorded in the actual history of salvation in the Old Testament. The idea of an elect people is not set aside, as if one concept must give place to another. Israel, and that which is revealed in the Old Testament, remains always the basis, though the limitation of salvation to its own people is done away." StH, XIX (1965), p.31.
forefather and with him they are related together in a common grace,\(^1\) so that they are truly one in salvation and the destiny of the one cannot be separated from the destiny of the other.\(^2\)

If this understanding of Rom.iv is correct, then its continuation and conclusion will be found not in ch.v, but most likely in chs.ix-xi. Here Paul has related the church to Abraham and the Covenant: how he will relate unbelieving Israel remains to be shown in chs.ix-xi.

---

1. Although we do not overlook the fact that Conzelmann distinguishes Luke's conception of 'Heilsgeschichte' from that of Paul (The Theology of St. Luke. ET London 1960) we find that the view of Abraham which Paul expresses in Romans is very similar to that of Luke in Luke-Acts. We find agreement on the following points:
   1. Abraham is the primary recipient of God's promise to the fathers;
   2. The priority of the Jews;
   3. The solidarity of the church with Abraham;
   4. Paul's mission to the Gentiles is part of that continuing history which began with God's revelation to Abraham;
   5. The church has not replaced Israel as the people of God. Cf. Dahl, op. cit., pp. 142, 147 and 150-152.
   
   This agreement may be taken as providing additional support for our understanding of the significance of Abraham in Romans iv.

Romans iv and ix-xi.

In the light of what we have already found in ch.iv let us now make a brief comparison between ch.iv and chs.ix-xi.

One of the distinctive features common to both these sections is the prominence of reference to, and quotation of the Old Testament. Barth, following Luther, has emphasized the proper understanding of the Old Testament as one of the most important reasons for Paul's writing this letter to Rome.¹ Lyonnet also emphasizes this aspect of Romans when he claims that chs.ix-xi form the scriptural illustration for the second part of the epistle in the same way as ch.iv does for the first.² We support this opinion in its emphasis upon the similarity in content between ch.iv and chs.ix-xi. As we have already noted, however, to describe ch.iv merely as a further illustration of what has previously been stated is to miss the real reason for its inclusion in the epistle; and the same we believe, is also true for chs.ix-xi.

Related to the emphasis upon the Old Testament is the question of continuity in the purpose and revelation of God. If, as Goppelt claims, the crucial problem in Hellenistic Christianity was the relationship of the message of Christ to the Old Testament,³ then it is most likely that a letter with so much reference to the Old Testament, will also be concerned with the question of continuity. This continuity seemed threatened by two related factors - the general unbelief of the Jews and the acceptance of uncircumcised Gentiles into the church. If there had been a real discontinuity between

---

3. Jesus, Paul and Judaism, p.112.
the Jewish nation and the new community of faith, this would have presented a great problem for Jewish people, even for Jewish Christians. On the other hand, Paul realized that a Gentile church which was unaware of the fact that it had been grafted on to the stem of Israel, would think of itself as a 'creatio ex nihilo' and begin to boast over those who had been rejected. Thus, for both Jews and Gentiles, it was imperative to see the continuity in God's ways as revealed in the Old Testament and in the Cross.

Paul also had to avoid misunderstandings of his gospel such as ch. iii:31 (by this you annul the Law) and ch.xi:1.f. (this means God has cast off His people). As Schlatter has noted, if Paul had allowed any separation between the Israel of the Old Testament and the new community of faith, this would have created for Paul's gospel an insurmountable problem.  

In Romans iv, Paul deals with this difficulty by relating Gentiles to Abraham, who himself believed as a Gentile. Since Abraham, on account of the covenant, is also the first of the believing Jews, Paul relates the new community to a common forefather. In chs.ix-xi the same problem is again under discussion. In ch.ix:8.f., the continuity and discontinuity within the seed of Abraham is demonstrated to emphasize the freedom of God's grace as in the case of Abraham in ch.iv. In ch.ix as in ch.iv, we have a discussion of the connection with Abraham, whether by natural or by spiritual descent. It is only in ch.xi, however, that the desperate problem of the continuity of God's revelation in relation to unbelieving Israel is really faced. In ch.iv Paul emphasizes the positive continuation of God's purpose which widens to embrace the Gentiles. In chs.ix-xi he has to face again the apparent discont-

1. p.158.
2. Cf. λογίζεσθαι in ix:8f. and iv:3-11.
inity caused by the unbelief of Israel and yet still affirms that "the
gifts and calling of God are irrevocable". (xi:29). Paul's thesis seems to
be that even as the justification of Abraham was the justification of the
ungodly (iv:5),¹ so too the Jewish people will come to faith by the route
that leads through disobedience (xi:32).

We find that in both sections Paul repudiates all false claims for
the Jewish people, especially in relation to works-righteousness (cf.iii:21-
iv:8 and ix:30 - x:13).² At the same time he allows their history and
their election a special place within the redemptive activity of God i.e.
in ch.iv. Paul's argument would enable him to claim that Abraham is father
of Gentiles first, and only secondarily of Jews - but he does not say that.
All, both Jews and Gentiles, must follow in file behind Abraham (iv:12).
In chs.ix-xi, Paul continues in a similar vein; he defends the freedom of
God to do as He will with His creation (ix:14.f.), but he still allows the
advantage of his natural kinsmen, the Jews (ix:3-6).³ He acknowledges him-
self to be of the seed of Abraham and, despite all criticism of Jewish dis-
obedience, he maintains that in the end, "all Israel will be saved."⁴
Paul's paradoxical treatment of the Israel after the flesh can lead to the

---

1. Käsemann justifies this description of Abraham by reference to the non-
reckoning of sins in Rom.iv:7-8, but he claims that we completely mis-
understand his meaning if we moralize this statement and equate it with
the justification of the wicked, "Der Glaube Abrahams in Röm.iv." pp140-50.
2. It is noteworthy that, with the possible exception of vii:7-25, (the
question of the Law) there is no real discussion of this antithesis
between faith and works in chs.v-viii.
3. Cf. Sanday and Headlam who criticize F.C. Baur and his followers for
exaggerating Paul's opposition to the Jews. "He defends himself and
his converts from their attacks (i.e. the Jews), but he fully concedes
the priority of their claim and he is most anxious to conciliate them
(Rom.xv:31; ix:1.f., x:1.f.; xv:8 etc.)." (p.24.).
4. We do not mean by this all the Jewish people; the meaning of 'all Israel'
will be discussed in relation to chs.ix-xi.
same misunderstanding in both Rom.iv and ix-xi i.e. the argument for the inclusion of the Gentiles in ch.iv can be interpreted to mean the exclusion of the Jews, and the election of the Israel of faith in ix-xi may be taken to mean the rejection of all Jewish people. It is only when we follow the full argument of Paul, that we can appreciate both his negative and positive evaluation of the Jewish nation.¹

If Paul did believe "to the Jew first", we might well ask why it is that this problem of Jewish unbelief is mentioned in ch.iii, but not dealt with in detail until chs.ix-xi. The answer is that Paul is speaking from the point of view of God's revelation in Christ. In the light of this it would have been inconceivable for Paul to deal with the subject of unbelieving Israel prior to his description of those who are now the true heirs of Abraham and inheritors of the promise.² Paul could not have discussed unbelieving Israel without reference to the historical revelation of God's righteousness in Christ and the new community of faith. This helps to explain the content of chs.i-xi.

In i-iv we find numerous references to Jews and Gentiles. They are discussed in relation to each other and to the purpose of God. In chs. v-viii however, this subject has practically disappeared from the discussion.³ Then in chs.ix-xi it reappears and is taken up again in ch.xiv and ch.xv. Our explanation of this is that Paul in ch.iv reaches the apex of

---

1. Cf. Cullmann, "The past is seen as salvation history in the light of the present, but the present cannot be recognized at all as salvation history without the positive 'presentation' of the past." (p.263).
2. The fact that Paul's statement concerning the universal sinfulness of humanity in i:18-iii:20 precedes iii:21.f. does not invalidate this assertion.
his argument which is to show that Gentile believers may truly call Abraham 'father' and that both peoples are united in a common salvation beginning with Abraham. Chs.v-viii follow the outworking of the Christian life in the here and now.

Paul's doctrine of the church is that "in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek" - hence in the positive description of the life of the believing community these arguments are not only unnecessary but undesirable. It is only in the discussion of the origin or constitution of the people of God that such arguments are permissible. Ch.viii is thus rightly seen as a high-point in Paul's exposition of the life of the church.¹ We would greatly misinterpret Paul, however, if we were to regard chs.ix-xi as an afterthought that was somehow less important than chs.i-viii. Paul the believer, could never be content while that people through whom the Messiah came were living without His blessings.

Having pursued the theme of the life of the new community in Christ, Paul must continue the Jew/Gentile theme of chs.i-iv. In ch.iv, he opposed the presumption of the Jews who assumed that they were related to Abraham and that Gentiles were therefore excluded. In ch.xi, Paul opposes the presumption of the Gentiles who assume that they can boast because the Jews were broken off so that they could be grafted in. The way of grace to both Jew and Gentile excludes all boasting, and Paul opposes the boasting in iv:2 and xi:18.f. The proper Christian boasting is outlined in chs.v:2,3,11 - a boasting in hope, in suffering, in God who reconciles us.

The way Paul deals with the questions of Jew and Gentile, of faith

and incorporation into the community of faith, of differences in opinion concerning food etc. (cf. chs. xiv and xv) shows that a basic aim of the letter to the Romans is to emphasize the unity of two peoples in one community of faith. This is evident in ch. iv and also in ix-xi where Paul shows that the new people of God can never disregard the future of that historical people through whom God chose to reveal Himself. God's purpose for Israel in the Old Testament, for the people of God in the New Testament, and His continuing purpose for a still unbelieving Israel, connects chs. iv and chs. ix-xi.

Abraham figures in both sections not just as an example but as the one to whom the promise was first given. He was called by the word of God which gives life to the dead and calls into existence things that are not (iv:17). Paul claims in ch.ix:6.f., that this word of God has not failed, but is still calling to Israel to return, (xi:21).

Let us now summarize the parallels which we have found in these two sections of the letter. We have found that the following themes are common to both - the use of the Old Testament; the emphasis upon the continuity of the purpose and people of God in the 'Heilsgeschichte' of God; the positive evaluation of God's revelation to the Jewish people; the place of Abraham and 'Abrahamskindschaft' i.e. what constitutes the children of the promise; the denial of boasting and of works/righteousness, above all, the emphasis that righteousness is for everyone who believes, both Jew and Gentile,

and the concern that these two peoples should accept each other and live in harmony in Christ.

Perhaps it is in the image of the tree into which the Gentiles were grafted after the unbelieving Jews had been broken off, that we get our best insight into the connection between chs.iv and ix-xi. Abraham as the 'Stammvater' of Israel, is the great concern of ch.iv. In chs.ix-xi we get the same idea in another image - that of the olive tree. It is no new tree into which the Gentiles are grafted but the old stem of Abraham and, if the Jews repent, they will be grafted back into the same tree.

The theme of election involving Jews and Gentiles is thus basic to both sections. We have already shown certain connections between ch.iii and chs.ix-xi. Chs.i and ii also deal with the general theme of Gentiles and Jews before God, and chs.xiv and xv continue to emphasize the oneness of these two peoples within the community of faith. A theme that is so central to the Roman letter i.e. in i-iv, ix-xi and xiv-xv, cannot be ignored in a full interpretation of the meaning and purpose of the letter.
The Situation to which Paul addresses himself in Rom.iii-iv.

The questions and objections which introduce and conclude ch.iii, indicate according to our previous findings that Paul is referring to discussions or problems within the Roman church.¹ The nature of these is indicated by iii:1-2 - "Then what advantage has the Jew or what is the value of circumcision? Much in every way." The fact that Paul qualifies this statement in iii:9, claiming that he has no intention of setting Jew before Gentile, as if God exercised partiality on a racial basis, suggests that Paul was addressing a situation where people were sensitive concerning Jew-Gentile relations. The question in iii:29 "Is God the God of Jews only?" and the discussion in ch.iv as to who are the true children of Abraham add weight to this suggestion.

Paul apparently feels obliged to uphold the priority of the Jewish people to whom God chose to reveal Himself. He attempts to do this in such a way as to emphasize that election takes place on the basis of grace and not of merit. This is analogous to the situation in chs.ix-xi which we have already shown to be closely connected to these chapters, (iii-iv). Although very much aware of the unbelief of the majority of the Jews, Paul argues in ix-xi that the Gentile Christians are wrong in their view that the Jews are rejected and that believing Gentiles have replaced them as the people of God.

Paul seeks to remove all grounds for boasting and to show the equality of all men in sin and in grace. This he does in the two sections in these chapters which do not conform to the question and objection style. In the first of these, iii:9-20, he shows the universality of sin and in the second, iii:21-26, he sets forth God's redemptive act in Christ as the fulfilment of the covenant promises. This divine act assures salvation first of all for

the Jew to whom the promises were originally given and also for the Gentile since salvation is by faith and apart from the Law. This removes all grounds for boasting in that salvation is by grace and is now equally available for all men in the new aeon that dawned with Christ's resurrection.

That the argument in chs.iii-iv is not purely theoretical is clearly indicated at the end of ch.iv when it is stated that God's purpose was that Abraham should become "the father of us all" (v.16), and that the words "it was reckoned to him" were written "not for his sake alone but for ours also"; (v.23). We take the first reference to imply the existence of two groups of people, probably Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians. The second reference concerns the significance of Abraham's faith. This may be understood as an indication that the meaning of faith was disputed among the Roman Christians and that Paul is using the Abraham tradition to clarify the issue.

This is supported by a comparison between Paul's use of the story of Abraham in Romans and that in Galatians.¹ In Romans the basic interest in Abraham is as the 'Stammvater' of Israel, the bearer of the promise, 'the heir of the world'. There is also a strong emphasis upon the continuity between Abraham and all believers. But in Galatians there is no interest in the continuity of 'Heilsgeschichte' and it is Christ who is the true seed of Abraham so that attention is not focussed on the relation of believers to the Jewish nation.² The use in Romans suggests that Paul addresses a situation where the positive meaning of continuity with Abraham, the question of who are the legitimate heirs of the promise and the relation of these with the historical people of God were disputed questions.

Bartsch holds that Paul's discussion in Rom.iv is a dialogue with the

---

2. Ibid.
Rabbinic interpretation of the Abraham tradition. He suggests that Jewish Christians probably stressed faith as obedience in reaction to Gentile Christians who emphasized faith as freedom from all restraint. The negative attitude of the latter to the Torah no doubt led to this conflict. In both groups Paul sees a danger of faith being regarded as a personal achievement, something to boast about. Paul's answer to this is that true covenant faith - that which made the Jews distinctive, originates from grace alone.

Another striking feature of ch.iv is the connection with chs.xiv-xv. Abraham, Paul says, did not become weak in faith (v.19, cf.xiv:1), but grew strong in faith (v.20, cf.xv:1). Abraham's faith is an example for both 'the weak' and 'the strong' since he is father of them all. Unlike the doubter in xiv:23, Abraham did not doubt but trusted God who is able to make the weak become strong. Jewett notes that the reference to Abraham's *οξμα in iv:19 is not found in Heb.xi:12 nor in the Rabbinic parallels but is peculiar to Paul, and that its inclusion is probably not accidental. In view of Paul's subsequent emphasis upon 'the dead body' (viii:10, cf.vi:12, vii:24) it may be that Paul's aim is to show that Abraham's recognition of the moral impotency of his own body is an essential aspect of exemplary faith. Although his body is dead he hopes in God and yields up his members as instruments of righteousness and not of sin (cf. vi:13-14).

We conclude that the situation Paul addresses in chs.iii-iv is consonant with that which we have posited for chs.vi-vii; it is also similar to that which is addressed in chs.ix-xi and xiv-xv. In all of these we see signs of a Gentile Christianity which has failed to appreciate the Judaic origins of their faith.

Paul concluded his argument concerning Abraham by relating his faith to that of the Christian community. Like Abraham the faith of believers will be reckoned to them as righteousness (iv:23.ff). These believers are further described as those "who believe in Him that raised from the dead Jesus our Lord" (v.24). Verse 25 elaborates this description in the words of a pre-Pauline confession "who was put to death for our trespasses and raised for our justification". The reason for the inclusion of this quotation seems to be to enable Paul to make a smooth transition from the theme of ch.iv to that of ch.v. It is interesting that the confession which Paul quotes speaks of Christ as being raised for our justification. This relates it to the theme of iii:21-26 and to some extent to ch.iv, so it is not entirely out of place in the context. The argument at the end of ch.iv however, is not referring so much to the justification of believers (this argument has already been completed) but rather to the application of justification to life.

Paul is referring to what was formerly termed 'santification' rather than justification. We also might argue that the death of Christ in v.25a refers to the justification of the believer, i.e. to the basis or origin of the Christian life, whereas v.25b refers to the realization and outworking of that life into which we have already entered. The first part of the verse is a conclusion of what has already been argued and the second forms the introduction for the succeeding theme. It would appear that Paul used

1. It is generally agreed that Paul is quoting from earlier material cf. H. Conzelmann An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament. (translated by J. Bowden) 1969, pp.64-70, 166, 191.
the words of an older formula which differentiated between the meaning of Christ's death and His resurrection. 1 In spite of the different terminology, Paul interprets the older tradition (in v.25b) as referring to Christian life as already received and enjoyed by the believing community. By the use of this convenient formula Paul has been able to make the desired transition from ch.iv to ch.v. 2 and has related the thought of iii:21.ff to that of v:1.ff. 3

From the background of Abraham, Paul has arrived at the 'now' of the new age, where the righteousness of God has been revealed. This connects ch.v (cf. v.9) with the 'now' of iii:21,26 and both may be related forward to viii:1.ff. Since ch.iv is not, for the most part, dealing with the 'now' in Christ Jesus, it is thus seen to be somewhat of a 'digression' (in the

---

2. Nygren notes how Paul skilfully joins the two chapters (and the first two sections of the letter) "It is particularly interesting to see how Paul joins the two, when he now turns from the first part to the second. 'Raised for our justification' he says in closing the first part. In so saying Paul has coupled justification, righteousness, with the resurrection of Christ. But since the resurrection of Christ is the beginning of the new age of life, we see that Paul has carried his presentation precisely to the point where, in the next section, he must show what the new life means. In the concluding statement of the first part one can already glimpse the issue to which the second part supplies the answer." (p.188). Cf. also K.A.Dahl, "Two Notes on Romans v." STh, V-VI (1951/52)p.39.
specialized meaning of the word given by Dahl\(^1\) originating from the questions in iii:27.ff.\(^2\)

In ch.v Paul has returned to the theme of the Christian community as the eschatological people of God who now enjoy the new life made available in Christ Jesus. He is not concerned whether they were formerly Jews or Gentiles. In Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek and Paul sees these people as the new humanity (cf. Ephs.ii:15), the new creation of God. The change of subject\(^3\) (i.e. from Jew-Gentile to the Christian community) is designated by very noticeable changes in vocabulary and style. Nygren has drawn attention to the fact that the word faith is used very often in chs.i-iv but very seldom in chs.v-viii,\(^4\) whereas, on the contrary the words 'life' and 'live' are not used in chs.i-iv but are frequently found in v-viii.\(^5\) We note also that hope occurs firstly at iv:18 and then becomes dominant in chs.v and vii in particular.

1. Cf. p.41. It is also our contention that those sections which are argumentative and show signs of discussions that had taken place within the missionary experience of Paul, are, in spite of their apparent character as digressions, basic to Paul's argument in this letter.

2. Jeremias connects v:1 directly to iii:21-30 and considers ch.viii is the continuation of ch.v. This has the effect of constituting iii:21-30, ch.v and ch.viii the central theme of the letter and iii:1-9, iii:31-iv, vi-vii and ix-xi are digressions or interruptions of the central line of argument. Cf. pp.148.f. Also Dahl, p.39.f.

3. This change of subject does not mean that Paul has come to the true theme of his letter. The change is only a temporary one and in chs.ix-xi Paul returns to the theme of Jews and Gentiles. Viewed in this light, the digression is seen to be in chs.v-viii, rather than in ix-xi.

4. ἀποκάθωσιν occurs in Rom.i:16,17; iii:2,3,22,25,26,27,28,30,31; iv:3,5,9, 11,12,13,14,16,17,18,19,24: and in vi1,2 but not again until ix:30. As Conzelmann rightly observes, the omission of this key term in this large area of the epistle creates a difficult problem for those who regard the three sections of Rom.i-xi as a threefold interpretation of justification by faith. Conzelmann's suggestions, though helpful, do not really solve this difficulty. Cf. pp.239-40.

Another change is that whereas the discussion in i:18-iv:22 is held mostly in the third person (the second person singular is used in a rhetorical manner), in chs.v-viii (with the exception of v:12-21) the apostle, on the contrary is directly addressing the Romans, writing in the second and first person plural. Chapter iv:23-25 marks the transition. Feuillet argues that certain similarities in vocabulary between v:1-11 and the previous chapters require us to regard this section as the conclusion of what precedes, rather than as the introduction to a new section. It is significant however, that Leenhardt who follows the opinion of Feuillet in regarding Rom.v:1-11 as the conclusion of what precedes, notes a change in tone and style from v.l.f. "the tone and style is no longer that of theological argument; it is now the believer who is speaking." Taken along with the marked change in tone and style, Feuillet's arguments are not really convincing, and it is better to regard the main break in Rom.i-viii as occurring

2. Feuillet regards v:1-11 as the crowning conclusion of the previous arguments. He notes the following points:- δικαιωθείσες (in v:1) relates back to ii:13; iii:4,20,25,28,30; iv:2-5. Κατάςωμος (in v:3,11) opposes the sinful boasting of ii:17,23; iii:27; iv:2 (and not used again until xv:17). Ἔργα (v:9) re-echoes i:18; ii:5,8; iii:5; iv:15; (and is not mentioned again until ix:22). The phrase τήν ἠφανίς ταυτίν (v:2) refers back to iii:24; the hope of the glory of God in v:1 recalls the privation of the glory of God in iii:23; the ἀλλιαστήρι ἢ τῆς ἠφανίς ταυτίν of v:8 corresponds to the δικαιοσύνης ὑποκείμενος of iii:5; the phrase ἐπ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ of v:9 is parallel to ἐπ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ of iii:25 (and nowhere else in the letter). (p.356 n.1). There is no need to dispute these parallels that have been illustrated. It is questionable however if they are sufficient proof that the content of ch.v is more closely related to chs.i-iv than vi-viii.
3. This division (between v.11 and v.12) was originally proposed by Th. Zahn Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer. 3 Aufl., 1925.
at the end of ch.iv.\(^1\) This is in accordance with the opinion of most modern commentators as opposed to the older view which held that the theme of i:18-v:21 was justification and the theme of vi-viii was sanctification.\(^2\) Support for connecting ch.v to the first section of Romans and not to ch.vi.ff. has been provided in Professor Dahl's excellent essay in which he notes a close parallelism between v:1-11 and viii:1-39.\(^3\) In Dahl's view chs.v and viii are not two parallel statements of related themes; as we have noted this cyclical

1. One of the first to make the division between chs.iv and v was Th. Haring - Der Römerbrief des Apostels Paulus (Stuttgart, 1926). Haring subdivided as follows "Die Offenbarung der Gerechtigkeit Gottes aus Glauben, (iii:21 - iv:25), zum Leben (v-viii)." C.H. Dodd has a similar arrangement "The Righteousness of God in Justification" (iii:21 - iv:25), and "The Righteousness of God in Salvation" (v-viii); cf. also A. Nygren "He Who through Faith is Righteous" (i:18 - iv:25), "He Who through Faith is Righteous shall Live" (v-viii); and O. Michel "Die Gerechtigkeit Gottes" (i-iv), "Das neue Leben aus Gott" (v-viii). This division is also held by Lietzmann, Schmidt, Luz, Dahl und Dupont (in the works already cited); by S. Lyonnet "Note sur le plan de l'Épitre aux Romains," RSch., XXXIX (1951) pp.301-316 and by J. Cambier L'Évangile de Dieu selon l'Épitre aux Romains. (Studia Neostamentica III), Brussels,1966 (cf. p.279). Luz also lists Huby, Viard, Cornély, Klein, Ortigues and Gümann in support of this division. (cf. p.176,n.43). Brunner retains iii:21 - viii:39 as one section and A. Deschamps regards iii:21 - xi:36 as one section preceded by the introduction i:18 - iii:30 "La Structure de Rom. i-xi." Analecta Biblica 17-18 (1963), p.10.

2. Eg. Godet (2nd Edit. 1883) Weiss (Meyer 1899) Sanday and Headlam (ICC, 5th Edit. 1902), Kühl (1913), Gaugler (1954), Althaus (9th Edit. 1959). In general this view is also held by Lagrange (6th Edit. 1950) and Schlatter (1935), and W. Manson "Notes on the Argument of Romans" (chs. i-viii): New Testament Essays in Memory of T.W. Manson (1959), p.159. "Two Notes on Romans v". STh,Vol.V-VI, 1951/52, pp.37 ff. Dahl sets out the Greek text of these chapters in parallel columns and, by putting similar verses alongside each other, he illustrates the parallels between the chapters. He says "This synopsis speaks for itself, and does not need much commentary. It shows that ch.viii contains a fuller development of the themes which are briefly stated in v:1-li". (p.39).
type of argument is not common in Paul, but his argument proceeds forward all the time even though it may proceed by means of wide and numerous digressions. Rather ch.v:1-11 states the themes, and viii:1-39 brings a fuller elucidation of the main points. This view destroys the systematic order which Nygren believes to exist in chs.v-viii. He claims that the theme of ch.v is "Free from the Wrath of God"; ch.vi "Free from Sin"; ch.vii "Free from the Law"; ch.viii "Free from Death". As Dahl notes, ch.v also deals with freedom from death and ch.viii with freedom from condemnation just as much as with freedom from death.

From this survey we may conclude that although there are close connections between ch.v and chs.iii-iv, the perspective of ch.v is different from that of ch.iv. Ch.v is much more closely related to ch.vi. As Gäumann states "Der innere Zusammenhang von Kapit.v und vi ist ein engerer als zwischen dem Schriftbeweis nach rabbinischer Art von Röm.iv und der vorwiegend christologischen Darlegung von Röm.v:1-11". (p.25). The changes in subject matter (no longer Jews and Gentiles), in vocabulary (life dominates rather than faith), in style (no longer argumentative but now triumphant) and from the third to second and first person plural, require us to connect

1. We feel that Feuillet exaggerates the significance and frequency of the ABA scheme which is sometimes found in Paul's letters. (Cf. Feuillet pp.356, 363, 376, 386, 490, 500, 504-506). Rom.ix-xi does seem to fit quite well into the ABA pattern but it is rather artificial to consider the whole structure of the letter as dominated by this literary devise. It may also be disputed whether chs.iv:25 - viii:33 are adequately understood when described as a "Ringkomposition". Cf. H. Conzelmann "Paulus und die Weisheit" NTS, Vol.XII (1963/66), p.232.
ch.v with the succeeding chapters rather than with chs.i-vi. The connections between ch.v and viii (as outlined by Dahl) further cement this view. With ch.v:1 a theme is commenced which comes to a climactic conclusion in viii:39. By regarding chs.v-viii as a single unit, intervening in the sequence between ch.iv and ch.ix we are better able to understand the sharp break that occurs at the end of ch.viii, and also to appreciate the connection of chs.ix-xi with chs.i-iv. While we are not completely happy about Feuillet's emphasis upon the ABA pattern, it does seem to find some confirmation in this outline of chs.i-ix. However our explanation of the intervention of chs.v-viii between ch.iv and ch.ix is that Paul could not speak of the unbelieving Jews prior to his description of the new community of faith in Christ Jesus. As always Paul sees everything in the light of, and proceeds from, the starting point of the new aeon that has dawned in Christ.

---

1. Part of the problem at viii:39 - ix:1 is this - when Paul moves from the discussion of the origin and basis of salvation in chs.iii and iv, to the theme of the new life that results, this seems a perfectly natural development of the argument. However, when Paul has outlined the life of the eschatological community from the Cross to the coming glory, then it seems a sudden transition to return to the mundane problems of the present, particularly that of Jewish unbelief; but we ought not to be surprised at this development. Paul always emphasized the present (and the future as resulting therefrom) - he was no 'Enthusiast' in this respect.

2. i.e. A = chs.i-iv with the general theme of Jews-Gentiles.
   B = chs.v-viii with the theme of life for the eschatological community.
   A = chs.ix-xi returns to the A theme of Jews-Gentiles and the purpose of God.
CHAPTER V:1-11.

Whereas in ch.iii:21.f. the issue in question was the origin of righteousness in Christ, in v:1.f., attention is focused upon its fulfilment, its realization in the present. Paul is not exhorting the Christian community to find peace, he is declaring that this has already been obtained for them.

In ch.v:1.f. Paul seeks to show that life is a present reality for the justified. Even though death and sin are still present, these are not decisive in the new aeon, where grace and righteousness lead to life.

The δικαιωθεντης of ch.v:1 is a sort of summary of the argument in iii:21-26.


2. In spite of the fact that the manuscript evidence is strongly in favour of ξαυματον (A.B.C.D.etc.) with most commentators we regard the present ξαυματον as most in keeping with Paul's line of thought here, and his theology in general. Barrett suggests that the subjunctive may be interpreted as a brachylogy: "Since we have been justified, we have peace; let us therefore enjoy it." (p.102). The NEB follows somewhat the same interpretation of v:1 as Lagrange (p.101) - "let us continue at peace with God." We feel it is best to accept the present as the proper reading with the explanation that the variation occurred because it was difficult to distinguish the two forms in the Hellenistic age. F.F. Bruce, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, p.122.


5. Cf. Dodd, p.71. This involves, as Michel also notes, (p.129), regarding ch.iv as an insertion or excursus. We do not agree with Dodd in his view of chapter iv as of only incidental importance but regard it as being only 'formally' a digression, because when Paul returns to the subject of iii:21-26 in ch.v:1.f. it is with the added benefits of the insight of ch.iv.
and establishes the point of view of the entire chapter. In v:10 we find the crux of the argument. - "For if while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more now that we are reconciled, shall we be saved by Him from the wrath of God." Here the resurrection life of Christ is related to the eschatological life of the believers and thus proceeds directly from iv:25 where Christ is said to have died for our sins and to have been raised for our justification.1

The argument in vv.1-11 is a proof 'a maiore ad minus': if righteousness is already present, then life even more. The substance of the proof is that life is already present in hope.2

Bultmann criticizes Barth for his failure to interpret this section within the context of the letter and in the light of the dominant question of the presence of salvation, or life. What interests Barth is the relationship between man and Christ, and the thought that Christ as a human individual person at the same time includes in Himself all other men.3 In this way he subordinates v:1-11 to v:12-21 and interprets the former in the light of the latter, whereas it is more usual to interpret v:12-21 as a development

1. This is not in contradiction to the assertion that v:1 continues from iii:21-26. This verse (iv:25) is transitional, also referring back to the 'now' of iii:21-26.
3. Cf. Bultmann, op.cit., p.150. K. Barth published his short essay "Christus und Adam nach Römer v" in 1952 (Theologische Studien No.35) and Bultmann replied to it in ZNW LV (1959). Barth's essay (translated by T.A. Smail) was published as Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers. No.5 (1956)
of the argument for the presence of life in v:1-11 - a second proof and further elaboration of the same theme.¹ Not only do we need to consider ch. v:1-11 in the context of the letter, but also in relation to the actual situation in Rome. We need to ask why it was that Paul felt compelled to emphasize the actualization of eschatological life for the Christian community. The mention of suffering (vv.3-4) and its use as a means of strengthening rather than destroying Christian hope may give us a clue to the actual situation. It may have been that the Roman Christians were faced with the possibility of persecution on account of their faith and were in danger of regarding this as a proof that the Messiah had not really come, or that life was not already available in the present.² We note also the references to suffering in viii:17.f., xii:13.f. and possibly an allusion to suffering behind the idea of resisting the authorities in ch.xiii. We do not dispute the fact that sufferings were expected to accompany the inauguration of the Messianic era and it is obvious that Paul interprets sufferings in exactly this way in this letter.³ It is possible that Paul merely refers to suffering in a general way to emphasize the arrival of the Messianic woes. In our opinion, this is not a full understanding of the situation. This interpretation is open to Bultmann's criticism of Barth, that we do not interpret

1. This is the view of Lietzmann (p.26), also followed by Bultmann (pp.151.ff) and others.
2. This could mean that the primary reference in this section is to Jewish Christians and former proselytes. On the other hand, it is possible that pneumatic Gentile Christians regarded suffering as inconsistent with the new life in Christ and were liable to rebel against any persecution from the Jews or from the Roman authorities. In either situation, it was necessary for Paul to show that suffering is to be expected and that it is not inconsistent with Christian life.
within the context. It seems to us preferable therefore to hold that there was real or threatened persecution in Rome and that Paul interprets this as the Messianic suffering of God's people. We do not hold that the theme of suffering is introduced because Paul wishes to emphasize Messianic fulfilment - but rather that Paul interprets the suffering already being experienced in Rome as a sign of eschatological fulfilment. But the suffering (or threat of it) precedes Paul's interpretation of it. It is because of some such situation in Rome that Paul in chs.v and viii emphasizes the reality of eschatological life in the present and the certainty of its final realization in the future.

It may also be possible that this situation is similar to that envisaged by E. Trocmé. He suggests that the possibility of an imminent rupture between church and synagogue caused the Christian community to be greatly concerned as to the possibility of Christian life outside the sphere of the Law and the synagogue. If there was a risk of Jewish Christians and former proselytes being persecuted by Jews in Rome, the question might be seriously asked as to whether God's love extended beyond the sphere of the Law, the Temple and the Synagogue. It might also be suggested that Gentile Christians argued that the Jews were broken off so that they might be grafted in (cf. xi:19.f.). The Jews then retorted by saying that if one election can fail, so can another, and so undermined the security of the Christian community. It was some such situation that caused Paul to write this particular letter at a specific time (i.e. when about to go to Jerusalem) and in order to understand its contents, we must look within it for signs of the 'Sitz im Leben' that originated it.

In the light of these practical problems, Paul expounds the meaning of Christian life for the present. He emphasizes the 'already' of the faith in order to give a true picture of the privileges now enjoyed by Christians in the present. In ch.viii the same emphasis is continued and there the 'already' is closely related to the 'not yet' of Christian hope. The use of the νῦν in vv.9-11 emphasizes as in iii:21-26 the relevance of the aeon question for the true understanding of Christian life. Paul is convinced that when the Christian community understands what has already happened in the Christ-event and what is now already in the process of becoming i.e. the new creation of God of which they already possess the ἐπαρχία of the Spirit, then they will be able to bear the sufferings to which their new faith has exposed them in Rome.

Feuillet divides v:1-11 into two sections - the first (1-5) describes the peace of the Christian; the second (6-11) describes the reason for it. C.H. Dodd holds the view that v:1-5 (or 1-11) contains in summary form the theme of the whole argument up to viii:39. Dahl agrees that this is a summary of the main themes but maintains against Dodd that in v:1-11 Paul is not yet concerned with the ethical aspect of salvation: "the love of God and the Spirit (v:5) are mentioned as guarantees of Christian hope, not as principles of Christian life. The aspect is eschatological not ethical, whereas in chs. vi-viii the 'ethical aspect' dominates, and the eschatological hope is in the background."

1. The fact that in iv:25 - viii:39 Paul uses many kerygmatic formulations has suggested to Luz that the exposition of the kerygma may be a strong structural element in Rom.i-viii. "Zum Aufbau von Röm.i-viii.", p.178.
In v:1.f. Paul elaborates the results of justification for the life of the believing community. As a result of having already been justified through faith in Christ (iii:21-26), we have peace (v.1); we have obtained access\(^1\) to the grace in which we stand (v.2),\(^2\) and we pride ourselves in the hope of the glory of God, (v.3). These realities are already ours because we have been justified. Not only this, but we can now boast in afflictions.\(^3\) The reason for this paradoxical situation is that Christians know that affliction can only lead to a renewal of Christian hope rather than to its destruction -εἰδότες ὅτι ἡ ἐλπὶς ὑπομονῆς κατεργάσθη, ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοξιμένη, ἡ δὲ δοξὴ ἡ ἐλπὶς. To support his assertion that affliction cannot harm the believers, Paul refers to common Christian catechetical or confessional statements\(^4\) which probably also underlie such passages as I Pet. i:6.f. and James i:2.f., 12.\(^5\) The fact that Paul uses earlier material to emphasize the security of the believers under persecution is no argument against the fact that persecution may have taken place in Rome also. As Selwyn notes, the readers of I and II Thessalonians, I Peter and James were

---

1. Cf. also Eph.ii:18; iii:12. This terminology originally referred to access to the Temple. Cf. Michel, p.130.
2. Michel notes that the use of the perfect -σωτήραμεν of v:2 strengthens the present -σωθήραμἐν of v:1. (p.130).
3. The whole tone of this section is that of Christian rejoicing and praise. The elevated tone is similar to that with which this section (v-viii) concludes i.e. viii:28.f.
4. As we have already noted (cf. Thesis pp.71-2, 105) when Paul uses οἰδαμεν etc., he is referring to commonly accepted traditions. Cf. Bornkamm "Baptism and New Life in Paul (Romans vi)", Early Christian Experience (p.85 n.5).
all enduring persecution, and this would support the suggestion that a similar situation may have existed in Rome.

Christian hope transforms the present for the eschatological community. The chain of development begins with affliction and reaches its climax in hope. In v.3 hope seems thus to be the result of a life process whereas in v.2 hope is already given with justifying faith. This is to emphasize that faith is no static possession, but that even in faith and hope the 'already' and 'not yet' of Christian life is always present. As Bultmann says "the believer lives always from the future; to grasp the present as something preliminary is the fruit of faith". The security of Christian hope is grounded in the fact of God's love.

This love originates in God (subjective genitive) and is poured out in our hearts by the Holy Spirit, which has been given to us (v.5). In this verse Paul expresses two ideas at the same time: we have the Spirit and we know the love of God. Our hope is secure and will not disappoint us because it is based on the love of God which has already given us the pledge of future salvation in the gift of the Holy Spirit.

In vv.1-5 Paul has outlined the great new realities enjoyed by the

1. Ibid., p.452.
2. Bultmann, op.cit. p.146.
3. Ibid.
4. This is the first mention of διτήλος (also in v:8, viii:35,39). In v:8 God establishes the proof of His love for us by Christ's death for us while we were yet sinners. In viii:35 the question is asked "who shall separate us from the love of Christ?" In viii:39 nothing is able to separate us from the love of God which is in Jesus Christ our Lord.
6. This is the first mention of the Spirit in the second main section of the letter. Like viii:6 this verse is a sort of link verse which keeps the theme of the Spirit in view until in viii:2.ff it becomes the centre of interest.
Christian community through faith. They already enjoy these because they have been justified. Now in vv.6-11 Paul proceeds to strengthen the argument by showing that Christians will continue to enjoy blessing and security because God's love has been demonstrated and is always working on their behalf. Thus vv.6-8 and 9-11 are a further proof of what is stated in v.5.

Bearing in mind the significant place given to the love of God in v:5 and in the remainder of v:1-11 along with the fact that in viii:35 and viii:39 the possibility of separation from the love of God is mentioned, it would not appear unwarranted to suggest that the question of the security of believers outside the sphere of the synagogue may have been in Paul's mind. The one guarantee that Christian hope would not be put to shame is that God's love has already been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit, who has been granted to us.

In v.6, the love of God is emphasized by the fact that it was demonstrated (in the death of Christ) while we were yet weak and without God. Paul elaborates what everyone knows - that no one wants to die - even for a righteous man - though he admits that possibly for such, one might dare to die. God on the contrary, "establishes the proof of His love for us" in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Throughout vv.6-10 the recurring present participles refer to the state in which man existed prior to the revelation of God's love in Christ. Similarly, by

1. Bornkamm draws attention to the repetition of the verb ἀμοιβαζόμενοι (at the end of vv.6,7a,7b,8) op.cit., p.79. This repetition might be accounted for by the fact that older confessional material is used here (in vv.6-8) as shown by the similarities with I Cor.xv:3 and I Pet.iii:18. Cf. Michel pp.134-5.
3. Bornkamm notes that these participles are another way of expressing the imperfect. op.cit.,p.79.
the use of words such as ἀθεονείς, ἀπεβαίνεις, ἀµαρτωλοί, ἐχθροί. Paul reminds the Christian community of what they once were and what a change has already occurred in their relationship to God. By emphasizing the darkness of the past, Paul is able to highlight the reality of the new life now enjoyed and so to reaffirm the confidence of believers. The love of God is so great and incalculable that it transcends all efforts at human expression. This is the real reason for the grammatical difficulties1 of vv.6-8 - as Bornkamm states "Die ungefuge Gestalt des Satzes v.6 und die Unsicherheit der Erläuterung v.7 ist Ausdruck dafür, dass die Sache, um die es geht, für menschliches Denken ungefuge und unbegriflich ist".2

In v.9 the argument is concluded by relating it to the present (νῦν).3 Since God has freely justified us in the blood of Christ4 much more (now that we have been justified) shall we be saved by Christ from the wrath of God.

---

1. These verses are included by Bornkamm in the texts discussed under the title "Paulinische Anakoluthe", though he himself admits that it is not strictly speaking an anakolouthon (op.cit., p.78) The variant readings may be divided into groups (1) Those that begin v.6 with ἐὰν γὰρ (XAI, w.33 Marcion) (2) Those that begin with εἰς γὰρ (C.Lat.) and (3) Those that begin with εἰ γένα (B sah). Ibid. Barrett considers that the textual problems arose from attempts to avoid the repeated ἐὰν which should be regarded as original "Paul wishes to emphasize that Christ died for us while we were still weak; to do so he places the word first in the sentence, and then uses it again in the normal place, perhaps forgetting that he had uttered it." (p101).

4. Paul is here using an older formula. Instead of saying ὄλα -through the death of Christ, it is rather ἐν τῷ σαρκωτί. Bultmann notes the dependence as in iii:25 on traditional formulae and also that it is only in these two places and in the Eucharist formula that Paul speaks of the blood, rather than the death or the Cross of Christ. op.cit., p.148.
The reference to the wrath of God would seem to suggest the far distant future of the final judgement of God. The context and the line of argument however would suggest that ὀργή should here be understood objectively in the same way as 'peace' in v.1 i.e. both may be experienced now and not only in the final eschatological fulfilment. This is in accordance with the theme of v.1-11 which is centred on the effects of justification in the present, showing how great is the new life into which we have obtained access through Christ. The εἰ γὰρ of v.10 refers back again to v.5, thereby revealing its function as a further elaboration of the love of God. The repetition of πολλῷ μᾶλλον in vv.9-10 (and also in vv.15,17) is a device used by

1. ὀργή also occurs in i:18, ii:5,8, iii:5, iv:15 and not again until ix:22. Dupont makes the point that here wrath is not mentioned as a threat but only to emphasize that we have already been justified. (p.373).

2. Cf. Leenhardt on vi:5. He points out that although participation in the resurrection life of Christ is indicated by a future tense (ἐσομαι) it should be ascertained whether this is future chronological or logical. He concludes that the latter is correct "because of the indissoluble unity constituted by the Cross and resurrection" and the parallel thought expressed in Col.ii:12. He further points out that vi:11 can only be understood on the basis of the believers (present) sharing in the life of the Risen Lord. (p.161). For a similar discussion on vi:5,8,11 cf. also G. Bornkamm, Early Christian Experience, pp.78.ff.

3. While agreeing with Bultmann's emphasis upon the present existence under the eschatological realities of ἔσομαι or ὀργή, with Barrett we do not consider that Paul's use of the future tense is only a reflection of his Jewish past. Rather we hold that the present is the anticipation of the future, the first-fruits of the coming harvest. (Cf. Barrett From First Adam to Last, London, 1962, p.89). Cf. also Stählin on νῦν as a "Proleptic First Stage of the Last Things" - "though there seems to be in John a full anticipation of the last things, the N.T. still speaks of eschatology beyond this Now, of the end which will consummate all things, so that in the Now there is both possession and hope." TDNT IV, p.1120.

4. It is also possible with D.E.H. Whiteley to regard the reference to mean deliverance from final judgement (cf. The Theology of St. Paul, Oxford, 1964, p.67). If this is so it would then be necessary to state as Barrett does, that Paul is emphasizing the present effects of the knowledge (that we will be saved) i.e. the anticipation in the here and now of God's verdict at the judgement, the peace of the kingdom of God. (p.109).
Paul to give assurance and confidence to the Christian community. If Christ died for those who were sinners (v.8) now that we have been saved, we can be all the more assured that He will save us from the wrath, for if He died for us when we were enemies of God, much more now that we have been reconciled can we be certain of being saved by (in) His life.

Barrett notes the close parallelism between verses 9 and 10, where the redemption of the believer is portrayed by means of the metaphors of justification and reconciliation. In vv.1-5 Paul outlined the blessings of the new life into which we have obtained access through the love of God in Christ. The progress of thought from iii:21-26 is demonstrated in that here in vv.6-8 the death of Christ is regarded as the demonstration of God's love poured out in our hearts through the Holy Spirit (v.5). In vv.9-11 by use of the 'πολλῷ μᾶλλον' Paul shows what great reason believers have for trusting God to care for those whom He has already justified and reconciled to Himself. He uses every argument to give confidence to the Christian community. Paul cannot express often enough the certainty of Christian hope.

1. The same type of argument occurs in Rom.xi:12, 24; I Cor.ix:12; II Cor. iii:7-8, 9-11. The Rabbis called this argument Kal Wachomer ( Cf. Str/Bill. III, pp.223.ff.
2. Bultmann notes the parallelism - πολλῷ μᾶλλον...σωκρόμεθα (op.cit., p.108), and concludes that for Paul the death of Christ and His resurrection belong together. Instead of life we would expect resurrection to be emphasized as the guarantee of life for the present. Paul's use here accords well with our interpretation of iv:25b as referring forward to the new life rather than back to the justification which is the basis for it.
3. Barrett outlines the parallel between vv.9-10 as follows -
(1) Justified  (1) Reconciled.
(2) Through the death of Christ  (2) Through the death of Christ.
(3) We shall be saved  (3) We shall be saved.
4. Bultmann regards the γὰρ which begins v.10 as also referring back to the basis in the love of God of v.5. (p.148).
5. Ibid., p.149.
In v.11 the development of thought is actually completed, but Paul still wishes to add something else to the discussion. He picks up again the motif of boasting from v.2 and repeats the οὐ μόνον δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχ-ώμεθα[^1] of v.3, and so sums up the whole argument with the picture of the Christian boasting in God through Jesus Christ by whom all other 'boasting' whether in the hope of glory, or in tribulation is made possible. The δὲ οὗ νῦν τὴν καταλαλήθην ἐλάβομεν (v.11) reminds us at the conclusion of the contrast between what we are now, i.e. the life we now enjoy, and what we once were.

Paul has shown that the presence of life is a reality for the believing community. Even though it is a paradoxical existence, present only in hope, and not yet fully realized, the believers do enjoy a new kind of life and this enjoyment carries with it a guarantee of the full realization of that life of which the present is only a foretaste.

---

[^1]: v.11 has καυχάμεθα instead of καυχάμενοι in v.3.
Chapter v:12-21.

The argument of ch.v:12-21 is connected to what precedes by the phrase διὰ τοῦτο. Many commentators regard this merely as a transitional formula between two separate parts of Paul's argument. But it is likely, as we will discover later, that it has greater significance than this. As Nygren claims - to come to this conclusion (i.e. that it is merely transitional) is to give up hope of finding any meaning in it.

To which part of the previous argument does this διὰ τοῦτο refer? Does it refer to v:1-11, iii:21-v:11, or to i:18-v:11? The reference to the figure of Adam in v.12.ff may help us here. If Miss Hooker is correct in her contention that the story of Adam underlies Paul's description of human sin in Romans i, (particularly in relation to the word εξωκ θανον in i:23), then it might be preferable to hold that the reference here is back to all that has preceded i.e. from i:18.ff. That this is the better way to understand this section is shown by the fact that it gives a suitable meaning to the διὰ τοῦτο and also by the fact that if we regard the reference back to v:1-11, the argument of this section (particularly vv.1-5) is itself a continuation and elaboration of iii:21-26. Moreover iii:21-26 as we have

2. p.211.
3. Cf. Bornkamm, op.cit., p.60. Dupont also holds that v:12-21 is a demonstration of, and continues the theme of v:1-11, particularly vv.6-10 on the death-life antithesis. (p.381).
already noted, is the antithesis to i:18 - iii:20. In iii:21-26 and v:1.ff. Paul is speaking from the standpoint of the 'now', the new aeon in Christ which usually stands in antithetical relation with the past aeon where men are regarded as weak, without God, or simply as sinners (cf. v:6-11). While we do not agree with Nygren that v:12-21 is the highpoint of the epistle, we do accept his contention that the aeon question is central to the understanding of this section and also for the whole letter. The διὰ τοῦτο therefore expresses something that Paul has had in mind all along. "All the time Paul has been speaking out of a very definite presupposition. All that has been said in the preceding chapters rests on the difference between the two aeons ... it has actually been implied throughout, but thus far it has only been glimpsed. But now it breaks forth out of the background into full view ... Adam and Christ stand as the respective heads of the two aeons. Adam is the head of the old aeon, the age of death; Christ is the head of the new aeon, the age of life." W. Hanson takes a similar view of ch.v:12.ff. when he states that Paul, "conscious of having attained a climax in his argument, is conscious also of having reached the high watershed of Heilsgeschichte (v:12-21). From this altitude ... the entire past history of the race appears as a domination of life by death through the separation of man from God by sin ... But now in distinction to the past, the new aeon of life in Christ has dawned and it far

1. Cf. TDNT, II on ὤν particularly pp.1114-1120.
3. Nygren claims "if one would understand what Paul has to say in this epistle, he must from the start take seriously this affirmation about the two aeons." (p.26); see also pp.26-37.
surpasses the era of sin and death begun with Adam. Marxsen, as we have already noted, also emphasizes the relevance of the aeon theme for the interpretation of Romans. The purpose in Paul's use of aeon terminology is to express what it is that has been given to us in Christ. By this he is able to say that in Christ the new era, the aeon of life has dawned and those who are in Christ have been taken out of the dominion of death which overshadows Adam's race. In Adam there is nothing but sin and death, in Christ there is life (I Cor. xv:22). This death is not merely physical but is more than this. In Paul's view human life from Adam until now, lies under the dominion of death. Death rules supreme in the world of man and "it is to miss the point to ask whether this means physical, spiritual or eternal death. Death is the status of all who belong to this world." 

Only through one man Jesus Christ and His power has life come to this world. While Adam stands as the head of the old aeon (σ αἰών οὐτος), so Christ stands, by reason of His resurrection, as the author and perfector of the new (σ αἰών δ ἐξάλλων). Since the resurrection of Christ, the new aeon is no longer merely in the future; it has already come though only in a hidden manner, visible only to faith. Christ stands at the frontier between

1. W. Manson, Jesus and the Christian, p.143.
4. Cf. Marxsen, pp.104.ff. Although Paul does not use this phrase (σ αἰών δ ἐξάλλων) apart from Eph.1:21 (if this is Pauline) the conception is basic to his eschatology - cf. v:14 where Christ is designated - σ ἐξάλλων.
5. Cf. Michel "der neue Aeon schon in der Gegenwart angebrochen ist." (p.104). This description of the 'now' of the Christian life is preferable to the description Michel gives elsewhere (on viii:23) "der alte Aeon ist noch nicht zu Ende gegangen, der neue noch nicht angebrochen." (p.205). We feel that for Paul the radical newness of the Christian faith was more significant than its character as an interim existence.
6. Cf. G. Bornkamm, Early Christian Experience (pp.78-81)
the two ages, outdating the old and blazing the way for the new. In Christ we belong to the new aeon — in Him the old has passed away and there is a new creation (II Cor. v:17). In his use of the term aeon, Paul does not mean two different or successive periods of world history such as B.C. or A.D., but rather two different orders of existence, one under the dominion of death, the other under the dominion of life. As W. Manson says "the two orders, the new and the old, now exist in the world together." This understanding of Paul's theology is most interesting in the light of the Jew-Gentile theme in Rom.i-ii, cf. the key phrase "to the Jew first and also to the Greek." (i:16). It is also particularly useful in helping us to understand ch.vii. As in chs.i-ii, ch.vii:7-25 also deals with man's sinful condition. As distinct from chs.i-ii, ch.vii stands in the context of the new life of the eschatological community which is the theme of chs.v-viii. This helps us to understand that the description of human sinfulness in ch.vii cannot be the pre-Christian man's description of himself, since the perspective here is from the new life in Christ, the new aeon.

The aeon question is also helpful for our understanding of the relation between chs.i-iv, v-viii and ix-xi. In i-iv the greater part of the discussion (apart from iii:21-26 and the last few verses of ch.iv) is centred on the life in the old aeon, or on the question of the transition from the old aeon to the

1. We should be careful not to direct our attention to the time factor or events in time in our understanding of aeon in Paul's theology. Cf. Nygren pp.23-24. What Goppelt writes in relation to the concept of the covenant is also true in this context "Die Begriffe alt und neu unterscheiden hier nicht innerweltliche Epochen der Geschichte, sondern eschatologisch alte und neue Schöpfung."


3. The Christian community lives in the new aeon by virtue of the fact that their life is determined by their relationship with the resurrected Christ, even though they must continue to live in a world that is not yet redeemed (cf. O.Kuss, Der Römerbrief II, p.486.).
new (cf. iv:23). In chs.v-viii however, there is an element of rejoicing, of confidence and hope, and the frequent use of the first person plural shows that Paul can now identify himself completely with the Christian community. Chapters v-viii presuppose the acquisition of life, the participation through the Spirit in the first-fruits of the new life in Christ.

On the other hand chs.ix-xi deal mostly with the problem of the Jews who as yet have not seen in Christ the turning point of the ages. Again ch.xii:2 commences the practical exhortation by μὴ συνματιστε ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν τοῦτο. We may well ask why it is that Paul chooses to introduce the aeon theme at this particular stage. Why did he not begin with it in ch.i, or even at ch.v:1? For Paul this would not have been possible; he can only fully discuss Adam and his aeon when he has already declared the reality of the new aeon in Christ — the old can only properly be seen as old in the light of the new. The πότε and τότε can only be fully understood from the new perspective of the νῦν. For Paul, Adam is seen in relation to Christ not Christ to Adam.

The content of the argument in v:12.ff. is not something completely

1. Cf. N. Gäumann who is aware of the differences between chs.i-iv and v-viii and seeks to find a real unity in chs.i-viii in spite of this. Cf. op.cit., pp.158-162.
2. As we noted in ch.iii:1-8, although Paul mentions the problem of Jewish unbelief, he is not willing to deal with it until after he has proclaimed the revelation of God's righteousness.
3. Cf. TDIT IV, p.1120. See also additional note on "This Aeon and the Coming Aeon in the New Testament" at the end of the Thesis, (pp.520-1).
new, but rather an elaboration, a widening of what has gone before. Adam may have been implicit in Rom.i, but now we have the explicit contrast between him and Christ. When the relevance for the life of the eschatological community of the Christ-event (as outlined in iii:21-iv:25) has been established i.e. in vi:1-11, Paul feels free to illustrate the greatness of the grace of God in Christ by means of the comparison with Adam. Even the concept of aeons is only a means to help declare the reality of the Christ-event; as Conzelmann states "the characteristic Pauline \( \nu \psi \nu \) describes the eschatological newness of the saving event."\(^2\)

It is generally agreed that Paul uses the figure of Adam in Rom.v:12-21 as a means of emphasizing the corporate solidarity of mankind in sin and death.\(^3\) As Dodd points out "for Paul Adam is a name which stands for the 'corporate personality' of mankind."\(^4\) As the argument in Gal.iii:16 shows, Paul was able to move very easily from the concept of the collective seed to the singular seed, meaning Christ.\(^5\) Christ, in Paul's eyes, is the new

---

1. Cf. Barth's comment "In the second half of the chapter, Paul goes further than the first half by setting the same material in a wider context." (op.cit. p.4). Michel states "In Wirklichkeit hebt Röm.v:12-21 die Allgemeingültigkeit des göttlichen Urteils hervor (vgl. Röm.i:16, \( \pi \omega \tau \iota \gamma \phi \) \( \pi \nu \tau \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \omega \nu \iota \)." p.16. Bornkamm considers v:12-21 a "geschichtstheologische Erörterung" arising from vi:1-11 (Das Ende des Gesetzes, p.80). According to J. Cambier v:12-21 is "une réflexion théologique sur l'histoire du salut, en partant de l'événement chrétien." (L'Epître aux Romains, p.279).

2. Cf. Theology, p.170. Cf. also Stählin "the \( \nu \psi \nu \) of the N.T. is wholly determined and filled by the Christ-event ... in this \( \nu \psi \nu \) the past of Christ and the future of Christ are both comprehended in the present of Christ." TDNT IV, p.1122.

3. P. Langsfeld finds the following emphases in Rom.v:12-21:

   (1) The universality of the salvation-event.
   (2) The relative "givenness" of salvation and corruption in the world because of which man always finds himself a sinner.
   (3) The totality of involvement whereby man must be either in Christ or in Adam, under the power of the flesh or the Spirit.


5. Cf. Barrett \( \text{Adam, p.79.} \)
corporate personality by whose person and influence, the new creation is begun. Paul speaks of Adam's sin and its results but his primary concern is not the question of the origin of sin,¹ "he is not really concerned about origin, but about the facts as they are."² The facts of life in Paul's opinion, do not mean that men as isolated individuals sin and die, but rather that their whole life is determined by their solidarity with the human race whose history is a history of sin and death. What Paul means by the reference to sin entering into the world (v.12) cannot adequately be described by the subsequent death of individuals who, as individuals, sin and die. It is the 'extra nos' of salvation in Christ that is compared with the other 'extra nos' explained by the mythological figure of Adam.³ This is necessary to explain what we mean by the world which is not merely the sum of all individuals but rather the sphere to which all individuals as part of corporate humanity belong.⁴

If, with Cullmann, we understand the one subjecting the creation to vanity (viii:20) to be Adam (and not God),⁵ then here is the link which explains the thought sequence between Christ and Adam i.e. that as through the one man Adam, the creation was cursed,⁶ so by the one man Jesus Christ begins the redemption of the whole creation. This aspect of redemption cannot adequately be expressed in terms of the individual; the Existentialist understanding is incomplete.⁷ A man's history in the world is always determined

1. Cf. Bultmann on v.12-21 "the actual intent of the sentence is not to point out the origin of sin but rather the origin of death as a background for the actual theme of the section - the origin of (new) life." Theology, I, p.152. Conzelmann, pp.195-196.
4. This is the view expressed by Professor Käsemann in his lectures on this passage.
by what and who have gone before him - he is born into a world in which sin has already taken root. 1 Although there are similarities between Paul's use of the Adam story and certain Gnostic formulations, 2 the introduction of the figure of Adam cannot be explained away simply as Paul's making use of the Gnostic mythology of the primeval man. The sin of Adam and its influence upon mankind was a common theme for discussion in Jewish religious circles in Paul's time, particularly in Diaspora Judaism. 3 In any case the decisive issue is the use Paul makes of his material rather than the sources from which the material may have originated. 4 Paul seeks to relate the state of humanity in sin to the sin of Adam. He does not say however, that all men sin in Adam, but rather that through Adam sin made its way to 5 all men. 6 By this he avoided the assertion that all men must sin. 7

1. Leenhardt, p.140.
2. Bornkamm sees both Jewish and Gnostic concepts behind this section - "Jüdische ist der Gedanke von Erbfluch und Erbtdod, Gnostisch schon der Gedanke der Zuordnung des 'Einen' und der 'Vielen' sowie der Anschauung von den beiden Menschen, dem gefallenen Urmenschen, der Wesen und Schicksal aller unausweichlich bestimmt, und dem neuen Himmelsmenschen, der mit ebensolcher universal wirkenden Gewalt die gefallene Menschheit zur Erlösung führt." (op.cit., p.83). Bornkamm's view is essentially that although Paul uses earlier material, he readapts it for his own ends - "Gesetz und Evangelium zerbrechen die mythische Konzeption des Abschnittes v:12-21. An ihnen zerbrechen schon der erste Satz." (p.90). Michel claims that the background for 'the one' and 'the many' is found in Judaism rather than Gnosticism. (p.140 and 144.ff). This is the opinion of J. Jeremias The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp.123.f.
4. Cf. R. McI. Wilson who says that in the comparison of Christianity with Gnosticism, "we have to note the differences as well as the similarities ...Paul can accept the contemporary Weltanschauung of his time, but he rejects the Gnostic interpretation of it." Gnosis and the New Testament. Oxford, 1968. (p.144).
5. Cf. Sanday and Headlam who state that here διηλοθεν contains the force of distribution. (p.133).
For Paul it is a fact that all men do sin as he shows by his qualification of the statement that death passed to all men - ἐφ' ὑπὸντες ἔμαρτσον (v.12).

Paul is not concerned to differentiate between individual and corporate responsibility in this statement. His concern is with the actual situation in which all men find themselves (for whatever reason). As Leenhardt says

1. It has been much disputed as to how we should interpret this phrase. Augustine greatly influenced interpretation by his understanding "in quo omnes peccaverunt" which many have regarded as diminishing or destroying personal responsibility in relation to human sin. In this interpretation the relative is regarded as masculine with the antecedent Adam in whom all men sin (and die). Sanday and Headlam (p.133) criticize this because (1) εἰ would not then be the correct preposition and (2) the φορτίον would be too far removed from its antecedent. Kasemann (lecture notes) however disagrees with the latter criticism and considers that there are frequent examples of such loosely connected relative sentences in Paul. Sanday and Headlam also dismiss the view that the relative may be regarded as masculine with the antecedent ὦν πάντως. They also disagree with the attempts to regard the whole phrase as equivalent to a conjunction with meanings such as 'in proportion as', 'just as' etc., and decide that the proper interpretation is the one which regards the φορτίον as neuter and the phrase, as a whole, meaning 'because' (for that in A.V. and R.V.). This is the view of Bultmann and many other modern commentators (cf. Bultmann, op.cit., p.151). Kasemann is very critical of the view that sin enters the world by sinning. The difficulty with the rendering 'because' is that it gives little or no content to the sin of Adam which is central to this section (cf. also Nygren, p.214). W.G. Kümmel (Das Bild des Menschen in N.T. 1949, p.36) considers that two related facts must be held together (1) through Adam sin and death come to all men (2) every man sins and so is personally responsible for his own death. To separate these two views is to misinterpret the mind of Paul. Michel emphasizes that in Judaism these two statements were bound up with each other, and gives examples from IV Esdras and the Apocalypse of Baruch (cf. p.139). Kasemann, following this point of view, claims that the phrase ἐφ' ὑπὸντες, may be interpreted as "aufgrund dessen" - "in view of this state of affairs, this being so." The phrase should also be understood as connecting back, not just to ὦν πάντως but also to the whole of the first part of the verse. The fact that men sin is to be understood in the light of all that has gone before - i.e. Adam's sin and the consequences proceeding from it. All become sinners when they by their deeds actualize and bring to expression the evil influence that pervades their existence. This view has the merit of emphasizing the results of Adam's sin, and personal responsibility for sin both of which are necessary in any adequate explanation of the human situation. For a good discussion of the problem and the history of interpretation see C.E.B. Cranfield "On some of the Problems in the Interpretation of Romans v.12". SJT XXII (1969), pp.324-41.
Paul is not concerned to differentiate between individual and corporate responsibility in this statement. His concern is with the actual situation in which all men find themselves (for whatever reason). As Leenhardt says - "the essential point for the apostle, is neither to describe nor explain what happened in the past ... his aim is to make us understand the redemption wrought by Christ."\(^1\) The situation in which men find themselves is one that is under the rule of death (v.17) and the explanation of the situation has to do with Adam before it has to do with men sinning as responsible individuals.\(^2\)

In the influence of Jesus Christ as the influence of one upon many, Paul saw a parallel to the story of Adam.\(^3\) But it is not ideal man, the idea of man,\(^4\) nor any kind of anthropology as such that is central to Paul's argument here.\(^5\)

---

1. p.142.
2. Bultmann (Theology, I, p.251) and Bornkamm (op.cit., p.83) claim that Paul's doctrine is that "sin came into the world by sinning." Käsemann (lecture notes) agrees with this, provided the 'sinning' refers first of all to Adam's sinning, thereby witnessing to the wider dimension of sin in that we ourselves actualize the sin that is already in the world.
3. A.M. Hunter considers that the Last Adam doctrine was probably pre-Pauline. Op.cit., p.123.
4. Cf. Bultmann's criticism of Barth "If for him Adam is not the head of pre-Christian mankind but 'one among others', 'who as such represents mankind', then Adam has become actually the idea of man after all". Op.cit., p.165.
5. Since Christ is regarded as eschatological Adam in Rom.v:12.f. (as Barrett has clearly shown in his book Christ and Adam especially ch.v) and since there is so much reference to Adam and to humanity in this section of the epistle, it is obvious that the question of anthropology is not entirely foreign to the context. In addition to this Michel (p.137) reminds us that the apocalyptic 'Son of Man' concept is a primary element of New Testament proclamation and a presupposition of Pauline theology. It is doubtful however if Paul intended the anthropological emphasis which Barth finds in this passage. Even allowing for the fact that the sub-title of his article reads "Man and Humanity in Rom.v", it is still possible, as Bultmann illustrates, to show how little foundation some of Barth's assertions actually have in the text e.g. "Paul says nothing about whether the Adamic mankind stood within the rule of Christ ... he does not say that we pride ourselves in looking back to the past period, as if Christ then were already present ... nor does Paul speak of human 'nature' but of the Adamic mankind and the Christian mankind." Cf. Bultmann, op.cit., pp.162-3. Cf. also Brandenburger's review of Barth's essay, op.cit., pp.267-270.
It is not the persons of Adam and Christ that are contrasted but their works, their influence upon others, upon the world. In speaking of Adam as a τύπος of Christ, Paul has here in Rom.v only one point of analogy in view - the similar relation between the 'one' and the 'many' in the old Adamitic and in the new Messianic humanity. The sin of Adam is not just something that is repeated in such a way that each man is his own Adam. The sin of the world and our misery is not to be explained as the sum total of the sins of many individuals. Paul saw in the work of Christ that the redemption which God has achieved is not merely a redemption that may be adequately described as the combined faith of all believers, believing as isolated individuals. Christ as the corporate personality of the new humanity, is not only someone who influences men as individuals, but whose redemption like that of Adam, has cosmological consequences.

It is when the work of Christ is seen in this light that we are able to understand the meaning of ch.v:12.f. in its historical context. Allowing for the close similarity between ch.v:1-11 and ch.viii as outlined by Dahl, the second part of ch.viii is most helpful for its illumination of

1. Käsemann notes that the faith of Abraham anticipates eschatological reality whereas Moses and the Law stand in antithesis to it (PP, p.173). We should expect Adam to be similar to Moses in this respect whereas Barrett makes the interesting observation that Moses provides Paul with no Christological material while Adam provides much (cf. Adam, p.80). Barrett's explanation of the typological significance of Adam is as follows "This defaulting Man points from himself to Man in his restoration, and indeed to Man the restorer, the conqueror of the powers of evil." (op.cit., p.82).


3. Cf. Käsemann, PP, pp.176-177. Cf. also Barrett's comment "The work of the new Adam is not simply to produce a handful of new individual men, all bearing the image of the heavenly Man, but to produce a new unit of existence, which is as truly one in Christ, as the human race as a whole is one in Adam, 'you are all one person (εἷς) in Christ Jesus.' Gal. iii:28." Cf. Adam, p.110.
the theme of v:12.f. If viii:18.f. is the conclusion of the section of which ch.v is the main part, then we should expect that the one part should help us to interpret the other. In viii:19.f. the κτίσις groans and eagerly expects its final redemption when the children of God attain their full inheritance. In ch.viii the certainty of salvation is also a basic theme (cf.viii:28.f.). If we remember that Paul in v:12 speaks of the entry of sin and death εἰς τὸν Χῶρον, then we can find a common life-context for both these arguments (i.e. in v:12.f. and ch.viii). In response to Paul's assertion that eschatological righteousness has now been revealed, the Jews might well have argued that righteousness is the gift of the new world of the Messianic day and this life will only be available when the righteous receive the fulfilment of the promise that they are to rule the world. In spite of the great number of fulfilment words that Paul uses in chs.v and viii, Jews might have argued that the world was still unredeemed, God's people were still liable to persecution by the Roman rulers etc., and that if righteousness had truly arrived they would have seen more proof of it. It is thus possible to see the arguments in Rom.v and viii, as arguments for the 'already', the realized aspect of Christian eschatology. In both chapters, Paul clearly emphasizes the 'not yet' but the basic emphasis in both is to reassure

1. This also assumes that vv.12.f. is a second proof or a widening of the argument in v:1-11 - so that if ch.viii is closely related to v:1-11 it follows that it should also have something to say about vv.12.f.
2. Cf. εἰρήνη, ἐλπίς, ἡλιοθεσία, δόξα, πνεῦμα, κληρονόμος, κατάλλαγή. See Hunter, Paul and his Predecessors, pp.145.f.
3. Cf. Bultmann who says re Rom.v:1-11 "Paul has to defend his thesis that eschatological righteousness is already present against the objection that the other signs of eschatological salvation are not yet to be seen. Hence, he has also to point out that 'life' is already bestowed upon the rightwised." (Theology, I, p.347). For similar view cf. also Gähmann, op.cit., p.160.
4. It is possible that Jewish Christians or those who were formerly proselytes might also have had similar problems and since Paul's argument is not polemical, his aim may be merely to reassure those with genuine doubts.
Christian people for the future,\(^1\) by the declaration of what they already enjoy (cf. v:1, viii:1). In this Christ event, the final and complete redemption of all things is already assured for His people who even now enjoy the ἀπαρχή of His salvation. (viii:23).

In answer to the question as to the proof of the supposed deliverance of God - Paul answers the new age has already dawned,\(^2\) eschatological life is now available through life in Christ. Since the first Easter the age of life has come, the apocalyptic events long ago expected have now become a reality. The Spirit has been poured out in our hearts. God in Christ has wrought a great reversal of man's sin; His redemption far surpasses the evil influence of Adam upon men and upon the world. If God did so much for us before we were in any way appreciative or aware of His work on our behalf, how much more can we expect Him finally to complete the redemption of those whom He has already justified, (viii:28.f.).

The argument in Rom.v:12.ff is thus centred on the realization, the actualization of life in the present.\(^3\) Against this it might be argued that the dominant tenses in v:12.ff are not the present, but rather the aorist and the future. Perhaps the best explanation of this fact is that Paul in this argument is contemplating the whole perspective of 'Heilsgeschichte' from Adam to final salvation and so these tenses are almost inevitable. But the reason for this wide survey of redemptive history, is for the immediate encouragement of Christians in the present. It may be argued that in any case, Paul's

---

1. This may be clearer if we remember that the love of God is the basis of hope at the beginning of ch.v and that the same love of God is the theme at the end of ch.viii in the triumphant exultation of viii:28.ff.
2. Cf. Barrett, Adam, p.94.
eschatology is best described as "inaugurated eschatology". As Barrett says "for Paul the eschatology of bliss and the eschatology of woe are partially realized in the present." Another suggestion is that some of these futures are logical rather than chronological. This is also in keeping with the character of this section which has the appearance of a reasoned theological argument. Bultmann notes that although the future βασιλεύειν is used in v.17, it is preceded by λαμβάνειν which denotes the paradoxical situation of the believer. Ch.v:12.f. continues from the point of view of v:1 δικαιοθέντες κατάλαλοι καθόμεθι. As with so much of this letter, the question is, in what day do we live, in which part of God's plan of deliverance do we stand? What is the significance of the present? This is why the aeon question is so central and why Paul uses it to aid his cosmological application of the work of Christ with the help of the antithetical analogy of Adam's sin. We may thus consider vv.12-21 under the theme of the two people, Adam and Christ, and their separate reigns - the reign of Χάρις διὰ δικαιοσύνης εἰς ζωήν αἰώνιον (v.21) and the reign of ἀμαρτία ἐν τῷ Θανάσι (cf. also the concluding verses of ch.vi -τῷ τῷ τέλος ἑκείνῳ θανάτῳ, (v.21)...νυνὶ δὲ...τῷ δὲ τέλος ζωῆς αἰώνιον (v.23).

2. Adam, p.13 (n 1).
3. Cf. Bultmann, op.cit., pp.157-9. A parallel to this is vi:5 where participation in the resurrection life of Christ is indicated by the future ἔσομαι; Leenhardt (p.161) shows that the logical rather than the chronological future is the best interpretation here since the immediate reference is most likely to the present participation of the believers in the life of the risen Lord. Cf. also D.M. Stanley, op.cit., p.185. Leenhardt also notes that vi:11 cannot be understood except on the basis of present participation in the risen life (cf. p.161). We must also bear in mind the Constative Aorist (ἐπερίσσευσα) of v.15. A salvation that in one place may be regarded as being already secured cannot elsewhere logically be described as still wholly in the future.
Bornkamm gives a good outline of the progress of Paul's argument in vv.12-14. "Ch. v.12 introduces the train of thought but does not arrive at the comparison with Christ; vv.13-14 form the first parenthesis - 'the universality of sin and death'. A second parenthesis - 'the dissimilarity of the influence of Adam and Christ' is introduced in vv.15-17." This part (15-17) may be subdivided as follows: 15a- thesis; 15b+c- proof; v.16a-thesis; vv.16b+c- explanation; v.17- proof; now at last the carrying through of the comparison in two parallel sentences 18a+b; 19a+b; v.20 renewed parenthesis, followed by conclusion and summary v.20b and v.21. The Ὄπωρ of v.12 introduces the first part of the comparison between Christ and Adam. But because Paul has to deal with certain other aspects the second part of the comparison is not included and it is only in vv.18-19 that we find the expected corresponding οὕτως. Already however the relation between the one and the many has been introduced as well as the two powers of sin and death.

The first parenthesis in vv.13-14 serves the purpose of emphasizing the universality of sin and death. Paul is aware that there was a time when the Law was not in the world, but he meets this problem by emphasizing that sin (ἁμαρτία) was there all along even though it was not reckoned until

1. Bornkamm, pp.81-82. Brandenburger (op.cit., pp.219.f) follows the general outline proposed by Bornkamm.
2. οὕτως occurs twelve times altogether in vv.12-21.
3. Cf. Feuillet's emphasis upon Sin, Death and Law who are almost personified by Paul "En v.12-21, trois acteurs étaient entrés successivement en scène : le Pêché, la Mort, la Loi. En vi-vii:6, ces trois acteurs sont successivement éliminés dans l'ordre même de leur apparition." (p.368). Cf. also Bultmann on the personification of flesh and sin in Paul "Sin came into the world (Rom.v:12) and 'achieved dominion' (Rom.v:21), Man is enslaved to it (Rom.vi:6,17.f.) sold under it (Rom.vii:13) and it pays him wages (Rom.vi:23)." Theology Vol.I, p.243. Cf. also T.W.Manson, On Paul and John, pp.27-8.
the Law came. 1 Thus sin reigned (ἐγκατεστήσατο) from Adam until Moses, even over those whose sin was not like the transgression of Adam who is a τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος. 3

The second parenthesis in vv.15-17 shows Paul's concern to contrast Adam and Christ. In spite of the fact that it is a useful comparison, Paul hastens to show that the influence of Adam cannot really be compared with that of Christ. 4 Here he emphasizes the actual outworking of the effects of Adam's sin and Christ's obedience. 5 This is indicated by the use of the

1. This is in accordance with iv:15 "Where there is no Law there is no transgression" (παρέχεσθαι ἀμαρτείαν). Michel notes how Paul continues a thin line of interest concerning the Law, its effects etc. from iii:20 via iv:15 and v:20-21 to viii:7-25. (cf. pp.138, 143).

2. Paul is able to look at the past history of mankind as a series of epochs i.e. that of Adam (sin), Abraham (promise) or Moses (Law). These epochs in themselves however, are not meaningful or decisive, it is the Christ-event alone which provides for Paul that decisive new perspective by which everything else is seen in its proper significance. Leenhardt claims that Paul is thinking theologically rather than historically in his reference to the epoch from Adam to Moses. Cf. p.146 (note). Cf. also Barrett, Adam, pp.5, 82, 93.f.

3. ὁ μᾶλλον is an enigmatic designation of the object of promise like ὁ ἐρχόμενος (Matt.xi:3; Heb.x:37), (Leenhardt, p.141). Here Christ is regarded as eschatological Adam. Cf. Barrett, Adam, especially ch.v.

4. In this we cannot agree with Barth's understanding of the relationship between Adam and Christ. Barth uses the πολλῷ μᾶλλον argument of vv.15f. to argue for a close relation between Christ and Adam. "Because the truth in Christ has this superiority in power over the truth in Adam, the two stand together under one ordering principle. That is why it is legitimate to relativise the opposition between them in such a remarkable way by the πολλῷ μᾶλλον of vv.15-17." (op.cit., p.18). The question that needs to be asked is - Did Paul intend to relativise the opposition as Barth thinks he did? Cf. Brandenburger's criticism that Barth interprets the 'much more' of vv.15-17 as if there were no opposition between the 'less' and the 'more' as in the same type of argument in vv.9-10, where God's grace to men is referred to in both sides of the argument. (op.cit., pp.277.f.)

5. D.M. Stanley claims that in vi:12-21 Paul combines the Servant theme of Deutero-Isaiah with that of the Second Adam. Its (vi:12-21) originality may be gauged by the fact that it represents a new synthesis in which there appear combined the theological values inherent in the earlier, Palestinian presentation of Christ as the 'Ebed Yahweh' together with certain advantages found in the Adam symbolism of the O.T. creation story. (op.cit., p.177).
terms 'paraptwmata' and 'charisma'. 1 Barrett claims that despite the fact that the latter term is used with a different meaning in i:11, xii:6, vi:23, "there can be little doubt that Paul uses it here to express the actualization of grace, just as the other word represents the actualization of sin." 2

By use of the twice repeated negative ὅχι ὡς (15,16) Paul seeks to show just how much the effect and influence of Christ exceeds that of Adam. The 'paraptwmata' of Adam is not so great as the 'charisma' of Christ (v.15) and the δι' ἕνος ἀναρτήσωμεν is not like the δῶρον (v.16) because the 'charisma ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων resulted in θανάτωμα whereas the 'charisma έκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων resulted in δικαίωμα (v.16). On the positive side if by τοῦ ἕνος παραπτώματος οἱ πολλοί ἀπέλαυσαν how much more ἡ χάρις ...καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ ...τῇ τοῦ ἕνος ... Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἑπερίσσευσεν (v.15). 3 If by Adam's sin, ὁ δίκαιος ἡμᾶς ἐκκένωσεν how much more οἱ τὴν περισσεῖαν τῆς χάριτος ...λαμβάνοντες βασιλεύσουσιν; If Paul had been consistent he should have said in v.17 that life reigned whereas he makes believers the subject in spite of the break this causes in the comparison. 4 In the difficult phrase

1. Cf. Barrett, p.113. It is most likely that 'paraptwmata' refers here to the concrete act of sinning in view of the comparison with Christ where Christ's life is viewed in totality as a single act of grace or obedience cf. Phils. ii:6 ff. The nouns in v.16 are all designed to emphasize the reality of life, the realized aspect of the Christ-event on our behalf. Cf. 'charisma', 'dikaios' and 'dórmia'.

2. Barrett's translation of v.16 makes this plain. In this he agrees with A.M. Hunter who also finds reference to the suffering servant in the pre-Pauline formula in iv:25. (op.cit., pp.32-33 and 141-2). "Again God's gift was not a mere equivalent of the result that followed from One who sinned; for from one act of transgression began the process of judgement which leads to condemnation, but the act of grace, wrought in a context of many transgressions, leads to justification." (p.114).


4. As we have noted elsewhere in Paul, the grammatical structure is sometimes bent to express what Paul wishes to express rather than what is merely consistent within the possibilities of good grammar. It is also significant that they who once were ruled by a tyrant should themselves reign. This would then point to the realization of Jewish apocalyptic hope when the righteous would rule the world. (I Cor.vi:8). Cf. Michel, p.142.
Διὰ πολλῶν παραπανάματων ἐν ν.16, Dahl sees an explanation of the argument why the effect of grace (or the work of Christ) is greater than the effect of sin (or the work of Adam). One explanation for Paul's πολλοὶ μέλλον argument is that the power of good is greater than the power of evil. But Dahl finds this and the many other arguments put forward by various commentators as entirely unsatisfactory. In his opinion the one fact which causes the difference between the order of sin and the order of grace is the Law. Dahl maintains that since with Adam and Christ we are concerned with an antithetical analogy, then all differences which are due to the fact of the contrast are matters of course and particular mention of them would be irrelevant. The special fact which renders the analogy incomplete is the difference caused by the giving of the Law. Whereas in the period between Adam and Moses, Paul could unreservedly claim that the death of all was due to the sin of one man, under the Law however, all men were guilty unto death because they had them-

1. This view has at least the merit of being a subject under discussion in Paul's own time. Cf. Michel, p.141 and p.141 (n.1).
2. Dahl notes the bewildering multitude of answers given in commentaries many of which discover a difference at two or three points. "The difference is said to lie e.g. in the fundamental contrast between sin and grace, death and life etc. (Weiss, Zahn, Sanday and Headlam, Gaugler). Or in the case of Adam the starting point was neutral, in the case of Christ it was negative; it is a greater and more difficult task to restore than to corrupt (Godet, Weiss, Lagrange, Nygren). Grace not only brings a restitution of the original state, but also new blessings (Sanday and Headlam). Goodness is somehow more real and effective than evil (Dodd Cf. Jülicher in Schriften des N.T. II, 3 Ed. Gött., 1917. Haering, Schlatter, Althaus in N.T. Deutsch 6, 3 Ed. Gött., 1935; Lietzmann and Lagrange find support for this idea from Jewish sources. Cf. also A. Marmorstein, "Paulus und die Rabbinen" ZNW XXX, 1931, pp.271-285). The grace of God weighs more than the sin of man (Moehl and Nygren). The contrast to the sin of Adam is the double grace of God and Christ (Weiss, Zahn, Althaus). A false step does not have so great consequences for others as a gift of grace directly bestowed upon them; the order of sin and retribution, as an almost mechanical scheme of cause and effect, is contrasted with the order of grace, which is the perpetual outpouring of a personal love towards man (Dodd cf. Zahn, Jülicher, Schlatter, Gaugler etc.)" op.cit., p.43. (including notes 1-7).
selves transgressed the Law (iii.18-iii.20).¹

Dahl's interpretation means that Paul has left v.15 logically incomplete. The reason for the difference between the act of grace in Christ and the act of sin in Adam has not really been stated in v.15. The 'much more' would suggest an argument such as 'grace is greater than sin, therefore Christ's work is greater than Adam's sin!' This would then be one argument for the abundance of grace over sin and the forgiveness of transgression increased by the giving of the Law would be another argument of the same type.

Dahl's point is however, that it is only in v.16 that the reason for the abundance of sin is explained. If there had been complete equivalence, the gift of grace would have brought forgiveness for this one sin of Adam and restoration from its effects.² As against this, the gift of grace arises from many transgressions (ἐξ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων). This is the additional factor which explains the greatness of the grace over against the sin. Thus v.20 explains that the Law παρεσιτήλεν ἐνα πλεονάση τὸ παράπτωμα. Through the Law ἐπελώσεσεν ἡ ἀμαρτία, but the superabundance of grace in Christ was victorious—ἡ χάρις ἐπερεπήρωσεν(ἐπερεπήρωσεν in v.15, περισσαίων v.17). "Grace is abundant because it is not simply grace towards a mankind dominated by sin and death in consequence of the fall of Adam, but grace towards a mankind whose sin was increased through the Law."³

Having noted the universality of sin and death both before the Law (vv.13,14) and during the time of the Law (vv.15-17) and having emphasized by how much the grace of Christ surpasses the sin of Adam, Paul is able in

1. Dahl, p.43.
2. Ibid., p.46.
3. Ibid., p.44.
vv.18-19 to complete the comparison in two parallel sentences. The δι' ἐνος παραπτώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάχριμα finds its corresponding apodosis οὕτως καὶ δι' ἐνος δικαίωματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν ὑμῖν. In v.19 the same is continued under the aspect of obedience and disobedience. We have now reached the climax of Paul's argument and in vv.18 and 19 we find the two representatives of humanity, their acts and consequences of their acts upon all men, all fully contrasted with each other.

Adam 18. παράπτωμα .............. κατάχριμα
19. παρακολ. .............. δικαιώματα

Christ 18. δικαίωμα .............. δικαιώσεις
19. δικαολ. .............. δικαιο

We note the recurrence of the aorist and future tenses in vv.17,19, (21). The reason for this may be because Paul wishes to contrast the entire effect of Adam's sin with those resulting from the act of grace of Christ. This would then be parallel to Paul's use of the aorist in viii:29-30 where he not only speaks of calling as a completed act (ἐκάλεσαν) but also of glorification (ἐδόξασαν). Of this (glorification) Leenhardt states "Here Paul speaks in the past tense of this phrase, but its realization will come only later," and he refers to viii:17 where glorification is something still future for those who are willing to share in the sufferings of Christ. He continues "we may see in his choice of tense at this juncture the assurance of faith; the divine will is already shaped in the eternity of God, and

3. Bultmann considers that the future character of life is expressed by the use of the future tense in these verses (op.cit.,p.159). Michel holds that the future can be eschatologically or logically understood in both instances (p.143). Cf. also Bultmann Theology, I pp.347-351.
the accidents of history can avail nothing against it."\(^1\)

The fact that v:12-21 may be understood as a sort of meditation\(^2\) may help us to understand Paul's use of aorist and future tenses. The change of style from the exultant rejoicing of v:1-ff to what Michel terms "einen lehrhaften, logisch deduzierenden Stil",\(^4\) is also very relevant. In this type of deductive and prolonged argument, it is not surprising to find the frequent use of logical futures. In the deductive style of reasoning it is exactly what we should expect. It is also to be expected that when Paul contemplates the whole span of human history under the concept of the reign of sin and its divinely-intended counterpart, the reign of grace (v.21) he should use the aorist because he regards the victory of God over sin as having already been achieved in the Christ-event. In any case, even if the simple future meaning is accepted, it must still be used within the eschatological perspective which dominated Paul's entire theology. The 'already' will need to be emphasized as well as the 'not yet' - the future is already present if only in hope. Salvation is not only something past or future but something present as well. One of the chief purposes in emphasizing the once-for-allness of salvation in the past (i.e. with the aorist), and its future fulfilment, must surely be to enable the Christian community to hold fast their salvation now in the present. This we believe is the proper understanding of past and future in Rom.v:12-21. This section does represent a change from the style and argument of v:1-11. It is nevertheless also closely connected to what

---

1. p.235.
3. Another difference between this section and both the preceding and succeeding sections is the absence of direct address (i.e. of 1st and 2nd pers. plural).
4. p.137.
immediately precedes it. That the πολλῆς μᾶλλον argument is found in vv. 9-10 as well as in vv.15-17 is of itself a strong indication of a common theme. The χάρις into which we have found access in v.2 becomes in the end of the chapter the grace which rules supreme and leads to eternal life (v.21).

The point then of v.12-21 is to emphasize the actualization of life through Christ in that very world enslaved and tyrannized by the sin of Adam. The arguments for the surpassing abundance of grace, the use of the aorist and future tenses, the whole section in fact even from v.6 is designed to convince or reassure the Christian community of the reality of life now and of the love of God which guarantees its realization in the future. Since the whole passage is irenical in tone, and positive in emphasis, it is possible to understand it, along with part of ch.viii, as a message to Jewish or former proselyte Christians who, because of persecution or because of uncertainty about the present fulfilment of Messianic prophecies, required reassurance as to the presence of eschatological life in the here and now. Alternatively it may be regarded as an assurance to Gentile Christians that although suffering, sin and death continue active on the stage of history, this is no deterrent to the view of Christian belief that the new aeon has already dawned and that already we enjoy eschatological life because we have been justified by faith.

It is interesting to note in conclusion, just how cleverly Paul prepares for the next chapters. Feuillet claims that Sin, Law and Death enter the scene as three actors who will be successively vanquished in the coming chapters. The shift from παράπτωμα to παρασκήνω and from δίκαιομα to ἱπατομα in vv.18,19 prepares the way for the obedience of Christ's servants

1. Feuillet, p.368.
in vi.12.ff. The reign of sin and death overcome by the rule of grace and life prepares the way for the admonition in vi.12 μὴ σὺν βαστάσει μου ἀμαρτίαν ἐν τῷ θυμῷ ἡμῶν σώματα. The δικαίωμα ἵνα θυμόν ἐπικρίνητος of vi.16 connects back to Adam in vi.12.f. The wrong inference of vi.1 "Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" obviously has its origin in the superabundance of grace in vi.20. Thus far we are in complete agreement with Feuillet who describes vi.1-11 as the crown of what has preceded, while vi.12-21 introduces new themes which Paul now wishes to elaborate. We do not agree however with his putting the main break between Rom.iv and vi at vi.11. The section vi.12-21 not only differs in style from what precedes but also with the following chapter, which as we have already noted is more similar to the 'question and objection' style of chapters such as iii and ix-xi. It is best therefore to regard vi.1-11 and 12-21 as two arguments for the certainty of

1. Dodd holds that Paul's teaching on baptism in ch.vi is a corollary of his second Adam doctrine in ch.v (cf. p.106).
2. The reign of sin (or death) is first mentioned in vi.14, then vi.17,21 and then vii.12 but nowhere else in the epistle (Feuillet, p.358).
3. P.358.
4. We cannot agree with Leenhardt (cf. p.24), who following Feuillet divides Rom.i-viii into two parallel structures of thought; the first in i.18 - vii.11, the second in vi.12 - viii.39. Leenhardt further sub-divides these sections into five corresponding paragraphs as follows:

   (1) i.18 - iii.20
   (2) iii.21-26
   (3) iii.27-31
   (4) iv.1-25
   (5) v.1-11
   (6) vi.1-21
   (7) vii.1-25
   (8) viii.1-17
   (9) viii.18-39

   Although a certain correspondence may be discovered in some sections of this plan i.e. i.18-iii.20 in relation to vi.12-21 and, as Dahl has shown, v.1-11 does have affinities with ch.viii, on the whole it is much too fanciful and elaborate. Ch.iii.27-31 can hardly be designated as a significant paragraph in Romans since it is chiefly composed of questions and unproven assertions. So also with ch.vii; while the Law is certainly referred to in vii.1-6, it is much more preferable to relate vii.1-6 to ch.vi and retain vii.7-25 as a separate section.
salvation, of eschatological life.\textsuperscript{1} This point of view is strengthened when we remember the similarities between v:1-11 and viii:1-39, where the common theme is also the certainty of salvation.

Ch.v:12-21 is related not only to the first part of this chapter but also to chs.i-iv in that it elaborates and clarifies the teaching on sin and justification by means of the aeon terminology.\textsuperscript{2} In this way Paul puts the work of Christ into a wider 'heilsgeschichtlich' setting,\textsuperscript{3} thus emphasizing its universal application.\textsuperscript{4} The inclusive and representative\textsuperscript{5} nature of Christ and Adam emphasized much in this section prepares the way for the argument based on the crucifixion of the believers with Christ through baptism in vi:1-vii:6. At the same time Paul also introduces the themes for the succeeding section, thereby using v:12-21 as a means of transition between v:1-11 and vii:1.ff.

It is this combination of the close relation to v:1-11 and vii:1.ff. that has led commentators to ascribe different functions to v:12-21. If the connection with what precedes is emphasized then v:12-21 may be seen as the conclusion of the argument in l:16-v:11.\textsuperscript{6} If on the other hand the difference between v:1-11 and v:12-21 is emphasized along with the connections

---

\textsuperscript{1} This is the view proposed by Lietzmann and followed generally by Bultmann, Bornkamm and Käsemann (Lecture notes). Cf. Michel, p.16.


\textsuperscript{3} Note also the close parallel between the final verse of ch.v and that of ch.vi.

\textsuperscript{4} Cf. Langfeld Adam und Christus, pp.101-104.

\textsuperscript{5} Cf. Gäumann, op.cit., p.24.

\textsuperscript{6} This is the view of the older commentators; see list on p.5.
with vi:1.f., then v:12-21 may be regarded as the first part in another main section of the letter.¹

We believe however, that v:12-21 is best understood when its connections with what precedes and also with what succeeds are both kept in mind.

¹. This is the view of Zahn, Feuillet and Leenhardt. Cf. Thesis p.233.
The Situation to which Paul addresses himself in Romans v.

Since Paul does not mention Jew or Gentile in this chapter, it is quite possible that the first person plural, so common in vv.1-11, refers to all the Christians in Rome - perhaps to all the Christian community. The specific thrust of the chapter is to establish the presence of life for the believing community. The persuasive nature of the argument 'a maiore ad minus' and its climax in declaring the superabundance of the reign of grace in Christ give us reason to suspect that it was originally intended for faint-hearted Christians. Who were these insecure Christians? They may have included both Jews and Gentiles who were persecuted on behalf of their faith. But it seems more likely that these faint-hearted were Christians of Jewish background who felt insecure because of a threatened or imminent rupture with the synagogue as Trocmé suggests.¹

If we follow Marxsen's view, this will not necessarily mean that these insecure Christians were all Jews.² Marxsen suggests that some Jewish proselytes, after becoming Christians, may have reacted strongly against the Jewish fetters which they had earlier taken upon themselves.³ Some of these may have been similar to the doubters mentioned in ch.xiv, compelled by force of circumstances to a course of action the rightness of which they were not fully convinced. At best we may say that these were probably Christians with strong Jewish background.

In favour of the view that they were all originally Gentiles, is the reference to their pre-Christian condition as sinners in v.8, to their obtaining access to grace in v.2, and to their eventual deliverance from God's

wrath in v.9. The reference to Adam in v.12f. also gives some support to the view that a Gentile audience is intended. In Rom.iv the story of Abraham provided the basis for Paul's exposition. It appears more likely that Adam would be used in the wider context of the Gentile world. The solidarity of all men in sin because of Adam was by no means unknown in Judaism, but the probability that the story of Adam is behind the description of Gentile sin in ch.i, lends strength to the view that Gentiles are addressed here.¹

On the other hand we must bear in mind the fact that the comparison and contrast of the one man Adam with the One Man Christ, emphasizes the solidarity of all men in sin and death, in grace and life. This kind of argument, like that of Abraham in ch.iv, is designed not to favour either Jew or Gentile, but to relate them together in a common solidarity of sin and of grace. If this is so then the existence of both Jewish and Gentile Christians in Rome is presupposed, since the solidarity argument is designed to overcome the normal divisions between these two groups. We should thus regard the reference to Adam in ch.v as an expansion of the story of Abraham in ch.iv, and the 'we' of both chapters represents the church composed of both Jews and Gentiles.

The reason for emphasizing the reign of life and the cosmic consequences of sin and grace was probably primarily to give security to wavering Christians of some kind of Jewish background. But another possibility is that the proclamation of the Christ-event in a world as yet apparently unredeemed, presented problems to Gentile Christians also. The continuing presence of death would prove a stumbling block to those who held firmly to a realized eschatology as Gentile Christians tended to do. If this is so, then this chapter may have as its aim to emphasize the superiority of the reign of grace and life

over that of sin and death. It is significant that the reign of grace and life is shown to originate from the obedience of Jesus Christ, whereas sin and death originate from Adam's disobedience. The connection between disobedience and death and between obedience and life is clearly a preparation for the call to Christian obedience in vii.1f. This indicates that Paul already has Gentile Christians in mind in ch.v. On the other hand Paul's references to the Law in this chapter are rather negative. The coming of the Law meant that sin was reckoned and had the effect of increasing transgressions rather than decreasing them. This description of the Law is more likely to have been directed at Christians of a Jewish background, who perhaps had too high a view of the Law, than at antinomian Gentiles who might have concurred all too readily with any criticism of the Law which Paul cared to make.

These suggestions appear inconclusive. This is partly due to the nature of ch.v. The various arguments concerning its place and function in the structure of the letter have a strong bearing on the outcome of our discussion here. Since ch.v is part of the section comprising chs.v-viii, we ought to emphasize those aspects of the chapter which have parallels in the remainder of the section. These include the emphasis upon the inability of the Law to produce life, upon obedience as the way to life, and upon the cosmic dimensions of salvation. The fact that some of these themes relate more readily to Jewish Christians whilst others are clearly directed to Gentiles, probably indicates that both groups are addressed. The strong emphasis upon human solidarity in Adam and in Christ lends support to this. This emphasis and the 'much more' type of argument with its stress on the present reality of the new life in Christ would be relevant in a situation where old cultural divisions and ways of life were threatening to reappear.
Romans viii: General Introduction.

In ch.viii:1.f. we continue the theme of ch.v.1 The predominance of eschatological terms and the kerygmatic exposition of what is ours in Christ shows that we are dealing with no new subject,2 but rather a continuation of a subject already introduced in v:1.f. Ch.viii:1-39 is a fuller elucidation of the themes already introduced in ch.v. particularly in v:1-11.3 By this connection we keep in mind the designation of v:1 - vii:6 and vii:7-25 as digressions (the word digression is used only in the sense of indicating the formal position of the sections).4 This is clear when we note that the theme of vii:1 - viii:13 is found not in v:5 as Dodd implies,5 but rather in v:20-21 "Law came in to increase the trespass; but where sin increased, grace abounded all the more, so that as sin reigned in death, grace also might reign through righteousness to eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." The general unity of chs.v - viii is further evidenced in the close connection of vii:7-25 with viii:1-17.6 With Michel we can regard vii:5 as a summary (in advance) of the theme of vii:7-25 and vii:6 as a similar preview of ch.viii7 where it is stated that our service must be according to

---

1. As already noted in connection with ch.v:1.f., Dahl has shown the close similarity between v:1-11 and viii:1-39 by setting out the Greek text in parallel columns, having rearranged the order of verses so that the corresponding verses are set alongside each other. (op.cit., pp.37-39). According to a note in a more recent article Dahl has had second thoughts on this parallel and seems now to prefer the view of Leenhardt in which the main break in Rom.i-viii is found at v:11. Cf. "The Atone¬ment - An adequate Reward for the Akedah? (Rom.viii:32)". Neotestament¬ica et Semitica. Studies in honour of Matthew Black (Edinburgh, 1969), pp.15-29 (p.17 n.15).
5. Cf., p.74.
the Spirit i.e. in the new life of the Spirit (vii:6) and no longer under the old written Law (cf. vii:5 and viii:15). Ch. viii:1-17 is thus the positive counterpart of vii:7-25, as well as the continuation of v:1-11. The close similarity in style between ch.v and ch.viii is most obvious in the jubilant note of rejoicing which is basic to both sections. With iii:21-26 and v:1, ch.viii continues on the plane of the "now" in Christ Jesus. The perspective of the problem passage concerning the Law in vii:7-25 should also be seen in this context, so that the whole of v-viii is viewed from the perspective of the coming aeon in Christ Jesus. The radical change of the aeons through the resurrection of Jesus Christ is presupposed throughout and it is most likely that ch.vii:7-25 should be understood as equivalent to the "once" or the "then" of man on his own with the Law, and without Christ, in contrast to the "now" of those who are in Christ Jesus and serve Him "in the Spirit".

In spite of Bultmann's opinion that vii:25b and viii:1 should both be regarded as exegetical glosses, with Bornkamm and Michel, we do not believe that these verses should be excluded. It may readily be granted

2. Cf. Bultmann. Glossen im Römerbrief. ThLZ, Vol.LXXII (1947) reprinted in R. Bultmann Exegetica Tübingen (1967), pp.278.f. Bultmann follows the article by Friedrich Müller in ZNW XL (1941), pp. 249-254. Müller claims that the connection between viii:1 and vii:25a may with difficulty be understood psychologically but logically not at all (p.249). Bultmann differs from Müller in that he considers it is wrong to insert viii:1 between viii:2 and viii:3 as Müller suggests. Bultmann prefers to regard viii:1 as a gloss beginning as in vii:25b with ἐν τούτῳ which, though not always indicating the introduction of extraneous comment on the text, may sometimes be regarded as a pointeur in this direction. (p.281).
that both verses do have the character of summaries of what Paul has already stated,¹ but this does not mean that they were not Paul's own summaries (cf. iii:9, vii:5,6), rather than exegetical comments that eventually intruded into the text. If, as we have already suggested in the study of ch. vii, vii:25b should be inserted between vv.23 and 24, then a smoother transition is given when viii:2 follows directly from vii:25a,² the sequence would then read as follows "Thanks be to God through Jesus Christ our Lord (vii:25a). For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set me free from the law of sin and death (viii:2). There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus (viii:1). For God has done what the law, weakened by the flesh could not do (viii:3).³ By this rearrangement we avoid the strong contrast between vii:1 and vii:25b, and provide a basis for the thanksgiving of vii:25a (i.e. in viii:2)⁴ as well as giving expression to the close connection between the thought of vii:1 and viii:3 (cf. κατάχρηστα in viii:1 and κατέχρησεν in viii:3).⁵

The central fact around which Paul builds his argument in vv.1-17 of ch. viii is set out in vv.3-4 ⁶— "For God has done what the law, weakened by the flesh, could not do: sending his own son in the likeness of sinful

---

¹ Cf. Bultmann, op. cit., p.279.
² Cf. Bornkamm, op. cit., p.103 n.33.
³ This is the rearrangement proposed by Michel, p.187.
⁴ Bultmann notes both these problems. He points out that there is a strong contrast between vii:25b and vii:1, and also the fact that the thanksgiving in vii:25a lacks a foundation in the succeeding verses (i.e. vii:25b and vii:1), op. cit., p.279.
⁵ In opposition to the rearrangement we have suggested stands Bultmann's claim that viii:2 and viii:3 ought not to be separated in that viii:3 provides the basis from which viii:2 can be asserted (op. cit., p.279). It may also be pointed out that vi:1 begins in a similar manner to vii:1 and that the 'now' of vii:1 may be understood as a direct resumption of the 'now' in vii:6, as Bornkamm notes (op. cit., p.103). This latter point will also hold good even if we replace vii:1 after vii:2.
⁶ Cf. Luz, "Zum Aufbau von Röm. i-viii.", p.177.
flesh and for sin, he condemned sin in the flesh in order that the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us ...". By the redemptive action of Jesus Christ, God condemned (κατάκρισις) sin in the flesh, and Paul for this reason is able to assert - ὁσίον ἄμα νῦν κατάκρισια ... 1

It is possible to interpret the sentence of God upon sin (viii:2) as relating to Christ's victory over sin in His earthly life 2 as well as in His death on the cross. E. Schweizer has emphasized the significance of the phrase περὶ ἀμαρτίας 3. This is not a spurious addition to the text but a technical phrase reminding us of the Old Testament concept of sin-offering, which shows that Paul understands the sending of Christ chiefly in the light of His crucifixion. Schweizer notes that in Gal.iv:4.f. and especially in Rom.viii:3.f., the emphasis is laid upon the divine judgement in the Cross and the pre-existence idea is in the background. 4 Paul has apparently changed a pattern which originally described the incarnation of the pre-existent Son into a proclamation of His death on the Cross. 5 From this it would appear that the condemnation of sin in the flesh is to be understood chiefly with reference to the Cross which is thus seen as the affirmation of the Law's verdict upon sin. 6 In the flesh, the very place which sin had usurped as a base for its hostile operations, God sent His Son to defeat sin and to

1. The ὁσίον reminds us of Paul's similar interpretation of the present in iii:21-26 and v:1.f. This also indicates that we are still dealing with the meaning of righteousness (or life) in the here and now.
3. "Die 'Mystik' des Sterbens und Auferstehens mit Christus bei Paulus". EvTh XXVI (1966), pp.252 n.54; 256 n.69. Cf. also the essay by the same author "Dying and Rising with Christ" (which appears to be a revision of this essay) in NTS, Vol.XIV, 1967/68, pp.1-14.
make possible a life of righteousness. The meaning of the phrase ἐν δομοίωμα ὑπὸ ἀμαρτίας is difficult to define. Paul could have said simply "in the flesh" had he not wished to designate the flesh as sinful flesh. Because this is his intention, he must speak of Christ's incarnation in such a way that He is like men but not completely identified with them. This way of understanding the Incarnation has the seeds of Docetic heresy within it. We should therefore prefer the interpretation of Lietzmann who regards this phrase (in the likeness of sinful flesh) as a rough equation for σῶμα. We can concur with the conclusion of Barrett where he says that "we are probably justified ... in deducing that Christ took precisely the same fallen nature that we ourselves have, and that He remained sinless because he constantly overcame a proclivity to sin."

It is because of God's sending His Son that the new power of the Spirit has been made available for men. They are empowered to live a new kind of life in freedom and in peace. This life differs radically from life "under the Law" and yet it is not a life that is contrary to the Law. This relationship becomes clearer when we study the connection of ch.viii with the preceding chapters.

The connection of ch.viii with what has preceded is evidenced in v:2 "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set me free from the law of sin and death." The reference to the Law points to the connection with

1. ὁμοίωμα also occurs in i:23; v:14; vi:5, (cf. also Phil.ii:7 where it is related to the human condition of the Son; truly man, but unlike other men, obedient). "Here the word implies both similitude and difference" (cf. Leenhardt, p.203).
2. Cf. J. Schneider, TDNT, Vol.V, pp.195-197; according to Schneider this word indicates two things, first the likeness in appearance and secondly the distinction in essence. Contra see R. Jewett (op.cit., p.152).
3. Cf. p.79.
5. Cf. Michel "Die Sendung des Sohnes ist die Voraussetzung für den Wandel im Geist.", p.188.
ch.vii (cf. the "law of sin" in vii:23 and the "law of sin and death" in viii:2) and the antithesis of the paradoxical expression - the "law of the Spirit of life" with that of the "law of sin and death", paralleled in the oldness of the letter and the newness of the Spirit in viii:6. The reference to the Spirit also continues the thought of v:5 where the Spirit is seen as the basis of hope; in viii:6 and viii:1.f. a new note is introduced in that the Spirit is now seen as the principle of the new life. Throughout chs.v-viii the dominating theme is the reality of eschatological life both as present experience and as future hope. The position of ch.viii as a conclusion or concluding summary of chs.v - vii is illustrated in the key word 'Spirit'.

The Spirit is referred to only twice in chs.i - iv (i:4 and ii:29). In the key verses v:5 and vii:6 the brief mention of the Spirit keeps the underlying theme in view as a subject still to be more fully dealt with later i.e. in viii:1.f. In the sense that the Spirit is the key to the experience of life in the present, and is also the guarantee of the full realization of Christian hope in the future, ch.viii, is thus to be regarded as a necessary and suitable climax to the thought of chs.v - vii. In this chapter the Spirit is

1. Schoeps claims that this view of the Law (as a Law unto death) is one which no Jew could hold. The Law according to the Jews was given for life. "Paul can prove the opposite inference, not from the Law itself, but only from faith in Jesus Christ, the Messiah who has come. The retrospective way of thought is the real axis of his argument. Not the meaning of scripture, but Christ is the 'a priori' for his judgement of the Law." (Paul, p.175). It is doubtful if Schoeps' criticism of Paul is valid in view of the fact that Paul probably has in mind Jer.xxiv:7; xxxi:33 and Ezek.xxxvi:26-28 and thus regards the Spirit as equivalent to the writing of God's Law on the heart. Cf. S. Lyomnet "Le Nouveau Testament à la lumière de l'Ancien à propos de Rom.viii:2-4." Nouv. Rev. Théol. LXXXVII (1965), pp.567.f. See also A.M. Hunter, Paul and his Predecessors, p.145.

mentioned no less than nineteen times\(^1\) whereas in chs.ix - xv there are only seven references (ix:1; xii:11; xiv:17; xv:13,16,19,30). That we have no new subject before us, however, is demonstrated by the recurrence of the vocabulary to which we have become accustomed in chs.v - vii, the Law (vv.2,3,4,7), sin (vv.2,3,10), death, die etc. (vv.2,6,10,11,13,34,38) and life, live etc. (vv.2,6,10,11,12,13,38). The death-life antithesis occurs throughout vv.1-17 (2,6,10,11,13).\(^2\) In this chapter we deal with the final victory over the powers that beset the Christian community. The last reference to Law in this chapter occurs in v.10, to sin also in v.10 and to death in v.13 (it is also mentioned in vv.34,38, but only as a defeated power).\(^3\) The victory over the powers has been achieved by God's sending His Son who has inaugurated the new age of the Spirit.

Since the background for life in the Spirit in ch.viii is life under the Law as outlined in ch.vii, we must devote more detailed attention to Paul's understanding of the relation between the Law and the Spirit.

---

1. The Spirit is mentioned in vv.2,4,5(2),6,9(3),10,11(2),13,14,15,16,23, 26(2),27. (We have excluded the first references in v.15 and the second in v.16; we do not follow the N.E.B. in interpreting the references in vv.6 and 10 as referring to the human spirit). Cf. Kuss, op.cit.Vol.II, p.486.
2. C. Feuillet, p.376.
3. The death-life antithesis is accompanied by that of flesh and Spirit - the latter will be dealt with in a later section.

The introduction of the theme of the Spirit in viii:1-4 as we have already noted, is closely related to the preceding section in that the Law and the Spirit are mentioned in conjunction with each other. C.H. Dodd has suggested that by the phrase - the law of the Spirit - should be understood the Spirit as a principle or system.\(^1\) Sanday and Headlam interpret this phrase as "the regulative influence of the Spirit which leads to life."\(^2\) Perhaps the idea of regulative influence is better than that of principle or system in that it is doubtful that Paul would consider the Christian life as controlled by an abstract principle rather than by the life-giving Spirit of Christ. A. van Dülmen says that in viii:2 "Paulus verwendet den Begriff νόμος in zweifacher Hinsicht. Mit νόμος umschreibt er sowohl die alte als auch die neue Ordnung, deren eine durch Christus überwunden die andere durch ihn angestochen und herausgeführt ist."\(^3\) According to van Dülmen νόμος in viii:2 should be understood as an 'order' - "eine 'Ordnung', eine 'Aion', ein 'Herrschaftssystem' und als 'Sphäre'."\(^4\) In so far as the Law is viewed apart from Christ, it is the sphere of the 'Unheilsmachte'. Sin, Flesh and Death; but in so far as the Law is seen 'in Christ', it is the sphere of the Spirit, of life and of salvation.\(^5\) The view proposed here appears to be that the Law is never in normal life merely an abstraction (save perhaps in Rom.vii:7-12) but something which exists in and with human beings whose lives as individuals are determined either by the power of Christ or by

2. Romans, p.190.
4. Ibid., p.120.
5. A. van Dülmen, op.cit., p.120.
bondage to the powers of Sin, Flesh and Death. The Law is therefore something which in one instance is related to human sin and bondage, and so becomes an order of sin and death; in another instance it is viewed in its 'heilsge-schichtlich' function in the light of Jesus Christ, and so participates in the order of Spirit, life and salvation. The Mosaic Law is bound up in this order as a Law which without Christ brings "Unheil", but which finds fulfilment in Christ.¹

This interpretation is also in accordance with the perspective of ch.vii:5,6 where Paul defines Christian service as being in newness of Spirit in contrast to the oldness of the letter. Christians are not freed from all control when they are delivered from bondage to the Law but they are transferred into a new life controlled by Christ and His Spirit. In vii:14.f. Paul has gone to great lengths to show that the Law itself is not evil, but spiritual (πνευματικός). Because of this fact, he is able to use the paradoxical expression νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς.² By this he witnesses to the fact that the Law is good in itself and that it is rightly interpreted when understood by faith as pointing to righteousness as the will of God for His people - cf. viii:4 where it is stated that God by sending His own Son

¹ Cf. A. van Dülmen, op.cit., p.120. See also p.118 where it is stated in commentary on vii:22,23 that everything that sets up a total claim upon the whole man, whether it be the will of God, or sin, is called νόμος. This νόμος sets man into a "Herrschaftssystem" that can lead to salvation or judgement. For Paul it (νόμος) is concentrated in the Mosaic Law which as such guarantees in itself the possibility of salvation or judgement. Cf. also K. Barth, A Shorter Commentary on Romans, pp.89.f.

² Nygren draws attention to the three-fold genitive construction νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς to which Paul adds ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ in order to indicate the source from which all these blessings proceed. Nygren outlines the new law or order in which we are placed through Christ in three ways: (1) It is the law of the Spirit, (2) It is the law of life, (3) It is the law, or order, which is given "in Christ Jesus", (p.312).
condemned, sin in the flesh - "in order that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled..."

In the expression "Law of the Spirit", there comes to view the typically Pauline concept of newness where the past is annulled not so much by the fact that it is abolished or condemned, but rather by the fact that it is transformed and renewed by the coming of Christ who is the τέλος of the Law (x:14). The transformation wrought by Christ is effected through the Spirit. This is well brought out by Schmidt in his discussion of "the Law of the Spirit." He notes how Paul boldly plays upon the word law in the expressions - Law of the Spirit, Law of sin. In both places the term is related to the Old Testament Law in which the double possibilities are already inherent i.e. for the Law to become either the Law of sin and death or the Law of the Spirit. In Schmidt's view the double possibilities inherent in the Law operate as follows - wherever sin-dominated or 'fleshly' man encounters the Old Testament Law, the Law itself is perverted to become a Law of works and hence a Law of sin. But wherever through Christ man receives the Spirit, then the Law reveals itself in its true nature (vii:14); the veil is drawn away from the Law and Christ as 'the Law' in the 'Law' is manifested, so that the Law becomes a Law of faith, a νόμος πνευματικός. As a Law of works it is cancelled, as witness to the truth of Christ it is established.

2. Cf. W.D. Davies "The gospel is not the annulment but the completion of Judaism". Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p.323.
3. Cf. The question whether this verse should be understood as referring to Christ as the end = finish rather than end= fulfilment of the Law has been much disputed, and must be discussed later in connection with x:4. Cf. Bandstra The Law and the Elements of this World, pp.181-189.
Jesus Christ is the goal of the Law in that in Him is the righteousness of God revealed. The righteous requirement (δικαιοσύνη) of the Law can now be fulfilled because what the Law requires is righteousness and this righteousness is available in Christ. Men who were unable to achieve this life by their own strength under the guidance of the Law are, by faith in Christ, through the Spirit enabled to reach the goal which the Law itself intended; as Dahl puts it - "The Apostle's thesis is that the Law is fulfilled only through the Spirit, given to those who are in Christ as justified." This view is close to that of W.D. Davies who has suggested that Jesus was considered in the early church to be the New Torah, the eschatological rule of God over His people. Davies claims that Paul may be described as a Pharisee who had accepted Jesus as the Messiah. As far back as the time of Jeremiah it was claimed that in the Messianic age the Torah would be spontaneously obeyed by every individual. Paul probably has these Old Testament hopes in mind in Rom.viii:2-4. Later Rabbinic literature (which may reflect earlier views) reveals a similar belief and some places speak of the Messiah as the bringer of a New Torah. Davies also notes that "when the Rabbis taught that

1. Cf. Barrett on viii:4 "Here the thought is not so much that what the Law requires is righteous, as that what the Law requires is righteousness", (p.157).
2. According to Bultmann the ultimate purpose of the Law is to lead men to death (cf. Theology, I, pp.267/8). Bultmann does make the distinction between the eternal will of God and the Law that is abolished. Viewed within the total purpose of God, whatever may be the immediate function of the Law, or its normal effect, in the sense that it was given by God, we may still claim that what it intended was life. Cf. C.E.B. Cranfield "St. Paul and the Law", SJT XVII (1964), pp.57.f.
the Messiah came, bringing a new Torah, they thought of that Law not in the sense that it would be contrary to the Law of Moses, but rather that it would explain it more fully.¹

For Paul the Law had found its completion and its real meaning in Christ—like every other aspect of Paul's doctrine the Law must be understood Christologically.² Nygren has warned us that we must guard carefully against a possible misunderstanding of the relation between Christ and the Law. It would be possible for us to hold some such view as this; "the Law sets forth God's demands of us and only if they are met in every way can we stand as righteous before God. But no one can by nature fulfill the requirements of the Law in that way; the weakness of the flesh makes it impossible for him. But in this situation, God comes to him with help. He gives him Christ and He gives him the Spirit. Thereby he receives the ability which he formerly lacked. Now, by the strength that God has given him, he can fulfill the requirements of the Law. The relation between the Law and the Gospel is accordingly understood in this way, that the Law is the goal and the gospel is the means to that goal."³

We can certainly agree with Nygren that such an interpretation flies directly in the face of Paul's whole view.⁴ Not only is the gospel not subservient to the Law but worse still, if we regard Christ as the New Torah, He would then also be considered as a means to an end, not the One in whom all God's promises are fulfilled (II Cor.i:20). The righteousness that we have can never be termed righteousness of the Law — δικαιοσύνη ἐκ νόμου — it

¹. Ibid., See also Schoeps, pp.249 ff.
². Cf. Du Plessis op.cit, p.145, Schoeps, pp.171 f, 210; Barth op.cit., p.216.
⁴. Ibid.
is a righteousness apart from Law (χαρίς νόμου). Because of the sinful human situation, the Law brings knowledge of sin, causes sin to be reckoned (v:13), not only exposes but increases sin in becoming its accomplice in arousing desire (vii:7,13), and in the end can only lead to παράκριμα (viii:1) not δίκαιοτροπία. Before the Law every mouth is stopped and the whole world is held accountable before God (iii:19). This is the only possibility for sinful men before the Law. It was for this reason that righteousness had to come apart from the Law and in Jesus Christ "what the Law intended but could not effect, is now brought about; but, note well, without the co-operation of the Law.²

The righteous requirement of the Law is fulfilled only by the fact that we are in Christ and that He is the righteousness of God. According to W. Cutbord, even though Paul does not specifically say so, it is logically implied...."that the cross of Christ is also a fulfilling of the Law in so far as the central purpose of the Law is fulfilled herein. The cross is the full achievement of obedience to God (Phil.ii:5.ff) and at the same time it is perfect love for men (Rom.viii:34.ff). This is the true goal of the Law. Hence it is disobedience to the Law to desire it other than in this fulfilment."³

Thus the Law and faith do not stand over against each other for the man of faith (cf. Gal.iii:21). The Law testifies to the righteousness of faith (cf. Rom.iii:21) and faith is the fulfilment of the Law's δίκαιωμα.⁴

As Nygren notes, this is the most positive thing that Paul has to say about the Law,⁵ but this in itself is very significant. It reveals the close

1. This is indicated by the fact that Paul states that the Law is fulfilled in us, not by us. Cf. Schweizer TDNT. Vol.VI, p.430.
5. Ibid.
connection between Paul's claim for freedom from the Law in vii:1-6, his sub-
sequent apologia for the Law as good and holy in vii:7-25, and his emphasis
upon "the Law of the Spirit" in viii:1 ff. By thus connecting vii:1-6, vii:
7-25 and viii, Paul has demonstrated his understanding of the true unity bet-
ween the Law, faith and the Spirit. His intention is to show that the Spirit
is given to men only in faith, apart from the Law; at the same time he also
wishes to avoid any hint of casting aspersions on the goodness of the Law it-
self. He achieves his two-fold aim by showing that the new life comes
through the Spirit, but that this new life of righteousness which the Spirit
mediates is the same righteousness as that to which the Law, when understood
in faith, always witnesses (cf.viii:4).

That this view of the relation between the Law and the Spirit is the
logical outcome of Paul's argument may be shown by a brief summary of the
argument from vi:1 ff. Arising out of the question of the super-abundance
of grace comes the misconception that increase of sin may cause a similar in-
crease of grace and hence bring glory to God (vi:1). Paul answers this by
arguing from the doctrine of baptism. By being united with Christ, believ-
ers are united with Him in His death and so they must reckon themselves to be
dead to sin and alive to God (vi:11). The purpose of baptism is that believ-
ers should begin to walk "in newness of life" (vi:4). Baptism means freedom
from sin i.e. from the dominion of sin - freedom for a new life. In vi:15 f
this picture of the new life is developed by means of the analogy of slavery.
Now the Christian community are no longer slaves of sin but slaves of God.
Paul admits that the imagery is not quite perfect (v.19 "I am speaking to you
on human terms"); but he uses it to emphasize the total claim of God upon
those who have been liberated.
In vii:1-6 Paul emphasizes that though total obedience is demanded by God, nevertheless it is a new kind of obedience; it is freedom from the old written code of the Law so that service may now be in the new life of the Spirit. In vii:7-25 the goodness, and yet at the same time, the weakness of the Law is demonstrated. It is only in viii:1.ff that Paul can fully elaborate the new life of freedom which is the goal of his argument. It is "newness of life" (vi:4). It is slavery not in the oldness of the written code (vii:7-25), but in the newness of the Spirit (vii:6; vii:11-12). The new slavery is in fact no slavery at all. Neither is it lawlessness (cf.vi:15). In Christ we are freed from the power of sin so that it should reign no longer over us. We are united with Him and are no longer bound by the Law. It is, however, only in the power of the Spirit that the Law is written on our hearts and the veil is taken away from the Law.1 The problem of Law versus faith is only fully resolved in the doctrine of the Spirit.2

Paul's argument has come full circle and it is interesting to note just how relevant and, in fact essential, are all the various parts of the argument from vii:1 - vii:25. For the sake of detailed study, some sections may be viewed as if they were digressions, but for the full understanding of Paul's

1. Cf. N.W. Hamilton on II Cor.iii:15.ff. "If it is asserted that where the Spirit is there is freedom, we must conclude, in view of the context, that the Spirit is the means of enlightening the minds of Israel about the true nature of the Law, the means of removing the veil." The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul, SJTOP, No.6, p.5. See also Lyonnet, op.cit., p.567.f.

2. That this connection between Law and Spirit is not in opposition to Pauline Christology is well brought out by Hamilton. He points out that it is normally in redemptive action that the Spirit and the Lord are identified (op.cit., p.7) and in this action the self-effacing work of the Spirit is most obvious "the Spirit is pre-eminently the One who throws light upon Christ. Therefore in all His action He seeks to fill the consciousness of men with the picture of Christ - and to do this, He must avoid making Himself the object of consciousness ... His work of revealing Christ is by nature self-effacing, mysterious lest in the performance of His office He should detract men from Christ" (op.cit., p.6,n.4)
Cf. also Barth, op.cit., pp.88.ff.
theme, the unity of the whole must always be kept in view. The Christian life is not simply being united with Christ in baptism, or being freed from the Law through Christ, it is both of these in and through the possession of the Spirit. Having discussed the relation between the Law and the Spirit, we must now deal with another dominant theme in Romans viii - that of the oft-recurring antithesis - flesh and Spirit.¹

¹. This particular antithesis occurs in almost all verses from 1-13 though not in verses 14-17, where Paul speaks directly only of the Spirit (cf. Feuillet, p.376).

According to Paul those who have been united with Christ have died to their former way of life and have begun to live the new life of the Spirit (v.10). The problem for the Christian community is how to actualize this new life in the sinful world of which they themselves are still very much a part. The danger of a spiritual enthusiasm that fails to concern itself with the ethical implications of the new-found faith was always a very real one for Gentile converts. Paul wishes them to grow up in the faith, to become what in fact they already are. This process of development demands a struggle, the conflict of those who, though already belonging to the coming aeon, must validate their (future) citizenship in this present evil world. It is in order to describe this struggle that Paul employs the antithesis flesh and Spirit.

Paul's basic word for human flesh is σαρκί - the equivalent to the Hebrew נא. Paul confines 'sarx' to human flesh. But it is not thought of merely as the substance out of which the body is formed, which can as such be contrasted with the body. Neither should 'sarx' be understood as a part of the body, but rather the whole person considered from the point of view of his physical existence. By virtue of this, the term 'sarx' is interchangeable

1. Because of the frequency with which this word is used in this section, it will be transliterated, except where the Greek is necessary.
3. Ibid., p.17.
4. Cf. Robinson, op.cit., pp.17,18. This point is very important when the ethical use of 'sarx' is under consideration. Since it is the whole man that is involved in the 'sarx', then he cannot avoid personal responsibility for his actions by blaming the flesh (as if it were something foreign or external to his real self). This understanding of 'sarx' is well brought out by Bultmann (Theology, I, pp.232.f.) See also the recently published study by R. Jewett. This book is specially useful because, as its title suggests, (Paul's Anthropological Terms. A Study of their Use in Conflict Settings, A Study of their Use in Conflict Settings.) it seeks to interpret Paul's statements in their historical context. (p.6). Jewett also gives a valuable survey of the history of research.
with the personal pronoun as in Eph.v:28 "He that loveth his own wife loveth himself; for no man ever hated his own 'sarx!', or in II Cor.vii:5 (KJ) "Our flesh had no relief" is simply a periphrasis for "I".  

When man is designated as 'sarx' it means that he is being viewed in a particular light, cf. Jer.xxxii:27 - God is"the God of all flesh" - and Isa.xxxi:3 - the Egyptians are "men and not God; their horses flesh, and not Spirit." As is common with many Old Testament references flesh here represents man in his mortality - in his distance from God and in his weakness before God. The term 'sarx' describes man in his solidarity with all earthly existence in this world. This usage of 'sarx' tends to develop into a contrast "between mere external, racial connection and what is of real, spiritual, divine import" as in phrases such as Israel 'after the flesh' (I Cor. x:18 KJ), and the son born 'according to the flesh' (Gal.iv:23,29). In the latter case the son born 'according to the flesh' is contrasted with the one born through promise and 'according to the Spirit'. This contrast probably prepared the way for the typically Pauline understanding of 'sarx'.

As we have already noted Paul's general use of 'sarx' is in close agreement with the normal pattern of Old Testament usage where flesh specifically designates man in his creaturely existence and hence in his distance from God. For Paul the fact that man lives in a world which is under the domination of sin means that although man, like the rest of the world has been created by God, in solidarity with the whole of creation, he lives in alienation from God. The order in which man exists is controlled by powers

4. Ibid., p.22. See also R. Jewett, op.cit., pp.100, 453.
organized in opposition to God - the rulers (I Cor. ii:12), the god (II Cor. iv:4), the spirit (I Cor. ii:12), the elements (Gal. iv:3; Col. ii:8,20) of this age.\(^1\) Since man lives 'in the flesh' he is also subject to those powers which enslave or destroy a man. "The personification of these powers expresses the fact that man has lost to them the capacity to be the subject of his own actions."\(^2\) Thus the pre-Christian man has his whole life determined by the flesh and walks according to the flesh (κατὰ σάρκα).\(^2\) This form of action implies not only human weakness in contrast to divine power but opposition over against the Divine will. Action according to the 'sarkx' has here an ethical connotation and this is the distinctive Pauline contribution. Man

---

3. The phrase κατὰ σάρκα is used by Paul in a double sense. It is used normally in relation to substantives to characterize primarily a person or human relationship in regard to facts present within natural life and verifiable by everyone i.e. 'Abraham, our forefather, according to the flesh'; Jews are Paul's kinsmen 'according to the flesh'. But another point of view always hovers behind this one. When κατὰ σάρκα is used as a modifier of verbs the phrase has an altogether different meaning. It stamps an existence or attitude of mind not as natural or human, but as sinful as in II Cor.1:17 (purposing according to the flesh. AV.), knowing (II Cor.v:16), walking (II Cor.x:2, Rom.viii:4), warring (II Cor. x:3), even living according to the flesh (Rom.viii:5). This latter verse amounts to a definition of the concept. Κατὰ σάρκα is also contrasted with such phrases as 'according to the Spirit' (Rom.viii:4), or 'according to the Lord' (II Cor.xi:17) (lit.trans.). Σάρκις can also have the meaning of 'according to the flesh' (cf. I Cor.iii:3; II Cor.1:12; x:4). Bultmann suggests that κατὰ σάρκα fills the place of an adverb σάρκις (which occurs in Ignatius but not in the N.T.). Paul also uses σάρκινος in the same sense (Rom.vii:14; I Cor.iii:1) though it properly means consisting of flesh, (as matter) as in II Cor.iii:3. Cf. Bultmann op.cit., pp.237/8. R. Jewett maintains that κατὰ σάρκα is never used in a neutral sense in the epistle to the Romans.(op.cit.,p.162) Jewett wonders if the Bultmann-Fuchs-Schweizer interpretation of 'sarkx' - that life in the flesh is in itself neutral whereas life according to the flesh is evil - is really valid.(p.153). He seems to distinguish between 'sarkx' (a) as a psychological category in which man as a moral agent is culpable the moment he puts his trust in the 'sarkx' and (b) as a cosmic category in which man as flesh is still in bondage to the old aeon where there is no longer any possibility of neutral existence in the flesh. (op.cit., pp.115 and 153.).
as defined and determined by 'sarx' has become part of that hostile regime which is at enmity with God. The flesh itself is not sinful but only the trusting in it.\(^1\) The 'sarx' is not in and of itself evil - "the ultimate enemy of the Spirit of God is not flesh, but the sin of which the flesh has become the weak and corrupted instrument."\(^2\) The flesh is a corrupted not a corrupting element, "the involuntary accomplice to the act of sin, but not the criminal."\(^3\) Thus when a man is described or defined in terms of Spirit, it describes that 'in virtue of which he is open to and transmits the life of God"\(^4\) whereas 'sarx' is man in contrast with God. It is man living as mere man, seeking his life in and by himself, whether in lawlessness or in works - righteousness - "following the pursuit of the merely human"\(^5\) and seeking one's praise from men and not from God (Rom.viii:8).

According to W.D. Davies, in fifty-six references in Paul 'sarx' is used "in a purely material sense either of physical structure, or kinship, or sphere of present existence, or fleshly weakness; in thirty five cases it has an ethical significance."\(^6\) Although we have shown that for Paul the flesh is not in and of itself evil as in Hellenistic dualism, it is nevertheless impossible for us to find an exact Rabbinic equivalent for his use of ἰδρυκίνος and σωμακίνος \(^7\) and πνευματικός - ψυχικός. The Rabbis did not develop

\(^1\) E. Schweizer, TDNT. Vol.VII, p.129.
\(^3\) W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p.19.
\(^5\) Bultmann, op.cit., pp.238-239.
the potential ethical connotation of the Old Testament concept of flesh. The Rabbinic description of the ethical tendencies of men would have been to relate them to the good or evil impulse; the 'spiritual' for them is the one in whom the good impulse prevailed, the 'fleshy' the one in whom the evil dominated. Davies believes that Paul's ethical use of 'sarx' can be explained as a development of the Rabbinic good and evil impulse theory. O. Kuss, who devotes a large section in his commentary to a detailed discussion of 'sarx' (thirty five pages) is not quite so sure that Paul is not influenced by other than Rabbinic usage. He finds that no clear and satisfying answer can be given to the problem but that in the usage of flesh as weak and frail "In diesem abgeschwächten Sinne brauchte schliesslich auch ein vorausgehender Einfluss griechisch - hellenistischen Denkens auf die Konzeption des Apostels nicht gänzlich geleugnet zu werden."4

A similar point of view is held by Egon Brandenburger who finds close similarities between Paul and Hellenistic Judaism, particularly with Philo's concept of Wisdom.5 This author disagrees with E. Schweizer's view that Paul

1. H.W. Robinson holds that the contrast between flesh as man's frailty, dependence and incapacity in contrast with God or with Spirit, did not occur in Hebrew thought before Is.xxxi:3. According to Robinson the importance of the contrast that was then facilitated "consists in its being the point of departure for the Pauline doctrine of the flesh, with distinct ethical reference." (op.cit., p.25).
3. Op.cit., p.30. Though admitting Paul's dependence on the Alexandrian Book of Wisdom (as in Rom.i) Davies believes Paul still moves strictly within the realm of Rabbinic ideas and he believes that this is confirmed by a comparison of Rom.i with Rom.vii.
5. Cf. Fleisch und Geist: Paulus und die dualistische Weisheit, WMANT, Neukirchen, 1968. This author makes it clear that what we find in Paul is not Hellenism, but rather "a particular interpretation of Old Testament traditions by means of a dualistic Wisdom". (p.230). E. Käsemann holds that "Fleisch ist nach Paulus so etwas wie ein gnostische Aeon" and that this understanding cannot be derived from traditional Jewish or Hellenistic beliefs. Leib und Leib Christi. Eine Untersuchung zur paulinischen Begrifflichkeit, (Tübingen, 1933), p.105.
was the first to use the concept of 'sarx' as a power in antithesis to the Holy Spirit. According to Brandenburger, Paul did not simply develop the seeds of the doctrine inherent in Old Testament usage. Although he finds no exact parallel in Philo for Paul's concept of being εὐ δαρκά, Brandenburger claims "doch ist der Sache ein vergleichbarer kosmisch - umfassender Raumspekt deutlich vorhanden ... so stehen sich denn in der dualistischen Weisheit nicht nur Sarx und Sophia als Mächte antithetisch gegenüber, sondern sie sind, wie bei Paulus Sarx und Christus-Pneuma, zugleich als sich gegen-
sätzlich ausschliessende Räumlichkeiten, als Machtbereiche gedacht."  

Brandenburger does not believe that Paul is an uncritical borrower of Wisdom ideas and terminology but he is quite certain that such concepts as man being indwelt by, or living in the sphere of, hostile or redemptive powers find their adequate 'Verstehenshorizont' not (as Schweizer thinks) in the Old Testament but in the corresponding statements in dualistic Wisdom.  

It may be argued that the explanation of Paul's terminology, method of argument etc. is necessitated by the premises of his opponents. But this is not a full explanation of the facts. Paul presupposes that those whom he

---

1. Op.cit., p.226. Käsemann points out that neither this phrase nor καθίσταση δαρκα can be paralleled in Hellenistic literature. He emphasizes the close similarity between Pauline thought and certain gnostic concepts in which a man is regarded as being subject to a semi-personified α'ων, a power to which he is subject so long as he remains within its sphere, (op.cit., p.103).  
3. Brandenburger emphasizes that Paul's Christology exercises the decisive control in his use of these concepts. Cf. pp.228 and 235.  
6. Cf. Brandenburger, op.cit., p.228; H.Preisker "Das historische Problem des Römerbriefes", p.28. It is possible that Paul had to show that salvation does not come through the indwelling of Wisdom or being in Wisdom, but through transfer to the salvation sphere of Christ and that it is through dwelling under His Lordship, the Holy Spirit is mediated. (Brandenburger op.cit., p.230). In view of the many references to boasting which we have already noted in this epistle and also because of the many warnings against becoming proud or self-conceited (cf.xiii:7,20,25; xii:3; xiv:1-3), it is possible that the Roman Christians were in danger of developing some doctrine of Christian Wisdom which had no connection with the Old Testament but originated from a libertinistic understanding of faith. Cf. Jewett, p.304.
addresses already possess a knowledge of these popular philosophic concepts and motifs but they are too basic to Paul's own thinking to be explained merely as accommodation to the thought-forms of his audience.\(^1\) They demand another explanation — they are part of Paul's own thought pattern which he received from earlier Christians — "Viel eher kommt eine Vermittlung durch das vorpaulinische, hellenistisch-jüdische Christentum des syrisch-palästini-
schen Raumes in Frage."\(^2\) It may even be true that Paul, the convert, did not merely receive these concepts from earlier Christians but that already as a Jew he was acquainted not only with Rabbinic and Apocalyptic theology but also with the popular Wisdom philosophy.\(^3\) The reason why Paul writes to his congregation of their justification in terms of Apocalyptic-Rabbinic thought patterns (as in Rom.i-iv) and also in the present-future terminology paralleled in dualistic Wisdom (as in Rom.v-viii) may equally well be due to Paul's own background as well as that of the congregation.\(^4\)

A contrary view of the origin and development of Paul's doctrine of 'sarx' is proposed by R. Jewett. In this author's opinion the research of the last half-century has clearly demonstrated that "Paul's usage is neither gnostic, nor Hellenistic, nor Rabbinic."\(^5\) The closest parallels are in Qumran and to a lesser extent in Philo, but Qumran exegetes do not explicitly relate flesh to the demonic realm nor do they place it in clear opposition to the Spirit.\(^6\) This shows that although apocalyptic Judaism provides the raw mat-

---

2. Ibid. See also p.232.
4. Op.cit., pp.233-4. H. Preisker holds that the reason why Paul deals with the problem of present and future salvation in Romans is precisely because this was a problem for the Romans (rather than for Paul), op.cit., p.29.
6. Ibid.
erials for Paul's understanding of cosmic dualism, his interpretation is strictly his own creative formulation.¹ Jewett's thesis is that when Paul wrote I and II Thessalonians he had not yet developed his use of 'sarx' as a technical term.² This development came later in the dispute with the Galatians. 'Sarx' was first used as a technical term in connection with the circumcision problem posed by the Judaisers; "it developed through Paul's typological exegesis (on Isaac and Ishmael in Gal.iv) into a full dialectical counterpart to the Spirit; and after having been created as an argument against nomism it was applied to the problem of antinomianism."³

The concrete situation of conflict with the Judaisers also led Paul to connect 'sarx' with the old aeon.⁴ It was Paul's previously held apocalyptic views which enabled him to interpret the opposition to the church as a work of the demonic sphere;⁵ "for Paul 'sarx' is a personal, strictly human sphere and yet at the same time ... a cosmic, demonic force".⁶

We agree completely with Jewett's stress upon Paul's apocalypticism. We are not so happy however with his view that Paul's usage in Romans marks a movement towards Gnostic usage⁷ and that in this epistle Paul moves decisively in the direction of physical dualism.⁸ Perhaps some kind of compromise between the views of Brandenburger and those of Jewett would provide a more

---

¹ Ibid.
⁴ "When those who boast in the circumcised flesh actively oppose those boasting in the Spirit, they take on the aspect of demonic opposition to the new aeon" (Jewett, op.cit., p.101).
⁵ Ibid. This is in opposition to Brandenburger's view that Paul already had a notion of 'sarx' as a cosmic sphere which he then applied to this particular situation. (Cf. Brandenburger, op.cit., p.202). Jewett claims that there is no evidence whatsoever for Brandenburger's view. (op.cit., p.101).
adequate solution.

But whatever may be the actual background of the Pauline concept of 'saráx', it is still difficult to give a systematic and reasoned account of his use of the concept. It would appear that it is only when κατά sárxa is used in connection with the verb that we can clearly state that the ethical meaning of 'saráx' is intended (cf. Rom.viii:4). Elsewhere we find that ἐν sarpfi may have not only the normal neutral sense of living a human or physical existence, as in II Cor.x:3 (where Paul says we are ἐν sarpfi but do not war κατά sárxa, cf. Gal.ii:20, Phil.i:17), but the ethical connotation as in Rom.viii:9 (where the Christian community is said to be not ἐν sarpfi but ἐν πνεῦμα). This usage of ἐν sarpfi would appear to correspond to the verbal modification κατά sárxa 1 as in Rom.viii:4; it would also appear equivalent to τὸ φρόνημα τῆς sarpfocos (viii:5) which is set in contrast to the φρόνημα τῆς πνεῦματος 2. If we relate being in the flesh or in the Spirit to being in Adam or in Christ 3 (I Cor.xv:22), we find ourselves confronted once again with the concept of the two aeons - this aeon and the coming aeon. In Adam, in the old aeon, we live in the flesh and according to the flesh, whereas in Christ, in the coming aeon, we are called to live in the Spirit.

1. Jewett claims that for Hellenistic congregations, these two terms were synonymous. Paul realized this because of the ineffectiveness of his arguments against the Corinthians and thereafter ceased to use the neutral form and so had to give up his attempt to work out a systematic distinction between 'in the flesh' and 'according to the flesh'. Op.cit., p.154.
and according to the Spirit. ¹

This gives a clearer picture of the situation, but still leaves us with certain problems of interpretation with verses such as Rom.viii:13, where those in Christ are warned "If you live according to the flesh, you will die", and I Cor.iii:3 where the Corinthian congregation are still designated as οὐρακέοι ² even though they have already become Christians. It would appear that the best understanding of Paul's use of his terminology is that he operated with a two-fold description of the Christian life.³

Men may live either in the flesh or in the Spirit. If we live in the flesh, we will then be forced to live according to the flesh and the double designation seems superfluous. But as believers although we are 'in the Spirit' because we are 'in Christ' it is still possible for us to walk according to the flesh and not according to the Spirit (viii:13). The varied description of Christian faith is not without relevance. Paul's double description has as its basic concern the promotion of practical Christian living in the present. By Christ's redemptive act and through their incorporation into Him,

---

1. Although life 'according to the flesh' is contrasted with that 'according to the Spirit', this antithesis does not mean that these are exact equivalents or on the same plane. To live by the 'sarx' as the norm by which one directs one's life is simply to live by one's own possibilities whereas to live by the Spirit is to live by an alien possibility granted only in grace. Cf. Schweizer's article on the Spirit in TDNT, VI, (p.430).
2. Cf. Brandenburger, op.cit., p.47. Bultmann is of the opinion that the use of οὐρακέος here is equivalent to κατὰ σάρξ cf. Theology, I, p.238.
3. According to Schweizer, Paul regards the Spirit both as norm and as power. In so far as he wishes to stress that the Spirit is wholly God's gift and not man's own possibility, he regards the Spirit as power; in so far as he seeks to emphasize that the Spirit is the power which summons to faith and not a substance which deifies automatically, the Spirit is the norm by which the believer is summoned to live. This two-foldness is sharply expressed in Gal.v:25 "if the Spirit is the source of our life, let the Spirit also direct our course" (NEB). "The first clause maintains that the power πνεύμα which is above man sustains his life, while in the second clause man is summoned consciously to acknowledge this fact and let his conduct be wholly shaped thereby". (TDNT, VI, pp.427-428).
Christians share the new life of the age to come. They live in Him as the sphere or kingdom in which their real existence is determined. 'In Christ' has then a sort of spatial significance, and Christ is an inclusive sphere into which we enter by faith and baptism. This is only one aspect of the situation because a parallel designation may also be given. In Rom.vii:17.f. sin (as a personified power) has come to 'lodge' (N.E.B.) in man. The antithesis of this is given in viii:10.f. where Christ and the Holy Spirit dwell in the believing community in place of sin.

Man is thus regarded as always being under a power or lord. He lives in a certain αὐδὴ and under the power of that αὐδὴ. The Christ event makes possible a "Herrschaftswechsel" — a change or transfer from one exclusive sphere to another and this may be expressed by being in Christ in contrast to being in Adam, or by a 'now - then' antithesis as in Rom.vii: 5,6. By being joined to Christ, we are freed from the Law and from the powers of sin and the flesh. Our old man has been crucified with Christ and we now no longer serve in the letter but in the Spirit. This expresses the radical change that has come about in the Christ event. But this has

2. The domination of men by other powers is illustrated by the use of such terms as υπὲρθέος (used of sin in vi:14, death vi:9 and Law vii:1) and βασιλεύειν (used of sin vi:21, vi:12; of death vi:14,17; of grace vi:21). So too, slavery to a lord is witnessed to in various references to δουλεύειν (used in connection with the slavery of sin in vi:6, of the Spirit vii:6) and δοῦλος εἶναι (used in connection with sin and righteousness in vii:16,20. Cf. also the references in Gal.iv:3 to slavery to the elemental spirits of the universe.) The same situation is illustrated in the use of ὑπαγόμενος (used in connection with sin vii:16; the passions (of sin) vii:12; righteousness in vii:16) ἐν εἰς ἤλλο (under sin iii:9; vii:14, under the Law vii:14f; under grace vii:14ff.) and in περιπατεῖν (or εἰσχωκε) κατὰ σάρκα (or κατὰ πνεῦμα (viii:4,5). Cf. Brandenburger, p.55 (notes 2-8).
to be worked out in practice and here the eschatological understanding of redemption is most important. It was possible for Christians to claim that being justified by faith, they were free from the Law and a misunderstanding of the significance of ethical behaviour may have thus resulted (cf. vi:15). In order to avoid this, Paul describes salvation in Christ not only in legal imagery\(^1\) as in ch.iii:19.f., but also in the present-future tension of chs.vi-viii. The soteriology of Paul is thus seen to be fully understood only in the light of his eschatology,\(^2\) 'the already' of justification in the light of the 'not yet' of final redemption. It is for this reason that those who are designated as being no longer 'in the flesh'\(^3\) but 'in Christ' and 'in the Spirit' are exhorted not to live a life of contradiction, living under the domination of powers which now have no legal claims upon them,\(^4\) building again the things which they have destroyed (Gal.ii:18).

In this way the two-fold existence of the Christian becomes apparent. He lives \(\epsilon\nu\ \sigma\mu\rho\chi\) and \(\epsilon\nu\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omega\) ; his life is in this world but must not be determined by its powers. He must not only be \(\epsilon\nu\ \sigma\mu\rho\chi\) , and \(\epsilon\nu\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omega\) but he must walk \(\epsilon\nu\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\) (Gal.ii:20). He must live not by his own strength but by a power other than his own, he is obligated to "accept as a norm the power which in fact shapes his life".\(^5\) By this we see that though Paul may use different expressions and move in a thought world whose concepts are determined by a popular philosophy of Hellenistic-Judaism, or by the thorough-

---

3. According to J.A.T. Robinson the 'sarx' is personified as a force rather than a sphere in Rom.viii:12; xiii:14; and in Gal.v:13.
4. Believers, having found freedom from death, are given in and with this gift freedom from the world and its powers so that they face the world free - participating in it - "but with an inner aloofness 'as if' they did it not." Cf. Bultmann, Theology, I, pp.351-352.
going apocalypticism of Qumran, yet the manner of presentation in ch.viii is not only consistent with, but really a further development of the presentation of iii:21.f. where salvation is expressed in more normal Jewish-Christian categories. Faith is decisive in both interpretations although the manner of expressing it may vary greatly.¹

From this survey of the meaning of 'sarx' in Paul, two factors have emerged. By his use of the term 'sarx' Paul emphasizes the change that has come about through the Christ event. The new possibility of life in the Spirit has revealed the bondage of the self or 'sarx'-determined man. Those who are in Christ are no longer 'in the flesh' but now they are 'in the Spirit'. 'Sarx' is the life of man apart from God, but viewed from the perspective of faith.²

On the other hand, the new creation of God is still a hidden reality; the glory has not yet come and the Spirit is in fact only the first-fruits of the coming harvest. In view of these facts Paul emphasizes the possibility of those in Christ allowing their lives to be ruled by the powers of this world, rather than by the power of God i.e. the Holy Spirit. Even though in Christ we have been delivered from the powers of this world, there is still the danger that we may allow them to usurp control over our existence. Paul describes the resulting contradictory behaviour as action "according to the 'sarx'". 'Sarx' is a term used by Paul to help express the tension between the 'already' and the 'not yet'. Its basic function is to aid in the definition and direction of true Christian life in the here and now - in the interval between the Cross and the Parousia.

The full relevance of our study of the relation between the Spirit and the Law, and the significance of the Spirit-flesh contrast will be developed later in our study of the actual life-situation which we can envisage as underlying the teaching of ch.viii. Meanwhile we must consider the aim of Paul's teaching on the Holy Spirit in ch.viii.
The Implications of the 'Already' of the Spirit in viii:9-17.

In viii:7-25 Paul shows that though the Law itself is spiritual, its actual effects in the life of sinful men is not to free them but to hold them in a deeper bondage; in ch.viii Paul shows that the actual experience of the Christian community is that new life is experienced through possession of the Spirit. "By declaring that the endowment of the Spirit can be and is a reality of experience, Paul is affirming that the era of the Spirit, the Messianic era has come". Since the presence of the Spirit in power was to be a sign of the 'Endzeit', and the beginning of the new age, this confirmed the Messianic claims of Christ. It is not as a reward for good works but as the result of faith in Him through baptism that the Spirit is received (Gal.iii:2-3). The baptismal context of viii:3 (the sending of the Son) has already been mentioned and this context as we will see later is also very much in evidence in vv.14-17. In v.9b the possession of the Spirit is given as a kind of definition of those who belong to Christ. This definition is extended in v.14 to show that it is the Spirit who controls us and not vice-versa; it is true to say that we have the Spirit dwelling in us (v.9), but this is only fully understood in the light of v.14 where the Spirit is a sort of 'Führer' who leads us in God's way. The Spirit is both the sphere in which the Christian community lives (v.9) and the norm by which they ought to set their mind (vv.5-6) and to order their behaviour (v.12). In v.14 we note another advance on the thought of v.9 in that believers are no longer described as those who belong to Christ but as those who are the sons of God.

2. D. Hill, Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings, p.269.
3. Ibid.
Paul in chs.v-viii as we have already noted, is deeply concerned with the actual life of men - with the actualization of life (or righteousness) and its significance in the present. In v.9 he addresses the Romans directly and reminds them of their real standing and identity due to their possession of the Spirit. Since Christ dwells in them the body is dead\(^1\) because of sin,\(^2\) but the Spirit is life because of righteousness. This Spirit is that power by which Jesus is raised from the dead and He can be expected to do for them what He has already done for Christ.\(^3\) But despite this declaration of what is ours through the possession of the Spirit (cf. also v.6 where the Spirit leads to life and peace, and v.8 where it is implied that by living in the Spirit we are enabled to live a life that is pleasing to God), Paul's real concern is not merely to inform the Romans about their inheritance in Christ Jesus. Neither is he imparting to them some esoteric knowledge such as might lead to antinomian enthusiasm. The direct form of address which begins in v.9 and is marked by ἀπό ὑμῶν, followed by the personal reference (brethren) in v.12, shows that Paul's intention is to establish the fact that the possession of the Spirit brings new demands, a new kind of obligation (cf.vi:15.ff) in contrast to the obligations to the flesh. It is possible that the Roman Christians held some such doctrine of obligation to the flesh or obligation to make provision for the flesh (ch.xiii:14).\(^4\) If this is so then the reason for Paul's direct personal appeal in vv.12.ff is that he regards this doctrine as

---

1. "This means that the flesh-ruled self is dead because sin is condemned; the new self ruled by the divine pneuma is alive because uprightness (of conduct) has now become a reality." Cf. Bultmann, Theology, pp.208-9. Cf. also J.A.T. Robinson, op.cit., p.30.
2. It is worth noting that the body is said to be dead not because of its fleshly constitution, but because of sin i.e. Paul avoids any suggestion that mere bodily existence is of itself the cause of sin and the corollary that freedom from the body is the guarantee to life, cf. Jewett, op.cit.p.148.
an extremely dangerous one. This is probably why in vv.12-13 he seems tempted to change from the normal indicative to the stronger imperative.\(^1\)

For Paul the possession of the Spirit means not just spiritual experience but the challenge of new ethical demands.\(^2\) It is required of those who have been freed from the power of the 'sarx' that they put to death the deeds of the body ('sarx')\(^3\) by the power of the Spirit. Only thus will they find the way to life. That this is no optional virtue is shown by the fact that Paul sees fit, even at this late stage in the discussion, to warn the Christian community of the possibility of death (v.13). For Paul, the Spirit did impart blessings to be enjoyed, but his warning here shows the seriousness with which he held that the Spirit is at the same time God's gift and God's demand.

Paul resists the temptation to turn to the imperative and instead includes a further exposition of baptismal teaching (v.14-17).\(^4\) Perhaps Paul felt that he had been too severe in his warning concerning Christian obedience and so he hastens to point out that the new obedience is not intended to bring again a servile obedience of fear,\(^5\) but rather the confident assur-

\(^1\) Cf. Luz. "Zum Aufbau von Röm.i-viii." (p.177).
\(^2\) Bultmann states that Paul's peculiar contribution to the doctrine of the Spirit is the attribution of ethical conduct. Theology, I, p.162. In this he follows Gunkel whom Hunter holds to be in error. Cf. op.cit., p.146. Snaith also holds that the ethical understanding of the Spirit was already present in the Old Testament, op.cit., p.156.
\(^3\) Cf. J. Robinson (op.cit., p.30). Bultmann attempts to distinguish between the self which has fallen under the sway of 'sarx' and the real self. It is more likely that Paul intends the whole man as under the sway of 'sarx'. Cf. Bultmann, op.cit., Vol.1 (p.197). Jewett holds that Paul refers to the body rather than the 'sarx' for theological reasons, namely that the 'body' category could bridge the gap between the old and the new man but the 'sarx' category could not. Op.cit., pp.159-60.
\(^4\) Cf. Luz, op.cit., p.177.
\(^5\) The reference to slavery in v.15 should be taken to refer to life under the Law. (cf. Schmidt, p.141). For this reason it seems preferable to regard this as a comparison of life under the Spirit with that under the Law and to understand both the references (in v.15) as referring to the Holy Spirit.
ance of adoption to sonship through the Spirit (v.15). The intimate confidence of the new relationship is demonstrated by the believers calling God 'Abba', as a child would speak to its father.\(^1\) This Aramaic word was so well understood by the Apostolic Church that it was not necessary for it to be translated. It probably did not refer to the opening word of the Lord's Prayer but rather to the cry of the baptized believer which was regarded as witness to his adoption as a son of God through the indwelling of the Spirit (Gal.iv:6). According to Gal.iv:1.f., God sent His Son that we might receive adoption as sons, and because we are sons God has also sent the Spirit of His Son into our hearts. The 'Abba' cry is the sign of our adoption. "In that cry the Spirit of God joins with our spirit in testifying that we are God's children" (v.16 NEB). "Through this witness the Spirit provides the believer with the subjective certainty of his sonship."\(^2\)

In both contexts, Gal.iv and Rom.viii, the point is that the old slavery is over and the new relationship is not slavery but love. An interesting fact which we must pursue later is that, in Galatians, Paul argues from the 'Abba' cry to show that the Galatians should not return to bondage to the elemental spirits,\(^3\) whereas in Romans he proceeds to the question of suffering.

---

1. Cf. J. Jeremias 'Abba' in The Central Message of the New Testament, London, 1965, pp.9-30. Jeremias holds that there is no evidence in the Palestinian Judaism of the first millennium that anyone addressed God as 'Abba', 'my Father'. It was a word which originated in the language of infants and though it developed wider meanings, in Jewish opinion it could not properly be used with reference to God. Jesus was the first who dared to use this address to God and He also taught His disciples to do so, so that by His authorisation they might also participate in His intimate communion with God. Hence this 'Abba' implies the claim of a unique revelation and a unique authority by Jesus. This is why it was preserved by the early church.

2. N.Q. Hamilton, op.cit., p.32.

3. According to Bandstra by the elemental spirits Paul means to refer to the Law and the flesh "as operative in the world of humanity before and outside of Christ." Cf. op.cit., p.173.
If we hold that the Galatian passage points to the actual situation of the Galatian Christians it is only consistent to hold that the references to suffering should give us a pointer to the actual situation to which Paul addresses himself in Rome.

Paul wishes to reassure the Romans by reminding them that they have been adopted as God's children. In v.17 he makes a progression of thought so that from the adoption of children (or sons), he proceeds to the concept of heirs to God, and even more significant, - joint-heirs with Christ. He is God's own Son, the true heir and "they will receive what He received i.e. they will be glorified with Him." Far from being slaves, the believers are the heirs of the world and with this imagery Paul reminds his readers again of the Messianic fulfilment in Jesus Christ - the new age is already dawning. What is most significant however is that the possession of the Spirit is related not to unbridled enthusiasm or world-denying rapture but to the concept of sonship and heirs. It would appear that the legal imagery of sonship has been wedded to the regenerative image of the Spirit. In the very place where he affirms the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit Paul takes care to avoid the extremes of spiritual enthusiasm to which Hellenistic communities were most susceptible. His mode of correction is to emphasize our incorporation into Christ and our sharing all things in Him. Here as in ch.vi the baptismal context is evidenced by the συμ compounds. An interesting insight into the meaning of the formula 'with Christ' is proposed by

1. H.Q. Hamilton, op.cit., p.32.
2. A.M. Hunter notes that Jesus' own baptism was linked with an experience of the Spirit and a realization of His own unique sonship, op.cit., pp.136-7.
Edouard Schweizer. In his opinion this phrase probably originally referred to post-parousia life with Christ. By the fact that resurrection had already taken place in Jesus Christ and that the gift of the Spirit had been experienced by believers, it seemed that in their rising with Christ in baptism the resurrection was past already and that in the church the new aeon had been fully established. Schweizer believes that instead of the Corinthians denying a future life (as Paul mistakenly thought) they believed that it had already come and was therefore no longer to be expected in the future. Against this enthusiasm Paul emphasizes that the rising with Christ is still to be awaited. This interpretation is helpful for our understanding of Rom.viii: 17.f. where we find that sharing in future glory with Christ is immediately related to sharing in earthly suffering with Him. Schweizer notes that 'with Christ' references occur only in apocalyptic and baptismal contexts and that in compounds with σῶv the usage is somewhat similar.

It would seem then that in the act of baptism where the transfer from the realm of flesh to that of the Spirit took place, Paul emphasized not only the 'putting off' of the old man and the 'putting on' of the new, but also the 'not yet' of redemption alongside the 'already' as a healthy corrective towards true Christian perspective.

---

1. According to Schweizer 'with Christ' was originally an apocalyptic formula. Sayings such as I Thess.iv:17 and II Cor.xiii:4 (cf. also Rom.vi:6b; Col. iii:14) show that 'with Christ' describes life after the parousia of Christ. Baptism was originally closely connected with apocalyptic ideas (cf. Rom. vi:6; Col.ii:13,20) and was understood as giving admission to the kingdom of God. (cf. Mk.x:15; Jn.iii:5; I Cor.vi:9-11). Cf. op.cit., pp.1-8. L.S. Thornton points out that in Matt.xix:28 θαυμάζωναθήσεται refers to the renewal of all things, whereas in Tit.iii:5 it refers to baptism. This usage supports Schweizer's thesis. Cf. The Common Life in the Body of Christ, p.189.


3. Ibid., p.8.

4. Ibid., p.3.
It was not that Paul did not believe that something definite happened in baptism. Paul believed that the dying to the old life of sin had definitely taken place in our incorporation into Christ, but in a paradoxical way. This life had to validate itself in the obedience of the believer - in suffering with Christ. Baptism does mean participation in the life of the Spirit but only in the first-fruits of the new life, not in the final apocalyptic 'living with Christ', which is still to be awaited. The practical meaning of Christ's resurrection (and our rising with Him in baptism) is to walk in newness of life and to share in His sufferings (cf. vi:4 and viii:17).

2. Ibid. Cf. Jewett's summary of this point - "the new life is characterized by obedience to the Spirit rather than by transcendence over the contingencies of earthly existence." op.cit., p.149.
The Implication of the 'Not Yet' of the Spirit in viii:18-30.

With v.18 Paul begins the second main section of ch.viii. We may regard it as related to the first in that viii:1-17 may be designated as the 'now' of the present i.e. the life in the Spirit in contrast to vii:7-25 the 'then' of life under the Law, whilst viii:18-39 may be regarded as the present in the light of the future fulfilment - the partial realization in the light of the final consummation.\(^1\) In the strange logic of faith,\(^2\) the sufferings of the present -\(\tau\omega\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\rho\omicron\omicron\upsilon\) are not worthy to be compared with the coming glory. The coming glory is central in vv.18-30 and the climax of this section (in v.30) concludes with the glorification of God's children.\(^3\) The emphasis of this section appears to be on the incompleteness of our present redemption. Verse 19 shows that the earth (\(\chi\iota\iota\omicron\iota\omicron\iota\omicron\zeta\)) has not yet been redeemed. It is literally "craning its neck" in expectancy\(^4\) for the great day of redemption. This reminds us of the 'extra nos' of salvation. The Spirit as the power of God comes from outside of and beyond us and what we find here is another aspect of redemption which cannot be understood simply in terms of the individual i.e. the renewal of the creation.\(^5\) The creation was subjected to futility\(^6\) (v.20) not by its own choice but through the sin

---

2. Cf. Schmidt's comment "\(\alpha\omicron\gamma\iota\chi\omicron\omicron\upsilon\) ist hier wie iii:28, vii:11 Ausdruck für die Logik des Glaubens", p.145.
4. This is the literal meaning of \(\alpha\omicron\omega\chi\alpha\omicron\omicron\iota\iota\alpha\) in viii:19 according to L.C. Allen, "The Old Testament in Rom.i-viii". Vox Evangelica, 1964, p.18.
6. \(\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\zeta\) has here the meaning of corruption (\(\varphi\theta\omicron\omicron\alpha\) ), cf. Schmidt, p.146.
Redemption is not purely a redemption of the inner man, but of the whole man and of the whole creation. Paul is no Hellenist in this respect. Life in the Spirit is not a denial of further earthly existence nor a means of release from the body. In v.11 he has already emphasized that the Holy Spirit is God's power by which our mortal bodies will be made alive. The use of this death-life terminology shows how much Paul's view differs from that of resuscitation or soul-survival beyond death. Paul accepted death as a reality, but he had faith in a God who gives life to the dead, (cf. iv:17).

The manner in which Paul addresses the Romans in v.11 ("He will give life to your mortal bodies") shows that for him the full and complete victory over death would be attained when the believers themselves had triumphed over death through the Spirit by whom Christ was resurrected from the dead. The process of redemption will not be complete until the redemption of our bodies (v.23). This is no private matter of individual resurrection,

1. As by the sin of man the creation was subjected to corruption (whether by Adam or God) so in the redemption of man the creation is also effected and thus participates in salvation history. Cf. Cullmann, op.cit., p.130 (n.1) and p.254.
2. The reference is not only to humanity as Schlatter suggests (p.269) but to the whole of the creation. Cf. Lietzmann, p.84.
3. Paul does see a continuity between the earthly and heavenly bodies, but in contrast to Gnostic views, this is based not on a continuity of existence through death, but rather upon a miracle of God. Cf. Schweizer, TDNT, Vol.VI, p.420.
4. Schweizer notes that out of the 124 occurrences of the word ανασκευασθησαν in the New Testament (counting the duplications in the Synoptics but excluding places where it is used as meaning corpse or slave) 91 occur in Paul (excluding the Pastorals). In accepted letters of Paul the term occurs 69 times in Corinthians and Romans and only 14 times elsewhere. From this pattern Schweizer concludes that the term body had been shaped by Paul in discussion with his opponents at Corinth. When Paul takes up this term he is first of all a Greek-speaking Hebrew. What is significant for us is to ask whether Paul discerned similar tendencies in Rome to those of Corinth or is he merely continuing to make use of a convenient theological concept? Cf. op.cit., pp.4.f. See also Jewett, op.cit., pp.254-304.
but involves the whole of the creation; from the renewal of believers through faith, Paul argues to the renewal of the whole of creation.

A similar emphasis upon the 'already' and the 'not yet' is clearly demonstrated in Paul's doctrine of the Holy Spirit. In v.23 the Christian community is described as having already received the first fruits of the Spirit;¹ their redemption however, is still incomplete. The Spirit shows us to be heirs who must await the coming glory.² Even though the Spirit designates us children of God (v.16) we are still groaning and so is the Spirit and the rest of creation in unison with us. We are heirs - we can be called sons of God but the full manifestation of our adoption is not yet possible. This is not in conflict (as some texts seem to have thought)³ with the receiving of the Spirit of adoption (v.15). We receive the first-fruits only of the Spirit and it would be inconsistent if we were to receive now the fullness of our adoption with only the first instalment of the Spirit. The new creation⁴ has

1. The άρωπή of the harvest is the guarantee of the coming of the whole. In II Cor.i:22 the Spirit is designated as the άρωπή - a word which means down-payment or deposit. In Rom.viii:23 the Spirit is designated as the first instalment of that which is still to be consummated. But it is a real foretaste and not merely a guarantee of a future participation. Cf. Lietzmann, p.85, also Michel, p.176 n.1.


3. Leenhardt notes that some witnesses of considerable authority (e.g. D G Ephr.) omit άρωπής έστιν. Lyonnet and Benoit agree with the opinion represented by these texts but Leenhardt considers they are all wrong in that the issue in question here is not the augmentation of the adoption, which is inconceivable, but of a development of its consequences, cf. v.19 where creation awaits not the presence of the sons of God, which is already a fact, but their manifestation. Cf. Leenhardt, p.228 (note).

4. Prof. Käsemann has emphasized the connection between justification by faith and the new creation (e.g. "The Righteousness of God in Paul" NTOT, pp. 177 ff.). In their studies under Professor Käsemann, P. Stuhlmacher and C. Müller have developed Käsemann's view, cf. Stuhlmacher, Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus (particularly pp.226 ff.) and Müller, Gottes Gerechtigkeit und Gottes Volk (particularly pp.99 ff.). E. Schweizer claims that since Paul viewed the cross and resurrection as the great turning point of history, then he has to view life in the Spirit as the life of the new creation (op.cit., p.416). Robinson makes the point not so often mentioned in radical German opinion that "the new creation is not a fresh start but the old made new - not a νέον but a καινόν κτίον (p.82). Cf. also Jeremias Justification by Faith, op.cit., pp.51-70.
already begun with the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and the Spirit has already been given but only as "the anticipation of the end in the present".\(^1\) What we have through the Spirit is real and significant but it is only a portion of that which is still to come. What we have now we have by faith and not by sight because what we see we do not need to hope for (v.24). In this world we are similar to the rest of the (as yet) unredeemed creation; the new creation is still visible only in faith and its full manifestation must be awaited with patience. The Son of God has already been revealed but not yet the sons of God. It is for the goal of their ultimate revelation that God's purpose\(^2\) is working. "For those who love God, the Spirit co-operates for good" (v.28).\(^3\)

The purpose of God is concerned with the creation of a new humanity patterned upon Jesus Christ the first-born\(^4\) of the new family of God.\(^5\) The \(\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\) compounds\(^6\) that have been so frequent since ch.vi:1 now come to their climax in

---

2. Paul gives a distinct new development to the term \(\pi\delta\sigma\sigma\upsilon\) when he uses it to designate God's decision for us which resulted in the Christ-event and which assures the elect of their final attainment of glory. For Paul this concept of God's purpose is primarily a reference to God's faithfulness, His self-consistency, cf. Is.xlii:10 "My council shall stand and I shall accomplish all my purpose." CF. C.Maurer, TWNT. VIII, pp.166.f. Cf. also Michel, (p.211, n.1 and 2).
3. This is the interpretation proposed by M. Black. Neotestamentica et Patristica. Festschrift, O. Cullmann. Leiden (1962), pp.166-172.
4. In \(\pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\upsilon\nu\) the basic emphasis is the idea of priority (in the order of sonship) the idea of generation is vague and secondary (Leenhardt, p.234).
6. Cf. Robinson's comment - "He (Paul) coins strange new words with the prefix \(\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\) rather than use the plain preposition. He clearly feels the painful inadequacy of language to convey the unique 'withness' that Christians have in Christ." op.cit., p.63.
the phrase - συμμόρφους της εἰκόνος τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ (v.29). The Son Himself is εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ (II Cor.iv:4; Col.i:15), so that by being conformed to Christ, we become conformed to the image of God. This transformation of humanity is effected through the gospel of Christ (II Cor.iv:4) by the work of the Holy Spirit whereby we are changed from one degree of glory to another (II Cor.iii:18). The purpose of God is to restore to man His own image2 and to enable man to share His glory by sharing (being conformed to) the image of His Son.3

The reference to glory (vv.17 and 30) reminds us again of the strong apocalyptic emphasis of ch.viii and also of the previous sinful condition of men described in ii:16 - iii:20, where sinning is equated with the falling short of the glory of God (iii:23). Through the gift of righteousness life and glory are now available in Christ Jesus. The corruption in which we now share with the whole creation, will one day be transformed to be replaced by its opposite - the glory of God (cf. the contrast of glory with corruption

1. Cf. Kümmel (on Col.iii:10) "The meaning of the sentence is that the Christian is renewed through becoming like the 'New Man', Christ; and that through this at the same time a likening to the image of the Creator also takes place. If Paul does not actually clearly state that the image of God given through belonging to the 'New Man', Christ is the renewing of the lost original image of God, we must nevertheless draw this conclusion". op.cit., pp.68-69.

2. Leenhardt notes that the meaning of μορφή is very close to that of δόξα; the words occur together not only here but also in II Cor. iii:18 and Phil.iii:21. It is this closeness of meaning between glory and form that facilitates the transition from the idea of 'conform' to that of 'glorify together with' (v.17), pp.233-234.

3. Leenhardt notes the close association in Paul of the ideas of μορφή - form, and εἰκὼν - image. The emphasis here is not on the external form (as opposed to the internal) nor on the peripheral (as opposed to the essential). "The form is that which permits us to know the reality; it is the content emerging and becoming communicable", p.233.
in Cor.xv:43). Glory is the final consummation of God's purpose for mankind.¹

For God's people glorification is still a future hope² though its realization should not be questioned. The prefix πρό occurring three times in vv.28-29 (πρόδεσις, πρόγνω, προφέρεσις) implies the priority of the purpose of God to historical manifestations and the aorist tenses in vv. 30-31 show that "the divine will is already shaped in the eternity of God and the accidents of history can avail nothing against it."⁴ The basic claim that Paul is making in this passage is that God has a purpose to create a new humanity after the image of Jesus Christ⁵ and that He will provide the means whereby

1. The significance of glory in the letter to the Romans is strongly emphasized by Barrett. cf.pp.46.ff, 74, 103, 164.ff., 170. Jeremias, following Aalen and von Rad, refers to Jerusalem as the city of God on the world-mountain from which the shining out of the bright beam of the 'kabhod' is the signal for the eschatological pilgrimage of the nations. In the idea of the 'kabhod' lies the conception of a geographical centre i.e. Jerusalem which is the centre of the one holy community of God's people. Jesus' Promise to the Nations. (p.66), The Gentile World in the Thought of Jesus. (pp.26-7).

In view of this we can appreciate how difficult it would be for Jewish Christians to envisage a messianic community which was divorced from Jerusalem and the Jewish people. Such a community could no longer hope to share in the holy presence of God - to dwell under the wings of the 'Shekinah'. Cf. H. Sahlin "The New Exodus of Salvation according to St. Paul, " in The Root of the Vine, pp.81-95 (p.90).

2. In the sense that we already enjoy the first-fruits of the Spirit it is also correct to say that glorification has already begun, cf. Zahn, as quoted in Leonhardt, p.235.

3. The reference to foreknowledge implies the concept of election. The Hebrew verb יָד signifies the most intimate personal knowledge, whereby God concerns Himself with those whom He knows, sets His love upon them and enters into covenant with them. Cf. Amos iii:2 "You only have I known of all the families of the earth" - cf. Snaith, op.cit. pp.108 and 135.f.


5. The predestination mentioned in v.29 is predestination to conformity with the image of Jesus Christ. Cf. also Conzelmann's statement - "it is wrong method to systematize the individual concepts as a series of different metaphysical acts or different stages of inner experience. The sequence is simply meant to point to the whole extent of salvation as God's act". Theology, p.253.
His plan will come to fruition. It is not a question of exclusion or inclusion of individuals as such (Paul's letters are normally addressed to the whole congregation; when he does send greetings, information etc. to individuals it is not generally to do with the doctrinal content of his message); Paul's concern is with the people of God and in vv.31-39 his intention is to show that God is for His people and therefore they are secure whoever or whatever may stand against them. Paul's doctrine is implicitly trinitarian. In vv.26-27 the Spirit helps and intercedes, in v.31 God is for us "He who delivered up His Son for us will give us all things with Him" and in v.34 Jesus Christ, the victorious risen, Lord stands at God's right hand to intercede for us.
The Function of Paul's Teaching on the Spirit in Ch.viii.

In our study of the function of Paul's doctrine of the Spirit in ch. viii, we have looked at the teaching on the Spirit under three main aspects, I. in relation to the Law, II. in contrast with the 'sarx', III. in relation to the 'already' and the 'not yet' of redemption.

In the first instance, the teaching on the Spirit is specifically connected with the baptismal instruction and points to the radical newness of life¹ in the coming aeon which has begun with the resurrection of Jesus Christ (by the Father through the Spirit). The Spirit is the One who brings life and sustains life. The Law became allied with the destructive powers of sin and death and so could not bring life. In the new age the Spirit transforms the Law so that it can be properly understood as a witness to Jesus Christ, whom we now serve not in the oldness of the letter, but in the newness of the Spirit. In place of slavery and fear we have now freedom and confidence, the confidence of children on intimate terms with their father. The Spirit is the means by which we personally partake of the life won for us by Jesus Christ. The Spirit is 'extra nos' but also gives within us the subjective assurance of our incorporation into Christ.

Secondly, in the contrast between the Spirit and the 'sarx' we noted that the chief emphasis was upon the understanding of the two-fold tension of the Christian life - the tension between the 'already' and the 'not yet'.²

1. Feuillet points out that it has not been sufficiently acknowledged in how great measure Paul's language is patterned upon that of the prophets who announced a new order, (p.379).
2. Cullmann considers this tension to be the essence of eschatology, and since it recurs throughout Rom.viii in connection with the teaching on the Spirit, this shows that Paul regarded the Spirit as central in his understanding of eschatology. Cf. Salvation in History, pp.229.f and 255.f.
The basic function of the Spirit - 'sarx' contrast was to give guidance as to the appropriate way of life for those who are already in Christ but who must live in the as yet unredeemed world.

The third use that Paul makes of his teaching on the Spirit is to emphasize the 'unfulfilledness' of our redemption. In this section the Christian life was characterized as a time of waiting. We wait because we have received the first-fruits, but not yet the full harvest of the Spirit. In this time of waiting the Spirit intercedes for us and helps us in our sufferings. Through the agency of the Spirit, God co-operates in all things for our good. The incompleteness of our salvation is further emphasized in the statement that we still await the redemption of our bodies. This is paralleled in the groaning of creation which also eagerly expects the day when the full revelation of God's sons takes place and the full fruits of the Spirit are enjoyed in a new creation.¹

Paul wished to show that in the gift of the Spirit the life of the new creation is already a present experience. But since it is only the first fruits of the Spirit which we now enjoy we must continue to live by faith and according to the Spirit. By this means alone we will reach the goal of full redemption when the conflict between the Spirit and the 'sarx' will be finally resolved in a new body in the renewed creation. For Paul the teaching on the Spirit (in Rom.viii at least) centres ultimately on the proper understanding and practice of the life of faith in the present time i.e. between the resurrection of Christ and the parousia.

Whether or not this conclusion gives us any real indication concerning the life-context to which Rom.viii is addressed will be discussed in a later section.

¹ Cf. Hamilton, op.cit., p.32.
The Theme and Style of Rom.viii:31-39.

The opening phrase of v.31 ( γι γνωστα σπουδασμι ) brings us back to the diatribe style again. With Jeremias we consider the προς ταυτα as referring to the content of an objection behind v.18. Verse 31 is thus recapitulating and concluding the answer to the false suggestion that suffering makes our salvation insecure. The emphasis upon the value and necessity of hope in vv.24-25 would appear to support the view that suffering, or the threat of suffering raised a severe problem for the Roman Christians.

Supporting evidence for the question-objection style in vv.18.f. may be found in the σομαν in vv.22 and 28. Verses 18-21 may then be regarded as a preliminary answer to the question and v.22 points to an accepted exegesis of Gen.iii:13, which would have been familiar to Jews and apparently also to Christians. Verse 28 would then be regarded as a further answer to the same problem, again by a reference to a commonly accepted belief - that God works for the good or the salvation of His people.

The interesting fact about the change in style, particularly from vv. 31.ff. is that this prepares us for the return of the diatribe style, so obvious in chs.ix-xi and shows that Paul was leading up to the questions of God's purpose for Israel in chs.ix-xi. The other characteristic of viii:31.ff is that it exhibits the exultant note of praise and the balanced structure common to credal or hymnic formulations.  

2. op.cit., p.148.
4. Michel divides this section into strophes - 31b-32; 33-34; 35-37; 38-39; he considers that it may have been an early Christian hymn. (p.213).
This section reveals parallels with the diatribe style of chs.ix-xi and also with the exultant kerygmatic style common in ch.v and ch.viii, and may thus be regarded as transitional between chs.viii and ix. The questions occurring throughout the section reveal a similar feature.\(^1\) The repeated questions remind us of the diatribe style but the parallel with the Old Testament law-suit pattern (cf. Is.50)\(^2\) brings before us the juristic imagery of viii:1-3 and chs.i-v. Verse 32 shows that we stand before the supreme Judge who has already decided in our favour, who has already in and with His Son decreed that all is ours. In v.33 an accuser is introduced to the scene. Then the question is asked - "Can anyone lay any charge against God's elect?"

In the following verses Paul lists all the things that might conceivably separate the Christians from the love of Christ. It is not clear whether he is thinking of a separation due to a legal condemnation, or the forceful separation of hostile powers who are seeking to destroy us. A problem is raised by the inclusion of life in the list in v.38. Death we can interpret as one of the powers threatening our existence (as already noted in chs.v-viii). In I Cor.iii:22 death and life are included in the list of the things that are ours in Christ. They are also preceded by a reference to the cosmos and followed in the list by "things present and things to come". The Corinthian context would seem to support the interpretation that Paul is considering all the powers and forces that might possibly threaten the believers'  

\(^1\) These questions are not merely rhetorical as Bultmann suggests (Der Stil, p.71) but real (or at least possible) objections that might be introduced against Paul's doctrine, cf. Michel, p.213.  
existence in this world.\textsuperscript{1} It is questionable whether Paul wished to give an exact meaning to each term but the investigation of the concepts helps us to discover what Paul intends to convey by their inclusion.

The LXX version of the Psalter translated 'Yahweh of hosts' as 'Lord of the powers' (συνάγωνος). It was also in the LXX that εξουσίαι (authorities) and ἑρωάς (principalities) were first applied to angelic beings.\textsuperscript{2} Lietzmann regards ὑσώμα and βάρος as astrological terms denoting the proximity or distance of a star from its zenith.\textsuperscript{3}

Caird points out that the personification of law, sin and death as a trio of evil forces by which human life is held in bondage is sufficient to explain Paul's teaching in Romans, but not to account for his thought in Galatians or Colossians.\textsuperscript{4} If we accept the interpretation of εξουσίαι in Rom. xiii:1 as referring to both the State and to the angel powers,\textsuperscript{5} we would be required to add another power to this suggested trio. Cullmann has shown that in all the earliest Christian creeds, no matter how brief they were, a reference was made to Christ's victory over the powers by His death on the cross.\textsuperscript{6} To the first Christians it was extremely important that Christ had obtained this cosmic victory. Caird follows Cullmann's interpretation of εξουσίαι and notes a parallel between the Law and the State.\textsuperscript{7} Both exhibit the double

\textsuperscript{3} op.cit., pp.88-89.
\textsuperscript{4} op.cit. pp.44-46.
\textsuperscript{5} This view was first proposed (though later rejected) by M. Dibelius in his book Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus, Göttingen, 1909. Its strongest exponent has been O. Cullmann, cf. Christ and Time and The State in the New Testament, London (1957). Cullmann argues that "in every other passage and Paul speaks of them often) the reference in exousias is to invisible angelic powers and forces." (cf. The State in the New Testament, p.66.)
\textsuperscript{6} The Earliest Christian Confessions. ET. London,1949 (pp.59.ff).
\textsuperscript{7} op.cit., p.23.
possibility, of serving the purpose of God, or of becoming a demonic force in the world.¹ Caird suggests that in Romans, the powers might be limited to the trio of law, sin and death. A somewhat similar view has been proposed by Bandstra in his book "The Law and the Elements of this World". According to this author, in the New Testament period ὁ τῶν ἁγγελών was used to designate the basic forces inherent in a thing, so that in Gal. iv:3,9 and Col. ii:8,20 this term refers to "the fundamental forces in the world by which Paul specifically means the law and the flesh as operative in the world of humanity before and outside of Christ."² This conclusion is based largely on the striking conformity between statements made about the Law and the ὁ τῶν ἁγγελών³ which had been previously noted by R. Leivestad.⁴

It would appear that Bandstra has conclusively proved that by these elemental spirits Paul very often intended to refer to the Law and the flesh. It is questionable if he has shown that Paul limits his understanding of the elemental spirits only to these two.⁵ Otherwise his thesis is very helpful and emphasizes the dual possibilities inherent in the Law, the flesh, in fact in every part of human existence in the world.⁶ Bandstra is consistent in that he appears to regard the angels in the same light - the Law being the instrument used by good angels (Gal. iii:19) and by evil powers (Col. ii:15)

1. op.cit. p.49.
2. op.cit., p.173.
3. op.cit., p.71.
5. The criticism has been made that Bandstra removes the terms which Paul uses from their apocalyptic context and redefines them in terms of human inability to fulfill the Law. Cf. The review by V. Furnish in JBL LXXXIV (1965), pp. 192-3.
6. The understanding of the cosmos in the New Testament is particularly illuminating in this respect. Bultmann points out that often in New Testament usage this word contains an adverse theological judgement. cf. Theology, I p.256.
alike.\(^1\) It would seem therefore that the Law, the flesh, the State, the cosmos and in fact the angels also, all share in this duality, of serving the purpose of God or acting as demonic forces in the world.

Bandstra’s case is supported to some extent by the view of G.H.C. Macgregor who states that "the truth is that in the context which we are discussing, Paul has in view demonic intelligences of a much higher order than the 'devils' who possessed the poor disordered souls that meet us in the Gospel pages. These are cosmic spirit forces which possess and control not only individual human lives but the very course of the universe."\(^2\)

Macgregor’s excellent description of the cosmic significance of redemption and his insistence upon its centrality in the reference to the demonic powers has been developed by C.D. Morrison, although the latter seems to have failed to appreciate Macgregor’s distinction between the demons of the gospels and the cosmic forces of Paul.\(^3\)

The redemption that Paul envisaged is a redemption of the whole world, and this may even include the demonic forces themselves.\(^4\) In contrast with contemporary Judaism which looked for the ultimate defeat of these powers at the last day, Paul held that the defeat had already taken place on the Cross and is even now being worked out in history.\(^5\) This is partly what is intend-

---

3. Cf. The Powers that Be. Earthly Rulers and Demonic Powers in Romans xiii:1-7. London, 1960, pp.111 ff.). Morrison's work is valuable in giving us an insight into the demonology of this era. However it offers more of a broad general background than any significant contribution to the interpretation of these powers in the New Testament.
5. Ibid., p.28.
ed in the reference to Ps.110 (v.34)\(^1\) where the risen Christ is seen as victorious over all the powers and hence able to give salvation to any created thing (v.39).

For Paul it would appear then, that the chief forces against us are those which misuse what was intended for good or are misused so as to become demonic in their effects in this world. Bandstra suggests that the \(\alpha\gamma\varepsilon\lambda\varsigma\) should be regarded as referring to the angel mediators of the Law in Gal. iii:19; these have now no legitimate claims against us because we are no longer under the Law.\(^2\) The evil powers who, in conjunction with sin misuse the Law as an agent of death are possibly what is intended in the term \(\alpha\rho\chi\alpha\) (and \(\epsilon\gamma\omega\nu\sigma\iota\alpha\) Col.ii:15).\(^3\) It is doubtful if we can be precise in our explanation of these terms, especially as they occur in a liturgical context where there may be a certain amount of duplication and repetition.

The fact that \(\alpha\rho\chi\alpha\), \(\alpha\gamma\varepsilon\lambda\varsigma\), and \(\delta\upsilon\nu\nu\mu\varepsilon\varsigma\) are mentioned along with other created but less than personal forces (cf. vv.35 and 38-39), and by the fact that Paul can replace the powers by existence concepts, shows that he is not concerned with giving us an outline of his teaching concerning demonology, but rather seeking to show the complete security\(^4\) of God's people who still live in a sinful world.\(^5\)

---

1. Cf. Cullmann notes that this verse is the most quoted Old Testament text in the whole of the New Testament. It became another way of expressing the earliest creed "Jesus Christ is Lord", but the recollection of the original context did not die "because it became typical that the session at the right hand of God and the victory over the angel powers were mentioned simultaneously." Cf. The State in the New Testament, p.102.

2. op.cit., p.168.

3. op.cit., p.168.

4. The seven-fold list of enemies in v.35 shows that Paul wishes to cover all possible contingencies that might threaten the believers' security.

5. Cf. Conzelmann. Theology, pp.174 and 194. This view is supported by Michel's interpretation of 'things present and things to come' as referring to earthly events, catastrophes etc., p.219.
The reference to ἐνεκτείνω (v.33), coupled with that of the reference to intercession (an allusion to the Servant's intercession in Is.53) \(^1\) and the quotation concerning martyrdom in v.36 combine to emphasize God's way of victory. \(^2\) In the life of the suffering Servant, in the life of Jesus Christ and in the life of his people, God triumphs through suffering. The picture given is that of God's elect who, as a corporate body, live in a hostile world continually open to accusation and persecution, but secure in the love of God and sure of His final vindication. In this we glimpse again the purpose of God to make us conformed to the image of Christ. If we are to be like Him, we too must travel the way of suffering.

Why salvation should have to come in this way and not in any other, or why vindication should have to wait until the final day of God remain unanswered questions. The only reply that Paul is able to give is that this is God's way and how can men dispute the purpose of God (cf. ix:14 ff). It is this question as to whether God is righteous in His dealings with His people that explains in part, at least, the recurring legal imagery throughout the letter to the Romans. No one can accuse God of unrighteousness and no one can condemn His elect. The solution that Paul gives is finally put in xi:33 "How unsearchable are His judgements, how untraceable His ways". He who in the mystery of His purpose delivered up His Son for us will also with Him freely give us all things (v.32). \(^3\)

---

1. Cf. C.H. Dodd. According to the Scriptures, London, 1962, p.94. Dodd's view is that the early Christians used certain Old Testament sections to document and elucidate the themes of their kerygma. These blocks of material were understood as wholes and where we find quotations from them in the New Testament, they are pointers to the entire context from which they are taken, rather than testimonia in and for themselves.

2. If with Michel we regard v.32 as a reference recalling Abraham's offering of Isaac in Gen.22:16, then we are reminded of the suffering of God the Father in His love for His children; as Michel says "Der Schmerz der Vaterliebe offenbart die Grösse des Opfers" (p.24). There may also be the suggestion here that God who gave Abraham the promises also gave him the means of their fulfilment.

3. With Schmidt the τὸ μένος (v.32) may be taken as meaning the whole inheritance including the full redemption of all things, (p.153).
Whether or not the fear of separation from the love of God originated when the Roman Christians were faced with the possibility of ex-communication from the synagogue is a difficult question to answer. It is at least a valid suggestion and Paul does seem to be very concerned to show that the believers are within the purpose and love of God and therefore not alone in a hostile world. He has already established that the goal of God's purpose is the new creation, but by referring to the inclusion of the Gentiles as a result of the disobedience of the Jews, Paul has raised the issue which he will discuss in ix-xi. Paul feels that he must now demonstrate that the salvation of the one does not necessarily involve the rejection of the other. Once again he must emphasize that it is not a question of Jew or Gentile but rather Jew and Gentile.

1. Cf. E. Trocmé, "L'Épitre aux Romains et la méthode missionnaire de l'apôtre Paul." NTS, VII, (1960/61), pp.148-153. The relationship between the Christian congregation(s) and the synagogue is difficult to determine in view of the fact that we are not really sure as to whether a united church from Jewish and Gentile Christians had as yet been formed in Rome. Cf. Minear, pp.7.f.
The Situation to which Paul addresses himself in Rom. viii.

Paul's inaugurated eschatology stands mid-way between the wholly realized eschatology to which Gentile congregations were susceptible, and the wholly futuristic eschatology of the Jews. In our search for indications as to the actual situation to which Paul addresses himself in Romans we must always ask ourselves the question - to which group of people and to what situation is Paul speaking? The problem is that when Paul makes a statement he may have in view the over-enthusiasm of Gentile converts who, in the experience of the Spirit believe that the new age has fully come. On the other hand he may be addressing himself to the criticism of unbelieving Jews who can see no messianic signs indicating the advent of the kingdom. This means that the same statement may refer equally well to two entirely different situations. This is one of the reasons why so many varied opinions have been proposed concerning the composition and outlook of the Roman Christian community. There are in Rom. viii certain indications as to a concrete historical situation and our task is to seek to interpret these by the exegesis of the text of the letter and to relate our findings to the information we can discover from other sources concerning the situation of the church in Rome.

In our study of the Spirit in Rom. viii:1-8 we noted that life in the Spirit is portrayed not only in contrast to life under the Law but also as a fulfilment of the righteousness to which the Law itself witnesses (viii:4).¹ A similar favourable opinion of the Law is expressed in vii:14 where Paul repudiates the objection of vii:7 (that the Law is sinful) and declares that

¹. This point is well put by K. Barth when he states - "in the whole of this chapter (viii) we must remember that by the 'Spirit' Paul means nothing but the validity and the power of the Law of grace established by the sending of the Son of God...". Op.cit., p.91.
the Law is spiritual. From the fact that Paul devotes so much attention to answering the objection against the Law, we may assume that this criticism of the Law (or some similar error) was being perpetrated in Rome. This already points to an antinomian or even anti-Jewish bias in Rome. Since it is in Romans that Paul gives his most favourable view of the Law, this would seem to point to a community composed of predominantly Gentile rather than Jewish Christians. It is possible that Paul wished to prove to the Jews that he was not antinomian, but it seems more likely that he would uphold the higher view of the Law to those who were apt to despise it rather than to those who were likely to trust in it (cf. the teaching on the Law in Romans with that of Galatians).

The favourable view of the Law in chs.vii:14 and vili:4 may also have in mind the suggestion of vi:1 that Christians should continue in sin in order to magnify grace. In iii:8 this suggestion is described as a blasphemous mis-representation of Paul's views. If this were the only reference to such opinions, we would expect that the suggestion originated from unbelieving Jews or possibly Law-abiding Jewish Christians who misunderstood Paul's attitude to the Law. However, in view of the references to antinomianism in ch.

---

1. H. Preisker holds that Paul gives a high evaluation of the Law in Romans (in contrast to Galatians) because some of the Roman Christians mistakenly believed that Paul had absolutely no place for the Law in his understanding of the gospel e.g. vii:7(a) the Law is sin, vii:13 - the Law brings death. "Das historische Problem des Römerbriefes", p.26. See also Lütgert, op.cit., pp.48-78.

2. Cf. Nygren, as quoted on p.12 of this chapter.

3. The anti-Jewish opinions of xii:19.ff could also be regarded as a misrepresentation of Pauline theology and this gives support to the view that although Paul has not founded the church in Rome, he felt grave concern on behalf of its members because they professed a hyper-Paulinism which they believed to represent the opinions of the apostle himself. The later emergence of a scholar with opinions such as those of Marcion gives slight support to this theory.
vi:1,15 etc. it seems more likely that those who misrepresented Paul in iii:8 did not do so in order to caricature his gospel, but rather to support their own liberal views on Christian freedom. They may indeed have sincerely believed that their understanding of the gospel was identical with that of Paul. "It may be that some members of his own churches so far misinterpreted him as to believe and teach that moral evil did not matter....". \(^1\)

These antinomian tendencies coupled with the antisemitic views of ch. xi give us good reason to believe that Paul deliberately related the Law and the Spirit in viii:1.ff in order to show that life in the Spirit is not a life without Law but a life under the 'Law of Christ' or the 'Law of the Spirit'. \(^2\) In viii:7 it is further stated that the mind of the flesh is opposed to God because it is not subject to 'the Law of God'. This appears to imply that those who are in the Spirit are subject to the Law of God (though this is by no means to be equated with being 'under the Law' which is really its antithesis). \(^3\)

There is also the possibility that by relating the Law and the Spirit in ch.viii, Paul wished to minimize the differences between the Jewish and Gentile sections of the church (cf. Abraham in ch.iv). Paul, by showing that the Law finds its proper understanding and fulfilment in the life of the Spirit thereby witnesses that the Law is not against the Gospel. Gentiles who come direct to Christ participate in the same righteousness which the Law

---

1. Barrett, p.65. See also Jewett, op.cit., p.46.
2. Cf. A.M. Hunter's comment - "to liberate men, as Paul sought to do, from the discipline of law in religion, without pointing them to some other guide would have been highly dangerous religious iconoclasm." Op.cit., p.97. See also C.H. Dodd."ΤΩΝΟΜΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ" in Studia Paulina, pp.96-110.
4. If Paul links the gift of the Spirit with the realization of the Old Testament hope of a new heart with God's Law written on it, then the control of the Spirit may be regarded as a universalizing of the Law of God. Cf. Lyonnet, op.cit., pp.567-71, Barth, pp.89-91.
existed to serve and so ought not to despise their weaker Jewish brethren who still as Christians adhere to the Law. Though originating in different cultures Christians, be they Jews or Gentiles, participate in the one Spirit and in the same righteousness and should not despise, but welcome one another (cf.xv:7.f.).

Although this interpretation does not actively support our understanding of the reason for the relation of the Law and the Spirit, it is nevertheless not in opposition to it. In our opinion, there is therefore much to be said in favour of the reference to antinomianism (we find no sign of Judaiizers in ch.viii so we can leave them out of the reckoning). Paul is not wholly against the enthusiasts. In viii:9 he proceeds from their point of view and defines being in Christ or belonging to Christ as being in possession of the Spirit. But having accepted their definition of Christian existence Paul proceeds to elaborate this enthusiastic understanding not only in the light of the new resurrection life but also in the category of crucifixion. (cf. v.10 where the indwelling of Christ is shown to involve death

4. According to Käsemann Paul adopted certain safe-guards to prevent the equation of 'being in the Spirit' with 'being in Christ' from leading to excesses of enthusiasm. We may summarize these rules as follows (1) Paul interpreted the Spirit as the power of the resurrected Christ which must daily be maintained in the new obedience of Christian life. (2) By identifying the resurrected with the crucified Christ Paul shows the Spirit is the power which preserves believers through suffering and temptation. (3) As the Jewish Christians had done previously, Paul presents the Spirit as the earnest of the future, and thus places his 'pneumatology' under the eschatological reservation. Op.cit., pp.214-5.
to sin). This is further spelled out in v.12 where it is shown that Christ's followers are now completely freed from all obligation to serve sin. As we have already noted, the personal address in this verse points to the fact that Paul was seriously concerned lest the Roman Christians should seek to live in the Spirit but continue to walk according to the flesh. A similar conclusion was formed from our study of Paul's contrast between flesh and Spirit. Paul's teaching appeared to be directed against the enthusiast's failure to appreciate the obligation, incumbent upon those possessing the Spirit, to live in obedience to Christ.

Support for enthusiast tendencies in Rome is also given in the use of the σαρκ℃' compounds in ch.viii. We have already noted the helpful contribution of E. Schweizer in this respect especially in connection with v.17 where suffering with Christ is related to being glorified with Him. In Rome as in Corinth, Paul found it necessary to emphasize that all that Christ has for us is not yet realized, that in fact we will only live the life of glory with Christ in the future if we also live the life of suffering with Him in the present.

In order to avoid misunderstandings of life 'in the Spirit' or life 'with Christ', Paul emphasizes the 'not yet' of redemption and portrays the present as a time of waiting. By this he succeeded in uniting two aspects of Christian life which for Hellenistic enthusiasts were virtually irreconcilable - the believer as one possessing the Spirit and yet as one who stands in

---

1. See section (c) of this chapter. We do not agree with Jewett's view that 'sarx' and related terms do not appear to be directly related to the concrete situation in Rome (op.cit.,p.135). It is probable that this conclusion springs from his thesis that "the interpretative axis for Romans is not so much the concrete situation in Rome as the Pauline gospel of the fulfilment of God's righteousness". (pp.47-48).

2. See pp.31 ff.
waiting. It is conceivable that Paul in pointing to the incompleteness of redemption was combating the opinion of Jews who used the unchanged world as an argument against Jesus as the Messiah. Possibly Paul accepted part of these criticisms as valid and hastens to explain the real understanding of the world according to the Christian view i.e. the 'not yet' of faith. But again it is more likely that the emphasis on waiting is a corrective against Gentile Christian realized eschatology. The references to the full redemption of the body, and also to the redemption of the creation suggest that Paul has in mind a wrong view of the relation of matter and Spirit so evident in Hellenistic dualism. According to Paul what is eagerly awaited is not the revelation (or epiphany) of the risen Lord, but the revelation of the sons of God. This envisages a continuing process, the outcome of which we must await with patience. Again the redemption Paul outlines in Rom.viii is not redemption out of the world into an everlasting kingdom as in II Pet. i:11 but the freedom of the sons of God in a liberated universe.

The need to wait points to the relevance of hope. What is said on this subject in vv.24-25 shows that Paul felt obliged to underline the future hope. He acknowledges that Christians are not visibly different from their fellow unbelievers and that there are no physical signs of redemption.

2. Cf. vi:13 - sin is not to rule in our mortal bodies; viii:11 - God will by the Spirit give life to your mortal bodies; viii:23 - where the full adoption of sons means the redemption of our bodies, and xii:2 where we are to present our bodies as a living sacrifice. Cf. also R. Jewett, p.302.
4. Cf. W. Manson's comment that Stephen criticized the Jerusalem church for waiting in Jerusalem for the restoration of Israel instead of going out to evangelize the nations. The interim period is the time of the church. Jesus and the Christian, pp.196.f.
in the ordinary world of nature - "hope that is seen is not hope" - it is because we cannot see that we require hope. Christians ought not to be surprised at suffering and that they do not have direct vision which would in fact be contrary to hope by which we are saved.¹ This seems to be the point of Paul's statement concerning hope. He seeks to encourage or develop hope in those in whom it was lacking. Michel suggests that Paul addresses himself here to a false enthusiasm (Pneumatikertum) which did not take the future hope quite seriously enough.² It would seem that these people are not likely to be Jewish Christians, but rather Gentiles who believed so strongly in the realization of God's promises in the present that they had little left to hope for in the future.³

To counteract this situation Paul takes up the apologetic previously used by Jewish Christians and, in face of the realized eschatology, emphasizes that the Spirit is the Spirit of hope,⁴ the anticipation and the foretaste of that which is still mainly in the future.⁵

One other factor seems to give some indication of the actual situation in Rome. As we have previously noted,⁶ the reference to the 'Abba' cry in Galatians is followed by an application to the specific situation of the Christian community there - as sons of God they ought not to turn back to bondage to the elemental spirits. In Romans the reference is succeeded by an application to suffering - the sufferings of the present are

¹. Cf. Feuillet, p.381.
². Cf. p.207.
³. Cf. Hamilton's differentiation between faith and hope, "faith is directed to the God who promises, while hope is directed more to the promises themselves." op.cit., p.35.
⁵. This aspect of the Spirit is well expounded by Hamilton in ch.2 of his book. op.cit., pp.17-25.
not worthy to be compared with the glory of the full adoption of God's sons (viii:18). In our opinion this indicates some kind of persecution at Rome. It is beyond dispute that Paul interprets this suffering as the birth-pangs of the new age - the Messianic woes.¹ But it is most unlikely that Paul introduces the idea of suffering merely to describe the interim period between the cross and the parousia - it is more probable that he had some knowledge of persecution (or at least the possibility of it) of the church in Rome.²

The list of what might be regarded as threats to the security of believers in viii:35 includes a reference to the sword and this cannot be understood to refer to Paul's own experience of persecution. Indeed it is no real solution to suggest that these are simply a list of Paul's own sufferings.³ It is more likely that the Christians in Rome had already experienced or were about to experience the same persecutions as Paul himself - which with Barrett we acknowledge as arising often merely from the general unpopularity of the Christians.⁴ If Paul has already suffered persecution then why not the Christians in Rome?

The impression is given that the Roman Christians were surprised and disturbed in the face of suffering. If our investigation of the question-objection style of vv.18.ff. is correct, it would suggest that to some believers at least, suffering appeared to be inconsistent with life in the Spirit. As Käsemann has shown, Paul met this objection by showing that the resurrected

---

2. "It is clear from viii:18,36.f. that the sufferings are not hypothetical but actual". T.W. Manson "Romans" - Peake's Commentary, p.946.
3. Cf. Barrett, p.173. Barrett does ask the question "Should it be inferred from these words (i.e. viii:35 and v.:3) that persecution had already fallen upon the Roman church?" But he does not develop this line of thought. In any case, if E. Güttgemann is correct, the sufferings of Paul are distinctly apostolic and not generally Christian. Cf. Der leidende Apostle und sein Herr. ERLANT, 90, Göttingen, 1966, pp.195-8.
Lord who gives the Spirit is identical with the suffering and crucified Jesus. ¹ Pallis points to this distaste in his interpretation of v.24 as "an argumentative council for patience addressed to such as felt troubled in their minds by the continued postponement of the revelation (cf. II Pet.iii-iv) and of exemption from death."² The apparent unwillingness to undergo suffering and to live in hope of the future again indicate signs of the realized eschatology of Gentile enthusiasm. Perhaps the clearest indication of a false understanding of life in the Spirit in the church at Rome is that given by Käsemann in his essay on viii:26-27.³ According to this view vv.26-27 represent the climax of Paul's argument in vv.18.f. This argument centres on the Spirit who is the first fruits of the kingdom, and the power of God to help us in our weakness while we wait for our full redemption. Our weakness is particularly manifested in the fact that we do not know what to pray - only the Spirit knows and apprehends God's plan - only the Spirit knows our need.⁴ The groaning mentioned in these verses takes place in the assembled congregation. Like glossolalia, (though to be differentiated from it) this groaning refers to utterances made under the influence of the Spirit. These are not wordless, "not unspoken but unspeakable" utterances.⁵ According to Käsemann Paul deals with the Roman Christians' enthusiasm in the same way as he has previously dealt with a similar problem among the Corinthians.⁶ In

2. Op.cit., p.104. Pallis considers that the exulting in persecution of v:3-4 is not likely to refer to this early date and simply suggests that the greater part of these verses is not genuine. (p.75). He makes no attempt to relate v:3.f. to viii:17.f.
4. Ibid., p.220.
5. Ibid., p.224.
6. Ibid., pp.228.f.
his letter to Corinth Paul did not rate speaking in tongues as an important or useful gift; in fact he evaluates this gift as not being very edifying for believers, its function being to warn unbelievers that the last days have come (cf. I Cor.xiv). So too in Rome, instead of prizing these peculiar sounds as signs of the enthusiasts' translation into the heavenly state, the apostle hears in these sighs of those still under temptation and death, who cry for the rebirth of the new creation. These strange sounds indicate not the realization of the heavenly state but exactly the opposite - the continuance in the earthly state. Paul has transformed the emphasis upon the 'already' of the Spirit into a witness to the 'not yet' of the Spirit. Here again Paul is dealing with pneumatics, with the same Hellenistic enthusiasm of which we have already found several traces in this chapter.

Although the total content of this chapter provides most support for the view that Gentile Christians are addressed, it is also possible that the latter half of the chapter, especially vv.31-39 has in mind the insecurity of Jewish Christians. This insecurity may have arisen from the fear that God's promises to the Jews had failed; it was probably increased by the Gentile Christians' boast that they were the true successors of Israel. If, as is likely, a united congregation of Jewish and Gentile Christians has not yet been formed in Rome, Paul may be writing to encourage the formation of a church. In view of the proposed fellowship with Gentiles, Jewish Christians

2. Cf. Hamilton's exegesis of this theme where he suggests that "the Spirit will be in the future, as well as in the present, the agent or medium of communication between God and man ... this privileged but imperfect access in the Spirit looks forward to the time in the future when partial knowledge and weakness will give way to a more perfect access to the Father in the same Spirit." Op.cit., p.37.
would be liable to persecution from fellow Jews and might also be uncertain whether the glory and presence of God could be enjoyed outside the sphere of the Law and the synagogue.\textsuperscript{1} The suggestion that the arguments in ch.v for the existence of life in the present may also have been addressed to Jewish Christians gives some support for a similar intention in the statements of ch.viii. On the other hand the warnings against living according to the flesh and the emphasis on the hope of full 'somatic' redemption in the context of a renewed creation are best understood as addressed to Gentile Christians.

From this survey we believe that we have obtained some insight into the situation to which Paul addresses himself in Rom.viii. In particular we are inclined to believe that the chief problems envisaged here are those that would originate in a mainly Gentile congregation, namely antinomianism\textsuperscript{2} and a false spiritual enthusiasm.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Cf. E. Trocmé, op.cit., pp.151.f, and J. Jeremias Jesus' Promise to the Nations, pp.66.f.
\item W. Lütgert claimed that this outlook was one of the main reasons for Paul's letter to the Romans (op.cit., pp.69-79, 111-2). H. Preisker agrees with Lütgert's approach but considers that his strong emphasis on antinomianism results in a one-sided interpretation. Op.cit., p.25.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
General Introduction with Particular Reference to the
Relation between Romans i-viii and ix-xi.

The general tendency to divide the letter to the Romans into three
sections, i-viii, ix-xi and xii-xv (or xvi) illustrates awareness of the
breaks that occur at the end of chs.viii and xi. Since ch.xii:1 begins the
parenthetic section it is especially the sharp break between chs.viii and ix
that has attracted the attention of the various commentators. Johannes Munck
finds that "there is no direct connection with the preceding passage; no trans¬
tional formula has been provided."¹ "In the midst of his joy that nothing
can separate 'us' from God's love in Christ, Paul breaks off in order to ex¬
press his sorrow that there is one exception to the company of those who have
been saved, namely the chosen people Israel".² It was this definite break at
ch.ix:1 which led Sanday and Headlam to the view that "St. Paul has now fin¬
ished his main argument."³ A similar view was proposed by C.H. Dodd. He found
that chs.ix-xi could "be read and understood quite independently and also with¬
out any sense of gap in the sequence of thought."⁴ Whilst acknowledging that
chs.ix-xi form a necessary section of the letter, Dodd held that "the immediate
sequel to viii:31-39 is not ix:1 but xii:1 - "Well then my brothers, I appeal
to you by all the mercy of God to dedicate your bodies as a living sacrifice
....".⁵ The reason why this sequel is postponed is in order to deal with
"certain theological difficulties left over from the foregoing chapters."⁶

¹. Christ and Israel, p.27.
². Ibid.
³. Sanday and Headlam, p.225.
⁵. Ibid.
⁶. Ibid.
It is plain that this emphasis on the break at the end of ch.viii and the resulting isolation of chs.ix-xi minimizes the significance of the content of these chapters and of their function within the thought of the epistle as a whole. The weakness of this position is that it overlooks the very real connections between chs.viii and ix\(^1\) as well as the connections we have already noted between chs.iii and iv and chs.ix-xi. Despite its inherent difficulties, this view of Romans ix-xi has enjoyed a long and wide acceptance. As far back as 1836, F.C. Baur criticized the common practice of commentators in his day who emphasized chs.i-viii as the real essence of the letter and demoted the thought of chs.ix-xi to a secondary and insignificant position. "It is thought that the dogmatic contents, as presented to us in the first eight chapters, must have been what the apostle started from; this was the germ from which the whole system of the epistle was developed. Everything else, and particularly what we find in chs.ix-xi, is secondary and subordinate to that, the main part of the epistle, and was added to it after the true theme had been fully discussed, as an inference resulting from it, and a practical application. Thus the epistle would be a complete whole even without this second part, its main idea being already fully worked out, and the end attained which the Apostle designed it to further."\(^2\) Unfortunately, as Baur himself confessed, few interpreters paid attention to his criticisms. For one reason or another, chs.ix-xi tended to attract little attention as an important part of a

\(^1\) Εὐαγγέλιον occurs in viii:15,23 and ix:4, the only other instances being Gal.ii:5 and Eph.ii:5; προθεσ forwards in viii:28 and ix:11, τέχνα θεοῦ in viii:16 and ix:8; καλέω in viii:30 and ix:12 and ἐγκαταστάσεως in viii:37 and ix:13.

\(^2\) This view was first expressed in an essay on Romans published in the Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie, 1836,III (pp.59f.). This quotation is taken from Paul: His Life and Works transl.from the second German edition edited by E. Zeller (Theological Translation Fund Library) 1876, Vol.I, p.314.
real letter. In his review of the interpretation of Rom.ix-xi since Baur, Christian Müller notes that exegetes have failed generally to relate these three chapters to their understanding of the righteousness of God; this is another indication of the fact that Rom.i-xi was treated as if it were two separate sections. Müller praises Lohmeyer and Schlatter for their attempts to find a unified theme for the whole of the epistle. Lohmeyer sought to relate the concept of God's people (ix-xi) and of God's righteousness (i-viii) in such a way as to give an adequate interpretation of all of Rom.i-xi. By relating ecclesiology to soteriology in the thought of Paul, he sought to resist the deterioration of the doctrine of justification into a theory of the rescue of the individual. In Lohmeyer's opinion, the doctrine of justification and that of the people of God as represented in the two main sections of Romans i-xi, must be held in relation to one another, because both will necessarily be falsified if they are considered in any other way. In this respect he is in agreement with Michel's contention that "Röm.ix-xi geben die Kriterien dafür, ob Röm.iii:21.f. (the doctrine of justification) richtig verstanden wurde." Müller however believes that in spite of his serious attempt to relate i-viii and ix-xi, Michel does not quite succeed in relating the doctrine of election to the doctrine of justification and in the end Michel's criterion "richtet sich als Kritik gegen ihn selbst".

It was in the exegesis of Adolf Schlatter that a unified interpretation

2. op.cit., p.18.
5. E. Lohmeyer Grundlagen paulinischer Theologie (Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie 1) Tübingen 1929, pp.52.f. and 176.f.; Müller, op.cit., p.15.
of Rom.i-xi was first fully worked out.¹ Schlatter’s understanding of the righteousness of God was based not only on chs.i-viii but also on ix-xi and both were related to the theme verse of i:17. The God who reveals His righteousness to the believer is the same God who reveals Himself as the Creator to Israel.² For Schlatter the righteousness of God means the execution of His judgement (as in chs.ix-xi) as well as His mercy (as in chs.i-viii). There is no need to omit chs.ix-xi from the interpretation of righteousness within the letter. "Das Urteil des Paulus über die Judenschaft war ebenso Gehorsam gegen Jesu Tat und Gebot wie seine Deutung des Evangeliums dass es die Botschaft von der Versöhnung Gottes mit der Welt sei, und der Kreuzigung Jesu, dass sie der Tod dessen sei, der für die Sünder gestorben ist."³ By this emphasis a unified interpretation of the letter is rendered possible "Dadurch sind der erste Teil des Briefes, die Rechtfertigungslehre, und sein zweiter Teil, das Urteil über Israel, zu völliger Einheit verbunden."⁴

Although we have now found an interpretation of the Roman letter that treats the whole under a unified theme, this does not mean that this interpretation is the best approach to the subject. We have already noted the problems that have arisen when the various sections of the letter are not properly related to each other. In conjunction with these we find other factors which have hindered the attainment of an adequate understanding of the

¹ Cf. Müller, op.cit., p.23.
³ op.cit., p.329.
⁴ Ibid. Cf. see also his comment on ix:1-5 - "Aus dem letzten Satz des ersten Teils wächst das neue Thema mit zwingender Notwendigkeit heraus." (p.291). Schlatter goes on to emphasize that all of chs.i-viii lead to this compelling question - "wozu hat Gott Israel gemacht und was macht er jetzt aus ihm?" op.cit., p.292.
whole letter. In order to clarify our discussion these will be sub-divided under several headings.

The Theological Interpretation

This has been the traditional view of the content of Rom.ix-xi. As chapters dealing with predestination, they were regarded as dealing with the ultimate questions of theology - the fore-knowledge and predestining will of God; the power and freedom of God; His relations with individual men as well as with the destiny of nations. When these chapters became the subject of controversy as they often did, we can see the problems that this kind of approach led to. The great merit of the re-formulation of the doctrine of election in the work of Karl Barth is that it freed theologians from the viewpoint of John Calvin. By emphasizing that election is in Jesus Christ, a whole new perspective is opened up and the break with the past firmly carried through. Basically however, Barth's exegesis is still too 'theologically' orientated and as one reads his work, particularly in the second volume of his dogmatics (2nd part) one wonders how this, in many ways excellent, theology can be related to the actual text of Romans.

The basic criticism which we feel may be made against Barth and to a lesser extent against Schlatter is that the historical situation which

---

2. See especially Barth's section on "The Elect and the Rejected". Despite similarities with the terminology of election in Romans, Barth's doctrine perverts such specific biblical terms as 'Israel' and 'the elect' chiefly by his neglect of the concrete realities these terms originally signified in the New Testament. Church Dogmatics Vol.II. The Doctrine of God, Part II, pp.340-354.
3. Schlatter does take into account the historical factors which caused the separation between the church and Israel. Cf.op.cit., pp.291.ff.
originated the statements in Romans ix-xi is seldom referred to. In this approach these theologians are by no means alone, but actually represent the majority of commentators until quite recently.\(^1\) As Munck himself states "attempts to understand the author's theological explanations in the context of a timeless, systematic line of thought have been given more attention than the discovery of its historical 'Sitz im Leben'."\(^2\) In fact one of the most recent contributions to Pauline studies tends to pursue a similar approach. Günther Bornkamm in his book "Paulus" designates Romans as Paul's last will and testament to the church. His opinion is that Romans was not literally intended for this by Paul himself, but due to his subsequent imprisonment and death, it did, in fact, become this.\(^3\) Despite the attention given to the actual circumstances surrounding the writing of the letter, Bornkamm's view has close affinities with all those which still regard the letter as a compendium of Pauline theology.\(^4\)

**Generalisation and Abstraction**

This is the approach to Rom.ix-xi which regards their content simply as an illustration or example for the benefit of Christian faith. Perhaps it could be summed up in the view of Käsemann in

---

1. What F.C. Baur said of current interpretations of the theme of Romans as a whole is also relevant here - "The dogmatic view is not to yield one step to the historical, lest the position of an Epistle such as that to the Romans should be impaired, and the Lutheran forensic process of justification, which is of such moment to maintain in its integrity, suffer from the shaking of its great buttress." op.cit., p.313.
2. Cf. Christ and Israel, p.95
4. Cf. Baur's criticisms of De Wette's description of Romans as "a purely objective presentation of the gospel to the Roman Christians", op.cit., p.211. Bornkamm differs from such views only in that he acknowledges that most of the letter was originally addressed to particular opponents but these opponents are now no longer visible in Romans, "the opponent has become an ideal figure." This enables Bornkamm to regard the letter as the final statement of Paul's theology, op.cit., p.110.
his essay "Paul and Israel" where he holds that the problem of unbelieving Israel is a reminder of "the Jew in every man".\(^1\) Basically we wish to justify ourselves and historical (unbelieving) Israel in God's way of reminding men of their need of God's grace and of the danger of trusting in ourselves.\(^2\) However true this may be as a matter of fact, it is certainly not Paul's chief intention in writing these chapters.

To a lesser extent we find this mistake exemplified in the view that Rom.ix-xi is a theological study of the relation of the church to Judaism.\(^3\) That these chapters do shed some light on this particular problem is in no wise disputed, but once again we believe that this does not represent the primary intention of the text. Even if we were to agree that the content of these chapters is primarily concerned with the relation of the church to Judaism, we would have to point out that the discussion here concerns only the relation of a particular congregation (or part of a particular congregation) to Judaism.

A similar weakness is apparent in the statement of A.H. McNNeile in which he describes Romans as "a comprehensive apologia for Universal Religion over against Jewish Nationalism."\(^4\) In spite of its concern with the actual text of Rom.ix-xi, Luz's detailed study may also be accused of


\(^2\) Käsemann believes that Rom.ix-xi repeats the argument of the whole epistle. He finds it strange that Rom.xi ends with the hope of the salvation of all Israel when the opposite would have been expected - "only the exemplary significance of Israel can explain and demand such an otherwise incomprehensible reversal....", op.cit., p.186.

\(^3\) Cf. W. Marxsen's view: "What we find in Romans is not the problem as to what the attitude of Christianity to Judaism ought to be, as a matter of principle, nor do we find a dogmatic treatment of the 'problem of Israel' as it affects the Church." Introduction to the New Testament, p.103.

generalization in that he uses these chapters simply for the purpose of discovering Paul's view of history.¹

**Neglect of Whole or Part of the Content**

This approach is most clearly evident in the writings of Bultmann. As a typical Lutheran he has always much to say about Rom.i-viii, but when we look for his views of chs.ix-xi, they are brief and very unsatisfactory.² It is possible that this approach stems from Bultmann's opinion that part of these chapters are contradictory.³ He is basically not interested in past history as such and thus he seems to have little appreciation of the continuity between the church and Israel which is so significant a part of these chapters.⁴ Even where Bultmann does deal with chs. ix-xi, it is by using snippets relating to justification and treating them without much concern for their total context.⁵

In essence this means that for Bultmann chs.ix-xi are not given any

---


2. In Bultmann's theology we find not only fewer references to chs.ix-xi as compared with chs.i-viii, but, apart from those texts relating to justification by faith, there is little substance in the actual comments that are given.

3. Cf. Glauben und Verstehen III (Tübingen 1960), pp.101-2; Bultmann also refers to Rom.xi:25 ff as "speculative fantasy" (Theology II, p.132).


proper standing in the letter as a whole and their piecemeal treatment in the end means that their content and value is decided from without i.e. by chs. i-viii. This leads to the emphasis upon the justification of the individual without adequate reference to the continuing people and purpose of God within history.¹ In a review of Bultmann in 1954, Dahl accused Bultmann of 'de-historizing' the New Testament in that he treated the doctrine of justification as an abstraction and related it exclusively to the existence of the individual.² It is strange that, in spite of all their differences, Bultmann and Barth should share this disregard of the actual historical situation.³

The Missionary Approach

This title is chosen because it represents a very useful and constructive attempt to set these chapters in the context of the life of Paul, the missionary to the Gentiles. This was the special merit of T.W. Manson when he suggested that Romans is a summing up of the position of Paul at the end of a decade of missionary work.⁴ His suggestion was further developed by Munck whose work on Rom.ix-xi has been most useful.⁵ In Munck's view these chapters represent Paul's special contribution to God's 'heilsge-schichtlich' purpose. Instead of the older view that Israel would first be

⁵ Munck's views are most clearly set out in his book Paul and the Salvation of Mankind; the exegetical basis of his views on Rom.ix-xi is elaborated in the later publication Christ and Israel. An Interpretation of Rom.ix-xi. In our opinion a full appreciation of Munck's contribution is attained only when these two volumes are studied in conjunction with each other.
saved and then the 'fulness of the Gentiles' would follow, Paul realized that through his missionary work the Gentiles had been brought in while the Jews as a whole had been hardened. Paul re-interprets the missionary situation of his time and Rom.ix-xi represents the setting out of his new understanding of God's redemptive purpose.

The merit of this approach is that it removes Rom.ix-xi from the realm of abstract metaphysical speculation and grounds it firmly in the missionary situation of the first century church. Unfortunately his view of Romans as a circular letter means that Munck did not ground his exposition of these chapters in the specific situation of the church at Rome, but only in the general missionary context of the whole church. A similar deficiency in Manson's contribution has been pointed out by Suggs who has suggested that Manson's essay would have been more appropriately entitled "St. Paul's Letter to others - and the Romans."

From this survey of the various approaches to the interpretation of these chapters, we conclude that the main element lacking in all of them, to a

1. This is also the approach of Goppelt who regards Rom.ix-xi as Paul's interpretation of the break between the church and Judaism, op.cit., pp. 134, 151.
2. Cf. Munck PSM, ch.ix and pp.275.f. in particular. Bornkamm (op.cit., pp.110 and 158.f.) also emphasizes this point. He notes that the particular themes of Rom.ix-xi are peculiar to this epistle (p.109). He fails however to draw any conclusions from this peculiarity as to the specific situation of the church in Rome, and his approach is thus to be grouped with that of Manson and Munck. Cf. Thesis pp.460-62.
3. The impact of Munck's (and Manson's) views is evidenced by the fact that in his recent book Peter Richardson can introduce his study of Romans with these words "There is a growing consensus that Romans must be interpreted in the light of Paul's missionary situation." Israel and the Apostolic Church, p.126.
4. Cf. Munck's statement "If we adopt (as he does) Manson's view, scholars need no longer look in the church at Rome for the background of the letter to the Romans" PSM, p.200.
greater or lesser extent, has been the consideration of the actual concrete historical situation in Rome, which occasioned this particular document.¹ In our approach to these chapters we wish to relate them to the whole of the letter and also to look for evidence of the original situation to which they were addressed.

In addition to the attempt to discover an inner unity of theme in Rom.i-xi in the light of a particular historical situation, a further question will also be kept in mind. Granted that chs.ix-xi form a consistent whole with the rest of the letter, what do we then regard as the most significant part of the letter? We have already excluded the view that the climax of thought is reached at the end of ch.viii. F.C. Baur criticized this opinion which was the prevailing one in his day.² When Paul's discussion was almost ended (i.e. at the end of ch.viii) he cast his eye over it again and the idea of unbelieving Jews led to the appendix of chs.ix-xi. Baur asked whether the very reverse of this relation (i.e. of chs.ix-xi as an appendix to i-viii) may not be the more correct and - "whether this view of the epistle would not give us a much more satisfactory account both of the aim and drift of the work, and of the historical relations out of which it arose. On this view we should find in these three chapters the germ and centre of the whole, from which the other parts sprang; and we should take our stand on these three chapters in order to enter into the Apostle's original conception, from which the whole organism of the epistle was developed, as we have it especially in the first eight chapters."³

1. Cf. F.C. Baur "...it certainly appears that he (Paul) cannot have devoted so large a part of his epistle to answering this question (the relation of Judaism and heathenism to each other, and the relation of both to Christianity) without some special outward reason prompting him to do so, such as may have arisen out of the circumstances of the church at Rome." (op.cit. p.316).
3. op.cit., p.315.
We may, of course, hold to the view that there is no progression towards a climax and that all of chs.ix-xi are of equal significance in the total picture. It does seem preferable to us, however, to concur with Baur's opinion that what comes first in order is not necessarily first in significance, and thus to seek to discover in chs.ix-xi the apex of Paul's argument.¹

¹ This view is also held by L. Goppelt - "Rom.ix-xi is not an appendix to the letter to the Romans. It actually is the key stone which closes the arch of Paul's theology and holds it all together". op.cit., p.153. Cf. also T.W. Manson's comment "In chs.ix-xi we have what perhaps is the innermost core of the epistle to the Romans ....the righteousness of God in history." (Romans : New Peake, p.179.)
Chapter ix:1-5.

As we have already discovered from ch.iii:1-2, Paul does not overlook the special standing of the Jew in the purpose of God. Throughout our survey of the letter, we have found that Paul is never one-sided in his discussion of the place of Jews and Gentiles in salvation. At times he could have turned his argument sharply against the Jews, but this was not his intention. For this reason we do not feel that Murray is justified in his contention that Paul (in ix:1) has to emphasize most strongly that he is speaking the truth (in declaring his love for Israel) because his denunciation of Jewry in the earlier part of the epistle might be regarded as estrangement from his kinsmen. In our study, we have not found Paul to be anti-Jewish in the thrust of his argument. Indeed, it comes somewhat as a surprise that Paul should have to protest so forcibly his sorrow and concern for his fellow-kinsmen.

His triplicate statement "I am speaking the truth in Christ, I am not lying; my conscience bears me witness in the Holy Spirit..." is too deliberate to be explained merely as Paul's affirmation of "his sincere desire to treat the question (i.e. of the unbelief of his fellow-kinsmen) with heartfelt truth." More probable is the suggestion that Paul as the Jewish 'apostle of the Gentiles' had been accused of indifference to the fate of his compatriots. Immediately we are faced with the question of the origin of this accusation against Paul. Is it not likely to have emanated from

---

1. Cf. our discussion of iv:9-12 and Leenhardt's criticism of Michel who claims that in the case of Abraham, Paul is concerned to point out that Abraham is first of all father of Gentiles and only secondarily of Jews. (Leenhardt, p.119 note).
Jews and Jewish Christians, rather than from Gentile Christians? At first glance this does seem to be the more likely solution. The Jewish Christians in Jerusalem, intent on evangelizing their own people, may well have complained that Paul's Gentile mission was actually hindering the work of the gospel among the Jews. If, as is possible, some Jewish Christians believed that Israel must first be evangelized (and saved) and that only then should the gospel go to the Gentiles, then this criticism of Paul is all the more understandable. That Jews also criticized Paul and regarded him as a renegade from his people, is well established in various references in Acts cf. Acts xvi:21, xxi:21.

A problem arises, however, when we try to relate this view to the situation in Rome. Are we to assume that the Roman Christians were mainly Jewish, or is Paul specially concerned about the position of a minority of Jewish Christians who are critical of his Gentile evangelism? This is certainly a possibility. It could also be that these Roman Jewish Christians were receiving criticism of Paul's work from their Jewish kinsmen and Paul feels obliged to meet these criticisms.

The most probable suggestion, in our opinion, is that these criticisms originated from Gentile Christians. Paul had for many years been accustomed to such accusations from the Jews and, to a lesser extent, from his fellow Jewish Christians and thus it is questionable if he would have reacted so strongly to them. But if they had originated from Gentile Christians, then

---

2. Cf. Jeremias' view that ix:1 is the answer to an implied criticism of Paul. We feel the hot breath of Paul's (Jewish) opponents around him and they are reproaching him in their hearts - You are a renegade - (Gedankenführung; _SP_, p.148). Cf. also Schoeps, _Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums_, Tübingen 1949, pp.135.f.
we can understand his anxiety. The situation we would envisage is something like this.

Roman Gentile Christians hear of Paul's Gentile missionary work and adopt him as their apostle. According to their understanding of his gospel, Paul is pro-Gentile and anti-Jewish. Because the Jews have failed to believe, the Gentiles have been brought in and the former people of God rejected. Paul is, in fact, credited with a gospel which he himself never preached. But this false understanding of the Pauline gospel arises in this instance, not from the deliberate misrepresentation of his Jewish opponents, but from the mistaken zeal of his disciples in Rome.¹

 Needless to say, this account of Paul's gospel and the attitude of these Gentile Christians would have completely undermined Paul's visit to Jerusalem and his influence with the nation of Israel. It is this, then, that accounts for the seriousness with which Paul faces this charge. He is not lying or pretending in his assertion that he longs to save his fellow-countrymen. The general unbelief of the Jews brings Paul no secret satisfaction, only unceasing anguish. Nor is this sentiment simply a reflection of Paul's nationalistic emotions. As Ellison puts it "Ties of blood and kindred may have added a sharper edge to Moses' prayer and Paul's anguish, but the predominating motive with both was that God's honour was bound up with his own people and this is precisely the point at issue. They are still God's people."²

 The problem is that when Paul is depicted as the apostle to the Gentiles, it is liable to be forgotten that he is the Jewish apostle to the

---

Gentiles and his concern for his own people is overlooked. If we remember that Paul thought of Jesus, of himself and all believers as the true Jews (cf. Rom.ii:28-29) rather than as the 'New Israel',\(^1\) then we would not be so liable to make this mistake of separating Paul completely from his Jewish heritage and hopes. In preaching to the Gentiles Paul was not deliberately rejecting the Jews, but evangelizing them 'the long way round' - by means of the Gentiles (Rom.xi:11). Viewed in this light there can be no implication of duplicity of motive when Paul, at the climax of his Gentile mission, instead of visiting Rome as he was expected to do, travels to Jerusalem with a special collection for the 'poor saints' there.

Like Moses, the best of all Jews (in some people's opinion at least), Paul is willing to sacrifice himself for the sake of his people. If it were possible,\(^2\) he could wish himself anathema - accursed from Christ, if only it would save his own kinsfolk. Munck emphasizes the close parallels between this passage and Exod.xxx:31-32.\(^3\)

(i) Both Moses and Paul are decisive 'heilageschichtlich' figures.

(ii) Munck notes the great solemnity with which in both instances the figure offers himself as a substitute.

(iii) In both situations it is not a question of atoning for the ordinary sins of the people - in both they have sinned unforgivably, showing disobedience immediately after great grace has been shown to them.\(^4\)

---

1. Peter Richardson shows that the church was not explicitly called 'the New Israel' within the New Testament. Cf. op.cit., pp.195-206.
2. The construction \( \text{ηυόχωμη} \) implies that Paul's wish is not capable of realization. In the Koine the imperfect may express the optative. Leenhardt, p.244 n*.
4. Ibid.
Paul, like Moses, is willing to represent his people even before God. He is willing to do this not because they are irreparably rejected but for precisely the opposite reason; in spite of their present disbelief, they are not yet beyond hope. When Paul remembers the privileges enjoyed by Israel, he cannot despair for them so he takes up again the unfinished list of ch.iii:1-2. Only now may the πρῶτον (iii:2) be added to and the privileges of Israel more extensively enumerated.

Instead of calling them Jews as he has done elsewhere in the letter,\(^1\) Paul now gives his own people their supreme title of honour - the designation of the people of God. "They are Israelites" (ix:4).\(^2\) Whatever the exact nature of Paul's understanding of this designation, one thing seems certain - he wishes to speak of his own nation not as rejected, but as potentially believing. This is his attitude not in this verse only but, in our opinion, throughout chapters ix-xi.

In maintaining that Paul has a favourable view of Israel in Rom.ix-xi, we are not forgetting the unfavourable historical situation of the general unbelief of the Jewish people (cf. x:21). Richardson holds that these chapters do not deal with 'hypothetical' situations concerning Israel or Judaism, but with practical historical realities.\(^3\) These practical historical

---

1. The plural is found only at iii:9,29; ix:24; (x:12). Elsewhere Paul seems to prefer the singular, cf. i:16; ii:9f., 17, 28f.; iii:1.
2. 'Ιουδαῖος occurs only at ix:24 and x:12 (in chs.ix-xi). 'Ισραήλ is found in ix:6,27,31; x:(1),19,21; xi:2,7,25.f. 'Ισραήλιτης occurs only in ix:4 and xii:1. (von Rad, Kuhn, and Gutbrod in TDNT III, p.356).
realities consisted chiefly in the rejection of the gospel by all but a few of the Jews and widespread acceptance of Christ by Gentiles. In the light of this concrete situation, two responses are possible -

(i) that of the Roman Gentile Christians who, knowing that the Jews have heard and not believed the gospel, assume that they (the Jews) are destined for rejection (cf. xi:1 and xi:11).

(ii) Paul’s view - the Jewish nation is at present unbelieving but is still potentially the Israel of God.

In this approach, then, we do not minimize the fact of Jewish unbelief, but we emphasize the importance of how one interprets this fact. In this we concur with Richardson when he states "the character of chs.ix-xi is first of all practical ... and secondly hopeful."¹ This hopeful outlook is illustrated in the term Israelite, - "the supreme title of honour to be recalled at the very start of the argument."² Whatever their failings, Paul can never overlook the fact that these people stand in the privileged position of being the initial recipients of God’s revelation. The content of the designation ‘Israelite’ is further spelt out in vv.4-5. Being Israelites means that they possess the sonship, (πρότασμα) . Barrett considers this term is used differently from ch.viii:15,23. Here Paul thinks of sonship as a status conferred upon Israel at the Exodus.³ The δόξα (v:4) may also be regarded as referring back to God’s glory in the theophany at Mount Sinai. (Ex. xxiv: 16 ff., xxxiii:18).

1. op.cit., p.136.
2. Leenhardt, p.244. If we feel that this designation is liable to misunderstanding, we must bear in mind Paul’s discussion in Rom.1-iv where he has already excluded all false claims upon God. The name ‘Israelite’ is applied by Paul to himself in ix:1 and the bad apostles in Corinth (II Cor. xi:22) It is used in the N.T. only of Jews (cf. Munck, op.cit., p.31,n.11).
3. op.cit., p.177.
As we have already noted in the case of Abraham in ch.iv, Paul goes back to the original constitution of Israel as the people of God. Here too Paul emphasizes the covenant, the basis of Israel's national and religious life. The reference to Israel's beginnings tends to the opinion that Paul both in ch.iv and in ch.ix is discussing what it is that makes Israel the people of God, or to put it another way - what it is that distinguishes Israel from the nations. In the peculiar history of Israel, the giving of the Law (v.4) marked them out as a privileged people among the nations of mankind. The fact that in ix:4 the covenant is followed by the reference to the giving of the Law goes against Schoeps' assertion that Paul did not perceive that in the biblical view the Law is integral to the covenant. The Law was given to apply the covenant concretely to the daily life of the people and the worship (νομοστατία), the ordinances relating to the temple cult stood at the centre of the Law and reminded Israel of God's continuing grace towards His people. The promises also

1. Barrett notes the strong evidence for the singular 'covenant', (P 46 BDG it) and suggests that, like other Jewish writers Paul probably distinguished three covenants within the great covenant of the Exodus, a covenant at Horeb, a second in the plains of Moab, and a third at Mounts Gerizim and Ebal. (pp.177-8)

2. Νομοστατία occurs only here in the New Testament, though it does occur in the LXX at II Macc.vi:23; IV Macc.v:35; xvii:16. Guthrod claims that it refers not so much to the act of legislation, but what has come out of the act and so should mean law or code of laws here; (Kittel Bible Key Words : Law, London 1962, pp.144-5). A reference to the giving of the Law makes better sense, however, in this context. Munck notes that the giving of the Law at Sinai is differently treated by Paul in Gal.iii:19-20 and II Cor.iii:7-18. (op.cit., p.32,n.15).

5. Cf. Leenhardt, p.244.
6. There is the same textual ambiguity between the singular and plural as already noted in relation to covenant. If the singular is accepted, it probably points back to the initial promise made to Abraham.
belong to Israel. In these promises God pledges Himself to Israel, thus guaranteeing the continuity of the life of His people and the eventual realization of their destiny.

The climax of this carefully enumerated list of Israel's privileges comes in v.5. They are the people descended from the patriarchs. That this heritage is not lightly regarded is evident from xi:28 where Paul speaks of the Jews as "enemies of God ... as regards the Gospel" but as regards election "beloved for the sake of their forefathers". To the patriarch Abraham God gave the promise concerning his posterity and for this reason the posterity of Abraham has become the people from whom "on the human side" the Messiah has come. Paul has built up a systematic enumeration of the privileges of Israel. It is possible that this list was already in existence prior to Paul's formulation of it as it is carefully structured into two sections with three parts to each.

Paul ends his list by an ascription of blessing to God, who has given these gifts to Israel. Munck considers the possibility that this may have been a customary Jewish doxology added to the enumeration of the mighty works

1. We noted on iii:21-26 that it was possible for a Jew to accept all that was said of God's redemption in Christ, without necessarily assuming that Gentiles are also to be included within the sphere of covenant grace. Cf. N.A. Dahl "The Atonement - An Adequate Reward for the Akedah?", Neotestamentica et Semitica Studies in honour of M. Black, Edinburgh, 1969, p.27.


3. This is Barrett's translation (p.177). Κατὰ σάρκα seems to demand a parallel as in i:4, but possibly Paul has in mind the creed he has already mentioned there and does not feel any need to repeat it all a second time.

4. Cf. νικηθείσα δόξα διαθήκη επαγγέλμα
   νομοθεσία λατρεία ἐπαγγέλμα

There seems also to be a correlation between the two sections i.e. the first word corresponds to the fourth, the second to the fifth and the third to the sixth, (Michel, p.227. n.2.).
of God. He rejects this because it "would seem out of place in a context that deals with God's gifts and their rejection by unbelievers." Without considering in detail the problem of interpretation posed by this verse, it would appear that Kunck's (rejected) suggestion - that it is a normal Jewish doxology added to the enumeration of God's gifts, is the best explanation. ²

Paul has finally succeeded in answering the question posed first of all in iii:1 - "What advantage has the Jew?" "Much in every way", is the answer given in iii:2 and again in ix:4-5. Paul has not flinched from setting forth the real advantages of Israel. ³ It is worth noting that if Paul had returned merely negative answers to the questions in iii:1.f., the result would be offensive not only to Jewish national sentiment but also to theology. The Old Testament shows that God did bestow special privileges upon the Jews, and to reduce them to the level of other nations is "either to accuse the Old Testament of falsehood, or to accuse God of failing to carry out His plans." ⁴

But what in fact is the advantage? The explanation of this is a problem that arose not just in iii:1.f., but already in i:16. ⁵ "To the Jew first" is just another way of claiming a special privilege for these particular people. Does this privilege consist simply in a temporal priority giving

---

2. For a review of the various interpretations see Leenhardt, pp.245-247.
3. Cerfau minimizes Paul's emphasis upon the advantage of Israel by his view that Paul emphasizes patriarchs, covenant and promise at the expense of the Law. The best explanation of Paul's concern with these advantages is that he is emphasizing the origin of Israel as the people of God. He is not really concerned at this point to differentiate between the gifts. Cf. Cerfau. op.cit., pp.340-41 (n.1).
5. Since it is generally acknowledged that i:16-17 is a summary of the central theme of the letter, this connection relates ix-xi very closely to the main issues of the letter.
no real advantage in salvation.¹ Or is it, as Barrett suggests, a real but terrible advantage which means that the Jew is "first in election" but also "first in judgement, instructed out of the Law, judged by means of the Law" - standing "as it were, nearer to the scene on which the divine purpose is worked out, a dangerous but real privilege?"² This "nearness to the scene of the divine purpose" is rather vague and its content is difficult to define.³ The advantage of the Jew is better explained in terms of the divine economy, in which the way to salvation for Gentiles must always be in dependence upon, and in relation to, the original 'Israel' of God.⁴

Dahl notes the close connection between Paul's view of the atonement and the Jewish-Christian understanding of it (as a reward for the Akedah). In Dahl's opinion Paul critically interpreted the Jewish-Christian tradition in the light of his soteriological affirmation - "There is no distinction" (Rom.iii:23; x:12). But although he re-interpreted it "Paul did not contradict the old tradition, but incorporated it in a new context. He recognized 'Jew first' to be a principle of divine economy and .... even when the order was reversed, Gentiles believing the Gospel and Jews rejecting it, Paul insisted that the Israelites were 'beloved for the sake of the fathers'."⁵

By this interpretation of ix:4-5 we have found a close connection

---

2. Barrett, p.62
3. The similarity of this view to that of Barth's is evident, and both reveal a common impreciseness cf. Barth - "he (the Jew) stands quite normally on the frontier of this world and at the point where the line of intersection by the new dimensional plane (i:4) must be veritably seen..." (p.40).
4. Cf. Michel's view that the advantage of Israel is not simply a "zeitlicher Vorsprung, sondern eine heilsgeschichtliche Notwendigkeit", and that this in fact means that the gospel to the Gentiles must always come by way of Judaism. (p.53).
between i:16, iii:1-2 and ix-xi. The emphasis upon the privileges of the Israelites, (iii:1-2 and ix:4-5) and the priority of the Jew (i:16, ii:9-10) make a suitable rejoinder to the presumptuous Gentile Christians and their anti-semitic attitudes as revealed in xi:17.f.\(^1\) Despite all the advantages of Israel, the underlying assumption in ix:1-5 is that Israel has not acted in accordance with her privileges. This is why, "immediately the list is completed, Paul hastens in v.6 to deny that the word of God has failed. He is aware of the original exalted status of Israel and her present disbelief,\(^2\) but he is not going to explain this contradiction at the expense of the word of God. Again it must be emphasized that the rebuttal of this criticism of the word of God arises not from Jewish patriotism but from Christian faith.\(^3\) After all if one election could fail, so could another and Christians could lose their inheritance just as easily as Jews, if God's word were not reliable.\(^4\)

1. This interpretation of the connections between these sections of Romans and the emphasis upon the 'Jewishness' of the gospel bring us close to the view of Noack who considers that the phrase 'to the Jew first' is a key to the interpretation of the letter. Instead of chs.v-viii being regarded as the centre of the letter, they are supplementary to chs.i, iii and ix-xi and serve the main purpose of the letter (as revealed in these latter chapters) "namely that of establishing the priority of the Jews and the claims of Jerusalem on Paul." "Current and Backwater in the Epistle to the Romans." S.Th. XIX (1965), p.165.

2. Ellison suggests that perhaps Paul was reminded of this glaring inconsistency by the jibes of Gentile Christians reminding him of the past and present disobedience of the Jews. op.cit., p.41.


4. Ellison. op.cit., p.28.

As a Jew and as a Christian, Paul must wrestle with the problem of the apparent failure of God to keep His word to those to whom He had given it.1 The purpose of ix: 6-13 is to show that whilst God’s promise was given to Israel, He Himself reserves the sovereign right at all times to determine the composition of this people. The term 'Israel' is not one that can be defined in and of itself as if it were a self-supporting, self-propagating entity with its own independent existence.2 Thus it cannot be defined in terms of mere physical descent; Israel is created "not by blood and soil, but by the promise of God, and therefore exists within the limits of God's freedom. If He were bound by physical descent, He would be unfree, and no longer God."3 Descent from Abraham is not the decisive factor, but only the καλεῖν and λόγιςεσθαι of God(v.7).4 Whilst we do not forget that the chosen sons, Isaac (v.7) and Jacob (v.10f) are both of the Jewish nation, the emphasis in these verses is that the Jew is not 'eo ipso' σπέρμα or τέκνον θεοῦ, but only through the λόγιςεσθαι of God.5 From the Jewish nation God, by His word of promise, ever creates Israel anew according to His purpose of

1. 'Ο λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ (v.6) (as in Is.xxxi:2 LXX) should be understood as God's oath-bound covenant promise (Murray NICHT. II. p.9). Cf. Michel "In diesem Zusammenhang ist der λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ Ausdruck für die Absicht und Willen Gottes, der sein Ziel trotz des Unglaubens der Menschen erreichen will." (p.231).
2. Cf. Müller, p.90.
4. Cf. Müller, p.90. Cf. Barrett, "The word 'counted' is of fundamental importance in this epistle... It points to the creative freedom of God, who creates 'righteousness' by 'counting' it, and annuls sin by not 'counting' it. (p.184).
5. Cf. Müller, p.28 and 90.ff. We note the close connections between this passage and ch.iv. Justification by faith is not limited to ch.iv and election is not confined to chs.viii-ix. See the section entitled "Rom.iv and ix-xi." The unity of Rom.i-xi is evidenced by the fact that ix:6-13 is an answer to a question in iii:3-4 and is already presupposed in the discussion of the case of Abraham in ch.iv.
God, as the divine Potter, uses the Jewish nation as His clay and from them He shapes the instruments for His service and glory.

The freedom of God to select from within the Jewish nation, His own Israel, lies behind Paul's preference for the word 'Israel' rather than Jew or Judaism in ix-xi. Richardson is quite correct to stress that ix:6(b) (not all who are descended from Israel, belong to Israel) stands as a heading over all that follows in Rom.ix-xi. This categorical statement reminds us at the very outset that any idea of the salvation of every individual Jew is ruled out of the question. Nor is this some novel doctrine proposed by Paul. Within the nation of Israel God has always exercised his prerogative to select an inner or true Israel, His own people of faith. Every Jew admitted this: Ishmael was a child of Abraham but no Jew believed that the Arabs, his descendants, were within the covenant. According to the Old Testament scriptures the children of faith were reckoned through the line of Isaac (v.8) and this was because the birth of Isaac was not a matter of ordinary physical generation, but the result of the promise of God, accepted in faith by Abraham (iv:18-22). If in Old Testament times there were descendants of Abraham who were not children of promise, then there is no need to claim that God's word has failed today any more than then.

Paul's answer to the questions concerning God's faithfulness to His word centres on the definition of the Israel of God. He has already prepared

---

2. Cf. the emphasis of Käsemann in his view of righteousness as the power of God active in the world for the formation of the new creation. "The Righteousness of God". NTOT, pp.168-182.
3. op. cit., p.136. Bornkamm holds that v.6(a) - "but it is not as though the word of God has failed" should be written over all that follows in ix-xi. "Mensch und Gott in der griechischen Tragödie und in der urchristlichen Botschaft." Das Ende des Gesetzes, p.173 ff. (186).
us for a distinction within the nation of Israel by his discussion in
ii:28-29 of ὁ Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι and ὁ Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τῇ κυριεύσει. The
statement "Not the outward Jew is a real Jew" is a parallel to "Not all de-
cendants of Israel belong to Israel" (ix:6b). The true Israel is 'of Israel'
but not co-extensive with historical Israel. We might distinguish the two
groups as Israel κατὰ σῷρακα and Israel κατὰ πνεύμα as in Gal.
iv:29 (cf. also the Israel of God in Gal.vi:16); again we might look back to
ch.iv:14-16 where the terms are ὁ ἐκ νόμου and ὁ ἐκ πληρεως.
Here however it is stated that the τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ are not the τέκνα
τῆς σῷρακα but the τέκνα τῆς ἐκ πνεύματος (v.8).

Despite the similarities with Gal.iv and Rom.iv, it is essential that
Rom.ix:6-13 be allowed to speak for itself. By doing this we may avoid two
possible misunderstandings. The first of these is illustrated by Lietzmann's
interpretation. He interprets this section with the aid of Gal.iv. Lietz-
mann understands Isaac in Gal.iv:20 as an 'allegorischer Prototyp' of the
Christian and so he understands 'the children of promise' as a reference to
the Christian church. With this kind of exegesis we soon arrive at the inter-
pretation which regards the Christian Church alone as the true heir to the

1. It is interesting to note how Paul's general introductory statements in
ch.ii are related to the concrete missionary situation of the early
church - cf. Richardson's view that chs.ii-iv are "the theoretical basis
of chs.ix-xi (a summary of historical realities and present problems).
One is inductive, the other deductive." (op.cit., p.143,n.2).
2. This is the only place where Paul explicitly refers to a group within
Israel as 'Israel'. Cf. 'the Israel of God', Gal.vii:16.
3. This is parallel to v.7 where a distinction is made between Abraham's
σῷρακα and Abraham's τέκνα.
4. An die Römer 3 Aufl. (1923), p.91. Munck, despite the fact that he
notes that Ishmael is not even mentioned by name and that the persecution
of those born according to the Spirit by those born according to the flesh
(Gal.iv:23), is not explicitly referred to, is inclined to agree with
Lietzmann that the ideas contained in the Galatian passage are implicit
here. (op.cit., pp.36-37).
promises and successor to the historical people of God. Müller correctly
notes that the purpose of this passage (ix:6-8) is not to prove that Christ-
ians are the true people of God but rather to show that the existence of
God's people Israel depends on the will of God alone.  

The second mistake is related to the first. This consists in regard-
ing this section as identical with iv:13.f. In ch.iv the true children of
Abraham (as distinct from his descendants) are defined as those who walk in
the steps of Abraham's faith. Since the promise did not come via the Law,
this means that believing Gentiles are also to be considered as true child-
ren of Abraham. But in ix:6-13 this is not the case. In this instance Paul
makes his distinction only within the nation of Israel. He "does not here
visualize 'Israelites' who do not belong to the physical Israel....". The
οβ πάντας of v.6 implies only the limitation to a part of Israel, and
not the rejection of all Israel, or the inclusion of the Gentiles. It is
only in vv.22.f. that the subject of Gentile inclusion is broached. Paul's
answer to the question of the failure of God's promises does not consist of
the easy assumption of Gentile Christians that they have simply replaced

1. Cf. Cerfau's opinion that the promises by-pass the historical Israel and
rest on the church of Christ. (Recueil Lucien Cerfau, p.355). Gaugler
protests against this interpretation of ch.ix and the view that the
promise to Israel has lapsed with the rise of the church. (Vol.II,
pp.24.f.).
2. Müller, p.90. Cf. also his excellent treatment of 'Schöpfungstradition'
(pp.27-33).
3. Munck, p.36.
4. How large a portion of Israel is intended here is difficult to discern;
it may only be Paul's delicate manner of referring to a very small number.
It seems likely however that a reasonable number is envisaged - more per-
haps than Munck allows in his view of the Jewish mission as almost a
complete failure. (FSM, pp.30-31).
5. Munck, Christ and Israel, p.36. As this book will be frequently referred
to throughout the discussion of chs.ix-xi it will in future be indicated
simply as Munck.
historic Israel in the purpose of God.¹ Munck points out that this easy transference of the promises from Old Testament Israel to the Christian Church was not made so lightly until after the fall of Jerusalem when Gentile Christians interpreted this event as God's judgement upon, and final rejection of the Jewish nation.² It is hard for us, and yet it is essential, to realize that in this respect the later Gentile church interpreted this question very differently from Paul and the New Testament church.³ Richardson sums up the position very well when he writes on this subject - "Two courses were possible: either to apply the prerogatives (of Israel) one by one to Christians and to them alone, or else to show how, while these prerogatives are opened up to include others, they retain their basic application to Israel. In following the latter course, Paul indicates his respect for 'Israelites' by refusing to set out a Christian take-over.⁴

That human descent is not the decisive factor in determining the 'Israel' of God is spelled out even more clearly in ix:10-13. A possible objection to the case of Isaac was that it could be argued that the choosing of one son of Abraham rather than the other, was due not to God's free election, but to the fact that Ishmael's mother was the bond-woman Hagar whereas Isaac's mother was the princess Sarah. So Paul takes what might be termed the most extreme example in order to prove his case. According to Gen.xxv:21, Rebecca bore twin sons to her husband Isaac. Yet before either Jacob or Esau had been born or had done good or evil, God had determined

¹. It was for this reason that the Gentile church took over the Old Testament as its own, regarding it as no longer the holy scriptures of the Jews. Cf. I Clement and Barnabas (Munck, p.35,n.25).
². op.cit., p.35,
³. Ibid.
⁴. op.cit., p.131. See also Müller's criticism of Peterson and his comment that he who wishes to find this view in the text must himself introduce it into the chain of Paul's thought. (p.90).
that Esau should serve Jacob (Gen. xv: 23). If in the case of two peoples, originating from sons of the same parents (unlike Isaac and Ishmael), God chooses one and by-passes another, or loves one and hates the other, even before they are born, it is plain that God's purpose of election is not

1. As Lietzmann (p. 91) correctly observes, the Genesis account is of two nations, not two individuals. Munck (op. cit., p. 38, n. 36) considers that Lietzmann is wrong to criticize Paul's treatment of Jacob and Esau in Rom. ix: 12, since, in his opinion, Paul is also referring to peoples and not individuals (as Lietzmann himself subsequently notes).

2. Verse 13, "Jacob I loved but Esau I hated", is a quotation from the LXX of Malachi i: 2. Following Leenhardt, we regard "love, hate" here as being "virtually synonymous with choosing or leaving aside". (p. 250). In Luke xiv: 26 to hate one's life means to be detached from it, to turn away from it, to surrender it. In this "love-hate" vocabulary of the biblical writers is none of the emotional associations of current ideas of "love-hate" (Leenhardt, p. 250). We take this reference from Malachi to be a parallel to the Genesis quotation saying that the elder should serve the younger. It is a choice or election for God's purpose, the interest being chiefly in the positive election and its outcome, rather than on the negative non-election or hating. Cf. Schmidt, op. cit., pp. 162-3.

3. ἡ κατ' ἔκλογην πρόθεσις - we should understand this to mean the purpose of God which operates by means of election (so that election designates the method by which God's purpose is achieved), and not that the two terms stand 'in dem Verhältnis eines zeitlichen Nachaeinander'. Cf. Schmidt, p. 162. The noun πρόθεσις is also found in Rom. viii: 28; Eph. ii: 11, iii: 11. The verbal form προσέθημεν is found in Rom. i: 13 and Eph. i: 9. ἔκλογη is not found in the LXX, although ἐκλεγμα is used regularly to translate την... Cf. Deut. xiv: 2 - "For you are a people holy to the Lord your God; and the Lord has chosen you to be a people for His own possession ...". See T. L. Vriend Die Erwägung Israels nach dem Alten Testament, ATANT No. 24 (Zürich 1953), pp. 41-50; and Gottlob Schrenk on ἔκλογα, TDNT IV, 145, pp. 168-70. In Rom. xi: 5 Paul states that a remnant of Israel now exists κατ' ἔκλογην χάριτος and in xi: 28 Israel as a whole is designated on account of the fathers, beloved κατ' τὴν ἐκλογὴν. In xi: 7 ἡ ἔκλογη usually a reference to God's choosing, is used to designate those chosen instead of ἔκλεξτοι as in viii: 33 (Cf. Schrenk, op. cit., pp. 179 f.).
determined either by human descent or human achievement.\(^1\) God’s freedom is 
absolute. However, this absolute freedom is not contrary to normal human 
conceptions of justice, freedom etc. as has often been the case with doctrin-
es concerning the predestination of the individual. The first point we must 
note is that the predestination mentioned is not predestination to salvation 
or judgement, but to the purpose of God. The quotation from Malachi does not 
mean that God destined Esau to perdition, but rather that God who conceived 
His purpose, must be free to invite collaboration in its execution.\(^2\) If 
God did not control the undertaking by freely choosing His collaborators, the 
divine purpose would not continue.\(^3\) “Far from being arbitrary, 
this divine liberty ensures, on the contrary, the continuity and permanence 
of God’s plan, the realization of which is thus protected from the caprice of 
man and his conduct whether good or bad.”\(^3\) But the free choice of means is 
not to be confused with the choice or rejection of individuals for a final 
destiny. What is involved is their participation in the purpose of God. 

The second point at issue here is whether or not we ought to think of 
the patriarchs as individuals at all. Leenhardt stresses the fact that the 
names mentioned do not connote individuals so much as peoples named after 

---

1. The rejection of Ishmael and Esau was attributed frequently to their own 
demerit (see Jub.xv:30 - "For Ishmael, and his sons and his brothers and 
Esau, the Lord did not cause to approach Him ... because He knew them, 
but He chose Israel to be His people." ) See also Str/Bill II, 526f., 
III, 266; The Sifre on Deut.xxxii:9, points out that Abraham and Isaac 
had worthless offspring, (Ishmael, Esau and descendants) but when Jacob 
arrived "no unworthy offspring issued from him, but all his children were 
born worthy like himself ..." (as cited by E. Mihaly "A Rabbinic Defense 
of the Election of Israel" HUCA, XXXV (1964), p.105. On the theme of 
traditional opposition between Jacob and Esau arising out of the Old Test-
ament accounts of Edom’s conduct towards Israel particularly when Jerusal-
em was destroyed in 586 B.C. and its subsequent enlargement in the later 
writing such as Jubilees, The Testament of Judah and Enoch, see Munck, 
pp.39-42.

2. Cf. Leenhardt, p.249.

3. Ibid.
their eponymous ancestors according to normal Old Testament practice.¹ A
good summary of the theme of Rom.ix:6-13 is given by Munck who considers that
this section is speaking "neither of individuals and their selection for sal-
vation, nor of the spiritual Israel, the Christian Church. It speaks rather
of the patriarchs, who without exception became founders of peoples. God
selected one son to carry on the chosen stock, but sent the other son away to
become the founder of an alien people outside the promised land."²

In this conclusion, Munck agrees with Leenhardt in that the collective
rather than the individualistic element in God's choice is emphasized. He
differs from Leenhardt in that, according to his view the interest here is
initially more on the actual figures of the patriarchs themselves rather
than on the peoples whose founders they became.

The point that Paul wishes to make is that God's choice depends only on
His call (ἐκ τοῦ καλοθύντος).³ By His call He creates His people
and His word accomplishes what He purposes (Is.iv:11). God's word is living
and life-bringing, creating a people for His name.⁴ By this alone are His
people constituted. This does not mean, however, that God uses His power to
create His people in an arbitrary fashion. He does have the power to make

1. op.cit., p.250.
2. op.cit., p.42.
3. The close connection between election and calling is illustrated by
   Is.xi:9 (LXX) where the two terms are practically identical "... Israel
   my servant ... whom I called ... you are my servant, I have chosen you." See also Is.xiii:1 (LXX) "and now thus saith the Lord, He who created
   you Jacob, He who formed you, Israel: Fear not, for I have redeemed you;
   I have called you by name, you are mine."
   Michel regards calling as the historical realization of the eternal election
   (p.247). Munck makes the point that not only God's action (i.e. calling) but also "God's choice is determined in the midst of history; God acts
   in history, decides, and ... makes new decisions, because, while his intention of salvation stands, it is achieved by constant interventions into the
   changing circumstances of history." (op.cit., pp.42-43. See also pp.75-76).
children from stones, but, in fact, what Paul states here is that He calls 
not stones, nor even Gentiles but from within the nation of Israel.

We reject therefore the solution of the problem of Israel's disbelief 
by the positing of an eschatological Israel over against the historical Is¬
rael. If we are to use these terms here at all, we must affirm that part 
of historical Israel is also eschatological Israel, and that it would appear 
that Paul could not have envisaged an eschatological Israel that contained 
none of the historical Israel. What Paul has now firmly established is that 
God has chosen a particular nation through which to operate His purpose in 
the world. But He has not committed Himself to this nation in such a way 
that His purpose is completely determined by the response of the nation whom 
He has chosen. He has secured the furtherance of His purpose by creating 
within this nation His own people who will further the purpose of their 
Creator.

Ch. ix:6-13 demonstrates both the continuity and discontinuity2 of God's 

1. This is the solution of E. Dinkler and to a lesser extent of C. Müller. 
We prefer to describe the Jews as 'historical' Israel rather than 'natural' 
Israel. The latter description is dangerous because it too easily 
labels the Jews 'in toto' as 'natural' Israel and the Christian church as 
'eschatological' Israel - the legitimate successor of the Jews in the in¬
eritance of God. 'Historical' Israel is the more suitable title because 
the terms historical and eschatological do not necessarily exclude one 
another, and this terminology enables us to include Jews as well as Gent¬
iles in the reconstituted people of God. 

2. The discontinuity has been strongly emphasized by G. Klein, who holds that 
Paul's theology "radikal entheiligt und paganisiert ... die Geschichte 
Israels." ("Röm. iv und die Idee der Heilsgeschichte". EvTh, 23, (1963) 
p.441). This negative view of Israel's history is often accompanied by a 
very negative view of the Old Testament. Cf. Bultmann's essays "History 
of Salvation and History" (review of O. Cullmann's Christ and Time) in 
Existence and Faith, 1960, pp.226-40; and "Prophecy and Fulfilment" in 
Essays on Old Testament Interpretation, Ed. G. Westermann, SCM, (1963), 
pp.50-75. In a review of the latter publication (Int. XVII, (1963), pp. 
482-85). W. Harrelson criticizes the essays by Bultmann, Baumgärtel and 
Hesse for their general agreement that the Old Testament "serves largely 
the function of enabling Christians to discern what faith is not."(p.484).
relationship with the Jewish nation. The discontinuity is shown by the fact that God's choice is not determined by human descent alone, but the continuity is maintained in that (in this section) the Israel of God is still regarded as being composed only of members of the Jewish nation\(^1\) (the inclusion of

1. We have already noted the continuity between the Testaments in connection with the story of Abraham in Rom.iv (see Thesis pp.176-80). O. Cullmann has insisted on the legitimacy of 'Heilsgeschichte' in opposition to the existentialist theologians (Bultmann in particular). See Salvation in History, especially pp.28-64. E. Käsemann ("Der Glaube Abrahams in Röm.
iv". HPP, pp.152.f.) has criticized the extreme views of G. Klein (claiming that his altogether negative approach to the history of Israel formalizes the doctrine of the justification of the ungodly). Käsemann has adopted a much more positive attitude towards 'Heilsgeschichte' than is typical of most scholars of the Bultmann school. The distinctive development of his own outlook is illustrated by his view that apocalyptic is the 'mother' of Christian theology (a view not shared by E. Puch and C. Bornkamm) - cf. "The Beginnings of Christian Theology". NTO.T, pp.82-107; - and also by his initiating, in association with W. Zimmerli, in Göttingen in 1958/59, a seminar on Rom.ix-xi and its relation to the Old Testament (see the article by J.H. Robinson "Basic Shifts in German Theology". Int. XVI, (1962) 76-97, p.89). Marcus Barth makes the interesting point that a concern for the solidarity of the church with Israel may well have been one of the reasons for the frequent use of the Old Testament by early Christian writers and speakers - "Conversion and Conversation: Israel and the Church in Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians", Int. XVII (1963) 3-24(19). If this is so then Rom.ix-xi is a particularly important section of the New Testament in the discussion of the relationship between the Testaments. J. Barr has shown, however, that the attempt to discover a unified relationship between the Testaments, particularly in connection with any philosophy of history, is fraught with serious difficulties, (Old and New in Interpretation, SCN, (1966) especially ch.iii). W. Fannenberg is more willing to commit himself to a specific view of history and salvation/history - (cf. "Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte". KuD, V, (1959), 218-237, 256-268). One of the best expositions of a 'heilsgeschichtlich' continuity is given by C. Westermann in his essay "God and His People: The Church in the Old Testament." Int. XVII, (1963), 259-70. According to this author the history of Israel is conceived as a unity (as illustrated by parables of a vineyard, the imagery of a child, a widow etc.) and the reason for this unity is basically the unity of the God of Israel (p.270). The solution would appear to be that there is both continuity and discontinuity between the Testaments, but the former is greater than the latter and encompasses it. Cf. H.H. Graham "Continuity and Discontinuity in the Thought of Paul". ATh, XXXVIII, (1956) 137-146. U. Wilckens coins the phrase "erwählungsgeschichtliche Kontinuität". ("Die Rechtfertigung Abrahams nach Römer iv."), in Studien zur Theologie der alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen, Fest­schrift für G. von Rad, (1961), 111-127(121).
Gentiles is not explicitly stated until ix:22). If we were to think only in terms of God's absolute freedom (which some believe is Paul's theme in these verses) then we would not be surprised if it were stated that God rejects Israel and chooses another nation in her place. But this overlooks God's consistent covenant-faith and His voluntary binding of His purpose to Israel. Thus the fact that the inclusion of the Gentiles is not explicitly noted until later in the chapter reminds us that at this stage Paul is speaking only of God's selection within that nation with whom He has already bound Himself in covenant. This interpretation has the merit of upholding at the same time both the freedom and the faithfulness of God.

1. R.E. Brown holds that the church originally thought in terms of 'renewed Israel'. The increase in the number of Gentile Christians tended gradually to change this to the 'new Israel' until in Barnabas v:17 we find that Israel has actually been replaced by a 'new Israel'. "The Unity and Diversity in New Testament Ecclesiology" in New Testament Essays. (London 1965) pp.41-43. See also P. Richardson, op.cit. chs.ii and vi.


Chapter ix:14-18.

The transition to a new section is marked by the usual question-objec-
tion diatribe style which is such a striking feature of this chapter. The
questions - "What shall we say then? Is there injustice on God's part?" (v.14), remind us that this theme (God's injustice) was first introduced in
iii:5. Paul repudiates such a suggestion as unthinkable. His retort, however, is not meant to be the prelude to a refutation of the accusation. As
in iii:1-8, Paul simply assumes (as do also his opponents) the righteousness
of God as an indisputable fact which does not require any defence. The ob-
jection is that if Paul's picture of God's action in history (as presented in
vv.6-13) is correct, then it would appear that this action is totally arbit-
rary since the 'Judge of all the earth' reserves the right to exercise part-
iality as He pleases. If we regard vv.14-18 as a discussion of an issue al-
ready raised by Paul in the previous section, then their function may be de-
scribed as a concluding summary of vv.6-13 which at the same time also prepares
the way for the theme of vv.19ff.

In v.15 Paul repeats his assertion of the absolute and unconditioned

1. As in iii:5; vi:1; vii:7; ix:30 this follows the common pattern of ob-
   jections.
2. Contra Barrett who says that Paul finds it necessary to demonstrate that
   God is righteous (p.185 n.1). Paul does not defend but simply declares
   God's electing grace. Cf. Dodd, p.45 (on Rom.iii:3-6), Nygren pp.365ff.
   Althaus states that Paul "begründet Gottes Handeln nicht, er zeigt ein-
   fach in der Heilsgeschichte auf, dass Gott nie anders gehandelt hat." (p.93).
   This section does not consist of Paul's "agonized theodicy" as K.
   Stendahl claims ("The Called and the Chosen: An Essay on Election",
   in The Root of the Vine, p.69), nor does it contain a defence of divine
   election (contra E. Dinkler "The Historical and the Eschatological Israel"
   Jr, 36, p.114).
   partiality in judgement. According to the Jerusalem Talmud on Ex.xxxiii:
   19, God spares him who is worthy to be spared and shows mercy upon him who
   is worthy of mercy. (St/Bill.III, 268).
freedom of the divine action. ¹ That this section is also related to the proof that the divine action is not governed by any kind of partiality is shown by the introductory μή in vv.15 and 17.² The first quotation cites the words spoken to Moses in Ex.xxxiii:19 "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion." The reason for Paul's reference to Moses,³ the recipient of the divine revelation for Israel, may be to show that God's word is a word of mercy and that He Himself is not bound by any law save the 'law' of His own free grace.⁴ This means that neither human determination ( ὁ ἐξουσίος ) nor human striving ( ὁ τρέχων )⁵ are the key to God's activity in history - cf. v.16 "so it depends not upon man's will or exertion, but upon God's mercy." This verse appears to be Paul's

1. Cf. Schmidt, p.163. It is noteworthy however that Paul does not immediately parry the objection with the stern image of the divine potter and his absolute right, but asserts first of all the divine compassion. (G. Bornkamm, Das Ende des Gesetzes, p.186).

2. Lagrange, pp.233-234.

3. Are we to consider Moses and Pharaoh as individuals as Martin Dibelius proposes? (Paul, p.34). It seems preferable to regard them as representatives of Israel, God's chosen people, and of the Egyptians, the non-elect or the enemies of God's people. Leenhardt grants that here again we are dealing with individuals. But he maintains that "they are both considered in the light of their function, not as individual personalities; they are treated as leaders of peoples, not as believers or un-believers." (p.253). Munck asserts that to Paul Pharaoh signified the Egyptians - a people that persecutes God's people and tries to destroy them. (p.48). He bases his position not only on the text of Rom.ix but also on the treatment of Pharaoh in late Jewish texts. He does tend, however, to over-emphasize the role of Israel as persecutor and the extent of Israel's unbelief. Cf. his excursus (i) on Israel as persecutor (pp.49.f.), and D. Hare's criticism of Munck in The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel according to St. Matthew. (p.62, n.1).

4. E. Kühl, as quoted by Schmidt, p.164.

5. Cf. B. Noack "Celui qui court". STH, XXIV (1970), pp.113-6. Noack claims that the origin of the imagery here is more likely to be Jewish - expressing determined zeal for the Law, than Hellenistic - drawing on the imagery of the sports-stadium to depict strenuous endeavour. In view of the allusion to athletics in Phil.iii:14 his argument is weak.
explanatory summary of what he understands the Exodus quotation to teach.\footnote{1}

Since v.16 gives Paul's own summary of the teaching, we must be careful to judge the total import of vv.14-18, not only by the apparent content of the Old Testament quotations but also by Paul's interpretation of them.

This is particularly relevant in the case of the reference to Pharaoh in v.17. The opening γάρ reminds us that this verse is to be associated along with v.15\footnote{2} in illustrating the free action of God's mercy in history. Thus the introduction of the theme of hardening in v.18\footnote{3} - "so then He has mercy upon whom He wills, and He hardens the heart of whomever He wills" - does not represent a further stage in the argument but rather a continuation of the same argument. This means that the hardening is to be viewed as the reverse of the 'exercising of mercy' which we have already been discussing and not as a new theme to be studied separately from the previous one. This means, in brief, that the freedom of God's grace stands over all the comments upon hardening and rejection, and the latter are to be understood strictly in the light of the former.\footnote{4}

1. Cf. Schmidt, p.164. Michel notes that this verse "klingt wie eine Regel oder ein Lehrsatz". (p.239.)
2. F.W. Maier \textit{Israel in der Heilsgeschichte nach Rom.ix-xi.} (35-36), Lagrange (233f.)
3. The use of the verb σχηματίζων originates in the story of Pharaoh in Ex.iv:21; vii:3 etc. J. Murray makes the point that hardening "may never be abstracted from the guilt of which it is the wages", and that Pharaoh hardened his own heart (Ex.vii:14). He acknowledges that the main emphasis in the Exodus account is that the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart (Vol.II, pp.28-29). In the thought of the Old Testament prophets hardening is normally regarded as the reaction of God to an already existing hardness of heart in Israel (Leenhardt, p.254). J.K.S. Reid allows that it is quite correct to state that unbelief or wickedness is the cause for hardening but holds that it is incorrect to say that it is the sole cause. (Introduction to J. Calvin's \textit{Concerning the Eternal Predestination of God}, p.18). It is unnecessary to distinguish here the respective activity of God and man in hardening since the concern is not primarily with the salvation of individuals but with their function in the 'Heilsgeschichte'.
4. Mercy is the key-note of chs.ix-xi. (Barrett, p.185).
This interpretation is supported by the context of the Exodus quotations. When God was faced with the infidelity of the Israelites in the incident of the golden calf, if His reaction has been governed by 'man's will or exertion' then the Israelites would have been cast off from His redemptive purpose. But instead of rejecting His thankless people, God acted towards them in unmerited kindness in keeping with covenant-loyalty.

Thus the Exodus reference gives ample proof\(^1\) that God's mercy is completely free and that He is not bound to punish those who deserve His wrath, but He is free to continue to act towards them in mercy.\(^2\) We must be careful to note that in the remainder of this chapter, God's freedom to harden stands alongside, and in service of, His freedom to choose whom He wills.\(^3\) This may lead us to the strange paradox that God is also free to preserve faithless Israel and retain for her the gifts and calling which Gentile Christians, with their own idea of God's justice, expected to be taken from her and given to another.

If we interpret this section (vv.14-18) in the light of the situation to which xi:17ff. seems to be addressed, it would appear that Paul's argument here is an argument from scripture\(^4\) designed to show Gentile Christians that God is free not only to reject the Jews if He pleases, but also to show mercy to them as He wills. It is not for Gentile Christians to decide whether the Jews are rejected or not - this depends ultimately on God's mercy and not

---

1. Contrary to Michel's view that v.15 offers no logical answer to the question in v.14 (p.238).
3. "It is not the will or the actions of man but solely God's mercy that decides whether the Heilsgeschichte shall be carried on through one part of a people or another..." (Munck, p.45).
4. According to v.15 God 'speaks' to Moses, and in v.17 the scripture 'speaks' to Pharaoh. In both places Paul explicitly draws attention to the fact that the Old Testament narrative is the basis of his theology.
merely on Jewish unbelief or even on the faith of Gentiles. The theme of the
section may be summarized as the sovereignty of God as illustrated in the
history of Israel. Since this sovereignty has to do with God's purpose of
salvation for His people, this means that a 'heilsgeschichtlich' understanding
of the passage is particularly appropriate. Moses and Pharaoh are summoned
on the stage of history for a particular purpose.\(^1\) Negatively or positively
they must serve the on-going purpose of God. Those who withstand God or His
people (as Pharaoh did)\(^2\) cannot thwart the purpose of God but can only
negatively assist in its fulfilment. The continuity of God's purpose depends
not merely on Moses or the faithful remnant whom God rewards, nor conversely
on Esau, Ishmael and Pharaoh in their opposition to God, but only upon God
Himself and His boundless mercy.\(^3\)

It is quite possible, as Barrett suggests, that Paul found in the
story of the Exodus a clue to the interpretation of the historical events of
his own day. Just as Pharaoh's opposition provided the occasion for a mani-
ifestation of God's power in a mighty act of deliverance, so now the nation
of Israel exists (a) to provide the occasion or context for the divine act
of deliverance whereby men are freed from the Law, and thus from sin and
death, and (b) to act so as to promote the publication of God's act of deliver-
ance throughout the world which occurs because of Israel's rejection of the
gospel.\(^4\) Thus as God used the opposition of Pharaoh for His own glory and did

---

1. Paul does not follow either the Hebrew or the LXX text exactly. In the
case of Pharaoh Ex.ix:16 records that he was spared death from boils,
but Paul speaks not of Pharaoh's preservation but of his being raised up
- ἐκθύειται v.17. Munck suggests that this verb probably means here -
to cause to appear in 'Heilsgeschichte' (p.46, see also PSM, p.29).
2. Cf. Munck's comparison of Pharaoh with the figure of Antichrist (p.47).
3. Cf. Munck. "God does not show mercy and harden at will. Rather, His
mercy is boundless, and even the aim of His hardening is mercy." (p.60).
not allow it to thwart His saving purpose, so God can over-rule the self-will of Israel and use even her disobedience in His all-embracing purpose of mercy.¹

It may be that Professor Barrett draws more from Paul's discussion of Israel's history than is adequately supported by the text, but his emphasis upon the function of Israel within the divine purpose is perfectly in keeping with the tenor of this chapter. If we relate this interpretation again to ch.xi,² we may suggest that in view of the Gentile Christian's belief in the divine rejection of Israel Paul maintains the freedom of God to have mercy on whom He wills and, conversely, that although Israel is disobedient, she still exists to serve the divine purpose.

¹ Barrett, p.187.
² In relating the argument of ch.ix to the theme of ch.xi we are assuming that chs.ix-xi are a unity, and that there is a gradual progression in the argument, so that ch.ix is not self-explanatory but is designed to support the conclusion arrived at in ch.xi.
Chapter ix:19-29.

In view of Paul's emphatic declaration of the freedom of God, the conclusion might be drawn that men can no longer be regarded as moral beings and that their response to the divine will, whether in obedience or disobedience, is irrelevant. This objection, first proposed in iii:7, is now reiterated in ix:19.⁠¹ If as Paul has claimed, God's sovereignty is absolute - why does He still find fault? For who can resist His will?² The first part of Paul's refutation is to remind the objector of his creatureliness - Who are you, a man, to answer back to God? Although this rhetorical question may not appear to be an adequate reply to the question asked, it does contain a salutary reminder that man is a creature and that his questioning should reflect his awareness of this fact.³ Paul will not allow God to be subjected to human standards of measurement. "If man is to dispute with God, he must at least try to share God's angle of vision...."⁴ To help his readers to adjust their field of vision, Paul proposes that they should consider the parable of the potter. That men should answer back to God is as ridiculous as the "model saying to the modeller, Why did you make me like this?"⁵

The image of the potter and the clay is a very popular one in the Old Testament, and this means that it is difficult to discover which text Paul

---

1. Whereas in iii:7 the objection is put in the first person, here it is in the second, 'You will say', as if Paul does not wish to associate himself with the objection in this extreme form. Cf. Sanday and Headlam, p.258.
2. Sanday and Headlam do not agree with this translation - Who can resist His will? Although ἄνωθεν is perfect tense, it has present sense and is best translated - "What man is there who is resisting God's will?" (p.259). The source of the objection is probably Wisdom xii:12 (Barrett, p.187).
4. Leenhardt, p.255.
5. Following Barrett's translation (p.187).
may have in mind. Verse 21(a) has closest connection with Is.xxix:16 but part
(b) of the same verse is closer to Is.xlv:9, where the emphasis is upon one
who strives with his Maker, "an earthen vessel with the potter". It may be
that Paul also has in mind the story of the potter in Jer.xviii:1f., where the
vessel was marred in the hand of the potter and he remoulded it again. In
Jeremiah this imagery is specifically related to the fortunes of nations in
the purpose of God and also includes a reference to their own obedience or
disobedience as determining their destiny (Jer.xviii:5-10). In none of these
texts is there any reference to God's shaping of individual human beings.
The image "is used rather in political and 'heilsgeschichtliche' contexts
where God is dealing with the Gentiles and the chosen people."

Michel points out that the figure of the potter is such a common one
that Paul works it in in a general way without explicitly quoting from any
particular passage. It is probable however that the main Old Testament pas-
sages with close affinities to Paul's subject matter are the most likely
sources of his thought. Leenhardt emphasizes in particular Is.xlv:9-13 as
the background of Paul's thought in v.21. In opposition to Michel, Leenhardt
claims that the interest here centres not on God as Creator, but on God as

1. Cf. also Job.ix:12 and Str/Bill III, 270ff. A similar emphasis is also
found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Cf. IQS XI, 22, and IQH III, 23.
2. Munck notes that another passage which is often cited in connection with
this passage - Wisdom xv:7f., does contain the image of the potter and
his power over the clay, but it is not used concerning God - only of
craftsmen making idols as in Is.xl:19-20. Sirach xxxvi:13 (LXX) deals
with the Creator's attitude to individuals rather than nations. (op.cit.,
p.58 n.81).
3. Job xi:8,9, xxxii:6. (Thy hands fashioned me - made me of clay etc.) may
be an exception here, but it is not likely to be the main context of
Paul's Old Testament references.
5. op.cit., p.242.
Providence. We must agree with Leenhardt in that the image of the potter is of one who shapes or moulds rather than one who creates; even if we use the word Creator in relation to man's dependence upon God, what we are thinking of in this context is more God's continuing control over what He has created than the initial act of creation. It is because he emphasized God's activity as Creator that C.H. Dodd found this section of the letter so poorly argued. He states "The trouble is that man is not a pot; he will ask, 'Why did you make me like this?' and he will not be bludgeoned into silence. It is the weakest point in the whole epistle." Leenhardt points out, however, that the comparison in the text is not concerned with the nature of the terms i.e. with men as clay etc., but the function to which the material is destined. "'Why have you made me thus?' - does not mean 'Why am I such and such a particular vase?' The potter does not create the clay, he moulds it and adapts it to the various uses he has in view."

1. Op.cit., p.258. Michel believes that Paul may also have in mind the idea of man being formed from the loam of the earth as in Gen.ii:7, (p.242). In accord with this emphasis upon God as Creator, Michel claims that it is impossible to distinguish between the historical part which God allots to a man and the eternal plan concerning him. Leenhardt on the other hand feels that the case of Cyrus is the best proof that Michel is wrong (op. cit., p.257).

2. P.159. It is noteworthy that Dodd uses here the image of the all-powerful Creator who literally forces His creatures into subjection. This image of God as absolute power is one that recurs in the classical exposition of predestination as in Augustine and Calvin. Cf. "Concerning the Eternal Predestination of God" translated by J.K.S. Reid and especially Reid's introduction (p.26) where he shows that in a proper understanding of the universe man can have his freedom within it and yet at the same time be controlled overall by the will of God. The thought in this passage however is not of God the Creator who forms men out of the same lump of clay to perdition or glory. The image of the potter is not of one who arbitrarily makes or destroys particular vessels but one who designs in a particular shape according to the use for which they are intended. The aim of the potter is creative activity for the benefit of humanity. (Leenhardt,p.256). See also Muller (p.30) and Munck (p.70).

3. op.cit., p.255.
When we bear in mind the providential aspect of the potter image, there is nothing offensive in God's making out of the same lump one vessel for beauty and another for menial use. In the Is.xlv passage, Cyrus is the key figure. Since the imagery here is used to refer to God's dealings in history with the nation of Israel, it is interesting to note the part played by Cyrus. In this passage although Cyrus may not be a vessel of honour for the reason that he is not a member of the nation of Israel, yet he is referred to as the chosen or anointed one (v.1) and his usefulness is great in spite of the fact that he is not a son of Abraham and the promise.

Although Paul does not explicitly refer to Cyrus, it is quite likely that he did have this context (Is.xlv) in mind and therefore intended to use the story of Cyrus as the general background for his argument. The example of God's use of Cyrus as His instrument is an excellent one to show the sovereign freedom of God to use men as He wills for the furtherance of His own purpose.

1. Σχεδός εἰς τιμὴν (ἀτιμίαν) does not refer to election or reprobation and hence the problems of determinism etc. really need not concern us here. Leenhardt opposes Michel's view (p.243, n.2) that this means honourable or shameful vessels. Instead he claims that these formulae apply solely to the use of the vessels without implying any judgement of value. "There is nothing in common between the idea of a vessel intended for a menial purpose and one intended to be destroyed". (p.256). That the emphasis should be upon the use to which the vessel is put is supported by II Tim.iii:20ff. where the quality of the vessel is mentioned (i.e. gold and silver) but the main emphasis is upon their usefulness (cf. also W. Bauer's Greek-English Lexicon, p.119).

2. "This ignoble vessel proved in fact to be very useful... His case shows that the advocates of a predestinarian interpretation entertain too human an idea of the resources at God's disposal". (Leenhardt, p.257).

3. This is in keeping with C.H. Dodd's emphasis that Paul often refers less to a particular text than to the whole context in which it stands. According to the Scriptures. London, 1962.
Up to the end of v.21 Paul has concentrated on showing the absolute freedom of God to act as He pleases. This point we may now take as proven. Here we come to a critical stage in the discussion. What Paul has done is to show that God has complete freedom, but he does not go on to say that God is going to use this freedom to destroy or to cast off the nation of Israel as the potter in Jeremiah did with his marred vessel. This is where so many interpreters of this chapter have gone astray. They have assumed that since Paul establishes God's freedom to do as He wills with Israel, that He is therefore obliged to reject her. In fact Paul states just the reverse.¹

Having argued in a rather theoretical way, using historical figures as examples, Paul now returns in v.22f to the concrete situation of Israel's present unbelief.² Instead of arguing that God is free to reject Israel, what he claims is that God is free to endure Israel, to continue to endure

---

1. Cf. B. Weiss, "Gott sich dieses absoluten Rechtes nicht bediente, sondern in Güte nach ganz anderen Normen verfuhr" (as quoted by Schmidt, pp.166-7)

2. Cf. Bornkamm "So drängt Paulus auch hier v.23f. sofort darin, die Diskussion von abstrakten Möglichkeiten abzuschneiden und sofort auf den Boden der in der Offenbarung seiner Gnade gesetzten Wirklichkeit zurückzuführen..." (Paulinische Anekdoten im Römerbrief. Das Ende des Gesetzes, 76-92 (pp.91-92.) The return to the 'facts of the case' is also indicated by the change of tense - from the present to the historic (Zahn, in Leenhardt, p.257, n.1).
with much patience\(^1\) even vessels of wrath\(^2\) ripe for destruction.\(^3\)

This point is brought out in the anakoluthic sentence comprising vv. 22-24. The if-clause or protasis is provided but no apodosis. Barrett sets out the meaning very clearly - "The construction is rhetorical in style, 'What if this is so?' being used for 'Why should this not be so?'; that is, 'This is in fact so, and there is no reason why it should not be so'.\(^4\) In order to clarify the meaning of these verses, one or two points must first be settled. The \(\Theta\varepsilon\lambda\nu\nu\) of v.22 may be taken as causal, i.e. 'what if God, because He wished', or concessive 'what if God, although He wished'. The first of these is to be preferred\(^5\) and this in turn means that the \(\kappa\alpha\iota\) should not be omitted at the beginning of v.23,\(^6\) since this verse ought to be regarded

---

1. "Gottes \(\mu\alpha\chi\rho\sigma\Theta\omicron\nu\omicron\iota\alpha\) ist nichts anderes als seine \(\Delta\nu\omicron\iota\gamma\) (iii:25)." Bornkamm op.cit., p.91. Cf. Rom.ii:4; I Tim.ii:16; I Pet.iii:20. See also J.W. Horst, TDNT, IV, 377-87. According to Leenhardt "the history of Israel is to be explained only by the patience of God". (p.257).

2. \(\Sigma\chi\omicron\upsilon\ \Theta\omicron\gamma\nu\varsigma\) - these appear to be those vessels or agents such as Pharaoh, and here possibly unbelieving Israel, who in a negative but definite way serve the execution of God's purpose. B. Weiss considers that here the reference is to the Jews who, although they already experience God's \(\Theta\omicron\gamma\nu\) are nevertheless by God's patience destined to a good end (as quoted by Schmidt, p.167). Kunck also discusses the possibility that in the light of Jer.xxvii:25 (LXX) the idea here may not be vessels for wrath but weapons or agents by which God's wrath is visited upon the disobedient. (He uses His weapons of wrath to destroy the land of the Chaldeans in Jer.xxvii.) Kunck however is not able to make up his mind on this point and it would seem that the other interpretation is better, p. 68. See also Schlatter, p.305, Str/Bill. III, pp.271-72.

3. The RSV reading "made for destruction" is not the best rendering of \(\chi\alpha\tau\eta\rho\tau\omicron\omega\lambda\varsigma\nu\). As Leenhardt points out, if it is translated "prepared for perdition" the suggestion is that someone has prepared them i.e. God. But the fact that the perfect tense is used here must not be overlooked (as it tends to be in the RSV translation) because the perfect suggests that a certain state has been reached - the vessels are in a certain condition which makes them ripe for destruction. Although he was familiar with the word \(\pi\rho\omicron\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\) (cf.II Cor.ii:15) Paul does not use it here, although it would have provided a parallel to \(\pi\rho\omicron\kappa\tau\omega\tilde{s}\varsigma\nu\) (Leenhardt, p.258).

4. P.189.


6. Probably because of the difficulty experienced in translating these verses the \(\chi\alpha\iota\) has been omitted in certain manuscripts. Cf. Bornkamm, op.cit., p.91.
as parallel to v.22, the καί in v.23 being taken as parallel to the causal participle in v.22. We should then translate these verses in this way - "But what if God with great long-suffering 'endured the vessels of wrath', 'ripe for destruction', because He wished to show forth His wrath and to make known His power, and moreover did so in order to make known the wealth of His glory for the vessels of mercy, which beforehand He made ready for glory".

The reason for God's patience is given as being that He wished to show forth His wrath and to make known His power and the wealth of His glory for the vessels of mercy. This is a close parallel to the reasons given for the raising up of Pharaoh in v.17 - for the demonstration of God's power and the proclamation of His name in all the earth. The point that Paul is making would seem to be - what is it to anyone, if, as is actually the case, God shows patience to disobedient Israel for the sake of His own glory and His merciful purpose just as He once did in the case of Pharaoh long ago? This interpretation means that God's patience and wrath are not to be regarded as two contrary forces; but both should be seen as different instruments used in the furthering of His merciful purpose i.e. in the bringing of glory

2. Apart from changing 'prepared for destruction' to 'ripe for destruction' this translation follows that of Barrett (p.109).
3. The clauses - 'because He wished to show forth His wrath and to make known His power' (v.22) are parallel to the clause 'in order to make known His power on the vessels of mercy' (v.23). All these clauses are subordinate to the main if-clause - "But what if God ... endured" (v.22a). Cf. Bornkamm, p.91; Lagrange, p.241; Müller, p.32.
4. Thus Гέλων ενδείκνυται (v.22) parallels ὡς ἐνδείκνυται (v.17), and καί ἵνα γνωρίσῃ (v.23) is equivalent to ὡς διεγέρσῃ (v.17). Thus Müller observes correctly that Paul in v.22 takes up the scriptural citation in v.17 and gives an exegesis of it in the light of it in the light of the contemporary events (p.33).
Thus it is no failure on the part of God's word, nor is it inconsistent with divine faithfulness or righteousness if God in the outworking of His gracious purpose has chosen some of Israel and has temporarily, for the sake of His purpose, hardened the rest whom He yet endures with much patience.

Verse 24 is simply an expansion of v.23, outlining who in fact are the vessels of mercy whom God has called. For the first time in ch.ix Paul, having begun to relate his arguments to the contemporary scene, immediately introduces the subject of Gentile Christians. The typically Jewish way of stating the facts of the case (that many Gentiles and comparatively few Jews have believed) is illustrated by Paul's first statement "Not from the Jews only." This shows how far from Paul's mind is any conception of a Gentile take-over of the heritage of the Jews. The church is composed firstly of Jews, and Gentiles participate in salvation only in association with their Jewish brethren.

1. On the meaning of ὅσα (v.23) cf. Müller's view "Das Wort neint wie im AT so auch hier 'endgültige Verwicklichung seines (Gottes) Herrschaftsanspruches an die Welt'. Der Apostel fasst mit dem Wort ὅσα die vorangegangenen Begriffe und Gedanken zusammen: die Freiheit des Erbarmens (v.15) Gottes ὅσον μετά, die Proklamation seines ὄνομα (v.17) und die ἐξουσία des Schöpfers (v.21)." (p.33). "In Israels Geschick geht es um Gottes ὅσα." (v.23). (p.32).

2. The 'effectual' calling which is mentioned here corresponds well with the previous description of the vessels of mercy as προσφέρομεν ἐλεον ὅσαν. The priority of God is emphasized in both.

3. We emphasize again that Munck appears to minimize the number of Jewish believers while at the same time magnifying the extent of Jewish persecution. The number of believing Jews is sufficiently large for Paul to state that the church is not made up of Jews alone (as if it could have been) but also contains Gentiles.

4. This is another way of saying "To the Jew first" in that the emphasis centres not on the small number of Jewish Christians but on the surprising fact (to the Jew) that Gentiles are also included. Cf. N.A. Dahl, "The Atonement - an Adequate Reward for the Akedah? (Rom.viii:32)."

Paul has emphatically declared the faithfulness and the freedom of God. The climax of his argument is reached in the anakoluthic sentence in ch.ix: 22-24. As we have noted it is in these verses that Paul first mentions the introduction of Gentiles into the church. Having arrived at certain principles by means of his highly complicated and rather abstract argument, Paul now returns to the understanding of the current missionary situation. This is the reason why Paul does not provide the apodosis for the protasis introduced in v.22. He wishes to return speedily to the application of his principles to concrete reality and to escape as quickly as possible from mere theoretical arguments. It is a pity that not all Paul's interpreters have been as keen to keep their theories in touch with the facts of the case as Paul himself.

Since Paul in ix:22.f. is actually setting out his interpretation of the contemporary situation, this section must be regarded as a crucial one in the understanding of the Roman letter. In iii:3 we have already had a preview of this problem - "What if some did not believe?" Now, at last, Paul comes to the point of facing the problem with the aid of the accumulated arguments in the intervening chapters. We note also that up to this point we have found no actual proof that Israel has been rejected. There have been several references to the fact that relatively few Jews have believed the gospel, but none saying that they have been rejected by God. Even all the references to hardening and to judgement in this chapter have not in any sense provided proof for the view that Israel has been rejected and replaced by the Gentiles in the purpose of God. In view of this conclusion it is unlikely that we will find any

1. Cf. Bornkamm, op.cit., p.92, contra Leenhardt who states that up to this point (ix:30-33) Paul's reflections have remained on the level of abstract doctrine. (p.261).
theory of rejection in vv.25-29 since these verses are mostly composed of scriptural quotations illustrating and proving the points that Paul has already put forward. Thus the content of these quotations is to be judged not by what they may appear to state, but by the statements for the support of which they have been introduced. This means that we cannot agree with Schmidt's view that the emphasis in v.24 is on the in-coming of the Gentiles and that therefore the following quotations are illustrations of this fact.1

Verse 24 has two main points

(a) that the church is composed of Jews and (b) that it is composed not of Jews only but also of Gentiles. The Old Testament quotations are introduced to illustrate and substantiate both of these points.2

It may be granted that Paul does place slightly more emphasis upon the inclusion of Gentiles since he gives the scriptural quotations concerning this (vv.25-26) prior to giving those concerning the Jews (vv.27-29). Paul's proof for the inclusion of the Gentiles takes the form of two quotations from Hosea - Hosea ii:23 (LXX ii:25) and Hosea i:10.3 Munck suggests that the reason for Paul's addition of Hosea i:10 to ii:23 may have been his liking for the phrase - the sons of the living God.4 Another interesting change

---

2. Richardson, p.133.
3. Michel believes that the reference to calling in v.24 and again in vv. 25-26 has determined the order of the two Hosea quotations which, in his opinion, belong to a collection of sayings already in existence prior to Paul's use of them here. (pp.246-7). This view finds support in the change of ἐκκαθαριζομαι in the LXX of Hosea ii:25 to καταλέγω in Romans ix:25.
4. Op.cit., p.72. Leenhardt thinks that Paul makes the change because he divests the personal names of their symbolic significance (p.260). F.F. Bruce notes also the shift of application from Northern Israel to Gentiles (Romans, p.196). Schoeps maintains that in Rabbinic exegesis these quotations from Hosea were never understood to support the idea of the rejection of Israel and her replacement by another people (op.cit., p.240).
which Paul may have made is noted by Munck following a suggestion first proposed by Sanday and Headlam. This is the addition of ἐκτιτω to the text of the LXX. As Sanday and Headlam noted, this means that Paul wishes to emphasize the place where the Gentiles will be called the sons of the living God, i.e. in Palestine. Munck feels that the significance of Jerusalem in the thought of Paul makes it highly probable that Paul did insert this word with the idea of emphasizing the proclamation of the Gentiles as sons of God in Jerusalem possibly when Paul arrives there with his collection and accompanying representatives of the Gentile congregation. This interpretation adds considerably to the significance of the Hosea quotation; it is now used to imply that in Jerusalem - the place where the separation and distinction between Jews and Gentiles is most clearly emphasized - here the dividing wall is broken down and the unity of all God's people recognised. The reference to the 'sons of Israel' is the link which may have led to Paul's choice of his next quotation - from Is.x:22.ff - "Though the number of the sons of Israel be as the sand of the sea, only the remnant of them will be saved; for the Lord will execute His sentence upon earth with rigour and despatch." (vv.27-28). The reason why Paul uses this quotation is not to emphasize the smallness of the remnant, i.e. that only a remnant will be saved, but to prove that a remnant will be saved. Verses 27-29 are therefore not to be regarded as

3. Christ and Israel, pp.72-73.
proof for a theory of rejection,¹ but as proof that God calls from the Jews as well as from the Gentiles.²

In holding to this interpretation, we do not deny that this verse contains also a strong emphasis upon God's judgement,³ most obviously illustrated by the fact of the smallness of the remnant, but the emphasis upon judgement along with mercy has been a feature of much of this chapter in which we have as yet found no verification for the view that Israel is rejected.⁴

Paul is well aware that at present only a remnant of Israel believes but his understanding of the meaning of this remnant is one that is hopeful rather than pessimistic. We can see this more clearly by looking closely at the context of the quotation from Isaiah. Here we find two specific themes - (a) God will execute his judgement swiftly and thoroughly by means of the Assyrians, (b) only a remnant of all the great number of Israel will be saved but soon God's indignation against Israel will come to an end and will be directed instead against the Assyrians. The twin themes of the Isaiah passage

1. Contra B. Lindars, New Testament Apologetic, pp.242ff., and PSM, ch.x. J. Jeremias gives a very full survey of those texts which illustrate the Old Testament hope that the Gentiles would come to the mountain of God and there participate in the salvation of God. Jesus' Promise to the Nations. (Ch.iii, pp.55-73).
2. Cf. Richardson, p.133. This is borne out by the γηφ at the beginning of v.27 - showing that this verse is a continuation of the proof already offered in vv.25-26.
3. If v.28 is taken literally then it refers not to God's execution of His sentence (RSV) but of His word (λόγος) on earth. This would mean that Paul regards God's word in the gospel as bringing both wrath (hardening?) and mercy, cf. Cranfield on Rom.1:18 (op.cit., pp.330-35).
4. We have already noted that even when Paul uses arguments which by their very nature could be turned into an anti-Jewish polemic, he is content to use the argument only to make his specific point and not to develop it in any polemical direction against the Jews, cf. on iv:9-12 where Paul does not claim that Abraham is first of all father of believing Gentiles although his argument would have permitted him to do so.
are judgement and hope for Israel. The remnant theme, whilst it always implies judgement, is nevertheless a consolatory one.¹ The Isaiah quotation is a good example of God showing His wrath and making known His power (vv.17 and 22), but the main point of the quotation is the evidence that a remnant will return - as demonstrated by the names of Isaiah's son (Is.vii:3, viii:18). It would be wrong to assume that Paul uses this verse to support a theory of rejection, since this use would be completely foreign to the original context. The proper understanding of Paul's intention would appear to be that although a large number of Israel is now unbelieving, the fact that already a remnant has believed is itself proof that God has not rejected Israel² and a hint that one day He will restore her.³

² Cf. Maier, op.cit., pp.57 f.; Munck, pp.74 f.
³ In this respect Paul differs from the Qumran sectarians who thought of themselves as a 'saved remnant' but not as a 'saving remnant'. Cf. M. Black, The Scrolls and Christian Origins, p.168.
Romans ix:30 - x:13.

The typical recurring phrase "What shall we say, then?" (v.30) introduces another stage in the argument. As is normal in Paul's argument in Romans, he gives a summary conclusion of the preceding discussion before introducing a new subject. What has long been assumed in this letter is now openly stated - Gentiles have found righteousness but Israel, pursuing after righteousness has somehow missed her goal. Here at last we are faced with the actual missionary situation in which Paul found himself - a church which was becoming more and more dominated by the great influx of believing Gentiles and which was not really having much success in winning the majority of the Jews to faith in Christ. In order to fully appreciate Paul's explanation of the reason for the Jewish failure to find righteousness, we must take note of his positive approach in x:1 ff. Paul is not seeking to criticize or condemn his fellow Jews on this point. He is simply indicating the fact of

1. As Sanday and Headlam note, Paul nowhere else in Romans follows τί οὖν ἐφοβήσατο by an immediate answer and were it not for the awkwardness thereby introduced into the construction it would be preferable to regard v.30b as a second question as in ix:14 (op.cit. pp.278-9). If in fact Paul intended v.30b as a second question it could be argued that his intention was to give a more delicate form of introduction to his summary of Israel's disobedience.

2. With Munck we cannot accept the older view that Rom.x is merely a recapitulation from another angle of what has already been said in ch.ix.(op. cit., p.78). Older exegesis tended to give three answers to the problem of theodicy (which was considered to be Paul's theme in these chapters). This was because, taken separately, these three chapters appear to give contradictory answers to the same question. Rom.ix is deterministic - only the predestined will be saved. Rom.x is indeterministic - all who believe will be saved. Rom.xi has aspects similar to both the previous chapters - after a temporary hardening the whole people will be saved. For a good discussion of the weaknesses of this interpretation see L.Goppelt, Jesus, Paul and Judaism, pp.151 ff.

3. The fact that Paul calls his own people Israel denotes that he is not minimizing their special standing in God's purpose, but is discussing them in a sympathetic way.
their unbelief and his interpretation of this fact. He does not minimize the fact that Israel has gone the wrong way and not reached her true destination (vv.31-32) but he acknowledges her zeal for righteousness (x:1f.) even though it is a mistaken zeal and ill-informed (οὐ κατ' ἐπιγνώσει) (x:2). Paul speaks as a witness to the good intent of Israel but sorrowfully acknowledges that she has sought righteousness the wrong way (οὐχ ἐκ πιστείς ἡλικίως ἐξ ἔργων) (ix:32). The result is that in her blind zeal, Israel has failed to recognize Christ as the foundation of true righteousness and tripped over Him in her unbelief as Isaiah prophecied. The image in vv.30ff. is that of runners in a race (cf. φέροντες in v.16). The Jews are zealously running in the race but running in their own (mistaken) way so that they stumble over God's chosen.

1. "Paul cannot bring himself to say 'They sought it by works'; this is to him so manifest an absurdity that he says 'as if it could be reached by works'." (Barrett, p.193).

2. The possibility that Paul refers to the Zealot movement or similar attitudes should not be ruled out. Recent studies on the history of the period from 40 A.D. up to the Jewish-Roman war have shown that the Zealots were a much more influential and popular movement than Josephus' accounts indicate. Cf. W.R. Farmer, Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period. New York, 1956. M. Hengel in Die Zeloten: Untersuchung zur judischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I bis 70 n. Chr. (Leiden, 1961) shows that even the most fanatical Zealots were eschatologically and not merely politically orientated. In the light of Hengel's research it seems unlikely that Pharisaic Judaism was normative in the pre-war period. See also B. Reicke, "Der geschichtliche Hintergrund des Apostelkonzils und der Antiochien-Episode, Cal. ii: 1-14." SP pp.172-187, and The New Testament Era: The World of the Bible from 500 B.C. to 100 A.D. (London, 1969). In reaction to older historians' relative disinterestedness in the political factors in the life of Jesus Christ and in the development of the church, S.C.F. Brandon tends to go to the opposite extreme and exaggerates its significance. Cf. Jesus and the Zealots: A Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity. Manchester, 1967, (especially ch.vii). See W.R. Farmer's criticisms of Brandon's book and the latter's reply to same. Mod. Church, XI, (1968), pp.117-20.

Messiah and, in spite of their striving (ὁδὸς ἡς ἡμῖν ἱστ., ζητοῦντες ἔχει) they do not arrive (οὖν ἦρας ἡς ἡμῖν ἐπὶ τοῦ δρόμου) at their intended goal. As we will emphasize later, this image from athletics is important for our interpretation of 'telos', i.e. of Christ as the 'telos', the goal or winning post of the race. But Paul speaks not as a Gentile gloating over the fall of Israel, but as a Jew, profoundly concerned and praying to God that she too may share in salvation (x:1). The significance of Paul's attitude for our exegesis is that we will not expect to find in this section a polemical outline of the failure of the Jews as many exegetes have done. We expect that although the argument will be for righteousness by faith in Christ and against all false ways of salvation, it will not necessarily be anti-Jewish.

Paul's irenic attitude to Israel is demonstrated by his description of their unbelief as due to ignorance (x:3). We agree with Munck that Paul in this section is speaking of the ignorance of the Jews during the earthly life of Jesus.² In I Cor. ii:8 Paul claims - "if the rulers of this age had understood the wisdom of God, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory", and in Acts we find it frequently stated that the Jews crucified Christ in ignorance (cf. Acts ii:23, 36, 39; iii:13-14, 17-21, 26; iv:10-11 etc.). Even Jesus' words on the cross reflect this same view - "Father forgive them for they know not what they do." (Luke xxiii:34).³

1. The transliterated form will be used in this section wherever possible.
2. But we do not agree that Paul is speaking of a different kind of ignorance in x:19.f. as Munck suggests (pp.81 and 94.f.). There is no basis in the text for making this arbitrary distinction between the ignorance displayed by the Jews at the crucifixion and that which Paul encountered.
3. Munck notes that according to Acts the obduracy of the Jews was only gradually realized but that according to the final form of the tradition contained in the Synoptic Gospels this obduracy is already evident among the Jews at the time of Jesus' ministry. It is likely however that the fact of continuing Jewish resistance to the gospel preaching led to a greater interest in the theological understanding of this hardening. (pp.82-83.)
This ignorance can be otherwise described in terms of the Law and of righteousness. The Jews sought to achieve righteousness by way of the Law, i.e. by using the Law as a means to legal righteousness, but they did not succeed in fulfilling the Law and so failed to find righteousness. They missed the goal of the Law - true righteousness, because they sought a righteousness of their own achievement and did not submit to God's righteousness (as revealed in Jesus Christ) (x:3). This is the dark background of Jewish unbelief which is presupposed in x:4. This verse marks the beginning of Paul's exposition of what Christ the 'telos' of the Law has done, rather than a continuation of what the Law and self-righteous Jews could not do. 

This leads us to the problem of the interpretation of 'telos' in x:4. The basic issue in the text is whether 'telos' has the temporal sense of

---

1. This description of the failure of the Jews to fulfill the Law is the negation of what Paul has claimed for believers in viii:4 where it is said that the just requirement of the Law is fulfilled in those who walk according to the Spirit. See F.F. Bruce, op.cit., p.198.


3. See Bandstra op.cit., p.104. Schlatter (p.313) was the first to compare Rom.x:4-11 with Phil.ii:10 in order to come to a clearer understanding of this difficult section. In the reference to the humiliation and exaltation of Christ in Phil.ii, Schlatter found a useful parallel to Rom.x:5-7. Munck further elaborates this and sets out the two texts in parallel columns to show the connection between them. His view is, however, that the parallel does not lead to any deeper understanding of the two texts with the possible exception of confessing Christ as Lord. (op.cit. pp. 88-89). Bandstra continues the comparison of these two texts (Rom.x:4f. and Phil.ii:7f.) and finds an additional parallel between Rom.x:5 and Phil.ii:7f. Christ as the one who became obedient even unto death on the cross is the equivalent of Rom.x:5 - the man who practises the righteousness which is based on the Law shall live by it. This leads Bandstra to the conclusion that in both cases the emphasis is not negative - on what sinful men cannot do, but positive - what the One Man, Jesus Christ has done. (p.104).
'end' or 'cessation',\textsuperscript{1} or whether it has the final sense of 'goal' or 'outcome'.\textsuperscript{2} The contrasts between faith and works in \textit{ix:30-31}, between God's righteousness and a righteousness of our own (\textit{x:3}), and the righteousness of the Law and the righteousness out of faith (\textit{x:5-6}), have been regarded as ample evidence for the temporal sense and Christ is thus considered as the end of the Law as a means to righteousness.\textsuperscript{3} This is the meaning preferred by the NEB which gets rid of the ambiguity of 'end' (which could be used both in the sense of termination or of goal), and translates "For Christ ends the Law", thereby actually strengthening the negative emphasis of the verse

\textsuperscript{1} This view with minor variations is held (among others) by Sanday and Headlam (p.284); Althaus (p.97); Gutbrod (TDNT, IV, pp.1068.f.); Lietzman (p.96); Lagrange (p.293); Schlatter (p.311); Munck (p.83); Bultmann "Christus des Gesetzes Ende" in Glauben und Verstehen, II (p.48); Schmidt (p.175); Stuhlmacher, op.cit., p.93; E. Bammel, op.cit., pp.123.f.


\textsuperscript{3} Cf. Sanday and Headlam, who hold that the 'principle of work righteousness' was brought to an end by Christ (pp.293.f.). The distinctions which they make between the various uses of the law in Paul are based partly on the anarthrous use of νόμος, the significance of which is open to dispute. Cf. W. Lütgert, op.cit., pp.66.f. Ellison holds that by the omission of the article before νόμος, Paul shows "that he is not thinking of the Law of Moses as an historical fact, but of a way of understanding and keeping it ..." (op.cit., p.57).
by using a verb instead of the Greek noun. We feel that this translation does less than justice to the original text. "Paul is not saying that Christ destroyed or ended the Law (τελευτάω) or that He is the 'cul-de-sac' (τελευτή) thereof."¹ If this is what Paul says it means that he allows that prior to Christ the achievement of righteousness by works was a perfectly valid activity.² Our modern distinction which regards the Old Testament as 'The Law' (in a legalistic sense) in contrast to the New Testament as 'The Gospel' tends to encourage such a view,³ particularly evident among Lutherans.⁴ It is most unlikely however, that Paul, who argued so strongly in Rom.iv that Abraham was justified by faith, would allow that anyone at any time could be justified by works of law ("...by such shall no flesh be justified." iii:20).

This problem is often overcome by the argument that Paul is not thinking of the Old Testament use of the Law, but rather of the legalistic use by the Judaism of his own time. He is not so much criticizing the Law as what the Jews were doing with the Law.⁵ If we bear in mind the fact that the Greek

2. It would also mean that Christ is the end of a false principle which, as a matter of historical fact, He was not, since law-righteousness continued to be the aim of the Jews. Cf. Barrett, p.198; Bandstra, p.101.
4. Bring points out however, that although Luther did distinguish between the Law in the Old Testament and the gospel in the New Testament (in order to emphasize the grace of the gospel), Luther's own lectures on Genesis show that he considered the chief content of the Old Testament to be the promise that Christ would come (op.cit., p.23). When Luther interpreted Rom.xi:4 as saying that Christ is the end of the Law, this was in line with his zeal to show that the gospel is the opposite of law-righteousness. But he himself did not intend to drive a wedge between Christ and the Old Testament, as Lutherans have sometimes tended to do, since his lectures, given towards the end of his life, show clearly that he found Christ in the Old Testament as well as in the New. Op.cit., pp.22 and 46f.
language which Paul used had no word-group to denote legalism, legalist or legalistic, then we can appreciate the great problem Paul faced when he sought to distinguish between a good Law and the bad use of it by the Jews. There is no doubt that this fact helps us to clarify some texts where Paul's language concerning the Law is rather ambiguous, but it is doubtful if it is of any help in this text. The ἐν δικαίωσιν cannot be equated with ἐν ἔργῳ etc. but is best understood as expressing purpose so that we should translate the verse "For Christ is the completion of the Law that everyone who has faith may be justified". But what law is intended here? We do not regard the Law in this section as the Old Testament Law misused, or as the Mosaic Law which is only part of the total revelation of God, or even as a reference to the promises contained in the Law but "as the Law in its fulness as a revelation of God's promises and righteous demands which were fulfilled in Christ and therefore reached their end in Him." That this interpretation of the Law is correct is confirmed by the fact, which we have already noted, that in vv. 30-32 Law and righteousness were virtually interchangeable and also that in

1. P. Althaus noted this when he attempted to explain Paul's understanding of the Law. He differentiated between Law (Gesetz) and will of God (Gebot). The latter is of a permanent nature but the former (Gesetz) represents God's will in the form it took due to sin. Gebot und Gesetz. BFChTh. 46(2) (Gütersloh 1952), pp.14 ff. Paul's lack of appropriate terms to express motivation in one's use of the Law has also been noted by C.E.B. Cranfield in his article "Paul and the Law". SJT (1964) p.55. More recently C.F.D. Moule has expressed appreciation of Cranfield's approach to this question and developed it in the essay "Obligation in the Ethic of Paul". CHINT, pp.389-407.

2. Bring finds this of particular value in interpreting iii:21 (righteousness of God apart from the Law) so as to avoid any suggestion of a depreciation of the Old Testament which according to iii:22 witnesses to the same righteousness as mentioned in iii:21 (op.cit. p.33). See also Moule, op.cit., pp.392 ff.


4. Cf. Du Plessis' view - "The primary sense is a negative one: termination of the profound fallacy that the fulfilment of the Law is a method of redemption at all." (op.cit., p.142).

not only is the Law quoted but Christ Himself is understood by Paul to stand in the place of the 'commandment'.

Karl Barth gives a good interpretation of 'telos' in this verse when he understands it as άλλαξατολίωνς the sum or totality of all that the Law stood for. When we regard the Law in this verse in its fullest sense and bear in mind the normal Jewish revulsion against any suggestion that the Law should be abolished, it is unlikely that the statement here means simply that Christ is the termination of the Law.

If there is any suggestion of termination in the verse, this negative sense cannot be primary, as Du Plessis suggests, but at best secondary. This is more in accord with the normal meaning of New Testament 'telos' according to Du Plessis' own investigation. Du Plessis found that "the New Testament revealed a unique use of the word 'telos'". In this application the creative appropriation of New Testament writers manifested itself.

1. Cf. Bandstra, op.cit., p.106. See also Bring, op.cit., p.49. Lietzmann notes that Paul has substituted the personified "Righteousness" for the original phrase in Deuteronomy "this commandment", (op.cit., p.96). According to A.T. Hanson the phrase "the righteousness based on faith says" is an indirect way of expressing "Christ says" and Paul probably looked on this word from Deuteronomy as originally uttered by Christ. "He simply sees Christ speaking to Israel in this Old Testament passage." Jesus Christ in the Old Testament. (p.38).

2. Barth believes that behind Paul's use of the term in x:4 is the rabbinic concept of the 'kelal' as a comprehensive formula for the manifold content of the Law." Church Dogmatics, II, 2. The Doctrine of God (p.245). See also Barth's discussion of ix:30-x:21. (op.cit., pp.240-59).

3. Cf. C.F.D. Moule, "Fulfilment Words in the New Testament". "If Christ is τέλος νόμου in a great fulfilling sense, He is more than the mere termination of the Law. If He is χάρισμα in the sense indicated, it is so that the Christian church may, in Him, go on to contribute to God's χάρισμα. (p.301). "If anything is superseded, it is not Torah as such but a temporary covenant; and thus the finality, paradoxically is the beginning of a new era." (p.302). A less favourable understanding of the relation between Christ and the Law is shown by E. Bammel, op.cit., pp.120-28. Cf. also J. Jocz "Jesus and the Law". Jud. XXVI (1970, pp.105-24.

conspicuously. 'Telos' received at their hands its Messianic and Eschatological connotation and this motif provided the fundamental theme of New Testament kerygma.¹ For the New Testament writers Christ Himself determined the meaning of 'telos' and all the separate uses of the word were determined by a Christological basis.² When we consider the Messianic and Christological emphases surrounding the word 'telos' these are more likely to have fulfilment rather than abrogation as their primary sense.³ Flückiger's investigation of secular and biblical uses of 'telos' supports this interpretation. He found that at every place in biblical Greek where 'telos' can be translated by 'end' (Ende), the basic meaning of 'goal' (Ziel) is also in the background.⁴ Another factor gives additional evidence that the primary meaning of 'telos' in v.4 is goal or completion. The διώκουν in ix:31 means striving after a goal (cf. Phil.iii:12,14). The Jews were running or striving after a goal but did not achieve it. This goal of righteousness is, in x:4, declared to be Christ.⁵ Bring gives as meaning for 'telos' 'the winning post in a race, the completion of a task, the climax of a matter.'⁶

If we accept the final sense of 'telos' as fulfilment or completion as primary in x:4, it may be allowed that the secondary sense of end or termination

---

3. If the primary sense is fulfilment rather than abrogation, this has the merit of emphasizing Paul's consciousness of the continuity between the church and the Old Testament (a necessary emphasis in view of the outlook of the Roman Christians). The problem with the temporal understanding of 'telos' is that it tends to make the Old Testament a sort of cul-de-sac, (cf. Du Plessis, op.cit., p.242).
may also be included. As Leenhardt suggests "Christ puts an end to the Law because the Law finds in Him its goal and its crown." ¹ In any case it is not a static abrogation of the Law that Paul intends by the word 'telos' because 'telos' itself is a dynamic concept embodying the idea of one phase ending, coinciding with the inception of another. Christ as the 'telos' of the Law is not so much abrogation of the Law, but "an act of transition, of transformation of its (the Law's) servitude from death to life."² The final sense of 'telos' fits in better with εἰς δικαιοσύνην and gives a better understanding of the γένος at the beginning of vv.4 and 5.

We have already asserted that the context of ix:30.f. shows that Paul is not attacking the Jews but simply outlining their failure to find salvation. In view of this we think it more fitting that Paul in x:3, instead of proceeding to contrast the way of Christ with the error of the Jews in order to magnify their sin, should proceed instead to explain that because the Jews did not understand the real meaning of the Law (ix:31) they could not appreciate Christ as the positive fulfilment of that Law. We conclude then that the γένος in x:4 means a continuation of the argument in x:3 and that it refers to Christ not to emphasize the distance from salvation but to so present Christ in Jewish terms³ as the completion of their revelation, that

2. Cf. Du Plessis, op.cit., p.142. See also the remainder of this section "Christ, Conversion of the Law". (pp.142-46.)
3. The immediate context supports this interpretation and, as Suggs has shown, so also does the content of the whole letter and the purpose for which it was written. Although we do not agree with Suggs' view that this is a letter completely dominated by the forthcoming visit to Jerusalem - a sort of 'brief' to Jerusalem rather than to Rome, we agree with him that Paul is anxious not to give needless offence to the Jews or to Jewish Christians in Jerusalem. Paul's aim in Romans "is to make his position as palatable as possible because of the Jews whose knowledge of his reputation would make them dangerously suspicious of him, and because of his determination to make it possible for the collection to serve as an efficacious symbol of the oneness of the church", (p.298). M.J. Suggs, "The Word is near you: Rom.x:6-10." CHIM, pp.289-312. Cf. Thesis pp.371 n.3, 449.f.
their failure to recognize Him becomes all the more surprising. They who strove for the fulfilment of the Law failed to recognize Christ who Himself fulfilled it. Paul is explaining in Jewish terms how his own people have missed the gift of God in Jesus Christ. By virtue of the fact that Christ has fulfilled the Law, life and righteousness are now freely available for the people of the Law. Likewise, life and righteousness are available on the same terms to those without the Law. Gentiles have found this life but the majority of the Jews have not because they have failed to appreciate the connection between Christ and the Law.

The γὰρ in χ:5 and the ἦς in v.6 present more problems since these have traditionally been regarded as plainly denoting a contrast between law-righteousness and the righteousness of faith, and as such were basic to the argument for the temporal sense of 'telos' in v.4. But neither of these words need necessarily mean that this contrast is intended. If we are correct in our view that χ:4 sets out not what men cannot do, but what Christ has done i.e. His fulfilment of the Law, then the γὰρ of v.5 may be regarded as introducing the explanation of how Christ is the goal of the Law. He is the completion of the Law by virtue of the fact that He lived it and practised it. Again the ἦς of v.6 is only an insurmountable obstacle to our argument if taken as adversative as is normally done. But this is not necessarily the only possibility and it is quite legitimate to interpret it as having only a transitional or explanatory function and so v.6.f. as well as v.5 is properly understood as a continuation of the explanation of v.4 of Christ as the goal

5. Ibid, (n.133); W. Bauer, Greek-English Lexicon, p.170.
of the Law.

This interpretation avoids the problem which we would otherwise have of holding that Paul in v.5 quotes Moses (Lev.xviii:5) as an example of the wrong kind of righteousness - law-righteousness, whereas in v.6 he quotes Deut.xxx:12.f. (also from Moses) in support of faith-righteousness.\textsuperscript{1} Given Paul's view of the Old Testament,\textsuperscript{2} it is unlikely as Bring asserts, that he himself could set scripture against scripture in the course of his own argument.\textsuperscript{3} As Ellis says, "The Scripture says, God says, and Isaiah says are for Paul only different ways of expressing the same thing."\textsuperscript{4} Instead of setting out a contrast between law-righteousness (v.5) and faith-righteousness (v.6) Paul intends both quotations to support his claim that the righteousness now realised in Christ is that to which Moses also pointed.\textsuperscript{5} The righteousness

\textsuperscript{1} Bring believes that it is absurd to hold that Paul would use the Old Testament in this way (op.cit., p.49).

\textsuperscript{2} Ibid. Bring gives an excellent survey of Paul's attitude to the Old Testament. A.T. Hanson studies the same theme from a different point of view. Though we may not always agree with their conclusions, the work of these authors shows that Paul looked at the Old Testament as a Christian expecting it to witness to the Christ whom he had come to know in faith - a very different view from our modern historical critical approach. On this question see M. Black "The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament" NTS, XVIII, (1971), pp.1-14.

\textsuperscript{3} There is of course the possibility that some of these texts were introduced by Paul's opponents in the course of debate. Bishop Kirk who criticizes Paul very severely for his apparent misuse of Old Testament texts to suit his own arguments, suggests that Deut.xxx:11 may have originally been put forward by one of Paul's opponents as a counter argument in defence of righteousness by the Law. Cf. The Epistle to the Romans, p.225. Michel holds that Paul's procedure in x:6-7 is to be explained by the fact that the synagogue understood Deut.xxx as the Law and played the passage off against Christian preaching. (p.256 n.4).

\textsuperscript{4} Paul's Use of the Old Testament, p.23.

\textsuperscript{5} Professor Barrett, although he holds that vv.5-13 are devoted to a contrast between the righteousness out of the Law and that which is based on faith, notes that "the Law itself points to a non-legal righteousness" and goes on to say that "in the present paragraph he (Paul) develops this point". (p.198). The problem which remains for those who hold to the contrast in these verses is well put by Feuillet - "Entre la justice de la loi et la justice de la foi le choix s'impose." "Le plan salvifique de Dieu d'après l'épitre aux Romains". RB, LVII (1950), p.498.
ἐκ τοῦ νόμου (v.5) is thus seen to be equivalent to the righteousness to which the Old Testament witnesses i.e. the righteousness of faith (and not law-righteousness). ¹

There has been much discussion as to what Paul means by his quotation from Deut.xxx:11-14 in v.6.f. Because of the striking divergence between Rom.x:7 and Deut.xxx:13² some scholars have decided that Paul "is not using his quotation as a rigid proof of what he asserts, but as a rhetorical form,"³ or that "no stress is being laid on the fact that the Old Testament is being quoted."⁴ Others like Kirk, as we have already mentioned, accuse Paul of "drastic and unwarrantable allegorizing" of the Old Testament.⁵ It is possible that Paul gives a careless quotation because he is quoting from memory,⁶ but it is much more likely from our survey of Paul's use of quotations in ch.ix, in particular, that a sober, responsible citation is intended.⁷ The first part of v.8 - "But what does it say?" - is probably intended as an abbreviation for "But what does the scripture say?" and the closeness of the quotation in v.8 to the LXX (cf. Deut.xxx:14) adds further confirmation that a serious proof from the scriptures is being offered.⁸ So wherever it first

---

2. Rom.x:7 reads Τίς κατασκευαστης εις την ζωνας; whereas Deut.xxx:13 reads Τίς διασπασε εις το περαν της θαλασσης;
5. Op.cit., p.225. J. Knox comments "it is hard to see why Paul should have chosen for use a passage for whose clear meaning he must substitute a meaning almost the exact opposite." "Romans", Interpreter's Bible, IX, p.557.
8. Suggs, op.cit., p.301. In support of his contention Suggs notes the following points. "The ten verses which precede and the ten which follow Rom. x:6-10 contain eleven Old Testament quotations. In no instance can any of these citations be regarded as allusive; each is made to score a point." The recurring phrase τουτ' ἐστιν (vv.6,7,8) should be regarded as an expository parenthesis and, as its use in Heb.vii:5 and I Pet.iii:20 indicates, is a phrase that normally follows scripture citations (pp.301-2).
originated (with Paul or his opponents) the question is used here by Paul as the main basis of his argument.

The change from 'sea' to 'abyss' in Romans may well have been a deliberate change by Paul in order to facilitate his argument in Romans. In late Jewish speculation about Wisdom there are many parallels to Paul's arguments in this section. The inaccessibility of Wisdom to men is a favourite theme and the use of terms such as 'sea', 'abyss', 'deep' etc., witness to the remoteness of wisdom from men. It is likely then that by the reference "Who will ascend into heaven?" (v.6), Paul has in mind well known statements about the inaccessibility of Wisdom. The personification of the righteousness based on faith may be regarded as an indication that Paul is also thinking of personified Wisdom along the lines current in the Judaism of his time. In I Corinthians Paul had taken the daring step of identifying the personified Wisdom with Christ. Now in his effort to relate Law and Gospel, Paul takes another step along the same lines as in I Corinthians. He equates Christ = Wisdom = Torah.

Suggs finds ample proof that this is a possible understanding of Paul's intention in Rom.x:6.f, in the sermon in Baruch iii:9-iv:4. Here the identification of Wisdom and Law is clearly made in a passage where Deut. iii:11-14 is interpreted as referring to divine wisdom and where the emphasis is on God's election of Israel and His gracious gift of the Torah (Wisdom) to "Israel whom He loved", (v.37). In Baruch the Wisdom who is unheard of in

Canaan and unseen in Teman (v.22), unknown even to the giants of ancient fame (v.26), has been given to Jacob (v.37). "She ... is the Law that endures forever". (iv:1). Baruch affirms of the Torah what Paul affirms of Christ: "that by this instrument the word is near you."

The great significance of establishing a link between Paul and the Wisdom tradition in Rom.x:6-10 is not merely that Paul is thereby acquitted of gross mishandling of Deut.xxx:11-14. The significance lies in the fact that Paul has sought to resolve the tension between Gospel and Law by the identification of Christ with Wisdom-Torah. It is likely that by this Paul hoped to rescue his gospel from the stigma of absolute opposition to the Law by which it was so often described.

The argument of this section goes somewhat like this. The righteousness based on faith does not annul the Law but brings it to its true goal, for 'the word of faith which is preached' is Jesus Christ, incarnate Wisdom, τέλος νόμου. The Jews should not think of the Messiah as distant and inaccessible. Paul explains what he means by descent to the abyss and ascent to heaven. Human activity - in keeping the Law assiduously so as to hasten the Messiah's coming - is not what is required. Incarnation and

4. Ibid. Although the Jerusalem visit is very much in Paul's thoughts as he writes to the Romans, the Jewishness of the letter should not be understood, as Suggs claims, only with reference to Jerusalem. The Jewishness of the letter is related to the situation in Rome where Paul also seeks to unite Jewish and Gentile Christians.
5. Ibid.
resurrection are God's work. What is required is not hard and not too far off (Deut.xxx:11) but it is near at hand. The Jews adhere closely to the Torah and the Torah is incarnate in Christ, so Christ cannot be far from any Jew. Christ, the incarnate Wisdom of Deut.xxx, is the 'word of faith' which Christians proclaim (cf. the word of Christ v.17) and all that is required is trust and public acknowledgement of Him as Lord.

The influence of Deut.xxx:14 "But the word is very near you; it is in your mouth and in your heart, so that you can do it", continues throughout vv.9 and 10 as well as in v.8. As Maier has shown the emphasis in x:5-13 is not to point out and prove the guilt of the Jews but that God has done everything possible to win the Jews. Salvation is near and it is accessible to Jews. The reason why the Jews ought not to seek to bring Christ down from heaven or up from the abyss is not simply that it is impossible for them, but because God has already done this and the Messiah is now present and near in the proclamation of the word of faith which Christians preach. This in fact means that the 'Age to Come' has already dawned and the eschatological confession of Jesus as Lord is the only appropriate response.

2. Cf. Barth, "While Israel reads its own Law, the Law of Moses, the word is already nigh to it". According to Barth "all that we read in x:6f. is one invitation, to participate in the Law's fulfilment." A Shorter Commentary on Romans, p.127.
3. On the significance of this early Christian confession, see Barrett, pp.200-201. Barrett believes that the conditional clause "if thou shalt confess..." suggests that this was originally a baptismal confession. See also Michel, pp.258-9.
In vv.9 and 10, the two-fold description of the act of believing seems to be directly related to the reference to the mouth and heart in Deut.xxx:14 and indicates not two separate acts but the total human response in acknowledging Jesus as Lord.\(^1\) Munck thinks it possible that by the reference to confession in the credal formula of v.9, Paul may be thinking of confessing Christ publicly before the Jews in Jerusalem.\(^2\) It would appear more feasible however that Paul is simply describing the act of believing as a continuation of x:5f, where he wishes to show that it is possible for Jews to believe since the Messiah has already come. In these verses he outlines the appropriate response to 'the word of faith'\(^3\) with the assumption that Jews and Gentiles are both capable of this response. This is borne out by the addition of τὰς in v:11 to the quotation from Isaiah xxviii:16 previously used in Rom.ix:33b. Paul's intention is clearly to emphasize the complete universality of the gospel at this stage. There is no distinction (as in iii:22) between Jew and Greek\(^4\) since the same Lord is Lord of all and bestows His riches upon all who call upon Him,\(^5\) for "everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord will be saved". (vv.12-13).

---

3. Note the occurrences of ἐκκλάον in verses 8,17 and 18. The equating of the ἐκκλάον of Deut.xxx:14 with the ἐκκλάον which we preach (v.8) and of both with the ἐκκλάον Ἰησοῦν (v.17) shows the drift of Paul's thought. "Inasmuch as ἐκκλάον is enjoined in Deuteronomy, the ἐκκλάον of faith, namely the gospel, which Christians preach was likewise enjoined by divine authority and must be the means which confers salvation." A.Pallis, p.121.
4. It is particularly appropriate that just as in ch.iii the unrighteousness of men before the Law means that there is no distinction, so now in ch.x, where Paul emphasizes the fulfillment of the Law, he is able also to emphasize the correlative of iii:22 - there is no distinction, since faith is now open to all.
5. The description of God and the description of the faithful in this verse have close affinities with Jewish liturgical practice and reflect the cultic life of the early Christian community. Cf. Michel, p.260.
We can understand the emphasis upon the universality of the gospel in two different ways. We have already noted how Paul in x:4.f. seeks to relate gospel and Law in a positive way so that he thereby shows that Law-keeping Jews are not far from Christ who is the fulfilment of their Law. Bearing in mind that in ch.xi we meet Gentile Christians who boast that the Jews have been rejected, it is quite likely that Paul's argument in ch.x is to show that, far from being rejected, Christ is very near to the Jews and they are still capable of believing. According to this view Paul means by his emphasis upon 'all' that Jews no less than Gentiles are called and are capable of believing the gospel. We may also take Paul's argument here to refer to the inclusion of Gentiles. Since Christ has kept the Law and completed it, there is no longer any need for Gentiles to become Jews and to observe the Law, but they can find the righteousness of God direct in Christ; since they live by faith in Him, the completed Law, the Law as such has no jurisdiction over them and they can be included in the people of God. In this view Paul's argument is that since the fulfilment of the Law has come, the gospel is automatically a universal gospel calling Gentiles to the Kingdom equally with Jews.

In our opinion the first of these views is the primary one in this passage, although the second need not be entirely excluded. Since neither view by itself offers an adequate explanation of Paul's statements, it is probable that both emphases are intended although we believe that Paul was more immediately concerned with the question of the salvation of the Jews. If both are to some extent intended this would give strong support for the view that Paul intends to show the election of both Jews and Gentiles in Christ, thereby challenging them to demonstrate the unity which is symbolized by the offering of the collection.
Romans x:14-21.

The argument begun in ix:1 proceeds through various stages to a climax at x:13. This means that the first part of ch.x has closest connections with ch.ix. The second part of the chapter (x:14-f.) is closer in thought to ch.xi in that Paul prepares in it for his argument that the Jews have not been rejected and that in His own way God will eventually save all Israel, (xi:1-f.). Chapter x:13 could be described as a watershed in Paul's argument. Chapters ix:1-x:13 deal with the background of the situation described in x:14-xi:36. The transition occurs after x:13. Before proceeding to study vv.14-21, it will be a useful exercise for us to review the progress of Paul's argument from ix:1 up to this point.

In ix:1, Paul expresses the most profound concern that his fellow Jews with all the advantage of their past religious history should find salvation in Christ. He is very conscious however, that up to this point in time, they have not done so and that the majority of the Jews are still unbelieving. We noted the likelihood that Paul may be repudiating the view that he himself is anti-Jewish. Some of the Roman Christians may have believed that he was, on account of his apostleship to the Gentiles. In our opinion the source of this and other misrepresentations of Pauline doctrine is more liable to be Gentile-Christian rather than Jewish. It is probably in response to anti-semitic feeling that Paul in ix:1-f. restates the advantages of Israel. From this he proceeds to show that God's promise has not failed despite the disobedience of the majority of the Jews. Paul is leading up to the apex of his argument which is that God calls whom He chooses, and that His call is not simply a

1. Cf. Richardson, p.130.
response to human actions, but is determined only by His own unconditioned mercy, (ix:1.f.).

It is for this reason that Paul asserts in ix:6 as a basic presupposition of his argument that God's word has not failed. God's way has always been to choose from within the nation of Israel His own children of promise. Jacob and Esau illustrate this point. We note Paul's frequent reference to the Old Testament to substantiate his argument. This is chiefly because the freedom of God to choose His own people can only be adequately illustrated from God's ways of dealing with His people as outlined in the Old Testament. This is one reason for the Jewishness of Romans ix-xi. In these chapters Paul uses the history of Israel to illustrate the freedom and the mercy of God. The constitution of God's people in the Old Testament is the best guide as to how God re-constitutes His people in the new aeon.

But Paul's argument is not primarily intended for Jewish Christians. Despite the fact that the objections in vv.14 and 19 would seem at first glance to demand a Jewish objector as their source, this is not necessarily so. The first objection that there is injustice on God's part and the second that if God chooses arbitrarily among the nations, He ought not then to attribute blame, can both be satisfactorily explained as having originated from Gentile Christians. We noted in connection with ix:14-29 that Paul seeks to establish the freedom of God to choose those whom He wills. But we found that this argument was not intended to provide a theory of rejection concerning the Jewish nation but was used instead as a basis for the thesis that if God is free to reject, He is also free not to reject. Viewed

1. Cf. T.W. Manson's description of these chapters as "the righteousness of God in history". "Romans". New Peake, p.179.
in this light, the argument is seen to be a preparation for Paul's teaching in ch. xi:1.f. that God has not cast off His people in spite of their disobedience.

The objections could then be understood in this way. Roman Gentile Christians believe that God has rejected Israel; according to their opinion if He has not, then this means that there is partiality with God. The answer to this problem is that God's choice is not determined by the action of men, whether good or bad but only by His mercy. It is God's free mercy which alone can explain His patience with Israel.

The second objection in v.19 leads on from this. If God chooses freely whom He wills, then this must rule out the possibility of judgement since God's election removes human responsibility. Paul does not really answer this question, but implies that the question itself reveals a wrong spirit in the one who asks it. In any case, contrary to what older commentators thought, Paul is not concerned with the question of theodicy or even with establishing human responsibility. Indeed this type of question i.e. of human responsibility in the face of divine election shows by its content that it is more likely to originate from a Gentile rather than a Jewish person in that the Jews did not differentiate so clearly between a man's own actions and God's providential ordering of his life. The only answer Paul is prepared to give is that God's purpose of mercy - to choose for Himself a people from both Jews and Gentiles (v.24), is sufficient reason for men to praise and trust Him, (cf.xi:33).

If God had not acted in mercy the Gentiles would not have been brought

---

1. Contra Sanday and Headlam (p.295) who take the view that Paul must show that the Jews have had the opportunity of knowing about salvation and that therefore their ignorance is culpable. See also Munck, pp.89.f.
within the sphere of salvation (ix:22.f.). But likewise, if God had not been merciful with regard to Israel, they would have been like Sodom and Gomorrah (vv.27-30). Chapter ix basically establishes God's right (and power) to save whomever He chooses in His mercy, whether Jew or Gentile.

In ix:30 Paul presents a summary conclusion in question form. What are we to say as a result of our discussion? It would appear that Gentiles have found salvation and that Jews have not. The new section which begins in v.30 discusses why it is that Israel has actually not believed. The explanation is that they have sought salvation the wrong way and stumbled blindly through ignorance (ix:30 - x:3). They have tended to regard Christ and the Law as representing mutually exclusive modes of existence. They have failed to appreciate the connection between the Law for which they are so zealous and Christ who is the fulfilment of the Law (x:4).

Despite this the word - the living Word, Christ as incarnate Wisdom - is near them and since they have not been rejected, it is still possible for them to believe. The climax of the section comes in vv.12 and 13, where it is stated that there is no distinction between Jew and Gentile and that everyone (whether Jew or Gentile) who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved.

We have not felt it necessary to regard chapters ix and x as separate sections; there is no significant break in the argument between them. This is well brought out by Richardson who divides ix-xi into two sections, ix:1 - x:13 and x:14 - xi:36. Richardson believes that this division into two sections rather than the usual three concentrates attention on the practical matters of whom God calls, how He calls and what that call's effect is.¹

The words ἀνεύ ναυ introduce a new section in v.14.¹ As is usual Paul begins with a question; this is the first of a series of questions which succeed one another in vv.14 and 15. It is possible as Sanday and Headlam note, that the use of the subjunctive in v.14 indicates that the question is not the question of an adversary, nor merely rhetorical, but deliberative.² In this verse Paul begins to consider the conditions necessary for the realization of faith. Having established that whosoever calls upon the name of the Lord will be saved, he begins to inquire if in fact these conditions have been fulfilled for Judaism.

From the ἐπικαλέσται of v.13 Paul proceeds to enumerate in reverse order the various stages in the process by which men are eventually led to call upon the name of the Lord. By means of a series of questions Paul works out the conditions necessary for salvation back to their starting point. In order for men to call upon the name of the Lord they must first believe in Him.³ But how can they believe except they hear His call and how can they hear except men are commissioned to preach the gospel to them? The quotation in v.15b from Is.52:7 may be interpreted as a scriptural proof that preachers have been sent as Christ's ambassadors and that the gospel has been proclaimed by them.⁴ But another possible interpretation

1. Cf. Sanday and Headlam, "the word ναυ, as often in Paul, marks a stage in the argument". (p.295).
2. Ibid. These authors do point out however that Grotius understood vv.14 and 15 as objections of an opponent to which Paul replies in vv.16.f. (p.298).
3. We take the subject of ἐπικαλέσται in v.14 to be those who may call upon the name of the Lord in the present or the future, rather than who actually do so i.e. this is most probably referring to the Jewish nation. Cf. Munck, p.91.
4. Cf. Munck, p.90. This quotation is closer to the Hebrew text than the LXX. In Rabbinic literature this text was already interpreted as referring to the Messianic era. Cf. Str/Bill. III, pp.282.f., Michel, p.261 n.2.
seems more fitting in this context. This regards the quotation as a script-
ural illustration summarizing and concluding the description of the process
of coming to faith as outlined in vv.14.f. This interpretation is support-
ed by Paul’s use of ἔκκαθισμός to connect the quotation with the preceding
sequence of thought.

It may be that Paul has also a secondary purpose in mind here. Al-
though we have no proof that this may be so, it could be that Paul is giv-
ing a reason why his forthcoming visit to Jerusalem is not out of keeping
with his view of the gospel. If Paul regarded his visit to Jerusalem with
the collection as a means of witnessing to Israel, then this emphasis on
the need for the proclamation of the gospel to all, so that all may call
upon the Lord can be seen as an apology for his continued concern for, and
evangelization of the Jews.

In vv.16.f. the provision of the means by which Israel may hear the
gospel is related to the contemporary situation. In spite of the fact that
the necessary conditions have been fulfilled, one thing is still lacking
i.e. faith - "they have not all heeded the gospel", (v.16). This verse re-
minds us as did ix:6 of the distinction that exists within the nation of
Israel, - "not all who are descended from Israel belong to Israel." Again
we note that this is stated simply as a straightforward recording of fact
and even this Paul does with great tactfulness. He could have said that

---

2. Cf. Nickle’s statement in his concluding summary of the theological
significance of the collection project. It is "an eschatological pilgrim-
age of the Gentile Christians to Jerusalem by which the Jews were to be
confronted with the undeniable reality of the divine gift of saving grace
to the Gentiles and thereby be themselves moved through jealousy to fin-
ally accept the gospel." (op.cit., p.142).
comparatively few Jews have believed or even that a great majority are disobedient, but this is not in keeping with Paul's approach in Romans and particularly in these chapters.

Munck expresses surprise that commentators are almost unanimous in agreeing that the aim of ch. x, including x:14-21, is to demonstrate Israel's guilt.\(^1\) Israel's guilt is mentioned here but it is not stressed as a main theme. The most to be found is a description of Israel as "a disobedient and contrary people", (x:21), but "Paul is not labelling this as guilt any more than he does Israel's negative attitude in vv.3 and 16''.\(^2\)

The reference to Is.53:1 in v.16 is designed to show that a refusal to obey the proclamation is in accord with Old Testament prophecy\(^3\) or that at least it is not inconsistent with it. This kind of unbelief is no new occurrence. "A negative response to the gospel is common to both prophetic and apostolic witness."\(^4\) Here it is the apostles who are reporting\(^5\) and are asking themselves the question "Lord who has believed what he has heard from us?" Munck sees a parallel to this in the story of the miraculous draught of fishes in Luke v:1-11 where Peter says to Jesus "Master we toiled all night and took nothing."\(^6\) The parallel is obvious, but surely it is exaggerating the general unbelief of the Jews to claim that the mission to Israel is equivalent to nothing!

Verse 17 is a brief concluding summary which rounds off the section which began at v.14. We ought not to treat this verse simply as a repetition

1. pp.89-90.
4. Barrett, p.204.
6. Ibid.
of v.14 or as a connecting parenthetical remark.\(^1\) There may be some doubt as to whether v.15 or v.16 has been misplaced and one does get the impression that Paul adds v.17 as a sort of afterthought. F.W. Maier however is of the opinion that in v.17 Paul is still thinking of Is.lix:1.\(^2\) The point that Paul is making is that there are three essential elements in the apostolate to the Jews; the first is faith, the second is the message proclaimed and the third is the divine commissioning of apostles.\(^3\) Of these three essentials the last one has been fulfilled. The only question that remains is whether in fact the Jews have really had the message preached to them. This is answered in vv.18 f.

We note once again how Paul continues to ask suggestive questions in order to introduce new sub-sections. We note also that the tone is still gentle and that there are no expressions of abhorrence in this section. Verse 18 takes up the question raised by the statement in v.16 that not all the Jews have believed. One excuse that might be made for their unbelief is that they may not actually have heard the gospel and therefore were prevented from exercising faith. This possibility is emphatically denied in v.18 by means of a direct quotation from Ps.xix:4(LXX). In the original psalm the quotation describes how universally the works of nature glorify God. But Paul does not quote this in order to emphasize the universality of the gospel.\(^5\) He means to refer to the universal proclamation of the

---

1. Cf. Munck, p.93. See especially the survey of the various interpretations of this verse in note 131 of this page.
3. Ibid.
5. Lagrange, p.262 contra Sanday and Headlam, pp.298/9. Munck's statement concerning Paul's use of the Old Testament is very relevant here: "The quoting of the texts from scripture cannot without weighty reasons be reduced to a mere appropriation of biblical expressions as a dress for one's own thoughts." (p.95). See also Thesis pp.388-89.
gospel to the Jews throughout the world. It is not the nature of the gospel message but the extent of its proclamation with which Paul is concerned.¹

Munck holds that the quotation from the psalm in v.18 is intended to signify that the mission to the Jews is already completed.² Since the mission has been rather unfruitful, it is one thing to claim that certain geographical regions have been evangelized but quite another to say that the mission has been completed. As we have already suggested, it is likely that Paul thought of his collection project and visit to Jerusalem as a means of witnessing to the Jews. It is quite possible that Paul thought of the delivery of the collection as the climax of the Jewish mission and, if this is so, Munck is to that extent correct. Nickle's view seems preferable however. He considers that the intention of Paul's visit to Jerusalem with the collection is to revive the Jewish mission.³ The problem with Munck's view is that he is inclined to identify the completion of the Jewish mission with its cessation and also to assume that in future it would be unnecessary to evangelize the Jews.⁴

---

² pp.96-99. Munck's emphasis on the representative nature of the evangelization must not be overlooked as it is essential to his interpretation of the Jewish mission as completed.
⁴ See K. Stendahl's foreword (p.9) to Christ and Israel. Here he seems to have got Munck's general position quite clear: "the final 'yes' to the Jews is to be a miracle of God, reserved for God's own time. At no point does Paul urge the Gentiles to carry on a mission for the purpose of converting the Jews." Against this we may assert that Paul's collection effort seems to have some reference to the salvation of the Jews i.e. divine miracles do not rule out the necessity for human endeavour or human agency. Secondly, whilst it was probably not fitting for Gentiles to evangelize Jews, it seems likely that Paul would assume that every Jewish Christian would seek to win his own people to faith. The Gentile representatives who accompany Paul with the collection can in some sense be regarded as the evangelization of the Jews by means of the Gentiles. Part of the problem here is that it is difficult to define the three periods into which Munck divides the Jewish mission, (see pp.124.f.).
Verse 19 is very similar in form to v.18. A brief introductory question is followed by a quotation from the Old Testament. We may paraphrase the question thus: despite the fact that Israel has heard the gospel, is it not possible that she did not understand it? Because of the similarity in form between vv.18 and 19 the answer to this question is generally assumed to be a repetition of the answer to the question in v.18, - on the contrary, of course she did. From this it has been concluded that Paul is seeking to prove the responsibility and hence the guilt of Israel. There are several indications however that this view is incorrect.

The most important one is that according to the text the question as to whether or not Israel has understood the gospel is left an open question. We have no reason to suppose that since Paul supplied no immediate answer we are at liberty to insert the same answer as in the preceding verse. It is not by accident that the μενοὐγε is not repeated. Richardson rightly points out that the usual understanding of vv.14-21 as referring to complete Jewish failure to hear the gospel can only be arrived at by neglecting the emphatic conclusion of v.13, "Every one (Jew and Greek) who calls upon the name of the Lord," and the logical connection of x:14 with what precedes. Paul has deliberately not answered this question as to Israel's understanding. When we remember that in x:3 Paul has already stated that Israel is ignorant of God's righteousness, this should lead us to expect a negative answer to the question concerning Israel's understanding in v.19. It is unlikely that Paul will contradict himself in the space of a few verses.

1. E.g. Sanday and Headlam, pp.299-300; Munck, p.100; Barrett, p.205.
Another factor that points to uncertainties in the generally accepted view that Israel has understood, is that it may be disputed whether it is correct to take ἐγνώ as referring only to intellectual comprehension. Bultmann correctly maintains that this word refers not to intellectual comprehension but full knowledge - acknowledgement and grateful submission to what is known. If this is correct, it is plain that instead of concluding that Israel did know, we must assert the opposite, that she was ignorant of the true knowledge of God, as in x:3.

These reasons are strong enough by themselves to prevent us from assuming that Paul believes that Israel has fully understood the gospel but refused it. Another factor makes this even more likely. This is the question of the place of πρῶτος in the sentence. Munck rejects Zahn's suggestion that the πρῶτος should be joined to the preceding ἐγνώ rather than to the succeeding quotation from Moses. In Zahn's opinion the concern is not so much to do with Israel's unbelief as with the order of events in the divine economy of salvation. This suggestion is particularly attractive in view of the emphasis "to the Jew first and also to the Greek" in 1:16 and ii:9.f. It is also very appropriate at this stage in the argument in that Paul is now about to deal in ch.xi with the apparent reversal of events in the 'Heilsgeschichte', in which the salvation of Gentiles has preceded

1. TDNT, I, pp.704-5.
3. Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer. 3 Aufl., 1925, pp.491.f. Leenhardt says of Zahn's interpretation "Grammar supports this but the meaning loses." (p.275).
that of the Jewish nation.  

Zahn suggests that this verse has to do with the question of the priority of Israel i.e. has Israel not first of all nations become acquainted with the gospel? Since salvation is first of all for the Jew, how can Paul claim that salvation has come and yet the Jews have not understood? This interpretation is preferable to that of Munck who, on this point rather surprisingly follows the traditional opinion: "Israel has understood while remaining unwilling to receive the offer of salvation." Munck notes that this interpretation causes this text to differ from other New Testament texts which normally state that hardening affects the very sight and hearing, so that it is no longer possible to understand what is preached. In our opinion Munck could have avoided this discrepancy and also the similar problem arising from his assertion that Paul is not speaking of this same thing in v. 3 as in v. 19 by following the alternative interpretation proposed by Zahn.

1. The pre-Pauline understanding of the sequence of events centred around the repentance and restoration of Israel. In so far as the Gentiles sought to destroy the people of God and could thus be regarded as God's enemies, they were to be defeated and destroyed. The prophets had emphasized however that God was God of the whole earth and that salvation would therefore eventually include all men. According to this view the salvation of Israel would become the means whereby Gentiles are brought to share in salvation on the same terms as Israel. The former exclusivist view was the dominant one in New Testament times and a nationalistic outlook held that all Gentiles would be destroyed save for those few who became a part of Israel to be servants to the chosen people. Jesus appears to have followed the prophetic emphasis that salvation is first of all for the Jews, and only then for Gentiles. Paul reverses this understanding of the pattern of events in view of the contemporary missionary situation. Cf. F. Hahn, Mission in the New Testament, SBTH, 47, (London 1965), pp. 19-21. J. Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations, SBTH, 24 (1958), pp. 46 ff. and 55-73. P. Volz, Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter, 2 Aufl. (Hildesheim 1966), pp. 357 ff. and Munck, PSM, pp. 247-281.

2. p. 100.

3. Ibid.

We must now turn our attention to vv.19b.f. to see whether they are in harmony with this interpretation. The first quotation, "I will make you jealous of those who are not a nation; with a foolish nation I will make you angry", is taken from Deut.xxxii:21. The quotation refers to a threatened judgement upon the people of Israel for worshipping false gods. Because of this God will temporarily favour the "Not a People" (which Paul takes to mean the Gentiles) in preference to those who consider themselves the people of God.

A similar emphasis upon God's judgement of Israel by means of the nations is also found in the prophetic literature. In this the emphasis is upon the severity of God's judgement on account of the faithlessness of Israel. Paul has taken up the concept of God's disciplining of Israel by means of the Gentiles, and developed it to explain the contemporary situation in which he believes that God is going to win the Jews by making them jealous of the favour shown to the Gentiles. Viewed in this light the quotation in v.19b is obviously a preparation for Paul's argument in xi:1.f.

The next quotation is preceded by Paul's introductory comment "Isaiah is so bold as to say", (v.20a). We may well ask wherein does Isaiah's boldness consist? Possibly it consists in the fact that this prophet dared to oppose the prejudices of his fellow-countrymen. The point of the Isaiah quotation is that it stresses the divine readiness to accept those who at

1. With the exception of substituting ὑπάκοα for δοκεῖν the citation follows the LXX.
2. Cf. Leenhardt, "today is happening the very thing with which God threatened Israel." p.275.
5. Apart from the inversion of the clauses, the quotation follows the LXX of Is. lxv:1.
present are disobedient and unwilling to listen to Him.

An interesting feature that emerges from our study of these verses is Paul's use of the Old Testament. As Munck notes, Paul means to make a serious point with each quotation. They are sometimes used as scriptural proof for Paul's statements, but they are not used merely to adorn or simply to illustrate his point. They are part of the argument itself. This fact constitutes part of the problem of their interpretation, as there are many quotations in this section and little explanatory comment to help clarify how Paul meant them to be interpreted.

Richardson has drawn attention to an important and at the same time a neglected aspect of Paul's use of the Old Testament which is demonstrated in Rom.x:20-21. The quotations from Is.lxv:1-2 which Paul uses here originally referred to a single group of people. But Paul considers them to refer to two groups i.e. Israel and the Gentiles. Richardson explains the procedure which Paul adopts here in this way. "Under the influence of 'ethne' in Is.lxv:1b (which he does not quote) Paul applies the idea of that verse to Gentiles, and 'laos' in Is.lxv:2 predisposed him to apply that verse to Israel."

Richardson notes that despite a certain degree of flexibility in the understanding of 'ethne', both here and in the other Pauline epistles 'laos' retains its primary reference to Israel.

---

2. p.135.
interpretation of 'nation' as meaning 'Gentiles' is readily understandable even though this is not necessarily what was originally intended.

The full meaning of vv.18-21 can be appreciated only by regarding these verses as a unity. The Isaiah quotation in v.21, "All day long I have held out my hands to a disobedient and contrary people", (Is.lxxv:2, LXX),¹ must be understood in the light of the context in which it is used here. In the quotation it is evident that Israel is disobedient and yet the emphasis is upon the great patience of God in tolerating and not destroying His disobedient people. Some commentators seem to feel that because the text claims that God has stretched out His hands all day, this day is now at an end and God has rejected Israel. This is to put too much stress on the image itself. The context in Rom.x shows that Israel has had the gospel preached to her. She has heard (v.18) but she has not understood. God's plan is to make her jealous by those who are "Not a People" (v.19). This implies that God is patient with Israel until His purposes are fulfilled. This is the reason why the quotations from Moses and from Isaiah are included in vv.19 and 20. These verses indicate God's roundabout way of reaching Israel; but this roundabout way requires great patience. In view of this we may confidently assert that v.21 depicts 'the waiting Father' whose hands are stretched out still. This fits in very well with our interpretation of v.19 and with the next verse (xi:1), where Paul repudiates the suggestion that God has rejected His people.

¹. Apart from a change in word order this verse also follows the LXX.
Romans xi:1-10.

In xi:1 Paul uses the introductory ὅτι and the accompanying ἐπὶ as in x:18,19 and xi:11. Then follows a question which might have been suggested by Paul's emphasis upon the freedom of God to elect or harden as He wills and to grant salvation to Gentiles - has God rejected His people? There is no doubt as to Paul's answer. The usual expression of abhorrence repudiates such a suggestion and the full reply to the suggestion follows immediately.

There are two possible sources from which this question concerning the rejection of the Jews might arise. It could come from the despondent apostles, who, following on their unsuccessful attempts to win the Jewish nation, see in this suggestion a possible explanation for their failure. It could also come from Gentile Christians. These may have boasted over the Jews because they considered that they had replaced them as the people of God, (cf.vv.17.f.). The second of these suggestions appears to be the more probable. Paul commences his argument by pointing to himself as

1. Although there is no need to deny Lagrange's view (p.266) that the ὅτι here refers back to ix:30-x:21, two qualifications should be added. There are also close connections with ix:6-29 and secondly, the immediate reference is to x:21. Cf. Richardson's view "there is no break in the argument when Paul inserts the rhetorical question that begins ch.xi." (op.cit. p.135).
2. The sentence, ὥστε καὶ πάντα τὰ ἥδιστα τῶν ἀνθρώπων (v.1), is found three times in the LXX, I Sam.xii:22, Ps.93:14, Ps.94:4.
4. Ibid.
proof that God has not rejected His people. Jülicher and Kühl have shown how pointless it would be for Paul to refer to himself as a proof that God had not rejected Israel if his audience were Jewish Christians.\(^1\) Paul would only add one more to the small number of Jews who have already accepted the gospel. His apostleship to the Gentiles would possibly detract from this argument in any case as it could also be used as a supporting argument for the view that the Gentiles had replaced Israel. If Jewish Christians or apostles were troubled by the thought that God has possibly rejected Israel, Paul's own faith would not necessarily remove their anxiety.\(^2\) Paul's reference to himself, as an example of a believing Jew is understandable only if he is addressing a majority of Gentiles, as in fact v.13 specifically states.

The fact that a Gentile Christian audience is necessitated by Paul's argument concerning the rejection of Israel in xi:1.f. is most significant for our understanding of the identity of the 'objector' in Romans. The question as to the rejection of Israel is one of the most Jewish of questions and yet it arises here from Gentile Christians rather than Jewish.

Gaugler suggests that when Paul cites himself as an example he has his Gentile apostleship in mind.\(^3\) If God had displaced the Jews on account of the Gentiles, He would not have chosen the apostle of the new people from amongst the Jews. This argument is not really very convincing. Paul refers primarily to himself as a devout Jew - an Israelite, a descendant

---

1. As quoted by Munck, p.106. See also Schmidt, pp.184-5.
2. If Paul intends his words in xi:1 to be understood as Lietzmann suggests - "How could I, a true Israelite, hold such an opinion?" (pp.101-2), this verse could then be understood as Paul's response to questions from anxious Jewish Christians.
of Abraham and a member of the tribe of Benjamin. The description of Paul's Jewish background is similar to that which he gives in Phil.iii:4-6. The essential point Paul wishes to make is that he himself as a devout, patriotic Jew Saul the persecutor of Christians, was a most unlikely candidate for Christian faith. But in spite of this, Jesus Christ laid hold of him on the Damascus road and made him become Paul, the apostle.

The example is therefore primarily concerned with Paul as a devout Jew but Gaugler is correct in that the apostleship is also relevant. It is an example of God's infinite grace transforming the most unlikely person into one of the leaders of the church. Paul's personal experience of God's grace is the foundation for his belief that similar grace will yet come to disobedient Israel.

Since Paul the apostle is of Jewish origin and has received God's grace, this provides the first part of the proof that Israel as a whole has not been rejected - the rejection at best can only be partial (v.25). The second argument stresses the fact that God has not cast off His people.

1. The apostle to the Gentiles is named after Saul the first king of Israel and is a member of the tribe of Benjamin, one of the leading tribes in post-exilic times. Cf. Michel, p.266; Schmidt, p.185, and W. Vischer, "Das Geheimnis Israels." Jud. VI (1950), pp.81-132(112).
2. Paul is patriotic but this sentiment is not the basis of his hope for Israel. Cf. Munck's criticism of Jülicher's view that Paul is far too warmhearted a patriot to admit that x:21 is the last word in the matter, (p.106).
4. Cf. L. Goppelt, Jesus, Paul and Judaism, p.165. See also Vischer, op.cit. p.113. Munck notes that Paul used God's call to him, through the revelation of Jesus Christ at Damascus as an element in his preaching, as the largely uniform version of the story in Galatians and Acts illustrates, (p.107 n.152). See also PSM, pp.11-35.
whom He foreknew, (v.2a). This reminds the Gentiles of the special history of the Jewish nation. In describing himself as an Israelite and as a descendant of Abraham, Paul already has drawn attention to Israel as God's chosen people.2

Paul's understanding of the relevance for salvation of Israel's past history is a subject which many commentators have found most confusing.3 It appears that he simultaneously allows and yet disallows any advantage to Israel (cf. v.28). Sanday and Headlam are typical in their comments (on xi:6) - "God's people are those whom He has chosen; it is not that the Jews are chosen because they are His people".4 This solves the problem by dismissing the entire history of Israel as of no significance. Munck supplies the probable interpretation in his formulation of the problem. "No one, not even the Jew, can make any claim upon God; but God will save all men in Christ, not only the Gentiles, but Israel also. In his sovereign freedom God chooses to save the people He once freely chose".5 This emphasis links up with what Paul has

1. ἐκλεγόμενον denotes election and refers to God's earlier choice of Israel to be His people." (Munck, p.107). The word is used here similarly to viii:29, cf. Bultmann, TDNT, I, p.715. Paul has in mind here the thought that since God is faithful, He will finish what He has begun. This applies to Israel as well as to the church (p.108 n.154).
2. The fact that Paul the Christian can still describe himself in this way shows the high regard in which he holds his Jewish heritage. For a full understanding of Paul's view of physical descent from Abraham, it is necessary to balance Rom.ix:6.f. with iv:13-16, ix:4-5 and xi:1.f. The fact that Paul's evaluation of Judaism is not always negative is also significant for our interpretation of κατὰ σάρξ in i:4.
3. We noted this particularly in connection with iii:2,9. Cf. Dodd, p.46.
4. p.313.
5. p.111.
already stated in ix:6-29.1 There too we noticed that the assertion of the
divine freedom was geared to the belief that this freedom means freedom to
save rebellious Israel as well as believing Gentiles.

The third and probably the most significant part of Paul’s argument
in xi:1.f. is introduced by the customary phrase οὐκ οὔτως which as we
have already noted is Paul’s way of reminding Christians of what they know
or ought to know.2 This time the reference is to the story of Elijah in
I Kings xix, in which Paul sees an excellent parallel with the contempor¬
ary situation.

Before noting the similarities between Paul’s situation and the
Elijah narrative we must note one distinct difference between these two
‘heilsgeschichtlich’ figures; the situation may be the same but the mood is
different.3 Whereas Elijah appeals to God against his people, Paul unites
himself in solidarity with his people in hope of their salvation.

Apart from this there are many interesting parallels between
Elijah’s situation and that of Paul. In both situations a majority of the
people are apostate and the divine representatives are in danger of their
lives, Elijah from Jezebel’s persecution and Paul from Jewish persecution.

1. Munck says that as early as ch.x Paul was laying the groundwork for a
decisive negation of the idea that Israel is to be rejected (p.105).
We would say this also of ch.ix. When chs.ix and x are allowed to say
what Paul meant them to say then there is no need for the surprise which
some scholars express when Paul denies in xi:1.f. that Israel is reject¬
ed, cf. e.g. Schmidt’s statement "Die Verneinung der Frage ist keines¬
wegs selbstverständlich." (p.184).
2. Cf. in ii:4; vi:3; vii:1; ix:21. "You must admit this or be ignorant of
what the scripture says." (Sanday and Headlam, p.310).
3. Paul is probably quoting from memory; the quotation is shorter than in
the LXX and the order of the clauses is inverted. Sanday and Headlam
believe that Paul may have inverted the clauses because the reference
to the killing of the prophets is the closest analogy to events in his
own time, (p.311). ξατέλειψε τό (I Kings xix:18, LXX) has been changed
to ξατέλειπον which agrees with the Masoretic text.
Both are very much alone against the rest of the nation.\(^1\) We must be careful however not to over-emphasize the personal, individual experience of Paul or Elijah.\(^2\) It is not normally Paul's habit to be introspective or full of self-pity; perhaps Munck places just a little too much emphasis on the comparison between Paul and Elijah and not enough on their parallel situations.\(^3\) It is very hard however to make any clear separation between the two emphases. As Munck points out, it was quite natural for Paul at the time of writing Romans to draw a parallel with Elijah as a figure in 'Heilsgeschichte' who has a task to fulfil towards his unbelieving people.\(^4\)

We also agree that Paul's approaching journey to Jerusalem has points of resemblance to Elijah's return to Israel for the final showdown on Mount Carmel.\(^5\) But the most significant parallel between the situation of Elijah and that of Paul's time is that in both instances God has preserved a

---

2. Elijah's lament as quoted in v.3 is not the high point of Paul's quotation. The divine oracle in v.4 is most significant because it shows that Elijah was mistaken in his belief that the entire nation was apostate.
3. This is probably because Munck lays so much stress on the eschatological significance of Paul's apostleship to the Gentiles. Cf. PSM, pp.282.f.
5. See Munck's summary of the parallels - "Elijah on his way to Mount Carmel and Paul heading for Jerusalem are much alike. Both are risking their lives by going to Palestine, and both aim in God's name to change the destiny of their people by making them believe in God and persuading them to turn away from the error that has made them His enemy." Ibid.
remnant. Elijah was wrong to despair because God still had seven thousand faithful to Him in Israel. So too in the present situation it is wrong for

1. The remnant is a frequent theme in the Old Testament e.g. II Kings xiii:30.f; Is.xi:11,16; xlvi:3.f; Jer.xxiii:3; xxxi:7; Micah iii:12; iv:7; Zech.viii:12 etc. The Hebrew יִשְׂרָאֵל is the normal word for remnant in the Old Testament, e.g. Shear-jashub Hos.viii:3 - "a remnant shall return", as Isaiah names his son. In Rom.ix-xi, Paul uses various words - λεπτομερία, (xi:5) ἡκόλουθον (ix:27 quotation), επέκειτο (ix:29 quotation) and ἐκλογή (xi:7). Basically the concept of the remnant embodies two emphases - judgement and salvation, cf. V. Herntwich, TDNT, IV, p.198. It emphasizes the severity of God's judgement so that only a part of the people will be saved. This number is generally thought to be comparatively small though according to Zech.xiii:8.f. one third of the people are to be saved in the day of God's judgement. But throughout the Old Testament the emphasis is that this remnant owe their existence only to the mercy of God (cf.Is.ii:9 as quoted in Rom.ix:29). This is the second emphasis in 'the remnant' theme - God preserves 'the remnant' and thus witnesses to His continuing purpose for Israel. Since in Old Testament times the judgement of God often meant the destruction of 'the rest', 'the remnant' becomes in fact equivalent to Israel, or at least the essential nucleus of Israel. Possibly this is why Paul does not base his hopes for disobedient Israel, i.e. 'the rest' in Rom.xi, simply on the concept of 'the remnant'. In Rom.xi, it is the emphasis upon the gracious action of God in preserving 'the remnant' which is to the fore. Paul is not primarily concerned with the judgement but with the vocation of Israel (Leenhardt, pp.278-9). In this respect Paul is in accord with the basic emphasis of 'the remnant' concept. Whilst the idea of judgement is always present 'remnant' is meant to be a positive, comforting term, cf. Herntwich, op.cit., p.198. "In Rom.xi the remnant concept is put forward in preparation for the message that the whole of Israel will eventually be saved; the stress lies on the fact that there is at least a remnant which stands as testimony that God's grace toward the chosen people has not ceased." (Munck, pp.110-11). For the relevant literature on this subject see Munck, "Excursus 2". (pp.111-2); H.H. Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election (London 1950), pp.69-87; P. Volz, Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter, pp.352.f.; J. Jeremias, "Der Gedanke 'Heiligen Restes' im Spätjudentum und in der Verkündigung Jesu," ZNW, XLII (1949), pp.184-94.

2. As Munck notes (p.109 n.156) some scholars believe that the figure 'seven thousand' represents a not inconsiderable part of the people. Munck's view is that Paul uses it simply because it was already in the text and that the mission to the Jews was almost a complete failure - "hardly any of the Jews" (p.93) - the number of Christians is "to be counted in thousands rather than tens of thousands". (p.97). Munck's general scepticism concerning the success of the Jewish mission is partly due to his concern to prove that the Pauline churches were purely Gentile Christian (PSM, pp.200.f.). Even if Munck is correct in this view of the Pauline congregations, it does not necessarily prove that there were not many Jewish Christians in Palestine.
Christians to despair of God's purpose for Israel. Even now there is a remnant chosen by grace — λειμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος. This remnant exists only by God's grace and not on account of any merit of their own.

Here Paul brings to its conclusion his doctrine of 'faith and works' which has been a dominant theme throughout the letter. It may even be questioned if it would not be legitimate to regard the previous discussion (particularly in ch. iv) as the foundation which Paul has laid, so that his statements concerning God's grace to Israel cannot possibly be misinterpreted here. This of course implies that chs. ix-xi are in fact the climax of Paul's argument in Romans. From a theological point of view at least, it is more appropriate that the doctrine of faith and works should exist to serve the doctrine of election and not vice-versa. Paul's emphasis is that God's ways with Israel have been, are, and will continue to be determined by grace alone. This fact means that any kind of claim upon God must be dismissed "otherwise grace would no longer be grace." (v. 6).

The τι εὖ which introduces v. 7 designates it as one of Paul's interim summaries marking a stage in the progress of the argument. In the Elijah narrative we discover that Israel failed to find the salvation it

---

1. Although Paul has previously mentioned 'the remnant' in ch. ix, we note a certain advance in thought in ch. xi. Whereas in ch. ix the emphasis is 'only a remnant' here it is 'already a remnant'. Cf. Goppelt, op.cit. p. 158. This advance in thought is made possible by the intervening chapter, (ch.x). Cf. Munck, "Paul returns in xi:1 to the train of thought found at the end of ix:16-29, especially the idea of the remnant; he returns, however, to that point in such a way that he is able, by virtue of the intervening passage, ix:30-xi:2, to solve the problem posed without being misunderstood by his readers." (p. 106).

2. Richardson holds that in chs. i-iv Paul sets out theoretical and theological first principles upon which he bases the discussion of practical and historical realities in chs. ix-xi, (op.cit., p. 126).

3. This is the reason why Paul gives a severe warning to presumptuous Gentile Christians in vv. 13 f.
sought. But 'the elect' (ἡ ἐκλογή) obtained it while 'the rest' were hardened. It is with the fate of the οἱ λοιποὶ that Paul is concerned at this stage. Israel can be divided into 'the elect' and 'the rest'. The former group received grace, the latter were hardened. The succeeding scriptural references are designed to show God's hardening at work in Old Testament times. In this section as in ch.ix, hardening and election are both closely related to God's purpose of grace. Probably Munck is correct to emphasize that "here (in ch.xi) as elsewhere God's election explains a visible state of affairs. Likewise the hardening of the Jews is Paul's attempt to describe and explain a visible circumstance. Israel has said no to Christ and then to the apostles." Looking more closely at this instance

1. The verb παρέδωκαν is found in the passive in Job xvii:7 (LXX), and Mk.vi:52. In the latter instance it is used with reference to the disciples. This demonstrates that hardening cannot be described simply as God's action upon men to prevent them from believing. In ch.xi we find various descriptions of this phenomenon - hardening (v.7), blinding (vv.8,10), and deafening (v.8). In Old Testament times God's judgement upon disobedient Israel often came in the form of domination by Gentile nations. In New Testament times the view of the church seems to have been that God now punishes the disobedient by a dulling of their faculties so that they are rendered (temporarily) incapable of receiving God's grace. Spiritual blindness is probably the best description of 'hardening'.

2. Verse 8 appears to be a combination of Deut.xxix:3 with Is.xxix:10 and also possibly with Is.vi:7. Cf. B. Lindars, New Testament Apologetic, pp.160-67. Leenhardt notes that the first word of the quotation ἑκκοσμεῖσθαι emphasizes the activity of God in hardening and is parallel to the three-fold ταπείνωσις in Rom.i (p.280). The quotation in xi:9f. is taken from Ps.lxviii:23,24 (LXX), "The apostle quotes the passage primarily for its allusions to blindness considered as punishment and servitude." (Leenhardt, p.280). Munck notes that this quotation appears frequently in New Testament passages where the Jewish opposition to Jesus is under consideration (pp.114-5). It is possibly because of this context that scholars have tended to translate διὰ ταπείνωσις (as quoted in v.10) as 'for ever' rather than as 'continually'. C.E.B. Cranfield shows convincingly that neither the Hebrew original, the Greek translation nor the immediate context (temporary hardening) in ch.xi give us any grounds for translating this other than as 'continually'. "The bending down of the backs is not to go on forever, but so long as it lasts it is to be continuous and sustained, not spasmodic." "The Significance of διὰ ταπείνωσις in Romans xi:10." SEv II, TÜ 87 (1964), pp.546-550(550).

3. p.113.
we note that hardening is related to disobedience, a factor which is common to many similar references to the theme. It appears therefore that whilst we emphasize the sovereignty of God in this as in all other aspects of salvation, we must also allow that hardening is, in the first instance, associated with human disobedience. Whatever implications this may have for our conception of the operation of God's unchanging purpose in world history, it is imperative that we do not lose sight of the human element, otherwise the whole drama of salvation becomes simply a divine charade played out in the theatre of world history. According to Paul's theology those who will not obey lose the ability to hear and, those who will not see are blinded and lose the ability to see the kingdom of God.

This is what has happened to the nation of Israel. Because of disobedience, God's word to them has become an agent of hardening and not a means of grace. In this there is a real parallel with the times of Elijah. The question that arises from this however, is the one that must always arise when we make an assertion that God hardens people against His gospel. Is it not then His purpose that these people should perish - are they not in

1. E.g. the case of Pharaoh in Exodus xiv and Rom.ix. This is not contradicted by the assertion which we have made in connection with x:19 that Israel has misunderstood the gospel. This verse is an attempt to explain why Israel has disobeyed but it seeks neither to blame nor to exonerate her.


3. L. Cerfaux believes that the similarities between Paul, Mark and John in their understanding of 'hardness of heart' may be explained by their acquaintance with a translation of Is.vi:9.f., "L'aveuglement d'esprit dans l'évangile de saint Marc." Recueil Lucien Cerfaux, II, pp.3-15.

fact vessels prepared for destruction (as some misleading interpretations of ix:22 suggest)? This is the question to which Paul turns his attention in vv.11.f.
The form of v.11 is similar to v.1. In vv.11.f. Paul continues his investigation into the fate of 'the rest' who are at present unbelieving.

The question in v.1 concerned the broader issue of the people of Israel as a whole. There Paul categorically denies that God has cast off His people. By taking himself as an example and arguing from the concept of 'the faithful remnant' Paul has established that a part of Israel is already receiving salvation. Verse 11 differs from v.1 in that the specific interest now centres upon those who are hardened. The disobedience of the majority of the Jews is already an acknowledged fact. Verses 11.f. deal with the interpretation of this fact. Some Gentile Christians have suggested that the unbelieving Jews were destined to fall from grace. Their fall is an end in itself.

1. We must be careful to note exactly how Paul uses the concept of 'the remnant' in ch.xi. Unlike contemporary Judaism Paul does not consider the salvation of 'the remnant' an alternative to the salvation of all Israel. Cf. Müller, pp.45-46. It may be that the reference to Elijah should be understood as a reference to Elijah 'redivivus' and as such a guarantee of the restoration of the whole people, (Ibid). Verse 16 shows that Paul thinks of 'the remnant' as being equivalent to the first-fruits and understands the concept representatively as pointing to the future salvation of all Israel. Cf. E. Flesseman-van Leer, "Jew and Gentile: Some Considerations Suggested by Dr. Hay's Reply." CJT, III (1957) pp.235-40(238).

2. W. Lütgert suggests that the Gentile Christians in Rome may have brought their anti-semitic (more specifically anti-Jewish) bias with them into the church. That the Jews were often very unpopular in Rome is witnessed by their expulsion by Claudius in A.D.49. It is possible that the Gentile Christians expected Paul to support them in these attitudes, probably because of his apostleship to the Gentiles and the slanders spread by unsympathetic Jews. Die historische Situation des Röm. Briefes, pp.86-89.

3. Cf. I'm suggesting that it was God's purpose to make Israel fall so that they could not rise again. This seems to be the best way to understand the Greek here, cf. W. Bauer, A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament, p.378. There is no need to try to soften the force of this verse in view of the fact that ch.xi is generally hopeful as to Israel's future. This is not Paul's comment on the failure of the Jews, but a rather nasty suggestion emanating from hostile Gentile Christians. Cf. Munck, pp.118-9.
as the people of God and that the focus of 'Heilsgeschichte' is now upon them.¹

Paul repudiates such a suggestion with his usual expression of horror. His immediate reply is that their fall is not an end but a means to an end.² By their fall salvation has come to the Gentiles. At this point however, Paul is not interested in the immediate benefit to Gentiles, having already touched upon this theme in earlier chapters. Even though he directly addresses Gentiles in this section, his primary concern is the salvation of unbelieving Israel. The result of Jewish disobedience has been salvation for Gentiles,³ but the outcome of this will in turn provoke the Jews to envy and thus lead to their salvation.⁴ In Paul's theology neither the salvation of Jews nor the salvation of Gentiles can become an end in itself since both exist to serve the glory of God in His purpose according to election.⁵ We note the circular argument which Paul uses here, "beginning with Jews and their antipathy it moves on to Gentiles and their acceptance and then back to Jews and

1. P. Richardson's valuable study Israel and the Apostolic Church shows how Paul refused to take the term 'Israel' and fill it with a solely Christian content. Richardson gives an excellent survey of how the view which Paul opposes here eventually came to be typical of the whole church. See especially the concluding summary (pp.195-206).
3. The unbelief of Israel forced the gospel out into the Gentile world and to develop in a non-nationalistic and non-legalistic form capable of acceptance by Gentiles, see J. Knox The Epistle to the Romans in The Interpreter's Bible IX, p.563 and G. Dix Jew and Greek, p.53.
4. This sequence - Jews, Gentiles, Jews, represents Paul's practical missionary method, cf. Munck, p.119. Paul probably understood his work in this way when it became apparent that Israel was not responding to the gospel, but he does not go so far as to say that Israel's refusal was necessary in order that salvation might go to the Gentiles, cf. Leenhardt, p.282.
5. Contra E. Flesseman-van Leer, who states "The ministry of Paul, as the apostle to the Gentiles, was entirely aimed at the Jews...", "The Significance of the Mystery of Israel." CJT, III (1957), pp.5-14(10). Michel points out that in v.13 Paul is not speaking of the Gentile mission 'per se', but only in its relation to the mission to Israel (p.273 n.6). See also Barth, p.140.
their ultimate ingrafting."\(^1\) The reason for this is that Paul wishes to stress that "the church has no existence apart from Israel and no separate identity."\(^2\)

The divine 'Heilsgeschichte' may appear at the moment to by-pass Israel. Because of disobedience she has at present lost her role as the primary agent of 'Heilsgeschichte' but this can only be temporary since Israel still occupies a unique place in God's purpose in world history. The latter emphasis is a necessary corrective to Gentile Christians who stress the newness of the church and forget their origins in Israel.\(^3\) Paul attacks their view that Israel's fall means the end of Israel by declaring that Israel's central position in the 'Heilsgeschichte' will become clear precisely in the 'last days'.\(^4\)

In this matter Paul appears to be less predestinarian than the Gentile Christians in Rome. In comparison with their opinion that Israel's rejection of Christ has resulted in God's final rejection of Israel,\(^5\) Paul's attitude is much more flexible and hopeful. The views of these Christians closely resemble the extreme doctrines of predestination which have so often been wrongly attributed to Paul on the basis of Rom.ix-xi. Yet it is not

---

1. Richardson, op.cit., p.130.
2. Ibid.
3. W. Lütgert describes these Gentiles as Christians who wanted to be called children of God but not of Abraham, and to believe in the Son of God but not the Son of David. They valued the Spirit but not the scriptures. They wanted to become Christians but to have nothing to do with Judaism - theirs was "ein gegen die Religion Israels gerichtetes Christentum." (op.cit., pp.87-89).
5. Gentile Christians may have believed that Israel had been rejected as a divine judgement because of her refusal to believe in Christ resulting in His crucifixion. The tendency to regard Israel as reprobate was probably also encouraged by the desire to consider themselves as the elect. Cf. Althaus, p.104.
correct to assert that Paul completely rejects the doctrine of predestination. It is obvious that he does hold to this doctrine in some form. The chief difference between Paul and exponents of extreme forms of predestination is that Paul’s view is dynamic whereas historically theirs has tended to be static.¹ This kind of static determinism is entirely foreign to Paul’s gospel.² Probably the exclusivism of Jewish nationalism and subsequent Gentile anti-semitism have tended to encourage static forms of predestination doctrine both in apostolic times and in succeeding periods of church history.

Paul’s attitude to Israel is founded on his confidence in the sovereignty of God, but Paul also allows for human freedom within the sphere of this sovereignty.³ Israel has stumbled but she has not fallen irrevocably—the lapse is only temporary. "And even the others, if they do not persist in their unbelief, will be grafted in..." (v. 23). Likewise presumptuous Gentiles will be cut away from the stem of Israel if they do not continue to live by faith (v. 22.) God is free to have mercy upon whom He wills.⁴ But

1. Paul’s discussion in chs. ix–xi does not arise from an interest in the doctrine of predestination as such. "Paulus spricht auch hier nicht spekulativ, sondern ad hominem." (Müller, p. 47). The discussion originates out of the practical missionary situation where, despite their apparent advantage the Jews as a whole have failed to believe. Cf. Richardson, op. cit., pp. 146-7.

2. Cf. Müller, p. 79. It should also be remembered that despite its failings Calvin’s doctrine of predestination, as all his theology, originated in the context of a living church and, to be properly understood should not be separated from this context. Calvin appears at his worst in controversial documents such as Concerning the Eternal Predestination of God. Unfortunately later Calvinist theologians developed a rather academic interest in doctrines such as predestination but neglected the context of practical Christian living which Calvin himself regarded as so important.


4. "God remains free as regards the disobedient, just as He remains free as regards the obedient." Barth, p. 143.
neither His kindness nor His severity are exercised in an arbitrary fashion as a superficial reading of Rom.ix-xi would perhaps suggest. God's kindness and severity are "correlates of faith and unbelief - this correlation appears clearly from the fact that both His kindness and the severity are reversible."²

This is not to say that there is no such a thing as genuine election. Israel still remains as the stem into which the Gentiles have been grafted and into which the at present unbelieving Jews may once again be grafted.³ This abiding election is not something upon which Jew or Gentile may presume but is based solely upon the faithfulness of God, whose nature is such that in sovereign freedom His gifts and calling are not revoked (v.29) and His creative word accomplish that which He pleases.(ix:6).

In vv.11.f. Paul sets out the grounds of his hope for Israel's future. In v.12 he changes from past tenses describing the background to the contemporary situation to present and future in which he expresses his hope for Israel.⁴ The ἐκ ὄς with which v.12 commences is typical of the syllogistic form of argument which is predominant in this section (vv.11-24).⁵ Paul bases his future hopes on what has already taken place. His statements throughout the remainder of the chapter are not mere prediction but might more accurately be described as 'Kreuzestheologie'.⁶ Paul's theology origin-

2. Ibid.
3. "The obvious feature of the olive tree figure, sometimes overlooked, is that a pruned Israel retains its place in God's activity", Richardson op.cit., p.129.
5. Cf. ἐκ ὄς (vv.12 and 17) and ἐκ ὄς ἡττ (vv.15, 21, 24).
ates from God’s redemptive activity in Jesus Christ\textsuperscript{1} by means of which the refusal of the Jews to accept their Messiah has been used by God for the promotion of His own glory in the extension of salvation to Gentiles. The God who thus used their disobedience and who transformed Saul the persecutor, cannot be defeated by Israel’s unbelief, but will once again overcome evil with good.\textsuperscript{2} This is the ground on which Paul bases his argument in vv.11.f.

Verse 12 is typical - "Now if their trespass means riches for the world, and if their failure means riches for the Gentiles, how much more will their full inclusion mean!" The best way to understand this verse seems to be to regard the first two clauses as exact parallels to each other. Thus 'riches for the κόσμος' is identical with 'riches for the Gentiles'\textsuperscript{3} and παράπτωμα is equivalent to ἡττημα.\textsuperscript{4} Munck claims that the only real advance in thought in v.12 is the change from παράπτωμα to ἡττημα in order to prepare for the coming contrast with τὸ πλήρωμα .\textsuperscript{5} The use of παράπτωμα may originally have been suggested by the outlook of hostile Gentile Christians who regarded Israel’s stumbling as an event in 'Heilsgeschichte' of the same decisive nature as the fall of Adam (vv.15.f.)\textsuperscript{6} The parallelism in v.12 suggests that we should regard παράπτωμα, ἡττημα and πλήρωμα as similar in implication.\textsuperscript{7} This raises a problem in connection with ἡττημα since the strict etymological derivation of this word requires

\textsuperscript{1} Cf. L. Goppelt, Jesus, Paul and Judaism, pp.165-67, but see also "Testing the Prediction in Rom.xi:25.f." (pp.161.f.).
\textsuperscript{2} "Israel’s Rettung beruht weder auf dem Heil der Heiden noch auf einem natürlichen Vorzug des Volkes, sondern allein auf Gottes Schöpferkraft." Müller, p.44.
\textsuperscript{3} Cf. Munck, p.120.
\textsuperscript{4} Contra F.W. Maier who separates the two terms (p.121 n.82).
\textsuperscript{5} p.120.
\textsuperscript{6} Munck, p.118.
\textsuperscript{7} Cf. Leenhardt, p.283.
us to translate it as 'defeat' (I Cor. vi:7). But Paul is not speaking here of the defeat of Israel; he is referring to a diminution of their numbers.\(^1\) Leenhardt points out that it is with the advantage which Gentiles enjoy and not with their greater numbers that the \(\tau\nu\tau\nu\mu\alpha\) of Israel is contrasted.\(^2\) It is doubtful however if the question of numbers can be entirely excluded at this point in view of the parallel with \(\pi\nu\rho\omega\mu\alpha\) (the full number)\(^3\) later in the verse. Although this 'full number' is not meant to refer to an exact number of individuals the quantatative aspect is still very much to the fore.\(^4\) In the light of all this it seems preferable to regard \(\tau\nu\tau\nu\mu\alpha\) as referring to the failure of Israel as demonstrated in the small number who respond positively to the gospel.

---

1. The Vulgate has 'diminutio'. Barrett believes that Paul may have derived this word (wrongly) from a comparative (\(\tau\nu\tau\nu\omega\nu\)), meaning inferior or smaller (p.214). For a similar view see Pallis, pp.127-8; Lietzmann, p.103.

2. p.283.

3. This could be taken to mean that 'the rest' fulfil the divine demand and thus attain salvation, cf. W. Bauer A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, p.678; Lietzmann, p.103; Pallis, p.128. Attractive though this suggestion may be, a majority of scholars hold that this must mean 'the full number' or some such concept. Cf. Sanday and Headlam, p.322; Barrett, p.214; Michel, p.272; G. Delling TDNT VI, pp.290-307(305); C.F.D. Moule "Fulfilment Words in the New Testament: Use and Abuse." NTS, XIV, (1967/68), pp.293-320; H.J. Schoeps Paul, pp.242.f.; Lagrange, p.276. Munck (pp.119.f.) considers the 'fullness of the Jews' an exact parallel to the 'fullness of the Gentiles'. More problematic is his identification of \(\pi\nu\rho\omega\mu\alpha\) with the conclusion of the Jewish mission, (Ibid). If instead of this view we take the reference here to be primarily to the final salvation of the Jews, this interpretation would also imply the conclusion of the Jewish mission, but in a modified sense from that which Munck suggests.

4. Munck correctly notes (on xi:25) that Paul does not refer to "a specific number to be obtained", (p.134). We agree that this "would introduce a notion of predestination which is alien to Paul's way of thinking in Rom. ix-xi", (Ibid). The frequent apocalyptic overtones in this chapter seem to contradict Munck's view. Michel's description, "die apokalyptische Vollzahl" (p.272), is much more appropriate in the context. We should also remember that Paul is thinking in terms of peoples rather than of individuals. What is meant here is the full number (not an exact number) of the Jewish people, but not every single Jew. See later on xi:25. Cf. G. Schrenk, op.cit., p.102.
Paul's argument runs something like this - if the fall of the Jews has brought riches for the world and if the diminution of their numbers has brought riches for the Gentiles how much more will all be enriched by their coming to full strength. The argument in this verse is similar to that in ch.v:9.f. If God has already done this we may expect Him to do even greater things in future. Israel's disobedience has brought the riches of the gospel to Gentiles. If disobedience has led to this, the consequences of obedience must be infinitely greater.

The content of v.15 is parallel to that of v.12. Here the contrast between the present and future state of the unbelieving Jews is provided by the words ἀπορολή and πρόσωπις. Paul introduces the former term on account of the latter. This may be due simply to his desire to express a similar truth to that of v.12 in a slightly different form. It is more likely however, that Paul deliberately chooses the verb προσλαμβάνω here because he intends to use it again in his concluding exhortation. He calls upon Jewish and Gentile Christians to accept one another as full members of the church of Christ (xiv:7), as God has received them (xiv:3).

The word ἀπορολή is another way of describing the present hardened state of the Jews. It means no more than has already been stated in the

1. Cf. Maier, p.121.
2. Sanday and Headlam, p.325.
3. This word is used in the Septuagint to describe the acceptance of men into close communion with God, or of God's acceptance of Israel as His people, cf. G. Delling, TDNT, IV, p.15. It seems to be used in obs. xiv-xv as a technical term for reception into full membership of the Christian community. This may indicate that no united Christian congregation had as yet been formed in Rome or that table-fellowship was no longer possible. Cf. Michel, p.358, and H.W. Bartsch "Die anti-semitischen Gegner des Paulus im Römerbrief." AJNT, pp.27-43(31).
4. Paul speaks primarily to the Gentile Christian majority who are to accept the weak and respect the conscience of the Jewish Christian minority. Cf. Bartsch, op.cit., p.35; Michel, pp.342.f.
images of stumbling, blindness etc., in vv.7-12. As we have previously suggested in connection with v.11 the severity of the term may indicate that it originates not from Paul but from Gentile Christians in Rome.¹

Reconciliation of the world (v.12) probably refers in the first instance to the spread of the gospel to Gentiles; it may however be more specific, referring to the fact that Jews and Gentiles have become truly one in Jesus Christ.² As Sanday and Headlam state, "the casting away of the Jews has meant the reconciliation of the world to Christ. Henceforth there is no more a great wall of partition separating God's people from the rest of the world. This is the first step in the founding of the Messianic kingdom."³

Paul has already argued in v.11 that since the stumble of the Jews has brought riches to Gentiles, the fullness of the Jews ought to bring much greater riches. In v.15 these are described in apocalyptic language as "life from the dead." It is possible, as Leenhardt claims, that by this phrase Paul means simply the conversion of Israel since "Israel is symbolically a people of the dead, the most dead of all because of its attitude to the Law,"⁴ In view of the particular type of argument which Paul uses here this does not seem quite correct. The outcome of Israel's acceptance is supposed to be much greater than the result of her disobedience,⁵ namely the conversion of Gentiles. But this would not be true if the phrase "life from the dead" were taken to refer merely to the conversion of Jews; is the conversion of Jews really much greater than the conversion of Gentiles? What

---

¹ Bartsch has indicated the existence of party slogans such as 'the weak in faith' and 'the strong in faith' among the Roman Christians (op.cit. pp.38 f.).
³ p.325.
⁴ pp.264-5.
⁵ Cf. Sanday and Headlam, p.325.
Paul has in mind here is a common blessing for believing Israel and for all believers whether Jews or Gentiles. The conversion of Israel is but the first step, as Sanday and Headlam note, "when all the people of Israel shall have come in there will be the final consummation of all things, and this means the realization of the hope which the reconciliation of the world has made possible."¹ In view of this it would appear that the phrase 'life from the dead' can mean nothing less than resurrection from the dead.

The fact that we have been able to proceed directly from v.12 to v.15 indicates that vv.13 and 14 are somewhat of a parenthesis.² By this we do not mean that they are insignificant. Parenthesis is used simply to describe the position in the immediate context, but not to imply any depreciation of their content. In fact it is extremely valuable for interpretation that Paul explicitly states in v.13 which audience he is addressing in these verses. He speaks specifically to Gentile Christians.³ This statement and the absence of Old Testament quotations in the remainder of the section (vv. 13-24) might be taken as proof that Paul has previously addressed himself to

2. Barth claims that in order to understand vv.11-15 we should read them in the order 11,13,14, 12,15, (p.140). Vischer (op.cit.,p.117) concurs with Barth but Leenhardt believes that the content of vv.13-14 is too important for them to be regarded as a parenthesis, (p.283).
3. Cf. Hort's definitive summary of this question in connection with chs. ix-xi - "Though the Greek is ambiguous the context appears to me decisive for taking Ἰησοῦ as the Church itself, and not as a part of it. In all the long previous discussion bearing on the Jews, occupying nearly two and a half chapters, the Jews are invariably spoken of in the third person. In the half chapter that follows the Gentiles are constantly spoken of in the second person. Exposition has here passed into exhortation and warning, and the warning is exclusively addressed to Gentiles: to Christians who had once been Jews, not a word is addressed." Romans and Ephesians, p.22 (as quoted with approval by Sanday and Headlam, p.324). For a similar view see W. Lütgert, Der Römerbrief als historisches Problem, p.85.
Jews. But this is not so. Paul has already been speaking to Gentiles. He refers to them again in v.13 because "he has now come to a point where what he has to say touches them nearly." He has some severe exhortations and warnings in store for them and the personal, direct address is intended to soften the harshness of the following verses, (vv.17-24).

This section is a most important one for our understanding of the purpose of the letter. The fact that Paul in the concluding section of his argument in Rom.ix-xi directly addresses his remarks to Gentile Christians and exhorts them not to boast over the Jews, is a clear indication of the actual situation in Rome. As such it is a useful pointer to the occasion and theme of the Roman letter.

The other reason why Paul pointedly addresses himself to Gentiles is given in v.13b. This verse states that although Paul is an apostle to the Gentiles, there is no inherent contradiction between this vocation and his deep-felt concern for the salvation of fellow Jews. His interest in Jews, far from diminishing his zeal for the Gentile mission, has exactly the opposite effect - "his love for his countrymen and his zeal in carrying out his mission to the Gentiles, combine towards producing the same end." In

4. Contra Pallis who after stating that Paul in v.13 turns from Jews to Gentiles, says "His tone is now less severe." (p.128). This statement seems to be bound up with the other related assumption that Paul always addresses Jews more severely than Gentiles." Cf. E.Flesseman-van Leer, "Jew and Gentile: Some Considerations suggested by Dr. Hay's Reply." LIT, III (1957), pp.235-40(238).
Paul's gospel it is never a question of Jew or Gentile, but always Jew and Gentile. Since the outcome of the Gentile mission is to lead eventually to the salvation of Israel, then the success of the one cannot but benefit the other. Paul believes that there is a direct causal connection between his magnifying (σοφαίον) his ministry and the making jealous of the Jews. This is what he has in mind when he says "Inasmuch then as I am an apostle to the Gentiles, I magnify my ministry in order to make my fellow Jews jealous, and thus save some of them." (vv.13b-14).

Paul glories in his office as apostle to the Gentiles because this offers to him the possibility of winning Israel. This does not mean that he depreciates his apostleship to the Gentiles or that he considers his office to be in any way inferior to that of other apostles who may have concentrated their efforts more on winning Jews. Exactly the opposite would appear to be the case.

Paul also glories in his apostleship for another reason. According to his understanding of 'Heilsgeschichte' the full riches of the divine grace which he has proclaimed to the Gentile world will be imparted only

1. In ch.xv:8 Paul claims that the ministry of Christ had a dual purpose - to confirm to the circumcised the promises made to the patriarchs and also to enable the Gentiles to glorify God for His mercy. In xvi:9-12 Paul quotes from the Law, the Writings and the Prophets to show that the salvation of Gentiles does not take place in isolation from that of Israel. As the ministry of Jesus concerns the salvation of both Jew and Gentile so also the ministry of Paul has a two-fold function and should not be regarded as partisan in any respect. All these emphases are designed to overcome the division between Jewish and Gentile Christians in Rome, so that together they may with one voice glorify God (xv:6). Cf. H.W. Bartsch, op.cit., pp.34-35.


3. Although we do not fully agree with all that Munck says of Paul's apostleship, he has done a great service to New Testament scholarship by focusing attention on the great significance which Paul attaches to his apostleship, cf. PSM, pp.36.f.
after the conversion of Israel. If the conversion of Israel is to benefit the Gentiles themselves, by virtue of this the ministry of Paul gains a far greater significance.¹

It seems somewhat strange that Paul should state here that he hopes to save only 'some' of the Jews. This may be due to humility on Paul's part since what he has to say here relates to his own missionary activity.² It may also be due to the fact that the salvation of all Israel is "a mysterious eschatological event, which is only prefigured in occasional personal conversions."³ Munck disagrees with both of these suggestions and claims that "there is no question, of apostolic humility here any more than there is a distinction between what Paul can do himself and what God will thereafter do."⁴ In Munck's opinion Paul speaks in a very careful, almost covert way of Israel's unbelief, cf.iii:3, ix:6, x:16, xi:17. The word ἀνές does not necessarily mean a small number but "an indefinite number, which the context must further define."⁵ On this basis 'some of them' must refer here to "no inconsiderable number."⁶ We agree with Munck as to the number involved here but not with the argument by which he arrives at this conclusion.

In this argument he claims that there are three periods in question here - "first, that already described, in which Israel, apart from the remnant, was unbelieving, while the Gentiles received the gospel: next, the period now beginning, when the great results of the mission among the

---

1. Cf. Leenhardt, p.283; Barth, p.140.
4. p.123.
5. p.124.
6. Ibid.
Gentiles begin to make an impression on Israel, so that the tide turns, and an indefinite but not inconsiderable number are won for Christ: and lastly, the decisive and final period, when God intervenes and saves the whole of Israel.  

It is extremely difficult to find any conclusive evidence as to whether Paul really held this view of the pattern of events. Munck himself states that Paul sees no decisive difference between the first and second periods mentioned above. Again it must be noted that Paul does not feel himself to be separated from the third period (i.e. the salvation of all Israel) as something he cannot take part in and prepare for. Even the arrival of the fulness of salvation mentioned in xi:25 is not an entirely new phase in 'Heilsgeschichte', as it makes use of that jealousy in the Jews which Paul believes is even now in the present the decisive means for breaking down Israel's obduracy and for changing the destiny of the people.

This connection between present and future is also indicated by the fact that Paul uses the same word παράσημον in vv.11 and 14. It would appear that in v.11 the expected outcome of the influence of believing Gentiles upon Jews is meant to refer to their total influence right up to the final ingathering of all Israel. Yet in v.14 Paul uses the same verb to refer to

---

2. p.124. In his discussion of 'the Apostle to the Gentiles' (PSM, pp.36-38), Munck speaks of two possible understandings of Paul's mission - (1) The apostle's mission to the Gentiles denotes a preparation for God's future intervention for Israel's salvation (2) the apostle's mission to the Gentiles is itself the way in which God is intervening for Israel's salvation. (p.46).
3. Munck qualifies this by adding "even though he himself will not experience it since his task is to be done when the fulness of the Gentiles has been achieved." (p.124).
4. Ibid.
the outcome of his own efforts in the winning of 'some of them' - an activity which must necessarily precede the salvation of all Israel.

The most difficult issue of all, however, is the connection which Paul posits between the conversion of Gentiles and their influence upon Israel in making them jealous.¹ It would appear that Paul has concluded on the basis of Deut.xxxii:21 (Rom.x:19) that God's grace to disobedient Israel operates by making them jealous of the salvation which has been granted to Gentiles and withheld from them.² This is not so much a theory as a deduction from the view that God's grace will not allow even His disobedient people to defeat His purposes for them.³ The faithfulness of God demands that He should complete the good work (i.e. of election) which He has already begun.

C.H. Dodd believes that Paul's Gentile mission did make the Jews jealous but not in the sense Paul intends here.⁴ It made them angry but with the same result as when the prodigal returned and the elder brother refused to join in the feast. It is possible however, that since Paul's conception of making jealous arises from his doctrine of grace, he looks not simply for a normal human response from the Jews but for more of God's gracious activity upon them, thereby enabling them to appreciate that the Gentiles are actually receiving the salvation which was first promised to them. Perhaps in Paul's zeal and the zeal of his fellow Christians the Jews will

2. In Deut.xxxii:21 the emphasis is upon the foolish nation, the 'not-a-people', rather than on the arousing of jealousy, cf. Munck, PSM, p.45.
3. We must also bear in mind the possibility that this may be a deduction from the 'mystery' that Paul speaks of in xi:25.
4. p.177. E.C. Blackmann has a similar view, "As reasoning, his (Paul's) thinking is not impressive on the great theme of how the final response of Israel is to be achieved." "Divine Sovereignty and Missionary Strategy in Romans ix-xi." CJT, XI (1965), pp.124-34(129).
be led to see the true zeal\(^1\) - that 'according to knowledge', and to turn away from the false zeal of the Zealots.

In v.16 Paul sets out in a brief summary the grounds on which he has been arguing in the previous verses. He takes up again the theme of 'the remnant' but in a slightly different form, this time superimposing the additional image of the first-fruits. He argues thus - if, as we believe is the case, the first-fruits are holy, so also must be the whole lump, (cf. Num.xv:17-21, LXX). As the offering of the first of the dough to Yahweh sanctifies the whole lump of dough so the first-fruits, the believing remnant, witnesses to the holiness of all Israel.\(^2\) Paul is thinking representatively here;\(^3\) as with the image of the olive tree, he is concerned to emphasize the solidarity of the people of Israel. Paul himself, the believing remnant and the image of the first-fruits are all used to show that Christians should not accept the view that Israel has been irrevocably rejected, but hope instead for the salvation of all Israel.\(^4\)

In view of the fact that the image of the 'root' appears again in v.18, scholars have felt the need to harmonize the two references with the result that the 'root' in v.16b is taken to refer to the fathers of the

---

1. Although the generally accepted view is that the negative meaning i.e. 'make jealous', rather than the positive 'make zealous' is what Paul intends here, it is unlikely that the positive sense should be excluded, cf. W. Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, p.338. The fact that the zeal of the Gentiles might stimulate the Jews to a similar zeal for God makes Paul's understanding of the situation more intelligible from the standpoint of human experience. On this see also Munck, *ESH*, p.43; Michel, p.271; K. Barth *Church Dogmatics II*, 2, p.284.

2. So also the one Christian partner in marriage (1 Cor.vii:14). Cf. Leenhartdt, p.286. Cf. also Michel's comment "Der Anfang bzw. der Ursprung entscheidet über den Fortgang..." (p.274).


4. Barth is quite correct therefore to see in vv.16-18, a second refutation of the Gentile-Christian opinion rejected in v.11. *Church Dogmatics II*, 2, p.284.
Jewish nation, and Abraham in particular. Unfortunately this leaves us with a certain discrepancy in the thought of v.16; the first part of the verse relates specifically to the believing remnant and the second part, which is apparently a parallel to the first, is based on the merit of the nation's founders (beloved for the sake of their forefathers, v.28). It is quite correct to state that the remnant may represent the nation as a whole but if this is so, then the remnant cannot be the same as the root from which the nation originally grew.

One possible solution is that Paul may be thinking here simply of the facts of early church history. In point of fact, it was by means of the faithful Jewish remnant that the Gentiles came to be ingrafted into the tree of God's people. In terms of the sequence of events, the Gentiles are connected to the source of salvation by means of the believing remnant, so that the latter are in an extended sense the root of the former. Leenhardt resolves the problem by connecting v.16a to what precedes and v.16b to what follows. This view has the merit of relating v.16 to a common Pauline pattern discernible in connection with summary or transitional verses e.g. iv:25, vii:5-6. Verse 16b should then be regarded as preparatory for the discussion in vv.17.f, (cf. branches in vv.16 and 17.f.). Barrett feels that there is no need to interpret v.16 in this way since "Paul is not yet speaking of the relation of Israel to the patriarchs." This is probably

1. Cf. Leenhardt, p.286; Lietzmann, p.104; Michel, p.274. Barth emphasizes those texts which may be taken to point to Jesus Christ as the root of Israel - e.g. "root of Jesse" Is.xi:10, the "root of David" Rev.v:5, xxii:16, (op.cit., pp.285.f.).
2. p.286.
3. p.216. Barrett also notes that although v.16 forms the transition from vv.11-15 to the elaborate allegory of the olive tree in vv.17-24, the connection with the latter is verbal rather than substantial (p.215).
the best explanation especially when we bear in mind that the Old Testament sources of the illustrations in v.16 give no precise indication as to which way the 'root' concept ought to be interpreted.¹

In v.17 Paul introduces the allegory of the olive tree² and immediately proceeds to address the Gentile Christians directly. By means of this allegory he describes the missionary situation as it actually existed at the time of writing. Some of the branches have been broken off; these are the unbelieving Jews. In their place wild olive branches have been grafted into the main stock of the people of God. These are Gentile Christians who may now be described in the words of Ephesians as "fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets ..." (ii:19-20). These Gentiles have been made partakers of the rich inheritance of God's chosen people but instead of being grateful, they have begun to boast over those whom they believe themselves to have replaced.

This is not merely a hypothetical situation which materialized only much later in the Ephesian church.³ Paul's condemnation of boasting is meaningless if in fact no one is actually boasting. The same applies if he is writing only generally without any clear idea of what the situation is at Rome. But the content of this section gives us no real reason for thinking that Paul is referring to a general situation; on the contrary there is every indication that he addresses himself to a quite specific

2. On Israel as an olive tree see Jer.xi:16 and Hos.xiv:6, as a vineyard Is.v:7, as a vine Ps.lxxx:8, as a "plant of righteousness" Jub.xvi:26, cf. Str/Bill I, pp.720.f., II, 563, III, 290; Volz op.cit., pp.392.f. Similar imagery is used in connection with the Qumran community e.g. "an everlasting planting" (IQS VIII 5).
set of circumstances that have arisen in Rome. Since the growth in numbers and influence of Gentile converts in the church took place some time prior to the writing of Romans, it is perfectly in keeping with the historical development of the church that this situation should arise at this time.¹ It is significant that when Munck comes to discuss this section, he is forced to refer again to Manson’s thesis that Romans tells us more of the real situation of Paul the apostle in the midst of his missionary endeavours, than of the actual situation of the Roman Christians.

Paul’s response to Gentile Christians who feel disposed to boast over the apparently rejected Jews is to remind them of their dependence upon the root of Israel. “If you do boast, it is still true that it is not you who bear the root, but the root that bears you” (v.18).² These Gentiles boast as if they were completely independent and self-determining. Paul literally ‘cuts their feet from under them’. As branches they are borne by the tree and not vice versa. They can never be truly independent or self-determining nor will they ever have any ground for boasting. “It is only if they were bearers and not borne, restorers to life and not restored, givers and not receivers that they would have occasion to magnify themselves and disparage the others.”³

But the Gentile Christian has still a strong point in favour of his self-conceit. “You will say”, says Paul “branches were broken off so that I might be grafted in.” (v.19).⁴ The reference here is to the historical

---

² Barrett’s translation, (p.217).
³ Barth, op.cit., p.289.
⁴ “No doubt Gentile Christians had said this.” Barrett, p.218.
events that succeeded the death of Jesus, specifically the general unbelief of the Jews and the success of the gospel in the Gentile world. Surely it may be argued, recent events prove decisively that the Jews have actually been rejected in favour of us Gentiles. The implication is that God prefers Gentiles to Jews. Paul admits the truth of the sequence of historical events but he immediately attacks this interpretation of them. One point has been overlooked, the real reason for the present situation of the Jews - their unbelief. The point Paul is stressing here is that the decisive mark of the elect community is faith.1 The Jewish 'branches' were broken off because of unbelief; the Gentiles were grafted in not because of any inherent superiority, but only because of faith. This knowledge ought to lead not to 'high-mindedness'2 but to reverent fear (v.20). In the next verse Paul re-inforces the admonition by reminding the Gentiles that if those who by birth were members of the Jewish race, have been excluded the community of salvation because of their proud self-confidence, Gentiles, having no such privilege should all the more readily suffer the same fate.

It is surprising how frequently in commentaries on Romans one finds a strong emphasis upon Paul's strictures against Jewish boasting and yet relatively little on the question of Gentile boasting. This has probably

1. H.W. Bartsch stresses that the meaning of 'faith' was a matter of dispute among the Roman Christians, hence the references to 'the weak in faith' and 'the strong in faith' in chs.xiv-xv and to Abraham in ch.iv. "The Concept of Faith in Paul's Letter to the Romans." BR, XIII (1968), pp.41-53. It is also possible that Gentile Christians boasted "We stand by faith." Paul responds to this by stating that faith excludes boasting. Cf. H.W. Bartsch, "Die antisemitischen Gegner des Paulus im Römerbrief." AJMT, pp.27-43(41).

2. The verb used here means to grow boastful or arrogant. The same expression occurs in xiii:16 but in a different sense, cf. Barrett, p.218, Schmidt relates this to the "Überschwang des Pneumatikers", (p.196); similarly Michel, p.277. See also Michel's note on the question of text in this verse, (n.5 on same page).
a lot to do with the tendency to regard Romans as essentially an anti-Jewish
document. Here the emphasis is in the other direction. Paul is deeply con-
cerned at the proud self-confidence of these Gentile Christians boasting
about their position in contrast with Israel.\(^1\)

He speaks with a certain
amount of contempt\(^2\) when he emphatically states "It is not you that support
the root but the root you." The imagery of the removal of branches is
designed to destroy such attitudes. The illustration seeks to prevent all
self-security, since the connection between the tree and its branches rests
solely upon God's faithfulness. This means that the attitude of the Gentile
Christians towards Israel is "a touchstone for their own self-awareness".\(^3\)

They do not stand in faith unless they "confess that the grace which saved
them can also save the most hopelessly lost, therefore, above all, the
severed branches of the people of the old covenant."\(^4\)

This is because even the hardened 'rest' have the possibility of re-
turning to the community of God's people i.e. provided they do not persist
in their unbelief (v.23). God has the power to graft them in if they turn
from their unbelief. This would seem to imply both the power of the gospel
and a believing response to it on the part of these hardened Jews. That
this is not too much to expect is illustrated by the use of the concept of
what is in keeping with nature and what is not, (cf. κονών φύσον vv.21,24).

---

1. The Jew "relies on circumcision and the promises made to the fathers,
and in his self-sufficiency refuses to believe. In exactly the same
way the Christian is tempted to trust in his own faith, his own Christ-
ianity." (Munck, p.131). Similarly Müller, p.47.
2. Pallis, p.130.
4. Ibid.
Looked at from the point of view of what is normal in nature, it is more likely that the branches broken off will be grafted back into their own tree, than that wild shoots should be brought in to replace them. Since the latter event, unlikely as it is, has already begun to take place, the former may the more legitimately be expected. Here again Paul seeks to demolish the complacent assumption of proud Gentile Christians who have come to think of themselves as 'the elect' over against the Jews as 'the rejected'. Election can as easily be perverted to 'electedness' by Gentiles as by Jews. In both cases the problem is the same - a wrong understanding of what election is.

Election is never something upon which men may presume. It is always a work of divine grace and therefore conditional upon a right attitude in those who would receive it. This aspect is brought out in v.22 where Paul

1. We see here that Paul is perfectly aware of what is normal in nature and what is not. There is no need to presume that since the grafting processes outlined in ch.xi are somewhat abnormal, that this means that Paul was a city dweller with no knowledge of horticulture (contra Lietzmann, p.105; Dodd, p.180). Barrett points out that Paul's language is technical here (p.217). In any case W.M. Ramsay and others have written to show that Paul's allegory in Rom.xi is not so far removed from actual practice as some suspect. On this see Munck, Excursus 3, "The True Olive Tree and the Wild Tree", pp.126-30, and Leenhardt, p.288. From a purely literary point of view it is not necessary in order for an analogy to prove useful, that it should correspond exactly in every detail. But the basic point to be noted is that Paul himself draws attention to the fact that what he proposes is contrary to nature, παρα φύσιν (v.24), and, in theological language, demands a miracle of grace. Cf. Barth's reference to the breaking off and grafting in of branches as "an impossible parable of an incomprehensible phenomenon." Shorter Commentary, p.142; Barrett, pp.217-220.

2. Leenhardt points out that Paul's comparison of a shoot according to nature with one contrary to nature corresponds to reality because a shoot succeeds more easily if the original tree and the engrafted shoot are more closely related in species (p.290).

3. Cf. E. Plessenman-van Leer, op.cit., p.238. We note that Paul does not speak of any kind of necessity here - he does not say that the branches broken off must be grafted in again. The freedom of God is most carefully guarded in Paul's understanding of the election of Israel. For Paul history is not a process which consists in the mechanical unfolding of external and immutable divine decrees but the arena where the freedom of God and the freedom of man interact for the furtherance of the divine purpose. Cf. Leenhardt, p.291.
draws attention to the kindness and the severity of God. This is parallel to the emphasis upon hardening and having mercy in ch.ix. But contrary to the view of the Roman Gentile Christians neither kindness nor severity are fixed irrevocable attitudes of God toward men or nations. His ways are not static nor are they so easily discernible by human understanding (cf. vv. 33.f.).

The conditional nature of salvation should not cause us to come to the conclusion which some scholars have reached (in spite of all that Paul has stated to the contrary) - that there is no real continuity in the out-working of God's purpose in history. The last phrase of v.24 suggests otherwise; unbelieving Jews can still be grafted back into their own olive tree. Some scholars seem to think it necessary that in order to maintain a doctrine of justification by grace, we must stress only the discontinuity within the history of God's people. Klein is mistaken when he claims that for Paul there exists no meaningful historical continuity between Abraham and the nation of Israel. Again it is equally wrong to suggest that since the coming of Christ all distinctions between Jews and Gentiles are rendered null and void. Paul does make statements that can be used as evidence for

1. The whole process (i.e. both the breaking off and grafting in) is a revelation of the nature of God (Barrett, p.218).
2. Cf. Barrett's emphasis upon the correlation between the kindness and severity of God and the belief and unbelief of men (p.219).
3. E.g. Müller's statement "Die Kirche tritt als keineswegs in geschichtlichen Kontinuität die Nachfolge Israels an." (p.97). He goes on to speak of how "die Neuschöpfung die geschichtliche Kontinuität Israels immer wieder brach und neu setzte ..." (Ibid). One-sided interpretation of Paul's attitude to the Law, of the relation between Law and gospel (particularly Rom.x:4), and of the church as eschatological Israel have combined to give a disproportionate emphasis upon the element of discontinuity.
this view, but he holds them in tension with others which stress that salvation is first of all to the Jews.

Properly understood there is no contradiction between Paul's understanding of grace and his emphasis upon the election of Israel. Against those who would emphasize only discontinuity, the image of the olive tree stands as witness for the other side of the case. "The illustration seeks to express the continuity of God's saving activity in history: God ties Himself to men."¹ This means that since God voluntarily binds Himself in covenant with man,² we can truly expect that His promises will one day find fulfilment in that nation whom He chose to be His own.

But this covenant relationship is not something upon which a man or nation can presume. If this were so "grace would be no more grace," (xi:6). If Paul had written ch.xi separately from iii:21-iv:25 and ix:1.f., misunderstandings of his viewpoint on Israel could be excused. But this is not so and his treatment of the Abraham tradition alone should prevent misinterpretation of the olive tree image in ch.xi.³

This olive tree image is properly understood as an illustration of 'erwählungsgeschichtliche Kontinuität' i.e. the continuity of God's free grace in action in history.⁴ In the immediate context it stands as a positive witness to Gentile Christians of the continuity of God's saving purpose in history. At the same time it also serves as a salutary reminder that His people were and continue to be constituted by grace alone.

2. Cf. Barth, Church Dogmatics II, 2, pp.53-54, 90-93.
3. Cf. our discussion of the significance of Abraham in the section entitled "Rom.iv and Rom.ix-xi", (pp.182-88 ).
Rom.xi:25-36.

The γάρ in v.25 indicates that what is stated here relates closely to the preceding argument.¹ The reason why Paul has put forward the allegory of the olive tree is because he does not want the Roman Gentile Christians to be ignorant of God's purpose for Israel.² There is nothing in Paul's gospel to cause Gentile Christians to congratulate themselves on their faith or to despise unbelieving Israel. We see from this that the allegory has a practical import. This is further indicated by the fact that Paul addresses these Christians directly as 'brethren' in order to emphasize that his remarks are specifically aimed at them. The direct address and the practical application of the allegory are proof that Paul is not depicting a purely hypothetical situation. There were Gentile Christians in Rome who actually boasted that they had replaced Israel. This was tending to give them an inflated sense of their own importance.³

The people addressed here are doubtless none other than the 'strong' Gentile Christians of chs.xiv-xv, who pride themselves on their knowledge and freedom. The attitude towards the 'weak' Jewish Christians in chs.xiv-xv is similar to the attitude towards Israel which we find expressed in ch.xi.

2. The phrase ὅσον ὑμᾶς ἀνευσίν (cf. i:13, I Cor.xi; xii:1; II Cor.i:8; I Thess.iv:13) is used by Paul to emphasize something of special importance which he wishes to bring home to his readers; cf. Sanday and Headlam, p.334, J.T. Sanders "The Transition from Opening Epistolary Thanksgiving to Body in the Letters of the Pauline Corpus", JBL, LXXXI, (1962) pp.348-62(349). There is no reason to suggest that this formula indicates that xi:25.f. originally existed separately and was inserted into Rom.xi as a later addition.
3. Cf. the reference in v.20 to growing boastful (ὑπερφέρειν). The same expression is used at xii:16 in a slightly different sense. The thought common to both is that of being 'above oneself', cf. Barrett, p.218; Jewett, p.46.
From a comparison of the contents of these chapters it appears most unlikely that Paul refers to different groups in ch. xi and in chs. xiv-xv.¹

The particular sin with which the Gentile Christians are threatened here is described as considering themselves wise in their own conceits, (v.25).² The Roman Gentile Christians give the appearance of being a highly intelligent and independent group of Christians. The fact that no apostle had been responsible for the initial founding of the Roman church may have encouraged this spirit of independence. Despite their spiritual stature however, they are lacking in an essential element of the Christian faith; they appear to have no appreciation of the Jewish origin of the church or of the history of the people of God in the Old Testament.³ In this they were probably typical of many Gentile Christians who were fully conscious of the newness of the gospel but not sufficiently aware that "salvation is of the Jews".⁴

These Christians are wise in their own conceits". Manson takes this to mean "relying on your own interpretation of history".⁵ They are people who judge life from their own experience and opinions and have no regard for

---

1. It seems inconsistent to regard chs. xiv-xv as relating to a specific situation at Rome and yet to hold that the same situation is not necessarily depicted in chs. i-xi. Contra Marxsen, Introduction to the New Testament, pp.101 f.
2. ἐν ἐκυπτότις φόρονέοι is probably the best reading here (cf. Michel, p.280 n.2). Michel holds that the 'strong' Roman Christians were pneumatic (p.13), and draws attention to their proud self-consciousness. He suggests that the word φόρονέοι was possibly a slogan of this group, cf. 'the wise in Christ' (I Cor.iv:10), p.280 n.3.
3. Cf. Lütgert, op.cit., pp.84-89. Lütgert is probably correct in seeing 'Marcionite' tendencies in the attitude of the Roman Christians whose beliefs he describes as "ein gegen die Religion Israels gerichtetes Christentum". (p.89).
tradition. They are in danger of being 'geschichtlos'. This helps us to understand the emphasis upon Abraham and continuity in chs.iv and ix-xi. 

Grace and our understanding of it is not something to be erected into an independent principle by which to interpret life. Grace and our experience of it, rightly understood, keeps us in subjection to God's purpose and related to all men who are included within that purpose. The Roman Christians had erected their own view of the gospel and of history into a 'Heilsegoismus' contrary to the true meaning of grace. They exhibited at a very early period in the history of the church the kind of Gentile arrogance which has so often been typical of the church's attitude towards the Jewish people.

To counteract this tendency to view God's purpose only in its relation to Gentile Christianity without reference to the Jews to whom the promise was originally given, Paul reminds the Roman Christians that God still has a purpose for Israel and that it is important for them to take this into account. There is no room for boasting over Israel because Israel is still "beloved for the sake of their forefathers", (v.28). The antidote to Gentile independence is to remind them that the new church stands on the patriarchal stem and therefore Gentiles must forever remain indebted to Old Testament Israel from whom they originated.

2. Ibid.
5. Cf. Pallis' translation of xi:25a "For lest your hearts lapse into arrogance...." (pp.183.f.). See also Ibid, p.131.
For Christians who judge themselves by themselves and see the whole of the divine 'Heilsgeschichte' as orientated towards them to the exclusion of others, it is salutary to be reminded of the 'extra nos' of salvation, that the divine purpose includes all men and encompasses the entire history of the world. Käsemann emphasizes that Paul always opposes the extremes of Gentile enthusiasm by stressing the apocalyptic elements in the gospel. The apocalyptic note is very evident in Paul's reference to a mystery that has been revealed to him.

It is possible to think of this mystery in the sense of a special revelation, which Paul has recently received. Noack goes so far as to suggest that it was in the course of writing the letter that Paul came to realize that God would eventually save all Israel. This view seems unlikely however since Paul has already given some indication earlier in the letter that this is what he has in mind; we believe that the emphasis upon the priority of the Jew indicates that Paul has been leading up to this since the beginning of the letter.

1. Cf. Käsemann's comment in the course of a discussion of the relation of Paul's eschatology to that of the enthusiasts - "The present eschatology of the enthusiasts is therefore picked up but apocalyptically anchored and delimited as it is not with them. For Paul it is not an alternative to, but a component of, a future eschatology". "Primitive Christian Apocalyptic", NTOT, p.133.


The more likely meaning of mystery here is that which is common in apocalyptic literature and in the New Testament in which mystery is understood as the eternal divine plan or an element in that plan which remains hidden until the correct time for its revelation. As Bornkamm states "The mysteries are God's counsels destined finally to be disclosed. They are the final events and states which are already truly existent in heaven and may be seen there, and which will in the last days emerge from their concealment and become manifest events".¹ The possibility is that Paul came to understand this 'mystery' through study of the scriptures. For the Qumran sectarians, although they did claim to receive divine guidance, the primary source of 'mysteries' was apparently the scriptures,² and this kind of revelation is very much in keeping with the way in which Paul emphasizes the Old Testament in Rom.ix-xi. But like the men of Qumran, Paul studied the Old Testament in the light of contemporary events.³ Thus in this study he looked at the words of scripture in the light of the fulfilment of the Old Testament promises in the Christ event and of his own conversion experience. As he studied the scriptures from this perspective, he came to realize that the God who revealed Himself on the Damascus road to Saul, the persecutor, could also save His own disobedient people. If the most unlikely persecutor had become an apostle,

---

2. Cf. Rigaux, op.cit., pp.237-46 and (especially) p.261. In the latter reference Rigaux makes a distinction between the 'mysteries' of Qumran which were learned from scriptural study and those of other literature which were received by direct apocalyptic revelations. On this theme in Qumran literature see R.E. Brown "The Pre-Christian Semitic Concept of Mystery", CBQ, XX, pp.417-43(466.f.). Cf. also M. Wilcox, "Dualism, Gnosticism, and Other Elements in the Pre-Pauline Tradition", The Scrolls and Christianity, Ed. M.Black, London 1969, pp.91-93.
why should it not be possible that disobedient Israel would yet be saved?¹

From the perspective of the knowledge of the Jews' eventual salvation, Paul is able to point out to the Gentile Christians that the hardening of Israel is only partial and for a limited period of time.² Paul now knows that a limit has been set to Israel's unbelief. It will last only as long as is necessary to complete the purpose for which it existed i.e. until the full number of the Gentiles has come in. As in v.12 the 'full number' here (v.25) probably refers to the 'totality' rather than an exact number of individuals.³ This expression is parallel to 'all Israel' - both formulae are to be understood as suggesting collectives or groups without prejudging the condition of any particular individual. The exact meaning of the expression is best understood in contrast to 'the remnant'.⁴

Just as Paul makes no prediction as to the exact number of Israelites, so too he does not define exactly when the 'fulness' will take place. The relation between the salvation of 'all Israel' and 'the fulness of the Gentiles' is not formulated in such a way as to indicate strict chronological dependence. In Paul's mind the two events are logically related but the relation should not be understood in a rigid arithmetical fashion.⁵

The content of the mystery which has been revealed to Paul is supported by the inclusion of a compositive quotation from Is.lix:20-21 and Is.

2. See discussion on v.12 (Thesis p.407) and also Pallis' suggestion that ἀπὸ μέρος is equivalent to τίνες in iii:3 (p.59).
5. "Paul did not write: καὶ τότε 'and then' but καὶ οὖν 'and so'". (Leenhardt, pp.293-4).
xxvii:9. That Paul intends these to apply specifically to unbelieving Israel is shown by the fact that he breaks off his quotation of Is.lix:20.f. just at the point where it becomes explicitly applicable to Christians by the reference to "my spirit which is upon you", (v.21).

The significance of the change from ἐνεκὼν Σω to ἐκ Σω is greatly emphasized by Munck. In his opinion the Old Testament quotations may mean something more than proof that all Israel will be saved. It is possible that the text is intended to give "an eschatological picture of Christ". "Christ descends from heaven and from (Paul has ἐκ) Mount Zion appears to Israel". Munck's picture of Paul's self-understanding and of his place in 'Heilsgeschichte' seems to us to be somewhat exaggerated. It is doubtful if Paul expected an immediate cataclysmal occurrence upon the acceptance of the collection in Jerusalem.

That for Paul the collection was "fraught with eschatological meaning" there is no doubt. But it is hard to discover exactly what his expectations were. The collection for Jerusalem represented the offering of the Gentiles and it also symbolized the offering up of the Gentile Christians themselves (cf. xv:16). It was intended to forge a bond of fellowship between the Gentile mission and the mother church. It was also possibly intended after the manner of prophetic symbolism to act as a catalyst towards

1. The first three lines of the quotation (up to ἐνεκὼν) are from Is. lix:20-21 and the fourth is a free rendering of Ps.xxvii:9, cf. Munck, p.137. See also Fitzmyer, op.cit., p.329.
3. p.137.
7. On the literature concerning the significance of the collection etc., see Thesis pp.442 n.4 and 452.
the full realization of that state of affairs which it symbolized. If we accept the latter interpretation it is conceivable that the link between the reception of the collection in Jerusalem and the conversion of all Israel is that Paul sees the acceptance of the collection as the first step in that process which will eventually culminate in the salvation of the Jews. This in turn will lead to the consummation of all things (cf. life from the dead, xi:15).^1

It would appear that the function of the Old Testament quotations is to provide additional proof in support of the mystery that Israel will eventually be saved. To take them as a direct reference to the Second Coming as Munck does,^2 is to read into them more than Paul intended. The quotations from Isaiah both indicate that God has not yet finished with Israel, and that He will maintain His covenant by the removal of her sins. Possibly these were the particular passages of scripture on the basis of which it was revealed to Paul that "All Israel will be saved".^3

Although we are not in full agreement with Munck we acknowledge the correctness of his view that Paul believes that the fullness of the Gentiles and the salvation of all Israel will lead to the consummation of all things

2. p.137.
3. The meaning of this phrase has been much disputed. For the various possible interpretations see Michel, p.261.n.2. On the basis of the argument up to this point and the immediate context we take it to mean the Jews as a whole i.e. the "full number" of the Jews. The "full number" is not necessarily identical with every individual Jew, (contra Vischer, Jud, VI (1950) pp.81-132(127). The belief that the whole of Israel would share in the world to come, expressed in Sanhedrin x:1 did not prevent the exclusion of several categories of sinners, cf. Str/Bill. IV, pp.1052-56. In any case what is actually stated here is not πάντες ὁλ'Ἰουδαίοι but πάντες Ἰσραήλ, cf. Gutbrod, TDNT, III, pp.388.f. On the question of Paul's use of 'Israel' here see also Richardson, pp.146/7.
which in Paul's mind is closely associated with Jerusalem, the centre of Judaism. We differ from him in that we believe that Paul saw the reception of the collection and the resulting harmony as only the first (but also a very decisive) stage in that series of events by which God's purpose for mankind would finally be completely realized.

Verses 28-32 are a recapitulation of the discussion concerning the present state of Jews and Gentiles and their function towards each other in the light of the divine purpose. These verses consist of two balanced sentences each constructed on the same pattern. They each contain a pair of antithetical clauses, 29a, 29b, 30, 31, explained by a 'for' (γιὰ) clause (vv. 29, 32).¹

The enigma of the unbelieving Jews is emphasized by their two-fold designation in v.28 - as regards the gospel, "enemies of God", as regards election, "beloved for the sake of their forefathers". It is best to understand ἔχομαι as active, expressing the opposition of the Jews to the gospel rather than as passive with the meaning 'hated by God'. The fact that this word is always used in the active sense elsewhere in the New Testament, and the context here also favour this reading.² Since the ἔχομαι is "for your sake", (v.28), this is best understood to refer to Jewish opposition to the gospel from which the Gentiles benefited when the gospel came to them instead.³

¹. Cf. Barrett, p.224. The great care with which these verses have been constructed evidences the seriousness which Paul attached to this closing paragraph of his argument. Richardson arranges vv.28-31 into two parallel columns relating to Jews and Gentiles respectively, with v.32 standing as the conclusion to both, (p.127). Cf. also Michel, p.282.
The strange contradiction is that the same Israel which persecutes the church is "beloved of God on account of their forefathers". The latter phrase emphasizes the significance which Paul placed upon ancestry. It should not be understood to refer to the Rabbinic doctrine of the merit of the fathers which formed a treasury upon which their sinful descendants can draw.\(^1\) Paul's reference to the fathers is a reference not to their merit but to their election through the grace of God. Verse 29 gives the reason for the love with which the Jews are favoured. Since God chose their forefathers and since His gifts and calling are irrevocable,\(^2\) then, despite their present opposition to the gospel, the Jews are still beloved.

Here we see the outcome of Paul's discussion in ch.ix. There we noted that Paul argued for God's freedom in election and we emphasized that this freedom was freedom to retain unbelieving Israel (in spite of her unworthiness) within the divine purpose.\(^3\) The freedom of God not to reject Israel is here related to His gracious election of the patriarchs. This is in perfect keeping with Paul's continued stress throughout this letter on the grace of God in salvation.\(^4\) At the conclusion of Paul's argument it becomes plain that it is grace and not merit which causes him still to hope for Israel's salvation. "Paul does not deny the importance of ancestry but only man's right to use it in making claims upon God".\(^5\)

---

2. Cf. Spicq, "\(\text{\underline{AL\'E}}\text{\underline{ET\'E}}\)\text{\underline{TA}}\) dans Romains xi:29". \(\text{RB, LXVII (1960), pp.210-19}\). Pallis points out that the idea expressed here is that God is legally bound to carry out His covenant, (p.132). Paul probably understands this as God being bound by His own faithfulness to remain true to His covenant, cf. Goppelt on the image of the olive tree "God ties Himself to men", op. cit., p.160.
3. As we have already noted in connection with ix:14-18, cf. Thesis, p.341.
5. Munck, p.139.
The final period in vv.30.f. is parallel to that in vv.28.f. but develops in more detail the connection in the gospel between Jews and Gentiles. The point of the carefully constructed statements is to show that in God's purpose the salvation of one group is designed to influence the salvation of the other. The gospel was not intended to have the effect of isolating Jew from Gentile or Gentile from Jew but exactly the reverse.¹ This is shown by a comparison of the different standing of Jews and Gentiles before the advent of the gospel of Christ (πότε) and now(vΌυ) in the time of eschatological fulfilment. Just as the Gentiles were then disobedient but on account of the Jews' disobedience have now obtained mercy, so the Jews have also now become disobedient whereas the Gentiles have obtained mercy with the eventual aim that the Jews may now receive God's mercy. The emphasis upon the mutual correspondence between the belief and unbelief of Jews and Gentiles is most striking. Although the Jews have lost their immediate place as God's agents in the 'Heilsgeschichte' they have only lost it temporarily because God's purpose does not proceed apart from the Jews and Israel's central position in the 'Heilsgeschichte' will become clear again precisely in the last days.²

Both the disobedience and the receiving of mercy by the Jews are set in the present,³ which suggests that even if the salvation of all Israel takes place on the "boundary of history",⁴ it is still within history.

---

1. Cf. Richardson's comment on vv.28-32 "... a complex interaction between two entities - one with a special relationship to God, the other far from Him. The positions of the two become inextricably related by God's action, so that both might benefit by His mercy". (p.127).
3. Despite the fact that νΌυ (v.31) is omitted by some manuscripts we agree with Barrett that 'now' is a very difficult, but Pauline reading and that the variants are secondary 'improvements', (p.222 n.1).
At the end of his discussion of the interrelation of Jews and Gentiles in 'Heilsgeschichte' Paul reveals to us his own explanation of the divine intention - "God has consigned all men to disobedience, that he may have mercy upon all" (v.32). In Paul's opinion God's purpose has always been directed towards all men; both Jew and Gentile have always been included. The reference in v.32 is not just to 'all Israel' or to 'the fullness of the Gentiles' but includes both these groups.

Thus Paul has arrived here at a fitting conclusion to his long discussion. The reference to the disobedience of Gentiles and of Jews reminds us of i:18-ii:29. The disobedience of both groups has been taken into account in the divine economy. The advantage of the Jew has been maintained by showing that God is free to act in grace even towards the disobedient, and that His gifts and calling are irrevocable precisely because they originate in His grace. Even the fact that some were unfaithful (iii:7) has not proved that God is unfaithful but quite the opposite; His faithfulness emerges all the more clearly in contrast to their disobedience.

The wonder and majesty of the divine purpose can only fittingly be appreciated in worship and adoration. It is on this note that Paul concludes his argument. Despite his own long discussion, Paul confesses at the end of it that it is impossible for human understanding to fully comprehend the activity of God. The depth of the riches, wisdom and knowledge of God,

1. The use which Paul makes of the disobedience of the Gentiles in the conclusion helps to clarify his emphasis on their disobedience at the commencement of his argument in i:18.f. The parallel between the former disobedience of Gentiles and the present disobedience of Jews suggests that the salvation of the Jews is the logical correlative of the salvation of the Gentiles. Cf. Munck, p.140.
His judgements and His ways cannot be discovered by human wisdom (v.33). Even through revelation, man can only appreciate a fraction of the all-embracing purpose of God.

God has no need to consult anyone for advice (v.34). He is no man's debtor; He can finance all His own undertakings (v.35). He is the source, sustainer and goal of all things, (v.36). The sovereignty of God is no doubt a fitting subject to elicit humility and to destroy human presumption. The emphasis upon the incomprehensibility of the divine wisdom suggests that even Paul's doxology is intended to humble those who considered themselves wise in their own estimation, and believed that they fully understood the workings of 'Heilsgeschichte' both for themselves and for the Jews. To those who were prone to boast of their own independent achievements, it was a necessary admonition to be reminded that since God acts in grace, neither Jew nor Gentile can establish any claims upon Him.

The Situation to which Paul addresses himself in Rom. ix-xi.

In accordance with our view that chs. ix-xi represent the climax of Paul's argument in Rom. ix-xi, we expect to find in these chapters the clue to the situation which occasioned the writing of the letter. Because of this view, and since the actual situation in the church at Rome will be discussed more fully later, in order to avoid repetition, we intend at this stage simply to outline the main feature of the 'Sitz im Leben' which we have discerned in these chapters.

Our starting point is that chs. ix-xi are a unity and that the situation to which they are addressed becomes clear only in ch. xi. In xi:13 we find that those addressed are specifically described as Gentile Christians. But the themes of the discussion i.e. the purpose of God in the 'Heilsgeschichte' of Israel and the Gentile Christians' attitude to the Jews, are those that would most likely originate in a situation where Gentile Christians lived in close contact with Judaism; this contact would be most likely to take place in a community where there were Jewish Christians as well as Gentiles.

From our survey of chs. ix-xi it would appear that the basic failing of the Gentile Christians in Rome is that they tended to repeat the mistakes of the Jews in their understanding of salvation. They were in danger of regarding themselves as 'the elect' over against the Jews whom they regarded as 'the rejected'. Like their Jewish counterparts they were tending to pervert 'election' into 'electedness' by forgetting that election and faith are correlates of one another. This wrong understanding of themselves in relation to the Jews led to boasting, to thinking of themselves more highly than they ought (cf. xii:3). In this high-mindedness they exhibited a deficient understanding of the Old Testament and of the origins of the church.

Paul's use of the allegory of the olive tree in xi:17.f. is partic-
ularly useful in that it indicates to us those areas in which he considered these Gentile Christians were deficient. They were lacking in their interpretation of the purpose of God which they tended to consider only in terms of their own salvation. To counter this failing Paul has already argued in ch.ix for the freedom of God in history. The reason why Paul wishes to establish the divine freedom is because he intends to argue in ch.xi that God is free to retain the Jews in His purpose just as He is also free to reject them for their disobedience.

It would appear that Gentile Christian arrogance is also the reason for Paul's revelation of the 'mystery' in xi:25.f. This is indicated by the preface "Lest you be wise in your own conceits", and by the fact that Paul's doxology at the end of the chapter is also slanted against the 'wise'. The Roman Christians were apparently in danger of making themselves (and not Christ) the norm for Christian life. Paul's frequent use of Old Testament quotations may also be intended to counter this tendency. He emphasizes that God's word (promise) to Israel has not failed and that the divine purpose includes the eventual salvation of 'all Israel' as well as the 'fullness of the Gentiles'. The emphasis upon the purpose of God is intended to include all men repudiates all false ideas of election, establishes the continuity of the divine purpose in history and gives to both Jew and Gentile their proper significance under God.

From the content of the carefully constructed conclusion in xi:28.f. it seems that Paul's argument is addressed to a situation in which he feels it imperative to emphasize the inter-relatedness of Jew and Gentile in salvation. The fact that he relates his own Gentile mission to the Jews, that he suggests in x:4 a positive connection between the Law and Christ and especially that he hopes for the salvation of 'all Israel', indicate that Paul in this section seeks to overcome Gentile Christian arrogance by a re-appraisal of the special place of the Jews in the divine economy.
The Purpose of Paul in the Letter to the Romans.

(a) Romans as a Letter of Self-Introduction.

One of the most common reasons given for the occasion of Paul's writing the letter to the Romans is that he wants to introduce himself and his gospel to the Christian community in order to prepare for his future mission there and in Spain.¹ Paul had for a long time planned to journey to the West to bring the gospel to Spain. For that trip he had to go through Rome and needed Rome as a base from which to operate - to care for converts and act as a link with the mother church in Jerusalem. Many obstacles had hindered Paul's proposed visit.² Probably the most serious of these was that trouble in the churches at Galatia and Corinth prevented him from organizing his collection project as quickly as he had hoped, thereby delaying all his future plans in Spain.³ This view has the obvious advantage that in Romans as nowhere else, Paul stresses the world wide mission of the church.⁴ In it he speaks of his apostleship to the Gentiles and his indebtedness to all men, the Greek and barbarian, cultured and uncultured (i:14). This interpretation also rightly recognizes Paul's stress in the introduction (i:10.f.) and in the conclusion (xv:22.f.) on his intention to visit the Roman Christians en route for Spain.

There are several strong reasons however why this understanding of the occasion of the letter is not adequate. We note first that Paul's references

---

to his forthcoming missionary visit are general (we might even say vague). He hopes to reap some harvest among the Romans as amongst other Gentiles (i:13). We would normally take this to mean that he hopes to conduct missionary work in Rome; but this is questionable since he has previously described his work in Rome as a process of mutual strengthening between himself and the Romans (i:11,12). In xv:15 Paul states that he has written to the Roman Christians "by way of reminder". In view of this we should probably accept that Paul is not going to Rome to evangelize, but only to build up an already existing Christian community. This is the sense in which he means his preaching of the gospel in Rome to be taken (i:15). That this is what Paul intends is to some extent dependent on the interpretation we put on xv:20, where Paul makes it his boast not to build on another man's foundation. If this refers back to his previous missionary work in the East, we could still hold that Paul intends to do missionary work in Rome because all other areas in the East have already been covered. This would imply a change in policy which does not seem to be indicated by the succeeding verses in ch.xv.

One other solution would be to hold that since the Roman church was not founded by any particular apostle and since it is probable that some of

2. H.W. Bartsch notes that Paul could not have used this phrase if the letter is a treatise about his own theology written in order to introduce himself. "The Concept of Faith in Paul's Letter to the Romans", BR, XIII (1988), pp.41-53(44).
3. G. Klein seeks to overcome the apparent discrepancy between xv:20 and i:11-15 not by following Lipsius' suggestion that xv:19b, 20b and 23.f. are interpolations but by interpreting both Paul's letter and visit as an assertion of his apostolic authority. "Der Abfassungszweck des Römerbriefes", Rekonstruktion und Interpretation. Ges. Aufs. München 1969, pp.129-44(130.f.). Bornkamm disagrees with Klein and points out that xv:20 is meant to explain Paul's delay and not to justify or excuse his visit to Rome. Cf. op.cit., pp.138-39 n.47.
these Christians have been converted in the Pauline mission and have then moved there from the East.¹ Paul does not regard this church as being any one's foundation and so feels free to evangelize there. We must look at this in more detail later.

Perhaps Paul himself has not yet thought out clearly what he intends to do in Rome. Other more important things are on his mind and it is only when these are finished that he will be able to pay full attention to his plans for Rome.²

If we note Paul's own references to his forthcoming visit to Rome and his plans there, he specifically states that he comes to Rome only on his way to Spain, where he intends to continue his missionary work (cf.xv:24,28).³ Whatever Paul intended to do in Rome, it seems that it is at least subsidiary to what he planned to do in Spain. This means that those interpretations which speak of Paul's longing to establish a mission in the capital of the Empire etc. do not take seriously the fact that to Paul Rome is only a stage on the way to Spain. This also puts paid to the view that in his letter to the Romans, Paul presents a sample gospel to show the Roman Christians the sort of gospel he will preach there in order to win their support.⁴ Even if

³. The view taken here is that Paul, in order not to offend the Roman Christians, did not mention in ch.i that he was really heading for Spain.
⁴. Cf. Jervell, op.cit., p.66. D. Georgi has the view that the letter is written to explain to the Roman Christians the grounds for Paul's coming visit. In his opinion the delivery of the collection, the letter and the forthcoming visit all have the same aim in view - support for his work in the West. Die Geschichte der Kollekte des Paulus für Jerusalem. Wissenschaftliche Beiträge zur kirchlich-evangelischen Lehre. Hamburg-Bergstedt, 1965, p.81.
we allow that Paul's real goal is Spain and that he is not primarily concerned about missionary work in Rome, it is unlikely that Paul would send an outline of his gospel for the tentative approval of the Roman Christians. The gospel he preached was not something that Paul received from men and not something which he allowed men to judge, (cf. Gal.i:6f.).

In any case if Paul were to preach the gospel in Rome himself, it seems superfluous to send a written copy of it in advance. If it is claimed that Paul writes because he needs to be sure of their support in his (Roman) missionary work, it is doubtful if the Roman Christians could have hindered him, whether or not they approved of his gospel.

There is something more to be said for the view that Paul writes to the Romans because he needed their support for his missionary work in Spain. The support of the Roman Christians was an absolute essential for further work in the West. Paul is now leaving the 'ecclesiastical province' of Jerusalem; he can no longer claim to be working concentrically from the latter city and he requires the Roman Christians to act as a link between Jerusalem and Spain. If this help were not forthcoming, the new converts in the West would be completely isolated and Paul's mission, apart from a real connection with the mother church in Jerusalem and the link with the Roman Christians, would become a purely individual effort. It is likely then that Paul hoped for financial support and hospitality etc. from the Roman Christians. It is doubtful however whether he looks to them for active participation in the Spanish

1. Contra Dodd who speaks of a natural ambition to want to work in the capital of the empire and to win support from the influential church of Rome (p.7).
5. Ibid.
mission.\(^1\) For Paul the role that the Roman Church would play in his journey to Spain was important and yet this must not be overemphasized.\(^2\) In view of this it would appear that although the reference to his forthcoming visit to Rome and to Spain is a reason for Paul's letter, it cannot be regarded as the reason.\(^3\)

That this is so is clearly indicated by the conclusion of ch.xv, particularly vv.30-32. Through the intercession of the Roman Christians Paul hopes that his collection will be received by the church in Jerusalem and that he himself will be delivered from the unbelieving Jews. But the significant fact is that Paul's request for their intercessory prayers is on behalf of his own safety and the acceptance of the collection, and his forthcoming visit is only mentioned at the end of the list.\(^4\) The importance of this is realized when we note that v.30 begins with τωρρακωλω and thus indicates in accordance with the form of the ancient letter and the Pauline letters that the writer is now concluding his letter with a sentence which sums up the theme and purpose of writing.\(^5\) As Jervell has shown, this fact means that the visit to Jerusalem with the collection has much more reason to be regarded as the occasion for the writing of Romans than the proposed visit to Rome and Spain.\(^6\)

---

1. Cf. Bornkamm. It is possible that certain of Paul's friends, such as Prisca and Aquila, would have assisted him in his mission to Spain.
3. Minear holds that there are several reasons for Paul's letter to the Romans. Note the sub-title of his book *The Purposes of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans*.
4. Cf. Jervell, op.cit., p.66. This is not to overlook the fact that Paul's visit to Rome is dependent on the success of his Jerusalem visit, as xv:32 implies. We may think of this under two headings (a) Paul's own personal safety and (b) his acceptance by the Jerusalem church. Bornkamm considers that Paul's mission in the West is dependent on both of these factors, op.cit., p.137.
If Paul's main aim in writing had been to elicit the support of the Roman Christians for his missionary work then it is unlikely that he would have omitted to make specific mention of it as a subject for prayer.\textsuperscript{1} We conclude therefore that neither Paul's intention to visit Rome, nor his concern to elicit support for his intended mission to Spain of themselves offer sufficient grounds for Paul's writing of this letter.\textsuperscript{2}

(b) Romans as an Assertion of Paul's Apostolic Authority.

This interpretation of Romans was originally proposed by Anton Fridrichsen.\textsuperscript{3} Fridrichsen emphasized the close connections, even identity, between the apostle Paul and his message. The letter to Rome was written by the apostle to the Gentiles 'to assert in a discreet way, the apostolic authority and teaching of Paul in the church of Rome.'\textsuperscript{4}

G. Klein has recently taken up this interpretation again and developed it into a full-blown explanation of the purpose of the letter.\textsuperscript{5} Klein rightly dismisses those views which consider that Paul is keen to preach in Rome because it is the capital of the Empire etc. He holds that Paul writes to the Romans not because of what he wants from them i.e. in the way of support etc., but because of what he has for them i.e. his apostolic authority as apostle to the Gentiles.\textsuperscript{6} Klein bases his interpretation largely on the fact that Paul addresses the Romans sometimes as full members of the Christian community, as brothers etc., and yet at other times he speaks of his intention to evangelize

\textsuperscript{1} Cf. Jervell, op.cit., p.66.
\textsuperscript{2} "Weder die Spanienreise noch der Aufenthalt in Rom machen diesen Brief notwendig oder erklären seinen Inhalt". Jervell, op.cit., p.67.
\textsuperscript{6} Ibid, p.135.
in Rome (i:15).\textsuperscript{1} Coupled with this he finds that no one has so far provided a satisfactory interpretation of the apparent contradiction between Paul's boast not to build on another man's foundation (xv:20) and his expressed desire to preach the gospel in Rome (i:11.f.).

In Klein's opinion there is only one solution to these problems. This is that whilst the Roman Christians may be regarded as Christians in the sense that they have believed the gospel etc., they still are not a properly founded church since they lack Paul's apostolic signature. This explains why he feels free to visit them even though they are already believers. This too is the reason why the designation \(\varepsilon\varepsilon\lambda\lambda\omega\varepsilon\alpha\) is missing in the prescript and throughout the letter.\textsuperscript{4}

There is thus seen to be a certain equivalence between the purpose of the letter and Paul's proposed visit to Rome.\textsuperscript{5} In both he stresses his gospel and his apostolic commission as apostle to the Gentiles. This is clearly demonstrated by the coupling of these two in both the introduction and conclusion of the letter. Romans is truly unique in that there is no real parallel to this situation where a church exists without a proper apostolic founder.\textsuperscript{6} For this reason Paul can say quite clearly that he goes there to preach the gospel and uses specific mission terminology because as far as he is concerned these people have not yet been fully evangelized; he still has a spiritual gift to give them in order to strengthen them, (i:11).\textsuperscript{7}

\textsuperscript{1} Cf. op.cit., pp.141.f.
\textsuperscript{3} Ibid. p.141.
\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., pp.142-3.
\textsuperscript{5} Ibid, p.135.
\textsuperscript{6} Ibid, p.141.
\textsuperscript{7} Cf. Klein's interesting discussion of Paul's terminology in i:11 (op.cit., pp.140-41).
Klein's exposition has the advantage that it pays full attention to the emphasis upon the gospel in Romans and also the corresponding emphasis upon the world-wide mission of the church.¹ His study serves to high-light the problem of harmonizing xv:20 and i:11-15.² Another merit of this interpretation is that it brings to the fore Paul's emphasis upon his apostolic office which plays a dominant role in several of his letters.

It is from this particular emphasis that one of the most serious objections against Klein's view arises. Since he does not claim that any particular heresy or problem exists in Rome, his view that the Roman Christians are in some way deficient is hard to accept. From this point of view Paul would appear to have a very authoritarian, almost officious understanding of his apostleship. If Klein had given any real indication of a specific deficiency in Rome, his interpretation might have been acceptable, but as he has expressed it, it is certainly not in keeping with what we know from elsewhere in the New Testament of Paul's conception of his apostleship.³

Although Paul does not refer to the church in Rome, there is abundant evidence to show that he did regard the believers there as Christians in the fullest possible understanding of the word. He refers to them as "called to belong to Jesus Christ", "God's beloved", and "called to be saints" (i:6.f.), in addition to various references to them as "brothers" etc.⁴ That they are not deficient in this respect in spite of their lack of apostolic foundation is witnessed by Paul's words in xv:15 - "I myself am satisfied about you, my brethren, that you are full of goodness, filled with all knowledge, and

---

2. But see Bornkamm's interpretation, op.cit., pp.138-39 n.47.
4. Ibid.
able to instruct one another." The weakness of Klein's interpretation is clearly revealed by the content of the succeeding verse (v.15) - "But on some points I have written to you very boldly by way of reminder". If the Romans were completely lacking in apostolic foundation, how could Paul write to them simply by way of reminder?

The Roman Christians were deficient in the same respect as other Christian communities to whom Paul wrote. What their particular deficiencies were we must discuss in more detail later. The fact that Paul does not specifically refer to the church in Rome may be satisfactorily explained other than as Klein does. Probably the Roman Christians were deficient in their understanding of the doctrine of the church. It is even possible that as yet a united Christian church had not been formed in Rome. In any case it was an area of thought on which the Romans required guidance, and that had to be given in as gentle a way as possible. This point of view has the advantage that it is very much in harmony with the content of the entire letter.

The delicate manner in which Paul addresses the Romans may also be explained by this understanding of the situation. If the Roman church had not been founded by any particular apostle, then these Christians may have had a highly individualistic and independent view of the Christian faith. They may not have been very willing to accept instruction from any apostle. This may be the reason why Paul in Romans often quotes from pre-Pauline credal formulations etc. Paul probably does this to show that his understanding of

2. Cf. Leenhardt, pp.15.f.
the Christian faith is not merely a personal or private opinion. Some such understanding of the situation at Rome helps to explain Paul’s emphasis upon his apostolic authority, not in the way Klein suggests, but as Fridrichsen proposes "in a discreet way".

(c) Romans as a Letter to Jerusalem.

This view has received a certain amount of support in recent articles on Romans.² Its merit is that it enables scholars to relate Romans to the situation of Paul at the time of writing. This is particularly valuable since it is now generally agreed that we cannot regard Romans, as Melanchthon did, simply as a compendium of Christian doctrine. The weakness of the latter view is that is has become increasingly plain to scholars that Romans does not cover the main doctrines of Christian belief.³ If Paul is selective in the choice of themes to be discussed in the letter then it is fair to ask what motivated the selection. The forthcoming journey to Jerusalem with the collection offers a good reason for this selection. It enables Romans to be regarded as a real letter, addressed to a particular situation about a

2. The suggestion that the secret address of Romans might really be the church in Jerusalem was proposed by E. Fuchs in Hermeneutik, Bad Canstatt 1954, p.191. This was taken up by W. Marxsen in his Einleitung in das Neue Testament, Gütersloh 1963 Cf. ET (1968), pp.94 ff. A similar view was proposed by M.J. Suggs in 1967 in an article in the series of studies presented to John Knox - "The Word is Near You: Rom. x:6-10 within the Purpose of the Letter", CHINT, pp.289-312. Most recently this interpretation has been advocated by Jervell in the article already cited.
3. Cf. W.G. Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, London 1966, p.221. Kümmel notes that some important elements of Pauline teaching, such as Christology and eschatology do not receive full attention, and some, such as the Lord's Supper and church polity are not touched upon at all.
specific issue.¹ Even more acceptable than this is the fact that now the occasion for the letter is located in the situation of Paul, rather than in the particular situation of the church at Rome. This appeals to many scholars who find it hard to view Romans as the same kind of letter as the other Paulines in view of the sparseness of specific information concerning practical problems in the church, etc.² If we wish to be unkind, we could suggest that this view of Romans is acceptable because it fits in better with the general tendency to regard Romans as in some way or other representing a 'systematic' outline of Pauline theology.³

The fact that the collection is recognised as occupying a significant place in Paul's life and work is another good feature of this interpretation. The study of the collection project by Munck, Nickle and Georgi has led to a fresh evaluation of its function and significance.⁴ Whatever purpose the collection was designed to serve, whether temple-tax, ⁵ diaspora gift or alms gift, it demonstrates the importance which Paul placed upon the unity of the church.⁶ Associated with the above is the central place that Jerusalem

---

2. In addition to those listed on p.449n2 others who regard Romans as some sort of general or circular letter may be included e.g. T.W. Manson, St. Paul's Letter to the Romans - and Others", BJRL, XXI, 1948, now in Studies in the Gospels and Epistles, Ed. M. Black, Manchester University Press, 1962, pp.225-41; J. Munck, PSM, pp.196-209; and G. Bornkamm in the article already cited.
3. Although Bornkamm denies that in his interpretation of Romans as 'Paul's last will and testament', he regards the letter as a summary of Christian doctrine, his conclusion comes very near to suggesting exactly this, see especially, p.139.
occupied in the mind of Paul.¹ He is still concerned with the salvation of
the Jews and in maintaining the connection between Gentile Christians and the
mother church in Jerusalem. The context and the emphasis of the letter to
the Romans could strongly support this aspect of Pauline theology. If Romans
is really to be regarded as a letter to Jerusalem its contents are not in-
appropriate for such an address.² This would in fact provide a good explana-
tion for a certain Jewishness about the letter that has often led scholars
to hold that the Roman Christians were predominantly of Jewish origin.³

Another feature that several scholars have noted in Romans, and one
which has recently been developed by Bornkamm, is the number of themes,
familiar on account of their mention in earlier letters, which are discussed in detail here.⁴ The great issue of the unity of Jews and Gentiles in
the church which Paul will face at Jerusalem involves many other important
issues which he has already dealt with - the Law, circumcision, faith and
works, sin and obedience, baptism, eating of meat etc. If Romans is really
addressed to Jerusalem this would help to explain the fact that Paul takes
up again the themes which he has already discussed elsewhere.⁵

In spite of the many good features of this interpretation, there are
several serious problems to which it does not really give satisfactory
answers. The first is that it puts too much emphasis on Paul and his sit-

---

¹ On this see the discussion on 'glory' in viii:30 (Thesis p.281n.1), and
the reference to Jerusalem in ix:26.f. (Thesis p.353.f.).
² See the list of themes of particular interest to Jerusalem in Jervell,
op.cit., p.70.
³ E.G. W. Manson, The Epistle to the Hebrews, Edinburgh 1951, pp.172-84.
Since F.C. Baur this view has been quite common although in recent times
it has been gradually ousted and Bornkamm can now refer to Baur's one-
sided anti-Jewish view of Romans, op.cit., p.124.
⁵ Cf. Bornkamm, p.cit., pp.130-35. See also Manson, op.cit., p.240; Munck,
FEM, p.199; Jervell, op.cit., p.68.
uation and not enough on the recipients of the letter and their particular problems. Jervell holds that Paul writes to Rome expressly to seek their support in what he is going to do in Jerusalem. More specifically he desires them to intercede in prayer for his safety and for the reception of the collection.

The contents of 1:18-36 may be described as "Reflexionen um und Hauptinhalt der 'Kollekt-Ansprache' oder der Verteidigungsrede die Paulus vor der Gemeinde in Jerusalem halten soll." According to Jervell it is wrong to seek to discover the historical situation that occasioned this letter in the letter itself. Baur's programme for discovering the situation of the letter in Paul's life and hence the historical situation that existed in the Roman congregation is not only impossible to realize, but ought not even to be attempted - "Die Veranlassung liegt in Paulus selbst zu dem Zeitpunkt, als er schrieb."

There is no reason to disagree with Jervell's assertion that Paul's letters concern not only the community addressed but Paul himself, his apostleship, gospel, plan etc. No adequate understanding of a letter can overlook this factor. But this is quite different from Jervell's thesis that we must free our minds from the presupposition that Paul's letters are basically determined by the situation of the recipients rather than by Paul himself. Jervell has over-emphasized an otherwise useful point. We simply cannot point

2. Ibid., p.64.
3. Op.cit., p.62. Jervell allows that it is legitimate to seek to discover whatever knowledge we can about the Christian community, its composition etc., but he maintains that because this knowledge is so limited and uncertain it is not legitimate to make an exegesis of the letter on this basis.
5. Ibid.
to any Pauline letter that is written more on account of Paul's situation than that of the community to which it is sent. Jervell's case is not proved by pointing to sections of letters such as I Thess.ii:1-iii:10.

Romans is not a monologue nor the theological self-confession of Paul. We repeatedly get the impression that Paul is polemizing against false views being advocated in the Roman congregations. Jeremias has emphasized the dialogue character of much of Romans. We believe that this aspect may reflect earlier discussions in Paul's missionary work but they are not simply brought up again as the record of a past debate. They are re-applied because the immediate situation demands them. Chs.xiv-xv are particularly relevant here. Despite the similarity with I Cor.viii-x the discussion in Romans is every bit as vital and alive as that in I Cor.

Nor is it true that Romans is about Paul's own problems. At some places it is obvious that Paul is actually asking a question himself, but as we have noted in connection with chs.vi-vii, it does not make good sense to hold that the objector is always a Jew or that the questions are simply rhetorical.

2. Ibid.
4. In an earlier version of his article "Der Römerbrief als Testament des Paulus" (Paulus 1969, pp.103-120) Bornkann claimed that Rom.xiv-xv are lacking in concreteness in comparison with I Cor.viii-x (p.109), but in the later article of the same title, he is not so dogmatic on this point but overcomes the problem of Rom.xiv-xv by claiming that these chapters do not refer to an actual situation in Rome but are to be understood in the context of the world-wide mission of the church (op.cit., p.135).
5. In this respect we agree with Jewett, (op.cit., p.70). But we believe it is misleading to maintain that Paul always asks the questions himself and that they bear no relation to concrete situations of the Roman Christians.
7. Even Kümmel who is quite cautious in his views concerning the actual historical situation Paul addresses in Rome, allows that Paul replies to objections which he expected would come from the Roman congregation, (op. cit., pp.221-3).
Why should Paul discuss libertine-antinomian deductions from his gospel with the Christians in Jerusalem? Surely they would know him better than to believe that his gospel advocated such principles. Altogether in Jervell's view, as in Bornkamm's, there is too much emphasis on the defensive aspect of Romans.

On a straight reading of the entire letter, the attitude of self-defence is not nearly so dominant as these scholars suggest. The majority of chapters are much more concerned about matters of faith and conduct than about defending Paul's gospel. Polemic against false doctrines and behaviour, exhortation, warnings, recital of credal statements and exposition of the present meaning of salvation account for much more of the letter than statements of Pauline self-defence.¹ The full answer to this question of Paul's self-defence in Jerusalem really demands a re-appraisal of Paul's relations with the mother church. Suffice to say at this stage that Jervell's interpretation would be more appropriate at a much earlier stage in the relationship than at the point reached at the time of writing Romans. Jervell appears to have made out a good case for regarding Romans as being basically concerned with Paul and the Jerusalem situation. We say 'appears' because in reality there is no Jerusalem situation, as we do not really get an insight into the problems of the Jewish Christian community but only into Paul's situation and his thought about Jerusalem.

The weakest point in Jervell's interpretation is that although he has demonstrated certain connections between the letter to the Romans and Jerusalem, he has failed to give any conclusive reason why it should have been

¹ Cf. W. Lütgert, Der Römerbrief als historisches Problem BFOhTh, 17, (2), Gütersloh 1913, pp.74-76.
addressed to Rome. This might not seem so very important in view of the fact that the references to Rome are missing in some manuscripts. There is however no more likely destination for this letter and its contents than the church in Rome and we have no concrete evidence whatsoever for believing it is addressed to Jerusalem.

We do not minimize the importance which Paul attached to the intercession of the Roman Christians on his behalf. It is not impossible that Paul should write a long letter with the sole purpose of obtaining support in prayer for a crucial mission. We can understand that it would be important for Paul to know that the whole church was one with him in what he attempts at Jerusalem and that the Romans should realize that he represents them since, as Gentile apostle, he represents the entire Gentile church. But the serious difficulty still remains - why write to a church he has not founded and to a church which he has not yet visited, about a collection in which they have not participated. If Paul had written the Roman letter to Philippi or Ephesus and requested their prayers on behalf of his visit to Jerusalem we could

1. Note the vague statement (concerning the address of the letter) "Er geht in erster Linie Jerusalem an, jedoch auch Rom, weil Paulus die Gemeinde dort nötig hat", (op.cit., p.64). Jervell does not give any convincing proof why Paul specifically needs the Roman Christians rather than any other.
2. We should also note T.W. Manson's opinion that the omission of the reference to Rome in both i:17 and i:15 is probably a sign of deliberate excision rather than evidence that the letter was not intended for Rome, (op. cit., pp.229.f.).
6. This would not be such a serious objection if Minear is correct in his suggestion that Phoebe was to ask the Roman Christians to join in the contribution to Jerusalem. But if we translate πορεύομαι in xv:25a a "I am on my way" (to Jerusalem) it would be difficult to see how the collection from Rome could be delivered at the same time as the other contributions. On xv:25 see Manson, op.cit., p.225 n.2. See also T.M. Taylor, "The Place of Origin of Romans", JBL, LXVII (1948), pp.281.f.
accept this as perfectly reasonable. We can find no adequate explanation why
he should send such a letter to Rome if there was not already in existence
there a situation which demanded such an address.

Another serious objection may be raised against the view that Romans
addresses the Jerusalem situation rather than that in Rome. All the advan-
tages which pertain to this interpretation can be retained without impairment
in an alternative view. This is that Romans is written in the light of Paul's
approaching visit to Jerusalem, but has its immediate reference to a concrete
set of circumstances that exist in Rome. Since the latter interpretation can
include the good points of the former and at the same time avoid some of its
problems, it ought to be preferred. We will deal with this interpretation at
a later stage.

(d) Romans as a Circular Letter.

It is intended in this section to consider those interpretations which
regard Romans as some kind of circular or general letter which was not direct-
ed to Rome only but was intended for other places (and purposes) as well. The
best statement of the view that Romans is a circular letter is that of T.W.
Manson who argued chiefly on the basis of the textual evidence, that Romans
is a letter from Paul "to the Romans - and Others."¹

According to Manson, Romans is a summing up of the positions reached
by Paul and his friends at the end of the long controversy whose beginnings
appear in I Corinthians and in Philippians iii.² When Paul had completed
this statement he decided to send a copy of it to his friends in Ephesus

whom he did not intend to visit on his way to Jerusalem (Acts xx:16). This copy would be available for all the churches of Asia. The Corinthian church was given the apostle's summing up by word of mouth and the churches in Syria and Palestine would soon receive it in the same way. At the same time Paul decided to send a copy of his summing up to the Romans with a statement concerning his future plans. Romans is not to be regarded as a letter of self-introduction from Paul to the Roman church, but becomes instead "A manifesto setting forth his deepest convictions on central issues, a manifesto calling for the widest publicity, which the apostle did his best, not without success to give it." ¹

Manson's interpretation represents a major step forward on the way to interpreting Romans as a real letter. In spite of the fact that this view still tends to emphasize the contents of the letter as a considered statement of Paul's theology, it has the merit that it places the letter in the context of the missionary situation out of which it arose. Munck realized the full potential of this aspect of Manson's interpretation and made good use of it in his own writings, especially in his study of Romans ix-xi.²

The most serious objection that can be levelled against Manson's view is similar to that which we have already made of Jervell's. Although Manson gives a good account of the connections between the letter to the Romans and Jerusalem, he provides no conclusive evidence why this letter should have been addressed to Rome.³ Suggs has focused attention on this weakness in Manson's article when he asserts that it really ought to have been entitled

---

² Cf. PSM, pp.196.f., and Christ and Israel. The entire approach of the latter book is influenced by the 'missionary' approach to Romans previously proposed by Manson.
³ See sub-section (c) pp.452.ff.
"St. Paul's Letter to Others - and the Romans." This discrepancy between the title and the actual content of the argument indicates that this is not a full solution to the problems that surround the letter to the Romans.

When we turn to the proposals by which Suggs hopes to overcome the weakness which he has noted in Manson's argument, we find that his own solution is equally weak but for a different reason. Suggs holds that there are four factors which require explanation in any attempt to establish the occasion of the letter. (1) Paul's double fear in view of his impending visit to Jerusalem - fear of persecution from the Jews and that his collection may not be acceptable. (2) The heavy use of themes with which we are familiar from the correspondence of the collection period. (3) The altered character of the polemic in relation to these themes - which for Manson and Bornkamm alike is explained by its being divorced from a specific situation in a particular congregation. (4) The sending of a letter with this content to Rome, since we have no doubt, even if the letter is a circular, that a copy did go to Rome.

Suggs finds that the greatest difficulties arise from the fourth of these factors, the sending of the letter to Rome. In view of the fact that there is no mention of any communication from Rome to Paul, were it not for 1:7,15, one would not conclude that the letter had actually been sent to Rome. Suggs believes that the other three requirements which he has outlined are fully met only if the letter is understood as a 'brief' drawn up by Paul in anticipation of the renewed necessity of defending his gospel in

---

2. Suggs believes that it is more logical to relate the Roman letter primarily to Jerusalem since it is so difficult to find in it any real connection with Rome. Cf. op.cit., pp.295 and 312.
Jerusalem.\(^1\) This brief necessarily goes back over the ground of the controversies of the collection period but it is not simply a summary of controversies now ended; it is prepared afresh in anticipation of a situation in which they may again recur.\(^2\)

In view of the delicate situation at Jerusalem, Paul presents a partially moderated position to Gentile churches - such a brief would be suitable for them all to receive, including Rome. With Jerusalem in view, Paul is at pains to develop a defence of his gospel which provides minimal offence to the Jews so that the Jerusalem Christian community's identification with him and his churches, will not increase the threat from unbelieving Jews in Judaea.\(^3\) The latter explains why Paul exalts his 'kinsmen' in Romans as in no other letter and why there is such a preoccupation in it with the priority and election of Israel particularly in the way Paul justifies his Gentile mission so as to retain Israel's 'heilsgeschichtlich' role.\(^4\)

Suggs concludes his article by reminding us again that the success of Paul's visit to Jerusalem hinges, in Paul's mind, on whether he can define his position in relation to Israel and the Law in such a way that the unity symbolized by the offering is protected from Jewish animosities and Jewish-Christian suspicions.\(^5\) In the interest of this cause Paul composes the document which we know as Romans, "a review of areas of prior dissension and a projection of solutions to possible future conflicts."\(^6\) Since this matter concerns the whole of Gentile Christianity, the brief is issued as a letter -

---

2. Ibid, pp.296-7.
4. Ibid, p.298.
5. Ibid, p.311.
one copy of which went to 'all God's beloved in Rome'.

The weakness to which Suggs drew attention in Manson's article is overcome by seeing Romans as primarily orientated towards Jerusalem and only secondarily concerned with the situation in Rome. This solution is however completely unacceptable. Suggs is more consistent than Manson, but also less accurate. In Manson's interpretation we have some grounds for the sending of the letter to Rome. In Suggs there is absolutely none, since Rome is only included as one of the 'mailing' list which included all Gentile churches, and in any case the letter is really 'addressed' to Jerusalem, if in fact it can be truly described as addressed to any place in particular.

It is clear from the title, "Der Römerbrief als Testament des Paulus" that Bornkamm's proposals concerning the nature of the letter owe a great deal to Manson. Both regard it as essentially Paul's final summing up of his theology. Bornkamm acknowledges the significance of xv:30-32 and relates the Roman letter both to Paul's visit to Jerusalem and his forthcoming visit to Rome. The delivery of the collection raised again the fundamental questions concerning the relation of Jews and Gentiles in the church - justification by faith, the keeping of the Law and the priority of the Jewish people. On the successful outcome of these issues depended not only Paul's well-being in Jerusalem but also his future work in the West.

Viewed in this context the letter to the Romans may be understood as Paul's preparation for the discussion of the above-mentioned problems in Jerusalem. The connection with Rome is maintained by Bornkamm by his assertion

1. op.cit., p.312.
4. Ibid.
that the message which Paul has to defend in Jerusalem and that which he intends to preach in Rome are one and the same thing.\(^1\) The connection between the two communities is further evidenced by Paul's request to the Romans for intercessory prayer for his safety and the reception of the collection in Jerusalem. Thus although Paul did not deliberately plan that it should be so, Romans became, in actual fact, his last will and testament to the church.\(^2\)

One difference between the views of Manson and Bornkamm is that Manson believes that Romans is a circular letter whereas Bornkamm holds that it is related to Paul's forthcoming visit to Jerusalem and also to Rome where Paul will proclaim the same gospel which he is to defend in Jerusalem.

Although they may differ somewhat in their individual emphases, the interpretations of Manson, Suggs and Bornkamm are all weak in that they fail to give a satisfactory explanation why the actual address of the document under discussion is Rome and not Jerusalem. Whether the letter is considered as 'addressed' to several places as Manson and Suggs believe, or only two as Bornkamm holds, there is lacking in all three an appropriate explanation of why Paul should write to Rome. These authors have all succeeded in explaining the limitations in subject matter in Romans by relating the letter to the situation of Paul looking towards Jerusalem. They have also provided an explanation for Paul's use of old themes in a new setting.

We are of the opinion however that the contents and presentation of material in the Roman letter are not adequately explained by this interpretation. It is a strange letter that bears little or no reference to the very place to which it is addressed and has closest connections with a place to

---

2. Ibid, p.139.
which no one has ever suggested it was actually sent (i.e. Jerusalem).

We must now qualify the comments which we have already made concerning Bornkamm's interpretation. One way to avoid the criticism that by connecting Romans with Jerusalem we are left with no adequate explanation for its being sent to Rome, is to claim that the problems in Rome are the same as those in Jerusalem. This view has been well expounded by Marxsen, and Bornkamm ought not to be so severely criticized in that he follows Marxsen to some extent by holding that the gospel which Paul is to defend in Jerusalem is the same as that which he will proclaim in Rome. But Bornkamm's view differs greatly from Marxsen's because unlike Marxsen, he does not allow that Rom.xiv-xv relate to an actual situation in Rome.

To this extent Bornkamm's view is more didactic and he tends to see Romans as the final universal statement of Pauline theology, released from the relativity of particular reference to historical circumstances.

We have already noted how Marxsen avoids some of the problems that result from regarding Romans as a letter to Jerusalem by claiming that the problems in Jerusalem are the same as those in Rome. He cannot therefore be included in the kind of criticism which we have levelled against the views of Manson, Suggs and Bornkamm. But he is not entirely dissimilar in all respects. Marxsen holds that a real situation is depicted in Rom.xii-xv; it is in these chapters that he discerns the actual situation at Rome. But in

1. Cf. op.cit., pp.100.f.
4. Cf. p.139, particularly the words "über den Augenblick bestimmten Situationen in die Sphäre des immer und für alle Gültigen...."
chs. i-xi he believes that we can speak only of an "'indirect situation' of which we cannot be certain that it actually did obtain in Rome, but which Paul nevertheless envisaged on the basis of his experiences at Jerusalem".\footnote{Op.cit., p.101.}

Thus Marxsen has affiliation with the view that Romans portrays only an indirect situation, but since he does allow that a real situation is discernible in part of the letter we must look at his interpretation in more detail in the next sub-section.

\begin{itemize}
\item [(e)] Romans as a Letter to Rome.
\item [(i)] The General Historical Situation.
\end{itemize}

Most scholars are of the opinion that some information concerning the church at Rome is contained in Paul's letter to the Romans. Some scholars believe that this information is very scant and is contained only in chs. i and xv. Others such as Marxsen allow that in addition to these chapters information concerning the situation of the church at Rome is also to be found in chs. xii-xiv. We believe that a good case can be made out for the view that the entire letter provides an insight into the situation at Rome. Before proceeding to discuss the information concerning the Roman Christian community which is contained in the letter itself, we must look briefly at some other relevant information available from sources outside the letter.

It is not our intention here to attempt to give a detailed reconstruction of the historical situation in Rome at the time Paul wrote his letter. However carefully this might be investigated, even the most detailed study would of itself prove inconclusive. There are so many unknown factors and so
much uncertainty as regards even the information which is available that it would be unwise to attach too much importance to such an exercise. The purpose of this brief discussion is simply to outline the general historical background in which the Roman Christian community first came into existence. The function of this description of the historical background is to show that the situation which we envisage on the basis of the information contained in the letter itself is consistent with what is already known about this period of Roman history from other sources.

Since Romans has so much to say about Jews and Gentiles in relation to the gospel and to one another, we must look first of all at the Jewish community in Rome. The size and influence of the community is well known. It had grown rapidly since huge numbers had been added to it by Pompey’s conquest of Judaea in 63 B.C. By the beginning of the Christian era the Jews of Rome numbered somewhere between forty and sixty thousand.\(^1\) The fact that emperors thought it necessary to put restraints upon the Jews, or even to banish them from the city\(^2\) is itself evidence that they comprised a not insignificant part of the population.

The great number of synagogues which we now know existed in the different districts of the city illustrates both the size and the cosmopolitan nature of the Jewish community.\(^3\) Although these synagogues have left abundant

---

3. Cf. G. La Piana "Foreign Groups in Rome during the First Centuries of the Empire", HTR, XX (1927), pp.183-403(350.f.).
evidence that they had a wide variety of office-bearers, it seems that they co-existed rather loosely, not having any organized system of central government as was the case with the Jews in Alexandria. The number and variety of the synagogues and their rather loose connection with each other may help to explain why the Jews whom Paul encounters in Acts xxviii express complete ignorance of the Christian faith apart from the fact that "everywhere it is spoken against", (v.22). If there were as yet only a relatively small number of Christians they might have connections with or be known to only a few synagogues.

Whatever their relation to each other a strong link was still maintained between the synagogues in Rome and the Jewish authorities in Jerusalem. Likewise the leaders of the Palestinian Jewry took a strong interest in the Jews of Rome and regularly sent missions and visitations to them. This strong connection between Jerusalem and Roman Jewry is important for a full understanding of the problems that strife between Jewish and Gentile Christians in Rome could cause in relation to Paul's reception with the collection at Jerusalem.

The second factor which is relevant to the understanding of the

2. W. Wiefel, "Die jüdische Gemeinschaft im antiken Rom und die Anfänge des römischen Christentums: Bemerkungen zu Anlass und Zweck des Römerbriefes". Jud, XXVI (1970), pp.65-88(74.f.). La Piana believes that there is some evidence to show that there were officials who could represent the whole Jewish community, (p.361). One sign of the unity of the entire community is the fact that the cemeteries were common to all, (p.363).
4. This however is open to the objection that if the trouble were confined to only a few synagogues, it would not necessarily become known to the authorities in Jerusalem.
historical background of the letter to the Romans is the cultural conflict which existed between Jews and Gentiles in the first century. This became extremely bitter from the time of Caligula onwards even though Claudius' tolerant attitude to the Jews briefly helped to mitigate its ferocity. Animosity between Jew and Gentile reached its peak in cities where there was a large concentration of Jews.

We have evidence of this particularly in Alexandria where there was strong anti-Jewish feeling among the Greeks to such an extent that in A.D. 38 Flaccus declared that all Jews in Alexandria were to be regarded as aliens. Later that same year he had thirty-eight Jewish elders publicly flogged at the emperor's birthday celebrations. Although Flaccus was soon banished as a consequence of these events, Caligula's policies did nothing to ease the tension between the opposing groups and it was only when Claudius became emperor that the strife began to die down. Claudius issued an edict which called upon both sides to desist from further conflict, and upheld at the same time the traditional rights of the Jews in Alexandria.

About this time conflict between Jews and Gentiles arose also in Caesarea, Antioch and Jamnia. The growing threat of the Zealot movement both

3. Ibid.
in Palestine and even beyond its borders helped to aggravate the already existing animosity towards the Jews. Rome was no different from other areas where a large Jewish population lived among Gentiles. Antisemitism was no new thing in Rome. Animosity was often directed not specifically at Jews as such but simply against all 'Oriental barbarians'. The rapid acceleration in the influence of the Zealot movement in Palestine coupled with the Jews' exclusive way of life and fierce nationalism no doubt gave good grounds for strong anti-Jewish sentiment. The fact that the Jews tended to attract a number of adherents and proselytes was an additional factor that increased their unpopularity.

The relevance for our study of this discussion of Jew-Gentile conflict is that it is most unlikely that a Christian community which included Jews and Gentiles could avoid being influenced by the 'Kulturkampf' especially in a city such as Rome. What we already know of the tensions existing between Jews and Gentiles in the Roman empire at this time leads us to expect similar problems in the Roman Christian community.

The third factor relevant to the historical context of the church at Rome is the reference by Suetonius to the expulsion of the Jews from Rome - "Ioudaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantis Roma expulit". This reference is taken by many scholars as proof of the arrival of the Christian gospel.

2. Cf. La Piana says that there was a constant undercurrent of antisemitism in Rome, op.cit., pp.389-90. See also Wiefel op.cit., p.83.
in Rome in 49 A.D.¹ The occurrence of the name Chrestus instead of Christus is explained by the fact that the pronunciation of both names was practically identical.² It is generally assumed that a theological debate concerning Jesus' Messiahship was the cause of troubles in Rome on account of which Claudius' edict was issued. As Filson states "it is possible and even probable that what happened in Rome was a series of riots or excited disputes between Jews who believed in Jesus as the Christ and Jews who rejected that claim. Suetonius mistakenly thought that the riots were stirred up by a Roman Jew named Chrestus."³ This view concerning the arrival of Christianity in Rome agrees well with the independent inference that Aquila and Priscilla were Christians before they came to Corinth.⁴ If this interpretation of Suetonius' record is correct it would be the only positive evidence for the existence of the Christian movement organized separately from Judaism at Rome before the arrival of Paul.⁵

Despite wide acceptance, this view raises several problems that are difficult to explain. Most serious of these is that according to the account in Acts xxxviii:17-22 the Jewish leaders who meet Paul know only that the Christian sect exists and meets everywhere with opposition, but nothing of its beliefs. Such ignorance would be most improbable if the riot which led to Jewish expulsion from Rome had taken place on account of the Christian faith.

3. A New Testament History, London 1965, p.66. See also Reicke, op.cit., pp.153, 184. Bruce believes that Suetonius may have thought Christ Himself was actually present in Rome and that he does not describe Chrestus further because he expected his readers to know who Christ was, op.cit., p.281.
5. Cf. Judge and Thomas "The Origin of the Church at Rome: A New Solution?" RThR XXV (1966), pp.81-95(85.f.).
Although the account in Acts does seem to exaggerate the ignorance of the Jews and the innocence of Paul, we are not convinced that it is entirely lacking in historical foundation.¹

The case against the view that the troubles to which Suetonius refers originated from the advent of Christian faith in Rome has been well argued by Judge and Thomas.² These scholars note that none of the subsequent references to Rome in the New Testament show any awareness of an outbreak of violence between Christians and Jews in Rome.³ This is not surprising since both Suetonius and Acts agree that the action in Rome was specifically directed against Jews as such.⁴

That Suetonius did not recognize that he was supposed to be talking about Christians is quite clear not only from what he says in this instance but also from the way in which he subsequently introduces them into his work as if he were referring to them for the first time.⁵ Thus Suetonius' source did not contain a clear identification of the troublemakers with Christians. The source suggested to Suetonius that there was a well-known person called Chrestus who instigated the disturbances in Rome. Even though we have no record of such a leader, it is quite possible that someone of that name did exist; the name itself was a common slave name.⁶ It is also likely that the trouble had Zealot origins. There is no need to suppose that Messianic movements were confined to Palestine. The letter of Claudius to the Alexandrians

---

3. Ibid.
refers to Jewish agitators imported from Syria to Egypt.\(^1\)

The view that the reference in Suetonius is only to Jewish (and not to Jewish-Christian) disturbances is strengthened by the fact that the Jews did not use the instance of the riots in A.D. 49 as a reason for having the Christians branded as political agitators. It seems likely that they might have been able to do this under Nero, since they were able to exercise some influence through Poppaea.\(^2\) The same argument holds good for the Jewish case against Paul when they accused him before Gallio. The Jews could have scored a useful point and certainly have forced the proconsul to give them a proper hearing in their accusation against Paul if they could have quoted to Gallio the precedent of Christians having caused riots in Rome. But the fact that they did not put forward this argument and that Gallio regarded the Jews' complaint against Paul as purely a domestic matter is sufficient proof that Acts has not glossed over the events which took place in Rome.\(^3\)

In Judge and Thomas' opinion, the most decisive objection against the view that Suetonius refers to Jewish-Christian disturbances is the fact that Paul met the Jews in Rome at all. Paul's arrival in Rome followed the normal pattern of evangelization in a new area. He usually worked first through the Jewish community and only later formed a new organization from the division that resulted from his preaching. The fact that Paul was given no formal reception by any Christian group at Rome implies that none had as yet been

---

1. Judge and Thomas, op.cit., p.85. Whilst we agree with the statement concerning Messianic activity outside Palestine we believe that another explanation is possible i.e. that the Jews were simply bringing in more of their own kind to assist in the struggle against the Greeks, (cf. Bruce, pp.277f.)
formed.¹ The problems noted above led Judge and Thomas to the conclusion that Christianity did not arrive in Rome in A.D. 49 but only some years later. A similar view has recently been expressed in a study of the same theme by Benko who concludes that "the edict of Claudius from A.D. 49 can best be understood within the general framework of the Jewish-Gentile 'Kulturkampf' and consequently Chrestus, in all probability, was an extremist ('Zealot') leader in the Jewish community at Rome."²

Before concluding this discussion of Claudius' edict, we must consider another report concerning Claudius' relations with the Jews. The second century historian Dio Cassius records that when the Jews had again increased in such numbers Claudius was afraid to expel them lest there should be a riot; instead "he forbade them to assemble together in accordance with their ancestral way of life."³

Two problems arise from this account. The first is that it is stated that the Jews were not expelled whereas we know from Acts xviii:2 that the Jews were in fact banished from Rome. Secondly Dio apparently places the date of the edict at the beginning of Claudius' reign somewhere around A.D. 41 or 42, whereas the generally accepted date is A.D. 49. One solution to the question as to whether or not the Jews were actually expelled is the suggestion that the prohibition against assembly amounted in practical terms to an expulsion since the fact that they would not be able to worship would be intolerable for the Jews.⁴

Another possibility favoured by some scholars is that there were in

---

fact two edicts. The first measure was not so severe as the second possibly because Claudius was very friendly with Agrippa,¹ who would be able to speak on behalf of the Jews. In view of Claudius' evident good will towards the Jews particularly at this period in his rule,² it is possible that he would not have legislated against them had there not been a clear necessity to do so. As Bruce suggests it is a reasonable inference that, when these measures proved inadequate to deal with the trouble, he took more drastic steps later.³

The evidence seems to point to two separate edicts rather than just the one involving expulsion in A.D. 49.⁴ Although there is a great deal of uncertainty as to what actually took place, one point is worth noting. We have a definite record of legislation against Jews which, whether it involves expulsion or prohibition of assembly, or possibly both, indicates that for some time after the edict of Claudius it is unlikely that normal synagogue worship could be publicly resumed in Rome without the risk of incurring drastic penalties. This is most significant for our understanding of the actual situation that existed there when Paul wrote his letter in A.D. 57.

A most important issue is whether or not it was possible for the Jews to practise normal synagogue worship between A.D. 41 and 49, and how soon things returned to normal when Nero became emperor. Judge and Thomas note that Claudius' edict prohibited assembly by private societies and that in Pliny's time the churches were classified under this heading.⁵ These scholars suggest that Dio's legislation possibly marks the official reaction to a premature attempt by Christians to set themselves up independently of the syn-

3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
agogues. Because of insufficient evidence however they subsequently reject this suggestion but note that "Dio's point is a valuable guide to the conditions which must have inhibited any desire of the Christians to form their own organisation when they did establish themselves in the city."¹

A different view is taken by Wiefel. He believes that the report by Dio makes better sense when understood to refer to the period after the expulsion of the Jews when, due to relaxation of the edict, the Jews were gradually able to return to Rome.² This understanding of events is more in keeping with Claudius' friendly attitude towards Jews in the earlier part of his reign.³ According to Leon the measures against the Jews were lifted at the latest by the beginning of Nero's reign. Then thanks to Poppaea the Jews soon gained substantial influence in the city.⁴ Some Jews had returned prior to this event but they were unable to hold synagogue meetings because these were regarded as the source of the previous disorders. Due to these restrictions the Christian community was at this time forced to separate from the synagogue and to adopt another form of organization so as not to come under the prohibition against the Jewish 'collegia'.⁵ The formation of many 'half-legal' house-churches in Rome meant the suppression of the Jewish element in the Christian community.⁶ Trouble began when greater numbers of Jews began to return to the city. Very soon pressure was exerted by the Jewish Christians, formerly in the majority but now very much in the minority in the Christian community. They resented the domination by Gentile-Christians who were unwilling to relinquish any of their power or freedom for the sake of the Jews.

3. Ibid. But see Bruce, op.cit., p.280.
6. Ibid., p.81.
Thus the key figures in the situation at Rome were the Gentile Christians and it was to them that the letter to the Romans was chiefly addressed. The problem that existed among the Roman Christians was that the very Gentiles whose good-will was necessary for the formation of a harmonious Christian fellowship were themselves influenced by anti-Jewish prejudice.¹

Though differing substantially in detail the common factor in the study by Judge and Thomas and that by Wiefel is that both see the anti-Jewish legislation of Claudius as a determining influence upon the social relationships of the Christian community which existed some years later in Rome. We agree with these writers concerning the value of research into the social relationships of the early Christian community.² This is most helpful for the understanding of the actual situation which Paul addresses in his letter to the Romans. We will return to this subject later and discuss it in the light of the information which we have discovered from the contents of the letter itself.

From this survey we conclude that there is no positive historical evidence for the advent of Christianity in Rome prior to the writing of Paul's letter. This does not mean however, that Christianity had not previously been in existence there for some years. Our tentative conclusion at this point is that the Christian faith probably came to Rome quite early and existed happily in association with the synagogue. We do know that from very early times there existed a strong tradition that Roman Christianity had a Jewish basis.³ The expulsion of the Jews in A.D. 49 effectively brought to an

2. This is one of the most fruitful areas for future research on the letter to the Romans.
end the association of Christianity with the synagogue. When the Jews began to return in large numbers shortly after the death of Claudius in A.D. 54, they found a strong independent Gentile church with very definite views on freedom from the Law, and emancipation from the fetter of Judaism. This is the background to the situation which Paul addresses in Romans.

The particular historical situation in the Christian community at Rome.

It is intended in this section to draw together the findings from our previous discussions and to seek to obtain by this means a clearer understanding of the particular situation which called forth Paul's letter to the Romans.

The discussion here will be based chiefly on the findings already noted in those sections where we have sought to discover, in the different parts of the letter, indications of a particular historical situation.¹ These will be considered in the light of the conclusions arrived at in sections (a) - (d) of this chapter.

The starting point for this section is the fact that the survey of Rom.i-xi has indicated very clearly that the greater part of these chapters is best understood as addressed to Gentile Christians with an aversion towards Judaism, and an unwillingness to accept the Jewish-Christian minority. Our investigation of the general historical situation that pertained in Rome indicates that most likely the Gentile Christian element would be the more dominant at this time, due to the temporary absence of the Jews as a result of their expulsion. The view is also taken here that at the time of writing, no united Christian congregation was in existence at Rome. Throughout the survey of the letter we have found no concrete evidence to

prove that a church did exist.\textsuperscript{1} The fact that Jewish and Gentile Christians in Rome had not been able to accept one another and live in harmony is no doubt one of the main reasons for the letter having been written.

Before we can outline in detail the situation which we believe to have existed in Rome, we must take another look at Marxsen's interpretation. Marxsen succeeds in relating Romans to both Rome and Jerusalem by asserting that the problems in both places were similar.\textsuperscript{2} When we bear in mind the subjects discussed at the Council of Jerusalem and the similar problems that frequently arose throughout the church in connection with the Pauline congregations and their relationship to Jerusalem, it is clear that the disputes referred to in Rom.xiv-xv were also important issues in Jerusalem. The fact that Paul talks about Jews and Judaism in Romans also lends support to this understanding.

In our opinion Bornkamm relates Romans to Jerusalem and to Rome in a more consistent manner than Marxsen. The problem of Marxsen's interpretation is that he regards Rom.xii-xv as depicting an actual situation in Rome but in the first eleven chapters he believes that only 'an indirect situation' can be discerned.\textsuperscript{3} Bornkamm's view is that none of chs.i-xv depict a specific situation at Rome.\textsuperscript{4} At least he is consistent in that he treats the whole of the letter in the same manner.

Although we are more in favour of Marxsen's interpretation, the problem is that he endeavours to relate the letter to both Jerusalem and to

\textsuperscript{1} Cf. Thesis pp.12.f., 408 and 468.f.
\textsuperscript{2} Op.cit., p.95. Marxsen suggests that Paul envisaged the 'indirect' situation in Rom.i-xi on the basis of his experiences at Jerusalem (p.101).
\textsuperscript{3} Ibid. See especially pp.98.f.
Rome, hence the dilemma concerning chs.i-xi. It would be much more consistent to regard the whole of Rom.i-xv as addressed to either Rome or Jerusalem. We do not see any way in which we can hold that the contents of this letter depict a specific situation other than by relating them all to one city or the other. The weak link is the connection between Romans and Jerusalem. If it can be shown that there is no real connection between the content of Rom.i-xv and Jerusalem, then we believe that Marxsen's positive understanding of chs.xii-xv as specifically addressed to Rome can be extended to include the whole of the letter.

The basic objection to the view that all or part of Romans is addressed to Jerusalem is that in Romans Paul does not simply discuss Jews and Gentiles in the third person. In the letter he specifically addresses a particular group of people, and these people, as we have noted above, are clearly for the most part Gentile Christians. If Paul had merely discussed Jews and Gentiles, this letter could conceivably have been addressed to Jerusalem. Similarly, there could be no objection to this view had Paul addressed himself directly only to Jews. Since however Paul, in some parts of the letter, specifically addresses himself to Gentile Christians, this makes it highly improbable that either the open or the secret address of the document was Jerusalem. What is most significant in this respect is that Rom.ix-xi, the section of the letter which is most Jewish and which ought therefore to have most relevance for Jerusalem is in fact explicitly directed to Gentile Christians, (cf. xi:13).

Similar problems arise in relation to Paul's discussion of problems which obviously relate to Gentile Christianity. There is no particular

reason why Paul should not discuss Gentile antinomianism in a letter which is addressed to Jerusalem. But it is most improbable that Paul has Jerusalem in mind when he specifically warns against antinomian behaviour as he does in Rom.vi:11.f.¹

We conclude therefore that the content and presentation of Paul's argument in Romans make it most unlikely that the letter was addressed to Jerusalem, or to Rome and Jerusalem. Although some of the contents of the letter do relate quite closely to Jerusalem, the presentation and particular address of these chapters indicate Gentile Christianity rather than Jewish or Judaism. The only real possibility we are left with is that Romans is a letter addressed to a particular situation at Rome and it is to this that we must now give more detailed attention.

Marxsen is really much too cautious in his approach to Rom.i-xi. If chs.xii-xv tell us about an actual situation which existed at Rome their connection with the previous eleven chapters is thus of crucial significance. Marxsen notes that xii:1-2 is a heading which marks the transition from a consideration of fundamental principles to that of ethics.² But surely the discussion of fundamental principles ought to have some connection with the section which deals with ethics. As Barrett points out, it is wrong to separate Paul's doctrine from his ethics and to treat the oV in v.12 as purely a transition-particle.³ It is better to regard "the mercies of God" as a summary of the content of chs.i-xi. It is on the basis of his previous argument that Paul can appeal to the Roman Christians to present themselves to God in xii:1.f.

As Marxsen rightly notes, the specific point which Paul makes in ch. xii is that Christians should not think of themselves more highly than they ought (v.3, vv.1-2 are regarded as a heading).¹ He accepts this as proof that there were in Rome those who thought of themselves more highly than others and finds confirmation of this in the discussion of the 'weak' and the 'strong' in chs.xiv-xv. It seems strange however that Marxsen sees no connection between the content of ch.xii and the high-minded Christians, wise in their own estimation whom Paul addresses in ch.xi:20,25. In our opinion there is an even closer parallel between ch.xi and chs.xiv-xv than between chs.xi and xii.

Since the unity of the letter is not in question it seems to us inconsistent to discuss the content of chs.xii-xv in relative isolation from that of chs.i-xi. If, as seems the more reasonable course, we take chs.ix-xi and xii-xv as referring to the same problem, then we find that the content of the one section illuminates that of the other and both harmonize easily to give us a reasonably clear picture of the situation to which Paul addresses himself in the whole letter. This view assumes the 'weak' Christians of chs.xiv-xv are predominantly of Jewish origin. But as this opinion has been disputed, we must take a brief look at the alternatives some scholars propose.

The fact that the 'weak' Christians in ch.xiv are apparently rather ascetic has caused much debate among scholars since a thoroughgoing ascetism was atypical in Judaism.² M. Rauer's detailed study of the 'weak' Christians

---

1. Op.cit., p.95. Käsemann also emphasizes xii:3 - "the theological foundation in v.4 makes it manifest that it is his (Paul's) intention to give the admonition of v.3 particular weight". "Worship in Everyday Life", PP, p.192.
in Rome raised many serious objections against the view that the 'weak' are of Jewish origin. If Rauer is correct in his conclusion that the 'weak' were Gentile 'Gnostics' who had retained their former vegetarianism after they became Christians, this would mean that we have an entirely Gentile congregation which Munck argues was normal for the Pauline Christian communities.

A major objection against the latter interpretation is that Paul's specific command with which he brings his parenetic section to a close presupposes two distinct parties. In xvi:8 Paul makes a basic statement concerning Christ's ministry showing that His mission was for the benefit of both Jews and Gentiles. "Christ became a servant to the circumcised to show God's truthfulness ... and in order that the Gentiles might glorify God for His mercy." The Old Testament quotations which follow continue this dual reference to Jew and Gentile. Thus it is clearly implied in vv. 8-12 that the two groups, the 'weak' and the 'strong' - who in v.7 were commanded to accept one another, comprise Jewish and Gentile Christians respectively.

The continuing emphasis in a large part of the letter upon Jew and Greek or Jew and Gentile, and our knowledge of the 'Kulturkampf' provide additional support for this understanding.

It seems that despite their variations from orthodox Judaism, the basic outlook of the 'weak' was Jewish. No doubt the 'weak' was a title

2. PSM, pp.200.f.
4. It is possible that the peculiarities of the customs of the 'weak' indicates that they were sectarians who followed differing practices from that of main-stream Judaism. Later Christian religious practices at Rome give some support to this view. Cf. M. Black, The Scrolls and Christian Origins, pp.114-5.
given to them by the self-styled 'strong' (Gentile) Christian group. The Jewish Christians probably did not consider themselves as 'weak' in any way but were possibly in a very difficult situation in the 'no-man's land' to which they were consigned, due to their differing in outlook from non-Christian Jews, and yet not being accepted by their fellow Gentile Christians. Probably some of them were 'doubters' and did not quite know which of the latter groups held a monopoly of the truth. It would appear that the Gentiles, being stronger in numbers and having a good grasp of the principles of Christian liberty (as far as their own freedom was concerned) may have attempted to force the 'weak' to act contrary to their own conscience (xiv:23).

It could also be argued that the division reflected in chs.xiv-xv took place between circumcised Gentile Christians (proselyte Christians), who kept the Law and other (Pauline) Gentile Christians, who were uncircumcised and did not regard the Law as binding. The problem with this view is that it can only remain as an open possibility; we do not appear to have any very definite proof for or against it. In this respect it is somewhat similar to Minear's view that there were five factions in the Roman Christian community. It could be argued that the debate concerning the 'Jewishness' of the Church originates not from Jewish Christians, but from

3. Richardson believes that one reason for the inclusion of the Old Testament quotations in xvi:9.f. may be because Paul seeks to eliminate Gentile domination over Jewish Christians (op.cit., p.145).
4. Marxsen holds that there were probably three kinds of Christians at Rome - Jewish, (Pauline) Gentile Christians and proselyte Christians, (p.98).
5. Cf. p.8. See also p.45 n.8, where Minear lists the particular audience which Paul has in view in the different sections of the letter.
former Gentile Christians who have adopted Judaism as well as Christianity.
Paul's favourable statements on circumcision in ii:25 and iii:1 could be re-
garded as indicating that he does not condemn these proselyte Christians who
possibly at an earlier period of the Christian mission had accepted circum-
cision. "The circumcised" in v.8 could then be taken to refer to these
proselyte Christians.

By the fact that Paul allows that circumcision is not in itself a
contradiction of Christian faith indicates that the proselyte Christians in
Rome did not regard circumcision as obligatory for all Christians.¹ It is
doubtful however if it is legitimate to understand the reference to "the
circumcised" in xv:8 as referring to proselyte Christians and not to those
of Jewish origin. The latter interpretation is much to be preferred.

If Munck's thesis that the Pauline churches were almost entirely Gent-
ile Christians could be firmly established, this would give strong support
for the view that the dispute of chs.xiv-xv was exclusively amongst Gentile
Christians. But since we are not convinced of the accuracy of Munck's op-
inion at this point, we conclude that although it is possible that such a
conflict would arise among Gentile Christians, the probability is that the
conflict took place between Christians of Jewish background and others of
Gentile origin. It is possible that the dispute concerned the place and
standing of the proselyte Christians as Marxsen rightly notes.²

1. Paul's ironic attitude towards circumcision speaks against Harder's view
that there was a conflict between Jewish and Gentile Christians on the
question of circumcision and that the latter group appealed to Paul to
help them in the dispute. "Der konkrete Anlass des Römerbriefes", ThV,
This conclusion is further substantiated by the study which we have made of the situation to which Paul addresses himself in the various sections of the letter. Although we found good grounds for the view that certain sections were primarily directed to Gentiles, there was also some evidence which was best explained by the fact that a Jewish Christian minority was being addressed.

In i:18 - ii:29 the declaration of God's judgement upon those who boasted in their own distinctive culture or moral standards indicated a situation where Christians were emphasizing their pre-Christian past and thereby maintaining old divisions.¹ We noted that Paul's treatment of all those who drew distinctions, whether Jew or Gentile, indicated his desire to draw attention away from these unprofitable discussions by blurring the distinctions themselves in the light of the gospel. Whatever the details of the actual situation, the strong emphasis upon Jew and Gentile in this section presupposes a Christian community which includes Christians of Jewish background as well as Gentile Christians.

In chs.iii-iv we came to a similar conclusion.² In this section we found indications that the priority of the Jew was a sensitive issue. The discussion of the meaning of faith and of the relation of Jewish and Gentile Christians to Abraham pointed to a community which included both Jewish and Gentile Christians. In particular the detailed discussion with the Rabbinic understanding of the Abraham tradition suggested that Jewish Christians were included in the Roman Christian community. The description of Abraham as "the father of us all" gave additional support to the view that

2. Ibid., pp.189-91.
Paul intended to stress the oneness of Jewish and Gentile Christians in the gospel. The emphasis upon Abraham's use of his body was considered as applicable to both the 'weak' and the 'strong' Christians in Rome.

The content of ch.v, though less explicit, indicated a similar situation. In chs.vi-vii a very definite reference to Gentile Christian antinomianism was noted in chs.vi:1-vii:6. The discussion of the Law in vii:7-25, particularly Paul's defence of the goodness of the Law was also seen to relate most closely to the attitude of antinomian Gentiles who failed to appreciate the divine origin of the Law.

In ch.viii we found strong support for the view that the chapter was addressed primarily to Gentile Christian 'enthusiasts'. The emphasis upon the control of the Spirit and the 'not yet' of the Spirit was felt to be best understood with reference to Gentile Christians. We noted however that the positive connection established between the Law and the Spirit could have been designed to minimize the differences between the Jewish and Gentile sections of the church. The latter view is in accord with the fact that vv.31-39 could have been intended to reassure Jewish Christians who suffered from a sense of insecurity.

In chs.ix-xi we found that although there was much in these chapters that cut across Jewish ideas of election and salvation, the main thrust of the chapters was to be found in ch.xi in the warning to Gentile Christians against a false view of election arising from a misunderstanding of God's purpose. But the pro-Jewish tone of much of these chapters, especially

2. Ibid., pp.113-9.
3. Ibid., pp.293-303.
4. Ibid., pp.302-3.
5. Ibid., pp.438-9.
the Christological understanding of the Law in xiv and the emphasis upon the continuity of the people of God convinced us that the admonition to Gentile Christians could best be understood in a context similar to that described in chs.xiv-xv, i.e. a situation where a Gentile Christian majority are called upon to accept and live in harmony with a Jewish-Christian minority. The fact that in the conclusion to the doctrinal section of the letter, Paul took pains to relate Jew and Gentile together in the divine purpose,¹ was seen to be clear proof that in emphasizing the theme of the relation of Jewish and Gentile Christians to each other, we had not mistaken Paul's purpose in writing.

This then is the situation to which Paul addresses himself in his letter to the Romans. The basic problem concerns the relation of Jews and Gentiles in the new aeon. In view of this, it is clear that Paul's theology and mission were of crucial significance in this dispute at Rome. Whether directly or indirectly Paul, as the Jewish apostle to the Gentiles, could not avoid being implicated in the dispute. The conclusion of the collection project and his own journey to Jerusalem to deliver it, was another important reason for his being implicated in the situation at Rome.

The fact that Paul is on his way to visit Jerusalem with the collection, instead of visiting Rome to support the views of the liberal Gentile Christians may have proved to be the last straw for the latter group, who no doubt considered Paul as their ally in the local conflict. Paul may also have been drawn into the dispute by the realization that the whole impact of his offering in Jerusalem would be lost if extremists claiming to represent

his theological viewpoint were encouraging anti-semitic activities at Rome. It is also likely that strife recurring in Rome would have severe repercussions for Jews, for the Pauline churches and for the proposed mission in Spain.

From this survey we conclude that when chs.i-xv are interpreted as a unity there emerges a picture of a specific situation in Rome where it is imperative for Paul to intervene. The conflict there was of such a nature and of such seriousness that it required a letter, in some ways similar to a theological treatise in order to deal with it adequately. The situation was such that a comprehensive discussion of the purpose of God for Jews and Gentiles was necessitated.¹

If any coherent picture of the Roman Gentile Christians emerges it is that of a group who exhibited certain characteristics best described as incipient Marcionism.² The despising of the Jewish way of life, particularly the Law, and the tendency to play down the historical antecedents of the church in Judaism, have closest parallels with Marcion even though he cannot be credited with the origin of the tendency at the period in which Paul is writing. But wherever Christians think of themselves as the 'New Creation' in too radical a fashion the shades of 'Marcionism' begin to appear.³

Jewett notes that the attitudes of these Christians were typical of pneumatic and gnostic groups in the Hellenistic church.⁴ Their proud self-consciousness as exhibited in their scorn for the 'weak' in faith is

¹. Richardson entitles his chapter on Romans - "Romans: Paul's interpretation of God's Purpose", (p.126). E. Best, although he holds that Romans was written to prepare for Paul's visit, also notes that the letter concerns the relationship of Jewish and Gentile Christians, The Letter of Paul to the Romans, p.6.
². Cf. Thesis, pp.118 n.5; 426 n.3 and 516.
⁴. Cf. pp.46.f.
particularly striking. No doubt the tendency to misuse their bodies and to believe that they possessed a superior insight into spiritual matters originated from this.\(^1\) Jewett finds it significant that the description of the body of Christ in Rom.xii is placed between the warning against the libertins to think more highly of themselves than they ought (v.3) and the discussion of the charisma (vv.6.f.). He considers that it leads one "to the suspicion that Paul may be guarding against some self-flattering implications which a libertinistic, enthusiastic group might draw from the 'body of Christ' concept."\(^2\) Jewett feels that some such hypothesis is necessary to explain why Paul avoids the identification of the church with Christ in Rom.xii.

Lütgert is probably correct in his view that it is Gentile Christians whom Paul warns against revolutionary tendencies in Rom.xiii. He is also correct to see this not as a general discussion of a Christian's duty to the State, but as a reference to a specific problem at Rome.\(^3\) It is of course possible that Jewish Christians in Rome were tempted to share in the aspirations of the Zealot movement. But from what we have already noted of their antinomian tendencies, it seems more likely that it is Gentile Christians who in this respect as in many others are repudiating Jewish tradition, of which Paul's teaching in this chapter is fairly representative.\(^4\) This Gentile Christianity was "not only independent of apostolic authority in particular, but proud of its freedom from authority in general."\(^5\) Apart from

---

2. Ibid., pp.303-4.  
their attitude to law in general, any other reason for rebelling against the
government is hard to find. Possibly some specific incident in the conflict
between Jews and Gentiles in Rome helped to spark it off.

We may sum up this description of the 'strong' Gentile Christians by
listing their characteristics: they were anti-Jewish and antinomian; they
were proudly self-conscious, boasting in their freedom, power, and wisdom; as
in many other matters they were radicals in their attitudes to the State,
potential revolutionaries.

It is more difficult to describe in detail the 'weak' Jewish Christians. We have noted references to what appears to us to be persecution or
the possibility of persecution in Rom.v and viii.¹ Perhaps the Jewish
Christians were suffering because of divided loyalties, torn between their
roots in Judaism and their common faith with Gentile Christians, who despis-
ed and ostracized them.

It is probable that they wanted to understand the meaning of faith
from a Jewish point of view² and were not open-minded enough as far as the
recognition of the freedom of Gentile Christians was concerned. It is
likely that they had a tendency to condemn the behaviour of those who dis-
agreed with them, thereby setting themselves up as the judge of another's
conscience. But as far as we can discover much of the Jewish Christian's
behaviour can be understood as a legitimate, though exaggerated, reaction
to Gentile Christians who were lacking in a concept of the people of God in
history and of the control which Christian faith ought to exercise of one's
freedom.

   pp. 48.f.
We base this opinion on the fact that Paul's strongest admonitions in the climax of the parenetic section (xv:8.f.) are specifically directed to Gentile Christians. We do not hold that Romans is a letter addressed equally to Jewish and Gentile Christians; we regard it as primarily addressed to the Gentile Christian majority. This is partly because their deficiencies were the main source of the conflict and also because they, being in the majority, were in a better position to heal the division between themselves and the Jewish Christians. This they could achieve by recognizing the conscience, freedom and faith of their 'weaker' brethren, in short, by acknowledging the importance of a united Christian community and for the sake of this, limiting their own personal freedom.

Although we have not come to any very clear conclusions concerning the specific beliefs of the two Christian groups in Rome, we do not regard this as a serious problem. That there was a division and that it was based on ethnic or racial distinctions is clear. In this respect these Christians were conforming to the world around them and not evaluating life from the new perspective of faith (cf.xii:2).

Because of the renewed interest in recent studies in the actual situation depicted in Rom.xiv-xv,¹ no doubt a better understanding of the views of the different groups will soon emerge.² But for the purpose of this

1. Marxsen was one of the first of modern interpreters to emphasize the significance of these chapters for the interpretation of the letter. H.W. Bartsch also emphasized the historical reference of the entire letter. In this he has recently been followed by Minear, and, to a lesser extent, Jewett. Although Minear follows the main lines of the approach previously suggested by Bartsch, he nowhere acknowledges his debt to him.

2. Jewett calls for a renewed discussion of the problems raised by Rauer's study, (p.44).
study, it is sufficient that the general outline of the situation is clear, i.e. the fact that there was a division between Jewish and Gentile Christians which was caused chiefly by the latter. This was proving to be extremely detrimental to the Christian community in Rome but was even more serious in that it was likely to lead to repercussions in Jerusalem and throughout the church.

We conclude that the main problem in the Christian community at Rome was a division between Jewish and Gentile Christians. It was this situation that led Paul to discuss the purpose of God for both Jew and Gentile as revealed in the gospel.¹

¹ Baur was convinced that Paul would not have devoted such a large part of his epistle to the relation of Judaism and heathenism to each other (and of both to Christianity) if circumstances in the church at Rome had not prompted him to do so. Cf. Thesis, p.314 n.1.
(f) Rom.ix-xi as the Climax of Paul's Argument in Rom.i-xi.

From the conclusion of the previous section it is clear that chs.ix-xi must represent the climax of Paul's thought in the letter as it is in these chapters that the purpose of God for Jew and Gentile is most fully discussed. At this point our interpretation parts company with that of Minear, although we agree generally with his emphasis upon chs.xiv-xv. It must be stressed that Paul was a theologian even though he was a very 'practical' one. What Minear has failed to realize is that the theological basis for the exhortations to unity etc. in chs.xiv-xv has already been laid in chs. ix-xi. Although Minear is correct in his complaint that commentators in general pay too little attention to chs.xii-xvi of Romans,¹ a similar criticism can be levelled against his own study in that he devotes only one eleventh of his book to chs.ix-xi which actually comprise more than onefifth of the letter.²

But it is not only because Paul discusses the purpose of God in chs. ix-xi that we regard these chapters as the apex of his argument. When we glance back over the structure and content of chs.i-viii, there are ample indications that the first eight chapters of the letter were written for the sake of chs.ix-xi and not vice-versa. If we view Romans as a theological exposition of the kerygma describing the means of justification, and the life of the justified, then it becomes necessary to regard chs.iii:21-viii as the centre of the letter which reaches its climax at the end of ch.viii.

---

1. Minear notes that Nygren gives one twenty-fifth of his space to chs. xiv-xvi - the last one sixth of the text (p.6).
2. Minear assigns ten pages out of the total one hundred and ten to chs.ix-xi (pp.72-81).
We have shown however that the break between chs.viii and ix is not so decisive as it might seem at first glance.\textsuperscript{1} It seems to us that any interpretation which has the effect of causing chs.ix-xi to be regarded as an appendix of secondary importance has not fully understood Paul's argument in the letter.\textsuperscript{2} It is most unlikely that an appendix would be inserted after the 'climax' of the doctrinal section in ch.viii and before the parenetic section in ch.xii.

More decisive still is the fact that the kerygmatic or declarative sections of the latter can be shown to arise out of the argumentative sections in the question/objection style.\textsuperscript{3} Since we found that the objections are not merely hypothetical but that these ought to be regarded as of primary importance in the discussion of the purpose of the letter,\textsuperscript{4} this also indicates that the climax of Paul's argument is more likely to be found in a section in this style - where he relates to actual issues at Rome, than in sections in the kerygmatic pattern. The study of argumentative and kerygmatic styles of argument indicated a close connection between chs.iii, vi-vii and ix-xi.\textsuperscript{5} In particular the fact that Paul lists in iii:1.f. a number of questions to be answered later in the letter, and that most of these are not dealt with until chs.ix-xi,\textsuperscript{6} also gives support for the view that Paul's argument progresses steadily to its high-point in chs.ix-xi.

That ch.viii is not the high-point of the epistle is also indicated by a consideration of the Jew-Gentile theme. R.H. Fuller has rightly noted

2. Ibid. pp.311-2, also p.140.
3. Ibid. pp.118-9, 68-9, also pp.144-6.
the significant part played by the Law in the argument of Romans.\(^1\) When the Law is seen as that which separated Jew from Gentile, then we are able to give chs. i-ii their proper place in the letter and also to give some reason for the continuous discussion of Law which runs throughout chs. i-xi.

We have already noted the absence of the Jew-Gentile theme in chs. v-viii.\(^2\) It would appear that this omission is not accidental but deliberately intended.\(^3\) It should also be noted that the fact that the Law continues to play a dominant role in these chapters means that the Jew-Gentile theme is not entirely foreign to the context. But the latter is not explicitly mentioned, and this means that if we emphasize the importance of the Jew-Gentile theme in Romans, then a definite unity in subject-matter is observable throughout chs. i-iv, ix-xi and xiv-xv; the result is that chs. v-viii, viewed from this angle, may be regarded as somewhat of a parenthesis.\(^4\) If a choice had to be made between putting chs. v-viii in parenthesis and regarding chs. ix-xi as an appendix, the total content of the letter would indicate that the former course is the more preferable.

However, when we regard chs. ix-xi as the climax of Paul's letter, we do not thereby depreciate the kerygmatic sections of the letter, particularly chs. v and viii. We believe that chs. ix-xi are the climax of Paul's


\(^2\) Cf. Thesis p.185.

\(^3\) Ibid. pp.185-7 and 63-4.

argument, and that this view gives the previous chapters an important and necessary function.

We have noted that to consider Rom.viii as the climax of the letter has the adverse effect of causing chs.ix-xi to be regarded as an appendix. This fact, we believe, indicates that justification by faith is not the theme of the letter.¹ If however we reverse the procedure and ask whether chs.ix-xi require chs.i-viii, the answer must be given in the affirmative.

The declaration in i:18-ii:29 of God's judgement upon both Jew and Gentile is designed to show that neither the Jewish Christian nor the Gentile has grounds for boasting over his pre-Christian past.² The connection of this theme with ch.xi is to be seen both in the warning against Gentile Christians boasting over the fate of Israel (vv.13.f.) and in the concluding verses of the same chapter where Paul states that God consigned all men to disobedience in order that He might have mercy upon all, (v.32). The discussion of 'the true Jew', the deliberate blurring of the distinctions between Jew and Gentile, and the question of the advantage of the Jew in the first three chapters have clear parallels in chs.ix-xi.³

It is helpful for us at this point to consider the reason for Paul's inclusion in iii:21.f. of the kerygmatic exposition of the Christ event. This event demonstrates God's covenant faithfulness as the basis on which salvation has already come to the Gentiles and on which Israel's eventual

¹. We do not adopt this position for the same reason as A. Schweitzer who considered that the doctrine of justification was only a "fragment" in the apostle's total gospel. Cf. The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, ET 1931, pp.226 and 294.f. The interpretation of Schläffer succeeds in maintaining the centrality of the doctrine of justification by faith and also in giving some kind of unified interpretation to chs.i-xi. Cf. Thesis, pp.307 and 140.
salvation as outlined in ch.xi, is to be expected. But the immediate use which Paul makes of this declaration in iii:21.f. is to demonstrate that a new aeon has dawned in which "there is no distinction".¹ The revelation of God's righteousness apart from Law means the removal of all possible grounds for boasting, and the positive demonstration that God is one, now seen to be truly God both of Jew and Gentile. The declaration of God's redemptive act in Christ has rendered groundless the conflict between Jew and Gentile, since both are equally dependent on His grace.

The fact that Paul in iii:25.f. reinterprets ancient Jewish Christian tradition for the sake of emphasizing that 'Now' "there is no distinction" does not mean that he rejects the priority of the Jew, a basic element in this tradition.² In iii:1-2 and in the story of Abraham in ch.iv Paul continues to acknowledge the special standing of the Jew in a manner in keeping with the conclusions which he eventually reaches in ch.xi. As we have already drawn attention to the close parallels between ch.iv and chs.ix-xi³ it is sufficient at this point simply to note the fact Paul's argument in Rom.iv does not reach its full conclusion until ch.xi.

The connection between ch.v and chs.ix-xi is more difficult to define. It should be noted however that the emphasis on the universal and cosmological effects of Adam's sin (and Christ's redemption) is not dissimilar to that of ch.xi where apocalyptic expectation looks for the salvation of the 'full number' of both Jews and Gentiles as a prelude to the consummation of all things (life from the dead, xi:15). The emphasis upon human

---

solidarity in Adam or in Christ is similar to the content of xi:32 and doubtless has a similar function i.e. to demonstrate the oneness of humanity in sin and in salvation.1

The connections of chs.vi and vii with ix-xi are clearer. It is noteworthy that the list of topics in the excursus of iii:1-8, although it includes primarily those themes which are discussed in chs.ix-xi, also includes a reference to antinomianism which is eventually answered in chs.vi-vii.2 This we have taken to indicate that the Roman Gentile Christians were deficient in their understanding of the Law in somewhat the same way as they were deficient in their understanding of the place of the Jews in 'Heilsgeschichte'.3

It is significant that the failure to appreciate the divine origin of the Law and the tendency to antinomianism are fully in keeping with the kind of Gentile pride that we find in ch.xi. Christians who are very conscious of being the new people of God, who pride themselves on their own liberal understanding of faith and freedom and who fail to appreciate their continuity with Israel, are the kind of people among whom the deficiencies noted in chs.vi-vii are likely to occur. We may take chs.ix-xi as denoting the basic weakness of these Christians (i.e. a mistaken view of election and reprobation) and chs.vi-vii to represent certain outward manifestations of the attitude which is more fully described in ch.xi, (and chs.xiv-xv).

A parallel to the warnings against antinomianism is found in ch.viii in the exhortations to live according to the Spirit and not according to the flesh. A positive understanding of the Law is indicated by the state-

2. Ibid. pp.69 and 131-2.
ment in vii:4 where the δικαίωμα of the Law is said to be fulfilled in those who walk according to the Spirit.\footnote{1} This positive statement is similar to that of ch.x:4 where Christ is described as the τέλος of the Law, the One who fulfills the Law and thereby supersedes it.\footnote{2}

The emphasis upon the relation of the Spirit and the Law taken along with the relation of Christ to the Law represent the high-point of Paul's teaching on the Law in the letter to the Romans.\footnote{3} These two statements supplement one another and are particularly useful in helping us to put into perspective Paul's numerous statements about the Law which he has already made earlier in the letter.\footnote{4} Without x:4, we would lack a very important Christological and 'heilsgeschichtlich' understanding of the role of the Law. We have already noted that the affirmation of the security of the Christian community within the divine election, as mentioned in vii:28.f., demands a discussion of the apparent failure of the election of Israel such as we find in chs.ix-xi.\footnote{4}

This brief survey has shown, in our opinion, that to regard chs.ix-xi as the climax of the letter gives co-ordination and relevance to the entire letter in a way which the emphasis upon justification by faith is unable to achieve.

One other feature of Rom.ix-xi is relevant to the evaluation of the significance of these chapters. The fact that this long discussion of Jewish unbelief with its hopeful conclusion is unique in the Pauline letters ought not to be overlooked.\footnote{5} Paul's inclusion of this particular subject

\footnotesize{
2. Ibid. pp.361.f.
4. Ibid., p.326.
}
in the letter to the Romans indicates, we believe, that whereas in other areas the subject was not relevant, the situation at Rome was such that this discussion was necessitated. If this is so, then we have here another reason for stressing the importance of the theme of Jew and Gentile in Romans, and thus for regarding chs.ix-xi as of decisive importance since they represent Paul's deepest thoughts on this subject.

We endorse Baur's contention that what comes first in Romans is not necessarily first in importance. This is possibly what Marxsen had in mind in his assertion that it is only towards the end that Romans discloses itself as a real letter. The essence of the letter was such that an extensive preliminary discussion was required in chs.i-viii before Paul could deal with the basic issue in chs.ix-xi and thus provide the theological basis for the exhortations to humility and mutual acceptance in chs.xii-xv.

Despite the error of his philosophical presuppositions, Baur was correct in his claim that in chs.ix-xi we should find "the germ and centre of the whole, from which the other parts sprang", and that it is in these chapters that we can discover "the Apostle's original conception from which the whole organism of the Epistle developed, as we have it especially in the first eight chapters."

5. Ibid.
Conclusion.

On the basis of our investigation we conclude that Paul writes the letter to the Romans in order to correct a misunderstanding of the gospel, which is hindering the formation of a united Christian community in Rome. Paul's basic intention in writing the letter is to emphasize the oneness of Jewish and Gentile Christians in Christ and thus to encourage fellowship between them. The fact that Paul's argument reaches its climax in chs.ix-xi, and the repeated emphasis upon Jew and Gentile throughout the letter require some such understanding of its purpose.

From the survey of the various interpretations in the earlier parts of this chapter, we have come to the conclusion that no other interpretation of the letter provides an adequate understanding of its content and destination. In particular we wish to draw attention to several important emphases throughout the letter which point, we believe, in the direction of the interpretation suggested.

In the thematic verses, i:16-17, we find the strange phrase 'to the Jew first'. The fact that this phrase occurs only in Romans, the letter in which we find also the unique discussion of Jewish disobedience in chs.ix-xi, suggests that the place of the Jew in the divine economy is of special significance in this letter. Questions concerning the value of circumcision and the advantage of the Jew, occurring in conjunction with the assertion that there is no distinction and the frequent repetition of the word 'all', endorse this point of view. The paradoxical situation where a letter which emphasizes the priority of the Jew and concludes with the revelation that 'all Israel' will eventually be saved, is sent to Christians who are for the most part of Gentile origin, also requires an explanation of
its purpose in terms of the relationship of Jew and Gentile.¹

The most significant point in favour of the view that the theme of Romans concerns the relationship between Jew and Gentile is that this is the subject for the climax of Paul's parenetic section in ch.xv:7.² His final command to the Roman Christians is to "welcome one another as Christ has welcomed you", (xv:7). Even in a section such as this where Paul is seeking to emphasize the oneness of all believers in Christ, we find the same tension which we have already noted in the earlier chapters, i.e. between the assertion of no distinctions and the acknowledgement of the different origins of the two constituent groups.³

The significance which Paul places upon this command to accept one another is demonstrated by the fact that he supports it by a long 'haraz' which centres around the key words ἀλογί and ἔθνη.³ The latter term retains its reference to the Jewish people and the point of the quotations is to relate Jews and Gentiles together in the praise of God. Paul wishes to emphasize that the salvation of Gentiles does not take place in isolation from Israel but only in association with the historical people of God. Here again we note the repeated emphasis upon the two groups in association with each other.

It should be borne in mind that the grounds on which Paul calls upon the Roman Christians to accept one another are basically those which he has previously established in the discussion in chs.ix-xi.⁴ In opposition to the view that the Gentile Christians have replaced Israel as the people of

2. As we have previously noted, cf. Thesis p.480.
3. Paul quotes from the Law, (Deut.xxxii:43), the Writings (Ps.xviii:49 = II Sam.xxii:50), and the Prophets (Is.xi:10). Cf. Richardson, p.144.
God, Paul argues that God's purpose is to win the Jews by means of the Gentiles. This is supported by the example of Paul's own mission. Although as apostle to the Gentiles, he is particularly concerned about Gentile Christians such as those in Rome, this does not mean that he is unconcerned about the salvation of Israel. On the contrary, Paul believes that success in the Gentile mission is specifically intended to win the Jews by making them jealous (xi:13-14). The fact that Paul is the apostle to the Gentiles does not mean that he betrays his vocation by evangelising Jews; exactly the opposite is true, he magnifies his ministry (xi:13). This is borne out by the fact that Paul thinks of himself as a priest who offers up the Gentiles (xv:16.f.). The purpose of this offering is the ultimate conversion of Israel.\footnote{Cf. Richardson, p.146.}

The concluding summary of chaptersix-xi (xi:28-32) demonstrates that Jews and Gentiles are inextricably related in the purpose of God. Both alike travel to the goal of salvation by the route that leads through disobedience and both are therefore equally dependent on divine grace. The call to mutual acceptance involves for the Roman Christians the free and gracious reception of one another in the same way as Christ has received them.

In xv:8.f. Paul substantiates his argument for Christian unity by showing that the mission of Christ was directed to both Jews and Gentiles, "Christ became a servant to the circumcised to show God's truthfulness, and in order that the Gentiles might glorify God for His mercy". The fact that Paul argues for unity on the basis of the ministry of Christ shows the seriousness with which he regarded the division in the Christian community. This of itself is proof that Paul considered the problem of sufficient magnitude as to require the writing of a letter such as that to the Romans. No doubt
Paul saw in the attitude of the Roman Christians a general tendency symptomatic of Gentile Christianity. The subsequent history of the early church demonstrates both the accuracy of Paul's diagnosis of the tendency and the necessity for his warnings against it.

The view that the purpose of Romans is to bring about unity in the Roman Christian community is also supported by Paul's use of the Abraham tradition in ch.iv. Abraham is described as the pioneer of faith, the father of both Jewish and Gentile Christians; Jews and Gentiles alike share within the community of faith which began with Abraham, the promises made to their common ancestor. The figure of Abraham is particularly fitting for Paul's argument in Romans. Who better to unite a group of 'weak' Jewish Christians and 'strong' Gentile Christians than Abraham, who believed as a Gentile but was regarded as the first Jew, who was weak but who through faith became strong? Paul believes that God's purpose was to make Abraham "the father of all who believe without being circumcised and who thus have righteousness reckoned to them, and likewise the father of the circumcised who are not merely circumcised but also follow the example of the faith which our father Abraham had before he was circumcised." (iv:11-12).

Whereas Christ and Abraham witness to the unity of God's people in grace, the figure of Adam in Rom.v witnesses to the unity of all men in sin. The emphasis upon the universal consequences of Adam's disobedience may be seen as a counter-argument against those who would emphasize distinctions among men. Viewed in this light the thrust of this chapter is similar to the emphasis on the universality of the divine wrath and judgement declared in i:18-iii:20.

To counteract Paul's argument for the unity of all men in sin as the
result of Adam's disobedience, the Jews might have argued that the possession of the Law set them apart from others. But Paul shows that because of the interaction between the Law and sinful humanity the good Law which was meant for life becomes instead "the law of sin and death" (viii:2). The emphasis that in Christ salvation is now available to faith "apart from law" (iii:21), may be seen as a declaration of the basis for the unity of Jew and Gentile in faith in the new aeon.

What is significant, however, is that Paul does not establish the unity of Jew and Gentile in salvation simply by declaring the termination of the Law in the Christ-event. If Paul had done this he might have encouraged the incipient Marcionism inherent in the Roman Gentile Christians. On the contrary, it is by a positive appreciation of the Law that Paul in Romans encourages unity within the church. If, as Goppelt has claimed, the crucial problem for Gentile Christianity was the relation of Christ to the Old Testament,¹ it would be essential for one who wished to establish harmony between Jewish and Gentile Christians to stress the positive connections between the Old Testament and Christ, (as Paul does most effectively in Romans). We have in this a possible reason for the frequent quotation of the Old Testament throughout the letter. In the paradoxical expressions "the law of faith" (iii:27),² "the law of the Spirit" (viii:2),³ and Christ "the τέλος of the law" (x:4),⁴ Paul demonstrates a positive understanding of the continuity between the Testaments.

The fact that Paul can associate the Law with faith and with the

---

Spirit is indicative of the positive understanding of the past history of the Jews which he desires the Gentile Christians to appropriate. This is even clearer in his Christological understanding of the Law in x:4.f.

Whilst Paul declares that Christ is the end of the Law because a new aeon has dawned, he sees Him as the end of the Law only because He is its fulfillment and goal. It follows that if the Christ whom Gentile Christians know through faith is the fulfilment of the Law of Judaism, then it would not be fitting for them to despise the Law or its adherents. Similarly, if the Christ whom Jewish Christians serve accepts Gentiles freely without obligating them to keep the Law, then Jewish Christians ought to accept these Gentiles as equals since they live in Christ in whom the Law is fulfilled, and by whose Spirit the Law is fulfilled in them.

If Paul's intention in Romans had been simply to outline the benefits of redemption in Christ, it would not have been essential for him to reinterpret the Law or to discuss the future of the Jews. Nor would it have been so necessary to stress the continuity of salvation history between the Law and Christ, between the Law and the Spirit, between Old Testament Israel and the people of God in the new aeon.

But precisely because it was his intention to evaluate the special place of the Jew in 'Heilsgeschichte' Paul had to interpret the present in the light of a positive appreciation of the past. Only in this way could he avoid the criticism that he was anti-Jewish. The situation at Rome where a Jewish Christian minority was in danger of being dominated by a Gentile majority caused him to give a positive evaluation of the advantage of the Jew in the light of the gospel. The situation was such that only by a

positive evaluation of the Old Testament could Paul hope to establish unity between the Jewish and Gentile Christian groups in Rome.

By this emphasis Paul also provided the strongest possible argument for the unity of the people of God both at the time of writing and throughout all ages. The appreciation of this unity is a basic prerequisite for understanding the nature of the church and was especially relevant to the formation of a united Christian community at Rome. The fact that there is no specific mention of the church and that Paul in Romans seems deliberately to avoid explicit reference to matters of church government or organisation suggest that this was a delicate issue in Rome. It was so delicate that Paul could only approach it in a covert way.

While Paul's teaching concerning the nature of the church is not explicit this does not mean to say that it is not basic to the letter. As Leenhardt has noted, the discussion of the people of God in chs.ix-xi is essentially a discussion of the origin and composition of the church.¹ The inclusion of the allegory of the olive tree with its emphasis upon the unity and continuity of God's people in the old and new aeon presupposes that Paul was aware of a basic deficiency in the Roman Christian community which this emphasis was designed to meet. The fact that Paul's teaching concerns the nature of the church and that he at the same time avoids explicit mention of the church throughout the letter, is also evidence for the view that there was a serious division in the Christian community at Rome.

In order to clarify the progress of our argument it will be useful at this stage to summarize its course up to this point. We have noted that

the recurring theme throughout Romans of Jews and Gentiles in association with each other suggests that Paul's purpose in writing was to overcome a division between two groups of Christians of differing backgrounds. The use of the figures of Abraham and Adam support this opinion and likewise the interpretation of the mission of Christ and that of Paul as directed to both Jews and Gentiles. Paul's positive understanding of the Law and his emphasis upon the continuity of God's people also suggest a similar purpose for the letter. It seems to us that there is substantial support in the letter for the interpretation which we have suggested. Furthermore it is particularly significant that our conclusion can relate to the content of all of chs.i-xi, particularly to Paul's treatment of the Law which is such a dominant theme in these chapters.

We now wish to indicate how the interpretation suggested meets those basic requirements which we have already noted in the earlier sections of this chapter as essential to a full understanding of the aim and occasion of the letter.

If Paul's intention in writing is to relate Jew and Gentile together in the purpose of God with a view to the formation of a united church in Rome, then this interpretation fits in well with what we know of his situation at the time of writing. No doubt thoughts concerning the election of Israel and the relationship of Jew and Gentile in the divine purpose were in the forefront of Paul's mind as he embarked for Jerusalem. The emphasis that Gentiles cannot find salvation independently of Israel is appropriate at a time when Paul is attempting, by the presentation of the collection, to

---

express the indebtedness of Gentiles to Israel and to strengthen their ties with the mother church. The argument of xv:27 that since the Gentile Christians have come to share in the spiritual blessings of Israel, the latter ought also to share in their material blessings, is particularly relevant in the context of Paul's labours on behalf of the collection.

While the proposed interpretation acknowledges a connection between Romans and Paul's journey to Jerusalem, it also provides the equivalence between the purpose of the letter and the proposed visit to Rome which Klein regards as desirable.¹ Paul's letter represents the presence of the apostle to the congregation — a substitute, for his bodily presence. It carries his authority and is designed to influence the situation in Rome in the same way as Paul himself would do if he were present in person.²

According to our interpretation, the letter has the same aim as Paul's future visit to the city — to build up the church in the faith and to heal divisions etc. This view implies that the division among the Roman Christians was probably of recent origin.³ If it had been of some years duration, Paul would not have allowed his visit there to be delayed as he had done. Had it not been for the fact that Paul felt his first duty was to go to Jerusalem with the collection, he would certainly have hastened immediately to Rome to seek to overcome the division within the Christian community, and doubtless, what he would have said on arrival in Rome would be the same as what he has written in his letter.

This understanding of the nature of the problem at Rome also helps to

---

2. Ibid., pp.5 and 447.
3. This is in accord with our investigation of the general historical situation. Cf. Thesis, pp.474-5.
explain a certain peculiarity in Paul's approach to it as indicated by the content of the letter, which in some respects is analogous to a theological treatise. The fact that Paul wrote a 'theological treatise' to counteract it implies the existence of a problem in Rome of sufficient magnitude to evoke this response. This is in keeping with the situation as we have envisaged it.

The nature of the division in Rome meant that it was of far greater seriousness than that which had previously threatened the church at Corinth. The local problem at Rome was also a Jerusalem problem; it was an issue which concerned the whole church. The cultural conflict that was prevalent throughout the Roman Empire at this time wherever there were large concentrations of Jews made the problem at Rome of much greater significance than any other kind of division within the church. If reports were to come to Jerusalem that 'Pauline' Christians at Rome were persecuting or despising the Jews (or Jewish Christians) this would have effectively hindered the good relations which Paul hoped the collection would secure. If Paul's life were in danger in Jerusalem as he rightly suspected it was, then a deterioration in the situation at Rome could have swung the balance completely against him. Another possibility is that an outbreak of trouble between Jewish and Gentile Christians in Rome, following on the troubles of A.D. 49 would possibly have led to legislation against Jews or Christians, or even against both, and effectively hindered the outreach of the church. For yet another time Paul's visit to Rome would be prevented and hence also his proposed mission to Spain.

Thus the local dispute was not merely local and certainly not trivial. It could have sabotaged the results of Paul's labour on the collection
project on which he had worked for several years. It could have jeopardised both Paul's own personal safety and the unity which he was endeavouring to maintain between the two sections of the church. If strife were to arise in Rome Paul's own missionary work and that of the whole church would suffer.

In addition to these, an even more serious aspect of the problem at Rome was that the faithfulness of God and the righteousness of His purpose were at stake. To a Jewish Christian this was no light issue. How could a God who had elected a people for Himself allow this people to miss the goal which He had planned for them? How could men trust in One whose word did not accomplish what He had promised? The thought of a God who apparently arbitrarily transferred His promises and replaced one elect people by another was entirely unacceptable to Paul. So too was a church which regarded itself as a 'creatio ex nihilo', and did not appreciate the origins of that heritage to which it had become heir.

Another factor helps to account for the seriousness with which Paul viewed the situation at Rome. This is that it was likely to recur elsewhere throughout the church in which Gentile Christians, lacking in an appreciation of the roots of the church in Judaism, were now increasingly in the majority.

From this we can appreciate better why Paul wrote a letter such as that to the Romans. It was the magnitude of the problem in Rome which determined the content of the letter. The nature of the problem was such that Paul believed that only a proper understanding of the righteous purpose of God for both Jew and Gentile would resolve it.
But in order to deal with the purpose of God Paul had to take into account the divine activity in the history of the nation of Israel, in the Christ-event and in the missionary expansion of the church. Thus in Rom. i-viii he discusses themes such as the Law, the revelation of the righteousness of God in Christ, justification by faith, and the gift of the Spirit. But it is only in Rom.ix-xi that Paul reaches the climax of his discussion which centres around the theme of the people of God, and the purpose of God in election.

This helps us to understand the content and structure of Rom.i-xi. More than any other letter Romans, takes the form of a continuous argument which, as we have noted in the previous section, gradually progresses to its climax in chs.ix-xi. It does not deal with a series of topics more or less unrelated to each other, as for example I Corinthians. The connection between the various themes which we have already noted that Paul deals with in chs.i-viii, is the fact that together they comprise a necessary preliminary to Paul's argument in chs.ix-xi. A theological understanding of the purpose of God in election requires an appraisal of these themes, since they are all included and gain their relative significance within the scope of that purpose.

Thus chs.i-viii are, in this sense, preparatory to chs.ix-xi. As we have already noted in the previous section, this does not mean that they are unnecessary or unimportant. They are a vital and essential part of Paul's total argument. But what ought to be realized is that since they form part of an argument, the climax of which comes only in the succeeding chapters, their content cannot adequately be understood in isolation from these chapters. While chs.i-viii may be regarded as preliminary, it should
be stressed that they do have a direct bearing on the actual situation at Rome. We have already expressed disagreement with the view that they have only an indirect connection with the situation.¹ To describe the function of chs.i-viii within Paul's argument as preliminary, does not necessarily imply that they have no connection with the historical circumstances in the church at Rome.

This understanding of the nature of the argument in Romans also helps to explain a feature of the letter to which Bornkamm has drawn attention, i.e. that a number of themes which have already been dealt with in earlier letters are discussed here in more detail and are given a universal application.² Although we do not agree with the latter point, we believe that our suggestion as to the relation of the individual themes and the discussion of the purpose of God, adequately explains the former. The difference in treatment of themes previously discussed is partly due to the fact that in Romans they are connected with, and subservient to, the one theme which is unique in the letter, i.e. the discussion of the people and the purpose of God in chs.ix-xi.

In our conclusions concerning the argument of Rom.i-xi, we have been able to take into account and give an explanation of some of its problems or peculiarities noted by other scholars.³ We have found that the sustained argument of chs.i-xi is in keeping with the view that Paul's intention in writing was to set forth the purpose of God for Jew and Gentile, so as

---

³ Cf. our assertion that the view that Romans is a real letter to Rome takes into account the advantages of other interpretations. (Thesis, p.456).
to unite both in one fellowship. The fact that in this interpretation an
equivalence is established between the purpose of the letter and Paul's
visit to Rome, and also between the purpose of the letter and Paul's visit
to Jerusalem with the collection, is further indication that this is a valid
interpretation.

Before concluding we wish to note one other factor which may have
influenced the thought of the letter. Since Romans is a particular letter
addressed to a specific situation, its teaching is only intelligible in the
light of that situation. Paul's situation and that to which he addresses
the letter help to explain what succeeding generations have found incompre-
hensible, namely that Paul should still hope for the salvation of 'all Is-
rael'. If we remember that Paul was faced with a Gentile Christianity
which regarded the Jews as rejected, then we will appreciate that he had no
alternative but to maintain that this was not the case. Positively, he was
also obligated to emphasize that his own experience of God's faithfulness
and grace persuaded him that Israel's unbelief could not be permanent. The
fact that his hopes were not or have not yet been realized does not mean
they were ill-founded. For a first-century Jewish Christian faced with the
paradoxical fact of the unbelief of his fellow Jews, and of God's grace to
him, "the chief of sinners", this was the only possible answer.

If he appears to have been over-optimistic, we should bear in mind
that the situation at Rome demanded exactly this emphasis, and also the sad
fact that later generations of Christians have shown themselves only too
willing to believe in Israel's rejection despite all that Paul has said to
the contrary.

In the course of this study we have come to realize that one of the
most tantalizing and confusing factors in Romans is the way in which a tension is maintained between two apparently opposing principles throughout the argument, i.e. between 'There is no distinction' and 'To the Jew first'. In the latter of these a certain priority is still accorded to the Jew which is apparently denied in the former. There exists the very real danger of stressing one of these principles in isolation from the other, and thereby obtaining an interpretation which is only valid for part of the letter. Goppelt¹ and Richardson² are exceptional in their clear recognition of this tension in Romans, and in their refusal to lightly dismiss the advantage of Israel.

From this we realize that it is inadequate to describe the theme of Romans as 'Salvation is by faith and therefore there is no longer any distinction between Jew and Gentile'. When we talk of faith and affirm that there is no distinction among men, we are still speaking too anthropologically. Certain tendencies in Bultmann's understanding of Paul's theology in Romans have proved fruitful in revealing the weaknesses of this kind of approach. A more adequate interpretation of the theme of the letter would be 'There is no distinction but the distinction that grace makes'. By this title we acknowledge that sovereignty is still the divine prerogative and that man, for all his knowledge of salvation through Christ, remains a creature within his Creator's all-embracing purpose. This purpose includes the individual and takes his faith into account but does not centre upon him. It includes the church and, in spite of continuing unbelief, the Jews also. It is a cosmic purpose which has the whole world within its focus, and is

---

determined finally not by human belief or unbelief but only by the divine purpose.

This understanding of the theme of the letter takes into account the emphasis upon God's grace in justification in Rom.i-viii and also the grace which ensures the special place to the Jew in Rom.ix-xi. At the same time a positive meaning is given to the Old Testament, to God's people Israel, and to the continuity of the divine purpose. This in no wise diminishes the significance of the doctrine of justification by faith, and it does have the effect of preventing some misunderstandings of it. Viewed in this light the doctrine is seen more clearly to have its basis in the faithfulness of God which triumphs in spite of the unfaithfulness of men. If a positive meaning is not given to the Old Testament and the events of which it is a record, the faithfulness of God does not emerge with the same distinctness and the continuity of the divine purpose is not fully appreciated. Paul's positive attitude is evident right at the beginning of his letter where he quotes an earlier formula describing Jesus as of Davidic descent (i:4). The emphasis continues throughout the letter in which, chiefly because of the deficiencies of the Roman Christians, Paul presents Christ as the annuling fulfilment of the Old Testament.
Over one hundred years ago David Schulz put forward the hypothesis that Rom.xvi is a letter to Ephesus. The possibility that ch.xvi originally existed as a separate letter has been the basis on which most modern understandings of the different endings of Romans have proceeded. One of the most significant studies on this subject is the essay by T.W. Manson, "St. Paul's Letter to the Romans - and Others". Manson felt that the whole question of the place of Rom.xvi had been set in a new light by the publication in 1935 of P46, the oldest Greek manuscript of Paul. Taking as a basis the fact that in this manuscript the doxology is situated at the end of ch.xv, Manson concluded that at an earlier date than P46 there had existed a text of Romans which did not include ch.xvi. This was the form of the epistle that had originally been sent to Rome.

According to Manson Paul wrote Rom.i-xv and sent this letter to Rome. A similar copy was also prepared and sent with a covering note (ch.xvi) to Ephesus. Marcion removed only ch.xv from his copy of Romans because at that time ch.xvi was not included. He probably removed this chapter because of his dislike of the Old Testament quotations in xv:l-13 and the idea that "whatever was written in former days was written for our instruction" (xv:4).

1. Schulz's suggestion was first proposed in Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 2 (1829), pp.609.f.
4. Ibid., p.236.
5. Ibid., p.235. Manson also makes the interesting suggestion that Marcion removed the personalia in xv:14-33 and the local references in Rom.i:7,15 and Eph.i:11 because of the rebuff he suffered from these congregations. See also p.230.
It was probably in Egypt that the last chapter of Romans was added; this is indicated by the fact that P⁴⁶ originated in Egypt and includes ch. xvi after the doxology at the end of ch.xv. The latter hypothesis is also supported by the fact that the text of P⁴⁶ stands nearer to the B type than does the text of the other chapters of the epistle.¹

We believe that the view proposed by Manson as to the origin of ch. xvi is basically correct; it existed originally as a letter to Ephesus. This was added in Egypt to the original text of Romans which consisted of chs.i-xv. We do not believe that it is necessary to hold as Manson does, that Romans is a circular letter.²

This view is the best explanation of a number of factors connected with the ending of Romans.³ It would account for the fact that Paul is acquainted with so many people in Rome - a church which he never visited. This is not such a serious objection as it may seem since many people emigrated to Rome at that time from the East⁴ and Paul could conceivably have met these people on his earlier missionary journeys.⁵ The fact that he was rather unsure as to

4. Cf. E.A. Judge and G.S.R. Thomas, "The Origin of the Church at Rome: A New Solution", (pp.81.f.) W. Marxsen suggests that as a result of the relaxation of Claudius' edict members of the church who came from Rome and whom Paul had got to know in the East while the edict was in force, have now returned to Rome. Introduction to the New Testament, p.108. Marxsen rejects this possibility because the majority of those greeted do not have Jewish names. K.P. Donfried has pointed out that according to H. Leon's study The Jews of Ancient Rome, a sample survey of 551 names of Jews showed that over half of these Jews had Latin names. In view of this Donfried holds that Marxsen should not have rejected the view that Rom.xvi is part of the original letter. "A Short Note on Romans xvi", JBL, LXXXIX (1970), pp.441-49(445/6).
how he would be received in Rome may provide a strong reason why Paul should send personal greetings to his acquaintances there.¹

In our opinion the strongest reason for regarding ch.xvi as a separate letter is the very sharp warning against those who create dissensions (xvi:17-20). As Kümmel notes "this paragraph is suitable neither in the framework of Romans, nor to the situation of the readers."² It has "an authoritative tone which is incompatible with the guarded contacts of i:10.f., xv:14.f., xii:3.f."³ It seems most unlikely that if Paul has been delicate and guarded in his approach throughout fifteen chapters he would suddenly speak out so sharply at a point so close to the conclusion of the letter.

Minear believes that the apparent shift in mood in xvi:17 may be explained by the fact that Paul has a different group of people in mind namely those leaders whose teaching and example must be shunned.⁴ Minear is not convinced that xvi:17.f. is out of keeping with the rest of the letter. In his view Paul is referring to those who persuaded a number of doubters to act in a manner contrary to their own conscience and "the sharp language merely reflects Paul's high estimate of the terrible cost of this injury."⁵ In spite of Minear's excellent study of the evidence, we are still not persuaded. Possibly he is too ready to regard ch.xvi as directed to Rome be-

---

¹ Cf. Donfried, op.cit., p.448. Minear believes that in his greetings in ch.xvi, Paul alternates between those whom he has met in the East and those of whom he has only heard, but on whom he could count to help to reduce the tension (in Rome) and prepare for the Spanish mission, (p. 25.f.).

² Op.cit., p.225. It is also uncertain to whom this sharp warning is addressed; Kümmel holds that there is nothing to suggest that it refers to 'Judaizers' true to the Law. He notes that Michel, Freisker and Schmithals agree that it may refer to Gnostics.

³ Ibid.


⁵ Ibid.
cause it is useful as evidence for the several groups of Christians which he believes he can discern among the house-churches in Rome.¹

A major objection that can be levelled against the view that ch.xvi is a separate letter to Ephesus is that by itself this makes a very strange letter. As Lietzmann pointed out "A letter consisting almost entirely of greetings, as chapter xvi:23 would be if it were an independent letter, is an absurdity."² This objection can now be shown to be much less serious than it appears to be because of the great number of papyri now available for comparison. In a recent article J.I.H. McDonald notes a close parallel to Rom.xvi in a third century letter (Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1962). In this letter the greetings comprise as is also the case in Rom.xvi, well over half of the total content of the letter. In view of several other parallels between Rom.xvi and the papyri McDonald concludes that "Rom.xvi:1-23 appears perfectly credible as an independent letter"³ and that its "resemblance to a short letter of Graeco-Roman times is sufficiently strong to refute those commentators who would rule out the possibility of its independent existence on 'a priori' grounds."⁴

Rom.xvi should not be regarded simply as a long list of greetings. It reveals its true nature in the opening - "I commend to you our sister Phoebe". It should therefore be regarded as Paul's letter of commendation for Phoebe.⁵ Its importance would be greatly enhanced if Minear is correct in his

¹. Cf. pp.7.f. and 22-35.
². p.129.
⁵. Cf. McDonald, op.cit., p.371. McDonald believes that G. Zuntz's conclusions in The Text of the Epistles (the Schweich Lectures, 1946, London 1953) are consonant with the view that Rom.xvi originally existed as a separate letter. Although we agree with McDonald's opinion, it would appear that he places more significance on Zuntz's findings than is legitimate.
suggestion that Phoebe's role may have included asking the Romans to join in the contributions to Jerusalem.¹

Whatever the arguments for or against the inclusion of ch.xvi in the original letter to Rome, we feel that the evidence is such that no firm conclusions concerning the letter as a whole may be based upon it. We do not entirely agree with Barrett's view that this problem in no way affects the substance of the epistle.² We can interpret Romans satisfactorily without ch.xvi. But, as Minear's study amply illustrates, we would gain a lot more useful information about the Roman Christian community if we could be sure that the content of this chapter refers to Rome.

Appendix II

This Aeon and the Coming Aeon in the New Testament:
Additional Note on v:12-21.

In the New Testament the present and future aeons are mentioned in the Synoptic Gospels, in the Pauline writings and in Hebrews, cf. Mk.x:30 (Lk.xviii:30) γινεν εν τη χαιρε του σου ... και εν τη αιωνι ερχομενη . In Lk.xvi:8 the sons of this aeon (οι νοι του αιωνος του σου ) are contrasted with the sons of light and in Lk.xx:35 with those who are counted worthy to take part in that aeon ( του αιωνος εκεινον τυχειν ) and in the resurrection. The saying in Mk.iii:29 - those who blaspheme against the Holy Spirit can never be forgiven, is reproduced in Mt.xii:32 where εις τον αιωνα is replaced by ουτε εν τοστη τη αιωνι ουτε εν τη μελλοντι . The phrase δ αιων ουτος occurs seven times in the Pauline writings (Rom.xii:2; I Cor.i:20, ii:6 twice, ii:8, iii:18; II Cor.iv:4). In Gal.i:4 we find πονηρος associated with the concept denoting Paul's normal designation of this aeon as that of sin (cf. II Cor.iv:4, I Cor.ii:6). In Eph.i:21 this additional description (as evil) is lacking and this is normal also for the Synoptics apart from Luke xvi:8. For δ αιων ουτος there can be substituted δ κοσμος ουτος (I Cor.iii:19, v:10, vii:31; Eph.ii:2). This latter is always preferred to δ αιων ουτος in the Johannine writings (Jn.viii:23, ix:39, xi:9, xii:25, 31, xiii:1, xvi:11, xvii:36; I Jn.iv:17). Sasse (TDNT. I, p.205) suggests that δ καιρος ουτος (Mk.x:30, Lk.xviii:30) and δ νυν καιρος (Rom.iii:16, viii:18, xi:5; II Cor.viii:14) are equivalents for δ αιων ουτος but this does not seem correct especially in relation to Paul's view of this age as evil and of καιρος as a time of opportunity. Stählin states δ καιρος cannot be an equivalent for δ αιων ουτος (TDNT. II, p.1115). Hebs.vi:5 has a reference to δυναμεις τε μελλοντος αιωνος the pneumatic powers of the future
world already experienced by believers.

Although this survey shows how normative is some kind of concept of two aeons for most of the New Testament, one problem is that Paul does not expressly use the term 'coming aeon' or 'new aeon' (that is if we assume that Ephesians is not by Paul and therefore the reference to the present and future aeons of Eph. i:21 cannot be considered). However in such terms as the old and new covenants, in the idea of the new creation, in the emphasis upon the newness of the 'now' in Christ Jesus, as well as in many other emphases of his theology, it is evident that even if he did not often explicitly refer to the coming aeon, the two aeon understanding is implicit in his eschatological understanding of the gospel. Paul's view of the two aeons is essentially in agreement with first century Jewish apocalyptic from which the doctrine originated, although Paul carefully avoids dualistic and temporal understandings such as were current in some circles at that time (cf. Str./Bill. IV, pp.799.ff).

Paul and the N.T. writers do depart from accepted notions in their emphasis that the αἰων μᾶλλον is no longer merely a future prospect but that believers have already been redeemed from this present evil age (Gal. i:4) and have already tasted the powers of the age to come (Heb.vi:5). With the resurrection of Jesus Christ the early church (in accordance with Jewish eschatology that the resurrection of the dead implies the transition from the one aeon to the other), claimed that the new aeon had already been inaugurated even though it was as yet concealed from the eyes of men (I Cor.xv:20,23).
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