

THE UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD

**TO EACH ACCORDING TO DEEDS:
DIVINE JUDGMENT ACCORDING TO DEEDS IN SECOND TEMPLE
JUDAISM AND IN PAUL'S LETTERS**

**A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF ARTS
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

DEPARTMENT OF BIBLICAL STUDIES

**BY
KENT L. YINGER**

JUNE, 1995

ABSTRACT

TO EACH ACCORDING TO DEEDS: DIVINE JUDGMENT ACCORDING TO DEEDS IN SECOND TEMPLE JUDAISM AND IN PAUL'S LETTERS

BY
KENT L. YINGER

Paul's use of the motif of 'judgment according to deeds' corresponds terminologically, rhetorically, and theologically with its use in second temple Judaism. In order to demonstrate this thesis, the author examines the tradition-history of the motif in the Jewish Scriptures, the OT Pseudepigrapha, and the Qumran literature. By the beginning of the common era 'judgment according to deeds' is a widespread, fundamental theological axiom, applicable to a variety of rhetorical purposes. The motif has an important soteriological function within what is now commonly termed Jewish 'covenantal nomism' (not legalism). This judgment does not entail a one-for-one recompense of good or evil deeds, but views works wholistically (i.e., as a whole either good or bad), and thus as revealing one's 'way' of life or 'heart.' One's deeds do not earn or merit God's grace and salvation; nevertheless, one's recompense—the blessings or the curses of the covenant—will be *congruent with* ("according to") this pattern of behavior, since one's works *reveal* what is hidden in the heart, either loyalty or disloyalty to God and his covenant. Salvation by covenant mercy and judgment according to works are complementary.

In both its form and function Paul's use of the motif places him firmly within this same tradition-history. In addition, he maintains the wholistic perspective of deeds common to the Jewish tradition. Although the term 'covenantal nomism' is not appropriate for Paul's thought (Christ replaces the Torah as the defining locus of electing grace), the fundamental structure of grace and works, election and obedience, salvation and judgment, remains remarkably similar. In Paul also one is justified by grace *and* judged according to works, issuing in eternal life or wrath. The juxtaposition of justification and judgment causes Paul no theological tension, because he inherited a way of speaking and thinking about judgment according to deeds which similarly related them without paradox.

PREFACE

What began as an attempt to gain a better understanding of Paul's language of 'reward' fairly soon evolved into a study of 'judgment,' since the nature of these rewards can hardly be fathomed apart from their role in the larger drama of divine judgment. In order to focus and limit the investigation, the decision was made to handle only one aspect of judgment in Paul's letters—judgment according to works (or deeds). Thereafter, what was originally planned to be only a brief overview of the "Jewish Background of Judgment According to Deeds" turned into half the dissertation. It became increasingly clear that neither students of Paul nor of second temple Judaism had given sufficient attention to this motif as it was understood and used by Jewish writers up to and including Paul's era.

As with so many pursuits in life, this study was also undertaken out of a sense of both fascination and concern; fascination with the interplay between justification and sanctification in the mind (and experience) of the apostle to the Gentiles, and concern that Western Protestantism not lose the existential dynamic which comes from seeking to preach and to live both these elements of the gospel. In the United States one need look no further than evangelical debates over 'lordship salvation' and 'Evangelical-Roman Catholic cooperation' to realize that this is still very much a live issue for many Christians.

Thanks are in order first of all to my adviser, Professor Andrew T. Lincoln, without whose encouragement and guidance this course of study would probably never have been undertaken, and whose suggestions and challenges along the way made this thesis a much better product than it would have otherwise been. The entire period of research and writing would have also been impossible without the understanding and flexibility shown by my wife, Debi. Dr. Rodney K. Duke reviewed an early draft of Chapter Two and offered critique that led to several significant changes. Finally, I wish to thank OC International, and in particular Dr. Larry Keyes (President), for generously allowing a flexible work load and occasional leaves of absence from my duties as a missionary while living in Germany and in the U.S.

Abbreviations follow the conventions used by the Society of Biblical Literature (*SBL Membership Directory and Handbook 1994* [Georgia: SBL, 1994] 226-40).

Colorado Springs, CO
June, 1995

Kent L. Yinger

To Jack and Wanda Yinger

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>PREFACE</i>	ii
CHAPTER	
ONE	ISSUES AND METHOD
	1
	HISTORY OF RESEARCH..... 1
	FACTORS WHICH CALL FOR A RENEWED TREATMENT OF JUDGMENT ACCORDING TO DEEDS IN PAUL... 19
	METHOD AND PROCEDURE: MOTIF ANALYSIS 22
PART ONE	
JUDGMENT ACCORDING TO DEEDS IN SECOND TEMPLE JEWISH LITERATURE	
TWO	THE USE OF THE MOTIF IN THE JEWISH SCRIPTURES...
	27
	THE FOUNDATIONAL CHARACTER OF THIS CHAPTER 27
	THE LITERARY MOTIF AS AN IDENTIFIABLE SEMANTIC FIELD 29
	A FUNCTIONAL TYPOLOGY OF MOTIF PASSAGES .. 40
	PASSAGES USING THE MOTIF TO PRAISE GOD'S MAN- NER OF DEALING WITH HUMANITY 41 (Jer 32:19)
	PASSAGES USING THE MOTIF TO JUSTIFY GOD'S DEALINGS WITH HUMANITY 44 (Judg 1:7; Ezek 36:19)
	PASSAGES USING THE MOTIF TO APPEAL TO YAHWEH TO INTERVENE ON BEHALF OF THE RIGHTEOUS.. 46 (Ps 28:4; 1 Kgs 8:32; 2 Chr 6:23; 1 Macc 7:42)
	Excursus: "Eschatological" in Reference to OT Recompense Statements 48
	PASSAGES USING THE MOTIF TO PRONOUNCE A BENEDICTION OR PRAYER-WISH 51 (Ruth 2:12)
	PASSAGES USING THE MOTIF TO MOTIVATE THE RIGHTEOUS TO OBEDIENCE..... 52 (Prov 19:17; 24:12; Eccl 12:14; Sir 11:26; 16:12, 14; 17:23)
	PASSAGES USING THE MOTIF TO COMFORT AND ASSURE THE RIGHTEOUS 60 (Ps 18:20, 24 [= 2 Sam 22:21, 25]; 103:10; 94:23)
	PASSAGES USING THE MOTIF TO PRONOUNCE SEN- TENCE UPON THE DISOBEDIENT 66 (Jer 17:10; 23:2; Ezek 7:8-9, 27; Hos 4:9)

	PASSAGES USING THE MOTIF TO SUMMON THE DISOBEDIENT TO REPENTANCE	74
	(Ezek 18:30; 33:20)	
	CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS.....	79
THREE	THE USE OF THE MOTIF IN THE OLD TESTAMENT PSEUDEPIGRAPHA	86
	INTRODUCTORY MATTERS.....	86
	THE USE OF THE MOTIF IN JUBILEES.....	87
	(Jub 5:11, 15)	
	THE USE OF THE MOTIF IN 1 ENOCH	92
	(1 En 95:5; 100:7)	
	THE USE OF THE MOTIF IN THE PSS OF SOLOMON ..	97
	(PssSol 2:7, 16, 25, 34-35; 17:8-9)	
	THE USE OF THE MOTIF IN JOSEPH AND ASENETH.	105
	(JosAsen 28:3)	
	THE USE OF THE MOTIF IN PSEUDO-PHILO'S BIBLICAL ANTIQUITIES	107
	(LAB 3:10; 44:10; 64:7)	
	THE USE OF THE MOTIF IN 2 BARUCH	112
	(2 Bar 54:21)	
	SUMMARY.....	116
FOUR	THE USE OF THE MOTIF IN THE QUMRAN LITERATURE.....	131
	INTRODUCTORY CONSIDERATIONS.....	131
	THE MANUAL OF DISCIPLINE (1QS)	133
	(1QS II, 7-8; X, 11, 17b-18)	
	THE THANKSGIVING HYMNS (1QH)	142
	(1QH IV, 18-19; V, 5-6; XIV, 24)	
	THE WAR SCROLL (1QM)	151
	(1QM XVIII,14; XI, 3-4)	
	THE DAMASCUS DOCUMENT (CD).....	157
	(CD III, 4-5; V, 15-16; VII,9 [= XIX,6]; XX, 24)	
	ADDITIONAL TEXTS	168
	1QpHab XII,2-3.....	168
	4QpPs37 IV,9	170
	CONCLUSIONS	171
EXCURSUS	POSTMORTEM JUDGMENT IN GRECO-ROMAN LITERATURE.....	180

PART TWO
JUDGMENT ACCORDING TO DEEDS IN PAUL'S LETTERS

FIVE	JUDGMENT ACCORDING TO DEEDS IN PAUL'S LETTER TO THE ROMANS	183
	JUDGMENT IN ROMANS, OVERVIEW.....	183
	THE OCCASION AND PURPOSE OF ROMANS	184
	ROMANS 2:6-11	187
	ROMANS 4:4-5.....	227
	ROMANS 6:23.....	234
	ROMANS 8:1-4.....	240
	ROMANS 14:10-12	243
	CONCLUSION.....	253
SIX	JUDGMENT ACCORDING TO DEEDS IN 1 CORINTHIANS	255
	1 COR 3:5-9ab	255
	1 COR 3:9c-15	268
	1 COR 3:16-17	276
	Excursus: "Sentences of Holy Law"	280
	1 COR 4:1-5	283
	CONCLUSIONS: 1 COR 3-4.....	288
	ADDITIONAL JUDGMENT-RELATED TEXTS IN 1 COR	292
	1 Cor 5:5.....	292
	1 Cor 6:9-11.....	305
	1 Cor 9:24-27	308
	Excursus: The Use of 'Crown' Imagery in the NT.	309
	1 Cor 10:1-22	314
	1 Cor 11:29-32.....	315
	1 Cor 16:22a.....	320
	SUMMARY.....	321
SEVEN	JUDGMENT ACCORDING TO DEEDS IN 2 CORINTHIANS AND COLOSSIANS.....	322
	2 COR 5:10	322
	2 COR 11:15b	335
	COLOSSIANS: AUTHENTICITY.....	337
	COL 3:22-25.....	340
	COL 1:22-23a, 28	348
	COL 3:6.....	349
EIGHT	PAUL AND A JEWISH MOTIF: CONCLUSIONS.....	350

APPENDICES

I	MOTIF-TEXTS IN THE JEWISH SCRIPTURES	360
II	MOTIF-TEXTS IN THE OT PSEUDEPIGRAPHA	363
III	MOTIF-TEXTS IN THE QUMRAN LITERATURE.....	364

BIBLIOGRAPHY 365

CHAPTER ONE ISSUES AND METHOD

Particularly since the Protestant Reformation, interpreters of Paul have pondered over the meaning of judgment according to deeds in the light of justification by faith alone. According to Romans 2:6-11 God will repay with eternal life those who do good, yet in Romans 3:28 “a person is justified by faith apart from works.”¹ Our study does not intend to focus primarily on reconciling these elements in Paul’s thought, but will direct its attention instead to the judgment motif, seeking to understand Paul’s use of the same against its traditio-historical background in second temple Jewish sources. Our reasons for this approach will be explored shortly.

Traditionally, however, attempts to understand judgment in Paul have approached the subject in terms of defining and resolving the theological paradox or tension perceived to exist between the twin Pauline affirmations of judgment and justification.

HISTORY OF RESEARCH²

D. E. Kühl argues, more theologically than exegetically, for a position that has played a major role in studies on judgment and justification in Paul.³ The key to

¹ We will use “deeds” and “works” interchangeably throughout this dissertation.

² For research prior to 1930, see esp. H. Braun, *Gerichtsgedanke und Rechtfertigungslehre bei Paulus* (UNT 19; Leipzig: Hinrich’sche, 1930) 14-31; further C. Haufe, *Die sittliche Rechtfertigungslehre des Paulus* (Halle: VEB Max Niemeyer, 1957) 37-68; and R. C. Devor, *The Concept of Judgment in the Epistles of Paul* (Ph.D. Diss.; Drew Univ., 1959) 95-150. For more recent work, see D. W. Kuck, *Judgment and Community Conflict: Paul’s Use of Apocalyptic Judgment Language in 1 Corinthians 3:5-4:5* (NovTSup 66; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992) 1-7. The stance of the apostolic fathers is examined by R. Bultmann (*Theologie des Neuen Testaments*⁸ [Uni-Taschenbücher 630; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1980] 552-565) and T. Aono (*Die Entwicklung des paulinischen Gerichtsgedankens bei den apostolischen Vätern* [Europäische Hochschulschriften 23/137; Bern: 1979]).

³ D. E. Kühl, *Rechtfertigung auf Grund Glaubens und Gericht nach den Werken bei Paulus* (Königsberg i.Pr.: Wilh. Koch, 1904).

his position lies in understanding saving grace to be exclusive of any sort of dependence on human activity. It is

der oberste religiöse Grundsatz des Apostels, daß das Heil des Menschen . . . nicht abhängig gedacht werden dürfe, sondern allein aus dem Urteil des gnädigen Gottes hergeleitet werden müsse, das dem Sünder Gerechtigkeit aus Gnaden zuspricht und damit die Errettung verbürgt (6).

For this reason,

kann auch das, was bei dem künftigen Gericht nach den Werken für den Christen herauskommt in keiner Weise unter dem Titel *σώζεσθαι* und *σωτηρία* beschrieben werden (9).

Judgment according to works does not conflict with justification by grace, because the former deals solely with “reward” (22), perhaps even with a “varying intensity of the *δόξα* of the heavenly resurrection body” (28), but cannot affect salvation. Justification, salvation and eternal life are seen as guaranteed by grace.

Jenseitiges, ewiges, unverlierbares Leben ist also durch die Geistesmitteilung in das diesseitige, vergängliche Leben des Menschen eingepflanzt; es ist positiv da und hat bleibende Bedeutung *auch abgesehen von einer sittlichen Ausnützung dieses göttlichen Gnadengeschenkes*. Die Objektivität und der unbedingte, unverlierbare Wert dieser göttlichen Gnadentat können . . . nicht genug betont werden (15, emphasis added; similarly p. 21—“die unverbrüchliche Garantie”).

There is a certain ambiguity in Kühl’s position regarding the place and importance of works in the lives of the justified. On the one hand, “Gott wirkt durch seine Geisteskraft, daß der Glaube sich sittlich bewährt” (17), and “walking in the Spirit” is everywhere “selbstverständlich” (25). He can even affirm in this vein, when speaking of vice-catalogs (1 Cor 6:9-10)—“Wer derartiges treibt, ist überhaupt nicht Christ, sondern Heide” (25; cf. also p. 26). Thus, good works are expected and *selbstverständlich*. Yet in the same breath, commenting on 1 Cor 3:15, he concludes that salvation and participation in life are “gewiß, auch wenn der Gesamtertrag seiner sittlichen Lebensarbeit im Endgericht als wertlos wird beurteilt werden müssen” (26). However important works might be in the process of salvation, they are not a necessity or condition for its final attainment. If we ask how Paul logically related grace and works, Kühl contends that Paul “fühlt eben kein Bedürfnis, zwischen beiden Gedankenkreisen die verbindenden Fäden zu ziehen” (19), since it was the strength of his position to tolerate absolutely no hint of devia-

tion from his chief principle, the “Alleinwirksamkeit der göttlichen Gnade zum Heil” (19).

Wetter’s particular concern focuses on Paul’s relation to his prior Jewish world of thought.⁴ “Sein ganzes voriges Leben und Streben stand im Zeichen der Vergeltung; wie viel davon bleibt noch dem Christen übrig?” (1-2). His answer, as far as retribution is concerned runs, “Wir haben gesehen, daß Pauli Religion ihren Grund in Gnaden-, nicht in [jüdischen] Vergeltungsgedanken hat” (161). Paul “verkündet nicht wie die Juden Vergeltung mit Strafe und Lohn, sondern er rief allen zu: Gott hat uns aus der Vergeltung errettet” (173). As a consequence for Christians, “zwar wirkt die Vergeltung draußen in der Welt immer fort, uns kommt sie doch nicht mehr bei” (85). In fact, Paul even had to jettison his previous view of God (180).

To reach this conclusion, Wetter argues that in the centuries immediately preceding Christ a mechanical, fate-oriented view of God dominated in Judaism (3-16). Paul’s conversion broke him of this view of God and of a mechanical retribution, and led him to a view of God as personal, merciful, yet also holy (161).

So ist seine Sittlichkeit nicht dadurch motiviert, daß er durch sie auf Lohn Anspruch machen könnte, sondern sie ist mit seiner Religion, mit seinem Christsein untrennbar verbunden. . . . Die Schwierigkeit liegt für uns eigentlich darin, daß Paulus dies indessen mit der alten jüdischen Gerichtsterminologie zum Ausdruck zu bringen sucht; er spricht von Auferstehung, von Gericht usw., und in Wirklichkeit ist ihm eine derartige Welt fremd. Er hat es nicht vermocht, überall die Schranken der alten Vorstellungen und der Sprache zu überwinden (127-128).

Thus although Paul may use images and terminology reminiscent of Jewish views of God—final judgment and retribution according to works—these are only an “äußere Form” (161) which now stands in contradiction to its Pauline content. While explainable psychologically (that is, Paul knew mystically he had been declared righteous by grace; yet also knew God remained holy and demanded ethical righteousness [170]), the apostle’s attempt to combine divine mercy and justice must be termed, logically and theologically, a failure (180). “So ist auch alle systemati-

⁴ Gillis P. Wetter, *Der Vergeltungsgedanke bei Paulus: Eine Studie zur Religion des Apostels* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1912).

sche Konstruktion von der paulinischen Eschatologie von vornherein unmöglich; denn die hier nebeneinander stehenden Züge *können nicht vereinigt werden*” (154; my emphasis). In short, Paul’s conversion is credited with leading to an abandonment of his Jewish mechanical-eschatological view of judgment and retribution in favor of grace. Wetter’s study is helpful in demonstrating how one’s understanding of “Paul’s prior Jewish view” on these matters is crucial to understanding Paul.

Never translated into English, Braun’s study remains fundamental to any work on the subject of judgment in Paul.⁵ Its thoroughness of treatment of the Pauline literature and breadth of grasp of and interaction with various competing positions make it a mine of information. Braun’s attempt to take seriously all the pertinent Pauline texts, even if that spells “inconsistency,” makes the study a challenge for any student of the subject. Rather than repeating the outline of the study itself, we will attempt to reiterate Braun’s main conclusions in thesis form as they pertain to our own investigation.

1. Judgment (of Christians) is integral to Paul’s doctrinal system. It is not an “unüberwundener jüdischer Rest.”
 - 1.1. This is evident statistically—Paul speaks of judgment on Christians approximately 60 times, of non-Christians only about 20 times—and even more by Paul’s “Radikalisierung” (i.e., adoption with forethought) of a Jewish view of judgment. Judgment is not simply taken up by Paul as a corrective against a rising enthusiasm or laxity in the churches, but forms the theistic presupposition to his thought.
 - 1.2. This judgment according to works is the same judgment as is in view in justification by faith. Its outcome for believers is salvation, not gradations of blessedness. Paul maintains a dominant note of hope, certain of a positive outcome, though there are occasional notes of uncertainty or even warning of loss.

⁵ H. Braun, *Gerichtsgedanke*.

- 1.3. Paul expects a Spirit-worked obedience resulting in a positive verdict at judgment, but not presuming perfection (against Wernle). Paul's "holistic ethic" is a rejection of Jewish atomization, but has not been fully worked out in his own thought.
- 1.4. Judgment, however, is subservient to justification by faith.
2. Justification by grace through faith is primary to Paul. This is in sharpest contrast to Judaism.
 - 2.1. Justification assures the eschatological verdict with a certainty which cannot be overturned by disobedience, even in the light of grave sinning.
 - 2.2. Nevertheless justification includes the fulfillment of the divine will.
3. Paul's use of judgment in paraenetic contexts is inconsistent.
 - 3.1. Judgment is a "selbstverständlicher Bestandteil," yet relatively unimportant and not emphasized (contrast Judaism). It is but one among many motivations Paul utilizes, and is lacking in theoretical discussions of ethics (Romans 6).
 - 3.2. Thus, texts which do allow a double possibility of behavior as well as of outcome for Christians (salvation or damnation) must be seen as inconsistent, as *an unreflected paraenetic use by Paul of his Jewish traditions*. The same must be said for texts stressing reward and recompense generally. This is made easier for Braun by reference to Paul's mode of "unsystematic Jewish thinking" and to some of the above points as due more to Paul's basic "pathos" than careful "lehrmäßige Formulierungen."

Floyd Filson attempts to understand Paul's thought against his Jewish-Pharisaic background.⁶

The Pharisee Saul was most certainly an adherent of the view that God recompenses men—to some extent now, fully at the great judgment—on the basis of their conformity to his law. There is ample reason to believe that Saul held this view in a legalistic, superficial, casuistical form, and that with all good intentions and effort he could not escape a suppressed, smoulder-

⁶ Floyd V. Filson, *St. Paul's Conception of Recompense* (UNT 21; Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche, 1931).

ing sense of lack and inadequacy (8).

Against those who would see Paul's conversion as leading to an abandonment of this Jewish recompense principle Filson concludes there was "a reorganization of his ideas to the extent that God's grace became central instead of God's recompensing activity, but this was merely a shifting of emphasis and not an abandonment of the recompense principle" (14).

Central to this contention, as well as to his later discussion of judgment on believers, is his adoption of P. Wernle's insight that the benefits of Christ's death avail only for pre-baptismal sins (*Der Christ und die Sünde bei Paulus* [1897]). This expectation of essential Christian sinlessness allows Paul to look toward the final judgment according to works with a basic assurance based upon "the feeling that the Christians will, in the vast majority of cases at least, pass the judgment successfully" (90).

For "Christians who had sinned yet had not completely forfeited their Christian standing" (91) Paul expected some sort of gradation in the sentence pronounced, generally an inferior place or privilege in the Kingdom. For those who persisted in deliberate sin, however, Paul clearly threatened the loss of eternal life (92-95).

Finally, Filson attempts a resolution of the seeming tension between grace and works along psychological or biographical lines.

This general principle that God's grace is morally conditioned is so vigorously asserted because Paul in his own life had an experience which would harmonize with it. His experience combined a sense of God's goodness with a sense of personal renewal and power. Because in his own life he felt no contradiction between the grace of God and the righteous demands of God, he was able to assert the validity of the recompense principle (131).

In short, Paul experienced a thoroughgoing moral renewal through God's grace, thus enabling him to perceive no tension between justification by grace and judgment by works. Yet Filson also admits that two thousand years of Christian history, including much Christian sinning, make this solution seem less workable for contemporary interpreters. Filson's presentation would appear to make justification essentially a term of initiation, without clear connection to the verdict of the last judgment.

Although he rejects this limiting of the impact of justification to an initiatory act (14), it is difficult to see how he can properly avoid this.

Haufe is primarily concerned with the relationship between grace and reward.⁷ He sees the chief difficulty to lie in the Protestant understanding of grace as excluding all conditions or requirements, and of faith as the opposite of human activity, work, or “Leistung” (31-35). Thus he begins by arguing that in Paul (Haufe includes the Pastorals) freedom from law is not meant absolutely (1 Cor 9:21), but applies only to the “Kultgesetz” (=circumcision, purification and ceremonial regulations [20-30]). The moral law on the other hand remains in force as the norm or condition for righteousness and salvation (11-19, 28). Haufe resolves the tension by what he calls “Evangeliums-Gesetz” or “Gnadenrecht.” Through Christ’s death and resurrection (thus through grace) God has relativized the former (=Jewish) requirement of sinless obedience and replaced it with a new norm that is attainable.

Das Gesetz ist nicht mehr absoluter Maßstab der Vergeltung, es wird durch die Gnade relativiert. Ein Recht, nach dem nur der Sündlose das ewige Leben erhalten sollte, ist somit abgeschafft, während die Forderungen, die in diesem Recht galten, weiterhin als Forderungen in Kraft bleiben (116).

Was ist also das Kriterium für einen “Heiligen” und “Gerechtfertigten” und “Abgewaschenen”, sowie für den würdigen Empfang des Herrnmahls? Der sittliche Wettlauf, das nach allen Kräften sittliche Streben (109).

Thus grace is “weder eine absolute Sündenvergebung noch eine Sündenüberwindung . . . , sondern die Möglichkeit des Weges zum Heil” (118). That is, salvation by grace means God has adjusted the condition of salvation, so that it is now something attainable, a life of obedience to the best of one’s ability (with the Spirit’s aid of course). In this way “reward” retains its full biblical content (=salvation), and the proper causal relationship between work and reward is maintained, yet without thereby losing the central place of grace in both establishing, enabling and completing this “Möglichkeit des Heils.”

⁷ C. Haufe, *Rechtfertigungslehre*.

But what of justification by faith as an eschatological reality already present for the believer? Using a metaphor, he suggests that the “already” of justification is like a race-car driver, who both in his own eyes and in the eyes of the racing fans, has “already won” from the moment he takes the lead. Of course, he could still suffer a mechanical breakdown and fail to gain the victory, and the actual victory is only his after the race is ended and he has fulfilled all the conditions for winning; yet still, assuming he continues on in good form, he can consider himself to have won, even before the race is officially ended (66-67). Haufe has resolved the resulting tension with grace by eliminating the *sola fide* as the ground of present and of future justification. Faith itself is no longer “reckoned as righteousness,” but instead becomes a confident hope that God’s new and gracious possibility of salvation through “sittliches Ringen” will indeed lead to the desired verdict—justified (=sanctified).

Devor asserts that the tension between justification by faith and judgment according to works is a perennial Protestant problem due to the reformational *sola fide* (95).⁸ His own position is that justification by faith leads to salvation, while judgment according to works determines the grade of glory within the sphere of salvation. The “judgment according to works has an altogether different significance [than justification]; it is a judgment, a division, a stratification within the sphere of salvation” and has “nothing at all to do with salvation” (113). He is careful to note that justification is not thereby an automatic guarantee of salvation (120-122).

The seriousness of judgment for the elect in Paul is reinforced by an examination of Jewish views, whereby Devor concludes that Paul was “an atypical Pharisee” (i.e., atypical in that he showed some concern over the outcome of judgment for the elect) and thus closer to the stream of Judaism one associates with the Dead Sea Scrolls (305). He then contrasts Paul’s view of righteousness to Judaism’s, concluding it is the “gift character” of justification that distinguishes Paul from a

⁸ R. C. Devor, *Concept of Judgment*.

Judaism which sought to earn righteousness (though he acknowledges some understanding of grace in Qumran).

That for which the Jew labored to acquire, that which he would lay hold of by his own right, is now given, freely, as a gift. This is *the direct inversion of all his previous concept*. As a Pharisee he had once believed that righteousness could be earned; it could even be claimed. But it was never a free gift (330; my emphasis).

Interestingly Devor wishes to stress both the ongoing ethical nature of justification in Paul and its newness as a once-for-all eschatological verdict. This he does through an understanding of “faith” as ultimately “life lived in fellowship with Christ” involving trust, surrender, acceptance, and obedience (351). Thus, while never a human achievement, faith “in Paul’s usage, is never entirely a gift” either (355); faith must be “effectualized” in love, and as such is a “ground of justification,” a “requirement,” a “qualifying condition.” Failure to maintain such a faith effectualized in behavior will result in condemnation (482, citing Col 1:21-23).

On the other hand his concern that it be faith alone which is determinative in the verdict for justification-salvation leads him to the theory that the judgment according to works deals only with recompense (other than salvation/eternal life). He appeals to Jewish views of varied rewards for the elect. Where a loss of salvation for Christians is in view he concludes that it “is only another way of saying that everything will be obtained through faith” (463).

By far one of the most influential monographs on the subject of judgment and justification in Paul is that by Luise Mattern.⁹ She opens by differentiating the views of Jewish apocalyptic and rabbinic literature on judgment, relying on D. Rössler (*Gesetz und Geschichte*, 1960) and Strack-Billerbeck’s *Kommentar* respectively. In the apocalyptic writings righteousness is not based on legalism (=Rabbinism) but “an der grundsätzlichen Stellungnahme des Menschen zu dem Gesetz” (25). Thus, the final judgment does not determine whether the individual was righteous or unrighteous (that was perfectly clear during their lifetime), but is

⁹ Luise Mattern, *Das Verständnis des Gerichtes bei Paulus* (ATANT 47; Zurich/Stuttgart: Zwingli, 1966).

simply the “Urteilvollstreckung.” Actually, the righteous are exempted from this judgment (=condemnation), and it is the wicked alone who will be judged. Paul shows certain similarities in this regard to Jewish apocalyptic thought, but in the last analysis Mattern concludes—“Das Gerichtsverständnis des Paulus ist nicht jüdisch” (215).

Turning to Pauline texts, she finds that the apostle does bring together judgment and justification language, but only when he wants to stress the impossibility of the justified falling under this judgment (59-75). This corresponds with apocalyptic views, and means that for Paul a Christian cannot be subject to this Last Judgment qua execution of wrath on the unrighteous. Since Paul obviously does speak often of Christians being subject to a divine judgment, this leads to Mattern’s fundamental assertion that there must be two different judgments envisioned by the apostle: a last judgment which simply separates Christians from non-Christians on the basis of faith and which results in the destruction of the unbelievers; and an evaluative judgment for Christians only, dealing with their “work” (sg.) and having no relation to salvation/damnation, but only judging the level of obedience (“gehorsam—gehorsamer—am gehorsamsten”) and resulting in reward.

Mattern’s exegetical work is arranged into two groups, texts dealing with the last judgment and those dealing with the evaluative judgment. Under the first category she examines passages which (a) declare Christians free from the last judgment, (b) assert their freedom despite “sins,” (c) mention the possibility of their falling into judgment (but based strictly on their loss of faith, not on deeds; i.e., those in view here are not really Christians), or (d) describe the last judgment as simply a “revelation” of who is and who is not a Christian. In the second category appear those texts speaking clearly of Christians present at judgment, thus implying the more limited evaluative judgment (2 Cor 5:10; Rom 14:10; 2 Cor 9:6-9; Phil 4:17; 1 Cor 3:5-15; 4:4-5), and having nothing to do with justification and the last judgment.

Thus she relieves Paul of the charge of inconsistency by cleanly separating justification by faith and judgment according to works, and Paul's doctrine of justification (versus Judaism's view of salvation through works of obedience to the Law) becomes an interpretative key which leads to sharp discontinuity with Jewish views of judgment.

Calvin Roetzel attempts to break the perceived impasse regarding Paul's statements on judgment, an impasse he believes is caused largely by trying to interpret all Pauline judgment statements against the backdrop of a theology of justification by faith.¹⁰ His alternative is to give greater attention to the occasional nature of the texts, and to highlight eschatology and ecclesiology as the primary conceptual background upon which to understand Paul's statements on judgment.

Roetzel further advances the discussion of this subject by challenging the prevailing assumption that Paul is best understood in juxtaposition or contrast to his Jewish background. A brief analysis of judgment in the post-exilic prophets, Jewish apocalyptic literature, Qumran and rabbinic materials leads to the conclusion that Paul's thought is in essential continuity with the eschatological framework found in all but the rabbinic materials (citing A. Schweitzer, W. D. Davies, J. Munck and H. J. Schoeps as precursors of this position). The major discontinuity is located in the apostle's christology. The cross of Christ means that the Eschaton (including judgment and salvation) is already present, while the still outstanding parousia simultaneously necessitates an "eschatological reservation" for believers in all these matters. This tension is rooted in the nature of the church which lives between the cross and parousia. Thus, Paul can say believers already enjoy salvation and freedom from wrath, yet, without contradiction, warn them that they must still face judgment and attain salvation.

Finally the reminder as to the corporate dimension of much of Paul's eschatology and the warning against trying to interpret every judgment text primarily

¹⁰ Calvin J. Roetzel, *Judgement In The Community: A Study Of The Relationship Between Eschatology And Ecclesiology In Paul* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972).

vis-à-vis a theology of justification by faith are worth keeping in mind in future studies. In some texts, eschatology and ecclesiology do indeed provide the more immediate theological coordinates for Paul's discussion of judgment.

As for the issue of *tension*,

while justification by faith is an important motif in Pauline theology . . . , it is a distortion of Paul's thought to view justification by faith and judgment in a dialectical relationship. Any attempt to reconcile these motifs may be more of a concern of the western theologian for consistency than a concern of Paul's (177-178).

Roetzel's justification for de-coupling these concepts is two-fold: (1) Paul's judgment statements have a corporate focus (i.e., are not addressing the issue of individual justification by faith), and (2) the apostle can speak of judgment without reference to faith or justification (a point made much earlier by H. Braun).

Though brief, the abbreviated form of a lecture originally delivered by Karl Donfried in 1974 is important as a concise attempt to apply the insights of E. Käsemann and K. Kertelge on justification to the question of last judgment in Paul.¹¹ Specifically, justification is misunderstood when viewed predominantly or exclusively as God's gift to the individual already received (as in R. Bultmann). Rather justification has both "a present and a future dimension—it is a matter of promise and expectation" (141). Justification "recaptures man for the sovereignty of God" (141), something which must be "actualized in sanctification, and is consummated with salvation" (143). This yields a "regular pattern in the Pauline letters" (145): (1) *justification* is an initiating event, which is actualized and made concrete through (2) *sanctification* (=a present process), leading to (3) *salvation* (=a future gift, already anticipated and partially experienced in justification and sanctification and clearly dependent upon them).

Occasional references to salvation as a present reality are not a contradiction since they condition this salvation upon continued obedience ("if you hold it fast," 1 Cor 15:2). As to judgment upon Christians,

¹¹ Karl P. Donfried, "Justification and Last Judgment in Paul," *Int* 30 (1976) 140-152.

Paul expects a last judgment for Christians which can have different results: salvation for the Christian who has been obedient in faith and wrath for the one who has been disobedient to his calling in Christ (147).

Synofzik takes as given two of Herbert Braun's conclusions: (1) judgment is not a "Jewish remnant" but an integrated part of Paul's theology, and (2) justification and judgment (in paraenetic contexts) cannot be fully harmonized.¹² He is, however, not satisfied with Braun's arbitrary dismissal of certain paraenetic texts as being "inconsistent" and evidencing a supposed "atomistic ethic." According to Synofzik Paul could indeed place judgment and justification in theological relation to one another, which is "ein Indiz dafür, daß Paulus die angebliche Unvereinbarkeit von Gericht und Rechtfertigung nicht als eine solche empfunden hat" (5).

His method is to examine all pertinent undisputed Pauline judgment/recompense sayings grouped according to form-critical categories (thus avoiding Mattern's imposition of a foreign theological framework), and to subject them to a rigorous traditio-historical investigation. Each text is questioned regarding (a) background in Jewish or Christian tradition; (b) Pauline additions/modifications; (c) function of the saying in context; and (d) theological significance in Paul's thought. In nearly every case he discerns the use of pre-existing Jewish or early Christian traditions. For Paul, however, as his modifications or corrections of the traditions show, these statements function not to instruct concerning eschatology, but strictly as "Argumentationsmittel," whether as an encouragement to endure, an admonition to Christian responsibility before God, or a warning of consequences.

By thus restricting Pauline intention to a rhetorical employment of such traditional "Argumentationsmittel," their conceptual significance is minimized, relieving Paul (and his interpreters) of the need to seek harmonization. While Braun and others dismiss such difficult sayings as an inconsistency, Synofzik answers—this is just rhetoric.

¹² Ernst Synofzik, *Die Gerichts- und Vergeltungsaussagen bei Paulus. Eine Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (GTA 8; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977).

The book contains a wealth of exegetical and traditio-historical insights, though one need not accept his every assignment of a saying to a particular Jewish or early Christian tradition. His methodology utilizing form-critical categories and traditio-historical methods does represent an advance over previous “theological” treatments. However, his conclusion is based on an unproven assumption; namely, once the paraenetic purpose of a particular judgment/recompense statement has been identified, one can safely ignore the associated conceptual matter that is being utilized (rhetorically) to make this paraenetic point. One wonders if it could not be equally argued that Paul takes up such eschatological judgment sayings as motivation for his paraenesis precisely because they were part of the conceptual worldview of both Paul and his readers.

Like many previous studies, the book relies on the view of Jewish theology as legalism.¹³ Thus, at numerous points Synofzik sets Paul’s view of justification in antithesis to this Jewish view of righteousness and judgment according to works reflected in the traditio-historical background of the various judgment statements. For Synofzik Paul must, in the end, be made to reject (or at least rhetorically side-step) the theology supposedly implicit in the sayings he adapts to his own purposes (otherwise Paul would reflect the very “atomistic ethic” which Braun perceived).

Nigel Watson focuses attention on the problem texts, those “which . . . are designed not to create but to demolish assurance and which appear to make the Christian’s final salvation depend not on his faith but on his deeds.”¹⁴ The crucial first step in his approach is “to give maximum weight to the occasional nature of Paul’s letters,” which suggests to Watson the thesis that “the message of justification

¹³ The term “legalism” (or “legalistic”) can denote different things: (i) emphasis on the letter rather than the spirit of the law; (ii) belief in salvation by obedience to the law rather than by the grace of God or by faith; or (iii) undue stress on legal details without balancing considerations of justice or mercy (D. T. Kauffman, *The Dictionary of Religious Terms* [Westwood N.J.: Revell, 1967] 287). For clarity these could be termed “literalism” (i) and “casuistry” (iii), with “legalism” reserved for definition (ii).

¹⁴ Nigel M. Watson, “Justified by Faith; Judged by Works—An Antinomy?” *NTS* 29 (1983) 209-221. The “problem texts” are: Rom 2:1-16; 14:7-12; 1 Cor 3:1-17; 4:1-5; 5:1-5; 6:9-11; 9:24-27; 11:27-34; 2 Cor 5:9-10; Gal 5:19-21; and 6:7-10.

and the warning of judgment are directed to different addresses.” Justification texts are directed at overscrupulous legalists, while judgment warnings aim at the presumptuous, “at the illusion that one is free to do whatever one wishes.” His examination of all the aforementioned problem texts concludes that, indeed, all are addressed, directly or indirectly, to situations of presumption (215-217). In 1 and 2 Corinthians, where “the language of righteousness and justification . . . is not at all prominent,” the situation of presumption is quite manifest. But even the passages in Romans and Galatians, letters in which the justification message is predominant, can be given a background of presumption. Romans 2, for instance, “is clearly directed not at the Christian reader but at the Jew who supposes that his possession of the law and his circumcision make him fully secure.”

In a second step, adopting the position of Wilfried Joest,¹⁵ he embraces both justification and judgment as fully Pauline (no Jewish leftover). Their relationship is, however, not one of logical consistency or theological system, but is understood properly only via “the dialectical nature of Christian preaching.” That is, the

two messages are not addressed equally to Christians as believers. . . . warnings of judgment to come . . . are addressed to Christians whose faith has degenerated to a false security, that is, to Christians in their unbelief. The message of judgment is the valid word of God, not for those whose sins have found them out (to whom “justification” is addressed) but for those who are presuming on God’s grace.

Paul did not draw these various elements from a single, and to him coherent, system. The result is a “contradiction which is conceptually unbridgeable,” so that “nothing else remains for us but to remain under the contradiction and to see it through.”

The burden of the book by Stephen Travis centers in the concept of *retributive* punishment and reward, a concept which seems inconsistent with a gospel of divine grace and therefore hinders effective communication of the gospel to modern humanity.¹⁶ “To talk freely of punishment in the sense of retribution is to distort the

¹⁵ *Gesetz und Freiheit: Das Problem des Tertius Usus Legis bei Luther und die neutestamentliche Paränese* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968).

¹⁶ Stephen H. Travis, *Christ and the Judgment of God, Divine Retribution in the New Testament* (Foundations for Faith; UK: Marshall Morgan and Scott, 1986).

Christian message and encourage misunderstanding. To speak of relationship or lack of relationship to God is to get to the heart of the matter” (169). Hence his thesis: “New Testament language which ‘looks retributive’ is best understood in relation to a non-retributive theology of judgment” (2). That is, “the judgment of God is to be seen not primarily in terms of retribution, whereby people are ‘paid back’ according to their deeds, but in terms of relationship or non-relationship to Christ” (Preface).

In spite of this difference in the precise problem being addressed, Travis is significant for our question inasmuch as he explicitly relates more recent work on justification by faith to the significance of judgment for Christians. He argues for a *dialectical relationship* between the two.

The real clue to the apparent problem of the relation between justification by faith and judgment according to works is to be found in a discovery of the true meaning of justification. Justification involves not merely a verdict of acquittal, but a relationship with God in which people experience God’s power at work. But it is a relationship which must be constantly affirmed and maintained. If this is correct, then a man is ‘righteous’ only so long as he lives under the power of God, i.e. as long as he lives in obedience to God and does good works (61; relying largely on E. Käsemann).

Finally, the careful study by David Kuck, although not actually directed towards our particular issue and dealing with only one Pauline passage, has made a significant contribution to the problem of judgment and justification in two respects.¹⁷ Relying heavily on the insights of social and rhetorical analysis for NT studies, Kuck is especially concerned to interpret the judgment sayings in the social context of the Corinthian church conflicts. An accurate assessment of such judgment texts must inquire first as to their function for the hearers, before turning to their function in Paul’s theology (15). Secondly, Kuck has recognized that any advance in understanding Paul’s judgment texts will require a renewed first-hand look at the traditions which influenced his language and thought. Thus, a large part of this book is devoted to “The Functions of Divine Judgment in Jewish Texts” (38-95) as well as “in Greek and Roman Traditions” (96-149).

¹⁷ David W. Kuck, *Judgment and Community Conflict*.

Conclusions. The above authors may be organized broadly into two basic groups, those for whom the tension between judgment and justification is ultimately unresolvable, and those who propose a resolution. To the first group belong those who see Paul's thought on this subject as incoherent or ultimately illogical,¹⁸ as well as N. Watson who calls contemporary listeners to "live under the paradox." Both Roetzel and Synofzik dispute that there is any tension to be resolved; at least Paul does not appear to have felt any. They nevertheless belong to this first group. Rather than finding a logical harmony, they remove any possible paradox by sealing off statements on justification and on judgment from ^{one} another. For Roetzel, the judgment statements deal with ecclesiology and eschatology, but do not touch on the justification of the individual; whereas for Synofzik the function of judgment statements as rhetorical devices ("Argumentationsmittel") allows justification to reign unmolested.

Those who seek some logical resolution of this tension may be further subdivided into three approaches. On the one hand are those who (re)define Paul's judgment statements.¹⁹ Judgment according to deeds has reference to rewards only, not to the determination of saving righteousness which is by faith alone; thus there can be no tension with justification by faith. As far as salvation is concerned, justification by faith is accorded the sole supremacy, and judgment according to deeds has an important, but clearly secondary, function for the believer's future. On the other hand are those who prefer instead to (re)define justification. For Donfried this means that justification is better understood as "the beginning of a process," the initial entry onto the path of life which must be "actualized in sanctification" and "consummated with salvation." Haufe goes much further, and eliminates the *sola fide* of justification altogether. By God's grace the standard has been lowered so that the verdict of 'righteous' at the judgment according to deeds is realistically

¹⁸ G. Wetter and H. Braun.

¹⁹ E. Kühl, R. Devor, L. Mattern.

attainable. Common to this second approach is a subordination of the 'already' of justification by faith to the 'not yet' of future justification. A third attempt at harmony accepts that both justification by faith and judgment according to works deal with the final verdict of righteousness for eternal life. The latter is complementary to the former because of the expectation that those justified by faith will also become (perfectly) righteous in behavior (Filson).²⁰ Judgment confirms justification.

There is, in any case, certainly nothing resembling consensus or even large-scale agreement on this issue today, while the fact that scholars return to it again and again demonstrates its importance for understanding Paul's theology.

What is remarkable in all of this is that the very thing which so exercises the modern interpreter of Paul, "tension," seems to have caused the apostle himself almost no apparent theological discomfort. We find no lengthy explanations or qualifications when judgment according to deeds is mentioned in his letters. He would appear to sense no serious tension between justification and judgment, nor does he seem to fear misunderstanding (i.e., the introduction of synergism or works-righteousness into salvation), although we know he was sensitive to potential or actual misunderstandings of his message (cf. Rom 3:1-8; 6:1-23).

This observation regarding Paul's own lack of tension on this matter is nothing new.²¹ Proponents of Pauline incoherence, of course, argue that Paul simply never put two and two together on this matter, and failed to perceive the inherent contradictions of his own teaching. This cannot be excluded *a priori*, but the fact that Paul does on occasion show awareness of their interrelationship

²⁰ To this third category one might also reckon John Calvin (*Institutes of the Christian Religion*, III.16:1-3, 18:1-4). It would, in fact, seem typical of reformational exegesis to turn the 'judgment according to deeds' in Rom 2 into a judgment over faith or unbelief (H. Braun, *Gerichtsgedanke*, 19-20, 22-23).

²¹ See, for instance, F. Filson, *Recompense*, 130; C. Roetzel, *Judgement*, 177-178; E. Synofzik, *Vergeltungsaussagen*, 11.

certainly means that it should be a solution of last resort.²² Perhaps the difference in perspective—modern interpreters' 'tension' and Paul's lack of it—is due to the apostle's unrealistic expectations (Filson), or to subsequent misunderstanding of Paul (Mattern, Synofzik). On any account, a key question guiding our study must be, "why does the apostle appear to sense no serious tension between judgment according to deeds and justification by faith?"

FACTORS WHICH CALL FOR A RENEWED TREATMENT OF JUDGMENT ACCORDING TO DEEDS IN PAUL

Most earlier treatments gave relatively little attention to a first-hand study of the use and meaning of this motif in Jewish sources prior to Paul. While some important work has been done in this direction in the past few decades, no study has been devoted to a thorough examination of the motif of divine judgment (or recompense) according to deeds in pre-Pauline Jewish sources.²³ The studies referred to even today by most when commenting on this issue are either in German (Braun, Synofzik, Mattern), have a different focus (Roetzel, Travis, Kuck), or are only suggestive in scope (Donfried, Watson, Snodgrass²⁴). Thus, one of the major goals of this study is to examine carefully the terminology and rhetorical functions of this motif in relevant Jewish sources. Paul's use of the motif will then be examined against the same background in order to ascertain the degree of terminological and functional continuity/discontinuity. Does he evince proximity to use in the Scriptures, to that in apocalyptic writings, in sectarian circles? Does he significantly modify the traditional wording or rhetorical function(s), and, if so,

²² Romans 2:6-11 occurs, after all, within the argument for justification by faith. 1 Cor 4:4-5 and 6:9-11 bring together justification and judgment terminology. See also Gal 6:7-8; Col 1:22-23; and Phil 2:12-13.

²³ R. Heiligenthal, *Werke als Zeichen, Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung der menschlichen Taten im Frühjudentum, neuen Testament und Frühchristentum* (WUNT 2/9; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983) 143-164, 172-184, 234-264; E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977; hereafter *PPJ*) see Subject Index "Reward and Punishment"; S. Travis, *Judgment*, 5-29; D. W. Kuck, *Judgment*, 38-95.

²⁴ K. Snodgrass, "Justification By Grace - To The Doers: An Analysis Of The Place Of Romans 2 In The Theology Of Paul," *NTS* 32 (1986) 72-93.

does such give any hint as to his own particular theological understanding of the motif?

Studies prior to the 1970's were generally reliant upon an understanding of Judaism represented in works such as those by F. W. Weber, W. Bousset, and H. Strack/P. Billerbeck.²⁵ These suggested a radical *discontinuity* between Paul and Judaism in regard to judgment. Whereas Judaism was thought to be a religion of works in which salvation had to be earned by the majority of good works, in Paul justification (and thus judgment) was by grace apart from works.

The debate over Paul's relationship to Judaism has received new impetus from the work of E. P. Sanders, who raises the possibility of greater *continuity* between Paul and Judaism on the point of judgment according to works.

Paul's view is typically Jewish. . . . the distinction between being *judged on the basis of deeds* and punished or rewarded at the judgment (or in this life), on the one hand, and being *saved by God's gracious election*, on the other, was the general view in Rabbinic literature. It is a very straightforward distinction, and it should occasion no surprise when it meets us in Paul. Salvation by grace is not incompatible with punishment and reward for deeds.²⁶

While Sanders himself argues that Paul and Palestinian Judaism represent two differing patterns of religion, they evince no essential difference in regard to the relationship between grace and works. A reevaluation of 'judgment according to works' in both Paul and second temple Judaism is necessary to determine whether Paul's understanding of judgment as well as of the relationship between faith—obedience—salvation—judgment might not be much closer to Jewish views than previously allowed. In this regard, Mark Seifrid has suggested that the resolution of the "inherent but invisible connection" in Paul between justification and

²⁵ F. W. Weber, *Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften*² (Leipzig; Dörffling & Franke, 1897); W. Bousset and H. Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*³ (HNT 21; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1926); H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (4 vols.; Munich: 1922; hereafter *Str-B*) esp. Exkursus 20: "Das Gleichnis von den Arbeitern im Weinberg Mt 20,1-16 u. die altsynagogale Lohnlehre" (4.484-500).

²⁶ *PPJ*, 517; see also 515-518, 543. For an illustration of the Sanders' influence on subsequent studies of Pauline judgment texts, see K. Snodgrass, "Justification by Grace," 72-93.

sanctification may only be achieved by a reexamination of the background of such a connection in Judaism.²⁷

Thus, another goal of this study will be to examine the place, theologically, of judgment according to deeds within the larger soteriological pattern(s) represented in the various sources. Of course, a full-scale study of their soteriological views is beyond the scope of this study. Therefore, we will be somewhat more reliant at this point on the findings of others. It should be acknowledged at the start that Sanders' basic insight into the pattern of Palestinian Jewish religion ('covenantal nomism') has been adopted as a working hypothesis, but has been tested constantly against the texts studied and in the secondary literature on these writings.²⁸

Ongoing debate regarding *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ* raises anew the question of the relationship between Pauline justification by faith and Christian obedience, and thus, of justification and judgment. For example, the movement away from a strictly

²⁷ *Justification by Faith: The Origin and Development of a Central Pauline Theme* (NovTSup 68; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 46.

²⁸ Covenantal nomism means that salvation is not earned by human initiative or merits, but is granted freely by means of God's election and the giving of the covenant. One "gets in" by grace. Within this covenantal relationship, however, obedience to God's will (the law) is required. Works are the condition of maintaining one's status within the saved. One "stays in" by obedience. See *PPJ*, esp. 75, 236, 422.

In adopting this hypothesis, we are not unaware of the challenges that have been raised against Sanders on the relation of grace and works in Judaism and in Paul. Laato, for instance, contrasts Jewish synergism with Pauline monergism. Paul's pessimistic anthropology demands both a radical doctrine of *sola gratia* and the rejection of Judaism's optimistic anthropology in which the freedom and ability of the human will remain intact (T. Laato, *Paulus und das Judentum: Anthropologische Erwägungen* [Abö: Abö Academy Press, 1991] 210). This rejection of Pauline continuity based upon Jewish synergism has been voiced as well by others (D. A. Carson, *Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility: Biblical Perspectives in Tension* [MTL; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1981] 45-109; R. H. Gundry, "Grace, Works, and Staying Saved in Paul," *Bib* 66 [1985] 1-38; S. Westerholm, *Israel's Law and the Church's Faith: Paul and His Recent Interpreters* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988] 142-149; and C. F. D. Moule, "Jesus, Judaism, and Paul," *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament: Essays in Honor of E. Earle Ellis* [ed. G. Hawthorne; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987] 43-52). While there may well be more variety in second temple Judaism than Sanders indicates, these critics have not succeeded in demonstrating that the grace-works axis in Judaism generally is any more synergistic or meritorious than in Paul. Both entry into and continued (and final) enjoyment of salvation find their cause in God's grace and mercy; the condition for the maintenance and final enjoyment of the same is human obedience. For general acceptance of this fundamental thesis of Sanders, see W. D. Davies, *Jewish and Pauline Studies* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984) 17-23, and 308, n. 27; idem., *Paul*⁴, xxix; J. D. G. Dunn, "The New Perspective on Paul," *BJRL* 65/2 (1983) 95-97; J. Neusner, "The Use of the Later Rabbinic Evidence for the Study of Paul," *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*, Vol 2 (ed. William Scott Green; Brown Judaic Studies 9; Atlanta: Scholars, 1980) 48, 50.

‘forensic-judicial’ perspective in favor of ‘Heilsetzende Macht’ and including more transformational categories virtually collapses justification and sanctification.²⁹

Again, within the constraints of this dissertation, we cannot hope to provide a fresh analysis of this issue. In understanding Paul’s letters, however, these developments will have to be kept in mind as providing possibly new avenues for defining the relationship between justification and judgment.

METHOD AND PROCEDURE: MOTIF ANALYSIS

In comparing one literary motif across several bodies of literature we will investigate its linguistic characteristics and rhetorical functions as well as its theological significance. The study of the motif in Judaism prior to Paul has value in its own right, apart from its significance for understanding Paul’s letters. Thus, Part One will be devoted to an examination of the pertinent Jewish literature. The attempt will be made to avoid imposing Pauline categories on this literature, or only combing it for parallels to Paul’s use (though these may certainly be noted as they occur). After a working definition of the motif’s semantic field, exegesis of texts containing the motif will follow. Attention will be given especially to identifying the vocabulary and rhetorical functions which are typical in order to provide a basis for determining to what extent Paul’s use is or is not continuous with that of second temple Judaism. Further, the theological significance of the motif within the soteriological pattern of each individual writing will be explored, and related motifs noted (e.g., divine impartiality, two-ways contrast, weighing of deeds). Thus by the end of Part One we should have formed a clear picture of the form, function and content of divine judgment according to deeds in second temple Judaism.

Part Two will turn to the Pauline texts and will follow a similar procedure to that in the first part, but with greater detail in the exegetical analysis. The same

²⁹ E. Käsemann, “Gottesgerechtigkeit bei Paulus,” *ZTK* 58 (1961) 367-378 (ET=*New Testament Questions of Today* [1969] 168-182). For a helpful overview of the debate, see M. T. Brauch (“Appendix: Perspectives on ‘God’s righteousness’ in recent German discussion,” in E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 523-542); and for a critical interaction with Käsemann and Sanders and developments since 1974, see M. Seifrid, *Justification*, 37-77.

issues of form, function, and content will guide the study of Paul's use of the motif, but in addition special attention will be given to the relationship between Paul's use and that in second temple Judaism. In particular, at what points does the form and function of the motif in Paul show continuity or discontinuity with common Jewish use? Is there evidence of his having modified the tradition in ways that hint at his (differing) understanding of its meaning within his own soteriological pattern? Or, lacking indications of significant change in form and function, does judgment according to deeds function for him theologically in the same way that it does in the Jewish sources? What is the meaning of this judgment motif for the believer's justification or salvation? Sanders has raised objections to such a comparison of individual motifs across patterns of religion, since the same motif, in spite of formal similarities, might have a radically different significance within a different pattern of religion.³⁰ This danger can be avoided by attempting to understand the motif in each instance within its own soteriological pattern before attempting any comparison.³¹

The concluding chapter will summarize these results and will suggest an understanding of judgment and justification in Paul which has been made plausible by the foregoing analysis.

In order to stay within the space limitations of such a dissertation, we will limit ourselves to *divine judgment upon those within the religious community*. Thus our focus is not upon intra-community (human) judgment or judgment upon outsiders, though we will make note of these related usages where appropriate. Primary texts to be considered will be those using the terminology of 'judgment (or 'recompense') according to deeds,' or texts where a divine judgment/recompense is

³⁰ E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 1-24, esp. 12-18; also T. Laato, *Paulus*, 48-60.

³¹ Examples of the approach we are using to understand a particular motif (or motifs) in Paul are J. Bassler, *Divine Impartiality: Paul and a Theological Axiom* (SBLDS 59; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1982) see esp. 1-4; R. Scroggs, *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966) xxiii; and W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*.

alluded to in connection with deeds.³²

As primary witnesses to the pre-Pauline Jewish use of the motif we will examine the Jewish Scriptures (both the MT and the LXX), the OT Pseudepigrapha, and the DSS.³³ Rabbinic texts will be cited occasionally for comparison, but the current state of research into this literature suggests that a defensible reconstruction of 1st century CE rabbinic perspectives is still a task for the future.³⁴ Greco-Roman views of judgment will be noted briefly. While they have importance for understanding Paul's language of judgment at numerous points, Paul's use of the particular motif under consideration stems by common consent from Jewish sources. Evidence for Paul's use of the motif will be taken from the undisputed Paulines, and from Colossians and 2 Thessalonians.³⁵

Our thesis is that Paul's use of this motif—terminologically, rhetorically, and theologically—demonstrates fundamental continuity with second temple Jewish sources, and this in spite of notable differences (e.g., the christological focus of judgment in Paul). While the roots of his usage are in the Scriptures, the influence of subsequent developments in the motif tradition are equally clear. His repeated use

³² Further definition of the semantic field is found on pp. 29-30.

³³ Philo can be omitted from consideration, since his language and concept of divine judgment differ fundamentally from that of both Paul and Jewish apocalyptic literature. "Not once does he suggest that God condemns the wicked. . . . It is easy to see that judgment for Philo lacks the same moral seriousness that it has for the apocalyptic writers and for Paul" (C. Roetzel, *Judgement*, 14, n. 1). See also R. Heiligenthal, *Werke*, 273-278.

³⁴ K. Müller, "Zur Datierung rabbinischer Aussagen," in *Neues Testament und Ethik: FS R. Schnackenburg* (ed. H. Merklein; Freiburg: Herder, 1989) 551-587.

³⁵ On the authenticity of Colossians, see chap. 7. The motif is found in 2 Thess 1:6, but applied to enemies of the gospel, thus not meeting our criteria for primary motif-texts. Although the Pauline authorship of this epistle is subject to increasing doubts (the current scholarly opinion is reviewed by E. D. Freed, *The New Testament: A Critical Introduction*² [Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1991] 319-323), arguments for its authenticity continue to find strong scholarly support (see, for instance, K. Neumann, *The Authenticity of the Pauline Epistles in the Light of Stylostatistical Analysis* [SBLDS 120; Atlanta: Scholars, 1990]; R. Jewett, *The Thessalonian Correspondence: Pauline Rhetoric and Millenarian Piety* [Foundations and Facets; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986] 3-18). We will cite 2 Thess as Pauline. The motif usage in Eph 6:8 may be safely overlooked, since it is so similar to Col 3:24 and would make little difference to our conclusions. 2 Tim 4:14 may also be mentioned here, being one of the few instances in the epistles where the motif is used to pronounce a sentence of divine punishment upon a named individual. Elsewhere such statements are generally left conditional ("if you") or more oblique in their reference ("whoever").

of the motif and related judgment themes in the same rhetorical contexts found in the Jewish sources favors the assumption that Paul, if not all his later interpreters, thought he was saying essentially the same thing on this point as were his predecessors. The fact that neither Paul nor second temple Jewish sources felt significant theological tension over this matter of judgment according to deeds within their soteriological pattern, raises at least the possibility that divine grace and human obedience were similarly interconnected in both patterns. For both, a universal and eschatological divine judgment awaited all humanity, applicable to those within as well as without the people of God. This judgment will be according to one's deeds, and will not so much determine as *reveal* one's character and status as righteous or wicked. Although a few texts hint at Paul's acceptance of the developing doctrine of varied eschatological rewards, in most instances this judgment results in eternal salvation or damnation.

PART ONE

**JUDGMENT ACCORDING TO DEEDS
IN SECOND TEMPLE JEWISH LITERATURE**

CHAPTER TWO

THE USE OF THE MOTIF IN THE JEWISH SCRIPTURES

THE FOUNDATIONAL CHARACTER OF THIS CHAPTER

When citing or alluding to the Jewish Scriptures Paul's letters use the Greek text almost exclusively.¹ This is not to deny Paul all familiarity with the Hebrew text, but simply to say that the LXX, in whatever text-form he may have known it, was his Bible and a main literary source for his thought.² However, these documents are more than simply a literary source for his quotations. "Within Israel as a reading community, 'all significant speech is Scriptural or Scripturally-oriented speech'."³ When Paul speaks of 'God repaying each according to deeds,' "the echo of Psalms and Proverbs recollects images of God that were in Paul's bones. We, belated rootless readers, can learn only through marginalia and concordances . . . what Paul knew by heart: to quote the confession that God will render to each one according to his works is to trigger overtones in which God's omniscience and mercy play in

¹ C. D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*, (SNTSMS 69, Cambridge: University Press, 1992) 67; D.-A. Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* (BHTh 69; Tübingen: Mohr, 1986) 48-57, 59, 78; E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: 1957); O. Michel, *Paulus und seine Bibel* (BFChThM 18; Gütersloh: 1929 [reprint, Darmstadt: 1972]).

² J. Barr, "The Interrelation of Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek," *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, Vol 2 (ed. W. D. Davies and L. Finkelstein; Cambridge: 1989) 110-114. Although the term *Septuagint* (LXX) refers, strictly speaking, only to "the collection of Greek biblical texts found in later codices, whatever their individual origins and text-histories," for convenience we will continue to use it as well for Paul's Greek *Vorlage*, noting where his text seems to have differed from the LXX of the later codices (C. D. Stanley, *Paul*, 41-42, n. 24; see also L. Greenspoon, "The Use and Misuse of the Term 'LXX' and Related Terminology in Recent Scholarship," *BIOSCS* 20 [1987] 21-29).

³ R. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University, 1989) 21; citing M. Fishbane, "Inner Biblical Exegesis: Types and Strategies of Interpretation in Ancient Israel," *Midrash and Literature* (ed. G. H. Hartman, and S. Budick; New Haven: Yale University, 1986) 34.

counterpoint and blend.”⁴

However, even this restriction to “the echo of Psalms and Proverbs” is too narrow. Divine recompense according to deeds was a motif found in nearly all strata of the OT and itself part of the ongoing ‘intertextual play’ aimed at better understanding the divine character and, among other things, the interplay between privilege and obligation in Israel, that is, between grace and works. What has just been said about Paul could be said equally of those intertestamental writers we will study in chapters three and four. For them too, the scriptural tradition of divine retribution according to deeds formed the foundation upon which they built their own usage and understanding.

For this reason, we will give somewhat more attention in this chapter to questions of form and function in order to adequately describe this foundation upon which later Jewish authors build. In particular, we will offer a definition of the motif’s semantic field and trace the degree of flexibility to which it is subject. We will also develop a functional typology which will allow us to compare the rhetorical use of the motif across the various bodies of literature. Due to the large number of texts involved we will be unable to give an extensive exegetical analysis of each motif occurrence. Instead we will group them according to function, focusing on representative texts in each grouping with more cursory reference, where needed, to other texts in each group.

In addition to the above, a number of further questions will guide our investigation. (i) Does this divine recompense address the people of God or the enemies of the righteous, the individual or the community? Since our thesis concerns primarily Paul’s usage of this motif in relation to (Christian) believers, we will want to give primary attention to passages indicating a judgment/recompense upon those belonging to the people of God, in both negative (punishment) and positive (blessing) senses. (ii) What related motifs occur in connection with divine recompense

⁴ R. Hays, *Echoes*, 42-43.

according to deeds (e.g., revealing of hidden deeds, weighing, divine omniscience or impartiality)? (iii) Are there indications as to how the writers (or the community) understood the relationship between this divine recompense according to deeds and one's participation in the covenant community? In particular, how do Yahweh's דָּבָר , covenant, and 'recompense according to deeds' relate, and what part do human obedience, faith, and repentance play in their interaction? In general, how is the motif related to soteriology and eschatology within the OT writings? (iv) Did the LXX translators introduce to the motif new conceptual elements? Did they eschatologize a previously this-worldly, temporal model? Did they individualize passages with a community reference? Is a greater degree of synergism present in the LXX?

Thus our *central aim* is to examine the motif's semantic form and the rhetorical purposes for which it was employed, and to discover how divine recompense according to deeds functioned theologically within the larger soteriological perspective(s) of the Jewish Scriptures.

THE LITERARY MOTIF AS AN IDENTIFIABLE SEMANTIC FIELD

A Working Definition of the Semantic Field

Our analysis will be limited to texts exhibiting each of the following elements:⁵

- a) God functions explicitly or implicitly as the subject of the recompensing activity. While we will have occasion to refer to texts with a human or an impersonal subject, this will only be for purposes of comparison, since our

⁵ Roman Heiligenthal refers to "die regelmäßig wiederkehrenden drei Grundelemente des Wortfeldes" which he identifies as:

a) $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma/\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ + $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\iota$ (or related verbs) *κατά*,

b) Object: $\epsilon\rho\gamma\omicron\nu/\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\varsigma$ (or related terms),

c) Personal Object: $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma/\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$ (or "him/her", "them", etc.).

However, *κατά* is not required in the motif, and Heiligenthal's inclusion of this as a criterion unnecessarily restricts his analysis (*Werke*, 148-151).

main concern is with possible influences on *divine* recompense according to deeds in Paul.

- b) A verbal component expresses the divine recompensing activity, whereby we will see that a considerable variety in terminology is found here.
- c) Reference is made to human deeds, again utilizing a broad range of terminology. We will seek to note along the way whether differences in number (*work* versus *works*) or terminology (e.g., *way*, *work of one's hands*, *righteousness*) bear any significance.

The reference to human deeds can be related syntactically to the verbal component in the form of:

- i) a standard: in which case it ^{is} usually introduced by *κατά* (Heb. כִּי), or
- ii) a direct object.

In the course of our examination we will demonstrate that these two ways of relating deeds to divine recompense are, in large part, stylistic, in some cases being influenced by the verb, and, in any case, equivalent in meaning and interchangeable.

- d) In most instances there is also reference to the person or group to whom or upon whom the divine recompense is directed.

The Semantic Field: Extent of Usage [See Appendix I]

With the exception of the Pentateuch, the motif is found across the various genres of OT literature, occurring in the LXX nearly seventy times.⁶

Observations on the Wording and Syntax of the Motif⁷

The motif in its Greek (LXX) form cannot be properly understood without reference to its use in the Hebrew Bible. Three Hebrew verbs predominate: שׁוּב

⁶ Passages will be cited according to the chapter and verse numbering of the English versions, with differences in the versification of the MT and LXX noted as they occur. Translations of motif-texts are generally the author's own and reflect the LXX; other passages are cited according to the NRSV unless otherwise noted.

⁷ The only other extended treatment of this motif is found in R. Heiligenthal (*Werke*, 143-164, "Die Vergeltung nach den Werken in der LXX und den anderen griechischen Übersetzungen des AT"). He fails, however, to examine the entire range of this motif in the OT since his focus on ἔργον

(Hiphil = “(re)turn,” 18x); נתן (Qal = “give,” 12x); and שָׁלַם (Piel = “(re)pay, recompense,” 13x).⁸ In spite of differences in nuance, the terms are largely interchangeable in the context of this motif.⁹ The use or absence of “according to . . .” (כְּ) is also more a matter of style than of significant change of meaning,¹⁰ as is, generally, the choice between singular or plural nouns. Thus Yahweh can recompense according to one’s “deed” or “deeds,”¹¹ “sin” or “sins,”¹² and can judge equally according to one’s “way” or “ways.”¹³ In some cases the choice between singular or plural “works” was determined by the noun itself,¹⁴ or by the use of a set phrase.¹⁵ In the MT the use of the singular for the motif predominates

limits the semantic field to (ἀντ)απο-δίδωμι + κατὰ + ἔργον/πράξις and closely related words (see also n. 5 above). See also F. Horst, art. “Vergeltung: II. Im AT,” *RGG*³, 6.1343-1346; P. D. Miller Jr., *Sin and Judgment in the Prophets: A Stylistic and Theological Analysis* (SBLMS 27; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1982); and the following chapters conveniently collected in *Um das Prinzip der Vergeltung in Religion und Recht des Alten Testaments* (ed. K. Koch; Wege der Forschung 125; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972): H. Gunkel, “Vergeltung im Alten Testament,” 1-7; K. Koch, “Gibt es ein Vergeltungsdogma im Alten Testament?” 130-180; J. Scharbert, “Das Verbum PQD in der Theologie des Alten Testaments,” and “ŠLM im Alten Testament,” 278-299, 300-324.

⁸ Additional verbs used include שָׁפַט (“judge,” 7x, all but one in Ezekiel), פָּקַד (“visit,” 4x), גָּמַל and עָשָׂה (“recompense” and “do (to),” 3x each), and מָצָע (“cause to find,” 2x).

⁹ So, for instance, Ps 28:4b where נתן and שָׁרַב stand in synonymous parallelism; or 1 Kgs 8:32, Ps 18:20, and 18:24 where God “gives,” “recompenses” (גָּמַל) and “returns” “according to one’s righteousness,” all with only minor shifts in meaning.

¹⁰ See for instance Isa 59:18 (“God will repay *according to* their dealings” = “God will repay their dealing”); or 2 Chr 6:23 (“give one’s way upon one’s head,” “give to one *according to* one’s righteousness” in antithetical parallelism). In some cases the use or absence of “according to” is determined by the choice of verb (e.g., עָשָׂה and גָּמַל both normally require כְּ).

¹¹ Prov 24:12; Hos 12:2b.

¹² Jer 16:18; Ps 103:10.

¹³ Ezek 33:20; 36:19. The singular “according to one’s way” in Ezek 36:19 stands in parallelism with “according to deeds.” See also Isa 59:18, “repay according to dealings (pl.)” = “repay one’s dealing (sg.).”

¹⁴ Thus עֲלֵלוֹת and מַעֲלָלִים (both “practices”) are only found in the plural form, while גְּמוּלָה (“dealing, recompense, due”) is always singular.

¹⁵ As in the “fruit (sg.) or evil (sg.) of one’s deeds (pl.),” or the “work (sg.) of one’s hands (pl.).”

slightly.¹⁶

The LXX translators followed their Hebrew *Vorlage* fairly closely in the case of this motif. Three verbs, all forms of *δίδωμι*, predominate:¹⁷

	<u>Hebrew Vorlage</u>			
<u>Greek Verb</u>	שוב	נתן	שלם	גמל
ἀνταποδίδωμι (22x) ¹⁸	10x		8x	3x
ἀποδίδωμι (12x)	7x	2x	2x	
δίδωμι (10x)		10x		

While not entirely synonymous, the choice between *ἀνταποδίδωμι* (“repay, recompense”) and *ἀποδίδωμι* (“return, give back”) appears to have been more a matter of translational taste than of theological meaning.¹⁹ The same motif is being employed whether God is said to “give,” “return,” “repay,” or “recompense” according to one’s deeds. Although *κρίνειν* (“judge”) and *ἐκδικεῖν* (“take vengeance, punish”) bring in a more juridical nuance, their synonymous parallelism with other non-juridical expressions of the recompense motif demonstrates that the same basic conception of a divine recompense according to deeds stands behind all the expressions.²⁰ The use or omission of *κατά* generally follows the MT,²¹ so that essentially the same conception is present whether God is said to “recompense one’s deeds” or “according to one’s deeds.” Likewise the use of singular and plural nouns appears to

¹⁶ Excluding set phrases (e.g., “work (sg.) of one’s hands (pl.)”) the singular occurs 39x, the plural 29x.

¹⁷ In addition: *κρίνω*, 9x (6x for טפֿשׁ, 3x without Hebrew original); *ἐκδίκω*, 4x (3x for פֿקד, 1x for טפֿשׁ); *ποιέω*, 3x (always for הִשָּׁע); and once each *ἀποστρέφω* (שׁוּב), *ἀποστίνω* (שָׁלַם), *ἀφανίζω* (הִמָּחֶה), *ἐκχέω* (שָׁפַךְ) and *εὕρισκω* (עָצַר).

¹⁸ Both *ἀνταποδίδωμι* and *ἀποδίδωμι* occur once each without an extant Hebrew original.

¹⁹ According to Büchsel, *ἀνταποδίδωμι* differs mainly in that “the thought of recompense in *ἀποδίδωμι* is strengthened by the prefix *ἀντί-*” (*TDNT* 3.169). The Greek MS tradition contains numerous instances of substitution between *ἀπο-* and *ἀνταποδίδωμι* (e.g., Jer 32:19; Lam 3:64; 2 Sam 22:25; Ps 94:23).

²⁰ Ezek 7:3, 8 [LXX = vv 7, 5], 27; Hos 4:9; 12:2 [LXX = v 3]. Cf. R. Heiligenthal, *Werke*, 150.

²¹ Exceptions: (adding) Ps 94:23; Prov 19:17; Jer 23:2; Ezek 7:27; (omitting) Ezek 7:3, 8, 9; 33:20.

be dictated for the most part by the Hebrew original. There does seem to be a slight tendency to prefer the plural *τὰ ἔργα* following *κατά*, but changes in number need not point to any theological bias (see below).²² Overall the use of singulars versus plurals for the motif is evenly balanced in the LXX.²³ The use of *ἕκαστος* (“each”) is relatively infrequent and mirrors the Hebrew original, so that the notion of an increasing “individualisation” of the doctrine of divine recompense by the LXX is unfounded.²⁴

Thus we find an axiom capable of great terminological variety available to a speaker/writer who might wish to make reference to God’s recompense according to deeds:²⁵

Give them according to their deeds
and according to the evil of their works;
according to the deeds of their hands give to them,
return to them their recompense.
*δὸς αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν
καὶ κατὰ τὴν πονηρίαν τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων αὐτῶν
κατὰ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν δὸς αὐτοῖς,
ἀπόδος τὸ ἀνταπόδομα αὐτῶν αὐτοῖς.* (Ps 28:4 [LXX:27:4])

who gives to each according to his/her deeds.
ὃς ἀποδίδωσιν ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ. (Prov 24:12)

therefore I shall give your way upon you,
διότι τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἐπὶ σὲ δώσω, (Ezek 7:4 [LXX:7:8])

and I shall doubly recompense their unrighteous acts and their sins,
καὶ ἀνταποδώσω διπλᾶς τὰς ἀδικίας αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν,
(Jer 16:18)

²² Changing singular to plural: Ps 28:4 (bis); 62:13; Prov 24:12; Lam 3:64. See also Jer 16:18; 23:2; further Sir 11:26; 16:12, 14, 35:24. However, over against twelve instances of change from singular to plural are six in the opposite direction (Jer 32:19; Ezek 7:9; 18:30; cf. also 1 Macc 7:42). Most of these changes can be explained on the basis of style, context (Jer 16:18; change from singular to plural “sins” due to plural “ways and unrighteous acts” in v 17), perception of a collective singular in the original (see below), or perhaps uncertainty regarding the pointing of the MT.

²³ Excluding set phrases, singular = 34x; plural = 34x.

²⁴ Job 34:11; Ps 62:12 [LXX: 61:13]; Prov 24:12; Jer 17:10; 32:19 [LXX: 39:19]; Ezek 18:30; 33:20; also Sir 16:14. R. Heiligenthal speaks somewhat misleadingly of “das regelmäßig vorkommende *ἕκαστος*” (*Werke*, 150, n. 30).

²⁵ Heiligenthal is correct to assert that the motif is “bereits in der LXX zu einer formelhaften Wendung geprägt worden,” but somewhat misleading to claim that *ἀποδίδωμι ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα* represents its “Kernstück” (*Werke*, 151).

to give his/her way upon his/her head . . .
 to give him/her according to his/her righteousness,
 δοῦναι τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ εἰς κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ . . .
 δοῦναι αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ, (1 Kgs 8:32)

The Possible Significance of Singular Versus Plural (“work/works”)

Paul’s understanding of “work(s)” has not infrequently been contrasted with that of Judaism. It is asserted that the latter speaks primarily of “judgment according to works (pl.)”: “Jeder Mensch tut gute und böse Werke, und das Gericht entscheidet nach der Mehrzahl der Werke”.²⁶ Paul, on the other hand, “setzt nicht mehr den Plural, als könnte man gute oder böse Werke summieren. ‘Werk’ ist nicht mehr Gesetzeswerk; es umfasst die Ganzheit eines Menschenlebens.”²⁷ Thus, while Judaism purportedly stressed a multiplicity of unrelated “Einzelleistungen” in judgment, and was prone to “adding” or “weighing” the same, Paul differentiated consciously between “works” and “work.”²⁸ For him judgment “geht nicht über die bessere oder schlechtere Leistung des Menschen—der Christ hat keine ‘Werke’ . . . —sondern über das bessere oder schlechtere Partizipieren der Christen am Werk Gottes.”²⁹

We will address in subsequent chapters the views of Paul and of second temple Judaism, desiring at this point only to clarify the situation as it is found in the Jewish Scriptures. There is scarce interest in a single isolated “deed,” but neither is recompense seen as applying to a multiplicity of unrelated actions. Rather, the easy interchange between singular and plural “deeds” is probably grounded in a

²⁶ L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 141, cf. 141-151. See also R. Bultmann, *Theologie*⁸, 283-284, 316-317, 525; and H. Braun, *Gerichtsgedanke*, 50-53.

²⁷ E. Schweizer, *RGG*³, 2.1406.

²⁸ “Vom ἔργον spricht Paulus ausschliesslich positiv, von ἔργα ausschliesslich negativ. Werden ἔργα nie von Christen getan, so ist das ἔργον ausschliesslich das Werk von Christen” (L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 144).

²⁹ Ibid., 151. However, Paul can have Christians’ “works” (pl.) in view in judgment: 2 Cor 5:10; 9:6-15.

wholistic view of human deeds.³⁰ One's deeds are regarded as a unity revealing the "way" upon which one walks:

I will give your way (ὁδός, sg.) upon you,
and your detestable practices (βδελύγματα, pl.) shall be in your midst.
(Ezek 7:4)

Likewise one's heart and kidneys (= the seat of thoughts and desires) are made known in one's actions:

I, the Lord, search hearts and prove kidneys,
to give to each according to his/her ways (ὁδός, pl.)
and according to the fruit of his/her actions (ἐπιτηδεύματα, pl.) (Jer 17:10)

This rejection of a fundamental distinction between the use of "deed" and "deeds" in the motif corresponds to the OT's wholistic attitude in general towards obedience.³¹ This is confirmed as well by the heavy use of terms and phrases with a collective meaning: "according to my way" or "righteousness," "the evil (sg.) of one's deeds," "the cleanness (sg.) of one's hands," etc.;³² and by the fact, noted above, that no general differentiation between the use of singular and plural "works," "ways," "sins," etc. can be discerned in the recompense motif.

Of course, the biblical texts do know the difference between a single "work" and a multitude of "works." They make, however, no *theological distinction* between the two of the sort mentioned above. While an occasional deed "out of character," as it were, is to be reckoned with (for which repentance, the sacrificial system, and forgiveness provide the remedy), the OT expects a generally consistent pattern of behavior or deeds giving visible testimony to one's true character as either righteous or wicked.

³⁰ See esp. the constant fluctuation of variants between singular and plural in the Greek MSS: e.g., Jer 32:19; Ezek 36:19.

³¹ See W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament* 2 vols (trans. J. A. Baker; OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961 [orig. *Theologie des Alten Testaments*⁶, 1959]) 1.93; 2.289, 303, 328, and esp. chap 21 "The Fundamental Forms of Man's Personal Relationship with God."

³² This use of collective terms and phrases is even more pronounced in the MT: "fruit (sg.) of one's deeds," "work (sg.) of one's hands," מַעֲלָלִים ("practices, deeds," only plural) which has "eine summierende Bedeutung" (cf. W. Roth and H.-J. Fabry, *TWAT* 6.151-160).

Retribution: An Innovation of the LXX?

In his influential article, “Gibt es ein Vergeltungsdogma im Alten Testament?,”³³ Klaus Koch argued that the legal-juridical ideas evoked by such terms as “recompense,” “retribution,” and “punishment” were first introduced by the LXX. Building on Fahlgren’s insight into the Hebrews’ “synthetische Lebensauffassung,”³⁴ he contended for what he termed “schicksalwirkende Tat(sphäre)”³⁵ or “Tun-Ergehen-Zusammenhang” as characteristic of the Hebrew Bible. That is, a deed and its consequences are organically connected, so that the deed produces a sphere or a fate surrounding the doer, which will eventually, and almost automatically, return to that person for good or evil.³⁶ Thus:

“they sow the wind, and they shall reap the whirlwind” (Hos 8:7);

“one’s mischief returns [יָשׁוּב] upon one’s own head,
and one’s violence descends upon one’s crown” (Ps 7:16);

“one who digs a pit will fall into it,
if one rolls a stone, it will roll back upon that person” (Prov 26:27);

“evil comes to the one who searches for it” (Prov 11:27).

Although God watches over this process, his intervention is best termed an “*In-Kraft-Setzen und Vollenden des Sünde-Unheil-Zusammenhangs bzw. des Guttat-Heil-Zusammenhangs*,”³⁷ rather than a retribution or punishment meted out according to some external measure of justice. The Hebrew שָׁלַם (Piel) means not “vergelten (to recompense)” but “vollenden,” i.e., to bring the deed-consequence

³³ ZTK 52 (1955) 1-42. Reprinted in *Um das Prinzip der Vergeltung in Religion und Recht des Alten Testaments* (ed. K. Koch; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972) 130-180; a shortened English translation can be found in *Theodicy in the Old Testament* (ed. J. L. Crenshaw, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983) 57-87. Citations follow the pagination in *Um das Prinzip*.

³⁴ K. H. Fahlgren, *Ṣedākā nahestehende und entgegengesetzte Begriffe im Alten Testament* (Uppsala: 1932). Cf. K. Koch, “Vergeltungsdogma,” 161.

³⁵ “Vergeltungsdogma,” 160-161.

³⁶ Ibid., 132-133.

³⁷ Ibid., 137-138.

connection to fulfillment.³⁸ Thus, rather than speaking of Yahweh's punishing and retribution, it is said:

"Whoever is kind to the poor lends to the Lord,
and the Lord will *complete* [שָׁלַם] that one's deed" (Prov 19:17);

"I will visit upon them their ways,
and *turn* their deeds *back* [שָׁבַח] upon them" (Hos 4:9b).

In addition, according to Koch, the Hebrew Bible did not have any term for "punishment."³⁹ The connection between a deed and its consequence was expressed not by terms with a legal-judicial flavor, but only in ways pointing to an organic and immanent *Tun-Ergehen-Zusammenhang*. "Von einer Vergeltungstheorie, nach der Jahwe dem Menschen für seine Tat gemäß einer Norm Strafe oder Lohn berechnet und als etwas Fremdes von außen an den Täter heranträgt, ist keine Spur zu bemerken."⁴⁰

A doctrine of retribution, according to Koch, was first introduced by the LXX which had too little understanding of the "schicksalwirkende Tat," and translated שָׁבַח and שָׁלַם with the legal-juridical terminology of ἀπο- or ἀνταποδίδωμι (=vergelten).⁴¹

It is certainly to Koch's credit that he so convincingly demonstrated the presence of this organic deed-consequence connection throughout the OT, and we will observe in the exegetical sections to follow its significant role in the motif of divine recompense according to deeds. However, his attempt to separate this cleanly from all legal-juridical background and, thus, to deny the presence of "retribution," must be judged unsuccessful.⁴² Among the criticisms are the following. 1) Koch

³⁸ Ibid., 134-135; and similarly for שָׁבַח (Hiphil) = "cause to return" and not "recompense, bring retribution," 139-140.

³⁹ Ibid., 164-165.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 156. Koch's own summary of his position is found on pp. 166-168.

⁴¹ Ibid., 174-176.

⁴² Notable proponents of Koch's thesis include G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (Einführung in die evangelische Theologie; Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1957) 1.263-265, 382-384; and J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes: Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament* (SUNT 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964) 13-19. Representative of many studies interacting critically with Koch's thesis: E. Pax, "Studien zum Vergeltungsproblem der

omits passages clearly showing a 'retribution' extrinsic to the deed itself,⁴³ and destruction as resulting from Yahweh's "wrath."⁴⁴ 2) Prophetic judgment-statements evidence a strongly judicial background and terminology.⁴⁵ 3) Koch's contention that terms such as פֶּקַד and שְׁלֹם do not carry any sense of "punishment," "recompense," or "retribution" has been refuted.⁴⁶ 4) There is an emphasis in many passages on *correspondence* (e.g., כֶּן) of deed and effect rather than organic *consequence*.⁴⁷

While we thus reject Koch's thesis that it was the LXX terminology which first introduced retribution into the OT, it will remain a task of the ensuing exegetical sections to determine what, if any, changes in the understanding and usage of the motif were introduced by the Greek translators (e.g., an 'eschatologizing' of the concept?).

On the Origin of the Motif⁴⁸

The motif of divine recompense according to deeds does not have the charac-

Psalmen," *Studii biblici Franciscani* (Liber Annuus XI; Jerusalem: 1960) 56-112; J. Scharbert, "Das Verbum PQD in der Theologie des Alten Testaments," *Um das Prinzip*, 278-299 (= *BZ* 4 [1960] 209-226), and "SHLM im Alten Testament," *Um das Prinzip*, 300-324 (= *Lex tua veritas. FS für Hubert Junker* [ed. H. Gross and F. Mussner; Trier: Paulinus-Verlag, 1961] 209-229); F. Horst, "Recht und Religion im Bereich des Alten Testaments," *Um das Prinzip*, 181-212 (= *Gottes Recht. Gesammelte Studien* [ed. H. W. Wolff, München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1961] 260-63, 266-291); J. G. Gammie, "The Theology of Retribution in the Book of Deuteronomy" *CBQ* 32/1 (1970) 1-12; O. Eckart, "Die 'synthetische Lebensauffassung' in der frühköniglichen Novellistik Israels: Ein Beitrag zur alttestamentlichen Anthropologie," *ZThK* 74 (1977) 371-400; P. D. Miller, Jr., *Sin and Judgment*, esp. 121-139.

⁴³ E.g., plagues on the Egyptians, disease (Num 11:33), drought (Jer 14:1-7), famine (Ezek 5:12, 16), earthquakes, lightning. Cf. S. H. Travis, *Judgment*, 8-9.

⁴⁴ Deut 7:4; 9:8, 19, 25; Num 16:21; Ezek 22:31; 43:8.

⁴⁵ See C. Westermann, *Grundformen prophetischer Rede*⁵ (BEvT 31, Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1978) esp. 130-136.

⁴⁶ See J. Scharbert, "Das Verbum PQD," and "SHLM"; G. Andre, *Determining the Destiny: PQD in the Old Testament* (ConBOTSeries 16; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1980); W. Eisenbeis, *Die Wurzel shlm im Alten Testament* (BZAW 113; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1969) 301-322.

⁴⁷ See P. D. Miller, *Sin and Judgment*, 121-137.

⁴⁸ The following depends heavily on the groundbreaking work done by Patrick Miller, "Source and Setting of the Correspondence Pattern," *Sin and Judgment*, 97-110. Although Miller's analysis deals with a broader "correspondence pattern" of which our motif forms merely one specific expression, his conclusions are equally relevant to both.

ter of a specific *Gattung*, for which we might expect a single *Sitz im Leben*. Rather it “belongs to the storeroom of materials available to the prophet, poet, or speaker,” and probably arose not from a single particular setting, but from “multiple settings, sources, or contexts for this pattern of speech.”⁴⁹ One source was probably the “general literary usage of poetic justice and irony,” found almost universally in myths, legends and novels of various locales, in which the doers’ fate corresponds to their deeds.⁵⁰ A second source was almost certainly the curses of the covenantal tradition. This (often verbal) correspondence of sin and punishment can be seen in the OT,⁵¹ in the ‘parity style’ of other international diplomatic communications, and in widespread futility curses in which the punishment is the frustration of the intention of a sinful action.⁵² A third source was the *lex talionis*, broadly understood rather than solely in its specific form “*x for x*.”⁵³ Here the religio-legal principle of *talio* was applied by the prophetic messenger of Yahweh’s heavenly court to a king or nation.⁵⁴ There was a flexibility of expression possible, yielding three different categories of logical relationship between sin and punishment:

⁴⁹ Ibid., 97-98. Similar recompense ideas and terminology (though not always “according to deeds”) were apparently widespread throughout the ancient Near East, being found in Accadian and Aramaic literature, though not in Ugaritic (H.-J. Fabry, *Die Wurzel ŠÛB in der Qumran-Literatur* [BBB 46; Köln/Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1975] 185-187).

⁵⁰ P. D. Miller, *Sin and Judgment*, 98.

⁵¹ Cf. Joshua chap 7 (esp. v 25); Hos 4:4-6; Deut 28:47-48 (note the repetition of “serve”); 31:16-18 (note the repetition of “abandon” and “evil” in both stipulation and curse). See also N. Lohfink, “Zu Text und Form von Os 4,4-6,” *Bib* 42 (1961) 303-332.

⁵² Cf. Lev 26; Deut 28; Amos 5:7, 10-11; Isa 5:8-10. See P. Miller, *Sin and Judgment*, 98-102. For the relation of prophetic preaching to covenant curses, see D. R. Hillers, *Treaty Curses and Old Testament Prophets* (Biblica et Orientalia; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964) esp. 82-89.

⁵³ Reference here and elsewhere is to the *lex* (or *ius*) *talionis* in which wrongdoers suffer precisely the same injury which they inflicted upon the victim. Thus “life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth” (Exod 21:23-35; Lev 24:18-20; Deut 19:21).

⁵⁴ See C. Westermann, *Grundformen prophetischer Rede*; and P. Miller, *Sin and Judgment*, 102-110.

- i) indication of a general correspondence or appropriateness between crime and punishment,
- ii) precise talionic correspondence,⁵⁵
- iii) the instrument or means of the crime becomes the object of the punishment.⁵⁶

A FUNCTIONAL TYPOLOGY OF MOTIF PASSAGES

By a functional typology we mean the rhetorical purpose(s) for which the motif is employed.⁵⁷ This should not be confused with divisions of classical rhetoric (epideictic, etc.). This functional typology can be applied easily to both later Jewish and Pauline writings, enabling us to compare the use of the motif across various bodies of literature without ignoring contextual considerations.⁵⁸ Although not completely exclusive of one another, the categories are sufficiently discrete and specific to provide clear-cut groupings.⁵⁹

- 1) Praising God's manner of dealing with humanity: 1 Sam 25:39; Jer 32:19.
- 2) Justifying God's manner of dealing with humanity: Judg 1:7; Job 34:11; Ezek 36:19; Zech 1:6.

⁵⁵ Cf. Exod 21:23-25; Lev 24:17-21; Deut 19:21. But see Lev 24:19-20; 1 Sam 15:33; and Obad 15, where the strict formulation can be elaborated with corresponding verbs ("as they have *done*, so shall it be *done* to them").

⁵⁶ Deut 25:11; Amos 7:16-17; Hos 10:1-3. See P. Miller, *Sin and Judgment*, 108-110.

⁵⁷ The term "functional typology" has been borrowed from D. W. Kuck who, without much explanation, suggests four categories:

- i) Moral recompense within the life of an individual or nation,
- ii) Announcement of God's decision to recompense his people,
- iii) Appeals to the higher court of God's judgment,
- iv) Israel and the nations in God's judgment (*Judgment*, 38-53).

⁵⁸ "Only . . . by studying the contextual function of a theological axiom, can a valid assessment of its significance be given. And only by comparing its function in different contexts can a valid statement of originality or dependence be made" (J. M. Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, 183). See also the comments of E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 1-24, esp. 12-18; and J. Neusner, "The Use of the Later Rabbinic Evidence," 43-63.

⁵⁹ Especially the "justification of Yahweh" tends to overlap at times with other purposes; a primary purpose is, nevertheless, easily discernible. Cf. Jer 17:10 (primarily "sentence" upon the disobedient, and secondarily "justification"); Ezek 18:30 ("summons to repent", and secondarily "justification").

- 3) Appealing to God to intervene on behalf of the righteous: 2 Sam 3:39; 1 Kgs 8:32; 2 Chr 6:23; Ps 28:4; Lam 3:64; 1 Macc 7:42; and Sir 35:23a, 24; cf. also Jer 50:29.
- 4) Pronouncing a Benediction or Prayer-Wish: Ruth 2:12.
- 5) Motivating the righteous to obedience: Prov 19:17; 24:12; (Eccl 12:14); Sir 11:26; 16:12, 14; 17:23.
- 6) Comforting or Assuring the righteous (i.e., that God will correct seeming injustices): 2 Sam 22:21, 25; Ps 18:20, 24; 62:12; 94:2, 23; 103:10; Isa 59:18; 66:6.
- 7) Pronouncing Sentence upon the disobedient: 1 Kgs 2:44(?); Jer 16:18; 17:10; 21:14; 23:2; 25:14; 51:6, 24; Ezek 7:3, 4, 8, 9, 27; 24:14; Hos 4:9; 12: 2, 14; Joel 3:4, 7.
- 8) Summoning the disobedient to repentance: Ezek 18:30; 33:20.

PASSAGES USING THE MOTIF TO PRAISE GOD'S MANNER OF DEALING WITH HUMANITY

Jeremiah 32:19

Although this use overlaps to some degree with texts seeking to justify Yahweh's dealings with humanity, Jer 32:19 (LXX = 39:19) employs the motif primarily as a means of ascribing praise to God. The saying occurs within Jeremiah's prayer (vv 17-25), uttered after he has obeyed the Lord's instructions and purchased a field in Anathoth (v 1), a sign of Yahweh's intention to restore Israel (v 15). Having regularly preached Yahweh's fierce judgment against a faithless people, Jeremiah is understandably disturbed by this seeming divine change of heart. His prayer climaxes with the question implied in v 25: If it is according to your will and purpose to destroy Israel, why then are you now having me give a sign of hope by buying this field?

With conventional language Jeremiah⁶⁰ recites Yahweh's character as one who "shows steadfast love [ἔλεος] to the thousandth generation, but repays

[ἀποδοῦς] the guilt of parents into the laps of their children after them” (v 18).

The prophet recounts God’s deeds of lovingkindness in the mighty deliverance from Egypt and the giving of the land (vv 20-23a). However, Israel did not obey God’s commands, and reaped disaster (v 23b). Thus mercy has been succeeded by repayment of sins. Now, however, this is all called into question by the sign of Yahweh’s intended mercy. Is he no longer willing or able to repay sins?

The motif of divine recompense according to deeds is here taken up as a supporting argument in praise of Yahweh’s consistent justice:

to give to each according to his/her way (MT = “ways,” pl.).⁶¹

לְכָל־אִישׁ כְּדֶרֶךְ־וְיָ

δοῦναι ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ⁶³

In this context the reference is to punishment only, since blessings are presented as based on Yahweh’s mercy (cf. vv 18a, 20-22) rather than according to deeds.

Jeremiah connects this motif with that of divine omniscience,⁶⁴ perhaps in order to reaffirm that the apparent divine reversal in attitude could not be due to God’s failure to note any of sinful Israel’s ways. Both motifs are connected terminologically by the word “way,” a further indication that “wicked ways” are meant in the light of Yahweh’s own depiction of Israel’s consistently wicked ways in vv 29-35.⁶⁵

⁶⁰ We will refer to authorship of the writings in accordance with their traditional ascriptions, since modern historical-critical questions were of little import in Paul’s use of the OT.

⁶¹ Here as in most other instances, the NRSV renders with plural forms (“rewarding *all* according to *their* ways”) to avoid “the danger of linguistic sexism” (Introduction, xxviii).

⁶² Omitting לְכָל־אִישׁ כְּדֶרֶךְ־וְיָ (“according to the fruit of one’s deeds”) with the LXX (cf. J. G. Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah* [HSM 6, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973] 49, also 34, 67-68).

⁶³ Codex A reads ἀποδοῦναι, and X reads the plural τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῶν (-τοῦ). A few MSS appear to have possessed a Hebrew *Vorlage* with an additional line which they translate: καὶ κατὰ τ. καρποὺς τ. ἐπιτηδεύμάτων αὐτοῦ (vl.-τῶν).

⁶⁴ “whose eyes are open to all the ways of mortals,” v 19b. Though the language is unique, the thought is conventional; see Prov 5:21; Job 34:21.

⁶⁵ See the similar formulations in Ps 28:4 and Jer 17:10 in reference to evil deeds or ways.

Already we see something that will reappear at many points; namely, the application of this motif in its negative (= punishment) aspect to the people of God.

This text raises some fascinating questions related to the interplay between God's mercy and his recompense according to deeds. Jeremiah's citation of the traditional character description of Yahweh as "doing נָסָה , and repaying sin" (v 18) suggests already a certain dialectic between these two aspects of Yahweh's dealings with humanity.⁶⁶ The prophet understood Israel's wicked ways as bringing Yahweh's נָסָה toward the nation to an end, and God's actions toward them now as operating strictly on the basis of recompense according to deeds. Yahweh's response in vv 36-44, while not negating the operation of his burning anger in recompense (cf. vv 26-35),⁶⁷ nevertheless stops it from being his 'last word' to the nation. While the recompense exhibited in the destruction and deportation of the nation certainly goes far beyond any corrective chastisement (cf. v 33 for this idea), it can still be followed at a corporate level by renewed נָסָה . Even this renewed mercy, however, is not without reference to behavior, being closely tied to a renewal of the nation's conduct (cf. v 39). This text also confirms the presence of legal-juridical ideas in the motif prior to the LXX, discernible here in the covenantal language of "provoking Yahweh to anger" by idolatry (vv 29, 30, 31).

As to the fate of individuals within the nation who die during the exhibition of God's fierce anger, the text is ambiguous. Unlike the nation, such individuals do not appear to enjoy a (personal/individual) renewed hope. For them retribution would seem, indeed, to be the last word. Perhaps Yahweh's unquenchable anger is directed toward the unrepentant individuals within the community, in order that a repentant remnant may once again enjoy his mercy.

⁶⁶ See W. L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 2: Chapters 26-52* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989) 217. In the light of this verse, Heiligenthal can hardly be correct to assert that "noch keine Verbindung zwischen den Vorstellungen, daß Gott nach den Taten vergilt und daß Gott als der Barmherzige vergebend handelt, erkennbar ist" (*Werke*, 153).

⁶⁷ Note Jeremiah's emphasis on Yahweh's burning anger at the nation, an anger which no one can quench (4:4b; 7:20; 21:12b) and which will burn forever (17:4).

PASSAGES USING THE MOTIF TO JUSTIFY GOD'S DEALINGS WITH HUMANITY

Judges 1:7

Of the four passages found in this category, two occur as the explanatory conclusion to a narrative of God bringing punishment upon evildoers. In both cases it is the evildoers themselves who take up the motif. Judges 1:4-7 recounts Judah's victory over the Canaanites and Perizzites, including the capture of Adoni-bezek, whose thumbs and big toes are consequently cut off. As a conclusion to this brief episode, Adoni-bezek's words are:

Seventy kings with their thumbs and big toes cut off used to pick up scraps under my table; as I have done, so God has paid me back (Judg 1:7).

כְּאֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתִי בִּן שְׁלֹמֹה לִי אֱלֹהִים

καθὼς οὐκ ἐποίησα, οὕτως ἀνταπέδωκέν μοι ὁ θεός.

In this case the *standard* of recompense is expressed by the related phrase “as I have done.”⁶⁸ Patrick Miller has demonstrated that Adoni-bezek's statement is a development of a talionic formulation such as is found in Lev 24:17-21.⁶⁹ However, rather than the impersonal “it shall be done to him” of Leviticus, Judg 1:7 advances to the identification of God as the active party. “The correspondence [of deed and consequence] is perceived as a part of divine justice, not simply human vengeance.”⁷⁰ This text demonstrates the “double-sided character” so common in judgment statements (i.e., both organic consequence and divine retribution), and is of interest, further, in showing a non-Israelite as subject to Yahweh's punishing retribution according to deeds.

Ezekiel 36:19

Ezekiel 36 concerns Israel's restoration following the exile in Babylon. Yah-

⁶⁸ Cf. Jer 50:29; Obad 15.

⁶⁹ *Sin and Judgment*, 94-95.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 94; cf. also J. Scharbert, “SLM,” *Um das Prinzip*, 316-317.

weh promises to punish with insult those who have insulted her (vv 1-7), to remove her disgrace and bring her back into the land (vv 8-15). This restoration, however, is purely a matter of God's gracious initiative, not Israel's obedience.⁷¹ In vv 16-19 the displacement of the people is explained as due to their own sins, which called down Yahweh's wrath and just judgment, and even in exile the nation has not ceased to sin (vv 20-21). The coming restoration is solely "for the sake of my holy name" (v 22), at which time Yahweh will give the people a new heart and spirit of obedience (vv 26-27).

Thus v 19b comes within a sub-section explaining that Israel's deportation was due to her own sins (= ἡ ὁδὸς αὐτῶν, v 17b), and the motif is applied to the people of God as justification/explanation for Yahweh's (past) punishment of them with destruction and deportation to Babylon.⁷²

according to their way and according to their sin I have judged them.

כְּדֶרֶכָם וּכְעֲלִילֹתָם שִׁפְטֵתִי

κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτῶν καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν αὐτῶν ἔκρινα αὐτούς.

Apart from two occurrences in the deuterocanonical literature⁷³ our motif is found with the verb "judge" (שִׁפֵּט/κρίνω) only seven times, all in Ezekiel. However, it would be a mistake to think that Ezekiel originated the combination of divine 'judgment' and 'recompense according to deeds.'⁷⁴ In Ezek 36:19 God's judgment of his people is an expression of his *wrath* (v 18). Israel's election and God's mercy

⁷¹ However, this prevenient grace does not render Israel's subsequent obedience less important: "when through you I display my holiness" (v 23b), "I will put my spirit within you, and make you follow my statutes and be careful to observe my ordinances" (v 27). If Israel's sin and exile as just recompense have meant anything, it is that *future maintenance of the covenant blessings is contingent upon obedience*. "Then you shall remember your evil ways . . . and you shall loathe yourselves for your iniquities and your abominable deeds" (v 31).

⁷² L. C. Allen, *Ezekiel 20-48* (WBC 29; Dallas, TX: Word, 1990) 178.

⁷³ Sir 16:12; 1 Macc 7:42.

⁷⁴ The language of judgment is found in the immediate context of our motif quite a number of times; 1 Kgs 8:32 (=2 Chr 6:23), Ps 94:2, Isa 66:16, Jer 51:9, Hos 5:1, Joel 3:2, 12, Sir 35:25, cf. also Eccl 12:14. Thus, in spite of the relative infrequency of the phrase "to judge according to one's deeds," the combination of divine "judgment" and "recompense according to deeds" was already an accomplished fact in the Jewish Scriptures. See R. Heiligenthal (*Werke*, 150), who still wishes to call "judgment according to works" a "later conception"; K. Koch ("Vergeltungsdogma"), of course, sees the combination as first occurring via the LXX translators.

are no protection from his just recompense, even for the people of God. However, as in Jer 32:19, divine punishment of the nation is not the last word, but is embedded within a greater promise of restoration by grace following judgment. Here (punitive) judgment and gracious restoration are related sequentially without the latter rendering the former impotent. This, of course, is addressed to the nation collectively rather than describing any particular individual's destiny.

Conclusion. When used to justify God's actions, the motif is made to refer exclusively to his *punishing* activity, particularly to justify his vengeance upon his own people (Zech 1:6; Ezek 36:19). This raises the issue of the relationship of God's (punitive) judgment to his gracious saving or restoring activity. In neither of the two texts addressed to the nation of Israel does God's recompense according to their deeds lastingly nullify the covenant relationship. Ezekiel 36:19 relates grace and recompense in a sequential manner (after punishing he restores), not restricting the validity of either for the people of God, but giving ultimacy in this instance to God's saving activity.⁷⁵ The fate of particular individuals at given stages of God's dealing with the nation is not considered in these passages. When it is applied to specific individuals (Judg 1:7; Job 34:11), the motif has reference to physical punishments or chastisements. We have also seen that the phrase "to judge (*κρίνω*) according to deeds" is an infrequent but fully established expression of the motif.

PASSAGES USING THE MOTIF TO APPEAL TO YAHWEH TO INTERVENE ON BEHALF OF THE RIGHTEOUS

Psalm 28:4

Psalm 28 "was probably . . . used as a prayer formulary in a great variety of afflictions," and reflects the situation of one falsely persecuted and hence taking

⁷⁵ This, however, should not be understood to imply that after restoration, recompense according to deeds is no longer operative (see n. 71 above).

refuge in God's sanctuary.⁷⁶ The petitioner fears being carried away with the wicked (v 3) and thus utters this cry for mercy (vv 2, 6), consisting of both protection for the innocent sufferer (v 3) and divine recompense (punishment) upon the oppressors (vv 4-5).

Give to them according to their works,
and according to the evil of their practices;
according to the works of their hands give to them,
repay to them their conduct. Ps 28:4 (LXX = 27:4)

תִּן־לָהֶם כַּפָּעֲלָם וּכְרָעַ מַעַלְלֵיהֶם
כַּמַּעֲשֵׂה יְדֵיהֶם תֵּן לָהֶם הָשֵׁב גְּמוּלָם לָהֶם
δὸς αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν
καὶ κατὰ τὴν πονηρίαν τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων αὐτῶν
κατὰ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν δὸς αὐτοῖς,
ἀπόδος τὸ ἀνταπόδομα αὐτῶν αὐτοῖς.

A great variety of nouns for the standard of recompense were clearly at the disposal of one wishing to utilize this motif. In this case all the terms are in reference to evil deeds or practices, and the LXX shows a preference for the plural κατὰ τὰ ἔργα in place of the singular כַּפָּעֲלָם and כַּמַּעֲשֵׂה. The final noun, ἀνταπόδομα, is normally rendered “repayment, reward, retribution, recompense” in Greek literature,⁷⁷ and when used as here with ἀπο- or ἀνταποδίδωμι yields the somewhat tautologous “repay them their repayment.” We have translated “conduct,” since this noun regularly renders in our motif the Hebrew גְּמוּלָה,⁷⁸ which refers generally to “ethically relevant action” or “the dealing(s) of a person which affect another person pleasantly or unpleasantly.”⁷⁹ Earlier attempts to include *retribution* within the meaning of the word itself have been abandoned in favor of a contextual reference, where necessary, to recompense.⁸⁰ When the “dealing” occurs

⁷⁶ H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1-59* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988) 340. Cf. vv 3-5, 7 and the parallels in Ps 27:9-10.

⁷⁷ BAGD, 72.

⁷⁸ Ps 28:4d; 94:2; Isa 66:6; Jer 51:6; Lam 3:64; Joel 3:4, 7. An exception is Prov 19:17 with δόμα.

⁷⁹ K. Seybold, art. גְּמוּלָה, *TWAT* vol 2, cols 24-35. See for instance 1 Sam 24:17[MT, v 18]: “You have treated me well [גְּמַלְתָּנִי הַטֹּבָה], but I have treated you badly [גְּמַלְתִּיךָ הַרָעָה].”

⁸⁰ Ibid., 2.27; and P. Miller, *Sin and Judgment*, 129.

in return for some previous action, it insinuates “*repay* good or evil.”⁸¹ When the noun is used in the motif of “returning” or “repaying” one’s *dealing(s)* (i.e., conduct) it most often has reference to a negative recompense (=punishment).⁸²

The recompense in Ps 28:4 appears to be this-worldly and not eschatological, but can result in death (vv 1, 3, 5), whereas the preservation of the righteous from this fate is part of Yahweh’s protection and salvation of his anointed one and his people (vv 8-9). The appeal for recompense is an appeal for God to punish the suppliant’s enemies, the “workers of evil, who speak peace with their neighbors, while mischief is in their hearts” (v 3). This mention of “neighbors” makes it likely that the enemies are fellow Israelites, while their recompense consists in lasting destruction (v 5) and exclusion from the salvation awaiting the righteous (vv 3, 9).

Excursus: “Eschatological” in Reference to OT Recompense Statements

Having just made an observation about recompense as “this-worldly and not eschatological” we will briefly clarify our use of this term. Since our goal in this study is oriented around Paul’s use of the motif, including his use of the tradition from the Jewish Scriptures, we may be allowed to sidestep the semantic confusion surrounding the use of the term ‘eschatological’ for the OT texts.⁸³ Instead we will restrict our use of this term to *that which pertains to the Eschaton, the radically new and discontinuous age of salvation*. Thus we are asking such questions as:

- Are rewards and/or punishments seen to be distributed in a new era, one discontinuous with the present world order, and thus part of an ultimate and lasting state of ‘salvation’ or ‘damnation,’ or were they part of corporate or individual experience in this world and its history?
- Is a recompense-scene envisioned as taking place at the end of or beyond this present cosmic and historical order?
- Does the recompense occur *post-mortem* for the individual or the community?

With this restriction of the term to its later, apocalyptically informed, meaning, it is obvious that we will find less of ‘eschatological recompense’ than might be the case if we were to employ a definition more appropriate to the OT writings themselves. Our goal once more, however, is to see whether ‘eschatological divine recompense according to deeds’ *as Paul*

⁸¹ Gen.50:15; Ps.7:4 (MT: v 5); 28:4; 94:2; 137:8.

⁸² Isa 3:11; 35:4; 59:18; 66:6; Jer 51:6; Obad 15; Joel 3:4,7. In this sense also Yahweh is termed “God of recompense [תַּלְמִיד לְאֵל]” (Jer 51:56).

⁸³ The issue of eschatology and (proto-)apocalypticism within this body of literature is, of course, one of vigorous debate, with consensus hard to come by even in matters of definition. In addition to the important articles on “Old Testament Eschatology” in *RGG*³ (A. Jepsen, 2.655-662) and the *ABD* (art. by D. L. Peterson; 2.575-579), see esp. the collections of essays on the subject in *Ex Auditu* 6 (Papers from the North Park Symposium on Theological Interpretation of Scripture, Oct 12-14, 1990; Theme: Prophetic and/or Apocalyptic Eschatology, 1990), and *Eschatologie im Alten Testament* (ed. H. D. Preuß; Wege der Forschung 480; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1978).

understood it may be found in the Jewish Scriptures. If indeed it proves to be scarce, we will need to ask whence came the apostle's *eschatological interpretation* of these OT recompense statements? And this question will lead us into the writings of second temple Judaism whose interpretations moved more strongly in eschatological and apocalyptic directions.

1 Kings 8:32 (= 2 Chronicles 6:23)

Another example of our motif used in an appeal to Yahweh occurs in Solomon's prayer of dedication of the temple in Jerusalem (1 Kgs 8:23-53 = 2 Chr 6:14-42). The setting involves a legal dispute among covenant members in Israel necessitating an oath before the altar (v 22). God is called upon to judge his people Israel, in the sense of 'adjudicating' between the guilty and the innocent.⁸⁴ This divine judgment is described as taking two courses:

- (i) destroying (NRSV: condemning) the lawless⁸⁵
by giving his/her way on his/her head,
לָתֵת יָדָיו בְּרֹאשׁוֹ
δοῦναι τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ εἰς κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ
- (ii) and justifying the righteous
by giving to him/her according to his/her righteousness.⁸⁶
לָתֵת לוֹ כְּצִדְקָתוֹ
δοῦναι αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ.

As always in divine judgment the result is more than a mere declaration of guilt or innocence, but includes as well the execution of the appropriate sentence. In this case the outcome of such a divine judgment is not detailed, though the expectation is clearly that a punishment corresponding to the crime will thereafter take place at Yahweh's bidding. Very likely the oath "laid upon" the accused was a self-maledictory curse which could result in physical harm and/or exclusion from the

⁸⁴ See L. Morris, *The Biblical Doctrine of Judgment* (London: Tyndale, n.d.) 7-25; V. Herntrich and F. Büchsel, art. κρίνω, *TDNT* 3.923-934.

⁸⁵ The use of ἀνομηθῆναι ἄνομον with this meaning is a woodenly literal rendering of the Hebrew (עָשָׂה רָשָׁע לְרָשָׁע), and otherwise means "to act lawlessly" or "corruptly" especially of idolatry (cf. Ex 32:7; Deut 4:16; [4:23]; 4:25; 9:12; 31:29; 1 Kgs 8:47; 1 Chr 10:13; 2 Chr 6:37; 20:35; Ps 25:3; 106:6; Isa 24:5; Jer 2:29; Dan 9:5, 15; 12:10; Amos 4:4) and "to destroy" (Num 32:15; Isa 21:2[bis]). The parallel in 2 Chr 6:23 reads "recompensing [שָׂוֹ/ἀποδίδωμι] the wicked."

⁸⁶ The NIV obscures the meaning and presence of the motif: "and so establish his innocence."

community.⁸⁷ Here we have a clear instance of the motif connected with divine ‘judgment’ in which it is Yahweh’s determination and initiative which must set the organic *Tun-Ergehen-Zusammenhang* in motion. Of further interest is the intersection within this text of the language of judgment with that of justification, so that judgment according to deeds is not dreaded as inimical to but in fact leading to the justification of the righteous.⁸⁸

1 Maccabees 7:42.

Our final example is found in the deuterocanonical literature.⁸⁹ 1 Maccabees 7 recounts how Nicanor is sent with a Roman army to Jerusalem to destroy Judas Maccabeus and the people (vv 25-26). Nicanor is treacherous (vv 29-30) and blasphemes Israel’s God and temple (vv 33-36). Thus, remembering in prayer how the Lord’s angel had once before destroyed a blasphemer (v 41), Judas now appeals to God to “crush this army” and so “let the rest learn that Nicanor has spoken wickedly against the sanctuary.” This appeal is then concluded with a reference to recompense according to deeds, using judgment language:⁹⁰

and judge him according to his wickedness.
καὶ κρίνον αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν κακίαν αὐτοῦ.

The wickedness for which this non-Israelite is judged is clearly his blasphemy (or “blasphemies” (pl.), v 38b). The judgment here results in divine vengeance (v 38) and the destruction and death of Nicanor and his army at the hands of Judas and his men (vv 38, 41, 43-46).

⁸⁷ See Exod 22:7-12; Num 5:4-31; further M. Noth, *Könige*² (BKAT 9/1; Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1983) 186; and J. Pedersen, *Der Eid bei den Semiten* (1914) 6, 82-83, 103-104, 112-114. Five out of the seven prayer topics in vv 31-51 relate to covenant curses from Deuteronomy 28 (R. D. Nelson, *First and Second Kings* [Interpretation Series; Atlanta: John Knox, 1987] 53).

⁸⁸ LXX: τοῦ δικαιῶσαι δίκαιον.

⁸⁹ See also Sir 35:24 (LXX = v 22), which functions as reassurance that the prayers of God’s humble people, Israel, will result in divine vengeance and destruction upon her enemies “according to their deeds.” Thus, here the motif is strictly an expression of divine judgment upon non-Jews, and is connected with the motif of divine impartiality (35:14-16).

⁹⁰ This is also a plea for help, since Judas’ forces are clearly outnumbered.

Conclusion. In summary, when used in prayer-appeals the motif can be directed against the wicked or oppressors outside of Israel (Lam 3:64; 1 Macc 7:42; Sir 35:24), or against the wicked within the covenant community itself (2 Sam 3:39; 1 Kgs 8:32; Ps 28:4). In some of the instances the divine recompense is a divine judgment. In most cases, the desired result of such divine recompense is nothing less than destruction, divine vengeance, wrath and curse,⁹¹ and in Psalm 28 exclusion from the ‘salvation’ which awaits the righteous. In the one appeal where the motif is applied positively to the people of God (1 Kgs 8:32 = 2 Chr 6:23), we saw an intersecting of the language of judgment and justification, so that judgment according to deeds actually results in justification for the innocent. In such instances, judgment and justification produce no theological tension since both are concerned with a determination of the same righteousness [תְּקַיֵּץ/δικαιοσύνη].

PASSAGES USING THE MOTIF TO PRONOUNCE A BENEDICTION OR PRAYER-WISH

Ruth 2:12

Closely related to the previously discussed use is that as benediction or prayer-wish, found only in Ruth 2:12. In response to Ruth’s demonstration of kindness, Boaz states:

May the Lord repay your deed,
And may your reward be full.
יְשַׁלֵּם יְהוָה פְּעֻלָּתְךָ
וְתִתֶּן מִשְׁכָּרְךָ תְּלֵמָה
ἀποτείσαι κύριος τὴν ἐργασίαν σου,
καὶ γένοιτο ὁ μισθός σου πλήρης⁹²

Ruth’s “deed” was to leave her own land and people (v 11) so as to remain with Naomi and live with “a people that [she] did not know before.” This stress on

⁹¹ David, for instance, appeals to God for just recompense against Joab’s line (2 Sam 3:39), desiring thereby that the curse of blood-guilt come upon his family (v 29). On the concept of “blood-guilt,” see H. Graf Reventlow, “Sein Blut komme über sein Haupt,” *Um das Prinzip*, 412-431; and K. Koch, “Der Spruch ‘Sein Blut bleibe auf seinem Haupt’,” *Um das Prinzip*, 432-456.

⁹² The LXX adds *παρὰ κυρίου θεοῦ Ισραηλ*.

her leaving one “people” for another highlights the covenant ideas present in the context,⁹³ which are then underscored by Boaz’ words: “under whose wings you have come for refuge.”⁹⁴ Thus the motif of divine recompense of deeds is used here to wish the covenant blessing upon one who has willingly entered into the covenant people. The recompense is seen, in fact, as a “wage”⁹⁵ earned or deserved through such entry into Yahweh’s covenant people. There would appear to be no tension involved at this juncture in combining covenantal ideas with economic conceptions. As we will note elsewhere, Yahweh’s gracious electing and sustaining of his people is not in tension with his “repayment” of their covenant obedience.⁹⁶

PASSAGES USING THE MOTIF TO MOTIVATE THE RIGHTEOUS TO OBEDIENCE

Proverbs 19:17

Proverbs 19:17 urges the listener to “be kind to the poor,” one of the chief characteristics of the wise and righteous person in the Wisdom literature.

⁹³ Note the similarity to the account of Abram and Sarah’s migration to the promised land (Gen 12:1-5; cf. R. L. Hubbard, Jr.; *The Book of Ruth* [NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988] 165 and footnotes).

⁹⁴ “Die Worte des Boas unterstreichen die religiöse Bedeutung der Übersiedlung Ruths in Bethlehem: sie wird an der Schutz- und Rechtssphäre Jahwes teilhaft” (G. Gerleman, *Ruth, Das Hohelied* [BKAT 18; Neukirchen: 1965] 27).

⁹⁵ Gk. *μισθός* = “wage”; also *ἀποτείσαι* = “make compensation, repay a debt” (*BAGD*, 101; *LSJ*, 223). The Heb. *תַּחְבִּיט* (collective) is used apart from Ruth 2:12 only in patriarchal narratives for “the wages of a servant” (Gen 31:7, 41; 29:15). The related *תַּחֲבִיט* (also collective singular) is also taken from the economic sphere referring to “hire” or “wages” for services rendered (e.g., Gen 30:28, 32, 33; Exod 2:9; 1 Kgs 5:20), and then applied by extension to Yahweh’s reward to those who serve him (Gen 15:1; Num 18:31; Isa 40:10; 62:11 [eschatological “wages” for the daughter of Zion!]; Jer.31:16). While “reward” is an appropriate translation in some contexts, this should not eliminate the “wage” connotations of the term. Contrast Cleon Roger’s comment which has obvious theological motivation but little linguistic support: “God never hires his servants; they work for him freely out of love and thanksgiving and he rewards them for faithfulness out of his grace” (*Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* [ed. R. L. Harris; Chicago: Moody, 1980] 878).

⁹⁶ “In short, as a debtor to Ruth, Yahweh was asked to pay off his account (cf. Prov. 19:17). Indeed, the language implied that the debt was so large that only Yahweh himself could repay it” (R. L. Hubbard, *The Book of Ruth*, 166).

Whoever is kind to the poor lends to the Lord,
and according to his/her gift he will repay him/her.

יְלֵם־לַיְהוָה יִשְׁלַח

κατὰ δὲ τὸ δόμα αὐτοῦ ἀνταποδώσει⁹⁷ αὐτῷ.

Whereas elsewhere this particular pious behavior is motivated by the desire to honor God and because one will thereby receive blessing,⁹⁸ here alone the motivation is explicitly found in the expectation of a divine repayment. Even more remarkable is the expression (found only here in the OT) that such an act constitutes “lending to Yahweh.” Von Rad is correct to assert that this repayment occurs “gewiß nicht in Form eines richterlichen Aktes Jahwes”;⁹⁹ on the other hand, the imagery of ‘lending’ and ‘repayment’ clearly moves beyond the confines of Koch’s *Tun-Ergehen-Zusammenhang* and does indeed suggest a belief in divine retribution, or, more precisely, retributive reward.¹⁰⁰ The motivation itself consists not so much in a calculable reward as in the assurance that one’s righteous deeds will not be forgotten.¹⁰¹ Readers of later Jewish texts should keep this in mind and not jump too quickly to the conclusion that “divine repayment of each good or evil deed” breathes a spirit of petty calculation.

Proverbs 24:12

Verses 11-12 constitute a unit addressed to one who has occasion and the ability to “rescue those taken away to death” and who are “staggering to the

⁹⁷ Codex Vaticanus reads a future passive: ἀνταποδοθήσεται.

⁹⁸ Prov 14:21, 31b; 22:9; 29:27.

⁹⁹ *Weisheit in Israel*, 172; cited with approval by O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos* (BKAT 17; Neukirchen: 1984) 224.

¹⁰⁰ Pace S. Travis (*Judgment*, 8-13) who acknowledges the presence of “retributive punishment” in the OT while contending that “the complementary idea of retributive reward is absent, or nearly so” (8). The language of “debt” and “repayment” in texts such as 1 Sam 24:19; Prov 11:18; 19:17; 25:22; Ruth 2:12; Sir 11:21-22; and 51:30 moves us beyond Travis’ “inherent (i.e., non-retributive) rewards,” especially when this is in a balanced formulation opposite what even Travis acknowledges to be retributive punishment. See further D. W. Kuck, *Judgment*, esp. 38-43; and F. Horst, art. “Vergeltung: Im AT” *RGG*³, vol 6, cols 1344-1345.

¹⁰¹ A. Meinhold, *Die Sprüche* (2 vols; Zürcher Bibelkommentare; Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1991) 2.321.

slaughter.”¹⁰² As such, it is an admonition to right behavior. Verse 12 motivates this admonition via a warning against excusing oneself from such a duty on behalf of the needy by pleading ignorance:

If you say, “Look, I did not know this”—
 Know that the Lord knows the hearts of all,
 and he who formed breath for all, he knows all things,
who repays to each according to his/her deeds.¹⁰³
 וַיֵּשִׁיב לְאָדָם כַּפָּעָלֹו
 ὃς ἀποδίδωσιν ἐκάστω κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ

This text illustrates the connection between the motifs “God knows (Heb. “weighs”) the hearts,” “God knows all things,” and divine recompense according to deeds. Thus the recompense motif functions to warn presumptuous sinners that none of their deeds will be overlooked, since God weighs hearts and knows all things. As in Prov 19:17, the recompense is left undefined, since the certainty (rather than the nature) of negative consequences is sufficient as a warning. As to *when* God will recompense such deeds, the text gives no information. In spite of Egyptian parallels to the “weighing of hearts” at a post-mortem judgment,¹⁰⁴ this text should probably be interpreted in the light of other Israelite wisdom sayings referring to consequences in this life. Thus righteous behavior is motivated by a warning that omission of the same will result in negative consequences for the doer, understood as a divine recompense. As would be expected in Israel’s wisdom literature, this warning of divine recompense is addressed to members of the covenant people.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰² Perhaps addressed to a judge (Plöger) or anyone observing a case of social oppression (Gemser).

¹⁰³ MT: “Does not he who weighs hearts perceive it?
 Does not he who keeps watch over your soul know it?
 Does he not return to each according to his/her deed?”

¹⁰⁴ Whatever the original connections, they play no role any longer in the Gk versions, which have eliminated the “weighing” motif. On the Egyptian background of this and other judgment motifs, see J. Gwyn Griffiths, *The Divine Verdict: A Study of Divine Judgement in the Ancient Religions* (Studies in the History of Religions 52, NumenSup; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991) 201-242, esp. 224-225, 239-242; and H. Greßmann, *Israels Spruchweisheit im Zusammenhang der Welt-Literatur* (Kunst und Altertum 6; Berlin: 1925) 43-44; cf. also Wm. McKane, *Proverbs: A New Approach* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970) 402.

¹⁰⁵ Brief reference may be made here to Prov 24:29, which is not included above since *human* and not *divine* recompense is in view:

“Do not say, “I’ll do to them as they have done to me;
 I’ll pay them back for what they did.”

Ecclesiastes 12:14

Although the syntax does not conform precisely to the pattern we have established for our motif, we include a discussion of Eccl 12:14 under this category of passages due to its close conceptual relationship to the motif:¹⁰⁶

For God will bring every act into judgment,
every hidden deed, whether good or bad.

כִּי אֶת־כָּל־מַעֲשֵׂה הָאֱלֹהִים יָבֵא בַּמִּשְׁפָּט

עַל כָּל־נֶעְלָם אִם־טוֹב וְאִם־רָע

ὅτι σὺν πάντων τὸ ποίημα ὁ θεὸς ἄξει ἐν κρίσει

ἐν παντὶ παρεωραμένῳ

ἐὰν ἀγαθὸν καὶ ἐὰν πονηρόν.

“There is a broad consensus that 12:9-14 is an addition to the book of Ecclesiastes” and “can be termed an epilogue or postscript.”¹⁰⁷ For some, this editor either contradicts or at least goes far beyond what Qoheleth was prepared to say. Others, while acknowledging the tensions in this addition, stress more the complementarity of the viewpoints.¹⁰⁸ Verse 14 functions as the concluding motivation or reason for obedience. One should fear God and obey him, *because* [כִּי/ὅτι] he brings every deed into judgment, even the secret deeds, both good and evil.¹⁰⁹ The

Although this appears at first sight to be a rejection of the principle of corresponding recompense, it is actually only a rejection of its *false use*, of acting unjustly toward another in a spirit of revenge, and thus akin to the maxim “two wrongs do not make a right.” See W. G. Plaut, *Book of Proverbs: A Commentary* (Jewish Commentary for Bible Readers; New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1961) 213, 252; Wm. McKane, *Proverbs*, 574-575; and O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos* (Proverbia), 287-288.

¹⁰⁶ Instead of a verb of recompense, we have *יָבֵא בַּמִּשְׁפָּט*/ἄξει ἐν κρίσει. Though originally separate concepts, divine *judgment* and *recompense according to deeds* came more and more to be associated, or even fused, in Jewish tradition, as evidenced by Ezekiel’s usage.

¹⁰⁷ R. E. Murphy, *Ecclesiastes* (WBC 23A; Dallas, TX: Word, 1992) 124. For an attempt to demonstrate the original unity of 12:9-14 with the preceding, see C. D. Ginsburg, *The Song of Songs and Coheleth* (Library of Biblical Studies; New York: KTAV, 1970) 470-479.

¹⁰⁸ D. A. Hubbard, *Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon* (Communicator’s Commentary 15B; Dallas, TX: Word, 1991) 253-254; G. Sheppard, *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct* (BZAW 180; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1980) 121-129; and G. Wilson, *JBL* 103 (1984) 175-192: “the epilogue serves to bind Qoheleth together with Proverbs and provides a canonical key to the interpretation of both” (178).

¹⁰⁹ See Paul’s similar formulation, “in order that each may receive the things done in the body, whether good or bad” (2 Cor 5:10b).

mention of “secret deeds” [נְעָלָם]¹¹⁰ alludes to the related motif of God as the knower of human secrets.¹¹¹ Further the double reference to “every deed,” while not unknown elsewhere in the motif (Jer 50:29), is certainly unusual, and probably occasioned by the emphasis of the epilogue in general “to give . . . an all-embracing key to life.”¹¹² Nothing in the text demands an eschatological judgment scene.¹¹³ As in most texts we have studied, the time, place and precise nature of the recompense are left ambiguous. The knowledge that God will assuredly reward or punish one’s behavior is considered sufficient to motivate proper action.

Sirach 11:26; 16:12, 14; 17:23

The deuterocanonical book of Sirach utilizes the motif of divine recompense according to deeds four times to motivate the righteous to obedience.¹¹⁴ That this was understood fundamentally as a *dual recompense* (i.e., punishment for the wicked; blessing for the righteous) is made especially clear in Sir 16:12-14:

Great as his mercy, so also is his chastisement (ἐλεγχος);

he will judge a person according to his/her deeds.

The sinner will not escape with plunder,

and the patience of the godly will not be frustrated.

He makes room for every act of mercy;

each will receive in accordance with his/her deeds.

(12b) אִישׁ כַּמַּפְעֵלִי יִשְׁפֹּט

(14b) וְכָל אָדָם כַּמַּעֲשִׂי יִמָּצָא

¹¹⁰ The term is used for guilt of which one is unaware (Lev 5:2-4; 4:13), or which remains hidden from others (Num 5:13), of concealed wisdom (1 Kgs 10:3; Job 28:21; 2 Chr 9:2), or of hypocrites, i.e., those who “conceal themselves” (Ps 26:4). The thought here is of deeds of (dis)obedience to Torah (Eccl 12:13, “keep His commandments”) concealed from public view and knowledge, which, however, are known to God’s penetrating gaze.

¹¹¹ See especially Prov 24:12-14; Jer 17:9-10; and additional references in D. W. Kuck, *Judgment*, 43, nn. 22-23. See also R. Heiligenthal, *Werke*, 156-157, and G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology* (ET), 437.

¹¹² D. A. Hubbard, *Ecclesiastes*, 252; see the emphasis on “all has been heard” and “the whole [duty] of humanity” (v 13).

¹¹³ Against C. Ginsburg, *The Songs of Songs and Coheleth*, 478.

¹¹⁴ 11:26; 16:12, 14; 17:23. Originally composed in Hebrew about 180 BCE, this work circulated for the most part in Greek, being translated first by ben Sira’s grandson around 125 BCE (P. W. Skehan and A. A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* [AB 39, New York: Doubleday, 1987] 8-10).

(12b) ἄνδρα κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ κρινεῖ . . .

(14b) ἕκαστος κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ εὐρήσει.

The larger context (15:11-16:23) aims to motivate the wise member of the covenant to choose obedience and fidelity to God's will (15:15-17). Chapter 16:5-14 focuses on God's sure retribution and recounts numerous instances from Israel's history (vv 6-11) where God recompensed the wicked, neither forgiving (v 7), sparing (v 8), nor pitying them (vv 9-11). The duality of God's dealings with his people (mercy and reproof) is noted in v 12a, followed by the statement of retributive principle in v 12b, understood as divine *judgment* (κρινεῖ).

Verse 13 makes the dual purpose of this motif explicit: (1) to warn presumptuous sinners that they will not escape;¹¹⁵ and (2) to comfort the godly who must often wait patiently through hardship for the reward of their obedience. In Sirach, as in the rest of the LXX literature, this comfort is addressed to Jews only, or to those who choose to live under Israel's covenant God. The warning, on the other hand, can be addressed as a *judgment sentence* on the consistently unfaithful in Israel or to heathen nations.¹¹⁶ Equally, however, this warning can be addressed to the covenant people as a stern but hopeful call to repentance.

Afterward he will rise up and repay them,
and he will bring their recompense on their heads.
Yet to those who repent he grants a return,
and he encourages those who are losing hope.
Turn back to the Lord and forsake your sins (Sir 17:23-25a).

In such cases, the listeners are generally not viewed as hardened impenitents or apostates, but as backsliders, whose laxity in trust and obedience could (if continued) place in jeopardy their standing in the divine favor. Sirach 17 is particularly interesting for its 'softening' of a strict doctrine of retribution according to works.

¹¹⁵ This presumption that one can 'get away with plunder' (i.e., with the results of sinning) may arise from a misuse of the notion of divine sovereignty (15:11-12) or the belief that God will not notice one's deeds (16:17).

¹¹⁶ Sir 35:23a, 24; see also the use of the motif to "pronounce sentence upon the disobedient" (below).

Israel's sinning is viewed almost as an inherent *inevitability* arising from human limitations and frailty:¹¹⁷

For not everything is within human capability, since human beings are not immortal (Sir 17:30).

And for this reason, the divine recompense according to deeds is superseded for the penitent by mercy and forgiveness:

How great is the mercy of the Lord,
and his forgiveness for those who return to him! (Sir 17:24)¹¹⁸

As will become more common in later Jewish literature, 'punishment' according to deeds is here reduced to 'chastisement' for Israel's sins:

Israel, as his firstborn, he cares for with chastisement (παιδεία)¹¹⁹
But the Lord, being good and knowing how they are formed, neither neglected them nor left off sparing them (i.e., from judgment).¹²⁰

In ben Sira's original (Hebrew) sayings this divine recompense was not understood eschatologically, but occurred in this life and was perceived most clearly at one's "end":¹²¹

Do not say, "I have enough, and what harm can come to me now?"
In the day of prosperity, adversity is forgotten,
and in the day of adversity, prosperity is not remembered.
For it is easy for the Lord on the day of death (ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τελευτῆς¹²²) to repay each person according to his/her ways.
An hour's misery makes one forget past delights,

¹¹⁷ This is attested further by the stress on "creation from the earth" (17:1, 11c [vl.], 21 [vl.: "knowing how they are formed"]); the penchant towards transgression (17:16 [vl.: Their ways from youth tend toward evil, and they are *unable* to make for themselves hearts of flesh in place of their stony hearts]); human limitedness (17:2, 30-32; 18:8-10); and God's forgiving patience with such frail creatures (18:11-14). See Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom*, 281; H. Duesberg and I. Fransen, *Ecclesiastico* (La Sacra Bibbia...di S. Garofalo: Antico Testamento; ed. G. Rinaldi; Turin: Marietti, 1966) 165.

¹¹⁸ See also Sir 17:29; 18:11, 14. This is termed "the way back," i.e., to divine grace and favor (17:24; cf. also Ezek 33:11; further Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom*, 284).

¹¹⁹ Sir 17:18a (vl.). This is spoken to Israel in explicit contrast to God's treatment of other nations (v 17).

¹²⁰ Sir 17:21 (vl.). This is added after "their sins are before the Lord," i.e., softening the sense of 'wickedness,' so that God "spares" them from punishment, instead disciplining.

¹²¹ 1:13; 9:12; 14:12; 14:16-17; 18:24. On Sirach's "eschatology" see Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom*, 83-87.

¹²² Lit. "end," but used euphemistically of 'death'; cf. *BAGD*, 810; also Matt 2:15. The Hebrew text reads באחרית.

and at the close of one's life one's deeds are revealed.

Call no one happy before their death;

by how he/she ends,¹²³ a person becomes known, Sir 11:24-27.

להשיב לאדם כדרכו

ἀποδοῦναι ἀνθρώπῳ κατὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ

At issue is fidelity to the covenant:

Stand firm in your covenant (ἐν διαθήκῃ σου)

and busy yourself in it

and grow old in your work (ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ σου). (v 20)

The wise person will not presume upon current blessings as an excuse for laxity in obedience, but will remember that God can easily reverse such blessing, even if only at the very end of one's life. This motivation (i.e., one's 'end' will reveal one's true happiness or condition) is also found widely in Greek sayings such as that of Aeschylus (525-456 BCE): "Only when man's life comes to its end in prosperity can one call that man happy."¹²⁴ Both here and in Sirach, the recompense is envisioned as earthly delights or sufferings.

The Greek translation of Sirach, on the other hand, does make definite allusion to *post-mortem* retribution.¹²⁵ We also see our motif associated in Sirach with several related motifs: God's knowledge of every human action (including hidden deeds),¹²⁶ and the "revealing" of deeds at the hour of recompense (11:27b).

Conclusion. Summarizing the above *Motivation*-texts, we note that this function belongs to Israel's wisdom tradition.¹²⁷ As such it is directed, as would be expected for this genre, to the covenant people, and envisions the recompense as undefined sufferings or blessings in this life (though the introduction of *post-mortem* categories may be seen in the LXX of Sirach). It is the certainly rather than the

¹²³ Following the MT. The LXX reads "and through offspring a person becomes known."

¹²⁴ Agamemnon, 1.928, citation in Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom*, 241.

¹²⁵ See Di Lella's comments on the 'eschatological' additions or modifications at 7:17b and 48:11b (Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom*, 86, 201-202, 531-532, 534).

¹²⁶ 15:19b; 17:15, 19-20.

¹²⁷ "Wisdom stands or falls with the validity of the doctrine of recompense" (E. Würthwein, *TDNT* 4.711).

precise nature of the reward/punishment which is felt to motivate. There is clearly a dual recompense envisioned in these texts (i.e., both reward and punishment), functioning to encourage the righteous to persevere in doing good, and to warn the presumptuous against laxity in obedience. The Jews' privileged standing in Yahweh's covenant mercy is not felt to be incompatible with the demands for covenant obedience. As elsewhere, especially in 'warning' texts the divine recompense is related to God's omniscience, including knowledge even of hidden deeds.

PASSAGES USING THE MOTIF TO COMFORT AND ASSURE THE RIGHTEOUS

Psalms 18:20, 24 (=2 Sam 22:21, 25)

The motif occurs ten times with this function, predominantly in the Psalms. The *nature* of the comfort provided by this belief in divine recompense can take several forms, including the comforting knowledge that one's occasional sins will not be recompensed.

Psalms 18:20, 24 (=2 Sam 22:21, 25) could be easily misunderstood as a relapse into Jewish-nomistic self-righteousness, not unlike caricatures of (legalistic) first-century Judaism:

(20) The Lord will repay¹²⁸ me according to my righteousness,¹²⁹
and according to the cleanness of my hands he will repay me.

(21) For I have kept the ways of the Lord,
and have not wickedly departed from my God.

(22) For all his judgments are before me,
nor have I turned aside from his righteous decrees.

(23) I will be blameless before him,
and I will keep myself from lawlessness.

(24) The Lord will repay me according to my righteousness,
and according to the cleanness of my hands in his sight.

¹²⁸ Both in vv 20 and 24 the LXX has replaced an original reference to *past* recompense with a verb in the *future* tense; and in v 23, *past* blamelessness becomes a vow of *future* behavior; cf. also vv 17, 19 (where future 'rescue' is mentioned amidst past deliverance), 25-29. For the significance of this, see below.

¹²⁹ Both here and in v 24 the parallel text in 2 Sam reads the plural כִּצְדִיקוֹתַי. It would not appear that any significant difference is intended between the use of "my righteousness" versus "my righteousnesses" in the Hebrew use of the motif.

This, however, is not an introspective assertion of sinless perfection, but rather a declaration of loyalty to the covenant. The above-cited words reflect the “Torah liturgy” recited by worshipers entering the temple:

O Lord, who may abide in your tent?
 Who may dwell on your holy hill?
 Those who walk blamelessly, and do what is right,
 and speak the truth from their heart;
 who do not slander with their tongue,
 and do no evil to their friends,
 nor take up a reproach against their neighbors . . . , (Ps 15:1-3).

In this manner those entering the temple professed their faith in the provisions and protection of the covenant:

‘Citizenship’ on Zion is only for the *ṣādîq*, the Israelite who lives according to the precepts of the covenant of Yahweh. He alone has a claim to the protective power of God. The *rāšā* has no right to appear before Yahweh; God is opposed to him (Ps. 5:5ff). Thus [Ps 18:]20ff. draw a picture of the *ṣādîq* who is adjusted to the covenant and admitted to the sanctuary. . . . The emphasis on obedience over against the *torah* and the profession of a righteous life are basically a reference to the declaration of loyalty on the part of the worshiper usually given upon entering the sanctuary.¹³⁰

Thus the motif does not speak of moral introspection and error-free behavior, but rather reflects liturgical traditions about general loyalty to the covenant.

The assertion that the divine recompense will be “according to my righteousness” reflects the psalmist’s conformity to the covenant demands of Yahweh, not in terms of moral perfection, but in contrast to those who “depart from God,” “despise his decrees,” and do not “keep his ways” or “keep themselves from sin” (vv 21-23). “Cleanness of hands” speaks of the “integrity of one’s conduct” within the framework of this covenant relationship, and especially of avoidance of idolatry.¹³¹ As throughout the OT, the *ṣādîq* is one whose behavior demonstrates consistency with Yahweh’s covenant demands.¹³² Provision is made for occasional transgressions

¹³⁰ H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1-59*, 262, see also 227 on “Torah-liturgy. Further, K. Koch, *Templeinlaßliturgien und Dekaloge: Studien zur Theologie der alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen* (1961) 45-60.

¹³¹ Cf. Ps 24:4; 1QS IX,15; and A. A. Anderson, *The Book of Psalms* (2 vols; NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972) 1.160.

¹³² “Despite divergence on details, and on the history of the root, there is something of a consensus that righteousness is covenant-behaviour, or loyalty to the covenant”; it is “activity which befits the covenant,” and thus “everything (including inward disposition) which fits the requirements of the covenant in a given situation is then ‘normal’ or righteous” (J. A. Ziesler, *The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul* [Cambridge: University Press, 1972] 39-40). He points especially to Gen

through the system of sacrificial atonement and through repentance,¹³³ showing that one's standing as 'righteous' and 'obedient' before God can be maintained in spite of occasional covenant violations.

It is therefore not a question of a protestation of innocence which, prompted by pharisaic self righteousness, gives an account to God of the king's own deserts, but of an affirmation of faith in the covenantal faithfulness of God, which may be experienced by those who in obedience to God's ordinances keep their faith in him. That it is at all possible to do so is not the merit of man but a gift of the grace of God who has instituted the Covenant and its ordinances for the benefit of his people. And thus, too, the 'righteousness' of the king is ultimately the gift of the divine saving grace, though, of course, within the framework (and consequently the limits) of the ancient Covenant.¹³⁴

In the MT this motif is included as part of a long litany of God's *past acts of deliverance* on behalf of the suppliant. The LXX of the Psalm, on the other hand, places the divine recompense in the future.¹³⁵ This may be an example of what M. Reiser calls the LXX's "eschatologisierende Tendenz," particularly in the Psalms.¹³⁶ In any case, the use of these future verbs (*ῥύσεται*, *ἀνταποδώσει*, etc.) certainly opened the way for the later eschatological understanding of divine recompense such as we see in Paul.¹³⁷

As for the theological import of the motif under consideration, we see that loyal members of the covenant community could look upon the divine recompense according to deeds as providing assurance and consolation. They could rejoice in this belief which meant (future) deliverance in times of trouble. Statements such as Ps 18:20-24, then, do not express 'self-righteousness,' nor do they tend toward 'synergism,' but thankfully affirm confidence in the covenant relationship, which at

18:19; Psalm 15; and Ezek 18 as showing this covenant connection.

¹³³ See W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 2.443-483.

¹³⁴ A. Weiser, *The Psalms* (ET: trans. H. Hartwell; OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962) 192-193.

¹³⁵ Cf. n. 128 above.

¹³⁶ *Die Gerichtspredigt Jesu: Eine Untersuchung zur eschatologischen Verkündigung Jesu und ihrem frühjüdischen Hintergrund* (NTAbh Neue Folge 23; Münster: Aschendorff, 1990) 7-8, 17-22.

¹³⁷ Cf. e.g., Rom 2:6; 1 Cor 3:8, 14, 4:5; Col 3:24-25.

one and the same time is completely an act of divine grace, and yet conditional upon the loyal obedience of those within this elect community.¹³⁸

Psalm 103:10

In quite a different fashion Psalm 103:10¹³⁹ employs a variation on the motif to comfort the righteous and reassure them of God's gracious conduct toward them:

He has not treated us according to our sins,
nor recompensed us according to our iniquities.

If Psalm 18 rejoiced in God's recompense according to the obedient conduct of the covenant people, this text rejoices that the principle of recompense is overturned or ignored in particular cases; namely, when the sins (plural!) of the righteous are considered. The tenet of divine retribution according to deeds is not being universally declared null and void in the case of Israelites; rather, this striking negation of recompense has application only to those who "fear him"¹⁴⁰ and otherwise "keep his covenant and remember to do his commandments" (v 18). For these, the principle of divine recompense according to *evil* deeds is overturned, being replaced by the forgiveness of sins, removal of transgressions far from the doer, and fatherly compassion.¹⁴¹ Clearly this abrogation of divine retribution has reference only to the *occasional transgressions* of those who otherwise walk faithfully in Yahweh's statutes, and who do not commit such sins haughtily, but have come to recognize and repent of their errors which arise not out of a heart aimed at disloyalty, but out of the frail and transitory character of human existence.¹⁴² It may, however, be

¹³⁸ On this covenantal interplay between divine grace and human obedience in the OT, see R. M. Fuller, *A Pauline Understanding of Rewards: Its Background and Expression in First Corinthians* (diss. Fuller Theological Seminary, 1991) esp. 16-107.

¹³⁹ LXX = 102:10.

¹⁴⁰ Verses 11b, 13b, 17.

¹⁴¹ Verses 3, 8, 12, 13.

¹⁴² See vv 14-15. "But take heed, warns the psalmist: this love is not to be wilfully abused. Its recipients must respond with respectful awe, vv 11, 13, 17. . . . The activity of God, v 6, must find an echo of obedient activity in their lives. *חסד* is essentially a two-way relationship of obligation" (L. C. Allen, *Psalms 101-150* [WBC 21; Waco, TX: Word, 1983] 22). The inference of

noted from this text that a *strict* doctrine of dual retribution whereby every good or evil deed must receive its corresponding reward or punishment is not characteristic of the OT. Rather, within the provisions and demands of the covenant relationship, divine compassion and forgiveness can allow for a flexible application with regard to the occasional sins of the elect, yet without leading to a general abrogation of the principle. We will want to keep this in mind when approaching Paul.

Psalm 94:23

Thus far we have seen the motif used to comfort the righteous in that their covenant integrity will be rewarded (Psalm 18) and their occasional sins will not be recompensed (Psalm 103). Psalm 94 presents us with another way of comforting, namely by assurance that the wicked oppressors will be repaid for their sins:

And he will give back to them their sin,
and according to their evil the Lord our God will destroy them.
Ps 94:23 (LXX = 93:23)

וַיִּשָׁבְבָהֶם עַל־אֲוִנֵיהֶם
וּבְרָצָתָם יִצְמִיתֵם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ
καὶ ἀποδώσει αὐτοῖς¹⁴³ τὴν ἀνομίαν αὐτῶν,
καὶ κατὰ¹⁴⁴ τὴν πονηρίαν αὐτῶν
ἀφανεῖ αὐτοὺς κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν.

The people of God are being crushed by the violence and injustice of the wicked. Therefore, appeal is made to “the God of vengeance” and “judge of the earth” to “give to the proud what they deserve” (vv 1-2). The Psalm concludes with an expression of firm certainty in the Lord as one’s refuge and help, who will correct these injustices and recompense the wicked according to their deeds.¹⁴⁵ In this

Israel’s “sonship” (vv 13, 17b) hints at the concepts of election and a relationship of trust (cf. Hos 11:1-2; H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms*, 2.292).

¹⁴³ Codex A: αὐτοῖς κύριος κατὰ τὴν ἀνομίαν.

¹⁴⁴ Omitted in codices B and X.

¹⁴⁵ A similar use of the motif is found in Isa 59:18 and Ps 62:12 (LXX 61:13), though in this latter instance a dual recompense is to be understood as the basis of comfort: reward to the righteous, retribution to the wicked.

case, the divine recompense is further described as a future “destruction¹⁴⁶ according to their evil.” Though likely not understood originally as referring to an eschatological judgment and recompense, the use of the future tense in v 23 and the theophanic language of vv 1-2 would have recommended such an interpretation to later Jewish readers,¹⁴⁷ so that such recompense could easily be viewed as eschatological divine vengeance. Interestingly in this instance, the comforting destruction of the wicked probably has reference not to non-Israelites, but it is the “foolish ones among the people (ἐν τῷ λαῷ)” (v 8) who will experience God’s judgment.¹⁴⁸

Conclusion. If our interpretation of the above texts is accurate, three complementary aspects of the interplay between grace, obedience and divine recompense according to deeds have been highlighted:

- 1) the divine recompense brings encouragement to the righteous that they will be blessed as promised within the covenant;
- 2) this applies equally to the righteous who repent from occasional sins, in which case a strict understanding of retribution is superseded by divine forgiveness; but
- 3) such ‘comfort’ is not extended to those within the nation (or without) whose ways are characterized by wickedness and unrighteousness without repentance; to them divine recompense according to deeds will mean divine vengeance and exclusion from ‘salvation’.

Though a temporal divine ‘repayment’ may have been envisioned originally in all of the above texts, we have begun to notice the presence of language in the LXX (e.g., future tense, theophanic language) which could very easily lend itself to

¹⁴⁶ Gk. ἀφανισμὸς = Attic form of ἀφανίζω: destroy, ruin. It commonly meant “make unseen, hide, suppress,” from which other uses arose such as “obliterate (footsteps), raze, erase (writing), disfigure” (NRSV: “and wipe them out”).

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Isa 10:3; 61:2; Ps 50:2; 80:1; Deut 33:2. See also H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60-150*, 239-240.

¹⁴⁸ Also clearly the case in the use of the motif in the MT of Isa 66:6 (cf. v 5: “Your own people who hate you”). The LXX, however, has modified v 5 so as to avoid identifying “brothers” (= Jews) with those who hate the righteous and who experience the coming divine retribution.

an eschatological interpretation among later readers. This is reinforced by the fact, noted previously, that the language of divine recompense is not infrequently brought into the orbit of divine 'judgment' language.

PASSAGES USING THE MOTIF TO PRONOUNCE SENTENCE UPON THE DISOBEDIENT

The most frequent application of the motif in the prophetic literature of the OT occurs in order to threaten and condemn the consistently disobedient, and especially the faithless people of God,¹⁴⁹ sometimes (but not always) including a summons to repentance which bears a note of continued hope. Ignoring Sirach for the moment, this particular function of the motif is limited to the prophetic literature, whereas its function to comfort the righteous and encourage them to obedience¹⁵⁰ is largely absent from this same literature.¹⁵¹ We will want to pay particular attention in this group of passages to the soteriological implications of these judgment threats directed against members of the elect community.

We begin with the book of the prophet Jeremiah. He has an obvious affinity for this motif, using it six times as a threat¹⁵² and twice more with different functions,¹⁵³ and can employ it with considerable terminological variety.¹⁵⁴

¹⁴⁹ A sentence upon Jews: Jer 16:18; 17:10; 21:14; 23:2; Ezek 7:3, 4, 8, 9, 27; 24:14; Hos 4:9; 12:2, 14; a sentence upon other nations: Jer 25:14, 51:6, Joel 4:4, 7, and Obad 15.

¹⁵⁰ In saying this, the fluidity of the categories being applied to these texts becomes obvious. A "summons to repentance" obviously contains an element of "encouragement to obedience." However, these categories are still distinct in that the "encouragement" is directed to those whom the speaker views as walking in Yahweh's ways, and needing such "motivation" only due to some form of opposition. The "threat" and "summons" on the other hand address those viewed as living in defiance of the covenant demands. Similarly a text such as Ezek 18:30, while primarily a summons to repent, also aims to justify Yahweh (cf. v 29: "O house of Israel, are my ways unfair?" cf. also Jer 17:10).

¹⁵¹ Exceptions are Isa 59:18 and 66:6.

¹⁵² Jer 16:18; 17:10; 21:14 [not in the LXX, but found in the MT, Hexapla, Aquila, and Theodotion]; 23:2; along with 25:14 and 51:6 which are directed at foreign nations.

¹⁵³ Jer 32:19; 50:29.

¹⁵⁴ Verbs: שָׁלַם, 4x; נָתַן and פָּקַד, 2x each; עָשָׂה, 1x. For the standard or object of recompense he uses ten different nouns or expressions.

Jeremiah 17:10

Jer 17:10 brings together our motif with the concepts of “trust in Yahweh” and of the deceitful human “heart.” As part of a larger indictment of Judah’s sin¹⁵⁵ there appears a wisdom saying¹⁵⁶ pronouncing a curse on those who trust in “mortals” or “flesh” (= “whose hearts turn away from the Lord,” v 5) and blessing on those who trust in God. Jeremiah’s response (v 9) is a confession of the insidious character of the human heart, which is sick beyond cure and unknowable to human understanding. As a response to Jeremiah’s exclamation, God speaks:

I, the Lord, test the heart
and examine the mind (lit. “kidneys”),
to give to each according to his/her ways,
according to the fruit of his/her deeds.

וְלִתֵּת לְאִישׁ כְּדֶרְכּוֹ כִּפְרִי מַעֲלָלָיו

τοῦ δοῦναι ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ καὶ κατὰ τοὺς καρποὺς τῶν ἐπιτηδεύματων αὐτοῦ.

Interestingly in this text, the divine recompense according to deeds is based upon Yahweh’s examination of one’s *inner* thoughts and affections, rather than strictly observable actions, and, in context, refers to God’s determination of one’s ‘faith’ [πέποιθεν/בטח, v 7]. The fascinating interplay of trust, heart, and deeds in this passage testifies to an understanding of human works and obedience far removed from any externalism. Rather, trust in Yahweh, which already marks one as belonging to the “blessed” and the “righteous,” and which is a reality of the unseen heart, is the ultimate basis of the divine examination.¹⁵⁷ At the same time it is understood that this inner reality *must of necessity* be worked out in one’s behavior, one’s “ways.” Thus there can be ultimately no disparity between a blessing (or

¹⁵⁵ Jer 17:1-13. The strongest indictment of Judah is omitted in the LXX (vv 1-4: “By your own act you shall lose the heritage. . . . for in my anger a fire is kindled that shall burn forever”). Is this simple haplography (W. Holladay, *Jeremiah* 1.484), or did the translator desire to soften the severity of judgment upon Judah?

¹⁵⁶ Verses 5-8; see A. Weiser, *Jeremia*, 150-151.

¹⁵⁷ For possible influence from the Egyptian motif of “weighing the heart,” see above, n. 104.

curse) based on trust (or its absence), and a recompense according to deeds.¹⁵⁸

Jeremiah 23:2

Jer 23:2 contains the prophet's oracle of woe against the shepherds of Israel.

The correspondence between sin and punishment is quite clear in this passage:

You have scattered them, that is, my flock, and driven them away and have not tended (פָּקַדְתֶּם) to them.

So I will tend (פָּקַד) to you for the evil of your deeds.¹⁵⁹

ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐκδικῶ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς κατὰ τὰ ποιηρὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα ὑμῶν

“Because the shepherds did not *pāqad* the people in a positive way, Yahweh will *pāqad* the shepherds in a negative way.”¹⁶⁰ This verb does not of itself signify “punishment” meted out after some legal-juridical determination of wrongdoing; its sense is “attend to, visit, investigate” someone or something with a view toward either blessing or harming. When used with “evil” as the direct object¹⁶¹ (as in the second colon), however, it takes on the sense of “visiting evil upon someone,” and hence to “punish” in a judicial-retributive sense.¹⁶² Thus, the LXX's ἐκδικέω (“take vengeance”) is an appropriate translation. As in a couple of other instances, the motif is employed here as a threat to counter failure in proper leadership, especially

¹⁵⁸ It has been suggested by M. Dahood that v 13 brings an eschatological meaning to this recompense, translating “those who turn away from you shall be *recorded in the underworld* [Heb. בְּאֶרֶץ יִפְתָּבוּ],” taking אֶרֶץ as a reference to the underworld in reliance on Ugaritic parallels (*Bib* 40 [1959] 164-168). It might just as well, however, be translated “recorded in the dust,” i.e., soon to be erased and forgotten (so the LXX translator). On the whole, see Thompson, *Jeremiah*, 423, n. 3, who notes additional translational possibilities from the Latin versions and Targum.

¹⁵⁹ Translation from P. Miller, *Sin and Judgment*, 68.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 68. Along with the word play using פָּקַד (not reproduced in LXX), Miller notes an additional correspondence between the *shepherds'* [רָעִים] failure to properly *shepherd* [רָעִים] the flock of God, which brings punishment for the *evil* [רָע] they have done.

¹⁶¹ Or equally with the preposition כִּי; see Jer 23:2 and Hos 4:9 with the direct object (=to visit their evil-doing upon them); Jer 21:14 and Hos 12:3 with preposition (=to visit [evil] upon them *according* to their evil-doing). There is no discernible difference between the two expressions.

¹⁶² See J. Scharbert, “Das Verbum PQD,” *Um das Prinzip*, 298; and A. Gunnel, *Determining the Destiny: PQD in the Old Testament* (ConBOTSeries 16; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1980), who translates “to determine the destiny of . . .” (241).

abuse of position and privilege.¹⁶³

Ezekiel 7:8-9, 27

Ezekiel's considerable usage of the motif¹⁶⁴ is of interest for a number of reasons, not least because he is often isolated as the one who initiated an "individualizing" of the doctrine of retribution in Jewish thought, moving from a "national" or "collective" application (i.e., retribution upon Israel's enemies and then upon the "unrighteous" in Israel) to one in which each individual stood independently before God to be judged.¹⁶⁵ Furthermore, Ezekiel's predilection for the verb "to judge" [שפוט/κρίνω/εκδικέω] in the motif is both unusual¹⁶⁶ and instructive for the development of the idea of "*judgment* according to deeds."

Following his proclamation of punishment upon the countryside, its mountains and high places (chapter 6), he then warns of the end [אָפֿטֿ/πέρας]¹⁶⁷ coming upon the "land of Israel" (7:2), both inside and outside the city walls (vv 15, 23). This divine judgment is given universal ("upon the four corners of the land/earth", v 2) and eschatological scope ("day of the Lord", v 10 [LXX]).¹⁶⁸ Ezekiel "makes Israel form up along with the other nations who are ripe for judgment. That spells a very effective attack upon the pride of the chosen people, who throw away their preferential position through the contempt they show for their God."¹⁶⁹ God will pour out his wrath and anger upon the nation,¹⁷⁰ neither sparing

¹⁶³ See Jer 21:14; Hos 4:9; and Paul's use of the motif against leaders in 1 Cor 3:5-17, Rom 14:10-12, and 2 Cor 11:15.

¹⁶⁴ As a threat: 7:3, 4, 8, 9, 27; 18:30; 33:20; as justification: 36:19.

¹⁶⁵ See on this subject B. Lindars, "Ezekiel and Individual Responsibility," VT 15 (1965) 452-467.

¹⁶⁶ Elsewhere in the motif only in Sir 16:12 and 1 Macc 7:42; cf. also 1 Kgs 8:32 (=2 Chr 6:23) and Eccl 12:14.

¹⁶⁷ Cf. Amos 8:2; Hab 2:3; Dan 8:17, 19; 9:26; 11:27. Theodotion here renders "the punishment of the end" (cf. 21:25, 29).

¹⁶⁸ See also the previous note on "the end."

¹⁶⁹ W. Eichrodt, *Ezekiel* (trans. C. Quinn; OTL; London: SCM, 1970 [orig. ATD 22/1-2; 1965-1966]) 102.

nor showing mercy (vv 4, 9). Such unsparing judgment is explained (*διότι*) as due to God's recompense according to deeds.

The motif occurs here in two nearly identical forms (vv 3b-4 and 8b-9) with only minor differences between the two (substitution of *ἐκδικέω* for *κρίνω* and sg. "way" for "ways"). They probably represent two similar oracles delivered separately but here brought together by the redactor,¹⁷¹ or perhaps testify to textual confusion.¹⁷² The juxtaposition of 'judging' and 'giving upon you all your deeds' shows again how the juridical and organic conceptions of recompense have been combined by this time.

Soon now I will pour out my wrath upon you; I will spend my anger against you.

I will judge you by your ways

and bring upon you all your detestable practices.

My eye will not spare you, neither will I show mercy,

for your ways I will bring upon you,

and your detestable practices shall be in your midst;

and you will know that it is I the Lord who strikes the blow.

Ezek 7:8-9 (= LXX 7:5-6)

וְשָׁפַתִּי כִדְרִי . . .

וְנָתַתִּי עָלֶיךָ אֶת כָּל-תּוֹעֲבוֹתֶיךָ

. . . כִּדְרִי עָלֶיךָ אֶתֵּן

וְתוֹעֲבוֹתֶיךָ בְּתוֹכְךָ תִּהְיוּ.

. . . καὶ κρινῶ σε ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς σου

καὶ δώσω ἐπὶ σὲ πάντα τὰ βδελύγματα σου·

. . . διότι τὰς ὁδούς σου ἐπὶ σὲ δώσω,

καὶ τὰ βδελύγματα σου ἐν μέσῳ σου ἔσονται,

Whereas we have noted numerous instances of divine mercy superseding this operation of recompense to Israel, here it is explicitly stated that God will not show mercy (*οὐδὲ μὴ ἐλεήσω*). As we have suggested earlier, the difference in the divine attitude (mercy/no mercy) can be traced to the difference between a fundamental

¹⁷⁰ ὀργή, θυμός; vv 3, 8; cf. also vv 12b, 19, and v 22 ("I will avert my face from them").

¹⁷¹ G. A. Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936 [repr. 1970]) 75.

¹⁷² W. Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, 99, n. d. The LXX transposes vv 3-5 and 6-9 so that it reads (following the numbering of the English versions): vv 1-2, 6a (6b is omitted), 7b (omitting the first 3 words of the MT: "doom (?) has come upon you"), 8-9, 3-5a (omitting MT 5b: "disaster [הָעָרָה] has come upon you"), 10ff (though with considerable difference; e.g., the addition of "the day of the Lord [הַיּוֹם הַהוּא]"), v 10; the omission of "doom" again).

and ongoing turning from Yahweh and his covenant (as here), and a disobedience which may still be viewed as reversible, as occasional, as a failure not indicative of one's way in general. The prophets give us no clearly defined line by which one could infallibly determine which of these two situations is present; rather the determination lies with God, who alone can see the hidden things of the heart and who acts not in submission to 'principles of retribution' but in sovereign freedom.¹⁷³

The oracle closes on a note of total calamity, with the people seeking in terror for some word or vision of hope (vv 25-26). But this is in vain, for neither prophet, priest, king, nor prince will^{be} able to help on the day of God's just recompense:

The ruler will wear destruction, and the hands of the people of the land will be paralyzed;
according to their ways I will do to them,

and in their judgments I will take vengeance on [MT: "judge"] them.¹⁷⁴

Then they will know that I am the Lord, Ezek 7:27.

אֶעֱשֶׂה אֲתָם¹⁷⁵ מִדְּרָכָם . . .

κατὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῶν ποιήσω αὐτοῖς

Thus, after a long period of chastising judgments, during which God was patient and did not deal with the people according to their sinful ways, he now judges them to be fundamentally "unwilling," "hardened and obstinate" (3:7), and so will begin to deal with them according to the principle of recompense.

Hosea 4:9

¹⁷³ See also Lev 26:14-45 with its progression of disciplining judgments until finally the nation is destroyed and cast out of the inheritance. It should be noted that this does not imply a last-ing abrogation of the covenant with Israel (vv 40-45).

¹⁷⁴ NIV: "and by their own standards I will judge them." The LXX phrase (καὶ ἐν τοῖς κρίμασιν αὐτῶν ἐκδικήσω αὐτούς), however, is not an instance of the recompense motif, since these 'judgments' are the words and visions being sought from earthly authorities (vv 25-26), not the sinful deeds of the people. Here is prophetic irony in that in the midst of their own attempts to find and provide comforting 'judgments' [Heb. בְּמִשְׁפָּטֵיהֶם], God will bring his own (and opposite) 'judgment' (cf. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*² [BKAT 13/1; Neukirchen: 1979] 179). Cf. also 23:24 for the same phrase in a different context.

¹⁷⁵ מִדְּרָכָם: probably just an alternative way of expressing "for . . ." or "on the basis of . . ." (G. A. Cooke, *Ezekiel*, 88). In any case, the LXX has understood as כְּדִרְכָּם.

In the midst of a ‘lawsuit’ (רִיב) against Israel, and particularly against her priests, Hosea prophesies:

And it will be: Like people, like priest;
I will take vengeance upon him for his ways,
And his deeds I will recompense to him, Hos 4:9.
 וּפְקַדְתִּי עָלָיו דְּרָכָיו
 וּמַעֲלָלָיו אֲשִׁיב לוֹ
 καὶ ἐκδικήσω ἐπ’ αὐτὸν τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ
 καὶ τὰ διαβούλια¹⁷⁶ αὐτοῦ ἀνταποδώσω αὐτῷ.

It was a prophetic innovation to apply this imagery of an Israelite lawsuit to the covenant relationship between Yahweh and Israel, with Yahweh becoming both prosecutor and judge.¹⁷⁷ Many divine lawsuit texts omit both a defense and a verdict, a rhetorical means of forcing the listeners to draw their own conclusions about their catastrophic situation so that they, or at least a remnant of them, will repent.¹⁷⁸ This usage reveals the prophets’ “decidedly ethical, normative conception of God and religious relation,” in which the divine moral order of the world, of community and individual affairs, cannot be violated with impunity;¹⁷⁹ yet it shows equally the *personal* character of divine recompense and

reveals the undogmatic, unsystematic way of thinking, in religious matters, of the Old Testament. All is ultimately left to . . . the Supreme Judge and Ruler, whose judgement is righteous, but unpredictable, and inscrutable for human understanding, whose ways are not ours. He is a person, not a system or an order.¹⁸⁰

In general, the prophetic lawsuits involve a battle against apostates within the nation in order to preserve the remnant for salvation.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁶ διαβούλια = “debatings, deliberations” (LSJ, 390). This word translates מעצות (“intrigues”) at Ps 5:10 and Hos 11:6. Perhaps the similar מעללים was misread by the translator or his Hebrew text.

¹⁷⁷ See K. Nielsen, *Yahweh as Prosecutor and Judge: An Investigation of the Prophetic Lawsuit (Rib-pattern)* (JSOTSup 9; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1978) 74; and B. Gemser, “The Rib or Controversy Pattern in Hebrew Mentality,” *Wisdom in Israel: FS H.H. Rowley* (VTSup 3; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1955) 124-137.

¹⁷⁸ K. Nielsen, *Yahweh as Prosecutor*, 39-40, 75.

¹⁷⁹ B. Gemser, “Controversy Pattern,” 136-137.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., 137.

¹⁸¹ K. Nielsen, *Yahweh as Prosecutor*, 82-83.

Hosea's lawsuit arises because of the covenant unfaithfulness of both people and priests.¹⁸² The epigrammatic "like people, like priest" may have been a popular saying with an originally positive sense designed to highlight the privileged position of the priestly class.¹⁸³ If so, the sense is here reversed. "Der Priester darf nicht auf eine Vorzugsstelle bei Gott hoffen."¹⁸⁴ Both priest and people will be judged upon the same basis, and thus the motif functions to avert the abuse of privilege.

The outcome of this particular judgment is Yahweh's rejection of these priests (4:6), and destruction and ruin upon both priest and people.¹⁸⁵ In Hos 12:2 and 14, where the motif occurs again in a lawsuit, the language suggests that the wicked in Israel are viewed as the "rebellious" covenant violators of Deuteronomy 32 whose lot will be rejection, vengeance and fiery wrath.¹⁸⁶ Whereas bloodguilt which was accidental could be removed by Yahweh (Josh 20:1-9), this defrauding of God himself and covenant unfaithfulness will not be removed, and the rebellious will be cut off from the covenant provisions, experiencing instead the covenant curses and a return to conditions as in the wilderness wandering.¹⁸⁷ Yet even in this ultimate threat there remains a note of hope for the remnant who repent.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸² 4:1, 6, 7, 10-13. See also the language of spiritual "prostitution" and "adultery" in vv 14-18, and note esp. v 10: "they have forsaken the Lord." As elsewhere, it is not so much individual sins which are in view, as one's ways and deeds which, as a unity, reveal departure from the covenant and its stipulations.

¹⁸³ D. Stuart, *Hosea-Jonah* (WBC 31; Waco, TX: Word, 1987) 79.

¹⁸⁴ H. W. Wolff, *Dodekapropheton 1, Hosea* (BKAT 14/1; Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1961) 103.

¹⁸⁵ 4:5-6, 14b. See P. D. Miller (*Sin and Judgment*, 9-15) whose excellent treatment of Hos 4 brings out the exact correspondence between sin and punishment (= talionic formulation) lying at the heart of the recompense principle in this chapter; also N. Lohfink, "Zu Text und Form von Os 4,4-6," 303-332.

¹⁸⁶ D. Stuart, *Hosea*, 195.

¹⁸⁷ Hos 2:11-13; 9:15-17.

¹⁸⁸ 12:6; 14:1-9.

PASSAGES USING THE MOTIF TO SUMMON THE DISOBEDIENT TO REPENTANCE

This final category in our functional typology is closely related to the foregoing. It differs, however, in that the threat is more strongly *conditional* due to the greater emphasis on a call to repentance.

Ezekiel 18:30

Ezekiel 18 is a disputation dealing with the charge by the people of Israel that Yahweh is not just or fair.¹⁸⁹ Thus the prophet pronounces that:

- (i) the individual who sins will die (vv 1-4), and
- (ii) the righteous person will live (vv 5-9).

Further, this status ('righteous' or 'wicked') cannot be passed on to the succeeding generation, for

- (iii) the wicked offspring of a righteous person will die (vv 10-13), while
- (iv) the righteous offspring of a wicked person will live (vv 14-20).

Finally, even the wicked who repent will live (vv 21-23), while the righteous who turn to wickedness will die (v 24). Thus (vv 25-29) Yahweh is just in his treatment of the people. This just treatment is confirmed by the prophet's citation of the motif immediately prior to the call to repentance (vv 30b-32).

Therefore, I will judge you, each one, O house of Israel according to his/her ways.
 לְכֵן אֵשׁ כִּרְרָכִי אֶשְׁפֹּט אֶתְכֶם בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל
 ἔκαστον κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ κρινῶ ὑμᾶς, οἶκος Ἰσραηλ.

Neither according to *another's* behavior, nor even according to one's own *previous* actions (assuming a change of ways) will God judge the individual. Rather so long as death has not put an end to opportunity, one can begin to walk in a new "way" according to which judgment will be determined.

The 'individualization' of the recompense doctrine is striking, and, not surprisingly, has resulted in the very common view that in Jeremiah and Ezekiel we see

¹⁸⁹ "Yet you say, 'The way of the Lord is unfair'" (v 25; cf. also v 29). On the whole chapter see especially the treatment by W. Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, 231-249.

the first beginnings of a consciousness that the *individual* (and not only the community) is subject to the deity's favor and anger.¹⁹⁰ However, as Rankin has demonstrated, this can hardly be correct. Rather, allowing for development and modification, it is clear that religious individualism of this kind had characterized Israelite religion throughout its recorded history.¹⁹¹ Individual accountability in matters of human judicial administration was never in dispute;¹⁹² and a personal-individual relationship to the deity was clearly expressed in Isaiah's call, the many Psalms reflecting an individual's plight, Hannah's petition and Eli's response (1 Sam 1:9-10, 17), and the strange tale in Exodus 4 regarding Zipporah's action in the restoration of a proper relationship between Yahweh and Moses, to name just a few examples. That Yahweh rewards and punishes on an *individual*, not only communal, basis was already well-known by the time of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. That Ezekiel did, however, wish his hearers to make an individual application of his prophecy seems unambiguous by the inclusion of "each [ἑκάστος]" in the motif of divine recompense.

On the other hand, there is no need to deny the presence of what has been called 'corporate solidarity.'¹⁹³ The prophecy of chapter 18 was intended as a corrective to a *false application* of this latter concept. The proverb quoted at the

¹⁹⁰ Though, as John Gammie has pointed out, it is not really so novel as some have thought ("The Theology of Retribution in the Book of Deuteronomy," 1-12). See Deut 24:16: "Parents shall not be put to death for their children, nor shall children be put to death for their parents; only for their own crimes may persons be put to death." A good overview of positions is offered in *Ezekiel 18 and the Rhetoric of Moral Discourse in the Book Ezekiel* by Gordon H. Matties (Diss. Vanderbilt University; 1989) esp. 195-217. Matties follows Gottwald, Joyce and others in acknowledging a sense of both individual and collective responsibility throughout Israel's biblical history, and in arguing against a 'developmental' view which makes Jeremiah and Ezekiel initiators of a dogma of individual responsibility.

¹⁹¹ O. S. Rankin, *Israel's Wisdom Literature: Its Bearing on Theology and the History of Religion* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1954 [orig. 1936]) esp. 53-76. See also G. H. Matties, *Ezekiel 18*, esp. 195-227, and the bibliography to the debate over "individualism" in Ezekiel (196, n. 2).

¹⁹² See for instance 2 Kgs 14:1-6 where Amaziah pardons the sons of his father's assassins. Cf. B. Lindars, "Ezekiel and Individual Responsibility," 452-467.

¹⁹³ Cf. for instance Hos 11:2; Jer 3:6-10; also 2 Kgs. 17:21-23 where a corporate punishment is envisioned, in some cases involving even sins of previous generations.

beginning of the chapter (“The parents have eaten sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge,” v 2) expresses a certain fatalism among the people and their leaders. Ruin and death can no longer be averted because they are being punished for the sins of past generations; thus the efficacy of a reformation of ways is also doubted. Ezekiel challenges this error, asserting that a change in ways, toward good or evil, both on an individual and on a corporate level,¹⁹⁴ can indeed work a change in the divine-human relationship and in the outcome of divine judgment.

However, the central rhetorical thrust of this passage is not so much to justify Yahweh’s actions to the people as it is to summon them to repentance. Precisely because each will be judged according to his/her own ways, the prophet immediately calls them to repent (vv 30b-32). Interpreters have commonly viewed these verses as an oracle of doom (announcing Yahweh’s sure destroying judgment), and have seen in the call to repentance only a subordinate element. Raitt suggests, instead, that vv 30-32 constitute a distinct prophetic speech-form, a “summons to repentance.”¹⁹⁵ Unique to this *Gattung* is that “both threat of judgment and promise of salvation are incorporated under a predominant motif of admonition,” resulting in a “tension” between doom and hope conditioned upon the people’s response, and a “planned ambiguity” regarding the fate of those addressed.¹⁹⁶

This does not mean, however, that the threat of judgment is merely an *Argumentationsmittel*. Barring repentance, they will surely die,¹⁹⁷ referring to premature death for the individual and/or premature extinction on the collective

¹⁹⁴ The recompense motif in v 30a also has a definite corporate thrust (בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל). On the corporate application of Ezek 18, see B. Lindars, “Ezekiel,” 452-467, and P. M. Joyce, “Individual Responsibility in Ezekiel 18?” (*Studia Biblica 1978: I. Papers on Old Testament and Related Themes* [Sixth International Congress on Biblical Studies; ed. E. A. Livingston; JSOTSup 11; Sheffield: JSOT, 1979] 185-196). However, their contention that only corporate responsibility is intended (“individual language is metaphorical of the nation”) is hardly correct.

¹⁹⁵ T. M. Raitt, “The Prophetic Summons to Repentance,” 30-49. Other instances, according to Raitt, are Amos 5:4-5 and Zech 1:2-6.

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 33.

¹⁹⁷ “Why will you die, O house of Israel?” v 31b. See also vv 4b, 13b, 18, 20a, 24b, 26b.

level. Death here carries the connotation of being cut off from Yahweh's favor and protection within the covenant.¹⁹⁸ On the other hand, Ezekiel's *aim* is clearly to move the wayward to repentance and thus to life,¹⁹⁹ so that the motif functions within this larger context *both* as a threat of imminent divine punishment and as a motivation to the errant to save themselves by repentance.

This text gives us further insight into the theological content of the motif. While quite a number of various sins or righteous acts are listed, no single one of them is viewed as bringing judgment or vindication.²⁰⁰ Rather, *together* they mark an individual as "wicked," as "one who sins"; or as "righteous," that is, as one who "follows my statutes and is careful to observe my ordinances, acting faithfully—such a one is righteous" (v 9). As we have noted elsewhere, the divine recompense (here 'judgment') has as its criterion the life of an individual (or group) seen as a whole.

Ezekiel does not consider here the case of the person who commits only minor sins or only one serious crime. . . . For the sake of clear and consistent casuistic reasoning, he is considering persons as totally good or as totally evil at the moment of their judgment. There is no calculation of how much good or how much evil anyone has done.²⁰¹

It is the sum of the individual works which are significant in indicating upon which "way" one is proceeding; they *reveal* one's true character or condition, either *righteous* or *wicked*, which God weighs in judgment.

But this also means, as is evident in this passage, that the verdict is not a future eventuality currently unknowable to the individual. The identification of the

¹⁹⁸ See L. Wächter, *Der Tod im Alten Testament* (Arbeiten zur Theologie II/8; Stuttgart: Calwer, 1967) esp. 205; W. Zimmerli, "'Leben' und 'Tod' im Buche des Propheten Ezechiel," *TZ* 13 (1957) 494-508 (repr. *Gottes Offenbarung* [TBü 19; Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1969] 178-191); and Marie-Louise Henry, "'Tod' und 'Leben': Unheil und Heil als Funktionen des rechtenden und rettenden Gottes im Alten Testament," *Leben angesichts des Todes: Beiträge zum theologischen Problem des Todes* (FS H. Thielicke) (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1968) 1-26 (repr. *Hüte dein Denken und Wollen*; BibS(N) 16; ed. B. Janowski and E. Noort; Neukirchen: 1992, 57-86).

¹⁹⁹ Not "eschatological life," but this-worldly life as part of Yahweh's covenant people (W. H. Brownlee, *Ezekiel 1-19*, 292).

²⁰⁰ See esp. vv 5-9, 11-13, 15-17.

²⁰¹ W. H. Brownlee, *Ezekiel 1-19*, 290.

wicked and the righteous is outlined in this chapter in a way that allows Ezekiel, and presumably his hearers, to recognize who is who right now. At issue, therefore, in this judgment, is not so much a verdict, nor even the sentence (“the soul that sins shall die/the righteous will live”), but the execution of the same, resulting in life or death. This ‘judgment according to deeds’ does not carry a note of uncertainty with regard to the verdict or sentence, as if one were anxiously waiting to discover whether one is to be considered by God righteous or wicked. Any anxiety it may occasion is caused more by the certainty of its execution than uncertainty as to the verdict.

This text also reveals that the works which identify one as righteous or wicked are not necessarily the sum of all one’s deeds in a lifetime. To repent and change one’s ways is tantamount to “getting a new heart and a new spirit” (v 31)²⁰² and results in one’s previous deeds no longer being ‘remembered’ in judgment (vv 22, 24), i.e., they will no longer be considered.

Ezekiel 33:20

Ezekiel 33:20 occurs in a context almost identical to that outlined for chapter 18 above. The exiled people of Israel, burdened under their sins, see no hope in Yahweh (“How then can we live?” v 10) and question his justice (vv 17, 20).

The disputation echoes and answers an objection voiced evidently by those whose pretensions of a comfortable, superior status and conventional religious categorizing had been shattered by this disconcerting message. It is not fair: is God so unjust as either to overlook earlier moral commitment . . . or to welcome back diehard sinners?²⁰³

On one pastoral front, Ezekiel must speak a message of grace promising forgiveness through repentance to those despairing of hope.

Say to them, As I live, says the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from their ways and live; turn back, turn back from your evil ways; for why will you die, O house of Israel? (33:11; cf. vv 14, 16, 19).

²⁰² What is viewed here as a human responsibility (!) is viewed elsewhere as a divine initiative (11:19; 36:26), alerting us to the very dynamic relationship existing between these two logical poles in the OT. See D. A. Carson, *Divine Sovereignty*, 9-54.

²⁰³ L. C. Allen, *Ezekiel 20-48*, 146.

Yet at the same time he must guard against this message of grace being misused to promote moral indifference and a false sense of security.

The righteous shall not be able to live by their righteousness when they sin. Though I say to the righteous that they shall surely live, yet if they trust in their righteousness and commit iniquity, none of their righteous deeds shall be remembered; but in the iniquity that they have committed they shall die. (33:12b-13; cf. v 18).

The prophetic word closes with the motif of judgment according to deeds, demonstrating once again its remarkable flexibility, functioning here simultaneously as warning, summons, encouragement, and justification.

I will judge you, each one, according to his/her ways.

אִישׁ כְּדֶרֶכְוֹ אֶשְׁפֹּט אֹתְכֶם
ἕκαστον ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς²⁰⁴ αὐτοῦ κρινῶ ὑμᾶς.

Particularly as a warning and summons to repentance, this passage shows much similarity to Paul's employment of the motif in Romans 2. Like that text, Ezekiel 33:20 is addressed to those who "trust in their righteousness" (v 13), summoning them to repent, and warning of a two-fold outcome in judgment in terms of "life" and "death." Without suggesting direct literary dependence, it would appear that Paul's usage of the motif as a warning to the complacent and falsely self-confident people of God, who may trust in status and righteous performance, has clear prophetic precedent.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

We have demonstrated how truly widespread the motif of divine recompense according to deeds is within the writings and the prophets of the Jewish Scriptures. Its absence from the Pentateuch may be coincidental, or it may indeed be present *in nuce* through the *lex talionis* and other correspondence patterns which were its predecessors.²⁰⁵

²⁰⁴ Several MSS read κατὰ τὰ ὁδοὺς (Codex A, Lucian, Syrian).

²⁰⁵ Cf. above, pp. 38-40.

In addition, the motif could be made to function in a great variety of ways: as praise or justification of God, as comfort for the righteous, or as warning to the disobedient (both within and without the covenant community). This widespread and varied usage counsels against insisting on linking Paul's use to any single scriptural text, unless there is unambiguous evidence for such. Rather we will not be surprised to find in Paul "echoes of Scripture" as he draws from the "storeroom of materials" available to one steeped in biblical tradition.²⁰⁶

This widespread use of the motif along with its flexible application to a broad range of rhetorical situations also suggests that divine recompense according to deeds has already become in the OT an important theological axiom for Judaism. Thus, the varying situation of the hearers can call forth varying applications and formulations. Especially when confronted with the wayward people of God, whose deeds are beginning to mark them as disloyal to God and his covenant, the motif assumes a hortatory function, motivating to (renewed) obedience via encouragement of reward and warning of punishment. In more extreme cases this assumes the form of a summons to repentance. The application as a warning to the errant and presumptuous people of God is the major function of the motif in this literature. Where God determines that the boundary between faith and apostasy has been crossed, the motif expresses the divine sentence of wrath. We also noted the association of this motif with others which illuminate how it was understood. Divine recompense according to deeds deals with the heart (Prov 24:12), and with hidden deeds (Eccl 12:14; Sir 17:15, 19-20) which will be revealed (Sir 11:26-27). Further God's omniscience (Prov 24:12) assures that 'every deed both good and evil' will be included in this judgment (Eccl 12:14). Although 'judgment according to deeds' is not as frequently attested as 'recompense,' it is firmly established within the Jewish Scriptures as an equivalent formulation. However, the rather late development of an eschatological perspective, noticeable mainly in the prophets and the LXX, means

²⁰⁶ P. D. Miller, *Sin and Judgment*, 97. See also pp. 27-28 above, and our comments below regarding the "citation (?)" in Rom 2:6.

that such a judgment should not at this stage be confused with the later apocalyptic judgment scenarios.

Since one of our concerns is to discover whether Paul's particular way of relating justification and judgment may have antecedents in his Jewish background, the question may be posed: How do the Jewish Scriptures relate gracious salvation to recompense (judgment) according to deeds? Braun for one denies that any genuine *tension* between the salvation and judgment of the individual is even possible in the OT for at least three reasons:

- i) its viewpoint is generally collective rather than individual;
- ii) it limits retribution to this life (i.e., the conceptions of 'salvation' and 'judgment' are too far removed from Paul's eschatological perspective); and
- iii) even where the individual comes into view (e.g., Ezekiel), there is no tension due to the increasing transformation of religion into a matter of ceremonial purity and self-confident legalistic 'Korrektheit' (i.e., works-righteousness). Even where a confession of personal sin breaks through, "so wendet man sich wohl an Gottes helfende Gerechtigkeit, hofft aber, dem richtenden Zorn Gottes zu entgehen, man erwartet Heil statt Gericht."²⁰⁷

However, earlier radical denials of the OT's interest in the individual have given way to more balanced treatments.²⁰⁸ Second, though limited to this life, salvation and judgment are firmly anchored within a covenantal framework.²⁰⁹ Particularly in the prophetic use of the motif to 'pronounce sentence on the disobedient' and to 'summon the disobedient to repentance' we saw that 'ultimate issues' are at stake. The coming judgment according to deeds threatens both the nation's and the individual's participation in salvation *qua* covenant blessings. Braun's third point represents an opinion of OT teaching and early Jewish piety which is no longer tenable.

²⁰⁷ *Gerichtsgedanke*, 6-8.

²⁰⁸ See esp. on Ezek 18 (p. 75 above), and O. S. Rankin, *Israel's Wisdom Literature*, esp. 53-76.

²⁰⁹ See W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 457-471.

Covenantal nomism rather than merit theology and casuistry has been seen repeatedly to characterize OT religion.

This is especially the case in regard to our motif which consistently regards one's works as an indivisible whole revealing inner character and faith, rather than atomistically as meritorious achievements. Our exegetical observations above have suggested that divine recompense according to deeds functions as follows within the general pattern of soteriology found in the Jewish Scriptures.²¹⁰ The invitation to, and the provision for, life within God's covenant favor and protection (= *salvation*) proceeds solely from God's grace.²¹¹ However, as would be natural in an ancient Near Eastern covenant arrangement, entry into and continuance in this gracious covenantal relationship requires walking in God's ways. This was not seen as *earning*²¹² a covenant status one did not yet have, but as the only proper response of love and trust in the covenant God who had already bestowed life in fullness. One's works of obedience are not viewed as *merits*, each to be recompensed in atomistic fashion, but instead are the observable manifestations of the covenant loyalty of the unseen heart.²¹³ One's deeds are thus viewed as a unity, the way upon which one is

²¹⁰ The depiction of OT soteriology in this section follows Eichrodt's analysis in his *Theology of the Old Testament*. There has been, and continues to be, considerable debate as to whether there exists any "center" of OT theology and just what that "center" might be (cf. G. Hasel, "OT Theology from 1978-1987" [AUSS 26 (1988) 133-157; idem., *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*⁴ [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991]; J. Goldingay, *Theological Diversity and the Authority of the Old Testament* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987]; D. G. Spriggs, *Two Old Testament Theologies: A Comparative Evaluation of the Contributions of Eichrodt and von Rad to our Understanding of the Nature of Old Testament Theology* [SBT 2nd.ser. 30; London: SCM, 1974]; and W. Kaiser, Jr., *Toward an Old Testament Theology* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978] esp. 1-69). However, as for Eichrodt's description of the fundamental relationship between Yahweh and Israel in terms of "covenant" (i.e., = soteriological pattern), there seems to be less debate (cf. Spriggs cited above, esp. pp. 11-33). "'Covenant' is the central expression of the distinctive faith of Israel as 'the people of Yahweh', children of God by adoption and free decision rather than by nature or necessity" (E. W. Nicholson, *God and His People: Covenant and Theology in the OT* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1986] viii).

²¹¹ "The covenant can only be bestowed as a gift of grace" (W. Eichrodt, *Theology*, 1.56; cf. also 36-69, 286).

²¹² Though even the economic language of 'earning' could be employed in this context (Ruth 2:12; Prov 19:17).

²¹³ Note Jer 17 (pp. 67-68 above) where works manifest one's faith, and it is actually such unseen matters which form the basis of divine judgment.

going.²¹⁴ It is this way, the *work of one's hands*, which normally forms the basis or standard for the divine recompense. Behavior demonstrating a fundamental inward disposition of covenant loyalty brings promise of continued participation in the covenant blessings; consistently disloyal behavior -- the curses of the covenant. The requisite obedience (righteousness) was never viewed as *flawless perfection*, but might be better described by such terms as *consistency*, *integrity*, and *authenticity* of action.²¹⁵ A stringent understanding of retribution, whereby all one's deeds without exception are brought together and judged by weighing good against evil deeds does not characterize the OT. Mercy could be applied as God determined (Ps 103:10), and repentance could bring a new beginning, a 'clean slate' as it were.²¹⁶ Provision was made for occasional failure,²¹⁷ and divine patience brought corrective chastisement upon the seriously wayward to bring them to repentance and a renewed commitment to God's way.

Nevertheless, the threat of divine retribution remains a real one, for both the elect nation and for groups or individuals within the covenant community. For those whose ways consistently reveal unbelief and disloyalty, who presume upon covenant lovingkindness, "throw off the yoke" and are *unrighteous*, there awaits as repayment only *wrath*, *anger*, *destruction*, and *death*. Or expressed in other terms,

²¹⁴ Eichrodt speaks of *sin(s)* as the "expression of a moral or immoral will," thus "preserving the unity of the personal moral will." "God had shown himself in the history of his people as holy love, unwearying faithfulness, righteousness calling for the response of trust, compassionate kindness; but at the same time he had solicited from men their personal consent to his offer, their unreserved self-surrender, and their willing obedience. For him no material performance, be it ever so great, could be a substitute for the living movement of the heart, expressing in love, faith, knowledge of God, and gratitude, a personal assent to his claim. Because the will of God was in this way relevant to the totality of human personal life, individual offences against this will could not be regarded atomistically. . . . Instead, the individual actions, as affronts to the divine will, point to a perverted direction of the human will. Behind the sin stands sin, in the sense of a wrong condition of human nature, since that nature has turned aside from its only proper goal in God." Thus in regards to judgment "the basic direction of the human will stands out as the really decisive factor" (*Theology*, 1.375-376, 2.386-387, 431; underlining added). Cf. also pp. 34-35, and 77 above.

²¹⁵ See above esp. pp. 61-62.

²¹⁶ See above pp. 63, 78.

²¹⁷ On 'atonement' and 'forgiveness' see W. Eichrodt, *Theology*, 2.443-483.

apostasy is possible, and will be punished with God's wrath and the loss of covenantal blessings (= salvation).²¹⁸ Yet in spite of its reality, the boundary between apostasy and fidelity is nowhere legislated in unambiguous fashion, since it is a matter not of legal boundaries but of the human heart and of sovereign divine freedom.²¹⁹ Hence questions as to the *quantity* of transgressions necessary to activate God's wrath are pointless. The sinner cannot check in any legal code to determine in casuistic fashion his/her status with God.

In short, these texts suggest a soteriology fully committed to the centrality of divine grace, yet stressing equally and without contradiction or tension the necessity of human obedience.²²⁰ Salvation, while not earned by human righteousness, is certainly not undemanding in regards to the same. Righteousness is both a status to be received by grace, and a behavior to be maintained.²²¹ This dynamic understanding of righteousness will have to be kept in mind when studying subsequent Jewish material so as to avoid a too-facile charge of synergism. Thus, overlooking for the moment the eschatological and christological differences, we suggest that a dialectic of salvation—judgment, already—not yet, grace—works is already present in the Jewish Scriptures. Having said this, however, it is good to remind ourselves that these same Scriptures present us not primarily with a 'system' of retribution—a set of principles by which one can always ascertain or predict God's (re)action—but with a living and personal God whose freedom to forgive, as well as to destroy, cannot be subjugated to any 'doctrine of retribution.'

²¹⁸ See W. Eichrodt, "Covenant-Breaking and Judgment," *Theology*, 1.457-471; and pp. 43, 48, 72, 76, and n. 182 above.

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 1.364; 2.388.

²²⁰ See above pp. 51, 52, and 67. Far from tension, one's deeds can bring assurance of salvation (cf. pp. 62-63).

²²¹ "usually the forensic and ethical (i.e., status and behaviour) are inseparable" (J. A. Ziesler, *The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul*, 43; see also 17-69 for 'righteousness' in the Jewish Scriptures).

*God's punishment [is] the operation of a personal relationship between God and Man. As such it resisted schematization, and made analogies from human legal practice valid only as subordinate aids to clarify the just correspondence of guilt and punishment.*²²²

²²² W. Eichrodt, *Theology*, 2.431 (original emphasis).

CHAPTER THREE

THE USE OF THE MOTIF IN THE OLD TESTAMENT PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

INTRODUCTORY MATTERS

Earlier studies of Jewish theology in the so-called intertestamental period generally drew upon tannaitic and pseudepigraphical sources indiscriminately, seeking to present a composite and more or less unified position. This approach falsely assumed that later rabbinic traditions accurately portrayed 'normative' Judaism in the first century CE.¹ Instead, it is now almost universally recognized that Judaism of the first century was a religion encompassing great creative variety, for which the OT Pseudepigrapha are a major documentary source of both Palestinian and Diaspora Jewish thought for the period 200 BCE to 100 CE.

The relevant texts are conveniently collected in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* edited by James H. Charlesworth,² whose translations we follow below unless otherwise indicated. Within this corpus we have limited our attention to those works which may be considered Jewish and may be dated no later than the end of the first century CE.³

In addition to offering an exegesis of those texts containing the recompense motif, we will place them within their respective rhetorical and theological contexts

¹ Representative of this older approach are P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1966; repr. of *Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba*² [Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1934]); and W. Bousset and H. Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums*³. For criticism see J. Neusner, "The Use of the Later Rabbinic Evidence," 2.43-63; and K. Müller, "Zur Datierung rabbinischer Aussagen," 551-587.

² 2 vols; New York: Doubleday, 1983; (hereafter *OTP*).

³ See J. H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament* (SNTSMS 54; Cambridge: Cambridge, 1985) 41-44. The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, though often used by others as background material for the NT, is considered by Charlesworth too questionable as a pre-Christian Jewish source.

through a discussion of the soteriology and doctrine of judgment in each document considered. Of particular interest will be the following questions. Do we note any development or change in the use of the motif in this period? Has the wording been modified? Are the same functions in evidence as in the OT? Is there a diminishing application to Israel and a correspondingly greater emphasis on the condemnation of the Gentiles? How is divine recompense/judgment according to deeds related to the salvation or damnation of Jews? Do we find tendencies toward an atomisation of deeds, toward a more legalistic, perfectionistic conception of righteousness? Does the covenant still form the basis of soteriological thought? How is this all related to the Torah?

List of Texts and Function [See Appendix II]

THE USE OF THE MOTIF IN JUBILEES

Jubilees 5:11

Composed in Palestine mid-second century BCE,⁴ this work is probably from the Hasidic or Essene branch of Judaism but prior to the establishment of the Qumran sect. Chapter five is a retelling of the biblical flood account, intertwined with the story of the imprisonment of the Watchers and the punishment of their children.⁵ Its purpose is “to portray the consequence of lawlessness (v, 2)” in order “to incite faithfulness to Torah”.⁶ The angels are bound in the depths of the earth (v 6), and the race of their giant offspring is destroyed by mutual bloodshed (vv 7-9).

⁴ O. S. Wintermute (*OTP*, 2.43-44). Theories of later redaction are less relevant to our purpose since they uniformly view our present chap 5 as original; see, for instance, G. L. Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees* (SPB 20; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971) 10-18. Against such redactional theories, see E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 386-387.

⁵ This same tradition appears in 1 En 6-12 and 1QH X,34-36. On the whole subject see G. L. Davenport, *Eschatology*, 47, n. 1.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 47-48. On the relationship of ethics and eschatology in Jubilees, see C. Münchow, *Ethik und Eschatologie: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik mit einem Ausblick auf das Neue Testament* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981) 43-64.

These slain offspring are then “bound in the depths of the earth forever, until the day of great judgment in order for judgment to be executed upon all of those who corrupted their ways and their deeds before the Lord” (v 10).⁷ As a conclusion to this account of destruction, the motif is cited (v 11) to explain or justify God’s action. This particular judgment is ultimately prototypical of the future universal judgment (vv 13-16) which is likewise according to deeds (see on v 15 below). In its role as a model of the future judgment, v 11 functions also as a warning to motivate the righteous to faithfulness.⁸

And he wiped out every one from their places and not one of them remained whom he did not judge according to all his wickedness.⁹

God’s punishing judgment did not overlook any of their evil deeds.¹⁰ As elsewhere the motif stresses the certainty and thoroughness of divine judgment according to deeds. This particular judgment is preliminary to the final judgment and is non-eschatological, though as we noted above it is clearly prototypical of the eschatological judgment.

Jubilees 5:15

Verses 12-19 focus on the new era resulting after the flood.¹¹ Having wiped out the corrupted angelic offspring, God “made for all his works a new and

⁷ Although their death was itself a form of divine judgment, it is clear in this text that ultimate judgment (“the day of great judgment,” cf. also 4:19, 24; 9:15; 10:17; 16:9; 23:11; 24:33) is eschatological, necessitating the concept of a sub-terrestrial waiting period between death and final judgment (cf. also 7:29; [10:9, for demons too]; 22:22).

⁸ This understanding of the past-tense references in vv 10-11 alleviates the need for emendation to future tenses (suggested by R. H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis* [London: 1902] 44-45, note). Against emendation, see G. L. Davenport, *Eschatology*, 48, n. 3. On the hortatory purpose of such eschatological motivation in Jub, see C. Münchow, *Ethik und Eschatologie*, esp. 60-62.

⁹ We must rely on English translations from Ethiopic MSS for Jub 5:11, 15, since the fragmentary Greek and Syriac MSS (themselves translations of a non-extant Hebrew text) do not contain these passages.

¹⁰ Note the inclusion of “all” in the motif and the stress on “all of them” in vv 12-19.

¹¹ Not “a prophecy of the new creation” (E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 381, n. 36). In favor of a non-eschatological interpretation, see K. Berger (*Das Buch der Jubiläen* [JSHRZ II/3; ed. W. G. Kümmel, et al.; Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1981] 351, n. 12b) and n. 8 above against emendation to future tenses. This makes for a slight disturbance in the chronology of the chapter, since the destruction of corrupt humanity at the flood must be assumed but will not be recounted until vv 19ff (though envi-

righteous nature so that they might not sin in all their nature forever, and so that they might all be righteous, each in his kind, always” (v 12). This is not speaking of an eschatological era of sinlessness,¹² but of a new (post-Flood) beginning for humanity with the *possibility* of righteousness.¹³ Verses 13-14 speak then of the (basis of) judgment for this new generation of humanity, followed by our motif, though in a slightly different form.

He will judge concerning every one: the great one according to his greatness and the small one according to his smallness, and each one according to his way.

Quite unusual here is the admission of differing standards of judgment according to smallness or greatness.¹⁴ The author hints in v 13 at differing rules of conduct for various groups of humanity (and of all creation).¹⁵

And the judgment of all of them [God’s works] has been ordained and written in the heavenly tablets without injustice. And (if) any of them transgress from *their way* with respect to *what was ordained for them to walk in*, or if they do not walk in it, the judgment for *every (sort of) nature and every kind* has been written.

Thus in v 15 the “great” and the “small” each have their own standard of judgment specific to their nature, and only in this way can judgment according to deeds be “without injustice.” This sounds something like Paul’s argument for differing standards of judgment (upon Jews and Gentiles) in Rom 2:12-16.

Verse 14 stresses the exhaustiveness of this judgment, “there is nothing excluded.”¹⁶ This is followed in v 16 by the motif of divine impartiality, proving he is a righteous judge for both small and great.¹⁷ Interestingly, v 19 qualifies this

sioned already at v 4).

¹² Cf. vv 17-18. Such a future era may be envisioned in 50:5.

¹³ The “primary point is that God has made faithfulness possible and he expects it to be forthcoming” (G. L. Davenport, *Eschatology*, 48-49, n. 2).

¹⁴ Cf. also Wis 6:6-8. See P. Volz, *Eschatologie*, 289-290.

¹⁵ Likewise v 12b; and 7:21. Cf. also 1QS III,15-17.

¹⁶ I.e., “from liability before the judgment mentioned in vs. 13” (O. S. Wintermute, *OTP*, 2.65, n. e).

¹⁷ See J. M. Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, esp. 28-31; though she makes nothing of the surprising qualification of impartiality in v 19.

impartiality in judgment. After mentioning the forgiveness available to repentant Israelites (vv 17-18) the author continues:

But to any who corrupted their way and their counsel before the Flood, he did not show partiality, except Noah alone, for *he showed partiality to him* for the sake of his sons, whom he saved from the waters of the Flood (and) for his sake because his heart was righteous in all of his ways just as it was commanded concerning him.

This implies that the post-Flood forgiveness of errant Jews *does* amount to a certain degree of ‘partiality’ on God’s part toward his covenant people, since it is both contrasted with God’s impartial judgment of Jew and Gentile alike before the Flood, and foreshadowed in the partiality shown to Noah. The condition of repentance, however, preserves this partiality from being viewed as unfair favoritism.

Within the larger rhetorical thrust of the chapter this use of the judgment motif functions as a warning intended to motivate faithful obedience to the way which God has ordained for each of his works. Such obedience is viewed as entirely within human capability due to the post-Flood renewal which brought to each “a new and righteous nature” (v 12). The author’s implicit assumption in vv 12-16 is that both the demand of obedience and the warning of eschatological judgment apply equally to the Gentiles (“all his works,” v 12).¹⁸ However, this remains only implicit, since his real concern is with Jewish faithfulness:

And for the children of Israel it has been written and ordained, “If they return to him in righteousness, he will forgive all of their sins and he will pardon all of their transgressions.” It is written and it is ordained, “He will have mercy on all who return from all their error, once each year [i.e., on the Day of Atonement]” (5:17-18).

The limitation of forgiveness to a specific annual event (v 18) may well be a later interpolation.¹⁹

In any case divine mercy in judgment consists here in the forgiveness of sins for the repentant Israelite. Judgment according to deeds demands not perfect

¹⁸ Cf. G. L. Davenport, *Eschatology*, 49; on the attitude of the rest of the book of Jub towards Gentiles, see E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 374-375.

¹⁹ See R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (2 vols; London: Oxford University Press, 1913) 20; and G. L. Davenport, *Eschatology*, 47-48, n. 2. M. Reiser refers to the later rabbinic doctrine of *annual repentance* and considers the phrase authentic (*Die Gerichtspredigt Jesu*, 59, and n. 20).

obedience but covenant faithfulness, including turning back to God's path when one has strayed.²⁰ Although the precise result of this judgment is not detailed in vv 12-16, it can hardly be other than exclusion from salvation. The implication of vv 17-18 is that unrepentant Israelites will not experience divine mercy and forgiveness, but instead will join the Watcher angels and their offspring in the "judgment to be executed upon all of those who corrupted their ways and their deeds before the Lord" (v 10). The exclusion of faithless members of the covenant from the promised blessings is a theme recurring throughout the book.²¹

Judgment and Salvation in Jubilees

Thus, judgment according to one's way concerns fundamentally one's adherence to the covenant and commandments of God. In it God "executes judgment with all who transgress his commandments and despise his covenant" (21:4b). Specific transgressions are certainly in view; yet it is not individual sins, atomistically conceived, which merit judgment, but rather the underlying turning from God and rejection of his covenant.²² Forgiveness of sins and mercy are necessary to salvation, with condemnation in judgment limited to those who "corrupt their way" and do not "return from all their error." In spite of some language which might suggest a certain moral perfectionism in the book, the righteous are those in Israel who consistently (but not necessarily perfectly) observe the covenant and commands of God. In this covenantal sense, some sins are so flagrant that they can be termed 'mortal', excluding all possibility of repentance and forgiveness.²³ The motif is not

²⁰ E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 375-380.

²¹ Cf. 2:27; 6:12-14; 15:32-34; 21:21-24 ('mortal sin', v 22); 30:21-23; 36:9-11 ('eternal reproach and execration and wrath and torment and indignation' on the Israelite who 'desires to harm his brother'); 41:26. See further G. L. Davenport, *Eschatology*, 77-79.

²² On the centrality of the 'covenant' to Jubilees, see J. C. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees* (CBQMS 18; Washington D.C.: 1987) esp. 226-233. This covenantal view stands against an older scholarly tradition which saw in this document "the glorification of legalistic Judaism" (R. H. Charles, *Eschatology: The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism and Christianity (A Critical History)* [New York: Schocken Books, 1963 <orig. 1899>] 236).

²³ Cf. 21:22; also 2:27; 6:12; 30:7; 33:13, 18 ('let them not commit a sin worthy of death'); 36:8-11; 49:8-9. On the other hand, sins of ignorance can be forgiven (22:14). See further, E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 368-370; and on 'righteousness' in Jubilees, 380-383.

used in Jubilees in reference to a rewarding judgment for righteousness. Rather it always has the punishment of the disobedient in view.²⁴

THE USE OF THE MOTIF IN 1 ENOCH²⁵

Judgment in 1 Enoch: An Overview

1 Enoch is preoccupied with “the great day of judgment” (or “day of great judgment”).²⁶ This is often an eschatological²⁷ and universal judgment upon every individual,²⁸ involving the transformation of earth and heaven.²⁹ At some points, however, the judgment is viewed as destruction wreaked by the righteous themselves upon the wicked at the end of the age, or prior to the Messianic kingdom.³⁰ Charles, in fact, found four differing ideas of judgment in this composite work.³¹ A thoroughgoing systematization of the various eschatologies of judgment has not been

²⁴ Cf. J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes*, 26.

²⁵ Even when taking into account the composite nature of this writing, there is now general agreement that all the individual sections (with the exception of the Similitudes, chaps 37-71) are Jewish and pre-date Christian times. The Similitudes are not critical to our study, and are variously assigned anywhere from the first to the fourth century CE (E. Isaac, *Enoch*, in *OTP*, 1.6-7).

²⁶ 10:7; 22:11; 25:4; 54:6; 62:3 (“that day”); 84:4; 91:15; 94:9; 98:10 (“day of destruction”); 99:15; 100:4; 104:5. Matthew Black calls this Enoch’s “dominant theme” (*The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition, with commentary and textual notes* [SVTP 7; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985] 8).

²⁷ 10:12; 16:1; 22:4; 25:4; 27:2; 91:9, [14], 15; 103:8 (postmortem); 104:5. A ‘measure for measure’ judgment can also come in this life (98:5).

²⁸ 22:8; 25:4; 27:2; [83:7]; 97:5; 104:5; see also chaps 1, 5, and 50.

²⁹ 45:4-5; 72:1; 91:16; also 15:1-7 (earthly/heavenly duality).

³⁰ 95:3, 7; 96:1; 98:12.

³¹ 1) Deluge or first world judgment, 2) final world judgment at the beginning of the Messianic kingdom (10:6, 12c; 16:1), 3) judgment of the sword at the beginning of the Messianic kingdom when the righteous slay the wicked (50:2; 90:19; 91:12; 95:7), and 4) final world judgment at the close of the Messianic kingdom (94:9; 98:10; 100:4; 103:8; 104:5) with combinations of (2) & (3) in 48:8-10 and of (3) & (4) in 99:9 and 99:15, (*The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* [rev. ed.; Jerusalem: Makor, 1912] 84, footnote on 45:2). S. Aalen notes that in addition to 1 Enoch, a *two-stage judgment* (i.e., both an immediately post-mortem and a final universal judgment) can be found in Wis 4:7; 3:3; 3:1; 4:19 (“St. Luke’s Gospel and 1 Enoch,” *NTS* 13 [1966] 6-9).

achieved, which is not surprising in the light of 1 Enoch's composite nature.³² The righteous, or elect, who have suffered injustice during earthly existence,³³ may expect eternal life as a result of divine mercy in judgment.³⁴ In fact, it is the general pattern in Enoch that the righteous may expect mercy and no judgment, whereas the wicked experience judgment with no mercy at all.³⁵ As Sanders notes:

While the righteous are also said to be recompensed in the final judgment for their labours (103:3), the author characteristically thinks that the reward of the righteous in the resurrection will not be earned by works, but be given by the mercy of God; even the righteous man's continuing uprightness in the new life will be by grace.³⁶

Thus, although the righteous are certainly characterized as such by their conduct, and their salvation is manifestly related to "walking in the ways of righteousness,"³⁷ the clear impression is that a 'judgment according to deeds' is not expected for them. That judgment day is, instead, a 'day of covenant for the elect' (60:6). They are resurrected³⁸ and rewarded with everlasting life in the new age free of evil.³⁹ We should note here a developing dichotomy between 'judgment according to deeds' (for sinners, including sinners within Israel) and the rewarding of the righteous (i.e., by mercy).⁴⁰ Furthermore we see the beginnings of an individual judgment occur-

³² In addition to Charles (cited in the previous footnote), helpful discussions of judgment in 1 Enoch are given by E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 352-358, 361-362; M. Reiser, *Gerichtspredigt*, 36-54; and G. E. W. Nickelsburg, Jr., *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (HTS 26; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972) 112-130.

³³ 102:5 - such earthly suffering is termed a reversal of just recompense, since it was not "in accordance with your goodness."

³⁴ 62:16; see also chap 58.

³⁵ 5:5; 27:3-5; 45:6; 60:6, 25; [62:11-12]; 81:4; 94:10; 104:5; see also chap 50.

³⁶ *PPJ*, 356; with reference to 92:4-5 for this last point.

³⁷ 91:19; 94:1-5; 99:10. On the single mention of their recompense "for their labors" in final judgment (103:3), see n. 40 below.

³⁸ Not necessarily a *bodily* resurrection (103:3-4, 7-8); see G. E. W. Nickelsburg, Jr., *Resurrection*, 123.

³⁹ 103:3-4; 108:11-12; see also chap 51.

⁴⁰ Reference to a positive recompense according to deeds might be found in 103:3: "much good will be given to you in recompense for your toil" (cf. M. A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A new edition in the light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* [Vol 2; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978] 240). However, v 3b is omitted in the Greek MSS (= homoioteleuton; C. Bonner, *The Last Chapters of Enoch in Greek* [SD 8; London: Christophers, 1937] 64), and more likely speaks of

ring immediately after death alongside the older conception of a 'last judgment' upon nations or groups.⁴¹

The wicked of all generations are likewise removed from Sheol, but to judgment.⁴² All their deeds, even secret sins,⁴³ have been recorded on tablets,⁴⁴ and will be "revealed" in heaven (98:6), and read aloud (97:6-7). Thus "sinners shall be judged for their sins,"⁴⁵ and their actions "weighed in a balance."⁴⁶ Hence, for 1 Enoch, this last judgment is especially "the day of tribulation and pain" for sinners.⁴⁷ While the language of organic consequence is not lacking, it is clearly the forensic imagery which has come to the fore by this time.⁴⁸ Yet this does not mean that we have a formal judgment scene with the interrogation of witnesses, etc. In spite of the forensic elements, the verdict is predetermined, and the judgment consists largely in the finalizing of the sentence and execution of the punishment.⁴⁹

'replacement' (i.e., of evil in this life by good in the next; see L. Goldschmidt, *Das Buch Henoch: aus dem Aethiopischen in die ursprünglich hebräische Abfassungssprache* [microform; Berlin: Richard Heinrich, 1892] 67).

⁴¹ See above n. 31. See also W. Bousset and H. Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums*, 293-294; P. Volz, *Eschatologie*, 19-20; and G. E. W. Nickelsburg, Jr., *Resurrection*, 123-124.

⁴² Whether they are "resurrected" is disputed. 1 En 51:2 seems to assume a general raising of all those in Sheol ("he shall choose the righteous from among them," i.e., from among those raised(?) or removed from Sheol). See further G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., *Resurrection*, 123-124.

⁴³ 49:4; 61:9; [63:3]; cf. also 96:4 - "hearts reprimand" sinners as a "witness against you, as a record of your evil deeds" (= conscience; cf. Rom 2:14-15).

⁴⁴ 81:2; [89:62-64, 70-71, 76-77]; 98:7-8; 104:7.

⁴⁵ 38:1; 63:9; 95:4.

⁴⁶ 41:1; 61:8.

⁴⁷ 54:6; 55:3; 96:2.

⁴⁸ Thus, "they all stood before him. Then his judgment took place. . . . they received their judgment and were found guilty, and they went to the place of condemnation" (90:23-24). On the other hand, sinners will "fulfill the deeds of their hands and eat the produce of crime" (53:2).

⁴⁹ M. Reiser, *Gerichtspredigt*, 36-54.

1 Enoch 95:5 and 100:7

With this larger judgment context of the book now in view, we turn our investigation to the only two references to our motif:

Woe unto you who reward evil to your neighbors!
For you shall be rewarded in accordance with your deeds. (95:5)

Woe unto you, sinners, when you oppress the righteous ones, in the day of hard anguish, and burn them with fire!
You shall be recompensed according to your deeds.⁵⁰ (100:7)

Although both verses constitute a sentence of judgment upon sinners, it is commonly acknowledged that chapters 91-107 are really given for the comfort and encouragement of the suffering righteous. "The announcement of the sinners' judgment is given as a reason for the righteous to 'fear not'," ⁵¹ just as the announcement of the reward of the righteous comforts them and encourages endurance.⁵² This primary intent to comfort and encourage the righteous⁵³ may help to explain why in 1 Enoch, as well as in Jewish apocalyptic literature generally, judgment according to works focuses primarily on punishment for the wicked while proclaiming mercy to the righteous. It is not so much the correction of the errant, but solace for the suffering which prompts these statements.⁵⁴

Reference in both instances is to the final eschatological punishment of the wicked, perhaps carried out by the righteous themselves.⁵⁵ While heathen oppres-

⁵⁰ Isaac's MS A reads: "Their deeds shall be recompensed."

⁵¹ G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "The Apocalyptic Message of 1 Enoch 92-105," *CBQ* 39 (1977) 312; cf. 95:3, 5; 96:1; 97:1. See also C. Münchow, *Ethik*, 32.

⁵² 104:2. See also J. C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984) 172-173; and R. A. Coughenour, "The Woe-Oracles in Ethiopic Enoch," *JSJ* 9/2 (1978) 197.

⁵³ Though a mild, implied threat is also present; see below.

⁵⁴ The issue of the sins of the righteous and the necessary repentance from such is touched upon (5:8), but remains peripheral to the document's central concern. See J. C. VanderKam, *Enoch*, 173.

⁵⁵ "You righteous ones, fear not the sinners! For the Lord will again deliver them into your hands, so that you may carry out against them anything that you desire" (95:3). See above n. 31.

sors are undoubtedly included, there are clear indications that the wicked within Israel are equally the objects of this damnation. It is because of their mistreatment of their “neighbors” (95:5; also 99:11, 15) and “honored brother” (100:2) that they are recompensed by God. Their Jewishness is further confirmed by the fact that they “alter the words of truth” and “pervert the eternal law (vl. “covenant”)” (99:2).⁵⁶

Yet, as in the OT, it is not individual transgressions *per se* which cause these apostate Israelites to experience God’s damnation. Rather, the deeds manifest that they are “wicked in [their] hearts” (104:9) and “do not fear the Most High” (101:9), while those who are accounted righteous fear God and “walk in the path of his righteousness” (99:10; 101:1).⁵⁷ It would appear that the use of the motif to threaten fundamentally disloyal members of the covenant community with ultimate destruction was very much alive just prior to the common era. Yet while acknowledging this fact, we should also note that this is not, strictly speaking, an individual judgment, but the sentencing and punishment of a group (‘sinners’) for the comfort and encouragement of the righteous.

In spite of the centrality of the judgment theme in this book, we note the relatively sparse use of our motif. It was apparently one among many prophetic and wisdom motifs which the apocalyptic writer, as a compiler of existing traditions, used in the attempt to provide a necessary eschatological framework to his ethical exhortation, since he saw no more improvement of the lot of the righteous in this life.⁵⁸ Its use is, perhaps, motivated in part by the attitude of the ‘sinners’ who fear no recompense after death:

As we die, so do the righteous die. *What then have they gained by their deeds?* Behold, like us they died in grief and in darkness, and *what have they more than we?* From now on we have become equal. What will they receive or what will they see forever?

⁵⁶ Cf. also 46:7b-8: “But they deny the name of the Lord of the Spirits. Yet they like to congregate in his houses and (with) the faithful ones who cling to the Lord of the Spirits.” See further E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 352-354 for identification of ‘sinners’ as both apostate Israelites (collaborators) and Gentile oppressors; also P. Volz, *Eschatologie*, 18-19.

⁵⁷ On the unity of deeds and “Glaubenshaltung” in 1 En, see C. Münchow, *Ethik*, 34.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 41-42.

(102:6b-8b; also 104:7)

Unfortunately our two motif passages are not extant in their original Hebrew or Aramaic form,⁵⁹ and only 100:7 is found in a single Greek translation:

ὅτι κομειῖσθε κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ὑμῶν.⁶⁰

The use of κομειῖσθε (“receive (back)” [pay, wages, reward])⁶¹ occurs here for the first time in the motif,⁶² but will become more common in the NT.⁶³

In both instances of the motif the correspondence pattern is emphasized,⁶⁴ bringing assurance to the godly (and warning to the wicked) that the wickedness of the wicked will not be forgotten as the latter assume, but repaid in kind. This note of the *certainty* of recompense is further reinforced in 100:10: “And now, do know that your deeds shall be investigated.” The certainty of eschatological recompense is meant to restore the courage of the righteous in a violent situation which threatens their confidence in an orderly and just world.⁶⁵

THE USE OF THE MOTIF IN THE PSALMS OF SOLOMON

Judgment And Salvation In The Psalms Of Solomon: An Overview

God’s *righteous judgments* are praised throughout these psalms.⁶⁶ Although this judgment can be worked out in this world and life (e.g., 4:14-22), it is more

⁵⁹ Lazarus Goldschmidt’s attempted translation from Ethiopic into Hebrew reads:

כי כפי מעשיכם יגמל לכם (95:5)

כי כפי מעשיכם יגמל לכם ביום המצוקה הגדולה (100:7),

but is of dubious value for our purposes (*Das Buch Henoch*, 62 and 65).

⁶⁰ M. Black, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970) 40; and C. Bonner, *The Last Chapters of Enoch in Greek*, 51.

⁶¹ Cf. 2 Macc 8:33 (“these received the proper reward for their impiety”); *BAGD* (442) suggests *μισθόν* as the understood subject in 1 En 100:7; but see our comments on the meaning of this verb in 2 Cor 5:10 (pp. 324-326).

⁶² Sir 16:14 has a similar formulation: “everyone will find (*εὐρήσει/מצא*) according to his/her deeds” (cf. p. 56 above).

⁶³ 2 Cor 5:10; Col 3:25; Eph 6:8. This usage is not at all surprising, since it was common to speak of one *receiving [good/evil] from God on account of good or evil behavior* (cf. Tob 4:14; 14:10; Wis 5:16; Sir 12:5-6; 1 Macc 2:51, 56).

⁶⁴ Those who “repay” evil to their neighbors will themselves be “repaid” according to these deeds (95:5). The persecutors will be persecuted (95:7), and those who “burn” the righteous

commonly conceived of in eschatological terms, leading to eternal life for the righteous and eternal destruction for sinners and hypocrites,⁶⁷ and taking place on a universal scale.⁶⁸ One striking thing about this doctrine of judgment is its thoroughgoing covenantal background, and the centrality of chastisement or discipline as the lot of God's people.⁶⁹ Israel cannot ultimately be rejected in God's judgment (7:8), something which is grounded in God's eternal covenant with her.⁷⁰ Although a certain universalistic tendency is to be noted,⁷¹ it is clear that faithful Israelites are treated differently than others, and this can be summed up in the words *mercy* and *discipline*. The PssSol repeatedly stress God's mercy upon those who fear him, love him, obey him, and endure his discipline.⁷² While such mercy can be understood as cleansing and forgiving,⁷³ it is most commonly seen as corrective discipline

with fire will themselves be burned "in blazing flames worse than fire" (100:7, 9).

⁶⁵ See Kuck's depiction of the *Sitz* of 1 En 1-36 (*Judgment*, 71).

⁶⁶ E.g., 2:10, (15, 19); 5:1; 8:8, 24; 9:2.

⁶⁷ Eternal life: 3:12; 13:11. Eternal destruction: 2:31; 3:11; 15:10-13. See also the recompense envisioned for the coming Messianic kingdom, PssSol 17-18.

⁶⁸ 8:24; 9:2.

⁶⁹ Cf. E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 390-391; G. Maier, *Mensch und freier Wille: Nach den jüdischen Religionsparteien zwischen Ben Sira und Paulus* (WUNT 12; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1971) 320-324; and J. Schüpphaus, *Die Psalmen Salomos: Ein Zeugnis Jerusalemer Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts* (ALGHJ 7; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977) 83-107.

⁷⁰ 9:8-11; 10:4; 18:3. See also the concluding phrase, "May the mercy of the Lord be upon the house of Israel forevermore" (9:11; 11:11).

⁷¹ 5:15; 17:34b; 'no partiality' 2:18. "Universalism" is here used in the sense "Jew and non-Jew alike."

⁷² 2:33; 4:25; 6:6; 7:6, 10; 8:27; 10:3; 13:12; 14:9; 15:13; 16:15; 18:5, 9. H. Braun finds two kinds of mercy—one undeserved and one earned—but he ignores the covenantal context of the statements and thus theorizes a false dialectic between grace and works ("Vom Erbarmen Gottes über den Gerechten: Zur Theologie der Psalmen Salomos," *Gesammelte Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt*³ [Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1971] 8-69, esp. 18-35 [= *ZNW* 43 (1950/1951) 1-54]).

⁷³ 9:6-7; 13:10.

preempting condemning judgment.⁷⁴ By acceptance of such discipline upon their unintentional sins,⁷⁵ the errant are brought back into the way of the Lord, their purity is restored or maintained,⁷⁶ and they thus “prove God’s judgments right.”⁷⁷ Thus, for the devout, the day of judgment is in fact the “day of mercy.”⁷⁸ The righteous are those who maintain faithful obedience to God’s gracious covenant with Israel, though such obedience is nowhere understood as flawless perfection.⁷⁹

Interestingly, the soteriological distinction between Jewish and non-Jewish sinners is removed, much as in Paul’s letters.⁸⁰ Both receive the same epithets (ἁμαρτωλός, ἄνομος) and are characterized by the same inward attitudes. Thus the terms “sinner” and “righteous” are not *qualitative* but *relational* concepts as in the OT.⁸¹ While judgment is expressly “according to deeds/sins,” this is not conceived as a legalistic measuring of merit, but such deeds *confirm* or *deny* one’s status vis-à-vis God; they do not *create* such status. As stated already, within this covenant framework, provision is made for unintentional transgressions. The judgment/salvation of the righteous is therefore viewed as a matter of divine mercy.

By contrast, sinners will be punished without mercy, according to their actions. This applies in these psalms especially to the hypocrites and sinners *within*

⁷⁴ 13:10 - sins are wiped away through discipline; cf. also 3:4; 7:3, 9; 8:26c, 29; 10:1-4; 13:7, 8-10; 14:1; 16:4, 11; 17:42; 18:4, 7-8.

⁷⁵ 3:7, 8; 18:4b. Sanders contends that in the PssSol 16:1-4 “even serious departure from God can be forgiven” (PPJ, 398).

⁷⁶ 3:7; 10:3; 17:26-27.

⁷⁷ 2:15; 3:3, 5; 4:8; 8:7, 26; 9:2. On this phrase see OTP, 652 n. p.

⁷⁸ 14:9; 18:9 (= Messianic era).

⁷⁹ See J. Schüpphaus, *Die Psalmen Salomos*, 101-102. On the sins and imperfections of the righteous, see 13:5, 10; 3:7; 9:4; 9:7; 17:5; 8:29; 16:1, 3, all of which are unintentional (cf. 3:8; 13:7; 18:4).

⁸⁰ See esp. D. Lührmann’s analysis of the theological continuity between PssSol and Paul, “Paul and the Pharisaic Tradition,” JSNT 36 (1989) 75-94.

⁸¹ Against H. Braun, “Vom Erbarmen Gottes,” 25-29; see J. Schüpphaus, *Die Psalmen Salomos*, 96, 118-121.

the covenant people, who reject discipline and depart from God's ways.⁸² Even their secret sins will be exposed when they are "condemned by the thoughts of their hearts."⁸³ The hypocrites differ from the others in the nation, in that their sins are intentional and are of a fundamental nature, amounting to rejection of the commandments.⁸⁴ Thus their punishment is ultimate and eternal and amounts to exclusion from the elects' salvation.⁸⁵ Maier is probably correct that there is no resurrection unto judgment in the PssSol. Rather, the righteous are raised not to judgment but to eternal life, while the wicked are judged and punished without being raised bodily.⁸⁶

The foregoing outline of soteriology in the PssSol differs markedly from an older but still prevalent interpretation as typical legalistic Pharisaism.⁸⁷ The identification of the theology of the PssSol with later first century CE Pharisaism is being increasingly challenged by scholars, and it is better to characterize this work as an expression of early Palestinian hasidism.⁸⁸

The Psalms of Solomon 2:7, 16, 25, 34-35

The second psalm justifies God's destruction of Jerusalem (vv 1-21) and implores him now to relent (vv 22-37), and in so doing utilizes our motif several

⁸² 4:1-3, 14-22; 8:8-22. On the identification of "sinners" and "righteous," see J. Schüpphaus, *Die Psalmen Salomos*, 94-105.

⁸³ 4:5, 7, 11b; 8:8; 9:3; 14:8; 17:25b.

⁸⁴ See E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 396, 400-406: "have sinned in such a way as to break the covenant between God and Israel" (404); also G. Maier, *Mensch und freier Wille*, 318-319.

⁸⁵ 15:13b; 14:9; 13:11; 3:11.

⁸⁶ *Mensch und freier Wille*, 295.

⁸⁷ A classic expression of this view was put forth by Herbert Braun, "Das Erbarmen Gottes," 8-69.

⁸⁸ See J. O'Dell, "The Religious Background of the Psalms of Solomon," *RQ* 3 (1961-1962) 241-257 (earlier literature is cited on pp. 252-254); E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 388, esp. nn. 4-5; and J. Schüpphaus, *Die Psalmen Salomos*, 127-137. Some, while still using the designation "Pharisaic," differentiate the covenantal nomism of the PssSol from a later Pharisaic "Gesetzesfrömmigkeit": A. Büchler, *Types of Jewish-Palestinian Piety from 70 B.C.E to 70 C.E.* (New York: KTAV, 1968 [orig. 1922] 128-195); and D. Lührmann, "Paul and the Pharisaic Tradition," 75-94. Otherwise G. Maier = "das 'normale' Pharisaertum" (*Mensch und freier Wille*, 293, also 300).

times.⁸⁹ After noting that God “did not interfere” (i.e., to protect Israel) when Pompey destroyed Jerusalem (2:1-2), the psalmist blames Israel for this judgment: “Because the sons of Jerusalem defiled the sanctuary of the Lord” (2:3-5).

He did (this) to them according to their sins,
so that he abandoned them to the hands of those who prevailed (2:7).
Κατὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν ἐποίησεν αὐτοῖς.⁹⁰

For you have rewarded the sinners according to their actions,
and according to their extremely wicked sins. (2:16)
ὅτι ἀπέδωκας τοῖς ἀμαρτωλοῖς κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν
καὶ κατὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν τὰς πονηρὰς σφόδρα.

Although this certainly does not spell the final rejection of Israel as God’s covenant people (cf. vv 22ff), the judgment does not seem to be corrective, but is strictly punitive.⁹¹ This generation of Jerusalemites must be removed far from God and his mercy and their memory obliterated from the earth, that the earth might know God’s righteous judgments (2:10) and God be proved right (2:15). Their disobedience is so grave (“their extremely wicked sins,” v 16) that the psalmist classes these Israelites with the sinners, whose judgment they now must share. As was the case in the OT, our motif is here associated with divine impartiality (v 18: “God is a righteous judge, he will not be impressed by appearances”), aimed in this case most likely at the privileged Hasmoneans to support their classification with the sinners. Thus, the motif is applied to groups within the elect nation who are cut off from God and his

⁸⁹ PssSol 9:5c does not conform to our motif-requirements, but is almost certainly a variation of the same:

for the Lord’s righteous judgments are according to the individual and the household.
τὰ γὰρ κρίματα κυρίου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ κατ’ ἄνδρα καὶ οἶκον.

The unusual κατ’ ἄνδρα καὶ οἶκον highlights individual accountability versus corporate responsibility, as in Ezek 18. Thus the doing of righteousness (= saving up life, v 5a) lies in the responsibility and choice of the individual (or one’s ‘house’) in contrast to the position that the individual is subject (without personal choice) to the fate of the nation. Against the more common interpretation of vv 4-5 as containing a doctrine of free will (Maier) or *Werkoptimismus* (Braun), see J. Schüpphaus, *Die Psalmen Salomos*, 102-104, n. 257.

⁹⁰ The Greek text of PssSol is taken from A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta* (2 vols.; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935) 2.471-490.

⁹¹ Cf. vv 4, 7b, 8a, 17b, 21. The appeal for God to relent (vv 22ff) is not motivated by Israel’s acceptance of chastisement, but is argued because of the unholy motives of the heathen conquerors (vv 23-24).

covenant mercy forever by a disobedience so extremely wicked that it amounts to a fundamental breaking of the covenant.

Verse 22 marks a turning point, now imploring God to judge the heathen conquerors and relent in his punishment of Jerusalem. This is not because of any repentance on Israel's part, but solely because the heathen "ridiculed [Jerusalem] and did not refrain in anger and vicious rage. . . . they have not done it in zeal, but in emotional passion" (2:22-23). Lest Jerusalem be finished off (v 23b), the psalmist appeals:

Do not delay, O God, to repay to them on (their) heads. (2:25)
 μὴ χρονίσῃς, ὁ θεός, τοῦ ἀποδοῦναι αὐτοῖς εἰς κεφαλὰς.

Although no 'deeds' are included in this formulation, it undoubtedly reflects the Hebrew phrase—'to return *one's deeds* upon one's head.'⁹² Possibly by this time the original sense of organic consequences is yielding to a greater focus on punishment and vengeance, and the phrase means 'to bring punishment on their head.' The psalmist records the answer to his appeal in vv 26-27, probably a reference to Pompey's subsequent ignominious demise, and now interpreted as "eternal destruction in dishonor" (v 31).⁹³

A concluding summons to praise (vv 33-37) highlights the differential treatment accorded sinners and righteous:

Praise God, you who fear the Lord with understanding,
 for the Lord's mercy is upon those who fear him with judgment.
 To separate between the righteous and the sinner
to repay sinners forever according to their actions
 And to have mercy on the righteous (keeping him) from the humiliation of the sinner,
and to repay the sinner for what he has done to the righteous (2:33-35).

ἀποδοῦναι ἁμαρτωλοῖς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν,
 καὶ ἀποδοῦναι ἁμαρτωλῷ ἀνθ' ὧν ἐποίησεν δικαίῳ.

As consistently in this psalm, repayment according to deeds is applied only to sin-

⁹² Heb.: הָשִׁיב עַל רֹאשׁ (J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes*, 28). Becker, however, incorrectly limits the meaning in this context (following K. Koch) to immanent consequences.

⁹³ R. B. Wright, *OTP*, 2.653, n. c2.

ners, whereas the righteous are dealt with according to God's mercy.⁹⁴ Such a differentiation is not intended as an abrogation of the principle of recompense in the case of the righteous;⁹⁵ rather it testifies to the centrality of divine mercy and empowerment in the salvation of the faithful (v 36).⁹⁶ The motif, however, is used solely in terms of punishment, and highlights especially the justice and certainty of God's judgment of the wicked as a form of comfort for the righteous. Ἀποδίδωμι is the preferred verb for the motif, though not exclusively.⁹⁷

The Psalms of Solomon 17:8-9

This same justice and certainty of divine judgment is brought out in the seventeenth psalm.

You rewarded (lit. will reward) them, O God, according to their sins;
it happened to them according to their actions.
 According to their actions,⁹⁸ God showed no mercy to them;
 he hunted down their descendants, and did not let even one of them go.
 The Lord is faithful in all his judgments which he makes in the world.
 (17:8-10)

κατὰ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα αὐτῶν ἀποδώσεις αὐτοῖς, ὁ θεός,
 εὐρεθῆναι αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν.
 οὐκ ἠλέησεν⁹⁹ αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός.

Exactly as in the second psalm, the motif refers exclusively to punishment against

⁹⁴ This contrast is brought out most strongly in v 36b where God is said "to treat his devout in accordance with his mercy."

⁹⁵ As we noted above, the principle applies without partiality even to Israelites guilty of "extremely wicked sins" = who break the covenant.

⁹⁶ Sanders argues that this merciful treatment is so formulated to avoid saying that God rewards the righteous for their merits. Though probably a correct guess, Sanders can offer no explicit evidence from the PssSol for this particular contrast (*PPJ*, 395; against H. Braun, "Vom Erbarmen Gottes," 8-69).

⁹⁷ Ἀποδίδωμι: 2:16, 25, 34, 35; 17:8. Ποιέω: 2:7. Ἐυρεθῆναι: 17:8b.

⁹⁸ This second "according to their actions" is omitted in several of the Greek MSS and in the Syriac version.

⁹⁹ All the Greek MSS read ἐλέησει (future), but this is probably a corruption prompted by the future verb in verse 8a. R. Hann terms this a 'coincidental' agreement of the extant MSS against the conjectured original (*The Manuscript History of the Psalms of Solomon* [SBLSCS 13; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1982] 99). See also J. Schüpphaus (*Die Psalmen Salomos*, 67, n. 303) arguing for an original Hebrew imperfect. S. Holm-Nielsen favors the future reading ("Die Psalmen Salomos," 99, notes).

sinners, again the Hasmoneans¹⁰⁰ who rose up against the devout (v 5), set up an arrogant and illegitimate monarchy in Jerusalem (vv 5-6), and were then overthrown by Pompey (v 7). Though Jews, they have no part in the “promise” (v 5b), but are “arrogant sinners,” classed with the Gentiles in contrast to the “holy people” who will be gathered under the Messiah (v 26).

As in psalm 2, when God repays sinners according to their sins it occurs as a merciless hunting down of the wicked which is praised in v 10 as his “faithfulness in judgment.” Both here and in psalm 2 the judgment spoken of is historical (Pompey), though it is meant to be understood as typical of eternal judgment (cf. 2:31, 35). The result is in any case the exclusion from divine grace and salvation.

Sanders notes in these psalms a tension between “rewarding the righteous according to their deeds” and “according to God’s mercy.”

The righteous on the one hand do obey the law (Ps. 14) and God is faithful to reward obedience, just as he punishes disobedience. On the other hand, the salvation of the righteous is due not to their own merits, but purely to the mercy of God [15:13], who chose them and who forgives them.¹⁰¹

And it is true, as we have noted above, that the PssSol fairly consistently refrain from speaking of judgment or recompense upon the righteous according to their deeds.¹⁰² However, that this decline in the use of the recompense motif in reference to the righteous is due to some *theological tension* between grace and works (so Braun) is unlikely in the light of the covenant framework of these sayings. Rather, as Sanders himself concludes, the resolution may be more psychological than theological, arising from a proper attitude of humility on the part of the righteous:

When speaking *of God*, one can say that he is a just judge who rewards and punishes in accord with fulfillment and transgression. When speaking of one’s own treatment by God, however, *particularly in the form of prayer to God*, one would hesitate to attribute good treatment by God to one’s own merit. Before God, man can best hope for mercy.¹⁰³

¹⁰⁰ R. B. Wright, *OTP*, 2.665. n. c; and J. Schüpphaus, *Die Psalmen Salomos*, 65-67.

¹⁰¹ *PPJ*, 393.

¹⁰² 9:5 may be the exception. Cf. H. Braun, “Vom Erbarmen Gottes,” 36.

¹⁰³ *PPJ*, 395.

Büchler's rhetorical explanation also merits mention; the author's purpose in the PssSol was—

to prove, perhaps against some writer who declared the catastrophe an undeserved and harsh punishment and questioned God's justice, that it was fully merited, and that God's justice was vindicated by having punished the sinners measure for measure. That is also the reason why the author dealt so frequently with the problem of punishment, and only very incidentally and casually with that of the reward of the righteous.¹⁰⁴

THE USE OF THE MOTIF IN JOSEPH AND ASENETH

Joseph and Aseneth 28:3

The date and provenance of this work are difficult to pinpoint. It was most likely composed between 100 BCE and 135 CE, with a majority of scholars choosing an Egyptian origin. The work is clearly Jewish, with some Christian interpolations, and “enhances our knowledge of Greek-speaking Judaism around the beginning of the present era.”¹⁰⁵ Scholars remain divided as to its purpose and audience, viewing it either as a *Missionsschrift* addressed to potential Gentile converts, or as a means of *strengthening the faith* of Jews and/or Gentile believers.¹⁰⁶ Our motif occurs only once:

And we have wickedly committed evil (things) against you and against our brother Joseph; and the Lord repaid us according to our works. (28:3)
καὶ κύριος ἀνταπέδωκεν ἡμῖν κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν.

This text refers to God's intervention on behalf of Aseneth against her (Jewish) oppressors. The latter take up the motif here as part of their confession of sin and plea for clemency (= justification of God's actions against them). The divine repayment consists in their swords falling from their hands before they could attack Aseneth (27:11), and thus takes place on a mundane level. From this text it is

¹⁰⁴ *Piety*, 168, n. 1.

¹⁰⁵ C. Burchard, *OTP*, 2.187.

¹⁰⁶ See G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., “Joseph and Aseneth,” *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* 2/2 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1984) 69-70 (to Gentile converts); C. Burchard, *OTP*, 2.195 (to Jewish readers). For a strong argument that its central concern was “to enhance that status of gentile converts in the Jewish community,” see R. D. Chestnutt, “The Social Setting and Purpose of Joseph and Aseneth,” *JSP* 2 (1988) 21-48, quotation p. 42.

clear that the motif has not been exclusively eschatologized, but can still be used to refer to divine interventions within this world. On the other hand, this is clearly far beyond any organic consequence. This understanding of the event as a divine retribution in the historical sphere fits in well with the general thrust of the second part of this story (chapters 22-29): God's deliverance is promised to proselytes and is demonstrated by the fact that God is with his new convert, protecting her in mortal danger.¹⁰⁷ Thus the motif attests that God is indeed with Aseneth, protecting her by repaying her enemies according to their evil deeds against her. This use of the motif as a piece of narrative explanation comes closest to our category of justifying God, but, in its larger context, functions as a comfort to the righteous that God will indeed be with them protecting them.

Eschatology in Joseph and Aseneth

In spite of the non-eschatological motif usage, the work as a whole exhibits a form of Jewish realized eschatology alongside a future eschatological dimension: "Alle Proselyten werden als Lohn für ihren Übertritt zum jüdischen Glauben nach ihrem Tod in den himmlischen Ruheort eingehen."¹⁰⁸ Entry into the heavenly rest is portrayed as "ein individuelles postmortales Heil . . . , durch das der mit der Bekehrung begonnene Heilsweg zum Abschluß gebracht wird."¹⁰⁹ However, whether "JA [JosAsen] mit einem jenseitigen Strafgericht Gottes über die Gottlosen rechnet, ist nicht mit Sicherheit zu sagen."¹¹⁰ Thus it is in general, "daß JA eine individuelle Jenseitserwartung vertritt, für die nicht der eschatologisch-apokalyptische Dualismus von dieser und der kommenden Welt kennzeichnend ist,

¹⁰⁷ G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., "Joseph and Aseneth," 65-71; see also JosAsen 26:2; 27:10-11.

¹⁰⁸ U. Fischer, *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* (BZNW 44; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1978) 113, see also 106-112.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 113.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 114; he notes that 83:6-7 and 84:6-7 could be "uneschatologisch gemeint" (114, n. 34).

sondern die mit einem definitiven postmortalen Heil im Himmel und einem definitiven postmortalen Verderben in der Hölle rechnet.”¹¹¹ It is possible that this form of judgment eschatology (i.e., individual immediate post-mortem judgment versus final universal last judgment) is a result of Hellenistic influence.¹¹²

THE USE OF THE MOTIF IN PSEUDO-PHILO’S BIBLICAL ANTIQUITIES¹¹³

LAB 3:10

This work “seems to reflect the milieu of the Palestinian synagogues at the turn of the common era,” and thus not that of any single group.¹¹⁴ Only later Latin translations are extant, the work being originally composed in Hebrew and soon thereafter translated into Greek. It would appear to be part of Jewish *aporiai* (“difficulties”) literature “intended to correct certain misconceptions about Judaism” and about Bible difficulties by supplying additional information not found in the biblical text.¹¹⁵

Chapter three is a retelling of the Flood narrative (Gen 6-9). In recounting God’s promise never again to curse the earth in this way (v 9 = Gen 8:21-22) the statement is made that this promise is valid “until the appointed times are fulfilled,”

¹¹¹ Ibid., 115. On the identification of this individual post-mortem resting place with the heavenly Jerusalem, see pp. 115-123.

¹¹² See D. Kuck, *Judgment*, 255-260; G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., *Resurrection*, 68-72; R. Bauckham, “Early Jewish Visions of Hell,” *JTS* ns 41 (1990) 355-85; W. Bousset and H. Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums*, 293-295; and R. H. Charles, *Eschatology*, 142-156, 305-306.

¹¹³ Hereafter abbreviated *LAB* after the Latin title of this pseudonymous work (*Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*).

¹¹⁴ D. J. Harrington, *OTP*, 2.300. He dates *LAB* between 135 BCE and 100 CE (299).

¹¹⁵ See the “Prolegomenon” by Louis Feldman in M. R. James, *Biblical Antiquities* (Translations of Early Documents 1: Palestinian Jewish Texts; New York: KTAV, 1971 [repr. London: 1917]) xxxiii-xlvi; and P. Winter, art. “Philo, Biblical Antiquities of,” *Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible* (New York: 1962) 3.796.

leading the author to insert a brief excursus pertaining to that future time when a (final) judgment will once again take place.

But when the years appointed for the world have been fulfilled, then the light will cease and the darkness will fade away. And I will bring the dead to life and raise up those who are sleeping from the earth. And hell will pay back its debt, and the place of perdition will return its deposit so that I may render to each according to his works and according to the fruits of his own devices, until¹¹⁶ I judge between soul and flesh. And the world will cease, and death will be abolished, and hell will shut its mouth. And the earth will not be without progeny or sterile for those inhabiting it; and no one who has been pardoned [Lat. *iustificatus est*] by me will be tainted. And there will be another earth and another heaven, an everlasting dwelling place. (3:10)

Here we have an instance of the motif plainly set within an eschatological judgment scene taking place at the end of this age and introducing the eternal age.¹¹⁷ A general resurrection to judgment may be envisioned, reminiscent of the language of Isa 26:19 and Dan 12:2 (though see below). Up to this point, the dead have been kept in “chambers”;¹¹⁸ whereby already a division between the righteous and the wicked had taken place. The intermediate abode of the righteous is described as “the repose of the just” (28:10) whose lot there is “eternal life . . . in peace” (23:13) and who resemble the stars,¹¹⁹ while the wicked are kept in darkness and fire.¹²⁰ Though we cannot be certain, the first phrase, with its reference to resurrection (“I will bring the dead to life and raise up those who are sleeping from the earth”), may pertain only to the righteous,¹²¹ while the second phrase (“hell [Sheol]

¹¹⁶ Or “inasmuch as,” i.e., judgment is simultaneous to recompense rather than subsequent to it; cf. G. Stemberger, *Der Leib der Auferstehung: Studien zur Anthropologie und Eschatologie des palästinischen Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter (ca. 170 v.Ch. - 100 n.Ch.)* (AnBib 56; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1972) 108.

¹¹⁷ M. Reiser, *Gerichtspredigt*, 95; G. Dellling, “Die Weise, von der Zeit zu reden, im Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum,” *NovT* 13 (1971) 306.

¹¹⁸ 15:5; 32:13.

¹¹⁹ 33:5; cf. also Dan 12:2-3.

¹²⁰ 15:5; 16:3; 23:6; 51:5; 63:4.

¹²¹ So also 19:12: “And I will raise up you [Moses] and your fathers from the land of Egypt in which you sleep and you will come together and dwell in the immortal dwelling place that is not subject to time.”

will pay back its debt, and the place of perdition [Abaddon] will return its deposit”) refers to the wicked only.¹²²

Although it is possible that the ensuing recompense according to deeds has both the righteous and the wicked in view, and thus a dual recompense,¹²³ it more likely has reference only to the punishment of the wicked, since the phrase “fruits of his own devices” hints at evil deeds.¹²⁴ Thus the wicked are brought forth from their dark chambers for the express purpose of receiving their final recompense from God (*ut reddam unicuique*). The standard against which they are measured is elsewhere termed the “everlasting Law” (11:2). The final result of this judgment upon all the wicked is nowhere made explicit, but is surely some form of destruction since it is modelled upon the Flood-judgment (3:1-9). The righteous, on the other hand, are resurrected directly to their “immortal dwelling place” (19:12-13) on the renewed and fruitful earth (3:10b). This is the “new age” (23:8), which is “without measure” (34:3), and which belongs to those who have been “justified” by God (3:10).¹²⁵

What then is the purpose of this eschatological insertion into the Flood account? If LAB is primarily a piece of Jewish apologetic literature designed to resolve Bible difficulties and other misconceptions about Judaism, then the purpose of 3:10 will consist in averting any sense of moral laxity which might arise from a misinterpretation of God’s promise never again to destroy mankind as he had at the

¹²² Cf. 33:3; for this idea of restoring the deposit, cf. also 2 Bar 21:23; 1 En 51:1; 4 Ezra 4:41-43.

¹²³ A positive recompense is envisioned in 64:7 (see below).

¹²⁴ Lat. *adinventionum*. M. R. James translates “fruit of their imaginations” (*Biblical Antiquities*, 82). An exact equivalent is found at Jer 6:19: “Hear, O earth; I am going to bring disaster on this people, the fruit of their schemes (Heb. מַחֲשָׁבָה = evil schemes).” More common in the OT was the phrase “fruit of their practices” (Heb. מַעֲלָל; Gk. ἐπιτηδεύματα) with reference to an evil way of life (cf. Jer 17:10; 21:14; 32:19; Mic 7:13; but referring to *righteous* practices in Isa 3:10). See also on 4:10 below.

¹²⁵ See also 32:17. The eschatological end = *tempus iustificationibus* (vl.: *iustificatis*) *suis*, “time of his justifications” (see M. Reiser, *Gerichtspredigt*, 97 and n. 18). On ‘justified’ in 3:10, see E. Reinmuth, “Beobachtungen zum Verständnis des Gesetzes im Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum,” *JSJ* 20/2 (1989) 161-162.

Flood. Thus the writer qualifies that promise by the addition, “until the appointed times are fulfilled” (3:9b). The miniature apocalypse of 3:10 highlights the need for obedience in this age in the light of the final judgment according to deeds, at which time God will once again destroy the earth as at the Flood. That moral laxity may have been on the author’s mind is confirmed by another insertion in the middle of v 9:

*And God said, “I will never again curse the earth on man’s account, for the tendency of man’s heart is foolish from his youth; and so I will never destroy all living creatures at one time as I have done. But when those inhabiting the earth sin, I will judge them by famine or by the sword or by fire or by death; and there will be earthquakes, and they will be scattered to uninhabited places. But no more will I destroy the earth by the water of the flood.”*¹²⁶

Thus God’s promise is given two more qualifications (against possible misunderstanding); namely, (a) God will continue to ‘judge’ those who sin, even destroying them by death; and (b) the promise refers only to the repeated destruction of the earth by flood waters, leaving the way open for a future universal destruction. For any readers, and especially Jews, who may have fallen prey to such a misunderstanding,¹²⁷ the text functions as an exhortation, a warning against disobedience in the light of coming judgment, and encouraging obedience in view of the resurrection of the just.¹²⁸

LAB 44:10

Although the precise idiom of ‘recompense according to deeds’ is not utilized in 44:10, the pronounced correspondence pattern merits comment. Concluding a

¹²⁶ The biblical citation (Gen 8:21) is in italics, the non-italicized portion is the author’s addition.

¹²⁷ Note the lengthy expansion of the tradition about Kenaz (chaps 25-26) centering around his discovery of apostates among the people and God’s destruction of them. See also E. Reinmuth (“‘Nicht vergeblich’ bei Paulus und Pseudo-Philo Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum,” *NovT* 33/2 [1991] 97-123) who argues that both Paul and Pseudo-Philo are grappling with the same problem of “die theologischen Bedingungen der Erwählungs- und Heilsgemeinschaft Israels” (121). I.e., who is the ‘true Israel’?

¹²⁸ See also M. Reiser (*Gerichtspredigt*, 97-98), who notes the close similarity in eschatological conceptions between LAB and 4 Ezra 7:32-38, including “der ausdrücklich genannte paränetische Zweck” (cf. LAB 33:1-5; 4 Ezra 9:7-12; 14:34-35). For a different view, see F. J. Murphy, “The Eternal Covenant in Pseudo-Philo,” *JSP* 3 (1988) 43-57: “to reassure and give hope to a beleaguered people” (44).

lengthy expansion of the OT account of the idolatry and punishment of the Ephraimite, Micah, and his mother,¹²⁹ the author appends a general divine warning:

but to every man there will be such a punishment that in whatever sin he shall have sinned, in this he will be judged. And if they have lied before me, I will command the heaven and it will deny them rain. And if anyone wished to covet the wife of his neighbor, I will command death and it will deny them the fruit of their womb. And if they will make a false declaration in my name, I will not hear their prayers. And when the soul is separated from the body, then they will say, 'Let us not mourn over these things that we suffer; but because whatever we ourselves have devised, these will we receive.'

Judgment (= punishment) will correspond to the particular form of one's sin.¹³⁰ Although this form of judgment is announced to "the race of men," it is clear that Israelites are particularly in view (44:6-8). The last phrase of v 10 stresses that this eschatological punishment¹³¹ will be far worse than any earthly suffering they may have experienced, and functions as a warning to the wayward.

Sin in this case is "departing from the Lord" (44:6) characterized by transgression of the Decalogue (44:6-7). Harrington notes, "(a)t the basis of Pseudo-Philo's views on God and humanity is the biblical notion of covenant."¹³² He points especially to the "Deuteronomic concept of history (sin-punishment-salvation)" which he finds at 3:9-10; 12:4; 13:10; and 19:2-5. We might add, that which excludes the individual or nation from participation in salvation in LAB is a "heart turned away from God" (25:3; 26:2), or to "depart from His name" (21:10). Perfectionistic legalism would seem to be excluded by 25:7 which teaches that confession of sin with temporal destruction *may* (though not automatically) avert eternal condemnation.

¹²⁹ 44:1-9; cf. also Judg 17-18.

¹³⁰ On the development of this correspondence pattern in the OT, see P. D. Miller Jr., *Sin and Judgment*; also E. Reinmuth, "Beobachtungen," 161-162.

¹³¹ "when the soul is separated from the body," i.e., at death. Thus the last sentence ("Let us not mourn . . .") is ostensibly being spoken by the wicked in their intermediate 'chambers' (cf. on 3:10 above) in view of what they are yet to receive at the final Judgment ("these we will receive").

¹³² *OTP*, 2.301.

LAB 64:7

This text does not contain the motif, but has an interesting reference to the day of judgment as “the time for being rendered the reward of my deeds.” This is spoken by Samuel upon being called forth (post-mortem) by the witch of Endor; and the section is, in part, an apologetic against necromancy.¹³³ The viewpoint that the deceased Samuel is *awaiting* the final day of recompense corresponds with what we discovered in chapter 3 about the intermediate state. The coming day does not appear to carry any tone of anxiety or terror for the righteous Samuel, who knows that on that day the final recompense of his deeds will be rewarded him. As we surmised above, this may likely be due to the belief that the righteous do not actually go through the same judgment process which awaits the wicked. Though the motif is not used, this text demonstrates that the concept of a positive recompense according to deeds for the righteous was still prevalent.

THE USE OF THE MOTIF IN 2 BARUCH

The Historical Setting of 2 Baruch

Written in Palestine following the destruction of the temple in 70 CE, this work shows close acquaintance with traditions we know from later Jewish rabbinical literature.¹³⁴ Although there can be no question of any literary influence on Paul, we may assume that many of the ideas presented were current in Paul’s day. With the cultic center of Judaism removed, the central concern of 2 Bar “is the continued efficacy of the covenant which God made with His people through Abraham and Moses.”¹³⁵ The author “was convinced that God’s judgment has confronted Israel and will come over the whole world; the only way to survive is to live according to

¹³³ C. A. Brown, *No Longer Be Silent: First Century Jewish Portraits of Biblical Women* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992) 189.

¹³⁴ See A. F. J. Klijn, *OTP*, 1.616-617, who dates the work in the early second century.

¹³⁵ G. Saylor, *Have the Promises Failed? A Literary Analysis of 2 Baruch* (SBLDS 72; Chico: Scholars, 1984) 153.

God's commandments. . . . at present nothing is left apart from God and his Law (80:3)."¹³⁶ To this end the author relativized the importance of the fall of Zion by locating the Temple and Jerusalem firmly in the present, passing age, but "adapted the covenantal idea by substituting eschatological reward for earthly prosperity as the blessing that went with the covenant."¹³⁷ Thus, fundamentally "the author seeks to recall the people to covenantal obedience,"¹³⁸ and "Baruch now understands the real Jewish nation as the righteous who follow God's law."¹³⁹

2 Baruch 54:21

The single occurrence of our motif appears in Baruch's prayer as a descriptive element of God's rule over the world.

For at the end of the world, a retribution will be demanded with regard to those who have done wickedly in accordance with their wickedness, and you will glorify the faithful ones in accordance with their faith. (54:21)

In the light of the larger purpose of the work the intent will be to motivate the righteous to continued faithful obedience to the Law. Coming at the end of the prayer (vv 1-22) this represents the writer's central concern, "daß zwischen geschichtlicher Tat und endzeitlichem Geschick ein unzerreißbarer Zusammenhang besteht."¹⁴⁰ A retribution will be demanded "at the end of the world" (=eschatological recompense)¹⁴¹ and is understood as punishment on the wicked "in accordance with their wickedness." Not surprisingly in this work, the Law takes

¹³⁶ A. F. J. Klijn, *OTP*, 1.618-619. See also C. Münchow, *Ethik*, 98-99.

¹³⁷ F. J. Murphy, *The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch* (SBLDS 78; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985) 9.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 28; see the covenant renewal in 2 Bar 84.

¹³⁹ T. W. Willett, *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 4; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989) 111.

¹⁴⁰ W. Harnisch, *Verhängnis und Verheißung der Geschichte: Untersuchungen zum Zeit- und Geschichtsverständnis im 4. Buch Esra und in der syr. Baruchapokalypse* (FRLANT 97; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969) 198, cf. also 246.

¹⁴¹ 83:7; cf. also 21:8; 48:2; 54:1; and further, W. Harnisch, *Verhängnis und Verheißung*, 201-208.

central place as the forensic norm of judgment. The wickedness which brings eschatological judgment can be variously described as “sinning,”¹⁴² “uncleanness” and “oppression” which amount to “not remembering the Law” (48:38), and “despising,” “not knowing,” “not loving,” or “rejecting” God’s Law.¹⁴³ These last expressions of human failure, elsewhere termed “denial” (= unbelief; 59:2), caution us, however, against charging this author with some sort of externalistic legalism.¹⁴⁴ The same unity of internal attitude with external behavior is assumed here as in the OT.

In contrast to retribution upon the wicked, the faithful are said to be “glorified” (cf. 51:3, 5) “in accordance with their faith,” rather than recompensed according to works. This corresponds to the same dichotomy we have noted elsewhere between judgment upon the wicked and mercy to the righteous.¹⁴⁵ This is not, however, evidence of any theological tension between grace and works, judgment and mercy. It is clear from v 22 (“those who sin, you blot out among your own”) that a judgment according to deeds applies equally to Israelites, making adherence to the Law the standard of recompense for Jews with the same consequences of rejection, condemnation and eternal punishment.¹⁴⁶ Just as the wicked exhibit a unity of unbelief and transgressions, so for the righteous faith is not in contrast to works, but means to live according to the Law.¹⁴⁷ The author can say the

¹⁴² 21:12; 48:40.

¹⁴³ 48:40, 47; 51:4; 54:14, 17. See further, C. Münchow, *Ethik*, 104-106.

¹⁴⁴ Pace R. H. Charles, *The Apocalypse of Baruch* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1896) lxix-lxx, lxxxi-lxxxiv.

¹⁴⁵ See above on the PssSol 2:34-35; 17:8-9; Jub 5:11, 15; 1 En 95:5; 100:7.

¹⁴⁶ On v 22 as supporting such a doctrine of dual recompense, see W. Harnisch, *Verhängnis und Verheißung*, 199-200, who paraphrases: “Diejenigen, die sich in diesem Äon beständig an das halten, was das göttliche Gesetz gebietet, werden im künftigen Äon von der Nähe Gottes begleitet werden. Die Sünder dagegen (die sich jetzt dem Gotteswillen widersetzen) werden am Ende für immer von der Zukunft (der Nähe Gottes) geschieden, die das göttliche Gesetz verheißt.”

¹⁴⁷ 54:5; see also 4 Ezra 6:27, 28; 9:7-8; 1 En 47:8. See further, A. F. J. Klijn, *OTP*, 1.633, n. 42a; and W. Bousset- H. Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums*, 195-196.

righteous are saved “because of their works and for whom the Law is now a hope” (51:7), and can tie their future hopes to their store of good works (14:12). It is easy to see why Charles would argue that “faith” here equals *righteous behavior, a meritorious fulfillment of the law*.¹⁴⁸ “Faith” in 2 Bar, however, is not a meritorious achievement, but consistently the inward attitude of submission and loyalty from which springs the corresponding behavior, just as in the OT.¹⁴⁹

Judgment in 2 Baruch: Additional Comments

Although 2 Bar is generally less concerned with the externals and details of the judgment than with “Inhalt und Maßstab,”¹⁵⁰ we nevertheless learn that the souls of the righteous are kept in a treasury until the end of times,¹⁵¹ that their good works constitute a store or treasure,¹⁵² while the sins of the disobedient are recorded in books (24:1), and that even their secrets will be exposed in the judgment (83:3). Following a temporary messianic kingdom of earthly bliss¹⁵³ the souls of the righteous will be resurrected from their treasuries to their eternal reward or rest,¹⁵⁴ while the wicked “will the more waste away” and “know that their torment has come and that their perditions have arrived” (30:4-5). Though this is not explicit, it

¹⁴⁸ R. H. Charles, *Apocalypse of Baruch*, 95, footnote; followed by W. Harnisch, (*Verhängnis und Verheißung*, 198, n. 5; = *Treue zum Gesetz*), though it is not entirely clear whether he wishes to understand this in the same legalistic way Charles does. For a critique of Charles’ arguments on this point, see F. J. Murphy, *Structure and Meaning*, 64-66.

¹⁴⁹ Note the use of the terms “faith” and “submit” in 54:4-5, which connect this passage to earlier ones (cf. 17:1-19:3; 48:19; and chaps 41-43) in which “the recipients of God’s revelatory consolation are identified as the few Jews and the proselytes who have remained loyal to their Mosaic heritage and who therefore represent ‘Israel’” (G. Saylor, *Have the Promises Failed?*, 68). For the opposite view, that 2 Bar is a legalistic work in contrast to the covenant theology of the OT, see W. Harnisch, *Verhängnis und Verheißung*, 213, 225-226.

¹⁵⁰ C. Münchow, *Ethik*, 104.

¹⁵¹ 11:4; 21:23-24; 30:1-3.

¹⁵² 14:12; 24:1.

¹⁵³ See T. W. Willett, *Eschatology*, 112-118. The retention of this prophetic expectation may be explained by the need for a national vindication of Israel, whereas individual, universal retribution is postponed until afterwards at the resurrection (119).

¹⁵⁴ 30:1-3; 54:16; 85:11, 15.

is likely that 2 Bar locates the judgment according to works following the temporary messianic kingdom rather than immediately post-mortem (30:1). The wicked are vigorously denied any hope of post-mortem repentance (85:12), whereas the righteous may expect forgiveness and pardon out of God's covenant mercy,¹⁵⁵ demonstrating once again that flawless obedience was not considered the necessary condition for righteousness.¹⁵⁶ The fate of the Gentile nations is everywhere assumed, though it is not central to the author's concern.¹⁵⁷ Rather, in his attempt to redefine Judaism without its cultic center and to explain the punishment which befell the people, righteous and unrighteous alike, he focuses judgment upon the Jewish nation, but makes Torah-obedience the distinguishing factor cutting right through the nation. "Alles Gewicht liegt auf der Behauptung, daß *die geschichtliche Stellung des Menschen gegenüber dem Gesetz ausschlaggebend ist für seine Stellung im künftigen Äon.*"¹⁵⁸ Thus, it is neither election nor external participation in the chosen nation which guarantees salvation, but "the doers of the law will be justified."¹⁵⁹

SUMMARY

Wording and Syntax

In spite of our limitation generally to English translations it has become sufficiently clear that the wording and syntax of the recompense motif in the

¹⁵⁵ 24:2; 75:1; 78:13; 85:8, 15.

¹⁵⁶ 85:2 speaks of "righteous prophets and holy men" who "trusted in their works." Whether or not this special class was credited with perfect obedience, they are contrasted with the present generation of righteous ones who need their intercession and purging from their sins.

¹⁵⁷ 12:2-4; 13:4-12; 39:3. See also T. W. Willett, *Eschatology*, 106-112.

¹⁵⁸ W. Harnisch, *Verhängnis und Verheißung*, 246.

¹⁵⁹ Rom 2:13. Thus, the issue of who is a *true Jew*, so evident in Paul's letter to the Romans, was very much a live one in 1st century Judaism, and 2 Bar is in agreement with the apostle that election and national identity alone do not suffice. See C. Münchow, *Ethik*, 105.

pseudepigraphical writings continues the OT tradition.¹⁶⁰ The number of relevant texts is too small to permit far-reaching conclusions, but the following tendencies have appeared. The predominant form of the motif now includes a *standard* (“according to . . .”) rather than a direct object,¹⁶¹ while passive constructions may be somewhat more common than in the OT.¹⁶² Explicit *judgment* terminology, rare outside Ezekiel in the OT use of the motif, also occurs in these writings.¹⁶³ In fact, given the central importance of judgment conceptions to these writings, the motif might be better termed ‘divine judgment according to deeds,’ even where the verb is one of *repayment*.¹⁶⁴ Also similar to the OT usage is the easy interchange between singular and plural “deed(s)” without theological distinction.¹⁶⁵

Function

All the major categories of our functional typology have been found in evidence in this literature.¹⁶⁶ This renders suspect a common verdict on this period, namely that the “prophetic announcement of God’s judgment on Israel” disappears altogether.¹⁶⁷ It is true that we have no occurrence of such a prophetic sentence against the nation *in toto*; but 1 En 95:5 and 100:7 clearly announce judgment-woes

¹⁶⁰ Some work in this direction has already been done by R. Heiligenthal, *Werke*, 172-182.

¹⁶¹ Exceptions: PssSol 2:25, (35).

¹⁶² 1 En 95:5; 100:7; PssSol 17:8. Rare in the OT; see Obad 15; Prov 19:17 (LXX, vl.).

¹⁶³ Jub 5:11, 15; (PssSol 9:5c).

¹⁶⁴ Note how often the ‘recompense’ occurs within a judgment scene: 1 En 95:5; 100:7; PssSol 2:33-35; 17:8-10; LAB 3:10; (44:10); 2 Bar 54:21. See further on the coalescing of ‘judgment’ and ‘recompense according to deeds’ during the intertestamental period, R. Heiligenthal, *Werke*, 172-182.

¹⁶⁵ See pp. 34-35 above. While the plural is the more common, the singular is found in PssSol 2:35; Jub 5:11, 15; 2 Bar 54:21.

¹⁶⁶ See Appendix II. The functions as “wish/benediction” and “summons to repentance” are absent from this literature, but may be ignored since their occurrence in the OT is similarly sparse.

¹⁶⁷ D. Kuck asserts such a disappearance (*Judgment*, 53).

against a group of wicked Israelites,¹⁶⁸ and numerous texts contain warnings which, if not heeded, are surely expected to lead to such a sentence upon the wicked within Israel.¹⁶⁹ It has been similarly thought by many that there is a diminishing use of judgment as applicable to Israel, that is, that judgment is made applicable only to the enemies of national Israel.¹⁷⁰ Quite the reverse is the case, since a majority of these motif texts have been shown to contain warnings to Israelites. In fact, and of considerable interest for Paul's use of the motif in Romans 2 and 1 Corinthians 3, we have seen repeatedly how these writers are deeply concerned to establish a distinction between the righteous and the wicked within the nation of Israel, and in this connection apply the motif of recompense according to deeds simultaneously to warn and to exhort.

Judgment Is Central In This Literature¹⁷¹

Not merely one element among others, *judgment is the central issue in Jewish eschatology of this period and forms the main theme of many of its literary products*.¹⁷² The explanation for this phenomenon will be best sought in the

¹⁶⁸ See p. 96.

¹⁶⁹ Cf. Jub 5; PssSol 2; 17; LAB 3:10 and comments on these texts above.

¹⁷⁰ So, for instance, H. Braun, *Gerichtsgedanke*, 8-11.

¹⁷¹ Luise Mattern's analysis of judgment in Jewish apocalyptic literature remains a good overview of our subject matter (*Verständnis*, 9-35; she deals only with 1 Enoch, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch). However, her failure to understand the dynamic between faith and works in this literature leads to similar misunderstandings of Paul (cf. R. Heiligenthal, *Werke*, 167-170, on the misunderstanding of works as "Leistungen"). She does not treat adequately the warnings of eschatological judgment according to deeds addressed to Jews in this literature which reveal the theological relevance of such a final judgment unto salvation/damnation even for the people of God. This leads her then to an artificial distinction in Pauline statements on judgment: when judgment according to deeds deals with salvation/damnation, this excludes Christians; when it deals undeniably with Christians and their work(s), then it must be a different judgment, one dealing only with reward. Already in her treatment of Jewish apocalyptic literature we can see at work the artificial wall between faith and works which will skew her interpretation of Paul: "dass vom Christsein oder Nichtchristsein (allein!) Heil oder Unheil abhängt, dass die Untauglichkeit des christlichen Werkes aber nicht das Heil gefährden kann" (110).

¹⁷² "Befolgung des Gesetzes und Erwartung des Gerichtes ist, wenn man es kurz umschreiben will, die Summa der jüdischen Frömmigkeit" (W. Bousset and H. Gressmann, *Religion*, 202; cf. also 192). See also M. Reiser, *Gerichtspredigt*, 293.

social-historical context of the writers and their communities, for whom the historical realm no longer held hope of improvement or justice. The coming age alone promised a reversal of the present evil reality, and the Judgment constituted the central event of such a reversal. For this reason as well, ethics in apocalyptic writings had to be grounded ultimately in eschatology in order to be effective.¹⁷³

However, this rooting of the centrality of the judgment theme in the social-historical matrix has a corresponding theological explanation. This pessimistic view of history as dominated by evil means that the fundamental question for the apocalypses is “die Frage nach der Machtergreifung Gottes,” or in language that sounds quite Pauline, “nach seiner Gerechtigkeit.” The eschatological Judgment becomes, then, the centerpiece of the apocalypticist’s answer. In this event God’s power and righteousness are finally revealed and established. By this means, potential doubts or resignation caused by political or religious setbacks could be countered and Israel both comforted and exhorted to continued vigilance.¹⁷⁴

Eschatological Recompense Is Clearly Prominent

Although divine judgment according to deeds can still be understood to operate within this historical realm as in the OT,¹⁷⁵ *THE judgment according to deeds* is being increasingly viewed as an event beyond or subsequent to this era.¹⁷⁶ Formulaic expressions such as “the great day of judgment” begin to carry a self-evident eschatological reference. This *eschatologizing* of the motif has not led, however, to any systematization of the whole concept, as evidenced by the co-

¹⁷³ See C. Münchow, *Ethik*, 41-42, 61 (referring specifically to 1 Enoch and Jubilees).

¹⁷⁴ See P. Stuhlmacher, “Eindeutige Verkündigung,” *EvTh* 24 (1964) 493; and W. Harnisch, *Verhängnis und Verheißung*, 19-88, 318-321. On the non-apocalyptic solution in the PssSol which locate the revelation of the divine righteousness in historical judgments, see J. Schüpphaus, *Die Psalmen Salomos*, 83-106.

¹⁷⁵ Cf. JosAsen 28:3; PssSol 2:7, 16, 25, 34-35; 17:8-9.

¹⁷⁶ 1 En 95:5; 100:7; 2 Bar 54:21; (Jub 5:10-11); LAB 3:10.

existence of earthly-messianic and transcendent futures, or individual post-mortem and universal final judgments (see below).

Punishment Is Normally Meant

Woe unto you, sinners, when you oppress the righteous ones, in the day of hard anguish, and burn them with fire!

You shall be recompensed according to your deeds (1 En 100:7).

In fact, we found not a single instance of the motif being used to promise a positive reward to the righteous according to their deeds.¹⁷⁷ This does not, however, mean that there existed no belief in a retributive reward. A dual recompense is attested by LAB 64:7 and suggested by other texts.¹⁷⁸ Nevertheless, the consistent use of the motif exclusively for punishment would suggest that this was its primary, if not sole, association during this period.¹⁷⁹

A Dichotomy Exists Between The Treatment Of The Righteous And The Wicked

While the wicked are threatened with recompense (= punishment) according to their deeds, the righteous are promised mercy.¹⁸⁰ This dichotomy of treatment is further reinforced by the explicit denial to the wicked of any mercy in judgment¹⁸¹ and the occasional assertion of 'no judgment' at all for the righteous.¹⁸² We noted above, however, that this contrast is not intended as an abrogation of the principle of just recompense in the case of the righteous,¹⁸³ nor does it testify to a fundamen-

¹⁷⁷ LAB 64:7 is no exception since it does not use the motif. On 1 En 103:3 and PssSol 9:5c, see above, nn. 40 and 89 respectively.

¹⁷⁸ 2 Bar 54:21b; PssSol 9:5c. On the nature of "reward" in this literature, see L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 32-35; D. Kuck, *Judgment*, 64-65, 95; and P. Volz, *Eschatologie*, 404-406. The idea of varying rewards for varying labor does not appear to be present, or if so, only in later texts; the 'reward' is the eternal blessing, the heavenly paradise, eternal life.

¹⁷⁹ See L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 16-25, 29.

¹⁸⁰ See esp. PssSol 2:34-35; 2 Bar 54:21; also PssSol 14:9; 18:9; 1 En 60:6.

¹⁸¹ 1 En 5:5; 94:10; PssSol 17:9; and above pp. 93(1 En), 99(PssSol), 114(2 Bar).

¹⁸² Cf. 1 En 81:4 (though the MSS are confused at this point). Otherwise 1:8: "there shall be a judgment upon all, (including) the righteous."

¹⁸³ See esp. pp. 103 and 104.

tal disharmony between grace and works (or grace and judgment) in Jewish soteriology of the period. While the favorable judgment upon the righteous will indeed be according to their deeds, pious humility and a primary focus upon the fate of the wicked combined to produce an avoidance of the language of judgment according to deeds for the righteous.¹⁸⁴ This represents a change from the usage of the OT where the pious did not hesitate to plead their righteousness before God.¹⁸⁵

Chastisement Is Prominent For The Righteous

Although present in the OT, and developed further in the deuterocanonical writings,¹⁸⁶ the idea that God's judgments upon the righteous take the form of chastisements or corrective discipline in this life becomes standard doctrine.¹⁸⁷

For the Lord will spare his devout,
and he will wipe away their mistakes with discipline. (PssSol 13:10)

Such temporal correction is contrasted explicitly with the fate of the wicked (PssSol 13:7, 11). These judgments are meant to turn God's people from their sins and thus lead to forgiveness (2 Bar 13:9-10). They are part of God's mercy to his people and preserve them from being judged (= punished) according to their deeds at the eschatological judgment.¹⁸⁸

An Intermediate State Is Prominent

Though we would wish to point out the great variety of conceptions present, it nevertheless remains generally true that these writers anticipated some sort of shadowy existence for both the righteous and unrighteous dead during the inter-

¹⁸⁴ See esp. p. 104.

¹⁸⁵ Cf. 1 Kgs 8:32b; Ps 18:20-24. See also pp. 66-69.

¹⁸⁶ See G. Bertram, art. *παιδεύω*, *TDNT*, 5.603-612.

¹⁸⁷ 2 Bar 13:8-10; 78:5-7; PssSol 3:4; 7:9; 8:26, 29, 32; 10:1-4; 13:7-12; 14:1; 16:12-15; 18:4-5. See also W. Bousset and H. Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums*, 385-386.

¹⁸⁸ This thought is made explicit in the rabbinic literature. "He deals strictly with the righteous, calling them to account for the few wrongs which they commit in this world, in order to lavish bliss upon and give them a goodly reward in the world to come" (Gen. Rab. 33:1; cited by E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 171).

mediate period.¹⁸⁹ For some writers this was merely a sort of holding chamber, while for others a preliminary reward and punishment was envisioned. In the case of righteous martyrs, both the intermediate state and the final judgment could be bypassed, with this special class of persons passing immediately to their eternal reward.¹⁹⁰ Regardless of whether a judgment scene is depicted or suggested in connection with this intermediate state (see the next point), an immediate post-mortem *division* of humanity (righteous/unrighteous; saved/damned) is everywhere assumed.

Both An Immediate Post-mortem Division And A Final Judgment Are Envisioned

The texts referred to in the previous paragraph demonstrate the prevalence of the concept of an immediate post-mortem *division* between the righteous and the wicked. Logically one might expect such a division to be accompanied by a judgment scene, but such is only rarely the case:

You yourselves know that they will bring your souls down to Sheol. . . . Your souls shall enter into the great judgment; it shall be a great judgment in all the generations of the world. Woe unto you, for there is no peace for you! (1 En 103:7-8)¹⁹¹

Only around the end of the first century CE do we begin to have irrefutable evidence of such a special judgment occurring for each individual immediately following death and with reference to one's earthly works.¹⁹² Prior to this it is nowhere made clear just *how* this post-mortem division and the assignment of souls to their various

¹⁸⁹ "Hence we may conclude that the universal tradition of Palestinian Judaism always taught the doctrine of an intermediate abode for the righteous" (R. H. Charles, *Eschatology*, 300). Cf. Jub 5:10 (p. 88); 7:29; 22:22; LAB 3:10 (p. 108); 15:5; 23:13; 28:10; 32:13; (44:10); 64:7; 1 En 22; 4 Ezra 7:32, 75-101; 2 Bar 11:4-5; 21:23-24; 30:1-5. See further P. Volz, *Eschatologie*, 117-121, 256-271. JosAsen seems to be the exception, since each individual enters immediately at death into their eternal salvation (see p. 106).

¹⁹⁰ G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., *Resurrection*, 68-92.

¹⁹¹ Our interpretation must assume that "they will bring your souls down to Sheol" and "your souls shall enter into the great judgment" refer to the same event. JosAsen may also suggest a post-mortem judgment, but this is not explicit; see p. 106.

¹⁹² Cf. T.Abr. 12:1-18 (recension A); b.Ber. 28b. See M. Reiser, *Gerichtspredigt*, 115, 121-122, 137-138; also W. Bousset and H. Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums*, 293-295; and R. Bauckham, "Early Jewish Visions of Hell," 355-385.

chambers occurs.¹⁹³

Widely attested, on the other hand, is a Last Judgment, universal and introducing the age to come.¹⁹⁴ We have noted at numerous points above that the motif of judgment according to deeds occurs normally in such a context. There would seem to be little concern at this stage to harmonize these two conceptions, and the variety we have noted elsewhere regarding details of judgment is equally in evidence here. It is entirely possible that the growing emphasis on an immediate post-mortem fate (and later, judgment) is due to Hellenistic influence.¹⁹⁵

Resurrection Is Occasionally Mentioned In Connection With Judgment

Actually a general resurrection of all the dead unto judgment is extremely difficult to document in this literature. Only LAB 3:10 and 1 En 51:2 come into question, but both admit of other interpretations.¹⁹⁶ In most instances, the language of resurrection is reserved for the righteous only, who are raised not to judgment, but directly to their eternal reward.¹⁹⁷ The wicked, on the other hand, are in some fashion brought forth from Sheol to face judgment, or proceed directly from Sheol to their eternal damnation. In 2 Bar 85:15 this final destruction of the wicked is explicitly contrasted with the resurrection of the righteous, so that elsewhere it can be said of the wicked that after their time in Sheol they simply “the more waste away” (30:4).

¹⁹³ Perhaps Reiser is correct that the earlier texts simply presuppose a judgment process which occurs throughout one's lifetime, and that with one's death that process is completed and it is clear to which group one belongs (*Gerichtspredigt*, 138).

¹⁹⁴ See, for instance, LAB 3:10; 2 Bar 30:1-5 (p. 116 above); 54:21; 1 En 95:5; 100:7 (p. 92); Jub 5:10 (p. 88).

¹⁹⁵ See, for instance, S. Aalen, “St. Luke's Gospel,” 1-13; and U. Fischer, *Eschatologie*, 256-258.

¹⁹⁶ See p. 108, and n. 42.

¹⁹⁷ LAB 19:12 (p. 109); 1 En 103:4; 108:11-12; 2 Bar 30:1-5; 85:15. On PssSol see above, p. 100.

The Equality Of Jewish And Gentile Sinners In Judgment Is Occasionally Envisioned

Faithful Israelites receive preferential treatment from God, especially the mercies of atonement and forgiveness for unintentional transgressions. For those who have proven themselves *sinner*s (i.e., who have rejected God's covenant and life according to his ways), however, judgment according to deeds applies without distinction to Jew and Gentile. Jubilees 5:12-16 applies our motif to "all [God's] works" (i.e., Jew and Gentile alike), and even suggests differing standards for various groups in order to assure impartiality. In the PssSol Jewish sinners are treated no differently than the heathen in judgment, all being classed together as 'sinners.'¹⁹⁸

The Purpose Of The Judgment Is More To Reveal Than To Determine Status

In no instance have we found the note of fearful uncertainty so often associated with judgment according to deeds in caricatures of legalistic Judaism.¹⁹⁹ As noted above divine judgment according to deeds usually meant punishment of the wicked and was not even applied to the righteous. For the latter it was instead a "day of mercy" or "of covenant," a day awaited without fear and at which they would receive their reward.²⁰⁰ "Niemals hat das Gericht den Charakter einer Untersuchung, um Sünder und Gerechte zu bestimmen; ihre Sonderung ist immer schon vorausgesetzt."²⁰¹ Rather than being necessary to *determine* one's status as righteous or wicked before God,²⁰² this judgment functions primarily to *reveal* this

¹⁹⁸ See p. 99; and J. Schüpphaus, *Die Psalmen Salomos*, 98.

¹⁹⁹ "die tiefste, quälendste Unsicherheit," "ein ängstliches Nachzählen und Abwägen der einzelnen Werke gegeneinander," "Das Leben wird zu einem Rechenbeispiel, zu einem fortwährenden Ziehen der Bilanz, die der Fromme bei Gott hat" (W. Bousset and H. Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums*, 392-393). See also P. Volz, *Eschatologie*, 108-113.

²⁰⁰ PssSol 14:9; 18:9; 1 En 60:6; LAB 64:7.

²⁰¹ M. Reiser, *Gerichtspredigt*, 147, cf. also 140. This receives additional confirmation from the fact, noted above, that the righteous are sometimes said to be resurrected directly to their eternal state, bypassing judgment altogether.

²⁰² See above on the intermediate state and on the division between righteous and wicked which it already presupposes; cf. also p. 99 (deeds do not create but confirm one's status).

status publicly and to initiate the execution of the appropriate sentence.

I swear to you, sinners, by the Holy Great One, that all your evil deeds are (vl. will be) revealed in the heavens. None of your deeds of injustice are covered and hidden.
(1 En 98:6-7)²⁰³

Such a public revealing is necessary due to the secret nature of many sins which must be exposed.²⁰⁴

But what of the imagery of “weighing deeds (or souls) in a scale” which seems to suggest a process of determining whether one is good or evil?²⁰⁵ Unfortunately, older studies relied almost exclusively on rabbinic sources and assumed later rabbinic conceptions were also present in passages from Jewish apocalyptic literature. Such is not the case, and the weighing motif is actually fairly rare in this literature. Where it does occur (generally in connection with the image of the heavenly records), the image

should not be taken to imply an adding up or a weighing of individual deeds so that God may recompense men in strict proportion to their deeds, or so that he may decide their destiny according to whether good or bad deeds are more numerous. . . . In no instance is a *mixture* of good and bad deeds recorded and men’s destiny determined by which are more numerous.²⁰⁶

In 2 Bar 41-42, in fact, there is a protest against any mechanical application of the weighing motif:

Their time will surely not be weighed exactly, and they will certainly not be judged as the scale indicates?
(2 Bar 41:6)

A Collective Focus Is Generally Maintained

We have noticed no greater *individualization* of the motif than was already present in the Jewish Scriptures, although the development of an immediate post-

²⁰³ Cf. also 1 En 97:6-7 where their sins will be “read aloud”; and 4 Ezra 14:35. On the ‘revelatory’ nature of judgment in Jewish apocalyptic literature, see L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 23; and R. Heiligenthal, *Werke*, esp. 195-197, 234-264.

²⁰⁴ 1 En 49:4; 61:9; 63:3; 2 Bar 83:3.

²⁰⁵ 1 En 41:1; 61:8; PssSol 5:4; 2 Bar 41:6; also 4 Ezra 3:34; T.Abr. 12:4-14; 13:10-11. Further, P. Volz, *Eschatologie*, 95-96, 293; and R. Heiligenthal, *Werke*, 247-270.

²⁰⁶ S. Travis, *Judgment*, 16. T.Abr. 12-14(A) unequivocally portrays a weighing of deeds which are ‘balanced’ (12:18), and which is to lead to the determination of eternal destiny based on the majority of deeds (see E. P. Sanders, *OTP*, 1.878.) However, the importance of this exception is diminished due to the probable date of composition (ca. 75-125 CE) and due to the possibility of late redactional activity.

mortem division late in the period under consideration opens the way to rabbinic teaching on a truly individual judgment. In the texts considered above, even where a single individual is in view, it is usually his/her membership in the group of the righteous or the wicked which is at issue. Thus, by and large we may still characterize all judgment conceptions for this period as collective.²⁰⁷

Judgment According To Deeds And The Soteriological Pattern Of The OT Pseudepigraphical Writings

We will seek here simply to draw together a number of threads already noted at various places above. In so doing we are cognizant of the inherent risks involved in speaking of *the soteriological pattern* of this group of writings,²⁰⁸ and thus can strive at best for an outline of what seems to be more or less common to most of them.

E. P. Sanders' depiction of this soteriological pattern as *covenantal nomism* has been confirmed by our studies; namely, the "noble idea of the covenant as offered by God's grace and of obedience as the consequence of that gracious gift," and according to which "obedience maintains one's position in the covenant, but it does not earn God's grace as such."²⁰⁹ We would modify this only insofar as "evidences" or "manifests" might be a better term than "maintains," since even this obedience is ultimately credited to God's mercy.²¹⁰ Earlier interpreters of this litera-

²⁰⁷ Only with the paraenesis of the tannaitic rabbis ("die immer wieder betonen, daß beim Jüngsten Gericht jeder einzelne vor Gottes Thron erscheinen und Rechenschaft über sein Leben ablegen müsse," M. Reiser, *Gerichtspredigt*, 151) was the preparation for a truly "individual" judgment given.

²⁰⁸ This is due both to the great variety of eschatological conceptions (cf. U. Fischer, *Eschatologie*, 4) and to the unsystematic nature of much Jewish thought and writing (cf. G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, The Age of the Tannaim* [3 vols; Cambridge: Harvard University, 1954 <orig. 1927>] 2.389).

²⁰⁹ *PPJ*, 419-420; see 346-430 for the extended treatment of this literature. This same covenantal religion has been found by J. Schüpphaus in the PssSol (*Die Psalmen Salomos*, 94-105), a work traditionally thought to exhibit a clear-cut Pharisaic legalism.

²¹⁰ Jub 5:12; 1 En 92:4-5; cf. also n. 36.

ture almost uniformly ignored or downplayed the role of the *covenant* in early Judaism, and thus placed judgment according to deeds within the context of a supposed mechanical legalism.²¹¹

One's *works* are not viewed mechanically or atomistically, but are a unitary whole revealing one's inner character (*Grundeinstellung*) or faith.²¹² Faith and works are not in competition with one another. Rather they represent two sides of the single coin of human response in the light of God's gracious covenantal arrangement. The "righteous" are not necessarily characterized by a flawless obedience,²¹³ but by the proper attitude of faith and commitment, evidenced by generally consistent outward obedience. Most occasional or unintentional sins would not exclude one from the covenant relationship, but could be dealt with via repentance, atonement and forgiveness. The sufferings of the righteous were sometimes viewed as divine chastisements for these sins, and usually as a stimulus to the required

²¹¹ Even Christoph von Münchow's otherwise excellent monograph fails to consider the influence of the covenant idea on Jewish apocalyptic literature (*Ethik und Eschatologie*, esp. 154-161). For Paul, Münchow asserts, behavior is the *consequence* of one's future hope, while for apocalyptic the *condition* (154). This ignores the unity of faith and works common to both the OT and the Pseudepigrapha which makes behavior in apocalyptic writings equally a *consequence* of divine grace rather than its condition. When contrasting Paul with Jewish apocalyptic he says for the latter, "daß die ethische Entsprechung zum Willen Gottes die eschatologische Hoffnung begründet" (156). Yet when Paul lists the works of the flesh in Gal 5:19-21 and concludes, "those who do such things will not inherit the kingdom of God," is not his eschatological hope likewise "ethisch begründet"? Von Münchow must relativize such passages in Paul by saying they are "traditionell vorgegeben" (159), and ultimately he must relativize all judgment statements in favor of justification by faith by claiming, "daß [for Paul] das Gericht nicht mehr konstitutiv für die Heilssetzung Gottes ist" (159).

²¹² D. Rössler, *Gesetz und Geschichte: Untersuchungen zur Theologie der jüdischen Apokalyptik und der pharisäischen Orthodoxie*² (WMANT 3; Neukirchen: 1962) 87, 100-105; *pace* P. Volz, *Eschatologie*, 95-96.

²¹³ We did not consider 4 Ezra since the motif is not found in this work. Sanders contends that 4 Ezra differs from the rest of the pseudepigraphical literature in that it teaches a legalistic perfectionism (*PPJ*, 409-418). This conclusion rests, however, on the theory that the angel's statements in the dialogues consistently represents the author's own view (rather than the statements of the seer). This complicated literary-critical question goes beyond the parameters of the present dissertation, and is far from being a settled question among scholars. For various answers, see M. E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 24, 30-33; C. Münchow, *Ethik*, 76-95; W. Harnisch, *Verhängnis und Verheißung*, 19-60; E. Breech, "These Fragments I have Shored Against My Ruins: The Form and Function of 4 Ezra," *JBL* 92 (1973) 267-274.

repentance rather than in and of themselves of atoning value.²¹⁴ Consistent, flagrant and/or intentional sins demonstrated fundamental covenant disloyalty (= unbelief) and brought the threat of God's judgment according to deeds.²¹⁵ There is thus in this literature ultimately no tension or conflict between salvation by faith and divine judgment according to deeds.

Likewise grace and works, or salvation by grace and judgment according to deeds, are not felt to be in theological tension. The general avoidance of applying 'judgment according to deeds' explicitly to the righteous can be better explained on historical and rhetorical grounds,²¹⁶ and (theologically) because the righteous were already assured of a positive verdict in accordance with their conduct.²¹⁷

In *Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility* D. A. Carson argues for a quite different pattern of soteriology in this body of literature, involving the ascendance of "merit theology," a redefinition of election based upon Israel's merit rather than divine grace, and a dilution in the value of grace and mercy so that they become merely "a kind response to merit."²¹⁸ His thesis deserves a more thorough response than we are able to provide within the scope of this dissertation. Nevertheless, we suggest that a more rigorous attempt to understand the various texts in their unique historical and rhetorical situations might have produced different results. As one example we take his use of PssSol 9:4, supposed proof of "man's unfettered choice between good and evil. . . . his unrestricted capacity to obey the law and to

²¹⁴ Against the idea of a "Leidenstheologie" in this literature (i.e., present suffering of the righteous *atones for* sins), see L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 30-31.

²¹⁵ See PssSol 2:16 (p. 101 above).

²¹⁶ See above pp. 105 and 121; and E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 421-422.

²¹⁷ Travis attributes inconsistency to these writings in regard to retributive judgment, because (a) they extend mercy instead of strict judgment to the righteous, (b) the allowance of anything less than perfect obedience "undermines the idea of a strictly retributive recompense," and (c) the heavenly records never contain a mixture of good and bad deeds (*Christ and the Judgment*, 15-16). However, such an overly strict and mechanical view of retributive justice is foreign to the writings we have examined.

²¹⁸ See esp. pp. 55-74. His position obviously puts him at odds with E. P. Sanders (see pp. 68-69, 84-109).

transgress it,” and thus proof that “the freedom of man is expressed more strongly in apocalyptic than in anything so far mentioned.”²¹⁹

Our works (are) in the choosing²²⁰ and power of our souls,
to do right and wrong in the works of our hands,
and in your righteousness you oversee human beings.

We have already noted above²²¹ that this passage is most likely not aimed at teaching a doctrine of free-will, but wishes to highlight individual accountability in contrast to the tradition that the individual is subject (without personal choice or authority) to the fate of the nation. This interpretation is confirmed by the flow of thought in the psalm: Israel’s evildoing justly brought God’s judgment of exile (vv 1-3); yet there is hope now if they call upon the Lord and repent, since “[their] works are in the choosing and power of [their] own souls” (vv 4-7); God’s gracious covenant gives hope “when [they] turn [their] souls toward [him],” leading to the concluding benediction, “May the mercy of the Lord be upon the house of Israel forevermore” (vv 8-11). There is no stress whatsoever upon one’s “unrestricted freedom,” but rather upon human failure, divine mercy (offered in the face of human demerit!),²²² and individual accountability. Divine mercy is explicitly grounded in God’s initiative and compassion as seen in the covenant, not in some ascending merit theology.²²³

Finally, we wish to mention the nuanced way in which this motif is applied to empirical Israel, the visible community of the saved. In the main this literature has addressed situations of collective crisis in which a consolidation or strengthening

²¹⁹ Page 57 (the first quotation is a citation from C. G. Montefiore, *Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as Illustrated by the Religion of the Ancient Hebrews* [London: 1897] 518); the verse is incorrectly cited as 9:7.

²²⁰ Carson notes the uncertainty of the translation of ἐν ἐκλογῇ (231, n. 15), which could refer either to God’s choice or (as he correctly concludes) our choice.

²²¹ Cf. n. 89.

²²² Pace Carson: “it is no longer grace in defiance of demerit and rooted in the sovereign goodness of God. Rather it is a kind response to merit” (69).

²²³ Carson admits the weakness of his case. “Few of the above examples in themselves would be conclusive to establish this shift in initiative [i.e., from divine to human initiative in salvation]. Moreover, it would be inaccurate to suggest that human freedom is *completely* unbounded [i.e., in this literature]” (59).

of group identity was called for.²²⁴ To those whose behavior marked them as disloyal to the covenant relationship, the motif functions as a *warning* of impending judgment. Especially for those who might be wavering and tending toward laxity in observance of God's demands, the motif stresses the certainty, thoroughness and impartiality of this judgment as a prod to repentance. For the faithful, on the other hand, it works to encourage continued faith in God's justice and concomitant obedience to his ways.

²²⁴ D. Kuck, *Judgment*, 93-94.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE USE OF THE MOTIF IN THE QUMRAN LITERATURE

INTRODUCTORY CONSIDERATIONS

It is generally agreed that Paul shows the influence of numerous traditions which we find represented in the Judaism of the scrolls.¹ These include such themes as salvation *sola gratia*, human sinfulness and inability, the contrast of 'light' and 'darkness,' and even justification (by faith).² We would suggest that divine judgment according to deeds is another such theme, and that tensions between grace and obedience, salvation and judgment, similar to those so often felt in Paul's letters, are to be found in the Qumran documents, raising at least the possibility that Paul's 'resolution' of this tension is prefigured in Judaism.

The question as to which documents represent reliable sources of the sect's theology is increasingly difficult to answer. In some cases it now appears that certain documents may contain pre-Qumranic sources.³ Also, with the matter of Qumran origins very much in flux today, some are prepared to argue that Jubilees and parts of 1 Enoch should be considered part of this same movement. Associated with this question of origins is the problem of terminology. Does "Essene," for instance, refer to a community inhabiting the settlement (monastery?) on the shore

¹ See especially D. Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity," *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. Rabin and Y. Yadin; Scripta Hierosolymitana 4; Jerusalem: 1965) 215-266. Also H.-W. Kuhn, "The Impact of the Qumran Scrolls on the Understanding of Paul," *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992) 327-339; J. A. Fitzmyer, *Responses to 101 Questions on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Paulist, 1992) 125-130; and H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1966) 2.166-172.

² See W. Grundmann, "The Teacher of Righteousness of Qumran and the Question of Justification by Faith in the Theology of the Apostle Paul," *Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. Murphy-O'Connor and J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Crossroad, 1990) 85-114 (= *RQ* 2 [1960] 237-259).

³ This applies especially to the Damascus Document; see p. 157 below.

of the Dead Sea, to a broader movement, or to a theology represented in the scrolls?⁴ Since an attempt at resolution of all these questions would take us far beyond the purpose of this dissertation we will restrict our attention to those principal documents which are considered by most to represent the distinctive views of this community:⁵

Manual of Discipline or Community Rule (1QS)
 Psalms of Thanksgiving or Hymns (1QH)
 War Scroll (1QM)
 Damascus or Zadokite Document (CD)
 and the Commentaries on Habakkuk (1QpHab) and Ps 37 (4QpPs37).⁶

Our procedure and aim will be like those adopted for the study of the OT Pseudepigrapha. The motif texts belonging to a particular document will be analysed together and will be placed within their respective rhetorical and theological contexts through a discussion of the soteriology and doctrine of judgment in that document. We will seek evidence of development or change in the function and formulation of the motif as compared with the OT and OT Pseudepigrapha. Additionally, since we are dealing with a Jewish group that understood itself to be the true “planting” or remnant of Israel, the people of God’s New Covenant in contrast to the bulk of Jews, we will want to give special attention to the way in which this sectarian perspective colors their use of the recompense motif.⁷

Overview of Texts and Functions in the Qumran Literature [See Appendix III]

⁴ See P. R. Davies, “The Birthplace of the Essenes: Where is ‘Damascus’?” *RQ* 14 (1990) 503-519, esp. 506-508.

⁵ See the careful discussion of appropriate sources by Hermann Lichtenberger (*Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde*; SUNT 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980; 13-45); also M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus: Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palestinas bis zur Mitte des 2.Jh.s v. Chr.* (WUNT 10; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1988) 407-414.

⁶ 11QMelch and the Temple Scroll contain no occurrences of the motif.

⁷ Unless otherwise noted, all English translations of the scrolls are taken from A. Dupont-Sommer, *Writings*, and the Hebrew text follows that in E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964).

THE MANUAL OF DISCIPLINE (1QS)

Date, Unity, and Character

The scroll recovered from Cave 1 dates from around 100 BCE⁸ with most scholars placing the original composition of 1QS between 200-100 BCE.⁹ Actually any date of origin is made even less certain by the fact that the Manual is a compilation of still earlier elements which *evolved* rather than being combined in a planned way by a single individual.¹⁰ The document resembles later monastic “rules,” and is sometimes titled “The Community Rule,” containing besides regulations for personal and corporate conduct, also “mystical and moral exhortations, doctrinal expositions, rituals and poetic exaltation.”¹¹

1QS II, 7-8

Cursed be thou, without mercy,
according to the darkness of thy deeds!
 Be thou damned (8) in the night of eternal fire!
 May God not favour thee when thou callest upon Him,
 and may He be without forgiveness to expiate thy sins!

אָרֹר אַתָּה לְאֵין רַחֲמִים בְּחֹשֶׁךְ מַעֲשֵׂיִךָ.

1QS I,18-II,10 recounts the ceremony of blessing/cursing performed by the priests and Levites when someone “passes into the Covenant,” i.e., enters the community. First they recount the history of God’s gracious dealing with Israel and of Israel’s constant rebellion and sin “under the dominion of Belial” (I,21-23). Following this, the initiates make their own confession of solidarity with the sinfulness

⁸ Cf. F. M. Cross, Jr., *Ancient Library*, 89; and A. R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning* (NTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966) 116.

⁹ P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction* (STDJ 1; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957) 1-21, esp. 20; and G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (rev. ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981) 45-46.

¹⁰ See J. Murphy-O’Connor “La genèse littéraire de la Règle de la Communauté,” *RB* 76 (1969) 528-549; A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (trans. G. Vermes; Cleveland/NY: Meridian, 1962) 70-71; and A. R. C. Leaney, *Rule*, 113-116.

¹¹ A. Dupont-Sommer, *Writings*, 70. He theorizes that this scroll is the *Book of Meditations* referred to in CD X,6; XIII,2; XIV,8 as the foundational document of the sect (70-71).

(=covenant-breaking) of their forefathers (I,24-II,1; cf. also XI,9-11).¹² Interestingly for our purposes, this confession ends with the juxtaposition of divine justice and mercy:

And just is God who has fulfilled His judgment against us and against our fathers.
But He extends His gracious mercy towards us for ever and ever. (II,1)

That is, justice is acknowledged in bringing the curses of the broken covenant upon the nation; mercy is praised in offering a (new) covenant of grace via the sect.

The priestly blessing occurs in II,1-4, and applies to “the men of the lot of God who walk perfectly in all His ways.” The “lot of God” will be contrasted in the ensuing curse with the “lot of Belial” (II,5) and demonstrates the Two-Way theology fundamental to this work. There are only two classifications of humanity, the righteous and the wicked, the elect and the damned; and two ways, that of God and of Belial (cf. IV,15). A mixture of the two ways, or a third middle group (partly righteous/partly wicked) is not envisioned. The reference to the pious as those who “walk perfectly in all His ways” is a common way of referring to the community members in this work,¹³ but should not be construed to imply sinlessness.¹⁴ Furthermore, it is now no longer “Israel” who is blessed, but only those who obey the interpretation of the community. The blessing assumes human need of divine grace or assistance for proper behavior, wisdom and “eternal bliss.”

Our motif occurs as part of the curses (II,5-10), and thus is used only on the negative side (punishment rather than reward). As was the case with the judgment of the wicked in the OT Pseudepigrapha, the wicked are cursed “without mercy.”¹⁵

¹² According to K. Baltzer this confession of sin preceding the blessings and curses in the Qumran hymns constitutes a new element in the *Gattung* of “Bundeserneuerungsformular” (cf. *Das Bundesformular*² [WMANT 4; Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1964] 58-59). The sect believed that Israel had broken the covenant, necessitating confession by those desiring entry into the community of the new covenant.

¹³ I,8; II,2; III,3, 9-10; IV,22; VIII,1, 9, 10, 18, 20, 25; IX,5,6,8-9,19; X,21; XI,11, 17.

¹⁴ Community members are not free from sins; see III,21-24; (IV,20-21: fully cleansed only at the eschaton); VI,24-VII,25; VIII,24-IX,2; X,11-12; XI,9-10,12,14.

¹⁵ See also II,8, 15. In II,8 no mercy = no forgiveness (“without forgiveness to expiate thy sins”).

Rather than “judgment,” we have a divine “curse” which takes its inspiration from Deuteronomy 27-30 (priestly blessings/curses associated with the establishment of the Mosaic covenant),¹⁶ but has become eschatologically oriented resulting in eternal damnation.¹⁷ “Eternal” has here, however, the more Hebraic sense of “long-lasting” rather than of an other-worldly eternity,¹⁸ and the Manual’s eschatology will ultimately have to be termed “historical eschatology” in contrast to more transcendent alternatives.¹⁹ Although the final phrase in line 8 is difficult,²⁰ it at least indicates exclusion from forgiveness, pardon and atonement, i.e., from salvation.

As to the intended objects of this curse-threat, reference to the “lot of Belial” (II,5) seems to direct it at those who stand outside the community, those who do not pass into the sectarian covenant community. Yet, while the community did expect the divine judgment to fall upon outsiders, the continuation of the curse in II,11-18 makes clear that it is really the hypocritical entrant²¹ who is being threatened.

(11) And the priests and Levites shall say again:

¹⁶ See J. A. Loader, “The Model of the Priestly Blessing in 1QS,” *JSJ* 14/1 (1983) 11-17.

¹⁷ “damned in the night of eternal fire” (II,8); cf. also II,15. The punishment envisioned in II,5 is unclear. Lohse suggests the “Executioners of punishment” (lit. “those who repay recompense,” מְשַׁלְמֵי גְמוּלָהִים) are the avenging angels (*Texte*, 279, n. 14); likewise, P. Wernberg-Møller, *Manual*, 52, n. 17, and 53, n. 19; cf. also Isa 59:19; 1QpHab XII,3; T. Levi 3:2f; 1 Enoch 62:11; Targ. Lev. xxvi, 25. Leaney sees both eschatological and non-eschatological references (*Rule*, 131): vv 5-6 speak of “punishment at the hand of human persecutors and torturers”; while vv 7-8 speak of the “final judgment, the event at the end of history, following the woes so far considered, the event to which the thought of the passage has now moved” (see esp. “everlasting fire”).

¹⁸ See J. Licht, “Time and Eschatology in Apocalyptic Literature and in Qumran,” *JJS* 16 (1965) 177-182.

¹⁹ See M. Reiser, *Gerichtspredigt*, 67-68.

²⁰ See P. Garnet, *Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls* (WUNT 2.ser., 3; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1977) 70-73: “may he not forgive by atoning for your iniquity.”

²¹ On this section see esp. C. Newsom, “Apocalyptic and the Discourse of the Qumran Community,” *JNES* 49 (1990) 139-140. She notes “the emphatic position given to the problem of the person who would enter the covenant community hypocritically.” Also Leaney, *Rule*, 134; and H. Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 106-108.

Cursed be he when he passes,²² together with the idols of his heart, (12) who enters into this Covenant leaving before him whatever causes him to fall into iniquity and to turn away (from God)! Behold, (13) as he listens to the words of this Covenant, he blesses himself in his heart, saying: May peace be with me (14) when I walk in the stubbornness of my heart!

We should also note that there is no gradation of obedience or disobedience, just as there is one blessing or curse which strikes all equally who belong to the one group or the other. This suggests that “according to the darkness of thy deeds” has no quantitative nuance, but assumes the unity of human activity as we noted in the OT.²³

Though only implicit in this text, there is a tension between divine determination and human responsibility. Judgment is “according to the darkness of thy deeds,” yet elsewhere it is made clear that one’s “lot” is attributed to predestination.

1QS X, 11

(10) When day comes and the night, I will enter the Covenant of God,
when night and morning depart, I will recite His precepts,
and for as long as they are, I will establish in them (11) my boundary so as not to turn back.²⁴
I will show His judgment to be right according to my iniquities,²⁵
my rebellions shall be before my eyes like the graven Decree.²⁶

²² I.e., “passes (עבר) into the covenant”; cf. I,16, 18, 19, 24; II,10.

²³ See H. Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 112-113; H. Braun, *Spätjüdisch-häretischer und frühchristlicher Radikalismus* (2 vols; BHT 24; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1957) I.26, n. 3. See also the similar phrase a few lines earlier (II,5b): “Be thou cursed in all the works of thy guilty ungodliness!” (or “in all the godless works of thy guilt”). Leaney calls this phrase “indeed comprehensive,” i.e., “emphasis . . . falls on general moral or immoral action” (*Rule*, 130). See also “the good” (I,2,5; II,3,24; X,18).

²⁴ This rendering of the last phrase is preferable to Dupont-Sommer’s “establish in them my realm of no return.” See P. Wernberg-Møller, *Manual*, 37; and E. Lohse, *Texte*, 36. Cf. also 1QS X,25 for similar use of גבול (“boundary”).

²⁵ Dupont-Sommer translates: “I will pronounce my judgment . . .” However, כִּחַ is better rendered “to prove” and has מִשְׁפָּט (“His judgments”) for its object (cf. E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Harvard Sem. St.; Atlanta: Scholars, 1986] 101). Compare Leaney’s translation: “and his decree will I declare to be according to my iniquity” (*Rule*, 234). The ‘justification of God’ is a common theme in Jewish literature of this period.

²⁶ The “graven Decree” (cf. X,1,6,8; IX,14) probably refers to “the divine law regulating the order of the world and the harmonious succession of the seasons” and is equivalent to “Inevitability, Destiny and Order generally among Gnostics of the Hellenistic era” (cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, *Writings*, 97, n. 1; 98, n. 7). Line 11b could be paraphrased: may I not forget my rebelliousness (i.e., that God is righteousness and I need His mercy) just as I do not forget the Decree. For a different understanding, see J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes*, 104, n. 1.

But to God I will say, My righteousness!
 (12) (and) to the Most High, Support of my goodness!
 Source of Knowledge! Fountain of Holiness!
 Infinite Glory and Might of Eternal Majesty!
 I will choose whatever (13) He teaches me
 and will delight in His judgment of me.

וּמִשְׁפָּטוֹ אֶכְיָה כְּנִצְחָתִי

X,1 - XI,22 contains a series of psalmic liturgical pieces in the first person singular. X,10-13a forms a discrete unit dealing with the daily renewal of one's covenant commitment. It begins (X,10) with the sectary's vow to renew constantly this commitment, to recite God's precepts, and thereby set up a fence to keep oneself within the realm of salvation.²⁷ X,11 consists of a "doxology of judgment,"²⁸ a vow to always remind oneself that God's (condemning) judgment, even of the community member, is justly deserved, "according to my iniquities." But this focus on one's own unrighteousness gives way (X,11b-12) to praise of God's righteousness ("But to God I will say, My righteousness!") as the source of human goodness, knowledge, etc.. Here we see the same juxtaposing of human inability and divine grace which can be seen elsewhere in this literature.²⁹ Finally (X,13) the psalmist learns to "delight in His judgment of me," since, for the elect, even God's punitive judgments lead to their purification.³⁰

Thus, the motif functions as part of a confession of human unrighteousness, which, however, is a necessary element of the humble godly attitude toward the divine righteousness and mercy in salvation. The same is found in XI,9-11, and in X,23 ("my tongue shall ever recount the deeds of God, together with the unfaithful-

²⁷ See A. R. C. Leaney, *Rule*, 245; and P. Wernberg-Møller, *Manual*, 145, n. 33.

²⁸ In such "doxologies" sinners confess their guilt and declare God to be righteous (cf. Lev 26:20; Josh 7:19; 1 Kgs 8:33, Ezra 10:11). See further, G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 1.357.

²⁹ For similar juxtapositioning outside Qumran, see Isa 45:7; Amos 3:6; Wis 12:12; Rom 9:14-29. See further, J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes*, 115-118.

³⁰ See P. Garnet, *Salvation and Atonement*, 76-77; and P. Wernberg-Møller, *Manual*, 145, n. 38.

ness of men"). There is little "pleading of one's own righteousness" such as we saw in the canonical Psalms.

This text functions clearly as justification of God's righteous judgment, but this time directed against the elect themselves (in the Psalms and elsewhere, it was generally directed against outsiders or apostates). A pronounced sense of unworthiness and human sinfulness seems to lie behind this usage; and is juxtaposed with the divine righteousness. This is connected with a strong sense of dependence on divine enabling and predestination in this work, leading ultimately to the wholly submissive exclamation: "I will choose whatever He teaches me and will delight in His judgment [=guidance] of me." (X,12b-13)

1QS X, 17b-18

To no man will I render the reward (18) of evil,
with goodness will I pursue each one;
for judgment of all the living is with God,
and He it is who will pay to each man his reward.

לֹא אֶשְׁיב לְאִישׁ גְּמוּלַת רָע
וְהוֹאֵה יִשְׁלֵם לְאִישׁ גְּמוּלוֹ

X,17b - XI,2a deals mainly with proper attitudes toward others, both within and without the community, but also includes vows of personal holiness (X,21-23). Within this thematic unit we find a collection of sentences beginning with "I will not . . ." (לֹא, 17b-23a) listing activities rejected by the psalmist,³¹ and which are themselves introduced (X,16b-17a) by a dogmatic affirmation of God's judgment-authority over all His creatures ("I know that in His hand is judgment of all the living").

X,17b-18a opens this section on attitudes toward others with a commitment to do good to the one who has done personal harm, rather than taking personal revenge. Because elsewhere the sectary is exhorted to hate the wicked and the

³¹ See H.-J. Fabry, *Die Wurzel ŠŪB*, 195, and n. 389. He suggests this is analogous to the "negative Beichte" known from Egypt.

enemies,³² some commentators have sought to emend this saying which appears to contradict this attitude. Thus they connect **בטוב**³³ (“with good”) with the first stanza and translate, “I will not repay evil with good, each one will I pursue.”³⁴ Fabry, however, has brought convincing arguments against this translation.³⁵ The avoidance of personal vengeance is not so uncommon in this literature.³⁶ Further, this usage of divine judgment as a denial of the appropriateness of *human* retribution has been seen earlier in the OT (Prov 24:29). The perceived tension between this rejection of personal revenge and the hatred toward the wicked found elsewhere is resolved when we recognize that these verses are directed not at the wicked outside the community, but refer only to other community members who may have caused personal affront or harm. That it is not the wicked outside the community who are in view in lines 17b-18 is confirmed by 19b-20 which begins: “As for the multitude of the men of the Pit . . .”; i.e., shifting now to the enemies of the sect. Furthermore, the other extra-canonical references to avoiding taking personal vengeance consistently refer to fellow Israelites or sect-members, not to the wicked in general.³⁷ Other attempts at harmonization are thus unnecessary.³⁸

³² I,3,10; II,6; IX,21f; X,19-20. See also Josephus, *War*, II, § 139: “He (the Essene) swears .. to hate the wicked always and to fight together with the good” (quotation taken from A. Dupont-Sommer, *Writings*, 73, n. 3).

³³ Or **לְטוֹב** which is found in the fragment of the Manual from cave 4.

³⁴ K. Schubert, “Die jüdischen und judenchristlichen Sekten im Lichte des Handschriftenfundes von En Fešcha,” *ZKT* 74 (1952) 1-62, esp. 55; and H. Wildberger, “Die ‘Sektenrolle’ vom Toten Meer,” *EvT* 13 (1953) 25-43, esp. 37.

³⁵ *Wurzel*, 195-196, n. 392: a) **הַשֵּׁיב** is never connected with its direct object by **ב** or **ל**; b) this makes the first stanza too long; and c) comparison with Ps 7:5-6 makes it probable that **וְגַ** was meant to end the first stanza.

³⁶ Cf. 1QS VII,9; CD IX,2-5; 2 Enoch 50:4; T.Gad 6:1-7; T.Jos. 18:2; T.Benj. 4:2-4; cf. further Hippolytus, *Elenchos*, IX, § 23: the Essenes were required ‘to hate no man, neither the unjust nor the enemy, but to pray for them’ (citation in A. Dupont-Sommer, *Writings*, 99, n. 2).

³⁷ Cf. n. 36 above. See also esp. Lev 19:18 as the source of this prohibition of intra-community vengeance.

³⁸ For example: “Hatred” deals more in the emotional realm and refers to an attitude of disdain, whereas “retribution” deals with deeds and refers to punishment; thus one can simultaneously “hate” the wicked, yet refrain from taking revenge (H.-J. Fabry, *Wurzel*, 196-197). Braun suggests that refraining from personal vengeance springs directly from hatred of the wicked (cf. Rom 12:20, “heaping burning coals upon their heads”). By accepting abuse meekly, even repay-

Refraining from human retribution is then grounded in the axiom of divine recompense of deeds:

He it is who will pay to each man his reward.

Human (i.e., personal) retribution is improper since it encroaches upon divine prerogatives.³⁹ This is the one instance we can discover in the Qumran literature suggesting an acceptance of dual recompense. The language mirrors that expression familiar to us now from the OT and the Pseudepigrapha, whereby it is axiomatic that God will “repay” (שָׁלַם) to each (i.e., both good and bad) their “recompense” or “dealing” (גְּמוּלָה).⁴⁰ This divine repayment is called “judgment” (מִשְׁפָּט) in the preceding line, where also its universality is noted (“of all the living”). Since it is clear from X,19b-20 that the writer has the final Day of reckoning in view, X,18 will also probably have included eschatological recompense, rather than referring only to recompense in this life. Having acknowledged the presupposition of a dual recompense here, however, we must note that as rhetoric the passage is interested in only one side of this dual recompense. The argument runs against human *vengeance*. Although the motif as cited here was admittedly understood broadly in Judaism as a dual recompense, in this context the author will have intended to utilize only the punishment aspect since it is God’s prerogative to *punish* the wicked which effectively prohibits human vengeance. That he also may reward the righteous is incidental to the argument.

As the theological basis against human retribution, this usage of the motif represents a new category in our functional typology.⁴¹ Although Prov 24:29

ing evil with good, the righteous knew that God would take vengeance upon the wicked all the more intensely (*Radikalismus*, I.39, n. 14).

³⁹ Note emphatic וְהוּא: “and He it is who” See also the previous line likewise emphasizing this divine prerogative: כִּי יֵאָדָם אֱלֹהִים מִשְׁפָּט.

⁴⁰ Prov 19:17; Isa 59:18; 66:6; PssSol 2:35.

⁴¹ This usage does *motivate* to obedience, but not by a promise of reward or warning of punishment to the doer; nor does it aim primarily at *comforting* the oppressed righteous by promising the punishment of their enemies.

likewise restricts personal vengeance and uses recompense terminology, it does not give divine retribution as the grounds for this restriction. Prov 20:22 roots a similar restriction in patient waiting for divine *aid*, not retribution.⁴² Of course, the idea that vengeance belongs to God was common enough,⁴³ but joining it in this way with the prohibition against personal vengeance seems to have occurred first in the intertestamental period.⁴⁴ Of interest for Pauline studies, of course, is the correspondence between this passage and Rom 12:17-21.

Rom 12:17, 19/1QS X,17b-18a	no personal repayment of evil ⁴⁵
Rom 12:20, 21/1QS X,18	render good for evil
Rom 12:19/1QS X,18	retribution belongs to God ⁴⁶

Conclusions

Although the idea that God will recompense according to deeds is clearly present in the passages considered above, the terminology is still variable. Alongside the familiar *שְׁלֵם גְּמוּלָה* (X,18), we have also seen a divine “curse according to the darkness of thy deeds” (II,7) and an instance of “proving God’s judgment right according to deeds” (X,11). The motif can be applied to the punishment of the wicked (II,7) as well as to pedagogical punishments upon the godly (X,11; cf. XI,13). In the case of these latter, the strong sense of human inability and sinfulness which pervades this document means that such chastising punishments are not only welcome because they lead to repentance from occasional sins, but even more because each individual stands fundamentally under divine judgment. Even for the righteous this remains true (X,11), and their constant remembrance of this leads

⁴² “Do not say, “I will repay evil”;
wait for the Lord, and he will help you.”

⁴³ Deut 32:35; Ps 94:1-3.

⁴⁴ Besides this passage, cf. CD IX,2-5; T.Gad 6:1-7; 2 Enoch 50:4; (Ps.Phoc. 77).

⁴⁵ Cf. also 1 Thess 5:15; 1 Pet 3:9.

⁴⁶ On the relationship between Rom 12:14-21 and this intertestamental tradition, see the author’s forthcoming article, “Rom 12:14-21 and Non-Retaliatio in Second Temple Judaism.”

them to an equally constant reliance on divine grace for renewal, obedience and justification (X,11b-13; XI,2b-3a).

New in this document is the function of the motif as a *theological basis against inter-personal retribution* (X,17b-18). This particular combination of the motif with the admonition against taking personal revenge seems to be of postbiblical origin, and will be seen again in Paul (Rom 12:17-20).

We did not wholly clarify in what sense the motif is eschatological in this document, but did note at one point (X,17-18) that the retribution can be placed within the context of the final War between the Sons of Light and Darkness, and is thus more akin to forms of OT historical eschatology than other-worldly conceptions found in apocalyptic writings. Along these lines, the elect can be portrayed as executors of divine judgment according to deeds in their destruction of the wicked at the time of this last battle (VIII,6-7, 10); and the yearly examination to which all community members were subject can be portrayed in terms that suggest a degree of proleptic experience of God's own judgment according to deeds (V,24; IX,14b-16a).

THE THANKSGIVING HYMNS (1QH)

Introductory Matters

The scroll from Cave I dates to the first century CE or somewhat earlier, but most would not even attempt to date the *composition* of the hymns themselves.⁴⁷ There is still no agreement as to whether we have here compositions by a single author—perhaps the Teacher of Righteousness—or should view these psalms as community products.⁴⁸ There does seem to be agreement, however, that whoever the author(s) were, and however the compilation came about, this document

⁴⁷ G. Vermes, *Perspective*, 56.

⁴⁸ E. P. Sanders gives a helpful overview of the situation up to 1977 in *PPJ*, "Appendix I: The Authorship and *Sitz im Leben* of the Hodayot," 321-323.

represents the views of the Qumran community. The numerous copies found in Caves I and IV witness to its great popularity.

1QH IV, 18-19

The content of this psalm (IV,5 - V,4) can be summarized as follows:

Praise of God for salvation through the covenant, to which the psalmist will adhere despite the deceitful enemies who entice him away from it. Their temptation will only lead to their own perdition.⁴⁹

There is a great deal of emphasis on the enemies, who are described as “interpreters of falsehood and seers of deceit” (IV,9b-10a), “hypocrites” who seek God “with a double heart” (IV,13-14), “they who have fallen away from Thy Covenant” (IV,19), and “who transgress Thy word” (IV,26b-27a). Interpreters are divided as to possible historical allusions contained in these descriptions. In any case, their opposition to the psalmist (and the sect) is traced to their rejection of the revelation that has now been granted Israel through the sect’s teaching:

For [they have] not [heeded] Thy [voice]
nor lent their ear to Thy word;
for they have said (18) of the vision of knowledge, It is not true!
and of the way of Thy heart, That is not it! (IV,17-18a)

This rejection of the truth results in divine judgment according to works:

But Thou, O God, wilt answer them,
judging them (19) in Thy might [according to] their idols
and according to the multitude of their sins,
that they who have fallen away from Thy Covenant
may be taken in their thoughts.
(20) And at the time of ju[dg]ment Thou wilt cut off all the men of deceit
and there shall be no more seers of error. . . . (21) But they that are according to Thy soul
shall stand before Thee for ever,
and they that walk in the way of Thy heart (22) shall stand fast eternally.
(IV,18b-22a)

כִּי אַתָּה אֵל תִּעֲנֶה לָהֶם לְשׁוֹפָטָם בְּגִבּוֹרֶתְךָ (כ) גְּלוּלֵיהֶם וְכָרוֹב פִּשְׁעֵיהֶם

This judgment results in death⁵⁰ which, though certainly physical, is also a soteriological category in contrast to the hope of the righteous who “shall stand

⁴⁹ S. Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran* (Acta Theologica Danica 2; Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960) 79.

⁵⁰ “cut off” [כרת, Hiphil] (IV,20; cf. also IV,26), used of the destruction of the life a) of animals (Lev 26:22; Mic 5:9) and b) of human beings by their enemies (Isa 10:7; Ezek 17:17) or by God (Deut 19:1; Isa 48:9). See M. Mansoor, *The Thanksgiving Hymns* (STDJ 3; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961) 126, n. 5.

before Thee for ever" (IV,21). Although not addressed to the wicked themselves, the motif amounts here to a declaration of God's coming judgment upon them, and thus has some similarity to the prophetic sentence of judgment. At the same time, the entire psalm is aimed at extolling God, so that even this judgment announcement is an important element that brings praise to God. His judgment demonstrates the triumph of his truth and power.⁵¹

Here we have a very clear instance of the unity of observable deeds and inner disposition. The judgment is explicitly "according to⁵² their abominable idols"⁵³ and "the multitude of their sins,"⁵⁴ which are themselves the expression of their fundamental rejection of the divine word and knowledge (IV,17-18). This is termed being "estranged from Thy Covenant."⁵⁵ Behind their works lies a "double heart," a "stubbornness of heart," because they are not "firm in Thy truth" (IV,14-15).

As for the psalmist, he seeks God whose Law is "graven in [his] heart" (IV,6, 10); and we may assume he counts himself among those "that are according to Thy soul" and "that walk in the way of Thy heart" (IV,21). Yet the emphasis in this psalm is not upon his own obedience, but upon God's mercy and the necessity of human dependence upon divine grace in the light of human frailty and sinfulness (cf. esp. IV,29-33). Righteousness and perfection of way are beyond mere human achievement, attainable only through divine intervention.

⁵¹ IV,13, 20b-21a, 25-27; (V,4).

⁵² Though the first prefixed כ ("according to") is illegible, experts are unanimous in reading it here in parallelism to the immediately following . . . וְכָרֹב.

⁵³ I.e., their acts of idolatry (גִּלּוּלִים); cf. IV,15 (see S. Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 83, n. 34).

⁵⁴ פְּעִיָּהֶם, "transgressions" (pl.).

⁵⁵ זוּר (Niphal) = "be estranged"; cf. Ezek 14:5; Isa 1:4. The similarities of thought and expression between this psalm and Ezek 14:1-5 have been noted by others. In the Ezekiel passage, idolatry and iniquity are combined with an emphasis on the 'heart' of the house of Israel which has thus become 'estranged' from Yahweh.

And I, I know that righteousness is not of man,
 nor of the sons of men perfection (31) of way;
 to the Most High God belong all the works of righteousness,
 whereas the way of man is not firm
 unless it be by the Spirit which God has created for him
 (32) to make perfect a way for the sons of men. (IV,30-32)

Unlike any spirit of works-righteousness, he stresses “because I lean on Thee I shall rise and stand,” and “I leaned on Thy favours and on the greatness of Thy mercy” (IV,22,37).

1QH V, 5-6

Similarly to the previous psalm, this one (V,5-19) extols God, who does not forsake the psalmist in the danger caused by his adversaries. Here it is God’s negation of the principle of judgment according to deeds which prompts the psalmist’s praise.⁵⁶

[For it is not]⁵⁷ according to my sin that (6) Thou has judged me
 and Thou hast not abandoned me because of the wickedness of my inclination,⁵⁸
 but hast succoured my life from the Pit. (V,5-6)

[ולא] כאשמתִי שפִּטְתָּנִי
 ולא עֲזַבְתָּנִי בְּזִמּוֹת יִצְרִי

The nature of this sin or guilt of the psalmist is not explored. In fact, it is probable that specific transgressions are not in view at all, but rather the evil imaginations or shameful intrigues (זִמּוֹת) which spring from one’s evil inclination (יִצְרִי).⁵⁹ If so, this expresses an attitude which finds application at all times for the

⁵⁶ A similar usage in Ps 103:10 was already examined in an earlier chapter. Both praise God because he does not judge the righteous strictly according to deeds. The two passages differ in that Ps 103:10 has occasional sins in view, while 1QH V,5-6 focuses more on sinful desires which characterize all humanity (see below).

⁵⁷ With most interpreters we read ולא at the end of the lacuna immediately preceding כאשמתִי (“according to my guilt”) since this is suggested by the parallelism with the following phrase. See B. Kittel, *The Hymns of Qumran* (SBLDS 50; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1981) 87-88; S. Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 92, n. 4; M. Wallenstein, “A Hymn from the Scrolls,” *VT* 5 (1955) 277-283, esp. 278-279. Otherwise J. Licht, “The Doctrine of the Thanksgiving Scroll,” *IEJ* 6/1 (1956) 100; H. Bardtke, *Loblieder* II, col 596.

⁵⁸ Or, “Thou hast not left me in the shameful intrigues of my desire” (S. Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 90).

⁵⁹ Cf. VII,6; XI,20; XVIII,11, 13; also Gen 6:5. Though G. Jeremias is correct to caution against exact identification with the later rabbinic t.t. (*Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* [SUNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963] 218, n. 6), יִצְרִי does refer to human nature as inclined to evil (cf. R. E. Murphy, “Yēser in the Qumran Literature,” *Bib* 39 [1958] 334-344). Kittel translates:

community member and is seen repeatedly in these psalms: innate sinfulness obviates reliance on one's own righteousness, leading one to cling to divine mercy and pardon which are offered in the Covenant. Or as Kittel phrases it: "The poet's theological statement is one of salvation by grace alone, not due to any righteous works on the part of the poet."⁶⁰

This text raises acutely the question of the relevance of our motif to the elect in the hymns. The writer seems to be asserting that divine judgment according to works does not apply in their case. Since we will seek below to place the motif within the larger soteriological pattern of the Hodayot, we will focus here merely on determining whether or not such an assertion was the writer's intention in this text. It must be noted that this text has an historical focus, looking *back* to a situation of adversity in which God did not abandon [עֲזָרָה] but helped or rescued [עֲזָרָה] the psalmist's life from the grave.⁶¹ Since the psalmist is ever aware of human frailty and sinfulness, "not according to my sin" need indicate no more than a reference to divine benevolence in the treatment of the elect; i.e., God does not treat them as they should deserve in the light of their sin. This historical focus likewise means that the text should not be taken as a categorical denial of the principle of judgment according to deeds with regard to future salvation.

1QH XIV, 24⁶²

This short piece (XIV,23-[27])⁶³ praises God, who forgives the penitent, but punishes the ungodly, and has taught the psalmist to do the same.

Thou who pardonest them that are converted from sin
and visitest the iniquity of the wicked [upon them]⁶⁴.

"wicked nature" (*Hymns*, 84).

⁶⁰ *Hymns*, 97.

⁶¹ See further V,12b-19 for this historical focus which is characteristic of such songs of thanksgiving.

⁶² Some translators find an additional occurrence of the motif at XIV,11b-12: "For according to the spirits [he divides] them between good and evil," in which case we have a possible reference to God's separation of the wicked from the righteous on the basis of their 'spirits'. The thought is also found elsewhere (cf. VII,12; 1QS IX,14-15). However, the lacunae in the MSS render any reconstruction suspect. See the thorough discussion of

[Thou lovest them that seek Thee] with a generous (25) [heart],
but Thou hatest perversity for ever.

וּפִי־קָדֵר עַל־רָשָׁעִים [עֲלֵיהֶם]

God is praised both for his forgiveness of the repentant and his just retribution upon the wicked. What apparently distinguishes the one group from the other is the repentance of the former,⁶⁵ whereas the wicked continue in their transgression. We noted earlier the negation of the retribution motif for the righteous (V,5-6), but this passage makes clear once again that this differential treatment is based not merely upon election, but upon a fundamental difference in inner disposition between the two groups, the one seeking God with a generous heart (though not entirely free from sins), the other characterized by perversity. A few lines later the psalmist makes equally clear that this distinction must ultimately be traced to God's gracious initiative.

Thou hast favoured me, Thy servant, with the Spirit of Knowledge,
[to love tr]uth (26) [and righteousness]
and to loathe all the ways of perversity.
and I will love Thee generously
[and seek] Thee with all my heart.
(27) [. . .] for it is by Thy hand that this is,
and without [Thy might has nothi]ng [been made . . .].

(XIV,25-27)

Judgment According To Works And The Soteriological Pattern In 1QH

The thanksgiving hymns are not infrequently singled out as showing remarkable similarity to Paul's theology at a number of points: emphasis on grace in salvation, utter dependence of sinful humanity on this grace, the same dependence for the saved who remain frail and sinful even after conversion (prompting comparison with

the textual problems in S. Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 220, nn. 5-6.

⁶³ The text is missing between XIV,27 and XV,9, so we cannot be certain of ending of this psalm and the beginning of the next.

⁶⁴ The lacuna following רָשָׁעִים almost certainly contained the preposition עַל since פִּקְדֵּן is nearly always found with this preposition in the OT. We have modified Dupont-Sommer's translation to reflect this decision. Cf. S. Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 225, n. 5.

⁶⁵ Heb. לְשִׁבְי פָשַׁע.

the idea of *simul iustus et peccator*), a proleptic experience of salvation ‘already’ by the saved, etc. Since a number of previous studies have resulted in a generally agreed upon outline of the soteriology of 1QH,⁶⁶ we can be content here to give a summary of their results. Since, however, our motif has not played much of a role in any of these previous studies, it will be our particular contribution to attempt to place it within that pattern.

Humanity’s frailty and sinfulness are “more distinctly expressed in 1QH than any other doctrine of the Sect. Man is a sinner, utterly helpless but for the grace of God upon him.”⁶⁷ We read:

Yet am I but a creature of clay and a thing kneaded with water,
a foundation of shame and fount of defilement,
a crucible of iniquity and fabric of sin,
a spirit of straying, and perverse,
void of understanding,
whom the judgments of righteousness terrify. . . .
But how can a man count up his sins,
and what can he answer concerning his iniquities?
And how can he, perverse, reply to the judgment of righteousness? (I,21-23, 25-26)⁶⁸

Thus it is no surprise that God’s *election* and *grace*, not human obedience or righteousness, are the main themes when the hymns reflect on the source or cause of salvation.

And I know that the inclination of every spirit is in Thy hand
[and that] Thou hast ordained [the way of every man]
[together with his visitation]
before ever creating him.
And how can any man change Thy words? (XV,13-14)⁶⁹

And I have no fleshly refuge;
[and man has no righteousness o]r virtue
to be delivered from si[n]

⁶⁶ Treatments of the theology of the Hodayot include: M. Mansoor, *Thanksgiving Hymns*, 52-92; J. Licht, “Doctrine,” 1-13, 89-101; S. Holm-Nielsen, “The Theological Concepts of the Hodayot,” *Hodayot*, 273-300; and E. H. Merrill, *Qumran and Predestination: A Theological Study of the Thanksgiving Hymns* (STDJ 8; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975).

⁶⁷ M. Mansoor, *Thanksgiving Hymns*, 59; see 58-62.

⁶⁸ See also IV,29-31, 33-35; VII,16-17,28; IX,13,15-17; XII,19,24-35; XIII,14-16; XVII,18-20. Note also the repeated phrase, *creature of clay* (e.g., XI,3; XVIII,31).

⁶⁹ See further, on election/predestination: I,7-31; III,19-25; XIV,13; XVI,10; XVII,21. Merrill’s study on predestination remains the most comprehensive to date (*Qumran and Predestination*).

[and wi]n forgiveness.

But I, I have leaned on Thy abun[dant mercy]

[and on the greatness of] Thy grace.

(VII,17-18)⁷⁰

As in Paul, this is grace to the *undeserving sinner*:

I give [Thee thanks, O Adonai],

for Thou hast given me understanding of Thy truth

and hast made me know Thy marvellous Mysteries

and Thy favours to [sinful] man

[and] the abundance of Thy mercy toward the perverse heart!

(VII,26-27)

Grace is likewise the cause of the continued obedience and perseverance of the saved:

for Thou hast upheld me by Thy might

and hast poured out Thy holy Spirit within me

that I should not stagger! . . .

Thou hast not permitted me cravenly to desert Thy Covenant. . . .

And Thou knowest the inclination of Thy servant,

that right[eousness] is not [of man].

[But] I have [le]aned [upon Thee]

that Thou shouldst lift up [my] hea[rt]

[and] give (me) strength and vigour.

(VII,6-7,8,16)

This last citation also reveals faith, or reliance upon God's grace and mercy ("I have leaned upon Thee"), as a central element in the human appropriation of this gracious salvation.⁷¹

At the same time, the human response is emphasized as a vital element in the elects' salvation, even though this too is a result of grace. The elect are those who have been "converted from sin,"⁷² who "know" and "adhere" to the Covenant revealed to the Community.⁷³ These are granted a spirit which produces obedience to the commands of God and the precepts of the community.⁷⁴ They walk in God's ways,⁷⁵ do not pervert, transgress or depart from His word and commands,⁷⁶ nor

⁷⁰ See further on grace in salvation: II,23,25; IV,31-33; VII,6-9,27,30-31; IX,7,29-34; X,5-7,14-19; XI,7-14; XIII,17-18; XVI,11-12; XVIII,26-29.

⁷¹ See also II,21b-22a,28b; IV,22,37; IX,10.

⁷² II,9; VI,6; XIV,24; XVI,17.

⁷³ II,21-22,28; IV,24,35,39; X,30; XV,15; XVI,7; XVIII,9.

⁷⁴ V,19-20; VI,6-7; VII,19-20; XIV,17-18; XV,11-12; XVI,17-18.

⁷⁵ IV,21,24; VI,7; XV,15.

⁷⁶ XII,24; XIV,15; XV,11-12.

sin against Him in any way.⁷⁷ They can, hence, be described as perfect of way or heart,⁷⁸ though this cannot be taken in an absolute sense in the light of the frequent confessions of continuing sinfulness.

Although final salvation is ultimately grounded in Qumran's emphasis on *sola gratia*, did the community also make it in some sense conditional upon this grace-induced obedience?⁷⁹ Would they be judged according to their works? In none of the three instances of the motif adduced above was there a warning or threat addressed to community members, nor did we find elsewhere language of God rewarding or repaying the righteous according to their works. Rather in XIV,24 we saw that God pardons the converted in explicit contrast to judgment according to works upon the wicked.⁸⁰ God's judgment of the converted is also stated elsewhere to be according to pardon or mercy.

Thou wilt judge them with abundant mercy and pardon because of Thy favours. (VI,9)

Thy loving keeping is for the saving of my soul
and over my steps is abundance of pardon
and when Thou judgest me, greatness of [mer]cy. (IX,33-34)⁸¹

Nevertheless several observations support our contention that salvation is dependent upon continuance in obedience in 1QH. In addition to the stress on obedience already noted above in describing the elect, one wonders how else we are to take such a passage as the following:

⁷⁷ XIV,17-18; XVII,22-23.

⁷⁸ I,36; XII,24; XVI,7.

⁷⁹ "Salvation includes not only deliverance from persecution but also deliverance from sin itself. Though man is predestined to belong to the elect *his election is dependent on his being of a righteous and moral character*. It is one of God's gifts to him; the ability to live a righteous life" (M. Mansoor, *Thanksgiving Hymns*, 64; my emphasis).

⁸⁰ In the OT Pseudepigrapha we observed the same dichotomy (mercy to the righteous/strict judgment without mercy to the wicked), yet without thereby intending to exempt the covenant people from divine judgment according to deeds.

⁸¹ Cf. also I,6.

And I knew there was hope for them that are converted from rebellion and that abandon sin by [. . .] and by walking in the way of Thy heart without any perversion. (VI,6-7)⁸²

Future hope is clearly contingent upon obedience, and a fairly radical obedience at that (“without any perversion”). Furthermore, the possibility of apostasy seems to be envisioned in a couple of places in a way that connects loss of salvation with departure from obedience.⁸³ To all these may be added I,21-23 which testifies to the psalmist’s fear of divine judgment in the light of his own sinfulness:

Yet I am but a creature of clay . . . a crucible of iniquity and fabric of sin . . . whom the judgments of righteousness terrify.

Divine pardon does not eliminate the urgency or necessity (with respect to salvation) of moral renewal; rather they are viewed as two sides of the same coin:

For Thou pardonest iniquity
and clean[sist m]an of sin by Thy righteousness. (IV,37)

Thus, inasmuch as the righteous are walking faithfully in the covenant, future divine judgment according to deeds has little practical relevance. They need not fear it and it is seldom utilized in relation to their situation (except as part of their own confessions). On the other hand, inasmuch as a covenant member strays (or in the light of potential straying), divine judgment according to deeds (= punishment) becomes immediately relevant once again as a threat to be taken seriously.

THE WAR SCROLL (1QM)

Introductory Matters

As with many of the Qumran documents any suggestion as to the date of composition of 1QM is tenuous. Suggestions range from the mid-2nd century BCE⁸⁴

⁸² Cf. also XVI,16-18.

⁸³ XVI,15; XVII,21-24. It is unclear whether the oft-used phrase “those who have fallen away/are estranged from Thy Covenant” refers to apostate former community members or non-sectarians (see E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 256-57, nn. 48-49). Eugene Merrill appears to deny the possibility of apostasy in 1QH due to its radical predestinarianism (*Predestination*, 44). He cites 1QH II,35-36 to the effect that God prevents the psalmist from exercising his free choice of abandoning the Covenant. The text reads: “in the midst of their outrages Thou hast not left me without courage to the point of departing from Thy service,” or as Merrill translates, “Thou hast not caused me to be dismayed into forsaking Thy service.” But is this statement not simply thanksgiving *post facto* rather than a universal dogma? It is one thing to look back on preservation, and thank God and His sovereignty for it; and another to look forward and declare “God will never allow me to”

to the early or even latter first century CE,⁸⁵ with the earlier date generally favored.⁸⁶ Whatever the exact genre and character of the work, its aim in giving these detailed regulations as to tactics, weaponry, etc. will likely have been to prepare for the imminent eschatological conflict, and to encourage the Sons of Light and “inflame their zeal” in the light of the coming holy war.⁸⁷ The stress on purity in the document may be explained in this light by the fact that the angels were to be co-warriors, and successful warfare depended on the purity of the human partners. Though most are now in agreement that this is a composite work, its precise literary structure needs further examination.⁸⁸

1QM XVIII,14⁸⁹

In spite of the badly damaged MS the text can be reconstructed and almost

⁸⁴ M. Avi-Yonah, “The ‘War of the Sons of Light and Sons of Darkness’ and Maccabean Warfare,” *IEJ* 2/1 (1952) 1-5; D. Dimant, “The War Scroll,” *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (ed. M. E. Stone; Compendium Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2/2; Assen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress, 1984) 517.

⁸⁵ E. Lohse, *Texte*, 178; Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (trans. B. and C. Rabin; London: Oxford University; 1962) ix, cf. also 4-7, 243-246.

⁸⁶ The MS from Cave 1 probably dates to the 2nd century BCE (cf. D. Dimant, “The War Scroll,” 515).

⁸⁷ A. Dupont-Sommer, *Writings*, 164-166. Note also the mention of the priests’ function to “strengthen the hands” of the warriors (VII,12; XV,7; XVI,13-14).

⁸⁸ See esp. P. R. Davies, *1QM, The War Scroll from Qumran: Its Structure and History* (BibOr 32; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1977), though his conclusions are far from being universally accepted (D. Dimant, “The War Scroll,” 516-517; and J. Duhaime, “The War Scroll from Qumran and the Greco-Roman Tactical Treatises,” *RQ* 13 [1988] 133).

⁸⁹ We do not consider the difficult text XIV,11b-12 to be a motif occurrence. The most extensive discussion can be found in H.-J. Fabry, *Wurzel*, 207-211, who does find the motif here and translates “Und ihren Vornehmen vergiltst du gemäß (in Bezug auf) der (sc. ihrer) Verachtung [ולנכבדיהם תשיב לבון]” (210). To our knowledge such a use of the prefix ל to express the *standard* (“according to . . .,” normally כ prefixed) would be singular in occurrences of the motif (cf. also Y. Yadin, *Scroll*, 328, note). Perhaps השיב + ל should be taken quite naturally in the sense “to cause (someone) to return to (location)” as in Jer 12:15: “and I will bring them [והשבתי] again to their heritage [לנחלתו] and to their land [לארצו], everyone of them.” The translation would then read: And as for their nobles you will return (them) to contempt.

assuredly contained the motif:⁹⁰

(13b) Thine is the might, and in Thy hand is the battle, and there is no one (14) [to save them] ⁹¹ Thy times and appointed times according to Thy pleasure, and retribution [of the wicked Thou wilt render unto Thine ene]mies, and Thou wilt cut off from [. . .].

וג[מז]ל⁹² [רשעים תשיב⁹³ לאויב]יכה⁹⁴

A reference to divine retribution is also supported by the context, since a divine punishment (“Thou wilt cut off . . .”) follows immediately afterward.

The fragmentary nature of cols XVIII and XIX make a reconstruction of the literary context somewhat conjectural. Columns XV,1-XVIII,5 describe the ebb and flow of the final battle between the sons of light and the sons of darkness. XVIII,4-5 indicates that the army of Israel is now being assembled by the priests for the final pursuit of the sons of darkness “to destroy them utterly.” The remainder of col XVIII (lines 6ff) consists of a prayer by the priestly leaders.⁹⁵ Sunset is approaching (XVIII,5b,12), threatening to stall the final pursuit and annihilation of the enemy. After blessing God for past miracles of victory and remembering that this is the appointed time “to abolish the dominion of the enemy that it might exist no more” (XVIII,11), the missing ending of the column most likely contained the request, patterned after Joshua 10, that God prolong the day for completion of the pursuit, or

⁹⁰ Yadin’s reconstruction and translation will be adopted for the most part below, cf. *Scroll*, 346-347. Most other translations have not attempted a reconstruction and contain no reference to the motif.

⁹¹ Yadin suggests something like “and Thou didst make . . .” before “Thy times” (*Scroll*, 347, note); cf. XIV,13; XVIII,9.

⁹² The initial וג and final ל are visible making the reconstruction of וגמזל certain.

⁹³ שוב (Hiph) is somewhat more speculative, but eminently reasonable as the complement of גמזל (cf. 1QM VI,6; XI,13-14; also Ps 28:4; 94:2; Lam 3:64; Joel 3[4]:4, 7; Sir 35:24.). The verb שלם is ruled out, since the ל would have been visible (cf. Y. Yadin, *Scroll*, 347, note). It may also be reasonably conjectured that the space between גמזל and תשיב contained the word רשעים (“of the wicked”), since this space is the right size and the construct “recompense of the wicked” is commonly used in Qumran (cf. 1QM VI,6; XI,13-14; 1QS X,17; CD VII,9; XIX,6; see also Fabry, *Wurzel*, 188-213).

⁹⁴ The restoration of a concluding לאויביכה (“your enemies”) is almost certain, some of the letters being partly visible.

⁹⁵ According to Davies this is a “Hymn of Thanksgiving” (XVIII,6b-XIX,8; *1QM*, 81).

that he intervene directly in the battle.⁹⁶ If this is correct, then lines 13-14 come just before this request.

These lines both praise and remind God that might in battle belongs to him, that he has set the appointed time for victory (i.e., now), and that retribution and punishment upon the enemies will assuredly come from him. Praise as a motivating reminder to God in preparation for a request is a normal part of Jewish piety.⁹⁷ Alongside this primary function of the motif, it will also have had the subsidiary aim of encouraging the zeal of the Israelite warriors who were hearing this prayer.

Here also, the motif functions strictly in terms of divine punishment upon the wicked. Although the language of organic consequences is still employed (שוב גמול), it is difficult to ascertain whether the ancient “synthetische Lebensauffassung” is still understood, or whether the phrase has simply become a periphrasis for divine punishment. While the sinfulness of the wicked is everywhere assumed, the interest in this particular passage does not seem to be so much upon the *appropriateness* of retribution (i.e., *in accordance with their sins*), but is used simply to raise confidence in the *certainty* of coming punishment based upon God’s power and character. These enemies who are to experience divine retribution are the forces of Belial, including both foreign nations and apostate Jews (i.e., those who reject the Covenant offered through the community).⁹⁸ Their end is to be “cut off” and “destroyed utterly.”

(1QM XI, 3-4)

Although the motif does not occur here, the reference to “deliverance because of mercy and not according to our (sinful) works” forms an important corollary and deserves brief mention.

For Thine is the battle!

And (3) he [i.e., David] struck [down] the Philistines many times by Thy holy Name.

⁹⁶ See Y. Yadin, *Scroll*, 12-13, 222-223; and P. R. Davies, *1QM*, 73, 82. Column XIX, lines 9ff implies that the Israelites were forced by nightfall to retire to their camp, but upon returning to the battlefield the next morning found the enemy annihilated by “the sword of God.”

⁹⁷ See 1 Kgs 8:22-53; Ezra 9:6-15; Neh 9:6-37; Jer 32:17-25.

And Thou hast also saved us many times by the hand of our kings (4) because of Thy mercy and not according to our works by which we have done evil nor (according to) our sinful deeds.

וְגַם בְּיַד מַלְכֵינוּ הוֹשַׁעְתָּנוּ פְּעָמִים רַבּוֹת בְּעֶבֶר רַחֲמֶיךָ וְלֹא כְמַעֲשֵׂינוּ . . . וְעַלִּילוֹת פְּשָׁעֵינוּ

The three-fold refrain, “Thine is the battle,”⁹⁹ stresses the contrast between divine and human ability. David is remembered first, who “set his trust in Thy majestic Name and not in the sword and the spear” (lines 1-2); then God’s deliverance of Israel via her kings is cited “because of Thy mercy and not according to our works” (lines 3-4); and finally God’s might alone is praised: “From [Thee] comes the power; truly (the battle) is not ours! Nor our might nor the strength of our hands display valour, but it is by Thy might and the strength of Thy tremendous valour” (lines 4-7). That God deals with his covenant people (i.e., saves/delivers) “according to compassion [רַחֲמִים]” and “not according to our sinful deeds” was already noted as a central tenet of Israel’s faith in the Pseudepigrapha. A clearer statement of reliance upon grace instead of works could hardly be demanded.¹⁰⁰ While the possibility exists that this implies a negation of judgment according to works for covenant members, that is not a necessary logical conclusion.¹⁰¹

CONCLUSIONS (1QM)

Since this writing is focused on tactics, weapons, etc. connected with the final War, there is less material of a theological nature. Apart from the presence of Belial and angelic forces in the battle (but angelic forces were also present in OT battles), and the dualism common to Qumran, there is little here that one could call

⁹⁸ Cf. I,2 (“and in league with them the offenders against the covenant”); IX,9; XI,9. On the “enemies” in 1QM, see E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 248-249; and Y. Yadin, *Scroll*, 26. Another occurrence of the motif directed against “all the nations of vanity” can be found in VI,5b-6. See also IV,12, where גְּמוּלָאֵל (“recompense of God”) and שְׁלוּמֵי אֵל (“repayment of God”) occur alongside “battle,” “vengeance,” “power,” “annihilation,” etc. as descriptions of this phase of the final war.

⁹⁹ XI,1,2b,4b; cf. also 1 Sam 17:47: “but the battle is the Lord’s.”

¹⁰⁰ On the possibility that this text lies in some way behind Tit 3:5, see J. A. De Waard, *Comparative Study*, 73-76.

¹⁰¹ See the discussion on this question in chaps 2-3 above, and below in connection with other theological statements in 1QM.

strictly apocalyptic. Although the destruction of the wicked is connected with God's anger and vengeance,¹⁰² there is no speculation as to their post-mortem fate.¹⁰³ On the other hand, this is clearly the Final War which is expected to usher in the everlasting age of blessing upon God's people, the people of the Covenant, and in that sense it is "eschatological."¹⁰⁴ Thus 1QM seems to operate with a "historical eschatology" much as in the OT, in which God's Judgment occurs at the end of, but still *within*, human history. Courtroom scenes and terminology are absent,¹⁰⁵ and the execution of judgment occurs via the physical annihilation of the wicked in battle. This eschatological judgment is seen as the necessary prelude to the restoration of God's kingdom on earth and the everlasting blessedness of the righteous.¹⁰⁶

In the salvation of the sons of light priority is clearly given to God's mercy and might (cf. esp. on XI,3-4 above), and as elsewhere in Judaism God's gracious covenant is the basis of all divine-human interaction.¹⁰⁷ At the same time this deliverance involves a considerable measure of human synergy. The retribution texts fuse divine and human activity in the eschatological recompensing of the wicked. In fact a new twist in the use of the motif to motivate the righteous to obedience is found in these texts. Whereas in the Jewish Scriptures the righteous were thereby encouraged to continued faithfulness to Torah, in 1QM the motif encourages them to valiant action in battle.

In 1QM the motif is taken up only in reference to the destruction of the wicked, and only within a setting of praise and prayer to God. In addition there

¹⁰² III,6,9; IV,1,12; VI,3; VII,5.

¹⁰³ M. Reiser, *Gerichtspredigt*, 65-66, 70.

¹⁰⁴ See esp. I,5, 8-9a; also I,9b-12; VII,5; IX,5-7; XI,11-15; XII,10-15; XIV,5; XV,1-2; XVIII,11.

¹⁰⁵ Only the "book of the names" of the elect is mentioned as being beside God in his holy abode (XII,2).

¹⁰⁶ We are left in the dark on the fate of deceased Israelites.

¹⁰⁷ I,2; X,10; XII,3; XIII,7-8; XIV,4,8; XVII,7,8; XVIII,7.

seems to be a certain hardening of the terminology:¹⁰⁸

God repays/returns (השיב, שלם)

the recompense of the wicked (גמול רשעים/רעתם)

to his enemies (various formulations).

Certainly with the attached phrase—"of the wicked"—the motif has become simply another way of saying "God will destroy the wicked." There is little evidence that the "synthetische Lebensauffassung" which originally stood behind these words was any longer felt or implied by the speaker.

THE DAMASCUS DOCUMENT (CD)

Introductory Matters

Generally acknowledged to be a composite work,¹⁰⁹ this document now consists of two parts; Admonitions (I-VIII) and Ordinances (IX-XVI). The two additional columns (XIX-XX) discovered on a separate fragment appear to be a slightly later recension of the ending of the Admonitions. All occurrences of the motif fall within the Admonitions. Until the publication of P. R. Davies' study¹¹⁰ Qumran scholars interpreted this document as of a piece with the other Dead Sea scroll literature, interpreting obscure passages in CD by means of assumed parallels in other scrolls. Davies' thesis is that the bulk of CD is a piece of pre-Qumranic exilic theology which, in its present form, evidences some Qumranic editing. For this reason, we will pay less attention to parallels from other Qumran documents when interpret-

¹⁰⁸ See n. 169 below on Fabry's thesis of "terminologische Verhärtung" and our criticism.

¹⁰⁹ See the series of articles in *RB* by Murphy-O'Connor on the literary structure of CD: "An Essene Missionary Document? CD II,14-VI,1," *RB* 77 (1970) 201-229; "A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document VI,2-VIII,3," *RB* 78 (1971) 210-232; "The Critique of the Princes of Judah (CD VIII,3-19)," *RB* 79 (1972) 200-216; "A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document XIX,33-XX,34," *RB* 79 (1972) 544-564. Also J. Maier, *Die Texte vom Toten Meer* (Munich: Ernst Reinhardt, 1960) 2.40.

¹¹⁰ *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"* (JSOTSup 25; Sheffield: JSOT, 1982).

ing CD. It seems reasonable to assign a date no later than 100 BCE to the composite work in its present form, though as with all Qumran literature, dates of composition remain highly uncertain.¹¹¹

CD III,4-5

After the exhortation to “choose that which [God] desires and reject that which He hates” (II,15) the compiler recounts Israel’s history. He demonstrates thereby how those who “did their own will and did not keep the commandments of their Maker” were cut off in God’s anger (II,17-III,1; III,4b-12), whereas Abraham, Isaac and Jacob “kept them and were inscribed as Friends of God and party to the Covenant for ever” (III,2-4a).

The sons of Jacob strayed because of this¹¹²
and were punished <according to> (5) their straying.

בְּנֵי יַעֲקֹב תָּעוּ בָּם וַיַּעֲנֹשׁוּ לִפְנֵי¹¹³ מִשְׁגֹּתָם

As consistently throughout this *Heilsgeschichte* the children of the faithful are portrayed as straying from God’s covenant and commandments. They are therefore punished according to their errors. From the context it is clear that divine punishment is meant and is further described with the terms “cut off” (III,1,7,9), “perish” (III,9,10), and “divine Anger kindled against” them (II,21; III,8). What appears to be described as physical destruction has, however, a clear soteriological implication. According to III,10-12 such rebels place themselves outside the Covenant relationship (“abandoned the Covenant”) and suffer the punishments of those who are not under God’s covenant mercy, including exposure to the “Anger of

¹¹¹ See D. Dimant, “The War Scroll,” 487-489, 490; G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*³ (Sheffield: JSOT, 1987) 81. The question of date and composition is tied to the thorny question of the relationship between CD and 1QS. The priority of 1QS seems to be the majority view, but weighty arguments have been advanced as well for the opposite order (cf. W. Eichrodt, *IOT*, 652). If correct, Davies’ thesis noted above calls for a complete reevaluation of the evidence in this regard.

¹¹² Lit. “in them,” i.e., in following their own will and guilty inclinations rather than God’s commandments.

¹¹³ B. Lohse (*Texte*, 70, n. a) correctly suggests לִפְנֵי (“according to”; cf. X,5; XX,24) for the hardly comprehensible לִפְנֵי (“punished in the presence of their error?”).

God.” Their fate is contrasted with that of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob who are “inscribed as Friends of God and party to the Covenant for ever” (III,3-4). The clear soteriological implications in this text should give us some insight into the meaning of ‘destruction’ in other texts as well. The author (or compiler) appears to be working with a remnant-theology, in which divine destruction connotes the punishment expected upon those who have abandoned the covenant and are treated no longer as Friends and party to the Covenant (i.e., covenant curses). In the light of the hortatory introduction to this section (II,14-16) the purpose of this motif usage will be to motivate the righteous to obedience by portraying the punishment according to deeds that befalls those who choose their own desires over God’s.¹¹⁴ The use of עָנַשׁ (“punish”) and מִשְׁגָּה (“error”) is unusual for our motif, probably under the influence of the surrounding context,¹¹⁵ and showing once again that divine recompense according to deeds was a fundamental axiom in Jewish thought which could be expressed with a great variety of terminology.

CD V,15-16

With IV,12b we begin a midrash on Isa 24:17,¹¹⁶ which focuses on Israel’s transgressions (“snares”) in the past (IV,17-V,15a), and finishes with the warning for the current generation: “He who associates with them will not be held innocent; the more he does it the guiltier he is, if he is not compelled” (V,14b-15a).¹¹⁷

Our motif comes at this point in the argument, as a transitional piece,¹¹⁸ giving justification (כִּי) for the warning just stated, and leading into the ensuing account (V,17-VI,1) of Israel’s infidelity.

¹¹⁴ This is true even if Murphy-O’Connor is correct in identifying II,14-VI,1 as originally a “missionary document” addressed to outsiders, since he acknowledges that it has now been “adapted to serve a different function” (“An Essene Missionary Document?” esp. 204-206).

¹¹⁵ Though they use other Hebrew words, see the references to punishment (II,18; III,1,7,9-10) and straying (II,17; III,1,11-12).

¹¹⁶ See J. Murphy-O’Connor, “An Essene Missionary Document?” 201-229; P. R. Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 105-107, 108-119; H. Stegemann, *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde* (Bonn: n.p., 1971) 150-165.

¹¹⁷ Following P. R. Davies’ translation (*Damascus Covenant*, 245; see also T. H. Gaster, *DSS in English*, 77; B. Lohse, *Texte*, 77).

For formerly <also> God visited (16) their works,
and His anger was kindled against their forfeits (“practices”).

כי אם¹¹⁹ למילפנים פקד אל את מעשהק
ויהר אפו בעלילותיהם

The warning of (current) punishment upon Jews who fall prey to falsehood is grounded in God’s punishing visitations upon Israel in the past.¹²⁰ The current ‘snares’ all stem from Israel’s rejection of the (community’s) true understanding of the law.¹²¹ Thus the warning has all the more force because God’s past punishments were likewise directed against “a people without understanding,” “a nation void of counsel” (V,16b-17a)¹²² who were “led astray” by those who “preached rebellion against the commandments of God” and prophesied falsely to turn Israel away from following God” (V,18-VI,1).

Thus the motif refers in this instance to *past retribution* against Israel, not to eschatological recompense. Having said this, however, it is certainly intended (in the light of V,15a) as a pattern for the current judgment warning as well, which does have a future reference, though not necessarily an eschatological one.¹²³ The motif functions here as part of an admonition to community insiders¹²⁴ to avoid associa-

¹¹⁸ P. R. Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 119.

¹¹⁹ Lohse suggests reading כִּי גַם (“for also”) here instead (*Texte*, 76, note). More likely is P. R. Davies’ suggestion that אֵם be dropped as an error following the preceding כִּי אֵם (*Damascus Covenant*, 247, notes).

¹²⁰ למילפנים: formerly, beforehand, in ancient times. The usage in CD points consistently to Israel’s (pre-exilic) history (II,17; III,19; V,17b). It is used in the OT only in Isa 41:26 (parallel with מֵרֵאשִׁית, “from the beginning”).

¹²¹ So for instance V,7 (“inasmuch as they do not distinguish in accordance with the Law”) and V,12 (“with a blaspheming tongue have opened their mouth against the precepts of the Covenant of God, saying, They are not true!”; i.e., they reject the community’s stricter interpretation).

¹²² Quoting Isa 27:11 and Deut 32:28a.

¹²³ The implication of *degrees of guilt* in V,15a suggests it is the community’s judgment of the individual that is in view.

¹²⁴ Or ‘newcomers’; see P. R. Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 108-119.

ting with or adopting the views and practices of non-community Jews. By means of a warning it seeks to motivate them to the more stringent interpretation of and obedience to Torah required by the sect.

Both in its past point of reference (i.e., Mosaic and exilic periods) and its present application to community members, the motif is applied to those among God's people who allow themselves to be led astray into "rebellion against the commandments of God (revealed) by the hand of Moses" (V,21). The nature of this retribution in Israel's past history involved divine "anger" (V,16) leading to the desolation and ravaging of the land (V,20-21). Its application to the community of the Damascus Document, as suggested above, probably involved community sanctions upon the transgressor and ultimately exclusion, with obvious soteriological implications. The text itself, however, makes no explicit reference to future divine (eschatological) judgment.

The use of both פקד ("visit, punish") and מעשה ("works") in the motif is known to us from the Jewish Scriptures,¹²⁵ with פקד both as verb and substantive ("Visitation") quite popular in CD and the other Qumran literature.¹²⁶

CD VII,9 = XIX,6

And (as for) all who reject - when God shall visit the earth to repay the reward of the wicked upon them, when there shall come to pass the word which is written in the words of Isaiah . . .
(VII,9)

And (as for) all who reject the commandments and the ordinances, to bring the reward of the wicked upon themselves when God shall visit the earth, when there shall come to pass . . .
(XIX,6)¹²⁷

וְכָל הַמִּוֹאֲסִים¹²⁸ בְּפָקֵד אֵל אֵת הָאָרֶץ
לְהָשִׁיב גְּמוּלָה שְׂעִים עֲלֵיהֶם¹²⁹
בְּבוֹא הַדָּבָר אֲשֶׁר

¹²⁵ פקד: Jer 21:14; 23:2; Hos 4:9; 12:2. מעשה: Ps 28:4; 62:12; Lam 3:64; Sir 16:14. They do not, however, occur together in the motif in the OT.

¹²⁶ See the references in K. G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960) under פקד and derivatives (179-180).

¹²⁷ In this instance we have followed Davies' translation which better reflects the syntactical ambiguities discussed below (*Damascus Covenant*, 251, 257).

¹²⁸ XIX,6 adds בַּמִּצְוֹת וּבַחֲקִים.

The syntax of this text has consistently puzzled translators, and we do not claim to have unraveled all its secrets.¹³⁰ However, if Davies is correct that VII,9-10 is part of a larger “covenant formulary” and forms the curse counterpart to the blessing promised in VII,4-6,¹³¹ then perhaps comparison with that text will yield some light.

(Promise)	בְּרִית אֵל נֶאֱמָנוּת לָהֶם	כָּל הַמִּתְהַלְכִּים בְּאֶלֶּה
(Curse)	בְּפִקְדוֹ אֵל לְהָשִׁיב גְּמוּלָה עֲלֵיהֶם	וְכָל הַמִּזְאָרִים

It would appear that in both cases the addressees are indicated by the first phrase (“All who . . .”). This is apparently a proleptic *casus pendens* construction, and may thus be best translated by “as for . . .,” to be taken up again by the concluding *להם/עליהם* in the second phrase.¹³² In the promise the relation of the ensuing clause to these addressees is clear enough: “for them the covenant of God stands firm.” On this pattern the sense of the curse must be “upon them God will repay the recompense of the wicked.”¹³³ Even if the solution to the syntactical problems lies elsewhere, the sense will almost certainly remain as stated above.

On this understanding then, VII,9b-10a is, like the promise, directed at would-be entrants into the community, but who, unlike the recipients of the prom-

¹²⁹ This infinitive clause is inserted *before* “when God shall visit . . .” in XIX,6.

¹³⁰ A nice overview of the problems is to be found in H.-J. Fabry, *Wurzel*, 193-194.

¹³¹ *Damascus Covenant*, 143, 148-150. See also J. Murphy O'Connor who sees a “hortatory epilogue” beginning at VII,4. He considers VII,6b-8, which separates the blessing from the curse, to be a later interpolation, thus bringing VII,9 even closer to the blessing (“A Literary Analysis,” [1971] 211, 220-228).

¹³² See H.-J. Fabry, *Wurzel*, 193 (n. 388), and 199. He lists III,20; XIV,1-2; XV,5-6 as additional examples of this construction, which he calls “fast schon typisch” for CD.

¹³³ The parallel text (XIX,6) seems to confirm this by its reversal of the two clauses (להשיב עליהם בפקדו אל), thus bringing the recompense statement into closer proximity to the addressees. Cf. H.-J. Fabry (*Wurzel*, 202-203), who, nevertheless, considers this merely a copyist's mistake (194). M. Kister translates the puzzling infinitive להשיב “predicatively, replacing a finite verb” which he says “is frequently encountered in Qumran Hebrew” (“Biblical Phrases and Hidden Biblical Interpretations and Pesharim,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* [ed. D. Dimant, and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992] 35, n. 22; see also E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Atlanta: Scholars, 1986] 70-72). If correct, this would adequately explain the syntax and support our understanding.

ise, will decide not to accept the community's rigorous standards ("all those who despise").¹³⁴

Retribution upon the wicked takes place "when God visits the earth." The *Admonitions* use both the verb פקד and the substantive פקד(ו)ה to refer consistently to a divine visitation for punishment, either in Israel's past or in the future.¹³⁵ Whether an eschatological future punishment is meant¹³⁶ must await our examination of the eschatology of this document, but if we are correct to see it in apposition to the promise of lines 4-6 ("they will live for thousands of generations"), then this punishment will certainly have been understood as having ultimate soteriological implications.¹³⁷

If our understanding of the literary context is correct, this motif-text functions as a warning to those about to enter the covenant community so as to motivate them to accept the sect's interpretation of Torah and the associated behavior.¹³⁸ If they do not, they shall suffer the same punishment to be accorded the rest of the wicked.

(CD XX,24)

Though not an instance of divine recompense according to deeds, we mention this text briefly in order to demonstrate how the motif was applied in an analo-

¹³⁴ The addition in XIX,6 of "commandments and ordinances" illumines the intended sense of the compact formulation in the earlier text—"all those who despise." It refers to the rejection of the community's Torah by initiates/members/apostates, a fact made clear from the use of the verb (סרס, "reject") in the surrounding material. See VIII,19 (=XIX,32); XX,8,11; also III,17; different II,15. See further, P. R. Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 143, 148-149.

¹³⁵ Past visitation: I,7; V,15; VII,21; XIX,11. Future (or present?) visitation: VIII,2,3; XIX,10,14,15. In the *Laws* we find only the meanings "muster" and "oversee" (X,2; XIII,11; XIV,3,6; XV,6,8). For its use elsewhere in the Qumran literature for divine retribution, see 1QS II,6; 1QH XIV,24. See further H.-J. Fabry, *Wurzel*, 200-201.

¹³⁶ So H.-J. Fabry, *Wurzel*, 198, but relying solely on the phrase "when God visits the earth."

¹³⁷ This soteriological implication may be made even clearer in the B recension of this passage which speaks of "being delivered up to the avenging sword, the avenger of the Covenant," and of God who "visits them for destruction by the hand of Belial" (XIX,13-14), though here it is clearly apostates rather than would-be converts who are in view.

¹³⁸ See J. Murphy-O'Connor, "A Literary Analysis," 227.

gous way to human or community judgment. Though the deterioration of the MS demands some conjectural restoration, the judgment motif is clearly recognizable.

B[ut] in the holy Council the people will be judged with few words,
each one of them according to his spirit.

Or perhaps:

but (they) returned again (24) [to the way] of the people in a few respec[ts. Ea]ch of them is to be judged individually, according to his spirit in the holy council.¹³⁹

בְּדִבְרֵי מִצְוֹתָיו כִּי לִפִּי רוּחוֹ יִשְׁפָּטוּ בְּעֵצַת הַקֹּדֶשׁ

This section deals with a group called ‘the house of Peleg’ (XX,22b) who were either apostates from the community,¹⁴⁰ or a group of non-community members who were in sympathy with the covenanters but differed in some matters of interpretation.¹⁴¹ Whichever the case, the stress on individuality of judgment (אִישׁ) calls for an individual examination of “each . . . according to his spirit” rather than according to one’s group affiliation. The phrase “according to one’s spirit,” though unique here to CD, in 1QS means according to whether one follows the spirit of God (i.e., holiness) or of Belial.¹⁴² Elsewhere in the Damascus Document community judgment is to be conducted on the basis of the community’s legal standards (XIX,31-32; XII,3). In all these cases, observable behavior (obedience) does not ‘earn’ one’s status in the community, but ‘reveals’ the spirit according to which one lives. Even though this is a human judgment, it has a clear connection with divine judgment.

The pericope embodies a certain duality; there is, on the one hand, the judgement pronounced by the community, and on the other, the punishment executed by God (XX,24 and 26). One

¹³⁹ P. R. Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 265; textual problems are discussed on pp. 191-193.

¹⁴⁰ In which case XX,25ff continues the description of the same group as “those who have entered the Covenant” but “have breached the bound of the Law.”

¹⁴¹ This requires a different restoration of XX,23b-24a: “and returned to the way of the people in a few respects”; cf. P. R. Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 191-194.

¹⁴² 1QS II,20; IV,26.

reflects the other in a way that very effectively emphasizes the importance of the present for the future.¹⁴³

Conclusions (CD)

It should not surprise us to find in these *Admonitions* to (prospective) community members the motif used exclusively to motivate the righteous to obedience. Yet in spite of this singularity of purpose we discovered considerable variety in formulation. One instance, where language heretofore unknown in the motif is clearly prompted by the context, suggested that we are dealing with a deep-rooted axiom of Jewish thought which can be formulated with great freedom according to the need of the moment.

In attempting to fit the motif into the larger pattern of religion in CD, we would note first that this document appears to represent an 'exilic theology.' Accordingly Israel's consistent rebellion against God's covenant and Law, especially that leading up to the destruction of Jerusalem in 721 BCE and the deportation, is seen to result in the continuation of the genuine covenant relationship through a remnant only, not the whole nation. God at that time made for Himself a remnant, called in IV,2 the "converts of Israel," who were converted "from the sin of Jacob" (XX,17) and began to heed the voice of the Teacher, fearing God once again and walking according to His commandments. The CD community considers itself to be the bearers of this remnant line in Israel. From those days until now are the "times of ungodliness" (VI,10) and "Israel's blindness" (XVI,2) when the Angel of Hostility is with(in) the Jew who has not yet converted (XVI,5).¹⁴⁴

The key to salvation lies in "entering the covenant" (VI,11; XX,25) and then "clinging to it" (III,20; XX,27) or "walking in perfection" (II,15-16; VII,5; XX,2,6-7; [XIII,6]), i.e., rigorous obedience to the Torah as interpreted in the community (XX,29,32; II,18,21; III,2,6,15-16). That a thorough conversion of the

¹⁴³ J. Murphy-O'Connor, "Literary Analysis," 558.

¹⁴⁴ On this exilic theology in CD, see especially P. R. Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 61-72, 76-104.

heart/inner person is meant, and not simply outward conformity, is clear from comments regarding the need to “choose God’s will” rather than “one’s own will” (III,3,7,11; VIII,7-8) and the warnings against superficial conversion (XIX,14, 16-17,33-35; XX,3,25; XV,13).

However, although this is termed occasionally a “new covenant” (VI,19; VIII,21) it is in actuality nothing other than the “covenant appointed for Israel forever” (XV,5), the covenant given to the patriarchs (VI,2; VIII,14-18; XII,11) and through Moses (XV,8-9,12). Unlike in 1QS, in CD we hear little of the “spirit of holiness” as constituting that which is “new”;¹⁴⁵ rather it is the revelation of the previously hidden (true) understanding of the Law through the sect that constitutes the major difference. Thus the acceptance of that knowledge constitutes salvation; this is ‘entering the covenant.’¹⁴⁶

Yet all this ‘legal’ focus should not cover up the fact that the religious framework, the soteriology, of this group is little different from what we have seen in the OT, namely covenantal nomism.¹⁴⁷ Election (double-predestination), grace and mercy remain fundamental (II,7-8; IV,3; XIX,1; XX,21,34). In spite of an emphasis on rigorous obedience divine forgiveness remains fundamental (II,5; III,18; IV,6,10; XX,34), and it is clear that “perfection of way” refers, as in the OT, to the whole of one’s behavior pattern, not to an atomistic legalism or perfectionism.¹⁴⁸ It is even stated explicitly that one’s standing before God must stem ultimately from God’s love, not from one’s own righteousness (VIII,14-18). One ‘gets in’ by covenantal grace, involving of course a personal ‘choice’ for God’s

¹⁴⁵ I.e., a new divine “enablement”; but cf. XVI,5 where it is implied that the “angel of hostility” leaves a person when he/she is converted.

¹⁴⁶ On the “covenant” in CD, see R. F. Collins, “The Berith-Notion of the Cairo Damascus Covenant and its Comparison with the NT,” *ETL* 39 (1963) 556-582.

¹⁴⁷ Against J. A. Huntjens who attempts to portray the ‘legalistic’ and ‘covenantal’ patterns as “contrasting notions of covenant and law” in CD (“Contrasting Notions of Covenant and Law in the Texts from Qumran,” *RQ* 8 [1974] 361-380, esp. 362-370).

¹⁴⁸ See XII,4-5 where one’s ‘perfection of way’ can be restored after committing sin(s). See also F. Nötscher, “Terminologie,” 181-182.

truth, and ‘stays in’ this merciful arrangement by not abandoning the covenant and its required obedience (III,11,20; XIX,14; XX,17; et al). The entrance was apparently connected as well with a thoroughgoing recognition and confession of one’s wickedness (I,8-9; XX,28-30). One never ‘earns’ salvation, but is ‘given’ it, along with the concomitant obligations of that covenant relationship.

What of judgment and retribution? God tries and judges all who “scorn” him (I,2). Scorning God, or ‘despising His commandments and statutes’ (XIX,6), means following one’s own way, being led astray by Belial. In the *Laws* it leads to disciplinary measures or exclusion (or even death). Where a fundamental apostasy is indicated in the *Admonitions* (so for instance XIX,14, 16-17,33-35; XX,3,25), the punishment is variously described:

- by covenant curses: I,17 (cf. also XV,2)
- by the avenger of the covenant: I,17-18; XIX,13
- by flames of fire: II,5
- by being ‘cut off’: III,1,7,9; XX,26 et al
- by being delivered to the sword: VII,13; VIII,1; XIX,10,13
- by destruction at the hand of Belial: VIII,2; XIX,14
- by divine Anger: VIII,3,13,18; XIX,16 et al
- by human vengeance: VIII,12
- by having no share in the house of the Law: XX,13

Is this an eschatological or even apocalyptic judgment which is expected? None of the above designations need necessarily lead us in that direction, and we nowhere have a depiction of a universal divine forensic judgment.¹⁴⁹ While it is possible that ‘flames of fire’ (II,5) and references to ‘that day’ (Day of Yahweh?; cf. VIII,2; XX,15) could be given an apocalyptic twist, all could equally well be understood as referring to punishments within history (e.g., ‘cut off’ = removed from the covenant and community by death) or to the final divine battle at the End. Certain phrases suggest a perspective of ‘historical eschatology’¹⁵⁰ and the expectation of a

¹⁴⁹ See H. W. Huppenbauer, “Zur Eschatologie der Damaskusschrift,” *RQ* 4 (1963/1964) 567-573; and M. Reiser, *Gerichtspredigt*, 64-65. L. Ginzberg argues for a post-mortem judgment in II,2ff based on the mention of “angels of destruction” and his understanding of CD as a form of Phariseism. The “angels of destruction,” however, are not decisive in this regard, being equally present at the final eschatological battle (*An Unknown Jewish Sect* [New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America <KTAV>, 1970] 160).

¹⁵⁰ Cf. “end of days” (IV,4; VI,11); “consummation of time” (IV,8-9); “last generation” (I,12). See further M. Reiser, *Gerichtspredigt*, 64-65.

future blessed existence on earth of unending duration,¹⁵¹ none of which take us much beyond what one can already find in the OT. It is clear, however, from our analysis of III,4-5 and VII,9 that historical divine judgments were understood in CD to have ultimate soteriological meaning.¹⁵² To be “cut off” and “delivered to the sword” meant to suffer the fate of those outside the covenant relationship.

The axiom of divine punishment according to deeds is meant to motivate current and prospective members of the community to accept the sect’s doctrine, to confess their own wickedness, and to submit in obedience to God’s grace and the interpretation of the divine will revealed through the community. The warning is meant with utmost seriousness, and apostasy is repeatedly referred to as a possibility which will lead to nothing less than exclusion from the salvation-blessings promised in the new covenant.

ADDITIONAL TEXTS

1QpHab XII,2-3¹⁵³

Following the citation of Hab 2:17 we read:

The explanation of this word concerns the Wicked Priest inasmuch as he will be paid (3) his reward for what he has done to the Poor;

לְשִׁלְמָם לוֹ אֶת גְּמוּלוֹ אֲשֶׁר גָּמַל עַל אֲבִיזָנִים

The Habakkuk text spoke of “violence done to Lebanon” and “cruelty used against the beasts” (XI,17). These are now interpreted of the evil actions undertaken by the Wicked Priest against members of the sect (XII,4-5), including plans to

¹⁵¹ “for a thousand generations” (VII,6; XIX,1).

¹⁵² See further on soteriological implications in CD, H. Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 97-98.

¹⁵³ The pesher commentary on Habakkuk 1-2 (1QpHab) is probably to be dated in the second half of the first century BCE. See D. Dimant, “The War Scroll,” 510; K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer* (BHT 15; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1953) 226-274, esp. 270-274; W. H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk* (SBLMS 24; Missoula, Montana: Scholars, 1979) 23.

“destroy” them (XII,6) and “steal their goods” (XII,10). For this he shall be “repaid his recompense” by God, the recompense being analogous to the very actions he himself did against the poor. The underlying talio conception is made clear in lines 5-6 where it is stated that God will determine to destroy (לכלה) the Wicked Priest just as he planned to destroy (לכלות) the Poor.

Although at first glance this text would seem to be a sentence pronounced against the Wicked Priest, the fact that the document was addressed not to the wicked but to the sectarians means we must look deeper for its ultimate purpose. Brownlee lists six aims of these midrash pesharim, two of which are “to strengthen the faith and endurance of the Teacher’s adherents” and “to warn the wavering of the dangers of apostasy.”¹⁵⁴ This would best fit our category “to motivate the righteous to obedience.” The context itself offers little in the way of rhetorical clues.

In spite of its brevity, 1QpHab places divine judgment (on the wicked) according to deeds clearly within a framework of historical eschatology familiar to us from the OT.¹⁵⁵ We encounter a universal¹⁵⁶ final Judgment.¹⁵⁷ The readers are given to understand that they are living in the “last generation”¹⁵⁸ at the “consummation of time.”¹⁵⁹ Although the righteous must still suffer for a time, soon God (through His elect, V,4), will without mercy (VII,16-17) eradicate all the wicked from the earth (XIII,4), including the “wicked of His people” (V,5), that is, Jews who reject the Teacher’s message. Alongside battle imagery for this final

¹⁵⁴ *Midrash Peshar*, 35-36.

¹⁵⁵ See especially the comments of K. Elliger (*Studien*, 278-284) and W. H. Brownlee (*Midrash Peshar*, 214-218), to whom we are indebted in what follows.

¹⁵⁶ V,4; X,4; XIII,1-4.

¹⁵⁷ This can be called the “Day of Judgment” (XII,14; XIII,2-3) or “House of Judgment” (VIII,2; X,3).

¹⁵⁸ VII,2; IX,5.

¹⁵⁹ VII,2; or the “final time,” VII,7,12.

destruction,¹⁶⁰ there also occur forensic notions¹⁶¹ and destructive judgment by “fire.”¹⁶² “Fire” could be taken as a reference to an apocalyptic world conflagration, but, since the earth clearly remains intact (XIII,2-4), Elliger is surely correct to perceive in this ‘judgment by fire’ the same ‘destruction of the wicked by fire’ as that found in the OT.¹⁶³ The righteous need not ultimately fear this judgment, for “God will deliver them from the House of Judgment because of their affliction and their faith in the Teacher of Righteousness” (VIII,2-3). The scroll ends¹⁶⁴ with the climactic announcement:

But on the Day of Judgment God will destroy all those who serve idols, together with the wicked, from the earth. (XIII,2-4)

We concur with Brownlee that the author has purposely let the words “from the earth” conclude his message on a note of hope in the eschatological victory of God.

Just as the prophet’s message at Hab.2:20 ended with “the earth,” so does the commentary itself; for it will be purged so as to become a fit place where those of God’s own planting may take root and thrive, living from the abundance of the fertile earth.¹⁶⁵

That the hope of the righteous was to flourish for unending generations upon an earth purged of evil was a thought well known in Judaism.¹⁶⁶

4QpPs37 IV,9

And God will not let [the Wicked Priest go] un[punished for the blood which] he has shed, but [God will] pay him his [re]ward by delivering him into the hands of the violent of the nations to execute [vengeance] upon him.

וְאֵל לֹא יִן [שִׁן] וְלִי [יְשֻׁלָּם] אֵל אֶת גְּמולוֹ

¹⁶⁰ IV,12-13; IX,6-7,9-12.

¹⁶¹ X,5 (“declare guilty”).

¹⁶² X,5,13.

¹⁶³ Isa 66:24; Mal 3:19; see further K. Elliger, *Studien*, 280-281.

¹⁶⁴ Whether the scroll continued and covered Hab 3 as well, or ended where our scroll ends (i.e., the end of Hab 2), cannot be determined without additional MS evidence. See W. H. Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 218-219.

¹⁶⁵ *Midrash Pesher*, 218; see also 215-218.

¹⁶⁶ Ps 37:10-11; 4QpPss^a II,5-11; also 1 En 10:16,20,22; 38:1,3; 45:6; 53:2; 62:2; 69:27-29; 84:6.

This badly damaged line consists of a midrash peshar on Ps 37:32-33 applying these words to the Wicked Priest. The OT text is one of comfort to the afflicted righteous that Yahweh “will not abandon them into the hand of the wicked.” Actually ‘judgment’ is not mentioned in the Psalm text until the next verse (v 34) which is cited and commented on in IV,10-12 (“the wicked are cut off”). Nevertheless, the interpreter includes the motif of divine recompense upon the wicked already, apparently viewing it as an important element explicating God’s comfort for the righteous.

The divine recompense consists in “delivering him [i.e., the Wicked Priest] into the hands of the violent of the nations to execute [vengeance]¹⁶⁷ upon him.” This is a historical judgment, which, however, may well have been part of a historical eschatology.¹⁶⁸ In the following midrash (IV,11) it appears that the righteous are permitted to look on at the judgment of the wicked.

QUMRAN LITERATURE: CONCLUSIONS

Wording and Functions

Motif-terminology in this literature has yielded few surprises. The writers utilized the same verbal elements as the OT and the Pseudepigrapha, namely שׁוּב (Hiph), שָׁלַם (Piel), פָּקַד and שָׁפַט. New is the usage of אָרַר (“curse”) and עָנַשׁ (“punish”), which arose naturally within their respective literary contexts, demonstrating that the formulation of this Jewish axiom has not become merely a rigid formulaic expression, but is a living belief seeking appropriate expression in varying historical situations.¹⁶⁹ Unlike the Pseudepigrapha, the motif is *not*

¹⁶⁷ Or “judgment.” See M. P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (CBQMS 8; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979) 222.

¹⁶⁸ See J. M. Allegro, “Further Light on the History of the Qumran Sect,” *JBL* 75 (1956) 94-95.

¹⁶⁹ We thus differ from H.-J. Fabry in one of the few studies devoted to the retribution formula in the Qumran literature (*Wurzel*, 185-213). His conclusions may be summarized briefly in the following four points:

A) The Qumran documents evince “eine starke terminologische Engführung” as over against the OT. The retribution formula occurs only in the form גַּמְלוּ + הַשִּׁיב/שָׁלַם, whereas the OT

expressed with a *standard* (“according to . . .”) in the majority of cases. Instead, seven of the fourteen instances used **גמול + השיב/שלם**, making this clearly the predominant formulation in the Qumran literature. We found no evidence that a *synthetische Lebensauffassung* is a major conceptual element behind this formula any longer, while the *talio* concept appears still to play an active role in the conception of just recompense. Explicit *judgment* terminology is not quite as prevalent in Qumran as compared with the Pseudepigrapha, though it should be noted that most of the motif occurrences do come in a larger context of divine judgment. The same interchange between singular and plural (deed/deeds) can be observed in this literature, suggesting once again that one’s “works” (pl.) constitute one’s “work” (sg.)

can use a variety of object-nouns, and God alone (no longer any human instruments) is the agent of retribution. There is, in fact, a definitive consolidation of the formula with the construct expression **גמול רשעים**.

B) This “terminologische Verhärtung” has a theological explanation. There is, namely, “einen ‘theologisch verhärteten Doktrinarismus’ am Werk”; i.e., a restriction to the meaning “punishment upon the enemies” (agreeing with K. Seybold, “Zwei Bemerkungen zu **גמול/גמול**,” VT 22 [1972] 117).

C) This ‘hardening’ of the formula can, in fact, be dated to around 100 BCE by an examination of early (1QS), middle (CD), and later (1QM) documents, whereby the ‘hardening’ can be pinpointed as occurring between 1QS and CD.

D) This ‘hardening’ was probably prompted by a military defeat prior to the writing of CD, because of which the community recognized that God alone would bring the retribution, excluding all human instrumentality.

While correct that **השיב** and **שלם** are followed only by the noun **גמול** in retribution formulas, Fabry failed to note the *other* forms of the motif which employ alternate verbal elements (**ענש**, **פקד**, **שפט**) and a wide variety of object-nouns or expressions of standard. This alone should warn against overemphasizing a supposed formulaic ‘hardening’ which then requires historical and theological explanation. His text-basis for such assertions is simply too small. The “erstarnte Konstruktion” (**גמול רשעים**) is found in only 4 texts (!) in all the literature (and he ignores the simple **שלם גמול** [without **רשעים**] in 1QpHab and 4QpPs37). Is it not more likely that the Qumran writings simply reproduce some of the variety in the motif known from OT and Intertestamental writings, with the emphasis on the negative ‘retribution’ already prepared for in the Jewish apocalyptic writings? Neither he nor Seybold give any evidence to support the assertion of “theologically hardened dogmatism.” The restriction of the motif to punishment may, instead, admit of a rhetorical explanation, while the avoidance of a positive recompense (reward) could have roots in the sect’s stress on human inability. Any theory of chronological development must remain highly suspect in light of the difficulties attached to dating the composition of any of these documents, even relative to one another. Point (D) is pure speculation. It could be just as easily argued that a crucial military defeat and subsequent sense of powerlessness might lead to even greater visions of future (apocalyptic) instrumentality in retribution.

viewed as a unity.¹⁷⁰

The motif still functions in a broad array of purposes as in the OT and the Pseudepigrapha, including as a *sentence* pronounced against the wicked both within and without Israel. The fact that a few of our categories did not turn up in the texts we considered may be simply coincidental, due either to the limited quantity of material studied, or to the particular genre of literature involved.¹⁷¹ On the other hand the lack of any texts used as an *appeal* to God to intervene on behalf of the righteous, or as a *benediction* may well have a theological explanation. The *appeal*-texts in the OT often involved the *assertion of one's own righteousness* to appeal for a *positive recompense* from God. As we have seen repeatedly in the Qumran literature, the sectarians tended to stress human inability and sinfulness very strongly and to attribute all blessings to God's gracious initiative. Add to this the fact that the motif is never used, at least as far as we have discovered, to inculcate the idea of God's positive reward of the righteous,¹⁷² and it is not surprising that this category seems to have disappeared. One point of particular interest for Pauline studies (cf. Rom 12:17-20) was the appearance of a new category of usage in 1QS X,17-18, namely as a theological argument against inter-personal retribution.

Judgment According to Deeds = Punishment of the Wicked

Not wishing to reiterate all that has been said about the doctrine of divine retribution in the foregoing exegetical sections, we content ourselves with highlighting two salient points in that regard. First, in Qumran God's judgment according to deeds meant almost exclusively *the punishment of the wicked*. Even the two texts which apply the motif to the righteous do so in the sense of "there but for the grace

¹⁷⁰ Even Braun says they are "einheitlich ausgerichtet" (*Radikalismus*, 1.26, n. 3). For support he refers to the repeated use of "the good" (sg.) in 1QS I,2,5; II,3,24; X,18.

¹⁷¹ For example we examined no texts that might be called a "prophetic summons to repentance" and thus the category connected with that genre in the OT was likewise missing.

¹⁷² While 1QS X,18 does seem to presuppose a belief in dual recompense, we have argued that the belief in God's rewarding of the righteous is incidental to the purpose (cf. p. 140 above).

of God go I,” i.e., as a wicked and undeserving person.¹⁷³ We found no evidence of the motif used to inculcate a dual retribution, i.e., reward for the righteous and punishment for the unrighteous. In fact, we found not a single example of the motif being used to refer to the positive rewarding of the righteous.¹⁷⁴ The sectaries, of course, believed that the righteous would receive the covenantal blessings; they refrained, however, from using reward terminology in such instances. Whereas the OT had relatively little hesitance to speak of the ‘reward of the righteous’ and even appealed to one’s own righteousness to call upon God’s reward or judgment (= vindication), this has apparently all but vanished in the second temple period.¹⁷⁵ An explanation of this development in Qumran has been suggested in the preceding paragraph.

Especially in contexts related to the final War the “wicked” are understood universally, i.e., as including heathen nations.¹⁷⁶ Otherwise the emphasis falls upon (potential) apostates, hypocrites within or Jews outside the sect’s membership. These are judged “without mercy” (just as in the Pseudepigrapha), whereas the judgment of the righteous is according to mercy and pardon.¹⁷⁷

Judgment in the Context of Historical Eschatology

The second point we wish to highlight concerns the eschatological conceptions surrounding judgment in the Qumran literature. Although not all the documents

¹⁷³ 1QS X,11 (pp. 136-138) and 1QH V,5-6 (pp. 145-146).

¹⁷⁴ Although Dupont-Sommer translates 1QS IV,16, 25 and 1QH XIV,12 with “reward,” suggesting a positive or dual reward, the Hebrew word common to all three passages [פְּעֻלָּה] should more likely be translated “doing, work.” Jakob Licht notes for the Thanksgiving Scroll: “The belief that the wicked shall be punished and the righteous rewarded is stated with great emphasis, but from a deterministic point of view. The righteous are assured of divine bounty, not by right as a recompense for their deeds (for which they cannot claim merit), but as a free gift of divine grace” (“Doctrine,” 7). However, the texts he cites from 1QH (XII,17-18; XV,16) speak not of “reward,” but more generally of God’s end-time salvation-blessings upon the elect. There is certainly no reward according to deeds, as Licht himself acknowledges.

¹⁷⁵ For the same phenomenon in the OT Pseudepigrapha and its explanation, see pp. 120-21 above.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. 1QS X,16-18; 1QM VI,5-6; XI,13; XVIII,14.

¹⁷⁷ 1QH I,6; VI,9; IX,33-34.

give an equally clear answer,¹⁷⁸ we found no evidence of the sort of transcendent eschatology normally associated with apocalyptic literature.¹⁷⁹ The stark contrasts between this age and the age to come in terms of *earthly* versus *heavenly* are missing in Qumran. There is no mention of a post-mortem resurrection of either the righteous or the wicked to judgment and we have no 'tours of hell' to depict what awaits sinners in the afterlife. No mention of any intermediate state can be found, and we are, in fact, left in the dark as to the post-mortem fate of either group.¹⁸⁰

On the other hand we found considerable evidence pointing to *historical eschatology* similar in many respects to the perspective of the Jewish Scriptures.¹⁸¹ Judgment upon the wicked is generally seen as occurring during the final eschatological War between the Sons of Light and of Darkness or Belial. The result of this judgment is consistently depicted as the physical destruction of the wicked under the anger and fury of God. References to being "damned in the night of eternal fire"¹⁸² are not inconsistent with this finding. "Fire" certainly need not refer exclusively to hell-fire, but can just as easily be used as the means of God's destruction of the wicked on earth at the end of this age of evil, as is clear both from the OT and Qumran; and "eternal" is more likely used in the sense of "long lasting,

¹⁷⁸ See J. Pryke, "Eschatology in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *The Scrolls and Christianity* (ed. M. Black; Theological Collections II; London: SPCK, 1969) 45-57, esp. 48.

¹⁷⁹ See J. Licht, "Time and Eschatology," 177-182. On the use of the term 'apocalyptic' for Qumran's eschatological thought, see the series of articles in *JNES* 49/2 (1990): R. L. Webb, "'Apocalyptic': Observations on a Slippery Term," 115-126; P. R. Davies, "Qumran and Apocalyptic or *OBSCURUM PER OBSCURIUS*," 127-134; and C. A. Newsom, "Apocalyptic and the Discourse of the Qumran Community," 135-144.

¹⁸⁰ J. Pryke, "Eschatology," 55. G. W. E. Nickelsburg disputes the value of this argument from silence, contending that death is not a real issue in these writings and that a highly realized eschatology renders concerns about an afterlife "of so little significance that it is hardly mentioned. This minimizing of the significance of physical death is most compatible with a theology of immortality [sic] (Wis.Sol.) or immediate assumption (Test.Asher)" (*Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life*, 167; cf. further 144-69). According to Lichtenberger the graves at Qumran testify to a belief in an afterlife (*Menschenbild*, 229).

¹⁸¹ See E. F. Sutcliffe, *The Monks of Qumran: As Depicted in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Westminster, MD: Newman, 1960) 88-90.

¹⁸² For instance 1QS II,7-8 (p. 135).

unending” than of a transcendental eternity. While God is ultimately seen as the Judge and Executor of judgment, in some cases the angels play an instrumental role, and in others the elect can witness and/or carry out God’s judgment.¹⁸³ That a historical eschatology of judgment is intended in these documents is further confirmed by the way in which the future blessedness of the righteous is portrayed. Rather than angelic or heavenly images, the saints enjoy unending bliss (“for a thousand generations”) on a renewed and fruitful earth purged of all evil. Here at last the triumph of the divine righteousness is experienced and God’s promises to His people fulfilled. The eradication of the wicked as well as the purging of all sinfulness (including that *within* the elect) is a necessary eschatological prelude to this final revelation of God’s victory.

Judgment and Soteriology in Qumran

Finally, the place of judgment according to deeds within the soteriology of the Qumran sect should be commented upon, noting particularly the sectarian slant given to the interaction between judgment and salvation.¹⁸⁴ The sectaries appear to have viewed themselves as living in the final period of history, just prior to the eschatological War in which the wicked and all wickedness would be destroyed and God’s triumphant rule on earth would be established to their blessing and God’s glory. With a distinctly sectarian narrowing of the people of God,¹⁸⁵ it is now through the sect alone that God’s saving (new) covenantal relationship is available.

¹⁸³ 1QS VIII,6-10; 1QM VI,5-6.

¹⁸⁴ On Qumran soteriology see esp. D. Flusser, “The Dead Sea Sect,” 215-266; P. Garnet, *Salvation and Atonement*; J. G. Harris, “The Covenant Concept among the Qumran Sectaries,” *EQ* 39 (1967) 86-92; and E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 233-328.

¹⁸⁵ “Although those entering the sect were all Jews, merely being born a Jew no longer constituted membership in the people of God. Israel as a whole had rejected and disobeyed God, and thus it was that the sectarians felt called through repentance and dedication to the Law to enter into a new covenant with God, the new covenant foretold by Jeremiah (Jer. 31. 31-34, cf. CD viii. 21, xx.12). They formed the new Israel, existing at the present time in the “dominion of Belial” but soon to enjoy all the blessings promised to God’s people in the new age” (C. H. H. Scobie, “John the Baptist,” *The Scrolls and Christianity* [ed. M. Black; Theological Collections II; London: SPCK, 1969] 65).

They appear to have subscribed to an “exilic soteriology”;¹⁸⁶ i.e., all (physical) Israelites are defiled and blind, belonging to the ‘Lot of Belial,’ and subject to God’s (punishing) judgment.¹⁸⁷ Entry into the realm of salvation is identical with entry into the sect, the ‘Sons of Light,’ the ‘Lot of God.’ This is first and foremost an act of God’s grace in election, and on the level of observable behavior occurs via acceptance of the sect’s teaching and wholehearted submission to the sect’s rigorous ordinances and interpretation of Torah.¹⁸⁸ Belonging to this remnant or “planting” (and no other) assures salvation from the coming judgment. Clearly, the covenant blessings are not ‘earned’ by obedience, nor could they ever be ‘merited’ by such inherently blind and sinful creatures;¹⁸⁹ rather they are given out of God’s love and mercy in remembrance of his (equally gracious) covenant with the patriarchs.

These blessings of divine mercy could, on the other hand, be *kept* only by those who were “perfect,” upholding the covenant obligations of belief and obedience in all respects. Such “perfection” (not the same as a legalistic perfectionism) coexisted paradoxically with the recurring confession of one’s own wickedness and inability combined with praise to God alone and his enabling unto righteousness.¹⁹⁰ Remaining in the salvific relationship with Israel’s God was indeed

¹⁸⁶ I.e., “that Israel was still in exile as regards the fulfilment of God’s purposes, so that she needed to pursue the kind of behaviour, including Law observance, which would bring the promised national restoration” (P. Garnet, “Qumran Light on Pauline Soteriology,” *Pauline Studies: Essays Presented to Professor F.F. Bruce on his 70th Birthday* [Exeter: Paternoster, 1980] 23).

¹⁸⁷ For the anthropological conceptions in the Qumran literature, see H. Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 174-235.

¹⁸⁸ “Die Bekehrung meint also eine persönliche Entscheidung für einen verschärften Tora-Gehorsam” (H. Braun, “‘Umkehr’ in spätjüdisch-häretischer und in frühchristlicher Sicht,” *ZTK* 50/3 [1953] 248).

¹⁸⁹ Against H. Braun: “Qumran kombiniere Glaube und Werke, Paulus behandle sie antithetisch. Das Heilmittel seien in Qumran verdienstliche Werke, bei Paulus der Glaube” (*Qumran und das Neue Testament*, 2.170; see also 229-235). Even D. A. Carson, whose thesis would be aided by the discovery of ‘merit theology’ in Qumran, admits that such “is decisively rejected in favour of a restored emphasis on divine grace” (*Sovereignty and Responsibility*, 83).

¹⁹⁰ See especially 1QH IV,30-32 cited above p. 145. It is too facile to equate “perfectionism” and “legalism” with the rigorous obedience demanded by the sect as M. Black does (*The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament* [Brown Judaic Studies 48; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1983] 18-24). For this reason, when admitting the “evangelical religion” of the Hodayot, he must appeal to variety of belief at this most fundamental level of how one’s religion ‘works’ as it were (125). On this coexistence of ‘perfection’ and ‘confes-

conditional upon maintenance of one's initial faith-commitment and evidenced by obedience.¹⁹¹

Divine judgment according to deeds did not amount to a future (and currently unknowable) determination as to whether one had measured up. It was rather the inevitable sentence upon those who had disdained God and his ways as revealed in the sect, behavior which would be more or less manifest to all the initiated. For this reason as well, within the community members were regularly 'judged according to their deeds' or 'spirit' to weed out hypocrites and hidden apostates, or, in cases of lesser offence, to give opportunity to be restored to perfection. Thus for 'believers' there would, in one sense, be no eschatological judgment (= punishment) according to deeds, at least as long as they remained faithfully within the sect and its way of life and observance. On the other hand, as a number of texts addressed to newcomers or to sect members as hypocrites or as potential apostates make clear, if they fail to keep the covenant, they will assuredly share in the punishment of the wicked, for now their works are evil just as the rest. Thus the righteous are both subject to and exempted from the future judgment according to deeds. It is not contradictory for the righteous to be terrified when contemplating the righteous judgments of God (1QH I,21-23) as well as to be assured of deliverance from judgment through faith (1QpHab VIII,2-3). This tension, if one wishes to call it that, is partly explainable as differing rhetorical strategies, and partly eschatologically. Salvation, while *already* assured to the sectary on the basis of grace and the covenant, had *not yet* arrived in its eschatological fulfillment, and thus would only be experienced in that Eschaton if one remained in that grace and covenantal relationship. Whether we

sion of sinfulness', see E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief*, 63 BCE-66 CE (London/Philadelphia: SCM/Trinity, 1992) 367-379, esp. 375-376.

¹⁹¹ A helpful attempt to interrelate Paul, "covenantal nomism," and the Qumran literature is "Qumran Light on Pauline Soteriology" by Paul Garnet in *Pauline Studies: Essays presented to Professor F.F. Bruce on his 70th Birthday* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1980) 19-32. Against his conclusion that second temple Judaism (i.e., Qumran) sought "justification by the works of the Law," see a text like 1QH IV,30-32 (cited above p. 145).

wish to bring this into proximity to either *synergism* or *Paulinism* will depend, in large part, on how we define those terms.¹⁹²

¹⁹² For example, J. Becker acknowledges the *sola gratia* of 1QH X, but then distinguishes it from Paul's by arguing that in the former salvation is still *conditional* ("an Bedingungen geknüpft, die der Mensch zu erfüllen hat," *Das Heil Gottes*, 125; cf. also 238-279). But does Paul really place no expectations or conditions upon believers vis-à-vis behavior?

EXCURSUS

POSTMORTEM JUDGMENT IN GRECO-ROMAN LITERATURE

Since the primarily Jewish roots of Paul's judgment conception are widely accepted, we will content ourselves with a brief summary of Greco-Roman perspectives for comparison.¹ On the one hand "the language and conceptions of post-mortem judgment were widely known and used on both the philosophical and popular levels."² Two different images dominated, the mythology of the underworld (Hades), and the transmigration of souls.³

The εἰδωλον or shadowy relic of the individual person apparently continued to exist for ever, without change, in Hades. Under Pythagorean and Orphic influence, this conception was transformed, so that the destiny of the uninitiated soul conformed to a cyclic pattern in time. Metempsychosis meant an endless process of birth and death, interspersed with periods of reward or punishment. Initiated souls learned how to break out of this ever recurring cycle of existence in time, and return to a state of eternal bliss. The temporal process was, accordingly, conceived as unceasing, and thus differed radically from the conceptions current in the Judaeo-Christian religions, in Islam and Zoroastrianism; for these faiths envisaged a definitive end to the temporal process, and this end would be coincident with a Final Judgment, conducted by God or his representative.⁴

A number of forms and functions can be identified.⁵ There is a stress on the therapeutic value of the process of (repeated) purgation and rebirth as the soul wanders toward its final rest. The terminology of *praise*, one of the highest goals in Greco-Roman society, is often found in such judgment contexts. A favorable post-mortem judgment is often seen as an extension of the sort of honors desired from

¹ The following is in large part a summary of D. W. Kuck, *Judgment*, 96-149. See also S. G. F. Brandon, *The Judgment of the Dead: The Idea of Life After Death in the Major Religions* (NY: Scribner, 1969) 76-97. H. Braun concludes that the "Pauline dilemma" of grace versus works could never have arisen on Greek soil. "Der Optimismus der Selbstbeurteilung weiß sich auch durch ein etwa bevorstehendes Gericht nicht erschüttert" (*Gerichtsgedanke*, 3, see also 2-5).

² D. W. Kuck, *Judgment*, 97.

³ *Ibid.*, 115.

⁴ S. G. F. Brandon, *Judgment*, 96.

⁵ D. W. Kuck, *Judgment*, 142-143.

the civic or athletic realm—a “prize,” a “victor’s crown,” being called a “hero,” a place on thrones beside the gods. A favorable verdict could be termed a “wage [μισθός],” viewing postmortem judgment as the pay-off for individual exertion in life.

The vast majority of moral philosophers appear not to have used postmortem judgment in their writings; temporal reward and punishment were the primary motivators of behavior. Nevertheless, “there is no doubt that an inhabitant of Corinth in the mid-first century CE would have at least been familiar with some conception, whether Homeric or Platonic, of a judgment for individuals after death.”⁶ Its main functions appear to have been in moral exhortation, or in consolation regarding death.⁷

Thus, Greco-Roman judgment language dealt generally with the everyday concerns of individuals—death and morality—not with situations of group conflict or historical crisis.⁸ Postmortem judgment was not a final apocalyptic act of God; in fact, it was generally the other semi-divine figures, or even other very righteous persons, who passed judgment.⁹

⁶ Ibid., 120.

⁷ Ibid., 148.

⁸ Ibid., 149.

⁹ H. Braun, *Gerichtsgedanke*, 3.

PART TWO

JUDGMENT ACCORDING TO DEEDS IN PAUL'S LETTERS

CHAPTER FIVE

JUDGMENT ACCORDING TO DEEDS IN PAUL'S LETTER TO THE ROMANS

JUDGMENT IN ROMANS, OVERVIEW

The simple verb *κρίνειν* is found in Romans eighteen times¹ with noticeably heavy concentrations in chapters 2(7x) and 14(8x). The noun *κρίμα* is found six times,² while the derivatives *κατακρίνειν* and *κατάκριμα* are found four and three times respectively.³ *Δικαιοκρισία* (NT hapax) is found at 2:5.

The heavy concentration of judgment terminology in chapter 2 is understandable since Paul is seeking to demonstrate that Jewish covenant privilege does not mean “escaping the judgment of God” (v 3). In chapter 14 the problem of intra-community judgment leads to the high incidence of *κρίνειν* and derivatives. The four occurrences in chapter 3 (vv 4, 6, 7, 8) testify to Paul's belief in a universal divine judgment of humanity, but add little to our understanding of his expectation for Christians in judgment. Similarly the praise of God's unfathomable *κρίματα* (11:33) need not detain us here. Since the only occurrence of the recompense motif is in chapter 2, that will be the focus of our examination. In what ways does Paul's use of the motif coincide with, or differ from, its use in Judaism? What role does the motif play in Paul's argument? How does the motif relate theologically to the theme of justification by faith for Jew and Gentile alike? We will then look at the other judgment texts in Romans and at two texts which use recompense terminology (*μισθός/ὀψώνιον*—4:4; 6:23) in order to confirm or supple-

¹ 2:1(3x), 3, 12, 16, 27; 3:4, 6, 7; 14:3, 4, 5(2x), 10, 13(2x), 22.

² 2:2, 3; 3:8; 5:16; 11:33; 13:7.

³ (Verb): 2:1; 8:3, 34; 14:23. (Noun): 5:16, 18; 8:1.

ment the findings from chapter 2.

THE OCCASION AND PURPOSE OF ROMANS

Without falling prey to the older view of Romans as a systematic theological treatise, it may still be granted that we have in the letter Paul's most thorough extant treatment of his gospel of God's saving righteousness in Christ. Particularly in chapters 1-8, with their explication of righteousness by faith apart from works, we may hope to discover a greater clarity regarding the relationship of justification to judgment and recompense.

The exact occasion and purpose of Romans is considerably more complex than in some of the other letters.⁴ The immediate occasion is stated clearly enough by Paul himself: he plans to visit the believers in Rome and preach the gospel there (1:10-15);⁵ and he hopes to be helped by them on his mission to Spain (15:23-24, 28-29). Yet this hardly explains the unusually thorough presentation of his gospel. Hence, scholars have rightly perceived his upcoming visit to Jerusalem to deliver the collection to be in the back of Paul's mind (15:25-32).⁶ Particularly his request for intercessory support reveals the depth of this concern ("that I may be rescued from the unbelievers in Judea, and that my ministry to Jerusalem may be acceptable to the saints," v 31); and Acts confirms Paul's fears ("[The Jewish believers] have been told about you that you teach all the Jews living among the Gentiles to forsake

⁴ On the continuing debate over the occasion and purpose of Romans, see K. P. Donfried (ed.), *The Romans Debate: Revised and Expanded Edition* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991); and N. Elliott, *The Rhetoric of Romans: Argumentative Constraint and Strategy and Paul's Dialogue with Judaism* (JSNTSup 45; Sheffield: 1990) esp. 9-94. For the view taken above of multiple purposes, see J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8* (WBC 38a; Waco: Word, 1988) liv-lvii; and J. C. Beker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Ltd., 1980) esp. 71-74.

⁵ That 15:20 ("Thus I make it my ambition to proclaim the good news, not where Christ has already been named, so that I do not build on someone else's foundation,") does not contradict this has been demonstrated by K. P. Donfried (*The Romans Debate: Revised*, 51-52), against G. Klein (*idem.*, 32-49). Cf. further S. Pederson, "Theologische Überlegungen zur Isagogik des Römerbriefes," *ZNW* 76 (1985) 51-53.

⁶ For this view see esp. J. Jervell, "The Letter to Jerusalem," *Romans Debate: Revised*, 61-74; also E. P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983 [hereafter *PLJP*]) 30-31, though Sanders excludes from the letter's occasion tensions in Rome.

Moses,” 21:21). The struggle for his law-free gospel in Galatia is still a fresh memory, and he is rightly concerned that his apostolic message and strategy be “acceptable,” along with the collection, to the church in Jerusalem. To have not only the prayer support, but also the *endorsement* of his gospel by the mixed congregation in Rome would greatly aid his case in Jerusalem.⁷

Furthermore, there is certainly a need to win the Roman church to his way of thinking. Chapters 14-15 reveal Jew-Gentile tensions,⁸ tensions which would certainly not be unknown to Paul if we accept chapter 16 as part of the original letter.⁹ The “strong” (mostly Gentiles) are judging the “weak” (mostly Jews),¹⁰ while the Jewish Christian minority still considers itself to be at a spiritual advantage over against Gentile Christians.¹¹ Such behavior threatens not only Paul’s plans for making Rome a mission base to the west, but even worse, weakens the credibility of the collection he is presenting at Jerusalem since their conflict speaks against his approach to uniting Jew and Gentile in the one body of Christ. Thus Paul writes “rather boldly by way of reminder” (15:15), so as to assure their adherence to his gospel and persuade them to behave accordingly (chapters 12-15).

This social background of the epistle will be important in examining chapters 1-4, since these chapters have traditionally been interpreted against the backdrop of the individual conscience, now convicted of sinfulness and needing to be shown the way to peace with God. Instead the hermeneutical key lies in the social relation of

⁷ A. J. M. Wedderburn, “Purpose and Occasion of Romans Again,” *Romans Debate: Revised*, 195-202.

⁸ On the nature of the Roman congregation, see P. Lampe, *Die Stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten: Untersuchungen zur Sozialgeschichte* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1987); and W. Wiefel, “The Jewish Community in Ancient Rome and the Origins of Roman Christianity,” *Romans Debate: Revised*, 100-119.

⁹ For a defense of Romans 16 as an original part of Paul’s letter, see P. Lampe, “Zur Textgeschichte des Römerbriefs,” *NovT* 27 (1985) 273-277.

¹⁰ 11:18-“do not boast over the branches”; cf. further 14:1,13; 15:1.

¹¹ 14:3b.

Jew and Gentile in the church as outlined above.¹² It is against this backdrop that Paul's focus on justification by faith coupled with the unusual emphasis on divine impartiality in this letter is best understood.¹³ For if neither Jew nor Gentile can claim an advantage over the other before God, but both must be accepted on the same basis, by grace through faith, then a proper understanding and appropriation of this doctrine should provide a foundation for overcoming potentially destructive social tensions in the church at Rome or at Jerusalem.¹⁴

Thus, the motives for this correspondence are complex, and no single one seems able alone to explain the epistle, which also explains the difficulty in defining a single addressee.¹⁵ At times Paul seems to be addressing Jewish tendencies, while elsewhere Gentile concerns are voiced. It lies beyond the scope of this paper to attempt a solution to the still-debated issues of exact audience and theological intention in Romans. Our working hypothesis will treat the letter as being addressed to both Gentile and Jewish elements of varied Roman house-churches, with the emphasis shifting according to the need of the argument.

Rhetorical analysis now generally views Romans as an epideictic argument designed to "increase the intensity of adherence to certain values . . . which (Paul) wants to reinforce until the desired action is actually performed."¹⁶ Thus, in spite of

¹² See H. Moxnes, "Honour and Righteousness in Romans," *JSNT* 32 (1988) 61-77; and K. Stendahl's now-classic essay, "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West," *HTR* 56 (1963) 199-215.

¹³ See J. M. Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, 166-170.

¹⁴ This corresponds to K. Haacker's description of the letter as "ein Plädoyer für Frieden in verschiedenen Dimensionen und geschichtlichen Kontexten" ("Der Römerbrief als Friedensmemorandum," *NTS* 36 [1990] 29).

¹⁵ A number of studies in recent years seem to be moving in this direction: K. Haacker, "Friedensmemorandum," 25-41; J. A. Crafton, "Paul's Rhetorical Vision and the Purpose of Romans: Toward a New Understanding," *NovT* 32/4 (1990) 317-339; G. Davies, *Faith and Obedience in Romans: A Study in Romans 1-4* (JSOTSup 39; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990) 32-34. Donfried sees the rejection of a "single purpose" as part of a general consensus (*Romans Debate: Revised*, lxx).

¹⁶ W. Wuellner, "Paul's Rhetoric of Argumentation in Romans," *CBQ* 38 (1976) 343. Or as he puts it elsewhere: "to affirm the communal values which Paul and the Romans share in being agents of faith throughout the world" (337). Although Elliott prefers "paraenesis" to any of the classical rhetorical categories (*Rhetoric*, 62-64, and notes), his conclusion sounds little different than Wuellner's: "to modify that basis (viz. of agreement between Paul and the Roman congregation) so as

the “summary” or “treatise-like” nature of chapters 1-11, we interpret them, along with the remainder of the letter, as addressed to specific house-churches in Rome in order to intensify adherence to the Pauline gospel¹⁷ and ultimately to lead them to action: “Welcome one another,” (15:7; also 14:1).

ROMANS 2:6-11

(6)For he will repay according to each one’s deeds: (7) to those who by patiently doing good seek for glory and honor and immortality, he will give eternal life; (8) while for those who are self-seeking and who obey not the truth but wickedness, there will be wrath and fury. (9) There will be anguish and distress for everyone who does evil, the Jew first and also the Greek, (10) but glory and honor and peace for everyone who does good, the Jew first and also the Greek. (11) For God shows no partiality.

The Problem

How can the preacher of justification by faith alone apart from works of the Law here promise eternal life to “those who *by patiently doing good* seek for glory and honor and immortality?” If “there is no one who is righteous, not even one” (3:10), how serious can Paul be in referring to “everyone who does good,” or a few verses later claiming that “the doers of the law will be justified” (v 13)?

Previous Treatments

In previous monographs on the theme of judgment or recompense, Romans 2 has been handled in widely varying ways.¹⁸ H. Braun, while concerned to stress the legitimacy of judgment and recompense concepts within Pauline thought, nevertheless viewed the above passage, with its possibility of a positive or negative result of such judgment for Christians, and thus its diminishing of Paul’s otherwise optimistic view of judgment for Christians, as largely reflecting Jewish modes of thinking. To

to win the audience’s disposition to act in accordance with the paraenesis in chaps 12-15” (105). Cf. also K. Donfried, *Romans Debate: Revised*, lxi.

¹⁷ 1:16 - “not ashamed of the gospel”; here is the real issue at stake.

¹⁸ For an overview, see K. Snodgrass, “Justification By Grace,” 72-75.

this extent, Romans 2 represents a pauline “inconsistency,” something which the apostle failed to “think through to the end.”¹⁹

F. Filson, in a sharp departure from traditional Reformation interpretation, claimed “that Rom 2:6-11 represents Paul’s own position as a Christian. He expected Christians to endure in good work, to seek glory, honor and immortality, to do the good, in a word to achieve real righteousness and hence be able to pass the judgment test.”²⁰ According to Filson, eternal life for Paul is both a gift of grace and a reward for Christian living, the latter being based on Paul’s (unrealistic?) expectation of Christian perfection.

L. Mattern adjudges that these verses in their context deal only with judgment upon *non-Christian* Jews and Gentiles.²¹ Nevertheless she can apply this passage to Christian believers as follows: “Rö 2 prüft nur, ob der Glaube wirklich Glaube und nicht vielmehr fromme Illusion ist”;²² i.e., Romans 2 can have Christians in view, but only such whose work (sg.) testifies to the reality of their faith, and it is faith alone which brings the verdict of “righteous.” For Christians the *duality* of this judgment (salvation/ damnation) does not apply, since a Christian’s deeds could never lead to damnation.

E. Synofzik, on the other hand, would deny that Romans 2 was designed to say anything at all about Christians and judgment. Rather Paul radicalizes traditional Hellenistic Jewish categories in order to convince self-righteous Jews that their covenant privileges will avail them nothing at the eschatological judgment. Judgment and recompense language are employed to prove Jewish culpability. The positive statements about giving eternal life to those who do good are merely a “foil,” and

¹⁹ *Gerichtsgedanke*, esp. 61, 96.

²⁰ *Recompense*, 102, n. 2.

²¹ *Verständnis*, 123-140, esp. 137, n. 377.

²² *Ibid.*, 138.

should be assigned no theological weight of their own.²³

Issues Raised for the Interpretation of Romans 2

This incomplete survey²⁴ points up a number of the crucial issues which must be resolved by the detailed exegesis of the passage. Is the “argument with Judaism” (chapters 1-4) directed at non-believing Jews, Jewish-Christian concerns, or even Gentile-Christian boasting? How does Paul utilize traditional Hellenistic Jewish material here, and what does this reveal about his rhetorical intent? Did Paul’s Jewish contemporaries expect “special treatment” as his argument seems to suppose, or is this a distortion of the true character of first century Judaism? Is there significance to Paul’s switch from “works” (plural) in the scripture citation of v 6 to the singular “work” in the following verse? Is indeed a “righteousness of good works” or, perhaps, even Christian perfection envisioned; or is “eternal life to those who do good” meant hypothetically, a foil for Paul’s real point; namely, no one can claim righteousness via Jewish privilege or good works? And finally, what of the seeming contradictions with his position in chapter 3 as noted above?

The Flow of Paul’s Argument

“There is no reason here to depart from the usual recognition that 1:16-17 are the climax of the introduction and theme for what follows.”²⁵ Paul announces that he has no grounds for shame with regard to his gospel of faith-righteousness for Jew and Gentile alike, a sentiment very understandable in the light of approaching

²³ *Vergeltungsaussagen*, 151-177.

²⁴ More recent treatments of Rom 2 would include: T. R. Schreiner, *The Law and Its Fulfillment: A Pauline Theology of Law* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993) 179-204; D. B. Garlington, “The Obedience of Faith in the Letter to the Romans: Part II, The Obedience of Faith and Judgment by Works,” *WTJ* 53 (1991) 47-72; G. N. Davies, *Faith and Obedience* [1990] 47-71; N. Elliott, *Rhetoric* [1990] 119-131, 167-204; J. Ziesler, *Paul’s Letter to the Romans* (London: SCM, 1989) 81; J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8* [1988] 76-128; K. Snodgrass, “Justification” [1986]; F. Watson, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1986) 106-122; E. P. Sanders, *PLJP* [1983] 123-135; J. M. Bassler, *Divine Impartiality* [1982] 121-170, 201-202.

²⁵ J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 38.

events in Jerusalem, and especially Jewish(-Christian) objections to his law-free gospel to Gentiles.

In 1:18-32 Paul has taken up standard elements of Hellenistic Jewish condemnation of the heathen world to stress the rightful judgment of God upon sinful humanity as a whole.²⁶ The divine righteousness always manifests itself as “wrath . . . against all the ungodliness and wickedness of those who by their wickedness suppress the truth.” J. Bassler has noted that already in this section Paul is preparing the way for his discussion of impartial judgment in chapter 2. Following E. Klostermann’s division of the periods (vv 22-24, 25-27, 28-31), there is “a consistent pattern of sin followed by retribution and in each case the retribution follows the law of talio and corresponds exactly to the previously named theological perversion.”²⁷ In good rhetorical fashion Paul begins his argument with a reminder of shared convictions before approaching possibly controversial matters.

Chapter 2:1-11 brings a sequel to this denunciation of heathen idolatry by now speaking in diatribal style²⁸ with those who sin and yet would exclude themselves from this strict judgment (2:3) because of “the riches of [God’s] kindness and forbearance and patience” (2:4). While phrased generally enough to be applicable to hypocrites of any race,²⁹ the very similar language in Wisdom 13-15, as well as the

²⁶ There are numerous indications that Paul has adapted traditional material in this section. The parallels with the Wisdom of Solomon (chaps 13-14) and its scathing denunciation of Gentile idolatry and immorality, have been sufficiently noted by other commentators. See, for example, J. Ziesler, *Romans*, 74-79. The use of ἀνθρώπων instead of ἔθνων (1:18), and the possible allusions to the Genesis account of the Fall may hint at a broadening of the scope of the indictment (cf. M. D. Hooker, “Adam in Romans 1,” *NTS* 6 [1960] 297-306).

²⁷ “Divine Impartiality,” 47-48; E. Klostermann, “Die adäquate Vergeltung in Rm. 1:22-31,” *ZNW* 32 (1933) 1-6; see also J. M. Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, “Appendix E: Objections to Klostermann’s Analysis of 1:22-31,” 201-202.

²⁸ On the use of diatribe in this passage see S. Stowers (*Diatribes*, 110-117). We here follow Stower’s conclusion that the introduction of diatribe at 2:1 is only a change of rhetorical style, not audience (112), and constitutes no appeal against a concrete historical setting for the letter (*pace* G. Bornkamm, *Paul* [New York: Harper & Row, 1971] 88-96). See also K. P. Donfried, “False Assumptions,” 132-141.

²⁹ See esp. the repetition of terms and ideas from 1:18-32 in 2:7-10 (“glory,” “honor,” “immortality,” “self-seeking,” “reject the truth”). F. F. Bruce cites Seneca for similar “excuses” among cultured Greeks (*Romans*, 86-87). On the condemnation of hypocrisy as typical of diatribe, see S. Stowers, *Diatribes*, 100-118.

subsequent development of the argument (see below), suggest that Paul already has a *Jewish* presumption in mind here.³⁰ Again, his point to the one who would presume on God's kindness for some advantage at judgment is: "do you imagine you will escape the judgment of God?" (v 3). We will return shortly to vv 6-11 in greater detail, but it should be noted here that impartial divine judgment according to works constitutes the capstone of Paul's attack on any sense of distinction or advantage in judgment. Rather than attacking supposed Jewish legalism, Paul is here found criticizing an over-reliance on grace which makes forgiveness too easy to obtain due to the supposed soteriological advantages of the Jew. For clarification, Paul's *audience* in this argument with Judaism is the mixed congregation of Jews and (mostly) Gentiles in Rome,³¹ and the *target* (or *imaginary debate partner*) in his diatribe is a "Jew."³² His primary *addressee* in these verses—the group he is particularly concerned to persuade among his audience by these arguments—is the Jewish-Christian minority.³³

Having introduced "the Jew" by name in v 9, Paul continues his argument against Jewish presumption in 2:12-29, now naming the supposed protective privileges—the law and circumcision—and arguing that such badges of membership are no substitute for heartfelt obedience (vv 25-27). In fact, the uncircumcised

³⁰ See A. Nygren, *Der Römerbrief* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951) 87-90; G. P. Carras, "Romans 2,1-29: A Dialogue on Jewish Ideals," *Bib* 73 (1992) 183-207. For caution, however, against overdependence on Wis 13-15, see N. Elliott, *Rhetoric*, 174-182, and H. Räisänen, *Paul*², 94-109; cf. also pp. 224-226 below. Stowers' rejection of a Jewish addressee for 2:1-5 is based upon a desire to maintain the same (Gentile) target as in 1:18-32. This is, however, unwarranted and unnecessary in light of the mixed audience in Rome and Stowers' own admission that diatribe is generally aimed at "any of the audience to whom it might apply" (*Diatribes*, 110); in this case the Jewish-Christian portion.

³¹ This "double character" of Romans (i.e., an argument with Judaism sent to a mostly Gentile audience) is conveniently summarized by W. G. Kümmel, *Einleitung*¹⁸, 270-271.

³² This is made explicit in 3:17, and strongly suggested by the Jewishness of the presumptions in 2:1-5 (see above). At this level, the argument has more the character of an inner-Jewish debate (i.e., Paul *the Jew* opposing a different *Jewish* position; cf. G. P. Carras, n. 30 above), and explains why some scholars see here little more than a modified synagogue sermon devoid of Christian perspective (e.g., W. Schmithals, *Römerbrief*, 86; E. P. Sanders, *PLJP*, 123-135).

³³ A. Lincoln, "From Wrath to Justification," *SBLSP* 1993 (Atlanta: 1993) 196-200.

Gentile is at no disadvantage to the Jew, and this because of Paul's radical adherence to "doing" as the criterion of eschatological judgment (2:12-16).

This debate is concluded with responses to various Jewish objections³⁴ (3:1-8) and a catena of scriptural testimonies (3:9-20) designed to demonstrate once and for all the equality of Jew and Gentile in judgment.³⁵ All alike are subject to the reign of sin (ὑφ' ἁμαρτίαν, 3:9), and equally accountable (ὑπόδικος, 3:19). Having thus demonstrated that being Jewish—possessing Torah and circumcision—provides no decisive advantage in eschatological judgment, Paul will proceed in the remainder of chapters 3-4 to argue for the same impartiality and equality in justification.

What has been said above highlights an important fact for our study of 2:6-11, namely that impartial divine judgment strictly according to works functions as the main theological foundation to Paul's argument for Jew-Gentile equality in judgment. The literary structure of the larger passage confirms this pivotal position of 2:6-11, since these verses sum up the argument for impartial judgment in the face of gross sin and hypocrisy (1:18-2:5), and introduce the discussion of impartiality in the light of Jew-Gentile distinctions such as the Torah and circumcision (2:12-3:20).³⁶

Universal Sinfulness or Jewish Advantage? An Unnecessary Antithesis

Traditionally Rom 1:18-3:20 has been understood to demonstrate (or illustrate) the universal sinfulness of all human beings (3:9,20), so as to lay the groundwork for Paul's solution: righteousness by faith in Christ.³⁷ This long-

³⁴ These objections center around the charge that such ignoring of Israel's covenant position impugns God's faithfulness, a charge which will be taken up in greater detail in chaps 9-11.

³⁵ Note the repetition of the programmatic phrase "the Jew first and also the Greek" at critical junctures: 1:16; 2:9, 10; 3:9.

³⁶ J. Bassler, "Divine Impartiality," 43-58.

³⁷ "Paul's aim is to show that the whole of humanity is morally bankrupt" (F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963] 81). This is "the testimony to a universal accusation against all men without exception" (C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans* [ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1975] 1.104, n. 1).

standing consensus has been challenged vigorously by numerous scholars, mainly on the grounds that 1:18-3:8 do not, in fact, prove that every individual without exception is a sinner.³⁸ The charge of universal sinfulness would seem to be ameliorated by the admission that there are some who live righteously (2:7, 10, 13-14, 26). Furthermore the arguments against hypocrisy in 2:1-4 and 17-24 would have force only for those who “practice the same things” (2:1, referring to the idolatry and immorality of 1:18-32) or are hypocritical “thieves,” “adulterers,” or “temple robbers.” As Sanders remarks, “Did they all (viz. Jews) rob temples?”³⁹ According to these scholars Paul is not so much seeking to prove every individual a sinner,⁴⁰ but is primarily arguing against some form of Jewish soteriological advantage.⁴¹

Perhaps in this case we can have our cake and eat it too if we distinguish between *what* Paul says, and *why* he says it. Paul states that “all, both Jews and Greeks, are under the power of sin” (3:9), then cites numerous Scripture texts to the effect that “there is no one who is righteous, not even one” (3:10-18), and concludes on the note of universal accountability (3:19b). Whatever else it is, this is certainly an assertion that every human being without exception both sins and is subject to sin just as the traditional interpretation claims.

On the other hand it is equally undeniable that the apostle returns again and again to the issue of advantage in judgment.

Do you imagine . . . you will escape the judgment of God? (2:3)
God shows no partiality. (2:11)

³⁸ “(N)ot all the material actually lends itself to the desired conclusion. . . . Paul’s case for universal sinfulness . . . is not convincing: it is internally inconsistent and it rests on gross exaggeration” (E. P. Sanders, *PLJP*, 123, 125); see also H. Räisänen, *Paul and the Law*² (WUNT 29; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1987) 97-109; K. Snodgrass, “Justification,” 76; C. Cosgrove, “What if some have not believed? The occasion and thrust of Romans 3.1-8,” *ZNW* 78 (1987) 90-105; and N. Elliott, *Rhetoric*, 191-198.

³⁹ *PLJP*, 125.

⁴⁰ See esp. Stendahl’s essay for the denial of this individualistic focus (n. 12).

⁴¹ Thus, for J. Bassler, God’s impartial treatment of both Jew and Gentile is the central focus of these chapters (“Divine Impartiality in Paul’s Letter to the Romans,” *NovT* 26/1 [1984] 43-58).

But if you call yourself a Jew and rely on the law and boast of your relation to God and know his will and determine what is best because you are instructed in the law. (2:17-18)

Then what advantage has the Jew? (3:1)

What then? Are we [Jews] any better off? (3:9)⁴²

For there is no distinction, since all have sinned and . . . are now justified by his grace as a gift. (3:22-24)

Then what becomes of boasting? (3:27)

Not only to the adherents of the law but also to those who share the faith of Abraham. (4:16)

The question either interpretation must answer is “Why does Paul argue against certain Jewish soteriological advantages and for universal sinfulness?” The traditional interpretation answers: because universal unrighteousness is the logical prerequisite of Paul’s gospel of righteousness to all through faith alone apart from works. That is, Paul must convince the hearers of the gospel that they need this faith-righteousness; i.e., that they have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God (3:23). However, while it may be agreed that universal sinfulness is logically necessary to Paul’s gospel, we may still be allowed to ask, “Who would need convincing of this?” The idea that every person, including Jews, commits sins was a shared conviction between Paul and his Jewish debater.⁴³ Thus Paul affirms this shared conviction. *But ‘why’ and ‘for whom?’* We suggest he does so *in order to convince Jewish Christians that Jewishness will not prevent Jews from being judged as “sinners” equally with the Gentiles.* Thus he indeed asserts universal subjection to sin (3:9b), but makes the point of this assertion and of the scriptural catena⁴⁴ clear (v 19) by arguing that these accusations must be allowed their full

⁴² Dahl argues for the textual variant *τί οὖν προεχόμεθα* (omitting *οὐ πάντως* with P, eth, Origen, Ephraem) which would be translated, “What, then, do we plead as a defense? (implied answer, “nothing”)” (“Romans 3.9: Text and Meaning,” *Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of C. K. Barrett* [ed. M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson; London: SPCK, 1982] 194; see also J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 146-148). If correct, this would only strengthen our contention that the removal of Jewish defenses is Paul’s central purpose.

⁴³ See Eccl 7:20; 1 Kgs 8:46; Ps 51:5; 1QH IV,29-30; VII,17-18; IX,14-15; Pss Sol 9:6-7; see also G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, 1.468, 479-489; E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 283-284; F. Thielman, *From Plight to Solution, A Jewish Framework for Understanding Paul’s View of the Law in Galatians and Romans* (NovTSup 61; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1989) 28-45.

⁴⁴ It is quite possible that Paul here draws on preformed material used by faithful Jews in the condemnation of Gentiles and apostates. See CD V,13-17; 4 Ezra 7:22-24; and L. E. Keck, “The Function of Romans 3:10-18 - Observations and Suggestions,” *God’s Christ and His People, FS N. A. Dahl* (ed. J. Jervell and W. A. Meeks; Oslo-Bergen Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget, 1977) 141-157.

force equally upon “those who are under the law” (= Jews) for the purpose [ἵνα] of eliminating any and all excuses (“that every mouth may be silenced”) and making all accountable to God [ὕποδικος τῷ θεῷ]. This is also the point of the thematic phrase “both Jews and Greeks” (1:16; 2:9-10).

Thus Paul’s purpose in Romans 1-4 is to destroy any sense of distinction, privilege, or advantage before the divine tribunal based on racial or religious differences.⁴⁵ These chapters constitute Paul’s initial defense of this equal treatment of both Jew and Gentile, focusing first on equal treatment in judgment due to God’s impartial judgment of a universally sinful world (1:18-3:20), then on equal treatment in salvation (3:21-4:25). It is not against a world claiming “we have not sinned” that he is arguing, but against Jews or Jewish-Christians claiming that they shall not be treated the same as the “sinners” in the judgment of God. “Do you imagine . . . you will escape the judgment of God?” (2:3).

The Chiastic Structure and the Content of Rom 2:6-11

Verses 6-11 detail the eschatological basis for this divine impartiality in judgment; namely, it will be strictly ἐκάστω κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ. Paul structures this chiastically:⁴⁶

A	v 6	divine judgment is according to deeds
B	v 7	do good/seek glory, etc. --- eternal life
C	v 8	obey unrighteousness --- wrath and fury
C'	v 9	do evil --- anguish and distress
B'	v 10	do good --- glory, honor, and peace
A'	v 11	no partiality with God

⁴⁵ In his thorough rhetorical analysis of Romans, N. Elliott comes to a similar conclusion: “The offense at the center of Paul’s apostrophic indictment is nothing other than considering oneself “excused” from God’s righteous demand” (*Rhetoric*, 123, 126). Elliott, however, views this as directed at Gentile Christian smugness. Against this, Dunn concludes with most others, “the principal focus of critique is Jewish self-assurance that the typically Jewish indictment of Gentile sin (1:18-32) is not applicable to the covenant people themselves” (*Romans 1-8*, 51; cf. pp. 51-88). Similarly G. P. Carras, “Romans 2, 1-29: A Dialogue on Jewish Ideals,” *Bib* 73 (1992) 183-207.

⁴⁶ See esp. K. Grobel, “A Chiastic Retribution-Formula in Romans 2,” *Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag* (ed. E. Dinkler; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1964) 255-261. However, Grobel’s assertion that this is a pre-pauline chiasm with several

A number of observations regarding Paul's intent can be made from this structure. Verses 7-10 elucidate Paul's understanding of the motif of divine recompense according to deeds (v 6). It is a *dual* recompense in that it encompasses both reward for good (vv 7, 10) and punishment for evil (vv 8-9). Its *universality* is made explicit by the addition of "the Jew first and also the Greek" (vv 9-10) and its *individuality* by the use of ἕκαστος (v 6). The use of ζωὴ αἰώνιος⁴⁷ (v 8) in opposition to ὀργὴ καὶ θυμός (v 9) makes of it an *eschatological* recompense issuing in one's ultimate *soteriological* fate. Thus this repayment (ἀποδώσει) is none other than the Last Judgment which takes place on the apocalyptic "day of wrath"⁴⁸ (v 5). Then sinners will "perish" (ἀπολοῦνται, v 12) while the righteous will be "justified," "on the day when, according to my gospel, God, through Jesus Christ, will judge the secret thoughts of all" (v 16). Excepting the christological comment of v 16, all of the above characteristics of Paul's use of the motif have manifold parallels in the materials we studied in chapters 2-4.

There is also a crucial rhetorical move to be noted. Verses 7-8 unfold the principle of recompense using language unmistakably reminiscent of the Jewish denunciations of pagan wickedness in chapter 1. If the wicked there are those who exchange the glory (τὴν δόξαν) of the immortal (ἀφθάρτος) God and are recompensed⁴⁹ with dishonor (ἀτιμάζεσθαι, vv 23-24), then the righteous, in precise contrast, are those "who seek δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν" (2:7). Likewise the description of the wicked—those who "obey not τῇ ἀληθείᾳ but τῇ ἀδικίᾳ" (2:8)—parallels the ἀδικία and suppression of τὴν ἀληθείαν among the

(Pauline?) insertions seems difficult of demonstration; see also J. Bassler, "Divine Impartiality," 46-47.

⁴⁷ "Eternal life", while comparatively rare, is clearly attested in Paul's writings: Rom 5:21; 6:22, 23; Gal 6:8. See J. Ziesler, *Romans*, 171.

⁴⁸ On "the day (of wrath)" in Paul, cf. G. Dellling, *TDNT*, 2.952.

⁴⁹ Note the recompense terminology in 1:27 ("and received [ἀπολαμβάνοντες] in their own persons the due penalty [τὴν ἀντιμισθίαν] for their error") along with the talionic principle embedded in the structure of 1:18-32 (cf. p. 190 above).

heathen (1:18). In both places the evildoers are consigned to divine wrath (ὀργή, 1:18; 2:8), now contrasted with the eschatological reward of eternal life to the righteous (2:7). To Jewish ears this would all sound quite unexceptional: salvation for Israel in covenant obedience; eschatological punishment for the nations or the apostates in their wickedness.

However, while repeating the foregoing in reverse order and with synonymous terminology, vv 9-10 contain one crucial addition: the two-fold reference to “the Jew first and also the Greek.” This harks back to the thematic introduction of the whole section (1:16), and with it Paul springs his trap on the diatribal target, hoping thereby to persuade⁵⁰ his Jewish-Christian addressees of the wrongheadedness of the thinking outlined in 2:1-5. He interprets and radicalizes the recompense concept of vv 6-8 in a way that strips the Jew of any eschatological advantage. The divine wrath, now termed “anguish and distress” (θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία), cannot be restricted to the Gentiles alone, but must apply to “everyone (ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου) who does evil.” Thus the Jews’ priority is turned against them, making them equally first in judgment. Correspondingly, the eschatological reward cannot be limited to the Jews alone, but is for the Gentiles on the same basis.

The underlying thrust of 2:1-11 now becomes explicit: the target is Jewish presumption of priority of privilege, which however soundly rooted in God’s election of Israel—a fact which Paul does not dispute (1:16) and to which he will return (3:1-4; chapters 9-11)—has led Paul’s kinsfolk to the effective conclusion that God’s judgment of Israel will be on different terms from his judgment of the nations as a whole. . . . In reformulating vv 7-8 Paul insists that both verses apply equally to both Jew and Gentile. Paul’s whole point here is that the terms of judgment are precisely the same for everyone.⁵⁰

Whether this “Jewish presumption” was thought by Paul to be characteristic of the Judaism he knew, or was simply a position he attributed to his diatribal target, will be discussed further below. We can say, however, that it was not a characteristic of the motif use in second temple Jewish texts. Both in the OT

⁵⁰ J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 88. Likewise G. P. Carras: “What Paul found wrong with the Jewish religion (as perceived through the ‘critic’) was that the Jew violated central tenets of his own religion by claiming a criterion of judgement for himself different from all others” (“Rom. 2,” 206).

Pseudepigrapha and the Qumran literature, admonitions were regularly addressed to members of the covenant communities, and to Jews at large, using this recompense motif, warning them of the loss of covenant status and blessings if they walked in wickedness.⁵¹ We did trace a developing dichotomy between God's treatment of the righteous and the wicked in judgment. However the division between the righteous and the wicked in these texts did not correspond generally to the division between Jews and non-Jews, but divided between the righteous and the wicked within Israel according to their deeds.⁵² The motif was seen to have been used especially in contexts of community conflict in order to identify true Jews within Israel. In a few instances the motif even asserted the equality of Jews and Gentiles in this judgment,⁵³ and in 2 Bar "it is neither election nor external participation in the chosen nation which guarantees salvation, but 'the doers of the law will be justified'."⁵⁴

This understanding of the rhetorical target also explains why punishment stands at the center of the chiasm (vv 8-9). Against the Jewish presumption so described it is the point of judgment to the Jew first which Paul must make. Whether this means that the positive statements (vv 7, 10) are merely a foil, a Jewish assumption which the apostle will later subvert, will be taken up at a later point in our discussion.

This equality in judgment (and destruction of Jewish presumption), finally, is rooted in the very character of God himself, namely his impartiality (*προσωπολημψία*, v 11).⁵⁵ The combination of these two motifs—impartiality and

⁵¹ See pp. 117-118, 177-178.

⁵² See pp. 118, 176-178.

⁵³ See Jub 5:12-16; and p. 124 above.

⁵⁴ P. 116. The same removal of soteriological distinction between Jewish and non-Jewish sinners was found in the PssSol (see pp. 99-100).

⁵⁵ Rooted in the OT (2 Chron 19:7; Deut 10:17; Job 34:19), divine impartiality became axiomatic during the intertestamental period (J. M. Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, 7-44).

judgment according to deeds—had already become traditional by Paul’s time.⁵⁶ This is one more indication that Paul is reliant on Jewish tradition for his argument here. However, his particular use of the doctrine of divine impartiality in this text, namely to relativize Jewish covenant advantage before God, may have been surprising to first century Jews. Note Peter’s surprise in Acts 10:34-35:

Then Peter began to speak to them: “I truly understand that God shows no partiality (προσωπολήμπτης), but in every nation anyone who fears him and does what is right is acceptable to him.”⁵⁷

Bassler’s study likewise concludes that this surprise attack on Jewish privilege via the axiom of impartiality, while not entirely novel, still represents an element of Pauline (or early Christian) originality.⁵⁸

With v 12 Paul begins a new section (2:12-29) focusing on the obvious advantage of the Jew in the possession of the Torah.⁵⁹ Even though lacking the Jewish Torah, the Gentile is at no disadvantage, because judgment according to deeds (here “doing” versus “hearing” [= possessing]) allows for differing standards of “law” against which one will be judged (vv 12-16).⁶⁰ Likewise (vv 17-29) the Jew who sins will find possession of the Torah and circumcision to be of no advantage in God’s impartial judgment according to works.

Quotation or Allusion?

We turn our attention now to the motif statement in v 6, giving particular attention to Paul’s handling of the motif-tradition, and noting points of continuity or

⁵⁶ Cf. Sir 35:12-19, 24; Jub 5:15-16; T.Job 4:7; PssSol 2:16, 18. On their continued combination in rabbinic literature, see J. Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, 17-76.

⁵⁷ A somewhat different attack on Jewish covenant presumption can be seen in Matt 3:9 (=Luke 3:8).

⁵⁸ *Divine Impartiality*, 44, 65, 76, 119.

⁵⁹ Not mentioned previously in the letter, νόμος and its cognate ἀνόμως are used twenty-one times in 2:12-29!

⁶⁰ It has only rarely been noted by NT scholars that Paul’s idea of “differing standards” in judgment was not unknown in Judaism: cf. Jub 5:12-19 (see on this text above, pp.88-91); Wis 6:6-8. See also H. Schlier, *Der Römerbrief* (HTK 6; Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1977) 75, n. 22.

discontinuity with that same tradition. We note first of all the uncertainty of commentators in identifying the precise source of this supposed quotation or allusion.⁶¹ Reference is usually made to one or both of the following OT texts:

Ps 62:13 ⁶²	ὅτι σὺ ἀποδώσεις ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ,
Prov 24:12	ὃς ἀποδίδωσιν ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ,
Rom 2:6	ὃς ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.

Paul’s wording is not an exact quotation of either of these passages in their LXX form; nor is he reflecting their MT-form.⁶³ We doubt, in fact, that Paul intends to quote or allude to any specific passage of the OT, or of any other Jewish literature for that matter. There is no introductory formula or other contextual clue that would alert us to the presence of a scripture citation. Interestingly, throughout the considerable usage of the motif in the Jewish literature traced in the previous chapters we found not a single instance of a writer citing the motif as a quotation of scripture. Instead, its use was so deep-rooted and widespread in Second Temple Judaism that Paul, like others before him, simply draws the motif from this storehouse of Jewish tradition in which it was everywhere recognized as a fundamental religious axiom rooted firmly in the OT.⁶⁴

Lexical Considerations

Paul’s wording of the motif likewise reflects traditional usage. His choice of ἀποδίδωμι reflects the preference, seen already in the LXX, for forms of δίδωμι in motif occurrences,⁶⁵ while the future tense mirrors the increasing tendency in second temple Judaism to place this recompense in the realm of eschatological fulfill-

⁶¹ Dunn favors a “direct citation” (*Romans 1-8*, 85) and Hays a “virtual citation” (R. B. Hays, *Echoes*, 42-43), while Ellis lists our text under “allusions” to the OT (E. E. Ellis, *Paul’s Use of the Old Testament*, 153). See also R. Heiligenthal, *Werke*, 172-174.

⁶² LXX = 61:13.

⁶³ In both cases the MT reads a *singular* (“according to his work”).

⁶⁴ R. Heiligenthal, *Werke*, 174.

⁶⁵ See p. 32 above.

ment.⁶⁶ The employment of *κατά* + *ἔργα* (pl.) appears to be a preferred mode of expression,⁶⁷ and the individuation of judgment (*ἐκάστω*) was likewise common throughout the literature surveyed earlier. The purpose of this individualizing, however, both in that earlier literature and here in Rom 2:6, is not so much to stress the *individuality* (i.e., judgment person by person) but the *inescapability* of judgment for every single person, and in Rom 2:6 specifically for the Jew. This thought of “no escape” or “no excuse” has been highlighted already in vv 1 and 3. “To each according to deeds” in v 6 is then explained to mean *for both good and evil to the Jew first and also the Greek without impartiality* (vv 7-11).

“Work” Versus “Works”

As noted in the previous paragraph the use of the plural (*ἔργα*) is what one would expect following the preposition *κατά* in the motif. However, attempts have been made to avoid the close juxtaposition of good works and justification/judgment by positing a technical distinction in Pauline literature between *ἔργα* (pl.) and *ἔργον* (sg.).⁶⁸ Allegedly the plural, with or without the addition of (*τοῦ*) *νόμου*, always has a negative connotation, referring to meritorious human achievement and self-righteousness. The singular, on the other hand, is supposedly reserved in Paul for Christians, whose entire life is but a single, indivisible “participation in Christ’s own work.”⁶⁹ Thus, it is not the “work,” as such, which results in salvation or condemnation, but the faith or unbelief which comes to expression in the same.⁷⁰ Mattern can go so far as to declare, “der Christ hat keine *Werke*.”⁷¹ This, then, enables

⁶⁶ See pp. 119, 174-176 above.

⁶⁷ Cf. pp. 32-33, 117.

⁶⁸ See for instance L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 141-151; also J. C. Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, 247-248; and (apparently) J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 85.

⁶⁹ L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 141-151.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 117.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 151.

her to interpret ἔργον ἀγαθόν (Rom 2:7) as “faith” rather than as actual “good works,”⁷² so that technically the judgment of believers is not according to “works” but according to “faith.”

The fact is, as Mattern herself admits, Rom 2:6-11 does not follow this supposedly technical usage, since the *plural* (ἔργα) in v 6 entails both good and bad deeds, followed immediately by the usage of the *singular* in vv 7 and 10 with no demonstrable difference in meaning. This is especially the case since vv 7-10 with their singular nouns are intended as an expansion upon the meaning of v 6 with its plural ἔργα. While one can acknowledge a general pattern in Paul’s usage of “work/works” along the lines of Mattern’s analysis, this cannot be pressed so as to remove the “works” themselves as the basis of the eschatological judgment. 2 Cor 5:10, like Rom 2:6, clearly refers to concrete deeds (pl.), both good and evil, as the basis of judgment.⁷³ Similarly, passages such^{as} 1 Cor 7:19 (“obeying the commandments of God”) and 2 Cor 9:8 (“you may share abundantly in every good work” - implying multiplicity; cf. also Col 1:10) speak against a rigid view of “works” in Paul as negative.⁷⁴ The switch from plural to singular in Rom 2:6-7 is better explained as due to the Jewish background of his thought here, than to a supposed aversion to “works.” The easy interchange between singular and plural “work(s)” in motif contexts was found to be characteristic of Jewish literature.⁷⁵ This linguistic phenomenon is grounded in the view of human works not so much as individual achievements or merits, but as together giving unified and visible expression to the unseen character of the person. The good person does good works, the evil person evil works. Non-Jewish readers of Romans would have understood this

⁷² “Das Gericht geht nicht über die bessere oder schlechtere Leistung des Menschen . . . sondern über das bessere oder schlechtere Partizipieren der Christen am Werk Gottes” (Ibid., 151).

⁷³ See chap. 7 below on this passage and on 2 Cor 11:15.

⁷⁴ This is even clearer in the disputed letters: Eph 2:10; 1 Tim 2:10; 5:10, 25; 6:18; 2 Tim 1:9; Tit 2:7, 14; 3:8, 14.

⁷⁵ See pp. 31, 34-35, 117, 172 above.

point equally well, since Hellenistic literature testifies to the same view among pagan Greeks; namely, ἔργα are the visible revelation of the true essence or character of an individual.⁷⁶ Rather than being some coded reference to ‘Christian faith,’ the patient doing of “the good” (τὸ ἀγαθόν; vv 7, 10)⁷⁷ is language that would appeal broadly to both Jews and Greeks, referring simply to behavior which is recognized to be good or excellent, and which brings honor rather than shame.⁷⁸ This “doing (the) good” is contrasted stereotypically with the actions of the wicked (vv 8-9) along the lines of Two-way traditions in Judaism, according to which the righteous inherit life, while the wicked are visited with destruction.⁷⁹

Excursus: “Works” As *Manifestation* Rather Than Merit

Our perspective on ἔργον/ἔργα goes against the grain of a long-standing tendency in Protestant scholarship to suspect all “works” of being the result of ‘fleshly’ effort and achievement, tainted by the motivation to acquire thereby one’s own status or merit before God, and thus always akin to the alleged “works righteousness” of Pharisaic Judaism. A classic example is Rudolf Bultmann, for whom not merely “ἔργα νόμου,” but equally human ἔργα *per se*, must be interpreted as “die Leistungen überhaupt,” and thus always in opposition to χάρις and leading to fleshly καύχημα before God. Ἔργα (νόμου) speak of “die Haltung des Menschen . . . , der aus eigener Kraft vor Gott bestehen will.”⁸⁰

Our understanding draws upon the work of Roman Heiligenthal, *Werke als Zeichen: Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung der menschlichen Taten im Frühjudentum, neuen Testament und Frühchristentum* (WUNT 2/9; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983; originally Diss: Heidelberg, 1981) whose thesis reads:

Der Analyse liegt die These zugrunde, daß Werke im Neuen Testament vor allem Zeichencharakter besitzen: sie offenbaren das Innere des Menschen gegenüber anderen Menschen und vor Gott. In dieser Funktion werden sie im Neuen Testament positiver beurteilt als eine tief in protestantischer Tradition verwurzelte Ablehnung von “Werkgerechtigkeit” vermuten läßt. (“Vorwort”)

⁷⁶ R. Heiligenthal, *Werke*, 1-25, 195.

⁷⁷ On the genitive construction in v 7, cf. *BDF*, §163.

⁷⁸ On “the good” in Greek philosophy, Hellenism and Judaism, see W. Grundmann, *TDNT*, art. ἀγαθός, 1.10-15. The correspondence of “the good” to the ἔργα of v 6, and the contrast with the way of the wicked (v 8) indicate that for Paul “doing (the) good” here is simply an alternate way of describing those whose goal (ἡ προῶσιν) remains unswervingly obedience to God (cf. Rom 12:2 - the will of God = τὸ ἀγαθόν). This usage of ἀγαθός/τὸ ἀγαθόν for the will of God which the pious are expected to fulfill is not otherwise foreign to Paul; cf. Rom 13:3; 2 Cor 9:8; Gal 6:9; Col 1:10; 2 Thess 2:17; also 1 Tim 5:10; 2 Tim 2:21; 3:17.

⁷⁹ L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 126-128.

⁸⁰ *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*⁸, 284; cf. also 280-285. Heiligenthal shows clearly how this understanding of “works” (=meritorious achievements) has guided Protestant interpretations of Rom 2 (*Werke*, 167-170).

This revelatory or sign-character of works is shown to be fundamental to the Hellenistic understanding of ἔργον/ἔργα (1-25). Whether it is a matter of human or divine evaluation, “es steht in beiden Fällen der Erkenntniswert der Taten im Gegensatz zu deren Leistungscharakter im Vordergrund. Werke werden nicht in erster Linie als Leistungsausweis, sondern als ein Erkenntnis- und Beurteilungsmittel verstanden” (25). He finds the same understanding in second temple Judaism (72-84, 143-164, 234-263, 290-296, 314).

This understanding is then tested in the exegesis of various NT passages. The sociological function of ἔργα as “Erkenntnis- und Beurteilungsmittel” is demonstrated for Jas 2:14-26 (criteria for human evaluation of genuine piety) and Matt 7:15-23; 23:1-12 (evaluation of true/false teachers) (26-92). In a similar vein ἔργα function to commend the Christian message and messengers to the larger society in Matt 5:13-16 and 1 Pet 2:12 (114-126). The ἔργα νόμου of Galatians “meint konkret Speisegebote und Beschneidung” (134) and function as “die sichtbaren Zeichen der Zugehörigkeit zum jüdischen Volk” (128; cf. also 127-134; similar to Dunn’s “identity markers”).

In relation to God ἔργα function as external signs of legitimation of the divine messenger in John’s gospel (135-142). In the judgment according to deeds in Rom 2:6-11 “geht es nicht um eine Abgrenzung von ‘Leistungen’, sondern um die Betonung der Gerichtsrelevanz der guten und schlechten Taten als Erkenntnisprinzip des inneren Seins des Menschen” (171, n. 69; cf. also 165-197). The definition of Christians’ behavior as κάρπος τοῦ πνεύματος in Gal 5:19-26 shows once again that their actions are not being viewed as meritorious human “Leistungen,” but are the product of the new Spirit-worked inner reality of believers in Christ (201-207).

Lest the above be misunderstood as demanding a strict either/or, Heiligenthal is not intent on denying all possibility of ἔργα = “Leistungen,”⁸¹ but merely on demonstrating that this was not the normal or primary understanding of the concept for Jews and Greeks. This thesis can be strengthened by two additional observations. Both the OT and second temple Jewish texts testify to a unitary versus atomistic view of human deeds, as we have sought to demonstrate in the earlier chapters. Thus the multiplicity of one’s deeds constitutes one’s “way” or “work” (sg.), the visible manifestation of one’s wickedness or uprightness of “heart.” Deeds are not ‘merits’ which gain entry into a particular status with God, but they manifest the status which one has already gained via election and covenant. Secondly, since the work of E. P. Sanders and others, first-century Judaism can no longer properly be characterized as a legalistic religion of works-righteousness. Thus, the foil commonly used to interpret Paul’s contrast between grace and works (i.e., works = Jewish merit-theology) is no longer valid.

⁸¹ For instance, Eph 2:8-9 contrasts salvation by grace through faith with salvation ἐξ ὑμῶν, thus focusing on the origin or authorship of salvation. “Not from yourselves” is then expanded in terms of οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, so that human activity or achievement is contrasted with God’s gift [δῶρον], and self-praise [καυχῆσθαι] is excluded. However, even here human ἔργα are rejected not because they lay claim to *legalistically earning* salvation, but because they are the *wrong source*. This same contrast between grace and works in order to emphasize the divine origin of salvation can be found in Hellenistic Judaism of the period (Heiligenthal, *Werke*, 290-291).

Function: Summons to Repentance

The fact that the motif occurs in this instance as one element within a larger diatribal unit (2:1-11) means that we must distinguish at least three levels of its function: (a) its role within the unfolding diatribal argument; (b) its intended effect, as part of the diatribe, upon the diatribal ‘critic’; and (c) its intended rhetorical force upon the addressee. Verses 1-5 are addressed in the form of a diatribe to an imaginary dialogue partner, in this case a Jew who condemns sinful Gentiles but presumes upon God’s covenant mercy to Israel for his/her own deliverance in spite of committing the same sins as the Gentiles. The pointed charges and rhetorical questions in vv 1-4 culminate in the judgment-sentence of v 5. The motif in v 6 supplies the theological basis for this sentence. The central position of punishment for evil (vv 8-9) in the chiasm of vv 6-11, along with the appearance in v 9 of the thematic “to the Jew first,” support this contention that the purpose of the motif within this diatribal setting is to press home the propriety of God’s judgment-sentence upon disobedient and impenitent Jews. Thus on the level of the logic within the diatribe itself (level *a* above), the motif functions simply as an explanation or a theological warrant for the charge made in v 5.

As for the intended effect upon the imaginary ‘critic’ (level *b*), the diatribe reads like a *sentence* or *summons to repentance*,⁸² or more generally as a *warning*. The ‘critic’ should recognize his/her presumptuous reasoning and hypocritical behavior (cf. vv 1-3), and allow God’s kindness to produce repentance (v 4); otherwise wrathful judgment is threatened (v 5). As in numerous Jewish texts we studied, the motif is brought in as a conclusion to such a warning, providing theological warrant and stressing the certainty and inescapability of the coming judgment if the warning is not heeded.⁸³ This characterisation as a summons to repentance in the face of

⁸² This is a conditional form of the prophetic sentence upon Israel (cf. pp. 74-79, esp. 76, 79 above). See also R. Heiligenthal, *Werke*, 167, 184 (Rom 2:1-11 = “Bekehrungspredigt”).

⁸³ See esp. Ezek 18:1-30; 33:10-20 (pp. 74-79 above). See also the use of the motif as a concluding rhetorical device in Judg 1:7; Ps 94:23; Zech 1:6; 1 Macc 7:42; Jub 5:11; 2 Bar 54: 16, 21; 1QM VI,6.

Jewish presumption finds support in those studies which see in this section an inner-Jewish debate. According to G. P. Carras Paul takes the side of a Jew who finds fault with an opposing position within Judaism because the latter “violated central tenets of his own religion by claiming a criterion of judgement for himself different from all others.”⁸⁴ Specifically, the opponent claimed preferential treatment due to a supposed moral superiority (2:1-11), possession of the Torah (2:12-16), national privilege (2:17-24, = “Jewishness”), and circumcision (2:25-29).⁸⁵ In a fashion possibly reminiscent of Jewish synagogue sermons,⁸⁶ those who hold such a position are called to repentance (2:4), since their thought and behavior contradict belief in God’s impartial judgment according to deeds.

As for Paul’s Jewish-Christian addressees in Rome (level *c*) the diatribal form is meant to challenge them in an indirect way to correct possibly faulty attitudes. Paul is not accusing them of impenitent sinning or apostasy; rather he is concerned lest they think like the diatribe partner, believing that Jewish covenant privileges will make a decisive difference for the Jew in judgment. As we have argued, it is this issue of Jewish advantage over Gentiles that is at the center of the theological argument of chapters 1-11 and of the social conflict reflected in chapters 12-15. Thus, understood as a call to abandon wrong attitudes, the motif and the diatribe function to summon the addressees to repentance.

Dual Retribution

Used in a *warning* or *summons to repentance* Rom 2:6 continues the tradition which began in the OT of using the motif to threaten punishment upon the con-

⁸⁴ “Romans 2,” 206.

⁸⁵ We would fault Carras only for failing to appreciate adequately the radicalization of Paul’s side of the debate, in that Paul goes beyond the point that even most Jews of his persuasion were prepared to go. That is, Paul relativizes the Jews’ covenantal salvation privileges vis-à-vis the Gentiles. Jews and Gentiles have equal access to God’s grace and salvation without regard to Jewishness. Carras also fails to explain why such an inner-Jewish debate was necessary in a letter to Roman Christians.

⁸⁶ See E. P. Sanders, *PLJP*, Appendix: “Romans 2,” 123-135. Until more examples of such Hellenistic-Jewish sermons turn up, this must remain only a plausible hypothesis.

sistently rebellious or potentially apostate in Israel, or upon Jewish opponents in later contexts of sectarian Judaism.⁸⁷ This fits in quite well with the exigencies of Romans since Paul's diatribe in 2:1-11 can be viewed in the context of inner-Jewish conflict.⁸⁸ Why, then, does Paul deviate from this traditional use (for punishment only) and explicate the motif in terms of an eschatological-soteriological duality (i.e., salvation to the good, wrath to the wicked)? Although the use of the motif for a positive reward for the righteous was not uncommon in the OT, it had all but disappeared during the two centuries preceding the common era.⁸⁹ Recompense according to deeds nearly always meant punishment. Mention of a dual retribution can be found a handful of times in the OT use of the motif,⁹⁰ and such a comprehensive statement of its duality was found only in Sir 16:12-14:

Great as his mercy, so also is his chastisement;
he judges a person according to one's deeds.
The sinner will not escape with plunder,
and the patience of the godly will not be frustrated.
He makes room for every act of mercy;
everyone receives in accordance with one's deeds.

Interestingly, this passage shows several parallels with Romans 2.⁹¹ Its aim is ultimately to motivate the wise member of the covenant to choose obedience and fidelity to God's will. It is likewise a warning directed against the presumption that sinful Jews can "escape [ἐκφεύξεται]" God's judgment according to deeds, as well as a comfort to the "patience of the godly [ὕπομονήν εὐσεβοῦς]" whose obedience will be rewarded.⁹²

⁸⁷ See pp. 66-79, 95-97 (cf. 1 Enoch 95:5; 100:7), 133-136, 178 (cf. 1QS II,7-8).

⁸⁸ See p. 206.

⁸⁹ Only a few texts in the Pseudepigrapha and the Qumran literature testify to a belief in a positive retribution according to deeds (cf. pp. 120, 140, 173-174 [nn. 172, 174]). This is not to deny their belief in the reward of the righteous, only that such was not commonly expressed in the terminology of our motif.

⁹⁰ Job 34:11, Eccl 12:14, Ezek 33:20, and in the explication of divine judgment found in 1 Kgs 8:32 (= 2 Chr 6:23).

⁹¹ See our discussion on pp. 56-59 above.

⁹² Note the verbal parallels to Rom 2:3 ("Do you imagine . . . you will escape [ἐκφεύξῃ] the judgment of God?") and 2:7 ("by patiently doing good [καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ]").

While this singular text illustrates that Paul's expression of dual retribution was not un-Jewish, it nevertheless remains true that the emphasis on only one aspect of the recompense (reward or punishment) was by far the more common. The choice appears to have been largely dictated by the purpose and context of the saying. What was there in the rhetorical exigency of writing to the Romans that called forth this comprehensive expression of dual retribution, in particular the positive aspect of reward? As our examination of the structure and occasion of these early chapters in Romans suggested, Paul's purpose is to demonstrate the equality of Jew and Gentile, both in terms of divine wrath and justification, with 2:6-11 occupying a central role in the theological foundation of this argument. With few exceptions, Gentiles as Gentiles (non-proselytes, outside the covenant) were assumed by most Jews to be among the wicked. Paul's use of the motif puts them on an equal footing with Jews, since all is "according to works" without respect to Jewishness. Beginning with the OT prophets, various streams within Judaism likewise challenged the presumption that Jewishness alone (i.e., without the accompanying wholehearted devotion and obedience) was a sufficient protection against divine judgment; but this challenge did not generally include the further conclusion that Gentiles were thereby put on the same footing *in regard to salvation*. That was still a matter exclusively of God's covenant with Israel. Because Paul is taking that next step, he feels the necessity to stress as well the positive side of the recompense duality. In order to prepare the way for the equality of Jew and Gentile in justification (not just in condemnation), he uses the motif to urge that *both* (justification and condemnation) are impartially according to deeds. Granted, he follows up this point by stressing the punishment aspect in v 12, and that is certainly the primary issue in the argument with Judaism, but if the point had been only that 'Jews shall be *condemned* on the same basis as Gentiles,' vv 13-16 would seem to pose an unnecessary risk by their assertion that equally "the (Gentile) doers of the law will be justified." Similarly in v 29 the point is not simply to disqualify faithless Jews from bearing that name, but

to redefine “Jew” so as to include both Jews and Gentiles in Israel’s inheritance (“Such a person receives praise . . . from God”).

Summary

Summarizing briefly our conclusions thus far regarding Rom 2:6-11, the section forms an integral part of the apostle’s theological argument designed to secure and/or solidify the Roman church’s adherence to Paul’s law-free gospel for both Jew and Gentile (and always in the back of his mind, to defend his gospel in the church at large). Chapters 1-4 are an argument with Judaism, addressed to Jewish Christians to demonstrate that membership in the covenant people (Israel) via submission to Torah and circumcision provides no salvific advantage, for justification comes by faith in Christ alone to all without distinction. Chapter 2:6-11 constitutes Paul’s central theological challenge to the presumption that “Jewishness” in any way provides a more favorable treatment in the eschatological judgment. Divine impartiality and the associated principle of judgment according to works are radicalized⁹³ by Paul to mean that Jewish sin will be treated no differently than Gentile sin, and that Gentile obedience must carry the same reward as Jewish (= eternal life).

It is our position that this last positive conclusion (“glory, honor and peace for everyone who does good”) represents Paul’s mature Christian thought as equally as the negative, and cannot be explained as “hypothetical” (Lietzmann), a mere “foil” (Synofzik) or unreflected “survival” from Paul’s Jewish background (Braun). For Paul the eschatological judgment, whether resulting in destruction or reward will be “according to works” for all without distinction. Thus, not only in the form and function of the motif, but also in its soteriological implications, Paul is arguing in a manner consistent with his Jewish background as viewed through the motif

⁹³ The idea that Paul has “radicalized” Jewish views of judgment was central to Braun’s study (*Gerichtsgedanke*, esp. 59). He posited three areas in which Paul had radicalized Jewish views: (1) strict carrying out of impartiality, (2) demand of perfection, and (3) nature of the “reward” (= eternal life). It is our view that points (2) and (3) are no radicalization, being based on Braun’s misreading of both Paul’s and Judaism’s position at these points. It is point (1), the strict adherence to impartiality in judgment, thus stripping the Jews of salvific advantage, which constitutes Paul’s radical stance vis-à-vis Judaism.

usage studied in chapters 2-4.

Objections: (1) Is Perfection Required?

But does this not involve us at once in a blatant contradiction with Rom 3:20 (διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιοθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ) and Paul's alleged insistence elsewhere that "perfection" is required if one is to come to God by "doing"? Taking the second objection first, nothing in Romans 2 indicates that Paul is envisioning perfect (= flawless) obedience. As noted above (p. 203), "patiently doing good" is the language of broad appeal to both Jews and Greeks and shows affinities to the Two-Way tradition in Judaism. In none of these contexts would it typically be understood in a perfectionistic sense. As we discovered repeatedly in the previous chapters, such behavior of the righteous in Judaism does not imply flawless obedience or sinlessness on their part. Paul's language is a typically Jewish way of describing those who live with consistency and integrity according to God's ways. Neither do the various formulations which follow for "keeping the law" refer to anything more than godly obedience.⁹⁴ Here Paul reflects his Jewish background, properly understood, which did not require a legalistic perfection (otherwise repentance would not have been so important in Judaism!), but submission to God's commandments and the intention to obey them.⁹⁵

Gal 3:10 and 5:3. Typically Gal 3:10 and 5:3 are cited as proof that Paul understood *perfect keeping of the law* to be necessary if one would seek to be justified by works.⁹⁶ Yet, as even the proponents admit, this involves a syllogism whose crucial middle step is more assumed than stated by Paul.

⁹⁴ Verses 13 (οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου), 25 (νόμον πράσσης), 26 (τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου φυλάσση), and 27 (τὸν νόμον τελοῦσα). Cf. C. E. B. Cranfield, *Romans*, 1.155, 171 (n. 3), 173-174. K. Snodgrass ("Justification," 83-84) also notes that the same language can be used for the obedience expected of Christians toward Jesus' teaching (John 12:47) as well as apostolic injunctions (Acts 16:4). Luke is likewise concerned to present Paul as thus "keeping the law" (Acts 21:24).

⁹⁵ E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 75, 94-101, 137-147, 175-176, 419-428 (an exception being possibly IV Ezra, cf. 416-417); and *PLJP*, 28 ("No rabbi took the position that obedience must be perfect,"). Cf. also G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, 1.494-495.

⁹⁶ H. Hübner, "Gal 3:10-12 und die Herkunft des Paulus," *KuD* 19 (1973) 215-231; "Pauli Theologiae Proprium," *NTS* 26 (1980) 445-473; F. Mussner, *Der Galaterbrief*⁵ (HTKNT 9; Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1988) 223-226, 347-348; T. R. Schreiner, "Is Perfect Obedience to

- 1) All who do not keep the law [perfectly] are cursed (Deut 27:26, cited in Gal 3:10b).
- 2) No one can keep the law [perfectly] (implied premise).
- 3) Therefore, all who rely on the works of the law are under a curse (Gal 3:10a).⁹⁷

We have repeatedly emphasized that such a form of ‘perfect law-keeping’ was hardly typical of Judaism in Paul’s time.⁹⁸ ‘True enough,’ say the proponents, ‘but this is Paul’s insight into the true nature of Jewish religion, which the Jews themselves failed to see or accept.’ Even if this were correct, it is almost certain that his Jewish listeners would not have accepted that Deut 27:26 necessitates ‘perfect law-keeping,’ and we doubt that Paul intended such an idea.

Why then does he stress the necessity (under the law) of “abiding by all things . . . in the law” (3:10)? Paul’s concern in the section (3:6-14) is to demonstrate to the Galatians from Scripture that righteousness and the blessing of Abraham for the Gentiles have always been intended to come through faith, not Torah/works of Torah (cf. esp. vv 6-9, 14). Thus Paul’s argument in this section consists of a string of assertions all connected with the above thesis, and each with an accompanying Scripture-proof. Hermeneutically, this means that our attention should focus first on Paul’s assertions in order to ascertain the thrust of that point in the argument, not on the Scripture-proof, since the latter (in typical rabbinic fashion) is closer to what we might call ‘proof-texting.’ This is crucial for understanding 3:10.

Focusing on Paul’s assertions, the argument in vv 6-14 runs as follows:

vv 6-7: “Believing” is connected with being “descendants of Abraham.”

Scripture proof: Abraham’s righteousness is connected with believing.

v 8: The gospel of the inclusion of Gentiles in Abraham’s blessing by faith was declared beforehand in Scripture.

Scripture proof: The Gentiles are blessed in Abraham. (That this is by faith can now be assumed from vv 6-7 and will be stated again v 9.)

the Law Possible? A Re-Examination of Galatians 3:10,” *JETS* 27/2 (1984) 151-160.

⁹⁷ T. R. Schreiner, “Perfect Obedience,” 160.

⁹⁸ See also G. Howard, *Paul: Crisis in Galatia* (Cambridge: 1979) 49-54: the Jerusalem temple was a visible monument to all that Judaism believed not in perfect law-keeping, but in God’s forgiveness for sins. Further, E. P. Sanders, *PLJP*, 28-29, 56 (nn. 54, 57).

v 9: Restatement (ᾧστε) of the thesis of a connection between believing and Abrahamic blessing. [No scripture proof]

(Verses 10-13 bring subsidiary arguments that further demonstrate the thesis of vv 6-9:)

v 10: Works of law are connected with a curse.

Scripture proof: "Curse" is connected with the νόμος.

v 11: Justification is not by law.

Scripture proof: Righteousness comes by faith

v 12: The law is not ἐκ πίστεως.

Scripture proof: Law is connected with 'doing.'

v 13: The curse of the law (v 10) was removed by Christ.

Scripture proof: Crucifixion = being accursed.

v 14: Abraham's blessing (and reception of the Spirit, cf. 3:1-5) comes "in Christ Jesus" to the Gentiles through faith.

Following this, 3:15-18 brings another argument for this same thesis—the Torah covenant (Sinai) cannot supersede the promise (i.e., Christ) given beforehand to Abraham.

Thus, Paul's point in v 10 is not to explain *why* the Law and the curse must be connected, but simply to assert their connection in parallel with the connection between ἐκ πίστεως and "blessing" (=righteousness/justification, vv 6-7, 9), and to 'prove' this via the citation of an authoritative Scripture-text. His choice of Deut 27:26 is an obvious one, since this is the only text in the LXX connecting νόμος with a curse. Besides the syllogistic explanation noted above, two additional suggestions have been made to explain *why* a curse would be connected with the law. E. P. Sanders considers all this to be strictly terminological: as 'blessing' was connected with 'faith,' so now 'curse' with 'law.'⁹⁹ J. Scott, on the other hand, sees Jewish traditions behind Paul's reasoning, traditions which asserted that disobedient Israel was under the divine curse of Deut 27:26 until a future time when God would redeem her from this curse. Thus, becoming part of national Israel (i.e., accepting circumcision and the works of the law) means coming under the divine curse now in effect upon her.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁹ *PLJP*, 20-23. Critical: H. Räisänen, *Paul*², p. 95, n. 13.

¹⁰⁰ "‘FOR AS MANY AS ARE OF WORKS OF THE LAW ARE UNDER A CURSE’ (Galatians 3.10)," *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* (ed. C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders; JSNTSup 83; Sheffield: JSOT, 1993) 194-221. See also on 'exilic theology' above, pp. 165-166.

The similar sounding statement in chapter 5 (v 3) makes no reference to a ‘curse,’ emphasizing instead the “obligation [ὀφειλέτης ἐστὶν] to do the whole law [ὅλον τὸν νόμον ποιῆσαι]” falling upon anyone who accepts circumcision (i.e., comes under the yoke of the Jewish law). In line with Jewish tradition about proselytes, Paul here is reminding the Galatians of something the Judaizers failed to tell them; namely, that entry into Judaism entails not merely a few ceremonial/ritual observances, but commitment to observe all the law.¹⁰¹ Again, the point of the language about “the whole law” is not ‘flawless obedience,’ but wholehearted and thoroughgoing (versus selective) obedience.

Objections: (2) ἔργα νόμου

The other objection to our interpretation revolves around the meaning of *works of (the) law* [ἔργα νόμου]. What is the relationship between Paul’s fundamental statements on justification in chapter three (not by works of law [ἐξ ἔργων νόμου] v 20, apart from works of law [χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου] v 28), and those in chapter two that eschatological glory/wrath will be given according to works [κατὰ τὰ ἔργα, v 6] and justification will be to the doers of the law [οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου, v 13]?

This phrase, which Paul apparently felt able to employ without further definition, has been the subject of considerable debate of late.¹⁰² Interestingly, the two dominant options are tending toward agreement on at least two points: (1) ἔργα νόμου refers to all that the Torah requires in terms of obedience,¹⁰³ and (2) it is a

¹⁰¹ “A proselyte who accepts all commandments of the Tora except for one is not accepted” (cited in P. J. Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law* [Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum, 1990] 88-89); cf. also E. P. Sanders, *PLJP*, 27-29 (thus reversing his position in *PPJ*). Perhaps the Judaizers were like many of the Jewish missionaries of the day, who advised introducing Gentile proselytes only gradually to ‘the whole law’; cf. E. P. Sanders, *PLJP*, 29, and p. 56, n. 58.

¹⁰² Helpful overviews are found in the articles by D. Moo (“Paul and the Law in the Last Ten Years,” *SJT* 40/2 [1987] 292-298), T. R. Schreiner (“‘Works of Law’ in Paul,” *NovT* 33/3 [1991] 218-225), and J. M. Scott (“For as many,” 188-194).

¹⁰³ See esp. Gal 3:10-12. On this agreement, see J. D. G. Dunn, “Yet Once More - ‘The Works of the Law’: A Response,” *JSNT* 46 (1992) 100-102.

Jewish code-phrase (not a Pauline creation) defining the conditions to be met for entry into, or maintenance of, the status of justification.¹⁰⁴ They radically disagree, however, over the nature of these conditions. The traditional interpretation, sometimes called the ‘Quantitative’ or ‘Legalistic’ view, places the emphasis on “works” understood as meritorious obedience.¹⁰⁵ Thus the phrase serves in Paul as a generic rebuttal of all human attempts to attain righteousness by doing (whether of the written Torah, or the “law inscribed on the heart” [Rom 2:15]). For this reason, no significant difference is posited between this phrase and Paul’s use of “works” alone (Romans 2). They all refer to “justification before God on the ground of one’s obedience to the law.”¹⁰⁶ Paul rejects “works of the law” because they ignore human inability under sin. Since everyone sins (Rom 1:18-3:20), and since it is perfect keeping of all the Law’s demands which is required (Gal 3:10; 5:3), no one can be justified by this means. Such a way is also excluded because it would lead to *boasting* in meritorious human achievement (Rom 3:27; 4:1-5). However, alongside the problem of attributing to Paul the demand for “perfect law-keeping” (see above), this interpretation sets him historically adrift. Who were these Jewish(-Christian) opponents who taught such a form of legalism?¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁴ Moo, for instance, accepts the verbal parallels in the Qumran literature as the background of Paul’s usage (“‘Law,’ ‘Works of the Law,’ and Legalism in Paul,” *WTJ* 45 [1983] 92, 94).

¹⁰⁵ See H. Hübner, “Was heißt ‘Werke des Gesetzes?’” in *Glaube und Eschatologie: FS für Werner Georg Kümmel* (ed. E. Gräßer, O. Merk; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1973) 123-134; D. J. Moo, “‘Law,’ ‘Works of the Law,’ and Legalism in Paul,” 73-100; C. E. B. Cranfield, “‘The works of the Law’ in the Epistle to the Romans,” *JSNT* 43 (1991) 89-101; T. R. Schreiner, “‘Works of Law’ in Paul,” *NovT* 33/3 (1991) 217-244. Additional proponents are listed in Schreiner, “‘Works of Law,’” 218, n. 6 and 220, nn. 10-11.

¹⁰⁶ C. E. B. Cranfield, “‘The Works of the Law,’” 95, also 93-95, 98.

¹⁰⁷ For attempts to answer this challenge to the traditional interpretation, see D. Moo, “Paul and the Law,” 298 (Judaism was more diverse than Sanders allows), and T. Schreiner, “‘Works of Law’ in Paul,” 241-244 (although Judaism thought it had properly balanced grace and works, Paul’s new perspective led him to see it as legalism). Schreiner, in particular, seems to have missed the force of Sanders’ work. He can still describe Jewish self-understanding (i.e., not just Paul’s new perspective) in terms of “the delusion of those who think they can earn merit before God by their obedience to the law, even though they fail to obey it” (244).

The ‘new perspective’ on Paul generally holds to what may be termed a **nationalistic interpretation**.¹⁰⁸ Works of the law refer indeed to the obedience demanded by the Torah; not, however, in terms of *earning righteousness*, but (in line with ‘covenantal nomism’) as the God-given means of determining (or maintaining) membership in God’s people (= the righteous, the justified). What Paul rejects as law-works is not some form of merit-theology but Judaism’s own understanding of the identity of God’s people and the conditions for belonging. Though the meaning of ἔργα νόμου is broader than a few selected ‘identity markers,’ the focus of Paul’s usage is on circumcision and food laws because it was precisely this subset of religious activity which both Jews and non-Jews recognized as the distinguishing identifiers of Jewishness and which Paul understood to be relativized through faith in Christ.¹⁰⁹

Since a thorough examination of all the texts and arguments pertaining to this disputed phrase is impossible within the limits of this paper, we will simply outline here four arguments which tip the scales in favor of this nationalistic or *social* interpretation. (1) The few occurrences of ἔργα νόμου¹¹⁰ all evince the same limited literary context, viz., To what extent can Torah-observance (in particular, circumcision and regulations for table fellowship) still be considered a necessary condition for God’s vindication of his people? Must Gentiles live like Jews in order to be

¹⁰⁸ See esp. J. D. G. Dunn, “New Perspective,” 95-122; *Romans* 1-8, 1.153-155; “Yet Once More,” 99-117; also R. Heiligenthal, “Soziologische Implikationen der paulinischen Rechtfertigungslehre im Galaterbrief am Beispiel der ‘Werke des Gesetzes.’ Beobachtungen zur Identitätsfindung einer frühchristlichen Gemeinde,” *Kairos* 26 (1984) 38-53; idem., *Werke*, 127-134; R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, “Sacred Violence and ‘Works of Law’: ‘Is Christ then an Agent of Sin?’ (Galatians 2:17),” *CBQ* 52 (1990) 55-75. These all build on the earlier work of E. Lohmeyer (“Gesetzeswerke,” *Probleme paulinischer Theologie* [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, n.d.] 31-74) and J. B. Tyson (“‘Works of Law’ in Galatians,” *JBL* 92 [1973] 423-431) who argued for the translation ‘nomistic service’ (*Dienst des Gesetzes*), referring to a sphere of existence with stress on the ‘Law’ rather than on the ‘works.’

¹⁰⁹ See esp. J. D. G. Dunn, “Yet Once More,” 100-103; “Works of the Law,” 524-532.

¹¹⁰ Only eight times in the NT, all in Paul, and concentrated in three chapters of his letters (Rom 3:20, 28; Gal 2:16 [3x]; 3:2, 5, 10). The use of the *singular* in Rom 2:15 [τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου], combined with the fact that it is used in a clearly *positive* sense (the Gentiles “do instinctively [φύσει] what the law requires [τὰ τοῦ νόμου]” and thereby demonstrate that it is “written on their hearts,” 2:14-15), warns against trying to equate this phrase with the ἔργα νόμου of 3:20.

assured of God's grace? This is, perhaps, most clear in Gal 2:16, where the preceding verses (11-15) formulate the issue as "compel[ling] the Gentiles to live like Jews" [τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις ἰουδαΐζειν, v 14b]. This argument continues in 3:1-5 where Paul cites their own experience of God's favor visibly evidenced in the reception of the Spirit and miracles (3:1-5) in order to prove to the Galatians that their own status in the grace of God came when they believed [ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως], and was not based on identifying with Judaism (justification cannot be διὰ νόμου, 2:21). Similarly in Gal 3:6-18 the larger context focuses on the role of Torah vis-à-vis status as heirs of Abraham ("if the inheritance comes from the law," v 18). The options are "faith in Christ" or "law-works," and again the argument revolves around whether Gentiles must adopt Judaism (at least circumcision and food laws) in order to be among the righteous, or whether faith in Christ is sufficient. Although the historical exigency behind Romans 1-3 is different from that behind Galatians, the value of Jewishness is still the focal point (2:17; 3:1). Jewish confidence in the law (2:12-24) and circumcision (2:25-29) are insufficient guarantors of God's favor. Finally, that Jew-Gentile distinctions are at the heart of Paul's use of ἐξ/χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου is made certain by Rom 3:28-29. Having stated his thesis once again (v 28), he poses a rhetorical question in v 29 based on the supposition that justification were, in fact, based on works of the law. If this were the case, then God would be "the God of the Jews only." Justification by works of the law would mean, and does mean for Paul, a restriction of God's saving activity to Jews only. Such a national restriction is the root of the problem.

(2) The second argument turns to the social context of Paul's debate with Jews and Jewish Christians over works of the law.¹¹¹ There are sufficient indications in the texts that behind the literary-contextual issues noted above lies the broader issue of the social function of the law in Judaism. Paul's use of the disparaging term "Gentile sinners" (Gal 2:15) reflects the typical Jewish insistence on

¹¹¹ See esp. J. D. G. Dunn, "Works of the Law and the Curse of the Law (Galatians 3.10-14)," *NTS* 31 (1985) 524-532; and R. Heilenthal, "Soziologische Implikationen," 38-53.

observing the law, an attitude “which regarded Gentiles ipso facto as ‘sinners’, that is, ignorant of and outside the law, and therefore outside the realm of righteousness.”¹¹² The Maccabean crisis had impressed on the Jews loyalty to the Torah (specifically circumcision and the food laws) as a life and death issue (see 1 Macc. 1:60-63). Maintaining Israel’s distinctive identity over against apostates and “Gentile sinners” became crucial to the social fabric of Judaism; hence the reaction in Antioch on the part of “certain people from James” to the Jewish-Christians’ ignoring of the food laws (Gal 2:11-13).¹¹³ Participation in God’s covenant, and thus in God’s righteousness, was inextricably tied to the loyal observance of these works of the law (especially those works which Jews were tempted to abandon), not as meritorious human achievements, but as the obligatory conditions laid upon those whom God had graciously favored with salvation. Thus Paul and his opponents have a common understanding of “works of the law.” They are Israel’s covenant obligations—in short, *Jewish covenantal nomism*. When Paul rejects works of the law, it is not a legalistic caricature of Judaism he is castigating, but the very obligations which Jews and some Jewish-Christians considered essential to covenant righteousness.

(3) Thirdly, Paul’s stress lies not on the character of ἔργα νόμου as “works,” but on their **relation to the law**. In Rom 3:20 it is the relationship of justification to Torah that is center stage, not its relationship to human effort. Thus Paul follows 3:20a not with a statement about human inability to perform the requisite “works,” but with a statement about the true function of the Law, “for through the law comes the knowledge of sin.” Furthermore, Paul repeats the theme of 3:20a in v 21 and this time uses the simple χωρὶς νόμου in place of “works of the law,” showing once again that the issue is the relationship of justification to the Law, not so much its

¹¹² J. D. G. Dunn, “Yet Once More,” 102.

¹¹³ Circumcision was accorded the same critical significance as a boundary marker, a fact made clear by Paul’s description of the Jews as “the circumcision” and Gentiles as “the uncircumcision” (Rom 2:26; 3:30; 4:9; Gal 2:7-9). See Dunn, “Yet Once More,” 102-103.

relation to human achievement. Likewise for the occurrence of the phrase in Rom 3:28, after discussing the exclusion of Jewish ‘boasting’ and works of the law, v 30 shows that the central issue in all this is the place of the Torah in determining who is “righteous before God,” (“Do we then overthrow the law by this faith?”). The same focus on the Torah-related aspect of these works is found in the occurrences in Galatians.¹¹⁴ Against this emphasis on “LAW-works,” proponents of the traditional interpretation usually point to the instances where Paul appears to use “works” alone as a shorthand for “works of the law.”¹¹⁵ The strongest arguments in this regard stem from Rom 4:1-5, where it seems that Abraham might boast in works which earn a reward. We refer the reader to our discussion of this section below for our view, but note in passing that in 4:9-16 Paul seems to abandon any supposed interest in “works” per se, and returns to the place of circumcision and Torah in Abraham’s righteousness.¹¹⁶

(4) Finally, attention should be paid to the **linguistic parallels** in the Qumran literature since these testify to a very similar understanding of the phrase in Judaism as we have posited for Paul.¹¹⁷ In these texts “works of the law” refers to a sectarian understanding of what was required to maintain proper status within the true people of God. The Manual of Discipline, for instance, gives detailed instructions

¹¹⁴ Gal 2:21b; 3:11, 18. Three times Paul substitutes “by [διὰ/ἐν/ἐκ] (the) law” for the fuller “by works of the law.” See J. B. Tyson, “Works,” 429-430.

¹¹⁵ Rom 4:1-6; 9:11-12, 32; 11:6. See C. E. B. Cranfield, “‘The Works of the Law’,” 98; D. Moo, “Law, Works of law,” 95-96; T. R. Schreiner, “‘Works of law’,” 232-238. In addition, reference is usually made to the manifold occurrence of “doing”-language in Romans 2 (vv 6-10, 13-14, 25-27), assuming such to be equivalent to “works of the law.” For our interpretation, see below.

¹¹⁶ See also J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus, Paul and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians* (London/Louisville: SPCK/Westminster, 1990) 237-241.

¹¹⁷ 1QS V,21, 23; VI,18; 4QMMT; also 2 Bar 57:2. Dunn’s inclusion of 4QFlor 1:7 as another occurrence of the phrase should probably be rejected, since the badly damaged text most likely reads מעשי תורה (“works of thanksgiving”) rather than תורה (“of Torah”). See H.-W. Kuhn, “Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Galaterbriefes,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. G. J. Brooke; Leiden/New York/Köln: E. J. Brill, 1994) 173-175; and G. J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOTSup 29; Sheffield: JSOT, 1985) 108.

for the examination of a novice before full entry into the covenant community (V,1-24). Specifically, it is one's readiness to obey the particular interpretations of the commandments given by the community that is under examination, thus proving one's preparedness to separate from the abominable ways of outsiders (i.e., Jews outside the sect, V,10) and their 'works of vanity [מעשי הבל]' (V,18-19). Therefore, it is one's "understanding and deeds in Torah [מעשיו בתורה]" (V,21) which must be confirmed, i.e., to what degree one understands and lives according to the sect's distinctive interpretation and requirements.¹¹⁸

Given this understanding of "works of the law," there is then no contradiction with Paul's more positive statements about "works" in chapter 2. These latter refer not to disputed conditions for entry into or identification with the people of God ("works of the law"), but to that godly obedience which Paul everywhere expects as the response to grace, and elsewhere terms "the obedience of faith."¹¹⁹ The statement that only the doers of the law will be justified (2:13) is, after all, simply the flip side of Paul's repeated insistence that those who do unrighteousness will not inherit the kingdom of God.¹²⁰ C. H. Cosgrove suggests one additional linguistic clue that Paul intends the statements in Romans 2 to be understood differently than the "works of the law" in chapter 3. Both Hellenistic and Pauline Greek usage are fairly consistent in employing certain prepositions to express the evidential basis of judgment and others to express instrumentality.¹²¹ Thus, it must

¹¹⁸ See also CD VI,18. In V,23 simply "deeds" [מעשי] is used for the fuller phrase. In 4QMMT the phrase clearly has reference to the distinguishing halakhic regulations of the sect. See L. H. Schiffman, "MIQSAT MA'ASEH HA-TORAH and the Temple Scroll," *RQ* 14 (1990) 435-457; and J. D. G. Dunn, "Echoes of Intra-Jewish Polemic in Paul's Letter to the Galatians," *JBL* 112/3 (1993) 459-477.

¹¹⁹ See above on "patiently doing good," p. 203. See also, A. B. Du Toit, "Faith and Obedience in Paul," *Neot* 25/1 (1991) 65-74; D. B. Garlington, "The obedience of faith in the letter to the Romans. Part I: The meaning of ὑπακοή πίστει (Rom 1:5; 16:26)," *WThJ* 52 (1990) 201-224. Otherwise J. Ziesler: "Yet 2:13 seems to say clearly enough that it is precisely by Jewish Law-works that people will be justified" (*Romans*, 83, n. d).

¹²⁰ E.g., 1 Cor 6:9-10; Gal 5:19-21; Rom 1:29-32. See also n. 94 above.

¹²¹ "Justification in Paul: A Linguistic and Theological Reflection," *JBL* 106 (1987) 653-670, esp. 656-661. Evidential basis: ἐπί + dat., κατά + accus., διὰ + accus.; Instrumentality: ἀπό + gen., ἐν + dat., διὰ + gen., simple dat., ἐκ + gen..

be seen as significant when Paul so consistently uses prepositions of instrumentality in disjoining “works of the law” from (and joining faith to) justification, while avoiding these same constructions in favor of those which express the evidential basis or norm of judgment in Romans 2.

The “works of the law” are not an *instrument* by which the sinner can *become righteous*. . . . Nevertheless, the believer, having been enlivened by the Spirit and liberated from sin’s power, does “the good” and will be justified in the final judgment *on that basis* (*kata ta erga autou*). Here the soteriological *instrumentality* of the law or works is no longer in view. Rather, the relation of work(s) to justification (or recompense, or praise) is that of *evidential basis*.¹²²

Thus, there is no reason to avoid the clear implication of our text—the eschatological judgment of Jews and Gentiles, both for salvation and for damnation, will be on the basis of works. We have suggested that this need not be taken as a justification ἐκ τῶν ἔργων and thus contradictory to the justification ἐκ πίστεως and χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου. Paul is concerned here with the *congruence* (κατά) of deeds and judgment in the context of an argument with Jewish presumption of advantage via election. One’s deeds or “works of the law” will not be the cause or instrument for the attaining of righteousness, but this verdict will be *congruent* with one’s deeds, i.e., will be pronounced on the basis of a norm or standard of behavior.¹²³

Hypothetical Argument?

If no contradiction between 2:6 and 3:19-20, 28 is present, then the chief reason for terming Paul’s statements here *hypothetical* is likewise removed. However, because this interpretation is particularly influential and comes in several varieties, it is worthwhile to examine it in greater detail. Hans Lietzmann is generally cited as the major early proponent of this view:

V. 5-12 stellt Paulus hypothetisch das Princip des Endgerichtes dar, wie es kommen würde wenn 1) das Evangelium nicht da wäre und 2) es möglich wäre, das Gesetz zu erfüllen. Der leitende Gedanke ist: ‘Gesetzt auch, es würde sich alles so erfüllen wie ihr Juden auf Grund des Alten Testamentes zu erwarten berechtigt seid, so habt ihr doch keinen Anlass, euch über die Heiden zu erheben. Denn dass es in diesem Falle aufs Tun allein ankommen würde, so müßte sich auch über euch, und zwar in erster Linie, der Zorn Gottes ergiessen, denn auch ihr

¹²² Ibid., 660.

¹²³ See also G. N. Davies, *Faith and Obedience*, 117; and D. B. Garlington, “The Obedience of Faith: Part II, The Obedience of Faith and Judgment by Works,” 47-72.

hält das Gesetz nicht.¹²⁴

Lietzmann's second argument (legal righteousness would be impossible to obtain since it demands perfection) has been dealt with above. Besides, to argue that Paul pressed the motif in such a perfectionistic or legalistic direction (i.e., if you were to be judged according to your deeds you would all fail because you have not kept the law perfectly) not only places his use in radical discontinuity with that in Second Temple Judaism as seen in chapters 2-4, but must also explain why his use of the motif elsewhere assumes the typical wholistic understanding, not a hypothetical one. In 2 Cor 5:9-10, for instance, he assumes that the norm of God's final judgment—specifically whether one has “done” good or evil while in the body—will be met by Christians. In Romans 2 as well, Paul's use of judgment according to deeds can be understood perfectly well in continuity with Jewish tradition.¹²⁵

The first argument (Rom 2:5-12 is written from a viewpoint without the gospel) can appeal to the fact that, apart from v 16 (“according to my gospel, God, through Jesus Christ, will judge the secret thoughts of all”), there is nothing specifically Christian about any of 2:1-16. But what about v 16? Lietzmann admits that it cannot be fitted properly into the flow of a hypothetical argument and suggests either 1) this is a later interpolation, 2) in a brief mental lapse, Paul steps out of the hypothetical rhetoric to exclaim “at the last judgment you will know that I speak the truth!” or 3) v 16 refers back to vv 12-13 (vv 14-15 forming a parenthesis).¹²⁶ Lietzmann himself rejects option #3, since it still has Paul admitting to justification for the doer of the law. But, likewise, option #1 must be judged a counsel of

¹²⁴ *Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus I: Die vier Hauptbriefe* (HzNT 3; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1910) 13.

¹²⁵ See P. Stuhlmacher, “Exkurs V: Das Endgericht nach den Werken,” *Der Brief an die Römer* (NTD 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989) 44-46.

¹²⁶ *Die Briefe*, 15.

despair, since there is no MS evidence in this direction;¹²⁷ and against #2 the syntax of v 16 marks it as a continuation of the previous argument, not a disconnected exclamation.¹²⁸

Thus, with v 16 the gospel is indeed present in Paul's thought, weakening the argument that the eschatological statements here are in some way hypothetical. Likewise, a review of the other references to eschatological judgment as well as of the terminology for the eschatological punishment/reward in 2:1-16 gives no support to the idea that we have here a viewpoint somehow removed from Paul's own gospel-informed expectation.¹²⁹ Apart from the concern over contradiction, nothing would incline us normally to view these statements as hypothetical or any way unpauline.¹³⁰

A variation of the hypothetical interpretation is E. Synofzik's attempt to view the positive recompense statements as a "foil" for the negative.

Obwohl Paulus in V.7-10 das Vergeltungsschema sowohl positiv wie negativ anwendet, liegt sein eigentliches Interesse allein an der negativen Vergeltung. Die Aussagen über den positiven Ausgang des Gerichtes in 2,7.10.14.26f sind nur Folie für seine Anklage gegen den Juden. . . . Das dualistische Schema von Gut und Böse, Lohn und Strafe dient nur zur Illustration des "nach dem Maßstab der Wahrheit" (2,2) sich vollziehenden richterlichen Handelns Gottes.¹³¹

Synofzik is certainly correct in noting that the negative side of the judgment is

¹²⁷ Cf. E. Käsemann, *An die Römer* (HzNT 8a; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1973) 61-62.

¹²⁸ C. E. B. Cranfield, *Romans*, 1.161-162.

¹²⁹ On "the day (of wrath)" and "eternal life" see p. 196 above. The use of *δικαιωθήσονται* (v 13) is a particularly risky choice of words for Paul if he is intending it in some sense *ante Christum*.

¹³⁰ This is not, of course, to deny the possibility of "hypothetical arguments" in the Pauline correspondence or ancient writers in general (cf. F. Thielman, *Plight*, 86, n. 36). However, even in Thielman's examples from both Hellenistic and rabbinic sources, the hypothetical nature of the argument is clearly signalled. "To argue that the text is hypothetical is rather difficult when there is nothing (such as an *ἀνθρώπινον λέγω*) in this extended section to suggest this option. Rather, the passage is assertive in character and has every indication of being meant seriously" (K. Snodgrass, "Justification," 74).

¹³¹ *Vergeltungsaussagen*, 159. Synofzik distances himself from the "hypothetical" interpretation inasmuch as the negative retribution is Paul's own Christian standpoint (171).

Paul's rhetorical focus in this passage.¹³² However, apart from this one observation he can give no justification for declaring the positive side "nur Folie," that is, not to be taken as expressing Paul's own viewpoint. This fits in with Synofzik's attempt generally to play down the theological weight of the judgment and recompense statements as merely "Argumentationsmittel." However, Paul will repeat the idea of a positive outcome in judgment in a non-hypothetical fashion:

The doers of the law . . . will be justified (2:13b);
Their conflicting thoughts will . . . perhaps excuse them (2:15b).

Furthermore, Paul is, in fact, convinced that believers by the Spirit will fulfill the Law's requirement (8:4, ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν).¹³³ Finally, as we have argued above, this view does not do justice to the rhetorical function of the positive side of the dual recompense statement in v 6.

Hence, in favor of our interpretation and against the "hypothetical" interpretation may be brought at least five arguments: 1) the text itself gives no indication that it contains a hypothetical case,¹³⁴ 2) the eschatological referents are otherwise perfectly at home within a Christian perspective,¹³⁵ 3) the thought of judgment according to works (both good and evil) is not at all unpauline,¹³⁶ 4) the rhetorical argument makes good sense without resort to this theory. Fifthly, as Snodgrass notes, it is difficult to understand how Paul could expect his argument to have any force with those of Jewish background when he ultimately rejects or subverts such a fundamental Jewish tenet as judgment according to works.¹³⁷

¹³² See above p. 198; confirmed clearly by v 3, which shows Paul's rhetoric is directed against Jewish presumption of "escaping from judgment (i.e., condemnation)."

¹³³ See also 13:8, 10. On 8:4, see below.

¹³⁴ See n. 130.

¹³⁵ See p. 222, and n. 129.

¹³⁶ Cf. Rom 14:10-12; 1 Cor 3:8, 13-15; 2 Cor 5:10*; (9:6); (11:15); Gal 6:7-8*; Col 3:24-25*; Eph 6:8*; 1 Tim 5:24-25*; 2 Tim 4:14. These passages expect a judgment according to works for believers in Christ; an asterisk marks a usage that includes *positive* retribution.

¹³⁷ "Justification," 79. Further on rejection of the "hypothetical" interpretation, see S. Travis, *Judgment*, 58-59; T. Schreiner, *The Law and Its Fulfillment*, 183-185.

Jewish Presumption as Paul's Foil

Finally, an assumption of the above exegesis is the existence of a “Jewish presumption” vis-à-vis eschatological judgment, against which Paul is arguing.¹³⁸ The apostle attributes to his diatribal critic a specifically Jewish reliance on divine mercy (2:4, τοῦ πλούτου τῆς χρηστότητος . . . καταφρονεῖς) which granted forbearance to Jewish sins, while maintaining a strictness of judgment upon the same sins among Gentiles (1:18-2:5). Such reliance was not predicated on any supposed works-righteousness or self-righteous boasting,¹³⁹ but on the covenant privileges of the elect, on grace. Thus Paul argues against Torah (2:12-24) and circumcision (2:25-29) as providing any protection against judgment upon Jewish sin, all of which is ultimately rooted in the question of Israel's advantage as God's elect (Romans 9-11).

That Israel's knowledge of election and covenant privilege *could* lead to such a presumption of “divine partiality” to the Jew in judgment in spite of sinful ways, should be clear enough from the warnings against the same in Jewish writings.¹⁴⁰ However, such a hypocritical abuse of covenant privileges was by no means typical of second temple Judaism,¹⁴¹ and Part One has shown that Jewish writers them-

¹³⁸ “Failure to recognize the specific diatribal objective of deflating Jewish presumption (that Israel's being the people of the law indicates God's predisposition in Israel's favor) is the root of the confusion among commentators over the purpose and theology of chap.2” (J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 77). Similarly, but from a reader-response approach to the texts, J. P. Heil, “Reader-Response and Interculturation in Paul's Letter to the Romans,” *Église et Théologie* 21 (1990) 283-301, esp. 289 (“wants to prevent his audience from thinking that Jews can presumptuously rely upon a special privilege before God”).

¹³⁹ On our view, the “boasting” in Rom 2:17, 23; 3:27; and 4:2 refers not to legalism, but to confidence in Israel's covenant privileges (see esp. 2:17 [boasting ἐν θεῷ] and 23 [boasting ἐν νόμῳ]) versus confidence in Christ (cf. 5:11; 15:17).

¹⁴⁰ See, for instance, Sir 5:4-7; also E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 87; G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, 1.508-509. Further H. D. Betz, “Christianity as Religion: Paul's Attempt at Definition in Romans,” *JR* 71/3 (1991) 315-44: “the three marks by which Israel distinguished itself from the Gentiles became instruments of abuse . . . Torah . . . ”Jew” . . . Circumcision” (326); but Betz goes too far when he claims that contemporary Judaism “is, in Paul's view, hardly different from corrupt paganism” (326); see Rom 10:2 (“they are zealous for God”) and 11:28.

¹⁴¹ The standard proof that such presumption was, indeed, typical is normally found in Wis 15:2—“For even if we sin we are yours.” However, this is an affirmation of divine mercy to Israel (v 1) in spite of occasional sins. That no such presumption is in mind is clear from vv 2b-6 (“but we will not sin”; see E. G. Clarke, *The Wisdom of Solomon* [CBC; Cambridge: Cambridge, 1973] 98-99). For opposing views on the question of Jewish overconfidence in election, see E. P.

selves used the motif of judgment according to deeds against such presumption. Unless one is prepared to assert that Paul has misunderstood or misrepresented Judaism, or was convinced that his former faith leads by some inherent logical necessity to such presumption, we will need to seek the actual source of this presumptuous thinking elsewhere.

Paul is engaged here in a diatribe, and the presumptuous attitude is attributed to the critic. The apostle's aim throughout is to lead Jewish-Christians to acknowledge that membership in the eschatological people of God no longer has anything to do with Jewishness (Torah, circumcision, law-works), but is by faith in Christ. He does this by putting the opposite assumption—being Jewish *does* constitute a soteriological advantage—in the mouth of the diatribal critic, and then proceeding to demolish this assumption; hopefully in a way his reading audience will accept. This strikes at the roots of Jewish covenantal nomism¹⁴² and goes to the heart of the debate between Paul's gospel and some forms of Jewish-Christianity. Is “Jewishness” ultimately an advantage?¹⁴³ Thus, the form which this presumption takes is, to some extent, a fiction, a foil to advance Paul's argumentative strategy; though the potential for such a presumption was certainly recognized within Judaism itself.

In spite of the exaggerated portrayal, this issue of the advantage of being Jewish would be of great relevance in the Roman congregation, not in the form of a “judaizing threat” as in Galatians, but inasmuch as Jewishness was threatening to

Sanders, *PPJ*, 147-182; J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 91; and H. Räisänen, *Paul²*, 168, n. 39.

¹⁴² On the whole question of Christian rejection of Israel's election and subsequent Jewish reaction, see B. W. Hefgott, *The Doctrine of Election in Tannaitic Literature* (New York: King's Crown, 1954). Hefgott sees many instances in Tannaitic literature of rabbinic reaction to a Christian rejection of Jewish election privileges.

¹⁴³ Paul, of course, affirms Judaism's clear advantages of knowledge and priority (3:1-2). What he denies is an intrinsic salvific advantage. Texts such as 1 Cor 10:1-13 (“Nevertheless [i.e., in spite of the covenant privileges listed in vv 1-4], God was not pleased with most of them”) and Matt 3:9 (“Do not presume to say to yourselves, ‘We have Abraham as our ancestor’” [= Luke 3:8]) testify to the consistent Christian challenge to this fundamental Jewish tenet.

undo the unity of the mixed congregation over the question of table fellowship (chapters 14-15). Although the paraenesis of these latter chapters appears to be addressed primarily to the Gentile majority, Paul's attempt at conflict-resolution must encompass the whole congregation. His resolution, however, is so non-Jewish¹⁴⁴ that he cannot hope to gain the full adherence of the Jewish minority without first neutralizing this Jewish-Christian sense of advantage.

Beyond the specifically Roman concern looms, of course, Jerusalem and the debate over the proper mode of integrating Jew and Gentile in the one people of God. That there were Jewish-Christians who saw Jewishness as a decisive advantage before God (and a necessity for Gentile proselytes as well) seems clear enough from the NT and post-apostolic developments. More to the point for Romans is the existence of a Jewish-Christianity which, without requiring proselytism of Gentiles, still regarded its own Jewish status as conferring advantage or at least demanding adherence by Gentiles to Jewish standards in mixed situations.

Paul's contribution to this debate in Romans 2 is to deny any such privilege thus understood, and this by appeal to the Jewish axiom of impartial judgment according to works, and to the righteousness of God through faith for both Jew and Greek alike.

Summary of Rom 2:6-11: No Tension

Although it is common to perceive an inherent *tension* between this text and the apostle's subsequent statements on justification, chapters 1-3 of the letter give no evidence of such in Paul's own mind. He uses the judgment motif, both for eternal punishment and reward, without apology and with no seeming fear of misunderstanding. For our explanation as to why and how Paul felt no tension on this matter we refer the reader to the final chapter of this dissertation.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. "nothing is unclean in itself" (14:14); "the kingdom of God is not food and drink" (14:17); "(t)he one who thus [i.e., not according to Torah prescriptions but according to love] serves Christ is acceptable to God" (14:18).

In Romans 2, Paul's use of the recompense motif evinces near-complete continuity with its use in second temple Judaism. The wording, its function within the argument, the eschatological framework, and the association with divine impartiality all point to Paul's familiarity with and adoption of this motif from the broad stream of traditional Jewish use of this axiom. It is the standard Jewish expectation that one's outward behavior (one's *works* or *way*) will correspond to, and be a visible manifestation of, inward reality. Thus, neither in Judaism nor here in Paul does one obey *in order to become* righteous. Nor is such obedience understood as sinless perfection, but as a consistent and wholehearted conformity to God's will. At two points we did note a modification (or radicalization) by Paul of this Jewish motif: (i) the comprehensive duality of recompense, and (ii) its employment in order to establish the soteriological equality of Gentiles with Jews. However, we were able to show that both these modifications relate directly to Paul's rhetorical purpose in the letter, and need not be construed as a rejection of the traditional Jewish concept of judgment/recompense according to deeds.

Is Paul, then, teaching here that believers' eschatological destiny will be dependent upon the outcome of this judgment according to deeds? In a strict sense the answer will be 'no', since the aim of this section is not to instruct regarding the believers' eschatological future, but to challenge faulty thinking about presumed Jewish soteriological advantages. Nevertheless a 'yes' is implied. Whether Jew or Gentile, Christian or not, at this final judgment God's apportioning of glory or wrath will be in accord with conduct, whether one's life pattern was to practice good, or to do evil. Divine judgment according to deeds is no less a fundamental axiom for Paul the apostle of Christ than it was for Saul the Pharisee.

ROMANS 4:4-5

Now to one who works, wages are not reckoned as a gift but as something due. But to one who without works trusts him who justifies the ungodly, such faith is reckoned as righteousness.

Reasons for Inclusion in this Study

Although this text does not make reference to judgment according to works and is not generally considered to be of major significance for understanding Paul's concept of judgment and recompense, it does appear to bring recompense terminology [*μισθός*] into direct connection with the concepts of justification, works, grace, faith, and merit/earning [*κατὰ ὀφείλημα*, v 4]. For many, these verses are conclusive evidence that Paul's argument in Romans stands primarily in opposition to Jewish legalism, to a reliance on human works qua achievement which thinks it can earn righteousness and which leads to fleshly boasting in merit.¹⁴⁵ For these scholars Rom 4:1-5 becomes important proof that *ἔργα νόμου* implies Jewish merit theology. Further, this text is sometimes cited as evidence of a fundamental Pauline opposition to the idea of recompense based on merit or deeds, suggesting instead a "reward of grace," a Gnadenlohn,¹⁴⁶ in polemical opposition to a Jewish legalistic view of rewards.

While acknowledging that Romans 4 has been a battleground over important questions regarding salvation history and genre, the limitations of a dissertation force us to focus on a few issues related specifically to our thesis. First we must seek to interpret the crucial terms within the context of this argument: justification *ἐξ ἔργων*, boasting, reward (or 'pay'), and grace versus debt. In tandem with the terminological investigation we will need to determine to what degree legalism and Jewish covenantal presumption play a role in this argument. We will then want to explore the significance of these findings for our understanding of judgment accord-

¹⁴⁵ H. W. Heidland, art. *λογίζομαι*, *TDNT* 4.290-292; H. Preisker, art. *μισθός*, *TDNT* 4.720 ("The doctrine of justification vanquishes the concept of reward."); R. Bultmann, *Theologie des NTs*⁸, 242, 264-265, 281; C. E. B. Cranfield, *Romans* 1.224-229; H. Lietzmann, *Römer*, 21; E. Käsemann, *Römer*, 99.

¹⁴⁶ This concept is particularly prominent among Roman Catholic theologians as a solution to the tension between salvation by grace and judgment according to works. "Die 'Werke' sind ja eher 'Frucht des Geistes' (Gal 5,22), der Lohn ein Gnadenlohn" (R. Schnackenburg, *Die sittliche Botschaft des Neuen Testaments* [Munich: 1954] 198, cf. also 104ff).

ing to works in Romans 2.

Literary and Traditio-Historical Context

In 3:21 Paul returns explicitly to the thesis regarding the divine righteousness (cf. 1:17), giving it now its full expression in v 28: For we hold that a person is justified by faith apart from works prescribed by the law. This is a direct challenge to Jewish particularism—Or is God the God of Jews only?—since both the circumcised and uncircumcised come to God on the same basis of faith (3:29-30). This, in turn, raises the question of the relevance and authority of the Torah (v 31: Do we then overthrow the law by this faith?). Such an inclusion of Gentiles in the eschatological people of God, without respect to Israel's election and the sign of circumcision, would clearly seem to be a direct abrogation of the Torah. Is this faith-righteousness without regard to "law-works" indeed testified to by the law and the prophets as Paul has claimed (3:21; cf. 1:17)? As a demonstration in the affirmative, Paul turns to Abraham (4:1-25).¹⁴⁷

His choice of Abraham and of Gen 15:6 was almost a necessity at this stage in the light of Jewish tradition.¹⁴⁸ As father of the nation, Abraham was regularly

¹⁴⁷ A great deal of ink has been spilled over the significance of οὖν (4:1). Does it refer back to 3:31 (J. Ziesler, *Romans*, 120; C. T. Rhyne, *Faith Establishes the Law: A Study on the Continuity Between Judaism and Christianity: Romans 3:31* [Diss.; Union Theological Seminary; University Microfilms; Richmond, VA, 1979] 25-61, 188), 3:29-30 (A. J. Guerra, "Romans 4," 265-66; R. Hays, "Have we found?" 83-88), or 3:27-28 (C. E. B. Cranfield, *Romans*, 1.223; J. Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans* [NICNT; 2 vols in 1; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968] 1.125-127; J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 196-199)? As is so often the case in debates of this nature, each option has grasped significant elements of truth. In the light of the fact that both 3:21 and 31 make reference to the law's predictive function (the latter more implicitly, of course), surely chap 4 may be understood, in part at least, as Paul's attempt to demonstrate that his gospel does not overturn the Torah, but was, in fact, foreshadowed therein. On the other hand, the clear connections between 4:2 and 3:27-28 (repetition of καύχημα/-σις, δικαιώσθαι, and ἔργων), and the relation of his arguments against Jewish particularism (4:9-25) to the earlier challenge against the same in 3:29-30, render it most likely that chap 4 relates to the whole argument of 3:27-31. Chapter 4 is intended to demonstrate that the law itself (i.e., the Jewish Scriptures) foreshadows the way of faith-righteousness rather than law-works, making Abraham the father of all who believe (Jew and Gentile), without reference to law-works.

¹⁴⁸ For details, including relevant passages, see A. T. Hanson, *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974) 60-62; U. Luz, *Das Geschichtsverständnis des Paulus* (Munich: Kaiser, 1968) 177-180; F. Hahn, "Genesis 15:6 im Neuen Testament," *Probleme biblischer Theologie: FS G. von Rad* (ed. H. W. Wolff; Munich: Kaiser, 1971) 94-97; J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 196-201.

presented as a model of the devout Jew, one who exercised faith (= faithful obedience) under pressure. Scholars remain divided as to the precise significance of this faith of Abraham in Jewish tradition. Was it “ein verdienstliches Tun,” simply one among many other meritorious works;¹⁴⁹ or was Abraham’s faith primarily viewed as a precursor to loyalty to Israel’s particular customs under the pressure of Hellenization during Maccabean times (esp. circumcision, Sabbath, idolatry and unclean foods).¹⁵⁰ Both find in Romans 4 Paul’s reaction to a Jewish interpretation of Abraham’s faith, but in one instance he is opposing legalism, and in the other Jewish particularism.

Paul opens his own midrash on Gen 15:6 with an exegetical question: *So then, what shall we say that Abraham, our forefather according to the flesh, has found* [i.e., to be the case regarding justification by faith or by works of the law]? (my translation)¹⁵¹ The issue remains precisely that raised in Paul’s previous discussion (3:27-31) as demonstrated by the reoccurrence in 4:2 of the key terms of that discussion: *For if Abraham was justified* [ἐδικαιώθη] *by works* [ἐξ ἔργων = ἐξ ἔργων νόμου], *he has something to boast about* [καύχημα]. In our discussion of the phrase ‘law-works’ we argued that this refers to Jewish confidence in covenantal privileges accruing only to those who identify with the nation, most notably by submission to circumcision and the food laws. Paul counters this Jewish particularistic understanding of law-works and of Abraham’s faithfulness by appeal to Gen 15:6:

¹⁴⁹ See, for example, U. Luz, *Geschichtsverständnis*, 177-180; C. E. B. Cranfield, *Romans*, 1.224, 226-227, 229; E. Käsemann, *Römer*, 99; and Str-B, 3.199-201.

¹⁵⁰ See esp. the works by Hanson and Dunn (n. 148), and F. Watson, *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles*, 136-138.

¹⁵¹ This verse is fraught with difficulties of text, translation and context (our conclusions differ from his own, but see esp. R. B. Hays, “‘Have we found Abraham to be our forefather according to the flesh’? A reconsideration of Rom 4:1,” *NovT* 27/1 [1985] 76-98). In our translation *εὕρηκέναι* echoes the specialized usage of the verb “to find” [מצא] known from rabbinic exegesis in the idiom “What do we find (in Scripture) concerning . . . ?” (suggested and rejected in R. B. Hays, “Have we found,” 82; cf. also M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* [Brooklyn: Traditional Press, 1903] 825). More often an allusion to Gen 18:3 (LXX) is suggested (“If I have found favor [εὕρον χάριν] before you”), thus setting the stage for a contrast between grace and works. We find this unlikely since Paul gives so little attention to *grace* in the ensuing argument (only vv 4[?], 16).

Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness (v 3). His aim in this citation will become explicit in v 5b: Abraham's faith [ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ], not any 'doing,' is reckoned as righteousness.

Exegesis: Verses 4-5

The mere citation of this passage, of course, does not prove his point, since Jews used the same text in support of the necessity of faithfulness to the covenant demands. Thus vv 4-5 are crucial to Paul's argument, for in them he will argue that 'doing' and 'believing' are mutually exclusive as the basis for reckoning. This exclusivity is set up nicely by the verbal contrast between "one who works" [τῷ δὲ ἐργαζομένῳ] and "one who does not work but trusts" [τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ, πιστεύοντι δὲ]. Paul's *proof* of their mutual exclusivity is, however, not entirely clear in its logic, owing in part to the confusing mixture of secular analogy (v 4) and theological assertion (v 5).¹⁵²

The commercial analogy in v 4 can be read perfectly clearly without resort to a 'theologizing' of the language. Ὁ ἐργαζόμενος is any common worker, and λογίζεσθαι a t.t. for the reckoning of one's wage [μισθός] according to the work done.¹⁵³ Similarly κατὰ χάριν and κατὰ ὀφείλημα simply state that such a wage arrangement is a matter of "what is owed" rather than "as a favor."¹⁵⁴ Now in which of these elements (or combination of them) does Paul find a contrast with "the one who does not work but believes," so that their mutual exclusivity is proven? One common interpretation can be formulated in the following syllogism:

¹⁵² J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 203-204; E. Käsemann, *Römer*, 103: "Doch hat der Apostel einmal mehr nicht die Geduld, seine Vergleiche und Bilder glücklich zu beenden. Die Anwendung mischt sich in den Vergleich und überdeckt ihn. Das bedeutet, daß die Terminologie, nun theologisch befrachtet, einen andern Sinn erhält."

¹⁵³ H. W. Heidland, art. λογίζομαι, *TDNT*, 4.284; H. Preisker, art. μισθός, *TDNT*, 4.695-698. Paul uses ἐργάζεσθαι for manual labor in 1 Thess 4:11 and 2 Thess 3:10-12 (see also Eph 4:28). Against the prevalent tendency in biblical scholarship to pass over everyday meanings of Greek words in favor of a more religious meaning, see D. B. Martin, *Slavery As Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1990) 75.

¹⁵⁴ See Thucydides 2.40.4, cited by F. Hauck, *TDNT*, 5.565.

(major premise): Based on an everyday analogy justification ἐξ ἔργων must be associated with ideas of earning and quid pro quo recompense – all clearly antithetical to grace.

(minor premise): But we know justification to be κατὰ χάριν.¹⁵⁵

(conclusion): Thus (Abraham's) justification by faith could not have been in any sense ἐξ ἔργων.

If this was Paul's point, it must be admitted that he has left the crucial minor premise implicit, or assumes the reader will supply δικαιούμενοι τῇ χάριτι from 3:24. The "justification of the ungodly" and the "reckoning of faith for righteousness" in v 5 must in that case be *assumed to imply* "by grace." We would suggest instead that Paul's contrast lies on the surface, in the presence or absence of *work*. First, this opposing of *the one who works* to *the one who does not work* remains the fundamental and explicit verbal contrast in vv 4-5 as noted earlier. Second, the rather shocking language of belief in "the one who justifies the ungodly" was not meant by Paul to overturn a fundamental biblical axiom,¹⁵⁶ but to hint at Abraham's lack of crucial law-works at the time of his believing in Gen 15:6. Jewish tradition itself could speak of Abraham as the prototypical proselyte, the stranger who is converted from idolatry (Josh 24:2) to the one true God.¹⁵⁷ Calling Abraham one of the "ungodly" looks ahead, therefore, to Paul's discussion of Abraham's uncircumcised condition at the point of his faith and initial justification (vv 9-12), and at this stage in the argument simply marks him as one who lacked the works crucial to Jewish identity, a fact of great importance in the light of the Jew-Gentile tensions central to the contingent concern of this letter. Third, though it may seem quite a leap in logic to the modern reader, the bald fact that *only* Abraham's *faith* is mentioned in Gen 15:6 as the basis of the reckoning of righteousness means that works were not pre-

¹⁵⁵ "Grace" is mentioned in 4:16; also 1:5; 3:24; 5:2.

¹⁵⁶ I.e., the phrase is *not* used here to describe Abraham's moral *character*, but his *status* as one who is outside the covenant relationship (cf. J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 204-205). The biblical axiom can be found in Exod 23:7; Prov 17:15; 24:24; Isa 5:23; Sir 42:2; CD I,19.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 205; A. T. Hanson, *Studies*, 60-62.

sent.¹⁵⁸ Finally, it is the reckoning of righteousness *without works* [χωρὶς ἔργων] that is highlighted by Paul in the supporting witness from the Psalms (vv 6-8).

Summary

We can now summarize our findings in this passage relative to the topic of judgment and recompense in Paul. First, vv 4-5 are not about grace versus works-righteousness, but are about the conditions required for membership in the new people of God—faith in Christ or law-works. Abraham is a fitting case study since he was regularly used in Judaism as a model of loyalty to Israel's particular customs (=faith/faithfulness). Paul will argue instead that Abraham's justification, his inclusion among the recipients of the covenant blessings, came by faith (alone) apart from and prior to any works (of the law). The point of vv 4-8 is simply that the faith-reckoning of Gen 15:6 excludes any consideration of 'doing' on Abraham's part, this point of its being χωρὶς ἔργων finding confirmation in the Psalm quotation (vv 7-8).

Second, the alleged use of recompense language in Rom 4:4 [μισθός] arises in a commercial analogy and not in polemic with a supposed Jewish theology of merit. The rabbis were themselves adamant in rejecting the idea that God "owes" a person any reward as a sort of "obligation," the fulfillment of which claim a person could press upon God.¹⁵⁹ Romans 4:4 does not constitute Paul's rejection of a "Jewish theology of recompense." Neither does he replace μισθὸς κατὰ ὀφείλημα with μισθὸς κατὰ χάριν, a "reward of grace."¹⁶⁰ Within the commercial analogy of v 4 a μισθός, by its very definition, cannot be κατὰ χάριν but only κατὰ ὀφείλημα. It should not be deduced from this text that Paul is fundamentally opposed to the idea of a reward related to achievement or obedience. When speaking of the rewards

¹⁵⁸ "*quod non in thora, non in mundo*," *Str-B* 3.694. Cf. Heb 7:3—Melchizedek had no father, mother, genealogy, birth or death (because they are not mentioned in the Gen account).

¹⁵⁹ Cf. G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, 2.89-111, esp. 90; J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 204. Note Paul's same hesitance to speak of eternal life as the wages of sanctification (Rom 6:23b).

¹⁶⁰ See above n. 146.

of the righteous Paul can use recompense terminology without embarrassment, and speak explicitly of rewards *κατὰ ἔργα*.¹⁶¹

Thirdly, the above should alert us to how carefully nuanced Paul's thought is. In Romans 4 he can speak of "the one who justifies the ungodly," meaning the uncircumcised, or Gentile "sinners," i.e., those who can bring no prior (covenant) claim to bear before God for their justification. In these cases "ungodly" is a *status* term. Yet in other contexts, speaking of the *character* of those whom God justifies (by faith), Paul will unequivocally side with the OT and Judaism which affirmed that God "will not acquit the guilty" (Exod 23:7). Humanity's *ἀσεβεία* brings divine wrath,¹⁶² while only those who "do good," who are "doers of the law," will enjoy eternal life.¹⁶³ This should at least caution the interpreter against too quickly ascertaining inherent contradiction in Paul's statements about justification and judgment according to works. Distinguishing between texts which speak of the character of the righteous and those which deal with the cause of justification just might reflect such nuanced distinctions in Paul's own mind.¹⁶⁴

ROMANS 6:23

For the wages of sin is death, but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.

For the purposes of our dissertation we will limit ourselves in the main to answering two questions relative to Romans 6 and judgment/recompense in Paul. To what extent is ethical righteousness (i.e., obedience, [good] works) here made necessary to ultimate salvation? Does Paul's avoidance of wage-terminology in rela-

¹⁶¹ Rom 2:6; 1 Cor 3:8,14; cf. also 2 Cor 5:10; Col 3:24.

¹⁶² Rom 1:18, 32.

¹⁶³ Rom 2:5-11, 13; cf. also Gal 6:7-8; 1 Cor 6:9, which affirm that only the righteous, those who "sow to the Spirit" and "do good" as opposed to "unrighteousness," will enter the kingdom.

¹⁶⁴ We posited just such a distinction to explain the apparent discrepancy between Paul's positive statements of justification *κατὰ ἔργα* in Romans 2 and the exclusion of works in Romans 3.

tion to eternal life (v 23) contradict our interpretation of 2:6-11 where eternal life is explicitly a recompense to those who do good?

In chapters 6-11 the apostle takes up a series of objections to, or false conclusions from, his gospel of faith-righteousness.¹⁶⁵ The concluding assertion of chapter 5, leads to the possible misunderstanding, "What then are we to say? Should we continue in sin in order that grace may abound?" (6:1). Similarly, "you are not under law, but under grace" (6:14) brings forth the false inference, "What then? Should we sin because we are not under law but under grace?" (6:15). A careless reading of the apostle's position thus far could have led to antinomian license: grace makes conduct irrelevant. If justification is by faith apart from Torah, then perhaps one's subsequent behavior can neither supplement nor endanger this justification (also 3:8).

To this false inference of antinomianism Paul gives two answers in Romans 6: first, in Christ the believer has died to the ruling power of the old master, Sin, making renewed service to Sin unthinkable (vv 1-14); and second, this freedom from Sin leads not to human autonomy but to a change of masters (vv 15-23; esp. v 22, "you have been freed from sin and enslaved to God"). Fundamental to the entire chapter is what Tannehill terms "the two dominions":

Paul sees man's situation as characterized by two sets of powers which "reign" or "have dominion over" men. . . . The two dominions are different because they are ruled by different powers. It is the powers operative in the dominion which determine its nature, which mark it off from another dominion where other powers are operative. . . . Since Paul sees human existence as being determined by such powers, this existence can be characterized by speaking of it as "in sin," "in law," "in flesh," or "in Spirit."¹⁶⁶

Rom 6:15-23 constitutes a running comparison/contrast between these two dominions. Servitude to the one or the other is inescapable and it is one's conduct which manifests to which dominion one belongs: "you are slaves of the one whom

¹⁶⁵ These false inferences are clearly marked by rhetorical questions (6:1, 15; 7:7, 13; 9:14, 19; 11:1, 11).

¹⁶⁶ *Dying and Rising with Christ: A Study in Pauline Theology* (Berlin: Alfred Topelmann, 1967) 15, 19. See also K. Snodgrass, "Spheres of Influence, A Possible Solution to the Problem of Paul and the Law," *JSNT* 32 (1988) 93-113.

you obey, either of sin, which leads to death, or of obedience [= God], which leads to righteousness?" (v 16). Dale Martin has demonstrated that the point of this extended comparison is missed if limited to the moral-ethical function. Paul is not simply exhorting the readers to obedience because they are *obligated* as slaves to do so. Rather against an antinomian charge he is seeking to portray the way of gracious faith-righteousness as a new slavery, whose "end" (τέλος) and "advantage" (καρπός) are inestimably better than under the old slavery to Sin. It is not so much the *obligation* as the *attractiveness* of the new servitude that is front and center.¹⁶⁷ Transfer from the old dominion to the new occurs for the individual definitively at conversion-initiation,¹⁶⁸ which can thus be described alternately as faith or as wholehearted obedience to the teaching (v 17).¹⁶⁹

As the last in this series of comparisons, v 23 functions to summarize and clarify the argument of the preceding, contrasting once again the two spheres of servitude and their respective results. Verse 23a reiterates the thoughts already present in vv 16b ("slaves . . . of sin, which leads to death") and 21b ("The end of those things is death"). Sin, the old master, pays its appropriate "wage [τὰ ὀψώνια]" to its subjects.¹⁷⁰ Originally the technical term for a soldier's subsistence pay or ration money, by NT times ὀψώνιον had broadened to encompass "salary, wages, allowance" in general, including the allowance or pocket-money (lat. *peculium*) which a slave received, a usage strongly favored by the present context.¹⁷¹ The wage which

¹⁶⁷ *Slavery as Salvation*, 61-62.

¹⁶⁸ See esp. the baptismal reference (vv 3-5) and the then/now scheme (vv 21-22).

¹⁶⁹ Thus "the obedience of faith" (1:5; cf. 15:18). On this phrase in Paul, see A. B. du Toit, "Faith and Obedience," 65-74.

¹⁷⁰ In parallel with the free gift of God [χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ], τὰ ὀψώνια τῆς ἁμαρτίας should be read as a subjective genitive (the wages which Sin pays; so nearly all commentators) and not "wages for sin."

¹⁷¹ Ὀψώνιον is used elsewhere non-metaphorically in Paul (1 Cor 9:7; 2 Cor 11:8; cf. also Luke 3:14). See further H. W. Heidland, *TDNT* 5.591-592. C. C. Caragounis proposes "provisions, viands" instead of "wages," but fails to explain why Paul would have shifted to χάρισμα in v 23b on this basis ("ΟΨΩΝΙΟΝ: A Reconsideration of its Meaning," *NovT* 16 [1974] 35-57; for critical response, cf. B. N. Kaye, *Argument*, 181, n. 29).

Sin pays is death. This is set in opposition to righteousness (v 16b) and eternal life (vv 21-22, 23), and denotes “death as God’s final eschatological judgment of condemnation.”¹⁷² In 2:6-10 God rather than Sin is the paymaster, but the idea is the same. Evildoers will be paid (*ἀποδίδωμι*) with the opposite of eternal life, namely eschatological wrath and fury.

Also summarizing the previous argument,¹⁷³ v 23b now contrasts the new dominion, slavery to God, and its incomparably greater benefit, eternal life. The careful listener might have expected the counterpart to “death” as “Sin’s wages” to have been “eternal life” as “God’s wages.” Instead Paul substitutes “gift [*χάρισμα*]” for “wage” on the divine side of the contrast. Thus not only is the result of the two dominions in starkest contrast (eternal life versus death), but the method of reckoning as well (wage versus grace). The gift of eternal life is freely bestowed as an unearned favor in contrast to a wage.

We consider it not entirely correct when Cranfield asserts broadly, “God does not pay wages, since no man can put Him in his debt.”¹⁷⁴ The apostle can, indeed, speak of a Christian’s wage (*μισθός*) according to works.¹⁷⁵ True, the benevolent gift of God is contrasted with the meager rations doled out by Sin, but throughout chapter 6 Paul has been at pains to demonstrate that this gift applies exclusively to the slaves of God. The free gift of salvation is to the obedient. The concluding “in Christ Jesus our Lord” is not merely a formulaic ending, but reiterates the thesis fundamental to 5:12-6:23, that all the benefits of the new righteousness are available only “in Christ,” and thus only to those who by faith are in Him.

¹⁷² C. E. B. Cranfield, *Romans*, 1.322, n. 3. While it is true that death is also a present reality under sin (5:12), it is here the result or end [*τέλος*] of one’s way of life that is in view, an end which is set in contrast to the life of the age to come.

¹⁷³ Cf. vv 16b, 19b, 22.

¹⁷⁴ *Romans*, 1.330. Braun calls Romans 6 a complete “Aufhebung des Verdienstgedankens” (*Gerichtsgedanke*, 67).

¹⁷⁵ 1 Cor 3:8, 14; 2 Cor 5:10; Col 3:23-25; further 1 Cor 9:24-27; (2 Tim 2:5).

Is a return to Sin's servitude (and thus to death) considered possible by Paul in this passage for believers? On the one hand "in Christ" believers have already been set free from Sin's dominion and have already become servants of righteousness (6:1-11, 18). From this perspective it must be termed an "impossibility" for a Christian to live in the service of Sin: "How can we who died to sin go on living in it?" (v 2). This impossibility constitutes Paul's first answer to the charge that faith-righteousness might open the door to libertinism (vv 1-11). On the other hand, believers do not yet fully partake of this new existence ("we will certainly be united with him in a resurrection like his," v 5b). Our mortal bodies (v 12) and their members (v 13) have not yet entered the new aeon where they, too, will reflect the glory of Christ's resurrection. Those who are already freed from Sin's dominion have not yet been removed bodily from the sphere of its power; hence the exhortations to avoid Sin's reign in vv 11-13, 19. As Dunn writes,

Only those who have not appreciated the eschatological tension in vv 1-11 would find Paul's turning to moral exhortation at this point surprising. Where the "not yet" of the believers' sharing in Christ's resurrection has not been allowed to qualify the "already" of their identification with Christ in his death, such exhortations can cause only puzzle and confusion: what meaning can such counsel have if the believer is already "dead to sin"? . . . For believers the body is still mortal, its appetites *still capable of determining their life's character and priorities*. But the power of grace, the power of the risen Christ enables them to rise above such merely self-centered concerns. It is this reality which Paul seeks to realize in his readers. Hence the sequence of imperatives. Paul is under no delusion that it will happen automatically.¹⁷⁶

What then is the soteriological implication of this "impossible possibility,"¹⁷⁷ of a potential return to the "old slavery" (cf. Gal 5:1, "do not submit again to a yoke of slavery")? To attempt an answer would take us well beyond the bounds of Romans 6. In such an eventuality (not excluded, but certainly not expected by Paul in Romans 6) Paul's summation would presumably apply: "the wages of sin is death."¹⁷⁸ Thus, we find the possibility of a return to the old slavery

¹⁷⁶ *Romans 1-8*, 350 (emphasis mine).

¹⁷⁷ The phrase is found in J. C. Beker, *Paul*, 219.

¹⁷⁸ "In a master-slave relationship the master can tolerate and forgive various breaches of discipline, though habitual sin (warned against in v 13) would presumably destroy the relationship itself" (J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 352). For a similar conclusion, see R. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 70-83.

to Sin implied in Rom 6:15-23. If this threat of death to the subjects of Sin is not (at least theoretically) applicable to believers, then the second half of Paul's argument in Romans 6 (vv 15-23) against grace as license is robbed of a good deal of its motivating power ("Do you not know that [slavery to sin] leads to death?" v 16). That Paul did have concerns about such an eventuality is amply demonstrated in his letters.¹⁷⁹

Summarizing our findings, justification by faith may not be taken as making the believer's obedience or sanctification somehow irrelevant, secondary, or optional in relation to the eschatological enjoyment of salvation.¹⁸⁰ It is probably just such a misinterpretation in the direction of libertinism or antinomianism which Paul is concerned to combat in chapter 6, a misinterpretation which would lead to grave conflict in a congregation composed of both Jews and Gentiles. The concluding "in Christ Jesus our Lord" is no mere formality, but highlights once again that God's gracious gift of future life is only to be found within the sphere of Christ's dominion.

Secondly, the imperatives in Romans 6 do not become a new ground or cause for the indicative ('you will be in Christ if you are obedient') replacing grace (6:23); nor is the indicative "realized" or "actualized" in the imperative ('what we are or have in principle in Christ only becomes ours in reality or experience via

¹⁷⁹ Rom 13:11-14; 1 Cor 5:6-7; 6:12-20; 10:1-22; 2 Cor 12:20-13:10; Gal 4:8-11; 5:16-21; 6:7-8; 1 Thess 3:1-5, 8.

¹⁸⁰ "For Paul the principle that eternal life is bestowed upon the basis of righteousness [=ethical righteousness as in Judaism] remains central, and the passages from here down to 8:13 are concerned with the possibility and necessity of living out that required righteousness. Paul's grace-vision is not to injure one bit the ethical seriousness of the Jewish tradition presupposed in Romans" (B. Byrne, "Living out the Righteousness of God," *CBQ* 43 [1981] 562-63). Byrne's article is an excellent attempt from a Roman Catholic perspective to relate grace, obedience, and salvation against the background of Romans 5-8. We would only question whether he has sufficiently acknowledged the forensic finality of Paul's use of the verb *δικαιοῦν* (for instance, *δικαιωθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως* [5:1]). When he formulates, "The union with the risen Lord . . . is the means whereby God creates a new moral possibility in Christians (cf. 7:4-6), a new righteousness and, on the basis of this righteousness, a destiny to resurrection life" (570), the "already" of justification by faith would seem to be lost.

obedience'). Rather obedience can better be described as the necessary *manifestation* of the indicative.

The actions of the individual reflect his participation in the dominion of which he is a part. . . . Thus the transfer from the old dominion to the new which takes place through dying with Christ *will manifest itself* in the actions of the believer. . . . [The] imperative means: allow God's lordship over you to manifest itself in your will and actions. And that also means: hold fast to the Lord who has been given to you; remain in his lordship.¹⁸¹

Paul is careful throughout that obedience does not replace grace as the cause of, and faith as the instrument of, salvation. Yet it is clear that for him this gracious salvation is wholly unthinkable apart from the ensuing obedience of the redeemed (6:16, 22). Thus, just as Paul could speak of God giving eternal life "to those who by patiently doing good seek for glory and honor and immortality" (2:7), so now slavery to obedience (= God) is *εἰς δικαιοσύνην* (=resulting in the final verdict of life-giving righteousness versus *εἰς θάνατον*, 6:16b), and eternal life is viewed as the result (*τέλος*) of a life of enslavement to God which produces holiness (6:22).

ROMANS 8:1-4

(1) There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus. (2) For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set you free from the law of sin and of death. (3) For God has done what the law, weakened by the flesh, could not do: by sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and to deal with sin, he condemned sin in the flesh, (4) so that the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit.

At first glance, v 1 would seem to remove all concern for believers vis-à-vis a future judgment to (eternal) life or death. For the Christian condemnation at the judgment must be an impossibility—*οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα*.¹⁸² We will attempt to examine briefly the correctness of such an implication from this text. In addition,

¹⁸¹ R. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising*, 81-82 (emphasis mine). See also E. Käsemann, *An die Römer*, 166.

¹⁸² L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 92, 110; J. M. Gundry-Volf, *Paul and Perseverance* (WUNT 2.37; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1990) 68, 157, 285. Interestingly, medieval exegetes went in the opposite direction, making the indicative of v 1 dependent on the condition implied in v 4b—"if someone does not walk according to the flesh but the Spirit" (K. Fröhlich, "Romans 8:1-11: Pauline Theology in Medieval Interpretation," *Faith and History: Essays in Honor of Paul W. Meyer* [ed. J. T. Carroll, et al.; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990] 245).

we must note whether, according to v 4, Paul does indeed expect that believers will fulfill the law.

The exclusion of condemnation harks back to Paul's only previous use of this noun (5:16, 18; cf. 2:1 [verb]). There he described all humanity in Adam as being under the sentence of condemnation through Adam's one trespass. Now, however, this situation has been reversed for those in Christ Jesus. As F. Büchsel has shown, the noun *κατάκριμα* can convey both the notion of a *sentence* of condemnation as well as its *execution*.¹⁸³ In this latter sense it could be better translated "damning situation" or "doom." In 8:1 *κατάκριμα* has reference primarily to the execution of the sentence, now being played out in the doomed situation of Adamic humanity (cf. 5:12-21; 7:7-25). Paul is not merely saying Christians need not fear a sentence of condemnation at the future judgment, but even more to the point in this context, they are now released from the wretched "penal servitude" (Bruce's translation) to which they were doomed in Adam.

The correctness of this view is confirmed by Paul's explanation [γάρ] of freedom from condemnation in vv 2-3 which is intimately connected to the work of the Holy Spirit in believers' lives and conduct.¹⁸⁴ It is the Spirit who liberates the believer from the "law of sin and death," viz. from the damning condition of chapter 7. This liberation by the Spirit is in turn grounded in God's condemnation [κατέκρινεν] of sin in Christ's flesh (i.e., in his death). This latter use of condemnation must mean not primarily that the sentence of destruction has been pronounced against sin (for in this the law was surely not ἀδύνατον, v 3a) but first of all its *execution* upon the twin powers of Sin and Death.¹⁸⁵ It is this destruction of the

¹⁸³ Art. κατακρίνω, TDNT, 3.951-952.

¹⁸⁴ With most commentators we take τοῦ πνεύματος here as a reference to God's Spirit rather than the human spirit, as generally throughout the chapter (v 16 is the only clear exception; cf. 2 Cor 3:6). The precise meaning of νόμος here ("principle" or "Torah"?) need not detain us, since the stress on the liberating role of the Spirit remains unchanged in either case (cf. J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans* 1-8, 417).

¹⁸⁵ J. Murray, *Romans*, 1.277-279 (though on p. 282 he reverts to "the strictly forensic import of condemnation").

power, not just the guilt, of Sin which was indeed τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου according to chapter 7, and which has now been applied by the Spirit to believers, thus freeing them from this damning situation and enabling the fulfillment of “the just requirement (sg.) of the law,” here understood in the broadest sense as conformity to the divine will.¹⁸⁶ For Paul this freedom from condemnation under Sin’s power occurs for “those who live according to the Spirit,” i.e., who have “set their minds on the things of the Spirit” (vv 5-6), who are indwelt by the Spirit (v 9), and are led by the same Spirit (v 14).

Thus freedom from condemnation is nothing other than victory over the power of Sin and Death, accomplished already in the death of Christ, appropriated by faith, and now made an ethical reality for those in Christ by the operation of the Holy Spirit. For “those who are in Christ Jesus,” who walk κατὰ πνεῦμα and thereby fulfill the law’s requirement, there is indeed “no condemnation” to be feared in the future (v 34). They are free from its curse now and need not fear it in the future judgment. This positive assurance of deliverance is the burden of chapter 8, and to this extent condemnation is an impossibility for those in Christ. But precisely the “in Christ” language with its nuance of eschatological tension should warn against pressing this assurance to mean a security with no relation to the believer’s pilgrimage [περιπατεῖν, v 4] between Christ’s resurrection and Parousia. Should they return to living κατὰ σάρκα and under the dominion of Sin and Death, then they do not belong to Christ (v 9) and will find themselves back under the same condemnation to death (v 13).¹⁸⁷ Thus, while Rom 8:1 may rightly be celebrated as Paul’s great shout of victory and assurance for believers vis-à-vis condemnation, this may not be taken as an unqualified denial of all relevance of present and future con-

¹⁸⁶ The closest parallel to this phrase is 2:26 where τὰ δικαιώματα (pl.) τοῦ νόμου refers to that which the Torah justly requires (so also 1:32). It is thus equivalent to τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου (2:15), and will not be much different than what Paul intends in 8:29 with “conformity to the image of His Son.” See also J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 423-424.

¹⁸⁷ The conditional sentences in v 13 (εἰ + indicative) emphasize “the reality of the assumption,” “the condition is considered ‘a real case’” (BDF, §371(1); cf. also 372(2a)).

demnation for Christians, nor as contradicting Paul's expectation of judgment according to works in 2:6.¹⁸⁸ If anything, his connection between freedom from condemnation and the fulfillment of the law points in the same direction. The forensic and the ethical dimensions of righteousness may not be so easily separated in Paul's thinking.¹⁸⁹

ROMANS 14:10-12

- (10) Why do you pass judgment on your brother or sister? Or you, why do you despise your brother or sister? For we will all stand before the judgment seat of God. (11) For it is written, "As I live, says the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall give praise to God."
 (12) So then, each of us will be accountable to God.¹⁹⁰

Although exhortation has not been entirely lacking from the earlier chap-

¹⁸⁸ So J. D. G. Dunn: "Paul saw the act of liberation as decisive, but still qualified or incomplete, that is, awaiting the final liberation of 8:21 (ἐλευθερωθήσεται)" (*Romans 1-8*, 418).

¹⁸⁹ Brendan Byrne has attempted to apply the insights of Käsemann, Stuhlmacher, Ziesler and others (i.e., justification as involving the "Machtcharakter der Gabe") to the interpretation of Romans 8 ("Living out the Righteousness of God," 557-581). Much of his study will be found reflected in our interpretation. We would part company only over the relation of the forensic (or participationist) and ethical categories, since Byrne seems to want to subordinate the former almost totally to the latter. "The nub of Paul's distinctiveness lies in the way participationist categories are placed at the service of righteousness, i.e., are presented as *the way in which the required righteousness is produced*" (571, emphasis mine). Although Byrne acknowledges the forensic categories, and repeatedly stresses that justifying righteousness is nothing other than Christ's righteousness, nevertheless the language of "producing," of "a new righteousness created" via "fulfillment of the moral demand" (569), leaves one wondering if a verse such as Rom 5:1 (δικαιωθέντες, aor. pass.) has been fully appreciated. We have already suggested that the language of "manifestation" more appropriately expresses the relationship between the ethical and forensic aspects of justification.

Luise Mattern represents the opposite tendency, namely to subordinate the ethical to the forensic, the pneumatological to the christological (*Verständnis*, 91-94). She views v 1 ("ein Siegesruf?") as a slight interruption between the question in 7:24 and its answer in 8:2ff. This freedom from the law of sin, and hence from condemnation, has its basis (v 3) in the divine execution of judgment on Sin at the cross. The result of the *Heilstat Christi* is past and future freedom from the "law of sin and death" and fulfillment (as a "reality" which "is fulfilled," not a "possibility" which "can be fulfilled") of the law's just requirement. She concludes: "Der Grund dafür, dass ἐν χριστῷ kein κατὰκριμα mehr möglich ist, ist einzig und allein Gottes Tat an Christus." This exegesis skips over the central pneumatological basis of freedom from condemnation given in v 2. Granted, Paul ultimately bases all of Christian existence, and especially life in the Spirit, upon Christ's work; nevertheless the burden of Romans 8 is to demonstrate how believers are delivered by the Spirit from the *damning condition* under Sin. Their deliverance from Sin's power in Christ was sufficiently dealt with in Romans 6.

¹⁹⁰ On reading τῷ θεῷ, see B. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 531-532.

ters,¹⁹¹ 12:1-15:13 constitute the apostolic paraenesis proper, the rhetorical *exhortatio* which “sets forth the ethical implications of the main thesis”.¹⁹²

With 14:1 begins a lengthy unit focused on two groups, “the weak” and “the strong” (to which latter group Paul reckons himself, 15:1), which is most likely addressed to a concrete situation in Rome, about which Paul is somehow informed.¹⁹³ At issue between the two groups is whether a fellow Christian should eat meat.¹⁹⁴ For Paul, however, the more fundamental issue lies in the threat thus posed to the maintenance of love¹⁹⁵ and to the peace or unity of the one church in Rome.¹⁹⁶ Members of the two groups are failing to “accept one another,”¹⁹⁷ instead despising, judging or even condemning.¹⁹⁸ Schneider has pointed out the Christian communal meal in Rome as a likely *Sitz* for such conflicts.¹⁹⁹ Chapter 14:1-12(13a) constitutes a sustained argument against such mutual judgment:

Who are you to pass judgment on servants of another? (v 4a)
 Why do you pass judgment on your brother or sister? (v 10a)
 Let us therefore no longer pass judgment on one another., (v 13a)

¹⁹¹ 6:12-14, 19b; 11:17-24.

¹⁹² R. Jewett, “Following the Argument of Romans,” *The Romans Debate: Revised*, 272.

¹⁹³ See above on “Occasion” (pp. 184-186); also J. Mosier, “Rethinking Romans,” 571-582; N. Schneider, *Die “Schwachen” in der christlichen Gemeinde Roms* (Diss. Wuppertal: 1989) 50-61; and R. L. Omanson, “The ‘Weak’ and the ‘Strong’ and Paul’s Letter to the Roman Christians,” *Bible Translator* 33 (1982) 106-114.

¹⁹⁴ 14:2, 5-6, 14, 20-23; which mention, in addition to “meat,” “observing sacred days” and “abstaining from wine.” The exact views of the “strong” and the “weak” are not relevant to this paper. For various reconstructions see Cranfield, *Romans* 2.690-97. According to N. Schneider (*Die “Schwachen”*, 3, 62-155) the current majority opinion favors a Jewish background.

¹⁹⁵ 14:15; also 15:1-3. Thus, 14:1ff is a specific application of the previous general exhortation to love (12:9-21; 13:8-10).

¹⁹⁶ 14:17-18, 19-20a; 15:5-6.

¹⁹⁷ Προσλαμβάνειν (14:1a, 3b; 15:7; = recognition as a true brother or sister [Schlier] or as “Christen im Vollsinn” [Asmussen]). A reference to “official reception into church fellowship” (Michel, Schlatter) is uncertain.

¹⁹⁸ Διακρίσεις (14:1b); μὴ ἐξουθενεῖτω (14:3, 10); μὴ κρινέτω (14:3, 4, 10, 13).

¹⁹⁹ *Die “Schwachen,”* 139-150.

The validity of the argument rests, in turn, upon the principle taken from the then-current practice of slavery stated in v 4—a servant’s judgment is the exclusive prerogative of the master.²⁰⁰ Neither the strong nor the weak may judge the other, for Christ has become the master of both. Each with their own conviction is serving this master, whether by eating or by abstaining, as evidenced in either case by “giving thanks to God” (vv 5-8).

This line of argument is then capped by the reference in vv 10-12 to divine judgment, which, following the two rhetorical questions of v 10a, functions as a theological reason [γάρ] for rejecting such intra-community judgment.²⁰¹ In other texts this judgment motif can serve as a warning to motivate correct ethical behavior (2 Cor 5:10; 1 Cor 3:16-17; Gal 6:7-8), along the lines of Matt 7:1, “Do not judge, so that you may not be judged.” Here, however, those guilty of judging another are not threatened with an equivalent divine judgment upon themselves for doing such. Not the outcome of the judged but the right of the Judge is preeminent in this passage.²⁰² In correspondence with the preceding social metaphor of slave-master relations, judgment is reserved for God alone as a means of eliminating human judgment upon one another. This purpose of the judgment motif is made explicit in v 13a, “Let us therefore no longer pass judgment on one another.” A similar use of divine judgment to invalidate intra-community judgment can also be found in Rom 12:19; 1 Cor 3:5-9a; 4:1-5; Gal 6:1-5.²⁰³

²⁰⁰ Gk.—σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ κρίνων ἀλλότριον οἰκέτην; τῷ ἰδίῳ κυρίῳ στήκει ἢ πίπτει. “Paulus denkt bildhaft im Sinn des antiken Sklavenrechts, nach dem der Sklave der Jurisdiktion seines Herrn untersteht . . . der nur seinem Herrn verantwortlich ist. Kein anderer Sklave vermag in dies Sklavenrecht einzugreifen” (O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*⁵ [MeyerK 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978] 424). See also D. Martin, *Slavery*, 59-60.

²⁰¹ E. Synofzik, *Gerichtsaussagen*, 63-87. Of course, in matters of overt sinning Paul applies a completely different principle: “I have already pronounced judgment . . . on the man. . . . Is it not those who are inside that you are to judge?” (1 Cor 5:3-4, 12b).

²⁰² “Die “Rechtsprechung”, das Ergebnis des Gerichtes, fehlt ganz” (L. Mattern; *Verständnis*, 160).

²⁰³ Wayne Meeks suggests such use of divine judgment to restrain judgmental and divisive tendencies may have been a Jewish theologoumenon. Pseudo-Phocylides 10-11 reads, “Cast the poor not down unjustly, judge not partially. If you judge evilly, God will judge you thereafter” (“Judgment and the Brother: Romans 14,1-15,13,” *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament: Essays in Honor of E. Earle Ellis* [ed. G. Hawthorne; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987] 294;

As usual, details of judgment scenery are sparse, making dogmatism difficult regarding Paul's larger conception of this judgment in this text. As in 2 Cor 5:10 the imagery for the locale of this judgment is borrowed from Paul's cultural environment. The judgment seat [τὸ βῆμα] was an elevated platform common in cities of the Roman empire for speeches in the public assembly,²⁰⁴ and before which litigants *appeared*.²⁰⁵ Its usage for the divine judgment seat (or "throne") is also attested in Judaism.²⁰⁶ Unlike the text in 2 Corinthians ("the judgment seat *of Christ*") here it is *God*²⁰⁷ who presides. As Conzelmann notes, "Das Nebeneinander von Gott und Christus als Richter macht Paulus kein Kopfzerbrechen."²⁰⁸ In line with the OT, Paul and the rest of the NT can speak of God as the final Judge of the world.²⁰⁹ Yet, probably following the lead of apocalyptic Judaism which can substitute the Son of Man or Messiah for God on the judgment throne,²¹⁰ they can equally name Christ as the Judge.²¹¹ 1 Cor 4:4-5 and Rom 8:33-34 seem to retain both figures. A theological explanation in terms of delegated authority is found in Acts 10:42, "he is

cf. also Jas 4:12) See also this author's forthcoming article, "Romans 12:14-21 and Non-retaliation in Second Temple Judaism: Addressing Persecution Within the Community."

²⁰⁴ So Matt 27:19; John 19:13; Acts 18:12; Polycarp 6:2. Further *BAGD*, 140. Partial remains of such a seat can still be seen in Corinth.

²⁰⁵ Παραστησόμεθα (different 2 Cor 5:10, φανερωθῆναι) can refer to a required court appearance to present a legal case (*BAGD*, 628); cf. Acts 23:33; 27:24. However, there appears to be in this text a mixing of legal and slavery metaphors, and in 2 Tim 2:15 παραστήσαι can be used for a "workman" [ἐργάτης] presenting himself for the employer's approval.

²⁰⁶ See *Str-B*, 1.1031-32; 1 En 62:3, 5.

²⁰⁷ Following a textual tradition as early as Marcion and Polycarp, the KJV reads "the judgment seat of Christ" at Rom 14:10. With most commentators, this reading must be regarded as secondary, arising through assimilation to the immediate context (v 9) and possibly to 2 Cor 5:10. External attestation clearly favors the reading τοῦ θεοῦ here.

²⁰⁸ *Grundriss der Theologie des Neuen Testaments*² (EETH 2; Munich: 1968) 88.

²⁰⁹ Rom 2:2-3, 5-6, 16; 3:5-6; 14:10; 1 Thess 3:13; 2 Thess 1:5-6; Heb 10:30; 12:23; Jas 4:12; 5:9; 1 Pet 1:17; 2 Pet 2:4-6; Rev 14:7; 18:20; 20:11-15.

²¹⁰ See Dan 7; further references in P. Volz, *Eschatologie*, 274-275.

²¹¹ 2 Cor 5:10; 2 Thess 1:8; 2 Tim 4:1, 8; Matt 25:31-46; Rev 22:12.

the one whom God appointed as judge of the living and the dead” (also John 5:22, 27).

There will be an individual accounting [λόγον δοῦναι = give account, make an accounting]²¹² given to God of oneself [περὶ ἑαυτοῦ]. The nature of this accounting takes its cue from the slave-master analogy begun in v 4 and is well illustrated by the parable in Luke 16:

There was a rich man who had a manager [οἰκονόμος], and charges were brought to him that this man was squandering his property. So he summoned him and said to him, ‘What is this that I hear about you [περὶ σοῦ]? Give me an accounting [ἀπόδος τὸν λόγον] of your management, because you cannot be my manager any longer.’ (vv 1-2)

In each case it is faithfulness in service which is under examination (cf. 1 Cor 4:2), i.e., whether one has served in a manner consistent with the master’s will. In regard to such issues as eating meat and observing holy days, the criterion of judgment is not some new halakhic ruling for the churches, but behavior consistent with one’s own conviction or conscience [ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοῦ πληροφροεῖσθω, v 5b], which in their turn are not autonomous but must reflect life τῷ κυρίῳ. Though Paul does not use the specific motif of judgment according to works here, the scene is one and the same. In the place of the motif language we have each rendering a personal account of service to God. The standard of judgment has nothing to do with a legalistic balancing of good and evil works, but the making public (“we must all appear . . . to give account”) of whether one has lived consistently τῷ κυρίῳ.

Apart from its futurity Paul is not particularly concerned to define more precisely the “when” of this judgment.²¹³ L. Mattern appeals to the stress on individuality of judgment in this text [ἕκαστος ἡμῶν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ] as favoring a judgment (immediately) following the death of the individual rather than a general Last Judgment.²¹⁴ This conclusion seems, however, to owe more to her desire to keep

²¹² BAGD, 478; cf. Luke 16:2; Heb 13:17; 1 Pet 4:5. On the rabbinic parallels see *Str-B*, 1.639-640 (Matt 12:36).

²¹³ Note the future verbs in this passage: παραστησόμεθα, κάμψει, ἐξομολογήσεται, δώσει (vl. ἀποδώσει).

²¹⁴ *Verständnis*, 161, 211-215.

the believer's judgment according to work separate from the final judgment determining salvation/damnation, rather than to clear exegetical considerations. As Mattern herself admits, what hints there are in the text point to a universal final judgment. Paul's citation of Isa 45:23,²¹⁵ originally referring to the future homage of all nations before Yahweh (see esp. v 22), is also used in the hymn quoted in Phil 2:6-11 (v 10) as a reference to the universal acknowledgement of Christ's Lordship,²¹⁶ an expectation associated in Paul's mind with the end [τέλος] and the Parousia of Christ (cf. 1 Cor 15:24-28).

Central to Ernst Synofzik's thesis is the denial that such passages reveal Paul's eschatological convictions. He compares Rom 14 with 1 Cor 8-10, following Conzelmann in terming the former "Überarbeitung und Weiterführung" of the latter, and noting about the Cor passage, "daß Paulus—anders als in Röm 14,1-12—den Hinweis auf das eschatologische Gericht nicht benötigt, um die individuelle Verantwortlichkeit des Christen vor Gott zu betonen" (*Die Gerichts- und Vergeltungsaussagen bei Paulus*, 82). Thus he can conclude that the judgment motif for Paul is "nur eine unter vielen und in 1.Kor 8-10 entbehrlich. Wichtiger dagegen ist Paulus die ekklesiologische und christologische Begründung" (84; also 80, 213). This "lesser importance" of the judgment motif is, then, one more reason for viewing it as only an "Argumentationsmittel" (209).²¹⁷ A correction must be made in the evaluation of the evidence he advances for this "lesser importance" of the motif. Its absence in the 1 Cor passage is due not to its lesser importance but to the difference in occasion. Intra-community judgment plays almost no role in 1 Cor 8-10. Thus Paul had no need to point out to the Corinthians at this point the answerability of each to God alone (and not to each other) in the Judgment. On the other hand judgment as a warning against improper behavior is quite in evidence in 1 Cor elsewhere (8:11-13; 9:24-27; 10:5-12, 22); and where the problem of judging one another does arise (4:1-5) the importance of judgment as a response is quite in evidence.

A particular emphasis in this passage lies on the inclusive nature of this judgment: πάντες, (v 10);²¹⁸ πᾶς γόνυ . . . πᾶσα γλῶσσα, (v 11); ἕκαστος ἡμῶν, (v

²¹⁵ The first four words of the citation ("As I live, says the Lord") are a common prophetic introductory formula (e.g., Num 14:28; Isa 49:18; Jer 22:24; 46[LXX 26]:18; Ezek 5:11) not found in Isa 45:23. Perhaps Paul switched introductory formulae in quoting from memory (Wilckens).

²¹⁶ "Even denizens of the underworld as well as inhabitants of heaven are included along with dwellers upon earth. That is, the entire cosmos is brought under the lordship of Christ, as in a vision the poet sees the fulfillment of God's purpose in the endtime" (R. Martin, *Philippians* [NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980] 101).

²¹⁷ His comment that in the following verses (13-23) Paul no longer needs the judgment motif is apparently intended to support his contention of the relatively lesser importance of this motif (80-83). He fails to observe, however, that vv 13-23 are no longer dealing with the issue of intra-community judgment but address the 'strong' regarding their responsibility to avoid causing the 'weak' to sin.

²¹⁸ "All" is in the position of emphasis.

12). Rather than “each of us” (v 12) limiting the “all” of vv 10-11 to believers only, we understand vv 10-11 to be referring to the appearing of all humanity before the eschatological judgment seat (clearly the case in Isaiah 45), with v 12 providing Paul’s application [ἄρα οὖν] to his audience. Thus, since every individual servant of God/Christ (along with all humanity) must give account of their service at this divine judgment, it is in every case a usurping of God’s role for one to sit in judgment on another.

While it is certainly the divine prerogative and not the outcome of such judgment that is at issue in vv 10-12, nevertheless there are hints as to its outcome for believers in the larger context.

Who are you to pass judgment on servants of another? It is before their own lord that they stand or fall. And they will be upheld, for the Lord is able to make them stand. (14:4)

Paul’s concern here is to overcome the mutual disdain and judgment occurring in the house churches in Rome (vv 1-3). In v 4a he compares their situation to that of a slave-owner and a family servant, with the point being that anyone other than the slave’s owner has no business judging such service. It is only in reference to their own master that they will “stand” or “fall.” In this context the metaphor of “standing” and “falling” will refer to the master’s acceptance or rejection of service, in line with Paul’s desire for mutual acceptance (v 1) patterned after God’s acceptance of each (v 3).

The second half of v 4 could possibly be understood as a simple continuation of the slave-master metaphor, i.e., servants will stand²¹⁹ (= be approved) since only their lord is in a position to render such judgment.²²⁰ However this requires

²¹⁹ Taking *σταθήσεται* with middle force as often in Hellenistic Greek (“shall stand”), rather than passive (“will be raised up, made to stand”; see the NRSV translation above). The passive sense would be somewhat redundant in the light of v 4d, and assumes the servant has fallen or erred, a thought Paul certainly did not want to suggest in this context. See M. Zerwick, *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament* (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1981) 490; C. E. B. Cranfield, *Romans*, 2.703-704; J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 804. Favoring the passive sense here: E. Käsemann, *Römerbrief*, 354; E. Kühl, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1913) 449.

²²⁰ *Δυνατεῖ στήσαι* has reference to the legal power of master over slave (J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 804).

importing the assumption that the servant in the metaphor has indeed acted appropriately. Thus with Käsemann, Cranfield and others we take v 4cd to be moving beyond the metaphor, making reference to the believers in Rome and to their *κύριος*, God.²²¹ Since Paul has already made clear his assumption that God accepts each of the parties in the dispute over eating meat (v 3), he now expresses this as an assured “standing” before the Lord, who alone has the right to make such a determination. Having moved beyond the metaphor, it is possible that “standing” now refers to perseverance in faith-obedience and acceptance in eschatological judgment as elsewhere,²²² but the context and metaphor suggest simply “God will approve of one’s behavior in (not) eating meat.”

Such total confidence in God’s approval is directed in this case against the mutual judgment occurring in the Roman church. That this was not an unconditional confidence on Paul’s part is, however, made clear by his demand that each act in full accord with their own conviction (v 5b) and the condition that one’s behavior be “to the Lord” (vv 6-8).²²³

If this “standing” in vv 1-12 refers primarily to divine approval or censure regarding such matters as eating meat, the ensuing section (vv 13-23) drives home to the strong the ultimate effect on the weaker believer who is led to act contrary to conscience:

Stumbling:

. . . to put a stumbling block [*πρόσκομμα*] or hindrance [*σκάνδον*] in the way of another (v 13).

. . . to make others fall [*διὰ προσκόμματος*] (v 20b).

. . . that makes your brother or sister stumble [*προσκόπτει*] (v 21b).

Destruction:

Do not let what you eat cause the ruin [*ἀπόλλυε*] of one for whom Christ died (v 15b).

Do not, for the sake of food, destroy [*κατάλυε*] the work of God (v 20a).

²²¹ An understanding supported by the variant reading [*θεός*] in a number of MSS.

²²² 14:10. See also W. Grundmann, *TDNT*, 7.638, 648-649; W. Michaelis, *TDNT*, 6.165.

²²³ Paul’s argument against intra-community judgment in 1 Cor 4:1-5 is a close parallel, though without the strong note of confidence in the outcome (E. Synofzik, *Vergeltungsaussagen*, 79).

But those who have doubts are condemned [κατακρίνεται] if they eat, because they do not act from faith; for whatever does not proceed from faith is sin (v 23).

The image of stumbling has a rich OT background reminiscent especially of Israel's idolatry (Exod 23:33; 34:12), or other occasions for disobedience leading to destruction (Ps 9:4; Prov 4:19; Isa 8:14).²²⁴ In the Synoptics destruction awaits anyone who would lead another believer into sin (Mark 9:42-47, par). "At issue in the question of *proskomma* are ultimate decisions, conscience and faith, sin and perdition."²²⁵ As we shall note below, this stumbling represents nothing other than a denial of Christ's lordship.

The language of destruction serves to reinforce the ultimate seriousness of what is at stake. Ἀπόλλυμι is regularly employed by the apostle to signify eschatological destruction,²²⁶ and κατακρίνειν likewise for ultimate condemnation.²²⁷ Thus Paul urges the strong in faith to limit their own exercise of freedom in regard to eating meat, lest the weak be thereby led to stumble (i.e., to sin by eating meat against their conscience) and fall into eternal destruction.

At first glance the threat of damnation for such *adiaphora* as eating or not eating meat may seem much overdrawn. It is not the eating per se, however, which brings condemnation ("all food is clean," v 20), but an eating which is not ἐκ πίστεως and hence is ἁμαρτία (v 23). It is genuinely difficult to determine just what Paul means by ἐκ πίστεως in this verse.²²⁸ One avenue is to view this as nothing other than justifying faith or creaturely dependence on God (so Dunn, Synofzik,

²²⁴ G. Stählin, *TDNT*, 6.748-751; 7.340-344.

²²⁵ *Ibid.*, 6.753. Cf. 1 Cor 8:9-13; 10:32; and esp. Rom 9:32-33 in reference to Israel's unbelief. A somewhat weakened sense is found in 2 Cor 6:3, where it denotes "cause offense at Paul's ministry."

²²⁶ Rom 2:2; 1 Cor 1:18; 8:11; 15:18; 2 Cor 2:15; 4:3; 2 Thess 2:10.

²²⁷ Rom 8:34; 1 Cor 11:32. See esp. L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 116-117, who notes that this destruction is contrasted explicitly with the salvific intent of Christ's death (v 15). See also 1 Cor 8:11-12 for a similar argument.

²²⁸ Cranfield's presentation of the options is one of the most thorough (*Romans*, 2.727-729).

Mattern). Understanding chapter 14 to revolve around Jewish identity markers, Dunn can portray the weak as those whose Christian faith was more dependent on such customs, and in whose own eyes such eating would be nothing other than a departure from that faith.²²⁹ This would appear, however, to put the more Jewish-oriented groups in Rome in proximity to the Judaizing position so vigorously opposed by Paul in Galatians. To tie such dependence on customs to their “faith,” as Dunn wishes to do,²³⁰ would seem to give the label “weak faith” to what Paul earlier challenged as no faith (cf. Romans 1-4), and have him now tolerating what he unalterably opposed in Galatia. Thus, here agreeing with many other commentators, *πίστις* must mean something like *conviction, an assurance that something is right* (so Ziesler, Bruce, Cranfield, Lietzmann, Zahn).²³¹ Such an understanding fits with the usage elsewhere in the chapter (vv 1, 2, 22; esp. v 2) as well as with the related (though not identical) argument in 1 Corinthians 8,²³² where “weak conscience [*συνείδησις*, vv 7-8, 10, 12]” seems to be used in a way roughly equivalent to “weak faith” in Romans 14.

On this view the gravity and sin of being led to act against one’s own conviction consists in rebellion against what, to one’s own mind, is God’s will and thus no

²²⁹ Romans 9-16, 827-829. He refers especially to “the fact that *ἐκ πίστεως* is one of Paul’s characteristic ways of referring to this thematic world . . . (1:17 twice; 3:26, 30; 4:16 twice; 5:1, 9:30, 32; 10:6)” (828).

²³⁰ “To be “weak in faith” is to fail to trust God completely and without qualification. . . . In this case the weakness is trust in God plus dietary and festival laws, trust in God dependent on observance of such practices, a trust in God which leans on the crutches of particular customs and not on God alone, as though they were an integral part of that trust” (ibid., 798).

²³¹ R. Jewett bridges the gap between these two interpretations. He equates *ἐκ πίστεως* here with the *μέτρον πίστεως* of 12:3, meaning “the norm that each person is provided in the appropriation of the grace of God,” and then combines this with understanding in the earlier chapters: “Although faith in its proper sense is the relationship of holding fast to the grace of God, it includes a measuring rod that allows for differentiation. What Paul warns against in 12:3 is either imposing that norm on others or failing to live up to it oneself” (*Christian Tolerance: Paul’s Message to the Modern Church* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982] 62, see also 65-66).

²³² On the relationship of Rom 14 and 1 Cor 8-10, concluding that they represent divergent concrete occasions, see N. Schneider, *Die “Schwachen”*, 50-61; and the thorough discussion and bibliography by G. D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) 357-363.

longer living $\tau\hat{\omega}$ $\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$. Such faithfulness to the will of one's lord has already been demonstrated as the criterion of the coming Judgment (vv 4, 10-12; see above). As in chapter 6 the possibility is once again contemplated that a believer might yield anew to the rule of sin resulting in eschatological condemnation and destruction.²³³

CONCLUSION

Our examination of relevant judgment/recompense texts in Romans has confirmed our interpretation of the motif in 2:6-11. Paul did expect believers (along with all humanity) to face the final judgment according to works resulting in eternal life or divine wrath. In 14:10-12 a scene similar to 2:6-11 is painted, stressing not perfect law-keeping or merit, but consistent living $\tau\hat{\omega}$ $\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$. Nor does Rom 8:1 contradict this expectation since freedom from the condemning slavery to Sin is made dependent upon walking according to the Spirit.

When Paul speaks of being judged according to works, this does not have a legalistic connotation (weighing good deeds against bad deeds), but operates within the framework of what has been termed covenantal nomism. Although Rom 4:4-5 is not infrequently taken to mean that Paul's message of faith-righteousness must be interpreted against a backdrop of Jewish legalism, we found that he is operating with the same dichotomy as in chapters 1-3—faith in Christ versus law-works (Jewish boundary markers). In continuity with his covenantal-nomistic background, Paul expected those incorporated into the people of God by grace to continue in obedience to God rather than to Sin (6:15-23), to fulfill the just requirement of the law (8:4), and to live to the Lord according to their conscience (14:1-23). Consistent failure (not temporary backsliding or occasional failure), obeying unrighteousness instead of righteousness, will bring eternal death (6:23) and ruin (14:15, 20-23). Obedience cannot *earn* life or salvation, but it remains nevertheless the evidential basis or norm for the final verdict.

²³³ Likewise Phil 3:12-14, 18-19; 1 Cor 8:11; 9:24-27. See L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 112-120.

At the same time, we have discovered significant points of *discontinuity* between Paul and Judaism. Most obviously, faith in Christ replaces submission to the Torah (law-works) as *the definitive identifier* of who does, or does not, belong to the people of God. This does not in any way diminish for Paul the importance of *works*, understood as obedience to God's will, within the process of salvation. At this point, in fact, Paul radicalized the motif of judgment according to works beyond what Judaism was typically prepared to do—namely, to apply this standard of judgment with complete impartiality to both Jew and Gentile, thus exposing Jewish boasting as presumption upon God's kindness. Paul also places ethical righteousness much more clearly within the context of his pneumatology than was the case in Judaism, since for Paul it is precisely the Spirit which does what the Torah could not do, namely liberate from Sin's condemning slavery and produce the fulfillment of the law (8:1-4). Because of Paul's confidence in the Spirit's ability and readiness to bear fruit in the believers' lives, he could look with confidence toward the final judgment according to works; for such works, such "patient doing of the good," were but the visible manifestation ("fruit") of that righteous status granted and maintained through faith in Christ. Thus, for Paul, there was no sense of tension or antinomy between justification by faith apart from law-works, and judgment according to deeds.

CHAPTER SIX

JUDGMENT ACCORDING TO DEEDS IN 1 CORINTHIANS

1 COR 3:5-9ab

Aim

Our motif occurs in this section explicitly only in 3:8b. However the judgment statements in 3:14-15, 16-17, and 4:5 must be considered as well, both because the terminology evidences their close relation to the motif in 3:8b (the repetition of “receive reward [μισθὸν λήμψεται]” in 3:14-15 for instance), and because they shed crucial additional light on Paul’s understanding of judgment as it relates to members of the Christian community. Our aim will be to examine the wording, function, and contextual meaning of the motif and related judgment sayings, noting along the way points of continuity or discontinuity with the same features in second temple Judaism. Of particular interest theologically will be 3:14-15, since this text has become a standard proof for many that no amount of disobedience on the part of one who has been justified by faith can ever endanger that one’s ultimate salvation. Such a one shall “suffer loss” but still “be saved.” Does Paul, after all, give a nod toward the typically Protestant tension felt to exist between judgment according to works and justification by grace through faith?

Context

“There is almost universal agreement that the first major unit of 1 Corinthians runs from 1:10-4:21.”¹ The opening subsection (1:10-17) names internal “divisions” and “quarrels” as the problem at hand, whereby the Corinthians are

¹ D. W. Kuck, *Judgment*, 151; see 151-156. On the literary structure of chaps 1-4, see further, G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 47-51; and M. M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (HUT 28; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1991) 207-225.

boasting in some leaders to the denigration of others.² Thus, the letter is often viewed as Paul's attempt to *inform* and *correct* the various Corinthian parties against a backdrop of internal party strife and in response to reports and questions arising out of such divided factions.³ However, this view is increasingly coming under attack, since (a) the existence of theological "parties" in the Corinthian church is questionable,⁴ (b) the language and style of the letter are generally more rhetorical and combative than we would expect if Paul were simply informing and correcting, and (c) with only a few exceptions, the letter does not address separate factions but the church as a whole.⁵ Instead what we discern is a developing conflict between Paul himself and the church at Corinth, relating both to his apostolic authority⁶ and his kerygma.⁷ It appears that some of the Corinthians view themselves as *spiritual ones* [πνευματικός],⁸ but are not so sure about Paul, who has not exhibited the power, prerogatives or wisdom of a truly spiritual leader-teacher.

After an initial appeal to the church to cease their disagreements and quarrels regarding the merits of various leaders, Paul turns immediately to the underlying error in their thinking -- an exaltation of "eloquent [human] wisdom" which empties

² "I belong to Paul," "I belong to Apollos"; see also 3:21, "So let no one boast about human leaders."

³ For an overview of scholarly opinion, see J. C. Hurd; *The Origin of I Corinthians*² (Macon, GA: 1983) esp. 97-105.

⁴ J. Munck; *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (London: SCM, 1959) esp. chap 5 ("The Church Without Factions: Studies in I Corinthians 1-4"); S. M. Pogoloff, *Logos and Sophia: The Rhetorical Situation of I Corinthians* (SBLDS 134; Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1992) 99-104, but acknowledging divisions along social-rhetorical lines (173-196).

⁵ For additional detail and bibliography on these points as well as the view of the letter's background adopted here, see G. D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 4-15. For a recent defense of the view that Paul is dealing with "factions" in 1 Cor, see M. M. Mitchell, *Paul*, 1, and n. 2. (However, her view is not so much that Paul is attacking identifiable "factions" or "parties," but "factionalism"; see esp. chap III.)

⁶ 2:1-5; 4:1-5, 8-21; 9:1-23.

⁷ Both the theology (1:18-31; 15:1-58) and the ethics (chaps 5-8, 10-14) of his gospel are being challenged.

⁸ 2:6-16; 3:1; 14:37.

his message of its power (1:17). This message of the cross of Christ is opposed to the wisdom of this world (1:18-25), something evidenced both by God's choice of the Corinthians who were weak and foolish in the world's eyes (1:26-31), as well as by Paul's original preaching which was without persuasive words of wisdom, yet with divine power and results (2:1-5). Ultimately, of course, God's wisdom is indeed wise not foolish, but this is discerned only through the Spirit by those who are spiritual (2:6-16). Here Paul wrests the label *πνευματικός* away from those who would tie it to a form of worldly wisdom [*σωφία*], binding it instead to "the mind of Christ" (2:16).

Chapter 3:1-4 is a transitional paragraph connecting the foregoing discussion of wisdom to the problem of boasting in various leaders. Far from being wise, the Corinthians reveal themselves by their boasting to be immature and fleshly. Then over against their notion of attachment to a particular wise leader,⁹ Paul unfolds his view of Christian teachers/leaders (3:5-23), emphasizing that they are servants of God, and to be valued equally (in spite of diversity), though the servants themselves must be careful to build in accordance with the one gospel foundation (= Christ). Thus neither worldly wisdom (3:19-20) nor boasting in persons (3:21) have any place, but only Christ (3:21b-23).

Then in chapter four Paul turns to the issue which has been beneath the surface all along, his own apostolic relationship to the church at Corinth. As God's servant, a judgment upon his service lies in God's hands, not theirs (4:1-5). With biting sarcasm he contrasts their expectation of worldly wisdom and power right now ("Already you have all you want!" v 8) with his apostolic weakness and suffering which identify him with Christ (4:6-13). He concludes with the reminder that he alone is their "father through the gospel" (4:15) and a warning against arrogance in

⁹ The history of religions background of the Corinthians' viewpoint remains much disputed. See, for instance, J. A. Davis, *Wisdom and Spirit: An Investigation of 1 Corinthians 1:18-3:20 Against the Background of Jewish Sapiential Traditions in the Greco-Roman Period* (Lanham/New York/London: University Press of America, 1984) = Hellenistic Judaism; and W. Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth, An Investigation of the Letters to the Corinthians* (ET; Nashville: Abingdon, 1971) = Gnosticism.

the light of his planned coming (4:18-21).

Exegesis: 1 Cor 3:5-9ab

Having exposed their false view of who is really wise and scolded their fleshly attachment to supposedly wise teachers, Paul now sets forth his view of Christian leadership in a series of three metaphors (vv 5-9ab, 9c-15, 16-17), with the goal of his argumentation made clear again in v 21, “So let no one boast about human leaders” (cf. also 3:3). He begins by singling out Apollos and himself as a case study “so that none of you will be puffed up in favor of one [Apollos] against another [Paul]” (4:6).¹⁰ The opening question raises the issue of comparative status—“What, then, is Apollos? What is Paul?” (3:5). That is, “as what (or “with what sort of status”) should one regard them?”¹¹ In contrast to the Corinthians’ proclivity to evaluate them as competing itinerant philosophers, Paul calls them servants [διδάκονοι, v 5] and co-workers [συνεργοί, v 9] in God’s field, the church.¹² Thus, he can answer the question as to comparative status—“So neither the one who plants [Paul] nor the one who waters [Apollos] is anything, but only God who gives growth” (v 7). In comparison to the true source of growth, the servants cannot lay claim to great status. How foolish for the Corinthians to be quarreling about whether one belongs to Paul or to Apollos. The conclusion (v 9a) captures the heart of the entire argument,¹³ Paul and Apollos are laborers together¹⁴ (not in competition) in

¹⁰ This holds true regardless of how one chooses to translate the notoriously difficult phrase in 4:6b—τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται (“Nothing beyond what is written,” NRSV). In any case the second *ἵνα*-clause expresses the purpose of the previous metaphors. See G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 166, n. 6.

¹¹ The answer to this question (οὐτε . . . ἐστίν τι, v 7) is decisive for reading τί . . . ἐστίν (“what is”) rather than τίς (“who”) in v 5. See G. Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles* (London: 1953) 131-132. On the use of ἐστίν τι as a term of status used especially in comparing one person to another as more important or superior, see Gal 2:6; 6:3; Acts 5:36.

¹² The wide-spread popularity of agricultural metaphors in both Hellenistic and Jewish circles cautions against seeking the background of the field-metaphor [γεώργιον] in the OT imagery of Israel as vineyard. See E. M. Embry, *NIDNTT*, 3.865-867; and G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 131.

¹³ Some interpreters take v 9a as explanatory [γάρ] of either (i) v 8a (apostles are “one” because co-workers with/for God [H. Lietzmann, *Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus I*, 93]), or (ii) v 8b (as God’s co-workers they may expect to be rewarded for their labor [C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, (HNTC; New York: Harper & Row, 1968) 86; and R. Heiligenthal, *Werke*, 211]). Our arguments in favor of (ii) can be found below. Nevertheless, the fact that *συνεργοί* and

God's field, the church; and most importantly, as such they are God's workers in God's field.

The relative insignificance of the human workers certainly does not, however, make them altogether worthless. It was, after all, "through [them] you came to believe" (v 5). Their respective status, like their differing tasks and abilities, can be determined not by comparing them with one another—as co-workers in a common task they are "one" (NRSV: "they have a common purpose," v 8)¹⁵—but only in relation to their Master. It is "as the Lord assigned to each" (v 5b).¹⁶ Paul is perfectly ready to acknowledge individually differing achievements (v 8b), but this gives no occasion for exalting one servant over another (v 9a).

How then does the recompense statement of v 8b function within this argument?

and each will receive wages according to the labor of each. (NRSV)

ἕκαστος δὲ τὸν ἴδιον μισθὸν λήμψεται κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον κόπον.

Many commentators have found this phrase disturbing to the flow of the argument, contending that it can be no more than a parenthetical thought, with the emphasis on unity before God (vv 6-8a) carried on smoothly in v 9a: "for we are God's servants,

γεώργιον explicitly reiterate the metaphor of vv 5-8, and the possibility that the emphatic *θεοῦ* is intended as a direct counter to the Corinthian slogans, allow v 9a to function as both the logical explanation of v 8b and an encapsulation of the point of vv 5-8.

¹⁴ Although "we are laborers together with God" (KJV) is a possible translation of *θεοῦ ἐσμεν συνεργοί*, the immediately following *θεοῦ γεώργιον, θεοῦ οἰκοδομή* clearly favors taking the genitive as a possessive—"co-laborers in God's service" (cf. 4:1, *ὑπηρέτας Χριστοῦ*). This creates a stark contrast with the Corinthian slogans, and corresponds to Paul's general usage of *συνεργός* as a designation for his pupils and companions (cf. Bertram, *TDNT*, 7.874; and M. M. Mitchell, *Paul*, 98-99), and thus corresponds also to *διάκονοι* (v 5). D. Kuck seeks to combine the two senses of the genitive (*Judgment*, 165).

¹⁵ Gk. *ἐν εἰσιν* speaks of the "unity of the church's task" (H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975] 74, n. 49). This is preferable to seeing a reference to "equality" (RSV) or "inseparability" (Lietzmann). See further G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 133; and M. M. Mitchell, *Paul*, 90, n. 141.

¹⁶ That this phrase has reference to the differing tasks given to each by the Lord, rather than to the faith given to each believer (v 5a, KJV), is confirmed by the immediately following reference to those differing assignments—"I planted. Apollos watered" (v 6a).

workers together.”¹⁷ Others find it surprising or obscure in its relation to the context.¹⁸ However, both of these views miss the dynamic at work in Paul’s argument, which must stress not only the leaders’ relative *unimportance* and *equality* before God (against the divisive Corinthian boasting), but likewise their individual *accountability* to God alone for the legitimate *diversity* of task.¹⁹ This individuality and diversity of the workers, which forms the basis of the Corinthians’ quarrels, must be somehow sustained by the apostle if he is to defend his unique position as founder (3:6-7) and father (4:14-17) of the church, yet without allowing it to remain a basis for human comparison and division.

Perhaps the place of v 8b in the argument can be better seen if the verses are arranged chiastically.²⁰ Verses 5a and 9ab are not part of this structure, but function as an opening and conclusion to the sub-section:

(Opening question) What then is Apollos? What is Paul? (v 5a)

A Servants through whom you came to believe,
 as the Lord assigned to *each*. (v 5b)

B I *planted*, Apollos *watered*,
 but *God* gave the *growth*. (v 6)

B’ So neither the one who *plants* nor the one who *waters* is anything,
 but only *God* who gives the *growth*. (v 7)

A’ The one who plants and the one who waters have a common purpose,
 and *each* will receive wages according to the labor of *each*. (v 8)

(Conclusion) For we are God’s servants, working together; you are God’s field.” (v 9ab)

The clearly-paralleled central lines (B-B’) express the main point of Paul’s argument; diverse gifts among the laborers are no cause for division or boasting since all

¹⁷ J. Moffatt, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians* (MNTC; London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1938) 39; H. Lietzmann, *Die Briefe*, 92; H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 74. See also n. 13 above.

¹⁸ W. Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (EKKNT 7/1; Zürich: Benziger, 1991) 292, n. 88; G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 133.

¹⁹ So Kuck, “the individual differences will be confirmed by God’s future judgment” (*Judgment*, 164). Kuck’s analysis supports ours in seeing a two-fold thrust in vv 5-9a (*unity* and *uniqueness*, 164-167). This stress on individual accountability is further confirmed by the five occurrences of ἕκαστος (3:5, 8, 13[2x]; 4:5).

²⁰ Whether one wishes to classify vv 5b-8 as a literary *chiasm* is unimportant to the point we are making, which is concerned primarily with the *thematic echo* of v 5b found in v 8ab (see below). On NT chiastic structures in general, see N. W. Lund, *Chiasmus in the New Testament* (Chapel Hill: 1942); and on 1 Cor 3:5-17, *idem.*, “The Significance of Chiasmus for Interpretation,” *Crozer Quarterly* 20 (1943) 113-114 [quite different from our reconstruction, however].

that really counts comes ultimately from God alone. The lines A-A' do not exhibit the same degree of terminological linkage (only "each"-“each”), but one can discern a thematic echo. In both vv 5b and 8, the first line recognizes their sharing in a common task, while the second line stresses their individual accountability for the diverse tasks assigned to them:

V 5b

Servants
through whom you came to believe

to each
as the Lord assigned

V 8

The one who plants and the one who waters
have a common purpose,

and each
will receive wages according to the labor of each.

Thus, while Paul's primary concern in this passage is to eliminate diverse abilities as a grounds for fleshly comparison and boasting (B-B'), he cannot eliminate such recognizable diversity altogether, but instead must set it within the context of accountability to the Lord (A-A'), and thus take it out of the realm of fleshly comparisons. Viewed in this manner, the motif of recompense according to labor is not an interruption, but is the structurally expected thematic echo of v 5b.²¹

Furthermore, this connection with v 5b helps clarify the *function* of the motif in this passage. Just as the diverse assignments of Paul and Apollos are traced to the prerogative of the κύριος in v 5b, thereby providing a bulwark against fleshly assessments; so likewise in v 8b their diverse wages will have to await the future pay-day according to individual labor, the payment of which belongs (implicitly) to the same Lord. Although the master's prerogative to determine and distribute appropriate wages is only *implicit* in the motif itself, this point is made *explicit* in v 9a ("For we are God's servants, working together"). θεοῦ is in the leading, emphatic position, laying stress on the fact that the servants belong to God; i.e., he alone can determine and distribute individually appropriate wages.²²

²¹ L. Mattern's view is similar, "mit V.8b schliesst Paulus den Kreis: Sagte V.5b, dass der Herr jeden einzeln zum Dienst begabt habe, dann sagt V.8b, dass jeder einzelne seinen eigenen Lohn nach seiner eigenen Arbeit erhalten werde" (*Verständnis*, 169-170).

²² E. Fascher, *Brief*, 133. See also the discussion of this same prerogative in Rom 14:10-12 (chap. 5 above).

This also explains the unusual two-fold use of ἴδιος (“one’s own”), something the NRSV translation obscures. Literally one would have to render the motif here:

each will receive *his/her own* wage according to *his/her own* labor.

Rather than an equal or common [κοινός] wage, each receives τὸν ἴδιον μισθόν, meaning a wage peculiar to that individual or according to his/her particular effort.²³ This two-fold ἴδιος appears to be Paul’s own addition to the motif-tradition and indicates his particular concern at this point—the determination of the recompense (or status in the Corinthian situation) appropriate to the diverse assignments and labors of leaders like Paul and Apollos must be reserved for God. Thus, the motif serves to restrain intra-community judgment, a function we find elsewhere in Paul and in second temple Judaism.²⁴

Up to this point we have assumed that v 8b contains the motif of divine recompense according to deeds in spite of the fact that “God” is not named as subject, and the typical words for “recompense” or “judge” and “works” are absent. Paul is not citing or alluding to any known formulation of the motif. Nevertheless, we are suggesting that Paul here takes up that same motif-tradition,²⁵ formulating it in an unusual but not wholly unprecedented manner, and demonstrating theological tendencies which we see mostly in later rabbinic literature.

The lack of explicit reference to God as the subject of the recompensing activity is not crucial in this instance. As we suggested above, the future “will receive reward” implies the distribution of wages by the servant’s master. Just as the “Lord” assigns a differing task to each (v 5b), so he will grant to each the

²³ In Koine Greek ἴδιος was generally little more than a simple possessive pronoun or reflexive adjective (=ἐαυτοῦ/αὐτοῦ). However, the classical meaning—“peculiar, private” (opposite κοινός)—can still be found in the NT (Acts 4:32; 1 Cor 3:8; 7:7; 12:11; 15:38; Tit 1:12; Heb 7:27), and is favored by grammarians for this text; see *BDF*, §286(1), and N. Turner, *Syntax*, 191-192.

²⁴ Rom 12:19; 14:10-12; 1 Cor 4:4b; CD IX,2-5; 1QS X,17b-18; 2 Enoch 50:3-4; T.Gad 6-7; Ps.Phoc. 76-78; Jos.Asen. 28:10, 14.

²⁵ The linguistic criteria identifying motif-occurrences are given on pp. 30-31 above.

appropriate pay (v 8b), for God is the master of each partner (v 9a). The same terminology [μισθὸν λήμψεται] recurs in v 14b, clearly in the context of God's fiery judgment Day (see on v 13 [ἡ ἡμέρα] below). In addition, reference may be made to 4:5b where this future reception of reward is expressed in different terminology ("Then each one will receive commendation [ὁ ἔπαινος γενήσεται ἐκάστῳ]"), but in this case explicitly "from God [ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ]."

This precise expression of the verbal component in terms of "to *receive* reward [μισθὸν λήμψεσθαι]" appears to be unique to 1 Cor 3:8b and 14b among motif-occurrences.²⁶ Of course, apart from our motif, and without a standard ("according to . . ."), the phrase "to receive/have a wage" carried a straightforward economic meaning,²⁷ which could then be applied figuratively to the religious sphere:

Whoever welcomes a prophet in the name of a prophet will receive a prophet's reward [μισθὸν προφήτου λήμψεται]; and whoever welcomes a righteous person in the name of a righteous person will receive the reward of the righteous [μισθὸν δικαίου λήμψεται] (Matt 10:41).²⁸

Of particular interest in this regard is 2 John 8, which, much like 1 Cor 3:8b, combines this figurative use of the phrase with human works:

Be on your guard, so that you do not lose what we²⁹ have worked for, but may receive a full reward.

Thus Paul's terminology here might be easily explained as the combining of this commercial phraseology with the ideas of equivalent recompense.

²⁶ See Prov 11:21 (LXX; not a motif-occurrence): "The one who sows righteousness shall receive a faithful reward [λήμψεται μισθὸν πιστόν]"; and the very similar ἀπολήμψεσθε τὴν ἀνταπόδοσιν in Col 3:24.

²⁷ See for instance John 4:36 (though used figuratively); Eccl 4:9; 9:5. This was also true in classical Greek (LSJ, 1137).

²⁸ Cf. also μισθὸν ἔχειν (Matt 5:46; 6:1) and ἀπέχειν (Matt 6:2, 5, 16). Its opposite is "to lose one's reward" (Matt 10:42; Mark 9:41).

²⁹ The variant, "what you have worked for [εἰργάσασθε]," would make the connection to the motif of recompense according to deeds even closer (=receive what you have done). However, in spite of strong external support, this reading is less probable on transcriptional and internal grounds (B. M. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 721).

Paul, however, was not the originator of such a combination. A similar expression can be found in Sir 16:14b.³⁰

(12) As great as his mercy, so also is his reproof;
he will judge a person according to their deeds.

(13) The sinner will not escape with plunder,
and the patience of the godly will not be frustrated.

(14) He will make room for every act of mercy;
each will receive [lit. "find"] in accordance with their deeds."

(14b) ἕκαστος κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ εὕρησει.

Like Paul, Sirach uses this formulation to speak of God's *positive* benefits which await the righteous in the future. One other text which speaks of future divine recompense (punishment) according to deeds in terms of "receiving" is 1 Enoch 100:7,³¹

because you shall receive according to your deeds.
ὅτι κομιεῖσθε κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ὑμῶν.³²

Thus, although unusual, it does appear that the righteous "receiving [reward] according to their deeds" could substitute for the more typical "God will recompense them according to deeds." It may also be the case that the increasing use of passive constructions in second temple Judaism ("shall be recompensed/judged") shaded over eventually into "shall receive."³³

Paul's use of the term "reward/wage [μισθός]" deserves special attention at this juncture, since it testifies to his belief in a *positive* reward to the righteous according to their deeds, and may hint at a belief in *varying* rewards. As we noted earlier, it is all too common in NT scholarship to pass over the common every-day meanings of Greek words in favor of more religious meanings.³⁴ In this instance,

³⁰ See above pp. 56-57 on this text.

³¹ See on this text pp. 95-97 above. Cf. also 1 Enoch 102:8b, "What will they receive?"

³² This text is of particular interest because Paul will elsewhere use κομιοῦσθαι ("receive [pay, wages]") in the motif (2 Cor 5:10; Col 3:25; [Eph 6:8]).

³³ See p. 117 (esp. n. 162) above; also 1 Enoch 95:5; 100:7 (Heb.); PssSol 17:8; Obad 15; Prov 19:17 (LXX, vl.).

³⁴ See above, p. 231, and n. 153.

μισθός (=wage) will have been suggested to Paul's mind by the metaphor of agricultural workers (vv 5-8), and should not immediately be understood with reference to some sort of heavenly 'rewards.' Nevertheless, the obvious interplay and alternation in the text between this metaphor and the reality in Corinth³⁵ suggest that Paul may indeed be willing to carry the metaphor of 'wages' into the theological realm. The OT was certainly not averse to speaking of Yahweh's wage/reward to those who serve him.³⁶ Ruth 2:12, examined above, equates the divine recompense according to deeds with receiving "a full reward [μισθός; שכר (pay, wage)] from the Lord." However, while the belief in Israel's 'reward' continued unabated in the second temple period,³⁷ we have traced a firm resistance to speaking of this positive reward with the terminology of our motif, i.e., as being given "according to deeds."³⁸ One explanation, suggested especially by the Qumran literature, lies in the heightened sense of unworthiness among the righteous produced by the situation of exile and oppression, yet without lessening the sense that such rewards, though originating in God's grace, will ultimately be given only to those who deserve them by faithful obedience. By the time represented in the rabbinic literature, however, this hesitation has been overcome, and the rabbis once again speak of the rewards of obedience corresponding to deeds, or in terms of 'measure for measure,' yet without falling prey to mechanical or mercenary excesses—"Gemäß der Mühe ist der Lohn."³⁹ Paul's readiness here and elsewhere to speak of believers' *reward(s)*

³⁵ Cf. "I planted, Apollos watered;" "through whom you came to believe;" and the repeated reference to "God".

³⁶ Gen 15:1; 30:18; Num 18:31; Isa 40:10; 62:11; Jer 31:16 (LXX, 38:16). See R. M. Fuller, *A Pauline Understanding of Rewards*, 16-107.

³⁷ Tob 4:5-11, 14; 4 Ezra 7:83; 8:33, 39; 13:56; 2 Bar 52:7; 54:16; 59:2; Jos. *Antiquities*, 1.183; 18.309; Philo *Leg.All.* 1.80; *Som.* 2.34, 38. The texts fluctuate somewhat between mundane and eschatological rewards, but more and more "the reward is the eternal blessing, the heavenly paradise, eternal life" (p. 120, n. 178). See also D. Kuck, *Judgment*, 64-65; E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 118-119; and L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 32-35.

³⁸ See p. 207, n. 89 (with references to earlier chapters).

³⁹ Aboth 5:23 (*Str-B* 3.333). See A. Melinek, "The Doctrine of Reward and Punishment in Biblical and Early Rabbinic Writings," *Essays Presented to Chief Rabbi Israel Brodie* (ed. H. J. Zimmels; London: 1967) 275-290, esp. 285-287; and M. Brocke, "Tun und Lohn im nachbiblischen Judentum: Ein Diskussionsbeitrag," *BibLeb* 8 (1967) 167-168. Brocke suggests that this renaissance

according to their deeds may be taken as evidence that this rabbinic tendency was present already in the first century.

But what of the idea that rewards are seen here to vary as appropriate to the varied work of each?⁴⁰ We have argued above that Paul's two-fold addition of ἴδιος is testimony to his concern to stress the diversity of tasks and appropriate rewards. The reward of each is individually appropriate to one's labor [κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον κόπον]. Paul's argument at this stage hinges upon the belief that the meting out of appropriate, individually diverse, wages lies within the prerogative of God alone. The situation in Judaism with respect to *varied rewards* corresponds to what we discovered above regarding 'rewards according to deeds.' The OT Pseudepigrapha and the Qumran literature give no evidence of a belief in differing rewards, in most cases 'reward' being another way of describing salvation, or life's blessings in the age to come.⁴¹ Rabbinic Judaism, on the other hand, spoke of great rewards for great obedience and small rewards for lesser obedience, and of particular rewards being connected with particular commandments (though these were not made explicit in the Torah in order to avoid encouraging obedience to some commandments over others).⁴² In this respect as well Paul shows his affinity with tendencies that will flower in Rabbinic Judaism in the use of the motif.⁴³ Kuck has demonstrated, fur-

of 'rewards according to deeds' is a reaction to Epicurean and Sadducean teachings about divine indifference to human activity (168).

⁴⁰ Favoring graded rewards: H. Braun, *Gerichtsgedanke*, 52-53; F. Filson, *Recompense*, 106; R. M. Fuller, *Rewards*, 221-229; D. W. Kuck, *Judgment*, 168; W. Pesch, "Der Sonderlohn für die Verkündiger des Evangeliums," *Festschrift für J. Schmid: Neutestamentliche Aufsätze* (ed. J. Blinzler and O. Kuss; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1963) 199-206; H. Preisker, *TDNT* 4.700; H.-D. Wendland, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*⁴ (NTD 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1946) 23. Against: L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 178. No decision possible: G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 143; W. Schrage, *Brief*, 293, n. 90; E. Synofzik, *Vergeltungsaussagen*, 41.

⁴¹ See n. 37 above.

⁴² G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, 2.92-93; D. Kuck, *Judgment*, 64-65; P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde*, 404-405; A. Melinek, "Reward and Punishment," 285-287.

⁴³ Attempts to tease out fundamental differences between Paul and Rabbinic Judaism at this point are specious. L. Mattern's interpretation of 1 Cor 3:8b relies on her portrayal of Rabbinic faith as a synergistic "Leistungsreligion" in which "die Leistung wird entlohnt." Paul, by contrast, allegedly speaks of both work and wage in terms of a passive 'receiving' (= grace) in which "der Gehorsam wird belohnt" (*Verständnis*, 170-173; original emphasis; in German, "entlohnen" carries a stronger contractual-commercial connotation than "belohnen" which is motivated by thankfulness

thermore, how the thought of variegated post-mortem rewards would have gained ready acceptance in a Greco-Roman environment.⁴⁴ However, apart from the bare *fact* of differing rewards *κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον κόπον*, we learn little here as to their precise nature.

Paul's choice of *κόπος* ("labor") rather than the more usual *ἔργον* should likewise occasion no surprise, since it was an appropriate term in connection with the agricultural metaphor,⁴⁵ and was also a favored term of his to refer to specifically apostolic labors.⁴⁶ In spite of the fact that *κόπος*, unlike the broader term *ἔργον*, usually refers to heavy, laborious work, there is no indication that the *effort* or *toil* involved in such work is central to the usage here.⁴⁷ Pesch argues for a distinct apostolic reward on the basis of this text, an "aureola doctorum" which elsewhere consists of the "corona discipulorum."⁴⁸ However, the return to *ἔργον* (vv 13-15) and the expansion beyond strictly apostolic labors (vv 9b-17) argue against this interpretation.⁴⁹

While it is most likely that Paul envisioned this varied recompense as being granted at the eschatological Judgment, this notion remains entirely in the background in this particular text.⁵⁰ Paul's sole concern in this instance is to stress the

rather than contractual obligation). This both misrepresents Rabbinic religion in order to make Paul look superior, and ignores Paul's own language and metaphor of a pay-day.

⁴⁴ *Judgment*, 143-144; 233-234.

⁴⁵ The verb [*κοπιᾶω*] is used this way in 2 Tim 2:6. See further, F. Hauck, *TDNT* 3.827-830.

⁴⁶ A. von Harnack, "Κόπος (*Κοπιᾶν*, *Οἱ Κοπιῶντες*) im frühchristlichen Sprachgebrauch," *ZNW* 27 (1928) 1-10.

⁴⁷ H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 74, n. 51. *Ἔργον* replaces *κόπος* in vv 13-15.

⁴⁸ "Sonderlohn," 199-206.

⁴⁹ A parallel to Paul's usage is found in Wis 10:17—"She [Wisdom] gave to holy people the reward of their labors [*μισθὸν κόπων ἁγίων*]."

⁵⁰ An eschatological recompense is made explicit at 3:14 and 4:5. Nor is it really part of Paul's purpose in 3:8b to argue that such recompense will have to wait until the eschatological judgment (*pace* D. Kuck, *Judgment*, 170). Paul's rhetorical goal revolves around the divine prerogative to recompense, and holds true regardless of the timing of this recompense.

divine prerogative in determining and distributing varied wages to his servants, and thereby to deny to the Corinthians this right.

1 COR 3:9c-15

This text has played a central role in a number of different Christian debates over issues of soteriology. In certain traditions of popular piety it is the key passage demonstrating that “how I build my own Christian life on Christ” cannot affect ultimate salvation (only the degree of reward). Closely related are Calvinist-Arminian debates over eternal security. Finally, Roman Catholics have in the past found proof of purgatory here.

The change from an agricultural to an architectural metaphor is syntactically abrupt [*θεοῦ γεώργιον, θεοῦ οἰκοδομή ἐστε*], but such a linking of the two metaphors was fairly common in antiquity and would probably not have occasioned much surprise among the Corinthian hearers.⁵¹ This new subsection is a continuation of Paul’s attempt to stop their boasting in human leaders begun in v 5. However between vv 5-9ab and 9c-15 a slight shift in tone and focus is noticeable. Whereas the previous verses were more instructive and only gently admonitory, vv 9c-15 carry a much sharper tone of warning—“let each beware how s/he builds” (v 10c, my translation).⁵² Likewise vv 13-15 mention not only the promise of reward (as in v 8b) but threaten with loss as well.⁵³ Further, while the text certainly carries implications for the whole congregation’s view of their leaders, Paul is now address-

⁵¹ W. Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 294-295, nn. 102-103. On the metaphorical use of *οἰκοδομή/οἰκοδομεῖν*, see P. Vielhauer, *Oikodome: Das Bild vom Bau in der christlichen Literatur vom Neuen Testament bis Clemens Alexandrinus* (Karlsruhe-Durlach: 1939) esp. 74-81; and M. M. Mitchell, *Paul*, 99-105.

⁵² The NRSV (“Each builder must choose with care how to build on it”) loses this sharp tone of Paul’s “Let each beware [*ἕκαστος δὲ βλέπῃτω*]” (cf. 1 Cor 8:9; 10:12; 16:10; Gal 5:15; Phil 3:2; Col 2:8; also Eph 5:15).

⁵³ “energische, drohende Worte . . . an Stelle der verbindlichen, kollegialen Ausführungen im Vorhergehenden” (J. Weiß, *Der erste Korintherbrief*¹⁰ [MeyerK 5; Göttingen: 1925] 78; cited in L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 170, n. 537).

ing a warning more specifically to the Corinthian leaders and wisdom teachers.⁵⁴ The rather detailed judgment imagery of vv 12-15 lends weight to Paul's warning, stressing that "how" one builds the church carries with it eschatological reward or loss. Although the architectural metaphor is, to a certain extent, carried forward in vv 16-17, the introduction of "temple" terminology, as well as the heightened sharpness of the warning ("God will destroy that person"), have led most commentators to view these two verses as a new thought (but see below).

Our attention will focus on vv 12-15 where Paul expands upon his warning (v 10c) by describing in terms of eschatological judgment the consequences for those who are building upon his foundation in Corinth.

(12) Now if anyone builds on the foundation with gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, straw— (13) the work of each builder will become visible, for the Day will disclose it, because it will be revealed with fire, and the fire will test what sort of work each has done. (14) If what has been built on the foundation survives, the builder will receive a reward. (15) If the work is burned up, the builder will suffer loss; the builder will be saved, but only as through fire.

Six different building materials are listed whose only significance as the metaphor progresses will be their resistance to fire (vv 14-15).⁵⁵ "Take care how one builds" now means "Take care that one is building with imperishable materials," i.e., that one's work will survive at the judgment.

What then is the criterion by which their work of edifying the church will be deemed perishable or imperishable? The answer, according to v 11, is consistency with the sole possible foundation of the church, Jesus Christ. Paul's foundational message of Christ crucified operates as a yardstick for all further builders (and by

⁵⁴ Whereas vv 9 and 16 explicitly address the whole congregation, vv 9c-15 clearly address those in the congregation (ἄλλος, ἕκαστος[3x], τίς[3x]) engaged in "building upon [ἐποικοδομεῖν]" Paul's foundation of Christ crucified. See D. W. Kuck, *Judgment*, 172; G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 136; F. L. Godet, *Commentary on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians* (trans. A. Cusin; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clarke, 1886 [reprinted: Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1977]) 180.

⁵⁵ See H. W. Hollander, "The Testing by Fire of the Builders' Works: 1 Corinthians 3.10-15," *NTS* 40 (1994) 93-95, esp. nn. 19-20; G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 140; W. Schrage, *Korinther*, 298-300; otherwise E. Fascher, *Der erste Brief*, 135. Although a "descending scale of values" is, perhaps, evident in Paul's list, he makes nothing of the element of costliness in the unfolding metaphor, referring only to their susceptibility to being "burned up."

implication for the congregation's evaluation of its leaders).⁵⁶ This all harks back to Paul's earlier discussion pitting God's wisdom in the message of Christ crucified over against all forms of human wisdom. That such was in his mind is probably confirmed by his reference to himself as a "wise master builder [σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων]," that is, as the one who had begun the work in accordance with the wisdom [σοφία] of God.⁵⁷

In v 13, through a series of phrases, Paul stresses that each builder's choice of materials will be revealed at the eschatological judgment Day.⁵⁸ Thus each builder's work will become known,⁵⁹ being tested by the fire that accompanies the day of judgment in order to determine "what sort of work [τὸ ἔργον ὁποῖόν]" one has done.⁶⁰ As consistently throughout the metaphor this "work [ἔργον, sg.]" refers to both the *process* of building (i.e., their choice of perishable or imperishable building materials)⁶¹ and the *product* resulting from this activity.⁶² This strongly revelatory function of the judgment Day is brought out by the verbs "disclose

⁵⁶ D. W. Kuck and some other commentators misread Paul's purpose in vv 10-15: "Paul places great stress on the final revealing of the work of each person in order to remind the spiritually over-zealous and competitive Corinthians that only at God's judgment can works be given their full due" (*Judgment*, 186). However, rather than postponing judgment, Paul is urging the Corinthian teachers to apply now the right criterion—Christ versus human wisdom—to make certain now that they are building upon the foundation properly.

⁵⁷ Although σοφός may be translated "skilled" (NRSV) or "expert" (NIV), this fails to alert the English reader to the renewed presence of the wisdom theme here (C. K. Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 86). On this relation of 3:5-17 to the earlier wisdom discussion in chaps 1-2, see J. A. Davis, *Wisdom*, 131-136.

⁵⁸ On Paul's use of the absolute ἡ ἡμέρα for the Day of the Lord (= Christ's parousia and the final Judgment), see G. Dellings, *TDNT*, 2.943-953.

⁵⁹ Φανερόν γενήσεται = become visible, open, manifest.

⁶⁰ Generally "testing [δοκιμάζειν]" can refer to either "purifying" or "testing" (i.e., determination of quality); cf. 1 Pet 1:7; Prov 17:3; Wis 3:6. Here the substances are not "purified" or "refined" but are "tested" and judged as to their imperishability. On "fire" as an element in eschatological judgment, see F. Lang, *TDNT*, 6.928-952.

⁶¹ Πῶς ἐποικοδομεῖ (v 10b).

⁶² Τὸ ἔργον ὃ ἐποικοδόμησεν (v 14). A few commentators favor viewing ἔργον as the persons converted or influenced by the Corinthian teachers, but it is difficult to imagine that Paul wished to say such teachers could lead others into destruction and themselves be saved.

[δηλώσει]" and "reveal [ἀποκαλύπτεται]." ⁶³ Both judgment *qua* disclosure and the unitary understanding of one's work (sg.) are central features of judgment in second temple Judaism, ⁶⁴ and point up once again that Paul is not thinking of a weighing of individual deeds. ⁶⁵

Verses 14-15 detail the consequences for those who built well or poorly. At this fiery judgment their work will either remain (*μενεῖ*=survives the fire)⁶⁶ or will be burned up (*κατακαήσεται*). Those who have taught and ministered in a manner compatible with the Pauline kerygma, and thus whose "gold, silver, and precious stones" survive the test by fire, "will receive a reward [*μισθὸν λήμψεται*]." This echoes what was already said at 3:8 about recompense for faithful service, but here without the stress on differentiation. The nature of this promised eschatological wage is left unspecified (though on its relation to "salvation," see below). Attempts have been made to fill out the meaning of this reward by importing ideas found elsewhere in Paul. These include *praise*,⁶⁷ *union with converts at the parousia*,⁶⁸ *supe-*

⁶³ The same note of revealing and disclosure (of secrets) at the judgment Day can be found in Rom 2:16. See also 2 Cor 5:10, "all of us must appear [*φανερωθῆναι*] before the judgment seat of Christ." Although "work" might conceivably be the subject of the compact *ὅτι ἐν πυρὶ ἀποκαλύπτεται*, "the day" lies closer at hand, which also avoids any redundancy with v 13d (see C. K. Barrett, *First Epistle*, 88; for the opposite view, H. W. Hollander, "Testing by Fire," 97, n. 31). Thus "fire" is both the accompanying phenomenon and the instrument of judgment.

⁶⁴ See 4 Ezra 7:35; 1 Enoch 45:3; 100:10; 2 Enoch 44:5; 2 Bar 83:2-3; also 2 Clem 16:3; Hermas Sim. 4:3.

⁶⁵ R. Heiligenthal, *Werke*, 212. C. W. Fishburne's thesis of literary dependence on T.Abr. 13 has found few proponents in spite of the striking similarities of the two texts ("1 Cor. iii.10-15 and the Testament of Abraham," *NTS* 17 [1970] 109-115; critical: D. W. Kuck, *Judgment*, 89-92, 184; H. W. Hollander, "Testing by Fire," 90-102; N. Turner, *The Testament of Abraham: A Study of the Original Language, Place of Origin, Authorship, and Relevance* [unpub. Ph.D. diss.; London: 1953] esp. 14-48).

⁶⁶ *Herm. Vis.* 4.3.4; *Did.* 16:5.

⁶⁷ Cf. 1 Cor 4:5; see G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 143, n. 42.

⁶⁸ R. Pesch, "Sonderlohn." While he may well be correct in seeing such a special apostolic reward in those passages which speak of a "crown," "boast," "joy," etc. (e.g., 1 Thess 2:19-20 and Phil 4:1), his evidence for including 1 Cor 3 as Paul's only use of *μισθός* in this sense is not convincing. It is not, strictly speaking, the apostolic work of winning new believers and organizing them into faith-communities that is in view in 3:10-15, but the more general work of "building upon" that apostolic foundation—leading, teaching, shepherding. Pesch admits as much when he says 3:9-13 is "auf alle im Dienste an der Gemeinde tätigen Männer ausgedehnt" (200).

rior privileges,⁶⁹ and the fact that the work abides.⁷⁰ However, beyond establishing the eschatological nature of the reward in this text, any attempt to specify what the apostle leaves vague will have to remain uncertain. In line with the character of a *warning*, it is not the promise, much less the nature, of the reward, but the consequences of failure that are uppermost in Paul's interest here.

The consequence for those whose work is consumed (v 15), who taught and ministered on a basis of human wisdom rather than Christ, is termed *ζημιωθήσεται* ("will suffer loss," NRSV). This word carries the sense of "suffering damage, injury or loss" and has led to two differing translations:

- a. "the builder will suffer damage," i.e., punishment,⁷¹
- b. "the builder will suffer loss," i.e., of reward.⁷²

Option (a) assumes some sort of post-mortem chastisement for believers, an idea not found elsewhere in Paul.⁷³ The other NT occurrences of *ζημιόω* favor (b) "suffer loss."⁷⁴ Further, the antithetical parallelism with "receive reward" (v 14) expects the loss of reward as its counterpart in v 15.

⁶⁹ F. Filson, *Recompense*, 115; A. Robertson and A. Plummer, *The First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (ICC; New York: Scribner's, 1911) 64.

⁷⁰ S. Travis, *Judgment*, 115. This is unlikely since *μισθὸν λήμψεται* is seen as the *consequence* not the equivalent of *τὸ ἔργον μενεῖ*. Travis' interpretation is dominated throughout by the avoidance of anything smacking of retribution.

⁷¹ "Gemeint ist wohl, dass er nach einiger Strafe (*ζημιωθήσεται*=ὡς διὰ πυρός) gerettet wird: ähnlich 5,5; 11,32" (H. Lietzmann, *Briefe*, 93). See also L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 177-178; J. Weiß, *Korintherbriefe*, 83; R. Heiligenthal, *Werke*, 213-214; A. Strobel, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (Zürcher Bibelkommentare NT 6/1; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1989) 83; BAGD, 338. This rendering was also favored, naturally, by proponents of the doctrine of purgatory (see the critique of this view by J. Gniska, *Ist 1 Kor.3.10-15 ein Schriftzeugnis für das Fegfeuer? Eine exegetisch-historische Untersuchung* [Düsseldorf: Triltsch, 1955]).

⁷² So C. K. Barrett, *First Epistle*, 89; G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 143, n. 43; J. Gniska, *Fegfeuer*, 127; J. Gundry-Volf, *Paul and Perseverance*, 242, 261; D. W. Kuck, *Judgment*, 182-183; W. Schrage, *Korinther*, 303; A. Stumpff, art. *ζημία/ζημιόω*, TDNT, 2.890.

⁷³ Reference is sometimes made to 1 Cor 5:5 and 11:32, but see below on these texts.

⁷⁴ Phil 3:8; 2 Cor 7:9(?); Matt 16:26; Mark 8:36; Luke 9:25. J. Shanor suggests "to be fined" based on ancient construction contracts ("Construction Terms," 462, 468-470; followed by H. W. Hollander, "Testing by Fire," 97, n. 35). While this would provide a nice contrast with "receive wage" (v 14), "suffer loss (of the wage)" makes better sense within the whole argument. Translating "to be fined" would seem to necessitate viewing "as through fire" as some form of punishment, and leads Shanor to interpret vv 16-17 not as a threat of destruction but of God levying "damage" in some way against the careless builder (see below on *φθείρειν*). The sense of our text is well illustrated by 2 John 8—"Be on your guard [*βλέπετε ἑαυτοὺς*], so that you do not lose [*ἀπολέσητε*] what we

The final phrase of v 15 has long played a critical role in the attempt to understand Paul's perspective on the judgment of believers—*αὐτὸς δὲ σωθήσεται, οὕτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός*. For many interpreters this is an afterthought, a correction added by the apostle to guard against equating, or in any way connecting, one's reward with one's salvation:

will . . . vielmehr betonen, daß die Heilsfrage für den christlichen Verkündiger trotz des Vernichtungsgerichtes über sein Werk gerade nicht tangiert wird. Somit stellt die nachklappende sprichwörtliche Redensart eine einschränkende Korrektur des vorangehenden Gerichtsgedankens dar, der nur Lohn und Strafe (bzw. Verlust) in Aussicht stellt.⁷⁵

This would testify to a sense of theological 'tension' in Paul. These same commentators, however, consistently fail to see that immediately following this Paul explicitly connects the Corinthian teachers' activity with their salvation (see below on vv 16-17).⁷⁶ If Paul had meant to say "take care how you build, for it will affect your eschatological reward, though, of course, not your eternal salvation," he would hardly have followed it with v 16 and its threat of eternal destruction.

We would suggest that v 15b is not a correction or afterthought, not some form of reassurance⁷⁷ to the erring Corinthian leaders that they will be saved in spite of their erroneous teaching, but instead intensifies the warning of v 15a.⁷⁸

[vl. "you"] have worked for, but may receive a full reward [*μισθὸν πλήρη ἀπολάβητε*] (see D. W. Kuck, *Judgment*, 182-183).

⁷⁵ E. Synofzik, *Vergeltungsaussagen*, 66. Similarly L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 177-178.

⁷⁶ L. Mattern ends her lengthy treatment of 1 Cor 3:5ff with v 15 (*Verständnis*, 168-179). Verses 16-17 are treated only superficially in a footnote (169, n. 528), where she acknowledges that (i) either *φθείρειν* ("destroy") refers to something entirely distinct from the *ἐποικοδομεῖν* ("build" [poorly]) of vv 10-15, or else (ii) these verses constitute a direct contradiction to her interpretation of the preceding section. On the relation of "destruction" to "building on another foundation" see below.

⁷⁷ So F. W. Grosheide: "His words contain a consolation for those who feared they might perish because they had not built in the right way" (*Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* [NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953] 87). But C. Roetzel is correct when he says, "Paul did not write this passage to reassure those who feared their salvation was in jeopardy, but he wrote to unnerve those who believed their salvation was assured" (*Judgment*, 169; citing 1 Cor 10:12 in support).

⁷⁸ G. D. Fee seems to point in this direction: "Thus Paul is not so much making a soteriological statement as he is warning his Corinthian friends" (*First Corinthians*, 144).

Thus the emphasis lies on the final “as through fire” which is in some measure a modification of the Corinthians’ expectations that “the builder will be saved.” “As through fire” was an idiomatic way of saying “just barely,” “by the skin of one’s teeth.”⁷⁹ Paul is not reassuring the one who built poorly (i.e., though you lose your reward you will still be saved) but warning—though you may attain salvation, it will be by the skin of your teeth as it were.⁸⁰ The point here is to stress the risk being entertained by those who may be building in a manner incompatible with the teaching of Christ. That risk will be amplified in vv 16-17 where Paul warns that improper building can, in fact, edge over into actual destruction of the church, resulting in the eternal destruction of the builder. To teach human wisdom instead of Christ carries with it the gravest of risks; at best the loss of any recompense for all one’s labor, at worst the loss of eschatological life itself. The dividing line between poor building and destruction is not clearly marked out, making Paul’s initial warning to “beware how you are building” all the more potent.⁸¹

Nevertheless, in vv 9c-15 “reward” is clearly distinct from “salvation.” Paul does seem to assume here that it was possible to enjoy salvation plus reward (v 14)

⁷⁹ Favored by most commentators, this sense can be found in the OT (Amos 4:11; Zech 3:2; et al.) and in Greek antiquity (references in H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 77, n. 85). J. T. Townsend argues that this phrase reflects instead a Shammaite doctrine that those who were neither wholly good nor wholly bad would be saved, but only after passing through the fires of Gehinnom (“1 Corinthians 3:15 and the school of Shammai,” *HTR* 61 [1968] 500-504). However apart from a general similarity, the parallels are hardly convincing (see the differences Townsend himself notes, 501).

⁸⁰ See J. Moffatt’s translation:
 “if a man’s work is burnt up,
 he will be a loser --
and though he will be saved himself,
 he will be snatched from the very flames” (*First Epistle*, 39, emphasis added).

⁸¹ A similar phenomenon, suggested in a letter by Prof. A. Lincoln, may be observed in Rom 14:13-23, where “to put a stumbling block or hindrance in the way of another” (v 13; =to injure, v 15) may “cause the ruin of one for whom Christ died” (v 15; also described as destruction, v 20; see pp. 260-261 above). Paul does not say that they have already caused the ruin of others, but that their current injurious behavior can easily (and perhaps imperceptibly) shade into the more lethal. One might perhaps say that it is characteristic of the NT writers in general when speaking of spiritually lethal behavior to assert its reality without quantifying the precise dividing line between occasional sins and a life in subjection to sin. See, for example, Heb 6:1-12 where this situation is described metaphorically as being “on the verge of being cursed [κατάρας ἐγγύς]” (v 8).

or salvation stripped of reward (v 15). This implies some sort of differentiation or gradation of blessedness in the eschaton for believers.

It is only when graded positions in the Kingdom are accepted as Paul's meaning that justice is done to the basic idea of judgment and to Paul's words about receiving a reward for good done.⁸²

Mattern denies this conclusion, but only by isolating Paul completely from his Pharisaic background and by contending that salvation and reward/punishment must always be viewed as strictly independent of one another (two-judgment theory). In her view this rewarding judgment is nothing more than Paul's attempt to "interpret the relationship between master and servant," a sort of metaphor meaning "God takes the servant and his service seriously."⁸³ However, such a demythologizing of Paul fails to do justice to the rising strength of a doctrine of varied rewards which flowers later in rabbinic Judaism and which has exercised clear influence on early Christian thought and terminology.⁸⁴

Most exegetes of a Reformed or Lutheran persuasion find in this passage a first line of defense against allowing the works of believers any *salvific* significance.

Obviously the idea has to be understood in the wider context of the doctrine of justification. The loss of faith means the loss of salvation. On the other hand, unsatisfactory works performed by the Christian as a Christian do not cause his damnation. This is the reverse side of the fact that works do not bring about salvation. But we remain responsible for our works before God . . . ; for the life of believers is service.⁸⁵

Besides the fact that this text is not about Christians' works in general, but about the

⁸² F. Filson, *Recompense*, 115. He bases this conclusion on exegesis of 1 Cor 3:8-15; 2 Cor 5:10; Eph 6:8 and 2 Cor 4:17 (105-109). Mention may also be made at this point of the occasional attempt to interpret σωθήσεται in a secular sense as "escape" (i.e., from a metaphorical conflagration) rather than salvation (K. P. Donfried, "Justification and Last Judgment," 148-149; for critique see D. W. Kuck, *Judgment*, 183).

⁸³ *Verständnis*, 177-178.

⁸⁴ See above on 3:8b, p. 266. The synoptics give clear evidence in this direction; see O. Michel, "Der Lohngedanke in der Verkündigung Jesu," *ZST* 9 (1932) 47-54. Cf. also Eph 6:8; Matt 5:12, 19; 10:41-42; Heb 10:35.

⁸⁵ H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 77. Interestingly, John Calvin was not nearly so squeamish regarding the conditional relationship between salvation and obedience in this passage (*The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians* [trans. J. W. Fraser; Calvin's Commentaries 9; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1960] 77-78).

specific work of teaching/leading, our interpretation turns this interpretation on its head. Rather than assurance that their poor work will not affect their salvation, we find in fact a warning that they are putting that very salvation at risk. Thus, having admonished the Corinthians against judging one leader at the expense of another in vv 5-9, Paul switches metaphors and tone in vv 10-15 and warns the leaders themselves (and implicitly the congregation) that the preceding does not render the “how” of their effort superfluous. The fact is, only those who build in line with the message of Christ rather than human wisdom will receive the reward mentioned in v 8. Those who disregard this warning risk finding all their labor eternally worthless; and, in fact, could be endangering their salvation. In order to drive home this ultimate danger, Paul now turns in vv 16-17 to a new metaphor, that of the temple.

1 COR 3:16-17

As noted above, the relation of these verses to the preceding is crucial to a proper understanding of judgment in Paul.⁸⁶ The introduction (“Do you not know?”), the shift in metaphor (from architecture in general to “temple” specifically) and the heightened form of warning (*lex talionis*) suggest that vv 16-17 constitute to some degree a new thought. This has led a large body of interpreters to stress a logical disjunction between vv 15 and 16.

There is no logical connection. . . . Paul’s thought has shifted since verses 12-15, where the fault in mind was not that of destroying the holy building (and of being destroyed in punishment), but that of putting unworthy material into its construction (and of losing one’s pay as a builder in consequence).⁸⁷

While generally acknowledging a certain logical progression through the three metaphors (promise of reward to leaders -- warning of loss of reward to poor leaders -- threat of destruction to destroyers of the church), these interpreters stress the discon-

⁸⁶ Failure to consider the implications of 1 Cor 3:16-17 mars seriously the work of L. Mattern (*Verständnis*) and J. M. Gundry-Volf (*Paul and Perseverance*).

⁸⁷ C. K. Barrett, *First Epistle*, 90-91. Similarly H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 77; L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 169, n. 528; E. Synofzik, *Vergeltungsaussagen*, 57-59, 66; F. W. Grosheide, *First Corinthians*, 88; and R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* (Oxford Theological Monographs; Oxford: Oxford Univ., 1969) 99.

tinuity rather than the continuity with the foregoing.⁸⁸ Its “character” is entirely different (Conzelmann), the action of “destroying” is something quite different from the careless building in vv 10-15 (Mattern, Hollander), or the “destroyers” of v 17 are actually “enemies of the gospel” in distinction from the poor but still saved builders (Synofzik).⁸⁹ Stressing the disjunction leads, then, to a crucial theological observation. The judgment on believing leaders resulting in (loss of) reward (vv 10-15) has little to do with a judgment as to their salvation (vv 16-17).⁹⁰ The intent here is usually to safeguard the doctrine of justification by faith lest works somehow sneak in to play a determinative role. Without this disjunction, not only reward but equally salvation itself seems to become dependent on “how one builds.”

The a priori assumption behind this approach (i.e., unsatisfactory works cannot be a cause or condition of a Christian’s salvation/damnation) will be examined later. Here we wish to concentrate on the exegetical evidence for a relationship of continuity rather than discontinuity flowing from v 15 to vv 16-17.

The abrupt *οὐκ οἴδατε* which opens v 16 is a rhetorical device used heavily in this letter, perhaps meant ironically in the light of the Corinthians’ boast in ‘knowledge.’⁹¹ Rather than signalling a logical disjunction, it always introduces a further argument on a subject already opened in the material immediately preceding its appearance. In some of these cases it introduces a strong warning which serves to

⁸⁸ Quite a number of scholars seek to connect 3:16-17 with problems of immorality elsewhere in Paul’s writings, where temple terminology is likewise employed (1 Cor 6:19; 1 Thess 4:6). See for example F. W. Horn, “Wandel im Geist: Zur pneumatologischen Begründung der Ethik bei Paulus,” *Kerygma und Dogma* 38 (1992) 149-170, esp. 163-165. However this necessitates excising 1 Cor 3:16-17 from its own immediate context.

⁸⁹ However as to “careless” versus “destructive” leaders, Barrett admits, “Probably Paul himself found it hard, in the situations with which he had in practice to deal, to distinguish between the two possibilities” (*First Corinthians*, 91).

⁹⁰ See the quotation from E. Synofzik above, p. 273.

⁹¹ 3:16; 5:6; 6:2, 3, 9, 15, 16, 19; 9:13, 24. Cf. also Rom 6:16 for the only other occurrence in Paul outside 1 Cor, and John 19:10 and Jas 3:3 for the remaining non-Pauline occurrences in the NT. On “do you not know” as irony, see G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 146, n. 3. Others suggest it is simply a reminder of previous teaching (B. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* [SNTSMS 1; Cambridge: University Press, 1965] 57).

intensify the risk involved in the wrong behavior Paul wishes to restrain. Thus in speaking against intra-community lawsuits we read,

Why not rather be wronged? Why not rather be defrauded? But you yourselves wrong and defraud—and believers at that. Do you not know that wrongdoers will not inherit the kingdom of God? (1 Cor 6:7-9)

And against sexual immorality,

Should I therefore take the members of Christ and make them members of a prostitute? Never! Do you not know that whoever is united to a prostitute becomes one body with her? (1 Cor 6:15-16)

The use of *οὐκ οἶδατε* in 3:16 follows this same pattern. Following the warning (not reassurance! see above) of vv 10-15, vv 16-17 serve to intensify the risk involved in building upon human wisdom rather than Christ.

As throughout 3:5-17, these verses are directed both at the whole congregation and to its teachers and leaders.⁹² Those who “destroy God’s temple” are not a different group (e.g., enemies of the gospel; nonbelievers) from those in view in vv 14-15. Rather this new description highlights the risk entertained by any teacher who builds with human wisdom. Harming the church shades imperceptibly into destroying the church, magnifying the risk for any who dare build with “wood, hay and stubble.”⁹³ These same hearers are in view in Paul’s continued admonition in vv 18-20 addressed to those in the church who consider themselves to be “wise in this age.”

In v 16 Paul reminds the congregation of who they are, and hence of the seriousness of building poorly or even destroying the church. They are collectively⁹⁴

⁹² On this dual audience in 1 Cor 1-4, see D. W. Kuck, *Judgment*, 187. The second person plural verbs and pronouns in vv 9 and 16 clearly have the whole community in view, while the indefinite singular pronouns used in the warnings (*τίς, ἕκαστος*; vv 8b, 10b, 12, 13, 14-15, 17) target the teachers and leaders.

⁹³ See our discussion above p. 274, and n. 81. Also W. Schrage—“wirkt . . . wie eine letzte Verschärfung und Steigerung der Warnung [of v 15], zumal die Grenze zwischen qualitativ wertloser und ruinöser Bauarbeit nur schwer zu bestimmen ist” (*Der erster Brief*, 304-305).

⁹⁴ This collective focus distinguishes 3:16 from 6:19 (“your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit”) and from the synoptic saying about “causing one of these little ones to sin” (Mark 9:42; Matt 18:6; Luke 17:2). See further on this community focus in 1 Cor 3:10-17, C. J. Roetzel, *Judgment*, 163-170.

God's sanctuary [ὁ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ], the dwelling place of God's Spirit, making them holy [ἅγιος]. This sacrosanct character of the divine sanctuary is the reason [γάρ] that destruction of the same is such a heinous act and will be repaid in kind by destruction at the hands of God himself.

In a striking chiastic formulation of the OT *lex talionis* Paul threatens future divine destruction upon any potential destroyer of the congregation:

A	εἴ τις
B	τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ
C	φθείρει
C'	φθερεῖ ⁹⁵
B'	τοῦτον
A'	ὁ θεός

The exact meaning of *φθείρειν* in this particular context is disputed. J. Shanor has argued, for instance, for the meaning “damage” rather than “destroy,” based on a technical usage in Greco-Roman construction contracts.⁹⁶ Others have pointed out the sense of “injure” or “corrupt” elsewhere, thus reducing Paul’s threat to something less than eschatological destruction.⁹⁷ The verb, however, was most commonly used to indicate the ruin or destruction of things, structures, animals or persons.⁹⁸ When used of the latter it could even mean “to kill,” or could be used as a curse—*φθείρεσθε* (“May you perish! Ruin take you!”).⁹⁹ In 1 Cor 3:16-17 the threat is related directly to the church’s nature as the divine temple in which God’s Spirit dwells, thus making it sacrosanct.¹⁰⁰ The violation of holy objects and places was widely held to be a capital offense in ancient society, with the sentence often

⁹⁵ A few, mostly Western, MSS read the present [*φθείρει*] under the influence of the preceding verb form.

⁹⁶ “Construction Terms,” 470-471.

⁹⁷ See 2 Cor 7:2; Rev 19:2.

⁹⁸ Rev 8:9 (destruction of ships); Jude 10 (destruction of individuals; cf. 2 Pet 2:12b[?]); and Luke 12:33 (destruction of clothes by moths).

⁹⁹ *LSJ*, art. *φθείρω*, 1928 (II.1). See also G. Harder, *TDNT* 9.93-106; and Robertson-Plummer, *1 Corinthians*, 67.

¹⁰⁰ See B. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 56-60; and R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 98-102.

executed by the deity directly.¹⁰¹ The presence of the *lex talionis* (“ruin for ruin”) likewise points to divine judgment. Thus it matters little whether we take the protasis to refer to profanation, damage, the actual demolition of a building, or as a known Greek rhetorical *topos* for the destruction of group unity through factionalism.¹⁰² Regardless of the exact manner, the ruining of God’s holy temple will inevitably bring ruin at God’s own hand in return, a sentiment not unlike the inscription found in Herod’s temple prohibiting Gentiles in the forecourt:

Whoever is caught [in the sacred precincts] is alone responsible for the death[-penalty] which follows.¹⁰³

Thus Paul is continuing the warning of v 15. Those who lead and minister in the congregation on the basis of human wisdom rather than Christ crucified imperil their own salvation (see on v 15 above). The sanctity of the congregation in Corinth spells ruin for anyone who would dare to ruin the church by replacing the cross with human wisdom and banishing the Spirit through boasting and division. Paul’s switch to the future tense in the apodosis (“God *will destroy* that person”) suggests that *eschatological* destruction is in view. As an intensification of the warning about imperiling one’s *salvation* (v 15), this is nothing less than the final destruction of those excluded from such salvation.¹⁰⁴

Excursus: “Sentences of Holy Law”

If accepted, E. Käsemann’s thesis regarding “Sätze heiligen Rechts” would further strengthen the argument for a reference to eschatological judgment in this text. His article “Sätze

¹⁰¹ Cf. 1 Sam 6:19-20; 2 Sam 6:6-7 (= 1 Chr 13:9-10); Num 4:15, 19-20; Josh 7:15; Acts 21:28 (also 19:37); Herodotus 8.36-38. On this ancient concept of “holiness,” see G. von Rad, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 1.204-207; B. S. Rosner, “Temple and Holiness in 1 Corinthians 5,” *TynBul* 42/1 (1991) 137-145; and H. Wenschkewitz, “Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament,” *Angelos* 4 (1932) 70-230.

¹⁰² J. Weiß, *1 Korintherbrief*, 85 (=“Entweihung”); J. Shanor, “Construction Terms,” 470-471 (=“damage”); W. Schrage, *1 Korintherbrief*, 306 (=“eine bis ins Fundament reichende Zerstörung”); M. M. Mitchell, *Paul*, 103 (=rhetorical *topos*).

¹⁰³ Cited in E. Käsemann, “Sätze,” 249.

¹⁰⁴ So most commentators. See also J. A. Draper, “The Tip of an Iceberg: The Temple of the Holy Spirit,” *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 59 (1987) 57-65. Cf. Rev 11:18 where in a similar chiasmic judgment threat divine eschatological destruction is announced upon those who destroy the earth (using the compound form *διαφθείρειν*).

Heiligen Rechtes im Neuen Testament" first appeared in 1955 as an attempt to get at the relation of *Geist* and *Recht* in earliest Christianity.¹⁰⁵ Three formal elements identified such a "sentence of holy law": (a) at root was the *lex talionis* of the OT ("an eye for an eye"), (b) now given chiastic form (*εἴ τις φθείρει . . . φθερεῖ ὁ θεός*), and (c) clothed as a casuistical legal saying (*εἴ τις, εἰάν τις, ὅς δ' ἄν* = rabbinic "should someone . . . , then . . ."). 1 Cor 3:17 constituted his clearest example of such a "sentence," with modified forms found in 1 Cor 14:38; 16:22; Gal 1:6; 1 Cor 5:3-5; 2 Cor 9:6 and Rom 2:12. Käsemann suggested the origin of such Christian "sentences" in Palestinian churches led by prophets who, imitating OT prophets, led the people of God by proclaiming God's eschatological judgments upon sinning members (74-80). For Käsemann the adoption and modification of these "sentences" for purposes of later Christian paraenesis shows that grace does not eliminate the need for divine *Recht*. Christ's purpose, in fact, is to establish God's *Recht* on earth, finding its correlate in Christian obedience. Far from excluding a judgment according to works, such an understanding of "law," "grace" and "spirit" grounds and enables this judgment for Christians (75). Subsequent analysis, however, has called this thesis into question. Klaus Berger criticized Käsemann's reliance on Bultmann's form-criticism, which did not properly distinguish form, content and *Sitz*. Berger argued instead for a stricter definition of "form" (= "die grammatisch-syntaktische Satzform" as "Ausgangspunkt einer Formbetrachtung"), and concluded, "daß es im NT so etwa wie Sätze heiligen Rechts gebe, deren Sitz im Leben die Verkündigung von Propheten gewesen sei, hat sich uns als formgeschichtlich nicht haltbar erwiesen."¹⁰⁶ Berger saw in them instead a development of Israel's wisdom tradition. David Aune, while not denying the possibility of such "Sätze," likewise felt "such pronouncements are found in such a wide variety of contexts (sapiential exhortation, eschatological parenesis, prophetic proclamation) that they cannot be tied exclusively to the setting of prophetic speech."¹⁰⁷ Thus our hesitation in using Käsemann's "sentence" thesis as further evidence of an eschatological judgment in 1 Cor 3:17.

So understood 1 Cor 3:16-17 constitutes one of Paul's most straightforward statements that one's "work" (here specifically the "work" of edifying [*οἰκοδομεῖν*] the church) is directly related not only to one's level of reward (as distinct from salvation), but also to "being saved [*σωθήσεται*]." Those who build so poorly that the church herself is destroyed are threatened themselves with sure and eternal destruction at God's judgment. Attempts to circumvent this exegetical conclusion by defining those in view as nonbelievers or enemies of the gospel are implausible. It is likewise futile to assert that the judgment here is actually pronounced on the basis of whether one had "faith" or not, and not directly on the basis of "work." As

¹⁰⁵ NTS 1 (1954/55) 248-260. Reprinted in *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen* (2 vols.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964) 2.69-82; ET: *New Testament Questions of Today* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969) 66-81.

¹⁰⁶ "Zu den sogenannten Sätzen Heiligen Rechtes," NTS 17 (1970) 10-40, quotations found on pp. 11 and 39.

¹⁰⁷ *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983) 240; cf. 166-167, 237-240.

certainly as the wage in vv 14-15 is granted or withheld on the basis of one's work of building, equally so is the threatened destruction meted out because one has destroyed the church. This is not to deny that, as always in Paul, there is a most intimate and indissoluble connection between faith and works, but in this context Paul seems to have no qualms about warning even members of the congregation of a potential eternal judgment according to what they have done. Whether this implies that such persons have lost, or perhaps never had, true faith is a larger question of Pauline theology, a question over which Paul shows little concern at this point.¹⁰⁸

Does this interpretation, then, make salvation dependent on works rather than on grace? We must remind ourselves that this text is not addressing the issue of whether Christians in general can be saved in spite of sinning (as much popular application asserts). Nor are the problems of immorality which crop up later already in view. Yet in spite of the text's limitation to the "work" of teachers and leaders in the congregation, it confirms what we discovered in Romans. To summarize, the future enjoyment of that salvation, of which even now the believer partakes by faith (1 Cor 1:2-9; 1:18-2:5), will indeed be conditioned upon one's labor. This work is not, however, a competing criterion alongside grace, but is itself wholly a product of grace (1:2, 4-8, 30-31), being the outworking of the divine righteousness which is the believer's from the beginning by faith alone. Nor are we saying that one "enters" by grace through faith but "stays in" by obedience, or that the verdict of righteousness issued upon entry by faith into the people of God cannot be considered assured until the final judgment when it is certified by works. The righteousness upon which salvation depends is by grace through faith from start to finish, and receives its *necessary confirmation* in the outworking of obedience to be judged at the end. Such a condition adds no uncertainty within the parameters of Paul's normal expectation, that is, for believers who are walking in obedience to the Spirit by faith. For the persistently unfaithful, however, the coming judgment according to

¹⁰⁸ See G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 148-149, n. 19.

works will reveal that they are no partakers of the righteousness of faith, that they are not of the Spirit or of Christ. Thus understood salvation is, in one well-defined sense, dependent upon works; but not in a way inconsistent with Paul's teaching on justification by grace through faith. The above sketch demonstrates Paul's thought to be in considerable continuity with that found in most quarters of second temple Judaism.

1 COR 4:1-5

Chapter four should be read as a continuation of Paul's argument with the boastful and divisive Corinthians regarding how they are to view their leaders.¹⁰⁹ It constitutes, however, more of a personal defense than has been evident before.¹¹⁰ The initial section of this apology (vv 1-5) revolves around the issue of properly evaluating or judging apostolic leaders.¹¹¹ Such judgment can be based upon only one criterion, being found faithful [*πιστὸς εὐρεθῇ*] to the task entrusted them as stewards of the mysteries of God (=the gospel of Christ crucified, vv 1-2). Thus the Corinthian standards of human wisdom and rhetoric are abolished. In fact, true judgment is left not even in the hands of individuals about themselves (vv 3-4), but with the Lord alone, who at the parousia will bring even that to light which is hidden in the heart from human view (v 5). Thus the central point of the section is summed up in v 5a: "Therefore do not pronounce judgment before the time, before the Lord comes."

¹⁰⁹ Cf. 3:5, "What then is Apollos? What is Paul?"; 4:1, "Think of us in this way, as servants of Christ." Note especially how "servants [*ὑπηρέτας*]" picks up the servant imagery from 3:5-9 (using the equivalent *διάκονοι*), and the judgment and reward themes from 3:5-17 are echoed in 4:5. As noted earlier (p. 258, and n. 10), 4:6 indicates that 3:5-4:5 is a unit designed by Paul to guide the Corinthians to a proper relationship with their apostles and leaders.

¹¹⁰ This is seen in the personal apology of 4:3-4, the appeal to Paul's unique "fatherhood" in the gospel (4:14-17), and the final warning of his personal coming to them (4:18-21). The apologetic function of this section is acknowledged by most commentators (e.g., C. Roetzel, *Judgment*, 135; G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 156-157; W. Schrage, *Korinther*, 318-319; otherwise D. W. Kuck, *Judgment*, 201; M. M. Mitchell, *Paul*, 54-55).

¹¹¹ Note the preponderance of evaluative-judicial terminology: *λογίζεσθαι* (v 1), *ἀνακρίνειν* (vv 3ab, 4b), *κρίνειν* (v 5), *δεδικαίωμαι* (v 4, see below).

For our purposes attention may focus primarily on v 5 with its reference to divine judgment issuing in *praise* [ὁ ἔπαινος]. It is true that Paul's purpose in this section is not, strictly speaking, to give a depiction of eschatological judgment, but rather to deflect human judgment by appeal to divine judgment. His judgment statements are here *Argumentationsmittel* (Synofzik). Nevertheless it may be properly assumed that Paul's motivational paraenesis employs material and beliefs mutually acceptable to both the apostle and his audience. In spite of their instrumental nature, these judgment statements may be taken as representing the apostle's own convictions regarding such eschatological matters.

That an *eschatological* judgment scene is in view may be substantiated by two observations. First, Paul ties this judgment explicitly to Christ's parousia. The Corinthians are admonished not to judge "ahead of time, prematurely [πρὸ καιροῦ]." Although not necessarily a technical term for Paul, *καιρός* can be used by him eschatologically,¹¹² as it clearly is here, since the time before which judgment should not take place is specified as the time of the Lord's coming.¹¹³ This language of Christ's coming [ἕως ἄν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος] is not Paul's typical way of referring to the parousia, but one which he can adopt as needed from other traditions in the early church.¹¹⁴ The picture of a master coming to evaluate the servant's faithfulness flows nicely from the imagery taken up in vv 1-2, but has now been applied by Paul eschatologically.

This eschatological referent is further confirmed by Paul's apparent utilization of a pre-existing judgment tradition about this coming Lord "who will bring to light the things now hidden in darkness and will disclose the purposes of the

¹¹² Cf. 1 Cor 7:29; Gal 6:9; 2 Thess 2:6.

¹¹³ See also Matt 8:29: *πρὸ καιροῦ*=the time appointed for torment. Further G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 163, nn. 30-31.

¹¹⁴ His only three other uses all occur in statements stemming from previous tradition: 1 Cor 11:26 (the Lord's supper); 16:22 (Aramaic); 2 Thess 1:10 (OT citation).

heart.”¹¹⁵ It was axiomatic in Jewish and early Christian literature that God was able to see human thoughts and plans, even prior to their observable expression in words or acts.¹¹⁶ Likewise “Greco-Roman tradition used the idea of divine omniscience to sanction moral recompense in the present time.”¹¹⁷ The combination of eschatological judgment as *disclosure* with the motif of divine omniscience was already known in second temple Judaism,¹¹⁸ and is well-attested in the NT.¹¹⁹ In fact, judgment as the revelation or disclosure of one’s (un)righteous character and status, rather than as obtaining or earning such, has been seen to be central to both Paul and second temple Judaism.¹²⁰ Thus Paul’s phrase is best taken as indicating a universal judgment at Christ’s parousia at which the divine omniscience discloses even the inner thoughts and intentions of the individual, and upon which basis each is judged, i.e., their character as righteous or unrighteous is disclosed.

We turn now to the conceptual details of this eschatological judgment according to 1 Cor 4:5, and especially to any relevance for the issue of judgment according to works in relation to Christian believers. Paul has been at pains in vv 1-4 to

¹¹⁵ Paul’s use of a pre-existing tradition is indicated by the introductory ὅς καὶ, *parallelismus membrorum*, and numerous expressions rarely found in Paul—φωτίζειν, τὰ κρυπτὰ τοῦ σκότους, τὰς βουλὰς (E. Synofzik, *Vergeltungsaussagen*, 71-72).

¹¹⁶ See for instance God’s knowing and judging “the heart” (1 Kgs 8:39; 2 Chr 6:30; 1 Chr 29:17; Prov 17:3; Jer 11:20; 17:10; 1QH XVIII,24; also Luke 16:15; Rev 2:23) as well as what is “hidden” (Eccl 12:14).

¹¹⁷ D. W. Kuck, *Judgment*, 206; see further pp. 38-149 on Jewish and Greco-Roman conceptions.

¹¹⁸ Against D. W. Kuck who claims there are no close parallels in either the OT or pre-Pauline Jewish literature, and suggests that Paul was the first writer in the Jewish-Christian tradition to combine them (*Judgment*, 205-206). Cf. Prov 24:12; Eccl 12:14; Jer 16:16-18; Sir 11:24-27; 15:19b(with 16:12-14); 17:15, 19-20, 24-27; 1 Enoch 97:6-7; 98:6-8; 4 Ezra 14:35; T.Abr. 13:9; 2 Bar 83:1-3. See also R. Heiligenthal, *Werke*, 156-157, 234-264.

¹¹⁹ Heb 4:12-13; Rev 2:23; Matt 6:4, 6, 18; Luke 8:17; 12:2-3. For the same in post-apostolic writings, see R. Heiligenthal, *Werke*, 194, n. 124.

¹²⁰ In Paul, Rom 2:16; 8:19 (= “the revealing of the children of God”); 1 Cor 3:13; 4:5; 2 Cor 5:10; (2 Thess 2:3, 6, 8). In Judaism, see the analysis in the earlier chapters of the texts mentioned in n. 118 above, and pp. 124-125.

thwart all *human* investigation of himself and other ministers.¹²¹ This he does now in v 5 by portraying final judgment as an examination of service to disclose faithfulness, resulting in praise.

The criterion of this judgment was introduced in v 2 (ἵνα πιστός τις εὐρεθῇ). This was “a truism in Greco-Roman society—one looks for a steward who will prove to be faithful in carrying out his assigned duties.”¹²² For Paul this was preeminently the faithful carrying out of his commission to take to the Gentiles this gospel-mystery entrusted to him.¹²³ Such judgment is not based upon the criterion of faith [πίστις] *qua* belief, but faithful service, the proper management [οἰκονόμος/-ία] of an entrusted task. We would seem to be operating here in the realm of what Paul elsewhere expresses via the motif of judgment according to works,¹²⁴ in this case echoing the note of God’s prerogative to recompense his servants (3:8-9).

In this instance, however, the criterion of faithful service probes even deeper than the observable works which are visible signs of inner reality. Here even “the things now hidden in darkness,” the “purposes of the heart,” are examined and judged. It is very difficult to ascertain whether τὰ κρυπτὰ τοῦ σκότους includes a reference to hidden *faults* in line with the often negative moral connotation of “darkness,”¹²⁵ or is to be taken as morally neutral, emphasizing more their *obscurity from view* than any evil character, and thus synonymous with “the

¹²¹ Note especially his use now of ἄνθρωπος (v 1) and ἀνθρωπίνης (v 3) stressing *human* evaluation rather than the indefinite τις as in chap. 3.

¹²² D. W. Kuck, *Judgment*, 198.

¹²³ W. F. Orr and J. A. Walther, *1 Corinthians* (AB 32; New York: Doubleday & Co., 1976) 179-180.

¹²⁴ Cf. Rom 14:4-5, 10-12; Col 3:22-24.

¹²⁵ So Prov 4:19 (“the way of the wicked is like deep darkness”); 2:13; 1QM I,10; III,6; T.Reub. 3:8; Philo *Leg.All.* 1:46; John 3:19-21; Rom 13:2; 2 Cor 6:14; 1 Thess 5:4-5; Eph 5:8, 11; 6:12; Col 1:13. See further H. Conzelmann, art. σκότος *TDNT* 7.442. Κρυπτός alone can likewise refer to that which is morally repugnant (2 Cor 4:2; Eph 5:12), but would seem to include both good and evil in the similar usage at Rom 2:16.

counsels of the hearts” which follows.¹²⁶ It is also possible that the Corinthians have impugned Paul’s motives, thus prompting this reference to one’s hidden thoughts and intentions.¹²⁷ Whichever the case, Paul is interested here only in such thoughts and motives as may result in a positive outcome (“praise”).

The precise nature of this eschatological praise is likewise difficult to pinpoint. Not a few commentators identify it with the *μισθός* mentioned earlier, and thus as something distinct from salvation.¹²⁸ Others note that justification appears to be in view in 4:4 [*δεδικαίωμαι*]¹²⁹ and that Paul can elsewhere use *ἔπαινος* as an equivalent for salvation (Rom 2:29) and thus prefer an equation with the salvation in 3:15.¹³⁰ Luke 16:8-9 and 1 Pet 1:7 may be taken as witnesses of such an early Christian understanding of eschatological praise as the fundamental approval of a servant’s faithfulness to his/her calling, allowing entry into the master’s glory and honor at Christ’s coming.¹³¹

It may well be, however, that Paul’s choice of this praise terminology here was influenced less by such theological considerations and more by his Hellenistic audience. It is striking that “praise” is quite rare in Jewish and Christian tradition as a term describing the result of God’s judgment. On the other hand, Kuck has demonstrated that such language of praise would have struck a very responsive

¹²⁶ Cf. Dan 2:22 and Matt 10:27 (= Luke 12:3) for such morally neutral use of “darkness.”

¹²⁷ G. Theissen, “Legitimation,” *NTS* 21 (1975) 192-221.

¹²⁸ Cf. 3:8, 14. L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 183-184; G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 143, n. 42; 163, n. 32.

¹²⁹ While *δικαιοῦσθαι* may occasionally carry a non-soteriological meaning in Paul (Rom 6:7), 1 Cor 4:4c-5 points unmistakably to a divine verdict in the context of eschatological judgment (against L. Mattern who disputes this connection by appeal to the supposed “parenthetical nature” of 4:4a,b [*Verständnis*, 184]). If this soteriological interpretation is correct, then we have here an instance of Paul’s combination of judgment and justification language, as well as an instance where *δικαιοῦσθαι* refers to a still outstanding (future) verdict. See C. H. Cosgrove, “Justification,” 663.

¹³⁰ E. Synofzik, *Vergeltungsaussagen*, 72.

¹³¹ See H. Preisker, art. *ἔπαινος*, *TDNT* 2.586-588.

chord among Hellenistic listeners.¹³² Attaining the praise of others and of the gods was a “characteristic goal in antiquity.”¹³³ The Corinthians’ desire to be recognized as wise and strong, to boast of their attachment to particular leaders, and to take pride in one over against another, all suggest that they continued to seek the praise which had formerly been so important to their pagan social environment.¹³⁴ What they are seeking now from one another shall, however, according to Paul be awarded at the final judgment by God, and shall not be based on human wisdom or rhetorical skill but on trustworthy stewardship of the gospel. “Paul in effect anticipates a postmortem eulogy from God for individual Christians.”¹³⁵

CONCLUSIONS: 1 COR 3-4

Paul’s use of the motif of divine recompense according to deeds in 1 Cor 3:8b suggests that we are dealing with a theological axiom central to his religious tradition, whose terminological expression can be adapted according to the need of the argument. Although the expression “receive reward [μισθὸν λήμψεται]” is not a common way of putting the motif, we have been able to demonstrate its place within that tradition. The two-fold use of ἴδιος and the substitution of κόπος for the normal ἔργον/α are easily attributed to Paul’s rhetorical purpose. In addition, the explicit use of the talionic formula in 3:17a has a direct relationship to Paul’s use of the recompense motif in 3:5-15, as well as being directly related to the development of

¹³² *Judgment*, 141-143, 208-209. On the rarity of “praise” in such contexts, see esp. 209, n. 309.

¹³³ H. Preisker, *TDNT* 2.586.

¹³⁴ See esp. G. Theissen, “Social Stratification in the Corinthian Community: A Contribution to the Sociology of Early Hellenistic Christianity,” Chap. 2 (pp. 69-119) in *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity* (ed. and trans. J. H. Schutz; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982 [originally: “Soziale Schichtung in der korinthischen Gemeinde: Ein Beitrag zur Soziologie des hellenistischen Urchristentums,” *ZNW* 65 (1974) 232-272]). Social differences between rich and poor in the Corinthian church may explain why issues of status, praise and group identity play such a central role in 1 Cor.

¹³⁵ D. W. Kuck, *Judgment*, 209.

the motif in its earliest stages in Israel.¹³⁶ The pertinent phrases in 3:14-15 and 4:5 are not themselves occurrences of the motif in Paul, but are clearly related to the same, with 3:14-15 taking up key words of the motif from 3:8b.

The motif functions in 1 Cor 3-4 with some of the same variety witnessed in Romans and as was common in second temple Jewish literature. In 3:8b it serves as the theological basis for precluding intra-community judgment (also 4:5). We have already seen this function in Rom 14:10-12 (also Rom 12:19). Although this particular function only developed in the second century BCE and later, it has already become important among the uses of the motif in Judaism. Interestingly, Paul's use in 1 Cor 3-4 testifies to continued development in the motif's functions, since second temple Judaism generally employed it only in its negative sense (i.e., do not *condemn*, because judgment/condemnation belongs to God). Paul now includes the positive side as well: do not be elevating one servant over another, since such rewarding is both premature (esp. 4:5) and belongs to God alone (3:8b-9a). As we will note shortly, this development in function parallels certain theological developments in contemporary Judaism.

In addition, Paul uses the motif in 3:14-15 simultaneously to call leaders of the Christian community to proper service and to warn them against disobedience in this regard. Employing the *lex talionis* in 3:17a he can intensify this to a threat of eschatological destruction against the persistently misdirected. As was typical of similar intra-community warnings and summonses to repentance in the Jewish literature surveyed, Paul does not pronounce sentence here upon named individuals, but allows the conditional form of the threat to motivate the errant by alerting them to the very real danger of falling under divine judgment *if* they fail to heed the warning.

This passage also serves to illuminate Paul's theological understanding of recompense according to works. It is particularly clear from 3:13-15, 17a, and 4:5

¹³⁶ See p. 39 above.

that an *eschatological* divine judgment/recompense according to deeds was expected for believers as part of an apocalyptic Day of judgment. Paul also witnesses to a strong *individualizing* of future judgment, whereby not only participation in the group of the “saved” is in view, but each individual [ἐκαστος] receives his/her own [ἴδιος] recompense in accordance with his/her own [ἴδιος] labor. Of course, as the earlier chapters of this dissertation have demonstrated, this individualisation is not new with Paul. Furthermore, this passage witnesses to the centrality of *disclosure*, rather than weighing, counting or the like, in Paul’s conception of this judgment according to labor. One does not first attain to divine approbation via this judgment, rather one’s already existing character or status as a faithful servant of God is hereby revealed publicly.

Paul also evidences the influence of developing rabbinic Judaism in his belief in positive *reward(s)* according to deeds. As noted earlier in this chapter, such belief, though present in the OT, faded from view during the intertestamental period, but begins to make its reappearance in those traditions which will later be codified in Rabbinic writings. The precise nature of such reward is left unspecified in these texts (“praise” in 4:5 is not necessarily an expansion upon the μισθός of 3:8b, 14-15), since such was not Paul’s interest here. Nevertheless, it is clear from 3:8b and 14-15 that this μισθός was distinct from “being saved.” These verses are, in fact, our clearest evidence of Paul’s belief in *varied rewards*, though it is not within his interest to speculate or expand upon what such might actually be.

This distinction between an individually varied μισθός and Christian salvation [σωθήσεται] does not, however, suggest that Paul draws a strict line of theological separation between an eschatological judgment issuing in μισθός and the final Judgment issuing in salvation/damnation. Paul does not consistently make the distinction found in this particular text. Rom 2:5-6 can speak of one’s behavior storing up a “treasure” resulting in “repayment” of either eternal life or divine wrath. In several places Paul employs an athletic metaphor to picture Christian existence as persistent striving after the “prize [βραβεῖον],” which we will argue is not a reward distinct

from eternal life or salvation. Col 3:24 uses the motif of divine recompense according to deeds which issues in the “reward [ἀνταπόδοσις] of (i.e., consisting of) the inheritance,” again suggesting all that is promised believers through faith. Furthermore, as we have sought to demonstrate through our exegesis, 3:14-15 is too often wrongly interpreted as reassurance to the errant that their inadequate behavior cannot, after all, impinge upon their being saved. Far from reassurance, this text warns such people of the terrible risk they run; namely, although they may be saved, it will be ‘by the skin of their teeth.’ This is then heightened in vv 16-17 to form a definite threat of divine destruction upon any in the community who would persist in destroying the church. This is directed to those whom Paul has thus far considered members in good standing of the elect community, and is threatened not on the basis of abandoning faith, but of behavior: “If anyone destroys God’s temple.”

Thus in Paul’s wording of the motif and in its rhetorical function, as well as in his theological use of the same, the apostle demonstrates substantial continuity with the Jewish tradition of divine recompense according to deeds. He can put statements about salvation, justification, and eschatological commendation in close proximity with those about eschatological judgment according to deeds, giving no evidence of any theological tension or paradox. Theological continuity with the Jewish covenantal perspective outlined in the earlier chapters of this dissertation suggests why that is so for Paul. Faithfulness to God (here in the specific context of ministry rather than in the context of Christian sanctification) is the required outworking of God’s justifying work in Christ through faith. This faithfulness will be disclosed at the eschatological judgment, being the criterion according to which one is approved and rewarded, or is destroyed. Paul implicitly acknowledges degrees of faithfulness/unfaithfulness in 3:9c-15, but his point throughout is the risk of unfaithfulness. This risk is particularly acute because the point at which one’s behavior marks one out as fundamentally unfaithful is left to God’s wisdom. Even for Paul 3:16-17 is a warning, not an irrevocable sentence. As we will observe in 1

Corinthians 5, even in extreme cases, Paul retains the hope of repentance and restoration.

ADDITIONAL JUDGMENT-RELATED TEXTS IN 1 CORINTHIANS

1 Cor 5:5

Although the motif does not occur in this text, it cannot be ignored in a study of Paul's understanding of judgment according to works. He is found passing judgment on a member of the congregation [κέκρικα, v 3] and urging the church to join him in thus judging "those who are inside" (v 12). Furthermore, this apostolic judgment does seem to have some relation to the individual's ultimate salvation [ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου, v 5], and is clearly prompted by the man's deeds [κέκρικα . . . τὸν οὕτως τοῦτο κατεργασάμενον, v 3]. Karl Donfried calls this "the single most important passage" among those which "state that God can and will reject disobedient Christians," and, at the same time, is "the one most frequently used as a support for the argument that the baptized Christian is guaranteed salvation."¹³⁷ The significance of this passage for our subject is made even clearer by looking at the various conclusions which interpreters have reached in the course of their exegesis. "The most common interpretation is that Satan was expected to cause the man's sudden death or a slower one by illness, that his death would expiate for his sin, and thus his immortal soul or his inner, true self would be saved."¹³⁸ For some, this verges on a "guarantee," a sort of *character indelebilis* for the baptized.

Die Sicherheit aber, mit der P[aulus] annimmt, daß wenigstens der Geist gerettet werden wird, beruht wohl darauf, daß dieses *pneuma* . . . durch die Taufe und die Berührung mit dem

¹³⁷ "Justification," 149-150. He also cites 1 Cor 10; 11:27-34; Gal 6:7; (and with less certainty 1 Cor 6:9 and Gal 5:21b) as pointing to the same divine rejection of disobedient Christians.

¹³⁸ A. Y. Collins, "The function of 'excommunication' in Paul," *HTR* 73 (1980) 257; citing Robertson & Plummer, Lietzmann, Allo, Schlatter, Bultmann, Bruce, Orr and Walther, and Barrett as proponents of this view; to which should also be added M. Goguel, *The Primitive Church* (trans. by H. C. Snape; New York: MacMillan, 1964) 233-234; H. Braun, *Gerichtsgedanke*, 50, 64; L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 103-108; E. Synofzik, *Vergeltungsaussagen*, 53-56; and I. Havener, "A curse for salvation—1 Corinthians 5:1-5," *Sin, Salvation, and the Spirit* (ed. D. Durken; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1979) 344, n. 31.

göttlichen Geiste eine Weihe empfangen hat, durch die es gegen die Angriffe des Satans fest geworden ist.¹³⁹

At rather the opposite end of the spectrum are a number of exegetes who translate “in order that the [Holy] Spirit may be preserved,” rather than as a reference to the salvation of the offender’s spirit. Understood this way, grave moral failure did indeed bring eternal destruction even for the one who had been counted among the justified. The “handing over to Satan” has no remedial purpose for the offender, but is strictly and irreversibly punitive.¹⁴⁰

A third group of scholars sees the offender’s salvation as a distinct possibility, but one which is conditioned upon his repentance. There remains an implicit threat of condemnation if the offender does not repent as a result of the discipline. Future judgment can result in damnation, even for one previously counted among the justified, if flagrant and ongoing evildoing is not discontinued.¹⁴¹

And even within any one of the above interpretive groupings there remains considerable disagreement as to individual details. If we are to gain any insight as to “Paul and judgment” from this text, the following questions will have to be addressed and answered with as much certainty as the evidence allows.

1. What precisely is the congregational action which Paul enjoins? Does “to hand over to Satan” speak of exclusion from the community, some form of solemn curse upon the offender, or perhaps a combination of both?
2. What is the expected result of this action [*εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός*]? Is death or physical suffering envisioned? Is it viewed as punishment or as remedial discipline, and are any conditions implied if this result is to be obtained?

¹³⁹ J. Weiß, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 131. Of much the same opinion is A. Strobel—“eine absolute Zusage” (*Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 99).

¹⁴⁰ A. Y. Collins, “Excommunication,” 259-260; H. von Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries* (trans. J. A. Baker; Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ., 1969 [German original: *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht*, 1953]) 134, n. 50; K. P. Donfried, “Justification,” 150.

¹⁴¹ G. W. H. Lampe, “Church discipline and the Interpretation of the Epistles to the Corinthians,” *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented John Knox* (ed. W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, R. R. Niebuhr; Cambridge: 1967) 342-355; C. J. Roetzel, *Judgement*, 122-124; V. C. Pfitzner, “PURIFIED COMMUNITY - PURIFIED SINNER: Expulsion from the Community according to Matthew 18:15-18 and 1 Corinthians 5:1-5,” *AustBibRev* 30 (1982) 46-47; G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 208-213 (“this was the standard view in the early church, being found explicitly in Origen, Chrysostom, and Theodore of Mopsuestia” [212, n. 82]).

3. How do we best understand the expressed purpose of this action [ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ]? What is this “spirit” which is to be “saved”? Is this purpose ensured by the action itself or is the offender’s response implied as a co-condition? Is the loss of salvation implied if the action is not carried out, or if the offender does not respond properly?

4. Does 2 Cor 2:5-11 (also 7:8-13) confirm that repentance was hoped for and not sudden death? Is this passage even speaking of the same situation?

The asyndeton at 5:1 and clear reference to the new topic of sexual immorality [πορνεία] mark out 5:1-6:20 as a new section focusing on problems related to immorality in the community, and especially to questions of community judgment on such behavior. The surface issue is a specific case of immorality, here specified as a believer living in an ongoing sexual relationship with his step-mother.¹⁴² While Greco-Roman society was much more tolerant on sexual matters than Jewish culture, this particular case of cohabitation between step-son and step-mother was equally abhorrent to both Jews and Greeks.¹⁴³

It is difficult, however, to explain Paul’s vehement reaction (“Drive out the wicked person from among you,” v 13) as due to this offense alone.¹⁴⁴ And, in fact, he gives relatively little attention to the offender himself, focusing instead on the church’s response to such sin in their midst.¹⁴⁵ They are arrogant instead of grieving and mourning.¹⁴⁶ They are boasting (5:6) in their tolerance or even support of such behavior. Such behavior, if tolerated, is a dangerous leaven that could threaten to corrupt the entire church (5:6-8). It is even possible that immorality has

¹⁴² On the nature of the relationship (was a marriage involved? status of the offender’s father?), see C. K. Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 122; and G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 200.

¹⁴³ F. Hauck and S. Schulz, *TDNT* 6.579-595. On Jewish attitudes, see esp. Lev 18:8; 20:11; Deut 27:20. On Greco-Roman attitudes, cf. Caius, *Inst* 1.63: “Neither can I marry her who has aforetime been my mother-in-law or step-mother, or daughter-in-law or step-daughter” (quoted in H. Conzelmann, *First Corinthians*, 96, n. 29).

¹⁴⁴ Serious offenses did not always result immediately in expulsion, cf. e.g., Gal 5:21; 6:1; 1 Cor 6:1-11; 11:17-34.

¹⁴⁵ “In chapter 5, one verse deals with the incestuous persons and twelve verses deal with the culpability of the congregation, with its power to rid itself of the ‘old yeast’” (P. S. Minear, “Christ and the Congregation,” 343). Further, no interest is expressed here in a restorative process such as in Gal 6:1 or Matt 18.

¹⁴⁶ See below on πένθειν, n. 189.

become a broader problem than this one instance, and that various forms are being practised by segments of the congregation.¹⁴⁷ Thus in examining v 5 we will have to keep in mind that this brief reference to the sinner's fate is secondary to the main intent of the passage, which is to bring congregational attitudes and behavior back into line with Paul's apostolic gospel.

His main interest lies not in the effects of judgment upon this offending believer, but with the purity of the community. Four times he reiterates the charge to the community to remove the man (5:2b, 5, 7, 13). In explicit contrast to the congregation's puffed up permissiveness Paul judges¹⁴⁸ the offender and directs the church to take action which reflects such judgment. The action against the offender is "shrouded in mystery" (Fee) and "läßt sich nur vermutungsweise deuten" (Synofzik). Thus while we will lay out the various interpretive options and argue for a particular understanding of v 5, it would be unwise to allow this verse to carry too much weight in the overall determination of Paul's view of judgment upon believers.

The unusual phrase—"to hand this man over to Satan [παραδοῦναι τὸν τοιοῦτον τῷ σατανᾷ]"—is almost certainly either a curse, a reference to exclusion from the community, or a combination of the two.¹⁴⁹ Those favoring a curse cite parallels with execration formulae in the magical papyri: "Daemon of the dead . . . , I deliver [παραδίδωμι] to thee so-and-so, in order that [ὅπως]"¹⁵⁰ In such a

¹⁴⁷ Cf. 5:9; 6:12-20; 7:2; 10:8. "In Corinth fornication was no isolated occurrence, no temporary affair, which could be repented of, confessed and forgiven within the community (cf. 2Cor 12:21). It was a situation which had lasted a long time (ἔχειν, v. 1), which had been accepted by those concerned and tolerated by the community itself" (G. Forkman, *Limits*, 140).

¹⁴⁸ Although some translate ἤδη κέκρικα (v 3) in the milder sense of "already resolved" or "decided" (e.g., H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 94, n. 9; C. K. Barrett, *First Epistle*, 124), "I have already judged" seems to make better sense of the difficult syntax (see BDF, §389; G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 205, n. 44; J. Murphy-O'Connor, "1 Corinthians V, 3-5," *RB* 84 (1977) 239-245, esp. 242-243; and W. Schrage, *An die Korinther*, 373-374).

¹⁴⁹ For other alternatives, see J. Klausner, *From Jesus to Paul* (trans. Wm. F. Stinespring; London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1944) 553; and W. F. Orr and J. A. Walther, *1 Corinthians*, 186.

¹⁵⁰ London Magical Papyrus 46.334ff, in A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East* (1910) 304. For additional literature, see H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 97, n. 37.

case the offender is cursed and devoted to destruction resulting in affliction or physical death. Reference can be made to Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1-11) where physical death resulted immediately; to the role of Satan in the OT and Judaism as “destroyer”;¹⁵¹ and to other early Christian parallels.¹⁵² This is considered preferable to excommunication since “the language implies a severer sentence than excommunication,” and evidence is weak for use of such a phrase in excommunications (but see below).¹⁵³ Among those favoring a curse (only) there is considerable disagreement as to its results (physical affliction, immediate death, etc.) and purpose (eternal destruction, substitute for eternal damnation, remedial).¹⁵⁴

On the other side are those who favor a reference to some form of excommunication.¹⁵⁵ Paul’s consistent response throughout 5:1-13 is to stress the exclusion of the offender. Though the language of v 5 is admittedly not attested elsewhere as an act of expulsion from a religious community, “1 Tim. 1:20 suggests that for Paul this was quasitechnical language for some kind of expulsion from the Christian community,”¹⁵⁶ possibly influenced by Job 2:6 (see n. 151). Calvin noted that while Christ reigns within, so Satan reigns outside the Church, possibly explaining why excommunication is viewed as “delivery to Satan.”¹⁵⁷ Although Paul’s

¹⁵¹ See esp. (LXX) Job 2:6: “The Lord said to the devil [τῷ διαβόλῳ], behold I deliver him over to you [παραδίδωμί σοι αὐτόν].”

¹⁵² H. Lietzmann, *An die Korinther*, 99.

¹⁵³ F. F. Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971) 55.

¹⁵⁴ Proponents of this “curse” (only) view include A. Y. Collins, “Excommunication,” 255; F. L. Godet, *First Corinthians*, 252-253; M. Goguel, *The Primitive Church*, 234; and G. G. Findlay, *St. Paul’s First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Expositor’s Greek Test.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, [reprinted] 1974) 2.809.

¹⁵⁵ Proponents include Augustine, Calvin, Beza, Olshausen, Bonnet, Heinrici, Robertson & Plummer, and Fee. J. Ruef appeals to “degrees of exclusion” in the Qumran writings and concludes that “‘deliver to Satan’ probably implies a degree of exclusion rather than complete loss of membership” (*Paul’s First Letter to Corinth* [Westminster Pelican Commentaries; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971] 40).

¹⁵⁶ G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 208-209.

¹⁵⁷ *First Epistle*, 108.

terminology of exclusion cannot be paralleled in Jewish sources, his general conception and practice can. The widespread practice, both in pagan and Jewish circles, of community exclusion (not merely restricted participation) for transgressions which threaten the foundations of the community itself has been sufficiently demonstrated.¹⁵⁸ Paul's reliance upon the OT is manifest in vv 7 and 13.

Quite a number of scholars combine both of the above views, taking the phrase to be a solemn curse executed by the community as part of the offender's exclusion from the community. "Der Ausschluß aus der Gemeinde erfolgte sehr wahrscheinlich unter der feierlichen Verfluchung: 'Wir übergeben dich dem Satan'."¹⁵⁹

However, nestled as it is within repeated calls for the expulsion of the sinner from the congregation, we consider it unlikely that Paul would now, at the point of formal instruction for community action, introduce a new and obscure edict. This contextual factor tips the balance in favor of viewing "delivery to Satan" as an alternate formulation for expulsion. The lack of formal parallels to Paul's phraseology may be explained either as an accident of the extant materials, or because its use only occurred within a very limited circle of the early church.¹⁶⁰ While the use here as an execration formula cannot be entirely ruled out, the salvific purpose assigned

¹⁵⁸ For examples outside Biblical influence, see G. J. Blidstein, "Atimia: A Greek Parallel to Ezra X.8 and to Post-Biblical Exclusion from the Community," *VT* 24 (1985) 357-360; and S. C. Barton and G. H. R. Horsley, "A Hellenistic Cult Group and the New Testament Churches," *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 24 (1981) 7-41. The connections between Paul's use and Jewish sources have been explored by B. S. Rosner, "Temple and Holiness," 137-145; and G. Forkman, *Limits*; cf. also W. Horbury, "Extirpation and Excommunication," *VT* 35/1 (1985) 13-38; and for Rabbinic practice, C. H. Hunzinger, *Die jüdische Bannpraxis* (Diss. Göttingen: 1954).

¹⁵⁹ E. Synofzik, *Vergeltungsaussagen*, 55. Additional proponents of both curse and exclusion: Héring, Roetzel, Forkman, Strobel, Collins, and Harris.

¹⁶⁰ As noted earlier, 1 Tim 1:20 testifies to the usage of this phrase in some disciplinary sense in Pauline circles. However its identification with the usage in 1 Cor 5 is made difficult due to the former's apparent lack of congregational involvement ("whom I have turned over to Satan"), and to the difference in purpose ("so that they may learn not to blaspheme"). In favor of viewing both texts as (related) expulsion formulae, see G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 208-209; E. F. Scott, *The Pastoral Epistles* (MNTC; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1936) 17; and J. N. D. Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Black's NT Commentaries; London: Adam & Charles Black, 1963) 58.

by Paul to this action places his usage in opposition to all the parallels for such formulae thus far gathered.¹⁶¹

The result of this expulsion is termed “the destruction of the flesh [εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός].” Three main options have generally been considered in the interpretation of this phrase, none of which is without problems. It may possibly refer to physical death, in which case the σάρξ/πνεῦμα contrast in v 5bc is usually interpreted as something like “body/soul” or “material/immaterial.” Interpretations of the nature and effects of such a death vary widely. It can be “sudden” and “immediate”¹⁶² or following a period of suffering;¹⁶³ and can be viewed alternately as “expiatory,”¹⁶⁴ as salvific because it prevents the offender from further sinning,¹⁶⁵ or as simply eternally damning punishment.¹⁶⁶ The main criticisms of this view include: a) the resulting σάρξ/πνεῦμα contrast sounds suspiciously Hellenistic and non-Pauline (‘shed the sarx to save the pneuma’); b) a *salvific* death is not found elsewhere in Paul; c) Pauline discipline normally has a more remedial character; and d) v 11 seems to assume this offender will still be around but must be avoided.¹⁶⁷

Others would emphasize physical affliction (sometimes seen as leading eventually to death). Reference is made to Satan’s role in Job’s afflictions and to Paul’s “thorn in the flesh” as examples of Satan’s bringing physical affliction. On

¹⁶¹ A. Robertson and A. Plummer, *First Epistle*, 100, note.

¹⁶² H. Lietzmann, *An die Korinther I*, 99; J. Schneider, *TDNT* 5.169; E. von Dobschütz, *Die urchristlichen Gemeinden* (1902) 271. Reference is often made to 1 Cor 11:30 and Acts 5:1-11.

¹⁶³ Thus overlapping somewhat with the interpretation as physical affliction (see below). Cf. J. Weiß, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 131 (“Vernichtungsleiden”); G. Forkman, *Limits*, 144-145 (material losses, personal tragedies, illnesses, and finally death).

¹⁶⁴ G. P. Wetter, *Vergeltungsgedanke*, 145-148.

¹⁶⁵ F. Filson, *Recompense*, 86-88.

¹⁶⁶ H. von Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority*, 134, n. 50.

¹⁶⁷ For these and other arguments against viewing “for the destruction of the flesh” as death, see G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 210-212; G. W. H. Lampe, “Church discipline,” 342-355.

this view, it is assumed that such affliction will bring the sinner to his senses, leading to repentance and reinstatement, thus preserving his salvation.¹⁶⁸ The major difficulty with this view lies in the word ὅλεθρος (“destruction”), which seems much too strong if Paul had wished to refer to afflictions rather than the destruction of the physical person (see on this word below). It has also been criticized for placing so much weight on repentance, something not explicit in the passage itself.¹⁶⁹

Thus, in the third place, interpreters have opted for taking σάρξ in the sense of ‘sinful nature,’ allowing “destruction of the flesh” as a reference to its “mortification” along the lines of Rom 6:6.¹⁷⁰ How such mortification actually occurs is variously explained.¹⁷¹ Difficulties sometimes cited in connection with this view are the use of ὅλεθρος instead of Paul’s usual terminology for “mortification,”¹⁷² and that delivery to Satan’s realm would seem to suggest an increase in the hold of the flesh over the sinner rather than its destruction.¹⁷³ In addition to these positions, some commentators support a combination of the above interpretations.

The interpretive crux lies clearly in Paul’s use of σάρξ in this context (opp. πνεῦμα). His normal range of usage is broad, including the concrete material corporeality of an individual; then humanity in its weakness, dependence on God, and

¹⁶⁸ This was generally the view of the early church fathers, see K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche* (1933) 178, 243-244 (cited by J. Schneider, *TDNT* 5.169, n. 8). Cf. also G. W. H. Lampe, “Church discipline,” 342-355 (esp. 346-352), and F. Filson, *Recompense*, 86-88.

¹⁶⁹ For instance, G. Harris, “The Beginnings of Church Discipline,” 18. But see below on repentance.

¹⁷⁰ N. G. Joy, “Is the body really to be destroyed?” *Bible Translator* 39 (1988) 429-436, and C. Roetzel, *Judgement*, 122-124.

¹⁷¹ G. D. Fee suggests that excommunication itself may be sufficient (*First Corinthians*, 213), while others return to the thought of physical afflictions (Robertson & Plummer, *1 Corinthians*, 99). Grosheide thinks of physical death as ending the reign of the flesh over this individual, leaving his spirit sanctified and saved (*First Corinthians*, 123-124).

¹⁷² Cf. καταργεῖν (Rom 6:6); νεκροῦν/θανατοῦν (Col 3:3; Rom 8:13); σταυροῦν (Gal 5:24); see also F. Godet, *First Corinthians*, 256.

¹⁷³ G. G. Findlay, *First Corinthians*, 809.

perishableness; and extending on to that special sense characteristic of Paul in which it signifies humanity in its sin and depravity and “die Sphäre . . . des Sündigen . . . , die nicht nur als die irdisch-vergängliche im Gegensatz zum jenseitig-ewigen Gott steht, sondern die ihm auch feindlich gegenübertritt, wie es denn Rm 8,7 heißt: τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς ἔχθρα εἰς θεόν.”¹⁷⁴

A. C. Thiselton argues against specifying flesh here as either the “physical side of person” (=death or physical suffering) or “lower nature,” contending instead for an *evaluative use* of the term derived primarily from the rhetorical context of 1 Corinthians.

Both the context of situation and the broader linguistic context of the earlier chapters suggest that ‘flesh’ and ‘fleshly’, together with ‘spirit’ and ‘spiritual’ had already acquired a highly evaluative and even emotive significance. . . . In the overwhelming majority of instances in which σὰρξ and πνεῦμα oppose each other, they set up a polarity between what accords with the working of the Spirit of God and human characteristics which, to all intents and purposes, have been arrived at independently.¹⁷⁵

Paul is not using the terms in a technical sense from his own perspective, but is entering into a “language game” with the Corinthians.¹⁷⁶ Whereas they thought such a demonstration of “freedom” showed freedom from the “flesh” in a truly “spiritual” existence, Paul counters that the flesh is very much alive amongst them and must still be destroyed if the “spirit” (*i.e., that which truly belongs to the realm of the “spiritual”*) is to be saved. By excluding the offender from the community of the wise and spiritual, his boastful fleshly attitude as well as (by implication) that of

¹⁷⁴ R. Bultmann, *Theologie des NT*⁸, 237, see also 232-239. On σὰρξ in Paul, see esp. R. Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of their Use in Conflict Settings* (AGJU 10; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971) 49-166, esp. 115; and H. Ridderbos, *Paul*, 93-95.

¹⁷⁵ “The Meaning of SARX in 1Corinthians 5:5: A Fresh Approach in the Light of Logical and Semantic Factors,” *SJT* 26 (1973) 204-228, here 215; on the “evaluative use of language,” see esp. 205-209.

¹⁷⁶ Thiselton, “Meaning,” 216. The concept of “language games” derives from Wittgenstein (whose views are expounded conveniently in A. C. Thiselton, *The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980] 407-415). In a similar vein, see J. Benedict, “The Corinthian Problem of 1Corinthians 5:1-8,” *Brethren Life* 32 (1987) 70-73: “Their fleshly attitudes would naturally be cut to the quick when the man, as a symbol of their supposed maturity and knowledge, was delivered to Satan (*i.e., expelled*)” (72). Benedict, however, restricts the meaning here to a corporate application, rather than allowing that what is said applies equally to the offender.

portions of the congregation will be dealt a mortal blow (“destroyed”). That the removal of such an *attitude* was uppermost in Paul’s mind is confirmed by the immediately following: Οὐ καλὸν τὸ καύχημα ὑμῶν.

On this interpretation “destruction” receives a natural rendering, being a severe term, ready to hand in the Hellenistic world for the destruction or ruin of something.¹⁷⁷ It should not be weakened to mean “affliction,”¹⁷⁸ nor made to correspond to Paul’s more normal terminology for “mortification of the flesh.” Neither need we seek uncertain parallels.¹⁷⁹

If asked *how* expulsion results in ‘destruction of the flesh,’ the interpreter is left to guesswork, since this is not explained by the apostle. If we are correct that Paul is directing the church to exclude the offender resulting in the destruction of both the individual’s and the congregation’s fleshly attitudes, then it may well be that the mere fact of such a one being thrust out of the community of the ‘spiritual’ was considered enough to puncture this puffed-up boasting.¹⁸⁰

Finally, what exactly is one to understand by the salvific final clause: ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου? Most of the various interpretations of this phrase have been noted at points above, so we will here only briefly review them.

1) Πνεῦμα refers to a constituent ‘part’ of the human being which will be saved. This view has been generally abandoned as reflecting a too Hellenistic, non-Pauline anthropology.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁷ Considered a strong term, often with the connotation of sudden destruction [ὄλεθρος αἰπῆς] and especially the destruction of life [ὄλεθρος ψυχῆς]. See C. Hahn, art. *Destruction*, *NIDNTT* 1.465; and *LSJ*, art. ὄλεθρος.

¹⁷⁸ Used elsewhere in the Pauline corpus with reference to eternal “destruction” at the parousia (1 Thess 5:3; 2 Thess 1:9 [ὄλεθρος αἰώνιος]; cf. also 1 Cor 10:10 [ὁ ὀλοθρεύτης = OT angel of destruction]; and 1 Tim 6:9 [par. ἀπωλεία]). On the whole, see J. Schneider, *TDNT* 5.167-171.

¹⁷⁹ Against B. S. Rosner who points to the verb ὀλεθρεύω used four times in the LXX to translate כרת (Num 4:18; Judg 6:25, 28, 30), a prominent term in the teaching of scripture on community *exclusion* (“Temple and Holiness,” 137-145). It is difficult to imagine, however, that Paul’s formerly pagan hearers would have been expected to catch such a nuance.

¹⁸⁰ A. C. Thiselton, “Meaning”; also (cautiously) G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 213.

¹⁸¹ See A. Sand, *Der Begriff ‘Fleisch’*, 143-145; and R. Jewett, *Anthropological Terms*, 167-200, esp. 194-198.

2) Πνεῦμα refers to the *Holy Spirit* (i.e., in the community), which will be “preserved” by ridding the community of the unholy person.¹⁸²

3) “The *pneuma* of the sinner which is to be delivered is the I given to him by God, a portion of God’s Spirit, though the whole of the new man of the believer is represented therein. But this is not an indelible character, for Paul reckons with the possibility of perdition if judgment is not exercised on the *sarx* (sickness, death? 11:30; cf. Acts 5:1-11). It is the new I of man which perishes if he ceases altogether to be a Christian.”¹⁸³

4) Like “flesh,” “spirit” reflects Paul’s evaluative use of language as seen in 1 Cor 1-4, rather than any particular technical usage derived from other letters or contexts.¹⁸⁴ It constitutes a “language game.”¹⁸⁵ Whereas the Corinthians prided themselves in already being πνευματικοί, and that in the face of flagrant immorality in their midst(!), Paul counters that eschatological salvation of that/those which truly belong/s to the realm of “spirit” will only be achieved by driving out the evil from amongst them.

We have previously noted our preference for this last-mentioned interpretation, in which case Paul’s intention can be understood at two levels, the individual and the corporate. Assuming that this individual (along with segments of the congregation) saw himself as already wholly spiritual and freed from the limitations of the flesh, Paul counters with a directive that marks the offender as in fact too much associated with the very realm from which he imagines himself to be free. That which is fleshly must be destroyed by exclusion from the community, in order that that which is genuinely spirit(ual) may be saved. For the individual this most likely involves repentance from the specific form of fleshly behavior he has been practicing (see further on ‘repentance’ below). For the community this means ridding themselves of their blind and boastful attitudes characteristic of the flesh in order that they might be genuinely πνεῦμα (=πνευματικοί, those who participate in the realm of πνεῦμα) and thus be “saved.” In either case, salvation is assured only to those who belong to the realm of πνεῦμα, or as Paul states it in Romans 8, who have τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος (v 6) and live κατὰ πνεῦμα (v 4). The ἵνα-clause

¹⁸² Above all, the eschatological referent (“saved in the day of the Lord”) renders this interpretation unlikely, since in reference to the Holy Spirit in the community it would have to be the present, not future, “preservation” that is prominent. Cf. E. Schweizer, art. πνεῦμα, *TDNT* 6.435, n. 691, who refers also to 1 Pet 4:6 against this interpretation.

¹⁸³ Ibid., 435. R. Jewett concludes that Paul has left τὸ πνεῦμα in 1 Cor 5:5 “in a very ambiguous relation to the human spirit . . . causing a profound terminological confusion” (*Anthropological Terms*, 190).

¹⁸⁴ See above pp 300-301.

¹⁸⁵ See above p. 300, n. 176.

(v 5c) should be understood in a strictly final sense, indicating “dass die Rettung des *pneuma* am Tag des Herrn vom jetzigen Vollzug des Gerichtes über die *sarx* abhängt.”¹⁸⁶ Salvation is here made conditional upon living in the Spirit, seen as the desired result of this act of exclusion.

It might be urged against this interpretation that it assumes something not explicit in the text itself -- repentance.¹⁸⁷ Absence of its mention in regard to the individual is easily understandable, since Paul's focus here is not on the offender and his fate, but on changing the congregation's attitude toward this situation.¹⁸⁸ Corporately, Paul most certainly has repentance in view.¹⁸⁹ As for the individual offender, 2 Cor 2:5-11 and 7:12 have been traditionally interpreted (following most church fathers except Tertullian) as referring to this same incident. “This punishment by the majority is enough for such a person; so now instead you should forgive and console him, so that he may not be overwhelmed by excessive sorrow.”¹⁹⁰ If correct, this would indicate that not death but repentance had been envisioned for the offender all along by the apostle. This traditional identification, however, is

¹⁸⁶ L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 107, n. 268; see also G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 209.

¹⁸⁷ Against the assumption of potential repentance: G. Harris, “The Beginnings of Church Discipline,” 18; E. Synofzik, *Vergeltungsaussagen*, 56; L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 107. Accepting a hope of repentance: G. W. H. Lampe, “Church Discipline,” 348; L. Brun, *Segen und Fluch im Urchristentum* (Oslo: 1932) 107; G. D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 212; J. Moffatt, *First Corinthians*, 57; M. E. Thrall, *The First and Second Letters of Paul to the Corinthians* (Cambridge Bible Comm.; Cambridge: University Press, 1965) 40; and most of the church fathers.

¹⁸⁸ See above p. 295.

¹⁸⁹ Πενθέω (v 2) was used esp. for sorrow over sins committed (*BAGD*, 642; cf. 1 Esdr 8:69; 9:2; 2 Esdr 10:6; T.Reub. 1:10) and may be drawn from OT forerunners in which Israel was called to mourn over a sinner in her midst because she shared corporately in the sinner's guilt (cf. Exod 16:27-28; Num 16:24, 27; Deut 19:13; 21:9; 29:19-21; Josh 7:1; 22:16, 18; 1 Sam 14:37-38; Ezra 9; Neh chaps 1 and 9; 13:18; Dan 9). See also B. S. Rosner, “OTXI MAAΛON EIΠENΘΗΣATE: Corporate Responsibility in 1 Corinthians 5,” *NTS* 38 (1992) 470-473. This sense of “repent over shared responsibility” corresponds with Paul's only other use, 2 Cor 12:21 (cf. Jas 4:9; 1 Clem 2:6; also 2 Cor 7:10 where Paul says “godly sorrow produces repentance”). The Passover-Leaven motif (vv 7-8) was likewise connected with repentance.

¹⁹⁰ F. C. Baur, *Der Apostel Paulus*, 234-235; J. Moffatt, *First Corinthians*, 57; G. W. H. Lampe, “Church Discipline,” 353-354; P. E. Hughes, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962) 59-72, 275-278.

most likely incorrect.¹⁹¹ Despite this, it may still reasonably be assumed that repentance and restoration were the apostle's (unexpressed) desire. This would be in line with his treatment elsewhere of offenders who had suffered some form of punishment.¹⁹² Such is, however, neither explicit in, nor central to, the text itself.

To summarize the import of our exegesis for the question of judgment: both the obscurity of Paul's language in v 5, along with the fact that his interest in this passage does not lie with the individual and his fate, but with the church's response, caution strongly against too much reliance on this text for discerning a Pauline understanding of individual judgment according to works. We have found no support in this text for the view of some that believers are assured of salvation in spite of ongoing sinful behavior. Neither do we hear Paul pronouncing an irreversible verdict of eternal condemnation. We have suggested that flesh and spirit can be best understood not via comparison with usage in other Pauline letters, but as language that is evaluative, emotive, a "word game" following on the heels of chapters 1-4. Their boasting in spiritual liberty and wisdom, which permitted (or even encouraged) shocking and licentious behavior, and which the Corinthians thought demonstrated their participation in *πνεῦμα*, Paul calls *σάρξ*. This will be destroyed when they exclude this pneumatic from the assembly.

Only by such judgment on the still active *σάρξ* can they demonstrate that they genuinely belong to the sphere of *πνεῦμα*, the sphere of salvation. Though not explicit, the same will likely have been intended regarding the individual offender. Exclusion from the community will hopefully produce the desired result. He too will recognize that his attitude and behavior reflect the flesh, not the Spirit. The

¹⁹¹ See esp. V. Furnish, *II Corinthians* (AB 32A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1987) 159-166.

¹⁹² See Gal 6:1; 2 Thess 3:14-15; 2 Cor 2:5-11; 1 Cor 11:27-32. While in itself shocking, it can hardly be said that the individual's sin in 1 Cor 5 is more serious than in these other passages. Paul's severity here is, in any case, not prompted so much by this sin as by the congregation's response (see above).

dominance of the flesh will thus be ended, and the individual can be restored to genuine pneumatic existence, and be saved.

On this view the salvation of the (justified) individual is, indeed, at stake. Flagrant and ongoing identification with the flesh does bring with it the potential of condemnation. Saved by grace, the believer will just as certainly be judged according to such deeds. If these deeds evidence an unrepentant commitment to the flesh, the goal of salvation will not be attained, conditioned as it is in 1 Cor 5:5 on the destruction of the flesh.

1 Cor 6:9-11

This sharp warning in the form of a traditional vice-list is closely connected with 6:1-8.¹⁹³ One brother has defrauded another, and rather than resolving the dispute within the community they have gone to civil court, something which sickens Paul for a number of reasons, not the least because of the *shame* this brings upon the community (v 5). After employing several different rhetorical tools to dissuade the Corinthians from this behavior,¹⁹⁴ Paul turns in vv 8-10 to charge and threat,¹⁹⁵ followed immediately, however, by a word of assurance (v 11), which serves not to dull the threat, but to encourage repentance.¹⁹⁶

Paul's basic threat was a truism throughout Judaism and early Christianity, "wrongdoers will not inherit the kingdom of God [ἄδικοι θεοῦ βασιλείαν οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν]." The Jewish Psalter opens with the reminder that "the wicked will not stand in the judgment" and "the way of the wicked will perish" (Ps 1:5, 6). It recurs in Paul in Gal 5:21 as an explicit element in his foundational initial teaching of new converts—οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες βασιλείαν θεοῦ οὐ

¹⁹³ For various attempts to reconstruct the exact dispute in these verses, see P. Richardson, "Judgment in Sexual Matters in 1 Corinthians 6:1-11," *NovT* 25/1 (1983) 37-58.

¹⁹⁴ Statements of horror (vv 1, 6), rhetorical questions (vv 2-4, 5b-6, 7b), and sarcasm (v 5).

¹⁹⁵ On the use of οὐκ οἶδατε (v 9a) to introduce an intensified warning, see above p. 277.

¹⁹⁶ See G. D. Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 228-229.

κληρονομήσουσιν.¹⁹⁷ Romans 1:18 makes clear that God's wrath rests upon all human ἀδικία, and Paul speaks a few verses later of "God's decree, that those who practice such things deserve to die" (1:32). This is echoed in 2:8-9 ("for those . . . who obey . . . wickedness [ἀδικία], there will be wrath and fury"), part of an expansion upon the divine recompense according to deeds (2:6). In Col 3:25 the recompense of wrongdoing (ἀδικός/ἀδικέω) is set in contrast to the Christian inheritance.

While it may be granted that such statements, especially as part of a vice-list, were typically understood to apply to the 'wicked' outside the believing community, this cannot be pressed so as to exclude their usage as a threat to the obstinately disobedient within, certainly not in 1 Cor 6:9-11 and Gal 5:21 where the believing community is explicitly addressed. Such obstinate disobedience raises the fundamental question as to whether the individual actually belongs to the group of the 'wicked' or the 'righteous,'¹⁹⁸ since one's deeds are the visible manifestation of the unseen realities of the heart. In line with the understanding of divine recompense according to works discovered in Judaism and thus far in Paul's letters, so here those whose behavior identifies them consistently as being 'wicked' will be excluded from the future inheritance of the elect. Although Paul has here adopted a piece of tradition, this does not make this traditional connection between works and entry into the Kingdom any less Pauline.¹⁹⁹ Even more significant, perhaps, is the close linkage in this passage of (past) justification "in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ" with the threat of disinheritance based upon behavior. This phenomenon testifies once again to the lack of theological tension felt by Paul in affirming simultaneously justification by grace and judgment according to works, while at the same time

¹⁹⁷ See also Eph 5:5.

¹⁹⁸ They are "in danger of lapsing back into their pre-conversion condition and of forfeiting their entry into the Kingdom of God at the End" (R. H. Fuller, "First Corinthians 6:1-11, An Exegetical Paper," *Ex Auditu* 2 [1986] 102).

¹⁹⁹ Against R. H. Fuller, "First Corinthians 6:1-11," 102.

heightening the existential tension (“are you what you claim to be?”) as a tool against wicked behavior or complacency. The same phenomenon characterized Jewish covenantalism, wherein the faithful drew comfort and assurance from the divine election and covenant mercies, and at the same time lived under God’s rule who would bring destruction upon all who chose the path of wickedness.

Those concerned with a more thoroughgoing systematization of Paul’s thought on this point not infrequently appeal to the idea of ‘false profession.’ That is, those who would actually experience the consequences of this threat are counterfeit believers, not the genuinely converted who thereafter fall into grievous and ongoing sin. “Paul argues ardently against immoral behavior on the part of believers, yet is not saying that such behavior leads to loss of salvation.” “Ethical failure has other consequences”; it indicates the prior inauthenticity of Christian profession, divine chastisement, or regression in sanctification.²⁰⁰ On this view 1 Cor 6:9-10 is perhaps a paraenetic device (i.e., hypothetical warning), and at most hints at a minority in the Corinthian congregation who were not genuine believers. However, while such an after-the-fact determination of unauthentic faith may be suggested by texts such as 1 Cor 5:11 [“so-called brother”?] and 1 John 2:19, it is excluded for 1 Cor 6:9 by Paul’s explicit identification of his hearers as those who were washed, sanctified and justified “in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God” (v 11). Even those engaged in wrongdoing he still calls ἀδελφοί (vv 5-6).²⁰¹ Paul is most assuredly not yet prepared to label the wrongdoers in Corinth “the wicked” (cf. v 11a). On the other hand, he clearly describes their current behavior as cut from the same cloth as that of the unrighteous (ἀλλὰ ὑμεῖς

²⁰⁰ J. Gundry-Volf, *Paul and Perseverance*, 155, 157; cf. also 132-141, 221-225.

²⁰¹ For this reason, one cannot help but sense that theology has triumphed over exegesis when 1 Cor 6:9-11 is interpreted to mean “the Corinthians could be included in οἱ ἄδικοι only if they are not Christians at all but actually ἄπιστοι” (ibid., 135). Ultimately there may be something to the idea that professing Christians who fall and suffer destruction in judgment are thereby revealed to be wicked and unbelieving (cf. 2 Tim 2:16-19; 1 Tim 1:19-20; 1 John 2:19), but such ideas as counterfeit disciples or veiled unbelief are foreign to this particular text and can only be found by importing them from outside. What Paul says here is—you *are* ‘brothers’ and have been justified, etc., but *if* you persist in wicked behavior you will suffer eschatological condemnation as an unrighteous person.

ἀδικεῖτε, v 8). His threat, if it is to retain any force at all, must imply the possibility that the currently righteous may yet fall under the condemnation reserved for the wicked if they persist unrepentantly in their wickedness. This is certainly the pattern we discovered in second temple Judaism, and is the force of Pauline statements such as 1 Cor 10:12: “So if you think you are standing, watch out that you do not fall.”

1 Cor 9:24-27

Our aim in this section can be phrased as follows: To what extent does Paul here envision reception of the ‘imperishable wreath,’ or on the other hand ‘disqualification’ from the metaphorical race, to be dependent on his performance in this race? As part of our answer we will need to clarify the meaning of this race metaphor as well as the nature of the ‘prize’ or ‘wreath.’

In the midst of his extended discussion of “food offered to idols [εἰδωλόθυτος]” (8:1-11:1), in which he is particularly urging the strong to limit their freedom in the interests of the weak (8:13; 10:31-11:1), the apostle pauses to offer a “defense” (9:3) of his apostolic practice on two fronts: (a) his right to financial support which he has not exercised (9:4-18), and (b) his seemingly vacillating behavior when in the company of Jews or Greeks (9:19-23). In both instances the self-imposed limitations on his own behavior have apparently been viewed by some Corinthians as signs of weakness and a lack of spiritual authority (otherwise he would accept monetary support and eat meat without restrictions).²⁰² Paul caps this defense in 9:23: “I do it all [i.e., restricting voluntarily my own freedom and rights] for the sake of the gospel, so that I may share in its blessings.”²⁰³

²⁰² On the nature of chap 9 as defense, or perhaps better “example,” see H. P. Nasuti, “The Woes of the Prophets and the Rights of the Apostle: The Internal Dynamics of 1 Corinthians 9,” *CBQ* 50 (1988) 246-264; W. Willis, “An Apostolic Apologia? The Form and Function of 1 Corinthians 9,” *JSNT* 24 (1985) 33-48; G. D. Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 357-363, 392-394.

²⁰³ Lit. “that I may be a fellow participant in it [ἵνα συγκαινωνὸς αὐτοῦ γένωμαι].” I.e., already Paul ties his own enjoyment of the blessings promised in the gospel to the behavior he has just defended in vv 4-22. For this meaning of *συγκαινωνός* (=one who shares in the benefits of something), cf. Rom 11:17 and Phil 1:7. For the opposite view (=partner *with* the gospel), see J. Gundry-Volf, *Paul*, 247-254.

Now in vv 24-27 the apostle follows this defense of his self-restricting behavior with an exhortation that they behave likewise—"Run in such a way that you may win it [the prize]. Athletes exercise self-control in all things; they do it to receive a perishable wreath, but we an imperishable one" (vv 24b-25). Perhaps with the nearby Isthmian games in mind, and certainly drawing on the broad Hellenistic tradition of athletic metaphors,²⁰⁴ Paul frames this exhortation in terms of two such metaphors. First he points to the foot-races, and highlights the fact that "only one receives the prize," namely, the one who "exercise[s] self-control in all things," and they do this for a "perishable wreath." We must fill in the syntactical blanks somewhat to understand properly Paul's application to the readers, which in Greek consists of only three words: *ἡμεῖς δὲ ἄφθαρτον* = "but we [exercise self-control in all things in order that we might receive an] imperishable [wreath]." Just as Paul controls his liberty in order to share in the blessings of the gospel (v 23), so he now exhorts the Corinthians to do the same in regard to the conflict over idol-meat, in order that they might gain the imperishable reward. This "imperishable wreath [*στέφανος*]" or "prize [*βραβεῖον*]" (v 24a) is a metaphorical way of depicting the gospel-blessings in which Paul also hopes to share (v 23).²⁰⁵

Excursus: The Use of 'Crown' Imagery in the NT²⁰⁶

The NT exhibits a remarkable unanimity regarding the significance of crown (or 'wreath') imagery.

- 1) Jesus is the Christian's example, who through faithful perseverance unto death was "crowned with glory and honor" (Heb 2:9; cf. Ps 8:4-6). This use of the verb [*στεφανόω*] indicates that the *awarding of glory and honor* is the central point of the imagery.
- 2) In nearly every relevant passage, the awarding of a crown as the symbol of one's victory, glory and honor is intimately tied in the immediate context to perseverance, endurance or faithfulness to one's calling. In many of these passages this is connected explicitly with the

²⁰⁴ V. C. Pfitzner, *Paul and the Agon Motif* (NovTSup 16; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967) esp. 187-191.

²⁰⁵ Although Pfitzner wishes to deny any "independent [metaphorical] weight" to the victor's prize and crown (*Agon*, 85-86, 89-90), by his own admission "*στέφανος* (like *βραβεῖον* in Phil 3:14) is definitely metaphorical," and the prize/crown images played a more important role in the athletic motif in Hellenistic Judaism than in purely Hellenistic usage (89, n. 4; cf. also 193: "the heavenly prize and crown" = "the reward of faithfulness").

²⁰⁶ On the whole subject see esp. K. Baus, *Der Kranz in Antike und Christentum* (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1940).

athletic metaphor noted already in 1 Cor 9:24-27 which likewise stresses the strict training and sacrifice necessary for those who would receive this honor.²⁰⁷

3) This 'crown' itself is reflected upon from many angles, which are all but varied ways of referring to that eschatological life, righteousness and glory which is every faithful believer's inheritance. It is often rewarded explicitly at the parousia, with Christ playing the role of judge, just as the judge in the games awarded the crown to the victor.²⁰⁸

4) There is no evidence that such 'crowns' were understood as varied rewards distinguishable from salvation itself.²⁰⁹

Such a use of crown imagery to depict salvation blessings lay ready to hand in the Jewish and Hellenistic environment of the NT authors. The OT used this imagery repeatedly as a way to symbolize the honor, joy, glory and victory promised to the faithful, and thus as a way of speaking of the promised blessed "life" and that which invests life with worth.²¹⁰

"Gray hair is a *crown of glory* [στέφανος καυχήσεως]; it is gained in a righteous life" (Prov 16:31).

"The *crown* [στέφανος] of the wise is their wisdom" (Prov 14:24).

"A good wife is the *crown* [στέφανος] of her husband, but she who brings shame is like rotteness in his bones" (Prov 12:4).

"He has stripped my *glory* [τὴν δόξαν] from me, and taken the *crown* [στέφανον] from my head" (Job 19:9).

"In that day the Lord of hosts will be a *garland of glory* [LXX: στέφανος τῆς ἐλπίδος, "of hope"], and a *diadem of beauty* [πλακεὶς τῆς δόξης], to the remnant of his people" (Isa 28:5).²¹¹

The Intertestamental literature of Judaism continued this usage, and apocalyptic literature transformed it into eschatological blessings.²¹² Sometime during the first century BCE tangible varying rewards (crowns, diadems) begin to appear, and the Tannaim testify to both

²⁰⁷ Cf. 2 Tim 2:5; 4:8; 1 Cor 9:25; Rev 2:10; 3:11; Jas 1:12; 1 Pet 5:4.

²⁰⁸ The varied nouns which follow as genitives after 'crown' are to be taken as appositives (cf. *BDF*, §167). Thus a "crown of righteousness" (2 Tim 4:8), "of life" (Rev 2:10; Jas 1:12), "of glory" (1 Pet 5:4), "of victory" (Rev 14:14), and "of boasting" (1 Thess 2:19) are not various "crowns," but various ways of referring to that righteousness, life, glory, etc., which will be awarded those who have proven victorious in the race of Christian existence. Compare esp. the "crown of righteousness" (2 Tim 4:8) which is "reserved [ἀπόκειται]" for "all who have longed for his appearing" with the "hope (=salvation) laid up [ἀποκειμένην] for you in heaven" (Col 1:5).

²⁰⁹ Those who wish to see in the NT 'crowns' such varied rewards nearly always cite 1 Cor 3:8-15 as proof; see, for instance, J. Héring, *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians* (ET; London: 1962) 80; J. Gundry-Volf, *Paul and Perseverance*, 233-247. However, as we have discussed earlier, that passage does not speak of the 'crown' or 'prize' awarded to the one who successfully runs the Christian race, but of the 'wage [μισθός]' paid to God's laborers. Furthermore the thrust of 1 Cor 3:9c-15 is not to reassure the Corinthians of salvation minus rewards, but to warn them of the *risk to salvation* they are entertaining by their behavior.

²¹⁰ O. S. Rankin, *Israel's Wisdom Literature*, 78.

²¹¹ Cf. also Prov 4:9; 17:6; Lam 5:15-16; Isa 62:3; Ezek 16:12; Wis 5:15-16. The same is true of the verb "to crown" which means "to bestow (glory, honor, etc.);" cf. Pss 8:5; 65:11; 103:4. See further R. M. Fuller, *Rewards*, 16-107.

²¹² R. M. Fuller, *Rewards*, 108-211; P. Volz, *Eschatologie*, 381. J. G. Griffith suggests that images such as a "crown of righteousness" came to Judaism from Egyptian sources where they were widespread (*The Divine Verdict*, 254-255). For usage in the DSS, cf. 1QH IX,25 and 1QS IV,7 (both "crown of glory").

this later conception and the more traditional (=life/salvation and its associated blessings).²¹³ Likewise in Greco-Roman society a wide variety of prize-imagery was employed “to refer to a favorable postmortem judgment,” such prizes being “seen as extensions of the sorts of honors an individual would seek within the city in this life.”²¹⁴ In general one may conclude from these Jewish and Hellenistic parallels that such crown imagery functioned not to depict literal degrees of reward, but to motivate proper behavior by portraying the blessedness of the future life/salvation in terms of those blessings one most desired even now.

Thus, in opposition to the Corinthians’ unrestricted exercise of freedom, Paul’s metaphor urges the exercise of self-control [*ἐγκρατεύεσθαι*] as the only way to successfully pursue Christian existence.²¹⁵ Maintaining the metaphor, but now putting himself forth as a model of such behavior (*ἐγὼ τοίνυν οὕτως τρέχω*, v 26a), Paul compares such self-control to his own goal-oriented running which is certainly not “aimless [*οὐκ ᾠδήλως*]”; i.e., freedom does not mean “anything goes,” but is instead a disciplined pursuit of the goal.

Switching metaphors, Paul now compares his self-limiting behavior to that of a boxer who does not “beat the air” (v 26b). This is intended to make the same point as the “aimless running” of v 26a, and is contrasted immediately (*ἀλλά*) with a boxer who would “lay [the opponent] flat with the right blow in the right place.”²¹⁶ This meaning is obscured by most translations, which render *ὑπωπιάζω* with “punish” (NRSV), “beat” (NIV) or “buffet” (NASB).²¹⁷ However, the literal use of the term—“to strike someone on the face (under the eyes) in such a way that he gets a ‘black eye’”²¹⁸—fits Paul’s boxing metaphor admirably. Rather than aimlessly beating the air, Paul seeks to land a knock-out punch. Paul’s mixture of meta-

²¹³ P. Volz, *Eschatologie*, 404-406; *Str-B*, 1.484-500.

²¹⁴ D. A. Kuck, *Judgment*, 143.

²¹⁵ “The central point of the image must lie in *πάντα ἐγκρατεύεται* in v.25” (V. C. Pfitzner, *Agon*, 85).

²¹⁶ R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul’s First and Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (Columbus, OH: 1937) 385.

²¹⁷ See also *BAGD*, art. *ὑπωπιάζω* (2), “symbolically . . . treat roughly, torment, maltreat.”

²¹⁸ K. Weiss, *TDNT* 8.590.

phor and application at this point has created a great deal of confusion among interpreters, and has provided a mainstay of ascetic theology. The opponent is Paul's own body [μου τὸ σῶμα]! One might conceivably take this as,

- a) the physical body (thus encouraging the bodily austerities of the ascetic tradition),
- b) the body of flesh (equivalent to σάρξ; cf. Rom 8:13, "put to death of the deeds of the body"),
- c) Paul's own physical body.

These all fail to see, however, that Paul uses τὸ σῶμα here only because the physical body is the obvious object of one's blows in the metaphor.²¹⁹ The application of the metaphor is not achieved by a figurative extension of "body," but by Paul's insertion of himself ("my body") into the picture. Paul's purposeful blows, like his goal-oriented running, are aimed at himself; the point being made quite clear by the immediately following verb taken from yet another metaphor—"I enslave (it=myself) [δουλαγωγῶ, or "bring into subjection"]." The thrust of Paul's exhortation remains the same throughout vv 23-27a: he subjects himself to voluntary limitations of his spiritual freedom, and so must the Corinthians.

Verse 27b gives a final reason or motivation for Paul's (and the Corinthians') self-controlled actions, putting this in terms of the avoidance of consequences which would result from failure to behave in this way²²⁰—"so that after proclaiming to others I myself should not be disqualified [ἀδόκιμος γένωμαι]." Regardless of whether the "proclamation [κηρύξας]" is part of the metaphor (i.e., the herald [κῆρυξ] at the games) or (more likely) Paul's own preaching of the gospel, the "disqualification" will almost certainly stem from the sports metaphor, and will have been so understood by the Corinthians.²²¹ "Ἀδόκιμος kann term. techn. sein . . . für den, der im Kampfe nicht nur unterliegt, sondern sich als unfähiger

²¹⁹ G. D. Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 439, esp. n. 31

²²⁰ μὴ πως . . . ἀδόκιμος γένωμαι = a consequence which one fears (N. Turner, *Syntax*, 99; *BDF* §370).

²²¹ Otherwise V. C. Pfitzner, *Agon*, 96. His treatment remains, nevertheless, the classic study of these sports metaphors (treatment of 1 Cor 9:24-27 on pp. 82-98).

Kämpfer, den man für diese Zwecke nicht brauchen kann, erweist.”²²² At the same time we may suspect that in Paul’s own mind this term resonated with deeper theological overtones connected to God’s final approval of his servants.²²³ Thus he closes as he began (cf. v 23), doing all things, in particular limiting his own freedom for the sake of the gospel, so that he may qualify to share in the blessings of the gospel, the imperishable wreath awarded to successful Christian athletes. The ultimate seriousness of this potential consequence (i.e., salvation itself rather than varied rewards *in addition to* salvation)²²⁴ will be pressed home in 10:1-13, using the disobedient Israelites as an example of such as fail to please God and provoke the Lord to their own destruction.

This passage confirms the understanding of judgment according to works discovered thus far in Paul’s letters. Final enjoyment of the blessings promised in Paul’s gospel is dependent upon faithful and enduring submission of oneself to the demands of that same gospel, especially the demands of mutual love. “That is, entry does not in itself guarantee a prize: it does so neither in athletics, nor in Christianity.”²²⁵ Just as in Romans 6-8 grace does not eliminate the continuing obligation to obey the Spirit rather than Sin, here the freedom that belongs already to those who are in the Spirit does not liberate from the need to “run the race to win.” As we have observed elsewhere, Paul appears able to speak of future salva-

²²² J. Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*¹⁰, 249. Whether one completes this to mean disqualified “from the race” or “for the prize” (NIV) is immaterial, since they both amount to the same thing.

²²³ See Rom 1:28; 2 Cor 13:5, 6, 7; also Rom 14:18; 16:10; 1 Cor 11:19; 2 Cor 10:18; 1 Thess 2:4; 2 Tim 2:15; 3:8; Tit 1:16; Heb 6:8. Jas 1:12 appears to draw on the same tradition: “Blessed is anyone who endures temptation. Such a one has stood the test [δόκιμος γενόμενος] and will receive the crown of life that the Lord has promised to those who love him.”

²²⁴ J. Gundry-Volf’s interpretation of 1 Cor 9:24-27 hinges on understanding ἀδόκιμος as “disqualified *from apostolic service*” (*Paul*, 233-237). Though she is doubtless correct that the term is used in many other texts in this fashion, her exegesis fails to take into account adequately that (i) the athletic metaphor applies to Christian existence (both Paul’s and the Corinthians’), not just apostolic service, (ii) what Paul will miss if disqualified is the ‘prize,’ or ‘imperishable wreath’ (see above), and (iii) the ensuing warning (10:1-12) makes the soteriological significance of disqualification unavoidable (see below).

²²⁵ C. K. Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 217.

tion being dependent upon continued obedience in the present, without thereby feeling any theological tension with the ‘already’ of justification by faith alone.

1 Cor 10:1-22

Here we wish only to note the way in which Paul uses Israel’s history to warn the proud Corinthians that *entry* into the elect community does not of itself constitute a guarantee against falling under God’s judgment. The OT people of God are described in vv 1-4 in terms designed to evoke comparison with Christian baptism and the Lord’s supper. The application to the hearers is made in vv 5-6.

Nevertheless, God was not pleased with most of them, and they were struck down in the wilderness. Now these things occurred as examples for us, so that we might not desire evil as they did.

This recalls the refusal of the Israelites in Numbers 14 to enter the land and their rebellion against Moses and God.²²⁶ The result was God’s threat to strike them all with pestilence, to disinherit them, and to raise up a new nation through Moses (14:12). In response to Moses’ intercession, God relents from his intention to disinherit Israel completely, but not from his purpose of gradually executing the sentence of death and destruction upon every individual of the present rebellious generation, with the exception of Caleb and Joshua. This annihilation at the hands of the Lord is the expression of his angry opposition to them as his enemies,²²⁷ or as Paul puts it, “God was not pleased [*εὐδόκησεν*] with them,” he rejected them as part of his elect people.²²⁸

Paul then calls upon additional instances of grave disobedience in Israel’s history (vv 7-10) which led to “falling” (Num 25=divine wrath leading to their death), and to others being “destroyed [*ἀπόλλυμι/ἀπολύω*].” The application is worded

²²⁶ On possible midrashic forerunners to Paul’s homily, see W. Meeks, “‘And Rose Up to Play’: Midrash and Paraenesis in 1 Corinthians 10:1-22,” *JSNT* 16 (1982) 64-78. In the NT, cf. Heb 3:7-4:13 and Jude 5 (“a terse summary of the point made in 1 Cor 10:1-12,” *ibid.*, 67).

²²⁷ Num 14:34. Heb. תַּנְוָאָה (“displeasure, opposition”); LXX: γινώσσετε τὸν θυμὸν τῆς ὀργῆς μου (“you shall know the rage of my wrath”); cf. also Job 33:10 (par. “count as enemy”).

²²⁸ See H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 167; G. Schrenk, art. εὐδοκέω, *TDNT* 2.738-742.

somewhat differently, but amounts to the same: “So if you think you are standing, watch out that you do not fall,” i.e., fall like the disobedient Israelites (v 12). Neither for the Israelites nor for the Corinthians will the fact that they are baptized, communicant members of God’s people protect them from the wrath of God should they persist in rebellion and disobedience. In the case of the Corinthians, their participation in pagan temple feasts amounts to idolatry, something fundamentally incompatible with Christian faith, and which constitutes “provoking the Lord to jealousy” (vv 14-22). It is an unwarranted weakening of the apostle’s intention to interpret all of this as anything other than a sharp warning to Christians of the direst eschatological consequences for persistent disobedience. Such a conclusion is strengthened by the observation that Paul appears to be following a pattern of covenantal judgment thought found elsewhere in Judaism and the NT (see n. 226 above).

1 Cor 11:29-32

Verses 17-34 envision a church gathering, including celebration of the Lord’s supper (vv 18, 23-26). In particular it is the abuses on such occasions which Paul wishes to address; abuses which involve disorder (vv 21, 33), drunkenness (v 21b), and humiliating the socially lower members of the group (v 22), and which have contributed to the “divisions” (v 18) or “factions” (v 19) in the church. Their behavior in eating together is termed by Paul “unworthy” (v 27). Paul attributes the (recent?) weakness, illness and even death of some members to God’s disciplinary judgment (vv 30-32).

Our exegesis will focus on two issues: (i) the nature of this judgment, in particular, how does disciplinary judgment relate to condemnation (v 32), and (ii) the basis of judgment (behavior or belief?). Beginning with the latter, the reason²²⁹ for this divine judgment is stated in v 29 to be “eating and drinking without discerning the body [*μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα*].” A common and ancient interpretation takes

²²⁹ Verse 30a, “for this reason [*διὰ τοῦτο*].”

“body” here as a reference to the eucharistic “body of Christ.”²³⁰ This can appeal to the nearby eucharistic reference in vv 23-27, and suggests that the cause of judgment was an undervaluation of the significance of the eucharistic elements (i.e., an issue of belief rather than behavior per se). However, as Barrett notes, “the Corinthians made too much rather than too little of their sacraments.”²³¹ Instead, Paul’s absolute use of “the body” elsewhere in this same passage (v 17) strongly suggests that he means the church. This same absolute usage (“the body”=the church) occurs in 12:12-27. In addition, the parallel between the wording of vv 29 and 31 (διακρίνειν τὸ σῶμα . . . διακρίνειν ἑαυτούς) also supports this meaning; i.e., ‘the body’=‘ourselves,’ the church). Thus the reference to the elements of the Lord’s supper is only a supporting argument for the section (“we who are many are one body, *for* we all partake of the one bread”) which revolves around the church-gathering (11:17, 20); the result of such ‘examination of the body’ should be the opposite of “show[ing] contempt for the church” (11:22b).²³² Another strength of this view is its recognition of the fundamentally social nature of the problem, rather than being primarily a theological-spiritual one.

What then is the failure “to discern” the church? On the sacramental interpretation, this means the failure to ‘distinguish’ between sacred and profane meals or food; i.e., the sin is the ‘profanation’ of the sacred elements. Again this is unlikely in the light of the magical sacramental views of the Corinthians implied in 10:1-13. Paul is obviously ringing the changes on the stem κριν- in this passage. With the prefix ἀνα- the sense of “distinguish between, discern” often becomes prominent. There is no compelling reason to avoid this sense here. The problem involves failure

²³⁰ Apparently so understood by numerous early scribes who added “of the Lord” to “body” in v 29. See also J. Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 291; J. Héring, *First Corinthians*, 120; Robertson & Plummer, *First Corinthians*, 252; E. Synofzik, *Vergeltungsaussagen*, 51.

²³¹ *First Corinthians*, 275; cf. 10:1-13.

²³² Supporting this interpretation of “the body”=the church; G. D. Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 563-564; L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 100; J. Moffatt, *1 Corinthians*⁴, 172; H. Conzelmann, *First Corinthians*, 202; J. Ruef, *First Corinthians*, 122.

to distinguish between (or ‘discern’) the gathering *qua* the body (of Christ) and a gathering *qua* “one’s own meal” involving drunkenness and self-centered behavior. That is, the Corinthians are failing to recognize that this is no Greco-Roman *symposium* (drinking party),²³³ but the ‘body’ gathered around the Lord’s table. This is confirmed by vv 27-28, where the largely synonymous δοκιμάζειν (“examine, test, prove”) is used, referring to a determination of whether or not they are eating and drinking ἀναξίως (“in an unworthy manner”), viz., whether their behavior (not their person) conforms to the character of this gathering.²³⁴ Thus the reason for God’s judgment is nothing other than the *behavior* spoken of in vv 17-22, 27, 33-34.

What then of the nature of such judgment? Such behavior has brought God’s judgment [κρίμα] (v 29), which Paul defines as divine discipline [παιδεύεσθαι] (v 32a), whose purpose [ἵνα] is to prevent them being “condemned [κατακρίνειν] along with the world” (v 32b). There are thus three levels of judgment mentioned in the passage.

1) *Self-judgment*: “But if we judged ourselves” (v 31a). This does not refer to seeking to be one’s own judge regarding status before God or regarding others’ consciences (cf. 4:3-5; Romans 14-15). Rather, as in 5:3, 12-13; and 6:1-6, it refers to the recognition and condemnation of overtly sinful behavior.

2) *God’s disciplinary judgment*: This occurs when individuals or groups fail to exercise the self-judgment just noted, and thus persist in overtly sinful behavior. In this particular instance it has led to sickness and even death; though this should not be construed as teaching that sin will always lead to sickness and death, nor that

²³³ On the relation of the Corinthian problem to such Greco-Roman practices, see esp. P. Lampe, “The Corinthian Eucharistic Dinner Party: Exegesis of a Cultural Context (1 Cor 11:17-34),” *Affirmation* 4 (1991) 1-15; S. M. Pogoloff, *Logos*, 237-271; and G. Theissen, “Social Integration and Sacramental Activity: An Analysis of 1 Cor. 11:17-34,” *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982) 145-174.

²³⁴ “Ganz konkret, er soll sich prüfen, ob er die Gemeinde verachtet durch seinen Genuss des Abendmahles” (L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 101, also 99-101); see also G. D. Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 564.

all such occurrences indicate sin as the cause. Such divine chastisement is meant to function as a *corrective measure*. It is divine παιδεία, a form of divine κρίμα (v 32), which is only necessary because the Corinthians have failed to judge [διακρίνειν] themselves (v 31). As we have seen, this refers to their failure to conform their behavior to the recognition of the gathering as the one body of Christ. Thus God's discipline is intended to do what they failed to do for themselves, recognize sin and change behavior. The avoidance of condemnation as the result assumes the acceptance of such discipline (=repentance), which is why Paul closes in vv 33-34a with the admonition which this divine chastisement is intended to press home to them.

This is supported by the understanding of God's chastising punishments in Judaism.²³⁵ God's discipline functions in obvious parallel to human parental discipline, especially in the wisdom literature. Parental discipline prevents ~~from~~ death (Prov 23:13-14) by instructing and correcting the child (1:8; 12:1; 19:20), and thus driving out folly (22:15). Such human discipline certainly does not prevent death by atoning for sins.²³⁶ God's punishments of his erring people operate in a similar fashion. They can be corrective, functioning to awaken and prompt them to repentance, not to destroy them.²³⁷ However, if not accepted (=no repentance) such chastisement is in vain and will lead to final rejection.²³⁸ This necessity of repentance as the object of chastisement, and as the grounds upon which final con-

²³⁵ See G. Bertram, art. παιδεία, *TDNT* 5.603-618; G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, 2.248-256, esp. 255; E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 286-287, 304-305, 390-391, 397-398. J. Gundry-Volf fails to appreciate the role of repentance when examining this chastisement tradition (*Paul*, 107-111).

²³⁶ Not infrequently the organic consequences of one's misdeeds, rather than God, chastise the sinner (cf. Prov 13:18).

²³⁷ Hos 10:9-11:11. Current punishments are for iniquity (10:10) as a call to repentance (10:12), not given to destroy (11:9), but to turn them back to the Lord (11:10-11). See also 2 Macc 6:12.

²³⁸ Jer 2:30; 7:27-29. See also the series of corrective punishments in Lev 26:14-45, each of which is introduced by some form of "but if you still will not repent." If they refuse to repent, God "will destroy them utterly and break [his] covenant with them" (v 44).

demnation may be avoided, is found in a multitude of texts.²³⁹ As we noted in an earlier chapter, such disciplinary judgments are sometimes said to be “in mercy,” and are contrasted with the more definitive judgment which is according to deeds.²⁴⁰

It has sometimes been suggested that this divine chastisement functions more in terms of *atonement* than correction, in line with later Jewish ideas of atoning suffering in this life substituting for eschatological punishment. While a few texts can be found which may suggest a theology of atoning suffering at this time,²⁴¹ this does not seem to be the predominant mode of understanding God’s chastisements.²⁴² Furthermore, the strong hortatory character of the 1 Corinthians passage speaks against this idea; plus the fact that such an atoning suffering (apart from Christ’s) is not attested elsewhere in the NT, whereas the corrective chastening is (cf. Heb 12:5-12; Tit 2:11-12; 1 Tim 1:20). Thus, it is correct to say that this divine chastising judgment, as well as the self-judgment, preserve from final condemnation, but they do so not automatically or via atonement, but through their function of leading to repentance.²⁴³ Thus, even here, it remains behavior/deeds which are determinative of the outcome of the final judgment.

3) *Final condemnation*: The language of being “condemned along with the world” makes a reference to the eschatological damnation of the non-believing world unavoidable here. Normally, of course, it was only this *massa perditionis*

²³⁹ Job 5:17; Ps 94:12-15; Sir 18:14; 21:6; PssSol 3:4; 10:1-2; 16:11b. See further pp. 98-99 (esp. nn. 74-77), 121; and in the Qumran literature, see 1QS X,10-13; XI,13 (pp. 136-138).

²⁴⁰ See chap. 2 on Sir 17 and Ezek 7:8-9, 27; 24:1-14 (pp. 57-58, 69-71).

²⁴¹ PssSol 9:6-7; 13:10. Nearly all the evidence for this view comes from Rabbinic literature, see E. P. Sanders, *PPJ*, 168-172, 397-398.

²⁴² See L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 30-31.

²⁴³ “Punishments are remedies which believers need, for otherwise they themselves would also rush onwards to eternal destruction, if they were not held in check by temporary punishments” (J. Calvin, *First Corinthians*, 256).

which Paul expected to fall under God's *κατάκριμα*.²⁴⁴ However, just as in 3:16-17, 6:9-10, 9:24-27, and 10:1-12, so here failure to repent from such evil behavior will assuredly result in destruction and condemnation by God. Otherwise they will indeed "come together *εἰς κρίμα*" (11:34). Paul's main thrust is not, in this instance, to threaten the Corinthians with eternal condemnation; however, one element in his persuasive technique is the explanation of current circumstances as expressions of divine judgment, with an accompanying implied threat of worse if they fail to heed the admonition. Such implied threat and ambiguity in the use of judgment language has been seen repeatedly in the Jewish literature studied, with the line separating *κρίμα* (still reversible) and *κατάκριμα* never spelled out in order to heighten the sense of danger and the urgency of repentance.

One final question may be permitted: What of those who had already died (v 30b)? Paul gives us no clear indication of their post-mortem fate in this passage. The corrective effect of such deaths will naturally have been upon the still living, as we see in Acts 5:1-11.²⁴⁵ At the very least the prospect of death under the judgment of God was something to be feared and avoided at all costs, whatever the situation of those who had already died. It is possible that Paul does not mean to imply that only those who were personally sinning in this manner were the ones getting sick and dying; conceivably this was a general community outworking of the judgment of God within the group, and thus not everyone who had died was guilty of the abuses in view.²⁴⁶

1 Cor 16:22a²⁴⁷

The curse [*ἀνάθεμα*] here pronounced on anyone "who has no love for the

²⁴⁴ L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 59-75.

²⁴⁵ Esp. vv 5b, 11. Against L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 101.

²⁴⁶ This would be along the lines of OT corporate personality conceptions; G. D. Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 565.

²⁴⁷ 1 Cor 14:38 is taken by some as a prophetic sentence of judgment upon any who fail to heed Paul's letter, and thus as one additional instance of Paul's readiness to tie salvation to behavior (see E. Käsemann, "Sentences," 68-69; G. D. Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 712; H. Conzelmann, *First Corinthians*, 246). However, it is also possible that we have here merely the non-recognition (by the

Lord” is almost surely a threat of eschatological exclusion directed against any in the Corinthian community who demonstrate by their actions that their allegiance lies elsewhere, or perhaps who reject obedience to the Lord as now laid out by Paul.²⁴⁸

SUMMARY

Outside of chapters 3-4 no additional occurrences of the motif have been discovered in 1 Corinthians. Nevertheless the numerous judgment-related texts in chapters 5-16 confirm our understanding of judgment according to works in the earlier chapters. Paul expected that the believers in Corinth would have to face eschatological judgment issuing in salvation or damnation, the verdict being conditioned upon their behavior. Nowhere does Paul give a hint of theological tension with his doctrine of justification. Judgment functions in many of these texts in a manner quite similar to the OT summons to repentance. A final, irreversible sentence is not being pronounced upon the hopelessly wicked. Instead a warning is uttered against disobedient members of the community, threatening them with what will assuredly occur (not merely a hypothetical possibility) if they do not turn from their disobedience. The precise point at which this conditional threat would become actual condemnation is left ambiguous, perhaps as a means of heightening the motivational force of the warning (i.e., one can never say, “I am still a long way from seriously endangering my covenant status”). Especially in 6:9 and 10:1-22 Paul’s language and use of the judgment theme remains firmly rooted in judgment beliefs axiomatic to Judaism, or in related Jewish convictions.²⁴⁹

community) of any individual who refuses to recognize Paul’s authority (C. K. Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 334).

²⁴⁸ See Gal 1:8-9; (diff. 2 Thess 3:14-15); also J. Behm, art. ἀνάθεμα, *TDNT* 1.354-355; C. Roetzel, *Judgement*, 142-162; G. D. Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 837-838.

²⁴⁹ See also 5:5 (expulsion of a sinning member in order to preserve group holiness), 9:25 (imperishable crown/reward granted to the faithful), and 11:29-34 (chastisement with repentance averting condemnation).

CHAPTER SEVEN

JUDGMENT ACCORDING TO DEEDS IN 2 CORINTHIANS AND COLOSSIANS

2 COR 5:10

For all of us must be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ, so that each may receive back the things done while in the body according to what each has done, whether good or evil.¹

2 Cor 5:1-10 is a well-known battleground over the precise contours of Paul's eschatology, in particular whether it was subject to development and/or change, and whether he envisioned an (unclothed?) intermediate state.² These debates, however, center almost exclusively on vv 1-8 and may therefore be left to one side.³ Instead we will focus on sorting through the difficult syntax of v 10 so as to determine its proximity to the motif tradition thus far traced, and on questions of function and content. It will be our contention that, however unusual the precise wording (some of which will be shown to be dependent on the thrust of Paul's argument), v 10 is best understood in line with second temple Jewish traditions of equivalent recompense, and is of a piece with Paul's judgment statements in his other letters. Furthermore we will argue that, as an important aspect of his own motivation, Paul places himself (and all believers) before the universal final judgment issuing in salvation or damnation according to deeds, and that this prospect not only co-exists with, but actually springs from, his certainty of future glory with Christ (4:16-5:8).

¹ Author's translation.

² See R. F. Hettlinger, "2 Cor 5,1-10," *SJT* 10 (1957) 174-194; F. G. Lang, *2.Korinther 5,1-10 in der neueren Forschung* (BGBE 16; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1973); R. P. Martin, *Second Corinthians* (WBC 40; Dallas, TX: Word, 1986) 97-101.

³ F. G. Lang, *2.Kor 5,1-10*, 199, n. 383.

Most are agreed that this verse comes within a larger unit in which Paul is defending his apostolic ministry. However one defines his opponents, he must deal, among other things, with the question, 'Why does this divinely ordained ministry appear in Paul's case so weak and frail?'⁴ Thus in 4:7-15 the apostle shows how divine power is revealed paradoxically through weak vessels. In 4:16-5:10, he goes on to explain why this apparent external weakness is not a cause for resignation,⁵ nor for the Corinthians to undervalue his apostleship. The reason lies in the new focus of hope on what is unseen rather than seen, on the eternal and heavenly rather than mortal and earthly.

Chapter 5 continues the train of thought started in 4:16-18. In spite of groaning in this earthly tent the apostle's confidence is grounded in the expectation of the resurrection body (vv 1-2) and in the Spirit as current guarantor or pledge of this future hope (v 5). Verses 6-9 continue the theme of confidence in the face of weakness (esp. vv 6, 8), but introduce as well the thought of "faith versus sight" (v 7) and a rather more 'spatial' conceptualization, "at home or away." With this note Paul returns to a theme he sounded at the beginning of this defense of his apostolic ministry. "Whether we are at home or away, we make it our aim to please him" (5:9). Compare 2:17: "For we are not peddlers of God's word like so many; but in Christ we speak as persons of sincerity, as persons sent from God and standing in his presence." One element in Paul's apologetic aim is to contrast himself with the false apostles. He speaks with sincerity as an ambassador of God (2:17); he aims to please God (5:9). And further, his sincerity in ministry is motivated by the knowledge that he stands in God's presence (2:17), which will now be expanded in 5:10 in terms of appearing before the judgment seat of Christ. Verse 11 will continue this line of thought briefly: "Therefore, knowing the fear of the Lord, we try to persuade others." As for the connection between Paul's apology and the judgment state-

⁴ See V. P. Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 277.

⁵ Note this repeated emphasis: "So we do not lose heart" (4:16), "So we are always confident" (5:6), "Yes, we do have confidence" (5:8); see also 3:4, 12; 4:1.

ment in 5:10, “Paulus erscheint somit als Apostel, dessen Verkündigung sich *deshalb* in Lauterkeit vollzieht, weil er sich dabei auf dem Weg hin zum Gericht durch Christus befindlich weiß.”⁶

This contextual overview already reveals a great deal about the *function* of the judgment motif in 5:10. Knowledge of coming judgment motivates Paul (and should motivate others) to sincerity in ministry, to obedience, to “pleasing God.” It will remain to be seen to what degree this motivation is tied to the positive promise of reward, or to the negative warning of recompense/punishment for disobedience (cf. 5:11, “knowing the fear of the Lord”), or to both (“whether good or bad”). This certainty of judgment functions, in turn, within Paul’s apology as a further proof of his sincerity and apostolic authenticity since his aim of pleasing God is even now manifest to both God and the Corinthians (v 11).

Turning now to the motif itself (v 10b), we must first clarify some troublesome lexical and grammatical issues.

ἵνα κομίσηται ἕκαστος τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ᾧ ἔπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε φαῦλον.

In the middle voice κομίζεσθαι refers to “getting” or “receiving” something (accusative object), whether wages, letters, crowns, salvation, etc.⁷ In most instances this involves receiving *back* or *in return* something which one was owed or previously had. Thus Abraham receives his son back from the dead as it were (Heb 11:19), the master expects to receive back with interest what was rightfully his own (Matt 25:27), and Judas Maccabeus’ enemy gets back a reward worthy of his impiety (2 Macc 8:33).⁸ Because this verb is used so frequently with wages, it is often translated, with or without contextual pointers to a commercial meaning, “to receive a

⁶ J. Schröter, *Der versöhnte Versöhner: Paulus als unentbehrlicher Mittler im Heilsvorgang zwischen Gott und Gemeinde nach 2 Kor 2,14-7,4* (TANZ 10; Tübingen: Francke, 1993) 225.

⁷ References in BAGD, art. *κομίζω*; and M-M., 354.

⁸ M.-M. argue for this meaning (“receive back, recover”) in all NT occurrences (354). See also LSJ, 976 (#8); Louw-Nida, *Gk-Eng. Lexicon*, 1.572 (#57.126), 1.573 (#57.136).

recompense for what one has done.”⁹ N. Baumert, however, has made a convincing case against this gloss, arguing that any sense of “recompense for” must lie in the context and is not inherent in the word itself.¹⁰ Instead, so Baumert, we have here a Hebraism, which can be found four times in the LXX as a translation of נָשָׂא עֲוֹן (=to bear/take back upon oneself (one’s own) sin/guilt).¹¹

Unfortunately, Baumert also gives no serious attention to the concept of organic consequences wherein a deed and its results are intimately tied together. The idea of “taking back one’s sins upon oneself” is embedded in this broader way of thinking about deeds and consequences¹² and provides the clue to the origin of Paul’s phrase. Just as sinners can receive back and bear their own sins, so God can return to them [הַשִּׁיב/שָׁלֵם] their sins, or their righteous deeds, a concept which found widespread application in the recompense motif.¹³ Thus to “receive back one’s deed” means “to suffer/enjoy the consequences.” Although κομίζεσθαι is not used for bearing/receiving back one’s *good* deeds in the LXX, it is not difficult to construe a development in this direction so that not only sin but also “good” (Eph 6:8), “good and bad” (2 Cor 5:10), and even “salvation” (1 Pet 1:9) can be “received back.” This is nothing other than viewing divine recompense (“*God returns* one’s good deeds”) from the human side (“*we receive* back the good deeds”). We have previously noted that the use of this verb in the recompense motif

⁹ BAGD, 442-443.

¹⁰ *Täglich Sterben und Auferstehen: Der Literalsinn von 2 Kor 4,12-5,10* (SANT 34; Munich: Kösel, 1973) 410-431.

¹¹ κομίζεσθαι ἁμαρτίαν; Lev 20:17; Ezek 16:52, 54, 58. See *ibid.*, 422-424, also 411-422. Although Baumert points the way to the correct understanding of Paul’s phrase, his attempt to isolate the concept of “bearing one’s sin (or guilt)” from punishment or recompense must be rejected. Granted, these two ideas (bear sin . . . bear punishment) are not identical, but they are so thoroughly intertwined in nearly all the OT texts he cites that bearing one’s sin will have come to mean via metonymy bearing one’s punishment or recompense for such sin. This can be seen clearly in Lev 20:17-21, where “to bear/receive back one’s sin” functions as part of the explanation for punishment. (The NRSV translates consistently “they shall be subject to punishment.”) The intimate connection is perhaps most clear in v 20b: “they shall bear their sin, they shall die childless” (my translation).

¹² K. Koch, “Vergeltungsdogma,” 1-37. See pp. 36-38 above.

¹³ 1 Sam 25:39; 1 Kgs 2:44; 8:32; 2 Chr 6:23; Ezek 7:3, 4, 8, 9; Hos 4:9.

pre-dates Paul.¹⁴ Thus whether or not Paul still thought in terms of OT organic consequences, the phrase should be translated “receive back (one’s deeds),” and is an especially vivid way of expressing divine recompense according to works.¹⁵

The phrase *τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ᾧ ἔπραξεν* seems to contain a repetition of the object, which led a few later scribes to emend to *ᾧ διὰ τοῦ σώματος ἔπραξεν*, thus easing the apparent redundancy.¹⁶ Actually, however, there is no duplication of the object. *Πρὸς* + accus. is not a second object of *κομίζεσθαι*, but another way of saying “according to” (classical), and thus corresponds to *κατὰ* in other motif occurrences.¹⁷ The object of the verb is to be found only in the first phrase, but its meaning depends on how we take *διὰ*¹⁸ + genitive. If instrumental, it will refer to “the things done through (or by) the body.”¹⁹ If temporal, it will refer to “the things done while in the body.”²⁰ One’s decision will not have a major impact on the sense. In either case it is human deeds which are meant. However, the

¹⁴ 1 En 100:7; cf. p. 97 above. See also the discussion of *μισθὸν λαμβάνειν* in 1 Cor 3:8b (pp. 263-264).

¹⁵ See also Col 3:25; Eph 6:8; further Heb 10:35-36; 11:13, 39; 1 Pet 5:4; 2 Pet 2:13 vl.; Barn. 4:12; 2 Clem. 11:5-6; Ign. *Pol.* 6:2. Thus it will hardly do to appeal to 1 Cor 3:14-15 and interpret *κομίζεσθαι* at 2 Cor 5:10 as Hoyt does: “An unfaithful Christian receives the appropriate recompense for that which is worthless, namely, no recompense at all” (“The Negative Aspects of the Christian’s Judgment,” *BSac* 137 [1980] 128). Receiving (back) one’s (evil) deeds has negative consequences in view, not simply the absence of positive rewards. See, for instance, the similarly worded LAB 44:10 (“whatever we ourselves have devised, *these will we receive*”).

¹⁶ The difficulty of these earlier scribes is reflected in modern translations. The NRSV’s “what has been done in the body” looks very much like the smoother variant.

¹⁷ *BDF* §239(8); N. Turner, *Syntax*, 274. Cf. 1 Cor 12:7; Luke 12:47. Baumert argues for “with reference to,” but with little difference ultimately in meaning (*Täglich Sterben*, 253-254). Cf. 1 En 100:7, *κομεισθε κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ὑμῶν*.

¹⁸ An early variant reads *τὰ ἴδια τοῦ σώματος* (p⁴⁶, et al.; “one’s own things of the body”), but it seems intrinsically more likely that scribes would emend *τὰ διὰ* to *τὰ ἴδια* than vice versa (contra P. E. Hughes, *Second Corinthians*, 181, n. 57).

¹⁹ So H. A. W. Meyer (*Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Corinthians, Vol II (First Epistle, chapters 14-16; Second Epistle)* [trans. (2.Cor only) D. Hunter; MeyerK; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1879] 271) and the majority of commentators.

²⁰ So Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, 17,4; R. Bultmann, *The Second Letter to the Corinthians* (trans. R. A. Harrisville; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1985) 144; H.-J. Klauck, *2.Korintherbrief* (EB 8; Würzburg: Echter, 1986) 52.

temporal meaning has the advantage of alleviating somewhat the stark redundancy inherent in “to receive the things through the body according to what each has done.” Taken temporally, the first phrase states that the recompense has reference only to deeds done during this present bodily existence, while the second phrase states the standard of that recompense. With this stress on deeds done during bodily existence, Paul concludes the line of thought developed in vv 6-9; namely, even though we are currently in the body and thus away from the Lord, it is our aim to please him. He also highlights thereby the eschatological importance of what one does during this present bodily existence away from the Lord. Synofzik is probably correct that the awkwardness of the construction can be explained best by assuming that τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος is Paul’s own addition to a largely traditional judgment saying, added in order to stress the importance of somatic existence.²¹

As for *ἐπράξεν*, it largely overlaps in meaning with *ποιεῖν*.²² If one is inclined to see significance here in Paul’s choice of the former, perhaps *πράσσειν* tends to stress the activity itself (=to practice or conduct oneself) more than the product of such activity.²³ Thus Rom 2:25 speaks of “practicing the law,” and 4 Macc 3:20 can characterize a righteous life as *καλῶς πράττειν* (“to conduct oneself well”). If such a nuance may be assumed here, then Paul is not thinking so much of individual deeds, but of one’s life-pattern as a whole. This may also be confirmed by Paul’s switch from plural to singular in the following phrase,²⁴ and would

²¹ *Vergeltungsaussagen*, 75-76. His reasons are (i) the phrase is found nowhere else in recompense statements, (ii) it is syntactically difficult, (iii) its syntactical difficulty is attested by the textual variants, and (iv) a gloss is unlikely. In addition, 1 En 100:7 attests to a traditional form without a stated object (see above n. 17).

²² See Rom 2:14, 25; 13:4.

²³ See C. Maurer, art. *πράσσω*, *TDNT*, 6.632-638. Plummer translates “habitual moral action” (*Second Corinthians*, 158). See also Louw-Nida, *Gk.-Eng. Lexicon*, 1.512 (#42.8).

²⁴ “The change to the neuter singular [*ἀγαθόν/φάυλον*] is significant. It seems to imply that, although persons will be judged one by one and not in groups, yet conduct in each case will be judged as a whole. In other words, it is character rather than separate acts that will be rewarded or punished” (A. Plummer, *Second Corinthians*, 158).

certainly be supported by the unitary way works were viewed in the motif in Jewish texts.

Finally, εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε φαῦλον will refer most naturally to *πρὸς ᾧ ἔπραξεν* which immediately precedes it, rather than the more distant *κομίσηται*. Thus this recompense envisions a dual outcome depending upon whether “the things one has done” are good or bad. It is unlikely that Paul’s use of *φαῦλος* instead of the more usual *κακός* (cf. Rom 2:6-10) is anything other than synonymous.²⁵ He uses this adjective only one other time in the undisputed letters. There it refers to Jacob and Esau who had not yet done anything “good or bad” in order that God’s purpose of election might be according to his choice rather than by works (Rom 9:11). The contrast of *ἀγαθός/φαῦλος*, like *ἀγαθός/κακός*, describes the two opposite possibilities for behavior which would characterize a person as either good or bad, i.e., either righteous or unrighteous.²⁶

Thus we find a vivid expression of the traditional recompense motif (“so that each may receive back according to his/her conduct, whether good or evil”), made somewhat awkward by the temporal qualifier (“the things [done] while in the body”) added by Paul in order to lay stress on the critical importance of pleasing God in this life (v 9). As we have observed elsewhere in Paul’s letters, the apostle can take up this fundamental axiom of God’s dealing with humanity, shaping its wording and function to suit the particular needs of his argument.

A number of important questions remain, but owing to the typical brevity of Paul’s judgment statements they are difficult to answer with certainty. Who are “all of us” in this judgment statement? Throughout 4:16-5:10 Paul has spoken in the

²⁵ Against Hughes, *Second Corinthians*, 181. See N. Baumert, *Täglich Sterben*, 255. The strongly attested variant [*κακόν*] also points in the direction of synonymy.

²⁶ Tit 2:8 uses the adjective in reference to an accusation of wrongdoing in contrast to a righteous life (cf. vv 6-8a). Jas 3:13-16 also contrasts “every bad deed” (NRSV: wickedness of every kind) with good [*καλός*] behavior, the one from above, the other being unspiritual and devilish. Finally two passages in John’s gospel show certain similarities to the thought world of 2 Cor 5:10 and use this adjective to describe those works which are of darkness and are evil [*πόνηρος*] and lead to condemnation (5:29; opp. *τὰ ἀγαθά*; also 3:19-21).

first person plural, and in 5:10 adds *πάντας* (“all of us”). The use of “we” has been characteristic of the epistle since 2:14, and is generally set over against the Corinthian congregation and/or the false apostles.²⁷ Although the “we” in 4:16-5:10 could conceivably include Paul’s closest co-workers or perhaps even apostles (or believers) of the New Covenant, a literary “we” (=“I”) is to be preferred. This is an apology for Paul’s own apostolic ministry, not that of his co-workers nor of all apostles in general.²⁸ With the addition of *πάντας* in v 10, Paul expands the “we,” making himself part of a larger whole.²⁹ He will most likely have “all Christians” primarily in mind at this point,³⁰ but not to the exclusion of all humanity which forms the larger conceptual backdrop.³¹ In the context of Paul’s personal apology, this is not meant as a warning to others, but is stated in order to place the apostle within the larger orbit of general Christian (and human) expectations, and thus to support his contention that his actions in the body are undertaken to please his unseen Lord (v 9).

It is, of course, by no means an assured result of NT scholarship that a universal last judgment forms the backdrop of Paul’s statement here. Does this recompense take place immediately after each individual’s death, constantly in the present in one’s conscience, or at Christ’s second advent? Does this judgment issue in salvation/damnation³² or in greater or lesser reward(s)?³³ First of all, this

²⁷ See 2:17; 3:1; 5:11-12. On the use of “we” in 2 Corinthians, see esp. N. Baumert, *Täglich Sterben*, 23-36; and K. Dick, *Der schriftstellerische Plural bei Paulus* (Halle: 1900).

²⁸ N. Baumert, *Täglich Sterben*, 32-34.

²⁹ *τοὺς πάντας ἡμᾶς* = “the sum total of us,” contrasting the whole with the part (N. Turner, *Syntax*, 201).

³⁰ So most commentators: P. E. Hughes, *Second Corinthians*, 179-180, 185; E. Synofzik, *Vergeltungsaussagen*, 74; L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 155; F. Filson, *Recompense*, 88, n. 3; H. Braun, *Gerichtsgedanke*, 44; A. Plummer, *Second Corinthians*, 155; R. Martin, *Second Corinthians*, 114; V. P. Furnish, *Second Corinthians*, 275.

³¹ See H. Lietzmann, *Briefe*, 188; R. Bultmann, *Second Corinthians*, 143; and esp. N. Baumert, *Täglich Sterben*, 47. Cf. Rom 14:10 (“We all” = all humanity).

³² So R. Bultmann, *Second Corinthians* (ET), 143.

³³ For a vigorous defense of ‘rewards’ only, not salvation, see P. E. Hughes, *Second Corinthians*, 181-183. He bases this largely on (i) the meaning of *φωῶλος* (=worthless, not wicked

recompense takes place before *τὸ βῆμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ* ("the judgment seat of Christ"). In Rom 14:10, Paul spoke of the final universal judgment of all humanity in similar terms. Although there are a number of differences between these two texts,³⁴ the recurrence of *τὸ βῆμα* in this judgment statement suggests that Paul has the same scenario of universal judgment in mind.³⁵

Furthermore, the stress here on the central revelatory function of this judgment (*φανερωθῆναι δεῖ*) argues for a universal eschatological judgment. This is not simply a court 'appearance' before the judgment seat (Rom 14:10), it constitutes a 'revealing',³⁶ in this case, of the person ("we all must be revealed"). Precisely what is revealed is given in the latter half of v 10, "what has been done in the body,

or evil), (ii) contradiction with justification by faith, and (iii) 1 Cor 3:10-15 (believer's works can only determine level of reward, but not affect salvation). Also favoring varied rewards here: F. Filsen, *Recompense*, 108; S. L. Hoyt, "The Judgment Seat of Christ and Unconfessed Sins," *BSac* 137 [1980] 32-40; idem., "Negative Aspects," 125-132.

³⁴ We have already noted Paul's (and Judaism's) easy interchange between Christ and God as the one presiding upon this judgment seat (pp. 246). Thus, the fact that it is here Christ (Rom 14:10 = God) does not indicate different judgments. The mention of Christ upon the throne in this instance has probably been occasioned by the thrust of Paul's argument. Although God has been prominent throughout the larger argument (e.g., 4:1, 2, 6, 7, 15; 5:1, 5, 11, 13, 18, 19, 20), there has been a constant interchange of focus between God and Christ (e.g., 4:4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 14; 5:14, 15, 16-21). In vv 6-9 the focus has been on the walk of faith (5:7) necessitated by the fact that while in the body we are "away from the Lord" rather than "at home with the Lord" (5:6, 8-9), which Paul elsewhere terms "to be with Christ" (Phil 1:23; 1 Thess 4:17; 5:10). Throughout 2 Cor Paul's tendency is to use *κύριος* for Christ rather than God, which certainly seems to be the case in 5:6-10 as well. Thus, Paul's argument here concerns the apostle's relationship to Christ, the Lord, and the fact that in spite of being away from the Lord while in the body, he still makes it his aim to please Christ; and this is then motivated finally by reference to his eschatological appearance before this same Lord Christ at the judgment.

³⁵ K. Prümm, *DIAKONIA PNEUMATOS, Der zweite Korintherbrief als Zugang zur apostolischen Botschaft, Auslegung und Theologie*; Vol. I: Theologische Auslegung des zweiten Korintherbriefes (Rom/Freiburg/Wien: Herder, 1967) 306; A. Plummer, *Second Corinthians*, 156-157. Baumert's failure to consider the use of a 'judgment seat' or 'throne' for eschatological judgment scenes in second temple Judaism weakens his case against 'universal judgment' considerably (see *Täglich Sterben*, 245-249).

³⁶ "unpaulinischer term. techn. für die eschatologische Offenbarung" (E. Synofzik, *Vergeltungsaussagen*, 75). Otherwise C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (Black's NT Comm.; London: Adam & Charles Black, 1973) 160 ("used of appearances in court"). However, the use of the same verb in v 11 argues for the revelatory sense rather than that of a court appearance, and the passive "be made manifest" further differentiates this appearance from the active "appearing" of Rom 14:10 (N. Baumert, *Täglich Sterben*, 245). Baumert also cites Chrysostom as having already remarked on this difference: *οὐ γὰρ παραστήναι ἡμᾶς ἀπλῶς δεῖ ἀλλὰ καὶ φανερωθῆναι* (245, n. 450).

whether good or bad,” which corresponds to one’s ‘work’ (1 Cor 3:13) and the hidden purposes of the heart (1 Cor 4:5; also Rom 2:16; Eph 5:13) that shall be made manifest. Besides the traditional use of this verb for the revelatory character of final judgment,³⁷ its presence here may also be related to his larger concern in the epistle. Paul’s ministry has been described as the “manifestation [*φανεροῦντι*] of the fragrance of the knowledge of Christ” (2:14), and the Corinthians “manifest” his authenticity as an apostle by being his letter of Christ (3:3). He is particularly concerned to contrast himself with those who practice “shameful things that one hides,” who “practice cunning or . . . falsify God’s word.” Instead “by the open statement [*τῇ φανερώσει*] of the truth we commend ourselves to the conscience of everyone in the sight of God [*ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ*]” (4:2; note the same language of “in the sight of [God]”). Immediately following 5:10, Paul will note as well that the God-fearing motivation of his ministry has been manifested (i.e., known) to God, and hopes it shall have been so to the Corinthians’ conscience as well (5:11; cf. also 11:6). Thus, the “manifestation” of Paul’s godly motives and methods is a major concern of his apology, and will most likely have influenced his choice of *θανερωθῆναι* in the judgment context.³⁸

In addition, the motif grounds Paul’s desire to please God (*εὐάρεστοι αὐτῷ εἶναι*, 5:9). *Εὐάρεστος* draws upon the slave-master imagery (Rom 14:18) or perhaps the sacrificial imagery (Rom 12:1-2; Heb 13:16); that is, a slave pleases (receives the approval of) the master, or a sacrifice is pleasing (=acceptable) to God.³⁹ In Hebrews it clearly refers to that which is fundamentally acceptable to God, to God’s ‘pleasure’ with the one who is characterized by faith and persevering obedience (11:5-6; 12:28; cf. also 1 Thess 2:15-16; Eph 5:10). The verb *εὐαρεστέω*

³⁷ See pp. 284-285 above.

³⁸ R. P. Martin, *Second Corinthians*, 77-79, 114.

³⁹ Danker suggests a Greco-Roman background for the combination of “pleasing” and “make it our aim”: “By combining the adjective(s) . . . Paul affirms that he desires to pass audit as a person of exceptional integrity” (*II Corinthians* [Augsburg Commentary on the NT; Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1989] 74-75).

was used consistently in this sense in the LXX version of Genesis to translate הִלְךְ (Hithpael), a term describing the righteous who “walk before God” in contrast to the wicked. “Noah was a righteous man, blameless in his generation; Noah walked with God [LXX: τῷ θεῷ εὐηρέστησεν].”⁴⁰ Thus this recompense will establish whether Paul has made it his aim to be pleasing to God, and refers to that fundamental acceptance by God of the person, not to varying degrees of ‘pleasure’ on God’s part.⁴¹ It is the divine approval of one’s service and way of life.⁴²

Thus there are strong grounds for perceiving a universal last judgment behind Paul’s statement, a perception shared by the entire patristic tradition.⁴³ It may be noted further: (1) Although a division between the good and the wicked immediately upon death was a prominent feature of the pseudepigraphical writings, a judgment according to deeds was only rarely associated with this post-mortem division, being instead generally reserved for the final universal judgment.⁴⁴ (2) The contrast of good/bad was found elsewhere in Paul and the NT to refer to the fundamental distinction between the righteous and the unrighteous, not degrees of righteousness among the saved (see above on κακός/φάυλος). (3) The use of πράσσειν hints at one’s whole pattern of conduct rather than individual deeds. (4) The use of similar language in Col 3:25 refers to one’s eternal inheritance (=life in the age to come).

⁴⁰ Gen 6:9; cf. also 5:22, 24; 17:1; 24:40; 48:15; Ps 26:3; 56:13; 116:9; Sir 44:16. A particularly instructive passage is Philo, Abr., 35: “[God] honors him moreover with a most noble proclamation, saying that “he pleased God,” (and what can there be in nature that is more excellent than this panegyric?) which is the most visible proof of excellence; for if they who displease God are miserable, those who please him are by all means happy.” The only occurrence of the *adjective* in the LXX is found in Wis 4:10; 9:10. Especially in 4:10-16 the fundamental contrast between those who please God (=the righteous) and the wicked comes out most clearly.

⁴¹ Against L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 156.

⁴² This understanding finds confirmation in a later passage, also a self-defense of Paul’s ministry, where he states: “For it is not those who commend themselves that are approved [δόκιμος], but those whom the Lord commends” (10:18). See also Exod 21:8 (LXX). Further H. Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief* (MeyerK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924) 168-169; W. Foerster, *TDNT* 1.456-457.

⁴³ N. Baumert, *Täglich Sterben*, 245.

⁴⁴ See p. 122 above.

(5) The preponderance of the use of the motif in Paul and second temple Judaism refers to the divine awarding of life or death based upon one's life-pattern of behavior. Having said this, however, it is only fair to reiterate that such details do not appear to have been central to Paul's concern in citing the motif at this point; rather the bare fact that he and others must have their deeds revealed at the judgment and be recompensed accordingly is sufficient motivation to make it his aim to please the Lord. Thus although 2 Cor 5:10 was not intended to teach about details of judgment, it does confirm what we have discovered elsewhere; namely, that Paul expects Christians to face the universal last judgment and there be awarded eternal life or death according to their deeds.

We noted earlier that the motif functions here to defend or explain Paul's own motivation to obey the Lord.⁴⁵ The appending of "whether good or bad" indicates that it is not merely the positive encouragement of reward that motivates his behavior, but equally the threat of negative consequences. The precise nature of the motivation is picked up again in the following verse 11: "Therefore, knowing the fear of the Lord, we try to persuade others." This takes up the central wisdom theme of the 'fear of God' and uses it in combination with the recompense motif in much the same way we observed in Eccl 12:13-14:⁴⁶

The end of the matter; all has been heard. Fear God, and keep his commandments; for that is the whole duty of everyone.

For God will bring every deed into judgment, including every secret thing, whether good ἀγαθόν] or evil [πονηρόν].

The 'fear of God' is not simply terror in the face of God's awful holiness and punishing vengeance, but more broadly the awesome recognition that one's entire life (including supposedly unseen thoughts and actions) is open to God who will deal

⁴⁵ C. Roetzel thinks Paul is primarily concerned in this text to turn back community judgment (*Judgement*, 173-175). While this may well be part of Paul's larger concern in the epistle (cf. 6:11-13; 7:2a), the motif functions in this context less to *deny others the right to judge* than to *explain or prove the apostle's own motivation* (cf. v 9).

⁴⁶ See pp. 55-56 above.

with one according to one's deeds.⁴⁷ It thus includes both hope of reward and fear of punishment, as it does in both Eccl 12:13-14 and 2 Cor 5:10-11. Paul's use corresponds closely to what we observed for the Motivation-texts in the Jewish Scriptures.

[The motif] envisions the recompense as undefined sufferings or blessings. . . . It is the certainly rather than the precise nature of the reward/punishment which is felt to motivate. There is clearly a dual recompense envisioned in these texts (i.e., both reward and punishment), functioning to encourage the righteous to persevere in doing good, and to warn the presumptuous against laxity in obedience. As elsewhere, especially in 'warning' texts, the divine recompense is related to God's omniscience, including knowledge even of hidden deeds.⁴⁸

Even this last element of divine omniscience and hidden deeds is implied in Paul's stress on the revelatory character of this judgment.

Finally, the explicit interplay in this particular passage between the concepts of guarantee, confidence, and faith in regard to his future on the one hand (5:5, 6-8; also 4:16-18), and the sense of fearful responsibility in the face of the coming judgment on the other (5:9-11), are a demonstration of the existential tension typically found in Paul's letters. On the other hand, the transition between vv 8 and 9 gives no indication of any *theological* tension, paradox or dialectic. Rather his faith-confidence in the unseen Lord's preparation of future blessings (vv 6-8) leads naturally into the thought of present ("while in the body") responsibility to that same Lord and Judge. He is confident that future glory is his by faith in Christ, and equally certain that such life in Christ means that all of life now must be aimed at pleasing Christ and must stand up to eschatological scrutiny before the final awarding of salvation will occur.⁴⁹ "Am Leben im σῶμα entscheidet sich Heil oder Unheil; denn hier ist der Ort des περιπατεῖν διὰ πίστεως, οὐ διὰ εἰδους."⁵⁰

⁴⁷ See G. A. Lee., art. "Fear," *ISBE* (Rev. ed.; 4 vols; Gen. ed. G. W. Bromiley; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982) 189-192; also W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the OT*, 2.268-277; and H. Balz and G. Wanke, art. φοβέω κτλ., *TDNT*, 9.197-208.

⁴⁸ See pp. 59-60 above.

⁴⁹ L. Mattern relates the certainty of Paul's hope in vv 1-8 to the uncertainty of vv 9-10 rather differently. For her this is proof that the judgment of v 10 cannot have any effect upon Paul's future hope: "Das ewige Leben ist den Christen gewiss, unabhängig vom durchaus noch unsicheren Ausgang des Gerichtes über das Werk des Christen" (*Verständnis*, 157). John Calvin argues from this text "that as evil deeds are punished by God, so also good deeds are rewarded, but for a different reason. Evil deeds are given the punishment they deserve, but in rewarding good deeds God does not

2 COR 11:15b

· Their end will match their deeds [ὡς τὸ τέλος ἔσται κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν].

However one resolves the literary-critical problems,⁵¹ most are agreed that Paul is here engaging in a vigorous defense of his person and gospel, and simultaneously attacking false apostles who have appeared on the scene in Corinth (cf. esp. 11:4-5, 12-15). In vv 13-15 Paul's invective reaches its high point. He unmasks these rivals for who he believes they really are: false apostles, deceitful workers, servants of Satan disguising themselves as apostles of Christ.⁵² This unmitigated denial of their legitimacy is climaxed by the phrase under consideration.

From the use of similar brief phrases inserted at the end of invective it would appear that Paul was fond of concluding such invective by an appeal to divine judgment.⁵³ J. Zmijewski has pointed out that this brief concluding word of judgment is analogous to prophetic oracles of judgment. Understood in this way, vv 13-15a bring the accusation or reason for judgment, and v 15b the sentence of judgment itself.⁵⁴

have regard to their merit or worth" (*The Second Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians* [trans. T. A. Smail; Calvin's Commentaries; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964 <reprint of 1547 edition>] 71-72). Such a "different reason" can in no wise be drawn from this text which applies the same standard to all works, whether good or bad!

⁵⁰ E. Synofzik, *Vergeltungsaussagen*, 77.

⁵¹ Chapters 10-13 are generally considered to be part of an originally separate letter since their aggressive and sarcastic tone contrasts markedly with the more conciliatory approach of the earlier chapters. See R. P. Martin, *Second Corinthians*, xxxviii-li, 298-301.

⁵² Verses 13-15 "bilden insofern eine Einheit, als Paulus hier in Form einer 'Schelt- und Drohrede' eine 'prophetische Enthüllung des diabolischen Wesens der Gegner' vornimmt" (J. Zmijewski, *Der Stil der paulinischen 'Narrenrede'* (BBB 52; Köln/Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1978) 153; see also pp 153-167.

⁵³ See Rom 3:8; Gal 5:12; 1 Thess 2:16; also 2 Tim 4:14. See esp. E. Synofzik, *Vergeltungsaussagen*, 31-38.

⁵⁴ *Stil*, 167, n. 419. See also C. Westermann, *Grundformen prophetischer Rede*, esp. 57-63.

This particular wording of the motif is not found elsewhere but gives admirable expression to the *lex talionis*, much as in Paul's sharp judgment statement in 1 Cor 3:17 -- destruction to the destroyer. A similarly constructed judgment statement is found in Rom 3:8 -- ὧν τὸ κρίμα ἔνδικόν ἐστιν.⁵⁵ The opponents' "end" refers to their "final destiny." The analogy of prophetic judgment oracles and the similar use of τέλος in the invective of Phil 3:19 ("Their end is destruction") makes it probable that Paul has in mind God's destroying eschatological [ἔσται] wrath as their "end."⁵⁶ This would correspond to an OT pattern, whereby a sinner's "end" is destruction at the hands of God.⁵⁷

The use of the recompense motif with its stress on "works" may perhaps have been suggested to Paul's mind by his previous designation of these rivals as "deceitful workers" (v 14). It may also be that some irony is intended, since those who "disguise themselves" (vv 13-15a) will be judged not by such appearances, but according to their deeds.

Thus we have one of those rare instances where Paul pronounces a *sentence of judgment* upon specific individuals.⁵⁸ There is no summons to repentance; these are enemies of Paul's apostolic calling and gospel, servants of Satan, who shall assuredly face divine wrath. Just as Paul calls down a curse upon those who would preach another gospel in Gal 1:9, so he does here with other words against those who are in fact preaching another gospel (v 4).⁵⁹

⁵⁵ Note particularly the same opening relative pronoun (ὧν) followed by the article and noun. Not only do τὸ κρίμα ("condemnation") and ἔνδικον ("just, deserved, based on what is right") correspond *structurally* to τὸ τέλος and κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν, they overlap considerably in meaning as well.

⁵⁶ See G. Delling, art. τέλος, *TDNT* 8.55; also Heb 6:8; 1 Pet 4:17.

⁵⁷ See for instance Ps 73:17-20; also T. Asher 6:4-5 where such destiny is related to the doctrine of the Two Ways (1:3-9); and Philo, *Virtue*, 182.

⁵⁸ "In der Tat, wenn irgendein Satz, dann ist dieser ein kategorischer Urteilssatz" (K. Prümm, *Diakonia*, 630).

⁵⁹ Cf. also 1 Thess 2:16.

Who then are these opponents whom Paul sentences? The ongoing debate as to their particular theology need not detain us.⁶⁰ Rather, what is of importance is the fact that nearly all interpreters understand them to be some type of Jewish-Christian apostles. It is clear from 11:13-15 that Paul wishes to deny their legitimacy as such (just as they were denying his). However it is equally the fact that they were recognized as genuine followers and representatives of Christ by some (most?) in the early Church. Paul is engaged here in a bitter struggle to determine which of two rival Christian apostolates will win out in Corinth.⁶¹ Is Paul then pronouncing a sentence of ultimate condemnation upon other Christians? For Paul the answer will certainly have been 'No.' Regardless of others' opinions of them, for Paul these are traitors to Christ and the gospel.⁶² For this reason, the text will yield little regarding the relation of judgment according to works to the justified.

COLOSSIANS: AUTHENTICITY

The majority opinion of current scholarship rejects the Pauline authorship of Colossians,⁶³ but there remain serious doubts about the conclusiveness of the evidence brought against authenticity.⁶⁴ External evidence gives little cause for doubt.

⁶⁰ On the various theories, see esp. J. L. Sumney, *Identifying Paul's Opponents: The Question of Method in 2 Corinthians* (JSNTSup 40; Sheffield: JSOT, 1990) 15-73. He summarizes the major positions under four headings: a) Judaizers (majority of interpreters); b) Gnostics; c) Divine Men (=Hellenistic Jewish propagandists); and d) Pneumatics.

⁶¹ See E. Käsemann, "Die Legitimität des Apostels: Eine Untersuchung zu II Korinther 10-13," ZNW 41 (1942) 33-71; W. Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth*³, 116; D. Georgi, *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians* (ET; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986) 315; J. L. Sumney, *Identifying Paul's Opponents*, 121-186; C. K. Barrett, "Paul's Opponents in 2 Corinthians," in *Essays on Paul* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982] 60-86; and "ΨΕΤΔΑΠΙΟΣΤΟΛΟΙ (2 Cor. 11.13)," 87-107.

⁶² See esp. C. K. Barrett, "ΨΕΤΔΑΠΙΟΣΤΟΛΟΙ," 87-107.

⁶³ See, for example, J. Gnllka, *Der Kolosserbrief* (HTKNT 10/1; Freiburg: Herder, 1980); A. Lindemann, *Der Kolosserbrief* (Zürcher Bibelkommentar 10; Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1983); P. Pokorny', *Der Brief des Paulus an die Kolosser* (THKNT 10/1; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1985); P. Müller, *Anfänge der Paulusschule* (ATANT 74; Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1988); G. S. Holland, *The Tradition That You Received From Us: 2 Thessalonians In The Pauline Tradition* (HUT 24; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1988); F. W. Hughes, *Early Christian Rhetoric and 2 Thessalonians* (JSNTSup 30; Sheffield: JSOT, 1989).

⁶⁴ See Robert Jewett, *Thessalonian Correspondence*, 3-18; and J. Lähnemann, *Der Kolosserbrief: Komposition, Situation und Argumentation* (SNT 3; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1971). Among commentators the Pauline authorship of Col has been accepted by Bruce, Dibelius-Greeven, Moule,

The letter claims to be from the apostle Paul (1:1,23), very likely with the help of a secretary (4:18).⁶⁵ This view of authorship went unchallenged until the nineteenth century.

Internal evidence, it is claimed, demands rejection of Pauline authorship. Differences in language and style between Colossians and the undisputed Paulines have been demonstrated by Bujard.⁶⁶ However, Bujard's conclusion that such differences indicate another author has been subjected to serious criticism.⁶⁷ Others have pointed to the possible stylistic influence of a secretary to explain some of the differences.⁶⁸ Arguments based on a supposed dependence on the canonical

Michaelis, Merk, and Kuss.

⁶⁵ Cf. E. R. Richards, *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1991) who regards Col as certainly written with the help of a secretary. Further, R. N. Longenecker, "Ancient Amanuenses and the Pauline Epistles," in *New Dimensions in New Testament Study* (ed. R. N. Longenecker and M. C. Tenney; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974) 281-297.

⁶⁶ W. Bujard, *Stilanalytische Untersuchungen zum Kolosserbrief als Beitrag zur Methodik von Sprachvergleichen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973); cf. further E. Schweizer, *Der Brief an die Kolosser* (EKKNT; Zürich: Benziger/Neukirchener, 1976) 22-23.

⁶⁷ Although Bujard's "ganzheitliche Betrachtungsweise" constitutes a distinct methodological advance in analyzing an author's style, G. D. Kilpatrick notes weaknesses (review in *NovT* 20 [1978] 334-336). Determination of a "distinctive style" in a single letter need not automatically exclude common authorship. Kilpatrick suggests, "we may perceive features, such as the use of $\tau\epsilon$, $\omicron\nu\nu$, which suggest that Romans has a distinctive style. We may then go on to ask what is the explanation of this, without suggesting that someone else wrote the epistle. Is the stylistic difference between Col and the other Epistles such that Col is not likely to be written by Paul?" (335-336) For Kilpatrick the verdict cannot be rendered conclusively on this basis. (Similarly R. Kieffer: "Manche statistische Resultate der zwei ersten Kapitel kann dem Leser immer noch eine gewisse Freiheit lassen, den Kol trotzdem Paulus zuzuschreiben. . . . die Frage ist leider noch immer nicht ganz gelöst." Review in *TZBas* 31 [1975] 44-45.) Failure to attend to relevant textual variations also weakens Bujard's case (esp. the particles, which form a significant part of his evidence). More recently K. Neumann has sought to refine further such stylostatistical analysis, and has come to conclusions opposite those of Bujard (*Authenticity of the Pauline Epistles*). In particular, Bujard's "procedure is limited to the Pauline corpus and does not allow him to test if the differences of Colossians from the rest of Paul are *real* differences [i.e., demonstrating a different author] or insignificant differences. The results of testing various indices by discrimination analysis suggest the differences are insignificant, i.e., the variation is about as great within Paul as it is between Paul and other authors" (214; also pp. 10-13).

⁶⁸ This is argued by T. J. Sappington, *Revelation and Redemption at Colossae* (JSNTSupp 53; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991) esp. 22-24. "The question of the role of an amanuensis is more telling with regard to arguments from style. . . . We know virtually nothing about the process of composition. The letter may have been dictated verbatim, or an amanuensis (Timothy? see Col 1.1) may have 'fleshed out' the general line of thought suggested by the author himself, who then approved the content of the letter and added his own signature and greeting. A change in amanuensis and/or a change in the degree of freedom given the amanuensis (due to a change in circumstances?) would readily account for differences in style between Col and the undisputed letters of Paul" (23). See further R. N. Longenecker, "Ancient Amanuenses"; E. Schweizer, "The Letter to the Colossians—Neither Pauline nor Post-Pauline?" in *Pluralisme et*

Ephesians have been generally abandoned.⁶⁹

Alongside the stylistic considerations, theological differences between Colossians and the recognized Pauline letters are said to exclude Paul's authorship of the former. Numerous specifically Pauline concepts are omitted (e.g., ἁμαρτία [sg], νόμος, ἐπαγγελία, δικαιοσύνη, πιστεύειν), and theological change may be detected (e.g., cosmic christology, Christ as "head" of the Body, no longer a near expectation of the parousia, a differently nuanced "realized" eschatology, baptism as "already risen with Christ"). However it may be questioned whether these observations really demand non-Pauline authorship. Surely some omission and adjustment of terminology may be allowed due to the particular occasion of Colossians. Likewise, what some view as "profound change" may be credibly viewed by another as acceptable development in one author's thought.⁷⁰ For instance, is the cosmic christology in the letter really so far removed from such texts as 1 Cor 2:8, 8:6; 2 Cor 4:4; Gal 4:3-9; and Phil 2:9-10? On other points arguments from silence (e.g., no mention of a near parousia) or debatable exegesis (e.g., the interpretation of apostolic office) are given a weight they should not bear. Add to these reservations the close relation to the epistle to Philemon, best explained as from the same author,⁷¹ and the case for Paul as author of Colossians may be judged to be still a serious alternative, and for this writer a convincing one.

oecuménisme en recherches théologiques: mélanges offerts du R. P. Dockx (ed. Y. Congar, et al.; Paris: Duculot, 1976) 14; and W. G. Kümmel, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*¹⁸ (Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1973) 299-300.

⁶⁹ Cf. E. Schweizer, *Kolosser*, 20, n.6.

⁷⁰ Against the argument that Col represents a significantly more "realized" eschatology than in Paul, see G. F. Wessels, "The Eschatology of Colossians and Ephesians" (*Neot* 21 [1987] 186-187); T. J. Sappington, *Revelation and Redemption*, 226-227; and A. T. Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet: Studies in the Role of the Heavenly Dimension in Paul's Thought with Special Reference to his Eschatology* (SNTSMS 43; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981) 131-132. For a different view, see H. E. Lona, *Die Eschatologie im Kolosser- und Epheserbrief* (FB 48; Würzburg: Echter, 1984).

⁷¹ Cf. W. G. Kümmel, *Einleitung*, 303-304; D. Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*³ (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 1970) 554; J. Lähnemann, *Kolosserbrief*, 178-179, n.72.

COL 3:22-25

(22) Slaves, obey your earthly masters in everything, not only while being watched and in order to please them, but wholeheartedly, fearing the Lord. (23) Whatever your task, put yourselves into it, as done for the Lord and not for your masters, (24) since you know that from the Lord you will receive the inheritance as your reward; you serve the Lord Christ [or: Serve the Lord Christ].⁷² (25) For the wrongdoer will be paid back for whatever wrong has been done, and there is no partiality.

This earliest extant Christian Haustafel (3:18-4:1) forms a distinct subunit within the letter. Since our purpose is to examine the concept of judgment and recompense present in this text, we will give only a brief treatment of the larger issue of the origin and intent of the NT household codes. Particular attention will be given to the following questions: (a) Why does the duty of “slaves” receive such expanded treatment? (b) Why is an eschatological motivation for this duty brought in and given expanded treatment? (c) What view of recompense/judgment for believers is present in this text and what is the relation of the same to the call to submission to earthly masters?

A glance at the structure⁷³ of this unit reveals the disparate emphasis given to the duty of slaves. In the Nestle-Aland Greek text the admonitions to wives, husbands, children and parents take 1½ lines of text each, and to masters 2½ lines, while that addressed to slaves occupies 8½ lines. Each of the paired admonitions consists of a command and a reason or motivation, and involves a ‘weaker’ and a ‘stronger’ partner. The command to the ‘weaker’ partner in each pair consists of “obedience/submission,” but to the slaves this is expanded to 4 lines of Greek text, with each of the phrases in vv 22-23 expanding on the precise nature of this obedience.⁷⁴ Likewise the motivation addressed to slaves (vv 24-25) is remarkable

⁷² See note 84 below.

⁷³ On the structure, see esp. M. Gielen, *Tradition und Theologie neutestamentlicher Haustafelethik: Ein Beitrag zur Frage einer christlichen Auseinandersetzung mit gesellschaftlichen Normen* (BBB 75; Frankfurt: Anton Hain, 1990) 108-115.

⁷⁴ There is no such expansion of the command element to any of the ‘stronger’ parties, unless 4:1a is viewed as unusually long.

for its length (3 lines) and detail.⁷⁵

This is all the more remarkable since research into the development of such household codes has not demonstrated a comparable disproportionate stress on slaves' duties elsewhere, whether in Greek or Hellenistic Jewish sources. In spite of the NT codes' obvious debt to these earlier traditions, the specific Christian form of such codes is now generally attributed to factors within early Christianity itself.⁷⁶ Thus a number of different causes within the early church have been suggested by scholars as having led to the development of these distinctively Christian codes, and in particular to the disproportionate attention devoted to the duties of slaves.⁷⁷ These include, (1) a connection with Onesimus' return to his master, Philemon; (2) the need for such traditional ethical teaching in light of waning expectation of the parousia; and (3) the need to counteract enthusiastic or emancipatory tendencies among slaves and women, possibly occasioned by Paul's own teaching.⁷⁸ In addition to the above suggestions, Robert Nash notes that elsewhere in the epistle Paul and his co-workers are portrayed as *servants* in God's household.⁷⁹ The instruction to

⁷⁵ In general the motivational element is more clearly expressed toward the 'weaker' members, where it is consistently christological and/or eschatological. To the 'stronger' this can either be replaced by a reformulation of the command in its negative form (see v 19), or refer to undesirable natural consequences (see v 21). Only with reference to masters (4:1) does Paul feel the necessity of a clearly christological/eschatological motivation, perhaps due to the novelty of the relation to a slave/brother (cf. Philemon).

⁷⁶ See esp. the helpful summaries of the current state of research into the origins of Christian household codes provided by G. Strecker ("Die neutestamentlichen Haustafeln (Kol 3,18-4,1 und Eph 5,22-6,9)," *Neues Testament und Ethik, für Rudolf Schnackenburg* [Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 1989] 349-375, esp. 357-359) and M. Gielen (*Haustafelethik*, 24-67). See also J. E. Crouch, *The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel* (FRLANT 109; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972) 9-31; and A. Lincoln, *Ephesians* (WBC 42; Dallas, TX: Word, 1990) 355-359.

⁷⁷ Note similar instructions to slaves Eph 6:5-8; 1 Pet 2:18-25; also 1 Cor 7:21-24.

⁷⁸ While much can be said for this last explanation (cf. 1 Cor 7:21-24; Gal 3:28; Phlm 16; Col 3:11), there does not appear to be sufficient evidence of such a 'revolutionary' movement among Christian slaves in the first century C.E. See M. Gielen, *Haustafelethik*, 119-120; S. Bartchy, *MALLON CHRESAI. First Century Slavery and the Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 7:21* (SBLDS 11; Missoula: Scholars, 1973); R. H. Barrow, *Slavery in the Roman Empire* (NY: Barnes and Noble, 1968); and T. Wiedemann, *Greek and Roman Slavery* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1981) 188-223.

⁷⁹ 1:7, 23, 25; 4:7, 9, 13.

slaves, he suggests, could then function as an *exemplum* of the sort of behavior seen in Paul and expected of all Christians, and thus deserving of more extended treatment.⁸⁰

Slaves are instructed to be obedient “in everything [κατὰ πάντα],”⁸¹ not superficially but “wholeheartedly.” This seemingly conservative ethic is built upon a revolutionary foundation. The earthly master is now qualified as ὁ κατὰ σάρκα κύριος (3:22) who is also subject to the same κύριος ἐν οὐρανῷ (4:1). The slaves’ true master is Christ (3:24b), which, far from releasing them from earthly service, commits them to sincere and wholehearted obedience. Already in the terms used to describe this obedience, its fundamental connection to one’s relationship to Christ is hinted at.⁸²

This obedience is then motivated or reinforced in vv 24-25 by reference to the already known fact of Christ’s eschatological rewarding of his servants.⁸³ The future verbs (ἀπολήμψεσθε, κομίσεσθαι), the content of the recompense (“the inheritance”), and the fact that it will be given by the *heavenly* κύριος in contrast to one’s *earthly* master, all point to an eschatological repayment. Both the reward and the rewarder are important as motivational factors in this context. The fact that this rewarding is “from the Lord [ἀπὸ κυρίου]” (note the position of emphasis) should motivate the kind of obedience [ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ] described in vv 22-23, particularly

⁸⁰ “Heuristic Haustafeln: Domestic Codes as Entrance to the Social World of Early Christianity. The Case of Colossians,” in *Religious Writings and Religious Systems, II* (J. Neusner, et al. [ed], Brown Studies in Religion 2; Atlanta: Scholars, 1989) 25-50, esp. p 44. Similarly, M. Gielen, *Haustafelethik*, 119.

⁸¹ This reflects back on the general exhortation to “do everything [πάντα] in the name of the Lord Jesus” (3:17). See also v 23a (v.l.).

⁸² This obedience is tied to pleasing God (see on 2 Cor 5:9-10), to (lit.) “singleness of heart” (i.e., against hypocrisy), and to the fear of the Lord (see on 2 Cor 5:11).

⁸³ This christological/eschatological motivation is not new with v 24; cf. “fearing the Lord” (v 22b), “work as unto the Lord” (v 23b), which has led some to see v 24 (εἰδότες ὅτι) as merely a continuation of the imperative. However, comparison with 4:1b (εἰδότες ὅτι) confirms that with v 24 the motivational element of this form properly begins (so Gnllka; Lähnemann). Εἰδότες ὅτι=a reminder of Jewish and Christian common knowledge. See Eph 6:8, 9; E. Synofzik, *Vergeltungsaussagen*, 138.

since slaves could expect no such inheritance as a reward from their earthly masters. This emphasis on the christological basis of obedience is confirmed by the immediately following *τῷ κυρίῳ Χριστῷ δουλεύετε*.⁸⁴ Thus, Christian slaves should obey “as working for the Lord, not for men” (NIV), because it is from the Lord and not from human masters that they expect this inheritance.

We actually have a dual recompense in vv 24-25, something already seen elsewhere in Paul’s letters. In this instance, however, rather than a single statement referring to a dual recompense, we have two separate motif statements, one strictly positive, the other strictly negative. In both instances, the *function* is the same: to motivate the righteous to obedience. The statement of positive reward (v 24) grounds the commands to obey and to work (vv 22-23), while the warning of punishment (v 25) grounds the command to serve (v 24b). The contrast in forms of address is both instructive and characteristic. The promise of reward takes the form of direct address to the listeners (“you will receive”), since the speaker assumes they belong to the group of those who thus behave and shall receive. The warning, on the other hand, uses the more oblique third person singular (“the wrongdoer will be paid back”), and only applies to the listeners *if* their behavior should identify them as belonging to those who are disobedient and unrighteous (ὁ ἀδικῶν).

Most aspects of the wording of these two motif statements have already been covered elsewhere. Thus “you will receive . . . reward [*ἀπολήμψεσθε τὴν ἀνταπόδοσιν*]” is synonymous with “receive reward [*μισθὸν λήμψεσθαι*]” in 1 Cor 3:8b and 14b.⁸⁵ Originally a commercial term “for receiving one’s pay,”⁸⁶ *ἀπολαμβάνω* came to be associated in Christian literature with eschatological

⁸⁴ This remains true whether one takes *δουλεύετε* as an indicative (NRSV) or imperative. Commentators and translations are divided, but the imperative is preferable, since the asyndetic connection to v 24a reads more easily as a reiteration of the command in v 23 than as a continuation of v 24a. This also gives a better connection to v 25, since otherwise the *γάρ* of that verse would have to refer back to the imperative in v 23. The Byzantine addition of *γάρ* to v 24b favors the indicative, but is textually inferior.

⁸⁵ See pp. 262-265 above.

⁸⁶ Cf. *BAGD*, 94; Rom 1:27.

reward.⁸⁷ The reward itself, *τὴν ἀνταπόδοσιν* (NT hapax),⁸⁸ is the positive divine “repayment” which the Lord will give his servants for their work. In the LXX the use of both the verbal and nominal forms of *δίδωμι* and its compounds was found to be quite prevalent in motif occurrences.⁸⁹ The content of this reward is nothing other than eschatological salvation (*κληρονομία*).⁹⁰ Paul has already referred to “the inheritance [*κληῆρος*] of the saints” (1:12), which is equivalent to “the hope laid up for you in heaven” (1:5) and the “life . . . hidden with Christ in God” (3:3), and now takes up this term which is elsewhere widely attested in its meaning “salvation as the inheritance of God’s children.”⁹¹ As Gnllka notes, both these terms stand in starkest contrast to the earthly situation of slaves: here they had neither an inheritance nor any claim to repayment for service.⁹² While already qualified to take part in the inheritance of the saints (1:12), Christian slaves have yet to receive this inheritance, conditioned as that is upon steadfast continuance in the faith (1:23) and its concomitant, sanctification (1:22). The absence of an explicit reference to “works” is of little concern. That such are in view is clear enough from the immediate context,⁹³ and the use of nouns of “repayment” as the object of the verb

⁸⁷ See Luke (16:25); 18:30 (vl.); 2 John 8. Patristic sources refer to “receiving” the promise, eternal life, the future age, etc. (references in BAGD, 94). Gal 4:5 speaks of “receiving the adoption as children,” which is, however, an eschatological gift received already by faith.

⁸⁸ This older form ending in *-σις* later yielded to the equivalent *ἀνταπόδομα* (*BDF*, §109.2,4) which is found in Luke 14:12 and Rom 11:9 (punishment as mostly in LXX). Positive “repayment” is found in Rom 11:35.

⁸⁹ See p. 32 above.

⁹⁰ Lit. “the reward of the inheritance,” and best taken as a genitive of content (= the repayment consisting of the inheritance); cf. *BDF*, §167. See also 2 Cor 5:5 (*τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος*) for a similar genitive of content. Thus the NRSV is quite correct to make “inheritance” the object of the verb (“you will receive the inheritance as your reward”).

⁹¹ Cf. Gal 3:18; Eph 1:14,18; 5:5; Heb 9:15; Acts 20:32; 1 Pet 1:4. For the rich OT and Jewish background with the same meaning, see J. Eichler, *NIDNTT*, 2.295-303.

⁹² J. Gnllka, *Kolosssebrief*, 222.

⁹³ *Ἔργάζεσθε* (v 23); *ὁ ἡδίκησεν* (v 25).

in the motif can make a reference to “works” superfluous.⁹⁴ This absence and the initial “from the Lord” combine to shift attention away from the correspondence between deed and reward, and toward the one who rewards and the certainty of his repayment.

If Paul perhaps showed some hesitation in Romans in applying terms such as “wage” (μισθός, 4:4) and “pay” (ὁψώνιον, 6:23) to the realm of salvation by grace, here he clearly utilizes the commercial language of “receiving repayment” for the reception of the Christians’ inheritance. The Romans passages just noted show well enough that Paul was sensitive to potential abuses of recompense concepts in the direction of merit theology (also Rom 11:35). However, a text like Col 3:24-25 shows equally well that recompense terminology did not automatically bring merit theology to Paul’s mind.⁹⁵ The history of the motif in second temple Jewish literature certainly yielded little evidence of a tendency toward merit theology.

The negative counterpoint to this promise of reward is found in the threat of judgment in v 25.⁹⁶ The wording here reads literally: “the one who does wrong will receive what he/she has done wrong [ὁ ἀδικῶν κομίσεται ὃ ἠδίκησεν],” and has verbal similarities to the motif expression in 2 Cor 5:10. As we determined in our discussion of this last-named text, this formulation is reminiscent of the OT concept of a person’s deeds returning upon one’s head.⁹⁷ Unlike the dual thrust of 2 Cor 5:10 (“whether good or bad”) Col 3:25 speaks only of the wrongdoers receiving back their unrighteous deeds. The nature of this ἀδικεῖν is not specified. Some interpreters can perceive no direct application to slaves, and thus understand v 25 as

⁹⁴ See LXX Ps 27:4d; 93:2b; Isa 59:18; 66:6b; Jer 28:6b (= MT 51:6b); Lam 3:64; Joel 4:4, 7; Sir 17:23.

⁹⁵ See also our discussion of Rom 2:6-11; 1 Cor 3:5-17 (esp. p. 265); 9:24-27 (salvation as a ‘prize’ to be won by endurance); cf. also Phil 3:14.

⁹⁶ “Hier bildet dieser Satz einen Gegenpol zu der Verheißung des ewigen Erbes aus 3,24 und macht auf die Möglichkeit der Verdammnis aufmerksam (vgl. 3,6)” (P. Pokorny, *Kolosser*, 155).

⁹⁷ See pp. 325-326 above. Some think this is another sentence of holy law (J. Gnllka, *Kolosserbrief*, 223).

addressed to both slaves and masters, but primarily warning masters against “mistreating” their slaves (cf. Eph 6:9).⁹⁸ Structurally, however, the admonition to masters begins only at 4:1, while v 25 is clearly meant to be a continuation of the admonition to slaves.⁹⁹ The immediate context suggests that the failure to obey one’s master “in everything,” “wholeheartedly,” “as done for the Lord,” constitutes this ἁδικεῖν. Was there, perhaps, as well a temptation for slaves to sin under pressure of mistreatment (1 Pet 2:18-25)? Whatever the social-historical occasion, Paul’s choice of this verb will have been influenced primarily by the thought of wrongdoing against one’s true master, Christ (v 24b). Refusal to obey one’s earthly master is in fact wrongdoing against Christ.¹⁰⁰ It is also possible, as in Rev 22:11, that the use of ὁ ἁδικῶν stems from Jewish or early Christian hortatory tradition in which “the wrongdoer”=the sinner, the ungodly.¹⁰¹ Thus Paul concludes his exhortation to obedience by a warning of God’s impartial recompense of deeds upon wrongdoers. Christian slaves who resist obedience to Christ (=submission to earthly masters) are in danger of falling under the condemnation of the unrighteous, thus providing the contrasting parallel to the positive eschatological statement in v 24. The similarity with 2 Cor 5:10, which likewise speaks of eschatological judgment upon the doers of good or evil, supports this understanding.

The associated reference to divine impartiality (v 25b) has been found in other motif occurrences, and supports our contention that God’s judgment is here in view.¹⁰² In this instance its inclusion may also reflect a tendency on the part of

⁹⁸ See Ralph P. Martin, *Colossians and Philemon* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981) 123-124. This interpretation can appeal to the common usage of ἁδικεῖν for ‘mistreatment’ of others.

⁹⁹ M. Gielen, *Haustafelethik*, 195-198.

¹⁰⁰ M. Gielen, *Haustafelethik*, 192-193.

¹⁰¹ E. Lohmeyer, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (HNT 16; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1926) 176. On the religious use of this stem (ἁδικ-) for the ungodly and sinners, and contrasted with the righteous, see G. Schrenk, *TDNT* 1.149-161; and (on Col 3:25) 1.160. See also LXX Ps 9:24; 70:4; and 1 Cor 6:9 (οἱ ἁδικοί).

¹⁰² See Rom 2:6-11; Eph 6:8-9; further references on p. 199, n. 56.

Christian slaves to excuse disobedience on the basis of extenuating circumstances such as the limitations of a slave's position or the new relation to the master as brother or sister. In any case Christian slaves should be obedient and not wrongdoers, both because Christ is their true master, and because their recompense (both as eschatological reward and as punishment) is tied to this behavior.

We discussed above the possible reasons for an expanded admonition to slaves in Christian household codes. A similar question may be posed in regard to the expanded eschatological motivation for slaves' obedience. Comparison with other NT and post-apostolic household codes does not support the idea that an *eschatological reward* as motivation was a traditional element in this particular form of ethical instruction to slaves. Since this eschatological expansion cannot be adequately explained via adoption of a pre-Christian tradition, we would suggest several influences which may help to explain its presence in Col 3:22-25. (1) In popular Greek ethical teaching, "some discussions of household management recommended motivating slaves by holding out various rewards, for example, more praise, more food, better clothing, and shoes."¹⁰³ (2) The servant-master analogy itself suggested quite naturally issues of reward and punishment, which for Paul meant normally eschatological reward and punishment.¹⁰⁴ (3) In general, eschatological motivation is of central importance in Paul's ethical teaching.¹⁰⁵

It remains now to mention briefly several additional texts in Colossians which contain possible reference to the future judgment of believers.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰³ A. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 422 (citing Xenophon, Oec. 13.9-12). Also M. Gielen, *Haustafelethik*, 162-166.

¹⁰⁴ See Rom 6:23; 14:1-12; 1 Cor 3:5-15; 4:1-5; 9:15-27.

¹⁰⁵ D. A. Low, *Apocalyptic Motivation in Pauline Paraenesis* (Unpub. Diss.; The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1988) esp. pp. 6 and 24.

¹⁰⁶ Although some translations refer to the loss of one's heavenly "prize" in Col 2:18 ("Do not let anyone . . . disqualify you for the prize," NIV; "beguile you of your reward," KJV), the verb in question [καταβραβεύω] means simply "to rule [i.e., as umpire or judge] against" someone (so NRSV, RSV, NEB, JB). In context this warns the hearers against losing their freedom in Christ by submitting to the judgments of visionary false teachers ("do not let anyone condemn you," 2:16a). See L. T. Wohlfeil, "A Few Remarks on Col.2:18.19a," *CTM* 8 (1937) 428.

COL 1:22-23a, 28

(22) he has now reconciled [you] in his fleshly body through death, so as to present you holy and blameless and irreproachable before him— (23) provided that you continue securely established and steadfast in the faith. . . . (28) It is he whom we proclaim, warning everyone and teaching everyone in all wisdom, so that we may present everyone mature in Christ.

Although “holy [ἅγιος]” and “blameless [ἄμωμος]” are cultic-sacrificial terms describing an unblemished animal set apart for God, they here seem to be pressed into the service of a judicial scene. “Irreproachable [ἀνέγκλητος]” describes those against whom no charge or accusation can be pressed¹⁰⁷ when they are “presented” before the court.¹⁰⁸ This goal of the reconciliation via Christ’s death is clearly conditioned upon continuance in the faith (i.e., faith in the gospel of Christ).¹⁰⁹

Thus, just as the result of their former alienation from God was “evil deeds” (1:21), so now, in total contrast, the aim of reconciliation is that believers be irreproachable at the judgment seat of God. This is likewise the aim of Paul’s ministry (v 28), using now the concept of “maturity/perfection [τέλειος].” While an ethical component is unmistakable in this word, it does not imply sinless moral perfection.¹¹⁰ Rather its focus is on “wholeness,” “completeness” or “maturity” in line with Jewish and Hellenistic parallels, and “he is ‘perfect’ who inwardly and in the manifestation of his life has appropriated the content of the Christian faith in the right way.”¹¹¹ That Paul views this as taking place at the eschatological judgment is

¹⁰⁷ W. Grundmann, *TDNT* 1.356.

¹⁰⁸ Although *παραστῆσαι* can be used for presenting a sacrifice, this meaning is excluded by *ἀνέγκλητος*. The judicial usage is common: 1 Cor 8:8; 2 Cor 4:14; 11:2; Rom 14:10; 2 Tim 2:15.

¹⁰⁹ Ἐι γε = if indeed.

¹¹⁰ “One does not find in the NT any understanding of the adjective in terms of a gradual advance of the Christian to moral perfection nor in terms of a two-graded ideal of ethical perfection” (G. Delling, *TDNT* 8.77).

¹¹¹ H. Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology* (trans. J. R. DeWitt; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975) 271. See also P. J. Du Plessis, *Teleios. The Idea of Perfection in the New Testament* (Kampen: 1959); and G. Delling, *TDNT* 8.67-78.

indicated again by the verb “that we may present [παραστήσωμεν],” and suggested by the preceding reference to “Christ in you, the hope of glory.”¹¹² Hence, this text would seem to testify to Paul’s expectation that believers will meet the requirements of a coming judgment according to works.¹¹³

COL 3:6

On account of these the wrath of God is coming [on those who are disobedient].¹¹⁴

The coming divine wrath is directed against practices associated with “whatever in you is earthly” (3:5), such as sexual immorality, greed and idolatry; practices which characterized the “old self” (3:9), and which once characterized believers (3:7), but should do so no longer (3:3, 8-10). Although believers have died to such things in Christ (3:3), they are still required to put them to death and to rid themselves of such evil behavior, instead putting on the new self, which is being renewed in knowledge in the image of its Creator (3:5, 10). There may be an implied warning should believers fail to heed this admonition, but if so it is left non-explicit.

¹¹² E. Lohse bases his non-eschatological interpretation on the use of “before him [κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ]” (1:22), which he claims “express[es] that the Christians’ present lives are lived in God’s presence” (*Colossians and Philemon* [Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971] 65). However, of the only two other NT usages of this phrase, while one may be understood in the present sense (Eph 1:4), the other is surely to be understood eschatologically (Jude 24). In any case, the use of this phrase cannot be taken alone as decisive for the (non)eschatological import of these verses.

¹¹³ “The eschatological judgment is a central issue in this letter. For the goal of Paul’s ministry, toward which he struggles (1.29) and suffers (1.24) is to present everyone perfect (τέλειος) in Christ (1.28), i.e. ‘holy’, ‘without blemish’ and ‘free from accusation’ at the last judgment (1.22). And this will take place only as they continue to live ‘in Christ’, ‘rooted and built up in him’ and ‘strengthened in the faith’ as they were taught by their earliest preachers and teachers. For it is only ‘in Christ’ that believers participate in his victory over the powers and authorities and share in the eschatological forgiveness he has secured” (T. S. Sappington, *Revelation*, 227).

¹¹⁴ The bracketed phrase is textually suspect (B. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 624-625).

CHAPTER EIGHT

PAUL AND A JEWISH MOTIF: CONCLUSIONS

Our aim in this concluding chapter is two-fold: to summarize the key findings regarding the character and use of the motif in second temple Judaism and in Paul, and to explore briefly the ramifications of this study for the perennial issue of judgment and justification in Paul. While the first aim derives directly from the analysis of the motif-texts in the previous chapters, the second must remain more tentative, since it would have to rest on a text-basis much broader than those passages containing the motif.

In Judaism we found the motif to be surprisingly wide-spread. It possesses the character of a fundamental theological axiom which does not appear to have been tied to any single OT text or texts and could be applied to a wide variety of rhetorical situations. This increases the probability that NT authors, when employing the motif of divine judgment (or recompense) according to deeds, are not citing or alluding to specific Scripture passages, but are drawing upon this common body of fundamental theological conviction.

Although certain authors may have preferred particular modes of expression, the literature as a whole evinces no formulaic rigidity. What most likely began as divine *recompense* of (or according to) deeds, with closer affinity to organic and talionic conceptions, evolved into divine *judgment* according to deeds, and in later texts was almost always conceived as a part of the larger topic of divine judgment. The range of terminological possibilities remains large throughout the period studied. We have suggested certain semantic criteria by which to identify the motif, a task to which little attention has been given in previous studies, but it must still be admitted that the boundaries between this motif and related concepts such as the *lex talionis*, organic consequences, or blood-guilt, remain quite fluid.

Our functional typology has proven useful, pointing up both continuity and development in the rhetorical use of the motif. The chief functions in Judaism are:

- to motivate the righteous to obedience (through both threat and promise),
- to comfort godly sufferers,
- to pronounce sentence upon the disobedient and summon the wayward to repentance, and
- to praise God and justify his actions toward humanity.

The use as an appeal to God to intervene on behalf of the righteous (either to bless them according to their righteousness or punish their enemies according to their wickedness) was strongly present in the Jewish Scriptures, but nearly absent thereafter. This probably has a theological explanation, since such appeals were not infrequently based upon the suppliant's righteousness.¹ Later writings tend to stress human inability and sinfulness and attribute all blessings to God's gracious initiative, thus making an appeal to one's own righteousness in this context seem somewhat out of place.

The increasing fragmentation in second temple Judaism led to two further developments in the use of the motif. Although present to some degree in the OT prophets, the use of the motif to distinguish between true and false Jews gains considerably in prominence. Completely new is the use as a theological warrant against intra-community judgment. Both of these developments will leave their mark on the NT.

Considerable attention was given in Part One to tracing the continuity and development in the understanding of the motif within the larger pattern of soteriology found in the Jewish documents. In particular, two conceptual aspects were found again and again to be characteristic of this motif throughout the period studied. First, when it is said that individuals will be recompensed or judged "according to their deeds," this presumes a wholistic or unitary view of human works. It is not a deed for deed inspection which is in view, but rather one's entire pattern of life, one's "way." Not even all one's deeds in a lifetime need be con-

¹ See esp. 1 Kgs 8:32; also Ps 18:20, 24.

sidered, since repentance and forgiveness could eliminate the relevance of past misdeeds and mark the beginning of a new way. Nor does this life-pattern demand flawlessly perfect obedience. Thus there is precious little evidence of the “Jewish atomisation” of deeds and ethics which has formed the backdrop to many studies of Paul.

Second, the understanding of this motif in Judaism was set squarely within the framework of covenantal nomism, not legalism.² The invitation to, and the provision for, life within God’s covenant favor and protection (=salvation) proceeds solely from God’s grace. This *sola gratia* becomes even more pronounced in the Qumran literature. However, entry into and continuance in this gracious covenantal relationship requires accepting and walking in God’s ways. This is not seen as *earning* a covenant status one did not yet have, but as the only proper response of love and trust in the covenant God who had already bestowed life. One’s works of obedience are not viewed as *merits*, each to be recompensed in atomistic fashion, but instead are the observable manifestations of the covenant loyalty of the unseen heart. One’s deeds are a single whole, the *way* upon which one is walking, and it is this which normally forms the basis or standard for the divine recompense. Behavior demonstrating this fundamental inward disposition of covenant loyalty brings the promise of continued participation in the covenant blessings; consistently disloyal behavior brings God’s wrath. Faith and works are not competing criteria of judgment, but represent two sides of the single coin of human response in the light of God’s gracious covenantal arrangement. The boundary between apostasy and fidelity is seldom legislated in unambiguous fashion, since it is a matter not of legal boundaries but of the human heart and of sovereign divine freedom. Questions as to the *quantity* of transgressions or righteous deeds are pointless. There is thus in this liter-

² This is not, of course, to claim that our study has established covenantal nomism as the soteriological pattern of second temple Judaism. It is, rather, to suggest that the understanding of the recompense motif found in these texts supports at crucial points covenantal nomism instead of legalism. Particularly in chaps. 3–4, the attempt was made to draw in a larger body of textual evidence in order to lend strength to this suggestion.

ature ultimately no tension or paradox between salvation by grace and judgment according to deeds. One “gets in” (to use Sanders’ terms) by covenantal grace, and “stays in” by not abandoning the covenant and its required obedience. This is equally true in sectarian circles such as Qumran, in which case, however, covenant grace is no longer manifested to all Israel through the Torah, but is channeled more narrowly through the revelation and interpretations given to the sect. Within this framework of covenantal nomism, divine judgment according to works functions to confirm or reveal one’s fundamental loyalty to God and his covenant. One does not *become* righteous at this judgment, but one’s righteousness is revealed or confirmed.

Alongside these two elements common to all the writings studied, there are also a number of developments which occur. The historical eschatology of the Jewish Scriptures gives way more and more to an apocalyptic or transcendental eschatology, so that judgment according to deeds occurs post-mortem and often in the context of an apocalyptic universal last judgment. Reflections on post-mortem existence open the door to an increasing individualization of judgment. Also, as mentioned above, there is an increasing use of the motif for the purposes of distinguishing “true Jews” in a sectarian sense. Alongside this development is a growing dichotomy between God’s treatment of the righteous (who are promised mercy and no judgment) and the wicked (who will be judged without mercy). This is often used to distinguish between God’s treatment of Jews and Gentiles respectively, but more and more the line between the righteous and the wicked tends to run right through the larger body of Jews. Only true Jews (i.e., faithful members of a particular sect or party) need not fear the Judgment, while Jews outside the sect will suffer the fate of the Gentiles. Even in such cases, however, the partiality shown to community insiders is contingent upon their continued faithfulness, rather than constituting a privileged immunity. Finally, there is a decreasing use of the motif for the reward of the righteous. The stronger emphasis on human sinfulness apparently made “reward according to deeds” seem less appropriate (though the belief in Israel’s “reward” remained strong).

As for Paul, in spite of their limited use of the motif his writings testify to the fact that judgment according to deeds remains a fundamental and living axiom in Judaism of the first century CE.³ He does not appear to be citing any set form(s) of the motif or authoritative text(s), but is appealing to a fundamental conviction of all Jews. His wording of the motif shows the influence of Jewish tradition. There is still no formulaic hardening and new terminological expressions are still being formed.

Paul's use also demonstrates the continuing variety of function and conceptual development of the motif. In terms of our functional typology he employs it as a call to repentance (Rom 2:6), motivation to obedience (2 Cor 5:10; Col 3:24-25), a sentence upon the disobedient (2 Cor 11:15b), and as the theological basis against intra-community judgment (1 Cor 3:8b). In broadening our investigation to include related judgment texts, the situations of conflict and intra-Jewish debate reflected in Paul's letters have highlighted the importance of the judgment theme in arguments over who is a "true Jew" and as a warrant against intra-community conflict. Also of interest is the seeming renaissance of "reward according to deeds" in Paul's writings, something that will flower in rabbinic writings, but had nearly died out in the last two centuries of the pre-Christian era.

Except for the reward-usage just mentioned, Paul is also a witness to the developments in the understanding of the motif which we noted above in Jewish texts. Even where recompense terminology is employed, this is clearly a part of an *eschatological* judgment scenario. Thus Rom 2:6 speaks of divine recompense according to deeds, but as an expansion upon the "righteous judgment" of God which will occur on the eschatological "day of wrath" (2:5). Though collective aspects are not eliminated, it is particularly *individual* accountability which is now stressed most strongly (see esp. 1 Cor 3:8b; Rom 14:10-12). We have already mentioned his use of the motif to *distinguish the "true Jew."* In addition, Paul continues

³ The motif itself occurs only in Rom 2:6; 1 Cor 3:8b; 2 Cor 5:10; 11:15b; and Col 3:24-25.

the same *dichotomy in the treatment of the wicked versus the righteous*. The ones will be “the objects of wrath . . . made for destruction,” the others “the objects of mercy . . . prepared beforehand for glory” (Rom 9:22-23). For Paul, however, it is not the distinction between Jew and Gentile which makes a difference, but between Christians and the rest of humanity. Thus the whole world, both Jew and Gentile, stands under the wrath of God (Romans 1-3) and vengeance awaits the enemies of the gospel (2 Thess 1:6-10), whereas “God has destined us [Christians] not for wrath, but for obtaining salvation” (1 Thess 5:9; also 1:10).⁴ However, just as the line dividing mercy and wrath could run right through the Jewish community, so in Paul it could run through the midst of the Christian congregation and did not constitute for community members a blanket immunity from divine judgment. Our exegesis has demonstrated at numerous points that Paul was fully prepared to threaten persistently sinful Christians with divine destruction,⁵ and the same is true for leaders or teachers within the community who departed from his apostolic message.⁶ Thus, as generally in second temple Judaism as well, Paul’s promise of mercy and no judgment was actually directed only to the genuinely faithful within the community, which corresponds precisely to the line of demarcation that will be revealed at the judgment according to deeds.

Paul demonstrates solidarity not only with the tradition-historical *developments* in the motif, but, even more importantly for our interpretation of his judgment statements, *he is also at one with second temple Judaism regarding the two fundamental areas of continuity* we identified above. NT scholars are generally perfectly ready to argue that Paul held to a *wholistic* or *unitary view of human* (or at least Christians’) *works*. Where they have sometimes erred is in asserting an

⁴ On this dichotomy in Paul, see G. P. Wetter, *Vergeltungsgedanke*, 16-85; and esp. L. Mattern, *Verständnis*, 59-111. As is typical of many, however, Mattern misconstrues this dichotomy in terms of an immunity for Christians from judgment (=condemnation) in spite of sin(s) (98-111).

⁵ E.g., 1 Cor 3:16-17; 6:9-10; 10:1-12; 11:29-34; 16:22a; Col 3:25.

⁶ 1 Cor 3:16-17; 2 Cor 11:15b; Gal 1:9.

essential discontinuity between Paul and Judaism at this point, based upon their misreading of the latter as a religion which fragments and atomizes.⁷ If our reading of Jewish texts in Part One is correct at this point, then judgment according to deeds in Paul stands much closer to the understanding of the same in Judaism than has commonly been allowed.

Second, we have maintained that *Paul understands the significance of this judgment within a larger soteriological framework remarkably similar to the covenantal nomism of Part One.*⁸ In short, one “enters” the sphere of salvation (or “becomes” a participant among those who are the saved) by God’s grace and election. One “stays in” by obedience; or in more Pauline terms, by “living in the Spirit.” The judgment of those saved by grace will be according to their deeds. While the *term* “covenantal nomism” may not be particularly appropriate for Paul, the fundamental structure of grace and works, election and obedience, salvation and judgment, remains the same.⁹ Certain differences are, of course, evident. The Christ-event replaces the giving of the Torah as the defining event of electing grace, and it is no longer relation to the Torah but to Christ which defines membership in the people of God. Thus it is no longer a specifically *Jewish* covenantal nomism which Paul presents, a fact which we have perceived in his treatment of the “works of the law [ἔργα νόμου]” and his radical soteriological equality between Jew and Gentile. Further, the role of the Spirit in enabling obedience, while not absent in

⁷ “It is common to distinguish between the supposed Jewish legalistic view that one is righteoused and judged on the basis of the sum of individual deeds and Paul’s view that behavior is conceived as a whole” (E. P. Sanders, *PLJP*, 113, and n. 77 for references).

⁸ The caveat issued above applies here as well (p. 350 and n. 2), since a demonstration of this thesis would require a much more thorough analysis of topics such as justification by faith, election, and the law in Paul’s letters. Nevertheless, at quite a number of points *judgment texts* have also touched explicitly on these issues, so that our suggestion is certainly not without textual warrant.

⁹ Here siding with M. Hooker (“Paul and Covenantal Nomism,” *Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of C. K. Barrett* [London: SPCK, 1982] 47-56). She is responding to E. P. Sanders (*PPJ*, 514). His response to Hooker’s article is found in *PLJP*, 210, n. 1.

Judaism, is certainly heightened significantly in Paul.¹⁰ Nevertheless, in both patterns salvation is not earned by human initiative, but is given by God's grace; *and* it is contingent upon continuance in the faith and obedience required by that relationship.¹¹ Such obedience remains a *condition* for the maintenance of righteousness and for final justification. More precisely, it remains the *necessary manifestation* of that which has already been obtained and assured through faith.¹²

Finally, we are now in a position to make a suggestion regarding the traditionally asserted tension or paradox in Paul between justification by faith alone and judgment according to deeds. As has become clear in Part Two, Paul's letters give no evidence of such a tension in Paul's own mind. He uses the judgment motif, both for reward and punishment, without apology and with no seeming fear of misunderstanding. This is easily explainable when one realizes that the apostle has inherited a

¹⁰ This is one of Sanders' main reasons for rejecting covenantal nomism as a description of Paul's pattern of religion. "In Pauline theory, deeds . . . flow from the Spirit, not from commandments" (*PLJP*, 208). Yet elsewhere, against those who would put too much distance between Spirit and Law in Paul, he can say, "there is no distinction between the manner in which Christians are to fulfill Paul's requirements—whether Paul calls those requirements "the law" or not—and the manner in which Jews traditionally observe the Mosaic law" (*ibid.*, 113).

¹¹ R. H. Gundry insists there is a fundamental difference. "Paul's un-Jewish extension of faith and grace to staying in makes good works *evidential* of having received grace through faith, *not instrumental* in keeping grace through works." "The evidence Sanders cites from Palestinian Jewish literature shows overwhelmingly that good works are a *condition* as well as a sign of staying in. It appears, however, that for Paul good works are *only* (but not unimportantly) *a sign* of staying in, faith being the necessary and sufficient condition of staying in as well as of getting in" ("Grace, Works, and Staying Saved in Paul," 11, 35). This comparison appears biased in our opinion. When Paul says—"So let us not grow weary in doing what is right, for we will reap [i.e., eternal life, v. 8b] at harvest time, if we do not give up" (Gal 6:9)—he makes continuance in "doing what is right" a *condition* for reaping eternal life exactly as in Judaism (see further the statements in Rom 11:22; 1 Cor 6:9-10; Gal 5:21; and Col 1:22-23). In both Paul and Judaism, "Loss and commendation . . . are both earned in the sense of "deserved," but salvation itself is not earned by enumerating deeds or balancing them against one another" (E. P. Sanders, *PLJP*, 111). That is, if one defines "condition" as the necessity of *congruence* to a given behavioral norm (i.e., only the righteous shall enter the kingdom of God), then both Paul and Judaism make salvation conditional. If "condition" is defined more *instrumentally* (i.e., by doing this one obtains what one formerly lacked), then neither should be called conditional.

¹² In spite of the previous note, *condition* can, perhaps, be too easily misunderstood in the sense of an entry requirement which must be met *before* or *in order that* one may obtain something. For Paul, the crucial *condition* in this sense has already been fulfilled (Rom 5:1 = faith), yet without rendering the manifestation of that ongoing reality in any way superfluous. It goes without saying that faith for Paul, as for Judaism, is more than any single (one-time) act of assent to the truth, commitment to God, etc., being instead one's life-long stance toward God and the truth (cf. H. Ridderbos: = "the new mode of existence"; *Paul*, 231-252).

way of speaking and thinking about divine judgment according to deeds which itself felt no such tension (Part One). Those who had already been justified by grace through faith in Christ were expected (by God's grace and the Holy Spirit, of course) to live righteous lives as well. That is, their righteousness by faith would manifest itself in obedience, in works; though not necessarily in sinless perfection. Their obedience is a consistent and wholehearted conformity to God's will, with provision made for unintentional sins, temporary backsliding, and restoration. Thus, there is no tension in saying that the status of righteousness is conferred solely by means of faith in Christ, and that all (including the righteous) will be judged according to their deeds. This is not a second justification, nor does it somehow place one's present justification (by faith) in doubt. It is the standard Jewish expectation that one's outward behavior (one's *works* or *way*) will correspond to, and be a visible manifestation of, inward reality. The eschatological recompense according to deeds confirms, on the basis of deeds, one's justification. For the justified, that is, for those who are in Christ by faith and therefore are walking in or according to Christ's Spirit, this future judgment causes no *theological* tension or paradox vis-à-vis their already assured justification by faith.

There is a remaining tension, but it is *existential* rather than theological. Those who would depart from the gospel and from Christ, who would walk according to the flesh rather than the Spirit, will be judged to be unrighteous according to their deeds. In Paul's letters this warning is made applicable repeatedly to his Christian audiences, and no less to the apostle himself. This "impossible possibility" (cf. Romans 6) does create an existential dynamic which permits the assurance of present and future justification by faith while denying any sort of unconditional guarantee or immunity. For all humanity, the righteous as well as the unrighteous, the believer as well as the unbeliever, it shall be "to each according to deeds."

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

MOTIF-TEXTS IN THE JEWISH SCRIPTURES

	<u>HB. VERB</u>	<u>GK. VERB</u>	<u>HB. NOUN*</u>	<u>GK. NOUN*</u>
Judg 1:7	שלם	ἀνταποδίδωμι	<u>[כַּאֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתִי]</u>	<u>[καθὼς ἐποίησα]</u>
Ruth 2:12	שלם	ἀποτείσαι	פַּעַל (sg.)	ἐργασία (sg.)
	[היה שלמה]	[γένοιτο πλήρης]	מִשְׁכָּחַת (sg.)	μισθός (sg.)
1 Sam 25:39	שוב	ἀποστρέφω	רָעָה (sg.)	κακία (sg.)
2 Sam 3:39	שלם	ἀνταποδίδωμι	רָעָה (sg.)	κακία (sg.)
2 Sam 22:21	גמל	ἀνταποδίδωμι	צָרָקָה (sg.)	δικαιοσύνη (sg.)
	שוב	ἀνταποδίδωμι	בֵּר יָדִי	καθαριότητα τῶν χειρῶν
2 Sam 22:25	שוב	ἀποδίδωμι	צָרָקָה (sg.)	δικαιοσύνη (sg.)
	---	---	בֵּר (sg.)	καθαριότητα τῶν χειρῶν
1 Kgs 2:44	שוב	ἀνταποδίδωμι	רָעָה (sg.)	κακία (sg.)
1 Kgs 8:32	נתן	δίδωμι	דָּרָךְ (sg.)	ὁδός (sg.)
	נתן	δίδωμι	צָרָקָה (sg.)	δικαιοσύνη (sg.)
2 Chr 6:23	נתן	ἀποδίδωμι	דָּרָךְ (sg.)	ὁδός (pl.)
	נתן	ἀποδίδωμι	צָרָקָה (sg.)	δικαιοσύνη (sg.)
Job 34:11	שלם	ἀποδίδωμι	פַּעַל (sg.)	<u>[καθὰ ποιεῖ]</u>
	מצע	---	אֶרֶץ (sg.)	---
Ps 18:20 ¹	גמל	ἀνταποδίδωμι	צָרָק (sg.)	δικαιοσύνη (sg.)
	שוב	ἀνταποδίδωμι	בֵּר יָדִי	καθαριότητα τῶν χειρῶν
Ps 18:24 ²	שוב	ἀνταποδίδωμι	צָרָק (sg.)	δικαιοσύνη (sg.)
	---	---	בֵּר יָדִי	καθαριότητα τῶν χειρῶν
Ps 28:4 ³	נתן	δίδωμι	פַּעַל (sg.)	ἔργον (pl.)
	---	---	רָעָה מַעַלְל (sg.)	πόνηρα τ. ἐπιτηδευμάτων (sg.)
	נתן	δίδωμι	מַעֲשֵׂה יָדִי (sg.)	ἔργον τ. χειρῶν (pl.)
	שוב	ἀποδίδωμι	גְּמוּלָה (sg.)	ἀνταπόδομα (sg.)
Ps 62:12 ⁴	שלם	ἀποδίδωμι	מַעֲשֵׂה (sg.)	ἔργον (pl.)
Ps 94:2 ⁵	שוב	ἀποδίδωμι	גְּמוּלָה (sg.)	ἀνταπόδομα (sg.)
Ps 94:23 ⁶	שוב	ἀποδίδωμι	אָן (sg.)	ἀνομία (sg.)
	צמה	ἀφανיῶ	רָעָה (sg.) + בֵּר	πονηρία (sg.)
Ps 103:10 ⁷	עשה	ποιέω	חַטָּא (pl.)	ἁμαρτία (pl.)
	גמל	ἀνταποδίδωμι	יָצַח (pl.)	ἀνομία (pl.)
Prov 19:17	שלם	ἀνταποδίδωμι	גְּמוּלָה (sg.)	δόμα (sg.)
Prov 24:12	שוב	ἀποδίδωμι	פַּעַל (sg.)	ἔργον (pl.)

1 MT = 18:21; LXX = 17:21
2 MT = 19:25; LXX = 17:25
3 LXX = 27:4
4 LXX = 61:13
5 LXX = 93:2
6 LXX = 93:23
7 LXX = 102:10

* If underlined, the noun is used as a *standard* (“according to . . .”).

Eccl 12:14	[יבא במשפט]	[ἄξει ἐν κρίσει]	מעשה (sg.)	ποίημα (sg.)
Isa 59:18	שלם	ἀνταποδίδωμι	גמלה (pl.)	ἀνταπόδοσις (sg.)
	שלם	— ⁸	גמול (sg.)	—
Isa 66:6	שלם	ἀνταποδίδωμι	גמול (sg.)	ἀνταπόδομα (sg.)
Jer 16:18	שלם	ἀνταποδίδωμι	תַּחֲסֹאֲתָא (sg.)	ἀδικία/ἀμαρτία (pl.)
Jer 17:10	נתן	δίδωμι	דָּרַךְ (pl.)	ὁδός (pl.)
			פְּרִי מַעֲלָל	καρπὸς τ. ἐπιτηδευμάτων (pl.)
Jer 21:14	פקד	— ⁹	פְּרִי מַעֲלָל	— ¹⁰
Jer 23:2	פקד	ἐκδικέω	רָעַ מַעֲלָל (sg.)	τ. πονηρὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα (pl.)
Jer 25:14	שלם	—	פָּעַל (sg.)	—
Jer 32:19 ¹¹	נתן	δίδωμι	דָּרַךְ (pl.)	ὁδός (sg.)
			פְּרִי מַעֲלָל	
Jer 51:6 ¹²	שלם	ἀνταποδίδωμι	גמול (sg.)	ἀνταπόδομα (sg.)
Jer 51:24 ¹³	שלם	ἀνταποδίδωμι	רָעָה (sg.)	κακία (pl.)
Lam 3:64	שוב	ἀποδίδωμι	גמול (sg.)	ἀνταπόδομα (sg.)
			מַעֲשֵׂה יָדַי	ἔργον τ. χειρῶν (pl.)
Ezek 7:3 ¹⁴	שפט	ἐκδικέω	דָּרַךְ (pl.)	ὁδός (pl.) + ἐν
	נתן	δίδωμι	תּוֹצְבוֹת (pl.)	βδέλυγμα (pl.)
Ezek 7:4 ¹⁵	נתן	δίδωμι	דָּרַךְ (pl.)	ὁδός (sg.)
	היה	εἰμί	תּוֹצְבוֹת (pl.)	βδέλυγμα (pl.)
Ezek 7:8 ¹⁶	שפט	κρίνω	דָּרַךְ (pl.)	ὁδός (pl.) + ἐν
	נתן	δίδωμι	תּוֹצְבוֹת (pl.)	βδέλυγμα (pl.)
Ezek 7:9 ¹⁷	נתן	δίδωμι	דָּרַךְ (pl.)	ὁδός (pl.)
	היה	εἰμί	תּוֹצְבוֹת (pl.)	βδέλυγμα (pl.)
Ezek 7:27	עשה	ποιέω	דָּרַךְ (sg.) + מְ	ὁδός (pl.)
Ezek 18:30	שפט	κρίνω	דָּרַךְ (pl.)	ὁδός (sg.)
Ezek 24:14	שפט	κρίνω	דָּרַךְ (pl.)	ὁδός (pl.)
			עֲלִילָה (pl.)	ὁδός (pl.)
	—	κρίνω	—	αἷμα (pl.)
	—	κρίνω	—	ἐνθύμημα (pl.)
Ezek 33:20	שפט	κρίνω	דָּרַךְ (pl.)	ὁδός (pl.) + ἐν
Ezek 36:19	שפט	κρίνω	דָּרַךְ (sg.)	ὁδός (sg.)
			עֲלִילָה (pl.)	ἀμαρτία (sg.)
Hos 4:9	פקד	ἐκδικέω	דָּרַךְ (pl.)	ὁδός (pl.)
	שוב	ἀνταποδίδωμι	מַעֲלָל (pl.)	διαβούλια (pl.)
Hos 12:2 ¹⁸	פקד	ἐκδικέω	דָּרַךְ (pl.)	ὁδός (pl.)
	שוב	ἀνταποδίδωμι	מַעֲלָל (pl.)	ἐπιτηδεύμα (pl.)
Hos 12:14 ¹⁹	נש	ἐκχέω	דָּם (pl.)	αἷμα (sg.)
	שוב	ἀνταποδίδωμι	תַּחֲסֹאֲתָא (sg.)	ὄνειδισμος (sg.)

⁸ See the recensions of Lucian and Origen.
⁹ Hexapla, Aquila & Theodotion: ἐπισκέψομαι.
¹⁰ Hexapla, Aquila & Theodotion: τὰ πονηρὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα (pl.).
¹¹ LXX = 39:19
¹² LXX = 28:6
¹³ LXX = 28:24
¹⁴ LXX = 7:7
¹⁵ LXX = 7:8
¹⁶ LXX = 7:5
¹⁷ LXX = 7:6
¹⁸ MT/LXX = 12:3
¹⁹ MT/LXX = 12:15

Joel 3:4 ²⁰	שוב	ἀνταποδίδωμι	גָּמול (sg.)	ἀνταπόδομα (sg.)
Joel 3:7 ²¹	שוב	ἀνταποδίδωμι	גָּמול (sg.)	ἀνταπόδομα (sg.)
Zech 1:6	עשה	ποιέω	בָּרַךְ (pl.)	ὁδός (pl.)
			מַעֲלֵל (pl.)	ἐπιτήδευμα (pl.)
Sir 11:26	שוב	ἀποδίδωμι	בָּרַךְ (pl.)	ὁδός (pl.)
Sir 16:12	שפט	κρίνω	מַפְעִיל (pl.)	ἔργον (pl.)
Sir 16:14	מצא	εὕρησει	מַעֲשֶׂה (pl.)	ἔργον (pl.)
Sir 17:23	— ²²	ἀποδίδωμι		ἀνταπόδομα (sg.)
Sir 35:23a ²³		ἀνταποδίδωμι		ἐκδίκησις (sg.)
Sir 35:24 ²⁴	שוב	ἀνταποδίδωμι	פָּעַל (sg.)	πρόξιος (pl.)
			גָּמול (sg.)	ἔργον (pl.)
			מַזְמִינָה (pl.)	ἐνθυμήματα (pl.)
1 Macc 7:42		κρίνω		κακία (sg.)

²⁰ MT/LXX = 4:4
²¹ MT/LXX = 4:7
²² No extant Hebrew text.
²³ LXX = 35:20b
²⁴ LXX = 35:22

APPENDIX II

MOTIF-TEXTS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT PSEUDEPIGRAPHHA

<u>Text</u>		<u>Function</u> ¹
Jub	5:11	J/M
	5:15	M
1 En	95:5	C/S
	100:7	C/S
PssSol	2:7	J
	2:16	J
	(2:25)	A
	2:34-35	P
	17:8-9	P/(J)
JosAsen	28:3	C
LAB	3:10	M
2 Bar	54:21	M

¹ P = Praise; J = Justification; A = Appeal; M = Motivation (for the righteous) to obedience; C = Comfort; S = Sentence/threat of condemnation. Cf. pp. 40-41 above.

APPENDIX III

MOTIF TEXTS IN THE QUMRAN LITERATURE

	<u>Function</u> ¹	<u>Verb</u>	<u>Object/Standard</u> ²	<u>Ind. Object</u>
1QS II,7-8	S	(ארור)	<u>בחושך מעשיכה</u> (sg.-pl.)	
1QS X,11	J	יכח משפט	<u>כנעתית</u> (pl.)	
1QS X,17-18	B	שלם	גמול (sg.)	לאיש
1QH IV,18-19	S/P	שפט	<u>ברוב פשעיהם/כגלוליהם</u> (pl./sg.-pl.)	
1QH V,5-6	C	שפט (לוא)	<u>כאשמתי</u> (sg.)	
1QH XIV,24	P	פקד	עון רשעים (sg.)	[עליהם]
1QM VI,6	P	שלם	גמול רעתם (sg.)	לכול גוי הבל
1QM XI,13-14	P(M/J)	השיב	גמול רשעים (sg.)	בראש אויביכם
1QM XVIII,14	P(M)	השיב	גמול רשעים (sg.)	לאויביכה
CD III,4-5	M	ענש	<u>לפי משגותם</u> (pl.)	
CD V,15-16	M	פקד	מעשיהם (pl.)	
CD VII,9 (=XIX,6)	M	השיב	גמול רשעים (sg.)	עליהם
1QpHab XII,2-3	M	שלם	גמול (sg.)	לו
4QpPs37 IV,9	C	שלם	גמול (sg.)	

¹ Praise; Justification; Motivation to obedience; Comfort; Sentence; Theological Basis against inter-personal retribution.

² Where a standard ("according to...") is present rather than a direct object, it will be underlined.

BIBLIOGRAPHY¹

- Andre, G. *Determining the Destiny, PQD in the Old Testament*. ConB OTSeries, vol. 19. Lund: Gleerup, 1980.
- Aono, T. *Die Entwicklung des paulinischen Gerichtsgedankens bei den apostolischen Vätern*. Europäische Hochschulschriften, vol. 23, no. 137. Bern: n.p., 1979.
- Bassler, Jouette M. "Divine Impartiality in Paul's Letter to the Romans." *NovT* 26, no. 1 (1984):43-58.
- , *Divine Impartiality: Paul and a Theological Axiom*. SBLDS, vol. 59. Chico, CA: Scholars, 1982.
- Baus, Karl. *Der Kranz in Antike und Christentum*. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1940.
- Beardslee, W. A. *Human Achievement and Divine Vocation in the Message of Paul*. London: SCM, 1961.
- Becker, Jürgen. *Das Heil Gottes: Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament*. SUNT 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.
- Beker, J. Christiaan. *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark Ltd., 1980.
- Berger, Klaus. "Zu den sogenannten Sätzen Heiligen Rechtes." *NTS* 17 (1970):10-40.
- Bornkamm, G. *Paul*. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
- Bousset, Wilhelm, and H. Gressmann. *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*. 3d ed. HNT. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1926.
- Brandon, S. G. F. *The Judgment of the Dead: The Idea of Life After Death in the Major Religions*. New York: Scribner, 1969.
- Braun, Herbert. *Gerichtsgedanke und Rechtfertigungslehre bei Paulus*. UzNT. Leipzig: Hinrich'sche, 1930.
- , *Qumran und das Neue Testament*. 2 vols. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1966.
- , "Vom Erbarmen Gottes über den Gerechten: Zur Theologie der Psalmen Salomos." In *Gesammelte Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt*, 8-69. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1971 [= ZNW 43 (1950/1951):1-54].

¹ This selective bibliography includes generally only those works consulted which have primary significance for the issue of judgment in second temple Judaism or Paul. Thus, there are few commentaries, reference works of a more general nature, or works dealing with only a single text or document, although quite a number of these have been cited in the footnotes.

- Brocke, M. "Tun und Lohn im nachbiblischen Judentum: Ein Diskussionsbeitrag." *BibLeb* 8 (1967):166-78.
- Broer, Ingo. "Das Ius Talionis im Neuen Testament." *NTS* 40, no. 1 (1994):1-21.
- Brun, L. *Segen und Fluch im Urchristentum*. Oslo: Dybwad, 1932.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. 8th ed. Uni-Taschenbücher 630. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1980.
- Büchler, Adolph. *Types of Jewish-Palestinian Piety from 70 B.C.E to 70 C.E.* New York: KTAV, 1922 [repr. 1968].
- Carson, D. A. *Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility: Biblical Perspectives in Tension*. MTL. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1981.
- Charette, Blaine B. *The Theme of Recompense in Matthew's Gospel*. JSNTSupp, vol. 79. Sheffield: JSOT, 1992.
- Charles, R. H. *A Critical History of the Doctrine of Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity*. London, 1899 [repr. *Eschatology: The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism and Christianity (a Critical History)*. New York: Schocken Books, 1963].
- Collins, R. F. "The Berith-Notion of the Cairo Damascus Covenant and Its Comparison with the NT." *ETL* 39 (1963):555-94.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *Grundriss der Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. 2d ed. EETH 2. Munich: Kaiser, 1968.
- Cosgrove, Charles H. "Justification in Paul: A Linguistic and Theological Reflection." *JBL* 106 (1987):653-70.
- Cossmann, W. *Die Entwicklung des Gerichtsgedankens bei den alttestamentlichen Propheten*. BZAW 29. Gießen: A Töpelmann, 1915.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *The Epistle to the Romans*. 2 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Ltd., 1979.
- , "'The Works of the Law' in the Epistle to the Romans." *JSNT* 43 (1991):89-101.
- Davies, Glenn N. *Faith and Obedience in Romans: A Study in Romans 1-4*. JSOT-Supp, vol. 39. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.
- Davies, Philip R. "Eschatology at Qumran." *JBL* 104, no. 1 (1985):39-55.
- Davies, William D. *Jewish and Pauline Studies*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- , *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*. 4th ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.
- Devor, Richard C. *The Concept of Judgment in the Epistles of Paul*. Ph.D. Diss. Drew Univ. 1959.
- Disley, E. "Degrees of Glory: Protestant Doctrine and the Concept of Rewards Hereafter." *JTS* n.s., 42, no. 1 (1991):77-105.

- Donfried, Karl P. "Justification and Last Judgment in Paul." *Int* 30 (1976):140-52.
- Du Toit, Andreas B. "Faith and Obedience in Paul." *Neotestamentica Pretoria* 25, no. 1 (1991):65-74.
- Dunn, James D. G. "Echoes of Intra-Jewish Polemic in Paul's Letter to the Galatians." *JBL* 112, no. 3 (1993):459-77.
- , *Jesus, Paul and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians*. London/Louisville: SPCK/Westminster, 1990.
- , "The New Perspective on Paul." *BJRL* 65, no. 2 (1983):95-122.
- , *Romans*. 2 vols. WBC, vol. 38. Dallas: Word, 1988.
- , "Works of the Law and the Curse of the Law (Galatians 3.10-14)." *NTS* 31 (1985):523-42.
- , "Yet Once More - 'The Works of the Law': A Response." *JSNT* 46 (1992):99-117.
- Eichrodt, Walther. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Translated by J. A. Baker. 2 vols. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961 [= *Theologie des Alten Testaments*. 6th ed., 1959].
- Eisenbeis, Walter. *Die Wurzel shlm im Alten Testament*. BZAW, vol. 113. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1969.
- Elliott, Neil. *The Rhetoric of Romans: Argumentative Constraint and Strategy in Paul's Dialogue with Judaism*. JSNTSupp, vol. 45. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.
- Fabry, Heinz-Josef. *Die Wurzel ŠÛB in der Qumran-Literatur*. BBB. Köln/Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1975.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Filson, Floyd. *St. Paul's Conception of Recompense*. UNT 21. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche, 1931.
- Fischer, Ulrich. *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum*. BZNW. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1978.
- Flusser, David. "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-pauline Christianity." In *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by C. Rabin and Y. Yadin. *ScrHier*. Vol. 4., 215-66. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1965.
- Freed, Edwin D. *The Apostle Paul, Christian Jew: Faithfulness and Law*. Lanham/New York/London: University Press of America, 1994.
- Fuller, Ruth Marion. *A Pauline Understanding of Rewards: Its Background and Expression in First Corinthians*. Ph.D. Diss. Fuller Theological Seminary. 1991.
- Gammie, John G. "The Theology of Retribution in the Book of Deuteronomy." *CBQ* 32, no. 1 (1970):1-12.

- Garlington, Don B. "The Obedience of Faith in the Letter to the Romans. Part I: The Meaning of 'ΤΗΛΑΚΟΗ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ (Rom 1:5; 16:26)." *WTJ* 52 (1990):201-24.
- . "The Obedience of Faith in the Letter to the Romans: Part II, The Obedience of Faith and Judgment by Works." *WTJ* 53 (1991):47-72.
- Garnet, Paul. "Qumran Light on Pauline Soteriology." In *Pauline Studies: Essays Presented to Professor F.F. Bruce on His 70th Birthday*, 19-32. Exeter: Paternoster, 1980.
- . *Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls*. WUNT 2.ser. Vol. 3. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1977.
- Gaston, Lloyd. *Paul and the Torah*. Vancouver (BC): University of British Columbia, 1987.
- Green, W. S., ed. *Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice*. BJS, vol. 1. Missoula: Scholars, 1978.
- Griffiths, J. Gwyn. *The Divine Verdict: A Study of Divine Judgement in the Ancient Religions*. Studies in the History of Religions, NumenSup 52. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991.
- Gundry, Robert H. "Grace, Works, and Staying Saved in Paul." *Bib* 66 (1985):1-38.
- Gundry-Volf, Judith M. *Paul and Perseverance*. WUNT, vol. 2/37. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1990.
- Gunkel, Hermann. "Vergeltung im Alten Testament." In *Um das Prinzip der Vergeltung in Religion und Recht des Alten Testaments*, edited by Klaus Koch. Wege der Forschung. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972. Pp. 1-7 [=RGG. 2d ed. Vol. 5. 1931. Cols. 1529-33].
- Harris, J. G. "The Covenant Concept Among the Qumran Sectaries." *EQ* 39 (1967):86-92.
- Hasel, Gerhard F. *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*. 4th ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Haufe, Christoph. *Die sittliche Rechtfertigungslehre des Paulus*. Halle: VEB Max Neimeyer, 1957.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven and London: Yale University, 1989.
- Heilighenthal, Roman. "Soziologische Implikationen der Paulinischen Rechtfertigungslehre im Galaterbrief am Beispiel der 'Werke des Gesetzes.' Beobachtungen zur Identitätsfindung einer frühchristlichen Gemeinde." *Kairos* 26 (1984):38-53.
- . *Werke als Zeichen, Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung der menschlichen Taten im Frühjudentum, neuen Testament und Frühchristentum*. WUNT, vol. 2/9. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983.

- Hengel, Martin. *Judentum und Hellenismus: Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palestinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jh.s v. Chr.* WUNT 10. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1988.
- Hooker, Morna D. "Paul and Covenantal Nomism." In *Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of C. K. Barrett*, edited by Morna D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson, 47-56. London: SPCK, 1982.
- Hoyt, Samuel L. "The Judgment Seat of Christ and Unconfessed Sins." *BibSac* 137 (1980):32-40.
- ". "The Negative Aspects of the Christian's Judgment." *BibSac* 137 (1980):125-32.
- Huntjens, Johannes A. "Contrasting Notions of Covenant and Law in the Texts from Qumran." *RQ* 8 (1974):361-80.
- Hübner, Hans. "Gal 3:10-12 und die Herkunft des Paulus." *KuD* 19 (1973):215-31.
- ". "Pauli Theologiae Proprium." *NTS* 26 (1980):445-73.
- ". "Was heißt bei Paulus 'Werke des Gesetzes'?" In *Glaube und Eschatologie, FS Werner Georg Kümmel zum 80. Geburtstag*, edited by E. Gräßer and O. Merk, 123-33. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1985.
- Jewett, Robert. *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings*. AGJU, vol. 10. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971.
- Joest, Wilfried. *Gesetz und Freiheit: Das Problem des Tertius Usus Legis bei Luther und die neutestamentliche Paränese*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968.
- Karner, F. K. *Die Bedeutung des Vergeltungsgedankens für die Ethik Jesu, dargestellt im Anschluss an die synoptischen Evangelien*. Oedenburg-Sopron: n.p., 1927.
- Käsemann, Ernst. "Gottesgerechtigkeit bei Paulus." In *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, 181-93. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964 [= *ZTK* 58 (1961) 367-78].
- ". *An die Römer*. HNT, vol. 8A. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1973.
- ". "Sätze Heiligen Rechtes im Neuen Testament." In *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, 69-82. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964 [= *NTS* 1 (1954/55) 248-60. ET: "Sentences of Holy Law." In *New Testament Questions of Today*, 66-81. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969].
- Klostermann, Ernst. "Die adäquate Vergeltung in Rm. 1:22-31." *ZNW* 32 (1933):1-6.
- Koch, Klaus. "Gibt es ein Vergeltungsdogma im Alten Testament?" *ZTK* 52 (1955):1-42.
- ". "Der Spruch 'Sein Blut bleibe auf seinem Haupt'" In *Um das Prinzip der Vergeltung in Religion und Recht des Alten Testaments*, edited by Klaus Koch, 432-56. Wege der Forschung. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972 [= *VT*, vol 12 (1962) 396-416].

- Kuck, David W. *Judgment and Community Conflict: Paul's Use of Apocalyptic Judgment Language in 1 Corinthians 3:5-4:5*. NovTSup, vol. 66. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992.
- Kuhn, Heinz-Wolfgang. "Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Galaterbriefes." In *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992*, edited by George J Brooke, 169-221. Leiden/New York/Köln: E. J. Brill, 1994.
- . "The Impact of the Qumran Scrolls on the Understanding of Paul." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, edited by Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport, 327-39. STDJ 10. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992.
- Kuntz, J. Kenneth. "The Retribution Motif in Psalmic Wisdom." *ZAW* 89 (1971):223-33.
- Kühl, D. Ernst. *Rechtfertigung auf Grund Glaubens und Gericht nach den Werken bei Paulus*. Königsberg i. Pr.: Wilh. Koch, 1904.
- Laato, Timo. *Paulus und das Judentum: Anthropologische Erwägungen*. Abo: Abo Academy Press, 1991.
- Licht, J. "The Doctrine of the Thanksgiving Scroll." *IEJ* 6, no. 1 (1956):1-13, 89-101.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. "From Wrath to Justification: Tradition, Gospel and Audience in the Theology of Romans 1:18-4:25." In *SBLSP 1993*, edited by E. H Lovering, Jr., 194-226. SBLSPS 32. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Lindars, Barnabas. "Ezekiel and Individual Responsibility." *VT* 15 (1965):452-67.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst. "Gesetzeswerke." In *Probleme Paulinischer Theologie*, 31-74. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, n.d.
- Low, Douglas A. *Apocalyptic Motivation in Pauline Paraenesis*. Ph.D. Diss. Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. 1988.
- Lund, N. W. *Chiasmus in the New Testament*. Chapel Hill: Univ. of No. Carolina, 1942.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Das Geschichtsverständnis des Paulus*. Munich: Kaiser, 1968.
- Maier, Gerhard. *Mensch und freier Wille: Nach den jüdischen Religionsparteien zwischen Ben Sira und Paulus*. WUNT. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1971.
- Malherbe, Abraham J. *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*. Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University, 1977.
- Martin, Ralph P. *2 Corinthians*. WBC 40. Dallas, TX: Word, 1986.
- Mattern, Luise. *Das Verständnis des Gerichtes bei Paulus*. ATANT, vol. 47. Zürich and Stuttgart: Zwingli, 1966.
- Meeks, Wayne. "Judgement and the Brother: Romans 14,1-15,13." In *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament: Essays in Honor of E. Earle Ellis*, edited by Gerald Hawthorne, 290-300. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

-----, *The First Urban Christians*. New Haven: Yale University, 1983.

Melinek, A. "The Doctrine of Reward and Punishment in Biblical and Early Rabbinic Writings." In *Essays Presented to Chief Rabbi Israel Brodie*, edited by H. J. Zimmels, 275-90. London: n.p., 1967.

Michel, Otto. "Der Lohngedanke in der Verkündigung Jesu." *ZST* 9 (1932):47-54.

Miller, Patrick D., Jr. *Sin and Judgment in the Prophets: A Stylistic and Theological Analysis*. SBLMS. Chico, CA: Scholars, 1982.

Miner, Paul S. *The Obedience of Faith: The Purposes of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans*. SBT (2d ser.) 19. Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1971.

Moo, Douglas. "Romans 2: Saved Apart from the Gospel?" In *Through No Fault of Their Own? The Fate of Those Who Have Never Heard*, edited by Wm. V. Crockett and James G. Sigountos, 137-45. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1991.

-----, "'Law,' 'Works of the Law,' and Legalism in Paul." *WTJ* 45 (1983):73-100.

Moore, George Foot. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, the Age of the Tannaim*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard, 1954.

Morris, Leon. *The Biblical Doctrine of Judgment*. London: Tyndale, n.d.

Moule, C. F. D. "Jesus, Judaism, and Paul." In *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament: Essays in Honor of E. Earle Ellis*, edited by Gerald Hawthorne, 43-52. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

Münchow, Christoph von. *Ethik und Eschatologie: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik mit einem Ausblick auf das Neue Testament*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.

Nicholson, Ernest W. *God and His People: Covenant and Theology in the OT*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1986.

Nielsburg, George W. E., Jr. *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. HTS. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1972.

-----, and Michael E. Stone, comps. *Faith and Piety in Early Judaism: Texts and Documents*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

Nötscher, Friedrich. *Zur Theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte*. BBB 10. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1956.

Pesch, Wilhelm. *Der Lohngedanke in der Lehre Jesu, verglichen mit der religiösen Lohnlehre des Spätjudentums*. Münchener Theologische Studien, vol. 1/7. Munich: Zink, 1955.

-----, "Der Sonderlohn für die Verkündiger des Evangeliums." In *Festschrift für J. Schmid: Neutestamentliche Aufsätze*, edited by J. Blinzler and Otto Kuss. Regensburg, 1963.

Preuß, Horst Dietrich, ed. *Eschatologie im Alten Testament*. Wege der Forschung. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1978.

- Pryke, John. "Eschatology in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Scrolls and Christianity*, edited by Matthew Black, 45-57. Theological Collections II. London: SPCK, 1969.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Theologie des Alten Testaments*. 2 vols. Einführung in die evangelische Theologie, vol. 1. München: Kaiser, 1957.
- Raitt, T. M. "The Prophetic Summons to Repentance." *ZAW* 83 (1971):30-49.
- Räsänen, Heikki. *Paul and the Law*. 2d ed. WUNT, vol. 29. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1987.
- Reiser, Marius. *Die Gerichtspredigt Jesu: Eine Untersuchung zur eschatologischen Verkündigung Jesu und ihrem frühjüdischen Hintergrund*. NTAbh n.s., vol. 23. Münster: Aschendorff, 1990.
- Reventlow, H. Graf. "Sein Blut komme ueber sein Haupt." In *Um das Prinzip der Vergeltung in Religion und Recht des Alten Testaments*, edited by Klaus Koch, 412-31. Wege der Forschung. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972 [= VT 10 (1960) 311-27].
- Rhyne, Clyde T. *Faith Establishes the Law: A Study on the Continuity Between Judaism and Christianity: Romans 3:31*. Ph.D. Diss., Union Theological Seminary. 1979.
- Ridderbos, Hermann. *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*. Translated by J. R. DeWitt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.
- Ringgren, Helmer. *The Faith of Qumran*. Translated by Emilie T. Sander. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1963.
- Roetzel, Calvin J. *Judgement in the Community: A Study of the Relationship Between Eschatology and Ecclesiology in Paul*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.
- Sanders, E. P. *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE-66 CE*. London/Philadelphia: SCM/Trinity, 1992.
- . "On the Question of Fulfilling the Law in Paul and Rabbinic Judaism." In *Donum Gentilicum: New Testament Studies in Honour of David Daube*, edited by E. Bammel, Charles K. Barrett, and W. D. Davies, 103-26. Oxford: Clarendon, 1977.
- . "Patterns of Religion in Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: A Holistic Method of Comparison." *HTR* 66 (1973):455-78.
- . *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
- . *Paul, the Law and the Jewish People*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- Scharbert, Josef. "SHLM im Alten Testament." In *Um das Prinzip der Vergeltung in Religion und Recht des Alten Testaments*, edited by Klaus Koch, 300-24. Wege der Forschung. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972.
- . "Das Verbum PQD in der Theologie des Alten Testaments." Idem., 278-99 [= *BZ* 4 (1960) 209-26].

Schoeps, Hans Joachim. *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History*. Translated by H. Knight. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961.

Schreiner, Thomas R. "Is Perfect Obedience to the Law Possible? A Re-Examination of Galatians 3:10." *JETS* 27, no. 2 (1984):151-60.

-----, *The Law and Its Fulfillment: A Pauline Theology of Law*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993.

-----, "Paul and Perfect Obedience to the Law: An Evaluation of the View of E. P. Sanders." *WTJ* 47 (1985):245-78.

-----, "'Works of Law' in Paul." *NovT* 33, no. 3 (1991):217-44.

Scott, James M. "'FOR AS MANY AS ARE OF WORKS OF THE LAW ARE UNDER A CURSE' (Galatians 3.10)." In *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*, edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, 187-221. JSNTSup 83. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.

Seifrid, Mark. *Justification by Faith: The Origin and Development of a Central Pauline Theme*. NovTSup, vol. 68. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992.

Sloan, R. B. "Paul and the Law: Why the Law Cannot Save." *NovT* 33, no. 1 (1991):35-60.

Snodgrass, Klyne R. "Justification by Grace - to the Doers: An Analysis of the Place of Romans 2 in the Theology of Paul." *NTS* 32 (1986):72-93.

Stendahl, Krister. "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West." *HTR* 56 (1963):199-215.

Stowers, Stanley K. *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans*. SBLDS, vol. 57. Chico, CA: Scholars, 1981.

Stuhlmacher, Peter. *ET Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary*. Translated by Scott J. Hafemann. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1994 [= *Der Brief an die Römer*. NTD, vol. 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989].

Synofzik, Ernst. *Die Gerichts- und Vergeltungsaussagen bei Paulus: Eine traditions-geschichtliche Untersuchung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.

Theissen, Gerd. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity*. Edited and translated by J. H. Schütz. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Thielman, Frank. *From Plight to Solution, a Jewish Framework for Understanding Paul's View of the Law in Galatians and Romans*. NovTSup, vol. 61. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1989.

Thiselton, Anthony C. "The Meaning of SARX in 1 Corinthians 5:5, a Fresh Approach in the Light of Logical and Semantic Factors." *SJT* 26 (1973):204-28.

Towner, W. Sibley. "Retributional Theology in the Apocalyptic Setting." *USQR* 26 (1971):203-14.

Travis, Steven H. *Christ and the Judgment of God, Divine Retribution in the New Testament*. Foundations for Faith. UK: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1986.

- Tyson, Joseph B. "'Works of Law' in Galatians." *JBL* 92 (1973):423-31.
- Volz, Paul. *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1966 [orig. *Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba*. 2d ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1934].
- Wacker, M.-T. *Weltordnung und Weltgericht: Studien zu I Henoch 22*. Würzburg: Echter, 1982.
- Watson, Francis. *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1986.
- Watson, Nigel M. "Justified by Faith; Judged by Works - an Antinomy?" *NTS* 29 (1983):209-21.
- Weber, Ferdinand W. *Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften*. 2d ed. Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1897.
- Westerholm, Stephen. *Israel's Law and the Church's Faith: Paul and His Recent Interpreters*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Wetter, Gillis P. *Der Vergeltungsgedanke bei Paulus: Eine Studie zur Religion des Apostels*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1912.
- Wilckens, Ulrich. *Der Brief an die Römer*. 3 vols. EKK, vol. 6/1-3. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchen, 1978-82.
- . "Was heißt bei Paulus: 'Aus Werken des Gesetzes wird kein Mensch gerecht'?" In *Recht fertigung als Freiheit: Paulusstudien*, 81-104. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1974.
- Wright, Nicholas Thomas. *The New Testament and the People of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God, vol. 1. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Würthwein, Ernst. "The Old Testament Belief in Recompense." In *TDNT*, edited by G. Kittel, translated by G. Bromiley, 4:706-12. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.
- Ziesler, J. A. *The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul*. Cambridge: University Press, 1972.
- Zmijewski, Josef. *Der Stil der paulinischen 'Narrenrede'* BBB 52. Köln/Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1978.