

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

5-1-1968

### Romans 3:24-26: An Evaluation of Form Critical Studies

Ronald Lehenbauer

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



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Lehenbauer, Ronald, "Romans 3:24-26: An Evaluation of Form Critical Studies" (1968). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 380.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/380>

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](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

ROMANS 3:24-26: AN EVALUATION OF  
FORM CRITICAL STUDIES

---

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  
Ronald W. Lehenbauer

May 1968

58908

Approved by:

Walter J. Bell  
Advisor

Edgar M. Wenzel  
Reader



BV  
4070  
C69  
M3  
1968  
no. 4  
c. 2

58908

CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY  
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
Problems and Solutions. . . . .	1
Purpose and Procedure . . . . .	6
II. COMPARISON OF FORM ANALYSIS WITH OTHER APPROACHES . .	8
Evidence for a pre-Pauline Formula. . . . .	8
Pauline Insertions in the Formula . . . . .	23
The Boundaries of the Formula . . . . .	28
Two Recent Textual-Gloss Hypotheses . . . . .	31
Reaction and Critique . . . . .	34
Summary . . . . .	38
III. THE THEOLOGY AND ORIGIN OF THE PRE-PAULINE FORMULA. .	39
The Theology of the Formula . . . . .	39
The Origin of the Formula . . . . .	70
Some Suggested Alternatives . . . . .	72
Summary . . . . .	77
IV. PAUL'S USE OF THE FORMULA . . . . .	79
Paul's Additions to the Formula . . . . .	79
Some Suggested Alternatives . . . . .	99
The Context and Paul's Use of the Formula . . . . .	105
V. CONCLUSION. . . . .	110
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	116



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Problems and Solutions

Rom. 3:24-26 stands at the eschatological turning point of this most significant epistle of St. Paul. After the announcement of the theme of the epistle, the Gospel as the power of God in which His righteousness is revealed for salvation to all who believe (1:16-17), Paul enters into a long discussion about the state of mankind fallen in sin and under the eschatological wrath of God (1:18-3:20). There is no distinction between Gentiles and Jews; all have broken the Law of God, all have turned away from God, all have sinned, and all stand under the condemning wrath and judgment of God. But in Rom. 3:21-31 Paul announces that God has changed all of this: God has intervened in the history of mankind, and in Jesus Christ He has inaugurated the new age (nuni de; en tō nun kai rō) and has revealed His saving righteousness for all who no longer boast in themselves but believe in Jesus Christ. These eleven verses of the epistle to the Romans are perhaps the most significant words that Paul has written; verses 24-26 stand at the center of this proclamation of the eschatological revelation of the righteousness of God and establish the justification of the sinner in God's grace and on faith in the crucified Christ. But if these verses are some of the most significant that Paul has written, they are also some of the most difficult to understand. As Knox has written, "these



words of the apostle have been interpreted in as many diverse ways and have occasioned as much controversy as anything he wrote."<sup>1</sup>

The following are some of the problems and questions which confront the reader and interpreter: (1) The first word in verse 24, dikaioumenoi, raises several problems. It appears to be the main verb of the sentence; but why is it a participle? Does it refer to "all" who have sinned (verse 23) or to "all who believe" (verse 22)? If it refers to the former, would it not have to be qualified? For "all who have sinned" are not justified; rather all who believe in Jesus receive God's righteousness. (2) The sentence which begins in verse 23 ("since all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God") is never really concluded. (3) Much of the vocabulary in these verses is otherwise strange to Paul, and it is difficult to determine precisely what Paul meant by many of the words. What does hilastērion mean? Is Paul comparing Christ with the cult object which stood on top of the Ark of the Covenant in the Old Testament (Ex. 25:16-21), or is he simply calling Christ a "means of expiation" in general? Should the word be translated "expiation" or "propitiation"? The prepositional phrase dia tēn paresin presents several difficulties. Does paresis mean the same as aphesis, forgiveness, or does it mean a passing over of sin or allowing it to go unpunished? Is dia with the accusative to be translated in a retrospective ("because of"), prospective ("with a view to"), or instrumental ("though, by means of") sense? Does the phrase refer to God's

---

<sup>1</sup>John Knox, "The Epistle to the Romans, Exegesis," Interpreter's Bible, edited by G. A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1954), IX, 431.



overlooking of sin in the past or to His present act of forgiveness? What is the anochē of God? Does it refer to the action and disposition of God in the present or to a period of time in the past? (4) The phrase dikaiousunē theou, occurring several times in these verses, raises difficulties of its own. What precisely does Paul mean by this phrase? Has Paul taken it over from the Old Testament and Judaism, or does he use it in a way which is his own creation? Is dikaiousunē the presupposition for salvation or is it to be equated with salvation and the new creation itself? In 3:25b the phrase appears to refer to a quality or attribute of God--the justice which demands payment of formerly committed sins. It is unusual for Paul to use the phrase in two different ways in two adjoining verses. Does dikaiousunē theou have two different meanings in 3:25 and 3:26? (5) This brings us to the problem of the relation of 3:25b to 3:26. Both verses begin in parallel fashion with an endeixin clause, but the verses do not seem to be saying the same thing and are difficult to relate to each other. Why does Paul repeat the endeixin clause? Is Paul contrasting God's retributive righteousness with His saving righteousness? Is he contrasting God's overlooking of sins in the past with His act of justification in the present? Or is he emphasizing that God's saving righteousness forgives the sins of the past as well as those of the present? Or is he saying something else? (6) A closely related problem arises in 3:26b. How are dikaion and dikaionta related to each other and to the foregoing verses? Do they both refer to God's saving righteousness, or does dikaion refer to God's attribute of justice and dikaionta to His saving righteousness?



These are some of the difficult questions relating to Rom. 3:24-26 which interpreters have been considering and discussing for many years. The form of some of our questions has already hinted at some of the solutions which have been proposed. We are not interested in examining every proposed solution or in proposing our own solutions. Rather we plan here to examine an approach which is relatively recent--the approach of form criticism.

Eduard Norden appears to have been the first scholar to suggest that not all of Rom. 3:24-26 came originally from Paul's hand. In 1913 he noted that the relative hon (3:25a) may indicate that Rom. 3:25a is a pre-Pauline sentence from older tradition of the church; he suggested that the tradition read: Christō Iēsou hon proetheto o theos hilastērion dia pisteōs en tō autou aimati.<sup>2</sup> Rudolf Bultmann expanded this suggestion in 1936 by suggesting that Paul appears to use a traditional formula in Rom. 3:24f., which could go back to the earliest church.<sup>3</sup> In 1948, in his Theologie des Neuen Testaments, Bultmann furnished more details for his hypothesis, suggesting that all of verses 24 and 25 was a traditional formulation, except for two Pauline insertions: dōrean tē autou chariti (3:24) and dia pisteōs (3:25).<sup>4</sup> Ernst Kaesemann made a major contribution to the form analysis of Rom. 3:24-26 in an article

---

<sup>2</sup>Eduard Norden, Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte religioeser Rede (Leipzig: Verlag B. G. Teubner, 1913), pp. 380, 383.

<sup>3</sup>Rudolf Bultmann, "Neueste Paulusforschung," Theologische Rundschau, VIII (January 1936), 11-12.

<sup>4</sup>Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, translated from the German by Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), I, 46.



published in 1950-51; he took up Bultmann's hypothesis and arguments, expanded them, developed them in detail, and made suggestions which have subsequently sent scholars in new directions in interpreting these verses of Romans.<sup>5</sup> He proposed that the traditional formula came out of Jewish Christianity and that it emphasized the restitution of the covenant as the result of God's act in putting Christ forth as the expiatory sacrifice of the new age. He suggested that Paul took up this formula only to correct it, for he viewed the new covenant not as the restitution of the old but as its antithesis. This article was a major breakthrough in the study of Rom. 3:21-26, and no serious study of these verses can properly ignore the Bultmann-Kaesemann hypothesis. Since the appearance of this article, several other scholars have published major studies which have adopted and expanded the hypothesis in various directions; some have accepted the hypothesis only in part, and others have rejected it entirely. Recently several scholars, using these form critical studies as a basis, have proposed that Rom. 3:24-26 contains not a pre-Pauline formula but a major scribal gloss. We will examine all of these positions later in this thesis.

---

<sup>5</sup>Ernest Kaesemann, "Zum Verstaendnis von Roemer 3:24-26," Zeitschrift fuer Neuestestamentliche Wissenschaft, this article also appeared in Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), I, 96-100.



## Purpose and Procedure

Our purpose in this thesis is to evaluate the form critical studies of Rom. 3:24-26; we also intend to compare these studies with some suggested alternative interpretations. Form analysis, as we shall see, offers some unique solutions to the problem. We do not expect that all of the questions will be answered; the suggestion that Paul in these verses is citing and correcting or commenting on an earlier formula, however, explains some of the puzzling features which have not been adequately explained before.

What is meant by a "pre-Pauline" formula? "Pre-Pauline" does not refer only to the time before Paul's conversion but includes the period of the earliest church's development from Pentecost to the decade in which Paul began to write the epistles which have come down to us from his hand,<sup>6</sup> thus roughly the years between 33 and 50 A.D. The criteria for discovering pre-Pauline formulae from the tradition will be discussed in Chapter II.

We shall proceed as follows. In Chapter II we shall evaluate the evidence that a pre-Pauline formula is to be found in Rom. 3:24-26. Our task will be then to discuss where the formula begins and ends and what insertions and comments Paul has added. In this connection we shall examine two recent textual gloss hypotheses. We shall then briefly examine the reaction of other scholars to this form critical approach.

---

<sup>6</sup>A. M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961), p. 9.



In the next chapter we shall try to determine the theological viewpoint and emphases of the formula and ask about the origin of the formula. Since most form critics limit the formula to verses 24 and 25, we shall then examine the interpretations of these verses by scholars who do not fully accept the form analysis; we thus plan to contrast the several approaches and to set the form critical studies in their proper perspective. In Chapter IV we shall examine both Paul's insertions in the formula and his interpretive addition at the end to determine how and why he used the formula. Again we shall set this interpretation in its proper perspective by examining the approach of other scholars to verse 26. Finally we shall examine the historical and literary context of Rom. 3:24-26 to see what light this may shed on why and how Paul used this formula from the tradition.

As we proceed, we shall find it necessary to study many of the words and concepts of these verses in some depth. The scope of this thesis, however, does not allow for a thorough study of all of the words and concepts. We are primarily interested in the words as they relate to the form analysis of our verses.

In the many discussions of this passage there is some confusion as to location of the verse divisions. In this thesis the verses will be referred to as follows:

- (3:26) dikaïoumenoi dōrean tē autou chariti dia tēs apolutrōseōs tēs en Christō Iēsou;  
 (3:25a) hōn proetheto ho theos hilastērion dia pisteōs en tō autou haimati,  
 (3:25b) eis endeixin tēs dikaiosunēs autou dia tēn paresin tōn progegonotōn hamartematōn en tē anochē tou theou,  
 (3:26a) pros tēn endeixin tēs dikaiosunēs autou en tō nun kairō,  
 (3:26b) eis to einai auton dikaion kai dikaiounta ton ek pisteōs Iēsou.



## CHAPTER II

### COMPARISON OF FORM ANALYSIS WITH OTHER APPROACHES

#### Evidence for a pre-Pauline Formula

That Paul used earlier literary sources in writing his epistles is obvious from the many Old Testament citations in his writings. Interpreters of the Pauline epistles are also generally agreed that traditions, either oral or written, which originated either with Jesus or in the earliest church can also be isolated in Paul's writings. 1 Cor. 11:23ff. and 1 Cor. 15:3ff.<sup>1</sup> are clear examples, for in both Paul cites formulations which he expressly says he has received through tradition. There are other passages which contain features characteristic of traditional material and which can with some degree of certainty be isolated as pre-Pauline formulations, even though Paul does not expressly state that he is citing the tradition.<sup>2</sup> In recent years several scholars, following Bultmann<sup>3</sup> and Kaesemann,<sup>4</sup> have developed

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, translated from the German by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall, revised edition (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, c.1963), p. 76.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., Phil. 2:5-11 may contain an ancient Christian Aramaic psalm or hymn from the earliest church, ibid., pp. 174-75; also Rom. 1:3ff. no doubt is taken from the tradition, ibid., p. 292; these are only two of many examples that could be cited.

<sup>3</sup>Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, translated from the German by Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), I, 46.

<sup>4</sup>Ernst Kaesemann, "Zum Verstaendnis von Roemer 3:24-26," Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), I, 96-100.



the hypothesis that Rom. 3:24-26 contains a formula from the tradition. Our purpose in this chapter is to examine this form analytical interpretation, in particular the evidence that a formula can be isolated in our passage, and evaluate it with reference to other approaches to Rom. 3:24-26.

One of the criterion by which traditional formulae can be isolated is their frequent use of vocabulary which is uncharacteristic of the author who is citing them.<sup>5</sup> Rom. 3:24-25 contains several words and phrases which occur infrequently, if at all, elsewhere in Paul. Bultmann noted that hilastērion occurs only here in Paul;<sup>6</sup> it occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only in Heb. 9:5. To this we can add anochē, which occurs only twice in Paul (here and in Rom. 2:4) and not at all in the rest of the New Testament or in the LXX.<sup>7</sup> Also endeixis, occurring here twice in two parallel phrases (3:25b, and 26a), is to be found only twice more in Paul (2 Cor. 8:24; Phil. 1:28) and not at all in the rest of the New Testament or in the LXX.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Reginald H. Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962), p. 21, lists seven criteria for discovering formulae from the tradition of the earliest church in the epistles of the New Testament; Ethelbert Stauffer, New Testament Theology, translated from the German by John Marsh (New York: Macmillan Co., 1965), Appendix III, pp. 338-39, lists twelve such criteria.

<sup>6</sup> Bultmann, I, 46.

<sup>7</sup> A Concordance to the Greek Testament, edited by W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden (4th revised edition; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), s.v.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., s.v.; but Paul also uses the verb endeiknumi nine times.



To this Kaesemann added paresis, progegonota hamartēmata, protithesthai in the meaning "to show forth", dikaiosunē as a divine quality in verse 25, and apolutrōsis as a designation of the already accomplished redemption.<sup>9</sup> Paresis occurs only here in the entire New Testament and never in the LXX, and its corresponding verb, pariēmi, is to be found only twice in the New Testament (Luke 11:42; Heb. 12:12 citing Is. 35:3). If paresis is taken to be equivalent to aphesis, "forgiveness," Kuemmel notes that Paul speaks of God's forgiveness elsewhere only twice (Col. 1:14; Rom. 4:7, citing Ps. 32:1), using aphesis and aphienai.<sup>10</sup> Proginomai can be found in the New Testament only in our passage, and it does not occur in the LXX at all.<sup>11</sup> Hamartēma occurs only twice in Paul (here and 1 Cor. 6:18) and five times in the entire New Testament;<sup>12</sup> Paul usually speaks of sin (hamartia) in the singular, but when he speaks about sins or transgressions against God he uses hamartia (nine times), paraptōma (fifteen times), and parabasis (five times). He does not speak of "formerly committed sins" in any other passage. The verb protithēmi is rare in the New Testament (three occurrences, here, Rom. 1:13, and Eph. 1:9), and Reumann, following Kaesemann's view that the verb means "to put

---

<sup>9</sup>Kaesemann, I, 96.

<sup>10</sup>Werner Georg Kuemmel, "Paresis und endeixis: Ein Beitrag zum Verstaendnis der paulinischen Rechtfertigungslehre," Zeitschrift fuer Theologie und Kirche, XLIX (1952), 164 (the article refers to Rom. 4:4, but this is no doubt a typographical error).

<sup>11</sup>A Concordance to the Greek Testament, s.v.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., s.v.



forward" in our passage, notes that in Rom. 1:13 it means "to intend."<sup>13</sup>

Apolutrōsis presents a more complicated picture; it occurs seven times in the Pauline epistles. Twice Paul uses the word of a redemption which is yet unaccomplished (Rom. 8:23; Eph. 4:30). In our passage and in four others it refers to an already accomplished redemption. Kertelge dismisses the two passages in Ephesians (1:7,14), stating that the epistle requires special treatment in the Pauline corpus;<sup>14</sup> there is some indication that these passages also stem at least in part from the tradition.<sup>15</sup> Although Kertelge sees 1 Cor. 1:30 as an obvious formula,<sup>16</sup> this occurrence of apolutrōsis cannot be explained so easily, as the vocabulary of the passage is not un-Pauline, and the passage fits properly into its context. Lohse, who does not consider Rom. 3:24 as part of the formula, says the word itself is probably from the tradition;<sup>17</sup> its occurrence in Col. 1:14 would

---

<sup>13</sup> John Reumann, "The Gospel of the Righteousness of God," Interpretation, XX (October 1966), 437.

<sup>14</sup> Karl Kertelge, "Rechtfertigung" bei Paulus (Muenster: Verlag Aschendorff, 1967), p. 52.

<sup>15</sup> Both passages contain formula characteristics: Eph. 1:7 (a) begins with a relative pronoun (en ho); (b) the word "blood" occurs mostly in traditional formulations in Paul; (c) aphesis is rare in Paul; (d) it is a basic Christological statement; Eph. 1:14 (a) begins with a relative pronoun (hos); (b) parallel lines beginning with eis indicate a hymn perhaps; (c) arrabōn (guarantee) occurs only twice more in Paul, and the same can be said for peripoiēsis; epainos occurs only six more times in Paul.

<sup>16</sup> Kertelge, p. 52.

<sup>17</sup> Eduard Lohse, Maertyrer und Gottesknecht (2nd edition; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), p. 149.



confirm this view.<sup>18</sup> One could not conclude from this word alone, however, that Rom. 3:24ff. contains a pre-Pauline formula.

Bultmann listed the word haimati as important evidence that Rom. 3:24f. contains a formula from the tradition; it is not "Paul's habit elsewhere (except Rom. 5:9 and, again following tradition, in reference to the Lord's Supper, 1 Cor. 10:16; 11:25,27) to speak of the 'the blood' of Christ, but of 'the cross.'"<sup>19</sup> Haima occurs twelve times in the Pauline corpus, but in only nine of these does it refer to the blood of Christ.<sup>20</sup> Most of these passages, as Bultmann noted, appear to go back to the tradition of the earliest church (including also Col. 1:20, and perhaps Eph. 1:7, supra, footnote 15). With regard to the other passages (Rom. 5:9; Eph. 2:13), Kertelge is perhaps correct in saying that the phrase haimi Christou is a phrase from the cult of the earliest Jewish Christians, which Paul simply took up in his writings without explanation.<sup>21</sup> The appearance of haimati in 3:25, then, may be another indication that we are dealing here with pre-Pauline material.

---

<sup>18</sup>Col. 1:14 very likely contains a traditional formula: (a) it is followed by what is commonly accepted as a pre-Pauline hymn, 1:15-20; (b) it begins with a relative pronoun (en ho); (c) aphesis is unusual in Paul; (d) Paul normally uses hamartia in the singular.

<sup>19</sup>Bultmann, I, 46.

<sup>20</sup>It occurs in the phrase "flesh and blood," meaning man in his creatureliness in 1 Cor. 15:50; Gal. 1:16; and Eph. 6:12; in Rom. 3:15, in the phrase "to shed blood" from Is. 59:7-8, it means "to murder"; cf. Johannes Behm, "haima haimatekchusia," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated from the German and edited by G. W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964), I, 172.

<sup>21</sup>Kertelge, p. 52.



Probably the most important linguistic feature of our passage which has led form critics to the conclusion that we have here a pre-Pauline formula is the peculiar use of dikaïosunē in 3:25. Obviously dikaïosunē and its cognates occur frequently in Paul, but in Rom. 3:25 form critics and non-form critics alike detect a usage uncharacteristic of Paul; this is because of the connection of dikaïosunē with hilastērion and dia tēn paresin tōn progegonotōn hamartematōn. Ordinarily dikaïosunē theou appears as a dynamic concept in Paul, closely related to the "power of God for salvation to everyone who believes" (Rom. 1:16f), which is only revealed in the eschaton (3:21,26).<sup>22</sup> But in Rom. 3:25 many exegetes see dikaïosunē as an attribute of God, His inherent justice<sup>23</sup> or His demanding holiness which made necessary the terrible death of Christ on the cross.<sup>24</sup>

Bultmann saw this as important evidence that Rom. 3:24f. contains a pre-Pauline formula, for "the idea found here of the divine righteousness demanding expiation for former sins is otherwise foreign to him."<sup>25</sup> Kertelge notes that it is improbable that Paul in so short a section as Rom. 3:21-26 would speak in two ways about the righteousness of God and place the two concepts next to or in contrast to one another; Paul does

---

<sup>22</sup> Infra, Chapter IV.

<sup>23</sup> John Murray, The Epistle to the Romans (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959), I, 118-119.

<sup>24</sup> Otto Kuss, Der Roemerbrief (2nd edition; Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1963), I, 117-118.

<sup>25</sup> Bultmann, I, 46.



not make such a distinction clearly. But the problem finds its solution in the hypothesis that Paul here cited a formula, which used dikaiosunē in this peculiar way.<sup>26</sup> Kaesemann agreed with Bultmann that dikaiosunē in 3:25 is an attribute of God, but he holds that it does not describe God's retributive justice but rather His covenant fidelity to His people. In the Old Testament and in Judaism dikaiosunē is closely related to mercy (חסד) and pity (רחמי). 4 Esdras 8:36 reads: "For through this will your righteousness and goodness be revealed, Lord, that you have mercy on those who have no treasury of good works." The formula of Rom. 3:24f. is distinguished from this covenant theology of Judaism, says Kaesemann, only in that it points to the working out of this covenant-fidelity in a unique eschatological divine act: the death of Christ.<sup>27</sup> It is in this way, then, that dikaiosunē in 3:25 is seen as evidence for traditional material in our passage.

We will have to return to a discussion of dikaiosunē theou several times in this thesis because of its central importance in these verses and in their context. At this point we should only note further that dikaiosunē does not necessarily have to be taken as an attribute of God in 3:25 but may be interpreted in the usual Pauline sense, as several commentators have done. Michel, for example, notes that eis endeixin tēs dikaiosunēs autou (3:25b) may mean that God acknowledged His

---

<sup>26</sup>Kertelge, pp. 49-50, 51-52.

<sup>27</sup>Kaesemann, I, 98-99; infra, Chapter III.



covenant faithfulness toward Israel, as Kaesemann holds, or that God through this saving event set forth His righteousness.<sup>28</sup> An argument for a pre-Pauline formula in 3:25 from dikaiousunē alone would not be convincing. But all of the linguistic phenomena of Rom. 3:24f., as we have seen, do make up the beginnings of a fairly convincing argument.

Another criterion for discovering traditional formulae in the epistles is the detection of possible "contextual dislocations"; the formula may fail to fit into its context syntactically or by reason of its content.<sup>29</sup> Content and syntactical problems are easily detectable in Rom. 3:23-24, and form critics have understood this to be caused by the presence of a formula in 3:24f. The problem is that verse 24 does not continue the sentence structure or thought of verse 23. Kaesemann pointed out that one would naturally expect the pantes stressed in verse 23 to be repeated again in verse 24: "all have sinned . . . but all are justified." There is no pantes in verse 24, however.<sup>30</sup> Michel comments that since verse 24 presents the main idea of the sentence, one would expect that the verb of that verse would be in the indicative and that the preceding negative clause would be connected

---

<sup>28</sup>Otto Michel, Der Brief an die Roemer (13th edition; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), p. 107; Anders Nygren, Commentary on Romans, translated from the Swedish by Carl C. Rasmussen (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1949), pp. 160-161, makes his point that "the righteousness of which verse 25 speaks is no other than that spoken of in verse 21. It is the same righteousness which is affirmed throughout the epistle."

<sup>29</sup>Stauffer, p. 339.

<sup>30</sup>Kaesemann, I, 96.



to the positive main clause with a linking particle; thus, instead of dikaioumenoi one would expect dikaountai de.<sup>31</sup> But there is no conjunction, and the participle dikaioumenoi "begins an intrusion, as if from another context" so that verse 23 is never completed as it ought to be.<sup>32</sup> If one assumes, however, that dikaioumenoi begins a traditional formula which Paul is citing, the problems are solved.

Other solutions have been offered to this problem. Michel and others have suggested that 3:22b-23 are parenthetical to the thought-sentence which begins at 3:21 and concludes in 3:24;<sup>33</sup> dikaioumenoi would then refer back to the tous pisteuontas of 3:22. Phillips' paraphrase of these verses clearly adopts this solution to the problem:

But now we are seeing the righteousness of God declared quite apart from the Law (though amply testified to by both Law and Prophets)--it is a righteousness imparted to, and operating in, all who have faith in Jesus Christ. (For there is no distinction to be made anywhere: everyone falls short of the beauty of God's plan.) Under this divine "system" a man who has faith is now freely acquitted in the eyes of God by his generous dealing in the Redemptive Act of Jesus Christ.<sup>34</sup>

Sanday and Headlam admit that such a construction would be irregular, but not too irregular for St. Paul.<sup>35</sup> Rhys points out the real

---

<sup>31</sup>Michel, pp. 105-106. .

<sup>32</sup>Reumann, XX, 435.

<sup>33</sup>Michel, p. 106; Murray, I, 114; William Sanday and A. C. Headlam, The Epistle to the Romans (5th edition; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, c.1902), pp. 85-86.

<sup>34</sup>J. B. Phillips, The New Testament in Modern English (New York: Macmillan Co., 1958), p. 323.

<sup>35</sup>Sanday and Headlam, pp. 85-86.



difficulty with this solution: dikaioumenoi is in the nominative case, "which implies that it refers to those who sinned, whereas it probably should be in the accusative to agree with all those who believe in verse 22."<sup>36</sup> This solution, then, is not wholly satisfactory and raises new difficulties.

Another solution is expounded by Lee.<sup>37</sup> He says that Paul's main point in 3:23-24 is to prove the universality of sin on the basis of the grace-character of justification; thus verse 24 is the subordinate clause supporting the main clause, verse 23: "Justification is by grace, and therefore all men have sinned." There are some things to be said in favor of this interpretation. One of Paul's chief points in Romans is the universality of sin and the inability of man to receive justification through law. In the sections preceding and following 3:21-26 Paul makes these points: "None is righteous, no, not one" (3:10); "For no human being will be justified in his sight by works of law since through the law comes the knowledge of sin" (3:20); "Then what becomes of our boasting? It is excluded . . . on the principle of faith" (3:27). This solution also explains why dikaioumenoi is a participle. But this does not explain why the pantes is not repeated in verse 24. Also with this solution the purpose of the statements of 3:25-26 becomes questionable: why does Paul use such a long modifying phrase about justification if his point is the

---

<sup>36</sup>Howard Rhys, The Epistle to the Romans (New York: Macmillan Co., 1961), p. 43.

<sup>37</sup>E. K. Lee, A Study in Romans (London: SPCK, 1962), pp. 53-54.



universality of sin? Sanday and Headlam argue that this "would be an inversion of the logical order."<sup>38</sup> But, as we noted, Paul does argue on the basis of faith that all boasting is excluded (3:27). It is difficult to hold, however, that Paul's chief point in 3:21-26 is the universality of sin; it appears more likely that the mention of this in verse 23 is simply Paul's way of connecting this section, which describes the eschatological revelation of the righteousness of God, with the previous section (1:18-3:20), which describes the wrath of God. 3:21-26 appears to be a section complete in itself: the nuni de (3:21) indicates the beginning of a new section, and, as Kertelge notes, in 3:27 the question marks a new section and a different method of discourse.<sup>39</sup> Therefore this solution is also found to be unsatisfactory.

Kuss sees no real difficulty in these verses (3:23-24). He agrees that one would expect an indicative in 3:24 and a participle in 3:23, but he finds an explanation for the text as it reads in the "freedom" which Paul loved, which affects even his writing style and which may, therefore, offend the grammarian.<sup>40</sup> This may not be a farfetched explanation; Paul's writing style may produce the solution to the problem of relating these two verses to each other. As Zerwick notes in his grammar, Paul frequently goes on with coordinate participles after a finite verb. "Occasionally puzzlement, and sometimes perhaps also exegetical difficulty, is caused by the expression in a participle

---

<sup>38</sup>Sanday and Headlam, p. 85.

<sup>39</sup>Kertelge, pp. 48-49; cf. also Michel, pp. 103-104.

<sup>40</sup>Kuss, I, 114.



of what is the principal notion, while the finite verb expresses what is but a circumstance."<sup>41</sup> The peculiar syntax of Rom. 3:23-24, then, may be explained simply as Paul's peculiar style; but because of the accumulation of evidence for an earlier formula here, the explanation that sees a traditional citation beginning in verse 24 is also a valid option.

Form critics have detected another contextual dislocation in 3:25b: dia tēn paresin tōn progegonotōn hamartēmatōn en tē anoche tou theou. A large number of exegetes have taken this phrase to mean that God was patient with man's sin in the pre-Christian era; "in the ages gone by God did not execute upon men the full measure of his displeasure but exercised forbearance."<sup>42</sup> The Revised Standard Version translates as follows: "because in his divine forbearance he had passed over former sins." Form critics see the phrase interpreted in this way as "a foreign element which is hard to explain in the context of Paul's thought."<sup>43</sup> Kaesemann notes that Juelicher raised the question of how the past can be described in terms of

---

<sup>41</sup> Maximilian Zerwick, Biblical Greek, translated from the Latin by Joseph Smith (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963), paragraphs 374, 376; e.g., cf. 2 Cor. 5:12; 7:5; 9:10-11; Rom. 5:10-11: "For if while we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more now that we are reconciled shall we be saved by his life. Not only so, but we also rejoice (kauchōmenoi) in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received our reconciliation."

<sup>42</sup> Murray, I, 119; cf. also Michel, p. 109; R. H. Miller, "An Exposition of Romans 3:21-31," Review and Expositor, XXX (October 1933), 428; Vincent Taylor, "Great Texts Reconsidered," Expository Times, L (April 1939), 300; and many others.

<sup>43</sup> Reumann, XX, 439.



paresin and anochē in the light of Rom. 1:18-3:20, where the orgē theou is said to be revealed against all wickedness of man.

Kaesemann is not satisfied with Juelicher's explanation that individuals in the past may have met with divine judgment, but not the nations; nor is he satisfied with Zahn's explanation that both divine wrath and patience ruled in the past.<sup>44</sup> But, says, Kaesemann, if one accepts Bultmann's thesis that 3:25b is part of a pre-Pauline formula, then the problem is solved.<sup>45</sup> This particular argument of the form critics is not without difficulties. First of all it is not clear that the phrase in question refers to an overlooking of sins in the past; Kaesemann, himself, holds that in the formula the phrase refers to the present forgiveness by God of the sins against the covenant.<sup>46</sup> Secondly, Paul does not characterize man in the pre-Christian situation as being only under the wrath and judgment of God; in Rom. 2:4f. Paul speaks of kindness, forbearance (anochē), and patience of God toward sinners, which is to lead them to repentance before the day of wrath and judgment arrives. Thus Rom. 3:25b is not necessarily a foreign element in this Pauline context.

Another contextual phenomenon which leads form critics to the hypothesis of a formula in 3:24f. is the apparent parallelism of the clause in 3:26a with that of 3:25b: eis endeixin tēs dikaiosunēs

---

<sup>44</sup>Kaesemann, I, 97.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., I, 98.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., I, 99; cf. also Christian Mueller, Gottes Gerechtigkeit und Gottes Volk (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), p. 110.



autou . . . pros tēn endeixin tēs dikaiosunēs autou. The question is, why does Paul use this phrase twice? Scholars have long puzzled over this exegetical difficulty and have come up with a variety of solutions. We will discuss this problem and its possible solutions in detail in Chapter IV; we need only note here that form analysis presents an appealing solution. Obviously one way for Paul to comment on a formula he has cited would be to repeat a phrase from the formula and follow it with his clarifying comments.<sup>47</sup> This is exactly what the form critics hypothesize Paul has done in 3:26a. Kertelge notes further that this hypothesis explains the addition of the article before endeixin in 3:26a: Paul stresses that the demonstration of God's righteousness of which he speaks in 3:26 is the important demonstration in contrast to the less important demonstration of which the formula (verse 25b) speaks.<sup>48</sup> Other proposed solutions to this problem do not require such a stressed repetition of the phrase in question; this solution of form analysis, therefore, argues strongly for the presence of a pre-Pauline formula in our verses.

We have now to examine the grammatical features of Rom. 3:24-26 which lead to the hypothesis that a traditional formula is located in these verses. Formulae often show a preference for participles,<sup>49</sup> and there are two in 3:24f. (dikaioumenoi, progegonotōn). In connection

---

<sup>47</sup>Reumann, XX, 435.

<sup>48</sup>Kertelge, p. 50.

<sup>49</sup>Fuller, p. 21.



with dikaioumenoi Reumann makes the point that this present tense form "is not characteristic of Paul" and that he normally uses a past tense, usually the aorist.<sup>50</sup> This is misleading; although Paul uses the aorist of dikaioō more than any other tense (ten times, passive; two, active), he uses the present tense almost as frequently (seven times, passive; two, active).<sup>51</sup> In connection with dia tēn paresin, Reumann offers the evidence that "dia with the accusative is rare in Paul."<sup>52</sup> This too is misleading; it does not occur as frequently as dia with the genitive, but it cannot be called "rare" in Paul, for in Romans alone it occurs a significant number of times and in significant passages.<sup>53</sup>

Traditional formulae often begin with the relative pronoun (hos).<sup>54</sup> Rom. 3:25 begins with hon. But according to Bultmann and Kaesemann the formula begins in verse 24, not in verse 25; we shall see that the hon is one factor that led Lohse to argue that the formula is located only in verse 25.<sup>55</sup>

Kaesemann lists the genitive constructions and the many prepositional phrases in these verses as evidence that we are dealing with a

---

<sup>50</sup> Reumann, XX, 440-441.

<sup>51</sup> Rom. 3:24,26,28; 4:5; 8:33; Gal. 2:16; 3:8,11; 4:5.

<sup>52</sup> Reumann, XX, 437.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Rom. 4:23,24,25 (twice); 6:19; 8:10 (twice), 11,20; 11:28 (twice); 13:5 (twice); 14:15; 15:15.

<sup>54</sup> Fuller, p. 21; cf. e.g. Col. 1:15,18; 1 Tim. 3:16.

<sup>55</sup> Lohse, p. 150.



pre-Pauline tradition, perhaps from a hymnological, liturgical setting.<sup>56</sup> To this can be added the lack of particles and conjunctions in these verses, another characteristic of formulae.<sup>57</sup>

Finally, Reumann<sup>58</sup> argues that the citing of traditional formulae was a method of discourse which was especially pertinent for the epistle to the Romans, since Paul is addressing a congregation which he had neither founded nor visited. "Therefore, it was to his advantage to cite and to appeal to familiar formulations likely already known to Christians there." Reumann sees traditional formulae in Rom. 1:3f.; 4:25; 8:34f.; 10:9; 14:9; in addition to 3:24f. and 3:30, and points out that Romans has been termed a sort of commentary on such formulae. It is not within the scope of this thesis to examine all of these passages. We should only note that for several of these passages, such as Rom. 1:3f. and 10:9 ("Jesus is Lord"), there is strong evidence that they do contain pre-Pauline formulae; Rom. 3:24f. would not be alone in Romans as the only passage containing a pre-Pauline tradition.

#### Pauline Insertions in the Formula

We have discussed the major arguments used by form critics to show that a pre-Pauline formula is contained in Rom. 3:24-26, and we

---

<sup>56</sup> Kaesemann, I, 96; e.g. cf. Rom. 1:3ff.

<sup>57</sup> Stauffer, p. 339.

<sup>58</sup> Reumann, XX, 433-34.



have seen that most analyses limit the formula to 3:24-25; 3:26, then, is Paul's comment on the formula. Most form critics also see Pauline additions within the formula itself. Bultmann considered dōrean tē autou chariti in 3:24, concepts natural to Paul, to be a Pauline insertion.<sup>59</sup> The charis of God in Christ is, of course, of central importance in Paul's theology (for example, Rom. 5:1f.; Gal. 2:21). However, dōrean does not occur frequently in the Pauline corpus; Reumann considers the word part of the pre-Pauline formula (note the alliterative dikaioumenoi dōrean) which Paul interprets with tē autou chariti.<sup>60</sup> However, Paul uses other words closely related to dōrean: dōrea (five times), dōrema (once), and dōron (once). Rom. 5:15-17 are especially significant; here he uses dōrea twice in close connection with charis and dikaiousunē.<sup>61</sup> Also, Sanday and Headlam point out that in Rom. 3:24 dōrean and tē autou chariti strengthen each other in a very emphatic way in order to stress that the justification and the redemption is entirely apart from works of law.<sup>62</sup> We cannot establish statistically that dōrean with charis is

<sup>59</sup> Bultmann, I, 46; cf. also Kertelge, p. 52.

<sup>60</sup> Reumann, XX, 441; cf. also Michel, p. 106, who says that the word has a liturgical and solemn flavor and probably stems from an old pattern; dōrean occurs three times in Paul meaning "as a gift," Rom. 3:24, 2 Cor. 11:7, and 2 Thess. 3:8, and once meaning "in vain," Gal. 2:21.

<sup>61</sup> Dōrean or its equivalent occurs in the same passage with charis seven times in the Pauline corpus (Rom. 5:15,16,17; 2 Cor. 9:14-15; Eph. 2:8f.; 3:7; 4:7) not including Rom. 3:24.

<sup>62</sup> Sanday and Headlam, p. 86.



uncharacteristic of Paul's writings and must, therefore, disagree with Reumann's suggestion that dōrean was part of the pre-Pauline formula.

The second insertion of Paul into the formula, according to Bultmann, is dia pisteōs in 3:25.<sup>63</sup> We need not discuss the central significance of faith for Paul here. If he is quoting a traditional formula in these verses, it is almost to be expected that he would insert his favorite concepts for clarity. That this phrase is an insertion is made more likely by its intrusion between hilastērion and en tō autou haimati, which go together naturally.<sup>64</sup>

These two sets of phrases are the only ones that Bultmann, Kaesemann, and others following in their path consider as Pauline insertions within the formula. But Lohse, who denies that verse 24 is part of the formula, raised the question about en Christō Iēsou in that verse, since this particular phrase is not evident before Paul and Paul is probably to be considered its creator.<sup>65</sup> Of the form critics who hold that the formula starts in verse 24, only Reumann has taken up this issue.<sup>66</sup> He puzzles over the problem and suggests that

---

<sup>63</sup> Bultmann, I, 46; cf. also Kaesemann, I, 100.

<sup>64</sup> Reumann, XX, 439; there are two other possibilities for the source of dia pisteōs here: (1) pistis may mean God's faithfulness here, as it frequently does in the LXX; en pistei is the usual form when God's faithfulness is in view, e.g. Hos. 2:22; Ps. 32(33):4; (2) it may be a scribal gloss for it is omitted in "A"; it is easier to imagine a scribe adding dia pisteōs here than it is to imagine him omitting it from the text; but the external evidence is heavily in favor of dia pisteōs as the original reading: ~~X~~, C, D, G, and a majority of the remaining witnesses.

<sup>65</sup> Lohse, pp. 149-150, footnote 4.

<sup>66</sup> Reumann, XX, 441-442.



either the phrase was in the formula and originally meant "through Messiah Jesus" or that it replaces whatever stood in the formula as the antecedent for hon (3:25). This brings out a significant weakness in the form analytical approach to Rom. 3:24-26, which we shall discuss further in the next section.

None of the form critics who have seriously examined these verses has up to now considered the possibility that the phrase eis endeixin tēs dikaiosunēs autou (3:25b) might also be a Pauline insertion. There are some things to be said in favor of this possibility: (1) The thought of the formula would flow just as well if this phrase were omitted:

being justified through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forth as hilastērion in his blood because of the passing over (or: with a view to the forgiveness) of formerly committed sins in the forbearance of God.

(2) As we noted above<sup>67</sup> dikaiosunē in 3:25 may have its usual, dynamic Pauline meaning as it does in 3:21 and 3:26. It seems likely that Paul would insert this favorite concept of his into the formula just as he inserted another of his favorite concepts, dia pisteōs; this is true especially since dikaiosunē is of central importance in the immediate context and in the whole epistle. (3) We have noted that endeixis is rare in Paul; but its related verb, endeiknumi, is not especially rare, occurring nine times in the Pauline corpus. Rom. 9:22 is significant:

---

<sup>67</sup>Supra, footnote 28.



What if God, desiring to show his wrath (endeixasthai tēn orgēn) and to make known his power, has endured with much patience the vessels of wrath made for destruction. . . .<sup>68</sup>

Since the wrath of God is said to be revealed in Rom. 1:18, it appears that Paul uses apokaluptō, endeiknumi, gnōrizō, and perhaps also phaneroō (3:20) almost synonymously. The manifestation of God's righteousness (3:20) is closely related to the revelation of that righteousness (1:17), and probably also to the demonstration of that righteousness in our verses (3:25,26). Thus the phrase in question in 3:25b may very well be a Pauline insertion once again striking the central theme of his epistle. (4) With this phrase omitted, the formula can be seen to be structured in six well-balanced lines:

dikaioumenoi dia tēs apolutrōseōs tēs  
en Christō lēsou

hon proetheto ho theos hilastērion  
en tō autou haimati

dia tēn paresin tōn progegonotōn hamartematōn  
en tē anoche tou theou.

(5) It may be asked why Paul changed the wording eis endeixin to pros tēn endeixin, if both phrases are his. But the same question can be asked of the form critics who hold that dia pisteōs and ek pisteōs are Pauline additions. The answer may lie in Paul's love for freedom and variety, which also affected his writing style.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup>Cf. also Rom. 2:15; 9:17; 2 Cor. 8:24; Eph. 2:7; 1 Tim. 1:16; 2 Tim. 4:14; Titus 2:10; 3:2.

<sup>69</sup>Kuss, I, 114, gives this solution to the problem of dikaioumenoi (v. 24).



## The Boundaries of the Formula

We have seen that there is some disagreement among the exegetes who find a pre-Pauline tradition in Rom. 3:24-26 as to exactly what words and verses constitute the formula. Where does the formula begin, and where does it end? A majority of the form critics follow Bultmann, who, as we have seen, held that the formula consists of 3:24-25 without the two Pauline insertions dōrean tē autou chariti and dia pisteōs.<sup>70</sup> Lohse, however, has dissented from this opinion and holds that only verse 25 constitutes the formula.<sup>71</sup> His arguments for omitting verse 24 are persuasive: (1) In the previous section we have noted his argument against including en Christō Iēsou in the formula. As it turns out, the only concept in verse 24 which may have been taken over from tradition is apolutrōsis. Talbert clarifies this point: "With the exception of the syntactical difficulty presented by the participle dikaioumenoi, all the significant arguments for a formula apply to verse 25 rather than to 24."<sup>72</sup> We have noted in our discussion of dikaioumenoi in the

---

<sup>70</sup>Bultmann, I, 46; Kaesemann, I, 96; Mueller, pp. 110-111; Kertelge, pp. 51-53; Peter Stuhlmacher, Gottes Gerechtigkeit bei Paulus (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), pp. 88-89; Klaus Wegenast, Das Verstaendnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen (Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962), p. 76; Georg Braumann, Vorpaulinische Christliche Taufverkuendigung bei Paulus (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1962), pp. 39-40; G. Schille, Fruehchristliche Hymnen (Berlin: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 1962), p. 60, suggests that v. 23, beginning with pantes, is also to be included in the formula, and that the gar introduces the formula; however the gar would stand after the first word of the formula; also, if Lohse's arguments below (that v. 24 is not included in the formula) are correct, then it is unlikely that v. 23 is part of the formula.

<sup>71</sup>Lohse, pp. 149-150.

<sup>72</sup>Charles H. Talbert, "A Non-Pauline Fragment at Romans 3:24-26?" Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXV (1966), 288.



first part of this chapter that the problem with this participle may simply be due to Paul's free style. (2) 3:25 is more easily seen as the beginning of a formula because of the relative pronoun with which the verse opens. We have already noted that traditional formulae often begin with a relative pronoun referring to Christ (for example, Phil. 2:5ff; 1 Tim. 3:16; and 1 Peter 2:5ff., as Lohse has indicated). (3) A third argument which we may offer is related to the first. As we shall see, most form critics detect a covenant theology in the formula, which Paul clarifies or corrects.<sup>73</sup> But almost all of the concepts which are seen to be related to the covenant are contained in verse 25; verse 24 is not essential to the covenant theology of the formula.

Talbert takes still another view regarding the boundaries of the formula.<sup>74</sup> He agrees with Lohse that the formula begins with 3:25, but, unlike any other form critic, he holds that the formula also continues into 3:26; he also holds that en tō nun kai rō and ton ek pisteōs Iēsou (3:26) were later scribal insertions. He lists three basic arguments for his position, in addition to those listed above for the omission of verse 24 from the formula: (1) With this analysis 3:25-26 is seen to be a unit with a formal, balanced structure, which is arranged and translated by Talbert as follows:

---

<sup>73</sup>Kaesemann, I, 98-100, was the first to suggest this.

<sup>74</sup>Talbert, LXXXV, 289-292.



Whom God put forth a hilastērion  
 Through the instrumentality of his blood,  
     for the purpose of proving his righteousness,  
     the end in view being the passing over of former sins;  
 Through the instrumentality of his forbearance,  
     for the purpose of proving his righteousness,  
     the end in view being the expression of God's righteousness in  
     his justifying activity.

(2) This structure gives a clue to the meaning of the verses. They contain synonymous or complementary expressions rather than contrasting or contradictory statements. After the initial phrase, each begins with a prepositional phrase denoting the instrumentality through which Christ became the hilastērion; then in each there follows the statement concerning the result or purpose of the hilastērion; finally the two concluding clauses give the reason for God's act: "To pass over former sins is essentially the same thing as dikaiounta." (3) Viewing 3:25-26 as a formula, Talbert has come up with a clever solution to the problem of dikaioumenoi in 3:24 and its relation to 3:23. 3:23 concludes the sentence begun in 3:22b. 3:24 is the subordinate clause of a new sentence which is concluded in 3:27, but which is interrupted in 3:25-26 by the formula: "Since we are justified freely by his grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, where then is our boasting? It is excluded."

This hypothesis is clever, but also has a serious weakness. The balanced structure which Talbert claims to see is almost forced onto the text by the arbitrary omission of phrases. 3:26 contains no other characteristics which would lead us to suspect a formula; the vocabulary is Pauline. It seems more likely that the parallelism of verse 26 and verse 25 are due to a comment of Paul on a formula rather than to parallel



thoughts within a formula; the Pauline emphasis in verse 26 also makes this likely. We shall discuss Talbert's theory further in the next section. To conclude this section, if a formula is present in these verses, the best evidence would limit the citation to verse 25 or to verses 24-25.

#### Two Recent Textual-Gloss Hypotheses

Many solutions have been offered to the problems of interpretation in Rom. 3:24-26 besides that of the form analysis of Bultmann and Kaesemann and those who have followed them. Recently at least two scholars have suggested that scribal glosses have been the cause of many of the problems we have in interpreting these verses. Talbert is one of these scholars. We have seen that he proposes that 3:25-26 is a non-Pauline formula. In the second part of his article he argues "that 3:25-26 is not integral to Romans but was interpolated at some later time into the epistle" by a scribe who wanted to sum up Paul's thought in the preceding section; this later editor took a formula, added Pauline phrases (dia pisteōs, en tō nun kairō, and ton ek pisteōs Iēsou), and inserted it in the middle of Paul's sentence of 3:24,27 ("Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption in Christ Jesus . . . where then is our boasting?").<sup>75</sup> Talbert's arguments are of two kinds: (1) It is impossible to conceive of Paul beginning a sentence, breaking off in the middle with a long interpolated formula, and

---

<sup>75</sup> Ibid., LXXXV, 292-296.



then concluding the sentence without a break in his thought. Paul is known to break off in the middle of a sentence (see, for example, Gal. 2:6ff.), but then he does not usually return to finish the original sentence. (2) Scholars have discovered parallel situations in Paul's writings where it appears that later interpolations have been put directly into the middle of sentences.<sup>76</sup> It is difficult to take this hypothesis of Talbert seriously, since it is built on several other hypotheses which are far from being proved. One must accept his hypothesis, outlined in the previous section, that 3:25-26 contains the formula, before one can consider this further hypothesis. One must also accept the view that there are many post-Pauline interpolations in Paul's epistles. Talbert's hypothesis is also very involved and highly speculative; it takes some mental gymnastics to imagine that a formula with its interpolations has been interpolated into Romans. Finally there is no manuscript evidence at all which even hints that such a process took place.

A second textual-gloss approach to our verses, but quite different from Talbert's, has been offered by Gottfried Fitzer. After criticizing the Bultmann-Kaesemann form analysis, he sets forth his own proposal that everything in these verses is essentially Pauline, except 3:25b, which is a scribal gloss.<sup>77</sup> On the basis of Paul's statement about

---

<sup>76</sup>Ibid., LXXXV, 292-294; he cites, e.g., Rom. 6:17b as interpolated into 6:17a and 18; 1 Cor. 12:31b-14:1a as interpolated into its context.

<sup>77</sup>Gottfried Fitzer, "Der Ort der Versoehnung nach Paulus," Theologische Zeitschrift, XXII (March 1966), 162-164.



God's salvation event in Christ demonstrating His righteousness and justifying the believer, the scribe asked "what about the sins committed before Christ?" He answered the question himself with a gloss, which is now Rom. 3:25b: God has been patient and has forgiven also the sins of the past because of Christ. Fitzner's arguments run as follows: (1) It is unlikely that Paul is commenting on a formula in 3:26 because of the fact that there is no linking particle between 3:25 and 26. Paul is not adverse to using particles and here one would expect at least a de if Paul is really correcting or clarifying a formula of the tradition. (2) Fitzner finds a stylistic difficulty in the fact that the word theos, appearing as the subject of 3:25, appears again in the prepositional phrase en tē anochē tou theou; one would expect autou as with dikaiousunē. The conclusion is that the phrase eis endeixin . . . anochē tou theou did not originally belong in this context. (3) If 3:25b is omitted, the coherence between 3:25 and 3:26 is much clearer, and the problem of the parallelism is resolved. (4) Fitzner also uses the argument of some form critics that 3:25b does not fit into the thought-context of Romans, for according to Paul it is God's wrath, not His forgiveness, which stands over man's sins. (5) Nowhere else in the New Testament do we find sins simply forgiven. In early Christianity forgiveness of sins is either connected with Jesus (Mark 2:10) or with baptism (Mark 1:4; Acts 2:38).

In evaluating Fitzner's proposal, we should note that some of his criticisms of the Bultmann-Kaesemann approach to Rom. 3:24-26 are significant. Fitzner's arguments, however, are not convincing. First of all, he has no manuscript evidence to support his proposal. Secondly,



the argument on the basis of theos (number [2] above) is not valid; it does not necessarily follow from the repetition of this word that all of 3:25b is a gloss--perhaps only en tē anochē tou theou. But this is even doubtful since Paul is not so strictly bound to grammatical rules; in the sentence in Rom. 3:21f., in fact, he uses theou twice. Next, in regard to the last argument (number [5]), if 3:25b is speaking about forgiveness, it is closely related to Christ as hilastērion in verse 25a. Finally, one gets the feeling that Fitzner has solved the major problems of our verses by getting rid of the clause causing the most difficulty, and we may ask if this is a legitimate way of solving the problems. In summary, we find both textual-gloss proposals discussed in this section unsatisfactory and unconvincing.

#### Reaction and Critique

We have already called attention to several of the weaknesses and criticisms of the form critical approach to Rom. 3:24-26 in our discussions of the evidence for a pre-Pauline formula, the Pauline insertions, and the boundaries of the formula. There are several other weaknesses and limitations which should be noted. (1) Kuss remarks that even if there are a number of words and concepts which occur rarely in Paul, this does not necessarily mean that these verses are not from Paul's hand originally; he emphasizes that we should put our efforts into determining what Paul meant by them.<sup>78</sup> On the other hand, although we must keep in mind the hypothetical nature of this form critical approach,

---

<sup>78</sup>Kuss, I, 160..



it is necessary to admit that the accumulation of linguistic and grammatical usages uncommon in the Pauline corpus and/or common in known traditional formulae is weighty evidence in favor of this approach to these verses; if Paul is citing a formula, would that not be significant for interpreting Paul's meaning here? (2) Kuss also emphasizes that Paul gives no indication that in verse 26 he intends a correction or clarification of a formula, and that therefore such an interpretation would not be very clear and impressive.<sup>79</sup> But we should note that if the formula was familiar to Paul's readers, his remarks within and following the formula would be obvious interpretations to the Roman readers. (3) With regard to hilastērion, Kuss points out that if this word does not occur any more in Paul, the concept of an expiatory sacrifice, which the word conveys, is of fundamental significance for the Pauline theology of the death of Christ.<sup>80</sup> Paul frequently speaks of Christ as dying "for" (huper) men (Rom. 8:32; 5:6-8; 2 Cor. 5:15; Gal. 2:20; Rom. 14:15; etc.); the concept of Christ's death as vicarious is also prominent (Gal. 3:13; 2 Cor. 5:21; Rom. 8:3; Gal. 1:4; 1 Cor. 15:3; the last two are probably pre-Pauline). (4) Fitzner points out that the attachment of haima to the Lord's Supper tradition does not mean that wherever haima occurs the whole sentence stems from the tradition; he also asks, if the blood formula in Rom. 5:9 is Pauline, why not also in 3:25?<sup>81</sup> (5) Talbert argues that it is

---

<sup>79</sup>Ibid., I, 161.

<sup>80</sup>Ibid., I, 165-166.

<sup>81</sup>Fitzner, XXII, 162.



improbable that 3:24-25 uses the formula that Bultmann and others suggest, for as they have set up the formula it is difficult to find a formal, balanced structure.<sup>82</sup> This is perhaps a significant weakness in the Bultmann-Kaesemann hypothesis; but, as we noted above in our discussion of insertions in the formula, if eis endeixin tēs dikaiosunēs autou is taken as an insertion, the formula in 3:24-25 can be seen to have a balanced structure. (6) Finally, we should note that in the immediate context of Rom. 3:24-26 there is none of the usual vocabulary that often introduces formulae in the epistles (for example, paredōka, 1 Cor. 15:2; homologeō and pisteuō, Rom. 10:9; hoti, legō).<sup>83</sup>

The pre-Pauline formula hypothesis is thus not without its difficulties, and exegetes are not by any means unanimously accepting it as their view. Aside from the gloss theories discussed above, we can generally distinguish three attitudes or reactions to the form analysis of Rom. 3:24-26. (1) First of all there is the approach which for all practical purposes ignores the form analysis. Leenhardt, for example, recognizes the Bultmann-Kaesemann theory in a footnote, but in his commentary proceeds on the assumption that all of the material is Pauline; Paul may, however, be using Old Testament concepts, such as hilastērion.<sup>84</sup> There is evidence in 3:21 that Paul is using Old Testament concepts for there he states that the revealed righteousness of God, of

---

<sup>82</sup>Talbert, LXXXV, 288.

<sup>83</sup>Stauffer, p. 338.

<sup>84</sup>F. J. Leenhardt, The Epistle to the Romans, translated from the French by Harold Knight (New York: The World Publishing Company, c.1961), pp. 102, 106-107.



which he is speaking, has its witness in the law and the prophets.

(2) A second approach would recognize that there are traditional words, phrases, and concepts which Paul uses in Rom. 3:24-26--for example, apolutrōsis, haimati; but those who take this approach would deny that there is an extensive traditional formula present here. Schmidt, for example, remarks that it is possible that Paul used formal phrases, but he emphasizes that the direction of the thought is uniform and displays Pauline character.<sup>85</sup> (3) Thirdly, there are those who admit the possibility of a formula here, and even state that such a formula is likely, but who then insist that the formula has been completely Paulinized, thus not accepting the Kaesemann hypothesis that Paul cites and corrects the formula. Kuemmel, for example, says that it is probable that Paul uses a traditional formula, but that he has put his own meaning into it.<sup>86</sup> Even Kuss admits that a formula may be detected here, but insists that Paul made it his own in a special degree.<sup>87</sup> In the next chapters we will examine further the exegetical and theological implications of the form analytical approach to Rom. 3:24-26 and compare them with the various interpretations of those exegetes who do not accept in its entirety the Bultmann-Kaesemann form critical approach.

---

<sup>85</sup> H. W. Schmidt, Der Brief des Paulus an die Roemer (Berlin: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 1962), p. 65.

<sup>86</sup> Kuemmel, XLIX, 164; cf. also Michel, pp. 103-104; L. C. Allen, "The Old Testament in Romans 1-8," Vox Evangelica, III (1964), 12, footnote 61.

<sup>87</sup> Kuss, I, 160.



## Summary

On the basis of form analysis, we have seen that there is a good amount of evidence that Rom. 3:24-25 contains a pre-Pauline formula from the tradition of the earliest church. We have also seen that verse 24 contains Pauline insertions, dōrean tē autou chariti and perhaps en Christō Iēsou, and that there is some good evidence that this entire verse is Paul's. We have noted that in verse 25 Paul inserted dia pisteōs and perhaps even eis endeixin tēs dikaiosunēs autou. Although we must not forget the hypothetical nature of such conclusions, we can now proceed to ask about the theology of the pre-Pauline formula and about its origin.



## CHAPTER III

### THE THEOLOGY AND ORIGIN OF THE PRE-PAULINE FORMULA

#### The Theology of the Formula

Assuming that Rom. 3:24-25 contains a pre-Pauline formula from the tradition of the earliest church, we can now ask what was the nature of that formula? What was its theological perspective? Ernst Kaesemann, who was the first to discuss the question in detail, described it as covenant theology. It saw in the offering of Christ on the cross, the decisive expression of God's fidelity to the covenant, that event in which God forgave the sins against the old covenant and restored the covenant with His people.<sup>1</sup> Most form analyses of our passage have followed Kaesemann along these same lines. Wegenast, for example, characterizes the content of the formula in this way: the placing forth of Christ as the means of expiation redeemed the trespassers by forgiving their transgressions against the old covenant, restored them to the covenant relationship with God, and thus demonstrated God's covenant-fidelity.<sup>2</sup> In this chapter we shall examine the words and

---

<sup>1</sup>Ernst Kaesemann, "Zum Verstaendnis von Roemer 3:24-26," Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), I, 98-100.

<sup>2</sup>Klaus Wegenast, Das Verstaendnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen (Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962), pp. 77-78; the following scholars adopt similar views: Karl Kertelge, "Rechtfertigung" bei Paulus (Muenster: Verlag Aschendorff, 1967), pp. 61-62; Christian Mueller, Gottes Gerechtigkeit und Gottes Volk (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), p. 110; John Reumann, "The Gospel of the Righteousness of God," Interpretation, XX (October 1966),



phrases of the formula in 3:24-25 to determine the validity of this view of the formula's theology, and to compare this interpretation with other approaches.

Our first task is to examine the words and phrases which are decisively important in the theology of the formula. The phrase hilastērion en tō autou haimati is the subject of much debate; we shall begin with the latter part of this phrase and then move to the meaning of hilastērion. The occurrence of haima is a good indication that we are dealing with covenant theology; an almost identical phrase, en tō emō haimati, appears in the tradition concerning the institution of the Lord's Supper handed down to Paul (1 Cor. 11:25), in which it is closely connected with the concept of the "new covenant." The new covenant, in fact, is established by the blood of Christ. Does this mean here and in our passage simply that Christ's death established the new covenant, or are there also old covenant sacrificial concepts in view? Kertelge seems to hold that when the formula refers to the shed blood, it is speaking only of the giving up of the life of Christ; the hilastērion, or expiation act of Christ, is defined as the giving up of His life.<sup>3</sup> Other scholars who do not take the form critical approach also hold this view. Rhys, for example, says that the phrase "in His blood"

---

pp. 442-43; Peter Stuhlmacher, Gottes Gerechtigkeit bei Paulus (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), pp. 89, 186; also for Rom. 3:25 only, Eduard Lohse, Maertyrer und Gottesknecht (2nd edition; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), pp. 153-154.

<sup>3</sup>Kertelge, p. 58.



simply means "in Christ's death."<sup>4</sup> Behm holds that the "blood of Christ" in the New Testament "is simply another and even more graphic phrase for the death of Christ in its soteriological significance," and calls it "a pregnant verbal symbol for the saving work of Christ."<sup>5</sup> It is true, in Paul at least, that there are no explicit signs in the contexts in which the blood of Christ is mentioned that this word refers to anything else than the violent death of Christ for the salvation of the world; in Col. 1:20 at the end of a probable pre-Pauline formula, this is also true.

There are indications in Rom. 3:25, however, that this phrase en tō autou haimati must be understood in terms of Old Testament background. Davies states that Paul's use of the term "blood" implies more than death; "it has the active connotation of life as well, as in the sacrificial system where the death of the victim was the necessary prelude, and no more, to the releasing of life."<sup>6</sup> The blood, because it contained the life, was of central significance in the sacrificial system:

For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it for you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that makes atonement, by reason of the life (Lev. 17:11).

---

<sup>4</sup>Howard Rhys, The Epistle to the Romans (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1961), p. 44.

<sup>5</sup>Johannes Behm, "haima, haimatekchusia," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated from the German and edited by G. W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964), I, 174-175; hereafter this dictionary will be referred to as TDNT.

<sup>6</sup>W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (2nd edition; London: SPCK, 1965), p. 234.



It was also of central significance for the institution of the covenant:

And Moses took half of the blood (of the sacrifice) and put it in basins, and half of the blood he threw against the altar. Then he took the book of the covenant, and read it in the hearing of the people; and they said, "All that the Lord has spoken we will do, and we will be obedient." And Moses took the blood and threw it upon the people, and said, "Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord has made with you in accordance with all these words" (Ex. 24:6-8).

The covenant with God was instituted and maintained by God's continual giving of new life to those who abandoned their lives, represented by the blood of the sacrifice, to God; as Leenhardt states, the blood sprinkled on the altar "is the sign of a life which is at first offered to God and then given back by God, renewed, restored and forgiven."<sup>7</sup>

That Rom. 3:25 must be understood with this background is indicated by the following: (1) The position of the autou in our phrase, en tō autou haimati, makes the pronoun emphatic. The genitive of the personal pronoun usually stands after its noun or before the article of its noun (in the LXX, New Testament, and Hellenistic Greek); or if the noun is modified by an adjective, the pronoun stands after the adjective. However, if it is emphatic the pronoun stands between the article and its noun, as in this passage.<sup>8</sup> Autou certainly refers to Christ; its emphatic position would seem to indicate that the blood referred to here is contrasted to some other blood, that of the animals of the

---

<sup>7</sup>F. J. Leenhardt, The Epistle to the Romans, translated from the French by Harold Knight (New York: The World Publishing Co., c.1961), p. 106.

<sup>8</sup>Nigel Turner, Syntax, in A Grammar of New Testament Greek, by James Hope Moulton (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), III, 190.



old sacrificial system. The emphasis then is that Christ made the sacrifice of the new covenant with His own blood, or at the cost of his own blood.<sup>9</sup> Taylor notes that in Rom. 5:9 ("being now justified by his blood," en tō haimaiti autou) the phrase "by his blood" cannot be explained adequately "by the violent circumstances of Christ's death; it bears a definitely sacrificial meaning, and refers to the life of Christ freely offered for men upon the Cross."<sup>10</sup> (2) Regardless of how hilastērion is understood in 3:25, it cannot be overlooked that in the sacrificial system of the old covenant it was closely involved in the ritual of the sprinkling of the blood (Lev. 16:14). Thus the use of the word hilastērion and the emphatic autou make it likely that this verse interprets the death of Jesus in terms of the sacrificial concepts of the old covenant. Kuemmel concludes that haima is used here by Paul in the sense of the sacrificial death of Christ,<sup>11</sup> and Mueller likewise holds that in the use of this word Christ is designated in the formula as the new covenant sacrifice.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., III, 253; Turner calls this "a curious instrumental dative of price;" but C. F. D. Moule, An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek (2nd edition; Cambridge: University Press, 1960), p. 78, suggests a dative of accompaniment or attendant circumstances.

<sup>10</sup>Vincent Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1952), p. 39.

<sup>11</sup>Werner Georg Kuemmel, "Paresis und Endeixis: Ein Beitrag zum Verstaendnis der paulinischen Rechtfertigungslehre," Zeitschrift fuer Theologie und Kirche, XLIX (1952), 166.

<sup>12</sup>Mueller, p. 110.



There has been much debate and disagreement among exegetes about the meaning of the word hilastērion both in our passage and in the LXX. It is difficult to comprehend precisely what it designates. In the LXX it clearly designates the כַּפֹּרֶת (kapporeth), the plate of gold, which stood on the top of the ark of the covenant, and on which the two cherubim stood; it was here that God met with Moses and spoke to him and thus revealed Himself and His commandments to His people (Ex. 25:16[17]-21[22]). This kapporeth also had significance as a cult object in the reconciliation sacrifices on the Day of Atonement; Aaron was instructed to sprinkle the blood of the sacrifice upon and before the hilastērion (Lev. 16:11-16). Kennedy points out that the kapporeth was not the lid or cover of the ark, since the ark was a chest or coffer complete in itself. He adopts the translation "propitiatory," based on the secondary and technical sense ("to expiate, atone for") of the root verb, כָּפַר, rather than on its primary meaning, "to cover."<sup>13</sup> Morris concurs with this and adds that hilastērion was used to translate kapporeth because of the kapporeth's propitiatory function, and not because hilastērion formed an exact translation of the Hebrew term. He also points out that in Ezekiel (43:6-20) hilastērion is used also of the ledge of the altar against which the blood was sprinkled. When hilastērion translates kapporeth "the LXX translators always have something in the context to make clear which propitiating thing hilastērion is to denote."<sup>14</sup> Thus

---

<sup>13</sup>A. R. S. Kennedy, "Tabernacle," A Dictionary of the Bible, edited by James Hastings, and others (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902), IV, 665.

<sup>14</sup>Leon Morris, "The Meaning of hilastērion in Rom. 3:25," New Testament Studies, II (1955), 36.



hilastērion and kapporeth are not identical. Manson says that hilastērion means either "an expiatory place or object" or "the place where God shows mercy to men," and he opts for the latter because it fits best the Jewish and Christian examples of the word.<sup>15</sup> Buechsel, however, argues that the LXX uses hilastērion for a "headpiece or vessel of expiation rather than for the place of expiation." He notes that at Ex. 25:16(17), the first reference to hilastērion in the LXX, kapporeth is translated by hilastērion epithema, but that thereafter the adjective is used as a neuter noun with the article and means generally "that which makes expiation."<sup>16</sup> Whatever the precise meaning is in the LXX, we can see that hilastērion is closely connected with the concepts of expiation and atonement in the sacrificial system of the old covenant.

It is even more difficult to determine what Rom. 3:25 means by calling Christ hilastērion. The question with which we are concerned is, does hilastērion in 3:25 refer the work of Christ back to the expiation concepts of the old covenant sacrificial system, perhaps even to the kapporeth, or does the word simply have a more general meaning, "that which expiates or propitiates, a means of expiation"?<sup>17</sup> Those who adopt the more general meaning must also decide whether hilastērion is a

---

<sup>15</sup>T. W. Manson, "HILASTERION," Journal of Theological Studies, XLVI (1945), 4.

<sup>16</sup>Friedrich Buechsel, and Johannes Hermann, "Hilastērion," TDNT, III, 319-320.

<sup>17</sup>Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, translated and revised by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), s.v., chose the latter, more general meaning; hereafter this lexicon will be referred to as BAG.



substantive ("means of expiation") or an adjective ("whom God put forth as expiatory"). A great many exegetes, including some of those who find a pre-Pauline formula in these verses, adopt the more general interpretation. Kaesemann, for example, holds that hilastērion denotes simply "means of expiation," and that an allusion to the "cover of the ark of the covenant" would have to be given more clearly.<sup>18</sup>

The following arguments are offered by those who do not accept the view that hilastērion refers to Christ's work in terms of the Old Testament cult object: (1) Lohse, among others, notes that nothing in Rom. 3:24-26 or its context points to a comparison of Christ with the kapporeth of the Old Testament.<sup>19</sup> (2) Next, Lohse points out that in the LXX hilastērion is always accompanied by the article, except in its first occurrence (Ex. 25:16 17), where it modifies the word epithema, as we noted above. In Heb. 9:5 the article is not lacking, and the ark and the cherubim are explicitly mentioned. Therefore, if Rom. 3:25 refers to the hilastērion of the Old Testament, it would have the article to.<sup>20</sup> (3) Thirdly, he points out that the kapporeth stood in the Holy of Holies where the action of the sprinkling of the blood took place, and there no one could see it. But Rom. 3:25 states that God publicly put Christ forth (proetheto) as hilastērion.<sup>21</sup> (4) To think

---

<sup>18</sup> Kaesemann, I, 99: "Suehnemittel."

<sup>19</sup> Lohse, p. 151; cf. also Otto Kuss, Der Roemerbrief (2nd edition; Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1963), I, 157.

<sup>20</sup> Lohse, p. 151.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.; cf. also Morris, II, 42.



of Christ as priest and victim (as in Hebrews) is striking, but "it is straining the image yet further to identify Him with the hilastērion" so that the "mercy-seat" is sprinkled with its own blood; the Christian "place of sprinkling" is rather the Cross.<sup>22</sup> (5) Morris argues that the usage of authors of the period is against a connection of hilastērion with the Day of Atonement:

Josephus uses the word not for mercy seat, but as an attributive adjective referring to a white stone as a "propitiatory monument" (hilastērion mnēma) (Ant. XVI 7:1), and when he refers to the mercy seat he calls it epithema (Ant. III 6:5). Philo calls the mercy seat epithema or pōma and proceeds to explain that it is called hilastērion in the Scripture. (De Vit. Mos. II:95,97; De Profug. 19)<sup>23</sup>

(6) Morris also argues that Paul is not moving in the sphere of Levitical symbolism in Romans. "It is difficult to imagine that Paul would take one solitary Levitical concept, and use it once with no explanation or hint that he was referring to an object of Temple furniture."<sup>24</sup> (7) Finally, a number of the exegetes point to 4 Macc. 17:20-22 as an important parallel to the usage of hilastērion in Rom. 3:25:

And these men, therefore, having sanctified themselves for God's sake, not only have received this honour, but also the honour that through them the enemy had no more power over our people, and the tyrant suffered punishment, and our country was purified, they having as it were become a ransom (antipsuchon) for our nation's sin; and through the blood (dia tou haimatos) of these righteous (eusebōn) men and the propitiation of their death (tou hilastēriou thanatou autōn), the divine Providence delivered Israel that before was evil entreated.

---

<sup>22</sup> William Sanday, and A. C. Headlam, The Epistle to the Romans (5th edition; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, c.1902), p. 87; cf. also Lohse, p. 152; Morris, II, 41.

<sup>23</sup> Morris, II, 40.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., II, 40-41.



The death of these martyrs has rendered expiation for the people, functionally affected through their shed blood. The similarity of this passage to Rom. 3:25 can be seen in that both view God's wrath as being active, both refer to blood being shed, both speak in terms of ransom or redemption, both regard the death as vicarious, and both see the hand of God in it.<sup>25</sup> Both passages also, then, use hilasterion in the more general sense of a sacrificial, expiatory death, with no specific thought of the Old Testament cult.

On the other side, some exegetes hold that Rom. 3:25 does speak of Christ in terms of the cult of the Old Testament Day of Atonement. Manson says that "Paul here thinks of Jesus in comparison with those institutions in the Old Testament whereby the mercy of God towards his people was most strikingly manifested." In contrast to the hilasterion of the old covenant, be it the kapporeth of the Pentateuch or the azarah of Ezekiel, "Paul claims that in Christ crucified God has brought to light a new and better centre."<sup>26</sup> What points speak in favor of this interpretation? (1) First of all, two of the arguments above (numbers [1] and [6]) lose their force if Rom. 3:25 is a part of a pre-Pauline formula. If Paul was quoting a creed or hymn, the formula's context may have made clear the contrast between the old covenant cult and the new covenant Christ, and may have moved in the sphere of Levitical symbolism. And if this hymn or creed was familiar to the Romans, Paul could cite this fragment without further explanation. (2) It is not so certain that

---

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., II, 42-43; cf. also Lohse, p. 152; Sanday and Headlam, p. 88.

<sup>26</sup> Manson, XLVI, 6.



nothing in Rom. 3:25 or its context points to a comparison with the Old Testament. Paul speaks of the Law and the Prophets witnessing to the righteousness of God (3:21). Davies remarks that Paul's emphasis in Romans 1-3 on the exceeding sinfulness of men would naturally suggest to him that greatest of all festival days, the Day of Atonement.<sup>27</sup> God's glory was manifested at the hilastērion as He appeared in a cloud upon it (Lev. 16:2; cf. Ex. 40:34ff.); in Rom. 3:23 Paul states that all have fallen short of God's glory.<sup>28</sup> The mention of Christ's blood should also be added to this list. (3) In the only other New Testament passage in which it occurs, hilastērion clearly refers to the Old Testament kapporeth (Heb. 9:5). Davies points out (in answer to argument number [4] above) that Paul is not writing a scientific treatise in which everything must be logically coherent and precisely defined; if Hebrews can call Christ priest and victim, why cannot Paul call Him priest, victim, and hilastērion?<sup>29</sup> (4) Buechsel argues that "Paul's letters are saturated with references and allusions to the LXX." Thus it is likely that hilastērion is also such an allusion. The LXX usage would also be very

---

<sup>27</sup> Davies, p. 239; Otto Michel, Der Brief an die Roemer (13th edition; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), p. 109, also suggests that paresis, the forgiveness or passing over of formerly committed sins reminds one that the Jews supposed that sins were accumulated in the course of the year until the great Day of Atonement; Good Friday then may be viewed as an eschatological Day of Atonement.

<sup>28</sup> Anders Nygren, Commentary on Romans, translated from the Swedish by Carl C. Rasmussen (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1949), pp. 157-158.

<sup>29</sup> Davies, p. 239.



familiar to Paul's Christian readers.<sup>30</sup> (5) Last of all, Davies argues that Paul frequently contrasts things of the new covenant with those in the old and that in the process he also alludes to Levitical elements. Davies notes that he speaks of the Christian life as a logikē latreia (Rom. 12:1), that he spiritualized the rite of circumcision (Phil. 3:3), that he contrasted the old and new covenants (2 Corinthians 3), so that "it is not inconceivable that he should also have thought of a new hilastērion to be contrasted with the old kapporeth."<sup>31</sup> Nygren holds that part of the contrast is that whereas the old hilastērion was hidden, God put Christ forward publicly before all the world as the new hilastērion.<sup>32</sup>

If this second interpretation is correct, then the pre-Pauline formula, which is thought to be found in this verse, would be saying that the means of atonement and expiation which established and maintained the old covenant is to be contrasted with the eschatological event of the cross, whereby Christ with his own blood has renewed the covenant by expiating the sins of man once and for all. Buechsel notes that the distinction between the two main interpretations of hilastērion is very small and that "it boils down to the question whether Paul has in mind the Jewish view of the expiation of sins in general, or whether he is thinking of a specific form of this expiation."<sup>33</sup> This appears

---

<sup>30</sup>Buechsel, and Hermann, III, 322.

<sup>31</sup>Davies, p. 239.

<sup>32</sup>Nygren, p. 158.

<sup>33</sup>Buechsel, and Hermann, III, 321.



to be a valid observation and is in accord with Kertelge's typological interpretation which lays less stress on any single element of the Old Testament cult than on the expiation and atonement which was worked out in the cult and is offered now to sinners through the death of Christ.<sup>34</sup> Whatever hilasterion means specifically in Rom. 3:25, we can conclude that it is describing the expiation which Christ worked out on the cross as the perfect expiation in contrast with all other means of atonement.

If Rom. 3:24 is part of the pre-Pauline formula, then apolutrōsis is an important concept in the theology of the formula. There is some debate as to whether this redemption is to be understood in reference to liberation from slavery in Roman society through the payment of a price<sup>35</sup> or as deliverance from sin with reference to the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian slavery. Mitton states that it is doubtful that the payment of a price remained an integral part of the word's meaning. He also notes that in Eph. 1:7 and Col. 1:14 (perhaps from tradition) the word is simply explained as "forgiveness of sins."<sup>36</sup> In the only passage in which apolutrōsis occurs in the LXX, it is doubtful that a payment of a price is involved in the concept (Dan. 4:34): Nebuchadnezzar

---

<sup>34</sup> Kertelge, p. 58.

<sup>35</sup> C. W. Swain, "'For Our Sins.' The Image of Sacrifice in the Thought of the Apostle Paul," Interpretation, XVII (February 1963), 136.

<sup>36</sup> C. L. Mitton, "Atonement," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, edited by G. A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), I, 312 (hereafter this dictionary will be referred to as IDB); cf. also Lohse, p. 149, who holds that Paul took the word over from tradition and used it as an equivalent for "forgiveness of sins."



is released from his insanity. Although the word does not occur frequently in the LXX, the concept of redemption plays a major role, as Kertelge points out.<sup>37</sup> God is the redeemer (lutroumenos) of Israel (Is. 41:14; 43:14); the redemption from captivity is a free gracious act of God, without the payment of a price (Is. 45:13; 52:3). The same can be said about the redemption from Egyptian slavery (Deut. 7:8; 9:26; 13:6-10; etc.), which was of the most significant importance in the history and theology of Israel. Redemption was also connected with the forgiveness of and release from sin (Ps. 129 130 :8; Is. 44:22). This seems to be the central emphasis of apolutrōsis as used by Paul and in our verses; this is especially clear through the mention of the forgiveness or overlooking of formerly committed sins (3:25). Miller has suggested that apolutrōsis and hilastērion have complementary functions in our verses: the first has in view the release from sin and the second the release from God's wrath and restoration into God's fellowship.<sup>38</sup> This neat distinction may not have been in the original intention of the author of these verses, but another distinction very well might have been. With the deliverance from Egypt looming so large in importance in Israel's theology, it is likely that the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ were looked upon by the early church as "God's New Exodus work of salvation, looked for

---

<sup>37</sup>Kertelge, p. 54.

<sup>38</sup>R. H. Miller, "An Exposition of Romans 3:21-31," Review and Expositor, XXX (October 1933), 427.



at the end of the ages, now already partially accomplished in Christ Jesus."<sup>39</sup> The deliverance from Egypt was closely connected with the establishment of the covenant (Ex. 19:4-5; Deut. 7:8-9), and therefore, with the means of expiation which God provided with that covenant. If the deliverance from Egypt is considered a type of the new deliverance from sin through Christ,<sup>40</sup> the thrust of our verses would be that the eschatological deliverance from sin (apolutrōsis) and the eschatological establishment of the new covenant and a new relationship with God (hilasterion en tō autou haimati) has been accomplished in Christ Jesus. Such would be the theological emphasis of the pre-Pauline formula, if it consists of both verses 24 and 25.<sup>41</sup> If, however, verse 24 is not part of the formula, the emphasis on the redemption would be Paul's introductory remark to the covenant theology of the formula he cites in verse 25.

We move next to the concepts dikaiousunē theou and dikaioō as they occur in the pre-Pauline formula. We noted in Chapter II that there is some degree of doubt as to whether either of these two words occurs in the formula. However, a majority of scholars who see a pre-Pauline formula in our verses hold that dikaiousunē theou in 3:25b is essential

---

<sup>39</sup>D. E. H. Whiteley, The Theology of St. Paul (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), p. 146.

<sup>40</sup>Karl Wennemer, "Apolutrōsis in Rom. 3:24-25a," Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus, 1961, vols. 17 and 18 of Analecta Biblica (Rome: E. Pontificio Biblico, 1963), I, 286.

<sup>41</sup>Cf. Kertelge, p. 62; cf. also Luke 1:68,72, a hymn of the earliest church in which redemption (lutrōsin) and the covenant (diathekē) with Abraham are connected.



to the covenant theology of the formula. We have also noted in Chapter II that Kaesemann views God's dikaiosunē in the formula as His faithfulness to the covenant which is revealed in the unique eschatological divine act at the cross of Christ. Stuhlmacher, among others, developed these ideas further. He states that God's righteousness is His covenant fidelity and that justification in the formula is the forgiveness of offenses committed against the old covenant and inclusion into the renewed, eschatological covenant through the sacrifice of Christ offered by God, Himself.<sup>42</sup>

The righteousness of God and justification are closely connected with the covenant concept in the Old Testament and in Judaism; it would be natural then to find these concepts closely related in the tradition of the earliest church. Achtemeier states that in the Old Testament God's righteousness is not His conformity to some norm or standard of right outside or above Himself nor a distributive justice which rewards the good and punishes the evil, as defined by the law; rather

Yahweh's righteousness is his fulfilment of the demands of the relationship which exists between him and his people Israel, his fulfilment of the covenant which he has made with his chosen nation. We might therefore note that only he who stood within the covenant could speak of Yahweh as righteous.<sup>43</sup>

We should note with Dodd<sup>44</sup> that dikaiosunē and dikaioi in the LXX not only translate **PTY** (to be right, in the right, righteous, true;

---

<sup>42</sup> Stuhlmacher, p. 185.

<sup>43</sup> E. R. Achtemeier, "Righteousness in the OT," IDB, IV, 82.

<sup>44</sup> C. H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935), p. 43.



to justify, absolve, make or declare righteous) and its cognates, but also אֱמֻנָה (faithfulness, truth), יָשָׁר (to be straight, straightforward), מִשְׁפָּט (judgment), יָרֵא (guiltless, innocent), and רַחֲמִים (love, mercy, grace).

Roehrs<sup>45</sup> has pointed to several important lines of correlation between the concepts of the covenant and the righteousness of God and justification. (1) "Both covenant and justification denote that a relationship exists between God and man." The Lord was to be known as the one who "practices steadfast love (of the covenant, רַחֲמִים), justice (מִשְׁפָּט), and righteousness (יָרֵא, dikaiosunē) in the earth." (Jer. 9:[23] 24). In Ps. 68(69):28 the Psalmist asks God not to let his enemies "enter into Your righteousness," as if he is asking God not to let them enter the covenant relation with Him. (2) The relationship of the covenant and the relationship of righteousness came into being as a free act of God's mercy and God maintains that relationship on the same basis. Thus the same Psalmist who pleads "Enter not into judgment with thy servant; for no man living is righteous before thee" can appeal to God's righteousness for deliverance: "Hear my prayer, O Lord; give ear to my supplications! In thy faithfulness answer me, in thy righteousness" (יָרֵא, dikaiosunē)! (Ps. 142 [143]:1-2) Roehrs' statement here is significant:

Israel can dare to invoke this righteousness of God in its behalf only because it rests its case on the promise of God that He will do the right thing in keeping His part of the covenant. God entered into an agreement with His people

---

<sup>45</sup>W. R. Roehrs, "Covenant and Justification in the Old Testament," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXXV (October 1964), 594-599.



on the basis that He would not let justice prevail in His relationship to them but be merciful and gracious, forgiving transgression and sin. The person who has no right has, as a covenant partner with God, the right to hold God to His agreement to be righteous, that is, to acquit him. The righteousness of God is the covenant God in action.<sup>46</sup>

He goes on to say:

All those who are not in this covenant relationship with God must expect God's righteousness to be just that. According to this righteousness, He gives the sinner what he deserves, the outpouring of His wrath upon unconfessed and unforgiven sin.<sup>47</sup>

The God who was burdened with Israel's sin and wearied with her iniquity (Is. 43:24) because His covenant people had broken the covenant and would not call upon Him in repentance to demonstrate His covenant fidelity (Is. 43:22) is the God who blots out transgressions, forgets sin (Is. 43:25), and promises faithfulness to the covenant: "my deliverance ( $\text{דִּיקָיוֹן}$ , dikaionē) will be forever, and my salvation to all generations" (Is. 51:8). After the return of the exiles Ezra prayed:

Thou art the Lord, the God who didst choose Abram and . . . thou didst find his heart faithful before thee, and didst make with him the covenant . . . and thou has fulfilled thy promise, for thou art righteous ( $\text{דִּיקָיוֹן}$ , dikaionē).

Now therefore, our God, the great and mighty and terrible God, who keepest covenant and steadfast love, let not all the hardship seem little to thee that has come upon us . . . . Yet thou hast been just (dikaionē) in all that has come upon us, for thou hast dealt faithfully and we have acted wickedly (II Esdras 19 [Nehemiah 9]:7-8, 32, 33).

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., XXXV, 596

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., XXXV, 597.



It is clear then that God's righteousness is practically synonymous with His covenant fidelity. Christian Mueller summarizes dikaiosunē in the Old Testament as the righteousness of God which demonstrates itself in help for the covenant people; and if they have fallen away from the covenant, it brings the judgment which leads the disloyal back to the covenant and establishes again the covenant fellowship between God and His people.<sup>48</sup>

The concept of God's righteousness as covenant fidelity and mercy continued in Judaism. In 4 Esdras this connection is expressed in another of Ezra's prayers:

Regard not the endeavors of those who act wickedly, but the endeavors of those who have kept thy covenants amid afflictions (3:27).

For we and our fathers have passed our lives in ways that bring death; but thou, because of us sinners, art called merciful (3:31).

For in truth there is no one among those who have been born who has not acted wickedly, and among those who have existed there is no one who has not transgressed. For in this, O Lord, thy righteousness and goodness will be declared, when thou art merciful to those who have no store of good works (3:35,36).

2 Maccabees records the following prayer, accompanying a covenant sacrifice, which connects the righteousness of God with His kingship over Israel, with His mercy and kindness, and with His choosing the fathers and rescuing Israel:

O Lord, Lord God, Creator of all things, who art awe-inspiring and strong and just (dikaios) and merciful, who alone art King and art kind, who alone art bountiful, who alone art just (dikaios)

---

<sup>48</sup>Mueller, p. 108.



and almighty and eternal, who dost rescue Israel from every evil, who didst choose the fathers and consecrate them, accept this sacrifice . . . .  
Gather together our scattered people, set free those who are slaves among the Gentiles, look upon those who are rejected and despised, and let the Gentiles know that thou art our God (1:24-27).

Thus they call upon God in His mercy and righteousness, that is, in His faithfulness to the covenant relationship, to rescue His people. Tobit asked for release from His sins and the sins of the fathers by appealing to God's righteousness and mercy:

Righteous (dikaios) art thou, O Lord; all thy deeds and all thy ways are mercy and truth, and thou dost render true and righteous (dikaian) judgment for ever. Remember me and look favorably upon me; do not punish me for my sins and for my unwitting offenses and those which my fathers committed before thee (Tobit 3:2,3).

The theology of the formula sounds very similar: God's righteousness is demonstrated in His forgiving or overlooking of formerly committed sins (Rom. 3:25b). Mueller points out that the Qumran scrolls also understand the righteousness of God as His covenant fidelity which deals graciously with the sins of His people:

49  
With the coming of day and night I will enter the Covenant of God . . . . I will declare His judgment concerning my sins and my transgressions shall be before my eyes as an engraved Precept. I will say to God, "My Righteousness" and "Author of my Goodness" to the Most High . . . . (1QS X, 10f.).

If I stagger because of the sin of flesh, my justification shall be by the righteousness of God which endures for ever. . . . He will judge me in the righteousness of His truth and in the greatness of His goodness He will pardon all my sins. Through His righteousness He will cleanse me of the uncleanness of man and of the sins of the children of men, that I may confess to God His righteousness . . . . (1QS XI, 14ff.).

---

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., pp. 109-110; the following quotations are from G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English (Middlesex, England: Penguin Books Ltd., 1962), pp. 90, 93-94, 147.



Thou hast kept Thy Covenant with us from of old, and has opened to us the gates of salvation many times. For the (sake of Thy Covenant Thou hast removed our misery, in accordance with) Thy (goodness) towards us. Thou has acted for the sake of Thy Name, O God of righteousness (1QM XVIII, 6-8).

Because justification and the righteousness of God were so closely involved with the covenant in the Old Testament and in Judaism, it is likely that the Jewish Christians of the earliest church also connected the concepts. Mueller defines dikaiosunē theou in Judaism and in Jewish Christianity, in summary, under three aspects: (1) constancy on the part of God; (2) the claim of God as covenant Lord, which is manifested in judgment on the sinful people who refuse to adhere to the covenant relationship, and (3) preservation or restoration of the covenant people, in His mercy and faithfulness.<sup>50</sup> The Christian tradition, as seen in the pre-Pauline formula of Rom. 3:24-25 however, in addition emphasized that in the sacrifice of Christ the covenant was restored once and for all by the redemption and restoration of the covenant people. We arrive at the following conclusions, then, if dikaioumenoi (3:24) and dikaiosunē theou (3:25b) are to be included in the pre-Pauline formula: the former refers to the forgiveness of or deliverance from the transgressions against the covenant and the restoration of God's people into covenant relationship with Him through the once-and-for-all sacrifice of Christ; the latter refers to God's covenant fidelity which is demonstrated in His forgiveness and in His establishment of the new covenant relationship in the blood of Christ.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup>Mueller, p. 112.

<sup>51</sup>Cf. Kertelge, pp. 60-61; cf. also Kaeseman, I, 99, who remarks that the dikaioumenoi may characterize one's standing in the restored covenant.



We come now to the difficult phrases in Rom. 3:25b, dia tēn paresin . . . en tē anochē tou theou. These words and constructions have been the subject of much controversy, and those who approach this verse through form analysis have not escaped the controversy. There is disagreement among them as to how this verse is to be understood in the pre-Pauline formula. Before we deal with each phrase in detail, we can discuss the questions which affect 3:25b as a whole: Does this clause refer to the past or to the present? Is the question of theodicy being considered here? Bultmann in his brief comments seems to suggest that the phrases refer to the past and speak to the question of theodicy by explaining the righteousness of God as that which demands expiation for former sins; he translates verse 25b as follows: "this was to show God's righteousness, because in his divine forbearance he had passed over former sins."<sup>52</sup> Although he allows that the phrase may be speaking of the present, Reumann concurs with Bultmann and, commenting on verse 25b, states that God's "forbearing, 'passing over' of sins, is now explained in the Cross," and that "God's characteristic righteousness is vindicated by this sacrifice," as though the formula dealt with the problem of theodicy.<sup>53</sup>

Most form critics disagree with this approach to verse 25b, however. Kaesemann states that what happened in the past is not being considered (that is, God's overlooking of sins in the past) but rather that the

---

<sup>52</sup>Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, translated from the German by Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), I, 46; cf. also I, 295.

<sup>53</sup>Reumann, XX, 437, 442.



past has come to an end and that a different kind of present has seized its place, the present of forgiveness brought in by the anochē.<sup>54</sup> Lohse states that the problem of theodicy is not being considered here, and that the question of the angry God needing the expiatory sacrifice of Christ to demonstrate His righteousness is not an issue.<sup>55</sup> Depending upon what en tē anochē tou theou is made to modify, this group would probably translate verse 25b as follows: to show His covenant fidelity (in His forbearance) by the forgiveness of formerly committed sins (committed at the time of His forbearance).<sup>56</sup> The en tō nun kairō (3:26a) would seem to indicate that 3:26a is to be contrasted with 3:25b; Bultmann and Reumann would then be right in understanding 3:25b as referring to the past. An examination of the individual words and phrases of 3:25b must be undertaken, however, before we can arrive at a conclusion.

The prepositional phrase dia tēn pāresin presents two problems: What is the meaning of pāresis, and what is the sense of dia with the accusative here? Dia with the accusative usually has a retrospective sense, translated "because of."<sup>57</sup> A majority of exegetes have taken the dia in Rom. 3:25b in this way, including Bultmann and Reumann.

---

<sup>54</sup> Kaesemann, I, 98; cf. also Kertelge, pp. 60-62..

<sup>55</sup> Lohse, p. 150.

<sup>56</sup> Kaesemann, I, 98, would make God's forbearance God's present activity, while Stuhlmacher, p. 89, would make it a period of time in the past.

<sup>57</sup> Moule, p. 54.



Kaesemann does not discuss the meaning of dia with the accusative, but his interpretation seems to imply a prospective sense. Reumann allows the translation "with a view to,"<sup>58</sup> while Moule notes that in our verse and in Rom. 4:25 "there is some doubt whether it should not be 'prospective,' with a view to, for the sake of." He also points out that in modern Greek gia with the accusative has developed fully into a prospective preposition.<sup>59</sup> On the other hand, Meecham notes that the prospective sense is very rare in Classical and Hellenistic Greek, and that it is not to be found in the LXX or in the papyri; he concludes that it is precarious to depart from the usual retrospective sense in interpreting Rom. 3:25.<sup>60</sup> However, we may note that there are passages in the LXX where dia with the accusative might have a prospective sense; for example, in 1 Sam. 23:10 David says "Saul seeks . . . to destroy the city on my account (di'eme)"; it is possible, as the next verse indicates, that the verse means that Saul was seeking to destroy the city with a view to capturing or killing David.<sup>61</sup> The prospective sense cannot be ruled out for Rom. 3:25b.

---

<sup>58</sup>Reumann, XX, 442.

<sup>59</sup>Moule, p. 55.

<sup>60</sup>H. G. Meecham, "Romans 3:25f., 4:25--the Meaning of dia c. acc.," The Expository Times, L (September 1939), 564; Douglas S. Sharp, "For Our Justification," The Expository Times, XXXIX (November 1927), 87-88, came to the same conclusion for Rom. 4:25, giving also the reason that the first dia clause there is retrospective.

<sup>61</sup>Gen. 18:26 may be another example: The Lord said, "If I find at Sodom fifty righteous in the city, I will spare the whole place for their sake" (di' autous, thus, perhaps, "with a view to saving them").



Kuemmel has suggested an instrumental meaning here, and so translates dia "through." He argues that the instrumental sense is frequently found in Hellenistic Greek and that it can also be found in the New Testament (John 6:57; Rev. 12:11; 13:14; Rom. 8:20 and perhaps 8:10).<sup>62</sup> These passages are not clearly retrospective, and could be taken as instrumental. Blass and Debrunner have listed these passages under a special usage, translating dia with "by someone's merit" or "by force of";<sup>63</sup> it is not a large step to the instrumental "through" from there. Stuhlmacher translates dia with kraft ("by virtue of"),<sup>64</sup> which is also not far removed from an instrumental sense. The prospective or instrumental senses would fit more easily into the train of thought of a pre-Pauline formula containing covenant theology, for then the dia would express the purpose for which or the means by which God's covenant fidelity is demonstrated.

The exact meaning of parensis is difficult to determine since it occurs only here in the New Testament and not at all in the LXX. It means either God's overlooking or passing over of sins or His forgiveness and remission of sins. The latter corresponds better with the thought of the pre-Pauline formula if dia is taken in the prospective or instrumental sense: God demonstrates His covenant fidelity through

---

<sup>62</sup> Kuemmel, XLIX, 164.

<sup>63</sup> F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament, translated and revised by Robert W. Funk (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), paragraph 222; hereafter this grammar will be referred to as BD.

<sup>64</sup> Stuhlmacher, p. 89.



or with a view to the forgiveness of formerly committed sins. Most form critics, therefore, adopt this meaning for paresis. For example, Mueller's view is that God forgave the progegonota hamartēmata, which had shattered the covenant, and reestablished the covenant through the sacrifice of Christ.<sup>65</sup> Even Bultmann, who, as we saw above, translated the word "passed over" in the formula, maintains elsewhere that paresis bears the same sense as aphesis, namely, forgiveness.<sup>66</sup> On the basis of extra-biblical usage, however, there is some indication that paresis should be taken as "passing over, letting go unpunished."<sup>67</sup> Those who consider this to be the meaning of the word in Rom. 3:25b point to Acts 17:30 as a parallel, although paresis does not appear there: "The times of ignorance God overlooked (huperidōn), but now he commands all men everywhere to repent . . . ."<sup>68</sup> Creed disagrees with some scholars who hold that in The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (VII,37,2) paresis means remission; the passage reads:

But from the tribunes, in spite of many entreaties, they were unable to obtain an absolute dismissal of the charges (tēn men oloscherē paresin) against Marcius, though they did get a postponement of his trial for as long a time as they asked.

---

<sup>65</sup> Mueller, p. 110; cf. also Kaesemann, I, 99; Kertelge, p. 59; Stuhlmacher, p. 89, who defines it as release from punishment or guilt.

<sup>66</sup> Rudolf Bultmann, "aphiēmi, aphasis, pariēmi, paresis," TDNT, I, 511; but cf. his Theology of the N.T., I, 287, 295.

<sup>67</sup> BAG, s.v.; the corresponding verb, parienai, according to this source means "leave unpunished," but the verb is also used of "remitting" debts and other obligations.

<sup>68</sup> J. M. Creed, "Paresis in Dionysius of Halicarnassus and in St. Paul," Journal of Theological Studies, XLI (1940), 28.



Paresis here cannot mean acquittal, for the issue is not whether or not Marcius will be acquitted or condemned but whether the trial itself should be allowed to take place. Creed also points out that Dionysius elsewhere speaks of acquittal and then consistently uses aphesis and aphienai (VII,46, and 60).<sup>69</sup> Kueimmel, however, argues that paresis, meaning "allowing to drop" in this passage from Dionysius, is not the same as "passing over" and is closer to "remission"; he argues that only the context of Rom. 3:25b can decide the meaning of paresis in verse 25b.<sup>70</sup>

If hilastērion can be seen as a reference to the eschatological Day of Atonement, then Michel may be correct in viewing paresis as the deferment of the punishment of sin by God until the eschatological day of settlement at the cross.<sup>71</sup> On the other hand it would seem more likely within the context of the covenant theology of the formula to view paresis as the result of the covenant renewal or the means by which the covenant is reestablished, namely the remission of sins through the sacrifice of Christ. We should note that the forgiveness of sins was connected with the new covenant meal of the Lord's Supper tradition (Matt. 26:28) and also in the promise of the new covenant in the Old Testament (Jer. 31:34). If Rom. 3:25b is taken as part of the pre-Pauline tradition, then it would appear most likely that dia tēn paresin refers to the present forgiveness of the eschatological new covenant and that

---

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., XLI, 29-30.

<sup>70</sup> Kueimmel, XLIX, 157-158; the meaning of the related verb, e.g. in Sirach 23:2 and Wisdom of Solomon 11:23(24), is also disputed and does not help with our verse.

<sup>71</sup> Michel, p. 109.



it should be translated "with a view to" or "through" "remission" or "forgiveness."<sup>72</sup> To summarize, of all the possible translations of dia tēn paresin the following three are the most likely interpretations:

- (1) "because of the passing over of . . . sins . . . ."
- (2) "with a view to the forgiveness of . . . sins . . . ."
- (3) "through the forgiveness of . . . sins . . . ."

What is the significance of the phrase progegonotōn hamartematōn?

There is general agreement that the sins spoken of here are those which were committed before the divine eschatological deliverance which the sacrifice of Christ on the cross provided. Kertelge remarks that the period of history before the death of Jesus was characterized by manifold violations of the old covenant.<sup>73</sup> Whether the formula had in mind only the sins of the covenant people is difficult to say. Lohse suggests that the formula is speaking collectively of the sins of the covenant people or of mankind,<sup>74</sup> but Stuhlmacher speaks of the sins as those committed before baptism,<sup>75</sup> thus emphasizing the individual nature of the sins. It is true that the Old Testament prophets emphasized the collective nature of the sin of Israel (for example, Is. 1:4, "Ah,

---

<sup>72</sup>The textual additions in minuscules 1908 (en tō nun aiōni) and 1898 (en tō nun kairō) may be ancient attempts by scribes to continue the parallelism of verse 25b with verse 26a and at the same time to clarify the meaning of paresis as the present forgiveness of sins.

<sup>73</sup>Kertelge, p. 60.

<sup>74</sup>Lohse, p. 153; cf. also Kuemmel, XLIX, 163.

<sup>75</sup>Stuhlmacher, p. 89.



sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity"), but they also emphasized the individual's responsibility for sin and God's interest in individual persons. Jeremiah (31:29-30) and Ezekial (18:2-4) rejected the proverb, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." The individual and the collective sides of sin are also evident in Judaism.<sup>76</sup> It is difficult to say, therefore, whether the pre-Pauline formula in our verses was speaking of sins collectively or individually.

The phrase en tē anochē tou theou presents us with at least two problematic questions which are closely related: What is meant by the anochē of God? Does this phrase refer to God's action and disposition in the present or to a period of time in the past? Its position in the sentence does not tell us whether the clause modifies eis endeixin ("for a demonstration of His righteousness in His patience"),<sup>77</sup> parestin ("because of the passing over of sin in His patience . . ."),<sup>78</sup> or progegonoton ("sins committed formerly at the time of God's patience").<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup>Cf. Gustav Staehlin and Walter Grundmann, "hamartanō, hamartēma, hamartia," TDNT, I, 290-291, who note the rejection of the collective aspect in the change of Ex. 20:5 ("I am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children. . .") in the Targum to ". . . when children proceed to sin according to their fathers." But they note the collective aspect maintained in the parable of the men in a boat; one man bores a hole in the boat; "When asked what he is doing, he says to his companions: 'What is that to you? Am I not boring under myself?' And he receives the answer: 'This is our affair, for the water will come in and the boat will go down with us.'"

<sup>77</sup>Cf. Kaesemann, I, 98; Wegenast, p. 78.

<sup>78</sup>Cf. Kuss, I, 188; Reumann, XX, 442.

<sup>79</sup>Cf. Kueimmel, XLIX, 165; Stuhlmacher, p. 89.



One answer to the above question is that God's anochē is something closely related to his righteousness (dikaiousunē) and forgiveness (pareisis), and that it is on the basis of all three of these action-characteristics of God that the past breaker of the covenant stands in a renewed covenant relation with God in the present.<sup>80</sup> Thus

Kertelge argues that anochē cannot refer to the past because that stood under the wrath of God. Although en with the dative can be used in this instrumental or causal sense, Moule points out that en is a very versatile preposition and also has a "temporal" use.<sup>81</sup> Also in answer to Kertelge; we need only point to Rom. 2:4-5, where Paul describes the past not in terms of wrath only, but also in terms of patience.

Kuemmel takes another approach to the problems. He sees the phrase as another description of the pre-Christian period when God punished those who broke the covenant; but the punishment was not meant to destroy (as will the final day of wrath), but to lead to repentance. Thus in the pre-Christian period the fate of man is left open, until the eschatological time of salvation.<sup>82</sup> Anechō appears in Isaiah with a meaning closely related to this interpretation of anochē; for example, in Is. 42:14,16, speaking of His people suffering in exile, God says:

For a long time I have held my peace, I have kept still and restrained (anexomai) myself; now I will cry out like a woman in travail, I will gasp and pant. I will lead the blind . . . . I will turn the darkness before them into light . . . . I will not forsake them (cf. also Is. 62:12; 63:15).

---

<sup>80</sup>Cf. Kaesemann, I, 98; Kertelge, pp. 60-61; Wegenast, p. 78.

<sup>81</sup>Moule, pp. 75-78; cf. also Maximilian Zerwick, Biblical Greek, translated from the Latin by Joseph Smith (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963), p. 40.

<sup>82</sup>Kuemmel, XLIX, 163.



Thus God was forbearing with the enemies of His people while His own people were suffering. If this is the meaning of anochē in Rom. 3:25b, Paul or the pre-Pauline formula is saying that in Christ God demonstrated His righteousness or covenant fidelity by forgiving the sins committed in the past when God was patiently allowing His people to be punished in order to lead them to repentance.

A third approach to the problems of this phrase, which is similar to the last approach, is that which sees the anochē as referring to the past period, which was a period both of the wrath and of the patience of God.<sup>83</sup> Paul seems to speak in this way: the wrath of God has been revealed (Rom. 1:18-32), but God has also been forbearing in order to lead His people to repentance before the final day of wrath (Rom. 2:4-5). Paul also speaks this way in Rom. 9:22:

What if God, desiring to show his wrath and to make known his power, has endured with much patience the vessels of wrath made for destruction.

To speak of the past as a period of God's patience is not incompatible with the theology of the pre-Pauline formula as we have discussed it.<sup>84</sup> But it is difficult to determine with the evidence at hand whether the formula is speaking of God's past attitude toward the sins against the old covenant or of His present activity of forgiving those sins and reestablishing a new covenant.

We conclude this section by offering an expanded interpretative paraphrase of the pre-Pauline formula which may be found in Rom. 3:24-25:

---

<sup>83</sup> Michel, p. 109

<sup>84</sup> Stuhlmacher, p. 89, takes this approach.



(Being restored into covenant relationship with God by means of the new deliverance [or: Exodus] from sin which is ours in Christ Jesus), Whom God set forth publicly as the expiation sacrifice [of the new covenant and the eschatological Day of Atonement] in His own blood, (in order to demonstrate His covenant fidelity) with a view to [or: through] the forgiveness of sins formerly committed [against the old covenant] when God was patient [or: by means of God's patience].<sup>85</sup>

### The Origin of the Formula

Having discussed the theology of the pre-Pauline formula found in Rom. 3:24-25, we can now ask about the origin of the formula: With what group of Christians did it originate and in what setting was it originally used? Most form critics point to early Jewish Christianity as the source of the formula. Kaesemann pointed to the Jewish character of the terminology: dikaïosunē, hilastērion, and apolutrōsis.<sup>86</sup> In the previous section we have discovered that these concepts can be understood only in the light of their Old Testament and Jewish background. Kertelge notes that not only the terminology, but also the conceptions of the infidelity of the covenant people, the covenant faithfulness of God, and the renewal of the covenant presume a Jewish-Christian origin of the tradition.<sup>87</sup> The same can be said of the cultic conception of Christ as the expiatory sacrifice of the new covenant.

---

<sup>85</sup>Those sections in parentheses are the words about which there is some degree of doubt as to whether they are to be included in the formula; the words in brackets are expanded explanations or alternate interpretations.

<sup>86</sup>Kaesemann, I, 98-99.

<sup>87</sup>Kertelge, p. 61.



Some scholars have pinned the origin down more explicitly to Hellenistic Jewish Christianity, because of the LXX terminology.<sup>88</sup> Lohse also suggests a Hellenistic source because of the similarity of the use of hilastērion in 4 Macc. 17:22 and in Rom. 3:25; and, because the Maccabean tradition was fostered in Antioch, he suggests this as the place of the origin of the formula.<sup>89</sup> Such a suggestion can be no more than a guess. The use of hamartēma may also suggest a Hellenistic source, as this word was commonly used in classical Greek, but only rarely in the New Testament.<sup>90</sup> This may, however, be pressing the point too far, for Davies points out that it is erroneous to over-emphasize the differences between Hellenistic and Palestinian Judaism; he notes that Palestine had been dominated by the Greeks since 333 B.C. and by the Romans since 63 B.C., and that "the synagogue both in Palestine and the Diaspora gave to Judaism an unmistakable unity and coherence."<sup>91</sup> We are thus on safer ground to hold merely to a Jewish-Christian origin of the formula.

Almost all of the form critics also suggest that the pre-Pauline formula was originally used in the celebration of the Lord's Supper in the earliest church.<sup>92</sup> The use of the phrase en tō autou haimati

---

<sup>88</sup>Reumann, XX, 442, 451; cf. also Kaesemann, I, 99; Stuhlmacher, pp. 185-186.

<sup>89</sup>Lohse, p. 152; he also points out the lack of a Semitic language basis in Rom. 3:24f.

<sup>90</sup>Cf. S. J. DeVries, "Sin, Sinners," IDB, IV, 371.

<sup>91</sup>Davies, pp. 5-7.

<sup>92</sup>Kaesemann, I, 99-100; Kertelge, p. 62; Michel, p. 106.



(3:25) and the covenant theology remind one of the tradition of the institution of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. 11:23-26). Reumann hypothesizes that if hilasterion is to be connected with the Day of Atonement under the old covenant, the formula may stem from the annual Lord's Supper celebrations on Good Friday, the Christian Day of Atonement.<sup>93</sup> Braumann, however, suggests that the formula may have its origin in the baptismal liturgy; he notes that the confession of sins and the forgiveness of sins was connected with the baptism tradition of Mark 1:4-5.<sup>94</sup> We cannot come to any definite conclusions about the original Sitz im Leben of the pre-Pauline formula which has been discovered in Rom. 3:24-25, but of these two suggestions, the Lord's Supper setting seems the more likely.

#### Some Suggested Alternatives

It will be helpful to contrast the interpretation of Rom. 3:24-25 as a pre-Pauline formula with other studies which were either made before the form analysis of these verses was begun or which do not accept the form analysis as we have described it. We have already discussed many interpretations of the major concepts of 3:24-25. In this section we need only concentrate on the various explanations of verse 25b; the interpretation of this verse decides for the most part a scholar's view

---

<sup>93</sup>Reumann, XX, 443.

<sup>94</sup>Georg Braumann, Vor-paulinische christliche Taufverkuendigung bei Paulus (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1962), p. 40; cf. Gottfried Schille, Fruehchristliche Hymnen (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962), p. 60, who says that "formerly committed sins" describe a baptism situation.



of this whole section. In particular, the interpretation of two phrases, dikaiousunē autou and dia tēn paresin, shapes one's view concerning what Paul is saying in these verses. Among the exegetes who hold that Rom. 3:24-25 are essentially Paul's own words and thoughts or traditional material which he has completely made his own, we can discern two radically opposed interpretations and two mediating interpretations.

The view which has probably been held by a majority of exegetes sees in the offering of Christ God's vindication of His own righteous character because in the past He had passed over sin in His forbearance. Barrett, for example, says that the question which is behind these verses is why God manifested His righteousness in the crucifixion of Christ, and the answer, according to him, is that "in the past He had overlooked men's sins, and decisive action was necessary if his righteousness was to be vindicated."<sup>95</sup> According to this interpretation dikaiousunē theou in 3:25b is an attribute of God: His attribute of justice,<sup>96</sup> His moral character which abhors unrighteousness,<sup>97</sup> His retributive righteousness which demands the payment of what is merited,<sup>98</sup> His outraged justice which needed the dead Christ on

---

<sup>95</sup> C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (New York: Harper and Row, 1957), pp. 79-80.

<sup>96</sup> John Murray, The Epistle to the Romans (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959), I, 118-119.

<sup>97</sup> L. C. Allen, "The Old Testament in Romans I-VIII," Vox Evangelica, III (1964), 12.

<sup>98</sup> Kuss, I, 159.



the cross to be atoned.<sup>99</sup> Dia with the accusative is taken in its usual casual sense, and paresis is translated "passing over."<sup>100</sup>

Knox holds that this phrase means that

God's apparent ignoring of man's previous sinning would have been impossible (because morally inadmissible) if it had not been for the fact that all the time the death of Christ, which was a "sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world" (past, present, future), was present in the purpose and foreknowledge of God.<sup>101</sup>

The translators of the Revised Standard Version of the Scriptures adopted this interpretation:

they are justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as an expiation by his blood, to be received by faith. This was to show God's righteousness, because in his divine forbearance he had passed over former sins . . . .

The opposite interpretation sees in the offering of Christ God's demonstration of His saving righteousness which forgives the sins of the past once and for all. Those who adopt this view deny that dikaiosunē theou in 3:25b means anything different from what it means

---

<sup>99</sup> Thomas Fahy, "Exegesis of Rom. 3:25f.," The Irish Theological Quarterly, XXIII (January 1956), 70.

<sup>100</sup> Kuss, I, 158-159; Murray, I, 119; Vincent Taylor, "Great Texts Reconsidered," Expository Times, L (April 1939), 298-299; Leenhardt, p. 107; and others.

<sup>101</sup> John Knox, "The Epistle to the Romans, Exegesis," Interpreter's Bible, edited by G. A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1954), IX, 434.



in 3:21 and 3:26.<sup>102</sup> Scott states that Paul is not interested in God's righteousness as an abstract quality of the divine nature; there is no evidence that the Divine attribute of Righteousness has been challenged.<sup>103</sup> Nygren remarks that Paul knows nothing of the question of theodicy here and that he is speaking "of what God has done, not of what He had to do."<sup>104</sup> According to this view dia with the accusative is taken in the instrumental or prospective sense, and paresis refers to God's free forgiveness.<sup>105</sup> Phillips' paraphrase of verse 25 essentially takes up this interpretation:

God has appointed him as the means of propitiation, a propitiation accomplished by the shedding of his blood, to be received and made effective in ourselves by faith. God has done this to demonstrate his righteousness . . . by wiping out the sins of the past (the time when he withheld his hand). . . .<sup>106</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup>Nygren, p. 161.

<sup>103</sup>C. A. A. Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul (Cambridge: University Press, c.1927), p. 65.

<sup>104</sup>Nygren, p. 160.

<sup>105</sup>Cf. Scott, p. 67; Kuemmel, XLIX, 164-165; Martin Luther, Die Bibel oder die ganze Heilige Schrift (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, n.d.), appears to have adopted this second view of v. 25b: "damit er die Gerechtigkeit, die vor ihm gilt, darbiere, in dem dasz er Suende vergibt, welche bis anher gelieben war unter goettlicher Geduld."

<sup>106</sup>J. B. Phillips, The New Testament in Modern English (New York: Macmillan Co., 1958). p. 323.



These are the two opposed interpretations of Rom. 3:25 by those who hold that this verse is essentially Paul's own work. This is not to say that every exegete holds strictly to one or the other of these views. There are many variations, too numerous to mention. There are, however, two interpretations which adopt some of the characteristics of both of these opposing views, and, therefore, may be called mediating positions. (1) Lietzmann agrees with the first interpretation that dikaiosunē in 3:25b is an attribute of God, but he also agrees with the second interpretation that dia tēn paresin refers to God's present forgiveness.<sup>107</sup> This view is probably expressed in the paraphrase of Drummond:

whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation  
through faith in His blood to declare His  
righteousness (His consistency with Himself)  
for the remission of sins that are past through  
the forbearance of God. . . .<sup>108</sup>

(2) Schmidt agrees that dikaiosunē in 3:25b is God's saving, justifying activity, but dia tēn paresin implies that God demonstrated His saving activity because in the past He had simply overlooked sin

---

<sup>107</sup>Hans Lietzmann, Einfuehring in die Textgeschichte der Paulusbriefe an die Roemer (2nd edition; Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1919), pp. 48-49.

<sup>108</sup>Robert J. Drummond, "A Comprehensive View of the Epistle to the Romans," Evangelical Quarterly, XIV (October 1942), 243.



and now wanted to put them away entirely by the death of Christ.<sup>109</sup>

Today's English Version of the New Testament appears to support this view:

God offered him so that by his death he should become the means by which men's sins are forgiven through their faith in him. God offered Christ to show how he puts men right with himself. In the past, God was patient and overlooked men's sins. . . .<sup>110</sup>

#### Summary

From this discussion it can be seen that there is much confusion among New Testament scholars as to the precise meaning of Rom. 3:24-25. Amidst the wide variety of interpretations, it is difficult to come to a decision. The form critical approach, which sees these verses as containing a pre-Pauline formula, and which, as we have seen, presents a coherent picture of what the verses may have originally meant, may be the best solution to the difficulties. We have seen that the pre-Pauline formula found in these verses stems from early Jewish Christian circles and emphasized the reconciling work of Christ as God's means of reestablishing the

---

<sup>109</sup> H. W. Schmidt, Der Brief des Paulus an die Roemer (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962), pp. 69-70; C. H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1932), pp. 59-60, appears to hold a similar view.

<sup>110</sup> Good News for Modern Man: The New Testament in Today's English Version (New York: The American Bible Society, 1966), p. 344.



covenant with His people or establishing a new covenant, and thus demonstrating His fidelity to His covenant; the sacrifice of Christ forgave and delivered man from his sins against the old covenant. Assuming this position and remembering its hypothetical nature, in the next chapter we shall ask how and why Paul has used this formula which he has derived from the tradition and inserted in the midst of this crucial passage in his epistle.



## CHAPTER IV

### PAUL'S USE OF THE FORMULA

#### Paul's Additions to the Formula

If Rom. 3:25 or 24-25 contains a traditional formula from the early Jewish-Christian church, we know of the formula only as it has come down to us through the hand of Paul in this epistle. It is imperative, therefore, that we ask how and why Paul used this formula here. In Chapter II our attention was called to the fact that Paul did not cite this formula without comment or explanation. We saw that in 3:26 Paul added a comment which began in a way parallel to the last line of the formula (3:25b), and that he introduced several of his favorite concepts into the formula itself. The insertions to which most form critics are agreed are dōrean tē autou chariti (3:26) and dia pisteōs (3:25a). We can begin by asking about the meaning of and reason for these insertions.

Both insertions present concepts which are clearly Pauline, which are central for his theology, and which play a prominent role in the epistle to the Romans. Paul opens and closes every one of his epistles with the mention of the grace of God in the greeting and salutation. Charis emphasizes that man has no claim on God or on the gifts which come to him from God, especially justification. Being under grace, then, is the opposite of being under the law (Rom. 6:14), so that those who seek their justification by law have fallen from grace (Gal. 5:4). As Bultmann states, the paradox of



grace is that it is precisely the transgressor, the sinner, the ungodly to whom it applies, for God justifies the ungodly (Rom. 4:5).<sup>1</sup> Bultmann further characterizes the grace of God as coming to man "not as approval of his striving and a prop for his failing strength, but as the decisive question: Will you surrender, utterly surrender, to God's dealing--will you know yourself to be a sinner before God?"<sup>2</sup> Thus God's grace comes only to the man who has no pride in himself, and dōrean in the phrase in question simply emphasizes the free, gift character of God's grace to such a man.

This leads us to the second concept, dia pisteōs. Only the man of faith, according to Paul, has put away all pride and has put all of his confidence in the God who justifies the ungodly; only such a man will be justified (Rom. 4:5). Kertelge points out that the grace of God and the faith of man are the two poles of the justification-event.<sup>3</sup> Grace views salvation from God's side, faith from man's side. Faith, like grace, lies in antithesis to works of law (Rom. 3:28). God's grace comes to man in Jesus Christ, and Christ is the content and the hope of man's faith in God (Rom. 5:1-2).

If the formula in 3:24-25 was theologically correct in itself, we may hypothesize that it was in danger of being misinterpreted. The

---

<sup>1</sup>Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, translated from the German by Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), I, 282.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., I, 285.

<sup>3</sup>Karl Kertelge, "Rechtfertigung" bei Paulus (Muenster: Verlag Aschendorff, 1967), p. 83.



covenant theology of the formula did not sufficiently clarify the radical break between the old and the new covenant (which Paul would emphasize).<sup>4</sup> It was possible that the law of the old covenant could be taken as having a continuing function in the new covenant. There was thus danger that the sin of pride would find occasion in the tradition. Pride had always been a danger for the covenant people (see Deut. 7:7). They were not only tempted to place false reliance on the law, but also to use the covenant in a perverted and selfish way. In proclaiming the judgment of God, Micah complained of the rulers of Israel: "they lean upon the Lord and say 'Is not the Lord in the midst of us? No evil shall come upon us'" (3:11). Paul warns against this kind of perversion; he warns his Roman readers not to presume upon the riches of God's kindness, forbearance, and patience (2:4); he notes the fallacy of the Jew's reliance upon the law and of his boast in his special relationship with God (2:17ff.). The sin of pride, therefore, presented a temptation to misinterpret the covenant theology of the formula in two ways: (1) There was the danger of believing that, as the covenant people, they in some measure deserve or could work for the redemption and salvation God was giving them. (2) There was the danger of too narrow a view of the scope of the redemption of the new covenant, as though the new covenant was only a restitution of the old and included only the sons of Israel, with whom the old covenant had been made.

---

<sup>4</sup>Ernst Kaesemann, "Zum Verstaendnis von Roemer 3:24-26," Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), I, 99; cf. also Klaus Wegenast, Das Verstaendnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen (Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962), p. 78.



To guard against these misinterpretations Paul introduced his favorite concepts, charis and pistis, into the formula itself. By inserting charis Paul emphasized that the redemption and justification of the new covenant are based solely in God. God's grace means that He comes to the man who has nothing of his own; otherwise grace would not be grace (Rom. 11:6; see Gal. 2:21). Grace and law are opposites, for the law increases the trespass and helps sin reign in death while grace brings eternal life through Jesus Christ (Rom. 5:21). As Kertelge points out, this also emphasizes the power-character of grace which effects the justification of sinners.<sup>5</sup> Grace emphasizes the universal character of salvation against any narrow, nationalistic interpretation of the covenant formula. God's grace in the one man Jesus Christ means salvation for the "many" just as "many" died through the trespass of the one man Adam (Rom. 5:15). God's grace is interested in the salvation of the world, fallen from the created perfection through Adam, and not just in the restitution of the covenant with one nation.<sup>6</sup> The promise of the Gospel rests on grace and is guaranteed to all who share the faith of Abraham, the father of many nations (Rom. 4:16-17).

Paul emphasizes the instrumentality of faith in justification twice in relation to the formula: He introduced dia pisteōs into the middle of the formula (3:25a), and he added it again in his comment at the end of the formula--ek pisteōs (3:26b). Pistis, as Michel states, is Paul's battle formula against Judaism's religion of law and against every

---

<sup>5</sup>Kertelge, p. 81.

<sup>6</sup>Peter Stuhlmacher, Gottes Gerechtigkeit bei Paulus (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), p. 89.



attempt to make Christianity into a new religion of law; dia pisteōs designates the new way of salvation in contrast to the law and works of the law.<sup>7</sup> Thus the faith-principle is added to the formula to insure against a false pride based on a law-interpretation. "Christ is the end of the law, that every one who has faith may be justified" (Rom. 10:4; see Rom. 9:30-32). Only the man who humbly recognizes that he has no righteousness of his own, based on his own works of law, and who clings to the promise of righteousness given to him by God in Christ is included in the new covenant; Abraham, the father of faith, received circumcision as the sign of the covenant only after he had received God's righteousness by faith (Rom. 4:9-12). The faith-principle also emphasizes, in contrast to the formula, that the salvation event is directed toward the individual and thus potentially to all mankind.<sup>8</sup> Justification by faith means salvation for both Jews and Gentiles (Rom. 1:16); the righteousness of God is given to all who believe (Rom. 3:22).

Paul does not repudiate the covenant theology of the tradition. Paul too used the idea of the new covenant in proclaiming the new act of God in Christ. But he also emphasizes that there is a radical difference between the old and the new covenant. The old was based on law; the new is based entirely on the sufficiency of God and on His spirit (2 Cor. 3:4-6). The new covenant is based on the promise of

---

<sup>7</sup>Otto Michel, Der Brief an die Roemer (13th edition; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), p. 109.

<sup>8</sup>Kertelge, p. 82; cf. Stuhlmacher, p. 90.



God made first to Abraham, and not on the law (Gal. 3:17-18). The people of the new covenant are children of promise, not of law (Gal. 3:29; 4:28). In this epistle Paul distinguishes sharply between the old written code and the new life of the Spirit; the old written code, based on the law, enslaved our flesh and aroused our passions, but the new covenant gives us the Spirit of new life and sets us free from sin and death (Rom. 7:6; 8:2; see also 2 Cor. 3:12-18).

Paul also appended an interpretative comment at the end of the formula (3:26): pros tēn endeixin tēs dikaiosunēs . . . ton ek pisteōs Iēsou. Most form critics hold that Paul took up the wording of the tradition, eis endeixin tēs dikaiosunēs autou, in order to comment on it. Paul emphasizes that the revelation or demonstration of God's righteousness is an eschatological occurrence of the new age which has broken in (en tō nun kairō), and that this demonstration of God's righteousness must be stressed over all demonstrations of that righteousness (stressed by the article before endeixin in 3:26a).<sup>9</sup> From this we conclude that Paul was not satisfied with the formula's presentation of the concept of the righteousness of God. In the past chapter we noted that dikaisounē theou in the tradition probably referred to God's active covenant fidelity. What does Paul mean by the "righteousness of God"? How does his understanding differ from the concept in the formula?

The meaning of justification and the righteousness of God in Paul's writings has been a much debated topic, and the controversy seems far from its conclusion. The scope of this thesis allows only a survey of

---

<sup>9</sup>Kertelge, pp. 83, 50.



the major points at issue. The following are some of the questions that have been raised: (1) Is "righteousness of God" simply a forensic concept referring only to the start of the new life, or is it a broader, more dynamic concept, meaning the same as salvation and including the new creation and the Lordship of Christ? (2) How does Paul's concept of the righteousness of God and justification differ from that of the Old Testament and Judaism? (3) What kind of genitive is found in the phrase dikaiousunē theou? (4) Does justification refer primarily to the individual, or is it a corporate, cosmic concept?

Lee<sup>10</sup> describes three different interpretations of dikaiousunē, while Leenhardt<sup>11</sup> lists five different meanings: exactness and conformity, judgment as the assessment rendered by a judge, the emancipating verdict of a judge, fidelity to a covenant or salvation, and a right relationship between persons. The forensic meaning is fairly clear, both in the Old Testament and in Paul: for example, Paul states that God reckoned Abraham's faith to him as righteousness (Rom. 4:3; see also Ex. 23:7; Is. 5:23; 43:26; Sir. 10:29; 42:2). In the past there has been discussion as to whether dikaioō should be translated "to declare or deem as righteous" or "to make righteous." Sanday and Headlam held the former interpretation to be correct and remarked: "whether the person so declared, treated as, or proved to be righteous is really so,

---

<sup>10</sup>E. K. Lee, A Study in Romans (London: SPCK, 1962), pp. 62-71.

<sup>11</sup>F. J. Leenhardt, The Epistle to the Romans, translated from the French by Harold Knight (New York: World Publishing Co., c.1961), p. 54.



the word itself neither affirms nor denies."<sup>12</sup> Taylor rejects the interpretation "to make righteous," but states that the alternative translations "tend to suggest the thought of an ethical fiction; someone who is not righteous is said to be righteous."<sup>13</sup>

Other scholars deny that justification involves a legal or ethical fiction. Whiteley remarks that it is safer to speak of justification as a relationship rather than a status or a quality:

A man may have a weight in relation to the earth, but the weight is always dependent upon the gravitational pull of the earth, and does not belong to the man as such. In the same way, a man has not righteousness in himself, even a righteousness given gratuitously by God. What God has gratuitously conferred upon men is a right relationship with Himself.<sup>14</sup>

Barrett defines justification as "an act of forgiveness on God's part, described in terms of the proceedings of a law court."<sup>15</sup> Bultmann emphasizes the forensic sense of dikaiosunē and points out that it is not something a person has as his own but something he has in the verdict of the divine forum. "God already pronounces His eschatological verdict (over the man of faith) in the present; the eschatological event is already present reality . . . ." But this righteousness is not sinlessness in the sense of ethical perfection but in the sense that

---

<sup>12</sup>William Sanday and A. C. Headlam, The Epistle to the Romans (5th edition; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, c.1902), p. 30.

<sup>13</sup>Vincent Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1952), p. 33.

<sup>14</sup>D. E. H. Whiteley, The Theology of St. Paul (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), p. 160; cf. Bultmann, I, 277.

<sup>15</sup>C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (New York: Harper & Row, 1957), p. 76.



God does not count man's sin against him (2 Cor. 5:19).<sup>16</sup> Bultmann's position is that "righteousness" or "being justified" is the presupposition or condition for receiving life or salvation (Rom. 5:1,2,9,18). Righteousness itself can become the essence of salvation (for example, Rom. 10:10) only because of the tight connection which exists between "righteousness" as condition and "life" as result and because not only the salvation but the condition of righteousness itself is the gift of God Himself.<sup>17</sup> The differences in Paul's use of this concept from that of the Old Testament and Judaism is not in its forensic-eschatological character, says Bultmann; it is rather in the following: (1) Paul asserts that this righteousness is already imputed or given to man in the present (on the basis of faith). (2) The more important difference is that according to Paul this righteousness comes to man without works of the law, on the basis of God's grace and man's faith.<sup>18</sup> He views the genitive in the phrase dikaiousunē theou as a genitive of authorship or source and summarizes its meaning as the righteousness from God which is conferred upon man as a gift by God's free grace alone.<sup>19</sup>

Ernst Kaesemann, one of Bultmann's students, has published his dissent from this interpretation of the righteousness of God in Paul.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup>Bultmann, I, 271-272, 276.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., I, 270-271.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., I, 272-274, 279.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., I, 285.

<sup>20</sup>Ernst Kaesemann, "God's Righteousness in Paul," translated from the German by Wilfred F. Bunge, The Bultmann School of Biblical Interpretation: New Directions?, in Journal for Theology and the Church, edited by Robert W. Funk and Others (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), I, 100-110; this article first appeared as "Gottesgerechtigkeit bei Paulus," Zeitschrift fuer Theologie und Kirche, LVIII (1961), 367-378.



He holds that as a gift of God, justification also obligates us to service and makes that service possible. He notes that the phrase "righteousness of God" parallels other Pauline phrases, such as the power, the love, the peace, and the wrath of God, which can be personified and which designate God's power coming to man (see Rom. 1:16; 10:6 where righteousness speaks and acts; 1 Cor. 1:30 where it is the manifestation of Christ).<sup>21</sup> Justification means that Christ assumes power over our life, and therefore justification and sanctification must coincide.<sup>22</sup> Kaesemann therefore interprets the righteousness of God as a broader, more inclusive term. He maintains that the genitive is a subjective genitive (the righteousness which belongs to God and issues from him) rather than an objective genitive (righteousness which is valid before God and is given us by him) or genitive of source. The significance of this subjective genitive is that the gift of righteousness is not severed from its giver but participates in the divine power; the reception of this divine gift places man under the dominion of God (see Rom. 10:3, "submit to God's righteousness").<sup>23</sup> For Paul Christ is the new Adam, and, therefore,

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., I, 101, 103.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., I, 105.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., I, 101, 103-104; cf. also Gottfried Quell, and Gottlob Schrenk, "dikē, dikaios, dikaiosunē, etc.," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated from the German and edited by G. W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964), II, 203 (hereafter this dictionary will be referred to as TDNT); Schrenk also argues for a subjective genitive: "The righteousness of God is God's alone; man is taken up into it and set in it."



justification refers to a new creation rather than a new covenant; dikaisounē theou "for Paul is God's dominion over the world, which is being revealed eschatologically in Christ."<sup>24</sup> In Chapter III we noted that in the Old Testament and in Judaism the righteousness of God was a covenant relationship term and frequently meant God's faithfulness in delivering and saving His people. Kaesemann holds that Paul took over this concept of the righteousness of God from the Old Testament and Judaism and radicalized and universalized it. In contrast to Bultmann he points out that Judaism (for example, in the Thanksgiving Psalms of Qumran) could extol the present manifestation of God's righteousness and that realized eschatology was not the exclusive possession of the earliest Church or Paul. Paul radicalized the concept by taking it away from the law and basing its reception on faith, thus also universalizing the concept to include Jews and Gentiles, the whole cosmos.<sup>25</sup> Also in contrast with Bultmann, Kaesemann holds that Paul's theology and view of history are not oriented primarily to the individual. While for Paul the believer is the recipient of the gift of salvation, the power and dominion character of the gift of righteousness "shows that God's action in Christ as well as in the creation has to do with the world . . . ." <sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., I, 109.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., I, 107-108.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., I, 105, 109-110.



Bultmann has not let this reply go unchallenged.<sup>27</sup> He responded that dikaiosunē theou does not necessarily always mean the same thing in Paul; its gift character is established by such passages as Phil. 3:9. He recognizes that God's saving power is effective in the righteousness, but he insists that God's declaration of righteousness and the saving act of God must be distinguished from one another. He argues that the personification of dikaiosunē is simply a rhetorical device and does not change the meaning of the concept. The gift of the dikaiosunē theou is based on the act and power of God, but dikaiosunē designates not the act itself, but the result--the gift.<sup>28</sup> The gift of justification results in the Lordship of Christ, but these are not to be identified. Bultmann sees significance in the fact that Paul almost always speaks of justification in the past tense; he holds that the future tenses (Rom. 2:13; 3:20; Gal. 3:24) and the present (Gal. 2:16) have no temporal significance but are logical or gnomic formulations. The righteousness of God is the gift which the believer has already received, and which has put him in the present and future under the Lordship of Christ.<sup>29</sup> Thus Bultmann continues to maintain that we are dealing with a genitive of source.<sup>30</sup> He denies that this usage of Paul is to be found in the Old Testament or in Judaism; there God's righteousness meant His judicial activity or His saving activity

---

<sup>27</sup>Rudolf Bultmann, "Dikaiosunē Theou," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIII (1964), 12-16.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., LXXXIII, 13-14.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., LXXXIII, 15.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., LXXXIII, 12.



and power upon which the covenant people depended. Paul does not generally use God's righteousness in this way, but has given it a meaning it has not had before: the gift of God based on the saving eschatological action of God in Christ; it is not only the radicalizing and universalizing of a Jewish phrase but a new creation of Paul.<sup>31</sup>

The issues of this debate have yet to be resolved, and this thesis does not pretend to have a solution to these questions. The resolution of the problem is, however, important for discovering Paul's use of the pre-Pauline formula in Rom. 3:24-26, for it is Paul's concept of dikaïosunē that determines the meaning of his additions to the formula in verse 26. We must, therefore, make some clarifying comments.

The question regarding the kind of genitive is a confusing issue. Bultmann argues firmly for a genitive of source; God's righteousness has been given to man and is now man's property. Thus Bultmann uses the genitive of source to emphasize the anthropocentric nature of dikaïosunē theou. Kaesemann holds out for a subjective genitive; God's righteousness is that which God is continually exercising in redeeming the world. Thus Kaesemann wishes to emphasize the theocentric, power character of dikaïosunē theou. This distinction between subjective genitive and genitive of source, however, appears to be more a matter of interpretation than grammatical usage. Greek grammars generally do not make such a sharp distinction. Turner states that dikaïosunē

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., LXXXIII, 13, 16.



theou in Rom. 1:17 and 3:22 "indicates the source and is therefore subjective."<sup>32</sup> Zerwick warns that the distinction between subjective and objective genitive is somewhat tenuous; it cannot be made always without sacrificing the fulness of the meaning of a given phrase; this applies to dikaiosunē theou (for example, in Rom. 10:3), and Zerwick prefers to call it a "general" genitive.<sup>33</sup> To clarify and summarize the distinctions that are being made, however, we may point out that while both the Kaesemann and Bultmann positions seem to view the dikaiosunē theou in the formula (3:25b) as a subjective genitive describing an attribute of God, the dikaiosunē theou of 3:26a is seen by Bultmann as a genitive of source, while Kaesemann sees it as a subjective genitive.<sup>34</sup>

The question of whether dikaiosunē theou includes only the forensic gift of righteousness from God or whether it also includes God's dominion

---

<sup>32</sup> Nigel Turner, Syntax, in A Grammar of New Testament Greek, by James Hope Moulton (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), III, 211; cf. also C. F. D. Moule, An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek (2nd edition; Cambridge: University Press, 1960), p. 39, who defines subjective genitive as "the Genitive indicating the subject from which the action, etc., originates . . . ."

<sup>33</sup> Maximilian Zerwick, Biblical Greek, translated from the Latin by Joseph Smith (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963), pp. 12-14; we might also note that Kaesemann's descriptions of subjective and objective genitives ("God's Righteousness," I, 100) are not the usual definitions of these grammatical categories; cf. Moule, pp. 39-40; F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament, translated and revised by Robert W. Funk (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), paragraph 163, says that dikaiosunē tou theou "indicates the originator;" hereafter this last grammar will be referred to as BD.

<sup>34</sup>Cf. John Reumann, "The Gospel of the Righteousness of God," Interpretation, XX (October 1966), 447.



and His power for the new life gets us right to the heart of the debate. It is a difficult question because Paul seems at times to use the concept one way and at other times another way. Thus in support of Bultmann's view, Paul does distinguish between justification and salvation; justification and reconciliation with God are events of the past while salvation from the wrath of God is still in the future (Rom. 5:9-11; but see 2 Cor. 5:20; Gal. 5:5). The reception of the free gift of righteousness is closely connected with reigning in life through Christ, and yet they are distinguished (5:17); righteousness and its fruits are distinguished (2 Cor. 9:10). It cannot be denied that Paul thinks in terms of a cosmic redemption (Rom. 8:18-25), but whether he meant justification to include this aspect of the redemption is still an unanswered question. But in support of Kaesemann's view, Paul does say that the justification of the ungodly is the manifestation of God's eschatological power, for it is revealed in the gospel (Rom. 1:16-17);<sup>35</sup> it thus appears to be more than the sentence of God the Judge, which otherwise we would not expect until the end of the world.<sup>36</sup>

Schrenk points out that Paul speaks of the divine righteousness as the power which overcomes adikia and hamartia (Rom. 6:13,17,18,20), so that in Paul dikaiosunē theou "can denote both the righteousness which acquits and the living power which breaks the bondage of sin;" he holds

---

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Gerhard Krodel, "The Gospel According to Paul," Dialog, VI (Spring 1967), 101.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Ernest Best, The Letter of Paul to the Romans (Cambridge: University Press, 1967), p. 41.



that righteousness can never be equated merely with what is found at the start of the Christian life.<sup>37</sup>

Another feature of the Pauline usage would support this view. In the last chapter we noted the close connection between the covenant and the righteousness of God in the Old Testament and in Judaism. Roehrs calls our attention to the fact that these two concepts also have this in common that they portray the breaking in of God's rule as king among men; he also suggests that when Paul talks about justification and the righteousness of God, "he is merely saying the same thing that the gospels portray with the concept of the kingdom of God."<sup>38</sup> In the Gospels "Kingdom of God" is a verbal noun and describes God as acting redemptively in order to establish His rule over and among men.<sup>39</sup> Perhaps in Paul the righteousness of God describes God as acting redemptively in order to establish His rule and thus to put man back into right relationship with Himself. Righteousness and the kingdom of God are closely related in the Gospels (see Matt. 6:32; 25:34-37). Just as the kingdom of God is recognized and received only by faith in Jesus (Mark 4:10-12), so also the righteousness of God in Paul (Rom. 1:16-17; 3:21-22). As the kingdom of God is at hand at the fulfillment of time (Mark 1:15), so also the righteousness of God is

---

<sup>37</sup> Quell and Schrenk, II, 209-210.

<sup>38</sup> W. R. Roehrs, "Covenant and Justification in the Old Testament," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXXV (October 1964), 602.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Martin H. Scharlemann, Proclaiming the Parables (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1963), p. 45.



revealed in the eschatological era (Rom. 3:21,26). Paul himself says that the kingdom of God consists in righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit (Rom. 14:17), and he speaks of grace "reigning" through righteousness (Rom. 5:21). In Rom. 6:17-19 Paul contrasts the old order of slavery to sin with the new order of slavery to righteousness, thus using "kingdom of God" language to describe the role of the righteousness of God in the new age. In the same way he can speak of submitting to God's righteousness (Rom. 10:3-5); the Jews would not accept God's rule that He graciously brings in to those who believe but instead tried to establish their own relationship with God on the basis of their works. Thus also he can contrast the servants of the devil with the servants of righteousness (2 Cor. 11:15). If this analysis is correct, Paul not only uses dikaiousunē theou for God's gift of righteousness as the presupposition of the new creation, he also uses it to describe God's saving activity which reestablished His Lordship over the entire world.

Kaesemann also spells out the implications of this more dynamic and more inclusive interpretation of God's righteousness in Paul for Paul's interpretation of the pre-Pauline formula in Rom. 3:24-26. If the formula spoke of God's covenant fidelity in establishing a new covenant with his people (dikaiousunē theou in 3:25b), Paul does not think primarily in terms of a renewed covenant but of a new creation; for him Christ is not the second Moses but the second Adam (see Rom. 5:15-19).<sup>40</sup> Paul thus universalizes the covenant theology into

---

<sup>40</sup>Kaesemann, "God's Righteousness," I, 106-107.



a creation theology, concerned not primarily with the salvation history of the Mosaic covenant people but with the salvation of the creation, thus of the Jews and the Gentiles.<sup>41</sup>

Other form critics have followed Kaesemann in this interpretation. Stuhlmacher states that the formula was concerned with God's covenant fidelity while Paul was concerned with God's fidelity as Creator to His creation, His creation fidelity (Schoepfertreue).<sup>42</sup> Thus for Paul the justified believer stands not only in a renewed covenant but in a new life.<sup>43</sup> Paul's concept of God's righteousness can then be summarized as follows: (1) God's constancy; (2) His claim as creator which manifested itself in judgment upon sinful people (see Rom. 3:5); (3) His restoration or recreation of the fallen creation, the world of Jews and Gentiles.<sup>44</sup>

Bultmann's interpretation differs somewhat from this. We noted previously that he held that dikaïosunē in the formula (3:25b) referred to God's judicial righteousness, His attribute of justness; Paul's addition in 3:26a, according to Bultmann, redirects those who use this pre-Pauline formula from God's judicial righteousness to His forensic gift of righteousness to the believer.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup>Kaesemann, "Zum Verstaendnis," I, 100.

<sup>42</sup>Stuhlmacher, pp. 90-91, 187; cf. also Wegenast, p. 78; Christian Mueller, Gottes Gerechtigkeit und Gottes Volk (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), pp. 111-112.

<sup>43</sup>Kertelge, p. 83.

<sup>44</sup>Cf. Mueller, p. 112.

<sup>45</sup>Bultmann, "Dikaïosunē Theou," LXXXIII, 13; cf. also Reumann, XX, 447.



Whichever of these two positions one takes, if one holds that Paul in Rom. 3:26 is reinterpreting a pre-Pauline formula, there can be some agreement on Paul's emphases in this reinterpretation.

(1) Probably his main emphasis is that God's righteousness comes to man solely on the basis of God's grace, through faith, and not on the basis of works; this is a central Pauline affirmation (Rom. 4:2-5,9-13; Gal. 2:16,21; 3:24; Phil. 3:9). (2) With the phrase en tō nun kairō Paul reemphasizes that the revelation of God's righteousness in Christ means that the eschaton is here; a totally new thing has happened (Rom. 3:21-22). Justification and salvation are firmly, eschatologically established.<sup>46</sup> (3) The third important emphasis of Paul is that justification is for Jews and Gentiles. God justifies the man who believes in Jesus.<sup>47</sup> The individualization of justification in this way assures a universal application of justification, for it is no longer based on works or one's inclusion in a special nation but on God's grace and man's faith in the promise fulfilled in Jesus Christ (Rom. 4:16ff.). (4) To these three emphases, Kaesemann and his followers would add that Paul also stresses by his additions the dynamic character of God's righteousness which places the believer under the Lordship of Christ and empowers him to the new life as God's new creation, and that God's righteousness is given not only to Jews and Gentiles but to the whole creation--to the cosmos.

---

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Kertelge, p. 83.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Eduard Lohse, Maertyrer und Gottesknecht (2nd edition; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), p. 153.



Most form critics are agreed on the formal significance of the phrase in Rom. 3:26b, eis to einai auton dikaion kai dikaiounta . . . . With this closing phrase, Paul ties together the theology of the formula and his own interpreting additions. Kertelge suggests that the auton is stressed and thus resumes the autou which follows dikaiosunē both in verse 25b and in verse 26a.<sup>48</sup> But because, as we have seen, there is disagreement as to the meaning of dikaiosunē theou in both of these verses, there is disagreement regarding the meaning of dikaion and dikaiounta. Bultmann and Reumann hold that dikaion refers to the dikaiosunē of verse 25b and means God's attribute of judicial righteousness, and that dikaiounta refers back to the dikaiosunē of verse 26a and means God's gift of righteousness to the believer.<sup>49</sup> The phrase means then that God maintains His just character but at the same time justifies the believer. On the other hand, Kaesemann and his followers hold that dikaion and dikaiosunē (3:25b) describe God as faithful to His covenant while dikaiounta and dikaiosunē (3:26a) describe God as justifying the ungodly and thus as faithful to His creation.<sup>50</sup> Paul thus ties the two meanings of God's righteousness together in this concluding phrase: God is both faithful to the covenant and faithful to His creation, and He demonstrates

---

<sup>48</sup> Kertelge, p. 84.

<sup>49</sup> Bultmann, "Dikaiosunē Theou," LXXXIII, 13; Reumann, XX, 447.

<sup>50</sup> Kaesemann, "Zum Verstaendnis," I, 100; cf. also Mueller, p. 111; Kertelge, p. 84; Stuhlmacher, pp. 90-91, although following Kaesemann in almost every other way, seems to adopt a view similar to Bultmann's here.



both in His justification of those who believe in Jesus. If our analysis of the pre-Pauline formula as containing a theology which focused on God's covenant fidelity in the restoration of the covenant is correct, then it follows that this second interpretation of Rom. 3:26b is the more logical interpretation. At any rate we have seen that Paul has cited a formula from the tradition, presented his own theological emphases as a radical reinterpretation or clarification of the formula, and then rounded off the entire section with this summary phrase which expresses the goal of all of God's saving activity.

#### Some Suggested Alternatives

A survey of the interpretations given to Rom. 3:26 makes one aware of the seemingly endless variety of meanings which commentators and exegetes have seen here. In order to comprehend a general pattern of interpretation, and at the risk of over simplifying, we can view almost every interpretation as falling into one of three categories. In every case two phrases are crucial: dikaiousunēs autou (3:26a) and dikaion kai dikaiounta (3:26b).

(1) In the previous chapter we noted that a number of scholars hold that by dikaiousunēs autou in 3:25 Paul meant God's quality or attribute of justice, His moral character, or His retributive justice. There are also a number of exegetes who understand dikaiousunēs autou in 3:26a in this same way. Fahy, for example, holds that Paul is speaking of God giving proof of his justice both in 3:25b and 3:26a: God is just in forgiving the sins of the past and in forgiving the



sins of the present time.<sup>51</sup> Paul's main concern then in both of these verses was to demonstrate that God is just in forgiving man's sins and justifying him. This, in fact, according to Fahy, is how Paul summarizes his concerns in the whole section; by dikaion kai dikaiounta. Paul was saying that God remained holy and just when he justified men, because he did it through the crucifixion of Christ, by which His outraged justice was satisfied.<sup>52</sup> Similarly, Rhys states that as God was in the right in passing over former sins, He "is also acting rightly in the eschatological period . . . when He gives the status of acquittal (justification) to those who make the response of faith."<sup>53</sup> Dikaion thus means the inherent justice of God and refers back to dikaiosunē both in 3:25b and in 3:26a,<sup>54</sup> while dikaiounta refers back to the dikaioumenoi in 3:24. Cadman, like the form critics, views dikaiosunē in both verses as God's covenant action, but he modifies this definition to God's righteousness "in the sense of His judging action of sin"; thus, like the other interpretations in this group he considers dikaiois as God's ancient covenant-righteousness in its aspect of judgment on sin.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup>Thomas Fahy, "Exegesis of Rom. 3:25f.," The Irish Theological Quarterly, XXIII (January 1956), 70-71.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid.

<sup>53</sup>Howard Rhys, The Epistle to the Romans (New York: Macmillan Co., 1961), p. 44.

<sup>54</sup>John Murray, The Epistle to the Romans (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959), I, 118-119; cf. also L. C. Allen, "The Old Testament in Romans I-VIII," Vox Evangelica, III (1964), 12.

<sup>55</sup>W. H. Cadman, "Dikaiosunē in Rom. 3:21-26," Studia Evangelica, edited by F. L. Cross (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964), II, part I, 533-534.



By omitting to translate dikaiousunē autou in 3:26b, the translators of the Revised Standard Version of the Bible indicate that it means the same as it does in 3:25b; they translate 3:25b-26 as follows:

This was to show God's righteousness, because in his divine forbearance he had passed over former sins; it was to prove at the present time that he himself is righteous and that he justifies him who has faith in Jesus.

(2) A second group of scholars take just an opposite view of Rom. 3:26. In the last chapter we noted that a number of exegetes view dikaiousunē autou in verse 25b in the usual Pauline sense as God's justifying activity, and not His quality of being righteous. Thus also in verse 26 Paul is not concerned about demonstrating God's righteous character but His righteous activity. Thus Schmidt says that Paul is talking not about the righteousness with which God judges, but the righteousness which He wants to give.<sup>56</sup> God's righteousness consists in this that He makes believers in Christ righteous; thus dikaion and dikaiounta are almost identical in meaning and are certainly not in tension with each other.<sup>57</sup> Dodd points out that for Paul dikaiousunē was heavily influenced by the Hebrew word דִּקְיָוָה, which included God's justice and mercy; thus Paul could speak of God as dikaios and dikaion without the least sense of paradox.<sup>58</sup> God's

---

<sup>56</sup> H. W. Schmidt, Der Brief an die Roemer (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962), p. 70.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., p. 71.

<sup>58</sup> C. H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935), p. 57.



righteousness is revealed in the divine intervention which delivers man from sin and wrath.<sup>59</sup> The kai in dikaion kai dikaiounta would then have an exegetical or neutral meaning: God is righteous, that is, He justifies.<sup>60</sup> Today's English Version of the New Testament appears to adopt this second view and translates Rom. 3:25b-26 as follows:

God offered Christ to show how he puts men right with himself. In the past, God was patient and overlooked men's sins; but now in the present time he deals with men's sins, to prove that he puts men right with himself. In this way God shows that he himself is righteous and that he puts right everyone who believes in Jesus.<sup>61</sup>

(3) Between these two interpretations lie two mediating interpretations which are very similar. A number of scholars hold that Paul's concept of dikaiosunē theou included both God's righteous character and His justifying activity. Thus Kuss remarks that the righteousness of God has a double meaning for Paul; it means His demanding righteousness and His forgiving righteousness.<sup>62</sup> The

---

<sup>59</sup> C. H. Dodd, The Epistle to the Romans (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1932), p. 60; cf. also Anders Nygren, Commentary on Romans, translated from the Swedish by Carl C. Rasmussen (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1949), p. 161.

<sup>60</sup> Zerwick, p. 154, gives Gal. 6:16 as an example of the "neutral use" of kai: "Peace and mercy be upon all who walk by this rule, that is, upon the Israel of God." cf. BD paragraph 442,9; also supporting this view, G and a few other manuscripts omitted the kai from the text, thus placing dikaiounta in apposition to dikaion.

<sup>61</sup> Good News for Modern Man: The New Testament in Today's English Version (New York: The American Bible Society, 1966), p. 344.

<sup>62</sup> Otto Kuss, Der Roemerbrief (2nd edition; Regensburg: Verland Friedrich Pustet, 1963), I, 159.



righteousness of God revealed in the horrible death of Christ on the cross revealed that God's love and grace are firmly rooted in His divinity and holiness.<sup>63</sup> The two sides of God's righteousness, justice and mercy, are expressed in the phrase dikaion kai dikaiounta: God is just and/but He also justifies the man who puts his faith in Jesus.<sup>64</sup> A difference of opinion appears, however, regarding the precise meaning of dikaiousunē theou in 3:25b and 26a. Lietzmann held that in 3:25b the phrase designated God's attribute and that in 3:26a it designated His gift of righteousness, both of which are tied together in the phrase in 3:26b.<sup>65</sup> We can note that Bultmann's and Reumann's interpretation is not far from this, except, of course, that they view verse 25 as part of a pre-Pauline formula. Sanday and Headlam's paraphrase expresses this interpretation well:

The object of the whole being by this public and decisive act to vindicate the righteousness of God. In previous ages the sins of mankind had been passed over without adequate punishment or atonement: but this long forbearance on the part of God had in view throughout that signal exhibition of His righteousness which He purposed to enact when the hour should come as now it has come, so as to reveal Himself in His double character as at once righteous Himself and pronouncing righteous, or accepting as righteous, the loyal follower of Jesus.<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., I, 121; cf. I, 115-121.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., I, 159; cf. also John Knox, "The Epistle to the Romans, Exegesis," Interpreter's Bible, edited by G. A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1954), IX, 434.

<sup>65</sup> Hans Lietzmann, Einfuehrung in die Textgeschichte der Paulus-briefe an die Roemer (2nd edition; Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1919), p. 48.

<sup>66</sup> Sanday and Headlam, p. 82.



Others hold that dikaiosunē in both verses, 3:25b and 26a, are at one and the same time grace and judgment, "which distinguishes between a sinner and his sin, which separated him from his sin, which bring him to a faith that is also repentance. . . ." <sup>67</sup> Barrett calls these two aspects of the righteousness of God justitia passiva and justitia activa, His quality of being right and His activity of setting right, which are summarized in the phrase of verse 26b: dikaion kai dikaiounta. <sup>68</sup> Bruce's paraphrase of these verses captures this second mediating interpretation:

This, then, is the way in which God has demonstrated His righteousness--He has vindicated His own character and at the same time He bestows a righteous status on sinful men. This is why God, in His patient dealing with men, could pass over the sins which they committed before the coming of Christ, instead of exacting the full penalty; He was showing them mercy in prospect of the demonstration of His righteousness at this present epoch. And this demonstration shows us how God remains perfectly righteous Himself while He pardons those who believe in Jesus and puts them in the right before His judgment bar. <sup>69</sup>

There is thus a confusing history in the interpretation of our verses, and perhaps the form analytical approach presents the clearest picture of what Paul was doing and saying.

---

<sup>67</sup> Friedrich Buechsel, and Johannes Herrmann, "Hilasterion," TDNT, III, 322.

<sup>68</sup> Barrett, pp. 73, 80.

<sup>69</sup> F. F. Bruce, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1963), p. 100.



## The Context and Paul's Use of the Formula

We return now to the final question regarding the form analysis of Rom. 3:24-26. If the covenant theology of the pre-Pauline formula cited by Paul in 3:24-25 was capable of ministerpretation, why did Paul cite it at all? The form critics have suggested several reasons. Kaesemann theorized that Paul was attracted to the Jewish-Christian formula because it described the salvation event in terms of God's righteousness established in the death of Christ.<sup>70</sup> Similarly Reumann speculates that the first word of the formula dikaioumenoi (3:24), may have been what attracted Paul to this tradition. He also suggests that the formula was familiar to the Romans and that it was to Paul's advantage to cite and to appeal to a familiar formula, since he himself had never visited the Roman Christians.<sup>71</sup> These suggestions are not mutually exclusive and probably pinpoint some of the factors involved in Paul's reason for using the formula.

The historical and literary contexts may also give some hints as to why and how Paul used this formula from the tradition. Christianity probably came to Rome through the Jewish diaspora of that city; nevertheless, it appears that the Roman congregation at the time of Paul consisted of a majority of Gentiles (see 1:5-6,13; 9:3ff.; 10:1f.; 11:13,23,28,31; 15:15ff.).<sup>72</sup> This does not mean that there was not a

---

<sup>70</sup> Kaesemann, "Zum Verstaendnis," I, 100; cf. also Wegenast, p. 79.

<sup>71</sup> Reumann, XX, 441, 433; cf. also A. M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961), p. 121.

<sup>72</sup> Paul Feine, and Johannes Behm, Introduction to the New Testament, completely reedited by Werner Georg Kueimmel, translated from the German by A. J. Mattill, Jr. (14th revised edition; New York: Abingdon Press, c.1965), pp. 218-219.



Jewish element in the Christian congregation there; Kueimmel points out that the admonition to mutual acceptance of Jews and Gentiles (15:7ff.) "would be pointless if both groups were not presupposed in the congregation."<sup>73</sup> Emperor Claudius issued a decree of expulsion against the Jews in Rome in 49 A.D., which probably brought about an important modification in the Christian congregation there, making it predominantly Gentile. Leenhardt points out that when this edict was toned down or revoked and the Jews began returning to Rome, there must have been a difficult problem of reintegrating the Jewish Christians into the Gentile congregation.<sup>74</sup> This may have been the situation in the Roman congregation when Paul wrote his epistle. With this there was probably a Judaizing threat in the congregation; Zahn noted that the congregation's close connection with the Church in Palestine and its location in the capital of the empire made it easy for the congregation to become a center of Judaistic propaganda.<sup>75</sup> Much of Romans appears to be a polemic against false, Judaizing views being advocated in the Roman congregation (2:17; 3:1-31; 4:1; 9:31f.; 11:11).<sup>76</sup> If the Judaizers were not active at that time, there certainly was a threat that they would be in the future. The Judaizers may have been using the Jewish-Christian formula from the tradition, misinterpreting it to emphasize the

---

<sup>73</sup> Ibid., p. 219; cf. his other evidence here also.

<sup>74</sup> Leenhardt, pp. 11-12.

<sup>75</sup> Theodor Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, translated from the German by John Moore Trout and Others (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909), I, 437.

<sup>76</sup> Feine, Behm, and Kueimmel, p. 221.



role of the law in the new covenant and the special position of the covenant people; or Paul may have seen that the formula was vulnerable to such misinterpretation. Thus he took up the formula himself and added his own insertions and additions to clarify the universal character of the Christian faith and the total abolition of the law in God's new plan of salvation in this eschatological era. Paul thus used a Jewish-Christian formula to emphasize the necessity of integrating the Jews and the Gentiles into one Christian fellowship.<sup>77</sup> Mueller also points out that using this formula with its covenant theology allowed Paul to hint at another point which he would emphasize later, namely, that Israel is the concealed central party or branch through which the Gentiles are grafted into the new people of God and through which God the creator worked to regain His Lordship over the whole creation (see Rom. 11:13-24; 28-32).<sup>78</sup>

When we see that the theme of this epistle is the righteousness that is revealed in the power of the gospel to faith for Jews and Gentiles (1:16-17), it is not surprising that Paul takes a traditional formula which is capable of being misinterpreted against this central affirmation and gives a commentary on it to guard against such a misinterpretation. McNeile states that Paul's task in this epistle was to explain "why the Jewish religion was no longer the religion, but was superseded by one that was not national but universal." He considers

---

<sup>77</sup>Cf. Lee, pp. 4-5.

<sup>78</sup>Mueller, pp. 112-113.



that in 1:16-8:39 Paul is dealing with this central problem: "Seeing that Israel were the chosen race, and their religion was the religion, wherein did their failure consist?"<sup>79</sup> Paul's answer is that they have failed to attain righteousness by law. He uses 1:18-3:20 to make the point that the Jews, as well as the Gentiles, have not kept the law, have fallen under the power of sin, and are under the wrath of God (1:18;2:12-16,23; 3:9-20). Paul even indicts the Jews for failing to achieve the universalistic goal which God had in choosing Israel; instead of bringing the Gentiles to God, they caused the Gentiles to blaspheme God (2:24). In 3:21-26, however, Paul announces the new divine action in the New Age--the revelation of righteousness through faith in Jesus. These verses are the eschatological reversal of 1:18-3:20.<sup>80</sup> Now he announces a righteousness given to man apart from law which frees from sin, a righteousness meant for all nations. In this context we can clearly see why Paul would cite a traditional formula, familiar to his Roman readers, which Judaizers could turn against these central affirmation of the Gospel he proclaimed. The eschatological act of God does not establish a new covenant based on law like the old covenant, but a new covenant based solely on faith in Jesus; and the eschatological act of God in Christ does not establish a covenant only again for an exclusive people, but a new covenant with the world, Jews and Gentiles, to restore His creation.

---

<sup>79</sup>A. H. McNeile, An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament, 2nd revised edition by C. S. C. Williams (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1953), p. 151.

<sup>80</sup>Stuhlmacher, p. 86.



This also tells us something of Paul's attitude toward and use of tradition in general. Lohse points out that Paul knew himself to be commissioned with the same proclamation with which Jesus commissioned the original twelve disciples, and he therefore passed on the formulae of the kerygma which he received from the earliest church (Gal. 1:15-16).<sup>81</sup> But the handing down of tradition was no mere mechanical repetition of formulae for Paul; the Gospel which he was commissioned to proclaim always stood as a norm over the tradition. If the tradition could endanger his Gospel, he could expand it, broaden it, reinterpret it, always in service of the Gospel.<sup>82</sup> The Living Lord of the Gospel which he proclaimed was also Lord over the tradition, and Paul used it in His service.

---

<sup>81</sup>Lohse, p. 147.

<sup>82</sup>Cf. Krodel, VI, 103-104; Reumann, XX, 451-452; Wegenast, p. 79.



## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION

This thesis has demonstrated and discussed some of the many problems of Rom. 3:24-26; we have also surveyed a wide variety of interpretations of this passage. The purpose of this thesis was to highlight the new approach of form analysis to these verses. Form analysis has answered many of the questions of interpretation in a manner more satisfactory than most other approaches. Although we leave many questions for further study, we can see that some progress has been made in the interpretation of these difficult verses through form criticism:

(1) The structural and contextual problems connected with dikaioumenoi (3:24) find solution in form analysis. If the problems cannot be attributed to Paul's rough, free style (and this is not impossible), they can be attributed to the contextual dislocation caused by the introduction of a pre-Pauline formula. A question remains, however, for further research: is verse 24 part of the pre-Pauline formula or is it Paul's introduction to the formula?

(2) If it is difficult to determine the meaning of many of the words and phrases in these verses because they are strange to Pauline usage and vocabulary, the assumption of a pre-Pauline formula in these verses at least explains why the vocabulary is rare and gives a new contextual dimension with which to determine its meaning and theological significance.



(3) According to the view followed by most form critics, the problem of dikaiousunē theou in these verses finds new possible solutions in form analysis. It is probable that the righteousness of God in verse 25b is an attribute ascribed to God. The formula hypothesis gives a good explanation as to why we find this un-Pauline usage in the midst of a context in which the Pauline usage abounds. And yet a firm, satisfactory answer to the many questions connected with this concept, dikaiousunē theou, still seems beyond our grasp. The form critics are in disagreement both as to what the phrase meant in the formula and what is meant to Paul. Did it mean God's retributive justice or His covenant fidelity in the formula? For Paul, did it mean God's forensic gift of righteousness or his saving power for a new creation? These questions await further study.

Another complication arises in our uncertainty as to whether the phrase eis endeixin tēs dikaiousunēs autou (3:25b) was originally even in the pre-Pauline formula (see Chapter II). Is it perhaps a Pauline insertion, and, therefore, does dikaiousunē perhaps have the same meaning it has elsewhere in Paul? It may appear as an attribute of God only because of its location in the formula (before the dia clause). Similarly dia pisteōs can be understood (perhaps falsely) to have Christ's blood as its object because of its strange location in the formula (before en tō autou haimati).

(4) Form analysis has neatly solved the problem of relating the two parallel clauses of verse 25b and verse 26a, a problem which has defied solution despite the many varied attempts and interpretations. If Paul has cited a formula from the tradition, he has probably taken



up the last line of the formula, and repeated it to make his own clarifying additions to the theology of the formula.

(5) The problem of the relation of dikaion and dikaiounta (3:26b) may be nearer to a satisfactory solution; they can be seen to connect and summarize the theology of the pre-Pauline formula and the Pauline theology of justification.

The following summary statements review our discoveries about the content and theology of the pre-Pauline formula:

(1) The pre-Pauline formula probably viewed the crucifixion of Christ as the one expiatory sacrifice of the new covenant in contrast to all of the old covenant cult sacrifices. It may also have viewed Good Friday as the eschatological Day of Atonement.

(2) If verse 24 is part of the formula, it described the crucifixion of Christ as affecting a new deliverance from sin, comparable to the Exodus from Egypt, which preceded the establishment of the old covenant.

(3) If verse 24 and dikaiousunē theou (verse 25b) are part of the formula, it described the crucifixion of Christ as God's demonstration of His covenant fidelity to His people by forgiving their past sins against the old covenant and restoring them into a new covenant relationship with Him. If dikaiousunē theou in verse 25b is Paul's insertion, however, the pre-Pauline formula would still speak of the crucifixion of Christ as the new covenant expiatory sacrifice (hilastērion en tō autou haimati) put forward by God for the forgiveness of the past sins against the old covenant. Paul's insertion, dikaiousunē theou, would then emphasize



that this has taken place to demonstrate God's saving righteousness which He has revealed and given to the man who believes in Jesus Christ.

(4) The formula probably speaks of the forgiveness of formerly committed sins against the old covenant. This forgiveness is the goal or the means by which the new covenant is established, and it is effected by the sacrificial death of Jesus.

(5) The covenant theology of the formula indicates that it may have originated in the Lord's Supper liturgy of the earliest Jewish Christian congregations.

The following summary statements review our intimations about Paul's use of the pre-Pauline formula:

(1) The formula was vulnerable to misinterpretation. Judaizers or weak Jewish Christians could find here an opportunity for resurrecting their sin of pride, boasting in their special status as a covenant people, adopting an exclusive view of the new covenant that would leave the Gentiles on a lower plain, and reestablishing the law--at least in part--to function in the new covenant.

(2) Paul repudiated any such interpretation of the formula. By his insertions of the grace and faith concepts he excluded all room for boasting on man's part, he totally separated the law from the new covenant, and he insisted on the universal goal of the new covenant to include all nations.

(3) By adding his own concept of the "righteousness of God" in verse 26a (and perhaps even in verse 25b) Paul guards against a concept of God's righteousness merely as a demanding, retributive quality of



God, or as God's saving covenant fidelity directed only to His special people. Paul emphasizes that God's righteousness is His saving righteousness given by grace to man solely on the basis of faith, and thereby he emphasizes that God's righteousness is directed to the salvation of every individual, and therefore to Jews and Gentiles. He may also be emphasizing that this saving righteousness of God brings about a new creation and places man under His Lordship; the righteousness of God would then have cosmic dimensions and reveal not only His fidelity to His covenant with Israel but also His fidelity to His covenant with His creation. Paul thus radically reinterprets the pre-Pauline formula.

(4) Paul concluded the pre-Pauline formula and his additional clarifications with a summarizing phrase (3:26b) which combined the theological viewpoint of the formula with his own emphases: (a) God is both true to His just character and justifies the believer, or (b) God is faithful both to the covenant with Israel and to His creation, and that fidelity is demonstrated in His justification of both Jews and Gentiles on the basis of faith in Jesus.

We conclude with a paraphrase of Rom. 3:24-26 which is based on our form analytical studies:

(Being justified and thus restored into covenant relationship with God [as a gift, by His grace] by means of the redemption or new Exodus from sin which is ours in Christ Jesus,)

Whom God set forth publicly as the expiatory sacrifice of the new covenant [to be received by faith] in His blood,

(In order to demonstrate His righteousness or covenant fidelity) through or with a view to the forgiveness of sins formerly committed against the covenant when God was patient



[In order to demonstrate His saving righteousness or creation  
fidelity in this new eschatological age

In order to be both just or faithful to His people and to justify or  
make a new creation him who puts his faith in Jesus.]<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Those words in parenthesis are those about which there is some degree of doubt as to whether they were originally a part of the pre-Pauline formula or Paul's own additions; those words in brackets are definite Pauline insertions or additions.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### A. Primary Sources and Tools

The Apocrypha of the Old Testament. Revised Standard Version. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, c.1957.

Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. Translated and revised by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Bible, Holy. Revised Standard Version.

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

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, The Roman Antiquities of. English translation by Ernest Cary, on the basis of the version of Edward Spelman. 7 vols. The Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1937.

Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath, editors. A Concordance to the Septuagint. 2 vols. Granz-Austria: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1954.

Kittel, Rudolf, editor. Biblia Hebraica. Stuttgart: Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, c.1937.

Moule, C. F. D. An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek. 2nd edition. Cambridge: University Press, 1960.

Moulton, W. F., and A. S. Geden, editors. A Concordance to the Greek Testament. 4th revised edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.

Nestle, Eberhard, editor. Novum Testamentum Graece. 25th edition. Stuttgart: Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963.

Rahlfs, Alfred, editor. Septuaginta. 2 vols. 6th edition. Stuttgart: Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1959.

Turner, Nigel. Syntax. Vol. III of A Grammar of New Testament Greek, by James Hope Moulton. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.

Vermes, G., translator and editor. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1962.



Young, Robert. Analytical Concordance to the Holy Bible. 8th revised edition. London: Lutterworth Press, 1939.

Zerwick, Maximilian. Biblical Greek. Translated from the Latin by Joseph Smith. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963.

#### B. Secondary Sources

Achtemeier, E. R. "Righteousness in the OT," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by G. A. Buttrick. IV. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 80-85.

Allen, L. C. "The Old Testament in Romans I-VIII," Vox Evangelica, III (1964), 6-41.

Barrett, C. K. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.

Behm, Johannes. "Haima, haimateckchusia," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated from the German and edited by G. W. Bromiley. I. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964. Pp. 172-177.

Best, Ernst. The Letter of Paul to the Romans. Cambridge: University Press, 1967.

Bornkamm, Gunther. Das Ende des Gesetzes. 4th edition. Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1963.

Braumann, Georg. Vor-paulinische christliche Taufverkuendigung bei Paulus. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1962.

Bruce, F. F. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1963.

Buechsel, Friedrich, and Johannes Herrmann. "Hilasterion," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated from the German and edited by G. W. Bromiley. III. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1965. Pp. 318-323.

Bultmann, Rudolf. "Aphiēmi, aphasis, pariēmi, paresis," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated from the German and edited by G. W. Bromiley. I. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964. Pp. 509-512.

----- "Dikaiosunē Theou," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIII (1964), 12-16.



- . "Neueste Paulusforschung," Theologische Rundschau, VIII (January 1936), 1-22.
- . Theology of the New Testament. Translated from the German by Kendrick Grobel. I. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.
- Cadman, W. H. "Dikaiosunē in Rom. 3:21-26," Studia Evangelica. II, Part I. Edited by F. L. Cross. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964. Pp. 532-534.
- Creed, J. M. "Paresis in Dionysius of Halicarnassus and in St. Paul," Journal of Theological Studies, XLI (1940), 28-30.
- Cullmann, Oscar. The Christology of the New Testament. Translated from the German by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall. Revised edition. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1963.
- Davies, W. D. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. 2nd edition. London: SPCK, 1965.
- DeVries, S. J. "Sin, Sinners," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by G. A. Buttrick. IV. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 361-376.
- Dodd, C. H. The Bible and the Greeks. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.
- . The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1932.
- Drummond, Robert J. "A Comprehensive View of the Epistle to the Romans," Evangelical Quarterly, XIV (October 1942), 241-249.
- Fahy, Thomas. "Exegesis of Rom. 3:25f.," The Irish Theological Quarterly, XXIII (January 1956), 69-73.
- Feine, Paul, and Johannes Behm. Introduction to the New Testament. Completely reedited by Werner Georg Kummel. Translated from the German by A. J. Mattill, Jr. 14th revised edition. New York: Abingdon Press, c.1965.
- Fitzer, Gottfried. "Der Ort der Versöhnung nach Paulus," Theologische Zeitschrift, XXII (March 1966), 161-183.
- Fuller, Reginald H. The Foundations of New Testament Christology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.
- Good News For Modern Man: The New Testament in Today's English Version. New York: The American Bible Society, 1966.



- Hunter, A. M. Paul and his Predecessors. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1961.
- Kaesemann, Ernst. "God's Righteousness in Paul," translated from the German by Wilfred F. Bunge, The Bultmann School of Biblical Interpretation: New Directions?, in Journal for Theology and the Church. I. Edited by Robert W. Funk, and Others. New York: Harper and Row, 1965. Pp. 100-110.
- "Zum Verstaendnis von Roemer 3:24-26," Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen. I. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960. Pp. 96-100.
- Kennedy, A. R. S. "Tabernacle," A Dictionary of the Bible. IV. Edited by James Hastings, and Others. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902. Pp. 653-668.
- Kertelge, Karl. "Rechtfertigung" bei Paulus. Muenster: Verlag Aschendorff, 1967.
- Knox, John. "The Epistle to the Romans, Exegesis," Interpreter's Bible. Edited by G. A. Buttrick. IX. New York: Abingdon Press, 1954.
- Krodel, Gerhard. "The Gospel According to Paul," Dialog, VI (Spring 1967), 95-107.
- Kuemmel, Werner Georg. "Paresis und endeixis: Ein Beitrag zum Verstaendnis der paulinischen Rechtfertigungslehre," Zeitschrift fuer Theologie und Kirche, XLIX (1952), 154-167.
- Kuss, Otto. Der Roemerbrief. 2nd edition. I. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1963.
- Lee, E. K. A Study in Romans. London: SPCK, 1962.
- Leenhardt, F. J. The Epistle to the Romans. Translated from the French by Harold Knight. New York: World Publishing Company, c.1961.
- Lietzmann, Hans. Einfuehrung in die Textgeschichte der Paulusbriefe an die Roemer. 2nd edition. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1919.
- Lohse, Eduard. Maertyrer und Gottesknecht: Untersuchung zur urchristlichen Verkuendigung vom Suenhetod Jesu Christi. 2nd edition. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963.
- Luther, Martin. Die Bibel oder die ganze Heilige Schrift. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, n.d.
- McNeile, A. H. An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament. 2nd revised edition by C. S. C. Williams. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.



- Manson, T. W. "HILASTERION," Journal of Theological Studies, XLVI (1945), 1-10.
- Meecham, H. G. "Romans 3:25f., 4:25--the Meaning of dia c. acc.," Expository Times, L (September 1939), 564.
- Michel, Otto. Der Brief an die Roemer. 13th edition. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- Miller, R. H. "An Exposition of Romans 3:21-31," Review and Expositor, XXX (October 1933), 424-431.
- Mitton, C. L. "Atonement," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by G. A. Buttrick. I. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 309-313.
- Moore, G. F. Judaism. I. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1946.
- Morris, Leon. "The Meaning of hilastērion in Rom. 3:25," New Testament Studies, II (1955), 33-43.
- Mueller, Christian. Gottes Gerechtigkeit und Gottes Volk. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.
- Murray, J. O. F. "Atonement," A Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by James Hastings, and Others. I. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898. Pp. 197-199.
- The New English Bible: New Testament. Oxford: University Press, 1961.
- Norden, Eduard. Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religioeser Rede. Leipzig: Verlag B. G. Teubner, 1913.
- Nygren, Anders. Commentary on Romans. Translated from the Swedish by Carl C. Rasmussen. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1949.
- Phillips, J. B. The New Testament in Modern English. New York: Macmillan Co., 1958.
- Quell, Gottfried, Georg Bertram, Gustav Staehlin, and Walter Grundmann. "Hamartanō, hamartēma, hamartia," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated from the German and edited by G. W. Bromiley. I. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964. Pp. 267-316.
- Reumann, John. "The Gospel of the Righteousness of God," Interpretation, XX (October 1966), 432-452.
- Rhys, Howard. The Epistle to the Romans. New York: Macmillan Co., 1961.



- Roehrs, W. R. "Covenant and Justification in the Old Testament," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXXV (October 1964), 583-602.
- Sanday, William, and A. C. Headlam. The Epistle to the Romans. 5th edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, c.1902.
- Schille, Gottfried. Fruehchristliche Hymnen. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962.
- Schlier, Heinrich. "Anechō, anektos, anochē," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated from the German and edited by G. W. Bromiley. I. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964. Pp. 359-360.
- Schmidt, H. W. Der Brief des Paulus an die Roemer. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962.
- Schrenk, Gottlob, and Gottfried Quell. "dikē, dikaios, dikaiosunē, dikaiōō, dikaiōma, dikaiōsis, dikaiokrisia," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated from the German and edited by G. W. Bromiley. II. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964. Pp. 174-225.
- Scott, C. A. A. Christianity According to St. Paul. Cambridge: University Press, c.1927.
- Sharp, Douglas S. "For Our Justification," The Expository Times, XXXIX (November 1927), 87-90.
- Stauffer, Ethelbert. New Testament Theology. Translated from the German by John Marsh. New York: Macmillan Co., 1956.
- Stevens, G. B. "A Paraphrase of the Epistle to the Romans," Biblical World, VIII (October and December 1896), 299-309, 390-395.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. Gottes Gerechtigkeit bei Paulus. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.
- Swain, C. W. "'For Our Sins.' The Image of Sacrifice in the Thought of the Apostle Paul," Interpretation, XVII (February 1963), 131-139.
- Talbert, Charles H. "A Non-Pauline Fragment at Romans 3:24-26?," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXV (1966), 287-296.
- Tasker, R. V. G. The Old Testament in the New Testament. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1947.
- Taylor, Vincent. Forgiveness and Reconciliation. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1952.



----- "Great Texts Reconsidered," Expository Times. L (April 1939), 295-300.

Wegenast, Klaus. Das Verstaendnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen. Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962.

Wennemer, Karl. "Apolutrōsis in Rom. 3:24-25a," Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus, 1961. I. Vol. 17-18 of Analecta Biblica. Rome: E. Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1963. Pp. 283-288.

Whiteley, D. E. H. The Theology of St. Paul. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.

Zahn, Theodor. Introduction to the New Testament. Translated from the German by John Moore Trout, and Others. I. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.