

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

3-1-1970

### "Waiting In Hope" An Exegetical Study of Romans 8:19-22

John Rische

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir\_rischej@csl.edu

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

Digital Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)  
Commons

---

Network

#### Recommended Citation

Rische, John, ""Waiting In Hope" An Exegetical Study of Romans 8:19-22" (1970). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 780.  
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/780>

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 Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

"WAITING IN HOPE"  
AN EXEGETICAL STUDY OF  
ROMANS 8:19-22

---

A Research Paper Presented to  
the Faculty of Concordia Seminary,  
St. Louis, Department of Exegetical Theology  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for EN-199

---

by

John H. Rische

March 1970

2-2-71  
gift  
V. Postleing

BS  
2665  
.2  
R5

84944

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	iii
CHAPTER	
I. THE OBJECT OF CREATION'S WAITING . . . . .	1
II. THE OCCASION FOR CREATION'S WAITING. . . . .	17
III. THE MOTIVE FOR CREATION'S WAITING. . . . .	26
IV. A SIGN OF CREATION'S WAITING . . . . .	39
NOTES. . . . .	46
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	66

CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY  
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

## INTRODUCTION

Romans 8:19-22 has always held a prominent place in theological discussions concerning the eschatology of the New Testament. Within the Lutheran theological tradition, it has become the center of exegetical controversy between the adherents of Paul Gerhardt's views on the annihilatio mundi and those of Luther who favor the concept of an eschatological conversio mundi. Similarly, within the Roman Catholic tradition, it is frequently employed as the locus classicus for the concept of "Universal Salvation" as opposed to the concept of a "Cosmic Redemption". More recently, this passage has received renewed prominence in the eschatological thought of the contemporary "Theology of Hope".

It is not the purpose of this study to review and evaluate either the past or the present systematic discussions of this passage, but to offer a critical exegesis of the text. Such an exegesis, of course, will have a direct bearing upon the past and present dogmatic debates. These implications will be pointed out where appropriate.

Because of its rather enigmatic character, this passage has enjoyed quite a colorful history of interpretation. One of the earliest commentators on Romans 8:19-22 could very well have been the author of II Peter. Commenting on the eschatological teaching of the apostle Paul, the author of this epistle remarks, "So also our beloved brother Paul wrote to you according to the wisdom given him, speaking of this as he does in all his letters. There are some things in them hard to understand. . .!" (3:15f). He certainly didn't overstate the matter.

In his preface to a sermon based on this text, Martin Luther likewise

refers to the difficulty and uniqueness of Romans 8:19-22:

Der heilige Paulus fueret hie eine sonderliche rede fur allen andern Aposteln, und lauten seine wort, so zum ersten her gehen, gleich wuenderlich und seltzam, Daruemb wollen sie mit vieis gestudirt und mit eigener erfahrung erkennet werden. . . . Daruemb ein Christ, der solche erfahrung nicht hat, wird gar ein geringen geschmack oder geruch aus solchen worten Pauli haben, ja sie werden jm gar undeutsch sein" (WA, XLI, 301, 14-21).

It would be presumptuous for this writer to claim either the mastery of Scripture or the personal experience in life which Luther considered requisite for an accurate understanding of this passage. But an attempt has been made to meet these criteria, at least to the degree possible for the author. It is to be hoped that these efforts have not been without result.

The title and outline of this study intentionally betray a certain understanding of the construction of Romans 8:19-22. The entire passage revolves around the ἀποκαταδοκία τῆς κτίσεως . Chapter One deals with the interpretation of this phrase and with the object of this expectant waiting mentioned in verse 19: "the revelation of the sons of God". Chapter Two deals with verse 20 of the pericope and, in particular, with the occasion for this waiting of creation: it waits because it has been "subjected to futility". In Chapter Three, verse 21 is examined with reference to the motive for creation's waiting: creation hopes to be set free. Finally, Chapter Four deals with verse 22 which offers a confirmatory sign of creation's expectant waiting-in-hope, a sign introduced by the phrase "We know. . .".

This outline can be illustrated by—and many of the exegetical conclusions arrived at in this paper are anticipated in—the following translation:

For creation waits eagerly—with outstretched head, so to speak—for this revelation to be made to God's sons. (For creation was made subject to futility—not of its own free will, but in accordance with the will of Him who subjected it.) Creation's expectant waiting is grounded in its hope that it, too, will be set free from the slavery of its present state of corruptibility, and be introduced into the freedom of the future state of glory that belongs to God's children. For we know that to this very day all creation has been groaning together in the pangs of childbirth.

In a sense, the four chapters of this study are merely extended footnotes to this translation.

## CHAPTER ONE

### THE OBJECT OF CREATION'S WAITING

ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαταδοκία τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται.

"For creation waits eagerly—with outstretched head, so to speak—for this revelation to be made to God's sons" (v. 19).

The unprepared reader, happening upon this pericope of Romans eight, is apt to be somewhat puzzled—and understandably so; for the precise connection of this passage to the rest of the chapter is a bit obscure. Yet there is a connection—and a very logical one at that, as a careful consideration of the context clearly reveals.

According to the useful outline of Romans offered by Anders Nygren<sup>1</sup>, chapters four through eight comprise the second major division of the epistle. Having argued in the first four chapters that righteousness comes only by faith, Paul turns his attention to the existential implications of this righteousness: "He who through faith is righteous shall live." This life is described as a life of freedom: freedom from wrath (chapter five), freedom from sin (chapter six), freedom from law (chapter seven), and freedom from death (chapter eight).

In 8:2 Paul introduces the thought that those who have received the Spirit of Christ are set free from their bondage to death. True, they still must experience suffering and even, one day, death. But now they have the assurance of a new life through the Spirit (v. 11), a life of glory. Consequently, even the sufferings which they experience in this present life "are not worth comparing with the glory that is to be revealed" to them in the new creation (v. 18). It is at this point that

Paul introduces the theme of the eager expectation of creation.

The conjunction γάρ indicates that what is to follow is somehow connected to what has just been said in the preceding verses. The precise relation must be gathered from the context.<sup>2</sup>

Kirk suggests that in verse 19 Paul is underscoring the certainty of the future glory promised to the children of God in verse 18. The connection might be expressed as follows: "If, as we believe, the redemption of the entire universe depends upon the 'revelation of the sons of God', how certain it is that that revelation will take place! The issues involved are too great for God's plans in this direction to be changed."<sup>3</sup> Kuss agrees that it is the certainty of the future glory that is being stressed; in fact, he sees this as the emphasis of the entire pericope: "Mit dem 'denn' (γάρ) wird der gesamte Zusammenhang vv. 19-22 begründend an v. 18 angeschlossen: die Sicherheit der Hoffnung auf eine überaus 'herrliche' Vollendung ergibt sich zunächst aus dem gegenwärtigen Zustand der 'Schöpfung'."<sup>4</sup> Althaus goes even further and extends this to include the entire section from verse 19 to verse 26f: "Diese Herrlichkeit ist uns gewiss. Alles drängt ihr entgegen. Die ganze Kreatur seufzt (v. 19-22), die Christen seufzen (v. 23-25), ja auch der Heilige Geist seufzt (v. 26f.)—wie sollte der barmherzige Gott dieses seufzen nicht erhören!"<sup>5</sup>

But even though a note of certainty is unmistakably present in these verses, the context indicates that Paul is reflecting here not so much on the certainty of the future glory as on the contrast between that future glory and the sufferings of the present. Thus Philippi, giving full weight to the μέλλουσαν, asserts that what is being affirmed in verse 19



is not the certainty but simply the futurity of the promised glory.<sup>6</sup>

But as Meyer correctly observes, this futurity is already quite "self-evident".<sup>7</sup> It is difficult to see why Paul would have felt a need to confirm it. Furthermore, μέλλουσιν is by no means all that emphatic. It merely stands in contrast to τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ, qualifying the noun δόξα in the same way that τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ qualifies παθήματα. The emphasis is not on the present-future antithesis but on the contrast between παθήματα and δόξα: "the sufferings of the present are nothing in comparison with the glory of the future."

Consequently, "the great majority of interpreters from Origen and Chrysostom to the present"<sup>8</sup> agree that what is being affirmed in verse 19 is the greatness of the glory promised in verse 18. As Schmidt puts it, "Paulus macht dem Leser die Grösse der zukünftigen Herrlichkeit dadurch deutlich, dass er die ganze Kreatur auf die Zeit ihres Anbruchs warten lässt."<sup>9</sup>

Murray, however, is not convinced. He suggests that Paul is pointing to creation's patient, persistent waiting as an example for Christians to emulate as they too await the promised glory to be revealed to them:

It seems that verse 19 is intended to lend confirmation and support to the patient and confident expectation to which, by implication, believers are urged in verse 18 and that this is done by instancing the "earnest expectation" of the creation. If "the creation" entertains persistent expectation, believers should do likewise--let us be astride the creation itself.<sup>10</sup>

In support of Murray's position, evidence might be adduced from the context. One of Paul's chief concerns in the last half of chapter eight certainly is to lend encouragement to Christians who are facing suffering and persecution, that they might remain steadfast in their faith and

hope (cf. verses 18, 25, 28, 31-39). Yet Paul does this not by holding up before their eyes the example of creation's patient waiting, but by demonstrating how insignificant their present sufferings are in comparison with the greatness of the glory that has been promised to them. How does the introduction of ἡ κτίσις in verse 19 enhance the conception of the greatness of the future glory? Knox expresses the thought as follows: "We do not grasp how great this glory will be until we recognize that the whole cosmic order--all things animate and inanimate--are waiting for it 'with eager longing'."<sup>11</sup>

Though this last interpretation is probably to be preferred, the other suggestions do bring out valid emphases of the text. The elements of certainty, futurity, and encouragement are certainly present in verses 18ff. Perhaps, then, the relationship between verse 18 and what follows can best be expressed by combining the above suggestions in some such way as this: Paul asserts in v. 18 that present sufferings which the children of God must experience are nothing in comparison with the future glory that will be theirs. Just how great that glory will be can be seen from the fact that creation itself is waiting for it in breathless anticipation (v. 19). Nor is there any doubt at all that it will come; everything testifies to its certainty (vv. 21-27). Knowledge of this greatness and certainty of the future glory should thus be a source of tremendous encouragement to God's children not to lose hope in times of affliction (vv. 28ff).

ἀνοκαπαδοξία, writes Bartling, "is one of those rare and beautiful words that convey a picture, whole and entire to the point of minute detail, to the mind of the attentive reader."<sup>12</sup> It is a compound made up

of *κῆρα* ("head") and *δέχομαι=δέχομαι* ("to take", or perhaps originally, "to stretch").<sup>13</sup> The prefix *ὑπο-* serves to intensify the force of the word. "The picture is that of one who watches eagerly for something with outstretched head. . . . Anyone who has watched a child breathlessly note the progress of an approaching parade knows the picture behind the word."<sup>14</sup> The graphic image contained in *ἀποκαταδοκία* has been translated quite effectively into a comparable English idiom by J.B. Phillips: "The whole creation is on tiptoe to see the wonderful sight."

Paul uses the word only one other time in all of his epistles; namely, in *Philippians* 1:20. There, too, it is used in connection with *ἐλπίς*. Commenting on the occurrence of *ἀποκαταδοκία* in these two passages, Delling writes:

Linked with *ἐλπίς* in *Phil.* 1:20, the word expresses confident expectation; the *ἐλπίς* denotes well-founded hope and the *ἀποκαταδοκία* unreserved waiting. The same is true in *R.* 8, where the former word is used of Christians in v. 24f. and the latter of the rest of creation in v. 19.<sup>15</sup>

Delling's distinction between *ἀποκαταδοκία* and *ἐλπίς* is helpful. But it should also be pointed out that both terms (not just *ἀποκαταδοκία*) are predicated of creation in *Romans* 8 (cf. vv. 19, 20).

As the more recent English versions indicate, the genitive *τῆς κτίσεως* is best understood as a subjective genitive.<sup>16</sup> But what does Paul mean by *ἡ κτίσις*? This question has been the center of debate from the time of the early Church Fathers to the present.

In classical Greek, *κτίσις* is used for the founding of cities, houses, games, and sects, and for the discovery and settlement of countries.<sup>17</sup> The word acquired additional connotations through its usage in the LXX, where

it is used most frequently of God's creation.<sup>18</sup> It can refer to either (1) "the sum of all created things"<sup>19</sup>; or (2) "physical creation", "the universe"<sup>20</sup>; or (3) "a single created thing", a "creature"<sup>21</sup>.

Within the New Testament, the word is used almost exclusively of God's creation, with reference either to the "act of creating" (Romans 1:20)<sup>22</sup>, or to the "thing created". The latter may be limited by its context to mean an individual "creature" or "created thing" (Romans 3:39, II Cor. 5:17; Col. 1:15; Heb. 4:13)<sup>23</sup>. Or where there is not contextual limitation, it may be taken to mean the totality of all created things, "creation" or "world" (Heb. 9:11; Rev. 3:14; cf. also Mark 10:6; 13:19; II Pet. 3:4; Mark 16:15 [limited to mankind]).<sup>24</sup>

Apart from Romans 8:19-22, the Pauline usage of *κτίσις* is similar to the general New Testament usage: (1) "act of creation" (Romans 1:20); (2) individual "creature" (which could also refer to a demonic being, Romans 8:39); (3) totality of "creation", "world" (in contrast to the Creator, Romans 1:25); and (4) the "new creature" (baptized Christians, II Cor. 5:17) or the "new creation" (the state of being in faith, Gal. 6:15).<sup>25</sup>

The question is which, if any, of the above meanings applies to the *κτίσις* of Romans 8:19-22. It is not merely an academic question. By no means is Kuss overstating the case when he writes, "Die Auslegung des Abschnittes vv. 19-22 im ganzen und im einzelnen hängt grundlegend davon ab, was man unter 'Schöpfung' zu verstehen hat."<sup>26</sup>

The writings of the early Church Fathers contain almost every conceivable interpretation of *κτίσις*.<sup>27</sup> Many of the Church Fathers understood it in the sense of "creation" in general, everything visible to

man.<sup>28</sup> Others took it to mean "rational creation"<sup>29</sup>, variously understood: (a) angels and demons<sup>30</sup>; (b) all visible and invisible creatures<sup>31</sup>; or just "mankind" alone<sup>32</sup>. Thomas Aquinas attempted a synthesis of these many views: "Man hier unter dem Ausdruck 'Schöpfung' dreierlei verstehen kann: erstens—die gerechten Menschen...; zweitens—die menschliche Natur, welche sich den Gütern der Gnade unterwirft...; drittens—die sinnenfällige Schöpfung, wie es die Elemente dieser Welt sind."<sup>33</sup>

The situation is quite similar with the more recent interpretations. Most commentators take the *κτίσις* of Romans 8:19-22 to mean the entire visible creation below the human level. Yet some still insist that it refers primarily, if not exclusively, to mankind. Still others are willing to concede that man at least can be included in the concept.

Schlatter is one of the few commentators who argue that *κτίσις* refers exclusively to "mankind". His argument, at times, seems rather tendential, based upon a dogmatic predilection in favor of a universalistic interpretation of the passage. But his primary objection to applying *κτίσις* to the non-human creation seems to be prompted by the use of such words as ἀποκαταδομία, ἀπεχδέχεται, οὐχ ἔκθοσα, συστενάζει, and συνωδίνει, all of which, he feels, imply rationality and volition. He states his argument as follows: "Ehe wir versuchen der Aussage des Paulus durch eine phantasievolle Personifikation Sinn zu geben, ist es exegetische Pflicht, zuerst die Geschaffenen, die unzweifelhaft Personen sind, in den Satz hineinzustellen."<sup>34</sup>

Although Schlatter has found little support for his view that *κτίσις* refers exclusively to "mankind", several other scholars contend that "mankind" is its primary reference. Hommel, for one, making a careful

comparison of the similar, at times identical, terms used in Romans 1 and Romans 8, concludes:

Wir dürfen also jetzt zuversichtlicher als vorher den Vergleich von Römer 1 und 8 gelten lassen und bei Beachtung aller Unterschiede die κτίσις auch an der späteren Stelle des Briefes abschliessend so deuten, dass zwar im weiteren Sinne die ganze Schöpfung vorschwebt, dass aber doch das Auge des Betrachters ganz spezifisch auf der "lebendigen" κτίσις, nämlich auf Tier und Mensch ruht, und dass hier wiederum der Mensch unausgesprochen im Mittelpunkt steht.<sup>35</sup>

Hommel goes even further and contends that κτίσις is limited primarily to non-christian humanity:

Dass in Römer 8 unter der κτίσις in der Tat die "ausserchristliche" Menschheit in allererster Linie verstanden worden sein muss, sollte nach all dem klar sein. Die Gegenprobe liefert überdies eine Äusserung des Paulus wie II Kor. 5,17 εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, καινὴ κτίσις "ist jemand in Christo, so ist er eine neue Kreatur". Dasselbe lässt sich aber wiederum auch von der παραϊότης her erörtern, an die jene in Sklaverei gekettet ist. Ist doch dieselbe παραϊότης I Kor. 3,19,20 wie auch Eph. 4,17 gerade den Heiden zugeordnet, und werden doch Acta 14,15 die heidnischen Abgötter als μάταιοι bezeichnet und dem lebendigen Gott gegenübergestellt, der gerade hier als wahrer Herr der κτίσις umschrieben ist. Schliesslich wird man fragen dürfen, ob die ausdrückliche Betonung der Unfreiwilligkeit (οὐχ ἑκούσα v.20) überhaupt einen Sinn gehabt hätte, wenn unter der κτίσις ausschliesslich der unbelebte κόσμος zu verstehen war und nicht vorwiegend sein mit freiem Willen ausgestatteter und zugleich von den Söhnen Gottes unterschiedener Teil.<sup>36</sup>

With Schlatter, then, Hommel appeals to the use of such phrases as οὐχ ἑκούσα and παραϊότης (understood in an ethical sense) as necessitating the inclusion of "man" in ἡ κτίσις—indeed, as pointing to "mankind" as its primary meaning.

Schmidt is yet another of the more recent commentators to revive the Augustinian notion that κτίσις means primarily "mankind" in this passage. He bases his argument on the statement in v. 21 which implies that the

κτίσις will share in "the glorious liberty of the children of God". This indicates, Schmidt argues, that κτίσις is to be understood in the sense of "mankind" in general as distinguished from "Christians" in particular:

Da aber Paulus das Heilsziel, zu der die κτίσις befreit wird, in der herrlichen Freiheit der Kinder Gottes sieht (v. 21), ist es doch richtiger, hier wie an anderen neutestamentlichen Stellen (Mark. 16,15) zunächst an die Menschenwelt zu denken, im Unterschied zu dem engeren Kreis derer, die das Angeld des Geistes haben (=Christenheit; v. 23).<sup>37</sup>

Common to all of these interpretations of κτίσις is a reluctance to attribute to the natural world language that applies properly only to man. This reluctance betrays a fundamental failure to take into consideration the nature and source of the conceptual material employed by Paul in this passage. As Michel indicates, Paul has here taken over traditional, Jewish apocalyptic thought patterns. Noting the relatively independent character of this pericope, Michel continues:

Offenbar übernimmt [Paulus] hier apokalyptisches Materiel, besondere Traditionen mit eigenen eschatologisch verstandenen Begriffen (ἐλευθερία, υἰοθεσία, δόξα, ἀποκάλυψις τῶν υἰῶν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀπολύτρωσις). Wichtig ist, dass das eschatologische Heil ganz auf den Menschen, auf den Kosmos, auf die Schöpfung bezogen wird und dass es als "Erlösung" von der Vergänglichkeit beschrieben wird. Ein hellenistischer Einschlag dieser spätjüdische=urchristlichen Apokalyptik ist unverkennbar.<sup>38</sup>

Poetic personification of the natural world is indeed quite common in traditional apocalyptic, and in fact, is not without parallel in the Old Testament itself, especially in the writings of the prophets.

In view of the apocalyptic background of Romans 8:19-22, Michel concludes that "Dieser Satz ist nur dann verständlich, wenn κτίσις die Fülle des Geschaffenen (ohne Begrenzung) bedeutet und den 'Söhne Gottes', die offenbar bevorrechtet sind, gegenübersteht."<sup>39</sup> The phrase "ohne Begrenz-

ung", of course, indicates that Michel is willing to include man in the meaning of κτίσις, though not in an exclusive or even primary sense.<sup>40</sup>

This interpretation certainly has more going for it than those that would limit the meaning of κτίσις in any way. For as Hodge correctly points out, "The words πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις (v. 22), the whole creation, are so comprehensive, that nothing should be excluded which the nature of the subject and the context do not show cannot be embraced within their scope."<sup>41</sup> It remains to be determined, therefore, whether "the nature of the subject" and the "context" do in fact limit the meaning of κτίσις in any way.

From the antithesis between ἡ κτίσις and οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ in verses 19, 21, and 23, it would appear that the latter would have to be excluded from the meaning of κτίσις.<sup>42</sup> This would preclude any simple identification of κτίσις with "mankind". Schmidt attempts to get around this difficulty by suggesting that the contrast implied by this antithesis is merely that between the whole and one of its parts; that is, between all mankind in general (κτίσις="Menschenwelt") and the narrower circle of people to whom the Spirit has been given (οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ="Christenheit"). But while it is true that when κτίσις is used in the New Testament for "mankind" it generally means all mankind without exception (cf. Mark 16:15), the οὐ μόνον δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ of verse 23 clearly shows that what is being contrasted are two mutually exclusive realities, not simply the whole and one of its parts.

But what about Hommel's thesis that the contrast is primarily between Christians (οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ) and non-Christian humanity (ἡ κτίσις)? Hommel supports his interpretation by appealing to parallels in Virgil and in the Jewish Sibylline Oracle which, he claims, bear witness to the



universal longing of mankind for immortality, the same longing supposedly expressed by the ἀποκαταδοκία τῆς κτίσεως of Romans 8:19. On this interpretation, Romans 8:19 would be a proof-text for the notion of a λόγος σπερματικός within natural man.

The difficulty with Hommel's interpretation is that the longing expressed in Romans 8:19 is directed towards a very specific event: τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ. This is something entirely different from the more general longing of mankind for immortality. Can it be said of mankind in general and of non-Christian humanity in particular that they are patiently awaiting this very specific event? Kuss' remarks seem conclusive: "Dass die Nichtglaubenden ungeduldig die Offenbarung der Söhne Gottes erwarten, ist kaum ein paulinischer Gedanke; von einem unbewussten Streben, soweit Menschen in Betracht kommen können, steht aber nichts da."<sup>43</sup>

The most probable interpretation of κτίσις, then, is the one adopted by the great majority of commentators; namely, that it refers to the entire creation below the human level—"nature" or the "created universe".<sup>44</sup> Romans 8:19 thus pictures the entire natural world as being in a state of eager expectation: ἡ ἀποκαταδοκία τῆς κτίσεως..ἀπεκδέχεται.<sup>45</sup>

The verb ἀπεκδέχομαι is always used by Paul in an eschatological sense to express "expectation of the end".<sup>46</sup> Christians are said to be living in this state of eager expectation by virtue of their reception of the Spirit (v. 23,25). This expectation is focused upon their "adoption as sons", visibly fulfilled in "the resurrection of the body" (v. 23), which will be the signal for the transformation of the entire creation

(v. 21). Thus the expectation of creation is directed towards the same goal as that of Christians (v. 19). Since this expectation will be fulfilled at the parousia of Jesus Christ, Christ Himself becomes the object of this expectation (Phil. 3:20; cf. I Cor. 1:7). Hence Grundman concludes:

The word ἀπεκδέχεσθαι thus describes the existence of Christians as one which on the basis of reception . . . awaits the consummation, the cosmos being included in this attitude. The theme of this expectation, i.e., the transformation of the world, gives meaning both to Christian existence and to the being of the cosmos.<sup>47</sup>

The object of creation's eager, expectant waiting is given in the phrase τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ.

In classical Greek, the words ἀποκαλύπτω and ἀποκάλυψις carried no theological overtones.<sup>48</sup> They were used in their etymological sense to refer to the "uncovering" of something that had previously been veiled or covered up (e.g., one's head).<sup>49</sup> Within the LXX, this literal sense is still retained in certain passages; but the figurative sense becomes far more prominent, and a definitely theological referent begins to emerge.<sup>50</sup> Within the New Testament itself, the literal sense has been dropped entirely in favor of the figurative.<sup>51</sup> The verb, ἀποκαλύπτω, is still used on occasion in a non-theological sense; but the noun, ἀποκάλυψις, is always used in the New Testament with some kind of religious or theological associations.

In its usage within the New Testament, ἀποκάλυψις occurs in a number of different contextual settings: (1) On several occasions the noun is used with reference to the revelation or disclosure of truth in general. In this case, ἀποκάλυψις is viewed as a present reality of some kind.

This type of contextual usage might be termed "General Revelation" (Rom. 16:25; Eph. 1:17; Luke 2:32). (2) Paul, in particular, frequently uses ἀποκάλυψις in the sense of a present mystical, or visionary, experience (Gal. 1:12; II Cor. 12:1; Gal. 2:2; Eph. 3:3; I Cor. 2:4, 14:6,26; II Cor. 12:7; cf. Rev. 1:1). For purposes of schematization, this usage might be termed "Mystical Revelation". (3) Finally, ἀποκάλυψις is used both by Paul and by the author of II Peter with reference to some future reality connected with the parousia (I Pet. 4:13, 1:7,13; I Cor. 1:7; II Thess. 1:7; Rom. 2:5, 8:19). This contextual usage might be called "Eschatological Revelation".

Since Romans 8:19 falls under this last category, a comparison of this passage with the other five "eschatological" passages will be most helpful in determining the meaning of the phrase τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ:

a)	ἐν τῇ	ἀποκαλύψει	τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ	[i.e. Χριστοῦ]	(I Pet. 4:13)
b)	ἐν	ἀποκαλύψει		Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ	(I Pet. 1:7,13)
c)	τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν	τοῦ κυρίου	ἡμῶν	Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ	(I Cor. 1:7)
d)	ἐν τῇ	ἀποκαλύψει	τοῦ κυρίου	Ἰησοῦ	(II Thess. 1:7)
e)	τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν	τῶν υἱῶν		τοῦ θεοῦ	(Rom. 8:19)
f)	ἐν ἡμέρᾳ...ἀποκαλύψεως	δικαιοκρισίας		τοῦ θεοῦ	(Rom. 2:5)

It is evident from the above that Romans 8:19 is unique in connecting ἀποκάλυψις with οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ. What is the precise nature of this connection?

The consensus of commentators and translators alike seems to be that τῶν υἱῶν is the object (i.e., an objective genitive) of τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν (=τὸ ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι): "the revealing of the sons of God" (RSV), that is, "the time when the sons of God are revealed".<sup>52</sup> The meaning of the phrase τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ would then be clarified by the similar

expression τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (cf. I Cor. 1:7; II Thess. 1:7; I Pet. 1:7,13), viewed in the light of Colossians 3:4—"When Christ who is our life appears, then you also will appear with him in glory" (RSV). "At the parousia," explains Oepke, "the exalted Christ, who is still hidden in God, will be revealed in glory, and believers with him."<sup>53</sup> Riddle feels that "it is a new expression of the deep-seated consciousness of fellowship with Christ, which leads the Apostle to call this 'the revelation of the sons of God', not of the Son of God."<sup>54</sup>

Interpreted in this way, Romans 8:19 would underscore the "already" but "not yet" character of life ἐν Χριστῷ. In that Christians have received the Spirit of adoption (v. 15), they already are "sons of God" (v. 14). Their adoption, however, is not yet complete. They have received only "the first fruits of the Spirit"; they must await the final and complete demonstration of their "adoptive sonship" in "the redemption of their bodies" (v. 23), which will take place at the parousia. The redemption of their bodies will confirm their sonship; that is, it will reveal them to be what they already are by faith—sons of God.

Such an exposition is certainly "Pauline" and corresponds nicely with the general thrust of Romans 8:12-30. But interpreting the phrase τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ in this way would leave it without parallel. Nowhere else in the New Testament (or in the LXX, for that matter) is the phrase "sons of God" the direct object either of the verb ἀποκαλύπτω or of the noun ἀποκάλυψις.<sup>55</sup> In eschatological contexts, the most frequent objects of ἀποκαλύπτω/ἀποκάλυψις are ἡ δόξα (Rom. 8:18; I Pet. 5:1), ἡ δόξα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (I Pet. 4:13), or simply "Christ" himself (I Pet. 1:7, 13; I Cor. 1:7; II Thess. 1:7; Luke 17:30 ["Son of Man"]).<sup>56</sup> Might there

not be another way of construing the phrase τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ that would be more in line with this general usage?

A good case conceivably could be made for understanding τῶν υἱῶν as a genitive of relation (rather than objective genitive), and for taking τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν in its concrete rather than verbal sense, i.e., as referring to the result, rather than the act, of revealing (=ἀποκάλυμμα, not τὸ ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι).<sup>57</sup> The verse might then be translated as follows: "For creation is eagerly awaiting the revelation to God's children", i.e., the revelation to be disclosed to God's children; or perhaps, "For creation is eagerly awaiting the revelation that belongs to God's children." What is this revelation? Paul has just defined it in the previous verse (v.18): ἡ δόξα. The phrase τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ is thus virtually synonymous with the phrase δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς (τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν = δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι; τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ = εἰς ἡμᾶς). This same theme is picked up again in verse 21, which speaks about "the glory that belongs to the children of God". Thus, the following parallel phrases:

V. 18—	δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι	εἰς ἡμᾶς
V. 19—	τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν	τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ
V. 21—	τῆς δόξης	τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ

The meaning of these verses might be paraphrased as follows: "The sufferings of the present are nothing in comparison with the future glory that is to be revealed to us, God's children. Why, even nature herself is eagerly awaiting the revelation of this glory to those who are sons of God....For nature, too, hopes to have a share in this glory that belongs to God's children."

Understanding the phrase τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ in this way, of course, does not materially alter the meaning of the pericope;

but it does bring the use of ἀποκάλυψις here more into line with the usage found elsewhere in the New Testament, where ἡ δόξα is presented as the content of the eschatological revelation to be disclosed at the parousia.<sup>58</sup> The thrust of the passage remains the same: God's children will one day be glorified.

In pagan, mythological literature, the phrase οἱ υἱοὶ (τὰ τέκνα) τοῦ θεοῦ is frequently used in the sense of "divine beings". A similar usage occasionally occurs also in the LXX (cf. Psalm 88:7 [89:6], θεοῦ παῖδες as heavenly beings); but more commonly the phrase οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ is used in the Old Testament to refer to the children of Israel. The Israelites are called "sons of God" not by virtue of some mythological physical descent but by virtue of their divine election.<sup>59</sup>

As the context indicates, Paul is using this expression here in this Old Testament sense, applying it, however, not to the Israelites but to Christians. Christians are called οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ in that they have been made sons of God through the Spirit: "For all who are led by the Spirit of God are sons of God" (v. 14). They have received the spirit of sonship (πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας, v. 15). This Spirit bears witness with their own spirit that they are indeed children of God (v. 16), "and if children, then heirs, heirs of God and fellow heirs with Christ" (v. 17). Their adoption, however, is not yet complete; it awaits the completion of the ἀπολύτρωσις τοῦ σώματος (v. 23). This redemption is the δόξα that will be revealed to them (v. 18) and for which they wait in hope (vv. 24f). But they do not wait alone. All creation waits with them, her eager expectation (ἀποκαταδοχία) directed towards that same event: the glorification of the sons of God (v. 19).

## CHAPTER TWO

### THE OCCASION FOR CREATION'S WAITING

τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὐχ ἑκοῦσα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα.

"For creation was made subject to futility—not of its own free will, but in accordance with the will of Him who subjected it" (v. 20).

Having pictured the entire natural world as anxiously awaiting the day when God's children will receive the glory that has been promised to them, Paul goes on to explain just how it came to be that creation finds herself in this position: τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη. Creation waits because (γάρ) at present she cannot do otherwise; she has been made subject to "futility".

"Even before knowing what it means," writes Petrusch, "we can tell from the context that 'mataiotes' must be a state or condition that characterizes creation as we know it now. The state is extrinsic to creation as such (ὑπετάγη). It is only provisional and will certainly come to an end (ἐφ' ἐλπίδι). Furthermore, it is going against the inherent tendencies of creation (οὐχ ἑκοῦσα)."<sup>1</sup>

The noun ματαιότης is rare outside of the biblical literature. Its cognate μάταιος is used in classical Greek to denote "the world of appearance as distinct from that of being."<sup>2</sup> μάταιος occurs at times in conjunction with κένος; but the two are not completely synonymous. κένος means "worthless" because devoid of content; whereas in μάταιος "there is always the implication of what is against the norm, unexpected, offending what ought to be."<sup>3</sup>

Within the LXX, ματαιότης occurs only in the Wisdom Literature, most

notably in the Book of Ecclesiastes,<sup>4</sup> where it is used in the sense of the ultimate meaninglessness of human existence. "Vanity of vanities," cries Qoheleth, "all is vanity!"<sup>5</sup> His entire message is but an amplification of this basic theme.

According to Bauernfeind, "Romans 8:20 is a valid commentary on Qoh. The passage does not solve the metaphysical and logical problems raised by vanitas. In detail it allows of different possibilities of understanding. But it tells us plainly that the state of ματαιότης ("vanity") exists, and also that this has a beginning and end. Before its beginning and beyond its end is God, and a κτίσις without ματαιότης."<sup>6</sup> Sanday and Headlam also hear in Romans 8:20 an echoe of Qoheleth: "That is μάταιον which is 'without result' (μάτην), 'ineffective', 'which does not reach its end'—the opposite of τέλειος: the word is therefore appropriately used of the disappointing character of present existence, which nowhere reaches the perfection of which it is capable."<sup>7</sup> Thus, Michel similarly concludes, "Der Begriff bezeichnet die Vergeblichkeit, die Inhaltsleere und die Nichtigkeit, vielleicht auch die Verkehrtheit und die Unordnung der Welt."<sup>8</sup>

These interpretations of ματαιότης still do not exhaust the connotations of the word. As Brinkman rightly contends, "The essential strength and religious meaning of this picture is somehow unnecessarily weakened by explanations which suggest that the vanity in question is an emptiness in things which do not yield what they promise or are in a perverse, disordered and frustrated condition since the Fall."<sup>9</sup> Brinkman prefers to call it "sin-vanity", since "the term is borrowed from the religious condition of men and, as Vaïrd pointed out, it should be taken



in an ethico-religious sense."<sup>10</sup> The meaning of Romans 8:20 would then be that ἡ κτίσις "like the Gentiles of Eph. 4:17 is subjected to 'sin-vanity', since its 'hold on the spiritual and eternal' (Westcott) is lost."<sup>11</sup> In short, ματαιότης is a concomitant effect of alienation from God.

As a characteristic of creation, then, ματαιότης refers not only to creation's inability to attain its true ends, but also to the "frustrating" effects of its subservience to sinful man. The latter, in fact, is perhaps the cause of the former.<sup>12</sup>

The use of the aorist, ἀπετάγη, indicates that this subjection to ματαιότης occurred at a definite point of time in the past.<sup>13</sup> Most commentators see here a reference to Genesis 3:17f, where the natural world is said to have been placed under a curse as a result of man's sin.

There are a few interpreters, however, who maintain that τῇ ματαιότητι .. ἀπετάγη refers to a condition imposed upon the natural world at the time of creation, rather than at the time of the Fall.<sup>14</sup> One of the more recent advocates of this position is Hans Schmidt, who presents a very interesting argument in support of it based upon the Christology of St. Paul:

Paulus sieht Christus als den Vollender und Erfüller in der Mitte alles Geschehens. Dieser Christozentrismus bestimmt auch seine Lehre von der Schöpfung. Die Schöpfung hat die "Herrlichkeit" nicht als ursprünglichen Besitz, sondern nur als eschatologisches, erst in Christus kommendes Erfüllungsziel (Kol. 1,15ff). Deshalb hat anscheinend für Paulus alles Geschöpfliche vor dem Anbruch des Christus Aeons nur "Vorläufigkeit", d.h., es ist "vergänglich, schwach und unansehnlich" und muss auf seine endgültige Bestimmung noch warten.<sup>15</sup>

To this Schmidt adds that also in I Cor. 15:42ff Paul is not referring

to a judgement of God which destroyed the pristine nature of creation ("die Urstands-natur"), but to the act of creation itself ("Schöpfungsgeschehen"). Commenting on this passage from I Corinthians, Schmidt writes,

In demselben Zusammenhang stellt er v. 46 das heilsgeschichtliche Gesetz auf: Nicht das Geistliche ist das Erste, sondern das Physische (d.h. das Vergänglich-Irdische), und dann erst kommt das Geistliche, d.h. das Unverweslich-Himmlische. Eine solche Geschichtsbetrachtung denkt nicht im Schema: Ursprüngliche Herrlichkeit der Schöpfung—Zerstörung derselben im Gericht über den Fall—Wiederherstellung derselben im Erlösungsgeschehen, sondern sie sieht alles vorchristliche Sein in unvollendeter, vorläufiger Weissagungsgestalt auf das erst in Christus geschenkte Erfüllungsleben hin entworfen.<sup>16</sup>

Schmidt contends that Romans 8:20 must be understood in the light of this Christocentric cosmology and theology of history. As he sees it, the phrase τῆ ματαιότητι ἣ κτίσις υπετάγη corresponds to the στείρεται ἐν φθορᾷ of I Cor. 15:42ff. ματαιότης would then be virtually synonymous with φθορά mentioned later on in verse 21. Schmidt then draws the following conclusion:

Paulus denkt an die Weltschöpfung. "Nichtig" ist die Schöpfung zunächst nicht im Blick auf das, was sie etwa durch den Sündenfall verloren hat, sondern im Blick auf das, was die in Christus, dem "Zweiten Adam" erwarten darf, gemessen an ihrer endgültigen Bestimmung.<sup>17</sup>

Schmidt's argument is far from convincing. First of all, it rests upon a highly questionable exegesis of Col. 1:15ff and I Cor. 15:42ff. It is true that there is no explicit reference to the Fall of Man in either of these passages. Yet the Fall is not eliminated, but merely presupposed. Col. 1:21 clearly shows that Paul is thinking of an order that has been disturbed by man's sinfulness and that thus stands in need of the reconciling activity of God in Christ. Furthermore, while Schmidt

is correct in contending that I Cor. 15:42ff does not have in view a divine judgement that destroyed the pristine nature of creation, he is wrong in concluding that it thereby refers to the original act of creation. In this passage Paul is merely stating an existential fact of life: whatever is born of man is perishable. This fact is not due, however, to a limitation imposed upon man in the beginning; it is due to the present, sinful condition of man. The phrase τῆ ματαιότητι ἣ κτίσις ὑπετάγη simply cannot be equated with σπείρεται ἐν φθορᾷ. Even the tenses of the verbs militate against such an equation: ὑπετάγη, an aorist, refers to an action that occurred at a definite point in time; σπείρεται, a present, suggests some kind of durative action.<sup>18</sup>

Secondly, the contextual support for Schmidt's interpretation is, at best, weak. His assertion that the close connection between ὑπετάγη and ἐφ' ἐλπίδι precludes any thought of an act of divine judgement<sup>19</sup> is wholly gratuitous. Furthermore, his contention that the phrase οὐχ ἔκοῦσα proves that Paul could not possibly have had in mind the Fall of man holds true only on the supposition that κτίσις means "mankind". Since man fell into sin of his own free will, it could not be said that his subjection to ματαιότης was οὐχ ἔκοῦσα. Ὑπετάγη would then have to refer to some aspect of the original act of creation.<sup>20</sup> But if, as the evidence seems to indicate,<sup>21</sup> κτίσις means "the natural world", the phrase οὐχ ἔκοῦσα would be a very appropriate qualification of ὑπετάγη, and the allusion to the account of man's Fall in Genesis 3:17 would be quite in place.

In view of these considerations, Althaus' evaluation of this interpretation seems fair:

Paulus spricht hier allerdings nicht unmittelbar von dem Fall.

Daher könnte man den Apostel etwa auch so verstehen: Gott hat die Schöpfung von Anfang an, ohne Zusammenhang mit dem Sündenfall in den vorläufigen Stand der Nichtigkeit gestellt; "nichtig" ist die Schöpfung im Verhältnis nicht zu einem herrlichen Urstande, sondern gemessen an ihrer endgültigen Bestimmung, zu der Christus sie führt. So H.W. Schmidt. Aber im Blick auf 5,12, das Eindringen des Todes durch den Fall, und angesichts der jüdischen Parallelen wird man die Stelle doch dahin verstehen müssen: Gott lässt die Schöpfung aus ihrem urständlichen Sein mit dem Menschen zusammen in die Seins=Entfremdung sinken.<sup>22</sup>

As Paul sees it, creation was subjected to futility  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\chi\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\theta\omicron\alpha$ , "against her own will."<sup>23</sup> Creation's present condition is hers not by choice. She was a "passive sufferer (cf.  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\gamma\eta$ ), sharing in the curse which fell on man for his apostasy."<sup>24</sup> Although Paul does not state explicitly that creation's fate was unmerited, this seems to be the implication of his words. As Althaus puts it, "Die Kreatur hat dieses Todeslos nicht, wie der Mensch, in freier Entscheidung gewöhlt. Gott hat sie, wider ihre ursprüngliche Natur und ohne ihre Schuld unter den Fluch gestellt, mit dem schuldigen Menschen zusammen."<sup>25</sup>

But if creation had been merely an innocent bystander, why was she punished together with man? Paul replies,  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\gamma\eta\ \dots\ \delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$ .

This phrase has occasioned much debate among interpreters, in that Paul seems to be setting over against nature's own will, not man's will but God's. Hence, efforts have been made to interpret  $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$  otherwise than as a reference to the activity of God. The reluctance of some scholars to attribute this to God is due in part to the apparently causal force of the preposition  $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$ . Zahn, for example, states his objection as follows:

Es wird kaum ein Beispiel finden, wo Gott als die begründende Ursache eines von ihm verhängten Leidens bezeichnet wird, ab-

gesehen natürlich von den zahlreichen Fällen, wo es sich um ein im Dienste Gottes und so um Gottes willen übernommenes Leiden handelt, wovon hier ja nicht die Rede sein kann.<sup>26</sup>

Zahn himself prefers to see this as a reference to mankind in general, in that all men are implicated in the original sin of Adam by which the natural world became subject to futility.

Godet likewise stumbles at the causal force of *διὰ*. God, he feels, cannot be considered the "moral cause" of evil. Hence, *τὸν ὑποτάξαντα* cannot refer to God. But neither can it refer to man; for man cannot be considered the active agent of creation's subjection, since man "so far as nature is concerned, played a purely passive part."<sup>27</sup> Consequently, Godet contends that *τὸν ὑποτάξαντα* must be a reference to Satan. In support of this interpretation, Godet appeals to such phrases as *ὁ ἀρχὼν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου* (John 12:31), *ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου* (II Cor. 4:4), and *κοσμοκράτορες τοῦ σκότους τούτου* (Eph. 6:12).

An examination of the New Testament use of the verb *ὑποτάσσω*, however, seems to rule out both of the above interpretations. There are two basic contextual usages of *ὑποτάσσω* in the New Testament. Most frequently the verb is used in an Ethical Context, but only in the middle voice. Included here are those parenetic passages in which the hearer is urged to submit himself to the authority or jurisdiction of another.<sup>28</sup> *ὑποτάσσω* in the active voice occurs only in four other passages in the New Testament: I Cor. 15:27-28, Eph. 1:22, Heb. 2:5-8, and Phil. 3:21. All of these are either quotations or allusions to Psalm 8:7, and the context is a Cosmic rather than Ethical one. The object of the verb in these passages is always *τὰ πάντα (ἢ) κτίσις*<sup>29</sup> and the subject is either God (I Cor. 15:27f, Eph. 1:22, Heb. 2:5ff) or Christ (Phil. 3:21).

In view of its Cosmic context and active form, the τὸν ὑποτάξαντα of Romans 8:20 would most readily have been understood by Paul's readers as a reference to a divine action of some kind.<sup>30</sup> The lack of a more explicit reference to God is perhaps due to the Jewish piety of the time. For fear of violating the second commandment, the Jewish people became more and more reluctant even to speak the divine name. When referring to some action of God, they would use various periphrastic expressions, such as the use of the passive voice of a verb (thus, ὑπετάγη=ὁ θεὸς ὑπετάξε).<sup>31</sup>

But if τὸν ὑποτάξαντα refers to God, what is the force of the preposition διὰ? As mentioned above, both Zahn and Godet objected to the common interpretation of τὸν ὑποτάξαντα as referring to God because of the apparently causal implications of διὰ. But διὰ with the accusative only infrequently is used to denote the efficient cause (which is better expressed by διὰ with the genitive). More commonly it expresses the reason why something happens: "because of..." or "for the sake of..." (cf. Rom. 13:5, I Pet. 2:13).<sup>32</sup> Hence, Winer's interpretation seems to be the most accurate rendering of this passage:

Here διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα constitutes an antithesis to οὐχ ἔκοῦσα, not voluntarily, but by reason of him that subjected it - by the will and command of God. Probably Paul intentionally avoided saying διὰ τοῦ ὑποτάξαντος equivalent to ὁ θεὸς ὑπετάξεν αὐτήν. Adam's sin was the proper and direct cause of the ματαιότης.<sup>33</sup>

Both antithetical phrases—οὐχ ἔκοῦσα and διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα—are apparently directed to the question "Why was creation subjected?"<sup>34</sup> It was not by reason of her own free will and choice (οὐχ ἔκοῦσα), but by reason of the will of Him who subjected her. This is the only explanation that Paul will give. The implication seems to be that the involvement of

creation in the fate of man is a mystery that can be "explained" only in terms of the will of God. Perhaps the two phrases were added to guard against the kind of fanciful theodidic speculations so popular among Rabbinic writers, who tried to explain the involvement in terms of creation's own guilt<sup>35</sup>, or in other ways to rationalize God's act of judgement upon the natural world.<sup>36</sup> Paul will have nothing to do with such speculations. If pressed for a more intellectually satisfying explanation, he might have replied in terms similar to Romans 9:20ff. At any rate, this passage forcefully expresses Paul's deep conviction--a conviction which he shared with his Jewish contemporaries--that the natural world has no real meaning apart from its connection with man, and that the fate of the natural world is thus inextricably bound up with that of man.

## CHAPTER THREE

### THE MOTIVE FOR CREATION'S WAITING

ἐφ' ἐλπίδι ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ.

"Creation's expectant waiting is grounded in its hope that it, too, will be set free from the slavery of its present state of corruptibility, and be introduced into the freedom of the future state of glory that belongs to God's children" (v. 21).

The entire creation anxiously awaits the day when God's sons will come into their glory. Creation waits for this event with eager anticipation; for she knows that her own fate is intimately linked up with that of man: even as she now must share man's curse, so also she shares man's hope--his hope for salvation. Like man, creation waits "in hope" (ἐφ' ἐλπίδι).

Ἐπί with the dative "most frequently denotes the basis [den Grund] for a state of being, action, or result . . . ." <sup>1</sup> Thus, ἐφ' ἐλπίδι : "on the basis of hope, supporting itself on hope." <sup>2</sup> But precisely what action or state of being does ἐφ' ἐλπίδι qualify in this pericope?

Since ἐφ' ἐλπίδι follows διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα, it would seem quite likely that the two phrases should be taken together: "by the will of him who subjected it in hope." <sup>3</sup> But as Philippi correctly notes, this rendering seems to ascribe the hope to God rather than to creation. <sup>4</sup> Furthermore, διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα ἐφ' ἐλπίδι makes a rather lopsided contrast to οὐχ ἔκοῦσα.

Consequently, the great majority of commentators connect ἐφ' ἐλπίδι with ὑπετάγη, <sup>5</sup> thereby retaining the balance of the οὐχ ἔκοῦσα ἀλλὰ διὰ



τὸν ὑποτάξαντα antithesis. The latter would then be construed as a slight parenthesis: τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἣ κτίσις ὑπετάγη (οὐχ ἔκοῦσα ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα) ἐφ' ἐλπίδι. The meaning would be, as Murray sees it, that "hope conditioned the act of subjection."<sup>6</sup> Or, as Michel expresses it, "Gott, der die Schöpfung unterwarf, setzt gleichzeitig die Hoffnung, die sich auf die Aufhebung des Gerichtes ausrichtet."<sup>7</sup>

Although such a rendering is not impossible syntactically, the notion of being "made subject in hope" seems rather odd. Nowhere else in the New Testament (or in the LXX) does the phrase ἐφ' ἐλπίδι occur in conjunction with the verb ὑποτάσσω; nor does there seem to be any parallels either in biblical or in Rabbinic literature to the notion that God subjected creation on the basis of hope. Furthermore, such a rendering of the construction still leaves it rather unclear just who the subject of the hope is: Is it God who hopes? Or man? Or creation?<sup>8</sup>

There is, however, another way of understanding the construction of this passage, which, for the most part, has been overlooked by commentators and translators. Connecting ἐφ' ἐλπίδι with the verb ἀπεχδέχεται at the end of verse 19 seems to make far better sense than taking it with either ὑποτάξαντα or ὑπετάγη. "Waiting in hope" (ἀπεχδέχεται ἐφ' ἐλπίδι) certainly is a more natural and intelligible expression than "subjected in hope" (ὑπετάγη ἐφ' ἐλπίδι), especially since ἀπεχδέχομαι is always used in the New Testament with reference to the various objects of Christian "hope".<sup>9</sup> Particularly illuminating here is Romans 8:25, where the two ideas of "waiting" and "hoping" are intimately connected: εἰ...ἐλπίζομαι, ...ἀπεχδέχομαι.

Understanding the construction of this passage in this way necessi-

tates taking all of verse 20 (with the exception of ἐφ' ἐλπίδι) as an explanatory parenthesis, resulting in the following punctuation: ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαταδοχία τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται (τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη—οὐχ ἔκοῦσα ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα) ἐφ' ἐλπίδι ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις ....<sup>10</sup>

The logic behind this construction seems to be this: Having asserted that creation is anxiously awaiting a definite future event (τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν...ἀπεκδέχεται), Paul felt a need to clarify this by explaining why creation must await that event: she waits because τῇ ματαιότητι ὑπετάγη. The verb ὑπετάγη also evidently called for some explanation in order to avoid misunderstanding: Creation was made subject οὐχ ἔκοῦσα ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα. After this slight explanatory digression, Paul picks up his original train of thought: Creation waits "in hope...."

The assumption that Paul would make such an extensive parenthesis may indeed seem somewhat "far-fetched",<sup>11</sup> but such a phenomenon is by no means unknown within the Pauline corpus.<sup>12</sup> As Blass-Debrunner state, "The NT, especially the Epistles of Paul, contain a variety of harsher parentheses, harsher than a careful stylist would allow. Since Paul's train of thought in general includes many and long digressions . . . it is not surprising that his sentence structure even in narrower contexts is not uninterrupted."<sup>13</sup>

Against this rendering of the construction it might be objected that had Paul intended ἐφ' ἐλπίδι to be taken in connection with ἀπεκδέχεται he could have expressed this much more clearly by saying, ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαταδοχία...ἐφ' ἐλπίδι ἀπεκδέχεται—τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι .... But Paul could not possibly have phrased the passage this way without destroying

the connection between ἐφ' ἐλπίδι and the ὅτι-clause that follows.

This raises another exegetical difficulty. What is the force of the connective ὅτι?<sup>14</sup> Is it causal (e.g. "because", or, somewhat more loosely, "for")?<sup>15</sup> Or is it explicative (e.g. "that")?<sup>16</sup> In other words, does the ὅτι-clause state the reason for creation's hopeful waiting, or does it describe the the content or object of creation's hope?

Alford adopts the causal force for ὅτι here, on the ground that if ὅτι had meant "that", there would have been no need for Paul to have repeated ἡ κτίσις so emphatically:<sup>17</sup> ὅτι καὶ αὐτή would have sufficed. Bartling concurs with this, and adds that since the object of creation's hope had already been stated in verse 19 (τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ), there would have been no need for Paul to explain it further.<sup>18</sup>

The apparently redundant repetition of ἡ κτίσις , however, is not at all redundant if ἐφ' ἐλπίδι is connected with ἀπεκδέχεται . In fact, the syntax demands that ἡ κτίσις be repeated. The subject of ἀπεκδέχεται is ἀποκαταδοκία, not ἡ κτίσις . Hence, had Paul merely said ἐφ' ἐλπίδι ὅτι καὶ αὐτή, the αὐτή would have referred to ἀποκαταδοκία . In order for Paul to make it clear that he was referring to creation, it was necessary for him to add ἡ κτίσις.<sup>19</sup> Bartling's observation, with which he supports the causal force of ὅτι here, is similarly inaccurate on the basis of syntax. Τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ is not the object of creation's hope; it is the object of creation's expectant waiting (ἀποκαταδοκία... ἀπεκδέχεται). Hence it would be quite in order for Paul to explain the object of this hope with an explicative ὅτι-clause: "Creation waits for the coming glory in the hope that..."

Taking ὅτι in its explicative rather than causal sense here at first

may seem to be a weakening of the thought contained in verse 21. If ὅτι were to mean "because", verse 21 would be a strong statement of fact, or at least of conviction: "Creation waits in hope, because she too will be set free." Accepting this rendering, Bartling can even refer to verse 21 as "Paul's statement of doctrine."<sup>20</sup> If, on the other hand, ὅτι means simply "that", verse 21 seems to be reduced to nothing more than an expression of a hopeful wish: "Creation waits, in the hope that it will be set free" (almost, "hoping to be set free").

This weakening is more apparent than real. The force of the word ἐλπίς in the New Testament is that of "expectation with the nuance of counting upon it."<sup>21</sup> It connotes not only an expectation of the future, but also trust and confidence.<sup>22</sup> It is not mere wishful thinking, but the present certainty and conviction of a future reality. To say then that creation is waiting for the parousia in the hope that it too will share in the coming glory, expresses just as strong a conviction as to say that Christians themselves wait in this same hope (cf. especially the discussion of the ἐλπίς that belongs to Christians in vv. 24ff.). The hope of Christians is also the hope of creation. As Michel expresses it, "[ἐλπίς ist] das göttliche Heilsziel, das Ende der Wege Gottes, das nicht nur für die Menschen, sondern auch für die Welt der Geschöpflichkeit bestimmt ist."<sup>23</sup>

The best rendering of the construction of this passage, then, is to connect ἐφ' ἐλπίδι with ἀπεκδέχεται and to understand the ὅτι-clause as a description of the content of ἐφ' ἐλπίδι.<sup>24</sup> This gives excellent sense to the passage and clearly demonstrates the logical continuity and development of its thought: Paul first states the object of creation's expect-

ant waiting (τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ, v. 19), then the occasion for this waiting (ματαιότητι...ὀπετάγν, v. 20), then the ground of its waiting (ἐφ' ἐλπίδι, v. 20) with a description of the content of this ground (ὅτι...ἐλευθερωθήσεται, v. 21), the entire clause, ἐφ' ἐλπίδι ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις, etc., being a statement of the motive for creation's waiting: "Creation waits in the hope that it too will be freed..."

Creation's hope is defined as a hope for freedom—freedom in a two-fold sense: ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ.

Paul is particularly fond of piling up genitives of various kinds within a single clause.<sup>25</sup> The rhetorical effect of such a concatenation of genitives is frequently quite forceful. But for the later exegete, it makes for a certain degree of ambiguity. The first genitive, τῆς δουλείας, occasions no difficulty; it is the only case used with the preposition ἀπὸ, which is used here to designate separation ("freed from").<sup>26</sup> Τῆς φθορᾶς, however, can be taken in a number of different ways: (1) an objective genitive—"bondage to decay, corruption"<sup>27</sup>; (2) a qualitative genitive—"corrupting bondage"<sup>28</sup>; (3) a subjective genitive—"bondage resulting from corruption" or "bondage belonging to the state of corruption"<sup>29</sup>; and (4) an appositional genitive—"bondage that consists in corruption"<sup>30</sup>.

Lange, among others, prefers to take τῆς φθορᾶς as an objective genitive. He bases his argument primarily on the theological force of the word δουλεία. The genitive cannot be appositional (that is, δουλεία cannot equal φθορά), he contends, because "even in its deliverance [the

creature] will remain in a state of δουλεία in relation to the children of God himself."<sup>31</sup> In other words, creation will be freed from its bondage to corruption, but not from every kind of bondage. In support of Lange's position, reference might be made to Romans 6:17f, 20-22, where Paul contrasts slavery to sin with slavery to God: Christians are no longer slaves to sin; they have become slaves to God. Taken in its entirety, however, Romans 6:21 clearly shows that Paul is contrasting not two kinds of slavery but two essentially different kinds of existence: δουλεία and ἐλευθερία.

A more convincing argument in support of taking τῆς φθορᾶς as an objective genitive can be made on the basis of a comparison of the terminology of v. 21a and that of v. 20. According to this view, τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς parallels τῆς ματαιότητι...ὑπετάγη (φθορά=ματαιότης; δουλεία=ὑπετάγη).<sup>32</sup> But while such an understanding of the phrase makes good sense and seems to fit the context, it also destroys the antithetic parallelism between the ἀπὸ and the εἰς phrases within verse 21:

ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς  
εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης

Τῆς φθορᾶς might be construed as an objective genitive, but its parallel τῆς δόξης certainly could not.

One way of preserving this parallelism would be to understand both τῆς φθορᾶς and τῆς δόξης as qualitative genitives: "corrupting bondage" and "glorious freedom".<sup>33</sup> The primary emphasis of verse 21 would then be on the contrast between δουλεία and ἐλευθερία. This would seem to be in keeping with the wider context of Romans 4-8 where the stress is on the concept of freedom from (as opposed to slavery to) wrath, sin, law, and

death.<sup>34</sup> The narrower context, however, especially verse 18, indicates that the chief emphasis of this passage is not on the δουλεία-ἐλευθερία contrast, but on the φθορά-δόξα contrast. As Sanday-Headlam correctly state, "'Glorious liberty' is a poor translation and does not express the idea: δόξα, 'the glorified state', is the leading fact, not a subordinate fact, and ἐλευθερία is its characteristic, 'the liberty of the glory of the children of God.'"<sup>35</sup>

This would suggest that the genitives τῆς φθορᾶς and τῆς δόξης might best be understood in some kind of subjective sense: "slavery that results from or belongs to..." Hofmann makes a distinction between δουλεία and φθορά that would lend support to this view: "Nicht Appositions-genetiv kann τῆς φθορᾶς sein sollen, da δουλεία ein Stand, φθορά ein Widerfahrniss ist, sondern die Knechtschaft der Schöpfung wird nach dem benannt, was ihnen Stand zu einem Stande der Knechtschaft macht."<sup>36</sup> Although Hofmann's distinction between "Stand" and "Widerfahrniss" may seem somewhat "over-refined"<sup>37</sup>, his rendering of τῆς φθορᾶς as a subjective genitive has much to be said for it, in that it takes into account both the inner parallelism of verse 21 and the emphatic nature of the φθορά-δόξα contrast.

These same factors, however, can just as easily be accounted for on the basis of what most commentators consider to be the most natural rendering of τῆς φθορᾶς; namely, as an appositional (exegetical) genitive: "the slavery that consists in corruption." Riddle states the case nicely:

There seems to be no good reason for objecting to the view of Tholuck, Meyer, Philippi, and others, that the bondage, which results from the vanity, and is borne not willingly (v.20), consists in corruption. This preserves the proper distinctions. The corruption is the consequence of the vanity; the unwilling subjection to a condition which is under vanity, and results in corruption, is well termed bondage.<sup>38</sup>

In view of the above, it would appear that both the subjective and the appositional renderings of the genitive τῆς φθορᾶς are equally live options in terms of preserving the parallelism and the proper emphasis of verse 20. A final decision for or against either one is dependent upon the exact meaning of the word φθορά.

According to Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, φθορά means "ruin, destruction, dissolution, deterioration."<sup>39</sup> Of the nine occurrences of the word in the New Testament, five are in Paul (Col. 2:22; I Cor. 14:42, 50; Romans 8:21; Gal. 6:8), the remaining four in II Peter (1:4, 2:12a, b, 19).

The II Peter 2:19 passage is especially significant in that it employs terminology similar to that of Romans 8:21. Warning his readers to resist the enticements of those who follow the lusts of the flesh, the author of II Peter writes, "They promise . . . freedom, but they themselves are slaves of corruption" (δούλοι τῆς φθορᾶς). Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich suggest that φθορά is used here in the sense of "religious and moral depravity".<sup>40</sup> It would appear possible, then, that τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς in Romans 8:21 might also carry a similar ethical connotation.<sup>41</sup> If so, the genitive in τῆς φθορᾶς could not possibly be appositional; for that would ascribe moral depravity to the entire created world—a concept wholly foreign to biblical thought and one apparently excluded by the words οὐχ ἔκοῦσα in verse 20. Consequently, τῆς φθορᾶς would have to be considered either an objective genitive (e.g. bondage to man's moral depravity<sup>42</sup>) or a subjective genitive (e.g. bondage proceeding from man's moral depravity<sup>43</sup>). In the final analysis, both renderings are similar in meaning, but the latter is probably to be preferred in order to preserve the parallelism of the phrases within the verse.



In the Pauline passages, however, the word φθορά seems to be used more in its original sense of physical corruption: the state of being perishable or subject to decay and destruction (Col. 2:22; I Cor. 15:42, 50).<sup>44</sup> As Galatians 6:8 indicates, the ethical dimension is not entirely absent in Paul. But here the thought seems to be not that φθορά is moral depravity, but that it is the result of moral depravity.<sup>45</sup> That is, physical corruption (and ultimately destruction) in the world is due to man's moral corruption. That φθορά in Romans 8:21 means "the state of being perishable" is made all the more probable in view of the apocalyptic background of this passage.<sup>46</sup> Understood in this sense, then, τῆς φθορᾶς is best taken as an appositional genitive: Creation will be "freed from the shackles of mortality."<sup>47</sup>

The second part of Paul's two-fold definition of the content of creation's hope is given in the phrase ἐλευθερωθήσεται...εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ.

Although the translation, "shall be freed into the freedom of...", effectively renders the Greek play on words (ἐλευθερωθήσεται...εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν), it sounds rather strange. This is probably what prompted Ambrose to suggest that the force of the preposition εἰς is temporal here; that is, it denotes the time of creation's liberation: it will be freed when the children of God receive the freedom of their glory.<sup>48</sup> This interpretation, however, besides being somewhat artificial, destroys the parallelism between the two phrases ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας and εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν. Since ἀπὸ is clearly directional, it would seem natural to interpret εἰς in the same way.

The difficulty occasioned by this construction can be resolved by assuming a slight ellipsis here (i.e., a zeugma<sup>49</sup>). Riddle suggests that either καταστασθήσεται or εἰσαχθήσεται might be supplied to make clear the sense of the phrase.<sup>50</sup> The translation would then be, "Creation will be freed from...and brought (or introduced) into", etc.<sup>51</sup>

The genitive τῆς δόξης, like its parallel τῆς φθορᾶς, offers some difficulty of interpretation. As mentioned above, it is not possible to take it as an objective genitive, while the emphasis of the context precludes understanding it as a qualitative genitive. This leaves three possibilities: (1) Possessive Genitive; (2) Subjective Genitive; (3) Appositional Genitive.

Godet revives the suggestion made already by Gerhard that τῆς δόξης should be taken as a Possessive Genitive: "Paul does not say that nature will participate in the glory, but only in the liberty of the glory of the children of God. Liberty is one of the elements of their glorious state..."

A similar meaning results from taking τῆς δόξης as a subjective genitive: "freedom that results from the glorified state of God's children." Both of these interpretations make a distinction between ἡ ἐλευθερία and ἡ δόξα.<sup>52</sup> This distinction, however, cannot be maintained in light of the New Testament usage of ἐλευθερία. The word ἐλευθερία occurs only here in the book of Romans, but its cognates ἐλεύθερος and ἐλευθεροῦν are used quite frequently. As Schlier indicates, the words are used most frequently in some quite concrete, rather than general, sense: "...the NT uses ἐλευθερία for freedom from sin (R.6:18-23; Jn.8:31-36), from the

Law (R.7:3f.; 8:2; Gl.2:4; 4:21-31; 5:1,13), and from death (R.6:21f; 8:21). Freedom is freedom from an existence which in sin leads through the Law to death."<sup>53</sup> Thus Michel notes, "ἐλευθερία hat hier nicht eigentlich philosophischen Sinn, sondern bedeutet zunächst ein Befreitsein von der Vergänglichkeit und ist ein Zeichen der eschatologischen Verwandlung."<sup>54</sup> The ἐλευθερία in which creation is to participate, then, does not differ materially from the δόξα which belongs to the children of God; for their δόξα is defined in terms of adoptive sonship (v. 17,19,23), that is, "the redemption of their bodies" (ἀπολύτρωσις τοῦ σώματος), or, to put it another way, the freeing of the body from its state of corruption (φθορά), which, in Schlier's terms, means "freedom from an existence which in sin leads through the Law to death."<sup>55</sup> It follows, then, that the ἐλευθερία about which Paul is speaking is virtually synonymous with ἡ δόξα (=freedom from decay).<sup>56</sup> Hence, the genitive τῆς δόξης, like its parallel τῆς φθορᾶς, is best taken as an Appositional Genitive: "Creation shall be freed from its slavery, that is, from its present state of corruptibility, and be introduced into the freedom, that is, into the state of glory that belongs to the children of God."

The meaning of this passage is well summarized by Murray:

"The liberty of the glory of the children of God" is the liberty that consists in the glory of God's children and, as liberty, stands in overt contrast with the bondage of corruption. The "glory" is that referred to in verses 17, 18. The creation is to share, therefore, in the glory that will be bestowed upon the children of God. It can only participate in that glory, however, in a way that is compatible with its nature as non-rational. Yet the glory of the children of God is one that comprises the creation also and must not be conceived of apart from the cosmic regeneration—the glory of the people of God will be in the context of the restitution of all things (cf. Acts 3:21). The liberty reserved for the creation is the goal of its "earnest expectation" and the terminus of its groanings and travailing.<sup>57</sup>

It should be quite apparent by now how beautifully constructed this entire passage is. As Bartling so aptly expresses it,

The longer one studies this extraordinary passage the more one is impressed by its perfect unity and symmetry. So intimately are its several parts related that every phrase, almost every word, is related to every other word and phrase in the paragraph. Janus-like, each section looks back over everything that has preceded it and ahead over all that is to follow.<sup>58</sup>

The controlling purpose of the entire section (vv. 19-22) is to illustrate and confirm the thematic statement of v. 18: The future glory that has been promised to God's children is incomparably great. Like a precious diamond, this δόξα is held up before the eyes of the reader and slowly turned to illuminate its many facets: this δόξα that is to be revealed to us (v.18) is that revelation that belongs to God's children for which all creation is waiting (v.19). It is characterized by freedom (ἐλευθερία), freedom from decay (ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς, v.20), which for creation means freedom from its bondage to vanity (τῇ ματαιότητι, v.20), and for those who have received the Spirit, redemption of their bodies (ἀπολύτρωσις τοῦ σώματος, v.23), the final confirmation of their adoptive sonship (υἰοθεσία). It is thus both the object of the hope in which we are saved (v.24), and the object of creation's expectant waiting, a waiting grounded in its hope (ἐφ' ἐλπίδι) of sharing in this self-same δόξα.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### A SIGN OF CREATION'S WAITING

οἴδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν.

"For we know that to this very day all creation has been groaning together in the pangs of childbirth" (v. 22).

The precise connection between this verse and the foregoing is again somewhat difficult to determine because of the ambiguity of the conjunction γάρ. Lange sees in this verse "the proof of the declaration in ver. 21; since [Paul] has proved the proposition of ver. 19 by ver. 20, and of ver. 20 by ver. 21."<sup>1</sup> As we have seen, however, verse 20 does not prove the statement in verse 19 (namely, that creation is eagerly awaiting the glorification of the sons of God). It rather explains that statement in terms of why creation must wait (i.e., she was subjected to vanity). Likewise, verse 21 does not "prove" verse 20; it rather outlines the content of creation's hope, and, taken in conjunction with ἐφ' ἐλπίδι (ὅτι="that"), it gives the basis upon which creation waits: it waits in hope of being freed. Both verse 20 and verse 21 are thus connected to the thought of verse 19: ἀποκαταδοκία τῆς κτίσεως...ἀπεκδέχεται.

Consequently, Stoeckhardt prefers to take all three of these verses (20, 21, and 22) together with verse 19. He writes, "Dieser Satz [v. 22] setzt sich mittels γάρ an die Hauptansage des Abschnitts, v. 19-22 an, die Ansage v. 19, welche v. 20 und 21 begründet ist, nämlich, dass die Creatur auf die Offenbarung der Kinder Gottes harret und wartet."<sup>2</sup> Meyer, however, objects that ἀποκαταδοκία τῆς κτίσεως is "much too distant" and that its "goal remains quite unnoticed here."<sup>3</sup> He proposes instead that

this verse be connected with the ἐφ' ἐλπίδι ὅτι clause of verse 21: "for if that hope of glorious deliverance had not been left to it, all nature would not have united its groaning and travailing until now."<sup>4</sup> He thus sees in this verse a confirmation of creation's hope. But in opposition to this, Zahn argues, "Nicht zur Begründung des Vorhandenseins einer Hoffnung dient der 22. Vers, denn aus dem Seufzen und Schmerzempfinden lässt sich das am allerwenigsten erschliessen."<sup>5</sup> Zahn himself connects verse 22 with τῆ γὰρ μεταίδησι...ὑπετάγη (v. 20a), viewing vv. 20b and 21 as a parenthetical statement. He summarizes Paul's thought as follows: "Von einer Knechtschaft des Verderbes rede ich - denn wir wissen ja, dass die ganze Schöpfung in allen ihren Theilen zusammenstöhnt und in Geburtswehen liegt bis auf diesen Tag."<sup>6</sup> While not impossible, Zahn's rendering limits the force of verse 22 to a statement of creation's subjection. The primary emphasis of the entire pericope, however, is not on creation's subjection but on creation's eager expectation which is pointed to as a verification of the greatness and certainty of the glory to come.

All things considered, then, a variation of Stoeckhardt's position is the most tenable: verse 22 should be connected with the leading thought of the pericope as it is expressed in verse 19. Verse 22 thus becomes not simply a proof that creation will be set free (Lange), nor a proof of creation's hope (Meyer), not a proof of creation's subjection (Zahn), but a general confirmation of the assertion that creation is anxiously waiting for the day when God's children will be glorified, in the hope that it too will share in this glory. Understanding the passage in this way preserves the logical progression of thought contained in the pericope: The greatness and certainty of the glory promised to God's children

(v. 18) is demonstrated by the fact that all creation is awaiting the revelation of that glory (v. 19). Creation must wait because she has been subjected to futility together with man (v. 20); but her waiting is grounded in the hope that she too will have a share in that glory (v. 21). That all of this is true is confirmed by the phrase: οἶδαμεν γάρ... (v. 22).

This phrase raises two important questions in the mind of the exegete: (1) Who is the "we" to whose knowledge the apostle Paul appeals? and (2) What is the basis of their "knowledge"?

Phillips translates this verse as follows: "It is plain to anyone with eyes to see that at the present time all created life groans in a sort of universal travail." He thereby interprets this verse to be a reference to mankind's universal experience of disharmony and discord within the natural world.

It is debatable, however, whether this experience is really so universal after all that Paul could thus appeal to it.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, this phrase, οἶδαμεν γάρ, is used by Paul most frequently as an introductory formula in appeals not to human consciousness in general, but to Christian consciousness (cf. Rom. 2:2, 3:19, 7:14, 8:26, 28).<sup>8</sup> So also here, the reference is to those who "have received the spirit of adoption" (v. 15f); namely, to Christians.

What, then, is the basis of this knowledge to which Paul appeals in this verse for confirmation of his previous statements? Paul does not elaborate on this. Perhaps he is referring to the general observation and experience of the natural world informed by Christian faith and hope, which enable the Christian alone correctly to interpret the signs of

discord and disharmony around him. Denney suggests that the hermeneutic in this case is the Christian consciousness of sin and grace:

Perhaps we may say that the Christian consciousness of sin and redemption is in contrast with the ultimate realities of the universe, and that no interpretation of nature can be true but one which, like this, is in essential harmony with it.<sup>9</sup>

Thus, Phillips' paraphrase might be reworded to read, "It is plain to us who view nature with the eyes of faith that at the present time . . . ."

Another possibility is that Paul is appealing to his reader's knowledge of the apocalyptic tradition from which he had derived many of the thought patterns used in this pericope. The meaning then would be something like this: "We know--on the basis of this same prophetic-apocalyptic tradition--that all creation...." Michel's comments are as accurate as any on this matter:

Wieder versucht Pls zu einer entscheidenden theologischen Aussage über die Schöpfung zu kommen; er hebt ihre Wichtigkeit durch ein einleitendes οἶδαμεν γάρ hervor. Es ist uns verwehrt, die von ihm zitierte apokalyptische Tradition aus der Erfahrung oder Beobachtung abzuleiten. Es ist aber wahrscheinlich, dass Gen 3, 17 nicht weit von Röm 8, 22 entfernt ist.<sup>10</sup>

At any rate, it is clear from the imagery that he employs in this verse (συστηνάζει and συνωδίνει) that Paul himself is interpreting the natural phenomena which he perceives in terms borrowed from apocalyptic vocabulary.

The compounds συστηνάζω and συνωδίνω are used only here in the New Testament; although the simple verbs σστηνάζω and ὠδίνω (and their cognates σστηναγμός and ὠδίνω) do occur occasionally elsewhere in the scriptures. The precise force of the prefix συν- has been much debated. Some com-



mentators have suggested that it refers to the first person plural subject of the verb οἶδαμεν.<sup>11</sup> Thus: "For we know that all creation groans and travails with us to this very day." But in view of the emphasis on the whole creation (πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις) and the specific reference to the children of God in the following verse (οὐ μόνον δὲ ἀλλὰ καὶ...), it is better to take συν- collectively (= "together"), that is, as referring to creation in all its parts. So already Theodor of Mopsuestia: βούλεται δὲ ἐπεῖν, ὅτι σύμφωνος ἐπιδείκνυται τοῦτο πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις.<sup>12</sup>

The verb στενάζω and its various cognates are used only nine times in the New Testament;<sup>13</sup> but this "groaning-motif" is a very familiar one to readers of the LXX. It occurs most frequently in the later Wisdom Literature, especially in the Book of Job and in many of the Psalms of Lament.<sup>14</sup> Though often not explicitly stated, the underlying theological premise for these Psalms of Lament is that Jahweh is a God who hears the groans of the poor and unjustly oppressed; and not only does he hear, but he acts decisively on their behalf, just as he had done when he delivered Israel from its bondage in Egypt.<sup>15</sup> Jahweh will not ignore these cries. He will deliver his people from their oppression.<sup>16</sup> Thus the prophet Isaiah can describe the Day of Salvation as a time when all such groanings shall cease.<sup>17</sup>

Against the background of this Old Testament "groaning-motif", the connection between this verse (22) and the central theme of the pericope as a whole (creation's "Waiting in Hope") becomes more apparent: We know (οἶδαμεν) that at the present time all creation is groaning together (συστενάζει). This groaning is a sign of the bondage (δουλεία) in which creation waits (ἀπεκδέχεται); yet it is also a sign of creation's hope

(ἐφ' ἑλπίδι), a confirmation of its future deliverance (ἐλευθερωθήσεται). For God will not ignore the groanings of creation; he will deliver it from its unwilling (οὐχ ἑκούσῃ) subjection to bondage: "Gott lässt die schuldlose Natur nicht vergeblich schreien."<sup>18</sup>

The conceptual background of σουστενάζω, then, is unmistakably Jewish, not, as Michel suggests, Hellenistic.<sup>19</sup> This is further confirmed by the connection of σουστενάζει with συνωδίνει, which, as even Michel himself admits, stems from the world of Jewish apocalyptic thought.<sup>20</sup>

The verb ὠδίνω means literally "to suffer birth-pangs" (from ὠδίν, "birth-pangs", "labor pains").<sup>21</sup> The word is used in its literal sense only infrequently in the New Testament and in the LXX.<sup>22</sup> Most often it is used figuratively, to refer to some kind of intense suffering or anguish.<sup>23</sup> In the later prophets, the word received an eschatological association and became a technical term of apocalyptic thought for the "Messianic Woes" (חַשְׁמֹנֵי שְׁלִי חֲבִלֵי), the terrors and torments that were to precede the Messianic age.<sup>24</sup>

It would be reading too much into this text, however, to see in the figure of a woman in labor an allusion to the birth of a new world out of the old, as some commentators suggest.<sup>25</sup> For the emphasis in this verse is not on the labor-birth imagery, but on the suffering-groaning-bondage imagery. Hence, the force of συνωδίνει must be derived from its connection with σουστενάζει, not vice versa. That this is indeed the case is verified by the fact that no further mention is made of these "birth-pangs"; whereas the "groaning-motif" is picked up and further elaborated in the following verse.<sup>26</sup> Συνωδίνει thus intensifies the force of σουστενάζει: "The whole created world is crying out for release from pain,

as a woman cries in childbirth."<sup>27</sup>

This groaning in bondage has been going on from the time of the Fall (ὁπετάγη) "to this very day" (ἕως τοῦ νῦν). This not only emphasizes the duration of creation's expectant waiting, it also hints that the realization of creation's hope is both imminent and inevitable: "Gott lässt die schuldlose Natur nicht vergeblich schreien!"

## NOTES

### CHAPTER ONE

1. Anders Nygren, Commentary on Romans, translated by Carl C. Rasmussen (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, c. 1949), pp. 38-41. Though it is helpful in enabling the reader to grasp the overall structure of Romans, Nygren's outline at times tends to be somewhat forced and artificial. But perhaps this is an unavoidable byproduct of any attempt to schematize the contents of a letter.

2. A.T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (Nashville: Broadman Press, c. 1934), p. 1191: "The precise relation between clauses or sentences is not set forth by γάρ. That must be gathered from the context if possible."

3. K.E. Kirk, The Epistle to the Romans (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937), p. 214.

4. Otto Kuss, Der RÖmerbrief, Zweite Lieferung (Röm. 6,11 bis 8,19) (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1963), p. 622. Emphasis added.

5. Paul Althaus, Der Brief an die RÖmer, in Das Neue Testament Deutsch, herausgegeben von Paul Althaus und Gerhard Friedrich (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), VI, p. 92. Emphasis added. Althaus' suggestion is especially significant in that it brings out the carefully designed structure of this entire pericope. Romans 8:19-27 can be divided into three roughly parallel sections: (1) vv. 19-22, where σουστανάζει is applied to κτίσις; (2) vv. 23-25, where στενάζομεν is applied to Christians; and (3) vv. 26-27, where στεναγμοῖς is applied to the Spirit. The transitions between the various sections are marked by the connectives οὐ μόνον δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ v. 23, and ὁσαύτως δὲ καὶ v. 26.

6. Friedrich Adolf Philippi, Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, translated from the 3rd edition by J.S. Banks (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1879), II, p. 7.

7. Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Romans, translated from the 5th German edition by John C. Moore and Edwin Johnson, revised and edited by William P. Dickson (New York: Funk and Wagnells, 1884), p. 319.

8. Walter Bartling, "The Groaning Creation: An Exegetical Study of Romans 8:18-22", Unpublished Bachelor's Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1948, p. 24. Bartling's statement is a rather sweeping one in view of the evidence he cites (or rather, doesn't cite); but it is probably quite accurate.

9. Hans Wilhelm Schmidt, Der Brief des Paulus an die RÖmer, in Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament, herausgegeben von D. Erich

Fascher (Berlin: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 1962), VI, p. 145.

10. John Murray, The Epistle to the Romans, in The New International Commentary on the New Testament, edited by Nod B. Stonehouse (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., c. 1959), I, p. 301.

11. John Knox, "The Epistle to the Romans", in The Interpreter's Bible, edited by George Buttrick, et al. (New York: Abingdon Press, c. 1954), IX, p. 518.

12. Bartling, p. 35.

13. Gerhard Delling, "ἄποκαταδοκία," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, c. 1964), I, p. 393. Hereafter Kittel's edition will be referred to as TDNT.

Bartling, perhaps following Thayer, incorrectly derives it from -δοκέω, "watch", p. 35.

14. Bartling, p. 35f.

15. Delling, p. 393.

16. So the Revised Standard Version: "For the creation waits with eager longing..."; The New English Bible: "For the created universe waits with eager expectation for..."; The New Jerusalem Bible: "The whole creation is eagerly waiting...". The King James Version retains the ambiguity of the genitive (as do most of the German translations): "For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth...". Hereafter these versions will be referred to as the RSV, NEB, JB, and KJV, respectively.

17. Werner Foerster, "κτίζω, κτίσις, κτίσμα, κτίστης," TDNT, III, p. 1025. Cf. Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, revised and augmented by Henry Stuart Jones and Roderick McKenzie (Oxford: University Press, 9th edition, 1966), ad loc. Hereafter Liddell and Scott's lexicon will be referred to as LSJ.

18. Foerster, p. 1028. Cf. B.R. Brinkman, "'Creation' and 'Creature', I: Some Texts and Tendencies (excluding Romans)," Bijdragen, XVIII (February 1957), 131.

Foerster, p. 1025, explains how it came to be that the LXX utilized the verb κτίζω and its cognates rather than the more common classical verb δημιουργέω: "If we start with the sense 'to found', it is obvious that from the time of Alexander the Great the term took on a special nuance. Founding is a task for the ruler, esp. the Hellenistic ruler with his autonomous glory and his approximation to divinity.... In this light it is clear why the LXX preferred the word group κτίζω to the more obvious δημιουργεῖν. δημιουργεῖν suggests the craftsman and his work in the strict sense, whereas κτίζειν reminds us of the ruler at whose command a city arises out of nothing because the power of the ruler stands behind his

word. δημιουργεῖν is a technical manual process, κτίζειν an intellectual and volitional."

19. Tob. 8:5, 15; Jdt. 16:14; Ps. 73:18.

20. Cf. Wisdom 2:6; 16:24; 19:6.

21. Cf. Sir. 43:25; 49:16.

22. Brinkman, p. 133f., adds Mark 10:6 and 13:9 to this group.

23. Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated and adapted by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 456f. Hereafter Bauer's lexicon will be referred to as BAG. BAG also includes Col. 1:23 (limited to human beings) and Gal. 6:15 in this category; Foerster adds I Pet. 2:13.

24. BAG adds Rom. 1:25 and 8:19-22 (?) to this group. Brinkman contends that even though κτίσις is capable of cosmic application, in its New Testament and LXX usage it is "habitually subject to rather exact limitations of context" (p. 138). After examining each instance of κτίσις outside of Romans, he concludes: "Thus it should appear that these N.T. texts together with their background in the LXX serve to show a marked preference for a usage of creation-creature (κτίσις) which avoids the simple universalizing connotation which we are apt to give the expression." In the second part of his two-part study ("'Creation' and 'Creature', II: Texts and Tendencies in the Epistle to the Romans," Bijdragen, XVIII [1957], 359-374), he begins by summarizing the conclusions reached in the first part: "the creation-creature expression is not used by N.T. writers to denote the wide universality of created being in the simple rectilinear sense familiar to us and owing much of its inspiration to Greek philosophical tradition" (p. 365). He then goes on to examine the instances of κτίσις in Romans to see whether the same trend towards "particularization" of the meaning of κτίσις obtains there as well, stating: "In a sense the usage of Rom 8 is a test case. At first sight it refers to the universality of creation simpliciter and thus constitutes an important exception to the trend we have established. But if we find that we have to make certain qualifications and nuances, these also will be significant" (p. 366). His conclusions concerning Romans 8 will be noted later in this paper.

25. Cf. Col. 1:15 (Christ as the first-born of all "creation" or of every "creature") and 1:23 (the gospel preached to "every creature").

26. Kuss, p. 622.

27. The following summary is from Kuss' brief, but very helpful, outline of the various interpretations adopted by the Church Fathers. Kuss, p. 622.

28. Irenaeus, Methodius, Gregory of Nazianzus, Apollinarius, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Gennadius, Oecumenius, Tertullian, Ambrosiaster.

29. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Hilary.

30. Diodorus, Gregory of Nyssa, Theodore of Mopsuestia; also Gennadius and Hilary.

31. Theodoret, Ambrosius.

32. Ephraem, Augustine.

33. Quoted without bibliographical information by Kuss, p. 622.

34. A. Schlatter, Gottes Gerechtigkeit: Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief (Stuttgart: Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1935), p. 270, passim.

35. Hildebrecht Hommel, "Das Harren Der Kreature," in his Schöpfer und Erhalter: Studien zum Problem Christentum und Antike (Berlin: Lettner Verlag, 1956), p. 20.

36. Ibid., p. 21.

37. Schmidt, p. 145. Cf. p. 146: "Sehnsüchtig harrend wartet die Menschheit auf die Offenbarung der Kinder Gottes, denn in das Heil derer, die zur Gemeinde gehören, sind alle eingeschlossen. Es fragt sich, ob hier bei Paulus der Gedanke eines universalen Sieges der Gottesgnade, einer Allerlösung sich andeutet (cf. 5:18, 11:32)".

38. Otto Michel, Der Brief an Die Römer, in Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, begründet von Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), Vierte Abteilung, 13. Auflage, p. 201. He refers to the apocalyptic background of this passage as follows: "so geht v. 19 ganz in die Form des apokalyptischen Lehrsatzes über. Schon die Ausdrucksweise und die Wahl der Begriffe zeigen an, dass eine eigenartige Tradition sich zu Worte meldet" (p. 201).

39. Ibid.

40. Cf. also Foerster, p. 1031: "this creation is all that which on man's account (including man himself) was subjected to vanity."

41. Charles Hodge, Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (New Edition, New York: A.C. Armstrong and Son, 1906), p. 423.

42. Dividing this pericope into four cola, Brinkman illustrates how even the structure of the passage emphasizes the antithesis between "creation" and "we" (i.e. "sons of God"):

The expectation of creation waits for the revelation of the sons of God	}	a	{	We know that creation groans and travails together till now
---	---	---	---	---

Creation was subjected to vanity--not willingly but by him who subjected it	b	Not Creation alone, but we who are in actual posses- sion of the first-fruits of the Spirit
With the hope that cre- ation would be freed from the slavery of cor- ruption	c	We groan within ourselves in expectation of this adoptive sonship
unto the freedom of the glory of the Sons of God	d	the redemptive restitu- tion of the body

Brinkman, II, p. 370, f.n. 64.

43. Kuss, p. 624. Cf. also I Thess. 4:13, where non-Christians are characterized as those "who have no hope" (μη ἔχοντες ἐλπίδα).

44. So Alford, Althaus, Barth, Bardenhewer, Denny, Dodd, Godet, Hodge, Lietzmann, Moule, Meyer, Murray, Philippi, Sanday-Headlam, Stöckhardt, Zahn. Kuss, p. 623, lists also the following in support of this view: Bisping, Cornelius a Lapide, Cornely, Estius, Gaugler, Gutjahr, Haering, Jülicher, Klee, Kühl, Lagrange, Lipsius, A. Maier, Reithmayr, Schaefer, Sickenberger, Taylor, Viard, B. Weiss. Even Brinkman is led to this interpretation: "In conclusion it must be said that the personification of creation-creature and the especial treatment it has received in Rom. 8 came quite easily to Paul. But the fact that the term does denote all creation in the sense supported by the exegetes cannot be denied. It is an exception, but a qualified exception, to the general tendency in the N.T. which as we have seen was reluctant to allow creation-creature to stand for the simple totality of created beings" (II, p. 373).

45. Bartling, p. 37, calls attention to the double prosopopeia here: "first an ἀποκαταδοχία is ascribed to nature; then the ἀποκαταδοχία itself is presented as being completely absorbed in an object."

46. Walter Grundmann, "δέχομαι, δοχή, ἀπεκδέχομαι, ἀποδοχή, ἐκ-, ἀπεκ-, προσδέχομαι, δεκτός, ἀπο-, εὐπρόσδεκτος," TDNT, II, p. 56. Although most commentators and translators accept this meaning of ἀπεκδέχομαι, Swetnam suggests that another meaning might be more appropriate. In certain non-biblical texts, ἀπεκδέχομαι is used with the meaning "to understand in a certain sense", "to infer", "to understand from the context". [cf. LSJ, ad loc.] "The relation between the two fundamental meanings 'to await' and 'to infer' for ἀπεκδέχεται would seem to lie in the common denominator of distinction from what is immediately perceptible: in one case the distinction is temporal ('await'), in the other, cognitional ('infer')." Romans 8:19 might then be translated: "For the longing of creation arrives by inference (ἀπεκδέχεται) at the revelation of the sons of God." Swetnam is attracted to this meaning of ἀπεκδέχομαι primarily because he feels that it can best account for the presence of οἰοθεσίαν in Romans 8:23. That Christians must "await adoptive sonship" seems to contradict the statement in 8:14f which suggests that Christians already possess this sonship. This apparent contradiction would be eliminated by understanding



ἀπεκδέχεται in the sense of "to arrive at by inference." The presence of υἰοθεσίαν in 8:23, therefore, is "based on the supposition that 'adoptive sonship' is something which is at once arrived at by inference. . . . even though already existing and which in turn serves as the basis for further inference of something which is not yet existing." The meaning of Romans 8:23 would then be, "arriving by inference at sonship as the redemption of our body." This interpretation would then explain why the majority of the best MSS have the lectio difficilior (reading υἰοθεσίαν), as well as why a minority of MSS do not (i.e., it was dropped by scribes who took ἀπεκδέχεται to mean "await" and who thus had difficulty reconciling this verse with the notion of υἰοθεσίαν as a present possession). Cf. James Swetnam, "On Romans 8,23 and the 'Expectation of Sonship'", Biblica, XLVIII (January 1967), pp. 102-108.

But there are a number of difficulties with Swetnam's suggestion: (1) No indication is given either in Romans 8:19 or in the surrounding context as to what the basis for creation's inference actually is. (2) The word ἀποκαταδοκία seems to imply an expectant waiting, not a manner of inferring. (3) The future eschatological orientation of the other instances of ἀπεκδέχομαι in the New Testament is quite clear—cf. I Cor. 1:7; Gal. 5:5; Phil. 3:20; Heb. 9:28; I Pet. 3:20. (4) The connection of "hope" (ἐφ' ἐλπίδι, v. 21) with ἀπεκδέχεται points to something in the future that is being awaited, rather than to a cognitional inference.

47. Grundman, p. 56.

48. Albrecht Oepke, "καλύπτω, κάλυμμα, ἀνα-, κατα-, ἀποκαλύπτω, ἀποκάλυψις," TDNT, III, p. 566: "The Greek language has many expressions for revelation, but rather oddly these do not include ἀποκαλύπτειν. It is usual to speak of God's ἐπίδειξις or σημαίνειν. This suggests that the concealment removed by revelation is not regarded as essential." Oepke suggests that this implies two fundamentally different concepts of revelation: "On the Greek view, man unveils God; on the biblical, God reveals Himself to man. On the one side we have proofs of God and praise of man, on the other side the praise of God." (p. 574)

49. Cf. BAG and LSJ, ad loc.

50. It cannot be finally determined whether or not the terms received their theological connotations independently of their usage in the LXX. Cf. Oepke, p. 571: "These data show beyond question that the terms bear no dogmatic impress and that their theological use is fundamentally alien to the Greeks. This use was imported from the Orient. In face of Jewish influence in the magic pap. and hardly contestable reminiscences of the OT in Hermes mysticism, the question arises whether the non-biblical use of the terms in the technical [theological] sense derives directly or indirectly from the Greek bible. It is philologically debatable, but makes good theological sense, when Jerome says of the word ἀποκάλυψις: proprie Scripturarum est...a nullo sapientium saeculi apud Graecos usurpatum (ad Gal., 1, 11ff., Vii, 1, 387, ed. Vallarsi)."

51. BAG, p. 91f.

52. Ibid.
53. Oepke, p. 583.
54. Cf. M.B. Riddle's note in John Peter Lange, The Epistle to the Romans, in Commentary on the Holy Scripture, translated from the German and edited by Philip Schaff (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, [1949]), XIX, p. 271.
55. Col. 3:4 is no exception; for there the verb is φανερώω not ἀποκαλύπτω.
56. Other objects mentioned in eschatological contexts are δικαιοκρασία τοῦ θεοῦ (Rom. 2:5) and σωτηρία (I Pet. 1:5).
57. Cf. the noun κτίσις which, as has already been noted, can mean either the act of creation or the result of that act, i.e., something created, "creature".
58. The meaning of ἡ δόξα will be discussed further in connection with the exegesis of verse 21, infra, p. 366.
59. Cf. Deut. 14:1f ("You are the sons of the Lord your God. . . the Lord has chosen you to be a people for his own possession.").

## CHAPTER TWO

1. Joachim Petrusch, "An Analysis of Romans viii, 19-22," Irish Ecclesiastical Record, CV (May 1966), p. 318.
2. O. Bauernfeind, "μάταιος, ματαιότης, ματαιόω, ματήν, ματαιολογία, ματαιολόγος," TDNT, IV, 519.
3. Ibid.
4. Ματαιότης occurs only in Psalms (thirteen times), Proverbs (once), and Ecclesiastes (thirty-seven times). It is used most frequently as the translation of the Hebrew מַטְיָוִת (thirty-three times in Ecclesiastes). Cf. Edwin Hatch and Henry Redpath, A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books) (photomechanical reprint, Graz, Austria, 1954), 899. This edition will hereafter be referred to as HR.
5. Bauernfeind, p. 523, makes the following comment on this message of Qoheleth: "The stern and irrefutable vanitas vanitatum ends the futile struggle which living man, in his desire for life, wages against his own insight into vanity."
6. Ibid.

7. William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, in The International Critical Commentary, edited by S.R. Driver, A. Plummer, and C.A. Briggs (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902), p. 208.

8. Michel, p. 202.

9. Brinkman, II, p. 368.

10. Ibid. The reference is to Vaird, "Expectatio Creaturae," Rev. Bibl., LIX (1952), 337-354.

11. Ibid., p. 369. The only other occurrence of ματαιότης in the New Testament (besides Rom. 8:20 and Eph. 4:17) is II Pet. 2:18. There the ethical connotation is clearly present.

12. In view of the ethical dimensions of the word, Knox' characterization of this ματαιότης of nature is somewhat inadequate: "the ceaseless round, the dreary circle, the endless repetition of existence" (p. 519). Luther seems to have caught something of the full force of the word; for he suggests that nature has been subjected to vanity in a twofold sense: (1) Her own nature and purpose have been frustrated; and (2) she must now suffer the misuse of sinful man. Cf. Nestor Beck, "The Liberation of the Creature: A Study of the Interpretation of Romans 8:19-22 by Representative Lutheran Theologians," (unpublished Master's Thesis, Concordia Seminary, 1967), pp. 55-59.

13. Cf. F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated and revised by Robert W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 318 (1). Hereafter, Blass-Debrunner's edition will be referred to as BDF.

14. Unfortunately, many who adopt this interpretation seem prompted more by dogmatic or philosophical assumptions rather than by strictly exegetical considerations. So Augustus Strong, Systematic Theology (New York: A.C. Armstrong & Co., 1896), p. 198, approaches the text with a preconceived notion of the sovereignty of God; Carl Frommann, "Ueber die Seufzende Creatur," in Jahrbuch für Deutsche Theologie, VIII (1863), bases his arguments on the presuppositions of natural science; and Edward Caird, The Evolution of Religion (Glasgow: Jas. Maclehose and Sons, 1907) II, 123, views the text through the eyes of evolutionary theory. For a further critique of the positions of these men, see Bartling, pp. 44-50.

15. Schmidt, p. 146.

16. Ibid.

17. Ibid., p. 147.

18. Cf. BDF, 318 (1), (2).

19. Schmidt, p. 147, argues as follows: "Dass zunächst nicht an Gottes Gericht über die gefallene Welt zu denken ist, zeigt die enge Verbindung von ὑπετάγη und ἐφ' ἑλπίδα; ein Gerichtsakt würde sich nicht so direkt als Entwurf zu einem hoffnungsreichen Ziel vollziehen. Paulus denkt an den Ratschluss des Schöpfers, der durch die notvolle Vorläufigkeit des Zeitlichen in Christus zur Vollendung führt."

20. Ibid. "Dass nicht an einen Sündenfall der κτίσις zu denken ist, zeigt auch das οὐχ ἑκοῦσα an: sie verfiel der Nichtigkeit 'nicht schuldhaft, sondern schicksalhaft' (O. Michel), 'ohne eigenes Zutun', 'nicht von sich aus', sondern auf Grund eines ursprünglichen, unprovokierten Gotteswillens; in διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα liegt der Gedanke: 'weil es Gott nun einmal so bestimmte' (E. Kuhl). An Adam (R.A. Lipsius, auch Th. Zahn) oder gar an den Satan zu denken, ist aus exegetischen und theologischen Gründen abwegig. Meist trägt man aber doch den Gedanken in den Text: Die Schöpfung musste des Menschen (Adams) Strafe teilen, ohne an dessen Fall mitschuldig zu sein, um aber dann auch an seiner Erlösung teilzunehmen. κτίσις meint aber zunächst die Menschheit im Unterschied zur Christusgemeinde, den 'Söhne Gottes'; auf Pflanzen und Tiere ist die v. 21 ausgesprochene Verheissung nicht anwendbar, so sehr es auch für sie eine Erlösung geben mag."

21. Supra, p. 7-11.

22. Althaus, p. 93. As Althaus indicates, the notion that the whole natural world somehow suffered a "fall" with Adam was a familiar one in the Jewish community of Paul's day. This idea is to be found within the Old Testament itself (Gen. 3:17-18, II Esdras 7:11-12; cf. the references in the prophets to the effects man's sin still has on creation: Jer. 4: 23-28, 9:9, 12:4, 14:2-6, Hag. 1:6-11, Zph. 1:3, Is. 24:4-7, Hos. 4:1-3, etc.). It was especially popular as a source of speculation for later Apocalyptic and Rabbinic thought. Herman Strack and Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar z. Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch (München: Ch. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926), III, 247-254, lists six blessings that Man was supposed to have lost as a result of his Fall: (1) "der Glanz seines Angesichts"; (2) "die Länge seines Lebens"; (3) "die Grösse seiner Gestalt"; (4) "die Fruchtbarkeit des Erdbodens"; (5) "die Fruchtbarkeit der Bäume"; (6) "die Helligkeit der Himmelslichter." Note that the first three involve man directly; the last three are directed against creation. These six blessings were to be restored to man by the coming Messiah. In addition, he would bring with him ten further blessings for man: "Die Leuchtkraft der Gestirne wird erhöht; lebendiges Wasser, das all Krankheiten heilt, wird fliessen; die Bäume bringen jeden Monat Früchte; die zerstörten Städte werden neu errichtet; Jerusalem wird mit Saphirsteinen erbaut; unter den Israeliten herrscht Friede; auch mit den Tieren wird Israel Frieden haben; Weinen u. Klagen hört auf; der Tod wird nicht mehr sein u. Seufzen u. Angstgeschrei u. Stöhnen wird nicht mehr gehört werden."

23. οὐχ ἑκοῦσα is properly an adjective; but it has an adverbial force. Cf. Robertson, p. 549: "The Greek uses the adjective often where the English has the adverb. That is, the Greek prefers the personal connection

of the adjective with the subject to the adverbial connection with the verb."

24. Hodge, p. 429.

25. Althaus, p. 93. Cf. Michel, p. 203: "Der Zusatz οὐχ ἑκοῦσα (dagegen οὐ θέλουσα nach G F) kann bedeuten: 'wider den eigenen Willen' bzw. 'ohne eigen Willen'. Hier ist gemeint, dass der Gerichtsakt sich nicht schuldhaft, sondern schicksalhaft vollzog, ohne dass die Geschöpfe durch eigene Tat an diesem Fall beteiligt wären. Die Schuld trifft ganz den Menschen, die Schöpfung dagegen ist an das Schicksal des Menschen gebunden."

26. Theodor Zahn, "Die Seufzende Creatur," Jahrbuch für Deutsche Theologie, (1865) X, p. 519.

27. F. Godet, Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, translated from the French by Cusin (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1883), II, 91.

28. It is used with the dative of that to which one is to submit himself: "Αἱ γυναῖκες ὑποτάσσεσθε τοῖς ἀνδράσιν" (Col. 3:18; cf. Titus 2:5); "Πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις ὑποτασσέσθω" (Rom. 13:1; cf. I Pet. 2:13); "τῷ γὰρ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑποτάσσεται." (Rom. 8:7); "τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑπετάγησαν" (Rom. 10:3).

29. Cf. BAG, p. 638. In support of the view that ἡ κτίσις can be taken as an equivalent expression for τὰ πάντα, cf. Eph. 3:9 (ἐν τῷ θεῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι), Col. 1:16 (ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα), and Rev. 4:11 (σὺ ἔκτισας τὰ πάντα).

30. The aorist participle of ὑποτάσσω is used in only one other passage of the New Testament: I Cor. 15:27c, 28c. There the reference clearly is to God.

31. Cf. Michel, p. 203: "Der Unterwerfende (ὁ ὑποτάξας) ist sicherlich weder Adam noch der Mensch schlechthin, auch nicht der Satan. Der Unterwerfende kann nur Gott selbst sein, dessen Name hier aus jüdischer Gottescheu vermieden wird."

32. BAG, p. 180.

33. George Benedict Winer, A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament, translated by Henry Thayer from the 7th German edition (Andover: Warren F. Draper, 1889), footnote, p. 399.

34. Against Edmund Hill, "The Construction of Three Passages from St. Paul", Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXIII (March 1961), 296-297. Hill contends that ἑκοῦσα answers the question how creation was subjected, while only διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα answers the question why. He thus claims that the two phrases are not the ones that are contrasted; rather the contrast is between οὐχ ἑκοῦσα and ἐφ' ἐλπίδι; the διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα is merely a paren-

thetical phrase which explains ἐφ' ἐλπίδι. Hill thus arrives at the following punctuation: τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὐχ ἔκοῦσα ἄλλὰ—διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα—ἐφ' ἐλπίδι: διότι καὶ αὐτῇ ἡ κτίσις..., which he translates, "For the creation was subjected to vanity, not willingly (indeed) but (nonetheless) in hope because of him who subjected it; for which reason creation too shall be set free...." Hill asserts that Paul was not concerned with the question why creation was subjected, but only with the question how it was subjected. This seems a rather arbitrary assertion in view of the meaning of οὐχ ἔκοῦσα and διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα as clarified above. Furthermore, his claim that both οὐχ ἔκοῦσα and ἐφ' ἐλπίδι qualify ὑπετάγη is open to question, as it shall be pointed out in the next chapter.

35. Strack-Billerbeck, III, p. 247-254, cite several Rabbinic passages which assert that creation was cursed because of its own disobedience: e.g., the earth failed to bring forth good fruit, the animals (with the exception of the Phoenix!) also ate of the forbidden fruit, etc.

36. Ibid. In answer to the question why creation had to share in the consequences of man's sin, Rabbinic literature offered several explanations: (1) Starting from the basic premise that the world was created for man (either for his use or in order to serve him), some Rabbis reasoned as follows: Once man was lost, of what possible use could the world be to God? ("Alle Dinge, sprach Gott, habe Ich um des Menschen willen ins Dasein gerufen; der Mensch ist verloren gegangen, was sollen mir noch jene?"). As R. Jehoshua ben Qarcha (150 A.D.) explained it: "Gleich einem Menschen, der für seinen Sohn das Brautgemach herrichtete u. von allen möglichen Arten (Speisen) das Mahl zubereitete. Nach etlichen Tagen starb sein Sohn. Da machte er sich auf u. brachte sein Brautgemach in Unordnung (zerstört es); er sprach: Habe ich es denn nicht bloss wegen meines Sohnes hergerichtet? Jetzt, da er tot ist, was soll mir das Brautgemach? Auch Gott sprach: Habe ich denn das Vieh u. das Wild nicht bloss um des Menschen willen geschaffen? Jetzt, da der Mensch gesündigt, was soll mir Vieh u. Wild?" (2) Others reasoned: Since the earth was the mother of man, she too must bear man's curse, in accordance with the traditional saying: "Verflucht seien die Brüste, die diesen Menschen gesäugt haben!" They base this primarily on Gen. 27:13—"So meinte es auch Rebekka: Auch was dich betrifft, auf mich komme der dir geltende Fluch, mein Sohn!". (3) Many other Rabbis, however, were content merely to state the fact that creation stands under a curse because of Adam's sin, without trying to explain the exact relationship involved.

### CHAPTER THREE

1. BDF, 235(2).
2. BAG, p. 287.
3. So RSV and KJV; cf. Vulgate, "qui subiecit eam in spe".

4. Philippi, p. 13.

5. So Althaus, p. 92: "Denn der Nichtigkeit wurde die Kreatur unterworfen, nicht mit eigenem Willen, sondern durch den, der sie unterwarf, auf Hoffnung hin—. . ."; Kuss, p. 622: "Denn der Nichtigkeit wurde die Schöpfung unterworfen, nicht freiwillig, sondern durch den, der sie unterworfen hat, auf Hoffnung hin, dass. . ."; Michel, p. 201: "Denn der Leerheit wurde die Schöpfung unterworfen, nicht mit eigenem Willen, sondern durch den, der sie unterworfen hat, auf Hoffnung hin, denn. . ."; and Schmidt, p. 144: "Denn die Kreatur wurde, ohne Anlass dazu gegeben zu haben, sondern um deswillen, der es so wollte, der Nichtigkeit unterstellt auf eine Homnungswelt hin." Cf. also Bartling, p. 64 and Sanday-Headlam, p. 208.

Some of the more recent English versions leave the connection quite vague, almost to the point where ἐφ' ἐλπίδι introduces an entirely new thought. Cf. NEB: "It was made the victim of frustration, not by its own choice, but because of him who made it so; yet always there was hope. . . ."; Phillips: "The world of creation cannot as yet see Reality, not because it chooses to be blind, but because in God's purpose it has been so limited—yet it has been given hope."; Beck: "Nature must waste away, not because it wants to but because its Master would have it so, but nature hopes it, too, . . ."; and JB: "It was not for any fault on the part of creation that it was made unable to attain its purpose, it was made so by God; but creation still retains the hope of . . .".

6. Murray, p. 304.

7. Michel, p. 203.

8. Cf. Zahn, p. 521: "Wer die Hoffnung hege, ob die Creatur, ob der Mensch, ob Godd, ist nicht gesagt, sondern nur, dass jene Unterwerfung so stattgefunden habe, dass dabei eine Hoffnung geblieben sei, dass man hoffen könne, die Creatur, wenn sie hoffen könnte, der Mensch, der ihre Schmerzen sieht, Gott, der all' seiner Geschöpfe mitleidig erbarmt."

9. BAG, p. 82.

10. According to Lange, p. 267, Forbes has made a similar suggestion regarding the construction of this passage. He outlines the passage as follows:

- a. ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαταδοκία τῆς κτίσεως
- b. τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται  
τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη  
οὐχ ἔκοῦσα ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα
- A. ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ὅτι καὶ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς
- B. εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ.

Commenting on this, Lange writes, "This makes the whole of v. 20, except 'in hope' parenthetical . . . . 'In Hope' is thus made to refer to both lines of the parenthesis, yet with the main reference to ἀπεκδέχεται .

The two lines of v. 19 find their parallels in v. 21, while aA refer to the expectation or hope that animates creation, bB to the final consummation to which it points."

11. This is Bartling's evaluation of Forbes' suggestion; he dismisses it without further comment. Bartling, p. 64, foot-note 49.

12. It is possible that Romans 2:12-16 contains an even more extensive parenthesis than this one. The gap in thought between ἀπολογουμένων and ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρα (v. 15f) certainly seems to suggest a parenthesis; a logical connection for ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρα can be found only some distance back. But cf. BD, 465(1), for the possibility of asyndeton here.

13. BD, 465(1). Romans 1:13 is cited as an example of this: ὅτι πολλάκις προεθέμην ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς (καὶ ἐκωλύθην ἄχρι τοῦ δεῦρο) ἵνα τινὰ καρπὸν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν, where the ἵνα-clause goes with προεθέμην.

14. Although Nestle-Aland accept the variant reading διότι, the evidence is clearly in favor of the ὅτι: (1) It is attested by the majority of witnesses [all but  $\delta D^*G$  and a few other MSS of no special importance]; (2) It is attested by the earliest witnesses [p27, 46 are both 3rd century MSS; the earliest witness for διότι is  $\delta$ , a 4th century MS]; (3) It is attested by the best textual family [the Hesychian family, except for  $\delta$ ]; and (4) It is attested by witnesses of a greater geographical distribution [διότι supported only by the Western type text; for even  $\delta$ , though not specifically Western, is known to include definite Western type readings].

The presence of διότι in some MSS is probably due to dittography, the scribe reading ΕΑΠΙΑΙΑΙΟΤΙ instead of ΕΑΠΙΑΙΟΤΙ.

The choice of connectives, however, does not materially effect the argument as to its relation to ἐφ' ἐλπίδι; for in Koine Greek, their meanings have become interchangeable (cf. BAG, p. 198 and 592f).

15. So KJV, RSV, NEB: "because"; Vulgate: "quia"; cf. Althaus, Michel, Schmidt: "denn".

16. So Phillips, Beck, Moffatt: "that"; cf. JB: "hope of being freed"; Kuss, "dass".

17. Alford, p. 394: "ὅτι is equal to 'because', not 'that', after ἐλπίζω—for then it is not likely that αὐτή ἢ κτίσις would be so emphatically repeated."

18. Bartling, p. 72: "Paul does not intend, primarily, to describe the hope as to its object but to show its validity. The immediate object of the hope was already mentioned in verse 19: τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ."

19. Thus Philippi's contention (adopted by Bartling, p. 73) that κτίσις contains an epexegetis of αὐτή which is really not essential since καὶ αὐτή, in allusion to ἡ κτίσις, v. 20, would have sufficed", is incorrect,



and the phrase should be translated ipse quoque, not, as Philippi has it, et ipse. Philippi, p. 14.

20. Bartling, p. 72. He reconstructs the thought as follows: "Nature anxiously awaits the Parousia and the manifestation of the glory in God's sons, because she is now subjected to frustration. Her subjection was caused by man's fall, not by any fault of her own. Therefore, God has left her a hope, associated with the revelation of the glory in God's children. This is not mere poetry or manner of speaking for 'creation shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.'"

21. Rudolf Bultmann, "Ἔλπις, ἐλπίζω, ἀπ-, προελπίζω," TDNT, II, 530. He cites the following in this connection: Luke 6:34; I Cor. 9:10, II Cor. 8:5; I Tim. 3:14; Acts 16:19.

22. Ibid, p. 531: "If hope is fixed on God, it embraces at once the three elements of expectation of the future, trust, and the patience of waiting. Any one of these aspects may be emphasized . . . . The term ἐλπίζειν has the element of sure confidence in R. 5:4f; 15:4; I Th. 1:3; Hb. 6:11, 10:23. The only point is that we can never isolate a single element."

23. Michel, p. 205.

24. Cf. Philippians 1:20 ("κατὰ τὴν ἀποκαταδοχίαν καὶ ἐλπίδα μου ὅτι οὐδένι ἀίσχυνθήσομαι"). This is an especially significant passage in that it is the only other place in the New Testament where the word ἀποκαταδοχία occurs. Notice particularly (1) the ὅτι-clause with the future indicative, dependent upon Ἔλπις: "hope that we shall..."; and (2) the close connection between ἀποκαταδοχία and Ἔλπις. Taking ἀποκαταδοχίαν καὶ ἐλπίδα as an hendiadys ("hopeful expectation that..."), the phrase is practically the equivalent of ἀποκαταδοχία...ἀπεκδέχεται...ἐφ' ἐλπίδι ὅτι (Romans 8:19ff).

25. Romans 8:21 and 23 are relatively simple cases in comparison with I Thess. 1:3 which contains two simple genitives, two in apposition, three together, one of the person and another of the thing. Cf. BD, 168, and Robertson, p. 503 for further examples.

26. BD, 160, 211.

27. So RSV; cf. Moffatt ("thralldom to decay") and JB ("slavery to decadence").

28. Cf. Beck, "slavery that destroys it".

29. None of the versions render it in this way, perhaps because of the difficulty of expressing this sense in English.

30. Cf. NFB, "shackles of mortality". German versions generally retain the ambiguity of the genitive by merely translating "der"—cf. KJV, "of".

The appositional sense, too, is not easily rendered into English.

31. Lange, p. 272.

32. Sanday-Headlam, p. 208.

33. Luther translates τῆς δόξης as a qualitative genitive ("zu den herrlichen Freiheit"), but not τῆς φθορᾶς. Likewise, Phillips ("magnificent liberty" for ἔλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης but "tyranny of change" for δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς), KJV, RSV, and Moffatt. Cf. the comment by C.F.D. Moule, An Idiom Book of the Greek New Testament (2nd Edition, Cambridge: University Press, 1959), p. 175: "It would be misplaced subtlety to translate Rom. 8:21. . . as corrupting bondage, when it obviously [sic!] means bondage to corruption (or morality); although in the same verse it seems more natural to translate τὴν ἔλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης 'semitically' as glorious freedom (rather than, for example, freedom consisting in the glory)."

34. Cf. the outline of the wider context given above, p. 1.

35. Sanday-Headlam, p. 208. Cf. Michel, p. 203: "Vielleicht sollte man doch darauf acten, dass ein besonderer Akzent auf den Begriff Herrlichkeit liegen bleibt." Also, Riddle, p. 272: "...the hendiadys of the E.V. (glorious liberty) is totally incorrect. It makes the prominent idea of the whole clause a mere attribute."

36. J. Chr. v. Hofmann, Die Heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments (Nürdingen: C.H. Beck'sche Buchhandlung, 1868), Theil 3, p. 333, as quoted in Bartling, p. 74.

37. This is Bartling's characterization. Gerhard seems to be operating with much the same distinction when he speaks about Creation being freed from bondage but not necessarily from corruption; just as Christians are freed from the bondage of sin, but not from sin itself: "addimus . . . apostolum nequaquam dicere, quod liberanda sit creatura a corruptione, quae phrasis substantiali interitui opposita videri poterat, sed a servitute corruptionis, quae eidem minime adversatur. . . . Si creaturae liberantur a servitute corruptionis, h. e. a servitio, quod hominibus impiis in hac vita mortali impendere conguntur, interim tamen ipsae non sunt nec fiunt liberae a corruptione." Johann Gerhard, Loci Theologici (Lipsiae: J.C. Hinrichs, 1875), IX, p. 175b, as quoted in Nestor Beck, p. 43.

38. In Lange, p. 272.

39. BAG, p. 865.

40. Ibid; II Peter 2:19 is also cited in this connection.

41. It would then parallel ματαιότης which also may have ethical overtones. See above, p. 18f.

42. Cf. JB, "slavery to decadence".

43. Murray, p. 304, footnote 30: "If φθορά has here ethical connotation (cf. Gal. 6:8; II Pet. 1:4; 2:19), then the bondage would be the bondage proceeding from man's ethical depravity, the bondage to which creation is subjected as a result of man's sin, and φθορά itself would not be predicated of the creation."

44. BAG, p. 865.

45. Even the II Peter passages could well be understood in this sense, rather than in the sense suggested by BAG. Thus, II Peter 1:4 would not be translated "the depravity that exists in the world because of passion" (BAG), but "the physical corruption that exists in the world because of sinful passion (ἐπιθυμία)." Likewise, II Peter 2:19 could be understood to mean that men become slaves of the state of being perishable (δούλοι τῆς φθορᾶς) as a result of their licentious passions of the flesh (ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις).

46. Michel, p. 204, footnote 1: ". . . der Begriff der φθορά hat noch ein substantielles Element in sich, wie Lagr R 209 mit Recht hervorhebt. Es ist beachtlich, dass. . . φθορά nur an dieser Stelle im Römerbrief auftaucht. Das Subst. findet sich vor allem in apokalyptischen Traditionen (I Kor 15, 42. 50; Gal 6,8). Gegensatz zu φθορά ist ἀφθαρσία, ἀθανασία und ζωὴ αἰώνιος. Auch in der jüdischen Apokalyptik begegnet uns der Tod als Verordnung Gottes über Adam und seine Nachkommen nicht selten (IV Esr 3,7; 7,118f.; Apk Bar 23,4). Allerdings werden Nichtigkeit und Vergänglichkeit der Schöpfung nicht ohne weiteres auf die Sünde Adams zurückgeführt (Str. B. III 247ff.)."

47. NEB.

48. Gerhard adopts Ambrose' interpretation: "Ex phrasi eis eleutherian colligi nequit, terminum ad quem liberationis fore unum ac eundem creaturae cum filiis Dei, alias enim sequeretur, creaturam etiam vitae aeternae et coelestis gloriae fillis Dei promissae fore participem, sed denotatur duntaxat liberationis tempus, ut ex Ambrosio monuimus."

Quoted in Nestor Beck, p. 45, footnote 45.

49. BD, 479(2) defines zeugma as "a special type of ellipsis requiring a different verb to be supplied. . . , i.e., one verb is used with two objects (subjects) but suits only one." In this passage, ἐλευθερωθήσεται is used with two prepositional phrases (ἀπό and εἰς), but suits only the one (ἀπό). The sense is clear, but some verb appropriate to the εἰς-clause must be supplied mentally.

50. In Lange, p. 272. Cf. Hodge, p. 431 and Philippi, p. 14.

51. Cf. BAG, p. 229: "be freed and come to"; RSV, "be freed from...and obtain".

52. Cf. the distinction which Hofmann makes between δουλεία and φθορά; supra, p. 33.

53. Heinrich Schlier, "ἐλεύθερος, ἐλευθερώω, ἐλευθερία, ἀπελεύθερος," TDNT, IV, p. 496.

54. Michel, p. 203.

55. Cf. Kittel, TDNT, II, p. 250: "Through Christ the σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως is in the resurrection σύμμορφος τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ Phil. 3:21. Believers will have a share in his appearing ἐν δόξῃ: σὺν αὐτῷ φανερωθήσεθε ἐν δόξῃ, Col. 3:4. We are συγκληρονόμοι Χριστοῦ, and therefore συνδοξασθῶμεν, R. 8:17. He is ἐλπὶς τῆς δόξης, Col. 1:27. This means that when the NT refers to the eschatological participation of believers in δόξα this is simply part of the general statement of salvation history concerning the connexion and parallelism between the resurrection of Christ and the resurrection and new aeon of believers. Participation in δόξα, whether in hope or one day in consummation, is participation in Christ. As it is only in the resurrection that God's aim for man is achieved, so His κλέϊν is fulfilled only in the αἰώνιος δόξα which is the true goal of vocation (1 Pt. 5:4, 10; 1 Th. 2:12; 2 Th. 2:14, 2Cor. 4:17; 2 Tm. 2:10). Hence it is an object of hope the certainty of which may be a theme of rejoicing (R. 5:2)."

56. Cf. I Cor. 15:42 and Romans 2:7 where δόξα occurs in synonymous parallelism with ἀφθαρσία.

57. Murray, p. 304. As he correctly notes, "this representation is not consistent with the notion sometimes entertained that the material creation is to be annihilated. . . .", p.304, footnote 28. Althaus comments on this passage as follows: "Welt und Mensch stehen bei Paulus, wie in der jüdischen Apokalyptik, in Schicksalsgemeinschaft. Seine Theologie hat es nicht nur mit dem Heil der Menschheit zu tun, sondern eben darin zugleich mit der ganzen Schöpfung. Mit dem Menschen ist die ganze geschaffene Welt ihrem Urstand entfremdet. Mit dem Menschen wird die Welt erlöst, nicht der Mensch ohne die Welt und vor ihr. Nirgends tritt der ungriechische und imustoscje Charakter der Theologie des Apostels so stark heraus wie hier. Der Wiedergeborene ist nicht in ein Jenseits entrückt, von dem aus er die Welt ihrem Schicksal ruhig preisgeben könnte. Er wird nicht aus der Welt erlöst, sondern mit ihr. Seine Erlösung ist nicht Preisgabe der Welt, sondern Anbruch der Welterlösung. Dieser Zusammenhang ist für Paulus einfach damit gegeben, dass der Mensch leib ist. Als solcher ist er offenkundig in den Kosmos verflochten, ein Teil seiner. Wie die mystische Preisgabe der Welt und Seelenglaube, so hängen Welt=umfassende Hoffnung und Erfassung des Menschen in seiner Leiblichkeit zusammen." (p. 93).

Nygren, too, recognizes the cosmic implications of the redemption outlined in this passage: "The redemption of mankind is also to be the redemption of creation. For Paul the two go hand in hand and are inseparably united. Just as God, on the day of resurrection, will give man a body which corresponds to the new aeon of glory, a "spiritual body", so He will create a corresponding new cosmos, "new heavens and a new earth".

So the consummation will not come by any automatic process of development. God does indeed lead the whole creation on toward a goal which He has fixed definitely; but the consummation will come through His own mighty action; and it will concern not only individuals, but it will have cosmic meaning and cosmic dimensions" (p. 332).

Likewise, Brinkman, II, p. 366: "That there is a connection between this passage and theories of world-regeneration and world-renewal which were common in the N.T. times is a commonplace. The doctrine of world regeneration is the direct teaching of Christ (Mt. 29,28) while the 'new heavens' and the 'new earth' of Isaias are of course echoed in 2 Pet. 3:13 and in Apocalypse 21:21. Works such as the book of Jubilees, Enoch, and the Apocalypse of Baruch and 4 Esdras all contain the doctrine of the renewal of creation" [cf. Jub. 1:29; I Enoch 45:4; 72:1; 2 Bar. 32:6; 44:12; 57:2; 4 Esdras 5:45; 7:75].

58. Bartling, p. 71.

#### CHAPTER FOUR

1. Lange, p. 273.
2. G. Stoeckhardt, Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Römer (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1907), p. 376.
3. Meyer, p. 325.
4. Ibid.
5. Zahn, p. 523.
6. Ibid.
7. Cf. Riddle's note in Lange, p. 273: "Prof. Smart urges that the longing of the natural world was not so familiar to all, that the Apostle could thus appeal to consciousness."
8. Also II Cor. 5:1, I Tim. 1:8. Cf. the frequent use of οἵδατε in I Cor. 6.
9. James Denney, "St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans", in The Expositor's Greek Testament (London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd, n.d.), p. 650.
10. Michel, p. 204.
11. So John Calvin, Commentary upon the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans (translated by Chr. Rosdell; Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1844), p. 219: "It joineth them (the creature) for companions to us." Schmidt also adopts this interpretation; for it is especially amenable to his view that κτίσις means "mankind": ". . .die ander Deutung, welche

das *cuv*- mit der ersten Person Plural in *οἴδαμεν* verbindet, ist auch möglich. Vom Leiden der Christen hatte ja die ganze Betrachtung ihren Ausgang genommen (v. 17d und 18); auch erfolgt die besondere Erwähnung der Gotteskinder in v. 23 nur unter dem besonderen Gesichtspunkt der Geistgabe. - Wir (nämlich die Christen) wissen, dass die ganze Menschheit dieses hoffnungsvolle Leid, diesen Geburtsschmerz des Erlösungslebens mit uns, den schon berufenen Kindern Gottes miterlebt: sie leidet mit, um mit verherrlicht zu werden (v. 17b). Der Satz will also nicht bloss sagen: Gott wird und kann das Wehgeschrei seiner Kreatur nicht überhören, oder: Überall findet sich dasselbe Leid, das auch uns bedrückt; das Schmerzerlebnis, wie Paulus es hier meint, ist nicht als Ausdruck einer verzweifelten Lage zu verstehen, sondern als 'Geburtsschmerz', der schon Anfang der Erlösung ist. Nur so verstanden dient der Satz dem von Paulus beabsichtigten Erweis: Das Leiderlebnis kann die Heilsgewissheit nicht anfechten, weil es ja immer schon selbst in den heilsgeschichtlichen Prozess hineingehört."

12. Quoted by Lange, p. 273.

13. *Ἐπενάχω* (II Cor. 5:2, 4; Hb. 13:17; Rom. 8:23; James 5:9; Mk. 7:34); *στεναγμός* (Acts 7:34; Rom. 8:26); *συστενάχω* (Rom. 8:22).

14. Cf. Job 3:24, 23:2, 9:27; Psalm 6:6, 30(31):10, 37(38):8,9, 101(102):5.

15. Cf. Ex. 2:23f: "And the people of Israel groaned under their bondage, and cried out for help, and their cry under bondage came up to God. And God heard their groaning, and God remembered his covenant with Abraham, with Isaac, and with Jacob." Ex. 6:5; Psalm 11(12):5: "Because the poor are despoiled, because the needy groan, I will now arise, says the Lord; I will place him in the safety for which he longs." Psalm 101(102): 20; and Isaiah 21:2.

16. Cf. Judges 2:18—"Whenever the Lord raised up judges for them, the Lord was with the judge, and he saved them from the hand of their enemies all the days of the judge; for the Lord was moved to pity by their groaning because of those who afflicted and oppressed them."

17. Isaiah 35:10 (=51:11).

18. Althaus, p. 93.

19. Michel, p. 204: "Es scheint zunächst so, als weise das 'Seufzen' stärker in die hellenistische Erlösungsfrömmigkeit, das Bild der Wehen aber in die apokalyptische Vorstellungswelt."

20. Ibid.

21. BAG, p. 904.

22. Ca. 8:5; Is. 45:10, 51:2, 54:1; cf. I Kings 4:19, III Kings 19:3,

Sir. 7:27, Ho. 9:11, 13:13.

23. Si. 19:11, 31 (34):5, 48:19, Jer. 4:31, 29(49):22. Cf. Ex. 15:14; Deut. 2:25, II Kings 22:6, Ps. 17(18):4,5, 47(48):6, 114(116):3, Is. 13:8, 21:23, 26:17, Jer. 6:24, 8:21, 13:21, 22:23, 27(50):43.

24. BAG, p. 904, and Strack-Billerbeck, I, 950. Cf. Is. 26:17, 66:7, Jer. 22:23, Hos. 13:13, Micah 4:9f, II Es. 7:62ff and 10:9ff.

25. Lange, p. 273: "The figure is happily chosen, not only because it announces a new birth and a new form of the earth, but because it reflects in travailing Eve the fate of the travailing earth, and vice versa."

Cf. Zahn, p. 525: "Der Vergleich selbst ist ein passender, weil die Schmerzen der Creatur, wie aus dem Vorigen klar ist, die Geburt einer neuen Welt aus der alten hinweisen."

26. Michel, p. 204: "συστενάζειν (v. 22) wird durch στενάζειν (v. 23) und στεναγμοῖς (v. 26) aufgenommen, so dass eine bestimmte Reihe oder Stufenfolge entsteht: Schöpfung, Sühnen Gottes, der Geist selbst. Damit ergibt sich eine Steigerung 'von unten nach oben'. Es fällt auf, dass das συνάδινειν nicht erläutert oder weitergeführt wird; es muss also eine Ergänzung zu συστενάζειν bilden."

27. Knox, p. 521: "We observed above Paul's sensitiveness to the pathos of nature's plight of subjection to futility; here he alludes more particularly to the sorrow of nature. He thinks of the sufferings of animals—the weak devoured by the strong—of the ruthless destruction of plant life, of natural catastrophes of all kinds; he listens, it is not too fanciful to suggest, to the crying of the wind and the sea; and he receives an impression that all of nature is 'groaning in travail together', i.e., in all its parts. The whole created world is crying out for release. . . ."

Moffatt's translation catches this emphasis on the groaning of creation: "To this day, we know, the entire creation sighs and throbs with pain" [emphasis added].

That the emphasis is on συστενάζει can also be seen from the only other passage in scripture in which both στενάζω and ἀδίνω occur together: Jeremiah 4:31, where the labor-pains imagery is used merely to heighten the impact of the anguished groaning.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alford, Henry. The Greek New Testament. II. Chicago: Moody Press, c. 1958.
- Althaus, Paul. "Der Brief an die Römer", Das Neue Testament Deutsch, Teilband 6. Herausgegeben von Paul Althaus und Gerhard Friedrich. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- Bartling, Walter James. "The Groaning Creation: An Exegetical Study of Romans 8:18-22." Unpublished Bachelor's Thesis, Concordia Seminary, 1948.
- Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated and adapted by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Bauernfeind, O[tto]. "μάταιος, ματαιότης, ματαιόω, μάτην, ματαιολογία, ματαιολόγος," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament [=TDNT]. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. IV. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, c. 1967, pp. 519-524.
- Beck, Nestor. "The Liberation of the Creature: A Study of the Interpretation of Romans 8:19-22 by Representative Lutheran Theologians." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Concordia Seminary, 1967.
- Bertram, G. "Apokaradokia", Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 49 (March-April 1958), 264-270.
- Bible, Holy. King James Version, 1611. New York: American Bible Society, n.d.
- Bible, Holy. Revised Standard Version, 1952. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons.
- Brinkman, B.R. "'Creation' and 'Creature', I: Some Texts and Tendencies (excluding Romans)," Bijdragen, 18 (Feb. 1957), 131ff.
- . "'Creation' and 'Creature', II: Texts and Tendencies in the Epistle to the Romans", Bijdragen, 18 (April 1957), 359-374.
- Bultmann, Rudolf, and Karl Heinrich Rengstorf. "ἐλπίς, ἐλπίζω, ἀπ-, προελπίζω," TDNT, II, 1966, pp. 517-535.
- Delling, Gerhard. "ἀποκαρδοκία," TDNT, I, 1965, p. 393.
- Denny, James. "St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans", The Expositor's Greek New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans' Pub. Co., [1897].



- Dodd, C.H. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, from "The Moffatt New Testament Commentary". London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932.
- Dubarle, A. "Le gémissément des créatures dans l'ordre divin du cosmos (Rom 8, 19-22)", Revue des sciences philosophiques et theologiques, 33 (1954), 445-465.
- Daddington, J.W. "Firstfruits of a Cosmic Redemption", Christianity Today, 3 (1959), 6-8.
- Fahy, Thomas. "Exegesis of Romans 8:16-25", Irish Theological Quarterly, 23 (1956), 178-181.
- Foerster, Werner. "κτίζω, κτίσις, κτίσμα, κτίστης," TDNT. III. c.1965, pp. 1000-1035.
- Frommann, Carl. "Ueber die seufzende Creatur", Jahrbuch für Deutsche Theologie, VIII (1863), 25-50.
- Gerber, U. "Röm. 8:18ff als exegetisches Problem der Dogmatik", Novum Testamentum, 8 (January 1966), 58-81.
- Godet, F[rederic]. Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Translated from the French by A. Cusin. Revised and edited by Talbot Chambers. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1883.
- Good News for Modern Man: The New Testament in Today's English. Second edition. New York: American Bible Society, c. 1966.
- Grundmann, Walter. "δέχομαι, δοχή, ἀποδέχομαι, ἀποδοχή, ἐκ-, ἀπεκ-, εἰσ-, προσδέχομαι, δεκτός, ἀπο-, εὐπρόσδεκτος," TDNT, II, 1966, pp. 50-59.
- Güemes, A. "La eleutheria en las Epístolas paulinas. Examen de textos. II. Epistola a los Romanos", Estudios Bíblicos, 22 (1963), 219-242.
- Hill, Edmund. "The Construction of Three Passages from St. Paul", Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 23 (March 1961), 296-301.
- Hitchcock. "'Every Creature' not 'all creation' in Romans 8, 22", The Expositor, 8th Series, II, (1916), 372-383.
- Hodge, Charles. Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. New Revised Edition. New York: A.C. Armstrong and Son, 1906.
- von Hofmann, J. Chr. Die Heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments, Theil 3. Nördlingen: C.H. Beck'sche Buchhandlung, 1868.
- Hommel, Hildebrecht. "Das Harren der Kreatur", in Schöpfer und Erhalter: Studien zum Problem Christentum und Antike. Berlin: Lettner Verlag, 1956.

- The Jerusalem Bible. General Editor, Alexander Jones. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., c. 1966.
- Kirk, K.E. The Epistle to the Romans. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937.
- Knox, John. "The Epistle to the Romans", The Interpreter's Bible, IX. Edited by George Buttrick, et al. New York: Abingdon Press, c. 1954.
- Kuss, Otto. Der Römerbrief. Zweite Lieferung (Röm 6, 11 bis 8, 19). Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1963.
- Lampe, G.W.T. "The New Testament Doctrine of Ktisis", Scottish Journal of Theology, 17 (April 1964), 449-462.
- Lange, John Peter. Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, XIX, "The Epistle OF Paul to the Romans". Translated from the German and edited with additions by Philip Schaff. Additional notes by M.B. Riddle. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, [1949].
- Lewis, E. "A Christian Theodicy: An Exposition of Romans 8:19-39", Interpretation, 11 (April 1957), 405-420.
- Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. A Greek-English Lexicon. Revised and augmented by Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie. Ninth Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Loane, Marcus L. The Hope of Glory: An Exposition of the Eighth Chapter in the Epistle to the Romans. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1968.
- Lyonnet, S. "Redemptio 'cosmica' secundum Rom. 8:19-23," Verbum Domini, 44 (5-6, 1966), 225-242.
- Mack, [M.J.]. "Ueber das Elend, die Sehnsucht und Hoffnung der Creatur. Erklärung der Stelle Röm. VIII, 16-25", Theologische Quartalschrift, 15 (1833), 601-638.
- Mackenzie, George. "'The Earnest Expectation of the Creature'", Expository Times, 5 (1893-1894), 333-334.
- Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Romans. Translated from the 5th German edition by John C. Moore and Edwin Johnson. Translation revised and edited by William P. Dickson. New York: Funk & Wagnells, Publishers, 1884.
- Michel, Otto. "Der Brief an die Römer", Kritisch- Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, begründet von Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer. Vierte Abteilung—13. Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.

- Moule, C.F.D. An Idiom Book of the Greek New Testament. Second edition. Cambridge: University Press, 1959.
- Moulton, James Hope. A Grammar of the New Testament, Vol. I, Prolegomena, 3rd edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1949.
- . A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. III Syntax (by Nigel Turner). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.
- Murray, John. "The Epistle to the Romans, Vol. I, Chapters 1 to 8", The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Edited by Ned B. Stonehouse. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., c. 1959.
- Neues Testament und Psalmen, nach der deutschen Uebersetzung D. Martin Luthers. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1961.
- The New English Bible: New Testament. Cambridge University Press, 1961.
- The New Testament. Translated by James Moffatt, in C. H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. London: Fontana Books, c. 1959.
- The New Testament in the Language of Today. Translated by William Beck. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1963.
- The New Testament in Modern English. Translated by J.B. Phillips. New York: Macmillan Company, 1959.
- Novum Testamentum Graece: cum apparatu critico curavit Eberhard Nestle, novis curis elaboraverunt Erwin Nestle et Kurt Aland. Editio vicesima quinta. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963.
- Oepke, Albrecht. "καλύπτω, κάλυμμα, ἀνα-, κατα-, ἀποκαλύπτω, ἀποκάλυψις," TDNT, III, pp. 556-592.
- Ogara, Fl. "'Expectatio creaturae revelationem filiorum Dei expectat'", Verbum Domini, 18 (1938), 193-201.
- Petrausch, Joachim. "An Analysis of Romans vii, 19-22", Irish Ecclesiastical Record, 105 (May 1966), 314-323.
- Philip, George. "Creation Waiting for Redemption, An Expository Study of Romans 8:19-22", Expository Times, 5 (1893-1894), 315-319, 415-416, 509-512.
- Philippi, Friedrich Adolf. Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Translated from the 3rd edition by J.S. Banks. Vol. II. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1879.

- von Rad, Gerhard, and Gerhard Kittel. "δοκέω, δόξα, δοξάζω, συνδοξάζω, ἔνδοξος, ἐνδοξάζω, παράδοξος," TDNT, II, 1966, pp. 232-255.
- Rengstorf, Karl Heinrich. "δοῦλος, σύνδουλος, δούλη, δουλεύω, δουλεία, δουλῶ, καταδουλῶ, δουλαγωγέω, ὀφθαλμοδουλεία," TDNT, II, 1966, pp. 261-281.
- Robertson, A.T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. Nashville: Broadman Press, c. 1934.
- Romaniuk, K. "Perspektywy 'cosmiczne' w soteriologii św. Pawła (Rz 8, 19-27) (Perspectives 'cosmiques' dans la sotériologie de S. Paul [Rom 8, 19-27])", Roczniki Teologiczne-Kanoniczne, 13 (1966), 81-94.
- Rupprecht, J.M. "Betrachtung der Stelle Röm 8, 18-23, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Erklärung derselben von Prof. Zyro," Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 24 (1851), 214-236.
- Sanday, William, and Arthur C. Headlam. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, in The International Critical Commentary. Edited by S.R. Driver, A. Plummer, and C.A. Briggs. Edingurgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902.
- Schlatter, A[dolf von]. Gottes Gerechtigkeit: Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief. Stuttgart: Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1935.
- Schlier, Heinrich. "ἐλεύθερος, ἐλευθερώ, ἐλευθερία, ἀπελεύθερος," TDNT, II, 1966, pp. 487-502.
- Schmidt, Hans Wilhelm. "Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer", Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament, VI, herausgegeben von D. Erich Fascher. Berlin: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 1962.
- Scott, Robert. "The Earnest Expectation of the Creature", Expository Times, 5 (1893-1894), 265.
- Stacey, W.D. "Paul's Certainties: II. God's Purpose in Creation, Romans 8:22-23", Expository Times, 69 (1958), 178-181.
- Stöckhardt, G. Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Römer. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1907.
- Strack, Hermann, and Paul Billerbeck. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, I and III. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1965 (4th edition).
- Swetnam, James. "On Romans 8,23 and the 'Expectation of Sonship'", Biblica, 48 (1967), 102-108.
- Thayer, Joseph Henry. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1889.

- Tisbe, Johann. Geist und Leben: Eine Auslegung von Römer 8. Heft 44 der Biblische Studien. Herausgegeben von Otto Weber. Neukirchen-Vlvyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins GmbH, c. 1965.
- Usteri, L. "Beitrag zur Erklärung der Röm 8, 19 u.f.", Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 5 (1832), 335-340.
- Viard, A. "Expectatio creaturae", Revue biblique, 59 (1952), 337-354.
- Volz, Paul. Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde in neutestamentlicher Zeitalter. Tübingen: Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1934.
- Winer, George Benedict. A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament. Translated from the 7th German edition by Henry Thayer. Andover: Warren F. Draper, 1839.
- Zahn, Theo. "Der Brief Paulus an die Römer", Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, VI. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. (Georg Böhme), 1910.
- . "Die Seufzende Creatur", Jahrbuch für Deutsche Theologie, X (1865), 511-604.
- Zyro, [F. Fr.]. "Neue Erklärung von Rom 8, 18-25", Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 18 (1845), 403-416.
- Zyro, F. Fr. "Neue Erörterung der Stelle Röm 8, 18-25", Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 24 (1851), 645-666.