

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1968

Rom 1:1-7- The Christology of an Early Christian Church Formula and the Apostle Paul's Reinterpretation

Kenneth Neumann

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Neumann, Kenneth, "Rom 1:1-7- The Christology of an Early Christian Church Formula and the Apostle Paul's Reinterpretation" (1968). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 348.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/348>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

ROM. 1:1-7: THE CHRISTOLOGY OF AN
EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH FORMULA AND THE
APOSTLE PAUL'S REINTERPRETATION

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

by

Kenneth John Neumann

May 1968

58914

Approved by:

Edgar M. Kreitzer

Advisor

Halter J. Beuthing

Reader

5

BV
4070
C69
M3
1968
no. 7

58914

TABLE OF CONTENTS

c.2

Chapter	Page
I. HISTORY AND METHODOLOGY	1
Definitions of Key Terms.	1
Overview of the Form Critical Study of Rom. 1:1-7.	5
Criteria for Establishing the Formula . .	10
Purpose and Methodology	12
II. STYLISTIC ARGUMENTS FOR THE PRE-PAULINE FORMULA	15
III. LINGUISTIC STUDY FOR PRE-PAULINE OR PAUL- INE CHARACTER	26
Preliminary Remarks	26
προεπαγγέλλομαι	26
διὰ τῶν προφητῶν	29
ἐν γραφαῖς ἀγίας	35
τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ	36
κατὰ σάρκα	45
τοῦ ὄντος θεοῦ	51
υἱοῦ θεοῦ	57
ἐν δυνάμει	69
κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιωσύνης	77
ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν	83
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν	89
Summary	93
IV. THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE PRE-PAULINE FOR- MULA.	95
The Christology	95
The Origin.	118
V. PAUL'S REINTERPRETATION OF THE FORMULA. . .	127
VI. SUMMARY AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY .	137
APPENDIX A: Key to the Verse Designation.	141
APPENDIX B: The Wording of the Formula.	142
BIBLIOGRAPHY	143

CHAPTER I

HISTORY AND METHODOLOGY

Definition of Key Terms

Certain terms which occur frequently in this writing need to be defined. References will be made to "pre-Pauline tradition." A. M. Hunter adequately defines "pre-Pauline not as the period between Jesus' crucifixion and Paul's conversion but as "'the twilight period' between the rise of the Christian church and the decade in which Paul's extant letters were written."¹ By "tradition" is meant

not merely the specifically doctrinal elements (as in 1 Cor. 15.3ff.) but kerygma, sacraments, "Words of the Lord," hymns, and so on--even Paul's use of the Old Testament.²

Tradition also includes Christological titles and "doctrinal elements" expressed in formulae. Four essential marks of Jewish tradition are noted by K. Wegenast: (1) the wording must be preserved under all circumstances; (2) an expression must always be cited in the name of its originator or of the teacher from whom the tradition was received directly; (3) all doctrine must be able to point

¹A. M. Hunter, Paul and his Predecessors (2nd edition; London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961), p. 9.

²Ibid., p. 13.

to its particular tradition; (4) only an ordained rabbi can give further traditions.³

Paul's use of παράδοσις "rests on the Jewish usage,"⁴ for he regards tradition with such seriousness that he hands it on as he received it (1 Cor. 15:3) and urges his hearers to keep it (1 Cor. 11:2; 2 Thess. 2:15; 3:6). A tradition, to be acceptable, must not be according to the tradition of men, that is, "initiated by himself or others" (Col. 2:8),⁵ but κατὰ Χριστόν. Ultimately, the tradition must go back to the Lord (1 Cor. 11:23), ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου. The use of apo instead of para "indicates the source of an item of information, which must have passed along the channel of tradition before reaching the Apostle," rather than "direct revelation" which would be suggested by para.⁶ The latter usage is illustrated especially in Gal. 1:12 and 2 Thess. 3:6, which speak of tradition given directly by word of mouth.

³Klaus Wegenast, Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen (Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962), p. 30.

⁴Friedrich Büchsel, "Ἰδωμεν," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, c. 1964), II, 172.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Jean Hering, The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians, translated from the 2nd French edition by A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock (London: Epworth Press, 1962), pp. 114-15.

Gal. 1:12 might seem to contradict Paul's attitude toward tradition expressed in the above passages. However, there Paul is speaking about his conversion experience, not his subsequent learning of the tradition. Paul nowhere speaks of learning the Gospel; for him it came not *παρὰ ἀνθρώπου* but through an *ἀποκάλυψις*, an experience which made him both a believer and apostle.⁷ While valuing this experience as a basis for his apostleship, Paul nevertheless also values and hands on the tradition taught him; therefore there is a strong possibility that part of his writings are "pre-Pauline" and "tradition."

The final word to be defined is "formula." Hunter views this as a subdivision of tradition and puts it in the same category as "Kerygma."⁸ In general, "formula" is defined by W. Kramer: "Where these two conditions are fulfilled--fixed key words and a clear formal pattern--we shall speak of 'formulae!'"⁹ "Homologia" as defined by V. Neufeld, that is, "the confession of Jesus with specific reference to his person or work," "that core of essential conviction and belief to which Christians subscribed and openly testified

⁷Albrecht Oepke, Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater, 2nd improved edition; (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1964), p. 29.

⁸Hunter, p. 24.

⁹Christ, Lord, Son of God, translated from the German by Brian Hardy (London: SCM Press Ltd, c. 1966), p. 112.

is a type of formula."¹⁰ He was able to discern three basic forms or patterns of "homologia" in the letters of Paul:

the simple formula kurios Iēsous, the two-article formula which refers to Jesus as Lord and to God as Father, and an antithetical pattern, appearing in several forms, in which a contrast is drawn between the earthly career of Jesus and the new position granted him in the resurrection.¹¹

Hunter points to the difficulty in locating such formulae, "for Paul does not expressly label them as 'tradition.'" But via the methods which will be outlined, "the inference will be strong that we are dealing with 'tradition,'" but "absolutely conclusive proof is not to be expected: the reader must decide in each particular instance whether on a balance of probabilities the case is made out."¹² In the early twentieth century Johannes Weiss emphasized the importance of the task to uncover the "important foundation stones" the early community contributed to Paul's theology.¹³

¹⁰Vernon H. Neufeld, The Earliest Christian Confessions (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1963), p. 20.

¹¹Ibid., p. 51.

¹²Hunter, p. 24.

¹³Johannes Weiss, Earliest Christianity, translated and edited from the German by Frederick C. Grant (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959), I, 4.

Overview of the Form Critical

Study of Rom. 1:1-7

The use of a pre-Pauline formula was conjectured already by W. M. L. de Wette¹⁴ on the basis of the relation of Rom. 1:3f. to 2 Tim. 2:8. B. Weiss (1886) and L. Lemme (1893) are noted by A. Seeberg as having the same idea.¹⁵ Seeberg himself (1903), through detailed investigation, conjectured what the early Christian formula in all its credal statements would have said.¹⁶ His arguments for Rom. 1:3f. being pre-Pauline are that Paul wanted to conform to the norm of the formula of faith (τύπον διδαχῆς; Rom. 6:17 is particularly in view for Seeberg), and that both Son of God and the Resurrection are mentioned in the original formula according to other data Seeberg had gathered.¹⁷ C. Clemen (1893), Ferdinand Kattenbusch,

¹⁴W. M. L. deWette, "Kurze Erklärung der Briefe an Titus, Timotheus und die Hebräer; Zweite verbesserte Auflage," Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Neuen Testament (4th improved and enlarged edition; Leipzig: Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1847), II, 1, 37.

¹⁵ [Bernhard] Weiss [Der Brief an die Römer (7th edition; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1886)] and [L.] Lemme, Jahrbucher für deutsche Theologie (1893), p. 9, as noted in Alfred Seeberg, Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1903), p. 75.

¹⁶Seeberg, p. 85.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 75.

(1894-1900) and Paul Feine (1925) are mentioned as having isolated "pericopai of creed-like tradition," such as 1 Cor. 15:1ff. and Rom. 1:3ff.¹⁸ Johannes Weiss (1914) asserts that Rom. 1:3-4 is "pre-Pauline, or at least uninfluenced by Paul"; he bases this on the Christology of the passage, namely, that Jesus is from the "seed of David" and "became" Messiah at the moment of his exaltation ("Adoptionist Christology").²⁰

The above attempts to determine the pre-Pauline character of Rom. 1:1-7 are of a general nature; some scholars attempted to determine the formula by linguistic and formal criteria. Eduard Norden (1913), on the basis of style and form, not on the basis of content, determined that Rom. 1:3-5a is (see Appendix A for verse designations) a fixed formula. He leaves it to theological departments to determine whether it stems from older tradition.²¹ With the rise of form criticism and greater interest on the

¹⁸Neufeld, pp. 6-7.

¹⁹This writer was unable to locate these writers' conjectures as to its pre-Pauline character.

²⁰J. Weiss, I, 10, 118, 123; Ferdinand Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), p. 251, fn. 3 names Weiss book as the first one to point to the pre-Pauline character of these verses.

²¹Agnostos Theos (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913), pp. 380, 385.

Synoptic Gospels,²² there seems to have been a lull in the deeper studies called for by J. Weiss and Norden.²³

The first in depth study of the verbal formulation seems to have been made by Ernst Barnikol (1933). He decided that in Rom. 1:2-5a Paul was quoting according to need from the older traditions of the Urgemeinde that reflected a non-preexistent "heilsgeschichtliche Messialogie."²⁴ Hans Windisch, following Barnikol with respect to Christology regards verses 3b-4c as a borrowing from Jerusalem or Antioch tradition which did not know pre-existence; thus he views verse 3a as a Pauline title denoting pre-existence similar to Gal. 4:4, Rom. 8:31, and 2 Cor. 8:9.²⁵ In 1936, Rudolf Bultmann stated that

²²The writings of Martin Dibelius, Formgeschichte des Evangeliums (1919; "in the choice of a name he was influenced by Eduard Norden, who had added to his book Agnostos Theos (1913, the sub-title Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte religioeser Rede . . ."), of Rudolf Bultmann, Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition (1921), of Karl Ludwig Schmidt, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu (1919), and others are noted by Alfred Wikenhauser, New Testament Introduction, translated from the German by Joseph Cunningham (New York: Herder and Herder, c. 1958), pp. 253-56; these three are noted as the founders of what has been inaccurately named 'Form-criticism,' according to Stephen Neill, The Interpretation of the New Testament: 1861-1961 (New York: Oxford University Press, c. 1964), p. 240.

²³J. Weiss, I, 4; Norden, p. 380.

²⁴Ernst Barnikol, Zurück zum alten Glauben Jesus der Christus (Halle: Akademischer Verlag, 1933), pp. 51-52.

²⁵Hans Windisch, "Zur Christologie der Pastoralbriefe," Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXXIV (1935), 215-16.

although Paul was citing a Christological confession, *κατὰ σάρκα* and *κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης* are Pauline additions.²⁶

In his Theology of the New Testament he reconstructs the formula omitting the above phrases and giving Rom. 1:3b-4c the heading, "(Jesus Christ) the Son of God."²⁷ C. H. Dodd alluded to a common confession in Rom. 1:3f. as early as 1932²⁸ but did not fully discuss the matter until much later, when he decided the confession extended to the end of verse 4.²⁹

The above references give a capsule history of the study of Rom. 1:1-7 in the last generation and a basis for the claim of most scholars of recent date that the pre-Pauline character of Rom. 1:3-4 is generally accepted.³⁰ However, the question of the extent of the formula and the

²⁶Rudolf Bultmann, "Neueste Paulusforschung," Theologische Rundschau, VIII (1936), 11.

²⁷Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, translated by Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), I, 49.

²⁸C. H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (New York: Harper, 1932), p. 5.

²⁹C. H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1951), p. 14.

³⁰For example, Wegenast, p. 70; Reginald H. Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), p. 180, fn. 80.

editorial work of Paul is much disputed.³¹ Few scholars doubt that there is reflected here a Christology which is held by the Roman congregation,³² if not also by Paul himself. There are no scholars of recent date who deny the contrast between the Christology expressed and Pauline Christology, except for W. L. Knox and K. Prümm. Knox asserts that Paul was avoiding statements offensive to his Jewish readers and assumed in Romans 1 that "his readers will regard it as compatible with Jewish orthodoxy."³³ Prümm denies the contrast by asserting that "Son of God" in verse 4 connotes preexistence.³⁴

³¹Wegenast, p. 70. For the possible variations in the boundaries, and variations within the framework of the boundaries, see Appendix B for table of current scholarly opinions.

³²Of those not recognizing a formula of recent date, W. L. Knox points to Paul seeing its compatibility with Jewish orthodoxy, "The 'Divine Hero' Christology in the New Testament," Harvard Theological Review, XLI (1948), 230; Karl Prümm, Die Botschaft des Römerbriefes: Ihr Aufbau und Gegenwert (Freiburg: Herder KG, 1960), pp. 21-22, sees the Roman readers already in spiritual possession of the Christology summarized by Paul here. Prümm designates Paul as the author or formulator of this Christological confession, vv. 2-4; he sees the two in agreement in theology, but this is done by seeing both Son of God references as pre-existent.

³³Knox, XLI, 230.

³⁴Prümm, p. 21.

Criteria for Establishing the Formula

With all these variations in the wording of the formula, it is necessary to establish criteria for judging the validity of the various opinions expressed.

Norden, in his study of forms of religious address, especially of Acts 17, established various criteria which were utilized by others after him.³⁵ Ethelbert Stauffer expanded these criteria,³⁶ while Reginald Fuller summarized Norden and Stauffer by seven criteria.³⁷ Finally, Gottfried Schille in his work on early Christian hymns suggested further criteria.³⁸

For this thesis, the following criteria have been utilized:

1. "Frequently the creedal formula fails to fit into the context syntactically, e.g. Rev. 1-4."³⁹
2. "We can often see how quite different passages repeat the same creedal formula with very little difference in each case, e.g. II Cor. 5.21; 8.9."⁴⁰

³⁵Norden, pp. 380-87.

³⁶Ethelbert Stauffer, New Testament Theology, translated from the German by John Marsh (New York: Macmillan Company, c. 1955), pp. 338-39.

³⁷Fuller, p. 21.

³⁸Gottfried Schille, Frühchristlichen Hymnen (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962), pp. 18-20.

³⁹Stauffer, p. 339, #3 criterion; cf. Fuller, p.21, #1; Schille, p. 18, #3.

⁴⁰Stauffer, p. 339, #5.

3. "Creedal formulae often strike us by their simple and clear syntax. They avoid particles, conjunctions and complicated constructions, and prefer parataxis to hypotaxis. Their thought proceeds by thesis rather than by argument, e.g. Acts 4.10."⁴¹
4. "Creedal formulae often stand out by reason of their monumental stylistic construction. They favour an antithetic or anaphoral style, e.g. I Tim. 3.16."⁴²
5. "Creedal formulae often favour participles and relative clauses, e.g. Rom. 1.3."⁴³
6. "Creedal formulae are often rhythmical in form" and "often arranged in lines and strophes, e.g. Col. 1.15ff."⁴⁴
7. The first person plural or third person singular style, rarely the first person singular style, is used in formulae (Eph. 1:3ff.).⁴⁵
8. For the sake of clarity, a formula may have a group of expletive words, synonyms, and formulated phrases⁴⁶ (Rom. 1:2-4).
9. The formula is frequently put in a place of emphasis (examples: at the opening part of a letter, Rom. 1:3f.; Eph. 1:3ff.; Col. 1:12ff.).⁴⁷

⁴¹Stauffer, p. 339, #6; cf. Schille, p. 19, #6.

⁴²Stauffer, p. 339, #7; cf. Schille, p. 19, #5.

⁴³Stauffer, p. 339, #11; cf. Schille, p. 19, #5; Fuller, p. 21, #5.

⁴⁴Stauffer, p. 339, #8 and 9; cf. Schille, p. 19, #5; Fuller, p. 21, #6.

⁴⁵Schille, p. 17, fn. 32, and p. 18, #1.

⁴⁶Schille, p. 19, #6.

⁴⁷Schille, p. 19, #8.

10. "The creedal formula often exhibits a different linguistic usage, terminology, or style from its context, e. g. 1 Cor. 16.22,"⁴⁸ or from its author.⁴⁹
11. "For the most part creedal formulae refer to the elementary truths and events of salvation-history as norms, e. g. IgnTr. 9.1f,"⁵⁰ or "are concerned with basic christological assertions."⁵¹

The first nine criteria have been used as "stylistic" criteria, the tenth as a "linguistic" criterion, and the last is applied as a Christological or theological criterion.

Purpose and Methodology

The purpose of this investigation is to determine the extent and text of the pre-Pauline tradition or formula generally acknowledged to be cited in this passage, secondly, to discuss the Christology embedded in the formula, and finally, to compare this earlier Christology with the Pauline reinterpretation of it. This study does not claim to exhaust the Christology of Rom. 1:1-7 but rather focus primarily on the verses which have possible pre-Pauline tradition. The questions concerning Christ's person which are raised in this passage demand much more space, particularly the questions of adoptionism and pre-existence, and

⁴⁸Stauffer, p. 339, #4.

⁴⁹Fuller, p. 21, #3; cf. Schille, p. 18, #3 and 4.

⁵⁰Stauffer, p. 339, #12.

⁵¹Fuller, p. 21, #7.

the relation of resurrection, ascension, and exaltation in the theology of this formula. The titles used in the formula are worthy of much more attention.⁵² However, the focus in this study will be upon the relation of the Christology of the formula and Paul. In this way, a foundation is laid for the understanding of the further development of the titles as employed elsewhere in the New Testament and for the further interrelating of the Christology found here with other parts of the New Testament; hopefully, this prepares the way for a sound understanding of the development of Christology up to the point of formulation in the three ecumenical creeds.

To accomplish this purpose, the methodology will be as follows: (1) on the basis of the stylistic and linguistic criteria established for identifying primitive Christian formulae, an examination of Rom. 1:1-7 will separate the pre-Pauline and Pauline elements; (2) a proposed wording of the formula will be given; (3) its Christology will be discussed in the light of the primitive church's preaching and pre-Pauline material; (4) the apostle Paul's Christology in his reinterpretation of the formula will be examined; (5) a general summary and evaluation of some current works

⁵² Fuller, passim; Kramer, on Son of God, pp. 108-28, 183-89; Hahn, on Son of David, pp. 242-79, on Son of God, pp. 280-346.

on Christological titles in the New Testament will be presented in the light of the results of the investigation of Rom. 1:1-7. The assumptions implicit in the above methodology are that the form-tradition method is one valid approach to determine pre-New Testament Christology, that the criteria used in the method are basically a correct measuring device of the pre-Pauline material in the passage, and that only those pre-Pauline passages having some bearing upon the various words and phrases of Rom. 1:1-7 will be admitted in the examination. A. M. Hunter's description of the sources for pre-Pauline tradition is accepted; "Pre-eminently, the epistles themselves [sic]. All, except the Pastorals, are accepted. The second source is Acts."⁵³

⁵³Hunter, p. 13.

CHAPTER II

STYLISTIC ARGUMENTS FOR THE PRE-PAULINE FORMULA

Certain phrases in the opening verses of Romans 1 are syntactically difficult in relation to the context, in particular the phrase *περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ* (1:3a). H. A. W. Meyer already pointed to the difficulties in 1866. The four reasons he gives are: (1) peri is most naturally tied grammatically to the nearest preceding word; (2) euaggelion is frequently followed by an objective genitive; (3) euaggelion occurs nowhere previously with peri in the New Testament; (4) if peri tou huiou autou modifies euaggelion, the important thought in verse 2 appears conspicuously isolated.¹ Point two is confirmed by the close proximity of verse 9, which uses euaggelion with the objective genitive huiou (*ἐν τῇ εὐαγγελίᾳ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ*). The translators of the Authorized Version also felt this difficulty in verse 2, for they enclosed this verse in parentheses. Syntactically, if peri tou huiou autou modifies proepēggeilato, verse 2 should have begun with *ἐν ᾧ*.² Thus, although stylistically there are difficulties,

¹H. A. W. Meyer, Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über den Römerbrief (4th edition; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1865), p. 46.

²Hans Lietzmann, Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus (2nd edition; Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1919), p. 24.

the phrase in question fits best with euaggelion (verse 1) and not with the relative sentence in which it stands, as recent commentators have noted.³

The case with ἐν δυνάμει is less clear. One expects either that some kind of genitive would follow dunamei (dunamis theou Rom. 1:16; en dunamei pneumatos 15:19) or that the phrase would be used adverbially to modify the preceding kata pneuma hagiōsunēs follows en dunamei and is not connected to it logically; rather, en dunamei modifies either horisthentos or huios theou. Syntactically, this provides no difficulty; but the phrase as it stands upsets the balance of verses 3b-4b. If this phrase is omitted, one has an exact parallelism of verb, object, and kata phrase. Fuller may be correct when he states that this phrase was added to balance the peri tou huiou autou added by Paul.⁴

The final phrase that presents a difficulty, Iēsou Christou tou kuriou hēmōn, does not stylistically follow very easily from the words preceding it; it does fit syntactically with the following verse. The genitive

³Otto Michel, Der Brief an die Römer (13th edition, 4th of his exegesis; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), p. 37; Hans Wilhelm Schmidt, Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962, p. 18.

⁴Reginald H. Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), p. 165.

case agrees with the noun huiou theou, (not in prepositional phrases) and verb tou horisthentos but since three prepositional phrases separate them, the phrase seems to be an abrupt insertion at this point of the text. The Authorized Version translators once again felt the difficulty, for they put this phrase, not at the end of verse 4 where it stands in the Greek text, but at the beginning of verse 3 following "concerning his Son."

Thus, the examination of these three phrases, according to the criterion of Stauffer that "frequently the creedal formula fails to fit into the context syntactically," suggests that there is reason to suspect a creedal formula within these verses of Romans.

Another argument for a formula is that "quite different passages repeat the same creedal formula with very little difference in each case." De Wette noted that in 2 Tim. 2:8 the phrase ek spermatos Daudid was related to Rom. 1:3 and inferred a common basic formula.⁵ A. Seeberg did a more thorough comparison of the two passages and came up with these points: (1) Both passages mention the coming of Jesus

⁵W. M. L. de Wette, "Kurze Erklärung der Briefe an Titus, Timotheus und die Hebräer: Zweite verbesserte Auflage," Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, (4th improved and enlarged edition; Leipzig: Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1847), II, 1, 37.

from the seed of David; (2) Both passages refer to the resurrection, the only difference being that the latter is prior in 2 Tim. 2:8; in contrast, it is put after ek spermatos Daud in Romans; (3) Both passages have the Davidic coming and the resurrection of Jesus appear as the content of the gospel.⁶ In the comparison of contexts, Romans is the presentation of Paul's credentials for apostleship, namely, the gospel of God for which he has been set apart, while 2 Tim. 2:8 presents the gospel for which Paul is suffering, the whole context relating the gospel and suffering. It should be noted that the clause that refers to the installation of the Son of God is not present in 2 Tim. 2:8, and also that the resurrection does not appear to play as large a role in the Romans passage as does the huios theou. Nevertheless, these passages are strikingly similar.

In accordance with Stauffer's sixth criterion, there is an obvious simplicity in the syntax of the passage. This is particularly noticeable in the lack of definite articles. Whereas there are seven definite articles in verses 8-9, there are only three definite articles in the opening four verses; yet there are twenty-three nouns

⁶Alfred Seeberg, Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1903), p. 75.

in the opening verses and only twelve nouns in verses 8-9. We shall demonstrate that two of the articles in verses 1-4 are in Pauline additions to the formula. This lack of articles is also due in part to this passage being a segment of a salutation, which belongs to that class of literature which is a "survival from earlier anarthrous usage."⁷ The word pneuma in the expression pneuma hagiōsunēs is anarthrous because "in Hebrew the nomen regens would appear in the construct or with a suffix" ⁸ The anarthrous hagiōsunēs follows because "When a genitive, determined in any way, follows a nomen regens, it also determines the nomen regens, which . . . is always in the

⁷F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated and revised from the German by Robert W. Funk (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), paragraph 252.

⁸Ibid., paragraph 259. "In the NT this Semitic construction makes its influence felt especially where a Semitic original lies behind the Greek (hence 'translation-Semitisms'). . . . The expression is an exact rendering of the Hebrew (שְׁפִיטָה טְהוֹרָה), Otto Procksch and K. G. Kuhn, "hagios," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, c.1964), I, 114.

construct state."⁹ Dunamis is labelled in Blass and Debrunner's grammar an anarthrous noun.¹⁰ Since there are so many prepositional phrases in this section, it is fit to note that "the article can be omitted in prepositional phrases (formulae from the earlier anarthrous stage of the language)" ¹¹ One special case that we have in these verses is en graphais hagiais. Although some say that the lack of article indicates a "character of holiness and divine origin,"¹² Hans Lietzmann¹³ and Otto Michel, among others, state that the phrase without the article was current for Paul's time.¹⁴

Simplicity of style is also to be seen in the lack of particles and conjunctions, in verses 2-4; in fact, there is only one conjunction (except for the closing greeting) in the opening seven verses, and that one connects a double accusative. The opening verses are presented in direct statements with crisp construction.

⁹Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, edited and enlarged by E. Kautzsch, the second English edition by A. E. Cowley (London: Oxford University Press, 1910), p. 410.

¹⁰Blass and Debrunner, paragraph 257.

¹¹Blass and Debrunner, paragraph 255.

¹²Schmidt, p. 18.

¹³Lietzmann, p. 23, suggests it is common in Hellenistic Greek.

¹⁴Michel, p. 36.

Another argument for the presence of a formula, based on the seventh criterion of Stauffer is the antithetic nature of the passage under discussion. Tou genomenou contrasts with tou horisthentos, ek spermatos David with huiou theou, but the antithetic nature is especially seen in the contrast of kata sarka and kata pneuma hagiōsunēs. If en dunamei is part of the formula, then the contrast of humiliation and exaltation becomes apparent in these verses.

Agreement with another criterion for a formula is seen in the use of participles and relative clauses. Verse 2 is a relative clause, while the following two verses are essentially participial phrases. The fact that all these verbs are in the passive voice is striking. E. Schweizer notes that in general

Jesus appears not only as the content of the confession but also formally as the subject of the proposition. At the same time however it must be maintained that he is often the subject [p. 95] of a verb in the passive voice, so that the formulas which present God as the subject and Jesus as the object of his work have substantially the same significance.¹⁵

The next stylistic consideration arises from the criterion that formulas often are rhythmical in a form "not determined by quantity, but by the number of stresses

¹⁵Eduard Schweizer, Lordship and Discipleship, translated and revised from the German by the author (London: SCM Press Ltd., c.1960), pp. 94-95.

or even of words,"¹⁶ and "arranged in lines and strophes."¹⁷ Bédá Rigaux says Rom. 1:1-7 is certainly rhythmically formed.¹⁸ He claims that in this passage the rhythm has the strongest power of expression and greatest compactness of content ("von stärkster Ausdruckskraft und grösster Inhaltsdichte").¹⁹ An arrangement into lines and strophes has been attempted by several scholars;²⁰ perhaps most typical is O. Michel's presentation.²¹ The parallelism in the groups of words is

¹⁶Ethelbert Stauffer, New Testament Theology, translated from the German by John Marsh (New York: Macmillan Company c.1955), p. 339.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Bédá Rigaux, Paulus und seine Briefe: der Stand der Forschung, translated from the French by August Berg (München: Kösel Verlag, 1964), p. 187.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 188.

²⁰M.-E. Boismard, "Constitué fils de dieu (Rom., I,4)," Revue Biblique, LX (1953), 7; E. Norden, Agnostos Theos (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913), p. 385; H. Windisch, "Zur Christologie der Pastoralbriefe," Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXXIV (1935), 215; Vernon H. Neufeld, The Earliest Christian Confessions (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1963), p. 50; J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Creeds (2nd edition; London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1960), p. 17; C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1957), p. 18.

²¹Michel, p. 32.

1. tou genomenou
2. ek spermatos David
3. kata sarka

1. tou horisthentos
2. huiou theou en dunamei
3. kata pneuma hagiōsunēs
4. ex anastaseōs nekrōn

plain to see from his chart. One could even break verse 2 into three portions according to the verb and the two prepositional phrases, and thus see parallelism with the other two verses. Without further discussion Michel asserts that in verses 1-7 there is a determined rhythm of thirteen lines (stichs) of hexameter length.²²

An interesting suggestion for line arrangement is that proposed by A. M. Hunter. He makes verses 3-4 into three lines by dividing verse 4. The last phrase is translated, "As a result of the resurrection of the dead Jesus Christ our Lord." Pneuma hagiōsunēs is viewed as equivalent to pneuma hagon. In this manner, verses 3-4 are seen to refer to Jesus as "the Messiah of Jewish prophecy," "his equipment with Messianic power at his baptism," and his resurrection and exaltation to Lordship. The Syriac Peshitta, which translates the third phrase, "who rose from the house of the dead, even Jesus Messiah our Lord," "would seem to suggest a third participle in the underlying Greek." The lack of a participle in the Greek text as now accepted, he feels, is not a decisive objection.²³ Stylistically speaking, the lack of a participle makes

²²Michel, p. 32.

²³A. M. Hunter, Paul and his Predecessors (2nd edition; London: SCM Press Ltd, 1961), pp. 25-26.

the last phrase seem difficult, but if the original language of the formula was Aramaic, the possibility that the translation to the Greek form was not quite accurate or that the Greek form was understood differently must be considered.

On the basis of Schille's criteria more stylistic arguments for the pre-Pauline character of the passage are presented. Certainly, there is the third person singular style in verses 2-4. In verse 5 can be noted the first person plural, elabomen.²⁴ In regard to the second criterion noted, the kata phrases appear to be expletives, and in verse 4 there seem to be several phrases modifying huios theou. Then too, the criterion of being in an emphasized place in the text is met, as Schille notes for Rom. 1:3f,²⁵ and is even further stressed within the salutation itself as the/a definition of the euaggelion theou . . . peri tou huiou autou.

²⁴Michel, p. 40, and Schmidt, p. 20 note that this is a "Schriftstellerischen Plural"; the latter refers to 1 Cor. 9:11ff. and Rom. 3:7-8, where without changing the situation the singular changes to the plural. Blass and Debrunner, paragraph 280, call it a "literary plural" used to have the hearers associate with the writer.

²⁵Gottfried Schille, Frühchristlichen Hymnen (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962), p. 19.

In conclusion, there have been suggested several stylistic arguments for a pre-Pauline formula, namely, the syntactical difficulties of certain phrases in relation to the context, the repeating of the same formula in another quite different context, the simplicity of the syntax, the antithetic or contrasting nature of verses 3-4 in particular, the use of participles and relative clauses, the rhythm displayed in the various lines of the salutation, the third person singular and first person plural usage, the several expletives modifying key expressions, and the position of emphasis of the passage within the framework of the epistle and even within the salutation itself.

CHAPTER III

LINGUISTIC STUDY FOR PRE-PAULINE OR PAULINE CHARACTER

Preliminary Remarks

In accordance with the criterion that creedal formulae often exhibit a "different linguistic usage, terminology or style" from their contexts, the terminology of Rom. 1:2-4 will be examined to see whether it is pre-Pauline or Pauline. The investigation will be made on the basis of Pauline usage and other sources, such as the other books of the New Testament, the Hebrew Old Testament, the Septuagint, and extracanonical writings. Since an analysis of the meaning of the words is dependent upon the context, a theology consistent with the text will not be proposed until all the words and phrases have been examined.

προεπαγγέλλομαι

This verb is used only one other time within the letters of Paul, in 2 Cor. 9:5; there it occurs not in the sense of "promise beforehand" (middle voice) but "to announce in advance" (passive voice). "Proepaggellomai is naturally rare, since there is already a pro in

epaggellomai."¹ The context of 2 Cor. 9:5 is the sending of Titus to the Corinthians by Paul in order to complete the work of gathering the collection for the saints in Jerusalem; the gift is here termed εὐλογία.² Thus, the subject of the action of the verb is the Corinthians. Although this verse contains the only other occurrence of proepaggellomai in the New Testament, nevertheless Paul does use the closely related words, epaggellomai and epaggelia, and in a significant manner, twenty-six times for the latter word. Particularly in Romans, the meaning is the Old Testament promise of blessing, especially to the seed of Abraham.³

Epaggelia in the sense of the promise of God "was developed in Judaism prior to Paul," as in 3 Macc.2:10,

¹Julius Schniewind and Gerhard Friedrich, "epaggellō, etc.," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, c.1964), II, 586. Hereafter this dictionary will be referred to as TDNT.

²Hermann W. Beyer, "eulogeō, etc." TDNT, II, 563.

³Rom. 4:13,14,16,20; 9:4,8,9. It is found similarly in Galatians, Gal. 3:16,17,18(2),21; 4:23. The ideas of the present promise of the Spirit (Gal. 3:14), present fulfilment of the promises in Christ (Rom. 15:8; 2 Cor. 1:20), and promise of sonship (Gal. 3:22; 4:28) are also found.

Ps. Sol. 12:8, Test. Jos. 20, and in rabbinic sources.

The term takes on an eschatological character with a view to the "future world," especially in apocalypses and rabbinic writings.⁴

In the New Testament, the most helpful parallels are found at the end of Luke and throughout Acts. In Rom. 1:2 the verb is connected by a relative pronoun to euaggelion theou. Acts 13:32f. says, "And we bring you the good news (euaggelizometha) that what God promised to the fathers (tēn pros tous pateras epaggelian), this he has fulfilled. . . . by raising Jesus"⁵ This verse is followed by a citation from Psalm 2. Jesus and his resurrection are viewed as the fulfilment of the promise of God here and in Acts 13:23; 26:6f. The Savior, Jesus, is brought to Israel according to His promise (13:23). Old Testament events in connection with Abraham and Moses, in particular the Exodus and possession of the land, are the promise of God (Acts 7:5, 17). Promise is also connected with the coming of the Holy Spirit, especially on the disciples (Acts 2). All these particular verses (except 26:6f.) may be viewed as earlier than Paul and part of the early

⁴Schniewind and Friedrich, II, 579-80.

⁵All quotes from the Bible in English, unless indicated otherwise, are from the Revised Standard Version (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, c.1946 & 1952).

church's preaching: However, this dating is subject to question.⁶

In conclusion, proepaggellomai is not used by Paul in the same connection as in Rom. 1:2. Paul's concept of epaggelia is prominent in his letters, but it is primarily used when addressing a group of hearers who are, at least in part, Jewish (Romans, Galatians). More strikingly similar is the preaching in Acts. The word as used in Rom. 1:2 would fit better with pre-Pauline tradition and is less likely a Pauline term.

διὰ τῶν προφητῶν

In Paul and the Gospel of Mark, there is a striking difference in the frequency of the word, prophētēs, in comparison with the other Gospels. Of the one hundred forty-four in the New Testament, Matthew has thirty-seven, Luke twenty-nine, Acts thirty, John fourteen, Mark six and Paul, exclusive of three passages in Ephesians and the Pastoral letters, ten.⁷ Six of these ten references are to New

⁶Eduard Schweizer, "Zu den Reden der Apostelgeschichte," Theologische Zeitschrift, XIII (1957), 1-11. Cf. Reginald H. Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), p. 20.

⁷H. Kramer, R. Rendtorff, R. Meyer and Gerhard Friedrich, "prophētēs," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, edited by Gerhard Friedrich (Stuttgart; W. Kohlhammer GMBH, 1959), VI, 829. Hereafter this dictionary will be referred to as TWNT.

Testament prophets (for example, 1 Cor. 12:28: "God has appointed in the church first apostles, second prophets . . . ").⁸ Rom. 3:21 refers to the "law and the prophets," a reference to the "whole Scripture,"⁹ therefore not referring to persons as 1:2. Finally, Rom. 11:3 and 1 Thess. 2:15 both refer to the persecution and killing of the prophets at the hands of the Jews; in fact, Rom. 11:3 is a near quote of the LXX version of 1 Kings 19:10.¹⁰ In Ephesians the term denotes New Testament prophets,¹¹ while Titus 1:12, which quotes the Cretan poet, Epimenides (6th century B.C.), calls him a prophet.¹² Thus, Paul generally uses prophētēs to denote the prophet of the Christian church.

⁸Also 1 Cor. 12:29; 14:29, 32(2), 37.

⁹H. Kleinknecht and W. Gutbrod, "nomos, etc.," TDNT, IV, 1071; Kramer, Rendtorff, Meyer, Friedrich, VI, 833.

¹⁰Kramer, Rendtorff, Meyer, Friedrich, VI, 835-36. A tradition had grown up about this mistreatment of the prophets, even in apocryphal writings, and early Christianity used this to assert the sin of the Jews in their treatment of the prophets and Christ.

¹¹Eph. 2:20; 3:5; 4:11; J. Armitage Robinson, St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians (Revised edition; London: James Clarke & Co. Ltd., n.d.), p. 163, points to the order "apostles and prophets," 3:5 which refers to current-day prophets, and 4:11 where "Old Testament prophets are obviously out of the question."

¹²A. J. B. Higgins, "I, II Timothy and Titus," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, edited by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., c.1962), p. 1007.

This interpretation is supported by Paul's use of cognate words such as prophēteia and prophēteuō in the same sense.¹³ The most striking occurrence of a cognate is in Rom. 16:25-27:

Now to him who is able to strengthen you according to my gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery which was kept secret for long ages but is now disclosed and through the prophetic writings (*διὰ τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν*) is made known to all nations, according to the command of the eternal God, to bring about the obedience of faith--to the only wise God be glory for evermore through Jesus Christ! Amen.

Michel believes that there is an older liturgical scheme with a basically apocalyptic tradition ("mystery," "revelation"); he does recognize there are elements of Pauline theology within Rom. 16:25-27 and even conceives the possibility these verses are a later revision.¹⁴ As in verse 2, the prophets and written documents are associated.

While the rest of the Pauline writings use the term of New Testament prophets, Romans uses prophētēs and its cognates five times (1:2; 3:21; 11:3; 12:6; 16:26), four times to refer to Old Testament prophets. Each of

¹³Prophēteia in Rom. 12:6; 1 Cor. 12:10; 13:2,8; 14:6,22; 1 Thess. 5:20; 1 Tim. 1:18; 4:14, and prophēteuō in 1 Cor. 11:45; 13:9; 14:1,3,4,5,24,31,29 are all in the sense of the prophet of the New Testament church.

¹⁴Otto Michel, Der Brief an die Römer (13th edition, 4th of his exegesis; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), p. 392. H. Lietzmann, Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus (2nd edition; Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck]), pp. 134-26, conjecture that it is a Marcion addition.

the four times (if Rom. 1:2 is included), the words occur in an older tradition. Friedrich argues that Paul sees the Old Testament prophets as Scripture, for Paul usually does not introduce an Old Testament citation with the prophet's name but with the phrase kathōs gegraptai.¹⁵

Is Rom. 1:2 part of a pre-Pauline tradition? It has been shown that there is frequent use of prophētēs in the Gospels, where dia tōn prophētōn is a formula introducing Old Testament citations.¹⁶ The Old Testament prophets are the mouth of God through whom He speaks to men (Acts 3:21, cf. Luke 1:70 and Acts 3:18).¹⁷ This attitude is drawn from the Judaism of that time. According to Michel, the men of the Old Covenant were called "prophets" because of their association with the word of God.¹⁸ Rabbinic sources say the prophets predicted the

¹⁵Kramer, Rendtorff, Meyer, Friedrich, VI, 833.

¹⁶Ibid., VI, 832; to rēthen hupo kuriō dia tou prophētou legontos (Matt. 1:22; 2:15). Dropping hupo kuriou, the phrase is in Matt. 2:17, 23; 3:3; 4:14; 8:17; 12:17; 13:35; 21:4; 24:15; 27:9.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Michel, p. 36.

Messianic time of salvation.¹⁹ They limited legitimate prophecy to a classic period of prophecy; this speculation over the classical period is closely connected with the concept of canon.²⁰ The close association of the prophet and writing became so pronounced that either parts of Scripture, a group of books, could be called the "Prophets" (Acts 7:42) or all of Scripture could be called the "Law and the Prophets" (Rom. 3:21) or the "Prophets" (Acts 13:27).²¹ Such ideas seem to have been in mind in Rom. 1:2; however, the Acts references are in contexts generally viewed as close to the early Church's preaching and hence pre-Pauline.

In summary, Paul generally uses the word prophētēs for the prophet of the New Testament people (although, except for the passages in Ephesians, all the references are in First Corinthians). The usage in the Gospels and Acts reflect the Judaic attitude toward the prophets as those of the Old Testament era especially associated with the Scriptures. Rom. 1:2 reflects the latter sense and is more likely to be pre-Pauline.

¹⁹Hermann Strack and Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926), III, 8, 12. Hereafter referred to as S-B.

²⁰Kramer, Rendtorff, Meyer, Friedrich, VI, 817.

²¹Ibid., VI, 833.

ἐν γραφαῖς ἁγίαις

Nowhere else in Paul is there a parallel to this formulation. Nowhere else is hagios attached to graphē or graphai, although nomos hagios is found in Rom. 7:12. The singular use of graphē occurs seven times, and the plural use occurs four times (except for 1:2).²² Each of the four times in the plural they are very likely within older traditional formulations.²³ When Paul wishes to cite Scripture, he introduces it, especially in Romans, by καθὼς γέγραπται or καθάπερ γέγραπται.²⁴ γέγραπται γάρ is rather frequent also in the rest of Paul.²⁵ The singular graphē occurs more times in Romans than any other epistle. These facts indicate that Paul

²²Singular use: Rom. 4:3; 9:17; 10:11; 11:2; Gal. 3:8,22; 4:30; see the remainder of the text for the plural usages.

²³Rom. 15:4, as viewed by Michel, p. 356, is a "Schlüssel"; it has a wording similar to other passages in Paul (Rom. 4:24; 1 Cor. 9:10; 10:11). He says the Hebraic construction is already in the pro- of the verb. 16:26 has been discussed under prophētēs (cf. Michel, p. 392.). The fact that 1 Cor. 15:3 & 4 is a formula is seen already by Gottlob Schrenck, "graphō, etc," TDNT, I, 752.

²⁴Kathōs gegraptai: Rom. 1:17; 2:24; 3:10; 4:17; 8:36; 9:33; 11:26; 15:3,9,21; 1 Cor. 1:31; 2:9; 2 Cor. 8:15; 9:9; kathaper gegraptai: Rom. 3:4; 9:13; 10:15; 11:8.

²⁵Gegraptai gar: Rom. 12:19; 14:11; 1 Cor. 1:19; 3:19; Gal. 3:10; 4:22,27.

in the epistle to the Romans is very much concerned for the graphē or graphai; however, the phrase which is in Rom. 1:2 is unlike any other passages in Paul (except for those contained in other formulae) that refer to the Scriptures.

In sources outside of Paul, it is to be noted that hai hierai graphai is a "specifically Rabbinic mode of expression which is also found in Philo and Hellenistic Judaism but not in the OT. In the Rabbis the formula is שְׁתֵּי קִדְוֹת כְּתוּבִי." ²⁶ Philo's use of the phrase is especially noteworthy, for example en hierais graphais legetai (Rer. Div. Her. 159). ²⁷

In Rom. 1:2 the word hagios modifies graphai. The Septuagint always uses hagios instead of hieros for the Hebrew שְׁתֵּי קִדְוֹת, and thus "we may see a conscious attempt to avoid the usual term for heathen sanctuaries." ²⁸ Philo comes closest to the phrase in Romans when he refers to the nomos as hagios (Spec. Leg. III, 119). ²⁹ Josephus used hagios very little "no doubt because hagios 'must have sounded strange in Greek ears.'" ³⁰

²⁶Schrenck, I, 751.

²⁷Lietzmann, p. 23 refers to other passages in Philo; cf. Schrenck, I, 751.

²⁸Otto Procksch and Karl Georg Kuhn, "hagios, etc.," TDNT, I, 95.

²⁹Ibid., I, 96.

³⁰Ibid.

The lack of an article in prepositional phrases is usual.³¹ Thus, although one of the criteria for a formula is the infrequent use of definite articles, this fact is not decisive in this case; indeed, graphai occurs frequently without the article, even in Rom. 16:26.³²

In summary, the phrase en graphais hagiais, if it is Paul's usage, is unique; it is more likely a pre-Pauline formula in agreement with rabbinic and Hellenistic Judaism.

τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ

According to the Greek dictionary originally edited by Walter Bauer, ginesthai ek tinos means "to be born or begotten."³³ Leenhardt notes certain Latin manuscripts implying the same meaning.³⁴ 1 Esdr. 4:16 is an older

³¹F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated and revised from the German by Robert W. Funk (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), paragraph 255. Hereafter referred to as Bl-D.

³²Schrenck, I, 751, fn. 7.

³³Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated and adapted from the fourth and revised German edition by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, c.1957), p. 157. Hereafter referred to as BAG. In addition to the other passages to be discussed, there is cited Jos., Ant. 2,216.

³⁴Franz J. Leenhardt, The Epistle to the Romans, translated from the French 1st edition by Harold Knight (Cleveland: World Publishing Company, c.1961), p. 36: "Instead of genomenou we read in 5161.441 and the Latin MSS. gennōmenou (natus)." The Vulgate has qui factus est ei.

example of this usage. By way of evidence the prior verse mentions giving birth (egennēsan); "women" are the subject of both verses. In verse 16, the phrase which has ginesthai ek is fitted in the first part dealing with giving birth and is followed by a clause regarding the nursing of children.³⁵ In Tobit 8:6, the man and woman both appear to be the source of the children, as follows: "Thou madest Adam and gavest him Eve his wife as a helper and support. From them the race of mankind has sprung" (ek toutōn egenēthē to anthrōpōn sperma). Note that ginesthai ek is used in association with sperma.

Gal. 4:4 is the strongest analogy to Rom. 1:3 in the New Testament. W. Kramer, when dealing with Gal. 4:4, is inclined to call genomenon ek gunaikos a pre-Pauline expression and notes Rom. 1:3 as a parallel passage, but he concludes, "It is impossible to decide whether it was linked with the first line [exapesteilen ho theos ton huion autou] by Paul himself or before Paul."³⁶ Kramer

³⁵Verse 16 appears to have the analogy (on the basis of similar verb and preposition of ginesthai ek) of women giving birth as similar to vineyards giving wine, thereby indicating not so much the act of giving birth as the source.

³⁶Werner Kramer, Christ, Lord, Son of God, translated from the German by Brian Hardy (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1966), p. 113, including Fn. 386.

presents the possibility that ginesthai ek was applied to Jesus Christ in another pre-Pauline passage other than Rom. 1:3. A. Oepke presents the theology of ginesthai ek in Gal. 4:4f. adequately. He states that although ginesthai ek can designate the parentage of someone (Rom. 1:3), this understanding of ginesthai ek is not very probable with a pre-existent Son and would wreck the parallelism of the two genomenon participles. Also, he argues that the Jew was not "born" under the Law; rather, the Jew was put under the Law via circumcision and custom. In general, gignesthai with a preposition designates the beginning of the corresponding einai with a preposition. God executed the "sending" of His Son in such a way that the Son became one who was born of a woman and under the Law. ek gunaikos is nearly the same in meaning as gennētos gunaikos (Job 14:1; Matt. 11:11).³⁷ Thus, the emphasis is not only the moment of birth but on the state of being "born of a woman."

Outside of Gal. 4:4f., ginesthai ek is closely paralleled by the uses of ginomai in Phil. 2:7 and John 1:14. In Phil. 2:7 the one who was en morphē theou willingly en homoiōmati anthrōpōn genomenos. John 1:14 declares

³⁷ Albrecht Oepke, Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater (2nd improved edition; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1964), pp. 96-97.

ho logos sarx egeneto. Thus, genomenos "throws particular stress on the birth as the moment of the Redeemer's entry into the 'form of a servant.'"³⁸ In general, ginesthai ek has been noted in pre-Christian extracanonical literature in possibly pre-Pauline, at least highly formulaic, writings, and in the Gospel of John; it is used in the sense of "born," the beginning of a state of being.

Sperma is a metonymic expression for "line of descent," "posterity," or "progeny."³⁹ As Hahn has pointed out, it is used generally in the Old Testament as well as in Greek in this sense; the singular is collectively understood.⁴⁰ 2 Sam. 7:12-14, a promise to David, contains some of the key words in Rom. 1:1-7; sperma, huios, anastasis (form: anastēsō).⁴¹

Paul uses the word fifteen times, all occurrences in the sense of "line of descent." with the exception of two verses, 1 Cor. 15:38 and 2 Cor. 9:10. S. Schulz has summarized Paul's use well, as follows: In the remaining passages, Paul speaks of sperma exclusively in reference

³⁸Fuller, p. 210.

³⁹Hans Wilhelm Schmidt, Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962), p. 18.

⁴⁰Ferdinand Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), p. 253.

⁴¹Eduard Schweizer, "huios," TWNT, VIII, 367.

to the Israelite-Judaic tradition of the lineage of David, Abraham, and Isaac. Paul uses the term most frequently with reference to Abraham's posterity: seven times about Abraham (Rom. 4:13,16,18; 9:7; 11:1; 2 Cor. 11:22; Gal. 3:16), two times typologically applied to Christ (Gal. 3:16,19), and two times to the New Testament Church (Rom. 9:8; Gal. 3:29), not to the Old Testament people. Concerning David's descendants (Rom. 1:3) and Isaac's descendants (Rom. 9:7) Paul uses the term one time.⁴²

Another usage of sperma which seems to reflect Pauline thought in some sense is 2 Tim. 2:8, in which B. S. Easton says the author "has simply condensed Romans 1:1-4,"⁴³ or which, as Lock maintains, is a semi-quotation from an early creed.⁴⁴ It has been noted in the previous chapter the relationship to Romans 1. A. Seeberg held that 2 Tim. 2:8 and Rom. 1:3-4 have a common pre-Pauline

⁴²Siegfried Schulz and Gottfried Quell, "sperma, etc." TWNT, VII, 545-46.

⁴³Burton Scott Easton, The Pastoral Epistles (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949), p. 53, cited in Vernon H. Neufeld, The Earliest Christian Confessions (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1963), p. 128, fn. 6.

⁴⁴Walter Lock, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924), p. 95, cited by A. M. Hunter, Paul and his Predecessors (2nd edition; London: SCM Press Ltd, 1961), p. 27.

tradition behind them.⁴⁵ However, Hahn argues that in 2 Tim. 2:8 egēgermenon ek nekrōn and ek spermatos Daud are two individual phrases from different traditions, not a unified tradition. He bases his argument on the fact that the exaltation motif is not connected with the mention of the Resurrection, on the (Iēsous) Christos placed before the whole passage, and the lack of a verb with the phrase ek spermatos Daud. Although they come from different traditions, the phrases have lost their force by the time 2 Tim. 2:8 was written.⁴⁶ Thus, Seeberg's argument for a unified tradition is weakened; however, 2 Tim. 2:8 could still have borrowed from some other pre-Pauline formulae.

C. K. Barrett notes that Davidic descent is used nowhere else by Paul though Rom. 15:12 may be similar to it.⁴⁷ Paul refers to the "root of Jesse" (hē hriza tou Iessai), as he quotes Is. 11:10 (LXX). Apoc. 5:5 has hē hriza Daud, where as Hahn points out in connection with

⁴⁵ Alfred Seeberg, Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1903), pp. 75-76.

⁴⁶ Hahn, pp. 258-59.

⁴⁷ C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the Epistles to the Romans (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1957), p. 18.

the latter verse, the "root" is used to refer to the Messiah.⁴⁸ Rom. 15:12 shows that Davidic descent was not antithetic to Paul's thought; it must, however, be noted that the phrase is contained within a quotation, whose purpose is to underscore the validity of the mission to the Gentiles, not make a Christological assertion.

It is difficult to definitely date any of the references in the rest of the New Testament as surely pre-Pauline. Three verses in the Apocalypse (3:7; 5:5; 22:16) contain allusions to the descent of David, and, although late in origin may reflect the early Jerusalem tradition associating Davidic sonship with the eschatological, end-time work of Jesus.⁴⁹ Acts 13:23 states that apo tou spermatos (of David, cf. verse 22) "God has brought to Israel a Savior (sōtēr), Jesus, as he promised." Hahn rightly associates this passage with the later view that Son of David referred to Jesus' earthly acts as Deliverer of Israel,⁵⁰ especially since sōtēr is found almost exclusively in Luke-Acts (four times), the late writings of the Pastoral Epistles (ten times) and the

⁴⁸More and more in late Judaism, the Messiah is שֵׁרֵי דָוִד, "shoot of David." Hahn, pp. 248-49, fn. 5, which refers to S-B, II, 113, and other sources, including Qumran.

⁴⁹Ibid., pp. 248-50.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 278, fn. 2.

Second letter of Peter (five times), Jude, the Gospel of John, the First letter of John. The Gospels present the Davidic sonship in various forms that are difficult to date in relation to Paul. Nevertheless, certain traditions appear to apply Son of David to Jesus Christ at a pre-Pauline time, for example the genealogies (Matt. 1:1-17; Luke 3:23-28), Luke 1:68-75, and Luke 1:32ff. As Hahn points out, the Davidic sonship in these passages portrays the eschatological work of Jesus as well as the Davidic origin of Jesus.⁵¹ One parallel to Romans is Mark 12:35-37, where Davidic sonship is viewed as a preliminary stage to the exaltation to Lordship;⁵² this will be discussed in the next chapter. At any rate, there are fairly good grounds for basing Davidic sonship in the early Church.

The importance of this ascription lies in its connection with the Judaic hope for the Messiah. The earliest reference to Son of David in a technical sense is Ps. Sol. 17:21: "Behold, O Lord, and raise up (anastēson) for them their king, the son of David (huion Daudid), At the time in the which Thou seest, O God, that he may reign over Israel Thy servant" (Charles, p. 649). Grey dates the Psalms in general between Pompey's invasion of Palestine

⁵¹Ibid., pp. 242-51.

⁵²Ibid., pp. 267-68.

and his death (63 and 48 B.C. respectively).⁵³ Although F. Leenhardt can say that Son of David "had become a current expression among the contemporaries of Jesus,"⁵⁴ Hahn says Son of David was seldom used in pre-Christian times, only in the Psalms of Solomon for sure, and that only in post-Christian times does it become more frequent in Jewish tradition.⁵⁵ Yet Hahn maintains that the descent from David was one of the constant elements of the concept of Messiahship.⁵⁶

In summary, the natal descent from David is not characteristic of Paul; sperma is usually associated with Abraham. The linguistic usage of Rom. 1:3 is more at home in the Gospels and Acts in early Christian tradition, and is in line with the Judaic hope for a Davidic ruler or Messiah whom God would raise up in the end of time.

ΚΑΤὰ ΣΑΡΚΑ

Sarx is found more frequently in the writings of Paul than in the rest of the New Testament--ninety times, in comparison with seven times in the Synoptic Gospels (not

⁵³The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English, edited by R. H. Charles (London: Oxford University Press, 1913), II, 630.

⁵⁴Leenhardt, p. 36.

⁵⁵Hahn, p. 245, fn. 3. He cites "Dalman, Die Worte Jesu, pp. 260ff.; S-B, I 12f. 525; also Bousset and Gressmann pp. 226f.; Volz, Eschatologie, p. 174."

⁵⁶Hahn, p. 157.

counting parallels), eleven times in John, thirty-two times in the remaining parts. Thus, this might indicate a Pauline phrase in Rom. 1:3; however, Paul's predominant connotation is not present here. The phrase, kata sarka, occurs twenty times, twelve times in a derogatory or negative sense. In the epistle to the Romans, sixteen of the twenty-six references are in this latter sense. It should also be noted that the meaning of the phrase is further limited by its parallelism with kata pneuma hagiōsunēs.

E. Schweizer, in his extensive treatment of sarx in the Theologisches Wörterbuch, distinguishes seven nuances in Paul, as follows: (1) Body (as weak, transitory, 2 Cor. 12:7, etc.); (2) Earthly sphere (Rom. 1:3; 1 Cor. 1:26); (3) Sarx kai haima, pasa sarx, meaning man (Gal. 1:16); (4) Sarx as object of trust (Rom. 2:28); (5) Kata sarka with verb (2 Cor. 11:18), meaning to have sarx as the norm for one's life, and not a neutral sense as the above meanings; (6) Sarx as subject to sin (Rom. 8:3); (7) The overpowering sarx (Rom. 7:11).⁵⁷ Immediately the third meaning is

⁵⁷Eduard Schweizer, et al, "sarx, etc." TWNT, VII, 124-35; cf. Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, translated by Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951 & 1955), I, 233-46.

ruled out. In the last three meanings, it is implied that sarx is sinful. Since kata sarka in Rom. 1:3 applies to "His Son," identified as Jesus Christ (verse 4), and Paul states elsewhere, "God made him [Christ] to be sin who knew no sin" (2 Cor. 5:21), these meanings are excluded. The fourth meaning does not designate sarx as sinful but indicates that trusting or putting one's confidence in the flesh is evil (Rom. 2:28; Gal. 3:2-5; 6:12; Phil. 3:3).⁵⁸ This latter connotation is not appropriate for Jesus Christ in the writings of Paul.

If the more common dualism of sinful flesh versus spirit is not found in Rom. 1:3-4, what kind of a contrast of sarx-pneuma is present? If sarx as the body would be the correct meaning, by parallelism this would imply that sarx would be the "human nature" and the pneuma hagiōsunēs would be the spiritual part of Jesus or His "divine nature." The question of the kind of sarx-pneuma contrast cannot be in isolation from the context but will be more precisely determined in connection with the meaning of pneuma hagiōsunēs.

⁵⁸Eduard Schweizer, "Rom. 1,3f. und der Gegensatz von Fleisch und Geist vor und bei Paulus, Evangelische Theologie, XV (1955), 565; Schweizer, et al, VII, 129.

The second usage Schweizer finds in Paul requires further clarification and expansion. Sarx denoting the earthly sphere (in contrast to the heavenly sphere) is certainly found in some passages in Paul's writings. Schweizer notes that kata anthrōpon is parallel to sarkikoi in 1 Cor. 3:3.⁵⁹ 1 Cor. 1:26 points to the fact that the Christians at Corinth are not the "wise according to worldly standards" (sophoi kata sarka) but the "foolish in the world" (mōra tou kosmou) (verse 27), who receive "life in Christ Jesus, whom God made our wisdom . . ." (egenēthē sophia apo theou) (verse 30). In this passage, the wisdom (cf. verses 24, 30) of the earthly realm is contrasted with the divine or heavenly realm.

The picture is further clarified from pre-Christian use. Is. 31:3 contrasts the sphere of man and his world (the "horses") as "flesh" with the world of God described as "spirit."⁶⁰ In late Judaism, the distance between God and man was stated in spatial terms, the world "above" contrasted to the world "below." This idea is also seen in parts of the Old Testament, in God moving down to earth, and human beings going up (mountains, for example) to meet

⁵⁹Schweizer, et al, VII, 128.

⁶⁰Schweizer, "Rom. 1,3f." XV, 568.

with God, particularly Moses and the elders.⁶¹ This view of the "vertical" worlds "above" and "below" even blended at the time of the New Testament with the "horizontal," eschatological view of the world "present" and "coming" (Gal. 4:25-26 contrasts the "present Jerusalem" [nun Ierousalēm] with the "Jerusalem above" [anō Ierousalēm]).⁶² A further difference of the two worlds is that the world of men is seen as corporeal, while the world of God is incorporeal; the two present an antinomy not without some Hellenistic influence.⁶³ Thus, there is much documentation for the interpretation of flesh as the earthly sphere.⁶⁴

The most decisive passages in connection with Rom. 1:3 are those places elsewhere in the New Testament

⁶¹Ibid. Refers to Gen. 11:5,7; 18:21; Ex. 3:8; 19:11-20; 34:5; 24:9f.

⁶²Ibid.

⁶³Ibid. The author cites an example from the LXX where "God of the spirits of all flesh" is changed to "God of the spirits and of all flesh" (Num. 16:22; 27:16). Enoch 15:4,8f. contrasts the "spirits" (the holy watchers of heaven) to the "flesh" (the men). Hahn sees this evidence as weak, p. 256.

⁶⁴Eduard Schweizer, Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und seinen Nachfolgern (Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, c.1955), pp. 131-32 unearths several more passages, even from Ezekiel and rabbinic sources.

that employ the same scheme of earthly-heavenly or flesh-spirit spheres, in particular 1 Tim. 3:16. As Schweizer observes,

The two spheres are clearly presented in a local sense as the two halves of the cosmos, one above the other. It is true that this depends on the interpretation of the hymn. But it should be clear that the lines are joined together in an inverted order so that every time an event 'below' and an event 'above' appear together in pairs.⁶⁵

The . . . formula in I Tim. iii.16 is constructed in rigidly chiasmic pairs: a-b/b-a/a-b. Sarx, ethnē, kosmos correspond to pneuma, aggeloi, doxa It is taken for granted in all this that the nature of the Redeemer is "spiritual"--that is why the mustērion begins with the phanerōthenai en sarki. The same goes for the phraseology in I Pet. iii.18b. It would be easy to understand pneumati as an instrumental dative, but this is out of the question for sarki. Therefore the interpretation here, as in 1 Tim. iii.16, must be: in the corporal sphere, in the spiritual sphere.⁶⁶

This same scheme is followed in Rom. 1:3.

A final linguistic question that needs consideration is that of the translation of kata. C. K. Barrett suggests at first the possibility that the preposition could mean "according to" but he concludes kata means "in the sphere of," especially on the basis of a study of kata pneuma hagiōsunēs.⁶⁷ Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich view the use of

⁶⁵Eduard Schweizer, Lordship and Discipleship, translated from the German and revised by the author (London: SCM Press Ltd., c.1960), p. 65.

⁶⁶Eduard Schweizer, et al, "Spirit of God," translated from the German by A. E. Harvey, Bible Key Words (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, c.1960), III, 57.

⁶⁷Barrett, p. 18.

sarx in Rom. 1:3 as corresponding to Schweizer's first concept of sarx in Paul, and hence kata denotes "relationship to someth., with respect to, in relation to k. sarka w. respect to the flesh, physically of human descent."⁶⁸ Schweizer notes that it cannot be an "instrumental" usage, "by virtue of," for this would be an impossible meaning with kata sarka. One can only interpret it "in the sphere of the flesh."⁶⁹ While this meaning for kata appears best, the meaning is most clearly viewed within the framework of the parallelism of the sarx-pneuma relationship and the full meaning of kata pneuma hagiōsunēs.

In conclusion, the apostle Paul more frequently uses sarx in a derogatory or negative sense, especially when he contrasts the life of man kata sarka and the life of the Christian kata pneuma. In Rom. 1:3 sarx and pneuma are contrasted in regard to Christ in a manner unique in Paul. The best explanation for the meaning of sarx in the passage is either that of the "human nature" of Christ, his body, or that of the earthly sphere in which he was a descendant of David; as noted previously, the meaning is more precisely defined in connection with pneuma hagiōsunēs.

⁶⁸ BAG, p. 408.

⁶⁹ Schweizer, "Rom. 1,3f.," XV, 569.

τοῦ ὀρισθέντες

Paul nowhere else uses horizō, but he does employ cognates. For instance, aphorizō occurs in verse 1, where Paul is "set apart" for the Gospel of God. In a similar use of aphorizō, Gal. 1:15, the action of the verb takes place prior to Paul's birth. The basic idea in these verses is the separation for a particular purpose, that of preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles (cf. Acts 13:2), just as the Old Testament prophets were chosen and called (Jer. 1:5; cf. Is. 49:1).⁷⁰

Paul uses proorizō more frequently (Rom. 8:29; 30; 1 Cor. 2:7; Eph. 1:5,11). In all but one case, the theme is the predestining of the believers for sonship. 1 Cor. 2:7 speaks of the "wisdom of God, which God decreed before the ages." Christ is called the wisdom of God in 1:24; however, here, in accord with the previous context of 2:7, it is more the total content of Paul's preaching, "Jesus Christ and him crucified" (2:2), or, as Hering submits, "Christ's struggle with the opposing powers of the spiritual world."⁷¹ The sophia is a predestined event

⁷⁰Oepke, p. 32; Lietzmann, p. 23; H. Schmidt, p. 17.

⁷¹Jean Hering, The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians, translated from the 2nd French edition by A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock (London: Epworth Press, 1962), p. 18.

or activity which was not revealed until Jesus Christ's crucifixion and resurrection, by which the archontes tou aiōnos toutou, the opposing powers, are brought to an end or made powerless (katargeō, verse 6).⁷² Thus, of all the use of cognates of horizō, there are no helpful connections to Rom. 1:3, the only possible exception being the latter verse considered; even in 1 Cor. 2:7, the emphasis is on the speaking of wisdom (verse 6) rather than upon a Christological declaration.

Elsewhere in the New Testament the word horizō occurs six times in Luke - Acts (Luke 22:22; Acts 2:23; 10:42; 11:29; 17:26,31) and once in Heb. 4:7. According to Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich, horizō, with relation to persons, means to "appoint, designate, declare," [although all three examples cited are translated "appoint"], while with the double accusative it means to "declare someone to be someth." (Rom. 1:4).⁷³ In the passages mentioned above, God is the subject of horizō in every case except Acts 11:29, where the disciples at Antioch decided to send relief to the saints in Jerusalem. The objects of the verb are Christological events (Luke 22:22; Acts 2:23), "allotted periods and the boundaries" (Acts 17:26), and

⁷² Ibid., pp. 16-17.

⁷³ BAG, p. 584.

the day of hearing the good news (Heb. 4:7). The only times horizō occurs in the New Testament with personal objects, Jesus as "judge of the living and the dead" (Acts 10:42) and Jesus as judge of the world on the "day" fixed (Acts 17:31) is the object in both cases; the resurrection of Jesus serves as "assurance."⁷⁴ R. Fuller proposes Acts 3:20 as a parallel usage, where the people are urged to repent

. . . that he may send the Christ appointed (ΠΡΟΚΕΧΕΛΡΙΟΜΕΝΟΥ) for you, Jesus, [verse 21] whom heaven must receive until the time for establishing all that God spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets from of old.

Significantly, all the passages in Acts listed above except 11:29, are found in formal speeches or sermons; of these, 2:23 and 10:42 are most certainly an expression of the early Church.⁷⁶

It is also to be noted that both in Hellenism and in the LXX the primary meaning of horizō is "to establish the borders," for example, the land of Israel,⁷⁷ or

⁷⁴Ignatius, Ephesians 3:2, cited by BAG, p. 584, Lietzmann, p. 24.

⁷⁵Fuller, p. 166.

⁷⁶Schweizer, "Zu den Reden," XIII, 2, 4.

⁷⁷Num. 34:6; Joshua 13:27; 15:12; 18:20.

"to set times and seasons."⁷⁸ Action is implied with this verb, not a mere declaration that certain things are true.

The fact that tou horisthentos is parallel to tou genomenou would also be a hint at the meaning. Genomenou is intended as the beginning of a phase of the Son's life, as we have seen.⁷⁹ Thus as Leenhardt suggests, "we see in horisthentos the second phase of the career of the Son, and not an allusion to the divine predestination of which He is said to be the object (Vulg. praedestinatus)."⁸⁰ Michel asserts that it is a step forward from genomenou and can only mean exaltation, the installation in Sonship.⁸¹ This latter statement can only be fully appreciated when the concept of huios theou is discussed.

There have been other suggestions for the meaning of horisthentos, all of them dependent on the understanding of huiou theou. If pre-existence is understood, then

⁷⁸K. L. Schmidt, "horizō, etc.," TWNT, V, 453.

⁷⁹Supra, p. 38.

⁸⁰Leenhardt, p. 36.

⁸¹Michel, p. 40.

"declared," "manifested," "proved to be,"⁸² "showed,"⁸³ is best. If an exalted kingly figure is understood, then "appointed," "installed," "established" or "constituted" is best.⁸⁴ There is a certain amount of ambiguity in the above distinctions, for some scholars have maintained both preexistence and yet have held to the view that the Son is appointed or installed at the Resurrection. One way to do this is to employ the parallel of Phil. 2:6-11, in which Christ is exalted to Lord. The exaltation "consists in an appointment to a new dignity which results in the granting of a new name."⁸⁵ It is the establishing of Christ in a new function, without denying what He already is from eternity.⁸⁶ Kramer

⁸²William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906), pp. 7-8; Seeberg, pp. 61-63.

⁸³H. A. W. Meyer, Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über den Römerbrief (4th edition: Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1865), p. 50.

⁸⁴Hunter, p. 26; Alexander Brown, "Declared or Constituted Son of God," The Expository Times, V (1893-1894), 308-9; Barrett, p. 19; C. H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (New York: Harper, 1932), p. 4; K. L. Schmidt, p. 454; Kramer, p. 109; M.-E. Boismard, "Constitué fils de dieu (Rom., I,4)," Revue Biblique, LX (1953), 5-17.

⁸⁵Schweizer, Lordship, p. 63.

⁸⁶K. L. Schmidt, V, 484.

examines the same evidence and concludes that Phil. 2:6-11 contains an adoption similar to Rom. 1-4.⁸⁷ A final view to be considered is that of R. Fuller's proposal that horizō means "predestined to be eschatological judge at the parousia;" he attempts to demonstrate this meaning by the Acts passages previously studied and by eliminating what he considers an exaltation phrase, en dunamei.⁸⁸

With these three possible views of horizō, "declare," "install" and "predestine," there are also three, at the minimum, views of huios theou; hence, the meaning of horizō is much dependent on the context. It is also upon an understanding of the context that the time of the verb action can be determined, whether the action took place from eternity, at Jesus' incarnation, baptism, or resurrection, or will take place at the end-time.

Thus, tou horisthentos or its cognates are not used by Paul in a Christological context except possibly one passage. The verb is used by the early Church for the appointment of Jesus to an office, indeed appointment of Jesus Christ to be the judge, at the end-time. The use in Rom. 1:4 indicates, by parallelism with verse 3, a new phase of sonship. More definite conclusions concerning its meaning cannot be stated until huios theou is investigated.

⁸⁷Kramer, p. 123.

⁸⁸Fuller, pp. 166-67.

υἱοῦ Θεοῦ

One of the most crucial phrases in the text under discussion is huiou theou. Werner Kramer, in his analysis of the pre-Pauline and Pauline uses of Christ, Lord, and Son of God, lists six occurrences of huios theou or an equivalent found in pre-Pauline formulas cited by Paul.⁸⁹ Otherwise, there are eleven passages with a Pauline formulation containing Son of God.⁹⁰ "In comparison with the passages in which the titles Christ Jesus or Lord occur, this is an infinitesimally small figure."⁹¹ Twice Paul uses a form of huios theou almost identical to that in Rom. 1:4 (2 Cor. 1:19; Eph. 4:13), once an absolute form (ho huios - 1 Cor. 15:28), and the rest of the passages speak of "His Son" (tou huiou autou). The variety of the contexts and the difference in words associated with huios is striking. In Rom. 1:3,9 the gospel of God is described as centered in "His Son." Other word associations are "the death of His Son" (Rom. 5:10), "the image of His Son" (8:29), "fellowship of His Son" (1 Cor. 1:9), the subjection

⁸⁹Kramer, p. 183, fn. 672, cites Rom. 1:4; 8:3,32; Gal. 2:20; 4:4f.; 1 Thess. 1:10.

⁹⁰Rom. 1:3,9; 5:10; 8:29; 1 Cor. 1:9; 15:28; 2 Cor. 1:19; Gal. 1:16; 4:6; Eph. 4:13; Col. 1:13. Kramer, p. 183, does not count the last two references, since they occur in letters not "generally agreed to be Pauline," p.13.

⁹¹Kramer, p. 183.

of the Son (15:28), the preached Son of God (2 Cor. 1:19), the revealed Son (Gal. 1:16), the God-sent Spirit of His Son (4:6), "the knowledge of His Son (Eth. 4:13), and "the kingdom of his beloved Son" (Col. 1:13). Otto Kuss has discerned that the concepts "Father" and "Son" are not used absolutely and next to one another (as Mark 13:32; Matt. 11:27; 28:19); rather Paul speaks of "God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. 1:3).⁹² It should also be noted that when Paul speaks of "His Son," "His" refers to God.⁹³ To summarize Paul's general use of Son of God,

he is simply referring in a general sense to him who brought salvation. Only in one respect does the term Son of God have distinctive significance in Paul's view, for it expresses literally, in a way that the other christological titles cannot do, the very close relationship between the bearer of salvation and God himself.⁹⁴

W. Kramer⁹⁵ and E. Schweizer⁹⁶ have done considerable study of pre-Pauline formulae, in particular of these

⁹²Otto Kuss, Der Römerbrief übersetzt und erklärt (2nd unchanged edition; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1963), Erste Lieferung, p. 13. Gal. 4:6 contains both Father and Son references, but the context pictures the "sons" acclaiming the "Father" and is not an absolute use of the two titles together.

⁹³Kramer, p. 183.

⁹⁴Ibid., p. 189.

⁹⁵Ibid., pp. 112-15.

⁹⁶Schweizer, "huios," VIII, 376-78; Eduard Schweizer, "Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der 'Sendungsformel'

instances, the "sending" formulae. According to Schweizer, there are four characteristics in these formulae: (1) God is always the subject, never the Father; (2) the meaning of salvation is always expressed in a hina-clause; (3) probably the formula speaks concerning "his," not "the" Son; (4) the word for "sending" alternates between (ex)apostellō, pempō, and didōmi.⁹⁷ The formula is plainly present in Gal. 4:4f.; the rest of the formulae are less in conformity with this pattern. Kramer suggests that Rom. 8:3 is "simply a fragment of the original pempēin formula."⁹⁸ Another pattern discerned by this scholar is the para-didonai formula, the "giving up" of the Son (Gal. 2:20; Rom. 8:32).⁹⁹ He thinks that the title Son in 1 Thess. 1:9b-10 "came to be associated with it (the parousia) as a result of processes of combination or merging which can no longer be demonstrated in detail,"¹⁰⁰ particularly since the parousia is not usually associated with the Son of God.¹⁰¹

Gal. 4,4 f., Ro. 8,3f., John 3:16f., I Joh. 4:9," Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, LVII (March-April, 1966), 199-210.

⁹⁷Schweizer, "huios," VIII, 376.

⁹⁸Kramer, p. 115.

⁹⁹Ibid., pp. 115-18.

¹⁰⁰Ibid., p. 126.

¹⁰¹Ibid., pp. 123-26.

While F. Hahn treats the passage as a picture of the Son of God at the end-time parousia,¹⁰² R. Fuller notes the "tendency in some places to substitute 'Son' for Son of man. This is evident at Mark 13:32, and more noticeably in part of the tradition underlying the fourth gospel;" thus, 1 Thess. 1:10 is a terminological shift.¹⁰³ The question as to whether preexistence is implied within the above formulae will be discussed in following chapters.¹⁰⁴

The examination of Paul has produced no useful parallels for "Son of God" in Rom. 1:4. Some scholars have suggested a source for the Son of God Christology in Jesus' use of Abba.¹⁰⁵ While Jesus scarcely used the expression Son of God, nevertheless, argue Schweizer and Higgins, by using Abba he stands in a particular relation to the Father, a relation not more closely defined;¹⁰⁶ he

¹⁰²Hahn, pp. 289-90, 292.

¹⁰³Fuller, p. 165; John 3:35f.; 5:19-23, 25f. mentioned on Fuller, p. 179, fn. 79; Schweizer, "huios," VIII, 372.

¹⁰⁴Infra, pp. 107, 127-29.

¹⁰⁵Schweizer, "huios," VIII, 367; he cites, among others, Joachim Jeremias, "Vatername Gottes," RGG³ [Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart (Dritte Aufl.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), c.1962)], VI, 1234f.

¹⁰⁶Schweizer, "huios," VIII, 367.

has a "unique filial consciousness."¹⁰⁷ Thus, one may argue for the origin of Son of God Christology from Jesus' use of Abba; on the other hand, there is no necessary connection between the two concepts. They do appear in the same context in Matt. 11:27, Luke 10:22, parallels (if patēr equals Abba¹⁰⁸), and Mark 13:32. C. E. B. Cranfield argues the strong likelihood that Mark 13:32 is an authentic Jesus logion, since "An assertion of Jesus' ignorance is unlikely to have been created by the Church."¹⁰⁹ Schweizer however connects these passages with Son of Man (Son is a shortening of the title), and thus finds it improbable that Jesus used ho huios in the absolute form.¹¹⁰ At the least it may be stated that Jesus' use of Son, since it is so limited,¹¹¹ did not

¹⁰⁷A. J. B. Higgins, Jesus and the Son of Man (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, c.1964), p. 152.

¹⁰⁸Gerhard Kittel, "abba," TDNT, I, 6.

¹⁰⁹C. E. B. Cranfield, The Gospel According to Saint Mark (Supplemented edition; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), p. 410.

¹¹⁰Schweizer, "huios," VIII, 367, 373-74.

¹¹¹It is clear only in Mark 14:62, although here the answer of Jesus is in regard to the Messianic Son of God, not the ontological Son of God. Parallels in Matt. 26:64 and Luke 22:70 either say that "You have said it" (su eipas) or tells the group that they would not believe it even if he would tell them, in effect not answering the question. $\theta \phi$ 13 pc geo arm Origen attest su eipas hoti egō eimi. Cranfield, p. 444, notes that if this reading is accepted, the answer, though it is affirmed, is "more guarded: 'it registers a difference of interpretation . . . as if to

influence the much greater usage of the title in the early Church as much as his teachings and life influenced the early Church's use.¹¹²

Another possible source for the pre-Pauline use of Son of God is the account of the baptism of Jesus (Mark 1:11, parallels), where the voice from heaven said, "su ei ho huios mou ho agapētos, en soi eudokēsa."¹¹³ The opening of heaven, the coming of the Spirit, and the sound of the voice from heaven are eschatological events, so that the huios is more the king of the end-time than the pais of Isaiah 42 and 44.¹¹⁴ Another view, not too dissimilar, is that Exodus typology is present; Jesus represents the

indicate that the Speaker has His own ideas about Messiahship' (Taylor)." In Mark the only beings who call Jesus "Son of God" are the devils (3:11; 5:7), and the centurion (15:39), but the disciples do not say this; Peter does confess that Jesus is the Christ (8:29).

¹¹²Cf. Schweizer, "huios," VIII, 367; Higgins, pp. 17-18.

¹¹³The citation appears to be, in the first line, from Ps. 2:7 with a different word order; Is. 42:1 has pais mou, and ho eklektos mou, prosedexato auton hē psuche mou. Is. 44:2 has pais, ho agapēmenos. Jer. 31:20 (LXX: 38:20) has huios agapētos Ephraim emoi, paidion entruphōn . . . Schweizer, "huios," VIII, 369, notes the use of a Targum to Ps. 2:7 (agapētos), but also says to cf. TgJs [Jerusalem?] 42:1.

¹¹⁴Schweizer, "huios," VIII, 369, gives much evidence for these from the LXX; he says the nearest parallels are Test. Levi 18:6f.; Jud. 24:2.

people of God as he is baptized.¹¹⁵ The kingly Messianic view is supported by the fact that eudokein en is not in the passage ordinarily associated with Jesus' baptism, namely, Is. 42:1, but the phrase is in the song of David (2 Kings 22:20 LXX).¹¹⁶ The opening words of the phōnē, which are a nearly exact quote of Ps. 2:7, require further study in connection with other Old Testament references.

In the Transfiguration account of Mark 9:2-8, a voice out of the cloud said, houtos estin ho huios mou ho agapētos, akouete autou. Schweizer notes the apocalyptic imagery in the story and "conjectures" that the picture of the king of the end-time is at the root of this usage of Son.¹¹⁷ Hahn however says the Transfiguration account may have very old origins but has been altered by the Hellenistic Son of God picture.¹¹⁸ Fuller sees a combination of Ps. 2:7; Is. 42:1; and Deut. 18:15 at the base; thus the eschatological prophet is the basic Christology.¹¹⁹ Though there may be elements of other images, the kingly Messiah-Son seems to fit the total picture best.

¹¹⁵Andre Feuillet, "Le Baptême de Jésus d'après l'évangile selon saint Marc (1,9-11)," The Catholic Bible Quarterly, XXI (1959), 468-90, cited by Schweizer, "huios," 369.

¹¹⁶Schweizer, "huios," VIII, 370.

¹¹⁷Ibid., VIII, 371; cf. Bultmann, I, 50.

¹¹⁸Hahn, pp. 334-40 in an excursus; a summary, p. 319.

¹¹⁹Fuller, pp. 171-72.

These are the more important occurrences of huios in the Gospels for understanding the meaning of the pre-Pauline formula.¹²⁰ The discussion shifts to the most significant parallel to Rom. 1:4, the exact quote of Ps. 2:7 (LXX) in Acts 13:33. In this passage, the Sonship of Jesus begins with his resurrection, identified as the sēmeron of Ps. 2:7. Since this use of the Psalm involved the application of a particular proof passage, it "perhaps" is pre-Lukan.¹²¹

The frequency with which the Old Testament occurs in relation to the huios passages is striking; therefore, an investigation of the use of huios in the Old Testament and Judaism may shed light on Rom. 1:3,4. Although huios was applied in several ways, only those meanings which are possibly relevant to the Romans passage will be studied.

¹²⁰Schweizer, "huios," VIII, 378-79, points to more passages of pre-Pauline nature, e.g. Luke 1:32 & 35; Mark 5:7; 1:24; Matt. 4:3, which is either from Mark 1:11 or the Hellenistic theios anēr; Matt. 27:43 is the suffering righteous man from Wisdom 2:18; Ps. 22:9.

¹²¹Schweizer, "huios," VIII, 368. In favor of its early date, U. Wilckens, Die Missionsreden der Ag (1961), 177f.; against the early date, Schweizer notes M. Rese, At.liche Motive in der Christologie des Lk (Diss Bonn [1965]), 131f. as saying it may be typically Luke style. Schweizer, "Zu den Reden," XIII, 7, states that early tradition may perhaps be in the choice of Scripture passages, in the scheme of Scripture proofs; in the Christological kerygma, it is particularly found; otherwise, Luke's editorial and composing work predominates.

The king is called Son of God three times in the Old Testament (2 Sam. 7:14; Ps. 2:7; 89:27f.).¹²² In all of these references there is no hint of any physical divine sonship as in the Oriental sacral kingships.¹²³

2 Sam. 7:12-16 emphasizes the divine legitimation of the Davidic dynasty and guarantees its lasting existence.¹²⁴ For this purpose, verse 14 is appropriate: "I will be his Father, and he shall be my son." Note that this verse refers to the descent of David.

Ps. 89:4-5, 20-38 is a poetic paraphrase of the divine legitimation of the Davidic dynasty in 2 Samuel 7. Verses 27-28 are especially significant for the descendants, for David the prōtotokon¹²⁵ is the beginning of a line that lasts forever (verses 28,35). However, the psalm does not refer to a physical divine sonship; rather, the context is concerned with David, the (human) servant (verse 21), the reiteration of the legitimation of 2 Samuel 7, and the request for help for the legitimate king.¹²⁶

¹²²Cf. the ruined text of Ps. 110:3. Schweizer, "huios," VIII, 349. Cf. Samuel Terrien, The Psalms and Their Meaning for Today (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., c.1952), pp. 82-83.

¹²³Schweizer, "huios," VIII, 349.

¹²⁴Ibid., VIII, 350.

¹²⁵Cf. Col. 1:15 prōtotokos pasēs ktiseōs; 1:18 prōtotokos ek tōn nekrōn.

¹²⁶Schweizer, "huios," VIII, 350-51.

Some of the elements from the crowning ritual are present in Ps. 2:7: the giving of the king's first request (verse 8) and the legitimation of the new king as Yahweh's son. Although generally scholars view Ps. 2:7 as the adoption of the king by Yahweh, yet the key passage of 2 Sam. 7:14 portrays the adoption not of any child but the one legitimately next in line from the king. The child is adopted in the same sense as the slave woman's child is recognized as substituting for the married wife's childlessness.¹²⁷ According to Fuller, this type of "royal mythology" is the Assyrian rather than the Egyptian form; the Assyrian form did not mean the king was a divine being as was the case with the Egyptian form but rather meant the adoption as the son of God. Thus, the form "was more easily assimilated to the emphasis on the covenantal election of the king as the representative of Yahweh's kingly rule on earth"¹²⁸

Much more frequently in the Old Testament, huios refers to Yahweh's people, Israel or the Israelites. While the

¹²⁷Ibid., VIII, 351.

¹²⁸Fuller, p. 31; cf. Klaus Wegenast, Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen (Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962), p. 73, who says that Son of God was not used as a title but as a poetic address (metaphor).

king had the Davidic Covenant with God, the people had the Sinaitic covenant with God stemming from the events of the Exodus and Sinai. There is a close relationship between the two covenants; indeed the people's sonship formed the pattern for the Davidic sonship.¹²⁹

There is no conclusive proof that the title Son of God was used of the Messiah in late Judaism of pre-Christian times.¹³⁰ There are several passages which speak of the Son of God, but they are held to be doubtful textually or not Messianic.¹³¹ Reginald Fuller and others see in the Qumran texts evidence that "'son of God' was indeed used as a Messianic title in pre-Christian Judaism," particularly on the basis of 4Q Flor. I. 10-14 employing a shortened form of 2 Sam. 7:10b-14;¹³² it shows that Ps. 2:7 was not the only Old Testament passage used in connection with the kingly Messianic hope in Judaism.¹³³ However,

¹²⁹Schweizer, "huios," VIII, 352-53.

¹³⁰Schweizer, "huios," VIII, 361; Fuller, p. 32, disagrees and says the title "was just coming into use," and cites Evald Lovestam, Son and Savior (Lund: C. Gleerup, 1961), p. 12.

¹³¹Schweizer, "huios," VIII, 361-62. He discusses in detail Eth. En. 105:2 where "my Son" is an addition; 4 Ezr. 7:28; 13:32, 37, 52; 14:9 has Latin filius meus, but undoubtedly there is an underlying pais (Heb. בֶּן) instead of huios.

¹³²Fuller, p. 32; Hahn, p. 285.

¹³³Hahn, pp. 285-86.

Schweizer, after a detailed study of the text and some others of Qumran, concludes that the title Son of God is not in any of the manuscripts once and cannot be convincingly conjectured in breaks of the texts. However, Psalm 2 and 2 Samuel 7 were used in midrash, but the interpretations never use the title Son of God. Thus, there is no known use of Son of God outside of Old Testament quotations.¹³⁴

In rabbinic Judaism the early usage of Son of God is only in connection with Ps. 2:7 and Messianic contexts, and outside of those texts the title is never found. There are also a series of polemical expressions of the rabbis, in which the assertion of the oneness of God is joined to the rejection of the idea that God could have a Son--clearly in opposition to the Christian usage of the title.¹³⁵ The expressions with Psalm 2, in some cases, may be dated at least as early as the second century A.D. and still express some form of polemic.¹³⁶

Thus, Son of God is not employed in late Judaism in any technical sense such as Rom. 1:4 seems to suggest, although use is made of certain Old Testament passages

¹³⁴Schweizer, "huios," VIII, 362-63.

¹³⁵Ibid., VIII, 363; S-B, III, 20.

¹³⁶Hahn, p. 285.

suggesting a kingly Son of God. The best clue to Rom. 1:4 appears to be the early Church's expressions, especially Acts 13:33 and its use of Ps. 2:7; Acts 13:33 pictures the sonship of Jesus as beginning with the resurrection and fulfilling the Davidic role of kingship. The Baptism and Transfiguration accounts support this interpretation of Son of God by setting huios into a context of powerful eschatological imagery. Abba as used by Jesus would seem not to be the primary source of the title; rather, Son of God has its roots in the Old Testament and Judaism. The huios in Rom. 1:3a is like many of the other occurrences in Paul; it has no particular image or context to which it is appropriate. However, it does indicate "the very close relationship between the bearer of salvation and God himself."¹³⁷ The full dimension of the theology of huios theou in Rom. 1:3-4 will be explored in the succeeding chapter.

Ἐν Δουράμει

The origin of this phrase is one of the most disputed points in Rom. 1:1-7 (check Appendix B). P. Stuhlmacher typifies the difficulty when he states that he is undecided

¹³⁷Kramer, p. 189.

concerning the whole matter, although he adds that en dunamei would fit Paul's astheneia-dunamis contrast (2 Cor. 13:4).¹³⁸ Thus, it is necessary to study carefully Paul's usage of dunamis.

Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich note several possible meanings for dunamis: (1) "power, might, strength, force;" for the phrase, en dunamei, "with power, powerful(ly)," Mark 9:1; Rom. 1:4; Col. 1:29; 2 Thess. 1:11; (2) "the outward expressions of power: deed of power, miracle, wonder."¹³⁹

Paul uses dunamis forty-five times, eight in the letter to the Romans. He uses it in the sense of the power of God (1:16,20; 9:17), of the Spirit's power (15:13,19), the powers (8:38), the power of signs (15:19), and in our passage (1:4) preceded by horisthentos huiou theou and followed by kata pneuma hagiōsunēs. Syntactically, there are no other phrases or words dependent upon it; rather, en dunamei apparently stands as the first of three modifying phrases of the participle and object of the verse.

In the other writings of Paul dunamis occurs in several variations and shades of meaning: the power of God, twelve

¹³⁸Peter Stuhlmacher, "Theologische Probleme des Römerbriefpräskripts," Evangelische Theologie, XXVII (July 1967), 382.

¹³⁹BAG, pp. 206-7.

times;¹⁴⁰ the power of Christ, three times;¹⁴¹ miracles, six times,¹⁴² the power of Satan (2 Thess. 2:9). En dunamei does not precede a genitive form four times.¹⁴³ Since ex anastaseōs nekrōn is in Rom. 1:4, it is important that 1 Cor. 6:14 links power (of God) with both Jesus' resurrection and the future resurrection of the Corinthians. As Grundmann says, "There is the closest possible connexion between the power which is given to Christ and the power of God."¹⁴⁴

Interesting is the occasional contrast of logos and dunamis, especially 1 Cor. 4:19-20.¹⁴⁵ 1 Thess. 1:5 indicates that Paul and his company were not among the Thessalonians en logō monon, alla kai en dunamei kai en pneumati hagiō kai plērophoria pollē. While Paul employed

¹⁴⁰1 Cor. 1:18; 2:4,5; 6:14; 2 Cor. 4:7; 6:7; 13:4 (2); 2 Thess. 1:7; Eph. 1:19; 3:7,20.

¹⁴¹1 Cor. 1:24; 5:4; 2 Cor. 12:9.

¹⁴²1 Cor. 12:10,28,29; 2 Cor. 12:12; Gal. 3:5; 2 Thess. 2:9.

¹⁴³Rom. 1:4; Col. 1:29; 1 Thess. 1:5; 2 Thess. 1:11. Cf. 2 Thess. 1:7 met' aggelōn dunameōs autou and 2:9 en pasē dunamei. En dunamei with the genitive occurs five times in Rom. 15:13,19 (2); 1 Cor. 2:5; 2 Cor. 1:6.

¹⁴⁴Walter Grundmann, "dunamai, etc.," TDNT, II, 306.

¹⁴⁵Also, 1 Cor. 1:18; 2:4-5; 2 Cor. 6:7; 1 Thess. 1:5. Sometimes logos and dunamis are not contrasted but correlate, 1 Cor. 1:18; 2 Cor. 6:7.

a form of verbal argument, the more important factor was the power accompanying his message, the divine reality of the Holy Spirit, which is in 1:5 parallel to dunamis. 1 Cor. 4:19-20 indicates a concern by Paul for the dunamis, not the logos, of the arrogant opponents in the Corinthian congregation. Was their dunamis the Holy Spirit or possibly Satan (2 Thess. 2:9)? Logos was used by many preachers of Paul's day. The kingdom of God, which was Paul's concern here, does not consist of logos but dunamis. This argument does not disapprove of logos, for Paul uses the ho logos . . . tou staurou (1 Cor. 1:18), but the distinctive sign of the Kingdom is the dunamis of the Holy Spirit (Rom. 15:13,19). Mark 9:1 is a parallel to 1 Cor. 4:20, for Jesus tells the group before him, "Truly, I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the kingdom of God come with power." Since the preceding verse (8:38) talks of the coming of the Son of man "in the glory of his Father with the holy angels," and the succeeding section is the account of the Transfiguration (Mark 9:2-8), it would seem that the connecting theme is that of the glory to come, and the phrase en dunamei heightens the meaning.¹⁴⁶ The passages might indicate that

¹⁴⁶ Cranfield, p. 285, calls this "an independent saying," and the phrase "kai elegen autois" an "editorial connecting-link." Pp. 285-88 are discussions of various interpretations; his final conclusion is that it is "a reference to the

Rom. 1:4 means the power of the Holy Spirit. Often cited in connection with Rom. 1:4 are those passages where the weakness of man and the power of God are contrasted. In discussing the nature of the resurrection body of believers, Paul says, "speiretai en astheneia, egeiretai en dunamei" (1 Cor. 15:43). Here dunamis is parallel to aphtharsia, doxē, and sōma pneumatikon. In connection with Paul's thorn in the flesh, the Lord told Paul, "My grace is sufficient in you, for my power is made perfect in weakness" (hē gar dunamis en astheneia teleitai, 2 Cor. 12:9). The most crucial passage in this connection is 2 Cor. 13:4. In reference to Christ, the verse reads, "for he was crucified in weakness, but lives by the power of God" (kai gar estaurōthē ex antheneias, alla zē ek dunameōs theou). On the basis of this contrast, some scholars see a weakness-power antithesis, humiliation-exaltation contrast, in Rom. 1:4.¹⁴⁷

Those passages that use en dunamei without a qualifying genitive present another possible frame of meaning for Rom. 1:4. The key verse, which has been discussed, is 1 Cor. 4:20: "For the kingdom of God does not consist in talk but in power (en dunamei)." Although the figure in

Transfiguration," a "foretaste of the Resurrection," "a foretaste of the Parousia."

¹⁴⁷Leenhardt, p. 37.

2 Thess. 2:9 is called ho anomos, the verse portrays his coming kat energeian tou satana en pasē dunamei kai sēmeiois kai terasin pseudos, and thereby indicates Satan as the reality behind dunamis. The final two verses for consideration, Col. 1:29 and 2 Thess. 1:11, pray that God might work "mightily" or "powerfully" (en dunamei) in the believers in order to do "every good resolve and work of faith." Thus en dunamei without a qualifying genitive does not present a single constant meaning.

The actual sense of the phrase en dunamei cannot be determined independent of its context; at this point, it may be stated that the phrase has definite Pauline usage and occurs in several Christological sayings.¹⁴⁸ A deeper study into the various shades of meaning that scholars have seen leads into the theology of the whole verse and will be reserved for the succeeding chapters.

Although the phrase is apparently common in Paul's writings, the possibility still exists that it may be pre-Pauline in origin. However, this is not demonstrable by the criteria established. The one passage that may be parallel to Rom. 1:4 and also be pre-Pauline according to

¹⁴⁸Cf. 1 Cor. 1:24; 5:4; 2 Cor. 12:9; 13:4 again. 5:4 has sun tē dunamei tou kuriou hēmōn Iēsou.

Schweizer¹⁴⁹ is Acts 10:38. In the context of Christological kerygma, it states, "how God anointed (echrisen) Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power" (pneumati hagiō kai dunamei). The anointing takes place after the baptism of John, but is mentioned prior to Jesus' earthly ministry of "doing good and healing" (euergetōn kai iōmenos). If this passage is pre-Pauline, then Acts 10:38 is an early assertion by the Church that the installation to sonship came around the time of Jesus' baptism.¹⁵⁰ Otherwise in the Synoptic Gospels, the dunameis or miracles are stressed more than in Paul.¹⁵¹ But Schweizer notes the difference between the functions of dunamis and pneuma in Lukan theology, as he says:

Although the miracles are of the greatest importance for Luke, they are never once ascribed to the Spirit. What brings salvation is the name of Jesus, faith in Jesus, Jesus himself, prayer, physical contact with the disciples, a shadow or a handkerchief--in other words, the power (dunamis) of Jesus. And although Luke is able to use power (dunamis) and Spirit . . . almost synonymously, in this case the distinction is clear However, the chief thing for which the Spirit is responsible is the preaching of the disciples.¹⁵²

¹⁴⁹Schweizer, "Zu den Reden," XIII, 4, 7; Schweizer, Erniedrigung, p. 105.

¹⁵⁰Hunter, p. 25; Barrett, p. 19.

¹⁵¹Paul uses dunamis 6 of 45 times in the sense of "miracles"; Matthew has 9 of 13 times, Mark 3 of 10 times, Luke-Acts 6 of 25 times.

¹⁵²Schweizer and others, "Spirit of God," III, 42-43.

Thus, the miracles result from dunamis of Jesus, while preaching comes from the pneuma. In Acts 10:38 God anoints Jesus with dunamis, which was used in his earthly ministry, not just after the Resurrection. If this is the background for Rom. 1:4 then, en dunamei would fit in with the above concepts, and support putting the whole verse as significant for Jesus' earthly ministry.

A linguistic question that needs consideration before deciding on the meaning of en dunamei is whether en is instrumental or a dative of manner. Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich opt for the latter in this verse.¹⁵³ However, some exegetes apparently have conceived of an instrumental usage.¹⁵⁴

T. Fahy translates it "by his miraculous power" and states that en with the dative to express means or manner is quite regular, especially after verbs of showing such as dēloō, to which class horizō belongs here. He also argues that the prepositional phrase en dunamei, if associated with huios theou, is contrary to the Greek idiom.¹⁵⁵ Fahy's argument assumes that ex anastaseōs nekrōn is the miracle

¹⁵³ BAG, p. 260.

¹⁵⁴ Leopold Sabourin, The Names and Titles of Jesus: Themes of Biblical Theology, translated by Maurice Carroll (New York: Macmillan Company, 1967), p. 250, translates it "by an act of power."

¹⁵⁵ Thomas Fahy, "Exegesis of Romans 8:29; 1:4," The Irish Theological Quarterly, XXIII (1956), 412.

by which Jesus was shown to be Son of God, and that the phrase concerning resurrection is syntactically linked with en dunamei. The argument also assumes that horis-
thentos means "to show" or something similar is one of several possible meanings.¹⁵⁶ His translation seems to be a paraphrase for "miracle", but it has been noted that this meaning occurs in the plural (exception: Mark 6:5); thus such an interpretation would be contrary to normal usage.

In summary, on linguistic grounds it is difficult to determine whether the phrase en dunamei is Pauline or pre-Pauline, although it does not appear to be contrary to his usage. As Hahn states, the difference, if it exists, must be sought according to criteria of content.¹⁵⁷

ΚΑΤὰ Πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης

There are a multitude of interpretations for this particular phrase, most of them based upon the idea of an individual pneuma rather than pneuma understood as a realm or sphere of activity.¹⁵⁸ J. A. Selbie says it is the "divine side of Christ";¹⁵⁹ W. Charlesworth views the phrase

¹⁵⁶Supra, p. 56.

¹⁵⁷Hahn, p. 254.

¹⁵⁸Kuss, pp. 6-7, lists several interpretations.

¹⁵⁹J. A. Selbie, "Romans I:4," The Expository times, V (1893-1894), 186.

as meaning not the Holy Spirit, but the spirit of Christ;¹⁶⁰ finally, A. Huddle interprets it as the Holy Spirit, for "there was a displacement of Christ's human spirit by the Holy Spirit."¹⁶¹

Pneuma hagiōsunēs is used nowhere else in Paul or in the whole New Testament. Pneuma occurs quite frequently in four epistles, namely, Romans, the first and second epistles to the Corinthians, Galatians, and elsewhere in Paul is used twenty-nine times. Hagiōsunēs, on the other hand, occurs but two other times, 2 Cor. 7:1 and 1 Thess. 3:13, both referring to holiness as a goal of believers.

Eduard Schweizer presents a good overview of Paul's use of pneuma when he states that

the Spirit (pneuma) is the ascended Christ, and that turning unto him is union with the realm of the Spirit. . . . But Paul was also influenced by early Christian eschatology. . . . For this, the important passage is 1 Cor. xv, where Paul's thought starts from the fact of the Resurrection The decisive event (of the Resurrection) thus had two moment: the raising up of Jesus, and the Parousia with the raising up of the faithful. Consequently the Spirit is to be understood, as in the early Church, as a sign of that which is still to come.¹⁶²

¹⁶⁰W. Charlesworth, "The Spirit of Holiness, Romans I:4," The Expository Times, V (1893-1894), 115.

¹⁶¹Alfred Huddle, "Romans I:4," The Expository Times, V (1893-1894), 116.

¹⁶²Schweizer, and others, "Spirit of God," III, 60-61, 64.

[His view] was also moulded by another factor: the event which, for Paul, was the ultimate scandal . . . the cross. The cross is recognized as the crisis, now past, which separates the new creation from the old. Paul is a Hellenist in so far as he understands the Spirit as the power which releases men from "this age" (I Cor. ii:6) and places them in the next.¹⁶³

In so far as Paul wants to emphasize the Spirit is entirely a gift of God, and not a potential of man himself, he conceives of it as power; but in so far as he wants to emphasize that it is the kind of power which summons to faith and not a substance which automatically makes a man divine, he conceives of the Spirit as the norm according to which the believer is called upon to live. This duality comes out most sharply in Gal. v. 25 Thus life in the Spirit has two sides. One, the negative side, is renouncing "the flesh," sarx; the other, the positive side, is laying oneself open to God and one's neighbour.¹⁶⁴

In Ga. v. 17, man is apparently regarded as the neutral battlefield between flesh and Spirit. . . . Therefore it is no accident that in Rom. viii:13 "by the Spirit," pneumati, which indicates the motive power of this new life, is contrasted with "according to the flesh," kata sarka, which expresses the standard. . . . Living "according to the Spirit," and being released from the flesh, means therefore just this: living in God's saving "sphere of action."¹⁶⁵

For that reason also, Paul can occasionally use God, Lord, and Spirit interchangeably, simply because their encounter with the believer always takes one and the same form. . . . The clearest instance of this is I Cor. xii. 4-6. . . .¹⁶⁶

¹⁶³Ibid., III, 67-68.

¹⁶⁴Ibid., III, 72.

¹⁶⁵Ibid., III, 75-76.

¹⁶⁶Ibid., III, 83.

Since there is not this same duality of sarx-pneuma in Rom. 1:3-4, the suggestion is near at hand that there is pre-Pauline tradition here.

The syntactical relationship of a noun followed by a noun denoting quality (termed "genitive of quality" by Schmidt¹⁶⁷) in the Hebrew language is the way to express an attribute of the first noun, especially with $\psi \cdot \tau \cdot \rho$, "holiness."¹⁶⁸ Thus, Fuller is justified in stating, "Pneuma hagiōsunēs is a prima facie Semitism ($\psi \cdot \tau \cdot \rho \cdot \tau \cdot \pi \cdot \iota \cdot \gamma$)."¹⁶⁹ Hagiōsunēs, "not found in pre-biblical Greek," occurs in the Septuagint only in Ps. 29:5; 95:6; 96:12; 144:5; 2 Macc. 3:12,¹⁷⁰ the last passage referring it to the temple, the rest denoting God. $\psi \cdot \tau \cdot \rho \cdot \tau \cdot \pi \cdot \iota \cdot \gamma$ occurs twice in Is. 63:10f. and once in Ps. 51:11 (50:13 LXX), translated by to pneuma to hagion.

"The pneuma hagiōsunēs is not a stronger form of pneuma hagion, but an exact rendering of the Hebrew . . . which signifies the creative principle of life" enabling people to be part of the kainē ktisis, and therefore "hagiōsunē is here identical with deity."¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁷Schmidt, p. 18; cf. B1-D, paragraph 165.

¹⁶⁸Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, edited and enlarged by E. Kautzsch, the second English edition by A. E. Cowley (London: Oxford University Press, 1910), p. 417, paragraph p.

¹⁶⁹Fuller, p. 180, fn. 84. However, he qualifies his statements by ruling out a Jewish origin.

¹⁷⁰Procksch and Kuhn, I, 114.

¹⁷¹Ibid., I, 114-15.

There is one other occurrence of pneuma hagiōsunēs in Testament of Levi 18:11. The saints of the end-time paradise are said to have the "spirit of holiness" on them. Fuller utilizes this verse to say that "a Hellenistic Jewish origin is not ruled out, whereas a Semitic origin is ruled out by the antithesis sarx/pneuma, implying a cosmological rather than an eschatological dualism."¹⁷² This particular view will be evaluated in the next chapter. At any rate, the phrase in question has a Judaic background of some kind.

Is this instead an individual sarx and pneuma in Rom. 1:4? E. Schweizer sets forth two reasons why such an interpretation is not the best one and the contrast of spheres is a better one: (1) sarx and pneuma are thought of not as occurring at the same time, but with pneuma temporally following after sarx; (2) most decisive of all, 1 Tim. 3:16 argues for an understanding of pneuma as heavenly sphere, since three times an event in the earthly sphere has been put together in chiastic arrangement with an event in the heavenly sphere; this view rules out pneuma hagiōsunēs as simply the Holy Spirit, but does not rule out in the sphere of the "heiligen Gottesgeistes."¹⁷³

¹⁷² Fuller, p. 180, fn. 84.

¹⁷³ Schweizer, "Röm. 1,3f," XIII, 569-70.

A parallel set of concepts, probably later in date but still related in some sense, are those found in the Gospel of John. Two worlds or spheres are, according to Schweizer, also found in these sources; in fact, sarx and pneuma are in contrast (3:6; 6:63). As alternate concepts for sarx appear katō, kosmos, diabolos; for pneuma, on the other hand, there is anō, theos.¹⁷⁴ In these writings, however, there is opposition between the two worlds, not merely a contrast by degree.

Thus the phrase kata pneuma hagiōsunēs is translated not as "according to the Holy Spirit" but "in the sphere of the Holy Spirit"¹⁷⁵ or "in the sphere of the heiligen Gottesgeistes."¹⁷⁶ Schweizer also renders the phrase "in the sphere of the Spirit" or the realm of divine or "celestial substance."¹⁷⁷ He interprets sarx and pneuma as the contrast of corporeality and incorporeality,¹⁷⁸ but Hahn asserts that Schweizer's evidence is not strong and is contradicted by the Jewish and Christian view of bodily

¹⁷⁴Ibid., VIII, 569. Other verses illustrating this are 1:13; 3:3; 8:23; 42-47; 15:19; 17:14, 16.

¹⁷⁵Barrett, p. 18.

¹⁷⁶Schweizer, "Röm. 1,3f.," XIII, 569.

¹⁷⁷Schweizer, et al, "Spirit of God," III, 57.

¹⁷⁸Schweizer, "Röm. 1,3f.," XIII, 568-69.

resurrection.¹⁷⁹ The contrast is between the realm characterized by weakness, transitoriness, and sinfulness and the realm of divine power, life, and salvation.¹⁸⁰ Applied to Rom. 1:4, this means that at some, as yet undefined, point in time, Jesus entered into this realm.

ἔξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν

This laconic phrase has stimulated almost as many opinions as there are scholars of Scripture. C. K. Barrett suggests these words were possibly added by Paul as a "true interpretation" of when the "appointment [to Son of God] took place."¹⁸¹ A. M. Hunter, on the basis of the Syrian Peshitta, sees a possible participle behind the anastaseōs, thus making the phrase independent of the preceding phrases and linked with "Jesus Christ, our Lord."¹⁸² Both of these scholars shed doubt on the generally accepted view that the phrase is part of the original formula and close to its original Aramaic form.

¹⁷⁹ Hahn, p. 256, fn. 2.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 256.

¹⁸¹ Barrett, pp. 19-20.

¹⁸² Supra, p. 23; Hunter, pp. 25-26; cf. T. W. Manson, "Romans," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, edited by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., c.1962), p. 941, although it must be understood that he views the first half of v. 4 as incarnation.

Anastasis occurs six times within the writings of Paul outside of Rom. 1:4 (Rom. 6:5; 1 Cor. 15:12,13,21,42; Phil. 3:10); all four passages in 1 Corinthians 15 use it with the phrase anastasis nekrōn.¹⁸³ Only Phil. 3:10 refers to Jesus' resurrection, while the rest point to the general resurrection of the dead (Rom. 6:5 indicates both the believers' and Jesus' resurrection). Ordinarily when Paul speaks of Jesus Christ's resurrection, the word egeirō in various forms is used (for example, 1 Cor. 15:4,12-16). If the phrase in Rom. 1:4 does not refer primarily to Jesus' resurrection, then 1:4 would conform to his limited usage of the word in his epistles, and be Paul's formulation.

The possibility still exists that Paul took over the formulation from the early Church, although, as with en dunamei, it is not demonstrable. Anastasis does not occur frequently in the Synoptic Gospels: Matthew--four; Mark--two, Luke--six. Luke 2:34 and 14:14 are the only two passages outside of the pericope concerning the questioning of Jesus by the Sadducees on the resurrection (Mark 12:18-27, parallels). The more frequent use in Luke is at least partly reflected in Acts (eleven occurrences); anastasis occurs six times in sermons or addresses, four of which are in speeches portrayed

¹⁸³Cf. 2 Tim. 2:18. Phil. 3:11 has a close parallel (tēn exanastasin tēn ek nekrōn).

after Paul's arrest in Jerusalem.¹⁸⁴ Most interesting and perhaps significant is the fact that at the end of his defense before Agrippa, Paul gives a testimony

saying nothing but what the prophets and Moses said would come to pass: that the Christ must suffer, and that, by being the first to rise from the dead [ei prōtos ex anastaseōs nekrōn], he would proclaim light both to people and to the Gentiles. Acts 26:22-23 .

This creed-like statement is an exact parallel to the phrase in Rom. 1:4; Jesus is the first to rise from the dead. This phrase may be part of a pre-Lukan tradition here and, at the minimum, is analogous to Rom. 1:4.

Judaism also had a hope for a resurrection from the dead, although there are not many references to it in the Old Testament (Is. 26:19 LXX and Dan. 12:2; anastasis in 2 Macc. 7:14; 12:43). The attitude toward the resurrection varies according to the type of literature (for example, apocalyptic) and the branch of Judaism (Sadducees and Samaritans rejected it).¹⁸⁵

Perhaps the key verse in the Old Testament for the interpretation of Rom. 1:4 is 2 Sam. 7:12-16; in verse 12,

¹⁸⁴The two speech, pre-arrest uses are 1:22 and 2:31; post-arrest use in speeches: 23:6; 24:15,21; 26:23. The non-speech uses: 4:2,33; 17:18,32; 23:8. The use of anastanai for Jesus: Acts 2:24,32; 3:33,34; 17:31; (3:26 for the paida).

¹⁸⁵Albrecht Oepke, "anistēmi, etc." TDNT, I, 371-72.

God promises David, "I will raise up your offspring after you" (anastēsō to sperma sou meta se). This sperma is equivalent to huios (verse 14), for whom God will be eis patera. Also, the sperma is not the huios from birth; he is huios only after the throne is restored. First God prepares the kingdom (basileia) of the sperma. The seed then builds God's temple, and finally God restores the seed's throne forever. Then it is finally that God makes him eis huios. Interestingly, "(ex) anistanai sperma is a Semitism for לָרִיץ אֶת הַיָּמִים, LXX Gn. 38:8, cf. Ju. 4:5,10 . . . , i.e., to raise up seed to a dead brother by Levirate marriage."¹⁸⁶ God implies that he will take the responsibility for the raising up of descendants after David has died, although this was not the case with the immediate successor of David.¹⁸⁷ Solomon presented his divine legitimation by Yahweh in the form of 1 Kings 3:4-15,¹⁸⁸ and in that sense was "raised up." In 2 Samuel 7, anastēsō is linked both with sperma and huios. This grouping of similar words would seem to suggest a similar basic motif behind Romans 1. Both sperma and huios in 2 Samuel 7 are used in relation to the Davidic kingship and hint at the same situation for Romans 1. This possibility will be explored further in the next chapter.

¹⁸⁶Ibid., I, 368.

¹⁸⁷Cf. Schweizer, "huios," VIII, 351.

¹⁸⁸Ibid., VIII, 350.

There are various explanations for the lack of definite articles in ex anastaseōs nekrōn. Hahn suggests that the same reason exists for dropping of the articles as in the Semitic phrase oneuma hagiōsunēs.¹⁸⁹ Lietzmann sees the articles lacking mainly for the sake of sound and brevity.¹⁹⁰ Another possibility noted previously is that the lack of an article could be due to its being part of the form of literature called a salutation.¹⁹¹ The genius of the Hebrew language in omitting the definite article in certain cases or the common usage of prepositional phrases without the article are other possible explanations.¹⁹² Finally, the reason may lie in the fact that it is a part of a formula.¹⁹³

A grammatical point much discussed is whether ex is temporal ("since," "after") or causal ("on the basis of") or some combination of the two ideas. The question has theological significance according to Leenhardt, who asks, "Is the resurrection of Christ the cause of His exaltation or

¹⁸⁹Hahn, p. 255.

¹⁹⁰Lietzmann, p. 24.

¹⁹¹Supra, p. 19.

¹⁹²Ibid.

¹⁹³Supra, p. 11.

does it merely disclose the latter?"¹⁹⁴ At this point, it is difficult to determine precisely the best meaning for ex in the phrase. S. H. Hooke notes that whenever Paul wants to speak of the resurrection of Jesus, he uses the phrase ek nekrōn; from this Hooke suggests that the reference is not to Jesus' resurrection but to the resurrection of the dead. Jesus' resurrection is the one that makes the resurrection of the dead possible.¹⁹⁵ While the statement about Paul's use of ek nekrōn is true, the verb egeirō, not anistēmi, is used with ek nekrōn. Also, in 1 Cor. 15:20-21 when both Jesus' resurrection and the anastasis nekrōn are mentioned, he is the aparchē tōn kekoimēmenōn, or as Acts 26:23 states, prōtos ex anastaseōs nekrōn, or Col. 1:18, archē, prōtotokos ek tōn nekrōn. In other words, anastasis nekrōn implies Jesus Christ is the first one to rise in the general resurrection of the dead; otherwise, rising from the dead will not take place until Christ's parousia (1 Cor. 15:23-24). The verses to which reference have just been made all indicate that the explanation of this phrase lies prior to ex anastaseōs nekrōn; by analogy to Acts 26:23, for example, a

¹⁹⁴Leenhardt, p. 37.

¹⁹⁵S. H. Hooke, "The Translation of Romans 1.4," New Testament Studies, IX (1962-63), 371; Kramer, p. 110, fn. 371, says, "Ex anastaseōs [sic] ek nekrōn would make it clearer that it is the resurrection of Jesus rather than the resurrection of the dead which is meant here, but the sense suggests taking it this way."

word should be supplied, and grammatically that word would seem to be huiou theou, the first noun which is not in a prepositional phrase and which precedes ex anastaseōs nekrōn. This discussion still does not answer the question whether ex is temporal or causal. The phrase by itself does not permit a definite statement at this point.

To sum up, ex anastaseōs nekrōn has no exact parallel in Paul, although anastasis nekrōn does occur four times in 1 Corinthians 15. However, it is found more frequently in Acts; in fact, there is an exact parallel to ex anastaseos nekrōn in Acts 26:23. The hope that God would raise up a Davidic son is seen in 2 Sam. 7:12-14; the hope for the resurrection of the dead came later in Judaism. The lack of definite articles and the terseness and seeming incompleteness of the phrase are characteristics of compressed formulation. Finally, the phrase cannot be determined as Pauline or pre-Pauline at this point; this is only possible in a comparison with the rest of the formula.

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν

It may seem unnecessary to examine whether this particular phrase is Pauline or pre-Pauline, for obviously various combinations of Jesus, Christ, and Lord are a part of much of Paul's writings; however, the possibility still exists that Paul was using a traditional way of naming the Being in whom his faith was centered. At least nine scholars have included this phrase in their version of the formula (Appendix B).

Paul uses this precise phrase four times (Rom. 1:4; 5:21; 7:25; 1 Cor. 1:9), whereas "our Lord Jesus Christ" is used twenty-eight times. Kramer points to a general rule of the Pauline corpus that there is a "pre-Pauline" usage where "Lord and Christ never stand immediately side by side." He does point out the exceptions in Rom. 5:21 and 7:25 (but not the other two references) and says these were added because "a fuller and more formal style was required at the close of such sentences." Another passage, Rom. 16:18, may be an "inexplicable exception," but Kramer notes that of the authorship of Romans 16 "has not been completely decided."¹⁹⁶ In general, his thesis that Christ and Lord do not stand next to one another holds up under examination. He infers that there seems to have been a sensitivity at an early date for the fact Christ was not a personal name but a title for Jesus.

Rom. 1:4, a passage he does not discuss in this context could also conceivably have had tou kuriou hēmōn added for the sake of fuller style at the end of the formula. This fact would mean the formula ended after Christou. Sanday and Headlam come close to suggesting an early usage in the phrase Iesou Christou; their commentary notes that when the epistles of Paul are listed in a "roughly chronological order" the

¹⁹⁶Kramer, p. 214, especially note 744.

early epistles (1 and 2 Thessalonians, Galatians) have "Jesus Christ" in the opening verse, whereas the later ones have "Christ Jesus."¹⁹⁷ Kramer, studying the problem in relation to Cullmann's view that the title Christ is not a proper name when it precedes Jesus,¹⁹⁸ concludes that Jesus Christ is Paul's way of speaking in the nominative case, but Christ Jesus is his form in the oblique cases. "The order Jesus Christ must be regarded as the normal one, for it corresponds to the Aramaic," but the reason Paul will place Christ before Jesus in the oblique cases is that "it shows immediately and unambiguously which particular case is intended." By Paul's time, it may be said "there can be no justification for saying that Christ has a special meaning when it precedes Jesus."¹⁹⁹ It may be concluded that at Paul's time "Jesus Christ" did not have the same connotations as earlier.

In summary, to call this phrase pre-Pauline on the basis of the criteria we have used is incorrect, since it does occur in Paul. However, this form of the combination

¹⁹⁷ Sanday and Headlam, pp. 3-4.

¹⁹⁸ Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, translated from the German 1st edition by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959), pp. 133-34.

¹⁹⁹ Kramer, pp. 205-6.

of titles, especially placing Christ and Lord next to one another, is quite unusual in Pauline writings. The fact that Jesus is placed before Christ, contrary to Paul's normal usage in oblique cases, raises the possibility that this is a pre-Pauline formulation. If "Jesus Christ" is pre-Pauline, "our Lord" might be added for the sake of a fuller style. This would be appropriate after the exceedingly long sentence preceding it containing verb, object, and three prepositional phrases.

This hypothesis must be tempered by the fact that this phrase seems to break abruptly into the wording and is not syntactically related to the words closely preceding. Another argument against "Jesus Christ" in Rom. 1:4 as pre-Pauline is most likely at least part of this name and title were used to introduce the formula,²⁰⁰ and hence "Jesus Christ" would be redundant if placed at the end of the original formula. On the other hand, appositional structure is also one of the characteristics of formulae. In this case, it might be argued that "Jesus Christ" is in apposition either to tou huiou autou or to the participles in the genitive case. Finally, the titles themselves occur so frequently in Pauline writings

²⁰⁰ Kramer, p. 108, including fn. 366, conjectures "Jesus" as the "grammatical subject" and argues versus Bultmann conjecturing "Son." Kramer feels Paul would not have added it, since he added in "Son" in 1:3a already.

that the only kind of argument possible is that based on the combination of the titles with the name Jesus. One final test for a pre-Pauline phrase will be applied in the next chapter, the test to see if it fits with the formula according to content.

Summary

In this chapter and the preceding one, an investigation of the words and phrases of Rom. 1:2-4 has been conducted on the basis of the criteria pertaining to style, linguistic usage and terminology.²⁰¹ Viewing verses 2-4 as a whole, it has been shown that stylistically there is reason to suspect a pre-Pauline formula. Some of the characteristic features may be listed as follows: the simplicity of style, especially with the lack of definite articles, the lack of conjunctions, the antithetic nature of verses 3-4, the rhythmical pattern, and the position of emphasis given to it by being part of a salutation and also denoted as a definition of the euaggelion theou.

Particular words and phrases within verses 2-4 present fairly strong arguments for a pre-Pauline nature. On the

²⁰¹The final criterion that a formula is generally Christological needs to be applied to Rom. 1:2-4; this task is reserved for the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV

THE CHRISTOLOGY AND ORIGIN OF THE PRE-PAULINE FORMULA

The Christology

The only criterion established for the content of formulae is that they "refer to elementary truths and events of salvation-history as norms,"¹ or to "basic christological assertions."² The formula isolated in Rom. 1:2-4 ought to correspond to this criterion. This particular chapter will attempt to determine the Christology of this formula and the possible origin of the formula, both in terms of locale and tradition.

One particularly striking feature of the formula and its setting within the salutation is that it is parallel in many ways to the pre-Pauline formula in 1 Corinthians 15.³

¹Ethelbert Stauffer, New Testament Theology, translated from the German by John Marsh (New York: Macmillan Company, c. 1955), p. 339.

²Reginald H. Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), p. 21.

³Ibid., p. 160-61; Werner Kramer, Christ, Lord, Son of God, translated from the German by Brian Hardy (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1966), p. 19-20; Joachim Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, translated from the 2nd German edition by Arnold Ehrhardt (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), pp. 129-30 puts the formula with the boundaries of vv. 3b-5.

Both of the formulae are presented as summaries of the euaggelion. Both sections indicate the source of the tradition. For 1 Corinthians it is the tradition handed on to Paul from the early Church, while for Romans it is apparently the prophets of the holy writings, who are, at least in part, the source of the expression of the euaggelion. Also, both formulae are introduced by what Schille calls a "Zitationspartikel (recitativum),"⁴ a transition word from the preceding text to the formula itself; 1 Cor. 15:3 is introduced by hoti, while Rom. 1:2-4 is introduced by ho. Then significantly and strangely, the content of the formulae themselves present almost a totally different expression of the euaggelion. 1 Cor. 15:3-5 speaks of Christ who died, was buried, was raised, and appeared to Cephas and to the twelve. Rom. 1:2-4 quotes a formula concerning His Son (1:3) promised through the prophets in the holy writings, born from the seed of David in the sphere of the flesh, and appointed Son of God (with power) in the sphere of the Holy Spirit, (the first one) from the resurrection of the dead.

Despite the difference in formulation, Paul still labels both of them euaggelion. The one significant thread that connects both of them together are the phrases concerning

⁴Gottfried Schille, Frühchristlichen Hymnen (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962), p. 16.

the graphai (kata tas graphas, 1 Cor. 15:3,4) and their being fulfilled in the person of Christ or the Son of God. Thus, it appears that in general the formula in Rom. 1:2-4 satisfies the criterion concerning salvation-history events or Christological assertions. The question now is, what kind of Christology is found in the formula under discussion.

In the second verse the subject of the verb proepēgeilato is the relative pronoun ho, which refers back to the gospel of God (Rom. 1:1); but the content of the gospel, namely, Jesus Christ, is more likely the content of the promise. Although he does not view Rom. 1:2-4 as a pre-Pauline formula, G. Friedrich nevertheless sums up the theology of this verse very well as he states,

For him [Paul] the OT belongs to the Gospel, for it bears witness to Christ. Hence the OT also serves to spread abroad the Gospel among the Gentiles and to bring them to faith (R. 16:25f.) [Rom. 1:5]. The Gospel is no new teaching. What is new is what is and will be effected through the message. If we were to sum up the content of the Gospel in a single word, it would be Jesus the Christ.⁵

As Stuhlmacher points out, the Old Testament is viewed in this verse as bounded and defined through the presence

⁵Gerhard Friedrich, "euaggelizomai, etc.," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, c.1964), 730-31.

of the Gospel.⁶ Thus, "Paul echoes the common conviction of the primitive Church that the saving acts of Christ were foretold by the prophets."⁷ This attitude toward the "holy writings" creates problems for the exegete. Stuhlmacher notes that while rabbinic Judaism explained the prophets as witnesses and exegetes of the Mosaic Law, verse 2 associates their witnesses expressly with the Gospel.

The Old Testament is for Paul [or the formula] a book which contradicts the Mosaic Laws in its deepest sense and bears witness concerning the gospel.⁸ But this gospel is not found in the Old Testament by tracing down particular Scriptural passages; the history of election of God's people shows the gospel.⁹ The early Church saw in the holy graphai the promises of God that were now fulfilled in Jesus Christ.¹⁰ So strong was this conviction in the early Church that E. Lichtenstein hazards the opinion, against Cullmann, that

⁶Peter Stuhlmacher, "Theologische Probleme des Römerbriefpräskripts," Evangelische Theologie, XXVII (1967), 374-89.

⁷C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1957), pp. 18-20.

⁸Stuhlmacher, XXVII, 378.

⁹Ibid., XXVII, 377-78, 384-85. He notes the current theological problem of coordinating the Old Testament to the word of the Gospel.

¹⁰Supra, pp. 27-29; A. M. Hunter, Paul and his Predecessors (2nd edition; London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961), p. 18; Barrett, p. 18.

formulae are to be found not as much where there are explicit sayings regarding the Lordship of Christ; rather, they are present where there is a connection (in contrast to Judaism) of Scripture and Spirit (pneumatic) witness, of divine plan of salvation and historical present, of the eschatological-now qualified through appearances of Christ.¹¹ Thus, Paul in this verse is using a formula that views the proclamation of ages past as fulfilled in the present through Christ.

The next part of the formula concerns the birth from the descent of David in the sphere of the flesh (verse 3b). Certain scholars raise a problem about this phrase; they question whether kata sarka and its parallel phrase, kata pneuma hagiōsunēs, in verse 4 actually are a part of the original formula. However, Hahn is able to interpret the phrase as part of its basic theology. He asserts that the kata sarka means that the descent from David's line interprets only the time of the earthly life of Jesus. This does not mean that the Davidic descent is merely the prerequisite and pledge for His future Messianic function.¹² Davidic sonship and divine sonship are ascribed to wholly differing realms of activity and are put with one another in a first-then

¹¹Ernst Lichtenstein, "Die älteste christliche Glaubensformel," Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, LXIII (1950), 72.

¹²As Dodd asserts, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1951), p. 14.

relationship. As a consequence the saying concerning Davidic kingly dominion is displaced as a description of the Messianic function of Jesus, and, on the other hand, the predication of Davidic Sonship is used as a sign of his earthly activity.¹³ Fuller sees Davidic sonship as both "the qualification for the end-time Messianic office" and "the whole of Jesus' earthly history."¹⁴

There are various interpretations of the degree of honor which the title Son of David ascribes to Jesus. Hahn argues that the title in Rom. 1:4 implies that "the Messiah in the state of his humanness and lowliness," in contrast to the exaltation.¹⁵ He regards this as a shift from the earliest Church's view of Jesus as the Davidic king expected, but yet he terms it a "preliminary stage of exaltation."¹⁶ Davidic sonship is no longer applied to the end-time work of Jesus or to his exaltation but is limited to his work in the earthly sphere. Fuller does not discuss the question of humiliation in connection with Davidic sonship but says the

¹³Ferdinand Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), p. 253.

¹⁴Fuller, p. 189.

¹⁵Hahn, p. 253, quotes Gunther Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, translated by Irene & Fraser McLuskey (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, c.1956), p. 228.

¹⁶Hahn, pp. 242-51.

title "has a positive significance for the whole of Jesus' earthly history"; it is used "to express, not the royal descent or Messianic rule of Jesus, but his miraculous help for the sick and suffering,"¹⁷ as in the several accounts of the Gospels where Jesus is addressed with the title "Son of David" and proceeds to heal them (Mark 10:47-52, parallels; Matt. 9:27; 12:23; 15:22). Fuller questions Hahn's interpretation, "preliminary stage of exaltation" in the earthly life of Jesus, for "it implies a highly paradoxical conception [Hoheit] which one would not expect to meet until Paul or John."¹⁸ Hahn's phrase does appear to be a unique use of the word exaltation which also is misleading. In contrast, other scholars, such as Kramer, do not view the title as a designation of humiliation but as one of high rank; Fuller says

Certainly the second clause describes a more exalted state than the first, but not its complete antithesis. Strictly, it is not a pattern of humiliation and exaltation we should speak of here, but rather one of adoption: a person who is already of high rank is¹⁹ "adopted" and receives a status which is supreme.

In the light of the Judaic background of the terms and the early Church witness to Jesus as the Christ, the title was not a title of humiliation but of honor. The honor was

¹⁷Fuller, p. 189.

¹⁸Fuller, p. 199, fn. 23.

¹⁹Kramer, p. 109.

not as great as that associated with the title huios theou (1:4). The phrases, kata sarka and kata pneuma hagiōsunēs, and the contrast between them show this; the difference of the realms in which each of the titles are applied give a more exalted sense to the title huiou theou than spermatos Dauid has. Nevertheless, being called Son of David or its equivalent in Rom. 1:4 is an honor; as Leenhardt notes,

The Davidic origin of the Messiah was a postulate of faith; we must see here a theological affirmation: the name of David sums up the whole history of Israel and expresses the hope that one day it will find a glorious fulfilment.²⁰

Rudolf Bultmann points up another aspect of this verse, namely, the historical aspect. When the descent from David is mentioned, this represents a change from non-Christian religion: "this occurrence of salvation, of which the Christian formulas speak, is peculiarly bound up with history, world history."²¹ At times, Paul seems to either reject or play down the historical aspect of the life of Jesus. In 2 Cor. 5:16 he states that "even though we once regarded Christ from a human point of view (kata sarka), we regard him thus no longer." Michel comments that what is meant here

²⁰Franz J. Leenhardt, The Epistle to the Romans, translated from the French 1st edition by Harold Knight (Cleveland: World Publishing Company, c. 1961), p. 36.

²¹Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, translated by Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, c.1955), II, 121.

is not a disregard for history; rather, history undergoes a metamorphosis in the believer and is viewed from a new eschatological perspective. For Paul, history is a presupposition of faith.²² Paul's Christology too is not unhistorical or antihistorical.²³ This statement is demonstrated by the skandalon which he presented to both Jews and Gentiles, Christ crucified (1 Cor. 1:23; 2:2); even in the context of 2 Corinthians 5, he points to Christ's death and resurrection (verses 14-15). But note it is not just the fact that some person died and was raised that is important; rather, what is significant is the kainē ktisis that results from the death and resurrection of Christ. The old, including the perspective kata sarka, passes away (verse 17). The old includes judging Christ by human measures, in historical terms as a figure among other figures.²⁴ In Rom. 1:3, Christ is Davidic Son kata sarka, born in world history in the royal line of Israel, but in his second and current phase, He is Son of God enthroned kata pneuma hagiōsunēs.

²²Otto Michel, "Erkennen dem Fleisch nach," Evangelische Theologie, XIV (1954), 24.

²³Ibid., XIV, 28.

²⁴Eduard Schweizer, Friedrich Baumgärtel, Rudolf Meyer, "sarx, sarkikos, sarkinos," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, edited by Gerhard Friedrich (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1964), VII, 131.

The fourth verse, according to Hahn, is filled with manifold difficulties.²⁵ The pattern of the whole verse is that of participle, title, three prepositional phrases, followed by some more titles which appear to intensify the first title. The only phrases which scholars definitely or very likely regard as part of the pre-Pauline formula are tou horisthentos huiou theou kata pneuma hagiōsunēs. The first phrase, tou horisthentos, has been defined in the sense of "declare," "install," or "predestine" someone to be something (for example, judge at the end-time).²⁶ In general, the evidence for huiou theou does not indicate that the title denotes the pre-existent divine being but rather the kingly figure; for Acts 13:33, in particular, the Son of God refers to installation to the office of Davidic kingship and applies to Jesus since His resurrection.²⁷ 2 Sam. 7:12-16 portrays God's promise to David that he will raise sperma after him and establish his kingdom; the sperma will build the house for the Lord, and the Lord will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. At this point, the Lord will take him for his huios. Thus, the title is especially reserved for the sperma who is enthroned with kingly powers

²⁵Hahn, p. 254.

²⁶Supra, pp. 54-56.

²⁷Supra, pp. 62-69.

and is thus a special title of the one who holds that position of king. The subject of the formula of Rom. 1:4 is not that of the normal earthly Israelite king, but the huios theou is enthroned kata pneuma hagiōsunēs in the realm of the holy Spirit, the realm where the Son of God has power, life, and salvation.²⁸ This, in capsule form, is a brief summary of the theology of the part of this verse that is most likely pre-Pauline. An examination of these phrases more closely will shed light on some of the questions as to the verse's full implications.

Tou horisthentos has been viewed as the second phase of the career of the Son or the second step forward, a step to exaltation²⁹ because it is set parallel to tou genomenou (verse 3), which marks off the beginning of the earthly stage of the Son's career. This installation as Son of God is accomplished by God himself. This fact is demonstrated by the passive voice of the verb, which demands a subject. The subject is not stated explicitly, but it can be noted that the heading for the whole formula is euaggelion theou, which would be a fair indication of the active Being in this formula.³⁰ God is also the one who raises sperma and

²⁸Supra, pp. 82-83.

²⁹Supra, pp. 54-55.

³⁰However, the phrase is not demonstrably part of the formula although it is not incongruous to it.

establishes the kingdom and throne and finally takes the sperma for his huios in 2 Sam. 7:12-16. He is also active in the same fashion in Psalm 2. The king is installed as Son of God by a prostagma of the kurios. Passive constructions seem to be part of creedal formulae in general (1 Cor. 15:4; 1 Tim. 3:16; 2 Tim. 2:8), and it is evident in Rom. 1:2-4.³¹ Creedal formulae present Jesus' resurrection in the passive voice. The one who raised him, God, is mentioned explicitly in other passages (Acts 2:24; 5:30; 10:41). The formulae which employ the title "Son of God," namely, the "sending" formulae and other similar formulae, always have God as the subject.³² Thus, while it is not explicitly stated in Rom. 1:4, it seems plain that the active agent in the installation of the Son is God.³³

In regard to huios theou, a caution must be expressed against a misunderstanding. This name or title is a "functional" rather than "ontological" title; "functional" titles are "not affirmations about the 'nature' or being of Jesus. They affirm what he is doing or what he will do."³⁴ This is shown by the nature of the verb horisthentos. As previously stated,

³¹Supra., p. 21.

³²Supra., pp. 58-59.

³³Cf. Schweizer, Lordship and Discipleship, translation of the German by the author (London: SCM Press Ltd., c.1960), p. 95.

³⁴Fuller, p. 247.

it marks a new phase in sonship, a new office assumed by the subject. Again, it is analogous to Old Testament use where the king was adopted rather than declared a god.³⁵ As Son of God, Jesus functions as the Davidic king now in office in the divine sphere as a result of his appointment. The question of whether simultaneously this kingly rule is exercised on earth is not answered.

The time of the Son of God's installation is not clearly implied. The first possibility is that the Son of God is preexistent and therefore horisthentos means to "be declared" or "shown to be" Son of God; this meaning seems to be an improbable meaning, especially because the concept of Son of God that the study of Rom. 1:4 has suggested is a functional sonship, not an ontological one. A functional view of sonship states nothing positive or negative concerning the Son's preexistence. Instead, a functional view means that this naming or appointment took place at some point in time.

Manson has suggested a second possibility that the appointing or, as he says, designation, took place at the birth of the Davidic son. "The royal birth and divine incarnation go together."³⁶ While the preexistence of the son is implied

³⁵ Supra, p. 66.

³⁶ T. W. Manson, "Romans," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, edited by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, c.1962), p. 941.

in this statement, Manson's suggestion is worth consideration. The two verses 3 and 4 are viewed as contemporaneous with one another and describe the action from the two differing points of view, kata sarka and kata pneuma hagiōsunēs. However, the participles genomenou and horisthentos argue against this suggestion. Both verbs indicate the beginning of a phase of the Son's existence. These beginnings are qualified by kata sarka and kata pneuma hagiōsunēs, the two different spheres within which the Son exists; therefore, the participles cannot indicate contemporaneous actions. One other argument against this view is that the birth of Jesus was not, as Manson suggests, a "royal birth." In fact, the other formulae of pre-Pauline nature indicate no interest in Jesus' birth; the nearest parallel to the birth of Jesus is in Gal. 4:4, "born of woman." Kramer indicates it is difficult to decide whether this phrase is part of the formula; however, its parallel "born under the law" is Pauline.³⁷ In any case, the phrase "born of woman" does not suggest a "royal birth." The "sending" formulae are not interested in the manner of Jesus' birth but in the "sending" from God. Paul in his epistles does not express interest in the birth of Jesus but only in the "Christ crucified." Only in the Gospels do we

³⁷
Kramer, p. 113.

find an interest in the manner of Jesus' birth. Thus, it is unlikely that the formula in Rom. 1:3 expresses a birth of a "royal" nature.

What other possibilities are there for the time of the appointment? A. M. Hunter proposes that the baptism of Jesus was the moment. "By the descent of the Holy Spirit upon him he was 'appointed' . . . Son of God . . . en dunamei refers to his equipment with Messianic power at his Baptism." He refers to Luke 3:22 and Acts 10:38 as evidence.³⁸ His statement implies a different view of kata pneuma hagiōsunēs than that of this thesis; he interprets it as meaning a divine Being rather than the sphere in which the Spirit of God is in full power. Also, against Hunter's view, in the early formulae which have been studied there has been no indication of interest in Jesus' earthly ministry; the same is true of Paul's writings. The only possible reference from the early Church is Acts 10:38; since it is part of the Christological kerygma of a speech, it may date from an earlier period than Luke. It is only in the Gospels that one finds interest in the baptism of Jesus, His Messianic anointing by the Holy Spirit, and the consequent display of the Messianic power.

The problematical phrase ex anastaseōs nekrōn presents the resurrection of Jesus as the moment of the elevation to

³⁸Hunter, p. 25.

the kingly office of Son of God. The phrase refers back to huiou theou, as other passages that use anastasis nekrōn or equivalent expressions make clear.³⁹ This assertion is also reflected in the early preaching and tradition of the Church.⁴⁰ In fact, His resurrection is viewed as "exaltation to the presence of God,"⁴¹ "the appointment of Jesus as 'Lord and Christ' [Acts 2:36] . . . the enthronement 'on God's right hand' (Acts 2.33ff.; 5.31)."⁴² This picture of the enthroned Son is also in line with the Old Testament kingly Son of God, whom God restores to the throne forever (2 Sam. 7:12-16).⁴³ With all the above points in its favor, the time of the appointment according to Rom. 1:4 is the resurrection of Jesus, the "first to rise from the dead"⁴⁴ (prōtos ex anastaseōs nekrōn, Acts 26:23). Consequently, since the sense of this phrase fits in so well with the formula, especially in answering a

³⁹Supra, pp. 88-89.

⁴⁰Notably Acts 13:33; cf. 1 Tim. 3:16; 1 Pet. 3:18; Schweizer, Lordship, pp. 36-37.

⁴¹Schweizer, Lordship, p. 36.

⁴²Ibid., p. 38.

⁴³Supra, pp. 85-86.

⁴⁴Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated and adapted from the 4th and revised German edition by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, c.1957), p. 732.

question which arises from the rest of the formula, and since it agrees well with the early Church's attitude toward the resurrection as the moment of appointment to exaltation, this phrase is also part of the pre-Pauline formula.

R. Fuller's view that the Davidic Son is "predestined" to be Son of God at the time of the Parousia also needs consideration. He cites good evidence from Acts for an appointment to this office at a future date.⁴⁵ He decides en dunamei is a Pauline addition made necessary by Paul's insertion of peri tou huiou autou. Kata pneuma hagiōsunēs is a Hellenistic addition since it is a phrase of exaltation; he does not find the concept of exaltation applied to Christ in the earliest Church. He asserts this especially upon the basis of his study of other titles, such as Kyrios, Christos, Son of David. Therefore, the meaning is that found in Acts, to "pre-destine" Jesus to the office of Son of God at the Parousia.⁴⁶ While the Acts evidence does appear to be strong for the active functioning in the office at the future Parousia, the verb horisthentos itself does not only refer to a present determining of future events; it also may

⁴⁵Fuller, pp. 166-67; Acts 10:42; cf. Acts 17:31; 3:20; he notes that "all our evidence (under Kyrios, Christos Son of David, and Son of God thus far)" show no evidence of the conception of exaltation. Therefore, it means "predestined."

⁴⁶Fuller, pp. 165-67.

refer to a past determination of present events (Acts 2:23 applies to Jesus) and to a present determining of a present state (the use in the LXX of "establish the borders"⁴⁷) or of a future close to the present (Acts 17:26: "allotted periods and the boundaries"). Also, the parallel to Rom. 1:3 indicates that horisthentos in verse 4 is the beginning of a new phase, not a phase to begin at the Parousia. It has also been shown that kata pneuma hagiōsunēs is Jewish and not a Hellenistic addition as Fuller sees it; since the phrase is part of the formula, its meaning argues against Fuller's interpretation of horisthentos. Kata pneuma hagiōsunēs means that the Son is in the realm of power; this would suggest that he is exercising his office of sonship from the moment of his entering this realm, not at some future date.

The phrase en dunamei will be discussed in the next chapter as a Pauline addition that reinterprets the verse.

The question of adoptionism must be discussed in connection with verse 4: did Jesus become Son of God at the resurrection? The question is not, as in later adoptionism: was Jesus Son of God before the resurrection? Verse 4 does not give an answer either affirmatively or negatively to that question. In fact, verse 3 argues that Jesus was from the spermatos David before the resurrection. Only in the

⁴⁷Num. 34:6; Joshua 13:27; 15:12; 18:20.

second phase is the subject of these verses given the title huios theou.

Rather than call it adoptionistic, C.H. Dodd states

The statement is pre-theological. It attests the fact that Jesus was a real man, that he was acknowledged as Messiah, and that after His Resurrection, though not before, He was worshipped as Son of God. . . . It is not, however, his present purpose to expound his theology, but to place on record the facts which he and his Roman readers alike regarded as fundamental.⁴⁸

Johannes Weiss does call 1:4 adoptionist: "Jesus became Messiah through his exaltation (Acts 2:36). . . . It is known as an Adoptionist Christology, since it presupposes an action of adoption. . . ." ⁴⁹ E. Kasemann notes

adoptionist Christology:

It is true that in his Baptism narrative, Mark reveals the continued existence within the community of an older view standing for an Adoptionist Christology and seeing in the Baptism the consecration of the Messiah (cf. Rom. 1.4; Acts 2.36; Heb. 1.5). But in his own work all traces of this view have been obliterated and Jesus is delineated without any reserve in the colours of the Hellenistic theios anthropos.⁵⁰

⁴⁸The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (New York: Harper, 1932), p. 5.

⁴⁹Johannes Weiss, Earliest Christianity, translated and edited from the German by Frederick C. Grant (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959), I, 118.

⁵⁰Ernst Käsemann, "The Canon of the New Testament and the Unity of the Church," Essays on New Testament Themes, translated from the German by W. J. Montague (London: SCM Press Ltd., c.1964), p. 96.

A. M. Hunter argues that, in contrast to Paul's incarnationist Christology, Rom. 1:4 is "adoptionist. . . . The resurrection is the birthday of the Son of God."⁵¹ John Knox, asserting that there was almost certainly an adoptionist Christology of the Roman Church at an early stage, presents this definition of the adoptionist pattern: it has a "sharp contrast between the humble human life and the final glorious exaltation."⁵² All of these men are agreed that there is adoptionism in this passage and do not distinguish Rom. 1:4 from the later adoptionism. As discussed before with regard to verse 3, there is not the contrast that Knox and others see, namely, humiliation and exaltation. Rather, the contrast is that of a person already with honor to that of one enthroned in the realm of power.⁵³

Other scholars show more clearly the contrast of Rom. 1:4 to later adoptionism. C. K. Barrett states

Undoubtedly, the earliest Christology has superficially an adoptionist tinge; but this is not to say that it was "Adoptionist" in the technical sense. The first attempts at Christological thought were made not in essential but in functional terms. Pre-existence was a possibility that had not been explored (Paul [p. 21] himself was perhaps the first explorer); there was a manifest difference between the obscure private life

⁵¹Hunter, p. 26.

⁵²John Knox, "The Epistle to the Romans," The Interpreter's Bible (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1954), IX, 382-83.

⁵³Supra, pp. 100-102.

of Jesus and the public ministry which was inaugurated at his baptism, and an even greater difference between the earthly life and the heavenly glory of Jesus Christ our Lord.⁵⁴

Eduard Schweizer notes the difference from later adoptionism in the amount of theological reflection as he states

For the Church had not yet reflected on the time before the exaltation and therefore did not say that Jesus had been merely an ordinary man. These formulations prove only that at a very early time the exaltation of Jesus was regarded as the decisive saving event.⁵⁵

Werner Kramer summarizes the adoptionism in Rom. 1:4 well:

1. Jesus was installed, adopted, by God as Son of God. Underlying this view is the idea of a legal act. Nothing in this statement suggests any idea that God and the Son of God are consubstantial.'
2. The act of adoption was accomplished at Jesus' resurrection. This means that the idea of pre-existence lies outside this formula's range of vision. On the other hand, we ought not to press the adoption statement so far as to speculate whether Jesus was not Son of God before the resurrection, for the formula says that before the resurrection he was Son of David.⁵⁶

Kramer distinguishes between the pattern of humiliation and exaltation and that of adoption: "a person who is already of high rank is 'adopted' and receives a status which is supreme."⁵⁷ Rom. 1:3-4 appears to fit with the latter pattern best; thus it is unlike later adoptionism, which denies the preexistence of Christ.

⁵⁴Barrett, pp. 20-21.

⁵⁵Schweizer, Lordship, p. 37.

⁵⁶Kramer, p. 110.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 109.

One more phrase needs discussion namely, the Iesou Christou at the end of verse 4. As noted previously, the placing of the name Jesus before the title Christ was the normal order "for it corresponds to the Aramaic. . . ."58

Kramer, after a study of the use of Jesus and Christ in the "pistis-formulae," that is, "the formula which has as its content the saving acts of death and resurrection,"59 makes the interesting conclusion that in the Aramaic-speaking church "The Christian understanding of the title 'Messiah' is perfectly expressed in the sentence, 'God raised Jesus from the dead.'"60

In the Greek-speaking Jewish Christian church, Christ, like the "Messiah" of later Judaism, represents the title and the eschatological status of an earthly figure. . . . Christ is seen as connected typologically with scriptural prophecies, as is witnessed by the phrase "in accordance with the scriptures" and by the quotation of OT passages.61

Theologically, Iēsou Christou in Rom. 1:4 appears to be the phrase summarizing what the whole formula asserts. The title Christ is associated with scriptural prophecies elsewhere as in verse 2. The spermatos Daud and huios theou in verses 3-4 are stages in Jesus' life and also build up

58 Ibid., p. 206.

59 Kramer, p. 21.

60 Ibid., p. 42.

61 Ibid., p. 43.

to the confession, Jesus is Messiah or Christos, the one promised to David and the one now enthroned and ruling in power. It has been shown that linguistically Iēsou Christou has an order that is found in pre-Pauline times; thus, there is a possibility that the phrase is pre-Pauline. However, as has been pointed out, there is a stronger possibility that this very phrase is the one missing phrase introducing the formula. Therefore, the phrase in its present position may not be in its original position in the formula; however, theologically and linguistically Iēsou Christou is very appropriate for a pre-Pauline formula such as Rom. 1:2-4.

After a Christological study of the way the various phrases are related, the wording of the formula suggested is as follows (dubious phrases in parentheses and Pauline phrases in brackets):

(Jesus Christ)

(hos) proepēggeilato dia tōn prophetōn autou en graphais
hagiais, peri tou huiou autou

tou genomenou ek spermatos Daidid kata sarka,
tou horisthentos huiou theou [en dunamei] kata pneuma
hagiōsunēs
ex anastaseōs nekrōn, (Iēsou Christou) [tou kuriou hēmōn].

The Origin

Origin does not mean here locale but rather the type of Christianity from which the formula came; some scholars do employ the former sense. Seeberg even hypothesizes that the formula of faith (more than just Rom. 1:3f.) originated between 30 and 35 A.D. in the circle of the original apostles.⁶² H. Windisch sees the formula stemming from Jerusalem or Antioch tradition.⁶³

However, as Hahn has pointed out, the attempt to determine localities for certain traditions is conjectural, especially since it is difficult to estimate the amount of the Hellenistic influence in any one given area.⁶⁴ Instead, a more helpful method is to distinguish the types of Christian traditions, for example, early Palestinian church, the pre-Pauline Hellenistic Christianity, and Pauline tradition.

⁶²Alfred Seeberg, Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1903), p. 193.

⁶³Hans Windisch, "Zur Christologie der Pastoralbriefe," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXXIV (1935), 216.

⁶⁴Hahn, p. 11.

Hahn and others see a need for another category, that of "Hellenistic Jewish Christianity;" by this term he means that tradition which has an obvious Hellenistic origin but yet has a recognizable tie to Jewish Christianity. Hellenistic Jewish Christianity is mostly an intermediate stage but in some cases can be treated as an entirely independent history of tradition.⁶⁵ Fuller devotes three chapters to defining the conceptual tools located in each of these three pre-Pauline strata of tradition.⁶⁶

Employing these categories of the various types of tradition, several scholars argue that the formula originated in the early Palestinian Aramaic-speaking church.⁶⁷ Hahn places it in Hellenistic Jewish Christianity.⁶⁸ Fuller has a unique view; he proceeds in a two-stage fashion to separate off, first of all, the Pauline additions en dunamei and peri tou huiou autou, and, secondly, the Hellenistic additions

⁶⁵Hahn, pp. 11-12.

⁶⁶Fuller, pp. 23-101.

⁶⁷Kramer, p. 111; Weiss, I, 119; Schweizer, Lordship, p. 37; Schweizer, "Röm. 1,3f. und der Gegensatz von Fleisch und Geist vor und bei Paulus," Evangelische Theologie, XV (1955), 569; H. Braun, "Der Sinn der neutestamentliche Christologie," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, LIV (1957), 345,353,362.

⁶⁸Hahn, p. 251.

of kata sarka and kata pneuma hagiōsunēs, and thus is left with the "original Palestinian nucleus."⁶⁹

Hahn's argument is that in the formula the Davidic sonship is associated with the earthly life of Jesus rather than with the parousia and also that the prominent exaltation motif in verse 4 is found only in Hellenistically-influenced Christianity; therefore Rom. 1:3-4 is from Hellenistic Jewish Christianity. The first argument is a true statement of the content of verse 3; however, the question may be asked whether it is necessary to assign such a viewpoint of the sonship of David to Hellenistic Jewish Christianity. The second argument of Hahn's is a good summary of the content of verse 4, but again the question may be asked whether it is necessary to assign the concept of exaltation only to Hellenistic Jewish Christianity. Did the early Church think of Jesus only as inactively waiting for the time of His parousia? Schweizer has argued for the idea of an active lordship already at an early stage on the basis of passages such as Acts 2:36, "a very primitive view," Acts 13:33⁷⁰ and

⁶⁹ Fuller, p. 165; he claims to be following Schweizer in eliminating the kata-phrases as Hellenistic additions, but actually Schweizer in "Röm. 1,3f.," XV, 368, points to a Judaic Old Testament background, although Hellenistic influence comes in late Judaism (the incorporeality-corporeality contrast). Hahn, p. 256, fn. 2, says Schweizer has provided too few proofs to show this occurrence in Judaism.

⁷⁰ Schweizer, Lordship, pp. 36-37.

Mark 12:35-37.⁷¹ At least, these passages put Hahn's arguments into question. Even if there is a distinction of passages portraying active lordship and those picturing inactive lordship, is it not more likely that this distinction is the result of reflection upon the work of Jesus Christ between the present time and the parousia rather than the result of the difference between Jewish and Hellenistic views? As has been argued earlier, Hahn's view can also be criticized for placing the kata phrases in a Hellenistic tradition.⁷² The same criticism can be raised against Fuller's view that the kata phrases are Hellenistic.

The most likely origin for this formula is that it is from the "early Aramaic-speaking church" tradition.⁷³ As the various phrases were studied in the preceding chapter, it may have been noticed that in no one phrase was it necessary to go beyond the Judaic background for an explanation. Certain of the phrases definitely have definite Semitic origin. The picture dominant in the formula is that of the Jewish expectation for the ideal Davidic king or Messiah. Kramer points

⁷¹Schweizer, "huios," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, edited by Gerhard Friedrich (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer GMBH, 1967), VIII, 371.

⁷²Supra, pp. 47-48, 80-81.

⁷³Kramer, p. 111.

to the fact that in the formula "the first concern was to express the importance of Jesus rather than to explain his saving significance for mankind,"⁷⁴ and notes this as a sign of early origin. Another argument for early Jewish origin is the fact that God is the active agent of the formula. The passive voice of the participles is similar to the early Palestinian formula in 1 Cor. 15:3-5. The idea of God raising Jesus is preferred in the early Church (Acts 2:24; 5:30; 10:41; 13:33); God raises Jesus after the Jews had rejected him by killing him, and therefore is the one promised by God. In this connection, the formula of Rom. 1:2-4 does not mention the death of Jesus Christ; this too is an argument for early origin, for "it can be stated with certainty that in Peter's sermons the death on the cross has no atoning significance."⁷⁵ Also, in Paul the central part of his message is "Christ crucified" (1 Cor. 1:23; 2:2). If Paul had freely formulated the passage in Romans 1, he would have at least included the death of Christ. A final argument for an early origin is the fact Rom. 1:2-4 follows a temporal order: first, the promise of the prophets, second, the earthly existence as spermatos Daud, and third, the enthroned existence in the realm of

⁷⁴Ibid.

⁷⁵Schweizer, Lordship, p. 33.

power as the adopted huios theou. Jewish formulations, such as 1 Cor. 15:3-5, follow the temporal order, whereas Hellenistic formulations are less concerned with this aspect (2 Tim. 2:8 reverses the order).

If these arguments are correct, then this formula is an expression going back to a very early stage of Christianity. Schweizer suggests a possible way in which the formula came about. The church, on the one hand, accepted the official Jewish Messianic presentation expecting a Davidic Son, and on the other hand, accepted the exaltation Christology in which the installation of Jesus as God's Son-King first took place on Easter. With the scheme of the two spheres, the church connected both, with the early Davidic stage as a preliminary, not humiliating, stage for Jesus.⁷⁶ This scheme of the two spheres marks such a great contrast that en dunamei is unnecessary if the readers understand the formula. Paul evidently felt the supplemental phrase was necessary to clarify for his readers, who were at least in part Gentile, the Semitic phrase kata pneuma hagiōsunēs. To Schweizer's theory also there needs to be added a theory concerning the addition of verse 2. This idea of the epaggelia seems to have more frequently an impersonal object, such as

⁷⁶Schweizer, "Röm. 1,3f.," XV, 569.

"future world," rather than a personal object, such as Christ. The subject of proepēggeilato would then be something like euaggelion theou; however, it might be argued that euaggelion is so closely connected in the New Testament with Jesus Christ as its content that Paul could also have altered the introductory pronoun from a reference to Jesus Christ to a reference to the euaggelion. This argument has three points in its favor. Acts 13:23 and 33 refer the promises as fulfilled with the coming of Jesus and his resurrection. In 2 Sam. 7:12-16, the Lord is in effect making a promise to do all the things listed, including raising up a sperma and enthroning and adopting him as his huios. Thirdly, making the subject of the formula the subject of proepēggeilato puts it in parallel agreement with verses 3-4, all three having a personal subject. In either case, verse 2 also fits in with the succeeding verses as the stage prior to Jesus' birth. Barnikol notes that in this formula the prophets serve as "preexistent ones" in the history of salvation portrayed.⁷⁷ It is even conceivable that the background of the formula was the 2 Samuel 7 passage, and therefore unlike Schweizer's theory of the formulation, the whole schema was formulated at one time.

⁷⁷Ernst Barnikol, Zurück zum alten Glauben Jesus der Christus (3rd edition; Halle: Akademischer Verlag, 1933), p. 52.

The above discussion leads directly into the consideration of the function of this formula in the early Christian community, its Sitz im Leben. Was it a confessional formula, a eucharistic formula, or an apologetic formula? It has been noted that Neufeld regards it as a "homologia" or "confession of Jesus with specific reference to his person or work."⁷⁸ Michel places stress upon the fact that the verses follow temporally after one another, and therefore the suggestion is that we have here a baptismal confession. Just as with Christ, there are the two phases of existence for the believer who is baptized, the one kata sarka and the one kata pneuma.⁷⁹ The eucharistic setting is not suggested by any of the parts of the formula. Neither does the formula seem to be primarily the function of an apologetic formulation; it does contain phrases referring to the earthly existence of Jesus, which could oppose any kind of docetism, and the formula does affirm the exaltation, which could oppose any view that Jesus Christ is a mere human being. The latter emphases do not seem to be the main stress of the formula. Rather, the formula attests the relation of Jesus to the Old Testament promises concerning the one to come, the sperma Daud and the huios, which are summed up in the late

⁷⁸Vernon H. Neufeld, The Earliest Christian Confessions (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1963), p. 20.

⁷⁹Otto Michel, Der Brief an die Römer (13th edition, 4th of his exegesis; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1966), p.39.

Jewish expectancy of the Messiah, the end-time ruler and deliverer of the people of Israel. By his exaltation, his rule is not limited to Israel but is now a powerful rule with universal dimensions. Thus, the formula is primarily a confession of Jesus as the promised Messiah or Christos presented in the form of the phases of his career; the believer in his baptism identifies with these phases and becomes united with him in the cultic confession and baptism.

CHAPTER V

PAUL'S REINTERPRETATION OF THE FORMULA

This chapter discusses Paul's reinterpretation of the formula, that is, those phrases inserted by Paul to modify the Christology of the formula; finally, the function of the formula within the salutation is discussed.

The first phrase Paul inserts, peri tou huiou autou, defines euaggelion theou (1:1) more precisely. Its function in relation to the formula is to supplement the christological stages in the formula and to reinterpret¹ the concept of huiou theou in verse 4. The sequence of thought is that the prophets tell in holy writings the promise of God, the birth and life kata sarka of the Davidic Son, and His elevation to the position of kingly Son of God into the realm of the holy Spirit at the time of His resurrection from the dead. The sequence, which approximates a temporal order, suggests that possibly Paul ascribed preexistence to the Son of God. It has been noted before that the primary meaning of Son of God in Paul designates the close relationship of the Son to God.²

¹Or to "correct" the view, Eduard Schweizer, Lordship and Discipleship, translated from the German by the author (London: SCM Press Ltd., c.1960), p. 36.

²Supra, p. 58.

E. Schweizer, in his analysis of the "sending" formulae previously discussed,³ states that heavenly preexistence is not necessarily connected with these formulae; on the surface, they indicate that the Son was "sent" in the manner of Old Testament prophets and the son of Mark 12:1-9. However, since these formulae appear only in Paul and John, in whose writings the preexistence of Christ is presented according to the picture of the Logos or Wisdom, Schweizer proposes that these formulae are rooted in the same realm of thought, namely, the Logos and Wisdom speculation of Egyptian Judaism. Thus, the sending of the Son and the Spirit (Gal. 4:4-6) correspond to the sending of Wisdom and the Spirit (Wisdom 9:10,17). The Son of God is different from the Old Testament view: the Son has heavenly proximity to God and is preexistent. Schweizer, however, cautions against an eschatological interpretation of the sending of the Son; the emphasis should be placed on the spatial sending of the Son from heaven to earth rather than on a temporal eschatological interpretation of the sending.⁴

³Supra, pp. 58-59.

⁴Eduard Schweizer, "huios," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, edited by Gerhard Friedrich (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer GMBH, 1967), VIII, 376-77.

F. Craddock pictures what may have been associated with the Son of God as he interprets Wisdom in the Wisdom of Solomon:

She [Wisdom] herself is divine both in nature and function (chs. 6-9). She is an emanation from God (7:25), an associate in his work (8:4), and sits by his throne (9:4). She fashions, pervades, oversees, renews, performs, and manages all things (7:22-27; 8:1,5). She not only existed before creation (9:9), but by her God created (9:1). In relation to God, Wisdom is the effulgence of light, the unspotted mirror of God's working, the image of God's goodness, the effluence of his glory, and the breath of his power (7:25-26).⁵

Thus, it may be concluded that Wisdom is preexistent. Since Wisdom appears to be the picture behind the Son in the "sending" formulae, and Wisdom imagery is used in Paul for pre-existence,⁶ therefore, the insertion of Son of God in 1:3 stresses preexistence; the primary emphasis is upon the closeness of the Son to God.

⁵Fred B. Craddock, The Pre-Existence of Christ in the New Testament (Nashville: Abingdon Press, c.1968), p. 32.

⁶Cf. Eduard Schweizer, "Zur Herkunft der Präexistenzvorstellung bei Paulus," Evangelische Theologie, XIX (1959), 65-70, in which passages in Paul implying preexistence are traced back to Wisdom and Logos speculation, e.g. 1 Cor. 10:4.

⁷Supra, p. 58; Werner Kramer, Christ, Lord, Son of God, translated from the German by Brian Hardy (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1966), p. 185, says that the question whether Paul implies adoption or preexistence strictly speaking cannot be answered. Passages such as Rom. 5:10 and 8:29 "would permit the assumption that for Paul the bearer of salvation had always been Son of God. This is tending towards the idea of preexistence, but we can hardly say more than that."

The en dunamei phrase is problematical; however, the phrase is best understood as added by Paul when its function in the verse is considered. In 1:4, en dunamei makes much sense in the light of Pauline Christology. It underscores the understanding of the Son of God as not a mere human kingly figure, but rather as a figure who is installed Son of God with power in the realm of the Spirit. Hahn notes that it makes no difference if en dunamei modifies horisthentos or huiou theou. It means in either case that adoption and enthronement to the Messianic position of power occur simultaneously.⁸ As with peri tou huiou autou, Paul is modifying the concept of Son of God in this verse. The Son of God is not just adopted but enthroned "at the right hand of Power" (Mark 14:62; Matt. 26:64). "Power" was one of the paraphrases the Jews used in order to avoid the name of God.⁹ Thus, the phrase en dunamei makes very specific the location of the huios theou.

With this understanding of the function of the phrase in Rom. 1:4, we may now ask whether it is pre-Pauline or not. If en dunamei is viewed as part of the formula, certain

⁸Ferdinand Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), p. 255.

⁹Walter Grundmann, "dunamai, etc.," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, c.1964), II, 297.

difficulties arise. First, it ruins the parallelism of the kata phrases in verses 3-4. Second en dunamei appears to be "superfluous" since the idea already is contained in the other phrases in verse 4.¹⁰ The phrase huios theou implies that the sperma of David is enthroned, in the light of 2 Sam. 7:12-16. Kata pneuma hagiōsunēs indicates a realm of divine power in which the kingly Son of God operates. Third, en dunamei, by way of parallelism, seems to make verse 3 refer to a stage of Christ's activity which is characterized by humiliation but has a certain degree of honor.¹¹ The en dunamei causes a shift "in favour of the pattern of humiliation and exaltation."¹² All the above arguments argue against the phrase being part of the original formula.

On the other hand, the en dunamei might suggest a different contrast. The logos-dunamis contrast, especially with regard to the Kingdom of God, occurs frequently in Paul and elsewhere (1 Cor. 4:19-20; 1 Thess. 1:5; cf. Mark 9:1). The Kingdom of God comes not only with preaching and teaching but with the power of God in concrete action. Rom. 1:2 presents the promises of God proclaimed by the prophets en graphais hagiiais. The first step of these promises was fulfilled with the sperma Dauid in verse 3. Finally, verse 4

¹⁰Kramer, p. 110.

¹¹Supra, pp. 100-102.

¹²Kramer, p. 110.

presents the huios theou not just en graphais hagiais but en dunamei. However, the other difficulties raised against including en dunamei in the formula argue against this particular view. Thus, the above arguments point to the conclusion that en dunamei is not part of the formula.

Why would Paul add such a phrase to the formula? Was the meaning already not implied? Fuller suggests it was added because of Paul's addition of peri tou huiou autou (verse 3).¹³ If Fuller means it was added to preserve the parallelism, then his argument is not valid, for en dunamei ruins the parallelism of verses 3-4. If Fuller means en dunamei was needed to maintain the same concept of sonship in verses 3 and 4, this argument is possible. Verse 3 implies a preexistent Son of God who is "near" God. In verse 4, en dunamei once again brings the Son "near" to God "at the right hand of Power" (Mark 14:62). Another possible reason Paul adds en dunamei is that the phrase implies lordship, and lordship is one of Paul's primary concerns in the opening verses of Romans. O. Cullmann notes that "Son of God with power" equals "Kyrios."¹⁴ The concept of kyrios as used by Paul is about to be discussed. No matter what reason he had

¹³Reginald H. Fuller, The Foundation of New Testament Christology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), p. 165.

¹⁴Oscar Cullmann, The Earliest Christian Confessions, translated from the German by J. K. S. Reid (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949), p. 55.

for adding en dunamei, Paul sees a need to modify the huiou theou in the formula of 1:4.

The final phrase which is regarded as a Pauline addition to the text is tou kuriou hēmōn. Fuller notes that this title was one of those which contributed to the "shift that was taking place from the strictly eschatological to the cosmological and ethical interpretation of his person and work."¹⁵ The term "connotated in classical Greek the rightful authority of a superior over an inferior. It was used by the LXX translators for the tetragrammation, YHWH"; thereby it was linked to covenant and redemptive history.¹⁶ Later, this title is given to the exalted Jesus, and "it is precisely through the exalted Jesus that God carries out these functions [of lordship]."¹⁷ In the earlier Christian use of kurios, Jesus is "Lord of the Church," especially in the cultic setting.¹⁸ Rom. 10:9 and Phil 2:11 illustrate that the homologia (or confession kurios Iēsous) occurs in the context of the verb homologeō or exomologeomai. "Thy hymn in Phil. 2.6-11 is recited at worship; in Rom. 10.8f. the

¹⁵Reginald H. Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), p. 67.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 68.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 186.

¹⁸Kramer, pp. 70-71; Schweizer, Lordship, p. 58.

pistis-formula and the confession [that is, homologia] are mentioned as proofs that the 'word of faith' is present in preaching."¹⁹ While Kramer is not sure about whether the final three verses of Phil. 2:6-11 are "an authentic exposition" of kurios,²⁰ Schweizer maintains that they signify:

the assertion of Jesus' lordship over his Church has been extended to a dominion over the whole of the cosmos But even Jesus' lordship over the Church, as we saw, naturally implied for her that he was Lord over all the other forces and power.²¹

It is noted that the form in Rom. 1:4 is "our Lord." Kramer concludes that for Paul, the meaning is the same whether "our" is there or not.²² For pre-Pauline tradition, the difference is not a difference of the scope of the Lord's domain but rather a difference in the function the forms were to serve. In an acclamation "our" is not needed since it is understood. In a confession of faith the common form is to include "our."²³ Rom. 1:4 is an example of the latter form.

¹⁹Kramer, p. 65.

²⁰Kramer, p. 70.

²¹Schweizer, Lordship, p. 64.

²²Kramer, p. 220.

²³Ibid., pp. 221-22.

The function that tou kuriou hemon has in the passage under discussion is that of a supplement to the concept of Son of God in verse 4; Paul indicates more clearly the exaltation of the Son.

This latter idea has significance for discovering the reason why Paul uses a confession about Jesus Christ at this point in his letter to the Romans. Leenhardt remarks,

This faith culminates in the confession of Christ as Lord, and it is with the sovereignty of Christ that Paul connects the mention of his apostolate about which he is anxious to give detailed information such as v. 1 could only have suggested.²⁴

The universal lordship of Christ enables Paul to be an apostle to the Gentiles. He is set apart as an apostle to preach the Gospel of God (1:1). The gospel is about His (God's) Son (verses 3,9). God is the active agent in Rom. 1:2-4, the one who promised beforehand, who caused to be born, who appointed Jesus to be the enthroned Son of God after He had raised him from the dead. After Paul reinterprets Son of God with three significant modifications, he uses this formula in the service of his apostolate as an interpretation of the universal lordship of Jesus Christ.

Why does Paul use a formula, especially a formula which he feels a need to reinterpret? The answer to this question

²⁴Franz J. Leenhardt, The Epistle to the Romans, translated from the French 1st edition by Harold Knight (Cleveland: World Publishing Company, c.1961), p. 38.

lies in the purpose for the epistle to the Romans. Paul is attempting to lay the foundation for a good reception by the Romans when he comes to them after a trip to Jerusalem with the collection for the saints in Judea. He hopes to enjoy their company for a time and then be supported by their encouragement and perhaps by financial support as he goes on to Spain (15:24-25). He wants to be viewed in their eyes as worthy of such support, and thus he marshals every support for the validity of his own apostolate, including the formula which evidently was usable by both the Roman congregation and himself. The formula in Romans 1 helps to cement the ties between the congregation and himself and to portray his apostolate to the Gentiles as far as his vision of the world can see.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

This thesis has presented a brief history of the form critical interpretation of Rom. 1:1-7; in noting the divergence of opinions as to the precise wording of the pre-Pauline formula generally regarded as present, criteria were suggested for the precise determination of its boundaries and phraseology. A detailed examination of the text of Rom. 1:2-4 based on the criteria isolated problematical phrases and separated Pauline additions from the phrases of the formula.¹ This wording, in turn, was more precisely defined when the theology of the pre-Pauline elements, along with the theology of the early Christian preaching in Acts, was employed to shed light on the problematical phrases. The proposed wording of the formula follows: (Pauline insertions are in brackets and dubious phrases in parentheses.)

(Iēsous Christos),

(hos) proepēgeilato dia tōn prophētōn autou en graphais
hagiais [peri tou huiou autou]

tou genomenou ek spermatis Daudid kata sarka,

tou horisthentos huiou theou [en dunamei] kata
pneuma hagiōsunēs

ex anastaseōs nekrōn, (Iēsou Christou) [tou kuriou
hēmōn] .

¹Supra, p. 94-95.

Having arrived at this wording and studied its Christology, the discussion proceeded to the possibilities of the origin of the formula, finally concluding that it has an early Aramaic Christian origin. Paul's reinterpretations of the formula shed light both upon his own Christology and that of the formula.

A detailed study of this passage stimulates many questions and suggestions for further study, some of which will be mentioned here. A determination of the function of the formula and its attendant qualifying phrases within the context of the salutation would prove helpful for an understanding of Paul in relation to his apostleship, his mission to the Gentiles, and ultimately to the whole purpose of the letter to the Romans. The possibility of verse 5 also being part of the formula needs to be studied. The tracing of Paul's use and modification of tradition throughout the whole letter would both be enlightened by and give light to the use of the formula in the opening verses. In connection with this, Paul's use of the Old Testament and Old Testament imagery in Romans is another area which demands a deeper probing. The interpretation and history of the titles of Son of David and Son of God, while discussed at some length, still could be expanded and be related to other New Testament Christological expressions in a more comprehensive manner. Problems raised with these titles, such as the relation of Son of David to the virgin conception and the use which the

Church makes of them in later eras and centuries are worthy of study. As noted before, the relation of the resurrection, ascension, and exaltation of Jesus Christ could be the subject of an investigation employing, for example, the accounts of Acts 1. In the area of pre-Pauline formulae, a further evaluation of the methods employed, the criteria established, and the results attained by the scholars using the tradition history approach is also suggested. Rom. 1:2-4 and its Christology could be more closely studied for the light which it brings to the dark period before Paul's writings; consequently it should be linked up with all the known early Christian formulae; some have a close connection and others a seemingly distant relationship to it. These are some of the areas which call for further study as a consequence of a deeper involvement with the Christological expressions of faith concisely formulated in Rom. 1:1-7, in particular verses 2-4.

APPENDIX A

Key to the Verse Designations

Since there are many references to various parts of a verse in the passage under consideration, the following standard verse designations and divisions are employed:

<u>Verse Designation</u>	<u>Corresponding Phrase</u>
1b	euaggelion theou
2	ho . . . graphais hagiais
3a	peri tou huiou autou
3b	tou genomenou ek spermatos David
3c	kata sarka
4a	tou horisthentos huios theou
4b	en dunamei kata pneuma hagiōsunēs
4c	anastaseōs nekrōn
5a	di' hou elabomen charin
5b	kai apostolēn

APPENDIX B

The Wording of the Formula

The scholars are listed according to the boundaries of the formula as they view it; any variations within these boundaries are noted. References to their works are abbreviated for sake of neatness; the numbers are page references.

<u>Verses</u>	<u>Phrases Omitted</u>	<u>Scholars</u>
2-4c	3a	Windisch (215)
2-4c	3a & <u>kata-</u> <u>phrases</u>	Michel (36, suggests possibility of verse 2, 38)
2-5		Rigaux (175, fn. 19)
2-5b		Barnikol (52)
2-6		Lichtenstein (14, 72)
3-4		Dodd (<u>Ap. Pr.</u> , 14), Neufeld (50), Hunter (25), Cullmann (<u>E.C.C.</u> , 55), Leenhardt (36)
3-5a		Kelly (17)
3-5b	<u>hagiōsunēs ex</u> <u>anastaseōs nek.</u>	Norden (385)
3-5		Braun (342)
3b-4b	<u>en dunamei</u>	Barrett (18)
3b-4c		Hahn (252ff.), Schmidt (18-19), J. Knox (382-83), Bruce (71-75)
3b-4c	<u>en dunamei</u>	Schweizer (Rom. 1,3f., 563-64), Stuhlmacher (? on <u>en dunamei</u> , 382-83), Wegenast (70-71), Kramer (108-10)
3b-4c	<u>kata-phrases</u>	Kuss (8), Bultmann (Th., I, 49)
3b-4c	<u>en dunamei &</u> <u>kata-phrases</u>	Fuller (165)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

Aland, Kurt. Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1964.

The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1913.

Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated and adapted from the German 4th and revised edition by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, c. 1957.

Bible, Holy. Authorized or King James' Version.

Bible, Holy. Revised Standard Version.

Biblia Hebraica. Edited by Rudolf Kittel. Masoretic text prepared by P. Kahle. 12th edition emended by A. Alt and O. Eissfeldt. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1961.

Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated and revised from the German by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. Edited and enlarged by E. Kautzsch. The 2nd English edition by A. E. Cowley. London: Oxford University Press, 1910.

Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath. A Concordance to the Septuagint. 3 vols. Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1954.

Moulton, H. K., editor. A Concordance to the Greek Testament. Edited by W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden. 4th edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.

Nestle, Eberhard, editor. Novum Testamentum Graece. Enlarged by Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland. 24th edition. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1960.

Septuaginta. Edited by Alfred Rahlfs. 2 vols. 7th edition. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1962.

B. Secondary Sources

- Althaus, Paul. Der Brief an die Römer. 6th improved edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949.
- Barnikol, Ernst. Zurück zum alten Glauben Jesus der Christus: Ein evangelischer Ruf an deutsche Theologen und Laien. 3rd edition. Halle: Akademischer Verlag, 1933.
- Barrett, Charles Kingsley. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1957.
- Boismard, M.-E. "Constitué fils de dieu (Rom., I,4)," Revue Biblique, LX (1953), 5-17.
- Braun, Herbert. "Der Sinn der neutestamentliche Christologie," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, LIV (1957), 341-77.
- Bröse, Ernst. "Zur Auslegung von Röm. 1,3-4," Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift, X (1899), 562-73.
- Brown, Alexander. "Declared or Constituted Son of God," The Expository Times, V (1893-1894), 308-9.
- Bruce, Frederick Fyvie. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans: An Introduction and Commentary. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1963.
- Büchsel, Friedrich. "didōmi, etc.," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, c. 1964. 166-73.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. "Neueste Paulusforschung," Theologische Rundschau, VIII (1936), 11.
- Theology of the New Testament. Translated from the German by Kendrick Grobel. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, c. 1951 and 1955.
- Charlesworth, Walter. "The Spirit of Holiness, Romans 1:4," The Expository Times, V (1893-1894), 115.
- Cullmann, Oscar. The Christology of the New Testament. Translated from the German by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.

- . The Earliest Christian Confessions. Translated from the German by J. K. S. Reid. London: Lutterworth Press, 1949.
- de Wette, W. M. L. "Kurze Erklärung der Briefe an Titus, Timotheus und die Hebräer. Zweite verbesserte Auflage," Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. II, 1. 4th improved and enlarged edition. Leipzig: Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1847.
- Dodd, C. H. The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1951.
- . The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. New York: Harper, 1932.
- Ellis, Edward Earle. Paul's Use of the Old Testament. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.
- Fahy, Thomas. "Exegesis of Romans 8:29; 1:4," The Irish Theological Quarterly, XXIII (1956), 410-12.
- . "St. Paul's Romans Were Jewish Converts," The Irish Theological Quarterly, XXVI (1959), 182-91.
- Friedrich, Gerhard. "euaggelizomai, etc.," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, c. 1964. II, 707-37.
- . "Lohmeyers These über 'Das paulinische Briefpräskript' kritisch beleuchtet," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLVI (1955), 272-74.
- Friedrich, Gerhard and others. "prophētēs," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. VI. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer GMBH, 1959. Pp. 781-863.
- Fuller, Reginald H. The Foundations of New Testament Christology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.
- Grundmann, Walter. "dunamai, etc." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, c.1964. II, 284-317.

- Hahn, Ferdinand. Christologische Hoheitstitel: Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963.
- Higgins, A. J. B. "Fuller, Reginald H. The Foundations of the New Testament Christology" (review), Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXV (1966), 362.
- Hooke, S. H. "The Translation of Romans 1.4," New Testament Studies, IX (1962-63), 370-71.
- Huddle, Alfred. "Romans I:4," The Expository Times, V (1893-1894), 116.
- Hunter, Archibald M. Paul and his Predecessors. 2nd edition. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961.
- Huntress, Erminie. "'Son of God' in Jewish writings Prior to the Christian Era," Journal of Biblical Literature, LIV (1935), 117-23.
- Käsemann, Ernst. "The Canon of the New Testament and the Unity of the Church," Essays on New Testament Themes. Translated from the German by W. J. Montague. London: SCM Press Ltd., c. 1964.
- "Geist," Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. VI. 3rd edition. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), c.1958. Pp. 1274ff.
- Kelly, J. N. D. Early Christian Creeds. 2nd edition. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1960.
- Knox, John. "The Epistle to the Romans," The Interpreter's Bible. IX. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1954. Pp. 382-83.
- Knox, Wilfred L. "The 'Divine Hero' Christology in the New Testament," Harvard Theological Review, XLI (1948), 229-49.
- Kramer, Werner. Christ, Lord, Son of God. Translated from the German by Brian Hardy. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1966.
- Kuss, Otto. Der Römerbrief, übersetzt und erklärt. 2nd unchanged edition. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1963. Erste Lieferung.

- Leenhardt, Franz J. The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary. Translated from the French 1st edition by Harold Knight. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, c.1961.
- Lichtenstein, Ernst. "Die älteste christliche Glaubensformel," Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, LXIII (1950), 1-74.
- Lietzmann, Hans. Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus. 2nd edition. Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1919.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst. "Probleme paulinischer Theologie," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXVI (1927), 158-73.
- Manson, T. W. "Romans," Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., c.1962. Pp. 940-53.
- Marshall, I. Howard. "Professor Ferdinand Hahn's 'Christologische Hoheitstitel,'" The Expository Times, LXXVIII (April 1967), 212.
- Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm. Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über den Römerbrief. 4th edition; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1865.
- Michel, Otto. Der Brief an die Römer. 13th edition, 4th of his exegesis. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- "Erkennen dem Fleisch nach," Evangelische Theologie, XIV (1954), 22-29.
- Neufeld, Vernon H. The Earliest Christian Confessions. Vol. V of New Testament Tools and Studies. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1963.
- Norden, Eduard. Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur formengeschichte religiöser Rede. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913.
- Oepke, Albrecht. "anistēmi, etc." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. I. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, c1964. Pp. 368-72.

- . Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater. 2nd improved edition. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1964.
- Procksch, Otto and Karl Georg Kuhn. "hagios, etc." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. I. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, c.1964. Pp. 88-115.
- Prümm, Karl. Die Botschaft des Römerbriefes: Ihr Aufbau und Gegenwertwert. Freiburg: Herder KG, 1960.
- Rigaux, Bédá. Paulus und seine Briefe: der Stand der Forschung. Translated from the French by August Berg. München: Kösel Verlag, 1964.
- Roller, Otto. Das Formular der paulinischen Briefe. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933.
- Sabourin, Leopold. The Names and Titles of Jesus: Themes of Biblical Theology. Translated from the French by Maurice Carroll. New York: Macmillan Company, 1967.
- Sanday, William and Arthur C. Headlam. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.
- Schille, Gottfried. Frühchristliche Hymnen. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962.
- Schlatter Adolph von. Gottes Gerechtigkeit: ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1935.
- Schmidt, Hans Wilhelm. Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962.
- Schmidt, K. L. "horizō, etc." Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. V. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1954. Pp. 453-57.
- Schniewind, Julius, and Gerhard Friedrich. "epaggellō, etc.," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. II. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, c.1964. Pp. 576-86.

Schrenck, Gottlob. "graphō, etc." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. I. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, Mich.; Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, c.1964. 742-73.

Schulz, Siegfried, and Gottfried Quell. "sperma," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. VII. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1964. Pp. 537-47.

Schweizer, Eduard. Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und seinen Nachfolgern. Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, c.1955. English translation: Lordship and Discipleship. Translation and revision from the German by the author. London: SCM Press Ltd., c.1960.

----- "huios," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. VIII. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1967. Pp. 334-84.

----- "Röm. 1,3f. und der Gegensatz von Fleisch und Geist vor und bei Paulus," Evangelische Theologie, XV (1955), 563-71.

----- "Zu den Reden der Apostelgeschichte," Theologische Zeitschrift, XIII (1957), 1-11.

----- "Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der 'Sendungsformel' Gal. 4,4f., Ro. 8,3f., John 3,16f., I John 4,9," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, LVII (March-April 1966), 199-210.

----- "Zur Herkunft der Präexistenzvorstellung bei Paulus," Evangelische Theologie, XIX (1959), 65-70.

Schweizer, Eduard, et al. "pneuma," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. VI. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1959. Pp. 330-453; English translation: "Spirit of God," translated from the German by A. E. Harvey, Bible Key Words. III. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, c.1960.

----- "sarx, sarkikos, & sarkinos," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. VII. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1964. Pp. 98-151.

Seeberg, Alfred. Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit. Leipzig: A. Deichertschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1903.

- Selbie, J. A. "Romans I:4," The Expository Times, V (1893-1894), 186-87.
- Stauffer, Ethelbert. New Testament Theology. Translated from the German by John Marsh. New York: Macmillan Company, c.1955. Pp. 338f.
- Strack, Hermann and Paul Billerbeck. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash. I-III. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. "Theologische Probleme des Römerbriefpräskripts," Evangelische Theologie, XXVII (July 1967), 374-89.
- Taylor, Vincent. "Fuller, Reginald H. The Foundations of New Testament Christology" (review), The Expository Times, LXXVII (February 1966), 141.
- Thomas, W. H. G. "Romans I:4," The Expository Times, XXIV (1912-1913), 44-45.
- Wegenast, Klaus. Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen. Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962.
- Weiss, Bernhard. Der Brief an die Römer. 7th edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1886.
- Weiss, Johannes. Earliest Christianity. I. Translated and edited by Frederick C. Grant. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1959.
- Wetter, Gillis. Der Sohn Gottes. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1916.
- Windisch, Hans. "Zur Christologie der Pastoralbriefe," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXXIV (1935), 213-16.