

IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS

&

RESURRECTION

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO

ROMANS 5:16-19

BY MATTHEW KENNETH PAUL OLLIFFE

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF THEOLOGY

MOORE THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE

NEWTOWN NSW

2014

Certification

Candidate: Matthew Kenneth Paul Olliffe

I certify that the substance of this dissertation of 54,958 words (excluding table of contents, bibliography, footnotes, primary source block quotations, primary source lists, and bible references in brackets) has not previously been submitted for any degree and is not currently being submitted for any other degree.

I also certify that any assistance received in conducting the research embodied in the dissertation, and all sources used, have been acknowledged in the text or notes.

Supervisor: Dr Philip Kern

I consider that this dissertation is in a form suitable for examination and conforms to the requirements of Moore College for the degree of Master of Theology.

Table of Contents

Certification	2
Synopsis	5
Chapter 1: Introduction: Definitions & Issues.....	9
1. Christ's 'Active' and 'Passive' Obedience	9
2. The recent imputation debates and Romans 5:18-19.....	17
3. Reasons for revisiting Romans 5:18-19	19
Chapter 2: Genesis 15:6 and the meaning of righteousness (δικαιοσύνη)	25
Genesis 15:6.....	25
Righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) in Paul.....	27
Righteousness as 'relational status'	28
Righteousness as 'covenant faithfulness'	29
Righteousness as 'conformity to a norm'	30
Righteousness as 'merit'	34
Chapter 3: Paul's appropriation of Genesis 15:6 in Romans 4.....	38
The syntax of Genesis 15:6 Romans 4:3	39
'Faith' is 'Righteousness'	40
The ungodly believer is considered 'as if' he is righteous.....	40
Chapter 4: Receiving and possessing the gift of righteousness (Romans 5:17)	57
Receiving Righteousness as a Gift (Romans 5:15-17).....	58
Scholars who cannot take 'the gift of righteousness' (Romans 5:17)	61
Righteousness and Metaphor: The Search for a Model.....	65
The Relational Model of δικαιοσύνη.....	66
The Attribution Model of δικαιοσύνη	67
Reified δικαιοσύνη	67
Righteousness as a 'possession' in the Old Testament	71
The two types of δικαιοσύνη and its 'possession'	74
Romans 9:30-10:6	74
The Righteousness of God (δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ).....	76
Philippians 3:9	79
Chapter 5: The Meaning of δικαίωμα and δικαίωσις, and the motif of resurrection in Romans 4.....	86
Accidence and word formation of δικαίωμα and δικαίωσις.....	86
Δικαίωμα in Secular Greek Usage.....	87
Δικαίωμα in the LXX	101
Δικαίωμα in the NT	104
Δικαίωμα in Paul (Romans 1:32; 2:26)	105
Δικαίωσις	106
The Resurrection in Romans 1-4 and Romans 4:25	108
Διὰ with the accusative in 4:25a-b	111
Meaning of τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν in 4:25b.....	112

Chapter 6: The Resurrection in Romans 5	
and the Meaning of δικαίωμα in Romans 5:16	115
Resurrection in Romans 5:1-11	115
Paul's <i>a fortiori</i> 'light and heavy' Argument	116
Discourse and Syntactical Analysis (Romans 5:15-19)	118
The referent of ἐνός (verses 12, 15-19)	121
Δικαίωμα in Romans 5:16	125
Δικαίωμα as the believer's justifying decree of life	140
Chapter 7: The ἐνός δικαιώματος of Romans 5:18	142
Arguments for the Consensus	144
Responding to the Consensus	145
Isaiah 53:10-11 MT and LXX	155
1 Corinthians 15:21-22	161
A Scholarly Movement to Change our Understanding of δικαίωμα in 5:18b	167
Δικαιώσις in Romans 5:18	170
Chapter 8: The referent of τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνός	
and the action of καθίστημι (Romans 5:19)	173
The referent of τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνός	174
The action of καθίστημι	177
Καθίστημι in the LXX as 'appoint'	177
Καθίστημι in the LXX as 'stand' or 'set'	179
Καθίστημι in the LXX as 'make', 'constitute' or 'establish'	180
Καθίστημι in the LXX as an equative verb	182
The quasi-accounting use of καθίστημι as 'consider', 'reckon' in the LXX	182
The forensic use of καθίστημι as 'stand trial', 'arraign' in the LXX	183
Καθίστημι in the Graeco-Roman Corpus	186
Καθίστημι in the New Testament	191
The meaning of δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί (Romans 5:19d)	194
Justification at the final judgment	200
The meaning of ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί (Romans 5:19b)	210
Chapter 9: Beyond Romans 5:	
Re-evaluating δικαιοῦ in Romans 6:7 and δικαίωμα in Romans 8:4	216
Re-evaluating 'The one who died has been justified from sin' (Romans 6:7)	216
Exegesis	220
Re-evaluating τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν (Romans 8:4)	228
Paul and the Law	231
Exegesis	241
Chapter 10: Conclusion	260
Bibliography	263

Synopsis

‘Chapter 1: Introduction: Definitions & Issues’ clarifies the systematic-theological terms ‘active’ and ‘passive’ obedience of Christ, in the light of the recent interaction between exegetes and systematicians in the debates about imputation. The recent interpretation of Romans 5:18-19, particularly δικαίωμα, differs markedly to that which pertained historically. Some advocates of imputation adopt an exposition of Romans 5:18-19 that is vulnerable to criticism. Reasons for re-examining Romans 5:18-19 are provided.

Chapters 2 to 3 provide an analysis of important exegetical matters that partly have arisen from the recent debates about imputed righteousness and partly from trends in NT scholarship. They provide necessary preparation for the main contentions of this thesis.

‘Chapter 2: Genesis 15:6 and the meaning of righteousness (δικαιοσύνη)’ analyzes the key text (Genesis 15:6MT/LXX) which uses the language of ‘imputation’ (λογίζομαι) and ‘righteousness’ (δικαιοσύνη). It investigates whether δικαιοσύνη has an habitual moral or ethical connotation. ‘Chapter 3: Paul’s appropriation of Genesis 15:6 in Romans 4’ analyses the Pauline usage, informed by a parallel construction in Romans 2:26.

Chapters 4 to 8 form the heart of the thesis. These chapters not only test and apply insights from NT scholarship to Romans 5:16-19, but also extends the application of some recent Pauline scholarship, and challenges other exegetical decisions of modern scholars, whether ‘Reformed’, ‘broadly Evangelical’ or ‘NPP’.

‘Chapter 4: Receiving and possessing the gift of righteousness (Romans 5:17)’ exegetes Romans 5:17 in context, and argues that the text ‘those who receive the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness’ (οἱ τὴν περισσεΐαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες), in the light of Philippians 3:9 and Romans 9:30-10:6, provides a corrective for those who assert that ‘righteousness’ cannot be given or possessed. It also discusses the relationship of imputation of righteousness with the motif of union with Christ.

Chapters 5 to 8 engage in detailed exegesis of Romans 5:16, 18-19 in context, with discussion of the key terms δικαίωμα and δικαίωσις. ‘Chapter 5: The Meaning of δικαίωμα and δικαίωσις and the motif of resurrection in Romans 4’, consists of a broad usage survey of δικαίωμα and δικαίωσις in the Graeco-Roman corpus, the LXX, the non-Pauline NT, and Paul’s usage prior to 5:16, 18 and 8:4, and closes with exegesis of Romans 4:25 in context. The motif of resurrection (Romans 1:4, 4:17, 24-25; cf 1:17; 2:8) brings the resurrection of Christ into relationship with Paul’s doctrine of justification.

‘Chapter 6: The Resurrection in Romans 5 and the Meaning of δικαίωμα in Romans 5:16’ continues the analysis of the motif of resurrection into Romans 5, determines the probable referent of ἐνός in verses 12, 15-19, and assesses the recent suggestion of J R D Kirk, that δικαίωμα means in Romans 5:16, ‘judgment’, ‘penalty’, or ‘reparation’, and not ‘justification’,¹ against the modern consensus.

¹ Kirk, ‘Reconsidering *Dikaiōma*’ (2007), 787-92.

‘Chapter 7: The ἐνὸς δικαίωματος of Romans 5:18’ argues that δικαίωμα in Romans 5:18 should be rendered ‘sentence of justification’, as it is in Romans 5:16, against the modern exegetical consensus. The phrase ‘the justification of the one’, refers to the resurrection of Christ as his divine judicial vindication, which then produces the ‘justification of life’ for those in Christ. Support for this contention is found in Isaiah 53:11LXX and 1 Corinthians 15:21-22, 45-49, and the arguments of some modern NT scholars. Imputation’s modern advocates will find that if they accept these arguments, which simply re-institute the accepted understanding of δικαίωμα from Augustine to the start of the 20th Century, they will have a sound foundation for the exegetical grounding of the imputation of Christ’s active obedience in Romans 5:19, subject to the findings of Chapter 8.

‘Chapter 8: The referent of τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς and the action of καθίστημι (Romans 5:19)’ finds firstly that ‘the obedience of the one’ refers to the whole course of Christ’s obedience, and there is no reason why any of Christ’s obedience should be excluded from its reference. Second, after a survey of Graeco-Roman, LXX and NT texts, the conclusion is drawn that καθίστημι in Romans 5:19 means ‘judicially establish’ (cf Susanna 1:60LXX), and does not connote ‘transformative righteousness’. Thus Romans 5:19 teaches that through the obedience of Jesus Christ, being his entire life of obedience to the precept of the Mosaic law, and any other intratrinitarian command received by him, the many will in the future be judicially established as righteous before the tribunal of God. Further, against a number of proposals, both the ground and instrument of initial and final justification is seen to be the same, the ground being the active and passive obedience of Christ, and the instrument being faith. Justification’s beginning, continual progress, and consummation is by fiduciary faith, not works (however categorised).

The final chapter ‘Chapter 9: Beyond Romans 5: Re-evaluating δικαίω in Romans 6:7 and δικαίωμα in Romans 8:4’ provides an initial sounding which works out the implications of the exegesis offered in Chapters 4 to 8 to two key texts in justification debates.

First, in Romans 6:7, (‘For the one who died has been justified from sin’), it is suggested that Paul is speaking primarily about Christ’s own experience of death and resurrection, the latter of which was his justification, and secondarily about the believer’s union with Christ in that justification, in which both Christ’s death (Romans 3:21-26; 4:25) and resurrection (Romans 4:25, 5:18-19; cf Romans 5:9-10) bring about the believer’s justification. The justification spoken of is forensic.

Second, another key text (Romans 8:3-4), thought by many to say nothing regarding imputation, is considered in context, especially the key phrase τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν (8:4). After providing an account of Paul and the law in Romans 1-7, and especially looking at Paul’s apology for the law in Romans 7:7-25, an account of Christ’s coming ‘in the likeness of the flesh of sin and for sin’ entails that Christ fulfilled the law’s precept and bore the law’s curse. The polyvalent genitive τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου firstly refers to the justification of the Mosaic law, the topic of Romans 7:7-25, which comes by the justification of the Christ, who received court-approved righteousness (Romans 5:18), and secondly refers to ‘the justification that the law requires’. It is fulfilled ἐν ἡμῖν by God because the theatre of sins operations was ‘in us’ (Romans 7:14-25), and because Christ dwells in our hearts by faith (Galatians 2:20-21; Ephesians 3:16-17).

Chapter 1

Introduction: Definitions & Issues

Introduction

This thesis assesses on exegetical grounds the Reformed systematic-theological concept of ‘imputed righteousness’, and whether both the ‘active’ and ‘passive’ obedience of Christ is imputed to the believer in justification. This necessitates interaction between two distinct domains of discourse, exegesis and theology.² In this introduction, first the systematic-theological terms pertaining to imputation will be analysed. Second, the place of Romans 5:18-19 in the recent debates about imputation will be introduced. Third, reasons for re-examining Romans 5:18-19 will be given.

1. Christ’s ‘Active’ and ‘Passive’ Obedience

Christ’s obedient work as the Mediator [...] was distinguished by the scholastics into *obedientia activa* and *obedientia passiva*, active and passive obedience. The *obedientia activa* describes the life of Christ from his birth to his passion, and particularly his ministry, during which Christ acted sinlessly and in perfect obedience to the will of God. The *obedientia passiva* refers to Christ’s passion, during which he accepted passively, without any resistance, the suffering and cross to which he was subjected for the satisfaction of sin.³

The term ‘passive obedience’ does not mean that in anything Christ did was he passive, the involuntary victim of obedience imposed upon him [...] The distinction between the active and passive obedience is not a distinction between periods.⁴

In current discourse concerning Christ’s ‘active’ and ‘passive’ obedience, there is confusion as to the meaning of the distinction among both systemeticians and exegetes. Muller’s definition above sharply distinguishes two phases of Jesus’ life chronologically, and imports

² Carson, ‘Vindication of Imputation’ (2004), 47.

³ Muller, *Dictionary* (1985), 205.

⁴ Murray, *Redemption Accomplished and Applied* (1961), 21

notions of passivity and activity. This is at variance with Murray and others, who distinguish between Christ's 'active' obedience to the law's precepts, and his 'passive' obedience rendered to the law's penalty.⁵ Murray's analysis is to be preferred to Muller's. It seems that traditional Reformed systematic theology used 'the righteousness of Christ' to refer to Christ's 'active obedience' to the precepts of the law,⁶ mainly during his pre-crucifixion earthly life, but not to the exclusion of his death. By contrast, Christ's 'passive obedience' traditionally refers not to Christ's 'passivity' to the Father's will, but the obedience that leads up to and results in Christ's 'passion', that is, his sacrificial death as a penal satisfaction for sin. The English adjective 'passive' is derived from the Latin verb *patior*, 'I suffer, endure'.⁷ Sometimes this distinction is expressed by distinguishing Jesus' 'blood' ('passive' obedience) from his 'righteousness' ('active' obedience).

For clarity in this thesis, this first distinction shall be labeled '**the essential or proper distinction**'. The distinction is between Christ's obedience to the law's 'precept' (active) and 'penalty' (passive). This is the traditional distinction used by Reformed theologians. Christ's active obedience fulfills the *precept* of the law, which can be stated as 'do this and you shall live'.⁸ Christ's active obedience is rendered to the law's commands by doing them.⁹ In contrast, Christ's passive obedience satisfies the *penalty* of the law, which can be stated as

⁵ Murray, *Redemption Accomplished and Applied* (1961), 20-1; Reymond, 'The Obedience of Christ' (1984), 785.

⁶ Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology* (1889-94), 720-2; R L Dabney, *Systematic Theology* (1878), 626-6; Buchanan, *Doctrine of Justification* (1867), 333-4.

⁷ Clark, 'Do This and Live' (2007), 230; cf Baker, 'Obedience of Christ' (1988), 474

⁸ Leviticus 18:5; Romans 7:10; 10:5.

⁹ Galatians 3:12.

‘the soul that sins shall die’.¹⁰ Christ’s passive obedience is rendered to the law’s curse by enduring it.¹¹

This proper or essential distinction between Christ’s active and passive obedience is fluid. Christ was *commanded* to offer satisfaction, and thus his ‘passive’ obedience is in a sense ‘active’, as it was rendered in obedience to the Father’s *precept* to redeem and to the moral law, ‘love your neighbor as yourself’.¹² Moreover, Christ conceivably bore the law’s curse (properly ‘passive obedience’) by bearing the sickness and diseases of his people as he went around doing good.¹³ Nevertheless, the ‘essential or proper distinction’ between Christ obeying the law’s precept and enduring its penalty serves a heuristic purpose. It provides conceptual clarification when it is denied that Christ’s preceptive obedience is part of the righteousness with which the believer is justified, or when it is asserted that Christ’s penal obedience alone is imputed.¹⁴

For further clarity, a second and more fluid and controversial distinction¹⁵ is made in this thesis. This distinction follows strictly only as a connotation of the ‘essential or proper distinction’. This second distinction relates to the time when each aspect of Christ’s obedience was rendered, and will be labeled the ‘**chronological distinction**’. It is evident in Muller’s definition above. Christ’s active obedience is mainly demonstrated in his sinless pre-crucifixion life of obeying the law’s precepts. However, this was not to the exclusion of

¹⁰ Ezekiel 18:4; Romans 1:32; 6:23.

¹¹ Galatians 3:10, 13; Reymond, ‘The Obedience of Christ’ (1984), 785; idem, *Systematic Theology* (1998), 631; Clark, ‘Do This and Live’ (2007), 230.

¹² Leviticus 19:18; Luke 22:42; John 4:34; 6:38; 15:13; Hebrews 10:5-8.

¹³ Acts 10:38; Matthew 8:14-17; Isaiah 53:4.

¹⁴ C Hodge, *Systematic Theology* (1946), 3:149-150.

¹⁵ Murray, *Redemption Accomplished and Applied* (1961), 21; Schreiner, ‘Justification: Saving Righteousness’ (2011), 30.

his death. Christ's passive obedience is mainly demonstrated in his sin-bearing death bearing the law's curse. However, this is not to the exclusion of his earthly life and ministry. Clark is probably right to say that 'it is not the intent' of the terminology to distinguish the work of Christ chronologically.¹⁶ However, many with Muller now express 'active' and 'passive' obedience using this temporal distinction,¹⁷ and Muller draws a sharp distinction between Jesus' 'ministry' and 'passion'.¹⁸ Perhaps it is best seen as a shorthand simplification, in which the primary reference of Christ's 'passion' is to his death

A related factor contributing to confusion is that 'passive' obedience can suggest to the English reader either Christ's 'passion' (thus Christ's suffering) or 'passivity' (thus connoting ideas of receptivity and infliction, not activity, initiative or positive performance). Thus, Muller's exposition explicitly used the words 'acted' and 'accepted passively'.¹⁹ Likewise, Vickers imports notions of 'passivity/activity' in his exposition of the distinction.²⁰ Vickers' 2013 statement, '*Passive* does not mean *passivity*'²¹ (his emphasis) seems to be a clarification subsequent to 2006. Thus, a third distinction has arisen, between 'passivity' and 'activity'. Some indeed call this an error.²² However, identifying this use of the terminology is necessary to understand the recent debates. It will be labeled **'the passivity-activity distinction'**. In the recent controversies, 'passive obedience' has been used (perhaps incorrectly) to describe Christ's 'passivity'. According to Muller, Protestant scholasticism

¹⁶ Clark, 'Do This and Live' (2007), 230.

¹⁷ Oden, *Classic Christianity*, (1992), 410; Seifrid, *Christ, Our Righteousness* (2000), 175; Vickers, *Jesus' Blood and Righteousness* (2006), 196; Frame, *Salvation Belongs to the Lord* (2006), 203; Horton, *Covenant and Salvation*, (2007), 114-115.

¹⁸ Muller, *Dictionary* (1985), 205.

¹⁹ Muller, *Dictionary* (1985), 205. Pace Murray, *Accomplished and Applied* (1961), 20; Clark 'Do This and Live' (2007), 230.

²⁰ Vickers, *Jesus' Blood and Righteousness* (2006), 44, 149, 197.

²¹ *Justification by Grace* (2013), 39 fn 10.

²² Clark, 'Do This and Live' (2007), 230; Murray, 'The Obedience of Christ' (1977), 154; idem, *Redemption Accomplished and Applied* (1961), 19-21; Pace Muller, *Dictionary* (1985), 205.

recognised 'passivity' and 'activity' within the 'obedience of Christ', but not to define the difference between 'active' and 'passive' obedience, but in describing certain characteristics of Christ's obedience considered as a whole:

[T]he *obedientia Christi* is both an *actio passiva*, a passive action, and a *passio activa*, an active passion. *Actio passiva* refers to Christ's subjection to the law, while *passio activa* refers to the real obedience of his life and death.²³

Following from this, and contributing to terminological confusion, there are elements of Christ's 'active obedience' proper that are 'passive' in terms of the 'essential distinction', because in them Christ bears the law's curse (eg Christ healed sick people, part of his love for his neighbour, thus carrying their diseases, part of the Deuteronomic curse).²⁴ There are elements of Christ's active obedience that are 'passive' in terms of the 'chronological distinction', because they occur in His 'passion' (eg Christ's obedience to the decree to redeem, and thus love his neighbour).²⁵ And there are elements of Christ's 'active obedience' that are passive in terms of the 'passivity/activity distinction', because Christ is receptive in them (eg Christ's loving reception of anointing).²⁶

Conversely, there are elements of Christ's 'passive obedience' proper that are 'active' in terms of the 'essential distinction', because Christ obeyed a precept of the Father to lay down his life and love his neighbour in his satisfaction.²⁷ There are elements of Christ's 'passive obedience' that are active in terms of the 'chronological distinction', because they occur during his infancy, childhood, and earthly ministry (eg Christ's circumcision).²⁸ And

²³ Muller, *Dictionary* (1985), 206.

²⁴ Deuteronomy 28:21-22, 27-29, 35, 60-61; Isaiah 53:4; Matthew 8:16-17.

²⁵ Hebrews 10:7.

²⁶ Matthew 26:6-13; Mark 14:3-9; Luke 7:36-50; John 12:1-8.

²⁷ Leviticus 19:18.

²⁸ Matthew 2:21-24; Galatians 4:4.

there are also elements of Christ's 'passive obedience' that are active in terms of the 'activity-passivity' distinction, because Christ voluntarily and actively offered his life.²⁹

For all these reasons, Murray denied that there is either a chronological element or notion of passivity or activity in the distinction, and maintained only the 'essential distinction'.³⁰

With such conceptual overlap, the fallacy of equivocation is a danger. Such appears to have occurred for Vickers. Vickers (2006) frequently and correctly demonstrates the 'active' element in Christ's 'passive obedience'³¹ (the 'passivity/activity distinction'), rightly observing that Christ actively obeyed God during the passion.³² However, showing that Christ's passion is an 'active passion' does not necessarily imply that Christ's 'active obedience' proper, being the whole course of Christ keeping the law's precepts, is imputed to the believer. Perhaps Vickers equated the *passio activa* of Christ's *obedientia passiva* with Christ's *obedientia activa*, when he said that the cross itself displays 'both active and passive obedience'.³³ This may well be because Vickers has imported 'active/passive' notions into his definitions.³⁴ If so, Vickers' terminological slippage causes confusion, because traditionally the *obedientia activa* was offered by Christ in fulfilment of the law's precept, which humans are bound to offer to God. By contrast, the *obedientia passiva* is a satisfaction, offered by Christ to fulfil the penalty of the law. In theological language, Vickers has only established that Christ's satisfaction is an active passion, and perhaps even

²⁹ John 10:18.

³⁰ Murray, *Redemption Accomplished and Applied* (1961), 20-22.

³¹ Vickers, *Jesus' Blood and Righteousness* (2006), 148-9, 196-7, 228.

³² Eg: Vickers, *Jesus' Blood and Righteousness* (2006), 197.

³³ *ibid*, 196-7.

³⁴ Vickers, *Jesus' Blood and Righteousness* (2006), 44, 148-49.

obedience in response to the precept of the eternal decree to redeem.³⁵ But the attempt to ground imputed righteousness in these facts alone proves unconvincing.³⁶

Vickers qualified his terminology by saying it is 'not a mere defence of the traditional arguments even though the terms are employed'.³⁷ More recently, Vicker's has stated: '*Passive* does not mean *passivity*'. Rather, it has to do with Christ's passion' (emphasis original).³⁸ This is a clarification given his 2006 emphasis on the 'activity/passivity' distinction. Nevertheless, Vickers returned almost immediately to the 'activity/passivity' distinction.³⁹ In this regard, Burk rightly observes that 'Vickers suggests a redefinition of Christ's active obedience' and that 'Vickers thinks that Paul does not necessarily have this total obedience to the law in mind when speaking of Christ's obedience in Rom 5:19'.⁴⁰

Vickers' attempt to reconfigure Christ's 'active obedience' faces a number of theological problems. An attempt to ground Christ's 'active obedience' upon the intra-Trinitarian command from the Father to the Son to offer a satisfaction (eg John 6:38), would face the systematic-theological difficulty that such a precept is not required of either Adam, of those under the law of Moses, or by the law written on the Gentile heart. It is difficult to see how it could be said to be fulfilled vicariously by Christ on behalf of his people. Only Christ was ever commanded to be a Mediator offering himself as a satisfaction for his people.⁴¹ Christ certainly offered his satisfaction as an expression of love for neighbour.⁴² Christ certainly

³⁵ Vickers, *Jesus' Blood and Righteousness* (2006), 148 fn 135.

³⁶ *ibid*, 196-7.

³⁷ *ibid*, 197 fn 6.

³⁸ Vickers, *Justification by Grace* (2013), 39 fn 10.

³⁹ *Ibid*, 40, 41.

⁴⁰ Burk, 'Review Article: Jesus' Blood and Righteousness' (2007), 118.

⁴¹ Exodus 32:32; Psalm 49:7; Romans 9:3.

⁴² John 15:13; Leviticus 19:18.

obeyed to the extent of death on a cross, and in doing the greatest act of love, he might be said to have demonstrated the whole.⁴³ But this does not demonstrate that *on behalf of his people* Christ has kept the law's precepts, which 'active obedience' requires from a systematic-theological perspective.

In this thesis, the 'essential and proper' distinction between Christ's active and passive obedience is employed. While the other two distinctions are evident in current discussions, they introduce unnecessary confusion.

In systematic-theological discourse, 'Christ's merit' originally probably referred to both Christ's active and passive obedience,⁴⁴ but it now denotes Christ's 'active obedience'.⁴⁵ 'Christ's satisfaction' refers to his 'passive obedience'.⁴⁶ When these distinctions were first formulated is debated.⁴⁷

⁴³ Philippians 2:7-8; Berends, 'The Obedience of Jesus Christ' (2001), 26-51 at 49.

⁴⁴ Muller, *Dictionary* (1985), 190.

⁴⁵ Clark, 'Do This and Live' (2007), 234.

⁴⁶ Muller, *Dictionary* (1985), 271-2.

⁴⁷ Muller, *Dictionary* (1985), 205; Berends, 'Obedience of Jesus Christ' (2001), 34, 36; Pelikan, *Christian Tradition* (1984), 4:164; Clifford, *Atonement and Justification* (1990), 190, 198 n 28; Kirk, 'Sufficiency (I)' (2006), 37.

2. The recent imputation debates and Romans 5:18-19

The doctrine of the imputation of Christ's active obedience has been subject to challenge within the protestant churches,⁴⁸ especially in recent decades. Traditionally, Romans 5:18-19 was one of the *sedes doctrinae* (seat of doctrine)⁴⁹ for imputed righteousness.⁵⁰ This is no longer so.

¹⁸Therefore, then, just as one [man's] transgression (δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος) led to condemnation (εἰς κατάκριμα) for all men, thus also one [man's] *dikaíomatos* (δι' ἑνὸς δικαίωματος) led to justification of life (εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς) for all men. ¹⁹For just as through the disobedience of the one man (διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου) the many were established sinners, thus also through the obedience of the one [man] (διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς) the many will be established righteous. (my translation)

Most modern exegetes, regardless of their view of imputation, find that Romans 5:18-19 does not refer to Christ's active obedience, only to his passive obedience.⁵¹ Of those who find Christ's active obedience in the phrases ἑνὸς δικαίωματος and τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς,⁵² most make exegetical decisions that make their adherence to the imputation of Christ's active obedience appear anomalous.⁵³ The exception is Cranfield, whose rendering 'through the righteous conduct of the one' can exegetically ground imputed righteousness.⁵⁴

⁴⁸ McGrath, *History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification* (2005), 272-3; Berends, 'The Obedience of Jesus Christ' (2001), 32-40; Bavinck, *Reformed Dogmatics* (2008), 4:223; Clark, 'Do This and Live' (2007), 230-7.

⁴⁹ Muller, *Dictionary* (1985), 278.

⁵⁰ *Westminster Confession of Faith* (1646), 11.1; A A Hodge, *Confession of Faith* (1958), 179; Kirk, 'Sufficiency (1)' (2006), 43.

⁵¹ Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:284; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 344; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 287; Wright, *Resurrection of the Son of God* (2003), 250; idem, 'Romans' (2002), 529; Witherington & Hyatt, *Romans* (2004), *Romans*, 150; Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 386; Matera, *Romans* (2010), 140, 141, 142, 144; Wright, *Justification: God's Plan* (2009), 200-1; Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 251; Hultgren, *Romans* (2011), 229; Berends, 'The Obedience of Jesus Christ' (2001), 45; Colijn, *Images of Salvation*, (2010), 210; Kirk, 'Sufficiency' (1) (2006), 51-52; Clifford, 'Justification: The Calvin-Saumur perspective' (2007), 346.

⁵² Romans 5:18-19.

⁵³ Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:201; Piper, *Counted Righteous* (2002), 110-114, Fesko, *Justification* (2008), 155; Clark, 'Do This and Live' (2007), 248; Vickers, *Jesus' Blood and Righteousness* (2006), 148-9; idem, *Justification by Grace* (2013), 39.

⁵⁴ Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:289.

For example, Murray decides in Romans 5:18 that ἐνὸς δικαιώματος means ‘one righteous act’ but then expounds this as synonymous with ‘the righteousness of the one’, with the following justification:

If the question be asked how the righteousness of Christ could be defined as ‘one righteous act’, the answer is that the righteousness of Christ is regarded in its compact unity in parallelism with the one trespass, and there is good reason for speaking of it as the one righteous act because, as the one trespass is the trespass of the one, so the one righteousness is the righteousness of the one and the unity of the person and of his accomplishment must always be assumed.⁵⁵

This seems to beg the question, because Murray’s assumption of the ‘compact unity’ of Christ and his accomplishment, not exegesis, grounds his exposition of ‘one righteous act’ as ‘the righteousness of the one’. On the basis of his exegetical decision that ἐνὸς δικαιώματος means ‘one righteous act’, Murray (and those following him)⁵⁶ cannot exegetically demonstrate that Romans 5:18-19 refers to Christ’s active obedience. Piper, more consistently than Murray, asserts that imputation does not depend on showing that the phrases in Romans 5:18-19 refer to Christ’s active righteousness.⁵⁷ Piper must concede this, because Romans 5:18-19, as currently understood, does not teach it. Consequently, many defenders of imputation rely heavily on covenantal theology to ground their exegesis.⁵⁸

A similar inconsistency to that of Murray is demonstrated by Vickers, who accepts of Romans 5:18-19 that ‘Paul’s main focus is on Christ’s death as the supreme act of righteousness, his act of obedience that secures the status of righteousness for those identified with him’, but then Vickers views the cross as both ‘active’ and ‘passive’

⁵⁵ Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:201.

⁵⁶ Clark, ‘Do This and Live’ (2007), 248; Fesko, *Justification* (2008), 155.

⁵⁷ Piper, *Counted Righteous* (2002), 110-114, esp 114.

⁵⁸ Chantry, *Imputation of Righteousness & Covenant Theology*, (2001), 4-7; Tipton, ‘Union with Christ and Justification’ (2007), 34-37, esp 36 n 24; Fesko, *What is Justification by Faith Alone* (2008), 8ff; *idem*, *Justification* (2008), 107ff.

obedience.⁵⁹ It is only by a shift in what Christ's 'active' obedience means – that it does not refer to obedience to the moral law as precept, but obedience to the intra-trinitarian command to redeem the elect, or that Christ's active obedience need only be 'activity' – that allows Vickers to say that both active and passive obedience is included in Romans 5:18-19.⁶⁰ Again, in 2013, Vickers accepts concerning the phrase δι' ἑνὸς δικαιώματος in Romans 5:18 that '[g]iven that Paul does call it "one act," it is most natural to take it as Christ's obedience to death on the cross'.⁶¹ But then Vickers asserts that 'Christ's obedience *must* be understood as simultaneously active and passive'⁶² (his emphasis), probably because of his (erroneous) use of the 'activity/passivity' distinction. So Vickers has fallen into the fallacy of equivocation.

3. Reasons for revisiting Romans 5:18-19

Reasons to revisit Romans 5:18-19 emerge from a diachronic survey of the history of exegesis (looking at recent interpretation in light of the past) and a synchronic survey of exegesis from different confessional camps.

First, good arguments have recently been presented from Romans 1:3-4, 4:25 and 1

Timothy 3:16, that show that Christ's resurrection was God's judicial act justifying Christ as the sinless Messiah.⁶³ 'After his death for sin, the righteousness of Christ is declared by his

⁵⁹ Vickers, *Jesus' Blood and Righteousness*, (2006), 148-9.

⁶⁰ Vickers, *Jesus' Blood and Righteousness*, (2006), 148 fn 135.

⁶¹ *idem*, *Justification by Grace*, (2013), 39.

⁶² *ibid*, 41.

⁶³ Gaffin, *Resurrection and Redemption* (1978/1987), 119-124; *idem*, *By Faith, Not By Sight* (2006), 84-5; *idem*, 'Justification and Eschatology' (2007), 6-14; Ridderbos, *Paul* (1975), 538-9; Head, 'Jesus' Resurrection' (1998), 58-80; Seifrid, *Christ, Our Righteousness* (2000), 47, 90-91; Bird, 'Raised for our Justification', (2003), 31-46; *idem*, 'Justified by Christ's Resurrection' (2004), 72-91; *idem*, 'Incorporated Righteousness' (2004), 266-7; *idem*, *Saving Righteousness* (2007), 40-59; *idem*, 'Progressive Reformed View' (2011), 149-50; Beale,

resurrection, which is the sign of his vindication'.⁶⁴ In our union with the justified Christ we are likewise justified.⁶⁵ Further, a good case has been made that δικαίωμα in Romans 5:18 refers not to 'one righteous act' but 'one vindicating act' or 'the justification of the one', who is Christ.⁶⁶ Δικαίωμα⁶⁷ thus refers to the justification or vindication Christ received in his resurrection, and in which believers share.⁶⁸

This insight's potential has not been appreciated by imputation's modern advocates. The implication of this re-evaluation of the meaning of δικαίωμα is that Christ's ἐνὸς δικαιώματος in Romans 5:18 *does not refer to Christ's death*, and as a result *there is no longer any reason to limit the reference* of τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς in Romans 5:19 *to Christ's obedient death alone* bearing the law's penalty and thus Christ's 'passive obedience'.

Second, this exegesis has similarities with that of Augustine, Calvin, and pre-20th Century protestant exegetes. Augustine (AD354-430) says of Romans 5:18:

Now when he says in reference to Christ, "By the *justification* of one," he has more expressly stated our doctrine than if he were to say, "By the *righteousness* of one", inasmuch as he mentions that justification whereby Christ justifies the ungodly, and which he did not propose as an object of imitation, for He alone is capable of effecting this.⁶⁹

Similarly, John Calvin (AD1509-64) comments on Romans 5:18:

He [Paul] does not say the righteousness – δικαιοσύνη, but the justification – δικαίωμα, of Christ, in order to remind us that he was not as an individual just for himself, but that the

'Resurrection in the Already-and-Not-Yet Phases of Justification' (2010), 193; Cf D L Dabney, 'Justified by the Spirit: Soteriological Reflections on the Resurrection', (2001), 46-68; Macchia, *Justified in the Spirit* (2010).

⁶⁴ Campbell, *Union with Christ* (2012), 398.

⁶⁵ Romans 4:25.

⁶⁶ O'Neil, *Romans* (1975), 105-106; Morris, *Romans* (1988), 238-9, Hooker, *Adam to Christ* (1990), 29-32, 39-40; idem, *Paul* (2003), 94ff.

⁶⁷ Romans 5:18.

⁶⁸ Hooker, *Adam to Christ* (1990), 30-4; Marshall, *Aspects of the Atonement* (2007), 87.

⁶⁹ *The Merits and Remission of Sins and Infant Baptism*, 1.14.18 cited by Wright, 'Justification in Augustine' (2006), 60-61, 61 n 25.

righteousness with which he was endued reached farther, in order that, by conferring this gift, he might enrich the faithful.⁷⁰

Others rendering δικαίωμα as 'justification' (Romans 5:16,18) include Godet (AD1812-1900),⁷¹ Shedd (AD1820-1894),⁷² and Sanday and Headlam (AD1902).⁷³

Third, some modern Roman Catholic⁷⁴ and Orthodox⁷⁵ scholars hold that Romans 5:19 refers to the whole course of Christ's obedience. Therefore, we should hesitate before we assert that the traditional protestant exegesis was overly influenced by polemics.

Fourth, the translation of Romans 5:18 in the major English versions from Wyclif to the AV differ significantly from our English versions produced subsequent to the Revised Version (1885).⁷⁶ The former are far more in accord with the traditional protestant doctrine of imputed righteousness, and unsurprisingly, the latter more in line with modern NT scholarship. Modern English versions and historic English versions divide almost uniformly over how to translate the parallel phrases, δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος and δι' ἑνὸς δικαιώματος.⁷⁷ The historic English versions follow the vulgate in translating ἑνὸς as personal.

⁷⁰ Calvin, *Comm Rom*, 5:18 in CC, 19:211.

⁷¹ Godet, *Romans* (1883), 224-5.

⁷² Shedd, *Romans* (1879), 138.

⁷³ Sanday & Headlam, *Romans* (1902), 141-2.

⁷⁴ Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 421.

⁷⁵ Royster, *Romans* (2008), 139.

⁷⁶ Moore, *Rectification ('Justification') in Paul* (2001-2), provides an exhaustive survey of English translation history.

⁷⁷ Romans 5:18.

- per unius delictum [...] per unius iustificationem: Augustine (earlier); Calvin's Latin Version (AD1539).
- per unius delictum [...] per unius iustitiam: Augustine (later); Vulgate (AD382-405).
- bi the gilt of oon [...] bi the riytwisnesse of oon: John Wyclif's Bible (AD1395).
- by the synne of one [...] by the iustifyinge of one: Tyndale's New Testament (AD1534).
- by the synne of one [...] by the righteousness of one: Coverdale (AD1535).
- by the offence of one [...] by the iustifying of one: Geneva Bible (AD1559).
- by the sinne of one [...] by the ryghteousnes of one: Bishop's New Testament (AD1595).
- by the offence of one [...] by the righteousness of one: AV (AD1611/1769).
- by the offence of one [...] by the justice of one: Douay-Rheims (AD1582/1609/1956).
- one man commits a fault [...] one man makes amends: Knox (ET Vulgate, AD1957).

This contrasts with the modern translations, which can be further divided. The first group:

- through one trespass [...] through one act of righteousness: RV (AD1885), ASV (AD1901).
- through one transgression [...] through one righteous act: NAB (AD1970).
- through one transgression [...] through one act of righteousness: NASB (AD1977) .
- the result of one trespass [...] the result of one act of righteousness: NIV (AD1984).
- one trespass led to [...] one act of righteousness leads to: ESV (AD2001).
- through one trespass [...] through one righteous act: HCSB (AD2004).
- one trespass resulted in [...] one righteous act resulted in: NIV (AD2011).

The second group:

- one man's trespass led to [...] one man's act of righteousness leads to: RSV (AD1952).
- through one man's offense [...] through one Man's righteous act: NKJV (AD1982).
- One man's offence [...] one man's good act: NJB (AD1985).

Two important issues for imputed righteousness become apparent. First, the older English versions, whether Catholic or Protestant, translate δικαίωμα as either an abstract noun, ('righteousness', 'justice'), or the result of the process denoted by the verb ('justifying', 'justification'). The modern English versions uniformly understand δικαίωμα in the singular to denote a 'righteous act'. Second, the older English versions understood the genitive cardinal adjective ἐνός (in form either masculine or neuter), to refer to 'one' man. They

generally adopt a personal referent for ἐνός, either Adam or Christ, consistently from verses 15-18. While the second group of modern English versions still treat ἐνός as personal ('one man'), the majority are in the first group, including translations popular among evangelicals,⁷⁸ and take the referent as impersonal, understanding ἐνός in verse 18 as modifying the genitive neuter noun that immediately follows it (ie παράπτωμα, δικαίωμα). In favour of this 'newer' reading is the simplicity of the relationship between ἐνός and παραπτώματος or δικαιώματος. Some take the article's absence as decisive in both vv16 and 18, and that ἐνός should therefore be understood as impersonal in both places. However, the overwhelming majority of translations still keep the referent in v16 as 'one man'. Tyndale, seeing the difficulty, has the referent as both 'one man' and 'one sin', thus, 'one synne of one that synned'.

These two translational and exegetical decisions in our modern English versions have removed any textual basis for the imputation of Christ's active obedience. At most, v18 as translated grounds only the imputation of Christ's passive obedience. Moreover, the translation of v18 tend to restrict the interpretation of verse 19. The obedience of Christ in v19 is usually restricted to Christ's obedience to death, his (shorthand) 'passive obedience', on the parallelism of v19 with v18.⁷⁹

⁷⁸ NIV, ESV, HCSB.

⁷⁹ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 344; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 287; Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 386; Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 251.

Thus we have the anomalous situation that Reformed systematicians cling to the theology of the imputation of the passive and active obedience of Christ, worked out in an exegetical milieu which more clearly supported their formulations. Meanwhile, modern NT scholars have cut the exegetical ground from under their Reformed systematic-theological formulations.

Chapter 2

Genesis 15:6 and the meaning of righteousness (δικαιοσύνη)

Introduction

The basis on which Paul develops the idea that ὁ θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χωρὶς ἔργων⁸⁰ in Romans 4 is the presence of the key words λογίζομαι and δικαιοσύνη in Genesis 15:6. Moreover, the notion of ‘imputed righteousness’ in Romans 4 informs Paul’s discussion of δικαίωμα in Romans 5:16, 18. Further, many modern scholars consider that δικαιοσύνη is only a relational term with no necessary moral connotation. Therefore, we turn to Genesis 15:6 in its original context and languages.

Genesis 15:6

וַיִּחְשַׁבְהָ לֹו צְדָקָה	וַיֵּאמֶן בַּיהוָה
6 ^a And he trusted in YHWH 6 ^b and he reckoned it to him righteousness.	καὶ ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβραμ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην
6 ^a And Abram trusted God 6 ^b and it was reckoned to him for righteousness.	

Genesis 15:6 is the narrator’s observation.⁸¹ Because of Abraham’s faith-righteousness, God blesses Abraham by guaranteeing the fulfillment of the divine promises of descendants and land.⁸² In verse 6a, offline hiphil וַיֵּאמֶן with ב of person indicates ‘trust or believe *in*’, the trust located *in the person* Yahweh, not simply in the specific promise.⁸³ In verse 6b,

⁸⁰ Romans 4:6.

⁸¹ Alexander, ‘Abraham Re-Assessed’ (1994), 14-15; Williamson, *Abraham, Israel and the Nations* (2004), 113; Wenham, *Genesis 1-15* (1987), 1:329; Moberly, ‘Abraham’s Righteousness (Genesis XV 6)’ (1990), 104.

⁸² Alexander, ‘Abraham Re-Assessed’ (1994), 15, 21; Williamson, *Abraham, Israel and the Nations* (2004), 113.

⁸³ BDB, 53 ‘Hiph 2(c)’; Schliesser, *Abraham’s Faith in Romans 4* (2007), 136-9; Moberly, ‘Abraham’s Righteousness’ (Genesis XV 6)’ (1990), 105; Zlotowitz, *Genesis* (1986), 512; Calvin, *Comm Genesis* 15:6, in CC, 1:407; pace Hamilton, *Genesis 1-17* (1990), 424; Kline, ‘Abram’s Amen’ (1968), 4, 9; Robertson, ‘Genesis 15:6’ (1980), 264.

wayyiqtol חשב means ‘consider’,⁸⁴ ‘count’,⁸⁵ ‘think’,⁸⁶ or ‘reckon’.⁸⁷ Neither the subject nor the object of וַיַּחְשְׁבֶהָ are specified, but the traditional explanation that Yahweh is implied subject best accords with the context.⁸⁸ The direct object of the verb (the referent of the feminine suffix) might be either (1) the verbal idea in v6a (‘Abraham’s trust’); or (2) the noun צִדְקָה in v6b; or (3) the construction is a ‘double accusative’⁸⁹ or ‘direct object and object complement’⁹⁰ whereby the antecedent of the suffix is ‘Abraham’s trust’ (v6a),⁹¹ and the ‘object complement’ is צִדְקָה.⁹² Effectively, option (3) embraces options (1) and (2) together, and option (3) is to be preferred. ‘Abraham’ is the indirect object (לֹא) of the verb.

When we compare the LXX, the MT’s double accusative syntax is obscured by two features:

(1) the use of the divine passive (ἐλογίσθη) to render the active Qal imperfect of חשב, and
 (2) the preposition εἰς introduced to govern δικαιοσύνην. However, Paul in his exposition of Genesis 15:6 still recognises that δικαιοσύνη is the object of deponent middle λογίζεται in Romans 4:6, the accusative of respect of the passive infinitive λογισθῆναι in Romans 4: 11, and that ἡ πίστις is the subject of passive λογίζεται in Romans 4:5 and passive ἐλογίσθη in Romans 4:9. Taken together, this is tantamount to a recognition of the double accusative in Genesis 15:6.

⁸⁴ Schliesser, *Abraham’s Faith in Romans 4* (2007), 94-98.

⁸⁵ BDB, 363.

⁸⁶ Hamilton, *Genesis 1-17* (1990), 425.

⁸⁷ Von Rad, ‘Faith Reckoned as Righteousness’ (1951), 125.

⁸⁸ Sarna, *Genesis* (1989), 113; Hamilton, *Genesis 1-17* (1990), 425; Moberly, ‘Abraham’s Righteousness’ (Genesis XV 6)’ (1990), 107-8.

⁸⁹ Schliesser, *Abraham’s Faith in Romans 4* (2007), 120, 34; Waltke & O’Connor, *Hebrew Syntax* (1990), 175; Moberly, ‘Abraham’s Righteousness’ (Genesis XV 6)’ (1990), 121.

⁹⁰ Gibson, *Davidson’s Hebrew Grammar – Syntax* (1994), 113-114.

⁹¹ *Contra* Moberly, ‘Abraham’s Righteousness’ (Genesis XV 6)’ (1990), 121.

⁹² Gibson, *Davidson’s Hebrew Grammar – Syntax* (1994), 113-4.

LXX λογίζομαι can mean ‘count’ or ‘reckon’, ‘calculate roughly’, ‘set down to one’s account’, ‘account’, ‘consider’, ‘conclude’, or ‘infer’.⁹³

Righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) in Paul

The noun **צִדְקָה** in Gn 15:6b brings us to the meaning of the word groups associated with the root **צדק** and the stem **δικαι-**. Detailed studies of these word groups constitute major treatments in themselves.⁹⁴ Accordingly, our more limited question is whether these words as appropriated by Paul carry a moral or ethical connotation.⁹⁵ If ‘righteousness’ denotes not just ‘right relationship’, but right relationship based on righteous conduct, then the necessary question is, how is this possible when God is justifying the ἀσεβής?⁹⁶ The traditional protestant answer is that Christ’s righteousness stands in the place of the righteousness that the sinner lacks. However, if righteousness only denotes a ‘relationship’, no imputed righteousness is required.⁹⁷ So argues Morris:

When we have grasped the fact that the righteous are those accepted by God, some of the controversy concerning imputed and imparted righteousness seems beside the point. What difference does it make whether we impute or impart a *status*?⁹⁸ (emphasis Morris’)

⁹³ LSJM, 1055; MM, 377-8.

⁹⁴ Burton, *Galatians* (1921), 460-474; Quell & Schrenk, *Righteousness* (1951); Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (1952), 1:270-285; Morris, *Apostolic Preaching* (1965), 251-298; Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings*, (1967), 82-162; Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness in Paul* (1972); Reumann, Fitzmyer, & Quinn, *Righteousness in the New Testament* (1982); Moo, *Romans* (1996), 79-90; Seifrid, ‘Righteousness Language: Hebrew’ (2001), 415-442; *idem*, ‘Paul’s Use of Righteousness Language Against Its Hellenistic Background’, (2004), 39-74; Westerholm, *Perspectives Old & New* (2004), 261-296; *idem*, ‘The Righteousness of the Law and the Righteousness of Faith in Romans’, (2004), 253-64.

⁹⁵ Alan Radloff, *Clothed with Christ: Justification and the Imputed Righteousness of Christ* (Unpublished Moore Theological College Issues in Theology Paper, 1999).

⁹⁶ Romans 4:5.

⁹⁷ G Shellrude, ‘Imputation in Pauline Theology’, (2010), 24, 25.

⁹⁸ Morris, *Apostolic Preaching* (1965), 272; cf Denney, *Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation* (1998) 164-5.

Righteousness as ‘relational status’

Bultmann posited that δικαιοσύνη is a forensic term but ‘does not mean the ethical quality of a person. It does not mean any quality at all, but a relationship.’⁹⁹ A person does not have it; righteousness is simply favourable standing – nothing more.¹⁰⁰ **Morris** likewise defines ὁ δίκαιος as ‘those accepted by God’.¹⁰¹ Righteousness is ‘not an ethical term but a religious [one]’.¹⁰² Morris believes there is a place for ‘imputed righteousness’, but not in the way traditionally understood.¹⁰³ He holds that the idea of Christ’s merits being imputed is ‘very difficult to substantiate’.¹⁰⁴ Morris adopts the idea of righteousness as a ‘conferred status’.¹⁰⁵ Only the status of acceptance is imputed. ‘Righteousness’ comes to have an ethical meaning, but this develops naturally out of the forensic idea.¹⁰⁶ Morris has a further objection to righteousness as an ethical quality.

Paul is thinking of [δικαιοσύνη] as a status, a standing; the term is forensic. We often use the word to denote an ethical quality, but such a quality cannot be given. It must be earned by righteous deeds. What Christ did for sinners was to obtain right standing before God.¹⁰⁷

Inconsistently, Morris accepts that sin can be ‘imputed’ to Christ: ‘He has caused Him to be regarded and treated as a sinner’.¹⁰⁸ If sin as an ethical quality can be imputed, why not righteousness?

Likewise, **Hill** sees ‘righteousness’ for the Hebrews as ‘not so much a moral quality as a legal status’, connoting not an ‘absolute ethical norm’ but the idea of status, that is, being in the

⁹⁹ Bultmann, *Theology of the NT* (1952), 272.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁰¹ Morris, *Apostolic Preaching* (1965), 269; idem, *Romans* (1988), 240 fn 97.

¹⁰² Morris, *Apostolic Preaching* (1965), 261; cf 267.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 281-2.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 261-2.

¹⁰⁷ Morris, *Romans* (1988), 237.

¹⁰⁸ Morris, *The Cross in the New Testament* (1965), 221, on 2 Corinthians 5:21.

right.¹⁰⁹ For Hill, 'righteousness' in Galatians retains only its forensic significance, and connotes not a quality but a status.¹¹⁰ '[Δ]ικαιοσύνη is not something a person has as his own; rather it is something he has in the verdict of the "forum"'.¹¹¹ Ziesler correctly sees this as not the 'usual protestant position' (ie, that the righteousness imputed in justification is a real righteous, the righteousness of Christ, coming from God to man, but for forensic purposes only).¹¹² Yet the purely 'status' view of righteousness has frequently been adopted by modern evangelical commentators.¹¹³

Righteousness as 'covenant faithfulness'

Many representatives of the New Perspective on Paul define righteousness in terms of 'covenant faithfulness'. So **Sanders** defines the righteous as those who are faithful to the covenant, not those who are perfect.¹¹⁴ 'Righteousness' can mean power, action, fidelity to what has been promised, or the status of forgiveness.¹¹⁵ Sanders view is based on **Käsemann's** understanding of 'righteousness' as God's power and saving activity¹¹⁶ and that righteousness 'does not convey primarily the sense of a personal ethical quality, but of a relationship.'¹¹⁷ **Dunn** holds the essence of 'righteousness' as the 'Hebrew' concept of meeting the claims of a relationship, rather than the 'Greek' ideal against which an individual is measured.¹¹⁸ Hence, 'righteousness' is 'covenant faithfulness' and becomes

¹⁰⁹ Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings* (1967), 84-85, 98, 160.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid*, 141.

¹¹¹ Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings* (1967), 141.

¹¹² Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness* (1972), 8.

¹¹³ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 88. Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 63-71; Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 312. Compare VanDrunen, 'To Obey is Better Than Sacrifice' (2006), 142 n 27.

¹¹⁴ Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (1977), 204-5.

¹¹⁵ *ibid*, 491-2.

¹¹⁶ Käsemann, *New Testament Questions* (1969), 182; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:42; Schreiner, *Paul* (2001), 196-7; Soards, 'Käsemann's "Righteousness" Reexamined' (1987), 264-267.

¹¹⁷ Käsemann, *New Testament Questions* (1969), 172; Gordon 'Ernst Käsemann and the New Perspective', 2.

¹¹⁸ Dunn, *Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 341; idem, *Romans* (1988), 1:40-41.

synonymous with salvation.¹¹⁹ Similarly, **Wright**, considers that δικαιοσύνη means ‘conformity with a norm’, but the norm is ‘the covenant’,¹²⁰ and thus δικαιοσύνη means ‘covenant faithfulness’¹²¹ when applied to God and ‘covenant membership’ when applied to humans.¹²² For Wright, ‘righteousness’ means ‘covenant-ness’. ‘Righteousness’ is forensic in that the court has found in a person’s favour, but *‘to insist that one needs “righteousness,” in the sense of “moral character or repute” [...] shows that one is still thinking in medieval categories of iustitia rather than in biblical categories of lawcourt and covenant’* (emphasis Wright’s).¹²³ ‘Righteousness’ is now frequently thought of as ‘covenant faithfulness’ without moral connotations.¹²⁴

Righteousness as ‘conformity to a norm’

While there is no single, specific stratum of meaning,¹²⁵ ‘righteousness’ language denotes more than a status of being right, or membership of the covenant, but ‘behaviour proper to some relationship’.¹²⁶ Belonging to the semantic domain of ethics,¹²⁷ δικαιοσύνη denotes

¹¹⁹ Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:40-41.

¹²⁰ Wright, *Justification: God’s Plan* (2009), 46.

¹²¹ *ibid*, 49.

¹²² Wright, ‘Justification: Yesterday, Today, and Forever’ (2011), 56.

¹²³ *ibid*, 57.

¹²⁴ Onesti & Brauch, ‘Righteousness’ (1993), 828-9; Grieb, ‘The Righteousness of God in Romans’, (2012), 70, 73; Humphrey, ‘Glimpsing the Glory’ (2011), 164, 167; Colijn, *Images of Salvation* (2010), 200-203.

¹²⁵ Campbell, *Rhetoric of Righteousness* (1992), 50; Southall, *Rediscovering Righteousness* (2008), 13.

¹²⁶ Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness* (1972), 38; Southall, *Rediscovering Righteousness* (2008), 17; MacLeod, ‘How Right Are the Justified?’ (2004), 186-7.

¹²⁷ Waltke, ‘Righteousness in Proverbs’ (2008), 233.

conformity to a norm,¹²⁸ behaviour in accord with some standard.¹²⁹ For Paul, that norm with regard to humans is God's law.¹³⁰

The OT does not frequently correlate righteousness language and that of the covenant.¹³¹ In Romans, the all-pervasive noun νόμος frequently denotes the Sinaitic covenant.¹³² 90% of Paul's uses of νόμος refer to the Mosaic law.¹³³ Yet διαθήκη appears only twice¹³⁴ and so late it is hardly fundamental.¹³⁵ Consequently, the 'covenantal faithfulness' idea must be implied or read back into exegesis. Indeed, διαθήκη's infrequency suggests that, for Paul, 'covenant' is an inappropriate framework to express the Christian's relationship with God.¹³⁶ Paul never links δικαιοσύνη with διαθήκη, the latter being 'virtually invisible' in Paul.¹³⁷ This should trouble proponents of the idea that 'righteousness' means 'covenantal faithfulness'. Any assumed 'covenant' must remain firmly in the background,¹³⁸ and even then, the question remains, 'Which covenant?' The assumed covenant that lies behind the New

¹²⁸ E Kautzsch, *Abhandlung über die Derivate des Stammes sdq im alttestamentlichen Sprachgebrauch* (Tübingen: L F Fues, 1881), 53; cited by Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness* (1972), 36; H H Schmid, *Gerechtigkeit als Weltordnung* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1969), cited by Waltke, 'Righteousness in Proverbs' (2008), 235; McGrath, *Iustitia Dei* (2nd Ed, 1998), 10; MacLeod, 'How Right Are the Justified?' (2004), 183; Southall, *Rediscovering Righteousness* (2008), 15; Thom, 'Justice in the Sermon on the Mount: An Aristotelian Reading', (2009), 320.

¹²⁹ Southall, *Rediscovering Righteousness* (2008), 14; MacLeod, 'How Right Are the Justified?' (2004), 182-3; Muraoka, *Greek-English Lexicon of LXX* (2002), 127.

¹³⁰ Sanday & Headlam, *Romans* (1902), 29; Waltke, 'Righteousness in Proverbs' (2008), 235; Quell & Schrenk, *Righteousness* (1951), 24; MacLeod, 'How Right Are the Justified?' (2004), 192.; *Contra* Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness* (1972), 40; Seifrid, 'Paul's Use of Righteousness Language' (2004), 43 fn 12.

¹³¹ Seifrid, 'Righteousness Language: Hebrew' (2001), 423; Southall, *Rediscovering Righteousness* (2008), 18-19; MacLeod, 'How Right Are the Justified?' (2004), 183; Surburg, 'Rectify or Justify?' (2013), 75 fn 130; *contra* Garlington, *A Review Article: Justification and Variegated Nomism, Vol I*, 19; Nathan, 'Is Covenant a Central Notion?' (2009), 466-7.

¹³² Romans 2:12-14, 15, 17-18, 20, 23, 25-27; 3:19-21, 27, 28, 4:13-15, 16, 5:13, 20; 6:14-15; 7:2-9, 12, 14, 16, 22, 23b, 25; 8:3-4, 7; 9:31; 10:4; 13:8, 9; Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 131-2; cf MacLeod, 'How Right Are the Justified?' (2004), 192.

¹³³ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 145 fn 7; cf Gordon, 'Why Israel Did Not Obtain Torah-Righteousness' (1992), 165 fn 5.

¹³⁴ Romans 9:4, 11:27; Isaiah 27:9.

¹³⁵ MacLeod, 'How Right Are the Justified?' (2004), 189-90.

¹³⁶ Windsor, 'The Fulfillment of the Covenants: An Acovenantal Perspective on Paul' (2006); cf Dunn, 'Did Paul Have a Covenant Theology?' (2003), 287-307; Nathan, 'Is Covenant Central' (2009), 463.

¹³⁷ MacLeod, 'How Right Are the Justified?' (2004), 190, 191.

¹³⁸ Southall, *Rediscovering Righteousness* (2008), 19.

Perspective on Paul's view of righteousness is the Abrahamic covenant, but against this, it seems that for Paul the covenant underlying the notion of righteousness is the Mosaic or Sinaitic covenant',¹³⁹ a righteousness of the law,¹⁴⁰ to be distinguished from the Abrahamic covenant of grace.¹⁴¹

Thus, there is something more basic to δικαιοσύνη than simply getting the verdict.¹⁴² Since God is δίκαιος in his δικαιοσύνη, and God has posited his νόμος, the moral connotations are unavoidable.¹⁴³ 'The juridical, the ethical and the religious are vitally related'.¹⁴⁴ "[N]orm" should not be abandoned in a flush of semitic enthusiasm.¹⁴⁵ Moreover, it is more likely that Paul 'has taken over terms that were current coin in popular moral philosophy'.¹⁴⁶ 'Righteousness did not mean one thing to Aristotle and another thing to Paul'.¹⁴⁷ Dunn's strict dichotomisation of 'Greek' and 'Hebrew' concepts inadequately deals with Hengel's finding that:

after a more than three-hundred-year history under the influence of Greek culture Palestinian Judaism can also be described as 'Hellenistic Judaism'.¹⁴⁸

A brief examination of the meaning of δικαιοσύνη in its Hellenistic context is necessary. The noun δικαιοσύνη is formed by nominalizing the adjective δίκαιος.¹⁴⁹ The adjective δίκαιος means 'observant of custom or rule', thus 'righteous', 'just',¹⁵⁰ or 'conforming with set and

¹³⁹ Gordon, 'Why Israel Did Not Obtain Torah-Righteousness' (1992), 165 fn 5.

¹⁴⁰ Romans 10:5.

¹⁴¹ Horton, 'Which Covenant Theology?' (2007), 212, 222-3.

¹⁴² Contra Wright, *What Saint Paul Really Said* (1997), 97-98.

¹⁴³ Compare Morris, *Apostolic Preaching* (1965), 258, 262, 273-4.

¹⁴⁴ Quell & Schrenk, *Righteousness* (1951), 26.

¹⁴⁵ Campbell, *Rhetoric of Righteousness* (1992), 148 fn 1; Southall, *Rediscovering Righteousness* (2008), 17.

¹⁴⁶ O'Brien, *Philippians* (1991), 502.

¹⁴⁷ MacLeod, 'How Right Are the Justified?' (2004), 184.

¹⁴⁸ Hengel, 'Hellenization' of Judaea (1989), 53

¹⁴⁹ Goodwin, *Greek Grammar* (1955), §824; Burk, 'The Righteousness of God' (2012), 347.

¹⁵⁰ LSJM, 429.

agreed standards'.¹⁵¹ A person is δίκαιος due to his or her disposition to act justly (ie, lawfully and fairly) in keeping with the behavioural requirements of the moral virtues.¹⁵² The suffix -σύν attaches to the adjective ending in -ος to turn the attribute (δίκαι-) into a noun.¹⁵³ Thus, δικαιοσύνη is not a verbal noun and does not denote a verbal action (eg saving righteousness, justification or just acts) as such.¹⁵⁴ Rather, for Aristotle, δικαιοσύνη is a dispositional quality of character distinguishable from righteous action; δικαιοσύνη *leads* to righteous effects in the person's actions and wishes.¹⁵⁵

Whether or not the δίκαι- terminology can ever lose its moral connotations, according to many scholars it clearly has not in Paul.¹⁵⁶ Moreover, those asserting that righteousness is a 'relational status' or 'covenantal faithfulness' tend to discount any ethical connotations, eg:

[W]hat is credited or given the believer is not "moral righteousness" but a soteriological standing before God'.¹⁵⁷

Methodologically, this discounts the possibility that the forensic declaration might be grounded on a moral basis. This is a false dichotomy. While δικαιοσύνη might stand *metonymically* for God's 'saving action', whereby God's δίκαιος nature motivates his redemptive acts,¹⁵⁸ nevertheless in Paul there is a habitual ethical connotation of the

¹⁵¹ Muraoka, *Greek-English Lexicon of LXX* (2002), 127.

¹⁵² Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 5.1.8 [1129^a]; Weed, 'Aristotle on Justice' (2006), 83.

¹⁵³ Burk, 'The Righteousness of God' (2012), 351.

¹⁵⁴ *ibid*, 352.

¹⁵⁵ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 5.1.3 [1129^a]; Weed, 'Aristotle on Justice' (2006), 81.

¹⁵⁶ Westerholm, *Perspectives Old & New* (2004), 277 fn 39; cf 265 fn 7-8; Burton, *Galatians* (1921), 469; Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness* (1972), 51; Seifrid, 'Righteousness Language: Hebrew' (2001), 422, 424; Carson, 'Vindication of Imputation' (2004), 51; Piper, *The Future of Justification* (2007), 73-80; Gordon, 'Observations on N T Wright's Biblical Theology' (2006), 67; VanDrunen, 'To Obey is Better Than Sacrifice' (2006), 140-2.

¹⁵⁷ Shellrude, 'Imputation in Pauline Theology' (2010), 21, cf 27.

¹⁵⁸ Burk, 'The Righteousness of God' (2012), 352.

δικαι— terminology. Therefore, false dichotomization of either the ‘relational’ or ‘covenantal’ status, or the ‘moral-ethical’ quality, must be avoided.¹⁵⁹

Righteousness as ‘merit’

Prior to 1977, New Testament scholarship in general viewed it as axiomatic that the Rabbis held a doctrine of merits which could be transferred. ‘[W]hat produces merits is righteousness’.¹⁶⁰ Thus, צְדָקָה could connote ‘merit’ (זְכוּת), and the Rabbinic doctrine was early enough to have influenced Paul.¹⁶¹ Consider Davies’ treatment of Romans 5:

[Paul] makes use of the concept of imputed sin in describing the consequences of Adam’s sin, and of its opposite, the concept of imputed righteousness or the doctrine of merits, in describing the effects of the obedience of Christ [...] Paul would naturally be helped by the fact that already in Judaism the belief that the merits of the righteous availed for others was a living one. Paul could think in terms of a ‘merit’ of Christ, gained through obedience, that was efficacious for all.¹⁶²

In 1977, Sanders published *Paul & Palestinian Judaism*, arguing it was misleading to translate *zakah* and *zekut* as ‘merit’, and qualifying the understanding of ‘merit’ in Rabbinic soteriology.¹⁶³ However, one of the few exceptions Sanders notes is Abraham, whose faith merited salvation.¹⁶⁴ Likewise, Sanders noted that someone can merit for himself or his descendants, and that ‘there is no doubt that the rabbis believed that obedience is meritorious and that God would give appropriate rewards’.¹⁶⁵ Nevertheless, Sanders found that there is no doctrine of transfer of merits to contemporaries,¹⁶⁶ though there was in

¹⁵⁹ Schliesser, *Abraham’s Faith in Romans 4* (2007), 126-129.

¹⁶⁰ Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness* (1972), 122-7, following Marmorstein, *The Doctrine of Merits in Old Rabbinical Literature* (London, 1920).

¹⁶¹ Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness* (1972), 123, 125, 182; Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (1965), 269, 272.

¹⁶² Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (1965), 273; cf Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness* (1972), 99-100.

¹⁶³ Sanders, *Paul & Palestinian Judaism* (1977), 186-7.

¹⁶⁴ *ibid*, 189 fn 41.

¹⁶⁵ Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 190.

¹⁶⁶ *ibid*, 191.

Rabbinic Judaism salvation and even a transfer of punishment ‘in consideration of the merits of the children’ interceding on behalf of the father.¹⁶⁷ Further, while Sanders did not find a transfer of the merits of the fathers, he did find the Rabbinic doctrine that God blessed Israel and the world because of the merit of the deeds of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron and Miriam.¹⁶⁸ The deeds of the Fathers help subsequent generations, though never in the final judgment,¹⁶⁹ by causing God to remember the covenant, do good, and suspend punishment. Thus, despite the qualifications that Sanders’ thesis required, Sanders left unchanged the proposition that צדקה connotes ‘merit’ (זכות) in Genesis 15:6. It is therefore unsurprising that many modern Jewish commentators hold that צדקה connotes ‘merit’ in Genesis 15:6, and Abraham’s act of faith made him worthy of God’s reward.¹⁷⁰

Against Sanders, the 2001 review of Sanders’ findings by Alexander established that Tannaitic Judaism was fundamentally a religion of works-righteousness, where it was held that the merits of the fathers covered the sins of all Israel.¹⁷¹ This basic works-righteousness doctrine, Alexander found, stands in unresolved tension with the doctrine of Israel’s election.¹⁷² The Targums teach that the merits of the ancestors, particularly those of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, are a treasure house of grace for the children of Israel, and the ‘unofficial targums’ teach that Jews are able to reap the rewards of Abraham, Isaac and

¹⁶⁷ *ibid*, 193-5.

¹⁶⁸ *ibid*, 195.

¹⁶⁹ *ibid*. 196-7 fn 76.

¹⁷⁰ Sarna, *Genesis* (1989), 113; Speiser, *Genesis* (1964), 110; Jacob, *Genesis*, 100; Plaut, *Genesis* (1974), 146; Compare Moberly, ‘Abraham’s Righteousness’ (1990), 109; Gaston, *Paul and the Torah* (1987), 55; Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness* (1972), 103, 109; Morris, *Apostolic Preaching* (1965), 266-8; Schliesser, *Abraham’s Faith in Romans 4* (2007), 129-130, 157, 214.

¹⁷¹ Alexander, ‘Torah and Salvation in Tannaitic Literature’ (2001), 300-1.

¹⁷² *ibid*.

Jacob.¹⁷³ 4 *Ezra* emphasises meriting eschatological reward by difficult obedience to the law,¹⁷⁴ 2 *Enoch* is characterized by harsh, rigorous legalism,¹⁷⁵ and 2 *Baruch* perceives of salvation as reward for adherence to the law,¹⁷⁶ in which God has mercy on the righteous because of their good works, such that divine mercy is his kind response to merit.¹⁷⁷ Phillips goes much further, arguing that 'in Judaism there is a concept of imputed righteousness for corporate Israel in which the meritorious actions of the ancestors are efficacious for their offspring'.¹⁷⁸ Phillips, returning to the position of Ziesler and Davies, presents the merits of the Fathers as a fund on which Israel could draw provided they followed in the footsteps of the Patriarchs, because God fulfills his covenant with Israel.¹⁷⁹ The covenant of grace was the foundation of God's response to the merits of the Patriarchs.¹⁸⁰ Collins, whose presentation bears remarkable similarity to that of Davies, goes even further when she argues that Paul's statements in Romans 5:9-17 were inspired by the Hebrew precursor of the Mishnah at Makk 3:15, upon which Paul depended, and developed it into his concept that 'the meritorious deed of [another] man, Jesus Christ, brought life [for many]!'.¹⁸¹ Thus, notwithstanding Sander's thesis, the pendulum has now swung back to admitting the concept of merit existed in Second Temple Judaism, so much so that Campbell says that 'the essential theoretical differences between covenantal nomism and legalism have effectively collapsed'.¹⁸² Campbell, following Alexander, believes 'legalism' is an unavoidable and can

¹⁷³ McNamara, 'Some Targum Themes' (2001), 326-8.

¹⁷⁴ Bauckham, 'Apocalypses' (2001), 156, 173-4.

¹⁷⁵ *ibid*, 156.

¹⁷⁶ *ibid*, 180.

¹⁷⁷ *ibid*, 182.

¹⁷⁸ Phillips, 'Loved on Account of the Patriarchs' (2010), 187.

¹⁷⁹ *ibid*, 189.

¹⁸⁰ *ibid*, 219.

¹⁸¹ Collins, 'The Jewish Source of Rom 5:17, 16, 10 and 9' (2005), 34-6.

¹⁸² Campbell, *The Deliverance of God* (2009), 104.

even be a positive and attractive description of the Judaism Sanders describes.¹⁸³ Jewish legalism is thus not a false accusation to be refuted, but a reality to be embraced.

Campbell's modified notion of 'merit' is that God freely initiates a contract with humanity, and is therefore under obligation to reward those who have earned or merited it.¹⁸⁴

Conclusion

Recent studies have confirmed the existence of the concepts of merit, legalism, and works-righteousness in aspects of Second-temple Judaism, particularly regarding Abraham, who was rewarded for his faith and merited salvation by his obedience. God blesses Abraham's descendants because of the merit of the father's deeds. Pre-Sanders scholars, Post-Sanders scholars, and Sanders himself, all hold that Abraham's obedient acts were righteous deeds that merited God's reward, not for himself alone, but also for his progeny, and indeed the whole world. Further, Second temple Judaism had aspects of legalism and works-righteousness that sit in unresolved tension with the Jewish doctrine of election. Thus, the Sander's 'revolution' has left the historicity of the Rabbinic doctrine of the 'merit of the fathers' in place, even if qualified. Therefore, the Hebrew background of Paul's use of Genesis 15:6 strongly suggest that 'righteousness' (δικαιοσύνη || צְדָקָה) connotes 'merit', while the Hellenistic background of δικαιοσύνη demonstrates it an ethical term denoting the quality of one who is δίκαιος, that is, whose behavior conforms to a given standard of justice. These connotations, as we shall now see, carry over into Paul's usage in Romans 4.

¹⁸³ Campbell, *The Deliverance of God* (2009), 109, citing Alexander, 'Torah and Salvation in Tannaitic Literature' (2001), 300.

¹⁸⁴ Campbell, *The Deliverance of God* (2009), 101-2.

Chapter 3

Paul's appropriation of Genesis 15:6 in Romans 4

Introduction

Romans 4 constitutes Paul's longest extant exposition of Genesis 15:6. Paul does not use the key words of Romans 5:15-19 (eg, δικαίωμα) in Romans 4, and only uses δικαίωσις in 4:25. However, Romans 4 is 'the most crucial passage'¹⁸⁵ in the imputation debate. If imputed righteousness does not arise from Romans 4, serious questions are raised about its exegetical basis, and it is unlikely to arise in Romans 5:15-19. The noun δικαιοσύνη¹⁸⁶ picks up its contextual nuances from earlier instances in Romans.¹⁸⁷ Moreover, λογίζομαι is not used in Romans 5 but Romans 4, so if the idea of 'imputed righteousness' is found in Romans 5, the earlier instances of λογίζομαι in Romans 4 would contextually have contributed to it.¹⁸⁸ The construction λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην¹⁸⁹ also colours Paul's use of the verb δικαιοῶ¹⁹⁰, and arguably the nouns derived from δικαιοῶ, namely δικαίωσις¹⁹¹ and δικαίωμα.¹⁹² Finally, Abraham's justification is paradigmatic for all believers.¹⁹³ If Abraham was imputed righteousness by faith, so are we.

¹⁸⁵ Carson, 'Vindication of Imputation' (2004), 55.

¹⁸⁶ Romans 5:17, 21.

¹⁸⁷ Romans 1:17; 3:5, 21, 22, 25, 26; 4:3, 5, 6, 9, 11(x2), 13, 22.

¹⁸⁸ Romans 2:26; 3:28; 4:3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 22, 23, 24.

¹⁸⁹ Romans 4:5.

¹⁹⁰ Romans 4:2, 5; 5:1; Carson, 'Vindication of Imputation' (2004), 63.

¹⁹¹ Romans 4:25; 5:18.

¹⁹² Romans 5:16, 18; 8:4.

¹⁹³ Romans 4:23-24; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 263.

The syntax of Genesis 15:6 || Romans 4:3

Neither the verb λογίζομαι nor the syntactical construction (Genesis 15:6; Romans 4:3) determines whether Abraham's 'faith' is viewed as a righteous act which God then declares as righteous, or it is an instance of something being imputed to another as something else.¹⁹⁴ The syntax could mean either.¹⁹⁵ The two basic interpretations of the construction ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραάμ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην (Romans 4:3 || Genesis 15:6LXX), which Paul expounds as equivalent to λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην (Romans 4:5), are:

(1) that 'righteousness' and 'faith' in Genesis 15:6; Romans 4:3, 5 are equivalent,¹⁹⁶

or

(2) that 'faith' and 'righteousness' are two different things, and the construction is an example of 'X is considered as if it is Y, though it is not'.¹⁹⁷

Option (2) is necessary but not sufficient for 'imputed righteousness', which also depends on lexical decisions. For example, Dunn holds (2), though for him, δικαιοσύνη denotes 'acceptance'.¹⁹⁸ So Dunn does not hold to imputation of the quality of δικαιοσύνη, which is required for 'imputed righteousness'.¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁴ Carson, 'Vindication of Imputation' (2004), 58.

¹⁹⁵ *ibid*, 58; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 262; Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness* (1972), 180-1.

¹⁹⁶ Eg Gundry, 'The Nonimputation of Christ's Righteousness' (2004); Seifrid, 'Luther, Melancthon and Paul on the Question of Imputation' (2004), 146; cf *idem*, 'Paul's Use of Righteousness Language' (2004), 60; Schliesser, *Abraham's Faith in Romans 4*, (2007), 124-5.

¹⁹⁷ Carson, 'Vindication of Imputation' (2004), 60; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 262; Ridderbos, *Paul* (1975), 177; Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:132, 353-9; cf Ziesler, *Romans* (1989), 124-5; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:206.

¹⁹⁸ Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:206.

¹⁹⁹ Cf Morris, *Romans* (1988), 197.

'Faith' is 'Righteousness'?

Some opponents of imputed righteousness argue that 'righteousness' and 'faith' are equivalent, equated, identical or interchangeable.²⁰⁰ For example, Gundry argues that the two are equivalent as a result of the reckoning process,²⁰¹ while Seifrid equates the two on the basis that faith is actually righteousness.²⁰² On either view, the two concepts are equivalent either because 'righteousness' is or is considered to be the same thing as 'faith', or 'faith' is included in whatever 'righteousness' is. If πίστις is understood as 'faithfulness', 'loyalty to God', 'behaviour appropriate to the covenant',²⁰³ then πίστις itself is the righteous conduct that God expects,²⁰⁴ and πίστις has moral connotations (cf antonym ἀπιστία || ἀδικία).²⁰⁵ Others take δικαιοσύνη as relational or creational, without any moral connotations. Faith is created by God's word, and justification is a divine creative act.²⁰⁶ There is thus no need to supply an 'as if'.²⁰⁷

The ungodly believer is considered 'as if' he is righteous

A stronger case, however, can be made that πίστις and δικαιοσύνη are conceptually different, that πίστις is the non-meritorious instrument for receiving δικαιοσύνη as an 'alien righteousness' which carries moral overtones.²⁰⁸ The construction λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην (Romans 4:5) is 'an abbreviated mode of expression for the idea that God

²⁰⁰ Eg Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness* (1972), 181-2; Sanday & Headlam, *Romans* (1902), 67, 100; Matera, *Romans* (2010), 110-1; Witherington & Hyatt, *Romans* (2004), *Romans*, 120; Schliesser, *Abraham's Faith in Romans 4* (2007), 125-126.

²⁰¹ Gundry, 'The Nonimputation of Christ's Righteousness' (2004), 25, 36 fn 41.

²⁰² Seifrid, 'Luther, Melancthon and Paul on the Question of Imputation' (2004), 146.

²⁰³ Eg Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness* (1972), 43, 182, 185.

²⁰⁴ Eg 1 Maccabees 2:52; Psalm 106:30-31 || Numbers 25:1-18; 2 Samuel 19:19; Psalm 32:2; Leviticus 7:18, 17:4.

²⁰⁵ Romans 3:3,5.

²⁰⁶ Käsemann, *Romans* (1980), 112-3; Seifrid, 'Paul's Use of Righteousness Language' (2004), 60-63; Schliesser, *Abraham's Faith in Romans 4* (2007), 137-8, 340.

²⁰⁷ Bultmann, *Theology of the NT* (1952), 1:277; Käsemann, *Romans* (1980), 112-3.

²⁰⁸ Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 214-6; Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:354-9; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 262; Robertson, 'Genesis 15:6' (1980), 265-6; Ridderbos, *Paul* (1975), 176; Piper, *Counted Righteous* (2002), 53-69; Morris, *Romans* (1988), 197.

imputes his righteousness given in Christ to one by faith and on that ground acquits him'.²⁰⁹

Six exegetical reasons, and one systematic-theological consideration, follow in support of the contention that the construction means 'the ungodly believer is considered as if he is righteous'.

(1) Paul elsewhere presents **faith as instrumental** for justification:

- the righteousness of God **'through faith'** (preposition διὰ with genitive πίστεως),²¹⁰ taking genitive πίστις Χριστοῦ as objective, 'through faith in Jesus Christ'.²¹¹
- justified **'by faith'** (dative πίστει) apart from works.²¹²
- righteousness **'originating from faith'** (preposition ἐκ with genitive πίστεως).²¹³
- the righteousness **'of faith'** (simple genitive πίστεως).²¹⁴
- the righteousness **'from God'** (ἐκ Θεοῦ) coming **'upon faith'** (ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει),²¹⁵ both prepositions having locative force, suggesting a metaphorical spatial movement of 'righteousness' from God to the destination 'faith'.²¹⁶

(2) For Paul, **'faith' is not in itself 'righteousness'**,²¹⁷ nor is 'faith' a substitute for 'righteousness'.²¹⁸ The lexemes point away from synonymity. Πίστις²¹⁹ denotes 'belief', 'trust',²²⁰ and contextually, 'trusting God's promise'.²²¹ Δικαιοσύνη is the nominalization of δίκαιος, ie, it is the quality possessed by ὁ δίκαιος.²²² Δικαιοσύνη thus ordinarily denotes 'righteousness', 'justice', which is the disposition leading to just behaviour.²²³ Δικαιοσύνη is

²⁰⁹ Ridderbos, *Paul* (1975), 177; cf Carson, 'Vindication of Imputation' (2004), 67.

²¹⁰ Romans 3:22; compare 3:25, 30; Galatians 2:16, 3:14, 3:26; Ephesians 2:8; Philippians 3:9; Colossians 2:12.

²¹¹ Silva, 'Faith Versus Works of Law in Galatians' (2004), 227-234; Lee, 'Against Richard B Hays's "Faith of Jesus Christ"' (2008), 51-80; Matlock, 'The Rhetoric of πίστις in Paul' (2007), 173-203; idem, 'Saving Faith: πίστις in Paul' (2009), 73-89; Bell, 'Faith in Christ: Philippians 3:9 and Ephesians 3:12' (2009), 111-125.

²¹² Romans 3:28, compare 5:2, 11:20.

²¹³ Romans 9:30; compare 1:17, 3:30, 5:1, 9:32, 10:6; Galatians 2:16, 3:8, 3:22, 5:5.

²¹⁴ Romans 4:11; compare 4:13.

²¹⁵ Philippians 3:9.

²¹⁶ See chapter 4 below.

²¹⁷ Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 214; contra Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness* (1972), 181ff.

²¹⁸ Käsemann, *Romans* (1980), 111; Witherington & Hyatt, *Romans* (2004), 120-3.

²¹⁹ Romans 4:3.

²²⁰ Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:204

²²¹ Genesis 15:5-6; Romans 4:13-22. Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:231, Käsemann, *Romans* (1980), 107, 110; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:204; Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 206.

²²² MacLeod, 'How Right are the Justified?' (2004), 192.

²²³ Romans 1:18-3:20, especially Romans 2:7; 2:13; 3:10; Westerholm, *Perspectives Old & New* (2004), 263-73.

the opposite of ἀδικία,²²⁴ expounded as ἀσέβεια,²²⁵ and Paul's listed litany of evil rendering the doer worthy of death.²²⁶ These evils explain δικαιοσύνη by antithesis, giving δικαιοσύνη an undoubted moral flavour. Moreover, Paul clearly distinguishes between πίστις and ἔργα.²²⁷ To define πίστις so that it effectively means (good) works hardly makes sense of Paul. So πίστις and δικαιοσύνη should not be equated or identified.

(3) Paul expresses **anthropological pessimism throughout Romans**. In Romans 1:18-3:20, Paul expressed this pessimism using the alpha privative ἀδικία,²²⁸ the negated adjective δίκαιος,²²⁹ or the negated verb δικαιώω.²³⁰ While Paul does not continue to use the 'unrighteousness' language in 3:20-5:21 (it reappears in 6:13), Paul's anthropologically pessimistic language continues unabated.²³¹ Before Romans 3:21, Paul is speaking of 'ordinary' righteousness²³² that comes from works, which every human lacks,²³³ but thereafter Paul speaks about 'extraordinary' righteousness' that comes by faith apart from works.²³⁴ Yet in Romans 4:3-8, several negative epithets²³⁵ apply to Abraham and David some time after they first exercised faith.²³⁶ The believer is *simul iustus et peccator*.²³⁷ If the 'unrighteousness' of which Paul has accused all humanity still taints even the justified, then

²²⁴ Romans 1:18, 29; 2:8.

²²⁵ Romans 1:18.

²²⁶ Romans 1:29-32; cf Romans 2:21-23; 3:13-18.

²²⁷ Romans 4:2-6; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 263-4; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 214-5; Schliesser, *Abraham's Faith in Romans 4* (2007), 337-9.

²²⁸ Romans 1:18, 29; 2:8; 3:5.

²²⁹ Romans 2:13; 3:10.

²³⁰ Romans 3:20; cf 2:13.

²³¹ ἀσέβεια: 1:18; cf ἀσεβής: 4:5, 5:6; ἀμαρτία: 3:9, 20; 4:7, 8; 5:12, 13, 20, 21, etc; ἀμαρτωλός: 3:7; 5:8, 19; 7:13; ἀμαρτήμα: 3:25; ἀνομία: 4:7, 6:19; παράβασις: 2:23; 4:17; 5:14; παράπτωμα: 4:25; 5:15, 16, 17, 18, 20; 11:11, 12; ἀσθενέω: 8:3 and cf ἀσθενής: 5:6; ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ: 3:23; cf 1:23; 2:7; μὴ ἐργαζομένω: 4:5; cf 2:10; 4:4; ἐχθροὶ: 5:10; κακός: 1:30; 2:9; 3:8; 7:19, 21 etc.

²³² Westerholm, *Perspectives Old & New* (2004), 263-273.

²³³ Romans 3:9-12, 19-20, 23.

²³⁴ *ibid*, 273-284.

²³⁵ ἀσεβής: Romans 4:5; ἀμαρτία: 4:7, 8; ἀνομία: 4:7; μὴ ἐργαζομένω: 4:5.

²³⁶ Romans 4:5; Genesis 15:6; Hebrews 11:8; Calvin, *Institutes* III.14.11 (1:778-9); Contra Rainbow, *The Way of Salvation* (2005), 85 fn 28; Schliesser, *Abraham's Faith in Romans 4* (2007), 348-50.

²³⁷ Romans 7:14-25, classical view; Galatians 5:17: Gathercole, *Where is Boasting* (2002), 243 fn 79. See Chapter 9.

it highly unlikely that ‘faith’ is the equivalent of ‘righteousness’, because believers are never righteous in and of themselves. They need ‘alien righteousness’.²³⁸

(4) The construction ‘reckoning X as Y’ elsewhere involves **reckoning something (X) as something else (Y) even though X is not in and of itself Y**, and that reckoning is appropriate because, from the perspective of the ‘reckoner’, there are good reasons to do so,²³⁹ even when there is a barrier to that reckoning, which is a situation that must be ignored or overcome for that reckoning to occur. The following are some OT examples:

- Laban (incorrectly, in Rachel and Leah’s eyes) reckons Rachel and Leah as strangers (though they are actually his daughters, which should be a barrier to Laban’s reckoning them strangers), *for the reason that* Laban sold them for Jacob’s labour (Genesis 31:15).

הֲלוֹא נִכְרִיּוֹת נִחְשַׁבְנוּ לוֹ (MT)
כִּי מִכְרָנוּ

Have we (X + barrier) not been reckoned strangers (Y) to him,
because (reason) he sold us?

οὐχ ὥς αἱ ἀλλότριαι λελογίσμεθα αὐτῷ (LXX)

πέπρακεν γὰρ ἡμᾶς (LXX)

Have we (X + barrier) not been reckoned by him as strangers (Y),
For (reason) he sold us?

- Judah (incorrectly) reckons Tamar as a prostitute (although she is actually his daughter-in-law, which should be a barrier to Judah’s reckoning), *for the reason that* Tamar’s face was covered (Genesis 38:15).

וַיִּרְאֶה יְהוּדָה וַיַּחְשְׁבֶהָ לְזוֹנָה
כִּי כִסְתָה פָנֶיהָ (MT)

Judah saw her

And he reckoned her (X + barrier) for a prostitute (Y),
because (reason) her face was covered.

καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτήν (LXX)

Ἰουδᾶς ἔδοξεν αὐτήν πόρνην εἶναι

κατεκαλύψατο γὰρ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς

καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνω αὐτήν

And beholding her,

Judah thought her (X + barrier) to be a prostitute (Y),

²³⁸ Carson, ‘Vindication of Imputation’ (2004), 60.

²³⁹ Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:206; cf Ziesler, *Romans* (1989), 124-5.

for (reason) her face was covered up
and he did not recognize her.

- Eli (incorrectly) reckons Hannah as drunk (although she is only deeply distressed), *for the reason that* Eli sees Hannah's lips moving but hears no sound (1 Samuel 1:13), though she was not a wicked woman (v16: which should be a barrier to Eli's reckoning).

וְחַנָּהּ הָיָא מְדַבֶּרֶת עַל-לִבָּהּ (MT)
רַק שִׁפְתֶיהָ נִעוֹת
וְקוֹלָהּ לֹא יִשְׁמָע
וַיַּחְשְׁבֶהָ עָלַי לְשֹׁכְרָה:

And (reason) Hannah herself was speaking in her heart
Only her lips were moving,
And her voice was not heard,
And Eli reckoned her (X) for a drunk [woman] (Y).

καὶ αὐτὴ ἐλάλει ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς (LXX)
καὶ τὰ χεῖλη αὐτῆς ἐκινεῖτο
καὶ φωνὴ αὐτῆς οὐκ ἤκούετο
καὶ ἐλογίσατο αὐτὴν Ἡλὶ εἰς μεθύουσαν
And (reason) she was speaking in her heart,
And her lips were moving,
Yet her voice he could not hear,
And Eli reckoned her (X) for a drunk [woman] (Y).

- [In the context of Job's perception and questioning of God], God (in Job's mind, but incorrectly) reckons Job as an enemy, (although in fact Job is upright and righteous, which is a barrier to such a reckoning), *for the reason that* God has hidden his face, evidenced by the fact that Job has experienced terrible undeserved suffering (a wrong inference by Job) (Job 13:24; cf 19:11; 33:10).

לְמַה־פָּנִיךָ תַּסְתִּיר (MT)
וְתַחֲשַׁבְנִי לְאוֹיֵב לָךְ:

For what reason do you hide your face?
And [why] do you reckon me (X) for an enemy of yours (Y)?

διὰ τί ἄπ' ἐμοῦ κρύπτῃ
ἡγήσῃ δέ με ὑπεναντίον σοι (LXX)
For what reason are you hidden from me
and have regarded me (X) hostile to you (Y)?

- Job's maids and guests (incorrectly) reckon Job as a stranger (although Job is not a stranger, a barrier to the reckoning), *for the reason of* Job's suffering (Job 19:15).

גִּרֵּי בֵיתִי וְאִמָּהֹתַי לֹזֵר תַּחֲשַׁבְנִי (MT)
נִכְרִי הָיִיתִי בְּעֵינֵיהֶם:

Sojourners of my house and my maids (barrier, they are *Job's* maids)
reckon me (X) a stranger (Y),
I have become an alien in their eyes.

γείτονες οἰκίας θεράπαιναί τέ μου (LXX)
 ἀλλογενῆς ἡμῶν ἐναντίον αὐτῶν
 The neighbours of [my] house and my maids-in-waiting,
 I (X) became a foreigner (Y) in the sight of them.

- [Leviathan or the dragon (לִיָּתָן || δράκοντα: Job 40:25)] (correctly) reckons iron as straw (although iron is not actually straw, a barrier to the reckoning), *for the reason that* Leviathan has great strength (Job 41:27).

יַחֲשֵׁב לְתַבֵּן בְּרֹזָל (MT)
 לַעֲץ רַקְבֹּן נְחוֹשֶׁה:
 And he reckons iron (X) for straw (Y)
 And bronze (X) for rotten wood (Y).

ἡγῆται μὲν γὰρ σίδηρον ἄχυρα (LXX)
 χαλκὸν δὲ ὥσπερ ξύλον σαθρόν
 For on one hand, he considers iron (X + barrier) chaff (Y),
 And on the other hand, bronze (X + barrier),
 just like rotten wood (Y).

- A neighbour's loud early morning blessing is (correctly) reckoned as a curse (although it is a blessing, a barrier to the reckoning) *for the reason that* no one enjoys being rudely woken up in the morning (Proverbs 27:14).

מְבָרֵךְ רֵעֵהוּ בְקוֹל גָּדוֹל בַּבֶּקֶר הַשְּׂכִימִים (MT)
 קָלָלָהּ תַּחֲשֵׁב לּוֹ:

The blessing of his friend with a loud voice in the early morning,
 it (X + implied reason + barrier) will be reckoned to him a curse (Y).

ὃς ἂν εὐλογῇ φίλον τὸ πρωὶ μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ (LXX)
 καταρωμένου οὐδὲν διαφέρειν δόξει
 Whoever might bless a friend in the early morning with a loud voice,
 He will think it (X + implied reason + barrier)
 differs nothing from being cursed.

In each of these examples we see a pattern. Someone reckons X 'as' Y or X 'to be' Y, even though X 'is not' Y, for what are good reasons, from the perspective of the one doing the reckoning or considering, even though there is a barrier to such a reckoning. The reason might be given in an explanatory clause (Genesis 31:15; 38:15; 1 Samuel 1:13) or drawn from the wider context (Job 13:24; 19:15; 41:27). On one occasion, the reason is actually built into the X-concept (Proverbs 27:14). Such an understanding of the construction in Romans 4:3 as expounded by Romans 4:5, yields the exposition that Abraham's πίστις (trust

in God's promise²⁴⁰) as the X-concept is also *the reason why* God imputes something else (δικαιοσύνη) to Abraham (cf Proverbs 27:14). A quality, attribute, or characteristic that would not normally be attributed to that person or thing (δικαιοσύνη), is attributed to that person or thing (Abraham), and the quality so attributed is *not inherent or otherwise attributable* to that person or thing (Abraham is ἄσεβής: Romans 4:5, which would normally be a barrier for the reckoning), but there are appropriate reasons (Abraham's πίστις) for the attribution or characterization through the process denoted by λογίζομαι.²⁴¹ An important parallel to Romans 4:5 is found in Romans 2:26. This parallel is important because the X and Y concepts in Romans 2:26 are diametrically opposed and can in no way be considered equivalent.

Romans 2:26	ἡ ἀκροβυστία αὐτοῦ (X) εἰς περιτομήν (Y) λογισθήσεται
Romans 4:5	λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ (X) εἰς δικαιοσύνην (Y)

	<i>X-concept</i>	<i>verb + preposition</i>	<i>Y-concept</i>
Romans 2:26	his uncircumcision ἡ ἀκροβυστία αὐτοῦ	will be reckoned as λογισθήσεται	circumcision εἰς περιτομήν [word order altered]
Romans 4:5	his faith ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ	is reckoned as λογίζεται	righteousness εἰς δικαιοσύνην [word order altered]

The analysis of this thesis will now be opposed to that of Gundry.²⁴² Gundry rendered the two constructions as follows:

	<i>X-concept</i>	<i>verb + preposition</i>	<i>Y-concept</i>
Romans 2:26 ²⁴³	his [...] uncircumcision	will be counted as	circumcision, won't it?
Romans 4:5 ²⁴⁴	his [the believer's] faith	is counted as	righteousness.

²⁴⁰ Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 205.

²⁴¹ For the attribution model of imputation, see Chapter 4, below.

²⁴² Gundry, 'The Nonimputation of Christ's Righteousness' (2004).

²⁴³ *ibid*, 19.

²⁴⁴ *Ibid*, 18.

However, a more adequate parallel requires giving contextual content to the pronoun ‘his’ αὐτοῦ in both Romans 2:26 and 4:5, underlined below. Gundry imported contextual content for both Romans 2:26 and 4:5.²⁴⁵ Gundry’s comparison would be:

<i>X-concept</i>	<i>verb + preposition</i>	<i>Y-concept</i>
Romans 2:26 ²⁴⁶ his [a gentile law keeper’s] uncircumcision	will be counted as	circumcision
Romans 4:5 ²⁴⁷ his [the believer’s] faith	is counted as	righteousness

For Romans 4:5, Gundry’s imported information is tautologous (‘[the believer’s] faith’) and does not inadequately provides the context of Romans 4:5, especially when compared to his more illuminating imported information of ‘[a gentile law keeper’s] uncircumcision’ for Romans 2:26. More adequate imported information (marked ‘[]’) than what Gundry provides for Romans 4:5 would be:

<i>X-concept</i>	<i>verb + preposition</i>	<i>Y-concept</i>
Romans 2:26 ²⁴⁸ his [a gentile law keeper’s] uncircumcision	will be counted as	circumcision
Romans 4:5 The [ungodly non-worker’s] faith	is reckoned as	righteousness

The result of importing the context for each construction is that the X-concept for both Romans 2:26 and 4:5 then provides the reason for the reckoning in each (cf Proverbs 27:14). The only difference is that in Romans 2:26, the reason for the reckoning is indicated by the genitive pronoun αὐτοῦ while the barrier is indicated by the nominative ἡ ἀκροβυστία, whereas in Romans 4:5 (cf 4:3), the reason is indicated by the nominative ἡ πίστις while the barrier is indicated by the genitive pronoun αὐτοῦ.²⁴⁹ That is to say, in Romans 2:26, the reason for the reckoning is ‘the gentile’s law keeping’. In Romans 4:5, the reason for the reckoning is faith. When adequate contextual information is supplied for both constructions, the X-concept in both cases provides both the reason for the reckoning, and

²⁴⁵ Gundry, ‘The Nonimputation of Christ’s Righteousness’ (2004), 19

²⁴⁶ *ibid*, 19.

²⁴⁷ *ibid*, 18.

²⁴⁸ *ibid*, 19.

²⁴⁹ I thank the Rev Dr Lionel Windsor for his assistance with articulating this.

also the barrier to be overcome so that the reckoning can occur.

Gundry claims that after the reckoning process, there is 'an identification of what is counted with what it is counted as'.²⁵⁰ But it is not apparent why 'uncircumcision' should be *identified with* 'circumcision'. Circumcision is not *of itself* uncircumcision. Uncircumcision is not *the means of*, or the *ground of*, circumcision. It is the antithesis of circumcision. It is a barrier to be overcome for circumcision to occur. It is only when the uncircumcised is actually a 'gentile law-keeper' that uncircumcision will be reckoned as circumcision. But even then, circumcision is not the equivalent of uncircumcision. That would be non-sense, like calling 'black', 'white'. Rather, a better explanation is that the gentile law-keeper is reckoned 'as if' he is circumcised, because although circumcision and uncircumcision may not matter, they can never be 'identified' or be 'equivalent', according to the nature of the case.

The question to be posed to Gundry's model is 'why should faith be reckoned as righteousness'? The best Gundry can say is 'God counts both faith and righteousness because he counts them as identical to one another.'²⁵¹ He implies that this counting is gracious.²⁵² And Gundry offers no other reason. But that Gundry on Romans 2:26 immediately feels the need to explain why this 'identification' is appropriate by adding 'Gentile law-keeper' as imported information, shows the limited explanatory power of his model. The following table further teases out *the reason why* the X-concept is reckoned as the Y-concept. There are three options for each of Romans 2:26 and 4:5.

²⁵⁰ Gundry, 'The Nonimputation of Christ's Righteousness' (2004), 21.

²⁵¹ Gundry, 'The Nonimputation of Christ's Righteousness' (2004), 25

²⁵² *ibid*, 30.

	<i>X-concept</i>	<i>verb + prep</i>	<i>Y-concept</i>	<i>for the reason that</i>
Romans 2:26	his uncircumcision	is reckoned as	circumcision	because... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Uncircumcision in itself is the same as circumcision; OR b. Uncircumcision is not the same as circumcision but is considered as an equivalent as a result of reckoning (Gundry); OR c. The uncircumcised person has law-keeping and is thus considered as if he is circumcised (this thesis). This is appropriate because...

	<i>X-concept</i>	<i>verb + prep</i>	<i>Y-concept</i>	<i>for the reason that</i>
Romans 4:5	his faith	is reckoned as	righteousness	because... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Faith in itself is the same as righteousness (eg Seifrid); OR b. Faith is not the same as righteousness, but it is considered as equivalent as a result of reckoning (Gundry); OR c. The ungodly non-worker has faith and is thus considered as if he is righteous (this thesis). This is appropriate because...

Option a. represents Siefrid's position on Romans 4:3, 5, but it cannot be adopted for Romans 2:26, as uncircumcision is not inherently the same as circumcision. Gundry also rejects Seifrid's position.²⁵³

Option b., Gundry's position, holds that reckoning is a divine cognitive redefinition of concepts, such as defining 'uncircumcision' as 'circumcision' or 'faith' as 'righteousness'. As such, it is an inadequate account of the construction 'X reckoned as Y', in that it fails to

²⁵³ Gundry, 'The Nonimputation of Christ's Righteousness' (2004), 36 fn 41.

identify the reasons why such a reckoning or attribution is appropriate. There is little capacity to explain why such an identification should occur. Further, Gundry's proposal is vulnerable lexically, because there is little support for the notion of 'identification with' adequately capturing the result of λογίζομαι. LSJM gives the meanings 'reckon', 'calculate', 'count', 'set down', 'charge', 'audit', 'expect', 'conclude', and 'infer', but not 'identify' or 'equate'.²⁵⁴ Gundry's concept of 'identification as' is too rigid and lacks sensitivity to the attested meanings of λογίζομαι.

The best account of why God reckons 'uncircumcision' as 'circumcision' is option c., that another factor more important than circumcision has interposed. This Gundry felt the need to make explicit, despite holding to option b.

As confirmation of this approach, 2:26 can be expressed after the manner of Romans 4:6:

Rom 4:5: His faith (X) is reckoned to him [by God] for righteousness (Y).

Rom 2:26: His uncircumcision (X) will be reckoned [to him by God] for circumcision (Y).

Rom 4:6: ὃς ὁ θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χωρὶς ἔργων
To him God reckons righteousness (Y) apart from works [of lawkeeping]²⁵⁵ (barrier)
[through faith: v3, 5] (X + reason).

So to express Romans 2:26 after the manner of Romans 4:6:

To him God will reckon circumcision (Y) apart from his uncircumcision (X + barrier)
[through his lawkeeping: v25, 26] (reason).

Because God's judgments are based on truth, the c. options must be justified by further reasoning, found not in the construction but from surrounding passages or wider Pauline theology.

²⁵⁴ LSJM, 1055.

²⁵⁵ This is tantamount to saying 'in spite of ungodly non-working'.

It is appropriate that God treat the ‘uncircumcised law-keeper’ as if he is ‘circumcised’²⁵⁶ because (moral) law-keeping is what God really requires for righteousness by law.²⁵⁷ In the Galatian context, circumcision obliges those undergoing it ὅλον τὸν νόμον ποιῆσαι,²⁵⁸ even though in the new salvation-historical era, the ritual of circumcision does not matter.²⁵⁹

It is appropriate that God treat the ‘ungodly non-working believer’ as if he or she is ‘righteous’,²⁶⁰ because the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ has been manifested διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ (Romans 3:21-22). Πίστεως χριστοῦ (Romans 3:22, 26) could denote the whole course of Christ’s faithfulness,²⁶¹ grounding imputed righteousness,²⁶² but the objective genitive is preferable.²⁶³ Free justification (δικαιούμενοι δωρεάν)²⁶⁴ has come to sinners²⁶⁵ believing in Christ (δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ)²⁶⁶ without compromising divine justice (εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον)²⁶⁷ on the ground of the ἀπολυτρώσις in Christ²⁶⁸ and God publicly displaying Christ as an ἱλαστήριον.²⁶⁹ Christ’s death as redemption and propitiation is sin’s penalty, inflicted by God’s justice.²⁷⁰ In terms of theological discourse, up to this point in Romans, only Christ’s ‘passive obedience’ has been expounded, not Christ’s obedience to

²⁵⁶ Romans 2:26

²⁵⁷ Romans 2:13-16; 10:5; cf 1 Corinthians 7:19; Matera, *Romans* (2010), 75.

²⁵⁸ Galatians 5:3; Hultgren, *Romans* (2011), 130.

²⁵⁹ Romans 4:11; 1 Corinthians 7:19; Galatians 6:15.

²⁶⁰ Romans 4:3, 5, 6, 11.

²⁶¹ Campbell, ‘The Faithfulness of Jesus Christ in Romans 3:22’ (2009), 57-71.

²⁶² O’Brien, *Philippians* (1991), 398-400.

²⁶³ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 224-5; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 181-6; Carson, ‘Atonement in Romans 3:21-26’ (2004), 125-127; Silva, ‘Faith Versus Works of Law in Galatians’ (2004), 227-234; Matlock, ‘The Rhetoric of πίστις in Paul’ (2007), 173-203; Matlock, ‘Saving Faith: πίστις in Paul’ (2009), 73-89; Watson, ‘The Faith (of Christ)’ (2009), 147-164.

²⁶⁴ Romans 3:24.

²⁶⁵ Romans 3:9-12, 19-20, 23.

²⁶⁶ Romans 3:26, 22, 25.

²⁶⁷ Romans 3:26.

²⁶⁸ Romans 3:24.

²⁶⁹ Romans 3:26; Carson, ‘Atonement in Romans 3:21-26’ (2004), 127-136, 137-8; Morris, *Apostolic Preaching* (1965), 40-51 at 45, 184-202 at 198-201; Contra Colijn, *Images of Salvation* (2010), 206-7.

²⁷⁰ Carson, ‘Atonement in Romans 3:21-26’ (2004), 128-9, 133.

the law's precept. Consequently, if Christ's active obedience is found in Romans 4, it is thus far based only on the moral connotations of δικαιοσύνη and the action of λογίζομαι. The doctrine of the imputation of Christ's active obedience is certainly defensible on that basis,²⁷¹ but a stronger case requires finding an explicit scriptural seat of doctrine for Christ's 'active obedience'. Romans 5:6-9a grounds only 'passive obedience', but Romans 5:19 is potentially an explicit ground of Christ's 'active obedience'.²⁷²

(5) Paul in fact does say that 'God reckons righteousness' to a person.

τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ᾧ θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην (Roman 4:6)
εἰς τὸ λογισθῆναι [καὶ] αὐτοῖς [τὴν] δικαιοσύνην (Roman 4:11)

In v6, δικαιοσύνην is the object of the finite verb λογίζεται, and the recipient is ᾧ. In v11, δικαιοσύνην is the accusative of respect of the (divine) passive infinitive λογισθῆναι, and the recipient αὐτοῖς.²⁷³ As Dunn says:

That Paul puts δικαιοσύνην as the direct object (in place of εἰς δικαιοσύνην in Gen 15:6) confirms that he does not think of God accepting faith merely as a substitute for righteousness, but that righteousness is actually accorded [...] the idea is of God treating someone as [...]²⁷⁴

(6) The imputed righteousness view accounts for καθάπερ καὶ (Romans 4:6) in that the

construction can mark what follows as a basis or ground for what precedes. The

relationship of οὐ μὴ λογίσσεται Κύριος ἁμαρτίαν²⁷⁵ with θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην²⁷⁶ is expressed by καθάπερ καὶ ('just as also').²⁷⁷ The Gundry-Seifrid position accounts for καθάπερ καὶ by equating 'righteousness' with 'not counting unrighteousness'. This, the

²⁷¹ Romans 4:3-6, 11; Carson, 'Vindication of Imputation' (2004), *passim*.

²⁷² Chapters 7-8, below.

²⁷³ cf Romans 4:24; Carson, 'Vindication of Imputation' (2004), 65

²⁷⁴ Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:205-6

²⁷⁵ Romans 4:8.

²⁷⁶ Romans 4:6.

²⁷⁷ Romans 4:6.

majority view, implies ‘justification is forgiveness, nothing but forgiveness’.²⁷⁸ The minority argue that the introductory formula θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην implies justification requires more than forgiveness.²⁷⁹ The majority view tends to confirm that justification is only the non-imputation of sin. The minority view allows in addition that the imputation of positive righteousness gained through Christ’s active obedience may be included in justification.

The link between Genesis 15:6 and Psalm 32:1-2 is the word λογίζομαι, following the pattern of the principle of *gezerah shewa*,²⁸⁰ by which forgiveness of sins²⁸¹ explains the blessing of imputed righteousness.²⁸² But the nature of that explanation is debated. The issue is whether one should embrace a reading which *expands* justification beyond ‘nonimputation of sins’ or whether to restrict the positive category of ‘imputed righteousness’ to mean only ‘non-imputation of sins’. The first gives καθάπερ καί the force of equivalence, the second leaves each phrases’ denotation unchanged but posits a different relationship established by καθάπερ καί. Vickers’ solution, to regard forgiveness as positive standing before God, and that imputation of righteousness ‘has primarily to do with’ the forgiveness of sins, again introduces terminological confusion and equivocation.²⁸³

Against the majority, καθάπερ καί need not imply equivalence, in some sort of mathematical

²⁷⁸ Jeremias, *Central Message of the NT* (1965), 66. Compare Calvin, *Comm Romans* 4:6 in CC, 19:169; Alford, *Greek NT* (1877), 2:348; Nygren, *Romans* (1952), 171; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:206-7; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:233; Wright, ‘Romans’ (2002), 493; Bruce, *Romans* (1985), 107; Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 208 and fn 109.

²⁷⁹ Lloyd Jones, *Romans: 3:20-4:25* (1970), 175; Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 315-6; Gathercole, *Where is Boasting* (2002), 248; Davies, *Faith and Obedience in Romans* (1990), 122.

²⁸⁰ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 266; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:233; Hultgren, *Romans* (2011), 182; Matera, *Romans* (2010), 111.

²⁸¹ Psalm 32:1-2.

²⁸² Genesis 15:6.

²⁸³ Vickers, *Jesus’ Blood and Righteousness* (2006), 108.

sense,²⁸⁴ but might indicate a basis, where one element grounds the other,²⁸⁵ especially where it introduces a scriptural citation.²⁸⁶ There is a clear conceptual distinction between imputing a positive thing (ὁ θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην: v6), and not imputing a negative thing (οὐ μὴ λογίσσεται κύριος ἁμαρτίαν: v8), so neither concept should be compromised nor merged into each other. Rather, we have a merismus, metonymy, and synecdoche. Paul cites one component of justification to stand for the whole. One discrete idea (forgiveness of sin) stands as the basis or ground metonymically for the other (imputation of righteousness), and justification is therefore remission of sins *plus* imputation of righteousness.²⁸⁷

(7) Finally, as a systematic-theological consideration, **the identification of ‘faith’ with ‘righteousness’ can potentially lead to ‘faith’ being a ‘work’**, and thus lead to a synergistic soteriology. If ‘faith’ is ‘faithfulness’ and is the equivalent of ‘righteousness’,²⁸⁸ and ‘righteousness’ connotes ‘merit’, then it is unavoidable that faith is a meritorious work. The traditional protestant reason why faith is not a work is that it is the bare passive instrument receiving Christ’s righteousness. But the ‘faith’ is ‘righteousness’ position potentially concedes this, though not if ‘faith’ is understood as passive ‘trust’ and ‘righteousness’ as forensic ‘acceptance’. Gundry and Seifrid answer this criticism by asserting that God creates faith, and thus it is not a good work.²⁸⁹ But while faith is a gift from God,²⁹⁰ this fact alone does not give righteousness an ‘external divine’ origin. Faith issues in works, for faith works

²⁸⁴ Heidland, λογίζομαι, *TDNT*, 4:292; Davies, *Faith and Obedience in Romans* (1990), 122.

²⁸⁵ Käsemann, *Romans* (1980), 113.

²⁸⁶ Cf Romans 10:15.

²⁸⁷ Calvin, *Institutes* III.11.2, cf 5,16; Owen, *Works* (1850-3), 5:321; Shedd, *Romans* (1879), 98; Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:135; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 266; Piper, *Counted Righteous* (2002), 117, 119.

²⁸⁸ Gundry, ‘The Nonimputation of Christ’s Righteousness’ (2004), 21.

²⁸⁹ Gundry, ‘The Nonimputation of Christ’s Righteousness’ (2004), 23-4; Seifrid, *Christ, Our Righteousness* (2000), 68.

²⁹⁰ Ephesians 2:8-9; Acts 18:27.

through love,²⁹¹ and Tridentine Catholicism, while holding to prevenient grace as much as Reformed Protestantism, also holds that faith formed by love justifies. Reformed protestants do not.

Faith is an active but internal act of the believer. Though enabled by God, it is still our own.²⁹² That Paul distinguishes ‘works’ and ‘faith’ does not deny the essential nature of faith as something done by the believer, for Paul in distinguishing ‘works’ and ‘faith’ is referring to faith *in so far as it receives and trusts in God’s promises that only God is able to fulfill*. So the gracious nature of justification depends on our attributing only an *instrumentality* to faith in its office of justification. Faith must be nothing more than instrumental to unite the believer to an external and alien righteousness. Moreover, not every aspect of faith justifies, but faith only *in so far as it receives God’s promise of salvation*, and thereby receives an external, extrinsic, alien righteousness. Compare Dabney:

[W]e define faith as a holy exercise of the soul; but we do not attribute its instrumentality to justify, to its holiness, but to the fact that it embraces Christ’s justifying righteousness. It is neither strange nor unreasonable, that a thing should have two or more attributes, and yet be adapted by one special attribute among them, to a given instrumentality. The diamond is transparent, but it is its hardness which fits it for cutting glass. True faith is obediential: it involves the will: it has moral quality: but its receptive nature is what fits it to be the organ of our justification.²⁹³

²⁹¹ Galatians 5:6; James 2:14-26.

²⁹² Owen, *Works* 5:319.

²⁹³ Dabney, *Systematic Theology*, 607

Conclusion

Carson's position, viz-a-viz Gundry,²⁹⁴ appears correct. Δικαιοσύνη connotes ethical 'merit', being the nominalisation of δίκαιος,²⁹⁵ and God credits us with this δικαιοσύνη which we do not have of ourselves.²⁹⁶ Like Abraham, we are ἄσεβής.²⁹⁷ Faith is the instrument of this imputation.²⁹⁸ God has done the crediting,²⁹⁹ and the δικαιοσύνη is called δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ.³⁰⁰ Moreover, λογίζομαι,³⁰¹ whose direct object³⁰² or subject in the passive,³⁰³ is δικαιοσύνη, contextually informs Paul's use of δικαιοῦμαι,³⁰⁴ and provides the background for Paul's use of the verbal nouns, δικαίωσις³⁰⁵ and δικαίωμα.³⁰⁶ Whether δικαιοσύνη is a gift received and possessed now must be determined.³⁰⁷

²⁹⁴ Gundry, 'The Nonimputation of Christ's Righteousness' (2004).

²⁹⁵ Chapter 2, above.

²⁹⁶ Romans 3:10-20, 23. Carson, 'Vindication of Imputation' (2004), 61.

²⁹⁷ Romans 3:9-20, 23; 4:5, 22-25.

²⁹⁸ *ibid*, 65.

²⁹⁹ Romans 4:6.

³⁰⁰ Romans 3:21-22.

³⁰¹ Romans 4:3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 22, 23, 24.

³⁰² Romans 4:6.

³⁰³ Romans 4:11.

³⁰⁴ Carson, 'Vindication of Imputation' (2004), 63.

³⁰⁵ Romans 4:25; 5:18.

³⁰⁶ Romans 5:16,18; 8:4. See chapters 5-6.

³⁰⁷ Chapter 4, below.

Chapter 4

Receiving and possessing the gift of righteousness (Romans 5:17)

Introduction

If we use the language of the law court, it makes no sense whatever to say that the judge imputes, imparts, bequeaths, conveys or otherwise transfers his righteousness to either the plaintiff or the defendant. Righteousness is not an object, a substance or a gas which can be passed across the courtroom [...] to imagine the defendant somehow receiving the judge's righteousness is simply a category mistake. That is not how the language works.³⁰⁸

Not to be rhetorically outdone, Michael Bird asserts that Jesus' obedience becomes ours 'not by way of righteousness molecules floating through the air to us'.³⁰⁹ Bird and Wright's *reductio ad absurdum* attempts to show that imputed righteousness is a misconstrual of the language of justification, and unfaithful to the text of scripture. Key to Wright's criticism is that 'righteousness' cannot be *given*, ie passed across the courtroom from one person to the other. To think of the defendant 'somehow receiving' somebody else's righteousness 'is simply a category mistake' as 'that is not how the language works'. Unfortunately for Wright, Paul actually says that righteousness *is* a gift received.³¹⁰ Paul himself made the 'category mistake' that Wright alleges. Gifts are given, bequeathed, conveyed or otherwise transferred. As Westerholm observes:

No one has better grasped the absurdity of 'receiving righteousness' than N T Wright [...] But the absurdity of it all in no way alters the fact that Paul speaks of 'receiving the abundant overflow of grace and of the gift of righteousness' (Romans 5:17).³¹¹

This chapter firstly engages in an analysis of Romans 5:17 in context, secondly outlines modern scholars' treatment of the notion of righteousness as a gift 'received' and union

³⁰⁸ Wright, *What St Paul Really Said* (1997), 98.

³⁰⁹ Bird, 'Progressive Reformed View' (2011), 150; idem, *Evangelical Theology* (2013), 563.

³¹⁰ Romans 5:17.

³¹¹ Westerholm, *Perspectives Old & New* (2004), 275 n 31.

with Christ, thirdly attempts to posit a model for accounting for righteousness as a gift received and possessed, and fourthly, looks further at the idea of righteousness as a possession in Romans 9:30-10:6 and Philippians 3:8-11.

Receiving Righteousness as a Gift (Romans 5:15-17)

¹⁵However, it is not, ‘as the transgression, thus also the gracious gift (τὸ χάρισμα)’. For if the many died through the transgression of the one, so much more has the grace of God (ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ) and the gift in grace (ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι) which came through the one man, Jesus Christ, abounded to the many. ¹⁶And it is not, ‘as through one[’s] sinning, thus also the gift (τὸ δῶρημα)’. For (γὰρ) the judgment was from one leading to condemnation, but the gracious gift (τὸ χάρισμα) was from many[’s] transgressions leading to justification (εἰς δικαίωμα). ¹⁷For if through the transgression of the one, death reigned through the one, so much more will those receiving (οἱ [...] λαμβάνοντες) the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness (τὴν περισσείαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης) reign in life through the one, Jesus Christ. (my translation)

In verse 15, τὸ χάρισμα denotes ‘gracious gift’,³¹² the phrase ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ refers to the favour that properly is God’s attribute (ie, God’s ‘goodwill’, ‘loving-kindness’ and ‘favour’),³¹³ and ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι (v15) is the concretization of that which flows from grace, a ‘gift’, ‘present’ or ‘bounty’³¹⁴ given from a gracious disposition. The noun δωρεά, derived from δωρέομαι, means a ‘present’,³¹⁵ a gift given gratuitously or freely, without payment. The origin of the free gift is God’s gracious benevolence, and alludes to ‘the gift of righteousness in 3:24’.³¹⁶ In verse 16a, a cognate of δωρεά, τὸ δῶρημα, denotes what has been given, ‘a gift’, ‘present’.³¹⁷ Thus, three different words (χάρισμα, δωρεά, δῶρημα) are used to denote the gift in verses 15-17. Each occurrence is definite, preceded by the article. The referent for each is almost certainly the same.

³¹² LSJM, 1979.

³¹³ LSJM, 1978.

³¹⁴ LSJM, 464.

³¹⁵ *ibid.*

³¹⁶ Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 381; *pace* Moo, *Romans* (1996), 335; Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 247 fn 66.

³¹⁷ LSJM, 464.

Kruse rightly observes that in verse 16 τὸ χάρισμα *brought* justification (εἰς δικαίωμα).³¹⁸

But then Kruse wrongly reasons that the gift ‘cannot be righteousness but rather that through which righteousness came, that is, the grace of God expressed in giving his Son’.³¹⁹

While Kruse may be right in what he affirms, he is wrong in what he denies, as in verse 17, the genitive τῆς δικαιοσύνης is most probably one of apposition,³²⁰ (the gift, which is righteousness). The gift *is* righteousness. So understood, Kruse’s denial militates against Paul’s express words in verse 17, whereby the phrase τὴν περισσείαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης serves as an explanation (note γάρ: v17) of both τὸ δῶρημα and τὸ χάρισμα [...] εἰς δικαίωμα (v16).

Τὸ δῶρημα (v16) is best identified with τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης (v17). So the gracious gift, τὸ χάρισμα (v16), is explained as τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης (v17), and this leads to and brings the sentence of justification, εἰς δικαίωμα (v16). Kruse wrongly glosses δικαίωμα (v16) as ‘lit. “righteousness”’.³²¹ But δικαίωμα rarely means ‘righteousness’; it properly means ‘decree of righteousness’ or ‘justification’.³²² So the outcome of the gift of righteousness (τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης: v17) is the gracious divine verdict and ensuing status of justification (εἰς δικαίωμα: v16). Thus, God issues the verdict of justification on the basis of the ‘gift’ (which is righteousness). There is no reason to think that this gift of

³¹⁸ Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 247 fn 66.

³¹⁹ *Ibid.*

³²⁰ Wallace, *Greek Grammar* (1996), 98-99.

³²¹ Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 247 fn 66.

³²² See Chapters 5-6, below.

righteousness comes any other way than that which Paul has already indicated, namely,

Θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χάρις ἔργων.³²³

Thus, the progression of ideas in vv15-17 is from the gracious attitude of God, ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ (v15) and the περισσεῖαν τῆς χάριτος (v17), to the concretization of this grace in the gracious gift, ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι (v15) = τὸ χάρισμα (vv15, 16) = τὸ δῶρημα (v16), which in turn is explained by and identified with the gift which is righteousness, τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης (v17).

In verse 17, Paul describes the gift as something believers *receive*. They are characterized as ‘the receivers’ (οἱ λαμβάνοντες). That which they receive is concretized as ‘the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness’ (τὴν περισσεῖαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης). The accusative τὴν περισσεῖαν governs both the first (τῆς χάριτος) and second genitival phrases (καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς) and indicates the quantity and abundance of both the grace and the gift. Both ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ are abundantly given. As argued above, the second genitival phrase is further modified by a genitive of apposition (τῆς δικαιοσύνης),³²⁴ indicating what the gift is, ‘righteousness’. Δικαιοσύνη is thus ‘received’ by the believer as a gift. Seifrid correlates ‘[t]he “gift of righteousness” (verse 17)’ with ‘nothing other than Christ’s “act of righteousness” (verse 18)’.³²⁵ But this correlation (1) assumes a meaning of δικαίωμα in verse 18 that is challenged by this thesis,³²⁶ (2) is not strongly supported by conjunction ἄρα οὖν, (v18) which does not mark explanatory material (as does γάρ in v17) but marks an inference from what proceeds, and in the case of verse 18, marks a return to

³²³ Romans 4:6.

³²⁴ Wallace, *Greek Grammar* (1996), 98-99.

³²⁵ Seifrid, *Christ, Our Righteousness* (2000), 71; Seifrid ‘Romans’ (2007), 631.

³²⁶ Chapters 5-7 below.

the comparison commenced in verse 12,³²⁷ (3) is at odds with the position argued above, ie, that in verse 16 (explained by verse 17), the gift (which consists in δικαιοσύνη: v17) 'leads to' (εἰς) a δικαίωμα and is not identified with it, and (4) does not explain Paul's assertion that the gift is received (οἱ λαμβάνοντες). Rather, the 'gift of righteousness' is more likely given to those receiving it δι' ἐνὸς δικαιώματος (v18),³²⁸ that is, through the instrumentality provided by the δικαίωμα ἐνὸς, and thus the gift of righteousness is not to be equated with the δικαίωμα ἐνὸς.

Scholars who do not think we take or possess 'the gift of righteousness' (Romans 5:17)

In his *Romans* Commentary, Wright does not comment on this concrete language of receiving gifts, and its implication for 'giving', 'receiving', and 'possessing'.³²⁹ But such language has not slipped past Dunn unnoticed:

The fact that [Paul] can speak so explicitly of 'righteousness' as a 'gift received' is important. It is not merely a rhetorically stretched usage (like δικαίωμα in v16); but neither should the usage be given determinative significance for all other occurrences (in view of the rhetorical character of the context). The phrase signifies that the status of one acceptable to God is a gift of God. As such it is a concrete expression of the outreaching grace of God (χάρισμα) and cannot be separated from the overflowing grace of God (ἡ περισσεία τῆς χάριτος). As such it cannot be regarded as an object, a package received and retained, as if it was one's own property; on the contrary, the relational force of righteousness remains and is reemphasized – God's acceptance as always God's – a gift given not by passing the gift from God's hands but by drawing the receiver into his arms.³³⁰

Dunn perceptively sees the consequences of Paul's language, but strangely departs from the meaning of Paul's words. Nothing in the passage suggests that God's gift of righteousness is an embrace of 'drawing the receiver into his arms', as beautiful as that image is. Paul

³²⁷ BAG, 103; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:282.

³²⁸ On the meaning of this phrase, see Chapter 7, below.

³²⁹ Wright, 'Romans' (2002), 528.

³³⁰ Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:281-2.

concretely characterizes the gift as ‘the gift of righteousness’. The gift is received. One would assume as a corollary that according to the normal use of language, the received gift becomes the beneficiary’s possession. Certainly, Paul is speaking figuratively. But this does not mean we should necessarily empty Paul’s language of all its normal denotations. Dunn’s treatment trades on overemphasising the relational content of righteousness language at the expense of the ethical and moral,³³¹ and is typical of those who see serious shortcomings in, or reject, imputed righteousness in Paul.

For example, Ziesler’s refrain is that ‘righteousness’ cannot be possessed and is not in any way a possession.³³² He still maintains this in the face of Paul’s language in Romans 5:17.

[I]s it odd that for the first time [righteousness] is a gift? We have repeatedly emphasized that it is not and never becomes a possession. Yet this case is not different, for it is a gift only within the total ‘in Christ’ theme of the passage, and in the normal sense is still therefore not a possession.³³³

Critics of imputation constantly remind their opponents that the phrase the ‘righteousness of Christ’ nowhere appears in Scripture. However, they too must remember:

The expression ‘union with Christ’ does not occur in the Bible. But it fairly describes the central reality in the salvation revealed there, from its eternal design to its eschatological consummation.³³⁴

Gaffin’s observation can be applied to Ziesler. Nowhere in Romans 5 does the phrase ‘in Christ’ or ‘in him’ appear. ‘Union with Christ’ undoubtedly underlies Romans 5 as an ‘underpinning framework’ or ‘deep structure’.³³⁵ But rightly bringing this theme to Romans 5 should not empty the actual language Paul uses of its normal meaning, and that one usually ‘possesses’ a gift.

³³¹ See Chapter 3, above.

³³² Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness* (1972), 158, 159, 160, 162, 169, 177, 188.

³³³ *ibid*, 198.

³³⁴ Gaffin, ‘Union With Christ’ (2006), 272.

³³⁵ Campbell, *Union with Christ* (2012), 343ff.

Seifrid,³³⁶ too, is critical of an approach that isolates justification and righteousness as a gift and present possession of the believer. He shows an understandable preference for a Christ-centred conception. Our righteousness is found in Christ, and not in us. It is certainly true to observe that Christ is our righteousness (1 Corinthians 1:30) and we become the righteousness of God in him (2 Corinthians 5:21). But again, Seifrid fails to account for Paul's statement that righteousness is a gift that the believer takes. Of course, the motif of union with Christ and Christological categories are very important. However, it is wrong to emphasise these categories in such a way that individual and possessive ideas are bypassed or simply absorbed into corporate Christological categories and thus cancelled out. This is the product of the false dichotomizing that holds that justification in Paul must either be grounded on 'union with Christ' or alternatively 'imputation of righteousness'.³³⁷ Instead, both are present in Paul, and the reception of the gift of righteousness is both exegetically and theologically as necessary as 'union with Christ' for a fully Pauline doctrine.

Similar thinking, albeit with more exegetical sympathy for the concept of imputed righteousness, stands behind Bird's critique of imputation and his alternative proposal 'incorporated righteousness'. Bird recognizes that imputation is a category which 'remains fitting within the discourse of systematic theology',³³⁸ and is of service because 'it explains how 'righteousness is given as a gift',³³⁹ but as far as exegesis is concerned:

³³⁶ Seifrid, *Christ, Our Righteousness* (2000), 173-5; Seifrid, 'Luther, Melancthon and Paul on the Question of Imputation' (2004), 151.

³³⁷ Eg D Garlington, 'Imputation or Union with Christ?' (2002), 45-113.

³³⁸ Bird, *Saving Righteousness* (2007), 87; cf idem, *Evangelical Theology* (2013), 563-4, following Carson, 'Vindication of Imputation' (2004), 46-52.

³³⁹ Bird, *Saving Righteousness* (2007), 87.

[I]t is far more appropriate to speak of *incorporated righteousness* for the righteousness that clothes believers is not that which is somehow abstracted from Christ and projected onto them, but is located exclusively in Christ as the glorified incarnation of God's righteousness.³⁴⁰

Bird is critical of Piper for seeing imputation 'as an exegetical necessity'.³⁴¹ Righteousness is located exclusively in Christ and is not to be 'abstracted' or 'projected onto believers'. This raises the question of what Paul means when he repeatedly speaks of a 'gift', that this gift is a 'gift of righteousness', and that it is 'received'. More recently, Bird accounts for τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης by saying:

If we take all the bits and bobs together, including this language of 'counting' from Romans 4, the gift of righteousness in Romans 5:17 and Philippians 3:9, the representative natures of Adam and Christ as federal heads, the forensic nature of *dikaioō* and *dikaiosyne* in several passages (eg Rom 3:21-26; 10:10; Gal 2:15-21; 5:4-5), and the indebtedness of salvation to Jesus' faithfulness and obedience in his task as Son, then, something like 'imputation' sounds like a logical necessity of describing the application of salvation for those who are "in Christ."³⁴²

Horton rightly observes that 'all the elements for active obedience and imputation (crediting) are present in Bird's own helpful and compact summary above'.³⁴³ Yet Bird still caricatures "'merit" that is imputed instead of imparted' as 'a medieval concept' which apparently requires 'righteousness molecules floating in the air to us'.³⁴⁴ But the word Paul has used throughout Romans 4 to describe what he later describes by the motif of 'gift' is λογίζομαι. This means that 'imputed righteousness' is in fact an exegetical necessity, not to the exclusion of 'incorporated righteousness' or the 'in Christ' motif, but as explaining an important aspect of justification that sits within the broader category of union with Christ.

³⁴⁰ Bird, *Saving Righteousness* (2007), 85.

³⁴¹ *ibid*, 85 fn 23.

³⁴² *idem*, 'Progressive Reformed View' (2011), 151.

³⁴³ Horton, 'Traditional Reformed Response', 162.

³⁴⁴ Bird 'Progressive Reformed View' (2011), 151.

‘[I]mputation is crucial, but it is itself grounded on something more comprehensive’.³⁴⁵

‘Imputation and union with Christ coexist, with one flowing from the other’.³⁴⁶

Righteousness and Metaphor: The Search for a Model

Chapter 2 highlighted the problem of regarding righteousness as purely relational. Dunn’s comment on Romans 5:17 above is an example.³⁴⁷ Current Pauline scholarship seems to lack the linguistic tools to analyse the phenomena found in Scripture, without either flattening out the nuances of Paul’s usage or resorting to caricatures and false dichotomization. In searching for adequate epistemological and linguistic categories that account for Paul’s usage of δικαιοσύνη, the following schema is offered, which places identified models of understanding δικαιοσύνη in its various contexts on an existential/essentialist spectrum. Each model is not of necessity exclusive of all the others, and indeed it is my contention that some clearly do co-exist in Paul (particularly the ‘Attribution Model’, ‘Metaphorical Reification’ and ‘Personification’), as shown in the table below.

← Existential Realism More abstraction		Metaphysical Essentialism → Increasing concreteness		
Relational Model Righteousness as ‘relationship’ not a quality. ³⁴⁸	Attribution Model Christ’s righteousness as a quality attributed and possessed Romans 5:19	Metaphorical Reification Righteousness as a gift received and possessed (from Christ) Romans 5:17; 8:4 ³⁴⁹	Personification Righteousness which rules and speaks, a metaphor for Christ Romans 6:18-20; 10:6	Hypostatization/ Deification Graeco-Roman goddesses <i>Iustitia</i> ³⁵⁰ & <i>Dikaiosyne</i> ³⁵¹
Bultmann, Morris, Hill Dunn, Wright ³⁵²	M A Garcia ³⁵³	This thesis	D J Southall ³⁵⁴ J R Dodson ³⁵⁵	Ovid, <i>Fasti</i> i.249 ³⁵⁶

³⁴⁵ Carson, ‘Vindication of Imputation’ (2004), 73.

³⁴⁶ Campbell, *Union with Christ* (2012), 401.

³⁴⁷ Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:281-2.

³⁴⁸ Bultmann, *Theology of the NT* (1952), 272.

³⁴⁹ See Chapter 9, below on Romans 8:4.

³⁵⁰ Southall, *Rediscovering Righteousness* (2008), 33, 312.

³⁵¹ Thielman, ‘God’s Righteousness’ (2011), 41.

³⁵² Chapter 2 above.

Paul does not regard *Dikaiosyne* as a separate deity, so we will not further examine the ‘Hypostatisation/Deification’ model. While Paul certainly personifies righteousness (eg 10:6),³⁵⁷ this does not immediately impact on the issue of imputation. Thus, what follows is an exposition of the three models pertinent to the issue of imputed righteousness: the ‘relational model’, ‘attribution model’, and ‘metaphorical reification’.

The Relational Model of δικαιοσύνη

Chapter 2 above outlines representative presentations of the ‘Relational Model’. The modern view of righteousness as primarily relational arose out of Bultmann’s existentialism,³⁵⁸ and has become dominant in Pauline studies. Wright’s view of δικαιοσύνη as ‘covenantal membership’ also falls under this rubric.³⁵⁹ Regarding Dunn’s view of Romans 5:17, Southall rightly says:

The idea that the gift is a status or relationship sustained by God is possible, but it does not seem overly convincing in the light of the “concrete” connotations of δωρεά. Furthermore, Dunn fails to explain why the idea of an object, which leaves the possession of the giver and becomes possession of the believer, is improbable. After all, the notion of gift does not preclude this idea but rather presupposes it [...].³⁶⁰

Southall rightly questions whether the relational view of righteousness, combined with a preference for univocality and an eschewing of polyvalence, adequately account for Romans 5:17.³⁶¹

³⁵³ Garcia, ‘Imputation and Christology’ (2006), 246-7; idem, ‘Imputation as Attribution’ (2009), 420-1; Cf Rev Dr Lionel Windsor, in personal conversation. Online <http://www.lionelwindsor.net/2011/02/21/justification-and-righteousness-are-not-the-same/> and <http://www.lionelwindsor.net/2009/09/30/improve-your-theological-word-power-imputation/>, accessed on 16 June 2014.

³⁵⁴ Southall, *Rediscovering Righteousness* (2008).

³⁵⁵ Dodson, ‘The Voices of Scripture: Citations and Personifications’ (2010), 419-432.

³⁵⁶ Axtell, *The Deification of Abstract Ideas in Roman Literature and Inscriptions* (1907), 78, 99.

³⁵⁷ See below in this chapter, on 10:6.

³⁵⁸ Richardson, ‘Existentialism’ (1969), 125-6.

³⁵⁹ Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (2013), 2:890.

³⁶⁰ Southall, *Rediscovering Righteousness* (2008), 23.

³⁶¹ *ibid*, 24-31.

The Attribution Model of δικαιοσύνη

Garcia has recently proposed that imputation be considered ‘soteriological attribution’.³⁶²

Observing that basic to justification is a divine verbal and linguistic action, Garcia rightly concludes that imputation is a declarative reckoning. Far from undervaluing ‘union with Christ’, imputation operates within that framework. However, imputation safeguards the fact that Christ and the believer remain distinct.³⁶³ Moreover, Garcia’s model clarifies that the quality of ‘righteousness’ is both ‘properly’ attributed to Christ, but by imputation is ‘improperly’ though truly attributed to the believer by virtue of union with Christ. In this way, Christ’s ‘righteousness’ becomes really the believer’s own as a personal possession.³⁶⁴

In this model, Garcia has accounted for (1) the ontological distinction between Christ and the believer, (2) the overarching concept of union with Christ within which imputation operates, (3) that righteousness is properly a quality and not a thing, (4) the nature of δικαίω as a declaration, and (5) the real though ‘improper’ possession of Christ’s righteousness by the believer united with Christ. These obvious strengths make it the superior model that accounts for most Pauline texts, in particular, Romans 5:19.³⁶⁵

Metaphorically Reified δικαιοσύνη

However, while the attribution model accounts for most Pauline texts, the metaphorical reification model provides a better explanation of Romans 5:17 than the attribution model, because an attribution is ‘a verbal or linguistic action, something which works naturally with understanding justification as judicial *declaration*’.³⁶⁶ However, gift giving and receiving is a physical action in human relationships, involving objects, givers and recipients, and generally does not connote verbal or linguistic acts. Giving implies transfer, even if the gift

³⁶² Garcia, ‘Imputation and Christology’ (2006), 246-7; idem, ‘Imputation as Attribution’ (2009), 420-1.

³⁶³ Garcia, ‘Imputation and Christology’ (2006), 246.

³⁶⁴ idem, ‘Imputation and Christology’ (2006), 247; idem, ‘Imputation as Attribution’ (2009), 419.

³⁶⁵ See chapter 8, below.

³⁶⁶ Garcia, ‘Imputation as Attribution’ (2009), 421.

comes with the giver. Garcia observes ‘transfer’ is something quite different to ‘attribution’.³⁶⁷ Thus, the attribution model is necessary but not sufficient to account for all of Paul’s use of righteousness language, and it needs to be supplemented by the metaphorical reification model for a case such as Romans 5:17.

Southall observes that the gift language has ‘concrete’ connotations, and the notion of a gift seems to presuppose a giving which ‘leaves the possession of the giver and becomes possession of the believer’.³⁶⁸ While the concrete connotations are clear, the notion that righteousness might leave Christ’s possession is objectionable, an objection long ago expressed by Calvin:

We do not, therefore, contemplate [Christ] outside ourselves from afar in order that his righteousness may be imputed to us but because we put on Christ and are engrafted into his body – in short, because he deigns to make us one with him. For this reason, we glory that we have fellowship of righteousness with him.³⁶⁹

Like Calvin, Garcia posits ‘that the *res* of salvation is the righteous Christ himself’.³⁷⁰ This is certainly true, and Calvin above expresses this using the ‘me/us in Christ’ motif of union with Christ.³⁷¹ However, in Romans 5:17, the gift, the *res*, is δικαιοσύνη, and this needs to be accounted for by our conceptual model for righteousness. And if the *res* is δικαιοσύνη, δικαιοσύνη is reified, at least metaphorically.

However, that the *res* is δικαιοσύνη in 5:17 need not mean that Christ ceases to be the *res* of salvation. The gift and the giver might be received by the believer together. That is, the gift of δικαιοσύνη received by the believer might actually come through the believer’s receipt of

³⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁶⁸ Southall, *Rediscovering Righteousness* (2008), 23.

³⁶⁹ *Institutes* 3.II.10; Gaffin, ‘Union With Christ’ (2006), 285-6.

³⁷⁰ Garcia, ‘Imputation and Christology’ (2006), 248.

³⁷¹ 1 Corinthians 1:30; 2 Corinthians 5:21.

the indwelling Christ. In this case, the union with Christ motif underlying 5:17 is not the ‘me/us in Christ’ (the Corporate Christ) motif but the ‘Christ in me/us’ (the Indwelling Christ) motif. Barclay suggests that “‘in Christ’ and ‘Christ in you’ can, at times, be functionally identical for Paul’.³⁷² Consider the following:

Romans 8:10: εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν [...] τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωῇ διὰ δικαιοσύνην
 Galatians 2:20: ζῆν δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός
 Ephesians 3:17: κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν

If the Corporate Christ, in whom we are, is our righteousness (ὁμοῖς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὃς ἐγενήθη σοφία ἡμῖν ἀπὸ θεοῦ, δικαιοσύνη: 1 Corinthians 1:30), it is certainly possible that the Indwelling Christ also brings that same gift. Indeed, in Romans 8:10, Paul says that Christ indwells a believer (Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν), and where Christ indwells a person, the instrumentality of righteousness (διὰ δικαιοσύνην) thereby operates. Arguably, this righteousness in 8:10 is the same righteousness that is gifted according to Romans 5:17.

For Garcia, reification is a ‘specter’, and only ‘a logical and communicative fallacy in which ideas or abstractions are treated as though they were real, concrete entities’.³⁷³ However, reification can also denote a metaphorical use of language in which abstract concepts and relationships are ‘reified’ (said to exist as a thing) for the purpose of analysis. Pauline scholarship requires a description of Paul’s use of language, akin to ‘personification’, and (metaphorical) ‘reification’³⁷⁴ is readily at hand. Unfortunately, the word ‘reification’ negatively connotes for many a crass and unsophisticated concretization. Perhaps for this reason alone it may prove unacceptable. Nevertheless, Paul’s use of concretized ‘gift’

³⁷² Barclay, *Christ in You* (1999), 111.

³⁷³ Garcia, ‘Imputation as Attribution’ (2009), 420-1.

³⁷⁴ Hookway ‘reification, hypostatization’, in J Dancy & E Sosa (eds), *A Companion to Epistemology: Blackwell Companion to Philosophy* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), 428.

language (ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι (v15) = τὸ χάρισμα (vv15, 16) = τὸ δῶρημα (v16), which in turn is identified with the gift which is righteousness, τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης (v17) suggests that Paul has adopted a ‘metaphorical reification’ of righteousness as a gift. The purpose of Paul’s ‘metaphorical reification’ was not to assert that δικαιοσύνη was a concrete substance, gas, object, package, or parcel. Δικαιοσύνη therefore does not move, float or fly. However, for Paul, δικαιοσύνη as an abstract noun can indeed be given, received and possessed.

The purpose of this metaphorical reification is to indicate that a right or privilege with real eschatological consequences has been given as a gift to one person but not another, and has been sourced from a third, God in Christ. The reason δικαιοσύνη is a gift is because it is given χάρις ἔργων.³⁷⁵ It is unmerited by the recipient. Each believer in Christ possesses the gift of righteousness as an individual, as each will appear in the eschatological judgment as an individual. A gift to each believer reflects the reality that each must appear individually before God’s judgment seat.

Conceptually, an analogous situation to that subsisting between imputation and union with Christ exists in the contrasting way of speaking in terms of rights and duties on the one hand, and of responsibilities in relationships on the other. The relational obligation of the Christian is to love neighbour as self. However, this relational obligation can be ‘metaphorically reified’ so that someone can talk about an individual possessing certain rights, such as the right to be loved. If there is a duty to love a neighbour, we could likewise conceive of a right to be loved as a neighbour. The rights and duties framework involves metaphorically reifying the relational responsibility expressed in ‘love your neighbour’,

³⁷⁵ Romans 4:6.

looked at from the perspective of only the recipient of love, but excluding for the purpose of analysis the person with the obligation to love. Again, compare the two ways Paul speaks about the remuneration of gospel workers. From the point of view of the individual, Paul speaks of a 'right' or 'authority' which gospel workers 'have' (ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν: 1 Corinthians 9:4-6; 2 Thessalonians 3:9). However, from the point of view of the relationship of the catechist with the congregation, the same topic is addressed by way of a command to the church to share all good things with its teacher (κοινωνεῖτω τῷ κατηχοῦντι ἐν πᾶσι ἀγαθοῖς: Galatians 6:6). Thus, the 'metaphorical reification' of 'having a right' should be recognised as a figurative use of language for the purpose of analysing the entailments of a relational responsibility from the perspective of the beneficiary only, with the benefactor for the moment excluded. The eschatological reality of the individual appearing before Christ's judgment seat requires some distancing of Christ from his gift, as it is *before Christ* the judge that the one clothed in Christ's righteousness appears.³⁷⁶

Righteousness as a 'possession' in the Old Testament

Righteousness is frequently viewed as a possession in the Old Testament. In the phrase

'righteousness will be to us' (וְצִדְקָהּ תִּהְיֶה-לָּנוּ: Deut 6:25), the preposition *lamed* has

possessive force. Righteousness will belong to Israel when she observes the Torah. In the

Old Testament there is frequent use of the possessive pronominal suffix with *צדק* root

nouns. For example:

- Israel might mistakenly believe she takes the land 'in my/your righteousness':
בְּצִדְקָתְךָ/בְּצִדְקָתִי: Dt 9:4-6.
- YHWH will return to each man 'his righteousness':
וַיְהִיָּה יוֹשִׁיב לְאִישׁ אֶת-צִדְקָתוֹ: 1 Sa 26:23.

³⁷⁶ 2 Timothy 4:1, 8; cf Acts 10:42; 17:31; Romans 2:16; 2 Corinthians 5:10; 1 Corinthians 4:5; John 5:22, 27.

- YHWH has dealt with me according to my righteousness, according to the cleanness of my hands he has recompensed me: **יִגְמְלֵנִי יְהוָה כְּצִדְקִי כְּבֵר יְדֵי יוֹשִׁיב לִי**: Psalm 18:20, 24; 2 Samuel 22:21, 25.
- I am strengthened in my righteousness and I will not abandon it: **בְּצִדְקָתִי הִחַזְקָתִי וְלֹא אֲרַפֶּה**: Job 27:6.
- Your righteousness only affects yourself: **וּלְבֶן-אָדָם צִדְקָתְךָ**: Job 35:8.
- Judge me, YHWH, according to my righteousness and according to my integrity upon me: **שְׁפִטֵּנִי יְהוָה כְּצִדְקִי וּכְתָמִי עָלַי**: Psalm 7:9.
- There is a righteous man who perishes in his righteousness: **יֵשׁ צַדִּיק אֶבֶד בְּצִדְקוֹ**: Ecc 7:15.
- If Israel had obeyed, 'your righteousness' (**וְצִדְקָתְךָ**) would be like the waves of the sea: Isaiah 48:18.
- YHWH will expose Israel's 'righteousness and works' (**וְאֶת-מַעֲשֵׂיךָ**), and they will not benefit from them: Isaiah 57:12.
- Your righteousness will go before you: **לִפְנֶיךָ צִדְקֶךָ**: Isaiah 58:8.
- Jerusalem's righteousness (**צִדְקָהּ**) shines like a bright light: Isaiah 62:1; nations will see your righteousness (**צִדְקֶךָ**): Isaiah 62:2.

A person's righteousness is the basis on which the supplicant claims a benefit from God. This is particularly the case in Ezekiel:

- And if a righteous man turns from his righteousness (**מִצִּדְקָתוֹ**) and does iniquity, and I set a stumbling block before him, he will die: Ezekiel 3:20.
- And if these three men be among them – Noah, Daniel, and Job – the same in their righteousness (**בְּצִדְקָתָם**) would save their souls [only]: Ezekiel 14:14; cf 14:20.
- The righteousness of the righteous person will be upon him: **צִדְקַת הַצַּדִּיק עָלָיו תִּהְיֶה**: Ezekiel 18:20; cf 24, 26.
- The righteousness of the righteous person will not deliver him on the day of his transgression: **צִדְקַת הַצַּדִּיק לֹא תִצִּילֵנוּ בְיוֹם פִּשְׁעוֹ**: Ezekiel 33:12.
- When I say to the righteous, 'He will certainly live', and he trusts upon his righteousness (**עַל-צִדְקָתוֹ**) and does iniquity, all his righteousness (**כָּל-צִדְקָתוֹ**) will not be remembered: Ezekiel 33:13, cf 18.

Righteousness is also personified:

- The righteousness of the blameless makes straight his paths, and in his wickedness the wicked falls: **צִדְקַת תָּמִים תִּישָׁר דְּרָכּוֹ וּבִרְשָׁעוֹ יִפֹּל רָשָׁע**: Proverbs 11:5.

- The righteousness of the upright will deliver them: **צְדָקַת יְשָׁרִים תַּצִּילֵם**: Proverbs 11:6.
- Righteousness was said to once lodge within the city of Jerusalem: **צֶדֶק יָלִין בָּהּ**: Isaiah 1:21.
- Righteousness does not reach us: **צְדָקָה תִּשְׁיָגֵנוּ**: Isaiah 59:9.
- Righteousness stands far away: **וּצְדָקָה מֵרְחוֹק תִּעֲמֹד**: Isaiah 59:14.

A further image is that of being clothed with righteousness.

- May your priests be clothed with righteousness: **יִלְבְּשׁוּ-צֶדֶק כֹּהֲנֶיךָ**: Psalm 132:9.
- I put on righteousness, and it clothed me; my justice was like a robe and a turban: **צֶדֶק לְבַשְׁתִּי וַיִּלְבַּשְׁנִי כַּמְעִיל וְצִנִּיף מִשְׁפָּטִי**: Job 29:14.
- YHWH clothes his people with the garments of salvation and a robe of righteousness: **הִלְבִּישָׁנִי בְגָדֵי-יִשְׁע מְעִיל צְדָקָה יַעֲטֵנִי**: Isaiah 61:10.

The clothing metaphor demonstrates a tendency to metaphorical reification, as clothing worn is in some sense ‘possessed’ by the wearer.

In the above instances, the frequent personal pronoun suggests that righteousness is viewed as a possession. The righteousness possessed by the supplicant often becomes the basis on which the supplicant pleads for vindication, reward or salvation. Similarly, the person’s possession of a ‘righteousness’ that avails before God is the difference, in the case of Ezekiel 18 and 33, of life and death, deliverance and destruction. This possession of righteousness that avails *coram Deo* is the OT background that sheds light on the instances where Paul says a person ‘receives’, ‘has’ or is given the ‘gift’ of righteousness.

An interesting usage is in Jeremiah, where the Davidic King is named ‘YHWH our righteousness’, which indicates that YHWH is the content of the righteousness, but the personal pronoun indicates that the Davidic King is somehow the people’s righteousness.

- And this is his [the Davidic King’s] name which he [YHWH?] will call him [the Davidic King]: YHWH our righteousness: **יְהוָה צְדָקָנוּ אֲשֶׁר-יִקְרָאוּ**: Jeremiah 23:6; cf. of Jerusalem, Jeremiah 33:16.

The Messiah is thus the people's 'righteousness', which includes their justice as a quality, and the saving presence and activity of YHWH.³⁷⁷

The two types of δικαιοσύνη and its 'possession'

Romans 9:30-10:6

In **Romans 9:30-31**, Paul uses the metaphor of a footrace. Gentiles have not pursued (μὴ διώκοντα), but paradoxically κατέλαβεν δικαιοσύνην.³⁷⁸ Καταλαμβάνω, 'seize', 'grasp', 'catch',³⁷⁹ here refers to attaining, winning, or laying hold of a prize, δικαιοσύνη.³⁸⁰ The obtained δικαιοσύνη originates ἐκ πίστεως. By contrast, Israel has pursued (διώκων) 'a law of righteousness', but did not attain to that law (εἰς νόμον οὐκ ἔφθασεν). The unusual phrase νόμον δικαιοσύνης (9:31) means a law 'for righteousness',³⁸¹ 'as a way of righteousness',³⁸² or 'whose object is righteousness',³⁸³ when its demands are met. Unfortunately, Israel by her works did not attain to the law's standard for achieving righteousness.³⁸⁴

Romans 10:3-6 posits two types of righteousness as exclusive alternatives.³⁸⁵ The first is τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ (v3), also conceived as ἡ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη (v6). The second is described as τὴν ἰδίαν [δικαιοσύνην] (v3). This righteousness

³⁷⁷ Thompson, *Jeremiah* (1980), 490-1.

³⁷⁸ Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 609; Morris, *Romans* (1988), 374.

³⁷⁹ LSJM, 897.

³⁸⁰ Romans 9:30; cf 1 Corinthians 9:24; Philippians 3:12-14; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 535-7; Morris, *Romans* (1988), 374 n 135; Sanday & Headlam, *Romans* (1902), 279; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 2:580; Käsemann, *Romans* (1980), 277; Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 394.

³⁸¹ Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 537; Schreiner, 'Israel's Failure: Romans 9:30-10:3' (1991), 213.

³⁸² Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 394.

³⁸³ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 625.

³⁸⁴ Romans 2:12; 3:10-20, 23; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 627; Cf Schreiner, 'Israel's Failure: Romans 9:30-10:3' (1991), 214; Westerholm, *Perspectives Old & New* (2004), 329.

³⁸⁵ Galatians 3:12; Westerholm, *Perspectives Old & New* (2004), 305; 326ff; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 645ff; Gordon, 'Why Israel did not obtain Torah-Righteousness' (1992), 163-4; Watson, *Paul and The Hermeneutics of Faith* (2004), 332; Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 401.

of one's own is also conceived as 'the righteousness from the law', τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ [τοῦ] νόμου (v5).

Νόμος refers to the Mosaic law, for it is what 'Moses writes' (Μωϋσῆς γράφει: v5).³⁸⁶ This righteousness is based on doing: ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς (v5).³⁸⁷

Therefore, 'one's own δικαιοσύνη' denotes a quality which produces righteous activity, ie, doing the Sinaitic legislation. Eschatological resurrection 'life' (ζωή) is the goal of observing the law, conditional on keeping the law's requirements.³⁸⁸ Ἰδαίαν (10:3) has a possessive sense. Their δικαιοσύνη is sourced from themselves as individuals.³⁸⁹ Individuals within Israel must meet the law's demands.³⁹⁰ This requires works that are co-extensive with the Mosaic legislation's demands, and not merely limited to 'boundary markers' and 'purity laws'.³⁹¹ In short, it is an attempt to attain δικαιοσύνη through good works.³⁹² This is true to the nature of νόμος, because it is based on doing, not faith.³⁹³ Israel's quest is futile because νόμος requires obedience³⁹⁴ without sin.³⁹⁵ Though some deny that the law demands perfection,³⁹⁶ what cannot be denied is that 'humanity has not obeyed the law, or even

³⁸⁶ Westerholm, *Perspectives Old & New* (2004), 326.

³⁸⁷ Leviticus 18:5.

³⁸⁸ Leviticus 18:5; Romans 2:13; Watson, *Paul and The Hermeneutics of Faith* (2004), 320-3; Westerholm, *Perspectives Old & New* (2004), 299; Sprinkle, *Law and Life* (2008), 173-5; Contra Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 2:601.

³⁸⁹ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 634; Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 401.

³⁹⁰ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 634-5.

³⁹¹ Schreiner, 'Israel's Failure: Romans 9:30-10:3' (1991), 217.

³⁹² Schreiner, 'Israel's Failure: Romans 9:30-10:3' (1991), 218; Watson, *Paul and The Hermeneutics of Faith* (2004), 333.

³⁹³ Galatians 3:12; Gordon, 'Why Israel did not obtain Torah-Righteousness' (1992), 164.

³⁹⁴ Galatians 3:10; 5:3; 6:13.

³⁹⁵ Romans 2:12-13.

³⁹⁶ Watson, *Paul and The Hermeneutics of Faith* (2004), 326; Sprinkle, *Law and Life* (2008), 175.

cannot obey it',³⁹⁷ because all are under sin.³⁹⁸ However, the law does indeed require perfection for justification.³⁹⁹

“Works of the law” will never justify, because what the law does is to reveal sin. Nobody can keep it perfectly.⁴⁰⁰

Instead of acknowledging ‘one’s own quest for righteousness is futile’ and throwing ‘oneself entirely upon the gift of righteousness offered in Christ (5:17)',⁴⁰¹ most of Israel has not submitted (ὑπετάγησαν) to the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ (10:3), which is the δικαιοσύνην ἐκ πίστεως (9:30). Δικαιοσύνη retains its meaning of dispositional justice issuing in right behaviour and thus is a status accruing to those who have adhered to the Mosaic law as norm.⁴⁰² However, the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is not identical with the δικαιοσύνη ἐκ νόμου,⁴⁰³ as it is an ‘extraordinary’ δικαιοσύνη, τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ (10:3), and stands in the place of the ‘ordinary’ δικαιοσύνη achieved through the law, as a δικαιοσύνην received ἐκ πίστεως.⁴⁰⁴

The Righteousness of God (δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ)

The genitive constructions τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην and τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ (10:3)

have traditionally been taken as ‘the righteousness that comes from God’.⁴⁰⁵ This

understanding relies heavily on the phrase τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην (Philippians 3:9), and

takes the genitive θεοῦ and the phrase τὴν ἰδίαν to both denote *origin*. The righteousness

³⁹⁷ Sprinkle, *Law and Life* (2008), 175.

³⁹⁸ Romans 3:10-20; 23; 6:23; 7:7-25.

³⁹⁹ Romans 2:12; 3:10-12, 20, 23; 10:5; Galatians 3:10, 12; 5:3; James 2:10-11; Schreiner, ‘Is Perfect Obedience Possible?’ (1984), 151-60; idem, ‘Paul and Perfect Obedience to the Law’ (1985), 245-78; idem, Schreiner, *The Law and Its Fulfillment* (1993), 41-71; Westerholm, *Perspectives Old & New* (2004), 436; McFadden, ‘Fulfillment of the Law’s *Dikaiōma*’ (2009), 492-3; Moo, *Galatians* (2013), 201-5; Gordon, ‘Why Israel did not obtain Torah-Righteousness’ (1992), 165.

⁴⁰⁰ Wright, *Justification: God’s Plan* (2009), 97.

⁴⁰¹ Byrne, *Romans* (1996), 315.

⁴⁰² Shedd, *Romans* (1879), 305; Westerholm, *Perspectives Old & New* (2004), 277-8 and fn 39;

⁴⁰³ Shedd, *Romans* (1879), 305.

⁴⁰⁴ Westerholm, *Perspectives Old & New* (2004), 263-273, 277-8.

⁴⁰⁵ NIV, RSV, ESV; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 515; Nygren, *Romans* (1952), 379; Hodge, *Romans* (1864), 334-5; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 634.

which comes from God as his gift is distinguished from the righteousness originating from one's self in obedience to the law.

This necessitates discussion of the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ. The phrase is probably polyvalent,⁴⁰⁶ the genitival flexibility making it useful for various contexts as one slogan apt to convey three ideas,⁴⁰⁷ none necessarily exclusive of the others:

- (1) **God's righteous activity of saving his people**, now revealed in Christ Jesus. God rescues and brings victory to his sinful people through the work of Jesus the Messiah.⁴⁰⁸
- (2) **God's attribute of righteousness**, being his fairness and equity, his righteous wrath against sin, and his justice in punishing it.⁴⁰⁹
- (3) **God's gift to believers of 'the righteousness of faith'**, whereby God reckons righteousness to the ungodly. 'The righteousness of God' in this sense is 'the righteousness *from* God', where the genitive is one of origin or source, denoting a gift received through faith, and is opposed to 'our own righteousness' by works.⁴¹⁰

God's righteousness as an action, an attribute, and a gift, are clearly related. God's saving actions win the victory by rescuing a people for himself. God does so in a way consistent with his justice, punishing wickedness in his Messiah. Yet God's salvation is gracious, in which he attributes to his people 'righteousness', the personal quality that produces law keeping, even though they are in fact 'ungodly'. All three aspects resolve in Jesus Christ. But the last, the gift of righteousness from God to the believer, makes the best sense in Romans 10:3, though it does not exhaust Paul's meaning.⁴¹¹ The righteousness that the believer receives is from without, from God. The genitive is one of origin or source,⁴¹² and it is an *alien* righteousness. This is confirmed in 10:4 by the verbless clause with the dative of

⁴⁰⁶ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 74; Thielman, 'God's Righteousness' (2011), 35, 45, 47.

⁴⁰⁷ Thielman, 'God's Righteousness' (2011), 35, 45; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 84.

⁴⁰⁸ Romans 1:16-17; 3:21-22, 26. Regarding 2 Corinthians 5:21, the phrase ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ (2 Corinthians 5:21) doesn't immediately suggest a gift of righteousness, but that ἡμεῖς, believers, become in Christ a concrete expression of the righteousness of God's saving acts: Martin, *2 Corinthians* (1986), 158; Pace Wright, 'On Becoming the Righteousness of God' (1993), 200-8.

⁴⁰⁹ Romans 1:17-18, 3:5; 3:25-26.

⁴¹⁰ Romans 10:3-4; Philippians 3:9; Romans 1:16-17; 3:21-22, 26: cf Romans 4:3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 22, 5:17; 9:30, 10:6, 31; 10:10; Galatians 2:21.

⁴¹¹ Ortland, 'Zeal Without Knowledge' (2011), 28-30.

⁴¹² *ibid*, 30.

advantage or recipient⁴¹³, εἰς δικαιοσύνη παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι: righteousness [comes] to all who believe.

Against this, Wright argues that ‘God’s righteousness’ is shorthand for the entire sweep of covenantally loyal actions God has undertaken from Abraham to the Messiah’.⁴¹⁴ Israel has rejected this history of God’s faithful actions (‘God’s righteousness’) to set up ‘their own righteousness’, which excludes the Gentiles and prevents Israel being pared down to a remnant. Paul is attacking the belief that God’s covenant is the Jews’ exclusive inalienable possession, and Wright sees no sign of ‘works righteousness’ in ‘their own righteousness’.

Wright minimizes the contrast between righteousness by law and that of faith. For Wright, Christians fulfill the doing of the law by their faith.⁴¹⁵ However, the righteousness of the Mosaic law (10:5) and the righteousness from faith (10:6) are contrasted.⁴¹⁶

[A]ny position which posits continuity between Rom 10:5 and 10:6-8 and fails to see a contrastive element does not seem to reflect the flow of the passage from Rom 9:30 onwards.⁴¹⁷

In verse 6, ‘righteousness’ is strongly personified.⁴¹⁸ The righteousness from faith speaks (λέγει). The righteousness sourced from God,⁴¹⁹ then reified as a gift,⁴²⁰ is attributed to humans as a quality,⁴²¹ and then personified.⁴²²

⁴¹³ Wallace, *Greek Grammar* (1996), 142-9

⁴¹⁴ Wright, ‘Romans’ (2002), 654-5.

⁴¹⁵ *ibid*, 660.

⁴¹⁶ Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 2:602.

⁴¹⁷ Southall, *Rediscovering Righteousness* (2008), 249.

⁴¹⁸ *ibid*, 254-5.

⁴¹⁹ Romans 3:21.

⁴²⁰ Romans 5:17.

⁴²¹ Romans 4:6, 11; 5:19.

⁴²² Romans 10:6.

Philippians 3:9

⁸However, quite to the contrary, I also regard everything to be loss, because of the surpassing greatness of knowing Christ Jesus my Lord, because of whom I have lost everything. I even regard [them] excrement, so that I may gain Christ ⁹and be found in him (ἐν αὐτῷ), not having my [own] righteousness, the [one that comes] from [the] law (μὴ ἔχων ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου), but [having] the [one that comes] through faith in Christ (ἀλλὰ τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ), the righteousness [that comes] from God [and rests] upon the [person who has] faith (τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει), ¹⁰to know him and the power of his resurrection (τοῦ γινῶναι αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ) and [the] fellowship of his sufferings, becoming conformed to his death, ¹¹if perhaps I will attain to the resurrection of the dead (εἴ πως καταντήσω εἰς τὴν ἐξανάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν).

As in Romans 9:30-10:6, Paul distinguishes two types of righteousness.⁴²³ The first is that which is ‘by the law’, κατὰ δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐν νόμῳ (v6). Paul calls it ‘my own righteousness by law’, ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου (v9a). While the first three items Paul rehearses in his Jewish heritage cannot be called personal achievements (v5), he does describe his personal accomplishments (vv5-6) using three prepositional phrases with κατὰ taking the accusative.⁴²⁴

περιτομῇ ὀκταήμερος,
ἐκ γένους Ἰσραήλ,
φυλῆς Βενιαμίν,
ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων,
κατὰ νόμον Φαρισαῖος,
κατὰ ζήλος διώκων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν,
κατὰ δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐν νόμῳ
γενόμενος ἄμεμπτος.

circumcised on the eighth day,
of the genus of Israel,
of the tribe of Benjamin,
a Hebrew of Hebrews,
according to law, a Pharisee,
according to zeal, persecuting the church,
according to righteousness in the law,
having become blameless. (Philippians 3:5-6)

Against Wright, the first six categories *do not* emphasise ethnic status, but only the first three.⁴²⁵ The last three are achievements Paul claimed as an individual, and do not apply to his nation.⁴²⁶ Even Paul’s claim to be a ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων (v5) distinguishes him from

⁴²³ Southall, *Rediscovering Righteousness* (2008), 304; Matlock, ‘Saving Faith: πίστις in Paul’ (2009), 77; Bell, ‘Faith in Christ: Philippians 3:9 and Ephesians 3:12’ (2009), 113.

⁴²⁴ O’Brien, *Philippians* (1991), 395-6; Bell, ‘Faith in Christ: Philippians 3:9 and Ephesians 3:12 (2009)’, 112.

⁴²⁵ Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (2013), 2:988.

⁴²⁶ Galatians 1:13-14; Acts 22:3-5; 26:9-11.

other Hebrews and suggests a claim to special achievement. Zeal, choice of party, good track record of persecution, and blamelessness according to the law's righteousness, were all part of his confidence in the flesh *as an individual*, which he held up against his opponents. Partly from heritage, but mostly from achievement, Paul evinced 'attitudinal self-righteousness'.⁴²⁷ Emphatic personal possessive ἐμήν reflects that this righteousness depends on Paul's efforts through works of the law.⁴²⁸ Pronoun with participle (ἔχων ἐμήν) indicates righteousness as a present possession.⁴²⁹ Preposition ἐκ denotes source or origin,⁴³⁰ being τὴν ἐκ νόμου. This righteousness is derived from the law.⁴³¹ It is not a 'national' righteousness, as then Paul would have said '*our own*' righteousness.⁴³² In any event, Paul's opponents also claimed 'national' righteousness, and Paul only had greater confidence (ἐγὼ μᾶλλον: v4) because of his personal achievements.⁴³³

Since Paul fulfilled the law's prescription for righteous behavior, he possessed righteousness from the law. He claims it to be *my own righteousness* because he achieved it by keeping the law. He owned it because he had earned it.⁴³⁴

Paul's previous blamelessness (γενόμενος ἄμειπτος: v6) was not a claim to sinlessness. Paul elsewhere saw himself in light of the law very differently (Romans 7:7-13).⁴³⁵ But here, ἄμειπτος refers to a scrupulous adherence to upright behavior and use of the means of the atonement.⁴³⁶ Paul is accenting his exemplary way of life conforming to the Mosaic law understood along Pharisaic lines, which provided grounds for contradicting Paul's claim.⁴³⁷

⁴²⁷ O'Brien, *Philippians* (1991), 395; Bockmuehl, *Philippians* (1998), 209.

⁴²⁸ Silva, *Philippians* (2005), 161; Hansen, *Philippians* (2009), 238; Bockmuehl, *Philippians* (1998), 209.

⁴²⁹ Fee, *Philippians* (1995), 321.

⁴³⁰ O'Brien, *Philippians* (1991), 397.

⁴³¹ Deuteronomy 6:25; Bockmuehl, *Philippians* (1998), 210.

⁴³² Kim, *Paul and the New Perspective: Second Thoughts* (2002), 77-79.

⁴³³ Hansen, *Philippians* (2009), 239.

⁴³⁴ *ibid*, 238.

⁴³⁵ Martin, *Philippians* (1959), 143-4. See Chapter 9, below.

⁴³⁶ Hansen, *Philippians* (2009), 228; Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (2013), 2:989.

⁴³⁷ O'Brien, *Philippians* (1991), 380; Fee, *Philippians* (1995), 309; Müller, *Philippians* (1955), 111; Vincent, *Philippians* (1897), 98-99.

In observable conduct and the judgment of men, Paul was blameless.⁴³⁸ Paul is responding *ad hominem* to those who have placed their hope in the flesh (vv3-4), in national righteousness, and obedience to the law, all of which Paul now considers σκύβαλα (v6) as a way of righteousness.

Strong adversative ἀλλά contrasts τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ [δικαιοσύνην] with ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου (v9). This righteousness is also described as τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει (v9). Prasad supplies to the beginning of the first clause the phrase ἔχων ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην, arguing that Paul intends to say that faith-righteousness is also ‘my own’.⁴³⁹ However, Philippians 3:9 evinces a chiastic structure.⁴⁴⁰ Thus, possessive ἐμὴν corresponds to ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει by way of *contrast*. Faith-righteousness is thus, for Paul, in one sense not ‘my own’ (in that it originates from God, not Paul’s keeping of the law), although in another sense faith-righteousness is possessed by Paul, as shall now be demonstrated.

Paul seeks to ‘gain Christ’ (ἵνα Χριστὸν κερδήσω: v8), therefore giving up other ‘gains’ (κέρδη: v7)⁴⁴¹ This in itself connotes ‘possession’,⁴⁴² though the verb focusses on future possession. Paul wants to perfectly appropriate Christ and make him his own.⁴⁴³ This occurs fully on the day of Christ.⁴⁴⁴ Paul then wishes to be found in Christ’ (εὑρεθῶ ἐν αὐτῷ: v 9).

⁴³⁸ Luke 18:21; Calvin, *Comm Philippians*, 3:6 in CC, 21:93; Alford, *Greek NT* (1877), 3:179; Ellicott, *Philippians* (1865), 70.

⁴³⁹ Prasad, ‘The Righteousness of the Believer: Phil 3,9’ (2004), 168.

⁴⁴⁰ O’Brien, *Philippians* (1991), 394; Silva, *Philippians* (2005), 160; *contra* Matlock, ‘Saving Faith: πίστις in Paul’ (2009), 76.

⁴⁴¹ O’Brien, *Philippians* (1991), 391.

⁴⁴² Martin, *Philippians* (1959), 147-8.

⁴⁴³ O’Brien, *Philippians* (1991), 391; Bockmuehl, *Philippians* (1998), 208-9; Vincent, *Philippians* (1897), 101.

⁴⁴⁴ O’Brien, *Philippians* (1991), 391.

again focussing on Judgment Day.⁴⁴⁵ Paul seeks a perfection and consummation of his inaugurated union with Christ.⁴⁴⁶ There is an interplay between the present and future aspect of Paul's quest for δικαιοσύνη by faith.⁴⁴⁷ The present aspect is reflected by participle μὴ ἔχων denegated by ἀλλά. Paul has δικαιοσύνη 'in the here and now as well as on the final day'.⁴⁴⁸ The future aspect is reflected by the subjunctives κερδήσω, εὐρεθῶ (vv8-9). Ziesler underplays this present possession.⁴⁴⁹ Therefore, Paul both presently has, but also seeks to gain, δικαιοσύνη.

This inaugurated eschatology is reflected in Philippians 3:12-14. The 'now' is expressed in that Paul has been grasped by Christ (note passive κατελήμφθην ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ: v13). The 'not yet' is Paul's quest, expressed by οὐχ ὅτι ἤδη ἔλαβον, ἤδη τετελείωμαι, εἰ καὶ καταλάβω (v12), and ἐγὼ ἑμαυτὸν οὐ λογίζομαι κατεληφέναι (v13). Paul does not reckon that he has yet grasped his goal, but he doesn't specify his object of pursuit (vv12-14). It should not be inferred that Paul presently lacks δικαιοσύνη in any sense.⁴⁵⁰ Probably, Paul's ultimate goal is the eschatological gaining of Christ himself,⁴⁵¹ conforming to Christ's death and resurrection (v10-11), all of which lie in Paul's future.

Regarding τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ (v9), preposition διὰ with genitive indicates the instrument through which δικαιοσύνη is received.⁴⁵² The genitive is probably objective⁴⁵³ not

⁴⁴⁵ *ibid*, 392; Hawthorne, *Philippians* (1983), 140; Collange, *Philippians* (1979), 130; Martin, *Philippians* (1976), 131.

⁴⁴⁶ O'Brien, *Philippians* (1991), 392, 415-6.

⁴⁴⁷ Hansen, *Philippians* (2009), 237; Campbell, *Union with Christ* (2012), 188.

⁴⁴⁸ O'Brien, *Philippians* (1991), 393.

⁴⁴⁹ Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness* (1972), 149.

⁴⁵⁰ Cf Romans 5:1-2, 9.

⁴⁵¹ O'Brien, *Philippians* (1991), 421-2.

⁴⁵² Campbell, *Union with Christ* (2012), 255.

subjective.⁴⁵⁴ The source of this righteousness is God (τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην) who gives it.⁴⁵⁵ It is a received righteousness.⁴⁵⁶ Hansen rightly observes:

Paul's unique way of qualifying righteousness as *the righteousness that comes from God* puts the expression in the category of Paul's references in Romans to righteousness credited, received, or obtained as a gift.⁴⁵⁷

Some argue that 'Paul presents two different meanings for the word *righteousness*' in verse 9.⁴⁵⁸ Paul's own δικαιοσύνη has 'ethical connotations' and refers to moral achievement, but the righteousness from God is 'not some higher kind of moral achievement but is a relational term, denoting basically a right relationship with God.'⁴⁵⁹ However, there is no need to evacuate the ethical connotations from τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην.⁴⁶⁰ The source is different (ἐκ θεοῦ, not ἐμῇν or ἐκ νόμου), but it is not a different species of δικαιοσύνη.⁴⁶¹ The undoubted relational status connoted by δικαιοσύνη is still grounded on ethical righteousness, but in the second case it is 'extraordinary righteousness',⁴⁶² the 'righteousness from God in Christ' comes to us as a gift and based on another's achievements.⁴⁶³ As Westerholm says:

⁴⁵³ Hansen, *Philippians* (2009), 241-2; Matlock, 'Saving Faith: πίστις in Paul' (2009), 78; Bell, 'Faith in Christ: Philippians 3:9 and Ephesians 3:12' (2009), 111-120; Moo, *Galatians* (2013), 38-48; Silva, *Philippians* (2005), 161; idem, 'Faith Versus Works', 227-234; Westerholm, *Perspectives Old & New* (2004), 305-6; Hawthorne, *Philippians* (1983), 141-2; Vincent, *Philippians* (1897), 102; Fee, *Philippians* (1995), 324-6, esp fn 44; Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness* (1972), 148-152.

⁴⁵⁴ Campbell, *Union with Christ* (2012), 252-5; Sumney, *Philippians* (2007), 80; Seifrid, 'The Faith of Christ', 144-5; Foster, 'Πίστις Χριστοῦ: Philippians and Ephesians' (2009), 93-100; O'Brien, *Philippians* (1991), 398-9; Bockmuehl, *Philippians* (1998), 210-2.

⁴⁵⁵ Marshall, *Philippians* (1992), 90; Hawthorne, *Philippians* (1983), 142; Martin, *Philippians* (1976), 132; Müller, *Philippians* (1955), 115; Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness* (1972), 148-9.

⁴⁵⁶ Westerholm, *Perspectives Old & New* (2004), 312.

⁴⁵⁷ Hansen, *Philippians* (2009), 240.

⁴⁵⁸ *ibid*, 240.

⁴⁵⁹ O'Brien, *Philippians* (1991), 396; Hawthorne, *Philippians* (1983), 140-1; Beare, *Philippians* (1973), 120.

⁴⁶⁰ *Per* Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness* (1972), 148-151.

⁴⁶¹ *Pace* Ziesler, *op cit*, 149.

⁴⁶² Westerholm, *Perspectives Old & New* (2004), 273-284.

⁴⁶³ Romans 5:17-19.

[T]hough 'dikaioisify' may broadly be said to mean "accept" or "approve," the point should be borne in mind that the "acceptance" or "approval" spoken of is that which, in the "normal" course of things, would be granted only to *doers* of dikaiosness.⁴⁶⁴

The prepositional phrase ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει (3:9) is difficult,⁴⁶⁵ and has been rendered 'built on', 'grounded upon', 'on the ground of',⁴⁶⁶ 'on the condition of',⁴⁶⁷ 'on the basis of',⁴⁶⁸ 'that upon which a state of being, an action, or a result is based',⁴⁶⁹ or 'that depends upon'.⁴⁷⁰ But it is preferable to recognise a locative use of both prepositions, ἐκ and ἐπὶ, and a spatial⁴⁷¹ movement of the gift of righteousness.⁴⁷² The basic meaning of both prepositions in their primary local senses is a spatial movement 'from within' (ἐκ) and 'resting upon' (ἐπὶ) something.⁴⁷³ Applied to Philippians 3:9, the δικαιοσύνη originates from within God (ἐκ θεοῦ), proceeds from God,⁴⁷⁴ and alights and rests⁴⁷⁵ 'upon the faith' (ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει) exercised by a believer towards Christ.⁴⁷⁶ If the article (τῇ πίστει) is personified, the righteousness comes 'upon the [person with] faith'.⁴⁷⁷ If ἐπὶ with the dative denotes a more close connection than with the genitive,⁴⁷⁸ then the gift of righteousness from God is identified with a person's faith in the closest possible way.

⁴⁶⁴ *ibid*, 278 fn 39.

⁴⁶⁵ cf Acts 3:16.

⁴⁶⁶ Silva, *Philippians* (2005), 168; Alford, *Greek NT* (1877), 3:180; Ellicott, *Philippians* (1865), 73.

⁴⁶⁷ Lightfoot, *Philippians* (1890), 150.

⁴⁶⁸ Hansen, *Philippians* (2009), 242; Bockmuehl, *Philippians* (1998), 213; O'Brien, *Philippians* (1991), 394; Martin, *Philippians* (1959), 148.

⁴⁶⁹ O'Brien, *Philippians* (1991), 400.

⁴⁷⁰ Martin, *Philippians* (1976), 133.

⁴⁷¹ Sumney, *Philippians* (2007), 81.

⁴⁷² First suggested to me by the Rev Dr Stephen Shead, in personal conversation.

⁴⁷³ Harris, 'Appendix: Prepositions and Theology in NT' (1971), in *NIDNTT*, 3:1188, 1193.

⁴⁷⁴ Beare, *Philippians* (1973), 119-21.

⁴⁷⁵ Vincent, *Philippians* (1897), 102.

⁴⁷⁶ Calvin, *Comm Philippians* 3:9, in *CC*, 21:97.

⁴⁷⁷ Sumney, *Philippians* (2007), 81.

⁴⁷⁸ Ellicott, *Philippians* (1865), 73.

Both union with Christ and receiving righteousness as a gift co-exist in Philippians 3:8-9.⁴⁷⁹

‘It is only by becoming one with Christ, that Christ’s righteousness can become our righteousness’.⁴⁸⁰ ‘Union with Christ’ and receiving ‘righteousness from God’ is not ‘either/or’, but ‘both/and’.⁴⁸¹

Conclusion

Paul expressly says that δικαιοσύνη is a gift given by God and received by believers.⁴⁸² Gifts are possessed, and the gift of righteousness is no exception. This gift of righteousness has come in the way that Paul has already indicated, by imputation.⁴⁸³ Imputation of righteousness sits within the broader category of union with Christ, and the best model to account for most texts is that it involves attributing a quality of righteousness that is ‘properly’ Christ’s to the believer.⁴⁸⁴ However, a ‘metaphorical reification’ of righteousness accounts for Romans 5:17, Philippians 3:9, and some uses of the polyvalent phrase δικαιοσύνη θεου. Such ‘reifications’ operate in the context of a broader attribution model and within the overarching category of ‘union with Christ’, and particularly with the reference to the indwelling Christ.

⁴⁷⁹ Martin, *Philippians* (1959), 148; Hawthorne, *Philippians* (1983), 140, 142.

⁴⁸⁰ Lightfoot, *Philippians* (1890), 149.

⁴⁸¹ O’Brien, *Philippians* (1991), 416, criticizing Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness* (1972), 149-51.

⁴⁸² Romans 5:15-17.

⁴⁸³ Romans 4:3, 6, 9, 11, 22.

⁴⁸⁴ Romans 5:19.

Chapter 5

The Meaning of δικαίωμα and δικαίωσις, and the motif of resurrection in Romans 4

Introduction

In his exposition of justification, Paul uses two rare terms, δικαίωμα (Romans 1:32; 2:26; 5:16, 18; 8:4) and δικαίωσις (Romans 4:25; 5:18). This chapter analyses the semantic range of δικαίωμα and δικαίωσις in the Graeco-Roman corpus, the LXX, and the NT outside of Romans 5:16,⁴⁸⁵ 18,⁴⁸⁶ and 8:4.⁴⁸⁷ The chapter closes with exegesis of Romans 4:25.

Accidence and word formation of δικαίωμα and δικαίωσις

Both δικαίωμα and δικαίωσις are verbal nouns, built onto the verb stem δικαιό-. Δικαιόω is a forensic term denoting the judicial process to ‘set right’, ‘hold or deem right’, ‘claim or demand as a right’, ‘pronounce judgment’, and especially in the LXX and NT, ‘pronounce and treat as righteous’, ‘justify’, ‘vindicate’.⁴⁸⁸ The root δικαι- denotes ‘justice’, ‘righteousness’ or ‘judgment’. The suffix -σις normally denotes the action or process of the verbal root, while -μα normally expresses the result or consequence of the action,⁴⁸⁹ although this must be born out by usage. ‘[Δ]ικαίωσις is the act of justifying of which δικαίωμα is the concrete

⁴⁸⁵ See Chapter 6.

⁴⁸⁶ See Chapter 7.

⁴⁸⁷ See Chapter 9.

⁴⁸⁸ LSJM, 429; cf MM, 162-3; Schrenk, ‘δικαιόω’, *TDNT*, 2:211-219; Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness* (1972), 1-7, 52-58, 71, 74-5, 83-5, 128-130, 141, 147; Moo, *Galatians* (2013), 50; Westerholm, *Perspectives Old & New* (2004), 264 fn 7; Seifrid, ‘Paul’s Use of Righteousness Language’ (2004), 52-53; Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1993), 308-9; idem, ‘Justification by Faith in Pauline Thought’ (2006), 83-85; Reumann, ‘Justification and Justice in the New Testament’ (1999), 27.

⁴⁸⁹ Schrenk, ‘δικαίωμα’, *TDNT*, 2:219; *EDNT*, 334; *TLNT*, 343; Moulton & Howard, *Grammar: Accidence & Word-formation* (1929), 2:353-5, 373-4; Goodwin, *Greek Grammar* (1955), 184-6; BDAG, 249; Robertson, *Grammar* (1934), 150-2; Beale, *Revelation* (1999), 936 fn 304; Sanday & Headlam, *Romans* (1902), 31.

expression'.⁴⁹⁰ In such cases, δικαίωμα is *prima facie*, the result of δικαίωσις. We turn now to usage.

Δικαίωμα in Secular Greek Usage

According to the lexica, in Greek secular usage, δικαίωμα was a term used in legal contexts for an 'act of justice', a 'rectification' or 'amendment' of a wrong, or a 'legal claim' or 'plea for justice'.⁴⁹¹ The nominalization of the result of δικαιοῖω, δικαίωμα denotes the actualization of justice.⁴⁹² It might thus be translated 'justification' or 'condemnation', 'punishment', depending on context. Further, δικαίωμα might denote a statute or ordinance, a legal 'act', again the concretization or result of the justice process.⁴⁹³ These are all types of 'decree'.⁴⁹⁴ Occasionally δικαίωμα denotes a 'righteous deed' or 'right action'.⁴⁹⁵ The following analysis of δικαίωμα used in specific cases will bear out the substantial correctness of the dictionaries.

1. Δικαίωμα as judicial correction, rectification, or justification by a judge

*Aristotle (384-322BC)*⁴⁹⁶, *Nicomachean Ethics, Book 5 Chapter 7*

An act of injustice (τὸ ἀδίκημα) differs from the unjust (τὸ ἄδίκον), and an act of justice (τὸ δικαίωμα) differs from the just (τὸ ἀδίκαιον). For what is unjust (ἄδίκον) is by nature or by enactment, but this very thing becomes an act of injustice (ἀδίκημά) once it is done; yet until what is unjust is done, it is not yet an act of injustice, though it is unjust (ἄδίκον). The case is similar also for an act of justice (δικαίωμα) (though this is more commonly called a 'just action' (δικαιοπράγημα), whereas an 'act of justice' is a correction of an act of injustice (δικαίωμα δὲ τὸ ἐπανόρθωμα τοῦ ἀδικήματος).⁴⁹⁷

⁴⁹⁰ Morris, *Apostolic Preaching* (1965), 288; idem, *Romans* (1988), 236 n 81.

⁴⁹¹ LSJM, 429; Schrenk, 'δικαίωμα', *TDNT*, 2:219-20.

⁴⁹² Schrenk, 'δικαίωμα', *TDNT*, 2:219.

⁴⁹³ *ibid*, 2:220.

⁴⁹⁴ BDAG, 249; Tov, 'Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings' (1990), 85.

⁴⁹⁵ LSJM, 429; Schrenk, 'δικαίωμα', *TDNT*, 2:220.

⁴⁹⁶ For dates: Hornblower, Spaworth & Eidinow, *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (2012).

⁴⁹⁷ English translation Bartlett & Collins, *Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics* (2011), 105; Greek text: Rackham (trs), *Aristotle: The Nicomachean Ethics*: LCL 73 Aristotle Vol XIX (1934), 296, cited *Nicomachean Ethics*; Lat *Ethica Nicomachea* [EN], 5.7.7, [1135^a13]; Compare Ross & Brown (trs), *Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics* (1980), 93.

Aristotle here distinguishes between universals and particulars, between justice and injustice in the abstract as rules that can be universalized, and justice and injustice in particulars, being acts which are done. Aristotle first uses δικαίωμα twice to refer to a particularization or concrete act of justice. However, Aristotle corrects his own terminology, instead using δικαιοπράγημα as the common term for a concrete act of justice. Aristotle thus reserves δικαίωμα for denoting a rectification or correction of an act of injustice. The neuter noun τὸ ἐπανόρθωμα denotes a correction.⁴⁹⁸ Since the correction is ordered by a judge, ‘justification’ or ‘rectification’ is an appropriate translation.

For Aristotle, ‘corrective justice’ (διορθωτικόν, ἐπανορθωτικόν) concerns the correction or rectification of losses. A judge rectifies harm by restoring what was lost to the wronged party, taking goods away from the party in the wrong, or simply by punishing the offender.⁴⁹⁹ ‘[J]ustice demands that the judge impose a judgment that best restores to the injured party what was lost’.⁵⁰⁰ Typically, that involves restitution. The judge tries to equalize the unjust gain by restoring the mean.⁵⁰¹ The goal of ‘corrective justice’ is not ‘punitive’. Rather ‘corrective justice’ seeks a judgment that restores both wrongdoer and the wronged person to their original condition.⁵⁰² In ‘corrective justice’, each party should be treated according to their merit (κατ’ ἀξίαν). Who one is (a freeborn citizen, a foreigner, a slave) and what one has done must also be taken into account.⁵⁰³

⁴⁹⁸ LSJM, 609, ἐπανορθ-όω.

⁴⁹⁹ Weed, ‘Aristotle on Justice’ (2006), 91; Thom, ‘Sermon on the Mount: An Aristotelian Reading’ (2009), 321; Pakaluk, *Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics: An Introduction* (2005), 196.

⁵⁰⁰ Weed, ‘Aristotle on Justice’ (2006), 92.

⁵⁰¹ *ibid.*

⁵⁰² *ibid.*, 92-3.

⁵⁰³ Thom, ‘Sermon on the Mount: An Aristotelian Reading’ (2009), 322.

The anonymous late-Antiquities commentator on Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* is a Greek-speaker and so his understanding of the Greek language will be connected to Paul's, although he writes much later. His exposition of *NE* Book 5 Chapter 7, confirms our reading of the paragraph:

<i>Anonymi in Aristotelis, Ethica Nicomachea, In ethica Nicomachea ii-v commentaria: Thesaurus Linguae Graecae {4033.001}</i>	<i>Anonymous Commentator on Nicomachean Ethics, English Translation⁵⁰⁴ (c AD13th Century)⁵⁰⁵</i>
<p>διαφορὰν γὰρ δείκνυσιν ἀδίκου τε καὶ ἀδικήματος καὶ δικαίου καὶ δικαιώματος ἢ δικαιοπραγίας.</p> <p>ἄδικον μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶ τῇ τάξει, ὃν καθόλου τε καὶ ὠρισμένον καὶ τεταγμένον τῷ λόγῳ.</p> <p>ὅταν δὲ πραχθῇ καὶ ἐν πράξει γένηται, ἀδικημὰ ἐστὶν, ὃν ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἕκαστα.</p> <p>ὁμοίως τὸ δίκαιον ὠρισμένον τε καὶ καθόλου δίκαιον, πραχθὲν δὲ τοῦτο δικαίωμα ἀνάλογον τῷ δικαίωmati.</p> <p>εἰπὼν δὲ δικαίωμα τὸ κατὰ τὸ ὠρισμένον τε καὶ καθόλου δίκαιον πραχθὲν ἐπανορθοῦται αὐτὸ καὶ φησι·</p> <p>καθόλου μὲν τὸ κατὰ τὸ ὠρισμένον δίκαιον πᾶν πραχθὲν δικαιοπράγημα καλεῖται ἀλλ' οὐ δικαίωμα, ἅν τε ἐν νομῇ ἢ ἅν τε περὶ τὰ συναλλάγματα, ἰδίως δὲ δικαίωμα τὸ ἐπανορθωτικὸν τοῦ ἀδικήματος, τουτέστιν ἢ ἐπὶ τῷ ἀδικήματι τιμωρία τε καὶ ζημία.</p> <p>τοιοῦτόν ἐστι καὶ τὸ “δικαιώσει δὲ Κόρινθον”, ἵσον τῷ ἐπανορθώσει καὶ κολάσει· τὸ γὰρ εἰς τὸν ἀδικήσαντα γινόμενον δικαιοπράγημα τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὸ δικαίωμα.</p> <p>ὁ μὲν γὰρ τὴν παρα-καταθήκην ἀποδιδούς δικαιοπραγεῖ, ὁ δὲ τῷ μὴ ἀποδιδόντι ἐπεξίων δικαιοὶ τὸν ἀδικήσαντα, καὶ τὸ τοιοῦτο δικαιοπράγημα δικαίωμα.</p>	<p>For [Aristotle] demonstrates a distinction between both ‘injustice’ and an ‘unjust act’, and also ‘justice’ and a ‘just outcome’ or a ‘just act’.</p> <p>For on the one hand, ‘injustice’ is in the class which [is] both general and also classified and defined by the word.</p> <p>But when ‘[injustice]’ is done, and comes to pass in an action, it is an ‘unjust act’, which is [categorised] among those that are particulars.</p> <p>Likewise, ‘justice’, both definite and in general, [remains] justice, but [when justice] is done, then this ‘just outcome’ is analagous to the ‘just decision’.</p> <p>But calling a just outcome according to both definition and in general ‘justice’ being done, he corrects it and says:</p> <p>On the one hand, general justice according to definition calls every [just] action a <i>dikaio-pragēma</i> (a righteous act) but not a <i>dikaiōma</i> (a righteous outcome), [no matter] if it be in law or if it concerns the conciliations, but especially <i>dikaiōma</i> (‘justification’) is the correction of an unjust act, that is, both the retribution and the penalty upon the unjust act.</p> <p>Such as this is also the saying ‘And he will justify Corinth’ (ie pronounce a verdict)’, equally he will correct [it] and punish it. For whatever brings about a righteous act for the one who has done unrighteousness, this is justification.</p> <p>For on the one hand, the one who pays back the deposit of money acts righteously; but on the other hand, the one [legally] prosecuting the one who does not give back [the deposit] justifies (ie judicially corrects) the unrighteous one, namely, the outcome of the justice process (which is) such an act of righteousness.</p>

⁵⁰⁴ I thank Rev Dr Peter Bolt for checking my translation and making suggestions.

⁵⁰⁵ Benakis, ‘Aristotelian Ethics in Byzantium’ (2009), 66.

A difference in the Anonymous commentary from my reading of Aristotle is that it is not clear that for Aristotle, the correction of the injustice involves punishment (as it does according to the Anonymous commentator). For Aristotle, corrective justice is not punitive, but seeks to restore the mean by judicial correction. But this difference is immaterial for my main point, in that the Medieval commentator has picked up that for Aristotle, δικαίωμα is the judicial correction of an act of injustice. Hence, to justify, means to correct the wrong. For the commentator, justification (δικαίωμα) is to bring about a righteous act (δικαιοπράγημα) ‘for the one who has done wrong’ (ἀδικήσαντα). The outcome of the justice process of restoration is δικαίωμα.

Thucydides (c460-c400BC), History of the Peloponnesian War, Book 6 Chapter 80 Section 2

And no one should regard as fair to us [the Syracusans], while safe for you [the Camerinaeans], that prudent course of yours – to aid neither [the Syracusan or the Athenians], forsooth, as being allies of both. Indeed, it is not as fair in fact, as when urged to justify you (οὐ γὰρ τὸ ἔργῳ ἴσον ὥσπερ τῷ καλοῦ δικαίωματί ἐστιν). For if through your failure to take sides as allies the sufferer shall be defeated and the conqueror shall prevail, what else have you done by this selfsame standing aloof but refused to aid the one to secure his salvation and to prevent the other from incurring guilt?⁵⁰⁶

Here, δικαίωμα denotes the vindication that the men of Camerina will not receive if they do not assist Hermocrates from Syracuse against the invading Athenians. Δικαίωμα in the sense of vindication moves close to the Aristotelian particular meaning of rectification of an injustice, vindication being the showing or declaring someone to be in the right by a (metaphorical) court.

Dio Cassius (c164AD-after229), Roman History, Book 52 Chapter 31 Section 2:

In the second place, you would do well to have all your legislation (πάντα τὰ νομοθετούμενα) enacted by the senate, and to enforce no measure whatever upon all the people alike except the decrees (δογμάτων) of this body. In this way the dignity of the empire would be more securely established and the judgments rendered in accordance with the law (καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα τὰκ τῶν νόμων) would instantly be free from all dispute or

⁵⁰⁶ Thucydides 6.80.2 in *History of the Peloponnesian War*: LCL 110 Vol III Books V-VI (1921), 322-5.

uncertainty in the eyes of all the people.⁵⁰⁷

Here, τὰ δικαιώματα are the judgments that are the result of the judging process. This is because the judgments are in accordance with the laws (τὰ δικαιώματα τὰκ τῶν νόμων), not the laws themselves.⁵⁰⁸

2. Δικαίωμα as a righteous claim or plea for justification

The following uses show that δικαίωμα can be used in the related forensic sense of a righteous claim or plea for justification. While δικαίωμα is not used in the technical sense found in Aristotle of the judge correcting the injustice, it is used in a closely derivative sense, of the litigant claiming that they have a just cause, and thus justice requires that the injustice should be rectified by the claimant being justified.

Plato (c429-347BC), Laws⁵⁰⁹, Book IX [864e3]

[864d] If any case of this kind [insanity or lack of mental capacity] is ever brought to the notice of the selected judges, either on the information of the doer of the act or on that of him who is pleading for the doer, and if it be judged that he was in this state of madness when he broke the law, [864e] then he shall certainly pay for the damage he has done, but only the exact sum, and he shall be acquitted of the other charges (τῶν δὲ ἄλλων δικαιωμάτων ἀφείσθω), unless it be that he has killed a man and has not purged his hands from blood: in this case he shall depart into another country and place, and dwell there as an exile for a year; and should he return within the time fixed by the law or set foot at all within his own country, he shall be put in the public jail by the Law-wardens for the space of two years⁵¹⁰

Here, Plato is not speaking of punishment, but charges,⁵¹¹ as a finding of guilt as charged does lead to punishment, but the punishment is not identical with the charge. A charge is a plea of right or claim for justice, but it brought against the defendant, not pleaded in his

⁵⁰⁷ Dio Cassius 52.31.2, in *Roman History*: LCL 083, Vol VI Book 51-55 (1917), 156-7.

⁵⁰⁸ καὶ appears to be an Attic crasis for καὶ εἶτα, used to denote logical or temporal sequence of one act or state upon another; thus of sequence in time: καὶ τὸ οὐδέχονται λιτάς: S. Ant. 1019, cited by LSJM, 498, εἶτα; Goodwin, *Greek Grammar*, §44.

⁵⁰⁹ Lat. *Leges*.

⁵¹⁰ Plato, [864^d4]-[864^e8] in *The Laws II*: LCL 192 Vol XI, (1926), 236-9.

⁵¹¹ Contra LSJM, 429 'Δικαίωμα'.

favour. The man who was without mental capacity shall be freed from the other pleas of right.

Thucydides (c460-c400BC), History of the Peloponnesian Wars, Book 6 Chapter 79 Section 2

And it is monstrous if they, suspicious of what this fine plea of right really means in practice (τὸ ἔργον τοῦ καλοῦ δικαιώματος), are unreasonably prudent, while you, on a speciously reasonable pretext, desire to aid those who by nature are your enemies, and in concert with your bitterest foes to ruin those who by a still closer tie of nature are your kinsmen.⁵¹²

Here, δικαίωμα means plea of right or plea for justification.

Isocrates (436-338BC), Discourse 6, 'Archidamus' Section 25

Discourse 6, 'Archidamus' is a speech put in the mouth of an heir of the Spartan rulers,

addressed to the Spartans, in which the speaker defends (ἀντιλεγέιν) his title to land in

Messene, which he claims to have held justly (δικαίως).⁵¹³

[B]ut if not one of you would consent to live if torn from the fatherland, then you ought to be of the same mind about that country; for in both cases we can advance the same justifications and the same reasons [τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ δικαιώματα καὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς λόγους] for our claim.⁵¹⁴

While using a legal motif, the speaker proposes the same 'justifications' and 'reasons' for his claims as others have. Here 'justifications', or 'grounds of justification' is a good translation.

In English, 'justifications' can refer to the legal ground or reason for the judicial correction as well as the plea of justification.⁵¹⁵

Aristotle, On the Heavens, Book 1 Chapter 10 Section 9

Aristotle is putting forward the argument that the world is ungenerated and indestructible.

In dealing with previous theories, which assert that the world is generated, he adopts a legal motif to consider their claims.

At the same time also the arguments which are to follow will inspire more confidence if the pleas of those who dispute them [τὰ τῶν ἀμφισβητούντων λόγων δικαιώματα] have been

⁵¹² Thucydides 6.79.2, in LCL 110 Vol III Books V-VI (1921), 322-3 .

⁵¹³ Isocrates 6.29, in LCL 209 Vol I (1928), 358-63,

⁵¹⁴ idem, 6.25, *op cit*, 358-63.

⁵¹⁵ LSJM, 429: 'δικαί-ωμα... b. justification, plea of right...'

heard first (προακηκόσι). It will not look so much as if we are procuring judgement (καταδικάζεσθαι) by default. And indeed it is arbiters (δαιτητάς), not litigants (ἀντιδίκους) who are wanted for the obtaining of an adequate recognition (κρίνειν) of the truth.⁵¹⁶

For Aristotle, the disputants' (τῶν ἀμφισβητούντων) arguments (λόγων) are to be heard first, because Aristotle is positioning both himself and his readers as the arbiters (δαιτητάς) to judge (κρίνειν) the dispute, not the litigants (ἀντιδίκους) in the dispute. Thus, τὰ δικαιώματα here are those reasons or pleas that justify or vindicate the earlier disputants' position. 'Justifications' or 'reasons for pleas' is an equally good translation.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus (c60BC-after AD7)

Dionysius in *Roman Antiquities*, Book 3 chapter 10 section 4 narrates that the Alban leader, Fufetius, argues the Albans should take pre-eminence over the city of Rome, based on the claim that the Albans established the Colony of Rome:

But to the sovereignty of the Latin nation, even if of no other, we think ourselves entitled, (ἡγεῖσθαι δικαιοῦμεν) not without reason [...] If indeed, Nature, inverting human rights (δικαιώσεις, plural of δικαίωσις), shall ever command the young to rule over the old [...] then we shall submit to seeing the mother country ruled by its colony [...] This, then, is one argument we offer in support of our claim (τὸ δικαίωμα), in virtue of which we will never willingly yield the command to you.⁵¹⁷

The close relationship between the cognate verb δικαιοῶ and its verbal nouns suggest δικαίωμα denotes the result of the verbal action, 'to justify', that is 'a justified claim'. For other examples in Dionysius of Halicarnassensis of δικαίωμα meaning 'claim', see further from *Roman Antiquities*:

- **Book 3 chapter 11 section 3 lines 4, 11:** [The King of the Romans, Tullius, as part of his reply, refutes the claims of Fufetius]: 'your first claim, then (τὸ πρῶτον ὑμῶν δικαίωμα) [...] in making this claim, too, (μάλιστα τὸ δικαίωμα)'.⁵¹⁸
- **Book 3 chapter 12 section 1:** 'τῶν πόλεων δικαιώματα', meaning 'claims' on behalf of each of the cities of Albana or Rome.⁵¹⁹
- **Book 4 chapter 34 section 4:** [From Tullius to Tarquinius, regarding the Roman kingship,

⁵¹⁶ Aristotle, *On the Heavens* (Lat *de Caelo*), 1.10.9 [279^b9], in LCL 338 Vol VI (1971), 94-97.

⁵¹⁷ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities*: LCL 347 Vol II Books III-IV (1939), 40-1.

⁵¹⁸ *ibid*, 44-47.

⁵¹⁹ *ibid*, 50-1.

thus]: ‘Unless, indeed, you have some claim to offer (εἰ μή τι τοιοῦτον ἔχεις δικαίωμα φέρειν) to the effect that your grandfather received the kingship upon certain express conditions [...]’.⁵²⁰

- **Book 8 chapter 50 section 3:** ‘these harsh and overbearing claims, which overstep the bounds of nature (ταῦτα τὰ σκληρὰ καὶ ὑπέραυχα καὶ τὴν θνητὴν φύσιν ἐκβεβηκότα δικαιώματα)’.⁵²¹
- **Second Letter to Ammaeus: On the Characteristics of Thucydides’ Style section 5:** where δικαιώματα in the plural means ‘pleas for justice’.⁵²²

Josephus (AD37/8-c100)

In *Jewish Antiquities* Book 17 section 108, in the context of Antipater’s trial for Herod’s

attempted murder, Nicolas sums up the evidence of the charges against Antipater, quoting

King Herod’s indulgence towards Antipater to heighten the enormity of Antipater’s offences.

[Because Herod’s other sons were very young and corrupted by wicked counselors], they had written off the righteous claims of nature (plural: τὰ τῆς φύσεως δικαιώματα) in their eagerness to possess the throne sooner than they should [to harm their benefactor Herod].⁵²³

The righteous claims of nature here denote the natural ties of kinship and impulses of gratitude and honour that a son should have towards his father. Likewise, In *Jewish*

Antiquities, Book 17 section 130, Josephus recounts:

For he [Antipater] had carried out all his plans as if no divine power existed, but when justice (δικῆς) hemmed him in from all sides and left him without any other means of justification (δικαιωμάτων) to acquit him of these charges (ἐγκεκλημένα) he once more insulted the divine virtue.⁵²⁴

Again, this use of δικαίωμα is for a ‘claim of right’, that is, a ‘plea for justification’, and according to Josephus, Antipater does not have one. Another instance in Josephus where δικαίωμα means ‘claim of right’ or ‘plea for justification’ is *Jewish Antiquities*, Book 17 section 228:

⁵²⁰ *ibid*, 384-5.

⁵²¹ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities*: LCL 372 Vol V Books VIII-IX.24 (1945), 148-9.

⁵²² *idem*, *The Critical Essays Vol II*: LCL 466 (1985), 412-3.

⁵²³ Josephus, *Ant.* 17.108, in LCL 410 Vol VII Books xv-xvii (1963), 420-1.

⁵²⁴ *ibid*, 17.130, *op cit*, 430-3.

Archelaus then sent letters (εἰσπέμψας γράμματα) to Caesar in which he set forth his claims (ἐν οἷς τὰ δικαιώματα προὔτιθει τὰ αὐτοῦ) [...].⁵²⁵

Rather than the letters Archelaus sent being the claims themselves (τὰ δικαιώματα),⁵²⁶ it would appear that the letters contained (ἐν οἷς... προὔτιθει) the justifying claims or pleas.

Dio Cassius

In *Roman History*, Book 5 chapter 22 section 2, Dio writes:

For they [the Patricians] put forward the death of the former tribunes as a justification of the vengeance they were going to take in their own behalf (τούς τε γὰρ ἀπολλυμένους ἐς δικαίωμα τῆς ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν τιμωρίας προεβάλλοντο).⁵²⁷

Here, δικαίωμα means a justification or righteous vindication, from the point of view of the Patricians, for their own actions of vengeance (τιμωρίας). Again, in *Roman History*, Book 8 chapter 37 section 4:

On the contrary, the more they beheld their creditors yielding, the more they became emboldened, as if they were successful by a kind of right (ὥς καὶ δικαίωματί τινι); and consequently they would minimize the concessions made to them from time to time, feeling that these had been won by force.⁵²⁸

Again, δικαίωμα means ‘plea of right’ or ‘justification’ for their actions, which the creditors believe they have, and so seek they more concessions from their debtors. Likewise, in

Roman History, Book 11 chapter 43 section 10:

[Claudius] persuaded them to send for Hanno; and when Hanno was unwilling to come down, he denounced him vigorously, inveighing against him and declaring that if the other had even the slightest right on his side (τὸ βραχύτατον δικαίωμα εἶχεν), he would certainly have come to a conference with him.⁵²⁹

Here δικαίωμα means a righteous plea and in that sense a justification for Hanno’s actions. From Claudius’ point of view, Hanno does not have a δικαίωμα, so he did not come to the conference. Other examples in Dio Cassius, *Romans History*, where δικαίωμα means ‘claim

⁵²⁵ *ibid*, 17.228, *op cit*, 476-7.

⁵²⁶ *Contra* Spicq, *TLNT*, 1:343-4 fn 94.

⁵²⁷ Dio Cassius, 5.22.2, in *Roman History*, LCL 032 Vol I Fragments of Books I-XXII (1914), 162-3.

⁵²⁸ *idem*, 8.37.4, *op cit*, 290-3.

⁵²⁹ *idem*, 11.43.10, *op cit*, 390-3.

of right', 'plea for justification' or 'just claim', are:

- **Book 41 chapter 32 section 4:** 'And yet I think my claims so much better justified than Pompey's (περιεῖναι τοῖς δικαιώμασι τοῦ Πομπηίου νομίζω) that I have often challenged him to a judicial trial (δίκην)'.⁵³⁰
- **Book 42 chapter 34 section 5:** 'And [Cleopatra in her appearance before Caesar] reposed in her beauty all her claims (τὰ δικαιώματα ἔθετο) to the throne'.⁵³¹
- **Book 58 chapter 20 section 3:** 'conditioning selection upon the merit of their claims (τοὺς δὲ ἐπὶ τε τοῖς δικαιώμασι), upon mutual agreement, or upon the lot'.⁵³²
- **Book 61 chapter 1 section 1:** [Dio observes wryly of succession that] 'no claim is stronger than that of arms; (ἀλλ' οὐδὲν γὰρ δικαίωμα τῶν ὅπλων ἰσχυρότερόν ἐστι) for everyone who possesses superior force always appears to have the greater right (δικαιότερα) on his side'.⁵³³

3. Δικαίωμα as a right or privilege to be enjoyed

Thucydides

In *History of the Peloponnesian War*, Book 1 chapter 41 section 1, Thucydides writes:

These, then, are the considerations of right [plural δικαιώματα] which we urge upon you – and they are adequate according to the institutions of the Hellenes [κατὰ τοὺς Ἑλλήνων νόμους]; but we have also to remind you of a favour [χάριτος].⁵³⁴

The rights or privileges (δικαιώματα) claimed here are not of grace (χάρις), but of the Hellenic laws (τοὺς Ἑλλήνων νόμους).

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Roman Antiquities, Book 4 chapter 84 section 3

Brutus in seeking the overthrow of the monarchy after the rape of Lucretia, asks the *comitia*

curiata to ratify the decision of the senate to expel the Tarquinii from Rome and to establish

the Republic:

If it is your pleasure that this resolution be confirmed, divide yourselves into your curiae and give your votes; and let the enjoyment of this right be the beginning of your liberty (καὶ τοῦθ' ὑμῖν πρῶτον ἀρξάτω τὸ δικαίωμα τῆς ἐλευθερίας).⁵³⁵

Josephus

⁵³⁰ Dio Cassius, 41.32.4, in *Roman History*: LCL 066 Vol IV Books 41-45 (1916), 56-57.

⁵³¹ idem, 42.34.5, *op cit*, 168-9.

⁵³² idem, 58.20.3, in *Roman History*: LCL 176 Vol VII Books 56-60 (1924), 236-7.

⁵³³ idem, 61.1.1, *op cit*, 35-36.

⁵³⁴ Thucydides 1.41.1, in *History of the Peloponnesian War*: LCL 108 Vol I Books I-II (1991), 74-5.

⁵³⁵ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities*: LCL 347 Vol II Books III-IV (1939), 522-5.

In *Jewish War*, Book 7 section 110, Josephus records that Emperor Titus came to Antioch, where the inhabitants petitioned him to tear down brass tablets on which were written the legal rights of the Jews (ἐν αἷς γέγραπται τὰ δικαιώματα τῶς Ἰουδαίων).⁵³⁶ These ‘statutes’ were really Jewish rights or privileges enshrined in law. Likewise, in *Jewish Antiquities*, Book 19 section 285, the Edict from Claudius concerning the Jews of Alexandria sent to Alexandria and Syria, said:

I desire that none of their rights [τὰ δικαίων τῶ Ἰουδαίων] should be lost to the Jews on account of the madness of Gaius, but that their former privileges [τὰ προτερον δικαιώματα] also be preserved to them, while they abide by their own customs.⁵³⁷

Josephus again reasserts the special privileges granted the Jews in *Against Apion*, Book 2 section 37:

If Apion had read [...] the slab [τὴν στήλην] which stands in Alexandria, recording the rights [τὰ δικαιώματα] bestowed upon the Jews by Caesar the Great [...] and yet had the face to contradict them in what he wrote, he was a knave; if he had no knowledge of them, an ignorant fool.⁵³⁸

Dio Cassius

Dio, in *Roman History*, Book 55 chapter 2 section 6, also uses δικαίωμα to denote privilege or right.

For in certain cases, formerly by act of the senate, but now by the emperor's, the law (ὁ νόμος) bestows the privileges (τὰ τῶν τρις γεγεννηκότων δικαιώματα χαρίζεται) which belong to the parents of three children upon men or women to whom Heaven has not granted that number of children.⁵³⁹

Again, in *Roman History*, Book 60 chapter 24 section 4, Dio says:

The men serving in the army, since they could not legally have wives, were granted the privileges of married men (τὰ τῶν γεγαμηκότων δικαιώματα ἔδωκε).⁵⁴⁰

⁵³⁶ Josephus, *War*, 7.110, in LCL 210 Vol IV Books v-vii (1997), 338-41.

⁵³⁷ idem, *Antiquities*, 19.285, in LCL 433 Vol XII Books xviii-xix (1965), 348-51.

⁵³⁸ idem, *Against Apion*, 2.37, in LCL 186 Vol I (1966), 307.

⁵³⁹ Dio Cassius, 55.2.6, in *Roman History*: LCL 083 Vol VI Book 51-55, (1917), 384-5.

⁵⁴⁰ idem, 60.24.4, in *Roman History*: LCL 175, Vol VII, Books 56-60, (1924), 428-9.

Both of Dio's examples are in the context of the law and demonstrate a reference to legal rights or privileges by plural τὰ δικαιώματα.

4. Δικαίωμα as statute or ordinance

Philo (c20BC–cAD50), The Worse that is Wont to Attack the Better⁵⁴¹, Section 67-68

Given that one of Philo's interests is expounding the OT, it is not surprising that his usage of

δικαίωμα reflects the LXX style:

This is the reason why Moses, in the blessings which he pronounces on Levi, crowns many marvelous eulogies by saying, 'he guarded thine oracles (τὰ λόγια σου) and thy covenant (τὴν διαθήκην σου) did he diligently keep'; then immediately afterwards 'they shall expound Thy judgments to Jacob and Thy law to Israel (τὰ δικαιώματά σου Ἰακώβ καὶ τὸν νόμον σου Ἰσραήλ)'.⁵⁴²

Observable in Philo is the predominant LXX usage of the term δικαίωμα in the plural as

'statute' (pace Yonge's translation 'justifications'⁵⁴³). For similar uses of δικαίωμα meaning

'statute' in Philo, compare:

- **Who Is the Heir of Divine Things,**⁵⁴⁴ section 8: 'Abraham ...kept my injunctions (τὰ προστάγματά μου), and my commands (τὰς ἐντολάς μου), my ordinances (τὰ δικαιώματά μου) and my statutes (καὶ τὰ νόμιμα μου).' (Genesis 26:3).⁵⁴⁵
- **On Dreams, That They Are God-sent,**⁵⁴⁶ Book II section 175: 'to keep all His commandments and ordinances (plural: τὰ δικαιώματα), and the judgments which are written in the book of the law' (Deuteronomy 30:9-10).⁵⁴⁷
- **Mating with the Preliminary Studies,**⁵⁴⁸ section 163: 'There [at Marah] He [the Lord] laid down for him [Moses] ordinances and judgments (plural: ἐκεῖ ἔθετο αὐτῷ δικαιώματα καὶ κρίσεις)' (Exodus 15:23-25).⁵⁴⁹
- **Questions and Answers on Genesis,**⁵⁵⁰ Book 4 fragment 184⁵⁵¹: 'and my rights (τὰ δικαιώματά μου)', which the Old Latin version of *Quaestiones in Genesin* renders 'justificationes', but here it clearly means 'statutes' as opposed to justification.⁵⁵²

However, Philo in *Questions and Answers on Genesis*, Book 4 fragment 184 (no longer

⁵⁴¹ Lat. *Quod deterius potiori insidiari solet*.

⁵⁴² Philo, Vol II: LCL 227, 'That the Worse is Wont to Attack the Better' (1929), 246-9.

⁵⁴³ Accessed <http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/yonge/book7.html> on 21 April 2014.

⁵⁴⁴ *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit*.

⁵⁴⁵ Philo, Vol IV: LCL 261 (1932), 286-7.

⁵⁴⁶ Lat. *Quod A Deo Mittantur Somnia*, Abbr. *de Somniis – II*.

⁵⁴⁷ Philo, Vol V: LCL 275 (1934).

⁵⁴⁸ *De Congressu Eruditionis Gratia*.

⁵⁴⁹ Philo, Vol IV, LCL 261 (1932), 542-3.

⁵⁵⁰ *Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesin*.

⁵⁵¹ Philo, *Supplement I: Questions and Answers on Genesis*: LCL 380, Books I-IV (1953), 467.

⁵⁵² *Ibid*, 467 fn 'h'.

extant in Greek), in commenting on Genesis 26:5LXX,⁵⁵³ explicitly distinguishes the LXX terms rendered precepts (προστάγματα), commands (ἐντολάς), ordinances (δικαιώματα, in the fragment below rendered ‘rights’), and laws (νόμιμα) from one another:

Now, of the four (things mentioned), the first two are to be consecrated to God, (namely) ‘the precepts and commandments,’ for He gives precepts as a ruler to those who do not readily obey without fear, and He gives commandments as to His friends to those who pray and have faith. But the other two, ‘the rights and laws,’ are virtues toward men, concerning whom it is fitting and proper to have great care of laws and rights, for rights can somehow exist and consist by nature, while laws (do so) by convention. But those things (existing) by nature are older than those (existing) by convention, and so, rights (are older) than laws.⁵⁵⁴

Thus, for Philo, δικαιώματα are grounded in nature or creation,⁵⁵⁵ rather than positive statute law or law by convention (the mere will of the legislator), and both are virtues (ἀρεταί) towards men. It is possible that Philo’s analysis also suggests that to the Greco-Roman mind an ‘ordinance’ (δικαιώματα) connotes older ‘rights’ previously judicially recognised (ie precedent), and therefore the δικαιώματα are the outcomes of previous processes of justification.⁵⁵⁶

Dio Cassius, Roman History, Book 55, Chapter 13, Section 7

Since also many were freeing their slaves indiscriminately, [Augustus] fixed the age by which the manumitter and also the slave to be freed by him must have reached and likewise the legal principles (καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα) which should govern the relations of both citizens in general and the former masters toward slaves who were set free.⁵⁵⁷

The plural here denotes statutes. Compare Josephus, *Jewish War*, Book 7 section 111, where ‘it is written in the statutes of the Jews’ (ἐν αἷς γέγραπται τὰ δικαιώματα τῶν

⁵⁵³ Philo, *Supplement I: Questions and Answers on Genesis*: LCL 380, Books I-IV (1953), 467 fn h.

⁵⁵⁴ Philo, *op cit*, 468. Unfortunately Book IV fragment 184 has been rendered in the LCL from the Armenian. However, in accordance with Book IV fragment 184 is the following fragment extant in Greek: Διαφέρει δικαιώματα νομίμου· τὰ μὲν γὰρ πως δύναται συνίστασθαι φύσει, τὰ δὲ νόμῳ θέσει. Προσβύτερα δὲ τῶν θέσει τὰ φύσει ὥστε καὶ τὸ δίκαιον νόμου: he distinguishes ‘rights’ from ‘laws’; for on the hand are able to consist by nature, but the laws by convention. But those existing from nature are older than convention, so that the right [is older] than law: Philo, *Supplement I: Questions and Answers on Genesis*: LCL 380, Books I-IV (1953), 468 fn ‘i’.

⁵⁵⁵ cf Romans 1:32.

⁵⁵⁶ I thank the Rev Dr Lionel Windsor for this suggestion.

⁵⁵⁷ Dio Cassius, 55.13.7, *op cit*, LCL 083 (1917), 426-7.

Ἰουδαίων).⁵⁵⁸

5. Δικαίωμα as a righteous act

Aristotle

In *Rhetoric*, Book I chapter 3 section 9, Aristotle states:

[An orator must] be ready with propositions dealing with greatness and smallness and the greater and the less, both universally and in particular; for instance, which is the greater or less good, or act of injustice or justice (ἢ ἀδίκημα ἢ δικαίωμα).⁵⁵⁹

Even though Aristotle does not conceive of this usage as ‘proper’,⁵⁶⁰ he does use the singular for ‘unrighteous thing’ or act (ἀδίκημα), which is contrasted with a ‘righteous thing’ or act (δικαίωμα). Again, *Rhetoric*, Book I chapter 12 section 13-chapter 13 section 3, Aristotle develops the following distinction:

Let us now classify just and unjust actions (τὰ δ’ ἀδικήματα πάντα καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα) generally, starting from what follows.⁵⁶¹

Therefore there are two kinds of just and unjust acts (Διὸ καὶ τὰ ἀδικήματα καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα διχῶς ἔστιν ἀδικεῖν καὶ δικαιοπραγεῖν), since they can be committed against a definite individual or against the community; he who commits adultery or an assault is guilty of wrong against a definite individual, he who refuses to serve in the army of wrong against the State.⁵⁶²

Aristotle uses the plural of δικαίωμα as the object of the infinitive of δικαιοπραγέω, suggesting he is using it synonymously with δικαιοπραγῆμα, a righteous act, as in *Rhetoric* 1.3.9. The examples of adultery and cowardice which follow his exposition show Aristotle speaks of individual acts as τὰ δικαιώματα.

Philo, ‘On the Decalogue’⁵⁶³, Section 109⁵⁶⁴

Others conceiving the idea that there is no good outside doing justice to men (πρὸς ἀνθρώπους δικαιομάτων) have no heart for anything but companionship with men.

⁵⁵⁸ Greek text *Thesaurus Lingua Graeca: Hist., De bello Judaico libri vii* accessed online at <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/inst/fontsel> on 19 April 2014.

⁵⁵⁹ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1.3.9 [1359a.25] in LCL: *The ‘Art’ of Rhetoric*, (1926), 38-39.

⁵⁶⁰ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 5.7.7, [1135^a13], quoted above.

⁵⁶¹ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1.12.13 [1373^b1] in LCL: *The ‘Art’ of Rhetoric*, (1926), 138-9.

⁵⁶² *ibid*, 1.13.3 [1373^b25], in *op cit*, 140-1.

⁵⁶³ Lat. *De decalogo*.

⁵⁶⁴ Philo, *Vol VII*: LCL 320, ‘On the Decalogue’ (1937), 62-3.

It is most likely that plural δίκαιωμάτων here refers to concrete acts of justice and fairness.

6. Summary of Graeco-Roman Lexical Data

To sum up the lexical data from Graeco-Roman usage, δικάϊωμα can mean:

- (1) 'the judicial correction or rectification of an injustice', 'justification' (Arist, *NE*, 5.7.7), 'to rectify one who has done the wrong' (Anon in *NE*, 5.7.7), 'the outcome of the judicial process', thus 'judgment' (Dio, *Rom. Hist.* 52.31.2), 'vindication' (Thucydides, 6.80.2).
- (2) A righteous claim or ground on which a plea for justification can be based (Isocr., *Disc.6* (Archid.), 25; Arist. *Heavens*, 1.10.9; Thuc. 6.79.2; Dionys. Halic. 3.10.4; etc; Josephus, *Antiq.* 17.108, 130, 228; Dio, 5.22.2; etc). In Plato, the related sense is 'charge' (*Laws*, [864^e3]).
- (3) A right or privilege (Thuc., 1.41.1; Dion. Halic., 4.84.3; Josephus, *War*, 7.110, etc; Dio, 55.2.6, etc).
- (4) Statute or ordinance (eg Dio, 55.13.7).
- (5) Perhaps improperly (Arist, *NE*, 5.7.7 [1135a 13]), a righteous act (Arist. *Rhet.* 1.3.9 [1359a.25]; 1.12.13-1.13.3 Philo, *The Worse is Wont to Attack*, 67-8, etc).

Δικάϊωμα in the LXX

Δικάϊωμα most often denotes in the LXX a legal or customary stipulation, requirement, statute, demand, ordinance⁵⁶⁵ or custom⁵⁶⁶, frequently in the plural, with other terms.⁵⁶⁷

Thus, 'Abraham kept my requirements (προστάγματα), my commandments (ἐντολάς), my

⁵⁶⁵ BDAG, 249; BAG, 197; LSJM, 429; *EDNT*, 1:335; *TLNT*, 344; Muraoka, *Greek-English Lexicon of LXX* (2002), 128; Tov, 'Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings' (1990), 87-89.

⁵⁶⁶ Eg Exodus 21:9; 1 Samuel 2:13 (contra Schrenk, 'δικαιώμα', *TDNT*, 2:220); 1 Samuel 27:11; Tov, 'Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings' (1990), 92-93.

⁵⁶⁷ Tov, 'Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings' (1990), 96.

decrees (δικαιώματα), my laws (νόμιμα).⁵⁶⁸ In these situations, the LXX translators have chosen δικαίωμα to translate words beyond the קִדְּשׁ group, including קִדְּשׁ/קִדְּשׁ and מִשְׁפָּט.⁵⁶⁹

However, sometimes in a judicial context in the LXX, δικαίωμα means ‘cause’, ‘plea for justification’, ‘vindication’, ‘act of justice’, ‘rectification’ or judicial ‘amendment’ of a wrong. Tov puts this meaning first,⁵⁷⁰ and thus in the LXX δικαίωμα moves towards the positive sphere of vindication.⁵⁷¹ Thus:

- Mephibosheth, speaking to David, says, ‘What right have I to plead my cause (δικαίωμα [...]) τοῦ κεκραγένοι με) before the King (πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα): 2 Samuel 19:28.⁵⁷² This is a ‘plea for justification’.
- Solomon pleads with the Lord for himself and for Israel that God would maintain their cause, or ‘to perform their justification’ (ποιεῖν τὸ δικαίωμα): 1 Kings 8:59.
- Solomon again prays that God would hear their prayer ‘and maintain their cause’, meaning their ‘claim of right’ or ‘plea for justification’: καὶ ποιήσεις τὸ δικαίωμα αὐτῶν): 2 Chronicles 6:35.⁵⁷³ The phrase thus means ‘and you will perform their justification’.
- Jeremiah speaking to the Lord, says, ‘I have uncovered my plea for justification (ἀπεκάλυψα τὸ δικαίωμα μου) before you (πρὸς σε): Jeremiah 11:20.⁵⁷⁴
- Jeremiah, speaking to God, says, ‘listen to the voice of my plea for justification (τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ δικαίωμάτός μου): Jeremiah 18:19.⁵⁷⁵
- ‘The dead will not give the Lord glory nor justification (singular δικαίωμα τῷ κυρίῳ): Baruch 2:17.⁵⁷⁶

Δικαιώμα can also mean ‘righteousness’ or ‘justice’ as an abstract noun in the general sense⁵⁷⁷, thus:

⁵⁶⁸ Genesis 26:5; Cf Exodus 15:25; 21:1; Leviticus 25:18; Numbers 30:17; 36:13; Deuteronomy 4:1,5,45; 6:17,20; 11:1; 30:10; 1 Samuel 8:9; Kings 2:3; 2 Kings 17:8, 37, 23:3; Psalm 118 [119LXX]:12; Ezekiel 18:9; 20:11; 36:27; Micah 6:16; Baruch 2:12; 1 Maccabees 1:13; 49; 2:21. For full list: *NIDNTT*, 3:354. The following singulars in genitive constructions are noteworthy: the regulation (δικαίωμα) of the daughters (Exodus 21:9); the ordinance of the law (τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου) of war prizes (Numbers 31:21); the ‘statute of judgment’ (δικαίωμα κρίματος), being the law of cities of refuge (Numbers 35:29).

⁵⁶⁹ Tov, ‘Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings’ (1990), 89; Schrenk, ‘δικαίωμα’, *TDNT*, 2:220; *EDNT*, 1:334-5.

⁵⁷⁰ Tov, ‘Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings’ (1990), 96; Contrast BDAG, 249.

⁵⁷¹ Schrenk, ‘δικαίωμα’, *TDNT*, 2:220.

⁵⁷² LSJM, 429; Schrenk, ‘δικαίωμα’, *TDNT*, 2:219; Tov, ‘Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings’ (1990), 84-5.

⁵⁷³ Schrenk, ‘δικαίωμα’, *TDNT*, 2:220; Tov, ‘Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings’ (1990), 85.

⁵⁷⁴ Tov, ‘Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings’ (1990), 85; Schrenk, ‘δικαίωμα’, *TDNT*, 2:219.

⁵⁷⁵ Tov, ‘Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings’ (1990), 85.

⁵⁷⁶ *TLNT*, 344; Schrenk, ‘δικαίωμα’, *TDNT*, 2:219; Brenton, *LXX with Apocrypha: Greek and English* (1851), 123.

- Solomon had the thinking of God in him to do justice (singular τοῦ ποιεῖν δικαίωμα, translating singular מִשְׁפָּט לַעֲשׂוֹת): 1 Kings 3:28.⁵⁷⁸
- The righteous walk in the ways of 'righteousness' (singular δικαιοσύνης translating צְדָקָה) and upon the middle of the paths of 'justice' (singular δικαίωματος translating מִשְׁפָּט): Proverbs 8:20.⁵⁷⁹
- The one acting as surety for a foolish child insults justice (singular δικαίωμα translating singular מִשְׁפָּט) and the mouth of the ungodly shall drink judgments (plural κρίσεις translating plural רְשָׁעִים iniquities): Proverbs 19:28.⁵⁸⁰

Δικαίωμα can also mean righteous statutes as a standard from which people depart. Thus:

- Samuel's sons turned away (ἐξέκλινον) from God's righteous statutes (plural δικαιώματα translating singular מִשְׁפָּט): 1 Samuel 8:3.

Compare the pseudipigraphic *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*:

- **Testament of Levi, the third son of Jacob and Leah, Testament 3 chapter 14 section 4:** 'teaching commandments which are opposed to God's just ordinances (ἐναντίας ἐντολὰς διδάσκοντες τοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ δικαίωμασι).'⁵⁸¹
- **Testament of Judah, the fourth son of Jacob and Leah, Testament 4 chapter 13 section 1:** 'keep my words so as to perform all the Lord's just decrees (τοῦ ποιεῖν τὰ δικαιώματα κυρίου) and to obey the command of God'.⁵⁸²

In Baruch 2:18-19, the plea is made οὐκ ἐπὶ τὰ δικαιώματα τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν (v19). Most take plural of δικαίωμα to denote 'righteous deeds' or 'right acts',⁵⁸³ some a concretization of the δικαιοσύνη of the fathers,⁵⁸⁴ although it is possible that the supplicant is simply saying he cannot avail himself of the righteous pleas that his fathers, which is slightly different from saying δικαίωμα denotes 'righteous deeds' or 'righteousness'.

⁵⁷⁷ Tov, 'Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings' (1990), 87, 96.

⁵⁷⁸ BDAG, 249, incorrectly gives 1 Kings 3:28 as 'righteous deed'; better 'justice': Tov, 'Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings' (1990), 87. Compare Schrenk, 'δικαίωμα', *TDNT*, 2:220.

⁵⁷⁹ Tov, 'Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings' (1990), 86; Schrenk, 'δικαίωμα', *TDNT*, 2:221.

⁵⁸⁰ Tov, 'Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings' (1990), 86-7.

⁵⁸¹ English Text: Charlesworth, *OT Pseudipigrapha*: (1983), 1:793; Greek text: *Thesaurus Lingua Graeca*: online at <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/inst/fontsel> accessed on 19 April 2014.

⁵⁸² English text: Charlesworth, op cit, 1:798; Greek text *TLG* online at <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/inst/fontsel> accessed on 19 April 2014.

⁵⁸³ BDAG, 249: Tov, 'Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings' (1990), 87; Schrenk, 'δικαίωμα', *TDNT*, 2:221; *Contra* BDAG, 249 re 1 Kings 3:28; Cf Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 290; Lampe, *PGL*, 371.8.

⁵⁸⁴ Brenton, *LXX with Apocrypha: Greek and English* (1851), 123; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:289; cf Epistle of Barnabas 1:2 in Roberts, *ANF*, 1:137.

Δικαίωμα in the NT

Outside of Paul, there are only five NT uses of δικαίωμα. Three adhere to the predominant

LXX usage 'ordinance' or 'statute' (Luke 1:6⁵⁸⁵ and Hebrews 9:1,10⁵⁸⁶). The final two

instances, both in Revelation, are debated. The first, plural τὰ δικαιώματά σου

ἐφανερώθησαν (Revelation 15:4), *contra* BDAG,⁵⁸⁷ refers to God's righteous judicial acts

answering the calls of the slaughtered for vengeance⁵⁸⁸ while vindicating the saints whose

blood was shed.⁵⁸⁹ Thus δικαίωμα denotes vindication and just condemnation.⁵⁹⁰ The

punishments that follow, the seven plagues,⁵⁹¹ are strictly the execution of God's righteous

judgments, not the decrees themselves.

Regarding the second (Revelation 19:8), the vision of the bright and clean fine linen (τὸ

βύσσινον) given to the saints is explained as τὰ δικαιώματα τῶν ἁγίων ἐστίν. The plural

could denote the saint's righteous acts (objective genitive)⁵⁹² or the judicial acts vindicating

the saints (subjective genitive).⁵⁹³ In the latter case, the plural speaks of many divine

'justifications' of the saints. Context and usage both support a meaning of 'vindication' or

'justification' resulting from divine judgments on behalf of the saints.⁵⁹⁴

⁵⁸⁵ BDAG, 249; Schrenk, 'δικαιώμα', *TDNT*, 2:221; *EDNT*, 1:335; *TLNT*, 344; Bovon, *Luke* (2002), 1:33; Bock, *Luke* (1994), 1:77; Noland, *Luke* (1989), 1:27.

⁵⁸⁶ BDAG, 249; Schrenk, 'δικαιώμα', *TDNT*, 2:221; *EDNT*, 1:335; O'Brien, *Hebrews* (2010), 305, 315; Lane, *Hebrews* (1991), 2:217, 225.

⁵⁸⁷ BDAG, 249; also Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 290. Kertelge nuances his understanding: *EDNT*, 1:335.

⁵⁸⁸ Revelation 6:9-10; 16:5, 7.

⁵⁸⁹ Revelation 16:6.

⁵⁹⁰ Schrenk, 'δικαιώμα', *TDNT*, 2:221; *TLNT*, 344; Beale, *Revelation* (1999), 798; Aune, *Revelation* (1998), 3:1031; Morris, *Revelation* (1969), 189.

⁵⁹¹ Revelation 15:5-16:21.

⁵⁹² Wallace, *Greek Grammar* (1996), 112-21; Beale, *Revelation* (1999), 934-6; BDAG, 249; *TDNT*, 2:221; *EDNT*, 1:335; Aune, *Revelation* (1998), 3:1031; Brighton, *Revelation* (1999), 497; Mounce, *Revelation* (1998), 347-8; Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 290.

⁵⁹³ '[M]ore likely': Beale, *Revelation* (1999), 941.

⁵⁹⁴ Isaiah 61:10; *Targum Zech* 3:1-5; Beale, *Revelation* (1999), 936-8; Mealy, *After the Thousand Years* (1992), 79-80 fn 2; Morris, *Revelation* (1969), 227; *idem*, *Apostolic Preaching* (1965), 288; Blocher, 'Justification of the Ungodly' (2004), 499.

Δικαίωμα in Paul (Romans 1:32; 2:26)

In **Romans 1:32**, the articular singular δικαίωμα is modified by genitive τοῦ θεοῦ and means

decree. The content of the decree is οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες ἄξιοι θανάτου εἰσίν. The

language is 'explicitly juridical'.⁵⁹⁵ Δικαίωμα refers to God's decree of punishment for

wickedness, being death.⁵⁹⁶ It may allude to the primeval sentence on Adam,⁵⁹⁷ or more

likely to the moral requirements reflected in the Mosaic law,⁵⁹⁸ but known by all humans

through creation.⁵⁹⁹ While this decree is not τοῦ νόμου,⁶⁰⁰ it is τοῦ θεοῦ, indicating not only

its divine source, but also that creation bears witness to it, and thus Paul's use here has

affinities with Philo, for whom δικαιώματα exists by nature, while νόμιμα exists by

convention.⁶⁰¹

In **Romans 2:26**, plural articular δικαιώματα with genitive singular τοῦ νόμου resembles LXX

usage,⁶⁰² and suggests the 'decrees'⁶⁰³ 'stipulations', 'requirements'⁶⁰⁴ or 'ordinances'⁶⁰⁵ of

the Mosaic law.⁶⁰⁶ However, the context of Gentiles⁶⁰⁷ and the above mentioned distinction

in Philo suggest Paul is referring to the moral law reflected in the Mosaic code and also in

⁵⁹⁵ Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 190; Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:51.

⁵⁹⁶ Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:69; Hultgren, *Romans* (2011), 104; Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 107; Morris, *Romans* (1988), 99; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:134.

⁵⁹⁷ Genesis 2:16: Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:69, *doubted by* Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 190; Genesis 3:19: Ziesler, *Romans* (1989), 79.

⁵⁹⁸ Thielman, *Paul & the Law* (1994), 169; Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 190 fn 305; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 99.

⁵⁹⁹ Romans 1:20-21; 32; 2:12; 5:12, 19, 6:23; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 121-2; Ziesler, *Romans* (1989), 79; Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 289-90; Wright, 'Romans' (2002), 434.

⁶⁰⁰ Romans 8:4.

⁶⁰¹ Philo, *Supplement I: Questions and Answers on Genesis*: LCL 380, Books I-IV, Book 4, fragment 184 (1953), 467. See above.

⁶⁰² Moo, *Romans* (1996), 170 fn 21; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:122; Wright, 'Romans' (2002), 448.

⁶⁰³ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 169.

⁶⁰⁴ Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 233; Hultgren, *Romans* (2011), 130; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:121; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:173; Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 322.

⁶⁰⁵ Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 140; Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:86; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:121; Morris, *Romans* (1988), 140 fn 154.

⁶⁰⁶ Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 153.

⁶⁰⁷ Romans 2:14, 27.

human hearts by nature.⁶⁰⁸

Consideration of Paul's use of δικαίωμα in Romans 5:16 is reserved for chapter 6 below, his use of δικαίωμα and δικαίωσις in 5:18 is assessed in chapter 7 below, and the remaining occurrence of δικαίωμα in Romans 8:4 is considered in chapter 9 below.

Δικαίωσις in Secular Graeco-Roman Usage

In Greek secular usage, the rare word δικαίωσις denotes a judicial action or process of corrective justice, thus, 'setting right' or 'doing justice', whether as a judicial condemnation or punishment of the guilty, or as a plea for justice or subsequent judicial justification of the innocent.⁶⁰⁹ It can mean a 'legal cause' or 'ground',⁶¹⁰ a 'plea or claim of right',⁶¹¹ 'punishment',⁶¹² or 'to justify or present as just'.⁶¹³ Dionysius of Halicarnassus⁶¹⁴ considers Thucydides to have coined the noun δικαίωσις (or at least to have used it once coined) and regards his style as an 'artificiality of vocabulary'. Harpocration provides an entry for δικαίωσις as follows:

⁶⁰⁸ Romans 2:15.

⁶⁰⁹ LSJM, 429; Hill, 102.

⁶¹⁰ Lysias 9:8 in *TLNT*, 1:344 fn 97.

⁶¹¹ Thucydides 1.141,1 in *TLNT*, 1:344 fn 97; Schrenk, 'δικαίωσις', *TDNT*, 2:223.

⁶¹² Dio Cassius, 40.43.3; Plutarch, *De Artaxerxe*. 14:2,3 in *TLNT*, 1:344-5 fn 97; Schrenk, 'δικαίωσις', *TDNT*, 2:223.

⁶¹³ Thucydides 3.82,4; Plutarch, *De Virtute Morali* 9, (II, 449b) in *TLNT*, 1:3445 fn 97; Schrenk, 'δικαίωσις', *TDNT*, 2:223.

⁶¹⁴ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 'Second Letter to Ammaeus on the Characteristics of Thucydides' Style, Section 3, Line 6, in *Critical Essays II*: LCL 466 Vol II, 410-11.

Valerius Harpocration, <i>Lexicon</i> ⁶¹⁵ (AD 1 st -2 nd Century) ⁶¹⁶	English [with interpretative comments] ⁶¹⁷
<p><i>Δικαίωσις:</i> Λυσίας ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ τοῦ στρατιώτου, εἰ γνήσιος, καὶ μάλα τὰς δικαίωσεις φησὶν ἀντὶ τοῦ δικαιολογίας. ὁ μέντοι Θουκυδίδης πολλάκις τὴν δικαίωσιν ἐπὶ τῆς κολάσεως τάττει. (Text: Thesaurus Lingua Graeca)</p>	<p><i>Dikaiōsis:</i> In [his oration] ‘For the Soldier’ Lysias [a forensic logographer⁶¹⁸] genuinely and earnestly declares the [heads of] ‘<i>dikaiōsis</i>’ [τὰς δικαίωσεις, ie: these are Lysias’ defence pleas on behalf of his clients in the justice process] instead of [using the word] ‘advocacies’ [ἀντὶ τοῦ δικαιολογίας: meaning ‘pleas in justification’⁶¹⁹]. However, often Thucydides classifies [the word] ‘<i>dikaiōsis</i>’ as [meaning the verdict of] punishment.</p>

The following are the discernible meanings for δικαίωσις in the Graeco-Roman corpus:

(1) Δικαίωσις as claim of right

- Thucydides: ‘For it means enslavement just the same when either the greatest or the least claim (καὶ ἐλαχίστη δικαίωσις) is imposed by equals upon their neighbours, not by an appeal to justice (δίκης) but by dictation’.⁶²⁰
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus: ‘[A]nd to both parties it seemed that their whole claim (δικαίωσις) to life and liberty was at stake in this trial’.⁶²¹

(2) Δικαίωσις as a legal process or process of justification or judging

- Thucydides: ‘And no search was made for those who did the deed, nor if they were suspected was any legal prosecution held (δικαίωσις ἐγίγνετο)’.⁶²²
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus: ‘The common judgment of all mankind (τὴν κοινὴν [...]) ἀνθρώπων [...] δικαίωσιν’.⁶²³

(3) Δικαίωσις as ‘vindication’ or ‘a plea for justification’, hence justified

- Dionysius of Halicarnassus, ‘On Thucydides’, Section 29 Line 34: [Dionysius comments on the pretentiousness of Thucydides’ style]: “Ingenuity” and “atrociousness” and “normal meaning of words” and “to suit their actions as they thought fit (δικαίωσις)” are more suited to the circumlocutions of poetry’.⁶²⁴

⁶¹⁵ Dindorf, *Harpocrationis lexicon* (1853) accessed at <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/> on 22 April 2014; Bekker, *Harpocration et Moeris* (1833), 62.

⁶¹⁶ Hornblower *et al*, *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (2012), 646.

⁶¹⁷ The translation is my own. I thank the Rev Dr Peter Bolt for his valued assistance and suggestions.

⁶¹⁸ Composed speeches for litigants to deliver in court: *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 876.

⁶¹⁹ LSJM, 428.

⁶²⁰ Thucydides, 1.141.1, in *History of the Peloponnesian War*: LCL 108, Vol I Books I-II (1928), 242-3.

⁶²¹ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 7.59.1, in *Roman Antiquities*: LCL 364 Vol IV Books VI.49-VII (1943), 318-19.

⁶²² Thucydides, 8.66.2 in, *op cit*, LCL 169, Vol IV Books VII-VIII (1923), 302-5.

⁶²³ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 8.34.3, in *op cit*, LCL 372, Vol V Books VIII-IX.24 (1945), 98-99.

⁶²⁴ idem, *On Thucydides*, 29.34, in *Critical Essays I*: LCL 465 Vol I (1974), 550-1.

- Lysias, 'For the Soldier' (c459/8–c380BC)⁶²⁵: 'I will put in a yet stronger array both of laws and of other justifications (καὶ ἄλλος δικαίωσεις)'.⁶²⁶

(4) Δικαίωσις as 'righteousness' or 'justification as a status'

- In perhaps a rare or disputable usage, Dionysius describes Aeneas' actions as 'contrary to the universal sense of justice (τῶν ἀνθρώπων δικαίωσιν)'.⁶²⁷ Perhaps it could be translated 'without human justification'.

(5) Δικαίωσις as 'the outcome of judgment' or 'punishment'

- In Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, Book 18 chapter 315 line 2: 'Because they accounted such punishment (τὴν δικαίωσιν λογιζόμενοι) a personal indignity'.⁶²⁸
- Harpocration: 'However, often Thucydides classifies 'dikaiōsis' as punishment'.⁶²⁹

Δικαίωσις in LXX (Leviticus 24:22; Psalms of Solomon 3:3)

The word appears twice in the LXX. In Leviticus 24:22 it translates **דִּקְיָוָה**, and thus probably

means not 'justification' or 'vindication',⁶³⁰ but 'law', 'statute',⁶³¹ 'administering justice',⁶³²

or 'legal process'. In Psalms of Solomon 3:3, δικαίωσις is a verbal noun meaning

'justification' or 'proving to be just'.⁶³³

The Resurrection in Romans 1-4 and Romans 4:25

The word δικαίωσις appears in Romans 4:25 in relation to Christ's resurrection, and so to

understand its usage we need to look at the context. 'Romans is suffused with

resurrection'.⁶³⁴ In Romans 1:4, Paul introduces the motif of resurrection in connection with

Christ's Davidic sonship.⁶³⁵ The Lord Jesus Christ, the human descendant of David (v3), was

marked out as the Son of God with power according to the Spirit of Holiness by his

resurrection from the dead (τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγίωσύνης

⁶²⁵ Hornblower *et al*, *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (2012), 875.

⁶²⁶ Lysias, Oration IX, 'For the Soldier', 8, in *Collected Works*, LCL 244 (1988), 188-9.

⁶²⁷ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 1.58.1.9, in *Roman Antiquities*: LCL 319, Vol I Books I-II (1937), 192-3.

⁶²⁸ Josephus, *Antiquities*, 18.315 in LCL 365, Vol IX Books XVIII-XX (1965), 182-3.

⁶²⁹ Dindorf, *Harpocrationis lexicon* (1853); Bekker, *Harpocration et Moeris* (1833), 62.

⁶³⁰ *pace* BDAG, 250.

⁶³¹ TLNT, 1:344 fn 97; Schrenk, 'δικαίωσις', TDNT, 2:223.

⁶³² Muraoka, *Greek-English Lexicon of LXX* (2002), 128; 128.

⁶³³ Cf *ibid*, 170; Brenton, *LXX with Apocrypha: Greek and English* (1851), Pss Sol 3:3.

⁶³⁴ Wright, *Resurrection of the Son of God* (2003), 241.

⁶³⁵ 2 Samuel 7:12-14; Psalm 2:7-9; Wright, *op cit*, 242-3; Head, 'Jesus' Resurrection' (1998), 61-3.

ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν). The motif of resurrection life is again alluded to in 1:17 by the future of ζῶω (Habbakuk 2:4).⁶³⁶ The eschatological life promised to the doers of the law⁶³⁷ is now promised to ‘the one-who-is-righteous-by-faith’.⁶³⁸ Watson rightly rejects the Christological interpretation of Habbakuk 2:4 || Romans 1:17,⁶³⁹ so Romans 1:17 does not refer to Christ’s resurrection life.

In Romans 4:17, Paul reintroduces the motif of resurrection.⁶⁴⁰ By introducing God’s resurrection power in 4:13-25, Paul connects resurrection with God’s verbal act of imputing δικαιοσύνη to Abraham (Romans 4:6, 11) and justifying τὸν ἄσεβῆ (Romans 4:3, 5, 6). God verbally calls (καλοῦντος) the dead to life just as he verbally declares the ungodly righteous. Abraham faces the deadness of his own body and Sarah’s womb (νενεκρωμένον; νέκρωσιν: Romans 4:19). But God makes the dead alive (ζωοποιοῦντος τοὺς νεκρούς) and calls those things not being as being.

The background of 4:17 is not creation *ex nihilo*,⁶⁴¹ because the seed (τὸ σπέρμα σου) already exists in Abraham and Sarah’s dead bodies. From their supposedly ‘dead’ bodies, living seed will be drawn.⁶⁴² The paradigm is not ‘something from nothing’ (*ex nihilo*) but ‘life from the dead’. It is not a calling into being, but a calling ὡς being.⁶⁴³ A further indicator that τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα (Romans 4:17) does not allude to creation *ex nihilo* is Paul’s parallel

⁶³⁶ Hooker, ‘Raised For Our Acquittal’ (2002), 332

⁶³⁷ Leviticus 18:5; Romans 2:7, 13; 10:5.

⁶³⁸ Habbakuk 2:4; Romans 10:6-8; Watson, ‘By Faith (of Christ)’ (2009), 154.

⁶³⁹ Watson, ‘By Faith (of Christ)’ (2009), 153-60.

⁶⁴⁰ Head, ‘Jesus’ Resurrection’ (1998), 66; Hultgren, *Romans* (2011), 187; Hooker, ‘Raised for Our Acquittal’ (2002), 331; Marshall, ‘Raised for Our Justification’ (2008), 256.

⁶⁴¹ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 232; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 236-7; Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 217.

⁶⁴² Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 236.

⁶⁴³ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 281-2; Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:1467; contra Visscher, *Romans 4* (2009), 2006-7.

use in 1 Corinthians 1:28.⁶⁴⁴ The Corinthian Christians are described as τὰ μὴ ὄντα, so that their calling might nullify τὰ ὄντα. Though not many were wise, powerful, or wellborn, God called (κλησιν: 1 Corinthians 1:26 | |καλοῦντος Romans 4:17) the so-called ‘nothings’, so that ‘no-one might boast before him’ (ὅπως μὴ καυχῆσθαι πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ: 1 Corinthians 1:29; cf Romans 3:27; 4:2). Again, this is not creation *ex nihilo*, but the divine calling of the despised, powerless, and lowborn, all of whom have no boast before God. By faith in the gospel the Corinthians have not themselves, but Christ, as their δικαιοσύνη (1 Corinthians 1:30).

Thus, in Romans 4:13-25, God is summoning and naming nations and descendants from Abraham where deadness suggests that fulfilling the divine promise is impossible.⁶⁴⁵ God has power to do what he promised,⁶⁴⁶ and Abraham believes both God’s promise and power, so is a paradigm for Christian faith.⁶⁴⁷ While Abraham’s belief in the face of deadness was directed towards God’s promise of seed (οὕτως ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου),⁶⁴⁸ the believer’s object of faith is He who accomplished the resurrection (τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐγεῖραντα [...] ἐκ νεκρῶν) of the Lord Jesus Christ.⁶⁴⁹ ‘The conception and birth of Isaac is therefore an anticipation of Jesus’ resurrection’.⁶⁵⁰

In the meantime, Abraham, though ἀσεβής, has δικαιοσύνη reckoned to him.⁶⁵¹ Abraham,

⁶⁴⁴ Hultgren, *Romans* (2011), 189.

⁶⁴⁵ Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 237.

⁶⁴⁶ Romans 4:21.

⁶⁴⁷ Bird, *Saving Righteousness* (2007), 50.

⁶⁴⁸ Romans 4:18; Genesis 15:5.

⁶⁴⁹ Romans 4:24; cf 10:6-9. Moo, *Romans* (1996), 287-8; Hooker, ‘Raised for Our Acquittal’ (2002), 331

⁶⁵⁰ Wright, *Resurrection of the Son of God* (2003), 247.

⁶⁵¹ Romans 4:5, 6, 11, 22.

like us, is *simul iustus et peccator*.⁶⁵² We likewise are summoned to believe unto righteousness (εἰς δικαιοσύνην)⁶⁵³ despite our continuing deadness because of sin.

Abraham's body was at once dead, yet, by the promise of God, living. Though we are dying, yet because of Christ's righteousness, we live. Compare Romans 8:10: εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, ὃ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν διὰ ἁμαρτίαν τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωὴ διὰ δικαιοσύνην. That is, because of the realized gift of (imputed) δικαιοσύνη (not the believer's moral uprightness) through the indwelling Christ, the Spirit is the source of future eternal life, though our bodies are dying because of sin.⁶⁵⁴

ὃς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν
καὶ ἡγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν.
who was delivered over for our transgressions
and was raised for our justification.
(Romans 4:25)⁶⁵⁵

Romans 4:25 is the conclusion of chapter 4, and syntactically consists of a relative clause with the antecedent Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν (v24), and two clauses in parallel. The issues to be decided is the meaning of διὰ with the accusative in both clauses, and the denotation and referent of διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν.

Διὰ with the accusative in 4:25a-b

Διὰ is clearly retrospective or causal in v25a. Some argue that διὰ with the accusative should have the same meaning in both clauses,⁶⁵⁶ but others that they need not.⁶⁵⁷ The issue is whether διὰ with accusative (v25b) is retrospective and causal ('because of our

⁶⁵² Romans 6:11-13; 7:14-25; 8:10; 11:18, 20; 12:3,9,16, 13:11, 14; 14:1-12, 20, 23; 16:17-19; Galatians 5:17.

⁶⁵³ Romans 10:10; 4:22-24

⁶⁵⁴ Lambrecht, 'Note on Romans 10:8' (2010), 174.

⁶⁵⁵ Cf Isaiah 53:6, 11-12 LXX: Moo, *Romans* (1996), 288-9; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:252; Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 221; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 243; Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 388.

⁶⁵⁶ Schlatter, *Romans* (1995), 118; Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:154.

⁶⁵⁷ Wright, *Resurrection of the Son of God* (2003), 247-8; Bird, *Saving Righteousness* (2007), 51; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 289; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:251; Hultgren, *Romans* (2011), 191; Marshall, 'Raised for Our Justification' (2008), 255.

justification')⁶⁵⁸ or prospective and final ('for our justification').⁶⁵⁹ However, making a decision is assisted by observing a parallel structure in vv23-24. In v23, δι' αὐτὸν means 'for' the benefit of Abraham, and is retrospective. Therefore, v23 teaches that Genesis 15:6 was not (οὐκ) only written 'for' (διὰ) Abraham in the past. In v24, δι' ἡμᾶς is prospective. Genesis 15:6 was written also 'for us' about to be (μέλλει) reckoned (righteous). This pattern within vv23-24 suggests that (1) διὰ with the accusative need not have the same meaning in each clause of 4:25,⁶⁶⁰ and (2) a pattern is established by vv23-24 in that that the first instance of διὰ is retrospective, and second causal, and that this also carries over into v25. Because of the close context and probability of a pattern established by vv23-24, the prospective meaning for v25b shall be adopted.

Meaning of τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν in 4:25b

As we have seen in reference to Graeco-Roman sources and the LXX, δικαίωσις means 'justification' or 'vindication'.⁶⁶¹ It denotes the action in a lawcourt of putting things to right by pronouncing the verdict.⁶⁶² The emphasis is on the process of justification rather than⁶⁶³ or in addition to⁶⁶⁴ its result. Genitive ἡμῶν is probably an objective genitive. That δικαίωσις is also used in Romans 5:18 suggests Paul has on view the salvific δικαίωσις ζωῆς

⁶⁵⁸ Schlatter, *Romans* (1995), 118; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 244; Harris, 'Prepositions' (1975), *NIDNTT*, 3:1184; Morris, *Romans* (1988), 215; Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 343.

⁶⁵⁹ Schrenk, 'δικαίωσις', *TDNT*, 2:224; *TLNT*, 1:345; Bird, *Saving Righteousness* (2007), 51; Wright, *Resurrection of the Son of God* (2003), 247-8; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 289; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:251; Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:154; Hultgren, *Romans* (2011), 192; Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 222; Käsemann, *Romans* (1980), 129; Leenhardt *Romans* (1957), 129; Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 389-90; Head, 'Jesus' Resurrection' (1998), 68; Hooker, *Paul* (2003), 94-5; idem, 'Use of Isaiah 53' (1998), 101 fn 12; Hofius, 'Fourth Servant Song' (2004), 180; Marshall, 'Raised for Our Justification' (2008), 255; Warnock, *Raised With Christ* (2010), 121.

⁶⁶⁰ Hendriksen, *Romans* (1981), 161; Bird, *Saving Righteousness* (2007), 51.

⁶⁶¹ LSJM, 429; BDAG, 250; Schrenk, 'δικαίωμα' *TDNT*, 2:220; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 288; Wright, *Resurrection of the Son of God* (2003), 248; idem, 'Romans' (2002), 504; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:251-2; Hultgren, *Romans* (2011), 191-2; Morris, *Romans* (1988), 216; idem, *Apostolic Preaching* (1965), 289; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:225; contra Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 343.

⁶⁶² Hooker, 'Raised for Our Acquittal' (2002), 331.

⁶⁶³ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 288 fn 8; Morris, *Romans* (1988), 216.

⁶⁶⁴ BDAG, 250; Bird, *Saving Righteousness* (2007), 51.

of the believer's resurrection, at least as justification's consummation, in 4:25.⁶⁶⁵ Hence, Christ was raised for our justification, in the sense that the resurrection of Christ procures our justification, consummated in resurrection. By virtue of Christ's resurrection, God's sentence of vindication (which is implicit in Christ's resurrection) is attributed to the believer.⁶⁶⁶ 'The unexpressed assumption is that Jesus' resurrection is his justification'.⁶⁶⁷ The present justifying verdict received by faith is an anticipation of the final verdict brought into the present, just as Christ's resurrection is an anticipation of the resurrection of all believers brought into the present.

⁶⁶⁵ Hofius, 'Fourth Servant Song' (2004), 182; cf Hooker, 'Raised for Our Acquittal' (2002), 332-3.

⁶⁶⁶ Bird, *Saving Righteousness* (2007), 51; Head, 'Jesus' Resurrection' (1998), 69.

⁶⁶⁷ Gaffin, *Resurrection and Redemption* (1978), 123

Conclusion

In the Graeco-Roman corpus and LXX, δικαίωμα can mean ‘the judicial rectification of an injustice’, ‘justification’, ‘vindication’, ‘the outcome of the judicial process’, or a ‘righteous claim’ on which a ‘plea for justification’ is based. It occasionally, perhaps improperly, means ‘a righteous act’. In the LXX, δικαίωμα denotes a legal or customary requirement or or statute. Likewise, δικαίωσις can denote a judicial action or process of corrective justice, thus ‘justification’. Paul’s use of the words in 1:32, 2:26 and 4:25 falls within their well-attested semantic ranges. The usage observed is consistent with what one would expect from accident and word formation evidence.

Paul introduces the motif of resurrection in Romans 1:4, 17, 4:17, and 24-25. Romans 4:25b brings Christ’s resurrection in history into the closest possible relation with the believer’s justification. However, except perhaps obliquely in 1:4, Romans has not yet explicated that Christ’s resurrection is Christ’s justification. So far, Christ was raised *for our justification* (4:25b), not for his. Hooker takes us part of the way in determining what Christ’s resurrection declares about Christ:

The link between justification and resurrection is a natural one. To pronounce a man righteous is to reverse the condemnation which sentenced him to death.⁶⁶⁸

Nevertheless, as Hooker observes, ‘the meaning of 4:25 is spelled out in chapters 5, 6 and 8’.⁶⁶⁹ This raises the question, Does ‘Paul explicitly link our justification with Christ’s justification through resurrection in Romans?’ This thesis argues that Paul indeed does this, in his use of δικαίωμα in Romans 5:18. This requires an analysis of Romans 5, which constitutes chapters 6 to 8.

⁶⁶⁸ Hooker, *Adam to Christ* (1990), 40.

⁶⁶⁹ idem, ‘Use of Isaiah 53’ (1998), 102.

Chapter 6

The Resurrection in Romans 5 and the Meaning of δικαίωμα in Romans 5:16

Introduction

The motif of resurrection introduced in Romans 4:17, 24-25 re-emerges in 5:9-10, 17, 20 as a key part of Paul's argument to give Christians confidence in their final salvation. The resurrection motif is highlighted in the 'lighter' part of Paul's *qal wayyōmer* argument in vv 8-11, 15, 17, 21. The referent of ἐνός in verses 12, 15-19 is assessed, and the argument presented that ἐνός in Romans 5:18 is masculine and personal. Then the recent argument of Kirk is countered, that δικαίωμα in Romans 5:16 means, 'judgment', 'penalty', or 'reparation', and not 'justification'.

Resurrection in Romans 5:1-11

The motif of resurrection emerges in Romans 5:9-10 with Paul's 'how much more' argument. If we have been justified in the present ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ (v9) while we were sinners (the harder thing), 'how much more' will be saved from God's future ὀργή 'through him' (the easier thing). Campbell regards δι' αὐτοῦ (v9) as referring back to God's love in Christ's death (v8),⁶⁷⁰ but this goes against the *a fortiori* argument. Verse 9 has introduced a new basis (δι' αὐτοῦ) which grounds the believer's greater confidence. Thus, the referent of δι' αὐτοῦ (v9) does not lie in v8 but v10. Verse 10 clarifies that being saved 'through him' is salvation ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ. Preposition ἐν is instrumental.⁶⁷¹ Ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ refers to

⁶⁷⁰ Campbell, *Union with Christ* (2012), 260.

⁶⁷¹ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 312; *contra* Morris, *Romans* (1988), 226; Wright, 'Romans' (2002), 520.

Christ's resurrection life,⁶⁷² not his pre-crucifixion life,⁶⁷³ nor the transformed lives of Christians prior to the parousia.⁶⁷⁴

Paul's *a fortiori* 'light and heavy' Argument

Romans 5 introduces a string of 'how much more' arguments (πολλῷ μᾶλλον),⁶⁷⁵ described as the Latin *a fortiori*⁶⁷⁶ ('even stronger') or *a minori ad maius* ('from the minor to the major'), or the Rabbinic *qal wayyōmer* ('light and heavy'), argument.⁶⁷⁷ In Romans, it appears only in chapter 5. Paul's argument proceeds from heavy to light.⁶⁷⁸

	Verses 8-9	Verses 10-11	Verses 15	Verse 17	Verses 21
Heavy Harder	ἔτι <u>ἁμαρτωλῶν</u> ὄντων ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν <u>ἀπέθανεν</u> . δικαιωθέντες νῦν ἐν τῷ <u>αἵματι</u> αὐτοῦ	<u>ἐχθροὶ</u> ὄντες κατηλλάγημεν τῷ θεῷ <u>διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ</u> καταλλαγέντες	τοῦ ἐνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοὶ <u>ἀπέθανον</u> ,	τῷ τοῦ ἐνὸς παραπτώματι <u>ὁ θάνατος</u> ἐβασίλευσεν διὰ τοῦ ἐνός	ὥσπερ ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ <u>ἁμαρτία</u> ἐν τῷ <u>θανάτῳ</u> ,
Conj	πολλῷ οὖν μᾶλλον	γὰρ...πολλῷ μᾶλλον	ἄλλ' [...] πολλῷ μᾶλλον	γὰρ [...] πολλῷ μᾶλλον	ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν (v20) [...] οὕτως καὶ
Light Easier	<u>δι' αὐτοῦ</u> ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς.	σωθησόμεθα ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ· οὐ μόνον δέ, <u>ἀλλὰ καὶ</u> καυχώμενοι ἐν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ νῦν τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν.	ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι τῇ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπερίσσευσεν.	οἱ τὴν περισσεΐαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες <u>ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύσουσιν</u> διὰ τοῦ ἐνός Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.	ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαιοσύνης <u>εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν</u> .

⁶⁷² Romans 8:34; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 311; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:266; Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:174-5; Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 238; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 264; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:260; Marshall, 'Raised for Our Justification' (2008), 248; Wright, *Resurrection of the Son of God* (2003), 249.

⁶⁷³ Phillips, 'A Justification of Imputed Righteousness' (2006), 93.

⁶⁷⁴ Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 367.

⁶⁷⁵ Romans 5:9, 10, 15, 17.

⁶⁷⁶ Collins, 'The Jewish Source of Rom 5:17' (2005), 28ff; Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:197ff.

⁶⁷⁷ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 309.

⁶⁷⁸ *ibid*, 310.

The table reveals that the two most frequent motifs in the **‘heavy-harder’** row is, firstly, death (v8: ἀπέθανεν; v9: διὰ τοῦ θανάτου; v15: οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον; v17: ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν; v21: ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ) and, secondly, sin or trespass (v8: ἔτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν; v10: ἐχθροῖ ; v15: παραπτώματι; v17: παραπτώματι; v21: ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία).

The most frequent motifs in the **‘light-easier’** column are, firstly, Jesus Christ, who is renominalised with increasing morphological bulk as the argument progresses (v9: δι’ αὐτοῦ; v10: τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ; v15: τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; v17: τοῦ ἐνὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; until the climactic v21: Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν), and, secondly, the related motif of his resurrection life (v9: δι’ αὐτοῦ; v10: ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ; v17: ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύουσιν; v20: εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον). The motif of the resurrection informs and conditions the motif of Jesus Christ, particularly the title Κύριος. Jesus Christ is now the *resurrected* Lord.⁶⁷⁹ He reigns as victor over death, and shares that reign with his people, who now also inhabit the realm of ‘life’. And so Christ’s people reign in the realm of life (ἐν ζωῇ: v17) with Christ, the risen Lord who has resurrection life.⁶⁸⁰

A third set of motifs is that of ‘grace’, ‘gift’, and ‘righteousness’, brought together in vv15, 17, 21 (v 15: ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι; v17: καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης; v 21: ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαιοσύνης). Δικαιοσύνης is both the content of the gift (v17), and the means through which ‘grace’ (favourable standing with God),⁶⁸¹ reigns in the realm of Lord Christ (v21). Thus, Kirk’s assertion that ‘Paul does not explicitly appeal to the

⁶⁷⁹ Romans 1:4.

⁶⁸⁰ Romans 5:17, 21; cf Romans 4:25; 5:9-10; Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 384.

⁶⁸¹ Romans 5:2

resurrection of Jesus in 5:15-21', ⁶⁸² requires serious modification. The resurrection motif is found in Paul's explicit references to 'life' and 'reigning Lord'. Yates correctly appreciates that '[w]hile the term "resurrection" does not occur it is implicit.'⁶⁸³

Two observations follow. **First**, Paul is increasingly backgrounding the motifs of death and sin, while he increasingly foregrounds righteousness, and the resurrection life that the living Lord Jesus Christ brings, until his climax in verse 21. **Second**, after verse 11, Paul is increasingly distancing 'Jesus Christ', however nominalized, from 'sin and death'. After verse 11, Christ is only brought into association with the motifs of (resurrection) life, ruling, and righteousness, not death. In one instance, 'many transgressions' is brought into relation to Christ. The one exception is v16b, where τὸ χάρισμα came from many παραπτωμάτων. But the motif of death is in the background in relation to Christ, and the resurrection and life is in the foreground. Hooker's conclusion is correct:

The logic that links these ideas is underlined by the use in each verse of the phrase πολλῶ μᾶλλον since, as in 5,15 and 5,17, life is more powerful than death.⁶⁸⁴

Discourse and Syntactical Analysis (Romans 5:15-19)

Context

In verse 12a, Paul begins a comparison (ὥσπερ δι' ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου) that he does not return to (an 'anacolouthon') until verse 18a (Ἄρα οὖν ὡς δι' ἐνὸς παραπτώματος).⁶⁸⁵ In the meantime, Paul expands on Adam's sin and the consequent spread of sin and death (vv12-14). Sin is a universal phenomenon, as shown by universal death.⁶⁸⁶ But sin not charged against the sinner's account (οὐκ ἐλλογείται) where there is no law (v13). 'Ελλογέω shares

⁶⁸² Kirk, *Unlocking Romans* (2008), 103.

⁶⁸³ Yates, *Spirit and Creation in Paul* (2008), 132.

⁶⁸⁴ Hooker, 'Raised for Our Acquittal' (2002), 332.

⁶⁸⁵ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 316, 319, 340.

⁶⁸⁶ *ibid*, 332.

the semantic field of λογίζομαι⁶⁸⁷ and perhaps Paul's choice of ἐλλογέω was influenced by his previous heavy usage of λογίζομαι.⁶⁸⁸ This situation, of sin spreading without a law to enable its proper accounting, persisted from Adam's disobedience till the receipt of the Mosaic law at Sinai (vv13-14). Even though Adam is a τύπος of the coming Christ (v14), Paul must make two further contrasts between Adam and his transgression and Christ and his gift (v15 and vv16-17).⁶⁸⁹ This brings us to vv15-19.

Discourse Grammatical and Syntactical Structure of Romans 5:15-19

<p>5:15 a ἄλλ' οὐχ a₁ ὥς τὸ παράπτωμα, a₂ οὕτως καὶ τὸ χάρισμα. b₁ εἰ γὰρ b_{1a} τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι b_{1b} πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον, b₂ πολλῷ μᾶλλον b_{2a} ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ (ἐν) χάριτι b_{2b} τῇ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ b_{2c} (εἰς) τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπερίσσευσεν.</p>	<p>5:16 a καὶ οὐχ a₁ ὥς (δι') ἑνὸς ἀμαρτήσαντος a₂ τὸ δώρημα. b₁ τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα b₂ (ἐξ) ἑνὸς b₃ (εἰς) κατάκριμα b₄ τὸ δὲ χάρισμα b₅ (ἐκ) πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων b₆ (εἰς) δικαίωμα. 5:17 a εἰ γὰρ a₁ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι a₂ ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν a₃ (διὰ) τοῦ ἑνὸς, b πολλῷ μᾶλλον b₁ οἱ τὴν περισσεῖαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες b₂ (ἐν) ζωῇ b₃ βασιλεύουσιν b₄ (διὰ) τοῦ ἑνὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.</p>	<p>5:18 a ὥρα οὖν a₁ ὥς (δι') ἑνὸς παραπτώματος a₂ (εἰς) πάντας ἀνθρώπους a₃ (εἰς) κατάκριμα, b οὕτως καὶ b₁ (δι') ἑνὸς δικαίωματος b₂ (εἰς) πάντας ἀνθρώπους b₃ (εἰς) δικαίωσιν ζωῆς. 5:19 a ὥσπερ γὰρ a₁ (διὰ) τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου a₂ ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί, b οὕτως καὶ b₁ (διὰ) τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς b₂ δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί.</p>
--	---	---

The mainline discourse is carried by 'extremely compact',⁶⁹⁰ 'compressed',⁶⁹¹ 'elliptical',⁶⁹² verbless clauses (vv15a, 16a, 18a) resembling exclamations,⁶⁹³ topic clauses or headings⁶⁹⁴ in

⁶⁸⁷ Louw & Nida, *GELNT*, Domain 57: Possess, Transfer, Exchange, T: To Keep Records, 57.226: ἐλλογέω, 57.227: λογίζομαι: Bibleworks7.

⁶⁸⁸ Romans 4:3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 22, 23, 24.

⁶⁸⁹ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 316, 334.

⁶⁹⁰ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 337.

⁶⁹¹ Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:280, 283.

highly abbreviated style reflecting ‘epigrammatic conciseness’.⁶⁹⁵ The verbless clause in v16a is brought into close association with that in v15a by mainline conjunction καί, which ‘links two items of equal status, constraining them to be closely related to one another without expressing continuity or discontinuity’.⁶⁹⁶ Conjunction γάρ (vv15b, 16b, 17, 19) marks offline or background expositions that explain, strengthen or support the preceding propositions or assertions.⁶⁹⁷

The conjunctions ἄρα οὖν introduce v18a. They are used together in the NT only by Paul.⁶⁹⁸ Ἄρα draws an inference from what precedes it. Οὖν ‘constrains what follows to be understood as building closely upon what precedes, yet as a distinct new development in the argument’.⁶⁹⁹ Οὖν often marks boundaries in the discourse where the next major topic is drawn from and builds upon what has preceded.⁷⁰⁰ Therefore, ἄρα expresses the inference from the previous material, and οὖν marks the transition, progression and development, resuming the mainline of the argument.⁷⁰¹ Together, ἄρα οὖν marks Paul’s return to the comparison he began in verse 12 between Adam and Christ, drawing on his discourse from vv12-17 to highlight some consequences in his ultimate comparison (vv18-19) of Adam and Christ.⁷⁰²

⁶⁹² Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 420; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 340.

⁶⁹³ Morris, *Romans* (1988), 238.

⁶⁹⁴ Wright, ‘Romans’ (2002), 528; Byrne, *Romans* (1996), 178.

⁶⁹⁵ Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:283.

⁶⁹⁶ Runge, *Discourse Grammar* (2010), 24.

⁶⁹⁷ *ibid*, 52.

⁶⁹⁸ Romans 7:3, 25, 8:12, 9:16, 18, [14:12], 14:19; Galatians 6:10; Ephesians 2:19; 1 Thessalonians 5:6; 2 Thessalonians 2:15: BAG, 103.

⁶⁹⁹ Runge, *Discourse Grammar* (2010), 44.

⁷⁰⁰ *ibid*, 43.

⁷⁰¹ BAG, 103; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:282.

⁷⁰² Moo, *Romans* (1996), 340; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:282; *Contra Jewett, Romans* (2007), 385.

In verse 18a₁, ὥς corresponds to ὥσπερ in verse 12, and the long delayed apodosis is finally introduced by οὕτως καί in verse 18b.⁷⁰³ In v19a, ὥσπερ γάρ introduces offline background discourse which serves to explain the preceding comparison in verse 18, with the γάρ marking explanatory material⁷⁰⁴ and the ὥσπερ marking the protasis of the comparison (v19a), the apodosis of which is marked by οὕτως καί (v19b).⁷⁰⁵

The referent of ἐνός (verses 12, 15-19)

The first occurrence of the genitive cardinal adjective ἐνός is in verse 12, δι' ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου ('through one man'), and the referent is Ἀδάμ (verse 14). The comparison of Adam is with τοῦ μέλλοντος (the coming one). The referent of ἐνός becomes easier to determine in the explanatory material (vv15b, 16b, 17 and 19), as ἐνός is modified either by ἀνθρώπου (vv15b_{2b}, 19a₁; cf v 12), Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (vv15b_{2b}, v17b₄), or possesses the genitive masculine article τοῦ in a different case to the substantive which follows it (vv 15b_{1a}, 15b_{2b}, 17a₁, 17b₄). Thus, every occurrence of ἐνός which occurs in the explanatory material clearly is a pronoun, referring to either Adam or Christ. If Paul wanted to unambiguously make all the referents of ἐνός personal in the mainline sections (vv15a, 16a, 18a), he could have done so explicitly, as he did in the offline explanatory sections (vv15b, 16b, 17, 19). Likewise, Paul could have made the identity of ἐνός as a neuter adjective explicit by adding the neuter article. Nevertheless, given that the offline sections are explanatory in nature, it is probable that Paul did indeed clarify the referents of ἐνός *by providing the explanatory offline material*. If it still be held Paul has not made the referent clear, perhaps it is intentionally multi-referential, Paul intending it to be both a masculine pronoun and a neuter adjective. In

⁷⁰³ Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:282-3.

⁷⁰⁴ Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 287.

⁷⁰⁵ BAG, 908.

verse 15b, each of the adjectives πολλοί and εἷς have a personal referent,⁷⁰⁶ suggesting a personal referent also for of ἐνός. A second table shows instances of ἐνός and πολλοί.

⁷⁰⁶ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 335-6.

ἑνός and πολλοί in Romans 5:15-19

<p>5:15</p> <p>...</p> <p>b_{1a} τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι by the trespass of the one</p> <p>b_{1b} οἱ πολλοὶ the many</p> <p>...</p> <p>b_{2b} τῇ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ by the [grace] of the one man, Jesus Christ</p> <p>b_{2c} εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς for the many</p> <p>...</p>	<p>5:16</p> <p>...</p> <p>a₁ δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος [masc ptcp] through one [man's] sinning⁷⁰⁷</p> <p>...</p> <p>b₂ ἐξ ἑνὸς from one [man]⁷⁰⁸ OR from one [sin]⁷⁰⁹ OR from one [man's] one [sin]⁷¹⁰</p> <p>...</p> <p>b₅ ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων from many trespasses⁷¹¹ OR from the many's sins⁷¹² OR from many trespasses of the many</p> <p>...</p> <p>5:17</p> <p>...</p> <p>a₁ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι by the trespass of the one</p> <p>...</p> <p>a₃ διὰ τοῦ ἑνός through the one [man]⁷¹³</p> <p>...</p> <p>b₄ διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. through the one [man] Jesus Christ</p>	<p>5:18</p> <p>...</p> <p>a₁ δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος through one trespass⁷¹⁴ OR through the one [man's] trespass⁷¹⁵</p> <p>a₂ εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους for all men</p> <p>...</p> <p>b₁ δι' ἑνὸς δικαιομάτος through one dikaïomatos⁷¹⁶ OR through the one [man's] dikaïomatos⁷¹⁷</p> <p>b₂ εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους for all men</p> <p>...</p> <p>5:19</p> <p>...</p> <p>a₁ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου through disobedience of the one man⁷¹⁸</p> <p>...</p> <p>a₂ ... οἱ πολλοί the many</p> <p>...</p> <p>b₁ διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἑνός through obedience of the one [man]</p> <p>...</p> <p>b₂ ... οἱ πολλοί the many</p>
--	---	--

⁷⁰⁷ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 337; Murray, *Romans* (1959) 1:197; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:286; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 283; Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 369; Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 419; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:280; Morris, *Romans* (1988), 236; Wright, 'Romans' (2002), 528; Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 248.

⁷⁰⁸ AV, Käsemann, *Romans* (1980), 153; Murray, *Romans* (1959) 1:197; Schlatter, 130; Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 369; Godet, *Romans* (1883), 218.

⁷⁰⁹ All major English versions: Moo, *Romans* (1996), 338; Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:201; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:286 fn 6; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 283, 285 fn 5; Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 419; Morris, *Romans* (1988), 236; Wright, 'Romans' (2002), 528; Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 248.

⁷¹⁰ All three are possibilities for Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:280.

⁷¹¹ Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 285; Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 382; Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 419; Morris, *Romans* (1988), 236; Wright, 'Romans' (2002), 528; Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 248.

⁷¹² Godet, *Romans* (1883), 218.

⁷¹³ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 339 fn 117; Murray, *Romans* (1959) 1:197; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:287.

⁷¹⁴ Murray, *Romans* (1959) 1:199; Schlatter, *Romans* (1995), 131; Sanday & Headlam, *Romans* (1902), 141-2; Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 369; Morris, *Romans* (1988), 238; Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 251.

⁷¹⁵ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 340; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:289; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 283, 86 fn 8; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:283; Wright, 'Romans' (2002), 529; Hultgren, *Romans* (2011), 287.

⁷¹⁶ Murray, *Romans* (1959) 1:199; Schlatter, *Romans* (1995), 131; Sanday & Headlam, *Romans* (1902), 141-2; Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 369; Morris, *Romans* (1988), 238; Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 251.

⁷¹⁷ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 341; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:289; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 283, 86 fn 8; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:283; Wright, 'Romans' (2002), 528; Hultgren, *Romans* (2011), 287.

⁷¹⁸ Murray, *Romans* (1959) 1:197.

In verse 16a, Paul could have said ‘through one man’s sinning’ (δι’ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἁμαρτήσαντος) or ‘through one sin’ (δι’ μιᾶς ἁμαρτίας). Probably, Paul used the participle to emphasise the sinful activity.⁷¹⁹ Nevertheless, ἐνός (v16a) is personal, as it is modified by the masculine adjectival participle ἁμαρτήσαντος.⁷²⁰ The Western Reading’s neuter participle in v16a (ἁμαρτήματος) would support taking ἐνός as neuter, but the masculine participle is preferable on textual grounds.⁷²¹ The context and conclusion in v17 support the view that ‘the stereotypically repeated δι’ ἐνός is always masculine’.⁷²² Käsemann’s conclusion is supported by the above discourse analysis, as vv17a₁, 17b₄ provide explanatory material for v16.

Regarding verse 18a₁, b₁, Murray thinks that the absence of the article in the phrases δι’ ἐνὸς παραπτώματος and δι’ ἐνὸς δικαιώματος leads us to expect that in each phrase one act, not one man, is on view.⁷²³ Murray rightly notes that the insertion of the genitive article [presumably in either v16b (ἐξ τοῦ ἐνός) or verse 18a,b (δι’ τοῦ ἐνὸς παραπτώματος [...] δι’ τοῦ ἐνὸς δικαιώματος)] would not remove the ambiguity as the substantives that would follow it are also genitives.⁷²⁴ Thus, the constructions so amended could also legitimately mean ‘from the one sin’, from the one trespass, from the one *dikaïomatos*, even with the article so inserted.

⁷¹⁹ Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 236.

⁷²⁰ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 337; Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:197; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:286; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 283; Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 369; Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 419; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:280; Morris, *Romans* (1988), 236; Wright, ‘Romans’ (2002), 528; Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 248.

⁷²¹ Käsemann, *Romans* (1980), 153. The best mss support ἁμαρτησαντος $\aleph^{01c2} A_{02} B_{03} K_{018} L_{020} P_{025}$ Or Chr Thdrt etc: Tischendorf’s Apparatus: Bibleworks7.

⁷²² Käsemann, *Romans* (1980), 153.

⁷²³ Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:201, esp fn 33.

⁷²⁴ Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:201, fn 33.

While Paul could have taken other steps to clarify his precise meaning, either making the referent unambiguously personal or unambiguously neuter, the contrast with πάντας ἀνθρώπους ('all men': v18a₂,b₂) is stronger if the ἐνός is taken to be a masculine pronoun.⁷²⁵ Moreover, ἐνός is undoubtedly masculine and personal in the offline explanatory material that follows verse 18 in v19a₁,b₁ and πολλοί in v19a₂,b₂ likewise has a personal referent. Indeed, every instance of either πολλοί or ἐνός in any background explanatory material in verse 15-19 is personal. Therefore, each instance of either πολλοί or ἐνός is debatably masculine in the foregrounded, mainline discourse. So Cranfield is right to say 'it is surely better to take ἐνός here [in verse 18] as masculine'.⁷²⁶ Moreover, if Dunn is correct to see v18a as 'a masterly compression of the different aspects picked out in the preceding verses', then all except two instances of ἐνός (v16b₂,b₂) are undoubtedly personal, and those two instances are conceivably personal or perhaps intentionally multi-referential. Thus, it is best to take ἐνός in Romans 5:18 as masculine and personal, despite the absence of the article. Still to be determined are the meanings of the key lexemes.

Δικαίωμα in Romans 5:16

Until recently, the belief that δικαίωμα (Romans 5:16) meant 'justification' or 'acquittal', demonstrated by its antonymous parallelism with κατάκριμα, went unchallenged. That is no longer the case. Kirk has recently argued δικαίωμα (v16) means 'judgment', 'penalty', or 'reparation'⁷²⁷ based on (1) the contextual unlikelihood that δικαίωμα is in antithetic parallelism with κατάκριμα (v16); and (2) the lexical unanimity that δικαίωμα does *not* mean 'justification' anywhere in the Graeco-Roman corpus outside Romans 5:16.⁷²⁸

⁷²⁵ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 341 fn 125; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 286 fn 8.

⁷²⁶ Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:289.

⁷²⁷ Kirk, 'Reconsidering *Dikaiōma*' (2007), 787; idem, *Unlocking Romans* (2008), 102.

⁷²⁸ Kirk, 'Reconsidering *Dikaiōma*' (2007), 787-8.

(1) Contextual considerations

Kirk is concerned about the reasoning by which commentators make their lexical decisions.

Eg:

δικαίωμα normally means “regulation, requirement” (BGD [sic]; and see on 5:18). But here it is chosen obviously as yet another $\mu\alpha$ word to provide rhetorical balance to κατάκριμα. As such it has to be taken as the opposite of “condemnation,” so “justification, acquittal.”⁷²⁹

δικαίωμα normally means “regulation, requirement” (as in 1:32, 2:26, and 8:4; 5:16 is rhetorically determined).⁷³⁰

δικαίωμα is apparently used in preference to δικαιοσύνη or δικαίωσις (used in v 18) because a counterpart to κατάκριμα is desired (see Bauer, sv δικαίωμα, 3). It is used here (as is also δικαίωσις in v 18) to denote justification in the sense not of the action of justifying but of the result of the action.⁷³¹

Kirk correctly regards it as more probable that Paul would ‘use familiar meanings of familiar words than that he will invoke the wrong word simply because he likes the sound of it’.⁷³²

The parallelism of the $\mu\alpha$ endings has clear rhetorical power, which the commentators rightly identify. Kirk is also correct to see that whatever parallelism Paul is using cannot convert δικαίωμα to meaning something other than what δικαίωμα really means. But contra Kirk, Paul *has invoked the correct* word to mean ‘justification’.⁷³³ The consensus of commentators is correct. However, Kirk’s criticism has some force vis-à-vis Dunn, because Dunn concedes that there is a ‘normal’ meaning of the term which is not ‘justification’. While it is true neither Dunn nor Cranfield provide any primary evidence that δικαίωμα means ‘justification’, Cranfield cites word formation evidence for the meaning ‘justification’.⁷³⁴ The $\mu\alpha$ ending provides *prima facie* evidence of what δικαίωμα might

⁷²⁹ Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:281.

⁷³⁰ *ibid*, 1:283.

⁷³¹ Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:287 fn 2.

⁷³² Kirk, ‘Reconsidering *Dikaiōma*’ (2007), 789.

⁷³³ See Chapter 5, above.

⁷³⁴ Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:287 fn 2.

mean, which can be supported or contradicted with usage surveys, such as chapter 5 provides.

Rhetorical Parallelism

Kirk challenges the widely-held view that Paul is using antithetical parallelism in vv15-18:

Stepping back to v15, Paul demarcates the effect of Adam's transgression by saying, "the many died." Based on the assumption that Paul is outlining a predictable antithetical parallelism between Adam and Christ, we would expect him to say here, "The many will be made alive." Instead, he talks about God's gift and grace abounding to the many. Both the structure and the content of the antithesis are unbalanced.⁷³⁵

Kirk's observations here are true, but have only limited relevance to the issue of determining whether there is antithetical parallelism in verse 16b. This is because, as the ἁλλά in verse 15a indicates, Paul must correct his statement, Ἀδάμ, ὅς ἐστιν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος (v14), by showing that in some ways Adam is *not* a type of Christ, though in other ways he is. Ἅλλά is thus not forward pointing to v16, but backward pointing to verse 14, correcting it.⁷³⁶ Again, Kirk says:

Similarly, if for v17 we attempt to predict the Christ side of the Adam/Christ divide, based on what Paul says about the result of Adam's sin, we will miss the mark. Opposed to 'through one transgression death reigned,' we find neither, 'through one act of obedience life reigned' nor 'through one act of obedience Christ reigned.' Instead, we find a piling up of 'grace' and 'gift' similar to what we have seen in v 15.⁷³⁷

Again, Kirk's basic observation is true. Paul does not adopt completely antithetical parallelism. But it is doubtful that absolute 'antithetical parallelism' is 'expected' in vv15b, 17, as syntactically, all that is 'expected' by the comparative structure is the parallelism required by the 'heavy to light' argument (nb: πολλῶ μᾶλλον: v15b, 17b). Such parallelism need not be absolutely antithetical, but must indicate a contrast. In addition, while verse 16 continues Paul's discourse (note καὶ οὐχ in 16a), Paul's ultimate statement of comparison is verse 18 (note ἄρα οὖν: v18a), and its explanation in verse 19 (note γάρ), both of which

⁷³⁵ Kirk, 'Reconsidering *Dikaiōma*' (2007), 789.

⁷³⁶ Runge, *Discourse Grammar* (2010), 56, 92-100.

⁷³⁷ Kirk, 'Reconsidering *Dikaiōma*' (2007), 789-90.

resolve the anacolouthon of verse 12. Whatever parallelism Paul adopts will be best exemplified by the parallelism within verse 18. And in verse 18b₃, Paul *does not* use δικαίωμα in parallel with κατὰκριμα to match the -μα ending (as is alleged for v16b), but the somewhat ‘unrhetorical’ δικαίωσιν ζωῆς (see table below). This militates against the claim that Paul chose δικαίωμα in verse 16 because it rhymed with κατὰκριμα. Far more likely, Paul chose each word for its well-attested meaning. Thus far, Kirk is correct, though he has not brought the best evidence forward.

Text containing -μα endings in 5:15-18

<p>5:15 Mainline a [αλλ'] οὐχ a₁ ὥς τὸ παράπτω<u>μα</u>, a₂ οὕτως καὶ τὸ χάρι<u>σμα</u>.</p>	<p>5:16 Mainline a καὶ οὐχ a₁ ὥς (δι') ἐνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος a₂ τὸ δώρη<u>μα</u>.</p> <hr/> <p>Offline b₁ τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρί<u>μα</u> b₂ (ἐξ) ἐνὸς b₃ (εἰς) κατὰκριμα b₄ τὸ δὲ χάρι<u>σμα</u> b₅ (ἐκ) πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων b₆ (εἰς) δικαίω<u>μα</u>.</p>	<p>5:18 Mainline a ἴαρα οὖν a₁ ὥς (δι') ἐνὸς παραπτώματος a₂ (εἰς) πάντας ἀνθρώπους a₃ (εἰς) κατὰκρι<u>μα</u>, b οὕτως καὶ b₁ (δι') ἐνὸς δικαιώματος b₂ (εἰς) πάντας ἀνθρώπους b₃ (εἰς) δικαίωσιν ζωῆς.</p>
--	--	---

Regarding the rhetorical parallelism, the first observation is that all three mainline texts above contain the syntactical structure ὥς [...] οὕτως καὶ in vv15a, 16a (οὕτως καὶ elided but implied from v15a₂) and 18a,b. This structure denotes a comparison.⁷³⁸ The presence of οὐχ in v15a, 16a shows it is a comparison by way of contrast.

The contrast in **verse 15a** is between τὸ παράπτωμα (trespass) and τὸ χάρισμα (gift). Both are definite, the article being used ‘*par excellence*’, in that both the trespass and the gift

⁷³⁸ BAG, 905; Moulton & Turner, *Grammar: Syntax* (1963), 3:330.

being spoken of are at the extremity of their class.⁷³⁹ The nouns are concrete (note –μα ending). While the nouns are not antonyms, there is a clear contrast. The explanatory material in verse 15b suggests that the παράπτωμα refers to the sin of the one man, being Adam's sin in the garden (Genesis 2:16; 3:6). The grace-gift τὸ χάρισμα is explained by ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι that came by (instrumental dative) Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τοὺς πολλούς. While in 5:8-9a, Paul highlighted Christ's death, in 5:9b-10, Paul has shifted his attention now 'much more' (πολλῶ μᾶλλον) to Christ's life. In 5:11, Paul renominalises with διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 'Our Lord Jesus Christ' is referred to in the previous verse as ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ. In other words, it is the risen Lord Jesus, who has shown himself Lord over sin and death by his resurrection (1:4), and thus will save his people (σωθησόμεθα ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ: 5:10b). The risen Lord Jesus Christ is the focus, not the Son God presented as the propitiation.⁷⁴⁰ Thus, the gift τὸ χάρισμα probably does not refer in the first instance to Christ's death in distinction to his resurrection life,⁷⁴¹ but to the gift of righteousness (5:17b₁)⁷⁴² that Christ distributes as a result of being the risen Lord.

The contrast in **verse 16a** is between ὡς δι' ἑνὸς ἀμαρτήσαντος and τὸ δῶρημα. Missing are several elements of the formal parallelism: the article, the parallel neuter nouns with –μα endings. Οὕτως καὶ is elided. The noun τὸ δῶρημα is definite by virtue of the article 'par excellence', and anarthrous masculine participle ἀμαρτήσαντος is definite by virtue of the masculine pronoun, ἐνός. The referent of ἐνός ἀμαρτήσαντος is the transgression of the one man, Adam. However, it is syntactically contrasted with the gift τὸ δῶρημα, par excellence.

⁷³⁹ Wallace, *Greek Grammar* (1996), 222.

⁷⁴⁰ Romans 3:24-26, 4:25a, 5:6-9a.

⁷⁴¹ Contra Kirk, *Unlocking Romans* (2008), 102, followed by Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 248.

⁷⁴² Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:284; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:280; Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 381.

In verse 16a₂, Paul uses the neuter δώρημα, following on from cognate feminine noun form (ἡ δωρεά) which he introduced in v15b_{2a}, instead of χάρισμα, which he used in v15a. Δώρημα emphasizes the freeness⁷⁴³ (cf 3:24 and cognate adverb δωρεάν), and the distributive nature of the gift (an inference from its usage as ‘present’⁷⁴⁴ and its relationship to cognate verb δίδωμι). Perhaps it alludes to the gift of the Spirit (5:5) who raised Christ from the dead (1:4). Χάρισμα emphasizes the source of the gift being God’s character of kindness and graciousness⁷⁴⁵, and thus denotes a gift sourced from divine benevolence. It is undeserved. Χάρισμα frequently denotes the individuations of manifestations of grace (note –μα ending), this time the content is ‘the gift of righteousness’ (5:17b₁), and thus the stress is on the result, or distribution, of the gracious gift.

Verse 16b is offline text, marked by γάρ. Verse 16b thus explains v16a. Syntactically, the explanation v16b offers is another contrast which uses the postpositive particles μὲν [...] δέ in construction, each particle correlating the respective clauses they introduce with one another.⁷⁴⁶ Verse 16b correlates τὸ μὲν... κρίμα ἐξ ἑνὸς εἰς κατάκριμα with τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα. Syntactically, εἰς δικαίωμα is formally parallel with εἰς κατάκριμα and τὸ κρίμα is formally parallel with τὸ χάρισμα. Thus, the judgment originates from one trespass into condemnation. Κρίμα (judgment) is intensified into the κατάκριμα (condemnation) into which it leads; likewise, the gift of grace τὸ χάρισμα ‘leads to’ or is ‘with a view to’, δικαίωμα.

⁷⁴³ Morris, *Romans* (1988), 235; Käsemann, *Romans* (1980), 153.

⁷⁴⁴ LSJM, 464.

⁷⁴⁵ Romans 3:24; 4: 4, 16; 5:2, 15, 17, 20, 21. Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1: 284.

⁷⁴⁶ Runge, *Discourse Grammar* (2010), 55.

Κρίμα is a ‘decision, judgment, verdict, decree’.⁷⁴⁷ It denotes a legal decision, especially condemnation.⁷⁴⁸ This is consistent with the –μα ending, suggesting an outcome of the judgment process. The forensic background of κρίμα is a feature it shares with δικαίωμα but not with χάρισμα.⁷⁴⁹ Intensified κατάκριμα denotes ‘condemnation’, or ‘punishment, fine, damage’,⁷⁵⁰ an unfavourable court judgment or the result of such a finding, which is punishment. The cognate verb, κατακρίνω, likewise denotes giving a negative sentence.⁷⁵¹

Before proceeding to the lexical meaning of δικαίωμα (v16b₆) it is to be observed that Paul has already explained the meaning of τὸ [...] χάρισμα [...] εἰς δικαίωμα, because conjunction γάρ introduces background material of an explanatory nature in v17a. Therefore, it was never necessary to view the meaning of δικαίωμα as somehow rhetorically malleable or only determinable by the arbitrary assumption of Paul’s antithetic parallelism. Paul gives his own explanation of the meaning of τὸ χάρισμα [...] εἰς δικαίωμα in the adjectival participial phrase οἱ τὴν περισσεῖαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες (v17b₁).⁷⁵² Γάρ in v17a establishes the link of v17 with v16b, telling us v17 explains v16b. Common vocabulary (χάρισμα: 16b₄ | | χάριτος: 17b₁; δικαίωμα: 16b₆ | | δικαιοσύνης: 17b₁) and their analogous position in their respective comparative syntactical structures further establishes the link between the phrases. Τὸ χάρισμα [...] εἰς δικαίωμα’ follows the δέ in the μὲν [...] δέ structure. Οἱ τὴν περισσεῖαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες occupies the ‘light-easier’ position in the εἰ [...] πολλῶ μᾶλλον (how much more) structure.

⁷⁴⁷ LSJM, 995.

⁷⁴⁸ *ibid.*

⁷⁴⁹ See chapter 5, above; Käsemann, *Romans* (1980), 153.

⁷⁵⁰ LSJM, 896.

⁷⁵¹ Matthew 20:18; LSJM, 896.

⁷⁵² Alford, *Greek NT* (1877), 2.364.

Hence, οἱ τὴν περισσεΐαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες (v17b₁) explains τὸ χάρισμα [...] εἰς δικαίωμα (v16b_{4,6}).

The explanation can be further specified because of vocabulary parallels.

οἱ τὴν περισσεΐαν τῆς χάριτος...λαμβάνοντες explains τὸ δὲ χάρισμα	οἱ...τὴν περισσεΐαν...τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες explains εἰς δικαίωμα
--	--

Consequently, whatever meaning is chosen for δικαίωμα from its attested semantic range must account for Paul's own explanation of the meaning of the work through what appears to be the explanatory parallelism of 'the abundance of the gift of righteousness' which has been received by many through Christ. Δωρεᾶς explains δικαίωμα as being a gift distributed 'through the one man Christ'. 'Οἱ [...] λαμβάνοντες explains that the δικαίωμα is 'received' or 'taken' by a group of people. And the cognate noun δικαιοσύνης explains in what the gift of δικαίωμα consists, once it is received. It is a gift of righteousness.⁷⁵³ The terms κρίμα, κατάκριμα and δικαίωμα determine a forensic or judicial context. Thus, the δικαίωμα of verse 16b is a forensic gift of righteousness distributed to many people freely through the agency of Jesus Christ. The nature of the agency is not (yet) further stipulated (though see 4:25b). However, those in receipt of such a wonderful gift will reign (βασιλεύσουσιν is an eschatological future) ἐν ζωῇ, meaning resurrection life. Those who receive the gift of righteousness will rise again at the eschaton to reign with their resurrected and reigning Lord, Jesus Christ. With the context now determined, the lexical issue must be faced.

⁷⁵³ See Chapter 4, above.

(2) Lexical issues

Kirk would be right to criticize the ‘consensus’ interpretation of Romans 5:16 if it really held hold that Paul chose δικαίωμα for stylistic purposes, that he wanted a δικαι— word ending in —μα.⁷⁵⁴ But the consensus opinion is not based on rhetorical considerations but the lexical meaning of δικαίωμα. Kirk says:

[N]o argument has been offered to challenge the lexicography of Liddell and Scott and confirmed in Bauer. That is to say, no suggestion has been made to the effect that “justification” is an attested meaning of δικαίωμα outside of Rom 5:16. The arguments offered for such a translation [of δικαίωμα as ‘justification’], function as pleas to set aside the agreed-upon lexicographical data in favor of this otherwise unattested meaning. Thus, although a review of word usage in the time period in question is a standard procedure in translation debates such as this, in this case agreement about the lexicographical data renders such a survey unnecessary.⁷⁵⁵

Kirk regards assigning the meaning of ‘justification’ to δικαίωμα as ‘novel’, ‘otherwise unattested’, an ‘idiosyncratic’ meaning that Paul would had to have ‘coined’, and improbable because ‘Paul is more likely to use a word with a meaning his readers would understand’.⁷⁵⁶ At the same time, Kirk himself dispenses with the need to go underneath BDAG and LSJM to the primary sources.⁷⁵⁷

[S]uch translations [ie ‘justification’ or ‘acquittal’ for δικαίωμα⁷⁵⁸] are lexicographically problematic inasmuch as both BAGD and LSJ list Rom 5:16 as the only place in the extant corpus of Greek literature where δικαίωμα bears such a meaning.⁷⁵⁹

This final assertion is open to criticism. The first thing to observe is Kirk’s dependence on BDAG and LSJM, and his belief that no further lexical work is required. They are not the only dictionaries, nor are they necessarily comprehensive or correct.

Second, while Kirk’s statement is formally true regarding BDAG, Kirk fails to acknowledge that BDAG is specifically a *NT* Lexicon. BDAG was never intended to be an exhaustive

⁷⁵⁴ Kirk, ‘Reconsidering *Dikaiōma*’ (2007), 788-89.

⁷⁵⁵ *ibid*, 788-9.

⁷⁵⁶ *ibid*, 787.

⁷⁵⁷ *ibid*, 789.

⁷⁵⁸ *ibid*, 787.

⁷⁵⁹ *ibid*.

coverage of usage for anything except the NT. Thus, it is not surprising that for rare Greek words, only one or a few examples of usage that are actually found in the NT are to be found in it.

Third, it is simply not in accordance with sound methodology for Kirk, having consulted LSJ and BDAG, to say that ‘agreement about the lexicographical data renders such a survey [of the meaning of δικαίωμα in the extant Greek corpus] unnecessary’. Kirk, it would seem, now believes he possesses some sort of lexical consensus for his rejection of the meaning ‘justification’, yet without anything near a comprehensive demonstration of the relevant Graeco-Roman Corpus and the LXX. For example, Kirk has not referred to any LXX lexicons (Muraoka⁷⁶⁰; Lust-Eynikel-Hauspie⁷⁶¹) which would have corrected his basic assertion, nor the theological *lexica* (*TLNT*, *TDNT*, *EDNT*, *NIDNTT*), nor Moulton-Milligan, any or all of which have substantial Graeco-Roman and LXX coverage, and all of which would have likewise contradicted his fundamental thesis. Any true ‘agreement about the lexicographical data’ requires these other resources to be taken into account. So, contrary to Kirk’s assertion, there is no such lexical unanimity against δικαίωμα meaning ‘justification’.

On the contrary, and fourthly, attending to Kirk’s substantive point, the LXX evinces 6 examples of δικαίωμα where ‘plea for justification’, ‘justification’ or ‘vindication’ is the meaning (2 Samuel 19:28;⁷ 1 Kings 8:59; 2 Chronicles 6:35; Jeremiah 11:20; 18:19; Baruch 2:17).

⁷⁶⁰ Muraoka, *Greek-English Lexicon of LXX* (2009), 170, which cites Je 11:20 for ‘state of not being guilty, ‘innocence’, and Baruch 2:17.

⁷⁶¹ Lust, Eynikel, Hauspie, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (2003), 154, which cites Jer 18:19 for ‘my justification’, 2 Samuel 19:29 for ‘justification, legal right’ and 1 Kings 3:28 for ‘justice’.

Fifth, again substantively, the secular Graeco-Roman corpus indicates that the meaning of ‘justification’ for δικαίωμα is quite acceptable, as this thesis has shown in chapter 5.

Sixth, even if Kirk restricted himself to LSJM, he fails to recognise the import of one of the meanings listed in *LSJM* for δικαίωμα:

b. justification, plea of right, Th.1.41, Isoc. 6.25, Arist. *Cael.* 279^b9, LXX 2Ki.19.28(29), *PLond.* 2.360.8(ii A.D), etc.; δικαίωματ' Ἑλληνίδων πόλεων, compiled by Arist. for Philip, Harp. s.v. Δρυμος.

Justification as a ‘plea of right’ is very close to justification as ‘the result of the process of δικαίωσις’. The one who brings a ‘plea of right’ eagerly awaits and pleads for the judges’ declaration that the litigant is ‘just’. This is the process of δικαίωσις, which can include the judges decision in the denotation.⁷⁶² That is why the same English word ‘justification’ can be used to translate δικαίωμα as a ‘plea of right’ or ‘plea for justification’ while the case is being heard and before the case is decided, and the favourable judgment of vindication after the case is decided. After the favourable decision, the ‘plea for justification’ has become court approved and sanctioned δικαίωμα, and thus ‘justification’ or ‘vindication’.

Seventh, the fact is that greater lexical problems lie with Kirk’s suggestion. Kirk’s preferred definitions are ‘judgment’, ‘penalty’, or ‘reparation’.⁷⁶³ But regarding ‘penalty’, there is no extant Graeco-Roman or LXX instance of δικαίωμα meaning ‘penalty’, and certainly none that Kirk has propounded. The closest instance is where τὰ δικαιώματα connotes (*not* denotes) ‘punishment’ (not penalty) in Revelation 15:4. But even in Revelation 15:4, ‘punishment’ is not the denotation of the phrase τὰ δικαιώματά, as τὰ δικαιώματα there refers to the ‘just judgments’ which consist in the divine judicial ‘vindications’ of the

⁷⁶² eg Thucydides 8.66.2.

⁷⁶³ Kirk, ‘Reconsidering *Dikaiōma*’ (2007), 787.

righteous (hence justifications) but also encapsulate the ‘condemnations’, which are made clear to all creation. These τὰ δικάϊώματα entail or connote ‘punishment’ for the wicked, but the word does not denote it. The word still refers to the divine judicial decree. If Kirk depends on Aristotle *NE* 5.7.7 for ‘penal’ connotations of δικάϊωμα, he faces the fact that for Aristotle, ‘corrective justice’ is not punitive. So it is unlikely that penalty enters into Aristotle’s conception, only correction and restoration.⁷⁶⁴ Aristotle’s objective in corrective justice is to restore the ‘mean’ and to justify the wrongdoer by bringing about a righteous outcome where before there was only wrongdoing. If Kirk depends on Plato, *Laws*, for δικάϊωμα denoting ‘punishment’, a closer analysis beyond simply citing LSJM will demonstrate that Plato, *Laws*, [864^e3] more likely means ‘charges’ than ‘punishment’. Neither does δικάϊώματα in Romans 2:26 denote the penalty itself, but the *just decree* of the punishment of death. The fact is that the verbal noun in the *dikai*— family that can unambiguously refer to punishment is not δικάϊωμα but δικάϊωσις.⁷⁶⁵ But Kirk does not want to challenge the definition of δικάϊωσις in 4:25 and 5:18, only δικάϊωμα in 5:16.

Likewise, Kirk suggests the meaning of ‘reparation’ in verse 16, which he defines as ‘an action performed *by a convicted person* that satisfies the court and that justifies the defendant’.⁷⁶⁶ (my emphasis) In Kirk’s favour, Godet regards Aristotle’s definition as quite suitable to the meaning of reparation of injury.⁷⁶⁷ However, the problem with this suggestion is that for Aristotle and his Anonymous commentator, it is not the litigant, but the judge, who corrects the injustice by imposing the decree on the litigant. No instance in the corpus has been shown where δικάϊωμα is used in the situation where the litigant is

⁷⁶⁴ Despite *Anonymous*, above, chapter 6.

⁷⁶⁵ Harpocration, citing Thucydides; Josephus, *Antiq.* 18.315.2.

⁷⁶⁶ Kirk, ‘Reconsidering *Dikaiōma*’ (2007), 787.

⁷⁶⁷ Godet, *Romans* (1883), 224.

taking the initiative to willingly make a reparation, or that the result of the reparation or restitution worked by the litigant is δικαίωμα. Every plea for justification involves a judge (real or metaphorical, actual or implied) making the decision and therefore bringing justification. It is judges who correct injustice, not, unfortunately, litigants.⁷⁶⁸ Judges do so by issuing just decrees, δικαιώματα. One type of these, the positive outcome of the trial process, is a justification or a vindication.

Kirk's last translation suggestion is that δικαίωμα means 'judgment' (more specifically, a judicial 'decree of judgment') as opposed to its execution in punishment. This is lexically possible.⁷⁶⁹ Thus inserted into verse 16b, this suggestion would read:

For on the one hand, the judgment (κρίμα) originated from one man, but the gift of grace originated from the sin of many resulting in judgment (δικαίωμα)

The effect of the 'how much more' argument is considerably muted (running from verses 8-21) and the end of the verse becomes anticlimactical as a return to what has been characterized above as the heavier/harder thing of Christ's death, rather than the lighter or easier thing of the victorious application of Christ's resurrection for our justification (4:25b). Consider the following:

⁷⁶⁸ cf Aristotle, *On the Heavens*, 1.10.9 [279^b9] in LCL 338 Vol VI (1971), 94-97.

⁷⁶⁹ eg Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 5.7.7; Dio Cassius, *Roman History*, 52.31.2; Romans 1:32; Revelation 15:4. See chapter 5, above.

'Heavy to Light' with Kirk's Preferred Translations Included

	Verses 8-9	Verses 10-11	Verses 15	Verse 16b	Verse 17	Verses 21
Hard Heavy	Yet while we were still sinners (ἁμαρτωλῶν), Christ died (ἀπέθανεν) for us. Now having been justified by his blood (αἵματι)	Being enemies (ἐχθροὶ), we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son (διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ)... having been reconciled...	By the one[’s] trespass (παραπτώματι), the many died (ἀπέθανον)	the judgment (τὸ κρίμα) from one [man’s sin] into condemnation (κατάκριμα)	By the trespass (παραπτώματι) of the one, death reigned (ὁ θάνατος) through the one	Just as sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) reigned in the death (ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ)
Conj	πολλῷ οὖν μᾶλλον	γὰρ...πολλῷ μᾶλλον	ἄλλ’ ... πολλῷ μᾶλλον	μὲν ... ὁ	γὰρ ... πολλῷ μᾶλλον	ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν (v20)... οὕτως καὶ
Easy Light	Shall we be saved by him (δι’ αὐτοῦ) from the wrath.	Shall we be saved in his life (ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ), and not only but also, we rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ (τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ), through whom we have now received reconciliation.	The grace of God and the gift and the gift in grace by the one man, (Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) abounded for the many.	The gift (τὸ χάρισμα) came from many transgressions (παραπτωμάτων) leading to reparation, or the righteous requirement of death being met ⁷⁷⁰ (δικαίωμα)	Those who receive the abundance of grace and the gift of righteousness (τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης) reign in life (ἐν ζωῇ) through the one, Jesus Christ (διὰ τοῦ ἐνὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ)	Grace reigns through through righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) into eternal life (εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον) through Jesus Christ our Lord (διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν)

Notice how, on Kirk’s interpretation, the Christ’s death has moved from the ‘hard-heavy’ side of Paul’s ‘much more’ comparison (eg vv8-11) to the ‘light-easy’ side (v16b), with the risen Lord Christ. This argues against Kirk’s interpretation. Kirk’s interpretation thus runs against the thrust of Paul’s *qal wayyōmer* argument. Moreover, the main motif on the ‘light’ side is the Lord Jesus, and his reign of life in which we share. Kirk’s reading of δικαίωμα, not only being itself lexically less likely, also reads the motif of the death of the Son against the thrust of Paul’s discourse on the resurrection life brought by the living Lord. Paul has left the

⁷⁷⁰ Kirk, ‘Reconsidering *Dikaiōma*’ (2007), 792.

motif of the death of the Son behind in 5:8-10, and as part of the ‘heavy-hard’ thing that God has done.⁷⁷¹

Eighth, Kirk suggests that translating δικαίωμα as justification requires that we ‘allow that [Paul] coined an idiosyncratic meaning for the term δικαίωμα for stylistic purposes’.⁷⁷² But modern bible translators are not alone in translating δικαίωμα, ‘justification’ as shown by the following six renderings of δικαίωμα from the Loeb Classical Library.

- as when urged to justify you (δικαιώματι).⁷⁷³
- and he shall be acquitted of the other charges (τῶν δὲ ἄλλων δικαιωμάτων ἀφείσθω)⁷⁷⁴
- we can advance the same justifications and the same reasons [τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ δικαιώματα καὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς λόγους] for our claim.⁷⁷⁵
- without any other means of justification [δικαιωμάτων] to acquit him of these charges [ἐγκεκλημένα].⁷⁷⁶
- the death of the former tribunes as a justification of the vengeance they were going to take in their own behalf (τούς τε γὰρ ἀπολλυμένους ἐς δικαίωμα τῆς ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν τιμωρίας προεβάλλοντο).⁷⁷⁷
- yet I think my claims so much better justified than Pompey's (περιεῖναι τοῖς δικαιώμασι τοῦ Πομπηίου νομίζω) that I have often challenged him to a judicial trial (δίκην).⁷⁷⁸

Of course, these translations might be mistaken. But they demonstrate that Paul is not given an ‘idiosyncratic’ reading if δικαίωμα is translated ‘justification’.

⁷⁷¹ Romans 6:9-10. See Chapter 9, below.

⁷⁷² Kirk, ‘Reconsidering *Dikaiōma*’ (2007), 788.

⁷⁷³ Thucydides, 6.80.2, in *History of the Peloponnesian War*: LCL 110 Vol III Books V-VI (1921), 322-5.

⁷⁷⁴ Plato, [864^d4]-[864^e8], in *The Laws II*: LCL 192 Vol XI, (1926), 236-9.

⁷⁷⁵ *Isocrates*, 6.25 in LCL 209 Vol I (1928), 358-63.

⁷⁷⁶ Josephus, *Ant.* 17.130 in *Jewish Antiquities*: LCL 410 Vol VII Books xv-xvii (1963), 430-3.

⁷⁷⁷ Dio Cassius, 5.22.2, in *Roman History*, LCL 032 Vol I Fragments of Books I-XXII (1914), 162-3.

⁷⁷⁸ Dio Cassius, 41.32.4, in *Roman History*: LCL 066 Vol IV Books 41-45 (1916), 56-57.

Conclusion: δικαίωμα as the believer's justifying decree of life⁷⁷⁹

Kirk has presented a unique (perhaps idiosyncratic) reading of δικαίωμα in verse 16b, that it means the judgment of death Jesus Christ assumed as a reparation for our sins.

Because the law's judgment of a death sentence has been fulfilled in Christ, those who are in Christ can be justified in the final judgment. Paul creates a context in Romans in which δικαίωμα refers to a legal requirement of death, a requirement met in the cross of Christ.⁷⁸⁰

Kirk's preferred translations of v16b are:

but the gift came through many transgressions leading to reparation

but the gift came through many transgressions leading to the righteous requirement [of death] being met.⁷⁸¹

But by 5:16, Paul has created a more proximate context and stronger note of victory than another recapitulation of the cross of Christ. By 5:16, Paul has progressed from the foundation of Christ's propitiation, redemption and blood, standing immovable in human history,⁷⁸² and has built upon it the present and future motifs of the resurrection life of *the Lord* Jesus Christ, who reigns over death.⁷⁸³ Since writing 1:32, 3:21-6, as important as they are, Paul has written 4:25b! And since Paul's reiteration of Christ's justifying blood (5:6-9a), Paul has inserted the 'much mores' of Christ's resurrection life (5:9-10), so that we now have ground for rejoicing in a living Κύριος (5:11). For Paul, 'death no longer reigns over Christ' (θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει: 6:9b) because Christ was raised from the dead no longer to die (6:9a).

⁷⁷⁹ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 338 fn 108; Käsemann, *Romans* (1980), 154; Morris, *Romans* (1988), 236; Matera, *Romans* (2010), 139; Witherington & Hyatt, *Romans* (2004), 149; Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:196-7; Wright, 'Romans' (2002), 528; Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 248 fn 70; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 285; Sanday & Headlam, *Romans* (1902), 141; Hultgren, *Romans* (2011), 227 fn 103; Barrett, *Romans* (1957), 115; Byrne, *Romans* (1996), 179; Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 419.

⁷⁸⁰ Kirk, 'Reconsidering *Dikaiōma*' (2007), 791.

⁷⁸¹ *ibid*, 792.

⁷⁸² Romans 3:24-26; 4:25a; 5:8-10a; cf 6:10a.

⁷⁸³ Romans 1:4, 4:25; 5:10b; 6:9-10.

Kirk attempts to foreground Christ's resurrection by saying, 'Romans 5:9-10 is structured to speak of present justification based on Christ's death as this present possession grounds the future hope of the believer through Christ's resurrection'.⁷⁸⁴ But even here, Kirk underplays the resurrection of the Lord, whose resurrection communicates to us *present justification*.⁷⁸⁵ Our justification is not yet consummated with bodily resurrection, but it is inaugurated by faith. In one sense, we are presently risen.⁷⁸⁶ Likewise, our justification is a present reality and the righteousness attributed to the believer is a present possession.⁷⁸⁷ The future declaration is brought into the present by faith. It is Christ's resurrection, not death, that unlocks Romans 5:15-19. Hence, the until recently unanimous consensus, that δικαίωμα in v16b refers to the justifying verdict that Christ gives as a gift to those who receive his gift of righteousness (v17), remains in tact.⁷⁸⁸ As a consequence, δικαίωμα is, as it turns out, placed in antithetical parallelism with κρίμα and κατακρίμα, and δικαίωμα denotes the judicial decree of righteousness, or 'justification'.⁷⁸⁹

⁷⁸⁴ Kirk, *Unlocking Romans* (2008), 91.

⁷⁸⁵ Romans 4:25b, 5:1-2.

⁷⁸⁶ Ephesians 2:6; Colossians 3:1.

⁷⁸⁷ Chapter 4, below.

⁷⁸⁸ Godet, *Romans* (1883), 219.

⁷⁸⁹ Romans 5:1.

Chapter 7

The ἐνός δικαίωματος of Romans 5:18

Introduction

This thesis and Kirk agree that our English translations incorrectly translate δικαίωμα in one place in Romans 5. Kirk says they are mistaken in v16b and correct in v18b. This thesis holds they are mistaken in Romans v18b but correct in v16b. In Chapter 1, the history of exegesis of Romans 5:18 demonstrated that our current translation tradition is relatively new, dating from the turn of the 20th century. The dissonance created by translating δικαίωμα differently in v18b and v16b will continue to cause pressure to resolve the translation inconsistency either one way (Kirk's) or the other (this thesis).

Whether or not ἐνός is a pronoun or an adjective, the current exegetical consensus is that δικαίωμα (v18b) refers to a singular 'act of righteousness', not 'justification'. Most modern commentators take δικαίωμα as referring to Christ's death,⁷⁹⁰ which then limits the scope of Christ's obedience (v19b) to his 'passive' obedience, Philippians 2:8 (γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου) then being used to confirm this interpretation.⁷⁹¹

However, a few scholars who accept the interpretation, 'act of righteousness' do not limit the scope of Christ's obedience to 'passive; obedience. Cranfield holds that ἐνός is personal,

⁷⁹⁰ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 344; Wright, 'Romans' (2002), 529; Ziesler, *Romans* (1989), 151; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:283; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 287; Kruse, *Romans* (2012), 251; Hultgren, *Romans* (2011), 229; Osborne, *Romans* (2004), 144; Bruce, *Romans* (1985), 125; Barrett, *Romans* (1957), 116; Matera, *Romans* (2010), 142; Byrne, *Romans* (1996), 185; Keck, *Romans* (2005), 154; Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 385; Alford, *Greek NT* (1877), 2:364; Haldane, *Romans* (1874), 216.

⁷⁹¹ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 344; Ziesler, *Romans* (1989), 151; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:284; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 287; Alford, *Greek NT* (1877), 2:364; Witherington & Hyatt, *Romans* (2004), 150; Byrne, *Romans* (1996), 181, 5; Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 385-6.

but argues that δικαίωμα means 'righteous act' and so implies 'righteous conduct', 'not just his atoning death but the obedience of his life as a whole'.⁷⁹² Cranfield correctly cites Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1359^a25 and Baruch 2:19, but his citations of Revelation 19:8 and 2 Samuel 19:29LXX can be challenged.⁷⁹³ Cranfield takes δικαίωμα as the equivalent of δικαιοσύνη.

Murray argues that (1) ἑνός modifies δικαιώματος and is not personal in v18b, and (2) δικαίωμα means 'righteous act' and thus ἑνός δικαιώματος means 'one righteous act' (v18b). Murray, too, interprets δικαίωμα to mean δικαιοσύνη, but says this is acceptable because 'δικαίωμα suited [Paul's] thought as a more apparent contrast to παράπτωματα'.⁷⁹⁴ Most tellingly, Murray assumes 'the unity of the person and of his accomplishment must always be assumed'.⁷⁹⁵ This 'compact unity' is an assumption Murray brings to the text, not what the text teaches. Murray is unable to maintain his focus on the nature of the act as 'one'. Perhaps systematic considerations are producing this inconsistency. Murray's position (now essentially adopted by Schreiner) is anomalous in that it accepts the definition of δικαίωμα as 'act of righteousness', and holds ἑνός a neuter adjective, yet does not confine Jesus' obedience to a singularity, Jesus death on the cross.⁷⁹⁶

⁷⁹² Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:289.

⁷⁹³ *ibid*, 1:289.

⁷⁹⁴ Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:201 fn 33.

⁷⁹⁵ *ibid*, 1:201-2.

⁷⁹⁶ Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:204-5, Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:291; Schreiner, 'Sermon: From Adam to Christ' (2011), 87.

Arguments for the Consensus

The arguments in favour of the rendering δικαίωμα as 'act of righteousness' are:

- (1) Paul easily moves from one meaning of a term to another.⁷⁹⁷
- (2) Paul has on view a single action because Adam's act of disobedience was a single act.⁷⁹⁸ Reading δικαίωμα in parallel with παράπτωμα as a single act is thus warranted,⁷⁹⁹ regardless of whether ἐνός is masculine or neuter.
- (3) The meaning 'righteous act' for δικαίωμα (v18) is fixed by its opposition to 'trespass' (παράπτωμα), whereas in verse 16, δικαίωμα is opposed to 'condemnation' (κατάκριμα), and thus rightly translated 'justification'.⁸⁰⁰
- (4) The strict parallelism between the first and second clauses suggests that παράπτωμα was something that Adam did, and so δικαίωμα was something that Christ did.⁸⁰¹
- (5) It is awkward to think of justification as being 'of Christ'.⁸⁰²
- (6) If δικαίωμα is translated 'justification' in v18b, then v18b is 'perplexed with a redundancy',⁸⁰³ because the term δικαίωσις is also translated 'justification'.⁸⁰⁴
- (7) The allusion to Isaiah 53:11 strengthens the allusion to the obedience of Christ's death.⁸⁰⁵ As suffering servant, Christ's obedience was not to the Mosaic law, but to the Father's commission to be his servant for the world.⁸⁰⁶
- (8) The consistent connection Paul makes is between justification and Jesus' death, and thus presumably not his resurrection.⁸⁰⁷

⁷⁹⁷ Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:200.

⁷⁹⁸ Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:284; Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:201.

⁷⁹⁹ Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 287.

⁸⁰⁰ Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:200.

⁸⁰¹ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 341 fn 127.

⁸⁰² *ibid.*

⁸⁰³ Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:201.

⁸⁰⁴ *ibid.*

⁸⁰⁵ Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 287; Wright, 'Romans' (2002), 529.

⁸⁰⁶ Wright, 'Romans' (2002), 529.

Responding to the Consensus

The following argument supports the contention that δικαίωμα (v18) should be rendered ‘sentence of justification’.

(1) **Regarding the ease with which Paul uses the same term in different ways**, no scholar understands δικαίωμα to bear exactly the same denotation in each instance. It denotes the righteous decree of death (1:32), the righteous decrees that constitute the law’s several moral precepts (2:26),⁸⁰⁸ and justification (5:16).⁸⁰⁹ However, given that God’s extraordinary righteousness has been manifested (Romans 3:21: νυνὶ δὲ [...] δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ), this colours the subsequent use of δικαί — terms: reckoning ‘righteousness’ (δικαιοσύνη),⁸¹⁰ ‘justify’ (δικαιόω),⁸¹¹ and ‘justification’ (δικαίωσις, δικαίωμα).⁸¹² Therefore, it is unsurprising that δικαίωμα bears its well attested meaning of ‘justification’ (v16b).⁸¹³ The proximity of vv16 and 18, and its common context, suggest a similar denotation, unless other factors warrant. Occasionally Paul indicates he is using a noun in a different sense (eg οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ: 9:6). But there is no explicit notification of a change in meaning here. Paul frequently uses νόμος with different nuances. It can refer to the Mosaic covenant consisting of precepts that promised life (3:21a, 3:28, 31),⁸¹⁴ the Pentateuch (3:21b),⁸¹⁵ a principle (3:27).⁸¹⁶ But even when νόμος means ‘principle’, the basic meaning ‘Mosaic law’ is not far from the surface, and has some importance for understanding Paul’s meaning.⁸¹⁷

⁸⁰⁷ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 344.

⁸⁰⁸ Chapter 5, above.

⁸⁰⁹ Chapter 6, above.

⁸¹⁰ Romans 4:3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 22; 5:17.

⁸¹¹ Romans 3:24, 26, 28, 30; 4:2, 5; 5:1, 9.

⁸¹² Romans 4:25, 5:16.

⁸¹³ Chapter 6, above.

⁸¹⁴ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 250, 254.

⁸¹⁵ *ibid*, 223.

⁸¹⁶ *ibid*, 249.

⁸¹⁷ *ibid*, 145-6 fn 7, 247, 250.

The onus is on the exegete to show why the word should bear different senses within its semantic range.

The view of a substantial group of exegetes is that despite our English versions, ἐνός in verse 18 does not modify δικαίωματος as a neuter adjective, but is a personal pronoun.⁸¹⁸ Thus, ἐνός is either in a subjective or objective genitive relationship to the verbal noun δικαίωματος. This thesis argues for an ‘objective genitive’ reading. If so, there is no necessary indicator that Paul is using δικαίωμα with a different denotation to verse 16. The word should therefore be given the meaning which Paul has already given it in verse 16, which is ‘justification’. Compared to the meaning ‘justification’, the meaning ‘righteous deed’ is only a relatively infrequent meaning of δικαίωμα. It is possibly used once that way (Baruch 2:17LXX), compared with 6 uses of the term meaning ‘justification’.⁸¹⁹ It is used with the meaning ‘righteous act’ by Aristotle, but Aristotle explicitly says that it is not the proper meaning of the term, which he defines to mean ‘the correction of an act of injustice’.⁸²⁰ When done by a judge, this is a sentence of justification. Of course, Paul might be using δικαίωμα in the way Aristotle regarded as improper.⁸²¹ Aristotle himself did. But that is unlikely, given the establishment of the meaning of the term in verse 16 as ‘justification’.

Regarding the objections numbered (2), (3), and (4), the answer to these objections is essentially the same. On balance, the meaning of δικαίωμα is established by its use in v16b, and presumptively it carries over to vv18, because Paul would have expected his readers to understand it as having the same meaning. It is unlikely that simply because a different

⁸¹⁸ Chapter 6, above.

⁸¹⁹ Chapter 5, above.

⁸²⁰ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 5.7.7, [1135^a13].

⁸²¹ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1.3.9, [1359^a25].

word (παράπτωμα rather than κατάκριμα) is placed in contrast with it, that δικαίωμα no longer means ‘justification’ but ‘righteous deed’. The argument that the word in parallel changes the term’s meaning is unsound. Rather, the meaning of δικαίωμα in verse 16b is fixed by (a) its explanation in verse 17 as receipt of the gift of righteousness, (b) the forensic connotations of δικαίωμα, in the context of its use with κρίμα and κατάκριμα, (c) its well attested usage meaning either plea of justification or vindication in secular and LXX sources, (d) the usage of the δικαι— word group established in 3:21-5:11 (δικαιοσύνη, δικαίω, δικαίωσις) with which δικαίωμα is in etymological relationship, the -μα ending suggesting it is the result of the process of δικαίω, (e) the relative infrequency of the use of δικαίωμα to mean ‘righteous deed’, when compared to the meaning ‘righteous decree’.⁸²² It is these factors which provide the case for δικαίωμα being a forensic decree of vindication or justification. After these considerations are weight, then the (f) antithetical relationship with κατάκριμα serves to confirm the meaning of ‘judicial sentence of justification’, but it is not this coupling alone that is depended upon to determine meaning.

Romans 5:15-19 cannot be read so as to require every couplet to be antonyms set in absolute antithesis. There are throughout verse 15-19 couplets set in ‘unexpected contrast’.⁸²³ Kirk has pointed out the lack of absolute symmetry in verses 15 and 17. Similar asymmetry is observable in verse 16.

Verse 16a compares two things neither formally nor materially antithetical. Δι’ ἐνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος is placed in parallel to τὸ δῶρημα. A gift is not strictly antithetical as an

⁸²² Baruch 2:17 LXX, Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.3.9; 1.12.13; 1.13.3; Philo, *On the Decalogue*, 109. See Chapter 6 above.

⁸²³ Keck, *Romans* (2005), 152.

antonym to the instrumentality (διὰ with genitive) of the one man's sinning. 'Wage' (μισθός) would be strictly antithetical to a gift (Romans 4:5), but not one man sinning. 'Paul is denying a direct and balancing contrast between the gift and the single act of sin'.⁸²⁴ Moreover, in verse 16b, a judicial and forensic word, τὸ κρίμα, is placed in rhetorical parallel with a word, which while ending in -μα, is a non-judicial word, τὸ χάρισμα. The strict antonym to τὸ κρίμα would be τὸ δικαίωμα.

In addition, in verse 16b, the function of preposition ἐκ in each of the clauses ἐξ ἑνός (v16b₂) or ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων (v16b₅) differs from one another, though they are formally parallel. Both might be considered denoting source, or cause,⁸²⁵ but even so, each instance functions in a remarkably different way. The precise connotation of preposition ἐκ remains rarely commented on,⁸²⁶ but clearly '[t]he relation indicated by ἐκ, in the first clause [...] is slightly different from what it is in the second clause [...]. That is, sin stands in a different relation to condemnation from that which it sustains to justification [...]'.⁸²⁷ Thus, ἐκ cannot have precisely the same meaning in each clause. While the one trespass (ἐξ ἑνός) grounds the condemnation (εἰς κατάκριμα), '[i]t would scarcely be feasible [...] to insist that the free gift is grounded upon the many trespasses'.⁸²⁸ 'It could not be the free gift of justification unless it blotted out the many trespasses'.⁸²⁹ True, but the ἐκ in ἐξ ἑνός does not denote the necessity of 'the blotting out' of many trespasses, but rather denotes the ground of 'condemnation' (εἰς κατάκριμα), which is 'the trespass of one' (ἐξ ἑνός).⁸³⁰ Thus, in this

⁸²⁴ Wright, *Climax of the Covenant* (1991), 37.

⁸²⁵ Wallace, *Greek Grammar* (1996), 371; Hodge, *Romans* (1864), 166.

⁸²⁶ Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 383.

⁸²⁷ Hodge, *Romans* (1864), 167.

⁸²⁸ Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:196.

⁸²⁹ *ibid* (1959), 1:196.

⁸³⁰ *ibid*.

pericope, it cannot be postulated that each clause in rhetorical parallel functions in exactly the same way. The parallelism is rhetorical, not necessarily absolutely antithetical.

The need to have absolute antitheses for parallelism to have rhetorical effect must be challenged. Rhetorical effect depends on alliteration, assonance, and rhyme, giving an aid to memory. The flexibility of certain grammatical structures allows for parallelism that transcends strict antithetical parallelism. The multivocality or polyvalency of the phrase δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is an example.⁸³¹ The width of possibilities of the genitive enriches the phrase, making it applicable to a number of contexts. Another example is the difference in function of διὰ with the accusative in each half of 4:25, and compare 4:23-24.⁸³² Hence, '[i]t is by no means certain that the poetic parallelism requires a further parallelism in meaning'.⁸³³ Again, the *qal wayyomer* argument does not require antithetical parallelism to serve its purpose,⁸³⁴ and indeed strict antonymous parallelism may militate against the purpose of the argument. Thus, the assumption of antithetical parallelism should be challenged.

(5) It is only as awkward to think of a sentence of justification as being 'of Christ' as it would be to consider ἐνός an objective genitive of the verbal noun δικαίωμα. In other words, there need be no awkwardness. Syntactically, the objective genitive is quite acceptable.

Contextually, Christ's resurrection has been brought into connection with justification in 4:25, and Christ's [resurrection] life is said to be salvific (Romans 5:9-10). The unusual phrase 'in life' is reintroduced in 5:17. Theologically, it is fitting that Christ be the object of

⁸³¹ Thielman, 'God's Righteousness' (2011), 35; Bird, *Saving Righteousness* (2007), 16. See Chapter 4, above.

⁸³² See Chapter 5, above.

⁸³³ Bird, *Saving Righteousness* (2007), 51-2.

⁸³⁴ See Chapter 6, above.

justification. Christ suffered an injustice that required correction. His death brought negative imputations upon his character and his claims. The resurrection corrected that injustice by justifying Christ.⁸³⁵ Far from being awkward, the objective genitive explains how the resurrection of Christ brings our justification (4:25b). The resurrection of the Christ brings our justification because it is Christ's justification. Because the believer is in union with Christ, the believer is likewise justified.

The justifying aspect of being raised with Christ [...] [rests] on the resurrection-approved righteousness of Christ which is his [...] the justification of the ungodly is not arbitrary but according to truth: it is synthetic with respect to the believer only because it is analytic with respect to Christ (as resurrected).⁸³⁶

Christ shares our condemnation in order that we might share his vindication by God, a vindication which was made known when he was proclaimed as Son by the resurrection of the dead.⁸³⁷

(6) Translating δικαίωμα as 'justification' (v18b) does not mean the verse is 'perplexed with a redundancy',⁸³⁸ because δικαίωμα refers to the completed act of justification of Christ in resurrection, whereas δικαίωσις refers to the process of 'justification' that comes to all people (who have faith) that will be consummated by their own resurrection from the dead. Δικαίωμα refers to the result or completed act of justification. Δικαίωσις refers to the process of justification. It is conceivable that Paul chose δικαίωσις (4:25b) because the process of bringing about the 'justification' of those who trust in Christ is not completed until the end of this age. Similarly, δικαίωσις in the phrase εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς (5:18) is fitting because the process of justification of believers is not consummated until their resurrection. The resurrection is God's judicial act of justification, and is completed and past for Christ (δικαίωμα), though it is future and in process for believers (δικαίωσις).

⁸³⁵ 1 Timothy 3:16; Romans 1:4.

⁸³⁶ Gaffin, *Resurrection and Redemption* (1978/87), 132.

⁸³⁷ Hooker, 'Use of Isaiah 53' (1998), 101-2.

⁸³⁸ Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:201.

[A]s believers are already raised with Christ they have been justified; as they are not yet resurrected they are, in some respect, still to be justified [...] the believer's justification is still in some sense future.⁸³⁹

Similarly, it is conceivable that Paul chose δικαίωμα (v16) not primarily because it rhymed with παράπτωμα (although the homeoteleuton makes δικαίωμα rhetorically well suited), but because δικαίωμα can denote the result of the process of justification as a completed act. Δικαίωμα (v16) thus refers to the final decree of justification at the eschaton, the antithesis of which is condemnation (κατάκριμα). This then suggests why Paul intensified κρίμα to κατάκριμα (v16). Outside of Christ, we remain under God's sentence of κρίμα in Adam. All in Adam remain under the temporal κρίμα of God,⁸⁴⁰ which foreshadows a more intense condemnation to come. But at the Great Assize, the κρίμα hanging over all 'in Adam' will then be confirmed and intensified into the eschatological κατάκριμα of ὀργή.⁸⁴¹ Κατάκριμα (vv16,18) thus represents the wrath that is coming.⁸⁴²

Similarly, δικαίωμα (v18) is fitting because Christ's resurrection was the result of Christ's justification. Christ has received a completed judicial decree of righteousness, actuated in his resurrection from the dead. Δικαίωμα would then be the most appropriate word to convey Paul's meaning.

(7) There is an undoubted and sustained theme of the death of the servant throughout Isaiah 53. While some minimize the theme of the death of the servant in Isaiah 53LXX,⁸⁴³ the motif of vicarious atoning suffering which effects salvation, while a little weakened in the

⁸³⁹ Gaffin, 'Justification and Eschatology' (2007), 8.

⁸⁴⁰ Romans 1:18-32.

⁸⁴¹ Romans 2:5-13.

⁸⁴² Romans 5:9; 2:5-6.

⁸⁴³ Sapp, 'The LXX, 1QIsa, and MT of Isaiah 53' (1998), 186.

LXX, remains unambiguous: '[t]he Servant's vicarious suffering cancels the guilt of sin and brings salvation to his people'.⁸⁴⁴

However, Isaiah 53:11LXX emphasizes the justification of the righteous one in resurrection.

Thus, an appeal to Isaiah 53:11 standing behind Romans 5:18 *strengthens the argument* that

δικαίωμα refers to the vindication of Christ by resurrection. Isaiah 53:10-12LXX substantially accords this thesis' exposition of Romans 5:18.

⁸⁴⁴ Hengel & Bailey, 'Effective History of Isaiah 53' (2004), 124.

¹⁰ And [the] Lord desires⁸⁴⁵ to cleanse (καθαρίζω) him with wounds⁸⁴⁶ when⁸⁴⁷ you (pl)⁸⁴⁸ present a sin offering⁸⁴⁹, your soul will see long-living offspring.⁸⁵⁰ Also, [the] Lord desires to take away¹¹ from the labour of his soul, to show him light (φῶς)⁸⁵¹ and to form him with understanding, to justify⁸⁵² [the] just one⁸⁵³ who is serving⁸⁵⁴ many well (δικαιῶσαι δίκαιον εἰ δουλεύοντα πολλοῖ)⁸⁵⁵, and he will bear their sins.¹² For this reason⁸⁵⁶, he will inherit many and divide [the] plunder with the strong⁸⁵⁷, because⁸⁵⁸ his soul was handed over to death (παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ), and he was reckoned among the lawless (ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη), and he offered himself up for the sins of many (καὶ αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν), and because of their sins he was handed over (καὶ διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη) (Isaiah 53:10-12LXX).⁸⁵⁹

Regarding **verse 10**, the LXX requires that the subject of the plural verb δῶτε is implied, and

that ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν function as the subject of singular ὁψεται. The MT has נַפְשׁוֹ with singular

⁸⁴⁵ The underlying Hebrew in 53:10 MT is, in the first instance, יְהוָה הִפְּיֵן דָּכָא, being the Qal perfect with the infinitive construct ('and YHWH delighted to crush him'), and in the second instance, יְהוָה בִּידוֹ יִצְלַח, being the emphatic fronted noun in construct, with the prepositional phrase followed by imperfect verb ('and the delight of YHWH in his hand will prosper'). For both constructions the LXX uses present middle indicative with aorist infinitive complement, eg, καὶ κύριος βούλεται.

⁸⁴⁶ Plural of πληγή, genitive of content, the cleansing consisting of wounds.

⁸⁴⁷ Hebraism translating אֲשֶׁר־אֶשָּׂא with εἰάν + aorist subjunctive, denoting time, 'when': Thayer. *Contra* Brenton, *LXX with Apocrypha: Greek and English* (1851), who translates 'if'.

⁸⁴⁸ The MT has נַפְשׁוֹ with singular personal suffix ('his soul'), which functions as the object complement of the verb אֶשָּׂא, thus, 'when he sets his soul an *asham*'. However, in the LXX, the subject of the 2nd person plural verb δῶτε is implied, and ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν seems to function as the subject of singular ὁψεται, following Brenton, *LXX with Apocrypha: Greek and English* (1851). This follows the possible reading of the MT verb form אֶשָּׂא as 2nd person singular (though the LXX makes it second person plural): Oswalt, *Isaiah* (1998), 2:401 fn 51.

⁸⁴⁹ περὶ ἁμαρτίας, an idiom for 'sin offering': Wright, 'The Meaning of περὶ ἁμαρτίας in Romans 8:3' (1991), 220-225; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 480.

⁸⁵⁰ Taking σπέρμα μακρόβιον as an hendiadys: Brenton, *LXX with Apocrypha: Greek and English* (1851); Oswalt, *Isaiah* (1998), 2:401 fn 51.

⁸⁵¹ The MT lacks אֵר but it is in DSS.

⁸⁵² Aorist infinitive of δικαιῶ.

⁸⁵³ Anarthrous accusative δίκαιον could be the accusative of respect of δικαιῶσαι or its object.

⁸⁵⁴ Anarthrous present accusative participle δουλεύοντα agrees with δίκαιον in case, number and gender. Without the article, δουλεύοντα could be functioning adverbially, and thus modify aorist infinitive δικαιῶσαι, the present tense of the participle perhaps indicating contemporaneous time with the aorist infinitive (to justify while he serves the many well), or it could be instrumental, describing the means by which the servant justifies (to justify by serving the many well). Proximity to the adjective which it immediately follows suggests it is adverbial modifying δίκαιον, thus 'the righteous one who serves many well'.

⁸⁵⁵ 'to justify the just one who serves many well': Brenton, *LXX with Apocrypha: Greek and English* (1851).

⁸⁵⁶ Gk: διὰ τοῦτο.

⁸⁵⁷ The genitive could be possessive, but more probably is partitive, as the underlying Hebrew יְחַלֵּק עִצְמוֹתַי וְאֶת־וְאֶת־ ('and he will divide with the strong'), taking prefixed אֶת as the preposition 'with': Chisholm, 'Forgiveness and Salvation in Isaiah 53' (2012), 197 fn 32.

⁸⁵⁸ LXX reads ἀνθ' ὧν, an idiom equivalent to ἀντί τούτων, ὅτι ('for that reason', 'because': Thayer) for אֲשֶׁר תַּחַת ('in return for [the fact]', 'because': BDB).

⁸⁵⁹ The translation is mine.

personal suffix ('his soul'), which functions as the object complement of the verb (שׁוֹ), translating MT אִם־תָּשִׂים אֶשְׁךָ נִפְשׁוֹ, 'when he sets his soul a sin offering'. This is a reference to the servant's self-sacrificial offering (MT). However, the LXX is probably explained by the fact that the form of תָּשִׂים can be either third person singular feminine (thus agreeing with נִפְשׁוֹ) or second person singular masculine ('you' singular).⁸⁶⁰ Given that verse 9 highlights the servant's death (בְּמוֹתָיו || τοῦ θανάτου), and burial (קִבְרוֹ || τῆς ταφῆς), the next two clauses in v10 MT then bring resurrection motifs to the fore: יָמִים יֵאָרֶיךָ יִרְאֶה זֶרַע יִאָרֶיךָ, 'and he will see seed, he will prolong days'. The servant will rise again, and so see his progeny and extend his life. The LXX seems to misread the personal suffix of נִפְשׁוֹ as plural (if MT represents the original) and makes נִפְשׁוֹ the subject of the following sentence. The LXX goes on to translate the finite verbal clause יָמִים יֵאָרֶיךָ with adjective μακρόβιον, thus giving the sense 'your soul will see long-lived offspring'.⁸⁶¹ Again, if addressed to the servant, in the context of death and burial (verse 9), this speaks of life after death.

Regarding **verse 11**, a significant difference between LXX and MT is φῶς in LXX as the object of infinitive δεῖξαι (omitted in MT). The LXX is supported by the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS), which reads אור ('light') as the object of יִרְאֶה.⁸⁶² The MT, thus amended by the DSS, is below compared with the LXX.

⁸⁶⁰ Motyer, *Isaiah* (1993), 439.

⁸⁶¹ Cf Brenton, *LXX with Apocrypha: Greek and English* (1851), 889.

⁸⁶² Great Isaiah Scroll online accessed at <http://www.ao.net/~fmoeller/qum-44.htm> on 1 May 2014; BHS, 760, Apparatus cites 1QIs^a (The Dead Sea Scrolls of St Mark's Monastery) and 1 QIs^b (The Dead Sea Scrolls of the

Isaiah 53:10-11 MT [Amended] and LXX

And the delight of YHWH in his hand will prosper. From the pain of his soul he will see light. He will be satisfied in his knowledge. He will justify [the] just one my servant for the many. And their iniquities he will bear.	וְחִפְצֵי יְהוָה בְּיָדוֹ יִצְלָח מֵעַמָּל נַפְשׁוֹ יִרְאֶה [אור] ⁸⁶³ יִשְׁבַּע בְּדַעְתּוֹ ⁸⁶⁴ יִצְדִּיק צְדִיק עַבְדִּי ⁸⁶⁵ לְרַבִּים ⁸⁶⁶ וְעֹנֹתָם הוּא יִסְבֹּל	καὶ βούλεται κύριος ἀφελεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ πόνου τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ δεῖξαι αὐτῷ φῶς καὶ πλάσαι τῇ συνέσει δικαιῶσαι δίκαιον εὖ δουλεύοντα πολλοῖς καὶ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν αὐτὸς ἀνοίσει	And the Lord desires to take away from the pain of his soul, to show to him light and to form with understanding, to justify [the] just one who is serving many well, and he will bear their sins.
---	--	--	--

While the MT has a We-X-yiqtol, an X-yiqtol clause, 2 yiqtol clauses, followed by a We-X-

yiqtol, the LXX has present indicative βούλεται followed by 4 infinitives.⁸⁶⁷ The final clause is

a future. Brenton thus takes the syntax of the LXX as four infinitive complements, thus:

¹¹the Lord also is pleased to take away from the travail of his soul, to shew him light, and to form *him* with understanding; to justify the just one who serves many well (Isaiah 53:11 LXX Brenton).⁸⁶⁸

The first infinitive of the LXX refers to God's desire to provide relief for the servant from his

labourous toil. The Lord cuts short the servant's agony.⁸⁶⁹ The will of the Lord is to deliver

Hebrew University); Harman, *Isaiah* (2005), 368; Hengel & Bailey, 'Effective History of Isaiah 53' (2004), 102; Sapp, 'The LXX, 1Qisa, and MT of Isaiah 53' (1998), 172; Petter, 'The Meaning of Substitutionary Righteousness in Isa 53:11' (2011), 175.

⁸⁶³ יִרְאֶה normally takes an explicit direct object, which though omitted by the MT was provided by the LXX (φῶς) and confirmed by 1Qisa^a and 1Qisa^b: Abela, 'Reconsidering Is 53:11B' (2006), 94.

⁸⁶⁴ 'The chiasmic disposition of the first and second colon [...] would suggest that the adverbial phrase *b^ada'tô* qualifies the verb *yisbā'* rather than the verb that follows, *yasdiq* [...]': Abela, 'Reconsidering Is 53:11B' (2006), 93.

⁸⁶⁵ Since the Vulgate, לְרַבִּים has been taken as direct object of the verb, despite prefixed preposition לְ:

Abela, 'Reconsidering Is 53:11B' (2006), 103. Cf GKC, 366 §117n. However, 'the government of the noun by the verb *SDQ* in the hiphil never passes through this preposition or any preposition for that [sic: matter]; the verb governs the noun directly as it does in Is 5,23 and 50,8.': Abela, 'Reconsidering Is 53:11B' (2006), 97.

⁸⁶⁶ Abela, following Dahood, reads this suffix not as first person singular ('my') but third person singular ('his'): Abela, 'Reconsidering Is 53:11B' (2006), 102. The requirement to emend the MT is a weakness in Dahood's/Abela's argument and in the LXX translation. However, it does not affect the argument here *if Paul used the LXX*, as it seems that he has regarding verse 12.

⁸⁶⁷ Sapp, 'The LXX, 1Qisa, and MT of Isaiah 53' (1998), 174; Hengel & Bailey, 'Effective History of Isaiah 53' (2004), 126-7.

⁸⁶⁸ Brenton adjusts the versification to include καὶ βούλεται κύριος ἀφελεῖν in verse 11: *LXX with Apocrypha: Greek and English* (1851), 889.

⁸⁶⁹ Sapp, 'The LXX, 1Qisa, and MT versions of Isaiah 53' (1998), 182.

the servant from the anguish of death.⁸⁷⁰ The second is that he sees light, a reference to life after and beyond death. The third is that the servant himself is formed by a new knowledge through what he suffered⁸⁷¹, rather than ‘the many’ know the servant, and by knowing him are justified.

Regarding the fourth infinitive in the LXX, this passage’s ‘boldest translation’,⁸⁷² the accusative δίκαιον following δικαίωσαι can be quite properly rendered not as the accusative of respect of δικαίωσαι but as its object.⁸⁷³ So in the LXX, the Righteous One is the object of the verb, so that the Lord, the subject of the verb, does something to the Servant, the Righteous One, which is to vindicate him. The servant is already righteous (δίκαιον), but the Lord shows him or proves him to be righteous (δικαίωσαι).⁸⁷⁴ The LXX translates the noun ‘my servant’ (עֶבְדִּי) by a participle (δουλεύοντα), adding the adverb ἐν (perhaps erroneously for the 1st person singular suffix in עֶבְדִּי), such that the servant becomes ‘one who serves many well’.⁸⁷⁵ Hengel and Bailey rightly observe of Isaiah 53:11LXX:

Here lies the root of the New Testament idea of the resurrection as the justification or vindication of the crucified one (1 Tim 3:16; John 16:10; cf also Rom 4:25) [...] The ‘justification’ of 53:11 is the justification of the one who, although considered ungodly in the eyes of sinners, was in fact the only truly righteous one. It is therefore the precondition of the justification of the real sinners, which the servant of the Lord effects through his vicarious death.⁸⁷⁶

The suffering servant must be justified through resurrection before sinners can be justified through him. This is exactly the contention of this thesis regarding Romans 5:18.

⁸⁷⁰ Hengel & Bailey, ‘Effective History of Isaiah 53’ (2004), 128.

⁸⁷¹ Oswalt, *Isaiah* (1998), 2:403; Petter, ‘Meaning of Substitutionary Righteousness in Isa 53:11’ (2011), 176.

⁸⁷² Hengel & Bailey, ‘Effective History of Isaiah 53’ (2004), 128.

⁸⁷³ Abela, ‘Reconsidering Is 53:11B’ (2006), 97.

⁸⁷⁴ Sapp, ‘The LXX, 1QIsa, and MT versions of Isaiah 53’ (1998), 174-5.

⁸⁷⁵ *ibid*, 175.

⁸⁷⁶ Hengel & Bailey, ‘Effective History of Isaiah 53’ (2004), 128.

Πολλοῖς (Isaiah 53:12) not only provides another connection with Romans 5:15-19, but prepositional phrase לְרַבִּים (MT) and dative πολλοῖς (LXX), both as indirect objects, suggests that the ‘many’ are not the direct object⁸⁷⁷ of the verbal action יִצְדִּיק/δικαιῶσαι, but those for whom the benefit is received. That is, the prepositional phrase/dative suggests the possibility that it is not ‘the many’ who are justified (against the great stream of translations since the Vulgate),⁸⁷⁸ but that the object of justification is ‘the righteous one, my servant’ (יְצַדִּיק עַבְדִּי/δικαίον ἐὶ δουλεύοντα), and the benefit of the justification of the righteous servant then accrues to ‘the many’. So, as Sapp rightly recognizes, the sense of the LXX is:

The Lord desires [...] to vindicate the righteous one who serves the many well [...] *The LXX has made the Lord’s vindication of the Servant and his righteousness the dominant theme in v 11b, not the Servant’s justification of sinners.* (emphasis Sapp’s)⁸⁷⁹

Similarly, Abela argues, based on the MT, that Yahweh is the subject, and the Servant the object, of the action spoken of in the clause, ‘The Just One (Yahweh) will vindicate him [the servant] in front of the multitude’.⁸⁸⁰ That this is also a possible reading of the MT is suggested by the JPS Translation (1917), though it switches the subject and object: ‘the servant, who by his knowledge did justify the Righteous One [Yahweh] [...]’.⁸⁸¹ However, as a modification of both Alba and the JPS (1917), it is probably better to read יְצַדִּיק עַבְדִּי as ‘the righteous one, my servant’, being a single object of the cognate verb יִצְדִּיק, and thus finding with the majority that יְצַדִּיק עַבְדִּי constitutes a fronted attributive adjective in

⁸⁷⁷ While *lamed* certainly can introduce the object (GKC, 366 §117n) it more usually introduces the more remote or indirect object (GKC, 381 §11r-s). For the former view, see Chisholm, ‘Forgiveness and Salvation in Isaiah 53’ (2012), 197; for the latter view, see Abela, ‘Reconsidering Is 53:11B’ (2006), 102-3.

⁸⁷⁸ Abela, ‘Reconsidering Is 53:11B’ (2006), 90-29, 103.

⁸⁷⁹ Sapp, ‘LXX, 1QIsa, and MT versions of Isaiah 53’ (1998), 175-6; Stuhlmacher, ‘Isaiah 53 in Gospels & Acts’ (2004), 154.

⁸⁸⁰ Abela, ‘Reconsidering Is 53:11B’ (2006), 104; Cf Tångberg, ‘The Justification of the Servant’ (2001), 31-2.

⁸⁸¹ Jewish Publication Society OT (1917).

apposition to its head noun,⁸⁸² with the rhetorical reason of root repetition explaining the anomalous word order. Abela's argument in response is that 'adjectives functioning as attributives [...] normally follow the head noun and share its definiteness'.⁸⁸³ However, there may be good rhetorical reasons for Isaiah reversing the normal order, such as root repetition, which emphasizes that the servant is justified *because he was just*, despite bearing punishment for sin according to Yahweh's will.

Thus, Isaiah 53:11MT/LXX can be rendered not that the servant justifies many, but that the servant himself, the Righteous One, is justified, 'for' the many. Contextually, the way the servant is justified is, at least in part, for the Lord to show him light. All this suggests that the servant, on the reading of the MT by the LXX, is justified by his resurrection.

Thus, according to this interpretation, the Septuagintal reading of the poem, which views justification (or vindication) as something that the servant himself receives from Yahweh [...] In the context of the poem in the LXX, it is Yahweh who fills him with understanding and justifies him.⁸⁸⁴

The Righteous One is declared righteous by seeing the light. Then we have another link between Isaiah 53:11, Romans 4:25, and this thesis' understanding of the ἐνὸς δικαιώματος in Romans 5:18. If Isaiah 53:11 stands behind Romans 5:18, as Schreiner and Wright suggest, this makes it more likely that it is Christ who is justified in the reference ἐνὸς δικαιώματος.

The links of Isaiah 53:12LXX with Romans 4:25a are further established with passive παρεδόθη twice in Isaiah 53:12LXX, and preposition διὰ with the accusative. Even the cautious

⁸⁸² GKC, 428 §132b; Motyer, *Isaiah* (1993), 441; Chisholm, 'Forgiveness and Salvation in Isaiah 53' (2012), 197.

⁸⁸³ Abela, 'Reconsidering Is 53:11B' (2006), 93.

⁸⁸⁴ Petter, 'The Meaning of Substitutionary Righteousness in Isa 53:11' (2011), 180-1 and fn 68.

Hooker⁸⁸⁵ argues Romans 4:25 is ‘the one clear echo of Isaiah 53’.⁸⁸⁶ More confidently, Hofius says, Romans 4:25 ‘is a summary of the fourth Servant Song distilled to essentials’.⁸⁸⁷ Sapp argues, ‘Romans 4:25a already alludes the Greek text of Isaiah 53:12’.⁸⁸⁸ Hofius goes further, taking Romans 5:15-19 as direct references to Isaiah 53.⁸⁸⁹ This is also suggested by Wagner, who argues that Paul’s phraseology in Romans 5:15-19 echos Isaiah 53:11-12.⁸⁹⁰

Stuhlmacher argues that Paul must have been influenced by the Hebrew, as Paul uses παρατώματα not ἁμαρτίαι.⁸⁹¹ Sapp argues that it is ‘not a big step’ to see that Romans 5:19b is an allusion to the Hebrew of Isaiah 53:11.⁸⁹² Against LXX influence, Stuhlmacher argues that if Paul had been influenced by Isaiah 53:11LXX, he would have spoken of ‘the justification of the Servant himself (cf 1 Tim 3:16) instead of the justification of the many’.⁸⁹³ But if Stuhlmacher will allow it, Paul *has* spoken about the justification of the Servant himself, in the ἐνὸς δικαιώματος through which (διὰ with the genitive) God justifies all/many (5:18). Paul has also spoken of the justification of the many (5:18b, 19). Hofius rightly sees not just a correlation between Isaiah 53:11LXX and Romans 5:15-19, but ‘direct reference’ to Isaiah 53, in the δικαι— terminology, as the ‘expressions δικαίωμα (v16b), δικαιοσύνη (v17b), δικαίωσις (v18b), δίκαιος καθίστασθαι (“to be made righteous,” v19b) all refer to the same subject matter’.⁸⁹⁴ Paul may use παρατώματα (Romans 4:25) not ἁμαρτίαι (53:12LXX) because in 5:12-21 Paul prefers to use the cognates of ἁμαρτία to describe the

⁸⁸⁵ Hooker, ‘Use of Isaiah 53’ (1998), 102-3.

⁸⁸⁶ *ibid*, 101.

⁸⁸⁷ Hofius, ‘Fourth Servant Song’ (2004), 180.

⁸⁸⁸ Sapp, ‘The LXX, 1QIsa, and MT versions of Isaiah 53’ (1998), 187.

⁸⁸⁹ Hofius, ‘Fourth Servant Song’ (2004), 182.

⁸⁹⁰ Wagner, ‘Heralds of Isaiah & Mission of Paul’ (1998), 219; Farmer ‘Reflections on Isaiah 53’ (1998), 260-80.

⁸⁹¹ Stuhlmacher, ‘Isaiah 53 in Gospels & Acts’ (2004), 154; Evans, ‘Isaiah 53 in the Letters’ (2012), 160.

⁸⁹² Sapp, ‘LXX, 1QIsa, and MT Versions of Isaiah 53’ (1998), 187-8.

⁸⁹³ Stuhlmacher, ‘Isaiah 53 in Gospels & Acts’ (2004), 154.

⁸⁹⁴ Hofius, ‘Fourth Servant Song’ (2004), 182.

broader notion of sin, which apply to those who lived from Adam until Moses (Romans 5:13-14) prior to the giving of the Mosaic law. The immediate referent of the ἡμῶν of 4:25, inclusive of Paul and his readers, are characterized in the 5:12-21 as those who commit παράπτωματα (5:15, 16) in the likeness of Adam (5:14). Παράπτωματα in 4:25 thus highlights the ‘against law’ nature of the sin that both Adam and those with the law have committed.

Therefore, it is likely that Paul alluded to Isaiah 53:11LXX in Romans 5:18, and that the δικαίωμα of Romans 5:18 expresses the ‘justification of the just servant’ (δικαιῶσαι δίκαιον) of Isaiah 53:11 by God showing him the light in resurrection. On the supposition that Clement of Rome (fl AD96) was Paul’s companion Κλήμεντος,⁸⁹⁵ a further possible link between Paul and the LXX is suggested by 1 Clement 16:12, which quotes Isaiah 53:11LXX in full. Certainly, Isaiah 53:11LXX was well known to Christians in the last decade of the first century.⁸⁹⁶

Wright argues that the obedience of the Messiah was not his ‘amazing a treasury of merit through Torah obedience’ because ‘obedience to the law would be beside the point’.⁸⁹⁷

Rather, the Isaianic servant ‘was obedient to the saving purposes of YHWH, the plan marked out for Israel from the beginning [...] to bring salvation to the world’.⁸⁹⁸ However, obedience to the law of Moses *was the means* of Israel bringing salvation to the world.⁸⁹⁹ To imply that the Servant’s commission was different to Israel’s is a false dichotomy, for the Servant was

⁸⁹⁵ Philippians 4:3.

⁸⁹⁶ Bird, *Saving Righteousness* (2007), 55.

⁸⁹⁷ Wright, ‘Romans’ (2002), 529.

⁸⁹⁸ *ibid.*

⁸⁹⁹ Deuteronomy 4:5-8; 19:5-6.

faithful where Israel sinned as God's servant.⁹⁰⁰ 'The servant's obedience should not be limited to his sacrificial death [...] His is a ministry of faithful obedience to Yahweh and his laws.'⁹⁰¹ Thus, a Suffering Servant background to Romans 5:18b does not limit Christ's obedience to 'passive' obedience in Romans 5:19.

A number of scholars also observe that Isaiah 53:11 could lie behind 1 Corinthians 15:4, that Christ was raised *κατὰ τὰς γραφάς*.⁹⁰² The link between the resurrection and Christ as the second Adam developed in 1 Corinthians 15:21-22, 45-49 also has affinities with Romans 4:25 and 5:18, and strengthens the view that it is Christ's resurrection that is the primary backdrop for Romans 5:15-19. In particular, 1 Corinthians 15:21-22 has affinities with Romans 5:12.

1 Corinthians 15:21-22

15:21 a ἐπειδὴ γὰρ δι' ἀνθρώπου θάνατος, b καὶ δι' ἀνθρώπου ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν. 15:22 a ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν, b οὕτως καὶ ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ πάντες ζωοποιηθήσονται.	a For if through a man [came] death, b also through a man [came] resurrection of [the] dead. a For just as in Adam all die, b thus also in Christ all will be made alive
--	--

The similarity between the structure of thought here and in Romans 5:12-21 is immediately apparent and hardly accidental. 1 Corinthians 15:21 enunciates the same proposition to Romans 5:12, except in more compact form.

1 Corinthians 15:21a	<u>...γὰρ δι'</u>	<u>ἀνθρώπου</u>	<u>θάνατος</u>
Romans 5:12	<u>...γὰρ δι'</u>	<u>ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου</u>	ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν
		καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας	<u>ὁ θάνατος</u>
		καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους	<u>ὁ θάνατος</u>
		διῆλθεν, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον	

⁹⁰⁰ Isaiah 44:21-22; 48:1-11.

⁹⁰¹ Petter, 'The Meaning of Substitutionary Righteousness in Isa 53:11' (2011), 183.

⁹⁰² Stuhlmacher, 'Isaiah 53 in Gospels & Acts' (2004), 155; Hofius, 'Fourth Servant Song' (2004), 177 and fn 57.

In Romans 5:12 when compared to 1 Corinthians 15:21, Paul adds the steps of universal sin⁹⁰³ and universal death. However, Paul leaves these steps out in 1 Corinthians 15:21. As is frequently acknowledged, Paul does not finish the comparison introduced in Romans 5:12, but it constitutes an anacolouthon while Paul explains the spread of sin and death and qualifies his Adam/Christ typology. Paul does not resume his comparison until verse 18.

In Romans 5:15-19, Paul picks up the motif of ‘death through Adam’ in verse 15b (εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον...) and verse 17a (εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν διὰ τοῦ ἑνός), by that stage he is arguing ‘how much more’ and not giving strict antithetical contrasts, and by the time Paul completes his comparison, (5:18-19), Paul is no longer using θάνατος and cognates to speak of the consequences of Adam’s sin, but the juridical terminology of κρίμα and κατάκριμα, in opposition to δικαίωμα and δικαίωσις (vv16, 18). Paul then re-introduces the language of death in verse 21, when he describes the situation in Adam as ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ.

In other words, though Paul intended to introduce a comparison between death and life (as per 1 Corinthians 15:21-22) in Romans 5:12, by the time he has introduced his explanations about the spread of sin and death (vv13-14) and his qualifications of the Adam/Christ typology (vv15-17), *Paul’s ultimate comparison in verse 18 is not the one he foreshadowed in verse 12*. The comparison has now altered. In this situation, 1 Corinthians 15:21 gives us *the comparison that Paul would have introduced in Romans 5:12* had he not been ‘sidetracked’ by his own desire to elaborate on the spread of sin and qualify his Adam typology. The comparison which Paul started in Romans 5:12 is actually fully given in 1 Corinthians 15:21.

⁹⁰³ Taking ἐφ’ ᾧ as ‘because’, with most commentators: Moo, *Romans* (1996), 322.

1 Cor 15:21 a ἐπειδὴ γὰρ δι' ἀνθρώπου θάνατος,
 b καὶ δι' ἀνθρώπου ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν.

The equivalent parallel between 'death' and 'life' in Romans 5:12-21 is verse 21:

[illegible]

However, by Romans 5:21, Paul has moved beyond the achievement of each ‘man’ to the consequent results for the many. Instead, the final contrast between *the two men* is expressed in the juridical terminology of Romans 5:18:

ὥς	δι' ἐνὸς παραπτώματος	εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους	εἰς κατάκριμα,
οὕτως καὶ	δι' ἐνὸς δικαίωματος	εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους	εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς·

Hence, the parallel between 1 Corinthians 15:20-22 and Romans 5:12-21 makes it more probable that the δι' ἐνδὸς δικαιώματος (5:18) refers to the resurrection of the Christ. For the same Adam/Christ typology underlies both passages. Essentially the same contrast is introduced. In 1 Corinthians 15:21, it is the resurrection of the Christ that undeniably grounds the eschatological resurrection of believers, where it is stated that 'through a man comes the resurrection of the dead' (δι' ἀνθρώπου ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν). Undoubtedly the agency of the ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν is attributed to Christ, and his own resurrection. Christ's resurrection is the means (διὰ with the genitive) by which the many will be raised in the eschaton. As Hofius says, 'Christ's resurrection provides the basis for the resurrection of the dead and has this resurrection as its necessary consequence'.⁹⁰⁴ Christ has now been raised as the firstfruits of the harvest of the resurrection (πρῶτον γὰρ Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων: 1 Corinthians 15:20), and this is the first component (nb γάρ:

⁹⁰⁴ Hofius, 'Fourth Servant Song' (2004), 179.

v21) of the resurrection of those who belong to him (οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ: 1 Corinthians 15:23).⁹⁰⁵

In other words, one might express the thinking of 1 Corinthians 15:20-22 in the judicial terminology of Romans 5:18, by saying ‘just as the firstfruit (ἀπαρχή: 1 Corinthians 15:20, 23), ie, Christ’s resurrection, brings about the harvest of those belonging to him’ (οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ: 1 Corinthians 15:23), so also, ‘the justification of the one man, Christ, by his own resurrection, brings about the justification of the many, consummated in their vindicating and salvific resurrection from the dead at the eschaton’. Our resurrection ‘is not wholly separate from Christ’s resurrection, but each constitutes either earlier and later parts of the same event, with the earlier part serving as as promise and guarantee of that which is yet to come’.⁹⁰⁶ ‘the resurrection, instead of being a single event at the end of time, has broken into history already in the single instance of Jesus Christ’.⁹⁰⁷ ‘Israel’s longed-for ‘resurrection’ has bifurcated’.⁹⁰⁸ Our resurrection and Christ’s share an ‘organic connection’ as ‘two episodes of the same event’.⁹⁰⁹

It is an analogous situation with the justification of the One. His justification (ἐνὸς δικαιώματος) is the ‘representative beginning’⁹¹⁰ and ‘actual beginning of the general event’⁹¹¹ of the believer’s justification of life (δικαίωσιν ζωῆς). ‘His resurrection and that of his people form an unbreakable unity’.⁹¹² ‘The rest must follow’.⁹¹³

⁹⁰⁵ Garland, *1 Corinthians* (2003), 706.

⁹⁰⁶ Ciampa & Rosner, *1 Corinthians* (2010), 761.

⁹⁰⁷ Wright, *Climax of the Covenant* (1991), 27.

⁹⁰⁸ *ibid*, 29.

⁹⁰⁹ Gaffin, *Resurrection and Redemption* (1978/87), 35.

⁹¹⁰ *ibid*, 34.

⁹¹¹ *ibid*, 35.

⁹¹² Ridderbos, *Paul* (1975), 538.

In 1 Corinthians 15:44-49, Paul re-introduces his Adam-Christ typology in connection with his explication of the resurrection. Christ's resurrection is brought into close connection with his role as the last Adam (ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ: 1 Corinthians 15:45) and the second man from heaven (ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ: 1 Corinthians 15:47). The risen Christ will come from heaven, where he now is seated, to earth, at his parousia (thus Christ is the ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ),⁹¹⁴ clothed in his spiritual body (σῶμα πνευματικόν: 1 Corinthians 15:44) in which he was raised from the dead, and then Christ will transform those who belong to him with his own life giving resurrected-body as 'the Last Adam' and 'life-giving spirit', ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν (1 Corinthians 15:45). In this way, the risen Jesus Christ is ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (1 Corinthians 15:47).

Therefore, rather than Christ's resurrection being a side issue only, read into Romans 5:12-21, *the resurrection of the Christ underlies Paul's whole Adam-Christ typology, as shown in 1 Corinthians 15*. 'The "last Adam" refers to the *eschatological* reality of Christ's resurrection and of his subsequently giving life to his own at their resurrection'.⁹¹⁵ (emphasis original) While there is a debate as to whether it is Christ's resurrection that *makes* Christ the last Adam,⁹¹⁶ the statements that Christ is ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν (1 Corinthians 15:45) and that he is ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (1 Corinthians 15:47), both depend on Christ's resurrection and session in salvation history. With the event of the resurrection now having occurred, Paul's Adam-Christology thus takes by necessity a resurrection shape.

Dunn's statement that 'the exposition of the [Adam Christology theme] in Romans 5 centres

⁹¹³ Garland, *1 Corinthians* (2003), 706.

⁹¹⁴ Ciampa & Rosner, *1 Corinthians* (2010), 823; Garland, *1 Corinthians* (2003), 736.

⁹¹⁵ Fee, *1 Corinthians* (1987), 790.

⁹¹⁶ Wright, *Climax of the Covenant* (1991), 29, 33-34, 38.

on the death of Christ (5:15-19)⁹¹⁷ must be challenged. This thesis sees that the resurrection of the Christ underlies the Adam Christology of *both* 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5. Wright more correctly sees that Romans 5:18-21 ‘corresponds more directly to the task envisaged in 1 Corinthians 15:20-28, 45’.⁹¹⁸

Consequently, it is far more probable that the δι’ ἐνδὸς δικαιώματος (Romans 5:18) refers to the vindication of Christ through his resurrection, which then produces the ‘justification of life’ for those in Christ. This justification of life is enjoyed presently by believers by their being spiritually raised with Christ and seated in the heavenly realms with him now,⁹¹⁹ but it will be consummated by their bodily resurrection from the dead. In Paul’s inaugurated eschatology, the resurrection of believers is the implementation of their future justification⁹²⁰ that has been declared in the present⁹²¹ but that will be consummated in their salvific bodily resurrection from the dead.

(8) While clearly Jesus’ death is foundational to justification,⁹²² Paul has also brought Christ’s resurrection into close relationship with justification (4:25b), and salvation and reconciliation (5:9-10). Moo regarded Paul’s connection between Jesus’ resurrection and our justification in 4:25b as ‘puzzling’,⁹²³ but in fact it may well be that 4:25b, rather than a puzzling anomaly, is the key to unlocking Romans 5, which then serves to illuminate 4:25. Bird is quite right to observe 4:25 ‘makes the risen Christ the instrument of eschatological

⁹¹⁷ Dunn, *Theology of Paul* (1998), 241.

⁹¹⁸ Wright, *Climax of the Covenant* (1991), 38.

⁹¹⁹ Colossians 3:1-4; Ephesians 2:5-7.

⁹²⁰ Romans 8:33-34.

⁹²¹ Romans 3:21; 5:1; 8:1; Bird, *Saving Righteousness* (2007), 51; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 310-11.

⁹²² Romans 3:25-26; 4:25a; 5:6-9.

⁹²³ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 289.

salvation (though without saying how)'.⁹²⁴ Bird rightly sees 'Rom 5:18 contains a similar pattern to the cause/result model of 4:25'.⁹²⁵ However, the interplay between 4:25b and 5:18b may be greater than Bird allows. That is, the completed δικαίωμα of the Christ, being the justification of the one man (5:18b) by his resurrection (cf 4:25b), is that which produces our δικαίωσις (4:25b), which is likewise our δικαίωσις ζωῆς (5:18b). Compare:

ὅς... καὶ ἠγέρθη	διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν (4:25b)
δι' ἐνός δικαιώματος	εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς (5:18b)

If the correlation above is correct, Jesus (ἐνός) was raised to life as his justification. Christ resurrection (ἠγέρθη) has brought about our justification (διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν: 4:25b) and led to the justification of life (εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς: 5:18b) for all people (in him). The δικαίωσιν in both 4:25 and 5:18 refers to the same event, being the resurrection of believers (cf 5:1; cf 1 Corinthians 15:23) at the eschaton. The universality of εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους is a mode of expression indicating a group co-extensive with the many (οἱ πολλοί). 5:18b adds to 4:25 explicitly what is implicit there, that Christ's resurrection is his 'justification'. As his justification, Christ's δικαίωμα is a court-approved decree or declaration that Jesus Christ is 'righteous', and that this status is appropriate, earned, and deserved (ie merited) by Christ's personal righteousness (δικαιοσύνη).

A Scholarly Movement to Change our Understanding of δικαίωμα in 5:18b

In Chapter 1, it was observed that Augustine and Calvin, along with English translations prior to 1885, understood δικαίωμα differently to the current consensus.⁹²⁶ While many throughout the centuries have argued similarly, a number of recent NT scholars have argued that δικαίωμα in Romans 5:18 refers not to 'one righteous act' but 'one justifying act' or the

⁹²⁴ Bird, *Saving Righteousness* (2007), 52.

⁹²⁵ *ibid.*

⁹²⁶ See Chapter 1, above.

‘justification of the one’, who is Christ.⁹²⁷ The ἐνὸς δικαίωματος thus refers to the acquittal or vindication Christ received in his resurrection,⁹²⁸ and in which believers share.⁹²⁹

[T]he Greek [...] more probably should be translated, ‘one trespass [...] one vindication’. The vindication referred to is the resurrection; [...] the word has already occurred in v 16, as here, in close proximity to *condemnation*, and there it means vindication (RSV: justification). We must therefore keep the same meaning here too.⁹³⁰

Since the 1960s, Leon Morris has made similar arguments. Morris’ statement that the word δικαίωμα ‘normally refers to a pronouncement of some kind, not an action’⁹³¹ has been confirmed by the above review of usage in the secular authors and the LXX above. He observes:

We are faced with a choice between an inexact antithesis and using the word in two different senses in the same passage without explanation [...] It seems better to retain consistency both in the way the word is used generally and in the way it is used in verse 16 (so SH, Lenski, and others). ‘Sentence of justification’ or ‘justificatory sentence’ (Godet, Gifford) suits the present context admirably, while the word has the meaning ‘righteous act’ rarely if at all.⁹³²

Since the late 1980s, Hooker has come to a similar position. Hooker takes δικαίωμα in verse 18 to refer to God’s act of acquittal, justification or vindication regarding Christ himself in raising Christ from the dead.⁹³³ Christ himself is justified and acknowledged to be righteous in his resurrection. Hooker argues that the unusual term δικαίωμα is appropriate because it means ‘the amendment of a wrong, the act of vindication’.⁹³⁴

Since the condemnation of the many results from the condemnation of Adam, the logic of the argument suggests that the acquittal of the many depends on the acquittal of Christ. This acquittal, which leads to life for the many, would have taken place at the resurrection, an act of vindication which established his righteousness.⁹³⁵

⁹²⁷ O’Neil, *Romans* (1975), 105-106; Morris, *Romans* (1988), 238-9, Hooker, *Adam to Christ* (1990), 29-32, 39-40; idem, *Paul*, 94ff.

⁹²⁸ Romans 1:4; 1 Timothy 3:16.

⁹²⁹ Romans 4:25; 5:19.

⁹³⁰ O’Neil, *Romans* (1975), 105-106.

⁹³¹ Morris, *Romans* (1988), 239; cf idem, *Apostolic Preaching*, 288.

⁹³² idem, *Romans* (1988), 239.

⁹³³ Hooker, *Adam to Christ* (1990), 29.

⁹³⁴ *ibid*, 31.

⁹³⁵ *ibid*, 29.

It is the obedience of the Christ (v19), that leads to the one act of acquittal of him by God the Father.⁹³⁶

In 1990, Hooker's exposition preferred to take ἐνός in 18b as an adjective, and thus referring to 'one act of vindication or acquittal'.⁹³⁷ Her later expositions, however, evince her preference for taking ἐνός as a pronoun.

And if 5,18 does indeed, as we have argued, build on 5,16, in the same way that 5,17 does on 5,15, this increases the probability that δικαίωμα has the same sense here as it does in 5,16, and means "acquittal" or "vindication". ... [W]e have the same kind of skewed "contrast" in 5,18 that we have in 5:15-17 – a contrast, that is, between the παράπτωμα of Adam, and the grace of God at work through Christ to set things right, rather than between actions of Adam and Christ:

As through the trespass of one [came] condemnation to all
So through the vindication of one [came] acquittal – resulting in life – for all.⁹³⁸

Believers share in Christ's acquittal before the Law, and in God's declaration of his righteousness, and so believers share in his righteousness, just as we once shared in Adam's transgression and condemnation.⁹³⁹ Marshall has more lately agreed:

'As Hooker has demonstrated, the *dikaiōma* in Romans 5:18 should have the same sense as in v 16, and refer to the vindication or acquittal of Christ by God that then results in the *dikaiōsis* or justification of all who are united with him through faith.'⁹⁴⁰

If imputation's modern advocates accept this recent finding by New Testament scholars, which simply re-institutes the accepted understanding of δικαίωμα prior to and subsequent to the reformation, they will have a sound foundation to rehabilitate Romans 5:19 as one of the *sedes doctrinae* (seat of doctrine) for the imputation of the whole course of Christ's obedience. No longer is justification by imputation limited to Christ's passive obedience only in Romans 5:19 by the δικαίωμα referring to Christ's death as a righteous deed.

⁹³⁶ Hooker, *Adam to Christ* (1990), 31.

⁹³⁷ *ibid*, (1990), 30.

⁹³⁸ *idem*, 'Raised for Our Acquittal (2002)', 327.

⁹³⁹ *idem*, *Adam to Christ* (1990), 34.

⁹⁴⁰ Marshall, *Aspects of the Atonement* (2007), 87; *idem*, 'Raised for Our Justification' (2008), 258.

Kirk's recent article on δικαίωμα is a head-on challenge to this modern scholarly trend. Perhaps Kirk rightly appreciates what the consequences are of a revision of ἐνὸς δικαίωματος in a Calvinian direction for a Piscatorian doctrine of the imputation of only Christ's passive righteousness.⁹⁴¹ In verse 18b, Kirk regards his preferred interpretation of δικαίωμα as certain,⁹⁴² no doubt because something similar holds sway with our modern translations. However, from the other side, the evidence presented in this thesis casts doubt on the confidence with which Kirk asserts that δικαίωμα 'means something akin to "righteous-making action," or "reparation," and it connotes Jesus' death on the cross'.⁹⁴³

Δικαίωσις in Romans 5:18

As has been foreshadowed, the δικαίωσιν ζωῆς (v18b) refers to the process of justification for all people (εἰς πάντας ανθρώπους) (impliedly, 'in Christ', not all people 'in Adam') that has been inaugurated by Christ's own resurrection as his δικαίωμα (v18b), and is apprehended in the present by humans by faith, and is thus enjoyed as a gracious standing before God (5:1-2), which will be consummated at the *parousia* of the Lord Jesus Christ (Philippians 3:9-11), when the risen Lord Jesus completes the resurrection begun on the first Easter morning.

In *The Resurrection of the Son of God* (2003),⁹⁴⁴ Wright, while arguing that δικαίωμα in v18b refers to Christ's 'Jesus' obedient death', also asserts that the δικαίωσιν ζωῆς of v18b, at least includes Christ's justifying resurrection.

⁹⁴¹ Kirk has written extensively against the imputation of Christ's active obedience: Kirk, 'Sufficiency (I)' (2006), 36-64; idem, 'Sufficiency (II)' (2006), 133-154.

⁹⁴² idem, 'Reconsidering *Dikaiōma*' (2007), 790

⁹⁴³ *ibid.*

⁹⁴⁴ This view is not found in Wright, *Romans* (2002), 528-9, where he says: 'Christ's *dikaiōma* in the middle of history leads to God's *dikaiōsis* on the last day. What was accomplished on the cross will be effective at the final judgment': 529. *Resurrection of the Son of God* (2003) represents a progression in Wright's thinking.

[T]he justification of life' appears to refer to the resurrection as God's act of vindication, not only of Jesus himself but, proleptically, of all those who are 'in him'. Paul can therefore explain in the next verse that it is through the 'obedience' of the one man (*now seeing Jesus' death and resurrection as a single act*) that the many are given the status of 'righteous' (verse 19).⁹⁴⁵ (my emphasis)

Wright does not explain how Christ's resurrection can be characterized as part of his 'obedience'. Generally, Christ is said to be the object of the action of resurrection, and God the Father is the subject, or Christ is the subject of the divine passive verb. Moreover, Philippians 2:9 portrays the resurrection as the *result* of Christ's obedience to death (nb διὸ καί: Philippians 2:9).⁹⁴⁶ Nor does Wright explain how Christ's 'righteous deed' on the cross (his understanding of δικαίωμα) produced his own resurrection, and thus account for διὰ with the genitive. Nor does Wright explain why Christ should be included in the action which is especially said to be εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, when Christ's death is said to provide the means (διὰ with genitive) of the action. Nor does Wright explain why the death *and resurrection* of Christ should be considered as a 'single act' in verse 19, when the 'single act' denoted by ἐνός δικαιώματος for Wright in verse 18 is exclusively 'Jesus' messianic action on the cross'.⁹⁴⁷ It appears that Wright wants to have his cake (of seeing δικαίωμα as referring only to Christ's death) and eat it too (by having a reference to Christ's resurrection in δικαίωσις ζωῆς). Moreover, Wright still wishes to exclude any reference to Christ's whole course of obedience to the law from τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνός (v19). But if the δικαίωσις ζωῆς includes Christ's resurrection, as Wright asserts, then the question is 'why was Christ raised from the dead?' Wright's answer would probably be 'because Christ obeyed his commission as servant.' This is true. But if the servant's commission was also to obey the law where Israel failed, the resurrection does more than simply demonstrate Christ's obedience as

⁹⁴⁵ Wright, *Resurrection of the Son of God* (2003), 250.

⁹⁴⁶ Hansen, *Philippians* (2009), 159; O'Brien, *Philippians* (1991), 232-3.

⁹⁴⁷ Wright, 'Romans' (2002), 529; idem, *Resurrection of the Son of God* (2003), 250.

servant. He is obedient as Servant of Yahweh, and Yahweh gave his *Torah* to his Servant Israel. This takes us to the meaning of τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνός in 5:19 and the action of καθίστημι.

Chapter 8

The referent of τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνός and the action of καθίστημι (Romans 5:19)

Introduction

Chapter 5 demonstrates the well-attested usage of δικαίωμα as ‘justification’, either as a plea or judicial decree. Chapter 6 presents the case for rendering δικαίωμα (Romans 5:16) as ‘justification’, in light of Paul’s explanation of it as a forensic gift of righteousness (Romans 5:17). Δικαίωμα (v16) then refers to the divine justifying decree of life declared concerning believers. The referent of ἐνός (Romans 5:12, 15-19) is best seen to be consistently masculine and personal, referring to either Adam or Christ. Chapters 5 and 6 also demonstrates that the motif of resurrection and Christ’s risen Lordship, found in Romans 4:17, 24-25, re-emerges in 5:9-10, 17, 20 as the emphasized element of Paul’s *qal wayyōmer* argument as that which is ‘easier’, now that the harder thing of reconciliation by Christ’s death has been accomplished. Chapter 7 argues that δικαίωμα (Romans 5:18) means ‘sentence of justification’, consistent with Romans 5:16. Pronoun ἐνός (v18) refers to Christ, and is an objective genitive of the verbal noun δικαίωμα, so that the phrase ἐνός δικαίωματος means ‘the justification of the one’. The referent of ἐνός δικαίωματος is thus Christ’s resurrection, which constituted a judicial justification of the risen Christ, attributing to him ‘court-approved righteousness’ through resurrection. The δικαίωμα of Christ, being the completed judicial decree of justification for Christ, leads to the δικαίωσιν ζωῆς, which is the process of the believer’s justification, inaugurated by their faith and consummated in the future by their own resurrection from the dead. This reading of Romans 5:18 is

supported by Isaiah 53:11LXX, which teaches that the servant himself, the Righteous One, is justified ‘for’ the many, and the Pauline parallel in 1 Corinthians 15:20-23 and 44-49.

This chapter determines the referent of τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνός and the nature of the action denoted by καθίστημι.

The referent of τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνός (Romans 5:19)

In verse 19a, γάρ marks background explanatory material. Thus, v19 explains v18. Another comparison is indicated by ὥστερ (v19) in the protasis and οὕτως καί in the apodosis. Thus, the explanatory relationship is between the two prepositional phrases, the latter explaining the former. Δι’ ἐνός δικαιώματος is explained by διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνός ἀνθρώπου.

Most take the nature of the explanation as ‘identification’, and thus the two phrases are assumed synonymous. For example, grounded on an assumption of synonymity, Hodge argues from the meaning of ὑπακοή (v19) to the meaning of δικαίωμα (v18).

[I]n verse 16, this word δικαίωμα is rendered *justification*, because it is there in antithesis to κατὰκριμα, *condemnation*; it is here [verse 18] properly rendered righteousness, because it is in antithesis to παράπτωμα, *offence* and because what is here expressed by δικαίωμα, is in verse 19 expressed by ὑπακοή.⁹⁴⁸

While Hodge takes ὑπακοή (v19) to condition δικαίωμα (v18), most modern commentators reverse the direction of conditionality, so that δικαίωμα, meaning ‘a righteous deed’ (v18), conditions ὑπακοή (v19), and the referent of τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνός is thereby limited to Christ’s obedience unto death. For example:

Paul’s thought at this point focuses more or less exclusively on Christ’s death [...] In the context it stands as the antithesis to the one act of disobedience of Adam.⁹⁴⁹

⁹⁴⁸ Hodge, *Romans* (1864), 169.

⁹⁴⁹ Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:284.

However, both methodologies are suspect. Γάρ does not *per se* indicate a relationship of synonymy or identity. It marks text providing a warrant for a previous proposition. These flawed methodologies are the product of an erroneous assumption of synonymous meaning wrongly inferred from parallel rhetorical structure.⁹⁵⁰ Rather, τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου provides the ground for ἐνὸς δικαιώματος as a ‘necessary explanation’.⁹⁵¹ Verse 19 provides *the reason for* ‘the justification’ of the one, which is ‘the obedience’ of that one. ‘The obedience’ causes ‘the justification’. The obedience, or righteousness, of Christ, is the reason that God justifies him in resurrection, per Isaiah 53:11LXX.

The noun ὑπακοή and cognate ὑπήκοος are used only three times in the NT in reference to Christ.⁹⁵² Elsewhere, Christ was said to become ‘obedient unto death’ (γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου: Philippians 2:8) and ‘learned obedience from what he suffered’ (ἐμαθεν ἀφ’ ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν: Hebrews 5:8). While the accent of both is on Christ’s suffering unto death, neither necessarily excludes other aspects of Christ’s obedience.

Wright argues that in Romans 5:19, the Christ was obedient to the Isaianic servant’s commission, and ‘almost certainly not’ to the *Torah*.⁹⁵³ Wright correctly sees the Isaianic servant in the background,⁹⁵⁴ but incorrectly sets Christ’s obedience as Servant against his obedience to Torah. The Isaianic servant speaks with an instructed tongue and listens morning by morning.⁹⁵⁵ ‘He was not endowed with an instant gift, *an instructed tongue*, but

⁹⁵⁰ Baxter, ‘Hebrew and Greek Word Study Fallacies’, (2010-2011), 21. The current scholarly method and its caution concerning the etymological fallacy (which has resulted in less regard for the evidence of accident and word formation) probably dates from Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (1961).

⁹⁵¹ Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:290; Calvin, *Comm Romans* 5:19, in CC, 19:212.

⁹⁵² Longenecker, ‘Obedience’ (1974), 142.

⁹⁵³ Wright, ‘Romans’ (2002), 529.

⁹⁵⁴ Longenecker, ‘Obedience’ (1974), 143.

⁹⁵⁵ Isaiah 50:4-5.

was subjected to the training procedures appropriate to all discipleship – concentration on the word of the Lord’.⁹⁵⁶ ‘[H]e has learned from the outset of the day to do what his Master tells him to do. A disciple speaks what he has learned through a life of obedience’.⁹⁵⁷ This instructed tongue and day by day obedience is almost certainly directed to the Torah.⁹⁵⁸ Thus, there is no reason to exclude Christ’s obedience to the whole Torah as τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνός. The Torah promised life to the doer.⁹⁵⁹ Jesus Christ was born under the Torah.⁹⁶⁰ Christ as the Jew *par* excellence needed to keep keep τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου that rested on Israel.⁹⁶¹ Christ also took resurrection life. Therefore, Christ’s resurrection shows he was the man who did the Torah.⁹⁶² Garlington well describes Christ’s ὑπακοή as ‘his perseverance or life-long commitment to do his Father’s will’.⁹⁶³ Even better is Murray, ‘obedience comprehends the totality of the Father’s will as fulfilled by Christ’,⁹⁶⁴ and Cranfield, ‘The term covers his whole life, not just His passion and death’.⁹⁶⁵ Best is Royster:

From the beginning He made it plain that He would obey the Father’s will, which was His own in His divine nature, even to the point of keeping the whole law, ‘to fulfill all righteousness’.⁹⁶⁶

Jesus’ declared purpose included fulfilling all the demands of the Mosaic law.⁹⁶⁷ The ‘righteousness of Christ’ throughout his life, his sinless obedience to God, is the reason that he is ‘declared righteous’ in his resurrection. Therefore, none of Christ’s obedience or righteousness is excluded from his work of justifying us. Romans 5:19 teaches that at the

⁹⁵⁶ Motyer, *Isaiah* (1993), 399.

⁹⁵⁷ Oswalt, *Isaiah* (1998), 2:324.

⁹⁵⁸ I thank Rev Dr Peter Bolt for this suggestion.

⁹⁵⁹ Romans 2:6, 13; 10:5; Leviticus 18:5; cf Galatians 3:12.

⁹⁶⁰ Galatians 4:4.

⁹⁶¹ Romans 2:26; Barth, *Adam and Christ: Romans 5* (1956), 73.

⁹⁶² Romans 1:4; 1 Timothy 3:16; Romans 5:18; Isaiah 53:11LXX.

⁹⁶³ Garlington, *Faith, Obedience and Perseverance* (1994), 104.

⁹⁶⁴ Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:205.

⁹⁶⁵ Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:291; cf Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 421.

⁹⁶⁶ Royster, *Romans* (2008), 139.

⁹⁶⁷ Matthew 5:17; Longenecker, ‘Obedience’ (1974), 145.

judgment, it will be the whole course of Christ's obedience to the Father, justified as it was by his resurrection, that will be the ground of God placing many, otherwise ungodly and sinful,⁹⁶⁸ in the class of 'righteous'. 'The Christian, therefore, stands before God as the beneficiary of both Christ's passive obedience and Christ's active obedience'.⁹⁶⁹ The final step of vindicating this argument depends on the action of the verb καθίστημι.

The Action of καθίστημι

The following assesses the denotation of καθίστημι. Methodologically, each instance in the LXX shall be analysed as evidence of the semantic field of καθίστημι. The findings from the LXX will be tested against select soundings from the Graeco-Roman usage. The New Testament will be rehearsed before looking at Romans 5:19.

Καθίστημι in the LXX as 'appoint'

The vast majority of instances of καθίστημι denotes a person being 'set over', 'appointed to' or 'established in' a particular office or responsibility (often with preposition ἐπί and the genitive), thus rightly translated 'appoint'. Eg:

- Potiphar set Joseph over his household: καὶ κατέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ
|| עֲלֵ-בֵיתוֹ יִפְקֹדֶהוּ: Genesis 39:4, cf v5.
- Pharaoh set Joseph over all Egypt: καθίστημί σε [...] ἐπὶ πάσης γῆς Αἰγύπτου
|| עַל אֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם: Genesis 41:41; cf v33, 34, 43; 47:5LXX.
- And now appoint over us a King to judge us (καὶ νῦν κατέστησον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς βασιλέα δικάζειν ἡμᾶς) just as also the rest [of the] nations: 1 Samuel 8:5; cf 10:19.
- And I set you over the four districts: καὶ καθίστημί σε ἐπὶ τῶν τεσσάρων νομῶν: 1 Maccabees 11:57.⁹⁷⁰

⁹⁶⁸ Romans 4:5; 7:14-25; *Contra* Garlington, *Faith, Obedience and Perseverance* (1994), 104, who rejects *simul iustus et peccator* ('simultaneously righteous and a sinner') for *tunc peccator – nunc iustus* ('once a sinner – now righteous'). See further Chapter 9, below.

⁹⁶⁹ Longenecker, 'Obedience' (1974), 147.

⁹⁷⁰ Also Exodus 2:14, 5:14; 18:21; Numbers 3:10; 4:19; 31:48; Deuteronomy 1:13, 15; 17:14-15; 28:36; Judges 11:11; 1 Samuel 19:20; 22:9; 2 Samuel 17:25; 1 Chronicles 9:29; 26:32; 2 Chronicles 12:10; 21:5; 2 Chronicles 36:1 (αὶ κατέστησαν αὐτὸν εἰς βασιλέα); Nehemiah 12:44; Esther 8:2; 1 Maccabees 10:69; 14:42; 2 Maccabees 5:22; 13:3; Psalm 8:7; 9:21 LXX; Psalm 44:17 LXX; Psalm 108:6 LXX; Jeremiah LXX 1:10; 6:17; 47:5,7,11; 48:2,18; Epistle of Jeremiah 1:33; Daniel 2:21,48,49; 3:21,97 LXX; 4:31 LXX Rahlfs; 4:37 LXX Rahlfs; 6:2 LXX; 6:4-5; 6:29. Though Judith 6:4 adopts this syntax (αὶ κατέστησαν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας τῆς πόλεως αὐτῶν, the

The verb can take an infinitive complement:

- He is appointed to dwell: κατέστησεν κατοικίσαι: Numbers 21:15LXX.
- Eleazar the Son of Aaron the Priest [was] appointed to guard the guards of the holy things: καθεσταμένος φυλάσσειν τὰς φυλακὰς τῶν ἁγίων: Numbers 3:32.⁹⁷¹

When the office or task is named, the office is usually in the accusative and the object of the active finite verb, thus:

- Appoint judges and recorders for yourselves: κριτὰς καὶ γραμματοεισαγωγεῖς καταστήσεις σεαυτῷ: Deuteronomy 16:18.
- And [David] appointed over them captains of thousands and hundreds: καὶ κατέστησεν ἐπ' αὐτῶν χιλιάρχους καὶ ἑκατοντάρχους: 2 Samuel 18:1.⁹⁷²
- The Lord has appointed prophets for you in Babylon: κατέστησεν ἡμῖν κύριος προφῆτας: Jeremiah 36:15LXX, Brenton.

Though sometimes the office or task is governed by a preposition εἰς or ἐπὶ with the accusative.

- And they appointed him for a King: κατέστησαν αὐτὸν εἰς βασιλέα: 2 Chronicles 36:1.⁹⁷³
- And these leaders who were appointed over the works of Solomon: οἱ καθεσταμένοι ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Σαλωμων: 1 Kings 2:35[8]LXX; also 5:30.

The appointee might also be in the accusative, or be the object complement, so that the active verb takes a double accusative.

Accusative

- And [Solomon] appointed him [Jeroboam] over the labour of the house of Joseph: καὶ κατέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰς ἄρσεις οἴκου Ἰωσηφ: 1 Kings 11:28.⁹⁷⁴

Double accusative

- And Joshua appointed them (καὶ κατέστησεν αὐτούς) on that day woodchoppers and watercarriers (ξυλοκόπους καὶ ὕδροφόρους): Joshua 9:27.
- Samuel also appointed his sons judges for Israel: Σαμουηλ καὶ κατέστησεν τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ δικαστὰς τῷ Ἰσραηλ: 1 Samuel 8:1.

meaning must be 'and they stood him before the rulers of the city': Cf KJV; Douay-Rheims; NAB; NJB). The absolute perfect passive participle καθεσταμένοι denotes 'appointees' (1 Kings 4:5, 7; 5:1; 2 Kings 22:5,9; 2 Chronicles 31:13; 34:10; 3 Maccabees 4:18). The LXX usage in 2 Samuel 3:39 appears anomalous, rendering concessive participle *ἡνὶκα* *ἡνὶκα* 'though anointed King', as ἐγὼ εἰμι [...] καὶ καθεσταμένος ὑπὸ βασιλέως, 'and I have been appointed by a King'.

⁹⁷¹ Also 1 Chronicles 22:2; 2 Chronicles 19:8; 1 Maccabees 6:17.

⁹⁷² Also Deuteronomy 20:9; 2 Kings 7:17; 10:3; 25:22,23; 1 Chronicles 6:16 (with idiomatic ἐπὶ χειρᾶς); 1 Chronicles 11:25; 2 Chronicles 11:15, 22; 17:2; 19:5; 33:14; Ezra 7:25; Esther 2:3; 1 Maccabees 3:55; 6:14; 11:59.

⁹⁷³ Also 2 Samuel 6:21 (direct object taking εἰς ἡγούμενον).

⁹⁷⁴ Also, for example, Tobit 1:22; 1 Maccabees 6:14, 55; 10:32; Sirach 17:17; 32:1.

- And he [Saul] appointed him [David] for himself captain of a thousand: καὶ κατέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐαυτῷ χιλιάρχον: 1 Samuel 18:13.
- [if] someone will appoint me [Absalom] judge in the land: τίς με καταστήσει κριτὴν ἐν τῇ γῇ: 2 Samuel 15:4.⁹⁷⁵

Likewise, the passive verb can take both appointee and office in the nominative:

- And I have been appointed King by him: ἐγὼ δὲ κατεστάθην βασιλεὺς ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ: Psalm 2:6LXX.⁹⁷⁶
- Paschor son of Emmer, the priest, this one had been appointed leader of the house of the Lord: Πασχωρ υἱὸς Εμμηρ ὁ ἱερεὺς καὶ οὗτος ἦν καθεσταμένος ἡγούμενος οἴκου κυρίου: Jeremiah 20:1.
- Now a certain Simon, from the tribe of Benjamin, having been appointed leader of the temple: Σιμων δέ τις ἐκ τῆς Βενιαμιν φυλῆς προστάτης τοῦ ἱεροῦ καθεσταμένος: 2 Maccabees 3:4.
- Some of them will be assigned to the fortress of the King: κατασταθήσεται ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐν τοῖς ὀχυρώμασιν τοῦ βασιλέως: 1 Maccabees 10:37.
- [Menelaus joined them] because he thought that he will be established ruler: ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς κατασταθήσεται: 2 Maccabees 13:3.

A rare instance is when that which is ruled is in the accusative, and the appointee takes the indirect object.

- And he charged the country to Alcimus: καὶ κατέστησεν τὴν χώραν τῷ Ἀλκίμῳ: 1 Maccabees 7:20.

Or where the periphrastic pluperfect passive is used:

- And Ptolemy the son of Aboubos had been appointed general: καὶ Πτολεμαῖος ὁ τοῦ Ἀβούβου ἦν καθεσταμένος στρατηγός: 1 Maccabees 16:11.

Καθίστημι in the LXX as ‘stand’ or ‘set’

Καθίστημι is also used in a sense closely related to its basic etymological meaning, ‘stand’:

- And they [the two young spies] stood (κατέστησαν) her [Rahab and her family] outside the camp of Israel: Joshua 6:23.⁹⁷⁷
- And Hannah rose after they had eaten in Shiloh and she stood before the Lord (καὶ κατέστη ἐνώπιον κυρίου) and Eli the priest sat upon the seat at the doorposts of the house of the Lord: 1 Samuel 1:9LXX; cf 1:26; 3:10.
- And they raised Dagon and stood him in his place: καὶ κατέστησαν εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ: 1 Samuel 5:3.

⁹⁷⁵ Also 1 Chronicles 12:19; 2 Chronicles 36:4; Psalm 104:21 LXX; Daniel 1:20; 1 Maccabees 9:25; 10:20; 15:38; 2 Maccabees 14:3; 4 Maccabees 4:16.

⁹⁷⁶ The LXX substantially alters the MT by putting the decree in the passive and in the mouth of the king.

⁹⁷⁷ Oepke, ‘καθίστημι’, *TDNT*, 3:444 takes this as meaning ‘lead to’, ‘conduct’, ‘bring’ here, but while the word can imply movement (eg a school teacher says to her class, ‘I will stand you in the playground’), the key idea conveyed is still ‘standing’.

- And he [Saul] stood in the midst of the people (καὶ κατέστησεν ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ λαοῦ) and he was taller than all the people from his shoulder upwards: 1 Samuel 10:23.
- But the Lord now will stand for judgment, and he will stand for judging his people: ἀλλὰ νῦν καταστήσεται εἰς κρίσιν κύριος καὶ στήσει εἰς κρίσιν τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ: Isaiah 3:13.
- He made me his target: κατέστησέν με ὥσπερ σκοπόν, hence, erect, set up: Job 16:12.
- And you drank the standing water: καὶ τὸ καθεστηκὸς ὕδωρ ἐπίνετε: Ezekiel 34:18.⁹⁷⁸

Or καθίστημι can simply mean ‘set’ or ‘assign’:

Of a task

- Now assign (κατάστησον δὲ σεαυτῷ LXX || שׂים־לְךָ MT) for yourself an ambush for the city behind it: Joshua 8:2.
- And assign men (καταστήσατε LXX || וְהִפְקִידוּ) to watch over them [the 5 kings]: Joshua 10:18.
- I have assigned watchmen: κατέστησα φύλακας: Isaiah 62:6.⁹⁷⁹

Of a place

- Send the man [David] back to his place which you assigned (κατέστησας) him: 1 Samuel 29:4, cf v10.
- And they put (probably ‘returned’: κατέστησαν) [the moneybox] into its place: 2 Chronicles 24:11.⁹⁸⁰

Καθίστημι in the LXX as ‘make’, ‘constitute’ or ‘establish’

The verb can also be translated ‘constitute’, which implies more than a declarative

appointment, but an ‘establishment’.

Of headship

- The Lord God will establish you as head (καταστήσαι σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου εἰς κεφαλὴν) and not as tail, and then you will be before and you will not be after, if you obey the commands of the Lord your God, as much as I am commanding you today, to keep and do [them]: Deuteronomy 28:13; cf Psalm 17:44LXX.

Of a restored spirit

- [The famished Egyptian ate and] his spirit was established [perhaps, restored] in him (κατέστη τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ || רִחוּ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) because he had not eaten: 1 Samuel 30:12.

⁹⁷⁸ Also 1 Samuel 10:19 (αὐτὸς νῦν κατὰστήτε ἐνώπιον κυρίου); 2 Chronicles 29:4 (cf v11); 1 Esdras 2:5; 5:47 (perhaps ‘stood up’, ‘took a stand’); Esther 5:11 LXX; 2 Maccabees 12:27; Jeremiah 26:4 LXX; 3 Maccabees 5:51. The idea, ‘to stand’ however, can obviously connote much beyond its basic denotation. Eg ‘to stand before the Lord’: καταστήσαι πάντας αὐτοὺς ἐνώπιον κυρίου (Psalms of Solomon 18:8). This connotes the establishment of a good relationship, a relationship of acceptance, and thus the person ‘stands’ and ‘remains’ before God.

⁹⁷⁹ Also Sirach 33:29 (‘set him to work’: εἰς ἔργα κατὰστήσιν); Daniel 2:24; 3 Maccabees 3:21.

⁹⁸⁰ Also 2 Chronicles 28:15 (TDNT, 3:444 takes this as ‘lead’, but it more likely means ‘stand’ as another word ἐξηγάσαν conveys the idea of ‘led out’); Nehemiah 13:19; Esther 8:12 LXX E:5 (Cf ‘involved’ NAB E:5; NJB (e)); 2 Maccabees 12:20; 2 Maccabees 12:30 (καθεστώτων = living among), also Jeremiah 51:28 LXX (οἱ καταστάντες ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ κατοικῆσαι ἐκεῖ = remaining to dwell in Egypt); Bel and the Dragon 39 (κατέστησε = returned, reestablished).

- He [the King] sprang from his throne and took her [Esther] up in his arms until which time she was restored: μέχρις οὗ κατέστη: Esther 5:1LXX.

Of the establishment of a ruler

- When the kingdom was established in his hand: ὡς κατέστη ἡ βασιλεία ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ: 2 Chronicles 25:3.
- [The King judging the poor in truth], his throne will be established (κατασταθήσεται) for a testimony: Proverbs 29:14LXX.⁹⁸¹

This usage is noteworthy, as a King might be established *de jure* but not *de facto*. The establishment of the Kingdom in this instance is not his appointment or accession to the throne, but when the King's rule is effectively acknowledged and popularly accepted. Thus, a King might be established (καθίστημι as 'appointment') in that he has legal title by right, but not yet established in fact (καθίστημι as 'establishment by popular acceptance and acclamation').

Of age

- Established old man (καθεστηκότος πρεσβύτου: Deuteronomy 32:25.

Of effecting a change or transformation or restoration of a state or emotion

- [The disobedient city] will be made hateful (ἔχθιστος κατασταθήσεται) not only to men but also to birds and wild beasts: Esther 8:12 [24]LXX.
- [Menelaus] becoming the great plotter against the citizens (μέγας τῶν πολιτῶν ἐπίβουλος καθεστώς: 2 Maccabees 4:50.
- To restore the tribes of Jacob: καταστήσαι φυλὰς Ἰακωβ: Sirach 48:10.
- He [Ptolemy] established his subjects' security⁹⁸²: εὐθαρσεῖς τοὺς ὑποτεταγμένους κατέστησεν: 3 Maccabees 1:7.⁹⁸³

Of the establishment or continuation of intentions and states of being

- Whose land, smoking, still stands desolate: κατέστηκε χέρσος: Wisdom 10:7.
- The Jews set dispositions and intentions: διαθέσει καὶ βουλῇ κατέστηκαν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι: 2 Maccabees 14:5.
- To restore [or re-establish] the [desolate] land [of Israel]: καταστήσαι τὴν γῆν || יְרֵאֵם יִשְׂרָאֵל: Isaiah 49:8.
- The fierce anger of the Lord shall certainly not turn back until he has done and until he has established the undertaking of his heart: ἕως καταστήσῃ ἐγγείρημα καρδίας αὐτοῦ: Jeremiah 37:24LXX.

⁹⁸¹ Psalm 96:1 LXX; Sirach 46:13; 3 Maccabees 3:26.

⁹⁸² Charlesworth (ed), *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (1983), 2:517.

⁹⁸³ Also Esther 3:13 LXX (makes lives of kingdom civilized: καταστήσαι βίους τὴν τε βασιλείαν ἡμερον); 2 Maccabees 15:9 (made them eager 'προθυμοτέρους αὐτοὺς κατέστησεν'); 3 Maccabees 4:11 (making the captives a public example); 3 Maccabees 1:11 (became responsible for the downfall of tyranny).

- And made them [the Sodomites] an example to later generations:⁹⁸⁴ παράδειγμα τοῖς ἐπιγινομένοις καταστήσας: 2 Maccabees 2:5.
- They persisted (καθειστήκεισαν) in the hope that they would obtain relief:⁹⁸⁵ 3 Maccabees 2:33.
- [The Jews] established a good reputation among all men:⁹⁸⁶ ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις εὐδόκιμοι καθειστήκεισαν: 3 Maccabees 3:5.
- To establish [the temple] a desert for all time: ἔρημον εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον καταστήσειν: 3 Maccabees 5:43.⁹⁸⁷

Καθίστημι as an equative verb

- Now the forms of wisdom are prudence and righteousness and courage and self-control: τῆς δὲ σοφίας ἰδέαι καθεστήκασιν φρόνησις καὶ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἀνδρεία καὶ σωφροσύνη: 4 Maccabees 1:18.

Two further interesting uses, potentially relevant for Romans 5:19, are the instances where καθίστημι is used in a quasi-accounting way, and in a forensic situation.

The quasi-accounting use of καθίστημι as ‘consider’, ‘reckon’

A single quasi-accounting use in the LXX is in the case of the Levirate marriage.

And it will be, that the child which she might bear will be set down (κατασταθήσεται) out of the name of the one who had died (ἐκ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ τετελευτηκότος), and his name will not be wiped out from Israel (Deuteronomy 25:6).

Καθίστημι is unlikely to mean ‘constitute’ here (as the child is not the biological child of the dead man). ‘Appoint’ is closer, but does not quite capture the idea. While the use καθίστημι in its basic etymological meaning to translate קָם ‘arise, stand up, stand’ would be quite understandable, Driver translates קָם עַל-שֵׁם as ‘lit. “stand upon the name,” &c, ie assume a position (or be established) as his heir...’.⁹⁸⁸ BDB gives the gloss ‘represent him’.⁹⁸⁹

The JPS *Tanak* (1985) renders it as ‘shall be accounted to the dead brother’. On the

supposition that the LXX is a faithful rendering of the MT, the context here suggests that

⁹⁸⁴ Charlesworth, *OT Pseudepigrapha*, 2:519.

⁹⁸⁵ *ibid*, 2:520.

⁹⁸⁶ *Ibid*.

⁹⁸⁷ Also Jeremiah 23:3; 3 Maccabees, 3:19; 4 Maccabees 4:25 (God established the law: καθεστάναι τὸν νόμον); 4 Maccabees 13:23; 4 Maccabees 15:4 (mothers constituted more sympathetic than fathers); 4 Maccabees 17:5 (moon ‘established’ in the heavens; seven sons ‘established’ in heaven).

⁹⁸⁸ Driver, *Deuteronomy* (1902), 283; BDB, 878; cf Woods, *Deuteronomy* (2011), 257.

⁹⁸⁹ *ibid*.

καθίστημι does not convey ‘an actual state of affairs’ (ie biological lineage) but instead denotes that the child ‘represents’, ‘assumes the position of’, or ‘is accounted to the name of’ the dead brother. *Prima facie*, then, this is evidence that καθίστημι has an overlapping semantic range with λογίζομαι. However, as it constitutes evidence of only one usage, it will need to be confirmed by use in the Graeco-Roman context.

The forensic use of καθίστημι as ‘stand trial’, ‘bring before court’, ‘arraign’
There is a forensic usage in the LXX,⁹⁹⁰ where καθίστημι appears to be a technical term.

¹⁵One witness shall not continue to testify against a man, against any unrighteousness, against any sinful act, and against any sin which he might sin. Upon [the] mouth of two witnesses and upon [the] mouth of three witnesses every accusation (πάν ῥῆμα) will be made to **stand (establish, σταθήσεται)**. ¹⁶But if an unjust witness (μάρτυς ἄδικος) **brings before the court [an accusation] (καταστή)** against a man (κατὰ ἀνθρώπου), accusing ungodliness against him (καταλέγων αὐτοῦ ἀσέβειαν), ¹⁷and the two men between whom the dispute (ἡ ἀντιλογία) exists **will stand (στήσονται)** before (ἐναντι) the Lord and before the priests and before the judges (ἐναντι τῶν κριτῶν) who might be [in office] in those days, ¹⁸and the judges (οἱ κριταὶ) will carefully examine [them], and behold, the unjust witness testified unjustly; he **stood against (= brought to court maliciously, ἀντέστη)** against his brother (κατὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ), ¹⁹and you shall do to him the [same] thing which he evilly planned to do against his brother (κατὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ), and you will remove the evil from among you. ²⁰And the rest, when they hear, will be afraid and will never again act (προσθήσουσιν) like this among you, according to this evil affair (κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ πονηρὸν τοῦτο). (Deuteronomy 19:15-20LXX, translation mine).

Deuteronomy 19:15-20LXX uses verbs built on the ἵστημι (‘to stand’) stem. Of these, one appears to denote a literal standing of two men before the court (ἵστημι: v17), one is the metaphorical denotation of ‘establishing’ a charge (v15, future σταθήσεται, and compare v14, establishing a boundary stone), and two appear to be technical terms. The first of these technical terms, καθίστημι, is used in v16 before the litigating parties ‘stand’ before the court and prior to the decision of the court being given. There is an accusation against a man (nb intensification by prefixed preposition κατὰ). Καθίστημι (v16) thus appears to mean ‘bring to court’. The context requires that the parties are in opposition against one another.

⁹⁹⁰ Deuteronomy 19:16; Muraoka, *Greek-English Lexicon of LXX* (2009), 351.

But the *bona fides* of each party is still assumed, because the court has not yet found that one of the parties before it is a malicious witness. The second of these, ἀντίστημι (verse 18), is introduced after the judges have made their finding that the witness is malicious. The technical term ἀντίστημι ('to stand in opposition to'),⁹⁹¹ has the connotation that this proceeding was an abuse of the court process and the witness was malicious.

Three observations follow. The first is that the profusion of ἵστημι and related terms is hardly accidental. The core idea 'to stand' is the key to both its forensic use and proliferation. This has an analogy in English idiom. Consider, 'to stand trial', 'his evidence stands', 'the accusation stands', 'please take the stand'. Second, each of the ἵστημι terms, while carrying its appropriate denotation, also bears a forensic connotation *in this context*. The type of standing is a 'legal' one. Thus, the two litigants must 'stand' before the court. The false witness 'stood against' an innocent person in court. The testimony can only 'stand' with corroboration, thus the requirement of two or three witnesses. Third, the future passive σταθήσεται (verse 15) speaks of the outcome, the establishment of a verdict that will stand as a result of the trial process.

Again, concerning the cities of refuge established for manslaughterers, καθίστημι connotes 'bring to trial':

Grant cities of refuge which I [the Lord] commanded you through Moses, a refuge for the killer who strikes down a life involuntarily, and the cities will be a refuge for you, and the killer will not be put to death by the kinsman [or avenger] of blood until he might stand trial before the congregation for judgment: ἕως ἂν καταστή ἐναντίον τῆς συναγωγῆς εἰς κρίσιν
 לְמִשְׁפָּט לְפָנֵי הָעֵדָה עַד-עֲמֹדוֹ: Joshua 20:2-3; also v9.

While the LXX translates מַעֲמֹד ('I stand'), the meaning is 'stand trial before the

⁹⁹¹ LSJM, 140, 'stand against'.

congregation for judgment’, and thus could be translated ‘arraigned’ or ‘called to account before the congregation’. It appears to have taken a technical legal connotation similar to ‘stand trial’.

This forensic use stands behind 1 Samuel 12:7, when Samuel arraigns Israel at his ‘retirement’ as judge:

And now, stand trial, and I will judge you before the Lord (καὶ νῦν κατὰσθητε καὶ δικάσω ὑμᾶς ἐνώπιον κυρίου), and I will announce to you all the righteousness of the Lord which he did among you: 1 Samuel 12:7; also 12:16.

The forensic nuance also stands behind Susanna 1:60LXX,⁹⁹² which alludes to Deuteronomy 19:15,19. The context is that a young Daniel re-examines two (false) witnesses, elders and judges among the Babylonian Jews, to demonstrate their false testimony against Susanna, a beautiful and pious Jewess. Out of their shared lust, the two wicked judges together demand Susanna’s sexual favours, or threaten her with the false charge of adultery. Susanna refused, and the two corrupt judges initially succeed in having her condemned. As Susanna is being taken to the place of execution, Daniel calls a halt to the execution, reconvenes the court, and separately interrogates each elder, asking under what sort of tree did Susanna commit the alleged offence. The two false witnesses give contradictory answers. Then, after the contradictory answer of the second false witness is heard:

And all the synagogue cried out against the younger [false witness], as out of his own mouth he [Daniel] established them both false witnesses together (ὁμολόγους αὐτοὺς κατέστησεν ἀμφοτέρους ψευδομάρτυρας), and as the law plainly declares, they did to them just as they wickedly sought to do against their sister, and they silenced them, and leading them away, they threw [them] into the chasm. Then the angel of the Lord threw fire through their midsts, and innocent blood was saved on that day. (Susanna 60 LXX Rahlf).⁹⁹³

⁹⁹² Rahlf’s Text (1935) Bibleworks7 (LXT).

⁹⁹³ The translation is my own. Greek Text Bibleworks7.

Here, the forensic nuance of the verb is not ‘stand trial’, but the establishment of the two scurrilous elders as ‘false witnesses’, using the double accusative. Κατέστησεν can thus mean ‘establishment of evidence’ by two witnesses, the conveyed in Deuteronomy 19:15^{LXX} by σταθήσεται. The nuance of καθίστημι here is establish by ‘showing’ or ‘proving’ in court. It denotes a legal ‘establishing’ by demonstration that they are false witnesses.⁹⁹⁴ The verb has a similar meaning of ‘establish’ in the sense of ‘demonstrate’ or ‘show’ in 3 Maccabees 3:19, where King Ptolemy Philopator says of the Jewish resistance, ‘But they plainly exhibited (δυσμένειαν ἔκδηλον καθιστάντες) their hostility to us’.⁹⁹⁵

Καθίστημι in the Graeco-Roman Corpus

Having established the semantic range of καθίστημι in the LXX, and noting that Romans 5:19 evinces a forensic setting (suggested by the terms κρίμα, κατάκριμα, δικαίωμα and δικαίωσις in vv16,18), soundings will be taken from the secular Graeco-Roman corpus which might elucidate the different meanings of the verb in those contexts. According to LSJM, καθίστημι evidences the same semantic range in the key areas in the Graeco-Roman corpus: ‘set down’, ‘appoint’, ‘stand’, ‘establish’, ‘make’, ‘set up’ (in the sense of ‘erect’), ‘reckon’, and ‘bring to trial’,⁹⁹⁶ all of which confirm the usage we have seen in the LXX. Some important examples follow.

The quasi-accounting use of καθίστημι as ‘consider’, ‘reckon’

According to LSJM, the Graeco-Roman sources likewise evince the meaning of καθίστημι as ‘reckon’ or ‘number’.

⁹⁹⁴ Muraoka, *Greek-English Lexicon of LXX* (2009), 350, also citing 3 Maccabees 3:19.

⁹⁹⁵ Charlesworth, *OT Pseudepigrapha*, 2:521; Muraoka, *Greek-English Lexicon of LXX* (2009), 350.

⁹⁹⁶ LSJM, 854-5.

Xenophon (430-354BC), Memorabilia Book 2, Chapter 1, Section 9⁹⁹⁷

And so, should anyone want to bring plenty of trouble on himself and other, I would educate him as you propose, and number him with ‘those fitted to be rulers’ (εἰς τοὺς ἀρχικοὺς καταστήσαιμι): but myself I classify with those who wish for a life of the greatest ease and pleasure that can be had (ἐμαυτὸν γε μέντοι τάττω εἰς τοὺς βουλομένους ἢ ῥᾶστά τε καὶ ἡδιστα).

LSJM cites this passage as an example of the meaning of καθίστημι as ‘reckon him as one of [...]’, a subclass of ‘bring into a certain state’.⁹⁹⁸ This confirms the meaning tentatively proposed for Deuteronomy 26:5 ‘account to, reckon’ as possible and within the semantic range of καθίστημι.

The forensic use of καθίστημι as ‘stand trial’, ‘bring before court’, ‘arraign’

According to LSJM, καθίστημι can be a technical term denoting ‘bring before a ruler or a magistrate’.⁹⁹⁹ This was the meaning in LXX Deuteronomy 19:16, Joshua 20:2-3, 9; and 1 Samuel 12:7, 16. The following are examples:

Herodotus (484-425BC), The Persian Wars, Book 1, Chapter 209 Section, 5¹⁰⁰⁰

[King Cyrus saw a vision of the eldest son of Hystaspes and commanded the Father to fetch him] Do you therefore go with all speed back to Persia, and so act that when I come thither after subduing this country you shall bring your son before me to be questioned of this (ὥς μοι καταστήσεις τὸν παῖδα ἐς ἔλεγχον).

Thucydides (c460-c400BC), History of the Peloponnesian War, Book 1 Chapter 131 Section 2¹⁰⁰¹

Then, having contrived after a time to get out [of prison], he [Pausanias] offered himself for trial (καὶ καθίστησιν ἑαυτὸν ἐς κρίσιν) to any who might wish to examine his case.

Lysias (c459/8-c380BC)

Lysias was one of the forensic λογογράφοι, that is, writers of speeches for others who are about to appear in court.¹⁰⁰² His orations further illustrate the forensic use of καθίστημι.

⁹⁹⁷ Xenophon, *Xenophon: Memorabilia, Oeconomicus, Symposium, Apology*, LCL 168, Vol IV (1923), 87.

⁹⁹⁸ LSJM, 855.

⁹⁹⁹ LSJM, 854-5 ‘καθίστημι’, meaning ‘3’.

¹⁰⁰⁰ Herodotus, 1.209.5, in *The Persian Wars*, LCL 117, Vol I Books I-II (1920), 264-5; LSJM, 855.

¹⁰⁰¹ Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, Books 1-2, Vol I, LCL 108 (1928), 220-221.

¹⁰⁰² Hornblower *et al*, *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (2012), 875.

XVI. Before the Council: In Defence of Mantitheus at his Scrutiny, 17.7

I acted in this way, not because I did not think it a serious thing to do battle with the Lacedaemonians, but in order that, if ever I should be involved in an unjust prosecution (εἴ ποτε ἀδίκως εἰς κίνδυνον καθιστάμην), the better opinion that you would form of me on this account might avail to secure me.¹⁰⁰³

VII. Before the Areopagus: Defence in the Matter of the Olive-Stump, 17-18

But as it is, they have manifestly absolved me, (νῦν δὲ καὶ ἐμὲ ἀπολύσαντες φαίνονται, καὶ σφᾶς αὐτούς) and have thus taken upon themselves a share of the charge in case they are lying (καὶ σφᾶς αὐτούς, εἴπερ ψεύδονται, μετόχους τῆς αἰτίας καθιστάντες).¹⁰⁰⁴

XIII. Against Agoratus: In Pursuance of A Writ, 12.3

The others remained here, with the design of subverting the democracy: they brought Cleophon to trial (εἰς ἀγῶνα Κλεοφῶντα καθιστᾶσι), on the pretext that he did not go to the camp for his night's rest, but really because he had spoken on your behalf against the destruction of the walls. So they packed a jury for his trial, and these promoters of oligarchy appeared before the court and had him put to death on that pretext (καταστήσασθαι ἀπέκτειναν ἐν τῇ προφάσει ταύτῃ).¹⁰⁰⁵

In both instances in this passage, the technical meaning of 'brought to trial' is apparent.

III. Against Simon: Defence 38, 44-45

How, pray, should I have been treated, if the case were the opposite of what has now occurred: if I, with a number of my associates, had gone to meet Simon, and fought with him, beaten him, pursued and caught him, and then tried to drag him by force, if, as it is, and when it is he who has done all these things, I have been subjected to proceedings like the present (ὅπου νῦν τούτου ταῦτα πεποιηκότος ἐγὼ εἰς τοιοῦτον ἀγῶνα καθέστηκα), in which I risk the loss of both my native land and all the property that I possess?¹⁰⁰⁶

I could wish that I were allowed to expose this man's wickedness before you in all its other effects, so that you might have understood how in justice he ought far rather to be on trial for his life (ἵνα ἡπίστασθε ὅτι πολὺ ἂν δικαιότερον αὐτὸς περὶ θανάτου ἡγωνίζετο) than bringing others into peril of losing their native land (ἢ ἑτέρους ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος εἰς κίνδυνον καθίστη).¹⁰⁰⁷

XII. Against Eratosthenes, 81-82

...for whereas he [Eratosthenes] was at once accuser and judge of the persons brought to trial, we to-day are parties engaged (=stand, καθέσταμεν) in accusation and defence (ἡμεῖς δὲ νυνὶ εἰς κατηγορίαν καὶ ἀπολογία καθέσταμεν).¹⁰⁰⁸

¹⁰⁰³ *Lysias*: LCL 224 (1930), 384-5.

¹⁰⁰⁴ *idem*, *op cit*, 154-5 ('On the Olive-Stump', 17-18).

¹⁰⁰⁵ *idem*, 286-7 ('Against Agoratus', 12).

¹⁰⁰⁶ *idem*, 88-9 (Against Simon', 38).

¹⁰⁰⁷ *idem*, 90-93 ('Against Simon', 44-45).

¹⁰⁰⁸ *idem*, 266-7 ('Against Eratosthenes', 81-2).

The Oxyrhynchus Papyri (P Oxy) II.281¹⁻³⁰ (AD20-50) ¹⁰⁰⁹

Syra, daughter of Theon, wishes to bring her husband Serapion before the judge,

Heraclides. Syra took Serapion into her parent's house because he was destitute, but

Serapion mistreated her, and spent the dowry. Now, Syra pleads, Serapion has left her in an impoverished state. She wishes to recover the dowry which she brought to the marriage.

To Heraclides, priest, chief justice, superintendent of the chrematistae and the other courts, from Syra, daughter of Theon. I married Sarapion, bringing him by cession a dowry amounting to 200 drachmae of silver. As he was destitute of means I received him into my parents' house, and I for my part conducted myself blamelessly in all respects. But Sarapion, having squandered my dowry as he pleased, continually ill-treated and insulted me, using violence towards me, and depriving (καθιστάς) me of the necessities of life; Finally, he deserted (ἐνκατέλιπέ) me leaving me in a state (καθεστῶσαν) of destitution. I therefore beg you to order him to be brought before you (διὸ ἀξιῶ συντάξαι καταστήσαι αὐτὸν ἐπὶ σέ), in order that he may be compelled perforce to pay back my dowry increased by half its amount. This petition is without prejudice to any other claims which I have or may have against him. (lines 1-30)¹⁰¹⁰

ὁ δὲ Σαραπίων καταχρησάμενος τῇ φερνῇ εἰς ὃν ἠβούλετο λόγον οὐ διέλειπεν κακουχῶν με καὶ ὑβρί[ζ]ων καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιφερων καὶ τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἐνδεῇ καθιστάς, ὕστερον δὲ καὶ ἐνκατέλιπέ με λειπὴν καθεστῶσαν. διὸ ἀξιῶ συντάξαι καταστήσαι αὐτὸν ἐπὶ σε. (lines 14-24)¹⁰¹¹

Evident is the proliferation of same verb καθίστημι in this passage, analogous with

Deuteronomy 19:15-20LXX. This time there are three instances of the same verb καθίστημι, which Danker calls 'a neat bit of word-play'.¹⁰¹² The first instance is the use of the masculine participle καθιστάς to mean that Syra is 'left standing' without the necessities of life. The second, feminine participle καθεστῶσαν, refers to the fact that Sarapion had left Syra in 'a poverty-stricken "stance"' ¹⁰¹³ or a destitute standing or state. Oepke takes the second to be the equivalent of the equative participle οὔσαν, and the first two instances to refer to the

¹⁰⁰⁹ Grenfell & Hunt (eds & trs), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri Part II* (1899), 271-2.

¹⁰¹⁰ idem, *P Oxy II.281¹⁻³⁰*, op cit, 272.

¹⁰¹¹ idem, *P Oxy II.281¹⁴⁻²⁴*, op cit; Oepke, 'καθίστημι' *TDNT*, 3:445; Danker, 'Under Contract' (1972), 106; MM, 313.

¹⁰¹² Danker, 'Under Contract', 106.

¹⁰¹³ *ibid.*

actual state of affairs.¹⁰¹⁴ The last instance (καταστήσαι) is the technical forensic meaning of ‘bring to trial’. So too are the following three examples.

The Flinders Petrie Papyri (Petr) III.30^{ii.2}

When I appeared in your court in my suit against Eirene: καταστάντος μου ἐπὶ [σοῦ πρὸς] Εἰρήνην.¹⁰¹⁵

Papyri in John Rylands Library (P Ryl) II 65¹⁰ (65BC)

They asked that the accused should be ordered to be brought forward: ἡξίουσιν συντάξαι καταστήσαι.¹⁰¹⁶

Papyri in John Rylands Library (P Ryl) II 136¹⁴ (AD34)

To bring them before you for the ensuing punishment: καταστήσαι ἐπὶ σὲ πρὸς τὴν ἐσομένην ἐπέξοδον.¹⁰¹⁷

Aorist and Future Tenses of the finite verb καθίστημι

The following demonstrates a use of aorist and future passives of καθίστημι as in Romans

5:19, mainly in the contexts of appointments to offices. In these examples, both the appointees and the office are in the nominative and the verb is passive, the construct being equivalent to the double accusative of the active verb.

Polybius Histories (c200-118BC), Book 22 Chapter 3 Section 6¹⁰¹⁸

[Lycortas, Theodoridas and Rositeles] were appointed envoys to Ptolemy (κατεστάθησαν πρεσβευταί).

Menander of Ephesus (early 2nd BC). Fragment Concerning the Babylonians (Against the Greeks, 1.21) in Josephus, Against Apion, Book 1 Section 157 line 2¹⁰¹⁹

[Nebuchadnezzar besieged Tyre 13 years during Ithobaal III's reign, then Baal II reigned 10 years] [...] after him judges were appointed, who judged [the people] (Μετὰ τοῦτον δικαταὶ κατεστάθησαν καὶ ἐδίκασαν): Ecnibalus, the son of Baslacus [...] Chelbes [...].

Diodorus of Sicily, Library of Histories (fl 60-30BC)

- Epameinondas [...] was appointed general by the men: Ἐπαμεινώνδας ὑπὸ τῶν στρατιωτῶν κατεστάθη στρατηγός (15.71.6).
- [I]n Rome the consuls elected were: κατεστάθησαν ὕπατοι (11.41.1).
- [A]nd in Rome the following ten men were elected to draft laws; ἐν δὲ τῇ Ῥώμῃ δέκα ἄνδρες κατεστάθησαν νομογράφοι: (12.23.1).

¹⁰¹⁴ Oepke, ‘καθίστημι’, *TDNT*, 3:445.

¹⁰¹⁵ MM, 313, cited Petr III. 30^{ii.2} (Ptol).

¹⁰¹⁶ *ibid.*

¹⁰¹⁷ *ibid.*

¹⁰¹⁸ Polybius, *Histories*, 22.3.6 in LCL 160, Vol V (1926), 346-7.

¹⁰¹⁹ http://www.livius.org/men-mh/menander/menander_of_ephesus.html, accessed 20 May 2014.

- [These young men] quickly formed a body of athletes (ἀθληταὶ κατεστάθησαν) trained to deeds of war (12.75.7).
- [I]n the place of consuls three military tribunes were elected: ἀντὶ τῶν ὑπάτων τρεῖς χιλίαρχοι κατεστάθησαν (13.104.1).
- [H]ere four governors were established: ἐν ταύταις ἀρχηγοὶ τέσσαρες κατεστάθησαν (31.8.9).¹⁰²⁰

T Reinach, Papyrus Grecs et Démotiques, 18³⁸⁻⁴² (108BC)¹⁰²¹

Βιαντι· ἐ[ι εσ]τι βασιλικος
γεωργος, [πρ]ονοηθηναι ως
ἀπερισπ[αστο]ς κατασταθῆσεται
μέχρι [αν ἀπο] του σπορου
γενηται. Li θωυθ κδ

A Bias: s'il est cultivateur royal, veiller à ce qu'il soit laissé
en repos jusqu'à ce qu'il ait terminé ses semailles.

An 10,24 Thou | h.

To Bias: If he is a royal farmer, give careful thought that he will remain (= stand,
κατασταθῆσεται) undistracted until he comes from his planting.

The above papyrus shows that future passive κατασταθῆσεται can apply to a state as well as an office or task.

Καθίστημι in the New Testament

Apart from Paul's letters, καθίστημι is used by Matthew, Luke, Hebrews, James and Peter.

The meaning of 'appoint' to an office or task accounts for the majority of instances.

- Matthew 24:45: The Master set him over his household slaves to give them their food on time (κατέστησεν ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκετείας αὐτοῦ τοῦ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς τὴν τροφήν ἐν καιρῷ).
- Matthew 24:47 || Luke 12:44: Truly I tell you that he [the Master] will set him over all his possessions (ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν αὐτοῦ καταστήσει αὐτόν).
- Matthew 25:21, 23: Well done, good and faithful slave! You were faithful over a few things (ἐπὶ ὀλίγα ἢς πιστός). You will be set over many (ἐπὶ πολλῶν σε καταστήσω).
- Luke 12:14: And he [Jesus] said to him, 'Man, who set me judge or arbiter over you?' (τίς με κατέστησεν κριτὴν ἢ μεριστὴν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς;).

¹⁰²⁰ Diodorus of Siculus, *Library of History*, LCL 279, 303, 340, 375, 384, 399, 389, 422, 377, 390, 409, 423 Vols I-XXII Books 1-20, Fragments of Books 21-40 (1935) Cf 11.68.8; 11.81.1; 11.88.1; 12.32.1; 12.60.1; 12.80.1; 12.81.1; 12.82.1; 13.43.1; 13.80.1; 14.44.1; 15.14.1; 15.23.1; 15.57.1; 15.61.1; 15.71.1; 15.71.6; 15.77.1; 15.78.1; 15.82.1; 15.90.1; 16.53.1; 17.49.1; 17.74.1; 17.112.1; 18.13.6; 18.26.1; 19.5.5; 19.73.1; 37.2.6.

¹⁰²¹ Théodore Reinach, *Papyrus Grecs Et Démotiques: Recueillis En Égypte Et Publiés* (1905), 97-98. Greek text, 97; French translation, 98. Cited by MM, 313.

- Luke 12:42: Therefore, who is the faithful prudent steward, whom the Master will set over his servants (ὃν καταστήσει ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπείας αὐτοῦ) to give [them] their rations on time (τοῦ διδόναι ἐν καιρῷ [τὸ] σιτομέτριον)?
- Acts 6:3: Now search out for yourselves, brothers, seven men of good reputation from among you, full of the Spirit and wisdom, whom we will appoint over this need (ἄνδρας [...] οὓς καταστήσομεν ἐπὶ τῆς χρείας ταύτης).
- Acts 7:10: [Pharoh] appointed him [Joseph] governor over Egypt and over his whole house (κατέστησεν αὐτὸν ἡγούμενον ἐπ' Αἴγυπτον καὶ [ἐφ'] ὅλον τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ).
- Acts 7:27: Who appointed you ruler and judge over us? (τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστὴν ἐφ' ἡμῶν (cf v35).
- Hebrews 5:1: Every High Priest taken from among men is appointed on behalf of men [concerning] things [pertaining] to God (ἀρχιερεὺς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν), so that he might offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins) (cf Hebrews 8:3).
- Hebrews 7:28: The Law appoints men high priests who have weakness (ὁ νόμος γὰρ ἀνθρώπους καθίστησιν ἀρχιερεῖς ἔχοντας ἀσθένειαν).

As with the LXX and Graeco-Romans sources, active καθίστημι takes the accusative of either the office or the appointee, or both (ie double accusative, object and object complement). Frequently, ἐπὶ with the genitive denotes the sphere of responsibility, while the infinitive complement might denote the task assigned. The passive takes the appointee or the office (or both) as nominative.

Acts 17:15 evinces the well-attested meaning, to 'conduct', 'lead to' or 'to bring', thus 'those conducting Paul (οἱ δὲ καθιστῶντες τὸν Παῦλον) brought [him] as far as Athens'.¹⁰²²

The final three NT uses of καθίστημι (James 3:6, 4:4, 2 Peter 1:8), are either examples of its use as an equative verb, or of the broad meaning 'constitute', 'make', or 'become'. The usage in James 3:6 suggests the meaning 'constitutes despite appearances to the contrary'.

The tongue 'is constituted' or 'constitutes itself'¹⁰²³ the world of unrighteousness in our members (ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας ἡ γλῶσσα καθίσταται ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν), taking ὁ

¹⁰²² LSJM, 855 '2. bring down to a place'; BDAG, 596; Oepke, 'καθίστημι' TDNT, 3:444; EDNT, 225.

¹⁰²³ Taken as reflexive middle by Blomberg & Kamell, *James* (2008), 158; Laws, *James* (1980), 149, 174; Moo, *James* (2000), 158; passive by McCartney, *James* (2009), 188; Martin, *James* (1988), 114-115; BDAG, 492.

κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας as the nominative predicate of middle-passive καθίσταται.¹⁰²⁴ James is explaining what the tongue really is, or to what the tongue leads, despite contrary appearances. The tongue is small (3:4-5). At first glance, it hardly seems ‘the world of unrighteousness’. But in reality, for sinners, it is. This usage here has one affinity with the meaning ‘reckoned’, in that something does not appear to be what it really is. However, the word does not mean ‘reckoned’ here, but probably should be translated with the equative verb ‘is’, ‘the tongue *is* the world of unrighteousness’,¹⁰²⁵ or is ‘placed’¹⁰²⁶ or ‘becomes’¹⁰²⁷ or ‘makes itself’.¹⁰²⁸

Likewise, the middle-passive in James 4:4 makes an equation between ‘friendship of the world’ and ‘enmity of God’:

a	ἡ φιλία τοῦ κόσμου	ἔχθρα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν;
b	ὃς ἐὰν οὖν βουληθῇ	φίλος εἶναι τοῦ κόσμου, ἐχθρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ καθίσταται.

The principle in 4:4a grounds the conclusion in 4:4b (οὖν). Though friendship with the world might not appear to make one an enemy of God, the reality is that friendship with the world is equated (ἐστίν) with hostility toward God (v4a). Thus, if someone by deliberate choice¹⁰²⁹ chooses such a friendship with the world (ὃς ἐὰν οὖν βουληθῇ), by that fact he ‘is established’ or ‘is establishing himself’¹⁰³⁰ as God’s enemy (v4b). Middle-passive καθίσταται could be rendered ‘is’,¹⁰³¹ ‘becomes thereby’,¹⁰³² ‘has become’, ‘is made’¹⁰³³ or ‘makes himself’.¹⁰³⁴

¹⁰²⁴ Moo, *James* (2000), 158.

¹⁰²⁵ Alford, *Greek NT* (1877), 4:305; Martin, *James* (1988), 114-5.

¹⁰²⁶ McKnight, *James* (2011), 283, 335.

¹⁰²⁷ McCartney, *James* (2009), 188.

¹⁰²⁸ Moo, *James* (2000), 158.

¹⁰²⁹ Adamson, *James* (1976), 170.

¹⁰³⁰ Blomberg & Kamell, *James* (2008), 190 fn 22; Laws, *James* (1980), 149; Martin, *James* (1988), 148.

¹⁰³¹ Oepke, ‘καθίστημι’ *TDNT*, 3:446.

Similarly, in 2 Peter 1:8, the meaning is ‘become’ or ‘be’. If Christians possess and abound in the virtues listed in vv5-7, they will not ‘be’,¹⁰³⁵ ‘become’, ‘make’¹⁰³⁶ or ‘render’¹⁰³⁷ themselves (present active καθίστησιν) idle or unfruitful in their knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The Meaning of καθίστημι in δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί (Romans 5:19d)

Paul uses the verb only three times in his extant works. In Titus 1:5, καθίστημι has the common meaning of ‘appoint’, taking the accusative of the office (καταστήσης κατὰ πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους). The passive indicative finite verb is used twice in Romans 5:19, the first instance an aorist, the second a future, with οἱ πολλοί as subject and ἁμαρτωλοί or δίκαιοι as predicate nominatives in their respective clauses, though they are in the fronted emphatic position.

- a ὥσπερ γὰρ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου
- b ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί,
- c οὕτως καὶ διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς
- d δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί.

The exegetical issues will be considered in dialogue with Bird’s recent expression of his position.

For some commentators, Adam’s disobedience is imputed to sinners and then believers have Jesus’ obedience imputed to them for justification. The problem is – and I have a little rhyme about this – No matter how much people may try, *kathistēmi* does not mean *logizomai* [...]. The word *kathistēmi* refers to an actual state of affairs and not to transactions. To say that believers will be made righteous is to posit a rectification in both their legal status and in their

¹⁰³² Alford, *Greek NT* (1877), 4:313.

¹⁰³³ Kistemaker, *James* (1986), 138.

¹⁰³⁴ Laws, *James* (1980), 174; Moo, *James* (2000), 158.

¹⁰³⁵ Davids, *2 Peter, Jude* (2006), 184.

¹⁰³⁶ Kistemaker, *Peter & Jude* (1987), 256; Cf Bigg, *Peter & Jude* (1902), 259; BDAG, 492.

¹⁰³⁷ Alford, *Greek NT* (1877), 4:392.

moral state. As Tom Schreiner comments, “This is powerful evidence that righteousness in Paul, although forensic, cannot be confined in every instance to forensic categories.”¹⁰³⁸

In 2007, Bird argued:

Thus the forensic should not be over emphasized at the expense of the real change wrought at the terminus of the salvation event. The constitution has in mind, *not the completion of sanctification in becoming morally righteous* but the eschatological re-constitution of humanity at the resurrection.¹⁰³⁹ (my emphasis).

This statement in 2007 is quite consistent with Gaffin’s view that resurrection is justification *in se*. However, in 2011, Bird affirmed that καθίστημι posits a ‘rectification in their moral state’, though he denied that Paul had the moral righteousness of the many in mind in 2007. By 2011, Bird stated that Romans 5:19 refers to a ‘transformative righteousness (an actual “becoming” righteous) in addition to a forensic righteousness’,¹⁰⁴⁰ and that ‘righteousness in the Scriptures is forensic and transformative’.¹⁰⁴¹ Bird’s position expressed in 2011 is a movement away from the traditional protestant view, because Bird has posited that for Paul, justification is at least partly analytic, and not wholly synthetic. Schreiner, whom Bird cites with approval for his view that ‘righteousness’ might sometimes be ‘transformative’ in Paul, has more lately retracted this view:

They [Don Carson and Bruce Ware] persuaded me that righteousness is forensic rather than transformative, and hence what I have written here [*Paul, Apostle of God’s Glory in Christ*] is an adjustment to the view I expressed in my book *Romans: BECNT*.¹⁰⁴²

Schreiner’s position seems to be developing in a different direction to Bird’s.¹⁰⁴³

In so far as καθίστημι and λογίζομαι are different words, with different histories of usage and semantic ranges, the lyrical Bird is obviously correct in his ‘little rhyme’ that ‘*kathistēmi*

¹⁰³⁸ Bird, ‘Progressive Reformed Response’ (2011), 113.

¹⁰³⁹ idem, *Saving Righteousness* (2007), 79

¹⁰⁴⁰ idem, ‘Progressive Reformed Response’ (2011), 148.

¹⁰⁴¹ *ibid*, 297.

¹⁰⁴² Schreiner, *Paul: Apostle of God’s Glory*, 192.

¹⁰⁴³ idem, ‘Sermon: From Adam to Christ: Romans 5:12-19’ (2011), 80-90; Schreiner, ‘Justification: The Saving Righteousness of God’, (2011), 19-34.

does not mean *logizomai*'. Nevertheless, this by itself does not prove that καθίστημι cannot, in any given instance, mean something very similar to λογίζομαι. Lexemes can have 'overlapping semantic ranges' with λογίζομαι. For example, γίνομαι comes to overlap with λογίζομαι in Romans 2:25-26.

²⁵ Περιτομή μὲν γὰρ ὠφέλει ἐὰν νόμον πράσσης·
ἐὰν δὲ παραβάτης νόμου ᾖ, ἡ περιτομή σου ἀκροβυστία γέγονεν.
²⁶ ἐὰν οὖν ἡ ἀκροβυστία τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου φυλάσσει,
οὐχ ἡ ἀκροβυστία αὐτοῦ εἰς περιτομήν λογισθήσεται; (Romans 2:25-26)

Without having to try, γίνομαι¹⁰⁴⁴ comes close to meaning λογίζομαι! It is a reckoning or counting, that is intended, not some sort of literal *epipasmos*¹⁰⁴⁵ to occur. The Gentile lawkeeper is considered circumcised, while the Jewish lawbreaker's circumcision 'counts for nothing'.¹⁰⁴⁶ The mental reconsideration or 'accounting' is expressed with the broad word γίνομαι, the meaning of which is coloured by its context and the use of λογίζομαι.

A second example is ποιέω, another broad word, meaning 'make', 'do', and thus, 'bring about, cause'.¹⁰⁴⁷ It thus can mean 'create an actual state of affairs', but it can also mean 'render', 'appoint', 'install', 'deem', 'count' or 'consider'.¹⁰⁴⁸ It must be read as 'count' or 'reckon' in 2 Corinthians 5:21, where Paul says τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποιήσεν. As in Romans 2:25-26, the meaning of ποιέω is coloured by the proximate use of λογίζομαι, which indicates that a 'transaction' or 'reckoning' has occurred (μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν).¹⁰⁴⁹ Thus, ποιέω means something similar to λογίζομαι, because the 'making' or 'doing' posited does not relate to an actual state of

¹⁰⁴⁴ LSJM, 349.

¹⁰⁴⁵ 1 Maccabees 1:15; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:121; Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 232-3; Sanday & Headlam, *Romans* (1902), 67.

¹⁰⁴⁶ Alford, *Greek NT* (1877), 2:335.

¹⁰⁴⁷ LSJM, 1427.

¹⁰⁴⁸ *ibid*, 1429.

¹⁰⁴⁹ 2 Corinthians 5:19.

affairs but to an accounted or reckoned state. Christ is ‘made sin’ in the sense of sin being imputed to him. Paul specifically denies that Christ knew sin in actuality. These examples show ‘that in Paul ποιεῖν and γίνεσθαι do not necessarily bear an effective sense’.¹⁰⁵⁰

Bird’s assertion that ‘*kathistēmi* refers to an actual state of affairs’ should be challenged, and so too his statement that it must posit ‘a rectification in both their legal status and in their moral state’. Against Bird, καθίστημι can mean ‘reckon’. LSJM, gives as an attested meaning of καθίστημι as ‘reckon him as one of’,¹⁰⁵¹ and it is translated by the Loeb Classical Library as ‘numbered’. This corroborates the reading of καθίστημι in Deuteronomy 25:6LXX as ‘accounted as’.¹⁰⁵² Regarding the child of a Levirate marriage,¹⁰⁵³ the child is not in biological relationship with the dead man, but rather is reckoned to have come from the name of the dead man, ‘set down’ to have originated from him. Therefore, the meaning of καθίστημι does overlap with the semantic field of λογίζομαι, and can mean something similar to λογίζομαι, if required by context. Finally, the fact that a King can be first ‘established over a Kingdom’ but that later his Kingdom is not yet ‘established in his hands’ suggests that the verb καθίστημι may not always indicate an actual state of affairs. Sometimes Kings were established *de jure* but not *de facto*.

As far as Bird grounds his view from the denotation of καθίστημι, the foregoing shows it is not required, and the context of Romans 5:19 militates against it. That καθίστημι sometimes denotes a change in a state does not mean that in 5:19, ‘righteousness’ is a transformative category. In fact, as in Romans 2:25-26 and 2 Corinthians 5:19-21, Paul has

¹⁰⁵⁰ Oepke, ‘καθίστημι’, *TDNT*, 3:445.

¹⁰⁵¹ Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, 2.1.9.

¹⁰⁵² Cf JPS Tanak 1985.

¹⁰⁵³ Deuteronomy 25:6 LXX.

set up a context where λογίζομαι colours the verb with a wider semantic range. Paul's preceding undeniably heavy use of λογίζομαι in correlation with δικαιοσύνη in Romans 4,¹⁰⁵⁴ the use of ἐλλογεῖται (5:13) and λογίζομαι's reintroduction (6:11), all suggests that since the verb καθίστημι can carry the denotation of 'reckon', then such an influence which occurred to ποιέω¹⁰⁵⁵ and γίνομαι¹⁰⁵⁶ should also be recognized in the denotation of καθίστημι in Romans 5:19. The many will be 'established' or 'set down' as righteous in the same way that Paul has already said that God attributes righteousness to people. They are 'reckoned' righteous, and so also they will be 'established' or 'set down' righteous in the same way.

The attested forensic uses of καθίστημι, while tending to confirm the influence of λογίζομαι, adds a further connotation to Paul's use in 5:19. Most commentators fail to account for the forensic connotations of καθίστημι, though 'the forensic element is evident at v 18 (κατάκριμα – δικαίωσις).'¹⁰⁵⁷ It is a 'judicial act of καθίστημι'.¹⁰⁵⁸ According to Danker, 'almost any use of the term καθιστάναι in a legal context would intimate someone's appearance under charges before a judge [...] In Paul's usage of καθιστάναι the main purpose *is* to convey the legal atmosphere'.¹⁰⁵⁹

Paul's use in Romans 5:19 *does not* denote 'bring to trial', because the (divine) passive of καθίστημι takes subject and predicate nominative, the equivalent of the active verb taking the double accusative. The closest usage to Romans 5:19 is that in Susanna 60 LXX, where

¹⁰⁵⁴ Romans 4:6, 11, 23, 24.

¹⁰⁵⁵ 2 Corinthians 5:21.

¹⁰⁵⁶ Romans 2:25-26.

¹⁰⁵⁷ Oepke, 'καθίστημι', *TDNT*, 4:445.

¹⁰⁵⁸ Bühner, *EDNT*, 3:225; Seifrid, *Christ, Our Righteousness* (2000), 71.

¹⁰⁵⁹ Danker, 'Under Contract', 106 and fn 3.

Daniel ‘established’ (κατέστησεν) the two Jewish elders as ‘both false witnesses together’.

Likewise, in 3 Maccabees 3:19 the meaning is ‘establish’ in the sense of ‘show’, or ‘prove’.

The technical forensic use of καθίστημι has still influenced Paul’s usage in Romans 5:19.

Expressing the courts finding in the passive ‘X established Y’ (the equivalent of active ‘A establishes X to be Y’), as in Susanna 1:60LXX, is a *derivative use* of the forensic technical term, ‘to bring to court’. This is suggested by the word play on καθίστημι in *P Oxy* II.281 and the proliferation of —ιστημι root terms in Deuteronomy 19:15-20LXX. Thus, we should translate καθίστημι in 5:19 as ‘judicially establish’, or ‘established in court’. The verb καθίστημι may have appealed to Paul because he already had used the δικαί- terminology to express only one side of the judicial ledger (viz, vindication, righteousness), yet he required a judicial verb which has not in its denotation the actual finding of the court (which he expresses in 5:19 with the adjectives ἁμαρτωλοί and δίκαιοι respectively), so that he could use the one verb for both sides of his contrast for rhetorical reasons. Thus, we find a functional equivalence of the following phrases, where X represents the object of justification:

Pass καθίστημι with subj and pred Nom	= δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται X (nom) (5:19d)
Active καθίστημι with double acc	= X (acc) κατέστησεν [δίκαιοι] (cf Susanna 60 LXX)
Verbless clause + adj with prep phrase	= X (nom) δίκαιοι παρὰ [τῷ] θεῷ (2:13a; cf Gal 3:11)
Subject of divine passive δικαιοῦ	= X (nom) δικαιοθήσονται (2:13b)
Subject of pass δικαιοῦ + prep phrase	= δικαιοθήσεται X (nom) ἐνώπιον [θεοῦ] (cf 3:20; Ps 142:2 LXX)
Active δικαιοῦ with subject & object	= ὁ θεὸς δικαιοῦσιν X (acc) (3:30; Galatians 3:8)

Hence, Paul’s teaching in v19c-d is that through the instrumentality of (διὰ with the genitive) the obedience of the one man, Jesus Christ, being his entire life of obedience to the precepts of the Mosaic law, and indeed any other intratrinitarian command received by him, the many will in the future be judicially established as righteous before the tribunal of God.

The mechanism that has thus far in Romans explained the transition from all who are sinners (Romans 3:10-12) becoming the many who are judicially established righteous (5:19)

is δικαιιῶσθαι πίστει ἄνθρωπον χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου (3:28) and ὁ θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χωρὶς ἔργων (4:6). It is a future justification, or being reckoned righteous, by faith, apart from works. The ground of this future justification is Christ's work for us, being his sinless life, sinbearing death and resurrection.¹⁰⁶⁰ The future synthetic reckoning (λογισθήσεται)¹⁰⁶¹ is the functional equivalent of the future judicial establishment of righteousness. Our justification has been accomplished outside of us. The instrumentality of this future justification is the incarnation of Christ under law, his obedient life to the precept of the Mosaic law, his death bearing the penalty of that law, and vindicating resurrection, taking the life promised to the doer of the Mosaic law.¹⁰⁶²

Justification at the final judgment (Romans 2:13, 3:20)

Given the finding that the phraseology of Romans 5:19d is a functional equivalent, *inter alia*, of Romans 2:13, the question is raised whether 2:13 and the future tense of καθίστημι in 5:19 requires Bird's (more recent) view that final justification embraces transformative righteousness. Wright famously argues regarding eschatological future justification that '[j]ustification, at the last, will be on the basis of performance [...]'.¹⁰⁶³ Elsewhere Wright says of 2:13, '[t]he right way to understand this, I believe, is to see that Paul is talking about the *final* justification'.¹⁰⁶⁴ And for Wright, present and future justification are based on two different principles. 'Present justification declares, on the basis of faith, what future justification will affirm publicly [...] on the basis of the entire life'.¹⁰⁶⁵ Seifrid asserts 'Both [James and Paul] understand that our justification at the last judgment will be based upon

¹⁰⁶⁰ Romans 3:21; 4:25; 5:6-9; 5:18-19.

¹⁰⁶¹ Romans 2:26, 4:3, 5, 6, 8, 11.

¹⁰⁶² Compare Seifrid, *Christ, Our Righteousness* (2000), 71.

¹⁰⁶³ Wright, 'Romans' (2002), 440.

¹⁰⁶⁴ Wright, *What Paul Really Said* (1997), 126.

¹⁰⁶⁵ *ibid*, 129.

works'.¹⁰⁶⁶ Rainbow concludes that 'good deeds are instrumental in meeting the outstanding condition for being justified finally'¹⁰⁶⁷ and 'good deeds done by believers through God's grace will be the criterion for their final justification'.¹⁰⁶⁸ Bird's (later) view of transformational righteousness is of a piece with Wright's view of final justification,¹⁰⁶⁹ and he asserts 'justification according to works is entirely biblical (eg Romans 14:10; 2 Corinthians 5:10)'.¹⁰⁷⁰ Bird's attempt to distance himself from Wright's view cannot really stand given his view of an analytic and transformative future righteousness in Romans 5:19.¹⁰⁷¹ Most recently, Preston Sprinkle has argued 'initial justification is by grace and final justification is conditioned (in part) on spirit-empowered works'.¹⁰⁷² Schreiner, a staunch advocate of imputed righteousness, has long conceded 'Paul does teach that good works are necessary for justification and for salvation'¹⁰⁷³ and 'believers must do good works to be justified'.¹⁰⁷⁴

These quotes evidence a confused comingling of Paul's justification terminology with his terminology of judgment according to works. However, when we turn to the evidence, in each instance where Paul puts forward the proposition that justification is by works or that justification is by law, the proposition that justification is by works or by law is negated either immediately or in the course of argument. Compare Romans 2:13 with 3:20ff.

¹⁰⁶⁶ Seifrid, *Christ, Our Righteousness* (2000), 182.

¹⁰⁶⁷ Rainbow, *Way of Salvation* (2005), 206; Rainbow, 'Justification according to Thessalonians' (2009).

¹⁰⁶⁸ Rainbow, *Way of Salvation* (2005), 194.

¹⁰⁶⁹ Bird, *Saving Righteousness* (2007), 170ff.

¹⁰⁷⁰ Bird, 'Progressive Reformed View' (2011), 154.

¹⁰⁷¹ *ibid.*

¹⁰⁷² Sprinkle, *Paul and Judaism Revisited* (2013), 204.

¹⁰⁷³ Schreiner, 'Justification: The Saving Righteousness of God', 21.

¹⁰⁷⁴ *ibid.*, 31. Cf Schreiner, 'Did Paul Believe in Justification by Works?', 131-158.

οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἀκροαταὶ νόμου δίκαιοι παρὰ [τῷ] θεῷ,
ἀλλ' οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου δικαιοθήσονται (Romans 2:13)

Then...

ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιοθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ (Romans 3:20)

δικαιοῦσθαι πίστει ἄνθρωπον χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου (Romans 3:28)

Εἰ γὰρ Ἀβραάμ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη, ἔχει καύχημα, ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς τὸν θεόν. (Romans 4:2)

τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ πιστεύοντι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἀσεβῆ

λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην (Romans 4:5; compare Galatians 2:16; 3:11; 5:4)

The understanding of Romans 2:13 that gives rise to the view that justification in Paul is at least partially by works is mistaken. It fails to see that in the course of the argument of Romans 1:18-3:20, for Paul those so justified by works are an 'empty set'.¹⁰⁷⁵ Paul raises the possibility of justification by works (Romans 2:13) only to explicitly deny it (Romans 3:9-12, 19-20, 23), a denial which has been implicit since at least Romans 2:12. 'Paul's comment in Romans 2:13 is part of an argument that reaches its apogee¹⁰⁷⁶ in 3:19-20'.¹⁰⁷⁷ The proposition ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιοθήσεται (Romans 3:20) shows Romans 2:13 a null set. Nor was Abraham justified ἐξ ἔργων. Paul's strong negation (ἀλλ' οὐ: 4:2) that Abraham has a boast πρὸς θεόν (*coram deo*) renders the protasis and apodosis unreal.¹⁰⁷⁸ Boasting is excluded before the divine tribunal because Abraham was not justified by works, but by faith apart from works.

Paul lays it down in 2:12 that ὅσοι γὰρ ἀνόμως ἥμαρτον, ἀνόμως καὶ ἀπολοῦνται, καὶ ὅσοι ἐν νόμῳ ἥμαρτον, διὰ νόμου κριθήσονται. All have in fact sinned (3:10-12, 23). Only Christ is without sin (2 Corinthians 5:21). Thus, even before he articulates the principle of 'justification of the doers of the law' (2:13), Paul in Romans 2:12 has already laid the

¹⁰⁷⁵ Horton, 'Traditional Reformed Response' (2011), 159, Calvin, *Comm Romans* 2:13 in CC, 19:95-6; Institutes, III.17.13.

¹⁰⁷⁶ Highest point.

¹⁰⁷⁷ Horton, *Covenant and Salvation* (2007), 74-5.

¹⁰⁷⁸ Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:228; Lambrecht, 'Why is Boasting Excluded?' (1985), 366-7; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 260-1; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 214; Stuhlmacher, *Romans* (1994), 72.

groundwork for his conclusion in 3:9-20, 23, that are all under sin, and cannot avail themselves of justification through the law.¹⁰⁷⁹

Bird argues that Romans 2:13 cannot be hypothetical because there are no explicit markers of conditionality, such as 'if ... then'.¹⁰⁸⁰ This fails to realize that justification ἐξ ἔργων νόμου has always been conditional on performance. It is a matter of doing.¹⁰⁸¹ Since conditional, then the possibility is open that the condition may not be in fact met. Paul explicitly says the condition is not met by anyone, because all have sinned.¹⁰⁸²

Rather than limiting the meaning of ἔργα νόμου, the phrase refers to *all works* done pursuant to the law, whether the Mosaic law or the moral law of the heart, and not limited to ceremonial law or identity markers. Against Dunn, Rainbow, *et al*, οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου δικαιωθήσονται (2:13) is functionally synonymous with ἐξ ἔργων νόμου [...] δικαιωθήσεται (3:20).¹⁰⁸³ The ἔργα νόμου are 'actions performed in obedience to the law',¹⁰⁸⁴ 'a comprehensive expression that refers to the entirety of the actions and abstentions prescribed by the law'.¹⁰⁸⁵ The reason that ἔργα νόμου¹⁰⁸⁶ cannot justify is 'because no one is able to perform works to the degree needed to secure such a standing'.¹⁰⁸⁷ Thus, 'Paul's

¹⁰⁷⁹ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 142-3.

¹⁰⁸⁰ Bird, 'Progressive Reformed View' (2011), 142.

¹⁰⁸¹ Romans 7:10; 10:5; Leviticus 18:5.

¹⁰⁸² Romans 3:9-12, 19-20, 23.

¹⁰⁸³ Sprinkle, *Paul and Judaism Revisited* (2013), 186-7; Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 338-9, idem, 'Justification by Faith' (2006), 88-90; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:198; Moo, 'Works of the Law' (1983), 73-100; idem, *Romans* (1996), 208-10; idem, 'The Law of Christ' (1996), 328-333; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 168-75; idem, *Paul* (2001), 110-15; *Contra* Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:153-5; Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 266.

¹⁰⁸⁴ Moo, 'Works of the Law' (1983), 92.

¹⁰⁸⁵ Watson, *Paul and The Hermeneutics of Faith* (2004), 334.

¹⁰⁸⁶ Romans 3:20, 28; 4:3, 5.

¹⁰⁸⁷ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 217; cf idem, 'Works of the Law' (1983), 98.

argument from 1:18-3:26 must be taken as a whole' and 'Paul does not envision Romans 2:13 to be a real possibility'.¹⁰⁸⁸

Further, against Rainbow¹⁰⁸⁹ and Tridentine Catholicism,¹⁰⁹⁰ the works that are excluded from Abraham's justification¹⁰⁹¹ *includes* those works done *after* Abraham first had faith.

Paul quotes Genesis 15:6, which occurred many years subsequent to Abraham's entering the life of faith.¹⁰⁹² Rainbow argues that Paul uses Abraham as an example of 'Christian

initiation',¹⁰⁹³ but a divine declaration that occurs decades after Abraham's first evidence of

faith (Genesis 15:6) cannot be Abraham's 'initiation' into righteousness. Moreover, Paul's

use of Psalm 32:1-2 cannot be so conceived, as free justification cannot be limited to *pre-*

conversion works. The context is David as an existing member of the covenant community,

not an outsider entering the covenant. You cannot get more within the covenant than

Messiah David. Yet David's words, part of his ongoing life of faith, illustrate the proposition

θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χωρὶς ἔργων (Romans 4:6). Thus, free justification 'apart from

works' applies not merely to 'initial justification', but to the ongoing application of the same

free justification apart from works to the very end of the believer's life and into the

Judgment.¹⁰⁹⁴ The enigmatic phrase ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν¹⁰⁹⁵ likewise suggests that faith

and nothing but faith, with no admixture of works, can justify sinful humans.¹⁰⁹⁶

¹⁰⁸⁸ Sprinkle, *Paul and Judaism Revisited* (2013), 187.

¹⁰⁸⁹ Rainbow, *The Way of Salvation* (2005), 85 fn 28.

¹⁰⁹⁰ *Council of Trent, Sixth Session, Decree Concerning Justification* (1547), Chapter 8, in Olin, *Reformation Debate* (1966), 121.

¹⁰⁹¹ Romans 4:3, 5.

¹⁰⁹² Genesis 12:1, Hebrews 11:8-9.

¹⁰⁹³ Rainbow, *The Way of Salvation* (2005), 85 and fn 28; cf Schliesser, *Abraham's Faith in Romans 4* (2007), 347-50.

¹⁰⁹⁴ Calvin, *Institutes*, III.14.11, (Battles 778-9).

¹⁰⁹⁵ Romans 1:17; cf 2 Corinthians 2:16.

¹⁰⁹⁶ NIV; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 76.

By definition, Rainbow excludes any works of the regenerate from ‘works of the law’

because they are:

[T]he endeavours of Adamaic or specifically Israelite human beings to present themselves righteous before God by performing what God commands in the law of Moses, *apart from the transformation and enablement that come about through union with the crucified and risen Lord.*¹⁰⁹⁷ (my emphasis)

The consequence of this is the same as the Roman Catholic doctrine, that is, that there is no longer free justification for the regenerate. Only ‘first’ justification is by faith only and apart from any works, and thereafter subsequent and final justification is by faith-empowered works.

The proponents of this view need to show that the basis of ‘first’ justification is different to its ‘continuance’ and also ‘final’ justification. Roman Catholicism has long posited this view. If justification is the final divine verdict of acceptance on a human brought into the present, the question that must be answered is how can a synthetic initial justification which is by faith apart from any works be grounded upon an analytic final justification which is to the doer of the law by the works of the person so justified? The initial justification then is not strictly apart from works at all. It is conditional on future good works. So Paul, to be clearer, should have posited justification by good works, or justification by love. That, of course, Paul never did. Instead, as Vickers says, we must posit that ‘the end-time declaration is the same as the declaration in the present’.¹⁰⁹⁸

It is not clear how Rainbow (who does not limit ἔργα νόμου to ceremonial works or identity markers) can say the regenerate are identified with οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου δικαιωθήσονται

¹⁰⁹⁷ Rainbow, *Way of Salvation* (2005), 95.

¹⁰⁹⁸ Vickers, *Jesus’ Blood and Righteousness* (2006), 156 fn 157.

(Romans 2:13) at the final judgment, but that they are at the same time not justified from works of the law (ἐξ ἔργων νόμου...δικαιωθήσεται: Romans 3:20), which is clearly future also. The law has always been a matter of doing (Romans 10:5). Moreover, the law is not based on faith, but the man who does these things will live by them (Galatians 3:12). Rainbow probably would say regeneration and union with Christ makes the difference, posit a temporal distinction between whether the good works are done before or after ‘first justification’, and argue that preceding justification turns ‘works of the law’ into ‘good works’, which do finally justify. That fails to explain Paul’s anger with the Galatians, who had received the Spirit and baptism (Galatians 3:1-5, 27), and so presumably were regenerated, yet were seeking completion in the flesh (Galatians 3:3), and by accepting circumcision were placing themselves under the Mosaic law with the obligation to obey the whole law (Galatians 5:3). As far as we know, the Galatians had no intention to separate themselves from Christ by submitting to circumcision. Thus, it would seem that for Paul, it is possible for the recipients of the Spirit to (inadvertently) seek justification by works of the law (ἐξ ἔργων νόμου: Galatians 3:2). Thus, *contra* Rainbow, regeneration does not turn ‘works of the law’ (by which we cannot be initially justified) to ‘good works’ (by which we are finally justified). The answer to both the doctrinal issue (of justification by faith) and the ethical issue (they were biting and devouring each other: 5:26) for the Galatian church is that the Galatians must return to the hearing of faith, to the gospel by which they were justified at the beginning (ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως: Galatians 3:2), and that faith will work through love (Galatians 5:6) as they keep in step with the Spirit (Galatians 5:16-25). Thus, for Paul, it is not justified by faith at the beginning, stay justified by ‘good works’ till the end, when you are actually justified by (good) works. Rather, it is justification by faith from first to last apart from any works, and that faith-righteousness will avail at the judgment, for the justification of Paul,

Abraham and David. But this same faith which alone justifies in the Pauline sense, produces the good works of love (Galatians 5:6), and we will be judged according to these good works, as they are both evidential indicators of faith, and are promised reward.¹⁰⁹⁹

However, in no way is our final justification in the Pauline sense dependant upon our good works.

It is true that 1 Corinthians 4:3-5 brings justification language into co-ordination with the topic of judgment according to works in the clearly forensic context of the final assize: οὐδὲν γὰρ ἑμαυτῷ σύνοιδα, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ δεδικαίωμαι, ὁ δὲ ἀνακρίνων με κύριός ἐστιν.

There is clearly a judgment to each according to works (1 Corinthians 4:5). However, strictly Paul says that he is *not* justified by the fact that he is not conscious of anything against him (ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ δεδικαίωμαι: 1 Corinthians 4:4). Paul has not actually posited that he will be justified by works, but that he is *not* justified by the cleanness of his conscience.¹¹⁰⁰ He has, in fact, not said how he will be justified, though he has said that he will be judged. In the preceding context, 1 Corinthians 3:15 points the other way from final Pauline justification by works, in that Paul distinguishes between αὐτὸς δὲ σωθήσεται and εἴ τις τινος τὸ ἔργον μενεῖ ὃ ἐποικοδόμησεν, μισθὸν λήμψεται. The 'future salvation' based as it is on the θεμέλιον [...] ὃς ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός (1 Corinthians 3:11) is distinguished from the assessment of the man's work, even when it is a negative assessment.

Positing a distinction between Pauline justification by faith and judgment according to works provides an explanation how God at the final judgment will judge each for that which

¹⁰⁹⁹ M Olliffe, 'What will happen on Judgment Day?' accessed at http://sydneyanglicans.net/blogs/indepth/what_will_happen_on_judgement_day on 11 July 2014.

¹¹⁰⁰ I thank Rev Dr Peter Bolt for pointing this out to me.

was practised in the body, whether good or bad (ἐκάστος τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε φαῦλον: 2 Corinthians 5:10) and yet not count men's sins against them (μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν: 2 Corinthians 5:19). The former relates to judgment according to works, the latter to Pauline justification by faith. As Harris argues:

Since, then, the tribunal of Christ is concerned with the assessment of works, not the determination of destiny, it will be apparent that the Pauline concepts of justification on the basis of faith and recompense in accordance with works may be complementary. Not status but reward is determined.¹¹⁰¹

It is hard to conceive of Paul's words in Titus 3:5 (οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἃ ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς) as of necessity excluding post-regeneration works. The phrase 'in righteousness which we have done' suggests that they are works after righteousness is received (cf Romans 5:17). Clement of Rome (fl AD96) likewise points out that 'works of heart holiness' do not justify:

And we too, being called by His will in Christ Jesus, are not justified by ourselves, nor by our own wisdom, or understanding, or godliness, or works which we have wrought in holiness of heart (οὐ δι' ἑαυτῶν δικαιούμεθα, οὐδὲ διὰ τῆς ἡμερτέρας σοφίας, ἢ συνέσεως, ἢ εὐσεβείας, ἢ ἔργων ὧν κατειργασάμεθα ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδιάς),¹¹⁰² but by that faith through which from the beginning, Almighty God has justified all men.¹¹⁰³

It is difficult to conceive of such language as εὐσεβείας and ἔργων ὧν κατειργασάμεθα ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδιάς as denoting strictly pre-conversion works, as Rainbow's theory requires. Moreover, for Paul, the law and commandment are holy, righteous and good (ὁ μὲν νόμος ἅγιος καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ἀγία καὶ δικαία καὶ ἀγαθή: Romans 7:12). Paul exemplifies the law with the coveting command, clearly moral (Romans 7:7-11) and continually binding on the

¹¹⁰¹ Harris, *2 Corinthians* (2005), 409; Barnett, *2 Corinthians* (1997), 276-7.

¹¹⁰² J.-P Migne (ed), *Patrologia Graeca* (or *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca* (PG)1:272 accessed at http://books.google.com.au/books?id=brbUAAAAMAAJ&pg=PP9&source=gbs_selected_pages&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=XXXII&f=false on 2 June 2014.

¹¹⁰³ 1 Clement 32, in Roberts, *ANF*, 1:13.

Christian. So Rainbow's strict distinction between 'good works' and 'works of the law' is unsound.¹¹⁰⁴

In most other passages usually proffered to show Paul believed in final justification by works, as opposed to judgment to each according to works,¹¹⁰⁵ δικαιώω or its cognates is not present at all.¹¹⁰⁶ Granted, some evince a forensic context.¹¹⁰⁷ But while justification for Paul is forensic, every forensic context need not connote (Pauline) justification. If Paul wished to unambiguously imply justification, he had a word he could use: δικαιώω! And he was not afraid to use it, whether at the beginning¹¹⁰⁸ or end (Titus 3:7)¹¹⁰⁹ of his ministry. This is the methodological weakness that makes Rainbow's argument unconvincing. Rainbow assumes every instance of eschatological judgment is synonymous with justification, even if the δικαι— terminology is absent.¹¹¹⁰ Rather, judgment according to works is a distinct but related forensic event to Pauline future justification.

In Philippians 3:9,¹¹¹¹ Paul clearly speaks of the future righteousness he requires to stand before God. 'With obvious anticipation of the final judgment',¹¹¹² Paul states that the righteousness he strives to attain he has not yet received (Philippians 3:12-13). Yet this future righteousness is still through the instrumentality of faith. It is not his own, and not from his attainment through law. It is difficult to see how Paul could at once expect a

¹¹⁰⁴ Rainbow, *Way of Salvation* (2005), 79-88.

¹¹⁰⁵ Bird, 'Progressive Reformed View' (2011), 154; Sprinkle, *Paul and Judaism Revisited* (2013), 188; Rainbow, *Way of Salvation* (2005), 155-174.

¹¹⁰⁶ Romans 14:10-12, 18; 2 Corinthians 5:9-10, 9:6; 11:15; Galatians 6:7.

¹¹⁰⁷ 1 Corinthians 4:3-5; 2 Corinthians 5:9-10.

¹¹⁰⁸ Acts 13:38-39; Galatians 2:16.

¹¹⁰⁹ For Pauline authorship of the pastorals: Knight, *Pastoral Epistles* (1992), 4-52; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* (2000), xxxix-cxxix; Towner, *Timothy and Titus* (2006), 1-88.

¹¹¹⁰ Rainbow, *Way of Salvation* (2005), 174.

¹¹¹¹ See Chapter 4, above.

¹¹¹² Seifrid, 'The Faith of Christ' (2009), 145.

positive final justification of a sinner like himself through the law, but then renounce that future righteousness by the law regarding himself. *Contra* Rainbow, Paul, on the day of judgment, will rely on faith-righteousness and not his own law-righteousness.¹¹¹³ The former comes by hearing and believing,¹¹¹⁴ the later by doing.¹¹¹⁵ Thus, those scholars who represent Paul as saying that justification of the believer must be even partially by works *fundamentally misread and misrepresent Paul*.

Thus, there is no wider reason in Pauline theology or the argument of Romans to read the obedience of believers into δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί. ‘Commentators regularly go astray in supposing that Paul speaks of the obedience of believers here’.¹¹¹⁶ The only instrumentality for this judicial verdict given is διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνός, which lies totally outside us, and in the achievement of Christ for us.

The meaning of ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί (5:19b)

The meaning of καθίστημι in verse 19b is likewise the judicial establishment of the many as sinners. The verb καθίστημι in both occurrences in verse 19 is transitive and stative.¹¹¹⁷ The passive in both future and aorist instances of καθίστημι is divine. The aorist encodes perfective aspect of the event viewed from a remote distance, and given that the instrument of this ‘judicial establishment’ is διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου, being Adam’s disobedience, the aorist tense form is suitable.¹¹¹⁸ While Adam’s disobedience is temporally remote, the aorist points to the many being judicially established ‘sinners’ by a

¹¹¹³ Philippians 3:9.

¹¹¹⁴ Romans 10:6ff; Galatians 3:2.

¹¹¹⁵ Romans 2:3; 10:5.

¹¹¹⁶ Seifrid, *Christ, Our Righteousness* (2000), 71.

¹¹¹⁷ Campbell, *Basics of Verbal Aspect* (2008), 55-59.

¹¹¹⁸ *ibid*, 34-9.

God as a judicial act in summary form. The aorist is thus a foil to the future, which likewise encodes perfective aspect, though future temporal reference.¹¹¹⁹

Paul has already noted a salvation-historical issue (Romans 5:13) that effects the judicial establishment of the many as sinners (v19). Before the Mosaic law was given, sin was in the world (5:13a), as demonstrated by universal death (5:12). However, sin is not accounted for when there is no law (5:13b): ἁμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου. The technical accounting term ἐλλογέω means ‘charge to ones account’.¹¹²⁰

Paul could refer to the subjective recognition of sins.¹¹²¹ But the verb ἐλλογέω itself seems to point away from a subjective knowledge of sin to a divine debiting *by the one to whom the debt is owed* of the debt of sin against the sinner’s account. Therefore, taking the passive as divine, the absence of law during the epoch ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι Μωϋσέως in some way causes God a ‘legal problem’ in judicially establishing (καθίστημι) the sin of ‘the many’ in Adam. God is reticent to count against sinners their sins during this ‘lawless’ period. But the fact that death reigned throughout this period (as it does throughout human history) shows the reality that all are indeed under sin.¹¹²²

While trespass is sin, not all sin is trespass. ‘Trespass’ (παράβησις= ‘going aside, beyond’, so ‘overstepping’: 5:14) or ‘transgression’ (παράπτωμα= ‘false step’, ‘fall’: 5:15) requires an outward law as a standard against which someone must transgress or trespass. For sin (ἁμαρτία= ‘miss the mark’, ‘fall short’: 5:13) to become trespass or transgression, it must be

¹¹¹⁹ Campbell, *Basics of Verbal Aspect* (2008), 39.

¹¹²⁰ BAG, 251; MM, 204; Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 376 fn 81.

¹¹²¹ Calvin, *Comm Romans* 5:13, in CC, 19:202.

¹¹²² Romans 5:14; cf 3:10-12, 20, 23; 6:23.

a falling short *of some posited and propounded law*. Those from Adam to Moses did not have the Mosaic law, although Adamic man has always had, in another sense, an interior law. Gentiles who unwittingly or in ignorance conform to the Mosaic law show that they are ‘a law to themselves’, as the work of the law is written on their heart.¹¹²³

Paul’s meaning appears to be that sin can only be charged explicitly against each person’s account if that person has knowingly disobeyed a direct commandment.¹¹²⁴ God does not judicially attribute sin to evildoers where there is no posited law.¹¹²⁵ That was the situation for the epoch between Adam and Moses. While those who lived in this period ‘sinned’, their sin was not ‘trespass’ or ‘transgression’, because of the lack of a posited law. However, their death showed the reality of their own sin.

The notoriously controversial ἐφ’ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον (5:12) is best understood as ‘because all have sinned’.¹¹²⁶ Against Moo, it is more likely that Paul meant that all sinned *in their own persons*, rather than corporately ‘in Adam’. An unexpressed middle term must be supplied, that all inherited a fallen sin nature from Adam.¹¹²⁷ ‘Paul was not dealing with original sin, at least *originated* original sin, in Romans 5’.¹¹²⁸ Thus, the sin of each individual, or their underlying inherited sin-nature, explains why death has spread to all men.

The role of Adam and of his sin in Romans 5 is *to make possible the imputation, the judicial treatment, of human sins* [...] Before the law of Moses was promulgated, sin was imputed and therefore death reigned owing to the relationship of all humans to Adam, the natural and legal head or mediator.¹¹²⁹ (emphasis Blocher’s)

¹¹²³ Romans 2:14-15.

¹¹²⁴ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 332; Schreiner, ‘*Sermon: From Adam to Christ*’, 83.

¹¹²⁵ Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 377.

¹¹²⁶ Eg Moo, *Romans* (1996), 321-3.

¹¹²⁷ Genesis 6:5; 8:21; Psalm 51:5; Ephesians 2:1-3.

¹¹²⁸ Blocher, *Original Sin* (1997), 81.

¹¹²⁹ *ibid*, 77.

Hence, in later reformed-theological language, the imputation of Adam's sin is *not* an immediate imputation of *peccatum alienum*.¹¹³⁰ Rather, each has sinned in their own person, as evidenced by actual sin and their consequent death.¹¹³¹ However, Adam is the appropriate federal head to represent sinful humanity before God's tribunal. In God's 'class action' against sinful humanity, Adam is the appropriate 'named party', in whom and under whom all his offspring are also arraigned. Adam committed transgression, not just sin. His descendants prior to Moses committed sin, not transgression. But διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου, all are judicially established sinners (ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί: 5:19), meaning that God has established a basis for indicting 'lawless' sinners, through the 'transgression' of Adam. God 'sees their sins as committed against the Genesis 2 command, as grafted on to Adam's sin in Eden'.¹¹³² This crediting against them (ἐλλογέω) is appropriate, because as Adamic men and women, Adam's descendants have 'a reflection, a trace, a witness, in the heart we inherit from Adam',¹¹³³ though some of Adam's children lived without revelation of the Mosaic law.

A strong tradition amongst post-reformation theologians argues that the parallelism of Romans 5:12-21 requires positing the immediate imputation of Adam's sin.¹¹³⁴ However, the evidence suggests only a *mediate* imputation of Adam's sin, though there is (and will be) an immediate imputation of Christ's righteousness.¹¹³⁵ Calvin did not require such strict

¹¹³⁰ For criticisms of immediate imputation: Dabney, *Systematic Theology* (1878), 341-51.

¹¹³¹ Romans 2:12; 3:9-20, 23; 5:12; 6:23.

¹¹³² Blocher, *Original Sin* (1997), 77.

¹¹³³ Romans 2:13-14; Blocher, *Original Sin* (1997), 81.

¹¹³⁴ Muller, *Dictionary* (1985), 149; Murray, *The Imputation of Adam's Sin* (1959), Ch 3, republished in Oliphant, *Justified in Christ* (2007), 203-294.

¹¹³⁵ For criticisms of mediate imputation: Murray, *Imputation of Adam's Sin* (1959), Ch 3, in Oliphant, *Justified in Christ* (2007), 203-294.

parallelism in his treatment of imputation.¹¹³⁶ Calvin viewed the sin of Romans 5:12 as neither actual nor imputed, but realistic, ontological and individual: ‘we have all sinned; for we have all been imbued with natural corruption, and so are become sinful and wicked’.¹¹³⁷ ‘For Calvin, there was not a strict parallel between the fall and justification; the fall was partly forensic and partly realistic [...] Justification, however, is totally forensic.’¹¹³⁸ The rhetorical parallelism in Romans 5:12-19 does not require parallelism in meaning. Calvin propounds a different basis for the imputation of Adam’s sin (mediate, grounded on our inherited corruption) than the imputation of Christ’s righteousness (immediate, grounded on Christ’s obedience).

Conclusion

The reason for ‘the justification’ of the one, Christ (verse 18), is τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου (v19). Christ was raised from the dead because of his obedience. This brings justification for the many.¹¹³⁹ There is no reason to limit the referent of Christ’s obedience to the Isaianic Commission or intra-trinitarian command, given the requirement to keep τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου which rests on Israel¹¹⁴⁰ and that Christ assumed.¹¹⁴¹ Christ as the Jew *par excellence* kept all these righteous decrees. Instrumental διὰ with the genitive (5:19) posits that the immediate basis of the believers’ ‘judicial establishment’ as righteous before the divine tribunal is Christ’s obedience. The believer stands before God as the beneficiary of both Christ’s passive and active obedience.¹¹⁴² The verb καθίστημι does not refer to ‘transformative’ righteousness, but a judicial establishment of those in Adam as ‘sinners’

¹¹³⁶ Murray, *Imputation of Adam’s Sin*, 219ff; Clark, ‘Do This and Live’ (2007), 246 fn 71.

¹¹³⁷ Calvin, *Comm Rom 5.12* (19:201); Murray, *Imputation of Adam’s Sin*, 219.

¹¹³⁸ Clark, ‘Do This and Live’ (2007), 246 fn 71.

¹¹³⁹ Isaiah 53:11 LXX; Romans 4:25; Romans 5:19.

¹¹⁴⁰ Romans 2:26.

¹¹⁴¹ Galatians 4:4.

¹¹⁴² Longenecker, ‘Obedience’ (1974), 147.

now, and those in Christ as 'righteous' at the final assize (5:19). This future judicial decision of 'righteous' is brought into the present as the believer's ongoing justified status.¹¹⁴³ The many will be 'established' or 'set down' as righteous at the final assize (5:19) in the same way that Paul has already said that God makes people righteous, viz, by imputation.¹¹⁴⁴ Similarly, the 'legal establishment' of the many as 'sinners' through Adam, is likewise a judicial accounting against sinners (5:13), but it is grounded on actual sins (5:12) caused by the inherited corruption in our union with our federal head, Adam, and his original sin.

Justification is the final verdict of righteousness brought into the present on the ground of Christ's obedience (5:19), death (5:8-9), resurrection (4:25; 5:18), and continuing intercession (8:33-34). Rather than positing a different basis for 'final' justification compared to justification's beginning and continual progress, the nature of the case, suggests that for Paul, the sinner's justification as to its initiation, continuation and consummation all rest on the same instrumentality, viz, the believers faith in Christ and the promise and power of God, who raises the dead (4:17).

¹¹⁴³ Romans 3:21-6, 28; 5:1, 8-11.

¹¹⁴⁴ Romans 4:3, 5, 6, 11, 22.

Chapter 9

Beyond Romans 5:

Re-evaluating δικαίω in Romans 6:7 and δικαίωμα in Romans 8:4

Introduction

The argument of this thesis, if accepted, has exegetical consequences for passages beyond Romans 5, and in particular, for Romans 6:7 and 8:4. The following chapter is offered as a beginning to the process of working through the implications of the readings here adopted. In particular, the reassessment of the use of τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου in Romans 8:4 may provide further fruitful ground for supporting the imputation of both the active and passive obedience of Christ to the believer in justification.

Re-evaluating ‘The one who died has been justified from sin’(Romans 6:7)

In current discussion, many evangelical scholars who hold to a ‘basically forensic’ view of δικαίω treat its usage in δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας as anomalous. For example, concerning the use of δικαίω in verse 7, Schreiner concludes:

[R]ighteousness is more than forensic in Paul. Those who are in right relation to God have been dramatically changed; they have been made righteous.¹¹⁴⁵

More polemically, Campbell regards Romans 6:7 as an embarrassment to what he calls ‘Justification theory’.¹¹⁴⁶ Bird has consistently argued that Romans 6:7 is ‘probably the best evidence for the view that righteousness is transformative’,¹¹⁴⁷ that *‘dikaioō* is used there in

¹¹⁴⁵ Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 319.

¹¹⁴⁶ Campbell, *Deliverance of God* (2009), 825.

¹¹⁴⁷ Bird, *Saving Righteousness* (2007), 18.

the sense of liberation from the power of sin that is, transformatively',¹¹⁴⁸ and that 'justification does edge toward transformation categories in certain places like in Acts 13:39 and Romans 6:7, which both talk about being "justified from sin" (ie declaring *and* making righteous)'.¹¹⁴⁹ Bird, following Sanders, points out the parallel with Romans 6:18, where Paul explicitly says that ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ, and reasons that in terms of the denotation of δικαιοῶ, the distinction between justification as a forensic declaration, and transformation, is not absolute at the level of exegesis.¹¹⁵⁰ Bird operates with an assumption that 'justification is essentially and principally forensic'.¹¹⁵¹ He also uses a concept introduced by Carson into the recent imputation debates of distinct 'domains of discourse' in systematic and exegetical theology.¹¹⁵² Carson introduced it as a tool to clarify thinking *not* in the debate whether justification is forensic or transformative, but in an intermural dispute between those who hold justification to be exclusively (and not merely principally) forensic, so as to assist theologians and exegetes to understand each other's terminology. Bird's extended use of the principle seems to be that justification is 'essentially and principally forensic' for the purpose of systematic theology, and both forensic and transformative at the level of exegesis.

So theologically I agree that justification and transformation are distinct. Yet exegetically, I have to concede that such a distinction is not absolute at the level of the biblical text.¹¹⁵³

Macchia is probably justified to criticize Bird's assertion that the link between justification and transformation is not conceptual but logical.¹¹⁵⁴ Macchia's challenge is that Bird's view is a finding made 'seemingly out of confessional loyalty (and in tension with the wording of

¹¹⁴⁸ Bird, 'Progressive Reformed View' (2011), 114, cf 298.

¹¹⁴⁹ idem, *Evangelical Theology* (2013), 561.

¹¹⁵⁰ Idem, 'Progressive Reformed View' (2011), 114.

¹¹⁵¹ idem, *Evangelical Theology* (2013), 561.

¹¹⁵² Carson, 'Vindication of Imputation' (2004), 47-55; Bird, 'Progressive Reformed View' (2011), 104, 112-3.

¹¹⁵³ Bird, 'Progressive Reformed View' (2011), 114.

¹¹⁵⁴ idem, *Evangelical Theology* (2013), 561.

the text)¹¹⁵⁵ It seems warranted, then, to return to one of the sources of this dispute,

Romans 6:7.

Structure and Translation of Romans 5:20-6:14

A chiastic frame is evident for Romans 6:3-10, whereby 5:20 corresponds to 6:14b (a-á) with

the contrast of the realms of νόμος and χάρις, and 5:21 corresponds to 6:11-14 (b-β) with

the language of βασιλεύω (5:21; 6:12) and the two contrasting rival kings, ἡ ἁμαρτία and ἡ

χάρις (5:21), as well as the two contrasting rival Lords, Jesus Christ (κυρίου: 5:21) and sin

(κυριεύσει: 6:21). Δικαιοσύνη (5:21; 6:13) is also present. Romans 6:1-2 corresponds to

Romans 6:11-13 (c-έ), with its imperatives. At the centre of the chiasm is Romans 6:3-10.

The following is my translation.

¹¹⁵⁵ Macchia, *Justified in the Spirit* (2010), 200 fn 33.

- a ²⁰ Now law was added so that transgression might increase, but where sin abounded grace superabounded,
- b ²¹ so that, just as sin reigned [as king] (ἐβασίλευσεν) in the [domain of] death, thus also grace might reign [as king] (βασιλεύσῃ) through righteousness (διὰ δικαιοσύνης) with the result of eternal life (εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον) through Jesus Christ our Lord.
- c ^{6:1} What, therefore, will we say? 'Let us remain (ἐπιμένωμεν) in the [practice of] sin, so that the [domain of] grace might abound? ² May it never be! We died to the [the loss of master] sin. How will we still live in it[’s practice]? (ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ;)
- ³ Or don't you know that we [who] were baptized into Christ Jesus, were baptized into his death?
- ⁴ Therefore, we were buried with him (συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ) through baptism into the [domain of] death, so that, just as Christ was raised from [the] dead (ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν) through the glory of the Father, thus also we might walk in newness of life (ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν). ⁵ For if (εἰ γάρ) we have become united with (σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν) the likeness of his death¹¹⁵⁶ (τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ), then we will certainly also (ἀλλὰ καί)¹¹⁵⁷ be [united with the likeness of his] resurrection (τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα), ⁶ knowing this (τοῦτο γινώσκοντες), that our old man was co-crucified (ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη), so that the body of sin might be abolished (καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας), with the purpose that we are no longer enslaved to the [master] sin (τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ). ⁷ For the one who died has been justified from the [penalty of] sin (ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας).
- ⁸ Now if (εἰ δέ) we died with Christ (ἀπεθάνομεν σὺν Χριστῷ), we believe that we will also live with him (καὶ συζήσομεν αὐτῷ), ⁹ because we know (εἰδότες) that Christ was raised from the dead no longer to die (Χριστὸς ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκέτι ἀποθνήσκει); death no longer rules over him [as Lord] (θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει). ¹⁰ For (γάρ) that which (ὃ) he died (ἀπέθανεν), to the [claim of] sin (τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ) he died once only (ἐφάπαξ); but that which he is living, his is living to God (ὃ δὲ ζῇ, ζῇ τῷ θεῷ).
- ć ¹¹ Thus also, you must reckon yourselves (ὁμεῖς λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς) [to be] dead to [the claim of] sin but living to God (νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ) in Christ Jesus (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ).
- ¹² Therefore (οὖν), do not let sin reign [as king] (βασιλεύέτω) in the [sphere of] your mortal body (ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι) with the result that [you] obey its lusts (εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ), ¹³ nor offer (μηδὲ παριστάνετε) your members [as] weapons of unrighteousness (ὅπλα ἀδικίας) to the [master] sin (τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ), but offer (παραστήσατε) yourselves to God as (ὡσεὶ) living from the dead (ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας) and your members [as] weapons of righteousness (ὅπλα δικαιοσύνης) to God.
- ḃ ¹⁴ For sin will not rule over you [as Lord] (ἁμαρτία γὰρ ὑμῶν οὐ κυριεύσει).
- á For you are not under law but under grace (οὐ γὰρ ἐστε ὑπὸ νόμον ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ χάριν).

¹¹⁵⁶ Taking dative τῷ ὁμοιώματι as object of σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν: Moo, *Romans* (1996), 368; Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:218 fn 5; Calvin, *Comm Romans* 6:5 in CC, 19:223; Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 400; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 314-5; Contra Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 435; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:307.

¹¹⁵⁷ Conjunction ἀλλὰ introduces the apodosis emphatically: Shedd, *Romans* (1879), 153; Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 401; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 312.

Exegesis

Using a simple condition, Romans 6:3 correlates baptism into Christ with baptism into Christ's death. Romans 6:4 infers (οὖν) that we were buried with Christ, laid in Christ's grave, through the instrumentality of our baptism (διὰ with genitive) as part of our 'conversion-initiation'.¹¹⁵⁸ This has the purpose (ἵνα + subjunctive) that the conduct of our life (περιπατήσωμεν) would reflect the newness (καινότητι) that characterizes Christ's own resurrection as the inbreaking of the new age (cf Romans 7:6).¹¹⁵⁹ The newness brought in by Christ's resurrection leads to life, taking ζωῆς as an objective genitive referring to eschatological resurrection life.¹¹⁶⁰

Verse 5 provides an explanation (γάρ) for verse 4. Verse 5 consists of protasis and apodosis. In the protasis, our having been united to the likeness of Christ's death (v5a) explains our being buried with Christ through baptism (v4a). In the apodosis (v5b), the fact that we will be united to the likeness of Christ's resurrection in the future resurrection (τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα: v5b) explains our present new lifestyle (περιπατέω: v4c), which is also modeled (nb οὕτως καί) on Christ's resurrection in history (ἠγγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν: v4b). With the vast majority of commentators, σύμφυτοι [...] τῷ ὁμοιώματι is taken as elided in v5b, and the article τῆς is taken to be anaphoric, referring to Christ's resurrection.

'Likeness', ὁμοίωμα, suggests not identity but both comparison and distinction, similarity and difference.¹¹⁶¹ Thus our union is to the likeness of Christ's death. This is a manner of speaking about the believer individually appropriating in the present Christ's once for all

¹¹⁵⁸ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 366, following Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, (1970), 145.

¹¹⁵⁹ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 366.

¹¹⁶⁰ *ibid*, 366 fn 71.

¹¹⁶¹ Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 313-4.

death in history by faith. Our death and Christ's death is not the same but similar. We do not die a natural death like Christ in the flesh, but we die to ourselves.¹¹⁶² This likeness of Christ's death, that believers die, is visually and sensorily dramatized and sacramentally appropriated in its own way, by water baptism, when rightly received in faith.¹¹⁶³ Baptism can be regarded as a moment of faith.¹¹⁶⁴ Since we have been united to Christ in the likeness of his death, our union will also be to the likeness of Christ's resurrection, which is the eschatological resurrection.¹¹⁶⁵ The resurrection of believers is the likeness of Christ's resurrection, to which it is organically related, as harvest is to firstfruits.

In verse 6, participle γινώσκοντες marks attendant circumstances.¹¹⁶⁶ Our old man was co-crucified with Christ. The phrase ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος is the man belonging to the era of Adam,¹¹⁶⁷ the man who lives under the tyranny of sin and death.¹¹⁶⁸ Christians, however are no longer in Adam but in Christ (indicative). The language is representational, positional and forensic, picking up the contrast between Adam and Christ in 5:15-19.¹¹⁶⁹ Romans 6:6 provides the mechanism for movement from those who die 'in Adam' to becoming those who live 'in Christ'.¹¹⁷⁰ The resolution of 5:19, which puts in parallel our existing judicial establishment as sinners through the one man, Adam, and our future judicial establishment as righteous through one man, Christ, is found in the fact that 'our old man',¹¹⁷¹ the 'us in

¹¹⁶² Calvin, *Comm Romans* 6:5 in CC, 19:223.

¹¹⁶³ Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:317; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 314; Ridderbos, *Paul* (1975), 406-12; Calvin, *Comm Romans* 3:4, in CC, 19:221.

¹¹⁶⁴ Kim, *The Origin of Paul's Gospel* (1981), 304.

¹¹⁶⁵ Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 401-2.

¹¹⁶⁶ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 372.

¹¹⁶⁷ Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:318.

¹¹⁶⁸ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 373.

¹¹⁶⁹ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 373-4; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 315.

¹¹⁷⁰ 1 Corinthians 15:22.

¹¹⁷¹ Colossians 3:9.

Adam', was crucified with Christ, the last Adam.¹¹⁷² The old man was co-crucified (συνεσταυρώθη), and thus those in Christ have been transferred from the old age to the new age.¹¹⁷³ The purpose¹¹⁷⁴ (ἵνα with subjunctive) of co-crucifixion was that the body of sin (τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας) be abolished (καταργέω). In other words, the rule of sin was decisively brought to an end¹¹⁷⁵ for those united to Christ's death. Τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας refers to the whole old man that belongs to the age ruled by sin and death.¹¹⁷⁶ The purpose, expressed by the genitive articular infinitive, is that we no longer are enslaved to personified sin (τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ). Those in Christ have been liberated from sin as a slave master. Verse 6 expresses indicative, not imperative.¹¹⁷⁷ Believers are now removed from the mastery of sin and now are under the Lordship of Christ.¹¹⁷⁸

Verse 7 is explanatory (γάρ) of vv5-6. Thus, v7 explains how we will be united in the likeness of Christ's resurrection (τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ: v 5b), and how freedom from sin's mastery (v6c) has been achieved. The aorist adjectival singular participle (ὁ ἀποθανών) is taken by most commentators as gnomic,¹¹⁷⁹ expressing a timeless aphorism, a general maxim, that 'death severs the hold of sin'.¹¹⁸⁰ Campbell points out this section is 'highly christocentric'¹¹⁸¹ and Kearns points out that the three other occurrences of the aorist participle in Paul refer to Christ, including the instance in Romans 8:34 (Χριστὸς [Ἰησοῦς] ὁ

¹¹⁷² Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 316.

¹¹⁷³ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 374.

¹¹⁷⁴ Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 316; Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 404.

¹¹⁷⁵ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 375; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:319.

¹¹⁷⁶ Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 402-3.

¹¹⁷⁷ *Contra* Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:320.

¹¹⁷⁸ Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 404.

¹¹⁷⁹ Wallace, *Greek Grammar* (1996), 562.

¹¹⁸⁰ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 377.

¹¹⁸¹ Campbell, *Deliverance of God*, 825.

ἀποθανών, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐγερθείς).¹¹⁸² Christ as the subject of passive δικαίω is also found at 1 Timothy 3:16.¹¹⁸³ Thus, primarily the verse refers to a specific death, the death of Jesus.¹¹⁸⁴ Likewise, Wedderburn prefers the view that Romans 6:7 is a Christological statement, not primarily a general maxim: 'in the first place the one who has died is Christ, although with him all died as well (2 Corinthians 5:14)'.¹¹⁸⁵ The aorist should primarily be viewed encoding perfective aspect and remoteness, with punctiliar *Aktionsart*. It refers to Christ's death in history viewed summarily.

However, the gnomic understanding of the aorist need not be absolutely excluded as 'ὁ ἀποθανών does refer to the believer, but only in so far as he has died with Christ'.¹¹⁸⁶ Kearns sees Paul speaking on multiple levels simultaneously.¹¹⁸⁷ Likewise, ὁ ἀποθανών should be seen to operate (1) on the level of Christ's own experience of death and resurrection, the latter of which was his justification, and (2) on the level of the believer's union with Christ in that justification, in which both Christ's death¹¹⁸⁸ and resurrection¹¹⁸⁹ bring about the believer's justification. According to the nature of the case (union with Christ), it is unsurprising that there might be polyvalence on two or more levels – that of Christ and the believer – because the history of Christ and its implications for him become ours by virtue of that union.

¹¹⁸² Kearns, 'Romans 6,7' (1963), 304.

¹¹⁸³ *ibid*, 305.

¹¹⁸⁴ Scroggs, 'Romans VI.7' (1963), 106, 7.

¹¹⁸⁵ Wedderburn, *Baptism and Resurrection* (1987), 64-5.

¹¹⁸⁶ Scroggs, 'Romans VI.7' (1963), 106.

¹¹⁸⁷ Kearns, 'Romans 6:7' (1963), 307.

¹¹⁸⁸ Romans 3:21-26; 4:25; 6:9.

¹¹⁸⁹ Romans 4:25, 5:18-19; cf Romans 5:9-10.

Fitzmyer and Dunn argue a primary reference to Christ renders Romans 6:10

tautologous.¹¹⁹⁰ But on the primarily Christocentric reading, something unique is brought to the pericope by verse 7, viz, the notion of Christ's justification, implicitly by resurrection, which is not found in v10.

On the primarily Christological reading of verse 7, Christ, the one who died in history, has been justified from sin, not his own sin, but the representation or finding of his criminality through judicial condemnation and crucifixion. This potentially explains v5b, (we will be [united with the likeness of his] resurrection: [τῷ ὁμοιώματι] τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα), because resurrection is a *de facto* justification. Christ's justifying resurrection is analytical with respect to him, because it is based on his righteousness,¹¹⁹¹ but our justifying resurrection at the eschaton is synthetic, based not on our own righteousness but Christ's. This accounts for both similarity and dissimilarity embedded in τῷ ὁμοιώματι. Our resurrection is like Christ's in that it is bodily and organically related to his as harvest to firstfruits. It is unlike Christ's in that ours is a gratuitous, not merited, justification.

The Christological reading of verse 7 also explains v6c, in that since the guilt or penalty of sin is dealt with (v7), the enslavement is ended to sin as a power (v6c). Forensic justification (v7) provides the ground (note γάρ) for liberation (v6c), because Christ, by blotting out our indebtedness to the guilt of sin, has subjugated the power of sin. The cancellation of the legal indictment is the removal of the means of enslavement.¹¹⁹²

¹¹⁹⁰ Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 437; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:321.

¹¹⁹¹ Romans 5:18-19.

¹¹⁹² Colossians 2:14-15; Hebrews 2:14; Blocher, 'Agnus Victor' (2002), 84-5.

Many scholars understand perfect divine passive δεδικαίωται (v7) as not primarily forensic but liberative, thus, 'freed from sin', rather than 'justified from sin'.¹¹⁹³ Campbell regards the presence of ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας as an acute problem for Justification theory.¹¹⁹⁴

Concomitantly, the supply of any of the meanings advocated by Justification theory simply makes no sense; Christ cannot die, leave the dominance of sin behind, and so be acquitted or justified or even vindicated.¹¹⁹⁵

The first mistake Campbell is making is to take the aorist participle ὁ ἀποθανών as providing the agency of Christ's justification, rather than simply the identity of Christ as the person justified.¹¹⁹⁶ On the Christological reading, Christ is the one who died, but it is not Christ's death that justified him, but his resurrection.¹¹⁹⁷ Christ's death has justifying significance for others in him, but not primarily for him.¹¹⁹⁸

Second, of course Christ can be justified or vindicated! The crucified Christ must be. Jesus Christ in history was found guilty of a capital offence and endured the wages of sin, death.¹¹⁹⁹ Christ was justified from the slanderous implications of his crucifixion¹²⁰⁰ by resurrection.¹²⁰¹

¹¹⁹³ Eg Calvin, *Comm Romans* 6:7 in CC, 19:7; Barrett, *Acts 1-14* (1994), 1:650; Hansen, 'The Preaching and Defence of Paul' (1998), 305; Campbell, *Deliverance of God* (2009), 826.

¹¹⁹⁴ Campbell, *Deliverance of God* (2009), 826-7.

¹¹⁹⁵ *ibid*, 826.

¹¹⁹⁶ Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness* (1972), 200 fn 2 makes the same mistake. Laato erroneously regards Christ as justified by his own death: Laato, 'Paul's Anthropological Considerations' (2004), 348.

¹¹⁹⁷ Romans 1:4; 4:25; 5:18.

¹¹⁹⁸ In so far as Christ's death was 'obedience' to the Father, it is part of the ground of his divine justification by resurrection, because Christ obeyed in everything and so received a court-approved declaration of righteousness.

¹¹⁹⁹ Romans 6:23.

¹²⁰⁰ Galatians 3:10-14.

¹²⁰¹ Acts 2:22-24; 3:13-15.

Third, attributing the meaning of ‘free’ or ‘liberate’ to δικαίω is not well attested,¹²⁰² while a forensic meaning of δικαίω is well attested, especially in Paul.¹²⁰³ Ziesler regards it as a ‘difficulty’ to interpret δικαιοῦν as ‘freedom from the power of sin’ because it is ‘an unusual meaning’.¹²⁰⁴ Dunn questions its adequacy,¹²⁰⁵ and Reumann says ‘the forensic sense is most likely’.¹²⁰⁶

Fourth, τῆς ἁμαρτίας in verse 7 should not be regarded as ‘sin as power’ (*pace* Campbell) but sin as act incurring guilt or penalty. This accounts for the presence of δικαίω which *prima facie* suggests forensic guilt and penalty.¹²⁰⁷

Fifth, rendering δικαίω ‘free’ is not ‘fully satisfactory’ as ‘this line of interpretation renders v7 virtually a redundant restatement of the preceding verse and weakens the argumentative force of γάρ’.¹²⁰⁸

Sixth, the forensic meaning of δεδικαίωται best suits verse 10, where Christ ἀπέθανεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἐφάπαξ. Christ’s death is not directed to sin as a power but toward or for sin in that it either has a claim of right, or it incurs guilt and penalty.¹²⁰⁹ Christ died to sin in that he who knew no sin became sin for us.¹²¹⁰ He came in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin.¹²¹¹

¹²⁰² The meaning is not given by LSJM, 429; MM, 162-3.

¹²⁰³ Cf Sanday & Headlam, *Romans* (1902), 159; Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 437; Wright, ‘Romans’ (2002), 540; Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:222; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:311 fn 1; Shedd, *Romans* (1879), 155.

¹²⁰⁴ Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness* (1972), 200.

¹²⁰⁵ Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:320.

¹²⁰⁶ Reumann, *Righteousness in the New Testament* (1982), 81.

¹²⁰⁷ Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 320; Scroggs, ‘Rom VI.6’, 105.

¹²⁰⁸ Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 405.

¹²⁰⁹ Shedd, *Romans* (1879), 157.

¹²¹⁰ 2 Corinthians 5:21; Sanday & Headlam, *Romans* (1902), 160.

¹²¹¹ Romans 8:3; Wright, ‘Romans’ (2002), 540.

To die to sin is to die under its weight.¹²¹² ‘He bore for them [sinners] the full penalty of their sins’.¹²¹³

Seventh, the fact that ἐλευθερώω in verse 18,22 also takes ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας need not alter the meaning of δικασιώω in verse 7 (*contra* Sanders, Bird), nor does it mean that the action of the verbs is the same. It is difficult to understand why Paul would use δικασιώω to mean ‘liberate’ or ‘free’ when there are many excellent expressions with that undoubted meaning that he actually employs throughout chapter 6 (τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν: 6:6; ἐλευθερωθέντες: 6:18, 22; ἐλεύθεροι ᾗτε: 6:20). As Wright quips:

Why, then, ‘justified,’ rather than ‘freed’? The answer must be that, unlike most of his recent readers, Paul is able to keep the lawcourt metaphor still running in his mind even while expounding baptism and the Christians solidarity in Christ. The Christian’s freedom from sin comes through God’s judicial decision.¹²¹⁴

Eighth, regarding other examples of δικασιώω with ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας often cited (Sirach 26:28,¹²¹⁵ *Testament Simeon* 6:1¹²¹⁶), neither must mean ‘freed’, and each of them could quite easily be rendered ‘justified’. Leenhardt, after considering some of them, says: ‘To be justified is to be the object of a judgment which exculpates and restores to the accused freedom of person’.¹²¹⁷

¹²¹² Wright, ‘Romans’ (2002), 540-1

¹²¹³ Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:314.

¹²¹⁴ Wright, ‘Romans’ (2002), 540.

¹²¹⁵ ‘Two sorts of callings have appeared to me hard and dangerous: a merchant is hardly free from negligence: and a huckster shall not be justified from the sins of the lips’ (Sirach 26:28 Douay-Rheims). Greek: μόλις ἐξελεῖται ἔμπορος ἀπὸ πλημμελείας καὶ οὐ δικαιωθήσεται κάπηλος ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας: Bibleworks7.

¹²¹⁶ ‘See, I have told you everything, so that I might be exonerated with regard to your sin’: Charlesworth, *OT Pseudipigrapha* (1983), 1:787.

¹²¹⁷ Leenhardt, *Romans* (1957), 163.

Ninth, the closest usage to Romans 6:7 is in Acts 13:38-39, in which Luke cites Paul as teaching ‘forgiveness and justification are benefits of Jesus’ resurrection’,¹²¹⁸ teaching which perfectly accords with Romans 4:25, 5:18. Paul’s exposition of ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν by δικαιοῶ and *vice versa* through the instrumentality of faith (ὁ πιστεύων δικαιοῦται) in Acts 13:38-9 accords with ἀφέθεσαν [...] αἱ ἁμαρτίαι as a scriptural proof of λογίσεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην in Romans 4:5-7.¹²¹⁹ There is no reason to think πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων δικαιοῦται in verse 39 should be rendered in any way but in the normal Pauline sense, ‘everyone who believes is justified in this’ (ἐν τούτῳ πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων δικαιοῦται).¹²²⁰ Therefore, it is not likely that Paul would have used two instances of δικαιοῶ in the space of 7 words to mean ‘free’ in the first instance and ‘justify’ in the second (Acts 13:38-39).¹²²¹ In both instances it should be understood to ‘refer to forensic acquittal’.¹²²²

Re-evaluating τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν (Romans 8:4)

Romans 8:4 has been considered one of the *sedes doctrinae* for imputed righteousness since the reformation. However, almost all modern scholars (including those in the imputation debate) find that the phrase ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν (Romans 8:4a) refers to the works or Christian obedience of believers, who now by the Spirit are enabled to fulfill the law’s prescriptions, and thus Romans 8:4a has no relevance to the imputed righteousness debate.¹²²³ Excluding Moo,¹²²⁴ imputation’s supporters do argue for imputed

¹²¹⁸ Hansen, ‘Preaching and Defence of Paul’ (1998), 305.

¹²¹⁹ Peterson, *Acts* (2009), 394.

¹²²⁰ *ibid.*

¹²²¹ *Contra* Peterson, *Acts* (2009), 394.

¹²²² Schnabel, *Acts* (2012), 583-4; Quell & Schrenk, *Righteousness* (1951), 65; Fitzmyer, *Acts* (1997), 518-19; Johnson, *Acts* (1992), 236.

¹²²³ Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:423-4; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 404-5; Wright, ‘Romans’ (2002), 580; Witherington & Hyatt, *Romans* (2004), 214-15; Jewett, 485-6; Bruce, *Romans* (1985), 153; Morris, *Romans*

righteousness from other passages.¹²²⁵ Many of imputation's recent defenders do not refer to Romans 8:3-4 at all.¹²²⁶ This is in marked contrast with Calvin (AD1509-64)¹²²⁷ and those who followed him,¹²²⁸ who argued that Romans 8:3-4 teaches the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the believer.

Nevertheless, some NT scholars have recently re-opened the question of the meaning of δικαίωμα. Hooker, connecting the usage of δικαίωμα in Romans 5:16, 18 to 8:4, understands δικαίωμα in 8:4 to mean 'the Law's requirement that we should be found righteous'¹²²⁹ or 'the law's requirement of righteousness'.¹²³⁰ In both 5:18 and 8:4, 'Paul is concerned with the declaration of righteousness which reverses our previous condition of being under condemnation'.¹²³¹ An analogous view has been adopted by Wright,¹²³² Seifrid,¹²³³ and

(1988), 303-4; Stuhlmacher, *Romans* (1994), 120-1; *idem*, *Revisiting Paul's Doctrine of Justification* (2001), 56; Bird, *Saving Righteousness* (2007), 173; Kirk, 'Sufficiency (1)' (2006), 64; McFadden, 'Fulfillment of the Law's *Dikaiōma*' (2009), 483-97; Sprinkle, *Paul and Judaism Revisited* (2013), 107 fn 37.

¹²²⁴ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 483-4; *idem*, 'Israel and the Law in Romans 5-11 (2004)', 207. Also Horton, *Covenant and Salvation* (2007), 121-2; *idem*, *The Christian Faith* (2011), 420; Pate, *Reverse of the Curse* (2000), 266-267.

¹²²⁵ Murray, *Romans* (1959), 1:282-4; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:383-5; Hoekema, *Saved By Grace* (1989), 227; Piper, *Counted Righteous* (2002), 79-80; *idem*, *The Future of Justification* (2007), 215-225; Vickers, *Justification by Grace* (2013), 159-60.

¹²²⁶ Carson, 'Vindication of Imputation' (2004); Vickers, *Blood and Righteousness* (2006); Venema, *Gospel of Free Acceptance* (2006); Johnson & Waters, *By Faith Alone* (2006); Oliphint, *Justified in Christ* (2007). Piper, after brief analysis, dismisses it: Piper, *Future of Justification* (2007), 215-16.

¹²²⁷ Calvin probably held the substance of the doctrine: Berends, 'The Obedience of Jesus Christ (2001)', 35; Wübbenhörst, 'Calvin's Doctrine of Justification' (2006), 114; Morris, *Apostolic Preaching* (1965), 281. *Contra* Clifford, *Atonement and Justification* (1990), 199 n 33; *idem*, 'Justification: The Calvin-Saumur perspective' (2007), 331-348.

¹²²⁸ **Thomas Jacomb (1622-87)**, *Sermons on Romans 8:1-4* (1672), 353ff, on whom Owen completely relies: **John Owen (1616-83)**, *Justification* (1677) in *Works*, 5:338; **John Gill (1697-1771)**, *Romans* (1746), 247-8; **Robert Haldane (1764-1842)**, *Romans* (1874), 325-327; **Octavius Winslow (1808-78)**, *No Condemnation: Romans 8* (1853), 43-52; **W G T Shedd (1820-94)**, *Romans* (1879), 231-3; **Charles Hodge (1797-1878)** *Romans* (1864), 254-5.

¹²²⁹ Hooker, *Adam to Christ* (1990), 32.

¹²³⁰ *idem*, *Paul* (2003), 98.

¹²³¹ *idem*, *Adam to Christ* (1990), 32.

¹²³² Wright, *Climax of the Covenant* (1991), 212.

¹²³³ Seifrid, *Christ, Our Righteousness* (2000), 119.

Gathercole,¹²³⁴ that the righteous decree of the law in 8:4 is the verdict of ‘life’,¹²³⁵ Wright says:

The meaning of τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου is best explained as ‘the just decree’, ie the decree that gives life in accordance with the covenant. This is complex, because Paul evidently intended the word to carry two connotations: first, of a decree which is itself just, and second, of a decree which announces, justly, that certain people are in the right, ie a justifying decree.¹²³⁶

Horton’s comment suggests Wright is making exegetical decisions moving towards the traditional protestant view:

The Reformation doctrine says as much as well: the law declares us righteous, since Christ’s righteousness is credited to us.¹²³⁷

Wright believes that commentators have been misled into treating the word δικαίωμα as indicating performance of the law’s demands by the apparent emphasis on ethical behavior which immediately follows in 8:4b. According to Wright, the believer’s behavior is simply evidence that a certain group of people are now in the Spirit.¹²³⁸

Moving even closer to a traditional protestant perspective on Romans 8:4 is Seifrid:

[I]t is best to understand this ‘righteous ordinance’ as the ‘life’ which the law offered on the condition of obedience, and that the resurrection from the dead is ‘the fulfillment of the righteous ordinance of the law.’¹²³⁹

Tantalisingly, Seifrid says:

He [Christ] vindicated us and gave us the life which the law offers by *first* effecting the sentence of death which it pronounces upon us.¹²⁴⁰ (my emphasis)

¹²³⁴ Gathercole, ‘Justified by Faith, Justified by his Blood’, (2004) 177.

¹²³⁵ McFadden, ‘Fulfillment of the Law’s *Dikaiōma*’ (2009), 484-6.

¹²³⁶ Wright, *Climax of the Covenant* (1991), 211.

¹²³⁷ Horton, *Covenant and Salvation* (2007), 122.

¹²³⁸ Wright, *Climax of the Covenant* (1991), 212.

¹²³⁹ Seifrid, *Christ, Our Righteousness* (2000), 119.

¹²⁴⁰ *ibid.*

Imagine if Seifrid added this sentence: ‘Christ also vindicated us and gave us the life which the law offers by secondly fulfilling the condition of obedience for receiving life which the law promises us.’ Such a sentence would teach the essence of the imputed righteousness of Christ’s active obedience.

Moreover, the fact that some patristic sources,¹²⁴¹ the Vulgate,¹²⁴² and Roman Catholic scholars¹²⁴³ all support what we might call an ‘objective’¹²⁴⁴ interpretation of ‘the δικαίωμα of the law fulfilled in us’ in Romans 8:4, and not a ‘subjective’ view that the fulfillment is the Spirit-wrought obedience inherent to us, should again give us reason to pause before we label the traditional reformed exegesis as overly influenced by systematic considerations.

On the other hand, McFadden has recently defended the modern consensus that the Christian’s own obedience fulfills τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου in Romans 8:4a.¹²⁴⁵ All this merits a return to Romans 8:1-4, in the light of the linguistic evidence of the meaning of δικαίωμα outlined in chapters 5-7, above.

Paul and the Law

The law’s true purpose in the realm of sin is stated in Romans 4:15, ὁ γὰρ νόμος ὀργὴν κατεργάζεται· οὗ δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος οὐδὲ παράβασις. Firstly, the Mosaic law produces divine wrath (4:15a). This is because sin operating through the commandments produces lust (Romans 7:8), which produces acts of transgression (Romans 5:20), against which God’s

¹²⁴¹ Eg, **John Chrysostom (344-407)** Hom 13, Rom 8:4 in *Homilies on Romans* in Schaff, *N & PNF* Ser 1, 11:433; **Ambrosiaster (fl c366-384)** CSEL 81:257-9, in Bray, *Romans* (1998), 205.

¹²⁴² The vulgate rendering as ut iustificatio legis has ‘thrown the weight of the Romanist interpreters on the side of ‘justitia imputata’: Alford, *Greek NT* (1877), 2:388.

¹²⁴³ Knox, *New Testament* (1957), 154; Benoit, *Jesus and the Gospel* (1974), 2:28-32; Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 488.

¹²⁴⁴ Benoit, *Jesus and the Gospel* (1974), 2:32.

¹²⁴⁵ McFadden, ‘Fulfillment of the Law’s *Dikaiōma*’ (2009), 483-97.

present (Romans 1:18) and eschatological (Romans 2:8) ὀργή is directed. Second, the absence of law means there is no transgression (v15b), not because there is no sin, but because, for Paul, παράβασις is a particular species of sin provoked by, in contravention of, and directed against, ὁ νόμος.¹²⁴⁶ Thus, in the realm of sin, the Mosaic law produces even more wrath, because it renders sinners even more accountable to God than they were without law.¹²⁴⁷ A similar logic underlies Romans 5:20. The principle of sin ruling over humanity prompts specific infractions against the posited and known law. Thus, the reason God brought in the law of Moses was that trespass might increase: νόμος δὲ παρεισηλθεν ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα (Romans 5:20). The law does not enter to change the situation created by Adam, but makes it worse.¹²⁴⁸ This was for a noetic anthropological purpose, so that men and women would subjectively know that they were sinners, as well as intensifying the sin into deliberate transgression.¹²⁴⁹ Far from salvific, Paul ranges the law with Adam, sin and death, against grace, Christ, righteousness and life.¹²⁵⁰

In Romans 6:1-13, ὁ νόμος recedes into the background, as Paul answers his first rhetorical objection (ἐπιμένωμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ: v1) by explaining how union with Christ in his death to sin ends the reign of sin and death for those united with Christ through baptism into death, so that Christians can now walk in resurrection life. After the imperatives of 6:11-13, Paul returns to the indicative in verse 14. Sin as power will not reign over Christians, for Christians are not ὑπὸ νόμον ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ χάριν (Romans 6:14, 15). Νόμος is thus a salvation-historical actor, the now Old Covenant Mosaic law, aligned with sin and an instrument of

¹²⁴⁶ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 276-7.

¹²⁴⁷ *ibid*, 277.

¹²⁴⁸ *ibid*, 347.

¹²⁴⁹ Cf *ibid*, 347-8.

¹²⁵⁰ *ibid*, 348.

sin's rule, in contrast with the new reign of χάρις brought in by Christ. Thus, those who live ὑπὸ νόμον live under the regime of νόμος, over which the ruler is sin. The law is *the power of sin* (ἡ δὲ δύναμις τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ νόμος: 1 Corinthians 15:56).¹²⁵¹ In contrast to offering our members to sin, our members are to be offered as weapons of δικαιοσύνη to God (Romans 6:13), δικαιοσύνη being the gifted righteousness received and possessed by believers (Romans 5:17, 21¹²⁵²). Christians' members are now offered as weapons of the judicially established righteousness attributed to them through the obedience of Christ (Romans 5:20).¹²⁵³

The law again recedes into the background through Romans 6:15-23, as Paul answers his second rhetorical objection (ἁμαρτήσωμεν: v15). Paradoxically, the regime of law (ὑπὸ νόμον: v15) ruled by sin (ἁμαρτία: v16) led to lawlessness into ever increasing lawlessness (τῇ ἀνομίᾳ εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν: v19; cf 5:20). Throughout 6:15-23, Paul is using rhetorically stretched language, ἀνθρώπινον λέγω διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν, 'I speak in a human way, because of the weakness of your flesh' (v19). Thus, the motifs of slavery to 'obedience leading to righteousness' (ὑπακοῆς εἰς δικαιοσύνην: v16), the Roman Christians' obeying from the heart the type of teaching to which you were delivered over (ὑπηκούσατε δὲ ἐκ καρδίας εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδασχῆς: v17),¹²⁵⁴ their enslavement to righteousness (ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ: v18), the presentation of their members as slaves to righteousness leading to sanctification (δοῦλα τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἁγιασμόν: v19), and

¹²⁵¹ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 387-91; Nygren, *Romans* (1952), 248.

¹²⁵² Nygren rightly identifies 'righteousness' in ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσεν διὰ δικαιοσύνης (Romans 5:21) as the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, the new righteousness which God gives us in Christ: Nygren, *Romans* (1952), 228.

¹²⁵³ *Contra* Moo, *Romans* (1996), 386-7, who takes δικαιοσύνη in 6:13 is not forensic but moral. However, it is better to see this righteousness as the same as 5:17,21 as both forensic and moral, being the gift of righteousness received from Christ and judicially established for believers through the obedience of Christ. Our members are offered as weapons of imputed righteousness to God. I thank Rev Dr Peter Bolt for directing my attention to this possibility.

¹²⁵⁴ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 400.

their freedom from righteousness (ἐλεύθεροι ἦτε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ: v20), are all forms of speech that Paul uses as concessions to human weakness, and probably not the language which he would prefer to use as best representing the Christian's status. His preferred language is most likely that they are not slaves again to fear but have received the Spirit of adoption to sonship (Romans 8:14-16).¹²⁵⁵ Moreover, the language of obedience (ὑπακοή, ὑπακούω) should be taken as a reference to the hearing (ἀκοή) that submits (ὑπό) in faith to the gospel message (Romans 1:16-17, cf ὑπήκουσαν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ: 10:16, ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς: 10:17, and ὑπακοήν πίστεως, 1:5, 16:26).¹²⁵⁶ 'Obedience leading to righteousness' is thus an equivalent for faith-righteousness, the righteousness reckoned by faith, and 'slavery to righteousness' is the new 'enslavement' to the forensic gift of imputed righteousness given through Christ's resurrection (5:16-19). This slavery to 'Christ's righteousness' also leads to sanctification (τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἁγιασμόν: v19). While the verbal noun ἁγιασμός might refer to a state of consecration or holiness,¹²⁵⁷ it is more likely given that δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἁγιασμόν (v19; cf v22) is parallel with τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἀνομίᾳ εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν (v19), which speaks of a degenerative process of uncleanness and lawlessness leading to [more] lawlessness,¹²⁵⁸ that ἁγιασμός most probably means progressive ethical holiness.¹²⁵⁹ Thus, 'slavery' to the gift of Christ's imputed righteousness leads to progressive ethical holiness. Justification by faith and sanctification are organically linked (δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἁγιασμόν), but play distinct roles in our salvation.

¹²⁵⁵ I thank Rev Dr Peter Bolt for these insights. Also Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:325-6.

¹²⁵⁶ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 400.

¹²⁵⁷ Peterson, *Possessed By God* (1995), 142, 163-4; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:347; LSJM, 9.

¹²⁵⁸ Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 451; Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 420; Wright, 'Romans' (2002), 546.

¹²⁵⁹ Hultgren, *Romans* (2011), 263; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 405; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:327; Morris, *Romans* (1988), 265 fn 87; Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 451; Sanday & Headlam, *Romans* (1902), 169; Godet, *Romans* (1883), 259; Ziesler, *Meaning of Righteousness* (1972), 202-3. Kruse believes it means both: *Romans*, 284.

Given that ὁ νόμος has taken a back seat while Paul has spoken of the reign of ἁμαρτία throughout Romans 6, it is understandable that the main topic of Romans 7 is the Mosaic law.¹²⁶⁰ Romans 7 provides an extensive explanation of the negative features of the Mosaic law, applies some of the points made in Romans 6 to the law, and picks up and elaborates on Paul's statement that the believer is no longer ὑπὸ νόμον (Romans 6:14-15).¹²⁶¹ While the law reigns, it only reigns over the living (Romans 7:1), just as the law of marriage only applies prior to the death of a spouse (Romans 7:2-3). Christians, however, have died to the law (ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ) through the body of Christ so that they can belong (εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς ἑτέρῳ) to the risen Christ, not the law (Romans 7:4; cf 6:14). Because death severs ones slavery to the law, just as it also severs the marriage bond, and because Christians have died with Christ, they now have a new 'master', Christ.¹²⁶² Their death to the law is both to its condemning power and to its function as a salvation-historical 'power' of the old age.¹²⁶³ Christians are no longer ἐν τῇ σαρκί, that sphere of existence where the passions of sin work διὰ τὸ νόμου to bear fruit to death (Romans 7:5), where the law aids and abets sin.¹²⁶⁴ This is the language of 'realm transfer'.¹²⁶⁵ In the sphere of the flesh, the law paradoxically serves to assist the production of sin (cf Romans 7:7-11).¹²⁶⁶ But since the Christian has now through Christ's death been released from the law (κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου), the result is that their enslavement (δουλεύειν) is in the newness of the Spirit and not the oldness of the letter (ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος) (Romans 7:6). The imperfect image of slavery continues from Romans 6:19.

¹²⁶⁰ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 409.

¹²⁶¹ *ibid*, 409-10.

¹²⁶² *ibid*, 411, 413.

¹²⁶³ *ibid*, 414-5.

¹²⁶⁴ *ibid*, *Romans*, 411.

¹²⁶⁵ *ibid*, 418.

¹²⁶⁶ *ibid*, 419, 420.

Romans 7:7-25 is Paul's **justification of the Mosaic law**. In 7:7-12, Paul shows how sin manipulated the law to bring death.¹²⁶⁷ Paul denies in the strongest possible terms that the law is sin (ὁ νόμος ἁμαρτία; μὴ γένοιτο: Romans 7:7). While Paul vindicates the law, he does not, however, retract his view that the law has become allied with sin (Romans 5:20).¹²⁶⁸ Paul confesses he would not know sin (ἁμαρτία) or lust (ἐπιθυμία) except διὰ νόμου, and particularly the tenth commandment.¹²⁶⁹ The tenth commandment focuses on prohibition of an inner attitude, and thus contributes to the picture of total human inability in doing the law.¹²⁷⁰ In Romans 7:8, Paul says of himself that opportunistic sin produced within Paul (ἐν μοί, denoting sphere of operation) every lust διὰ νόμου, that is, through the instrument of the commandment itself. The principle, χωρὶς γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία νεκρά, refers to the law's perverse work in fallen humans, now that it has been hijacked by sin, of prompting sinful acts¹²⁷¹ as well as its divine role of giving subjective knowledge of sin. The law is not sin, nor the origin of sin, but the occasion or opportunity of sin's operations.¹²⁷² People are told not to do something, so therefore they perversely want to do it. Paul is speaking, not salvation-historically of Israel, but of his own experience before he became aware of the real force of the law.¹²⁷³ That Paul was alive apart from the law (ἐγὼ δὲ ἔζων χωρὶς νόμου ποτέ: Romans 7:9), refers to the time before his eyes were opened to the true nature of the law's requirements, which no doubt came *after* his conversion.¹²⁷⁴ Paul was alive apart from the law in that he was blissfully ignorant of the true nature of the law. Paradoxically, Paul

¹²⁶⁷ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 424.

¹²⁶⁸ *ibid*, 432.

¹²⁶⁹ Romans 7:7; Exodus 20:17; Deuteronomy 5:21.

¹²⁷⁰ Ziesler, 'The Role of the Tenth Commandment in Romans 7,' (1988) 41-56, cited in Moo, *Romans* (1996), 435 fn 37.

¹²⁷¹ Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:350.

¹²⁷² Moo, *Romans* (1996), 436.

¹²⁷³ Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:340ff, *Contra* Moo, *Romans* (1996), 437.

¹²⁷⁴ Calvin, *Comm Romans* 7:9, in CC, 19:255-6.

properly understood the law only after the Damascus Road encounter, and his rethinking of his previous life of Judaism. His life ὑπὸ νόμου was in a true sense χωρὶς νόμου. By contrast, Paul's perspective on his pre-Christian past in Philippians 3:6 adopts the twin perspective of law righteousness as outward conformity to the law, and from the perspective of his unenlivened, pre-Christian past. On the coming of the commandment, 'Do not covet', with Paul's new sense of its meaning, sin also sprang to life (Romans 7:9), and Paul died. Not only this, but in Romans 7:10-11, Paul also found that the effect of the commandment, with sin operating in him, but now with an enlivened sense of its meaning, was that he could not benefit from the conditional promise of life under the Mosaic covenant in which the commandment operated, but rather the commandment ministered to him proleptic death as condemnation, because the law both prompted and revealed his transgression. Because of this, Paul could not fulfill the conditional covenant of the law (ἡ ἐντολὴ ἥ εἰς ζωὴν αὕτη εἰς θάνατον: Romans 7:10; cf Romans 10:5; Leviticus 18:5). As sin was the true villain, exploiting the occasion afforded by ὁ νόμος, and using Paul as its sphere of operations (ἐν μοί: 7:8), the law thus remains holy and the individual commandment, holy and righteous and good (Romans 7:12).

Romans 7:13, in the face of the accusation that the good thing, the commandment, became death to Paul, maintains instead (ἀλλά) that it was sin, the true culprit, working through the good commandment, that produced death.¹²⁷⁵ The two purpose clauses (ἵνα + subjunctive) show that the law manifests sin for what it really is, and that through the instrumentality of the commandment sin becomes 'exceedingly sinful'.¹²⁷⁶

¹²⁷⁵ Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:354.

¹²⁷⁶ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 452-3; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:354-5.

Romans 7:14-25 is notoriously controversial. While Romans 7 is most concerned to vindicate the law, the identity of the ἐγώ is not unimportant. This thesis takes the ‘classical’ or ‘autobiographical’ view, that the ἐγώ is Paul the believer in the narrative present, and is thus applicable to all believers existing in the overlap of the ages.¹²⁷⁷ Since believers have not yet experienced the consummation of redemption, they understand they are unable to keep God’s law, and the struggle with sin continues in the now but not yet.¹²⁷⁸ In verse 14, Paul reasserts the spirituality of the law (ὁ νόμος πνευματικός) as opposed to the fleshly existence (σάρκινος)¹²⁷⁹ of the ἐγώ under sin in this fallen world. The law is of divine origin, breathed out by the divine πνεῦμα. It is not surprising that the inner man delights in it (Romans 7:22), if that inner man is indwelt with the divine πνεῦμα. Fleshly weakness and sin, not the law itself, has produced human inability to keep the law.¹²⁸⁰ The phrase πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ‘sold under sin’ refers to the depth of indwelling sin in Paul’s flesh in the bifurcated anthropology Paul goes on to adopt (vv18, 20).¹²⁸¹ While Paul states that it is the ἐγώ which is sold under sin (v14), it is not the ἐγώ as Paul finally expounds it, but the ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου (v18). Paul will move from the conflicted ἐγώ (vv14-16) to the bifurcated ἐγώ (vv18, 20), returning to the conflicted ἐγώ (v19, 21). Paul also limits the sphere in which nothing good lives to ‘in his flesh’ (τοῦτο ἔστιν, ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου: v18). This is a necessary qualification, if Christ and the Holy Spirit also live ἐν ἐμοί.¹²⁸² It is thus the limited sphere, not the whole ἐγώ, which still lives ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν. The true Paul, the ἐγώ as ultimately expounded, agrees that God’s (moral) law is good (cf σύμφημι τῷ νόμῳ, v16, with συνήδομαι

¹²⁷⁷ Peterson, *Possessed by God* (1995), 106-109; Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:340-70; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:388ff; contra Moo, *Romans* (1996), 423ff.

¹²⁷⁸ Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 390.

¹²⁷⁹ cf 1 Corinthians 3:1; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 454.

¹²⁸⁰ Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 373.

¹²⁸¹ Against which construct, see Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 374. Rather than a mistake, a significant distinction, a bifurcation, provides a helpful analytical tool.

¹²⁸² Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:360.

γὰρ τὸ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ, v22),¹²⁸³ and wishes to do it, but cannot practice it (v15). But the blame for Paul's continuing inability lies with οὐκέτι ἐγώ but ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία (vv17, 20; cf Galatians 2:20), whose sphere of operations is ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου (v18), Paul's flesh.

Paul concludes (ἄρα) that he finds a particular principle (τὸν νόμον: v21), which is aligned to the 'other law' (ἕτερον νόμον: v23),¹²⁸⁴ at work in his members, one drawn from his own experience.¹²⁸⁵ The first part of the principle is explained by the fact that Paul rejoices in God's (moral) law κατὰ τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον (v22).¹²⁸⁶ 'One of the strongest arguments in favour of identifying the *ēgo* in this passage with the Christian is that only those regenerated by God's Spirit can truly "delight in" God's law'.¹²⁸⁷ In Ephesians 3:16-17, Paul prays for the Ephesian Christians that God might strengthen them διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν. Given the delight Paul has for the moral law, and the indwelling of the Spirit in the inner man, not only is this an argument for Romans 7:14-25 including reference to the Christian, but also it suggests that Christ is resident in the ἔσω ἄνθρωπον || ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις through faith. On this reasoning, Paul delights in the moral law in the inner man because, through faith, Christ dwells in his heart. Given the Adam/Christ parallels,¹²⁸⁸ ἔσω ἄνθρωπον in this context might even allude to Christ being the ἄνθρωπος residing in Paul's heart, bringing Paul delight in the

¹²⁸³ *Contra Moo, Romans* (1996), 461.

¹²⁸⁴ *Moo, Romans* (1996), 464.

¹²⁸⁵ *ibid*, 460.

¹²⁸⁶ Cf 2 Corinthians 4:16; Ephesians 3:16-17.

¹²⁸⁷ *ibid*, 461.

¹²⁸⁸ Romans 5:15-19.

moral law.¹²⁸⁹ Hence, it is not necessary to distinguish ἄνθρωπος (7:22) from its use in Romans 6:6.¹²⁹⁰

The 'other law' (v23) operating in Paul is an authority¹²⁹¹ opposed to God's moral law. Paul returns to a conflicted ἐγώ, whose members are the theatre of war. Ὁ νόμος τοῦ νοός μου (the law of my mind) is God's moral law of God with which Paul's enlightened mind agrees,¹²⁹² because of the indwelling Christ. Ὁ νόμος τῆς ἁμαρτίας τῷ ὄντι ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου (the law of sin being in my members) is the 'other law', the authority of sin resident in Paul's members (Romans 7:23; || vv17, 20, ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία, and v18, ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου).

Paul, in his embodied self, with the law of sin at work in his members waging war against the law of his mind and imprisoning him, cries out παλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος (Romans 7:24). His wretchedness expresses his current predicament of living between two aeons, between Adam and Christ, but the resolution is a rescue ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου, which he knows to be coming (Romans 7:25a)¹²⁹³ from the risen Lord Jesus Christ, who will raise him from the body of sin which leads to physical death. Verse 25b 'sums up with clear sighted honesty'¹²⁹⁴ the bifurcation under which the Christian currently lives, as ἄρα οὖν marks a summarizing recapitulation of the dividedness of the ἐγώ.¹²⁹⁵ 'I myself' (αὐτὸς ἐγώ) in my mind (τῷ νοῷ) am enslaved to God's moral law (νόμῳ θεοῦ). The inner

¹²⁸⁹ cf Galatians 2:20.

¹²⁹⁰ *ibid*, 462

¹²⁹¹ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 464.

¹²⁹² Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:364; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 464.

¹²⁹³ Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:366.

¹²⁹⁴ *ibid*, 1:369.

¹²⁹⁵ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 467.

man, where Christ dwells, the ‘true Paul in Christ’ is enslaved to God’s law. Paul is continuing the stretched metaphor of slavery from Romans 6:19. However, in the flesh (τῇ σαρκί), the law of sin as an authority still operates. The area of the flesh is the arena in which Christ’s condemnation of sin in the flesh occurred (Romans 8:3).

Exegesis of Romans 8:1-4

The combination of ἄρα νῦν (v1) marks a significant conclusion, picking up themes from Romans 6-7 to reiterate the message of Romans 5:12-21.¹²⁹⁶ The ‘now’ alludes to the salvation-historical reality of Christ, but applies those benefits to the present existence of the ἔγω. The rescue of the ἔγω from his body of death is future (ῥύσεται), but the forensic verdict, οὐδεν [...] κατάκριμα τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ is in the present, νῦν (v1).

Conjunction γάρ indicates Romans 8:2 is the explanation for the statement ‘no condemnation’ (v1). There is no condemnation (v1), because of the liberation (ῥήλευθέρωσεν) that has now been experienced by Christians from the Mosaic law in its operation under the power of sin and death (ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου: v2). This liberation has been effected by the ‘law of the spirit of life’ (ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς: v2). This liberation is further explained (γάρ) in Romans 8:3, by God’s action in sending his own Son in the likeness of the flesh of sin and for sin (πέμψας ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας: v3). This suggests that the ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς relates not existentially and directly to those walking κατὰ πνεῦμα (Romans 8:4b), but salvation-historically to the event of sending the Son as a pneumatic act. The content of the ‘law of the Spirit of life’ encapsulates the earthly ministry of Christ – Christ being sent by the Father

¹²⁹⁶ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 472.

(implying his incarnation), life in the likeness of the flesh of sin (implying his sinlessness: 2 Corinthians 5:21), and for sin, being his sin offering, or his death – as the arena of the activity of the Spirit. That is, ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς is a play on words referring to the gospel. As Theilman reasons, ‘Christ’s atoning work and “the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus” are synonymous’.¹²⁹⁷ Precedent for this play on words is ‘the law of faith’ (Romans 3:27).¹²⁹⁸

By contrast, however, the law of sin and death (τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου: Romans 8:2) refers to the law of Moses under the conditions of its hijacking by sin and in light of the fact that it now serves to bring the condemnation of death to its transgressors. The freedom from the law of Moses posited by the verb ἡλευθέρωσεν (Romans 8:2) is judicial freedom from its condemnation, as indicated by κατάκριμα (Romans 8:1; cf 6:7), and as positional removal from the domain of sin (Romans 6:6; 7:6), so that sin cannot execute its function as ruler, but this freedom from the law does not extend in so far as the Mosaic law represents the moral law of God. To this the ἐγώ remains enslaved (Romans 7:16, 22, 25b).

The syntax of the main clause in verse 3 is difficult: τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου ἐν ᾧ ἡσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός, ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας [...] κατέρρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί. The construction is either a ‘nominative absolute’ attached to verse 2, and thus it could be rendered ‘[this liberation from sin and death being] the impossibility of the law. God sending his own Son, condemned [...]’. Alternatively, it could be an ‘accusative absolute’ in apposition to κατέρρινεν, thus, ‘the impossibility of the law God [made possible] by

¹²⁹⁷ Thielman, *Paul and the Law* (1994), 201.

¹²⁹⁸ *ibid*, 201-2.

condemning sin'.¹²⁹⁹ However, most English translations posit a broken construction and supply the main verb ἐποίησεν, thus, 'the impossibility of the law, God did'.¹³⁰⁰

In the phrase 'the inability of the law' (τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου), the singular adjective refers to the thing that the law was unable to do. The genitive (τοῦ νόμου) is subjective. It is *the law's* inability. Νόμος refers to the Mosaic law, which is holy (Romans 7:12). In Romans 8:2, the Mosaic law is that from which freedom is required and has now been obtained. The Mosaic law was not part of the solution of rescuing people from the domain of sin and death,¹³⁰¹ at least, not immediately part of the solution. Because of the reign of sin, the law was unable to give eschatological life. While at one level the commandment was given 'for life',¹³⁰² it actually worked death (ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωὴν, αὕτη εἰς θάνατον: Romans 7:10), because of the flesh and sin. This continues the theme of the law as that which reveals sin.¹³⁰³

The reason for the law's inability in Romans 8:3 is given in the prepositional phrase ἐν ᾧ ἡσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός. The problem is not with the Mosaic law, but with the flesh (Romans 7:7-25). The flesh weakens the law such that the law unable to save. The presence of the flesh means that obeying the law is impossible for weak sinful humans. The flesh (σὰρξ) is 'the this-worldly orientation that all people share'.¹³⁰⁴

¹²⁹⁹ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 477 n 37.

¹³⁰⁰ *ibid.*

¹³⁰¹ *idem*, *Romans* (1996), 478.

¹³⁰² Compare Romans 10:5 citing Leviticus 18:5: 'the man doing these things will live by them, ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς.

¹³⁰³ Romans 3:20; 4:15; 5:20; 7:7-25.

¹³⁰⁴ *idem*, *Romans* (1996), 478

God himself provides the remedy for the Mosaic law's inability to provide eschatological salvation by sending his own Son (ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας: v3). Participle (πέμψας) is instrumental and dependent on verb κατέκρινεν. Through sending his own Son ἐν τῇ σαρκί, God (the Father) condemned sin in the location of the flesh (ἐν τῇ σαρκί).

In the flesh' naturally implies the humanity of Christ, but it also alludes to that sphere of human weakness into which Christ entered to accomplish his work. The flesh that made the law ineffective in dealing with sin *was conquered from within*.¹³⁰⁵ (my emphasis)

The way God condemned sin was from within humanity. Christ being 'in the flesh' (ἐν τῇ σαρκί: Romans 8:3) therefore emphasizes Christ's solidarity with those for whom he came. Romans 8:3 therefore meets the need of the ἐγώ in Romans 7:18, who confesses 'that nothing good dwells in me, this is, in my flesh' (ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου). 'In the flesh' refers to the incarnation of the Son. The 'sending' of God's own son in the flesh is for the purpose of condemning sin in the flesh. God's own Son, from within the flesh, has met the problem of the inability of the Mosaic law, caused by the flesh.

The main verb in Romans 8:3, κατέκρινεν (cf cognate noun κατάκριμα, Romans 8:1), 'condemned', is forensic and judicial, denoting the decree of an unfavourable judgment. God, by sending his own Son, is the one who condemned sin in the flesh. God's condemnation of sin in the flesh of Christ (κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί) certainly suggests a judicial decree of punishment in the sphere of Christ's flesh. However, it is also possible that such divine judicial condemnation is achieved by an example to the contrary wrought ἐν τῇ σαρκί. The resurrection life of one 'in the flesh' would also condemn 'sin' in the flesh, by showing the freedom of the flesh, now meaning the physical human body, from

¹³⁰⁵ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 480

the power of death. The whole problem of the law was not that it was sin (μὴ γένοιτο: Romans 7:7-25). Rather, it is the law's impotency, it's fundamental characteristic in the aeon of sin as unable to save (τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου), because it is weakened through the flesh (ἐν ᾧ ἡσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός), that has prompted the need for Paul's apology for the law (Romans 7:7-25). The commandments of the Mosaic law, from one perspective, were given for the purpose of life (ἐντολὴ ἢ εἰς ζωὴν: Romans 7:10). This reflects the conditional nature of the Mosaic covenant *per* Romans 10:5, citing Leviticus 18:5, that 'the man doing these things will live by them' (ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς). For Paul and everybody else, according to Romans 3:19-20; 6:23, the law actually brought death, because of the reign of sin. However, according to Romans 7:10, 10:5, the Mosaic law will give life if it is done. The sending of God's own Son in the flesh was the occasion of the νόμος having the power to give life to one person ἐν τῇ σαρκί, because the condition of the law was met. Christ was raised from the dead, showing that he had fulfilled the conditions of the Sinaitic covenant. The law has thus been vindicated in one human, God's own Son, Jesus Christ. Since the Mosaic law has in fact been kept by the unique Son, sin is condemned ἐν τῇ σαρκί, because someone coming ἐν τῇ σαρκί has given an example to the contrary of resurrection life, demonstrating the ability of the law to give life *when those stipulated conditions are met*. The law is thereby justified.

Two prepositional phrases in Romans 8:3 modify υἱόν. The first, ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας, 'in the likeness of the flesh of sin', indicates the form in which the Son was sent into the world. Christ also has been said to have condemned sin ἐν τῇ σαρκί (v3) which suggests his identity with those for whom he was sent. However, in the phrase ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας, the term ὁμοίωμα indicates that Christ bore both a likeness but not

identity, as it does in Romans 1:23; 5:14, 6:5. The use of ὁμοίωμα reflects a reservation in completely identifying sinful flesh with Christ, introducing a 'note of distinction'.¹³⁰⁶ Christ is fully human, and became incarnate (enfleshed), but he has not become enfleshed so as to actually be termed 'sinful flesh'.¹³⁰⁷ The second, περὶ ἁμαρτίας, is a technical term referring to the sin offering,¹³⁰⁸ with καί 'used to link two items of equal status'.¹³⁰⁹

Hence, by coming in the flesh as fully human, yet being in the likeness of sinful flesh and thus without sin, Christ firstly condemned sin in the flesh by becoming what sin had defeated, true human flesh. In this way, sin was conquered from within human flesh. Christ thus overcame the weakness inherent in the Mosaic law, for its power of giving life is taken away because sinful human flesh is unable to meet its stipulations for life. No one can keep it perfectly. But the Son of God indeed has done this, as shown by his resurrection from the dead. A systematic-theological way of saying this is that Christ lived the perfect life of righteousness, in obedience to the precepts of the law. Christ continued to do everything written in the book of the law,¹³¹⁰ ie, Christ's 'active' obedience. Secondly, God condemned sin in the flesh by sending Christ 'for sin', as a sin offering.¹³¹¹ Christ bore the condemnation of the penalty of sin in his own flesh, ie, Christ's 'passive obedience'.¹³¹²

The forgoing answers McFadden's objection that in Romans 8:4a, 'Paul is not introducing something new into his immediate argument, whether the imputed righteousness of Christ

¹³⁰⁶ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 479; Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 314, but contra Schreiner on 8:3: *Romans*, 402-3.

¹³⁰⁷ *Contra*, Schreiner, *Romans* (1998), 403.

¹³⁰⁸ Wright, *Climax of the Covenant* (1991), 220-225; Moo, *Romans* (1996), 480.

¹³⁰⁹ Runge, *Discourse Grammar* (2010), 24.

¹³¹⁰ Galatians 3:10; Calvin, *Comm Romans*, 8:3, in CC, 19:283.

¹³¹¹ cf 2 Corinthians 5:21.

¹³¹² Galatians 3:13.

or the law's decree of life'.¹³¹³ Christ's 'active' and 'passive' obedience are a direct entailment of the sending of the Son in the likeness of the flesh of sin and for sin to condemn sin in the flesh (8:3).

In Romans, 8:4, the conjunction ἵνα indicates the purpose of God having condemned sin in the flesh, so that τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου might be fulfilled, πληρωθῇ, in us, ἐν ἡμῖν. An advantage of an objective view of the fulfillment of τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου immediately by Christ, rather than a subjective view of fulfillment by Spirit-filled Christians, is that it does not require an interposition of intermediate premises to complete the apostle's logic. Such steps must include that God then sends the Spirit to Christians, that Christians' faith then works in faith, and that love then fulfills the law. In fact, it is McFadden who must 'introduce something new into [Paul's] immediate argument', by intruding all these above steps into his reasoning as he moves from verse 3 to verse 4.¹³¹⁴ By contrast, on the 'imputed righteousness' view, the Father's sending of Christ has brought about the τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου directly by the twofold action of the Christ event outlined in verse 3,.

Δικαίωμα is definite and singular. It can mean 'stipulation' (eg plural in 2:26), or 'just decree' (eg singular in 1:32), particularly in the LXX,¹³¹⁵ or it can mean 'judicial decree of righteousness' or 'justification' (eg Romans 5:16,¹³¹⁶ 18¹³¹⁷). Some commentators interpret the singular as reflecting a particular characteristic about the Mosaic law, that the law is

¹³¹³ McFadden, 'Fulfillment of the Law's *Dikaiōma*' (2009), 487.

¹³¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹³¹⁵ See Chapter 5.

¹³¹⁶ See Chapter 6.

¹³¹⁷ See Chapter 7.

essentially a unity,¹³¹⁸ and effectively treat it as a plural.¹³¹⁹ Others see in singular δικαίωμα a reference to a specific commandment, such as the law of coveting,¹³²⁰ the law of love (13:8-10),¹³²¹ the ordinance that decrees punishment for sin (those practicing such things deserve death: 1:32),¹³²² or the ordinance that decrees life for obedience, ('do this and you shall live').¹³²³

There are good arguments for each of these positions, and the word δικαίωμα can certainly mean 'requirement', 'decree' or 'stipulation'.¹³²⁴ However, older translations rendered the word δικαίωμα here either as 'righteousness'¹³²⁵ or 'justification'.¹³²⁶ Modern scholars, except for Kirk, are unanimous, and rightly so, that Paul uses it in the sense of 'justification' in Romans 5:16.¹³²⁷ This thesis has presented the arguments for the meaning 'justification' in verse 5:18.¹³²⁸ A solution to the intractable debate concerning the referent of τὸ δικαίωμα, and determining which particular commands Paul is alluding to, is that the meaning is not 'stipulation' or 'requirement' at all, but 'justification', consistent with Paul's last two uses of the term in Romans 5:16, 18. The purpose of God condemning sin by sending Christ is for 'the justification τοῦ νόμου'. The genitive is polyvalent and bi-referential. The phrase τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου firstly refers to the justification of the Mosaic law, the topic of Romans 7:7-25. Through the sending of God's own Son, the Mosaic law has received a decree of justification. The law is not sin, but holy. The law's powerlessness was

¹³¹⁸ Eg Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:384

¹³¹⁹ Eg NIV84.

¹³²⁰ Eg Watson, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles*: (1986), 157, criticized by Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:423.

¹³²¹ Eg Jewett, *Romans* (2007), 485; Barnett, *Romans* (2003), 170.

¹³²² Eg Benoit, *Jesus and the Gospel* (1974) 2:28-29.

¹³²³ Eg Wright, 'Romans' (2002), 580, 658ff. Romans 7:10; 10:5, Leviticus 18:5.

¹³²⁴ See chapter 5 above.

¹³²⁵ Eg the Tyndale, Geneva, Bishops', Authorised (King James) Version.

¹³²⁶ Eg the Vulgate, Peshitta, Douay-Rheims.

¹³²⁷ See chapter 5 above.

¹³²⁸ See chapter 7, above.

caused by sin. The law has rendered (resurrection) life in one instance, that of God's own Son. The justification of the law comes by the justification of the Christ, who received court-approved righteousness for his obedience (Romans 5:18), and shares that righteousness that came from obedience with Christians.

The genitive secondly refers to 'the justification that the law requires' or 'the Law's requirement that we should be found righteous'.¹³²⁹ Thus, Barrett argues:

[W]hat the law requires is righteousness. The law tells us that God has the right to summon us to his court, and that he requires that we be found righteous.¹³³⁰

The justification that the law requires presupposes two conditions are met. First, the law is requires the soul that sins must die (cf Romans 1:32). It also requires that the doer of the law lives (cf Romans 10:5). Again, the exposition of Romans 8:3 above posits the meeting of this twofold condition of the Mosaic law through Christ's active and passive obedience.

The passive aorist subjunctive (πληρωθῇ) is a divine passive. God in Christ has fulfilled the singular δικαίωμα of the law. Some commentators see no distinction between πληρόω and cognates and Paul's other terms for doing, keeping or completing the law (οἱ ποιηταί: Romans 2:13; ποιέω: Romans 2:14; πράσσω: Romans 2:25; φυλάσσω: Romans 2:26; τελέω; Romans 2:27). Thus, Dunn and Wright treat the 'doing' and 'fulfilling' terminology as effectively interchangeable with πληρόω and cognates.¹³³¹ However, Kern, following Barclay, observes that the connection of the law with the fulfillment terminology is a Pauline innovation.¹³³² Moo makes a similar observation.

¹³²⁹ Hooker, *Adam to Christ* (1990), 32

¹³³⁰ Barrett, *Romans* (1957), 157.

¹³³¹ Eg Wright, 'Romans' (2002), 441; Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:424.

¹³³² Kern, 'Justification by Faith in Galatians' (1996), 52-3; Barclay, *Obeying the Truth* (1988), 138-9.

Vital to understanding Paul's perspective on the law is to recognize a principal [sic?] distinction in his writings between 'doing' and 'fulfilling' the law. Nowhere does Paul say that Christians are to 'do' the law, and nowhere does he suggest that any but Christians can 'fulfill' the law. 'Doing' the law refers to that daily obedience to all the commandments that was required of the Israelite. 'Fulfilling' the law, on the other hand, denotes that complete satisfaction of the law's demands that comes only through [sic, the?] Christian's identification with Christ (Romans 8:4[...]) and their submission to that commandment that Christ put at the heart of his new covenant teaching: love (Gal 5:14; Rom 13:8-10).¹³³³

Paul thus uses the terms with the πληρ— root in a new way, as a result of the new salvation-historical situation brought about by Christ.

Hence, the commandment to love functions in Paul's theology in a different way compared with the commandments to do the Torah in Jewish theology.¹³³⁴

Because of their views of Romans 7:14-25,¹³³⁵ Dunn and Cranfield must relativise the 'fulfillment' that occurs in Romans 8:4. Thus Dunn says:

[I]t cannot mean 'fulfill' in a one-to-one sense, an item by item correlation. It must mean 'fulfill' in a more profound sense – the essential requirement (note again the singular) which lies behind the individual requirements.¹³³⁶

Likewise, Cranfield:

But πληρώθη is not to be taken to imply that the faithful fulfill the law's requirement perfectly. Chapter 7 must not be forgotten. They fulfill it in the sense that they do have a real faith in God (which is the law's basic demand), in the sense that their lives are definitely turned in the direction of obedience, that they do sincerely desire to obey and are earnestly striving to advance ever nearer to perfection. But, so long as they remain in this present life, their faith is always in some measure mixed with unbelief. Their obedience is always imperfect and incomplete.¹³³⁷

Such a fulfillment does not seem to be a fulfillment at all. Dunn characterizes it as a fulfillment in a 'more profound sense', but that seems euphemistic for fulfillment in a 'more diluted sense'. McFadden rightly sees that the righteous requirement of the Mosaic law

¹³³³ Moo, 'The Law of Christ' (1996), 359-60.

¹³³⁴ Betz, *Galatians* (1979), 275.

¹³³⁵ Both hold Romans 7:14-25 applies to the Christian.

¹³³⁶ Dunn, *Romans* (1988), 1:423.

¹³³⁷ Cranfield, *Romans* (2001), 1:384.

must be perfect obedience: 'Paul does not, however, indicate that the moral requirement of the law is lessened in any way'.¹³³⁸ But then McFadden posits:

Rather, to the degree that Christians genuinely love one another, they have fulfilled the law (13:8). In the same way, to the degree that Christians genuinely obey, they have fulfilled the righteous requirement of the law (8:4). But we must view all of this, I will now argue, in light of the resurrection, for it is only at the resurrection that Christians will be completely liberated and thus will completely fulfill the requirement of the law. [...] Ethical behavior is bound up with life, that is, resurrection life. The Spirit according to whom Christians walk is the Spirit who confers life. [...] Since the liberating work of the Spirit is not complete until the resurrection, the righteous requirement of the law will not be perfectly fulfilled in us until the resurrection.¹³³⁹

This reasoning militates against McFadden's basic premise, that 'to fulfill the law [...] implies that the obedience offered *completely satisfies* what is required'.¹³⁴⁰ On McFadden's reasoning, Christians 'completely fulfill' the law, but not all the time in this life, and they will not be able to do it properly until the resurrection. This seems somewhat of an anticlimax from what clearly appears to be an attainment of the 'no condemnation' verdict (Romans 8:1), and God's achievement in sending his Son (Romans 8:3) to overcome the inability of the law and condemn sin in the flesh. McFadden has imported the unrealized aspect of resurrection eschatology into 8:4a, when *prima facie*, it seems that the fulfillment language points to a complete and full realization of the justification of the law in Romans 8:4a.

¹³³⁸ McFadden, 'Fulfillment of the Law's *Dikaiōma*' (2009), 492-3.

¹³³⁹ *Ibid*, 493-4.

¹³⁴⁰ *ibid*, 493, citing Westerholm, *Perspectives Old & New* (2004), 436.

The conjunctions and forensic language in Romans 8:1-4a point us in the direction of a complete and 'full' fulfillment.

v1 οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα [...]

A significant conclusion from Romans 5-7



v2 ὁ γὰρ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἠλεθέρωσέν σε [...]

Explanatory of verse 1. No condemnation because set free.



v3 τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου [...] ὁ θεὸς ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας [...] κατέκρινεν [...]

Explanatory of verse 2. Set free because God sent the Son to condemn sin.



v4 ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν τοῖς [...] περιπατοῦσιν [...] κατὰ πνεῦμα.

Purpose of verse 3.

Verses 2-4 all provide explanatory background material for verse 1. The judicial terminology δικαίωμα (v4) and κατέκρινεν (v3) explain the nature of the freedom (ἠλεθέρωσεν) either as a judicial freedom, or, more likely, the judicial ground of the freedom from the rule of the principle of sin and death through the 'law of the Spirit of life', which is the gospel. The freedom as 'realm transfer' through the law of the Spirit of life explains the 'no condemnation'. McFadden regards 'the liberating work of the Spirit is not complete until the resurrection' and thus 'the righteous requirement of the law will not be perfectly fulfilled in us until the resurrection'.¹³⁴¹ However, the liberation of verse 2 is complete and positional, as it is a 'realm transfer' from sin and death that grounds the judicial declaration.¹³⁴² This suggests that the judicial declarations in verse 1 (οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα) and verse 3 (ὁ θεὸς ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας [...] κατέκρινεν) are also complete, which is also suggested by the forensic nature of the terms. One would likewise expect that the purposive ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ to be as complete as the decisive action and judicial declaration that grounds it.

¹³⁴¹ McFadden, 'Fulfillment of the Law's *Dikaiōma*' (2009), 494.

¹³⁴² Moo, *Romans* (1996), 477.

At this juncture, McFadden argues that previously in Romans, the pattern Paul establishes is that the work of Christ has the purpose or result of Christian obedience,¹³⁴³ and that 'Romans 8:3-4a likely follows the same pattern, with a statement about the work of Christ (8:3) followed by a purpose clause involving Christian obedience (8:4a)'.¹³⁴⁴

The first answer to McFadden's argument, in addition to the variations from the pattern he himself observes in Romans 8:3-4 that 'Christ is the one who died and the righteous requirement is fulfilled passively in us',¹³⁴⁵ is that McFadden has not appreciated the forensic import of singular τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου (8:4). It is better to translate τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου, given the usage in Romans 5:16, 18 and the context of Romans 7:7-25, as the 'justification of the law'. The forensic meaning of the phrase τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου suggests that the pattern does not apply. The forensic nature of the topic governs the type of 'purpose' Paul is expressing.

Second, the purpose clause in Romans 6:6, *contra* McFadden, is not a reference to 'Christian obedience', but to a decisive 'realm transfer' from the authority or power of sin. As Jewett argues:

Freed from bondage to the cosmic power of sin, Paul is contending that believers 'cannot sin' because they are under the lordship of Christ.¹³⁴⁶

So the supposed 'pattern' of (1) Christ's work for the purpose of (2) Christian obedience, does not hold for Romans 6:6.

¹³⁴³ Romans 6:4, 6, 7:4, 7:6; cf 6:18-19, 22.

¹³⁴⁴ McFadden, 'Fulfillment of the Law's *Dikaiōma*' (2009), 488-9.

¹³⁴⁵ *Ibid*, 489 fn 29.

¹³⁴⁶ *Ibid*.

However, McFadden's insightful correlation of resurrection motifs to Romans 8:1-4, and his reference to the now-not yet nature of resurrection eschatology, helpfully points us to a better understanding of Romans 8:3-4 than McFadden himself was able to attain in his article. McFadden points out the undeniable 'not yet' aspect of the believer's resurrection life as an incomplete fulfillment. But there is, of course, one in whom the resurrection is now realized and complete. That one is Christ. His resurrection shows he has completely fulfilled the requirements of the law, in both precept and penalty, and in so doing justifies both the law and us. Our resurrection is based on his justifying resurrection (Romans 4:25; 5:18), grounded on his own obedience (Romans 5:19).

The phrase ἐν ἡμῖν ('in us') is said to be the greatest difficulty for the 'imputed righteousness' view,¹³⁴⁷ and Moo's failure to deal with ἐν ἡμῖν is a substantial weakness in his presentation.¹³⁴⁸ Preposition ἐν has locative force 'in the sphere of us',¹³⁴⁹ and thus 'Christians are the theatre in which'¹³⁵⁰ the fulfillment occurs.¹³⁵¹ In Käsemann's words:

What is meant is not an instrumental 'through' or modal 'with or to us' [...] but, as in Gal 2:20, a local 'in us,' with an anthropological reference to individual Christians and an ecclesiological reference to the whole community.¹³⁵²

Many commentators interpret 'in us' to suggest not simply a sphere or arena, nor even simply an internal or interior location, but more than this, a renovative and regenerative work in individual Christians. What is not often recognized is that it is *an interpretative step*

¹³⁴⁷ Piper, *Future of Justification* (2007), 215-6; cf idem, *Counted Righteous* (2002), 79-80.

¹³⁴⁸ Cf Moo, *Romans* (1996), 481-5.

¹³⁴⁹ Fitzmyer, *Romans* (1992), 488.

¹³⁵⁰ Benoit, *Jesus and the Gospel* (1973), 2:32

¹³⁵¹ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 483 n 61.

¹³⁵² Käsemann, *Romans* (1980), *Romans*, 219.

to move from interiority (ἐν ἡμῖν) to an assumption of internal renovation, renewal and progressive sanctification in the believer. This assumption may not be correct.

Against my view, on the other hand, instead of ἐν ἡμῖν, Paul could have easily used ‘for us’, ἀντὶ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, or even περὶ ἡμῶν, which would make the reading offered in this thesis unassailable. In response to this argument against my reading of Romans 8:4, four explanations of ἐν ἡμῖν are offered:

- (1) Righteousness comes to a person through the instrumentality of faith. But faith is an internal action, of the heart. Thus, ‘if you believe in your heart [...] you will be saved’ (πιστεύσης ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου: Romans 10:9). Since faith is itself an internal action issuing from the heart of the believer, it is appropriate that the fulfillment grasped by faith be also described internally, ἐν ἡμῖν.
- (2) Elsewhere in Paul, Christ is said to be ‘in us’.¹³⁵³ The clearest example of this is Galatians 2:20, compared to Romans 7:17, 20. While the blame for Paul’s continuing inability lies with οὐκέτι ἐγὼ but ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία (vv17, 20), when Paul credits the grace of God for righteousness apart from the law, he says ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ but ζῇ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός (Galatians 2:20). Paul’s rejoicing in God’s law according to the inner man (κατὰ τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον: v22) also might point to the indwelling Christ.¹³⁵⁴ Thus, for Paul, the motifs ‘me in Christ’ and ‘Christ in me’ are not really that different, and the motif ‘me in Christ’ can express what we would otherwise consider as *Christus pro nobis*, Christ for us. So immediately after Paul says ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ (Galatians 2:20a), he says ὁ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί (so in a sense Paul does

¹³⁵³ Romans 8:9-10; Galatians 2:19-21, 4:19; 2 Corinthians 13:5; Ephesians 3:17; Colossians 1:27, 2:6, 3:11.

¹³⁵⁴ Cf 2 Corinthians 4:16; Ephesians 3:16-17.

live!) ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ (Christ dwells in Paul's heart in faith)¹³⁵⁵

τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ (so Christ 'for me' becomes very closely aligned with Christ 'in me' through faith: Galatians 2:20b). It is toward this that Carson heads when he says:

Or, to put the matter another way, even if some sort of 'incorporation' idea lurks behind the expression in Galatians 2:20, the idea in this context is tied much less to any sort of vitalism than it is to the kind of deep identification of the believer with Christ that stands behind 'the great exchange.'¹³⁵⁶

(3) The immediate context of Romans 7 also suggests that the judicial solution should be

expressed ἐν ἡμῖν in Romans 8:4. In Romans 7:8, opportunistic sin produced every lust through the agency of the law, and sin's theatre of operations was in Paul (ἐν μοί). Moreover, in Romans 7:18, nothing good lives in Paul's flesh (ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου) and in Romans 7:17, 20, the power of sin still resides within Paul (ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία). The theatre of operations of indwelling sin is ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου (Romans 7:18, 25b), and the law of sin being ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου (Romans 7:23). Given that the arena of sin's operations have been expressed as ἐν ἐμοί, ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου, ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου, etc, it is fitting that the location of the judicial decree of justification be located ἐν ἡμῖν.

(4) Since the condemnation of sin Christ wrought occurred 'in the flesh' (κατέρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί: Romans 8:3), it is fitting that the gift of this justification that the law requires is received in a parallel way, ἐν ἡμῖν. Paragraph (2) above has shown that, for Paul, Christ lives in a person through the instrumentality of faith. If Christ is in the believer, whatever gift Christ gives to the believer can also be said to be 'in us' (so Romans 8:4). This is important for the great assize. 'Christ pours *into us*

¹³⁵⁵ Cf Ephesians 3:16-17.

¹³⁵⁶ Carson, 'Vindication of Imputation' (2004), 75 fn 54.

enough of his power *to meet the judgment of God*¹³⁵⁷ (my emphasis). On the last day, as a consequence of Christ dwelling ‘in us’ by faith, each Christian individually takes to the judgment this gift of righteousness (Romans 5:17) required by the law, which Christ has fulfilled for us and thus by virtue of the gift, fulfilled in us (Romans 8:4). ‘In us’ reflects an intimate association with us akin to possession.¹³⁵⁸

The final phrase, Romans 8:4b, describes those who receive this justification. Adjectival participial phrase τοῖς [...] περιπατοῦσιν is governed by preposition ἐν and is placed in apposition to ἡμῖν. The participial phrase is not instrumental but descriptive.¹³⁵⁹ The description of those ‘in whom’ the fulfillment of the law’s justification occurs is (1) they are us, Paul along with his believing readers, and (2) they have a manner of walking. Such a construction is quite consistent with a view that the adjectival participial phrase in Romans 8:4b is ‘evidential’. That is, the evidence that the justification that the law requires is fulfilled in ‘us’ is the manner of life in which we walk (τοῖς [...] περιπατοῦσιν [...] κατὰ πνεῦμα). The correspondence of language between Romans 8:4b and 8:5 (κατὰ πνεῦμα, κατὰ σάρκα) suggests the explanatory γάρ in 8:5 applies to the descriptive participial clause and not the whole of verse 4, that is, not to 8:4a.

Romans 8:8-9 might be thought to provide a difficulty for the reading of Romans 7:18ff offered. It says:

⁸ But the ones being in the flesh (οἱ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες) [are] not able to please God. ⁹ But you (pl) are not in [the] flesh, but in [the] Spirit, if [the] Spirit of God dwells in you (ὁμοῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλὰ ἐν πνεύματι, εἴπερ πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν).

¹³⁵⁷ Calvin, *Institutes*, III.11.23.

¹³⁵⁸ See Chapter 4, above.

¹³⁵⁹ Moo, *Romans* (1996), 484.

The answer is that while Christians still have the flesh, which they must continue to put to death (Romans 8:12-13), they themselves are not 'in the flesh' as an aeon or realm. *The flesh is in them, but they are not in the flesh.* They have decisively been transferred from the realm of flesh, death and sin to the realm of Spirit, life and righteousness. There is a distinction between 'in the flesh' as an aeon or realm (Romans 8:8-9) in contrast with 'in my flesh' (Romans 7:18), the latter speaking of the sinful propensity resident in bifurcated Christians during this life. The residue of the flesh in them is an expression of the 'not yet'. The fact of their decisive transfer from the realm of the flesh is an expression of the 'already'.

Conclusion

There is no condemnation in Christ Jesus, because God sent Christ to condemn sin 'in the flesh' in two ways. First, Christ overcame the weakness of the law, caused by human sin, because he came 'in the likeness of the flesh of sin', entailing his sinlessness. This sinlessness was demonstrated by his resurrection, in which not only did the law justify Christ (by giving him the life promised to obedience: Romans 7:10; 10:5; Galatians 3:10, 12), but Christ justified the law (consistent with Paul's argument in 7:7-25, that the commandment is good and the law is holy, but that it was hijacked by sin). A systematic-theological entailment of this justification of both Christ and the law is that Christ obeyed the law's precepts, called in theological discourse 'active obedience'. This justification of the law is based immediately on Christ's being sent in the likeness of sin but obeying the requirements of the law, as proven by his resurrection life.

Second, and equally important, Christ was sent 'for sin', a technical expression meaning a 'sin offering'. Thus Christ bore the law's penalty: cursed is the one hung on a tree (Galatians 3:13). This two-fold ground of justification (Christ's sinlessness in incarnation vindicated by resurrection and Christ's sinbearing death), meant that the justification of the law was fulfilled in us. The law requires our justification, in that the soul that sins shall die, and the one who does shall live. Christ fulfilled all of these things by passive and active obedience, and this fulfillment is so gifted over to us that it is described by interiority (in us). Moreover, the law itself, holy and good, required justification. Though it promised life, it was emasculated by sin. Christ, who kept the law, received the resurrection life it promised, thus justifying the law.

Chapter 10

Conclusion

εἰ οὖν συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ (Colossians 3:1)
καὶ συνηγείρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (Ephesians 2:6)

Frequently the charge is made that imputed righteousness involves a ‘**legal fiction**’, but this oft-cited criticism proves too much, for it equally applies to the remission of sins¹³⁶⁰ and imputations of our sins to Christ¹³⁶¹ as much as to the imputation of Christ’s righteousness to believers. For Paul, believers have already been raised with Christ¹³⁶² and seated with him in the heavenly realms, where their lives are hidden with Christ in God.¹³⁶³ The believer now shares in Christ’s ‘position and status as hidden with God’.¹³⁶⁴ Few complain that such a status by virtue of our union with Christ is a ‘legal fiction’. Nevertheless, at one level, believers clearly are not in the heavenly realms, as they have not been physically raised.¹³⁶⁵ Believers are therefore *simul suscitatus et moriens* (at once risen and dying) as well as *simul iustus et peccator* (at once righteous and sinner). Neither are legal fictions, because God is a God of truth in what he reveals to us in Scripture. We walk by faith, not by sight.¹³⁶⁶

Another oft repeated criticism of ‘imputed righteousness’ is that **“the righteousness of Christ” is not a New Testament expression at all**.¹³⁶⁷ However, if the argument of this thesis is accepted, Paul actually says something even more germane to the doctrine of

¹³⁶⁰ 2 Corinthians 5:19; Romans 4:7-8; cf Hebrews 8:12; 10:17

¹³⁶¹ 2 Corinthians 5:21

¹³⁶² Ephesians 2:6; Colossians 2:12, 3:1; Campbell, *Union with Christ* (2012), 235-6.

¹³⁶³ Ephesians 2:6; Colossians 3:3; Campbell, *Union with Christ* (2012), 221-2.

¹³⁶⁴ Campbell, *Union with Christ* (2012), 222.

¹³⁶⁵ 2 Timothy 2:18.

¹³⁶⁶ 2 Corinthians 5:6.

¹³⁶⁷ Morris, ‘Introduction’, in Valdés, *The Benefit of Christ* (1984), xxvi.

imputed righteousness: ἐνὸς δικαιώματος (Romans 5:18). That is, Paul does not simply say, δικαιοσύνη Χριστοῦ, but δικαίωμα Χριστοῦ [ἐνός referring to Christ], which embraces everything δικαιοσύνη Χριστοῦ denotes, but adds to it this: that Christ's righteousness was also divinely vindicated and judicially approved in resurrection.

The presentation of imputed righteousness in this thesis does not depend on a developed **covenant theology**, and in this it bears a similarity with Calvin. 'In Calvin's writings we do not find the issue of Christ's obedience discussed in the context of a covenant of works'.¹³⁶⁸ An under-developed covenant theology need not prohibit an appreciation of Paul's teaching on imputation. Nor is a strict parallelism between the imputation of Christ's righteousness¹³⁶⁹ and **the imputation of Adam's sin**¹³⁷⁰ required. Again, it was certainly not obvious to Calvin, who commented:

[B]y Adam's sin we are not condemned through imputation alone, as though we were punished only for the sin of another; but we suffer his punishment, because we also ourselves are guilty; for as our nature is vitiated in him, it is regarded by God as having committed sin. But through the righteousness of Christ we are restored in a different way to salvation.¹³⁷¹

Finally, the question is raised whether the imputation of Christ's righteousness be regarded as an '**evangelical shibboleth**'. Consider this comment by Ryle.

We must learn to distinguish between things that are of the essence of the gospel and things which are of the perfection of the gospel. We may think that a man preaches an imperfect gospel who denies election, *considers justification to be nothing more than forgiveness*, and tells believers in one sermon that they may attain perfection in this life, and in another sermon that they may entirely fall away from grace. But if the same man strongly and boldly exposes and denounces sin, clearly and fully lifts up Christ, distinctly and openly invites men to believe and repent, shall we dare to say that the man does not preach the gospel at all? [...] If I am asked whether I prefer Whitfield's gospel or Wesley's, I answer at once that I prefer Whitfield's. I am a Calvinist, and not an Arminian. But if I am asked to go further, and

¹³⁶⁸ Berends, 'The Obedience of Christ' (2001), 35

¹³⁶⁹ Romans 4:6, 11; 5:18-19.

¹³⁷⁰ Romans 5:12-13.

¹³⁷¹ Calvin, *Comm Romans* 5:17 in CC, 19:210.

to say that Wesley preached no gospel at all, and did no real good, I answer at once that I cannot do so.¹³⁷² (my emphasis)

Gundry had a point in his criticism of 'The Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Evangelical Celebration', in that the title was a misnomer, and its content was 'too Reformed'.¹³⁷³

Consider these two statements:

We declare that Faith in the perfect obedience of Christ by which he fulfilled all the demands of the Law of God on our behalf is essential to the Gospel [...]

We affirm that the doctrine of the imputation (reckoning or counting) both of our sins to Christ and of his righteousness to us, whereby our sins are fully forgiven and we are fully accepted, is essential to the biblical gospel.¹³⁷⁴

This thesis has presented an argument vindicating both statements. However, it is questionable, following Ryle, whether it is necessary to hold that the 'imputation of Christ's righteousness' as Christ's 'active obedience' is 'essential to the biblical gospel'. It is the best presentation of it, a necessary entailment of it, and can be justified from Scripture, making other presentations of the gospel deficient. But someone who teaches that Christ's 'active obedience' was for the sole purpose for Christ to provide a perfect satisfaction for our sins holds to the essence of the gospel that 'Christ died for our sins'.¹³⁷⁵

To God Be The Glory.

¹³⁷² Ryle, *Christian Leaders of the 18th Century* (1885), 85-86

¹³⁷³ Gundry, 'Why I Didn't Endorse' (2001), 6-8.

¹³⁷⁴ 'Appendix One: The Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Evangelical Celebration' in Ankers, Armstrong, Woodbridge (eds), *This We Believe* (2000), 246-7.

¹³⁷⁵ 1 Corinthians 15:3.

Bibliography

- Abela, A, 'When Tradition Prevails over Good Parsing: Reconsidering the Translation of Is 53:11B', in H M Niemann & M Augustin (eds), *Stimulation from Leiden: Collected Communications to the XVIIIth Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament, Leiden 2004*, Frankfurt/New York: Lang, 2006, 89-104
- Adamson, J, *James*: NICNT, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976
- Alexander, P S, 'Torah and Salvation in Tannaitic Literature', in D A Carson, P T O'Brien, M A Seifrid (eds), *Justification and Variegated Nomism Vol 1: The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*, Tübingen/Grand Rapids: Mohr Siebeck/Baker, 2001, 261-302
- Alexander, T D, 'Abraham Re-Assessed Theologically: The Abraham Narrative and the New Testament Understanding of Justification by Faith' in R S Hess, G J Wenham, P E Satterthwaite (eds), *He Swore and Oath: Biblical Themes from Genesis 12-50*, 2nd ed Paternoster/Baker: Carlisle/Grand Rapids, 1994
- Alford, H, *The Greek New Testament*, 7th ed: 1877: Reprint Grand Rapids: Guardian, 1976, 4 Volumes
- Alt, A, Eissfeldt, Kahle, P, Kittel, R (eds), *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS), Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1969/77
- Ankers, J N, Armstrong J H, Woodbridge, J D, (eds), *This We Believe: The Good News of Jesus Christ for the World*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000
- Aristotle, *On the Heavens*: LCL 338 Vol VI, ET W K C Guthrie: Cambridge/London: Harvard University/Heinemann, 1971
- *The 'Art' of Rhetoric*, ET J H Freese: London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard University Press, 1926
- Aune, D E, 'Recent Readings of Paul Relating to Justification by Faith', in David E Aune (ed), *Rereading Paul Together: Protestant and Catholic Perspectives on Justification*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006, 188-245
- *Revelation*: WBC 52, Waco, TX: Word, 1998, 3 Vols
- Axtell, H L, *The Deification of Abstract Ideas in Roman Literature and Inscriptions*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1907, accessed at <https://archive.org/details/deificationofabs00axterich> on 17 June 2014.
- Balz, H and Schneider, G, *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* (EDNT), Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1990, 3 Vols
- Barclay, J, *Obedying the Truth: A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians*, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988
- Barclay, W B, *"Christ in You": A Study of Paul's Theology and Ethics*, Lanham/New York/Oxford: University Press of America, 1999
- Barnett, P, *2 Corinthians*: NICNT, Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1997
- *Romans*: FOTB, Fearn: Christian Focus, 2003
- Barr, J, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961. Reprinted Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2004
- Barrett, C K, *Acts 1-14*: ICC, London: T&T Clark, 1994, 2 Vols
- *Romans*: BNTC, London: A&C Black, 1957
- Barth, K, *Adam and Christ: Man and Humanity in Romans 5*, ET: T A Smail: New York: Harper, 1956

- Bartlett, R C, & Collins, S D (ed & trs), *Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*, Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 2011
- Bauckham, R, 'Apocalypses' in D A Carson, P T O'Brien, M A Seifrid (eds), *Justification and Variegated Nomism Vol 1: The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*, Tübingen/Grand Rapids: Mohr Siebeck/Baker, 2001, 135-187
- Bauer, W, Arndt, W F, Gingrich, F W, (BAG), *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 4th Rev Ed: Chicago/Cambridge: University Chicago Press/Cambridge, 1952
- Bauer, W, Danker, F W, Arndt, W F, Gingrich, (BDAG), F W, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd Ed: Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 2000
- Bavinck, H (1854-1921), *Reformed Dogmatics: Vol 4: Holy Spirit, Church and New Creation*, J Bolt (ed), J Vriend (trs), Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008
- Baxter, B J, 'Hebrew and Greek Word Study Fallacies', *MJTM* 12 (2010-2011), 3-32
- Beale, G K, 'Resurrection in the Already-and-Not-Yet Phases of Justification', in S Storms & J Taylor (eds), *For the Fame of God's Name: Essays in Honor of John Piper*, (Wheaton: Crossway, 2010), 190-212
- *Revelation*: NIGTC, Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1999
- Beare, F W, *The Epistle to the Philippians*: BNTC, 3rd Ed: London: A & C Black, 1973
- Beilby, J K, & Eddy, P R, (eds), *Justification: Five Views*, Downers Grove: IVP, 2011
- Bekker, I, *Harpocraton et Moeris*, Berlin, 1833, accessed at <https://archive.org/details/harpocratonetm00bekkgoog> on 22 April 2014
- Bell, R H, 'Faith in Christ: Some Exegetical and Theological Reflections on Philippians 3:9 and Ephesians 3:12' in M F Bird and P M Sprinkle (eds), *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Pistis Christou Debate*, Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009, 111-128
- Bellinger, W H, Jr & Farmer, W R, (eds), *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*, Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998
- Benakis, L, 'Aristotelian Ethics in Byzantium', in C Berber & D Jenkins, *Medieval Greek Commentaries on the Nicomachean Ethics*, Leiden: Brill, 2009, 63-70
- Benoit, P, *Jesus and the Gospel*, Benet Weatherhead (trs), New York: Seabury, 1974, 2 Vols
- Berends, B, 'The Obedience of Jesus Christ: A Defence of the doctrine of Christ's Active Obedience', *Vox Reformata* 66 (2001), 26-51
- Berkhof, L (1873-1957), *Systematic Theology*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996
- Betz, H D, *Galatians*: Hermeneia, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979
- Bigg, C, *Peter & Jude*: ICC, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902
- Bird, M F, 'Incorporated Righteousness: A Response to Recent Evangelical Discussion Concerning the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness in Justification', *JETS*, 47/2 (June 2004), 253-75
- 'Justified by Christ's Resurrection: A Neglected Aspect of Paul's Doctrine of Justification', *SBET* 22 (2004), 72-91
- 'Progressive Reformed View' in J K Beilby & P R Eddy (eds), *Justification: Five Views*, Downers Grove: IVP, 2011, 131-157
- 'Raised for our Justification: A Fresh Look at Romans 4:25', *Colloquium* 35/1 (2003), 31-46
- *Evangelical Theology: A Biblical and Systematic Introduction*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2013

- *The Saving Righteousness of God: Studies on Paul, Justification and the New Perspective*: PBM, Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2007
- Bird, M F, and Sprinkle, P M (eds), *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Pistis Christou Debate*, Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009
- Blocher, H, 'Agnus Victor: The Atonement as Victory and Vicarious Punishment', in J G Stackhouse (ed), *What Does it Mean to be Saved: Broadening Evangelical Horizons of Salvation*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002, 67-94
- 'Justification of the Ungodly (Sola Fide): Theological Reflections', in *Justification & Variegated Nomism*, in D A Carson, P T O'Brien, M A Seifrid (eds), *Justification and Variegated Nomism: Volume 2 – The Paradoxes of Paul*, Tübingen/Grand Rapids, MI: Mohr Siebeck/Baker Academic, 2004, 465-500
- *Original Sin: Illuminating the Riddle*, Downers Grove: IVP, 1997
- Blomberg, C L, & Kamell, M J, *James*: ZECNT, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008
- Bock, D L, & Glaser, M, (eds), *The Gospel According to Isaiah 53: Encountering the Suffering Servant in Jewish and Christian Theology*, Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2012
- Bock, D L, *Luke*: BECNT, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994, 2 Vols
- Bockmuehl, M, *Philippians*: BNTC, London: A&C Black/Hendrickson, 1998, 209.
- Bovon, F, *Luke*: Hermeneia, E T C M Thomas: Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002, 2 Vols
- Bray, G, *Romans*: ACCNT, Downers Grove: IVP, 1998, 205
- Brenton, L C L, *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English*, 1851: Reprint Peabody: Hendrickson, 2011
- Brighton, L A, *Revelation*: Concordia Commentary, Saint Louis: Concordia, 1999
- Brown, C (ed), (NIDNTT), *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1971, 3 Vols
- Brown, F, Driver, S R, Briggs, C A (BDB), *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1951
- Bruce, F F, *Romans*: TNTC, 2nd Ed; Leicester/Grand Rapids: IVP/Eerdmans, 1985
- Buchanan, J, *The Doctrine of Justification: An Outline of its History in the Church and of Its Exposition from Scripture*, 1867: Reprint: Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977, 333-4
- Bultmann, R, *Theology of the New Testament*, ET K Grobel: London: SCM, 1952
- Baker, J P, 'Obedience of Christ', in S B Ferguson & D F Wright (eds), *New Dictionary of Theology*, Leicester/Downers Grove: IVP, 1988, 473-4
- Burk, D, 'The Righteousness of God (Dikaïosunē Theou) and Verbal Genitives: A Grammatical Clarification', *JSNT* (2012) 34(4), 346-360
- 'Review Article: *Jesus' Blood and Righteousness: Paul's Theology of Imputation*. By Brian Vickers', in *Criswell Theological Review* (2007) NS 4(2): 117-19
- Burton, E de Witt, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*: ICC, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1921
- Byrne, B, *Romans*: Sacra Pagina Vol 6, Michael Glazier/Liturgical: Collegeville, 1996
- Calvin Translation Society, *Calvin's Commentaries*: 22 Vols, Reprint: Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989
- Calvin, J, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed J T McNeill; tr F L Battles; Library of Christian Classics Vol XX, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960, 2 Vols
- Campbell, C R, *Basics of Verbal Aspect in Biblical Greek*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008
- *Paul and Union with Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012

- Campbell, D A, *The Rhetoric of Righteousness in Romans 3:21-26*: JSNTSup 65, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992
- *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009
- 'The Faithfulness of Jesus Christ in Romans 3:22', in M F Bird & P M Sprinkle (eds), *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Pistis Christou Debate*, Peabody/Milton Keynes: Hendrickson/Paternoster, 2009, 51-71
- Carpenter, C B, 'A Question of Union with Christ? Calvin and Trent on Justification', *WTJ* 64 (2002) 363-86
- Carson, D A, 'Atonement in Romans 3:21-26', in C E Hill & F A James III, *The Glory of the Atonement: Essays in Honor of Roger Nicole*, Downers Grove: IVP, 2004, 119-139
- 'The Vindication of Imputation: On Fields of Discourse and Semantic Fields' in M Husbands and D J Treier (eds), *Justification: What's at Stake in the Current Debates?*, Downers Grove/Leicester: IVP/Apollos, 2004, 46-78
- *Exegetical Fallacies*, 2nd Ed: Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996
- Chantry, W, *Imputation of Righteousness & Covenant Theology: An Overview of Romans 5:12-21*, Fullerton: Reformed Baptist Publications, 2001
- Charlesworth (ed), J H, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Vol 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*, London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983
- Chisholm, R B, 'Forgiveness and Salvation in Isaiah 53', in D L Bock & M Glaser (eds), *The Gospel According to Isaiah 53: Encountering the Suffering Servant in Jewish and Christian Theology*, Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2012), 191-210
- Ciampa, R E, & Rosner, B S, *1 Corinthians: Pillar*, Grand Rapids/Cambridge/Nottingham: Eerdmans/Apollos, 2010
- Clark, R S, 'Do This and Live: Christ's Active Obedience as the Ground of Justification' in R Scott Clark (ed), *Covenant, Justification and Pastoral Ministry: Essays by the Faculty of Westminster Seminary California*, Phillipsburg: Presbyterian & Reformed, 2007, 229-65
- (ed), *Covenant, Justification and Pastoral Ministry: Essays by the Faculty of Westminster Seminary California*, Phillipsburg: Presbyterian & Reformed, 2007
- Clifford, A C, *Atonement and Justification: English Evangelical Theology 1640-1790 – An Evaluation*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1990
- 'Justification: The Calvin-Saumur perspective', *EQ* 79.4 (2007), 331-348
- Colijn, Brenda B, *Images of Salvation in the New Testament*, Downers Grove: IVP, 2010
- Collange, J-F, *The Epistle of Saint Paul to the Philippians*, ET A W Heathcote: London: Epworth, 1979
- Collins, K J, 'The Doctrine of Justification: Historic Wesleyan and Contemporary Understandings', in M Husbands and D J Treier (eds), *Justification: What's at Stake in the Current Debate?*, Downers Grove, IL/Leicester: IVP/Apollos, 2004
- Collins, N L, 'The Jewish Source of Rom 5:17, 16, 10 and 9: The Verses of Paul in Relation to a Comment in the Mishnah at M. Makk 3.15', *RB* 2005 - T 112-1, 27-45
- Cope, E M, *Commentary on the Rhetoric of Aristotle*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1877
- Cranfield, C E B, *Romans 1-8*: ICC, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2001; 10th corrected Impression
- Culver, R D, *Systematic Theology: Biblical and Historical*, Fearn: Mentor, 2005
- Dabney, D L, 'Justified by the Spirit: Soteriological Reflections on the Resurrection', *IntJST* Vol 3 No 1 March 2001, 46-68

- Dabney, R L, *Systematic Theology: Syllabus and Notes of the Course of Systematic and Polemic Theology Taught in Union Theological Seminary, Virginia*, 2nd Ed 1878: Reprint: Edinburgh/Pennsylvania: Banner of Truth, 1985
- Danker, F W, 'Under Contract: A Form-Critical Study of Linguistic Adaptation in Romans', in E W Barth & R E Cocroft, *Festschrift to Honor F Wilbur Gingrich*, Leiden: Brill, 1972, 91-114
- Davids, P H, *2 Peter*, Jude: Pillar, Grand Rapids-Cambridge/Nottingham: Eerdmans/Apollos, 2006
- Davies, G N, *Faith and Obedience in Romans: A Study in Romans 1-4*: JSNTSup 39, Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1990
- Davies, W D, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*, London: SPCK, 1965
- De Bruyn, T (trs), *Pelagius' Commentary on St Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1993
- Denney, J, *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*: BCL, Reprint Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998
- Dennison Jr, J T, *Reformed Confessions of the 16th and 17th Centuries in English Translation*: Vol 2 1552-1566, Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2010
- Dindorf, W, *Harpocratonis lexicon in decem oratores Atticos*, Vol 1, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1853, repr. Groningen: Bouma, 1969, at <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/> on 22 April 2014
- Dio Cassius, *Roman History*, LCL 032 Vol I Fragments of Books I-XXII, ET E Cary: London/Cambridge: Heinemann/MacMillan, 1914
- *Roman History*: LCL 066 Vol IV Books 41-45, ET: E Cary: London/New York: Heinemann/Putnam's, 1916
- *Roman History*: LCL 083, Vol VI Book 51-55, ET: E Cary: London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard University Press, 1917
- *Roman History*: LCL 175, Vol VII, Books 56-60 (ET: E Cary: London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard University Press, 1924
- *Roman History*: LCL 176 Vol VIII Books 61-70, ET: E Cary: London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard University Press, 1924
- Diodorus of Siculus, *The Library of History*, LCL 279, 303, 340, 375, 384, 399, 389, 422, 377, 390, 409, 423 Vols I-XXII Books 1-20, Fragments of Books 21-40, ET: C H Oldfather: London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard University Press, 1935
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities*: LCL 319, Vol I Books I-II, ET: E Cary: Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press, 1937
- *Roman Antiquities*: LCL 347 Vol II Books III-IV, ET: E Cary: Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1939
- *Roman Antiquities*: LCL 364 Vol IV Books VI.49-VII, ET: E Cary: London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard University Press, 1943
- *Roman Antiquities*: LCL 372 Vol V Books VIII-IX.24, ET: E Cary: London/Harvard: Heinemann/Harvard University Press, 1945
- *The Critical Essays Vol I*: LCL 465, ET: S Usher: London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard University Press, 1974
- *The Critical Essays Vol II*: LCL 466, ET: S Usher: London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard University Press, 1985
- Dodson, J R, 'The Voices of Scripture: Citations and Personifications in Paul', *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 20.3 (2010): 419-432.
- Driver, S R, *Deuteronomy*: ICC, 3rd Ed: Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902

- Dunn, J D G, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, Chatham/Naperville: SCM/Allenson, 1970
- *Romans 1-8, 9-16*: WBC 38A-B, Waco, TX: Word/Nelson, 1988, 2 Vols
- *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998
- 'Did Paul Have a Covenant Theology? Reflections on Romans 9:4 and 11:27', in S E Porter and J C R De Roo (eds), *The Concept of the Covenant in Second Temple Period*: SJSJ 71, Lieden/Boston: Brill, 2003, 287-307.
- Ellicott, C J, *St Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, Colossians and to Philemon*, Andover: Draper, 1865
- Evans, C A, 'Isaiah 53 in the Letters of Peter, Paul, Hebrews, and John', in D L Bock & M Glaser (eds), *The Gospel According to Isaiah 53: Encountering the Suffering Servant in Jewish and Christian Theology*, Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2012, 145-170
- Fee, G D, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians*: NICNT, Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1995
- *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*: NICNT, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987, 790
- Fesko, J V, 'NT Wright on Imputation', *RTR* 66(1) April 2007, 2-22
- *Justification: Understanding the Classic Reformed Doctrine*, Phillipsburg, P & R, 2008
- *What is Justification by Faith Alone: Basics of the Reformed Faith Series*, Phillipsburg: P & R, 2008
- Fitzmyer, J A, 'Justification by Faith in Pauline Thought: A Catholic View' in D E Aune (ed), *Rereading Paul Together: Protestant and Catholic Perspectives on Justification*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006, 77-94
- *Acts of the Apostles*: AB, New York: Doubleday, 1997
- *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*: AB, New York: Doubleday, 1992
- Foster, P 'Πίστις Χριστοῦ Terminology in Philippians and Ephesians', in M F Bird & P M Sprinkle (eds), *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Pistis Christou Debate*, Peabody/Milton Keynes: Hendrickson/Paternoster, 2009, 91-109
- Frame, J, *Salvation Belongs to the Lord*, Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed, 2006
- Gaffin Jr, R B, *By Faith, Not By Sight: Paul and the Order of Salvation*, Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006
- *Resurrection and Redemption: A Study in Paul's Soteriology*, Grand Rapids/Phillipsburg: Baker/P&R, 1978/1987
- 'Union With Christ: Some Biblical and Theological Reflections', in A T B McGowan (ed), *Always Reforming: Explorations in Systematic Theology*, Leicester: Apollos, 2006, 271-288
- 'Justification and Eschatology' in K Scott Oliphant (ed) *Justified In Christ: God's Plan For Us in Justification*, Fearn: Mentor, 2007
- Garcia, M A, 'Imputation and the Christology of Union with Christ: Calvin, Osiander, and the Contemporary Quest for a Reformed Model', *WTJ* 68(2006), 219-51
- 'Imputation as Attribution: Union with Christ, Reification and Justification as Declarative Word', *International Journal of Systematic Theology* Vol 11 No 4 October 2009: 415-427
- Garland, D E, *1 Corinthians*: BECNT, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003
- Garlington, D B, 'Imputation or Union with Christ? A Response to John Piper', *Reformation and Revival Journal* 12 (2003), 45-113
- *Faith, Obedience and Perseverance: Aspects of Paul's Letter to the Romans*: WUNT79, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994

- 'A Review Article: D A Carson, P T O'Brien, and M A Seifrid (eds), *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, Vol I: The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism', at http://www.thepaulpage.com/Variegated_Nomism.pdf accessed on 10 April 2014
- Gaston, L, *Paul and the Torah*, Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987
- Gathercole, S J, 'Justified by Faith, Justified by his Blood: The Evidence of Romans 3:21-4:25', in D A Carson, P T O'Brien and M A Seifrid (eds), *Justification and Variegated Nomism: Volume 2 – The Paradoxes of Paul*, Tübingen/Grand Rapids: Mohr Siebeck/Baker, 2004
- *Where is Boasting?: Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1-5*, Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2002
- Gesenius, W, Kautzsch, E, Cowley, A E (GKC), *Hebrew Grammar*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1910.
- Gibson, J C L, *Davidson's Introductory Hebrew Grammar – Syntax*, 4th ed, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994
- Gill, J, *An Exposition of the Epistle of Paul to the Romans*: Newport Commentary Series, 1746: Reprint Springfield: Particular Baptist Press, 2002
- Godet, F L, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 1883: Reprint Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1977
- Goodwin, W W, *A Greek Grammar*, London: Macmillan, 1955
- Gordon, T D, 'Observations on N T Wright's Biblical Theology: With Special Consideration of "Faithfulness of God"' in G L W Johnson and G P Waters, (eds), *By Faith Alone: Answering the Challenges to the Doctrine of Justification*, Wheaton: Crossway, 2006, 127-146
- 'Why Israel Did Not Obtain Torah-Righteousness: A Translation Note on Rom 9:32', *WTJ* 54 (1992) 163-166
- Grenfell, B P & Hunt, A S (eds & trs), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri Part II* (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1899, accessed at <http://www.archive.org/stream/oxyrhynchuspappt02grenuoft#page/270/mode/2up> on 16 May 2014.
- Grieb, A Katherine, 'The Righteousness of God in Romans', in J L Sumney, *Reading Paul's Letter to the Romans* (Atlanta: SBL, 2012), 65-78
- Gundry, R H, 'The Nonimputation of Christ's Righteousness' in M Husbands and D J Treier (eds), *Justification: What's at Stake in the Current Debates?*, Downers Grove, IL/Leicester: IVP/Apollos, 2004, 17-45
- Gundry, R H, 'Why I Didn't Endorse "The Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Evangelical Celebration', *Books & Culture* (2001) January/February, 6-9
- Haldane, R, *Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans*, 1874 9th Ed Reprint Edinburgh/Carlisle: Banner of Truth, 1958
- Hamilton, V P, *Genesis 1-17*: NICOT, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990
- Hansen, G W, 'The Preaching and Defence of Paul', in I H Marshall & D Peterson, *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998, 295-324
- *The Letter to the Philippians*: Pillar, Grand Rapids-Cambridge/Nottingham: Eerdmans/Apollos, 2009
- Harman, A, *Isaiah*; FOTB, Fearn: Christian Focus, 2005
- Harris, M J, 'Appendix: Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament', in C Brown (ed), *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* (NIDNTT), Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975, 3:1171-1215
- *2 Corinthians*: NIGTC, Grand Rapids/Milton Keynes: Eerdmans/Paternoster, 2005
- Hawthorne, G F, *Philippians*: WBC43, Waco: Word, 1983

- Head, P M, 'Jesus' Resurrection in Pauline Thought: A Study in Romans' in P M Head (ed), *Proclaiming the Resurrection: Papers from the First Oak Hill Annual School of Theology*, Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998, 58-80
- Hendriksen, W, *Romans*: NTC, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980-1
- Hengel, M, *The 'Hellenization' of Judaea in the First Century after Christ*, ET: J Bowden: London/Philadelphia: SCM/Trinity, 1989
- Hengel, M, & Bailey, D P, 'The Effective History of Isaiah 53 in the Pre-Christian Period', in B Janowski & P Stuhlmacher (eds), *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*, ET: D P Bailey: Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004, 75-146
- Herodotus, *The Persian Wars*, LCL 117, Vol I Books I-II, ET: A D Godley: London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard University Press, 1920
- Hill, D, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms*: SNTSMS 5, Cambridge: CUP, 1967
- Hodge, A A, (1823-1886), *The Confession of Faith: A Handbook of Christian Doctrine Expounding the Westminster Confession*, London: Banner of Truth, 1958
- Hodge, C, (1797-1878), *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 1864: Reprint London: Banner of Truth, 1972
- *Systematic Theology*, Abridged Ed, E N Gross Editor: Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992
- *Systematic Theology*, Reprint: Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1946, 3 Volumes
- Hoekema, A A, *Saved By Grace*, Grand Rapids, MI/Carlisle: Eerdmans/Paternoster, 1989
- Hofius, O, 'The Fourth Servant Song in the New Testament Letters', in B Janowski & P Stuhlmacher (eds), *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*, ET: D P Bailey: Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004, 163-188
- Hooker, M D, 'Did the Use of Isaiah 53 to Interpret His Mission Begin with Jesus', in W H Bellinger Jr & W R Farmer (eds), *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*, Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998, 88-103
- 'Raised for Our Acquittal' (Rom 4:25), in R Bieringer, V Koperski & B Lataire, *Resurrection in the New Testament: Festschrift J Lambrecht*, Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 2002, 323-341
- *From Adam to Christ: Essays on Paul*, Cambridge: CUP, 1990
- *Paul: A Short Introduction*, Oxford: One World, 2003
- Hookway, C, 'reification, hypostatization', in J Dancy & E Sosa (eds), *A Companion to Epistemology: Blackwell Companion to Philosophy*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1992, 428
- Hornblower, S, Spaworth, A, & Eidinow, E, *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 4th Ed: Oxford: OUP, 2012
- Horton, M S, 'Traditional Reformed View' in J K Beilby & P R Eddy (eds), *Justification: Five Views*, Downers Grove: IVP, 2011, 83-111
- 'Which Covenant Theology?', in R S Clark, *Covenant, Justification and Pastoral Ministry*, Phillipsburg: P & R, 2007, 197-227
- *Covenant and Salvation: Union with Christ*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007
- *The Christian Faith: A Systematic Theology for Pilgrims on the Way*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011
- Hultgren, A J, *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2011

- Humphrey, E M, 'Glimpsing the Glory: Paul's Gospel, Righteousness and the Beautiful Feet of NT Wright', in N Perrin & R B Hays (eds), *Jesus, Paul and the People of God: A Theological Dialogue with N T Wright*, Downers Grove: IVP, 2011, 162-182
- Jacob, B, *The First Book of the Bible Genesis*, ET E I Jacob and W Jacob: New York, KTAV, nd
- Jacomb, Thomas, *Sermons on the Eight Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, Verses 1-4*, 1672: Reprint Edinburgh/Carlisle: Banner of Truth, 1996
- Janowski, B, & Stuhlmacher, P, (eds), *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*, ET: D P Bailey: Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004
- Jeremias, J, *The Central Message of the New Testament*, London: SCM, 1965
- Jewett, R, *Romans*: Hermeneia, Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007
- Johnson, G L W, and Waters, G P, (eds), *By Faith Alone: Answering the Challenges to the Doctrine of Justification*, Wheaton: Crossway, 2006
- Johnson, L T, *Acts of the Apostles*: SP, Collegeville: Liturgical, 1992
- Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*: LCL 365, Vol IX Books XVIII-XX, ET L H Feldman: London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard University Press, 1965
- *Jewish Antiquities*: LCL 410 Vol VII Books xv-xvii, ET R Marcus & A Wikgren: London: Heinemann, 1963
- *Jewish Antiquities*: LCL 433 Vol XII Books xviii-xix, ET L H Feldman: London: Heinemann, 1965
- *The Jewish War*: LCL 210 Vol IV Books v-vii, ET H St J Thackeray: Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press, 1997
- *The Life; Against Apion*: LCL 186 Vol I, ET H St J Thackeray: London: Heinemann, 1966
- Käsemann, E, *Commentary on Romans*, ET: G W Bromiley: Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980
- *New Testament Questions of Today*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969
- Kautzsch, E, *Abhandlung über die Derivate des Stammes sdq im altestamentlichen Sprachgebrauch*, Tübingen: L F Fues, 1881
- Kearns, C, 'The Interpretation of Romans 6,7', in *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus 1961*: AB 17-18, Rome: Pontifical Bible Institute, 1963), 1:301-7
- Keck, L E, *Romans*: Abingdon NTC, Nashville: Abingdon, 2005
- Kern, P H, 'Justification by Faith in Galatians: A Test Case', in R J Gibson (ed), *Justification and Christian Assurance*: Explorations 10, Sydney: Openbook, 1996, 27-58
- Kim, S, *Paul and the New Perspective: Second Thoughts on the Origin of Paul's Gospel*, Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2002
- *The Origin of Paul's Gospel*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981
- Kirk, J R D, 'Reconsidering *Dikaiōma* in Romans 5:16, *JBL* 126 No 4 (2007), 787-92
- 'The Sufficiency of the Cross (I): The Crucifixion as Jesus' Act of Obedience', *SBET* 24:1 (2006), 36-64
- 'The Sufficiency of the Cross (II): The Law, The Cross, and Justification', *SBET* 24:2 (2006), 133-154
- *Unlocking Romans: Resurrection and the Justification of God*, Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2008
- Kistemaker, S J, *James*: NTC, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1986
- *Peter & Jude*: NTC, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987
- Kittel, G, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (TDNT), ET G Bromiley: Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1964

- Kline, M G, 'Abram's Amen' *WTJ* (1968) Vol XXXI, Nov, 1-11 at 4
- Knight, G W, III, *The Pastoral Epistles*: NIGTC, Grand Rapids/Carlisle: Eerdmans/Paternoster, 1992
- Knox, R A, *The New Testament*, London: Burns and Oates, 1957
- Kruse, C G, *Paul's Letter to the Romans*: Pillar, Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans/Nottingham: Apollos, 2012
- Laato, T, 'Paul's Anthropological Considerations', in D A Carson, P T O'Brien, M A Seifrid (eds), *Justification and Variegated Nomism: Volume 2 – The Paradoxes of Paul*, Tübingen/Grand Rapids, MI: Mohr Siebeck/Baker Academic, 2004, 343-359
- Lambrech, J, 'Why is Boasting Excluded? A Note on Rom 3,27 and 4,2', *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 61/4 (1985) 365-369
- 'Style and Content: A Note on Romans 8,10', *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 86/1 (2010) 171-6
- Lampe, G W H (ed), *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (PGL), Oxford: Clarendon, 1961
- Lane, A N S, 'Twofold Righteousness: A Key to the Doctrine of Justification: Reflections on Article 5 of the Regensburg Colloquy (1541)', in M Husbands and D J Treier (eds), *Justification: What's at Stake in the Current Debate?*, Downers Grove, IL/Leicester: IVP/Apollos, 2004
- Lane, W L, *Hebrews*: WBC 47, Waco, TX: Word, 1991, 2 Vols
- Laws, S, *James*: BNTC, London: A&C Black, 1980
- Lee, J H, 'Against Richard B Hays's "Faith of Jesus Christ"', in *JGRChJ* 5 (2008), 51-80
- Leenhardt, F J, *The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary*, ET: H Knight: London: Lutterworth, 1957
- Levenson, J D, 'Why Jews Are Not Interested in Biblical Theology', in J Neusner, B A Levine, E S Frenchs (eds), *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel*, Fortress, Philadelphia, 1987, 281-307
- Lightfoot, J B, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, London: Macmillan, 1890
- Lloyd Jones, D M, *Romans: Exposition of chapters 3:20-4:25: Atonement and Justification*, London: Banner of Truth, 1970
- Longenecker, R N, 'The Obedience of Christ in the Theology of the Early Church' in R Banks (ed), *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology Presented to L L Morris on his 60th Birthday*, Carlisle: Paternoster, 1974, 142-152
- Lust, J, Eynikel, E, Hauspie, K, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, Revised: Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003
- Lysias, *Collected Works*: LCL 224, ET: W R M Lamb: London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard, 1930
- Macchia, F D, *Justified in the Spirit: Creation, Redemption, and the Triune God*, Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010
- MacLeod, D 'How Right Are the Justified? Or, What is a Dikaio?', in *SBET*, 22:2 (Autumn 2004), 173-195
- Marshall, I H, 'Raised for Our Justification: The Saving Significance of the Resurrection of Christ', in W Dembski & T Schirrmacher (ed), *Tough Minded Christianity: Honoring the Legacy of John Warwick Montgomery*, Nashville: B&H, 2008), 244-271
- *Aspects of the Atonement: Cross and Resurrection in the Reconciling of God and Humanity*, Milton Keynes, Paternoster, 2007
- *The Epistle to the Philippians*, London: Epworth, 1992
- Martin, R P, *2 Corinthians*: WBC40, Waco: Word, 1986
- *James*: WBC 48, Waco: Word, 1988

- *Philippians*: NCB, London: Oliphants/Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1976
- *Philippians*: TNTC, London: Tyndale, 1959
- Matera, F J, *Romans*: Paideia, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2010
- Matlock, R B, 'The Rhetoric of πίστις in Paul: Galatians 2:16, 3:22, Romans 3:22, and Philippians 3:9' *JSNT* 30.2 (2007), 173-203
- 'Saving Faith: The Rhetoric and Semantics of πίστις in Paul' in M F Bird and P M Sprinkle (eds), *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Pistis Christou Debate*, Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009, 73-90
- McCartney, D G, *James*: BECNT, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2009
- McCormack, B L (ed), *Justification in Perspective: Historical Developments and Contemporary Challenges*, Grand Rapids/Edinburgh: Baker/Rutherford House, 2006
- McFadden, K W, 'The fulfillment of the Law's ΔΙΚΑΙΟΜΑ: Another Look at Romans 8:1-4', *JETS* 52/3 (September 2009), 483-97
- McGrath, A E, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, 2nd Ed: Cambridge: CUP, 1998; 3rd Ed: Cambridge: CUP, 2005
- McKnight, S, *James*: NICOT, Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2011
- McNamara, M, 'Some Targum Themes' in D A Carson, P T O'Brien, M A Seifrid (eds), *Justification and Variegated Nomism Vol 1: The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*, Tübingen/Grand Rapids: Mohr Siebeck/Baker, 2001, 303-356
- Mealy, J W, *After the Thousand Years: Resurrection and Judgment in Revelation 20*: JSNTSS 70, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992
- Migne, J.-P, (ed), *Patrologia Graeca (or Patrologiae Cursus Completus), Series Graeca (PG)1:272* accessed at http://books.google.com.au/books?id=brbUAAAAMAAJ&pg=PP9&source=gbs_selected_pages&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=XXXII&f=false on 2 June 2014
- Moberly, R W L, 'Abraham's Righteousness (Genesis XV 6)', in J A Emerton (ed), *Studies in the Pentateuch*, Leiden: Brill, 1990, 103-30
- Molnar, Paul D, 'The Theology of Justification in Dogmatic Context', in M Husbands and D J Treier (eds), *Justification: What's at Stake in the Current Debate?*, Downers Grove, IL/Leicester: IVP/Apollos, 2004
- Moo, D J, '"Law," "Works of the Law," and Legalism in Paul', *WTJ*, 45 (1983), 73-100
- 'Israel and the Law in Romans 5-11: Interaction with the New Perspective', in D A Carson, P T O'Brien, M A Seifrid (eds), *Justification and Variegated Nomism: Volume 2 – The Paradoxes of Paul*, Tübingen/Grand Rapids, MI: Mohr Siebeck/Baker Academic, 2004
- 'The Law of Christ as the Fulfillment of the Law of Moses: Modified Lutheran View' in *Five Views on Law and Gospel*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 319-376
- *Galatians*: BECNT, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2013
- *James*: Pillar, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000
- *The Epistle to the Romans*: NICNT, Grand Rapids, MI; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1996
- Moore, R K, *Rectification ('Justification') in Paul, in Historical Perspective and in the English Bible, God's Gift of Right Relationship, Part 1: Paul's Doctrine of Rectification; and Part 3: Paul's Doctrine of Rectification in English Versions of the New Testament* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 2001-2), 2 Vols
- Morris, L, *Revelation*: TNTC, London: Tyndale, 1969
- *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross: a study of the significance of some New Testament terms*, 3rd Ed: Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965,

- *The Cross in the New Testament*, Exeter: Paternoster, 1965
- *The Epistle to the Romans*: Pillar, Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge/Leicester: Eerdmans/Apollos, 1988
- Motyer, J A, *The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction & Commentary*, Downers Grove: IVP, 1993
- Moulton, J H & Turner, N, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek: Vol III Syntax*, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1963
- Moulton, J H, & Howard, W F, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek Vol II Accidence and Word-formation* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1929
- Moulton, J H, & Milligan, G, (MM) *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament: Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1930
- Mounce, R H, *Revelation: NICNT*, Revised: Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998
- Mounce, W D, *Pastoral Epistles*: WBC 46, Nashville: Nelson, 2000
- Müller, J J, *The Epistles of Paul to the Philippians and to Philemon*: NLCNT, London/Edinburgh: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1955
- Muller, R A, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms: Drawn Principally From Protestant Scholastic Theology*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985
- Muraoka, T (ed) *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, Louvain/Paris/Walpole: Peeters, 2009
- (ed) *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets*, Louvain/Paris/Dudley: Peeters, 2002
- (ed), *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography*, Melbourne: SBL, 1990
- Murray, J, 'The Obedience of Christ' in *Collected Writings of John Murray: Volume 2: Select Lectures in Systematic Theology*, Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1977, 151-7
- *Redemption Accomplished and Applied*, London: Banner of Truth, 1961
- *The Epistle to the Romans*: NICNT, Grand Rapids: MI, 1959, 1965
- *The Imputation of Adam's Sin* (1959), in K S Oliphant (ed), *Justified in Christ: God's Plan for Us in Justification* (Fearn: Mentor: 2007), 203-294
- Nathan, E, 'Is Covenant a Central Notion in Paul's Letter to the Romans?: An Exploratory Paper' in U Schnelle (ed), *The Letter to the Romans*, Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2009, 463-473
- Niemann, H M, & Augustin, M (eds), *Stimulation from Leiden: Collected Communications to the XVIIIth Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament, Leiden 2004*, Frankfurt/New York: Lang, 2006
- Noland, J, *Luke*: WBC 35, Waco, TX: Word/Nelson, 1989, 3 Vols
- Nygren, A, *Commentary on Romans*, ET C C Rasmussen: London: SCM, 1952
- O'Brien, P T, *Hebrews*: Pillar, Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans/Apollos, 2010
- *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, Grand Rapids/Carlisle: Eerdmans/Paternoster, 1991
- O'Neil, J C, *Paul's Letter to the Romans*: PelNNTC, Hammondsworth: Penguin, 1975
- Oden, T C, *Classic Christianity: A Systematic Theology*, New York: HarperCollins, 1992
- Oliphant, K S, *Justified in Christ: God's Plan For Us in Justification*, Fearn: Mentor, 2007
- Onesti, K L, and Brauch, M T, 'Righteousness', in G F Hawthorne, R P Martin, D G Reid, *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, (Downers Grove: IVP, 1993), 828-9
- Ortland, D C, "'Zeal Without Knowledge": For What Did Paul Criticize His Fellow Jews in Romans 10:2-3?', *WTJ* 73 (2011): 23-37
- Osborne, G R, *Romans*: IVPNTC, Downers Grove/Leicester: IVP, 2004

- Oswalt, J N, *Isaiah*: NICOT, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998, 2 Vols
- Owen, J, *Communion with God*, Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1991
- *The Doctrine of Justification by Faith through the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ; Explained, Confirmed and Vindicated* (1677) in W H Goold, *The Works of John Owen* Vol 5, 1850-53: Reprint Edinburgh/Carlisle: Banner of Truth, 1965
- Pakaluk, M, *Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics: An Introduction*: Cambridge Introductions to Key Philosophical Texts, Cambridge: CUP, 2005
- Pate, C M, *The Reverse of the Curse: Paul, Wisdom, and the Law*: WUNT2:114, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000
- Paulson, S D, 'The Augustinian imperfection: faith, Christ and imputation and its role in the ecumenical discussion of justification', in Wayne Stumme (ed), *The Gospel of Justification in Christ: where does the church stand today*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006, 104-124
- Pelikan, Jaroslav, *The Christian Tradition, a History of the Development of Doctrine* Vol 4: *Reformation of the Church Dogma*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984
- Peterson, D G, *Acts: Pillar*, Grand Rapids/Cambridge/Nottingham: Eerdmans/Apollos, 2009
- *Possessed By God: A New Testament Theology of Sanctification and Holiness*, Downers Grove: IVP, 1995
- Petter, T D, 'The Meaning of Substitutionary Righteousness in Isa 53:11: A Summary of the Evidence', *TRINJ* 32NS (2011) 165-189
- Phillips, E, 'They are Loved on Account of the Patriarchs': Zekhut Avot and the Covenant with Abraham', in S A Hunt (ed) *Perspectives on Our Father Abraham: Essays in Honour of Marvin R Wilson*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010, 187-220
- Phillips, R D, 'A Justification of Imputed Righteousness', in G L W Johnson & G P Waters, *By Faith Alone: Answering the Challenges to the Doctrine of Justification*, Wheaton: Crossway, 2006, 75-98
- Philo, *Supplement I: Questions and Answers on Genesis*: LCL 380, Books I-IV, ET: R Marcus: London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard University Press, 1953
- *Vol II*: LCL 227, 'That the Worse is Wont to Attack the Better', ET F H Colson & G H Whitaker: Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press, 1929
- *Vol IV*: LCL 261, ET F H Colson & G H Whitaker: London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard University Press, 1932
- *Vol V*: LCL 275, ET F H Colson & G H Whitaker: London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard University Press, 1934
- *Vol VII*: LCL 320, 'On the Decalogue' (ET F H Colson: London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard University Press, 1937), 62-3
- Piper, J, *Counted Righteous in Christ: Should We Abandon the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness?*, Wheaton: Crossway Books, 2002
- *The Future of Justification: A Response to NT Wright*, Wheaton: Crossway, 2007
- Plato, *The Laws II*: LCL 192 Vol XI, ET: R G Bury: London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard University Press, 1926
- Plaut, G W, *The Torah Genesis: A Modern Commentary*, New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1974.
- Polybius, *Histories*: LCL 160, Vol V, ET: W R Paton: Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press/Heinemann, 1926
- Prasad, J, 'The Righteousness of the Believer: A Close Look at Phil 3,9, *Bible Bhashyam* Vol XXX No 3 September 2004, 161-186

- Quell, G, & Schrenk, G, *Righteousness: Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, ET: J R Coates: London: A & C Black, 1951
- Rackham, H (trs), *Aristotle: The Nicomachean Ethics*: LCL 73 Aristotle Vol XIX, Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press, 1934
- Radloff, A, *Clothed with Christ: Justification and the Imputed Righteousness of Christ*, Unpublished Moore Theological College Issues in Theology Paper, 1999
- Rainbow, P A, 'Justification according to Paul's Thessalonian Correspondence', *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 19.2 (2009) 249-274
- *The Way of Salvation: The Role of Christian Obedience in Justification*, Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2005
- Reinach, Théodore, *Papyrus Grecs Et Démotiques: Recueillis En Égypte Et Publiés*, Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1905, accessed <https://archive.org/details/papyrusgrecsetd00rein> on 16 May 2014
- Reumann, J, Fitzmyer, J A, Quinn, J D, *Righteousness in the New Testament: "Justification" in the United States Lutheran—Roman Catholic Dialogue*, Philadelphia/New York: Fortress/Paulist, 1982
- 'Justification and Justice in the New Testament', *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 21:1 (1999), 26-45
- Reymond, R L, 'The Obedience of Christ' in W A Elwell (ed), *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984, 785
- *A New Systematic Theology of the Christian Faith*, Nashville: Nelson, 1998, 631
- Richardson, J, 'Existentialism' in A Richardson (ed), *A Dictionary of Christian Theology*, London: SCM, 1969), 125-6
- Ridderbos, H, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*, ET J R De Witt: Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975
- Roberts, A, & Donaldson, D, & Coxe, A C (eds), *Ante-Nicene Fathers* (ANF), 1885: American Ed: Reprint Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994, 10 Vols
- Robertson, A T, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, Nashville: Broadman, 1934
- Robertson, O P, 'Genesis 15:6: New Covenant Expositions of an Old Covenant Text', *WTJ* (1980) Vol XLII No 2, 259-289
- Ross, D, (trs) & L Brown (rev), *Aristotle: The Nicomachean Ethics: Oxford World's Classics*, Oxford: OUP, 1980
- Royster, D, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Romans: A Pastoral Commentary*, Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2008
- Runge, S E, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis*, Peabody: Hendrickson, 2010
- Ryle, J C, *Christian Leaders of the 18th Century*, 1885 Reprint: Edinburgh/Carlisle: Banner of Truth, 1978
- Sanday, W & Headlam, A C, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*: ICC, 5th Ed: Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902
- Sanders, E P, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*, London: SCM, 1977
- Sapp, D A, 'The LXX, 1Qisa, and MT versions of Isaiah 53' in W H Bellinger Jr & W R Farmer, *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*, Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998, 170-192
- Sarna, N M, *The JPS Torah Commentary: Genesis*, New York: JPS, 1989

- Schaff, P, (ed), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, (NF, PNF), 1st Series, trs J Morris, W H Simcox, G B Stevens, 1889: Reprint: Peabody, Hendrickson, 1995
- Scheck, T P (trs), *Origen: Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*: Introduced, translated and annotated, The Fathers of the Church series, Vols 103 & 104, Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2001-2, 2 Vols
- Schlatter, A, *Romans: The Righteousness of God*, ET: S S Schatzmann; Peabody, Hendrickson, 1995
- Schliesser, B, *Abraham's Faith in Romans 4: Paul's Concept of Faith in Light of the History of Reception of Genesis 15:6*: WUNT2:224, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2007
- Schmid, H H, *Gerechtigkeit als Weltordnung*, Tübingen: Mohr, 1969
- Schnabel, E J, Acts: ZECNT, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012
- Schreiner, T R, 'Is Perfect Obedience to the Law Possible? A Re-examination of Galatians 3:10,' *JETS* 27 (1984), 51-60
- 'Paul and Perfect Obedience to the Law: An Evaluation of the View of E P Sanders', *WTJ* 47 (1985), 245-78
- 'Did Paul Believe in Justification by Works? Another Look at Romans 2', *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 3 (1993), 131-158
- *The Law and Its Fulfillment: A Pauline Theology of Law*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993
- 'Israel's Failure to Attain Righteousness in Romans 9:30-10:3', *TrinJ* 12NS (1991) 209-20
- 'Justification: The Saving Righteousness of God in Christ', *JETS* 54:1 (March 2011), 19-34
- *Paul: Apostle of God's Glory in Christ: A Pauline Theology*, Downers Grove/Leicester: IVP/Apollos, 2001
- *Romans*: BECNT, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1998
- 'Sermon: From Adam to Christ: The Grace that Conquers all our Sin (Romans 5:12-19)', *SBJT* 15.1 (2011): 80-90
- Scroggs, R, 'Romans VI.7 Ο ΓΑΡ ΑΠΟΘΑΝΩΝ ΔΕΔΙΚΑΙΩΤΑΙ ΑΠΟ ΤΗΣ ΑΜΑΡΤΙΑΣ', *NTS* 10:1, October 1963, 104-8
- Seifrid, M A, 'Luther, Melancthon and Paul on the Question of Imputation: Recommendations on a Current Debate', in M Husbands and D J Treier (eds), *Justification: What's at Stake in the Current Debate?*, Downers Grove, IL/Leicester: IVP/Apollos, 2004
- 'Paul's Use of Righteousness Language Against Its Hellenistic Background', in *Justification and Variegated Nomism Vol 2: The Paradoxes of Paul*, Tübingen/Grand Rapids: Mohr Siebeck/Baker Academic, 2004, 39-74
- 'Righteousness Language in the Hebrew Scriptures and Early Judaism' in D A Carson, P T O'Brien, M A Seifrid (eds), *Justification and Variegated Nomism Vol 1: The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001, 415-442
- 'Romans' in G K Beale & D A Carson (eds), *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids/Nottingham: Baker/Apollos, 2007, 607-94
- 'The Faith of Christ' in M F Bird and P M Sprinkle (eds), *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Pistis Christou Debate*, Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009, 129-146
- *Christ, Our Righteousness: Paul's Theology of Justification*: NSBT 9,, Leicester: Apollos/IVP, 2000
- Shedd, W G T, (1820-1894), *Dogmatic Theology*, 3rd Ed 1889-1894: Reprint: A W Gomes Ed: Phillipsburg: P & R, 2003
- *A Critical and Doctrinal Commentary on The Epistle to the Romans*, 1879: Reprint Birmingham AL: Solid Ground Christian Books, 2007

- Shellrude, G, 'Imputation in Pauline Theology: Christ's Righteousness or a Justified Status', *SBET*, 28:1 (Spring 2010), 18-23
- Silva, M, *Philippians*: BECNT, 2nd Ed: Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005
- 'Faith Versus Works of Law in Galatians' in D A Carson, P T O'Brien, M A Seifrid, *Justification and Variegated Nomism Vol 2 – The Paradoxes of Paul*, Tübingen/Grand Rapids: Mohr Siebeck/Baker Academic, 2004, 217-248
- Soards, M L, 'Käsemann's "Righteousness" Reexamined', *CBQ* 49 1987, 264-267
- Southall, D J, *Rediscovering Righteousness in Romans: Personified dikaiosynē within Metaphoric and Narrational Settings*: WUNT2 240, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008
- Speiser, E A, *Genesis*: AB, New York: Doubleday, 1964
- Spicq, C, *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament* (TLNT), ET J D Ernest: Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994, 3 Vols
- Sprinkle, P M, *Law and Life*: WUNT2:241, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008
- *Paul and Judaism Revisited: A Study of Divine and Human Agency in Salvation*, Downers Grove: IVP, 2013
- Strehle, S, 'Imputatio iustitiae: Its Origin in Melanchthon, its Opposition in Osiander', *Theologische Zeitschrift* 50 No 3 (1994), 201-219
- Stuhlmacher, P, 'Isaiah 53 in the Gospels and Acts, in B Janowski & P Stuhlmacher (eds), *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*, ET: D P Bailey: Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004, 147-162
- *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary*, ET S J Hafeman: Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994
- *Revisiting Paul's Doctrine of Justification: A Challenge to the New Perspective*, Downers Grove: IVP, 2001
- Sumney, J L, *Philippians: A Greek Student's Intermediate Reader*, Peabody: Hendrickson, 2007
- Sungenis, R A, *Not By Faith Alone: The Biblical Evidence for the Catholic Doctrine of Justification*, Goleta, CA: Queenship, 1997
- Surburg, M P, 'Rectify or Justify?' A Response to J Louis Martyn's Interpretation of Paul's Righteousness Language' *CTQ* 77 (2013) 45-77
- Tångberg, A, 'The Justification of the Servant of the Lord: Light from Qumran on the Interpretation of Isaiah 53:11', *TTKk* 1-2 (2001), 31-36
- The Council of Trent, Sixth Session, Decree Concerning Justification* (1547), Chapter 8, in H J Schroeder (trs), *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (St Louis: Herder, 1941), 29-46 in J C Olin (ed), *A Reformation Debate: John Calvin and Jacopo Sadoletto* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1966), 114-136
- Thesaurus Lingua Graeca* accessed online at <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/inst/fontsell>
- Thielman, F, 'God's Righteousness as God's Fairness in Romans 1:17: An Ancient Perspective on a Significant Phrase', *JETS* 54:1 (March 2011) 35-48
- *Paul and the Law: A Contextual Approach*, Downers Grove: IVP, 1994
- Thom, J C, 'Justice in the Sermon on the Mount: An Aristotelian Reading', *Novum Testamentum* 51 (2009) 314-448
- Thompson, J A, *The Book of Jeremiah*: NICOT, Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 1980
- Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*: LCL 108 Vol I Books I-II, ET C F Smith: London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard University Press, 1928
- *History of the Peloponnesian War*: LCL 110 Vol III Books V-VI, ET C F Smith: Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press, 1921

- *History of the Peloponnesian War*: LCL 169, Vol IV Books VII-VIII, ET: C F Smith: London/Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1923
- Tipton, L G, 'Union with Christ and Justification' in K Scott Oliphant, *Justified in Christ: God's Plan for Us in Justification*, Fearn, Ross-shire: Mentor/Christian Focus, 2007
- Tov, E, 'Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings' in T Muraoka (ed), *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography*, Melbourne: SBL, 1990, 83-126
- Towner, P H, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*: NICNT, Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2006
- Valdés, J de & Benedetto, D, *The Benefit of Christ: Living Justified Because of Christ's Death*, ET: H T Betts, 1865, Ed J M Houston: Portland: Multnomah, Reprint 1984.
- VanDrunen, D, 'To Obey is Better Than Sacrifice': A Defence of the Active Obedience of Christ in the Light of Recent Criticism', in G L W Johnson and G P Waters, *By Faith Alone: Answering the Challenges to the Doctrine of Justification*, Wheaton: Crossway, 2006, 127-146
- Venema, C P, *The Gospel of Free Acceptance in Christ: An Assessment of the Reformation and New Perspectives on Paul*, Edinburg/Carlisle: Banner of Truth, 2006
- Vickers, B, *Jesus' Blood and Righteousness: Paul's Theology of Imputation*, Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2006
- *Justification by Grace through Faith: Finding Freedom from Legalism, Lawlessness, Pride and Despair*, Phillipsburg: Presbyterian & Reformed, 2013
- Vincent, M R, *The Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon*: ICC, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1897
- Visscher, G H, *Romans 4 and the New Perspective on Paul: Faith Embraces the Promise*: SBL 122, New York: Peter Lang, 2009
- Von Rad, G, 'Faith Reckoned as Righteousness (1951)', in G Von Rad, *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, Edinburgh/London, 1966, 125-130
- Wagner, J R, 'The Heralds of Isaiah and the Mission of Paul: An Investigation of Paul's Use of Isaiah 51-55 in Romans', in W H Bellinger Jr & W R Farmer (eds), *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*, Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998, 193-222
- Wallace, D B, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996
- Waltke B K, and O'Connor, M, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990
- Waltke, B K, 'Righteousness in Proverbs', *WTJ* 70 (2008): 225-37
- Warnock, A, *Raised With Christ: How The Resurrection Changes Everything*, Wheaton: Crossway, 2010
- Watson, F, 'By Faith (of Christ): An Exegetical Dilemma and its Scriptural Solution' in M F Bird and P M Sprinkle (eds), *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Pistis Christou Debate*, Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009, 147-164
- *Paul and The Hermeneutics of Faith*, London: T & T Clark, 2004
- *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles*: SNTSMS 56, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986
- Wedderburn, A J M, *Baptism and Resurrection*: WUNT44, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987
- Weed, R, 'Aristotle on Justice (δικαιοσύνη): Character, Action and Some Pauline Counterparts', *JGRChJ* 3 (2006), 72-98
- Wenham, G J, *Genesis 1-15*: WBC, Waco: Word, 1987
- Westerholm, S, 'The Righteousness of the Law and the Righteousness of Faith in Romans', *Interpretation* 58:3 July 2004, 253-64

- *Perspectives Old and New On Paul: The "Lutheran" Paul and His Critics*, Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004
- Whidden, W W, 'Wesley on Imputation: A Truly Reckoned Reality or Antinomian Polemical Wreckage', *Asbury Theological Journal*, 52 Fall (1997), 63-70
- Williamson, P R, *Abraham, Israel and the Nations: The Patriarchal Promise and Its Covenantal Development in Genesis*: JSOT SuppS 315, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000
- Windsor, L, 'The Fulfillment of the Covenants: An Acovenantal Perspective on Paul' (2006) accessed at <http://www.lionelwindsor.net/bibleresources/bible/new/Acovenantal%20Perspective%20on%20Paul.pdf> on 7 July 2014
- Winslow, O, *No Condemnation in Christ Jesus: As Unfolded in the Eighth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans*, 1853: Reprint Edinburgh/Carlisle: Banner of Truth, 1991
- Witherington III, B, with Hyatt, D, *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004
- Woods, E J, *Deuteronomy*: TOTC (Downers Grove/Nottingham: IVP, 2011
- Wright, D F, 'Justification in Augustine' in B L McCormack (ed), *Justification in Perspective: Historical Developments and Contemporary Challenges*, Edinburgh/Grand Rapids: Rutherford House/Baker, 2006
- Wright, N T, 'Justification: Yesterday, Today, and Forever', *JETS*, 54.1 (March 2011), 49-63
- 'On Becoming the Righteousness of God': 2 Corinthians 5:21', in D M Hay (ed), *Pauline Theology*, Augsburg: Fortress, 1993, 200-208
- 'The Letter to the Romans' in *New Interpreter's Bible*, Vol X, Nashville: Abingdon, 2002
- *Justification: God's Plan and Paul's Vision*, London: SPCK, 2009
- *Paul and The Faithfulness of God*, London: SPCK, 2013, 2 Vols
- *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991
- *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, London: SPCK, 2003
- *What Saint Paul Really Said*, Oxford: Lion, 1997
- Wübbenhorst, K, 'Calvin's Doctrine of Justification: Variations on a Lutheran Theme' in B L McCormack (ed), *Justification in Perspective: Historical Developments and Contemporary Challenges*, Grand Rapids/Edinburgh: Baker/Rutherford House, 2006
- Xenophon, *Memorabilia, Oeconomicus, Symposium, Apology*: LCL 168, Vol IV, ET: E C Marchant, O J Todd: Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press, 1923
- Yates, J W, *The Spirit and Creation in Paul*: WUNT2 251, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008
- Ziesler, J A, 'The Role of the Tenth Commandment in Romans 7,' *JSNT* 33 [1988] 41-56
- *Paul's Letter to the Romans*: TPINTC, London/Philadelphia: SCM/Trinity, 1989
- *The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul: A Linguistic and Theological Enquiry*: SNTSMS 20, Cambridge: CUP, 1972
- Zlotowitz, M, *Bereishis – Genesis*, New York: Mesorah, 1986