THE GENITIVE OF ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗ ΘΕΟΥ

IN ROMANS 3:21

by

Daniel A. Hoopert

Submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the degree of Master of Theology in
Grace Theological Seminary
May 1994

Title: THE GENITIVE OF ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗ ΘΕΟΥ IN ROMANS 3:21
Author: Daniel A. Hoopert
Degree: Master of Theology
Date: May, 1994
Adviser: Dr. Martin G. Abegg

In the present century, there has been debate concerning the expression δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ. The debate has discussed what the righteousness of God is. Positions have been attached to different semantic interpretations of the Greek phrase. This thesis is concerned in particular with the expression as it is used in Romans 3:21. The purpose is to determine the classification of the phrase, grammatically and semantically, and from that to understand what the text puts forth as "the righteousness of God."

The thesis reviews what individuals have said about the righteousness of God, including two from the early church, two from the Reformation, and some from the twentieth century. While not all of these writers have provided a classification for the genitive phrase, their comments about the righteousness of God provide information that one can associate with classifications that are presented here.

To arrive at an analysis, a definition of subjective genitives is adopted in Chapter IV, in which the modified substantive of an adnominal phrase is a verbal noun, while the modifying substantive, which is in the genitive case, serves as the subject of the verbal idea when the sense of the phrase is expressed as a clause.

Secondly, theory is employed with respect to how topics are introduced in discourse, along with properties of topics. Attention is given to one of the properties of topics, namely, that topics consist of "known" information. This calls for attention to the immediate context.

δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, then, is noted to be a subjective genitive, with the sense "God justifies [unrighteous people]." The observation is made that the writers of the early church and of the Reformation, as well as C. E. B. Cranfield, have an exegetical basis for their interpretations of "the righteousness of God." On the other hand, writers who present "the righteousness of God" as His power, or His faithfulness to His creation, His covenant, or mankind, are found to not have such a basis.

Accepted by the Faculty of Grace Theological Seminary
in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree
Master of Theology

_____
                    Adviser

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

ALS   Autograph Letter, Signed

BAGD   W. Bauer, W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, and F. W. Danker, <u>Greek-English Lexicon of the NT</u>

BDB   F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, <u>Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</u>

BDF   F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, <u>A Greek Grammar of the NT</u>

ICC   International Critical Commentary

LS   Letter, Signed

LSETF   Letter, Signed, Electronically Transmitted Facsimile

LSJ   Liddell-Scott-Jones, <u>Greek-English Lexicon</u>

INTRODUCTION

A person who seeks to present an interpretation of Scripture may be well advised to present his own presuppositions of things concerning the Scriptures, so that his reader might have an idea of the beliefs with which the writer approaches a text. Two presuppositions are therefore presented here, along with a statement for the need for this study on the expression δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 3:21.

A Statement Concerning Presuppositions

This writer holds that the Scriptures are the infallible, inspired Word of God, that they are without error in their original manuscripts, and that they are fully authoritative and reliable for doctrine, for faith and for conduct.

It is also the author's belief that the form in which the Scriptures were given was intentional, and that the form in which we find the Word needs to be taken seriously when interpreting the text. This includes the grammatical constructions that we might find. When difficulties are encountered, one would do well to respectfully acknowledge that our understanding of the language with which we are

1

working may be limited, and that the difficulties that are encountered may be because of that limitation. This can press the interpreter to further discoveries of the language, and possibly to a greater appreciation for the way in which the Scriptures have been stated. The interpreter may find that the Scriptures present quite exactly a particular message.

A Statement Concerning the Need for this Study

This writer holds that strictly defined terms in grammar, exegesis, or other textual analysis, can have two benefits. First, they can require an interpreter to seek exactly what is presented in a text of Scripture, and, secondly, when the analysis has been made, strictly defined terms can enable the interpreter to express exactly what he understands the message of the text to be.

In the history of interpretation of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in the twentieth century, the terms subjective genitive and objective genitive seem to have been loosely defined. For instance, the classification of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a subjective genitive has been said to speak of "the righteousness which belongs to God and proceeds from him,"[1]

---

[1]Ernst Käsemann, "'The Righteousness of God' in Paul," in New Testament Questions of Today, trans. W. J. Montague from Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen, 2nd ed.

or the righteousness that is "God's own righteousness, describing either his being ... or his action ..., or both." In referring to His being, the sense of the phrase could be rendered, "God is righteous." In reference to His action, the idea would be that "God acts righteously."[2]

Associated with these interpretations of the phrase, the righteousness of God itself has been said to be God's saving activity, His saving power, or His faithfulness to His covenant, to His creation, to His promises, or to mankind.

As an objective genitive, the righteousness of God has been said to refer to the righteousness that God gives and that is acceptable to Him.[3]

A problem with definitions that seem to be broad is that it enables writers to present interpretations for δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 1:17 and 3:21 which may not conform to what the text says. Indeed, an array of theological

---

(Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1965; paperback ed., Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 169.

[2]Manfred T. Brauch, "Perspectives on 'God's Righteousness' in recent German discussion," in Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion, by E. P. Sanders (London: SCM Press, 1977), 524.

[3]See Käsemann, "Righteousness," 169; and Brauch, "Perspectives," 524.

interpretations of what the righteousness of God is have been associated with particular classifications of the genitive of the phrase δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ. Some of these interpretations are presented in the history of interpretation in Chapter III of this thesis, along with some other theological concerns that are associated with particular interpretations of what the righteousness of God is.

An example of interpretations that have been associated with the classification of the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a subjective genitive, broadly defined, are the interpretations that see the righteousness of God as His saving activity, His power, or His faithfulness to His covenant, to His creation, to His promises, or to mankind.

Others interpret the righteousness of God to be the righteousness which God has and gives. This view has been associated with the classification of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as an objective genitive, broadly defined, or as a genitive of origin.

Associated with the problem of using broadly defined terms is the fact that the use of such terms conveys a meaning that is different from the understanding one could have from a more narrow definition.

For instance, the classification of the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as an objective genitive, broadly defined, is taken to indicate the righteousness that is given by God. As an objective genitive, narrowly defined, it is taken to mean "[Someone or something] justifies God."

A third reason for this study is that different views of the atonement seem to be associated with different interpretations of what the righteousness of God is. Those who interpret "the righteousness of God" as God's saving activity, as His power, or as His faithfulness to His covenant, to His creation, to His promises, or to mankind, seem to dismiss the idea that Christ was a substitutionary sacrifice who was given for the forgiveness of sins.

John Piper has noted that those who interpret the righteousness of God as "his eschatological saving action in accomplishing redemption through the death of Jesus" do not embrace the satisfaction theory of the atonement.[4]

In place of a satisfaction or a propitiatory view of the atonement, the views of the writers in this group are reminiscent of a view put forth by Gustaf Aulén. In this view, Aulén sees the atonement as the place where God won a victory over the forces of evil. In presenting this view,

---

[4]John Piper, "The Demonstration of the Righteousness of God in Romans 3:25,26," Journal for the Study of the New Testament 7 (April 1980): 10, 20, emphasis his.

Aulén discounts the satisfaction theory and the exemplar theory of the atonement.[5]

On the other hand, the interpretation that holds that the righteousness of God is a status that is given to believers by God also maintains that Christ was given as a propitiatory sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins.[6]

A fourth area which contributes to the need of this study is in the area of interpretation itself. Writers who have argued for the interpretation of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a subjective genitive, broadly defined, or who have seen it as God's saving activity, power, or faithfulness, have gathered their definitions from the Old Testament or from extra-Biblical Jewish writings, and have to some extent used an

---

[5]See Gustaf Aulén, <u>Cristus Victor: An Historical Study of the Three Main Types of the Idea of Atonement</u>, paperback ed. trans. A. G. Hebert, with a foreword by Jaroslav Pelikan (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1969; reprint, Collier Books, 1986), 1-7, 55-60, 145-159, and cf. Leon Morris, <u>The Cross of Jesus</u> (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988), 22-24.

[6]This view is presented by C. E. B. Cranfield in this century (C. E. B. Cranfield, <u>A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of the Romans</u>, vol. 1, ICC, sixth ed. [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975], 214-18. See also below, 130-132.). This view was also presented by John Calvin (John Calvin, <u>Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans</u>, trans. and ed. John Owen [Edinburgh: Printed for the Calvin Translation Society, 1849], 141). See also below, 56-7.

eschatological interpretation to define δικαιοσύνη. In the
process, the lexical content of the term seems to be lost.

While this writer believes that the use of the inspired
Scriptures of the Old Testament are or can be a source for
the theological meaning of terms found in the whole of
Scripture, it is held here that a rigid analysis of the text
under consideration, Romans 3:21, with its grammar and
syntax, along with the lexical content of the terms and the
immediate literary context, can provide an adequate basis
for understanding the expression δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ. Such an
understanding can be used to understand the theology of "the
righteousness of God," and can be used to weigh other
theological statements for this term.

This writer holds that a sound analysis of the passage
in Romans 3:21 and its context will provide a sound basis
for a theological statement of that to which δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ
"the righteousness of God" refers in Romans 3:21.

A Statement of the Thesis

The thesis of this paper is that the genitive of
δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ "the righteousness of God" in Romans 3:21 is
a subjective genitive, narrowly defined. The phrase is
analyzed to have the sense "God justifies [unrighteous
people]." An analysis of the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as

a genitive of source can also be substantiated. In that case, δικαιοσύνη would refer to the righteous status or condition that an individual can have, and which would be the result of God's act to justify unrighteous people.

A Statement Concerning Method

Chapters I-III of the thesis review the positions of various writers through history. Not all of these writers presented a grammatical or semantic classification of the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 3:21. However, their theological interpretations of the term indicate the semantic-grammatical classification that would be appropriate for their interpretations.

The first writers who are considered are from the early church. They are John Chrysostom and Augustine. The second set of writers are taken from the Reformation. The writers considered here are Martin Luther and John Calvin.

The third group of writers are chosen from among those who have been involved in the debate of the interpretation of the term in the twentieth century.

Chapter IV presents grammatical and textual matters that are used to demonstrate the thesis. Definitions of adnominal genitives that are relevant to this thesis are presented. Definitions are presented that seek to be

linguistically acceptable, and which accurately communicate a proposed interpretation of a text.

This chapter also presents theory regarding topics in Koiné Greek, fronting, and the conjunction δέ. These matters are then used in an analysis of χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 3:21.

The final chapter provides conclusions, and presents the acceptability or unacceptability of the various interpretations that were presented in Chapters I-III in light of the findings of the study.

CHAPTER I

HISTORY OF INTERPRETATION:
PRE-REFORMATION WRITERS

Pre-Reformation and Reformation writers did not use the terms subjective genitive, objective genitive, or genitive of source, or, they may have used these terms differently from the way that they are used in this thesis, and in some recent commentaries and grammars. But as their writings are studied, their comments on "the righteousness of God" can reveal how their understanding of the genitive construction would fit with classifications of the genitive construction as it is used in the current debate.

In this thesis, διακιοσύνη θεοῦ has the sense "God justifies [unrighteous people]" when the genitive is defined as a subjective genitive. This classification of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ could express the idea of the means whereby sinners are justified. As a genitive of source, δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ could refer to the condition or status of righteousness that a person who believes in Christ has before God. This could refer to the result of God's act of justifying

unrighteousness people. As an objective genitive, δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ means "[Someone or something] justifies God," or "[Someone] acknowledges God as just." These interpretations of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ will be derived later in this paper, but to have them in mind as the pre-Reformation and Reformation writers are reviewed can help the reader understand the interpretations of the "righteousness of God" which these writers make in comparison to the interpretations of writers in the current debate.

John Chrysostom

In Chrysostom's "Homilies on Romans," righteousness is seen as a gift from God, as something that is received. It could be seen as the result of God's justifying action.

In Chrysostom's view, to be justified means to be made righteous. But to be made righteous is more than to be saved from the punishment of sin; to be made just is more than to be forgiven; it is more than being saved. To be made righteous speaks of being changed, with the result that a person possesses a moral quality of righteousness, as this writer understands Chrysostom.[7]

Righteousness as a moral quality can be seen in Chrysostom's comments on the purpose of the (Mosaic) law and

---

[7]See the discussion that follows.

in his discussion of what a person has who believes in Christ. It can also be seen in his comments on the change found in those who have been baptized into Christ's death, and those who have been made righteous.

Commenting on Romans 8:4 and Romans 10:4, Chrysostom states that the law enjoined "to be without sin."[1] Its purpose was to "make man righteous," or, "that man might be justified." But, he says, the law did not have the power to make people righteous. However, "Christ gave a fuller accomplishment" through faith to the law's purpose to justify people. The one who believes in Christ "hast fulfilled it [the Law] also, and much more than it commanded. For [he has] received a much greater righteousness." Not only that, but Chrysostom states:

> [Paul] shows that there is but one righteousness, and that has its full issue in this, and that he that hath taken to himself this, the one [righteousness] by faith, hath fulfilled that [the 'righteousness from the deeds of the Law'] also .... But he that hath Christ, even though he have not fulfilled the Law aright, hath received the whole.

---

[1]John Chrysostom, "The Homilies of St. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, on the Epistle of St. Paul the Apostle to the Romans," trans. J. B. Morris and W. H. Simcox, rev., with notes, by George B. Stevens, in Saint Chrysostom: Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Romans, in vol. 11 of A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, ed. Philip Schaff, 14 vols. ([1889]; reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1979), 433.

To have the one righteousness which is by faith, which fulfills the law, means to have a moral, or ethical, righteousness, which is given to a person by faith.[2]

That righteousness is understood as a moral concept in Chrysostom's writing is seen in his comments on Romans 6:3,4. He writes of the change that takes place in the lives of those who have been baptized into Christ's death, stating that "sin is mortified, and righteousness hath risen again." There is a change in people's lives. "The old life," he says, "hath been made to vanish, and this new and angelic one is being lived in."[3]

Chrysostom also speaks of God making sinners, who are "filled with the putrefying sores ... of sin suddenly righteous."[4] The contrast between the state of sinners, described as "filled with the putrefying sores ... of sin," with the fact that they are made righteous, suggests that being made righteous is being made whole, that righteousness is a state of wholeness, a state with a right quality of character in contrast to sin.

The justification of the sinner, in Chrysostom's writing, is accomplished through Christ's death on the

---

[2]Ibid., 472, 473.

[3]Ibid., 405-6.

[4]Ibid., 378.

cross. Commenting on the passage "Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification" (Romans 4:25), Chrysostom says,

> How came He to be crucified?--For others ... Now to prevent your saying, How, when liable for so great sins, came we to be justified? he points out One that blotteth out all sins, that both from Abraham's faith, whereby he was justified, and from the Savior's Passion, whereby we were freed from our sins, he might confirm what he had said.[5]

As indicated in the one reference above, Chrysostom states that righteousness is received. It is received when a person believes in Christ and is baptized. He says, "For it is not to all absolutely, but to them that receive it." Those who receive it are those who have "received the word concerning the Cross, and have been baptized," and so have "blotted out all" their sins.[6] This means that in Chrysostom's view, righteousness is directed to individuals.

Commenting on Romans 3:21, Chrysostom says that Paul "does not say righteousness simply, but the righteousness of God, so by the worthiness of the Person displaying the greater degree of the grace, and the possibility of the promise."[7] Commenting on the term "the righteousness of God" in Romans 10:3, Chrysostom says, "But this he calls

---

[5]Ibid., 395.

[6]See above, 12, and Chrysostom, Homilies, 349.

[7]Ibid., 377.

God's righteousness, that from faith, because it comes entirely from the grace from above, and because men are justified in this case, not by labors, but by the gift of God."[8]

Conclusions

In Chrysostom's <u>Homilies on Romans</u>, righteousness is seen as a gift from God. It is something that is received by man. Chrysostom understands that it is called the righteousness of God because of the worthiness of God, who is the One "displaying the greater degree of the grace, and the possibility of the promise," and because "it comes entirely from the grace from above, and because men are justified in this case ... by the gift of God." As a gift from God, and as something that is received by individuals, Chrysostom's understanding of the righteousness of God would fit into the classification of "genitive of source" as that term is used in this paper.

As a quality that a person receives, and as something accomplished by Christ's death on the cross, the righteousness of God could be seen as the person's condition which is the result of God's justifying work. As noted above, this is an interpretation which seems to be suited to

---

[8]Ibid., 472.

the classification of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a genitive of source.

Augustine

Augustine presents several significant points about the righteousness of God in his comments on Romans 3:21f. in "The Spirit and the Letter." His understanding of the righteousness of God, as found in this work, is that it is a gift from God, given to believers. It is something that is received by individuals, and so is possessed by them. The righteousness of God that is given to individuals is a thing that is moral or ethical in quality. It makes the one who receives it righteous, so that he himself is made morally upright in nature.

Augustine states:

"The righteousness of God"--not the righteousness of man or the righteousness of our own will--the righteousness of God, not that by which God is righteous, but that wherewith he clothes man, when he justifies the ungodly ... [The law] gives ample token that man is justified by the gift of God through the help of the Spirit;... how does the apostle continue?-- "The righteousness of God through the faith of Jesus Christ": that is, the faith whereby we believe in Christ. The "faith of Christ" here meant is not that by which Christ believes, any more than the righteousness of God is that by which God is righteous. Both are our own; called "of God" and "of Christ," because bestowed upon us by his bounty ... God confers

it [the righteousness of God without law] upon the believer through the Spirit of grace.[9]

Comments in "The Spirit and the Letter" on other Scripture references complement Augustine's view of "the righteousness of God" noted above.

Augustine's view of the righteousness of God, which Augustine presents in "The Spirit and the Letter," corresponds largely to a view of the righteousness of God as a genitive of source.

The Righteousness of God as a Gift

One of Augustine's statements cited above is especially defining of his view of the righteousness of God. He says, "The righteousness of God ... wherewith he clothes man, when he justifies the ungodly." This is a righteousness that is conferred upon the believer. That it is from God is seen in a statement on Romans 9:30, where Augustine refers to the righteousness which is received as "the righteousness which is of faith." He says, "[The Gentiles] received it in answer to their prayer from God."[10] The righteousness of

---

[9]Augustine, "The Spirit and the Letter," in Augustine: Later Works, selected and trans. with Introductions, John Burnaby, in vol. 8 of The Library of Christian Classics, ed. John Baillie, John T. McNeill, and Henry P. Van Dusen, 26 vols. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955), 205, emphasis indicated in the source cited.

[10]Ibid., 234.

God is given to the believer "by the bestowal of the Spirit."[11]

The righteousness of God is given to individuals by faith. Following his comment on Romans 3:21, Augustine cites 3:22-23, indicating that the righteousness of God is "unto all that believe."[12] A comment on pp. 249-250 indicates that righteousness is possessed individually. The reference quoted above indicates that God confers righteousness upon the believer, indicating that it is individuals who receive it.

The righteousness which God gives to individuals is something that is then possessed by them. Again, in the reference quoted above, Augustine says of the "righteousness of God" and of the "faith of Christ" that "both are our own;... bestowed upon us by his bounty." Because reference is made to the righteousness of God as "our own," it can be, and is, possessed by individuals, in Augustine's view.

Righteousness as a Moral or Ethical Quality

When Augustine writes of righteousness, he writes of it as a moral or ethical quality. This can be seen in statements from "The Spirit and the Letter."

---

[11]Ibid., 241.

[12]Ibid., 205.

In reference to the Gentiles, "who 'do by nature the things contained in the law'" (Romans 2:14), Augustine writes of acts "which judged by the standard of right conduct call not only for the withholding of blame but even for merited and proper commendation."[13] In using the expression "judged by the standard of right conduct," Augustine indicates that the concern is an ethical concern. These actions are not explicitly called righteous acts, but it seems that they are implied to be righteous in form when he says, "It is true that enquiry into the end or purpose of such actions would make it less easy to discover any that deserve the praise or the defence due to genuine righteousness."[14] "Genuine righteousness," then, is reflected in actions that conform to a standard of right conduct along with right ends, or right purposes. Such a righteousness could be called an ethical or moral righteousness.

Another passage suggests that righteousness is that which is in accord with "the holy and righteous commands of God." Augustine says, "in whom [Christ] ... everyone that is incorporated through the Spirit, and made a member of him [Christ], is enabled to work righteousness." The context

---

[13]Ibid., 231.

[14]Ibid., 231.

indicates that righteousness, as referred to here, is that which is in accord with "the holy and righteous commands of God."[15]

Finally, Augustine says, "[God] extends his righteousness whereby he justifies the ungodly, not because they are upright in heart, but that they may become upright in heart."[16] In the next section, Augustine's understanding of "to be justified" as "to be made righteous" will be presented. If being justified is being made righteous, and the purpose of being justified is to be made upright in heart, to be made righteous would be to be made upright in heart. Righteousness in the individual would be uprightness of heart.

"To Be Justified" is "To Be Made Righteous"

The main interpretation of "to be justified" in "The Spirit and the Letter" is "to be made righteous." It is found in the reference cited above, where Augustine says, "[God] extends his righteousness whereby he justifies the ungodly, not because they are upright in heart, but that they may become upright in heart." The ungodly are justified, and, in this, are made upright in heart.

---

[15]Ibid., 234-5.

[16]Ibid., 201.

Commenting on Romans 1:17, Augustine says that the righteousness of God which is revealed in the New Testament is "called the righteousness of God, because God by imparting it makes man righteous."[17]

These references suggest that "to be justified" is "to be made righteous." This concept is stated explicitly in Augustine's comments on Romans 2:13. There, he says, "The word 'justified' is equivalent to 'made righteous'--made righteous by him who justifies the ungodly, so that he who was ungodly becomes righteous."[18]

Augustine does state, however, that "justified" could mean "held [acknowledged as] just." He argues that as an alternative to the foregoing statement that "'justified' is equivalent to 'made righteous,'" "shall be justified" could have the sense "'shall be held just,' ' shall be accounted just,'" just as "sanctify" and "sanctified" can mean "makes saints of men who are not saints" and "be held [acknowledged] ... as holy," respectively. He notes these senses of "sanctifies, sanctified" when they are used in the statement, "God 'sanctifies his saints,'" and in the request, "Let thy name be sanctified." In the first, God is understood to make his saints holy; in the second, the sense

---

[17]Ibid., 208.

[18]Ibid., 228.

is that "what is ever holy in itself may be held ... as holy." In the first, men who were not saints are made saints; in the second, that which is already holy is acknowledged as holy. In the same way, "shall be justified" could mean "shall be held [acknowledged as] just." But, just as that which is acknowledged as holy is already holy in the above example, the understanding of Augustine that those who "shall be held [acknowledged as] just" are those who will be just because God will have made them so.[19]

The Righteousness of God in the Individual

In his work, "The Spirit and the Letter," Augustine writes of the receiving of righteousness by individuals. The reception of righteousness effects the individual. Some of the things of which he writes are attributed to the work of grace. These, however, may perhaps be viewed as part of what it means to be made righteous, since he says that man is justified "by grace freely given."[20]

---

[19]Ibid., 228-9.

[20]Ibid., 212, and cf. Augustine, "On Nature and Grace," in Saint Augustine: Four Anti-Pelagian Writings: On Nature and Grace: On the Proceedings of Pelagius: On the Predestination of the Saints: On the Gift of Perseverance, trans. John A. Mourant and William J. Collinge, with introductions and notes by William J. Collinge, in vol. 86 of The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation, 89 vols. (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1992). In these writings, it seems that the work of grace is seen to be to justify. For example, in "On Nature and Grace," Augustine speaks of "the grace of Christ, by

According to Augustine, one of the things that grace does is to restore the will. At the end of the passage cited above, Augustine says, "that grace may restore the will and the restored will may fulfill the law."[21]

A second result of being made righteous is that the individual is enabled to do righteousness. He is enabled to do "the holy and righteous commands of God" because God "gives the increase from within."[22]

Commenting on 2 Corinthians 3:7,13,14, and 16, Augustine says that from Christ "we have the justification whereby we do what he commands."[23] Such comments indicate that there is a change in the individual's nature when he is justified.

Augustine also speaks of renewal, and of the likeness of Christ being formed again from day to day, beginning "now."[24] He speaks of the presence of the Holy Spirit

---

which we are justified" (p. 41). Later, he says, "But God himself, when ... he spiritually heals a sick person or raises a dead one, that is, justifies the ungodly,..." (p.44). He also speaks of the soul, how it "accomplishes only dead works, until through the grace of Christ it is brought back to life" (p.41).

[21]Augustine, "The Spirit and the Letter," 205.

[22]Ibid., 234, 235.

[23]Ibid., 218.

[24]Ibid., 222-3.

within a person, whose presence is what constitutes "the laws of God, written by God himself upon the heart."[25]

One of the images which Augustine uses a number of times is that of healing. The person who has received grace is healed "from his old failing." Augustine writes of the one who "trusts himself to God ... for the healing of all his sicknesses." This healing would be a spiritual healing, a restoration from the consequences of sin.[26]

Thus, the effect of righteousness upon the individual is to restore the will, to enable him to do that which is righteous, and to be healed.

The Righteousness of God as a Genitive of Source

"The righteousness of God," as seen by Augustine, is a gift which is given by God. It is from God, and is received by individuals. Other terms which Augustine uses for the giving of the righteousness of God are "bestowed" and "conferred." With "the righteousness of God" viewed as a gift given by God, from God, the construction δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ would be seen as a genitive of source.

"The righteousness of God" is also seen as a quality that individuals possess. It is a condition, an uprightness

---

[25]Ibid., 221.

[26]Ibid., 221, 242-3. Cf. also Augustine, "On Nature and Grace," 44.

of heart, that results from a change in the individual's nature. This characteristic of a condition of the individual suggests further that δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ be classified as a genitive of source.

The Righteousness of God as a Genitive of Agent

One or more of Augustine's statements indicate that at times "the righteousness of God" could be seen as a genitive of agent, or as a subjective genitive, narrowly defined. In a statement already cited, Augustine says, "he extends his righteousness whereby he justifies the ungodly."[27] Again, when he says, "the doers of the law shall be justified," he argues that "the grace of the justifier" is needed "in order that [people] may be doers [of the law]." In other words, people must be made righteous in order to do the things that are righteous.[28] If δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ would be taken as "God acts to make people righteous," the genitive of this construction could be a genitive of agent, or a subjective genitive, narrowly defined, where the "subject" would be the "agent" of the verbal idea "make righteous."

However, in Augustine's writing, the idea is that God imparts a quality of righteousness to the individual who

---

[27]Augustine, "The Spirit and the Letter," 201.

[28]Ibid., 228-9.

believes, and that quality of righteousness is what makes the unrighteous person righteous.[29] Commenting on "the righteousness of God" in Romans 1:17, Augustine says, "called the righteousness of God, because God by imparting it makes man righteous,"[30] and, in the reference cited at the beginning of this section, he writes of the righteousness of God as "that wherewith he clothes man, when he justifies the ungodly."

Conclusions

Augustine writes of the righteousness of God as a gift given by God. It is from God, and is received by the individual upon the individual's faith. It is something that can be possessed by the individual. With "righteousness" understood in this way, Augustine's interpretation of "the righteousness of God" would correspond to the interpretation of the genitive of the construction δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a genitive of source.

---

[29]Commenting on 2 Corinthians 5:21, Augustine says of the righteousness of God, "that by which we are made so by him" (Augustine, "The Spirit and the Letter," 219). He also says, "The righteousness of God by which we are made righteous," but goes on to say, "That is the righteousness of God, which he ... gives by the bestowal of the Spirit" (Ibid., 241).

[30]Ibid., 208.

Other important items to note about Augustine's view of
the righteousness of God is that it is an ethical or moral
quality. The righteousness that is received by the
individual has an effect on the nature of the one who
receives it, so that he is made righteous; he has a
condition of righteousness.

CHAPTER II

HISTORY OF INTERPRETATION:

REFORMATION WRITERS

Luther

Introduction

In Luther's writing, the righteousness of God is that righteousness which God gives to the believer. It is a righteousness that is imputed. This righteousness itself makes the believer righteous before God. That is, because the believer possesses this righteousness, he is considered by God to be righteous.

In his "Scholia" on Romans 3:26, Luther says that Paul himself interprets the term "the righteousness of God" expressed in verse 21 as "a term which describes that by which He makes us righteous, just as the wisdom of God is that by which He makes us wise."[1]

---

[1]Martin Luther, "Scholia," in _Lectures on Romans: Glosses and Scholia_, chapters 1-2 trans. Walter G. Tillmans, chapters 3-15 trans. Jacob A. O. Preus, ed. Hilton C. Oswald, in vol. 25 of _Luther's Works_, 55 vols. (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1972), 249.

Defining Statements

Three of Luther's statements present a definition of the "righteousness of God" as he interprets it. In his "Scholia" on Romans 1:17, Luther says:

> The righteousness of God is revealed. In human teachings the righteousness of man is revealed and taught, that is, who is and becomes righteous before himself and before other people and how this takes place. Only in the Gospel is the righteousness of God revealed (that is, who is and becomes righteous before God and how this takes place) by faith alone ... For the righteousness of God is the cause of salvation. And here again, by the righteousness of God we must not understand the righteousness by which He is righteous in Himself but the righteousness by which we are made righteous by God.[2]

In his glosses on Romans 1:17, Luther says, "For the righteousness, by which a person is worthy of such salvation, of God, by which alone there are righteous people before God."[3]

Luther also speaks of the "righteousness of God" which is to be taken in a passive sense in the "Preface to the Complete Edition of Luther's Latin Writings." His work with the active and passive senses of the term, as he describes it, will be discussed below in the section on his work on classifying the genitive construction. Regarding the

---

[2]Ibid., 151.

[3]Martin Luther, "Glosses," in Lectures on Romans: Glosses and Scholia, chapters 1-2 trans. Walter G. Tillmans, chapters 3-16 trans. Jacob A. O. Preus, ed. Hilton C. Oswald, in vol. 25 of Luther's Works, 55 vols. (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1972), 9.

"righteousness of God" as he writes of it in this reference, he says, "And this is the meaning: the righteousness of God is revealed by the gospel, namely, the passive righteousness with which merciful God justifies us by faith, as it is written, 'He who through faith is righteous shall live.'"[4]

Luther also presents a statement on the "righteousness of God" in On the Bondage of the Will. There, he says, "'The righteousness of God', which in Latin idiom would denote a righteousness which God has, means, according to Hebrew idiom, a righteousness which we have from God and in God's sight."[5]

In Luther's interpretation, "the righteousness of God" is a righteousness which is imputed to the one who believes. By having this imputed righteousness, the person of faith is considered by God to be righteous. Thus, the righteousness of God is the "cause of salvation" for the sinner; it is what makes a person "worthy of ... salvation."

---

[4]Martin Luther, "Preface to the Complete Edition of Luther's Latin Writings: Wittenberg, 1545," trans. Lewis W. Spitz, Sr., in Career of the Reformer, IV, ed. Lewis W. Spitz, in vol. 34 of Luther's Works, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut T. Lehmann, 55 vols. (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1960), 337.

[5]J. I. Packer and O. R. Johnston, Martin Luther on "The Bondage of the Will": A New Translation of "De Servo Arbitrio (1525)": Martin Luther's Reply to Erasmus of Rotterdam (Westwood, NJ: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1957), 291.

As stated, Luther sees "the righteousness of God" as the righteousness which God gives to the believer, so that the believer is "made righteous" before God. In viewing "the righteousness of God" in this way, Luther sees himself as following Augustine. He cites Augustine from <u>On the Spirit and the Letter</u>, saying, "It is called the righteousness of God because by imparting it He makes righteous people."[6] However, he maintains that he differs from Augustine in that he sees righteousness as being imputed. He says, "Although this was heretofore said imperfectly and he [Augustine] did not explain all things concerning imputation clearly."[7] For Luther, then, to say that the believer is "made righteous" would mean that the believer has a righteousness imputed to him so that he is considered righteous by God.

The Righteousness of God as a Genitive

of Source in Luther's Writings

Characteristics which Luther ascribes to the term "the righteousness of God," along with his own analyses of the construction, indicate that Luther would classify the

---

[6]Luther, "Scholia," 151.

[7]Luther, "Preface," 337.

genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a "genitive of source," as
that classification is used in this thesis.

Characteristics of the "Righteousness of God,"
as Interpreted by Luther

Luther speaks of "the righteousness of God" as given by
God and as possessed by individuals. It is from God, and is
foreign to the individual. The fact that it is given by God
and is possessed by the believer can be seen both in
references where Luther follows Augustine, and where he
makes direct assertions himself.

In his glosses on Romans 3:21, Luther cites chapter 9
of Augustine's On the Spirit and the Letter. He includes
the statement, "Both ['the faith of Christ' and 'the
righteousness of God'] are ours. But it is called God's
righteousness and Christ's righteousness because He gives it
to us out of His bounty."[8] Because the righteousness of
God can be spoken of as "ours," it is something that is
possessed. Luther also includes Augustine's statement that
God "gives it to us out of His bounty." So it is also a
righteousness that is given.

In his own comments on the righteousness of God, Luther
says:

---

[8]Luther, "Glosses," 30, n. 20.

> [Paul] declares that the latter [the righteousness of
> God which is assigned to grace, in contradistinction to
> the righteousness assigned to the law] is given without
> the former and without its works, and that the former
> without the latter does not justify or avail
> anything.[9]

Also, in his glosses on Romans 3:22, Luther states that the

righteousness of God is something that can be

"possessed."[10] Furthermore, it is possessed through

faith. Since it is individuals that have faith, this

righteousness would be possessed by individuals.

Thus, the righteousness of God is a righteousness that

is given by God and is possessed by individuals.

A third characteristic of "the righteousness of God"

which indicates that the genitive is a genitive of source is

that the righteousness is "from God." Luther explicitly

expresses the genitive θεοῦ as "from God" in his glosses on

Romans 3:22. There, he says, "The righteousness, that

righteousness, I say, of God, from God, through faith is

Jesus Christ."[11]

---

[9]Packer and Johnston, On the Bondage of the Will, 290.

[10]He says, "He [Paul] is describing what or of what
nature the righteousness of God is, namely, that it is not
something by which He Himself is righteous or by which a
person could be righteous, but it is that which can be
possessed in no other way than through faith" (Luther,
"Glosses," p. 31, n. 22).

[11]Ibid., 31.

Finally, Luther speaks of the righteousness of God as "from without" and "entirely foreign to us." He says,

> God certainly desires to save us not through our own righteousness, but through the righteousness and wisdom of someone else or by means of a righteousness which does not originate on earth, but comes down from heaven. So, then, we must teach a righteousness which in every way comes from without and is entirely foreign to us.[12]

Luther's Analysis and Classification of "The Righteousness of God"

In the "Preface" to his Latin writings, Luther uses the analogies of other genitive constructions to explain his understanding of the righteousness of God. He refers to "the work of God," "the power of God," "the wisdom of God," and "the glory of God." He explains the first three of these in his "Preface." An explanation of "the glory of God" is found in his "Scholia" on Romans 3:23.

Luther interprets "the work of God" as "what God does in us." "The power of God" is understood as that "with which he makes us strong," and "the wisdom of God" is that

_____

[12]Martin Luther, _Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans_, trans. and abridged J. Theodore Mueller (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1954), 12-13. See also Martin Luther, "Two Kinds of Righteousness, 1519," trans. Lowell J. Satre, in _Career of the Reformer: I_, ed. Harold J. Grimm, vol. 31 of _Luther's Works_, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut T. Lehmann, 55 vols. (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1957), 297.

"with which he makes us wise."[13] Concerning "the glory of God," Luther says, "'Glory of God' is used in the same way as righteousness, wisdom, and virtue, that is, something which is given to us by God and because of which we can before Him glory in Him and about Him."[14]

The first of these, "the work of God," understood as "what God does in us," would be classified as a subjective genitive, as this classification is discussed later. The second two would fit the classification of the genitive as "genitive of source." Luther's interpretation of "the glory of God" may incorporate the notion that "glory" represents "glorying." The idea would be that God gives us a glorying, whereby "we can before Him glory in Him and about Him."[15] This analysis of "the glory of God" is not the same as an analysis that this writer would make. Nevertheless, Luther's comments disclose his interpretation and understanding of the expression "the righteousness of God." For him, "the righteousness of God" is a righteousness which is given by God, and, by having that righteousness, the individual is made righteous. The righteousness which the individual has, however, is an imputed righteousness in

---

[13]Luther, "Preface," 337.

[14]Luther, "Scholia," 248.

[15]Ibid., 248.

Luther's writing, and the person is considered righteous, although, so far as a doctrine of justification is concerned, the person is not given a moral quality of righteousness.[16]

Such an interpretation of "the righteousness of God" fits a classification of the expression as a "genitive of source," as used in this thesis.

"The Righteousness of God" Understood in

Active and Passive Senses

Luther makes a distinction between what he refers to as an active or formal sense of "the righteousness of God," and what he refers to as the passive sense. He expresses the active sense as that "with which God is righteous and punishes the unrighteous sinner." He says:

> For I hated that word "righteousness of God," which, according to the use and custom of all the teachers, I had been taught to understand philosophically regarding the formal or active righteousness, as they called it, with which God is righteous and punishes the unrighteous sinner.[17]

The distinction he makes between the active sense and the passive sense of certain terms is found in a discussion of "the glory of God." He associates the active sense with

---

[16]Luther does write of a believer's being made righteous "in effect." This would belong to a doctrine of sanctification, and will be discussed briefly below.

[17]Luther, "Preface," 336.

"the Latin idiom," and the passive sense with "the Hebrew idiom."

The active sense would be the one associated with "the Latin idiom," and would refer to a righteousness that God has. He holds that "the righteousness of God" should be taken according to the Hebrew idiom, or, in the passive sense. It would then have the meaning as expressed above, "a righteousness which we have from God and in God's sight."[18]

"To Be Justified" in Luther's Writings

In Luther's writings, "to be justified" is to be considered righteous. It is to have a righteousness imputed. The significance of this, for a study of the classification of the genitive of "the righteousness of God," is that this righteousness would not be a moral quality of righteousness. Rather, it would be a standing that is imputed. It would seem to be a status which one has before God, but which, nevertheless, would be a status that is given to the person by God.

Statements

Luther expresses his understanding of the term "to be justified" in "The Disputation Concerning Justification."

---

[18]Packer and Johnston, On the Bondage of the Will, 291, and see above, 30.

He says, "In short, the term 'to be justified' means that a man is considered righteous."[19] In his thirty-third thesis in this disputation, he says that the idea of being justified "includes that idea, namely that we are considered righteous on account of Christ."[20]

The Nature of Justification

In the act of justification, there is an exchange. The person who is justified can say, "Mine are Christ's living, doing, and speaking, his suffering and dying, mine as much as if I had lived, done, spoken, suffered, and died as he did."[21]

There is also an exchange in that Christ is said to carry our sins, and "His righteousness in turn is ours."[22]

But Luther not only speaks of Christ's righteousness belonging to the believer, he says that "he [Christ] himself becomes ours." The believer is said to be "one with

---

[19]Martin Luther, "The Disputation Concerning Justification, 1536," trans. Lewis W. Spitz, in Career of the Reformer: IV, ed. Lewis W. Spitz, vol. 34 of Luther's Works, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut T. Lehmann, 55 vols. (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1960), 167.

[20]Ibid., 153.

[21]Martin Luther, "Righteousness," 297.

[22]In his "Scholia" on Romans 3:27, Luther says, "For Christ carries all sins, if only they are displeasing to us, and thus they are no longer ours but His, and His righteousness in turn is ours" (Luther, "Scholia," 254).

Christ." Luther says, "He who trusts in Christ exists in Christ; he is one with Christ, having the same righteousness as he."[23] Nevertheless, Luther seems to speak primarily of a righteousness being imputed.

As an act where righteousness is imputed, the person of faith is "decree[d]" to be righteous, or "pronounced" righteous by God.[24]

In justification, in Luther's view, sin is not removed; it "remains in human nature." But God is said to "consider us to be righteous and pure." The sin that remains, then, is not imputed, or, it is "imputed as having been removed ... although it remains in nature and substance." The sin which remains is said to be "absorbed by the goodness of God who conceals it on account of Christ who overshadows it."[25]

God does, however, "begin materially to purge and to forgive completely."[26] There is a work in the believer's life where an actual righteousness is realized. This is discussed below.

---

[23]Luther, "Righteousness," 298.

[24]Luther, "Justification," 152, 162.

[25]Ibid., 191, 166-7.

[26]Ibid., 167.

Significance

The implication of the view that justification is a matter of being considered righteous and that righteousness is a status that is imputed to a person is that righteousness is not seen as a quality; rather, it is something that is placed on a person's account. As such, it would appear to be a status, a status where the person who has faith in Christ is considered by God to be righteous as he is judged by God.

The Life of the Person Who is Justified by Faith

Luther believed that there should be an obedience which follows the forgiveness of sins. He believed that good works should follow faith.

He also believed that sin remained in the person who had faith. That sin was being purged, but it would not be purged completely until the final conflagration.

There is, however, a process in which actual righteousness is being brought about in the person of faith. This process is a work of the Holy Spirit.

Obedience, Good Works

Luther did not believe that a doctrine of justification, in which God was understood to impute righteousness to believers, should permit the practice of sin. Rather, there was to be an obedience, and evidence of

faith, which would be shown in good works. He says, "This is that Christian liberty, our faith, the effect of which is, not that we should be careless or lead a bad life, but that no one should need the law or works for justification and salvation."[27] He also stated that there should be an obedience which follows forgiveness of sins, and that there should be evidence of faith, shown "through [good] works."[28]

Sin Remains. It will be Completely Destroyed Only in the Final Conflagration

Luther believed that sin remained in the person who was justified by faith. Therefore, such a person was not perfectly righteous. The sin that remained was original sin. "Original sin" is seen as "the root of actual sins," and that original sin "continually cleaves to us." Luther believed that original sin would not be "substantially or essentially destroyed except in the conflagration of fire," or "when we die."[29]

---

[27]Martin Luther, "Concerning Christian Liberty," in Luther's Primary Works: Together with his Shorter and Larger Catechisms: Translated into English, ed. with Theological and Historical Essays by Henry Wace and C. A. Buchheim (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1896), 262.

[28]Luther, "Justification," 190.

[29]Ibid., 191, 164-5. See also Luther, "Scholia," 245, 247.

The Work of the Holy Spirit to Make a Person Actually
Righteous

But Luther believed that the Holy Spirit is working in
the believer to make him actually righteous, that is,
righteous in effect. Two teachings, one on being made
righteous by imputation, and the one on being made righteous
in effect, are seen in a statement from "The Disputation
Concerning Justification." Luther says, "For he [God] first
purifies by imputation, then he gives the Holy Spirit,
through whom he purifies even in substance. Faith cleanses
through the remission of sins, the Holy Spirit cleanses
through the effect."[30] In Luther's view of justification,
the person who is justified is considered to be righteous
because a righteousness has been imputed to him. Sin is
thought to actually remain, but the believer is considered
to be righteous. In this sense, he is "purifie[d] by
imputation," cleansed "through the remission of sins" that
comes through faith. This would be the first teaching, the
teaching on justification. But after this cleansing, there
is a purification where "he [God] personally and really
purifies."[31] This would be the purification that is "even

---

[30]Luther, "Justification," 168.

[31]Ibid., 191.

in substance," the cleansing by the Holy Spirit "through the effect." This would be the second of the two teachings.

Luther speaks elsewhere of the work of the Holy Spirit in the life of the believer, to make a change in him. He says, "The Spirit makes the heart glad and free, as the law requires that it shall be. Thus good works come out of faith." He also speaks of the change that the Holy Spirit works in a person's life, stating, in effect, "God's Spirit ... makes a man equal to the law."[32]

Conclusions

In Luther's writings, the way a person is considered righteous is to have the righteousness of God given to him. That righteousness is the righteousness of Christ, and is imputed to the person who has faith in Jesus Christ. Because the person of faith has this righteousness, God considers him to be righteous. Luther does write of not only receiving Christ's righteousness, but of receiving Him, and of being one with Him. However, in the works of Luther that were consulted, Luther wrote primarily of righteousness in justification as a righteousness that is imputed to a person.

The righteousness of God in justification is primarily seen as a righteousness that is given, that is possessed by

---

[32]Luther, Commentary, xiii, xii.

people who have faith, and that is from God. Luther says that the expression is to be understood in a "passive" sense, and so would mean "a righteousness which we have from God and in God's sight." These characteristics of "the righteousness of God" would lend themselves to the classification of the genitive of the phrase as a genitive of source, as that term is used in this thesis.

Finally, the righteousness of God, as written about by Luther, could be seen as a status. It is "a righteousness which we have ... in God's sight." As a status, it could be seen as the result of God's justifying work. The interpretation of the genitive of "the righteousness of God" as a genitive of source may lend itself especially to an understanding of the righteousness of God as a condition or a status that is the result of God's justifying work.

Calvin

Introduction

This section presents three interpretations of the construction "the righteousness of God" in Romans 3:21 which are found in John Calvin's writings. It also presents his understanding of what it means to be justified. The view of what happens in justification is seen here to incorporate an interpretation of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a genitive of source.

Finally, a section is devoted to the implications of the righteousness of God in the Christian's life.

Comments on references outside Romans 3:21 to "the righteousness of God" and justification are used, as well as comments on that passage. This writer holds, however, that these comments are valid for Calvin's understanding of "the righteousness of God" in Romans 3:21.

The Righteousness of God: What It Is

Three interpretations of "the righteousness of God" are found in Calvin's writings. These are termed "attributive genitive," "genitive of source," and " possessive genitive" in this thesis.

δìκαιοσύνη θεοῦ as an Attributive Genitive

In his comments on Romans 1:17, Calvin speaks of "the righteousness of God" as "that which is approved before his tribunal."[33] It is the righteousness which is acceptable when it is judged by God.

"The righteousness of God" is defined in terms of a contrast with a righteousness that is approved by man. Calvin says, "I take the righteousness of God to mean, that which is approved before his tribunal; as that, on the contrary, is usually called the righteousness of men, which

---

[33]Calvin, Commentaries, 64.

is by men counted and supposed to be righteousness." [34]

Considered as a righteousness that is acceptable to God, when judged by God, in contrast to a righteousness that is acceptable to people when judged by people, "the righteousness of God" would be a kind of righteousness. That is, θεοῦ has the sense "God-approved" in the rendering of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as "God-approved righteousness." Because the term θεοῦ represents the quality "God-approved," the genitive is considered to be an "attributive" genitive in this thesis.

The righteousness that is acceptable when judged by God is seen as "the true standard of righteousness," and as "the perfection which is to satisfy the justice of God."[35] As

---

[34]Ibid., 64. Romans 1:17 is taken by this writer to represent the theme of the book of Romans. See below, 115, and 115, n. 118. This writer also holds that Romans 3:21 repeats and amplifies that theme. What is said about δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 1:17, if correct, should be valid for the term δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 3:21. Conversely, what is found to be true for δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 3:21 should test what is proposed for the term in 1:17.

[35]John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, trans. Henry Beveridge (single volume ed., Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989), 64, 60. This single volume edition of Calvin's Institutes was first published in two volumes. The pagination of the original second volume is retained in the second part of the single volume edition. Thus, pagination begins with "1" following page 582. All references that are cited in this thesis are from the second part of the single volume edition.

that which is acceptable to God, δικαιοσύνη would be a
standard.

δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a Genitive of Source

In comments on Romans 1:17, Calvin states that "the
righteousness of God" could be understood as "the
righteousness which is freely given us by God." He says
that "the words will bear this sense."[36] On Romans 3:21,
he says that the righteousness of God could be called that
because "the Lord in his mercy confers it on us." He says
that both this interpretation and the one which sees the
righteousness of God as that which is acceptable to God are
"suitable."[37]

Interpreted as a righteousness that is given to us by
God, as one that the Lord confers upon us, the genitive of

---

[36]Calvin, Commentaries, 65. Commenting on "the
righteousness of God" in Romans 1:17, Calvin says, "Some
explain it as the righteousness which is freely given us by
God: and I indeed confess that the words will bear this
sense; for God justifies us by the gospel, and thus saves
us: yet the former view seems to me more suitable, though
it is not what I make much of." The former view is the one
in which Calvin considers the righteousness of God to be the
righteousness which is approved by God when it is judged by
God.

[37]Ibid., 134. On Romans 3:21, Calvin says, "It is not
certain for what distinct reason he [Paul] calls that the
righteousness of God, which we obtain by faith; whether it
be, because it can alone stand before God, or because the
Lord in his mercy confers it on us. As both interpretations
are suitable, we contend for neither."

"the righteousness of God" would be classified as a genitive of source. Calvin uses the term "founder, (autorem, the author)" to indicate the role of God that is expressed in the construction in Romans 3:22. He says,

> Even the righteousness of God, &c. He [Paul] shows in few words what this justification is, even that which is found in Christ and is apprehended by faith. At the same time, by introducing again the name of God, he seems to make God the founder, (autorem, the author,) and not only the approver of the righteousness of which he speaks; as though he had said, that it flows from him alone, or that its origin is from heaven, but that it is made manifest to us in Christ.[38]

Calvin's reference to God as the "founder (autorem)" of this righteousness suggests a classification of the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a genitive of author. Later in this thesis, that classification will be spoken of as a genitive of source. If "the righteousness of God" is a righteousness that flows from God, or that has its origin in heaven, the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ could be classified as a genitive of source.

Calvin makes other comments which would seem to make the classification of the genitive of "the righteousness of

---

[38]Ibid., 138. Romans 3:22 is seen to expand upon δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in v. 21 (see, for example, ibid., 139), so that what is said about the classification of the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in v. 22 would be applicable to the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in v. 21.

God" a genitive of source. He refers to it as the righteousness "which Christ confers upon us," and that it "proceeds" from God.[39] It is "communicate[d]" to the "undeserving", "bestowed upon us," and "conveyed to us."[40]

Of the two interpretations examined to this point, "the righteousness of God" as that which is acceptable to Him, and "the righteousness of God" that is given to us by God, Calvin prefers the first, although he would not contend much for the one over the other.[41] The two, however, are brought together in the following reference. Commenting on Romans 3:22, Calvin says:

> When therefore we discuss this subject, we ought to proceed in this way: First, the question respecting our justification is to be referred, not to the judgment of men, but to the judgment of God, before whom nothing is counted righteousness, but perfect and absolute obedience to the law; which appears clear from its promises and threatenings: if no one is found who has attained to such a perfect measure of holiness, it follows that all are in themselves destitute of righteousness. Secondly, it is necessary that Christ should come to our aid; who, being alone just, can render us just by transferring to us his own righteousness.[42]

---

[39]Calvin, Institutes, trans. Beveridge, 50.

[40]Ibid., 68, 70; Calvin, Commentaries, 44.

[41]See above, nn. 36 and 37.

[42]Calvin, Commentaries, 138.

Here, the righteousness that is required by God, that is acceptable to Him, is the righteousness that is given, by Him, to the person of faith.

The righteousness that God requires is perfect obedience to the law. This is the righteousness that is acceptable to Him. Since no one possesses this righteousness through his own endeavors, but since Christ does possess it, the righteousness of Christ is given to the unjust person.

δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a Possessive Genitive

Calvin presents one other interpretation of "the righteousness of God," which is classified here as a possessive genitive. Commenting on Romans 3:26, he says that "God is just ... as one who contains within himself all fulness of righteousness." He says that this verse is a definition of the righteousness which Paul "declared was revealed when Christ was given, and which, as he [Paul] has taught us in the first chapter, is made known in the gospel."[43] The reference to the righteousness which "he [Paul] has taught us in the first chapter" and which "is made known in the gospel" would be a reference to "the righteousness of God" in Romans 1:17. As was noted above,

---

[43]Ibid., 146.

what is said about δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 1:17, if correct, should be valid for the term in 3:21.[44]

To Be Justified

An examination of Calvin's understanding of what it means to be justified can contribute to an understanding of his interpretation of "the righteousness of God" as a genitive construction.

In Calvin's view, to be justified is to be reckoned righteous, and to be accepted on account of the righteousness of Christ. The first of these two ideas incorporates the forgiveness of sins, and the imputation of Christ's righteousness. The second is taken by this writer to speak of the matter of reconciliation with God.

To be Reckoned as Righteous

The one who is justified by faith is the one who grasps the righteousness of Christ. That righteousness is said to be imputed to him and he is said to be clothed with the righteousness of Christ. With that righteousness imputed to him and covering him, the believer is considered by God to

---

[44]See above, n. 34.

be righteous.[45] Furthermore, God is said to "assert" that
the believer is righteous.[46]

To be Reconciled

The second item in justification is to be "accepted on
account of his [Christ's] righteousness." God cannot
"receive him [a person] into favour, nor unite him to
himself, without changing his condition from that of a
sinner into that of a righteous man." Calvin says that this
is accomplished "by remission of sins." As a result, he
says that "justification may be termed in one word the
remission of sins."[47] In his commentary on Romans, Calvin
adds that "we are reconciled to him [God] when we are
accepted through his righteousness."[48] He also says:

> Therefore, we explain justification simply as the
> acceptance with which God receives us into his favor as
> righteous men. And we say that it consists in the
> remission of sins and the imputation of Christ's
> righteousness.[49]

---

[45]Calvin, Institutes, trans. Beveridge, 38, 47.

[46]Ibid., 38.

[47]Ibid., 37-38, 57.

[48]Calvin, Commentaries, 143.

[49]Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion: In Two
Volumes, vol. 1, ed. John T. McNeill, trans. and indexed by
Ford Lewis Battles, vol. 20 of The Library of Christian
Classics, ed. John Baillie, John T. McNeill, and Henry P.
Van Dusen, 26 vols. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press,
1960), 727.

He also says that "[God] absolves us [of guilt] ... by the imputation of righteousness, so that we ... may be reckoned as such [righteous] in Christ."[50] So in Calvin's view, we are reconciled to God by the forgiveness of sins. There is also the imputation of Christ's righteousness. It seems that the idea is that as God beholds the righteousness of Christ covering the believer, the believer is absolved of his guilt, and God can admit him into union with Himself.

Union with Christ

In Calvin's view of justification, it is also said that the reckoning of the believer as righteous and the acceptance into God's favor take place in a union with Christ. Justification is realized in a union with Christ. To be accepted into that union, as mentioned above, one must have his sins forgiven.

In that union, however, the righteousness of God is transferred to the believer; that is, Christ's righteousness is said to be given to believers, to be bestowed upon them. That righteousness is the righteousness of God.[51]

Calvin also says that the believer partakes of the righteousness of Christ. He says, "So soon as you are ingrafted into Christ by faith, you are made ... a partaker

---

[50]Ibid., 728.

[51]Institutes, trans. Beveridge, 95.

of righteousness."[52] Not only is the righteousness of God

given to believers, but they are also said to share in the

gifts which Christ was given. Calvin states:

> We assign the highest rank [to the mystical union of
> the head and members, where Christ is said to reside in
> the believers' hearts], Christ when he becomes ours [in
> this mystical union] making us partners with him in the
> gifts with which he was endued.[53]

In addition to this, Calvin says that Christ is made to

be the believer's righteousness. He says, "Our foundation

in Christ ... is to acknowledge that he has been given us

for righteousness ... [Christ] was himself to be our

righteousness." Later he says that, along with being a

partaker of righteousness, a believer is "made a son of God,

an heir of heaven ... a possessor of life, and ... all the

merits of Christ."[54]

There is a sense in which Christ is given to us, and,

with him as our possession, his gifts are communicated to

us.[55] Yet all the things that are given to the believer,

all the things in which he is said to participate, seem to

---

[52]Ibid., 95. Battles translates the one phrase "a
partaker in righteousness" (Institutes, trans. Battles,
794).

[53]Calvin, Institutes, trans. Beveridge, 46.

[54]Ibid., 94, 95.

[55]In his commentary, Calvin says that by faith "we
receive Christ, in whom righteousness is conveyed to us"
(Calvin, Commentaries, 138).

be given to him by imputation in Calvin's interpretation of justification. A word about Calvin's view of that union, and a difference which he held with Osiander, may clarify that, as well as present Calvin's understanding of the nature of the righteousness which the Christian possesses.

The Nature of the Union with Christ.

Calvin held that the believer and Christ were brought together in a mystical union. In that union, Christ is said to reside in the hearts of believers.[56] At this point, Calvin differed from a position that he claimed the Lutheran Osiander held. Calvin claimed that Osiander believed that there was a mixture of the essence of God with the essence of the believer, that there was a transfusion of the essence of God into the individual.[57] An implication of this was that in Osiander's view, righteousness was an "essential righteousness,"[58] which would apparently be a quality. But for Calvin, there was no transfusion of the essence of God into the essence of the believer. The righteousness that the believer received in the union with Christ was by imputation only. That righteousness, then, it would seem,

---

[56]Calvin, Institutes, trans. Beveridge, 46.

[57]Ibid., 40, 46.

[58]Ibid., 41. Calvin stated that, according to Osiander, "We are substantially righteous in God by an infused essence as well as quality" (Ibid., 41).

would be a righteousness that is reckoned to a person's account; it would not be a quality. To have that righteousness would be to have a status, a standing, of righteousness when judged by God. The believer would be considered righteous, while in reality he was unrighteous. Calvin presents this view in a reference in his Institutes, and a reference in his commentary. He says:

> Thus ingrafted into him we are made partakers of eternal life, and hope for admission into the kingdom of God. Nor is this all. Being admitted to participation in him, though we are still foolish, he is our wisdom; though we are still sinners, he is our righteousness; though we are unclean, he is our purity.[59]

In his commentary, he says, "Men are pronounced just, not because they are such in reality, but by imputation."[60] This would seem to mean that in Calvin's understanding of justification, there is not a change in the believer's nature; his righteousness is a righteousness of standing, a status before God. He is considered to be righteous by imputation only.

The Means of Justification

Before proposing implications of Calvin's understanding of justification for the classification of the genitive of

---

[59]Ibid., 94.

[60]Calvin, Commentaries, 144.

δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, a few comments will be made about Calvin's understanding of how a person is able to be justified. He says, "And to show by the way that this righteousness consists in reconciliation, he [Paul] says that Christ was 'set forth to be a propitiation.'"[61] In his comments on Romans 3:24, Calvin says:

> Christ by his obedience satisfied the Father's justice, (judicium--judgment,) and by undertaking our cause he liberated us from the tyranny of death, by which we were held captive; as on account of the sacrifice which he offered is our guilt removed ... And Paul immediately explains more clearly what this redemption is, and what is its object, which is to reconcile us to God; for he calls Christ a propitiation, (or, if we prefer an allusion to an ancient type,) a propitiatory. But what he means is, that we are not otherwise just than through Christ propitiating the Father for us.[62]

The means whereby a person can be justified, in Calvin's view, is by the work of Christ on the cross as a propitiation.

Implications

In justification, the righteousness of Christ is given to the believer. The righteousness of Christ is identified as the righteousness of God. It is given to him by imputation. Since this is given, the genitive of the

---

[61]Calvin, Institutes, trans. Beveridge, 86. See also ibid., 72.

[62]Calvin, Commentaries, 141.

expression "the righteousness of God" would fit the classification of a genitive of source.

Secondly, because the righteousness of God is imputed to a person, the person is said to be considered by God to be righteous. He could be said to have a righteousness that is a status. That status would itself be the result of God's act of justifying the sinner, and that act, as noted above, is found in the presentation of Christ as a propitiation. The interpretation of the righteousness of God as a status which the believer has, that is a result of God's justifying work, seems to be appropriate to an analysis of the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a genitive of source.

The Christian Life

In Calvin's view, faith and justification are to have effects in the Christian's life in purity or holiness of life and in good works. He says, "We dream not of a faith which is devoid of good works, nor of a justification which can exist without them."[63] He refutes a position that claims "that men are invited to sin when we affirm that the pardon in which we hold that justification consists is

---

[63]Calvin, _Institutes_, trans. Beveridge, 98.

gratuitous."[64] The object of righteousness is always to
be "the service of God," and the object of regeneration is
to be "a harmony and agreement between God's righteousness
and their [the believers'] obedience."[65]

The power to live this life, and to do these good
works, comes from God. The faith which believers have
"derives all its power" from Christ, and the "first power to
act aright is derived from regeneration."[66]

Calvin notes that Scripture contains exhortations "to
purity and holiness of life" and to "every good work." The
exhortations are based on the fact that "the death of
Christ" has destroyed "the depravity of our flesh," that by
his resurrection he has "effect[ed] the renovation of a
better nature," and that "we are admitted into a
participation of this grace" by baptism. He also says that
the exhortations to train "the man of God to every good
work" are based "on the fact, that ... our salvation depends
entirely on the mercy of God."[67]

Good works themselves are seen as a gift of God. They
can confirm one's faith, and can prove that "God dwell[s]

---

[64]Ibid., 101.

[65]Ibid., 75, and Institutes, trans. Battles, 684.

[66]Calvin, Institutes, trans. Beveridge, 98, 76.

[67]Calvin, Commentaries, xxxiii, 221; Institutes, trans.
Beveridge, 100.

and reign[s] in us," provided that one has placed his faith, and continues to place his faith, in the promise of God.[68]

Good works which believers do are pleasing to God "because of his indulgence," according to Calvin. He says, "because of his indulgence, ... he accepts them [good works that are covered with stains] just as if they were most pure."[69] All good works will have evil mixed in them because they are performed by people who are not perfect. Nevertheless, God accepts them as perfect because these "imperfections ... are obliterated by the blood of Christ;... their defects are covered by free pardon."[70] He sets a value upon them because of his own "benignity," and rewards those who do them.[71]

Conclusions

Calvin's comments on the righteousness of God suggest three possible classifications of the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ into which various of his comments would fit. The first has been called an "attributive genitive." With the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ classified as an attributive

---

[68]Calvin, Institutes, trans. Beveridge, 86-7.

[69]Ibid., 93.

[70]Calvin, Commentaries, 138-9.

[71]Calvin, Institutes, trans. Beveridge, 92.

genitive, the righteousness expressed by the construction δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ would be considered a kind of righteousness. It is seen to be the righteousness that is approved when it is judged by God.

The second classification of the genitive of "the righteousness of God" into which various of Calvin's comments would fit would be a "genitive of source." With the genitive of the construction classified as a genitive of source, the righteousness that is expressed by this phrase would be seen as a righteousness that God gives to or confers upon people. Calvin used the term "autorem" to refer to the role of God that is expressed in δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 3:22.

Of the two classifications presented here, Calvin prefers the first one, although he says he would not contend much for one over the other.

One other classification seems to fit Calvin's understanding of "the righteousness of God." Here, there is a description of God "as one who contains within himself all fulness of righteousness." This interpretation has been termed a "possessive genitive" in this thesis.

CHAPTER III

HISTORY OF INTERPRETATION:

TWENTIETH CENTURY WRITERS

Introduction

The writers that are presented here are writers who
have been involved in the debate of the interpretation of
δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in the twentieth century. They are
considered in two groups.

The writers in the first group present the genitive of
δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a subjective genitive, broadly defined,
for the most part. However, there are two other
characteristics of these writers. The writers in this group
tend to view righteousness relationally, as something in a
relationship. They also tend to interpret δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in
Romans 1:17 and 3:21, and other terms, as eschatological
terms.

The second group is represented by just one person, C. E. B. Cranfield. The position represented here sees the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a genitive of origin.[1]

Not all of the writers in the first group present a statement on how the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ should be classified. However, their statements on what the righteousness of God is, and their method of interpretation, are used to group them with others who hold to a similar position of what the righteousness of God is, and who follow a similar approach in interpreting the term. The writers of this group include Ernst Käsemann, J. A. Ziesler, Richard B. Hays, and Sam K. Williams. Rudolf Bultmann is also included with this group. Although he classifies the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a genitive of the author (which is here taken to be like the genitive of origin, or genitive of source), he is included with this group because of his eschatological interpretation of δικαιοσύνη, and because he views righteousness relationally.

---

[1]This view also fits the classification of the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as an objective genitive, broadly defined. Because both of these positions, the classification of the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a genitive of origin and the classification of the genitive term as an objective genitive, broadly defined, see the righteousness of God as something that is given by God and as something that comes from Him, the two classifications could be grouped as one.

Bultmann

Genitive of the Author

Bultmann considers the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ to be a genitive of the author. He says, "The reason why 'righteousness' is called 'God's righteousness' is just this: Its one and only foundation is God's grace--it is God-given, God-adjudicated righteousness."[2]

Bultmann uses Romans 10:3 and Philippians 3:9 as texts to classify the genitive of "the righteousness of God" as a genitive of the author. In interpreting these texts, he sees "the righteousness of God" to be in contrast to a righteousness of the Jews in Romans 10:3, expressed as "their own," and in contrast to a righteousness "of my own" in Philippians 3:9. Both of these, he says, are "the righteousness which man exerts himself to achieve by fulfilling the 'works of the Law.'" He concludes that "'God's righteousness' means the righteousness from God which is conferred upon him [man] as a gift by God's free grace alone." He translates τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην in Romans 10:3 as "the righteousness that comes from God," and

---

[2]Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. 1, trans. Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1951), 285, emphasis his.

τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην in Philippians 3:9 as "the righteousness _from God_."[3]

"The righteousness of God," then, is seen as a righteousness from God. The genitive is classified by Bultmann as a genitive of the author. As a righteousness that is from God, the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ would be classified as a genitive of source in this thesis.

What Righteousness Is

Bultmann sees righteousness as "the condition for receiving salvation." Used this way, salvation is "life." He says that the relation between righteousness and salvation is so close that "_righteousness itself can become the essence of salvation._"[4]

In Bultmann's view, δικαιοσύνη can have an ethical sense, which would be uprightness, or, it can have a forensic sense. He says that when δικαιοσύνη is used as the condition for salvation it is used in a forensic sense. Used in this way, it does not indicate a quality. Instead,

---

[3]Ibid., 285, emphasis his.

[4]Ibid., 270, 271, emphasis his.

it is a "relationship."[5] This relationship would be something that is "adjudicated" to the person by God.

Righteousness is also a matter of being acknowledged innocent. The person may not actually be innocent; rather, he is acknowledged innocent. Bultmann says that a person (of faith) "is 'righteous' not to the extent that he may *be* innocent, but to the extent that he is <u>acknowledged</u> innocent. 'Righteousness' then is the 'favorable standing' that a person has in the eyes of others."[6]

The idea of righteousness is defined by Bultmann in terms of relationship and in terms of "the structure of the community." Discussed in this way, it is again said to not be a quality. This understanding is said to be found in the Old Testament. It is said that in the Old Testament and in Judaism, "a man has a certain righteousness in relation to others, that is, it characterizes his attitude toward others." Bultmann says that a person is given "the acknowledgement of his innocence" and "the establishment of his recognition in the structure of the community" by the judge's pronouncement.[7]

---

[5]Ibid., 271-2.

[6]Ibid., 272, emphasis his.

[7]Rudolf Bultmann, "Christ the End of the Law," in <u>Essays, Philosophical and Theological</u>, trans. James C. G. Greig (London: SCM Press, 1955), 42.

In relation to God, righteousness is also spoken of as "recognition." Bultmann says "righteousness mean[s] righteousness accorded to man by the pronouncement of the judge (God), and so means recognition (in God's sight)." Bultmann indicates that righteousness spoken of in this way is a righteousness which God "ascribes" to a person, so that it "is recognition of him, and the honouring of him."[8]

The above comments that a person can be righteous because he is acknowledged innocent seem to suggest that a person can be said to be "righteous" while he is still a sinner in nature. This is also found in the following comments that Bultmann makes. He says:

> The simul justus, simul peccator principle does not just mean that the sin cancelled out through belief continually manifests itself as still living, and requiring to be overcome. It does mean that the new righteousness is not my own (as being made perfect in my deeds), but is accorded to me as aliena justitia. That is to say, therefore, that I, the peccator, am such as I stand in God's presence--precisely as I have emerged from my past--as a sinner, and not only as I commit actual sins from time to time. In other words, my new being has overcome the old, only in such a way that it imports the old into every conceivable present situation, so that I am never holy, even when I have ceased to transgress any commandments, but I live always and only by forgiving grace.[9]

---

[8]Ibid., 42, emphasis his.

[9]Ibid., 63-4.

Summary

Righteousness is seen as the condition for salvation. It is taken to be so closely associated with salvation that it becomes salvation. Righteousness is also referred to as a "favorable standing," as "recognition," and as a "relationship," which are said to be declared or pronounced by God.

Terms Interpreted Eschatologically

To understand what righteousness is, the term must be understood in a forensic-eschatological sense, according to Bultmann. This term, as well as others, is interpreted by Bultmann in an eschatological sense. However, when these terms are interpreted in this way, they are understood differently than if they were interpreted lexically. The following discussion seeks to demonstrate this.

Bultmann holds that Paul is in agreement with the "Jewish piety" of his day in seeing righteousness as a "forensic-eschatological term," but differing with them on the basis for receiving righteousness, and with respect to the time when this righteousness could be realized. Bultmann states that Jewish piety increasingly "expected God's rightwising verdict to come from His eschatological judgment," so that "the forensic term 'righteousness' became

an eschatological term" in a likewise growing extent.[10]
Paul is to have agreed with such a view. However, he is
said to have perceived faith to be the basis for receiving
righteousness, and to have considered the "eschatological
verdict" to be realized in the present, as well as being a
future hope, whereas for the pious Jew, righteousness was to
be attained by doing the works that the Law required, and
the "eschatological verdict" was only something to be
received in the future. Bultmann says that righteousness,
understood in an eschatological sense as used by Paul, is
found in Romans 2:13 and Galatians 5:5.[11]

Other terms are interpreted eschatologically by
Bultmann. These include "revealed," "wrath," and "grace,"
as well as "righteousness." When they are taken
eschatologically, however, they appear to have a different
sense than if they were understood in terms of the lexicon
of the day.[12]

_____

[10]Bultmann, Theology, 273, emphasis his.

[11]Ibid., 273-4, 276, 279-80.

[12]The term "lexicon," as used here, refers to the
totality of the meaningful terms of a language that a
speaker of that language might have used or understood.
Those terms would include words, meaningful parts of words,
and idioms. Such a collection would not be what is meant by
the term "dictionary." A dictionary would be a written
compilation of such terms. See Benjamin Elson and Velma
Pickett, An Introduction to Morphology and Syntax, 2nd ed.
(Santa Ana. CA: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1964), 7,
n.1.

Revealed

Bultmann presents an eschatological interpretation of

ἀποκαλύπτω "reveal" in comments on Romans 1:17 and 18. In

Romans 1:17, it is rendered "becomes a possibility."

Bultmann says:

> Rom. 1:17 is to be understood in this same way when it
> says that in the preaching of the gospel the
> righteousness of God "is revealed." For this does not
> mean that the preached gospel expounds some teaching
> about righteousness, but that through it righteousness
> becomes a possibility (which in faith becomes reality)
> for the hearer of the gospel.[13]

Bultmann further specifies the eschatological

interpretation of "be revealed" as "appears, takes place" in

his comments on Romans 1:18. He says, "'Revealed' has the

same meaning in Rom. 1:18: 'the wrath of God is revealed

from heaven'; i.e. God's wrathful judgment ... appears,

takes place--likewise in the present."[14]

The eschatological interpretation of this term, and

φανερόω (Romans 3:21) are expressed further in his comments

on the coming of faith in Galatians 3:23, 25. The fact that

there is a difference between an eschatological

interpretation and the sense a term would normally seem to

have when understood lexically can be seen by comparing

---

[13]Bultmann, Theology, 274-5.

[14]Ibid., 275.

Bultmann's eschatological interpretation with the senses

provided in LSJ and BAGD, and with an additional comment

that Bultmann includes. Commenting on the coming of faith

in Galatians 3:23, 25, he says:

> for this is just what 'be revealed' (ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι) or
> its noun 'revelation' (ἀποκάλυψις), and also 'be
> manifested' (φανεροῦσθαι, Rom. 3:21), mean when used as
> eschatological terms--appear on the scene, become
> possibility, or become operative.

The additional comment he makes is "Of course, both the verb

and the noun can also mean the disclosing of something

hitherto hidden, the divulging of a secret." This final

statement would seem to be in line with what one would

expect the term to mean lexically, and would seem to

indicate that the eschatological interpretation of a term

may be different from its lexical sense.[15]

Wrath, Grace

Other terms which seem to be understood differently

when taken eschatologically are "wrath" and "grace."

Bultmann sees "the wrath of God" as "an occurrence, viz.

the judgment of God," rather than "a quality, an emotion,

wrathfulness." Grace, understood eschatologically, is taken

---

[15]Ibid., 275, emphasis his. Cf. LSJ, s.v. ἀπο-κάλλυμα, 201; s.v. φανερ-όω, 1915; and BAGD, s.v. ἀποκαλύπτω, 92; s.v. ἀποκάλυψις, 92; and φανερόω, 852-3. The senses found in LSJ and BAGD are compatible with the additional comment that Bultmann makes.

to mean "a deed or event," rather than "simply to be graciously disposed toward another."[16]

Righteousness

As a forensic-eschatological term, righteousness is said to refer to a future judgment of God, but which is already present upon the person of faith. According to Bultmann, this means that "the righteousness which God adjudicates to man (the man of faith) is not 'sinlessness' in the sense of ethical perfection, but is 'sinlessness' in the sense that God does not 'count' man's sin against him." This would mean that the sinner who has been justified "is not merely 'regarded as if' he were righteous, but really is righteous--i.e. absolved from his sin by God's verdict."[17]

---

[16]Bultmann, Theology, 288, 284. See also ibid., 289. Cf. LSJ, s.v. ὀργή, 1246. The definitions found in LSJ are in line with the sense of disposition or anger. They do, however, cite a reference which says, "Πανὸς ὀργαί, and render it "visitations of Pan's wrath." This, however, is the only occurrence observed where ὀργή could be considered to be an act (and so "an occurrence"), which makes one ask if the expression cited by LSJ should be understood in a different way. LSJ continue "but ... c. gen. objecti, ὀργή τινος anger at or because of a thing."

See also LSJ, s.v. χάρις, 1978-9. In the senses given for χάρις, they say, under III, "in concrete sense, a favour done or returned, boon, χάριν φέρειν τινί confer a favour on one."

[17]Bultmann, Theology, 276.

Righteousness, then, interpreted eschatologically, would be an absolution from sin by God's verdict. Following this approach, it would not be seen as an ethical quality.

Shift in the Ages

Bultmann also speaks of the end of "the old course of the world" and an introduction of "the new aeon." This is a concept which is frequently found in the writings of those who follow an eschatological interpretation of δικαιοσύνη, or who classify the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a subjective genitive, broadly defined.[18] With respect to the ending of "the old course" and the introduction of "the new aeon," Bultmann says, "The present reality of righteousness rests upon its having been 'revealed' by the occurring of salvation in Christ." Romans 3:21-26 and 2 Cor. 5:21 are cited as references to support this. Bultmann continues, "This saving occurrence, however, is the eschatological event by which God ended the old course of the world and introduced the new aeon."[19]

---

[18]See the discussion of other writers in this chapter.

[19]Bultmann, Theology, 278, emphasis his.

Justification

The person who is righteous, in Bultmann's view, is expressed in the words, "he who lets himself be 'justified' by God and receives recognition from him as a gift is 'righteous' (or 'just') in God's sight, that is to say, is acceptable."[20] The faith by which a person would receive justification would involve a renunciation of reliance on self and a "readiness to accept from God this endowment of 'justification', recognition and honour," and would also be an "absolute <u>trust</u> ... in the grace of God."[21]

Justification, then, would seem to involve a renunciation of reliance upon one's self, or self-glorification, and an acceptance of the recognition that God is said to offer. This would involve a pronouncement of "justified," and the acceptance of a relationship.

The Christian Life

Bultmann speaks of "the flesh" in the life of a Christian. The flesh is the "past," or "sin," which is

---

[20]Bultmann, "End," 54.

[21]Ibid., 59, emphasis his. Here, Bultmann presents two aspects of faith. One is "the renunciation of all self-glorification in the presence of God, and the readiness to accept from God this endowment of 'justification', recognition and honour." Such faith is seen to be "obedience" because it is seen as "submission to God." The other aspect of faith, as Bultmann presents it, is "absolute trust, confidence in the grace of God."

"alive in the present." It must be mortified in daily
decisions. But the Christian is freed from sin, so that he
is able to choose to not live according to the flesh.
Bultmann states:

> The flesh is crucified, and is swallowed up in the
> death of Christ--and yet it is constantly living and
> must constantly be mortified. Being crucified with
> Christ (Rom. 6.6) ... must be continually perfected in
> the life of the believer. That we are dead to sin but
> living to God through Christ is something which must be
> constantly lifted up to the level of a decision (Rom.
> 6.11). But Paul knows, therefore, the paradoxical
> parallelism and conflict of the old and the new man
> which Luther describes by the formula simul justus,
> simul peccator. And this juxtaposition is to be
> characterized entirely as one of past and present: for
> it is the past that is actually the flesh or the sin
> which is alive in the present.[22]

Bultmann makes the following statements regarding a
sense of sin in a person's life. He says, "It is an error
to think that belief in the grace of God requires a sense of
sin or a confession of sin, in the sense that man must admit
to himself how much or how often and grievously he has
sinned and continually is sinning." Rather, "he is to
consider the reason for his being, and to ask himself whence
his life comes." He would need to see that it comes from
God, and, presumably, if he thinks that it comes from
himself, he would need to become conscious of this as
sin.[23]

---

[22]Ibid., 63.

[23]Ibid., 48-9.

It would seem, then, that a person would not need to acknowledge responsibility for personal, individual affronts to God's standard of holiness.

<div align="center">Käsemann</div>

<div align="center">Introduction</div>

Käsemann says that an initial question with respect to the matter of "the righteousness of God" is whether the construction δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is a subjective genitive or an objective genitive. As a subjective genitive, he says that the construction means "the righteousness which belongs to God and proceeds from him." It is also "the triumphant saving faithfulness of God," and, as a subjective genitive, it "characterizes God's own activity and nature." As an objective genitive, he says that the expression means "the righteousness which is acceptable in God's eyes and bestowed by him upon us." Furthermore, as an objective genitive, it is "the divine righteousness ... imputed to us, justifying us."[24]

Käsemann sees the objective genitive interpretation as the primary one. He cites Philippians 3:9 and Romans 5:17 to support this. Regarding the last reference, he says that "Rom. 5:17 speaks expressly in the same sense of the δωρεὰ

---

[24]Käsemann, "Righteousness," 169, and 169, n. 1.

τῆς δικαιοσύνης." He also notes that "the general tenor of the Pauline utterances on the subject ... tells in favour of the objective genitive."[25]

Käsemann also states that he has held that the sense represented by the "genitivus auctoris" is the dominating sense. He says:

> I have never maintained that the righteousness of God means exclusively or primarily a subjective genitive ... On the contrary, I have called, the genitivus auctoris, i.e., the soteriological sense of the phrase, the dominating one. I have never denied that the righteousness of God establishes a relation ... It is for that very reason that I so vigorously deny an attributive interpretation.[26]

Nevertheless, Käsemann gives attention to the subjective genitive interpretation, even to the point, it seems, of emphasizing it. He bases its consideration as a subjective genitive on the following: He holds that the context of the term, and Paul's overall theology, do not permit one to interpret δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ only as a gift. Rather, he holds that Paul took over a formula that "speaks primarily of God's saving activity." He says that the "sense 'the power which brings salvation' ... qualifies

---

[25]Ibid., 169.

[26]Ernst Käsemann, "Justification and Salvation History," in Perspectives on Paul, trans. Margaret Kohl, from Paulinische Perspektiven (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1969; first American edition, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 77.

throughout the sense 'divine gift', so that gift and Giver remain inseparable." Furthermore, δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is said to appear "in Rom 1.17; 10.3ff. in personified form as Power and that it can therefore be identified with Christ in I Cor 1.30." He also holds that it is an "undisputed subjective genitive in Rom. 3.5, 25f."[27] Other arguments are also presented.

Käsemann also sees righteousness as a relationship rather than as a norm.[28]

Issues

Three issues that are found in a study of Käsemann's work are presented here. The first concerns the recipient to which God directs His "saving activity." Is it directed to the individual, or is it directed to the world, the world which has rebelled against God and over which God is said to establish His rightful claim? Käsemann holds that "the righteousness of God does not ... refer primarily to the individual and is not to be understood exclusively in the context of the doctrine of man." This, however, is

---

[27]Käsemann, "Righteousness," 172; 168, n.; 169.

[28]Ernst Käsemann, Commentary on Romans, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (reprint ed., Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1990), 24.

unavoidable, he says, if "its character as gift is given first priority."[29]

Such a position would take δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ to be an objective genitive, as Käsemann uses the term. It is only by seeing righteousness as a gift that "the fundamental either/or of righteousness by or through faith and righteousness by works is ... comprehensible."[30] Thus, one of the tenets of Reformation theology is disputed by arguing for a subjective genitive, broadly defined.

A second issue involves an eschatological interpretation of terms. This seems to remove lexical and contextual considerations from the interpretation of terms, and instead uses theological interpretations from other writings, and even extra-Biblical sources, which are then assigned to terms under consideration.

A third issue relates to one's understanding of the atonement. Those who interpret δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a subjective genitive, broadly defined, or who interpret it as an eschatological term, appear to dismiss the satisfaction

---

[29]"Righteousness," 180-81.

[30]Ibid., 169.

theory of the atonement.[31] Käsemann's definition of the
righteousness of God as "the rightful power with which God
makes his cause to triumph in the world"[32] is reminiscent
of Aulén's view of the atonement.

Defining Statements

Käsemann speaks of "the righteousness of God" as God's
saving activity, as power, and as His covenant-faithfulness.
The first two seem to be similar. They are all
understandings associated with an interpretation of the
genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a subjective genitive, broadly
defined.

Käsemann states that "Δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is for Paul, as it
is for the Old Testament and Judaism in general, a phrase
expressing divine activity." It is also spoken of as a
"saving activity," and "a power which brings salvation to
pass."[33]

---

[31]This position is derived from a statement by John
Piper. He believes that the interpretation of "the
righteousness of God" in Romans 3:25, 26 as "an unswervingly
saving action or gift" is "based mainly on the assumption
that Paul stands in the stream of the OT-Jewish tradition
and that the OT-Jewish view of God's righteousness, as a
relational term embracing mercy, rules out the satisfaction
theory of the atonement in which God's righteousness demands
punishment for sins" (Piper, "Demonstration," 10, 19-20).

[32]Käsemann, "Righteousness," 180.

[33]Ibid., 174, 172, 181.

Käsemann also holds that the righteousness of God is covenant-faithfulness. This interpretation of "the righteousness of God," which is said to be found in the Old Testament and in Judaism, is said to be extended to all of creation, so that "the righteousness of God" is seen as God's faithfulness to His creation.[34] This will be taken up below, but is introduced here to understand the following statement which seems to provide his definition of "the righteousness of God" in Paul's writings.

At the close of his article, "'The Righteousness of God' in Paul," Käsemann says:

> All that we have been saying amounts to this: δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is for Paul God's sovereignty over the world revealing itself eschatologically in Jesus. And, remembering the Greek root, we may also say that it is the rightful power with which God makes his cause to triumph in the world which has fallen away from him and which yet, as creation, is his inviolable possession.[35]

So, as a power, as God's faithfulness to His creation which has fallen away from Him, "the righteousness of God" is, for Käsemann, God's act, His power, whereby He is said to bring His creation back into a relationship with Himself. That relationship, as understood by this writer, is the relationship in which creation is brought back under God's

---

[34]Käsemann, Commentary; 101, "Righteousness," 178.

[35]Käsemann, "Righteousness," 180.

power or control, His Lordship.[36] The righteousness of
God, as mentioned in the statement above, would be God's
"rightful power." His righteousness is also said to be "the
power of the justification of the ungodly."[37]

The Righteousness of God as His Covenant-Faithfulness

Käsemann speaks of God's righteousness as His covenant-
favor or His covenant-faithfulness. He maintains that both
the Old Testament and Judaism interpreted Exodus 34:6f. to
contain an appeal "to God's patience and, identical with
that, to his righteousness as covenant favor, which will
make atonement."[38] He also sees "the tradition of the Old
Testament and later Judaism" as a basis for understanding
"the basic sense of 'righteousness'" as "faithfulness in the
context of the community." Paul is also said to be able to
"speak of the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as God's covenant-faithfulness"
in Romans 3:25f.[39]

However, in the act of Christ's death, there apparently
is an "eschatological restitution of the covenant."[40]

---

[36]Cf. Käsemann, Commentary, 92.

[37]Käsemann, "Righteousness," 180.

[38]Käsemann, Commentary, 99.

[39]Käsemann, "Righteousness," 174, 177.

[40]Käsemann, Commentary, 100.

This is something directed not only to Israel, but apparently is the establishment of "the new covenant and the new creation." God's covenant faithfulness, then, is no longer directed only to Israel; it "becomes his faithfulness to his whole creation and his right which is established in this relationship."[41]

The Righteousness of God as Power

Käsemann also depicts the righteousness of God as a gift which has the characteristic of power. As a power, he says that it "possesses us before we grasp it," and that "we retain it only as long as it holds us fast." As a gift, it, like all gifts from God, is said to "convey both the obligation and the capacity to serve." The capacity to serve is given because God gives Himself with the gift, apparently enabling the recipient to serve.[42]

One of the implications of this is that righteousness is not seen as a norm, nor as "a property of the divine nature." The latter of these is said to "postulate what cannot be convincingly intellectualized--namely, the making-over to a human being of a property of the divine nature." Thus, the idea of righteousness for the individual as an

---

[41]Käsemann, "Righteousness," 178; Commentary, 101.

[42]Käsemann, "Righteousness," 170, 173-4.

ethical condition would be ruled out, or the idea of a "new birth" as part of being justified.[43]

Justification

Salvation is seen by Käsemann to be God's "establish[ment of] his right to his creation with the power of grace."[44] It is the world's "being recaptured for the sovereignty of God." [45] It would seem to be the establishment of "the sphere of Christ's lordship" over the world. The matter of God's right to his creation is something that "transcends the individual and is directed toward a new world." Furthermore, it is an eschatological event inasmuch as it is "the Creator's grasping of his world."[46]

Salvation for the individual, or, the individual's justification, occurs when an individual "become[s] obedient to the divine righteousness," when he enters into the sphere of Christ's lordship. "Standing in salvation" for the individual is "standing in obedience, that is, in the presence and under the power of Christ."[47]

---

[43]Käsemann, _Commentary_, 24; "Righteousness," 174.

[44]Käsemann, _Commentary_, 93.

[45]Käsemann, "Righteousness," 182.

[46]Käsemann, _Commentary_, 92, 93.

[47]Käsemann, "Righteousness," 182; _Commentary_, 29.

Faith

Faith for the individual "is basically human receptivity, as actively as it may express itself in obedience." So for the Christian to exercise faith, he would simply "fall back" into "the sphere of Christ's lordship" where "there is worldwide salvation for a cosmos under the wrath of God." Faith for Käsemann would seem to be much like it is for Bultmann, where faith was accepting the acknowledgement that God provides. It would seem to be a simple acceptance of something that God has provided.[48]

The Shift in the Ages Applied to the Individual

Käsemann speaks of a shift in the ages, enacted by the death of Jesus. In this change of aeons, it is said that the sins of God's people could be set aside. Käsemann argues that Paul took over a primitive Christian message, which apparently contained the message of a change in the aeons.[49] This shift is supposedly reflected in Romans. That is, Romans 1:18-3:20 is said to speak of the past. Romans 3:21-26 is said to indicate a change in the aeons. From what Käsemann says about salvation, that shift would occur when the world is brought back under the rule of God.

---

[48]Käsemann, Commentary, 94, 92. Käsemann does state that faith is forced "to go out in service to the world" (Käsemann, "Justification," 78, in n. 27).

[49]Käsemann, Commentary, 29.

For the individual, Paul is said to have extended that message "anthropologically to the proclamation of a change in existence."[50] That change in existence is a change from being under the power of sin to a coming under the power of Christ. The individual would receive Christ's gift, and also Christ, who would enable the person to do what he was obligated to do. But since Käsemann had argued that there is no change in essence in the individual, the change in existence would simply seem to be a change from one lordship to another, with the presence of divine power to enable the person to do what he should do.[51]

The Atonement

As noted earlier, Piper has pointed out that certain interpreters rule out a satisfaction theory of the atonement by following a certain line of interpretation.[52] Because of this, and because of similarities between Käsemann's views and Aulén's view of the atonement, it seems necessary to note some statements by Käsemann that relate to the atonement.

---

[50]Ibid., 29.

[51]See ibid., 98.

[52]See above, n. 31.

Käsemann indicates that the satisfaction theory of the atonement cannot be based on the use of ἱλαστήριον, or, the statement which contains that term, in Romans 3:25. Although Paul used terms that related to the sacrifice, Käsemann holds that he was primarily concerned with the disarming of sin. He accepts Paul's use of sacrificial terminology by holding that Paul used a liturgical piece, which he would not have authored.[53] Käsemann's view, then, is that the purpose of Christ's death is to enact the new covenant. He says:

> As blood brings the covenant into effect, so it also belongs to its eschatological renewal ... God himself makes this expiation and hence makes possible again the fellowship which had been disrupted. The translation 'means of forgiveness' ... is thus too weak.[54]

Finally, Käsemann sees "the act of the death of Jesus" as God's intervention which makes his patience, as the covenant partner, "concrete." This death effects "the change in aeons," with which the sins of God's people could be "set aside." Forgiveness of sins is seen to be a result of God's patience.[55]

---

[53]Käsemann, Commentary, 98-99.

[54]Ibid., 97. For a comparison with Aulén's view, cf. Aulén, Christus Victor, 31, 55, 57-58, 71, and 77.

[55]Käsemann, Commentary, 100.

The Christian Life

The Christian life is lived by the gifts of God. God is said to give Himself with His gifts, and this apparently enables the Christian to do what he is obligated to do. By His gifts, "he subordinates us to his lordship and makes us responsible beings." By "enter[ing] the arena ... he maintains his lordship ... in his giving."[56] This is taken by this writer to mean that by coming to the individual along with the gift that He gives, Christ maintains His Lordship.

God is also said to give a gift of service, a service of righteousness. This service "can be properly rendered only by those to whom God has given the gift of such service and whom he has counted among his liberated children."[57]

Methodology

Some observations on Käsemann's approach to interpretation may be in order. First, he assumes that δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is a fixed term and that Paul took it over from Jewish apocalyptic. Having taken over this term, Käsemann holds that Paul "impressed on this tradition the stamp of his own theology." Käsemann takes this to mean

---

[56]Käsemann, "Righteousness," 174.

[57]Ibid., 171.

that in interpreting this term, a person must start with the
original sense of the word. That means that a person would
go first to the term's use in the Old Testament and in
Jewish apocalyptic literature to interpret its occurrence in
the New Testament. The interpreter would then seek to find
how Paul developed the term in the epistle.

Käsemann's statement is worth quoting because of its
ramifications in interpretation. He says:

> Even with extreme caution we may hold that it is ...
> probable that Paul did take over this characteristic
> catchword [δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ] as a fixed formula from
> Jewish apocalyptic ... and that he impressed on this
> tradition the stamp of his own theology. If this is
> so, we should begin with the genitive construction and
> its original reference to God's covenant faithfulness.
> This blocks from the beginning the temptation to treat
> δικαιοσύνη initially by itself and to reach a purely
> juridical meaning, or even, in the light of Greek
> usage, to come up where possible with the sense of a
> legal norm. Our further analysis need concern itself
> only with how the apostle develops this catchword for
> his epistle and orients it in various ways.[58]

This statement, as well as the following one, present
the implications of this approach, that is, that the lexical
content of a term, as one may derive it from its immediate
context, will be overlooked. Instead, the sense the term
has in its Old Testament usage, or in extra-Biblical

---

[58]Käsemann, Commentary, 30. See also ibid., 101, where
Käsemann also indicates that Paul took over a fixed term.
He says, "The catchword righteousness of God was most
welcome to Paul as indication of the change in aeons;
nevertheless, he interpreted it in terms of his own
theology."

literature, will be given to the term in its New Testament
usage. Other benefits of noting the term's immediate
context, such as implications from the grammar, will, in
this writer's opinion, not be used. Käsemann's other
statement is as follows:

> The methodological implication of Paul's adoption of a
> ready-made formulation is that the righteousness of
> God, as he uses the term, is not to be subsumed under
> the general concept δικαιοσύνη and thus deprived of its
> peculiar force.[59]

Other terms that are interpreted eschatologically
include ἀποκαλύπτειν, χάρις, and φανεροῦν. It is to be noted
that the interpretations which these terms receive are
different from their regular lexical sense.

Regarding ἀποκαλύπτειν, Käsemann says:

> If v. 17 contains the theme of the epistle, due
> weight must be given to each word in it. Even if
> ἀποκαλύπτειν does not necessarily have an "apocalyptic"
> sense, in this context that seems most natural. The
> gospel is the power of God because in it the divine
> righteousness breaks into the world as eschatological
> revelation.[60]

Thus, ἀποκαλύπτειν would have the eschatological sense
"breaks into the world as eschatological revelation,"

---

[59]Käsemann, "Righteousness," 172.

[60]Käsemann, Commentary, 30.

whereas it normally would mean "uncover," or "disclose, reveal," or something similar.[61]

On χάρις, Käsemann says, "Here again [in Romans 3:24] χάρις is ... eschatological power."[62] LSJ present the sense "grace, kindness, goodwill, τινος for or towards one," among other definitions.[63]

On φανεροῦν, Käsemann says, "For this reason the verb φανεροῦν, which, like ἀποκαλύπτειν, belongs to the vocabulary of revelation ... [and means or implies] God's ultimate victory manifests itself now."[64] For φανερόω, LSJ provide the sense "make manifest ...; reveal, make clear;" and the sense "make known or famous," or, in the passive, "become so."[65]

---

[61]LSJ, s. v. ἀποκαλύπτω, 201. These are from senses one and two.

[62]Käsemann, Commentary, 96.

[63]LSJ, s. v. χάρις, 1978.

[64]Käsemann, Commentary, 93.

[65]LSJ, s. v., φανερ‒όω, 1915. They do provide a citation "ἀληθῆ πεφανέρωται have been demonstrated" under the first sense, so that the word could possibly have the meaning "demonstrate."

Ziesler

Introduction

J. A. Ziesler sees "the righteousness of God" as God's covenant loyalty extended to his faithfulness to mankind, as saving activity, and as power. No direct statements were noted on the classification of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a genitive construction in Ziesler's writings. However, his comments on "the righteousness of God" indicate that he follows the interpretation of the genitive as a subjective genitive, broadly defined.

The distinctives of Ziesler's position are a double-sided doctrine of justification by faith and righteousness by faith, and a participatory view of the righteousness of Christ. The first of these is in line with a double-sided view of sin which he presents. The second distinctive holds that a believer participates in the righteousness that is Christ's righteousness, but that he does not possess it.

Ziesler also holds to a participatory view of the atonement. He also claims that the corporate Christ concept is important.

Defining Statements

Ziesler sees the righteousness of God as his faithfulness to mankind, as his saving activity, and as power. The first of these is also presented as God's

covenant loyalty extended to all mankind. The first two seem to be much the same, and there seems to be an interplay among all three concepts.

The Righteousness of God as His Faithfulness to Mankind

Ziesler speaks of the righteousness of God as His covenant loyalty. In his view, it includes God's faithfulness to His covenant and to His covenant people. This idea is said to be found in the Old Testament and in other Jewish writings. This is the sense that Ziesler claims is present in "the righteousness of God" in Romans 1:17. However, this covenant loyalty is said to be extended beyond Israel to all of mankind who will receive it.[66]

These interpretations can be seen in Ziesler's interpretation of Romans 1:17. He expresses the meaning of this verse as, "God's consistent faithfulness to his people now embraces the rescue of all races."[67]

The sense of God's righteousness as His faithfulness to all of mankind who will receive it is associated with the other two ideas--as God's saving activity, and as power.

---

[66]J. A. Ziesler, The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul: A Linguistic and Theological Enquiry (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1972), 187, 194; "Salvation Proclaimed: IX. Romans 3.21-26," Expository Times 93 (September 1982): 356-7; and Paul's Letter to the Romans (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1989), 70.

[67]Ziesler, Letter, 67.

Ziesler speaks of God's righteousness as a power into which people are drawn, and which transfers them from the power of sin to the dominion of Christ's lordship. He says that God's covenant faithfulness is saving because people are drawn into it and live in it. He sees it as power in that people are seen to live under it and by it.[68] It is said to come to the aid of people who are under the power of sin.[69]

The Righteousness of God as Saving Activity

Ziesler also speaks of the righteousness of God as saving activity. The sense of God's righteousness as saving activity is associated with the sense of His covenant loyalty. Ziesler says that God's righteousness is "his acting to sustain his people." He indicates that the loyalty may at times involve "judg[ing]", but also sees it as "vindicat[ing]" and "liberat[ing]."[70] This sense is said to be found in "the OT and much later Jewish writing." It is said that "salvation is the form that God's righteousness increasingly takes."[71]

---

[68]Ziesler, Meaning, 187.

[69]Ziesler, "Salvation," 357.

[70]Ziesler, Letter, 70. See also Ziesler, Meaning, 194.

[71]Ziesler, Letter, 70, emphasis his.

For the sense of "the righteousness of God" in Romans 3:21-26, Ziesler says that "it could denote God's own integrity," but he prefers the interpretation of "his saving activity," based on the development of what Paul says in the larger context, and the meaning of "the righteousness of God" as it is used elsewhere. Here, he seems to have in mind especially its use in Romans 1:17. God's "saving activity" in this passage in Romans 3 would be seen as "his justifying (accepting) those who do not deserve it."[72]

The Righteousness of God as Power

Ziesler also speaks of "the righteousness of God" as a power. Speaking of "the righteousness of God" in Romans 3:21, 22, Ziesler says, "It is effectively a power into which the believer is caught up, forgiven and transformed." This righteousness is said to be communicated, and is something in which the believer participates, but it is never possessed.[73]

Ziesler says that "power and lordship ... merge when we speak of God." This seems to bring in the idea of the Giver being given along with the gift, and of the "inseparability" of gift and power. This sense of "the righteousness of God" is also expressed as a dominion, the dominion "of Christ," a

---

[72]Ibid., 108.

[73]Ziesler, "Salvation," 357.

dominion that "replace[s] the old power and dominion of sin."[74]

Appeal is again made to the Old Testament for this sense of "the righteousness of God." Ziesler says that "in the OT it may be more than simply something done, and be also a field of force into which one is drawn and in which one lives."[75]

A person is said to be caught up into this power as he allows himself to be.

Justification

The idea of justification in Ziesler's writings is associated with righteousness in what is called a double-sided doctrine of justification by faith and of righteousness by faith. It involves a forensic element, which is a matter of being accepted, and an ethical element, wherein the believer lives righteously.

Justification by Faith and Righteousness by Faith

Justification is a matter of being accepted by God, of being acquitted, of being forgiven. This is seen as a forensic matter. To be accepted by God means to be restored to a relationship with God, or it results in such a

---

[74]Ziesler, Meaning, 201-2. See also ibid., 170.

[75]Ibid., 201.

relationship. Ziesler uses Jewish tradition to say that "the verb behind 'justify' is used much more widely than in a strictly judicial sense, and refers to the restoration of persons to their proper place in a relationship of some kind."[76] Hence justification for Ziesler is "relational."

The matter of justification by faith involves a participation in Christ's righteousness. That righteousness is said to have an effect on the individual, so that the believer lives righteously.[77]

Each of these two emphases can be seen to be the cause or to be the result of the other. It is said that because a person is accepted, and therefore restored to relationship with God, that he participates in Christ's righteousness, and so lives ethically.

On the other hand, to share in the righteousness of Christ means that a person's life will actually be righteous; the person will be ethically righteous. Because of that ethical righteousness, it is said that God can declare the person to be righteous.[78]

The double-sided doctrine of justification by faith and righteousness by faith is also discussed in terms of

---

[76]Ziesler, "Salvation," 357.

[77]Ziesler, Meaning, 169.

[78]Ibid., 169.

righteousness as a power. The righteousness of God is seen as a power into which the believer is drawn. When a person is restored to a right relationship, which would be the forensic concept of justification, he is said to participate in Christ's righteousness. This is a power that has an effect on the individual's life. When a person participates in Christ's righteousness, he is said to be transferred from one sphere of power to another; he is said to be transferred from the dominion of sin to the dominion of Christ's lordship. In being transferred from the dominion of sin to the dominion of Christ's lordship, the person is said to be "liberated."[79]

Ziesler also presents a double-sided doctrine of sin. In that view, sin is seen as "something for which we are responsible because of wrong choices," and "also something we cannot help because we are caught and imprisoned under its power." The first of these speaks of people's responsibility for their state of sinfulness, and, therefore, their guilt. The second speaks of sin as a power. The double-sided doctrine of justification by faith and righteousness by faith is seen to be the answer to the double-sided doctrine of sin. It is seen to provide release from guilt by the forensic aspect of acceptance, and

---

[79]Ziesler, "Salvation," 357.

liberation from the dominion of sin by the transfer to the dominion of the power of God's righteousness.[80]

A Shift in the Ages Applied to the Individual

Ziesler says that salvation "consists" in a transfer from one sphere of power to another, from the dominion of sin to the dominion of Christ. This transfer is said to be related to "the eschatological scheme of two ages," in which there is said to be a "present evil age ruled over by wickedness, and a future age in which God will rule absolutely."[81]

The transfer from one dominion to another is said to be enabled by Christ's death and resurrection. When the believer is transferred from one sphere of power to another, he "enters a pattern of death and resurrection." The forensic and ethical elements may be seen in this transfer. Ziesler says, "this provides justification (acceptance) indeed, but also a whole new basis of existence."[82]

The transfer of dominions is not necessarily related only to an eschatological shift in the ages in Ziesler's view. He also sees it as related to the subjection of people to forces of evil that limit their choices, and sees

---

[80]Ibid., 356-7.

[81]Ziesler, Letter, 51.

[82]Ziesler, "Salvation," 359.

salvation as a liberation from that dominion to another. However, there does seem to be an application to the individual of the idea of a shift in the ages brought about by Christ's "death and resurrection."[83]

Faith

Faith is seen by Ziesler as the individual's response to God. It is an acceptance of what God has done. Ziesler indicates that faith is "the willingness to be accepted freely through Jesus Christ."[84] But it is also seen as an experience in which one participates. It is seen not only as a faith in Christ and what He has done, but also as a "dying and rising with him."[85]

Participation in Christ's Righteousness

One of the main points of Ziesler's position is that the believer participates in Christ's righteousness. Ziesler claims that three passages especially present the idea of participating in Christ's righteousness. They are 1 Corinthians 1:30; 2 Corinthians 5:21; and Philippians 3:9. Ziesler bases his position especially on Philippians 3:9.

---

[83]Ibid., 359.

[84]Ziesler, Letter, 107. See also Ziesler, "Salvation," 357, 359.

[85]Ziesler, Meaning, 193.

The points to be noted about this position are that the believer never possesses this righteousness, but he participates in it by being "in Christ." That righteousness is said to be effective in the believer, however, so that he is actually righteous. A second point in this view is that the one who participates in this righteousness participates in God's covenant loyalty. A third point is that such a person submits to this righteousness.[86]

The participation in Christ's righteousness takes place in the relation described by the term "in Christ." However, in Ziesler's view, this relationship does not seem to be simply an individual's own relationship with Christ; rather, it seems that it involves being a part of what he calls the "corporate Christ." It seems that Ziesler holds that it is in the corporate Christ, the totality of believers, that the individual believer "shares in the risen life of Christ," that it is here that he finds "power, including ethical power,"[87] so that his life is righteous, ethically.

But Ziesler seems to unite the idea of the "corporate Christ" to a "new humanity," by incorporating an interpretation of a corporate solidarity for Romans 5:12-21.

---

[86]Ibid., 169, 160, 206.

[87]Ibid., 168-9.

He sees this passage as speaking of "the two men, or two humanities, two solidarities."[88]

He also says:

> He [Paul] sees Christ as inaugurating a new way of being human ..., a way that is free from oppressive powers like sin. This is no merely individual matter, but concerns the human race in its solidarity, indeed its alternative solidarities, that of Adam/sin/death, and that of Christ/righteousness/life. Adam is the head and representative of the kingdom of Death, and Christ of the kingdom of Life.[89]

The Atonement

Ziesler argues for a participatory view of the cross, rather that a propitiatory or an expiatory view, although he does indicate that ἱλαστήριον probably "has some sort of expiatory meaning."[90] The cross, or Christ's death and resurrection, is seen as God's "means of dealing with sin by bringing about death to it."[91]

In Ziesler's view of the cross, the believer participates in Christ's death and resurrection in that he, the believer, dies to sin and rises to a new life in the sphere of righteousness.

---

[88]Ibid., 168, 197.

[89]Ziesler, Letter, 144-5.

[90]Ibid., 115. See also ibid., 112-14.

[91]Ziesler, "Salvation," 358.

Ziesler bases his view on the way he interprets ἱλαστήριον and ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι "in His blood" in Romans 3:25. This involves an assumption that Paul uses tradition in this verse, and a belief that a wider context must be used to interpret these expressions.

ἱλαστήριον

Ziesler says that ἱλαστήριον in Romans 3:25 is a word from tradition "which Paul does not exploit in any technical way."[92] To interpret it, then, a person must understand its sense from a wider context. Ziesler seems to use the context of Romans 5, 6, and 8, but especially chapter 6. Its sense in the Septuagint, he says, is "the mercy-seat, i.e. the lid of the Ark of the Covenant." The ritual in the temple "obtained forgiveness of sins, and ... repaired the damage done to the covenant by those sins." He concludes that "Hilastērion would thus mean the place where, or the means by which, sins are dealt with. For Paul, this is now the cross of Christ."[93] Ziesler interprets the death of Christ, then, to be the means by which a sinner can die to sin as he participates in Christ's death through faith.[94]

---

[92]Ibid., 358.

[93]Ziesler, Letter, 113.

[94]"Salvation," 358.

It enables the individual to be transferred from the power of sin to the dominion of Christ's lordship.

ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι

Ziesler interprets ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι by looking to the use of "blood" in passages such as Leviticus 17:11 and Deuteronomy 12:23. These are taken to indicate the idea that the blood of the sacrifice "represents not only death," but also "life released and offered up through death," or to "life." He concludes that "we probably have more than a reference to the death of Christ; also included is the idea of new life through death, available to all who have died with Christ."[95]

Elsewhere he says that the death to sin "happens by faith, and the reference to 'by his blood' supports an implicit understanding of resurrection as well as death, because blood represents life released through death, and not just death itself."[96]

Ziesler does, however, talk about the death of Christ as "in some sense sacrificial and for us, and on it our redemption and justification depend."[97] But then he says,

---

[95]Ziesler, Letter, 114.

[96]Ziesler, "Salvation," 358-9.

[97]Ziesler, Meaning, 193.

"It was not necessarily that there had to be some sacrifice to satisfy the demands of divine justice, though some hold this."[98]

He sees Paul's view of the cross, then, as "not so much a means to the forgiveness of sinners as an event in which those sinners could participate, and so find not only forgiveness but new life and freedom."[99]

The Cross and the Corporate Christ

Ziesler had said that the corporate Christ idea was important to his thesis. It may be that, in his view, the believer participates in the death and resurrection of Christ as he participates in the "corporate Christ."

Christ's death is said to "represent the end of the old world, the Old Age." As a result, when an individual participates in His death, the individual's death "represents ... [his] entering, or being prepared for entering, the New Age."[100] There is a dying to sin and a rising to righteousness. But when the individual rises to righteousness, he is said to rise in Christ. This seems to indicate the idea of participating in the "corporate

---

[98]Ibid., 193, n. 2.

[99]Ziesler, "Salvation," 358.

[100]Ziesler, Letter, 114.

Christ," and of entering a "solidarity" of righteousness.
Ziesler says:

> The atonement ... may be expressed within, and is
> vital to, this circle of ideas [the circle of ideas
> that believers are a part of the corporate Christ, the
> new humanity]. Christ on the Cross enters our
> solidarity, dying 'for us', so that we may enter his
> solidarity, dying and rising with him to new life.[101]

Ziesler also says:

> [The sacrificial action of Christ's death] is closely
> associated with and requires the notion of the
> corporate Christ, because faith is never separable from
> being in Christ, and because one cannot separate faith
> in Christ and his saving action, from faith which is
> dying and rising with him.[102]

Finally, he says that to be in the body of "God's
people is freedom from other powers, notably the power of
sin."[103]

Summary

Ziesler's view of the atonement is participatory.
Christ's death is seen to be representative. By
participating in the death and resurrection of Christ,
individuals die to sin and the dominion of sin, and
participate in a new life in Christ's dominion.

---

[101]Ziesler, Meaning, 166. This reference also depicts
Christ's death as representative in the words "for us."

[102]Ibid., 193. See also ibid., 199.

[103]Ziesler, Letter, 52.

The cross is also seen as the answer to the double problem of sin, the problem of guilt and powerlessness. The cross is said to offer acceptance, and to enable the believer to leave the sphere of sin and enter the sphere of righteousness. Sin is said to be "obliterated."[104]

Methodology

Three areas of Ziesler's methodology are noted here. The first is his interpretation of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 3:21 according to its interpretation in 1:17. The second is his position that Paul stands in a tradition, with the inference that δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is to be interpreted by its use in that tradition. The third is his use of a wider context to interpret terms in Romans 3:25.

The Use of Romans 1:17 to Interpret Romans 3:21

Ziesler states that "the parallel between 3.21f and 1.17 is clear." He uses this parallel to interpret "the righteousness of God" in 3:21 by the interpretation that he presents for it in 1:17.[105]

---

[104]Ibid., 107; See also Ziesler, "Salvation," 359.

[105]Ziesler, Meaning, 191. The quotation continues, "and in 1.17 it is certainly God's own active righteousness, whatever else it may be." See also Ziesler, Letter, 108.

To interpret δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 1:17, Ziesler claims that there is a parallel between 1:17a and 1:18a. He states that in 1:18, God's wrath is an activity. Because of the parallelism, he holds that "we have a case for saying that God's righteousness in v. 17 is also his activity." He notes that in verse 16, the gospel is "the power of God leading to salvation for every believer," and that it is "the site of revelation of God's righteousness." He infers that the activity which "the righteousness of God" is supposed to be is "God's saving righteousness."[106]

Ziesler also presents "God's righteousness" as "a power (v. 16) for those who have faith."[107]

In response to this method, it should be noted that the construction ὀργὴ θεοῦ in Romans 1:18 is in a different paragraph from δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in 1:17. While the forms may be parallel, the ideas may not be. Furthermore, the rendering of ὀργὴ θεοῦ as an activity in 1:18 may not itself be adequate.[108]

---

[106]Ziesler, Meaning, 186-7.

[107]Ziesler, Letter, 70, emphasis his.

[108]See above, n. 16, where it was noted that ὀργή does not seem to represent an activity, with the one possible exception from Euripedes.

Secondly, it should be noted that while Romans 1:17 and 3:21 may be parallel, as they are taken to be by this writer, the statement in 1:17 appears to be only introduced at that point. It is taken here to be the theme of the epistle, but it is restated in 3:21-22 as an amplification. This means that the two would be equivalent, but that more information is added in 3:21-22. Furthermore, there appears to be more context at 3:21 with which to interpret δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, as will be discussed later. It would seem better, then, to interpret δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in 3:21 first, and use that interpretation to interpret its use in 1:17, rather than to interpret it in 1:17, and use that interpretation to interpret it in 3:21. Such an approach would avoid the position, which is taken here to be unfounded, that δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is a power or is to be understood as an activity which will be called covenant-faithfulness, based on an alleged parallelism with ὀργὴ θεοῦ in 1:18, and an association with δύναμις in 1:16.

The Use of Tradition to Interpret Romans 3:21

Ziesler appeals to Jewish tradition, from the Old Testament and from later Jewish writings, to propose that "the righteousness of God" is "the way he acts," his covenant loyalty, and that it is "activity-in-relationship."

He indicates that, based on "Biblical tradition," "the righteousness of God" is not to be thought of as an attribute. He infers that Paul stood in this tradition. The implication is that an interpretation of Jewish tradition is to be used to interpret Paul's use of the expression δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ.[109]

The writer of this thesis argues for an interpretation of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ based on the context of that term in Romans 3:21. To adopt a meaning from a tradition, especially an extra-Biblical tradition, would mean to set aside an interpretation incorporating the lexical content of a term in the immediate context. To adopt a meaning from tradition would seem to bring something into the interpretation of the text, rather than to start with an analysis of the text and to make a theological interpretation based upon that.

The Use of a Wider Context to Interpret Romans 3:25

The third area of methodology concerns Ziesler's interpretation of Romans 3:25, in particular the interpretation of ἱλαστήριον and ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι. The first thing to be noted is that Ziesler proposes that this

---

[109]Ziesler, Meaning, 186, "Salvation," 356-7. See also Ziesler, Letter, 70, and Meaning, 201.

verse uses sacrificial language that Paul gets from a tradition. Because it is sacrificial language from a tradition, Ziesler holds that, to understand Paul's theology of the cross, the particular meaning for ἱλαστήριον is not to be "over-stressed." Rather, it is to be "underplayed," and Paul's understanding of the cross is to be determined more from the "total context than [by] the implications of one word."[110] This seems to mean that the actual use of a word is to be dismissed, and that another interpretation from the wider context can be brought in here. For ἱλαστήριον, this means that its sense as a "propitiation" or as an "expiation" in which there was a substitutionary sacrifice by which the price was paid for the forgiveness of sins is excluded, and that the meaning "God's means of dealing with sin," is provided. That interpretation is derived from Romans 5,6 and 8, but, it seems, especially from Romans 6, and includes the idea that Christ's death and resurrection were participatory, as described above.

In a similar way, ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι is taken to refer to "more than ... the death of Christ," but also "the idea of new life through death, available to all who have died with

---

[110]Ziesler, "Salvation," 358.

Christ,"[111] rather than as a reference to Christ's death as a sacrifice.

<div align="center">Hays</div>

Richard B. Hays interprets δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a subjective genitive, broadly defined. According to his view, "the righteousness of God" is "God's own salvation-creating power." He sees it as an attribute of God, which "is manifested in his saving activity."[112] Hays bases his argument on what he perceives to be the structure of the argument in Romans 3, and on a study of Psalm 143.

Hays notes that commentators have seriously questioned Käsemann's view that δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ was a term that Paul took over from apocalyptic literature.[113] He concludes from his study, however, that Psalm 143 "provides much stronger support for Käsemann's interpretation of δικαιοσύνη

---

[111]Ziesler, Letter, 114.

[112]Richard B. Hays, "Psalm 143 and the Logic of Romans 3," Journal of Biblical Literature 99 (1980): 108, 111, emphasis his.

[113]Ibid., 108. He refers to E. P. Sanders in particular as one who has questioned Käsemann's position. See E. P. Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion (London: SCM Press LTD, 1977), 305-12.

θεοῦ as 'the power that brings salvation' than any possible Qumran parallels."[114]

The Argument of Romans 3

Hays sees Romans 3 as consisting of three segments. He claims that the first segment, verses 1-8, raises the question as to whether God is just/righteous because He judges the world. The second segment, verses 9-20, is said to establish the point that "God is _just_ in his judgment of the world." The third part, verses 21-26, is said to return the discussion to the earlier part of the chapter, where the question is said to have been raised regarding the righteousness of God in judging the world. The point of the third part, according to Hays, is that God "has now revealed his justice/righteousness in a new way, overcoming human unfaithfulness by his own power and proving himself faithful/just."[115]

Hays indicates that it is crucial to see that there is no structural break between Romans 3:20 and 3:21. He maintains that the transition between these two verses can be understood by a study of Psalm 143.

---

[114]Ibid., 115.

[115]Ibid., 112-113, emphasis his.

The Use of Psalm 143

Hays indicates that the pattern of thought in Psalm 143 is the same as that of Romans 3. The first part of the Psalm presents the inability of man to stand before God, as does Romans 3:9-20. Psalm 143 also contains an appeal for God to rescue the psalmist by His righteousness. The deliverance for which the psalmist looks, which is said to be by God's saving power, is that which is now manifested, and to which reference is made in Romans 3:22.[116] Because δικαιοσύνη (LXX) in Psalm 143:11 is understood as "a power of deliverance," it is taken to be that in Romans 3:21.[117]

The continuity between Romans 3:20 and 3:21 permits Hays to hold that Paul takes up the discussion of verses 1-8 in verses 21-26, if this writer correctly understands Hays' position. This also permits Psalm 143 to be used to interpret δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 3:21 because of the sameness of the flow of thought in both passages. It is crucial, then, that there be no structural break between Romans 3:20 and 3:21, a point which Hays makes in his conclusion.

---

[116]Ibid., 115; 115, n. 33; 114.

[117]Ibid., 115. Hays also indicates that the reference to the righteousness of God in Psalm 143:2 should be understood in this way (ibid., 114).

Comments

Hays claims that there is no evidence for a structural break between Romans 3:20 and 3:21. The text, however, presents evidence for such a break.

First, there is a return in Romans 3:21 to a nonsubordinated, higher level theme. It has been proposed here that the theme statement for Romans is presented in Romans 1:17.[118] It has also been proposed here that Romans 3:21-22 is an amplification of that theme. This means that Romans 3:21-22 restates the theme in a fuller, "amplified," form.[119] This restatement occurs after intervening, subordinated material on the wrath of God

---

[118]Cranfield notes that it is disputed as to whether the "theological theme" of Romans is presented in verses 16-17, verses 16b-17, or in verse 17 (Cranfield, _Romans_, 27). John Murray writes of verses 16 and 17 as the theme of the epistle (John Murray, _The Epistle to the Romans: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes_, vol. 1, in _The New International Commentary on the New Testament_, ed. F. F. Bruce [one vol. edition, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968], 26-33). James D. G. Dunn states that the theme is found in verses 16 and 17. In his comments on these verses, he writes of the effect that verses 16b and 17 have of tying the letter together (James D. G. Dunn, _Romans 1-8_, vol. 38A of Word Biblical Commentary, ed. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker, and Ralph P. Martin [Dallas: Word Books, Publisher, 1988], 36, 37). Cranfield considers verses 16b-17 to represent the theme (Cranfield, _Romans_, 27, 28, 87). See also, Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, _Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to The Epistle to the Romans_, trans. John C. Moore and Edwin Johnson, translation rev. and ed. William P. Dickson (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, Publishers, 1884), 48.

[119]See also Cranfield, _Romans_, 100.

(Romans 1:18 to, possibly, 3:20). Beekman and Callow indicate that the return of a discourse to a "nonsubordinated, higher level proposition" is evidence for a paragraph boundary.[120]

Secondly, the expression χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is fronted in Romans 3:21. This entire noun phrase, or part of it, namely, δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ , is taken here to be the topic of the statement in Romans 3:21, if not of a larger section of the discourse. As a topic, it serves as a point of departure for what follows. It signals a shift in the topic, that is, in what was being discussed.[121]

Thirdly, the conjunction δέ is used. This conjunction serves as "a developmental marker, in the sense that the

---

[120]John Beekman and John Callow, "The Semantic Structure of Written Communication," Pre-publication ms., 1978, 66. Beekman and Callow state that a return to a non-subordinated, higher level theme may indicate a "shift," but not a complete break, in the "dependency chain," that is, in the relations between the propositions. However, the other evidence presented in the present discussion indicates that a structural break does occur between 3:20 and 3:21.

[121]For a discussion of topics and points of departure see below, chapter 4.

information it introduces builds on what has gone before and makes a distinct contribution to the argument."[122]

This evidence, taken together, indicates a new paragraph or larger unit at Romans 3:21. This means that a structural break exists between Romans 3:20 and 3:21.

Methodology

Hays uses a definition of δικαιοσύνη which is taken from a text outside Romans 3 to interpret δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 3:21. The definition that he uses is one that he finds in Psalm 143:11. His use of Psalm 143 as a source to interpret δικαιοσύνη in Romans is based on the proposed similarity between the argument of that Psalm and that of Romans 3.

Williams

Sam K. Williams interprets the righteousness of God in Romans basically as "God's fidelity to his promise(s) to Abraham." He calls this the "leading connotation" of this expression in Romans. He takes "the righteousness of God" to mean "that aspect of God's nature which we might point to

---

[122]See Stephen H. Levinsohn, Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook (Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1992), 64. See also below, chapter 4, for further discussion on δέ.

with such additional expressions as God's steadfast adherence to what is right and fitting, his constancy, his trustworthiness and his readiness to save."[123] The interpretation of "the righteousness of God" as God's "fidelity to his promise(s) to Abraham," and His "readiness to save," is taken here to be a variation of the interpretation of the term as "God's covenant faithfulness." Williams also sees "the righteousness of God" as relational.[124] These interpretations of "the righteousness of God" speak of it as an attribute, and fit the classification of the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a subjective genitive, broadly defined, as exhibited by other writers who have been reviewed in this section.

Williams bases his view on two issues: first, he bases his view on an interpretation of "the righteousness of God" in the Old Testament, and, secondly, on a belief that Romans 3:1-7 is the passage that determines the meaning of "the righteousness of God" in Romans.[125] He says that Paul did

---

[123]Sam K. Williams, "The 'Righteousness of God' in Romans," Journal of Biblical Literature 99 (June 1980): 285, 263.

[124]Ibid., 241. Williams says that "righteousness" in the Old Testament and in Paul is to be understood as "conduct or activity appropriate to a relationship rather than an inherent quality, static attribute or absolute moral norm."

[125]Ibid., 265.

not explain what he meant by δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ at its

occurrence in Romans 1. Rather, he would have expected the

recipients of his letter in Rome to know what he meant by

the term from their knowledge of the Old Testament.

Williams states that the noun that is used to refer to the

righteousness of God in the Old Testament, צְדָקָה, is

concentrated especially in Isaiah and the Psalms.[126] He

uses this as a basis, or at least a background, for an

understanding of the term "the righteousness of God."

The Use of the Old Testament

Williams says that "righteousness" has the sense

"salvation" in Isaiah 56:1, and "power" in Isaiah 59:16, and

that it has "overtones of God's deliverance and salvation"

in the Psalms.[127]

He indicates that the two terms, אֱמוּנָה and אֱמֶת, are

parallel to righteousness, and that they "point to the

faithfulness, constancy and trustworthiness" of God. He

says that these two terms, along with חֶסֶד, "designate the

nature of God" and are "covenant terms, that is, they

describe God as he is known in covenant relationship with

---

[126]Ibid., 260.

[127]Ibid., 260.

Israel." He says that these words, along with "righteousness," are not used for "activity," but "characterize the being of the God who makes himself known in deeds; they point to aspects of the divine nature."[128]

Williams rejects "the righteousness of God" interpreted as "salvation from distress or God's saving power," or as "acts which bestow salvation." He sees it rather as a "constancy" in God's nature to be "willing" and to do "that which is right and fitting in the context of his relationship with those who obey his will."[129]

Concerning Romans 1:16-17, Williams says that "righteousness" cannot be defined as "salvation," because "the gospel is God's power for (leading to) salvation because by it the righteousness of God is being revealed."[130]

Nevertheless, Williams states that the recipients of Paul's letter in Rome would have had "ideas of deliverance or salvation" when they heard δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ at Romans 1:17.[131]

---

[128]Ibid., 260-1.

[129]Ibid., 262, 263.

[130]Ibid., 262, emphasis his.

[131]Ibid., 262.

The Use of Romans 3:1-7

Williams takes Romans 3:1-7 to be the passage that determines the meaning of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans.[132] He bases this on the fact that Paul quotes from the Psalms, that a parallel is said to exist between God's righteousness and his truthfulness, which he maintains is supported by the Psalms, and that there is no break between Romans 3:20 and 3:21.

Williams says that the juxtaposition of the two ideas, "the apistia of some Jews," and "the pistin tou theou" "makes it clear that he [Paul] is referring to God's fidelity to the divine plan announced to Abraham."[133] He says that the relation of these two ideas to δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is found in the contrasting phrases and clauses of 3:3-7. He concludes that "the faithfulness of God," "righteousness of God," and "the truthfulness of God" are to be taken as "virtual equivalents." He says that this is supported by parallels in the Psalms between God's righteousness, צְדָקָה, rendered in the Septuagint as δικαιοσύνη, and אֱמֶת or אֱמוּנָה,

---

[132]Ibid., 265, 270.

[133]Ibid., 268.

rendered in the Septuagint as ἀλήθεια.[134] These three terms, "the faithfulness, truthfulness and righteousness of God in Rom 3:1-7," he says, "refer to God's fidelity to the promises given to Abraham, the promises that on the basis of faith God will justify all peoples of the earth."[135]

The Righteousness of God in Romans 3:21

Williams argues further that there should not be a break between Romans 3:20 and 21. By seeing a connection between these two verses, he finds a "confirmation" of his position that the "'righteousness of God' in Romans" has the idea of "God's faithfulness to his promises."[136]

Williams notes that Psalm 143 (142, LXX), from which Paul quotes in Romans 3:20, has both the term for "be justified" and the term for "thy righteousness." He states further that the second term is used in "close conjunction" to the first. He defines "the righteousness of God" in Psalm 143 as "that aspect of the divine nature from which issues a judgment, a relationship, other than the one deserved by the petitioner." This δικαιοσύνη σοῦ, he says,

---

[134]Ibid., 268. See also 269.

[135]Ibid., 269.

[136]Ibid., 270, 271.

is "the equivalent of" ἀλήθεια σοῦ, God's "truthfulness" or "dependability."[137]

Then, since Paul quotes from Psalm 143 at Romans 3:20, his use of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in 3:21 should have the connotation of δικαιοσύνη σοῦ in Psalm 143. That is, δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ should have "the connotation of God's truthfulness, his dependability."[138]

Williams contends that this confirms to some degree his suggestion that the meaning of "the righteousness of God" in Romans has the idea of "God's faithfulness to his promises" associated with it.[139]

Comments

Williams notes that Paul does not explain, in the first chapter of Romans, what he means by his use of the term δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 1:17. Williams takes the position that Paul would have expected the recipients of his letter in Rome to know what he meant by that term from their knowledge of the Old Testament.

---

[137]Ibid., 271.

[138]Ibid., 271.

[139]Ibid., 271.

As stated earlier, Romans 1:17 is interpreted to be the
theme of the book of Romans.[140] It is understood by this
writer only to be introduced in Romans 1, but to be repeated
in Romans 3:21-22 in an amplified form. As stated
elsewhere, this means that its expression in 3:21-22 will be
equivalent to its use in 1:17, but with information added.
Furthermore, it has been argued that δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is the
topic of the statement in Romans 3:21-22, and it has been
suggested that it could also be the topic of a paragraph
extending from Romans 3:21 through 3:26. If δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ
is the topic of the statement in 3:21-22, or of the
paragraph in 3:21-26, then 3:21-22, or 3:21-26, apart from
χωρὶς νόμου and the topic itself, provide a comment on
δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ.[141] That comment would tell what δικαιοσύνη
θεοῦ is. As a repetition of the theme of Romans, along with
a comment on the topic δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, Romans 3:21-22 (or
3:21-26) is taken to provide the information for
understanding δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 1:17. It is also
taken to provide the basis for understanding δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ

---

[140]See above, 115, and 115, n.118.

[141]The position taken in the discussion of χωρὶς νόμου
is that it is not part of the comment.

elsewhere in Romans, unless the immediate context of another occurrence indicates that the sense of the term in that occurrence should be understood otherwise.

The matter of a break between Romans 3:20 and 3:21 has been discussed in the interaction with Hays' view.

Cranfield

Introduction

C. E. B. Cranfield interprets δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a genitive of origin. This is considered to be a genitive of source in this paper.

Definition and Classification

Cranfield interprets the term θεοῦ of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 1:17 and 3:21,22 as a genitive of origin, and δικαιοσύνη as "a status of righteousness before God which is God's gift." This status of righteousness is a status of man. It is "the result of God's action of justifying," and is something which is given by God. Cranfield interprets Romans 1:17 to be: "For in it (i.e. in the gospel as it is being preached) a righteous status which is God's gift is being revealed (and so offered to men)--a righteous status which is altogether by faith."[142]

---

[142]Cranfield, Romans, 202, 97, 100.

Arguments

In interpreting δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 1:17 and 3:21,22, Cranfield indicates that one must decide if θεοῦ is a subjective genitive or a genitive of origin, and if δικαιοσύνη is an activity (God's saving power in action) or "a status of man resulting from God's action,... a gift from God."[143] He presents four arguments for the position set out above in his definition of δικαιοσύνη and his classification of θεοῦ.

First, Cranfield finds that other occurrences of the phrase, or a similar phrase, provide "strong support" for this position. He notes Paul's use of δικαιοσύνη in Romans 10:3, Philippians 3:9, 1 Corinthians 1:30, 2 Corinthians 5:21, and Romans 5:17. For Romans 10:3, Cranfield finds that the "natural" way to take τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην is "the status of righteousness which is given by God," since it is set over against "their own righteousness," which would be a "status of righteousness achieved by their own efforts." He finds this interpretation confirmed by Philippians 3:9, in which he says the ἐκ is especially

---

[143]Ibid., 96. The term "subjective genitive" would be used in a broadly defined sense.

important in the contrast between a righteousness from the law and the righteousness which is from God, by faith.[144]

In 2 Corinthians 5:21, Cranfield sees θεοῦ as a genitive of origin, and δικαιοσύνη as "the righteous status bestowed on men." On Romans 5:17, he says that τῆς δικαιοσύνης in the expression τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης can hardly be anything but an objective genitive, so that this would be "an explicit reference to righteousness as God's gift."[145]

For 1 Corinthians 1:30, Cranfield notes that not only is the term σοφία "qualified by ἀπὸ θεοῦ," but so are δικαιοσύνη, ἁγιασμὸς, and ἀπολύτρωσις. The verse then would speak of "Christ as being our righteousness from God." Cranfield interprets this as "the one in whom we have a righteous status."[146]

In his second argument, Cranfield takes the expression ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν in Romans 1:17 to support the view that δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is "the status of righteousness conferred on man by God's action." He says it is hard to see how Paul

---

[144]Ibid., 97-98.

[145]Ibid., 97-98.

[146]Ibid., 97.

could have used ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν in a natural way if he had meant "God's activity" by his use of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ.[147]

In his third argument, Cranfield states that the quote from Habakkuk "focuses attention on the justified man, not on God's act of justifying him."[148]

In his fourth argument, Cranfield finds that the interpretation of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ for which he argues fits best with "the structure of the argument of the epistle." He sees Romans 1:18-4:25 as developing the idea of ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως, and Romans 5:1-8:39 as being concerned with "the promise that the man who is righteous by faith ζήσεται." He finds this argument to be the most important, and believes that it should be "decisive."[149]

The Atonement

It was noted above that those who view "the righteousness of God" as a subjective genitive, broadly defined, or as a "power," seem to play down the

---

[147]Ibid., 98.

[148]Ibid., 98.

[149]Ibid., 98.

substitutionary aspect of the atonement where Christ is seen as being offered as a sacrifice to pay a price for the forgiveness of sins. Cranfield's view of the atonement is presented here in contrast to the views of those who hold to a subjective genitive interpretation of the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, broadly defined.

Cranfield sees that God acted to provide a righteous status for believers by delivering them from the condemnation of sin. This act involved a "purpos[ing of] Christ as a propitiatory victim" that would righteously avert God's wrath from man, and one in which God bore the cost of righteously and lovingly forgiving man's sin.[150] This view may be seen in Cranfield's comments on ἀπολύτρωσις and ἱλαστήριον.

ἀπολύτρωσις

Cranfield understands διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως to refer to an act that redeems a person from "the slavery of sin." That slavery to sin is a "subjection to sin's effects, that is, to God's condemnation, God's wrath, the condition of having an unrighteous status before Him." He bases this on

---

[150]Ibid., 207-8, 217, 200.

"the fact that διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως is linked with

δικαιούμενοι" in verse 24.[151]

With respect to the term ἀπολύτρωσις, Cranfield says

that the idea of the payment of a ransom "cannot be

excluded." He bases this on the argument that the idea of a

ransom is present in the use of "λύτρον and its derivatives"

in secular Greek and in the Septuagint. He says that a

payment was involved in the manumission of slaves, a

practice with which Paul's readers would have been

acquainted. In addition, references in the New Testament

refer to the purchase of Christians "with a price," such as

1 Corinthians 6:20 and 7:23. Finally, Cranfield cites

references in the New Testament which present the idea that

Christ was given as a ransom, or that Christians had been

purchased by His blood. These references include Mark

10:45; Matthew 20:28; Acts 20:28; 1 Timothy 2:6; 1 Peter

1:18f; 2 Peter 2:1; and Revelation 5:9.[152]

ἱλαστήριον

Cranfield notes that verses 25 and 26 form a single

relative clause that depends on Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ in verse 24.

---

[151]Ibid., 207-8.

[152]Ibid., 206-7.

The clause itself consists of a main element, and three clauses that are equivalent to final clauses. Each element is seen to explain the term ἱλαστήριον.[153]

On the word itself, Cranfield sees it as a propitiatory sacrifice by which God's wrath is averted. He finds that the ἱλάσκεσθαι word group has "the idea of the averting of wrath" in the Old Testament just as much as "in extra-biblical Greek." The references in the Old Testament are different, however, in that they are used with a sense that God's wrath is "perfectly righteous," and that "in the process of averting this righteous wrath from man it is God Himself who takes the initiative."[154]

Cranfield prefers the meaning "a propitiatory sacrifice" for the term ἱλαστήριον. He indicates that "the presence of ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι ... indicate[s] that a propitiatory sacrifice is in mind."[155]

On the first part of the last ἵνα clause in this section, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον, Cranfield makes the point that in doing what God did, He did that He might <u>be</u>

---

[153]Ibid., 208.

[154]Ibid., 216.

[155]Ibid., 216.

righteous. He "purposed Christ as ἱλαστήριον, in order to show His righteousness ... (v.26a), in order that He might be righteous ... (v.26b)."[156]

Cranfield concludes that "God purposed Christ as a propitiatory victim" in order that He might forgive people in a righteous way. To do this, He "purposed to direct against His own very Self in the person of His Son the full weight of that righteous wrath which they deserved."[157]

Method

Two things may be noted about Cranfield's method. Both relate to the understanding of words or terms in Scripture.

The first is that Cranfield perceives Paul's use of terms related to righteousness to be influenced by the Septuagint. He holds that these terms could not be interpreted only by their use in secular Greek. He says:

> That Paul's use of the words δίκαιος, δικαιοσύνη and δικαιοῦν (and also of δικαίωμα and δικαίωσις) reflects his familiarity with, and is to a very considerable extent moulded by, the LXX use of them to render words of the sdk group is clear, and is generally agreed. It is most obvious in the case of the verb δικαιοῦν; for none of the occurrences of δικαιοῦν in the Pauline epistles ... can be at all tolerably explained on the basis of the word's use in secular Greek.[158]

---

[156]Ibid., 213, emphasis his.

[157]Ibid., 217.

[158]Ibid., 95.

Secondly, however, Cranfield places a priority on the context of a term as it is used in the New Testament to interpret the term, rather than to interpret the term by its use in the Old Testament. This is followed in the interpretation of "by faith" in Romans 1:17. In this case, he asks if "ἐκ πίστεως is to be connected with the verb [ζήσεται], as it is in the LXX and as the equivalent expressions are in the MT and the Targum," of if ἐκ πίστεως should be understood to modify ὁ δίκαιος. He finds that ἐκ πίστεως should be understood to modify ὁ δίκαιος in its use in Romans 1:17. He bases this on three arguments. First, "the context contains no direct reference to living by faith, but does contain a direct reference to righteousness by faith." Secondly, he says, "The structure of the epistle requires it."[159] In the third place, he finds that Romans 5:1 "explicitly" connects the two in a summary statement. He notes that other references also combine the two, i.e. Romans 4:11, 13; 9:30; and 10:6.[160]

Cranfield's priority on the interpretation of a term in the New Testament by its immediate context, rather than by

[159]The structure to which Cranfield refers is indicated above, 128.

[160]Cranfield, Romans, 101-02.

its use in the Old Testament, is consistent with the approach used in this thesis to interpret δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 3:21.

However, the weight that he gives to the Septuagint to interpret words in the צדק group is questioned here, due to the help that is available to interpret δικαιοσύνη in Romans 3:21 from its immediate context.

CHAPTER IV

GENITIVES, TOPICS, FRONTING AND POINTS
OF DEPARTURE, THE CONJUNCTION ΔE, AND
THE ANALYSIS OF ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗ ΘΕΟΥ

This chapter takes up areas of theory which contribute to the interpretation of Νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 3:21.

The use of genitives is presented, followed by a definition of the subjective genitive. A discussion of topics includes some observations that linguists have made on some of their properties. These observations permit δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ to be analyzed as the topic of 3:21, or even of 3:21-26, and to interpret it in terms of δικαιωθήσεται in 3:20. These observations also permit δικαιοσύνη to be analyzed as a verbal noun, which in turn permits δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ to be interpreted as a genitive construction with a subjective genitive.

The matter of fronting contributes to an understanding of topics, but also permits one to see why χωρὶς νόμου is fronted.[1]

Finally, the discussion of δέ is presented to add to the analysis of δικαιοσύνη as the topic of 3:21.

Genitives

The genitive case may be used in general to limit the meaning of other substantives, adjectives, adverbs, and verbs.[2] In such instances, the genitive may be an

---

[1]Fronting refers to the placement of a constituent of a clause or a sentence prior to the position that that constituent would normally have in the clause or the sentence. For languages in general, fronting can refer to the placement of a constituent in a clause-initial or sentence-initial position, or to the placement of a constituent of a noun phrase prior to the position that that constituent would normally have in the noun phrase. For Koiné Greek, fronting refers to the placement of a constituent of a clause or sentence prior to the verb. (This assumes that the normal word order for Koiné Greek is verb-subject-object.) The term fronting is also used for Koiné Greek to refer to the placement of a constituent of a noun phrase prior to the position it would normally have in the noun phrase. An example of this would be the placement of a noun in the genitive case before the noun that it modifies. See John Beekman and John Callow, "The Semantic Structure of Written Communication," Part 1, Prepublication draft, fourth revision (1979), 101, Timothy Friberg, New Testament Greek Word Order in Light of Discourse Considerations (Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 1982), 335, 336, 340, and Levinsohn, Discourse Features, 17, 18, 94.

[2]Robert W. Funk, A Beginning-Intermediate Grammar of Hellenistic Greek, Vol. 2, Syntax (2nd ed., Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973), 711, and Herbert Weir

adnominal genitive, an adverbial genitive, or a genitive of
comparison. A genitive may also be used with an adjective
or an adverb, or may express time or place.[3]

Adnominal Genitives

The adnominal genitive consists of a substantive in the
genitive case that modifies or limits another substantive.
The substantive that is modified could be called the main
substantive or the independent substantive.[4] It can appear
in any case. The substantive in the genitive case that
modifies the independent substantive is called the dependent
substantive. The term θεοῦ in δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is an
adnominal genitive. For this reason, only the adnominal
genitives are discussed here.

Grammarians have classified adnominal genitives in
Greek in eight or nine ways. Some have presented fewer
classifications, others more.[5] Classes may include the

Smyth, Greek Grammar, rev. Gordon M. Messing (Cambridge, MA:
Harvard University Press, 1956), 313.

[3]F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New
Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, 9th-10th
German ed., trans. and rev. Robert W. Funk (Chicago:
University of Chicago Press, 1961), 89-100.

[4]BDF use the term nomen regens "governing nominal."
BDF, 89.

[5]BDF provide six classifications (BDF, 89-93). Goodwin
presents seven (William Watson Goodwin, Greek Grammar, rev.
Charles Burton Gulick [Waltham, MA: Blaisdell Publishing

genitive of source, subjective and objective genitives, the
genitive of possession, the attributive genitive or genitive
of quality, the genitives of relationship, apposition,
content, and the partitive genitive. The first five of
these classifications (considering the subjective genitive
and the objective genitive to be two classifications) are
the only ones that have been proposed as classifications of
δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in the literature that has been reviewed, or
that could reasonably be considered to be a classification
for the term in Romans 3:21-22. Four require further
comment.

The Genitive of Source

The genitive of source is the classification of a
genitive construction in which the substantive in the
genitive case is seen as "the source of the substantive it
modifies." It incorporates the idea of "ablative of
source," and is taken here to indicate the classification of
origin.[6]

Company, 1958], 229-30). The adnominal genitive has been
presented as a device to indicate a relationship between two
terms (BDF, 90), or to serve as an adjective (BDF, 89,
Smyth, Grammar, 313, and Funk, Syntax, 712).

[6]The definition of "genitive of source" that is
presented here is adapted from Brooks and Winbery's
definition of ablative of source (James A. Brooks and
Carlton L. Winbery, Syntax of New Testament Greek [Lanham,
MD: University Press of America, Inc., 1979], 23). Goodwin

The Attributive Genitive

The attributive genitive is the name given to what BDF call the genitive of quality. It indicates an attribute or quality that could be supplied by an adjective.[7]

The Subjective and The Objective Genitives

The terms "subjective genitive" and "objective genitive" have been used in different ways. They have been used in a general manner to speak of the classification of the genitives of adnominal genitival phrases, and they have been used more specifically to speak of particular instances of the use of the adnominal genitive. Two uses of the terms "subjective genitive" and "objective genitive" are discussed here--a general use, and a more specific use. An attempt is made to understand the rationale for the general classification, but reasons for using the more narrow definitions are also presented.

Subjective and Objective Genitives, Broadly Defined

Grammarians have used the term "subjective genitive," along with one or two other terms, to classify the genitive of adnominal phrases.

---

includes a class of the adnominal genitive which he calls "the causal genitive," which represents the relation of "cause or origin" (Goodwin, Grammar, 230).

[7]See BDF, 91.

Nigel Turner uses the terms subjective genitive and objective genitive to classify the genitives of adnominal genitive constructions. In his explanation of the classification of these genitives, the classification is based on the direction that the relationship between some substantive and the substantive in the genitive case takes as that direction is perceived in relation to the dependent substantive. That is, if the relationship is "_directed outwards from_" the referent of the dependent substantive to some other referent, the genitive is considered to be a subjective genitive. If the relationship is directed "_to_" the referent of the dependent substantive from some other referent, the genitive is considered to be an objective genitive.[8]

Turner also speaks of the classification of genitives of an adnominal genitival phrase in terms of an action that is "_implied_" by the independent substantive in relation to the referent of the dependent substantive. The classification of these genitives is based on "whether or not the action implied by the independent noun is carried out by the noun in the genitive."[9] If the implied action

[8]Nigel Turner, _Syntax_, vol. 3 of _A Grammar of New Testament Greek_, by James Hope Moulton, 4 vols. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), 207, emphasis mine.

[9]Ibid., 207, emphasis mine.

is carried out by the referent of the dependent substantive, the genitive would presumably be classified as a subjective genitive. If the action is not carried out by that referent, the genitive would presumably be classified as an objective genitive.

In this proposed schema for classifying the genitive, the action of the independent substantive of which Turner speaks only needs to be implied; it does not need to be represented in the form of the independent substantive. This can be observed in Turner's classification and rendering of τῶν ὅπλων τῆς δικαιοσύνης of 2 Corinthians 6:7. He classifies the genitive as a subjective genitive, and says that its sense is "probably that [the armor] which the divine righteousness provides."[10] In the rendering of the phrase, the verb "provides" is supplied; it is not formally represented in the genitive phrase.

John M. Taylor's analysis of the traditional classification of the subjective and objective genitives describes in more specific terms the relations between the independent substantive and the dependent substantive of the genitival phrase and the classification based upon these relations. He notes that if the independent substantive "is done, caused by, or the goal of" the dependent substantive,

---

[10]Ibid., 207.

the genitive is classified as a subjective genitive. On the other hand, if the dependent substantive "is done, caused by, or the goal of" the independent substantive, the genitive is classified as an objective genitive. The substantives may refer to referents or actions.[11]

Bruce Waltke and M. O'Connor speak of the classification of genitives as they are represented by the Hebrew "noun-noun genitive phrase or construct chain."[12] They classify the genitive in two major classifications, to which they refer in relation to grammar. The two classifications are based on whether the dependent substantive serves as a subject or as a modifier of the

---

[11]John M. Taylor, "Notes on the Greek Genitive," in "Chapter 6: The Genitive Construction," in Notes on Translation with Drills, ed. John Beekman (Santa Ana, CA: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1965), 196.

[12]Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 143. Although Waltke and O'Connor write of Hebrew grammar, their discussion can be instructive with respect to the classification of the genitives of adnominal genitival phrases. This assertion is based on the similarity between the function of the Hebrew noun-noun genitive phrase and the function of the adnominal genitival phrase in Greek, on the similarity between the two general classifications that Waltke and O'Connor make for the genitive and the traditional classifications of the genitives of adnominal genitival phrases, and on the assumption that semantic notions are not limited to the description of specific languages. See Beekman and Callow, "Semantic Structure" (1979), 6, for a comment on the non-language specific nature of semantic notions (i.e., the "features, relations, and functions" of "semantic structure"). They propose that "semantic structure is near universal."

independent substantive. Reference is made to the first
classification as subjective genitive. The second of these
groups, in which the dependent substantive is classed as a
modifier of the independent substantive, is divided further
into adverbial and adjectival genitives. Thus, there are
two main categories of the genitive of a noun-noun genitive
phrase, which are divided further into three categories.
These categories could be called grammatical
classifications. The three classifications are subjective
genitive, adverbial genitive, and adjectival genitive.[13]

Each of these major classifications is subdivided into
particular classifications, based on the meaning that is
exhibited by the Hebrew construct chain. The subjective
genitive includes such classifications as the "genitive of
agency," the "genitive of authorship," the "genitive of
instrument," the "possessive genitive," a genitive that is
concerned with motivation or intention which is called an
"abstract subjective genitive," and others.[14]

The adverbial genitive includes such classifications as
the "objective genitive," the "genitive of effect," the
"genitive of advantage," and others. The adjectival
genitive includes the "attributive genitive," the

---

[13]Waltke and O'Connor, Hebrew Syntax, 142, 143.

[14]Ibid., 143-146.

"epexegetical genitive," the "genitives of substance," and others.[15]

The classifications that are included in the major categories could be considered semantic classifications.[16] They are used to indicate the meaning carried by individual construct chains, and could be used to indicate the meaning of individual adnominal genitival phrases. These classifications are more narrow than the general categories that include them. They limit the meanings that can be associated with each narrow classification.

Problems Associated with General Definitions

A genitive may be classified by the use of one of the two or three general classifications of the genitive of an adnominal genitival phrase. Such a classification would include several possible semantic classifications. A problem results in that the use of such a term provides little information to understand the specific interpretation of a text.

A second problem may result from the use of a general term such as "subjective genitive." When a reader sees such a term, he may think that the semantic classification "subjective genitive" is intended, when in fact the genitive

_____

[15]Ibid., 146-154.

[16]See ibid., 142.

may be, for example, a genitive of authorship, using Waltke and O'Connor's classifications.

Subjective and Objective Genitives, Narrowly Defined

The problems described above can be alleviated or reduced by dispensing with the general classifications and using only the specific semantic classifications. In this schema, subjective and objective genitives are found only in constructions where the independent substantive represents an action, thought, emotion, or other verbal idea. The genitive of the genitival phrase is then classified as a subjective genitive if the referent of the dependent substantive serves as the subject of the verbal concept found in the independent substantive. On the other hand, if the referent of the dependent substantive serves as the (direct) object of the verbal concept found in the independent substantive, the genitive is classified as an objective genitive.[17]

---

[17]Grammars which employ the narrow definitions of the subjective and objective genitives include Goodwin, _Grammar_, 229; H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, _A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament_ (Toronto: The Macmillan Company, 1955), 78-9; and, possibly, Funk, _Syntax_. Funk says, "When the noun in the genitive is the subject of the action, emotion, etc. expressed by the noun to which it is related, it is called the subjective genitive." If the "etc." speaks of verbal ideas only, then Funk's definition would be of the narrow definition of the subjective genitive presented above. He provides a similar definition for the objective genitive (Funk, _Syntax_, 712-13).

The term "subjective genitive, narrowly defined," has been used in this thesis when the referent of the dependent substantive serves as the subject of the verbal idea represented by the independent substantive. The term "subjective genitive, broadly defined," has been employed for the more general use of the term "subjective genitive."

The genitives of adnominal genitival phrases are classified in other ways when the independent substantive does not formally represent an action, thought, emotion, or other verbal concept.

Three advantages are seen by using the narrow definitions for the subjective and the objective genitives. First, a verb does not need to be supplied from the context apart from the formal terms of the genitival phrase when the meaning is expressed. Second, the specific meaning of the narrow definition requires that the interpreter be precise in his interpretation of a genitival phrase. In cases where a single interpretation cannot be determined, the interpreter can present the specific choices that are possible representations of the text. Third, when the interpretation has been made, the interpreter has specific terms with which to communicate to his reader what he claims the meaning of the text to be.

The Interpretation of Adnominal Genitive Phrases

The forms of a subjective genitive and of an objective genitive, or any other adnominal genitive phrase, will be the same. To interpret a genitive phrase, then, the interpreter must depend upon "the meaning of the words," "the context," and "the facts presupposed as known."[18] His analysis will result from an examination of a construction in its context.

Multiple Senses of a Single Adnominal Genitive

Some grammarians indicate that the genitive of a single adnominal genitival phrase may have more than one sense. Smyth states that such a genitive could be classified in more than one way. His comments introduce another issue as well. He states that it may be difficult to classify the genitive with precision because the relation between the two substantives is "so loose."[19]

It seems that a single construction in a text should have a single meaning.[20] If a single adnominal genitival

---

[18]Smyth, _Grammar_, 314. See also Funk, _Syntax_, 711. Funk lists the first two of these.

[19]Smyth, _Grammar_, 314. See also Turner, _Syntax_, 210.

[20]A communication could be expected to express a single meaning for a single construction to avoid ambiguity, except in special cases. Those cases could include texts which are intended to be cryptic, poetry, and perhaps texts that are intended to cause the listener to consider possible alternatives for some term used in a statement. Cf. Elliott

phrase has a single meaning, a single classification of the
genitive should represent the meaning of that genitive. The
"loose" nature of the relationship between the two
substantives in such a phrase may make it difficult,
however, to narrow the possible classifications to one.

Evidence is presented in this thesis to classify the
genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 3:21 as a subjective
genitive, narrowly defined. However, evidence is also
presented to classify the genitive as a genitive of source.
If Smyth and others are correct that the genitive of an
adnominal genitival phrase can at times be classified in
multiple ways, then the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ could be

E. Johnson, "Dual Authorship and the Single Intended Meaning
of Scripture," Bibliotheca Sacra 143 (July-September 1986):
222, and Bruce Waltke, "Historical Grammatical Problems," in
Summit II: Hermeneutics Papers: Hyatt Regency O'Hare
Chicago: November 10-13, 1982, Part 1 (Oakland:
International Council on Biblical Inerrancy, 1982), pp. 2-39
to 2-40.
    In this thesis, the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is
interpreted as a subjective genitive, narrowly defined, with
the sense "God justifies [unrighteous people]." Evidence is
presented for the analysis of the genitive as a genitive of
source as an alternate interpretation, or, if the
grammarians cited above are correct, as an interpretation
that is present with the interpretation of the genitive as a
subjective genitive, narrowly defined. The possibility of
the classification of the genitive as a "possessive
genitive" is also presented.

both a subjective genitive, narrowly defined, and a genitive
of source.[21]

If, however, the classification of the genitive of a
particular phrase is limited to one, then a determination
must be made from the various possibilities. Smyth presents
criteria to interpret an adnominal genitival phrase. This
criteria is noted above. Two areas may be crucial to the
final determination of the classification of the genitive of
δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 3:21. One is to determine if in
Paul's use of δικαιοσύνη he emphasizes the verbal nature of
the action, δικαιόω, or if the use of the abstract noun
δικαιοσύνη places an emphasis upon the result of God's
action to justify unrighteous people.[22] Another area
which may contribute to a final determination of the
classification of this genitive is a study of Romans 3:21-26

---

[21]It is noted below that an examination of Romans 3:21-
26 as a paragraph may indicate that the genitive of
δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ could (also) be a possessive genitive (149-
50; 150, n. 23; 182, n. 1; 183-4).

[22]In a personal communication from Joel Williams. He
says, in part, "It seems to me that the real issue lies in
the extent to which δικαιοσύνη is being used as a verbal
noun in this context. Is Paul emphasizing the action of
God's justifying work or is he emphasizing righteousness as
a possession that we have from God or (as you are arguing)
is it both?" Williams also states that Paul's overall
theology may be a factor in making a decision on the
classification of this genitive (personal note, May, 1993).

as a paragraph. In that paragraph, the material apart from

χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ would serve as a comment on

δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, and so indicate how δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is to be

understood.[23]

Topics

A topic is what a sentence or a larger unit of

discourse is about.[24] It may occur in a form such as a

noun, a phrase, a nominalized clause, or some other form.

Koiné Greek uses a variety of ways to indicate topics.

These include the use of περί or περὶ δέ, fronting, and the

use of the passive form of the verb.

An awareness of the means of indicating topics and a

consideration of them when interpreting a text can, in this

writer's opinion, facilitate the interpretation of a Koiné

text when these features occur. An understanding of the

properties of topics in general can also contribute to the

interpretation of a text in which topics occur. Some

properties which have been recognized for topics are used in

---

[23]See above, 124. Such a study may also provide
evidence to classify this genitive as a possessive genitive.

[24]Levinsohn, Discourse Features, 17, and Beekman and
Callow, "Semantic Structure (1979)," 40, 104.

this thesis for the interpretation of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in

Romans 3:21.

Properties of Topics

Charles Li and Sandra Thompson list several properties

of topics. Those that contribute to the interpretation of

δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 3:21 are presented here. Some

additional observations by Stephen Levinsohn, John Beekman

and John Callow are also included.

The first property to be noted is that topics are

definite. For a noun or a noun phrase to be definite means

that its referent is known at the point at which it occurs

in the discourse, and that its referent can be

identified.[25] Known information is information that would

be recognizable or recoverable from the discourse or from

the situation apart from the discourse.[26]

A second property of topics is that they announce the

matter about which a discourse, or a section of discourse,

is spoken or written. Subjects, on the other hand, have a

---

[25] Charles N. Li and Sandra A. Thompson, "Subject and
Topic: A New Typology of Language", in Subject and Topic,
ed. Charles N. Li (New York: Academic Press, 1976), 461.

[26]See M. A. K. Halliday, "Notes on Transitivity and
Theme in English: Part 2," Journal of Linguistics 3 (October
1967): 204, 205. Halliday speaks in terms of "given"
information. The term "known" is used here in a way similar
to the way Halliday uses "given."

function limited to the clause or sentence. They "provide

the orientation or the point of view of the action,

experience, state, etc., denoted by the verb," and are

"involved in the action, experience or state, etc."[27]

A third property of topics is that they are fronted.

They may or may not be sentence initial.[28]

A fourth property of topics is that they are usually

pronouns or noun phrases.[29] Beekman and Callow indicate

that "in many languages" the topic will have a "nominalized"

---

[27]Li and Thompson, "Subject and Topic," 463-4, citing a
personal communication from Michael Noonan. This property
may be useful in seeing δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as the topic of a
paragraph consisting of Romans 3:21-26.

[28]This statement modifies what Li and Thompson say.
They indicate that the "coding of the topic in all languages
we have examined always involve [sic] the sentence-initial
position" (Li and Thompson, "Subject and Topic," 465). It
seems, however, that a sentence may have a constituent
occurring in the sentence-initial position for other reasons
than to serve as a topic, and still have a topic occurring
before the verb. In a personal communication, Levinsohn
notes that a sentence may have more than one point of
departure. In such a sentence, the points of departure
would need to be at the beginning of the sentence, and would
have to occur one after the other (Stephen H. Levinsohn,
Pasto, Colombia, to Daniel A. Hoopert, Winona Lake, IN, 17
January 1994, transcript in the personal possession of
Daniel A. Hoopert). It may be that the first point of
departure would set the time or place, while the second one
would be the topic. Hence, the topic would not necessarily
be sentence-initial. See also Levinsohn, Discourse
Features, 81, 208. See also Friberg, Word Order, 335, for a
comment on fronting of topics.

[29]Levinsohn, Discourse Features, 16. Levinsohn makes
his comment with respect to propositional topics.

form.[30] In an earlier edition, they spoke of the
presentation of an "Event" concept as a topic in the
"surface structure." They said, "A topic which is an Event
may occur in the surface structure as a nominalized
form."[31]

Topics as Known Information

The first property of topics that was noted is that
topics must be definite. One requirement for a noun phrase
to be definite is that it must consist of "known"
information.

The way new information is introduced into a discourse,
and how it receives the "status" of "known" information, is
used later in this thesis in the interpretation of
δικαιοσύνη in Romans 3:21.

Levinsohn states, "Frequently, the propositional topic
is information that the author considers to be 'known' to

---

[30]Beekman and Callow, "Semantic Structure" (1979), 41.
See also ibid., 42.

[31]Beekman and Callow, "Semantic Structure" (1978), 49.
This means that if a concept that would normally be
expressed as a verb were to be presented as a topic, it
would appear in a nominalized form, such as an abstract
noun, or perhaps as a nominalized participle. A statement
could also be expressed as a topic by presenting it as a
noun phrase that employed an abstract noun to represent the
verbal idea, along with modifiers that are used as adjuncts
of that noun, or perhaps as a nominalized participial
clause.

the reader and the subject is most frequently the topic."
He adds, "The observed tendency for the subject to be
arthrous in Greek naturally follows."[32]

Levinsohn also says, "Similarly, the comment usually
contains 'new' information." Citing M. A. K. Halliday,
Levinsohn provides further understanding on what is called
"new" information. New information would be information
that is presented as though it were not "recoverable from
the preceding discourse."[33] Known information would be
readily "recoverable."

Information may also be taken to be known by an
association through something that is called "script."
Levinsohn says:

> The definite article may be used also to refer to
> particular referents that are associated by a 'script'
> with a known entity. For example, once reference has
> been made to a father, an arthrous reference to his
> child is acceptable, even if previously
> unmentioned.[34]

---

[32]Levinsohn, Discourse Features, 97. Levinsohn uses
the term "propositional topic" to refer to "the part of a
clause or sentence about which a comment is made" (ibid.,
16, n. 2). There are also topics which serve as topics for
discourse units such as paragraphs or sections (see, e.g.,
Beekman and Callow, "Semantic Structure" [1979], 84).

[33]Levinsohn, Discourse Features, 97. See also M. A. K.
Halliday, "Transitivity and Theme," 204.

[34]Levinsohn, Discourse Features, 97.

Anarthrous Subjects

If subjects tend to be arthrous in Greek, and the claim is made that δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is the topic of Romans 3:21, the question may be asked why δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is anarthrous, since it should be known information.

Levinsohn indicates that an article generally indicates that "the referent of any noun to which an article is attributive is 'known' and 'particular.'" The exceptions to this would be instances where the article is "obligatory." He later adds, "However, the absence of the article does not necessarily imply that the referent is <u>not</u> known or particular." An anarthrous reference "is simply <u>unmarked</u> for the feature" that indicates that something is "known" and "particular." An anarthrous construction "in no way implies that its referent is either particular or known or <u>not</u> particular or known."[35] If a noun is anarthrous, but its referent is "known and particular," the referent of that noun "is salient,"[36] that is, prominent.

---

[35]Ibid., 98. Emphasis his.

[36]Ibid., 107.

Levinsohn also remarks that "a constituent may be anarthrous because its referent is <u>abstract</u>, not known or particular."[37]

<div align="center">Indications of Topics in Koiné Greek</div>

There are several ways of indicating topics in Greek. Two of these are important in the interpretation of δικαιοσύνη in Romans 3:21.

One way of indicating a topic is through the use of περί or περὶ δέ. Examples are found in 1 Corinthians 7:1, 25; 8:1, 4; 12:1; 1 Thessalonians 5:1; and 1 Peter 1:10. For instance, in 1 Corinthians 8:1, Paul says:

Περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων,

> Now concerning the of idols [that which was sacrificed to idols].

In these instances, a noun, a noun phrase, or a nominalized form is introduced by περί or περὶ δέ. The item that is introduced seems to be the thing to which a larger portion of the discourse refers, so that these items would seem to be topics of paragraphs or sections. In 1 Corinthians 8:1, τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων is then discussed in verses 1-3. (It is presented again in 8:4, so that it is likely the topic of 1 Corinthians 8, or possibly of 1 Corinthians 8-10.)

---

[37]Ibid., 108. Emphasis his.

A second means by which topics are indicated in Greek is by the use of the passive form of the verb.[38] Friberg notes that the topic of a sentence in Greek is the subject in unmarked occasions.[39] The use of the passive permits a constituent that is not normally the subject of the clause to be presented as the subject. Since the topic of a clause is normally the subject, the use of the passive permits a constituent that is not normally the topic to be presented as the topic of the clause. Such constituents, which would be the Patient, Recipient, or Undergoer of the action indicated by the verb, would be expressed as substantives in an oblique case if a clause or sentence employed an active verb.

When a constituent such as a Patient, Recipient, or Undergoer of the action of the verb is presented as the subject of a clause or sentence, it receives a certain prominence.[40] The term "marked topic" is also used to refer to such a topicalized constituent.[41] This would be

---

[38]Friberg, Word Order, 195, and Robert E. Longacre, The Grammar of Discourse (New York: Plenum Press, 1983), 230. See also Beekman and Callow, "Semantic Structure" (1979), 41.

[39]Friberg, Word Order, 197. See also Longacre, Grammar, 230.

[40]See Longacre, Grammar, 230.

[41]Beekman and Callow, "Semantic Structure" (1979), 41.

because the subject of a sentence has a greater degree of prominence than a constituent in an oblique case, which, as noted, would be the case for expressing such a constituent in the unmarked instances.

The use of the passive verb also permits a discourse, or a segment of a discourse, to have a continuity of topic when a constituent described above (a Patient, Recipient, or Undergoer of an action) is "central" to the topic structure of that discourse unit. That is, the use of a passive verb permits a Patient, Recipient, or Undergoer to be established as the topic of a segment of discourse, and permits it to be maintained as the established topic. Longacre notes that the use of "active clauses," which would relegate such constituents to object positions, could do two things which would diminish the desired topic continuity to the discourse segment: First, it could fail to provide such a constituent with the prominence that is necessary to recognize that it is a topic. Second, the use of some other noun as the subject of an "active clause" could suggest that that other noun is to be recognized as the topic.[42]

While the use of the passive provides a prominence or markedness to a constituent that would not normally be a

---

[42]Longacre, Grammar, 230. The term "continuity of topic" is used here for what Longacre terms "thematicity." The term "topic structure" is used for his term "thematic structure."

subject, the position that a subject occupies in a clause or sentence provides a word-order prominence to the term. The subject may occur after the verb. Such a word order is considered to be "unmarked,"[43] and such a position of the subject could be called "unmarked." As a variation of the unmarked order, the subject may be indicated only by a person-number suffix on the verb.

On the other hand, the subject of a passive verb may occur overtly before the verb.[44] This is the "marked" position, and the word order of the clause is the "marked" order.

The unmarked order is used to establish a "minor participant or non-participant" as a topic, to reintroduce a "residual participant,"[45] or to maintain a topic as a topic that has already been established. Friberg uses Luke 1:13b to illustrate the unmarked order of a sentence with a passive verb:

---

[43]Friberg, Word Order, 195.

[44]Ibid., 196.

[45]A "residual participant" would be one that was previously introduced into a discourse as a topic, but which has not been used as the topic for some interval before being re-introduced (See ibid., 198-9.).

Μὴ φοβοῦ, Ζαχαρία, διότι εἰσηκούσθη ἡ δέησίς σου.

Do not fear, Zachariah, for your prayer has been heard.[46]

The marked order of a clause may be used to establish a "major participant" as the topic.[47] 1 Corinthians 15:20a may illustrate this with a passive verb:

Νυνὶ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν.

But now Christ has been raised from the dead.

The use of the unmarked and the marked orders of clauses with passive verbs may also be seen in Romans 7:2:

7:2a ἡ γὰρ ὕπανδρος γυνὴ τῷ ζῶντι ἀνδρὶ δέδεται νόμῳ·

> For a wife is bound by law to her husband as long as he lives.

7:2b ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἀνήρ,

> But if the husband dies,

7:2c κατήργηται ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ἀνδρός.

> she is released from the law of her husband.

In this passage, the marked order is used in 7:2a to establish ἡ … γυνή as the topic of 7:2-3. It occurs as a

---

[46]Ibid., 197, 198-9, 196.

[47]Friberg lists "emphasis" and "contrast between two subject arguments" as additional reasons for fronting a subject (Ibid., 196).

fronted subject, and, as the topic of 7:2-3, is analyzed here to be a topic at the sentence or paragraph level.

In 7:2c, the unmarked order is used. The subject is only indicated by the verbal suffix. The use of the unmarked order is analyzed here to maintain ἡ γυνή as the topic that was established in 7:2a.

7:2b has a subject in the postverbal position. That subject is analyzed here to be the topic of the conditional clause, 2b, which is supporting 2c semantically.[48] The topic of 2c, ἡ γυνή, is analyzed to be the topic that was established in 2a at the sentence or paragraph level. (Alternatively, ἡ γυνή could be re-introduced as a "residual participant" in 2c.)

Finally, topics may be indicated in Greek by fronting.[49] An example of a constituent that is presented as a topic is found in 1 Corinthians 2:6:

---

[48]See Beekman and Callow, "Semantic Structure" (1979), 54, 56-7, for a discussion of the relative prominence and relationship between "support" and supported propositions.

[49]Friberg, Word Order, 335. See also Beekman and Callow, "Semantic Structure," (1979), 84.

Σοφίαν δὲ λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις,

We do, however, proclaim a wisdom among the mature.[50]

There are other reasons for fronting, however, in addition to that of indicating that something is a topic. Reasons for fronting that are pertinent to the analysis of Romans 3:21 are discussed below.

Fronting and Points of Departure

Points of Departure

Fronting may occur in Greek texts at points of discontinuity. "Appropriate" constituents that are fronted at such points are called points of departure. Points of departure may be topics, or may be other constituents. There may also be fronting of constituents for the purpose of emphasis.

Levinsohn notes that a coherent text usually has unity around a topic. Coherence, however, is broken by local discontinuities. These consist in changes in setting of place or time, changes in "participants," and changes in "topics." In nonnarrative text, local discontinuities occur where there are changes of situation or changes in topics.

---

[50]Beekman and Callow, "Semantic Structure," (1979), 84. They analyze σοφὶαν as the topic of a paragraph consisting of verses 6-8.

These local discontinuities are generally reflected by points of departure.[51]

Levinsohn states that points of departure do two things: First, they "set a 'domain' for what follows," and, secondly, they "provide the primary basis for relating what follows to the context."[52]

Levinsohn indicates that points of departure may "repeat information contained in a previous clause," or they may "represent a switch to the fronted constituent from a corresponding constituent in a previous clause."[53] He indicates that all points of departure are anaphoric.[54]

In nonnarrative text, as in narrative, a point of departure "reflects a _discontinuity_ of situation or topic." Levinsohn states, "In argument, _condition_, _purpose_ and other relations encoded by adverbial constituents are also commonly fronted as points of departure."[55]

---

[51]Levinsohn, _Discourse Features_, 13, 16, 69. See also ibid., 23.

[52]Ibid., 18.

[53]Ibid., 16.

[54]Ibid., 20.

[55]Ibid., 69, 18, emphasis his.

Other Reasons for Fronting

Fronting may also be used in Greek text to focus attention on a "significant" constituent, or it may be used to emphasize a constituent. When a constituent is fronted for emphasis, "strong feelings" may be indicated, or the constituent that is fronted may be "a matter expected to surprise the hearer."[56]

Levinsohn indicates that a constituent that is fronted for focus or for emphasis is typically anarthrous. Later, he points out that there are times when points of departure, which he says are typically arthrous, are anarthrous. The use of points of departure that are anarthrous has the effect of emphasizing them or focusing attention on them.[57] Levinsohn uses ἐν νόμῳ in Galatians 3:11, cited below, as an illustration of a constituent that is anarthrous to highlight it:

ὅτι δὲ ἐν νόμῳ οὐδεὶς δικαιοῦται παρὰ τῷ θεῷ δῆλον.

Now it is clear that no one will be justified before God by Law.[58]

---

[56]Ibid., 83.

[57]Ibid., 83, 109.

[58]Ibid., 109.

Foils

A foil is a particular kind of focus. Levinsohn defines a foil as "a constituent that is presented for the purpose of being contrasted or added to in the following material. The foil comes into temporary focus in anticipation of a switch of attention to a corresponding constituent."[59] Levinsohn indicates that ἐν νόμῳ, cited in the example above, is likely a foil to ἐκ πίστεως in Galatians 3:11b:

ὅτι ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται.

Because the just will live by faith.[60]
Such a consideration may be useful in the analysis of the position and use of χωρὶς νόμου in Romans 3:21.

Preposed Constituents in the Noun Phrase

In a noun phrase, a constituent may be presented before the head noun "to highlight it or to make it the point of departure." Such constituents may consist of a term in the genitive case, an

---

[59]Ibid., 83, 84.
[60]Ibid., 109.

adjective, a dative expression, or an adverbial construction.[61]
Levinsohn writes with respect to the first two of these.

Regarding a preposed adjective, Levinsohn says, "In some
instances, the adjective precedes the noun because it seems to
relate back to a corresponding constituent of the context
and/or to emphasize it." He provides an example from James 2:2,
where the preposed ῥυπαρᾷ "shabby" appears to contrast to
λαμπρᾷ "splendid" in the preceding clause.[62] If χωρὶς
νόμου (Romans 3:21), an improper prepositional phrase, can
be analyzed to have the same function as an adjective in a
noun phrase, reasons may be seen for its position prior to
δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 3:21.

The Conjunction δέ

Levinsohn refers to δέ as a developmental conjunction.
He indicates that the information that developmental
conjunctions introduce "<u>builds</u> on what has preceded it," but
also indicates that what is introduced "represents a <u>new</u>

---

[61]Ibid., 94, emphasis his. The term "highlighting"
includes the ideas of "focus" and of "emphasis" (ibid., 20).

[62]Ibid., 95.

<u>development</u> in the story or argument as far as the purpose of the author is concerned."[63]

Higher Level Uses of δέ

δέ may be used where a paragraph begins. This would be a higher level use of δέ. That is, the material that is introduced may be a paragraph or larger discourse unit which "as a whole builds on" what has gone before and "represents" something new.[64]

The thing to note here is that δέ is a conjunction that may be used at the beginning of a paragraph. One may also expect to find a point of departure at such a place. This means that one could expect to find δέ used with a fronted topic, where that fronted topic would serve as a point of

---

[63]Ibid., 31. Emphasis his. Levinsohn makes a distinction between developmental markers and points of departure. The former, he says, "relate to the <u>purpose</u> of the story or argument" (emphasis his). The latter relate to the unity of a text around a topic (See ibid., 36.).

[64]Ibid., 195, 35. See ibid., 65-66 for an example. δέ may also introduce other discourse units which are larger than a sentence, but which may not be considered a paragraph. Such units are termed "propositional clusters" by Beekman and Callow (Beekman and Callow, "Semantic Structure" [1979], 46-47).

departure. Levinsohn provides an example of where the use

of δέ coincides with fronting in James 1:4.[65]

The Analysis of χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ

χωρὶς νόμου

The construction χωρὶς νόμου occurs prior to δικαιοσύνη

θεοῦ. It is taken here to be fronted for one of two

reasons.

First, χωρὶς νόμου may be part of a noun phrase

consisting of χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ. That entire noun

phrase may serve as the point of departure and as the topic

of verse 21.[66] χωρὶς νόμου may be preposed before the head

noun, δικαιοσύνη, to highlight it. One of the reasons that

it could be fronted for emphasis is that it presents

something that may be unexpected to the reader. It also

presents something that contrasts to an earlier constituent

to which it could correspond. The expression χωρὶς νόμου is

taken here to indicate that the righteousness of God is a

---

[65]Levinsohn, Discourse Features, 65.

[66]Earlier, it was noted that, in Greek, a topic is
usually a pronoun or a noun phrase. See above, 152.

righteousness that is realized apart from works of the law.[67] The phrase χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ appears to contrast with the earlier statement that "By works of the law no flesh will be justified in His [God's] sight." The idea that a righteousness could be realized χωρὶς νόμου could be unexpected. The phrase to which χωρὶς νόμου could be contrasted would be ἐξ ἔργων νόμου.

The second reason that χωρὶς νόμου is fronted may be that it serves as a foil to διὰ πίστεως in verse 22. That is, it may be fronted to temporarily focus attention on it because attention will be given to a later constituent that corresponds to it, and to which information will be added. That corresponding constituent would seem to be διὰ πίστεως, and the information that is added to it would be Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ

δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is taken here to be the topic of verse 21. The complete topic may be the noun phrase δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, or even χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ. δικαιοσύνη, however,

---

[67]Cf. Murray, Romans, 109-10.

would be the head noun of either of these phrases. The topic of verse 21 may also be a higher level topic, serving as the topic of Romans 3:21-22, or even of a paragraph consisting of Romans 3:21-26.

The Properties of a Topic found in δικαιοσύνη

δικαιοσύνη has properties of a topic. Some of these that assist in the interpretation of the term are listed below.

First, δικαιοσύνη consists of known information. It is held here that δικαιοσύνη consists of known information because the concept it contains, "justify," is introduced in the immediate context by the verb δικαιωθήσεται in verse 20, in the part of the sentence which constitutes the comment of verse 20, the part where new information would be expected to be introduced. Because it is introduced in verse 20, the concept "justify" could be seen as being "recoverable" from the context. It may be that the idea of a "script" would be used in seeing δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as known information.

Second, δικαιοσύνη has the property of a topic in that it is a nominal. The concept "justify" that was introduced in verse 20 was introduced in the form of a verb. That

verbal concept, however, is taken here to be nominalized and presented as the abstract noun δικαιοσύνη.

Third, δικαιοσύνη has a property of a topic in that it is fronted. It might be noted that this is where known information is found.

Fourth, δικαιοσύνη occurs as the subject of a passive verb.

Fifth, δικαιοσύνη is taken here to be the point of departure for what follows, and occurs with δέ. As a point of departure, it indicates that there has been a change in the topic, and it sets the domain for what follows. The occurrence of δέ as a developmental conjunction indicates that what follows builds on what has preceded, but also that what follows is a new development in the argument; what follows represents something new.

The Contributions to the Interpretation of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ

As a term that is introduced by the verb δικαιωθήσεται, and then nominalized (which is necessary for it to be a topic), two things are provided for the interpretation of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ.

First, the noun δικαιοσύνη can be interpreted, so far

as its lexical content is concerned, by the verb from which

it was nominalized, that is, δικαιωθήσεται. That means that

δικαιοσύνη will have a sense of "justify" in it.[68]

Second, since the concept was introduced by means of

the verb δικαιωθήσεται, and then nominalized as δικαιοσύνη,

δικαιοσύνη can be considered a verbal noun. That permits

the genitive θεοῦ in the construction δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ to be

interpreted as a subjective genitive, narrowly defined.

Using the sense "justify" from the verb, the sense of

δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ would be "God justifies."

"Justify," however, is a transitive verb and requires

an object. To propose an object for "justify," it is

suggested that the sense of χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ be

compared to the statement ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα

σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ. The two statements are taken to

contrast. The contrasting senses would be:

---

[68]Cf. LSJ, s.v. δικαι-όω, 429. Under meaning I, they
say, "set right, ...," under meaning II, "hold or deem
right, claim or demand as a right, ...," and under meaning
III.3, "pronounce and treat as righteous, justify,
vindicate,..." They cite Exodus 23:7 and Jeremiah 3:11 from
the LXX as examples for the last meaning.

By works of the law God will not justify any person in His sight/God will justify unrighteous people in His sight,

and,

Apart from [works of the] law God justifies [unrighteous people] in His sight.

The term σάρξ is taken to be used metaphorically for "person."[69] Since the people to whom reference is made are in need of justification (which is all people [πᾶσα σάρξ]), σάρξ could perhaps be expressed as "unrighteous people." This is the rendering that has been given to σάρξ throughout this thesis. Since σάρξ is the object of the verbal idea in verse 20 when verse 20 is expressed in the active sense,[70] it is taken to be the object of the verbal

---

[69]Cf. Meyer, Romans, 126. Meyer equates πᾶσα σάρξ with πᾶς ἄνθρωπος.

[70]Linguists speak of expressing sentences with a passive verb in equivalent sentences using verbs in the active voice (See e.g. Eugene Van Ness Goetchius, The Language of the New Testament [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965], 92-95. His discussion, however, is about expressing sentences that had used verbs in the active voice by sentences that use verbs in the passive voice.). At times a sentence in the passive voice will not have an agent of the verbal idea expressed. In such instances, the agent is taken to be implied (See Graham Mallison and Barry J. Blake, Language Typology: Cross-linguistic Studies in Syntax, in North-Holland Linguistic Series, ed. S. C. Dik, J. G. Kooig and S. A. Thompson [New York: North-Holland

idea in the rendering of χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in verse
21. χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is therefore rendered as,
"Apart from [works of the] Law, God justifies [unrighteous
people]."

δικαιοσύνη is taken to be anarthrous because it is
salient, or because it is further highlighted. νόμου is
also anarthrous, and is taken to be so because it is
salient, or because it has received emphasis.

δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a Subjective Genitive

and as a Genitive of Source

Blass, Debrunner and Funk state that the purpose of the
adnominal genitive is to indicate a relationship.[71] This
seems to indicate that the relationship between the two
constituents in an adnominal genitive phrase is a rather
loose relationship. Ilah Fleming has stated something
similar. She indicates that a loose semantic association is

Publishing Company, 1981], 73-4, and Goethchius, Language,
97.).

An implicit agent of δικαιωθήσεται is expressed in the
above rendering of verse 20a with a verb in the active
voice. One might propose an alternate rendering such as "By
works of the law unrighteous people will not justify
themselves in God's sight," where the agent would be taken
to be "unrighteous people."

[71]BDF, 90.

involved when a noun is related to a referent using the genitive case. She adds, "This would be in keeping with the use of a noun for underlying events to give prominence to the action, or attribution and to downplay the associated objects or referents."[72] This would seem to mean that an action could be presented in a verbal noun and be placed in a genitive construction. In that construction, emphasis would be given to the action that is indicated by the noun, and that the referent in the genitive case would not be receiving semantic prominence. If the head noun in the genitive phrase were an attribute, it would receive emphasis as the head noun.

This would mean that, if a subjective genitive is used in particular to express the means whereby something is accomplished, the phrase δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a subjective genitive would speak especially of the means whereby God justifies unrighteous people. On the other hand, if a genitive of source is used in particular to express the result of an action, the phrase δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a genitive of source would speak especially of the result of God's action of justifying unrighteous people.

---

[72]Ilah Fleming, Ft. Myers, FL, to Daniel A. Hoopert, Winona Lake, IN, 26 June 1992, transcript in the personal possession of Daniel A. Hoopert.

If an adnominal genitive can represent more than one kind of classification of the genitive, δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ could be a subjective genitive and a genitive of source.

δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a Subjective Genitive

J. Harold Greenlee proposes the following rendering for Romans 3:21, "But now apart from law God's justification (God's way of putting people right with Him) is revealed." In speaking of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as "God's way of putting people right with Him," δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ would speak of a means.[73] This interpretation seems suited to the classification of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a subjective genitive.

---

[73]J. Harold Greenlee, Duncanville, TX, to Daniel A. Hoopert, Winona Lake, IN, 24 October 1992, transcript in the personal possession of Daniel A. Hoopert. Greenlee sees δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as the righteousness which God provides. He says, "As for the use of the genitive case of theou in 3:21-22, I can hardly see how it could be anything other than a subjective genitive, or whatever term someone might want to give it, with the meaning, 'the justification which God provides.'" In speaking of 'the justification which God provides,' Greenlee may prefer the classification of the genitive as a genitive of source, in contradistinction to the interpretation given to his comments in the text above. In addition, he renders δικαιωθήσεται in verse 20 with "put right" (ibid.).

δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a Genitive of Source

The term δικαιοσύνη includes a suffix -συνη. Greenlee indicates that this suffix has the sense of "quality."[74] David Black states, "Abstract nouns denoting quality or condition are formed with -ια, -συνη, and -ος."[75] δικαιοσύνη, then, would have the sense "a quality of uprightness; the quality that is a righteous quality," or, "a righteous condition."

However, Greenlee notes, "Suffixes are sometimes extended to other meanings." He then provides an example in which he says, "κρίσις sometimes means 'judgment' (the result) instead of 'judging' (the process)."[76] The term δικαιοσύνη in the phrase δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ could then be seen as the result of God's act of justifying unrighteous people. That result would seem to be the condition or status of righteousness that is given to an unrighteous person when

---

[74]J. Harold Greenlee, A New Testament Greek Morpheme Lexicon (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1983), 311.

[75]David Alan Black, Linguistics for Students of New Testament Greek: A Survey of Basic Concepts and Applications, with a Foreword by Moisés Silva (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1988), 66.

[76]J. Harold Greenlee, A Concise Exegetical Grammar of New Testament Greek, 5th ed., rev. (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1986), 18.

God justifies him; it would be seen as something from God. It seems that the interpretation of "the righteousness of God" as a status or condition that is given by God would be suited to the classification of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a genitive of source.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the evidence from the text of Romans 3:21 and its context in verse 20 seems to lead, first of all, to the interpretation of the genitive in δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a subjective genitive, narrowly defined. Evidence is also seen that supports the interpretation of the genitive of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a genitive of source.

By seeing the concept "justify" as a concept that was introduced in the verb δικαιωθήσεται, and then presented as a nominal form and made the topic of verse 21, δικαιοσύνη can be seen as a verbal noun with a sense of "justify" present in it. δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ can then be seen as a subjective genitive, in which the term θεοῦ represents the subject of the verbal idea "justifies." The sense of the phrase would then be "God justifies [unrighteous people]." The concept "unrighteous people" is supplied as an implied object of "justifies" from the term σάρξ in verse 20.

If, however, Paul is referring to the result of God's act of justifying unrighteous people by his use of the noun δικαιοσύνη, employing the suffix -συνη, the analysis of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ could be a genitive of source. The result of God's act of justifying unrighteous people would be seen as a condition or a status of righteousness that is from God, something given to individuals by God.

If an adnominal genitive can represent more than one kind of genitive in the same expression, then δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 3:21 may be both a subjective genitive and a genitive of source.

It has been suggested that δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ could be the topic of a paragraph extending from Romans 3:21 to 3:26. If δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is indeed the topic of such a paragraph, it is this writer's opinion that an analysis of that paragraph could supply further evidence for the classification of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a subjective genitive, a genitive of source, or both. Such an analysis would be a matter for further study.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this thesis was to consider the genitive
construction δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Romans 3:21, and to decide
what kind of genitive is found in the term θεοῦ. The
genitive has been analyzed in this thesis as a subjective
genitive, narrowly defined, and has the sense "God justifies
[unrighteous people]."

This conclusion was arrived at by adopting a definition
of the subjective genitive as put forth by certain grammars.
In that definition, the modified substantive of an adnominal
genitive construction under consideration must be a verbal
noun. For the genitive to be a subjective genitive, the
modifying substantive, in the genitive case, serves as the
subject of the verbal idea that is contained in the modified
substantive when the sense of the construction is expressed
as a clause.

A second step in the analysis of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a
subjective genitive was to note that the concept "justify"
is introduced in the verb δικαιωθήσεται in verse 20. That

concept is then presented in a nominal form and as the topic of verse 21, according to the analysis of this thesis. This is seen to enable the interpreter to interpret δικαιοσύνη, so far as its lexical content is concerned, in light of δικαιωθήσεται. The fact that the concept "justify" is introduced in the verb δικαιωθήσεται, and then nominalized as δικαιοσύνη, enables the interpreter to view δικαιοσύνη as a verbal noun, and the genitive in δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a subjective genitive, narrowly defined, with the sense for the construction, "God justifies [unrighteous people]."

Secondly, it was noted that δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ could be interpreted as a genitive of source, in which the noun δικαιοσύνη could be seen as the result of God's action of justifying. That result would be a condition or status of righteousness, a status or condition that would be from God, given to individuals who believe.

These findings indicate that there is an exegetical basis for the interpretations presented by the writers from the early church and from the Reformation who were reviewed. Although some of these writers may have seen the righteousness that a believer receives as a condition, while others viewed it as a status, an exegetical basis was found

in the classification of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a genitive of

source to support those interpretations.

Cranfield's interpretation of righteousness, and his

classification of the genitive in δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as a

genitive of origin, also have a basis insofar as the textual

interpretation of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is concerned.

On the other hand, no basis was found for the

interpretation of "the righteousness of God" as a power, or

as God's faithfulness. While this writer holds to the

belief that God is omnipotent, and that He is faithful to

His own, these attributes were not found to be what is

expressed by the expression δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ.[1]

Rather, what was found in a review of the writers who

considered the righteousness of God to be a subjective

genitive, broadly defined, a power, or God's faithfulness to

His covenant or to mankind, was a difference in approach to

interpretation. It was held that these writers interpreted

δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, and other terms, using a method that was

termed an eschatological method. Contexts were used to

---

[1]It may be that a further study of the paragraph in
Romans 3:21-26 will show that the expression δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ
also includes the sense of a possessive genitive, which
would speak of God's quality of being upright, and His
acting in conformity to that quality.

interpret the term that were more distant than the immediate context. Definitions were also used from extra-Biblical apocalyptic literature, and from texts in the Old Testament. While this writer believes that the inspired Word of God, including the Old Testament, is a true source for one's understanding of other Scriptures, the effect of these writers was what seemed to be a substitution of other meanings for that which would normally belong to the lexical content of δικαιοσύνη, and which could be found in the immediate context of Romans 3:21.

Secondly, it was perceived that these writers disregarded the nature of the atonement which understands that God put forth His Son as a sacrifice to pay the price for the forgiveness and cleansing of our sins. Cranfield, on the other hand, held to the view that Christ was set forth as a propitiatory sacrifice for our sins.

The thesis concluded with the suggestion that δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ may not only be the topic of Romans 3:21, but also of a paragraph consisting of Romans 3:21-26. It is this author's belief that an analysis of that paragraph would provide further indication that δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is a subjective genitive, narrowly defined, a genitive of source, or both. It may be that an analysis of this paragraph would

show that δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is also a possessive genitive, and

that it speaks of the righteous attribute of God whereby He

justifies unrighteous people in a way that is righteous and

that is consistent with His upright, righteous character.

This writer believes that that righteous way of justifying

unrighteous people would be the setting forth of Christ as

the ἱλαστήριον for the forgiveness of our sins (Romans

3:25).

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SOURCES CONSULTED

Augustine. "The Spirit and the Letter." In <u>Augustine:</u>
<u>Later Works</u>. Selected and translated with
Introductions by John Burnaby. In vol. 8 of <u>The</u>
<u>Library of Christian Classics</u>. Edited by John Baillie,
John T. McNeill, and Henry P. Van Dusen. 26 vols.
Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955.

Aulén, Gustaf. <u>Christus Victor: An Historical Study of the</u>
<u>Three Main Types of the Idea of Atonement</u>. Paperback
ed. Translated A. G. Hebert. With a foreword by
Jaroslav Pelikan. New York: Macmillan Publishing
Company, 1969; reprint, Collier Books, 1986.

Achtemeier, Paul, "Apropos the Faith of/in Christ: A
Response to Hays and Dunn," 1991. TMs [Photocopy].

Aland, Kurt, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M.
Metzger, and Allen Wikgren, editors. <u>The Greek New</u>
<u>Testament</u>. Third ed., corrected, Stuttgart: United
Bible Societies, 1983.

Bauer, Walter, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich, <u>A</u>
<u>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other</u>
<u>Early Christian Literature</u>. 2nd ed. revised and
augmented by F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick W.
Danker. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press,
1979.

Beekman, John, and John Callow. "The Semantic Structure of
Written Communication," Part 1, 1979. Prepublication
manuscript.

_____. "The Semantic Structure of Written
Communication," 1978. Prepublication manuscript.

Black, David Alan. <u>Linguistics for Students of New</u>
<u>Testament Greek: A Survey of Basic Concepts and</u>
<u>Applications</u>. With a Foreword by Moisés Silva. Grand
Rapids: Baker Book House, 1988.

Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. 9th-10th German edition. Translated and revised by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Brauch, Manfred T. "Perspectives on 'God's Righteousness' in recent German discussion." In Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion, by E. P. Sanders. London: SCM Press, 1977.

Brooks, James A., and Carlton L. Winbery. Syntax of New Testament Greek. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc., 1979.

Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, editors. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1968.

Bruce, F. F. The Letter of Paul to the Romans, an Introduction and Commentary. The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Edited by Leon Morris. Second edition, Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, and Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1985.

Bultmann, Rudolf. "Christ the End of the Law." In Essays, Philosophical and Theological. Translated by James C. G. Greig. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1955.

_____. Theology of the New Testament. Vol. 1. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.

Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion: In Two Volumes. Vol. 1. Edited by John T. McNeill. Translated and indexed by Ford Lewis Battles. Vol. 20 of The Library of Christian Classics. Edited by John Baillie, John T. McNeil, and Henry P. Van Dusen. 26 vols. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960.

Calvin, John. "Against Osiander." In Calvin's Ecclesiastical Advice. Translated by Mary Beaty and Benjamin W. Farley. With a foreword by John Haddon Leith. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991.

_____. Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans. Translated and edited by John Owen. Edinburgh: Printed for the Calvin Translation Society, 1849.

_____. Institutes of the Christian Religion. Translated
    by Henry Beveridge. Single volume edition, Grand
    Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989.

Chrysostom, John. "The Homilies of St. John Chrysostom,
    Archbishop of Constantinople, on the Epistle of St.
    Paul the Apostle to the Romans." Translated by J. B.
    Morris and W. H. Simcox. Revised, with notes, by
    George B. Stevens. In Saint Chrysostom: Homilies on
    the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Romans,
    Vol. 11. In A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-
    Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. Edited by
    Philip Schaff. 14 vols. Grand Rapids: William B.
    Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979.

Cranfield, C. E. B. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on
    the Epistle of the Romans. 2 vols. ICC. Sixth
    edition, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975.

_____. "The OT Law." In "Essay II." In A Critical and
    Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.
    Vol. 2. ICC. Sixth edition, Edinburgh: T. & T.
    Clark, 1979.

Cremer, Hermann. Die paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre im
    Zusammenhange ihrer geschichtlichen Voraussetzungen.
    Second edition. Gutersloh: Druck und Berlag von C.
    Bertelsmann, 1900.

Dana, H. E., and Julius R. Mantey. A Manual Grammar of the
    Greek New Testament. Toronto: The Macmillan Company,
    1955.

Dunn, James D. G. "Once More, ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ." Society of
    Biblical Literature Seminar Paper Series (1991): 730-
    744.

_____. Romans 1-8. Vol. 38A of Word Biblical
    Commentary. Edited by David A. Hubbard and Glenn W.
    Barker and Ralph P. Martin. Dallas: Word Books,
    Publishers, 1988.

Elson, Benjamin, and Velma Pickett. An Introduction to
    Morphology and Syntax. Second edition. Santa Ana, CA:
    Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1964.

Fleming, Ilah, Ft. Myers, FL, to Daniel A. Hoopert, Winona
    Lake, 26 June 1992. LS by Ilah Fleming. Transcript in
    the personal possession of Daniel A. Hoopert.

Friberg, Timothy. New Testament Greek Word Order in Light
    of Discourse Considerations. Ann Arbor, MI:
    University Microfilms International, 1982.

Funk, Robert W. A Beginning-Intermediate Grammar of
    Hellenistic Greek. 3 vols. Second edition. Missoula:
    Society of Biblical Literature, 1973.

Geytenbeek, Helen. "A Classification of the Adnominal
    Genitives of I Peter." Notes on Translation 61
    (September 1976): 21-32.

Godet, F. Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.
    Translated by A. Cusin. The Translation Revised and
    Edited with an Introduction and Appendix by Talbot W.
    Chambers. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, Publishers,
    1883.

Goetchius, Eugene Van Ness. The Language of the New
    Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.

Goodwin, William Watson. Greek Grammar. Revised by Charles
    Burton Gulick. Waltham, MA: Blaisdell Publishing
    Company, 1958.

Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic
    Domains, Vol. 1, Introduction and Domains, and Vol. 2,
    Indices. Edited by Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A.
    Nida. New York: United Bible Societies, 1988.

Greenlee, J. Harold. A Concise Exegetical Grammar of New
    Testament Greek. Fifth ed., revised. Grand Rapids:
    William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1986.

_____. A New Testament Greek Morpheme Lexicon. Grand
    Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1983.

Greenlee, J. Harold, Duncanville, TX, to Daniel A. Hoopert,
    Winona Lake, IN, 24 October 1992. LS by J. H.
    Greenlee. Transcript in the personal possession of
    Daniel A. Hoopert.

Haldane, Robert, Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans.
    From the fifth Edinburgh edition; New York: Robert
    Carter, 1847.

Halliday, M. A. K. "Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English: Part 2." Journal of Linguistics 3 (October 1967): 199-244.

Hays, Richard B. "ΠΙΣΤΙΣ and Pauline Christology: What is at Stake?" Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Paper Series (1991): 714-729.

_____. "Psalm 143 and the Logic of Romans 3." Journal of Biblical Literature 99 (1980): 107-115.

Hershberger, Ernest J. "The Eschatological Framework of the Sermon on the Mount." Th.M. thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1978.

Hill, David. Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1967.

Howard, George E. "Christ the End of the Law: The Meaning of Romans 10:4ff." Journal of Biblical Literature 88, Part III (September 1969): 331-337.

Hultgren, Arland J. "The PISTIS CHRISTOU Formulation in Paul." Novum Testamentum 22 (June 1980): 248-263.

Hwang, Shin Ja, Duncanville, TX, to Daniel A. Hoopert, Winona Lake, 15 July 1992. LS by S. J. Hwang. Transcript in the personal possession of Daniel A. Hoopert.

Johnson, Elliott E. "Dual Authorship and the Single Intended Meaning of Scripture." Bibliotheca Sacra 143 (July-September 1986): 218-227.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. "Romans 3:21-26 and the Faith of Jesus." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 44 (January 1982): 77-90.

Käsemann, Ernst. Commentary on Romans. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Revised ed. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1990.

_____. "Justification and Salvation History." In Perspectives on Paul. Translated by Margaret Kohl from Paulinische Perspektiven. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1969; first American edition, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

_____. "'The Righteousness of God' in Paul." In <u>New Testament Questions of Today</u>. Translated by W. J. Montague from <u>Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen</u>. Second edition. Göttingen: Vanderhoeck und Ruprecht, 1965; paperback edition, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.

Lange, John Peter. <u>Romans</u>. In <u>Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Critical, Doctrinal and Homiletical</u>. Translated and edited with additions by Philip Schaff. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.

Levinsohn, Stephen H. <u>Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook</u>. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1992.

Levinsohn, Stephen H., Pasto, Colombia, to Daniel A. Hoopert, Winona Lake, IN, 17 January 1994. LSETF by Stephen H. Levinsohn. Transcript in the personal possession of Daniel A. Hoopert.

Li, Charles N., and Sandra A. Thompson. "Subject and Topic: A New Typology of Language." In <u>Subject and Topic</u>. Edited by Charles N. Li. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott, compilers. <u>A Greek-English Lexicon</u>. Revised and augmented throughout by Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie <u>et al</u>., with a supplement. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1968.

Lloyd-Jones, D. M. <u>Romans, An Exposition of Chapter 1, The Gospel of God</u>. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1985.

Longacre, Robert E. <u>The Grammar of Discourse</u>. New York: Plenum Press, 1983.

Longacre, Robert E., Mooers, NY, to Daniel A. Hoopert, Winona Lake, n.d. ALS by R. E. Longacre. Transcript in the personal possession of Daniel A. Hoopert.

Luther, Martin. <u>Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans</u>. Translated and abridged by J. Theodore Mueller. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1954.

_____. "The Disputation Concerning Justification, 1536."
Translated by Lewis W. Spitz. In Career of the
Reformer IV, edited by Lewis W. Spitz. Vol. 34 of
Luther's Works. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut
T. Lehmann. 55 vols. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press,
1960.

_____. Lectures on Romans: Glosses and Scholia.
Translated by Walter G. Tillmans and Jacob A. O. Preus.
Edited by Hilton C. Oswald. Vol. 25 of Luther's Works.
55 vols. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House,
1972.

_____. "Preface to the Complete Edition of Luther's
Latin Writings: Wittenberg, 1545." Translated by
Lewis W. Spitz, Sr. In Career of the Reformer IV.
Vol. 34 of Luther's Works. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan
and Helmut T. Lehmann. 55 vols. Philadelphia:
Muhlenberg Press, 1960.

_____. "Two Kinds of Righteousness, 1519." Translated
by Lowell J. Satre. In Career of the Reformer: I.
Edited by Harold J. Grimm. Vol. 31 of Luther's Works.
Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut T. Lehmann. 55
vols. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1957.

Luther: Lectures on Romans. In The Library of Christian
Classics: Ichthus edition. Trans. and ed. Wilhelm
Pauck. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961.

Luther's Primary Works: Together with his Shorter and Larger
Catechisms. Translated into English. Edited with
Theological and Historical Essays by Henry Wace and C.
A. Buchheim. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1896.

Mallison, Graham, and Barry J. Blake. Language Typology:
Cross-linguistic Studies in Syntax. In North-Holland
Linguistic Series. Edited by S. C. Dik, J. G. Kooig
and S. A. Thompson. New York: North-Holland
Publishing Company, 1981.

Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm. Critical and Exegetical
Hand-book to The Epistle to the Romans. Translated by
John C. Moore and Edwin Johnson. The translation
revised and edited by William P. Dickson. New York:
Funk and Wagnalls, Publishers, 1884.

Moo, Douglas. Romans 1-8. The Wycliffe Exegetical
Commentary. Chicago: Moody Press, 1991.

Morris, Leon. The Cross of Jesus. Grand Rapids: William
     B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988.

Moule, C. F. D. "The Biblical Conception of Faith." The
     Expository Times 68 (February 1957): 157.

_____. An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek. Second
     edition, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1959.

Murray, John. The Epistle to the Romans: The English Text
     with Introduction, Exposition and Notes. The New
     International Commentary on the New Testament. Edited
     by F. F. Bruce. One volume edition, Grand Rapids: Wm.
     B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968.

Nida, Eugene A. "Science of Translation." In Language
     Structure and Translation: Essays by Eugene A. Nida.
     Selected and introduction by Anwar S. Dil. Stanford,
     CA: Stanford University Press, 1975.

The New International Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol.
     3. S.v. "Righteousness, Justification," by Colin
     Brown.

Packer, J. I., and O. R. Johnston, Martin Luther on "The
     Bondage of The Will": A New Translation of "De Servo
     Arbitrio (1525)": Martin Luther's Reply to Erasmus of
     Rotterdam. Westwood, NJ: Fleming H. Revell Company,
     1957.

Piper, John. "The Demonstration of the Righteousness of God
     in Romans 3:25,26." Journal for the Study of the New
     Testament 7 (April 1980): 2-32.

_____. The Justification of God: An Exegetical and
     Theological Study of Romans 9:1-23. Grand Rapids:
     Baker Book House, 1983.

_____. "The Righteousness of God in Romans 3,1-8."
     Theologische Zeitschrift 36 (January/February 1980):
     3-16.

Robertson, A. T. A Greek Grammar of the Greek New Testament
     in the Light of Historical Research. Nashville:
     Broadman Press, 1934.

Saint Augustine: Four Anti-Pelagian Writings: On Nature and Grace: On the Proceedings of Pelagius: On the Predestination of the Saints: On the Gift of Perseverance. Translated by John A. Mourant and William J. Collinge, with Introductions and Notes by William J. Collinge. Vol. 86 of Fathers of the Church: A New Translation. Edited by Thomas P. Halton. 89 vols. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1992.

Sanders, E. P. Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion. London: SCM Press LTD, 1977.

Shedd, William G. T. A Critical and Doctrinal Commentary on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1879; reprint, Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1967.

Smyth, Herbert Weir. Greek Grammar. Revised by Gordon M. Messing. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Soards, Marion L. "The Righteousness of God in the Writings of the Apostle Paul." Biblical Theology Bulletin 15 (July 1985): 104-109.

Taylor, John M. "Notes on the Greek Genitive." In "Chapter 6: The Genitive Construction." In Notes on Translation with Drills. Edited by John Beekman. Santa Ana, CA: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1965.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. 4. S.v. "Νῦν," by Gustav Stählin.

_____. Vol. 2. S.v. "δίκαιος," by Gottlob Schrenk.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. Vol 2. S.v. "צדק‎," by Harold G. Stigers.

Torrance, Thomas F. "One Aspect of the Biblical Conception of Faith." The Expository Times 68 (January 1957): 111-114.

Turner, Nigel. Syntax. Vol. 3 of A Grammar of New Testament Greek, by James Hope Moulton. 4 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.

_____. Grammatical Insights into the New Testament. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1965.

Waltke, Bruce. "Historical Grammatical Problems." In Summit II: Hermeneutics Papers: Hyatt Regency O'Hare Chicago: November 10-13, 1982, Part 1. Oakland: International Council on Biblical Inerrancy, 1982.

Waltke, Bruce K., and M. O'Connor. An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Werner, John R., Richardson, TX, to Daniel A. Hoopert, Winona Lake, 10 June 1992. LS by J. R. Werner. Transcript in the personal possession of Daniel A. Hoopert.

Westerholm, Stephen. Israel's Law and the Church's Faith, Paul and His Recent Interpreters. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1990.

Williams, P. R. Review of The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul: A Linguistic and Theological Enquiry, by J. A. Ziesler, in Bibliotheca Sacra (January 1974): 73-4.

Williams, Sam K. "The 'Righteousness of God' in Romans." Journal of Biblical Literature 99 (June 1980): 241-290.

_____. "Again Pistis Christou." Catholic Biblical Quarterly (July 1987): 431-447.

Zemek, George J., Jr. "Interpretive Challenges Relating to Habakkuk 2:4b." Grace Theological Journal 1 (Spring 1980): 43-69.

Ziesler, J. A. The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul: A Linguistic and Theological Enquiry. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1972.

_____. Paul's Letter to the Romans. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1989.

_____. "Salvation Proclaimed: IX. Romans 3.21-26." Expository Times 93 (September 1982): 356-359.