

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Irish Biblical Studies* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_ibs-01.php

Rome, IBS 11, April 1989

Rome (and Jerusalem): The Contingency of Romans

3:21-26

Warren C. Carter

Exegetes of this oft-discussed passage have employed a range of methods. One approach has been to note the key phrase dikaïosunē theou (v21,22,25) and discuss the passage as explicating that concept. /1 Another method begins with the literary context of Romans 3 and delineates the new material introduced at 3.21ff. /2 A third discussion has focussed on 3.24-26 and sought to determine whether Paul cites traditional material and what "this tradition means for him and for his theology of justification" (my emphases). /3 A fourth approach is that of most commentaries where, after the mandatory introduction to the letter, the content of 3:21-26 is discussed in its literary context and in relation to the rest of Paul's thought.

Methodologically, these approaches have concentrated on the "coherence" of the passage, but what is lacking is an attempt to struggle explicitly with the "contingency" of 3:21-26. /4 Why did Paul write this particular passage to the Roman church - pasin tois ousin en Rōmē (1.7)? What dimensions of the Roman situation does 3:21-26 specifically address?

This article will address the contingency of 3:21-26. We will briefly survey some recent discussions of the purpose of Romans and will note that, although the Roman situation is difficult to determine, tensions between Jewish and Gentile Christians at Rome (and at Jerusalem) provide the most likely setting. Then we will consider 3:21-26 in relation to such a situation. Our contention will be that Paul seeks to resolve the tensions of Jewish and Gentile Christians by stressing three themes. Important for Paul's argument is the assertion that the saving act of God in Christ not only determines relation with God, but also radically transforms social relationships. /5 Limits of space will prevent a full discussion of the passage and the letter; our focus will be restricted to making explicit the link of the content

of 3:21-26 to the Roman situation.

1. Purpose and contingency

Paul's purpose in writing Romans has been widely debated. The controversy has resulted from the letter's treatise-like nature, from the fact that its statements of purpose are by no means clear, /6 from the difficulty of reconciling what Paul says his purposes are with what he writes, /7 from the difficulty of determining Paul's familiarity with the Roman church, /8 and from the textual problems of ch.16. /9

Three lines of interpretation have been advanced for understanding Paul's purpose. One interpretation has concluded that the difficulties noted above prevent any articulation of contingency. Paul was writing a general theological treatise. Bornkamm thus designated the letter "Paul's last will and testament", arguing that "we are on the wrong tracks with the questions about the actual condition of the church at Rome."/10 While the content arose originally in the conflicts and issues Paul had previously confronted in his churches, in Romans it has lost its "occasional dress" and is worked out universally. /11

While such an approach reflects the universal nature of the thought, the carefully structured and developed argument, and the (supposed) lack of references to local church issues (contrast 1Cor), there are problems with it. Themes presented in other letters that do not appear in Romans (the body of Christ, the Lord's Supper) and content in Romans not used in other letters (justification by faith, baptism) do not allow the letter to be seen as a compendium of Paul's thought; the letter's own statements of purpose noted above are ignored in this formulation; and the fact that other Pauline letters are addressed to concrete situations encourages us to search for contingency in Romans also. /12

Secondly, several attempts have been made to identify the situation at Rome to which the letter was addressed. Klein has argued on the basis of 15.20 that Paul sought to lay a proper apostolic foundation for the church not founded by an apostle. /13 But this lacks exegetical support, faces the problem of Paul's complimentary remarks about the church

(1.8;15.14), and does not easily fit the stated purpose of a stopover on the way to Spain. P. Minear has argued that the Church at Rome was seriously divided into five factions and Paul's purpose was to reconcile the groups. /14 The strength of Minear's analysis is the degree of specificity he attempts in seeking the letter's context, yet it is also this specificity that renders his analysis vulnerable. Reconciling such extensive division with 1.8 and 15.14 is difficult, as is Minear's method of reading the descriptions of wrong attitudes, and the exhortations to right thinking in ch 14.15 as representing actual groups physically divided from each other. Such an identification is questionable in each instance but particularly so for groups four and five. Nor does Minear support his claim that "the disputes described in ch 14 are such as to have made common meetings impossible." /15 A comparison with Corinth indicates that it is precisely in the chaos of a meeting together that the divisions are revealed (1 Cor.8; 10.23-33;11.17-34)

Minear's analysis, though, does have the merit of alerting us to tensions (rather than divisions) in the Roman church. His identification of these along the broad lines of Jewish and Gentile Christians on the basis of 14-15.13, though not without problems, is essentially convincing.

A third approach situates the letter largely in relation to Paul's own circumstances. /17 Paul plans to visit Spain (15.24,28) with a stopover at Rome (15.24,29), but first he must visit Jerusalem with the collection, a visit that entails danger and the possibility of rejection of the collection (15.31). In the letter to Rome, Paul practises his defence of the gospel, and asks them for prayer and solidarity (15.30) with him as the apostle to the Gentiles (15.15). Acceptance of the collection by Jerusalem would signify the unity of the church, and the validity of Paul's gospel, apostleship and churches. But why should a letter preoccupied with Jerusalem go to Rome? Jervell points to Paul's travel plans to Spain, and his need to gain support for his gospel from Rome, the representative of the Gentile world. /18

Jervell's analysis highlights an important aspect of the letter's context in Paul's own circumstances and accounts for the reference to the Jerusalem visit (15.25-33). Its weakness, however, is in determining why this letter should be sent to Rome. Jervell's explanation of the representative nature of the Roman church is not convincing, given Paul's apparent lack of previous contact with the church, and it overlooks the specificity of the content of ch 14-15 as referring to a particular church situation.

J.C. Beker's discussion provides a more successful link of the Roman and Jerusalem situations. Beker identifies a "convergence of motivations" that indicate the letter's purposes. One important factor is the absence of Galatia from the list of contributors to the collection (15.26), suggesting a likely loss of support for Paul. This situation, plus Paul's Galatian letter, probably resulted in a deterioration of Paul's relationship with Jerusalem. It is also likely that a misrepresentation of his view of the place of Jews in salvation history had spread through his churches. Faced with these factors, as well as his own impending trip to Jerusalem where he would probably have to defend his ministry, and having heard of the conflicts between Jewish and Gentile Christians at Rome, Paul writes to them. The letter is intended to counter a betrayal of the gospel and a misrepresentation of his own position, as well as to prepare for a mission to Spain. In the face of disunity, he insists on the fundamental equality of Jew and Gentile "sola fide in the sola gratia of God's righteousness in Christ" and on a unity that "preserves the salvation-history priority of Israel." /19

Beker's insistence on a "convergence of motivations" has several strengths. It allows the diverse statements of purpose to be held together without elevating one and ignoring others. Paul is realistically recognized as being involved in several spheres - Rome and Jerusalem - at one time. Since the former is addressed, Rome will be uppermost in our attempt to understand the letter, but there is no competition of spheres since the issues facing Paul at both Jerusalem and Rome center on the relationships of Jewish and Gentile Christians. Thus our discuss-

ion of 3.21-26 will be more explicitly concerned with Rome, but Paul's relationship with Jerusalem must also be kept in view. We will now indicate three emphases Paul makes in 3.21-26 as he seeks to reconcile Jewish and Gentile Christians.

II

Emphasis I: The Equality of Jew and Gentile before God

Paul fills 3.21-26 with references to the unity and equality of Jew and Gentile before God. We will argue that Paul thereby seeks to counter the faulty thinking and divisive actions in the Roman church; the perception of such equality of status and treatment provides a basis for social equality and unity in the church, and removes any possible grounds (such as ethnicity) for divisive behaviour.

The emphasis on equality is introduced in the preceding section (1.16-3.20) where two themes have dominated. First, Paul has stressed that all human existence is revealed to be marred by sin (1.18). A striking amount of "comprehensive" language is evident - pas frequently occurs as all sin (1.18,29), affecting all human beings (2.19;3.9-12). We also have: comprehensive pairings (Ioudaioi/Hellēni 2.9;3.9; cf 1.16; and akrobugtia/peritomē - 2.25-29), /20 the generic anthrōpos (1.18;2.1) stressing equal sinfulness.

Secondly, the divine response to all (Jew and Gentile) who commit ungodliness (2.2-3) is impartial judgment. /21 There is no escape or privileged treatment on the basis of ethnicity, election or gift, for those who disobey tē alētheia (the truth) (2.8,12). Having the law but not doing it means nothing other than God's judgment (2.12-24) on Gentiles (1.32) and Jews (2.5). There is no partiality in God's eyes (2.11); "the whole world" (pas ho kosmos) is "accountable" (hupodikos) to God (3.19; cf 3.9). The catena in 3.10-18 supplies scriptural authority for the argument. The judge can do no other than condemn all humankind for its sinfulness (3.20)

Just as sinfulness and condemnation are universal, so too is God's saving act (dikaiosunē theou). Its means [chōris nomou (apart from law), en christō (in Christ)]

and its required response (pistis:faith) accentuate universality, providing the basis for unity and equitable social relations in the Roman church.

Dikaiosunē theou (3.21) has been widely debated, being understood as God's gift to human beings of the status of righteousness, /22 or as God's apocalyptic saving power and action. /23 Several issues have been to the fore - whether to construe the genitive theou as subjective or objective; /24 how to interpret the history of religions material; /25 how much diversity exists within the concept. /26 It is not our intention to enter into the debate, except to indicate that we will utilize Käsemann's subjective genitive reading. Instead, our focus is on the term's "social function and implications."

Immediately to be observed is that dikaiosunē theou must be related to Paul's preceding argument. /27 Important to note are the series of antitheses of 3.1-8 where human and divine qualities are contrasted, particularly the contrast of the faithlessness of humans with God's faithfulness. /28 We have already observed Paul's emphasis on the universal scope of human sin; dikaiosunē theou continues the same focus, though, by way of contrast, depicting God's universal and faithful saving action.

The reference to God's faithfulness raises the question - to what is God being faithful? Stuhlmacher has suggested, unconvincingly, that creation is in view, while Hays has argued that God is being faithful to his covenant promises. /29 Williams also thinks Paul is referring to the promises God had graciously made to Abraham, that Abraham would be the father of many nations. /30 In revealing his saving power (dikaiosunē thou) God is faithful to promises that embrace all humankind; his saving activity has a universal focus, embracing Jew and Gentile. In such equality of treatment before God lies a further foundation for reconciliation and unity in the church at Rome.

Further, the revelation of God's saving activity has been manifested chōris nomou: "apart from law" (3.21). Many discussions have noted that the reference to this dimension of the manifestation is necessary following 3.30 and results from "the internal logic of Paul's argument." Paul

had concluded the previous section by declaring that the Mosaic law brings epignōsis hamartias (knowledge of sin). (3.20; cf 5.20). This is the awareness that "the moral order is a rebellion, a transgression, an act against God, and an infidelity to the covenant relation and stipulations formulated in the Decalogue." /31 Although the law brings knowledge of God's will (2.18), knowledge without obedience is condemnation (2.20-24). The law cannot empower obedience since it lacks the dunamis (power) of life that the gospel brings (1.16), having instead the dunamis of sin (cf 1 Cor 15.56). Therefore if life is to be attained, if the saving promises are to be kept, a manifestation apart from the law is required.

But when the contingent circumstances of the letter are kept in mind, a further social dimension becomes evident. The law was a gift particularly to Israel (2.17-24), but given the universality of both sin and promise to Israel (Chs 3 & 4), God's saving action must be revealed to all chōris nomou. With this phrase Paul again reminds the Christians in conflict in Rome that neither Jew nor Gentile has any advantage or preference in God's eyes. There is thus no basis for excluding behaviour or attitudes of superiority in the church. Rather, God's gracious /32 saving act en Christō has provided the basis for social unity and reconciliation

The saving act, the act of universal deliverance (3.24), /33 is effected in and through the death of Jesus Christ. Paul's formula en Christō /34 is particularly appropriate here, signifying not only the instrumentality by which the manifestation was made, but also the sphere and new allegiance of existence in the new age. Life en Christō is life determined by the saving event. It embraces a new quality of life, including social relationships. To be en Christō is to be one (heis), to be oukIoudaios oude Hellēn (Neither Jew nor Greek) (Gal. 3.28; cf 1 Cor 12.13; Rom 12.4). In the sphere of God's saving action and Lordship is the end of divisions and barriers; the saving action is not just directed towards individuals but has corporate expression, in the unity of Jew and Gentile in the church at Rome (and between Gentile churches and Jerusalem).

Carter, Rome, IBS 11, April 1989

Paul's emphasis on "faith" in Jesus Christ (3.22,25,26) /35 is also important for the Roman situation. God's action in Christ in fulfilling the promise to Abraham does not take effect in human lives either automatically, or ex ergōn nomou(on basis of works of the law)(3.20). By contrast to human striving and pride (kaukasai - 2.17;3.27) /36 faith receives and depends on God's saving act.

The Roman tensions are addressed by this emphasis in two ways. Here faith is not the exclusive response of Jew or Greek. God's saving act in Christ is revealed eis pantas tous pisteuontas (to all who believe) (3.22). Pantas is emphatic and universal, not confined to ethnic boundaries or subject to claims on God's favour (22b). Jew and Gentile stand before God and beside one another in making this common response to God's gracious and impartial act. And secondly, while faith involves receptivity to God's activity and presence, it does not mean passivity. Receptivity entails active obedience; the gift calls and enables humans for service. /37 Hence as well as the noun pistis (faith)(22a), the participle pisteuontas (22b) is employed. The verb form maintains the focus on activity, while the present tense highlights continuous obedience.

Later in the letter, Paul states explicitly what such a way of life involves. Paul calls the Romans to unity en heni sōmati (in one body) (12.4). They are to please (15.2,3), to welcome (15.7), to love (12.10), but not to despise or judge (14.4,5,10,13) one another. Such unity is not uniformity- there is diversity in the expressions of God's grace in service (12.6) nor does Paul forbid the diverse practices and convictions of the "weak" and the "strong" (14.5-6) even though he does insist on tolerant attitudes and relationships. At Rome where God's saving act in Christ is known, where Christ's lordship is acknowledged, there should be such unity and a new social reality (cf Gal 3.28).

Emphasis 2: Jewish Temporal Priority

A second emphasis accompanies the focus on unity and universality. God's saving act takes place in continuity

Carter, Rome, IBS 11, April 1989

with God's dealings with the Jewish people in the past. As new and as discontinuous as God's act may seem (en tō nun kairō (at the present time -3.21,26), Jewish temporal priority is upheld

This emphasis appears first in 3.21. While God's saving power has been manifested chōris nomou, salvation history has not been breached since the saving act is witnessed to hupo tou nomou kai tōn prophetōn (by the law and the prophets). Continuity is established in that the OT scriptures bear witness to this act. /38 Various suggestions have been made as to the nature of the continuity. One view is that the scripture created the situation which necessitated the new manifestation by defining sin and by showing the impossibility of finding zōē (life) by works of the law. The catena of 3.10-18 illustrates this concept. /39 Others suggest that particular OT prophecies, especially messianic ones, are in mind. /40 J.C. Beker refers specifically to the promise to Abraham (4.1-12 and the midrash on Gen 15.6). /41 While the general links are not to be ruled out, this specific reference to Abraham merits a prominent place given his significance in ch.4, and the other links with 3.21-26 noted above. The Jewish scriptures thus point to God's saving action in Christ. The notion of priority and universality expressed in the formula Ioudaiō to prōton kai Hellēni (2.9) with regard to sin, are here stated in relation to salvation (so 1.16)

Other elements of continuity with Jewish traditions are evident. The prominent role of the Jewish patriarch, the recipient of the promise of universal blessing, has been noted. So too has Kasemann's (disputed) claim for the influence of Jewish apocalyptic thought in the phrase dikaïosunē theou (righteousness of God) Jewish cultic ritual from the Jerusalem temple is also seen by some to provide a further figure whereby the act's meaning can be articulated. Jesus is the hilastērion (3.25), the mercy-seat, the place in the Holy of Holies of God's presence and self-disclosure. In Jesus' death, (en tō autou haimati: lit. in his blood) revelation is manifested and atonement accomplished. A recognition of this emphasis on Jewish temporal priority in 3.25-26 offers

Carter, Rome, IBS 11, April 1989

one explanation among others, for Paul's use of this earlier formulation. /43

Why should Paul make this emphasis in his letter? Several scenarios can be suggested. Perhaps the success of the Gentile mission and the comparative non-response of Jewish people has led some Gentile Christians to suggest arrogantly that Israel was disqualified from the divine plan (11.1-12, 25-32). Stendahl comments that Paul "has an eerie feeling about the attitudes he discerned among many Gentile Christians to Jews. Thus he set himself the task to break an attitude of condescension (11.25)." /44 Paul counters such claims by asserting that the route to God's universal saving act was via Jewish temporal priority. Gentiles have been included but Jews have not been excluded. Or perhaps Paul's teaching about the law has led to a misunderstanding and accusation that he saw Israel as now having no place in God's economy, and that God was now on the side of the Gentiles, having rejected Israel. Against these charges of discontinuity and Gentile partisanship, Paul affirms divine impartiality, equality of Jew and Gentile in the new age, and Jewish temporal priority. The accusations and controversies over lifestyle in ch 14-15 suggest that some Jewish and Gentile Christians may well have doubted the other's right to be part of the ekklēsia (14.3,4,8,10,13; 15.7,8-12). Paul reminds these Christians of the universality of God's saving action, and of its continuity with God's dealings with Israel in the past. There is thus no reason for haughty, excluding or judgmental attitudes and behaviour at Rome; rather there should be unity, acceptance and love.

Emphasis 3: The Visibility of God's Acts

A third emphasis in this passage is that of the historical concreteness and visibility of the manifestation of God's saving power in Christ. Pephanerōtai (has been manifested v21) introduces this emphasis. The verb is a synonym of apokaluptein (reveal) /45, denoting literally an "unveiling" or "uncovering". God's saving power has been uncovered or revealed for Paul in the death/resurr-

Carter, Rome, IBS 11, April 1989

action of Jesus, and in its proclamation [nuni(now) -vs21: en tō nun kairō (in the present time) -vs26]. Three references - Iēsou Christou (3.22), Christō Iēsou (v24), Iēsou (v26) - maintain the focus on the crucified one in whose death (en tō autou haimati) redemption is found (v25). Proetheto (v25) (put forward) maintains the emphasis on a discernible and visible act with its sense of public display; in Jesus' death God has publicly displayed and executed his saving power and will. /46 In this act God has been able to "show forth and vindicate", to "demonstrate" /47 (endeixis - 3.25,26) his righteousness. The vocabulary thus emphasizes the public and visible unveiling of God's gracious saving will and power, in the death of Christ.

Why should Paul emphasize the manifestation of God's righteousness in a person and event, in an "earthly epiphany?" /48 Because, Käsemann argues, the revelation of God's saving power can occur no other way; dikaiosunē theou is manifested on earth only in visible acts of service. Such actions result only when "God's power takes possession of us and ...enters us;" since power is gift, address means service and obligation derives from Lordship. God's sovereign power and Lordship call and empower us for concrete acts of service and daily obedience. /49

Paul's thrust is, then, that God's saving power should be manifested with visible effect amongst God's people at Rome. Unity is one such expression of dikaiosunē theou since God's saving act is universal and impartial, based in and expressive of his own unity (so 3.29-30). Visible displays of God's saving power would also mean reconciliation between Jew and Gentile Christians at Rome (14.1-15.13), and active expressions of love and service, both there (12.3-8) and in the reception of the Gentile collection by the Jerusalem church (15.16-31). The challenge for the church at Rome (and beyond to Jerusalem) is to express visibly in the social relationships the universality and unity expressed in God's gracious and universal act.

We have argued that contingency is an important and hitherto neglected dimension in the discussions of Rom. 3.21-26. We have indicated that Romans was composed

from a convergence of motivations related to both the Roman church and to Paul's larger mission. A common factor in these situations was tension in the relationships of Jewish and Gentile Christians, and we have argued that in 3.21-26 Paul addresses this issue. We have noted three emphases, and have explored them, not so much in terms of the wider context of Paul's coherent theology, but in relation to the contingency of the Roman situation. The emphases on the universality of God's saving act, on Jewish temporal priority, and on the visibility and concreteness of God's saving power address directly tensions between Jewish and Gentile Christians at Rome, and challenge the community to manifest the reality of God's saving power in acts of reconciliation, unity and service. /50

Notes

1. W.A. Maier, "Paul's Concept of Justification and Some Recent Interpretations of Romans 3.21-31." The Springfielder 37 (1974) 248-68
2. R. Hays, "Psalm 143 and the Logic of Romans 3," JBL 99 (1980) 107-115
3. For example P. Stuhlmacher, "Recent Exegesis on Romans 3.24-26," Reconciliation, Law and Righteousness (Philadelphia: Fortress; 1986) 94-109
4. J.C. Beker, Paul the Apostle (Philadelphia: Fortress 1980) ch.3. In employing these terms Beker refers to the "peculiar inter-relation of 'catholicity' and 'particularity'" (28) which has often seen an emphasis on the general coherence of Paul's thought at the expense of the occasional and historical concreteness (contingency).
5. So N. Dahl, "The Doctrine of Justification: Its Social Function and Implications," Studies in Paul (Minneapolis: Augsburg; 1977) 95-120 esp 95. He did not, though, discuss the social implications for the Roman situation.
6. In 1.10-12 Paul desires to come to Rome, yet Spain is his goal (15.24). At 1.13 he intends to conduct mission activity in Rome, but at 15.20 he declares he does not want to build on another's foundation.
7. In between the statements about Rome (1.10-13) and Spain (15.24) is the extended theological statement of ch 1-11.
8. He says he has not been to Rome (1.13), yet greets over 20 people in ch.16
9. The doxology of 16.23 appears in some mss at 14.23 or 15.33 (P46). The ms support for 14.23 is one factor that has led some to see

ch.16 as part of a letter to Ephesus. See T.W. Manson, "St Paul's Letter to the Romans - and Others" in K. Donfried (ed), The Romans Debate; (Minneapolis; Augsburg; 1977) 1-16. Donfried convincingly replies in Ch.4

10. G. Bornkamm, "The Letter to the Romans as Paul's Last Will and Testament," Romans Debate 17-31, esp 22
11. Bornkamm, op.cit. 23,28-29
12. K. Donfried, "False Assumptions in the Study of Romans," Romans Debate 120-148, esp 122
13. G. Klein, "Paul's Purpose in writing the Epistle to the Romans," Romans Debate ch.3
14. P. Minear, The Obedience of Faith (London SCM 1971) 1-35
15. Minear, op.cit. 8
16. Minear, op.cit.9-10 notes several weaknesses. Against the identification of the "weak" as Jewish Christians is 14.2 (eat only vegetables) and 14.21 (refuse to drink wine). By way of explanation, he argues the former may reflect a polemical statement, or the practice in social settings of avoiding meat for fear of it not being kosher. The latter he attributes to avoiding lawless excess and guilt by association with drunken Gentile Christians. He also concedes that the "weak" may include Gentiles (9) and the "strong" may include Jewish Christians who had thrown off the law (11). Thus for Minear the division is largely but not exclusively ethnic. R.J. Karris ("The Occasion of Romans," Romans Debate) seems to press these difficulties too far and rigidly in concluding no ethnic division existed. Minear's position has also been advocated by W. Marxsen [Introduction to the NT (Philadelphia, Fortress 1968) 95-104]
17. J. Jervell, "The Letter to Jerusalem," Romans Debate 61-74
18. Jervell, op.cit. 73-74. E.P. Sanders, (Paul, the Law and the Jewish People [Philadelphia, Fortress 1983] 31) also minimalizes the Roman situation, emphasizing relations of Jewish and Gentile Christians in respect of Jerusalem and the Galatian difficulties.
19. J.C. Beker, op.cit. 71-76, esp 74. S.K. Williams ("Righteousness of God in Romans," JBL 99 [1980] 241-90) has a similar statement of "multiple motivations" (254-55) - i) the Jerusalem trip and defence of his ministry; ii) a "theological resumé" to gain support for the Spanish mission; iii) a theological basis for his parenthesis of 12-14 directed to conflict at Rome.
20. See J. Marcus, "Circumcision! Foreskin! The Contingent Character of Romans" (forthcoming) who argues that these were terms of abuse used by the two groups.
21. See J. Bassler, Divine Impartiality(Chico Scholars 1982).
22. R. Bultmann, Theology of the NT I (London SCM 1952) 270-87; idem, "DIKAIOSUNE THEOU," JBL 83 (1964) 12-16; C.E. Cranfield, The Epistle to the Romans I (Edinburgh T&T Clark 1975) 91-9, 202; G. Klein, IDB Supp.Vol. (Nashville Abingdon 1976) 750-752
23. E. Kasemann, " 'The Righteousness of God' in Paul", NT Questions of Today (Philadelphia Fortress 1969) 168-182; M. Soards, "The Righteousness of God in the Writings of the Apostle Paul," BTB 14-15 (1984-1985) 104-9; M.T. Brauch, "Perspectives on 'God's Righteousness' in Recent German Discussion," Appendix in E.P. Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism (Philadelphia, Fortress 1977) 523-42; J.C. Beker, op.cit 262-64.

24. A key difficulty has been one of method. Käsemann ("Righteousness" 172) complains that Bultmann equated dth with "righteousness" and so ensured a focus on gift and human status (an objective genitive). Reversing this, Käsemann subsumes "righteousness" to dth, arguing that dth must be treated as a "terminus technicus" and as the central concept to which the cognates belong but with which they are not identical in meaning. Such an approach emphasizes divine activity. Käsemann's subjective genitive seems a more convincing reading of Paul's usage (1.17; 3.5, 25; 10.3; 2 Cor 5.21). His use of parallel concepts of divine activity and power (1.17; 5.21; 6.13, 18; 10.3; 1 Cor 1.30; Gal 2.20) offers support from the wider context of Paul's thought, with its cosmic and apocalyptic view of God's activity rather than an individualistic and anthropocentric understanding.
25. Käsemann argued that in early Judaism and Qumran dth was a technical term for God's activity. But this has been disputed since Käsemann cannot produce many unambiguous examples - E.P. Sanders (PPJ 305-12) argues that the Qumran passages do not mean "salvation power" but "Mercy". M. Soards ("Käsemann's 'Righteousness' Reexamined," CBQ 49 [1987] 264-7) has cast doubt on the T. Dan 6.10 reference; Bultmann ("DIKAIOSUNE THEOU") is not convinced it is a technical term, but argues it was "ein Neuschöpfung des Paulus". R. Hays ("Psalm 143" 108) has proposed a way through the impasse, from the use of Ps 143 and the logic of Paul's thought in ch 3 that the term means "God's own salvation-creating power."
26. Against Bultmann's focus on gift and human status, Käsemann (ibid, 171-2) delineates a more comprehensive concept, combining "present and future eschatology, 'declare righteous' and 'make righteous', gift and service, freedom and obedience, forensic, sacramental and ethical approaches." Käsemann is concerned to locate the unitary centre for these dimensions
- 27/28 R. Hays, 109-115; Williams 265-80. N28 Hays 114; Williams, 268
29. Stuhlmacher, op.cit 81; idem Gottesgerechtigkeit bei Paulus (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965) 86-91; Hays, op.cit. 111. Hays notes (Fn 17. point 2) against Stuhlmacher that Paul appeals not to creation but "to the universal implication of the promise to Abraham."
30. Williams, op.cit. 266-69
31. J. Fitzmyer, "Paul and the Law", To Advance the Gospel (Ny, Crossroad 181) 190
32. V24 stresses that the saving act is not motivated by any human claim (achievement, ethnicity) on God. It derives from and expresses God's grace (dōrean, chariti); it is God's active eschatological power ("eschatologische Macht"). E. Käsemann, An die Römer (Tübingen, J.C. Mohr [Paul Siebeck] 1974) 90
33. For discussion of apolutrōsis, see C.K. Barrett, A Commentary on Romans (London, A&C Black, 1957); F. Büchsel, TDNT IV (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1967) 351-356; Cranfield, op.cit. 206-7; L. Morris, "Redemption", The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross (3rd edit, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1980) 11-64, esp 40-51
34. See A. Oepke, TDNT II, 1964, 541-543; F. Neugebauer, Das Paulinische 'In Christus', NTS 4 (1957-58) 124-38; A.J.M. Wedderburn, "Some Observations on Paul's use of the Phrase 'in Christ' and 'with Christ'", JSNT 25 (1985) 93-97

35. I take these as objective (so Käsemann, op.cit; Cranfield, Barrett, op.cit) Williams, op.cit. 272-275 and L.T. Johnson ("Romans 3.21-26 and the faith of Jesus" CBO 44 [1982]77-90) read them as subjective genitives, referring to Jesus' faith in God. Against this i) Paul does not use Iēsous as the subject of pisteuō; ii) Iēsou in 3.26 need not indicate the earthly Jesus - cf 1 Thess 1.10, and the synonymous Iēsous and Christos in Rom 8.11 and 2 Cor 4.10-14; iii) in 3.21-26 the objective genitive appropriately indicates in whom faith is to be placed as the human response to God's saving act.
36. Kauchaomai ("boast" or "exult") denotes self-confidence and glorying one's own efforts, which is brought to nought by God's saving act in Christ (3.27). See R. Bultmann, TDNT III, op.cit. 648-53
37. E. Käsemann, Righteousness, 174-177
38. For other examples, 1.2; ch.4; 9.25-33; 10.16-21; 11.1-10,26-29; 15.8-17; See Cranfield, op.cit. 202
39. Williams, op.cit 271
40. In part Barrett, op.cit.73
41. Beker, op.cit. 81
42. For discussion, Stuhlmacher, op.cit. esp 96-103; E. Lohse, Märtyrer und Gottesknecht (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963) 149ff and "Die Gerechtigkeit in der paulinischen Theologie," Die Einheit des Neuen Testaments (Göttingen, 1973) 209-227 esp 220ff
43. In support of a unit comprising 3.24-26, see R. Bultmann, Theology 1 54; E. Käsemann, "Zum Verständnis von Römer 3.24-26", ZNW 43 (1950-51); in favour of 3.25-26a, B. Meyer, "The Pre-Pauline Formula in Romans 3.25-26a, NTS 29 (1983) 198-208; Stuhlmacher, op.cit. 94-109. C. Talbert's suggestion of a post-Pauline addition ("A Non-Pauline Fragment at Romans 3.24-26?" JBL 85 [1966] 287-96) lacks textual support, and his reconstruction leaves the nominative masculine plural participle dikaioumenoi (24) unattached, since kauchēsis (boasting) (27) is a feminine singular noun.
44. K. Stendahl, "A Response," USQR 33 (1978) 189-191, esp 190; also E.P. Sanders, "Paul's Attitude Towards the Jewish People," USQR 33 (1978) 175-187; N. Dahl, "The Future of Israel," Studies in Paul, 137-58
45. phaneron estin(1.19) occurs after apokaluptetai in 1.17,18
46. With Barrett Romans 77; Käsemann, Römer 91; Stuhlmacher, "Recent Exegesis," 102
47. Barrett's translations (Romans,79) express the "ambiguity" of endeixis. a "showing forth" and a "proof". W.G. Kummel ("Paresis und Endeixis: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der paulinischen Rechtfertigungslehre," ZTK 49 [1952] 154-67) emphasizes "demonstration" rather than "proof". So also Stuhlmacher, op.cit.95, contra Cranfield, op.cit.211
48. Käsemann, Righteousness, 173
49. ibid, 173-176; the language ("us") indicates Käsemann is not concerned with the contingency of the letter in his discussion.
50. My thanks to Dr. Joel Marcus for his response to a previous draft of this article.