

1-1-1958

## Justification by Faith in Modern Theology

Henry P. Hamann Jr.

*Concordia Seminary, St. Louis*

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



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Hamann, Henry P. Jr. (1958) "Justification by Faith in Modern Theology," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 29, Article 2.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol29/iss1/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concordia Theological Monthly by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

# Justification by Faith in Modern Theology

By HENRY P. HAMANN, JR.

[EDITORIAL NOTE. This is the first of a series of articles which will appear in this journal under this title. These articles are a condensation, especially in this first installment, and a reworking of the major section of a doctoral dissertation presented by the author to the faculty of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis. We are grateful to Dr. Hamann for this extra labor which makes it possible for a wider circle of readers to consider his findings than may be reached by the full original dissertation. This dissertation, we are happy to announce, has been published December 23, 1957, by the School for Graduate Studies of Concordia Seminary and may be obtained at the price of \$2.00 by addressing the Director of Graduate Studies, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.]

IN one of his justly famous *Gesammelte Aufsätze* entitled *Die Rechtfertigungslehre im Lichte der Geschichte des Protestantismus* Karl Holl quotes the scholar Lagarde as declaring that justification as a doctrine was dead — this was in 1873 — and that no one lived by it any longer. The far more pressing task, moderns tell us, is to show to modern man that there is a God. Whether there is a God at all is the problem he has to face, not something about God, say, that God justifies. To this criticism of the very *raison d'être* of this study we should reply that justification concerns questions which are perennially alive. No generation of men can be indifferent to the questions: How do I stand with God? How is God disposed to me? A doctrine which answers these questions cannot be temporally parochial. It must be in its very nature eternally valid. The God who justifies is what this generation needs, not merely the truth that God exists.<sup>1</sup> The bare

<sup>1</sup> By no means all moderns would agree with Lagarde. F. W. Dillistone, "The Recovery of the Doctrine of Justification by Faith," *Theology Today* (July 1954), pp. 199—209, defends strongly the relevance of the teaching of justification for the modern age. In opposition to Paul Tillich he declares: "It seems to me that this doctrine has taken on new relevance and even meaning through the witness of modern psychological studies." He refers to the stress laid in such studies on anxiety in modern life and the many attempts made by men to justify themselves, their work, and their existence. "Man has sought to justify himself in the presence of his predecessors . . . in the presence of his God — and all the time the threat of non-acceptance, meaninglessness, nothingness grows more alarming. Both society and the individual today are engaged in a frantic pursuit of self-justification. It is in the face of such a situation that the seers and prophets of our own day are proclaiming afresh the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith."

knowledge that God exists is useless knowledge for the individual if he does not know how God is disposed toward him. Does God exist? is not the existential question. That question is: Does God exist for me? Does He want me? And on what conditions? This is the question with which justification has to do.

The scope of this study of justification may be roughly described as being a triangle with the Lutheran Confessions at one point, modern views of justification at another, and St. Paul at the third. The question to be investigated is: Is the Lutheran teaching of justification a faithful interpretation of St. Paul? Or have modern views made the Lutheran interpretation untenable? It seems to me that modern views on the subject fall into two main points of attack on the Lutheran teaching, one direct, the other indirect. The direct attack is the modern view that holds justification to be regeneration. The indirect attack is the view that justification is only peripheral with St. Paul, so that Lutherans are guilty of distorting St. Paul by making justification the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*, the doctrine by which the church stands or falls. Only the material dealing with the direct attack will be presented in this series of articles.

### THE LUTHERAN TEACHING OF JUSTIFICATION

"We confess that we receive forgiveness of sins and are justified before God, not by our works, but by grace, for Christ's sake, through faith." This statement from a well-known Lutheran children's catechism is the brief summary, the classic formulation of the Lutheran teaching of justification. The unfolding and developing of the content of the four elements making up this definition must follow what is standard and normative for all Lutherans, the Lutheran Confessions of the Book of Concord, especially the Augsburg Confession.

#### a) Justify

Justification is, above all, forgiveness of sins. AC IV 1, 2; Ap IV 40, 41, 76; SA III 13; Ep III 4, 7; SD III 9, 10, 17, 62.<sup>2</sup> If justi-

<sup>2</sup> The following abbreviations are used for references to the Lutheran Confessions: AC, Augsburg Confession; Ap, Apology of the Augsburg Confession; SA, Smalcald Articles; SC, Small Catechism; LC, Large Catechism; FC, Formula of Concord; Ep, Epitome of the Formula; SD, Solida Declaratio of the Formula.

fiction is the forgiveness of sins, then justification is a *declaring* righteous, a forensic act. The same conclusion is demanded by the identification in the confessions of justification with the imputation of Christ's righteousness, or of His merits, or of His obedience. Ap IV 305 f.; XXI 19; SD III 56.

b) *By grace, not by works*

That the sinner is justified by grace alone without works is the plain statement of AC IV. Compare also Ep III 4; SD III 9—11, 36—39. But the confessional writings are replete with similar statements, repeated in ever new variations, so that a collection of them is quite unnecessary.

c) *For Christ's sake*

The polemic against works in the confessions is the reverse of their concern for Christ's honor as sole Savior. Everywhere "for Christ's sake" is understood as His vicarious atonement, AC IV 2; XX 9; SC-II II; SA-II I. In Art. III of the FC the righteousness of Christ is carefully defined as His obedience, both active and passive, and the view of Osiander that it is the righteousness of Christ within the believer is repudiated.

The *propter Christum* occupies a strategic position in the Lutheran formula, with close ties backward to the "by grace" and equally important connections forward to the final phrase "through faith." The decision over against Osiander shows how the "for Christ's sake" modifies the previous phrase. Osiander declared and could show that his aberrations did not violate the truth that all is of grace and that man can point to no merit of his own. The same was claimed by Major, who mingled justification and sanctification. The divine initiative was preserved by them both. *Soli Deo gloria* is not in itself a Christian tag.<sup>3</sup> Osiander and Major in spite of their insistence on grace did each in his own way let in works by the back door, and, in so doing, they robbed Christ of His glory. The proper understanding of the *propter Christum*

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Werner Elert, *Morphologie des Luthertums* (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1931), I, 90: "Es ist für das gesamte Luthertum von konstitutiver Bedeutung, dass es in dem kalvinischen Satze 'Alles zu Gottes Ehre' noch nichts spezifisch Christliches oder gar Evangelisches fand, als diese Ehre nicht dem in *Christo* offenbarten Gott erwiesen wird."

rigidly excludes works, upholds the grace of God and preserves Christ's glory. The *propter Christum* is just as important for the understanding of the next phrase "through faith."

*d) Through faith*

The place of faith in the matter of justification, according to the Confessions, is indicated already by the preposition used with it: *per fidem*, *durch den Glauben*, *through faith*. Particularly when this preposition is taken together with and in contrast with the *propter Christum*, we see that faith is sheer instrumentality, pure receptivity. To use the theological short cut, it is *medium ληπτικόν*, a means of reception. That faith justifies because it is a good work is repeatedly disavowed, Ap IV 109; SD III 13. Faith justifies merely because of its object. As objects of justifying faith we find the following: grace and the forgiveness of sins (AC XX 28), reconciliation through Christ (Ap IV 144), the promise of the Spirit (IV 128), Christ and, in Christ, the righteousness that avails before God (Ep III 5), God's grace and merits of Christ (SD III 38), etc. The objects of faith are, in short, all the gifts God would give us in Christ. *Fides est λατρεία quae accipit a Deo oblata beneficia*, "Faith is the service which accepts the benefits offered by God," Ap IV 49. It is this quality of faith as reception that enables it to be called righteousness. *Iustitia autem est fides in corde*, "Righteousness is faith in the heart," IV 263. So closely is faith tied to its object that by metonymy faith is named for its object. Faith in its essence is reception. Justification must be *per fidem*.<sup>4</sup>

The Confessions are at pains to ward off certain serious misunderstandings of their teaching of faith. Faith is not a general acceptance of the fact of God (Ap XII 60, 45), nor is it mere knowledge of the Gospel (AC XX 23; Ap IV 48, 148, 229, 337; Ep III 6; and especially SD IV 12), nor is faith compatible with an ungodly life, with mortal sin and the determination to sin (Ep III 11; SD III 26, 41; IV 15). Faith is always joined with love and good works (Ap IV *passim*), for faith is the starting point of new life

<sup>4</sup> Edmund Schlöcker, *Theologie der lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften*, 3d ed. (Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1948), p. 147. Cf. also his statement, p. 149: "Darum ist der Einsatz für das 'sola fide' identisch mit der Eifersucht und Leidenschaft, die über dem 'solus Christus' wacht."

in the believer, Ap IV 125 especially, but cf. also IV 64, 100, 374; SD III 36; IV 8, 10—12.

Our examination of the teaching of faith in the Confessions has revealed two quite different facts about it: first, that faith is the means through which the grace of God and the righteousness of Christ become the believer's, and secondly, that faith is the source and principle of the new life. In the former relation faith is pure reception, in the latter it is a creative power. It is because we are justified alone through faith without works that we are enabled to do good works. The exclusion of works in the article of justification establishes the possibility of good works in the article of sanctification. The objection that the Lutheran teaching of justification makes for moral laxity and destroys moral purpose we counter with the assertion that this teaching alone makes possible moral renewal.<sup>5</sup>

The teaching of the Confessions as here summarized is the Lutheran interpretation of the New Testament, in particular of the epistles of St. Paul. What do moderns have to say about this?

#### THE DIRECT ATTACK: JUSTIFICATION IS REGENERATION

In presenting the widespread modern view which makes justification essentially the same as regeneration, I shall allow a few authorities to speak as much as possible for themselves and refer to others in the notes. The first and completest speaker shall be:

*C. H. Dodd*

What Dodd means by justification we shall understand best after we have first seen what he says about matters closely connected with it. Everywhere is implicit the thought that man has it in him to become better. So Romans 7 is referred to the life of the apostle before his conversion. The following quotation shows what Dodd thinks of man: "It is a matter of common experience among men that a wrongdoer can best be helped to better ways if someone can be found for whose opinion he has the highest respect, and who will treat him, not as the hopeless wastrel he may have been, but

---

<sup>5</sup> For a complete statement of the Lutheran view concerning justification the statements of the Confessions on Law and Gospel are important. This material is omitted here in the interest of brevity.

as the decent citizen he has it in him to become. This was how Jesus treated the publicans and sinners."<sup>6</sup>

Dodd on Christ and His work:

The question in Paul's mind is not a question of the scarcely thinkable combination in one person of the contradictory attributes of transcendent Deity on the one hand and of a purely "natural" and non-divine humanity on the other. Humanity itself *means* Christ, and has no proper meaning without Him. Unless a man is a "son of God," he is so far less than a man: he has yet to grow "to a mature man, i. e., to the measure of the full stature of Christ." The history of man is the story of the course by which mankind is becoming fully human. The controlling Mind in this history — the "life-giving Spirit" of the whole process — Paul conceives as a real personality, standing already in that relation to God in which alone man is fully human; already, and eternally, Son of God.<sup>7</sup>

And:

Only if a man can come to believe that God Himself has passed the barrier of guilt and come to him, can religion help him to become better. Now, what Paul declares as "the Gospel of God" is that God has, in fact, not only passed the barrier, but removed it. The assurance that He has done so he finds in the fact of Christ. . . . With the Gospels before us, we must either agree with the enemies of Jesus that He suffered justly for an attitude to sin which undermined the foundations of morality; or we must concede that this way of dealing with sinful men is inherently divine, and an index to God's unchanging attitude to sinners. When a man comes to believe that, and accordingly trusts himself to God as thus conceived, he knows that the sense of guilt with which he has been oppressed does not separate him from God, and he can make a fresh start with divine assistance.<sup>8</sup>

And: "The Christ of Nazareth had one life only to live. . . . He must live again in countless human lives before He is fully Messiah of mankind."<sup>9</sup>

<sup>6</sup> *The Epistle to the Romans*, in the *Moffatt New Testament Commentary* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938), p. 84.

<sup>7</sup> *The Meaning of Paul for Today* (London: The Swarthmore Press Ltd., 1920), p. 89.

<sup>8</sup> *The Epistle to the Romans*, pp. 58 f.

<sup>9</sup> *The Meaning of Paul for Today*, p. 130.

That is to say, as Christ was a perfect man, every perfect man is a Christ. As perfect man Christ displayed God as a God of forgiveness, as a God who breaks down the barrier of guilt and comes to man. Now we are ready to understand what faith and justification mean to Dodd.

The following mixed bag of utterances on faith shows one thing plainly, which is that faith is pre-eminently a change of heart and that the object of faith is relatively unimportant. "Faith is that attitude in which, acknowledging our complete insufficiency for any of the high ends of life, we rely utterly on the sufficiency of God. It is to cease from all assertion of self, even by way of effort after righteousness, and to make room for the divine initiative. . . . It is an act which is the negation of all activity, a moment of passivity out of which the strength for action comes, because in it God acts."<sup>10</sup> It describes the attitude of pure receptivity in which the soul appropriates what God has done.<sup>11</sup>

On the other hand, we may accept the principle of what Christ did. We may accept it ". . . as those who are willing that the act and mind of God so revealed should be the principle of their own lives, and will leave the shaping of those lives to Him. This is what Paul calls 'faith.'"<sup>12</sup>

Accordingly, we find that justification is now defined in terms which make it the equivalent of regeneration. It makes little difference whether Dodd holds that to justify means "to declare righteous" or "to make righteous," for the thought that is developed is simply that any person who has the faith as described has in that faith a true righteousness on the basis of which he is righteous and looked upon as such by God, justified.

What is the actual state of mind of the "justified" person? He has disowned, not merely certain evil practices, but his own guilty self. . . . Outwardly, he is the same man he was . . . but really the man is changed through and through by that act of self-committal, self-abandonment to God. Before God he is indeed dead to sin and alive in quite a new way to righteousness. In fact, he is righteous, in a fresh sense of the word; in the sense in which

<sup>10</sup> *The Epistle to the Romans*, pp. 15 f.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 56.

<sup>12</sup> *The Meaning of Paul for Today*, pp. 106 f.



righteousness is no longer, so to say, quantitative, but qualitative; in which it consists not in a preponderant balance of good deeds achieved, but in a comprehensive attitude of mind and will.<sup>13</sup>

### *Vincent Taylor*

This is righteousness according to Vincent Taylor:

If the righteousness is real, it must have the positive notes of righteousness, that is to say, it must characterize a man as standing in complete conformity with the will of God. . . . As related to the doctrine of justification by faith, it need not, and indeed cannot, connote ethical perfection, since the entire life of a man, or even his past life, is not in question. What is in question is the character of his life, as he stands in the moment of a decision on which his future depends. What is his position in relation to God? . . . Does he cast himself wholly upon God, relying upon all that His grace has done for him in Christ and associating himself with all that redeeming activity is meant to express and do? When he so acts, he has stepped out of the category of the godless, and can be accepted by God as righteous, because, to the full extent of his present apprehension of the divine purpose for himself and the world, an apprehension ever growing from this focal moment in rightness and insight, he has identified himself with that purpose.<sup>14</sup>

This plainly agrees very closely with what Dodd says, a fact which Taylor himself acknowledges.<sup>15</sup> In one point, however, Taylor is dissatisfied with Dodd, and that is in the rather shabby role given to Christ and His work. Taylor wants to link justification and faith more decidedly with the redemptive work of Christ. But what Taylor actually advances is far from satisfactory, for he denies the vicarious nature of Christ's death.<sup>16</sup> The following quotation shows how Taylor links the redemption of Christ and the justification of man.

We are faced, then, by a double dilemma. The righteousness must be our own, but we cannot create it; it must be of God, but He cannot confer it; it must be ours, and of Him, at one and the same

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 110 f.

<sup>14</sup> *Forgiveness and Reconciliation* (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1941), p. 64.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 71.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 232.

time. . . . There is good reason to think that the best solution of the problem is one which sees in God's redemptive activity in Christ the perfect revelation and embodiment of the highest ethical values, of love, righteousness, and truth; an affirmation made in the name of mankind, which individual men, through faith, can re-affirm and make their own, thus finding in it the avenue of their approach to God.<sup>17</sup>

### James Stewart

In many a point James Stewart is more orthodox than the men so far considered, but at the very point which we are studying he falls into step with them. For him, too, at bottom justification is regeneration. One quotation will suffice.

There is no such thing in Paul's epistles as a mechanical imputing of the righteousness of Christ to sinners. Everything turns upon faith. Justification does not happen in a vacuum. It happens in a faith-pervaded atmosphere. Paul's faith-conception we have already examined. . . . The sinful soul, confronted with God's wonderful self-disclosure in Christ, and with the tremendous and subduing fact of the cross where the whole world's sins were borne, responds to that divine appeal and abandons itself to the love that stands revealed: and that response, that abandonment, Paul calls faith. *This is what God sees when He justifies the ungodly.* Far from holiness and truth and all that makes a son of God, the sinner may yet be: but at least his face is now turned in a new direction. He may still, like Abraham, be in the midst of paganism, but his heart is in the land of promise. He may still dwell, like Daniel, in Babylon, but his windows are "open toward Jerusalem." This is what God sees; and on the basis of this, God acts.<sup>18</sup>

What these three hold is a very common modern view, and a glance at the names mentioned in the last note will bear out this contention. All these hold that the change in man by faith

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 81.

<sup>18</sup> James S. Stewart, *A Man in Christ* (New York: Harper and Bros., n. d.), p. 256. My italics. Similarly William Sanday and A. C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, in *The International Critical Commentary*, 5th ed. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1905), p. 36: "When a man makes a great change such as that which the first Christians made when they embraced Christianity, he is allowed to start his career with a clean record. . . . The change is the great thing; it is that at which God looks." For similar views on regeneration as justification I refer the reader to

is the essential part of justification. Here all our authorities agree, although they may not agree whether regeneration and justification are to be one hundred per cent identified, or only eighty, if we may be permitted this short excursion into arithmetic. And it is just here where they all do decidedly disagree with the Lutheran Confessions, which in justification see only the grace of God, only Christ's obedience in doing and suffering, only faith as the means of receiving the unmerited gift of God. That faith is at the same time regeneration they do not dispute, but they do declare that faith as regeneration is not a thought that is in place when presenting the teaching of justification. As Adolf Koeberle has put it:

Lutheran theology has at all times felt it to be important, yes, essential, that the faith of justification should not be exchanged for or confused with the dynamic process of our moral healing and holiness. Certainly, where there is forgiveness of sins, there is also life, Christ gives also healing, renewal, sanctification, the new obedience, and the mystical union with Christ through faith. One should consider the gracious gift of God's love for sinners by itself in all its wonderful glory, and should write the material which deals with the renewal of life by the Holy Spirit on another page, because it is better not to describe with the same word both the perfect and the imperfect, both what has been definitely promised and what will and must still become.<sup>19</sup>

---

the following: C. S. Lewis, *Beyond Personality* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1945), pp. 28—31; Geoffrey C. Bosanquet, "St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans," *Catholic Quarterly Review* (July—September 1950), p. 179; Raymond T. Stamm, book review on Pierre Bonnard and Charles Masson, "L' Epitre de Saint Paul aux Galates," and "L' Epitre de Saint Paul aux Ephésiens," Vol. IX in *Commentaire du Nouveau Testament* (Neuchatel et Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé S. A., 1953), *Theology Today* (January 1954), p. 568; Paul L. Holmer, "Law and Gospel Re-examined," *Theology Today* (January 1954), pp. 477 ff.; R. A. Knox, *A New Testament Commentary for English Readers* (London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne Ltd., 1954), p. 83; Jacques Maritain, *The Living Thoughts of St. Paul*, trans. Henry Lorin Binsse (London: Cassell and Company Ltd., 1942), pp. 52 ff.; H. Lietzmann, *The Beginnings of the Christian Church*, trans. Bertram Lee Woolf (London: Lutterworth Press, 1953), pp. 116—121; Emil Brunner, *The Mediator*, trans. Olive Wyon (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c. 1947), pp. 523 f. and 591 f.; and *The Divine-Human Encounter*, trans. Amandus W. Loos (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c. 1943), pp. 100, 152—156.

<sup>19</sup> "Versöhnung und Rechtfertigung," *Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* (January 15, 1950), p. 5. The German original runs: "Es ist der lutherischen Theologie alle Zeit wichtig und wesentlich gewesen, dass der Rechtfertigungsglaube nicht verwechselt oder vermengt wird mit dem dynami-

## THE PAULINE ANSWER TO THE MODERN CONTENTION

It will be necessary to make a number of preliminary remarks concerning the convictions held by the writer of this article with respect to St. Paul and his writings.

One of his convictions pertains to the source of St. Paul's teachings. In keeping with Paul's own statements and the testimony of his writings as a whole he believes that the strongest influences by far in shaping Paul's theology were the Old Testament and the training he received from Gamaliel and other rabbis at Jerusalem. With respect to the latter, after Paul's conversion, this influence was restricted to the formal, to ways of expression and certain habits of thinking, for the very heart of rabbinism was displaced by the Christian Gospel. The writer believes that the influences of Hellenistic Judaism were, apart from the LXX, comparatively unimportant and that the influence of the pagan religions was to all intents and purposes nonexistent, although it is possible that the apostle borrowed a word here and there from the mystery religions and gave it a new meaning. In this view of the importance of the various possible sources of the Pauline theology he differs considerably from men like Klausner and Lietzmann, not to mention older writers, and accepts the findings of men like Holl, Machen, Moe, Stewart.<sup>20</sup>

The writer holds next that there is no good reason for denying the traditional view concerning the extent of the Pauline writings. Although many New Testament scholars are inclined to deny the

---

schen Prozess unserer sittlichen Heilung und Heiligung. Gewiss . . . wo Vergebung der Sünden ist, da ist auch Leben, da schenkt Christus auch . . . *sanatio, renovatio, sanctificatio, nova obedientia*, ja auch *mystica unio personalis per fidem*. . . . Man soll das Gnadengeschenk der Sünderliebe Gottes in seiner grossartigen Herrlichkeit für sich stehen lassen, und man soll das Kapitel, das von der Lebenserneuerung im Heiligen Geist handelt, auf ein anderes Blatt schreiben, weil man das Vollkommene und das Unvollkommene, das festgültig Zugesagte und das, was erst noch werden will und muss, besser nicht mit ein und demselben Wort bezeichnet."

<sup>20</sup> Joseph Klausner, *From Jesus to Paul*, trans. W. F. Stinespring (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1946); Lietzmann, op. cit.; Karl Holl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1928), II, 19; J. Gresham Machen, *The Origin of Paul's Religion* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1947), pp. 223—317; Stewart, op. cit., pp. 71—80; Olaf Moe, *The Apostle Paul: His Life and Work*, trans. L. A. Vigness (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1950), I, 136—140.

Pauline authorship of Ephesians and the Pastoral Epistles, the writer believes that all these are Pauline letters, although it is quite possible that he made free use of the services of an amanuensis in composing the Pastorals.

He agrees with the majority of scholars in the rather self-evident fact that Paul was no systematician and that his writings were very much occasional ones, called forth by specific questions, difficulties, and problems that needed immediate and authoritative answers. This fact, however, is decidedly not the case with respect to the Epistle to the Romans. The immediate occasion for that letter could have been met by the composition of a very short letter, containing, let us say, something of each of the present chapters 1 and 15. The Letter to the Romans is the mature fruit of years of missionary activity, a letter written in the comparatively quiet months after the struggle for recognition as a true apostle of Jesus Christ by the Corinthians and for the peace of that congregation. Romans, accordingly, must be granted first place in every attempt to present again the apostle's teaching, particularly his doctrine of justification. Next to Romans stands the Letter to the Galatians, a letter evoked by direct attacks specifically against his teaching of justification. The Letter to the Romans, as the more deliberate statement of his views, may possibly be the more valuable for an accurate presentation of the apostle's views. On the other hand, it might be argued that this fact is counteracted by the fact that the passion of Galatians makes for the greater sharpness of definition. In any case these two letters are the main ones for our purpose. A practical application of the principle of importance just enunciated is the following: It would be wrong method to deny the importance of some teaching in St. Paul on the ground that it does not appear in the majority of his letters. The apostle repeatedly took much for granted in his letters, so much sometimes that we might wish that he had stated his mind more fully. Nor is it reasonable to expect that every letter should say everything, since the letters were, as stated above, almost all of them, writings produced to meet a special situation. The wrong method just mentioned turns out, upon examination, to be a wrong use of the *argumentum e silentio*.

With these preliminaries out of the way, we may proceed to the examination of what St. Paul taught on justification, with particular reference to the problem that has been stated. We shall do this by examining in turn Paul's use of words connected with the idea of righteousness and justification, the Greek words exhibiting the stem δικ-, his use of the term πίστις, and his view of the position of Christ in the scheme of justification.

*(To be continued)*