

Concordia Theological Monthly



F E B R U A R Y ♦ 1 9 5 8

Justification by Faith in Modern Theology

By HENRY P. HAMANN, JR.

(Continued)

RIGHTEOUSNESS AND RELATED TERMS IN ST. PAUL

IN accordance with the writer's convictions concerning the source of St. Paul's teachings mentioned in the previous article we begin the investigation of the present topic with the questions: What might Paul be expected to mean by words like "righteous" (δικαιος), "righteousness" (δικαιοσύνη), "justify" (δικαιοῦν) on the basis of his knowledge of the Old Testament? What effect would the use of these terms and related ones in Aramaic by the rabbis be expected to have on his own usage?

Righteousness in the LXX

Without any shadow of doubt the most important single source influencing Paul's presentation of the Gospel was the Old Testament. The very great number of references of various kinds (full quotations and part quotations from and mere allusions to Old Testament material) is decisive proof of this statement. The Nestle text of Paul's letters prints in black type no fewer than 165 of such Old Testament references. Of these over half refer to the books of the Psalms and Isaiah, with some 50 to the Law (20 to the last book of Moses), and 30 to the rest of the Old Testament writings. Schweitzer, quoting Kautzsch, says that 80 per cent of full quotations are either quoted directly in the language of the LXX or with slight variations from it.¹ The tremendous importance of the Old Testament, and particularly of the LXX form of the Psalms and Isaiah, for the formation of Pauline teaching is the important fact for us that emerges from these figures.

Turning now to the Psalms and Isaiah in their LXX dress, we shall find that there are certain facts about the word group display-

¹ A. Schweitzer, *Paul and His Interpreters*, trans. W. Montgomery (London: A. and C. Black, 1912), p. 88.

ing the stem *δικ-* that Paul must have known. One of these facts is the group of words with which righteousness especially is paralleled.

δικαιοσύνη is paralleled in various places by one or more of the following: judgment (*κρίσις, κρίμα*), mercy, the RSV "steadfast love" (*ἔλεος*), truth (*ἀλήθεια*), salvation (*τὸ σωτήριον, σωτηρία*), peace (*εἰρήνη*), wisdom (*σοφία, ἐπιστήμη*), the fullness of goodness (*πλήθος χρηστότητος*), blessing (*εὐλογία*), piety (*εὐσέβεια*), the name of the Lord (*ὄνομα κυρίου*), the glory of God (*δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ*).

Some of the more striking parallels in the Psalms are the following:² 36:5,6: "Thy mercy, O Lord, is in the heavens; and Thy faithfulness reacheth unto the clouds. Thy righteousness is like the great mountains; Thy judgments are a great deep." Ps. 51:14: "Deliver me from bloodguiltiness, O God, Thou God of my salvation; and my tongue shall sing aloud of Thy righteousness." In Ps. 85, after a reference to the forgiveness of the people's sins, the prayer is for continued divine blessing and grace. We find in it a protracted, continuous parallelism between the following: *ἔλεος, τὸ σωτήριον, εἰρήνη, δόξα, ἀλήθεια, δικαιοσύνη, εἰρήνη*.

Similar striking parallels are found in Isaiah. In 33:5 f. we have closely combined in thought *ἅγιος ὁ θεός, κρίσις, δικαιοσύνη, σωτηρία*; while *σοφία, ἐπιστήμη*, and *εὐσέβεια* are called "treasures of righteousness" (*θησαυροὶ δικαιοσύνης*). Is. 45:21-25 is almost a summary of the idea of righteousness in the Old Testament. "And there is no God else beside Me; a just God [*δίκαιος*] and a Savior [*σωτήρ*]; there is none beside Me. Look unto Me, and be ye saved [*σωθήσεσθε*], all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by Myself, the word is gone out of My mouth in righteousness [*δικαιοσύνη*], and shall not return, that unto Me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. Surely, shall one say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength [*δικαιοσύνη καὶ δόξα*]: even to Him shall men come;

² The Bible is most often quoted in the words of the KJV, and these quotations appear within quotation marks, without further note. Other translations will be specially referred to as they are quoted. Translations without quotation marks are my own.

and all that are incensed against Him shall be ashamed. In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified and shall glory [δικαιωθήσονται καὶ εὐδοξασθήσονται].” In 51:4-8 we have a triple conjunction of δικαιοσύνη and τὸ σωτήριον. Almost the whole of chapter 59 is interpenetrated by these interesting parallels. In vv. 8-14 we have εἰρήνη . . . κρίσις; κρίσις . . . δικαιοσύνη; κρίσις . . . σωτηρία; κρίσις . . . δικαιοσύνη . . . ἀλήθεια. In vv. 16 ff. we find τῷ βραχίονι . . . τῇ ἐλεημοσύνῃ (ΠΡΤΞ); δικαιοσύνη . . . τὸ σωτήριον.

In many of these passages and others which might be mentioned the words paralleling δικαιοσύνη, and δικαιοσύνη itself, are contrasted with ideas of vengeance, wrath, fury, as, for example, in 59:16 ff. The specific point to be made, however, is simply the frequent paralleling of δικαιοσύνη with words expressing blessing and salvation and good, and with words indicative of God's essence and being, like ὄνομα and βραχίων.

A second fact about the use of words connected with the idea of righteousness that Paul must have noticed from his study of the Psalms and Isaiah is the more than occasional translation of the Hebrew ΠΡΤΞ by ἐλεημοσύνη, as in Is. 59:16, quoted above. We find this translation in the following passages: Deut. 6:25; 24:13; Ps. 24:5; 33:5; 103:6; Is. 1:27; 59:16; 61:1.

These two facts could not have escaped St. Paul. It is not too much to assume further that he would have known that they corresponded with certain truths concerning the meaning of the Hebrew root ΠΡΤΞ and the words derived from it. The point involved here, I think, can be best illustrated by using material supplied by C. H. Dodd and Norman H. Snaith.³

Dodd in his work is concerned to point out the differences in meaning between certain Hebrew words and the Greek terms used to translate them and to show the subtle changes religion undergoes in the process of such translation. With respect to the noun ΠΡΤΞ and its twin ΠΡΤΞ he makes *inter alia* the following points:

1. The Hebrew noun tends away from the more abstract and intellectual Greek conception of justice in the direction of some-

³ C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935). Norman H. Snaith, *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament* (London: The Epworth Press, 1944).

thing warmer and more humane. "It includes a largehearted construction of the claims of humanity; it is, as has been said, the humanitarian virtue *par excellence*" (quoting Skinner). In later Hebrew it comes to mean "any exercise of benevolence which goes beyond a man's legal obligations." The pull away from abstract justice becomes so great as to pull it away from the word *δικαιοσύνη* altogether.

2. The verb *צדק* means primarily to "be in the right" rather than "to be righteous," and the *hiphil* of it means not "to make righteous" but "to declare righteous," or better still "to put a person in the right." The adjective *צדק* means "in the right" rather than "righteous." The meaning "righteous" came about because only the truly righteous person can be absolutely in the right.

3. *צדק* and *צדקה* have to do service for two different ideas: the moral quality of the *צדק*, and the action corresponding to the *hiphil* of *צדק*. For the first, *δικαιοσύνη* is a satisfactory translation; it is quite out of place for the latter, and in some places the LXX translators were aware of the fact and hence fell back on *ἐλεημοσύνη*. The divine *צדקה* is also (like the human) rendered by *ἐλεημοσύνη* or *ἔλεος* because of the gracious act of God in deliverance or vindication of His people. "The two aspects of *צדק* are polarized into *δικαιοσύνη* and *ἐλεημοσύνη*. In place of the comprehensive virtue of *צדקה*, we have justice on the one hand, mercy on the other. Similarly, in reference to God, instead of thinking of a *צדק* which included the element of grace, the Greek reader of the Old Testament was obliged to think here of justice, there of mercy. The idea is impoverished by the division of its two elements." But Paul could not make that mistake, for he knew the Old Testament in both forms. As Dodd goes on to remark: "In particular, the Pauline usage of these terms must be understood in the light of the Septuagintal usage and the underlying Hebrew. The apostle wrote Greek, and read the LXX, but he was also familiar with the Hebrew original. Thus while his language largely follows that of the LXX, the Greek words are for him always coloured by their Hebrew association."⁴ From N. H. Snaith I quote his findings concerning the essential meaning of *צדק*:

⁴ Dodd, pp. 45, 57.

דָּקָא, with its kindred words, signifies that standard which God maintains in this world. It is the norm by which all must be judged. What this norm is, depends entirely upon the Nature of God. [The Nature of God Snaith had previously defined as the Holiness of God, expressed in Hebrew by the stem קדש.]⁵ "It is incidental that דָּקָא stands for justice. It is incidental because דָּקָא actually stands for the establishment of God's will in the land, and secondarily for justice, because that in part is God's will."⁶ Our conclusion for St. Paul's use of δικαιοσύνη and related words of the same stem is also that of Snaith: "Our contention is that the meaning of these words is governed in the New Testament almost entirely by the meaning of the root קדש in the Old Testament."⁷

Righteousness in Palestinian Judaism

In assessing the influence of the teaching of contemporary rabbis upon St. Paul we must be aware of a fundamental difficulty attending the inquiry, which is the absence of contemporary sources and of direct witness to what the rabbis of Paul's time actually taught.

⁵ Snaith, p. 77.

⁶ Ibid., p. 70. Cf. Karl Barth, *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik* (Zollikon-Zürich: Evang. Verlag AG., 1953), IV, 1, pp. 591 f.: "Diese Übereinstimmung mit sich selbst ist Gottes Recht. . . . Gott erkennen heisst: Gottes *Recht* in dieser Sache erkennen. Und umgekehrt: Gottes *Recht* in dieser Sache erkennen heisst: Gott erkennen. . . . Gerade der Gott, der in des sündigen Menschen Rechtfertigung und als der gnädige Gott auf dem Plan ist und handelt, hat Recht und ist im Recht. Er ist—keinem fremden Gesetz unterworfen, selber Ursprung, Grund, und Offenbarung jedes wahren Gesetzes—in sich selber *richtig*. Das ist das Rückgrat des Rechtfertigungsgeschehens." What Snaith declares concerning the דָּקָא of God in the Old Testament, so much in line with what Barth declares to be the *Recht* of God, is in essence accepted by Hebrew scholars of note generally. I refer to the following: Emil Kautzsch, *Über die Derivate des Stammes קדש im Alttestamentlichen Sprachgebrauch* (Tübingen: 1881); K. H. J. Fahlgren, *Tsedaka, nabestehende und entgegengesetzte Begriffe im Alten Testament* (Uppsala: 1932); Otto Proksch, *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1950), pp. 568—577. Cf. also Volkmar Hentrich, "αἰνῶν," TWNT (i. e. *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, ed. G. Kittel), III, 928: "Wir erkannten, dass Jahwehs Wesen durch die Nebeneinanderstellung der Begriffe טָמֵא, קָדֵשׁ und דָּקָא gekennzeichnet wurde." If we consider, now, that קָדֵשׁ (εἰσος) and טָמֵא (αἰσος) are constantly recurring parallels for דָּקָא, and if we consider further, that דָּקָא is occasionally paralleled by מִשְׁ (ἁνομα) itself, then it will be seen that the statements of Snaith and Barth are every whit justified.

⁷ Snaith, op. cit., p. 161; cf. Dodd, op. cit., p. 57.

Schweitzer declares that of the rabbinism of Paul's day we know almost nothing, on the ground that the earliest stratum of rabbinic writings dates from the third century of the Christian era, with the destruction of the Jewish state in 70 A. D. lying between Paul and the earliest literature.⁸ This judgment is certainly an exaggeration. It is not fanciful to hold that what we find in the old Jewish writings stands in close relation with what was taught a century and a half earlier. It would be strange if there were no connection at all, especially in view of the strong traditionalism of the Jews. If, moreover, what we find in the rabbinic writings corresponds closely with what we find, say, in the Gospels, in St. Paul, and in other Christian writings of the first century, then we are certainly justified in using that rabbinic material as a source for the theology which St. Paul was taught at the feet of Gamaliel and which was accepted by Paul's Jewish and Judaizing opponents. Still the need for cautious use of that material and for continual testing of it is certainly there.

A considerable amount of material illustrating the New Testament has been collected from rabbinic sources by Strack and Billerbeck in the monumental *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. What the old rabbis taught about the way of salvation is presented in some detail in the two excursuses of Volume IV, 1, entitled "Zur Bergpredigt Jesu," pp. 1—22, and "Das Gleichnis von den Arbeitern im Weinberg, Matt. 20:1-16, und die altsynagogale Lohnlehre," pp. 484—500. One thing is very plain about this material, that the old rabbis looked at salvation as a judicial thing, a forensic procedure. This one fact is sufficiently strong to establish the forensic use of the verb "to justify" (*δικαιῶν*) in the writings of St. Paul. Once it is granted that the common Jewish teaching was that as outlined in the excursuses mentioned; that St. Paul received that training in Palestinian schools; that much of his activity, in preaching and writing, was directed to the proclamation and the defense of his Gospel of justification against Jews and Judaizing Christians; that St. Paul uses the verb *δικαιῶν* and the related noun *δικαίωσις* without any attempt at definition — granted all this, then the conclusion is inescapable that he was using these words in the meaning current,

⁸ Schweitzer, p. 50.

accepted, acknowledged, taken as a matter of course at the time. No wonder that Thackeray can say categorically: "There can be no doubt that δικαιούν has the same forensic sense of 'to declare righteous,' 'to acquit' (not 'to make righteous'), which is borne by the Biblical דָּיָן and the Talmudic דִּינָא." ⁹

Our excursions into the LXX and the rabbinic writings have given us two pointers toward the understanding of St. Paul's use of words exhibiting the stem δικ-: (1) that his use of δικαιοσύνη will very probably be that of the LXX and the underlying Hebrew; (2) that his use of δικαιούν will most certainly be the common Jewish usage of his day.

Righteousness and Related Terms in St. Paul

It will be convenient to begin with what St. Paul has to say under the idea of the righteousness of God (δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ). The θεοῦ, as is generally admitted, is subjective genitive; so: the righteousness which God has, or, better, the righteousness which God displays. For God's righteousness is not thought of by St. Paul as a mere attribute, but as an activity, as a way of acting and doing. ¹⁰

Once, in Rom. 3:5, θεοῦ δικαιοσύνη describes God as upright, righteous in all His ways. However, in its specific Pauline sense δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ describes His will and activity for man's blessing and salvation, a use completely in line with what we found in the Psalms and in Isaiah. Thus in Rom. 1:16f. the Gospel Paul preaches is defined in parallel statements as "the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth" and as that in which "the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith." With this passage should be compared Rom. 10:9f., where we have precisely the same combination of salvation (σωτηρία) and righteousness (δικαιοσύνη). Somewhat similar is the meaning of δικαιοσύνη in the quotation 2 Cor. 9:9. The completest statement concerning the righteousness of God as bringing about good and blessing for man is found in the passage Rom. 3:21-26. Here St. Paul tells us that the righteousness of God, witnessed already

⁹ H. Thackeray, *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1900), p. 87.

¹⁰ Rom. 1:17 ἀποκαλύπτεται; 3:21 πεφανέρωται; 3:25, 26 εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ . . . πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ; 10:3 τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑπετάγησαν.

in the Old Testament, has been revealed once and for all in the present age (νυνί). God in His righteousness has set forth Christ Jesus to be "mercy-seat," a means of expiation through the shedding of His blood. Through this act in Christ God has shown His righteousness in a comprehensive and fundamental way: He remains true to Himself, righteous in Himself, and at the same time He has made it possible for men to be blessed, justified. The righteousness of God, above all, means blessing for men. In fact, in Paul's language it is as much a possession of men as of God. In the only passage outside Romans where St. Paul uses the term δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, 2 Cor. 5:21, it is said that we become righteousness of God in Him, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ. The righteousness of God is for faith, Rom. 1:17; 3:22, 26. According to Phil. 3:9, the righteousness through faith in Christ is righteousness which comes from God, τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην.

God's righteousness, as God's own and as man's, has been well described by Ellwein: "God's righteousness, which as *God's* righteousness is a foreign righteousness, has become mine completely. It is a righteousness which is given and received, and so it is wholly our possession. The traditional alternative, whether the righteousness of God is a divine or a human attribute, is here quite put aside: it is wholly God's own essential righteousness and still it has also become wholly ours. For God is righteous and He justifies (makes righteous). He communicates what He Himself is."¹¹

The blessing that God's righteousness means to men is a very comprehensive one. If the theme of the Letter to the Romans is the righteousness of God, Rom. 1:17, then all the letter has to say about God's work for man is properly part of that righteousness.¹²

¹¹ "Gottes Gerechtigkeit, die als *Gottes* Gerechtigkeit eine fremde Gerechtigkeit ist, ist ganz und gar mein eigen geworden. Sie ist geschenkte und empfangene Gerechtigkeit, und damit ist sie ganz unser Eigentum. Die herkömmliche Alternative, ob mit der Gerechtigkeit Gottes eine Eigenschaft Gottes oder des Menschen gemeint sei, ist hier völlig zerbrochen: sie ist ganz Gottes eigene, wesenhafte Gerechtigkeit und ist doch ganz unser eigen geworden. Denn Gott ist gerecht und rechtfertigt. Er teilt mit, was er selber ist." Eduard Ellwein, "Die Botschaft des Römerbriefes" (a review of H. Asmussen, *Der Römerbrief*), *Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, ELKZ (Jan. 1, 1954), pp. 11 f.

¹² Cf. Ellwein, especially his words: "Die Offenbarung der Gerechtigkeit Gottes ist Aufrichtung des Gnadenrechts, ist, so können wir Asmussen verdolmetschen, Aufrichtung der Gottesherrschaft in Christo, das Wirksamwerden,

However, the blessing that is most directly connected with that righteousness is man's justification. To have God's righteousness is, above all, to be justified. This appears most decidedly from Rom. 3:22, 25, 26. In those verses we have the parallel phrases: "the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ" (v. 22); "whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness" (v. 25); and "that He might be just and the Justifier of Him which believeth in Jesus." In these phrases it is plain that the righteousness of God is for faith as justification is for faith, the faith in Jesus throughout. So the statement: to have God's righteousness is to be justified, is completely accurate. Support for this is afforded by the repeated use of "counting faith for righteousness" as a parallel phrase to "justifying."¹³

What does Paul mean by "justify"? In an earlier section the claim was made that Paul must have meant the same as con-

Sichtbarwerden und Inerscheinungtreten der Basileia Gottes im Raum des einzelnen und des Kosmos, das Ich erlösend und in das Bild Christi verwandelnd und die Zeiten durchwaltend und umspannend bis hin zum jüngsten Tag."

EDITORIAL NOTE: With reference to Paul's use of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Rom. 1:17; 3:21, 22; 10:3; 2 Cor. 5:21; Phil. 3:9 (also δικαιοσύνη without θεοῦ in such passages as Rom. 5:17, 21; 8:10; 9:30; 2 Cor. 3:9), many scholars still hold, in contrast to the view propounded throughout this article, that it denotes a *righteousness bestowed by God*, "richterlich zugesprochene Gerechtigkeit." See, for example, the commentaries on Romans by Stoeckhardt, Lietzmann, and Zahn; also W. Bauer in his *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, 4th ed., 1952, article δικαιοσύνη, 3 (Arndt-Gingrich in their translation of W. Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, 1957, however, have added the words: "In this area it closely approximates *salvation*," giving a reference to the book of Snaith referred to above by the author of this article). This opposing view has received strong support by students of Jewish thought. We refer to Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (1922—8), III, 29 f. and 162—164; Albrecht Oepke "ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗ ΘΕΟΥ bei Paulus in neuer Beleuchtung," *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, May 1953, cols. 257—264 (cf. the brief remarks of Oepke in the article "εἰς," *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N. T.*, ed. G. Kittel, II, 427 f.). If the contentions of these scholars are correct, Paul gives the Old Testament concept of צְדָקָה a new slant; in opposition to Jewish views of a righteousness before God to be attained by man through performance of legal works, Paul declares that God saves man by *giving* him a righteousness, a righteousness from God and valid before God, not of works but by faith, a righteousness in Him (Christ). The two views, of course, are in no doctrinal conflict with each other.

¹³ Rom. 4:3, 5, 6, 9, etc.

temporary Jewish teachers meant by that term; that, accordingly, he meant "to declare righteous," "to regard as righteous"; that the term is forensic at bottom, describing God's verdict concerning the standing of man in His sight. That Paul's actual use of the term agrees with what we should expect is evident from a number of passages where the term is used, as well as from other passages containing expressions parallel to this one. Apart from a number of inconclusive passages, the term is plainly forensic in Rom. 2:13; 3:4; 8:33 f.; 1 Cor. 4:4; and 2 Cor. 3:9. In the first passage we have, after the judicial idea suggested by *κριθήσονται* (they will be judged) in v. 12, *δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ* (righteous in the sight of God) in parallelism with *δικαιωθήσονται* (they will be justified). In Rom. 3:4 we have *δικαιωθῆς* ("Thou mightest be justified") paralleled by the very evident forensic phrase *νικήσεις ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε* ("and mightest overcome when Thou art judged"). In 8:33 f. we have the question: "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?" (*τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν;*) answered by: "It is God that justifieth." And then follows a second forensic question: "Who is he that condemneth?" (*τίς ὁ κατακρινῶν;*). The forensic nature of *δικαιοῦν* is so strong here that even Goodspeed forsakes his favorite "to make upright" in this passage and translates "God pronounces them upright." The same contrast between condemnation and justification is found in 2 Cor. 3:9, where *ἡ διακονία τῆς κατακρίσεως* ("the ministration of condemnation") is contrasted with *ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης* ("the ministration of righteousness"). In 1 Cor. 4:4 the forensic meaning is also inescapable, what with the heaping of law-court terms in *ἀνακρίνω* (judge, three times), *ἡμέρας* (literally "day," used in the sense of "judgment"), *κρίνετε* (judge). Goodspeed again senses the force of this and renders: "that does not prove that I am innocent."

Additional proofs of Paul's forensic way of thinking in this matter are to be found in ideas paralleling that of justification. Thus in Rom. 4, directly after the cardinal passage of the previous chapter, we have the idea of justifying paralleled by that of "accounting faith for righteousness," a phrase suggested by the LXX version of Gen. 15:6, and by the idea of forgiveness of sins suggested by the LXX of Ps. 32:1, 2. The forensic, declarative thought

in justification is supported by both of these phrases. Conversely, neither of them can be thought of as suggesting a change in the believer. The parallel idea of adoption (υιοθεσία), a legal term, though not specifically forensic, is further support. As Christ, according to Rom. 3:25; 4:25; 5:18, etc., came for righteousness and justification, so, according to Gal. 4:4, He came for the adoption of sons. So also Rom. 8:30: "Moreover, whom He did predestinate, them He also called; and whom He called, them He also justified" (προώρισεν . . . ἐδικαίωσεν), parallels Eph. 1:5: "Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ" (προορίσας ἡμᾶς εἰς υιοθεσίαν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). The idea of a change of being is quite excluded by υιοθεσία, rather does the term confirm the idea that justification has to do with a state or condition or relation between God and man. A last and most important parallel idea is that of reconciliation. Thus in Rom. 5:9 f. the phrase "being now justified by His blood" is in line with "we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son." In 2 Cor. 5:19-21 this parallel idea of reconciliation is still more fully expanded. As has been well stated by F. K. Schumann, "everything that is said here about reconciliation is simply identical with the basic thoughts of justification."¹⁴ Reconciliation is the establishing of the proper relation of peace which should exist between God and man. This is a completely objective thing according to 2 Cor. 5, although this fact will still have to be established over against arguments like those of Buechsel in Kittel's *Wörterbuch*.

These are the arguments for the forensic character of justification in St. Paul's epistles. These arguments are so strong that there is widespread agreement among theologians of all shades on this point. According to Sanday and Headlam, the forensic meaning of δικαιοῦν is a "philological fact,"¹⁵ a declaration seconded by Schrenk in Kittel's dictionary, "einhellig und unbestreitbar" (plain and indisputable).¹⁶

At this point we must take up an argument which tries to preserve for δικαιοῦν both the idea of "declaring righteous" and "mak-

¹⁴ Friedrich Karl Schumann, "Versöhnung und Rechtfertigung," *ELKZ* (December 31, 1950), p. 371.

¹⁵ Sanday and Headlam, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, pp. 30 f.

¹⁶ Gottlob Schrenk, "δικαίωσις," *TWNT*, II, 219.

ing righteous." Granted that *δικαιοῦν* does not mean "make righteous" but "declare righteous," does it exclude the idea of "making righteous"? We may quote Schlier here: "With the use of *δικαιοῦν* he takes over an idea to which the formal meaning of accounting righteous adheres. . . . That it is *not* a question of *declaring* righteous in opposition to making righteous is shown by the following considerations of the Pauline idea."¹⁷

In taking up this question we shall examine the expressions of the apostle referred to by Schlier and others, chiefly Kimme.¹⁸ One argument of Schlier runs as follows: "Finally *δικαιοῦν* is realized as the accomplishment of the divine righteousness in us in the future (Rom. 2:13; 3:30; 5:18 f.; 8:33 f.; 1 Cor. 4:4; Gal. 5:5 f.; doubtful cases are Rom. 3:20 and Gal. 2:16). That at this point, where you would expect it, it is not a question only of a judgment of God, although that is not excluded as 1 Cor. 4:4 shows, is proved by Rom. 5:18 f. The *δικαίωσις ζωῆς* ('justification of life'), the eschatological being justified, consists in this that men who were made sinners through Adam are made righteous through Christ"¹⁹

That justification is future as well as present is not to be denied, chiefly because of Gal. 5:5 f.: "we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness through faith" (*ἐκ πίστεως ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης ἀποδεχόμεθα*), and because of the similar presents and futures connected with *νόθεσία* and *ἀπολύτρωσις* (redemption), and the tension between present and future in St. Paul and the New Testament generally—but not because of the future tenses of *δικαιοῦν* in the passages quoted. It is doubtful whether any of these futures are strictly temporal, except 2:13, which text, however, does not

¹⁷ H. Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1949), p. 53. The German runs: "Damit übernimmt er einen Begriff, an dem der formale Sinn des Gerechtsprechens haftet. . . . Dass es sich damit aber bei *δικαιοῦν* nicht um ein Gerechterklären im Gegensatz gegen ein Gerechtmachen handelt, zeigen folgende Beobachtungen des paulinischen Begriffes."

¹⁸ A. Kimme, "Union und Konfession," *ELKZ* (April 30, 1950), p. 53.

¹⁹ Schlier, p. 54. "Endlich vollzieht sich das *δικαιοῦν* als Auswirkung der göttlichen Gerechtigkeit an uns in der Zukunft (Rom. 2:13; 3:30; 5:18 f.; 8:33 f.; 1 Cor. 4:4; Gal. 5:5 f.; fraglich ist Rom. 3:20; Gal. 2:16). Dass es sich auch hier, wo es am nächsten liegt, nicht nur um ein Urteil Gottes handelt, wiewohl ein solches eingeschlossen ist, wie 1 Kor. 4:4 zeigt, ergibt sich aus Rom. 5:18 f. Die *δικαίωσις ζωῆς*, das eschatologische *δικαιοῦσθαι* besteht darin, dass die durch Adam zu Sündern gemachten Menschen durch Christus zu *δίκαιοι* gemacht werden."

refer to the justification we are speaking of. The argument of Schlier takes for granted that *δικαιοῦν* and the establishment of God's righteousness are identical. "*δικαιοῦν* is accordingly simply the accomplishment of the divine righteousness."²⁰ This, I believe, is a mistake. The righteousness of God revealed in the Gospel has to do with more than the justification of men. The fundamental idea of Nygren's *Commentary on Romans* puts the matter more correctly. The righteousness of God has to do (1) with the man who through faith is righteous; and (2) with the living of the righteous man. The righteousness of God as God's gift of blessing is primarily man's justification, as stated above, but it includes more. It is described in Rom. 3:21—4:25 and in Rom. 5—8. The *δικαιωθέντες* ("being justified") of Rom. 5:1 already indicates that what comes is a result of what has preceded it and is not part of it, but the righteousness of God includes both. Rom. 5:18 f. quoted by Schlier is not at all conclusive for a "making righteous." *δικαίωσις*, the noun for the infinitive *δικαιοῦν*, is the act of justifying through the divine judgment of acquittal. The addition of *ζωῆς* indicates that justification and life belong together, so that *δικαίωσις ζωῆς* comes to be the short phrase for the thematic Habakkuk quotation *ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται* (he who through faith is righteous shall live). It does not, however, indicate that the life which is connected with justification is part of justification. It is not correct to make *δικαίωσις ζωῆς* equivalent to *δικαιοῦσθαι*, as Schlier does. And that *δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται* means "shall be made righteous," with emphasis on the *made*, has to be proved. In fact, the comparison of Christ and Adam is wrongly used by Schlier. Of course, "the many" were made sinners through Adam, but this was a different kind of making from that implied in the opposition: make righteous — declare righteous. There is no reference in the word *κατεστάθησαν* to the nature of sinners. There is reference merely to the objective fact that the sin of the great representative by that very fact involved all his descendants also in sin and death. God's will, decision, judgment established all men as sinners in Adam, just as it establishes all men righteous in Christ. The choice of Rom. 5:18 f. seems a particularly unfortunate

²⁰ Ibid. "*δικαιοῦν* ist demnach das schlechthinnige Geltendmachen der göttlichen Gerechtigkeit."

one for the support of the view that *δικαιοῦν* contains elements of "making righteous" as well as those of "declaring righteous."

More to the point appear to be other texts, which I shall exhibit in parallel form. The point in these parallels is that the apostle in certain passages joins forgiveness of sins or justification with the regeneration or renewal of man in much the same way as he joins them with the work of God in Christ for our salvation. 2 Cor. 5:19: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." Rom. 3:24: "through the redemption in Christ Jesus being justified."

And now: 1 Cor. 6:11: "but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified." Col. 2:13: "And you, being dead in your sins . . . hath He quickened . . . having forgiven you all trespasses." Titus 3:5-7: ". . . He saved us, by the washing of regeneration . . . that being justified by His grace, we should be made heirs."

Compare 1 Cor. 6:11 and Rom. 6:3 ff., and consider the statement of Schlier: "This *δικαιοῦν* is accomplished fundamentally in the case of the individual in Baptism, as 1 Cor. 6:11 testifies. In Baptism man is taken up into the demonstration of God's righteousness, into the death and resurrection of Christ and a new beginning is created for him with the death of his previous being, cf. Rom. 6:3 ff. He is made righteous sacramentally — this is not to be overlooked as we take Rom. 6 and 1 Cor. 6:11 together."²¹ On the basis of Rom. 5:18 and Col. 2:13 Kimme claims an "original synonymity" ("ursprüngliche Indifferenz") of justification and vivification.

The argument of Schlier is quite impermissible. St. Paul declares in the array of three verbs in 1 Cor. 6:11 in terse summary approximately what he has outlined and described in full in some six chapters in Romans. His demand that the Corinthians avoid the sins of the heathen is based on the great things that happened to

²¹ Ibid. "Dieses *δικαιοῦν* vollzieht sich grundlegend am Einzelnen in der Taufe, wie 1 Kor. 6:11 bezeugt. In ihr wird ja auch der Mensch in den Erweis der Gerechtigkeit Gottes, in Tod und Auferstehung Christi aufgenommen und ihm mit der Tilgung seines bisherigen Menschen ein neuer Ursprung geschaffen, vgl. Rom. 6:3 ff. Er wird — das ist nach Rom. 6 in Zusammenhang mit 1 Kor. 6:11 nicht zu übersehen — in der Taufe sakramental gerecht gemacht."

them when they became Christians. The beginning of their Christian state is, of course, their Baptism, "ye were washed" (ἀπελούσασθε). As to the connection between that and "ye were justified" (ἐδικαιώθητε), 1 Cor. 6:11 gives us no inkling whatever. The only legitimate procedure would be to apply the whole argument of Romans to the three verbs of 1 Cor. 6:11, not one small portion of that argument, for the three verbs are a summary statement of the whole. Bultmann is far closer to the mark when he writes: "Christ is 'our righteousness and our consecration' (1 Cor. 1:30); and side by side with 'you were rightwised' stand 'you were consecrated' (1 Cor. 6:11). But that is not expressed by the term 'righteousness' itself and the relation between 'righteousness' and 'consecration' is for the present unclear."²² The argument is fundamentally the same with regard to the other passages mentioned: Col. 2:13 and Tit. 3:5-7. These are short statements, not complete expositions of justification and regeneration. In point of time these processes are contemporaneous. Justification and regeneration take place in the same moment of time, but that does not make the two mean the same thing.²³ The mention of the act of regeneration in man before the act of justification in 1 Cor. 6:11; Col. 2:13; Titus 3:5-7 may be purely accidental, or it may be based on the logic of the matter.

No support for the view that regeneration is justification can be found in the Pauline use of δικαιῶν and related words. God's righteousness as brought to man is first and foremost his justification, and justification is God's divine verdict of acquittal over against him. Men are pronounced just, righteous, and, since God's pronouncement is always valid and true, they are truly just and righteous before Him, even though they in themselves are ungodly, for God is He who justifies the ungodly, τὸν δικαιῶντα τὸν ἄσεβῆ, Rom. 4:5. But having established this, we are still a long

²² R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. Kendrick Grobel (London: SCM Press, 1952), I, 276.

²³ The same problem, that of the unity in time of justification and regeneration, and yet of their disparity in idea, we meet in the Lutheran Confessions. Cf. Edmund Schlink, *Theologie der lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften* (3d edition; Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1948), pp. 134-141, 165-169; and Fr. H. R. Frank, *Die Theologie der Concordienformel* (Erlangen: Theodor Blaesing, 1861), II, 183, 191 f.

way from meeting the attack with which we have to do. As stated repeatedly, justification as a forensic thing is generally granted by all and sundry. The argument that we really have to meet is one based on the grounds of such justifying verdict. Paul is quite definite on this point. His standing opposition is: not by works, not by the Law, but by faith. But what is faith? Ah, there's the rub. As we have seen, the Confessions of the Lutheran Church answer that faith justifies merely as reception of the divine gift, trust in a divine promise and assurance. The moderns, on the other hand, see in faith an essential change of heart, the turning of man toward God, a new thing in man, on the basis of which God's justifying verdict is given. The next stage of the argument is hereby introduced. It must be to examine what St. Paul means by faith.

Highgate, Parkside, S. Australia

(To be continued)